



Child Labour Free Zones Country Report: India

By Andante - tools for thinking

Asmita Basu and Ananda Millard

17.05.2015



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report is a case study of Mamipudi Venkatarangaiya Foundation (MVF)'s work in India, with a particular focus on the application of the area based 'Child-Labour-Free-Zone Approach' ('CLFZ approach')—used to eradicate child labour by bringing children into the formal education system. A central element of the CLFZ model is its adaptability. Over the years the approach has been implemented in a variety of areas—in other states in the India and internationally (in Africa).

The CLFZ approach is based on the belief that poverty is only one of several factors that compel child labor and is not the most important one. Hence the approach proposes that an effective way to eradicate child labor is to ensure children gain access to education. Using this approach, MVF has mobilized parents and communities, provided 'bridge' support to reduce the gap between an illiterate child/child laborers and the school system, and facilitated the improvement of the quality of education as a means to increase retention rates. Its emphasis on supplementing State efforts is in keeping with a rights based approach that demands that the State to provide better facilities for children and supports their parents. MVF has primarily focused on the 5-14 age group.

During this evaluation the application of the CLFZ approach in MVF experiences in two states in India were examined:

- *Telengana* where the approach was applied the longest was examined to answer questions on sustainability, and
- *Bihar* where the approach is currently being applied was examined to answer questions on effectiveness.

A broader review of MVF's work over the past two decades was also conducted to present a historical profile of the organization. A variety of data collection methods were utilized during this evaluation including literature reviews, key informant interviews, focus group discussions and recording observations. Sites for field visits were chosen in consultation with MVF staff by applying purposive and stratified random sampling methods. In total 11 project sites in Bihar (Vaishali district) and 12 project sites in Telengana (Ranga Reddy and Nalgonda districts) were visited. Progress towards achieving CLFZ outcomes was assessed in all project sites. Field visits were also undertaken to areas adjoining project sites to examine spread effects and prepare a counterfactual situational analysis.

There were contextual and programmatic variations in each state in terms of—the size of the zone declared CLFZ (villages in Telengana and smaller wards/Tolas within villages in Bihar), length of implementation period (in Telengana the programme has been implemented for nearly two decades, whereas in Bihar it has been running for the past five years only), program focus areas (the program in Bihar focuses particularly on improving quality of education in schools), etc. Overall, MVF has declared 907 villages, in the two districts visited in Telengana and 25 Tolas in Bihar, CLFZ. All villages visited in Telengana had been declared CLFZs and 11 out of 14 Tolas visited in Bihar had been declared CLFZ. The MVF declares an area a CLFZ by assessing progress against a set of predefined outcomes. These include: 1) changes in social norms; 2) the establishment of supportive environments in schools; 3) the existence of community ownership; 4) the enrollment of all children in school; 5) the removal of all children from work. These outcomes have been strictly defined

in an effort to deliver simple messages. However, it is noted that there is a contradiction between the absolute nature of the messages and the declaration of CLFZ, which do not always meet the criteria in a very strict sense. Rather, it would be more accurate to say that MVF has been able to create environments where the community, together with the government, is jointly working towards attaining CLFZ objectives. Indeed it is important to note that achieving the full range of CLFZ outcomes may remain as a permanent work in progress. Still there has been considerable progress, and this can be attributed to some key factors and strategies applied including—mobilizing communities, using non-negotiable principles, recruiting volunteers locally, length of the program, engagements with administrative officials, creating a range of community collectives and involving existing collectives (such as youth groups and women's groups) to deliver program interventions at the ground level, maintaining data collection systems, facilitating children's access to schools and planned phasing out of activities.

In terms of the effectiveness of CLFZ projects, MVF's Bihar project has been effective in improving school enrollments, although irregularities in attendance were reported as a concern in sites where MVF has phased out its support. Its pilot interventions to improve the quality of education in schools have demonstrated successful models for replication. The examination of the Telengana experience shows that efforts to establish CLFZ, or more precisely to enable the achievement of a CLFZ can be sustainable. Areas visited continued to demonstrate solid success even multiple years after MVF had left. It is clear that MVF has a wealth of experience that it continues to benefit from. Over the years it has learned how and when to adapt projects to yield the best possible results. This is not to say that they always succeed, but rather that MVF has been able to identify the key elements, which it requires in order to attain a good output and is not shy to step away when those elements cannot be secured.

While MVF has made great progress, there are some key recommendations that can be highlighted here. MVF should consider:

- To engage in a mechanism that serves to ensure that the experience and knowledge gained by the CRPFs is effectively transferred to the SMCs, which have a statutory standing.
- To engage more actively in the protection of the rights of all children 0-18 years of age in Telengana. MVF has a wealth of experience on supporting child rights and can use this experience to target broader challenges.
- To support efforts to align policy and legislation on child labour with relevant policies and legislation on child rights generally and rights to education specifically.
- To support the development of effective school attendance monitoring systems.

Cover Photo

This photo taken in the late 1990s shows CRPF members in Nalgonda District, Telengana, mobilizing villagers to send their children to school.

Photo credit: MVF

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to acknowledge the MVF team in Bihar and Telangana, particularly members of MVF's core team, volunteers, coordinators and organisers for facilitating field visits, sharing their insights and compiling documents. Special thanks are due to Dr. Shantha Sinha, Mr. Venkat Reddy, Mr T Yadaiah, and Mr. Bhaskar for their patience when explaining the MVF philosophy and details of the interventions reviewed. Mr. Harsh Mander's inputs on the issue are also gratefully appreciated. Finally thanks are due to all the respondents mentioned in Annex 3 for generously giving their time to participate in discussions.

ABBREVIATIONS

Child Labour Act	Child Labour (Prohibition and Regulation) Act, 1986
CLFZ	Child Labour Free Zone
CRPF	Child Rights Protection Forum
DPEP	District Primary Education Program
GP	Gra, Panchayat
HS	High School
MS	Middle School
MVF	Mamidipudi Venkatarangaiya Foundation
NAFRE	National Alliance for the Right to Education
NCERT	National Council for Educational Research and Training
NCPCR	National Commission for the Protection of Child Rights
NPS	New Primary School
PS	Primary School
RBC	Residential bridge course
Right to Education Act	Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act, 2009
RTE	Right to Education
SCERT	State Council for Educational Research and Training
SCPCR	State Commission for the Protection of Child Rights
SKN	Stichting Kinderpostzegels Nederland
SMC	School Management Committees
SSA	Sarva Shikshya Abhiyan (Universal Education Mission)
TFCR	Teacher's Forum on Child Rights
UMS	Upper Middle School

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	2
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	4
ABBREVIATIONS	5
TABLE OF CONTENTS	6
CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION.....	8
1.1 Background	8
1.2 Theory of Change.....	11
1.3 Purpose of Evaluation.....	12
1.4 Evaluation Methods	12
CHAPTER 2. HAVE CLFZS BEEN CREATED?.....	17
2.1 What is a CLZF?.....	17
2.2 How many areas have been targeted? How many CFLZs have been created?	17
2.3 To what extent are CLFZ actually child labor free?	20
2.4 What are the factors that make a CLFZ work?.....	24
CHAPTER 3. CLFZ PROJECTS	28
3.1 Project Objectives.....	28
3.2 Project Implementation	28
3.3 Project Outcomes	29
3.4 Effectiveness	29
CHAPTER 4. IMPORTANCE OF CONTEXT.....	33
4.1 The political environment and policy framework.....	33
4.2 The economic environment.....	34
4.3 Social cohesiveness and equity	34
4.4 Accountability and empowerment	35
CHAPTER 5. CHANGE OUTSIDE THE INTERVENTION AREA	37
5.1 Dissemination of the model and evidence of spread effects.....	37

5.2 Evidence of Spread Effect	39
5.3 The counterfactual situation	39
CHAPTER 6. SUSTAINABILITY	41
6.1 What is it that is sustained (or hoped to be sustained)?	41
6.2 Threats to sustainability	42
6.3 Contextual factors contributing to sustainability	43
6.4 Mechanisms that build sustainability	44
7. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	47
Bibliography	48
ANNEX 1. TERMS OF REFERENCE	Error! Bookmark not defined.
ANNEX 2. Tools for Data Collection	58
ANNEX 3. LIST OF RESPONDENTS	64
Additional Annexes:	
Annex A- Number of withdrawn from labor and mainstreamed into formal schools	
Annex B- Time line of MVF activities	
Annex C- Contextualizing MVF's work in Bihar's administrative structure	
Annex D- Impact of policy advocacy in nationally and in Andhra Pradesh	
Annex E- List of NGO partners	

CHAPTER 1.

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

Mamidipudi Venkatarangaiya Foundation (MVF) was established in 1981 in Andhra Pradesh¹ and initially focused on issues of land, housing, minimum wage, the running of cooperatives and non-formal education centers. Over time, MVF realized the link between low wages and bonded labor (which included child labor), which led it, in 1991, to start working against child labor in three villages in the Ranga Reddy district in Andhra Pradesh. That year it released and rehabilitated 15 child laborers.² By 2002, in recognition of its successful efforts, other state governments began inviting MVF to replicate its innovative methods elsewhere. As of 2014, MVF works in five states (Telangana, Tamil Nadu, Bihar, Madhya Pradesh, Chhattisgarh), either directly or in collaboration with state governments, and has successfully brought 1,051,532 children in the 5-14 age group into schools.³

MVF's goal is to eradicate child labor by ensuring that all children attend full-time regular school, either government-run or private. Although it initially supported non-formal education and open school initiatives, it no longer does so, arguing that such initiatives enable child labor, by implicitly allowing children to engage in full time work during school hours.⁴

MVF's emphasis on education is in keeping with constitutional guarantees on the right to education and the Government of India's Right to Education Act, 2009 (Right to Education Act). MVF's effective advocacy for policy reform is reflected in the fact that the Right to Education Act institutionalizes many of MVF's principles, methodologies, and initiatives.

MVF has pioneered an area-based approach with the introduction of Child Labor Free Zones (CLFZ) based on the following "fundamental beliefs"⁵:

- All forms of child labor can be eliminated
- Parents want a better future for their children.
- Parents are willing and capable of making the necessary sacrifices to ensure that the child does not go to work but to school instead.
- Communities want the norm 'no child should work'.

¹ In 2014, Andhra Pradesh was reorganised into two states: Andhra Pradesh and Telangana. MVF's project areas now mostly fall in Telangana state territory. Consequently, this document refers to MVF's work in Telangana, but older documents prepared before 2014 will refer to its work in Andhra Pradesh.

² Purushottam, Shome, Vissa. 2014. Impact Assessment of the Quality Improvement in the Primary Education Programme in Nalgonda District. n.p. Hyderabad. January

³ MVF. Number of Children Withdrawn from Work and Mainstreamed into Formal Schools. Unpublished. See **Annex A**.

⁴ As argued by MVF's Shantha Sinha, "in proposing Non Formal Education as a major strategy for dealing with illiteracy among working children, the Government has failed to realize the potential of formal primary education as a powerful tool for withdrawing children from work...[it is] assert[ed] that compulsory education, at least at the primary level, is not only desirable but also a viable and practicable solution to the problem of increasing child labor." See Sinha, Shantha. 1996. *Child Labor and Education Policy in India*. The Administrator, Vol: XLI, July-September.

⁵ MVF. 2008. An Introduction for Organizations Considering the Use of the Area-based Approach to Eliminate Child Labor and Universalise Education. N.P. Hyderabad. Also see Bharadwaj. 2008. Handbook for Organizations for the 'Area Based Approach' to Eliminate Child Labor and Universalize Education. n.p. MVF. May.

- Communities can be mobilized to plan and implement programs to ensure no child works but goes to school.
- Professionals and functionaries of the system want to fulfil their professional responsibilities.

Further, MVF outlines the following Charter of Basic Principles for Emancipation of Child Labor, also known as the “non-negotiables”:⁶

- All children must attend full-time formal day schools
- Any child out of school is a child laborer.
- All labor is hazardous and harms the overall growth and development of the child.
- There must be total abolition of child labor. Any law regulating child work is unacceptable
- Any justification perpetuating the existence of child labor must be condemned.

According to MVF, its “programme has been implemented in a variety of areas (forest regions, coastal belts, deserts and dry land farms) and has been adopted by diverse groups of people (among fisherfolk, nomads, tribal people, migrants, landless poor, agricultural laborers and quarry workers)”⁷—and despite all the contextual differences and variation in the experiences of different groups the response has been consistently positive. It is this ‘CLFZ approach’ that is being examined in this evaluation.

Over the last two-and-a-half decades, MVF has expanded its target group, focus issues, and implementing partners: from working on child labor/education issues in the 5-14 age group, it has (in different project areas) monitored all rights of children in the 0-18 age group, by addressing issues such as quality of education, child marriage, girl children’s education, health, and nutrition; and actively partnering with local institutions and collectives to ensure sustainability. Additionally, it has provided technical expertise in government initiatives aimed at child labor/education.⁸

Budget allocation

Major donors of MVF include: HIVOS, UNDP, UNICEF, NCLP, SKN, ILO, CRS, Action Aid, CRY, Ford Foundation, MacArthur Foundation, and the Government of India.

During the 2001-2009 period the MFV utilized in excess of 5.5 Million EUR for CLFZ related interventions (see the table below)

⁶ Bharadwaj. *Op. cit.*

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ Wazir, Rekha and Saith, Ashwani. 2009. *Universalising Child Rights: A Review of M.V. Foundation’s Achievements and Future Directions*. Secunderabad: M.V. Foundation. December.

Table 1 MVF Utilization of Funds for the 2001-2009

Year	Total INR	Total in EUR
2001-2001 (March to April)*	20 537 379	289 929
2002-2003(March to April)***	38 425 109	542 584
2003-2004(March to April)**	38 469 687	730 738
2004-2005(March to April)*	45 068 099	792 571
2006 (January-December)**	37 800 967	535 191
2007 (January to December) *	43 952 308	621 011
2008 (January to December)**	65 629 421	926 654
2009 (January to December)**	80 940 358	1 143 177

* Budget in both Euro and INR

** Budget in rupees only

**Budget in EUR only

Data has been rounded and some disparity may exist as where exchanges were not available the currency was exchanged at current rates.

Background information on the MVF project sites visited

For this evaluation, we have focused on two specific areas in India- Telengana and Bihar. As aforementioned, this study examines the CLFZ approach applied in two states in India— Telengana, where the approach was piloted and has been applied the longest; and Bihar where the approach is currently being applied.

MVF has worked in Telengana since 1991. Its focus has included 14 districts and has targeted 5,18,642 who have been enrolled into formal schools.⁹ As of 2014, 476 villages in Ranga Reddy district – where MVF has its longest presence – remain CLFZ.¹⁰ Telengana also serves as a testing ground for MVF's theory of change. The CLFZ programme under review in Telengana was supported by HIVOS and completed in 2009.

Upon the invitation of the state government, MVF began work in Bihar's Vaishali district in 2007 as part of the Sarva Siksha Abhiyaan (SSA, the Central Government's Comprehensive Universal Education Mission). "The core elements of the MVF intervention [in Bihar included]... identifying children [laborers and those] who were not in school, putting them in short-duration residential bridge courses to cover the 'learning gap', and finally, putting them back in appropriate grades in [local] government schools. This approach reaffirmed MVF's philosophy of supplementing and not substituting State efforts"¹¹ and also supporting the State in identifying alternatives, which are viable/scalable.

MVF's work in Bihar has proceeded in phases with funding support from SKN. MVF now works in 16 panchayats of the Lalganj block in Vaishali district with an emphasis on

⁹ MVF. Number of Children Withdrawn from Work and Mainstreamed into Formal Schools. Unpublished. See **Annex A**.

¹⁰ Data Compiled by MVF, April 2015.

¹¹ Priyam, Manisha. 2011. State-NGO Partnership for Bringing the Child Back In: The M.V. Foundation in Bihar. n.p.

strengthening the implementation of the Right To Education Act and improving the quality of education as a way to achieve universal retention.

This evaluation has focused on both effectiveness and sustainability. Since MVF has worked in Telengana since the start of the implementation of the CLFZ approach, and indeed has tested their theory of change there, it was found appropriate to return to some of the areas that had been targeted to examine the sustainability of the effort. Nalgonda and Ranga Reddy districts were, therefore, visited. In addition, MVF's work in Bihar was examined to respond to the questions of effectiveness.

1.2 Theory of Change

There is an ongoing debate about the link between child labour and poverty, and the direction of causality.¹² On the basis of its experience, MVF staunchly opposes the 'poverty argument', which purports that economic factors compel child labor, arguing that, in fact, poverty is only one of several factors that leads to child labor and, even then, is not the most important factor.¹³ Data indicates that the "threshold income for keeping a child out of work and in school is quite low and that most families have incomes in excess of this amount." Indeed, similar literacy rates between groups having dissimilar income levels as well as varying literacy rates between groups with the same income levels seem to suggest that sending a child to school had much to do with being accustomed to do so rather than the economic burden educating a child may place on the family."¹⁴ According to MVF, child labor is a result of a number of failures of the State. These include the failure to adequately combat poverty, the failure to enforce the implementation of laws protecting the rights to unorganized workers, the failure to institute adequate social protection mechanisms, the failure to provide adequate child day care services and the failure to provide quality and relevant education in schools or build a conducive learning environment.¹⁵ MVF counters the 'poverty argument' with the 'education argument', which "reverses the direction of causality and suggests that child labor is not only an effect of poverty but one of its important causes as well. The education argument suggests that investment in [good quality] education has spin off effects in reducing poverty by increasing access to higher value employment and consequently to a better life opportunities."¹⁶

MVF's interventions are based on the firm conviction that "parents, even poor parents, are not only capable of sending their children to formal daytime schools but are also willing to do so".¹⁷ Because MVF regards non-formal / part time education initiatives as a result of the poverty argument, it "rejects the need to provide for education to working children outside the working hours and has the formal school as the only means to universalise education and simultaneously eliminate child labor"¹⁸, both of which processes it sees as inseparable.

¹² Mander, Harsh on behalf of the National Advisory Council, Government of India. December 2011. Abolition of Child Labour and Implementation of Right to Education: A Brief Note. Unpublished.

¹³ Sinha, Shantha. Undated. *The Poverty Argument*. Secunderabad: MV Foundation. n.p.

¹⁴ Mander. *Op. cit.*

¹⁵ Mander. *Op. cit.*

¹⁶ Mander. *Op. cit.*

¹⁷ Sinha. *Op. cit.*

¹⁸ Sinha. *Op. cit.*

Indeed, any educational support to working children would be an implicit acceptance of child labor.

Hence, starting from the point of view that a majority of factors that influence parents' decisions regarding children's education/labor are non-economic, MVF focuses on the area based approach to respond to the challenge of eradicating child labor. Using this approach, MVF mobilizes parents and communities, provides 'bridge' support to reduce the gap between an illiterate child/child laborers and the school system, and improves the quality of education to increase retention rates. Its emphasis on supplementing State efforts is in keeping with a rights based approach that demands accountability from the State to provide better facilities¹⁹ for children and support to their parents.

