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## THEY REACHED THE REMOTEST VILLAGES OF INDIA

## ANDHRA PRADESH

DIET, Karimnagar
DIET, Srikakulam
DIET, Vizianagaram
DIET, Visakhatnam
DIET, East Godavari
DIET, West Godavari
DIET, Krishna
DIET, Prakasam
DIET, Nellore
DIET, Kadapa
DIET, Chittoor
DIET, Anantapur
DIET and Google volunteers, Kurnool
DIET and Google volunteers, Rangareddy
DIET, Medak
DIET, Nizamabad DIET, Adilabad
DIET, Khammam DIET, Nalgonda
DIET, Guntur
DIET, Warangal
Naandi, Mahbubnagar

## ARUNACHAL PRADESH

NSS, Changlang
Idu Culture and Literator society/Ebo Fourmus club, Dibang Valley
Centre for Rural Community Children, East Kameng
Tayeng Women's Group, East Siang NSS Tezu College, Lohit
NSS Hailung, Lohit
Action Aid Society, Lower Subansiri Action Aid
Society, Papum Pare NSS, Tawang
Tirap Youth Club, Tirap
Action Aid Society, Upper Subansiri Tayeng
Women's Group, Upper Siang Rupa Town Club, West Kameng
West Siang Youth Foundation, West Siang

## ASSAM

Socio-Economic Development Organization (SEDO), Dhemaji
Pragati Foundation, Jorhat
Pragati Foundation, Tinsukia
Pragati Foundation, Sonitpur
Pragati Foundation, Goalpara
Uttaran, Sivasagar
Bongaigaon Gana Sewa Society, Bongaigaon
Pragati Foundation, Lakhimpur
Pragati Foundation, Barpeta
Pragati Foundation, Dhubri
Pragati Foundation, Nalbari
Nabarun Sangha Community Centre, Karimganj Wodichee, Hailakandi
Assam Mahila Samata Society (AMSS), Marigaon
Socio Educational Welfare Association (SEWA), Dibrugarh
All India Student's Federation (AISF), Golaghat Society for Progressive Implementation \& Development, Cachar
Assam Mahila Samata Society(AMSS), Nagaon Pragati Foundation, Kokrajhar

Jirsong Asong, Karbi Anglong
Social Unity Keepers Association For All (SUKAFA), Darrang
Social Unity Keepers Association For All
(SUKAFA), Kamrup

## BIHAR

Bhardwaj Seva Kendra, Araria
Kartavya Welfare Organization, Katihar
Crescent Education \& Welfare Trust, Kishanganj
National Rural Development Trust, Purnia
Koshi Kshetriya Viklang Vidhwa Vridh Kalyan
Samiti, Saharsa
St. Paul Foundation, Khagaria
Jan Mahila Utthan Sansthan, Begusarai
Rachna, Bhagalpur
Disha Vihar, Munger
Aakriti Serva Seva, Jamui
AID India, Madhepura
Koshi Ksetriye Viklang Vidhwa Birddh Kalyan Samiti, Supaul
Akriti Samajik Sansthan, Vaishali
Jawahar Jyoti Bal Vikash Kendra, Samastipur Vikash sarthi, Siwan
Sadbhawna Vikash Mandal, Saran
Shanti Seva Ashram, Muzaffarpur
Prajapati Missr Sikhchhan evam Vikash
Sansthan, West Champaran
Prerna Development Foundation, East Champaran
Sanjeevani Darpan, Darbhanga
Bihar Sewa Samiti, Madhubani
Nav Jeevan Manav Uthan Kendra, Gopalganj
Islami Ummat, Sitamarhi
Khadi Gram Udyog Sansthan, Sheohar
Nav Manas Kalyan Samiti, Patna
An Unit Of Research, Gaya
AID India, Jehanabad
Samagra Manav Sewa Samiti, Bhojpur
Gramin Sansadhan Vikash Parishad, Buxar
Akhil Bhartiya Shikshit Berojgar Yuva Kalyan Sansthan, Rohtas
Shanti Shilp Kala Kendra, Bhabua
Jeevan Jyoti Kendra, Aurangabad
Chhatrachhaya, Lukhisarai
Ragho Seva Sansthan, Shiekhpura
Akriti Sarva Seva, Banka
Gramin Manav Seva Mandir, Nalanda
R-Teach Communication, Nawada

## CHHATTISGARH

Adhar Seva Sansthan, Bastar
Naya Nari Kalyan evam Jan Seva Samiti, Bilaspur Pehla Kadam Seva Sansthan, Dhamtari Sanjivani Seva Sansthan, Durg
Kulipota Gram Seva Samiti, Janjgir Champa
Ashray Seva Samiti, Jashpur
Grameen Vikas Seva Sansthan, Kanker Naandi Foundation, Kanker
Shri Bhoramdev Janjagran Shiksha \& Lok Kala
Samiti, Kawardha
Srout, Korba
Sanskar Vikas, Koriya
Pragati Manthan Shikshan Sansthan,

Mahasamund
Pragati Manthan Sikshan Sansthan, Raigarh DIET, Raipur
Lalit Kala Manch, Rajnandgaon
Chhattisgarh Janjati Vikas Parishad, Surguja

DADRA AND NAGAR HAVELI

Senior Khanvel College, Dadara and Nagar Haveli Dadara Nagar Haveli Education Department, Dadara and Nagar Haveli

## DAMAN AND DIU

Dalit Sangathan, Diu
Lakshmi Mahila Mandal, Daman

## GOA

Smt. Parvatibai Chowgule College of Arts \& Science, South Goa
Khemraj Memorial School, South Goa D M C
College, North Goa
Shikshanagrahi (Maharashtra), North Goa

## GUJARAT

Matrubhumi Khadi Gramudhyog Seva Trust, Ahmedabad
Shikshan \& Samaj Kalyan Kendra, Amreli Shree
N.S.Patel Institute of Social Work, Anand Shree
J.M.Patel Institute of Social work, Anand

Adivasi Sarvangi Vikas Sangh, Banas Kantha
Development Support Unit, Bharuch
Mahila Samakhya, Bhavnagar
Prakriti Foundation, Dahod
Shri P.H.G Municipal Arts \& Science College, Kalok, Gandhinagar
Ashapura Charitable Trust, Jamnagar Sahyog
Development Foundation, Junagadh Healing Touch ,
Kheda
Marag, Kutchh
College Students, Mahesana
Samarpan Foundation, Narmada
Gram Seva Trust, Navsari
Anandi, Panch Mahal
Navjagriti Yuvak Mandal, Patan
Janda Gram Vikas Trust, Porbandar
Sargam Yuva Mandal, Rajkot
Navjivan Charitable Trust, SabarKantha Manav Ekta Charitable Trust,Surat
Bajrang Gram Vikas Trust, Surendranagar Mahila
Samakhya, Thedangs
Samarpan Foundation, Baroda
Anarde Foundation, Valsad
Manav Ekta Charitable Trust, Tapi

## HARYANA

Dayanand Vedic College, Hissar
Bhagwan Parshuram College, Kurukshetra
Govt. College, Karnal
Chaudhary Devi Lal College, Sonipat Arya College, Panipat
Govt. PG College, Jind

Manohar Memorial (MM) College, Fatehabad
Chandan Mal Karnani College, Sirsa
Mukand Lal National (MLN) College, Yamunanagar Radha Krishnan Sanathan Dharm College,Kaithal Jat College, Rohtak
Govt. PG College, Jhajjar
Janta College, Bhiwani
RDS College, Rewari
Govt. College, Mahendragarh
Pratham, Google, PWC Volunteers, Gurgaon Yasin Mave College, Mewat
Sanathan Dharam College, Amba Govt. College, Panchkula Aggarwal College, Faridabad

## HIMACHAL PRADESH

DIET, Bilaspur
Govt. PG College, Chamba
General Jorawar Singh College, Nadoun,Hamirpur
Govt. PG College, Dharamshala, Kangra
Govt. Degree College, Recongpeo, Kinnaur
Govt. PG College, Kullu
Pratham, Lahul \& Spiti
Amass Institute, Mandi
Govt. PG College Seema, Shimla
Govt. PG College Nahan, Sirmaur
Vaidh Shankar Lal Memorial College of Education, Chandi, Solan
Govt. PG College, Una

## JAMMU AND KASHMIR

Maulana Azad Memorial ( MM ) College, Jammu
Maulana Azad Memorial ( MM ) College, Kathua Maulana Azad Memorial ( MM ) College, Udhampur Maulana Azad Memorial (MM )
College, Poonch Maulana Azad Memorial (MM )
College, Rajauri Maulana Azad Memorial ( MM )
College, Doda Kashmir University, Srinagar Kashmir University, Budgam Kashmir University, Anantnag Kashmir University, Kupwara Kashmir University, Baramulla Kashmir University, Pulwama Pratham team, Kargil
Pratham team, Leh

## JHARKHAND

Sahyogini, Bokaro
Society for Reformation and Advancement of
Adivasis, West Singhbhum
Lok Prerna Kendra, Chatra
NEEDS, Deoghar
Jharkhand Gramin Vikas Trust, Dhanbad Nehru Yuva Kendra, Dumka
Rural Outright Development Society, Purbi Singhbum
Samajik Parivartan Sansthan, Giridih Santhal Pargana Gram Rachana Sansthan, Godda Vikas Bharti, Gumla
Nav Bharat Jagriti Kendra, Hazaribagh Lok Chirag Sewa Sansthan, Jamtara
Veer Jharkhand Vikas Sewa Manch, Kodarma Gramin Samaj Kalyan Vikas Manch, Latehar Lohardagga Gram Swarajya Sansthan, Lohardaga Nav Bharat Jagriti Kendra, Pakaur

Bihar Pradesh Yuva Parishad, Palamu Maharishi Menhi Kalyan Kendra, Ranchi Abhiyan, Sahibganj
Gram Jyoti Kendra, Simdega
Lok Hit Sansthan, Sarikela
Jan Chetana Kendra, Garwha

## KARNATAKA

Sadhana; Department of Social Work, Jagadguru Sri Shivarathreshwara College (JSS); Adivasi Mattu Graminabivruddi Samsthe (Tribal and Rural Development Institution), Chamarajanagar Samvardhana Samsthe; Sri Bhuvaneshwari Central Foundation; Students of Bachloer of Business Management (BBM), Government College, Maleyuru,
Mandya
PRATHAM Samsthe; Department of Social Work and Department of Studies in
Education, University of Mysore; Department of Social Work, Jagadguru
Sri Shivarathreshwara College (JSS) College;
Department of Social Work, Mahajana College;
Department of Social Work, Vidya Vikas College,

## Mysore

Asare Samsthe; Spandana Samsthe; Harshitha Alur Yojane; Srikantha Vidya Samsthe; Bhoomi
Samsthe; Prachodana Samsthe, Hassan;
EMBARK Youth Association; Botlappa Yuva
Sangha; Govt. First Grade College Students, Virajpet
Sri Basaweshwara Yuvaka Sangha,
Suntimangalore, Kodagu
Siddeshwar Rural Development
Society,Chitradurga
Samanvya Samsthe, Department of Social Work and Department of Education, Kuvempu University, Shimoga
PADI - VALORED (Value Oriented Education), Mangalore; Department of Social Work, Mangolore University; Students of Shreenivas Institute of Management Studies; Department of Social Work, Karavali Group of Colleges; Jilla Mahila Vedike; Jilla Shikshana Sampanmula Kendragala Okkuta, Mangalore, Dakshina Kannada
Centre for Rural Studies, Manipal University; District Institute for Education and Training (DIET), Udupi; Students of Mulki Sundar Ram Shetty College, Shirva; Students of Govt. Women's First Grade College, Ajjarkad, Udupi; Students of Sri Sharada College, Basrur, Kundapur
Dept. of Public Health (Master of Social Work), Manipal University; Community Radio Department, Manipal Institute of Communication, Manipal University, Udupi Prabhodini Trust, Hariharapura, Koppa, Chikkamagalur
Malenadu Education and Rural Development Society, Sirsi; Mukta Trust Honnavar ; Think Centre, Sirsi; Vidya Poshak; Navya Navodaya Sangha Kanchikai, Siddapur
Arpana Samsthe, Binaga, Karawar, Uttar Kannada SLEEGS, Gadag

Navachetana Rural Development Society, Gadag; Students of Dr. B. R. Hiremath BSW College, Bagalkot
Basaweshwar D.Ed. College, Bagalkot
Kalidas BSW college, Badami, Bagalkot
Bsaveshwara Vidya Vardhaka Sangha (BVVS)
Rural Development Foundation, Bagalkot;
Akshara Foundation, Raichur; Janahita, Raichur;
Prerana, Raichur; Kisan Bharati Trust, Sindhanur; Shri Kotturu Basaveshwar Yuvaka Mandali, Kudloor; Vivekanad Rural Education Trust, Raichur; Shri Gururaj Samskritika Kala Sanga, Lingasur; Samskruti, Raichur; Asare, Devadurga, Raichur
Development Association Reconstruction for Institute (DARI); Shade Society, Bidar; Nirantara Foundation, Bidar; Post Graduation Centre, Gulburga University, Halahalli; Vidya Vikas Trust (Department of Social Work), Bidar; Green Field NGO Bidar; Shaheen Education Society, Bidar; Adishakthi Education Society, Bidar Nirantara Social Welfare Society; Grama Seva Samaja, Thruvekere; Organisation for Resource Development and Environment Rejuvenation (ORDER), Tipaturu; Centre for Urban and Rural Development Society (CURDS), Kunigal \& Chikaanayakanahalli; Village Education and Development Society (VEDS), Sira \&Koratagere; Department of Social Work, Tumkuru University; Students of Hemadhri Institute of Management Studies, Tumkuru; Madugiri Department of Social Welfare (Dept, BSW), Tumukur ; Yashaswini Vividhodhesha Samaja Seva Samsthe; Team for Reformation Education And Environment Service (TREES), Bangarapet; Parivarathana Maluru; Rakshana Gramina Abivruddhi Samsthe, Mulubagilu; Sri Shridi Saibaba Samsthe, Kolar; Ysahaswini Mhila Mandali, Kolar; Leehardes Samsthe,
Kolar; Jagruthi Foundation, Chikkaballapura; Govt. Post Graduation College, Kolar Navodaya Educational and Environment Development Service (NEEDS); Vidya Poshak; Chaitanya Rural Development Society; Gandhi Rural Development Society; Spoorthi Rural Development Society; Arunodaya Education and Health Development Society, Haveri Belgaum Integrated Development Society (BIRDS); Vidya Posha, Belgaum
Center for Rural Development (CORDS), Ballary; Human Resource Development Society, Vahini Rural Development Society, The Rural Economic Agriculture Development Society (READS), Nisarga Mahila

## Mandala, Bellary

Department of Social Study ,Gulbarga University, Gulbarga; Shri Sai Pasad College of MSW (Sujay Education \& Welfare Society); Paryaya College of BSW (IARRD-Institute for Alternative Research and Rural Development); Sire Yadagir; Future World Association (FWA), Shahapur; Akshara Foundation, Gulbarga
Spoorthi Sasmsthe; Swaradha; Meera Mahila Foundation; Neasara Samsthe; Marks-K Samsthe, Davangere

Sarvodaya Integrated Rural Development Society; Institute of Social Studies and Research (ISSAR), Koppal
Akshara Foundation, Bangalore Deutsche Bank, Bangalore (South)
Mahila Grammena Vidya Abhivardhi Samsthe, Devanahalli; The Rural Economic Agriculture Development Society (READS); Pragathi Austin(Kanakapura); Akshara Foundation; Jagruthi Samaja Seva Samsthe,Hosakote; Spsward Samsthe, Chikkaballapura, Bangalore(Rural) Akshara Foundation, Dharwad, Vidya Poshak, Dharwad
Akshara Foundation; People Organisation for Waste Land and Environment Regeneration (POWER); Vidya Poshak; Jai Gurudev BSW College, Bijapur

## KERALA

Kudumbashree, All districts

## MADHYA PRADESH

Pragati Krushi Seva Samiti, Sagar
Masum Samiti, Panna
Bal Adhikar Suraksha Samiti, Tikamgarh Chhatarpur Mahila Jagruti Manch, Chhatarpur Nohaleshwar Grameen Vikas Trikuti Sansthan, Damoh
Nehru Yuva Kendra, Bhind
Sab Jan Vikas Foundation, Bhopal
Nehru Yuva Kendra, Datia
Government Chandra Vijay Mahavidyalaya, Dindori
Padam Ganesh Sewa Kalyan Samiti, Guna Takshshila Samaj Sevi Sansthan, Gwalior Jan Kalyan Shiksha Samiti, Mandla Takshshila Samaj Sevi Sansthan, Morena Bandhan Sansthan, Narsinghpur
Nehru Yuva Kendra, Raisen
Sab Jan Vikas Foundation, Rajgarh Kesari Sansthan, Sehore
Padam Ganesh Sewa Kalyan Samiti, Sheopur Raval Mahila Samiti, Vidisha
Padam Ganesh Sewa Kalyan Samiti, Shivpuri Jagruti Nehru Yuva Mandal, Balaghat
Nav Jyoti Shiksha Samiti, Chhindwara
Late Shri Ramnarayan Samaj Uthan Samiti, Jabalpur
Anupama Education Society, Katni Sadhana Shiksha,Arogya evam Krushi Kanlyan Samiti, Rewa
Sadhana Shiksha,Arogya evam Krushi Kanlyan Samiti, Satna
Mahila Vikas Parishad, Seoni
Vishwas Samaj Sevi Sangathan, Shahdol Swaraj Gramothan Jan Kalyan Yuva Vikas Samiti, Sidhi Dipika Sangeet Samiti, Umaria
Pratham Shiksha Welfare Society, Barwani Usha Nari Samajik Kalyan Sansthan, Dewas Pratham, Dhar
Shri Janmangal Sansthan, East Nimar/ Khandwa Jai Bharat Bharti Seva Samiti, Harda Kesri Yuva Vikas Samiti, Hoshangabad Pratham Shiksha

Welfare Society, Indore Janshikshan Sansthan , Jhabua
Agrim Technical Education Social Welfare Society, Mandsaur
Dev Sanskrutik Zhan Prachar Samiti, Neemuch
Sab Jan Vikas Foundation, Ratlam
Lok Kalyan Jansabha, Shajapur
Chatrasal Samajik Jankalyan Samiti, Ujjain Gaddi
Yuva Mandal, West Nimar/Khargaon Volunteer
Organisation Information Center for
Empowerment, Betul

## MAHARASHTRA

Balvikas Bahu-uddeshiya Shikshan Sanstha, Shrirampur, Ahmednagar
Dyanganga Samajik Shaikshanik Sanstha, Osmanabad, Ahmednagar
Santh Gadge Baba Kanishtha Vidyalaya, Akola
Nursing Mahavidyalaya, Akot, Akola
Ankur Bahu-uddeshiya Sanstha Jawala, Amravati
Pratham Bahu-uddeshiya Shikshan Sanstha, Amravati
Janjagruti Grameen Vikas Sanstha Bhandaraj, Amravati
Sanket Multipurpose Society, Aurangabad
Sangharsha Yuva Krida Mandal, Aurangabad
Rajmata Jijau Bachatgat, Aurangabad
Jay Gavlibaba Mitra Mandal, Aurangabad
Janshikshan Sevabhavi Sanstha, Beed
Jansagar Bahu- udeshiya Sevabhavi Sanstha, Beed
Mauli Bahu-udeshiya Sevabhavi Sanstha,Beed
Tuljabhawani Sevabhavi Sanstha, Beed Jay
Shreeram Sewabhavi Sanstha, Beed Anurag
Adhyapak Vidyalaya, Bhandara
Nirmik Samajik Sanshodhan \& Vikas Kendra, Buldhana
Samajik Arthrik Vikas Sanstha Kerwadi Branch, Buldhana
Sankalp Bahu-uddeshiya Prakalp, Chandrapur Sanket Multipurpose Society, Dhule
Dr.Babasaheb Ambedkar M.S.W College, Dhule
Prayas Bahu-udeshiya Sanstha, Gadchiroli
Prahar Samajik Sanstha, Gondia
Sankalp Pre School Teacher Center, Gondia
Economical Stable and Commercial Education
Project(ESCEP), Rojgar Seva Sahakari Sanstha, Gondia
Satha Samajik Sanstha, Hingoli
Toshniwal College, Hingoli
Shivaji College, Hingoli
Narayanrao Vaghmare Mahavidyalaya, Hingoli
Dhyanjyoti Bahu-udeshiya Sanstha, Jalna
Shankarao Chavan Samajkarya
Mahavidyalaya, Jalna
Chhatrapati Bahu-uddeshiya Grameen Seva Bhavi Sanstha, Jalna
Sanket Multipurpose Society, Jalgaon
Chintamani Trust, Kolhapur
Pace Prashikshan Center, Kolhapur
Pragati Shikshan Mandal, Kolhapur Chhatrapati
Shivaji Shikshan Shastra Mahavidyalaya,
Kolhapur

Jijamata Sevabhavi Sanstha, Latur
Navjeevan Grameen Bahu-uddeshiya Sanstha, Latur
Tejas Mahila Mandal, Nagpur
Pratham Sakham Center, Nagpur
Mother Teresa Samajkarya Mahavidyalya, Nagpur
Annapurna Sanstha, Nagpur
Vanchit Vikas Lok Sanstha, Nanded
Manav Vikas Sanstha, Nanded
Nisarg Sevabhavi Sanstha, Nanded
Yaha Pandhar Adivasi Vikas Sanstha, Nandurbar
Samata Bahu-udeshiya Sanstha, Nandurbar
Pratham DRC- Centre, Nashik
Dyanganga Samajik Shaikshanik Sanstha,
Osmanabad
Manvi Hakka Abhiyan, Osmanabad
Krantijoyti Samajik Sanstha, Osmanabad
Shamnath Sevabhavi Sanstha Patha,
Osmanabad
Samata Shikshan Prasarak Adhyapak
Mahavidyalaya, Osmanabad
Shankarrao Patil Junior Mahavidyalaya,
Osmanabad
Beleshwar Sevabhavi Sanstha, Parbhani Dyan
Sarswati Grameen Sevabhavi Sanstha ,
ParbhaniNirmik Samajik Sanshdhon Vikas
Kendra, Parbhani
Swapan Bhoomi , Parbani
Pratham Pune Shikshan Mandal, Pune Kranti Joyti
Mahila Mandal, Pune Suvidha Swayam Rojgar
Seva Sahakari Sanstha, Pune
Suprabhat Mahila Mandal, Pune
Arts \& Science College, Raigad Pragat Konkan
Sanstha, Raigad
Senior College Path Panhale, Ratnagiri
P.K.Darekar College, Ratnagiri

Datar Bahere Joshi College, Ratnagiri R.P. Gogte
Jogalekar College, Ratnagiri Pragat Konkan
Sanstha, Ratnagiri Pratham Agri Learning Centre, Sangli
Chandramani Ranjane Rajmata Mahila Vikas
Sanstha, Sangli
Duva Samajik Sanstha, Sangli
Parivartan Samajik Sanstha, Jat, Sangli Anarth Swayamsevi Sanstha, Sangli Sadhar Centre,
Sangli
Voluntary Organisation for Integrated Community
Empowerment, Satara
Kranti Joyti Mahila Udyogik Sahakari Sanstha, Satara
Shivparvati Mahila Bachat Gat, Satara Arts \&
Commerce Junior College, Satara
Sahakar Maharishi Shankarrao Mohite Patil
Mahavidyalaya, Satara
Sudhir Sawant \& Sandip Sawant, Sindhudurga
Rajendra Nimbalkar, Sindhudurg
Banda Junior College, Sindhudurg Pratham, Sindhudurg
Vidya Vikas Bahu- uddeshiya Shikshan
Sanstha, Solapur
Dr. Ambedkar Shetti Vikas Savshodan Sanstha, Solapur
Navyug Bahu- uddeshiya Samajsivi Sanstha,
Solapur

Satyashodhak Shaikshanik Samajik
Bahu-uddeshiya Sanstha, Solapur
Bhagodya Bahu- uddeshiya Sanstha, Solapur Dayanand Mahavidyalaya, Solapur
D.Ed College, Thane

Vartak College, Thane
Yuva College, Thane
Deutsche Bank Mumbai, Thane
Sankalp Bahu-uddeshiya Prakalp Ralegaon, Wardha
Udor Multipurpose Society, Wardha Nishant
Sarwjanik Wachanalya, Wardha Yash Sanstha, Hinganghat, Wardha
Chaatraveer Sambhaji Raje Bahu-uddeshiya
Shikshan Krida Prasarak Mandal, Washim
Bhavanatai Gavali Janshikshan Prashikshan Sanstha, Washim
Sankalp Bahu-uddeshiya Prakalp, Yavatmal

## MANIPUR

Community Development Society (CDS)
Irengbam, Bishnupur
Kapaam Development Club (KDC) and Mrs.
Dungkham Moyon, Kapaam, Chandel
Mr.T Vunglallian, Churachandpur
Community Development Soceity (CDS).
Shikhong Sekmai, Imphal-East
Dedicated Peoples' of Kangleipak (DPK) Terat, Imphal-West
Expedited Rural Agency (ERA), Senapati Bazar, Senapati
Mr. Khugai Kamei, Tamenglong
Youth Sporting Club, Khundongbam Leikai, Thoubal
Institute of Tribal Development, Phungreitang, Ukhrul

## MEGHALAYA

NEHU Tura, South Garo Hills
Martin Luther University,Shillong, East Khasi Hills Individuals, West Khasi Hills
Martin Luther University,Shillong, Jaintia Hills Martin Luther University,Shillong, Ri Bhoi NEHU
Tura, West Garo Hills
NEHU Tura, East Garo Hills

## MIZORAM

Kristian Thalai Pawl, Mamit Adventure Club, Kolasib
Youth Adventure Club, Khatla South, Aizawl Karawt YMA (Friends Club), Champhai Kristian Thalai Pawl, Serchhip
Kristian Thalai Pawl, Lunglei Thalai Kristian Pawl, Lawngtlai Kristian Thalai Pawl, Saiha

## NAGALAND

Konyak students Union, Mon
Eastern Naga Students Federation, Tuensang
Nanglang Society, Longleng
Hill's Club, Kiphire

Jakhama Students' Union, Kohima Purana Bazaar Students Union, Dimapur People's Agency for Development, Peren Eureka Life Foundation, Phek Ejan \& Associate, Wokha
Mr. Yapang and his research team, Mokokchung
PBSSU, Zunheboto

## ORISSA

Samanta Chandra Shekhar College, Anugul
Agalpur Panchayat Samiti College, Balangir
Khaira College, Baleshwar
Panchayat College, Bargarh
Palsaguda Panchayat College, Boudh
Utkalmani Gopabandhu Sanskrit College, Bhadrak
Grameen Sevak Samaj, Cuttack
Panchayat College, Deogarh
Jiral College, Dhenkanal
Parshuram Gurukul Mahavidyalaya, Gajapati
Kukudakhandi Science College, Ganjam
Addikabi Sarala Das Mahavidyalaya, Jagatsinghapur
Dharmashala Mahavidyalaya, Jajpur
Mahima College, Jharsuguda
Goverment (Autonomus) College, Kalahandi
DIET, Tikabali, Kandhamal
Lokanath Mahavidyalaya, Kendrapara
Woman Organisation for Socio-cultural Awareness
(WOSCA), Kendujhar
Bhaskar Multi Action Seva Samiti, Khorda
Similiguda College, Koraput
Malkangiri Govt. Arts College, Boys Hostel
Student Union, Malkangiri
Mahavir Yuvak Sangha, Mayurbhanj
Maydhalpur College, Nabarangapur
Niswartha Social Organization, Nayagarh
Upendra Pravakar College, Nuapada
Young India, Puri
Gunupur College, Rayagada
DIET, Sambalpur
Research Academy for Rural Enrichment (RARE), Sonapur
Rourkela Municipal College, Sundargarh

## PUDUCHERRY

International People Resource Centre (IPRS), Puducherry
International People Resource Centre( IPRS), Karaikal

## PUNJAB

DAV Public School, Amritsar
DAV Public School, Gurdaspur
Trare Haat Institute, Patiala
Pahal, Jalandhar
Pahal, Kapurthala
J.D College of Education, Muktsar Govt. Senior

Secondary School, Mansa Lok Seva Center, Bhatinda
Red Cross, Faridkot
Govt. Senior Secondary School Suman, Sangrur
Multi-partner organization \& ex Pratham people, Ludhiana

Right Choice Open School, Fatehgarh Sahib D.M. College, Moga
Local volunteers gathered by Parro Punjab District Cordinator, Hoshiarpur
Friends Club, Firozpur
Govt. College, Mohali
Sajari Saver, Rupnagar
Govt. Senior Secondary School, Nawashehar DAV Public School, Tarn Taran

## RAJASTHAN

Doosra Dashak, Ajmer
Mata Shri Gomti Devi Jan Seva Nidhi, Alwar Centre for Community Economics and
Development Consultants Society (Cecoedecon), Banswara
Centre for Community Economics and
Development Consultants Society (Cecoedecon), Baran
Centre for Community Economics and
Development Consultants Society (Cecoedecon), Barmer
Lupin Human Welfare Research Foundation, Bharatpur
Shreeji T.T. College, Bijoliya, Bhilwara
Maru Vikas Evam Paryavaran Sudhar Samiti, Bikaner
EIIT, Computer Institute, Bundi
CUTS, Chittaurgarh
Lakshmi and Usha Mittal Foundation, Churu
Rajasthan B. Ed College, Dausa
Udghosh Social Welfare Society, Dhaulpur
Rajasthan Bal Kalyan Samiti, Dungarpur
Suratgarh Educational \&Social Welfare Trust,

## Ganganagar

Swami Vivekananda TT College, Hanumangarh
Centre for Community Economics and
Development Consultants Society (Cecoedecon),
Jaipur
Centre for Community Economics and
Development Consultants Society (Cecoedecon), Jaisalmer
Shri Shantinath Vidya Bharti TT College Jalor
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Notes on ASER 2009

ASER started in October 2005 as a result of the UPA government's $2 \%$ education cess on all central taxes. The logic was that citizens should monitor the impact of their extra tax and, if possible, hold the government responsible.

Actually, this is the role of the people's representatives. But, given the way our legislature functions, people's representatives do not hold the government accountable except when it presents a political opportunity. It is another matter that they do not want to be held accountable either. The UPA 1 government did declare that it would like to see outcomes over outlays and attempted to get all departments to generate outcome budgets. It is not clear if the idea of outcome budgets has worked at all.

The President of India, in her speech in June 2009, soon after UPA 2 took charge, declared that her government would bring out five annual reports on the subjects of education, health, employment, environment, and infrastructure. We have not heard about it since then. Perhaps we should wait and find out if it was a genuine declaration or whether the speech writer goofed up.

What has India achieved in the last five years in elementary education? The numbers of schools and classrooms built is staggering. No mean achievement. The number of teachers hired is quite large in many of the states. Not an easy task. Mainly as a result of the above two, the enrollment rate in schools has gone up substantially.

But, it is necessary to look at these achievements closely.
While enrollment- the registration of children in school rosters- has improved, the attendance rate of children has not improved. Although enrollment is nearing $96 \%$ in Bihar, the attendance in Bihar schools averages still under $60 \%$. Is that true enrollment? Bihar is not alone in this. Excepting Himachal, Kerala, Tamil Nadu, Karnataka, Goa, Nagaland, and Maharashtra, in all other states, attendance is about $15 \%$ to $30 \%$ lower than the enrollment rate. The average attendance rate is the true enrollment rate of a state. In India, the average attendance rate seems to be around $75 \%$ on any given day.

So, for elementary education to be truly universal, most children need to be in school most of the time. Hence, attendance has to be improved and monitored. Who will do this? The Right to Education Act talks of compulsory attendance. Who will compel the children to come to school? How?

Now, what about learning? ASER has been monitoring if basic learning levels of children are improving. What do we mean by improvement in learning outcomes? How do we measure it?

| $\begin{array}{c}\text { \% Children in ASSAM who can at } \\ \text { least read a }\end{array}$ |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 |
|  | Std I level text |  |  |$]$

Various states have now started measuring learning levels of children. Usually a baseline of students is done at the beginning of the year and an endline at the end of the year. The difference between endline and baseline is taken to be the improvement in learning. It cannot be denied that this constitutes progress, but does it indicate that the learning process has become more effective? Is the learning process in 2009 more productive that it was in, say, 2007? Take the example of Assam and look at the proportion of children who could read at Std 1 level in different years. In 2007, the percentage of children in Std 2 who could read at that level was $23.8 \%$. This cohort moved to $\operatorname{Std} 3$ in 2008 and the proportion of children who could read (Std 1 level text) went to $42.2 \%$ - an increase of $18.4 \%$. In the Std 2 cohort of 2008, on the other hand, $19.8 \%$ more children learnt to read in going to Std 3 in 2009.

So, while the absolute number of Std 3 readers in 2009 appears to have reduced over 2008 and 2007, the actual process of improvement is more or less the same in 2008-09 than in 2007-08. But, if the ASSAM government were to measure the reading ability of Std 2 children early in the academic year, and then again at the end of the academic year, they would find that about $18-19 \%$ more children have learnt to read. This could be misunderstood as a major success but in fact it would be nothing more than what was being achieved all the previous years. And the fact is that regardless of the year, the proportion of children in Std 3 who can read at Std 1 level is still less than $50 \%$. Year after year, children remain at least two grade levels behind where they need to be if they are going to make satisfactory progress through the primary stage.

The process of learning can be said to have improved when results in the next cohort show more children improving within a period than the previous cohort. The ASER results over last five years indicate that whenever states focused on learning outcomes, the effectiveness of the process improved over the previous year. When this focus is lost, the effectiveness decreases. The case of Chhattisgarh, which lost its focus in early 2009, clearly indicates that while the state did not quite go back to the learning levels of 2007, the 2009 results are well below those of 2008. In many states, the process of learning has remained either as ineffective as before or in some cases, it has become worse.

It is almost predictable that the Right to Education Act, the way it is framed, will lead to distraction from learning outcomes. In a centralized scheme of things, the priority focus of the state-governments will determine what the ground level will do or not do.

In the latest circulars that guide the formulation of Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan's Annual Work Plans at district and state levels, the Government of India has sent a Results Framework for SSA Goals. The outcome indicators refer to enrollment not attendance, to provision of toilets rather than to whether toilets function, to water provision rather than on whether water is available. After 17 such "outcome" indicators, the $18^{\text {th }}$ item is "State level sample Learning Achievement Surveys (designed in the spirit of RTE for the purpose of checking health of system)". It is not clear what warranted the content in the brackets. No other indicator is honored with such a bracket. Aren't all outcome indicators supposed to "check the health of the system"? It appears that SSA is being apologetic about this; it is also an effort to dilute learning achievement as not so important. Learning outcomes are not mentioned in RTE document. It certainly is not important to the letter of the law and whether the spirit will survive will depend entirely upon the pressure on the government.

So, whether in letter or in spirit, given the record of Indian government in implementing any law, the real responsibility of giving the child her right to education will ultimately rest with the citizen.

| ASER 2009 | Based on household survey data | Observed on a random day in the school year in all government schools |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| States | Total school enrollment (Age 6-14) in all schools (govt+pvt) | Primary schools Std 1-4/5 : \% enrolled children attending (average) | Upper primary schools Std 1-7/8 : \% enrolled children attending (average) |
| Goa | 99.8 | 96.4 | 92.2 |
| Kerala | 99.9 | 91.9 | 91.7 |
| Tamil Nadu | 99.1 | 91.7 | 90.1 |
| Maharashtra | 99.0 | 90.6 | 90.6 |
| Himachal Pradesh | 99.3 | 90.4 | 90.2 |
| Karnataka | 96.8 | 88.0 | 79.6 |
| Jammu and Kashmir | 98.2 | 86.7 | 90.0 |
| Arunachal Pradesh | 96.6 | 86.0 | 88.0 |
| Mizoram | 98.7 | 85.8 | 85.9 |
| Sikkim | 97.7 | 84.8 | 88.5 |
| Punjab | 94.6 | 84.4 | 86.1 |
| Uttarakhand | 98.7 | 84.2 | 76.3 |
| Nagaland | 97.6 | 84.1 | 87.1 |
| Haryana | 96.9 | 83.7 | 84.9 |
| Gujarat | 95.7 | 83.5 | 83.1 |
| Chhattisgarh | 96.7 | 76.7 | 73.3 |
| Tripura | 98.1 | 76.2 | 71.1 |
| Andhra Pradesh | 93.9 | 76.0 | 77.3 |
| Meghalaya | 96.2 | 75.6 | 80.5 |
| Orissa | 93.7 | 74.4 | 72.9 |
| Manipur | 98.9 | 74.0 | 77.1 |
| Rajasthan | 93.4 | 72.0 | 74.0 |
| Assam | 95.7 | 70.6 | 66.1 |
| Madhya Pradesh | 97.7 | 67.9 | 67.1 |
| Jharkhand | 94.6 | 62.8 | 63.6 |
| West Bengal | 94.3 | 65.9 | 66.4 |
| Uttar Pradesh | 95.1 | 59.8 | 60.9 |
| Bihar | 96.0 | 57.4 | 57.6 |
| Total | 96.0 | 74.2 | 76.6 |

The training of ASER volunteers was over. It was evening in Gauriganj - a block town in Sultanpur district in Uttar Pradesh. More than seventy young people had attended the two day training. On the first day there were many questions about what exactly needed to be done. But with enough practice in the field, and enough discussions, by the end of the second day, most people were clear.

Two people are needed in each ASER team. Each team is assigned a village. Each team gets a "village pack" of survey sheets, testing tools and instructions. The training focuses on what to do in a village and then in a household. In each district, a local group gets together to "do" ASER. The local group also disseminates findings. Local engagement and ownership are important if this assessment is to lead to action.

The training hall began to empty out. There was a buzz in the air, as if an important homework assignment had been handed out. A young woman came up to me as everyone was leaving. She could not have been more than twenty. Shyly, she requested a word in private. Softly she said, "I have never been anywhere other than my home and college without someone from the family with me. I am very nervous. I really want to go to the village for the survey. But I am very worried about how I will talk to the people there. Do you think they will listen to someone like me? Will I be able to do what you want me to do?" Her shining eyes and quivering voice communicated her mixed feelings: the desire to try something new as well as her anxiety at the prospect.

I had observed this girl for two days, both in the training hall and in the practice session in a nearby village. She was an attentive and intelligent participant in the training process. Softly, I made a suggestion. "Go home and get your entire family to sit down. Tell them what you have learned about ASER and what you are going to do. If you can convince your family about ASER, then you can convince anyone anywhere."

A vast range of people participate in ASER, both as individuals and as institutions. We estimate that 25,000 to 30,000 volunteers and maybe 500 organizations and institutions participate in each year's survey. For example, Bihar has 37 districts. In five years, 105 organizations have participated. In all likelihood, since 2005, over 10,000 people have been involved with carrying out ASER in Bihar alone. We think that over five years at least 100,000 people across India have been part of ASER in one form or another.

All that an ASER volunteer gets is a certificate of appreciation and a nominal sum of money to cover the costs of going to a village in their district and back home. Neither the organization nor the individual has any monetary incentive to participate in ASER. Although the actual involvement is for four days - two days in training and two days in a village, it is hard work and needs commitment and a sense of adventure.

Feedback sessions at district level are full of stories of challenges and discoveries. One year we got a phone call from Leh district in Ladakh from two young surveyors who said that although their village was listed in the Indian census, local people were telling them that it was in China. Last year, in the random sample of villages in Chandel district in Manipur, there were some villages that were easier to access via Myanmar. A young girl and her companion set off on a motorcycle across international borders to complete their ASER task. In remote villages, people are surprised that someone has made the effort to come all the way to find out how their children are doing. Far from the border areas, even in the Hindi heartland, volunteers are often very shocked to find that there are villages in their own district that take more than a day from the district headquarters to reach.

In many ways ASER reflects realities on the ground. The growing Naxalite presence was felt in this year's ASER. As the ASER surveyors were returning from Joratarai village of Nagri block in Dhamtari district, Chhattisgarh, some Naxalites stopped and questioned them and eventually destroyed the survey reports. Apart from the danger, the two surveyors were distraught that their two days of hard work had gone waste. From the beginning of ASER, Dantewada district in Chhattisgarh has never been done. This year there were problems in Malkangiri, Raygada and Sundargarh districts in Orissa. Political disturbances affected ASER work in large parts of Hooghly district in West Bengal where it was hard to find people who were willing to go to villages in specific parts of the district. Similarly in Garwah in Jharkhand and N.C. Hills in Assam.

In the first year of ASER, existing organizations and networks were approached in many states. Many of these organizations such as Gram Vikas in Orissa, Kudumbashree in Kerala, Kheti Virasat in Punjab were not involved in education but considered primary education to be an essential service that needed citizen participation and support. Other networks such as Abhivyakti in Madhya Pradesh, Sankalp in Chhattisgarh, Navbharat Jagriti Kendra in Jharkhand, Voluntary Forum for Education in Bihar, and the Kalvi network in Tamil Nadu were involved in education. Some of these early partners have continued with ASER for the last five years.

In many states there has been a steady and lasting involvement of district degree colleges over this five year period. Many students in these colleges are from villages in the district. Across the North East, in Jammu-Kashmir, Himachal Pradesh, Haryana, Orissa and West Bengal, participation from colleges and students has been high. In Arunachal Pradesh there are very few colleges; here high school students are involved in ASER. The "doing" of ASER inevitably raises many questions: in district after district, students raise basic questions about sampling, about tools and about analysis. Much of the college participation in ASER is done as part of social service requirements in NSS. And yet analyzing the last five years of experiences with district colleges, it is obvious that "learning by doing" could be included in the curriculum of such colleges. Such "project based" short duration exercises can be useful on two counts. For students, this is a chance to build capacity and integrate theory and practice as well life skills like self confidence, communication and time management. For the institution, it is an opportunity to provide vital information and analysis and get engaged in the process of development in their district. Why only education, all social sector programs in India need systematic and active analysis and engagement for improvement. To make institutions of higher education more relevant and vibrant, links to the ground and connections to the field can only be productive.

The participation of universities in ASER has also been interesting. While it has been difficult to interest high profile universities in metros to participate, individual professors in regional universities have been quick to take the opportunity to build stronger links with research or with teaching. Manipal University's rural development department has used the ASER platform to conduct further research studies. NEHU-Tura is another example where ASER has been the starting point for deeper investigations. Jammu University's communication department used ASER to provide opportunities for exposure to more remote areas. Martin Luther University in Meghalaya gives academic credit to students who participate in ASER.

Andhra Pradesh has provided one of the most remarkable cases in the short history of ASER. In the first two years of ASER, 2005 and 2006, Loksatta organization coordinated and led ASER across the state. Although their primary focus as an organization has been on electoral reform, their participation in ASER was based on the idea that this kind of peoples' initiative is important and that education is an important field of activity. Loksatta organization continues to be a strong supporter of ASER and is very helpful in disseminating ASER findings in the state.

Since 2007, DIETs in Andhra have done ASER in their own districts. ${ }^{1}$ This is a model that can be adopted in other states too. Each DIET has more than 200 students enrolled in a two year course. ASER provides an excellent learning opportunity for these future primary school teachers of the district. Students experience "learning" problems first hand and hopefully this also gives them a chance to analyze what can be done and perhaps to build a foundation for effective teaching and learning. Several DIET principals have told me that while the usual teacher training curriculum makes trainees do practice teaching in the district's schools, only ASER makes them spend time in the village and in children's homes. It should be possible to build in ASER like rapid assessments into the normal curriculum and activities of the DIET that could feed into the annual work plan and review process of a district under SSA.

The other major actors in ASER are a wide range of non-government organizations. Here too there are significant variations across regions. In states like Maharashtra and Gujarat where local governance is strong and active, local level organizations seem to be more rooted and confident. Still, even here there are needs and demands for continued learning. Often in small or local NGOs, the field level staff does not get opportunities for professional development. ASER gives them the chance to learn something new and to do something outside of their usual work.

So, one major learning from ASER is that India has many people who are willing to participate both to learn and to help to change what is around them, provided what needs to be done is simple to do and easy to understand. For individuals, it is a chance to travel, to learn, to discover themselves and to explore their surroundings. For institutions, ASER provides a learning platform whose potential is visible but needs to be further explored and institutionalized.

The challenge that lies before us all is how to channel this vast citizen energy and interest into effective action for outcomes. On the one hand, the question is how to build substantive "learning-by-doing" into such exercises so that individuals benefit. On the other hand, the task is also to translate the raw energy of people into structured pressure for responsibility and outcomes.

ASER has taught us some very basic lessons. People in India care. People are generous with their time. People of India are ready. The need of the hour is to create mechanisms to learn and to act, to build capacities of citizens - individuals and institutions, and to strengthen the forces demanding accountability.

It gets dark early in rural areas; or so it feels in Gauriganj. I was about to turn in for the night when there was a loud knock on my door. Two excited people burst into the room. One was familiar - the shy hesitant girl from the training. The quiver in her voice was gone and her eyes were shining even more brightly. She had brought her sister-in-law along to report back to me. "it was exactly as you said", the young girl gushed. "I had a hard time getting my family to all sit down. But once I told them about ASER properly, they listened to me. And now they all want to do ASER".


The debate on whether private schools provide better quality primary education as compared to government schools is heating up in India. This is completely understandable in the current scenario. On the one hand, for almost ten years, through Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan, the government has intensified the move towards universalizing elementary education and more recently the Right to Education Bill has been passed in the Parliament. This push has led to impressive increases in provision and enrolment. On the other hand, ASER as well as other data show a clear rising trend in private school enrolment in rural India.

At the all India level, private school enrollment increased from $16.3 \%$ in 2005 to about $22.6 \%$ in 2008 - an increase of about $40 \%$. In the last year, between 2008 and 2009, private school enrollment has marginally dropped to $21.8 \%$ in rural India. There is considerable variation across states. On the one end of the spectrum are states like UP, Haryana, Punjab and Kerala where private school enrollment is as high as $40 \%$ and on the other end of the spectrum are states like Bihar and West Bengal with enrollment in private school closer to $5 \%$. However, what is clear is that whether enrollment in private schools is high or low, it has been increasing over time. ${ }^{1}$

What has led to this shift towards private schools in rural areas? The standard answer and the common perception is that private schools provide a better quality education. This trend was started by parents living in urban areas - the elite having opted out of the government school system and the middle and lower income classes trying their level best to send their children to private schools - and now their rural counterparts are coming to the same conclusion. After all teacher attendance is much better in private schools and these schools often give instruction in English, mastery of which leads to better job prospects in the future. ${ }^{2}$

Indeed, the ASER results indicate that this might be the case. In the ASER 2008 report, I wrote a preliminary piece on the differences between learning outcomes in government and private schools and how these differences narrow when household and other characteristics are controlled for. ${ }^{3}$ ASER 2009 has additional controls available, mainly tuition and father's education, and this note takes advantage of that. In addition, ASER 2009 tests children for English as well. ${ }^{4}$ This gives us another learning outcome to check for differences between government and private schools. More importantly, it gives us a learning outcome - ability to read and comprehend basic English - which is often cited as the reason for sending children to private schools.

In 2009, in classes 1-5, the percentage of children who could read at least a class 1 level text was 43.6 in government schools. The corresponding figure in private schools was 52.2 - a whopping 8.6 percentage point advantage. However, this is an uncontrolled difference in learning outcomes - one that is obtained in a simple cross-tabulation of learning outcomes against type of school. It does not take into account that many different things affect a child's learning level. For instance, it is well established that the mother's education has a positive impact on the probability that a child goes to school as well as her learning ability. Supplemental help offered at home, in the form of paid tuition or by family members will also improve learning outcomes of children, regardless of whether they go to government or private school. If any of these factors is positively correlated with the probability of going to a private school, their impact will show up as enhanced learning outcomes in private schools.

[^0]For instance, richer households can afford to pay for additional tuition for their children. It is also well established that a larger proportion of children from more affluent homes attend private schools. ${ }^{5}$ In this case, part of the observed learning differential between government and private schools would be due to the extra help that private school children were getting at home and not because of the better quality of education being imparted in private schools. Therefore, it becomes important to try and estimate the learning differential once other things that impact learning are taken into account.

Apart from type of school, ASER 2009 has information on many other factors that can impact learning. A simple model is built to try to disentangle the effect of other factors from that of private schools on learning outcomes of children. Two learning outcomes for children in primary school (class $1-5$ ) are considered: ${ }^{67}$

- Ability to read a class 1 level text or more in their local language
- Ability to read simple words or more in English

The model controls for child characteristics like age, gender, number of siblings, education of both parents; household characteristics like type of house ("katcha", "semi-pucca", and "pucca"), whether the house had a television, phone, electricity, some kind of vehicle; and characteristics of the village the child lives in like whether the village had a bank, post office, government primary, middle or secondary school, private school, STD booth, etc.

All the variables are significant in the model and have the expected impact. Learning increases with age, but then levels off. (This is to be expected as the learning measure is a very basic and "floor" level indicator for reading.) A larger number of siblings, presumably, reduces time spent on learning and reduces learning outcomes. Education of both parents is positively correlated with their children's learning level. Further, the impact of parents' education rises monotonically with their education level. Tuition has a large impact on learning - almost as large as the impact of mother's education. Finally, all household characteristics signifying greater affluence are positively correlated with learning outcomes.

Once we control for characteristics other than the type of school the child goes to, the learning differential between government and private schools falls drastically from 8.6 percentage points to 2.9 percentage points - from $20 \%$ to a measly $5 \%$. This means that $2 / 3^{\text {rd }}$ of the learning differential between government and private schools can be attributed to factors other than the type of school. So at least in the case of reading in the local language private schools perform no better (or worse) than government schools.

Table 1: Learning Differentials between Government and Private Schools

| States | Reading in own language |  | Reading in English <br>  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Uncontrolled <br> Difference | Controlled <br> Difference | Uncontrolled <br> Difference | Controlled <br> Difference |
| Jammu and Kashmir | 15.84 | 11.08 | 11.61 | 6.49 |
| Himachal Pradesh | -1.39 | 0.75 | 5.66 | 4.45 |
| Punjab | 27.78 | 15.06 | 44.89 | 31.65 |
| Uttarakhand | 7.90 | 2.15 | 20.74 | 13.32 |
| Haryana | 17.09 | 12.24 | 21.92 | 16.07 |
| Rajasthan | 13.07 | 9.55 | 15.11 | 11.15 |
| Uttar Pradesh | 16.66 | 9.15 | 16.96 | 9.92 |
| Bihar | 17.87 | 9.12 | 23.50 | 14.41 |
| Assam | 14.59 | 8.52 | 20.64 | 14.27 |
| West Bengal | 5.99 | 8.05 | 23.45 | 22.26 |
| Jharkhand | 19.76 | 13.29 | 20.99 | 14.35 |
| Orissa | 10.10 | 4.43 | 14.38 | 7.44 |
| Chhattisgarh | 2.35 | 0.86 | 5.86 | 1.89 |
| Madhya Pradesh | 2.10 | -3.39 | 9.72 | 3.26 |
| Gujarat | 22.50 | 10.81 | 27.27 | 14.85 |
| Maharashtra | 18.11 | 1.94 | 27.56 | 14.88 |
| Andhra Pradesh | -3.06 | -7.00 | 21.03 | 15.77 |
| Karnataka | 5.45 | 2.44 | 28.02 | 22.86 |
| Kerala | 3.99 | 2.16 | 13.76 | 10.81 |
| Tamil Nadu | -3.62 | -4.91 | 20.39 | 16.99 |

## Note:

In UP, for instance, the difference between government and private schools, in a simple cross-tab of reading in local language and type of school is 16.66 percentage points the uncontrolled difference. Once other factors are controlled for, this difference narrows to 9.15 percentage points. This means that 7.51 of the observed difference is due to other factors.

[^1]In the case of English, the starting differential is greater and the narrowing a little less. The percentage of children in class 15 who can read simple words (or more) in English is $26.5 \%$ compared to $44.2 \%$ in private schools - an advantage of 17.7 percentage points or $67 \%$. Once we control for other factors, this differential falls to $10.8 \%$ or $41 \%$. In other words, about $40 \%$ of the observed differential in English learning levels between government and private schools can be attributed to other factors.

A similar analysis was done for states and there is considerable variation here. Table 1 gives the learning differentials between government and private schools for the two learning outcomes. The "Uncontrolled" difference refers to the observed learning difference in a simple cross-tabulation, while the "Controlled" difference refers to the difference once other factors that affect learning are taken into account.

In the case of reading in the local language, in many cases most of the learning differential disappears once other factors are controlled for - Uttarakhand, Chhattisgarh, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Andhra Pradesh, and Tamil Nadu. In the case of Madhya Pradesh, the difference is actually reversed - once other factors are controlled for government schools perform better than private schools. In the case of Andhra Pradesh and Tamil Nadu, where government schools had higher learning levels to start with, the gap widens once other factors are taken into account.

On the other hand, in the case of Himachal Pradesh and West Bengal controlling for other factors widens the gap between government and private schools. Both these states have very different private school enrolment rates - since 2006 Himachal has had private school enrolment of about $22 \%$, while the number is closer to $5 \%$ in West Bengal.

In the case of English, in most states, the starting differentials are greater and the narrowing of the differential smaller as was the case for All India. However, there are still states like Chhattisgarh and Madhya Pradesh where $2 / 3^{\text {rd }}$ of the learning difference is attributable to factors other than private schooling.

This analysis is based on the provisional ASER 2009 data for rural India. The wide variations across states indicate that there is more beyond the type of village, type of school or type of family that determines the educational destiny of the child. While the debate over private and government schools heats up and opinions and perceptions accumulate, India is also seeing more empirical evidence being gathered. Not only is more and better data needed for "controls" for explanatory variables on the right hand side of the equation but the left hand side - "children's learning" also needs to be measured much more comprehensively. Currently ASER is one of the few nationally representative data sets that are available to explore the question on hand. So, as we look more closely at families and schools, the more we understand what else is important in children's lives, the closer we will get to the "real" determinants of children's learning. Until then, the real verdict has to wait.

Still, while we wait, we have much to think about. Questions that are important for the family and for the country: Does the evidence that is available support parental decisions to move children to private schools? How much should be the "bang" for the "buck" for the expenditure that poor families incur to send their children to the private schools that are currently available? Does the evidence justify the RTE provision of government funding children to move from government schools to private schools? As policy makers sit down translate the law into action, they need to think hard about the basis on which they are making these key decisions for the next many generations and millions of Indian children.

The last two or three years have witnessed a fairly vigorous debate in the education space over the role of the private sector in education, particularly at the elementary level, and its merits and/or otherwise. The somewhat contentious provisions of the then Draft Right to Education Bill, 2005, recently passed as The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act, 2009, also contributed to this debate. Among other things, the Act stipulates that even unaided schools under private management would be responsible for providing free education to disadvantaged children between the ages of six and fourteen years from their immediate neighbourhood, at least to the extent of 25 percent of their strength in the entry class.

Although the Act has yet to be notified, not surprisingly, this provision has managements of recognised private schools up in arms. Joining them, albeit for very different reasons, are the proprietors of the unrecognised private schools, who risk monetary fines and jail terms if they continue to operate their schools without seeking recognition as prescribed under the Act. Ironically therefore, an Act that seeks to universalise elementary education for children in India has succeeded in alienating a significant proportion of those who are engaged in contributing to that very objective.

While the numbers offered by different sources vary slightly, it does appear to be more or less agreed that private (recognised) schools in India account for anything between 15-25 percent of available schools. The District Information System for Education (DISE) data for 2007-08, released in November 2009, places the number of schools under private, unaided management at 173,282 out of a total of $1,250,775$ schools in India ${ }^{1}$, or about 14 percent. If one adds the number of aided schools under private management, we arrive at a figure of nearly 20 percent. According to NCERT's $7^{\text {th }}$ All-India Educational Survey based on figures for 2002, enrolment in such private schools was 15 percent and 19 percent at the primary and upper primary stages respectively. While NUEPA and NCERT data capture the picture as related to recognised schools, ASER only notes the fact of private school enrolment without distinguishing between recognised or otherwise, thus providing the slightly higher figure of 21.8 percent children enrolled in private schools in 2009.

While there are minor variations in the private school enrolment indicated by ASER between 2007-2009, it would seem to be fairly clear that roughly one-fifth of elementary schools in India are under private management. If one adds the number of unrecognised private schools, about which little data is available, the percentage of children enrolled in what may be called non-government schools may be conservatively assumed to be between $25-30$ percent, if not more. A study in 2006 showed that even in rural areas, almost 28 percent of the population had access to fee-charging private schools ${ }^{2}$. In 2009, ASER data indicates that nearly 44 percent villages have access to private schools, and it would seem safe therefore to assume that this is a sector that is now well established.

At the same time, it may not be correct to presume that private schools are coming up in the absence of government schools; in many cases, they come up in areas with poor government school performance ${ }^{3}$. Various studies have shown that while the private school sector has grown in recent years, leading to a decline in the relative enrolment in government schools, the former do not necessarily compete with the latter in terms of addressing unmet demand. Rather, in establishing themselves in areas where government schools already exist, these private schools meet differentiated or quality demand, attracting children from higher-income groups or from advantaged social groups ${ }^{4}$.

Many years ago, when Milton Friedman first postulated his concept of vouchers in schools, he was convinced that liberalising the school sector would result in the emergence of a market where none existed, with educational "entrepreneurs" entering the market to take advantage of opportunities offered and in turn, to offer quality school services ${ }^{5}$. While the effectiveness of voucher programmes remains a matter of some debate, it does seem true that the desire of parents to find an alternative to poorly performing government schools may have led in recent years to a growth in the number of available private schools, under both recognised and unrecognised management. In his book, The Beautiful Tree ${ }^{6}$, James Tooley argues quite convincingly that notwithstanding the costs involved, poor parents in urban areas are choosing to vote with their feet and move their children from free government schools into private (and in many cases, unrecognised) schools, thus setting off an increase in the number of such schools.

[^2]It is certainly true that there is greater interest in establishing private schools today than there was earlier; no longer viewed as a purely philanthropic activity, the setting up of private schools is now attracting more and more corporate firms who see this as a potential business. In the case of some real estate developers, it is even being seen as another form of forward integration, making the purchase of apartments in their developments more attractive by virtue of guaranteeing a "good" school in the neighbourhood; a case in point is the recent announcement by a well-known real estate group, of a chain of 150 CBSE schools to be set up all over India. Similarly, the provisions of The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act, 2009, requiring the earmarking of 25 percent seats for children from disadvantaged families, are being viewed by many in the private sector as an opportunity to invest in setting up schools, in order to take advantage of the "guaranteed" reimbursement of costs by government.

The government's proposal to establish 2500 "model" schools in various districts through the Public Private Partnership (PPP) mode has also generated significant interest in the private sector, with several corporate houses exploring options of investing in the sector. Thus, the creation of educational "entrepreneurs" does appear to be taking place to some degree, even though the numbers remain comparatively small.

But what of quality in these private schools? As ASER 2008 showed, when various variables such as family background, income and others are controlled for, the difference in learning levels between government and private schools becomes marginal'. Similarly, Education Initiatives (EI), India's largest private sector testing organisation, found that "any lead that private schools show in their learning outcomes over government schools can be completely explained away by... (1) students' socio-economic background, (2) students' initial levels, (3) rote/procedural nature of learning tested. In other words, if you control for factor 1 , look for improvements between say, Grade 3 and Grade 7 (to nullify any initial advantage), and the test is not rote/testing procedural knowledge only, private schools (do not) show any advantage over government schools" ${ }^{8}$. In part of course, the trouble arises on account of the usual assumption in reference to private schools-they are generally seen to be high-end private schools of the likes of say, a Delhi Public School in New Delhi or a Cathedral in Mumbai. The reality however, is that a majority of private schools are only marginally different from their counterparts in government; the major difference lies in their ability to ensure accountability amongst the teaching staff.

In fairness, it must be said that this is an area that remains open to debate and further research. Tooley for instance, records a difference of 16-17 percentage points in the learning levels of children in private schools in urban areas, as compared to their counterparts in government schools ${ }^{9}$, but it is not clear whether this is after controlling for factors of the nature mentioned in the preceding paragraph. His findings are clearly in contradiction to findings elsewhere, so there is certainly a case for deeper examination of the underlying causes.

Given that ASER 2009 data reconfirms what has been observed in earlier years in respect of enrolment, finding only about 4 percent children in the 6-14 year age group still out of school, the question of what happens to the 96 percent children in school acquires great significance. Since this year's data has been discussed in some detail elsewhere in this report, let us take just one example, that of reading ability; on an overall basis, ASER 2009 finds that nearly 47 percent children in Class 5 are unable to read a Class 2 text. More worryingly, at the national level, the percentage of children in Class 5 unable to read a Class 2 text actually shows an increase between 2008 and 2009, from 44 percent to 47 percent. Regardless of how the difference between government and private schools is explained, the fact remains that these are unacceptably high numbers.

Going forward, two conclusions would appear to be inescapable; first, private management participation in the school sector is only likely to increase over time, and it may be wise to develop policies that address this situation. It may even be time to move away from our traditionally hypocritical approach to private investment, which insists that such investment should be on a not-for-profit basis, thus compelling school operators to find alternatives by which they can make a return on their capital, to a regime that actively encourages private investment within a regulated environment. Second, action is urgently required to improve quality in our classrooms, whether these are in government or private schools. A failure to address this need will lead to increasing numbers of children going through the school system without learning very much, something that no nation can afford.

The most significant thing that ASER has done over the last five years has been to focus attention on the need to improve learning outcomes. Greater public awareness and parental demand, improved infrastructure and more resources have brought us to a point where enrolment is reasonably satisfactory. But we would be failing future generations if we do not take this to the next logical step, improving what children do once they're in the classroom. It is to that-regardless of whether the child is in a government or private school-that we must now turn our attention.

[^3]
## Transparent and Accountable Financing for Universal Elementary Education in India: Lessons from Financing Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan

Yamini Aiyar ${ }^{1}$, Anit Mukherjee ${ }^{2}$ and Avani Kapur ${ }^{3}$

Who and how should we finance the provision of elementary education in India? The Right to Education Act (RTE) passed in August 2009 has committed the Government of India to the provision of free and compulsory universal education to all of India's children. Now, the issue of financing is one of the central challenges faced by India's policy makers. The focus of the debate is currently on the question of who ought to be the primary financial provider - the state government or the central government? Crucial as this question is, there is a second, and more critical issue that ought to be at the forefront of the financing debate - that of ensuring that the mechanisms and process for effective and efficient expenditure are in place so that these funds are spent in a manner that is transparent and accountable. After all, regardless of the amount of money and where it comes from, the ultimate objective is to ensure that money reaches its ultimate destination and fulfils it explicit purpose.

The RTE has many provisions for ensuring accountability in its delivery including the creation of school management committees (SMC) empowered to make plans and monitor school level expenditures. But as is well known in India, the devil lies in the implementation. How effectively these provisions will work on the ground depends on getting the 'right' design that will ensure accountability and transparency in implementation process. And to get the design right, we need to learn from current experience. What do schools, officials and citizens know about money that flows in and out of the system? Is there sufficient autonomy at the local level for citizen committees to influence decision making? What capacities exist at the local level?

Understanding the nature and shape of the pipe is the first step to getting the water to flow through it. To do this, the Accountability Initiative, National Institute of Public Finance and Policy and the ASER Centre came together to implement a project called PAISA to monitor fund flows and build decision making capacities at the local level. The project started with a pilot in Nalanda district in Bihar before it became a part of ASER 2009. This article highlights some of the findings from the PAISA experience.

First principles of public accountability require that expenditures must adequately reflect citizens' interests and priorities. When it comes to basic services, citizens' interests are best captured locally at the point where services are delivered. This means greater local autonomy and discretion particularly in resource allocation.

PAISA found that SSA allows no room for local autonomy. This is ironic given that SSA through its guidelines envisions a bottom up planning process where plans are made at the habitation level through village education committees (or equivalent bodies) and aggregated at the district level, thereby allowing for local autonomy and discretion in resource allocation. In practice however, funds arrive based on norms and guidelines developed nationally with limited flexibility. Consequently, plans have to be made on the basis of norms that do not reflect local priorities and local autonomy is severely constrained.

To illustrate the point, SSA guidelines stipulate the type and quantum of grants that ought to be devolved to the school (see Fig 1 for a pictorial representation of the grants). As the figure highlights, every school receives three grants - School Development Grant (SDG), School Maintenance Grant (SMG) and Teaching Learning Material Grant (TLM). Three other grants - classroom, repair and furniture - are based on demands made through the planning process. However, the quantum of funds received is determined by national norms.

As this description highlights, funds reach schools 'tied' to norms and have to be put to specific uses. For instance, TLM grants have to be used for teaching aids in class and SDG is provided specifically to procure items such as chalk, duster, blackboards and other articles used in the classrooms. And if a school wants to spend more on learning materials rather than painting or buy furniture, the norms simply won't allow it.

[^4]

Source: SSA Guidelines, Ministry of Human Resource Development, New Delhi

A second problem with this 'tied' approach to funding is that norms determine the quantum of funds that the schools receive, resulting in a mismatch between school needs and funds received. To illustrate the point, a school with 1,000 students receives just about two and a half times more money than a school that has 100 students. ${ }^{4}$ The assumption behind this approach - that all schools need the same inputs for better infrastructure and quality - curbs any space for local discretion and autonomy and therefore local needs are rarely reflected in local expenditures.

Autonomy apart, accountability requires transparency and predictability in fund flows. After all, you need to know how much money is due and when it ought to arrive in order to make plans and hold the system to account. This is one of SSA's greatest weaknesses. In March 2009, PAISA undertook a survey of a 100 schools in Nalanda, Bihar to understand fund flows in the district. The survey found that majority schools received funds somewhere between the months of December and February (officially, fund receipts ought to be scattered through the financial year so that expenditures match local and time specific needs). Consequently, expenditures are only incurred in the last quarter of the financial year. This last minute rush often results in inefficient and insufficient expenditures - just over 50 percent of the grant funds are spent within the financial year ${ }^{5}$.

The findings at this micro level are reflected in the financial data collected from schools across the country as part of the 2009 ASER survey. ASER findings report that in October 2009, less than 50 percent of the schools reported receiving SSA funds and October is half way through the school year.

The problem of delayed fund flows is exacerbated by the lack of transparency. Schools and village education committees (or equivalent bodies), and often even block and district officials remain unaware of the processes through which funds arrive at their final destinations and thus are unable to plan effectively or hold the system accountable for delayed and unpredictable

[^5]fund flows. Worse still, in most cases, apart from the headmaster, no other stakeholder has any information on the quantum of funds available or the norms and guidelines that govern their expenditures. In 2008, the Accountability Initiative in partnership with the ASER Centre undertook a rapid assessment of 34 VECs across the country to find that with the exception of the headmaster, none of the members of the VEC had any information on allocations and grants received in schools.

This lack of information is a consequence of two factors. First, very little has been done by the higher tiers of government to train local officials and stakeholders particularly village education committees. Consequently, their access to information on key elements of education delivery and particularly resource allocation is extremely limited. Second, and perhaps more importantly, there are very few incentives within the system to collect and disseminate 'real time' information on fund flows and expenditures in the course of the financial year. As a result, there simply is no regular available information on fund flows as funds travel from the centre to the schools and delays and leakages proliferate, unchecked.

Information is widely recognized as a necessary condition for accountability. Information ensures that plans are made effectively to reflect local needs, that fund flows and expenditures are monitored and inefficiencies addressed. Information enables citizens to monitor government performance and hold the system to account. The information failures in SSA have seriously compromised accountability.

As the experience with SSA amply demonstrates, accountability and transparency require an implementation design that ensures a high degree of local autonomy so that resource allocations match local needs and priorities. This must be accompanied by a system where information on fund flows and expenditures is collected regularly and reliably. Information should be disseminated widely so that implementation can be monitored and citizens have the tools necessary to demand accountability. To create such a system, processes need to be designed such that incentives are built in for regular information collection.

Education policy in India today is at a crossroads. There is a clear consensus that improved education outcomes hold the key to India's future and the passage of the RTE stands testimony to this. Now as bureaucrats take to their drawing boards to develop rules and guidelines for the implementation of the RTE and as the issue of financial provisioning gets debated, the focus must shift to getting the design right. Only then will the RTE achieve its potential.


In a recent visit to rural schools in Ajmer district, the children sitting in the last couple of rows were in a world of their own, as back-benchers often are. They paid little attention to the teacher, rarely participated in group recitations or volunteered an answer to a question, and were never once called upon by the teacher. In general they were wholly out of sync with the teacher-led, recitation-dominated activity taking place in the class - which was largely with the participation of the first two or three rows of students.

What was heart breaking was the fact that almost every one of these students in the back was working. They were quiet and serious. Some copied English words while the rest of the class was copying from the Hindi textbook. Others copied from the maths textbook while the rest of the class was copying word meanings from the blackboard. Almost without exception, they engaged with one or other academic task throughout the class - but not the ones everyone else was engaged in. There was no doubt that they were trying to learn. And without exception, they were ignored by the teacher from beginning to end.

Who were these students? In conversation with their teachers, we learnt that they were the children who weren't keeping up academically, though it wasn't always clear whether sitting at the back was a cause or a consequence of poor academic performance.

The teachers laid the blame for poor learning outcomes unequivocally at the door of the children's homes. Practically every teacher we spoke to told us without the least awkwardness, let alone embarrassment, Ye bachhe to ghar mein padhai bilkul karte hi nahin hain... to phir kaise seekhenge? Despite the huge investments in the elementary education sector over the last decade and the considerable expansion in infrastructure and enrollment, schools often behave as though ensuring that children learn is the responsibility of parents rather than teachers. And indeed, in many households, we observed families putting great effort into providing academic support, such as sending children to paid tuition classes and getting older siblings to help younger ones.

But there are many households which are not in a position to provide support for children's learning.

This year for the first time ASER recorded the schooling level of both parents of children in the sampled households. These data reveal that a quarter of all children studying in Stds 1-5 in government schools are first generation students. In these households parents are ill equipped to support or even monitor their children's educational progress, and usually assume that if their children are going to school, then they must be learning.

In many such homes the adults have no idea that their schoolgoing children are unable to read, write, or do simple arithmetic. Five years of ASER have produced countless stories of adults in rural households reacting with shock and disbelief at the evidence - generated before their very eyes - of how little their children have learnt despite two, three, four or five years of schooling. Even when they know differently, parents often feel that their
 responsibility ends with sending their children to school. A mother we met in Ajmer labeled "Deepak sir", her son's teacher, as corrupt and badmaash. But she felt that since she herself is illiterate, there isn't much she can do about it: hum keval school bhej sakte hain. After that he is the teacher's responsibility.

Obviously when neither parents nor, very often, teachers are even aware of what individual children have or haven't learnt, let alone able or willing to do something about it, then it is those students most in need of support who fail to get it. A breakdown of ASER 2009 data on learning outcomes by parents' schooling demonstrates that first generation students are indeed at a disadvantage in terms of learning: among a population of children who are learning far below grade level on average, first generation students do even worse than others. The teachers in Ajmer, and in many other schools around the country, were quite correct.

How is this situation to be changed?
As has often been pointed out, the Right to Education bill is alarmingly vague on the subject of learning outcomes and how they are to be assessed, specifying only that teachers must regularly assess the learning level of each child, ... provide supplementary instruction needed by the child, ... (and) regularly apprise every parent/guardian about the progress of learning and development of his child/ward studying in the school. In addition, it is the responsibility of the "competent academic authority" to conduct learner evaluation in a continuous and comprehensive manner such that it tests the child's understanding and ability to apply knowledge rather than rote learning.

While the RTE bill places both generation and control of information on learning outcomes squarely in the hands of teachers and "competent authorities", real accountability requires that parents and other stakeholders be able to evaluate learning outcomes independently. It is here that ASER-like tools can potentially play a huge role, by providing even illiterate parents with an immediate, simple means of understanding whether their children have mastered some basic competencies. It is possible to imagine that a copy of an ASER or ASER like tool in the hands of every parent and SMC member in a village might begin to alter the power dynamic between teachers and less educated parents, and catalyze actions that lead to learning outcomes quite different from those reported in ASER 2009.

A far more difficult but increasingly urgent task is the development of similar tools for higher level competencies. More urgent because with external examinations soon to be abolished throughout the elementary cycle, methods and metrics for conducting the continuous and comprehensive evaluation required under RTE on scale need to be generated. More difficult because designing tools that measure higher level competencies in ways that, ASER like, are quick to use and simple to understand presents a much greater challenge. ${ }^{1}$

But as the example of the Ajmer mother illustrates, and the experience of five years of ASER proves, providing information is only a first step. Across India, children are learning no better in 2009 than they did in 2005 . Structuring actions that ensure that the buck stops passing is the challenge before us.


[^6]The story of ASER in the last five years has been a mixed bag for most Indian states. But whatever the tenor, every year since 2005, the story of "what is the status of education" in rural India has been heard, read and discussed by many.

What was different about ASER in 2009 was its adoption and adaptation in three East African countries - Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania. This ASER like initiative in East Africa is called 'UWEZO’ which means 'capability' in Kswahili. It is led by government, civil society organizations, and citizen groups to "promote learning in East Africa". UWEZO seeks to adapt ASER methods to measure the learning competencies of children in literacy and numeracy. Like ASER, the UWEZO effort will generate information on children's learning in a manner that informs the public, stimulates national debate and creates pressure for policy changes. The acceptance of ASER in other countries as an innovative example of how to engage citizens to measure progress towards goals of elementary education has been an impact in itself.

I was part of the ASER team from India that visited Tanzania to help start the process. Our task was to train a pool of master trainers who would train volunteers for the national assessment. The first such training was for the master trainers from the northern region of Tanzania. Besides giving an overview of ASER in India, we were not sure what else we could contribute. But our Tanzanian counterparts told us that our mere presence in the training workshop was crucial for the trainers to realize "it is doable; they have done it for many years".

In the frenzy and intensity of doing ASER in India, we sometimes forget the core essence of the activity itself. But in a country thousands of miles away from India, ASER came across as an inspiring example for fueling another national citizen led endeavour. In many instances, during our visit, the scale of ASER in India was quoted to motivate Tanzanians and to convince them that they were embarking upon a mission that would prompt action based on real time evidence and informed discussion. Listening to these discussions we regained our confidence and realized that ASER was not just about training a pool of volunteers to collect data from the villages but an accomplishment that is seen as a means to push a collective force towards a national cause.

The approach for undertaking a large scale assessment such as UWEZO in Tanzania is very different than it is in India. In our country, any organized group can carry out surveys in the field. Also after several years of doing ASER in India, we do not find it daunting to mobilize substantial number of participants in every district. However, in Tanzania, a sequence of administrative processes needs to be followed. From seeking permission from the ward offices for conducting the survey, to ensuring that participants are compensated appropriately, the implementation of any 'non-government' activity in Tanzania is marked by a lot of clerical groundwork.

Given this backdrop, ASER as an uncomplicated, feasible platform for mass participation came across powerfully during the field visits. In our visits to semi urban areas and government schools, we found that school teachers, parents, government officials and youth were getting interested and engaged. This was reassuring for the UWEZO team members who were initially not sure how Tanzanian people would react to the ASER approach. As foreign observers we could not comprehend the actual conversations in the village about children, education, reading or math. However, we could see that the process of testing children in the household was sparking off discussions quite similar to those that happen in India. The simple act of testing reading in an easy-to-do and easy-to-understand way gave concrete shape to the problem and a definite direction to the solution. It helped people see that learning outcomes are measureable, simple tools are available and results can be generated instantly for immediate action. All of this helped UWEZO gain ready acceptance in the land whose first president was a teacher. The initial work with seeding UWEZO also led participants to see that community led, volunteer driven, large scale evaluations were possible. This was a revelation among civil society organizations in Tanzania since the 'spirit of volunteerism' is thought not to be inherent in the Tanzanian community. However, through our field visits in Tanzania we recognized a strong underlying current - it sets the stage for a united national campaign that can drive the wheels of change. In a country largely driven by foreign aid, this nuance of ASER and now a driving force of UWEZO was remarkable.

As "doers" of ASER in India we have had many opportunities to discuss the data, list out its implications, drive community action, fight the opponents, disseminate the findings to a vast and varied audience and stimulate debate. After several years of experiences with ASER across the country, we had begun to take these key elements for granted. Getting caught up in this whirl was easy and therefore the characteristics of ASER became as a matter of fact for us. But as representatives of ASER in a country in East Africa we became mindful of the strength of ASER - speed, scalability and regularity; strengths which are now guiding UWEZO and becoming internalized by its "doers". We realized that the UWEZO coordinators were conscious and sensitive of these unique traits of ASER and wanted to instill these in the UWEZO initiative. They made all efforts to ensure that their master trainees and core team members engaged in conversations with us to take full advantage of our visit. It became evident to us that the purpose of our visit was not just to impart technical knowledge about the survey to the UWEZO team members but also to inculcate in them the fundamentals of ASER.

Whether it is through UWEZO or through a similar activity in Pakistan in 2008, numbers from such national assessments tell us the status of how much or how little are children learning in school. But whatever the numbers; whatever the saga of elementary education in India or in Kenya or in Tanzania - what is extraordinary is the fact that ASER as a method, as a design, as a mass movement has no boundaries. Asante ASER!



## About the survey

## What's new in ASER 2009

The purpose of the ASER 2009's rapid assessment survey in rural areas is twofold: (i) to get reliable estimates of the status of children's schooling and basic learning (reading and arithmetic level) at the district level; and (ii) to measure the change in these basic learning and school statistics from last year. Every year a core set of questions regarding schooling status and basic learning levels remains the same. However a set of new questions is added for exploring different dimensions of schooling and learning at the elementary stage. The latter set of questions is different each year.

ASER 2009 brings together elements from various previous ASERs. English testing and questions on tuition have been brought back from 2007. As in 2006, mothers have been tested for basic reading. As in 2008, ASER 2009 records household and village characteristics. In addition, this year ASER records education of fathers.

Every alternate year, ASER surveyors visit a government primary or upper primary school in each sampled village. The school information is recorded either based on observations (such as attendance or usability of the facilities) or with information provided by the school (such as grants information). School observations were done reported in 2005 and 2007 and also in ASER 2009.

Finally, ASER 2009 continues the process of strengthening and streamlining started in 2008. In each district $2-4$ villages were re-visited after the survey in order to check how the survey was conducted.

## Sampling Strategy (Household sample - children's learning and enrolment data)

The sampling strategy used helps to generate a representative picture of each district. All rural districts are surveyed. The estimates obtained are then aggregated (using appropriate weights) to the state and all-India levels. Like previous years, since 2006, the sample size is 600 households per district. The sample design is a two-stage sample, stratified in the first stage. The sample is obtained by selecting 30 villages per district and 20 households per village.

The villages are randomly selected using the village directory of the 2001 Census. The sampling is done using the PPS (Probability Proportional to Size Sampling) technique. PPS is a widely used standard sampling technique and is the appropriate technique to use when the sampling units are of different sizes. In our case, the sampling units are the villages. This method allows villages with larger populations to have a higher chance of being selected in the sample.

In ASER 2008, we retained 10 villages from 2006 and 2007 and added 10 new villages. In ASER 2009 we drop the 10 villages from ASER 2006, keep the 10 villages from 2007 and 2008 and add 10 more villages from the Census village directory. The 10 new villages are also chosen using PPS. The 20 old villages and the 10 new villages give us a "rotating panel" of villages, which generates more precise estimates of changes. Since one of the objectives of ASER is to measure the change in learning, creating a panel is an appropriate sampling strategy.
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## How to make a map and make sections

## To start MAKING A MAP - walk \& talk:

- To get to know the village, walk around the whole village first before you start mapping. Talk to people: How many different hamlets/sections are there in the village? Where they are located? What is the social composition of the households in each hamlet/section? What is the estimate of households in each hamlet/section? Tell them about ASER. This initial walking and talking may take more than an hour.


## Map:

- Rough map : It is often helpful to first draw all the roads or paths coming into the village and going out of the village. It helps to begin by drawing a map on the ground so that people around you can see what is being done. Use the help of local people to show the main landmarks - temples, mosques, river, road, school, bus-stop, panchayat bhavan, shop etc. Mark the main roads/streets/paths through the village prominently on the map. If you can, mark the directions - north, south, east, west.
- Final map : Once everyone agrees that this map is a good representation of the village, and it matches with your experience of having walked around the whole village, copy it on to the map sheet that has been given to you.


