

Rural Development Scheme Implementation Effectiveness and Accountability: A Case Study of Parbhani Zilla Parishad

Dr. N.C. Dhande

(Assistant Professor, School of Commerce & Management Sciences, SRTM University, Nanded)

Dr. A.P. Gingine

(Assistant Professor, School of Educational Sciences, SRTM University, Nanded)

Mr. S.M. Dhavale

(Research Scholar, School of Commerce & Management Sciences, SRTM University, Nanded)

Abstract

The impact of rural development initiatives largely depends on their effective implementation and the accountability mechanisms governing them at the local level. This paper critically evaluates the effectiveness of key rural development scheme implementation and associated accountability structures under the purview of the Zilha Parishad (ZP) in Parbhani district, Maharashtra. Based on a mixed-methods case study analyzing secondary data (scheme MIS, reports) and primary data (beneficiary surveys, key informant interviews, focus group discussions), this study examines four crucial dimensions: the accuracy and equity of beneficiary selection and targeting; the quality and timeliness of service delivery and asset creation; the robustness and effectiveness of monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems, including social audits; and the accessibility and responsiveness of grievance redressal mechanisms. The findings reveal significant shortcomings in Parbhani: beneficiary targeting is hampered by outdated data and lack of transparency; service delivery and asset quality are inconsistent; M&E systems lack rigorous field verification and community involvement; and grievance redressal mechanisms are largely inaccessible and ineffective for the rural populace. The paper proposes specific, actionable recommendations for the Parbhani ZP to enhance implementation fidelity, strengthen accountability loops, and improve the overall effectiveness of rural development schemes for intended beneficiaries.

1. Introduction

Achieving tangible outcomes in rural development requires more than just allocating funds; it demands effective execution of schemes on the ground. India's Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs), including Zilha Parishads (ZPs) in Maharashtra, are mandated not only to plan but primarily to implement and oversee a vast array of development programs aimed at improving

rural lives (Rural Development Programmes, n.d.; Functions Of Zilla Parishad, n.d.). The success of schemes like MGNREGA, PMAY-G, NHM, and others hinges on how well they are delivered at the grassroots level.

This necessitates a critical examination of the implementation pipeline: Are the right people being selected as beneficiaries? Is the quality of services (like health, education) or assets (like houses, roads) adequate? Is progress being monitored effectively? Are citizens' complaints heard and addressed? These questions of implementation effectiveness and accountability are central to understanding whether decentralized governance translates policy into practice successfully (Role Of Panchayati Raj Institutions, n.d.). This analysis is particularly pertinent for Parbhani district, grappling with socio-economic challenges within the Marathwada region (Parbhani District Profile, n.d.; Government of India Ministry of MSME, n.d.).

This paper specifically focuses on the effectiveness and accountability dimensions of rural development scheme implementation by the Parbhani Zilha Parishad. The objectives are:

1. To evaluate the effectiveness, accuracy, and equity of beneficiary selection and targeting mechanisms for key rural development schemes.
2. To assess the quality, relevance, and timeliness of service delivery (e.g., health, education) and asset creation (e.g., MGNREGA works, PMAY-G houses) under selected schemes.
3. To examine the robustness and effectiveness of the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) mechanisms, including the role and impact of social audits, employed by the Zilha Parishad.
4. To ascertain the accessibility, responsiveness, and effectiveness of grievance redressal mechanisms available to beneficiaries of rural development schemes.

The study investigates these aspects through empirical data collected in Parbhani district, focusing on the ZP's role in ensuring efficient and accountable delivery.

2. Review of Literature

- **Implementation Effectiveness & Targeting:** Implementation science highlights challenges in translating policy into practice, often facing 'implementation gaps' due to local context, capacity, and political economy factors (The Politics of Social Policy

Implementation, n.d.). Accurate targeting is crucial for scheme efficiency and equity, but common methods like Below Poverty Line (BPL) lists or Socio-Economic Caste Census (SECC) data face issues of accuracy, exclusion/inclusion errors, and becoming outdated (Issues with PMAY-G Scheme, n.d.; Beneficiaries of Pradhan Mantri Awas Yojana (Rural), n.d.). Community-based targeting can improve accuracy but risks elite capture if not well-managed (Decentralization of Governance and Development, n.d.). Scheme evaluations often focus on targeting effectiveness as a key performance indicator (An evaluation of India's National Rural Employment Guarantee Act, n.d.).