1.3 Purpose of Evaluation

As per the Terms of Reference (ToR),²⁰ this evaluation has included an examination into both effectiveness and sustainability issues relating to the CLFZ approach. In order to assess effectiveness we focused on an area where MVF has an ongoing project (Bihar). In order to address questions of sustainability we have focused on work that has long been completed (Telengana). Additionally, MVF's work in India, in implementing projects in collaboration with various partner agencies, has been more broadly examined to prepare MVF's historical profile.²¹

In Telegana, the purpose of the evaluation was to examine the following questions:

- To what extent do social norms regarding abolition of child labor and compulsory children's education continue to exist even after MVF interventions have been phased out?
- To what extent have the processes introduced during the intervention continued to be implemented locally (organically) after the intervention phased out?
- What were the major factors which influenced the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the programme or project?
- What components of the intervention are required to maintain CLFZ status?

Questions on effectiveness examined in Bihar included:

- How the interventions were designed and have progressed?
- How the project areas compared to other areas?
- Any changes in the situation in project sites? and
- The degree to which the project site can be called a CLFZ?

1.4 Evaluation Methods

A variety of data collection methods were utilized. These included:

- Literature including project documents, previous evaluation reports, and other country level survey and other reports relevant to the issue of child labor and children's right to education, as well as on broader child rights issues, was reviewed.

¹⁹ In terms of education and protection

²⁰ See Annex 1

²¹ Please refer to **Annex B** for a timeline of MVF's work in India

- Field visits were conducted in Bihar and Telengana to understand experiences at the state, district and village levels.

Sites for field visits were chosen in consultation with MVF staff and volunteers on the basis of the guidelines detailed in the inception report as follows:

In Bihar, 11 school catchment areas (eight primary school catchment areas and three middle school catchment areas) in five Gram Panchayats were chosen in the Lalganj block of Vaishali district. As each school catchment area may cover more than one *Tola* (wards or smaller habitations within catchment areas) 14 *Tolas* were visited. Of these, 11 *Tolas* were declared CLFZs by MVF. For further details on the administrative context in which the CLFZ approach is applied in Bihar see **Annex C**.

Purposive sampling based on the following criteria was used to identify the schools visited:

- Longest project presence
- Shortest project presence
- Areas where most number of children were brought to school
- Areas with the most diverse population
- Areas with CLFZs despite having high rates of poverty

Details of the project sites visited are provided in the table 2. Details of project sites visited in Bihar was also entered into the truth table to facilitate the qualitative comparative analysis.

In addition two primary schools and four middle schools were visited in the adjoining block in Vaishali district to facilitate a counter-factual situation analysis.²²

In Telengana, eight blocks (or Mandals)²³ in Nalgonda and five blocks in Ranga Reddy districtis were visited. Stratified random sampling based on the following criteria was used to identify the areas visited:

- Longest project presence
- Shortest project presence
- Areas identified as “most difficult” by the MVF staff
- Areas with most diverse populations
- Areas with higher levels of migration and /or poverty.

Villages within the blocks were selected using purposive (in terms of ease of access) and random sampling methods. Details of project sites visited are provided in the table 3.

²² NPS Soharti, MS Soharti, NPS Soharti East, MS Chackakhali, UMS Mehpurakanya, UMS Hariprasad.

²³ Although visits to five project sites in Nalgonda were planned, a greater number was visited as some of the mandals visited had concluded the Axis Bank Foundation supported project on Quality Education in 2014. Hence, villages without this intervention were also visited to study sustainability issues.

Table 2 Details of projects visited in Bihar

Name of GP	Sr. no.	Catchment area	Tolas visited	Date visited	CLFZ*	Other criteria applied for site selection	Children brought into school (Boys + Girls)
Kartahan Bujurg	1	NPS Chhandwara	Paswan tola	25-26.2.15	Yes	Longest presence RBC in 2007	36+26=62
	2	NPS Purvi Tola	Purvi tola		Yes	Primary school adopted	11+6=17
Rikhar	3	UMS Pachrukhi	Ram tola, DilawarpurMa hato tola	27-28.2.15	No	2 nd phase Presence of youth groups and girl volunteers	19+23=42
	4	NPS Chakmanohar	Khatichakman ohar Tola Rikhar Mushahari Tola		Yes No	2 nd phase Primary school being monitored High poverty	27+18=45
EtwarpurSisaula	5	UMS SisolaEtwarpur	Yadav tola * Kumar tola	1.3.15	Yes	Most number of schools enrolled?	12+9=21
	6	NPS MadhusudhanPakri	School visited (SMC, Parents, Teachers meet)	2.3.15	Yes	Primary school adopted Most number of children enrolled	14+8=22
Laxminaray anpur	7	PS Koba-mohamaddpur Urdu school	Musalman tola	3.3.15	No	Predominantly muslim area	22+15=37
	8	NPS Kobamohammad-pur	Ram tola Kobamohamm ad-pur	3.3.15	Yes	Diverse area	11+18=29
	9	NPS BhagwanPakri	Koyritola Kanutola	4.3.15	Yes Yes	Most diversity Presence of muslims, backward classes as well as Rajputs.	22+26=48
Anwarpur	10	PS Arri	Paswantola Musalman tola	8-.3.15	Yes Yes	Phase 1 area with model primary school adopted	105+99=204
	11	UMS Prabodhi Narendra	Dhobitola	9.3.15	Yes	Phase 2 area with middle school adopted	20+16=36

*Declared CLFZ by MVF

Table 3 Details of projects visited: Telengana

Sl.N	Date	Block Name	Selection Criteria	Village Name
Nalgonda				
1	29.03.2015	Atmakur	Longest program presence	Tummalpen Pahad
2	30.03.2015	Nuthankal	Comparitively higher levels of migration	Gorentla
3	30.03.2015	Chivvemula	Most diverse population and with relatively significant tribal population	Munyanayak thanda
4	31.03.2015	Thirmalgiri	Most difficulties faced in the area	Phanigiri
5	01.04.2015	Penpahadu	MVF presence till 2014	Nagulapahad
6	01.04.2015	Munagala	Area with history of political movements	Kokkireni
7	02.04.2015	Nadigudem	Shortest project presence	Sriranagapuram
8	02.04.2015	Thungaturthy	Comparitively higher levels of child labor	Kuntapally
Ranga Reddy				
1	03.04.2015	Kothpally	Longest Project presence	Shankarpally
2	04.04.2015	Midimyala	Highest number of children mainstreamed in school	Chevalla
3	05.04.2015	Nagaram	Highest number of bonded labor released	Dharur
4	06.04.2015	Ennaram	Shortest project presence	Batwaram
5	07.04.2015	Ghanapur	Most difficulties faced in the area	Kulkacheria

*All villages visited in Telengana have been declared CLFZ by MVF

One visit each to villages adjoining MVF intervention sites (villages) in Ranga Reddy (Nakkalapally village, Moinabad mandal) and Nalgonda (Sri Rangapuram village, Nadigudem Mandal) was made to study spread effects. In Nalgonda district, a non-intervention village was also visited to facilitate a counterfactual situation analysis.

During village visits a series of interviews and focus group discussions were held.²⁴ These included, but were not limited, to MVF volunteers, members of MVF-initiated collectives,

²⁴ Local elected representatives (including ward members, Sarpanch, Mukhiyas, Panchayat Education Committee members) and political party members.

project partners, and administrative officials were met with at mandal and district headquarters as well as at the state level. A complete list of respondents is provided in **Annex 3**. In addition to interviews and focus group discussions, site visits to schools were also conducted and observations noted according to a standard observation checklist. Tools those were adapted for use in collecting data is provided in **Annex 2**.

Limitations

The study had a few shortcomings worth mentioning. First, as there is wide awareness among the community about the illegality of child labor and child marriage hence major under reporting on both these issues is known. In order to get some insights into these issues, without antagonizing respondents, indirect questions were asked. Second, no interviews were conducted with children because parental consent could not be obtained in time. However, some MVF girl volunteers and ex-bridge camp students, in the age group 16-18, were interviewed in the presence of community guardians and MVF community volunteers who organize and guide their activities with parental consent. Third, MVF volunteers/staff were present during some of the focused group discussions and meetings which may have influenced the respondents.

Guide to the reader

The report is divided into 7 Chapters. The following chapter—Chapter 2—Have CLFZs been created?—presents and compares data collected particularly from CLFZs in both states on applying the CLFZ approach. Chapter 3 focuses on CLFZ Projects focuses on MVFs Bihar program described earlier, which has been studied to assess effectiveness. Chapter 6 focuses on on the other hand focuses, on MVF's work in Telengana as sustainability issues are studied in detail. Chapter 4 provides a discussion on contextual factors that are implicated in the implementation of the program both in Telengana and Bihar. Chapter 5 focuses on dissemination, spread effects and counter factuals discusses data collected from MVF's records on broader interventions and methods of disseminating the CLFZ approach. Chapter 5 also presents findings from non-MVF intervention sites visited in both states. Recommendations and conclusions are provided in Chapter 7.

-
- Teachers (including head masters, teachers, additional teachers, teachers engaged in bridge courses, hostel authorities).
 - School Management Committee (SMC) members.
 - *Anganwadi* (state-supported crèche service) workers.
 - Ex-bridge school students.
 - Parents (including male and female parents of ex-bridge course students and parents whose children are currently attending school.)
 - Members of Child Rights Protection Forum (CRPF) at the village/Panchayat, mandal and district levels.
 - Members of Teacher's Forum on Child Rights (TFCR) at the mandal and district level.
 - Members of village level youth and girl volunteer groups, as well as members of women's self-help groups.
 - MVF volunteers/staff at the village, block, district and state levels.
 - Administrative officials and law enforcement officials (including staff and resource persons under the Sarva Sikhshya Mission, Education Officers at the Block level, Block Development Officers, etc.).
 - Representatives of State Council for Educational Research and Training and State Commission on the Protection of Child Rights as well as representatives of the state Women and Child Development Department and Labor Department in Telangana.
 - Representatives from civil society networks (Coalition against Child Labor and National Alliance for the Fundamental Right to Education).

While clearly the data collected far exceeds the information provided here, the focus in these pages has been on the questions delineated in the ToR and highlighted earlier in this chapter. Additional information compiled from MVF's documentation is provided in Annexures A-E.

CHAPTER 2. HAVE CLFZS BEEN CREATED?

2.1 What is a CLZF?

MVF pioneered the concept of the CLFZ based on its earlier work in Telengana in the late eighties. MVF defines a CLFZ as an area that meets the achieves the following outcomes/characteristics:²⁵

1. All children are in schools and enjoy their right to education in the project area.
2. The sustained norm within a community has become that 'no child should work'.
3. The school is developed as an institution that takes care of all aspects of a child's development.
4. Community takes ownership of child rights.
5. Neighboring communities change their norms.
6. Institutions are sensitized to reduce the barriers to communities changing their norm to 'no child should work'.
7. The project area becomes a resource center for all other areas in the country.

In India these characteristics are used to assess project sites in order declare them 'CLFZ'. These are also the indicators used to assess the extent to which CLFZs are actually child labor free in Section 2.3 below.

2.2 How many areas have been targeted? How many CFLZs have been created?

This section discusses and compares findings from intervention sites visited in the two states

In 1991, MVF began applying the CLFZ approach in three villages of Shankarpally Mandal of Ranga Reddy district.²⁶ "By 2000, MVF had implemented its programme in 18 mandals and 500 villages of Ranga Reddy district; 85 villages were now child labor free and 4,000 bonded laborers had been released...Every child in the 5-14 age group in 168 villages was in school and every child in the 5-11 age group in 400 villages was in school. This included 5,000 adolescent girls, a group traditionally denied education because they are forced into

²⁵ See Bharadwaj, *Op Cit.* N 5

²⁶ Marsden, Chris. 2009. *A Case Study on MVF*. Unpublished.

marriage.”²⁷ In the period 2001-2009 MVF applied the CLFZ approach in other districts in Telengana and as well as other states in India.

Nalgonda was the second district to be brought under the remit of MVF’s work in Telengana. Also, MVF was active in some mandals in Nalgonda until 2014 through its ‘Quality Improvement in Primary Education program.’²⁸ This program showed a shift in focus from the need for quantity to the recognition that quality education is a key element for success. In Bihar, the CLFZ approach was applied in targeted rural areas in Lalganj block in Vaishali district in 2012. Here too, there has been a shift in focus on quality education and working towards compliance with standards prescribed under the Right to Education Act. A brief description of each of these districts is presented in the Table 2 below.²⁹

Table 4 Description of the CLFZ under review

Name of district	Year started	Location of project sites	Current project status	Area of CLFZ	No. CLFZ *
Ranga Reddy	1991	18 of 37 blocks in the period 1991-2009	1 block	Revenue village/Gram Panchayats	476
Nalgonda	2000	19 of 36 blocks in the period 2000-2009	9 blocks	Revenue village/Gram Panchayats	431
Vaishali	2010	1 block, covering 16 Gram Panchayats	Active (till 2016) in 16 Gram Panchayats, with more focus on areas in model school catchment areas	Wards/habitations/ Tolas within school catchment areas	25

* Declared by MVF as of April 30, 2015

A central element to the CLFZ approach is its ability to adapt. One clear example of this is how zones have been defined in different regions across India. In Bihar, for example, because Gram Panchayat areas are larger than those in Telengana, MVF has targeted Tolas or wards/habitations within school catchment areas.

In both Telangana and Bihar, child labor was mostly used to support in agricultural labor and cattle grazing. Target areas in Bihar were primarily Mahadalit areas, while there was greater

²⁷ Purushottham et al. 2014. Impact Assessment of the Quality Improvement in Primary Education Programme in Nalgonda District N.P. MVF. January.

²⁸ MVF covered 226 schools in 2014 under this program.

²⁹ For details on MVF interventions see **Annex B**

demographic diversity in areas targeted in Telangana. In Telangana, not only were children brought into the school system, there were also negotiated releases of child bonded labor.

Migratory patterns also differ in between both states. In most cases there is migration to from rural to urban areas and from poorer areas to more prosperous ones. However, migration out of Bihar villages (and in higher numbers) was more often reported than in Telangana. On the other hand, migratory labor from bordering states coming into Telangana was reported by community members in project sites visited in Ranga Reddy district.

Farming and agricultural patterns and overall development of CLFZs also vary in accordance with geographical and weather conditions in the two states. Further, between and within the two states, there is marked variation in the overall development level of villages within districts, with more urbanised blocks being better developed than more remote ones; these variations are also reflected in the implementation of CLFZ projects. Still, as was observed in both Bihar and Telangana, CLFZ were declared even in relatively more impoverished, remote and less developed Tolas/villages. In Bihar this was especially seen in areas where MVF has worked consistently for longer periods.

Other than contextual features, another distinguishing feature of CLFZs is the length and stage of the intervention in the project district and, hence, the maturity of the intervention. Therefore, CLFZs in Telangana, which have been established for much longer than those in Bihar, appear stronger in terms of experiential learnings and confidence within the community. It was notable that communities where the interventions had a longer presence, had a deeper understanding of MVF's approach and appeared more willing to speak about rights-based violations. This is remarkable considering that in some project sites visited, MVF had phased out its activities from these sites many years ago. Further, in Telangana MVF volunteers and staff observed that, areas where overcoming resistance from communities was most challenging at the start, were today areas where the understanding is deeper and intervention outcomes have been better sustained.

In terms of state government policies, there are a few variations in how Central Government Schemes, namely the SSA and the Right to Education Act³⁰ is implemented in each state. These have some implications for realizing the right to education, as implementation levels of both the SSA and RTE vary considerably between the two states that were visited.³¹ State governments also fund schemes that are additional to Central Government schemes. For instance, the Bihar government has introduced a scheme, which provide free cycles to girls in high schools. Respondents mentioned that this scheme has had an impact on school accessibility and attendance. It is, however, important to stress that in India the existence of schemes /policies supporting the realization of constitutionally guaranteed human rights do not necessarily translate to changes on the ground. Indeed in many cases effective implementation of such schemes and policies are largely dependent on the local authorities and bureaucrats. In all places visited in Telangana and Bihar, MVF had to invest

³⁰ For example there are variations in Rules (delegated legislation detailing procedures) adopted to enforce the Right to Education Act in both states.

³¹ For instance, the state government in Telangana discourages private tuitions (remedial help) outside school hours. This does not appear to be the approach in Bihar, where most parents met felt that tuitions were essential, particularly in higher classes. Thus, tuition fees push up education costs in Bihar, which is not the case in Telangana.

considerable efforts to ensure that government functionaries performed their roles as stipulated in laws and policies.

2.3 To what extent are CLFZ actually child labor free?

MVF maintains that a CLFZ is an area that meets 7 outcomes delineated in the ToR. In all, 11 project sites (Tolas) in Bihar and 12 project sites (villages) in Telengana were declared as CLFZs by MVF were visited. However, a point to be noted here is that these outcomes have been defined in a somewhat utopian manner to ensure simplicity of messaging to achieve universal goals. However, progress in achieving *all* these outcomes has varied. The findings for each of these outcomes as gleaned from field visits and an examination of MVF compiled data are presented below.

Outcome 1: *The sustained norm within a community has become that ‘no child should work’.*

Teachers and CRPF members interviewed in CLFZs stressed that all children in the 6-14 age group are enrolled in school.³² There appears to be a consensus among all parents interviewed that their children should study at least till Class 10 (Age 16), although retention of children in the higher 14-18 age group is a challenge. Community respondents also reported that sending and preparing for children school has become part of parents' routine. Monitoring of schools under the program also helped enforce a certain level of discipline in the local government schools.³³ In CLFZs in Bihar, where the program is still active, perceptible differences, in comparison to non-CLFZ sites,³⁴ could be observed in attitudes towards children going to school as also better discipline in schools.

Parents reported to have stopped wasting time and ordering children around.³⁵ In both states, respondents reported that changes in family expenditure patterns have occurred, with wasteful expenditure and expenditure on 'luxury items'³⁶ decreasing. Parents further noted that they were taking on more work and have taken loans (from women's Self Help Groups in Telangana) or have sold their cattle to educate children. In addition they also noted that grandparents were engaged in housework/chores, such as sibling care and animal grazing, previously done by children. Lower spending on alcohol has also brought down rates of alcoholism according to CRPF and other community respondents.³⁷

³² This statement is based on school records, census reports and local level surveys conducted by MVF volunteers. Since the right to *primary* education is an enforceable right in India, teachers and school authorities are now compelled to monitor children in the school catchment area. These is done more rigorously in primary schools, for reasons that middle schools are fewer and cater to larger catchment areas, whereas primary schools are in the local area. However, collecting data on children out of school is challenging. Even State compiled data may not add up. See Sinha. 2014. *Missing Children*. <http://mvfindia.in/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/Shantha-Sinha-The-Missing-Children-Andhra-Jyothi-7th-February.pdf> Hyderabad. February. At the field level, migration of children out of catchment areas and/or to private schools, are challenges in collecting data and monitoring children who are out of the government school system. However, these claims cannot be entirely inaccurate, since according to the *National Sample Survey of Estimation of Out of School Children in the Age 6-13, 2014*, (<http://ssa.nic.in/pabminutes-documents/ND.pdf>) the proportion of out of school children has been reducing in the last years from 6.94% in 2006—to 4.28% in 2009 to—2.97% in 2014.

³³ Hence previously, where school timings were not properly maintained or children would abscond during school hours, bells are rung to mark periods and gates are locked to prevent children from absconding.

³⁴ See Chapter 5

³⁵ Also reported as early experiences in Telangana project sites.

³⁶ Such as TVs, mobiles and other electronic items, expenditure incurred at festivals, etc.

³⁷ In Chimvela Gram Panchayat in Nalgonda district, Telengana, a village known for its alcohol production, CRPF members observed a 70% decrease in both alcohol production and supply.