## ONCE THE MAP IS MADE, HOW TO MAKE SECTIONS IN THE MAP:

- How to mark and number sections on the map you have made?


## Village with hamlets:



- If it is a village with hamlets:
o Mark the hamlets on the map and indicate approximate number of households in each hamlet.
o If the village consists of more than 4 different hamlets, then make chits with numbers for each hamlet. Randomly pick 4 chits. On the map, indicate which hamlets were randomly picked for surveying.

If there are 4 or less hamlets, then go to all of these hamlets. Do not worry if there are more people in one hamlet than in other.

We will survey that hamlet as long as there are households in it.

- If it is a village with continuous habitations:
o Divide the entire village into 4 sections equally.
0


## What to do in each section/hamlet

- In the entire village, information will be collected for $\mathbf{2 0}$ randomly selected households:

5 households from each of the 4 hamlets/sections.

- Go to each selected hamlet/section. Try to find the central point in that hamlet/section. Stand facing dwellings in the center of the habitation.
- Conduct the survey with every $5^{\text {th }}$ household rule. While selecting households count only those dwellings that someone lives in. In every $5^{\text {th }}$ dwelling (ghar/house):
o Multiple kitchens : Ask how many kitchens or 'chulhas' there are? If there is more than one kitchen, then randomly select any one of the kitchens in that household. After completing survey in this house proceed to next $5^{\text {th }}$ house. (House in this case refers to the every 'door or entrance to the house'). In each selected household, ask about all children in the age group 3 to 16 who eat from the same kitchen.
o No children : If there are no children or no children in the age group 3-16 in the selected household but there are inhabitants, INCLUDE THAT HOUSEHOLD. Take the following information like name of head of the household, total number of members of the household, information about adult woman in the household and household assets. Such a household WILL COUNT as one of the 5 surveyed households in each hamlet/section.
o House closed: If the selected house is closed or if there is nobody at home, note that down on your compilation sheet as "house closed". THIS HOUSEHOLD DOES NOT COUNT AS A SURVEYED HOUSEHOLD. DO NOT INCLUDE THIS HOUSEHOLD IN THE SURVEY SHEET. Move to the next/adjacent open house. Continue until you have 5 households in each hamlet/section in which there were inhabitants.
o No response: If a household refuses to participate, note that down on your compilation sheet as "No response". However, as above, THIS HOUSEHOLD DOES NOT COUNT AS A SURVEYED HOUSEHOLD. DO NOT INCLUDE THIS HOUSEHOLD IN THE SURVEY SHEET. Move on to the next house. Continue until you have 5 households in each hamlet/section in which not only were the inhabitants present, but they also participated in the survey.
- Stop after you have completed $\mathbf{5}$ households in each hamlet/section. If you have reached the end of the section before 5 households are sampled, go around again using the same every $5^{\text {th }}$ household rule. If a surveyed household gets selected again then go to the next household. Continue the survey till you have 5 households in the section.
- Now move to the next selected hamlet/section. Follow the same process.
- Make sure that you go to households ONLY when children are likely to be at home. This means that it should be on a Sunday.



## WHAT TO DO IN EACH HOUSEHOLD

IN EACH SAMPLED HOUSEHOLD: We will note information about the household and about the children, their mother, father and all other adult female members of that household who live there on a regular basis.

Household with multiple kitchens: In case of a household with multiple kitchens, randomly pick one and record the total number of members who eat from that chosen kitchen.

Children 3 to 6: On the household sheet, note down the child's name, age, whether they are attending anganwadi (ICDS) or balwadi or nursery/LKG/UKG, etc. If the child is not going to any anganwadi/preschool, etc., note it down under the "Not going". We will not test these children if they are under 5.

## A 6 year old child in LKG will be recorded under 'Anganwadi or Pre School status'.

A 7 year old child in LKG will be recorded under 'schooling status'. Write LKG under 'Std'.

Children 5 to 16: On the household survey sheet, note down child's name, age and all other details.
o Ask all children between the age of 5-16, if they ever went to an anganwadi/balwadi.
o Ask all children if they take any tuition, meaning paid classes in addition to regular school.
o Also ask children if they go to the specific school which you have/will be surveying.
o All children in this age group will be tested in basic reading, basic math and English. (We know that younger children will not be able to read much or do sums but still follow the same process for all children so as to keep the process uniform). Ensure that the child is comfortable before and during the test and that sufficient time is given to each child.

Fathers: Note down information about the father for each child in the age group of 3 to 16 . This will include age, whether he has attended school or not and up to what class he has studied. Fathers will not be tested.
o If father is not present in the house at the time of your visit, note down all information available.
o Do not take information if the father is dead.
Mothers and all other adult women in the household: Note down the name of the mother for each child in the age group 3 to 16. In the adult female education box, note down the following information for mothers and all other women in the household who are above the age of 16: name, age, whether she has attended school or not and up to what class she has studied. Then ask the woman to read the simple paragraph from the testing tool and note whether she was able to read the paragraph or not in the adult women test box. Ask each woman to read even if she has never been to school.

Please note that it would be best to have at least one female member in the survey team or be accompanied by a (local) woman to gather this information.

## Dropped out children who are not currently in school:

o Probe carefully to find out the class in which the child was in when she left/dropped out of school. Note the drop out class irrespective of the fact whether the child passed or failed in that class.
o Record the actual year when the child left school. E.g. if the child dropped out in 2002 write ' 2002 '. Similarly if the child dropped out in the last few months write ' 2009 '.

Other things to remember: Ask members of the household as well as neighbours about who all live in the sampled household on a regular basis. We will take information only about those children.
o Older children: Often older girls and boys (in the age group 11 to 16) may not be thought of as children. Be sensitive to this issue. Avoid saying "children". Probe about who all live in the household to make sure that nobody in this age group gets left out. Often older children who cannot read are very shy and hesitant about being tested.
o Children who are not at home but somewhere in the village: Often children are busy in the household or in the fields. If the child is in the village, but not at home, take down information about the child, like name, age, schooling status. Ask family members to call the child so that you can speak to her directly. If she does not come immediately, mark that household and revisit it once you are done surveying the other households.
o Children out of the village: If there are children in the family but who are not present in the village during the visit, do not take their details.
o Visiting children : Do not survey or test children who are visiting their relatives or friends in the sampled village or household.

Many children may come up to you and want to be included out of curiosity. Do not discourage children who want to be tested. You can interact with them. But concentrate on the fact that data must be noted down ONLY for children from households that have been randomly selected.

Household indicators: All information on household indicators is to be recorded based, as much as possible, on observation and evidence. However, if for some reason you cannot observe it note down what is reported by the household. Ensure that information is about assets owned by the household. This information is being collected in order to link education status of the child with household economic conditions.

- Type of house the child lives in: Types of houses are defined as follows:
o Pucca House: A pucca house is one which has walls and roof made of the following material:
- Wall material: Burnt bricks, stones (packed with lime or cement), cement concrete, timber, ekra etc
- Roof Material: Tiles, GCI (Galvanised Corrugated Iron) sheets, asbestos cement sheet, RBC,(Reinforced Brick Concrete), RCC (Reinforced Cement Concrete), timber etc.
o Kutcha House: The walls and/or roof are made of material other than those mentioned above, such as unburnt bricks, bamboos, mud, grass, reeds, thatch, loosely packed stones, etc.
o Semi-Pucca house: A house that has fixed walls made up of pucca material but roof is made up of the material other than those used for pucca house.
- Electricity in the household:
o Mark yes or no by observing if the household has wires/electric meters and fittings or not.
o Mark yes or no if the household had electricity on the day of your visit.
- Toilets:
o Mark yes or no by observing if there is a constructed toilet in the house.
- Television and phone:
o Phone means only mobile phones.
- Vehicles:
o For each of the given types of vehicles write the number in the appropriate box. Apart from cycle other vehicles recorded should only include motorized vehicles. Three wheeler may include auto, tempo. Four wheeler may include bus, car, truck, etc.

Be polite. Often a lot of people gather around and want to know what is going on. Explain what you are doing and why. Tell them about ASER. Remember to thank people after you have finished surveying the household.

## ASER 2005

Age group 6-14
Children were asked

- Enrollment status
- Type of school


## Children also did:

- Reading tasks
- Arithmetic tasks

School visits

## Sampling :

20 randomly selected villages

## ASER 2006

Age group 3-16
Children were asked

- Enrollment status
- Type of school

Children 5-16 also did:

- Reading tasks
- Arithmetic tasks
- Comprehension tasks
- Writing tasks

Mothers education Mothers were also asked to read a simple text

## Sampling :

20 ASER 2005 villages
Randomly selected 10 new villages

## ASER 2007

Age group 3-16
Children were asked

- Enrollment status
- Type of school
- Tuition status

Children 5-16 also did:

- Reading tasks
- Arithmetic tasks and
- Comprehension tasks
- Problem solving tasks
- English tasks

Mothers education School visits

## Sampling :

Randomly selected
10 ASER 2005 villages
10 ASER 2006 villages
10 New ASER 2007 villages

## ASER 2008

Age group 3-16
Children were asked

- Enrollment status
- Type of school

Children 5-16 also did:

- Reading tasks
- Arithmetic tasks
- Telling time
- Currency tasks

Mothers education Household characteristics Village information

## Sampling :

Randomly selected
10 ASER 2006 villages
10 ASER 2007 villages
10 New ASER 2008 villages

## ASER 2009

Age group 3-16
Children were asked

- Enrollment status
- Type of school
- Tuition status
- Pre-school status (Age 5-16)

Children 5-16 also did:

- Reading tasks
- Arithmetic tasks
- English tasks

Mothers education
Fathers education
Mothers were also asked to read a simple text
Household characteristics
Village information School visits

## Sampling :

Randomly selected
10 ASER 2007 villages
10 ASER 2008 villages
10 New ASER 2009 villages

## ASER 2009 : REAdING TASkS



All children were assessed using a simple reading tool. The reading test has 4 categories:

- Letters : Set of common letters.
- Words: Common familiar words with 2 letters and 1 or 2 matras.
- Level 1 (Std 1) text: Set of 4 simple linked sentences. Each no more than 4-5 words. These words or their equivalent are in the Std 1 text book of the state.
- Level 2 (Std 2) text: "Short" story with 7-10 sentences. Sentence construction is straightforward, words are common and the context is familiar. These words (or their equivalent) are in the Std 2 textbook of the state.


## पढ़ने की जॉँच (3)

Std IILevel
विमला और अजय मेला देखने
गये। उन्हें मेले में तरह-तरह की
दुकाने दिखीं। मेले में बहुत झूले
थे। वहाँ गरम-गरम हलवा और
जलेबियाँ भी बिक रहीं थर्ं।
जलेबी देखकर दोनों के मुँह में
पानी आने लगा। उन्हें जलेबी
खाने का मन करने लगा। विमला
ने जलेबी खरीदी। दोनों ने
मिलकर जलेबी खाई। शाम को
दोनों घर लौट आये।


## In developing these tools, in each state language, care is taken to ENSURE

- comparability with the previous years' tool with respect to word count, sentence count, type of word and conjoint letters in words
- compatibility with the vocabulary and sentence construction used in Std 1 and Std 2 language textbooks of the state
- familiarity with words and context through extensive field piloting


## How to test reading?

## LEVEL 1 (Std. 1 TExT)

## START

HERE:
Present the easy paragraph to the child. Ask her to read it. Listen carefully to how she reads.

The child may read slowly. She may read haltingly; she may make 3 or 4 mistakes in not reading words correctly.

However, as long as the child reads the text like she is reading a sentence, rather than a string of words, mark her as a child who "can read LEVEL 1 text".

While reading the paragraph, if the child stops very often, has difficulty with more than 3 or 4 words and reads like she is reading a string of words not a sentence, then show her the list of words.

## WORDS

Ask the child to read any 5 words from the word list. Let the child choose the words herself. If she does not choose, then point out words to her.

If she can correctly read at least 4 out of the 5 words with ease, then ask her to try to read the Level 1 text again.

If she can correctly and comfortably read words but is still struggling with the Level 1 text, then mark her as a "word" level child.

If she cannot correctly read at least 4 out of the 5 words she chooses, then show her the list of letters.

If the child reads the paragraph fluently and with ease, then ask her to read the long text. This is also called LEVEL 2 text.

## LeVEL 2 (Std. 2 Text)

Show the child the story. If she can read fluently with ease, then mark her as a child who "can read LEVEL 2 text".

If she is unable to read the long text fluently and stops a lot, mark her as a child who "can read LEVEL 1 text".

LETTERS Ask the child to read any 5 letters from the letters list. Let the child choose the letters herself. If she does not choose, then point out letters to her.

If she can correctly recognize at least 4 out of 5 letters with ease, then show her the list of words again.

If she can read 4 out of 5 letters but cannot read words, then mark her as a child who "can read letters".

If she cannot read 4 out of 5 letters correctly, then mark her as a child who "cannot even recognize letters" or as "nothing".


All children were assessed using a simple arithmetic tool. The arithmetic test has 3 categories:

- Number recognition 1 to 9 : randomly chosen numbers from

1 to 9

- Number recognition 11 to 99 : randomly chosen numbers from

11 to 99

- Subtraction: 2 digit numerical problems with borrowing
- Division: 3 digit by 1 digit numerical problems.


## MATH TEST/गणित SAMPLE(3)



## SUBTRACTION: 2 DIGIT WITH BORROWING

## START HERE

Show the child the subtraction problems. She can choose, if not you can point.
Ask the child what the numbers are.
Now ask her to write and solve the problem. Observe to see if she does it in the correct written numerical form.

Ask her to do a second one.

If she cannot do both subtraction problems, then give her the number recognition (11-100) task.

## NUMBER RECOGNITION (11-100)

Point one by one to at least 5 numbers. Child can also choose.

Ask her to identify the numbers.
If she can correctly identify at least 4 out of 5 numbers then mark her as a child who can "recognize numbers from 11-100."

If she cannot recognize numbers from 11-99, then give her the number recognition (1-9) task.

## NUMBER RECOGNITION

 (1-9)Point one by one to at least 5 numbers. Child can also choose.

Ask her to identify numbers.
If she can correctly identify at least 4 out of 5 numbers then mark her as a child who can "recognize numbers from 1-9."

If not, mark her as a child who "cannot recognize numbers" or "nothing".

If she does both the subtraction problems correctly, ask her to do a division problem.


DIVISION
3 DIGIT BY 1 DIGIT
Show the child the division problems. She can choose one to try. If not, then you pick one. Ask her to tell you what the problem is and what she has to do.

Ask her to write and solve the problem.
Observe what she does. If she is able to correctly solve the problem, then mark her as a child who can do "division"

If she is unable to do one problem, give her another problem from the sheet.

If she is unable to solve a division problem correctly, mark her as a child who can do "subtraction".

## ASER 2009 : ENGLISH TASK

All children are given reading tasks in their own language (or the language of their choice). All children are also given a set of simple tasks to do in English.

The English test includes reading and simple comprehension activities.
Children were asked to read :
Capital letters

## Small letters

Words: These are common 3 letter words, familiar to children from their daily life. After reading the word, the child is asked what the word means. The child can reply in her own language. Words are chosen with care. Not only is the word easy to read in English, it is also a simple and familiar word in the child's own language.

Sentences: These are sentences with common words and simple syntax. Each sentence has no more than 5 words. After reading the sentence, the child is
 asked the meaning of the sentence in her own language.
The child is marked at the highest level that she can read comfortably. If the child can read a word, then she is asked the meaning of the word. If the child can read sentences, then she is asked the meaning of the sentence.

## ENGLISH TEST Sample (1)

Give this test is NiL ehaldren.
Wocost the highest reeding level.
For word 4 sertance mearinge, nats childy ability to do each.

| ${ }^{(1)} \mathbf{A} \quad \mathbf{J} \quad \mathbf{Q}$ | ${ }^{\infty} \mathbf{h}$ lll |
| :---: | :---: |
| R E | u m |
| Y $\mathrm{N} \quad \mathrm{O}$ | d $\quad \mathrm{g}$ |
|  |  |
| ${ }^{\text {® }}$ | What is your name? |
| cup | This is a small bag. |
| lip pig | 1 like to read. |
| bus | I have a mother. |
|  | - |
|  | , mixmmem |

## CAPITAL LETTERS

## START HERE

Point one by one to at least 5 letters.
Ask her to identify the letters.

If she correctly recognizes 4 out of 5 letters then show her the list of small letters. If she reads capital letters but is struggling with identifying small letters, then mark her as a child who can read "capital letters."

If she is unable to recognize 4 out of 5 capital letters from the list, then mark her as a child who "cannot even recognize capital letters" or as "nothing".

## SMALL LETTERS

Point one by one to at least 5 letters.
Ask her to identify the letters.

If she correctly recognizes 4 out of 5 small letters with ease, then show her the list of words.

If she reads small letters but is struggling with reading words, then mark her as a child who can read "small letters."

## SIMPLE WORDS

Point one by one to at least 5 words.
Ask her to read the words.

If she correctly reads 4 out of 5 words, then show her the list of sentences.

If she reads words but is struggling with reading sentences, then mark her as "word" level child.

## EASY SENTENCES

Ask her to read the 4 sentences. If she reads at least 2 out of the 4 sentences fluently (does not stop frequently or read like she is reading a string of words), then mark her as "sentence level" child.

## Meaning of words and sentences in local language.

Word meanings : If a child is able to read words, ask her the meaning of the words in her own language. Meaning of words can be the literal meaning or it can be a close associated word. If she correctly says the meaning of at least 4 words, mark her as a child who "can say meanings"; else mark her as a child who "cannot say meanings".

Sentence meanings : If a child is able to read sentences, ask her the meaning of the sentences in her own language. She should, at least, be able to say the meaning of the underlined words in the sentence. If she can correctly tell the meaning of at least 2 sentences, mark her as a child who "can say meanings"; else mark her as a child who "cannot say meanings".

## WHAT TO DO IN A SCHOOL?

## GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

- Visit any government school in the village with classes from Std 1 to 7/8. If there is no school in the village which has classes from 1 to 7/8, then from the remaining government schools visit the school with the highest enrollment in Std 1 to $4 / 5$. In the top box of the Observation Sheet, tick according to the school type. Do not visit if it does not have classes from Std 1 to $4 / 5$.
- If the village does not have a government school with primary classes, do not visit any school.
- Note the time of entry, date and day of visit to the school.
- Meet the Head Teacher (if the Head Teacher (HM) is absent, then meet the senior most teacher of the school). Explain the purpose and history of ASER and give the letter.
- Ask the year in which the school was established.
- Also ask for the school's DISE (District Information System for Education) code.
- When at the school, ask the Head Teacher for the Enrolment register or any official document on the enrolment in that school.


## WHAT TO DO

## Section 1-Children's Enrollment \& Attendance

- ASK for the registers of all the standards and fill in the enrollment. If a standard/class has many sections, then randomly choose any one section.
- Then MOVE AROUND to the classes/areas where children are seated and take down their attendance class-wise by counting them YOURSELF. You may need to seek help from the teachers to distinguish children class-wise as they are normally found seated in mixed groups. In such a case, ask children from each standard to raise their hands. Count the number of raised hands and accordingly fill the same in the observation sheet, class - wise. Please note that only children who are physically present in the class while you are counting should be included.


## Section 2-Teachers

- Ask the HM and note down the number of teachers appointed.
- Observe how many are present. Please note that the number of regular government teachers does not include the Head Master.
- If the school has para-teachers or teachers, mark them separately. In many states para-teachers are called by different names such as Shiksha Mitra, education volunteer etc.
- Thereafter note how many teachers are absent.


## Section 3-Class Room Observations

- This section is for Std. 2 and Std. 4 only. If there is more than one section for a class, then randomly choose any one. You may need to seek help from the teachers to distinguish children class-wise as they are normally found seated in mixed groups.
- OBSERVE the seating arrangement of children (are they in mixed groups or sitting class-wise) and condition of the blackboards and fill accordingly.
- OBSERVE where children are sitting (in classroom, in the verandah or outside) and fill accordingly.
- OBSERVE if there is any other (except text books) teaching material available in the classroom like charts etc.


## Section 4- Mid-day meal (MDM)

- Ask head teacher/ any other teacher if the MDM happened in the school on the day of the survey.
- Observe if it was served to the children, if there was any other evidence of MDM such as dirty utensils or food being brought from outside the school. Mark Yes or No accordingly.


## Section 5-Facilities in the school

- Count the total number of pucca rooms in the school and the number of rooms being used for teaching purposes.
- OBSERVE if there is a hand pump/tap which can be used for drinking water and if not, whether drinking water is available.
- OBSERVE if the school has a boundary wall/fence or not.


## Section 6-School Grant Information

- For this section, note down information for financial year 2008 and financial year 2009.
- The Head Teacher should be asked this section. In the absence of the Head Teacher, ask a teacher present and tick the designation of the person being asked (Head Teacher/ Regular teacher/ Para teacher).
- Ask the person answering this section about the grant very politely. If the person refuses to answer or is hesitant to answer this section, then do not force the person and move on to the next section.
- Ask if the school got four grants viz. new classrooms, school maintenance, school development and TLM grant. If yes, note down the amount. If the HM says that he/she is going to receive the grant in the future, then mark "no".
- Thereafter ask whether the entire amount was spent or not.
- If the respondent does not know under what head the grant was received or spent include such information under 'other grants'.
- Then ask if the school has had the school whitewashed, constructed new classrooms and a boundary wall since April 2008. Tick the appropriate boxes.


## Section 7 - Toilet Facility in the School

- OBSERVE whether the school has a common toilet, a separate toilet for girls, a separate toilet for boys and a teacher's toilet.
- For each type of toilet facility that you find at the school, note whether it was unlocked and usable or not.


ASER 2009 SURVEY - HOUSEHOLD SURVEY SHEET


| State Name | HARYANA | Block name | ROHTAK |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| District Name | ROHTAK | Vlllage Name | PAHARAWAR |
| Names of ASER Surveyors |  |  |  |
| Date of Survey | 28 | 11 | 09 |

Please fick the relevant box
Did You See/Observe yoursell?(Mark these answes based on your own observation)

|  | Pucca road leading to the villoge? | YES | NO |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Electricity connection in the village? | YES | NO |
|  | Post office in the village? | YES |  |
|  | STD Booth? | YES | NO |
|  | Bank? (Any type) | YES | NO |
|  | Govt Ration Shop in the village? | YES | NO |
|  | Primary/Sub Health Centre? [Gout.) | YES | NO |
|  | Ptivate Health Clinic? | YES | NO |
|  | ASHA Volunteer? | YES | NO |
| $\begin{aligned} & n \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | Govt Primary School (Upto Std. 4/5) | YES | NO |
|  | Govt Middle School(Upto Std 7/8) | YES | NO |
|  | Govt Secondary SchoollUpto Std 10) | YES | NO |
|  | Private School | YES | NO |
|  | Anganwadi/Pre-School | YES | NO |

गाँव की जानकारी
2009

| दाज्य का नाम |  | HARYANA | ब्लौक/तालुका का नाम | KALANUR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| जिल का नाम |  | ROHTAK | गाँव का नाम | BALAB |
| सर्वैक्षक का नाम |  | VIKRAM | सर्वे का बिनांक | 27\|11/2009 |
|  |  | JASMER | सर्य का दिन | FRIDAY |
| उचित खाने में निशान लगाए |  |  | क्या आपने गाँद में निम्नलिख्तित तुुियाओं को खुद वेखा/अवलोकम किज्या (अपने अवलोकन के आघार पर निशान लगाए) |  |
|  | क्या गीव में जाले क लिये प्क्का रोह है? |  | हों $V$ | नही |
|  | क्या गत्य मे बिजाली ? ? |  | हों $\checkmark$ | नही |
|  | क्या गगँत में दाकघर है? |  | हों | नही |
|  | STD बूथ है? |  | होँ | नही |
|  | बैंक हैं (किसी मी प्रकार का) |  | ถึ่ ป | नही |
|  | क्या गौव में सरकारी राशन की दुकान है? |  | हाँ | नही़ी |
|  |  |  | ถi $\cup$ | नहीं |
|  | Pvt. ठौक्टर/ दवाखाना है? |  | ही | नहीं |
|  | क्या गौँव मों आशा कार्यकता है |  | E | नही |
| $E_{6}^{E_{6}}$ | सरकारी प्राथगिक विवालय (करता $4 / 5$ तक) |  | ถี่ | नही़ी |
|  | सरकारी उत्ष प्राषमिक विद्यालय (कक्षा 7/8 तक) |  | सึ | नही |
|  | सरकारी माव्यमिक विद्यालय (क्षा 10 तक) |  | (f) | नही |
|  | निजी विदालय (pv7) |  | हों | नरी |
|  | आंगनवांड/ बालयार्डी |  | (1) | नही |
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| VI. School Grant Information (\$SA) <br> Ask Heocmaster tisis section it absens, ask a feacher who a present |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Igot inlomatian te tha fabice from (tici all applicable\| |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 Heod Moster |  |  | Teocher Poro-lectier |  |  |  |
| Tirant type | Did you gat the gront |  |  |  |  |  | H yer what was the amomil teceved |  | Did you spend the tulamount? |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Abr 2000 -Mar 2009 |  |  | Apr 2009 - 51 date |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Apr } 2009 \\ \text { Bt cole } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Kpr 2008 Mar 2009 |  |  | Apr 2009 - sil date |  |  |
|  | res | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don' } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ | Yes | No | Dan' know |  |  | Ye | No | Don'1 knaw | Tes | No | Bon't know |
| New Classoorm |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Schocl Márvainance Grant | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |  |  | 7500 | 7500 |  |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 5enool Deveicarnent Geant |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2000 | 2000 |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  |
| Teocher GiranifisM\| (tor al teachers) |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3500 | 3500 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other cionts ITolat |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

A1 gavernment schoals in inda receve cerfain fied grants under Sorvo shiksha
Aohipan/SSA]. $\$ 54$ nomb for these granis ate given below. They can way by state.

$$
\text { R. } 2.00 .000 \text { per addWiongi classroom }
$$

$$
\text { Whto Rs } 10000 \text { /sehocls with more thon } 3 \text { clasgoams }
$$

Rs, 1,000 per year/primary school \& 7,000per weor Upreer primory)
25. 500 per feacher per year



## SCHOOL OBSERVATION SHEET - ASER 2009

Pitict Sehore


| L. Childrer's enrollment \& Altendance | 51d. 1 | S08. 2 | 5sd. 3 | Std. 4 | Sod. 5 | S0. 6 | Stid 7 | Id. 8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Chidratsarmiment (Takefom) register youself | 20 | 25 | 30 | 35 | 22 | 31 | 20 | 10 |
| Cbibern's ahendance today" | 15 | 20 | 25 | 14 | 13 | 10 | 11 | 10 |


|  | 9 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% |  | $>$ |  |  | SCHOOL OBSERVATION SHEET－ASER 2009 PAGE 1 of 2



| II．शिद्धक ［प्यावापक से पूर्ये। | कृत्ब बिपूक्त | $\begin{aligned} & \text { पूल उपर्वित } \\ & \text { (सी के मनयद) } \end{aligned}$ | क्त अनुपर्वित <br> （लत्य हं समव） |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| उुख्य अप्वापक | 1 |  | 1 |
| नियमित मख्कारी निशक（ मुख्याज्यामक तो न戶िते | 4 | 2 | 2 |
| पात हीज |  |  |  |
|  | 2 | 2 |  |


| V．विधालय की सुविघाओं पर जानकती（अवलोकन ये जनुस्तार） |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 10 |  |
|  निन्गन लियो） | 0 |  |
|  | ＊ | नA |
|  |  | $\checkmark$ |
|  |  | $\checkmark$ |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |


| 1．बच्चों का नामांकन एवं उपसिथि | ＊＊！ 1 | गखा 2 | went 3 | कहा |  | ＊＊m 5 | Went 6 | अलता 7 | बबा 5 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| क्जा का नामांबन（बद रहैस्टर से तो） | a） 17 | 17 | 35 | 34 |  | 31 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 14 | 15 | 20 | 25 |  | 25 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  <br>  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| III．कहा की जानकारी |  |  |  |  |  |  | IV．मयक्यन योजन |  |  |  |  |
| निनलोकन कर् |  | कड़ी 2 |  | उस्ष 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | f | － 1 | ह | नही |  |  |  |  | （1） | चt |
|  <br>  |  | $\checkmark$ |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  | उस आज विदालम में गर्यान गंग्यन विस्टा <br>  |  |  |  |  |
|  पा किलान तमा। | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { ex }=5 \\ & \hline \text { whe } \end{aligned}$ | $\checkmark$ |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 空可 ${ }^{\text {®N }}$ |  |  |  | 小वा अपने मलनन मोलन टिजित में भाल <br>  |  |  |  |  |
| क्या सड़ा दे सेक बाड़ है？ |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  b |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |  |  <br>  |  |  |  |  |
|  <br>  stre（） |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |  |  <br>  |  |  |  |  |

SCHOOL OBSERVATION SHEET - ASER 2009


## Village Map



## The National Picture



Statewise map showing
\% OF 11 TO 14 YEAR-OLD GIRLS Who ARE NOT IN SCHOOL


Maps may not be accurate or to-scale. These are mere representations.

Statewise map showing \% enrolled children ATTENDING PRIMARY SCHOOL (Std. I-IV/V)


Maps may not be accurate or to-scale. These are mere representations.

## INDIA rural

Std. I-II READING

Statewide map showing \% Children in Std. I-II who cannot even
recognise letters
\% Children in Std. I-II WHO CANNOT EVEN RECOGNISE LETTERS


ANDAMAN \& NICOBAR ISLANDS
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Maps may not be accurate or to-scale. These are mere representations.


## INDIA rural

Std. III-V READING

Statewise map showing \% Children in Std. III-V who can read Level I (Std. I) text or more


Maps may not be accurate or to-scale. These are mere representations.

## INDIA rural

Std. V ENGLISH

Statewise map showing \% children in Std. V who Can read sentences in english

## INDIA rural

Std. IV-VIII TUITION

Statewise map showing \% Children in Std. IV-VIII attending tuition classes

## ASER 2009 Findings

## Fewer girls 11-14 out of school

- The overall percentage of children (6-14) who are out of school has dropped from $4.3 \%$ in 2008 to $4 \%$ in 2009.
- Out of school girls in the age group 11 to 14 has dropped from $7.2 \%$ in 2008 to $6.8 \%$ in 2009. In terms of a decline in percentage points, this decrease is clearly visible in Chhattisgarh (3.8), Bihar (2.8), Rajasthan (2.6), Orissa (2.1), Jammu and Kashmir (1.9). Other than Meghalaya all other states in the North East also show a drop.
- Andhra Pradesh records an increase in the percentage of $11-14$ year old girls out of school from $6.6 \%$ in 2008 to $10.8 \%$ in 2009. So does Punjab from $4.9 \%$ in 2008 to $6.3 \%$ in 2009.


## Private school enrolment hasn't changed much

- Overall, for 6-14 year olds, between 2008 and 2009 there has been a slight decline in the percentage of children enrolled in private school ( 0.8 percentage points). However, six states show a decline in private school enrolment of more than 5 percentage points. Of these, Punjab which has one of the highest private school enrollments in the country shows the greatest drop ( 11.3 percentage points).


## Half of India's five year olds are enrolled in primary school

- In 2009 as in 2008, well over $50 \%$ of 5 year olds are enrolled in school.
- Although for the country as a whole, the status of 3 and 4 year olds going to preschool (anganwadi or balwadi) has not changed much since 2008, among the major states Bihar, Orissa, Chhattisgarh and Gujarat record a more than five percentage point increase in the proportion of children going to anganwadi.


## Learning levels improving in Std 1

- The foundation of children's learning is built in early grades. Overall, the percentage of children in Std 1 who can recognize letters or more has increased from $65.1 \%$ in 2008 to $68.8 \%$ in 2009. Similarly there is an increase in number recognition, with percentage of children recognizing numbers or more increasing from $65.3 \%$ in 2008 to 69.3 in 2009.
- For Std 1 children in government schools in Punjab, Haryana, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh, Jharkhand and Orissa there is an increase of 10 percentage points or more as compared to last year in their ability to at least recognize letters and numbers up to 9. In Tamil Nadu and Goa, there is an improvement in both reading and maths of more than 5 percentage points. Similar increases are visible in Uttarakhand and Maharashtra in maths and in Karnataka in letter recognition.

No major improvements in learning levels for children in Std 5 except in Tamil Nadu for reading and in a few states in maths.

- The all India figure for percentage of all rural children in Std 5 reading text at Std 2 level shows a decline from $56.2 \%$ in 2008 to $52.8 \%$ in 2009. This means that well over $40 \%$ of all rural children in Std 5 in India are at least three grade levels behind.
- In reading, for government school children in Std 5 in Tamil Nadu there is an 8 percentage point increase over 2008 levels. Karnataka and Punjab also show improvements over last year. Hardly any change in other states in reading as compared to 2008.
- In maths, for children in Std 5, for the country as a whole, the ability to do division problems has hardly increased. However 7 states show increases of 5 to 8 percentage points. These states are Himachal Pradesh, Punjab, Assam, West Bengal, Orissa, Andhra Pradesh and Karnataka.


## Wide variation in the ability to read and comprehend English across India.

- The all India numbers indicate that a quarter of all rural children in Std 5 children can read simple sentences. Of those who can read sentences, over $80 \%$ can understand the meaning of the sentence.
- By Std 8, $60.2 \%$ of all children can read simple sentences. In all the north-eastern states (except Tripura), Goa, Himachal Pradesh and Kerala more than $80 \%$ of children in Std 8 can not only read simple sentences fluently but also understand the meaning.


## Increase in tuition classes for all children across all grades

- Nationally, between 2007 and 2009, the percentage of children taking paid tuition increased for every class, in both government and private schools. Only Kerala and Karnataka show a small but consistent decline in the incidence of tuition across government school children in most classes.
- Among government school children, the percentage going to tuition class increases steadily as children move into higher classes: from $17.1 \%$ in Std 1 to $30.8 \%$ in Std 8. Among children attending private schools, almost a quarter (23.3\%) take private tuition from Std 1 onwards. The percentage peaks at $29.8 \%$ in Std 4.
- Children in West Bengal are by far the most intensive users of paid private tuition in the country; more than half of all Std 1 and almost $90 \%$ of all Std 8 government school children take some kind of paid tuition. The incidence of tuition in Bihar and Orissa is also high, with very large numbers of government school children taking tuition, ranging from about a third in Std 1 to well over half in Std 8.


## Children's attendance needs improvement in some states ${ }^{1}$

- Children's attendance in school, as observed on a random day in the school year, varies considerably across states. There are states like Bihar where less than $60 \%$ of enrolled children are attending on the day of the visit in comparison to southern states where average attendance is well above $90 \%$.
- States like Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh, Jharkhand, Orissa and Madhya Pradesh need to pay more attention to raising attendance in schools. In most states, on the day of the visit, close to $90 \%$ of appointed teachers were present in the school.


## Multigrade grouping is widespread

- In 2007 and 2009, surveyors were asked to observe if Std 2 and Std 4 were grouped and sitting together with any other grade. In both years, the incidence of multigrade groupings was high. At the all-India level close to $50 \%$ children in Std 2 and Std 4 were sitting with other classes.


## Increase in usable toilets and improvements in availability of drinking water

- All India figures indicate that overall, the percentage of schools with no water or toilet provision is declining over time. Water is available in $75 \%$ of government primary schools and $81 \%$ of upper primary schools. Usable toilets can be found in over $50 \%$ of government schools. Four out of ten government primary schools do not have separate toilets for girls. This number is lower for upper primary schools at 26\%. About 12-15\% girls' toilets are locked and only about 30-40\% are usable.


## Not all schools received the annual school grants for the last school year

- There is considerable variation across states for grants received in the last school year. In Nagaland close to $90 \%$ of schools visited had received all their annual grants, where as the percentage of visited schools receiving their grants in the 2008-2009 school year was 60\% or below in Jharkhand, Orissa and Madhya Pradesh.

[^7]| Table 1: \% Girls Out of School 2006-2009: Age 11 to 14 |  |  |  |  | Change in \% points |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Selected states | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | $\begin{aligned} & 2006 \\ & 2009 \end{aligned}$ |
| Rajasthan | 19.6 | 14.4 | 14.8 | 12.2 | 7.4 |
| Uttar Pradesh | 11.1 | 8.4 | 10.2 | 9.5 | 1.6 |
| Bihar | 17.6 | 9.7 | 8.8 | 6.0 | 11.7 |
| West Bengal | 12.1 | 8.3 | 7.7 | 8.5 | 3.6 |
| Jharkhand | 13.0 | 8.0 | 9.4 | 7.5 | 5.5 |
| Orissa | 13.7 | 12.4 | 12.0 | 9.9 | 3.8 |
| Chhattisgarh | 13.6 | 8.5 | 8.7 | 4.9 | 8.7 |
| Gujarat | 11.7 | 7.6 | 10.9 | 10.2 | 1.5 |
| Andhra Pradesh | 8.6 | 8.1 | 6.6 | 10.8 | -2.2 |
| Karnataka | 8.0 | 6.2 | 5.9 | 6.1 | 1.8 |
| All India | 10.3 | 7.3 | 7.2 | 6.8 | 3.4 |

Drop in percentage of girls (age 11-14) who are out of school.

- Table 1 lists the states which had the highest incidence of out of school children in 2006.
- Of these states, all except Andhra have recorded a decline in the period 2006-2009.
- Bihar has shown the biggest decrease in percentage points.
- In all these states except Rajasthan, Gujarat and Andhra Pradesh the percentage of out of school girls in the 11-14 age group is below $10 \%$.

| Table 2 : Enrollment in Private Schools 2006-2009 |  |  |  |  |  | Change in \% points |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Selected states | \% 6 to 14 year olds enrolled in private schools |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | $\begin{gathered} 2006 \\ -2009 \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { I } \\ & \text { 프́ } \end{aligned}$ | Kerala | 46.8 | 55.2 | 50.5 | 51.5 | 4.6 |
|  | Haryana | 43.1 | 36.1 | 40.3 | 40.9 | -2.2 |
|  | Punjab | 41.5 | 31.8 | 41.7 | 30.3 | -11.2 |
|  | Jammu and Kashmir | 32.0 | 29.7 | 37.5 | 32.0 | 0.0 |
|  | Uttar Pradesh | 30.3 | 29.1 | 35.9 | 35.8 | 5.5 |
|  | Rajasthan | 25.2 | 26.7 | 32.7 | 30.4 | 5.2 |
|  | Uttarakhand | 21.0 | 25.0 | 27.9 | 24.7 | 3.7 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\bar{D}}^{-1} \\ & \overline{\bar{u}} \\ & \sum \end{aligned}$ | Tamil Nadu | 19.5 | 15.5 | 20.6 | 19.7 | 0.2 |
|  | Himachal Pradesh | 19.0 | 22.6 | 24.3 | 22.0 | 2.9 |
|  | Maharashtra | 18.3 | 25.8 | 25.9 | 28.2 | 9.9 |
|  | Andhra Pradesh | 18.5 | 29.3 | 27.6 | 29.4 | 10.9 |
|  | Karnataka | 16.0 | 11.6 | 18.1 | 16.8 | 0.8 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\sum}^{N} \\ & \overline{\bar{u}} \\ & \sum \end{aligned}$ | Bihar | 11.5 | 7.4 | 8.3 | 5.0 | -6.6 |
|  | Madhya Pradesh | 11.5 | 13.2 | 16.2 | 14.8 | 3.3 |
|  | Jharkhand | 11.3 | 10.3 | 9.9 | 10.0 | -1.3 |
|  | Chhattisgarh | 8.5 | 8.5 | 10.3 | 9.4 | 0.9 |
| $3$ | Gujarat | 5.1 | 5.8 | 8.3 | 10.2 | 5.2 |
|  | Orissa | 4.3 | 3.3 | 4.5 | 4.4 | 0.1 |
|  | West Bengal | 3.5 | 4.3 | 5.3 | 6.5 | 3.1 |
|  | All India | 18.7 | 19.3 | 22.6 | 21.8 | 3.1 |

## Highlights 2006 to 2009

- 14 out of 19 states listed in Table 2 show a rise in private school enrollment.
- Orissa and West Bengal remain states with a very low incidence of private school enrollment.
- Bihar has recorded a steady decline in private school enrollment in this period.
- Five states record an increase of more than 5 percentage points. These are Uttar Pradesh, Rajasthan, Maharashtra, Andhra Pradesh and Gujarat.

| Table 3 : \% Children in Std V in government schools who can read Std II level text 2006 to 2009 |  |  |  |  | Change in \% points |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Selected states | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2006-2009 |
| Madhya Pradesh | 73.1 | 77.3 | 86.8 | 76.0 | 2.8 |
| Kerala | 71.8 | 73.3 | 73.3 | 63.9 | -7.9 |
| Uttarakhand | 69.3 | 67.9 | 64.6 | 65.5 | -3.8 |
| Haryana | 68.8 | 65.2 | 61.1 | 59.3 | -9.4 |
| West Bengal | 65.1 | 68.2 | 45.2 | 45.9 | -19.1 |
| Bihar | 64.3 | 66.7 | 62.8 | 56.7 | -7.6 |
| Himachal Pradesh | 61.9 | 81.2 | 73.6 | 72.2 | 10.3 |
| Maharashtra | 60.1 | 73.7 | 74.3 | 71.5 | 11.4 |
| Assam | 58.7 | 53.0 | 40.9 | 39.8 | -18.9 |
| Jharkhand | 58.5 | 56.6 | 51.9 | 45.9 | -12.6 |
| Orissa | 55.4 | 49.5 | 59.6 | 56.4 | 1.0 |
| Chhattisgarh | 52.6 | 56.8 | 74.1 | 64.1 | 11.5 |
| Rajasthan | 52.2 | 45.6 | 45.1 | 40.1 | -12.0 |
| Gujarat | 47.4 | 47.9 | 43.8 | 42.8 | -4.6 |
| Punjab | 44.3 | 65.9 | 61.3 | 63.8 | 19.5 |
| Andhra Pradesh | 41.0 | 70.6 | 57.6 | 55.2 | 14.2 |
| Uttar Pradesh | 30.9 | 41.8 | 33.4 | 30.3 | -0.6 |
| Jammu and Kashmir | 30.0 | 30.4 | 23.2 | 20.2 | -9.7 |
| Karnataka | 28.8 | 43.3 | 42.9 | 46.1 | 17.2 |
| Tamil Nadu | 27.8 | 33.9 | 26.7 | 34.6 | 6.8 |
| All India | 51.4 | 56.7 | 53.1 | 50.3 | -1.1 |

Note : North East states are not included in this table as coverage of districts varies across states

## Highlights 2006 to 2009

- All India figure does not show change over time.
- However, in Maharashtra, Himachal Pradesh, Chhattisgarh, Punjab, Andhra Pradesh and Karnataka there has been an increase of more than 10 percentage points.
- Tamil Nadu shows an increase of almost 7 percentage points.

| Table 4 <br> : \% Children in Std V in government schools who can |  | Change in <br> \% points |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Selected states | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | $2007-2009$ |
| Madhya Pradesh | 65.2 | 77.5 | 64.9 | -0.3 |
| Himachal Pradesh | 64.6 | 57.4 | 62.9 | -1.7 |
| West Bengal | 61.4 | 29.4 | 36.5 | -24.9 |
| Bihar | 61.4 | 50.9 | 51.5 | -9.9 |
| Punjab | 55.2 | 39.7 | 47.5 | -7.7 |
| Haryana | 53.8 | 45.7 | 46.5 | -7.3 |
| Uttarakhand | 50.9 | 38.4 | 42.3 | -8.6 |
| Maharashtra | 45.7 | 46.9 | 49.8 | 4.1 |
| Andhra Pradesh | 45.2 | 33.5 | 41.5 | -3.7 |
| Jharkhand | 40.4 | 30.5 | 29.8 | -10.6 |
| Kerala | 39.9 | 38.3 | 36.4 | -3.6 |
| Gujarat | 34.0 | 24.1 | 23.6 | -10.4 |
| Orissa | 31.7 | 36.0 | 44.0 | 12.4 |
| Rajasthan | 31.5 | 25.9 | 25.7 | -5.8 |
| Chhattisgarh | 31.1 | 59.5 | 50.7 | 19.7 |
| Jammu and Kashmir | 28.7 | 17.5 | 16.9 | -11.7 |
| Assam | 28.1 | 15.5 | 22.02 | -6.1 |
| Uttar Pradesh | 25.9 | 15.8 | 16.0 | -10.0 |
| Karnataka | 18.9 | 14.9 | 21.0 | 2.2 |
| Tamil Nadu | 15.2 | 9.0 | 11.9 | -3.3 |
| All India | 41.0 | 34.4 | 36.1 | -4.9 |

Note : North East states are not included in this table as coverage of districts varies across states
Highlights 2007 to 2009

- Overall, India figure over this period shows a decline from $41 \%$ to $36 \%$.
- Other than Chhattisgarh, Maharashtra and Orissa, no other state shows substantial improvement.



## SCHOOL ENROLLMENT AND OUT OF SCHOOL CHILDREN

| Table 1: \% Children in different types of SCHOOLS 2009 |  |  |  | \% Out of school |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in School |  |
| Age: 6-14 ALL | 73.0 | 21.8 | 1.2 | 4.0 | 100 |
| Age: 7-16 ALL | 70.4 | 22.2 | 1.1 | 6.3 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 75.6 | 20.5 | 1.3 | 2.6 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 BOYS | 74.3 | 22.1 | 1.2 | 2.4 | 100 |
| AGE: 7-10 GIRLS | 77.2 | 18.5 | 1.4 | 2.9 | 100 |
| AgE: 11-14 ALL | 70.0 | 23.0 | 1.0 | 6.0 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 BOYS | 69.4 | 24.4 | 0.9 | 5.3 | 100 |
| AGE: 11-14 GIRLS | 70.9 | 21.2 | 1.1 | 6.8 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 ALL | 56.9 | 24.9 | 0.8 | 17.4 | 100 |
| AgE: 15-16 BOYS | 57.1 | 25.3 | 0.8 | 16.8 | 100 |
| AgE: 15-16 GIRLS | 57.0 | 24.4 | 0.8 | 17.8 | 100 |


'кот IN SCHool' = dropped out + never enrolled.


| Std. | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 23.2 | 46.4 | 17.2 | 7.6 | 5.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| II | 3.0 | 13.5 | 38.6 | 29.4 | 6.6 | 5.3 | 3.7 |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| III |  | . 5 | 10.7 | 42.2 | 24.6 | 11.4 | 2.7 | 4.9 |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| IV | 3.8 |  |  | 12.6 | 34.0 | 33.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 3.9 |  |  |  | 100 |
| V | 5.1 |  |  |  | 7.6 | 43.7 | 22.8 | 12.3 | 4.1 | 4.4 |  |  | 100 |
| VI | 3.5 |  |  |  |  | 11.9 | 30.6 | 36.9 | 9.4 | 4.8 | 2.9 |  | 100 |
| VII | 5.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 7.2 | 41.5 | 28.2 | 11.6 | 4.7 | 1.8 | 100 |
| VIII | 4.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12.6 | 36.5 | 30.7 | 10.7 | 5.5 | 100 |

How to read the table: In Std III, $78.2 \%(42.2+24.6+11.4)$ children are in age group 8 to 10 .

## Young children in pre-school and school

|  |  |  | In School |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { त } \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | anganwadi | UKG | Govt. | Pvt. | Other |  |  |
| Age 3 | 63.6 | 7.4 |  |  |  | 29.0 | 100.0 |
| Age 4 | 64.6 | 16.6 |  |  |  | 18.8 | 100.0 |
| Age 5 | 27.8 | 8.1 | 36.5 | 16.8 | 1.3 | 9.5 | 100.0 |
| Age 6 | 6.0 | 3.2 | 64.7 | 20.3 | 1.5 | 4.3 | 100.0 |

Chart 3: Trends over time
\% Children age 3-4 not attending Pre-school (ICDS OR OTHER) 2006-2009


[^8] villages.

## Reading in own language

Table 4: CLass-wise \% Children who CAN READ (All Schools) 2009

| StD. | Nothing | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (Std 1 Text) | Level 2 <br> (Std 2 Text) | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 31.2 | 44.6 | 16.1 | 4.8 | 3.3 | 100 |
| II | 11.2 | 33.6 | 31.9 | 14.9 | 8.4 | 100 |
| III | 5.3 | 19.4 | 28.7 | 26.8 | 19.8 | 100 |
| IV | 2.6 | 10.5 | 19.5 | 29.8 | 37.6 | 100 |
| V | 1.8 | 6.7 | 13.2 | 25.5 | 52.8 | 100 |
| VI | 1.0 | 3.9 | 8.1 | 20.8 | 66.3 | 100 |
| VII | 0.9 | 2.8 | 5.3 | 15.6 | 75.4 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.6 | 1.9 | 3.4 | 11.8 | 82.5 | 100 |
| TOTAL | 7.6 | 16.8 | 16.7 | 18.9 | 40.1 | 100 |

NOTE : Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. Thus a child who can read Std II level text can read letters, words, and Std 1 level text.

| Reading Tool |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| पहनन का कण (1) |  |
| बहुत विगों से बारिश हो रसी थी। गाँव में खनी जगह गंदा पानी भर ग्या था। समी बारिक के ककने की राह देख रहे ये। अधानक एक दिन बारिश एक गई। सूरण निकल आया। सब लोग सुश हो गये। आसमान में चिड्रियाँ उहने लर्गीं। लोग अपने कपहे सुखाने लगे। बच्चे भी पर्ँों से वाहर निकलकर खेलने लगे। |  |

CHART 5: TRENDS OVER TIME
\% Children who CAN READ Std II level text (in govt schools in Std IV - VII) 2006-2009


Chart 4: Trends over time
\% Children who CANNOT EVEN IDENTIFY LETTERS (IN GOVt Schools in Std I - IV) 2006-2009


## ARITHMETIC

| STD. | Nothing | Recognize Numbers |  | Subtract | Divide | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1-9 | 11-99 |  |  |  |
| I | 30.7 | 44.6 | 18.7 | 4.0 | 2.0 | 100 |
| II | 11.3 | 34.2 | 36.9 | 13.6 | 4.1 | 100 |
| III | 5.4 | 20.5 | 35.1 | 28.4 | 10.6 | 100 |
| IV | 2.8 | 11.8 | 26.7 | 34.8 | 24.0 | 100 |
| V | 1.9 | 7.5 | 19.8 | 32.7 | 38.0 | 100 |
| VI | 1.2 | 4.6 | 14.3 | 29.7 | 50.2 | 100 |
| VII | 0.9 | 3.4 | 10.8 | 25.3 | 59.7 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.6 | 2.2 | 7.7 | 20.8 | 68.7 | 100 |
| Total | 7.6 | 17.4 | 22.1 | 23.4 | 29.4 | 100 |

NOTE : Each cell shows the highest level of arithmetic achieved by a child. Thus a child who can do division, can also recognize numbers 1-9, 11-99 and do subtraction.

Chart 6: Trends over time
\% Children who CANNOT EVEN RECOGNIZE NUMBERS UPTO 9 (IN GOVt schools in Std I - IV) 2007-2009



Chart 7: Trends over time
\% Children who CAN DO DIVISION (in govt schools in Std IV - VII) 2007-2009


## TUITION

Table 8: Class-wise \% children ATTENDING TUItion CLASSES. by School type 2007 AND 2009

| Year | School | I | II | III | IV | V | VI | VII | VIII |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | Govt | 12.0 | 15.7 | 19.1 | 21.3 | 23.3 | 23.5 | 24.3 | 26.1 |
|  | PVT. | 19.5 | 23.0 | 25.0 | 25.9 | 26.2 | 24.1 | 25.0 | 24.8 |
| 2009 | Govt | 17.1 | 20.4 | 22.2 | 23.4 | 25.3 | 27.6 | 28.2 | 30.8 |
|  | Pvt. | 23.3 | 26.5 | 28.6 | 29.8 | 28.2 | 26.1 | 26.4 | 27.4 |

NOTE : The ASER survey in 2007 and 2009 recorded information about tuition. In both years, the question asked was the following: "Does the child take any paid additional class currently?" Therefore, these numbers do not include any supplemental help in learning that children may have received from parents or siblings or from anyone else that did not require payment.

## LEARNING LEVELS IN GOVERNMENT AND PRIVATE SCHOOLS : TRENDS OVER TIME

Chart 8: \% Children in Std III who CAN AT LEAST READ Std I LEVEL TEXT. BY SCHOOL TYPE 2006-2009


Chart 9: \% Children in Std V who CAN DO DIVISION.
BY SCHOOL TYPE 2006-2009


Learning levels by gender : Trends over time

Chart 10: \% Boys and girls in Std III who Can read at least Std I LEVEL text 2007-2009


Chart 11: \% Boys and girls in Std V who CAN do division 2007-2009


## EDUCATION : FATHERS AND CHILDREN

| Table 9: Fathers and Children 2009 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

NOTE : ASER 2009 recorded information about mothers' education. Similar analyses can be done with mothers and children.


## SCHOOL ENROLLMENT AND ATTENDANCE : TRENDS OVER TIME

| TABLE 10: ToTAL SCHOOLS VISITED |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Type of school | $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | 2007 | 2009 |
| Std I-IV/V : Primary | 4874 | 9230 | 9302 |
| Std I-VII/VIII : Primary + Upper Primary | 3432 | 4836 | 5258 |
| Total schools | 8306 | 14066 | 14560 |


| TABLE 12: Teacher attendance | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Type of school | Std I-IV/V |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |
| \% Teachers attending (average) | 80.9 | 90.9 | 89.3 | 78.6 | 87.3 | 88.7 |
| \% Schools with no teacher present | 4.7 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 3.5 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| \% Schools with all teachers present | 57.4 | 73.7 | 69.6 | 38.2 | 53.7 | 57.9 |


| TABLE 11: ChILDREN'S ATtendance 2005 | 2007 | 2009 | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Type of school | Std I-IV/V |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |
| \% Enrolled children attending <br> (average) <br> \% Schools with less than 50\% | 73.5 | 73.4 | 74.2 | 75.2 | 75.6 | 76.6 |
| enrolled children attending | 12.5 | 12.3 | 11.4 | 10.5 | 11.8 | 9.3 |
| \% Schools with 75\% or more <br> enrolled children attending | 55.5 | 53.5 | 55.0 | 60.5 | 60.6 | 60.8 |

Type of school
\% Enrolled children attending (average)
\% Schools with less than 50\% \% Schools with 75\% or more enrolled children attending

## Table 13: Multigrade classes

200520072009200520072009
\% Of schools in which:
Std II class sitting with another class
Std IV class sitting with another class

| 2005 | 2007 | 2009 | 2005 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2007 |  |  |  |

$\begin{array}{llllll}73.5 & 73.4 & 74.2 & 75.2 & 75.6 & 76.6\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llllll}55.5 & 53.5 & 55.0 & 60.5 & 60.6 & 60.8\end{array}$

## School facilities : TRENDS OVER TIME

| Table 14: Facilities in school |  | 20052007 |  | 2009 | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \% Schools with: |  | Std I-IV/V |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |
| $\stackrel{\vdots}{ \pm}$ | No facility | 21.4 | 15.7 | 15.5 | 16.6 | 12.9 | 11.4 |
|  | Facility but water not available | 11.9 | 8.8 | 9.7 | 11.1 | 7.2 | 7.6 |
|  | Available | 66.7 | 75.4 | 74.8 | 72.3 | 79.9 | 81.0 |
|  | No facility | 39.0 | 22.3 | 16.4 | 22.6 | 14.0 | 10.3 |
| $\stackrel{\square}{0}$ | Facility but toilet not usable | 18.1 | 17.9 | 32.0 | 21.6 | 16.2 | 34.7 |
|  | Usable | 42.9 | 59.8 | 51.6 | 55.8 | 69.8 | 55.1 |
|  | dday meal served on day | 70.5 | 92.5 | 82.4 | 74.6 | 91.6 | 87.4 |


| TABLE 16: GIRLS ToILETS | 2009 | Std I-IV/V |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |
| No of schools visited <br> \% Schools with no separate provision <br> for girls toilets | 7816 | 4573 |
| Of schools where there are separate girls toilets, \% schools where: |  |  |
| Toilet locked | 12.0 | 15.1 |
| Toilet not usable | 17.2 | 19.3 |
| Usable | 31.8 | 39.8 |

Table 15: School improvement \& construction since April 2008

|  <br> Construction | Std I-IV/V |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% schools |  | No. of | \% schools |  |  |
| schs | Yes | No | schs | Yes | No |  |
| Whitewash | 8689 | 67.8 | 32.2 | 4901 | 71.3 | 28.8 |
| Construction of new <br> classroom <br> Construction of boundary <br> wall | 8547 | 24.8 | 75.2 | 4763 | 31.4 | 68.6 |
|  | 8543 | 21.1 | 78.9 | 4746 | 27.9 | 72.1 |

ASER survey was carried out in Oct-Nov 2009. One govt school with primary grades was visited in each sampled village. If there was more than one govt school in a village, then the school with the highest enrollment was visited. Hence the schools visited in the ASER survey do not represent a random sample of schools of the district. The school visits were generally done either on a Saturday or a Monday.

| School Grants |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| New classrooms | Rs 2 lacs per additional room |
| Maintenance grant | Rs. 5000 pa upto 3 classrooms. Upto Rs 10000 pa for more than 3 classrooms |
| Development grant | Rs. 5000 pa for primary schs \& Rs 7000 pa for upper primary schs |
| TLM grant | Rs. 500 pa per teacher |

## School Grants

| TABLE 17: <br> \% Primary <br> SCHOOLS RECEIVING <br> DIFFERENT GRANTS | April 2008-March 2009 |  |  |  | April 2009-October 2009 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Std I-IV/V |  |  |  | Std I-IV/V |  |  |  |
|  | No. of schs | Yes | No | Don't know | No. of schs | Yes | No | Don't know |
| New classroom | 7771 | 21.5 | 67.3 | 11.2 | 6678 | 12.9 | 72.6 | 14 |
| Maintenance grant | 8092 | 73.1 | 15.8 | 11.1 | 6753 | 49.0 | 36.6 | 14 |
| Development grant | 7671 | 64.5 | 23.5 | 12.0 | 6550 | 43.7 | 41.2 | 15 |
| Teacher grant (TLM grant) | 8022 | 80.1 | 12.0 | 7.9 | 6720 | 55.7 | 33.1 | 11. |
| Other grants | 3903 | 22.1 | 62.6 | 15.2 | 3437 | 15.3 | 67.3 | 17. |

Note : No grant information was available for 905 schools out of 9302 primary schools that were visited. This could be because the head teacher was not present, register was not available or the surveyors could not obtain the information. Therefore, the above table is based on schools for which information was available for at least one indicator.

| TABLE 18: <br> \% UPPER PRIMARY SCHOOLS RECEIVING different grants | April 2008-March 2009 <br> Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |  | April 2009-October 200 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |  |
|  | No. of schs | Yes | No | Don't know | No. of schs | Yes | No | Don |
| New classroom | 4397 | 26.0 | 66.0 | 8.0 | 3738 | 14.8 | 74.8 | 10 |
| Maintenance grant | 4486 | 78.9 | 13.4 | 7.8 | 3746 | 57.2 | 32. | 10 |
| Development grant | 4210 | 71.5 | 20.1 | 8.3 | 3564 | 54.3 | 35.0 | 10. |
| Teacher grant (TLM grant) | 4400 | 84.6 | 9.9 | 5.6 | 3641 | 62.5 | 29.6 | 8.0 |
| Other grants | 2248 | 27.7 | 61.7 | 10.6 | 1941 | 18.1 | 68.7 | 13 |
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## Performance of states

| Table 19: | $\begin{gathered} \text { ANGANWADI } \\ \text { OR } \\ \text { BALWADI } \end{gathered}$ | OUT OF SCHOOL | Private <br> SCHOOL | Tuition | Mothers' <br> Reading | Std I-II : Learning levels |  |  | Std III-V : Learning levels |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| States | \% Children (Age 3-4) in anganwadi or pre-school | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) <br> out <br> of <br> school | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) in private school | \% Children (Std IV-VIII) attending tuition classes | \% Mothers <br> (Age: 17-55) <br> who CAN READ | \% Children <br> (Std I-II) who CAN READ letters, words or more | \% Children (Std I-II) who CAN RECOGNIZE NUMBERS 1 to 9 or more | \% Children (Std I-II) who CAN READ LETTERS or more in ENGLISH | \% Children <br> (Std III-V) who <br> CAN READ Level 1 <br> (Std 1 Text) or more | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% Children } \\ & \text { (Std III-V) } \\ & \text { who } \\ & \text { CAN DO } \\ & \text { SUBTRACTION } \\ & \text { or more } \end{aligned}$ | \% Children (Std III-V) who CAN READ sentences in ENGLISH |
| Andhra Pradesh | 84.8 | 6.2 | 29.4 | 26.7 | 53.2 | 82.9 | 85.1 | 70.6 | 66.2 | 63.8 | 26.3 |
| Arunachal Pradesh* | 40.6 | 3.4 | 10.1 | 17.7 | 56.1 | 97.8 | 98.2 | 95.4 | 75.5 | 89.8 | 53.2 |
| Assam* | 73.8 | 4.3 | 14.5 | 23.3 | 72.6 | 76.5 | 78.7 | 46.5 | 58.4 | 50.4 | 14.8 |
| Bihar | 67.9 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 54.0 | 39.5 | 71.0 | 72.2 | 47.8 | 62.1 | 63.7 | 18.2 |
| Chhattisgarh* | 88.5 | 3.3 | 9.4 | 4.0 | 43.9 | 90.0 | 90.0 | 61.3 | 73.4 | 66.8 | 10.5 |
| Dadra and Nagar Haveli | 94.0 | 2.1 | 3.5 | 14.7 | 71.7 | 98.5 | 96.4 | 38.4 | 81.2 | 69.7 | 11.8 |
| Daman and Diu | 93.1 | 0.7 | 34.9 | 41.2 | 89.2 | 90.1 | 90.5 | 53.2 | 67.8 | 59.2 | 24.4 |
| Goa | 91.2 | 0.2 | 55.8 | 52.2 | 92.0 | 97.4 | 98.7 | 88.7 | 95.8 | 91.6 | 65.8 |
| Gujarat | 95.3 | 4.3 | 10.2 | 12.0 | 65.2 | 75.8 | 75.4 | 31.8 | 57.3 | 41.1 | 5.0 |
| Haryana | 71.9 | 3.1 | 40.9 | 20.5 | 66.3 | 85.2 | 85.8 | 76.3 | 70.2 | 67.9 | 32.1 |
| Himachal Pradesh | 93.8 | 0.7 | 22.0 | 11.7 | 85.8 | 91.5 | 92.1 | 82.5 | 82.4 | 81.8 | 43.4 |
| Jammu \& Kashmir | 45.5 | 1.8 | 32.0 | 21.3 | 63.4 | 85.4 | 85.8 | 80.2 | 48.6 | 45.7 | 30.6 |
| Jharkhand* | 72.5 | 5.4 | 10.0 | 31.1 | 50.7 | 77.1 | 77.2 | 55.9 | 57.5 | 51.3 | 10.6 |
| Karnataka | 92.1 | 3.2 | 16.8 | 10.1 | 56.9 | 85.7 | 83.3 | 45.7 | 64.0 | 46.0 | 10.3 |
| Kerala | 85.9 | 0.1 | 51.5 | 40.6 | 97.5 | 96.7 | 96.0 | 88.2 | 83.0 | 75.5 | 42.4 |
| Madhya Pradesh | 86.5 | 2.3 | 14.8 | 14.5 | 40.0 | 95.4 | 94.4 | 70.8 | 87.5 | 81.9 | 18.5 |
| Maharashtra | 95.7 | 1.0 | 28.2 | 12.6 | 76.1 | 93.0 | 93.3 | 52.1 | 86.8 | 73.7 | 18.5 |
| Manipur | 71.1 | 1.1 | 71.5 | 41.6 | 80.6 | 97.9 | 97.7 | 96.3 | 77.3 | 81.5 | 58.6 |
| Meghalaya | 57.1 | 3.8 | 30.7 | 20.8 | 62.1 | 90.3 | 91.2 | 86.3 | 59.6 | 61.5 | 37.2 |
| Mizoram | 88.8 | 1.3 | 17.9 | 11.8 | 87.4 | 91.3 | 91.7 | 87.8 | 73.5 | 79.3 | 42.2 |
| Nagaland | 57.5 | 2.4 | 35.3 | 25.2 | 75.6 | 96.5 | 98.2 | 95.9 | 69.0 | 73.1 | 44.3 |
| Orissa | 82.3 | 6.3 | 4.4 | 54.1 | 61.3 | 88.9 | 87.1 | 44.2 | 69.5 | 64.4 | 17.4 |
| Puducherry | 99.1 | 0.5 | 21.2 | 43.9 | 72.6 | 86.2 | 89.8 | 82.1 | 59.2 | 60.0 | 17.8 |
| Punjab | 80.3 | 5.4 | 30.3 | 26.5 | 70.6 | 90.8 | 87.8 | 75.7 | 71.9 | 70.0 | 24.4 |
| Rajasthan | 64.0 | 6.6 | 30.4 | 10.2 | 37.7 | 71.3 | 71.3 | 48.7 | 55.9 | 47.5 | 10.7 |
| Sikkim | 79.9 | 2.3 | 28.3 | 37.2 | 65.0 | 95.5 | 97.4 | 94.0 | 78.9 | 77.8 | 60.9 |
| Tamil Nadu | 92.6 | 0.9 | 19.7 | 24.0 | 66.6 | 62.4 | 70.0 | 57.5 | 53.0 | 39.7 | 14.9 |
| Tripura | 75.6 | 1.9 | 4.3 | 76.0 | 72.4 | 92.7 | 94.9 | 83.2 | 52.1 | 58.1 | 17.9 |
| Uttarakhand | 84.2 | 1.4 | 24.7 | 12.8 | 72.2 | 83.9 | 82.7 | 69.4 | 73.8 | 62.2 | 23.2 |
| Uttar Pradesh | 53.5 | 4.9 | 35.8 | 13.0 | 33.4 | 68.0 | 66.3 | 45.6 | 48.6 | 35.7 | 8.9 |
| West Bengal | 73.0 | 5.7 | 6.5 | 79.9 | 63.5 | 84.0 | 87.2 | 65.3 | 67.6 | 60.0 | 19.6 |
| Total ${ }^{\wedge}$ | 76.3 | 4.0 | 21.8 | 26.9 | 55.2 | 78.5 | 78.7 | 54.6 | 64.2 | 56.3 | 16.7 |

* Arunachal Pradesh data available for 8 out of 13 districts. Assam data available for 22 out of 23 districts. Chhattisgarh data available for 15 out of 16 districts. Jharkhand data available for 21 out of 22 districts.
^ India estimate based on survey done in 575 districts including 9 districts with incomplete data.


## Andhra Pradesh

Arunachal Pradesh

Assam<br>\section*{BIHAR}<br>\section*{Chhattisgarh}<br>GoA<br>Gujarat



## SCHOOL ENROLLMENT AND OUT OF SCHOOL CHILDREN

| Table 1: \% Children in different types of SCHOOLS 2009 |  |  |  | \% Out of school |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in School |  |
| Age: 6-14 ALL | 64.3 | 29.4 | 0.2 | 6.2 | 100 |
| Age: 7-16 ALL | 63.4 | 27.0 | 0.2 | 9.4 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 63.0 | 32.9 | 0.2 | 3.9 | 100 |
| AGE: 7-10 BOYS | 58.7 | 37.6 | 0.1 | 3.6 | 100 |
| AgE: 7-10 GIRLS | 67.1 | 28.5 | 0.3 | 4.2 | 100 |
| AgE: 11-14 ALL | 67.9 | 22.8 | 0.1 | 9.2 | 100 |
| AgE: 11-14 BOYS | 65.7 | 26.3 | 0.2 | 7.8 | 100 |
| AgE: 11-14 GIRLS | 69.8 | 19.3 | 0.1 | 10.8 | 100 |
| AgE: 15-16 ALL | 53.8 | 22.5 | 0.2 | 23.5 | 100 |
| AgE: 15-16 BOYS | 53.9 | 22.8 | 0.2 | 23.2 | 100 |
| AgE: 15-16 GIRLS | 54.0 | 21.8 | 0.1 | 24.0 | 100 |


note: 'отнer' includes chidren going to madarssa and EGS.
'кот in school' = dropped out + never enrolled.



How to read the table: In Std III, 84.8\% (56.3+19.5+9.0) children are in age group 8 to 10 .

## Young CHILDREN IN PRE-SCHOOL AND SCHOOL

|  |  |  |  | In Scho |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | anganwadi | UKG | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{2} \underset{\pi}{\bar{N}}$ |  |
| Age 3 | 71.7 | 7.7 |  |  |  | 20.6 | 100 |
| Age 4 | 63.7 | 26.2 |  |  |  | 10.1 | 100 |
| Age 5 | 19.5 | 7.3 | 33.5 | 34.9 | 0.4 | 4.5 | 100 |
| Age 6 | 3.5 | 4.5 | 49.1 | 39.5 | 0.1 | 3.3 | 100 |

Chart 3: Trends over time
\% Children age 3-4 not attending Pre-school (ICDS OR Other) 2006-2009


[^10]
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## Reading in own language

Table 4: Class-wise \% children who CAN READ (All Schools) 2009

| StD. | Nothing | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (Std 1 Text) | Level 2 <br> (Std 2 Text) | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| I | 25.2 | 46.3 | 19.6 | 4.4 | 4.6 | 100 |
| II | 7.7 | 30.6 | 38.6 | 14.0 | 9.1 | 100 |
| III | 4.1 | 15.9 | 33.7 | 25.6 | 20.8 | 100 |
| IV | 2.1 | 9.8 | 19.3 | 28.2 | 40.7 | 100 |
| V | 1.2 | 5.2 | 13.2 | 23.8 | 56.6 | 100 |
| VI | 1.1 | 2.7 | 8.5 | 19.4 | 68.4 | 100 |
| VII | 1.2 | 3.0 | 5.9 | 14.4 | 75.4 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.9 | 1.5 | 3.7 | 10.8 | 83.1 | 100 |
| TOTAL | 5.9 | 15.2 | 18.2 | 17.7 | 43.1 | 100 |

NOTE : Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. Thus a child who can read Std II level text can read letters, words, and Std 1 level text.

| Reading Tool |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
| Sod ilter Steliterel |  |  |
| ad weet ins ofordin dis <br>  dodn moduet will pe of we w comb refe bigh ome why oidin noilecodurde uf ther sedet sorrth repto sulbo beliduod apricteros wis weftr Scyos. Joed erdate ets dinthel wodet so then ans es rate trect alge $i=0$ at 60046 6/5 \$00\$w 60 Nsos parboothe th ils weil doord <br>  |  | 006. <br> orth <br> relidiod. <br> 600. <br> bo \$eo <br> $\square$ <br> Itar of <br> Hoeo \$0 <br> vil <br> nd 2var |

Chart 4: Trends over time
\% Children who CANNOT EVEN IDENTIFY LETTERS (IN GOVt Schools in Std I - IV) 2006-2009


CHART 5: TRENDS OVER TIME
\% Children who CAN READ Std II level text (in govt schools in Std IV - VII) 2006-2009


## Reading and comprehension in english

## TABLE 5: CLASS-WISE \% CHILDREN WHO CAN READ

ENGLISH (All Schools) 2009
Cannot Can readCan readCan read Can read Total Std. read
capital
capital
letters $\begin{gathered}\text { small } \\ \text { letters }\end{gathered}$ simple easys capital letters letters words sentences letters

| I | 36.1 | 29.4 | 15.5 | 12.6 | 6.4 | 100 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| II | 21.5 | 28.4 | 18.6 | 19.6 | 11.9 | 100 |
| III | 12.6 | 20.5 | 24.8 | 27.4 | 14.8 | 100 |
| IV | 8.3 | 13.6 | 18.9 | 34.5 | 24.7 | 100 |
| V | 4.1 | 9.2 | 15.3 | 34.1 | 37.3 | 100 |
| VI | 2.8 | 5.0 | 11.9 | 30.3 | 50.0 | 100 |
| VII | 2.2 | 4.1 | 8.2 | 26.0 | 59.5 | 100 |
| VIII | 2.2 | 3.7 | 5.4 | 19.2 | 69.6 | 100 |
| TOTAL | 11.8 | 14.8 | 15.2 | 25.6 | 32.7 | 100 |


| Std. | Of those who can read words, \% who can tell meaning of the words | Of those who can read sentences, \% who can tell meaning of the sentences |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 65.7 | 70.1 |
| II | 70.7 | 72.8 |
| III | 68.9 | 71.5 |
| IV | 70.5 | 72.6 |
| V | 73.2 | 77.6 |
| VI | 69.9 | 79.5 |
| VII | 73.3 | 82.3 |
| VIII | 78.5 | 85.5 |
| Total | 71.4 | 79.4 |

## ARITHMETIC

| Std. | Nothing | Recognize Numbers |  | Subtract | Divide | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1-9 | 11-99 |  |  |  |
| I | 21.6 | 40.2 | 28.7 | 5.6 | 3.9 | 100 |
| II | 6.9 | 23.6 | 47.5 | 16.3 | 5.8 | 100 |
| III | 3.5 | 11.0 | 41.2 | 33.7 | 10.7 | 100 |
| IV | 2.2 | 6.9 | 25.0 | 39.0 | 26.8 | 100 |
| V | 1.0 | 4.1 | 16.9 | 33.8 | 44.2 | 100 |
| VI | 1.2 | 2.2 | 13.6 | 28.9 | 54.1 | 100 |
| VII | 0.8 | 1.5 | 11.2 | 24.8 | 61.6 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.7 | 1.2 | 7.7 | 20.2 | 70.3 | 100 |
| Total | 5.1 | 12.1 | 24.4 | 25.3 | 33.2 | 100 |

NOTE: Each cell shows the highest level of arithmetic achieved by a child. Thus a child who can do division, can also recognize numbers 1-9, 11-99 and do subtraction.

Chart 6: Trends over time
\% Children who CANNOT EVEN RECOGNIZE NUMBERS UPTO 9 (IN GOVT SCHOOLS IN STD I - IV) 2007-2009


| Maths Tool |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
| Tusperina |  | anda | prowidida |
| 27 | 76 58 | $\begin{array}{r}74 \\ -56 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | 1) 993 ( |
| 3 <br> 5 | 69 | $\begin{array}{r} 87 \\ -29 \\ -\quad-35 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 8) 758 ( |
| 9 <br> 8 |  | $\begin{array}{r} 41 \\ -15 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $7 \longdiv { 8 6 5 } ($ |
| 41 | 68 | $\begin{array}{rr} 36 & 68 \\ -18 & 49 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 4) $658($ |
|  | -un-sente | -maturum | -6, |

Chart 7: Trends over time
\% Children who CAN DO DIVISION (in govt schools in Std IV - VII) 2007-2009


## TUITION

| Year | School | I | II | III | IV | V | VI | VII | VIII |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2007 | Govt | 11.0 | 16.4 | 17.0 | 18.6 | 20.8 | 17.3 | 24.6 | 13.5 |
|  | Pvt. | 24.8 | 29.0 | 33.1 | 31.5 | 37.6 | 31.7 | 36.7 | 28.5 |
| 2009 | Govt | 21.2 | 22.9 | 24.7 | 22.3 | 24.7 | 22.4 | 24.1 | 19.8 |
|  | Pvt. | 31.6 | 40.6 | 36.7 | 37.4 | 37.1 | 40.4 | 35.3 | 39.2 |

NOTE : The ASER survey in 2007 and 2009 recorded information about tuition. In both years, the question asked was the following: "Does the child take any paid additional class currently?" Therefore, these numbers do not include any supplemental help in learning that children may have received from parents or siblings or from anyone else that did not require payment.


## ANDHRA PRADESH rural

## LEARNING LEVELS IN GOVERNMENT AND PRIVATE SCHOOLS : TRENDS OVER TIME

Chart 8: \% Children in Std III who CAN AT LEAST READ Std I LEVEL TEXT. BY SCHOOL TYPE 2006-2009


Chart 9: \% Children in Std V who CAN DO DIVISION. BY SCHOOL TYPE 2006-2009


Learning levels by gender : Trends over time

Chart 10: \% Boys and girls in Std III who Can read at least Std I LEVEL text 2007-2009


Chart 11: \% Boys and girls in Std V who CAN do division 2007-2009


## EDUCATION : FATHERS AND CHILDREN

Table 9: Fathers and children 2009

| Fathers' <br> Education | \% Fathers | Of these fathers : |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | \% Children (Std III-V) who can read level 1 (Std 1 Text) or more | \% Children (Std III-V) who can do subtraction or more | \% Children (Std III-V) who can read words or more in English | $\%$ Children (Std IV-VIII) attending tuition |
| No Schooling | 39.8 | 10.6 | 60.0 | 57.3 | 48.3 | 20.0 |
| Std I-V | 17.1 | 5.9 | 67.4 | 64.2 | 58.0 | 25.0 |
| Std VI-VIII | 12.8 | 5.0 | 66.1 | 64.9 | 64.2 | 28.5 |
| Std IX-X | 18.1 | 4.4 | 72.5 | 68.7 | 69.5 | 33.4 |
| Above Std X | 12.2 | 2.8 | 76.8 | 77.4 | 79.3 | 33.7 |

NOTE: ASER 2009 recorded information about mothers' education. Similar analyses can be done with mothers and children.

