A comprehensive
& objective rating
of the Elected
Representatives'
performance

MUMBAI

REPORT CARD

M L A   R A T I N G S   2 0 1 9

PRAJA.ORG

MAKING DEMOCRACY WORK

PRAJA.ORG

MAKING DEMOCRACY WORK

Founded in 1998, the PRAJA Foundation is a non-partisan voluntary organisation which empowers the citizen to participate in governance by providing knowledge and enlisting people's participation. PRAJA aims to provide ways in which the citizen can get politically active and involved beyond the ballot box, thus promoting transparency and accountability.

Concerned about the lack of awareness and apathy of the local government among citizens, and hence the disinterest in its functioning, PRAJA seeks change. PRAJA strives to create awareness about the elected representatives and their constituencies. It aims to encourage the citizen to raise his/her voice and influence the policy and working of the elected representative. This will eventually lead to efforts being directed by the elected representatives towards the specified causes of public interest.

The PRAJA Foundation also strives to revive the waning spirit of Mumbai City, and increase the interaction between the citizens and the government. To facilitate this, PRAJA has created www.praja.org, a website where the citizen can not only discuss the issues that their constituencies face, but can also get in touch with their elected representatives directly. The website has been equipped with information such as: *the issues faced by the ward, the elected representatives, the responses received and a discussion board, thus allowing an informed interaction between the citizens of the area.*

PRAJA's goals are: empowering the citizens, elected representatives & government with facts and creating instruments of change to improve the quality of life of the citizens of India. PRAJA is committed to creating a transparent, accountable and efficient society through people's participation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter   **Pg. No.**

Market Research Agency

Hansa Research

Ashok Das
Managing Director, Hansa Research

Anjan Ghosh
Senior Vice President, Hansa Research

And the rest of the Hansa team including **Tristan Braganza, Ann Benny, Tarun Shroff, Joy Chakraborty, Utpal Patra, Harish Singh, Bhaskar Bhadra and Sushil Gaud.**

Praja Team

Milind Mhaske Director

Priyanka Sharma Capacity Building Head

Yogesh Mishra Research and Data Head

And rest of the Praja Team including **Ashwini Agavne, Aviral Dubey, Avinash Rokade, Balwant Kirar, Benaifer Reporter, Bandita Bisht, Eknath Pawar, Ganesh Jadhav, Ganesh Phulsundar, Guruprasad Kamble, Harshil Suresh, Jennifer Spencer, Kshitija Gidaye, Mahesh Bhaskar, Meghna Bandelwar, Neha Kori, Nilam Mirashi, Nilesh Kadam, Pallavi Kakaji, Pooja Verma, Pragati Watve, Prasna Padmanabhan, Radhika Uppal, Rakesh Pote, Rajesh, Rupesh Kumar, Sangeeta Patwa, Sarika Nair, Saikiran Kairamkonda, Shraddha Gurav, Shubham Singh, Steffi Xavier, Swapneel Thakur, Vibesh Kakkapoil, Vidya Tamboli, Vipul Gharat.**

The People of India have had Elected Representatives representing them in various bodies from the parliament to the panchayat for the last 60 years.

These representatives have deliberated, debated, questioned, proposed new laws, passed new laws and governed the nation at all levels using the mechanisms given to them by the Constitution of India. The 1950 constitution which we gave to ourselves laid out the way in which we would govern ourselves. *In the last three decades we have seen a steady decline in the quality of governance due to various reasons, prime amongst them being commercialisation of politics and criminalisation of politics, this has created a huge governance deficit in our country.*

The Electorate has remained a silent witness for most part of this and are feeling let down and frustrated by the Government and the elected representatives.

The time when the citizen has a 'real' say, is during elections which happens once in five years. The elections are the only time when the elected representatives are appraised for their performance in the corresponding term by the electorate.

Looking at the growing problems of Governance and the ever increasing needs of the citizens there is a need of a continuous dialogue and appraisal of the working of the elected representatives.

It is this need of continuous dialogue and appraisal that made Praja develop this Report Card.

Performance Appraisal of Elected Representatives has become the need of the hour.

This appraisal has been done keeping in mind the constitutional role and responsibility of the elected representatives and the opinion of their electorate.

We believe this Report Card which we will be publishing every year will give to the citizens, elected representatives, political parties and the government valuable feedback on the functioning of the elected representatives. We also hope that it will set standards and bench marks of the performance of the elected representatives not only in Mumbai but across the country.

What does one want from their elected representatives? What is the role of the elected representatives? What values one would want their elected representatives to have? What sort of work ethic should they represent?

These are the questions which decide the quality of life one would want for oneself, one's family, country, state and one's local area.

In a parliamentary democracy, quality of legislation and deliberation is key to the kind of policies that will be implemented which would in turn impact the quality of life of citizens. Hence it is important for MLAs to be good legislators for better governance and improved quality of living.

We would first like to congratulate the Top 3 rankers for this year's report card, MLA Sunil Shinde (Rank 1 - Score 79.38), MLA Amin Patel (Rank 2 - Score 79.29) and MLA Aslam Shaikh (Rank 3 - Score 78.29) for their performance.

At Praja, since the last 8 years we have been tracking the performance of our elected representatives through a very comprehensive matrix system. We see that there is a direct relation between the people we elect and our quality of life.

Overall scores have improved from 59 in 2018 to 64 in 2019, quality of life has also increased from 65% to 68%, perceived accessibility has risen from 53% to 60%, and perceived corruption has fallen from 19% to 14% in the said period.

A comparison of the Top 6 performers (Top 20 percentile) overall scores to quality of life as perceived by citizens recorded through a household survey, shows that with an improvement in scores from 74 in 2018 to 77 in 2019, percentage perceiving improvement in quality of life has also increased from 80% to 92%, showing improved perception of quality of living with better performance of MLAs. The perceived accessibility of Top 20 percentile performers also improved from 69% to 75%, while perceived corruption has fallen from 11% to 4%.

This shows that better scores have a positive impact on accessibility, quality of life and perceived corruption. Had all our legislators performed like the top 20 percentile, would 92% of all citizens claim their quality of life to have improved?

Let us look at the performance of MLAs in the previous years, to understand the correlation better. From 2017 to 2018 the overall scores fell from 61 to 59 and the overall quality of life perceived also fell from 66% to 65%.

If we look at the performance of Top 6 and Bottom 6 (Bottom 20 percentile) MLAs, the gap between them has increased in the last four years, showing increasing disparity in performance among the MLAs. The average score of the Top 6 performers is consistently higher than the overall average; in 2019 the score of Top 6 percentile was 77, while the average overall score was 64. Performance of MLAs in the Top 6 percentile has a positive impact on the overall scores as well.

Further, compared to the last term, MLA scores have improved from 59 in 2014 to 64 in 2019 while the quality of life improved from 60% to 68%, with perceived accessibility also improving from 33% to 60% and perceived corruption falling from 38% to 14%.

The performance of Top 6 has improved compared to the last term from 68% in 2014 to 78% in 2019, while the Bottom 6 has fallen from 50% to 46%, while quality of life of Top 6 has risen by 15% (77% in 2014 to 92% in 2019) and that of Bottom 6 has remained same (44% in 2014 and 2019) showing that improvement in overall scores and improved perception of quality of life is driven by the top performing MLAs.

This reiterates the importance that the performance of MLAs holds in terms of their deliberative skills, criminal record, perceived corruption, since it is clear from the data that an elected representative who is ethical, hardworking and fulfils his or her role as a law maker, does actually improve the quality of life.

With the Maharashtra state government elections round the corner, we would appeal to political parties to give tickets to candidates who are capable of understanding the constitutional processes of governance, deliberation and who can be good legislators that make policies to improve the quality of life of the populace.

For us as citizens, it is necessary to understand and access the performance of MLAs to make informed choices, and elect representatives with a clean criminal record, active attendance and those with good legislative and deliberative skills in the assembly.

NITAI MEHTA,
Managing Trustee,
Praja Foundation

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Never doubt that a small group of thoughtful, committed citizens can change the world; indeed, it's the only thing that ever has.

– Margaret Mead

The change comes when people stand up and demand for it, and then strive to get it. Today we are at that juncture of history where time demands that we stand up and demand that change and go and get it.

Individuals involved in developing this report card strongly believe that they cannot just wait and remain mute spectators when time is demanding action from them. All of them have come together to develop this report card with a over-arching belief in the Constitution of India and the opportunity it creates for improved and efficient governance – the mean towards achieving the high ideals of the constitution – Justice, Liberty, Equality and Fraternity.

This book is a compilation of sincere, concerned efforts of the Core Praja Team. We would like to particularly appreciate the guidance of: Dr. C R Sridhar, KMS (Titoo) Ahluwalia and Dr. Suma Chitnis. And also to Praja's Advisors for their active support.

It is important here to acknowledge Hansa Research for conducting the opinion poll. It is also very important to acknowledge the support of Vakils for doing a splendid publishing work.

Praja has obtained much of the data used in compiling this report card through Right to Information Act, 2005; without which sourcing information on the MLAs would have been very difficult. Hence it is very important to acknowledge the RTI Act and everyone involved, especially from the civil society, in bringing such a strong legislation. Also to those government officials who believe in the RTI Act and strive for its effective implementation.

Very importantly, Praja Foundation appreciates the support given by:

ASSESSING THE PERFORMANCE OF MLAs OBJECTIVELY

The air in India is thick with criticism of politicians. The question that arises is: how can the performance of our elected representatives be assessed objectively? Surely the right way cannot be by asking them for their opinion of themselves. Nor is it adequate to get a few political pundits (who may have their own angles) to evaluate them.

The only way such an assessment can be done in a manner that is, and is seen to be, unbiased and credible, is through a systematic and transparent study undertaken independently by respected professionals. That is precisely what The Praja Report Card seeks to accomplish.

The ratings of the MLA's are based on:

(a) Data accessed through RTI on attendance of Assembly sessions, number and type of questions raised, use of discretionary funds, etc.

(b) Personal interviews with 22,845 citizens of Mumbai conducted by a reputed survey research organisation, to investigate the views of citizens on their elected representatives.

We believe the Report Card is an important step forward in promoting accountability and transparency in the political governance of the country.

K.M.S. (TITOO) AHLUWALIA, Formerly Chairman &
CEO of A.C. Nielsen ORG-MARG

PROFILES
AND
PERFORMANCE
OF MLAs

Prakash Manchhubhai Mehta

Birth Date: 22nd April 1959

Birth Place: Ghatkopar, Suburbs Mumbai

Language: Marathi, Hindi, English and Gujarati

Constituency: 170 (Area: Ghatkopar (E), District - Mumbai Suburbs)

Political Party: Bharatiya Janata Party

Education: SSC

Profession: Business

BJP

He was elected as member of state legislative assembly from 1990-1995, 1995-1999, 1999-2004, 2004-2009 and 2009-2014. He was Minister of State for Slum Development, Housing and Urban Land Ceiling and Employment Planning from May 1995 to August 1996. He was also Minister for Consumer Welfare, Special Assistance & Tourism and Guardian Minister for Mumbai suburban district from August 1996 to June 1997. He was also Minister for State for Excise and Special Assistance Department from June 1997 to July 1999. He was active participant in Anti-corruption and Anti-emergency agitation in 1975-1977. He was re-elected to Legislative Assembly in October, 2014. He was Minister for Industries, Minerals and Parliamentry Affairs from 2nd November to 5th December, 2014. Currently he is the minister of Housing, Minerals and Labour Department and Guardian Minister for Raigarh district.

Ravindra Dattaram Waikar

Birth Date: 18th January 1959

Birth Place: Mumbai

Language: Marathi, Hindi and English

Constituency: 158 (Area: Jogeshwari (E), District - Mumbai Suburbs)

Political Party: Shiv Sena

Education: B.Sc.

Profession: Industry & Trade

SS

He has been Municipal Councillor as well as Chairman of Standing committee for four terms, Chairman of the Education committee of MCGM. He got elected to Maharashtra Assembly in October 2009. He received award of Best Corporator from Lions Club and Best Social worker award from Acharya Atre Pratishthan, Pune. He was re-elected to State Legislative Assembly in 2014. He is the Minister of State for Housing since 5th December 2014.

Vidya Jaiprakash Thakur

Birth Date: 15th June 1961

Birth Place: Benipur, Varanasi (Uttar Pradesh)

Language: Marathi, Hindi and English

Constituency: 163
(Area: Goregaon,
District - Mumbai Suburbs)

Political Party:
Bharatiya Janata Party

Education: Eighth

Profession: Business

BJP

Vinod Shreedhar Tawde

Birth Date: 20th July 1963

Birth Place: Mumbai

Language: Marathi, Hindi, English and Malvani

Constituency: 152
(Area: Borivali,
District - Mumbai Suburbs)

Political Party:
Bharatiya Janata Party

Education: B.E. (Electronics)

Profession: Business

BJP

She has been working in the BJP since 1992. She was General Secretary of the BJP's women wing in Mumbai in 2013-14. She was elected as municipal councillor to MCGM on four occasions during 1992-2012. She was Deputy Mayor of Mumbai in 2007. She headed Public Health Committee of the MCGM for two times. She was member of Standing Committee, Market and Gardens Committee and Improvements Committee of MCGM. She was elected to Legislative Assembly in 2014. She was entrusted with the responsibility of Minister of state for the departments of Women and Child Welfare, Food and Civil Supplies and Consumer Protection and Food and Drug Administration in December 2014.