In CLFZs in both Bihar and Telangana, parents appeared to be willing to pay higher education costs. For instance in Bihar, 'tuitions' or additional lessons are considered necessary at higher school levels. In Telangana, on the other hand, school related expenses increase considerably when parents opt to send their children to private schools, which are not free. However, in many cases, although parents reported difficulties and challenges, they appeared to be willing to pay higher costs to ensure that their children received quality education.³⁸ This shift showing parental willingness to invest in education has also highlighted challenges around gender issues whereby parents appear far more willing to pay school fees/ tuition fees for educating their male children than their female children.

In CLZs visited in both states, respondents recall numerous mobilization activities that were conducted such as door-to-door meetings led by MVF volunteers, village meetings and events, etc. Respondents went on to argue that these types of activities were a central component leading to the success of the project. This outcome appears to be the most successfully achieved in all the CLFZs visited.

Outcome 2: The school is developed as an institution that takes care of all aspects of a child's development.

In the early years, MVF took a number of steps to facilitate first generation learners' entries into regular schools: organising motivation centers, camps and residential bridge schools. With increasing enrollments, some of these activities have been transformed to meet emerging requirements in the areas—such as the need to improve the quality of education. To illustrate, initially in Telangana, residential bridge schools were required to bring children into the school system. However, with increasing and timely enrollments, bridge courses were no longer required. Instead summer schools³⁹ (in Telangana) and remedial lessons in schools (in Bihar) to help academically weaker students are organized or provided by MVF volunteers.

There have also been transformations in terms of more focused engagements with the school system. Since 2010, MVF has undertaken projects, which have focused on improving the quality of education in schools and strengthening the implementation of the Right to Education Act. The Bihar MVF project being a case in point.⁴⁰ Under the Bihar program a number of strategies are used to improve children's development in school including the preparation of better teaching materials, forming children's clubs in school, etc. Simultaneously, in Bihar, efforts to strengthen the school system have been taken by targeting recently appointed statutory School Management Committees (SMC) and teachers for training. The individuals and groups are then federated at higher levels as forums to promote children's rights. These initiatives are discussed further in Chapter 3.

Many of MVF's strategies have now been codified into the Right to Education Act, 2009, which aims to realize children's "right to full time elementary education of satisfactory and equitable quality in a formal school which satisfies certain essential criteria"⁴¹. MVF strategies are also reflected in numerous government orders and in national and state policy

³⁸ In a few sites visited in Telangana, community respondents opined that families are having fewer children as they would not be able to afford educating all.

³⁹ This is particularly useful in cases of irregular students.

⁴⁰ Purushottam et al *Op. cit.*

⁴¹ <http://mhrd.gov.in/rte> Website of the Department of School Education & Literacy, Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India

frameworks and policies.⁴² Hence, there is currently an environment to develop schools further.⁴³ However, the enactment of the law does not mean that it is effectively implemented.⁴⁴

Following the enactment of the Right to Education Act, MVF has provided resource support in different states on methods of effective implementation which are drawn from their own practical experiences.⁴⁵ However, given the deficits in the system, and despite the project interventions, much needs to be done to develop schools as institutions that take care of all aspects of a child's development.

This outcome indicator has not been achieved in most areas, which have been declared CLFZ. Field respondents and MVF staff argue, increasing enrollments created a demand for better school facilities and things have improved significantly when compared to the initial days as a result of community activism. However, the outlay to achieve this outcome is heavily dependent on how the State responds to community demands, which in most cases, has been inadequate.

Outcome 3. Community takes ownership of child rights.

Steps towards achieving the goal of ensuring that the community takes ownership over child rights was done by supporting a number of initiatives. In both states, a number of collectives were created with interested individuals or strengthened at the community levels, the most successful initiative in this regard has been the creation of the following:

- Child Rights Protection Forums (CRPF) –constituted by interested community members including local elected representatives, Panchayat elders, ex-employers⁴⁶ (in Telangana), etc.
- Teachers' Forum on Child Rights (TFCR) –constituted by teachers who had participated in MVF activities and interventions.

These collectives continue to exist in Telangana and were verified as active currently, even after MVF phased out its program five years ago.⁴⁷ Although CRPF meetings have become more irregular at the village level and collective action has decreased,⁴⁸ CRPF members, both former and current, appear to be known and respected for their earlier efforts and are often approached by teachers and parents for support.⁴⁹ In some sites visited in Ranga Reddy districts, CRPFs have raised funds in the recent years for supplementary teachers in the village school. CRPFs at higher levels⁵⁰ are useful as a watchdog body to lobby with

⁴² For details on MVF practices institutionalized in State laws and policies see **Annex D**.

⁴³ For instance, a high degree of awareness was witnessed on the illegality of corporal punishments during field visits. As corporal punishment was identified by most of the ex-bridge course students as a reason for them dropping out of school, this kind of awareness (and subsequent legal adherence) signifies a progress towards making schools an enabling and learning environment for children.

⁴⁴ Issues relating to the implementation of the Right to Education are discussed in Chapter 4 (4.1).

⁴⁵ For details on MVF interventions as a resource agency, see Chapter 5 (5.1) and **Annexes D and E**

⁴⁶ Employers or land lords using child labor, often times as a means to recover debts taken by the children's parents. A process of conciliation and negotiation was used with these employers to convince them of releasing child laborers working for them. After having done so, many of these employers were brought into the CRPF to convince other employers/landlords to do the same.

⁴⁷ Phasing out was because saturation had been reached and parents didn't need persuasion to send their children to school.

⁴⁸ These interactions are also not as needed as before. See Chapter 6 for more details.

⁴⁹ To improve school facilities, in annual enrollment drives and to monitor attendance, take action in individual cases, etc.

⁵⁰ Mandal level CRPFs are constituted by representatives of village CRPFs.

authorities, respond to individual cases of child rights violations⁵¹ and report on village level concerns, particularly in relation to inadequacies in government provided education services and the school system.

On the other hand, CRPFs in Bihar, appear to be less established than those in Telengana, where the program has had a longer intervention period. Also, overall community involvement in collective action at the Tola level is not that evident in Bihar, as CRPFs are at a higher Gram Panchayat level.⁵² Here, again some variations were observed—CRPF members in CLFZs within model school catchment areas appeared more engaged and involved in current issues relating to child rights than those in other CLFZs.

Outcome 4: Neighboring communities change their norms

The degree to which neighboring communities have or have not changed their own norms as a result of CLFZ interventions is discussed in detail in Chapter 5 where the question of spread effect is addressed. Hence this outcome is not discussed here.

Outcome 5: Institutions sensitized to reduce barriers to communities changing their norm to 'no child should work'.

Key government officials at various levels, from village revenue officers and *anganwadi* workers to SSA functionaries to Mandal level education and development officers, state level institutions on education and labor,⁵³ who have worked with MVF have carried forward the principles, particularly while discharging their duties under the Right to Education Act.⁵⁴ For instance, in CLFZs in both states teachers clearly understand their role of monitoring children in their school catchment areas.⁵⁵ Another instance was found in Nalgonda district in Telengana, where the block/ mandal level development officer makes efforts to ensure that issues relating to children's education are included in administrative review meetings.⁵⁶

Teachers joining schools servicing CLFZs, after MVFs interventions were phased out in Telengana, require further training to create a more enabling and inclusive learning environment for children.⁵⁷ This was done in a focused manner in programmes on improving quality education in Nalgonda district in Telangana and is also being done in Biihar. Pedagogical lessons to improve quality from these interventions sites are also transmitted to other areas in the block/mandal through the dissemination of learning materials and

⁵¹ Such as preventing child marriages.

⁵² It is felt that operating CRPFs at the Tola level will be untenable. Also the presence of the CRPF is more needed at the Gram Panchayat levels and they also will have a more permanent presence.

⁵³ SCERT, SCPCR.

⁵⁴ For illustrations see N 78 in Chapter 5 (5.1)

⁵⁵ Section 24 (1) of the Right to Education Act, enlists the statutory duties of teachers. This includes various aspects of delivering the curriculum as also duties to monitor regularity and attendance and have regular interactions with parents. In most CLFZs visited, teachers appear to be performing these two roles better, with community members verifying that they were aware of the happenings in the local school and were in contact with the teachers.

⁵⁶ Interview with Ms. G Amba Bai (Mandal Development Officer) and D Shankar (Mandal Education Officer), Suryapet, 30.03.2015. Matters of education are rarely discussed at these meetings as, in practice, these meetings are more focused on broader developmental and infrastructural issues.

⁵⁷ Teachers are frequently transferred as they are required to spend a minimum of two years and a maximum of 8 years in one place. Hence teachers transferred from other parts of the state to schools in CLFZs were not always aware of MVF's interventions in the area, although they were familiar with MVF's work more generally.

resources developed by subject forums⁵⁸ and MVF's involvement in teacher trainings in these areas as resource persons.

Outcome 6: *All children are in school and enjoy their right to education in the project area*

As mentioned earlier in this report, in all CLFZs visited, it was reported that all children in the 6-14 age group are enrolled in school.⁵⁹ However, irregularity of attendance was cited an issue by teachers and CRPF members alike.⁶⁰ In this regard, teachers and SMC members in both states assert they are discharging their statutory roles in that they follow up on children who are absent for more than 5-7 consecutive days. However, as teachers in both states have a number of responsibilities, they may not have adequate time to closely monitor *all* children. Absenteeism is attributed to a number of reasons such as disturbed family situations, seasonal migration of young children with their parents, as well as work during the time of harvesting. In such cases teachers state that they conduct remedial classes and organise summer camps to bring absentee students up to speed. However, all respondents agreed that the irregularity reported is nowhere close to what it used to be before MVF started its activities.⁶¹

Accessing higher education was a concern expressed in both states.⁶² This is due to higher costs involved, and in cases, gender discriminatory attitudes and child marriages. The latter, in cases, determine family choices on who to send to school. Most often preference is given to boys to continue their education while girls are married off.⁶³ Although boys are treated preferentially, there were instances reported from male ex-bridge school students that they were not always able to educate themselves to the extent they wanted to,⁶⁴ as they were unable to afford the cost.

The above review shows that while clear progress has been made, it would be incorrect to say that CLFZ outcomes have been fully attained in India. Rather, it would be more accurate to say that MVF has been able to create environments where the community, together with the government, is jointly working towards attaining CLFZ outcomes. Indeed it is important to note that achieving the full range of CLFZ outcomes may very well be a permanent objective rather than an expected tangible outcome.

2.4 What are the factors that make a CLFZ work?

However, while clearly CLFZ have not been achieved as such, meaning the successful attainment of all seven outcomes, considerable progress appears to have been made. In moving forward some key factors that jointly contribute to enabling the success of the CLFZ model have been identified. These factors are discussed below:

⁵⁸ Forums of active teachers to review and improve methods of delivering academic curriculum organized under subject heads.

⁵⁹ In places CRPF members felt that children out of school are not enrolled as they are migratory labor.

⁶⁰ There are, however, significant numbers in private schools as well, particularly in Telangana.

⁶¹ Spot checks in most schools CLFZs in Bihar showed above 90% attendance. In Telangana, a spot check in a CLFZ in Dharur Mandal showed that 10% of the children were absent.

⁶² State level functionaries in Bihar observe that while there is a 95% enrolment at the primary level, it reduces to about 35% at the secondary level and approximately 15% at the higher secondary level.

⁶³ The aspect of child marriages is discussed in detail in Chapter 6.

⁶⁴ Most cited example was the inability to pursue college degrees.

1. Mobilizing communities using non-negotiable principles: Strategies of negotiation and resolution, instead of community confrontations,⁶⁵ to achieve universal goals brought in social cohesion among different political and caste groups to coalesce around the clear message conveyed in the non-negotiable principles. These principles were conveyed in simple forms and repeatedly to the broader community to effect a change in norms.

2. Recruiting locally: Paid volunteers, who played a key role at the community level, were recruited from the community to deliver interventions and coordinate activities at the ground level. This strategy allowed for interventions to be tailored to the context.⁶⁶ Being local, MVF volunteers were more trusted by the community, which strengthened mobilization efforts. They were also able to bridge the gap between the first generation learners and the school system. To illustrate, in Telangana (and in parts of Bihar), most teachers do not live in the same village as the school. Hence, they are physically removed from the community. By being based in the community, MVF volunteers were able to effectively liaise between the school and the broader community and better monitor children out of school. Their location also allowed them to accurately identify and resolve local problems.

Recruiting locally and working with community groups also enabled the building of community ownership. For instance, ex MVF volunteers in Ranga Reddy district⁶⁷ stated that they collected data on the issue of child marriage and the situation of girls on their own initiative, and then used the data in their local level advocacy efforts against child marriages. Finally, unlike government officers and teachers, who tend to get transferred, MVF volunteers and community collectives remain in the community thus ensuring continuity. Hence even in CLFZs where MVF has phased out its activities, many field respondents claimed that they continue to seek assistance from ex-MVF volunteers when needed, e.g. to assist with transferring children to higher schools, in lobbying with administrative officials and local elected representatives for better school amenities, etc.

In fact, most of MVF core staff and resource persons started their association with MVF as volunteers. Organizationally, MVF maintains a small core group of staff to coordinate activities and act as resource persons at state, national and international level.⁶⁸ Field level activities are coordinated by district, block and cluster (of villages) coordinators and organizers, all of who are locally recruited. Overall, the emphasis that ground level interventions are delivered by persons belonging to the community, facilitated better community engagements and adaptation of MVF methods.

3. Length of the program: Most implementing agencies believe that the program should be allowed to run for at least 10 years so that a single generation can be educated, thus allowing for inter-generation transfer of commitment to education. Premature withdrawal

⁶⁵ For example, in Telengana, it was discovered early on in the program that confronting employers of child labor or threatening them with legal action, antagonized such individuals and did not help the cause of freeing the children from child labor. This strategy was therefore substituted with strategies of negotiating with employers on behalf of parents and acknowledging the role played by employers in releasing their child bonded laborers. Employers releasing child bonded laborers were publicly felicitated. These employers, who were often more economically, politically and socially more powerful, then became MVF allies and in times CRPF members. Numerous illustrations were provided by ex-employers and CRPF members of them having leveraged their positions to promote children's rights in the area.

⁶⁶ In Bihar, volunteers and teachers keep children's belongings in school during the lunch break to prevent children from leaving school after the mid-day meal. They also use innovative techniques like monitoring children by collecting information from their classmates.

⁶⁷ CRPF members interviewed in Ennaram GP, Batwaram Mandal. 04.04.2015

⁶⁸ MVF's organizational structure is described in detail in Chapter 5

has been seen to have an impact on attendance levels.⁶⁹ In non-CLFZ project sites in Bihar where activities were reduced when the focus shifted to the quality education program, the main impact reported from community respondents was increases in irregular attendance.

4. Engagement with administrative officials: Engagements with administrative officials at various levels, have fostered a more enabling policy environment, where such officials and implementing agencies are open to the idea of implementing some of MVF's initiatives. The change in thinking effected in administrative officials at different levels with whom MVF personnel have engaged with over the years is acknowledged by the officials themselves. Indeed some officials interviewed spoke of their continued application of MVF's non-negotiable principles in their work, even when moving to other fields.

5. Creating community collectives: Creating CRPFs is a crucial first step whereby the community assumes responsibility for protecting child rights. MVF was mindful of limiting itself to a supportive role in facilitating community mobilization from the very initiation. Thus, community collectives such as CRPFs were trained to lead collective action under the MVF's guidance. CRPF membership drawn from active women and youth group members, local level elected representatives, anganwadi workers, school committee members, etc. thus creating a common platform that transcended social categories. Including local elected representatives in these collectives have proven to be particularly useful and their continuing interest with child rights issues is evident at the field level in CLFZs.

Subsequently, in Telangana, village level CRPFs were federated into mandal, district and State level committees. These entities continue to exist in Telangana at all levels despite MVF phasing out its activities at the village level; they raise funds through annual membership fees (Rs. 25/-). The Telangana state level CRPF was registered as a society in 2004. CRPFs at higher levels are useful as a watchdog body to lobby with authorities, respond to individual cases, track developments and report on village level concerns.

6. Creating teachers' collectives to promote child rights: In Telangana, Teachers Forum for Child Rights was initially created as a platform for teachers who had collectivised to release child laborers and had participated in MVF initiatives. Subsequently, many MVF volunteers who were placed in schools as supplementary teachers and engaged in conducting bridge courses,⁷⁰ joined these forums. With reductions in child labour, this forum expanded its ambit over broader child issues and continues to be active at the block and district levels in Telangana. This system has been replicated in project sites in Bihar.⁷¹ This forum plays a useful role in monitoring entitlements disbursed under different government schemes, encouraging parent-teacher interactions and undertaking localised campaigns to promote adherence to the Right to Education Act.

7. Involving youth and women's groups: Involvement with and focus on youth group members, who have increasingly taken on more important political roles within the community is also a key element contributing to success. Child education/labour work

⁶⁹ Wazir and Saith. *Op. cit.*

⁷⁰ Most of these volunteers went on to join government schools as teachers.

⁷¹ This strategy has been replicated in all other states (Maharashtra, Tamil Nadu, Madhya Pradesh, Bihar, Andhra Pradesh) where MVF has delivered an intervention or has acted as resource persons to government programs. These forums have been federated to form a national level TFCR. These forums raise their funds through annual membership fees collected from their members. (Rs. 50/-).

continues to be an agenda item of youth clubs after MVF phased out. Thus ensuring that the progress made is not lost and that further progress towards the ideal is fostered.⁷²

Involving women's self-help groups (SHGs) in Telangana was also a useful strategy initiated by MVF. First, these and other women's groups were able to better respond to issues specific to girl children, including child marriages. Second, a number of community members—parents and CRPF members—reported that in cases of emergency they often approach such groups for loans. Representatives of SHGs interviewed during the site visits confirmed that loans were often sought for various household purposes, including to pay for the education of individual children.⁷³

8. Data collection systems: Surveys conducted at the beginning of the intervention were essential in terms of establishing independent and accurate data systems, which could be used for monitoring children.⁷⁴ However, because research and mobilisation have gone hand in hand in MVF interventions surveys have also served as a first point of engagement with community members, including the identification of potential volunteers and CRPF members, the mapping of local issues, etc.

9. Facilitating access to schools: regarded as tangible direct support to children, was also useful to create/build community trust. This also revealed the problems in enrolling and attendance – e.g. need for birth certificates, corruption in obtaining transfer certificates, etc. which were then responded to at the local level. These problems and local resolution methods also informed MVF's broader advocacy initiatives to effect policy changes. For instance, the Right to Education Act, includes provisions on flexible times for admission and proof of identity requirements at the time of admissions—the importance of these issues were identified by MVF during their implementation of projects on the ground prior to the drafting of the Right to Education Act.

10. Planned phasing out of activities: MVF has a solid exit strategy developed for each intervention. The exit strategy delineates when they should exit, how, and what should remain. For instance, in Telangana, phasing out of community mobilization activities, started when saturation points⁷⁵ were reached and the intensive role played by the CRPF in mobilizing the broader community was no longer required. However, CRPF's presence, as a reactive 'watchdog' forum (responding to complaints of rights violations and monitoring child rights violations) was continued and managed by collectives at higher administrative levels and with limited MVF support.