## SCHOOL ENROLLMENT AND ATTENDANCE : TRENDS OVER TIME

| Table 10: Total schools visited |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Type of school | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 |
| Std I-IV/V : Primary | 192 | 379 | 483 |
| Std I-VII/VIII : Primary + Upper Primary | 168 | 229 | 148 |
| Total schools | 360 | 608 | 631 |


| Table 12: Teacher attendance | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Type of school | Std I-IV/V |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |
| \% Teachers attending (average) | 80.7 | 86.4 | 80.4 | 79.5 | 84.0 | 80.3 |
| \% Schools with no teacher present | 2.1 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \% Schools with all teachers present | 50.3 | 59.9 | 44.3 | 29.3 | 33.5 | 28.0 |


| TABLE 11: CHILDREN'S ATTENDANCE 2005 | 2007 | 2009 | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Type of school | Std I-IV/V |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |
| \% Enrolled children attending <br> (average) <br> \% Schools with less than 50\% <br> enrolled children attending | 78.5 | 75.8 | 76.0 | 76.7 | 77.4 | 77.3 |
| \% Shools with 75\% or more <br> enrolled children attending | 63.3 | 58.5 | 5.4 | 1.2 | 2.6 | 2.7 |

Table 11: Children's attendance
Type of school
\% Enrolled children attending (average)
\% Schools with less than 50\% enrolled children attending enrolled children attending

## Table 13: Multigrade classes

200520072009200520072009
\% Of schools in which:
Std II class sitting with another class
Std IV class sitting with another class

Std I-IV/V Std I-VII/VIII


## School facilities : TRENDS OVER TIME

| Table 14: Facilities in school |  | 200520072009200520072009 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \% Schools with: |  | Std I-IV/V |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{ \pm}{ \pm} \\ & \stackrel{N}{0} \end{aligned}$ | No facility | 32.1 | 14.5 | 18.1 | 22.8 | 16.1 | 18.9 |
|  | Facility but water not available | 10.0 | 9.9 | 14.6 | 6.0 | 7.4 | 16.1 |
|  | Available | 57.9 | 75.6 | 67.3 | 71.3 | 76.5 | 65.0 |
| $\stackrel{\text { む }}{\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\circ}}$ | No facility | 32.8 | 20.4 | 26.4 | 20.4 | 12.8 | 23.4 |
|  | Facility but toilet not usable | 21.2 | 23.0 | 31.8 | 26.3 | 20.2 | 35.9 |
|  | Usable | 46.0 | 56.6 | 41.8 | 53.3 | 67.0 | 40.7 |
| Midday meal served on day of visit |  | 99.5 | 98.1 | 97.3 | 98.8 | 98.7 | 96.6 |

Table 15: School improvement \& construction since April 2008

| School improvement \& Construction | Std I-IV/V |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. of schs | \% schools |  | No. of schs | \% schools |  |
|  |  | Yes | No |  | Yes | No |
| Whitewash | 473 | 59.0 | 41.0 | 141 | 59.6 | 40.4 |
| Construction of new classroom | 472 | 22.3 | 77.8 | 144 | 29.9 | 70.1 |
| Construction of boundary wall | 471 | 25.3 | 74.7 | 144 | 29.9 | 70.1 |

ASER survey was carried out in Oct-Nov 2009. One govt school with primary grades was visited in each sampled village. If there was more than one govt school in a village, then the school with the highest enrollment was visited. Hence the schools visited in the ASER survey do not represent a random sample of schools of the district. The school visits were generally done either on a Saturday or a Monday.

| School Grants |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| New | Rs 2 lacs per <br> classrooms <br> additional room |
| Maintenance <br> grant | Rs. 5000 pa upto 3 <br> classrooms. Upto <br> Rs 10000 pa for <br> more than 3 <br> classrooms |
| Development |  |
| grant | Rs. 5000 pa for <br> primary schs \& Rs <br> 7000 pa for upper <br> primary schs |
| TLM grant | Rs. 500 pa per <br> teacher |

## School Grants

| TABLE 17: <br> \% Primary <br> SCHOOLS RECEIVING <br> DIFFERENT GRANTS | April 2008-March 2009 |  |  |  | April 2009-October |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Std I-IV/V |  |  |  | Std I-IV/V |  |  |  |
|  | No. of schs | Yes | No | Don't know | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No. of } \\ & \text { schs } \end{aligned}$ | Yes | No | Don't know |
| New classroom | 429 | 16.6 | 74.6 | 8.9 | 367 | 5.5 | 86.4 | 8.2 |
| Maintenance grant | 446 | 84.1 | 7.9 | 8.1 | 357 | 13.2 | 79.8 | 7.0 |
| Development grant | 432 | 73.8 | 17.6 | 8.6 | 344 | 8.7 | 84.3 | 7.0 |
| Teacher grant (TLM grant) | 443 | 87.6 | 6.6 | 5.9 | 348 | 12.6 | 81.0 | 6.3 |
| Other grants | 282 | 9.9 | 79.1 | 11.0 | 250 | 4.0 | 87.2 | 8.8 |

NOTE : No grant information was available for 21 schools out of 483 primary schools that were visited. This could be because the head teacher was not present, register was not available or the surveyors could not obtain the information. Therefore, the above table is based on schools for which information was available for at least one indicator.

| TABLE 18: |
| :--- |
| \% UpPER PRIMARY |
| sCHOOLS RECEIVING |
| DIFFERENT GRANTS |
| New classroom |
| Maintenance grant |
| Development grant |
| Teacher grant <br> (TMM grant) <br> Other grants $\mathbf{l}$ |

April 2008-March 2009 April 2009-October 2009
Std I-VII/VIII Std I-VII/VIII

| No. of <br> schs | Yes | No |  | Don't <br> know | No. of <br> schs | Yes | No |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 126 | 21.4 | 69.1 | 9.5 | 103 | 11.7 | 77.7 | 10.7 |
| 133 | 84.2 | 10.5 | 5.3 | 98 | 18.4 | 71.4 | 10.2 |
| 123 | 71.5 | 22.0 | 6.5 | 98 | 18.4 | 68.4 | 13.3 |
| 126 | 87.3 | 7.1 | 5.6 | 93 | 17.2 | 71.0 | 11.8 |
| 86 | 14.0 | 74.4 | 11.6 | 70 | 8.6 | 78.6 | 12.9 |

NOTE: No grant information was available for 10 schools out of 148 upper primary schools that were visited. This could be because the head teacher was not present, register was not available or the surveyors could not obtain the information. Therefore, the above table is based on schools for which information was available for at least one indicator.

## Performance of districts

| Table 19: | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { ANGANWADI } \\ \text { OR } \\ \text { BALWADI } \end{gathered}\right.$ | OUT OF SCHOOL | Private <br> SCHOOL | Tuition | Mothers' READING | Std I-II : Learning levels |  |  | Std III-V : Learning levels |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Districts | \% Children <br> (Age 3-4) in anganwadi or pre-school | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) <br> out <br> of <br> school | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) in private school |  | \% Mothers <br> (Age: 17-55) who CAN READ | \% Children <br> (Std I-II) who CAN READ letters, words or more | \% Children <br> (Std I-II) who CAN RECOGNIZE NUMBERS 1 to 9 or more | \% Children <br> (Std I-II) <br> who CAN READ LETTERS or more in ENGLISH | \% Children <br> (Std III-V) who CAN READ Level 1 (Std 1 Text) or more | \% Children <br> (Std III-V) who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more | \% Children <br> (Std III-V) <br> who CAN <br> READ <br> sentences <br> in ENGLISH |
| Adilabad | 73.4 | 7.0 | 26.6 | 9.6 | 31.2 | 78.1 | 79.8 | 64.5 | 59.0 | 53.3 | 19.1 |
| Anantapur* |  | 9.8 | 19.2 | 24.5 | 47.5 | 80.9 | 85.1 | 66.0 | 66.4 | 69.3 | 22.6 |
| Chittoor | 94.1 | 2.5 | 21.5 | 37.4 | 68.1 | 83.3 | 84.8 | 74.0 | 67.5 | 73.1 | 31.1 |
| Cuddapah | 93.0 | 3.6 | 30.0 | 26.3 | 66.7 | 87.9 | 91.4 | 76.0 | 79.3 | 74.6 | 30.3 |
| East Godavari | 78.5 | 8.3 | 22.4 | 25.5 | 74.9 | 81.4 | 82.0 | 74.3 | 57.5 | 56.0 | 21.7 |
| Guntur | 79.3 | 5.1 | 28.6 | 39.4 | 59.9 | 86.4 | 86.3 | 72.1 | 62.6 | 66.2 | 23.9 |
| Karimnagar | 86.7 | 2.9 | 48.1 | 14.1 | 62.7 | 93.1 | 91.5 | 78.4 | 82.2 | 74.9 | 37.4 |
| Khammam | 78.8 | 8.7 | 24.2 | 14.0 | 71.4 | 75.4 | 78.1 | 58.8 | 66.2 | 49.5 | 19.5 |
| Krishna* |  | 2.4 | 38.5 | 37.2 | 71.6 | 92.8 | 92.8 | 80.6 | 81.3 | 74.6 | 46.3 |
| Kurnool | 75.6 | 8.9 | 25.2 | 30.3 | 43.5 | 78.5 | 81.9 | 67.6 | 59.7 | 51.0 | 24.5 |
| Mahbubnagar | 81.5 | 6.4 | 30.7 | 6.4 | 16.1 | 64.9 | 68.8 | 47.7 | 58.3 | 46.4 | 13.7 |
| Medak | 81.5 | 6.2 | 28.4 | 11.5 | 41.1 | 71.5 | 78.1 | 53.9 | 52.7 | 52.9 | 21.2 |
| Nalgonda | 93.8 | 2.2 | 33.2 | 12.6 | 34.4 | 81.5 | 85.8 | 78.4 | 59.7 | 59.4 | 17.5 |
| Nellore | 92.0 | 5.0 | 22.0 | 31.5 | 65.7 | 94.0 | 94.0 | 83.1 | 76.7 | 76.5 | 30.9 |
| Nizamabad | 97.3 | 10.4 | 34.6 | 14.6 | 80.0 | 88.4 | 91.2 | 78.8 | 63.0 | 61.7 | 25.5 |
| Prakasam | 85.6 | 5.7 | 33.5 | 90.9 | 49.9 | 88.4 | 86.5 | 79.5 | 65.4 | 61.1 | 29.6 |
| Rangareddy | 63.8 | 7.8 | 35.5 | 22.3 | 44.4 | 85.2 | 84.9 | 79.4 | 56.1 | 58.9 | 26.8 |
| Srikakulam | 80.8 | 6.1 | 25.5 | 42.4 | 61.6 | 86.8 | 92.8 | 76.1 | 76.2 | 77.2 | 34.0 |
| Visakhapatnam | 86.8 | 6.9 | 27.0 | 21.6 | 41.0 | 86.4 | 84.0 | 65.5 | 62.5 | 65.9 | 17.9 |
| Vizianagaram | 89.0 | 4.8 | 19.3 | 21.3 | 30.5 | 85.5 | 87.7 | 63.9 | 69.9 | 64.6 | 19.1 |
| Warangal* |  | 16.3 | 30.7 | 11.6 | 51.4 | 86.8 | 89.9 | 80.3 | 54.0 | 55.1 | 14.1 |
| West Godavari | 91.0 | 4.0 | 32.9 | 32.6 | 74.1 | 79.7 | 88.1 | 70.7 | 72.2 | 69.4 | 38.4 |
| Total | 84.8 | 6.2 | 29.4 | 26.7 | 53.2 | 82.9 | 85.1 | 70.6 | 66.2 | 63.8 | 26.3 |

*Blank cells indicate insufficient data.


## SCHOOL ENROLLMENT AND OUT OF SCHOOL CHILDREN

| Table 1: \% Children in different types of SCHOOLS 2009 |  |  |  | \% Out of school |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in School |  |
| Age: 6-14 ALL | 86.2 | 10.1 | 0.2 | 3.4 | 100 |
| Age: 7-16 ALL | 86.0 | 8.9 | 0.2 | 4.9 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 86.8 | 10.6 | 0.1 | 2.6 | 100 |
| AgE: 7-10 BOYS | 86.3 | 11.4 | 0.1 | 2.2 | 100 |
| AgE: 7-10 GIRLS | 86.8 | 9.9 | 0.0 | 3.3 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 ALL | 86.8 | 7.7 | 0.5 | 5.0 | 100 |
| AgE: 11-14 BOYS | 86.4 | 7.3 | 0.4 | 5.9 | 100 |
| AgE: 11-14 GIRLS | 88.2 | 7.0 | 0.7 | 4.2 | 100 |
| AgE: 15-16 ALL | 80.8 | 5.8 | 0.1 | 13.4 | 100 |
| AgE: 15-16 BOYS | 80.8 | 6.6 | 0.1 | 12.5 | 100 |
| AgE: 15-16 GIRLS | 81.1 | 4.9 | 0.0 | 13.9 | 100 |



NOTE: 'отнеR' includes chidren going to madarssa and EGS.
'от IN SCHool' = dropped out + never enrolled.


| Std. | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 23.2 | 51.0 | 15.6 | 6.4 | 3.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| II | 2.4 | 12.7 | 50.2 | 19.1 | 5.9 | 5.5 | 4.3 |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| III |  | 2.2 | 10.2 | 51.1 | 17.8 | 8.6 | 2.7 | 4.5 |  |  | 8 |  | 100 |
| IV | 4.0 |  |  | 13.7 | 37.2 | 27.0 | 4.9 | 5.4 | 3.4 | 4.4 |  |  | 100 |
| V | 0.7 |  |  | 5.7 | 9.3 | 44.9 | 15.3 | 11.1 | 3.7 | 5.3 | 4.0 |  | 100 |
| VI | 1.1 |  |  |  | 4.2 | 15.9 | 31.8 | 26.8 | 6.3 | 8.9 | 5. | . 0 | 100 |
| VII | 6.2 |  |  |  |  |  | 8.2 | 40.6 | 18.8 | 10.0 | 9.3 | 7.0 | 100 |
| VIII | 5.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 13.7 | 36.7 | 22.5 | 11.3 | 10.3 | 100 |

How to read the table: In Std III, $77.5 \%(51.1+17.8+8.6)$ children are in age group 8 to 10 .

## Young CHILDREN IN PRE-SCHOOL AND SCHOOL

|  |  |  | In School |  |  |  | - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | anganwadi | UKG | Govt. | Pvt. | Other |  |  |
| Age 3 | 20.5 | 5.7 |  |  |  | 73.8 | 100 |
| Age 4 | 33.9 | 22.6 |  |  |  | 43.6 | 100 |
| Age 5 | 5.5 | 13.4 | 59.0 | 8.7 | 0.1 | 13.3 | 100 |
| Age 6 | 3.3 | 3.2 | 75.5 | 14.2 | 0.0 | 3.8 | 100 |

Chart 3: Trends over time
\% Children age 3-4 not attending pre-school (ICDS or other) 2006-2009


Of the villages visited, Anganwadi/Pre-School presence has been recorded in 63.2 \% villages.

## Reading in own language

Table 4: Class-wise \% children who CAN READ (All Schools) 2009

| TABLE 4: CLASS-wise \% Children who CAN READ (ALL Schools) 2009 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| STD. | Nothing | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (Std 1 Text) | Level 2 <br> (Std 2 Text) | Total |
| I | 3.7 | 64.3 | 22.2 | 6.4 | 3.4 | 100 |
| II | 0.5 | 18.9 | 60.7 | 13.4 | 6.5 | 100 |
| III | 0.3 | 4.7 | 39.6 | 41.0 | 14.5 | 100 |
| IV | 0.1 | 3.4 | 14.5 | 40.9 | 41.1 | 100 |
| V | 0.0 | 0.9 | 9.3 | 30.6 | 59.2 | 100 |
| VI | 0.0 | 1.3 | 4.1 | 15.9 | 78.8 | 100 |
| VII | 0.1 | 1.4 | 3.6 | 7.8 | 87.2 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.0 | 0.8 | 2.7 | 6.2 | 90.3 | 100 |
| TOTAL | 0.8 | 15.3 | 23.0 | 21.1 | 39.8 | 100 |

NOTE : Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. Thus a child who can read Std II level text can read letters, words, and Std 1 level text.


NOTE : The test was also available in Bodo, Bengali and English.
Chart 5: Trends over time
\% Children who CAN READ Std II level text (in govt schools in Std IV - VII) 2006-2009


Chart 4: TRENDS OVER TIME
\% Children who CANNOT EVEN IDENTIFY LETTERS (IN GOVt Schools in Std I - IV) 2006-2009


## ARITHMETIC

| Std. | Nothing | Recognize Numbers |  | Subtract | Divide | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1-9 | 11-99 |  |  |  |
| 1 | 2.5 | 31.7 | 52.7 | 11.1 | 2.0 | 100 |
| II | 1.0 | 5.4 | 56.9 | 31.7 | 5.0 | 100 |
| III | 0.3 | 1.3 | 18.2 | 64.8 | 15.5 | 100 |
| IV | 0.4 | 1.1 | 5.1 | 46.8 | 46.6 | 100 |
| V | 0.3 | 0.6 | 3.2 | 30.9 | 65.1 | 100 |
| VI | 0.1 | 0.7 | 0.9 | 19.2 | 79.1 | 100 |
| VII | 0.0 | 0.3 | 1.4 | 8.9 | 89.5 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.0 | 0.9 | 1.0 | 7.8 | 90.3 | 100 |
| Total | 0.7 | 6.7 | 21.8 | 29.5 | 41.3 | 100 |

NOTE : Each cell shows the highest level of arithmetic achieved by a child. Thus a child who can do division, can also recognize numbers 1-9, 11-99 and do subtraction.

Chart 6: Trends over time
\% Children who CANNOT EVEN RECOGNIZE NUMBERS UPTO 9 (IN GOVt Schools in Std I - IV) 2007 ANd 2009



Chart 7: Trends over time
\% Children who CAN DO DIVISION (in govt schools in Std IV - VII) 2007 AND 2009


## TUITION

| Year | School | 1 | II | III | IV | V | VI | VII | VIII |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2007 | Govt | 7.8 | 8.2 | 8.9 | 11.1 | 11.9 | 13.1 | 10.8 | 17.9 |
|  | Pvt. | 37.1 | 40.5 | 48.6 | 54.6 | 50.1 | 55.4 | 34.3 | 43.3 |
| 2009 | Govt | 8.9 | 8.3 | 10.9 | 13.3 | 10.1 | 14.9 | 18.9 | 18.6 |
|  | Pvi. | 57.6 | 64.3 | 64.6 | 63.0 | 62.7 | 42.3 | 43.1 | 58.6 |

NOTE : The ASER survey in 2007 and 2009 recorded information about tuition. In both years, the question asked was the following: "Does the child take any paid additional class currently?" Therefore, these numbers do not include any supplemental help in learning that children may have received from parents or siblings or from anyone else that did not require payment.


## ARUNACHAL PRADESH ruRal

## LEARNING LEVELS IN GOVERNMENT AND PRIVATE SCHOOLS : TRENDS OVER TIME

Chart 8: \% Children in Std III who CAN AT LEAST READ Std I LEVEL TEXT. BY SCHOOL TYPE 2006-2009


Chart 9: \% Children in Std V who CAN DO DIVISION. BY SCHOOL TYPE 2006-2009


## Learning levels by gender : Trends over time

Chart 10: \% Boys and girls in Std III who Can read at least Std I level text 2007 and 2009


Chart 11: \% Boys and girls in Std V who CAN do division 2007 AND 2009


EDUCATION : FATHERS AND CHILDREN

| TABLE 9: FATHERS AND CHILDREN 2009 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

NOTE : ASER 2009 recorded information about mothers' education. Similar analyses can be done with mothers and children.


## SCHOOL ENROLLMENT AND ATTENDANCE : TRENDS OVER TIME

| TABLE 10: Total schools visited |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Type of school | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 |
| Std I-IV/V : Primary | 18 | 135 | 83 |
| Std I-VII/VIII : Primary + Upper Primary | 24 | 105 | 77 |
| Total schools | 42 | 240 | 160 |


| Table 12: Teacher attendance | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Type of school | Std I-IV/V |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |
| \% Teachers attending (average) | 79.4 | 91.2 | 89.0 | 89.3 | 82.3 | 83.6 |
| \% Schools with no teacher present | 5.6 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \% Schools with all teachers present | 50.0 | 77.0 | 63.2 | 54.2 | 39.0 | 36.2 |

Table 11: Children's attendanca<br>200520072009200520072009<br>Type of school Std I-IV/V Std I-VII/VIII<br>\% Enrolled children attending (average)<br>\% Schools with less than 50\% enrolled children attending \% Schools with 75\% or more enrolled children attending<br>$\begin{array}{llllll}90.4 & 80.9 & 86.0 & 88.0 & 79.7 & 88.0\end{array}$<br>$\begin{array}{lllllll}0.0 & 7.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 9.2 & 1.3\end{array}$<br>$\begin{array}{llllll}100.0 & 71.1 & 88.9 & 87.5 & 73.5 & 94.7\end{array}$

## Table 13: Multigrade classes

200520072009200520072009
\% Of schools in which:
Std II class sitting with another class
Std IV class sitting with another class

## School facilities : trends over time

| Table 14: Facilities in school |  | 20052007 |  | 2009 | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \% Schools with: |  | Std I-IV/V |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \pm \\ & \stackrel{\#}{0} \\ & \vdots \end{aligned}$ | No facility | 61.1 | 36.2 | 24.4 | 45.8 | 20.2 | 8.0 |
|  | Facility but water not available | 5.6 | 11.0 | 5.1 | 16.7 | 13.1 | 5.3 |
|  | Available | 33.3 | 52.8 | 70.5 | 37.5 | 66.7 | 86.7 |
|  | No facility | 61.1 | 55.1 | 30.8 | 52.2 | 39.8 | 11.8 |
|  | Facility but toilet not usable | 22.2 | 14.4 | 20.5 | 0.0 | 17.3 | 30.3 |
|  | Usable | 16.7 | 30.5 | 48.7 | 47.8 | 42.9 | 57.9 |
| Midday meal served on day |  | 22.2 | 66.9 | 50.6 | 57.1 | 62.4 | 44.7 |


| TABLE 16: GIRLS ToILETS 2009 | Std I-IV/V | Std I-VII/VIII |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| No of schools visited | 69 | 57 |
| \% Schools with no separate provision <br> for girls toilets | 88.4 | 56.1 |
| Of schools where there are separate girls toilets, \% schools where: |  |  |
| Toilet locked | 1.4 | 8.8 |
| Toilet not usable | 2.9 | 10.5 |
| Usable | 7.2 | 24.6 |

Table 15: School improvement \& construction since April 2008

| School improvement \& Construction | Std I-IV/V |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. of schs | \% schools |  | No. of schs | \% schools |  |
|  |  | Yes | No |  | Yes | No |
| Whitewash | 76 | 54.0 | 46.1 | 67 | 55.2 | 44.8 |
| Construction of new classroom | 73 | 27.4 | 72.6 | 67 | 43.3 | 56.7 |
| Construction of boundary wall | 74 | 14.9 | 85.1 | 67 | 19.4 | 80.6 |

ASER survey was carried out in Oct-Nov 2009. One govt school with primary grades was visited in each sampled village. If there was more than one govt school in a village, then the school with the highest enrollment was visited. Hence the schools visited in the ASER survey do not represent a random sample of schools of the district. The school visits were generally done either on a Saturday or a Monday.

| School Grants |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| classrooms | Rs 2 lacs per <br> additional room |
| Maintenance | Rs. 5000 pa upto 3 <br> grant |
| classrooms. Upto |  |
| Rs 10000 pa for |  |
| more than 3 |  |
| classrooms |  |$|$

## SCHOOL GRANTS

| TABLE 17: <br> \% Primary <br> SCHOOLS RECEIVING DIFFERENT GRANTS | April 2008-March 2009 |  |  |  | April 2009-October 2009 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Std I-IV/V |  |  |  | Std I-IV/V |  |  |  |
|  | No. of schs | Yes | No | Don't know | No. of schs | Yes | No | Don't know |
| New classroom | 62 | 22.6 | 72.6 | 4.8 | 51 | 7.8 | 82.4 | 9.8 |
| Maintenance grant | 77 | 67.5 | 20.8 | 11.7 | 54 | 37.0 | 37.0 | 25.9 |
| Development grant | 76 | 63.2 | 22.4 | 14.5 | 55 | 30.9 | 38.2 | 30.9 |
| Teacher grant (TLM grant) | 76 | 72.4 | 13.2 | 14.5 | 51 | 41.2 | 31.4 | 27.5 |
| Other grants | 39 | 2.6 | 66.7 | 30.8 | 37 | 2.7 | 62.2 | 35.1 |

NOTE : No grant information was available for 7 schools out of 83 primary schools that were visited. This could be because the head teacher was not present, register was not available or the surveyors could not obtain the information. Therefore, the above table is based on schools for which information was available for at least one indicator.

| TABLE 18: |
| :--- |
| \% UpPER PRIMARY |
| sCHOOLS RECEIVING |
| dIFFERENT GRANTS |
| New classroom |
| Maintenance grant |
| Development grant |
| Teacher grant |
| (TMM grant) |
| Other grants |

April 2008-March 2009 April 2009-October 2009
Std I-VII/VIII Std I-VII/VIII

| No. of <br> schs | Yes | No | Don't <br> know | No. of <br> schs | Yes | No | Don't <br> know |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 67 | 35.8 | 56.7 | 7.5 | 64 | 15.6 | 68.8 | 15.6 |
| 70 | 58.6 | 20.0 | 21.4 | 66 | 43.9 | 22.7 | 33.3 |
| 70 | 58.6 | 18.6 | 22.9 | 63 | 41.3 | 20.6 | 38.1 |
| 69 | 71.0 | 15.9 | 13.0 | 61 | 52.5 | 23.0 | 24.6 |
| 37 | 2.7 | 64.9 | 32.4 | 35 | 2.9 | 57.1 | 40.0 |

NOTE : No grant information was available for 4 schools out of 77 upper primary schools that were visited. This could be because the head teacher was not present, register was not available or the surveyors could not obtain the information. Therefore, the above table is based on schools for which information was available for at least one indicator.

## ARUNACHAL PRADESH <br> RURAL

## Performance of districts

| Table 19: | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { ANGANWADI } \\ \text { OR } \\ \text { BALWADI } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | OUt of SCHOOL | Private SCHOOL | TUITION | $\begin{gathered} \text { Mothers' } \\ \text { READING } \end{gathered}$ | Std I-II : Learning Levels |  |  | Std III-V : Learning Levels |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Districts | \% Children <br> (Age 3-4) in anganwadi or pre-school | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) <br> out <br> of school | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) in private school | \% Children (Std IV-VIII) attending tuition classes | \% Mothers <br> (Age: 17-55) who CAN READ | \% Children <br> (Std I-II) <br> who <br> CAN READ <br> letters, <br> words or more | \% Children <br> (Std I-II) <br> who CAN <br> RECOGNIZE <br> NUMBERS <br> 1 to 9 <br> or more | \% Children (Std I-II) who CAN READ <br> LETTERS or more in ENGLISH | \% Children <br> (Std III-V) who CAN READ Level 1 (Std 1 Text) or more | \% Children (Std III-V) who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more | \% Children (Std III-V) who CAN READ sentences in ENGLISH |
| Dibang Valley | 5.1 | 0.9 | 8.9 | 13.3 | 95.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 95.6 | 98.9 | 79.2 |
| East Kameng | 37.6 | 1.6 | 3.7 | 4.3 | 19.3 | 90.2 | 94.2 | 94.9 | 40.3 | 66.8 | 13.9 |
| East Siang | 73.1 | 0.4 | 15.7 | 23.4 | 94.6 | 99.5 | 98.6 | 97.1 | 75.8 | 87.9 | 43.9 |
| Lohit | 57.4 | 11.1 | 14.3 | 25.4 | 61.9 | 97.0 | 97.0 | 82.0 | 80.5 | 89.7 | 57.3 |
| Tawang* |  | 3.2 | 12.0 | 48.6 | 36.1 | 95.5 | 93.5 | 96.7 | 40.6 | 87.6 | 46.9 |
| Tirap | 23.7 | 0.2 | 9.8 | 5.8 | 70.4 | 99.8 | 100.0 | 99.8 | 78.1 | 96.2 | 62.3 |
| Upper Siang | 79.5 | 0.5 | 4.9 | 21.5 | 82.7 | 99.4 | 100.0 | 99.4 | 78.9 | 87.7 | 47.6 |
| Upper Subansiri* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 40.6 | 3.4 | 10.1 | 17.7 | 56.1 | 97.8 | 98.2 | 95.4 | 75.5 | 89.8 | 53.2 |

*Blank cells indicate insufficient data.


## SCHOOL ENROLLMENT AND OUT OF SCHOOL CHILDREN

| Table 1: \% Children in different types of schools 2009 |  |  |  | \% Out of school |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in School |  |
| AgE: 6-14 ALL | 77.9 | 14.5 | 3.4 | 4.3 | 100 |
| Age: 7-16 ALL | 75.3 | 14.3 | 3.3 | 7.1 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 80.6 | 14.5 | 2.7 | 2.2 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 BOYS | 78.8 | 16.0 | 3.0 | 2.3 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 GIRLS | 82.8 | 12.5 | 2.6 | 2.1 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 ALL | 73.6 | 14.6 | 4.2 | 7.6 | 100 |
| AGE: 11-14 BOYS | 72.8 | 14.5 | 4.1 | 8.6 | 100 |
| AGE: 11-14 GIRLS | 74.3 | 14.6 | 4.6 | 6.4 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 ALL | 63.8 | 13.3 | 2.9 | 20.0 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 BOYS | 62.5 | 11.4 | 2.4 | 23.7 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 GIRLS | 65.6 | 15.4 | 3.2 | 15.8 | 100 |


note: 'отнer' includes chidren going to madarssa and EGS.
'№т in school' = dropped out + never enrolled.


| Std. | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 23.4 | 43.5 | 21.7 | 7.6 | 3.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| II | 1.7 | 13.1 | 39.9 | 30.4 | 8.0 | 4.3 | 2.6 |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| III |  | 3.2 | 11.1 | 41.4 | 26.7 | 11.3 | 2.0 | 4.2 |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| IV | 4.1 |  |  | 11.1 | 28.1 | 40.2 | 6.4 | 5.8 | 4.3 |  |  |  | 100 |
| V |  |  | . 1 | 3.4 | 8.0 | 35.1 | 28.4 | 14.0 | 5.1 |  | 3.9 |  | 100 |
| VI | 4.0 |  |  |  |  | 11.0 | 21.3 | 44.9 | 11.3 | 4.6 | 3.0 |  | 100 |
| VII | 4.6 |  |  |  |  |  | 6.3 | 32.6 | 36.1 | 14.2 | 4.8 | 1.4 | 100 |
| VIII | 3.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9.4 | 29.4 | 41.9 | 11.1 | 4.4 | 100 |

How to read the table: In Std III, 79.4\% (41.4+26.7+11.3) children are in age group 8 to 10 .

## Young CHILDREN IN PRE-SCHOOL AND SCHOOL

|  |  |  |  | n Scho |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | anganwadi | UKG | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | 흔 춛 |  |
| Age 3 | 64.9 | 4.1 |  |  |  | 31.1 | 100 |
| Age 4 | 70.3 | 8.1 |  |  |  | 21.7 | 100 |
| Age 5 | 35.3 | 7.6 | 38.3 | 9.3 | 1.5 | 8.0 | 100 |
| Age 6 | 8.1 | 2.3 | 71.1 | 12.3 | 2.8 | 3.4 | 100 |

Chart 3: Trends over time
\% Children age 3-4 not attending pre-school (ICDS or other) 2006-2009


[^11] villages.

## Reading in own language

Table 4: CLass-wise \% Children who CAN READ (All Schools) 2009

| StD. | Nothing | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (StD 1 Text) | Level 2 <br> (StD 2 Text) | Total |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| I | 32.8 | 44.2 | 16.1 | 4.8 | 2.1 | 100 |
| II | 12.2 | 34.3 | 31.8 | 13.7 | 8.0 | 100 |
| III | 5.6 | 19.5 | 31.6 | 24.9 | 18.4 | 100 |
| IV | 2.9 | 11.8 | 23.8 | 29.7 | 31.7 | 100 |
| V | 2.9 | 7.0 | 18.1 | 31.2 | 40.8 | 100 |
| VI | 1.3 | 4.0 | 13.4 | 22.5 | 58.9 | 100 |
| VII | 1.1 | 3.6 | 9.2 | 19.3 | 66.7 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.6 | 2.9 | 4.7 | 14.0 | 77.8 | 100 |
| TOTAL | 9.1 | 18.4 | 19.5 | 19.4 | 33.6 | 100 |

NOTE : Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. Thus a child who can read Std II level text can read letters, words, and Std 1 level text.


CHART 5: TRENDS OVER TIME
\% Children who CAN READ Std II level text (in govt schools in Std IV - VII) 2006-2009


## Reading and comprehension in english

## TABLE 5: CLASS-WISE \% CHILDREN WHO CAN READ

ENGLISH (All Schools) 2009

Cannot Can readCan readCan read Can read Total Std. | read |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| capital | capital |  |  |
| letters | small | simple | easy |
| letters | words sentences |  |  | letters

| I | 64.0 | 21.9 | 7.7 | 4.8 | 1.7 | 100 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| II | 40.9 | 30.6 | 14.9 | 9.7 | 3.9 | 100 |
| III | 23.7 | 25.4 | 20.9 | 22.7 | 7.3 | 100 |
| IV | 14.2 | 19.9 | 20.9 | 32.3 | 12.7 | 100 |
| V | 7.3 | 13.5 | 17.0 | 36.6 | 25.6 | 100 |
| VI | 3.4 | 7.3 | 12.1 | 35.2 | 42.1 | 100 |
| VII | 2.7 | 6.5 | 7.9 | 29.6 | 53.3 | 100 |
| VIII | 1.6 | 4.4 | 4.8 | 21.9 | 67.4 | 100 |
| TOTAL | 23.2 | 17.5 | 13.6 | 22.8 | 23.0 | 100 |


| Std. | Of those who can read words, \% who can tell meaning of the words | Of those who can read sentences, \% who can tell meaning of the sentences |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 68.1 | 65.1 |
| II | 67.0 | 75.9 |
| III | 64.1 | 76.4 |
| IV | 61.4 | 80.4 |
| V | 64.6 | 73.5 |
| VI | 70.7 | 74.8 |
| VII | 68.5 | 74.0 |
| VIII | 72.9 | 78.6 |
| Total | 66.4 | 75.9 |


| English Tool |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
| C K S  <br>  $\mathbf{Q}$  F <br> W O Z  | n  $\mathbf{p}$ $\mathbf{g}$ <br>  $\mathbf{v}$  $\mathbf{e}$ <br>  $\mathbf{j}$  $\mathbf{r}$ <br>   $\mathbf{b}$  |
|  | ---m****-me |
| ${ }^{a}$ hen  old <br>  sit  <br> run  fox <br>  bay  | 3 <br> What is your name? <br> This is a big bus. <br> 1 Hike to ning. <br> 1 have a sister. |
|  |  |

## ARITHMETIC

| Std. | Nothing | Recognize Numbers |  | Subtract | Divide | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1-9 | $11-99$ |  |  |  |
| I | 29.7 | 48.7 | 17.6 | 2.8 | 1.1 | 100 |
| II | 11.1 | 34.8 | 41.0 | 10.6 | 2.5 | 100 |
| III | 5.5 | 20.4 | 39.8 | 26.7 | 7.5 | 100 |
| IV | 2.3 | 12.8 | 29.8 | 40.0 | 15.0 | 100 |
| V | 2.5 | 7.7 | 26.6 | 39.6 | 23.7 | 100 |
| VI | 1.4 | 4.9 | 16.7 | 42.5 | 34.5 | 100 |
| VII | 1.4 | 4.1 | 12.1 | 37.9 | 44.5 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.9 | 3.4 | 7.9 | 31.7 | 56.1 | 100 |
| Total | 8.3 | 19.8 | 24.9 | 27.0 | 20.0 | 100 |

NOTE : Each cell shows the highest level of arithmetic achieved by a child. Thus a child who can do division, can also recognize numbers 1-9, 11-99 and do subtraction.

Chart 6: Trends over time
\% Children who CANNOT EVEN RECOGNIZE NUMBERS UPTO 9 (IN GOVT SCHOOLS IN STD I - IV) 2007-2009


Maths Tool


Chart 7: Trends over time
\% Children who CAN DO DIVISION (in govt schools in Std IV - VII) 2007-2009


## TUITION

Table 8: Class-wise \% children ATTENDING TUItion CLASSES. by School type 2007 AND 2009

| Year | School |  | II | III | IV | V | VI | VII | VIII |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | Govt | 7.8 | 11.4 | 15.5 | 17.2 | 20.6 | 26.0 | 28.2 | 33.7 |
|  | Pvt. | 16.3 | 30.0 | 32.2 | 31.0 | 24.0 | 24.4 | 29.3 | 38.7 |
| 2009 | Govt | 11.0 | 12.9 | 13.8 | 19.0 | 20.7 | 23.0 | 21.6 | 29.4 |
|  | PvT. | 24.2 | 29.0 | 31.2 | 40.5 | 30.7 | 27.8 | 30.3 | 27.9 |

NOTE : The ASER survey in 2007 and 2009 recorded information about tuition. In both years, the question asked was the following: "Does the child take any paid additional class currently?" Therefore, these numbers do not include any supplemental help in learning that children may have received from parents or siblings or from anyone else that did not require payment.


## LEARNING LEVELS IN GOVERNMENT AND PRIVATE SCHOOLS : TRENDS OVER TIME

Chart 8: \% Children in Std III who CAN AT LEAST READ Std I LEVEL TEXT. BY SCHOOL TYPE 2006-2009


Chart 9: \% Children in Std V who CAN DO DIVISION. BY SCHOOL TYPE 2006-2009


Learning levels by gender : Trends over time

Chart 10: \% Boys and girls in Std III who Can read at least Std I LEVEL text 2007-2009


Chart 11: \% Boys and girls in Std V who CAN do division 2007-2009


## EDUCATION : FATHERS AND CHILDREN

Table 9: Fathers and children 2009

| Fathers' <br> Education | \% <br> Fathers | Of these fathers : |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | \% Girls 6 to 14 out of school | \% Children (Std III-V) who can read level 1 (Std 1 Text) or more | \% Children (Std III-V) who can do subtraction or more | \% Children (Std III-V) who can read words or more in English | \% Children (Std IV-VIII) attending tuition |
| No Schooling | 26.7 | 6.8 | 48.6 | 37.6 | 34.7 | 11.3 |
| Sto I-V | 18.3 | 4.3 | 52.5 | 44.9 | 39.8 | 21.1 |
| Std VI-VIII | 15.7 | 1.4 | 58.9 | 50.4 | 47.8 | 23.7 |
| Std IX-X | 26.4 | 1.3 | 72.9 | 65.4 | 55.3 | 30.5 |
| Above Std X | 12.9 | 0.2 | 78.1 | 72.6 | 65.8 | 40.5 |



[^12] and children.

## SCHOOL ENROLLMENT AND ATTENDANCE : TRENDS OVER TIME



## Table 16: Girls Toilets 2009

Std I-IV/V Std I-VII/VIII
No of schools visited
\% Schools with no separate provision
for girls toilets
$447 \quad 36$
for girls toilets
60.2
66.7

Of schools where there are separate girls toilets, \% schools where:

| Toilet locked | 6.7 | 8.3 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Toilet not usable | 11.9 | 8.3 |
| Usable | 21.3 | 16.7 |

Table 14: Facilities in school
200520072009200520072009
Std I-IV/V Std I-VII/VIII
$\begin{array}{llll}37.4 & 92.2 \quad 69.9100 .0 \quad 90.979 .0\end{array}$

## Table 11: Children's attendanca

200520072009200520072009

\% Enrolled children attending (average)
\% Schools with less than 50\% enrolled children attending \% Schools with 75\% or more enrolled children attending

## Table 13: Multigrade classes

200520072009200520072009
\% Of schools in which:

Std II class sitting with another class
Std IV class sitting with another class

Std I-IV/V Std I-VII/VIII
$\begin{array}{llllll}71.0 & 71.2 & 70.6 & 87.6 & 72.6 & 66.1\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{llllll}14.8 & 13.8 & 12.5 & 0.0 & 8.8 & 17.9\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llllllllll}51.3 & 48.1 & 48.9 & 100.0 & 47.1 & 41.0\end{array}$

## SCHOOL FACILITIES : TRENDS OVER TIME

| School improvement \& Construction | Std I-IV/V |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. of schs | \% schools |  | No. of schs | \% schools |  |
|  |  | Yes | No |  | Yes | No |
| Whitewash | 484 | 53.5 | 46.5 | 33 | 54.6 | 45.5 |
| Construction of new classroom | 484 | 30.6 | 69.4 | 35 | 20.0 | 80.0 |
| Construction of boundary wall | 481 | 5.6 | 94.4 | 35 | 8.6 | 91.4 |

ASER survey was carried out in Oct-Nov 2009. One govt school with primary grades was visited in each sampled village. If there was more than one govt school in a village, then the school with the highest enrollment was visited. Hence the schools visited in the ASER survey do not represent a random sample of schools of the district. The school visits were generally done either on a Saturday or a Monday.

| School Grants |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| classrooms | Rs 2 lacs per <br> additional room |
| Maintenance | Rs. 5000 pa upto 3 <br> grant |
| classrooms. Upto |  |
| Rs 10000 pa for |  |
| more than 3 |  |
| classrooms |  |$|$

## School Grants

| Table 17: <br> \% Primary <br> SCHOOLS RECEIVING <br> DIFFERENT GRANTS | April 2008-March 2009 |  |  |  | April 2009-October 2009 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Std I-IV/V |  |  |  | Std I-IV/V |  |  |  |
|  | No. of schs | Yes | No | Don't know | No. of schs | Yes | No | Don't know |
| ew classroom | 442 | 33.5 | 62.7 | 3.9 | 352 | 19.0 | 75.9 | 5.1 |
| Maintenance grant | 438 | 78.8 | 16.7 | 4.6 | 361 | 66.5 | 28 | 5.0 |
| Development grant | 409 | 61.9 | 33.0 | 5.1 | 344 | 53.8 | 40. | 5.8 |
| Teacher grant (TLM grant) | 437 | 86.7 | 10.1 | 3.2 | 349 | 75.4 | 21.2 | 3.4 |
| Other grants | 184 | 10.9 | 83.7 | 5.4 | 162 | 7.4 | 85.8 | 6.8 |

NOTE: No grant information was available for 30 schools out of 521 primary schools that were visited. This could be because the head teacher was not present, register was not available or the surveyors could not obtain the information. Therefore, the above table is based on schools for which information was available for at least one indicator.

| TABLE 18: |
| :--- |
| \% UPPER PRIMARY |
| SCHOOLS RECEIVING |
| DIFFERENT GRANTS |
| New classroom |
| Maintenance grant |
| Development grant |
| Teacher grant |
| (TLM grant) |
| Other grants |

April 2008-March 2009 April 2009-October 2009 Std I-VII/VIII Std I-VII/VIII

| No. of <br> schs | Yes | No | Don't <br> know | No. of <br> schs | Yes | No | Don't <br> know |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 35 | 25.7 | 71.4 | 2.9 | 23 | 30.4 | 60.9 | 8.7 |
| 33 | 72.7 | 24.2 | 3.0 | 22 | 63.6 | 36.4 | 0.0 |
| 28 | 60.7 | 35.7 | 3.6 | 21 | 52.4 | 47.6 | 0.0 |
| 34 | 94.1 | 5.9 | 0.0 | 26 | 76.9 | 23.1 | 0.0 |
| 11 | 45.5 | 54.6 | 0.0 | 8 | 37.5 | 50.0 | 12.5 |

NOTE : No grant information was available for 1 schools out of 40 upper primary schools that were visited. This could be because the head teacher was not present, register was not available or the surveyors could not obtain the information. Therefore, the above table is based on schools for which information was available for at least one indicator.

## Performance of districts

| Table 19: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ANGANWADI } \\ & \text { OR } \\ & \text { BALWADI } \end{aligned}$ | Out of SCHOOL | Private SCHOOL | Tuition | Mothers' Reading | Std I-II : Learning levels |  |  | Std III-V : Learning levels |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Districts |  | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) <br> out <br> of <br> school | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) <br> in <br> private <br> school | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% Children } \\ & \text { (Std } \\ & \text { IV-VIII) } \\ & \text { attending } \\ & \text { tuition } \\ & \text { classes } \end{aligned}$ | \% Mothers (Age: 17-55) who CAN READ | \% Children <br> (Std I-II) who CAN READ letters, words or more | \% Children (Std I-II) who CAN RECOGNIZE NUMBERS 1 to 9 or more | \% Children (Std I-II) who CAN READ LETTERS or more in ENGLISH | \% Children (Std III-V) who CANREAD Level 1 (Std 1 Text) or more | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% Children } \\ & \text { (Std III-V) } \\ & \text { who } \\ & \text { CAN DO } \\ & \text { SUBTRACTION } \\ & \text { or more } \end{aligned}$ | \% Children (Std III-V) who CAN READ sentences in ENGLISH |
| Barpeta | 54.5 | 3.7 | 17.0 | 21.0 | 66.4 | 82.4 | 85.3 | 50.7 | 57.6 | 51.1 | 8.0 |
| Bongaigaon | 64.3 | 4.5 | 12.8 | 29.0 | 77.4 | 81.1 | 90.0 | 45.8 | 65.7 | 84.4 | 13.6 |
| Cachar | 85.2 | 1.7 | 9.9 | 43.5 | 80.0 | 79.8 | 82.2 | 55.2 | 37.7 | 42.5 | 6.0 |
| Darrang | 60.3 | 4.3 | 21.8 | 19.9 | 77.9 | 60.5 | 61.5 | 48.6 | 54.1 | 42.3 | 24.4 |
| Dhemaji | 67.4 | 2.5 | 21.5 | 13.0 | 89.3 | 65.5 | 61.9 | 33.9 | 40.6 | 23.0 | 8.4 |
| Dhubri | 72.5 | 7.8 | 7.7 | 35.4 | 59.2 | 73.0 | 75.9 | 41.9 | 50.7 | 40.1 | 14.8 |
| Dibrugarh | 72.4 | 1.7 | 23.8 | 30.2 | 76.6 | 86.1 | 82.8 | 53.9 | 70.4 | 61.1 | 23.9 |
| Goalpara | 63.7 | 5.7 | 17.4 | 13.8 | 53.9 | 77.1 | 77.7 | 40.5 | 60.1 | 50.9 | 24.0 |
| Golaghat | 82.3 | 4.4 | 12.4 | 14.6 | 80.4 | 79.2 | 77.4 | 61.5 | 76.1 | 50.7 | 19.6 |
| Hailakandi | 14.7 | 2.7 | 6.2 | 21.7 | 57.9 | 67.1 | 64.8 | 20.0 | 48.9 | 46.7 | 9.0 |
| Jorhat | 80.4 | 1.9 | 9.8 | 27.0 | 88.9 | 82.6 | 81.5 | 52.8 | 78.5 | 61.7 | 28.2 |
| Kamrup | 81.9 | 3.0 | 15.1 | 22.3 | 73.0 | 75.7 | 82.7 | 51.0 | 68.9 | 62.1 | 17.8 |
| Karbi Anglong | 43.1 | 3.4 | 24.1 | 12.5 | 70.9 | 73.0 | 73.8 | 67.4 | 36.9 | 32.6 | 30.8 |
| Karimganj | 82.0 | 4.6 | 8.2 | 33.9 | 67.5 | 83.9 | 88.1 | 56.8 | 35.1 | 44.9 | 7.9 |
| Kokrajhar | 63.1 | 3.2 | 24.5 | 12.1 | 64.0 | 73.6 | 79.9 | 43.7 | 69.8 | 52.5 | 10.9 |
| Lakhimpur | 88.9 | 3.2 | 10.6 | 16.1 | 74.2 | 65.0 | 69.9 | 36.8 | 50.5 | 46.3 | 11.6 |
| Marigaon | 72.1 | 5.9 | 4.8 | 15.3 | 84.0 | 73.6 | 74.0 | 31.1 | 50.9 | 35.3 | 6.2 |
| Nagaon | 92.5 | 3.7 | 8.0 | 20.1 | 69.8 | 76.8 | 76.4 | 33.7 | 70.6 | 58.2 | 10.0 |
| Nalbari | 72.7 | 2.5 | 18.8 | 24.3 | 80.5 | 83.0 | 84.0 | 66.5 | 68.8 | 66.2 | 33.7 |
| Sibsagar | 77.0 | 6.4 | 18.4 | 28.5 | 77.8 | 90.5 | 94.0 | 56.4 | 82.6 | 64.9 | 23.9 |
| Sonitpur | 84.3 | 5.9 | 21.9 | 29.9 | 62.4 | 75.7 | 78.9 | 42.7 | 53.9 | 40.5 | 11.0 |
| Tinsukia | 64.7 | 9.3 | 21.9 | 5.5 | 86.8 | 79.6 | 82.5 | 51.8 | 59.5 | 52.9 | 15.1 |
| Total | 73.8 | 4.3 | 14.5 | 23.3 | 72.6 | 76.5 | 78.7 | 46.5 | 58.4 | 50.4 | 14.8 |



## SCHOOL ENROLLMENT AND OUT OF SCHOOL CHILDREN

| Table 1: \% Children in different types of SCHOOLS 2009 |  |  |  | \% Out of school |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in School |  |
| Age: 6-14 ALL | 89.0 | 5.0 | 2.1 | 4.0 | 100 |
| Age: 7-16 ALL | 88.1 | 4.6 | 2.0 | 5.4 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 89.2 | 5.3 | 2.2 | 3.3 | 100 |
| AGE: 7-10 BOYS | 89.0 | 5.9 | 2.1 | 3.0 | 100 |
| AgE: 7-10 GIRLS | 89.6 | 4.5 | 2.3 | 3.7 | 100 |
| AgE: 11-14 ALL | 89.0 | 4.0 | 1.7 | 5.3 | 100 |
| AgE: 11-14 BOYS | 89.1 | 4.5 | 1.5 | 4.8 | 100 |
| AGE: 11-14 GIRLS | 88.9 | 3.2 | 1.9 | 6.0 | 100 |
| AgE: 15-16 ALL | 80.6 | 3.3 | 1.7 | 14.4 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 BOYS | 81.8 | 2.8 | 1.4 | 14.0 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 GIRLS | 78.8 | 4.3 | 2.2 | 14.7 | 100 |


note : 'отнек' includes chidren going to madarssa and EGS.
' 'от in school' = dropped out + never enrolled.



How to read the table: In Std III, 68.9\% (30.5+19.0+19.4) children are in age group 8 to 10 .

## Young children in pre-school and school

|  |  |  |  | In Scho |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | anganwadi | UKG | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | io त |  |
| Age 3 | 60.2 | 4.0 |  |  |  | 35.8 | 100 |
| Age 4 | 65.8 | 6.0 |  |  |  | 28.3 | 100 |
| Age 5 | 33.1 | 2.4 | 44.4 | 4.6 | 2.4 | 13.1 | 100 |
| Age 6 | 8.9 | 1.0 | 75.8 | 5.8 | 2.3 | 6.3 | 100 |

Chart 3: Trends over time
\% Children age 3-4 not attending PRE-SCHOOL (ICDS OR OTHER) 2006-2009


[^13]
## Reading in own language

Table 4: Class-wise \% children who CAN READ (All Schools) 2009

| StD. | Nothing | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (Std 1 Text) | Level 2 <br> (Std 2 Text) | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 43.0 | 38.8 | 11.2 | 3.8 | 3.1 | 100 |
| II | 14.1 | 35.6 | 29.5 | 12.2 | 8.6 | 100 |
| III | 6.1 | 20.4 | 29.8 | 23.8 | 19.9 | 100 |
| IV | 3.0 | 10.4 | 19.9 | 26.9 | 39.8 | 100 |
| V | 2.2 | 6.4 | 11.2 | 23.1 | 57.2 | 100 |
| VI | 1.2 | 4.0 | 6.4 | 16.4 | 71.9 | 100 |
| VII | 1.5 | 2.5 | 4.1 | 9.2 | 82.7 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.6 | 1.5 | 2.5 | 7.5 | 87.9 | 100 |
| TOTAL | 11.7 | 18.5 | 16.4 | 15.6 | 37.8 | 100 |

NOTE : Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. Thus a child who can read Std II level text can read letters, words, and Std 1 level text.


Chart 4: Trends over time
\% Children who CANNOT EVEN IDENTIFY LETTERS (IN GOVt Schools in Std I - IV) 2006-2009


CHART 5: TRENDS OVER TIME
\% Children who CAN READ Std II level text (in govt schools in Std IV - VII) 2006-2009


## Reading and comprehension in english

## TABLE 5: CLASS-WISE \% CHILDREN WHO CAN READ

ENGLISH (All Schools) 2009
Cannot Can readCan readCan read Can read Total

\section*{Std.} | read |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| capital | capital |  |  |
| letters | small | simple | easy |
| letters | words sentences |  |  | letters


| I | 66.6 | 19.7 | 8.3 | 3.9 | 1.6 | 100 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| II | 36.9 | 31.4 | 16.9 | 11.4 | 3.5 | 100 |
| III | 20.4 | 26.2 | 22.0 | 23.4 | 8.0 | 100 |
| IV | 10.5 | 18.6 | 21.3 | 31.8 | 17.8 | 100 |
| V | 7.6 | 11.5 | 16.9 | 32.7 | 31.3 | 100 |
| VI | 4.7 | 7.1 | 11.1 | 31.1 | 46.0 | 100 |
| VII | 3.5 | 4.7 | 7.3 | 23.8 | 60.7 | 100 |
| VIII | 2.0 | 3.1 | 5.2 | 19.1 | 70.6 | 100 |
| TOTAL | 23.9 | 17.7 | 14.5 | 20.8 | 23.2 | 100 |


| Std. | Of those who can read words, \% who can tell meaning of the words | Of those who can read sentences, \% who can tell meaning of the sentences |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 62.8 | 69.4 |
| II | 66.9 | 73.6 |
| III | 65.8 | 75.0 |
| IV | 67.6 | 79.9 |
| V | 71.2 | 79.9 |
| VI | 75.3 | 82.6 |
| VII | 80.0 | 86.0 |
| VIII | 80.3 | 87.8 |
| Total | 71.0 | 83.1 |


| English Tool |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
| B H $\mathbf{R}$  <br>  $\mathbf{L}$  $\mathbf{V}$ <br> $\mathbf{M}$ $\mathbf{P}$ $\mathbf{F}$  |  |
| $\|$rat  hot <br>  big  <br> cow  man | $\qquad$ <br> 4 <br> What is the time? <br> This is a rod balli. <br> 3 Bike to play, <br> 1 have a fiathes: |
| \#\#-*-*-*-* |  |

## ARITHMETIC

| Std. | Nothing | Recognize Numbers |  | Subtract | Divide | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1-9 | 11-99 |  |  |  |
| I | 41.0 | 38.1 | 14.0 | 4.9 | 2.1 | 100 |
| II | 14.0 | 32.6 | 31.7 | 15.2 | 6.4 | 100 |
| III | 5.9 | 19.2 | 29.4 | 29.3 | 16.2 | 100 |
| IV | 3.2 | 9.5 | 18.5 | 35.0 | 33.9 | 100 |
| V | 2.1 | 5.8 | 10.8 | 29.1 | 52.1 | 100 |
| VI | 1.8 | 3.7 | 7.4 | 19.2 | 67.9 | 100 |
| VII | 1.3 | 2.3 | 4.8 | 13.1 | 78.5 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.7 | 1.7 | 2.9 | 9.1 | 85.5 | 100 |
| Total | 11.3 | 17.5 | 17.2 | 19.6 | 34.4 | 100 |

NOTE : Each cell shows the highest level of arithmetic achieved by a child. Thus a child who can do division, can also recognize numbers 1-9, 11-99 and do subtraction.

Chart 6: Trends over time
\% Children who CANNOT EVEN RECOGNIZE NUMBERS UPTO 9 (IN GOVT SCHOOLS IN STD I - IV) 2007-2009



Chart 7: Trends over time
\% Children who CAN DO DIVISION (in govt schools in Std IV - VII) 2007-2009


## TUITION

Table 8: Class-wise \% children ATTENDING TUItion CLASSES. by School type 2007 AND 2009

| Year | School | I | II | III | IV | V | VI | VII | VIII |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | Govt | 23.9 | 31.5 | 37.9 | 39.9 | 42.3 | 44.2 | 51.6 | 54.8 |
|  | PVT. | 53.3 | 56.5 | 64.1 | 65.1 | 66.6 | 67.2 | 70.3 | 65.8 |
| 2009 | Govt | 32.9 | 38.5 | 43.4 | 47.4 | 51.2 | 56.5 | 55.9 | 61.0 |
|  | Pvt. | 53.2 | 62.9 | 68.7 | 65.8 | 68.5 | 73.4 | 73.3 | 66.4 |

NOTE : The ASER survey in 2007 and 2009 recorded information about tuition. In both years, the question asked was the following: "Does the child take any paid additional class currently?" Therefore, these numbers do not include any supplemental help in learning that children may have received from parents or siblings or from anyone else that did not require payment.


## LEARNING LEVELS IN GOVERNMENT AND PRIVATE SCHOOLS : TRENDS OVER TIME

Chart 8: \% Children in Std III who CAN AT LEAST READ Std I LEVEL TEXT. BY SCHOOL TYPE 2006-2009


Chart 9: \% Children in Std V who CAN DO DIVISION. BY SCHOOL TYPE 2006-2009


Learning levels by gender : Trends over time

Chart 10: \% Boys and girls in Std III who Can read at least Std I LEVEL text 2007-2009


Chart 11: \% Boys and girls in Std V who CAN do division 2007-2009


## EDUCATION : FATHERS AND CHILDREN

Table 9: Fathers and children 2009

| Fathers' Education | \% Fathers | Of these fathers : |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | \% Girls 6 to 14 out of school | \% Children (Std III-V) who can read level 1 (Std 1 Text) or more | \% Children (Std III-V) who can do subtraction or more | \% Children (Std III-V) who can read words or more in English | \% Children (Std IV-VIII) attending tuition |
| No Schooling | 40.3 | 7.1 | 54.8 | 57.6 | 38.8 | 45.2 |
| Std I-V | 12.3 | 4.5 | 60.9 | 61.2 | 42.8 | 54.3 |
| Std VI-VIII | 13.5 | 2.3 | 63.8 | 66.9 | 50.1 | 58.1 |
| Std IX-X | 21.2 | 2.5 | 67.7 | 68.8 | 53.2 | 60.8 |
| Above Std X | 12.8 | 1.8 | 76.2 | 75.5 | 63.8 | 62.3 |

NOTE: ASER 2009 recorded information about mothers' education. Similar analyses can be done with mothers and children.


## SCHOOL ENROLLMENT AND ATTENDANCE : TRENDS OVER TIME

| Type of school | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std I-IV/V : Primary | 321 | 481 | 358 |
| Std I-VII/VIII : Primary + Upper Primary | 251 | 491 | 602 |
| Total schools | 572 | 972 | 960 |
| Table 12: Teacher attendance 20052007 | 2009 | 20052007 | 2009 |
| Type of school Std I-IV/V |  | Std I-VII/ |  |
| \% Teachers attending (average) 79.885 .7 | 81.7 | 75.385 .8 | 82.7 |
|  | 0.9 | 1.3 0.4 | 0.4 |
| \% Schools with all teachers present 51.157 .5 | 50.2 | 29.247 .1 | 40.7 |


| TABLE 11: ChILDREN'S ATtendanc: 2005 | 2007 | 2009 | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Type of school | Std I-IV/V |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |  |
| \% Enrolled children attending <br> (average) <br> \% Schools with less than 50\% <br> enrolled children attending | 52.9 | 59.0 | 57.4 | 52.5 | 56.6 | 57.6 |  |
| \% Schools with 75\% or more <br> enrolled children attending | 11.7 | 31.1 | 21.5 | 17.1 | 16.5 | 42.6 | 34.7 |

## Table 11: Children's attendanc:

 Type of school \% Enrolled children attending (average)\% Schools with less than 50\% enrolled children attending enrolled children attending

## Table 13: Multigrade classes

200520072009200520072009
\% Of schools in which:
Std II class sitting with another class
Std IV class sitting with another class

Std I-IV/V Std I-VII/VIII


## School facilities : trends over time

| Table 14: Facilities in school |  | 20052007 |  | 2009 | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \% Schools with: |  | Std I-IV/V |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \pm \\ & \stackrel{\#}{0} \\ & \vdots \end{aligned}$ | No facility | 21.0 | 17.1 | 16.2 | 10.0 | 7.5 | 5.0 |
|  | Facility but water not available | 14.4 | 11.7 | 7.5 | 18.1 | 7.5 | 6.7 |
|  | Available | 64.6 | 71.2 | 76.3 | 71.9 | 84.9 | 88.3 |
|  | No facility | 64.0 | 35.8 | 33.1 | 32.3 | 17.1 | 14.1 |
|  | Facility but toilet not usable | 14.6 | 17.0 | 41.1 | 31.9 | 21.2 | 43.9 |
|  | Usable | 21.3 | 47.2 | 25.7 | 35.9 | 61.7 | 42.0 |
| Midday meal served on day |  | 38.4 | 64.8 | 54.0 | 40.2 | 66.0 | 60.3 |


| TABLE 16: GIRLS ToILETS | $\mathbf{2 0 0 9}$ | Std I-IV/V |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |
| No of schools visited | 270 | 478 |
| \% Schools with no separate provision <br> for girls toilets | 62.2 | 41.4 |
| Of schools where there are separate girls toilets, \% schools where: |  |  |
| Toilet locked | 9.3 | 12.8 |
| Toilet not usable | 16.7 | 23.2 |
| Usable | 11.9 | 22.6 |

Table 15: School improvement \& construction since April 2008

| School improvement \& Construction | Std I-IV/V |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. of schs | \% schools |  | No. of schs | \% schools |  |
|  |  | Yes | No |  | Yes | No |
| Whitewash | 320 | 63.4 | 36.6 | 545 | 78.0 | 22.0 |
| Construction of new classroom | 317 | 30.3 | 69.7 | 540 | 41.3 | 58.7 |
| Construction of boundary wall | 323 | 28.8 | 71.2 | 533 | 37.7 | 62.3 |

ASER survey was carried out in Oct-Nov 2009. One govt school with primary grades was visited in each sampled village. If there was more than one govt school in a village, then the school with the highest enrollment was visited. Hence the schools visited in the ASER survey do not represent a random sample of schools of the district. The school visits were generally done either on a Saturday or a Monday.

| School Grants |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| New | Rs 2 lacs per <br> classrooms <br> additional room |
| Maintenance <br> grant | Rs. 5000 pa upto 3 <br> classrooms. Upto <br> Rs 10000 pa for <br> more than 3 <br> classrooms |
| Development |  |
| grant | Rs. 5000 pa for <br> primary schs \& Rs <br> 7000 pa for upper <br> primary schs |
| TLM grant | Rs. 500 pa per <br> teacher |

## School Grants

| TABLE 17: <br> \% Primary <br> SCHOOLS RECEIVING <br> different grants | April 2008-March 2009 |  |  |  | April 2009-October 2009 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Std I-IV/V |  |  |  | Std I-IV/V |  |  |  |
|  | No. of schs | Yes | No | Don't know | No. of schs | Yes | No | Don't know |
| New classroom | 311 | 21.9 | 60.1 | 18.0 | 259 | 11.2 | 66.0 | 22.8 |
| Maintenance grant | 309 | 63.8 | 19.4 | 16.8 | 258 | 33.7 | 43.0 | 23 |
| Development grant | 295 | 64.8 | 18.3 | 17.0 | 255 | 33.7 | 41.6 | 24 |
| Teacher grant (TLM grant) | 306 | 68.6 | 16.0 | 15.4 | 259 | 36.7 | 41.7 | 21 |
| Other grants | 153 | 17.0 | 56.2 | 26.8 | 123 | 11.4 | 54.5 | 34 |

NOTE : No grant information was available for 58 schools out of 358 primary schools that were visited. This could be because the head teacher was not present, register was not available or the surveyors could not obtain the information. Therefore, the above table is based on schools for which information was available for at least one indicator.

| Table 18: <br> \% UPPER PRIMARY SCHOOLS RECEIVING DIFFERENT GRANTS |
| :---: |
| New classroom |
| Maintenance grant |
| Development grant |
| Teacher grant (TLM grant) |
| Other grants |

April 2008-March 2009 April 2009-October 2009 Std I-VII/VIII Std I-VII/VIII

| No. of <br> schs | Yes | No | Don't <br> know | No. of <br> schs | Yes | No | Don't <br> know |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 527 | 34.0 | 52.4 | 13.7 | 434 | 21.2 | 59.7 | 19.1 |
| 522 | 72.6 | 13.4 | 14.0 | 415 | 38.8 | 41.9 | 19.3 |
| 509 | 74.5 | 11.8 | 13.8 | 399 | 42.4 | 39.1 | 18.6 |
| 509 | 75.4 | 13.8 | 10.8 | 390 | 42.1 | 40.8 | 17.2 |
| 259 | 30.1 | 52.5 | 17.4 | 220 | 20.5 | 59.1 | 20.5 |

NOTE : No grant information was available for 83 schools out of 602 upper primary schools that were visited. This could be because the head teacher was not present, register was not available or the surveyors could not obtain the information. Therefore, the above table is based on schools for which information was available for at least one indicator.

PERFORMANCE OF DISTRICTS

| Table 19: | ANGANWADI OR BALWADI | Out of SCHOOL | Private SCHOOL | Tuition | Mothers' Reading | Std I-II : Learning levels |  |  | Std III-V : Learning levels |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Districts | \% Children <br> (Age 3-4) <br> in anganwadi or pre-school | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) <br> out <br> of <br> school | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) <br> in private school | \% Children <br> (Std <br> IV-VIII) <br> attending tuition classes | \% Mothers (Age: 17-55) who CAN READ | \%Children <br> (Std I-II) who CAN READ letters, words or more | \%Children <br> (Std I-II) <br> who CAN <br> RECOGNIZE <br> NUMBERS <br> 1 to 9 <br> or more | \% Children <br> (Std I-II) <br> who CAN <br> READ LETTERS or more in ENGLISH | \% Children <br> (Std III-V) <br> who <br> CAN READ <br> Level 1 <br> (Std 1 Text) <br> or more | \% Children <br> (Std III-V) who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more | \% Children <br> (Std III-V) <br> who CAN <br> READ sentences in ENGLISH |
| Araria | 77.6 | 4.9 | 3.0 | 63.0 | 36.7 | 71.1 | 68.5 | 39.2 | 53.3 | 54.8 | 10.2 |
| Aurangabad | 53.4 | 3.0 | 8.0 | 22.8 | 52.9 | 71.9 | 71.5 | 53.4 | 76.0 | 73.8 | 25.4 |
| Banka | 78.5 | 4.5 | 4.9 | 13.7 | 57.9 | 68.1 | 58.4 | 33.1 | 41.5 | 46.7 | 10.7 |
| Begusarai | 54.8 | 3.9 | 6.2 | 58.0 | 39.0 | 70.5 | 77.4 | 48.4 | 63.5 | 69.6 | 25.8 |
| Bhagalpur | 65.9 | 5.0 | 2.4 | 59.5 | 41.3 | 67.1 | 68.8 | 53.9 | 64.6 | 67.3 | 21.3 |
| Bhojpur | 70.5 | 3.7 | 6.9 | 53.2 | 54.1 | 91.9 | 91.0 | 72.2 | 74.0 | 77.0 | 27.9 |
| Buxar | 69.8 | 2.6 | 4.3 | 50.0 | 41.4 | 79.3 | 76.1 | 56.0 | 66.9 | 60.7 | 14.9 |
| Darbhanga | 59.3 | 8.6 | 3.6 | 77.2 | 54.6 | 86.8 | 84.5 | 72.1 | 73.9 | 74.7 | 30.3 |
| Gaya | 53.2 | 4.5 | 4.0 | 26.1 | 68.4 | 76.3 | 77.3 | 56.3 | 68.7 | 67.8 | 30.6 |
| Gopalganj | 69.8 | 1.4 | 5.7 | 58.2 | 45.3 | 84.2 | 89.9 | 69.7 | 75.3 | 79.8 | 35.7 |
| Jamui | 37.6 | 1.3 | 1.8 | 41.4 | 14.5 | 62.0 | 59.7 | 31.7 | 63.0 | 63.0 | 22.3 |
| Jehanabad | 93.5 | 2.6 | 3.5 | 44.8 | 53.6 | 80.8 | 82.6 | 51.9 | 65.5 | 63.0 | 20.7 |
| Kaimur(Bhabua) | 98.0 | 0.6 | 1.4 | 29.6 | 55.2 | 89.1 | 90.7 | 62.7 | 79.3 | 74.5 | 17.7 |
| Katihar | 92.0 | 2.3 | 0.3 | 49.0 | 43.0 | 73.9 | 73.4 | 44.1 | 54.6 | 60.0 | 11.3 |
| Khagaria | 93.0 | 2.6 | 1.9 | 42.5 | 47.4 | 85.5 | 85.7 | 57.8 | 76.7 | 79.3 | 31.4 |
| Kishanganj | 22.1 | 11.2 | 7.2 | 42.5 | 20.9 | 72.5 | 77.8 | 46.7 | 56.6 | 53.0 | 7.3 |
| Lakhisarai | 60.5 | 4.3 | 7.2 | 52.4 | 46.1 | 66.1 | 73.0 | 38.7 | 58.2 | 71.1 | 11.3 |
| Madhepura | 53.8 | 7.1 | 2.4 | 64.7 | 47.4 | 54.5 | 59.3 | 30.7 | 51.3 | 57.2 | 17.6 |
| Madhubani | 71.3 | 3.5 | 1.4 | 72.2 | 32.9 | 69.5 | 69.3 | 40.0 | 69.4 | 70.2 | 16.4 |
| Munger | 79.7 | 2.6 | 7.8 | 48.8 | 44.8 | 63.7 | 64.8 | 40.1 | 61.4 | 65.0 | 22.3 |
| Muzaffarpur | 80.6 | 1.2 | 1.5 | 61.5 | 32.7 | 59.8 | 62.1 | 37.0 | 52.9 | 51.8 | 8.0 |
| Nalanda | 80.0 | 2.8 | 14.1 | 64.7 | 68.2 | 67.0 | 70.3 | 45.2 | 71.9 | 73.2 | 20.5 |
| Nawada | 55.9 | 10.5 | 7.2 | 56.2 | 35.2 | 63.9 | 70.1 | 41.3 | 61.5 | 62.2 | 21.6 |
| Pashchim Champaran | 68.2 | 3.7 | 8.7 | 24.1 | 16.1 | 67.0 | 74.8 | 45.9 | 58.2 | 69.5 | 16.3 |
| Patna | 58.5 | 4.5 | 11.4 | 54.6 | 43.3 | 73.0 | 76.2 | 55.2 | 62.0 | 61.1 | 27.4 |
| Purba Champaran | 62.9 | 3.2 | 4.2 | 56.4 | 44.5 | 60.3 | 59.8 | 37.3 | 42.2 | 40.8 | 9.3 |
| Purnia | 69.2 | 7.4 | 1.7 | 52.6 | 18.8 | 77.5 | 77.8 | 51.5 | 59.9 | 60.7 | 10.8 |
| Rohtas | 75.3 | 1.1 | 10.1 | 45.3 | 55.6 | 94.3 | 92.8 | 71.3 | 71.2 | 66.7 | 14.1 |
| Saharsa | 53.6 | 3.3 | 1.3 | 64.9 | 36.5 | 73.3 | 69.9 | 47.4 | 53.1 | 66.9 | 11.3 |
| Samastipur | 59.1 | 3.5 | 6.3 | 62.3 | 29.9 | 60.3 | 60.1 | 37.7 | 50.9 | 52.3 | 13.4 |
| Saran | 89.8 | 1.8 | 9.3 | 52.6 | 38.4 | 70.6 | 74.0 | 47.2 | 76.7 | 81.4 | 22.8 |
| Sheikhpura | 66.0 | 10.5 | 6.0 | 57.4 | 42.3 | 80.6 | 87.1 | 51.3 | 79.6 | 79.9 | 30.0 |
| Sheohar | 67.4 | 4.1 | 2.3 | 67.6 | 36.0 | 63.8 | 62.9 | 38.3 | 57.8 | 62.9 | 15.6 |
| Sitamarhi | 69.9 | 5.2 | 4.4 | 74.9 | 51.8 | 74.5 | 71.0 | 53.4 | 63.1 | 55.5 | 13.8 |
| Siwan | 76.9 | 1.9 | 9.8 | 36.7 | 38.0 | 53.4 | 56.2 | 32.2 | 51.2 | 48.6 | 9.2 |
| Supaul | 65.4 | 5.0 | 1.6 | 71.6 | 25.1 | 70.9 | 71.9 | 45.3 | 74.0 | 80.7 | 23.3 |
| Vaishali | 77.9 | 1.3 | 4.2 | 79.2 | 51.4 | 77.7 | 82.5 | 63.0 | 57.7 | 58.3 | 21.0 |
| Total | 67.9 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 54.0 | 39.5 | 71.0 | 72.2 | 47.8 | 62.1 | 63.7 | 18.2 |

## SCHOOL ENROLLMENT AND OUT OF SCHOOL CHILDREN

| Table 1: \% Children in different types of schools 2009 |  |  |  | \% Out of school |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in School |  |
| AgE: 6-14 ALL | 87.0 | 9.4 | 0.2 | 3.3 | 100 |
| AgE: 7-16 ALL | 85.3 | 8.5 | 0.2 | 6.0 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 87.6 | 9.7 | 0.3 | 2.5 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 BOYS | 87.1 | 10.4 | 0.2 | 2.3 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 GIRLS | 88.1 | 9.1 | 0.3 | 2.5 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 ALL | 87.4 | 7.7 | 0.1 | 4.7 | 100 |
| AgE: 11-14 BOYS | 87.1 | 8.4 | 0.2 | 4.3 | 100 |
| AGE: 11-14 GIRLS | 88.2 | 6.9 | 0.1 | 4.9 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 ALL | 75.0 | 7.5 | 0.2 | 17.3 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 BOYS | 74.0 | 7.7 | 0.3 | 18.0 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 GIRLS | 76.6 | 6.9 | 0.2 | 16.3 | 100 |


note : 'отнer' includes chidren going to madarssa and EGS.
'от IN SCHool' = dropped out + never enrolled.


| Std. | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 17.2 | 56.8 | 18.6 |  |  |  |  | 7.4 |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| II | 1.7 | 9.3 | 44.5 | 35.6 | 5.2 |  |  |  | 3.8 |  |  |  | 100 |
| III | 1. | . 7 | 6.1 | 38.9 | 41.1 | 7.8 |  |  |  | 4.5 |  |  | 100 |
| IV |  | 1.8 |  | 7.7 | 33.8 | 43.2 | 6.5 | 3.9 |  | 3 | . 0 |  | 100 |
| V |  | 1. |  |  | 3.9 | 37.3 | 38.0 | 10.6 | 4.1 |  | 4.2 |  | 100 |
| VI |  |  | 1.8 |  |  | 5.9 | 24.5 | 48.7 | 10.3 | 6.2 | 2. | 6 | 100 |
| VII |  |  | 2. | . 7 |  |  | 4.7 | 26.1 | 42.2 | 14.7 | 6.6 | 3.1 | 100 |
| VIII |  |  |  | 2.9 |  |  |  | 6.1 | 23.7 | 45.2 | 12.9 | 9.1 | 100 |

How to read the table: In Std III, $87.8 \%(38.9+41.1+7.8)$ children are in age group 8 to 10 .

## Young children in pre-school and school

|  |  |  |  | In Scho |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | anganwadi | UKG | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{2} \underset{\pi}{\pi}$ |  |
| Age 3 | 83.4 | 3.1 |  |  |  | 13.5 | 100 |
| Age 4 | 82.5 | 8.7 |  |  |  | 8.9 | 100 |
| Age 5 | 47.6 | 5.2 | 30.9 | 9.3 | 0.5 | 6.6 | 100 |
| Age 6 | 7.0 | 0.8 | 75.3 | 14.2 | 0.3 | 2.4 | 100 |

Chart 3: Trends over time
\% Children age 3-4 not attending Pre-school (ICDS OR OTHER) 2006-2009


Of the villages visited, Anganwadi/Pre-School presence has been recorded in 98.2 \% villages.

## Reading in own language

Table 4: Class-wise \% children who CAN READ (All Schools) 2009

| StD. | Nothing | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (Std 1 Text) | Level 2 <br> (Std 2 Text) | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| I | 14.9 | 62.3 | 16.4 | 4.0 | 2.4 | 100 |
| II | 4.3 | 36.1 | 37.9 | 15.4 | 6.2 | 100 |
| III | 1.3 | 14.1 | 32.1 | 35.9 | 16.6 | 100 |
| IV | 0.8 | 6.4 | 16.0 | 37.0 | 39.8 | 100 |
| V | 0.3 | 3.0 | 9.4 | 22.5 | 64.9 | 100 |
| VI | 0.3 | 2.1 | 5.1 | 14.6 | 78.0 | 100 |
| VII | 0.2 | 1.7 | 3.0 | 10.2 | 85.0 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.2 | 1.3 | 2.4 | 7.0 | 89.1 | 100 |
| TOTAL | 3.0 | 16.9 | 15.7 | 18.9 | 45.5 | 100 |

NOTE : Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. Thus a child who can read Std II level text can read letters, words, and Std 1 level text.

| Reading Tool |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
| बह्नुत दिनों से बारिश हो रही थी। गॉँव में समी जगह बंदा पानी भर गया बा। सभी वारिश के रुकने की राह देख रहे थे। अयानक एक दिन बारिश रुक गई। सूरज निकल आया। सव लोग सुश हो गये। आसमान में विड्यियों उड्डने लर्गी। लोग अपने कपडे सुखाने लगे। बच्ये भी पर्रों से बाहर निकसकर खेलने लगे। | रारा के पार उसकी घाँ <br> वह बहु स्प को |  | 7an <br> है। <br> 1 |

Chart 4: Trends over time
\% Children who CANNOT EVEN IDENTIFY LETTERS (IN GOVt Schools in Std I - IV) 2006-2009


CHART 5: TRENDS OVER TIME
\% Children who CAN READ Std Il level text (in govt schools in Std IV - VII) 2006-2009


## Reading and comprehension in english

| Std. | Cannot read capital letters | Can read capital letters | Can read small letters | Can read simple words | Can read easy sentences | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 50.6 | 36.4 | 9.1 | 2.7 | 1.3 | 100 |
| II | 24.7 | 46.7 | 19.7 | 7.3 | 1.6 | 100 |
| III | 12.8 | 38.1 | 29.7 | 15.5 | 3.9 | 100 |
| IV | 5.3 | 27.3 | 30.7 | 29.9 | 6.9 | 100 |
| V | 3.3 | 22.5 | 22.0 | 33.2 | 19.0 | 100 |
| VI | 1.6 | 10.6 | 15.7 | 39.0 | 33.1 | 100 |
| VII | 1.0 | 7.8 | 12.9 | 31.0 | 47.2 | 100 |
| VIII | 1.4 | 5.3 | 8.1 | 23.1 | 62.2 | 100 |
| TOTAL | 13.4 | 25.3 | 18.9 | 22.5 | 19.8 | 100 |

ENGLISH (AlL Schools) 2009
Cannot Can readCan readCan read Can read Total Std. capital letters letters words sentences letters

| TABLE 6: CLASS-WISE \% CHILDREN wHO COMPREHEND ENGLISH (All Schools) 2009 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std. | Of those who can read words, \% who can tell meaning of the words | Of those who can read sentences, \% who can tell meaning of the sentences |
| I | 41.7 | 76.4 |
| II | 34.4 | 70.4 |
| III | 36.3 | 60.3 |
| IV | 48.6 | 64.0 |
| V | 59.2 | 73.7 |
| VI | 56.6 | 75.1 |
| VII | 67.5 | 83.7 |
| VIII | 64.6 | 83.5 |
| Total | 55.3 | 78.8 |


| English Tool |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
| A <br> J <br> Q <br> R <br> E |  |
| $\mathrm{Y} \quad \mathrm{N} \quad \mathrm{O}$ | d $\quad \mathrm{E}$ t |
| - - - - - - - - |  |
| 3 <br> cat <br> red | What is your name? |
| cup | This is a small bes |
| lip pig | Ithe to read. |
| bus | I have a mother: |
|  |  $=5$ |

## ARITHMETIC

|  |  | Recogni | Numbers |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| STD. | Nothing | 1-9 | 11-99 | Subtract | Divide | Total |
| 1 | 14.8 | 63.6 | 17.7 | 2.4 | 1.5 | 100 |
| II | 4.3 | 36.5 | 43.8 | 11.9 | 3.5 | 100 |
| III | 1.1 | 16.1 | 40.0 | 32.2 | 10.8 | 100 |
| IV | 0.6 | 7.5 | 21.8 | 45.1 | 25.0 | 100 |
| V | 0.5 | 3.7 | 12.3 | 31.5 | 52.0 | 100 |
| VI | 0.7 | 2.3 | 9.4 | 28.2 | 59.4 | 100 |
| VII | 0.1 | 1.7 | 6.3 | 22.9 | 69.1 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.3 | 2.1 | 5.3 | 16.5 | 75.8 | 100 |
| Total | 3.1 | 17.8 | 19.9 | 24.1 | 35.2 | 100 |

NOTE : Each cell shows the highest level of arithmetic achieved by a child. Thus a child who can do division, can also recognize numbers 1-9, 11-99 and do subtraction.

Chart 6: Trends over time
\% Children who CANNOT EVEN RECOGNIZE NUMBERS UPTO 9 (IN GOVt schools in Std I - IV) 2007-2009


Chart 7: Trends over time
\% Children who CAN DO DIVISION (in govt schools in Std IV - VII) 2007-2009


## TUITION

Table 8: Class-wise \% children ATTENDING TUITION CLASSES. BY SCHOOL TYPE 2007 AND 2009

| Year | School | 1 | II | III | IV | V | VI | VII | VIII |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2007 | Govt | 1.1 | 1.2 | 0.7 | 1.6 | 2.1 | 2.0 | 2.1 | 3.8 |
|  | Pvt. | 7.4 | 4.8 | 8.6 | 5.4 | 17.1 | 4.1 | 9.5 | 9.0 |
| 2009 | Govt | 2.8 | 3.1 | 3.4 | 3.6 | 3.0 | 2.7 | 2.6 | 3.2 |
|  | Pvt. | 8.3 | 9.1 | 12.4 | 18.9 | 15.0 | 10.5 | 17.4 | 19.2 |

NOTE : The ASER survey in 2007 and 2009 recorded information about tuition. In both years, the question asked was the following: "Does the child take any paid additional class currently?" Therefore, these numbers do not include any supplemental help in learning that children may have received from parents or siblings or from anyone else that did not require payment.