He was part of the student movement through Akhil Bhartiya Vidyarthi Parishad along with holding post of National General Secretary of the organisation. Played key role in getting MUTP scheme worth Rs. 5500 crores for Mumbai. He was the General Secretary of the BJP, Maharashtra from 1996 to 2000. He has handled many important responsibilities within the BJP. He was the member of the Maharashtra Legislative Council for two consecutive terms from 2002 to 2014. From 2011 to 2014, he was leader of opposition in the Legislative Council. Currently he is the minister for School Education, Higher Technical Education, Sports and Youth Welfare, Medical Education, Marathi Language and Tourism Departments. On the invitation of American government in 1996, he toured USA, England and six nations in Europe for two months to study the Democratic social system and political social structure in foreign nations.

HOW TO READ THE RANKING PAGE:

Overall Rank for the current year (2019) is given after summation of all the weightages. The top three ranks are awarded a trophy - The Torch. The first gets gold, the second silver and the third bronze.

Areas for ranking:
1. Attendance
2. Questions Asked
3. Quality of Questions
4. Criminal Record (including the negative marking for criminal records)
5. Perceived Performance (Perception of Public Services)
6. Perceived as accessible
7. Perceived Least Corrupt

Colour Coding:
1-10
11-22
23-32

| QUALITY OF QUESTIONS #27 | NO. OF QUESTIONS #15 | PERCEIVED LEAST CORRUPT #14 |

RANK #3

| ATTENDENCE #3 | | PERCEIVED ACCESSIBILITY #3 |

MS/MR POPULAR

| CLEAN CRIMINAL RECORD #1 | | PERCEIVED PERFORMER #5 |

Score: 72.05%

Badges for high ranks in individual areas

MS/MR POPULAR
PERCIEVED PERFORMER + PERCIEVED AS ACCESSIBLE

MS/MR COMMITTED
QUALITY OF QUESTIONS + NO. OF QUESTIONS

MS/MR CLEAN
CLEAN CRIMINAL RECORD + PERCIEVED LEAST CORRUPT

Total Scores

Personal details

MUMBAI'S 32 MLAs AND THEIR RANKINGS

#1

#15

#32

QUALITY OF QUESTIONS	NO. OF QUESTIONS	PERCEIVED LEAST CORRUPT
↑12	↑11	↑22
2018 — #17	2018 — #17	2018 — #27

RANK #23

ATTENDANCE		PERCEIVED ACCESSIBILITY
↑1		↓32
2018 — #26		2018 — #29

2018 RANK #26

CLEAN CRIMINAL RECORD	Abu Asim Azmi	PERCEIVED PERFORMER
↓30		↓32
2018 — #24		2018 — #27

Score	
2019	2018
57.19%	48.37%

Birth Date: 8th August 1955
Birth Place: Manjirpatti in Uttar Pradesh
Language: Urdu, Hindi and English

Education: Bachelor of Arts
Profession: Industry & Trade
Constituency: 171
(Area: Mankhurd Shivaji Nagar, District - Mumbai Suburbs)

SP

He was the President of Samajwadi Party, Mumbai from 1995 to 2000 and has been the General Secretary, Maharashtra since. He was elected as Member of Rajya Sabha where he was the member of Rajya Sabha Committee for Urban & Rural Development, Committee for Commerce, Committee on Rules, Consultative Committee under Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Member Defence Committee. He was elected to Maharashtra Legislature from two constituency assemblies: Mankhurd-Shivaji Nagar (Mumbai) and Bhiwandi East (Dist-Thane). He has subsequently resigned from Bhiwandi East, (Dist-Thane) constituency in 2009. He had handled various posts in Samajwadi Party. He was re-elected to Legislative Assembly in 2014.

QUALITY OF QUESTIONS ↓13 2018 — #9	NO. OF QUESTIONS ↓13 2018 — #9	PERCEIVED LEAST CORRUPT ↓25 2018 — #20

RANK #11

MR POPULAR

2018 RANK #17

ATTENDANCE ↑1 2018 — #16		PERCEIVED ACCESSIBILITY ↑5 2018 — #6

Ajay Vinayak Choudhari

CLEAN CRIMINAL RECORD ↑1 2018 — #24		PERCEIVED PERFORMER ↓11 2018 — #3

Score

2019	2018
70.73%	60.55%

Birth Date: 5th July 1953
Birth Place: Mumbai
Language: Marathi, Hindi and English

Education: Eleventh
Profession: Business
Constituency: 183
(Area: Shivadi,
District - Mumbai City)

SS

He has been involved in various social work activities. He was deputy head of Shiv Sena local office, Parel. He headed Shivsena's South Mumbai region since 2000, till 2014. He was elected to Maharashtra Legislative Assembly in 2014.

QUALITY OF QUESTIONS ↓17 2018 — #16	NO. OF QUESTIONS #16 2018 — #16	PERCEIVED LEAST CORRUPT ↑1 2018 — #26

RANK #12

ATTENDANCE #1 2018 — #1

MR CLEAN

2018 RANK #10

PERCEIVED ACCESSIBILITY ↑17 2018 — #20

CLEAN CRIMINAL RECORD #1 2018 — #1

Ameet Bhaskar Satam

Score

2019	2018
70.37%	**65.95%**

PERCEIVED PERFORMER ↑6 2018 — #12

Birth Date: 15th August 1976
Birth Place: Mumbai
Language: Marathi, Hindi and English

Education: Masters of Management Studies (Personnel)
Profession: Management Consultant
Constituency: 165 (Area: Andheri (W), District - Mumbai Suburbs)

BJP

He has been involved in various social, cultural activities. He was Personal Assistant (PA) to Late Gopinath Munde from 2004-2006. He went on to handle various responsibilities within BJP. In 2012 he was elected as Municipal Councillor on MCGM and then to Legislative Assembly in October, 2014.

QUALITY OF QUESTIONS	NO. OF QUESTIONS	PERCEIVED LEAST CORRUPT
↓2	↓2	↑8
2018 — #1	2018 — #1	2018 — #32

RANK #2

ATTENDANCE		PERCEIVED ACCESSIBILITY
↓19		↑24
2018 — #16		2018 — #28

MR COMMITTED

2018 RANK #1

CLEAN CRIMINAL RECORD		PERCEIVED PERFORMER
#1	Amin Amir Ali Patel	↑5
2018 — #1		2018 — #6

Amin Amir Ali Patel

Score	
2019	**2018**
79.29%	**76.45%**

Birth Date: 13th January 1963
Birth Place: Mumbai
Language: Marathi, Hindi and English

Education: SSC
Profession: Business
Constituency: 186 (Area: Mumbadevi, District - Mumbai City)

INC

He has been an active worker of congress party and has held important positions such as General Secretary Youth Congress South Central Mumbai in 1988 and Vice President of Minority Cell in 1994. He was the member of Z.R.U.C.C., Western Railway in 1996. He was Member of All India Congress Committee in the year 2007. He was nominated as Municipal Councillor in 2002 and got elected to the Mumbai Municipal Corporation in 2007. He was member of Improvement Committee from 2005 to 2009 and whip of Congress party in 2007. He got elected to the Maharashtra Legislative Assembly in October, 2009. He was re-elected to the Legislative Assembly in 2014.

QUALITY OF QUESTIONS ↑7 2018 — #8	NO. OF QUESTIONS ↑7 2018 — #8	PERCEIVED LEAST CORRUPT ↓19 2018 — #16

RANK #16

ATTENDANCE ↓19 2018 — #1		PERCEIVED ACCESSIBILITY ↓10 2018 — #9

2018 RANK #8

CLEAN CRIMINAL RECORD ↓26 2018 — #20	**Ashish Babaji Shelar**	PERCEIVED PERFORMER ↑19 2018 — #23

Score

2019	2018
67.08%	66.16%

Birth Date: 27th August 1972
Birth Place: Mumbai
Language: Marathi, Hindi and English

Education: L.L.B
Profession: Social Worker
Constituency: 177
(Area: Bandra (W),
District - Mumbai Suburbs)

BJP

He has been fulltime worker of Akhil Bhartiya Vidyarth Parishad from 1988-1995. He was elected as a secretary of Mumbai University student council. He has handled various responsibilities within BJP. He was elected as municipal councillor from 2002 to 2012. He was group leader of the BJP in MCGM during this period. He has also worked as member of the Standing Committee, BEST Committee and Chairman of the Improvements Committee of the MCGM. He is member of the MMRDA. He was elected to Maharashtra Legislative Council in 2012-2014 and then elected to the state Legislative Assembly in October, 2014.

QUALITY OF QUESTIONS ↓30	NO. OF QUESTIONS ↓30	PERCEIVED LEAST CORRUPT ↓24
2018 — #20	2018 — #21	2018 — #3

RANK #32

ATTENDANCE ↓19		PERCEIVED ACCESSIBILITY ↓11
2018 — #16		2018 — #10

2018 RANK #28

CLEAN CRIMINAL RECORD #32	Ashok Dharmaraj Patil	PERCEIVED PERFORMER ↑10
2018 — #32	Score	2018 — #20

	Score	
	2019	2018
	40.08%	46.48%

Birth Date: 28th December 1958
Birth Place: Uttambar, Ratnagiri District
Language: Marathi, Hindi and English

Education: B.A. L.L.B
Profession: Business
Constituency: 157
(Area: Bhandup (W),
District - Mumbai Suburbs)

SS

He handled various interparty responsibilities in Shiv sena. He was elected as Municipal Councillor on MCGM from 2002 to 2007 and 2011 to 2017, where he was member of the Standing Committee (2002-2005), Chairman of the 'S' ward committee (2004-2005), member of the Law and Justice Committee (2002-2007) and Works Committee (2013-2014). He also headed BEST Committee for the year 2012-13 and received award for 'Best Administrator' (BEST) in 2012-2013 by the Central Government. He was elected to state Legislative Assembly in October, 2014.

QUALITY OF QUESTIONS ↑1 2018 — #3	NO. OF QUESTIONS ↑1 2018 — #3	PERCEIVED LEAST CORRUPT ↑20 2018 — #30
ATTENDANCE ↑19 2018 — #26	RANK #3 / MR COMMITTED / 2018 RANK #5	PERCEIVED ACCESSIBILITY ↓13 2018 — #8
CLEAN CRIMINAL RECORD #1 2018 — #1	**Aslam Ramazan Ali Shaikh**	PERCEIVED PERFORMER ↓17 2018 — #14

Score

2019	2018
78.29%	**72.31%**

Birth Date: 5th November 1968
Birth Place: Mumbai
Language: Marathi, Hindi, English, Gujarati and Urdu

Education: Eighth
Profession: Social Worker
Constituency: 162
(Area: Malad (W),
District - Mumbai Suburbs)

INC

He has been Municipal Councillor from 2002 to 2012. He was Chairman of P/North ward committee of MCGM between 2007-2008. He got elected to Maharashtra Legislative Assembly in October 2009.

He was re-elected to Legislative Assembly in 2014.

QUALITY OF QUESTIONS **↓9** 2018 — **#7**	NO. OF QUESTIONS **↓9** 2018 — **#7**	PERCEIVED LEAST CORRUPT **↓28** 2018 — **#25**

RANK **#6**

2018 RANK **#3**

ATTENDANCE **#1** 2018 — **#1**	PERCEIVED ACCESSIBILITY **#1** 2018 — **#1**

Atul Bhatkhalkar

Score	
2019	2018
74.42%	**74.67%**

CLEAN CRIMINAL RECORD **#1** 2018 — **#1**	PERCEIVED PERFORMER **↓21** 2018 — **#19**

Birth Date: 8th March 1965
Birth Place: Pune
Language: Marathi, Hindi and English

Education: B. Com.
Profession: Business
Constituency: 160
(Area: Kandivali (E),
District - Mumbai Suburbs)

BJP

He was a General Secretary of the BJP, Maharashtra state from 1999 to 2014. He worked as Spokesperson of BJP for four years. He was elected to the Legislative Assembly in October, 2014.

QUALITY OF QUESTIONS ↑25 2018 — #27	NO. OF QUESTIONS ↑25 2018 — #27	PERCEIVED LEAST CORRUPT ↑4 2018 — #8

RANK #20

ATTENDANCE #1 2018 — #1	2018 RANK #21	PERCEIVED ACCESSIBILITY ↑15 2018 — #21

CLEAN CRIMINAL RECORD #1 2018 — #1	**Bharati Hemant Lavekar**	PERCEIVED PERFORMER ↓22 2018 — #13

Score

2019	2018
61.23%	**57.46%**

Birth Date: 6th June 1966
Birth Place: Washim
Language: Marathi, Hindi and English

Education: Ph.D.
Profession: Business
Constituency: 164
(Area: Versova, District - Mumbai Suburbs)

BJP

She received 'Ahilyabai Holkar' award from Maharashtra Government in 2000-2001. She also received 'Maharashtra Ratna' award in 2005 for her distinguish social work. She was among the two persons selected from India by the American Government to study the Legislative Elections in America in 2006. She has been involved in various social work activities. She was elected to State Legislative Assembly in October, 2014.

QUALITY OF QUESTIONS	NO. OF QUESTIONS	PERCEIVED LEAST CORRUPT
↓15	↓14	↑16
2018 — #12	2018 — #12	2018 — #22

RANK #14

ATTENDANCE		PERCEIVED ACCESSIBILITY
↑1		↑30
2018 — #29		2018 — #32

2018 RANK #14

CLEAN CRIMINAL RECORD		PERCEIVED PERFORMER
#1		↓20
2018 — #1		2018 — #9

Kalidas Nilkanth Kolambkar

Score	
2019	2018
67.26%	62.93%

Birth Date: 13th November 1953
Birth Place: Malvan, Sindhudurg District
Language: Marathi, Hindi and English

Education: SSC
Profession: Social Worker
Constituency: 180 (Area: Wadala, District - Mumbai City)

INC

He was appointed as Shiv Sena Ward President from 1977. He worked as Nanded Shiv Sena Chief Coordinator in 1999. He was elected as the municipal councillor in MCGM from 1985-1990. He was Member of Maharashtra Legislative Assembly for 1990-95, 1995-99, 1999-2004, 2004-2009 and 2009-2014 terms. He was In-charge of catering committee in 1995. He was Minister of State for Food and Civil Supplies from February, 1999 to May, 1999. He also headed Ministry of State Urban Development from May, 1999 to October, 1999. He was re-elected to state legislative assembly in 2014.