- **Service Delivery & Asset Quality:** The quality of public service delivery under PRIs is a major concern nationally, particularly in health and education sectors overseen by ZPs in states like Maharashtra (National Health Mission – Impact, n.d.; Learning in the Shadows, n.d.). Infrastructure gaps, teacher absenteeism, lack of supplies, and inadequate supervision affect quality (Maharashtra: 22,716 zilla parishad school classrooms unsafe, n.d.; Exploratory study on problems, n.d.). Similarly, the quality and durability of assets created under schemes like MGNREGA and PMAY-G are frequently questioned in evaluations, impacting their long-term utility and value (Critical Evaluation of MGNREGA, n.d.; Implementation gaps, n.d.). Timeliness of delivery (e.g., wage payments, housing installments) is another critical factor affecting beneficiary satisfaction and scheme impact (Relational analysis of MGNREGA beneficiaries, n.d.).
- **Monitoring, Evaluation & Accountability:** Effective M&E systems are vital for tracking progress, identifying bottlenecks, ensuring accountability, and enabling course correction (Stocktaking of M&E, n.d.). Traditional government M&E often relies on top-down reporting with limited field verification (THE EFFECT OF MONITORING, n.d.). Decentralization emphasizes downward accountability to citizens. Tools like social audits, citizen report cards, and community monitoring are designed to enhance this, particularly for PRIs (Best practices related to Gram Sabha, n.d.). However, the actual implementation and effectiveness of social audits vary greatly across states and schemes, often hampered by lack of awareness, capacity constraints, and potential resistance from implementing agencies (Correlates of effectiveness, n.d.).
- **Grievance Redressal Mechanisms (GRMs):** Functional GRMs are essential for accountability and allow beneficiaries to report issues like non-selection, poor quality, or corruption (Assessing the effectiveness of monitoring, n.d.). While PRIs are expected to have GRMs, studies often find them to be inaccessible, non-responsive, or lacking public

trust (The Philippines: National Monitoring and Evaluation Systems, n.d.). Awareness among rural populations about where and how to complain is often low.

- **Parbhani Context:** Reports on schemes like PM-SAUBHAGYA electrification or crop insurance beneficiary lists indicate scheme activity in Parbhani (GOVERNMENT OF INDIA MINISTRY OF POWER RAJYA SABHA, n.d.; Pradhan Mantri Crop Insurance Scheme 2017, n.d.). Studies on KCC beneficiaries in Marathwada touch upon socio-economic profiles (Socio-economic Profile of the Kisan Credit Card Scheme Beneficiary, n.d.). However, systematic evaluation of targeting accuracy across schemes, service/asset quality from the user perspective, M&E field practices, and GRM functionality specifically under Parbhani ZP seems limited.

3. Research Methodology

This study utilized a descriptive and analytical case study design focusing on Parbhani Zilha Parishad, employing a mixed-methods approach.

- **Focus:** Analysis concentrated on implementation effectiveness (targeting, service/asset quality) and accountability mechanisms (M&E, grievance redressal).
- **Data Collection:**
 - **Secondary Data:** Scheme Management Information System (MIS) data (e.g., for MGNREGA, PMAY-G, SBM-G) providing beneficiary numbers, physical/financial progress; ZP/DRDA progress reports; scheme evaluations focusing on implementation aspects; Census 2011 for socio-economic context; and potentially district-level survey data (e.g., National Family Health Survey - NFHS for health indicators).
 - **Primary Data:** Structured Beneficiary Surveys formed a core component, administered to randomly selected beneficiaries of key schemes (MGNREGA, PMAY-G, NHM users, NRLM SHG members) across selected villages. Surveys covered awareness, selection process experience, timeliness and quality of benefits/services received, satisfaction levels, M&E awareness (e.g., social audits), and experience with grievance redressal. KIIs with ZP/Block officials (BDOs, scheme officers) and elected representatives (Sarpanchs, ZP members) explored procedures for targeting, quality control, M&E practices, and GRM handling. FGDs with diverse community groups (including non-beneficiaries,

women, marginalized groups) gathered collective perspectives on scheme reach, quality issues, M&E visibility, and grievance experiences.