## CHHATTISGARH rural

## LEARNING LEVELS IN GOVERNMENT AND PRIVATE SCHOOLS : TRENDS OVER TIME

Chart 8: \% Children in Std III who CAN AT LEAST READ Std I LEVEL TEXT. BY SCHOOL TYPE 2006-2009


Chart 9: \% Children in Std V who CAN DO DIVISION. BY SCHOOL TYPE 2006-2009


Learning levels by gender : Trends over time

Chart 10: \% Boys and girls in Std III who CAN READ AT LEAST Std I LEVEL text 2007-2009


Chart 11: \% Boys and girls in Std V who CAN do division 2007-2009


## EDUCATION : FATHERS AND CHILDREN

Table 9: Fathers and children 2009

| Fathers' <br> Education | $\begin{gathered} \% \\ \text { Fathers } \end{gathered}$ | Of these fathers : |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | \% Children (Std III-V) who can read level 1 (Std 1 Text) or more | \% <br> Children <br> (Std III-V) who can do subtraction or more | \% Children (Std III-V) who can read words or more in English | \% Children (Std IV-VIII) attending tuition |
| No Schooling | 32.1 | 6.5 | 70.7 | 64.7 | 37.5 | 1.9 |
| Std I-V | 22.8 | 2.9 | 72.0 | 62.2 | 32.7 | 2.3 |
| Std VI-VIII | 18.4 | 2.6 | 75.7 | 69.7 | 37.2 | 3.7 |
| Std IX-X | 12.4 | 1.0 | 72.0 | 69.7 | 38.3 | 6.3 |
| Above Std X | 14.4 | 0.6 | 81.1 | 75.3 | 42.9 | 10.5 |



NOTE: ASER 2009 recorded information about mothers' education. Similar analyses can be done with mothers and children.

## SCHOOL ENROLLMENT AND ATTENDANCE : TRENDS OVER TIME



| TABLE 11: CHILDREN'S ATTENDANCE 2005 | 2007 | 2009 | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Type of school <br> \% Enrolled children attending <br> (average) | 72.3 | 72.0 | 76.7 | 77.6 | 72.5 | 73.3 |
| \% Schools with less than 50\% <br> enrolled children attending | 10.1 | 9.1 | 4.6 | 2.4 | 8.0 | 14.7 |
| \% Schools with 75\% or more <br> enrolled children attending | 51.5 | 49.3 | 60.9 | 61.0 | 45.3 | 58.8 |

TABLE 11: Children's ATtendance 200520072009200520072009 Type of school Std I-IV/V Std I-VII/VIII
\% Enrolled children attending
\% Schools with less than 50\% enrolled children attending
\% Schools with 75\% or more

## Table 13: Multigrade classes

200520072009200520072009
\% Of schools in which:
Std II class sitting with another class
Std IV class sitting with another class

Std I-IV/V Std I-VII/VIII

$65.8 \quad 63.3$
$56.6 \quad 57.7$

## School facilities : TRENDS OVER TIME

| Table 14: Facilities in school |  | 20052007 |  | 2009 | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \% Schools with: |  | Std I-IV/V |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |
| $\stackrel{\vdots}{ \pm}$ | No facility | 13.2 | 17.1 | 11.2 | 7.3 | 11.8 | 9.4 |
|  | Facility but water not available | 13.7 | 8.8 | 9.3 | 12.2 | 9.2 | 25.0 |
|  | Available | 73.1 | 74.1 | 79.5 | 80.5 | 78.9 | 65.6 |
|  | No facility | 86.9 | 61.9 | 35.7 | 52.5 | 69.7 | 25.7 |
|  | Facility but toilet not usable | 4.8 | 17.3 | 31.1 | 22.5 | 11.8 | 22.9 |
|  | Usable | 8.3 | 20.8 | 33.2 | 25.0 | 18.4 | 51.4 |
|  | dday meal served on day | 94.8 | 97.4 | 95.6 | 100 | 98.7 | 100 |


| TABLE 16: GIRLS ToILETS | 2009 | Std I-IV/V | Std I-VII/VIII |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No of schools visited | 277 | 34 |  |
| \% Schools with no separate provision <br> for girls toilets | 58.8 | 55.9 |  |
| Of schools where there are separate girls toilets, \% schools where: |  |  |  |
| Toilet locked | 6.1 | 0.0 |  |
| Toilet not usable | 17.0 | 20.6 |  |
| Usable | 18.1 | 23.5 |  |

Table 15: School improvement \& construction since April 2008

|  <br> Construction | Std I-IV/V |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. of <br> schs | \% schools |  | No. of <br> schs | \% schools |  |
| Whitewash | 285 | 86.0 | 14.0 | 32 | 81.3 | 18.8 |
| Wenstruction of new <br> Classroom <br> Construction of boundary <br> wall | 265 | 25.3 | 74.7 | 31 | 25.8 | 74.2 |
|  | 266 | 18.4 | 81.6 | 32 | 9.4 | 90.6 |

ASER survey was carried out in Oct-Nov 2009. One govt school with primary grades was visited in each sampled village. If there was more than one govt school in a village, then the school with the highest enrollment was visited. Hence the schools visited in the ASER survey do not represent a random sample of schools of the district. The school visits were generally done either on a Saturday or a Monday.

| School Grants |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| New |  |
| classrooms | Rs 2 lacs per <br> additional room |
| Maintenance | Rs. 5000 pa upto 3 <br> classrooms. Upto <br> Rs 10000 pa for <br> more than 3 <br> classrooms |
| Development |  |
| grant | Rs. 5000 pa for <br> primary schs \& Rs <br> 7000 pa for upper <br> primary schs |
| TLM grant | Rs. 500 pa per <br> teacher |

## School Grants

| Table 17: <br> \% Primary <br> SCHOOLS RECEIVING <br> different grants | April 2008-March 2009 |  |  |  | April 2009-Octobe |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Std I-IV/V |  |  |  | Std I-IV/V |  |  |  |
|  | No. of schs | Yes | No | Don't know | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No. of } \\ & \text { schs } \end{aligned}$ | Yes | No | Don't know |
| New classroom | 265 | 18.5 | 64.9 | 16.6 | 237 | 14.4 | 64.1 | 21. |
| Maint | 279 | 74.9 | 9.7 | 15 | 246 | 57 | 24.0 | 18.7 |
| Development gr | 271 | 70.5 | 17.0 | 12.6 | 245 | 53.5 | 29.4 | 17. |
| Teacher grant (TLM grant) | 277 | 84.5 | 5.1 | 10.5 | 243 | 62.6 | 22.6 | 14.8 |
| Other grants | 134 | 25.4 | 54.5 | 20.2 | 122 | 13.9 | 62.3 | 23 |

[^14] is based on schools for which information was available for at least one indicator.

| TABLE 18: |
| :--- |
| \% UpPER PRIMARY |
| sCHOOLS RECEIVING |
| dIFFERENT GRANTS |
| New classroom |
| Maintenance grant |
| Development grant |
| Teacher grant |
| (TMM grant) |
| Other grants |

April 2008-March 2009 April 2009-October 2009
Std I-VII/VIII Std I-VII/VIII

| No. of <br> schs | Yes | No |  | Don't <br> know | No. of <br> schs | Yes | No |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 28 | 14.3 | 57.1 | 28.6 | 26 | 15.4 | 53.9 | 30.8 |
| 33 | 66.7 | 12.1 | 21.2 | 27 | 44.4 | 29.6 | 25.9 |
| 30 | 73.3 | 6.7 | 20.0 | 27 | 59.3 | 18.5 | 22.2 |
| 32 | 71.9 | 12.5 | 15.6 | 28 | 53.6 | 25.0 | 21.4 |
| 23 | 30.4 | 47.8 | 21.7 | 21 | 33.3 | 38.1 | 28.6 |

NOTE : No grant information was available for 5 schools out of 35 upper primary schools that were visited. This could be because the head teacher was not present, register was not available or the surveyors could not obtain the information. Therefore, the above table is based on schools for which information was available for at least one indicator.

## Performance of districts

| Table 19: | ANGANWADI <br> OR <br> BALWADI | Out of SCHOOL | Private SCHOOL | Tuition | Mothers' Reading | Std I-II : Learning levels |  |  | Std III-V : Learning levels |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Districts | \% Children (Age 3-4) in anganwadi or pre-school | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% Children } \\ \text { (Age: 6-14) } \\ \text { out } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { school } \end{gathered}$ | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) in private school | \% Children (Std IV-VIII) attending tuition classes | \% Mothers <br> (Age: 17-55) who CAN READ | \% Children <br> (Std I-II) who CAN READ letters, words or more | \% Children (Std I-II) who CAN RECOGNIZE NUMBERS 1 to 9 or more | \% Children (Std I-II) who CAN READ LETIERS or more in ENGLISH | \% Children <br> (Std III-V) who CAN READ Level 1 (Std 1 Text) or more | \% Children (Std III-V) who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more | \% Children (Std III-V) who CAN READ sentences in ENGLISH |
| Bastar | 90.5 | 7.0 | 0.8 | 0.6 | 31.0 | 95.3 | 95.3 | 68.9 | 82.7 | 74.4 | 6.5 |
| Bilaspur | 83.3 | 1.8 | 5.5 | 2.7 | 28.4 | 89.5 | 89.5 | 47.3 | 58.2 | 60.9 | 5.3 |
| Dhamtari | 78.1 | 2.1 | 16.5 | 4.9 | 71.8 | 88.0 | 87.9 | 48.3 | 63.7 | 56.8 | 5.8 |
| Durg | 86.5 | 3.1 | 4.5 | 4.4 | 52.2 | 88.9 | 87.5 | 48.0 | 82.6 | 73.6 | 6.1 |
| Janjgir-Champa | 68.2 | 3.3 | 21.3 | 6.3 | 36.6 | 91.5 | 86.9 | 65.5 | 83.2 | 83.9 | 5.2 |
| Jashpur | 89.6 | 5.3 | 14.5 | 12.4 | 66.9 | 86.2 | 88.9 | 60.7 | 64.3 | 52.1 | 9.8 |
| Kanker | 96.0 | 2.4 | 5.4 | 2.7 | 41.0 | 86.3 | 89.6 | 69.1 | 81.2 | 66.9 | 3.0 |
| Kawardha | 89.0 | 2.5 | 10.7 | 1.9 | 30.6 | 88.5 | 87.6 | 72.8 | 67.4 | 53.5 | 6.4 |
| Korba | 98.9 | 6.2 | 5.2 | 6.3 | 50.9 | 93.7 | 93.6 | 62.8 | 71.7 | 69.1 | 9.6 |
| Koriya | 99.4 | 1.1 | 4.5 | 2.5 | 59.2 | 89.0 | 88.5 | 77.2 | 58.5 | 46.4 | 16.3 |
| Mahasamund | 96.7 | 2.3 | 5.6 | 5.3 | 43.1 | 90.9 | 92.8 | 78.2 | 66.1 | 52.1 | 19.3 |
| Raigarh | 95.5 | 2.7 | 11.1 | 5.0 | 54.0 | 88.7 | 92.1 | 64.9 | 89.0 | 78.2 | 20.7 |
| Raipur | 78.7 | 3.6 | 11.7 | 4.8 | 50.0 | 86.8 | 86.7 | 54.4 | 58.4 | 55.7 | 8.9 |
| Rajnandgaon | 99.0 | 0.4 | 10.7 | 4.5 | 61.4 | 92.5 | 92.5 | 57.3 | 86.7 | 85.5 | 9.9 |
| Surguja | 91.6 | 4.5 | 13.7 | 0.6 | 30.4 | 90.9 | 91.3 | 68.0 | 87.3 | 74.2 | 26.3 |
| Total | 88.5 | 3.3 | 9.4 | 4.0 | 43.9 | 90.0 | 90.0 | 61.3 | 73.4 | 66.8 | 10.5 |



## SCHOOL ENROLLMENT AND OUT OF SCHOOL CHILDREN

| TABLE 1: \% Children in different types of SCHOOLS 2009 |  |  |  | \% Out of school |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in School |  |
| AgE: 6-14 ALL | 43.2 | 55.8 | 0.9 | 0.2 | 100 |
| Age: 7-16 ALL | 36.3 | 62.5 | 0.8 | 0.4 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 52.4 | 47.1 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 BOYS | 46.2 | 53.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 GIRLS | 58.8 | 40.7 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 ALL | 31.2 | 67.0 | 1.5 | 0.3 | 100 |
| AgE: 11-14 BOYS | 32.3 | 66.5 | 1.0 | 0.3 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 GIRLS | 30.6 | 67.0 | 2.1 | 0.3 | 100 |
| AgE: 15-16 ALL | 19.2 | 79.5 | 0.4 | 0.9 | 100 |
| AgE: 15-16 BOYS | 17.7 | 81.5 | 0.3 | 0.5 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 GIRLS | 21.2 | 76.9 | 0.4 | 1.5 | 100s |



NOTE: 'отнеR' includes chidren going to madarssa and EGS.
'кот IN SCHool' = dropped out + never enrolled.


| Std. | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 3.6 | 42.1 | 47.4 | 3.1 | 3.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| II | 0.6 | 3.2 | 45.0 | 45.6 | 5.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| III |  | 5.6 |  | 25.8 | 53.9 | 12.9 | 1.8 |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| IV | 3.8 |  |  |  | 21.4 | 64.6 | 8.0 | 2.1 |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| V | 3.9 |  |  |  |  | 27.3 | 59.1 | 7.1 | 2.6 |  |  |  | 100 |
| VI | 4.7 |  |  |  |  | 2.2 | 11.6 | 67.3 | 12.1 | 2.0 |  |  | 100 |
| VII | 4.1 |  |  |  |  |  | 2.5 | 29.9 | 49.0 | 12.9 | 1.7 |  | 100 |
| VIII | 5.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8.9 | 22.3 | 56.6 | 5.2 | 1.8 | 100 |

How to read the table: In Std III, $92.6 \%(25.8+53.9+12.9)$ children are in age group 8 to 10 .

## Young CHILDREN IN PRE-SCHOOL AND SCHOOL

|  |  |  | In School |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\square}{\square}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | anganwadi | UKG | Govt. | Pvt. | Other |  |  |
| Age 3 | 66.7 | 7.4 |  |  |  | 25.9 | 100 |
| Age 4 | 74.6 | 23.2 |  |  |  | 2.2 | 100 |
| Age 5 | 16.0 | 22.7 | 39.2 | 21.1 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 100 |
| Age 6 | 8.0 | 5.9 | 48.1 | 38.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100 |

Chart 3: Trends over time
\% Children age 3-4 not attending pre-school (ICDS or other) 2006-2009


Of the villages visited, Anganwadi/Pre-School presence has been recorded in 98.2\% villages.

## Reading in own language

Table 4: Class-wise \% children who CAN READ (All Schools) 2009

| StD. | Nothing | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (STD 1 Text) | Level 2 <br> (Std 2 Text) | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 4.0 | 23.6 | 39.8 | 16.2 | 16.5 | 100 |
| II | 1.2 | 4.5 | 26.4 | 33.5 | 34.4 | 100 |
| III | 0.0 | 1.2 | 5.0 | 27.4 | 66.4 | 100 |
| IV | 0.0 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 30.9 | 67.6 | 100 |
| V | 0.0 | 2.0 | 3.9 | 10.4 | 83.8 | 100 |
| VI | 0.0 | 1.5 | 0.5 | 5.7 | 92.3 | 100 |
| VII | 0.0 | 0.8 | 2.9 | 3.8 | 92.4 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 3.7 | 95.4 | 100 |
| TOTAL | 0.6 | 4.1 | 9.4 | 18.2 | 67.6 | 100 |

NOTE : Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. Thus a child who can read Std II level text can read letters, words, and Std 1 level text.

## Reading Tool

बान्तन चान्णी ( B )
5elifiterel
 कासा आर्न साजके परात झमहत
 आर्चा कपाइण एवसेश की क्या
 कवणनको हो लितो, उत्वा fनन स्वल
 रोखणनिए पहलं का खल्बः मुयो भाया सगफह खमल्प्यो करमी नाना़्ता पव्वशज गानसे ता नामख पायक युष्ट लायाग आोताणा नबा सनच्त अले जा गुले

Ste liod

सेखेना बर सीटौती खागा गयात उलक्षापय गएच, चिय कानयद करी गता लटप साणक बन्रुल्य करण,


Chart 4: Trends over time
\% Children who CANNOT EVEN IDENTIFY LETTERS (IN GOVt Schools in Std I - IV) 2006-2009


CHART 5: TRENDS OVER TIME
\% Children who CAN READ Std II level text (in govt schools in Std IV - VII) 2006-2009


## Reading and comprehension in english

## TABLE 5: CLASS-WISE \% CHILDREN WHO CAN READ

ENGLISH (All Schools) 2009

Cannot Can readCan readCan read Can read Total Std. | read |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| capital | capital |  |  |
| letters | small | simple | easy |
| letters | words | sentences |  | letters

| I | 18.8 | 26.9 | 18.2 | 25.8 | 10.4 | 100 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| II | 2.5 | 23.2 | 11.6 | 41.9 | 20.8 | 100 |
| III | 0.0 | 7.6 | 8.4 | 40.4 | 43.6 | 100 |
| IV | 0.0 | 1.2 | 2.7 | 21.5 | 74.7 | 100 |
| V | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.3 | 9.7 | 87.0 | 100 |
| VI | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 5.5 | 94.0 | 100 |
| VII | 2.9 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 5.4 | 89.2 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.2 | 94.8 | 100 |
| TOTAL | 2.8 | 7.4 | 5.9 | 21.0 | 63.1 | 100 |


| Std. | Of those who can read words, \% who can tell meaning of the words | Of those who can read sentences, \% who can tell meaning of the sentences |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 47.4 | 64.9 |
| II | 64.8 | 75.0 |
| III | 85.3 | 90.5 |
| IV | 81.0 | 88.0 |
| V | 52.4 | 99.2 |
| VI | 46.7 | 97.8 |
| VII | 100.0 | 93.9 |
| VIII | 71.4 | 96.7 |
| Total | 72.1 | 93.0 |


| English Tool |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
| $\mathbf{D}$ L T  <br>  K  $\mathbf{G}$ <br> $\mathbf{X}$ P N  | y  $f$ i <br>  $s$  v <br> m a h  |
|  | What in the time? <br> This is a blue shirt. <br> I Hile te slecp. <br> 1 have a beother: |
|  |  |

## ARITHMETIC

| Std. | Nothing | Recognize Numbers |  | Subtract | Divide | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1-9 | 11-99 |  |  |  |
| 1 | 2.5 | 40.4 | 41.8 | 6.8 | 8.5 | 100 |
| II | 0.0 | 6.9 | 55.5 | 31.3 | 6.3 | 100 |
| III | 0.0 | 2.4 | 11.7 | 50.4 | 35.5 | 100 |
| IV | 0.0 | 0.8 | 3.9 | 42.1 | 53.2 | 100 |
| v | 0.0 | 0.7 | 5.2 | 14.7 | 79.4 | 100 |
| VI | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 9.8 | 88.2 | 100 |
| VII | 1.2 | 0.0 | 3.3 | 4.6 | 90.9 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.3 | 95.7 | 100 |
| Total | 0.4 | 6.2 | 15.0 | 23.7 | 54.7 | 100 |

NOTE : Each cell shows the highest level of arithmetic achieved by a child. Thus a child who can do division, can also recognize numbers 1-9, 11-99 and do subtraction.

Chart 6: Trends over time
\% Children who CANNOT EVEN RECOGNIZE NUMBERS UPTO 9 (IN GOVt schools in Std I - IV) 2007-2009


## MATHS TOOL



Chart 7: Trends over time
\% Children who CAN DO DIVISION (in govt schools in Std IV - VII) 2007-2009


## TUITION

| Year | School | 1 | II | III | IV | V | VI | VII | VIII |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2007 | Govt | 23.3 | 40.1 | 37.1 | 44.9 | 31.8 | 37.1 | 42.1 | 54.5 |
|  | Pvi. | 37.6 | 42.7 | 51.1 | 44.1 | 55.3 | 51.7 | 51.6 | 66.3 |
| 2009 | Govt | 22.7 | 14.3 | 25.5 | 26.5 | 30.2 | 33.8 | 48.2 | 65.3 |
|  | Pvt. | 27.8 | 43.3 | 32.0 | 51.7 | 67.1 | 62.5 | 54.6 | 76.7 |

NOTE : The ASER survey in 2007 and 2009 recorded information about tuition. In both years, the question asked was the following: "Does the child take any paid additional class currently?" Therefore, these numbers do not include any supplemental help in learning that children may have received from parents or siblings or from anyone else that did not require payment.


## LEARNING LEVELS IN GOVERNMENT AND PRIVATE SCHOOLS : TRENDS OVER TIME

Chart 8: \% Children in Std III who CAN AT LEAST READ Std I LEVEL TEXT. BY SCHOOL TYPE 2006-2009


Chart 9: \% Children in Std V who CAN DO DIVISION. BY SCHOOL TYPE 2006-2009


Learning levels by gender : Trends over time

Chart 10: \% Boys and girls in Std III who CAN READ AT LEAST StD I LEVEL TEXT 2007-2009


Chart 11: \% Boys and girls in Std V who CAN DO DIVISION 2007-2009


## EDUCATION : FATHERS AND CHILDREN

| Table 9: Fathers and children 2009 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Of these fathers : |  |  |  |  |
| Fathers' <br> Education | ```% Fathers``` | \% Girls 6 to 14 out of school | \% Children (Std III-V) who can read level 1 (Std 1 Text) or more | \% Children (Std III-V) who can do subtraction or more | \% <br> Children <br> (Std III-V) who can read words or more in English | \% Children (Std IV-VIII) attending tuition |
| No Schooling | 6.0 | 2.3 | 90.5 | 87.8 | 90.5 | 47.1 |
| Std I-V | 7.5 | 0.0 | 96.4 | 91.7 | 87.5 | 23.1 |
| Std VI-VIII | 12.1 | 0.0 | 94.8 | 90.7 | 88.1 | 43.3 |
| Std IX-X | 35.2 | 0.0 | 94.0 | 89.5 | 92.8 | 50.7 |
| Above Std X | 39.3 | 0.0 | 97.4 | 93.3 | 92.1 | 64.7 |

NOTE: ASER 2009 recorded information about mothers' education. Similar analyses can be done with mothers and children.

## SCHOOL ENROLLMENT AND ATTENDANCE : TRENDS OVER TIME

| Type of school |  | 2005 |  | 2007 | 2009 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std I-IV/V : Primary |  | 22 |  | 13 | 49 |
| Std I-VII/VIII : Primary + Upper Primary |  | 15 |  | 33 | 3 |
| Total schools |  | 37 |  | 46 | 52 |
| Table 12: Teacher attendance 20052007 |  | 2009 | 2005 | 2052007 | 72009 |
| Type of school | Std I-IV/V |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |
| \% Teachers attending (average) 98.4 | 87.5 | 98.9 | 90.6 | 696.4 | 4100 |
| \% Schools with no teacher present 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | O 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \% Schools with all teachers present 95.2 | 75.0 | 97.9 | 57.1 | 185.7 | 100 |


| TABLE 11: CHILDREN'S ATtENDANCE 2005 | 2007 | 2009 | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Type of school | Std I-IV/V |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |
| \% Enrolled children attending <br> (average) <br> \% Schools with less than 50\% <br> enrolled children attending | 89.1 | 95.5 | 96.4 | 89.9 | 93.0 | 92.2 |
| \% Shools with 75\% or more <br> enrolled children attending | 95.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100 | 100 |

\% Enrolled children attending
\% Schools with less than 50\% enrolled children attending

Schools with 75\% or more

Table 13: Multigrade classes 200520072009200520072009
\% Of schools in which: Std I-IV/V Std I-VII/VIII
Std II class sitting with
another class
Std IV class sitting with another class

## SCHOOL FACILITIES: TRENDS OVER TIME

| Table 14: FaCilities in school |  | 200520072009200520072009 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \% Schools with: |  | Std I-IV/V |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{ \pm}{ \pm} \\ & \stackrel{N}{0} \\ & \vdots \end{aligned}$ | No facility | 9.1 | 0.0 | 6.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | Facility but water not available | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 6.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | Available | 90.9 | 100 | 93.8 | 93.3 | 100 | 100 |
| $\stackrel{\text { む }}{\stackrel{\text { ® }}{0}}$ | No facility | 27.3 | 15.4 | 0.0 | 6.7 | 3.0 | 0.0 |
|  | Facility but toilet not usable | 40.9 | 0.0 | 24.5 | 46.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | Usable | 31.8 | 84.6 | 75.5 | 46.7 | 97.0 | 100 |
| Midday meal served on day |  | 50.0 | 92.3 | 100 | 42.9 | 97.0 | 100 |

## TABLE 16: GIRLS ToILETS 2009 <br> Std I-IV/V Std I-VII/VIII

| No of schools visited | 46 | 3 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| \% Schools with no separate provision <br> for girls toilets | 6.5 | 0.0 |
| Of schools where there are separate girls toilets, $\%$ schools where: |  |  |
| Toilet locked | 17.4 | 0.0 |
| Toilet not usable | 6.5 | 0.0 |
| Usable | 69.6 | 100 |

Table 15: School improvement \& construction since April 2008

| School improvement \& | Std I-IV/V |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Construction | No. of <br> schs | \% schools <br> Yes |  | No of <br> schs | \% schools |  |
|  | 49 | 81.6 | 18.4 | 3 | 33.3 | 66.7 |
| Whitewash | 48 | 25.0 | 75.0 | 3 | 0.0 | 100 |
| Construction of new <br> classroom | 49 | 49.0 | 51.0 | 3 | 33.3 | 66.7 |
| Construction of boundary <br> wall | 49 |  |  |  |  |  |

ASER survey was carried out in Oct-Nov 2009. One govt school with primary grades was visited in each sampled village. If there was more than one govt school in a village, then the school with the highest enrollment was visited. Hence the schools visited in the ASER survey do not represent a random sample of schools of the district. The school visits were generally done either on a Saturday or a Monday.

| School Grants |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| classrooms | Rs 2 lacs per <br> additional room |
| Maintenance | Rs. 5000 pa upto 3 <br> grant |
| classrooms. Upto |  |
| Rs 10000 pa for |  |
| more than 3 |  |
| classrooms |  |$|$

## School Grants

| Table 17: <br> \% Primary <br> SCHOOLS RECEIVING <br> DIFFERENT GRANTS | April 2008-March 2009 |  |  |  | April 2009-October 2009 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Std I-IV/V |  |  |  | Std I-IV/V |  |  |  |
|  | No. of schs | Yes | No | Don't know | No. of schs | Yes | No | Don't know |
| New classroom | 42 | 0.0 | 100 | 0.0 | 43 | 2.3 | 95.4 | 2.3 |
| Maintenance grant | 49 | 100 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 49 | 93.9 | 4.1 | 2.0 |
| Development grant | 42 | 76.2 | 23.8 | 0.0 | 42 | 66.7 | 31.0 | 2.4 |
| Teacher grant (TLM grant) | 49 | 95.9 | 4.1 | 0.0 | 48 | 93.8 | 4.2 | 2.1 |
| Other grants | 17 | 0.0 | 100 | 0.0 | 17 | 0.0 | 94.1 | 5.9 |

NOTE : No grant information was available for 0 schools out of 49 primary schools that were visited. This could be because the head teacher was not present, register was not available or the surveyors could not obtain the information. Therefore, the above table is based on schools for which information was available for at least one indicator.

| TABLE 18: |
| :--- |
| \% UPPER PRIMARY |
| SCHOOLS RECEIVING |
| DIFFERENT GRANTS |
| New classroom |
| Maintenance grant |
| Development grant |
| Teacher grant |
| (TLM grant) |
| Other grants |

April 2008-March 2009 April 2009-October 2009 Std I-VII/VIII Std I-VII/VIII

| No. of <br> schs | Yes | No | Don't <br> know | No. of <br> schs | Yes | No | Don't <br> know |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | 0.0 | 100 | 0.0 | 2 | 0.0 | 100 | 0.0 |
| 3 | 100 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3 | 100 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 3 | 100 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3 | 100 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 3 | 100 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3 | 100 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

NOTE : No grant information was available for 0 schools out of 3 upper primary schools that were visited. This could be because the head teacher was not present, register was not available or the surveyors could not obtain the information. Therefore, the above table is based on schools for which information was available for at least one indicator.

## Performance of districts

| Table 19: | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { ANGANWADI } \\ \text { OR } \\ \text { BALWADI } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Out of SCHOOL | Private <br> SCHOOL | TUITION | Mothers' Reading | Std I-II : Learning Levels |  |  | Std III-V : Learning Levels |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Districts | \% Children (Age 3-4) in anganwadi or pre-school | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) <br> out <br> of <br> school | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) in private school | \% Children (Std IV-VIII) attending tuition classes | \% Mothers <br> (Age: 17-55) who CAN READ | \% Children <br> (Std I-II) who <br> CAN READ letters, words or more | \% Children <br> (Std I-II) <br> who CAN RECOGNIZE <br> NUMBERS <br> 1 to 9 <br> or more | \% Children <br> (Std I-II) <br> who CAN <br> READ <br> LETTERS or more in ENGLISH | \% Children <br> (Std III-V) who CAN READ Level 1 (Std 1 Text) or more | \% Children (Std III-V) who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more | \% Children (Std III-V) who CAN READ sentences in ENGLISH |
| North Goa* |  | 0.2 | 48.1 | 50.3 | 90.1 | 100.0 | 99.2 | 82.1 | 98.3 | 95.8 | 60.8 |
| South Goa* |  | 0.3 | 66.7 | 54.4 | 94.8 | 94.4 | 98.1 | 96.2 | 91.5 | 84.3 | 74.5 |
| Total* |  | 0.2 | 55.8 | 52.2 | 92.0 | 97.4 | 98.7 | 88.7 | 95.8 | 91.6 | 65.8 |

[^15]

ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM 26 OUT OF 26 DISTRICTS

## SCHOOL ENROLLMENT AND OUT OF SCHOOL CHILDREN

| Table 1: \% Children in different types of SCHOOLS 2009 |  |  |  | \% Out of school |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in School |  |
| Age: 6-14 ALL | 85.4 | 10.2 | 0.1 | 4.3 | 100 |
| Age: 7-16 ALL | 79.7 | 12.7 | 0.2 | 7.4 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 91.0 | 7.2 | 0.2 | 1.7 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 BOYS | 90.8 | 7.4 | 0.2 | 1.6 | 100 |
| AGE: 7-10 GIRLS | 91.2 | 6.8 | 0.2 | 1.8 | 100 |
| AgE: 11-14 ALL | 77.7 | 14.5 | 0.1 | 7.8 | 100 |
| AgE: 11-14 BOYS | 79.3 | 14.8 | 0.1 | 5.8 | 100 |
| AGE: 11-14 GIRLS | 75.7 | 14.0 | 0.1 | 10.2 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 ALL | 48.9 | 25.5 | 0.4 | 25.3 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 BOYS | 51.5 | 27.1 | 0.4 | 21.1 | 100 |
| AgE: 15-16 GIRLS | 45.4 | 23.4 | 0.4 | 30.9 | 100 |


note : 'отнеR' includes chidren going to madarssa and EGS.
'кот in school' = dropped out + never enrolled.


| Std. | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 22.6 | 65.1 | 9.2 |  |  |  |  | 3.1 |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| II | 1.1 | 7.7 | 70.2 | 15.5 |  |  |  | 5. | . 5 |  |  |  | 100 |
| III | 1. | 5 | 7.1 | 66.0 | 20.2 |  |  |  | 5.1 |  |  |  | 100 |
| IV |  | 1.9 |  | 8.0 | 61.7 | 22.5 |  |  |  | . 9 |  |  | 100 |
| V |  | 6 | . 4 |  | 67.0 | 19.7 | 4.3 |  |  | 2.7 |  |  | 100 |
| VI |  |  | 1.6 |  |  | 5.6 | 59.6 | 24.8 |  | 8. |  |  | 100 |
| VII |  |  | 2 | . 1 |  |  | 4.4 | 61.2 | 22.1 | 6.6 | 3. |  | 100 |
| VIII |  |  |  | 2.7 |  |  |  | 6.9 | 59.9 | 21.5 | 6.0 | 3.0 | 100 |

How to read the table: In Std III, $93.3 \%(7.1+66.0+20.2)$ children are in age group 7 to 9 .

## Young CHILDREN IN PRE-SCHOOL AND SCHOOL

|  | In balwadi or anganwadi | In LKG/ UKG | In School |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\text { ¢ }}{\stackrel{\text { ® }}{0}}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Govt. | Pvt. | Other |  |  |
| Age 3 | 90.9 | 2.9 |  |  |  | 6.3 | 100 |
| Age 4 | 93.6 | 3.0 |  |  |  | 3.4 | 100 |
| Age 5 | 43.2 | 3.5 | 46.6 | 4.6 | 0.0 | 2.1 | 100 |
| Age 6 | 3.1 | 0.3 | 89.6 | 5.5 | 0.2 | 1.3 | 100 |

Chart 3: Trends over time
\% Children age 3-4 not attending pre-school (ICDS or other) 2006-2009


Of the villages visited, Anganwadi/Pre-School presence has been recorded in 96.9\% villages.

## Reading in own language

Table 4: Class-wise \% Children who CAN READ (All Schools) 2009

| StD. | Nothing | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (STD 1 Text) | Level 2 <br> (Std 2 Text) | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 36.9 | 46.3 | 9.3 | 5.3 | 2.3 | 100 |
| II | 11.7 | 40.6 | 29.1 | 11.2 | 7.5 | 100 |
| III | 5.9 | 26.0 | 30.2 | 22.0 | 15.9 | 100 |
| IV | 2.6 | 14.6 | 22.3 | 31.2 | 29.4 | 100 |
| V | 2.4 | 9.4 | 15.0 | 28.9 | 44.4 | 100 |
| VI | 1.5 | 6.8 | 9.3 | 25.7 | 56.8 | 100 |
| VII | 1.6 | 5.1 | 6.1 | 20.7 | 66.6 | 100 |
| VIII | 1.3 | 4.4 | 2.9 | 14.2 | 77.2 | 100 |
| TOTAL | 8.0 | 19.5 | 16.1 | 20.4 | 36.0 | 100 |

NOTE : Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. Thus a child who can read Std II level text can read letters, words, and Std 1 level text.

## Reading Tool

| Reading Tool |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sta 4 (evel | Sod linel |  |
| 43 nexeed efuman $4 \lambda$ al <br>  - <br> nec uym Mém st. <br>  <br> dal av tr |  <br>  <br>  <br>  |  |
|  uneor werl that shat. <br>  <br>  B. |  |  |
|  | - - - ant | - |

Chart 5: TRENDS OVER TIME
\% Children who CAN READ Std II level text (in govt schools in
Std IV - VII) 2006-2009




Hीy bell umon ds a.


Chart 4: Trends over time
\% Children who CANNOT EVEN IDENTIFY LETTERS (IN GOVt Schools in Std I - IV) 2006-2009


## Reading and comprehension in english

## TABLE 5: CLASS-WISE \% CHILDREN WHO CAN READ

ENGLISH (All Schools) 2009

Cannot Can readCan readCan read Can read Total Std. | read | capital | small | simple | easy |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| capital |  |  |  |  |
| letters | letters | words | sentences |  | letters

| I | 74.7 | 17.4 | 2.9 | 4.5 | 0.5 | 100 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| II | 62.0 | 25.2 | 5.9 | 5.3 | 1.5 | 100 |
| III | 47.2 | 34.1 | 8.3 | 7.9 | 2.5 | 100 |
| IV | 33.3 | 36.9 | 13.4 | 12.1 | 4.4 | 100 |
| V | 18.9 | 35.4 | 18.6 | 19.2 | 7.9 | 100 |
| VI | 12.4 | 30.5 | 20.6 | 24.1 | 12.5 | 100 |
| VII | 9.0 | 24.2 | 20.7 | 28.1 | 18.0 | 100 |
| VIII | 5.1 | 17.4 | 15.7 | 25.9 | 35.9 | 100 |
| TOTAL | 33.5 | 28.2 | 13.3 | 15.6 | 9.4 | 100 |


| Std. | Of those who can read words, \% who can tell meaning of the words | Of those who can read sentences, \% who can tell meaning of the sentences |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 76.8 | 19.5 |
| II | 69.1 | 32.9 |
| III | 67.9 | 50.1 |
| IV | 67.8 | 43.1 |
| V | 62.8 | 59.9 |
| VI | 63.4 | 59.1 |
| VII | 65.2 | 61.4 |
| VIII | 70.7 | 61.4 |
| TOtAL | 66.3 | 58.4 |


| English Tool |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
| $\mathbf{C}$ K S  <br>  $\mathbf{Q}$  $\mathbf{F}$ <br> $\mathbf{W}$ $\mathbf{O}$ $\mathbf{Z}$  | $\begin{array}{llll} \mathbf{n} & \mathbf{p} & \mathbf{g} \\ & \mathbf{v} & & \mathbf{e} \\ & & & \\ \mathbf{j} & \mathbf{r} & \mathbf{b} \end{array}$ |
|  | --imotorn-m- |
| $\begin{array}{\|lll} \text { hen } & & \text { old } \\ & \text { sit } & \\ \text { run } & & \text { fox } \\ & \text { bagg } & \end{array}$ | 3 <br> What is your name? <br> This is a big bus. <br> 1 Whe to ning. <br> 1 have a sister. |
|  |  |

## ARITHMETIC

|  |  | Recogni | Numbers |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std. | Nothing | 1-9 | 11-99 | Subtract | Divide | Total |
| I | 35.2 | 50.5 | 8.8 | 4.1 | 1.4 | 100 |
| II | 14.1 | 46.9 | 28.5 | 7.4 | 3.0 | 100 |
| III | 7.2 | 31.4 | 37.9 | 16.8 | 6.7 | 100 |
| IV | 4.3 | 20.9 | 32.8 | 26.5 | 15.5 | 100 |
| v | 3.8 | 13.1 | 25.6 | 32.9 | 24.6 | 100 |
| VI | 2.5 | 10.3 | 21.5 | 33.1 | 32.7 | 100 |
| VII | 2.2 | 8.2 | 14.6 | 30.2 | 44.9 | 100 |
| VIII | 1.1 | 6.5 | 11.3 | 24.9 | 56.3 | 100 |
| Total | 8.9 | 23.9 | 23.3 | 22.1 | 21.9 | 100 |

NOTE : Each cell shows the highest level of arithmetic achieved by a child. Thus a child who can do division, can also recognize numbers 1-9, 11-99 and do subtraction.

Chart 6: Trends over time
\% Children who CANNOT EVEN RECOGNIZE NUMBERS UPTO 9 (IN GOVT SCHOOLS IN STD I - IV) 2007-2009


CHART 7: TRENDS OVER TIME
\% Children who CAN DO DIVISION (in govt schools in Std IV - VII) 2007-2009


## TUITION

| Year | School | 1 | 11 | III | IV | v | VI | VII | VIII |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2007 | Govt | 3.9 | 5.6 | 6.0 | 5.8 | 7.4 | 7.3 | 10.2 | 13.0 |
|  | Pvi. | 19.8 | 23.5 | 26.6 | 26.1 | 40.3 | 31.1 | 35.2 | 26.0 |
| 2009 | Govt | 5.5 | 7.1 | 7.1 | 9.0 | 9.2 | 9.0 | 9.1 | 11.9 |
|  | Pvi. | 29.4 | 33.8 | 39.9 | 40.4 | 44.0 | 38.8 | 31.0 | 23.8 |

NOTE : The ASER survey in 2007 and 2009 recorded information about tuition. In both years, the question asked was the following: "Does the child take any paid additional class currently?" Therefore, these numbers do not include any supplemental help in learning that children may have received from parents or siblings or from anyone else that did not require payment.


## GUJARAT rural

## LEARNING LEVELS IN GOVERNMENT AND PRIVATE SCHOOLS : TRENDS OVER TIME

Chart 8: \% Children in Std III who CAN AT LEAST READ Std I LEVEL TEXT. BY SCHOOL TYPE 2006-2009


Chart 9: \% Children in Std V who CAN DO DIVISION. BY SCHOOL TYPE 2006-2009


Learning levels by gender : Trends over time

Chart 10: \% Boys and girls in Std III who CAN ReAD at least Std I LEVEL text 2007-2009


Chart 11: \% Boys and girls in Std V who CAN do division 2007-2009


## EDUCATION : FATHERS AND CHILDREN

Table 9: Fathers and children 2009

| Fathers' <br> Education | \% Fathers | Of these fathers : |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | \% Girls 6 to 14 out of school | \% Children (Std III-V) who can read level 1 (Std 1 Text) or more | \% Children (Std III-V) who can do subtraction or more | \% Children (Std III-V) who can read words or more in English | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% } \\ \text { Children } \\ \text { (Std IV-VIII) } \\ \text { attending } \\ \text { tuition } \end{gathered}$ |
| No Schooling | 24.4 | 9.4 | 50.8 | 34.9 | 14.9 | 6.5 |
| Std I-V | 17.0 | 7.6 | 51.3 | 35.9 | 14.1 | 8.2 |
| Std VI-VIII | 18.1 | 4.2 | 59.4 | 40.6 | 16.8 | 10.6 |
| Std IX-X | 24.3 | 2.8 | 63.3 | 45.5 | 20.4 | 15.9 |
| Above Std X | 16.2 | 0.6 | 69.1 | 56.4 | 29.3 | 23.5 |

NOTE: ASER 2009 recorded information about mothers' education. Similar analyses can be done with mothers and children.


## SCHOOL ENROLLMENT AND ATTENDANCE : TRENDS OVER TIME

| TABLE 10: ToTAL SCHools visited |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Type of school | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 |
| Std I-IV/V : Primary | 40 | 76 | 67 |
| Std I-VII/VIII : Primary + Upper Primary | 396 | 558 | 603 |
| Total schools | 436 | 634 | 670 |


| TABLE 12: Teacher attendance | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Type of school | Std I-IV/V |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |
| \% Teachers attending (average) | 83.4 | 94.7 | 96.2 | 87.9 | 93.0 | 94.8 |
| \% Schools with no teacher present | 5.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \% Schools with all teachers present | 64.9 | 85.7 | 89.2 | 54.4 | 69.9 | 76.1 |


| TABLE 11: CHILDREN'S ATtENDANCE 2005 | 2007 | 2009 | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Type of school | Std I-IV/V |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |
| \% Enrolled children attending <br> (average) <br> \% Schools with less than 50\% <br> enrolled children attending | 79.7 | 81.0 | 83.5 | 81.5 | 85.5 | 83.1 |
| \% Shools with 75\% or more <br> enrolled children attending | 68.4 | 68.1 | 0.0 | 74.2 | 77.6 | 85.9 |

TABLE 11: Children's ATtendance 200520072009200520072009 Type of school Std I-IV/V Std I-VII/VIII \% Enrolled children attending (average) Schools with less than 50\% \% Schools with 75\% or more enrolled children attending


## School facilities : TRENDS OVER TIME

| Table 14: Facilities in school |  | 20052007 |  | 2009 | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \% Schools with: |  | Std I-IV/V |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \pm \\ & \stackrel{ \pm}{N} \\ & \vdots \end{aligned}$ | No facility | 23.1 | 17.6 | 13.8 | 19.1 | 12.8 | 10.8 |
|  | Facility but water not available | 12.8 | 10.8 | 6.2 | 7.7 | 2.0 | 3.5 |
|  | Available | 64.1 | 71.6 | 80.0 | 73.2 | 85.2 | 85.7 |
| $\stackrel{\text { む }}{\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}}$ | No facility | 42.5 | 13.6 | 17.2 | 23.5 | 6.6 | 5.4 |
|  | Facility but toilet not usable | 15.0 | 4.5 | 25.0 | 9.2 | 3.0 | 30.4 |
|  | Usable | 42.5 | 81.8 | 57.8 | 67.3 | 90.4 | 64.1 |
| Midday meal served on day |  | 92.3 | 94.6 | 92.3 | 88.3 | 94.7 | 88.8 |


| TABLE 16: GIRLS ToILETS | 2009 | Std I-IV/V | Std I-VII/VIII |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No of schools visited <br> \% Schools with no separate provision <br> for girls toilets | 60 | 529 |  |
| Of schools where there are separate girls toilets, \% schools where: |  |  |  |
| Toilet locked | 13.3 | 16.6 |  |
| Toilet not usable | 1.7 | 13.0 |  |
| Usable | 50.0 | 55.8 |  |

Table 15: School improvement \& construction since April 2008

|  <br> Construction | Std I-IV/V |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. of <br> schs | \% schools <br> Yes |  | No. of <br> schs | Yes <br> Ychools |  |
| Whitewash | 64 | 65.6 | 34.4 | 556 | 68.4 | 31.7 |
| Construction of new <br> classroom | 63 | 15.9 | 84.1 | 530 | 24.0 | 76.0 |
| Construction of boundary <br> wall | 62 | 41.9 | 58.1 | 537 | 49.4 | 50.7 |

ASER survey was carried out in Oct-Nov 2009. One govt school with primary grades was visited in each sampled village. If there was more than one govt school in a village, then the school with the highest enrollment was visited. Hence the schools visited in the ASER survey do not represent a random sample of schools of the district. The school visits were generally done either on a Saturday or a Monday.

| School Grants |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| New classrooms | Rs 2 lacs per additional room |
| Maintenance grant | Rs. 5000 pa upto 3 classrooms. Upto Rs 10000 pa for more than 3 classrooms |
| Development grant | Rs. 5000 pa for primary schs \& Rs 7000 pa for upper primary schs |
| TLM grant | Rs. 500 pa per teacher |

## School Grants

| TABLE 17: <br> \% Primary <br> SCHOOLS RECEIVING <br> DIFFERENT GRANTS | April 2008-March 2009 |  |  |  | April 2009-October 2009 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Std I-IV/V |  |  |  | Std I-IV/V |  |  |  |
|  | No. of schs | Yes | No | Don't know | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No. of } \\ & \text { schs } \end{aligned}$ | Yes | No | Don't know |
| New classroom | 53 | 9.4 | 84.9 | 5.7 | 48 | 6.3 | 87.5 | 6.3 |
| Maintenance grant | 55 | 74.6 | 23.6 | 1.8 | 49 | 69.4 | 24.5 | 6.1 |
| Development grant | 54 | 85.2 | 13.0 | 1.9 | 49 | 85.7 | 8.2 | 6.1 |
| Teacher grant (TLM grant) | 60 | 93.3 | 5.0 | 1.7 | 54 | 85.2 | 11.1 | 3.7 |
| Other grants | 17 | 23.5 | 70.6 | 5.9 | 15 | 13.3 | 80.0 | 6.7 |

Note : No grant information was available for 5 schools out of 67 primary schools that were visited. This could be because the head teacher was not present, register was not available or the surveyors could not obtain the information. Therefore, the above table is based on schools for which information was available for at least one indicator.

| TABLE 18: |
| :--- |
| \% UpPER PRIMARY |
| SCHOOLS RECEIVING |
| DIFFERENT GRANTS |
| New classroom |
| Maintenance grant |
| Development grant |
| Teacher grant <br> (TMM grant) <br> Other grants $\mathbf{l}$ |

April 2008-March 2009 April 2009-October 2009 Std I-VII/VIII Std I-VII/VIII

| No. of <br> schs | Yes | No | Don't <br> know | No. of <br> schs | Yes | No | Don't <br> know |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 467 | 14.8 | 80.5 | 4.7 | 403 | 13.2 | 80.7 | 6.2 |
| 468 | 80.6 | 16.2 | 3.2 | 413 | 69.3 | 24.7 | 6.1 |
| 463 | 86.6 | 9.9 | 3.5 | 405 | 77.0 | 17.8 | 5.2 |
| 471 | 95.5 | 2.6 | 1.9 | 416 | 84.1 | 12.5 | 3.4 |
| 144 | 29.9 | 66.7 | 3.5 | 126 | 28.6 | 63.5 | 7.9 |

Note : No grant information was available for 65 schools out of 603 upper primary schools that were visited. This could be because the head teacher was not present, register was not available or the surveyors could not obtain the information. Therefore, the above table is based on schools for which information was available for at least one indicator.

## Performance of districts

| Table 19: | $\begin{gathered} \text { ANGANWADI } \\ \text { OR } \\ \text { BALWADI } \end{gathered}$ | Out of SCHOOL | Private SCHOOL | Tuition | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Mothers' } \\ \hline \text { Reading } \end{array}$ | Std I-II : Learning levels |  |  | Std III-V : Learning levels |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Districts | \% Children (Age 3-4) in anganwadi or pre-school | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) <br> out <br> of <br> school | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) <br> in private school | \% Children (Std IV-VIII) attending tuition classes | \% Mothers <br> (Age: 17-55) who CAN READ | \% Children <br> (Std I-II) who CAN READ letters, words or more | \% Children (Std I-II) who CAN RECOGNIZE NUMBERS 1 to 9 or more | \% Children (Std I-II) who CAN READ LETTERS or more in ENGLISH | \% Children (Std III-V) who CAN READ Level 1 (Std 1 Text) or more | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% Children } \\ & \text { (Std III-V) } \\ & \text { who } \\ & \text { CAN DO } \\ & \text { SUBTRACTION } \\ & \text { or more } \end{aligned}$ | \% Children (Std III-V) who CAN READ sentences in ENGLISH |
| Ahmedabad | 100.0 | 6.0 | 4.4 | 5.3 | 66.8 | 88.1 | 85.3 | 49.1 | 63.3 | 59.0 | 6.0 |
| Amreli | 93.9 | 5.1 | 10.1 | 9.1 | 73.6 | 70.2 | 72.2 | 40.5 | 61.0 | 43.0 | 4.0 |
| Anand | 96.6 | 2.0 | 24.9 | 27.9 | 76.4 | 69.0 | 70.1 | 26.7 | 55.9 | 36.4 | 9.0 |
| Banas Kantha | 100.0 | 9.5 | 5.9 | 8.1 | 70.1 | 59.0 | 67.5 | 20.0 | 51.1 | 26.3 | 4.9 |
| Bharuch | 97.7 | 3.9 | 15.3 | 11.1 | 78.1 | 79.8 | 77.5 | 41.6 | 52.4 | 35.4 | 2.2 |
| Bhavnagar | 95.5 | 3.9 | 8.7 | 12.5 | 57.8 | 65.0 | 55.4 | 17.2 | 48.7 | 30.4 | 4.7 |
| Dahod | 98.3 | 4.9 | 3.3 | 4.1 | 35.3 | 73.3 | 71.5 | 21.9 | 50.7 | 33.6 | 1.1 |
| Gandhinagar | 93.4 | 4.8 | 22.9 | 23.2 | 54.6 | 73.2 | 69.7 | 23.2 | 59.1 | 34.5 | 6.4 |
| Jamnagar | 100.0 | 0.9 | 6.7 | 14.2 | 74.2 | 85.3 | 84.5 | 61.5 | 70.2 | 61.5 | 9.5 |
| Junagadh | 97.9 | 1.5 | 6.5 | 7.1 | 87.5 | 70.6 | 68.5 | 18.7 | 53.1 | 33.9 | 2.0 |
| Kachchh | 87.8 | 7.2 | 4.9 | 13.9 | 58.2 | 76.4 | 80.8 | 23.4 | 52.9 | 41.2 | 2.2 |
| Kheda | 83.7 | 3.0 | 10.1 | 6.9 | 64.6 | 75.8 | 73.3 | 27.7 | 60.9 | 43.0 | 13.7 |
| Mehsana | 100.0 | 3.7 | 7.0 | 6.1 | 83.0 | 80.4 | 81.1 | 30.2 | 79.6 | 70.8 | 3.9 |
| Narmada | 95.4 | 3.6 | 2.8 | 4.2 | 73.5 | 69.2 | 71.6 | 40.1 | 41.2 | 26.1 | 2.3 |
| Navsari | 97.4 | 2.5 | 4.6 | 20.3 | 83.3 | 85.5 | 82.3 | 21.1 | 65.6 | 47.0 | 2.9 |
| Panch Mahal | 92.5 | 3.3 | 4.8 | 7.8 | 52.7 | 79.1 | 76.7 | 26.7 | 55.3 | 28.6 | 3.8 |
| Patan | 99.4 | 4.0 | 5.5 | 6.0 | 67.1 | 84.4 | 82.4 | 51.7 | 59.0 | 48.9 | 1.5 |
| Porbandar | 97.8 | 4.3 | 11.2 | 14.2 | 61.4 | 86.3 | 84.7 | 43.4 | 57.3 | 43.8 | 3.9 |
| Rajkot | 91.9 | 3.2 | 12.4 | 18.5 | 60.7 | 91.4 | 86.5 | 42.4 | 65.3 | 46.8 | 7.2 |
| Sabar Kantha | 99.5 | 1.6 | 24.4 | 14.7 | 55.2 | 76.2 | 79.9 | 33.3 | 60.3 | 41.2 | 4.1 |
| Surat | 94.0 | 4.2 | 28.8 | 47.7 | 85.2 | 81.5 | 86.9 | 34.6 | 71.8 | 67.6 | 14.1 |
| Surendranagar | 87.6 | 4.5 | 8.5 | 9.8 | 66.1 | 86.3 | 87.8 | 52.3 | 66.7 | 59.3 | 4.0 |
| Tapi | 97.3 | 4.6 | 9.1 | 14.5 | 58.8 | 72.5 | 71.0 | 24.7 | 41.4 | 32.3 | 3.9 |
| The Dangs | 99.6 | 6.7 | 3.6 | 6.7 | 63.1 | 82.4 | 81.0 | 15.7 | 46.1 | 28.1 | 1.1 |
| Vadodara | 88.2 | 5.7 | 15.6 | 9.5 | 43.2 | 63.2 | 60.9 | 27.0 | 36.3 | 18.1 | 2.3 |
| Valsad | 90.7 | 4.7 | 8.7 | 10.2 | 88.9 | 82.8 | 77.8 | 47.2 | 55.1 | 43.8 | 7.8 |
| Total | 95.3 | 4.3 | 10.2 | 12.0 | 65.2 | 75.8 | 75.4 | 31.8 | 57.3 | 41.1 | 5.0 |



# Haryana <br> Himachal Pradesh <br> Jammu and Kashmir <br> JHARKHAND <br> Karnataka <br> Kerala 



## SCHOOL ENROLLMENT AND OUT OF SCHOOL CHILDREN

| Table 1: \% Children in different types of schools 2009 |  |  |  | \% Out of school |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in School |  |
| AgE: 6-14 ALL | 55.6 | 40.9 | 0.4 | 3.1 | 100 |
| Age: 7-16 ALL | 55.8 | 39.3 | 0.4 | 4.5 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 53.4 | 43.7 | 0.5 | 2.5 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 BOYS | 50.2 | 46.9 | 0.5 | 2.4 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 GIRLS | 57.7 | 39.6 | 0.3 | 2.4 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 ALL | 59.3 | 36.4 | 0.3 | 4.0 | 100 |
| AGE: 11-14 BOYS | 55.4 | 40.8 | 0.3 | 3.6 | 100 |
| AGE: 11-14 GIRLS | 65.1 | 30.2 | 0.4 | 4.3 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 ALL | 54.4 | 34.4 | 0.3 | 10.9 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 BOYS | 52.0 | 38.6 | 0.4 | 9.1 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 GIRLS | 58.8 | 28.4 | 0.2 | 12.6 | 100 |



NOTE: 'оTHER' includes chidren going to madarssa and EGS.
'от IN SCHool' = dropped out + never enrolled.


| Std. | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 31.1 | 38.6 | 18.0 | 7.3 |  |  |  |  | . 0 |  |  |  | 100 |
| II | 5.3 | 16.3 | 38.2 | 26.1 | 7.1 |  |  |  | 7.1 |  |  |  | 100 |
| III |  | 4.2 | 13.6 | 39.7 | 24.1 | 11.8 | 3.4 |  | 3. | 3 |  |  | 100 |
| IV |  | 4.3 |  | 15.4 | 30.0 | 29.5 | 9.5 | 7.0 |  | 4.3 |  |  | 100 |
| V |  |  | . 3 |  | 10.9 | 42.1 | 18.7 | 13.6 | 5.7 |  | 3.8 |  | 100 |
| VI |  |  | 4.9 |  |  | 16.4 | 26.6 | 33.2 | 11.2 | 5.4 | 2. |  | 100 |
| VII |  |  |  | 6.7 |  |  | 11.4 | 37.7 | 25.9 | 11.2 | 5.0 | 2.1 | 100 |
| VIII |  |  |  | 5. | . 5 |  |  | 17.2 | 31.2 | 28.8 | 12.4 | 4.9 | 100 |

How to read the table: In Std III, $75.6 \%(39.7+24.1+11.8)$ children are in age group 8 to 10 .

## Young children in pre-school and school

|  |  |  |  | n Scho |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | anganwadi | UKG | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | 울 |  |
| Age 3 | 53.5 | 12.9 |  |  |  | 33.6 | 100 |
| Age 4 | 46.7 | 31.1 |  |  |  | 22.3 | 100 |
| Age 5 | 16.1 | 11.8 | 26.8 | 35.3 | 0.8 | 9.3 | 100 |
| Age 6 | 3.4 | 3.8 | 44.8 | 42.5 | 0.3 | 5.2 | 100 |

Chart 3: Trends over time
\% Children age 3-4 not attending Pre-school (ICDS or other) 2006-2009


Of the villages visited, Anganwadi/Pre-School presence has been recorded in 97.3\% villages.

## Reading in own language

Table 4: Class-wise \% children who CAN READ (All Schools) 2009

| StD. | Nothing | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (Std 1 Text) | Level 2 <br> (Std 2 Text) | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| I | 23.2 | 42.5 | 19.9 | 5.7 | 8.8 | 100 |
| II | 6.8 | 28.7 | 31.3 | 16.8 | 16.4 | 100 |
| III | 3.2 | 16.5 | 25.0 | 23.0 | 32.3 | 100 |
| IV | 2.8 | 8.7 | 17.2 | 23.6 | 47.7 | 100 |
| V | 0.8 | 5.4 | 10.2 | 17.8 | 65.8 | 100 |
| VI | 0.6 | 4.4 | 6.6 | 17.0 | 71.5 | 100 |
| VII | 0.3 | 2.8 | 3.8 | 11.5 | 81.5 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.5 | 2.7 | 2.9 | 7.7 | 86.4 | 100 |
| TOTAL | 4.9 | 14.5 | 15.3 | 15.8 | 49.4 | 100 |

NOTE : Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. Thus a child who can read Std II level text can read letters, words, and Std 1 level text.


CHART 5: TRENDS OVER TIME
\% Children who CAN READ Std II level text (in govt schools in Std IV - VII) 2006-2009


Chart 4: Trends over time
\% Children who CANNOT EVEN IDENTIFY LETTERS (IN GOVt Schools in Std I - IV) 2006-2009


## ARITHMETIC

Table 7: Class-wise \% children who CAN Do ARIthmetic (All Schools) 2009

| STD. | Nothing | Recognize Numbers |  | Subtract | Divide | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| I | 22.6 | 42.4 | 22.4 | 6.1 | 6.5 | 100 |
| II | 6.3 | 27.0 | 36.1 | 18.9 | 11.7 | 100 |
| III | 3.2 | 14.7 | 29.0 | 27.9 | 25.2 | 100 |
| IV | 2.8 | 9.6 | 19.5 | 27.5 | 40.7 | 100 |
| V | 1.3 | 5.0 | 11.9 | 27.1 | 54.7 | 100 |
| VI | 1.1 | 4.3 | 8.3 | 21.4 | 64.9 | 100 |
| VII | 0.6 | 2.5 | 7.0 | 13.1 | 76.8 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.7 | 2.4 | 3.9 | 10.9 | 82.1 | 100 |
| TOTAL | 4.9 | 14.0 | 18.0 | 19.6 | 43.5 | 100 |

NOTE : Each cell shows the highest level of arithmetic achieved by a child. Thus a child who can do division, can also recognize numbers 1-9, 11-99 and do subtraction.

Chart 6: Trends over time
\% Children who CANNOT EVEN RECOGNIZE NUMBERS UPTO 9 (IN GOVt schools in Std I - IV) 2007-2009



Chart 7: Trends over time
\% Children who CAN DO DIVISION (in govt schools in Std IV - VII) 2007-2009


## TUITION

Table 8: Class-wise \% children ATtending tuition classes. BY SCHOOL TYPE 2007 AND 2009

| Year | School | 1 | II | III | IV | V | VI | VII | VIII |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2007 | Govt | 5.1 | 5.2 | 7.2 | 7.3 | 9.6 | 7.6 | 6.3 | 10.6 |
|  | Pvt. | 11.0 | 11.2 | 14.5 | 14.0 | 17.1 | 16.8 | 16.3 | 19.7 |
| 2009 | Govt | 9.6 | 11.1 | 13.8 | 12.5 | 15.2 | 12.4 | 15.3 | 19.0 |
|  | Pvt. | 17.8 | 20.5 | 23.7 | 27.0 | 30.5 | 30.0 | 24.7 | 32.7 |

NOTE : The ASER survey in 2007 and 2009 recorded information about tuition. In both years, the question asked was the following: "Does the child take any paid additional class currently?" Therefore, these numbers do not include any supplemental help in learning that children may have received from parents or siblings or from anyone else that did not require payment.


## HARYANA <br> rural

## LEARNING LEVELS IN GOVERNMENT AND PRIVATE SCHOOLS : TRENDS OVER TIME

Chart 8: \% Children in Std III who CAN AT LEAST READ Std I LEVEL TEXT. BY SCHOOL TYPE 2006-2009


Chart 9: \% Children in Std V who CAN DO DIVISION.
BY SCHOOL TYPE 2006-2009


Learning levels by gender : Trends over time

Chart 10: \% Boys and girls in Std III who CAN READ AT LEAST Std I LEVEL text 2007-2009


Chart 11: \% Boys and girls in Std V who CAN do division 2007-2009


## EDUCATION : FATHERS AND CHILDREN

|  |  |  |  | Of these father |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fathers' <br> Education | $\%$ <br> Fathers | \% Girls 6 to 14 out of school | \% Children (Std III-V) who can read level 1 (Std 1 Text) or more | \% Children (Std III-V) who can do subtraction or more | \% Children (Std III-V) who can read words or more in English | \% Children (Std IV-VIII) attending tuition |
| No Schooling | 21.8 | 7.3 | 60.2 | 55.2 | 49.9 | 13.8 |
| Std I-V | 9.9 | 4.7 | 63.1 | 58.3 | 47.4 | 15.5 |
| Std VI-VIII | 18.7 | 2.3 | 69.0 | 64.2 | 57.9 | 19.6 |
| Std IX-X | 27.0 | 1.1 | 75.2 | 75.7 | 66.2 | 23.1 |
| Above Std X | 22.7 | 1.1 | 81.2 | 81.3 | 75.8 | 28.3 |

NOTE: ASER 2009 recorded information about mothers' education. Similar analyses can be done with mothers and children.


## SCHOOL ENROLLMENT AND ATTENDANCE : TRENDS OVER TIME

| TABLE 10: Total schools visited |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Type of school | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 |
| Std I-IV/V : Primary | 270 | 335 | 353 |
| Std I-VII/VIII : Primary + Upper Primary | 100 | 95 | 149 |
| Total schools | 370 | 430 | 502 |


| TABLE 12: TEACHER ATtENDANCE | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Type of school | Std I-IV/V |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |
| \% Teachers attending (average) | 75.3 | 91.8 | 86.4 | 73.7 | 90.6 | 84.9 |
| \% Schools with no teacher present | 2.2 | 0.0 | 1.2 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 0.7 |
| \% Schools with all teachers present | 34.8 | 72.6 | 56.8 | 18.4 | 62.7 | 34.3 |


| TABLE 11: CHILDREN'S ATTENDANCE 2005 | 2007 | 2009 | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Type of school | Std I-IV/V |  |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |
| \% Enrolled children attending <br> (average) <br> \% Schools with less than 50\% <br> enrolled children attending | 80.4 | 82.1 | 83.7 | 81.7 | 84.4 | 84.9 |
| \% Shools with 75\% or more <br> enrolled children attending | 74.5 | 80.7 | 1.1 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 1.2 |

\% Enrolled children attending
\% Schools with less than 50\% enrolled children attending chools with

Table 13: Multigrade classes 200520072009200520072009 \% Of schools in which:
Std II class sitting with another class
Std IV class sitting with another class


## School facilities : trends over time

| Table 14: FACILIties in school |  | 20052007 |  | 2009 | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \% Schools with: |  | Std I-IV/V |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |
|  | No facility | 18.4 | 9.9 | 16.6 | 8.2 | 11.0 | 7.7 |
|  | Facility but water not available | 10.2 | 6.4 | 8.0 | 6.1 | 6.6 | 5.6 |
|  | Available | 71.4 | 83.7 | 75.4 | 85.7 | 82.4 | 86.7 |
|  | No facility | 10.4 | 4.7 | 4.0 | 4.1 | 7.5 | 1.4 |
| $\stackrel{\text { ¢ }}{0}$ | Facility but toilet not usable | 21.6 | 9.0 | 27.2 | 23.5 | 14.0 | 28.0 |
|  | Usable | 67.9 | 86.3 | 68.8 | 72.4 | 78.5 | 70.6 |
| Midday meal served on day |  | 82.7 | 97.6 | 89.1 | 70.1 | 94.7 | 93.2 |


| TABLE 16: GIRLS ToILETS $\mathbf{2 0 0 9}$ | Std I-IV/V | Std I-VII/VIII |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| No of schools visited <br> \% Schools with no separate provision <br> for girls toilets | 306 | 136 |
| Of schools where there are separate girls toilets, \% schools where: |  |  |
| Toilet locked | 11.8 | 5.1 |
| Toilet not usable | 2.9 | 8.8 |
| Usable | 55.6 | 31.6 |

Table 15: School improvement \& construction since April 2008

|  <br> Construction | Std I-IV/V |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. of <br> schs | \% schools |  | No. of | \% schools |  |
| schs | Yes | No |  |  |  |  |
| Whitewash | 322 | 62.7 | 37.3 | 132 | 63.6 | 36.4 |
| Construction of new <br> classroom <br> Construction of boundary <br> wall | 322 | 35.4 | 64.6 | 129 | 42.6 | 57.4 |
|  | 316 | 38.3 | 61.7 | 127 | 31.5 | 68.5 |

ASER survey was carried out in Oct-Nov 2009. One govt school with primary grades was visited in each sampled village. If there was more than one govt school in a village, then the school with the highest enrollment was visited. Hence the schools visited in the ASER survey do not represent a random sample of schools of the district. The school visits were generally done either on a Saturday or a Monday.

| School Grants |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| New classrooms | Rs 2 lacs per additional room |
| Maintenance grant | Rs. 5000 pa upto 3 classrooms. Upto Rs 10000 pa for more than 3 classrooms |
| Development grant | Rs. 5000 pa for primary schs \& Rs 7000 pa for upper primary schs |
| TLM grant | Rs. 500 pa per teacher |

## School Grants

| TABLE 17: <br> \% Primary <br> SCHOOLS RECEIVING <br> DIFFERENT GRANTS | April 2008-March 2009 |  |  |  | April 2009-October 2009 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Std I-IV/V |  |  |  |
|  | No. of schs | Yes | No | Don't know | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No. of } \\ & \text { schs } \end{aligned}$ | Yes | No | Don't know |
| New classroom | 286 | 31.1 | 56.6 | 12.2 | 237 | 27.4 | 61.2 | 11.4 |
| Maintenance grant | 290 | 77.2 | 14.5 | 8.3 | 248 | 72.6 | 20.6 | 6.9 |
| Development grant | 271 | 71.2 | 19.6 | 9.2 | 226 | 62.0 | 30.5 | 7.5 |
| Teacher grant (TLM grant) | 282 | 85.1 | 9.9 | 5.0 | 240 | 75.8 | 19.6 | 4.6 |
| Other grants | 138 | 13.0 | 79.7 | 7.3 | 122 | 8.2 | 84.4 | 7.4 |

NOTE : No grant information was available for 54 schools out of 353 primary schools that were visited. This could be because the head teacher was not present, register was not available or the surveyors could not obtain the information. Therefore, the above table is based on schools for which information was available for at least one indicator.

## TAble 18: <br> \% UPPER PRIMARY schools receiving different grants New classroom Maintenance grant <br> Development grant <br> Teacher grant <br> (TLM grant) <br> Other grants

April 2008-March 2009 April 2009-October 2009
Std I-VII/VIII Std I-VII/VIII

| No. of <br> schs | Yes | No | Don't <br> know | No. of <br> schs | Yes | No | Don't <br> know |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 117 | 37.6 | 59.8 | 2.6 | 106 | 31.1 | 66.0 | 2.8 |
| 128 | 86.7 | 11.7 | 1.6 | 104 | 76.9 | 22.1 | 1.0 |
| 111 | 70.3 | 27.0 | 2.7 | 95 | 57.9 | 39.0 | 3.2 |
| 122 | 86.1 | 13.1 | 0.8 | 99 | 71.7 | 27.3 | 1.0 |
| 63 | 20.6 | 73.0 | 6.4 | 55 | 18.2 | 74.6 | 7.3 |

Note: No grant information was available for 18 schools out of 149 upper primary schools that were visited. This could be because the head teacher was not present, register was not available or the surveyors could not obtain the information. Therefore, the above table is based on schools for which information was available for at least one indicator.

## Performance of districts

| Table 19: | $\begin{gathered} \text { ANGANWADI } \\ \text { OR } \\ \text { BALWADI } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Out of SCHOOL | Private <br> SCHOOL | Tuition | Mothers' Reading | Std I-II : Learning levels |  |  | Std III-V : Learning levels |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Districts |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% Children } \\ \text { (Age: 6-14) } \\ \text { out } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { school } \end{gathered}$ | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) in private school | \% Children (Std IV-VIII) attending tuition classes | \% Mothers (Age: 17-55) who CAN READ | \% Children <br> (Std I-II) who CAN READ letters, words or more | \% Children (Std I-II) who CAN RECOGNIZE NUMBERS 1 to 9 or more | \% Children (Std I-II) who CAN READ LETIERS or more in ENGLISH | \% Children <br> (Std III-V) who CAN READ Level 1 (Std 1 Text) or more | \% Children (Std III-V) who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more | \% Children (Std III-V) who CAN READ sentences in ENGLISH |
| Ambala | 80.2 | 1.8 | 33.1 | 32.5 | 54.6 | 84.8 | 84.4 | 72.6 | 68.4 | 61.5 | 29.5 |
| Bhiwani | 80.9 | 0.8 | 45.6 | 23.4 | 86.3 | 91.9 | 90.2 | 82.0 | 72.6 | 70.9 | 37.7 |
| Faridabad | 64.7 | 0.4 | 60.2 | 29.8 | 73.9 | 91.8 | 93.3 | 81.5 | 76.1 | 70.8 | 29.5 |
| Fatehabad | 57.5 | 4.7 | 31.3 | 13.1 | 66.8 | 79.1 | 78.2 | 65.4 | 65.9 | 61.3 | 19.4 |
| Gurgaon | 66.7 | 0.7 | 35.4 | 29.6 | 73.9 | 82.6 | 84.4 | 63.4 | 75.8 | 81.5 | 30.1 |
| Hisar | 59.0 | 1.1 | 45.7 | 8.6 | 56.2 | 72.4 | 73.1 | 70.4 | 70.8 | 61.2 | 19.4 |
| Jhajjar* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jind | 83.5 | 1.7 | 27.6 | 6.1 | 75.4 | 83.7 | 85.9 | 79.2 | 68.5 | 69.1 | 29.1 |
| Kaithal | 75.4 | 1.5 | 37.2 | 14.9 | 35.3 | 92.9 | 93.6 | 81.9 | 72.9 | 63.8 | 23.1 |
| Karnal | 61.4 | 10.1 | 46.0 | 35.3 | 79.6 | 83.9 | 87.5 | 72.8 | 69.8 | 61.6 | 26.2 |
| Kurukshetra | 92.7 | 1.1 | 39.6 | 23.1 | 70.1 | 80.0 | 75.6 | 67.5 | 39.1 | 48.5 | 6.7 |
| Mahendragarh | 84.7 | 1.1 | 43.8 | 16.9 | 83.7 | 91.3 | 87.7 | 85.1 | 76.8 | 68.0 | 41.7 |
| Mewat | 31.9 | 17.0 | 14.1 | 10.8 | 13.8 | 75.9 | 76.5 | 57.9 | 56.3 | 53.7 | 20.5 |
| Panchkula | 98.9 | 1.3 | 32.1 | 47.9 | 85.8 | 94.8 | 94.7 | 86.8 | 78.6 | 79.8 | 36.6 |
| Panipat | 91.4 | 3.3 | 45.3 | 19.3 | 70.5 | 85.9 | 86.3 | 81.7 | 49.5 | 42.4 | 19.5 |
| Rewari | 81.2 | 0.5 | 32.0 | 19.4 | 73.5 | 87.4 | 88.5 | 78.6 | 74.4 | 75.0 | 52.4 |
| Rohtak | 80.0 | 0.5 | 53.7 | 21.9 | 80.1 | 96.4 | 97.4 | 93.7 | 83.6 | 84.5 | 50.6 |
| Sirsa | 76.3 | 3.4 | 40.0 | 25.3 | 75.3 | 92.4 | 91.9 | 89.3 | 82.8 | 81.8 | 41.2 |
| Sonipat | 77.9 | 1.4 | 59.2 | 25.9 | 82.7 | 84.6 | 85.0 | 82.7 | 75.8 | 82.6 | 45.3 |
| Yamunanagar | 86.8 | 1.4 | 44.3 | 21.1 | 79.0 | 79.4 | 83.4 | 70.5 | 60.8 | 56.5 | 25.4 |
| Total | 71.9 | 3.1 | 40.9 | 20.5 | 66.3 | 85.2 | 85.8 | 76.3 | 70.2 | 67.9 | 32.1 |

* Blank cells indicate insufficient data.



## SCHOOL ENROLLMENT AND OUT OF SCHOOL CHILDREN

| Table 1: \% Children in different types of SCHOOLS 2009 |  |  |  | \% Out of school |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in School |  |
| Age: 6-14 ALL | 77.1 | 22.0 | 0.2 | 0.7 | 100 |
| AgE: 7-16 ALL | 78.9 | 19.7 | 0.2 | 1.2 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 76.1 | 23.2 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 BOYS | 73.5 | 25.8 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 100 |
| AgE: 7-10 GIRLS | 79.7 | 19.5 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 100 |
| AgE: 11-14 ALL | 80.4 | 18.5 | 0.1 | 1.0 | 100 |
| AgE: 11-14 BOYS | 77.1 | 22.0 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 GIRLS | 84.1 | 14.5 | 0.3 | 1.1 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 ALL | 83.4 | 12.2 | 0.1 | 4.3 | 100 |
| AgE: 15-16 BOYS | 84.2 | 11.2 | 0.2 | 4.5 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 GIRLS | 81.7 | 14.0 | 0.0 | 4.3 | 100 |


note : 'оther' includes chidren going to madarssa and EGS.
'от IN SCHool' = dropped out + never enrolled.


| Std. | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 38.6 | 49.2 | 8.3 |  |  |  |  | 4.0 |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| II | 3.0 | 22.4 | 53.3 | 16.4 |  |  |  |  | 5.0 |  |  |  | 100 |
| III | 1.4 |  | 19.0 | 56.3 | 18.8 |  |  |  | 4.6 |  |  |  | 100 |
| IV |  | 2.1 |  | 24.6 | 51.6 | 17.3 |  |  |  | . 5 |  |  | 100 |
| V |  | 2 | 2 |  | 15.7 | 58.5 | 17.4 | 3.7 |  | 2.7 |  |  | 100 |
| VI |  |  | 1.0 |  |  | 13.9 | 51.8 | 25.7 | 5.2 |  | 2.5 |  | 100 |
| VII |  |  |  | . 9 |  |  | 10.7 | 47.1 | 32.1 | 5.7 | 2.5 |  | 100 |
| VIII |  |  |  | 2.4 |  |  |  | 13.6 | 40.9 | 29.6 | 10.4 | 3.2 | 100 |

How to read the table: In Std III, $94.1 \%(19.0+56.3+18.8)$ children are in age group 7 to 9 .

## Young children in pre-school and school

|  |  |  |  | n Scho |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | anganwadi | UKG | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | 울 |  |
| Age 3 | 80.0 | 11.1 |  |  |  | 8.9 | 100 |
| Age 4 | 65.8 | 31.0 |  |  |  | 3.3 | 100 |
| Age 5 | 21.3 | 10.1 | 37.1 | 30.0 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 100 |
| Age 6 | 1.5 | 2.1 | 65.7 | 29.8 | 0.1 | 0.9 | 100 |

Chart 3: Trends over time
\% Children age 3-4 not attending Pre-school (ICDS or other) 2006-2009


Of the villages visited, Anganwadi/Pre-School presence has been recorded in 92.5 \% villages.

## HIMACHAL PRADESH ruRal

## Reading in own language

Table 4: Class-wise \% children who CAN READ (All Schools) 2009

| Std. | Nothing | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (Std 1 Text) | Level 2 <br> (Std 2 Text) | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| I | 15.0 | 53.6 | 21.3 | 4.3 | 5.8 | 100 |
| II | 2.0 | 22.6 | 43.5 | 19.4 | 12.6 | 100 |
| III | 1.2 | 8.2 | 25.0 | 42.2 | 23.5 | 100 |
| IV | 0.4 | 3.9 | 9.7 | 38.2 | 47.8 | 100 |
| V | 0.4 | 1.6 | 4.9 | 19.9 | 73.2 | 100 |
| VI | 0.1 | 0.9 | 3.2 | 12.1 | 83.7 | 100 |
| VII | 0.1 | 0.7 | 3.2 | 6.7 | 89.3 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.7 | 5.6 | 93.0 | 100 |
| TOTAL | 2.5 | 11.6 | 14.0 | 18.7 | 53.3 | 100 |

NOTE : Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. Thus a child who can read Std II level text can read letters, words, and Std 1 level text.

| Reading Tool |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| कडन से कीन (3) |  |  |  |
| विमला और अजय मेला देखने गये। छन्हें मेले में तरह-वरह की दुकाने दिसी। मेले में बहुत इूले थे। वालँ गरम-वरम हलवा और जलेबियों मी किक रहीं थी। जलेवी डेखकर दोनों के मुँह में पानी आने लगा। उर्हें जसेयी खाने का मन करने लगा। विमला ने जलेवी खरीदी। दोनों ने मिलकर जलेबी खाई। शाम को दोनों पर लौट आये। |  | 1 <br> राजा <br> भाता <br> र जा <br> लातो <br> नाक <br> 1 3 - <br>  |  |

Chart 4: TRENDS OVER TIME
\% Children who CANNOT EVEN IDENTIFY LETTERS (IN GOVt Schools in Std I - IV) 2006-2009


CHART 5: TRENDS OVER TIME
\% Children who CAN READ Std II level text (in govt schools in Std IV - VII) 2006-2009


## Reading and comprehension in english

## TABLE 5: CLASS-WISE \% CHILDREN WHO CAN READ

ENGLISH (All Schools) 2009
Cannot Can readCan readCan read Can read Total Std. read capital small simple easy capital letters letters words sentences letters

| 27.5 | 35.5 | 20.7 | 10.9 | 5.4 | 100 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| 7.6 | 27.3 | 26.9 | 26.7 | 11.5 | 100 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| 2.9 | 16.3 | 17.3 | 42.6 | 20.9 | 100 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

1.0
5.8
4.2
6.2
24.6
63.3
0.8
3.0
1.9
3.2
1.0
. 0
11.9

11

| Std. | Of those who can read words, \% who can tell meaning of the words | Of those who can read sentences, \% who can tell meaning of the sentences |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 59.3 | 99.5 |
| II | 61.0 | 73.0 |
| III | 76.5 | 74.8 |
| IV | 69.7 | 79.8 |
| V | 73.1 | 85.2 |
| VI | 62.1 | 87.9 |
| VII | 64.2 | 89.1 |
| VIII | 69.9 | 90.1 |
| TOtAL | 69.1 | 86.5 |

## ARIthmetic

|  |  | Recogn | Numbers |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std. | Nothing | $1-9$ | 11-99 | Subtract | Divide | Total |
| I | 13.6 | 40.7 | 35.1 | 5.9 | 4.7 | 100 |
| II | 2.1 | 15.6 | 47.9 | 26.0 | 8.4 | 100 |
| III | 0.9 | 7.6 | 25.4 | 49.1 | 17.0 | 100 |
| IV | 0.3 | 3.1 | 12.4 | 44.9 | 39.3 | 100 |
| V | 0.5 | 1.9 | 4.9 | 28.7 | 64.1 | 100 |
| VI | 0.4 | 1.3 | 2.8 | 14.5 | 81.0 | 100 |
| VII | 0.1 | 0.4 | 2.4 | 13.0 | 84.1 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.5 | 0.1 | 1.7 | 7.9 | 89.8 | 100 |
| Total | 2.4 | 9.0 | 16.7 | 23.9 | 48.1 | 100 |

NOTE : Each cell shows the highest level of arithmetic achieved by a child. Thus a child who can do division, can also recognize numbers 1-9, 11-99 and do subtraction.