QUALITY OF QUESTIONS	NO. OF QUESTIONS	PERCEIVED LEAST CORRUPT
↑19	↑19	↓14
2018 — #21	2018 — #20	2018 — #6

RANK #19

ATTENDANCE		PERCEIVED ACCESSIBILITY
↓28		↓12
2018 — #16		2018 — #7

MR POPULAR

2018 RANK #16

CLEAN CRIMINAL RECORD		PERCEIVED PERFORMER
#1		↑4
2018 — #1		2018 — #17

Mangal Prabhat Lodha

Score	
2019	2018
64.24%	61.20%

Birth Date: 18th December 1955
Birth Place: Jodhpur (Rajasthan)
Language: Marathi, Hindi, English and Gujarati

Education: L.L.B
Profession: Industry & Trade
Constituency: 185 (Area: Malabar Hill, District - Mumbai City)

BJP

He tabled Right to Information Bill for the first time in the country in 1997 and forced discussion in the assembly. He was the Member of assembly in 1995-99, 1999-2004, 2004-2009 and 2009-2014. He was re-elected to Legislative Assembly again in October, 2014.

QUALITY OF QUESTIONS	NO. OF QUESTIONS	PERCEIVED LEAST CORRUPT
↑11	↑11	↓32
2018 — #24	2018 — #24	2018 — #19

RANK
#13

ATTENDANCE		PERCEIVED ACCESSIBILITY
↑1		#26
2018 — #16		2018 — #26

2018 RANK
#22

CLEAN CRIMINAL RECORD		PERCEIVED PERFORMER
↑1		↑7
2018 — #17		2018 — #21

Mangesh Anant Kudalkar

Score	
2019	**2018**
70.19%	**54.73%**

Birth Date: 18th June 1971
Birth Place: Prabhadevi, Mumbai
Language: Marathi, Hindi and English

Education: SSC
Profession: Self Employed
Constituency: 174
(Area: (SC) Kurla, District - Mumbai Suburbs)

SS

He has handled various responsibilities in Shiv Sena. He was the head of Shiv Sena local office, Kurla from 2000 to 2006. He was awarded 'Samajbhushan' and 'Rohidas Ratna' award for his social work. He was elected to legislative assembly in October, 2014.

QUALITY OF QUESTIONS ↓14	NO. OF QUESTIONS ↓14	PERCEIVED LEAST CORRUPT ↑2
2018 — #13	2018 — #13	2018 — #18

RANK #5

Mrs. CLEAN

Mrs. POPULAR

2018 RANK #6

ATTENDANCE #1		PERCEIVED ACCESSIBILITY ↑2
2018 — #1		2018 — #4

CLEAN CRIMINAL RECORD #1		PERCEIVED PERFORMER ↑1
2018 — #1		2018 — #7

Manisha Ashok Chaudhary

Score

2019	2018
75.62%	**70.94%**

Birth Date: 18ᵗʰ June 1961
Birth Place: Gholvad, Palghar District
Language: Marathi, Hindi, English and Gujarati

Education: B.Sc.
Profession: Business
Constituency: 153 (Area: Dahisar, District - Mumbai Suburbs)

BJP

She was director of the Thane Rural Bank from 2002 to 2006. She held various positions in Bhartiya Janta Party. She was Chairman of the Dahanu Municipal Council from 1997-2001 after being municipal councillor from 1997-2007. She was elected as municipal councillor to MCGM in 2009. She was elected to the Legislative Assembly in 2014. Since May 2015, she is the head of the women rights and welfare committee in the Maharashtra Legislature.

QUALITY OF QUESTIONS ↑4 2018 — #11	NO. OF QUESTIONS ↑4 2018 — #11	PERCEIVED LEAST CORRUPT ↑13 2018 — #29

RANK #7

ATTENDANCE ↑19 2018 — #26	**2018 RANK #13**	PERCEIVED ACCESSIBILITY ↓27 2018 — #19

CLEAN CRIMINAL RECORD #1 2018 — #1	**Md. Arif (Naseem) Lalan Khan**	PERCEIVED PERFORMER ↑27 2018 — #30

	Score	
	2019	**2018**
	74.18%	**63.43%**

Birth Date: 21st October 1963
Birth Place: Akbarpur, Uttar Pradesh
Language: Marathi, Hindi, English and Urdu

Education: Non Matric
Profession: Business
Constituency: 168
(Area: Chandivali, District - Mumbai Suburbs)

INC

He was appointed as Vice-president of North east district youth Congress committee between 1988-93 then Joint Secretary between 1993-98. He has held position of General Secretary, Mumbai Pradesh Yuvak Congress committee between 1995-98. He was acting secretary, Mumbai Pradesh Congress Committee (minority cell). He was member of Maharashtra legislative assembly from 1999 to 2004, 2004 to 2009 and 2009 to 2014. He was Minister of State for Food and Civil Supplies, Consumer Protection Department from November, 1999 to October, 2004, From December, 2008 to October 2009 onwards he was Minister of State for Home, Food and Drug Administration. He is State Minister for Textiles, Minorities Development, Wakf Board and welfare of former soldiers. He was re-elected to state legislative assembly in October, 2014.

QUALITY OF QUESTIONS	NO. OF QUESTIONS	PERCEIVED LEAST CORRUPT
↑8	↑8	↓26
2018 — #10	2018 — #10	2018 — #23

RANK #10

ATTENDANCE
↓19
2018 — #16

2018 RANK #19

PERCEIVED ACCESSIBILITY
↓16
2018 — #14

CLEAN CRIMINAL RECORD
↑1
2018 — #24

Parag Madhusudan Alavani

Score	
2019	2018
72.04%	**58.25%**

PERCEIVED PERFORMER
↑16
2018 — #26

Birth Date: 11th February 1967
Birth Place: Vileparle, Mumbai
Language: Marathi, Hindi, English, Gujarati and Sanskrit

Education: L.L.B
Profession: Business
Constituency: 167
(Area: Vile Parle, District - Mumbai Suburbs)

BJP

He handled various responsibilities in Bhartiya Janata Party. He was the BJP president of the North Mumbai district from 1998 to 2002. He was municipal councillor in MCGM during 1997-2007. He was Chairman of the K/East ward committee in 2001-2002. He headed Improvement Committee of the MCGM, 2002-2003. He was group leader of the BJP in MCGM from 2003-2007. He was elected to Legislative Assembly in 2014.

QUALITY OF QUESTIONS ↓28 2018 — #18	NO. OF QUESTIONS ↓28 2018 — #18	PERCEIVED LEAST CORRUPT ↑5 2018 — #17

RANK #25

ATTENDANCE #1 2018 — #1		PERCEIVED ACCESSIBILITY ↑14 2018 — #17

2018 RANK #18

CLEAN CRIMINAL RECORD ↓26 2018 — #20		PERCEIVED PERFORMER ↓8 2018 — #1

Prakash Rajaram Surve

Score

2019	2018
52.96%	59.35%

Birth Date: 1st June 1962
Birth Place: Rudrauli, Raigad District
Language: Marathi, Hindi and English

Education: B.Com.
Profession: Business
Constituency: 154 (Area: Magathane, District - Mumbai Suburbs)

SS

He was the Chairman of Sanjay Gandhi Niradhar Yojna Committee. He has been involved in various social activities. He received 'Samaj Bhushan' award from Navshakti for distinguished social work. He was elected to the Legislative Assembly in October, 2014.

QUALITY OF QUESTIONS ↑20 2018 — #22	NO. OF QUESTIONS ↑20 2018 — #22	PERCEIVED LEAST CORRUPT ↓11 2018 — #5

RANK #18

ATTENDANCE #1 2018 — #1	2018 RANK #15	PERCEIVED ACCESSIBILITY ↓23 2018 — #15

CLEAN CRIMINAL RECORD #1 2018 — #1	**Prakash Vaikunt Phaterpekar**	PERCEIVED PERFORMER ↓18 2018 — #15

Score

2019	2018
64.55%	**62.30%**

Birth Date: 24th October 1958
Birth Place: Chembur, Mumbai
Language: Marathi, Hindi, English and Kokani

Education: SSC
Profession: Business
Constituency: 173
(Area: Chembur, District - Mumbai Suburbs)

SS

He has been involved in various social activities in Mumbai. He was Municipal Councillor in MCGM from 2007-2012. He was member of the various committees of MCGM like Improvements Committee (2009-2010), Works Committee (2009-2012), Public Health Committee. He was elected to Maharashtra Legislative Assembly in October, 2014.

QUALITY OF QUESTIONS ↑26 2018 — #28	NO. OF QUESTIONS ↑26 2018 — #28	PERCEIVED LEAST CORRUPT ↑3 2018 — #13

RANK #22

ATTENDANCE ↓19 2018 — #1

MR CLEAN

2018 RANK #20

PERCEIVED ACCESSIBILITY ↑7 2018 — #12

CLEAN CRIMINAL RECORD #1 2018 — #1

Raj Purohit

Score	
2019	**2018**
58.86%	**57.82%**

PERCEIVED PERFORMER ↓12 2018 — #5

Birth Date: 31st August 1954
Birth Place: Fungani, Sirohi (Rajasthan)
Language: Marathi, Hindi, English and Gujarati

Education: L.L.B
Profession: Advocate
Constituency: 187 (Area: Colaba, District - Mumbai City)

BJP

He has handled various responsibilities within organisation in BJP and ABVP. He was municipal councillor on MCGM during 1985-1992. He was member of the state legislature from 1990 to 2009. He has been chief whip of the BJP in State Legislature. He was the Head of the Assurance Committee in 1995. He was minister of state for Housing, Slum Improvement, Housing Repair and Redevelopment, Urban Land Ceiling Act, Employment and Self-employment and Parliamentary affairs from 1996 to 1999. He carried out important work of rent control act. He was again elected to state legislative assembly in October, 2014.

QUALITY OF QUESTIONS	NO. OF QUESTIONS	PERCEIVED LEAST CORRUPT
#32	**#32**	**↓31**
2018 — **#32**	2018 — **#32**	2018 — **#7**

RANK #31

ATTENDANCE
↑28
2018 — **#32**

PERCEIVED ACCESSIBILITY
↓6
2018 — **#3**

MR POPULAR

2018 RANK #32

CLEAN CRIMINAL RECORD
↓26
2018 — **#20**

Ramchandra Shivaji Kadam

Score	
2019	**2018**
41.69%	**33.37%**

PERCEIVED PERFORMER
↑2
2018 — **#28**

Birth Date: 24th January 1972
Birth Place: Hadoli, Latur District
Language: Marathi, Hindi, English, Gujarati

Education: SSC
Profession: Construction Enterprising
Constituency: 169
(Area: Ghatkopar (W), District - Mumbai Suburbs)

BJP

He has been involved in various social work activities. He started a rationing scheme for more than 2500 aged and homeless couples in Ghatkopar. He is working as spokesperson for Maharashtra BJP since 2015. He was elected to Maharashtra Assembly in 2009 and again got re-elected in 2014.

QUALITY OF QUESTIONS	NO. OF QUESTIONS	PERCEIVED LEAST CORRUPT
↓31	↓31	↑30
2018 — #30	2018 — #30	2018 — #31

RANK #29

ATTENDANCE		PERCEIVED ACCESSIBILITY
#1		↓28
2018 — #1		2018 — #25

2018 RANK #27

CLEAN CRIMINAL RECORD	Ramesh Kondiram Latke	PERCEIVED PERFORMER
↓23		↓28
2018 — #18		2018 — #11

Score

2019	2018
47.46%	48.24%

Birth Date: 21st April 1970
Birth Place: Andheri, Suburbs Mumbai
Language: Marathi, Hindi, English and Gujarati

Education: SSC
Profession: Business
Constituency: 166
(Area: Andheri (E),
District - Mumbai Suburbs)

SS

He has led various social organisations and held various posts and responsibilities within Shivsena. He was Municipal Councillor on MCGM from 1997-2012. He was elected to State Legislative Assembly in October, 2014 and currently he is the member of Legislative Library Committee.

QUALITY OF QUESTIONS ↓27	NO. OF QUESTIONS ↓27	PERCEIVED LEAST CORRUPT ↓18
2018 — #26	2018 — #26	2018 — #12

RANK #30

ATTENDANCE #1		PERCEIVED ACCESSIBILITY #31
2018 — #1		2018 — #31

2018 RANK #29

CLEAN CRIMINAL RECORD ↓30	**Sadanand Shankar Sarvankar**	PERCEIVED PERFORMER ↓14
2018 — #24		2018 — #8

Score	
2019	2018
45.65%	**45.36%**

Birth Date: 1st June 1954
Birth Place: Mumbai
Language: Marathi, Hindi and English

Education: SSC
Profession: Social Service
Constituency: 181
(Area: Mahim, District - Mumbai City)

SS

He has been involved in various social activities. He has also handled various responsibilities within Shiv Sena. He was the municipal councillor on three occasions in MCGM and headed the Standing Committee on two occasions. He was again elected to state legislature in October, 2014.