⁷² For instance, the Athmakur gram panchayat Nalgonda district has 10 registered youth groups working on various aspects of community development, political mobilization, etc. Members of these groups continue to be associated with the CRPF and continue the agenda of working against child labor and promoting children's right to education. They ensure that potential elected representatives commit themselves to promoting children's education as an electoral promise.

⁷³ Case study: In Shankarapally mandal [Ranga Reddy district], a mahila sangam member who is also a member of the school SMC mentioned that the government sources scholarship funds through her group. The SHG is responsible for identifying students in need of scholarships, assisting parents file their applications before appropriate authorities and monitoring timely payments of the amount. Her membership in the SMC has been useful for identifying appropriate children. While this case study is not representative of work done by all SHGs, it is useful to illustrate the ways in which women's SHGs can be involved in promoting children's right to education.

⁷⁴ To illustrate, in Bihar information on school going and non school going children are collected from schools in the catchment area and used to track over 30,000 children in the areas covered.

⁷⁵ With school enrollments and school going routinized, and decreases in child labor.

CHAPTER 3. CLFZ PROJECTS

3.1 Project Objectives

For a description of MVF's project objectives, partners, stakeholders and activities in Telangana, please refer to Chapters 5 and 6. In this Chapter, we focus on MVF interventions in Bihar, with a view to assessing their effectiveness.

MVF's intervention in Bihar has occurred in three phases as follows:

Phase I [2007-2010]	Upon the invitation of the state government of Bihar, MVF provided resource persons to conduct bridge courses under the state government's SSA initiatives, ⁷⁶ with particular focus in the Vaishali district.
Phase II [2010-2012]	With funding from SKN, MVF began focused work in 10 Gram Panchayats of the Lalganj block in Vaishali district.
Phase III [2012-2016]	MVF expanded its work to 16 Gram Panchayats with a focus on strengthening the implementation of the RTE Act and improving the quality of education to achieve universal retention. In this phase, it shall prepare 15 schools as model schools.

3.2 Project Implementation

MVF's interventions in Bihar focus on the following⁷⁷:

- Social mobilisation and awareness campaigns on provisions of RTE Act and entitlements of children.
- Capacity development of Gram Panchayats to monitor children's rights.
- Strengthening of School Management Committees (SMC) on their role and responsibilities as provided under the Right To Education Act.
- Training and resource support to elected representatives, CRPFs and other community organisations, girls, schoolteachers, government officials, and other NGOs to facilitate effective implementation of the Right To Education Act.

The total funding provided by Stichting Kinderpostzegels Nederland (SKN) for the project cycle 2010-2013 is 9785860 INR (134577.027 EUR under the current exchange). The 2014 expenditure is 5592040 INR (76880.011 EUR). That means that the total for the current phase of the project in Bihar as funded by SKN is 15377900 INR (211416 EUR). A simple mathematical calculation would suggest that given the project objectives it has costs approximately 38 EUR per child targeted. However, this calculation is incorrect because as the project progresses costs are reduced. In short the initial hardware costs do not need to be repeated. This means that for the current cycle the costs per child is 38 EUR, but if the project were to be continued the cost per child would reduce incrementally. Notably an

⁷⁶ In 2007, there were 47 Residential Bridge Courses (RBCs) in 7 districts; by 2009, the number of RBCs had increased to 480; and by 2010, there were 1,246 RBCs covering all 38 districts of the state Data obtained during interview with Mr. Yadaiah, MVF resource person in charge of Bihar initiative. February 2015.

⁷⁷ MVF. No date. LFA Based Report: July 2011-June 2012. n.p.

analysis of the funding of the project engagement in Telangana showed that costs vary year to year as do funding allocations. This shows that the flexibility of the CLFZ model is also has budget allocation implications. MVF explains that needs in advocacy, for example, might reduce over time allowing for a reassignment of funds to other activities. Crucially this means that the flexibility built into the model requires a donor that is also flexible in allowing for re-allocation of funds between budget lines as needs manifest themselves locally.

3.3 Project Outcomes

According to MVF's reports and field respondents, the outcomes thus far of its interventions include⁷⁸:

- Successful mobilization of 80% children to schools (government schools) in 16 Gram Panchayats. The focus on children of Dalit Tolas has resulted in the enrolment and retention of all the children in 37 Tolas of these disadvantaged communities.
- Panchayats and SMCs are actively involved in addressing issues concerning schools.
- School functioning and amenities (toilets, furniture, mid-day meals, etc.) have improved significantly as a result of the active involvement of teachers, parents, gram panchayats members, SMCs, CRPFs, line department officials and service providers, in school development issues.
- Girl youth groups are taking up the issues like stopping early marriages and supporting peer education.
- In some model school areas, parents reported that children leave private schools to attend model schools.

3.4 Effectiveness

What was striking from school site visits were the number of children attending school—in some places there was barely any space for the children to sit.⁷⁹ Unexpected increases in numbers of student attending primary classes are a clear indication of the intervention's effectiveness in ensuring that all children are in school. Telangana respondents also related similar early experiences.

During field visits it was observed that mobilisation for enrolment is still continuing in areas where model schools have been adopted. These schools appear to be better attended and children better monitored than schools where village level volunteers are no longer active. Also, regularity was reported as a concern in project sites where MVF is not as active at the village level.

In so far as strengthening the implementation of the Right To Education Act is concerned, the spectrum of quality education initiatives fosters better implementation and monitoring of the Right To Education Act. Improving teaching methods and working towards creating enabling/supportive school environments for children are particular efforts in this regard. Here, it must be noted that MVF had to work hard to gain the trust of government schoolteachers who initially greeted MVF's school interventions with hostility. However, all

⁷⁸ MVF. October 2014. Ensuring Quality Education in the 15 Child Labour Free Zones of Bihar: A Proposal to Stichting Kinderpostzegels Nederland. Unpublished.

⁷⁹ This was also verified by checking attendance registers in schools.

teachers interviewed across project sites appear to be strongly supportive of MVF's interventions now. Involvement of SSA Cluster Resource Coordinators (CRC) in the implementation of project activities, particularly in the selection of volunteers placed in model schools, has been a useful strategy to overcome teacher hesitance in this regard.

MVF's efforts to improve record-keeping in schools, such as maintaining individual student profiles, have institutionalised methods of monitoring students' academic progress and taking remedial action as needed. In project sites visited, regular academic assessment of school children is being done and MVF volunteers placed in model schools conduct regular remedial classes. MVF girl volunteers in several Tolas also provide remedial lessons/tuitions to younger children in their Tolas. Often, they are able to motivate their friends and peers to assist them in providing such lessons. It is heartening to observe the pride and care with which girl volunteers speak of their work.

Particular attention is paid to pedagogical matters—for example, teachers from most intervention sites report to have participated in subject forum meetings to develop learning tools. This, according to them has been a very useful strategy in delivering academic curricula in a child friendly manner. The supplying of library / workbooks and sports materials to model schools by MVF has also been widely appreciated. This has been particularly important for children from impoverished backgrounds whose parents struggle to provide them essential school supplies.⁸⁰

In addition to improving children's academic performance, efforts are also taken to encourage children's overall development. For instance, model schools establish Children's Clubs where children can be involved in decision-making about school matters such as hygiene, health, nutrition, etc. Children's clubs on current affairs have been constituted to encourage children's awareness of national and local developments.⁸¹ According to the teachers interviewed, these efforts instil a sense of ownership and responsibility amongst these key stakeholders and encourage a broader worldview. MVF also facilitated the organization of inter-school events and competitions where the successful performance of children in targeted schools raised their self-esteem and promoted their overall development.⁸² Teachers in all schools visited appreciated this role played by MVF. Particularly since encouraging children's overall development is a neglected area in government schools where the tendency of teachers is to focus on delivering the academic curriculum alone. Teachers interviewed also claimed that in addition to the academic work, they are also overburdened with school and other administrative responsibilities, which means that they have limited time to organize co-curricular activities.

In terms of parent engagements with the school system, there appeared to be greater parent-teacher interaction in project sites, with many interviewed parents reporting that they attend parent-teacher meetings on a monthly basis and are involved in school activities. Parents, in sites declared as CLFZs, also appeared to be aware of who the members of the

⁸⁰ Here it must be noted that the government provides free textbooks to school children under the SSA. However, notebooks, pens etc. have to be purchased by parents.

⁸¹ Members of this current affairs club read out the newspapers during school assemblies and discuss news items with other children.

⁸² According to the teachers interviewed, competing successfully with children in private schools, who are in most cases more socially and economically privileged than children attending government schools, played a significant role in boosting confidence levels among government school children in targeted sites.

statutory School Management Committees (SMCs) and their roles in promoting children's education.

SMC formation is mandated in all schools under the Right to Education Act.⁸³ SMCs are constituted by elected parents, teachers and local elected representatives.⁸⁴ These committees are required to have a 50% representation of women.⁸⁵ As the implementation of the Right to Education Act has been weak, across India, although these committees have been constituted in most schools, members are not necessarily active or are aware of their roles. In interviews with SMC members in Bihar it appeared that most are aware of their roles and duties, although some members are more active than others. In areas where SMCs have been active, particularly in model schools, they serve as an essential link between the community and schools and supplement at the local level the panchayat-level work of CRPFs. However, much work remains to strengthen SMCs in project sites in Bihar as:

- These bodies are comprised mostly of women who face gender disadvantages and who must be empowered to fulfil their responsibilities.
- SMCs have limited resources to ensure adequate school amenities, especially with regard to major outlays such as construction of new buildings or additional teacher recruitment which the Mukhiya (Head of Gram Panchayat)⁸⁶ of the Gram Panchayat is better equipped to enable.

Therefore, much depends on how active the Mukhiya is and how responsive higher level government functionaries are. There were some reports of Mukhiya using monies available to them to carry out minor maintenance work or commissioning such works under the central government employment laws/schemes. However, involvement of Panchayat members in promoting RTE/abolition of child labour is varied across project sites, except for model school areas and a few other sites. Inattention of Mukhiyas to issues, relating to children's education and improvement of school facilities, was reported by community members in some sites.

In terms of monitoring local level developments, CRPF members, teachers and administrative officials in sites, targeted for quality education interventions reported that child education/child labour status review meetings are regularly conducted at the Panchayat level. These meetings are attended by line department officials, service providers, etc. to discuss problems, strategise solutions, and foster inter-agency cooperation, more intensively in quality intervention sites.

Through its demonstration of successful quality delivery models, the MVF sets a standard that can be emulated. This is evidenced by the fact that many parents whose children are attending model schools mention incidents of children leaving private schools to attend government schools as the quality of education is better. Community members (including, parents, SMC members, CRPF members, teachers, local elected representatives) also appear to be more integrated and engaged in achieving right to education goals in areas with model schools. However, MVF's shift in focus to quality education interventions has

⁸³ Section 21 of the Right to Education Act.

⁸⁴ Rule 13, Bihar State Free and Compulsory Education of Children Rules, 2011

⁸⁵ Section 21 (3) of the Right to Education Act.

⁸⁶ See Chapter 4 for further details.

also meant a reduction in activities in other project sites, which are not covered by model school interventions. While field respondents assert that MVF's withdrawal has not resulted in increased school drop out rates, regularity of attendance was raised as a concern in many such sites visited.

CHAPTER 4. IMPORTANCE OF CONTEXT

4.1 The political environment and policy framework

The Indian Constitution was amended in 2002 to recognize children's right to free primary education. This right is implemented through in the Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act, (Right to Education Act) which was enacted in 2009, and puts in place a mechanism to ensure that "children's human capital is developed to its fullest potential, benefitting children themselves, their families and communities and society as a whole".⁸⁷ The National Commission for the Protection of Child Rights (NCPCR),⁸⁸ which is vested with the responsibility of monitoring children's right to education, was constituted earlier in 2007.⁸⁹ MVF's crucial role in drafting the Right to Education law is evident from the number of MVF practices that have been institutionalized in it.

However, India's right to education is not consistent with its law and policy on child labour. Article 24 of the Constitution prohibits children under the age of 14 from being employed in hazardous industries. The Child Labour (Prohibition and Regulation) Act, 1986, with its principles firmly derived from the 'poverty argument' discussed in Chapter 1, gives effect to the Constitutional mandate in a restrictive manner by enlisting occupations, which are prohibited and regulated. This means that not all forms of child labour are prohibited. Moreover this law is not effectively implemented—conviction rates are low and the minimal penalties that are imposed do not have any significant deterrent effect.⁹⁰

Despite advocacy efforts by various groups and statutory bodies, this dichotomy has not been bridged. Maintaining CLFZs and implementing the right to *compulsory* education, in the context of a policy regime, that is largely permissive of child labour, is challenging. In relation to broader child protection rights, the lack of coordination between state departments and state governments *inter se* (in cases of migrant child labour), poses challenges in monitoring, prevention, rescue and rehabilitation of child labourers.⁹¹

Further, implementation of the Right to Education Act has been slow and none of the states is close to achieving the 2015 targets set by the law. Hence, although the Right to Education Act institutionalizes norms, there is much to be done in terms of ensuring its implementation at the ground level.⁹²

⁸⁷ See n 39

⁸⁸ The NCPCR is supported by State Commissions on the Protection of Child Rights in each state.

⁸⁹ The NCCPR was constituted under a separate laws, which also outlines other responsibilities of the NCCPR in relation to child rights. MVF's Dr. Shantha Sinha was appointed the first chairperson of the NCCPR and is credited as the main drafter of the Right to Education Act.

⁹⁰ Usha Ramanathan. 2009. Evolution of the Law on Child Labour in India in in Hugh D. Hindman ed., *The World of Child Labor – An Historical and Regional Survey*. Armonk, NY: ME Sharpe (<http://www.ielrc.org/content/a0905.pdf>)

⁹¹ Interview with Ms. Shyam Sundari, Joint Secretary, Department of Women and Child Development on 7.4.2015, where she related her experiences of rescuing child laborers in the bangle industry in Hyderabad under a recently concluded police initiative 'Operation Smile'.

⁹² Indian Express. 2014. 5 Years On, Right to Education is Still Far Cry in AP, TS <http://www.newindianexpress.com/states/tehrangana/5-Years-On-Right-to-Education-is-Still-Far-Cry-in-AP-TS/2014/08/28/article2401978.ece> September. See also, Rai. 2012. *Challenges in implementing the RTE Act*. <http://infochangeindia.org/education/backrounders/challenges-in-implementing-the-rte-act.html>

In addition to laws, the Sarva Shikshya Abhiyan (SSA), which also started in 2002, complements the state education department's infrastructure, including planning direct fiscal flows to support local administrations to achieve the programmatic norms.⁹³ Other important Central Government schemes include: the Mid-Day Meal scheme which is the government's school meal program for primary and upper primary classes; Kasturba Gandhi Balika Vidyalaya (KGBV) schemes which provide residential school facilities for girls from remote and backward areas. The National Policy on Education (1986) is another key policy initiative on the right to education in India. Overall all these schemes have jointly contributed to improving school enrolments in India.⁹⁴

4.2 The economic environment

The IMF ranks India 7th on the nominal GDP criteria (2014), and India ranks 135 in the Human Development Indices (HDI) (2014). Despite its low HDI ranking, there have been cuts in budgetary allocations of the Union (Central) Budget towards education this year, including SSA allocations. These decisions have alarmed child rights activists who are of the opinion that the SSA is under-resourced as it is.⁹⁵

At the field level, in terms of overall economic development there is variation between blocks that are more urbanized than those more remote; and those with significant presence of disadvantaged caste groups. These context variations also affect the kinds of concerns faced in promoting children's rights. For instance, Shankarapally Mandal in Ranga Reddy district (Telangana) has been able to capitalize on the urbanization that has taken place in the area. Here, concerns articulated by community respondents related to lack of employment opportunities and increasing costs of higher education. Hence ex MVF volunteers have taken on the role of helping educated youth set up their own businesses. Due to increased demand for education in the area, a number of private schools have also opened in the recent years.

On the other hand, in more remote areas, for instance in Dharur Mandal, in the same district (Ranga Reddy), concerns raised by community respondents relate more to inadequate teachers, as teachers are often times reluctant to serve in remote and developmentally backward areas. Other than teachers, amenities in school are often lacking and its access more challenging. Due to migration labour in these areas, community members also raised concerns on the lack of easily accessible residential hostel facilities for children of migrant parents or for rescued children from other areas.

4.3 Social cohesiveness and equity

In Bihar, populations in Tolas are closely aligned to caste groupings, whereas there is more diversity in villages in Telangana. There appeared to be comparatively greater cohesiveness in intervention sites in Telangana, particularly as caste issues had to be confronted and overcome to unite over promoting a children's agenda. In Nalgonda district it was observed

⁹³ Marsden. Op. cit. School uniforms, text books and a small allowance are some of the benefits available to children under the SSA

⁹⁴ For instance in Bihar, provision of cycles for girls in Class 9 (age 15) (and consequently boys), has significantly raised their attendance

⁹⁵ Interviews with K Anuradha (Rainbow Foundation) and Murali (NAFRE), Hyderabad April 7, 2015.

that caste divides became less profound when children of all castes started attending school together and became friends. In Bihar it was observed that in certain areas higher caste groups would prevent the entry of children belonging to disadvantaged castes. However, this was overcome through MVF-facilitated initiatives.

4.4 Accountability and empowerment

India has a federal system of government with a national Parliament and executive government at the centre, with state Legislative Assemblies and a state level executive. Powers and revenues are divided between the centre and state in accordance with a Constitutional scheme. In 1993-94, the Constitution was amended to mandate the setting up of a 'third tier' of elected 'local self-government.' In rural areas these are known as Gram Panchayats⁹⁶. Panchayats are also present at the higher block and district levels. At the village level, a Gram Panchayat is constituted by elected ward members and headed by the Sarpanch in Telangana and Mukhiya in Bihar. While the Constitution provides a list of powers and functions that may be devolved by the state to local governments, each state is responsible for both formulating its own legislation and rules to operationalize the aforementioned Constitutional directives, and for aspects related to the practical devolution of power to local governments.

Panchayat members have been specifically targeted in programs in both states. Indeed, as mentioned earlier, former and present Panchayat members associated with MVF interventions, particularly those who were/are members of CRPF, continue to be active on child labor/RTE issues. Sarpanchs who actively supported the program and lobbied for better services, etc. also headed many of the CRPFs in Telangana. However, there were also some reports from Telangana and many more from Bihar about Sarpanchs not showing enough interest in matters relating to education. Perceived levels of corruption among political leaders appeared higher in Bihar than in Telangana. Also Panchayat Education Committees, vested with the responsibility of monitoring education issues, have not been constituted/ are active in Ranga Reddy⁹⁷ and in Bihar.

Even so the Panchayat's role continues to be crucial in responding to or facilitating responses to requests for school improvements and in implementing the Right to Education Act, particularly since their role has been institutionalized under the law and they are now obligated to perform statutory duties. However, experiences of Panchayat members' involvement in the implementation of the Right to Education Act remain uneven. In most places visited, Panchayat ward members, who are members of SMCs play an active role. However, as they have limited powers and they are dependent on the Sarpanch/Mukhiyas support to follow up on demands for major infrastructural outlays—this assistance is not always forthcoming.

As has been discussed Chapter 3, SMCs can play a crucial role to ensure accountability of State entities and to maintain regular links between the school and the community. However, the role of the SMCs needs much more strengthening as discussed earlier. Further, in

⁹⁶ Gram Panchayat also denotes the jurisdiction of a revenue village, which may be constituted by smaller habitations or villages.

⁹⁷ Panchayat heads in Telangana and Bihar

Telangana, there also appears to be indications of the politicization of the SMC appointments.