Chart 6: Trends over time
\% Children who CANNOT EVEN RECOGNIZE NUMBERS UPTO 9 (IN GOVT SCHOOLS IN STD I - IV) 2007-2009


Maths Tool



Chart 7: Trends over time
\% Children who CAN DO DIVISION (in govt schools in Std IV - VII) 2007-2009


## TUITION

Table 8: Class-wise \% children ATtending tuition CLASSES. BY SCHOOL TYPE 2007 AND 2009

| Year | School | 1 | II | III | IV | V | VI | VII | VIII |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2007 | Govt | 1.4 | 2.0 | 3.4 | 3.6 | 4.6 | 4.1 | 6.3 | 8.0 |
|  | Pvt. | 10.9 | 12.5 | 14.4 | 20.7 | 12.8 | 30.1 | 22.6 | 23.1 |
| 2009 | Govt | 6.2 | 4.8 | 5.7 | 6.1 | 8.5 | 8.4 | 10.2 | 9.9 |
|  | Pvt. | 16.3 | 19.5 | 17.2 | 19.8 | 22.2 | 35.8 | 23.9 | 22.7 |

NOTE : The ASER survey in 2007 and 2009 recorded information about tuition. In both years, the question asked was the following: "Does the child take any paid additional class currently?" Therefore, these numbers do not include any supplemental help in learning that children may have received from parents or siblings or from anyone else that did not require payment.


## HIMACHAL PRADESH rural

## LEARNING LEVELS IN GOVERNMENT AND PRIVATE SCHOOLS : TRENDS OVER TIME

Chart 8: \% Children in Std III who CAN AT LEAST READ Std I LEVEL TEXT. BY SCHOOL TYPE 2006-2009


Chart 9: \% Children in Std V who CAN DO DIVISION.
BY SCHOOL TYPE 2006-2009


Learning levels by gender : Trends over time

Chart 10: \% Boys and girls in Std III who Can read at least Std I LEVEL text 2007-2009


Chart 11: \% Boys and girls in Std V who CAN do division 2007-2009


## EDUCATION : FATHERS AND CHILDREN

## Table 9: Fathers and children 2009

| Fathers' <br> Education | \% Fathers | Of these fathers : |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | \% Children (Std III-V) who can read level 1 (Std 1 Text) or more | \% Children (Std III-V) who can do subtraction or more | \% Children (Std III-V) who can read words or more in English | \% Children (Std IV-VIII) attending tuition |
| No Schooling | 5.2 | 1.7 | 74.4 | 83.2 | 77.7 | 4.6 |
| Sto I-V | 11.0 | 1.3 | 75.2 | 76.7 | 72.8 | 7.5 |
| Std VI-VIII | 17.8 | 1.2 | 78.6 | 78.9 | 72.2 | 7.2 |
| Std IX-X | 36.7 | 0.2 | 85.6 | 84.3 | 82.9 | 14.9 |
| Above Std X | 29.3 | 0.1 | 88.4 | 86.6 | 86.8 | 17.4 |

NOTE : ASER 2009 recorded information about mothers' education. Similar analyses can be done with mothers and children.

## SCHOOL ENROLLMENT AND ATTENDANCE : TRENDS OVER TIME

| TABLE 10: Total schools visited |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Type of school | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 |
| Std I-IV/V : Primary | 66 | 224 | 313 |
| Std I-VII/VIII : Primary + Upper Primary | 6 | 26 | 17 |
| Total schools | 72 | 250 | 330 |


| TABLE 12: TeACher ATtendance | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Type of school | Std I-IV/V |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |
| \% Teachers attending (average) | 70.8 | 88.5 | 90.8 | 57.9 | 89.6 | 84.8 |
| \% Schools with no teacher present | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \% Schools with all teachers present | 34.8 | 70.3 | 74.1 | 16.7 | 68.2 | 60.0 |



LDNEN'S ATHENDANC

## Std I-IV/V Std I-VII/VIII

$91.988 .6 \quad 90.495 .991 .590 .2$
$\begin{array}{llllll}1.5 & 2.4 & 1.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llllll}93.8 & 91.3 & 91.6 & 100 & 95.7 & 88.2\end{array}$

## Table 13: Multigrade classes <br> 200520072009200520072009 <br> \% Of schools in which: <br> Std II class sitting with another class <br> Std IV class sitting with another class <br> Std I-IV/V Std I-VII/VIII <br> 

## School facilities : trends over time



| TABLE 16: GIRLS ToILETS | $\mathbf{2 0 0 9}$ | Std I-IV/V Std I-VII/VIII |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| No of schools visited | 255 | 15 |
| \% Schools with no separate provision <br> for girls toilets | 31.4 | 66.7 |
| Of schools where there are separate girls toilets, $\%$ schools where: |  |  |
| Toilet locked | 9.8 | 0.0 |
| Toilet not usable | 27.1 | 20.0 |
| Usable | 31.8 | 13.3 |

Table 15: School improvement \& construction since April 2008

| School improvement \& | Std I-IV/V |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Construction | No. of <br> schs | \% schools <br> Yes |  | No. of <br> schs | \% schools |  |
|  | 291 | 80.1 | 19.9 | 16 | 62.5 | 37.5 |
| Whitewash | 284 | 15.5 | 84.5 | 17 | 17.7 | 82.4 |
| Construction of new <br> classroom <br> Construction of boundary <br> wall | 281 | 22.8 | 77.2 | 15 | 13.3 | 86.7 |

ASER survey was carried out in Oct-Nov 2009. One govt school with primary grades was visited in each sampled village. If there was more than one govt school in a village, then the school with the highest enrollment was visited. Hence the schools visited in the ASER survey do not represent a random sample of schools of the district. The school visits were generally done either on a Saturday or a Monday.

| School Grants |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| New classrooms | Rs 2 lacs per additional room |
| Maintenance grant | Rs. 5000 pa upto 3 classrooms. Upto Rs 10000 pa for more than 3 classrooms |
| Development grant | Rs. 5000 pa for primary schs \& Rs 7000 pa for upper primary schs |
| TLM grant | Rs. 500 pa per teacher |

## School Grants

| Table 17: <br> \% Primary <br> SCHOOLS RECEIVING <br> DIFFERENT GRANTS | April 2008-March 2009 |  |  |  | April 2009-October 2009 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Std I-IV/V |  |  |  | Std I-IV/V |  |  |  |
|  | No. of schs | Yes | No | Don't know | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No. of } \\ & \text { schs } \end{aligned}$ | Yes | No | Don't know |
| New classroom | 264 | 14.0 | 82.2 | 3.8 | 227 | 15.0 | 78.9 | 6.2 |
| Maint | 286 | 88.5 | 8.0 | 3.5 | 240 | 81.3 | 14. | 4.6 |
| Development g | 270 | 80.7 | 17.0 | 2.2 | 223 | 75.3 | 21.1 | 3.6 |
| Teacher grant (TLM grant) | 289 | 93.8 | 4.5 | 1.7 | 238 | 87.0 | 9.2 | 3.8 |
| Other grants | 133 | 50.4 | 44.4 | 5.3 | 118 | 47.5 | 45.8 | 6.8 |

[^16]| TABLE 18: <br> \% UPPER PRIMARY SCHOOLS RECEIVING DIFFERENT GRANTS | April 2008-March 2009 Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |  | April 2009-October 200 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |  |
|  | No. of schs | Yes | No | Don't know | No. of schs | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don } \\ & \text { Dnov } \end{aligned}$ |
| New classroom | 13 | 30.8 | 69.2 | 0.0 | 12 | 16.7 | 83.3 | 0.0 |
| Maintenance grant | 15 | 100 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 11 | 81.8 | 18.2 | 0. |
| Development gran | 12 | 83.3 | 16.7 | 0.0 | 12 | 83.3 | 16.7 | 0.0 |
| Teacher grant (TLM grant) | 15 | 86.7 | 13.3 | 0.0 | 12 | 75.0 | 25.0 | 0.0 |
| Other grants | 7 | 71.4 | 28.6 | 0.0 | 4 | 25.0 | 75.0 | 0. |

Note : No grant information was available for 0 schools out of 17 upper primary schools that were visited. This could be because the head teacher was not present, register was not available or the surveyors could not obtain the information. Therefore, the above table is based on schools for which information was available for at least one indicator.

## PERFORMANCE OF DISTRICTS

| Table 19: | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { ANGANWADI } \\ \text { OR } \\ \text { BALWADI } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | OUt of SCHOOL | Private SCHOOL | TUITION | Mothers' Reading | Std I-II : Learning Levels |  |  | Std III-V : Learning Levels |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Districts | \% Children (Age 3-4) in anganwadi or pre-school | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) <br> out <br> of <br> school | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) in private school | \% Children (Std IV-VIII) attending tuition classes | \% Mothers <br> (Age: 17-55) who CAN READ | \% Children <br> (Std I-II) who <br> CAN READ letters, words or more | \% Children <br> (Std I-II) <br> who CAN RECOGNIZE NUMBERS 1 to 9 or more | \% Children <br> (Std I-II) <br> who CAN <br> READ <br> LETTERS or more in ENGLISH | \% Children <br> (Std III-V) who <br> CAN READ Level 1 <br> (Std 1 Text) or more | \% Children (Std III-V) who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more | \% Children (Std III-V) who CAN READ sentences in ENGLISH |
| Bilaspur | 94.3 | 0.1 | 23.9 | 6.4 | 89.7 | 94.2 | 96.8 | 92.1 | 81.1 | 85.9 | 45.6 |
| Chamba | 89.1 | 2.5 | 7.3 | 8.0 | 66.3 | 89.3 | 91.4 | 80.6 | 79.4 | 79.5 | 31.1 |
| Hamirpur | 92.5 | 0.6 | 25.2 | 15.7 | 83.5 | 96.9 | 96.3 | 85.4 | 82.7 | 83.2 | 39.4 |
| Kangra | 98.9 | 0.3 | 30.2 | 18.9 | 80.9 | 86.9 | 87.1 | 73.9 | 79.8 | 79.1 | 35.1 |
| Kinnaur | 88.0 | 0.2 | 17.6 | 8.4 | 77.9 | 91.5 | 94.3 | 79.9 | 80.3 | 80.9 | 47.0 |
| Kullu* | 100.0 | 0.2 | 23.1 |  | 96.6 | 94.6 | 97.6 | 87.2 | 86.9 | 76.9 | 35.2 |
| Lahul \& Spiti* |  | 0.8 | 24.4 | 9.8 | 74.3 | 89.2 | 88.4 | 82.1 | 89.0 | 90.3 | 49.0 |
| Mandi | 83.0 | 0.4 | 21.2 | 4.4 | 88.1 | 95.7 | 98.9 | 86.0 | 85.5 | 85.7 | 47.1 |
| Shimla | 96.8 | 0.2 | 23.1 | 3.9 | 98.8 | 97.3 | 95.6 | 93.6 | 92.0 | 88.2 | 64.3 |
| Sirmaur | 98.0 | 2.1 | 16.5 | 4.9 | 89.2 | 81.7 | 79.4 | 72.7 | 75.0 | 73.5 | 50.8 |
| Solan | 97.2 | 0.7 | 13.6 | 2.8 | 95.4 | 93.4 | 95.4 | 83.7 | 88.2 | 80.6 | 48.0 |
| Una | 98.1 | 0.7 | 20.8 | 25.1 | 83.7 | 86.3 | 83.7 | 79.1 | 72.6 | 81.2 | 33.3 |
| Total | 93.8 | 0.7 | 22.0 | 11.7 | 85.8 | 91.5 | 92.1 | 82.5 | 82.4 | 81.8 | 43.4 |

*Blank cells indicate insufficient data.


## SCHOOL ENROLLMENT AND OUT OF SCHOOL CHILDREN

| Table 1: \% Children in different types of SCHOOLS 2009 |  |  |  | \% Out of school |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in School | To |
| AgE: 6-14 ALL | 65.8 | 32.0 | 0.4 | 1.8 | 100 |
| Age: 7-16 ALL | 68.1 | 29.0 | 0.3 | 2.6 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 64.8 | 33.5 | 0.5 | 1.2 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 BOYS | 64.4 | 33.9 | 0.6 | 1.1 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 GIRLS | 64.9 | 33.2 | 0.5 | 1.4 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 ALL | 67.5 | 29.9 | 0.2 | 2.5 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 BOYS | 66.1 | 31.9 | 0.1 | 2.0 | 100 |
| AGE: 11-14 GIRLS | 69.2 | 27.4 | 0.3 | 3.1 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 ALL | 74.7 | 20.0 | 0.2 | 5.2 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 BOYS | 75.5 | 20.2 | 0.2 | 4.2 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 GIRLS | 74.2 | 19.7 | 0.1 | 6.1 | 100 |


note : 'отнer' includes chidren going to madarssa and EGS.
'мот in SChool' = dropped out + never enrolled.


How to read the table: In Std III, $83.9 \%(36.7+37.3+9.9)$ children are in age group 8 to 10 .

## Young children in pre-school and school

|  |  |  |  | In Scho |  | $\stackrel{\infty}{\underline{\infty}}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | anganwadi | UKG | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | - |  |
| Age 3 | 36.8 | 14.6 |  |  |  | 48.6 | 100 |
| Age 4 | 21.4 | 21.2 |  |  |  | 57.4 | 100 |
| Age 5 | 12.0 | 12.4 | 35.9 | 24.8 | 0.5 | 14.4 | 100 |
| Age 6 | 1.8 | 4.5 | 56.7 | 32.3 | 0.6 | 4.2 | 100 |

Chart 3: Trends over time
\% Children age 3-4 not attending pre-school (ICDS or other) 2006-2009


Of the villages visited, Anganwadi/Pre-School presence has been recorded in 80.4 \% villages.

## Reading in own language

Table 4：Class－wise \％children who CAN READ（All Schools） 2009

| Std． | Nothing | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> （Std 1 Text） | Level 2 <br> （Std 2 Text） | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| I | 25.0 | 58.5 | 12.7 | 1.8 | 2.0 | 100 |
| II | 6.1 | 46.2 | 39.1 | 6.4 | 2.2 | 100 |
| III | 2.4 | 20.8 | 46.3 | 24.9 | 5.6 | 100 |
| IV | 0.6 | 9.1 | 43.3 | 34.0 | 13.1 | 100 |
| V | 1.4 | 5.0 | 26.4 | 40.3 | 26.9 | 100 |
| VI | 0.4 | 2.6 | 22.7 | 39.6 | 34.7 | 100 |
| VII | 0.8 | 1.7 | 12.2 | 34.8 | 50.6 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.3 | 1.1 | 8.6 | 29.1 | 61.0 | 100 |
| TOTAL | 4.2 | 17.3 | 26.9 | 26.9 | 24.7 | 100 |

NOTE ：Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child．Thus a child who can read Std II level text can read letters，words，and Std 1 level text．


NOTE ：The test was also available in Hindi and Urdu．
Chart 5：Trends over time
\％Children who CAN READ Std II level text（in govt schools in Std IV－VII）2006－2009

## Reading Tool

Hari went lo the itver． ve suw alarge boal． and went to the other alde．



Chart 4：Trends over time
\％Children who CANNOT EVEN IDENTIFY LETTERS （IN GOVt Schools in Std I－IV）2006－2009


## Reading and comprehension in english

## TABLE 5：CLASS－WISE \％CHILDREN WHO CAN READ

ENGLISH（All Schools） 2009

Cannot Can readCan readCan read Can read Total Std． | read |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| capital | capital | small | simple |
| letters | letters | words | sentences | letters

| I | 30.5 | 34.4 | 19.6 | 8.2 | 7.4 | 100 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| II | 11.4 | 24.8 | 28.8 | 25.2 | 9.8 | 100 |
| III | 6.1 | 13.4 | 25.8 | 36.8 | 18.0 | 100 |
| IV | 2.7 | 9.4 | 20.0 | 36.6 | 31.3 | 100 |
| V | 1.9 | 7.7 | 13.8 | 35.0 | 41.8 | 100 |
| VI | 2.0 | 6.8 | 10.3 | 32.8 | 48.1 | 100 |
| VII | 1.8 | 3.9 | 6.7 | 29.3 | 58.4 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.6 | 2.3 | 4.3 | 23.2 | 69.7 | 100 |
| TOTAL | 6.5 | 12.3 | 16.1 | 28.9 | 36.3 | 100 |


| Std． | Of those who can read words， \％who can tell meaning of the words | Of those who can read sentences，\％who can tell meaning of the sentences |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 45.2 | 83.9 |
| II | 42.0 | 67.5 |
| III | 54.8 | 65.3 |
| IV | 43.1 | 68.3 |
| V | 43.6 | 70.7 |
| VI | 42.5 | 73.6 |
| VII | 40.6 | 78.8 |
| VIII | 50.5 | 78.9 |
| Total | 45.3 | 74.5 |


| English Tool |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { ZMOUSH TERF Banderal } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |
| D L T  <br>  K  G <br>     <br> X P N  | $y$  $f$  $i$ <br>  $s$  $y$  <br> $m$  a  h |
|  | －3ットロロ＊ |
| ${ }^{\circ}$ dog  fat <br>  gun  <br> boy  man | What in the time？ <br> This is a blue shirt． <br> 1 Hike te slexp． <br> 1 have a brather： |
|  | － |

## ARITHMETIC

| Std. | Nothing | Recognize Numbers |  | Subtract | Divide | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1-9 | 11-99 |  |  |  |
| I | 23.4 | 50.5 | 22.1 | 2.2 | 1.9 | 100 |
| II | 6.8 | 40.8 | 42.5 | 7.8 | 2.2 | 100 |
| III | 2.4 | 20.4 | 45.2 | 28.0 | 3.9 | 100 |
| IV | 0.8 | 9.6 | 46.2 | 32.3 | 11.1 | 100 |
| V | 0.4 | 6.9 | 32.1 | 37.0 | 23.6 | 100 |
| VI | 0.6 | 3.2 | 28.5 | 38.3 | 29.5 | 100 |
| VII | 0.6 | 1.9 | 17.0 | 36.5 | 44.0 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.4 | 1.2 | 9.5 | 40.0 | 49.0 | 100 |
| Total | 4.0 | 16.1 | 30.7 | 28.3 | 20.9 | 100 |

NOTE : Each cell shows the highest level of arithmetic achieved by a child. Thus a child who can do division, can also recognize numbers 1-9, 11-99 and do subtraction.

Chart 6: Trends over time
\% Children who CANNOT EVEN RECOGNIZE NUMBERS UPTO 9 (IN GOVT SCHOOLS IN STD I - IV) 2007-2009



Chart 7: Trends over time
\% Children who CAN DO DIVISION (in govt schools in Std IV - VII) 2007-2009


## TUITION

Table 8: Class-wise \% children ATTENDING TUItion CLASSES. BY SCHOOL TYPE 2007 AND 2009

| Year | School | I | II | III | V | V | VI | VII | VIII |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | Govt | 6.0 | 5.4 | 6.5 | 5.9 | 8.0 | 11.8 | 12.6 | 17.9 |
|  | Pvt. | 13.0 | 22.4 | 21.0 | 19.2 | 32.5 | 30.3 | 28.1 | 33.9 |
| 2009 | Govt | 3.6 | 8.5 | 11.2 | 14.7 | 19.3 | 14.9 | 20.5 | 22.0 |
|  | Pvt. | 12.5 | 13.7 | 18.4 | 25.7 | 33.8 | 25.0 | 32.8 | 27.9 |

NOTE : The ASER survey in 2007 and 2009 recorded information about tuition. In both years, the question asked was the following: "Does the child take any paid additional class currently?" Therefore, these numbers do not include any supplemental help in learning that children may have received from parents or siblings or from anyone else that did not require payment.


# JAMMU AND KASHMIR rural 

## LEARNING LEVELS IN GOVERNMENT AND PRIVATE SCHOOLS : TRENDS OVER TIME

Chart 8: \% Children in Std III who CAN AT LEAST READ Std I LEVEL TEXT. BY SCHOOL TYPE 2006-2009


Chart 9: \% Children in Std V who CAN DO DIVISION.
BY SCHOOL TYPE 2006-2009


Learning levels by gender : Trends over time

Chart 10: \% Boys and girls in Std III who Can read at least Std I LEVEL text 2007-2009


Chart 11: \% Boys and girls in Std V who CAN do division 2007-2009


## EDUCATION : FATHERS AND CHILDREN

## Table 9: Fathers and children 2009

| Fathers' Education | \% Fathers | Of these fathers : |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | \% Children (Std III-V) who can read level 1 (Std 1 Text) or more | \% Children (Std III-V) who can do subtraction or more | \% Children (Std III-V) who can read words or more in English | \% Children (Std IV-VIII) attending tuition |
| No Schooling | 54.1 | 2.3 | 41.4 | 33.2 | 60.0 | 19.9 |
| Sto I-V | 3.7 | 1.2 | 45.0 | 50.3 | 72.8 | 14.9 |
| Std VI-VIII | 8.0 | 2.8 | 49.9 | 51.7 | 68.1 | 22.2 |
| Std IX-X | 17.8 | 1.2 | 49.9 | 46.9 | 71.1 | 18.9 |
| Above Std X | 16.5 | 1.5 | 61.1 | 60.3 | 77.4 | 37.6 |

NOTE : ASER 2009 recorded information about mothers' education. Similar analyses can be done with mothers and children.


## SCHOOL ENROLLMENT AND ATTENDANCE: TRENDS OVER TIME

| TABLE 10: Total schools visited |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Type of school | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 |
| Std I-IV/V : Primary | 68 | 115 | 81 |
| Std I-VII/VIII : Primary + Upper Primary | 32 | 176 | 265 |
| Total schools | 100 | 291 | 346 |


| TABLE 12: TEACHER ATtENDANCE | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Type of school | Std I-IV/V |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |
| \% Teachers attending (average) | 85.1 | 92.6 | 92.1 | 78.0 | 87.0 | 91.6 |
| \% Schools with no teacher present | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \% Schools with all teachers present | 61.5 | 80.4 | 74.4 | 27.6 | 51.3 | 62.7 |

TABLE 11: Children's Attendance 200520072009200520072009
Type of school Std I-IV/V Std I-VII/VIII
\% Enrolled children attending (average)
\% Schools with less than 50\% enrolled children attending \% Schools with 75\% or more enrolled children attending

$\begin{array}{llllll}86.6 & 81.4 & 86.7 & 81.6 & 83.5 & 90.0\end{array}$

## Table 13: Multigrade classes

200520072009200520072009

| \% Of schools in which: | Std I-IV/V |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Std II class sitting with <br> another class | 60.2 | 73.8 | 49.4 | 47.3 |
| Std IV class sitting with <br> another class | 53.0 | 72.2 | 37.0 | 41.9 |

## School facilities : trends over time

Table 14: Facilities in school
200520072009200520072009

|  | Schools with: | Std I-IV/V |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No facility | 51.5 | 43.9 | 45.0 | 43.3 | 43.5 | 21.1 |
| ¢ | Facility but water not available | 11.8 | 9.3 | 1.3 | 6.7 | 9.7 | 3.4 |
|  | Available | 36.8 | 46.7 | 53.8 | 50.0 | 46.8 | 75.5 |
|  | No facility | 67.6 | 42.7 | 40.0 | 40.6 | 34.6 | 11.8 |
| \# | Facility but toilet not usable | 13.2 | 8.7 | 16.3 | 15.6 | 13.1 | 18.3 |
|  | Usable | 19.1 | 48.5 | 43.8 | 43.8 | 52.3 | 69.8 |
|  | dday meal served on day | 62.7 | 95.5 | 96.3 | 62.1 | 94.6 | 95.7 |

Std I-IV/V Std I-VII/VIII

## Table 16: Girls Toilets 2009

## No of schools visited

\% Schools with no separate provision
for girls toilets
Of schools where there are separate girls toilets, \% schools where:

| Toilet locked | 5.7 | 10.8 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Toilet not usable | 2.9 | 4.8 |
| Usable | 18.6 | 48.2 |

Table 15: School improvement \& construction since April 2008

| School improvement \& Construction | Std I-IV/V |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. of schs | \% schools |  | No. of schs | \% schools |  |
|  |  | Yes | No |  | Yes | No |
| Whitewash | 74 | 52.7 | 47.3 | 260 | 66.2 | 33.9 |
| Construction of new classroom | 73 | 15.1 | 84.9 | 255 | 8.2 | 91.8 |
| Construction of boundary wall | 74 | 12.2 | 87.8 | 255 | 11.4 | 88.6 |

ASER survey was carried out in Oct-Nov 2009. One govt school with primary grades was visited in each sampled village. If there was more than one govt school in a village, then the school with the highest enrollment was visited. Hence the schools visited in the ASER survey do not represent a random sample of schools of the district. The school visits were generally done either on a Saturday or a Monday.

| School Grants |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| New classrooms | Rs 2 lacs per additional room |
| Maintenance grant | Rs. 5000 pa upto 3 classrooms. Upto Rs 10000 pa for more than 3 classrooms |
| Development grant | Rs. 5000 pa for primary schs \& Rs 7000 pa for upper primary schs |
| TLM grant | Rs. 500 pa per teacher |

## School Grants

| TABLE 17: <br> \% Primary <br> SCHOOLS RECEIVING <br> different grants | April 2008-March 2009 |  |  |  | April 2009-October 2009 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Std I-IV/V |  |  |  | Std I-IV/V |  |  |  |
|  | No. of schs | Yes | No | Don't know | No. of schs | Yes | No | Don't know |
| New classroom | 74 | 6.8 | 67.6 | 25.7 | 64 | 4.7 | 73.4 | 21.9 |
| Maintenance grant | 76 | 60.5 | 17.1 | 22.4 | 67 | 56.7 | 26.9 | 16. |
| Development grant | 77 | 61.0 | 20.8 | 18.2 | 66 | 60.6 | 21.2 | 18 |
| Teacher grant (TLM grant) | 76 | 69.7 | 14.5 | 15.8 | 68 | 63.2 | 23.5 | 13 |
| Other grants | 52 | 7.7 | 71.2 | 21.2 | 47 | 12.8 | 72.3 | 14 |

NOTE : No grant information was available for 11 schools out of 81 primary schools that were visited. This could be because the head teacher was not present, register was not available or the surveyors could not obtain the information. Therefore, the above table is based on schools for which information was available for at least one indicator.

| TABLE 18: |
| :--- |
| \% Upper PRIMARY |
| schools receiving |
| DIFFERENT GRANTS |
| New classroom |
| Maintenance grant |
| Development grant |
| Teacher grant <br> (TLM grant) <br> Other grants $\mathbf{l}$ |

April 2008-March 2009 April 2009-October 2009
Std I-VII/VIII Std I-VII/VIII
No. of

schs Yes No \begin{tabular}{c}
Don't <br>
know

 

No. of <br>
schs

 Yes No 

Don't <br>
know
\end{tabular}

NOTE : No grant information was available for 20 schools out of 265 upper primary schools that were visited. This could be because the head teacher was not present, register was not available or the surveyors could not obtain the information. Therefore, the above table is based on schools for which information was available for at least one indicator.

## Performance of districts

| Table 19: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ANGANWADI } \\ & \text { OR } \\ & \text { BALWADI } \end{aligned}$ | Out of SCHOOL | Private SCHOOL | Tuition | Mothers' Reading | Std I-II : Learning levels |  |  | Std III-V : Learning levels |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Districts |  | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) <br> out <br> of <br> school | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) <br> in <br> private <br> school | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% Children } \\ & \text { (Std } \\ & \text { IV-VIII) } \\ & \text { attending } \\ & \text { tuition } \\ & \text { classes } \end{aligned}$ | \% Mothers <br> (Age: 17-55) who CAN READ | \% Children <br> (Std I-II) who CAN READ letters, words or more | \% Children (Std I-II) who CAN RECOGNIZE NUMBERS 1 to 9 or more | \% Children (Std I-II) who CAN READ LETTERS or more in ENGLISH | \% Children (Std III-V) who CANREAD Level 1 (Std 1 Text) or more | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% Children } \\ & \text { (Std III-V) } \\ & \text { who } \\ & \text { CAN DO } \\ & \text { SUBTRACTION } \\ & \text { or more } \end{aligned}$ | \% Children (Std III-V) who CAN READ sentences in ENGLISH |
| Anantnag | 19.4 | 2.0 | 35.4 | 38.1 | 65.6 | 93.1 | 88.6 | 77.8 | 53.4 | 48.4 | 34.2 |
| Baramulla* |  | 0.0 | 36.1 | 26.8 | 65.9 | 82.8 | 82.7 | 80.6 | 57.0 | 52.3 | 46.3 |
| Budgam | 47.2 | 1.7 | 32.2 | 21.7 | 57.9 | 88.5 | 85.0 | 83.9 | 50.0 | 42.2 | 36.1 |
| Doda | 71.1 | 5.9 | 21.8 | 15.6 | 56.9 | 84.8 | 84.0 | 75.9 | 31.9 | 41.0 | 22.9 |
| Jammu | 73.7 | 0.2 | 35.8 | 17.4 | 75.0 | 76.3 | 86.3 | 80.3 | 42.0 | 39.9 | 21.0 |
| Kargil | 17.4 | 1.3 | 29.2 | 25.3 | 55.0 | 83.2 | 87.5 | 79.8 | 53.9 | 55.4 | 38.1 |
| Kathua | 66.3 | 1.4 | 30.6 | 25.6 | 64.9 | 74.8 | 80.1 | 64.2 | 51.9 | 45.9 | 16.4 |
| Kupwara* |  | 3.4 | 33.6 | 28.5 | 49.6 | 90.1 | 90.4 | 77.7 | 57.4 | 52.8 | 36.9 |
| Leh (Ladakh) | 66.7 | 0.5 | 34.3 | 9.9 | 67.3 | 90.4 | 91.0 | 89.3 | 50.0 | 57.1 | 33.5 |
| Poonch | 19.5 | 1.1 | 25.9 | 29.0 | 78.0 | 81.2 | 74.4 | 79.1 | 40.3 | 26.9 | 14.6 |
| Pulwama* |  | 0.9 | 44.5 |  | 63.2 | 92.5 | 92.3 | 85.3 | 59.9 | 60.4 | 15.0 |
| Rajauri | 31.0 | 0.9 | 28.3 | 4.4 | 61.7 | 93.6 | 91.2 | 91.7 | 38.0 | 42.6 | 64.4 |
| Srinagar | 25.4 | 0.7 | 46.2 | 17.9 | 65.6 | 93.1 | 89.5 | 86.6 | 55.2 | 44.2 | 36.1 |
| Udhampur | 32.6 | 2.9 | 18.6 | 8.1 | 46.9 | 81.4 | 81.5 | 84.9 | 35.1 | 33.1 | 17.1 |
| Total | 45.5 | 1.8 | 32.0 | 21.3 | 63.4 | 85.4 | 85.8 | 80.2 | 48.6 | 45.7 | 30.6 |

*Blank cells indicate insufficient data.


## SCHOOL ENROLLMENT AND OUT OF SCHOOL CHILDREN

| Table 1: \% Children in different types of SCHOOLS 2009 |  |  |  | \% Out of school |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in School |  |
| AgE: 6-14 ALL | 83.3 | 10.0 | 1.4 | 5.4 | 100 |
| AgE: 7-16 ALL | 80.5 | 10.4 | 1.3 | 7.8 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 84.9 | 9.3 | 1.5 | 4.4 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 BOYS | 84.7 | 9.9 | 1.4 | 3.9 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 GIRLS | 85.3 | 8.5 | 1.4 | 4.8 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 ALL | 80.6 | 10.9 | 1.1 | 7.5 | 100 |
| AGE: 11-14 BOYS | 80.3 | 11.4 | 0.9 | 7.4 | 100 |
| AGE: 11-14 GIRLS | 80.8 | 10.5 | 1.2 | 7.5 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 ALL | 64.0 | 13.2 | 1.3 | 21.6 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 BOYS | 63.3 | 12.6 | 1.4 | 22.7 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 GIRLS | 64.9 | 13.9 | 1.1 | 20.2 | 100 |



NOTE: 'отнеR' includes chidren going to madarssa and EGS.
'мот IN SCHool' = dropped out + never enrolled.


| Std. | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 27.0 | 41.6 | 14.6 | 10.2 |  |  |  |  | 6.6 |  |  |  | 100 |
| II | 3.9 | 15.2 | 27.5 | 32.3 | 7.9 | 8.1 |  |  |  | 5.1 |  |  | 100 |
| III | 4. | 0 | 9.9 | 36.1 | 19.7 | 17.4 | 4.8 | 5.3 |  | 2.9 |  |  | 100 |
| IV |  | 5.4 |  | 11.6 | 20.0 | 31.3 | 10.4 | 13.3 | 3.7 |  | 4.4 |  | 100 |
| V |  | 1.3 |  | 4.8 | 7.2 | 34.1 | 18.0 | 19.8 | 7.6 | 4.4 | 2. | 7 | 100 |
| VI |  |  | 4.2 |  |  | 13.6 | 18.6 | 37.0 | 12.5 | 8.3 | 4.2 | 1.7 | 100 |
| VII |  |  | 6. | . 5 |  |  | 7.4 | 33.8 | 25.5 | 15.4 | 8.0 | 3.4 | 100 |
| VIII |  |  |  | 4.4 |  |  |  | 14.6 | 27.3 | 31.9 | 14.0 | 7.8 | 100 |

How to read the table: In Std III, 73.2\% (36.1+19.7+17.4) children are in age group 8 to 10 .

## Young children in pre-school and school

|  |  |  |  | In Scho |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | anganwadi | UKG | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | $\bar{i} \underset{\pi}{\bar{\sigma}}$ |  |
| Age 3 | 64.7 | 2.7 |  |  |  | 32.6 | 100 |
| Age 4 | 71.6 | 6.1 |  |  |  | 22.3 | 100 |
| Age 5 | 31.1 | 2.6 | 47.0 | 6.6 | 1.6 | 11.1 | 100 |
| Age 6 | 10.4 | 1.0 | 73.2 | 8.3 | 1.7 | 5.4 | 100 |

Chart 3: Trends over time
\% Children age 3-4 not attending PRE-SCHOOL (ICDS OR OTHER) 2006-2009


Of the villages visited, Anganwadi/Pre-School presence has been recorded in 91.1\% villages.

## Reading in own language

Table 4: Class-wise \% children who CAN READ (All Schools) 2009

| StD. | Nothing | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (Std 1 Text) | Level 2 <br> (Std 2 Text) | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 33.5 | 49.0 | 12.1 | 3.2 | 2.2 | 100 |
| II | 12.3 | 40.8 | 30.5 | 11.2 | 5.2 | 100 |
| III | 4.5 | 22.6 | 35.2 | 24.3 | 13.3 | 100 |
| IV | 2.4 | 12.1 | 22.7 | 31.0 | 31.7 | 100 |
| V | 1.1 | 6.5 | 16.7 | 27.9 | 47.8 | 100 |
| VI | 0.7 | 4.4 | 10.2 | 20.3 | 64.4 | 100 |
| VII | 0.6 | 2.1 | 6.6 | 14.3 | 76.4 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.6 | 1.5 | 2.9 | 12.4 | 82.7 | 100 |
| TOTAL | 8.8 | 21.2 | 19.2 | 17.9 | 33.0 | 100 |

NOTE : Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. Thus a child who can read Std II level text can read letters, words, and Std 1 level text.

| Reading Tool |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
| Sted BLevel <br> बहुत दिनों हो बारिश हो रही थी। मौब में सथी जगह गंबा बानी भर गया रहा। सली बारिस के रुकने की चह वेख रहे थे। अचानक एक विन बरिश रुक गई। सूरज निकल आया। सब बोग चुल हो गये। आसमान में बिड़िवी उढ़ने नर्गी। लोग अपने कुपदे सुखाने लगो। बच्चे मी घरों से बाहर निकलकर खेनने नगे। | Std यां मे हल वह बहुत उसे सोनी साने के बाद म ₹ था हु शा स च न क ग | evel <br> बनाय <br> ठा था <br> खाया <br> हह सो <br> बना <br> 4 <br> अत्व <br> आताण |  |

Chart 4: Trends over time
\% Children who CANNOT EVEN IDENTIFY LETTERS (IN GOVt Schools in Std I - IV) 2006-2009


CHART 5: TRENDS OVER TIME
\% Children who Can read Std Il level text (in govt schools in Std IV - VII) 2006-2009


## Reading and comprehension in english

## TABLE 5: CLASS-WISE \% CHILDREN WHO CAN READ

ENGLISH (All Schools) 2009

Cannot Can readCan readCan read Can read Total Std. | read |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| capital | capital | small | simple |
| letters | easy |  |  |
| letters | words sentences |  |  | letters

| I | 58.2 | 29.1 | 8.5 | 2.8 | 1.4 | 100 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| II | 29.9 | 40.7 | 20.7 | 6.6 | 2.2 | 100 |
| III | 16.9 | 31.3 | 30.1 | 17.6 | 4.1 | 100 |
| IV | 9.0 | 20.4 | 30.0 | 29.7 | 10.9 | 100 |
| V | 5.1 | 14.6 | 27.5 | 34.7 | 18.1 | 100 |
| VI | 2.9 | 10.8 | 18.1 | 38.2 | 30.1 | 100 |
| VII | 2.2 | 6.2 | 12.7 | 32.1 | 46.7 | 100 |
| VIII | 1.1 | 3.8 | 10.4 | 28.3 | 56.5 | 100 |
| TOTAL | 19.2 | 22.5 | 20.5 | 21.4 | 16.5 | 100 |


| Std. | Of those who can read words, \% who can tell meaning of the words | Of those who can read sentences, \% who can tell meaning of the sentences |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 53.1 | 45.3 |
| II | 57.3 | 57.1 |
| III | 61.6 | 78.8 |
| IV | 59.5 | 75.7 |
| V | 59.8 | 71.2 |
| VI | 61.5 | 74.5 |
| VII | 67.3 | 78.3 |
| VIII | 64.0 | 78.2 |
| Total | 61.5 | 75.6 |


| English Tool |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
| B H R  <br>  $\mathbf{L}$  $\mathbf{V}$ <br> $\mathbf{M}$ P F  | z  $j$  0 <br>  w  g  <br> u  $s$  k |
|  | +-*--1+3-1- |
|   hot <br> rat   <br>  bige  <br> cow  man | What is the time? <br> Thals is a red lyall. <br> I Hike to play, <br> I have a fiather: |
|  |  |

## ARITHMETIC

| Std. | Nothing | Recognize Numbers |  | Subtract | Divide | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1-9 | 11-99 |  |  |  |
| I | 34.2 | 46.7 | 15.4 | 2.4 | 1.2 | 100 |
| II | 11.3 | 40.3 | 36.1 | 10.1 | 2.3 | 100 |
| III | 4.8 | 24.0 | 39.1 | 25.8 | 6.3 | 100 |
| IV | 1.7 | 11.7 | 30.6 | 38.3 | 17.7 | 100 |
| V | 1.0 | 7.6 | 21.9 | 37.7 | 31.8 | 100 |
| VI | 0.7 | 4.3 | 14.3 | 33.4 | 47.3 | 100 |
| VII | 0.4 | 3.3 | 8.9 | 26.0 | 61.5 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.2 | 1.6 | 5.8 | 20.8 | 71.5 | 100 |
| Total | 8.6 | 21.1 | 23.7 | 23.0 | 23.6 | 100 |

NOTE : Each cell shows the highest level of arithmetic achieved by a child. Thus a child who can do division, can also recognize numbers 1-9, 11-99 and do subtraction.

Chart 6: Trends over time
\% Children who CANNOT EVEN RECOGNIZE NUMBERS UPTO 9 (IN GOVt schools in Std I - IV) 2007-2009


Maths Tool



Chart 7: Trends over time
\% Children who CAN DO DIVISION (in govt schools in Std IV - VII) 2007-2009


## TUITION

Table 8: Class-wise \% children ATtending tuition CLASSES. by School type 2007 AND 2009

| Year | School | I | II | III | IV | V | VI | VII | VIII |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | Govt | 13.4 | 14.5 | 17.3 | 19.6 | 19.8 | 24.6 | 23.3 | 29.7 |
|  | PVT. | 39.9 | 38.7 | 39.5 | 49.4 | 44.9 | 45.8 | 38.9 | 46.7 |
| $\mathbf{2 0} \mathbf{2 0 0 9}$ | Govt | 15.5 | 20.6 | 22.2 | 25.6 | 26.9 | 32.7 | 33.6 | 38.7 |
|  | PVT. | 38.9 | 39.9 | 36.1 | 40.2 | 38.6 | 31.9 | 30.3 | 41.4 |

NOTE : The ASER survey in 2007 and 2009 recorded information about tuition. In both years, the question asked was the following: "Does the child take any paid additional class currently?" Therefore, these numbers do not include any supplemental help in learning that children may have received from parents or siblings or from anyone else that did not require payment.


## LEARNING LEVELS IN GOVERNMENT AND PRIVATE SCHOOLS : TRENDS OVER TIME

Chart 8: \% Children in Std III who CAN AT LEAST READ Std I LEVEL TEXT. BY SCHOOL TYPE 2006-2009


Chart 9: \% Children in Std V who Can do division.
BY SCHOOL TYPE 2006-2009


Learning levels by gender : Trends over time

Chart 10: \% Boys and girls in Std III who CAN READ AT LEAST Std I LEVEL text 2007-2009


Chart 11: \% Boys and girls in Std V who CAN do division 2007-2009


## EDUCATION : FATHERS AND CHILDREN

## Table 9: Fathers and children 2009

| Fathers' <br> Education | \% Fathers | Of these fathers : |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | \% Girls 6 to 14 out of school | \% Children (Std III-V) who can read level 1 (Std 1 Text) or more | \% Children (Std III-V) who can do subtraction or more | \% Children (Std III-V) who can read words or more in English | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% } \\ \text { Children } \\ \text { (Std IV-VIII) } \\ \text { attending } \\ \text { tuition } \end{gathered}$ |
| No Schooling | 42.3 | 8.6 | 49.1 | 43.5 | 27.5 | 23.8 |
| Std I-V | 15.3 | 5.7 | 56.7 | 50.1 | 37.6 | 29.3 |
| Std VI-VIII | 15.3 | 3.1 | 63.3 | 56.3 | 44.4 | 33.9 |
| Std IX-X | 19.0 | 1.9 | 65.1 | 60.6 | 48.4 | 40.2 |
| Above Std X | 8.1 | 1.4 | 78.4 | 67.9 | 61.4 | 44.9 |

NOTE : ASER 2009 recorded information about mothers' education. Similar analyses can be done with mothers and children.

## SCHOOL ENROLLMENT AND ATTENDANCE : TRENDS OVER TIME

| TABLE 10: Total schools visited |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Type of school | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 |
| Std I-IV/V : Primary | 187 | 246 | 194 |
| Std I-VII/VIII : Primary + Upper Primary | 122 | 300 | 327 |
| Total schools | 309 | 546 | 521 |


| TABLE 12: TEACHER ATtENDANCE | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| Type of school | Std I-IV/V |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |
| \% Teachers attending (average) | 83.4 | 92.3 | 91.0 | 78.6 | 85.0 | 86.2 |
| \% Schools with no teacher present | 1.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.7 | 0.4 | 0.0 |
| \% Schools with all teachers present | 59.4 | 79.5 | 74.9 | 35.3 | 44.8 | 54.9 |


| TABLE 11: CHILDREN'S ATTENDANCE 2005 | 2007 | 2009 | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Type of school | Std I-IV/V |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |
| \% Enrolled children attending <br> (average) <br> \% Schools with less than 50\% <br> enrolled children attending | 60.3 | 26.3 | 62.8 | 61.0 | 62.0 | 63.6 |
| \% Shools with 75\% or more <br> enrolled children attending | 25.7 | 24.1 | 18.8 | 26.9 | 22.3 | 17.0 |

Table 11: Children's attendanc
200520072009200520072009
\% Enrolled children attending
\% Schools with less than 50\% enrolled children attending \% Schools with 75\% or more

Table 13: Multigrade classes
200520072009200520072009
\% Of schools in which:
Std II class sitting with another class
Std IV class sitting with another class

Std I-IV/V Std I-VII/VIII


## SCHOOL FACILITIES : TRENDS OVER TIME

| Table 14: Facilities in school |  | 200520072009200520072009 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \% Schools with: |  | Std I-IV/V |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \pm \\ & \stackrel{ \pm}{ \pm} \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | No facility | 33.5 | 25.8 | 18.9 | 13.1 | 5.8 | 6.0 |
|  | Facility but water not available | 13.5 | 6.0 | 15.4 | 13.1 | 7.2 | 12.0 |
|  | Available | 53.0 | 68.2 | 65.7 | 73.8 | 87.0 | 82.0 |
| $\stackrel{\text { む }}{\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}}$ | No facility | 69.7 | 59.7 | 43.5 | 27.0 | 18.8 | 20.6 |
|  | Facility but toilet not usable | 12.4 | 14.7 | 31.1 | 24.6 | 32.0 | 39.3 |
|  | Usable | 17.8 | 25.7 | 25.4 | 48.4 | 49.2 | 40.2 |
| Midday meal served on day of visit |  | 64.3 | 86.3 | 82.4 | 80.0 | 93.3 | 84.7 |


| TABLE 16: GIRLS ToILETS 2009 | Std I-IV/V Std I-VII/VIII |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| No of schools visited | 164 | 282 |
| \% Schools with no separate provision <br> for girls toilets | 54.9 | 32.6 |
| Of schools where there are separate girls toilets, $\%$ schools where: |  |  |
| Toilet locked | 12.2 | 14.5 |
| Toilet not usable | 16.5 | 33.3 |
| Usable | 16.5 | 19.5 |

Table 15: School improvement \& construction since April 2008

| School improvement \& Construction | Std I-IV/V |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. of schs | \% schools |  | No. of schs | \% schools |  |
|  |  | Yes | No |  | Yes | No |
| Whitewash | 169 | 64.5 | 35.5 | 291 | 81.8 | 18.2 |
| Construction of new classroom | 167 | 32.3 | 67.7 | 276 | 42.8 | 57.3 |
| Construction of boundary wall | 167 | 9.0 | 91.0 | 282 | 13.1 | 86.9 |

ASER survey was carried out in Oct-Nov 2009. One govt school with primary grades was visited in each sampled village. If there was more than one govt school in a village, then the school with the highest enrollment was visited. Hence the schools visited in the ASER survey do not represent a random sample of schools of the district. The school visits were generally done either on a Saturday or a Monday.

| School Grants |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| New classrooms | Rs 2 lacs per additional room |
| Maintenance grant | Rs. 5000 pa upto 3 classrooms. Upto Rs 10000 pa for more than 3 classrooms |
| Development grant | Rs. 5000 pa for primary schs \& Rs 7000 pa for upper primary schs |
| TLM grant | Rs. 500 pa per teacher |

## School Grants

| TABLE 17: <br> \% Primary <br> SCHOOLS RECEIVING <br> DIFFERENT GRANTS | April 2008-March 2009 |  |  |  | April 2009-October 2009 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Std I-IV/V |  |  |  | Std I-IV/V |  |  |  |
|  | No. of schs | Yes | No | Don't know | No. of schs | Yes | No | Don't know |
| ew classroom | 136 | 30.9 | 53.7 | 15.4 | 103 | 24.3 | 60.2 | 15. |
| Maintenance gran | 141 | 60.3 | 29.1 | 10.6 | 107 | 39.3 | 47. | 13 |
| Development gran | 147 | 70.8 | 15.7 | 13.6 | 104 | 44.2 | 40.4 | 15 |
| Teacher grant (TLM grant) | 150 | 80.7 | 12.0 | 7.3 | 104 | 51.9 | 37.5 | 10 |
| Other grants | 42 | 2.4 | 83.3 | 14.3 | 31 | 3.2 | 83.9 | 12. |

NOTE: No grant information was available for 43 schools out of 194 primary schools that were visited. This could be because the head teacher was not present, register was not available or the surveyors could not obtain the information. Therefore, the above table is based on schools for which information was available for at least one indicator.

## TABLE 18: <br> \% UPPER PRIMARY schools receiving different grants New classroom Maintenance grant <br> Development grant <br> Teacher grant <br> (TLM grant) <br> Other grants

April 2008-March 2009 April 2009-October 2009
Std I-VII/VIII Std I-VII/VIII

| No. of <br> schs | Yes | No | Don't <br> know | No. of <br> schs | Yes | No | Don’t <br> know |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 250 | 44.0 | 44.4 | 11.6 | 176 | 16.5 | 65.9 | 17.6 |
| t 264 | 73.5 | 13.6 | 12.9 | 182 | 45.6 | 39.6 | 14.8 |
| 257 | 75.1 | 11.7 | 13.2 | 181 | 48.6 | 37.0 | 14.4 |
| 262 | 81.3 | 8.4 | 10.3 | 183 | 49.7 | 39.3 | 10.9 |
| 92 | 13.0 | 68.5 | 18.5 | 75 | 8.0 | 74.7 | 17.3 |

NOTE: No grant information was available for 60 schools out of 327 upper primary schools that were visited. This could be because the head teacher was not present, register was not available or the surveyors could not obtain the information. Therefore, the above table is based on schools for which information was available for at least one indicator.

## Performance of districts

| Table 19: | ANGANWAD OR BALWAD | Out of SCHOOL | Private <br> SCHOOL | Tuition | Mothers' Reading | Std I-II : Learning levels |  |  | Std III-V : Learning levels |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Districts | \% Children (Age 3-4) in anganwadi or pre-school | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) <br> out <br> of <br> school | \%Children (Age: 6-14) in private school | \% Children (Std IV-VIII) attending tuition classes | \% Mothers <br> (Age: 17-55) who CAN READ | \% Children <br> (Std I-II) who CAN READ letters, words or more | \% Children (Std I-II) who CAN RECOGNIZE NUMBERS 1 to 9 or more | \% Children (Std I-II) who CAN READ LETTERS or more in ENGLISH | \% Children (Std III-V) who CAN READ Level 1 (Std 1 Text) or more | \% Children (Std III-V) who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more | \% Children (Std III-V) who CAN READ sentences in ENGLISH |
| Bokaro | 82.3 | 2.5 | 13.2 | 49.8 | 43.5 | 78.6 | 84.8 | 63.0 | 61.6 | 47.2 | 10.0 |
| Chaibasa | 76.9 | 11.5 | 8.4 | 19.5 | 54.7 | 62.6 | 73.1 | 44.7 | 48.5 | 47.6 | 12.8 |
| Chatra | 65.4 | 9.2 | 4.8 | 41.4 | 54.9 | 71.2 | 77.5 | 65.4 | 61.0 | 65.6 | 9.6 |
| Deoghar | 76.3 | 7.5 | 1.9 | 38.2 | 18.5 | 80.5 | 79.1 | 57.9 | 51.8 | 49.6 | 5.5 |
| Dhanbad | 73.8 | 5.3 | 20.1 | 54.1 | 69.9 | 81.7 | 81.2 | 64.8 | 68.4 | 61.8 | 15.7 |
| Dumka | 63.4 | 8.0 | 5.2 | 42.6 | 52.7 | 85.3 | 80.8 | 46.6 | 50.8 | 46.4 | 4.5 |
| Giridih | 81.0 | 2.2 | 9.5 | 38.3 | 39.9 | 72.5 | 71.5 | 56.9 | 67.0 | 56.8 | 13.5 |
| Godda | 88.2 | 2.7 | 3.2 | 31.2 | 56.4 | 90.7 | 90.7 | 72.9 | 50.2 | 57.1 | 17.7 |
| Gumla | 83.9 | 8.0 | 19.3 | 6.1 | 64.7 | 66.8 | 69.2 | 45.0 | 44.7 | 48.1 | 5.7 |
| Hazaribagh | 80.3 | 1.7 | 23.0 | 33.0 | 56.2 | 83.3 | 80.5 | 63.1 | 61.5 | 52.5 | 18.1 |
| Jamtara | 95.4 | 9.3 | 1.5 | 41.0 | 60.4 | 95.5 | 92.9 | 74.7 | 67.6 | 72.8 | 11.5 |
| Koderma | 94.9 | 0.3 | 3.8 | 47.2 | 78.5 | 86.6 | 86.8 | 67.0 | 83.8 | 84.0 | 33.0 |
| Latehar | 55.1 | 2.6 | 6.6 | 5.9 | 30.4 | 59.9 | 58.1 | 21.5 | 44.6 | 40.4 | 1.9 |
| Lohardagga | 93.1 | 2.4 | 8.2 | 16.2 | 45.3 | 80.6 | 78.5 | 61.5 | 64.7 | 52.7 | 10.5 |
| Pakur | 47.4 | 7.4 | 3.8 | 42.2 | 34.3 | 82.1 | 77.9 | 32.2 | 31.6 | 30.9 | 3.0 |
| Palamu | 65.8 | 3.0 | 1.7 | 15.5 | 36.5 | 73.8 | 68.8 | 56.9 | 64.6 | 48.5 | 5.0 |
| Purbi Singhbhum | 76.7 | 7.5 | 7.9 | 43.5 | 50.9 | 68.0 | 72.0 | 44.0 | 27.4 | 23.8 | 8.0 |
| Ranchi | 87.7 | 3.1 | 13.5 | 10.9 | 78.5 | 79.4 | 78.0 | 56.7 | 55.2 | 40.8 | 4.9 |
| Sahibganj | 43.0 | 21.3 | 8.4 | 37.8 | 46.0 | 58.8 | 69.1 | 42.5 | 32.3 | 25.3 | 4.2 |
| Saraikela | 25.2 | 2.1 | 2.0 | 42.1 | 92.5 | 94.9 | 94.8 | 75.5 | 88.3 | 86.0 | 19.4 |
| Simdega | 81.1 | 6.4 | 35.7 | 5.1 | 80.5 | 82.4 | 84.6 | 75.0 | 73.9 | 45.9 | 10.6 |
| Total | 72.5 | 5.4 | 10.0 | 31.1 | 50.7 | 77.1 | 77.2 | 55.9 | 57.5 | 51.3 | 10.6 |



## SCHOOL ENROLLMENT AND OUT OF SCHOOL CHILDREN

| Table 1: \% Children in different types of schools 2009 |  |  |  | \% Out of school |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in School |  |
| AgE: 6-14 ALL | 79.4 | 16.8 | 0.7 | 3.2 | 100 |
| Age: 7-16 ALL | 77.2 | 16.8 | 0.7 | 5.3 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 80.9 | 16.8 | 0.9 | 1.4 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 BOYS | 80.0 | 18.0 | 0.7 | 1.2 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 GIRLS | 81.9 | 15.6 | 1.0 | 1.6 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 ALL | 78.7 | 15.6 | 0.6 | 5.1 | 100 |
| AGE: 11-14 BOYS | 78.8 | 16.5 | 0.6 | 4.1 | 100 |
| AGE: 11-14 GIRLS | 78.6 | 14.7 | 0.6 | 6.1 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 ALL | 63.6 | 20.3 | 0.6 | 15.5 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 BOYS | 63.2 | 20.4 | 0.9 | 15.6 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 GIRLS | 64.2 | 20.4 | 0.3 | 15.2 | 100 |


note : 'отнer' includes chidren going to madarssa and EGS.
'кот in school' = dropped out + never enrolled.


| Std. | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 6.9 | 60.3 | 29.0 |  |  |  |  | 3.9 |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| II | 0.6 | 5.5 | 37.2 | 50.4 |  |  |  | 6 | . 3 |  |  |  | 100 |
| III | 0 | . 9 | 4.8 | 31.1 | 57.1 |  |  |  | 6.1 |  |  |  | 100 |
| IV |  | 1.2 |  | 6.4 | 33.0 | 53.7 |  |  |  | . 7 |  |  | 100 |
| V |  | 1. |  |  | 4.9 | 37.0 | 49.8 |  | 7.2 |  |  |  | 100 |
| VI |  |  | 1.2 |  |  | 6.6 | 26.4 | 59.2 |  | 6 | 7 |  | 100 |
| VII |  |  | 2. | . 6 |  |  | 6.5 | 34.3 | 48.8 | 6.8 | 1.0 |  | 100 |
| VIII |  |  |  | 1.6 |  |  |  | 7.6 | 33.6 | 51.1 | 6.0 |  | 100 |

How to read the table: In Std III, $93.0 \%(4.8+31.1+57.1)$ children are in age group 7 to 9 .

## Young children in pre-school and school

|  |  |  |  | In Scho |  | $\stackrel{\infty}{\underline{\infty}}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | anganwadi | UKG | Govt. | Pvt. | Other |  |  |
| Age 3 | 83.0 | 5.1 |  |  |  | 12.0 | 100 |
| Age 4 | 82.3 | 12.6 |  |  |  | 5.1 | 100 |
| Age 5 | 61.4 | 18.5 | 8.7 | 8.4 | 0.1 | 3.0 | 100 |
| Age 6 | 10.6 | 6.0 | 60.8 | 19.9 | 0.6 | 2.1 | 100 |

Chart 3: Trends over time
\% Children age 3-4 not attending Pre-school (ICDS OR Other) 2006-2009


Of the villages visited, Anganwadi/Pre-School presence has been recorded in $98.7 \%$ villages.

## Reading in own language

Table 4: Class-wise \% children who CAN READ (All Schools) 2009

| STD. | Nothing | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (STD 1 Text) | Level 2 <br> (STD 2 Text) | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| I | 20.8 | 50.4 | 20.8 | 5.3 | 2.8 | 100 |
| II | 8.2 | 33.7 | 33.5 | 16.3 | 8.3 | 100 |
| III | 3.8 | 17.8 | 31.7 | 28.1 | 18.6 | 100 |
| IV | 2.1 | 9.7 | 21.8 | 34.4 | 32.0 | 100 |
| V | 2.0 | 6.0 | 15.2 | 29.5 | 47.2 | 100 |
| VI | 1.2 | 4.0 | 10.5 | 27.8 | 56.5 | 100 |
| VII | 1.1 | 2.6 | 6.5 | 22.3 | 67.5 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.6 | 1.6 | 5.4 | 18.5 | 73.9 | 100 |
| TOTAL | 4.7 | 15.1 | 18.2 | 23.3 | 38.7 | 100 |

nOTE : Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. Thus a child who can read Std II level text can read letters, words, and Std 1 level text.

Chart 4: TRENDS OVER time
\% Children who CANNOT EVEN IDENTIFY LETTERS (IN GOVt Schools in Std I - IV) 2006-2009


## Reading Tool

## atences - 2

Shd UIEN

## Tand Ros net



 abeolancia nwaiungy acet sho iscatio acel escenth tade ngrib

 desando ag. edel tydgat dart

 जmiasb. migodio morkaeaibor acestimionale


Chart 5: Trends over time
\% Children who CAN READ Std II level text (in govt schools in
Chart 5: Trends over time
\% Children who CAN READ Std II level text (in govt schools in Std IV - VII) 2006-2009


| Reading Tool |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Sh U1-0 Exty | Sid lleal |
|  <br>  <br>  <br>  ascaib acel efegchuly Aade igho <br>  Wigras wert nusys con bext. <br>  fowhtr eseity em an poen <br>  <br>  guestimanda | Elarje syet wac misk sodobosg wact en olonly fouvd In Leand and scas etry <br>  <br>  (0) |

## Reading and comprehension in english

## TABLE 5: CLASS-WISE \% CHILDREN WHO CAN READ

ENGLISH (All Schools) 2009

Cannot Can readCan readCan read Can read Total Std. | read |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| capital | capital | small |
| letters |  |  | \(\begin{gathered}simple <br>

letters\end{gathered} \quad $$
\begin{gathered}\text { easy } \\
\text { words } \\
\text { sentences }\end{gathered}
$$\) letters

| I | 63.0 | 22.1 | 8.4 | 4.5 | 2.0 | 100 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| II | 46.2 | 27.1 | 14.4 | 8.5 | 3.8 | 100 |
| III | 32.4 | 31.7 | 17.8 | 12.8 | 5.4 | 100 |
| IV | 18.1 | 28.9 | 26.0 | 17.9 | 9.2 | 100 |
| V | 9.1 | 20.0 | 27.0 | 28.2 | 15.6 | 100 |
| VI | 4.9 | 15.6 | 19.2 | 30.2 | 30.1 | 100 |
| VII | 3.6 | 10.2 | 14.9 | 30.1 | 41.2 | 100 |
| VIII | 3.2 | 7.5 | 11.6 | 25.0 | 52.7 | 100 |
| TOTAL | 21.7 | 20.5 | 17.9 | 20.1 | 19.9 | 100 |


| Std. | Of those who can read words, \% who can tell meaning of the words | Of those who can read sentences, \% who can tell meaning of the sentences |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 58.8 | 68.6 |
| II | 54.2 | 78.4 |
| III | 58.9 | 79.7 |
| IV | 62.0 | 82.4 |
| V | 68.8 | 81.3 |
| VI | 64.8 | 77.6 |
| VII | 64.6 | 81.0 |
| VIII | 65.0 | 82.8 |
| Total | 64.1 | 80.7 |



## ARITHMETIC

Table 7: Class-wise \% children who CAN Do ARIthmetic (All Schools) 2009

| StD. | Nothing | Recognize Numbers |  | Subtract | Divide | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 23.9 | 50.6 | 21.6 | 2.7 | 1.2 | 100 |
| II | 10.0 | 31.4 | 45.7 | 11.7 | 1.3 | 100 |
| III | 5.4 | 18.4 | 48.2 | 24.5 | 3.4 | 100 |
| IV | 2.8 | 10.6 | 40.5 | 35.0 | 11.1 | 100 |
| V | 2.6 | 6.6 | 29.2 | 39.8 | 21.7 | 100 |
| VI | 1.2 | 4.9 | 22.4 | 42.0 | 29.5 | 100 |
| VII | 0.9 | 3.5 | 19.6 | 37.3 | 38.7 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.7 | 2.2 | 17.1 | 31.3 | 48.8 | 100 |
| TOTAL | 5.6 | 15.4 | 30.7 | 28.8 | 19.5 | 100 |

NOTE : Each cell shows the highest level of arithmetic achieved by a child. Thus a child who can do division, can also recognize numbers 1-9, 11-99 and do subtraction.

Chart 6: Trends over time
\% Children who CANNOT EVEN RECOGNIZE NUMBERS UPTO 9 (IN GOVt schools in Std I - IV) 2007-2009


Maths Tool


Chart 7: Trends over time
\% Children who CAN DO DIVISION (in govt schools in Std IV - VII) 2007-2009


## TUITION

Table 8: CLass-wise \% children ATTENDING TUITION CLASSES. BY SCHOOL TYPE 2007 AND 2009

| Year | School | I | II | III | V | V | VI | VII | VIII |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | Govt | 7.1 | 7.0 | 9.5 | 8.3 | 9.9 | 9.1 | 8.4 | 6.7 |
|  | Pvt. | 15.6 | 16.7 | 18.7 | 13.4 | 24.2 | 16.5 | 13.7 | 8.8 |
| 2009 | Govt | 5.0 | 7.5 | 7.4 | 9.2 | 9.1 | 7.6 | 8.5 | 6.2 |
|  | Pvt. | 20.4 | 21.6 | 26.5 | 20.3 | 20.7 | 26.4 | 21.9 | 14.2 |

NOTE : The ASER survey in 2007 and 2009 recorded information about tuition. In both years, the question asked was the following: "Does the child take any paid additional class currently?" Therefore, these numbers do not include any supplemental help in learning that children may have received from parents or siblings or from anyone else that did not require payment.


## KARNATAKA rural

## LEARNING LEVELS IN GOVERNMENT AND PRIVATE SCHOOLS : TRENDS OVER TIME

Chart 8: \% Children in Std III who CAN AT LEAST READ Std I LEVEL TEXT. BY SCHOOL TYPE 2006-2009


Chart 9: \% Children in Std V who CAN DO DIVISION.
BY SCHOOL TYPE 2006-2009


Learning levels by gender : Trends over time

Chart 10: \% Boys and girls in Std III who CAN READ AT LEAST Std I LEVEL text 2007-2009


Chart 11: \% Boys and girls in Std V who CAN do division 2007-2009


## EDUCATION : FATHERS AND CHILDREN

## Table 9: Fathers and children 2009

| Fathers' <br> Education | \% Fathers | Of these fathers : |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | \% Girls 6 to 14 out of school | \% Children (Std III-V) who can read level 1 (Std 1 Text) or more | \% Children (Std III-V) who can do subtraction or more | \% Children (Std III-V) who can read words or more in English | ```% Children (Std IV-VIII) attending tuition``` |
| No Schooling | 35.6 | 7.1 | 57.6 | 37.4 | 21.2 | 6.9 |
| Sto I-V | 17.5 | 2.4 | 64.9 | 46.6 | 25.3 | 6.7 |
| Std VI-VIII | 14.4 | 1.5 | 67.6 | 50.8 | 34.5 | 12.4 |
| Std IX-X | 19.2 | 1.5 | 68.9 | 52.8 | 39.7 | 14.7 |
| Above Std X | 13.3 | 0.3 | 73.7 | 59.6 | 49.8 | 16.4 |



NOTE: ASER 2009 recorded information about mothers' education. Similar analyses can be done with mothers and children.

## SCHOOL ENROLLMENT AND ATTENDANCE : TRENDS OVER TIME

| TABLE 10: Total schools visited |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Type of school | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 |
| Std I-IV/V : Primary | 92 | 168 | 133 |
| Std I-VII/VIII : Primary + Upper Primary | 423 | 582 | 623 |
| Total schools | 515 | 750 | 756 |


| TABLE 12: Teacher attendance | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Type of school | Std I-IV/V |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |
| \% Teachers attending (average) | 78.3 | 91.6 | 94.6 | 78.3 | 85.0 | 91.7 |
| \% Schools with no teacher present | 2.2 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 1.2 | 0.6 | 0.0 |
| \% Schools with all teachers present | 56.0 | 76.1 | 84.1 | 24.9 | 43.3 | 62.1 |

Table 11: Children's attendance
Type of school
\% Enrolled children attending (average)
\% Schools with less than 50\% enrolled children attending \% Schools with 75\% or more enrolled children attending

## Table 13: Multigrade classes

200520072009200520072009
\% Of schools in which:
Std II class sitting with another class
Std IV class sitting with another class

200520072009200520072009
Std I-IV/V Std I-VII/VIII
$\begin{array}{llllll}83.3 & 78.3 & 88.0 & 77.3 & 75.0 & 79.6\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llllll}4.4 & 10.1 & 1.5 & 10.2 & 16.7 & 8.3\end{array}$

| 75.8 | 66.1 | 84.1 | 63.2 | 64.3 | 70.0 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

## SCHOOL FACILITIES: TRENDS OVER TIME

| Table 14: Facilities in school |  | 20052007 |  | 2009 | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \% Schools with: |  | Std I-IV/V |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \frac{ \pm}{ \pm} \\ & \frac{\pi}{3} \end{aligned}$ | No facility | 28.3 | 28.8 | 19.2 | 15.8 | 16.4 | 12.0 |
|  | Facility but water not available | 5.4 | 4.4 | 8.8 | 7.6 | 8.2 | 7.0 |
|  | Available | 66.3 | 66.9 | 72.0 | 76.6 | 75.4 | 81.0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 世 } \\ & \stackrel{\text { O}}{0} \end{aligned}$ | No facility | 37.0 | 12.0 | 11.5 | 10.2 | 5.1 | 5.5 |
|  | Facility but toilet not usable | 9.8 | 10.1 | 51.9 | 20.1 | 20.2 | 48.7 |
|  | Usable | 53.3 | 77.8 | 36.6 | 69.7 | 74.6 | 45.8 |
| Midday meal served on day |  | 83.7 | 97.0 | 93.9 | 79.4 | 98.6 | 90.2 |

it

Table 15: School improvement \& construction since April 2008

|  <br> Construction | Std I-IV/V |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. of <br> schs | \% schools |  | No. of | \% schools |  |
| schs | Yes | No |  |  |  |  |
| Whitewash | 131 | 83.2 | 16.8 | 610 | 80.0 | 20.0 |
| Construction of new <br> classroom <br> Construction of boundary <br> wall | 128 | 18.8 | 81.3 | 588 | 28.9 | 71.1 |
|  | 125 | 17.6 | 82.4 | 582 | 25.4 | 74.6 |

ASER survey was carried out in Oct-Nov 2009. One govt school with primary grades was visited in each sampled village. If there was more than one govt school in a village, then the school with the highest enrollment was visited. Hence the schools visited in the ASER survey do not represent a random sample of schools of the district. The school visits were generally done either on a Saturday or a Monday.

| School Grants |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| New | Rs 2 lacs per |
| classrooms | additional room |$|$|  | Rs. 5000 pa upto 3 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Maintenance | classrooms. Upto |
| grant | Rs 10000 pa for <br> more than 3 <br> classrooms |

Rs. 5000 pa for Development primary schs \& Rs grant $\quad 7000$ pa for upper primary schs

Rs. 500 pa per teacher

## School Grants

| Table 17: <br> \% Primary <br> SCHOOLS RECEIVING <br> DIFFERENT GRANTS | April 2008-March 2009 |  |  |  | April 2009-October 200 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Std I-IV/V |  |  |  | Std I-IV/V |  |  |  |
|  | No. of schs | Yes | No | Don't know | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No. of } \\ & \text { schs } \end{aligned}$ | Yes | No | Don't know |
| New classroom | 118 | 17.8 | 76.3 | 5.9 | 108 | 6.5 | 83.3 | 10.2 |
| Maintenance | 120 | 91.7 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 102 | 70.6 | 21.6 | 7.8 |
| Development g | 114 | 73.7 | 21.1 | 5.3 | 100 | 59.0 | 33.0 | 8.0 |
| Teacher grant (TLM grant) | 112 | 94.6 | 3.6 | 1.8 | 100 | 57.0 | 35.0 | 8.0 |
| Other grants | 55 | 27.3 | 65.5 | 7.3 | 48 | 12.5 | 77.1 | 10 |
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## TABLE 18: <br> \% UPPER PRIMARY <br> schools receiving <br> different grants <br> New classroom <br> Maintenance grant <br> Development grant <br> Teacher grant <br> (TLM grant) <br> Other grants

April 2008-March 2009 April 2009-October 2009
Std I-VII/VIII Std I-VII/VIII

| No. of <br> schs | Yes | No | Don't <br> know | No. of <br> schs | Yes | No | Don't <br> know |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 547 | 25.8 | 71.7 | 2.6 | 475 | 13.7 | 81.9 | 4.4 |
| 587 | 92.2 | 4.4 | 3.4 | 499 | 81.6 | 13.6 | 4.8 |
| 558 | 82.8 | 13.4 | 3.8 | 477 | 73.0 | 21.4 | 5.7 |
| 572 | 93.5 | 3.7 | 2.8 | 484 | 79.6 | 16.1 | 4.3 |
| 319 | 43.9 | 51.1 | 5.0 | 270 | 31.1 | 61.1 | 7.8 |

NOTE : No grant information was available for 17 schools out of 623 upper primary schools that were visited. This could be because the head teacher was not present, register was not available or the surveyors could not obtain the information. Therefore, the above table is based on schools for which information was available for at least one indicator.

## Performance of districts

| Table 19: | ANGANWADI <br> OR <br> BALWADI | OUt of SCHOOL | Private SCHOOL | Tuition | Mothers' Reading | Std I-II : Learning levels |  |  | Std III-V : Learning levels |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Districts | \% Children (Age 3-4) in anganwadi or pre-school | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% Children } \\ \text { (Age: 6-14) } \\ \text { out } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { school } \end{gathered}$ | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) <br> in private school | \% Children (Std IV-VIII) attending tuition classes | \% Mothers <br> (Age: 17-55) who CAN READ | \% Children <br> (Std I-II) who CAN READ letters, words or more | \% Children (Std I-II) who CAN RECOGNIZE NUMBERS 1 to 9 or more | \% Children (Std I-II) who CAN READ LETTERS or more in ENGLISH | \% Children (Std III-V) who CAN READ Level 1 (Std 1 Text) or more | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% Children } \\ & \text { (Std III-V) } \\ & \text { who } \\ & \text { CAN DO } \\ & \text { SUBTRACTION } \\ & \text { or more } \end{aligned}$ | \% Children (Std III-V) who CAN READ sentences in ENGLISH |
| Bagalkot | 98.7 | 2.3 | 13.0 | 8.3 | 37.4 | 83.4 | 81.0 | 38.8 | 63.7 | 29.0 | 7.4 |
| Bangalore | 93.2 | 1.4 | 47.9 | 37.8 | 70.1 | 87.5 | 92.7 | 79.0 | 66.1 | 57.7 | 34.9 |
| Bangalore Rural | 100.0 | 1.3 | 16.7 | 16.8 | 77.3 | 98.3 | 85.7 | 64.1 | 64.6 | 72.6 | 14.7 |
| Belgaum | 99.4 | 1.5 | 18.5 | 5.1 | 46.7 | 85.3 | 84.3 | 34.6 | 66.0 | 39.3 | 9.2 |
| Bellary | 88.3 | 12.3 | 11.9 | 6.9 | 30.4 | 82.8 | 79.1 | 41.9 | 44.7 | 29.8 | 6.8 |
| Bidar | 100.0 | 1.6 | 18.7 | 18.6 | 47.1 | 78.9 | 80.4 | 46.0 | 40.9 | 34.2 | 6.6 |
| Bijapur | 82.3 | 4.0 | 16.5 | 19.0 | 43.0 | 81.9 | 74.9 | 50.0 | 65.1 | 51.3 | 8.6 |
| Chamaraj Nagar | 95.0 | 2.0 | 12.2 | 2.7 | 67.8 | 91.7 | 86.7 | 18.8 | 78.5 | 48.8 | 2.5 |
| Chikmagalur | 89.0 | 2.0 | 20.4 | 8.5 | 62.5 | 95.5 | 90.9 | 61.9 | 72.2 | 46.2 | 14.9 |
| Chitradurga | 85.3 | 1.4 | 1.8 | 13.3 | 77.5 | 83.8 | 83.2 | 63.5 | 72.6 | 54.6 | 10.4 |
| Dakshin Kannada | 85.4 | 0.9 | 30.0 | 4.2 | 77.9 | 95.1 | 96.5 | 51.1 | 82.6 | 59.3 | 15.4 |
| Davanagere | 96.6 | 2.9 | 21.0 | 7.1 | 80.0 | 84.7 | 86.6 | 60.5 | 59.3 | 37.8 | 7.3 |
| Dharwad | 91.5 | 2.7 | 9.7 | 8.4 | 46.1 | 76.9 | 79.3 | 43.9 | 63.0 | 36.6 | 6.2 |
| Gadag | 94.1 | 3.1 | 13.4 | 9.0 | 63.5 | 84.0 | 81.4 | 45.8 | 64.2 | 50.0 | 7.8 |
| Gulbarga | 77.7 | 8.0 | 14.7 | 9.6 | 29.0 | 69.5 | 70.1 | 23.9 | 48.4 | 22.9 | 5.0 |
| Hassan | 93.7 | 0.1 | 21.5 | 6.2 | 60.7 | 90.9 | 88.1 | 43.2 | 69.3 | 50.0 | 7.3 |
| Haveri | 94.3 | 3.4 | 12.3 | 8.9 | 79.9 | 85.7 | 85.3 | 57.1 | 58.3 | 38.1 | 11.0 |
| Kodagu | 100.0 | 1.3 | 26.0 | 4.7 | 67.9 | 91.3 | 95.7 | 55.0 | 84.7 | 58.9 | 19.5 |
| Kolar | 100.0 | 1.4 | 21.9 | 12.6 | 77.6 | 92.8 | 88.2 | 45.5 | 59.2 | 53.9 | 7.3 |
| Koppal | 89.0 | 5.4 | 15.6 | 5.5 | 35.5 | 77.4 | 75.2 | 35.0 | 41.5 | 19.7 | 6.9 |
| Mandya | 92.1 | 2.0 | 24.7 | 15.0 | 58.0 | 94.3 | 89.3 | 75.4 | 71.7 | 65.0 | 16.6 |
| Mysore | 92.0 | 2.0 | 11.7 | 12.7 | 83.2 | 82.7 | 82.7 | 57.9 | 71.9 | 48.5 | 16.2 |
| Raichur | 72.7 | 15.8 | 6.4 | 7.1 | 15.3 | 76.7 | 69.4 | 23.2 | 37.0 | 29.3 | 3.1 |
| Shimoga | 87.6 | 1.2 | 17.1 | 5.8 | 64.1 | 90.5 | 92.0 | 52.3 | 81.7 | 45.7 | 11.5 |
| Tumkur | 97.5 | 1.1 | 13.0 | 13.9 | 65.6 | 96.7 | 85.8 | 53.3 | 67.9 | 53.5 | 13.5 |
| Udupi | 88.8 | 0.0 | 30.1 | 4.6 | 82.5 | 93.0 | 92.9 | 62.8 | 86.4 | 68.2 | 23.7 |
| Uttar Kannada | 97.2 | 0.1 | 4.6 | 2.2 | 65.0 | 98.0 | 96.6 | 31.7 | 84.3 | 80.3 | 9.6 |
| Total | 92.1 | 3.2 | 16.8 | 10.1 | 56.9 | 85.7 | 83.3 | 45.7 | 64.0 | 46.0 | 10.3 |



## SCHOOL ENROLLMENT AND OUT OF SCHOOL CHILDREN

| Table 1: \% Children in different types of SCHOOLS 2009 |  |  |  | \% Out of school |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in School |  |
| Age: 6-14 ALL | 46.8 | 51.5 | 1.7 | 0.1 | 100 |
| Age: 7-16 ALL | 48.2 | 50.1 | 1.5 | 0.2 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 47.0 | 51.3 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 BOYS | 48.1 | 50.4 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 100 |
| AGE: 7-10 GIRLS | 46.0 | 52.1 | 1.9 | 0.0 | 100 |
| AgE: 11-14 ALL | 48.2 | 50.1 | 1.6 | 0.2 | 100 |
| AGE: 11-14 BOYS | 47.3 | 51.2 | 1.3 | 0.2 | 100 |
| AGE: 11-14 GIRLS | 49.4 | 48.6 | 1.8 | 0.2 | 100 |
| AgE: 15-16 ALL | 51.5 | 47.2 | 0.8 | 0.5 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 BOYS | 49.8 | 48.9 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 GIRLS | 52.8 | 45.9 | 0.8 | 0.5 | 100 |


note : 'отнек' includes chidren going to madarssa and EGS.
'кот IN SCHool' = dropped out + never enrolled.


| Std. | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 18.7 | 59.4 | 17.2 |  |  |  |  | 4.7 |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| II | 0.1 | 15.0 | 62.0 | 17.6 |  |  |  |  | 5.3 |  |  |  | 100 |
| III |  | 0.7 | 12.2 | 65.0 | 19.5 |  |  |  | 2.6 |  |  |  | 100 |
| IV |  | 0.4 |  | 11.0 | 63.6 | 22.1 |  |  | 3. | . 0 |  |  | 100 |
| V |  | 1 | . 3 |  |  | 12.8 | 65.2 | 17.7 |  | 3.1 |  |  | 100 |
| VI |  |  | 1.3 |  |  |  | 12.6 | 55.5 | 25.8 |  | 4.8 |  | 100 |
| VII |  |  | 1. | 6 |  |  |  | 11.1 | 63.8 | 21.2 | 2. | 3 | 100 |
| VIII |  |  | 0. | . 7 |  |  |  | 0.6 | 15.1 | 67.1 | 14.4 | 2.0 | 100 |

How to read the table: In Std III, $96.7 \%(12.2+65.0+19.5)$ children are in age group 7 to 9 .