QUALITY OF QUESTIONS ↓**21** 2018 — **#19**	NO. OF QUESTIONS ↓**21** 2018 — **#19**	PERCEIVED LEAST CORRUPT ↓**27** 2018 — **#21**

RANK #28

2018 RANK #30

ATTENDANCE ↓**32** 2018 — **#29**		PERCEIVED ACCESSIBILITY ↑**18** 2018 — **#27**

CLEAN CRIMINAL RECORD ↑**1** 2018 — **#24**	**Sanjay Govind Potnis**	PERCEIVED PERFORMER ↑**31** 2018 — **#32**

Score

2019	2018
50.76%	**44.27%**

Birth Date: 19th July 1956
Birth Place: Bardesh-Goa
Language: Marathi, Hindi, English and Kokani

Education: SSC
Profession: Business
Constituency: 175
(Area: Kalina, District - Mumbai Suburbs)

SS

He is well known as art director, theatre producer. He has been involved in various social activities in Mumbai. He was Municipal Councillor in MCGM on two occasions during 1997-2002 and 2007-2012, during which he was member of the various committees like Works Committee (1997-2000), Law Committee in 2002. He also headed BEST Committee in (2007-2008 & 2009-2010). He was elected to Legislative Assembly in October, 2014.

QUALITY OF QUESTIONS ↓16	NO. OF QUESTIONS ↓17	PERCEIVED LEAST CORRUPT ↓12
2018 — #6	2018 — #6	2018 — #2

RANK #15

ATTENDANCE ↑1		PERCEIVED ACCESSIBILITY ↓9
2018 — #16		2018 — #5

2018 RANK #12

CLEAN CRIMINAL RECORD ↑1		PERCEIVED PERFORMER ↓24
2018 — #24		2018 — #16

Sardar Tara Singh

Score	
2019	**2018**
67.12%	**64.60%**

Birth Date: 10th August 1937
Birth Place: Haripur Hazara, Hazara District (Punjab)
Language: Marathi, Hindi, English, Gujarati and Punjabi

Education: Up to SSC
Profession: Business
Constituency: 155 (Area: Mulund, District - Mumbai Suburbs)

BJP

He has been a Municipal Councillor for three terms between 1984-1999. He was Chairman of Standing committee and Public health committee. He was group leader of BJP in the corporation. He was awarded 'Best Corporator Award' by the Governor. He was elected as Member of Maharashtra Assembly in 1999-2004 and 2004-2009 and 2009-2014. He was elected to state legislature again in October, 2014.

QUALITY OF QUESTIONS	NO. OF QUESTIONS	PERCEIVED LEAST CORRUPT
↑22	↑22	↓17
2018 — #31	2018 — #31	2018 — #9

RANK #24

ATTENDANCE		PERCEIVED ACCESSIBILITY
↓19		↓29
2018 — #1		2018 — #24

2018 RANK #31

Selvan R. Tamil

CLEAN CRIMINAL RECORD	Score	PERCEIVED PERFORMER
↑23	**2019** — **2018**	↑25
2018 — #24	**53.81%** — **41.74%**	2018 — #31

Birth Date: 1st December 1958
Birth Place: Thanjavur, Thanjavur District (Tamilnadu)
Language: Marathi, Hindi, English and Tamil

Education: Eleventh
Profession: Business
Constituency: 179 (Area: Sion-Koliwada, District - Mumbai City)

BJP

He was elected to MCGM as Municipal Councillor in 2012 and then to the Legislative Assembly in October, 2014.

QUALITY OF QUESTIONS	NO. OF QUESTIONS	PERCEIVED LEAST CORRUPT
#5	#5	↑6
2018 — #5	2018 — #5	2018 — #28

RANK #1

ATTENDANCE		PERCEIVED ACCESSIBILITY
#1		↓3
2018 — #1		2018 — #2

2018 RANK #4

CLEAN CRIMINAL RECORD	Sunil Govind Shinde	PERCEIVED PERFORMER
↑1		↓15
	Score	
	2019 — 2018	
	79.38% — 72.69%	
2018 — #18		2018 — #4

Birth Date: 22nd February 1963
Birth Place: Worli, Mumbai
Language: Marathi, Hindi and English

Education: SSC
Profession: Business
Constituency: 182
(Area: Worli, District - Mumbai City)

SS

He has been involved in various social and welfare activities. He was Chairman of the Sanjay Gandhi Niradhar Swawlamban Yojana from 1995-2000. He has handled various responsibilities within Shivsena. He was Municipal Councillor from 2007-2012. He was Chairman of the G/South ward Committee from 2007-2009, Chairman of BEST Committee in 2012 in MCGM. He was elected to Legislative Assembly in 2014.

QUALITY OF QUESTIONS ↑23	NO. OF QUESTIONS ↑23	PERCEIVED LEAST CORRUPT ↓9
2018 — #25	2018 — #25	2018 — #4

RANK #21

ATTENDANCE #1		PERCEIVED ACCESSIBILITY ↑21
2018 — #1		2018 — #23

2018 RANK #25

CLEAN CRIMINAL RECORD ↑23	Sunil Rajaram Raut	PERCEIVED PERFORMER ↑3
2018 — #24		2018 — #22

Score	
2019	2018
59.57%	48.68%

Birth Date: 20th July 1965
Birth Place: Ghatkopar, Suburbs Mumbai
Language: Marathi, Hindi and English

Education: HSC
Profession: Business
Constituency: 156 (Area: Vikhroli, District - Mumbai Suburbs)

SS

He has been involved in various social and cultural activities. He was elected to State Legislative Assembly in October, 2014.

QUALITY OF QUESTIONS ↓3	NO. OF QUESTIONS ↓3	PERCEIVED LEAST CORRUPT ↓29
2018 — #2	2018 — #2	2018 — #10

RANK #4

ATTENDANCE ↑1		PERCEIVED ACCESSIBILITY #22
2018 — #16		2018 — #22

MR COMMITTED

2018 RANK #2

CLEAN CRIMINAL RECORD #1		PERCEIVED PERFORMER ↑23
2018 — #1		2018 — #25

Sunil Waman Prabhu

Score

2019	2018
77.75%	75.61%

Birth Date: 11th July 1969
Birth Place: Not Given
Language: Marathi, Hindi and English

Education: HSC
Profession: Commission Agent
Constituency: 159
(Area: Dindoshi, District - Mumbai Suburbs)

SS

He has been elected to MCGM since 1997 as councillor. He was the chairman of Standing Committee of the MCGM in 2004. He was the leader of the house (Shivsena) in MCGM during 2005 to 2011. He is former Mayor of Mumbai from 2012 to 2014. During this period he raised a historical museum depicting struggle of Sanyukta Maharashtra. He was adjourned as 'Best Municipal Councillor' by the Praja Foundation for his outstanding work in MCGM. He was ranked 16th in the list of 500 top reputed persons released by the Foreign Policy Magazine. He is also member of Mumbai Regional Development Authority (MMRDA). He has been involved in various social activities in Mumbai.

QUALITY OF QUESTIONS ↓18 2018 — #15	NO. OF QUESTIONS ↓18 2018 — #15	PERCEIVED LEAST CORRUPT ↓23 2018 — #11

RANK #17

ATTENDANCE #1 2018 — #1		PERCEIVED ACCESSIBILITY ↑4 2018 — #13

2018 RANK #11

CLEAN CRIMINAL RECORD #1 2018 — #1	**Trupti Prakash Sawant**	PERCEIVED PERFORMER ↓30 2018 — #24

Score	
2019	**2018**
65.30%	**64.91%**

Birth Date: 15th September 1980
Birth Place: Mumbai
Language: Marathi, Hindi and English

Education: Graduate
Profession: Housewife
Constituency: 176 (Area: Bandra (E), District - Mumbai Suburbs)

SS

She was elected to Legislative Assembly in April, 2015 through By-Election and hence she was not considered for 2016 ranking.

QUALITY OF QUESTIONS	NO. OF QUESTIONS	PERCEIVED LEAST CORRUPT
↓24	↓24	↓15
2018 — #23	2018 — #23	2018 — #14

RANK #27

2018 RANK #24

ATTENDANCE		PERCEIVED ACCESSIBILITY
↓19		↓20
2018 — #1		2018 — #18

CLEAN CRIMINAL RECORD		PERCEIVED PERFORMER
↓26		↑13
2018 — #20		2018 — #18

Tukaram Ramkrishna Kate

Score

2019	2018
51.66%	**52.39%**

Birth Date: 1st June 1958
Birth Place: Borichamal, Raigad District
Language: Marathi, Hindi and English

Education: Ninth
Profession: Farmer and Business
Constituency: 172 (Area: Anushakti Nagar, District - Mumbai Suburbs)

SS

He has been involved in various social activities. He was the head of Bhartiya Kamagar Sena at Pepsi Company, Deonar, Chembur from 1995 to 1998. He was elected as the municipal councillor from 1997-2007 to MCGM. He headed Works Committee (suburban) in MCGM from 2005 to 2006. He was felicitated with Samaj Ratna award in MCGM along with Swachata Probodhan Award. He was elected to Legislative Assembly in October, 2014.

QUALITY OF QUESTIONS ↓6	NO. OF QUESTIONS ↓6	PERCEIVED LEAST CORRUPT ↑10
2018 — #4	2018 — #4	2018 — #24

RANK #8

ATTENDANCE ↑28		PERCEIVED ACCESSIBILITY ↓19
2018 — #29		2018 — #16

2018 RANK #9

CLEAN CRIMINAL RECORD #1		PERCEIVED PERFORMER ↑9
2018 — #1		2018 — #29

Varsha Eknath Gaikwad

Score

2019	2018
73.70%	65.97%

Birth Date: 3rd February 1975
Birth Place: Mumbai
Language: Marathi, Hindi and English

Education: Bachelor of Education (B.Ed)
Profession: Social Worker
Constituency: 178 (Area: (SC) - Dharavi, District - Mumbai City)

INC

She was the member of Maharashtra Pradesh Congress working committee between 2004-2009. She got elected to Maharashtra Legislative Assembly from 2004-2009 & 2009-2014. She was member and Head of Women's rights and Welfare Committee between 2008-09 and 2009 onwards she became Minister of State for Medical Education, Higher and Technical Education, Tourism and Special Assistance Department. She has won 'Commendable Legislator' award from Maharashtra branch of Commonwealth Parliamentary Union for the year 2006-07 and she participated in the delegation appointed for monitoring the election of the U.S. President. She was Minister of Women and Child Welfare Department during 2010 to 2014. She was re-elected to state legislative assembly in October, 2014.

QUALITY OF QUESTIONS	NO. OF QUESTIONS	PERCEIVED LEAST CORRUPT
#29	**#29**	**↓7**
2018 — **#29**	2018 — **#29**	2018 — **#1**

RANK #26

ATTENDANCE		PERCEIVED ACCESSIBILITY
↓28		**↑25**
2018 — **#16**		2018 — **#30**

2018 RANK #23

CLEAN CRIMINAL RECORD		PERCEIVED PERFORMER
#1		**↓29**
2018 — **#1**		2018 — **#2**

Waris Yusuf Pathan

Score

2019	2018
52.05%	**54.59%**

Birth Date: 29th November 1966
Birth Place: Not Given
Language: Hindi, English and Gujarati

Education: L.L.B
Profession: Advocate
Constituency: 184 (Area: Byculla, District - Mumbai City)

AIMIM

A Lawyer by profession, he has keen interest in reading and social work.

QUALITY OF QUESTIONS ↑10	NO. OF QUESTIONS ↑10	PERCEIVED LEAST CORRUPT ↓21
2018 — #14	2018 — #14	2018 — #15

RANK #9

ATTENDANCE ↑1		PERCEIVED ACCESSIBILITY ↑8
2018 — #16		2018 — #11

2018 RANK #7

CLEAN CRIMINAL RECORD #1		PERCEIVED PERFORMER ↓26
2018 — #1		2018 — #10

Yogesh Sagar

Score	
2019	**2018**
73.02%	**66.90%**

Birth Date: 4th October 1962
Birth Place: Malad, Suburbs Mumbai
Language: Marathi, Hindi, English and Gujarati

Education: F.Y.J.C.
Profession: Business
Constituency: 161
(Area: Charkop, District - Mumbai Suburbs)

BJP

He has been Municipal Councillor from 2000-2012. He is also the district President of North Mumbai BJP. In the year 2003 he was awarded the Mayor Award under MCGM cleanliness work. He was elected to Maharashtra Legislative Assembly in October 2009. He has funded and worked for Shanti Sandesh Foundation and Mahila Microfinance Credit Society. He was adjourned as best elected representative by Praja Foundation for three consecutive years from 2011 to 2012, 2012 to 2013 and 2013 to 2014. He was re-elected to the Legislative Assembly in October, 2014.

Note for all graphs and tables: Number of MLAs who were ranked in 2016 are 31, in 2017, 2018 and 2019 are 32.

Sessions taken into account for deliberation for **2016** report card are Winter 2014, Budget 2015 & Monsoon 2015; For **2017** report card are Winter 2015, Budget 2016, Monsoon 2016 & Special 2016; For **2018** report card are Winter 2016, Budget 2017, GST 2017 & Monsoon 2017; For **2019** report card are Winter 2017, Budget 2018, Monsoon 2018 & Winter 2018.