Overall context variations appear to influence the strength of a CLFZ initiative. However, it must also be noted that despite contextual features, CLFZ outcomes were successfully achieved, particularly those relating to changing social norms towards the idea that all children must be in school and communities must take ownership of children's rights,⁹⁸ even in more difficult/ challenging areas and under adverse circumstances. According to respondents in both states, achieving this outcome led to a demand for better services from the State. Numerous instances were reported where lobbying efforts by community members led to improvements in the school, for example—the construction of more class rooms and school buildings to accommodate increasing numbers of children, community monitoring of materials used in the construction of school buildings, improved disbursements of mid-day meal schemes, etc. Changes in laws and policies have also played a facilitative role in ensuring that all children in the 5-14 age group are enrolled in school. However, responses from State authorities have not always been adequate enough to meet all the outcomes of a successful CLFZ. The relevance of context for achieving outcomes such as developing schools as a supportive environment for children and sensitized institutions, is more important than those related to community mobilization and changes in social norms.

In terms achieving normative change in neighbouring communities, it was found that contextual features, particularly geographical location, had limited relevance unless the places were very far away.⁹⁹ To provide an example of where contextual factors have had an effect in this regard—in Bihar, where the program is implemented in school catchment areas, considerable variations between wards/Tolas within school catchment areas was observed. In Rikhar Gram Panchayat for instance, Tolas with severely disadvantaged caste groups (Mushahair Tola) existed side-by-side Tolas populated by comparatively more affluent caste groups (Kumar Tola) within the same Panchayat/ school catchment. Here, while more progress against indicators has been achieved in the Kumar Tola, there was limited spread effect of Kumar Tola's successes into the Mushahiar Tola. One of the many reasons for this may be the severely disadvantaged socio-economic situation of the community. However, amongst all the areas visited in Bihar this was the only one that exhibited this experience.

⁹⁸ Not all outcomes were uniformly achieved as discussed in Chapter 2

⁹⁹ See Chapter 5 discusses spread effects of MVF interventions. However, as sites were chosen by using purposive sampling methods, villages very far away from the project sites were not visited. However, this appears to be a reasonable assumption based on interactions with teachers who had been transferred from schools far away from MVF intervention sites in Telengana. Most of them had heard of MVF's work, which is not surprising given MVF's strong presence in the state, but not of project initiatives and efforts.

CHAPTER 5. CHANGE OUTSIDE THE INTERVENTION AREA

5.1 Dissemination of the model and evidence of spread effects

As mentioned earlier, over the years, MVF has been called upon to share its models and experiences in different arenas both nationally and internationally.¹⁰⁰ The method applied by MVF in disseminating its model has developed in the following stages:

- First, the capacity of community members, including teachers, school committees and members of different collectives was developed to implement program activities—which they could then conduct with limited guidance from MVF staff.
- Second, from the pool of trained community members, some were transformed into resource persons.
- Resource persons were then deputed to other areas to provide *in situ* training or other practical training with an emphasis on non-negotiable principles and their application.¹⁰¹ More senior resource persons provide support to deputed resource persons and as also play an advisory role in international projects.¹⁰²

As part of the dissemination method, as well as in other cases, exposure visits are organized to project sites, particularly in Telangana, a place where they have worked the longest to demonstrate how the CLFZ approach may be applied effectively.¹⁰³ A number of respondents in Bihar reported that they found these visits very useful and some reported to having tried to emulate similar initiatives under their own areas of work.

Other than trainings to mobilize communities MVF develops, and disseminates child friendly pedagogical approaches at project sites through teacher trainings.¹⁰⁴ Further to intensive dissemination activities under broader improvement of quality education interventions at the community level, MVF also provides support to the State Council for Educational Research and Training (SCERT) and state level SSA in both states to develop appropriate curriculum and teaching materials, as also to train government teachers.¹⁰⁵ Trainings on various

¹⁰⁰ For a list of NGOs and agencies MVF has collaborated with see **Annex E**. Excerpt from Measles, Victoria. 2013. *MVF as a Resource Organization: An Initial Report Examining the History of MV Foundation as a Resource from 1991- 2013*. np. September.

¹⁰¹ This method was witnessed in operation in Bihar, where T Shivaramalu, an MVF resource person from Telangana, manages the work in Vaishali district and coordinates the work of community and teaching local volunteers at different levels. Shivaramalu, had no connection with Bihar when he moved to there seven years ago. At the beginning, he was not even fluent in the local language (Hindi) used or able to understand local dialects. Even so he was able to apply MVF methods in this unfamiliar context. His efforts and commitment were appreciated in all project sites with many recalling his persistent and innovative mobilization methods. This example indicates the high adaptability of MVF methods. However, Shivaramalu's commitment to the cause, which was evident in our interactions, may not be as easily replicable.

¹⁰² E.g. Mr. Venkat Reddy, MVF National Coordinator, is a consultant to the Mastercard Foundation's initiatives in Kenya and Uganda, Mr. Rajendra Prasad Chief Program Coordinator provides advice to global campaigns.

¹⁰³ Similar mobilization efforts are also applied to exposure visits- wherein MVF staff insist that community members from proposed project sites are part of the visiting delegation. No research fees are charged for these visits, particularly visits facilitated under government programs, to maintain autonomy. (Venkat Reddy, core committee meeting, Hyderabad , 10.4.2015)

¹⁰⁴ A number of teachers interviewed in Nalgonda district Telangana mentioned having attended MVF organized training and found them useful. Particular examples provided across sites were—learning how to develop teaching plans, discipline children without resorting to corporal punishment, proving information in text books in a more participatory and child friendly manner, etc.

¹⁰⁵ Mr. S Vinayak Coordinator of Curriculum provided an illustration of the nature of support SCERT has received from MVF. Previously school text books progressed in a linear manner with each chapter dealing with a separate

aspects of using the educational system and the Right to Education Act effectively is provided to officials of educational departments. Special training packages are also devised for specific interventions.¹⁰⁶

Along with trainings, MVF has documented its experiences in a vast body of handbooks, review reports guidelines, modules, etc. to document processes. These are then used to replicate different MVF strategies by other organizations and under different government initiatives. Finally, MVF's advocacy to effect policy changes have always been taken as part of civil society networks and coalitions. This provides the opportunity to build consensus among civil society groups, which is in line with MVF's education argument.¹⁰⁷

All these efforts help to disseminate MVFS experience generally and the CLFZ model specifically. As a result of the efforts to disseminate the MVF experience, the MVF approach to working with communities has been successfully replicated in many different environments. Examples of this include:

- **Conflict areas:** Participation of MVF resource persons in the NCPCR's Bal Bandhu initiative¹⁰⁸ in conflict and disturbed areas demonstrated that the MVF model can be successfully applied even in unstable environments.
- **Urban areas:** MVF's methods of community mobilization and establishment of bridge schools has been used by Rainbow Foundation/the Aman Biradari network working with street children in Hyderabad and Delhi.¹⁰⁹ Another illustration is the campaign conducted by the Labor Department, Telengana in 2005 to create CLFZs in busy commercial streets in Hyderabad.¹¹⁰ In this process, instead of penalties, Labour Department officials with MVF guidance, successfully motivated employers in primarily in commercial establishments to stop using child labour in partnership with business unions, non-state service providers¹¹¹ and state level business federations.¹¹² Employers who complied were given 'No Child Labour Used' certificates to display in their premises. These signs became very popular with shop owners in the area.¹¹³ Representatives from Maharashtra and Tamil Nadu came to see this campaign and were inspired to apply a similar model in their own states.

topic. Application of this method meant that children late entrants were unable to catch up with lessons, which had already been covered. Hence another method was adopted—to repeat the same lessons at progressively advanced levels, which allows late entrants to catch up more effectively

¹⁰⁶ To illustrate, a special training package on corporate social responsibility was devised towards training company officials not to employ any child labor. Interview with Dhananjay, MVF Resource Person, Hyderabad, 8.4.15

¹⁰⁷ Interview with Murali (Coordinator NAFRE), Hyderabad April 7, 2015. Murali convenes the 'National Alliance for the Right to Education' which includes a wide range of NGOs working on child rights in Telengana. He provided numerous examples of how NGOs in Telengana have applied MVF methods or components thereof such as conducting bridge schools in some parts, community mobilization, etc.

¹⁰⁸ NCPCR. *Bal Bandhu in defence of child rights*. Government of India (https://www.academia.edu/11829410/Bal_Bandhu). Delhi

¹⁰⁹ Interview with R Anuradha, Hyderabad, 07.04.2015. See also <http://www.therainbowfoundation.com>

¹¹⁰ Audio Visual CD prepared by the Labor Department, State of Andhra Pradesh, 2005

¹¹¹ Divya Drishti Foundation, which runs a residential school in Hyderabad where children were sent, and Lion's Club Hyderabad, which is engaged in various social service activities.

¹¹² Federation of Andhra Pradesh Chambers of Commerce and Industry (FAPCCI)

¹¹³ Interview with Naresh Kumar, Labor Commissioner, Hyderabad, April 9, 2015

5.2 Evidence of Spread Effect

In Bihar, not much discernable spread effect was observed.¹¹⁴ Spread effects were, however, much more obvious in sites visited in Telangana as illustrated below:

- *Sriranga ruram, Naugudum Mandal, Nalgonda District*- motivated after attending a conference organized by MVF at Suryapet, members of a youth club organized an 8 member CRPF in their own village. The CRPF focused on facilitating local children's access to MVF's residential bridge school in the area. Parents in the village were and continue to be supportive of this initiative. They have collectively raised demands for a middle school in their village and improvement of the teaching standards. (particularly the use of the English medium of instruction) in the government school.
- *Nakkalapalli GP Moinabad Mandal, Ranga Reddy District* –a village representative was selected with MVF support to participate in the Mandal level CRPF. After participating in this initiative the representative was able to identify and send non-school going children to the MVF bridge camps. He also established a CRPF in the village, which the other community members interviewed appeared to be aware of. However, the CRPF in the village did not appear to be very active. The village also appeared to be in contact with MVF volunteers and CRPF members from other Mandals in efforts to prevent child marriage.¹¹⁵ Community members identified the adjoining village, which had an MVF intervention, as a role model as they felt that community members cooperated more due to the MVF's motivation efforts. According to respondents mutual trust between MVF volunteers and community members enabled cooperation, which in turn led to progress and development.

5.3 The counterfactual situation

In visits to two non-MVF intervention areas some differences were clear and are discussed below:

- *In Bihar*- a visit to a school¹¹⁶ in the adjoining block showed that most of the children were outside rather than in classes during school hours, garbage was not cleared on school premises, no bells were used, etc. It was also found that 50% of girls in class 8-9 in one of the middle schools visited were married. Some were attending classes on the day of the visit.¹¹⁷ In some other schools, about half the numbers of enrolled children were attending on the day of the field visit.¹¹⁸ This is a very low attendance compared to a village where the CLFZ programme is active. In the middle schools visited¹¹⁹, teachers reported that children often left after the mid-day-meal was distributed. They also noted that they do not count with Panchayat's level support for their work. The teacher's scepticism in relation to the Right To Education Act was also noted in areas where the CLFZ model is not being

¹¹⁴ However, teachers and elected representatives, particularly those in Gram Panchayats where regular review meetings are held mentioned that they discussed successful practices at the Tola levels at these meetings. See Chapter 3 for more details on review meetings.

¹¹⁵ Community members mentioned that girl children's education is an issue. Irregular attendance of children due to floriculture harvesting was also identified as a serious concern.

¹¹⁶ MS Soharti and NPS Soharti East, which share common premises. 09.03.2015

¹¹⁷ These girls could not be spoken in the absence of parental consent.

¹¹⁸ Verified spot checks in NPS Soharti, UMS Mehpurakanya and UMS Hariprasad. 09.03.2015

¹¹⁹ MS Soharti, MS CHackakhali, UMS Mehpurakanya, UMS Hariprasad 09.03.2015

implemented. Most teachers felt that the law will be used by parents to harass them and were of the view that disallowing corporal punishments under the law has led to lower levels of discipline amongst children. These attitudes are in direct contrast with attitudes held by teachers met in MVF intervention sites where, teachers appeared to agree with the principles and spirit of the Right To Education Act. Further, parents of children met inside school premises¹²⁰ did not seem to be aware of the SMC or who its members were though they said that they were aware of school activities.

- *In Telangana*, teachers and community members in MVF non-intervention sites,¹²¹ mentioned that child labour and child marriage continues to be a problem. Parent and community engagements with the school also appeared considerably lower than in MVF intervention sites, including those where the program had been phased out.

The above analysis is merely illustrative and cannot be used to generalize the situation in all villages where MVF has not worked. However, these illustrations help to compare and contextualize MVF's efforts. It is also important to highlight that in areas visited to study spread effects and the counterfactual situation, government programs to promote children's education have played a role in improving school enrolment. Moreover, while it is difficult to reach a conclusion on the child labour situation due to known underreporting, a notable difference observed in non CLFZ areas is that community members appeared to be less engaged with the school system than in MVF intervention areas. There may be numerous reasons for these conclusions, but at least some of the credit for progress is due to the CLFZ programme.

In terms of achieving 'spread effects'—in Telengana, CRPF/TFCR meetings conducted regularly at higher (block, district) levels played a crucial role in motivating others to replicate the CLFZ approach in their own villages.¹²² It is recommended that this strategy be replicated in Bihar to achieve broader spread effects.

¹²⁰ NPS Soharti (East) 09.03.2015

¹²¹ Sri Rangapuram village, Nadigudem Mandal, Nalgonda district, Telegana (02.04.2015) and Nakapally village, Moinabad Mandal, Ranga Reddy district (05.04.2015)

¹²² CRPF meetings at higher levels are more widely attended by other Gram Panchayat members, not covered by MVF interventions, in the same Mandal.

MVF started to exit Telangana in 2009, after having applied the CLFZ approach in a consistent and widespread manner for the better part of 2 decades.¹²³ In addition components of MVF's model have also been replicated by other agencies working in the state. These combined factors make Telangana an ideal location to explore the sustainability question.

6.1 What is it that is sustained (or hoped to be sustained)?

MVF's indicators of a sustainability of CLFZs include¹²⁴:

- Retention of children in school at any one time is at 95% or above.
- Violations of child rights are reacted to.
- There is continuous dialogue and meetings focused on child rights.
- The community does all this without any external project support.
- The school is developed as an institution that takes care of all aspects of a child's development.

In order to achieve an above 95% retention rate, the community must accept the norm that all children must be in formal education and any child not engaged in formal school is a child labourer. In Telangana, the success of MVF's interventions is demonstrated by the fact that intensive community mobilization is no longer required in project sites to ensure that children are enrolled in school. One significant factors that led to the establishment of the norm as reported in project sites is that children who benefitted from program, particularly ex-bridge class students, inspired other community members to send their children to school.

However, this does not imply that monitoring is unnecessary. Here again, some of MVF's principles, methodologies, and interventions have been institutionalized in the Right To Education Act: for example, teachers and SMCs are mandated to monitor school attendance.¹²⁵ Additionally, regular tracking of enrolment and attendance is necessary. This is being done by maintaining and regularly updating records of all children in school in project sites.

Community efforts must now be towards improving the quality of education and school facilities, issues of child protection and safety, all of which require different kinds of mobilization and negotiating strategies. To this end, CRPFs in Telangana are being federated at different levels with MVF support to continue community tracking of the situation of child rights at the village level.¹²⁶ CRPF members interviewed recounted numerous instances where they have been called upon to intervene or take actions in cases of

¹²³ Please refer to **Annex B** for a time line of MVF's work in Telangana.

¹²⁴ Marsden, *Op. cit.*

¹²⁵ However, SMCs may not be able to monitor children who are not in the school system, such as children of migratory labor.

¹²⁶ An indicator of the activeness of this group is an observation made by SCPCR member Mohd. Raheemuddin that MVF associates and CRPF members at the mandal and district levels bring in the most number of complaints to the Commission. (Interview, Hyderabad, April 7, 2015)

violations of child rights, particularly to prevent child marriages. Hence the responsive or 'reactive' role played by the CRPF continues.

At the community level, however, regular activities of the CRPF have decreased. Although there were a few instances of recent collective action cited by community respondents, including that of CRPFs organizing meetings on their own when needed, raising funds to engage supplementary teachers at local government schools, etc.—there was limited evidence of the CRPF's 'proactive' role—i.e. undertaking independent initiatives on aspects of child labor/right to education—across project sites.

The area of developing conducive environments for children continues to be a challenge.¹²⁷ Some issues need to be highlighted in this regard. First, there has been significant development in overall school facilities over the last two decades. In MVF intervention sites, as a result of MVF activities and community mobilization, local authorities were compelled to deliver on infrastructural demands to accommodate the unexpected (increased) number of children attending school. Mobilization also led to a demand for quality education. CRPF members reported that these factors have led to more numbers not only attending government schools but also private schools.

There appeared to be a clear preference for private schools in most of the sites visited, the use of English medium instruction in private schools was the most common reason provided for the preference. The quality of education in private schools is a matter of dispute.¹²⁸ However, most parents felt that private schools are better able to monitor children's education and offer extra-curricular activities to encourage a child's holistic development.¹²⁹ Simultaneously, there is a strong demand for the strengthening of government schools, as private schooling is expensive.

6.2 Threats to sustainability

Threats to sustainability discussed earlier include:

- Irregular attendance in school¹³⁰
- Absence of a consistent legal and policy environment
- Tracking of migratory children

¹²⁷ Infrastructure is still inadequate and allocations are often badly planned: for instance, in a site visited in Bihar, two middle schools were situated adjacent to each other, while other areas had no schools at all. Use of low quality of materials in constructing school infrastructure was also reported.

Inadequate amenities were reported across Telangana, with water problems in the Ranga Reddy district being a major concern. The lack of water and, consequently, sanitation/toilet facilities is a particular disadvantage for girl students who, in cases, have to go back home to relieve themselves.

¹²⁸ All teachers believe that the standard of education, in terms of vigor of curriculum, is not high in private schools. However, according to them sending children to private schools is regarded as a status symbol.

¹²⁹ It is true that there is no emphasis on co-curricular activities in government schools. To bridge this gap, MVF has often supplied library books, sports, equipment, etc. to schools. But teachers also complain that they are burdened with too many administrative responsibilities and, hence, have time only for academic work with students.

¹³⁰ Community members' (teachers and community) estimates of irregularity vary from less than 10% in villages with stronger MVF program presence to 30% in places where it is weaker. According to attendance figures provided by the MVF Bihar team, attendance at model schools in Bihar in December 2014 varies between 73-98%. Although it is also observed that there has been increases in percentage attendance in the period May-December 2015. In Bihar, 75% attendance is essential to avail of benefits under support programs. 80-85% attendance is considered to be equal to nearly universal education. See Times of India. 2014. *Fixing classroom processes*. http://www.ideasforindia.in/article.aspx?article_id=298. June

- Unaffordable costs of private education and concerns of quality in government schools
- Concerns with higher education
- Premature withdrawal of the program
- Lack of institutional preparedness and the will to deal with the increasing demand for education
- Frequent transfers of state officials interrupt continuity
- Delays and systemic failures in ensuring delivery of welfare benefits¹³¹

A significant threat to sustainability is **gender discrimination**, which exacerbates vulnerability in female children. MVF has, over the years, taken special measures to counter gender discrimination, including the forging of women's and girls' groups to advocate against child marriages and other issues to promote girls' education and development (e.g. health). Intensive activities have been conducted over the years to prevent child marriages.¹³² As most people are aware that child marriage is an offence, there is considerable under reporting on this issue. However, community level interactions indicate that there is a certain level of acceptance that girls should get married after finishing school, which is either Class 8 (Age 14)¹³³ or 10 (Age 16) – both being under the legal marriage age (18 years for girls).¹³⁴ Security concerns, such as sexual harassment generally and particularly while commuting were cited by parents and community members as reasons for child marriage.