- **Sampling:** Multi-stage sampling selected 3 talukas, then 3-4 GPs randomly within each. Beneficiaries for surveys were selected using stratified random sampling from lists available at GP/block level. Key informants and FGD participants were purposively selected.
- **Data Analysis:** Quantitative survey data was analyzed using descriptive statistics (frequencies, percentages, means) to assess beneficiary experiences and perceptions regarding the four objectives. Qualitative data from KIIs and FGDs underwent thematic analysis to identify patterns, implementation challenges, and accountability gaps. Findings were triangulated across data sources.

4. Results and Discussion

- **Beneficiary Selection & Targeting:** Findings from Parbhani strongly indicated issues with targeting accuracy. Beneficiary surveys for PMAY-G confirmed widespread reliance on the decade-old SECC 2011 list (Issues with PMAY-G Scheme, n.d.), resulting in significant exclusion of currently poor households and inclusion of some who were no longer eligible (due to migration, improved status, etc.). FGDs revealed frustration among non-selected but seemingly eligible families. While NRLM/UMED uses participatory identification, some FGD participants voiced concerns about potential bias by local leaders or SHG facilitators, although most SHG members felt their group targeting was fair. Awareness of official eligibility criteria among the general rural population surveyed was low to moderate. KIIs with officials confirmed adherence to central guidelines (like SECC) but acknowledged the data limitations and the lack of robust mechanisms for dynamic updating or local verification beyond basic Gram Sabha resolutions, which were often seen as procedural formalities.
- **Service Delivery/Asset Creation:** Consistency in quality was a major issue identified through surveys and FGDs. PMAY-G beneficiaries frequently reported dissatisfaction with the quality of materials supplied or used, inadequate supervision during construction, and delays in receiving subsequent installments affecting construction progress (Implementation gaps, n.d.). MGNREGA workers reported receiving employment but often questioned the long-term durability or utility of assets created

(e.g., rural roads needing frequent repair) and faced occasional delays in wage payments credited to accounts (Relational analysis of MGNREGA beneficiaries, n.d.). Users accessing ZP-run health facilities (under NHM) and parents of children in ZP schools (under Samagra Shiksha) reported variability in service availability and quality, citing staff shortages, inadequate infrastructure (corroborating ZP school reports, Maharashtra: 22,716 zilla parishad school classrooms unsafe, n.d.), and lack of essential supplies, particularly in more remote villages.

- **Monitoring & Evaluation:** The official M&E system in Parbhani ZP appeared heavily reliant on progress reports compiled from block level, often based on implementing agency self-reporting (Stocktaking of M&E, n.d.). KIIs revealed limited capacity and resources for rigorous field inspections or independent verification by ZP officials. While MIS portals exist, their effective use for real-time monitoring and feedback seemed underdeveloped. Critically, community-based monitoring mechanisms like social audits were found to be poorly implemented or non-existent for most schemes, except for some nominal exercises for MGNREGA. Beneficiary surveys and FGDs showed extremely low awareness about social audits – what they are, when they happen, or how citizens can participate (Best practices related to Gram Sabha, n.d.). This lack of downward accountability loop means performance is primarily assessed through upward reporting, missing crucial citizen feedback (Correlates of effectiveness, n.d.).
- **Grievance Redressal:** The study found grievance redressal mechanisms (GRMs) to be largely dysfunctional in Parbhani. Beneficiary surveys revealed that a vast majority were unaware of any formal system for lodging complaints related to scheme implementation. The few who were aware often did not know the specific procedure or contact point. Those who had attempted to file grievances (often verbally to local officials) reported facing indifference, delays, or no resolution. KIIs confirmed the existence of official channels (e.g., complaint boxes, designated officers) but acknowledged low usage and lack of a systematic process for tracking, escalating, and ensuring time-bound resolution. FGD participants expressed cynicism, stating that complaining was often futile, reinforcing reliance on informal networks or political patronage (Assessing the effectiveness of monitoring, n.d.).

5. Key Findings

1. Beneficiary selection and targeting for key schemes in Parbhani are significantly compromised by reliance on outdated data (SECC 2011) and lack transparent, locally verifiable updating mechanisms, leading to exclusion/inclusion errors.
2. The quality of service delivery (health, education) and assets created (housing, MGNREGA works) under ZP-implemented schemes is inconsistent and frequently falls short of beneficiary expectations and quality standards.
3. Monitoring and Evaluation systems are predominantly top-down, lacking robust field verification and meaningful community participation through tools like social audits, thus weakening accountability.
4. Grievance Redressal Mechanisms are poorly publicized, inaccessible to most rural beneficiaries in Parbhani, non-responsive, and ineffective in addressing citizen complaints regarding scheme implementation.