Attendance

Quality of Questions

Number of Questions

		Above 150
		50 to 150
		Below 50

	2016	2017	2018	2019
No. of questions asked -	4,343	6,199	4,519	7,284

Clean Criminal Record

Good - above 80%
Average - 80% to 50%
Poor - below 50%

Perceived Performer

Number of MLAs

Year	Green	Orange	Red
2016	0	31	0
2017	0	32	0
2018	0	32	0
2019	1	31	0

Good - above 80%
Average - 80% to 50%
Poor - below 50%

Perceived Accessibility

Number of MLAs

Year	Green	Orange	Red
2016	0	6	25
2017	0	13	19
2018	0	22	10
2019	1	24	7

Good - above 80%
Average - 80% to 50%
Poor - below 50%

Perceived Least Corrupt

Good - above 80%
Average - 80% to 50%
Poor - below 50%

Overall

Good - above 80%
Average - 80% to 50%
Poor - below 50%

Party-wise Average Score

	AIMIM (1)	BJP (12)	INC (5)	SP (1)	SS (13)	All (32)	
2016	25	18	5	17	18		**Average Rank**
2017	27	16	3	17	21		
2018	23	15	8	26	19		
2019	25	16	7	23	20		

Party-wise Average Score for Different Parameters in 2019

	Attendance (out of 10)	Number of Questions (out of 16)	Quality of Questions (out of 21)	Perceived Performer (out of 20)	Perceived Accessibility (out of 6)	Perceived Least Corrupt (out of 10)	Clean Criminal Record (out of 5)
AIMIM (1)	6.0	1.5	4.2	12.1	3.1	9.2	5.0
BJP (12)	8.7	7.6	7.6	14.0	4.0	8.8	3.4
INC (5)	8.0	13.6	11.8	13.7	3.2	8.8	5.0
SP (1)	10.0	10.3	9.7	11.4	2.0	8.3	-5.0
SS (13)	8.9	6.4	7.1	13.5	3.5	8.4	1.2

Average Score for Different Parameters

	Attendance (out of 10)	Question Asked (out of 16)	Quality of Questions (out of 21)	Perceived Performer (out of 20)	Perceived Accessibility (out of 6)	Perceived Least Corrupt (out of 10)	Clean Criminal Record (out of 5)	Overall Score (out of 100)
2014	8.6	7.9	11.9	12.9	2.0	6.2	-0.6	59.2
2016	9.7	8.0	12.4	14.5	2.6	7.2	1.3	65.1
2017	9.2	8.0	8.0	13.8	2.7	6.9	1.4	60.5
2018	8.1	8.0	8.1	12.8	3.2	8.1	0.8	59.3
2019	8.6	8.0	8.0	13.6	3.6	8.6	2.6	63.7

No. of questions asked	2014: 10,435	2016: 4,343	2017: 6,199	2018: 4,519	2019: 7,284

Note: Scores for the corresponding year (2014) in the last term have been given for comparison with the current year (2019).

Top and Bottom 20 Percentile Average Scores

	Top 20 2014	Bottom 20 2014	Top 20 2016	Bottom 20 2016	Top 20 2017	Bottom 20 2017	Top 20 2018	Bottom 20 2018	Top 20 2019	Bottom 20 2019
Questions Asked	14.4	1.2	14.7	1.5	14.7	1.2	14.7	1.3	14.7	1.3
Quality of Questions	13.0	10.7	16.3	8.2	12.7	3.0	12.6	3.2	12.6	3.3
Perceived Performer	13.8	11.4	15.4	13.5	14.5	12.8	14.2	11.4	15.4	12.0
Perceived Accessibility	2.6	1.5	3.3	1.8	3.4	1.7	4.1	2.2	4.5	2.5
Perceived Least Corrupt	6.9	5.6	7.8	6.6	7.6	6.0	8.9	7.1	9.6	7.6

Note: Scores for the corresponding year (2014) in the last term have been given for comparison with the current year (2019).

Questions asked by Mumbai MLA during 2014 - 2018

| MLA Name	2014	2015			2016			2017			2018			Total	Rank
	WS	BS	MS	WS	BS	MS	WS	BS	MS	WS	BS	MS	WS		
Abu Asim Azmi	30	47	32	69	46	38	23	44	43	43	48	56	55	574	14
Ajay Vinayak Choudhari	12	83	61	68	62	50	40	56	81	62	54	41	40	710	10
Ameet Bhaskar Satam	3	19	16	18	40	33	12	39	63	44	60	60	25	432	17
Amin Amir Ali Patel	112	309	634	491	477	412	256	185	221	131	209	254	169	3860	1
Ashish Babaji Shelar	18	35	43	48	105	45	51	52	109	74	114	89	63	846	8
Ashok Dharmaraj Patil	14	25	62	22	20	16	20	13	45	5	21	18	9	290	25
Aslam Ramazan Ali Shaikh	129	70	288	306	406	346	105	33	139	133	355	252	258	2820	2
Atul Dattatray Bhatkhalkar	7	34	41	41	62	63	41	69	120	62	87	49	49	725	9
Bharati Hemant Lavekar	3	5	4	0	1		11	23	20	31	25	15	15	153	29
Kalidas Nilkanth Kolambkar	29	45	46	88	92	57	28	64	51	29	49	34	83	695	11
Mangal Prabhat Lodha	8	35	42	31	36	16	30	25	36	27	46	50	44	426	18
Mangesh Anant Kudalkar	13	29	14	13	17	18	20	22	20	20	51	85	46	368	20
Manisha Ashok Chaudhary	10	34	33	28	65	15	38	43	49	43	59	64	29	510	15
Md. Arif (Naseem) Lalan Khan	5	71	74	164	80	251	81	14	72	96	117	119	103	1247	4
Parag Madhusudan Alavani	4	23	34	30	45	38	49	40	79	60	65	77	52	596	13
Prakash Rajaram Surve	5	38	14	26	21	40	34	37	35	27	15	21	6	319	24
Prakash Vaikunt Phaterpekar	3	39	31	6	41	12	14	21	33	37	44	37	48	366	21
Raj Khangaraji Purohit	10	43	3	25	44	18	3	9	15	13	29	23	14	249	27
Ramchandra Shivaji Kadam	0	1	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	32
Ramesh Kondiram Latke	2	7	4	6	1	0	3	0	8	5	7	9	9	61	31
Sadanand Shankar Sarvankar	12	37	91	35	44	10	21	15	19	20	28	8	20	360	22
Sanjay Govind Potnis	2	37	59	11	62	34	25	40	39	40	46	33	25	453	16
Sardar Tara Singh	6	56	104	102	112	112	60	86	89	27	89	14	43	900	7
Selvan R. Tamil	0	2	0	0	4	1	0	4	6	24	31	33	31	132	30
Sunil Govind Shinde	12	43	84	55	68	16	61	94	91	85	153	62	116	940	6
Sunil Rajaram Raut	11	35	55	43	74	33	13	9	35	22	33	32	18	413	19
Sunil Waman Prabhu	25	97	139	99	109	47	83	133	122	122	122	135	93	1326	3
Trupti Prakash Sawant#				38	34	4	7	48	60	14	60	51	44	360	22
Tukaram Ramkrishna Kate	14	45	27	6	17	6	27	16	20	16	26	27	22	269	26
Varsha Eknath Gaikwad	39	114	87	50	125	49	77	89	99	42	144	125	51	1091	5
Waris Yusuf Pathan	3	16	23	16	11	9	5	13	5	8	37	12	10	168	28
Yogesh Amritlal Sagar	33	81	69	58	65	35	4	46	71	33	78	66	46	685	12

BS- Budget Session   MS- Monsoon Session

(*) WS - Winter Session

(#) She was elected to legislative Assembly in April, 2015 through by-election and hence she was not considered for 2016 ranking.

Attendance (in%) of Mumbai MLA during 2014 - 2018

MLA Name	2014		2015			2016				2017				2018		Avg. (in %)	Rank
	WS	BS	MS	WS	BS	MS	SS	WS	BS	GS	MS	WS	BS	MS	WS		
Abu Asim Azmi	100	100	100	77	96	100	100	90	50	33	100	90	91	100	100	88	21
Ajay Vinayak Choudhari	100	100	100	38	87	87	100	0	95	100	100	100	91	92	75	84	24
Ameet Bhaskar Satam	92	100	100	100	100	100	0	100	100	100	79	90	100	77	100	89	20
Amin Amir Ali Patel	92	87	100	92	100	100	100	70	90	100	100	80	91	69	100	91	16
Ashish Babaji Shelar	92	100	100	92	100	100	100	100	90	100	93	100	82	85	100	96	4
Ashok Dharmaraj Patil	100	91	93	77	100	73	100	60	80	100	79	70	86	77	88	85	23
Aslam Ramazan Ali Shaikh	100	91	100	69	78	87	100	40	75	100	93	60	82	77	100	83	26
Atul Dattatray Bhatkhalkar	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	0	100	100	100	85	100	92	14
Bharati Hemant Lavekar	100	100	93	100	100	100	100	70	100	100	100	100	100	100	88	97	2
Kalidas Nilkanth Kolambkar	100	74	100	85	96	93	100	90	75	0	0	70	100	100	100	79	28
Mangal Prabhat Lodha	85	96	100	69	96	87	100	70	85	100	93	80	59	62	75	84	25
Mangesh Anant Kudalkar	92	91	100	100	100	93	100	90	80	100	100	100	82	92	100	95	7
Manisha Ashok Chaudhari	100	100	100	92	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	99	1
Md. Arif Lalan Khan	23	87	79	54	74	100	100	70	55	100	93	60	91	77	100	77	29
Parag Madhusudan Alavani	92	100	100	77	100	100	100	90	100	100	71	80	95	77	100	92	15
Prakash Rajaram Surve	100	96	100	77	87	80	0	80	95	100	93	100	100	92	88	86	22
Prakash Vaikunth Phaterpekar	77	100	100	77	100	93	100	70	90	100	100	90	100	100	88	94	10
Raj Khangaraji Purohit	100	96	93	77	91	100	100	70	100	100	100	80	82	85	88	91	17
Ramchandra Shivaji Kadam	85	91	100	85	91	100	100	40	45	0	64	30	91	46	75	70	31
Ramesh Kondiram Latke	100	100	100	85	100	100	100	80	100	100	100	100	100	85	88	96	3
Sadanand Shankar Sarvankar	100	96	100	69	91	93	100	90	95	100	100	100	100	69	100	94	12
Sanjay Govind Potnis	100	65	93	77	57	67	100	40	55	67	71	40	18	0	75	62	32
Sardar Tara Singh	77	96	100	92	96	100	100	100	90	100	79	80	95	100	100	94	11
Selvan R Tamil	92	96	100	77	100	93	100	70	95	100	100	90	86	77	75	90	18
Sunil Govind Shinde	100	100	100	85	96	93	100	90	95	100	93	90	95	100	88	95	6
Sunil Rajaram Raut	100	100	93	92	100	87	100	90	100	100	100	90	100	77	88	94	8
Sunil Vaman Prabhu	100	100	100	92	100	100	100	50	95	100	100	100	100	100	88	95	5
Trupti Prakash Sawant#	-	-	-	77	100	80	100	70	100	100	100	100	91	100	100	93	13
Tukaram Ramkrishna Kate	85	100	100	85	100	100	100	70	100	100	93	70	100	85	63	90	19
Varsha Eknath Gaikwad	77	96	100	100	96	93	100	50	55	67	71	0	95	62	75	76	30
Waris Yusuf Pathan	100	87	71	62	100	93	100	50	100	100	86	0	95	46	100	79	27
Yogesh Amrital Sagar	100	100	86	100	100	93	100	100	100	100	57	100	100	77	100	94	9

(*) WS - Winter Session   MS- Monsoon Session   BS- Budget Session   MS- Monsoon Session

(#) She was elected to legislative Assembly in April, 2015 through by-election and hence she was not considered for 2016 ranking.

Comparison (figures in %) of Actual Performance (Deliberation = Attendance + No. of questions + Quality of questions) with Perceived Performer (Perception of Public Services)

MLA Name	2016			2017			2018			2019			Avg.AP	Avg. PP	Avg. Rank
	AP	PP	Rank	AP	PP	Rank	AP	PP	Rank	AP	PP	Rank			
Abu Asim Azmi	70	73	17	64	66	17	46	58	26	64	57	23	61	64	22
Ajay Vinayak Choudhari	81	78	10	61	71	16	65	70	17	62	70	11	67	72	13
Ameet Bhaskar Satam	44	70	21	53	71	13	57	65	10	56	73	12	53	70	14
Amin Amir Ali Patel	92	78	1	84	67	1	80	69	1	78	73	2	83	72	1
Ashish Babaji Shelar	65	72	12	71	68	10	71	61	8	68	66	16	69	67	11
Ashok Dharmraj Patil	69	69	18	36	65	29	44	62	28	27	70	32	44	67	31
Aslam Ramazan Ali Shaikh	90	71	5	78	71	3	72	64	5	80	67	3	80	68	3
Atul Dattatray Bhatkhalkar	59	77	11	67	69	6	73	62	3	69	66	6	67	69	6
Bharati Hemant Lavekar	41	79	19	28	75	23	37	65	21	40	66	20	36	71	21
Kalidas Nilkanth Kolambkar	69	75	7	75	70	2	51	66	14	58	65	14	63	69	10
Mangal Prabhat Lodha	61	73	13	41	71	18	44	64	16	42	76	19	47	71	15
Mangesh Anant Kudalkar	48	67	30	38	65	22	38	61	22	64	72	13	47	66	20
Manisha Ashok Chaudhary	57	72	16	56	73	11	62	69	6	58	86	5	58	75	9
Md. Arif (Naseem) Lalan Khan	70	72	8	76	67	4	57	57	13	74	63	7	69	65	8
Parag Madhusudan Alavani	54	71	28	58	68	20	63	59	19	67	67	10	60	66	18
Prakash Rajaram Surve	52	74	27	43	69	24	53	71	18	35	72	25	46	72	24
Prakash Vaikunt Phaterpekar	55	73	15	42	61	21	46	65	15	49	66	18	48	66	17
Raj Khangaraji Purohit	47	73	22	43	69	14	34	70	20	34	70	22	40	70	19
Ramchandra Shivaji Kadam	37	67	31	21	66	32	0	58	32	13	77	31	18	67	32
Ramesh Kondiram Latke	43	73	29	33	70	28	31	65	27	29	62	29	34	67	30
Sadanand Shankar Sarvankar	78	73	14	47	69	26	38	66	29	36	68	30	50	69	26
Sanjay Govind Potnis	62	73	23	46	71	25	38	53	30	26	57	28	43	63	28
Sardar Tara Singh	83	74	9	79	69	12	71	64	12	56	65	15	72	68	12
Selvan R. Tamil	39	68	26	28	63	30	29	55	31	41	63	24	34	62	29
Sunil Govind Shinde	76	73	6	60	67	9	76	71	4	77	68	1	72	70	4
Sunil Rajaram Raut	68	61	24	62	72	15	40	61	25	44	75	21	54	67	23
Sunil Waman Prabhu	89	72	2	77	70	5	78	59	2	80	65	4	81	66	2
Trupti Prakash Sawant#	-	-	-	39	65	19	58	60	11	53	59	17	50	61	16
Tukaram Ramkrishna Kate	63	69	20	34	64	31	44	62	24	38	69	27	45	66	27
Varsha Eknath Gaikwad	86	70	3	73	64	7	66	58	9	66	71	8	73	66	5
Waris Yusuf Pathan	41	74	25	32	65	27	28	71	23	25	61	26	32	68	25
Yogesh Amritlal Sagar	85	73	4	66	71	8	56	66	7	67	64	9	68	68	7

(*) AP – Actual Performance PP – Perceived Performer

Note: The above ranking is based on overall performance of Mumbai MLAs during 2014 – 2018.