Overall, MVF has had limited targeted interventions to reduce gender disparity. CRPFs members are mostly male, and female CRPF members do not appear to be as active or as articulate as their male counterparts.¹³⁵ Dr. Shantha Sinha¹³⁶ responded to this issue by emphasizing the importance of a clear uniformly child-centric message to ensure the effectiveness of the intervention and community cohesion. Adding targeting of gender norms in MVF interventions would have complicated the message and diluted the achievement of universal goals. Still MVF has paid special attention to monitoring schoolgirls and girl marriage specifically.

6.3 Contextual factors contributing to sustainability

While contextual factors that contribute to the success of a CLFZ have been discussed in detail in Chapters 2 and 4, issues affecting sustainability specifically are mentioned here. First, mass withdrawal of child labour in villages resulting in better adult wages was reported in many sites in Nalgonda and Ranga Reddy visited.¹³⁷ These wage rates have been

¹³¹ This is of particular concern for very poor children, whose parents cannot even afford to supply them with learning materials (mid-day meals, text books, maintenance and are provided free of cost in government schools)..

¹³² This was one of the main activities conducted under MVF initiatives to target the 14-18 age group.

¹³³ Some ex-bridge course girl students in Bihar reported that some of their female classmate got married immediately after completing Class 8 in the bridge school. In Nalgonda district (Telangana), an ex-bridge course girl was married after completing Class 7 in the bridge school.

¹³⁴ Purely anecdotal accounts suggest that (girl) child marriage rates remain high. Also even though there may be comparatively fewer cases of girls younger than 14 getting married, they do happen.

¹³⁵ CRPF memberships may be contrasted with SMC memberships which, under Right to Education Act, must have a 50% female membership.

¹³⁶ Interview, Hyderabad, April 8, 2015

¹³⁷ In Chevella and Kotapally gram panchayats in Ranga Reddy district (Telangana), adult wages were negotiated upwards when child labour was eliminated. In two villages instances were reported where landowners leased

sustained over the years. However, it must be borne in mind that wage improvement was not a result of MVF's efforts alone. The enactment and implementation of the National Rural Employment Guarantees Act, 2005 was also a factor in driving up adult wages. The improvement of family income has obvious implications on reducing vulnerability to child labour.

Overall, MVFs efforts have created a community demand for education, which must be met by the supply side: namely the State, which is accountable for upholding fundamental rights. A question that was discussed with CRPF members and MVF staff was whether limitations in the supply side would result in the children dropping out at a later stage. In this regard, both CRPF members and MVF staff are of the opinion that once the norm is set, there will be a continuing demand for quality education, even if supply side limitations make the situation more challenging. Hence they argue that drop out rates, particularly in the 5-14 age group may not rise substantially solely due to inadequacies on the supply side. Also given that the State is now obliged to deliver quality education with progressive changes in law and policy, there is now a normative framework for the community to articulate their demands and seek entitlements.

6.4 Mechanisms that build sustainability

All factors that contribute to the success of the CLFZ approach, as discussed in Chapter 2, also contribute to the sustainability of program achievements. Additionally, program achievements have also been sustained in other ways. First, the planning of an exit strategy for withdrawal from MVF sites was made an integral part of the program interventions. Second, the institutionalization of community collectives by registering federations of these collectives at higher levels, as is done for establishing non-governmental organizations,¹³⁸ played a role in achieving sustainability. Both these strategies are explained below.

In relation to MVF's exit strategy—from the very beginning, MVF did not envisage a permanent role for itself in project sites. As detailed earlier, the responsibility of program delivery was shifted to the community at an early stage and community collectives were trained on the following:

- To track school going and non-school going children,¹³⁹
- On methods of addressing child labour,
- On methods of mobilizing resources for the development of the school,
- Methods to bring back drop outs and ensuring retention.¹⁴⁰

MVF's exit strategy has been to gradually phase out MVF support by decreasing numbers of volunteers, to withdrawing village volunteers, to maintaining a smaller team of organizers and coordinators at the higher village cluster and mandal levels. Prior to withdrawal of MVF

tracts of land to groups of adult agricultural labourers, the rate was both profitable for the lessor and more equitable than before for the lessee, when child labor was eliminated.

¹³⁸ National level CRPFs and TFCRs have been registered under the Societies Registration Act as a non-governmental organization.

¹³⁹ In Ennnaram Gram Panchayat, Bantawaran mandal (Ranga Reddy district), ex-MVF volunteers along with CRPF continue to track enrollment and attendance in schools. Their list matched the school records almost exactly, showing a 10% absentee rate. This is a remarkable achievement given that the MVF had phased out its program 6 years ago.

¹⁴⁰ MVF. 1999. Annual Progress Report n.p.

volunteers, communities were consulted and informed of reasons for withdrawal and discussions were encouraged on strategies to ensure that the village remains a CLFZ or keeps working towards that goal. Further, even after phasing out, the CRPF members and MVF staff reported that, contact was maintained with the community through various means, such as, visits to the village to respond to specific concerns and ad hoc needs as also to monitor the situation in villages.

The MVF is a relatively small organization and sees its role as being supportive of communities. It is in a position to turn down communities that they do not believe have the necessary commitment to assume ownership of the CFLZ approach, and to exit from communities when it believes that a sufficient foundation for progress has been laid or when it feels a lack of commitment.

However, most community respondents in areas in Telangana where MVF exited many years ago felt that MVF should continue to play an anchoring role at the village level so that activities are more regularized. Community collectives also felt that they need MVF's continued guidance.¹⁴¹ Indeed it was observed that not all the activities that community collectives were trained to do, are being conducted equally well in all sites visited. However, the nature of community level activities has also changed in some significant ways. For instance, many of the functions performed by CRPFs are required to be done by statutory SMCs and teachers. Hence the intensive level of tracking school enrolments / child labour is no longer required.¹⁴² However, the transfer of experiential learnings of CRPFs to SMCs does not appear to have happened systematically. In places where community members, who had been closely involved with MVF activities, joined SMCs, they appeared to have strengthened these bodies with their commitment to the issue and prior experience. But in most places SMC-CRPF interactions appear to be limited. Hence, though SMC members have, in some instances, sought out CRPF assistance,¹⁴³ due to their lesser visibility SMC members tend to be familiar with individual CRPF members rather than the CRPF as a collective.¹⁴⁴ Newly appointed teachers¹⁴⁵ are also not very familiar with the work of the CRPF nor are they able to identify them as a collective.¹⁴⁶

On the second point of institutionalizing collectives- select community collectives – namely CRPFs and TFCR – are being federated and institutionalized at the higher levels (mandal, district, state and national). At the Mandal level CRPFs are constituted by CRPF convenors from each village as well as interested individuals. MVF continues to support this initiative,

¹⁴¹ Even while admitting that they are capable of taking action themselves.

¹⁴² This is acknowledged by most CRPF members met with in Telangana, who also think that their role has changed to advocating on broader issues relating to quality education. In Telangana, the need for English medium instruction was highlighted.

¹⁴³ For instance, as per interviews with CRPF members in Thungaturthy and Kuntapalli, in a number of villages CRPF support was taken to improve school facilities: assistance with getting power connection, collection of funds to supplement school staff, etc.—these activities being done much after MVF phased out its activities in these villages. Teachers in some sites in Telangana also rely on CRPF assistance during annual enrollment and to assess children's performance.

¹⁴⁴ This has also to do with the structural differences between SMCs and CRPFs in that SMCs are appointed for a two-year term, whereas CRPFs have a more permanent presence. Here it must be mentioned that in interactions with broader community members, CRPF individuals were better identified than CRPF as a collective.

¹⁴⁵ Teachers can be in one position for a minimum of 2 to a maximum of 8 years

¹⁴⁶ In some mandals in Ranga Reddy district (Dharur and Bantawaran), CRPF members observed that because they were no longer as active as before, recently appointed teachers do not recognize them and are not entirely aware of their work in collectives.

though the MVF staff find forum building at higher levels more challenging than at lower village levels. Here it must be noted that although CRPF visibility has reduced at the village level, total CRPF membership at the district level is currently at 12,000, with 2,000 members being added in the last two years.¹⁴⁷

Similar efforts are being made to collectivize ex-bridge school students in Telengana at the Mandal level. This process appears to be at a nascent stage. Although members of this collective met during the field visits appeared to be strongly committed to the cause, there is limited evidence of their tangible actions. However, this group has the potential to carry forward MVF's agenda.

Overall, the Telengana experience demonstrates that sustainability of gains made through an application of the CLFZ approach over a long period of time, is possible. Efforts taken to incorporate exit strategies in the program design and the planned phasing out of activities, played a significant role in ensuring sustainability. Even so, phasing out program interventions has not been easy for many reasons, particularly in cases where community members felt the need for continuing support. Phasing out also meant that MVF had to let go a cadre of trained volunteers. Although many volunteers continue to be engaged in child labour/right to education issues, their potential for contributing to the achievement of child rights is not fully realised.

The change in community norms and effective collectivisation strategies are also factors that help to successfully sustain progress achieved by the program. However, a point that needs to be made is that although MVF has exited from villages, it continues to be active at higher levels in Telegana, through its efforts to institutionalize and federate local collectives. These collectives were formed and continue to be supported by MVF to play a crucial community-monitoring and advocacy role. Hence, MVF's continuing, albeit reduced, support to community groups, have also played a role in sustaining program achievements.

¹⁴⁷ Interview with Sudarshan (Ranga Reddy CRPF District Convener) and P Ranga Reddy (Member of Ranga Reddy District CRPF) Vikrabad, 06.04.2015

7. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Overall, there is no critical evidence to contradict the claim that the CLFZ approach has worked in India and can be sustained. MVF's significant achievements have been well documented in various process documents and review reports. MVF's own role has progressed from being a research-based organization, to a catalyst for ground level mobilization, and to a resource agency both nationally and internationally. Its most significant strategy has been to embed non-negotiable principles in all its interventions. By doing so, it has been able to mobilize and create community consensus to achieve universal goals. It has also created a cadre of highly trained individuals to disseminate its message to other areas.

In areas declared CLFZs, the norm of 'every child must be in school' has been established after considerable efforts, and intensive efforts to sustain this norm are no longer needed. Significant attrition rates were not observed in any of the project sites visited. However, the realization of children's right to compulsory *quality* education still needs work. Being the prime mover of the Right to Education Act, MVF is in the best position to leverage state accountability for its enforcement and demonstrate best practice models. Towards this end, MVF is piloting interventions to improve the quality of education, particularly the on-going intervention in Bihar. To this end it is recommended that MVF take steps to ensure that the experience and knowledge gained by the CRPFs in Telengana is effectively transferred to the SMCs, which have a statutory standing.

There is also a demand from community stakeholders and MVF partners in Telengana to expand its mobilization work to address broader issues of child protection including to address concerns that affect all children from 0-18 years of age. MVF certainly has both the expertise and human resources to embark on such initiatives. The challenge, however, will be to devise a clear message that can unify communities on such broad issues. Advocacy efforts to ensure consistency between child labour and right to education laws are also needed. Further, since regular attendance of students has been raised as an issue in both states, it is suggested that MVF develop data collection systems to track attendance in schools.

In Bihar, the strategy of creating 'model schools' is positive but appears to require further consistent support. It may be the case that an exit at this early stage is premature. It is important that MVF follow through with their engagement until the efforts are adequately consolidated on the ground in all project sites.

Bibliography

- Aziz, Mathew, Vora (2001) *MVF – An Impact Assessment (for HIVOS)*, n.p. MV Foundation
- Bharadwaj. 2008. *Handbook for Organizations for the 'Area Based Approach' to Eliminate Child Labour and Universalize Education*. n.p. MV Foundation. May
- Dowling M (2010), *A guide to residential bridge course camps*, n.p. MV Foundation
- Hindman ed., *The World of Child Labor – An Historical and Regional Survey*. Armonk, NY: ME Sharpe (<http://www.ielrc.org/content/a0905.pdf>)
- IGNSS (2012), *Evaluation Report of Enabling Implementation of the Right to Education Act through involvement of Gram Panchayats, School Management Committees, and Local Communities in 10 Panchayats of Bihar*, n.p.
- Indian Express. 2014. 5 Years On, Right to Education is Still Far Cry in AP, TS
<http://www.newindianexpress.com/states/tehrangana/5-Years-On-Right-to-Education-is-Still-Far-Cry-in-AP- TS/2014/08/28/article2401978.ece>
- Levet D (2010), *Why Education? Analyzing Benefits for Child Laborers*, n.p.
- Lexow J and Pinto M, (2001) *MVF India: Social Mobility for getting Children out of Work and into School*, n.p.
- Mahajan. 2004. *MVF India; Education as Empowerment*. Azad Reading Room. Hyderabad
- Mahajan. 2008. *Education for Social Change: MVF and Child Labor*. National Book Trust.
- Marsden, Chris. 2009. *A Case Study on MVF*. n.p. MV Foundation
- Measles, Victoria. 2013. *MVF as a Resource Organization: An Initial Report Examining the History of MV Foundation as a Resource from 1991- 2013*. n.p. September
- Ministry of Women and Child Development, Government of India (2011) *Third and Fourth Combined Periodic Report on the Convention of the Rights of the Child*
- Mukherjee, Sarkar, Sudarshan. 2005. *MV Foundation, An Evaluation of the programme 'Elimination of Child Labour through the Universalisation of Elementary Education'*; MVF-EU Donor Consortium. n.p. MV Foundation
- Murphy D, (2005) *Eliminating Child Labor through Education: The Potential for Replicating the Work of the MV Foundation in India*, n.p. MV Foundation
- MVF (10.3.2010); Proposal to SKN on '*Enabling Implementation Of The Right To Education Act Through Involvement Of Gram Panchayats, School Management Committees And Local Communities*
- MVF (17.7.2014); '*Quality Education To Achieve Universal Retention In Government Schools, Progress Report Oct 2013-March 2014*. NP
- MVF (2008) *Our Children: Our responsibility- a commitment by Child Rights Protection Forum; an initiative of MV Foundation*. n.p. MV Foundation
- MVF (2011), *Annual Report 'Enabling Implementation Of The Right To Education Act Through Involvement Of Gram Panchayats, School Management Committees And Local Communities July 2010-June 2011*. NP
- MVF. *An Introduction for Organizations Considering the Use of the Area-based Approach to Eliminate Child Labour and Universalise Education*. np. Hyderabad

National Advisory Council, Government of India. December 2011. *Abolition of Child Labour and Implementation of Right to Education: A Brief Note*. n.p. New Delhi.

NCCPR. 2005. *Bal Bandhu: In Defence of Child Rights*. NCCPR

Priyam, Manisha. 2011. *State-NGO Partnership for Bringing the Child Back In: The M.V. Foundation in Bihar*. n.p.

Purushottham et al. 2014. *Impact Assessment of the Quality Improvement in Primary Education Programme in Nalgonda District* n.p. MV Foundation. January

Rai. 2012. *Challenges in implementing the RTE Act*.
<http://infochangeindia.org/education/backgrounders/challenges-in-implementing-the-rte-act.html>

Robertson. 2007. *Good Practices of Community Participation in the Context of Universalization of Education*. European Union. July

Shantha Sinha, 2005. *Emphasising Universal Principles for Deepening of Democracy-Actualizing Child Rights*. Economic and Political Weekly.

Shantha Sinha. 2010. *Perceptions on Getting Children to Schools Before and After the RTE Act*. https://www.academia.edu/10453507/Preceptions_of_Getting_Children_into_Schools-Before_and_After_RTE_Act_2009

Sinha, Shantha. 1996. *Child Labour and Education Policy in India*. The Administrator, Vol: XLI, July-September 1996, pp.17-2

Sinha, Shantha. Undated. *The Poverty Argument*. Secunderabad: n.p. MV Foundation

Usha Ramanathan. 2009. *Evolution of the Law on Child Labour in India* in Hugh D.

Wazir, Rekha and Saith, Ashwani. December 2009. *Universalising Child Rights: A Review of M.V. Foundation's Achievements and Future Directions*. Secunderabad: n.p, M.V. Foundation.

Wazir. 2002. *MV Foundation: getting children out of work and into school*. MV Foundation/UNDP. New Delhi

Wazir. 2004. *No to child labor, yes to education: Unfolding of a grassroots movement in Andhra Pradesh*. Azad Reading Room. Hyderabad.

ANNEX 1. TERMS OF REFERENCE

Date: October 18TH, 2014

Terms of Reference

For an External Evaluation of Child Labour Free Zones (CLFZ) programmes, as implemented in India, Ethiopia, Kenya, Uganda, Zimbabwe, Ghana and Morocco.

1. Background – creating Child Labour Free Zones (CLFZ)

Since 1991 the the Mamidipudi Venkatarangaiya Foundation (MVFoundation or MVF) in India has been working to eradicate Child Labour. MVF addresses all forms of child labour, and not only attacks the so-called “worst forms” of child labour¹⁴⁸.

According to MVF’s analysis the relationship between poverty and child labour is indirect at best. Child labour is found in non-poor families and, inversely, there are poor families who send their children to school and do not involve them in child labour.

Not only MVF’s analysis of child labour stands out. So does its approach to eliminating it. The approach developed and applied by MVF is an *area based approach*, which aims to create so called *Child Labour Free Zones (CLFZ)*, areas where all children go to school and are out of work. For MVF eradicating child labour and the right to education are two sides of the same coin.

MVF’s “Theory of Change” is laid down in the “*Handbook for organizations for the ‘area-based approach’ to eliminate child labour and universalise education (2008)*”¹⁴⁹. This approach combines a strong focus on community awareness raising and organizing (about the importance for children to be in school and out of work) with support activities for parents and teachers/schools to integrate all children in the formal education system.

The central outcome of this area based approach is a *Child Labour Free Zone*, in which

- The sustained norm within a community has become that ‘no child should work’,
- The school is developed as an institution that takes care of all aspects of a child’s development,
- Community takes ownership of child rights,
- Neighboring communities change their norms,
- Institutions are sensitized to reduce the barriers to communities changing their norm to ‘no child should work’,
- All children are in schools and enjoy their right to education in the project area,
- The project area becomes a resource centre for all other areas in the country.

MVF has developed its practice in the Indian states of Andhra Pradesh/Telangana, from where it has spread and also inspired other actors. Along with the spread and multiplication

¹⁴⁸ www.mvfindia.in

¹⁴⁹ the Handbook can be downloaded here:

http://www.google.nl/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&frm=1&source=web&cd=1&ved=0CCEQFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.hivos.nl%2Fdut%2Fcontent%2Fdownload%2F82617%2F745489%2Ffile%2FMVF%2520Handbook%2520Area%2520Based%2520Approach%2520may%25202008.pdf&ei=QnM_VKzdHMXQ7AbeolGQBA&usg=AFQjCNE7MUbmhASYbOGJN_GCz7uxUS85qQ&sig2=xoBOc8ueUfluuyrjC2Spbw

of its approach MVF has assumed different roles, from direct implementer to capacity builder and trainer of others.