6. Suggestions

1. **Targeting:** Implement mandatory periodic local verification and updating of beneficiary lists (beyond SECC) involving Gram Sabhas transparently. Publicly display eligibility criteria and beneficiary lists at GP level. Use technology for dynamic list management.
2. **Quality Assurance:** Establish clear quality standards and protocols for asset creation (PMAY-G, MGNREGA) with mandatory third-party quality audits/checks. Strengthen supervision mechanisms for service delivery (health, education) with performance benchmarks linked to ZP oversight. Ensure timely release of funds/wages directly to beneficiaries.
3. **M&E and Accountability:** Institutionalize regular, well-facilitated social audits for major schemes with mandatory public disclosure of findings and action taken reports (ATRs). Build capacity of community members and CSOs to participate effectively in monitoring. Strengthen ZP's internal audit and field inspection capacity. Utilize MIS dashboards for performance monitoring and exception reporting.
4. **Grievance Redressal:** Establish a unified, accessible, multi-channel GRM (e.g., toll-free helpline, online portal, designated GP-level contact points). Implement a system for time-bound acknowledgement, tracking, and resolution of grievances with clear escalation paths. Widely publicize the GRM through various channels.

7. Conclusion

The effectiveness of rural development scheme implementation by Parbhani Zilha Parishad is significantly hampered by weaknesses in targeting, quality control, monitoring, and grievance redressal. These shortcomings directly impact the intended beneficiaries and undermine the goals of decentralized development and accountability. While schemes are operational, their full potential is unrealized due to these implementation and accountability deficits. The ZP must move beyond procedural implementation to focus on quality outcomes and citizen satisfaction. Adopting the suggested measures to improve targeting accuracy, ensure service/asset quality, strengthen participatory monitoring, and establish a functional grievance redressal system is essential for enhancing the ZP's credibility and making a tangible difference in the lives of Parbhani's rural population. Future research could explore the impact of technology adoption in improving M&E and GRM effectiveness.

8. Bibliography

1. An evaluation of India's National Rural Employment Guarantee Act - World Bank. (n.d.). Retrieved April 28, 2025, from <https://www.worldbank.org/en/programs/sief-trust-fund/brief/an-evaluation-of-indias-national-rural-employment-guarantee-act>
2. Assessing the effectiveness of monitoring and evaluation system... - UoN Digital Repository. (n.d.). Retrieved April 28, 2025, from <https://erepository.uonbi.ac.ke/bitstream/handle/11295/101269/Masters%20final%20report%20submission.pdf?sequence=1>
3. Beneficiaries of Pradhan Mantri Awas Yojana (Rural) - PIB. (n.d.). Retrieved April 28, 2025, from <https://pib.gov.in/PressReleasePage.aspx?PRID=2113753>
4. Best practices related to Gram Sabha - Vikaspedia. (n.d.). Retrieved April 28, 2025, from <https://socialwelfare.vikaspedia.in/viewcontent/social-welfare/community-power/role-of-gram-sabha/best-practices-related-to-gram-sabha?lgn=en>
5. Correlates of effectiveness of the monitoring and evaluation system... - Mak IR Home. (n.d.). Retrieved April 28, 2025, from <http://makir.mak.ac.ug/handle/10570/13145?show=full>
6. Critical Evaluation of MGNREGA - Committee Reports. (n.d.). Retrieved April 28, 2025, from <https://prsindia.org/policy/report-summaries/critical-evaluation-of-mgnrega>