The 'Average Rank' has been calculated based on the MLA's ranks in Praja's Report Cards for the period 2016–2019.

(#)She was elected to legislative Assembly in April, 2015 through by-election and hence she was not considered for 2016 ranking.

Movement of Rank & Score (in %)

	Name	2016 Score	2016 Rank	2017 Score	2017 Rank	2018 Score	2018 Rank	2019 Score	2019 Rank	Average Score	Average Rank
SP	Abu Asim Azmi	63.04	17	58.46	17	48.37	26	57.19	23	56.77	22
SS	Ajay Vinayak Choudhari	68.80	10	59.15	16	60.55	17	70.73	11	64.81	13
BJP	Ameet Bhaskar Satam	59.27	21	62.52	13	65.95	10	70.37	12	64.53	14
INC	Amin Amir Ali Patel	84.33	1	78.25	1	76.45	1	79.29	2	79.58	1
BJP	Ashish Babaji Shelar	67.40	12	68.56	10	66.16	8	67.08	16	67.30	11
SS	Ashok Dharmaraj Patil	60.85	18	46.50	29	46.48	28	40.08	32	48.48	31
INC	Aslam Ramazan Ali Shaikh	75.76	5	74.12	3	72.31	5	78.29	3	75.12	3
BJP	Atul Dattatray Bhatkhalkar	67.98	11	72.79	6	74.67	3	74.42	6	72.47	6
BJP	Bharati Hemant Lavekar	60.14	19	53.91	23	57.46	21	61.23	20	58.19	21
INC	Kalidas Nilkanth Kolambkar	72.54	7	74.93	2	62.93	14	67.26	14	69.41	10
BJP	Mangal Prabhat Lodha	67.13	13	58.20	18	61.20	16	64.24	19	62.69	15
SS	Mangesh Anant Kudalkar	53.96	30	55.83	22	54.73	22	70.19	13	58.68	20
BJP	Manisha Ashok Chaudhary	65.71	16	68.32	11	70.94	6	75.62	5	70.15	9
INC	Md. Arif (Naseem) Lalan Khan	72.13	8	73.87	4	63.43	13	74.18	7	70.90	8
BJP	Parag Madhusudan Alavani	54.51	28	57.54	20	58.25	19	72.04	10	60.59	18
SS	Prakash Rajaram Surve	56.25	27	52.63	24	59.35	18	52.96	25	55.30	24
SS	Prakash Vaikunt Phaterpekar	65.88	15	56.94	21	62.30	15	64.55	18	62.42	17
BJP	Raj Khangaraji Purohit	58.60	22	60.79	14	57.82	20	58.86	22	59.02	19
BJP	Ramchandra Shivaji Kadam	49.55	31	41.96	32	33.37	32	41.69	31	41.64	32
SS	Ramesh Kondiram Latke	54.39	29	48.11	28	48.24	27	47.46	29	49.55	30
SS	Sadanand Shankar Sarvankar	66.38	14	51.41	26	45.36	29	45.65	30	52.20	26
SS	Sanjay Govind Potnis	58.37	23	51.65	25	44.27	30	50.76	28	51.26	28
BJP	Sardar Tara Singh	68.81	9	65.84	12	64.60	12	67.12	15	66.59	12
BJP	Selvan R. Tamil	57.21	26	46.18	30	41.74	31	53.81	24	49.74	29
SS	Sunil Govind Shinde	75.63	6	69.26	9	72.69	4	79.38	1	74.24	4
SS	Sunil Rajaram Raut	57.77	24	59.81	15	48.68	25	59.57	21	56.46	23
SS	Sunil Waman Prabhu	80.97	2	73.17	5	75.61	2	77.75	4	76.87	2
SS	Trupti Prakash Sawant*	–	–	57.84	19	64.91	11	65.30	17	62.68	16
SS	Tukaram Ramkrishna Kate	59.70	20	44.70	31	52.39	24	51.66	27	52.11	27
INC	Varsha Eknath Gaikwad	79.40	3	72.28	7	65.97	9	73.70	8	72.84	5
AIMIM	Waris Yusuf Pathan	57.71	25	51.24	27	54.59	23	52.05	26	53.90	25
BJP	Yogesh Amrittal Sagar	78.35	4	70.20	8	66.90	7	73.02	9	72.12	7

Note: (*)She was elected to legislative Assembly in April, 2015 through by-election and hence she was not considered for 2016 ranking.

DETAILED SCORE SHEET
FOR THE YEAR 2018 AND 2019

Party	MLAs Name	Attendance (Out of 10)		Questions Asked (Out of 16)		Quality of Questions (Out of 21)		Development Fund (Out of 5)		Criminal Record (Out of 5)		IT+ Edu.* (Out of 3)	
		2018	2019	2018	2019	2018	2019	2018	2019	2018	2019	2018	2019
SP	Abu Azmi	6	10	7.73	10.32	7.78	9.70	5	5	-5	-5	3	3
SS	Ajay Choudhari	8	10	11.86	9.79	10.77	9.35	3	4	-5	5	3	3
BJP	Ameet Satam	10	10	8.26	8.26	8.50	8.29	5	5	5	5	3	3
INC	Amin Patel	8	8	16.00	15.47	13.45	13.05	5	5	5	5	3	3
BJP	Ashish Shelar	10	8	12.38	12.90	11.04	11.28	5	5	-2	-2	3	3
SS	Ashok Patil	8	8	5.66	1.02	6.81	3.67	5	5	-10	-10	3	3
INC	Aslam Shaikh	6	8	14.96	16.00	12.86	13.43	5	5	5	5	2	2
BJP	Atul Bhatkhalkar	10	10	12.90	11.86	11.41	10.61	5	5	5	5	3	3
BJP	Bharati Lavekar	10	10	2.58	3.60	4.58	5.22	5	5	5	5	3	3
INC	Kalidas Kolambkar	4	10	10.32	8.77	9.66	8.59	5	5	5	5	3	3
BJP	Mangal Prabhat Lodha	8	6	6.19	6.70	6.70	7.21	4	5	5	5	3	3
SS	Mangesh Kudalkar	8	10	4.13	10.32	5.66	9.73	5	5	3	5	3	3
BJP	Manisha Chaudhary	10	10	9.79	8.77	9.24	8.61	5	5	5	5	3	3
INC	Md. Arif (Naseem) Khan	6	8	10.83	14.45	10.14	12.40	5	5	5	5	2	2
BJP	Parag Alavani	8	8	11.34	12.38	10.32	10.92	5	5	-5	5	3	3
SS	Prakash Surve	10	10	7.22	2.06	7.60	4.21	5	5	-2	-2	3	3
SS	Prakash Phaterpekar	10	10	5.15	6.19	6.34	7.02	5	5	5	5	3	3
BJP	Raj Purohit	10	8	2.06	3.09	4.11	4.66	5	4	5	5	3	3
BJP	Ramchandra Kadam	0	6	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	5	5	-2	-2	3	3
SS	Ramesh Latke	10	10	1.02	0.51	3.58	3.17	5	5	0	0	3	3
SS	Sadanand Sarvankar	10	10	3.09	2.58	4.77	4.58	3	3	-5	-5	3	3
SS	Sanjay Potnis	4	0	6.70	5.66	7.20	6.57	5	5	-5	5	3	3
BJP	Sardar Tara Singh	8	10	13.41	7.73	12.01	8.36	5	5	-5	5	2	2
BJP	Selvan Tamil	10	8	0.51	5.15	2.99	6.18	5	5	-5	0	3	3
SS	Sunil Shinde	10	10	13.92	13.92	12.02	12.10	5	5	0	5	3	3
SS	Sunil Raut	10	10	3.60	4.64	5.37	6.11	5	5	-5	0	3	3
SS	Sunil Prabhu	8	10	15.47	14.96	13.10	12.86	5	5	5	5	3	3
SS	Trupti Sawant	10	10	8.77	7.22	8.68	7.66	3	5	5	5	3	3
SS	Tukaram Kate	10	8	4.64	4.13	5.90	5.69	5	5	-2	-2	2	2
INC	Varsha Gaikwad	4	6	14.45	13.41	12.44	11.69	2	5	5	5	3	3
AIMIM	Waris Pathan	8	6	1.54	1.54	3.79	4.17	5	5	5	5	3	3
BJP	Yogesh Sagar	8	10	9.28	11.34	8.96	10.32	5	5	5	5	3	3

* Income Tax and Educational Qualification

Perceived Performer (Out of 20)		Perceived Accessibility (Out of 6)		Perceived Least Corrupt (Out of 10)		Broad Measures (Out of 4)		2018		2019		Reasons
2018	2019	2018	2019	2018	2019	2018	2019	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	
11.75	11.41	2.11	2.02	7.36	8.34	2.65	2.41	48.37	26	57.19	23	
14.22	14.04	3.85	4.34	8.05	8.03	2.80	3.17	60.55	17	70.73	11	Attendance; Perceived Accessibility; Criminal Case Withdrawn
13.06	14.58	3.11	3.64	7.37	9.99	2.65	2.62	65.95	10	70.37	12	
14.02	14.70	2.56	3.09	6.75	9.10	2.66	2.88	76.45	1	79.29	2	
12.13	13.35	3.72	3.95	8.25	8.59	2.64	3.01	66.16	8	67.08	16	Attendance
12.49	14.10	3.57	3.94	8.98	8.29	2.97	3.06	46.48	28	40.08	32	Questions asked; Quality of Questions
13.03	13.39	3.78	3.80	7.07	8.56	2.62	3.12	72.31	5	78.29	3	
12.50	13.23	4.54	5.03	7.52	7.72	2.81	2.98	74.67	3	74.42	6	
13.06	13.22	3.07	3.73	8.55	9.45	2.62	3.02	57.46	21	61.23	20	
13.30	13.27	2.00	2.43	7.98	8.71	2.67	2.49	62.93	14	67.26	14	
12.85	15.25	3.81	3.83	8.68	8.77	2.96	3.47	61.20	16	64.24	19	
12.37	14.42	2.59	2.95	8.12	7.06	2.86	2.71	54.73	22	70.19	13	Attendance; Questions asked; Quality of Questions; Perceived Performance; Criminal Case Withdrawn
13.81	17.18	4.02	4.70	8.23	9.86	2.85	3.51	70.94	6	75.62	5	
11.33	12.63	3.12	2.93	7.22	8.79	2.79	2.98	63.43	13	74.18	7	Attendance; Questions asked; Quality of Questions; Perceived Performance
11.79	13.41	3.25	3.71	7.93	8.01	2.62	2.61	58.25	19	72.04	10	Questions asked; Perceived Performance; Overall Perception; Criminal Case Withdrawn
14.34	14.39	3.18	3.73	8.25	9.37	2.77	3.20	59.35	18	52.96	25	Questions asked; Quality of Questions
12.99	13.36	3.24	3.29	8.73	8.88	2.86	2.81	62.30	15	64.55	18	
14.09	14.03	3.34	4.17	8.44	9.60	2.77	3.32	57.82	20	58.86	22	
11.72	15.30	4.06	4.17	8.62	7.57	2.96	2.65	33.37	32	41.69	31	
13.18	12.43	2.69	2.92	7.04	7.68	2.73	2.75	48.24	27	47.46	29	
13.48	13.76	2.03	2.29	8.46	8.59	2.53	2.85	45.36	29	45.65	30	
10.69	11.42	2.57	3.64	8.02	7.78	2.08	2.68	44.27	30	50.76	28	
12.95	13.08	4.01	4.08	9.10	8.81	3.14	3.07	64.60	12	67.12	15	
11.12	12.77	2.77	2.48	8.54	8.60	2.82	2.62	41.74	31	53.81	24	Questions asked; Quality of Questions
14.20	13.57	4.37	4.42	7.33	9.25	2.85	3.13	72.69	4	79.38	1	Criminal Case Withdrawn; Perceived Least Corrupt
12.21	15.27	2.80	3.32	8.89	9.07	2.82	3.17	48.68	25	59.57	21	Questions asked; Quality of Questions; Overall Perception
11.84	13.16	3.06	3.30	8.52	7.72	2.62	2.76	75.61	2	77.75	4	
12.03	11.92	3.28	4.36	8.49	8.33	2.66	2.82	64.91	11	65.30	17	Questions asked; Quality of Questions
12.53	13.82	3.14	3.42	8.42	8.74	2.75	2.86	52.39	24	51.66	27	
11.62	14.38	3.18	3.51	7.54	8.89	2.74	2.83	65.97	9	73.70	8	
14.34	12.13	2.04	3.09	9.26	9.18	2.63	2.94	54.59	23	52.05	26	
13.19	12.75	3.51	4.15	8.31	8.39	2.65	3.07	66.90	7	73.02	9	