Since 1995 MVF's work has been supported –financially and otherwise- by Hivos, the Humanistic Institute for Development Cooperation from the Netherlands¹⁵⁰. Through Hivos, other Dutch and European NGOs joined this support initiative for MVF's work¹⁵¹. The Dutch organisations established an ongoing joint campaign under the name *Stop Child Labour – School is the best place to work*¹⁵², organizing public awareness raising and lobby & advocacy work on Child Labour, in the Netherlands and in Europe¹⁵³.

The members of the Stop Child Labour Campaign (SCL) have also promoted the further expansion of the CLFZ-concept outside India, both to Africa and Latin America. As a result of this a growing number of organisations outside India has adopted the CLFZ concept and is applying it in practice. These expansion initiatives are a collaborative effort of the above mentioned Dutch organisations, African partner organisations and MVF in its capacity of advisor and capacity builder, now at an international level. As a result of these efforts, a community of practice and learning has been emerging and growing around the concept of CLFZ.

The SCL campaign has been quite successful in influencing Northern and Southern policy-makers' viewpoints on Child Labour and how to eradicate it, and in attracting funding for the spreading of the application of the CLFZ approach. In 2012 the Dutch Postcode Lottery approved funding for *Omars Dream*, a programme for the creation of CLFZs in Ethiopia, Uganda, Kenya, Zimbabwe, Ghana and Morocco, coordinated by Hivos^{154 155}. In 2014 the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs approved funding for the programme *Out of Work and into School: joint efforts towards Child Labour Free Zones*.

2. This evaluation

With this increasing appeal, and in the result oriented climate of international cooperation, comes an increasing demand for evidence that shows the effectiveness and sustainability of the CLFZ approach. This is all the more challenging as the CLFZ approach has a number of unique features distinguishing it from other approaches towards Child Labour (area based; focusing on all forms of child labour; targeting community norms as central outcome)

Hivos decided to invest in a major external evaluation exercise of the CLFZ- approach, its effectiveness and sustainability. This exercise will focus on two major ‘expressions’ of the CLFZ approach: its oldest and one of its most recent i.e. MVF’s work in India and the *Omars Dream* programme in Africa. The Dutch and African participants in Omars Dream agreed with Hivos’ proposal for evaluating the programme. Regarding MVF it turned out that Stichting Kinderpostzegels Nederland (SKN) and Hivos had similar thoughts regarding the usefulness of an evaluation of the work of MVF, for which they decided to join forces. MVF welcomed the initiative.

¹⁵⁰ Historically and in terms of financial commitments, MVF is one of Hivos' top partner organisations. Over time Hivos has disbursed more than € 9 million to MVF's work.

¹⁵¹ <http://www.stopchildlabour.org/Stop-Childlabour/Who-we-are/The-Stop-Child-Labour-Coalition2>

152 www.stopchildlabour.org

¹⁵³ In the context of the European network Alliance 2015

¹⁵⁴ Omars Dream programme proposal for Dutch Postcode Lottery:

http://www.google.nl/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&frm=1&source=web&cd=4&ved=0CDcQFjAD&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.globalcampaignforeducation.nl%2F1%2Flibrary%2Fdownload%2FDsiRWeRNGCU8F7TjxooPtVxUaatS2Oo2%2F2Fomar's%2Bdream%2D255B1%255D.pdf%3Fformat%3Dsave_to_disk%26ext%3D.pdf%3Freturn_uri%3D%252F2Fnews%252Fview%252F873360%252F583957%252F12-juni-internationale-kind-gegen-kind-arbeit.html&ei=3vBCVK2IOYG7Yqbaj4GYCA&usq=AFQjCNHws-iarv64SPiV1VKhqE_y-m-zOfq

¹⁵⁵ Omars Dream progress report: <http://www.stopchildlabour.org/Stop-Childlabour/News-Items/Second-Annual-report-Omars-Dream>

The present Terms of Reference guide this evaluation, which focuses on different and complementary aspects of the CLFZ approach.

2.1. Purpose: Intended use/intended users

The organisations promoting the CLFZ concept are the intended users of the findings of this evaluation. They will use them in at least two ways:

- they will use them for improving their future programmes & interventions. In other words this evaluation initiative explicitly aims to serve the learning community on CLFZ,
- they will use the findings to account for the results of their programmes to their backdonors.

Intended users are the members of the above mentioned CLFZ community of practice and learning, both the implementing and the supporting organisations. They are:

Country		Implementing organisations ¹⁵⁶	Supporting organisations
Omar s Drea m	Ethiopia	-ADAA –African Development Aid Assistance -WCAT-WABE Children’s Aid and Training -FSCE-Forum on Sustainable Child Empowerment	SKN
	Kenya	-KAACR – Kenya Alliance for the Advancement of Children’s Rights	Icco
	Uganda	-ANPPCAN – African Network for the Protection and Prevention against Child Abuse and Neglect -KIN-Kids in Need	Hivos
	Zimbabwe	-CACLAZ-Coalition Against Child Labour in Zimbabwe	Hivos
	Ghana	-GAWU- General Agricultural Workers’Union	FNV
	Morocco	-SNE- Syndicat National de l’Enseignement	FNV
India		-MV Foundation	Hivos SKN

2.2. Object & Scope of the evaluation.

The central object of the evaluation is the **CLFZ- approach**. The evaluation will consist of two studies. One study will focus on *current* efforts to implement Child Labour Free Zones, in Africa and in India. The other study will focus on the *historical* portfolio of MV Foundation in India, since MVFoundation started its work of creating CLFZs.

¹⁵⁶ <http://www.stopchildlabour.org/Stop-Childlabour/Who-we-are/Our-partners-worldwide>

Africa + India	1 .The current portfolio of projects being implemented since 2012- under the umbrella of the <i>Omars Dream programme</i> in various African countries.
	2.The project “ <i>Quality Education to Achieve Universal Retention in Government Schools</i> ” currently implemented – since 2010- by MVF in Bihar, and supported by SKN ¹⁵⁷ ,
India	3. The historical portfolio of child labour projects implemented by MVF in India, since 1991 .

2.3. Objective of the evaluation

The objective of the evaluation is to describe and document the CLFZ-approach and critically study it, or rather its applications (i.e. the projects and portfolios mentioned above), to find out whether they work (or not) and how and why they work, and whether their results are sustainable.

As was indicated before, with the spread of the CLFZ approach has come the increasing need to demonstrate that “it” works. It is very important to stress, however, that there is no single “it”, no “one-size-fits-all” version of the CLFZ approach. The CLFZ approach has been clearly demarcated by MVF, but it is not a fixed recipe. In each different context it comes to life and is applied in varying form and with varying components, depending on the local context and possibilities and on the understanding of the implementing organization. It is the explicit aim of this evaluation that this “diversity in uniformity” be captured in the study.

Of the two studies in this evaluation, one will focus on the **effectiveness** criterium; the other study will focus on the criterium of **sustainability**. In each study the **units of analysis** are (*prospective*) *Child Labour Free Zones*.

Evaluation Criterium	Country	Implementing organisations	No. of CLFZs=units of analysis
Effectiveness	Ethiopia	-ADAA –African Development Aid Assistance -WCAT-WABE Children’s Aid and Training -FSCE-Forum on Sustainable Child Empowerment	8 7 2
	Kenya	-KAACR – Kenya Alliance for the Advancement of Children’s Rights	8

¹⁵⁷ <http://mvfindia.in/portfolio/quality-education-to-achieve-universal-retention-in-government-schools/>

	Uganda	-ANPPCAN – African Network for the Protection and Prevention against Child Abuse and Neglect -KIN-Kids in Need -	2 2
	Zimbabwe	-CACLAZ-Coalition Against Child Labour in Zimbabwe	1
	Ghana	-GAWU- General Agricultural Workers' Union	7
	Morocco	-SNE- Syndicat National de l'Enseignement	1
	India	-MV Foundation-project “ <i>Quality Education to Achieve Universal Retention in Government Schools</i> ”	16 Panchayats

Sustainability	India	-MV Foundation – historical portfolio	All, as far as documented by MVF
----------------	-------	---------------------------------------	----------------------------------

Definitions

In this evaluation “Effectiveness” and “Sustainability” are understood in the following way, in line with the OECD –DAC definitions:

- Effectiveness is about the relationship between Results and Objectives of an intervention.
- Sustainability is about the permanence of the results of an intervention, after the intervention has ended.

2.4. Evaluation Questions

The evaluation will answer the following evaluation questions

-Effectiveness study

- How were the various intervention areas characterized at the start of the interventions, in terms of children in child labour/children in & out of school, in quantitative and qualitative terms?
- How did these areas compare to neighboring areas, and to the national situation in their country?
- What have been the interventions of the implementing organizations?
- What has changed in the situation described above since the start of the interventions?
- To what degree can the intervention areas now be called Child Labour Free Zones?
- How do the changes in in the intervention areas compare to changes in neighboring areas, and to the national situation in the country?
- Which internal factors –i.e. pertaining to the intervention- may explain the findings?

- Which external factors – i.e. pertaining to the context- may explain the findings?
- Was the intervention necessary, could the result have been achieved without it?

-Sustainability study

- Describe the historical portfolio of MVF's CLFZ interventions.
- To what degree have the CLFZs created in the past by MVF persisted (flourished / withered), i.e. to what degree do they still have the characteristics that made them a CLFZ?
- Are there indications of other changes in these zones, beyond the objectives of the CLFZ interventions, which may be related to/triggered by the past interventions of MVF?
- To what degree have the CLFZs influenced neighboring areas?
- What could explain the findings under these previous questions?

3. Answering the evaluation questions – the organization of the evaluation

3.1. How –methods and phasing

-Effectiveness study

Evaluation object and evaluation questions call for a *comparative yet context-specific* approach. The evaluation will consist of a series of *CLFZ case studies* based on a general evaluation framework.

Each case will be studied in its own right and context-specifically, but the findings from all cases will also be compared –with each other and with the approach as developed by MVF- in a synthesis. The evaluation will answer the questions for all of the units of analysis (i.e. each intervention area).

The evaluation questions have clearly *quantitative* and *qualitative* aspects: talking about school enrollment and children out of work makes little sense without talking numbers. Calling an area a *Child Labour Free Zone* is foremost depending on the prevalent norm in the community about the unacceptability of Child Labour, but obviously that is not only a qualitative statement and has to be expressed in numbers as well.

All cases will be studied. All countries will be visited. A number of cases will be studied more in-depth. In-depth study will focus on a sample of cases that will cover as much as possible the variety of contexts and approaches represented in the work of the implementing organisations. The Bihar project will be one of the in-depth case studies. The final proposal for African in-depth case studies will be developed in the inception phase and argued in the inception report.

-Sustainability study

The first step of this study will be to describe –as completely as possible- the study's object: the full historical portfolio of MVF CLFZ interventions.

The study will try to answer the evaluation questions on the basis of data held by MVF. This information will be complemented/triangulated with additional data-collection by the evaluation team. This additional data collection is expected to include a number of case studies.

The evaluation will start with an **inception phase** in which the selected evaluation team elaborates its original proposal, on the basis of documentation to be provided and interviews with stakeholders.

Their *inception report* will specify

- the precise objects of the evaluation,
- the theory of change of the studied interventions,
- the indicators to be used,
- data sources to be used,
- data collection methods,
- methods of analysis, both of the individual projects and comparatively.
- the sampling procedure to be applied and the sample proposed for in-depth case studies.

The inception report must be approved by Hivos before the actual research phase will start.

The **research phase** will lead to three reports:

1. On effectiveness, presenting the findings of each & all the cases studied, and a comparative synthesis,
2. On sustainability, based on the findings on the MVF portfolio,
3. A brief reflection on the CLFZ-approach, providing an executive summary of the two studies and interpreting their findings.

Draft case study findings will be presented to and discussed with the responsible implementing organisations before they are integrated in the main reports.

3.2. Who – Evaluation Team

Hivos is inviting proposals covering the entire Terms of Reference. This means we are looking for an evaluation team that integrates research capacity for Africa as well as for India. Proposals should consist of a technical and financial proposal responding to these Terms of Reference.

Proposals must convincingly demonstrate the team's:

- a) Evaluation expertise,
- b) Subject matter expertise, in terms of child labour, and understanding of the social dynamics involved the CLFZ approach,
- c) Track record of evaluations in Africa and India,
- d) Correct understanding of the Terms of Reference,
- e) Creative approach towards answering the Evaluation Questions, particularly showing:
 - how Qualitative and Quantitative study will be combined,
 - data can be collected at community level,
 - cases will be compared,
 - how the 'attribution' question will be addressed,
- f) Capacity & flexibility to implement in-depth case studies in the countries involved, and must provide CVs of proposed team leader and members as annexes.

The technical proposal will not exceed 10 pages (excluding annexes).

3.3. Timing of the evaluation

November 20th 2014: Deadline for receiving proposals,

December 15th: selection and appointment Evaluation team, start inception phase,
January 31st, 2015: Deadline inception report,
February 15th: Start research phase,
May 15th: draft Evaluation report,
May 18th-22nd: Presentation Evaluation report at meeting in Ghana,
May 31st: Final evaluation report.

3.4. Management of the Evaluation

3.4.1. The evaluation is formally commissioned by the Head of Hivos TEC –Audit and Evaluation- department,

3.4.1. The evaluation is managed by the Hivos Evaluation Manager, assisted by Hivos' Stop Child Labour team and the SKN programme staff for the Bihar project.

3.5. Internal Reference Group

All stakeholders (see under paragraph 2.1) will constitute a virtual Internal Reference Group. They have commented on these ToR and will be in a position to comment on:

-The draft Inception Report,

-The draft Evaluation Report,

and will assist the evaluation team in the proper implementation of the evaluation.

3.6 Budget

The budget for this evaluation (including VAT where applicable) shall not exceed a maximum of € 200,000.

Proposals must be sent by email to:

Hivos Evaluation Manager

Karel Chambille

kchambille@hivos.org

ANNEX 2. Tools for Data Collection

FGD Guide for CRPF

Preamble / Consent

Hello: My name is _____, Thank you for accepting to talk to us about your experience with the CLFZ Project implemented by [insert name of Local Implementing Partner organizations] in collaboration with The reason we are having these interviews is to understand the ways in which the Project has been implemented and draw lessons for the future. We want you to share your honest and open thoughts with us. We will not be revealing your name in our report.

Are you comfortable with getting started? In saying yes, we anticipate that you give your consent to take part in this interview.

Questions

1. Names, current occupation and association with MVF
2. When did MVF come to your village and when was the CRPF formed? How are members incorporated? What is the current strength of the CRPF? When was the last member inducted?
3. What was the problem that was being addressed? And the changes observed over the years
 - a. Nature of child labor
 - b. Literacy levels (how far are children able to study now, what do they do with their education)
 - c. Poverty levels
 - d. Employment
 - e. Infrastructure
 - f. Migration
 - g. Accountability of leaders – panchayat, education department, panchayat sub committee
 - h. School facilities available
 - i. Specific situation of girl children
 - j. Caste based discrimination
4. Other changes observed
 - a. Village economy and occupational changes
 - b. Changes in adult wages
 - c. Expenses within the family
 - d. Collectivization in the village
5. Challenges faced in bringing about these changes
6. Which activities most useful? (with examples) Probe for
 - a. Campaign / drives/ door to door advocacy
 - b. Bridge schools

- c. Interactions with employers
 - d. Interactions with political representatives and administration
 - e. Child right groups
 - f. Youth clubs
 - g. Mothers/ women's groups
 - h. Parent teacher associations
7. Any external factors that also influences the changes above?
8. Visits from outside
9. Current functioning of the CRPF
- a. Number of members and how active are they?
 - b. How often do they meet? Who calls for the meetings? Who gets them to the meetings?
 - c. Nature of activities
 - d. Issues addressed
 - e. Interactions with parents
 - f. Interactions with other collectives
 - g. Interactions with SMC- have they taken over any of the CRPF functions
 - h. Interactions with political representatives
 - i. Interactions at mandal and district level
10. Difference in functioning from the time MVF support withdrawn/reduced
11. Challenges for the future
12. Any added support from MVF needed?

FGD guide for TFCR

Preamble / Consent

Hello: My name is _____, Thank you for accepting to talk to us about your experience with the CLFZ Project implemented by [insert name of Local Implementing Partner organizations] in collaboration with The reason we are having these interviews is to understand the ways in which the Project has been implemented and draw lessons for the future. We want you to share your honest and open thoughts with us. We will not be revealing your name in our report.

Are you comfortable with getting started? In saying yes, we anticipate that you give your consent to take part in this interview.

1. Please give me your name, the name of the school you teach in, when you started and when you got involved with MVF activities?
2. When was the TFCR formed? What are its activities today? How often do you meet? Who organises/ mobilises attendance for the meetings?
3. What is the most common issues discussed? What are the challenges in promoting children's right to education? (Probe for regular attendance, drop outs, parents interest in educating their children, quality of education, adequacy of amenities in school, existence of monitoring structures, responsiveness of higher authorities, existence of private schools)
4. Interactions with and usefulness of such interactions with
 1. Parents
 2. SMCS
 3. CRPF
 4. MVF volunteers
 5. Panchayats and Panchayat subcommittees
 6. Any other community structures (youth groups, women's groups)
5. How far do you think the schools are RTE Act compliant?
6. Any changes in MVF participation? How have these changes affected the functioning of the TFCR?
7. Any changes in community level activities since MVF has reduced its activities?
8. Should MVF continue to provide support? If yes, what kind of support?

Thank you very much and have a lovely day!

FGD guide for teachers and SMC members

Preamble / Consent

Hello: My name is _____, Thank you for accepting to talk to us about your experience with the CLFZ Project implemented by [insert name of Local Implementing Partner organizations] in collaboration with The reason we are having these interviews is to understand the ways in which the Project has been implemented and draw lessons for the future. We want you to share your honest and open thoughts with us. We will not be revealing your name in our report.

Are you comfortable with getting started? In saying yes, we anticipate that you give your consent to take part in this interview.

1. Please introduce yourself with your name, the class you teach and the year you joined this school
2. If you've taught in any other area, what are the differences you see here?
3. Are you aware of the activities MVF has undertaken in this area? If yes, please give examples
4. Any interactions with and the usefulness of interactions (including regularity of interaction and nature of support received) with
 - a. SMC
 - b. Parents
 - c. CRPC
 - d. Panchayat members (probe for regular inspections by Panchayat sub committees inter alia
 - e. School administration
 - f. TFCR
5. Anyone / organisation from the community to monitor?
6. How far do you think the children in your school will study? What are the challenges of retaining them in school?
7. What are the challenges you face in discharging your duties?

Questions for SMCs

9. Name, number and class of children studying in the school
10. How did you join the SMC? Who nominated/ elected you? How many members are there?
11. How do you define your role as SMC? What are your roles and responsibilities?
12. How often do you meet? What is the most common issue discussed at these meetings?
13. Do you have regular interactions with parents of children studying in your school? Do you think most parents are interested in their children's academic performance in school?
14. Have you ever sought the assistance of the CRPF? Panchayat members? School administration for resolving issues facing the school

FGD Guide for Male and Female Parents of Ex students

Preamble / Consent

Hello: My name is _____, Thank you for accepting to talk to us about your experience with the CLFZ Project implemented by [insert name of Local Implementing Partner organizations] in collaboration with The reason we are having these interviews is to understand the ways in which the Project has been implemented and draw lessons for the future. You will not be directly benefitted by speaking to me. We want you to share your honest and open thoughts with us. We will not be revealing your name in our report.