## Young children in pre-school and school

|  |  |  |  | In Scho |  | $\stackrel{\infty}{\infty}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | anganwadi | UKG | Govt. | Pvt. | Other |  |  |
| Age 3 | 59.0 | 11.8 |  |  |  | 29.2 | 100 |
| Age 4 | 47.7 | 46.8 |  |  |  | 5.5 | 100 |
| Age 5 | 14.6 | 33.9 | 14.7 | 33.8 | 0.7 | 2.2 | 100 |
| Age 6 | 1.7 | 8.3 | 33.6 | 54.0 | 2.0 | 0.5 | 100 |

Chart 3: Trends over time
\% Children age 3-4 not attending Pre-school (ICDS or other) 2006-2009
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## Reading in own language

Table 4: Class-wise \% children who CAN READ (All Schools) 2009

| StD. | Nothing | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (STd 1 Text) | Level 2 <br> (Std 2 Text) | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| I | 3.9 | 28.7 | 42.7 | 15.1 | 9.6 | 100 |
| II | 2.7 | 11.8 | 33.2 | 26.6 | 25.7 | 100 |
| III | 0.5 | 7.3 | 18.6 | 30.7 | 42.9 | 100 |
| IV | 0.8 | 3.4 | 11.0 | 25.8 | 59.2 | 100 |
| V | 0.5 | 2.6 | 7.7 | 17.9 | 71.3 | 100 |
| VI | 0.4 | 1.3 | 4.8 | 16.4 | 77.0 | 100 |
| VII | 0.5 | 1.4 | 3.2 | 13.3 | 81.7 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.3 | 0.5 | 2.0 | 11.1 | 86.1 | 100 |
| TOTAL | 1.1 | 6.5 | 14.4 | 19.6 | 58.5 | 100 |

NOTE : Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. Thus a child who can read Std II level text can read letters, words, and Std 1 level text.


Chart 4: Trends over time
\% Children who CANNOT EVEN IDENTIFY LETTERS (IN GOVt Schools in Std I - IV) 2006-2009


CHART 5: TRENDS OVER TIME
\% Children who CAN READ Std II level text (in govt schools in Std IV - VII) 2006-2009


## Reading and comprehension in english

## TABLE 5: CLASS-WISE \% CHILDREN WHO CAN READ

ENGLISH (All Schools) 2009

Cannot Can readCan readCan read Can read Total Std. | read | capital | small | simple |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| capital | easy |  |  |
| letters | letters | words | sentences | letters

| I | 15.4 | 22.4 | 20.0 | 29.8 | 12.4 | 100 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| II | 8.4 | 15.8 | 19.9 | 35.4 | 20.5 | 100 |
| III | 6.3 | 13.1 | 14.7 | 38.2 | 27.7 | 100 |
| IV | 3.3 | 7.2 | 11.0 | 36.1 | 42.5 | 100 |
| V | 2.0 | 5.4 | 6.0 | 32.2 | 54.5 | 100 |
| VI | 3.2 | 2.9 | 4.1 | 26.5 | 63.3 | 100 |
| VII | 1.6 | 2.3 | 3.3 | 18.8 | 74.0 | 100 |
| VIII | 1.7 | 1.2 | 1.9 | 14.0 | 81.2 | 100 |
| TOTAL | 4.9 | 8.3 | 9.6 | 28.7 | 48.6 | 100 |


| TABLE 6: CLASS-wISE \% CHILDREN wHO |
| :--- | :---: |
| COMPREHEND ENGLISH (ALL ScHOOLS) 2009 |


| English Tool |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
| D L T  <br>  K G  <br> X P N  | y   $f$  <br>    $i$  <br>  $s$  $v$  <br> m  a  $h$ |
| - |  |
| $\left.\right\|^{\text {dog }}$ fat  <br>  gan  <br> boy  man | What in the time? <br> Thle is a blue shirt. <br> 1 Hike to sleep. <br> 1 have a beother: |
|  |  |

## ARITHMETIC

Table 7: Class-wise \% children who CAN Do ARIthmetic (All Schools) 2009

| StD. | Nothing | Recognize Numbers |  | Subtract | Divide | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 5.6 | 26.0 | 53.6 | 10.2 | 4.6 | 100 |
| II | 2.5 | 9.7 | 51.2 | 31.8 | 4.9 | 100 |
| III | 1.2 | 4.1 | 32.1 | 55.3 | 7.4 | 100 |
| IV | 1.1 | 2.8 | 18.9 | 52.6 | 24.5 | 100 |
| V | 0.9 | 2.0 | 12.2 | 39.6 | 45.4 | 100 |
| VI | 0.8 | 1.3 | 9.7 | 30.2 | 58.1 | 100 |
| VII | 0.9 | 1.5 | 7.3 | 24.0 | 66.3 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.3 | 0.8 | 5.3 | 18.0 | 75.6 | 100 |
| TOTAL | 1.5 | 5.4 | 22.4 | 33.3 | 37.3 | 100 |

NOTE : Each cell shows the highest level of arithmetic achieved by a child. Thus a child who can do division, can also recognize numbers 1-9, 11-99 and do subtraction.

Chart 6: Trends over time
\% Children who CANNOT EVEN RECOGNIZE NUMBERS UPTO 9 (IN GOVt schools in Std I - IV) 2007-2009



Chart 7: Trends over time
\% Children who CAN DO DIVISION (in govt schools in Std IV - VII) 2007-2009


## TUITION

Table 8: Class-wise \% children ATtending tuition CLASSES. BY SCHOOL TYPE 2007 AND 2009

| Year | School | I | II | III | IV | V | VI | VII | VIII |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | Govt | 28.2 | 32.7 | 30.3 | 39.0 | 36.8 | 39.6 | 42.0 | 42.4 |
|  | Pvt. | 20.1 | 28.3 | 29.6 | 35.6 | 39.2 | 38.8 | 35.8 | 41.9 |
| 2009 | Govt | 21.4 | 33.1 | 31.2 | 34.4 | 41.8 | 34.2 | 35.1 | 41.5 |
|  | Pvt. | 28.7 | 32.4 | 37.6 | 43.3 | 43.0 | 43.1 | 42.6 | 47.8 |

NOTE : The ASER survey in 2007 and 2009 recorded information about tuition. In both years, the question asked was the following: "Does the child take any paid additional class currently?" Therefore, these numbers do not include any supplemental help in learning that children may have received from parents or siblings or from anyone else that did not require payment.


## KERALA rural

## Learning Levels in government and private schools : Trends over time

Chart 8: \% Children in Std III who CAN AT LEAST READ Std I LEVEL TEXT. BY SCHOOL TYPE 2006-2009


Chart 9: \% Children in Std V who CAN DO DIVISION.
BY SCHOOL TYPE 2006-2009


Learning levels by gender : Trends over time

Chart 10: \% Boys and girls in Std III who CAN READ AT LEAST Std I LEVEL text 2007-2009


Chart 11: \% Boys and girls in Std V who CAN do division 2007-2009


## EDUCATION : FATHERS AND CHILDREN

Table 9: Fathers and children 2009

| Fathers' <br> Education | \% Fathers | Of these fathers : |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | \% Girls 6 to 14 out of school | \% Children (Std III-V) who can read level 1 (Std 1 Text) or more | \% Children (Std III-V) who can do subtraction or more | \% Children (Std III-V) who can read words or more in English | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% } \\ \text { Children } \\ \text { (Std IV-VIII) } \\ \text { attending } \\ \text { tuition } \end{gathered}$ |
| No Schooling | 1.3 | 0.8 | 79.6 | 62.2 | 59.3 | 14.6 |
| Std I-V | 11.3 | 0.2 | 76.8 | 55.5 | 55.8 | 19.6 |
| Std VI-VIII | 19.2 | 0.2 | 80.4 | 71.2 | 70.1 | 33.0 |
| Std IX-X | 47.8 | 0.0 | 83.5 | 78.4 | 82.3 | 48.0 |
| Above Std X | 20.4 | 0.0 | 88.7 | 86.1 | 89.5 | 47.6 |

NOTE : ASER 2009 recorded information about mothers' education. Similar analyses can be done with mothers and children.


## SCHOOL ENROLLMENT AND ATTENDANCE : TRENDS OVER TIME

| Table 10: Total schools visited |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Type of school | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 |
| Std I-IV/V : Primary | 95 | 127 | 176 |
| Std I-VII/VIII : Primary + Upper Primary | 132 | 64 | 79 |
| Total schools | 227 | 191 | 255 |


| TABLE 12: Teacher Attendance | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| Type of school | Std I-IV/V |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |
| \% Teachers attending (average) | 85.9 | 90.2 | 87.0 | 84.1 | 87.7 | 90.9 |
| \% Schools with no teacher present | 1.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \% Schools with all teachers present | 58.1 | 58.4 | 56.6 | 35.6 | 39.0 | 46.3 |

## Table 11: Children's attendance

200520072009200520072009

\% Enrolled children attending (average)
\% Schools with less than 50\% enrolled children attending \% Schools with 75\% or more enrolled children attending
$\begin{array}{llllll}94.9 & 90.0 & 91.9 & 95.2 & 91.5 & 91.7\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llllll}0.0 & 3.6 & 0.6 & 0.0 & 3.6 & 1.3\end{array}$

Table 13: Multigrade classes

| 97.8 | 93.7 | 96.4 | 99.2 | 92.9 | 96.1 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

200520072009200520072009
\% Of schools in which:
Std II class sitting with another class
Std IV class sitting with another class

Std I-IV/V Std I-VII/VIII


## School facilities : TRENDS OVER TIME

Table 14: Facilities in school
200520072009200520072009

| \% Schools with: |  | Std I-IV/V |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No facility | 7.5 | 5.0 | 2.4 | 3.8 | 0.0 | 2.7 |
| \% | Facility but water not available | 6.5 | 1.7 | 6.6 | 5.4 | 0.0 | 1.4 |
|  | Available | 86.0 | 93.3 | 91.0 | 90.8 | 100 | 95.9 |
|  | No facility | 3.2 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 2.3 | 1.7 | 0.0 |
| $\stackrel{0}{0}$ | Facility but toilet not usable | 5.3 | 0.0 | 23.6 | 3.8 | 0.0 | 22.8 |
|  | Usable | 91.6 | 99.2 | 76.4 | 93.9 | 98.3 | 77.2 |
| Midday meal served on day |  | 92.4 | 99.2 | 100 | 95.3 | 96.6 | 100 |


| TABLE 16: GIRLS ToILETS 2009 | Std I-IV/V | Std I-VII/VIII |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No of schools visited | 165 | 77 |
| \% Schools with no separate provision <br> for girls toilets | 4.2 | 0.0 |
| Of schools where there are separate girls toilets, \% schools where: |  |  |
| Toilet locked | 6.7 | 5.2 |
| Toilet not usable | 28.5 | 28.6 |
| Useble | 60.6 | 66.2 |

Table 15: School improvement \& construction since April 2008

| School improvement \& Construction | Std I-IV/V |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. of schs | \% schools |  | No. of schs | \% schools |  |
|  |  | Yes | No |  | Yes | No |
| Whitewash | 166 | 80.7 | 19.3 | 74 | 79.7 | 20.3 |
| Construction of new classroom | 157 | 24.8 | 75.2 | 66 | 31.8 | 68.2 |
| Construction of boundary wall | 153 | 30.7 | 69.3 | 65 | 38.5 | 61.5 |

ASER survey was carried out in Oct-Nov 2009. One govt school with primary grades was visited in each sampled village. If there was more than one govt school in a village, then the school with the highest enrollment was visited. Hence the schools visited in the ASER survey do not represent a random sample of schools of the district. The school visits were generally done either on a Saturday or a Monday.

| School Grants |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| New | Rs 2 lacs per <br> classrooms <br> aditional room |
| Maintenance | Rs. 5000 pa upto 3 <br> grant |
| classrooms. Upto |  |
| Rs 10000 pa for |  |
| more than 3 |  |
| classrooms |  |$|$

## School Grants

| Table 17: <br> \% Primary <br> SCHOOLS RECEIVING <br> DIFFERENT GRANTS | April 2008-March 2009 |  |  |  | April 2009-October 200 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Std I-IV/V |  |  |  | Std I-IV/V |  |  |  |
|  | No. of schs | Yes | No | Don't know | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No. of } \\ & \text { schs } \end{aligned}$ | Yes | No | Don't know |
| New classroom | 112 | 18.8 | 74.1 | 7.1 | 85 | 9.4 | 78.8 | 11.8 |
| Maintenance g | 146 | 89.0 | 7.5 | 3.4 | 98 | 78.6 | 15.3 | 6.1 |
| Development g | 134 | 83.6 | 9.7 | 6.7 | 97 | 68.0 | 23.7 | 8.3 |
| Teacher grant (TLM grant) | 150 | 97.3 | 0.0 | 2.7 | 99 | 90.9 | 4.0 | 5.1 |
| Other grants | 75 | 49.3 | 38.7 | 12.0 | 51 | 41.2 | 47.1 | 11 |

NOTE: No grant information was available for 17 schools out of 176 primary schools that were visited. This could be because the head teacher was not present, register was not available or the surveyors could not obtain the information. Therefore, the above table is based on schools for which information was available for at least one indicator.

## TABLE 18: <br> \% UPPER PRIMARY schools receiving different grants New classroom Maintenance grant <br> Development grant <br> Teacher grant <br> (TLM grant) <br> Other grants

April 2008-March 2009 April 2009-October 2009
Std I-VII/VIII Std I-VII/VIII

| No. of <br> schs | Yes | No | Don't <br> know | No. of <br> schs | Yes | No | Don't <br> know |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

NOTE : No grant information was available for 3 schools out of 79 upper primary schools that were visited. This could be because the head teacher was not present, register was not available or the surveyors could not obtain the information. Therefore, the above table is based on schools for which information was available for at least one indicator.

## Performance of districts

| Table 19: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ANGANWADI } \\ & \text { OR } \\ & \text { BALWADI } \end{aligned}$ | Out of SCHOOL | Private <br> SCHOOL | Tuition | Mothers' Reading | Std I-II : Learning levels |  |  | Std III-V : Learning levels |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Districts | \% Children (Age 3-4) in anganwadi or pre-school | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) <br> out <br> of <br> school | \% Children (Age: 6-14) in private school | \% Children (Std IV-VIII) attending tuition classes | \% Mothers <br> (Age: 17-55) who CAN READ | \% Children <br> (Std I-II) who CAN READ letters, words or more | \% Children (Std I-II) who CAN RECOGNIZE NUMBERS 1 to 9 or more | \% Children (Std I-II) who CAN READ LETTERS or more in ENGLISH | \%Children (Std III-V) who CANREAD Level 1 (Std 1 Text) or more | \%Children (Std III-V) who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more | \% Children (Std III-V) who CAN READ sentences in ENGLISH |
| Alappuzha | 98.5 | 0.2 | 46.9 | 68.4 | 98.1 | 95.7 | 96.5 | 93.9 | 81.4 | 76.3 | 42.0 |
| Ernakulam | 97.1 | 0.0 | 68.0 | 46.1 | 99.0 | 98.9 | 87.2 | 89.0 | 83.7 | 78.9 | 53.2 |
| Idukki | 95.2 | 0.2 | 58.2 | 20.9 | 97.1 | 95.2 | 95.8 | 86.8 | 73.3 | 68.1 | 32.1 |
| Kannur | 70.0 | 0.0 | 60.3 | 12.5 | 96.9 | 99.3 | 99.3 | 92.5 | 89.6 | 82.9 | 35.6 |
| Kasaragod | 79.3 | 0.5 | 30.5 | 8.3 | 94.4 | 94.7 | 93.0 | 74.0 | 83.5 | 68.1 | 35.6 |
| Kollam | 91.0 | 0.0 | 72.0 | 74.1 | 99.5 | 100.0 | 99.0 | 95.1 | 92.7 | 88.0 | 63.0 |
| Kottayam | 90.4 | 0.3 | 76.1 | 38.5 | 99.1 | 100.0 | 99.2 | 94.4 | 84.9 | 79.1 | 56.8 |
| Kozhikode | 85.0 | 0.0 | 51.7 | 19.6 | 97.4 | 100.0 | 97.2 | 81.4 | 87.1 | 74.6 | 32.1 |
| Malappuram | 69.7 | 0.0 | 36.8 | 16.9 | 96.3 | 95.2 | 97.8 | 84.5 | 82.4 | 63.3 | 29.0 |
| Palakkad | 87.7 | 0.3 | 30.7 | 33.6 | 94.3 | 94.2 | 94.9 | 81.1 | 76.1 | 70.4 | 35.1 |
| Pathanamthitta | 98.3 | 0.1 | 60.3 | 56.1 | 97.5 | 96.2 | 93.8 | 88.5 | 80.2 | 81.0 | 38.3 |
| Thiruvananthapuram | 91.4 | 0.0 | 39.2 | 69.1 | 98.3 | 99.2 | 97.6 | 96.1 | 81.7 | 81.4 | 49.8 |
| Thrissur | 72.7 | 0.0 | 59.7 | 50.2 | 97.6 | 91.5 | 92.5 | 87.7 | 81.6 | 80.1 | 50.5 |
| Wayanad | 89.7 | 0.0 | 44.9 | 8.8 | 95.7 | 93.9 | 93.1 | 76.8 | 82.6 | 62.6 | 28.6 |
| Total | 85.9 | 0.1 | 51.5 | 40.6 | 97.5 | 96.7 | 96.0 | 88.2 | 83.0 | 75.5 | 42.4 |
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## SCHOOL ENROLLMENT AND OUT OF SCHOOL CHILDREN

| Table 1: \% Children in different types of SCHOOLS 2009 |  |  |  | \% Out of school |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in School |  |
| Age: 6-14 ALL | 81.9 | 14.8 | 1.0 | 2.3 | 100 |
| Age: 7-16 ALL | 80.2 | 14.8 | 0.8 | 4.2 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 82.3 | 14.8 | 1.4 | 1.5 | 100 |
| AgE: 7-10 BOYS | 81.3 | 15.9 | 1.3 | 1.6 | 100 |
| AgE: 7-10 GIRLS | 83.7 | 13.3 | 1.6 | 1.4 | 100 |
| AgE: 11-14 ALL | 81.5 | 14.4 | 0.4 | 3.7 | 100 |
| AGE: 11-14 BOYS | 80.0 | 16.1 | 0.4 | 3.5 | 100 |
| AGE: 11-14 GIRLS | 83.5 | 12.2 | 0.4 | 3.9 | 100 |
| AgE: 15-16 ALL | 70.3 | 15.8 | 0.1 | 13.9 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 BOYS | 69.9 | 17.4 | 0.1 | 12.6 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 GIRLS | 71.0 | 13.4 | 0.1 | 15.5 | 100 |


note : 'отнек' includes chidren going to madarssa and EGS.
'кот in school' = dropped out + never enrolled.



How to read the table: In Std III, 82.6\% (47.4+26.9+8.3) children are in age group 8 to 10 .

## Young CHILDREN IN PRE-SCHOOL AND SCHOOL

|  |  |  |  | n Scho |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | anganwadi | UKG | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | 울 |  |
| Age 3 | 77.7 | 5.2 |  |  |  | 17.1 | 100 |
| Age 4 | 81.7 | 8.5 |  |  |  | 9.8 | 100 |
| Age 5 | 28.8 | 6.1 | 45.0 | 14.6 | 1.3 | 4.2 | 100 |
| Age 6 | 3.5 | 1.7 | 76.1 | 15.4 | 1.6 | 1.6 | 100 |

```
Chart 3: Trends over time
\% Children age 3-4 not attending Pre-school (ICDS or other) 2006-2009
```



Of the villages visited, Anganwadi/Pre-School presence has been recorded in 95.1 \% villages.

## Reading in own language

Table 4: Class-wise \% children who CAN READ (All Schools) 2009

| STD. | Nothing | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (STD 1 Text) | Level 2 <br> (STD 2 Text) | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| I | 7.5 | 59.2 | 25.3 | 5.2 | 2.8 | 100 |
| II | 1.5 | 24.5 | 47.4 | 20.4 | 6.3 | 100 |
| III | 0.6 | 5.6 | 18.2 | 48.6 | 27.1 | 100 |
| IV | 0.4 | 2.2 | 7.0 | 34.3 | 56.1 | 100 |
| V | 0.1 | 1.0 | 3.3 | 18.2 | 77.3 | 100 |
| VI | 0.2 | 0.4 | 1.6 | 10.6 | 87.3 | 100 |
| VII | 0.1 | 0.6 | 0.8 | 6.5 | 91.9 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 4.3 | 94.9 | 100 |
| TOTAL | 1.4 | 12.3 | 13.6 | 19.4 | 53.4 | 100 |

NOTE : Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. Thus a child who can read Std II level text can read letters, words, and Std 1 level text.

| Reading Tool |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
| Stal ELevel <br> " 104 <br> गगमा समझदार सञुकी थी। मगर उसका घोटा भाई अमन बहुत नटलट या। एक दिन दोनों बाजार में मूम रहे थे। अमन ने वारते ये पकीझे देखे। उरो पकीक बहुत पसंद थे। मौँ उसके लिये पकौड़े बनाती यी। नलमा ने कहा यह चकीठे तीलो होंगे। सगर अमन नड़ी माना। अमन ने पकौड़े खाये और उसकी औँबों सो औँचूू निकलने बगे। | रात क्ष सीता छत आकाश में चाँद मी दि $\qquad$ $\qquad$ |  |  |

Chart 4: Trends over time
\% Children who CANNOT EVEN IDENTIFY LETTERS (IN GOVt Schools in Std I - IV) 2006-2009


CHART 5: TRENDS OVER TIME
\% Children who CAN READ Std II level text (in govt schools in Std IV - VII) 2006-2009


## Reading and comprehension in english

## TABLE 5: CLASS-WISE \% CHILDREN WHO CAN READ

ENGLISH (All Schools) 2009

Cannot Can readCan readCan read Can read Total Std. | read |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| capital | capital | small | simple |
| letters | easy |  |  |
| letters | words sentences |  |  | letters

| I | 39.1 | 43.3 | 13.3 | 3.4 | 0.9 | 100 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| II | 18.9 | 40.2 | 29.1 | 10.2 | 1.6 | 100 |
| III | 8.5 | 26.4 | 32.1 | 26.1 | 7.0 | 100 |
| IV | 4.5 | 16.4 | 27.4 | 34.3 | 17.5 | 100 |
| V | 2.5 | 10.5 | 18.5 | 39.0 | 29.6 | 100 |
| VI | 1.9 | 5.3 | 12.5 | 35.5 | 44.8 | 100 |
| VII | 1.2 | 3.7 | 6.6 | 32.7 | 55.8 | 100 |
| VIII | 1.0 | 3.0 | 4.2 | 24.7 | 67.1 | 100 |
| TOTAL | 10.1 | 19.4 | 18.7 | 25.8 | 26.0 | 100 |


| TABLE 6: CLASS-WISE \% CHILDREN wHO COMPREHEND ENGLISH (All Schools) 2009 |  |  | English Tool |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std. | Of those who can read words, \% who can tell meaning of the words | Of those who can read sentences, \% who can tell meaning of the sentences | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 3YGUSH TEGT SIMPIE (II) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  |  |  | $\mathbf{C} \quad \mathrm{K} \quad \mathrm{~S}$ | ${ }^{*} \mathrm{n} \quad \mathrm{p} \quad \mathrm{~g}$ |
| I | 54.3 | 77.0 | Q F | $v$ e |
| II | 59.1 | 77.1 | W O Z | j r b |
| III | 66.3 | 74.3 |  | - |
| IV | 61.8 | 82.3 | a hen old |  |
| V | 68.9 | 82.3 | sit |  |
| VI | 68.8 | 81.3 |  | 1 Whes to ning. |
| VII | 69.2 | 85.6 | basg | 1 have a sister: |
| VIII | 70.6 | 85.7 |  |  |
| Total | 66.8 | 83.4 | =t-m*-momerm |  |

## ARITHMETIC

| Sti. | Nothing | Recognize Numbers |  | Subtract | Divide | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1-9 | 11-99 |  |  |  |
| I | 9.2 | 60.8 | 24.9 | 3.3 | 1.7 | 100 |
| II | 1.9 | 27.4 | 51.2 | 16.2 | 3.3 | 100 |
| III | 0.6 | 7.2 | 24.3 | 49.6 | 18.3 | 100 |
| IV | 0.4 | 3.0 | 12.1 | 40.3 | 44.2 | 100 |
| V | 0.3 | 1.5 | 6.1 | 25.7 | 66.4 | 100 |
| VI | 0.3 | 0.6 | 3.2 | 19.0 | 76.9 | 100 |
| VII | 0.2 | 0.8 | 1.7 | 13.6 | 83.8 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.9 | 8.9 | 89.8 | 100 |
| Total | 1.7 | 13.3 | 16.2 | 22.8 | 45.9 | 100 |

NOTE: Each cell shows the highest level of arithmetic achieved by a child. Thus a child who can do division, can also recognize numbers 1-9, 11-99 and do subtraction.

Chart 6: Trends over time
\% Children who CANNOT EVEN RECOGNIZE NUMBERS UPTO 9 (IN GOVT SCHOOLS IN STD I - IV) 2007-2009


Chart 7: Trends over time
\% Children who CAN DO DIVISION (in govt schools in Std IV - VII) 2007-2009


## TUITION

| Year | School | 1 | II | III | IV | V | VI | VII | VIII |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2007 | Govt | 3.0 | 4.7 | 5.2 | 5.6 | 8.0 | 7.6 | 9.3 | 11.4 |
|  | Pvi. | 12.8 | 13.5 | 17.0 | 19.5 | 20.8 | 23.7 | 23.7 | 30.6 |
| 2009 | Govt | 4.6 | 6.4 | 8.8 | 9.2 | 10.8 | 11.8 | 13.4 | 16.5 |
|  | Pvi. | 15.7 | 21.0 | 25.1 | 27.6 | 26.9 | 29.5 | 33.3 | 35.4 |

NOTE : The ASER survey in 2007 and 2009 recorded information about tuition. In both years, the question asked was the following: "Does the child take any paid additional class currently?" Therefore, these numbers do not include any supplemental help in learning that children may have received from parents or siblings or from anyone else that did not require payment.


## LEARNING LEVELS IN GOVERNMENT AND PRIVATE SCHOOLS : TRENDS OVER TIME

Chart 8: \% Children in Std III who CAN AT LEAST READ Std I LEVEL TEXT. BY SCHOOL TYPE 2006-2009


Chart 9: \% Children in Std V who CAN DO DIVISION. BY SCHOOL TYPE 2006-2009


Learning levels by gender : Trends over time

Chart 10: \% Boys and girls in Std III who CAN READ AT LEAST
StD I LEVEL TEXT 2007-2009


Chart 11: \% Boys and girls in Std V who CAN DO DIVISION 2007-2009


## EDUCATION : FATHERS AND CHILDREN

Table 9: Fathers and children 2009

| Fathers' <br> Education | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% } \\ \text { Fathers } \end{gathered}$ | Of these fathers : |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | \% Children (Std III-V) who can read level 1 (Std 1 Text) or more | \% Children (Std III-V) who can do subtraction or more | \% Children (Std III-V) who can read words or more in English | \% Children (Std IV-VIII) attending tuition |
| No Schooling | 34.3 | 4.5 | 85.6 | 79.6 | 47.5 | 11.0 |
| Std I-V | 18.0 | 2.3 | 86.5 | 81.3 | 49.8 | 11.6 |
| Std VI-VIII | 19.5 | 1.6 | 88.1 | 82.6 | 52.3 | 13.8 |
| Std IX-X | 13.4 | 0.6 | 89.1 | 83.1 | 56.2 | 20.0 |
| Above Std X | 14.8 | 0.6 | 91.6 | 86.0 | 62.3 | 24.2 |



NOTE: ASER 2009 recorded information about mothers' education. Similar analyses can be done with mothers and children.

## SCHOOL ENROLLMENT AND ATTENDANCE : TRENDS OVER TIME

| Table 10: Total schools visited |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Type of school | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 |
| Std I-IV/V : Primary | 468 | 921 | 928 |
| Std I-VII/VIII : Primary + Upper Primary | 194 | 334 | 343 |
| Total schools | 662 | 1255 | 1271 |


| Table 12: Teacher attendance | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Type of school | Std I-IV/V |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |
| \% Teachers attending (average) | 86.9 | 91.3 | 92.6 | 79.6 | 85.4 | 89.8 |
| \% Schools with no teacher present | 3.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \% Schools with all teachers present | 72.4 | 76.9 | 79.8 | 46.9 | 50.7 | 63.8 |


| TABLE 11: ChILDREN'S ATtendanc: 2005 | 2007 | 2009 | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Type of school | Std I-IV/V |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |
| \% Enrolled children attending <br> (average) | 67.0 | 67.0 | 67.9 | 69.1 | 64.9 | 67.1 |
| \% Schools with less than 50\% <br> enrolled children attending | 15.3 | 14.9 | 12.1 | 10.9 | 19.6 | 13.8 |
| \% Schools with 75\% or more <br> enrolled children attending | 40.7 | 37.5 | 35.5 | 43.2 | 34.6 | 33.4 |

Table 11: Children's attendance 2
200520072009200520072009
Type of school Std I-IV/V Std I-VII/VIII
\% Enrolled children attending
\% Schools with less than 50\% enrolled children attending

## Table 13: Multigrade classes

200520072009200520072009
\% Of schools in which:
Std II class sitting with another class
Std IV class sitting with another class

Std I-IV/V Std I-VII/VIII


## School facilities : TRENDS OVER TIME

| Table 14: Facilities in school |  | 20052007 |  | 2009 | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \% Schools with: |  | Std I-IV/V |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \pm \\ & \stackrel{ \pm}{N} \\ & \vdots \end{aligned}$ | No facility | 23.2 | 18.0 | 13.2 | 19.7 | 14.5 | 9.0 |
|  | Facility but water not available | 14.3 | 9.1 | 8.6 | 10.9 | 7.0 | 9.0 |
|  | Available | 62.6 | 72.9 | 78.2 | 69.4 | 78.5 | 82.0 |
|  | No facility | 53.8 | 34.2 | 22.9 | 44.0 | 32.4 | 21.0 |
|  | Facility but toilet not usable | 18.7 | 15.8 | 28.0 | 16.2 | 15.8 | 22.2 |
|  | Usable | 27.5 | 50.0 | 49.1 | 39.8 | 51.8 | 56.8 |
| Midday meal served on day of visit |  | 75.5 | 96.3 | 91.3 | 82.5 | 93.4 | 91.9 |


| TABLE 16: GIRLS ToILETS $\mathbf{2 0 0 9}$ | Std I-IV/V Std I-VII/VIII |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No of schools visited | 716 | 292 |
| \% Schools with no separate provision <br> for girls toilets | 52.7 | 41.4 |
| Of schools where there are separate girls toilets, | \% schools where: |  |
| Toilet locked | 7.0 | 3.8 |
| Toilet not usable | 14.7 | 20.9 |
| Usable | 25.7 | 33.9 |

Table 15: School improvement \& construction since April 2008

| School improvement \& Construction | Std I-IV/V |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. of schs | \% schools |  | No. of schs | \% schools |  |
|  |  | Yes | No |  | Yes | No |
| Whitewash | 849 | 78.2 | 21.8 | 304 | 78.0 | 22.0 |
| Construction of new classroom | 829 | 17.5 | 82.5 | 300 | 28.7 | 71.3 |
| Construction of boundary wall | 831 | 12.5 | 87.5 | 298 | 16.8 | 83.2 |

ASER survey was carried out in Oct-Nov 2009. One govt school with primary grades was visited in each sampled village. If there was more than one govt school in a village, then the school with the highest enrollment was visited. Hence the schools visited in the ASER survey do not represent a random sample of schools of the district. The school visits were generally done either on a Saturday or a Monday.

| School Grants |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| New | Rs 2 lacs per <br> classrooms <br> additional room |
| Maintenance <br> grant | Rs. 5000 pa upto 3 <br> classrooms. Upto <br> Rs 10000 pa for <br> more than 3 <br> classrooms |
| Development |  |
| grant | Rs. 5000 pa for <br> primary schs \& Rs <br> 7000 pa for upper <br> primary schs |
| TLM grant | Rs. 500 pa per <br> teacher |

## School Grants

| TABLE 17: <br> \% Primary <br> SCHOOLS RECEIVING <br> DIFFERENT GRANTS | April 2008-March 2009 |  |  |  | April 2009-October 2009 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Std I-IV/V |  |  |  | Std I-IV/V |  |  |  |
|  | No. of schs | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ | No. of schs | Yes | No | Don't know |
| New classroom | 794 | 10.6 | 76.5 | 13.0 | 657 | 6.1 | 78.8 | 15.1 |
| Maintenance grant | 833 | 64.2 | 24.1 | 11.6 | 668 | 32.9 | 52.0 | 15.1 |
| Development grant | 772 | 48.5 | 39.0 | 12.6 | 638 | 27.3 | 58.0 | 14.7 |
| Teacher grant (TLM grant) | 825 | 80.1 | 12.0 | 7.9 | 663 | 43.9 | 43.1 | 13.0 |
| Other grants | 438 | 16.7 | 68.0 | 15.3 | 390 | 10.3 | 74.1 | 15.6 |

[^19]| TABLE 18: |
| :--- |
| \% UPPER PRIMARY |
| SCHools RECEIVING |
| DIFFERENT GRANTS |
| New classroom |
| Maintenance grant |
| Development grant |
| Teacher grant <br> (TLM grant) <br> Other grants $\mathbf{l}$ |

April 2008-March 2009 April 2009-October 2009
Std I-VII/VIII Std I-VII/VIII

| No. of <br> schs | Yes | No | Don't <br> know | No. of <br> schs | Yes | No | Don't <br> know |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 279 | 11.8 | 75.6 | 12.5 | 243 | 6.6 | 79.0 | 14.4 |
| 291 | 67.7 | 21.7 | 10.7 | 244 | 36.1 | 51.6 | 12.3 |
| 264 | 43.9 | 42.8 | 13.3 | 230 | 24.8 | 60.4 | 14.8 |
| 291 | 81.4 | 10.3 | 8.3 | 242 | 50.8 | 40.1 | 9.1 |
| 173 | 21.4 | 64.2 | 14.5 | 149 | 8.7 | 72.5 | 18.8 |

NOTE: No grant information was available for 45 schools out of 343 upper primary schools that were visited. This could be because the head teacher was not present, register was not available or the surveyors could not obtain the information. Therefore, the above table is based on schools for which information was available for at least one indicator.

PERFORMANCE OF DISTRICTS

| Table 19: | ANGANWADI OR BALWADI | Out of SCHOOL | Private SCHOOL | Tuition | Mothers' Reading | Std I-II : Learning levels |  |  | Std III-V : Learning levels |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Districts | \% Children <br> (Age 3-4) <br> in anganwadi or pre-school | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% Children } \\ \text { (Age: 6-14) } \\ \text { out } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { school } \end{gathered}$ | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) <br> in private school | \% Children (Std IV-VIII) attending tuition classes | \% Mothers (Age: 17-55) who CAN READ | \% Children <br> (Std I-II) who CAN READ letters, words or more | \% Children <br> (Std I-II) <br> who CAN <br> RECOGNIZE <br> NUMBERS <br> 1 to 9 <br> or more | \% Children <br> (Std I-II) <br> who CAN <br> READ <br> LETTERS or more in ENGLISH | \% Children <br> (Std III-V) <br> who <br> CAN READ Level 1 <br> (Std 1 Text) or more | \% Children <br> (Std III-V) who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more | \% Children <br> (Std III-V) <br> who CAN <br> READ sentences in ENGLISH |
| Balaghat | 86.5 | 2.6 | 15.0 | 8.1 | 74.0 | 96.1 | 92.3 | 82.2 | 72.7 | 57.2 | 11.8 |
| Barwani | 82.0 | 1.4 | 9.4 | 1.6 | 30.4 | 99.6 | 99.6 | 56.1 | 96.7 | 93.5 | 8.6 |
| Betul | 100.0 | 2.0 | 8.8 | 5.5 | 39.6 | 97.6 | 97.2 | 73.2 | 97.1 | 96.3 | 9.9 |
| Bhind | 94.8 | 1.5 | 19.0 | 9.1 | 82.9 | 97.3 | 98.6 | 85.6 | 83.8 | 81.4 | 2.0 |
| Bhopal | 96.4 | 0.8 | 17.1 | 10.6 | 33.1 | 99.4 | 98.5 | 75.5 | 98.0 | 96.8 | 27.1 |
| Chhatarpur | 95.2 | 0.3 | 13.3 | 24.7 | 37.6 | 95.7 | 96.4 | 69.7 | 87.4 | 78.0 | 9.9 |
| Chhindwara | 92.0 | 1.2 | 12.1 | 9.6 | 50.8 | 66.9 | 73.7 | 39.3 | 45.2 | 35.1 | 6.2 |
| Damoh | 80.3 | 5.1 | 5.3 | 7.9 | 52.9 | 72.6 | 79.2 | 56.6 | 62.6 | 51.3 | 9.9 |
| Datia | 99.0 | 0.4 | 9.3 | 75.4 | 58.9 | 99.5 | 99.5 | 90.7 | 82.1 | 80.6 | 28.7 |
| Dewas | 87.2 | 1.0 | 42.7 | 10.5 | 41.2 | 99.4 | 98.9 | 64.4 | 97.9 | 97.9 | 9.5 |
| Dhar | 82.8 | 1.5 | 25.7 | 10.6 | 32.1 | 98.6 | 98.6 | 66.7 | 96.2 | 93.7 | 22.6 |
| Dindori | 99.3 | 1.3 | 5.0 | 2.2 | 44.6 | 97.3 | 93.3 | 72.0 | 86.6 | 73.9 | 9.3 |
| East Nimar | 98.9 | 1.0 | 17.8 | 32.1 | 67.9 | 99.5 | 99.5 | 82.3 | 97.3 | 97.8 | 39.6 |
| Guna* |  | 0.6 | 3.5 | 29.3 | 15.1 | 98.2 | 97.1 | 91.2 | 91.5 | 82.7 | 5.7 |
| Gwalior | 75.5 | 0.2 | 17.0 | 36.3 | 40.6 | 99.1 | 97.7 | 50.9 | 63.8 | 51.3 | 8.5 |
| Harda | 69.6 | 2.4 | 22.5 | 14.9 | 39.9 | 98.4 | 95.1 | 49.2 | 90.2 | 86.9 | 15.2 |
| Hoshangabad | 90.7 | 2.4 | 21.3 | 14.5 | 46.9 | 97.7 | 94.9 | 52.2 | 96.3 | 92.8 | 10.9 |
| Indore | 87.6 | 1.8 | 36.3 | 9.5 | 49.7 | 100.0 | 98.2 | 72.5 | 98.9 | 96.9 | 17.6 |
| Jabalpur | 91.0 | 0.9 | 15.8 | 4.0 | 46.0 | 94.9 | 94.6 | 77.0 | 93.6 | 81.6 | 8.9 |
| Jhabua | 62.9 | 23.1 | 2.9 | 2.3 | 7.0 | 81.1 | 73.7 | 43.5 | 57.0 | 42.5 | 11.4 |
| Katni | 97.7 | 2.4 | 9.8 | 6.1 | 30.3 | 94.4 | 92.7 | 83.7 | 84.0 | 80.3 | 22.1 |
| Mandla | 79.4 | 2.7 | 8.3 | 4.2 | 34.6 | 95.8 | 91.7 | 38.0 | 86.5 | 71.7 | 2.4 |
| Mandsaur | 98.7 | 1.4 | 27.6 | 11.0 | 38.9 | 95.2 | 91.3 | 64.1 | 86.2 | 85.4 | 5.4 |
| Morena | 98.7 | 1.6 | 18.7 | 40.7 | 63.7 | 97.7 | 97.3 | 84.2 | 95.3 | 90.4 | 23.1 |
| Narsinpur | 82.8 | 1.8 | 27.4 | 8.5 | 45.8 | 90.0 | 86.6 | 55.1 | 77.8 | 69.7 | 8.1 |
| Neemuch | 69.1 | 2.8 | 24.4 | 10.1 | 43.0 | 99.6 | 98.2 | 50.9 | 98.9 | 95.5 | 24.0 |
| Panna | 85.8 | 2.1 | 11.2 | 1.5 | 24.0 | 97.0 | 95.2 | 92.9 | 91.1 | 89.1 | 17.0 |
| Raisen | 68.1 | 2.4 | 19.1 | 12.3 | 53.3 | 95.5 | 94.9 | 47.7 | 89.3 | 88.2 | 7.9 |
| Rajgarh | 86.4 | 3.4 | 11.9 | 22.8 | 16.2 | 98.8 | 98.4 | 66.4 | 92.8 | 90.2 | 12.7 |
| Ratlam | 86.2 | 1.5 | 18.2 | 3.1 | 31.1 | 99.2 | 99.2 | 85.8 | 95.5 | 94.7 | 44.4 |
| Rewa | 62.8 | 1.0 | 16.9 | 10.8 | 44.1 | 97.4 | 96.3 | 77.7 | 92.7 | 84.9 | 16.2 |
| Sagar | 94.4 | 0.6 | 6.5 | 9.5 | 35.1 | 98.7 | 98.7 | 71.1 | 78.4 | 73.4 | 7.7 |
| Satna | 69.2 | 0.3 | 8.9 | 17.7 | 38.6 | 97.5 | 94.2 | 75.4 | 92.1 | 86.6 | 39.9 |
| Sehore | 94.2 | 0.7 | 25.9 | 14.9 | 36.2 | 99.1 | 96.7 | 76.7 | 94.6 | 85.0 | 18.1 |
| Seoni | 94.4 | 0.8 | 3.3 | 2.1 | 44.9 | 98.1 | 97.7 | 87.1 | 81.6 | 80.7 | 11.2 |
| Shahdol | 99.3 | 1.1 | 2.3 | 1.3 | 20.2 | 95.1 | 96.4 | 91.1 | 79.2 | 75.9 | 4.7 |
| Shajapur | 81.1 | 2.1 | 41.8 | 8.6 | 34.2 | 96.5 | 96.5 | 63.1 | 94.9 | 91.2 | 23.1 |
| Sheopur | 100.0 | 0.3 | 11.7 | 15.9 | 20.5 | 98.8 | 97.6 | 86.5 | 80.8 | 72.5 | 19.1 |
| Shivpuri | 100.0 | 1.6 | 4.1 | 24.3 | 32.9 | 94.3 | 91.1 | 63.9 | 92.7 | 94.1 | 28.4 |
| Sidhi | 76.2 | 4.5 | 6.3 | 6.9 | 29.1 | 91.6 | 89.8 | 75.4 | 89.2 | 79.3 | 37.1 |
| Tikamgarh | 88.1 | 0.1 | 25.5 | 66.7 | 67.9 | 96.7 | 96.7 | 93.4 | 98.6 | 94.8 | 35.4 |
| Ujiain | 82.6 | 2.9 | 22.1 | 12.4 | 24.5 | 95.9 | 95.3 | 88.5 | 94.2 | 80.8 | 54.6 |
| Umaria | 100.0 | 1.1 | 4.3 | 9.4 | 70.6 | 96.8 | 96.8 | 77.7 | 79.6 | 66.5 | 2.6 |
| Vidisha | 82.8 | 1.7 | 14.8 | 10.8 | 57.9 | 95.4 | 94.6 | 46.2 | 93.8 | 88.3 | 5.3 |
| West Nimar | 90.6 | 2.2 | 14.4 | 5.4 | 40.3 | 100.0 | 99.2 | 77.6 | 97.3 | 96.5 | 28.3 |
| Total | 86.5 | 2.3 | 14.8 | 14.5 | 40.0 | 95.4 | 94.4 | 70.8 | 87.5 | 81.9 | 18.5 |
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## SCHOOL ENROLLMENT AND OUT OF SCHOOL CHILDREN

| Table 1: \% Children in different types of SCHOOLS 2009 |  |  |  | \% Out of school |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in School |  |
| Age: 6-14 ALL | 70.6 | 28.2 | 0.3 | 1.0 | 100 |
| Age: 7-16 ALL | 61.3 | 36.8 | 0.2 | 1.7 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 89.5 | 9.7 | 0.2 | 0.6 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 BOYS | 89.3 | 10.0 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 100 |
| AgE: 7-10 GIRLS | 90.1 | 9.0 | 0.2 | 0.7 | 100 |
| AgE: 11-14 ALL | 48.0 | 50.2 | 0.3 | 1.5 | 100 |
| AgE: 11-14 BOYS | 48.6 | 50.1 | 0.3 | 1.0 | 100 |
| AGE: 11-14 GIRLS | 4.6 | 50.1 | 0.3 | 2.0 | 100 |
| AgE: 15-16 ALL | 20.7 | 73.7 | 0.3 | 5.3 | 100 |
| AgE: 15-16 BOYS | 21.3 | 73.7 | 0.3 | 4.8 | 100 |
| AgE: 15-16 GIRLS | 19.7 | 74.3 | 0.3 | 5.7 | 100 |


note: 'отнer' includes chidren going to madarssa and EGS.
'кот in school' = dropped out + never enrolled.



How to read the table: In Std III, $94.9 \%(33.3+56.1+5.5)$ children are in age group 8 to 10 .

## Young CHILDREN IN PRE-SCHOOL AND SCHOOL



Chart 3: Trends over time
\% Children age 3-4 not attending Pre-school (ICDS or other) 2006-2009


Of the villages visited, Anganwadi/Pre-School presence has been recorded in $98.7 \%$ villages.

## Reading in own language

Table 4: Class-wise \% children who CAN READ (All Schools) 2009

| StD. | Nothing | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (Std 1 Text) | Level 2 <br> (Std 2 Text) | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| I | 11.2 | 44.3 | 30.4 | 10.4 | 3.7 | 100 |
| II | 2.9 | 15.1 | 34.8 | 34.8 | 12.5 | 100 |
| III | 1.0 | 5.8 | 18.6 | 41.8 | 32.8 | 100 |
| IV | 0.3 | 2.0 | 7.5 | 29.9 | 60.4 | 100 |
| V | 0.2 | 0.8 | 4.5 | 20.7 | 73.8 | 100 |
| VI | 0.3 | 0.7 | 2.3 | 14.2 | 82.6 | 100 |
| VII | 0.1 | 0.4 | 1.4 | 9.9 | 88.3 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.1 | 0.4 | 0.9 | 7.1 | 91.5 | 100 |
| TOTAL | 2.0 | 8.6 | 12.6 | 21.7 | 55.1 | 100 |

NOTE : Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. Thus a child who can read Std II level text can read letters, words, and Std 1 level text.


Chart 4: Trends over time
\% Children who CANNOT EVEN IDENTIFY LETTERS (IN GOVt Schools in Std I - IV) 2006-2009


CHART 5: TRENDS OVER TIME
\% Children who CAN READ Std II level text (in govt schools in Std IV - VII) 2006-2009


## Reading and comprehension in english

## TABLE 5: CLASS-WISE \% CHILDREN WHO CAN READ

ENGLISH (All Schools) 2009

Cannot Can readCan readCan read Can read Total Std. | read |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| capital | capital |  |  |
| letters | small | simple | easy |
| letters | words | sentences |  | letters

| I | 59.9 | 26.0 | 8.1 | 4.2 | 1.8 | 100 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| II | 35.9 | 32.8 | 18.1 | 10.7 | 2.4 | 100 |
| III | 19.7 | 25.8 | 23.8 | 25.6 | 5.2 | 100 |
| IV | 10.0 | 20.4 | 19.2 | 35.2 | 15.3 | 100 |
| V | 4.3 | 11.9 | 12.4 | 36.8 | 34.6 | 100 |
| VI | 2.3 | 6.3 | 9.5 | 34.5 | 47.5 | 100 |
| VII | 1.5 | 4.2 | 7.4 | 26.4 | 60.4 | 100 |
| VIII | 1.1 | 4.3 | 4.6 | 18.8 | 71.3 | 100 |
| TOTAL | 16.7 | 16.7 | 13.3 | 24.6 | 28.7 | 100 |


| Std. | Of those who can read words, \% who can tell meaning of the words | Of those who can read sentences, \% who can tell meaning of the sentences |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 70.6 | 86.4 |
| II | 76.1 | 87.8 |
| III | 70.0 | 80.2 |
| IV | 69.1 | 84.0 |
| V | 75.9 | 86.0 |
| VI | 75.7 | 87.2 |
| VII | 78.3 | 87.2 |
| VIII | 78.7 | 90.4 |
| Total | 74.0 | 87.5 |


| English Tool |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | TBamely |
| B H R  <br>  $\mathbf{L}$  $\mathbf{V}$ <br> M $\mathbf{P}$ F  |  |
|  | --*-*-*- |
| ${ }^{9}$ rat  <br>  biget <br> cow  <br>   <br>  pen | What is the time? <br> This is a reod ball. <br> 1 Hike to play, <br> 1 have a father: |
| - |  |

## Arithmetic

| Sti. | Nothing | Recognize Numbers |  | Subtract | Divide | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1-9 | 11-99 |  |  |  |
| I | 10.9 | 56.7 | 26.3 | 4.2 | 1.9 | 100 |
| II | 2.6 | 23.5 | 48.4 | 23.1 | 2.5 | 100 |
| III | 1.2 | 9.7 | 33.6 | 45.1 | 10.4 | 100 |
| IV | 0.3 | 3.5 | 18.3 | 46.5 | 31.4 | 100 |
| V | 0.3 | 2.8 | 10.6 | 35.3 | 51.0 | 100 |
| VI | 0.3 | 1.3 | 7.2 | 29.5 | 61.7 | 100 |
| VII | 0.1 | 0.9 | 4.5 | 22.5 | 72.0 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.2 | 0.4 | 4.8 | 14.8 | 79.8 | 100 |
| Total | 1.9 | 12.2 | 19.5 | 28.5 | 37.8 | 100 |

NOTE : Each cell shows the highest level of arithmetic achieved by a child. Thus a child who can do division, can also recognize numbers 1-9, 11-99 and do subtraction.

Chart 6: Trends over time
\% Children who CANNOT EVEN RECOGNIZE NUMBERS UPTO 9 (IN GOVT SCHOOLS IN STD I - IV) 2007-2009


Chart 7: Trends over time
\% Children who CAN DO DIVISION (in govt schools in Std IV - VII) 2007-2009


## TUITION

Table 8: Class-wise \% children ATTENDING TUITION CLASSES. by School type 2007 AND 2009

| Year | School | I | II | III | IV | V | VI | VII | VIII |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | GoVt | 3.3 | 4.0 | 4.9 | 5.6 | 7.3 | 7.2 | 7.9 | 10.6 |
|  | PVT. | 23.1 | 22.4 | 21.4 | 19.8 | 13.2 | 12.2 | 11.8 | 12.0 |
| $\mathbf{2 0} \mathbf{2 0 0 9}$ | Govt | 7.5 | 7.1 | 9.0 | 10.1 | 10.9 | 11.2 | 11.7 | 15.3 |
|  | PVT. | 24.8 | 30.6 | 27.4 | 28.7 | 17.2 | 12.7 | 15.3 | 13.5 |

NOTE : The ASER survey in 2007 and 2009 recorded information about tuition. In both years, the question asked was the following: "Does the child take any paid additional class currently?" Therefore, these numbers do not include any supplemental help in learning that children may have received from parents or siblings or from anyone else that did not require payment.


## LEARNING LEVELS IN GOVERNMENT AND PRIVATE SCHOOLS : TRENDS OVER TIME

Chart 8: \% Children in Std III who CAN AT LEAST READ Std I LEVEL TEXT. BY SCHOOL TYPE 2006-2009


Chart 9: \% Children in Std V who CAN DO DIVISION. BY SCHOOL TYPE 2006-2009


Learning levels by gender : Trends over time

Chart 10: \% Boys and girls in Std III who Can read at least Std I LeVEL text 2007-2009


Chart 11: \% Boys and girls in Std V who CAN do division 2007-2009


## EDUCATION : FATHERS AND CHILDREN

|  |  |  |  | Of these father |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fathers' <br> Education | $\%$ <br> Fathers | \% Girls 6 to 14 out of school | \% Children (Std III-V) who can read level 1 (Std 1 Text) or more | \% Children (Std III-V) who can do subtraction or more | \% Children (Std III-V) who can read words or more in English | \% Children (Std IV-VIII) attending tuition |
| No Schooling | 17.0 | 3.1 | 83.0 | 70.1 | 48.1 | 7.2 |
| Std I-V | 15.0 | 2.6 | 82.4 | 68.9 | 45.0 | 9.7 |
| Std VI-VIII | 14.8 | 0.7 | 86.7 | 73.7 | 47.9 | 12.6 |
| Std IX-X | 30.0 | 0.3 | 88.5 | 74.7 | 53.0 | 13.4 |
| Above Std X | 23.3 | 0.3 | 90.3 | 78.4 | 58.5 | 19.2 |

NOTE: ASER 2009 recorded information about mothers' education. Similar analyses can be done with mothers and children.


## SCHOOL ENROLLMENT AND ATTENDANCE : TRENDS OVER TIME

| TABLE 10: ToTAL SCHools visited |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Type of school | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 |
| Std I-IV/V : Primary | 305 | 488 | 486 |
| Std I-VII/VIII : Primary + Upper Primary | 332 | 411 | 445 |
| Total schools | 637 | 899 | 931 |


| TABLE 12: Teacher attendance | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Type of school | Std I-IV/V |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |
| \% Teachers attending (average) | 85.9 | 94.1 | 95.0 | 83.2 | 89.8 | 92.7 |
| \% Schools with no teacher present | 3.1 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 3.8 | 0.0 | 1.2 |
| \% Schools with all teachers present | 65.1 | 83.0 | 84.7 | 45.7 | 63.6 | 71.5 |


| TABLE 11: CHILDREN'S ATtENDANCE 2005 | 2007 | 2009 | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Type of school | Std I-IV/V |  |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |
| \% Enrolled children attending <br> (average) <br> \% Schools with less than 50\% <br> enrolled children attending | 82.7 | 91.7 | 90.6 | 83.2 | 92.8 | 90.6 |
| \% Shools with 75\% or more <br> enrolled children attending | 80.1 | 0.8 | 0.2 | 3.7 | 94.0 | 82.1 |

TAble 11: Children's Attendance 200520072009200520072009
Type of school Std I-IV/V Std I-VII/VIII
\% Enrolled children attending
\% Schools with less than 50\% enrolled children attending
$75 \%$ or more

TAble 13: Multigrade classes 200520072009200520072009
\% Of schools in which: $\quad$ Std I-IV/V Std I-VII/VIII
Std II class sitting with
another class
Std IV class sitting with another class

## SCHOOL FACILITIES : TRENDS OVER TIME

| Table 14: Facilities in school |  | 20052007 |  | 2009 | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \% Schools with: |  | Std I-IV/V |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \pm \\ & \stackrel{y}{N} \\ & \vdots \end{aligned}$ | No facility | 40.1 | 25.3 | 18.4 | 28.2 | 12.0 | 11.6 |
|  | Facility but water not available | 7.6 | 5.0 | 8.5 | 10.1 | 7.6 | 7.6 |
|  | Available | 52.3 | 69.7 | 73.1 | 61.7 | 80.4 | 80.8 |
| $\stackrel{\text { む }}{\bar{\circ}}$ | No facility | 39.5 | 12.5 | 3.9 | 22.5 | 5.9 | 1.8 |
|  | Facility but toilet not usable | 14.3 | 6.3 | 46.6 | 19.8 | 7.9 | 43.7 |
|  | Usable | 46.2 | 81.3 | 49.5 | 57.8 | 86.2 | 54.5 |
| Midday meal served on day |  | 86.6 | 98.5 | 96.0 | 82.4 | 99.0 | 97 |


| TABLE 16: GIRLS ToILETS 2009 | Std I-IV/V | Std I-VII/VIII |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| No of schools visited | 432 | 417 |
| \% Schools with no separate provision <br> for girls toilets | 17.8 | 9.8 |
| Of schools where there are separate girls toilets, \% schools where: |  |  |
| Toilet locked | 30.8 | 30.0 |
| Toilet not usable | 16.4 | 18.7 |
| Usable | 35.0 | 41.5 |

Table 15: School improvement \& construction since April 2008

## School improvement \&

Construction
Whitewash
Construction of new classroom Construction of boundary wall

| Std I-IV/V |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. of <br> schs | \% schools <br> Yes |  | No. of <br> schs | \%es schools |  |
| 452 | 76.3 | 23.7 | 412 | 75.5 | 24.5 |
| 434 | 16.8 | 83.2 | 399 | 20.8 | 79.2 |
| 446 | 26.7 | 73.3 | 406 | 26.6 | 73.4 |

ASER survey was carried out in Oct-Nov 2009. One govt school with primary grades was visited in each sampled village. If there was more than one govt school in a village, then the school with the highest enrollment was visited. Hence the schools visited in the ASER survey do not represent a random sample of schools of the district. The school visits were generally done either on a Saturday or a Monday.

| School Grants |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| New | Rs 2 lacs per <br> classrooms <br> additional room |
| Maintenance <br> grant | Rs. 5000 pa upto 3 <br> classrooms. Upto <br> Rs 10000 pa for <br> more than 3 <br> classrooms |
| Development |  |
| grant | Rs. 5000 pa for <br> primary schs \& Rs <br> 7000 pa for upper <br> primary schs |
| TLM grant | Rs. 500 pa per <br> teacher |

## School Grants

| TABLE 17: <br> \% Primary <br> SCHOOLS RECEIVING <br> DIFFERENT GRANTS | April 2008-March 2009 |  |  |  | April 2009-October 2009 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Std I-IV/V |  |  |  | Std I-IV/V |  |  |  |
|  | No. of schs | Yes | No | Don't know | No. of schs | Yes | No | Don't know |
| New classroom | 360 | 21.4 | 75.3 | 3.3 | 290 | 19.7 | 75.5 | 4.8 |
| Maintenance grant | 446 | 93.5 | 3.8 | 2.7 | 363 | 81.8 | 13. | 4.7 |
| Development grant | 385 | 80.3 | 17.4 | 2.3 | 333 | 71.8 | 24.0 | 4.2 |
| Teacher grant (TLM grant) | 460 | 97.6 | 0.9 | 1.5 | 381 | 89.0 | 7.9 | 3.2 |
| Other grants | 163 | 31.9 | 63.2 | 4.9 | 137 | 24.8 | 69.3 | 5.8 |

[^21]| TABLE 18: |
| :--- |
| \% UPPER PRIMARY |
| SCHOoLS RECEIVING |
| DIFFERENT GRANTS |
| New classroom |
| Maintenance grant |
| Development grant |
| Teacher grant <br> (TLM grant) <br> Other grants $\mathbf{l}$ |

April 2008-March 2009 April 2009-October 2009
Std I-VII/VIII Std I-VII/VIII

| No. of <br> schs | Yes | No | Don't <br> know | No. of <br> schs | Yes | No | Don't <br> know |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 367 | 20.4 | 74.4 | 5.2 | 327 | 15.0 | 78.6 | 6.4 |
| 408 | 92.4 | 3.7 | 3.9 | 369 | 72.1 | 22.2 | 5.7 |
| 363 | 74.7 | 20.7 | 4.7 | 322 | 62.7 | 31.4 | 5.9 |
| 413 | 96.9 | 1.5 | 1.7 | 357 | 79.6 | 17.4 | 3.1 |
| 178 | 33.7 | 60.7 | 5.6 | 164 | 19.5 | 71.3 | 9.2 |

PERFORMANCE OF DISTRICTS

| Table 19: | $\begin{gathered} \text { ANGANWADI } \\ \text { OR } \\ \text { BALWADI } \end{gathered}$ | Out of SCHOOL | Private SCHOOL | Tuition | Mothers' Reading | Std I-II : Learning levels |  |  | Std III-V : Learning levels |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Districts | \% Children (Age 3-4) in anganwadi or pre-school | ```% Children (Age: 6-14) out of school``` | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) <br> in private school | \% Children (Std IV-VIII) attending tuition classes | \% Mothers (Age: 17-55) who CAN READ | \% Children <br> (Std I-II) <br> who <br> CAN READ letters, words or more | \% Children <br> (Std I-II) <br> who CAN RECOGNIZE NUMBERS 1 to 9 or more | \% Children <br> (Std I-II) <br> who CAN <br> READ <br> LETTERS or more in ENGLISH | \% Children <br> (Std III-V) <br> who CAN READ Level 1 <br> (Std 1 Text) or more | \% Children <br> (Std III-V) <br> who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more | \% Children <br> (Std III-V) <br> who CAN <br> READ sentences in ENGLISH |
| Ahmednagar | 94.7 | 0.1 | 40.3 | 5.3 | 82.4 | 99.0 | 98.0 | 27.2 | 94.7 | 92.5 | 10.9 |
| Akola | 98.2 | 0.4 | 37.2 | 7.6 | 80.2 | 99.5 | 98.9 | 90.3 | 97.0 | 90.9 | 24.6 |
| Amravati | 95.5 | 0.3 | 48.8 | 14.3 | 84.2 | 98.8 | 98.8 | 86.1 | 93.5 | 64.8 | 16.2 |
| Aurangabad | 100.0 | 0.6 | 11.6 | 3.2 | 76.3 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 55.6 | 100.0 | 85.1 | 15.0 |
| Bhandara | 99.1 | 0.2 | 31.2 | 3.0 | 84.6 | 98.1 | 98.7 | 59.2 | 86.4 | 66.9 | 5.5 |
| Beed | 99.3 | 0.4 | 29.3 | 9.9 | 81.1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 83.6 | 92.2 | 92.9 | 25.3 |
| Buldana | 97.3 | 1.4 | 30.6 | 6.9 | 73.0 | 92.3 | 91.6 | 64.1 | 73.3 | 58.3 | 8.9 |
| Chandrapur | 99.1 | 1.1 | 29.8 | 3.5 | 79.5 | 93.0 | 92.2 | 65.3 | 82.1 | 70.9 | 8.9 |
| Dhule | 83.5 | 1.0 | 38.8 | 12.9 | 80.3 | 98.5 | 98.0 | 44.3 | 98.4 | 80.6 | 18.3 |
| Gadchiroli | 100.0 | 1.0 | 25.8 | 6.5 | 54.7 | 99.3 | 97.9 | 28.8 | 78.8 | 55.8 | 0.4 |
| Gondiya | 100.0 | 0.1 | 27.2 | 5.0 | 79.0 | 95.9 | 96.6 | 50.3 | 88.9 | 58.0 | 4.7 |
| Hingoli | 97.4 | 2.2 | 14.9 | 10.9 | 57.9 | 86.6 | 89.6 | 50.9 | 67.4 | 59.3 | 18.6 |
| Jalgaon | 96.0 | 3.4 | 30.9 | 24.7 | 69.6 | 94.1 | 92.3 | 35.0 | 69.4 | 53.8 | 4.9 |
| Jalna | 96.9 | 0.7 | 16.0 | 4.0 | 73.5 | 92.6 | 93.1 | 44.0 | 79.1 | 55.7 | 6.5 |
| Kolhapur | 80.8 | 0.3 | 26.5 | 11.9 | 80.2 | 93.9 | 92.7 | 62.2 | 81.9 | 70.3 | 16.7 |
| Latur | 100.0 | 0.0 | 21.1 | 19.7 | 68.1 | 83.2 | 81.7 | 44.1 | 77.8 | 73.7 | 19.5 |
| Nagpur | 98.0 | 0.2 | 43.2 | 9.7 | 82.6 | 99.1 | 100.0 | 64.3 | 96.7 | 91.7 | 32.8 |
| Nanded | 99.3 | 1.3 | 24.9 | 12.2 | 80.2 | 84.8 | 88.8 | 47.0 | 78.5 | 40.8 | 7.8 |
| Nandurbar* | 99.4 | 2.1 | 16.0 | 1.8 | 33.5 | 94.1 | 92.6 | 91.0 | 90.0 | 88.6 |  |
| Nashik | 92.2 | 1.5 | 23.3 | 17.5 | 75.2 | 81.2 | 79.1 | 25.1 | 79.3 | 56.6 | 5.3 |
| Osmanabad | 100.0 | 0.9 | 19.9 | 14.0 | 75.9 | 95.4 | 97.4 | 63.9 | 98.3 | 96.4 | 35.9 |
| Parbhani | 99.1 | 0.9 | 26.3 | 4.4 | 38.8 | 81.3 | 82.4 | 22.8 | 72.9 | 63.1 | 6.4 |
| Pune | 81.9 | 0.5 | 24.5 | 21.8 | 78.5 | 91.1 | 93.8 | 32.8 | 85.2 | 74.2 | 15.6 |
| Raigad | 100.0 | 0.2 | 56.3 | 39.0 | 86.6 | 96.8 | 95.2 | 51.9 | 95.2 | 89.2 | 38.1 |
| Ratnagiri | 96.9 | 0.3 | 4.2 | 10.5 | 91.3 | 98.0 | 98.0 | 71.2 | 92.6 | 86.2 | 27.8 |
| Sangli | 92.9 | 0.6 | 34.9 | 7.9 | 82.7 | 94.5 | 94.6 | 53.5 | 89.9 | 76.1 | 10.1 |
| Satara | 85.5 | 0.4 | 34.2 | 15.0 | 87.8 | 93.8 | 95.7 | 56.4 | 95.8 | 86.0 | 28.0 |
| Sindhudurg | 93.2 | 0.1 | 14.8 | 10.7 | 84.8 | 99.5 | 98.9 | 54.0 | 96.5 | 89.8 | 32.3 |
| Solapur | 98.3 | 0.9 | 22.3 | 1.4 | 63.6 | 93.9 | 93.9 | 60.9 | 98.1 | 95.8 | 43.9 |
| Thane | 93.2 | 4.6 | 30.1 | 31.4 | 75.3 | 85.9 | 87.4 | 32.5 | 78.9 | 55.8 | 8.3 |
| Wardha | 99.0 | 0.3 | 27.9 | 14.0 | 85.5 | 95.1 | 92.8 | 66.7 | 83.0 | 66.7 | 8.7 |
| Washim | 98.1 | 0.4 | 26.9 | 9.7 | 78.9 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 98.8 | 99.6 | 99.6 | 60.4 |
| Yavatmal | 100.0 | 2.4 | 26.0 | 8.5 | 69.8 | 86.5 | 89.7 | 39.9 | 79.1 | 55.7 | 13.0 |
| Total | 95.7 | 1.0 | 28.2 | 12.6 | 76.1 | 93.0 | 93.3 | 52.1 | 86.8 | 73.7 | 18.5 |

* Blank cells indicate insufficient data.


## SCHOOL ENROLLMENT AND OUT OF SCHOOL CHILDREN

| Table 1: \% Children in different types of SCHOOLS 2009 |  |  |  | \% Out of school |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in School |  |
| Age: 6-14 ALL | 26.9 | 71.5 | 0.4 | 1.1 | 100 |
| Age: 7-16 ALL | 26.6 | 70.8 | 0.3 | 2.3 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 26.7 | 72.2 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 100 |
| AgE: 7-10 BOYS | 28.7 | 70.1 | 0.7 | 0.5 | 100 |
| AgE: 7-10 GIRLS | 25.4 | 73.6 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 100 |
| AgE: 11-14 ALL | 27.5 | 70.5 | 0.2 | 1.9 | 100 |
| AgE: 11-14 BOYS | 27.0 | 71.3 | 0.2 | 1.5 | 100 |
| AGE: 11-14 GIRLS | 28.5 | 69.1 | 0.1 | 2.3 | 100 |
| AgE: 15-16 ALL | 24.0 | 68.1 | 0.0 | 7.9 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 BOYS | 23.5 | 69.4 | 0.0 | 7.2 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 GIRLS | 24.6 | 67.0 | 0.0 | 8.5 | 100 |


note : 'отнек' includes chidren going to madarssa and EGS.
'кот in school' = dropped out + never enrolled.


| STD. | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 12.7 | 29.8 | 30.5 | 14.3 | 7.4 |  |  |  | 5.3 |  |  |  | 100 |
| II | 4.5 | 10.4 | 26.8 | 27.3 | 13.6 | 10.7 |  |  |  | 8 |  |  | 100 |
| III | 1.1 | 4.3 | 8.8 | 18.6 | 21.0 | 24.7 | 9.9 | 7.5 |  | 4.3 |  |  | 100 |
| IV |  | 5.2 |  | 8.4 | 18.6 | 29.5 | 16.7 | 12.1 | 5.7 | 3.3 |  | 6 | 100 |
| V |  | . 6 | 7.6 | 5.2 | 5.4 | 20.9 | 18.8 | 21.3 | 11.3 | 6.0 |  | 9 | 100 |
| VI | 3.4 |  |  |  | 2.7 | 8.1 | 14.9 | 31.2 | 21.8 | 11.6 | 4.3 | 2.0 | 100 |
| VII | 1.2 |  |  |  | 7.2 | 4.7 | 3.4 | 20.5 | 28.3 | 21.2 | 10.0 | 3.7 | 100 |
| VIII | 7.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 10.4 | 24.7 | 25.1 | 21.7 | 10.9 | 100 |

How to read the table: In Std III, 64.3\% (18.6+21.0+24.7) children are in age group 8 to 10 .

## Young CHILDREN IN PRE-SCHOOL AND SCHOOL

|  |  |  |  | In Scho |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | anganwadi | UKG | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | io त |  |
| Age 3 | 37.2 | 22.9 |  |  |  | 39.9 | 100 |
| Age 4 | 32.2 | 47.6 |  |  |  | 20.2 | 100 |
| Age 5 | 10.7 | 24.3 | 18.0 | 40.7 | 0.6 | 5.7 | 100 |
| Age 6 | 3.8 | 15.1 | 20.3 | 58.2 | 1.0 | 1.8 | 100 |

Chart 3: Trends over time
\% Children age 3-4 not attending pre-school (ICDS or other) 2006-2009


Of the villages visited, Anganwadi/Pre-School presence has been recorded in 79.8 \% villages.

## Reading in own language

Table 4: Class-wise \% children who CAN READ (All Schools) 2009

| StD. | Nothing | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (STd 1 Text) | Level 2 <br> (Std 2 Text) | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| I | 3.6 | 40.7 | 40.4 | 11.3 | 4.0 | 100 |
| II | 0.8 | 14.8 | 42.1 | 27.5 | 14.8 | 100 |
| III | 0.6 | 9.1 | 26.2 | 28.5 | 35.6 | 100 |
| IV | 0.4 | 3.5 | 15.9 | 33.5 | 46.7 | 100 |
| V | 0.5 | 1.3 | 10.2 | 34.2 | 53.9 | 100 |
| VI | 0.3 | 0.4 | 3.6 | 19.9 | 75.9 | 100 |
| VII | 1.3 | 0.4 | 2.8 | 12.2 | 83.3 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.7 | 0.3 | 0.9 | 7.9 | 90.1 | 100 |
| TOTAL | 1.1 | 10.0 | 19.8 | 22.7 | 46.5 | 100 |

NOTE : Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. Thus a child who can read Std II level text can read letters, words, and Std 1 level text.


NOTE : The test was also available in Meitei Mayek and Manipuri.
CHART 5: TRENDS OVER TIME
\% Children who CAN READ Std II level text (in govt schools in Std IV - VII) 2006-2009


Chart 4: Trends over time
\% Children who CANNOT EVEN IDENTIFY LETTERS (IN GOVT SCHOOLS IN Std I - IV) 2006-2009


## Reading and comprehension in english

## TABLE 5: CLASS-WISE \% CHILDREN WHO CAN READ

ENGLISH (All Schools) 2009

Cannot Can readCan readCan read Can read Total Std. | read | capital | small | simple | easy |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| capital |  |  |  |  |
| letters | letters | words | sentences |  | letters

| I | 6.0 | 20.6 | 32.6 | 34.1 | 6.7 | 100 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| II | 1.6 | 7.3 | 21.4 | 45.9 | 23.9 | 100 |
| III | 1.1 | 4.7 | 11.8 | 35.6 | 46.8 | 100 |
| IV | 0.4 | 2.2 | 7.2 | 27.4 | 62.8 | 100 |
| V | 0.5 | 1.0 | 4.4 | 27.5 | 66.6 | 100 |
| VI | 0.3 | 0.4 | 2.2 | 13.7 | 83.3 | 100 |
| VII | 1.7 | 0.4 | 1.9 | 7.9 | 88.1 | 100 |
| VIII | 1.2 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 4.8 | 93.4 | 100 |
| TOTAL | 1.7 | 5.1 | 11.4 | 26.5 | 55.3 | 100 |


| TABLE 6: CLASS-wise \% CHILDREN who COMPREHEND ENGLISH (AlL Schools) 2009 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std. | Of those who can read words, \% who can tell meaning of the words | Of those who can read sentences, \% who can tell meaning of the sentences |
| I | 53.4 | 63.8 |
| II | 49.2 | 72.9 |
| III | 44.0 | 80.1 |
| IV | 48.4 | 73.2 |
| V | 41.2 | 77.5 |
| VI | 57.5 | 81.5 |
| VII | 59.8 | 88.9 |
| VIII | 62.4 | 89.3 |
| Total | 48.7 | 81.2 |

## ARITHMETIC

| Std. | Nothing | Recognize Numbers |  | Subtract | Divide | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1-9 | 11-99 |  |  |  |
| 1 | 3.2 | 24.2 | 59.7 | 11.4 | 1.6 | 100 |
| II | 1.5 | 10.8 | 45.2 | 35.7 | 6.8 | 100 |
| III | 1.0 | 3.5 | 25.6 | 44.9 | 25.0 | 100 |
| IV | 0.4 | 2.0 | 13.0 | 43.0 | 41.5 | 100 |
| V | 0.5 | 0.8 | 8.0 | 39.6 | 51.1 | 100 |
| VI | 0.6 | 0.3 | 2.4 | 21.1 | 75.7 | 100 |
| VII | 1.3 | 0.1 | 1.6 | 12.7 | 84.3 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.5 | 0.1 | 1.3 | 8.4 | 89.7 | 100 |
| Total | 1.2 | 5.9 | 22.0 | 28.5 | 42.5 | 100 |

NOTE : Each cell shows the highest level of arithmetic achieved by a child. Thus a child who can do division, can also recognize numbers 1-9, 11-99 and do subtraction.

Chart 6: Trends over time
\% Children who CANNOT EVEN RECOGNIZE NUMBERS UPTO 9 (IN GOVT SCHOOLS IN STD I - IV) 2007-2009



Chart 7: Trends over time
\% Children who CAN DO DIVISION (in govt schools in Std IV - VII) 2007-2009


## TUITION

| Year | School | 1 | II | III | IV | V | VI | VII | VIII |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2007 | Govt | 17.2 | 18.0 | 19.5 | 26.0 | 24.1 | 26.6 | 28.9 | 35.3 |
|  | Pvt. | 43.6 | 52.4 | 53.1 | 53.7 | 58.6 | 53.5 | 59.2 | 59.9 |
| 2009 | Govt | 12.0 | 18.8 | 16.0 | 17.1 | 17.6 | 21.6 | 15.2 | 29.7 |
|  | Pvt. | 42.4 | 46.0 | 49.5 | 50.7 | 45.7 | 49.9 | 51.8 | 55.2 |

NOTE : The ASER survey in 2007 and 2009 recorded information about tuition. In both years, the question asked was the following: "Does the child take any paid additional class currently?" Therefore, these numbers do not include any supplemental help in learning that children may have received from parents or siblings or from anyone else that did not require payment.


## LEARNING LEVELS IN GOVERNMENT AND PRIVATE SCHOOLS : TRENDS OVER TIME

Chart 8: \% Children in Std III who CAN AT LEAST READ Std I LEVEL TEXT. BY SCHOOL TYPE 2006-2009


Chart 9: \% Children in Std V who CAN DO DIVISION. BY SCHOOL TYPE 2006-2009


Learning levels by gender : Trends over time

Chart 10: \% Boys and girls in Std III who CAN READ AT LEAST StD I LEVEL TEXT 2007-2009


Chart 11: \% Boys and girls in Std V who CAN DO DIVISION 2007-2009


EdUCATION : FATHERS AND CHILDREN


NOTE: ASER 2009 recorded information about mothers' education. Similar analyses can be done with mothers and children.

## SCHOOL ENROLLMENT AND ATTENDANCE : TRENDS OVER TIME



| TABLE 11: CHILDREN'S ATtENDANCE 2005 | 2007 | 2009 | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Type of school <br> \% Enrolled children attending <br> (average) <br> \% Schools with less than 50\% <br> enrolled children attending | 0.0 | 13.0 | 13.2 | 0.0 | 11.8 | 13.0 |
| \% Schools with 75\% or more <br> enrolled children attending | 75.0 | 62.0 | 64.5 | 100.0 | 73.5 | 69.6 |

Type of school Std I-IV/V Std I-VII/VIII
\% Enrolled children attending
\% Schools with less than 50\% enrolled children attending Schools with 75\% or more

## Table 13: Multigrade classes

200520072009200520072009

| \% Of schools in which: | Std I-IV/V |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Std II class sitting with <br> another class | 22.9 | 28.7 | 5.7 | 19.4 |
| Std IV class sitting with <br> another class | 14.7 | 27.0 | 8.8 | 17.1 |

## School facilities : TRENDS OVER TIME

| Table 14: FaCilities in school |  | 200520072009200520072009 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \% Schools with: |  | Std I-IV/V |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \pm \\ & \stackrel{ \pm}{N} \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | No facility | 90.0 | 83.3 | 80.9 | 55.6 | 72.4 | 83.9 |
|  | Facility but water not available | 10.0 | 3.3 | 9.6 | 33.3 | 3.4 | 6.5 |
|  | Available | 0.0 | 13.3 | 9.6 | 11.1 | 24.1 | 9.7 |
|  | No facility | 36.4 | 43.9 | 38.5 | 44.4 | 20.0 | 18.9 |
|  | Facility but toilet not usable | 9.1 | 13.4 | 28.8 | 11.1 | 16.7 | 48.6 |
|  | Usable | 54.5 | 42.7 | 32.7 | 44.4 | 63.3 | 32.4 |
| Midday meal served on day of visit |  | 45.5 | 77.1 | 59.2 | 33.3 | 74.3 | 54.3 |


| TABLE 16: GIRLS ToILETS 2009 | Std I-IV/V | Std I-VII/VIII |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No of schools visited | 87 | 30 |
| \% Schools with no separate provision <br> for girls toilets | 93.1 | 70.0 |
| Of schools where there are separate girls toilets, \% schools where: |  |  |
| Toilet locked | 1.1 | 13.3 |
| Toilet not usable | 1.1 | 6.7 |
| Usable | 4.6 | 10.0 |

Table 15: School improvement \& construction since April 2008

| School improvement \& Construction | Std I-IV/V |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. of schs | \% schools |  | No. of schs | \% schools |  |
|  |  | Yes | No |  | Yes | No |
| Whitewash | 96 | 22.9 | 77.1 | 35 | 25.7 | 74.3 |
| Construction of new classroom | 98 | 25.5 | 74.5 | 36 | 33.3 | 66.7 |
| Construction of boundary wall | 99 | 7.1 | 92.9 | 35 | 28.6 | 71.4 |

ASER survey was carried out in Oct-Nov 2009. One govt school with primary grades was visited in each sampled village. If there was more than one govt school in a village, then the school with the highest enrollment was visited. Hence the schools visited in the ASER survey do not represent a random sample of schools of the district. The school visits were generally done either on a Saturday or a Monday.

| School Grants |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| New | Rs 2 lacs per <br> classrooms <br> additional room |
| Maintenance <br> grant | Rs. 5000 pa upto 3 <br> classrooms. Upto <br> Rs 10000 pa for <br> more than 3 <br> classrooms |
| Development |  |
| grant | Rs. 5000 pa for <br> primary schs \& Rs <br> 7000 pa for upper <br> primary schs |
| TLM grant | Rs. 500 pa per <br> teacher |

## School Grants

| TABLE 17: <br> \% Primary <br> SCHOOLS RECEIVING <br> DIFFERENT GRANTS | April 2008-March 2009 |  |  |  | April 2009-October 2009 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Std I-IV/V |  |  |  | Std I-IV/V |  |  |  |
|  | No. of schs | Yes | No | Don't know | No. of schs | Yes | No | Don't know |
| New classroom | 86 | 22.1 | 76.7 | 1.2 | 75 | 6.7 | 70.7 | 22.7 |
| Maintenance grant | 89 | 53.9 | 44.9 | 1.1 | 74 | 23.0 | 52.7 | 24 |
| Development grant | 81 | 43.2 | 55.6 | 1.2 | 71 | 16.9 | 53.5 | 29 |
| Teacher grant (TLM grant) | 93 | 69.9 | 30.1 | 0.0 | 71 | 28.2 | 50.7 | 21 |
| Other grants | 40 | 7.5 | 87.5 | 5.0 | 40 | 2.5 | 62.5 | 35. |

NOTE: No grant information was available for 10 schools out of 106 primary schools that were visited. This could be because the head teacher was not present, register was not available or the surveyors could not obtain the information. Therefore, the above table is based on schools for which information was available for at least one indicator.

| TABLE 18: |
| :--- |
| \% UPPER PRIMARY |
| SCHOOLS RECEIVING |
| DIFFERENT GRANTS |
| New classroom |
| Maintenance grant |
| Development grant |
| Teacher grant |
| (TLM grant) |
| Other grants |

April 2008-March 2009 April 2009-October 2009 Std I-VII/VIII Std I-VII/VIII

| No. of <br> schs | Yes | NoDon't <br> know |  | No. of <br> schs | Yes | No | Don't <br> know |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 33 | 30.3 | 69.7 | 0.0 | 27 | 14.8 | 81.5 | 3.7 |
| 32 | 84.4 | 15.6 | 0.0 | 25 | 20.0 | 72.0 | 8.0 |
| 27 | 40.7 | 55.6 | 3.7 | 25 | 8.0 | 80.0 | 12.0 |
| 31 | 83.9 | 16.1 | 0.0 | 25 | 36.0 | 64.0 | 0.0 |
| 15 | 20.0 | 80.0 | 0.0 | 12 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 |

NOTE : No grant information was available for 0 schools out of 37 upper primary schools that were visited. This could be because the head teacher was not present, register was not available or the surveyors could not obtain the information. Therefore, the above table is based on schools for which information was available for at least one indicator.