Number of FIR/Chargesheet as per (2014) affidavit and RTI in subsequent years

MLAs Name	Party		From Affidavit (2014)	New FIR/ Charge sheet From RTI (Oct 2014 - Dec 2018)	Total cases as on December 2018
Abu Asim Azmi	SP	FIR	5		5
		Charge sheet	2	2	4
		Withdrawn			0
Ajay Vinayak Choudhari	SS	FIR	1		0
		Charge sheet	1		0
		Withdrawn		1	1
Ashish Babaji Shelar	BJP	FIR	1		1
		Charge sheet		1	1
		Withdrawn			0
Ashok Dharmaraj Patil	SS	FIR	3	1	3
		Charge sheet		1	1
		Withdrawn		1	1
Mangesh Anant Kudalkar	SS	FIR	2		0
		Charge sheet	1		0
		Withdrawn		2	2
Parag Madhusudan Alavani	BJP	FIR	1		0
		Charge sheet	1		0
		Withdrawn		1	1
Prakash Rajaram Surve	SS	FIR	3		1
		Charge sheet	3		1
		Withdrawn		2	2
Raj Khangaraji Purohit	BJP	FIR	1		0
		Charge sheet	1		0
		Withdrawn		1	1
Ramchandra Shivaji Kadam	BJP	FIR	10		7
		Charge sheet	5		5
		Withdrawn		3	3
Ramesh Kondiram Latke	SS	FIR	1		1
		Charge sheet			0
		Withdrawn			0
Sadanand Shankar Sarvankar	SS	FIR	10	1	5
		Charge sheet		2	2
		Withdrawn		6	6
Sanjay Govind Potnis	SS	FIR	1		0
		Charge sheet	1		0
		Withdrawn		1	1
Sardar Tara Singh	BJP	FIR	5		0
		Charge sheet	3		0
		Withdrawn		5	5
Selvan R Tamil	BJP	FIR		2	1
		Charge sheet		1	0
		Withdrawn		1	1
Sunil Rajaram Raut	SS	FIR	4		2
		Charge sheet	1		0
		Withdrawn		2	2
Tukaram Ramkrishna Kate	SS	FIR	3		3
		Charge sheet	3		3
		Withdrawn			0

1. The Matrix – Scale of Ranking

The Matrix for measuring the functioning of the MLAs has been designed by Praja with inputs from reputed people with sectoral knowledge in governance, political science, market research, media.

In order to design the research and get the desired output, it was important to answer the following two questions:

a. On what parameters should the performance of MLAs be evaluated?

b. How should the research be designed in order to represent areas of each MLA and meet the right people?

For the first question; The Indian Democracy functions on rules and strictures laid down in The Constitution of India adopted on 26th November, 1949. The Constitution has been amended on numerous occasions and various acts have been passed and adopted by subsequent assemblies to strengthen the functioning of centre, state and local self government institutions. All these acts/legislations with their base in the Constitution give our elected representatives needed powers for functioning; have built the needed checks and balances; and serve as the source of the terms of reference for the elected representatives on all aspects of their conduct as the people's representatives. Hence the first parameter for evaluating the performance of MLAs is based solely in the mechanisms and instruments and duties and responsibilities as led in The Constitution of India.

However; The Constitution itself derives its power from the free will of its citizens as also the document itself states that it has been adopted, enacted and given to themselves by the people. Hence the perceptions of the people who are represented by the elected representatives are the other important, necessary parameter for evaluating the performance of the elected representatives (the MLAs). Thus, to answer the second question it is necessary to study people's perceptions of the MLAs performance, in their respective constituencies.

The next few pages will elaborate the study design and details of the study conducted to judge the performance of MLAs in Mumbai; but before we get into details, it is important to understand the sources of data and its broad usage in the ranking matrix.

The following information was required to judge the performance of each MLA in the city:

1. Some of the tangible parameters like an elected MLAs' attendance in the assembly, the number of questions (issues) she/he has raised in the house, importance of those questions and utilisation of funds allotted to her/him.

2. Some parameters on her/his background such as educational qualification, income tax records & criminal record (if any).

3. Some soft parameters like the perception/impression of the people in her/his constituency, awareness about them, satisfaction with their work and improvement in the quality of life because of the MLA.

Once the areas of evaluation were finalised, it was important to decide upon the methodology which would best provide the required information. Information mentioned in points 1 & 2 above was gathered from RTI & by means of secondary research. MLA Scores have been derived out of maximum 100 marks with 60% weightage given to tangible facts about the MLA. For the Information on the 3rd point a primary survey was conducted amongst the citizens in each constituency to evaluate the perceived performance of the MLA. 40% weightage was given to perceived performance of MLAs in the minds of common man.

The data used for points 1 and 2 has been collected from government sources:

a. Election Commission of India's Website.
b. Under Right to Information Act from Vidhan Bhavan.
c. Under Right to Information Act from City and Suburban Collector Offices.
d. Under Right to Information Act from Mumbai Police.

> *People's perception as per point 3 has been mapped through an opinion poll of 22,845 people across the city of Mumbai by Hansa Market Research conducted through a structured questionnaire.*

It is very important to understand here that the matrix is objectively designed and provides no importance to the political party of the representative or to any personal/political ideology.

Criminalisation of politics in the country has been growing since independence and is a phenomenon which if not checked now can destroy the democratic foundations of our nation. Hence personal criminal record related parameters pertaining to the elected representative are taken into consideration such as: their FIR cases registered against them as stated in the election affidavit; new FIR cases registered against them after being elected in the current term; and important pending charge sheets.

Sr. No.	Indicator	Max	Comments
	Scale of Ranking		
1	**Present**		
A	Sessions Attended (*)	10	Based on percentage of attendance. 1) 100% to 91%-10; 2) 90% to 76% - 8; 3) 75% to 61% - 6; 4) 60% to 51% - 4; and 5) below 50% - 0.
B	Number of Questions Asked	16	Against Group Percentage Rank. 16 being the top most percentile and so on to the lowest.
C	Importance of Questions Asked (Quality of Questions)	21	Issues are given certain weightages depending on the importance of the issue as per the seventh schedule of the Constitution of India. Further weighted by the score for number of questions asked.
D	Total Local Area Development Funds Utilised during (October 2014 to March 2019)	5	The calculation for this report card is done as per the sanctioned fund of Rs. 2 crores per financial year (as per G.R. dated 15-01-2011), approved from October 2014 to March 2019. (1) 100% or more to 91% - 5; (2) 90% to 76% - 4; (3) 75% to 61% - 3; (4) 60% to 51% - 2; and (5) below 50% - 0.
	Total	**52**	
2	**Past**		
A	Education Qualification	1	A minimum of 10th Pass - 1; if not - 0
B	Income Tax	2	(1) Possessing PAN Card - 1 (2) Disclosing Income in Affidavit - 1
C	Criminal Record	5	If the candidate has zero cases registered against her/him, then 5; else as below: (1) Criminal Cases Registered containing the following charges: Murder, Rape, Molestation, Riot, Extortion - 0 (2) Other criminal cases than the above mentioned - 3
	Total	**8**	
3	**Perception**		**Based on a opinion poll of 22,845 people spread across different constituencies in the city of Mumbai**
A	Perception of Public Services	20	Score on Public Services
B	Awareness & Accessibility	6	Score on Awareness amongst people about their representative, their political party and ease of access to the representative
C	Corruption Index	10	Score on perceived personal corruption of the representative
D	Broad Measures	4	Score on overall satisfaction and improvement in quality of life
	Total	**40**	

Scale of Ranking			
Sr. No.	Indicator	Max	Comments
4	**Negative marking for new criminal cases registered during the year**	-5	For any new FIR registered during the year.
5	**Negative marking for Charge sheet**	-5	For any Charge sheet in a criminal case.
6	**Negative marking for no annual pro-active disclosures by the elected representatives of Assets and Liabilities and Criminal record**	-5	This can be done on own website, newspaper, Praja Website or any other source which should be announced publicly. Also marks would be cut for wrong disclosures in the above mentioned forums. (**)
	Total	**100**	

(*) Sessions taken into account for this report card are Winter 2017, Budget 2018, Monsoon 2018 and Winter 2018.

(**) This negative parameter on proactive disclosures has not been applied. But as one of the primary purpose of the Report Card is to promote transparency amongst elected representatives, it is imperative that they proactively provide personal information on their personal annual economic status and to emphasise their probity in public life, they should share every year their updated criminal record.

2. Parameters for Past Records as per Affidavit

Parameters for Past Records are based on information in election affidavit that includes educational, criminal and financial records of MLAs. Total eight Marks out of Maximum 100 marks are allocated for this parameter.

a. Education

If the elected representative has declared in his affidavit, education qualification as 10th pass or more than that then on the scale one mark is allocated, else zero marks are given.

As a developing 21st century country, basic modern education is an important criterion for human development. Even at lowest clerical jobs in the government, the government insists on a minimum educational level. Going by the same logic and the times, it is prudent that a similar yardstick be applied to our elected representatives. However, we also believe that the educational parameter should be given a minimal weightage in the overall scheme vis-a-vis other parameters, that are more crucial for judging performance of the elected representatives.

b. Income Tax

It is widely published and believed in India that annual income levels and wealth of those who are elected sees a manifold increase in the few years when they represent. On this parameter, marks are allocated only for declaring returns (one mark) and for possessing a PAN card (one mark), as per the affidavit.

c. Criminal Record

Criminalisation of politics is a sad reality. A significant number of elected representatives have a criminal record i.e. 1) they have FIRs registered against them; 2) charge sheets filled; and 3) even convictions given by the courts of law.

There is no excuse for not having moral probity in public life. It is the right of the citizens to have people representing them with no criminal records. Hence the scheme of ranking has taken into account marks for people with clean records:

i. Those with absolutely no criminal FIRs registered are given five marks.

ii. Those with FIRs registered against, with cases containing the following charges: murder, rape, molestation, riot and extortion are given zero marks.

iii. Those with other FIRs registered against, other than those mentioned in No. ii above, are given three marks.

We have negative markings as explained in No. 5 ahead for other parameters related to crime records like charge sheet.

Kindly note that allocating scoring for each individual case would have been complex, instead scoring for cases after them being categorised as above seemed more logical and hence number of individual cases are not that important but the category of case needed for the scoring.

3. Parameters for Present Performance in the State Legislature

In an indirect, representative democracy like India's, citizens elect their representatives so that these representatives can represent them in the houses of legislation and deliberate on issues related to the citizens and form needed legislations under the guidelines of and using the mechanisms of the Constitution. Thus it is very clear that the weightages in the performance scale have to be more biased to these functions of the elected representatives i.e. of **Deliberation**.

a. Session Attendance

The mandate given by citizens to the representatives is to attend the business of the respective legislative houses. It is hence prudent that the representatives attend 100% or near to 100% sessions of their respective houses. Hence the marking as follows based on percentage of attendance: (1) 100% to 91% - 10 marks; (2) 90% to 76% - eight marks; (3) 75% to 61% - six marks; (4) 60% to 51% - four marks; and (5) below 50% - zero marks.

b. Number of Questions Asked

There cannot be really a set benchmark for the right number of questions or issues that have to be asked by a representative. However given the range and complexity of issues that our country is facing, it is necessary for the

representative to raise as many issues as they can, which are necessary for the citizens. Hence to stimulate the representatives to ask maximum number of questions the scale uses the percentile system for scoring.

> **Devices used for asking 'Questions' that have been considered in the marking:**
> - **Starred Question**
> - **Calling attention to matters of urgent public importance**
> - **Half an hour discussion**
> - **Motion of adjournment for purpose of debates**
> - **Non Officials Bills (Private Member Bill)**
> - **Resolutions/Non-Official Resolutions**
> - **Short Notice Questions**

The marking for this section is out of a maximum 16 marks that the representative can get for being the person with the maximum number of questions asked. The marking here is done against Group Percentage Rank: 16 being the top most percentile and so on to the lowest.

c. Importance of Questions Asked (Quality of Questions)

It is not just the number of questions that are asked but also the quality of questions that are asked. The system for weightages here is designed as below:

Step 1:

Issues are given certain weightages depending on the importance of the issue being prime functions of the State Legislature or of the Municipal bodies or the Centre as per the seventh schedule of the constitution of India. As explained ahead in weightages to issues raised in the questions.

Weightage to Issues raised in the questions			
Classification	**Issues**	**Weightages**	**Total**
Social Infrastructure	Civic (civic amenities such as roads, sewage, etc.)	5	33
	Community Welfare	5	
	Crime	8	
	Education	5	
	Health	5	
	Social cultural concerns	5	
Physical Infrastructure	Energy	7	20
	Transport	5	
	Forest/Environment	8	
Economic Infrastructure	Financial Institutions	3	9
	Industries	6	
Governance/Policy Making	Revenue	7	20
	Corruption & Scams	7	
	Schemes / Policies	6	
Agriculture/ Food Infrastructure	Irrigation	7	18
	Agriculture	6	
	Animal Husbandry	5	
Total			**100**

Step 2:

Questions asked are categorised into:

Formula representation of the calculation done to determine importance of the question asked by categorisation in seventh schedule

I - Issue; Q - Question; T - Total; C - Category; M - Marks as per categorisation

$$(I1 * Q1)+(I1 * Q1)+.....(Inth * Qnth) = T1; \qquad (I2 * Q2)+(I2 * Q2)+.....(Inth * Qnth) = T2$$

$$(I3 * Q3)+(I3 * Q3)+.....(Inth * Qnth) = T3;$$

$$T1+T2+T3 = Tx;$$

$$Tx / TQ = M$$

The score in step 2 (M) is further weighted by score for Number of Question Asked (Point C).