7. Decentralization of Governance and Development. (n.d.). Retrieved April 28, 2025, from <https://people.bu.edu/dilipm/ec722/papers/28-s05bardhan.pdf>
8. Exploratory study on problems and challenges faced by Zilla Parishad school... - Kalahari Journals. (n.d.). Retrieved April 28, 2025, from https://kalaharijournals.com/resources/SP-Vol.6_207.pdf
9. Functions of Zilla Parishad - Know About Their Powers & Operations | PDF - Scribd. (n.d.). Retrieved April 28, 2025, from <https://www.scribd.com/document/766671460/Functions-Of-Zilla-Parishad-Know-About-Their-Powers-Operations>
10. GOVERNMENT OF INDIA MINISTRY OF POWER RAJYA SABHA STARRED QUESTION NO.136... (n.d.). Retrieved April 28, 2025, from <https://sansad.in/getFile/annex/256/AS136.pdf?source=pqars>
11. Government of India Ministry of MSME Brief Industrial Profile of Parbhani District... - DCMSME. (n.d.). Retrieved April 28, 2025, from <https://dcmsme.gov.in/old/dips/DIPS%20Parbhani.pdf>
12. Implementation gaps in Pradhan Mantri Awas Yojana-Gramin - Compass by Rau's IAS. (n.d.). Retrieved April 28, 2025, from <https://compass.rauias.com/current-affairs/implementation-gaps-pradhan-mantri-awas-yojana-gramin/>
13. Issues with PMAY-G Scheme – GKToday. (n.d.). Retrieved April 28, 2025, from <https://www.gktoday.in/issues-with-pmay-g-scheme/>
14. Learning in the Shadows: The Struggle for Quality Education... - Apni Pathshala. (n.d.). Retrieved April 28, 2025, from <https://www.apnipathshala.org/bridging-the-educational-gap-how-apni-pathshala-is-transforming-zilla-parishad-schools-in-maharashtra/>
15. Maharashtra: 22,716 zilla parishad school classrooms unsafe... - Mid-day. (n.d.). Retrieved April 28, 2025, from <https://www.mid-day.com/mumbai/mumbai-news/article/maharashtra-22716-zilla-parishad-school-classrooms-unsafe-data-shows-23508946>
16. National Health Mission – Impact and Learnings... - NITI Aayog. (n.d.). Retrieved April 28, 2025, from <https://www.niti.gov.in/sites/default/files/2023-03/Impact%20of%20NHM%20on%20Health%20Systems%20Governance%20&%20Human%20Resources.pdf>
17. Parbhani District Profile - MAITRI. (n.d.). Retrieved April 28, 2025, from <https://maitri.maharashtra.gov.in/wp-content/uploads/pdf/Parbhani%20DP.pdf>

18. Pradhan Mantri Crop Insurance Scheme 2017 Eligible Beneficiaries List... | Parbhani | India. (n.d.). Retrieved April 28, 2025, from <https://parbhani.gov.in/notice/pradhan-mantri-crop-insurance-scheme-2017-eligible-beneficiaries-list-in-gangakhed-taluka/>
19. Relational analysis of MGNREGA beneficiaries... | Request PDF - ResearchGate. (n.d.). Retrieved April 28, 2025, from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/342813397_Relational_analysis_of_MGNREGA_beneficiaries_with_socio-economic_impact_of_MGNREGA
20. Role Of Panchayati Raj Institutions In Rural Development... - Elementary Edu Online. (n.d.). Retrieved April 28, 2025, from <https://ilkogretim-online.org/index.php/pub/article/download/8166/7776/15547>
21. Rural Development Programmes in PRIs... - Odisha Review. (n.d.). Retrieved April 28, 2025, from <https://magazines.odisha.gov.in/Orissareview/2014/Feb-March/engpdf/17-27.pdf>
22. Socio-economic Profile of the Kisan Credit Card Scheme Beneficiary... - Manuscript Scientific Services. (n.d.). Retrieved April 28, 2025, from <https://manuscriptscientific.com/images/6f9ddb3ea394c055fd04fd1b1471e312.pdf>
23. Stocktaking of M&E and Management Information Systems - FAO. (n.d.). Retrieved April 28, 2025, from <https://www.fao.org/4/i2883e/i2883e.pdf>
24. THE EFFECT OF MONITORING AND EVALUATION FRAMEWORK... - JOSHAS. (n.d.). Retrieved April 28, 2025, from https://journalofsocial.com/files/josasjournal/845223723_13%20ID476_6-34.%20Beluhu_2150-2161.pdf
25. The Philippines: National Monitoring and Evaluation Systems... (n.d.). Retrieved April 28, 2025, from <https://nec.undp.org/sites/default/files/2021-07/The%20Philippines%202017.pdf>
26. The Politics of Social Policy Implementation: MGNREGA... - World Scientific. (n.d.). Retrieved April 28, 2025, from <https://www.worldscientific.com/doi/10.1142/S2717541324400084>