## Performance of districts

| Table 19: | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { ANGANWADI } \\ \text { OR } \\ \text { BALWADI } \end{array}$ | Out of SCHOOL | Private SCHOOL | Tuition | Mothers' Reading | Std I-II : Learning levels |  |  | Std III-V : Learning levels |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Districts | \% Children (Age 3-4) in anganwadi or pre-school | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) out of school | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) in private school | \% Children (Std IV-VIII) attending tuition classes | \% Mothers (Age: 17-55) who CAN READ | \% Children (Std I-II) who CAN READ letters, words or more | \% Children (Std I-II) who CAN RECOGNIZE NUMBERS 1 to 9 or more | \% Children (Std I-II) who CAN READ LETTERS or more in ENGLISH | \%Children <br> (Std III-V) who <br> CAN READ Level 1 (Std 1 Text) or more | \% Children (Std III-V) who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more | \% Children (Std III-V) who CAN READ sentences in ENGLISH |
| Bishnupur | 69.7 | 1.8 | 79.0 | 56.7 | 76.1 | 96.9 | 96.9 | 95.5 | 72.9 | 75.9 | 55.1 |
| Chandel | 95.7 | 1.0 | 82.2 | 75.0 | 89.5 | 99.6 | 99.6 | 100.0 | 95.9 | 95.5 | 92.1 |
| Churachandpur | 42.2 | 1.6 | 86.0 | 8.9 | 85.7 | 98.8 | 100.0 | 93.3 | 93.6 | 92.7 | 87.9 |
| Imphal East | 83.6 | 0.4 | 70.8 | 40.3 | 72.9 | 95.5 | 97.4 | 95.5 | 62.7 | 68.8 | 31.5 |
| Imphal West | 88.1 | 0.3 | 79.9 | 78.2 | 92.6 | 99.0 | 100.0 | 98.1 | 81.7 | 81.8 | 64.1 |
| Senapati | 46.0 | 1.1 | 60.1 | 25.0 | 88.9 | 95.7 | 99.0 | 98.0 | 83.0 | 88.1 | 79.0 |
| Tamenglong | 52.0 | 4.6 | 53.9 | 29.7 | 75.4 | 99.0 | 99.0 | 98.4 | 73.1 | 73.5 | 35.5 |
| Thoubal | 80.2 | 0.6 | 80.6 | 61.2 | 69.1 | 98.1 | 91.6 | 95.7 | 73.8 | 82.8 | 46.9 |
| Ukhrul | 66.4 | 0.6 | 45.1 | 10.5 | 88.4 | 98.7 | 99.1 | 92.9 | 78.8 | 86.9 | 78.2 |
| Total | 71.1 | 1.1 | 71.5 | 41.6 | 80.6 | 97.9 | 97.7 | 96.3 | 77.3 | 81.5 | 58.6 |



## SCHOOL ENROLLMENT AND OUT OF SCHOOL CHILDREN

| Table 1: \% Children in different types of SCHOOLS 2009 |  |  |  | \% Out of school |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in School |  |
| Age: 6-14 ALL | 65.1 | 30.7 | 0.4 | 3.8 | 100 |
| AgE: 7-16 ALL | 62.9 | 31.8 | 0.3 | 5.0 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 69.7 | 27.1 | 0.4 | 2.8 | 100 |
| AGE: 7-10 BOYS | 69.4 | 27.4 | 0.6 | 2.6 | 100 |
| AgE: 7-10 GIRLS | 70.1 | 26.8 | 0.2 | 3.0 | 100 |
| AgE: 11-14 ALL | 59.3 | 35.5 | 0.4 | 4.9 | 100 |
| AGE: 11-14 BOYS | 60.6 | 34.1 | 0.5 | 4.7 | 100 |
| AGE: 11-14 GIRLS | 59.2 | 36.1 | 0.2 | 4.6 | 100 |
| AgE: 15-16 ALL | 53.6 | 35.4 | 0.0 | 11.0 | 100 |
| AgE: 15-16 BOYS | 54.3 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 12.4 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 GIRLS | 52.9 | 37.5 | 0.0 | 9.7 | 100 |


note: 'отнer' includes chidren going to madarssa and EGS.
'кот in school' = dropped out + never enrolled.



How to read the table: In Std III, $46.1 \%(8.2+17.9+20.0)$ children are in age group 8 to 10 .

## Young CHILDREN IN PRE-SCHOOL AND SCHOOL

|  |  |  |  | n Scho |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | anganwadi | UKG | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \text { त }$ |  |
| Age 3 | 37.8 | 9.3 |  |  |  | 53.0 | 100 |
| Age 4 | 33.9 | 35.0 |  |  |  | 31.1 | 100 |
| Age 5 | 14.4 | 7.6 | 41.2 | 20.7 | 0.8 | 15.3 | 100 |
| Age 6 | 10.2 | 8.0 | 51.7 | 20.7 | 0.3 | 9.1 | 100 |

Chart 3: Trends over time
\% Children age 3-4 not attending Pre-school (ICDS OR Other) 2006-2009


Of the villages visited, Anganwadi/Pre-School presence has been recorded in 70.1 \% villages.

## Reading in own language



NOTE : The test was also available in Garo and English.
CHART 5: TRENDS OVER TIME
\% Children who CAN READ Std II level text (in govt schools in Std IV - VII) 2006-2009


## Reading Tool

## Reading Test (2)

## Story



Chart 4: TRENDS OVER TIME
\% Children who CANNOT EVEN IDENTIFY LETTERS
(in govt schools in Std I - IV) 2006-2009


| READING IN |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Table 4: Class-wise \% children who Can Read (All Schools) 2009 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Std. | Nothing | Letter | Word | $\begin{gathered} \text { Level } 1 \\ \text { (STd } 1 \text { Text) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Level } 2 \\ \text { (STd } 2 \text { Text) } \end{gathered}$ | Total |
| I | 14.7 | 55.6 | 22.5 | 4.7 | 2.5 | 100 |
| II | 4.1 | 36.8 | 26.7 | 25.8 | 6.6 | 100 |
| III | 2.4 | 24.0 | 25.3 | 28.2 | 20.0 | 100 |
| IV | 2.6 | 13.9 | 21.1 | 31.7 | 30.8 | 100 |
| V | 1.8 | 10.1 | 15.9 | 20.1 | 52.2 | 100 |
| VI | 3.7 | 4.9 | 10.5 | 17.4 | 63.5 | 100 |
| VII | 1.8 | 4.3 | 3.4 | 12.1 | 78.4 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.7 | 2.4 | 2.2 | 9.6 | 85.0 | 100 |
| Total | 5.3 | 26.3 | 19.4 | 19.3 | 29.6 | 100 |

Table 4: Class-wise \% children who CAN READ (All Schools) 2009

NOTE : Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. Thus a child who can read Std II level text can read letters, words, and Std 1 level text.

## Reading and comprehension in english

## TABLE 5: CLASS-WISE \% CHILDREN WHO CAN READ

ENGLISH (All Schools) 2009

Cannot Can readCan readCan read Can read Total Std. | read |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| capital | capital | small |
| letters |  |  | \(\begin{gathered}simple <br>

letters\end{gathered} \quad $$
\begin{gathered}\text { easy } \\
\text { words sentences }\end{gathered}
$$\) letters

| I | 20.1 | 40.3 | 23.0 | 14.8 | 1.9 | 100 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| II | 6.7 | 18.5 | 32.0 | 32.8 | 10.0 | 100 |
| III | 4.8 | 8.3 | 28.7 | 35.8 | 22.5 | 100 |
| IV | 3.4 | 5.6 | 12.4 | 40.4 | 38.3 | 100 |
| V | 3.6 | 5.7 | 8.1 | 25.5 | 57.0 | 100 |
| VI | 4.5 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 21.4 | 68.3 | 100 |
| VII | 3.3 | 3.5 | 2.1 | 7.8 | 83.3 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.8 | 2.4 | 0.0 | 6.0 | 90.8 | 100 |
| TOTAL | 7.9 | 15.7 | 18.5 | 25.6 | 32.3 | 100 |


| TABLE 6: CLASS-wise \% CHILDREN who COMPREHEND ENGLISH (AlL Schools) 2009 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std. | Of those who can read words, \% who can tell meaning of the words | Of those who can read sentences, \% who can tell meaning of the sentences |
| I | 40.8 | 78.7 |
| II | 56.8 | 51.2 |
| III | 48.4 | 76.9 |
| IV | 61.7 | 64.7 |
| V | 36.6 | 88.4 |
| VI | 43.3 | 90.5 |
| VII | 53.8 | 84.0 |
| VIII | 8.1 | 86.2 |
| TOTAL | 50.6 | 80.1 |

## Arithmetic

| Std. | Nothing | Recognize Numbers |  | Subtract | Divide | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1-9 | 11-99 |  |  |  |
| 1 | 13.1 | 51.1 | 30.0 | 4.7 | 1.2 | 100 |
| II | 3.9 | 22.6 | 53.5 | 17.2 | 2.7 | 100 |
| III | 1.9 | 8.9 | 43.2 | 36.8 | 9.2 | 100 |
| IV | 1.6 | 5.8 | 23.1 | 47.1 | 22.4 | 100 |
| V | 2.0 | 4.2 | 20.5 | 40.6 | 32.7 | 100 |
| VI | 2.3 | 3.0 | 8.0 | 41.4 | 45.3 | 100 |
| VII | 1.9 | 4.5 | 2.1 | 38.8 | 52.9 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.7 | 2.4 | 0.0 | 41.8 | 55.0 | 100 |
| Total | 4.6 | 18.5 | 29.1 | 28.8 | 18.9 | 100 |

NOTE : Each cell shows the highest level of arithmetic achieved by a child. Thus a child who can do division, can also recognize numbers 1-9, 11-99 and do subtraction.

Chart 6: Trends over time
\% Children who CANNOT EVEN RECOGNIZE NUMBERS UPTO 9 (IN GOVT SCHOOLS IN STD I - IV) 2007-2009



Chart 7: Trends over time
\% Children who CAN DO division (in govt schools in Std IV - Vil) 2007-2009


## TUITION

| Year | School | I | II | III | IV | V | VI | VII | VIII |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2007 | Govt | 2.7 | 5.7 | 4.3 | 3.9 | 8.4 | 14.9 | 15.7 | 11.0 |
|  | Pvt. | 23.7 | 28.0 | 25.8 | 29.9 | 24.7 | 29.9 | 37.3 | 34.6 |
| 2009 | Govt | 4.9 | 7.3 | 11.4 | 8.1 | 12.8 | 19.5 | 31.1 | 37.3 |
|  | Pvt. | 24.4 | 18.4 | 18.4 | 27.2 | 22.7 | 21.6 | 20.1 | 39.2 |

NOTE : The ASER survey in 2007 and 2009 recorded information about tuition. In both years, the question asked was the following: "Does the child take any paid additional class currently?" Therefore, these numbers do not include any supplemental help in learning that children may have received from parents or siblings or from anyone else that did not require payment.


## LEARNING LEVELS IN GOVERNMENT AND PRIVATE SCHOOLS : TRENDS OVER TIME

Chart 8: \% Children in Std III who CAN AT LEAST READ Std I LEVEL TEXT. BY SCHOOL TYPE 2006-2009


Chart 9: \% Children in Std V who Can do division. BY SCHOOL TYPE 2006-2009


Learning levels by gender : Trends over time

Chart 10: \% Boys and girls in Std III who CAN READ AT LEAST StD I LEVEL TEXT 2007-2009


Chart 11: \% Boys and girls in Std V who CAN DO DIVISION 2007-2009


## EDUCATION : FATHERS AND CHILDREN

|  |  | Of these fathers : |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fathers' Education | \% <br> Fathers | \% Girls 6 to 14 out of school | \% Children (Std III-V) who can read level 1 (Std 1 Text) or more | \% Children (Std III-V) who can do subtraction or more | \% Children (Std III-V) who can read words or more in English | \% Children (Std IV-VIII) attending tuition |
| No Schooling | 36.4 | 5.8 | 58.0 | 58.3 | 67.8 | 12.9 |
| Std I-V | 21.9 | 4.0 | 50.1 | 58.0 | 69.7 | 14.1 |
| Std VI-VIII | 15.5 | 2.9 | 52.1 | 55.3 | 69.8 | 16.2 |
| Std IX-X | 17.8 | 1.5 | 58.1 | 57.2 | 76.9 | 21.2 |
| Above Std X | 8.3 | 1.5 | 78.1 | 77.6 | 83.8 | 30.7 |



NOTE: ASER 2009 recorded information about mothers' education. Similar analyses can be done with mothers and children.

## SCHOOL ENROLLMENT AND ATTENDANCE : TRENDS OVER TIME

| Type of school |  | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std I-IV/V : Primary |  | 27 | 107 | 127 |
| Std I-VII/VIII : Primary + Upper Primary |  | 5 | 9 | 4 |
| Total schools |  | 32 | 116 | 131 |
| Table 12: Teacher attendance 20052007 |  | 2009 | 20052007 | 2009 |
| Type of school St | Std I-IV/V |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |
| \% Teachers attending (average) | 92.5 | 91.81 | 00.091 .1 | 77.1 |
| \% Schools with no teacher present 18.8 | 1.3 | 0.8 | $0.0 \quad 0.0$ | 0.0 |
| \% Schools with all teachers present 81.3 | 83.5 | 77.31 | $00.0 \quad 60.0$ |  |


| TABLE 11: CHILDREN'S ATtENDANCE 2005 | 2007 | 2009 | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Type of school <br> \% Enrolled children attending <br> (average) <br> \% Schools with less than 50\% <br> enrolled children attending | 01.0 | 85.0 | 75.6 | 94.9 | 85.6 | 80.5 |
| \% Schools with 75\% or more <br> enrolled children attending | 100.0 | 1.2 | 7.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

Type of school
\% Enrolled children attending (average) \% Schools with less than 50\% enrolled children attending Schools with 75\% or more

## Table 13: Multigrade classes

\% Of schools in which:
Std II class sitting with another class
Std IV class sitting with another class

200520072009200520072009
Std I-IV/V Std I-VII/VIII
$\begin{array}{llllll}91.0 & 85.0 & 75.6 & 94.9 & 85.6 & 80.5\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llllll}0.0 & 1.2 & 7.6 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0\end{array}$
$100.084 .9 \quad 59.3100 .0100 .0 \quad 75.0$

## School facilities : trends over time

| TABLE 14: FACILIties in School |  | 200520072009200520072009 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \% Schools with: |  | Std I-IV/V |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{ \pm} \\ & \stackrel{\text { N}}{3} \end{aligned}$ | No facility | 77.8 | 61.7 | 62.1 | 20.0 | 50.0 | 75.0 |
|  | Facility but water not available | 7.4 | 12.8 | 14.5 | 40.0 | 16.7 | 0.0 |
|  | Available | 14.8 | 25.5 | 23.4 | 40.0 | 33.3 | 25.0 |
|  | No facility | 88.9 | 43.9 | 39.2 | 40.0 | 12.5 | 25.0 |
|  | Facility but toilet not usable | 0.0 | 9.8 | 19.2 | 0.0 | 25.0 | 50.0 |
|  | Usable | 11.1 | 46.3 | 41.6 | 60.0 | 62.5 | 25.0 |
| Midday meal served on day of visit |  | 75.0 | 89.3 | 59.7 | 60.0 | 88.9 | 50.0 |


| Table 16: GIRLS ToILeTS $\mathbf{2 0 0 9}$ | Std I-IV/V | Std I-VII/VIII |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No of schools visited | 109 | 2 |
| \% Schools with no separate provision <br> for girls toilets | 85.3 | 100.0 |
| Of schools where there are separate girls toilets, $\%$ schools where: |  |  |
| Toilet locked | 6.4 | 0.0 |
| Toilet not usable | 2.8 | 0.0 |
| Usable | 5.5 | 0.0 |

Table 15: School improvement \& construction since April 2008

## School improvement \&

Construction
Whitewash
Construction of new classroom Construction of boundary wall

ASER survey was carried out in Oct-Nov 2009. One govt school with primary grades was visited in each sampled village. If there was more than one govt school in a village, then the school with the highest enrollment was visited. Hence the schools visited in the ASER survey do not represent a random sample of schools of the district. The school visits were generally done either on a Saturday or a Monday.

| Std I-IV/V |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. of <br> schs | Yeschools <br> Yes |  | No. of <br> schs |  | \% schools |  | No |
| 122 | 32.8 | 67.2 | 4 | 50.0 | 50.0 |  |  |
| 122 | 15.6 | 84.4 | 4 | 0.0 | 100.0 |  |  |
| 121 | 2.5 | 97.5 | 4 | 25.0 | 75.0 |  |  |


| School Grants |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| classrooms | Rs 2 lass per <br> additional room |
| Maintenance | Rs. 5000 pa upto 3 <br> grant |
| classrooms. Upto |  |
| Rs 10000 pa for |  |
| more than 3 |  |
| classrooms |  |$|$

## School Grants

| TABLE 17: <br> \% Primary <br> SCHOOLS RECEIVING <br> DIFFERENT GRANTS | April 2008-March 2009 |  |  |  | April 2009-October 2009 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Std I-IV/V |  |  |  | Std I-IV/V |  |  |  |
|  | No. of schs | Yes | No | Don't know | No. of schs | Yes | No | Don't know |
| New classroom | 104 | 18.3 | 72.1 | 9.6 | 85 | 4.7 | 78.8 | 16.5 |
| Maintenance grant | 106 | 59.4 | 31.1 | 9.4 | 78 | 23.1 | 60.3 | 16 |
| Development grant | 100 | 30.0 | 60.0 | 10.0 | 82 | 6.1 | 78.1 | 15 |
| Teacher grant (TLM grant) | 103 | 80.6 | 9.7 | 9.7 | 79 | 53.2 | 27.9 | 19 |
| Other grants | 72 | 6.9 | 79.2 | 13.9 | 73 | 1.4 | 80.8 | 17.8 |

NOTE: No grant information was available for 20 schools out of 127 primary schools that were visited. This could be because the head teacher was not present, register was not available or the surveyors could not obtain the information. Therefore, the above table is based on schools for which information was available for at least one indicator.

| Table 18: |
| :--- |
| \% UPPER PRIMARY |
| SCHOOLS RECEIVING |
| DIFFERENT GRANTS |
| New classroom |
| Maintenance grant |
| Development grant |
| Teacher grant |
| (TLM grant) |
| Other grants |

April 2008-March 2009 April 2009-October 2009 Std I-VII/VIII Std I-VII/VIII

| No. of <br> schs | Yes | NoDon't <br> know |  | No. of <br> schs | Yes | No | Don't <br> know |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 3 | 0.0 | 66.7 | 33.3 |
| 4 | 75.0 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 3 | 0.0 | 66.7 | 33.3 |
| 3 | 33.3 | 66.7 | 0.0 | 2 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 50.0 |
| 4 | 75.0 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 3 | 0.0 | 66.7 | 33.3 |
| 3 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 2 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | that were visited. This could be because the head teacher was not present, register was not available or the surveyors could not obtain the information. Therefore, the above table is based on schools for which information was available for at least one indicator.

## Performance of districts

| Table 19: | ANGANWADI <br> OR <br> BALWADI | Out of SCHOOL | Private <br> SCHOOL | Tuition | Mothers' Reading | Std I-II : Learning levels |  |  | Std III-V : Learning levels |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Districts | \% Children (Age 3-4) in anganwadi or pre-school | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) <br> out <br> of <br> school | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) <br> in private school | \% Children (Std IV-VIII) attending tuition classes | \% Mothers <br> (Age: 17-55) who CAN READ | \%Children <br> (Std I-II) who CAN READ letters, words or more | \% Children (Std I-II) who CAN RECOGNIZE NUMBERS 1 to 9 or more | \% Children (Std I-II) who CAN READ LETTERS or more in ENGLISH | \%Children (Std III-V) who CAN READ Level 1 (Std 1 Text) or more | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% Children } \\ & \text { (Std III-V) } \\ & \text { who } \\ & \text { CAN DO } \\ & \text { SUBTRACTION } \\ & \text { or more } \end{aligned}$ | \%Children (Std III-V) who CAN READ sentences in ENGLISH |
| East Garo Hills | 34.5 | 4.0 | 9.3 | 8.0 | 66.1 | 95.8 | 95.8 | 90.8 | 63.9 | 56.6 | 31.8 |
| East Khasi Hills* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jaintia Hills | 73.6 | 9.2 | 34.4 | 28.3 | 54.4 | 98.3 | 97.4 | 81.9 | 73.2 | 72.2 | 45.4 |
| Ri Bhoi* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| South Garo Hills | 32.2 | 2.4 | 10.8 | 2.7 | 53.9 | 87.6 | 88.3 | 89.6 | 55.9 | 52.3 | 28.2 |
| West Garo Hills | 70.8 | 3.6 | 17.1 | 3.3 | 50.1 | 82.5 | 85.3 | 81.4 | 31.9 | 48.5 | 17.9 |
| West Khasi Hills* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 57.1 | 3.8 | 30.7 | 20.8 | 62.1 | 90.3 | 91.2 | 86.3 | 59.6 | 61.5 | 37.2 |

*Blank cells indicate insufficient data.


## SCHOOL ENROLLMENT AND OUT OF SCHOOL CHILDREN

| Table 1: \% Children in different types of SCHOOLS 2009 |  |  |  | \% Out of school |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in School |  |
| Age: 6-14 ALL | 80.5 | 17.9 | 0.3 | 1.3 | 100 |
| Age: 7-16 ALL | 80.0 | 16.8 | 0.3 | 2.9 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 80.6 | 18.6 | 0.2 | 0.6 | 100 |
| AgE: 7-10 BOYS | 81.9 | 17.2 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 100 |
| AgE: 7-10 GIRLS | 79.7 | 19.6 | 0.1 | 0.6 | 100 |
| AgE: 11-14 ALL | 81.0 | 16.3 | 0.4 | 2.4 | 100 |
| AgE: 11-14 BOYS | 80.3 | 16.8 | 0.2 | 2.7 | 100 |
| AGE: 11-14 GIRLS | 82.6 | 15.2 | 0.5 | 1.8 | 100 |
| AgE: 15-16 ALL | 75.3 | 12.4 | 0.2 | 12.1 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 BOYS | 76.8 | 12.8 | 0.0 | 10.5 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 GIRLS | 75.0 | 11.1 | 0.5 | 13.5 | 100 |

## Chart 1: Trends over time <br> \% CHILDREN OUT OF SCHOOL BY AGE GROUP AND GENDER 2006 AND 2009


nOTE: 'отнеR' includes chidren going to madarssa and EGS.
'кот IN SCHool' = dropped out + never enrolled.


## Reading in own language

Table 4: Class-wise \% children who CAN READ (All Schools) 2009

| StD. | Nothing | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (Std 1 Text) | Level 2 <br> (Std 2 Text) | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 14.8 | 35.0 | 41.9 | 5.9 | 2.5 | 100 |
| II | 2.4 | 14.9 | 45.7 | 29.2 | 7.7 | 100 |
| III | 1.4 | 8.1 | 31.4 | 34.2 | 24.9 | 100 |
| IV | 0.8 | 3.8 | 19.0 | 28.5 | 47.9 | 100 |
| V | 0.4 | 0.9 | 10.4 | 29.5 | 58.8 | 100 |
| VI | 0.2 | 1.2 | 4.3 | 15.1 | 79.2 | 100 |
| VII | 0.3 | 1.3 | 2.9 | 8.7 | 86.8 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.3 | 0.3 | 1.2 | 5.3 | 92.9 | 100 |
| TOTAL | 3.1 | 9.9 | 23.3 | 21.3 | 42.4 | 100 |

NOTE : Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. Thus a child who can read Std II level text can read letters, words, and Std 1 level text.

Chart 4: Trends over time
\% Children who CANNOT EVEN IDENTIFY LETTERS (IN GOVt Schools in Std I - IV) 2006 ANd 2009


## Reading Tool

## Renting Ies (in



| Reading Tool |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Renting Iet ail |  |  |
| $5 \mathrm{td}-11$ <br> Ramengi leh a thlante chm Bazar-ah an kal a. Ramengi chuan maute lem a awt hle a. Mahse, pawisa a nel lo. A neitute hriatloh lailn maute | Biald chu na ni. <br> Thian pathe Nitin an infia Khawnuam- |  |
| a hrilh a. A mu chuan thilrak thatlohzia a lo lerilh a. A inchhir em em a. A neitwte heenah naute lem chu a pelier leh ta a. |  |  |

CHART 5: TRENDS OVER TIME
\% Children who CAN READ Std II level text (in govt schools in StD IV - VII) 2006-2009


## Reading and comprehension in english

## TABLE 5: CLASS-WISE \% CHILDREN WHO CAN READ

ENGLISH (All Schools) 2009

Cannot Can readCan readCan read Can read Total Std. | read |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| capital | capital | small | simple | easy |
| letters | letters | words sentences |  |  | letters

| I | 18.6 | 31.7 | 20.3 | 26.8 | 2.6 | 100 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| II | 5.4 | 16.2 | 20.8 | 47.4 | 10.2 | 100 |
| III | 3.0 | 9.2 | 14.5 | 49.5 | 23.8 | 100 |
| IV | 2.1 | 4.0 | 6.7 | 38.3 | 48.9 | 100 |
| V | 1.1 | 1.3 | 3.5 | 36.3 | 57.8 | 100 |
| VI | 0.5 | 1.3 | 1.5 | 21.4 | 75.3 | 100 |
| VII | 0.9 | 0.5 | 2.3 | 13.6 | 82.7 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 6.5 | 92.7 | 100 |
| TOTAL | 4.8 | 9.8 | 10.4 | 33.2 | 41.9 | 100 |


| Std. | Of those who can read words, \% who can tell meaning of the words | Of those who can read sentences, \% who can tell meaning of the sentences |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 44.8 | 45.8 |
| II | 50.3 | 47.8 |
| III | 61.9 | 49.3 |
| IV | 69.6 | 52.2 |
| V | 82.4 | 65.0 |
| VI | 82.0 | 67.5 |
| VII | 80.2 | 78.0 |
| VIII | 93.8 | 84.5 |
| Total | 63.8 | 66.6 |


| English Tool |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
| $\mathbf{C}$ K $\mathbf{S}$  <br>  $\mathbf{Q}$  $\mathbf{F}$ <br> $\mathbf{w}$ $\mathbf{O}$ $\mathbf{Z}$  | n p g  <br>  $\mathbf{v}$  e <br>     <br> j r b  |
| -mentutiontivom |  |
| a hen  <br>  sit  <br> run  fox <br>   bage <br>    | 3 <br> What is your name? <br> This is a big bus. <br> 1 Wike to ning. <br> 1 have a sister. |
|  |  |

## ARITHMETIC

| Std. | Nothing | Recognize Numbers |  | Subtract | Divide | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1-9 | 11-99 |  |  |  |
| I | 13.6 | 30.4 | 44.8 | 8.9 | 2.3 | 100 |
| II | 2.6 | 14.7 | 38.7 | 38.1 | 5.9 | 100 |
| III | 1.3 | 7.5 | 23.9 | 46.7 | 20.6 | 100 |
| IV | 0.7 | 3.5 | 13.7 | 37.1 | 45.0 | 100 |
| V | 0.5 | 0.6 | 8.0 | 31.2 | 59.7 | 100 |
| VI | 0.2 | 0.7 | 4.5 | 19.3 | 75.2 | 100 |
| VII | 0.0 | 0.7 | 2.9 | 12.0 | 84.5 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.0 | 0.3 | 1.5 | 7.0 | 91.1 | 100 |
| Total | 2.9 | 8.9 | 20.5 | 27.4 | 40.3 | 100 |

NOTE : Each cell shows the highest level of arithmetic achieved by a child. Thus a child who can do division, can also recognize numbers 1-9, 11-99 and do subtraction.


## TUITION

| Year | School | I | II | III | IV | V | VI | VII | VIII |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2009 | Govt | 5.3 | 5.3 | 5.8 | 8.9 | 6.4 | 7.6 | 9.7 | 6.3 |
|  | Pvt. | 17.5 | 23.6 | 35.9 | 29.3 | 33.7 | 38.0 | 37.0 | 24.2 |

NOTE : The ASER survey in 2007 and 2009 recorded information about tuition. In both years, the question asked was the following: "Does the child take any paid additional class currently?" Therefore, these numbers do not include any supplemental help in learning that children may have received from parents or siblings or from anyone else that did not require payment.


Learning Levels in government and private schools : Trends over time

Chart 8: \% Children in Std III who CAN AT LEAST READ Std I LEVEL TEXT. BY SCHOOL TYPE 2006 AND 2009


Chart 9: \% Children in Std V who CAN DO DIVISION. BY SCHOOL TYPE 2006 AND 2009


## EDUCATION : FATHERS AND CHILDREN

|  |  |  |  | Of these father |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fathers' <br> Education | \% <br> Fathers | \% Girls 6 to 14 out of school | \% Children (Std III-V) who can read level 1 (Std 1 Text) or more | \% Children (Std III-V) who can do subtraction or more | \% Children (Std III-V) who can read words or more in English | \% Children (Std IV-VIII) attending tuition |
| No Schooling | 11.0 | 2.0 | 64.2 | 73.7 | 81.4 | 8.2 |
| Std I-V | 20.6 | 2.4 | 78.3 | 81.5 | 85.6 | 8.8 |
| Std VI-VIII | 27.8 | 0.7 | 75.9 | 80.4 | 83.4 | 11.3 |
| Std IX-X | 25.7 | 0.3 | 72.7 | 79.3 | 86.7 | 14.2 |
| Above Std X | 14.9 | 0.4 | 73.3 | 76.9 | 79.9 | 16.5 |

NOTE : ASER 2009 recorded information about mothers' education. Similar analyses can be done with mothers and children.


## SCHOOL ENROLLMENT AND ATTENDANCE : TRENDS OVER TIME

| TAbLe 10: Total schools visited |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Type of school | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 |
| Std I-IV/V : Primary | Survey | 134 |  |
| Std I-VII/VIII : Primary + Upper Primary | not <br> done | 16 |  |
| Total schools |  | 150 |  |


| Table 12: Teacher attendance | 5200 | 2009 | 20520 | 2009 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Type of school | Std I-IV/V |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |
| \% Teachers attending (average) | Survey not done | 93.8 | Surveynot done | 88.8 |
| \% Schools with no teacher present |  | 0.8 |  | 0.0 |
| \% Schools with all teachers present |  | 78.7 |  | 50.0 |

TABLe 11: Children's Attendance 200520072009200520072009

| Type of school | Std I-IV/V |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| \% Enrolled children attending <br> (average) | Survey | 85.8 | Survey | 85.9 |
| \% Schools with less than 50\% <br> enrolled children attending <br> \% Schools with 75\% or more <br> enrolled children attending | not <br> done | 0.8 | not <br> done | 0.0 |

## School facilities : TRENDS OVER TIME

| Table 14: Facilities in school | 2005200 | 2009 | 005200 | 2009 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \% Schools with: | Std I-IV/V |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |
| No facility |  | 38.6 |  | 100 |
| N Facility but water not available |  | 13.4 |  | 0.0 |
| Available | Survey not done | 48.0 | Survey not done | 0.0 |
| No facility |  | 6.8 |  | 31.3 |
| \% Facility but toilet not usable |  | 35.3 |  | 37.5 |
| Usable |  | 57.9 |  | 31.3 |
| Midday meal served on day of visit |  | 93.9 |  | 93.8 |


| TABLE 16: GIRLS ToILETS 2009 | Std I-IV/V | Std I-VII/VIII |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| No of schools visited | 131 | 15 |
| \% Schols with no separate provision <br> for girls toilets | 56.5 | 100.0 |
| Of schools where there are separate girls toilets, | \% schools where: |  |
| Toilet locked | 9.2 | 0.0 |
| Toilet not usable | 3.8 | 0.0 |
| Usable | 30.5 | 0.0 |

Table 15: School improvement \& construction since April 2008

| School improvement \& Construction | Std I-IV/V |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. of schs | \% schools |  | No. of schs | \% schools |  |
|  |  | Yes | No |  | Yes | No |
| Whitewash | 129 | 27.1 | 72.9 | 16 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Construction of new classroom | 130 | 12.3 | 87.7 | 16 | 12.5 | 87.5 |
| Construction of boundary wall | 128 | 17.2 | 82.8 | 16 | 12.5 | 87.5 |

ASER survey was carried out in Oct-Nov 2009. One govt school with primary grades was visited in each sampled village. If there was more than one govt school in a village, then the school with the highest enrollment was visited. Hence the schools visited in the ASER survey do not represent a random sample of schools of the district. The school visits were generally done either on a Saturday or a Monday.

| School Grants |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| New | Rs 2 lacs per <br> classrooms <br> additional room |
| Maintenance <br> grant | Rs. 5000 pa upto 3 <br> classrooms. Upto <br> Rs 10000 pa for <br> more than 3 <br> classrooms |
| Development |  |
| grant | Rs. 5000 pa for <br> primary schs \& Rs <br> 7000 pa for upper <br> primary schs |
| TLM grant | Rs. 500 pa per <br> teacher |

## School Grants

| Table 17: <br> \% Primary <br> SCHOOLS RECEIVING <br> DIFFERENT GRANTS | April 2008-March 2009 |  |  |  | April 2009-October |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Std I-IV/V |  |  |  | Std I-IV/V |  |  |  |
|  | No. of schs | Yes | No | Don't know | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No. of } \\ & \text { schs } \end{aligned}$ | Yes | No | Don't know |
| New classroom | 117 | 11.1 | 85.5 | 3.4 | 102 | 6.9 | 81.4 | 11 |
| Maintenance | 119 | 82.4 | 13.5 | 4.2 | 98 | 59.2 | 30.6 | 10.2 |
| Development gr | 104 | 67.3 | 27.9 | 4.8 | 92 | 41.3 | 47.8 | 10.9 |
| Teacher grant (TLM grant) | 118 | 75.4 | 22.9 | 1.7 | 97 | 58.8 | 33.0 | 8.3 |
| Other grants | 74 | 25.7 | 71.6 | 2.7 | 63 | 19.1 | 74.6 | 6.4 |

NOTE: No grant information was available for 4 schools out of 134 primary schools that were visited. This could be because the head teacher was not present, register was not available or the surveyors could not obtain the information. Therefore, the above table is based on schools for which information was available for at least one indicator.

| TABLE 18: <br> \% UPPER PRIMARY SCHOOLS RECEIVING DIFFERENT GRANTS |
| :---: |
| New classroom |
| Maintenance grant |
| Development grant |
| Teacher grant (TLM grant) |
| Other grants |

April 2008-March 2009 April 2009-October 2009 Std I-VII/VIII Std I-VII/VIII

| No. of <br> schs | Yes | No | Don't <br> know | No. of <br> schs | Yes | No | Don't <br> know |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 14 | 7.1 | 92.9 | 0.0 | 16 | 0.0 | 87.5 | 12.5 |
| 15 | 93.3 | 6.7 | 0.0 | 15 | 13.3 | 80.0 | 6.7 |
| 12 | 8.3 | 91.7 | 0.0 | 13 | 0.0 | 92.3 | 7.7 |
| 14 | 92.9 | 7.1 | 0.0 | 15 | 20.0 | 73.3 | 6.7 |
|  |  |  |  | 1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |

NOTE : No grant information was available for 1 schools out of 16 upper primary schools that were visited. This could be because the head teacher was not present, register was not available or the surveyors could not obtain the information. Therefore, the above table is based on schools for which information was available for at least one indicator.

Performance of districts

| Table 19: | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { ANGANWADI } \\ \text { OR } \\ \text { BALWADI } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Out of SCHOOL | Private <br> SCHOOL | TUITION | Mothers' READING | Std I-II : Learning levels |  |  | Std III-V : Learning levels |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Districts | \% Children (Age 3-4) in anganwadi or pre-school | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) <br> out of school | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) in private school | \% Children (Std IV-VIII) attending tuition classes | \% Mothers <br> (Age: 17-55) who CAN READ | \% Children <br> (Std I-II) who CAN READ letters, words or more | \% Children (Std I-II) who CAN RECOGNIZE NUMBERS 1 to 9 or more | \% Children <br> (Std I-II) <br> who CAN <br> READ <br> LETTERS or more in ENGLISH | \% Children <br> (Std III-V) who <br> CAN READ Level 1 (Std 1 Text) or more | \% Children (Std III-V) who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more | \% Children (Std III-V) who CAN READ sentences in ENGLISH |
| Aizawl* |  | 0.5 | 24.1 | 16.0 | 93.1 | 96.1 | 96.6 | 91.9 | 65.9 | 75.7 | 23.7 |
| Champhai | 97.8 | 0.3 | 21.9 | 6.6 | 93.9 | 95.0 | 96.5 | 91.4 | 90.0 | 86.6 | 60.5 |
| Kolasib | 79.4 | 4.4 | 25.6 | 14.1 | 87.0 | 97.9 | 97.9 | 95.8 | 89.6 | 89.5 | 71.0 |
| Lawngtlai | 89.9 | 0.4 | 6.1 | 11.5 | 73.8 | 80.0 | 79.7 | 81.6 | 60.7 | 64.0 | 37.3 |
| Lunglei | 100.0 | 2.9 | 14.8 | 8.7 | 84.7 | 91.4 | 87.8 | 85.1 | 71.8 | 68.3 | 45.0 |
| Mamit* |  | 1.7 | 23.9 | 15.0 | 82.0 | 87.7 | 91.6 | 79.9 | 88.0 | 92.5 | 51.0 |
| Saiha | 58.0 | 0.6 | 8.9 | 9.1 | 96.2 | 99.0 | 99.3 | 93.7 | 63.4 | 96.6 | 23.9 |
| Serchhip | 100.0 | 1.6 | 35.3 | 17.7 | 95.1 | 98.0 | 99.5 | 94.9 | 95.4 | 98.8 | 64.7 |
| Total | 88.8 | 1.3 | 17.9 | 11.8 | 87.4 | 91.3 | 91.7 | 87.8 | 73.5 | 79.3 | 42.2 |

*Blank cells indicate insufficient data.


## SCHOOL ENROLLMENT AND OUT OF SCHOOL CHILDREN

| TAble 1: \% Children in different types of schools 2009 |  |  |  | \% Out of school |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in School |  |
| Age: 6-14 ALL | 62.3 | 35.3 | 0.1 | 2.4 | 100 |
| Age: 7-16 ALL | 61.1 | 35.0 | 0.1 | 3.9 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 66.9 | 31.7 | 0.1 | 1.3 | 100 |
| AGE: 7-10 BOYS | 66.5 | 32.0 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 100 |
| AgE: 7-10 GIRLS | 67.1 | 31.8 | 0.0 | 1.2 | 100 |
| AgE: 11-14 ALL | 58.3 | 37.9 | 0.1 | 3.8 | 100 |
| AgE: 11-14 BOYS | 56.0 | 40.2 | 0.1 | 3.7 | 100 |
| AgE: 11-14 GIRLS | 60.4 | 35.9 | 0.1 | 3.6 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 ALL | 49.9 | 37.2 | 0.0 | 13.0 | 100 |
| AgE: 15-16 BOYS | 47.5 | 38.4 | 0.0 | 14.1 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 GIRLS | 53.1 | 36.1 | 0.0 | 10.8 | 100 |


note : 'отнек' includes chidren going to madarssa and EGS.
'кот in school' = dropped out + never enrolled.


| Std. | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 9.1 | 37.2 | 29.3 | 11.7 | 6.4 |  |  |  | 6.3 |  |  |  | 100 |
| II | 0.7 | 6.7 | 30.1 | 28.2 | 15.7 | 9.2 | 3.6 |  |  | 5.9 |  |  | 100 |
| III |  | . 8 | 5.1 | 35.8 | 21.8 | 15.5 | 9.1 | 6.2 |  |  | 4.7 |  | 100 |
| IV |  | 1.5 |  | 8.4 | 31.1 | 23.9 | 10.2 | 13.0 | 7.0 |  | 4.9 |  | 100 |
| V |  | 2. |  |  | 3.7 | 36.7 | 16.9 | 20.1 | 10.1 | 6.6 | 4. | . 0 | 100 |
| VI |  |  | 2.1 |  |  | 9.2 | 22.8 | 32.3 | 15.3 | 12.8 | 5. | . 6 | 100 |
| VII |  |  |  | . 8 |  |  |  | 29.4 | 24.1 | 25.7 | 9.4 | 4.7 | 100 |
| VIII |  |  |  | 4.7 |  |  |  |  | 25.7 | 35.5 | 21.9 | 12.2 | 100 |

How to read the table: In Std III, $73.1 \%(35.8+21.8+15.5)$ children are in age group 8 to 10 .

## Young CHILDREN IN PRE-SCHOOL AND SCHOOL

|  |  |  |  | In Scho |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | anganwadi | UKG | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | io त |  |
| Age 3 | 15.8 | 17.5 |  |  |  | 66.7 | 100 |
| Age 4 | 13.4 | 64.3 |  |  |  | 22.3 | 100 |
| Age 5 | 5.3 | 21.3 | 39.9 | 25.4 | 0.0 | 8.1 | 100 |
| Age 6 | 0.4 | 10.1 | 48.3 | 37.2 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 100 |

Chart 3: Trends over time
\% Children age 3-4 not attending pre-school (ICDS or other) 2006-2009


Of the villages visited, Anganwadi/Pre-School presence has been recorded in 76.5\% villages.

## Reading in own language

Table 4: Class-wise \% children who CAN READ (All Schools) 2009

| STD. | Nothing | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (STD 1 Text) | Level 2 <br> (Std 2 Text) | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 6.1 | 54.5 | 30.9 | 6.6 | 1.9 | 100 |
| II | 1.1 | 27.4 | 47.0 | 20.0 | 4.5 | 100 |
| III | 0.1 | 11.3 | 38.6 | 35.6 | 14.5 | 100 |
| IV | 0.3 | 4.5 | 25.2 | 38.4 | 31.6 | 100 |
| V | 0.0 | 1.4 | 9.2 | 28.7 | 60.6 | 100 |
| VI | 0.0 | 1.4 | 4.0 | 18.7 | 75.9 | 100 |
| VII | 0.0 | 0.3 | 3.2 | 14.0 | 82.4 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.0 | 0.2 | 2.8 | 6.6 | 90.4 | 100 |
| TOTAL | 1.0 | 13.7 | 22.7 | 22.9 | 39.7 | 100 |

NOTE : Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. Thus a child who can read Std II level text can read letters, words, and Std 1 level text.


Chart 4: Trends over time
\% Children who CANNOT EVEN IDENTIFY LETTERS (IN GOVt Schools in Std I - IV) 2006-2009


CHART 5: TRENDS OVER TIME
\% Children who CAN READ Std Il level text (in govt schools in Std IV - VII) 2006-2009


## Reading and comprehension in english

## TABLE 5: CLASS-WISE \% CHILDREN WHO CAN READ

ENGLISH (All Schools) 2009

Cannot Can readCan readCan read Can read Total Std. | read | capital | small | simple | easy |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| capital | letters | letters | words | sentences | letters

| I | 6.5 | 41.1 | 31.7 | 18.1 | 2.8 | 100 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| II | 2.0 | 17.6 | 34.3 | 36.6 | 9.5 | 100 |
| III | 1.2 | 7.9 | 19.0 | 47.4 | 24.5 | 100 |
| IV | 0.9 | 3.1 | 11.1 | 41.1 | 43.8 | 100 |
| V | 0.5 | 1.1 | 4.6 | 25.7 | 68.0 | 100 |
| VI | 0.4 | 0.5 | 1.6 | 17.6 | 80.0 | 100 |
| VII | 0.7 | 0.4 | 1.5 | 12.4 | 85.0 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 7.2 | 91.9 | 100 |
| TOTAL | 1.6 | 9.8 | 14.6 | 28.3 | 45.8 | 100 |


| Std. | Of those who can read words, \% who can tell meaning of the words | Of those who can read sentences, \% who can tell meaning of the sentences |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 44.8 | 75.9 |
| II | 59.6 | 63.1 |
| III | 74.8 | 70.5 |
| IV | 75.2 | 81.3 |
| V | 79.4 | 91.0 |
| VI | 88.6 | 93.3 |
| VII | 90.4 | 97.2 |
| VIII | 93.4 | 98.1 |
| Total | 71.9 | 89.6 |


| English Tool |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
| $\begin{array}{llll} \mathbf{C} & \mathrm{K} & \mathrm{~S} \\ & \mathrm{Q} & & \mathrm{~F} \\ \mathrm{w} & \mathrm{O} & \mathbf{Z} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{llll} \mathbf{n} & \mathbf{p} & \mathbf{g} \\ & \mathbf{v} & & \mathbf{e} \\ & & & \\ \mathbf{j} & & \mathbf{r} & \mathbf{b} \end{array}$ |
|  | --m****- |
| $\begin{array}{\|lll}  & \text { hen } & \\ & \text { old } \\ \text { run } & & \\ & \text { fox } & \\ & \text { bagy } & \end{array}$ | 4 <br> What is your name? <br> This is a big bus. <br> 1 Hike to nimg. <br> 1 have asister: |
|  |  |

## ARITHMETIC

|  |  | Recogni | Numbers | Subtract |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| STD. | Nothing | 1-9 | 11-99 | Subtract | Divide | Total |
| 1 | 3.3 | 42.0 | 46.9 | 6.4 | 1.4 | 100 |
| II | 0.4 | 16.2 | 57.1 | 22.0 | 4.4 | 100 |
| III | 0.2 | 5.7 | 36.6 | 46.1 | 11.4 | 100 |
| IV | 0.4 | 4.0 | 21.8 | 44.4 | 29.4 | 100 |
| V | 0.0 | 0.5 | 8.8 | 28.7 | 62.0 | 100 |
| VI | 0.1 | 2.6 | 4.7 | 23.0 | 69.6 | 100 |
| VII | 0.0 | 0.3 | 2.9 | 17.0 | 79.8 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 9.3 | 90.2 | 100 |
| Total | 0.6 | 9.7 | 25.1 | 26.7 | 37.9 | 100 |

NOTE: Each cell shows the highest level of arithmetic achieved by a child. Thus a child who can do division, can also recognize numbers 1-9, 11-99 and do subtraction.

Chart 6: Trends over time
\% Children who CANNOT EVEN RECOGNIZE NUMBERS UPTO 9 (IN GOVt SCHOOLS IN Std I - IV) 2007-2009



Chart 7: Trends over time
\% Children who CAN DO DIVISION (in govt schools in Std IV - VII) 2007-2009


## TUITION

Table 8: Class-wise \% children ATTENDING TUITION CLASSES. BY SCHOOL TYPE 2007 AND 2009

| Year | School | I | II | III | IV | V | VI | VII | VIII |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | Govt | 15.4 | 14.6 | 19.1 | 19.6 | 27.1 | 12.7 | 16.3 | 23.7 |
|  | PVT. | 28.5 | 34.3 | 40.2 | 40.1 | 38.5 | 49.9 | 48.5 | 57.7 |
| 2009 | Govt | 13.0 | 10.7 | 9.5 | 8.6 | 14.6 | 12.9 | 15.2 | 22.5 |
|  | Pvt. | 35.9 | 36.8 | 41.3 | 39.5 | 40.3 | 45.5 | 51.5 | 54.3 |

NOTE : The ASER survey in 2007 and 2009 recorded information about tuition. In both years, the question asked was the following: "Does the child take any paid additional class currently?" Therefore, these numbers do not include any supplemental help in learning that children may have received from parents or siblings or from anyone else that did not require payment.


## LEARNING LEVELS IN GOVERNMENT AND PRIVATE SCHOOLS : TRENDS OVER TIME

Chart 8: \% Children in Std III who CAN AT LEAST READ Std I LEVEL TEXT. BY SCHOOL TYPE 2006-2009


Chart 9: \% Children in Std V who CAN DO DIVISION. BY SCHOOL TYPE 2006-2009


Learning levels by gender : Trends over time

Chart 10: \% Boys and girls in Std III who CAN READ AT LEAST StD I LEVEL TEXT 2007-2009


Chart 11: \% Boys and girls in Std V who CAN DO DIVISION 2007-2009


## EDUCATION : FATHERS AND CHILDREN

| Table 9: Fathers and Children 2009 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |



NOTE : ASER 2009 recorded information about mothers' education. Similar analyses can be done with mothers and children.

## SCHOOL ENROLLMENT AND ATTENDANCE : TRENDS OVER TIME

| Type of school | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std I-IV/V : Primary | 28 | 213 | 218 |
| Std I-VII/VIII : Primary + Upper Primary | 3 | 23 | 25 |
| Total schools | 31 | 236 | 243 |
| Table 12: Teacher attendance 20052007 | 2009 | 20052007 | 2009 |
| Type of school Std I-IV/V | Std I-IV/V | Std I-VII/VIII |  |
| \% Teachers attending (average) 21.591 .6 | 89.4 | 0.093 .0 | 79.6 |
| \% Schools with no teacher present 69.60 .5 | 0.0 | $100 \quad 0.0$ | 0.0 |
| \% Schools with all teachers present 8.764 .7 | 56.8 | 0.045 .5 | 52.0 |


| TABLE 11: CHILDREN'S ATtENDANCE | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Type of school <br> \% Enrolled children attending <br> (average) | 91.5 | 85.0 | 84.1 |  | 79.9 | 87.1 |
| \% Schools with less than 50\% <br> enrolled children attending | 5.6 | 3.0 | 1.9 |  | 13.6 | 0.0 |
| \% Schools with 75\% or more <br> enrolled children attending | 88.9 | 83.5 | 78.6 |  | 81.8 | 88.0 |


| TABLE 13: MuLTIGRADE CLASSES | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| \% Of schools in which: | Std I-IV/V |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |  |
| Std II class sitting with <br> another class | 3.4 | 16.9 |  | 4.8 | 12.0 |  |
| Std IV class sitting with <br> another class | 2.9 | 13.9 |  | 4.6 | 12.5 |  |

## SCHOOL FACILITIES : TRENDS OVER TIME

| Table 14: Facilities in school |  | 200520072009 |  |  | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \% Schools with: |  | Std I-IV/V |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \pm \\ & \pm \\ & \vdots \end{aligned}$ | No facility | 85.7 | 65.0 | 64.4 | 66.7 | 47.4 | 32.0 |
|  | Facility but water not available | 0.0 | 4.4 | 5.9 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | Available | 14.3 | 30.6 | 29.7 | 0.0 | 52.6 | 68.0 |
|  | No facility | 67.9 | 15.9 | 8.7 | 66.7 | 13.6 | 0.0 |
|  | Facility but toilet not usable | 3.6 | 3.7 | 19.7 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 20.8 |
|  | Usable | 28.6 | 80.4 | 71.6 | 0.0 | 86.4 | 79.2 |
| Midday meal served on day of visit |  | 48.2 | 93.8 | 34.1 | 0.0 | 100 | 33.3 |


| TABLE 16: GIRLS ToILETS 2009 | Std I-IV/V | Std I-VII/VIII |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| No of schools visited | 198 | 24 |
| \% Schools with no separate provision <br> for girls toilets | 54.5 | 20.8 |
| Of schools where there are separate girls toilets, \% schools where: |  |  |
| Toilet locked | 10.6 | 16.7 |
| Toilet not usable | 5.1 | 4.2 |
| Usable | 29.8 | 58.3 |

Table 15: School improvement \& construction since April 2008

|  <br> Construction | Std I-IV/V |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. of <br> schs | \% schools |  | No. of | \% schools |  |
| schs | Yes | No |  |  |  |  |
| Whitewash | 208 | 42.8 | 57.2 | 23 | 78.3 | 21.7 |
| Construction of new <br> classroom <br> Construction of boundary <br> wall | 215 | 66.5 | 33.5 | 24 | 91.7 | 8.3 |
|  | 214 | 42.5 | 57.5 | 23 | 60.9 | 39.1 |

ASER survey was carried out in Oct-Nov 2009. One govt school with primary grades was visited in each sampled village. If there was more than one govt school in a village, then the school with the highest enrollment was visited. Hence the schools visited in the ASER survey do not represent a random sample of schools of the district. The school visits were generally done either on a Saturday or a Monday.

| School Grants |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| classrooms | Rs 2 lacs per <br> additional room |
| Maintenance | Rs. 5000 pa upto 3 <br> grant |
| classrooms. Upto |  |
| Rs 10000 pa for |  |
| more than 3 |  |
| classrooms |  |$|$

## School Grants

| TABLE 17: <br> \% Primary <br> SCHOOLS RECEIVING DIFFERENT GRANTS | April 2008-March 2009 |  |  |  | April 2009-October 2009 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Std I-IV/V |  |  |  | Std I-IV/V |  |  |  |
|  | No. of schs | Yes | No | Don't know | No. of schs | Yes | No | Don't know |
| New classroom | 177 | 70.1 | 29.9 | 0.0 | 190 | 40.0 | 55.8 | 4.2 |
| Maintenance grant | 187 | 97.3 | 2.7 | 0.0 | 191 | 76.4 | 20.9 | 2.6 |
| Development grant | 180 | 88.9 | 11.1 | 0.0 | 180 | 73.9 | 23.3 | 2.8 |
| Teacher grant (TLM grant) | 183 | 98.4 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 183 | 82.5 | 16.9 | 0.6 |
| Other grants | 47 | 48.9 | 51.1 | 0.0 | 35 | 22.9 | 65.7 | 11.4 |

[^22]| TABLE 18: |
| :--- |
| \% UPPER PRIMARY |
| SCHOOLS RECEIVING |
| DIFFERENT GRANTS |
| New classroom |
| Maintenance grant |
| Development grant |
| Teacher grant |
| (TLM grant) |
| Other grants |

April 2008-March 2009 April 2009-October 2009 Std I-VII/VIII Std I-VII/VIII

| No. of <br> schs | Yes | No |  | Don't <br> know | No. of <br> schs | Yes | No |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 24 | 79.2 | 20.8 | 0.0 | 20 | 65.0 | 30.0 | Don't <br> know |
| 23 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 21 | 71.4 | 23.8 | 4.8 |
| 21 | 85.7 | 14.3 | 0.0 | 18 | 55.6 | 38.9 | 5.6 |
| 22 | 95.5 | 4.6 | 0.0 | 20 | 80.0 | 20.0 | 0.0 |
| 7 | 42.9 | 57.1 | 0.0 | 4 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 |

NOTE: No grant information was available for 1 schools out of 25 upper primary schools that were visited. This could be because the head teacher was not present, register was not available or the surveyors could not obtain the information. Therefore, the above table is based on schools for which information was available for at least one indicator.

Performance of districts

| Table 19: | $\begin{gathered} \text { ANGANWADI } \\ \text { OR } \\ \text { BALWADI } \end{gathered}$ | OUT OF SCHOOL | Private SCHOOL | TUITION | Mothers' Reading | Std I-II : LeARNing |  | LeVELS | Std III-V : Learning |  | EVELS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Districts | \% Children (Age 3-4) in anganwadi or pre-school | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) <br> out <br> of school | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) in private school | \% Children (Std IV-VIII) attending tuition classes | \% Mothers (Age: 17-55) who CAN READ | \% Children <br> (Std I-II) who <br> CAN READ letters, words or more | \% Children <br> (Std I-II) <br> who CAN <br> RECOGNIZE <br> NUMBERS <br> 1 to 9 <br> or more | \% Children <br> (Std I-II) <br> who CAN <br> READ <br> LETTERS or more in ENGLISH | \% Children <br> (Std III-V) who CAN READ Level 1 (Std 1 Text) or more | \% Children (Std III-V) who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more | \% Children (Std III-V) who CAN READ sentences in ENGLISH |
| Dimapur* |  | 0.2 | 26.8 | 27.7 | 96.3 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 99.1 | 80.8 | 89.2 | 45.5 |
| Kiphire | 28.4 | 2.6 | 48.5 | 0.8 | 94.8 | 99.4 | 99.7 | 99.1 | 66.9 | 76.8 | 43.1 |
| Kohima | 50.7 | 2.6 | 74.7 | 33.4 | 63.0 | 98.8 | 99.4 | 98.8 | 95.6 | 95.6 | 84.0 |
| Longleng | 65.9 | 6.1 | 53.1 | 33.4 | 65.7 | 94.6 | 95.5 | 95.1 | 49.1 | 59.4 | 22.1 |
| Mokokchung | 42.1 | 1.9 | 29.5 | 31.9 | 92.7 | 98.8 | 99.2 | 98.8 | 81.1 | 82.9 | 50.4 |
| Mon | 37.9 | 5.4 | 48.0 | 32.6 | 59.6 | 96.8 | 96.8 | 95.9 | 66.1 | 62.4 | 41.6 |
| Peren* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Phek | 78.4 | 1.7 | 33.0 | 11.4 | 79.8 | 87.0 | 96.7 | 92.8 | 60.6 | 78.4 | 54.8 |
| Tuensang | 93.1 | 2.4 | 23.0 | 6.2 | 40.6 | 96.9 | 99.3 | 81.2 | 49.3 | 36.2 | 9.0 |
| Wokha | 26.4 | 0.3 | 11.1 | 11.8 | 77.9 | 95.5 | 97.3 | 96.4 | 45.0 | 54.3 | 24.1 |
| Zunheboto | 97.2 | 2.5 | 18.2 | 33.3 | 58.4 | 99.2 | 99.2 | 99.3 | 62.7 | 61.9 | 35.7 |
| Total | 57.5 | 2.4 | 35.3 | 25.2 | 75.6 | 96.5 | 98.2 | 95.9 | 69.0 | 73.1 | 44.3 |

*Blank cells indicate insufficient data.
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## School enrollment and out of school children

| Table 1: \% Children in different types of sChools 2009 |  |  |  | \% Out of school |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in School |  |
| Age: 6-14 ALL | 89.1 | 4.4 | 0.3 | 6.3 | 100 |
| Age: 7-16 ALL | 85.6 | 4.3 | 0.3 | 9.9 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 90.9 | 4.0 | 0.5 | 4.6 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 BOYS | 91.0 | 4.3 | 0.4 | 4.3 | 100 |
| AgE: 7-10 GIRLS | 91.2 | 3.6 | 0.4 | 4.9 | 100 |
| AgE: 11-14 ALL | 86.8 | 4.1 | 0.1 | 9.0 | 100 |
| AgE: 11-14 BOYS | 88.0 | 3.8 | 0.1 | 8.2 | 100 |
| AGE: 11-14 GIRLS | 85.4 | 4.6 | 0.1 | 9.9 | 100 |
| AgE: 15-16 ALL | 68.5 | 5.2 | 0.1 | 26.2 | 100 |
| AgE: 15-16 BOYS | 69.9 | 5.0 | 0.2 | 24.9 | 100 |
| AgE: 15-16 GIRLS | 66.8 | 5.8 | 0.1 | 27.3 | 100 |


note : 'отнеr' includes chidren going to madarssa and EGS. ' от in school' = dropped out + never enrolled.

## Chart 2: Trends over time

\% Children age 6-14 enrolled in pvt. school 2006-2009


How to read the table: In Std III, $79.6 \%(64.2+11.6+3.8)$ children are in age group 8 to 10 .

## Young CHILDREN IN PRE-SCHOOL AND SCHOOL

|  |  |  | In School |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\square}{0}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | anganwadi | UKG | Govt. | Pvt. | Other |  |  |
| Age 3 | 75.9 | 2.9 |  |  |  | 21.1 | 100 |
| Age 4 | 79.4 | 6.3 |  |  |  | 14.3 | 100 |
| Age 5 | 27.4 | 2.9 | 57.6 | 4.6 | 0.4 | 7.2 | 100 |
| Age 6 | 7.0 | 1.7 | 80.1 | 6.6 | 0.3 | 4.4 | 100 |

Chart 3: Trends over time
\% Children age 3-4 not attending pre-school (ICDS or other) 2006-2009


Of the villages visited, Anganwadi/Pre-School presence has been recorded in 88.5\% villages.

## Reading in own language

Table 4: CLASS-wise \% children who CAN READ (All Schools) 2009

| StD. | Nothing | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (STD 1 Text) | Level 2 <br> (StD 2 Text) | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 15.7 | 52.6 | 18.2 | 5.0 | 8.5 | 100 |
| II | 5.7 | 30.2 | 34.4 | 14.2 | 15.5 | 100 |
| III | 2.9 | 15.9 | 28.6 | 24.0 | 28.5 | 100 |
| IV | 2.0 | 7.2 | 19.2 | 26.4 | 45.3 | 100 |
| V | 1.4 | 4.2 | 11.9 | 26.1 | 56.4 | 100 |
| VI | 1.4 | 3.5 | 6.6 | 19.7 | 68.7 | 100 |
| VII | 0.6 | 3.8 | 5.2 | 16.8 | 73.6 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.8 | 2.1 | 4.1 | 12.7 | 80.3 | 100 |
| TOTAL | 4.2 | 16.3 | 16.6 | 18.1 | 44.9 | 100 |

NOTE : Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. Thus a child who can read Std II level text can read letters, words, and Std 1 level text.

Chart 4: Trends over time
\% Children who CANNOT EVEN IDENTIFY LETTERS
(IN GOVt SCHOOLS IN Std I - IV) 2006-2009


Reading Tool
घア®Q बFI日
9 P 8 ( $618-\mathrm{e}$ )


Chart 5: Trends over time
\% Children who CAN READ Std II level text (in govt schools in Std IV - VII) 2006-2009


## Reading and comprehension in english

## TABLE 5: CLASS-WISE \% CHILDREN WHO CAN READ ENGLISH (All Schools) 2009

Cannot Can readCan readCan read Can read Total
Std. read capital small simple easy
capital letters letters words sentences
letters

| I | 65.5 | 19.2 | 8.2 | 4.5 | 2.7 | 100 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| II | 44.4 | 25.9 | 12.7 | 11.7 | 5.3 | 100 |
| III | 24.4 | 25.7 | 21.8 | 19.0 | 9.0 | 100 |
| IV | 16.5 | 20.5 | 16.5 | 30.1 | 16.3 | 100 |
| V | 16.0 | 14.3 | 14.2 | 30.2 | 25.3 | 100 |
| VI | 12.2 | 10.6 | 10.2 | 28.9 | 38.1 | 100 |
| VII | 11.7 | 8.7 | 9.1 | 26.0 | 44.6 | 100 |
| VIII | 12.0 | 7.0 | 6.4 | 20.2 | 54.5 | 100 |
| TOTAL | 25.3 | 16.6 | 12.6 | 21.6 | 23.9 | 100 |


| Std. | Of those who can read words, \% who can tell meaning of the words | Of those who can read sentences, \% who can tell meaning of the sentences |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 60.2 | 60.6 |
| II | 62.7 | 72.0 |
| III | 66.0 | 72.0 |
| IV | 62.0 | 74.5 |
| V | 72.2 | 70.2 |
| VI | 71.1 | 77.0 |
| VII | 77.4 | 77.2 |
| VIII | 69.6 | 81.5 |
| Total | 69.3 | 76.2 |


| English Tool |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\qquad$ |  |
| B H $\mathbf{R}$  <br>  $\mathbf{L}$  $\mathbf{V}$ <br> $\mathbf{M}$ $\mathbf{P}$ $\mathbf{F}$  |  |
|  |  |
| $\underbrace{9}$ rat  hot <br>  big  <br> cow  man | $a$ <br> What is the time? <br> This is a rod ball. <br> 1 Bike to play, <br> I have a fiather: |
|  |  |

## ARItHMetic

|  |  | Recogni | Numbers |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std. | Nothing | 1-9 | 11-99 | Subtract | Divide | Total |
| 1 | 18.5 | 52.3 | 18.0 | 5.1 | 6.1 | 100 |
| II | 6.2 | 33.4 | 34.9 | 15.2 | 10.4 | 100 |
| III | 3.4 | 17.7 | 30.7 | 29.5 | 18.8 | 100 |
| IV | 2.3 | 9.8 | 22.1 | 32.3 | 33.6 | 100 |
| V | 1.1 | 5.6 | 16.4 | 32.8 | 44.1 | 100 |
| VI | 1.3 | 4.3 | 10.9 | 27.7 | 55.8 | 100 |
| VII | 0.9 | 3.8 | 10.8 | 22.0 | 62.5 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.7 | 2.3 | 5.5 | 19.2 | 72.3 | 100 |
| Total | 4.7 | 17.4 | 19.1 | 22.8 | 36.0 | 100 |

NOTE : Each cell shows the highest level of arithmetic achieved by a child. Thus a child who can do division, can also recognize numbers 1-9, 11-99 and do subtraction.


Chart 6: Trends over time
\% Children who CANNOT EVEN RECOGNIZE NUMBERS UPTO 9 (IN GOVT SCHOOLS IN Std I - IV) 2007-2009

எฺฺด घவ1ヌI: $e$


Chart 7: Trends over time
\% Children who CAN DO DIVISION (in govt schools in Std IV - VII) 2007-2009


## TUITION

| Year | School | 1 | II | III | IV | V | VI | VII | VIII |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2007 | Govt | 32.9 | 45.5 | 43.7 | 50.3 | 50.8 | 51.5 | 51.0 | 52.1 |
|  | Pvt. | 57.0 | 60.8 | 40.1 | 52.6 | 62.3 | 42.3 | 55.3 | 36.8 |
| 2009 | Govt | 35.6 | 44.5 | 51.6 | 50.2 | 52.2 | 55.3 | 55.8 | 56.0 |
|  | Pvt. | 64.9 | 68.7 | 81.9 | 67.9 | 81.2 | 66.1 | 68.1 | 60.9 |

NOTE : The ASER survey in 2007 and 2009 recorded information about tuition. In both years, the question asked was the following: "Does the child take any paid additional class currently?" Therefore, these numbers do not include any supplemental help in learning that children may have received from parents or siblings or from anyone else that did not require payment.


Facilitated by PRATHAM

LEARNING LEVELS IN GOVERNMENT AND PRIVATE SCHOOLS : TRENDS OVER TIME

Chart 8: \% Children in Std III who CAN AT LEAST READ Std I LeVEL text. By school type 2006-2009


Chart 9: \% CHILDREN IN Std V who CAN DO DIVISION. BY SCHOOL TYPE 2006-2009


LEARNING LEVELS BY GENDER: TRENDS OVER TIME

Chart 10: \% Boys and girls in Std III who CAN READ AT LEAST Std I level text 2007-2009


CHART 11: \% Boys and girls in Std V who CAN DO DIVISION 2007-2009


EDUCATION : FATHERS AND CHILDREN

|  |  |  |  | Of these fathe |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fathers' Education | $\begin{gathered} \% \\ \text { Fathers } \end{gathered}$ |  | \% Children (Std III-V) who can read level 1 (Std 1 Text) or more | \% Children (Std III-V) who can do subtraction or more | \% Children (Std III-V) who can read words or more in English | \% Children (Std IV-VIII) attending tuition |
| No Schooling | 28.6 | 14.1 | 62.0 | 54.4 | 37.4 | 35.8 |
| Std I-V | 24.4 | 5.5 | 70.4 | 65.4 | 39.8 | 47.4 |
| Std VI-VIII | 14.6 | 3.4 | 75.7 | 72.4 | 44.8 | 58.1 |
| Std IX-X | 20.8 | 2.1 | 76.1 | 74.5 | 52.1 | 68.8 |
| Above Std X | 11.6 | 1.2 | 84.7 | 83.0 | 68.6 | 78.6 |

NOTE : ASER 2009 recorded information about mothers' education. Similar analyses can be done with mothers and children.


## SCHOOL ENROLLMENT AND ATTENDANCE : TRENDS OVER TIME

| TABLE 10: TOTAL SCHOOLS VISITED |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Type of school | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 |
| Std I-IV/V : Primary | 299 | 406 | 414 |
| Std I-VII/VIII : Primary + Upper Primary | 214 | 306 | 329 |
| Total schools | 513 | 712 | 743 |

TABLE 12: TEACHER ATTENDANCE 200520072009200520072009
Type of school

| $\%$ Teachers attending (average) | 78.6 | 91.1 | 92.2 | 69.0 | 87.2 | 90.2 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| \% Schools with no teacher present | 3.1 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 2.4 | 0.0 | 0.4 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |



Table 11: Children's ATtendance 200520072009200520072009

Type of school
\% Enrolled children attending (average)
\% Schools with less than 50\% enrolled children attending \% Schools with 75\% or more enrolled children attending

## Std I-IV/V <br> Std I-VII/VIII

Table 13: Multigrade classes
\% Of schools in which:
Std II class sitting with another class
Std IV class sitting with another class

200520072009200520072009
$\begin{array}{llllll}67.9 & 72.4 & 74.4 & 66.7 & 70.1 & 72.9\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llllll}15.8 & 12.9 & 7.9 & 17.5 & 13.2 & 9.2\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llllll}41.2 & 51.6 & 55.8 & 35.0 & 44.7 & 50.0\end{array}$

| 72.1 | 71.1 |  | 65.1 | 71.1 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 59.1 | 65.3 |  | 48.8 | 61.3 |

## SCHOOL FACILITIES : TRENDS OVER TIME

| Table 14: Facilities in school |  | 200520072009200520072009 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \% Schools with: |  | Std I-IV/V |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{ \pm}{ \pm} \\ & \stackrel{N}{N} \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | No facility | 13.4 | 9.3 | 9.8 | 10.3 | 5.9 | 6.8 |
|  | Facility but water not available | 19.4 | 9.3 | 11.1 | 19.6 | 11.4 | 7.5 |
|  | Available | 67.2 | 81.4 | 79.0 | 70.1 | 82.7 | 85.7 |
| $\stackrel{\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0}}{\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\circ}}$ | No facility | 56.5 | 23.0 | 24.1 | 39.7 | 14.7 | 15.2 |
|  | Facility but toilet not usable | 21.4 | 25.1 | 22.9 | 34.6 | 32.7 | 25.9 |
|  | Usable | 22.1 | 51.9 | 53.0 | 25.7 | 52.6 | 58.9 |
| Midday meal served on day |  | 66.1 | 97.0 | 91.4 | 70.8 | 97.3 | 92.8 |


| TABLE 16: GIRLS ToILETS 2009 | Std I-IV/V | Std I-VII/VIII |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No of schools visited | 227 | 198 |
| \% Schools with no separate provision <br> for girls toilets | 37.0 | 24.7 |
| Of schools where there are separate girls toilets, \% schools where: |  |  |
| Toilet locked | 12.8 | 10.1 |
| Toilet not usable | 14.5 | 17.2 |
| Usable | 35.7 | 48.0 |

## School Grants

| TABLE 17: <br> \% Primary <br> SCHOOLS RECEIVING <br> DIFFERENT GRANTS | April 2008-March 2009 |  |  |  | April 2009-October 2009 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Std I-IV/V |  |  |  | Std I-IV/V |  |  |  |
|  | No. of schs | Yes | No | Don't know | No. of schs | Yes | No | Don't know |
| New classroom | 349 | 35.8 | 52.4 | 11.8 | 310 | 19.7 | 63.2 | 17 |
| Maintenance grad | 304 | 55.3 | 27.0 | 17.8 | 272 | 39.3 | 39.3 | 21 |
| Development grant | 301 | 61.1 | 20.3 | 18.6 | 268 | 47.8 | 31.3 | 20. |
| Teacher grant (TLM grant) | 300 | 82.0 | 7.7 | 10.3 | 254 | 66.9 | 18.9 | 14 |
| Other grants | 144 | 36.1 | 38.9 | 25.0 | 126 | 32.5 | 39. | 27.8 |

[^23]| School improvement \& Construction | Std I-IV/V |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. of schs | \% schools |  | No. of schs | \% schools |  |
|  |  | Yes | No |  | Yes | No |
| Whitewash | 357 | 74.8 | 25.2 | 305 | 77.4 | 22.6 |
| Construction of new classroom | 363 | 36.9 | 63.1 | 297 | 49.8 | 50.2 |
| Construction of boundary wall | 359 | 18.7 | 81.3 | 298 | 24.5 | 75.5 |

ASER survey was carried out in Oct-Nov 2009. One govt school with primary grades was visited in each sampled village. If there was more than one govt school in a village, then the school with the highest enrollment was visited. Hence the schools visited in the ASER survey do not represent a random sample of schools of the district. The school visits were generally done either on a Saturday or a Monday.

## School Grants

New Rs 2 lacs per classrooms additional room

Rs. 5000 pa upto 3 classrooms. Upto Maintenance grant Rs 10000 pa for more than 3 classrooms

Rs. 5000 pa for Development primary schs \& Rs grant 7000 pa for upper primary schs

TLM grant
Rs. 500 pa per teacher

| TABLE 18: |
| :--- |
| \% UPPER PRIMARY |
| SCHOOLS RECEIVING |
| DIFFERENT GRANTS |$|$| New classroom |
| :--- |
| Maintenance grant |
| Development grant |
| Teacher grant <br> (TLM grant) |
| Other grants |

April 2008-March 2009 April 2009-October 2009

$$
\begin{array}{|l|l}
\hline \text { Std I-VII/VIII } \quad \text { Std I-VII/VIII }
\end{array}
$$

| No. of <br> schs | Yes | No | Don't <br> know | No. of <br> schs | Yes | No | Don't <br> know |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 279 | 50.2 | 38.7 | 11.1 | 245 | 25.7 | 62.0 | 12.2 |
| 239 | 65.3 | 20.9 | 13.8 | 214 | 46.7 | 38.3 | 15.0 |
| 228 | 73.7 | 13.2 | 13.2 | 208 | 57.7 | 28.4 | 13.9 |
| 236 | 85.2 | 5.9 | 8.9 | 213 | 69.5 | 20.2 | 10.3 |
| 119 | 48.7 | 37.0 | 14.3 | 102 | 26.5 | 53.9 | 19.6 |

PERFORMANCE OF DISTRICTS

| Table 19: | ANGANWADI OR BALWADI | Out of SCHOOL | Private SCHOOL | Tuition | Mothers' Reading | Std I-II : Learning levels |  |  | Std III-V : Learning levels |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Districts | \% Children <br> (Age 3-4) <br> in anganwadi or pre-school | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) <br> out <br> of <br> school | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) <br> in private school | \%Children <br> (Std <br> IV-VIII) attending tuition classes | \% Mothers (Age: 17-55) who CAN READ | \%Children <br> (Std I-II) who CAN READ letters, words or more | \%Children <br> (Std I-II) <br> who CAN <br> RECOGNIZE <br> NUMBERS <br> 1 to 9 <br> or more | \% Children <br> (Std I-II) <br> who CAN <br> READ LETTERS or more in ENGLISH | \% Children <br> (Std III-V) <br> who <br> CAN READ <br> Level 1 <br> (Std 1 Text) <br> or more | \% Children <br> (Std III-V) who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more | \% Children <br> (Std III-V) <br> who CAN <br> READ sentences in ENGLISH |
| Anugul | 89.0 | 6.9 | 3.7 | 55.2 | 70.7 | 93.0 | 93.0 | 49.6 | 70.9 | 67.0 | 16.2 |
| Balangir | 69.9 | 5.8 | 2.8 | 30.4 | 44.0 | 87.5 | 89.1 | 12.5 | 59.2 | 52.2 | 13.6 |
| Baleshwar | 78.2 | 2.3 | 3.1 | 84.6 | 84.8 | 97.2 | 92.3 | 75.9 | 71.5 | 70.8 | 29.3 |
| Bargarh | 98.1 | 3.9 | 5.6 | 37.4 | 70.9 | 98.9 | 97.8 | 40.5 | 88.5 | 82.3 | 16.0 |
| Boudh* |  | 1.8 | 0.7 | 31.5 | 57.0 |  |  |  | 76.5 | 74.5 | 8. |
| Bhadrak | 90.9 | 2.0 | 2.9 | 73.7 | 76.7 | 95.7 | 95.7 | 66.4 | 76.1 | 78.0 | 20.5 |
| Cuttack | 91.9 | 1.7 | 6.7 | 74.3 | 80.8 | 95.8 | 96.3 | 71.0 | 75.7 | 73.5 | 37.7 |
| Deogarh* |  | 13.2 | 1.7 | 28.5 | 59.6 | 87.3 | 83.1 | 41.6 | 66.1 | 52.9 | 4.7 |
| Dhenkanal | 98.3 | 2.5 | 2.4 | 53.6 | 55.5 | 99.6 | 99.2 | 46.9 | 72.2 | 64.1 | 21.3 |
| Gajapati | 90.2 | 7.7 | 5.1 | 48.2 | 46.6 | 79.1 | 75.0 | 34.5 | 67.2 | 62.9 | 9.3 |
| Ganjam | 77.8 | 5.1 | 3.1 | 62.9 | 40.4 | 85.2 | 80.3 | 51.1 | 57.7 | 46.2 | 9.0 |
| Jagatsinghapur | 62.0 | 5.8 | 14.6 | 81.3 | 83.2 | 90.3 | 86.9 | 38.6 | 79.2 | 70.9 | 17.3 |
| Jajapur | 77.4 | 3.5 | 8.3 | 71.3 | 76.7 | 88.5 | 86.7 | 63.3 | 68.6 | 61.8 | 26.5 |
| Jharsuguda | 100.0 | 5.2 | 4.6 | 30.8 | 63.1 | 76.8 | 75.0 | 28.7 | 60.3 | 51.8 | 6.4 |
| Kalahandi* |  | 4.5 | 7.3 | 44.7 | 70.7 | 89.7 | 85.9 | 11.8 | 81.1 | 80.2 | 4.3 |
| Kandhamal | 96.4 | 10.2 | 3.0 | 28.2 | 25.9 | 93.4 | 95.2 | 3.5 | 59.9 | 55.3 | 2.9 |
| Kendrapara | 77.2 | 1.5 | 3.5 | 68.4 | 78.9 | 90.6 | 89.0 | 53.9 | 84.9 | 78.9 | 37.0 |
| Kendujhar | 85.1 | 6.3 | 5.1 | 50.0 | 62.0 | 73.2 | 77.9 | 24.4 | 55.3 | 51.4 | 14.2 |
| Khordha | 92.9 | 3.2 | 10.4 | 79.1 | 83.1 | 94.6 | 94.3 | 66.9 | 91.0 | 85.7 | 29.8 |
| Koraput* | 73.6 | 17.5 | 1.8 | 25.1 | 22.5 | 95.1 | 96.0 |  | 71.1 | 72.3 | 9.6 |
| Malkangiri | 61.7 | 23.4 | 1.1 | 16.9 | 18.5 | 70.2 | 67.2 | 15.6 | 51.5 | 41.7 | 7.1 |
| Mayurbhanj | 89.4 | 9.4 | 2.5 | 44.8 | 67.2 | 85.0 | 79.4 | 32.6 | 65.0 | 56.1 | 14.4 |
| Nabarangapur* | 61.0 | 21.6 | 1.5 | 11.4 | 24.7 | 83.0 | 74.9 |  | 42.7 | 30.9 | 7.4 |
| Nayagarh* |  | 5.0 | 5.8 | 56.1 | 71.6 | 97.5 | 98.8 | 42.9 | 88.8 | 86.8 | 4.6 |
| Nuapada | 93.4 | 4.8 | 2.7 | 20.5 | 33.9 | 86.0 | 84.3 | 30.9 | 48.2 | 32.4 | 7.3 |
| Puri* |  | 4.8 | 1.5 | 76.9 | 69.6 | 100.0 | 98.8 | 90.5 | 83.4 | 86.0 | 19.8 |
| Rayagada | 64.5 | 16.1 | 0.6 | 41.5 | 87.0 | 63.3 | 60.6 | 26.7 | 56.6 | 53.0 | 16.7 |
| Sambalpur | 94.4 | 6.3 | 6.7 | 37.5 | 65.9 | 91.1 | 90.2 | 25.3 | 54.4 | 40.8 | 8.4 |
| Sonapur | 92.9 | 4.3 | 4.0 | 53.6 | 49.2 | 89.2 | 92.1 | 92.0 | 74.8 | 80.4 | 75.6 |
| Sundargarh* |  | 4.9 | 4.2 | 23.4 | 78.6 | 93.6 | 92.5 | 7.1 | 71.0 | 71.0 | 0.7 |
| Total | 82.3 | 6.3 | 4.4 | 54.1 | 61.3 | 88.9 | 87.1 | 44.2 | 69.5 | 64.4 | 17.4 |

[^24]ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM 19 OUT OF 19 DISTRICTS

## SCHOOL ENROLLMENT AND OUT OF SCHOOL CHILDREN

| Table 1: \% Children in different types of SCHOOLS 2009 |  |  |  | \% Out of school |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in School |  |
| Age: 6-14 ALL | 61.4 | 30.3 | 2.9 | 5.4 | 100 |
| Age: 7-16 ALL | 61.2 | 28.6 | 2.8 | 7.3 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 59.8 | 32.8 | 3.3 | 4.2 | 100 |
| AGE: 7-10 BOYS | 56.1 | 35.9 | 3.2 | 4.7 | 100 |
| AgE: 7-10 GIRLS | 61.2 | 31.8 | 3.0 | 4.1 | 100 |
| AgE: 11-14 ALL | 63.7 | 26.9 | 2.5 | 6.8 | 100 |
| AGE: 11-14 BOYS | 60.0 | 30.2 | 2.4 | 7.3 | 100 |
| AGE: 11-14 GIRLS | 67.1 | 24.2 | 2.4 | 6.3 | 100 |
| AgE: 15-16 ALL | 58.9 | 23.4 | 2.6 | 15.1 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 BOYS | 58.9 | 25.0 | 2.8 | 13.2 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 GIRLS | 60.5 | 22.7 | 1.4 | 15.5 | 100 |


note: 'отнer' includes chidren going to madarssa and EGS.
'кот in school' = dropped out + never enrolled.


| Std. | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 25.6 | 35.9 | 20.8 | 9.8 | 2.2 |  |  |  | 5.6 |  |  |  | 100 |
| II | 4.8 | 14.1 | 34.5 | 28.6 | 12.4 | 3.1 |  |  |  | 5 |  |  | 100 |
| III | 4. | 4 | 14.7 | 35.3 | 25.1 | 13.9 | 3.5 |  |  | 3.3 |  |  | 100 |
| IV | 2. | 4 | 4.0 | 14.8 | 26.7 | 33.8 | 10.4 | 5.4 |  | 2. | 6 |  | 100 |
| V |  |  | 6.0 |  | 9.6 | 36.3 | 25.6 | 16.0 | 4.3 |  | 2.3 |  | 100 |
| VI |  |  | 3.8 |  |  | 10.2 | 23.2 | 38.5 | 16.3 | 5.1 | 2.9 |  | 100 |
| VII |  |  | 4. | . 0 |  |  | 8.6 | 31.4 | 31.8 | 16.1 | 7.4 | 0.7 | 100 |
| VIII |  |  |  | 2.6 |  |  |  | 11.6 | 26.4 | 34.5 | 17.5 | 7.4 | 100 |

How to read the table: In Std III, 74.2\% (35.3+25.1+13.9) children are in age group 8 to 10 .