Illustration for marking Importance of Questions Asked

If a MLA has asked a total of 5 questions: 1 related to civic, 3 question related to crime and 1 related to financial institutions; then the marking will be as below:

	Weightages	No. of questions asked	Calculation of Quality of questions
Civic	5	1	5*1=5
Crime	8	3	8*3=24
Fin. Ins.	3	1	3*1=3
Total		5	32

32/5 = 6.4 (Hence 'M' is 6.4)
Assuming the score for number of questions asked is 4 out of 16.
∴ (((((6.4/21)×100)+((4/16)×100))/2)×21)/100=**6.4** out of maximum 21. So the MLA gets 6.4 Marks.

d. Total Local Area Development Funds Utilised during October 2014 to March 2019

MLAs get a Local Area Development Fund during their tenure. This fund they can spend as per their discretion on certain specified development work in their constituencies. It is necessary that the funds are utilised in a planned phased manner to achieve optimal results. And this can only happen if the representative has an appropriate plan for funds utilisation spread across the term and that not entirely towards the end of their term without focus on the needs of their constituency.

Hence the calculation for this report card is done as per the sanctioned fund of Rs. 2 crores per financial year (as per G.R. dated 15-01-2011), approved from October 2014 to March 2019. (1) 100% or more to 91% - 5; (2) 90% to 76% - 4; (3) 75% to 61% - 3; (4) 60% to 51% - 2; and (5) below 50% - 0.

SAMPLE SIZE: BY ASSEMBLY CONSTITUENCY

	Sample
152 Borivali (Minister Const)	834
153 Dahisar	612
154 Magathane	807
155 Mulund Amboli	620
156 Vikhroli	584
157 Bhandup West	827
158 Jogeshwari (Minister Const)	490
159 Dindoshi	798
160 Kandivali East	629
161 Charkop	920
162 Malad West	772

No.	Constituency	Value
180	Wadala	719
181	Mahim	389
182	Worli	711
183	Shivadi	603
184	Byculla	663
185	Malabar Hill	412
186	Mumbadevi	585
187	Colaba	615

No.	Constituency	Value
175	Kalina	201
176	Vandre East	991
177	Vandre West	574
178	Dharavi (SC)	731
179	Sion Koliwada	596

No.	Constituency	Value
163	Goregaon (Minister Const)	826
164	Versova	666
165	Andheri West	717
166	Andheri East	818
167	Vile Parle	828
168	Chandivali	559
169	Ghatkopar West	521
170	Ghatkopar East (Minister Const)	526
171	Mankhurd Shivaji Nagar	812
172	Anushakti Nagar	698
173	Chembur	760
174	Kurla (SC)	933

4. Parameters for People's Perception as per Opinion Poll

Since perceived performance was given a weightage of 40 points, we divided it further in to 4 broad areas in order to evaluate the performance in detail. All these four areas were given differential weightage based to the importance in defining the MLAs performance. The weightages were divided in the following scheme:

- Perception of Public Services (impression of the people about the facilities in the area) was given a weightage of **20 points**,
- Awareness & Accessibility of the MLA was given a weightage of **6 points**,
- Corruption index was given a weightage of **10 points** and
- Broad overall measures were given a weightage of **4 points**

The rationale for giving the above scoring points was to give more importance to the key issues like facilities in the area & corruption as compared to the citizens being aware of the MLA and the MLA being accessible or overall feel of the people being positive. This is because we believe that scoring positively overall or being popular is actually a function of your work in different areas. Hence, these areas should be given more importance than the overall satisfaction. Moreover a blanket overall performance for an individual may be good but when interrogated deeply about different traits the positives and negatives can be clearly pointed.

The next step after assigning weightages to four broad areas was to make sure that facilities which come under the state jurisdiction get more importance than the ones which come under the central government's jurisdiction or the local self government's jurisdiction. Hence the weightage for Perception of Public Services was further divided into a hierarchy of 4 levels to meet the desired objective. Level 1 included facilities which are more critical to state government whereas Level 4 included facilities that are more critical to central government or the local self government.

- Level 1 – This level included areas like Power supply, Law & Order situation & Instances of crime. It was given a weightage of **8 points**.
- Level 2 – This level included areas like Pollution problems. It was given a weightage of **5 points**.
- Level 3 – This level included areas like Hospitals & other Medical facilities & Appropriate Schools & Colleges. It was given a weightage of **4 points**.
- Level 4 – This level included rest of the areas like Condition of Roads, Traffic Jams & Congestion, Availability of public gardens, Availability/Adequacy of public transport facilities, Water Supply, Water logging problems, Cleanliness & Sanitation facilities, Availability of footpaths & Pedestrian walking areas, Availability of public toilets and Cleanliness of public toilets . It was given a weightage of **3 points**.

Research Design:

- A Member of Legislative Assembly or MLA, is a representative elected by the voters of an electoral district to the Legislature of a State in the Indian system of Government. An electoral district (also known as a constituency) is a distinct territorial subdivision for holding a separate election for a seat in a legislative body.

- Winner of this seat in the constituency is termed as an MLA and has the power to manage the functioning of the constituency.

- In Mumbai, each constituency has further been divided into administrative wards and a municipal Councillor is elected to oversee the functioning of each ward. Hence, there is a clear delegation of responsibilities at the ground level.

- Since, our study focused on evaluating the performance of MLAs it was necessary to cover and represent all the assembly constituencies to which each of these MLAs belonged.

- Hence, we decided to cover a sample from each constituency. However, it is also known that constituencies differ in size as calculated in terms of area coverage and population. The number of the wards within each assembly constituency also differs.

- The total sample for the study covered for 36 MLA Assembly constituency = 22,845 respondents.

- Next step was to define the target group for the study. We finalised on covering within each ward:
  - ☐ Both Males & Females
  - ☐ 18 years and above (eligible to vote)

- Once the target group was defined, quotas for representing gender and age groups were set.

- The quotas were set on the basis of age and gender split available through Indian Readership Study, a large scale baseline study conducted nationally by Media Research Users Council (MRUC) & Hansa Research group for Mumbai Region.

- The required information was collected through face to face household interviews with the help of structured questionnaire.

- In order to meet the respondent, following sampling process was followed:
  - ☐ 2 – 3 prominent areas in the ward were identified and the sample was divided amongst them.
  - ☐ Respondents were intercepted in households in these areas and the required information was obtained from them.

- Sample composition of age & gender was corrected to match the universe profile using the baseline data from IRS. (Refer to Weighting paragraph on the next pages)

- The final sample spread achieved for each assembly constituency is as follows:

Parameters of Evaluation:

While deciding the parameters of evaluation for a MLA, we wanted to make sure that we covered issues at both the state & central level and hence decided to capture the information on four important aspects. These were as follows:

- Impression of the people about different facilities in his/her area
  - Condition of Roads
  - Traffic jams & Congestion of roads
  - Availability of public gardens/open playgrounds
  - Availability/Adequacy of public transport facilities like Auto, Taxis, Buses & Local Trains
  - Hospitals and other medical facilities
  - Appropriate schools and colleges
  - Power Supply
  - Water Supply
  - Water Logging during rainy season
  - Pollution problems
  - Instances of Crime
  - Law & Order situation
  - Cleanliness & Sanitation facilities
  - Availability of footpaths & Pedestrian walking areas
  - Availability of public toilets
  - Cleanliness of public toilets
- Awareness & Accessibility of the MLA
- Perception of corruption for MLA – among those who are aware of the MLA
- Broad overall measures like overall satisfaction with MLA & improvement in quality of life because of MLA.

Illustration of Scorecard for an MLA:

Below is an illustration of scorecard for a MLA which will help us to understand the scoring pattern:

Parameter Scores

Sr. No.	Parameters	Broad groupings	Scores	Maximum Score
1	Recall for party name to which the MLA belongs	Awareness & Accessibility	77	100
2	Recall for Name of the MLA	Awareness & Accessibility	77	100
3	Accessibility of the MLA	Awareness & Accessibility	69	100
4	Satisfaction with the MLA	Broad overall measures	59	100
5	Improvement in Lifestyle	Broad overall measures	69	100
6	Corruption	Corruption Index	72	100
7	Power Supply	Impression of people - Level 1	67	100
8	Instances of Crime	Impression of people - Level 1	57	100
9	Law & Order situation	Impression of people - Level 1	61	100
10	Pollution problems	Impression of people - Level 2	56	100
11	Hospitals and other medical facilities	Impression of people - Level 3	67	100
12	Appropriate schools and colleges	Impression of people - Level 3	68	100
13	Condition of Roads	Impression of people - Level 4	58	100
14	Traffic jams & Congestion of roads	Impression of people - Level 4	57	100
15	Availability of public gardens/ open playgrounds	Impression of people - Level 4	62	100
16	Availability/Adequacy of public transport facilities like Auto, Taxis, Buses & Local Trains	Impression of people - Level 4	59	100
17	Water Supply	Impression of people - Level 4	62	100
18	Water Logging during rainy season	Impression of people - Level 4	56	100
19	Cleanliness & Sanitation facilities	Impression of people - Level 4	59	100
20	Availability of footpaths & Pedestrian walking areas	Impression of people - Level 4	61	100
21	Availability of public toilets	Impression of people - Level 4	59	100
22	Cleanliness of public toilets	Impression of people - Level 4	59	100

Scores of Netted Variables

Sr. No.	Netted Variables	Weightage Assigned	Scores	Maximum Score
1	Awareness & Accessibility	6	74	100
2	Broad overall measures	4	64	100
3	Corruption Index	10	72	100
4	Impression of people - Level 1	8	61	100
5	Impression of people - Level 2	5	58	100
6	Impression of people - Level 3	4	68	100
7	Impression of people - Level 4	3	59	100

Weighted Final Scores

Perceived performance score of the MLA =

((6*74)+(4*64)+(10*72)+(8*61)+(5*58)+(4*68)+(3*59))/100 = **26.5 out of 40**

This score was further added with the performance on hard parameters and a composite score for each MLA was derived.

Weighting the data:

When conducting a survey, it is common to compare the figures obtained in a sample with universe or population values. These values may come from the same survey from a different time period or from other sources.

In this case, we compared the age & gender compositions achieved in our survey with the similar compositions in IRS study (Indian Readership Survey). In the process, minor deviations for demographics were corrected.

Hence, weighting not only helped us to remove the demographic skews from our sample data but also ensured that the representation of demography was correct.

5. Parameters for Negative Marking

Negative marking for new FIR cases registered

If there has been a new FIR registered against the elected representative after his election then this happens to be a matter of concern; and hence out of the marks earned by the representative, five marks would be deducted.

Do note that in the process of allocating marks does not take into account number of new criminal FIR cases, but simply takes into account even a single occurrence for allocating marks based on the severity of the crime.

Negative marking for Charge Sheet registered

A charge sheet signifies prima facie evidence in the case. This is again a serious concern for moral probity of the representative. Hence out of the marks earned by the representative, five marks would be deducted.

Do note that in the process of allocating marks does not take into account number of criminal charge sheets, but simply takes into account even a single occurrence for allocating marks based on the severity of the crime.

Negative marking for no annual pro-active disclosures by the elected representatives of Assets and Liabilities and Criminal record

As per the election commission norms the candidate standing for elections have to file an affidavit detailing amongst other things, their own asset and liabilities and criminal records. The candidate who gets elected later, does not share this information with his constituency or the election commission until and unless he/she stands for re-election or for a new election on different seat or post. However given the need of the time, we feel that it is necessary that the elected representatives proactively make their assets and liabilities (income status) and criminal records available to their constituencies at the end of every financial year when they are representing. This can be done through Newspapers or other Public Medias or through their own Websites or through Praja Website. This will bring larger transparency.

The four lions of the Ashoka Pillar, symbolizing power, courage, pride and confidence are the ethos behind the Indian Republic as embedded in our Constitution. We salute the top 3 ranking MLAs of Mumbai as torch bearers of this idea. They have topped the list by on an objective ranking system as explained earlier in this report card, performing more efficiently relative to their peers. Jai Hind.

#2: SILVER

#1: GOLD

#3: BRONZE

Trophy 1 – The Best Elected Representative as per Praja Matrix of Ranking Performance of MLAs.

Trophy 2 – The Second Best Elected Representative as per Praja Matrix of Ranking Performance of MLAs.

Trophy 3 – The Third Best Elected Representative as per Praja Matrix of Ranking Performance of MLAs.

THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA

WE, THE PEOPLE OF INDIA,
HAVING SOLEMNLY RESOLVED TO
CONSTITUTE INDIA INTO A
SOVEREIGN SOCIALIST SECULAR
DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC AND
TO SECURE TO ALL ITS CITIZENS:
JUSTICE, SOCIAL, ECONOMIC AND
POLITICAL;

LIBERTY OF THOUGHT, EXPRESSION,
BELIEF, FAITH AND WORSHIP;

EQUALITY OF STATUS AND OF
OPPORTUNITY; AND TO PROMOTE
AMONG THEM ALL

FRATERNITY ASSURING THE DIGNITY
OF THE INDIVIDUAL AND THE UNITY
AND INTEGRITY OF THE NATION.

PRAJA.ORG
MAKING DEMOCRACY WORK