Are you comfortable with getting started? In saying yes, we anticipate that you give your consent to take part in this interview.

1. How many children do you have and what are they doing now?
2. Why did they drop out of school? What were they doing outside school? Were there others in the same situation as you?
3. What was your first engagement with MVF? Did they get your children to bridge school? How did they help? Who else in the community helped? (Probe for CRPF, youth groups, women's groups, panchayat members, MVF volunteers, etc)? How did you settle your debts in cases of bonded labor?
4. How did you manage the work / finances when the children went to school? Did you witness any changes in wages? Any changes in occupations? Any changes in household expenditure patterns? Were there any other factors that made these changes possible?
5. Were the school facilities adequate when your children started going to school? Did you have regular interactions with the teachers in the school?
6. Were you involved in any other MVF activities?
7. Have things improved for the parents sending their children to school today? If yes, what are the changes? (All children go to school, there are people/groups to monitor children's attendance, better school facilities?
8. Do you think these changes will continue in the long term? What will help in allowing these changes to continue?
9. Do you think that MVF volunteers at the village level are still needed? Is there anything else you wish MVF should have done?
10. Is there any advice you have for parents, in similar situations, regarding children's education?
11. Is there anything else you would like to share with me?

Thank you very much for your time

Questions for Parents of children currently in school

1. Name, number of children and class they are in
2. How much have you studied? Did you want to study more? What were the reasons you didn't study further?
3. What are the challenges in bringing up your children these days?
4. Have you heard of any child labor in your village? Is there someone / structure which monitors children's attendance?
5. Do you interact regularly with teachers, SMCs, CRPF, panchayat members?

ANNEX 3. LIST OF RESPONDENTS

	Name	Position	Gender	Contacts	Date and type of Interview (If relevant)
1	Akky de Kort	Programme Officer, Stop Child Labour Campaign, Hivos	F	a.de.kort@hivos.nl Skype: akkydekort Tel:+31 703765500	12.02.2015
2	Annette Selten	Project Officer	F	a.selten@kinderpostzegels.nl	12.02.2015
3	G. Oonk	India Committee Netherlands	M	g.oonk@indianet.nl	12.02.2015
Bihar					
4	T. Yadaiah	Senior Resource Person, MVF	M	mvfpatna@gmail.com	23.02.2015
5.	T Sivaramalu	MVF Program Coordinator, Bihar	M	mvfpatna@gmail.com	23.02.2015
6.	Satish Kumar	MVF Organizer, Purkhauri GP, Bihar	M		23.02.2015
7.	Chandra Bhushan Kumar	MVF Organizer, Rikkar GP, Bihar	M		23.02.2015
8.	Rafat Khanum	MVF Organizer, Laxminarayanpur GP, Bihar	F		23.02.2015
9.	Anjana Kumari	Supplementary Teacher, Sitalbukrahar, GP, Bihar	F		23.02.2015
10.	Manju Kumari	MVF Organizer, Anwarpur GP, Bihar	F		23.02.2015
11.	Ravi Kumar	MVF Organizer, Kartahanbujurg	M		23.02.2015
12.	Ramnath Chaudhuri	MVF Cluster Organizer, Bhatuali Bhagwan, Bihar	M		23.02.2015

13.	Umesh Kumar	MVF Cluster Organizer, Kharouna GP, Bihar	M		23.02.2015
14.	Sanjeet Paswan	MVF Organizer, Shadullapur GP, Bihar	M		23.02.2015
15.	Manoj Kumar	MVF Organizeer, Sirsaberan GP, Bihar	M		23.02.2015
16.	Priyanka Kumari	MVF Supplementary Teacher, Paura Madan Singh GP, Bihar	F		24.02.2015
17.	Pammi Kumari	MVF Supplementary Teacher, Paura Madan Singh GP, Bihar	F		24.02.2015
18.	Binod Kumar	MVF Supplementary Teacher, Bhatauli Bhagwan GP, Bihar	M		24.02.2015
19.	Chandan Kumar	MVF Supplementary Teacher, Basatha Jahanabad GP, Bihar	M		24.02.2015
20.	Ravindra Kumar	MVF Supplementary Teacher, Bhatauli Bhagwan GP, Bihar	M		24.02.2015
21.	Ravi Kumar	MVF Supplementary Teacher, Kartahan Bujurg GP, Bihar	M		24.02.2015
22.	Pappu Kumar	MVF Supplementary Teacher, Etwarpur Sisaula, Bihar	M		24.02.2015
23.	Rima Kumari	MVF Supplementary Teacher, Anwarpur, Bihar	M		24.02.2015
24.	Pallavi Kumari	MVF Supplementary Teacher, Ghataro D GP, Bihar	F		24.02.2015
25.	Santosh Rajak	MVF Supplementary Teacher, Gurmiya GP, Bihar	M		24.02.2015
26.	Angad Kumar Ray	MVF Supplementary Teacher, Parva Medasing GP, Bihar	M		24.02.2015

27.	Nand Kishor Ray	MVF Supplementary Teacher, Anwarpur	M		24.02.2015
28.	Shyamanandan Sahu	CRPF Convenor, Kartahan Bujurg GP, Bihar	M		25.02.2015
29.	Ashok Rajat	CRPF Member , Kartahan Bujurg GP, Bihar	M		25.02.2015
30.	Shiv Pujan Kumar	Cluster Resource Coordinator, SSA, Bihar	M		25.02.2015
31.	Shiv Kumar Paswan	Government Teacher, Kartahan Bujurg GP, Bihar	M		25.02.2015
32.	Naga Paswan	Ward Member, Kartahan Bujurg GP, Bihar	M		25.02.2015
33.	Manisha Kumari	Teacher, Kartanhan Bujurg GP, Bihar	F		25.02.2015
34.	Santosh Kumar Srivastava	Ward Member, CRPF member, Karatahan Bujurg GP, Bihar	M		25.02.2015
35.	Suman Kumar	CRPF member, Kartahan Bujurg GP, Bihar	M		25.02.2015
36.	Rajvardhan Sinha	Teacher, NPS Chandwara, Paswan Tola	M		25.02.2015
37.	R.N.Paswan	CRPF Member	M		25.02.2015
38.	Gauri Shankar	Government Teacher, Bihar	M		26.02.2015
39.	Surinder Kumar	Panchayat Primary Teacher, Bihar	M		26.02.2015
40.	Mahesh Kumar	Government Teacher, Prakhanda Block, Middle School, Bishnupur	M		26.02.2015
41.	Vijay Kr. Das	Government Teacher, Primary School, Sitalpaurah, Goswamitola	M		26.02.2015

42.	Vasant Kr. Srivastava	Panchayat Teacher, Primary School, Kartaha	M		26.02.2015
43.	Sashat Kumar	Government Teacher, Upper Middle School, Probodhinarayan, Bihar	M		26.02.2015
44.	Tulsi Kumar	Panchayat Teacher, Primary School Shekhpura, Bihar	M		26.02.2015
45.	Sunita Kumari	Government Teacher, Middle School Kartahan, Bihar	F		26.02.2015
46.	Kumari Chanda	Government Teacher, Middle School, Kartahan, Bihar	F		26.02.2015
47.	Santosh Kumar	Government Teacher, NPS Kartahan Bujurg	F		26.02.2015
48.	Bipin Kumar	CRC, SSA, UMS Panchrukkhi, Bihar	M		27.02.2015
49.	Nand Kishore Mishra	Head Master, UMS Panchrukki, Bihar	M		27.02.2015
50.	Vaidyanath Thakur	Ward Member, Rikkar, Bihar	M		27.02.2015
51.	Manju Tewari	Government Teacher, UMS Panchrukki, Bihar	F		27.02.2015
52.	Pramod Kumar	Headmaster, NPS Chakmanoharkati, Rikkar, Bihar	M		28.02.2015
53.	Satyanarayan Sahu	Ward Member, SMC Chairperson Chakmanoharkati, Rikkar, Bihar	M		28.02.2015
54.	Preeti Kumari	Government Teacher	F		28.02.2015
55.	Jayanti Kr. Srivastava	Mukhiya, Etwarpur Sisaula, Bihar	M		01.03.2015
56.	Ajay Pandit	Ward Member, Etwarpur Sisaula, Bihar	M		01.03.2015

57.	Binayak Kr. Ray	Panchayat Samiti member, Etwar Sisaula, Bihar	M		01.03.2015
58.	Basant Kumar	CRPF member, Private School HS Teacher	M		01.03.2015
59.	Hemant Kumar	CRPF member, Private School HS Teacher	M		01.03.2015
69.	Sanjiv Kumar Tripathi	Block Resource Person, SSA, Bihar	M		02.03.2015
70.	Shweta Kumari Singh	Head Teacher, NPS Madhusudan Pakri	F		02.03.2015
71.	Tahir Hussain	Former Headmaster, NPS Kobamohammadpur, Bihar	M		03.03.2015
72.	Md. Noor Aslam	Parent, Kobamohammadpur, Bihar	M		03.03.2015
73.	Yunus Khan	Parent, Kobamohammadpur, Bihar	M		03.03.2016
74.	Sibadevi	Anganwadi worker, Shyampur	F		03.03.2015
75.	Jameela Khatun	Ex-president of SEC, NPS, Shyampur Pakri	F		03.03.2015
76.	Subodh Rai	Head Master, NPS Shyampur Pakri, Bihar	M		04.03.2015
77.	Renu Kumari	Teacher, NPS, Shyampur Pakri, Bihar	F		04.03.2015
78.	Veena Paswan	Government Teacher, UMS Shyampur Pakri, Bihar	F		04.05.2015
79.	Anjum Ara	Government Teacher, UMS Shyampur Pakri, Bihar	F		04.03.2015
80.	Poonam Kumari	Government Teacher, UMS Shyampur Pakri, Bihar	F		04.03.2015

81.	Umesh Paswan	Government Teacher, UMS Shyampur Pakri, Bihar	M		04.03.2015
82.	Rameshwar Prasad Gupta	Government Teacher, UMS Shyampur Pakri, Bihar	M		04.03.2015
83.	Ramchandra Baitha	Government Teacher, UMS Shyampur Pakri, Bihar	M		04.03.2015
84.	Chulahi Rai	Ward Member, Ghataro D, Bihar	M		04.03.2015
85.	Banmila Devi	Deputy Mukhiya, Ghataro D, Bihar	F		04.03.2015
86.	Chintandevi	Ward member, Ghataro D, Bihar	F		04.03.2015
87.	Ravi Kumar	Cluster Organizer, Bihar Mahila Samkhya, Patna, Bihar	M		05.03.2015
88.	Umesh Shahu	Ward Volunteer, Hindustan Latex Family Planning Trust, Patna, Bihar	M		05.03.2015
89.	Abha Rani	Program Officer, SSA, Patna, Bihar	F		05.03.2015
90.	A.K.Pandey	Program Officer SSA, Patna, Bihar	M		05.03.2015
91.	Shekhar	Bihar Sjikshya Magazine Editor, Patna, Bihar	M		05.03.2015
92.	Niraj Kumar	Former Additional Project Coordinator, SSA, Patna, Bihar	M		05.05.2015
93.	Deepak Kumar Singh	State Project Officer, Bihar Education Program, Patna, Bihar	M		05.05.2015
94.	Ravindra Rathore	CARE Consultant, Patna, Bihar	M		05.05.2015
95.	Venkatraman	CARE Consultant, Patna, Bihar	M		05.05.2015

96.	Avinash Kr. Gupta	Sarpanch, Anwarpur, Bihar	M		08.03.2015
97.	Mahesh Das	Deputy Sarpanch, Anwarpur, Bihar	M		08.03.2015
98.	Laldev Paswan	CRPF Convenor, Anwarpur, Bihar	M		08.02.2015
99.	Surendra Kr. Ram	CRPF member, Panchayat Vikas Mitra, Anwarpur, Bihar	M		08.03.2015
100.	Kumari Preeti	Anganwadi worker, Anwarpur, Bihar	F		08.03.2015
101.	Guarav Kumar Nirav	CRC, SSA, Zandola	M		10.03.2015
102.	Malti Rai	Head Teacher, UMS Mehpurakanya, Bihar	F		10.03.2015
103.	Usha Kumari	Head Mistress, UMS Hariprasad, Bihar	F		10.03.2015
104.	Ramjit Chaudhury	CRCC, SSA, Lalganj Block, Bihar	M		10.03.2015
105.	Dileep Kr. Deepak	Government Teacher, Hajipur, Bihar	M		10.03.2015
106.	Dr. Prabhas Kr. Sinha	Block Resource Person, Lalganj Block, Bihar	M		10.03.2015
Telengana					
1.	Venkat Reddy	National Convener, MVF, Hyderabad	M	mvfindia@gmail.com	27.03.2015
2.	Rajendra Prasad	Chief Program Coordinator	M		27.03.2015
3.	Nagamani	MVF Ranga Reddy Organizer	F		27.03.2015
4.	Devakumari	MVF Ranga Reddy Organizer	F		27.03.2015
5.	Venkatesh	MVF Resource Person, Ranga Reddy	M		27.03.2015
6.	Narsimha	District Coordinator, Ranga Reddy	M		27.03.2015

7.	Prakash	MVF Ranga Reddy Coordinator	M		27.03.2015
8.	Dhanamma	MVF Organizer, Nalgonda District	F		27.03.2015
9.	Lalitha	MVF Organizer, Nalgonda District	F		27.03.2015
10.	Bhaskar	MVF Resource Person, Hyderabad	M		27.03.2015
11.	Dhananjay	MVF Resource Person (trainings), Hyderabad	M		27.03.2015
12.	Y Ramesh	Ex MVF Volunteer	M		29.03.2015
13.	Venkat Reddy	State Resource Person, SSA, Nalgonda, Telengana	M		29.03.2015
14.	Nogula Venkat Reddy	TFCR Convenor, Nalgonda, Telengana	M		29.03.2015
15.	M Ananda	Head Master, Velchella PS, Nalgonda, Telengana	M		29.03.2015
16.	Chandraiah	Government Teacher, PS Jamlatanda, Nalgonda, Telengana	M		29.03.2015
17.	R Lingaya	Subject Forum Member, Government Teacher Nuntankal PS, Nalgonda, Telengana	M		29.03.2015
18.	G Ambabai	Mandal Development Officer, Nalgonda, Telengana	F		30.03.2015
19.	D Shankar	Mandal Education Officer, Nalgonda, Telengana	F		30.03.2015
20.	John Wesley	Ex MVF Volunteer, Thirmalgiri, Nalgonda, Telengana	M		31.03.2015
21.	A Yadagiri	Ex MVF Volunteer, Thirmalgiri, Nalgonda, Telengana	M		31.03.2015

22.	P Sudarshan	Cluster Organizer, Penpahadu, Nalgonda, Telengana	M		01.04.2015
23.	S Sandhya	Ex MVF Volunteer, Munagala, Nalgonda, Telengana	F		01.04.2015
24.	Somnath	Ex MVF Volunteer, Thungaturthy, Nalgonda, Telengana	M		02.04.2015
25.	Vijayalaxmi	Government Teacher, PS Thungturthy, Nalgonda, Telengana	F		02.04.2015
26.	D Yadagiri	MVF associate, Addagudu, Modhpur, Nalgonda, Telengana	M		02.04.2015
27.	Shobha Sudhakar Reddy	Sarpanch, Kothapally GP, Ranga Reddy, Telengana	F		03.04.2015
28.	Sudhakar Reddy	Ex Sarpanch, Kothapally GP, Ranga Reddy, Telengana	M		03.04.2015
29.	M Narsimha	Ex MVF Volunteer, Kothapally	M		03.04.2015
30.	M Ganesh	Ex MVF Volunteer, Kothapally	M		03.04.2015
31.	V Kumar	Ex MVF Volunteer, Kothapally	M		03.04.2015
32.	M Ravinder	Ex MVF Volunteer, Kothapally	M		03.04.2015
33.	J Upendra	CI, Police, Shankarapally, Ranga Reddy, Telengana	M		03.04.2015
34.	Srisailam	Co-Convenor, Mandal CRPF, Vikrabad, Ranga Reddy	M		04.04.2015
35.	Narsimhan	MVF Mandal Coordinator, Ranga Reddy, Telengana	M		05.04.2015

36.	Mhd. Sharif	Ex MVF volunteer, Ranga Reddy, Telengana	M		05.04.2015
37.	Sudarshan	District CRPF Convenor, Ranga Reddy, Telengana	M		06.04.2015
38.	P Ranga Reddy	District CRPF Member, Ranga Reddy, Telengana	M		06.04.2015
39.	K Anuradha	Executive Director, Rainbow Foundation India, Hyderabad	F	Kanuradha.rfi@rainbowhome.in	07.04.2015
40.	S Vinayak	Coordinator Curriculum and Text Book Dept. SCERT, Hyderabad	M		07.04.2015
41.	Murali	Convenor CACL, Hyderabad	M		07.04.2015
42.	ShyamSundari	Joint Director, Dept. of Women and Child, Hyderabad, Telengana	F		07.04.2015
43.	David Raj	Child Protection Unit, UNICEF, Hyderabad	M	pdrhyd@gmail.com	08.04.2015
44.	Md. Raheemuddin	Member, SCPCR, Hyderabad	M	Raheem-scpcr@gmail.com	08.04.2015
45.	Shantha Sinha	Co-Founder MVF, Ex Chairperson NCPCR, Hyderabad	F		08.04.2015
46.	M.R. Vikram	MVF Secretary Trustee, Hyderabad	M		08.04.2015
47.	Naresh Kumar	Deputy Commissioner of Labor, Ranga Reddy, Hyderabad	M		08.04.2015
48.	M Krishnamurthi	MVF Chairman and Founder Trustee, Hyderabad	M		09.04.2015
49.	Mr. Verkataiah	BJP State Council member /CRPF 1997	M		07.04.2015
50.	K. Ramulu	CRPF	M		07.04.2015

51	G. Keshawulu	CRPF	M		07.04.2015
52	Mr. Sailu	CRPF	M		07.04.2015
53	Mr. Barappachary	CRPF	M		07.04.2015
54	Mr. Ramulu	Ex-MVF Volunteer	M		07.04.2015
55	Ms. Peamilla	Worked with the CRPF, but was never offered membership	F		07.04.2015
56	Mr. Hanumanthu	SMC Chairman	M		07.04.2015
57	B. Romchandaiah	Ex-MVF Volunteer	M		07.04.2015
58	Venkataiah Goud	Mandal Congress Leader/ ex Sarpanch and Chairman for Alliance of Child Rights.	M		07.04.2015
59	Mr. Vijaykumar	Governor, SMC	M		07.04.2015
60	K. Seinivas	Headmaster, Kulakacharla Mandal, 1995 BKVV	M		07.04.2015
61	Mr. Sataih	Headmaster, Doma Mandal, 1995 BKVV	M		07.04.2015
62	Mr. Kaisim	Teacher (2008), Former MVF volunteer (2001)	M		07.04.2015
63	Mr. Beemaiah	Headmaster, Pothiledy Palli, TFCR (2010)	M		07.04.2015
64	Ms. Bhagya	Teacher, Former Child Labourer and MVF bridge school students	F		07.04.2015
65	Mr. Krishna	Ex Youth Organization Member	M		07.04.2015