## Young CHILDREN IN PRE-SCHOOL AND SCHOOL

|  |  |  |  | In Scho |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | anganwadi | UKG | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{2} \underset{\pi}{\pi}$ |  |
| Age 3 | 48.8 | 20.0 |  |  |  | 31.2 | 100 |
| Age 4 | 42.9 | 47.4 |  |  |  | 9.7 | 100 |
| Age 5 | 12.3 | 10.0 | 29.7 | 35.6 | 3.6 | 8.9 | 100 |
| Age 6 | 3.2 | 5.8 | 50.7 | 32.4 | 3.2 | 4.8 | 100 |

Chart 3: Trends over time
\% Children age 3-4 not attending Pre-school (ICDS or other) 2006-2009


Of the villages visited, Anganwadi/Pre-School presence has been recorded in 75.0\% villages.

## Reading in own language

Table 4: CLASS-wise \% children who CAN READ (All Schools) 2009

| StD. | Nothing | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (Std 1 Text) | Level 2 <br> (Std 2 Text) | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 14.4 | 56.8 | 14.8 | 5.7 | 8.3 | 100 |
| II | 4.2 | 34.9 | 32.0 | 16.4 | 12.5 | 100 |
| III | 2.1 | 13.2 | 33.7 | 26.5 | 24.5 | 100 |
| IV | 0.7 | 7.2 | 16.7 | 29.6 | 45.9 | 100 |
| V | 0.6 | 4.4 | 9.8 | 20.9 | 64.3 | 100 |
| VI | 1.5 | 2.9 | 7.4 | 14.5 | 73.7 | 100 |
| VII | 1.1 | 3.0 | 5.8 | 13.3 | 76.9 | 100 |
| VIII | 1.3 | 1.4 | 3.9 | 6.5 | 86.9 | 100 |
| TOTAL | 3.1 | 14.8 | 15.3 | 17.0 | 50.0 | 100 |

NOTE: Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. Thus a child who can read Std II level text can read letters, words, and Std 1 level text.


Chart 4: Trends over time
\% Children who CANNOT EVEN IDENTIFY LETTERS (IN GOVt Schools in Std I - IV) 2006-2009


CHART 5: TRENDS OVER TIME
\% Children who CAN READ Std Il level text (in govt schools in Std IV - VII) 2006-2009


## Reading and comprehension in english

| Std. | Cannot read capital letters | Can read capital letters | Can read small letters | Can read simple words | Can read easy sentences | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 32.3 | 30.7 | 16.9 | 11.3 | 8.8 | 100 |
| II | 16.6 | 26.0 | 24.9 | 22.7 | 9.8 | 100 |
| III | 9.5 | 19.8 | 30.9 | 25.3 | 14.6 | 100 |
| IV | 4.2 | 15.7 | 22.1 | 36.1 | 21.9 | 100 |
| V | 2.9 | 9.7 | 18.5 | 34.5 | 34.5 | 100 |
| VI | 2.9 | 5.2 | 11.9 | 27.5 | 52.5 | 100 |
| VII | 2.3 | 4.7 | 9.7 | 26.3 | 57.0 | 100 |
| VIII | 2.1 | 3.8 | 5.4 | 21.2 | 67.4 | 100 |
| TOTAL | 8.7 | 14.2 | 17.5 | 26.0 | 33.6 | 100 |

ENGLISH (AlL Schools) 2009
Cannot Can readCan readCan read Can read Total Std. capital letters letters words sentences letters

| TABLE 6: CLASS-wISE \% CHILDREN WHO COMPREHEND ENGLISH (All Schools) 2009 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std. | Of those who can read words, \% who can tell meaning of the words | Of those who can read sentences, \% who can tell meaning of the sentences |
| I | 83.7 | 96.3 |
| II | 83.3 | 80.5 |
| III | 76.2 | 87.8 |
| IV | 82.4 | 87.9 |
| V | 82.2 | 89.5 |
| VI | 81.5 | 84.3 |
| VII | 85.7 | 86.3 |
| VIII | 87.3 | 88.8 |
| Total | 82.6 | 87.5 |


| English Tool |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
| A <br> J <br> Q <br> R <br> E |  |
| $\mathrm{Y} \quad \mathrm{N} \quad \mathrm{O}$ | d $\quad \mathrm{E}$ t |
| - - - - - - - - |  |
| 3 <br> cat <br> red | What is your name? |
| cup | This is a small bes |
| lip pig | Ithe to read. |
| bus | I have a mother: |
|  |  $=5$ |

## ARITHMETIC

| STD. | Nothing | Recognize Numbers |  | Subtract | Divide | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1-9 | 11-99 |  |  |  |
| I | 17.3 | 45.9 | 23.4 | 7.5 | 6.0 | 100 |
| II | 7.2 | 33.3 | 33.2 | 21.6 | 4.7 | 100 |
| III | 2.2 | 17.9 | 29.0 | 37.3 | 13.6 | 100 |
| IV | 1.9 | 7.8 | 17.2 | 42.5 | 30.6 | 100 |
| V | 0.9 | 6.3 | 10.8 | 33.2 | 48.9 | 100 |
| VI | 2.1 | 3.5 | 7.9 | 27.5 | 59.1 | 100 |
| VII | 1.5 | 4.0 | 7.7 | 23.6 | 63.2 | 100 |
| VIII | 1.5 | 2.0 | 3.3 | 19.5 | 73.7 | 100 |
| Total | 4.1 | 14.4 | 16.2 | 27.1 | 38.2 | 100 |

NOTE : Each cell shows the highest level of arithmetic achieved by a child. Thus a child who can do division, can also recognize numbers 1-9, 11-99 and do subtraction.

Chart 6: Trends over time
\% Children who CANNOT EVEN RECOGNIZE NUMBERS UPTO 9 (IN GOVT SCHOOLS IN STD I - IV) 2007-2009



Chart 7: Trends over time
\% Children who CAN DO DIVISION (in govt schools in Std IV - VII) 2007-2009


## TUITION

| Year | School | 1 | 11 | III | IV | V | VI | VII | VIII |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2007 | Govt | 9.1 | 11.7 | 13.8 | 13.6 | 16.2 | 14.6 | 12.6 | 20.4 |
|  | Pvi. | 22.8 | 20.9 | 23.0 | 30.9 | 28.7 | 20.7 | 26.2 | 29.6 |
| 2009 | Govt | 13.8 | 15.6 | 20.3 | 19.1 | 21.5 | 18.0 | 21.1 | 28.6 |
|  | Pvt. | 29.2 | 30.6 | 35.0 | 30.7 | 41.3 | 31.7 | 35.7 | 43.6 |

NOTE : The ASER survey in 2007 and 2009 recorded information about tuition. In both years, the question asked was the following: "Does the child take any paid additional class currently?" Therefore, these numbers do not include any supplemental help in learning that children may have received from parents or siblings or from anyone else that did not require payment.


## PUNJAB rural

## LEARNING LEVELS IN GOVERNMENT AND PRIVATE SCHOOLS : TRENDS OVER TIME

Chart 8: \% Children in Std III who CAN AT LEAST READ Std I LEVEL TEXT. BY SCHOOL TYPE 2006-2009


Chart 9: \% Children in Std V who CAN DO DIVISION. BY SCHOOL TYPE 2006-2009


Learning levels by gender : Trends over time

Chart 10: \% Boys and girls in Std III who Can read at least Std I LeVEL text 2007-2009


Chart 11: \% Boys and girls in Std V who CAN do division 2007-2009


## EDUCATION : FATHERS AND CHILDREN

| Table 9: Fathers and children 2009 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Of these fathers : |  |  |  |  |
| Fathers' <br> Education | $\begin{gathered} \% \\ \text { Fathers } \end{gathered}$ | \% Girls 6 to 14 out of school | \% Children (Std III-V) who can read level 1 (Std 1 Text) or more | \% Children (Std III-V) who can do subtraction or more | \% Children (Std III-V) who can read words or more in English | \% Children (Std IV-VIII) attending tuition |
| No Schooling | 27.2 | 7.0 | 66.5 | 62.9 | 45.3 | 16.3 |
| Std I-V | 11.9 | 5.3 | 70.4 | 65.3 | 48.9 | 24.5 |
| Std VI-VIII | 18.2 | 6.5 | 76.3 | 73.5 | 61.3 | 29.5 |
| Std IX-X | 29.2 | 3.8 | 75.7 | 74.7 | 67.2 | 31.2 |
| Above Std X | 13.6 | 3.4 | 77.3 | 75.9 | 75.9 | 38.1 |

NOTE: ASER 2009 recorded information about mothers' education. Similar analyses can be done with mothers and children.


## SCHOOL ENROLLMENT AND ATTENDANCE : TRENDS OVER TIME



| TABLE 11: ChILDREN'S ATtENDANCE | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Type of school <br> \% Enrolled children attending <br> (average) <br> \% Schools with less than 50\% <br> enrolled children attending | 82.7 | 80.6 | 84.4 | 85.4 | 82.6 | 86.1 |
| \% Schools with 75\% or more <br> enrolled children attending | 80.1 | 72.3 | 8.8 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 1.8 |

\% Enrolled children attending
\% Schools with less than 50\% enrolled children attending Schools with 75\% or more

## Table 13: Multigrade classes

200520072009200520072009
\% Of schools in which:
Std II class sitting with another class
Std IV class sitting with another class

Std I-IV/V
Std I-VII/VIII
 $\square$

## SCHOOL FACILITIES : TRENDS OVER TIME

| Table 14: Facilities in school |  | 20052007 |  | 2009 | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \% Schools with: |  | Std I-IV/V |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \pm \\ & \stackrel{ \pm}{N} \\ & \vdots \end{aligned}$ | No facility | 5.4 | 2.7 | 11.1 | 2.5 | 3.3 | 2.6 |
|  | Facility but water not available | 12.4 | 12.0 | 5.0 | 17.3 | 6.6 | 10.3 |
|  | Available | 82.2 | 85.3 | 83.9 | 80.2 | 90.2 | 87.2 |
| $\stackrel{\text { む }}{\bar{\circ}}$ | No facility | 5.5 | 2.4 | 1.9 | 0.0 | 1.6 | 0.0 |
|  | Facility but toilet not usable | 8.3 | 6.2 | 21.5 | 7.6 | 3.3 | 35.7 |
|  | Usable | 86.2 | 91.4 | 76.5 | 92.4 | 95.1 | 64.3 |
| Midday meal served on day |  | 20.4 | 82.5 | 95.5 | 10.1 | 82.0 | 100 |


| TABLE 16: GIRLS ToILETS | 2009 | Std I-IV/V | Std I-VII/VIII |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No of schools visited <br> \% Schools with no separate provision <br> for girls toilets | 393 | 41 |  |
| Of schools where there are separate girls toilets, \% schools where: |  |  |  |
| Toilet locked | 8.7 | 12.2 |  |
| Toilet not usable | 25.2 | 14.6 |  |
| Usable | 60.3 | 53.7 |  |

Table 15: School improvement \& construction since April 2008

| School improvement \& Construction | Std I-IV/V |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. of schs | \% schools |  | No. of schs | \% schools |  |
|  |  | Yes | No |  | Yes | No |
| Whitewash | 393 | 56.2 | 43.8 | 40 | 80.0 | 20.0 |
| Construction of new classroom | 379 | 36.2 | 63.9 | 39 | 48.7 | 51.3 |
| Construction of boundary wall | 371 | 35.0 | 65.0 | 36 | 47.2 | 52.8 |

ASER survey was carried out in Oct-Nov 2009. One govt school with primary grades was visited in each sampled village. If there was more than one govt school in a village, then the school with the highest enrollment was visited. Hence the schools visited in the ASER survey do not represent a random sample of schools of the district. The school visits were generally done either on a Saturday or a Monday.

| School Grants |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| classrooms | Rs 2 lacs per <br> additional room |
| Maintenance | Rs. 5000 pa upto 3 <br> grant |
| classrooms. Upto |  |
| Rs 10000 pa for |  |
| more than 3 |  |
| classrooms |  |$|$

## School Grants

| TABLE 17: <br> \% Primary <br> SCHOOLS RECEIVING <br> DIFFERENT GRANTS | April 2008-March 2009 |  |  |  | April 2009-October 2009 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Std I-IV/V |  |  |  | Std I-IV/V |  |  |  |
|  | No. of schs | Yes | No | Don't know | No. of | Yes | No | Don't know |
| New classroom | 292 | 27.7 | 69.2 | 3.1 | 233 | 31.3 | 63.1 | 5.6 |
| Maintenance grant | 336 | 80.4 | 16.7 | 3.0 | 228 | 55.3 | 39.0 | 5.7 |
| Development grant | 328 | 84.8 | 12.5 | 2.7 | 250 | 73.2 | 21.6 | 5.2 |
| Teacher grant (TLM grant) | 365 | 95.3 | 2.5 | 2.2 | 295 | 91.2 | 5.8 | 3.1 |
| Other grants | 218 | 60.1 | 34.9 | 5.1 | 171 | 56.1 | 39.2 | 4.7 |

[^25]| TABLE 18: |
| :--- |
| \% UPPER PRIMARY |
| SCHOOLS RECEIVING |
| DIFFERENT GRANTS |
| New classroom |
| Maintenance grant |
| Development grant |
| Teacher grant |
| (TLM grant) |
| Other grants |

April 2008-March 2009 April 2009-October 2009 Std I-VII/VIII Std I-VII/VIII

| No. of <br> schs | Yes | No | Don't <br> know | No. of <br> schs | Yes | No | Don't <br> know |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 35 | 42.9 | 51.4 | 5.7 | 19 | 31.6 | 52.6 | 15.8 |
| 30 | 93.3 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 20 | 80.0 | 15.0 | 5.0 |
| 30 | 83.3 | 10.0 | 6.7 | 22 | 68.2 | 22.7 | 9.1 |
| 33 | 97.0 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 26 | 92.3 | 3.9 | 3.9 |
| 25 | 48.0 | 44.0 | 8.0 | 20 | 45.0 | 45.0 | 10.0 |

NOTE : No grant information was available for 1 schools out of 42 upper primary schools that were visited. This could be because the head teacher was not present, register was not available or the surveyors could not obtain the information. Therefore, the above table is based on schools for which information was available for at least one indicator.

Performance of districts

| Table 19: | $\begin{gathered} \text { ANGANWADI } \\ \text { OR } \\ \text { BALWADI } \end{gathered}$ | Out of SCHOOL | Private SCHOOL | Tuition | Mothers' Reading | Std I-II : Learning levels |  |  | Std III-V : Learning levels |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Districts | \% Children (Age 3-4) in anganwadi or pre-school | \% Children (Age: 6-14) out of school | \%Children (Age: 6-14) in private school | \% Children (Std IV-VIII) attending tuition classes | \% Mothers (Age: 17-55) who CAN READ | \% Children <br> (Std I-II) <br> who <br> CAN READ letters, words or more | \% Children <br> (Std I-II) <br> who CAN RECOGNIZE NUMBERS 1 to 9 or more | \% Children <br> (Std I-II) <br> who CAN <br> READ LETTERS or more in ENGLISH | \% Children <br> (Std III-V) <br> who CAN READ Level 1 (Std 1 Text) or more | \% Children <br> (Std III-V) who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more | \% Children <br> (Std III-V) <br> who CAN <br> READ <br> sentences <br> in ENGLISH |
| Amritsar* |  | 3.0 | 45.9 | 19.0 | 66.8 | 90.0 | 85.3 | 82.0 | 63.2 | 54.5 | 27.5 |
| Bathinda | 83.3 | 3.2 | 34.2 | 18.9 | 77.0 | 89.4 | 88.4 | 70.4 | 73.6 | 68.9 | 31.9 |
| Faridkot* |  | 2.8 | 28.0 | 25.0 | 79.2 | 91.7 | 90.2 | 61.3 | 70.9 | 74.5 | 17.8 |
| Fatehgarh Sahib | 82.8 | 1.7 | 31.3 | 32.2 | 89.0 | 88.0 | 86.5 | 68.5 | 79.2 | 79.9 | 35.8 |
| Firozpur | 60.8 | 10.7 | 14.8 | 20.3 | 52.4 | 95.1 | 86.0 | 74.0 | 66.3 | 65.3 | 14.0 |
| Gurdaspur | 66.3 | 4.8 | 36.4 | 25.8 | 69.2 | 97.2 | 95.7 | 90.7 | 81.4 | 76.2 | 25.0 |
| Hoshiarpur | 92.6 | 2.4 | 34.1 | 34.9 | 83.0 | 88.7 | 87.3 | 79.9 | 79.7 | 75.3 | 28.9 |
| Jalandhar* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Kapurthala | 95.0 | 0.4 | 40.9 | 20.3 | 77.4 | 91.6 | 87.3 | 74.5 | 68.6 | 80.7 | 26.2 |
| Ludhiana* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mansa | 83.8 | 9.2 | 25.3 | 13.7 | 42.9 | 87.8 | 83.8 | 75.6 | 71.6 | 73.2 | 27.3 |
| Moga | 85.0 | 2.4 | 45.3 | 36.8 | 84.3 | 90.2 | 84.5 | 73.4 | 73.6 | 68.4 | 32.8 |
| Muktsar | 71.6 | 7.1 | 39.5 | 17.1 | 65.8 | 88.6 | 93.0 | 78.5 | 67.3 | 55.7 | 24.5 |
| Nawanshehar | 93.0 | 1.0 | 16.6 | 31.1 | 84.7 | 91.8 | 87.1 | 81.8 | 71.3 | 81.1 | 28.6 |
| Patiala* |  | 1.8 | 19.9 | 31.7 | 56.4 | 87.5 | 88.8 | 78.8 | 79.4 | 74.6 | 24.0 |
| Rupnagar | 91.1 | 4.6 | 29.5 | 15.0 | 64.7 | 86.0 | 81.6 | 72.9 | 54.9 | 68.2 | 15.9 |
| Sangrur* |  | 11.5 | 32.5 | 24.5 | 74.5 | 92.9 | 86.6 | 77.7 | 65.5 | 53.4 | 21.5 |
| SAS Nagar* |  | 7.3 | 33.6 | 37.0 | 83.9 | 85.7 | 85.2 | 84.9 | 76.3 | 71.5 | 45.4 |
| Tarn Taran* |  | 2.6 | 40.0 | 16.7 | 67.6 | 85.7 | 87.4 | 85.9 | 58.8 | 57.3 | 26.4 |
| Total | 80.3 | 5.4 | 30.3 | 26.5 | 70.6 | 90.8 | 87.8 | 75.7 | 71.9 | 70.0 | 24.4 |

*Blank cells indicate insufficient data.

## SCHOOL ENROLLMENT AND OUT OF SCHOOL CHILDREN

| TABLE 1: \% Children in different types of SCHOOLS 2009 |  |  |  | \% Out of school |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in School |  |
| AgE: 6-14 ALL | 62.5 | 30.4 | 0.6 | 6.6 | 100 |
| Age: 7-16 ALL | 61.3 | 28.7 | 0.5 | 9.5 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 62.7 | 31.5 | 0.6 | 5.3 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 BOYS | 60.7 | 35.3 | 0.5 | 3.5 | 100 |
| AgE: 7-10 GIRLS | 65.3 | 26.8 | 0.5 | 7.4 | 100 |
| AgE: 11-14 ALL | 62.5 | 28.3 | 0.6 | 8.7 | 100 |
| AGE: 11-14 BOYS | 62.6 | 30.7 | 0.5 | 6.1 | 100 |
| AGE: 11-14 GIRLS | 62.4 | 24.7 | 0.7 | 12.2 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 ALL | 55.4 | 22.5 | 0.3 | 21.9 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 BOYS | 56.7 | 25.6 | 0.4 | 17.3 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 GIRLS | 53.7 | 17.5 | 0.1 | 28.6 | 100 |


note : 'отнек' includes chidren going to madarssa and EGS.
'№т in school' = dropped out + never enrolled.


| Std. | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 36.3 | 35.2 | 13.5 | 8.8 | 6.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| II | 9.6 | 22.1 | 29.2 | 23.5 | 7.0 | 8.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| III | 2.2 | 6.4 | 18.9 | 35.5 | 16.5 | 12.7 | 7.8 |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| IV |  | 2.5 | 5.8 | 22.8 | 22.8 | 28.2 | 6.7 | 7.1 |  | 4.1 |  |  | 100 |
| V | 2.8 |  |  | 8.7 | 12.5 | 36.1 | 14.8 | 14.5 | 4.6 | 5.9 |  |  | 100 |
| VI | 3.3 |  |  |  | 5.4 | 22.0 | 21.1 | 29.4 | 10.2 | 5.4 | 3.4 |  | 100 |
| VII | 2.8 |  |  |  |  | 8.0 | 11.0 | 35.5 | 23.1 | 12.4 | 7.2 |  | 100 |
| VIII | 7.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 18.5 | 25.5 | 25.2 | 15.2 | 8.4 | 100 |

How to read the table: In Std III, 64.7\% (35.5+16.5+12.7) children are in age group 8 to 10 .

## Young CHILDREN IN PRE-SCHOOL AND SCHOOL

|  |  |  |  | In Scho |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | anganwadi | UKG | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | io त |  |
| Age 3 | 44.2 | 12.7 |  |  |  | 43.1 | 100 |
| Age 4 | 42.8 | 28.6 |  |  |  | 28.6 | 100 |
| Age 5 | 11.8 | 5.2 | 40.4 | 28.7 | 0.8 | 13.1 | 100 |
| Age 6 | 4.4 | 3.0 | 54.4 | 30.3 | 0.6 | 7.4 | 100 |

Chart 3: Trends over time
\% Children age 3-4 not attending Pre-school (ICDS OR OTHER) 2006-2009
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## Reading in own language

Table 4：Class－wise \％Children who CAN READ（All Schools） 2009

| STD． | Nothing | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> （STD 1 Text） | Level 2 <br> （Std 2 Text） | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 42.9 | 44.1 | 8.5 | 2.3 | 2.2 | 100 |
| II | 15.2 | 44.7 | 26.6 | 8.6 | 4.9 | 100 |
| III | 6.4 | 27.9 | 31.2 | 20.4 | 14.0 | 100 |
| IV | 2.6 | 14.0 | 26.2 | 29.7 | 27.5 | 100 |
| V | 1.1 | 8.4 | 16.1 | 29.5 | 45.0 | 100 |
| VI | 0.6 | 4.3 | 8.3 | 23.4 | 63.4 | 100 |
| VII | 0.5 | 2.2 | 4.6 | 15.6 | 77.2 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.4 | 1.2 | 2.2 | 9.8 | 86.5 | 100 |
| TOTAL | 8.7 | 18.6 | 15.8 | 17.6 | 39.3 | 100 |

NOTE ：Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child．Thus a child who can read Std II level text can read letters，words，and Std 1 level text．

| Reading Tool |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
| रमेश और महेश मित्र थे। एक दिन वे दोनों आम के बगीवे में पूसने गये। अयानक दोनों ने वहाँ साँप और नेवसे को लक़ते हुये देखा। उन्हॉंने लहाई रोकने के लिये एक तरीका निकगला। महोश ने पर्दी से गेवले की ओर लकरी करेकी। गेयला दर कर भाग गया। सौच मी बित में छिप गया। एमेश और चहेता यह देखकर बुता हुये। |  | जel ता आ चजा आ बजाई चाना मान आनू आ आग | $\square$ <br> I <br> का। <br> 1 <br> $-\infty$ <br> गुण <br> बोला <br> 4 4 <br> I <br> मर |

Chart 5：TRENDS OVER TIME
\％Children who CAN READ Std II level text（in govt schools in Std IV－VII）2006－2009


## READING Tool



Chart 4：Trends over time
\％Children who CANNOT EVEN IDENTIFY LETTERS （IN GOVt Schools in Std I－IV）2006－2009


## Reading and comprehension in english

## TABLE 5：CLASS－WISE \％CHILDREN WHO CAN READ

ENGLISH（All Schools） 2009

Cannot Can readCan readCan read Can read Total Std． | read | capital | $\begin{array}{c}\text { small } \\ \text { capital } \\ \text { letters }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c}\text { simple } \\ \text { words }\end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| letters | sentences |  |  | letters

| I | 65.4 | 24.5 | 5.8 | 2.8 | 1.5 | 100 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| II | 37.9 | 35.9 | 16.8 | 7.4 | 2.1 | 100 |
| III | 24.4 | 32.6 | 22.1 | 16.7 | 4.2 | 100 |
| IV | 13.4 | 26.4 | 24.0 | 26.8 | 9.3 | 100 |
| V | 8.7 | 19.7 | 21.5 | 32.4 | 17.8 | 100 |
| VI | 4.6 | 11.7 | 15.5 | 35.5 | 32.7 | 100 |
| VII | 2.9 | 7.3 | 10.4 | 32.7 | 46.6 | 100 |
| VIII | 1.7 | 4.6 | 6.6 | 25.8 | 61.4 | 100 |
| TOTAL | 19.9 | 20.7 | 15.6 | 22.5 | 21.4 | 100 |


| Std． | Of those who can read words， \％who can tell meaning of the words | Of those who can read sentences，\％who can tell meaning of the sentences |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 58.9 | 81.0 |
| II | 68.8 | 75.4 |
| III | 70.7 | 75.7 |
| IV | 72.8 | 74.9 |
| V | 69.1 | 78.0 |
| VI | 71.6 | 82.5 |
| VII | 73.2 | 81.5 |
| VIII | 79.6 | 83.8 |
| Total | 72.3 | 81.6 |



## ARITHMETIC

| Std. | Nothing | Recognize Numbers |  | Subtract | Divide | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1-9 | 11-99 |  |  |  |
| I | 42.9 | 44.4 | 9.4 | 1.9 | 1.4 | 100 |
| II | 15.5 | 45.2 | 28.9 | 7.6 | 3.0 | 100 |
| III | 6.5 | 30.5 | 36.0 | 19.5 | 7.6 | 100 |
| IV | 2.7 | 17.7 | 31.6 | 30.7 | 17.4 | 100 |
| V | 1.5 | 9.8 | 23.0 | 34.1 | 31.6 | 100 |
| VI | 1.0 | 5.2 | 15.4 | 29.4 | 49.0 | 100 |
| VII | 0.6 | 3.0 | 8.4 | 24.8 | 63.3 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.4 | 1.5 | 5.2 | 16.7 | 76.2 | 100 |
| Total | 8.8 | 19.8 | 20.1 | 20.7 | 30.5 | 100 |

NOTE : Each cell shows the highest level of arithmetic achieved by a child. Thus a child who can do division, can also recognize numbers 1-9, 11-99 and do subtraction.

Chart 6: Trends over time
\% Children who CANNOT EVEN RECOGNIZE NUMBERS UPTO 9 (IN GOVT SCHOOLS IN STD I - IV) 2007-2009


## TUITION

Table 8: Class-wise \% children ATTENDING TUItion CLASSES. BY SCHOOL TYPE 2007 AND 2009

| Year | School | 1 | II | III | IV | V | VI | VII | VIII |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2007 | Govt | 1.5 | 2.1 | 2.5 | 3.0 | 3.6 | 3.9 | 5.8 | 8.9 |
|  | Pvt. | 6.8 | 8.8 | 9.2 | 11.2 | 11.1 | 13.6 | 13.1 | 19.6 |
| 2009 | Govt | 3.3 | 3.6 | 4.7 | 4.8 | 5.8 | 7.4 | 7.5 | 12.0 |
|  | Pvi. | 12.0 | 11.4 | 13.1 | 11.5 | 16.1 | 14.0 | 13.8 | 26.5 |

NOTE : The ASER survey in 2007 and 2009 recorded information about tuition. In both years, the question asked was the following: "Does the child take any paid additional class currently?" Therefore, these numbers do not include any supplemental help in learning that children may have received from parents or siblings or from anyone else that did not require payment.

Maths Tool



Chart 7: Trends over time
\% Children who CAN DO DIVISION (in govt schools in Std IV - Vil) 2007-2009


## RAJASTHAN <br> RURAL

## LEARNING LEVELS IN GOVERNMENT AND PRIVATE SCHOOLS : TRENDS OVER TIME

Chart 8: \% Children in Std III who CAN AT LEAST READ Std I LEVEL TEXT. BY SCHOOL TYPE 2006-2009


Chart 9: \% Children in Std V who Can do division. BY SCHOOL TYPE 2006-2009


Learning levels by gender : Trends over time

Chart 10: \% Boys and girls in Std III who CAN READ AT LEAST StD I LEVEL TEXT 2007-2009


Chart 11: \% Boys and girls in Std V who CAN DO DIVISION 2007-2009


## EDUCATION : FATHERS AND CHILDREN

|  |  |  |  | Of these fathers |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fathers' <br> Education | $\%$ <br> Fathers | \% Girls 6 to 14 out of school | \% Children (Std III-V) who can read level 1 (Std 1 Text) or more | \% Children (Std III-V) who can do subtraction or more | \% Children (Std III-V) who can read words or more in English | \% Children (Std IV-VIII) attending tuition |
| No Schooling | 36.1 | 15.1 | 50.9 | 42.5 | 28.5 | 5.4 |
| Std I-V | 15.4 | 9.5 | 52.3 | 43.6 | 33.1 | 9.7 |
| Std VI-VIII | 18.5 | 6.2 | 57.9 | 48.7 | 37.3 | 12.2 |
| Std IX-X | 17.5 | 3.0 | 61.1 | 54.4 | 43.6 | 13.2 |
| Above Std X | 12.6 | 2.8 | 65.8 | 57.8 | 53.3 | 17.3 |

NOTE: ASER 2009 recorded information about mothers' education. Similar analyses can be done with mothers
 and children.

## SCHOOL ENROLLMENT AND ATTENDANCE : TRENDS OVER TIME

| TABLE 10: Total schools visited |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Type of school | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 |
| Std I-IV/V : Primary | 319 | 393 | 274 |
| Std I-VII/VIII : Primary + Upper Primary | 267 | 488 | 561 |
| Total schools | 586 | 881 | 835 |


| Table 12: Teacher attendance | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| Type of school | Std I-IV/V |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |
| \% Teachers attending (average) | 81.1 | 91.3 | 92.9 | 78.9 | 85.3 | 88.8 |
| \% Schools with no teacher present | 5.1 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 0.5 | 0.0 |
| \% Schools with all teachers present | 56.2 | 74.9 | 79.8 | 36.2 | 50.7 | 58.3 |


| TABLE 11: CHILDREN'S ATTENDANCE 2005 | 2007 | 2009 | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Type of school <br> \% Enrolled children attending <br> (average) <br> \% Schools with less than 50\% <br> enrolled children attending | 71.3 | 67.8 | 72.0 | 74.9 | 72.6 | 74.0 |  |
| \% Schools with 75\% or more <br> enrolled children attending | 49.4 | 14.4 | 9.0 | 9.9 | 4.2 | 8.4 | 55.6 |

Table 11: Children's attendance Type of school \% Enrolled children attending (average) \% Schools with less than 50\% enrolled children attending enrolled children attending

## Table 13: Multigrade classes

200520072009200520072009
\% Of schools in which:
Std II class sitting with another class
Std IV class sitting with another class

Std I-IV/V Std I-VII/VIII
$67.9 \quad 60.6$
63.965 .0
$52.6 \quad 52.1$
$46.3 \quad 51.8$

## SCHOOL FACILITIES : TRENDS OVER TIME

| Table 14: Facilities in school |  | 20052007 |  | 2009 | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \% Schools with: |  | Std I-IV/V |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{ \pm} \\ & \stackrel{\text { N}}{3} \end{aligned}$ | No facility | 26.7 | 14.3 | 16.4 | 26.1 | 10.6 | 13.8 |
|  | Facility but water not available | 8.5 | 8.9 | 10.9 | 11.9 | 8.4 | 12.0 |
|  | Available | 64.8 | 76.9 | 72.7 | 62.1 | 81.0 | 74.3 |
|  | No facility | 23.5 | 9.6 | 7.7 | 14.4 | 2.8 | 3.8 |
|  | Facility but toilet not usable | 16.9 | 14.0 | 26.8 | 17.0 | 13.2 | 29.1 |
|  | Usable | 59.6 | 76.4 | 65.4 | 68.6 | 84.0 | 67.1 |
| Midday meal served on day of visit |  | 82.0 | 99.0 | 92.1 | 83.3 | 98.5 | 96.1 |


| TABLE 16: GIRLS ToILETS | 2009 | Std I-IV/V | Std I-VII/VIII |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No of schools visited | 237 | 512 |  |
| \% Schools with no separate provision <br> for girls toilets | 30.4 | 13.1 |  |
| Of schools where there are separate girls toilets, \% schools where: |  |  |  |
| Toilet locked | 9.7 | 7.6 |  |
| Toilet not usable | 26.2 | 32.0 |  |
| Usable | 33.8 | 47.3 |  |

Table 15: School improvement \& construction since April 2008

| School improvement \& Construction | Std I-IV/V |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. of schs | \% schools |  | No. of schs | \% schools |  |
|  |  | Yes | No |  | Yes | No |
| Whitewash | 257 | 59.9 | 40.1 | 530 | 60.4 | 39.6 |
| Construction of new classroom | 254 | 18.5 | 81.5 | 512 | 31.1 | 69.0 |
| Construction of boundary wall | 254 | 19.7 | 80.3 | 509 | 22.6 | 77.4 |

ASER survey was carried out in Oct-Nov 2009. One govt school with primary grades was visited in each sampled village. If there was more than one govt school in a village, then the school with the highest enrollment was visited. Hence the schools visited in the ASER survey do not represent a random sample of schools of the district. The school visits were generally done either on a Saturday or a Monday.

| School Grants |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| New | Rs 2 lacs per <br> clditional room |
| Massrooms | Rs. 5000 pa upto 3 <br> classrooms. Upto |
| grant | Rs 10000 pa for <br> more than 3 <br> classrooms |
| Development |  |
| grant | Rs. 5000 pa for <br> primary schs \& Rs <br> 7000 pa for upper <br> primary schs |
| TLM grant | Rs. 500 pa per <br> teacher |

## School Grants

| Table 17: <br> \% Primary SCHOOLS RECEIVING DIFFERENT GRANTS | April 2008-March 2009 |  |  |  | April 2009-October 2009 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Std I-IV/V |  |  |  | Std I-IV/V |  |  |  |
|  | No. of schs | Yes | No | Don't know | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No. of } \\ & \text { schs } \end{aligned}$ | Yes | No | Don't know |
| New classroom | 232 | 16.8 | 78.9 | 4.3 | 208 | 5.3 | 89.4 | 5.3 |
| Maintenance grant | 240 | 70.4 | 24.6 | 5.0 | 197 | 33.0 | 61.4 | 5.6 |
| Development grant | 225 | 57.3 | 37.3 | 5.3 | 195 | 34.9 | 58.5 | 6.7 |
| Teacher grant (TLM grant) | 238 | 84.5 | 10.1 | 5.5 | 198 | 46.5 | 46.0 | 7.6 |
| Other grants | 104 | 22.1 | 68.3 | 9.6 | 98 | 11.2 | 80.6 | 8.2 |

[^27]| TABLE 18: |
| :--- |
| \% UPPER PRIMARY |
| SCHOOLS RECEIVING |
| DIFFERENT GRANTS |
| New classroom |
| Maintenance grant |
| Development grant |
| Teacher grant |
| (TLM grant) |
| Other grants |

April 2008-March 2009 April 2009-October 2009 Std I-VII/VIII Std I-VII/VIII

| No. of <br> schs | Yes | No | Don't <br> know | No. of <br> schs | Yes | No | Don't <br> know |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 471 | 22.5 | 72.6 | 4.9 | 400 | 8.8 | 84.3 | 7.0 |
| 489 | 68.9 | 25.4 | 5.7 | 392 | 32.9 | 58.7 | 8.4 |
| 446 | 55.6 | 38.8 | 5.6 | 370 | 33.2 | 60.3 | 6.5 |
| 490 | 86.5 | 9.8 | 3.7 | 389 | 46.3 | 47.6 | 6.2 |
| 253 | 25.3 | 66.4 | 8.3 | 219 | 15.5 | 74.9 | 9.6 |

NOTE: No grant information was available for 46 schools out of 561 upper primary schools that were visited. This could be because the head teacher was not present, register was not available or the surveyors could not obtain the information. Therefore, the above table is based on schools for which information was available for at least one indicator.

Performance of districts

| Table 19: | ANGANWADI <br> OR <br> BALWADI | OUT OF SCHOOL | Private SCHOOL | Tuition | Mothers' Reading | Std I-II : Learning levels |  |  | Std III-V : Learning levels |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Districts | \% Children (Age 3-4) in anganwadi or pre-school | \%Children <br> (Age: 6-14) <br> out of school | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) <br> in private school | \% Children (Std IV-VIII) attending tuition classes | \% Mothers (Age: 17-55) who CAN READ | \% Children <br> (Std I-II) <br> who <br> CAN READ letters, words or more | \% Children <br> (Std I-II) <br> who CAN <br> RECOGNIZE <br> NUMBERS <br> 1 to 9 <br> or more | \% Children <br> (Std I-II) <br> who CAN <br> READ LETTERS or more in ENGLISH | \% Children <br> (Std III-V) <br> who <br> CAN READ Level 1 <br> (Std 1 Text) or more | \% Children <br> (Std III-V) who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more | \% Children <br> (Std III-V) <br> who CAN <br> READ sentences in ENGLISH |
| Ajmer | 61.1 | 9.7 | 27.1 | 9.7 | 24.9 | 70.8 | 74.7 | 48.5 | 64.5 | 50.7 | 12.6 |
| Alwar | 78.5 | 2.6 | 49.0 | 12.2 | 54.3 | 70.7 | 68.4 | 49.8 | 57.6 | 48.1 | 13.7 |
| Banswara | 75.2 | 10.0 | 10.8 | 9.4 | 24.8 | 58.3 | 58.8 | 28.4 | 30.8 | 21.4 | 3.9 |
| Baran | 58.6 | 7.8 | 14.2 | 9.9 | 32.0 | 68.0 | 72.2 | 45.5 | 55.1 | 46.9 | 10.5 |
| Barmer | 27.7 | 9.7 | 14.5 | 8.1 | 38.6 | 74.5 | 74.3 | 48.6 | 62.7 | 58.1 | 10.6 |
| Bharatpur | 73.3 | 8.8 | 41.7 | 20.1 | 52.0 | 87.6 | 90.8 | 75.0 | 58.2 | 68.0 | 18.7 |
| Bhilwara | 72.3 | 9.3 | 18.5 | 14.7 | 54.0 | 71.6 | 72.4 | 54.4 | 55.6 | 49.1 | 15.7 |
| Bikaner | 49.4 | 7.7 | 20.4 | 5.6 | 43.8 | 57.6 | 61.8 | 36.9 | 58.2 | 52.8 | 6.5 |
| Bundi | 81.3 | 4.0 | 25.9 | 12.5 | 49.1 | 75.4 | 70.1 | 64.9 | 48.7 | 44.4 | 14.4 |
| Chittaurgarh | 75.4 | 9.0 | 20.2 | 12.2 | 34.1 | 66.3 | 64.8 | 50.0 | 46.6 | 37.4 | 12.9 |
| Churu | 69.6 | 6.7 | 36.0 | 5.8 | 42.1 | 67.9 | 65.3 | 36.7 | 61.7 | 56.1 | 12.5 |
| Dausa | 81.0 | 3.3 | 36.4 | 8.8 | 47.1 | 74.6 | 67.8 | 53.3 | 57.5 | 47.7 | 10.7 |
| Dhaulpur | 42.5 | 7.2 | 38.5 | 17.5 | 37.8 | 55.7 | 57.2 | 37.1 | 48.4 | 41.5 | 10.8 |
| Dungarpur | 62.1 | 7.2 | 11.9 | 8.7 | 16.6 | 60.8 | 61.2 | 29.7 | 47.2 | 32.5 | 5.7 |
| Ganganagar | 63.6 | 3.4 | 40.3 | 8.0 | 71.0 | 85.5 | 86.5 | 74.5 | 74.6 | 64.4 | 18.1 |
| Hanumangarh | 53.9 | 6.4 | 50.2 | 10.1 | 54.2 | 81.8 | 81.6 | 65.6 | 66.4 | 65.0 | 20.7 |
| Jaipur | 82.2 | 2.8 | 40.0 | 8.3 | 43.6 | 77.4 | 72.8 | 45.2 | 65.6 | 52.5 | 11.9 |
| Jaisalmer | 73.7 | 8.4 | 16.6 | 7.4 | 44.2 | 72.7 | 79.5 | 40.7 | 61.2 | 53.3 | 10.0 |
| Jalor | 39.4 | 10.4 | 21.7 | 13.5 | 30.1 | 69.8 | 69.2 | 49.8 | 54.1 | 50.6 | 9.0 |
| Jhalawar | 47.7 | 9.2 | 32.5 | 5.9 | 25.7 | 66.8 | 69.5 | 28.5 | 39.0 | 30.6 | 3.9 |
| Jhunjhunu | 74.8 | 2.1 | 39.5 | 6.9 | 57.8 | 89.5 | 87.1 | 72.5 | 69.5 | 63.5 | 9.6 |
| Jodhpur | 48.2 | 16.1 | 23.8 | 5.0 | 21.5 | 55.9 | 58.8 | 35.8 | 46.0 | 35.2 | 7.3 |
| Karauli | 42.4 | 5.4 | 46.5 | 26.2 | 32.8 | 71.4 | 71.9 | 55.4 | 66.2 | 57.8 | 17.6 |
| Kota | 48.4 | 4.3 | 49.2 | 12.3 | 62.3 | 78.4 | 82.8 | 65.6 | 65.9 | 52.4 | 17.5 |
| Nagaur | 67.1 | 2.6 | 41.0 | 6.5 | 62.1 | 74.8 | 72.7 | 49.8 | 54.9 | 44.8 | 9.4 |
| Pali | 77.3 | 8.2 | 24.1 | 20.7 | 44.5 | 79.4 | 79.5 | 62.8 | 62.9 | 47.6 | 11.2 |
| Rajsamand | 52.8 | 2.6 | 4.2 | 4.4 | 24.2 | 72.2 | 70.1 | 15.5 | 57.8 | 41.3 | 6.9 |
| Sawai Madhopur | 58.6 | 6.0 | 31.2 | 12.4 | 20.5 | 78.5 | 67.5 | 57.4 | 54.1 | 43.3 | 3.9 |
| Sikar | 62.8 | 1.9 | 56.2 | 5.7 | 35.1 | 79.2 | 78.8 | 60.7 | 64.2 | 55.0 | 16.7 |
| Sirohi | 44.4 | 13.8 | 14.8 | 15.9 | 30.8 | 58.2 | 61.2 | 33.0 | 45.1 | 34.0 | 6.0 |
| Tonk | 68.6 | 4.3 | 30.9 | 10.5 | 56.4 | 84.5 | 82.1 | 60.3 | 61.8 | 47.5 | 10.5 |
| Udaipur* |  | 5.0 | 12.4 | 7.8 | 15.8 | 63.8 | 67.6 | 42.0 | 35.4 | 30.2 | 0.6 |
| Total | 64.0 | 6.6 | 30.4 | 10.2 | 37.7 | 71.3 | 71.3 | 48.7 | 55.9 | 47.5 | 10.7 |

* Blank cells indicate insufficient data.


## SchOOL ENROLLMENT AND OUT OF SCHOOL CHILDREN

| Table 1: \% Children in different types of SCHOOLS 2009 |  |  |  | \% Out of school |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in School |  |
| Age: 6-14 ALL | 69.3 | 28.3 | 0.2 | 2.3 | 100 |
| AgE: 7-16 ALL | 72.9 | 22.7 | 0.2 | 4.1 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 64.0 | 34.3 | 0.2 | 1.5 | 100 |
| AGE: 7-10 BOYS | 59.5 | 37.4 | 0.4 | 2.7 | 100 |
| AgE: 7-10 GIRLS | 69.0 | 30.7 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 100 |
| AgE: 11-14 ALL | 77.5 | 19.1 | 0.3 | 3.2 | 100 |
| AgE: 11-14 BOYS | 73.9 | 21.5 | 0.5 | 4.1 | 100 |
| AgE: 11-14 GIRLS | 81.0 | 16.6 | 0.0 | 2.4 | 100 |
| AgE: 15-16 ALL | 78.9 | 10.8 | 0.2 | 10.2 | 100 |
| AgE: 15-16 BOYS | 73.9 | 12.8 | 0.4 | 12.8 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 GIRLS | 82.1 | 9.5 | 0.0 | 8.4 | 100 |



NOTE: 'оTHER' includes chidren going to madarssa and EGS.
'№т in school' = dropped out + never enrolled.


| Std. | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 15.1 | 33.0 | 24.0 | 15.0 | 9.6 |  |  |  | 3.3 |  |  |  | 100 |
| II | 3.1 | 7.8 | 19.5 | 31.9 | 19.9 | 9.4 |  |  |  | 8.6 |  |  | 100 |
| III |  | 5.3 |  | 17.0 | 27.8 | 22.2 | 9.2 | 10.2 | 4.7 |  | 3.6 |  | 100 |
| IV |  | 2.7 |  | 5.6 | 16.1 | 21.5 | 19.7 | 14.9 | 9.7 | 6.4 | 3. | . 6 | 100 |
| V |  |  | 3.9 |  |  | 18.2 | 19.1 | 26.0 | 14.3 | 9.4 | 6.6 | 2.6 | 100 |
| VI |  |  | 6. | . 9 |  |  | 10.1 | 19.8 | 26.1 | 18.9 | 10.4 | 7.8 | 100 |
| VII |  |  |  | 4.7 |  |  |  | 11.5 | 23.0 | 23.9 | 22.7 | 14.2 | 100 |
| VIII |  |  |  | 7. | 1 |  |  |  | 13.9 | 25.5 | 30.8 | 22.8 | 100 |

How to read the table: In Std III, 67.0\% (17.0+27.8+22.2) children are in age group 8 to 10 .

## Young CHILDREN IN PRE-SCHOOL AND SCHOOL

|  |  |  |  | In Scho |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | anganwadi | UKG | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | io त |  |
| Age 3 | 32.7 | 40.0 |  |  |  | 27.2 | 100 |
| Age 4 | 29.0 | 58.8 |  |  |  | 12.1 | 100 |
| Age 5 | 9.0 | 23.2 | 23.7 | 37.8 | 0.0 | 6.3 | 100 |
| Age 6 | 1.7 | 5.2 | 45.3 | 45.8 | 0.0 | 2.1 | 100 |

Chart 3: Trends over time
\% Children age 3-4 not attending pre-school (ICDS or other) 2007-2009


Of the villages visited, Anganwadi/Pre-School presence has been recorded in 83.1 \% villages.

## Reading in own language

Table 4: Class-wise \% children who CAN READ (All Schools) 2009

| StD. | Nothing | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (STd 1 Text) | Level 2 <br> (Std 2 Text) | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| I | 6.8 | 34.2 | 42.9 | 14.9 | 1.2 | 100 |
| II | 1.8 | 17.2 | 45.9 | 28.1 | 7.0 | 100 |
| III | 1.0 | 6.0 | 31.8 | 40.1 | 21.1 | 100 |
| IV | 0.7 | 2.1 | 15.2 | 44.6 | 37.4 | 100 |
| V | 0.7 | 1.1 | 4.4 | 38.9 | 54.9 | 100 |
| VI | 0.0 | 0.4 | 2.0 | 25.3 | 72.3 | 100 |
| VII | 0.0 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 14.5 | 84.1 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.6 | 0.0 | 1.1 | 11.6 | 86.8 | 100 |
| TOTAL | 1.5 | 8.1 | 19.2 | 29.1 | 42.1 | 100 |

nOTE : Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. Thus a child who can read Std II level text can read letters, words, and Std 1 level text.


Chart 4: Trends over time
\% Children who CANNOT EVEN IDENTIFY LETTERS (IN GOVt Schools in Std I - IV) 2007-2009


CHART 5: TRENDS OVER TIME
\% Children who CAN READ Std II level text (in govt schools in Std IV - VII) 2006-2009


## Reading and comprehension in english

## TABLE 5: CLASS-WISE \% CHILDREN WHO CAN READ

ENGLISH (All Schools) 2009
Cannot Can readCan readCan read Can read Total Std. $\begin{array}{ccc}\text { read } \\ \text { capital } & \text { capital } \\ \text { letters }\end{array} \begin{gathered}\text { small } \\ \text { letters }\end{gathered}$ simple $\begin{gathered}\text { easy } \\ \text { words }\end{gathered}$ capital letters letters words sentences letters

| I | 9.5 | 18.7 | 20.4 | 41.8 | 9.7 | 100 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| II | 2.2 | 9.5 | 14.8 | 52.6 | 21.0 | 100 |
| III | 1.9 | 3.1 | 5.2 | 44.0 | 45.9 | 100 |
| IV | 2.8 | 2.4 | 3.6 | 34.1 | 57.2 | 100 |
| V | 1.0 | 1.6 | 1.1 | 15.5 | 80.8 | 100 |
| VI | 1.7 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 16.4 | 81.5 | 100 |
| VII | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.6 | 96.2 | 100 |
| VIII | 1.6 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 9.4 | 87.9 | 100 |
| TOTAL | 2.7 | 4.8 | 6.0 | 29.0 | 57.4 | 100 |


| Std. | Of those who can read words, \% who can tell meaning of the words | Of those who can read sentences, \% who can tell meaning of the sentences |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 79.7 | 53.4 |
| II | 72.8 | 64.2 |
| III | 87.7 | 67.6 |
| IV | 90.2 | 77.5 |
| V | 90.9 | 85.0 |
| VI | 92.8 | 95.7 |
| VII | 100.0 | 95.6 |
| VIII | 88.3 | 96.0 |
| Total | 84.0 | 85.3 |


| English Tool |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2MOUSH TLST Sampleal |  |
| C K S  <br>  Q  F <br> w O $\mathbf{Z}$  |  |
|  |  |
| arn  old <br> run  fox <br>   sit <br>    <br>   buga | 3 <br> What is your name? <br> This is a big bus. <br> 1 Hike to ning. <br> 1 have a sister. |
|  |  |

## ARITHMETIC

| Std. | Nothing | Recognize Numbers |  | Subtract | Divide | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1-9 | 11-99 |  |  |  |
| I | 3.6 | 32.2 | 50.9 | 10.9 | 2.4 | 100 |
| II | 1.6 | 12.2 | 55.7 | 26.7 | 3.8 | 100 |
| III | 0.6 | 3.3 | 31.2 | 46.8 | 18.1 | 100 |
| IV | 1.0 | 1.9 | 18.1 | 46.0 | 32.9 | 100 |
| V | 0.3 | 0.0 | 10.2 | 40.6 | 49.0 | 100 |
| VI | 0.0 | 0.7 | 4.2 | 31.1 | 64.0 | 100 |
| VII | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 19.3 | 79.7 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.6 | 1.0 | 2.9 | 12.5 | 83.0 | 100 |
| Total | 1.0 | 6.7 | 23.4 | 31.1 | 37.9 | 100 |

NOTE : Each cell shows the highest level of arithmetic achieved by a child. Thus a child who can do division, can also recognize numbers 1-9, 11-99 and do subtraction.

Chart 6: Trends over time
\% Children who CANNOT EVEN RECOGNIZE NUMBERS UPTO 9 (IN GOVt schools in Std I - IV) 2007-2009


Maths Tool


Chart 7: Trends over time
\% Children who CAN DO DIVISION (in govt schools in Std IV - VII) 2007-2009


## TUITION

Table 8: Class-wise \% children ATTENDING TUItion CLASSES. BY SCHOOL TYPE 2007 AND 2009

| Year | School | I | II | III | IV | V | VI | VII | VIII |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2007 | Govt | 29.0 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 23.8 | 27.7 | 19.2 | 16.0 | 38.7 |
|  | Pvt. | 45.5 | 44.4 | 45.5 | 41.7 | 61.5 | 45.5 | 0.0 | 20.0 |
| 2009 | Govt | 20.9 | 27.2 | 21.8 | 31.3 | 24.5 | 28.5 | 31.0 | 42.6 |
|  | PvT. | 54.8 | 67.6 | 63.5 | 65.3 | 59.3 | 57.6 | 68.9 | 64.6 |

NOTE : The ASER survey in 2007 and 2009 recorded information about tuition. In both years, the question asked was the following: "Does the child take any paid additional class currently?" Therefore, these numbers do not include any supplemental help in learning that children may have received from parents or siblings or from anyone else that did not require payment.


## LEARNING LEVELS IN GOVERNMENT AND PRIVATE SCHOOLS : TRENDS OVER TIME

Chart 8: \% Children in Std III who CAN AT LEAST READ Std I LEVEL TEXT. BY SCHOOL TYPE 2007-2009


Chart 9: \% Children in Std V who Can do division. BY SCHOOL TYPE 2007-2009


Learning levels by gender : Trends over time

Chart 10: \% Boys and girls in Std III who CAN READ AT LEAST StD I LEVEL TEXT 2007-2009


Chart 11: \% Boys and girls in Std V who CAN DO DIVISION 2007-2009


EdUCATION : FATHERS AND CHILDREN

| Table 9: Fathers and children 2009 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Of these fathers : |  |  |  |  |
| Fathers' Education | $\begin{gathered} \% \\ \text { Fathers } \end{gathered}$ |  | \% Children (Std III-V) who can read level 1 (Std 1 Text) or more | \% Children (Std III-V) who can do subtraction or more | \% Children (Std III-V) who can read words or more in English | \% Children (Std IV-VIII) attending tuition |
| No Schooling | 19.0 | 1.1 | 73.2 | 78.0 | 92.8 | 26.4 |
| Sto I-V | 25.7 | 2.1 | 76.1 | 74.3 | 90.9 | 38.3 |
| Sto VI-VIII | 21.8 | 1.3 | 78.6 | 70.1 | 92.1 | 39.9 |
| Std IX-X | 18.7 | 0.5 | 86.1 | 86.0 | 97.4 | 38.3 |
| Above Std X | 14.7 | 0.0 | 97.4 | 84.6 | 99.4 | 50.4 |



NOTE : ASER 2009 recorded information about mothers' education. Similar analyses can be done with mothers and children.

## SCHOOL ENROLLMENT AND ATTENDANCE : TRENDS OVER TIME

| TABLE 10: Total schools visited |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Type of school | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 |
| Std I-IV/V : Primary |  | 7 | 20 |
| Std I-VII/VIII : Primary + Upper Primary |  | 5 | 39 |
| Total schools | 0 | 12 | 59 |

## TABle 11: Children's attendance

200520072009200520072009

| Type of school <br> \% Enrolled children attending <br> (average) <br> \% Schools with less than 50\% <br> enrolled children attending <br> \% Schools with 75\% or more <br> enrolled children attending | Std I-IV/V |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |


| TABLE 12: TeACHER ATtendance | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Type of school | Std I-IV/V |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |  |
| \% Teachers attending (average) | 93.9 | 87.0 | 100 | 88.3 |  |  |
| \% Schools with no teacher present | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |
| \% Schools with all teachers present | 66.7 | 36.8 | 100 | 35.3 |  |  |

## School facilities : TRENDS OVER TIME

TABle 14: FACilities in school
200520072009200520072009

|  | Schools with: | Std I-IV/V |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No facility | 83.3 | 42.1 | 25.0 | 13.2 |
| $\stackrel{\text { ¢ }}{ }$ | Facility but water not available | 16.7 | 5.3 | 0.0 | 2.6 |
|  | Available | 0.0 | 52.6 | 75.0 | 84.2 |
|  | No facility | 0.0 | 5.6 | 0.0 | 7.7 |
| $\stackrel{\bar{\omega}}{\overline{0}}$ | Facility but toilet not usable | 60.0 | 22.2 | 0.0 | 25.6 |
|  | Usable | 40.0 | 72.2 | 100 | 66.7 |
|  | dday meal served on day visit | 100 | 89.5 | 100 | 84.2 |


| TABLE 16: GIRLS ToILets $\mathbf{2 0 0 9}$ | Std I-IV/V | Std I-VII/VIII |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No of schools visited <br> \% Schols with no separate provision <br> for girls toilets | 17 | 38 |
| Of schools where there are separate girls toilets, | \% schools | where: |
| Toilet locked | 5.9 | 21.1 |
| Toilet not usable | 0.0 | 2.6 |
| Usable | 52.9 | 55.3 |

Table 15: School improvement \& construction since April 2008

|  <br> Construction | Std I-IV/V |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. of <br> schs | \% schools |  | No. of | Nos <br> schs | Yes | No |
| Whitewash | 19 | 68.4 | 31.6 | 38 | 52.6 | 47.4 |  |
| Construction of new <br> classroom | 19 | 42.1 | 57.9 | 38 | 44.7 | 55.3 |  |
| Construction of boundary <br> wall | 19 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 38 | 31.6 | 68.4 |  |

ASER survey was carried out in Oct-Nov 2009. One govt school with primary grades was visited in each sampled village. If there was more than one govt school in a village, then the school with the highest enrollment was visited. Hence the schools visited in the ASER survey do not represent a random sample of schools of the district. The school visits were generally done either on a Saturday or a Monday.

| School Grants |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| classrooms | Rs 2 lacs per <br> additional room |
| Maintenance | Rs. 5000 pa upto 3 <br> grant <br> classrooms. Upto <br> Rs 10000 pa for <br> more than 3 <br> classrooms |
| Development |  |
| grant | Rs. 5000 pa for <br> primary schs \& Rs <br> 7000 pa for upper <br> primary schs |
| TLM grant | Rs. 500 pa per <br> teacher |

## School Grants

| TABLE 17: <br> \% Primary <br> SCHOOLS RECEIVING <br> DIFFERENT GRANTS | April 2008-March 2009 |  |  |  | April 2009-October |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Std I-IV/V |  |  |  | Std I-IV/V |  |  |  |
|  | No. of schs | Yes | No | Don't know | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No. of } \\ & \text { schs } \end{aligned}$ | Yes | No | Don't know |
| New classroom | 15 | 40.0 | 60.0 | 0.0 | 14 | 35.7 | 57.1 | 7.1 |
| Maintenance grant | 18 | 77.8 | 16.7 | 5.6 | 14 | 78.6 | 14.3 | 7.1 |
| Development grant | 16 | 50.0 | 43.8 | 6.3 | 11 | 45.5 | 45.5 | 9.1 |
| Teacher grant (TLM grant) | 17 | 64.7 | 29.4 | 5.9 | 13 | 76.9 | 15.4 | 7.7 |
| Other grants | 9 | 22.2 | 66.7 | 11.1 | 7 | 14.3 | 71.4 | 14.3 |

NOTE : No grant information was available for 2 schools out of 20 primary schools that were visited. This could be because the head teacher was not present, register was not available or the surveyors could not obtain the information. Therefore, the above table is based on schools for which information was available for at least one indicator.

| TABLE 18: |
| :--- |
| \% UPPER PRIMARY |
| SCHOOLS RECEIVING |
| DIFFERENT GRANTS |
| New classroom |
| Maintenance grant |
| Development grant |
| Teacher grant |
| (TLM grant) |
| Other grants |

April 2008-March 2009 April 2009-October 2009 Std I-VII/VIII Std I-VII/VIII

| No. of <br> schs | Yes | No | Don't <br> know | No. of <br> schs | Yes | No | Don't <br> know |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 33 | 27.3 | 60.6 | 12.1 | 31 | 29.0 | 61.3 | 9.7 |
| 32 | 78.1 | 6.3 | 15.6 | 27 | 70.4 | 18.5 | 11.1 |
| 26 | 57.7 | 23.1 | 19.2 | 28 | 46.4 | 35.7 | 17.9 |
| 30 | 76.7 | 6.7 | 16.7 | 29 | 69.0 | 13.8 | 17.2 |
| 26 | 34.6 | 38.5 | 26.9 | 20 | 10.0 | 65.0 | 25.0 |

## Performance of districts

| Table 19: | $\begin{gathered} \text { ANGANWADI } \\ \text { OR } \\ \text { BALWADI } \end{gathered}$ | Out of SCHOOL | Private SCHOOL | TUITION | Mothers' Reading | Std I-II : Learning Levels |  |  | Std III-V : Learning Levels |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Districts | \% Children (Age 3-4) in anganwadi or pre-school | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) <br> out of school | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) in private school | \% Children (Std IV-VIII) attending tuition classes | \% Mothers <br> (Age: 17-55) who CAN READ | \% Children <br> (Std I-II) who <br> CAN READ letters, words or more | \% Children <br> (Std I-II) <br> who CAN <br> RECOGNIZE <br> NUMBERS <br> 1 to 9 <br> or more | \% Children (Std I-II) who CAN READ <br> LETTERS or more in ENGLISH | \% Children <br> (Std III-V) who <br> CAN READ Level 1 (Std 1 Text) or more | $\qquad$ | \% Children (Std III-V) who CAN READ sentences in ENGLISH |
| East* |  | 1.5 | 32.1 | 44.8 | 68.1 | 96.6 | 100.0 | 95.0 | 87.6 | 81.9 | 62.8 |
| North | 54.6 | 1.7 | 25.6 | 33.3 | 52.4 | 98.7 | 99.3 | 97.4 | 75.6 | 79.8 | 69.2 |
| South | 80.5 | 3.7 | 27.7 | 32.5 | 64.7 | 94.8 | 94.7 | 92.7 | 71.2 | 65.4 | 53.7 |
| West | 84.0 | 2.6 | 23.7 | 27.2 | 65.2 | 92.7 | 94.8 | 91.9 | 73.8 | 81.4 | 60.4 |
| Total | 79.9 | 2.3 | 28.3 | 37.2 | 65.0 | 95.5 | 97.4 | 94.0 | 78.9 | 77.8 | 60.9 |

* Blank cells indicate insufficient data.



## SCHOOL ENROLLMENT AND OUT OF SCHOOL CHILDREN

| Table 1: \% Children in different types of SCHOOLS 2009 |  |  |  | \% Out of school | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in School |  |
| Age: 6-14 ALL | 79.2 | 19.7 | 0.2 | 0.9 | 100 |
| AgE: 7-16 ALL | 79.0 | 18.1 | 0.2 | 2.7 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 77.9 | 21.3 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 100 |
| AgE: 7-10 BOYS | 75.4 | 23.9 | 0.2 | 0.6 | 100 |
| AgE: 7-10 GIRLS | 80.5 | 18.7 | 0.3 | 0.5 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 ALL | 82.2 | 16.1 | 0.2 | 1.4 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 BOYS | 81.0 | 17.1 | 0.2 | 1.7 | 100 |
| AgE: 11-14 GIRLS | 83.5 | 15.2 | 0.2 | 1.1 | 100 |
| AgE: 15-16 ALL | 73.9 | 15.3 | 0.2 | 10.7 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 BOYS | 72.6 | 16.1 | 0.2 | 11.0 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 GIRLS | 75.1 | 14.5 | 0.1 | 10.3 | 100 |


note : 'отнer' includes chidren going to madarssa and EGS.
'кот in school' = dropped out + never enrolled.


| Std. | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 39.5 | 52.2 | 5.0 |  |  |  |  | 3.4 |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| II | 1.0 | 20.3 | 69.8 | 6.9 |  |  |  |  | 2.0 |  |  |  | 100 |
| III |  | . 1 | 17.5 | 73.7 | 6.3 |  |  |  | 1.4 |  |  |  | 100 |
| IV |  | 1.6 |  | 16.4 | 73.1 | 8.0 |  |  |  | 1.0 |  |  | 100 |
| V |  | 1. |  |  | 9.0 | 80.1 | 7.0 |  |  | 2.0 |  |  | 100 |
| VI |  |  | 1.8 |  |  | 8.0 | 65.5 | 21.0 |  |  | 8 |  | 100 |
| VII |  |  | 1. | . 8 |  |  | 9.1 | 70.7 | 14.9 |  | 3.5 |  | 100 |
| VIII |  |  |  | 1.6 |  |  |  | 11.3 | 72.9 | 10.6 |  | 3.6 | 100 |

How to read the table: In Std III, $97.5 \%(17.5+73.7+6.3)$ children are in age group 7 to 9 .

## Young CHILDREN IN PRE-SCHOOL AND SCHOOL

|  |  |  |  | In Scho |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | anganwadi | UKG | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | io त |  |
| Age 3 | 68.6 | 20.0 |  |  |  | 11.4 | 100 |
| Age 4 | 53.8 | 42.4 |  |  |  | 3.7 | 100 |
| Age 5 | 17.4 | 18.6 | 39.2 | 23.4 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 100 |
| Age 6 | 1.5 | 2.3 | 64.5 | 30.9 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 100 |

Chart 3: Trends over time
\% Children age 3-4 not attending pre-school (ICDS or other) 2006-2009


Of the villages visited, Anganwadi/Pre-School presence has been recorded in 94.3 \% villages.

## Reading in own language

Table 4: Class-wise \% children who CAN READ (All Schools) 2009

| STD. | Nothing | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (STD 1 Text) | Level 2 <br> (STd 2 Text) | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| I | 55.4 | 29.8 | 10.5 | 1.9 | 2.5 | 100 |
| II | 20.0 | 33.8 | 35.1 | 7.8 | 3.2 | 100 |
| III | 10.5 | 19.5 | 41.1 | 20.5 | 8.4 | 100 |
| IV | 4.3 | 9.9 | 30.7 | 33.5 | 21.6 | 100 |
| V | 3.7 | 7.2 | 19.4 | 34.4 | 35.3 | 100 |
| VI | 1.2 | 4.5 | 15.6 | 30.0 | 48.7 | 100 |
| VII | 0.7 | 3.4 | 10.9 | 25.4 | 59.6 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.6 | 1.6 | 7.2 | 21.6 | 69.1 | 100 |
| TOTAL | 10.6 | 12.6 | 20.9 | 23.0 | 33.0 | 100 |

NOTE : Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. Thus a child who can read Std II level text can read letters, words, and Std 1 level text.

## Reading Tool

andibsid Apompis pror - 4


Chart 4: Trends over time
\% Children who Cannot even identify letters (in govt schools in Std I - IV) 2006-2009


Chart 5: Trends over time
\% Children who Can read Std II level text (in govt schools in Std IV - VII) 2006-2009


## Reading and comprehension in english

## TABLE 5: CLASS-WISE \% CHILDREN WHO CAN READ

ENGLISH (All Schools) 2009

Cannot Can readCan readCan read Can read Total Std. | read |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| capital | capital | small | simple |
| letters | letters | words | sentences | letters

| I | 56.7 | 17.5 | 15.8 | 7.7 | 2.4 | 100 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| II | 28.4 | 22.0 | 30.5 | 13.4 | 5.8 | 100 |
| III | 17.5 | 19.1 | 35.2 | 19.9 | 8.4 | 100 |
| IV | 8.9 | 11.9 | 34.3 | 29.2 | 15.8 | 100 |
| V | 6.5 | 10.0 | 29.7 | 34.9 | 19.0 | 100 |
| VI | 3.0 | 7.7 | 21.2 | 38.4 | 29.8 | 100 |
| VII | 1.8 | 4.6 | 18.1 | 36.5 | 39.0 | 100 |
| VIII | 1.5 | 2.8 | 14.2 | 34.3 | 47.3 | 100 |
| TOTAL | 13.8 | 11.4 | 24.9 | 27.9 | 22.1 | 100 |


| Std. | Of those who can read words, \% who can tell meaning of the words | Of those who can read sentences, \% who can tell meaning of the sentences |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 58.7 | 77.7 |
| II | 64.7 | 59.7 |
| III | 59.8 | 68.6 |
| IV | 61.8 | 69.5 |
| V | 60.5 | 74.1 |
| VI | 61.7 | 77.6 |
| VII | 66.9 | 74.8 |
| VIII | 69.2 | 78.9 |
| Total | 63.6 | 75.3 |


| English Tool |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
| B H R <br>  $\mathbf{L}$  <br> M V  <br> P F  | z  $j$  <br>  w  g <br>     <br> u  5 k |
| $\|$rat  hot <br>  big  <br> cow  man <br>    <br>   pen | $\qquad$ <br> 4 <br> What is the time? <br> This is a rod ball. <br> 1 Hike to play, <br> 1 have a fiathers |
|  |  |

## ARITHMETIC

|  |  | Recogni | Numbers |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| STD. | Nothing | 1-9 | 11-99 | Subtract | Divide | Total |
| I | 44.8 | 31.6 | 19.4 | 2.8 | 1.5 | 100 |
| II | 15.4 | 27.0 | 49.8 | 6.7 | 1.2 | 100 |
| III | 8.4 | 14.6 | 57.7 | 16.7 | 2.6 | 100 |
| IV | 3.5 | 6.2 | 51.1 | 32.3 | 6.9 | 100 |
| V | 2.8 | 3.5 | 38.2 | 41.5 | 13.9 | 100 |
| VI | 0.7 | 1.7 | 28.4 | 45.5 | 23.7 | 100 |
| VII | 0.7 | 1.8 | 20.9 | 44.3 | 32.3 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.5 | 0.7 | 14.3 | 42.5 | 42.0 | 100 |
| Total | 8.4 | 9.8 | 34.6 | 30.7 | 16.5 | 100 |

NOTE : Each cell shows the highest level of arithmetic achieved by a child. Thus a child who can do division, can also recognize numbers 1-9, 11-99 and do subtraction.

Chart 6: Trends over time
\% Children who CANNOT EVEN RECOGNIZE NUMBERS UPTO 9 (IN GOVT SCHOOLS IN STD I - IV) 2007-2009



Chart 7: Trends over time
\% Children who CAN DO division (in govt schools in Std IV - Vil) 2007-2009


## TUITION

Table 8: Class-wise \% children attending tuition classes. BY SCHOOL TYPE 2007 AND 2009

| Year | School | I | II | III | IV | V | VI | VII | VIII |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | Govt | 10.8 | 12.9 | 13.8 | 16.0 | 16.7 | 18.3 | 17.5 | 17.1 |
|  | PvT. | 26.5 | 29.5 | 33.5 | 37.5 | 39.9 | 30.9 | 29.5 | 30.8 |
| $\mathbf{2} \mathbf{2 0 0 9} \boldsymbol{2 0 0}$ | Govt | 16.3 | 20.9 | 19.5 | 22.3 | 24.1 | 22.5 | 19.6 | 20.0 |
|  | Pvt. | 28.6 | 31.9 | 37.2 | 41.4 | 36.1 | 29.4 | 33.1 | 35.2 |

NOTE : The ASER survey in 2007 and 2009 recorded information about tuition. In both years, the question asked was the following: "Does the child take any paid additional class currently?" Therefore, these numbers do not include any supplemental help in learning that children may have received from parents or siblings or from anyone else that did not require payment.


## LEARNING LEVELS IN GOVERNMENT AND PRIVATE SCHOOLS : TRENDS OVER TIME

Chart 8: \% Children in Std III who CAN AT LEAST READ Std I LEVEL TEXT. BY SCHOOL TYPE 2006-2009


Chart 9: \% Children in Std V who CAN DO DIVISION. BY SCHOOL TYPE 2006-2009


## Learning Levels by gender : Trends over time

Chart 10: \% Boys and girls in Std III who CAN READ AT LEAST Std I LEVEL text 2007-2009


Chart 11: \% Boys and girls in Std V who CAN do division 2007-2009


## EDUCATION : FATHERS AND CHILDREN

| Fathers' Education | \% Fathers | Of these fathers : |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | \% Girls 6 to 14 out of school | \% Children (Std III-V) who can read level 1 (Std 1 Text) or more | \% Children (Std III-V) who can do subtraction or more | \% Children (Std III-V) who can read words or more in English | \% Children (Std IV-VIII) attending tuition |
| No Schooling | 26.0 | 1.1 | 47.6 | 32.7 | 33.2 | 17.4 |
| Std I-V | 18.6 | 0.7 | 53.0 | 36.3 | 37.6 | 24.9 |
| Std VI-VIII | 21.0 | 0.7 | 54.5 | 41.6 | 47.6 | 25.5 |
| Std IX-X | 22.2 | 0.4 | 55.1 | 43.4 | 50.2 | 27.3 |
| Above Std X | 12.2 | 0.5 | 60.4 | 49.8 | 57.3 | 30.2 |

[^28] and children.


## SCHOOL ENROLLMENT AND ATTENDANCE : TRENDS OVER TIME



| TABLE 11: CHILDREN'S ATtendance 2005 | 2007 | 2009 | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Type of school | Std I-IV/V |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |
| \% Enrolled children attending <br> (average) <br> \% Schools with less than 50\% <br> enrolled children attending | 91.2 | 91.2 | 91.7 | 89.7 | 90.2 | 90.1 |
| \% Shools with 75\% or more <br> enrolled children attending | 95.1 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.0 |

Type of school
\% Enrolled children attending (average)
\% Schools with less than 50\% enrolled children attending enrolled children attending

## Table 13: Multigrade classes

200520072009200520072009
\% Of schools in which:
Std II class sitting with another class
Std IV class sitting with another class

Std I-IV/V Std I-VII/VIII
$76.1 \quad 77.3$
77.871 .5
$69.3 \quad 73.3$
70.163 .6

## School facilities : TRENDS OVER TIME

| Table 14: Facilities in school |  | 20052007 |  | 2009 | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \% Schools with: |  | Std I-IV/V |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \pm \\ & \stackrel{y}{N} \\ & \vdots \end{aligned}$ | No facility | 23.4 | 15.4 | 12.0 | 16.4 | 12.6 | 9.8 |
|  | Facility but water not available | 10.8 | 5.3 | 6.4 | 8.5 | 5.0 | 6.4 |
|  | Available | 65.8 | 79.2 | 81.6 | 75.1 | 82.4 | 83.8 |
|  | No facility | 27.8 | 20.1 | 16.5 | 20.6 | 13.7 | 11.6 |
|  | Facility but toilet not usable | 14.1 | 31.7 | 30.4 | 14.3 | 15.1 | 30.5 |
|  | Usable | 58.1 | 48.2 | 53.1 | 65.1 | 71.2 | 57.9 |
| Midday meal served on day |  | 83.7 | 79.8 | 97.2 | 85.7 | 79.1 | 99.6 |


| TABLE 16: GIRLS ToIlets 2009 | Std I-IV/V Std I-VII/VIII |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| No of schools visited | 281 | 227 |
| \% Schools with no separate provision <br> for girls toilets | 29.5 | 21.6 |
| Of schools where there are separate girls toilets, \% schools where: |  |  |
| Toilet locked | 13.2 | 11.0 |
| Toilet not usable | 14.2 | 15.4 |
| Usable | 43.1 | 52.0 |

Table 15: School improvement \& construction since April 2008

| School improvement \& Construction | Std I-IV/V |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. of schs | \% schools |  | No. of schs | \% schools |  |
|  |  | Yes | No |  | Yes | No |
| Whitewash | 375 | 56.8 | 43.2 | 257 | 63.4 | 36.6 |
| Construction of new classroom | 373 | 16.1 | 83.9 | 254 | 32.7 | 67.3 |
| Construction of boundary wall | 372 | 26.6 | 73.4 | 242 | 33.9 | 66.1 |

ASER survey was carried out in Oct-Nov 2009. One govt school with primary grades was visited in each sampled village. If there was more than one govt school in a village, then the school with the highest enrollment was visited. Hence the schools visited in the ASER survey do not represent a random sample of schools of the district. The school visits were generally done either on a Saturday or a Monday.

| School Grants |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| New | Rs 2 lacs per |
| classrooms | additional room |$|$| Ms. 5000 pa upto 3 |
| :---: | :---: |

Rs. 5000 pa for Development primary schs \& Rs grant $\quad 7000$ pa for upper primary schs

Rs. 500 pa per teacher

## SCHOOL GRANTS

| Table 17: <br> \% Primary <br> SCHOOLS RECEIVING <br> DIFFERENT GRANTS | April 2008-March 2009 |  |  |  | April 2009-October 2009 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Std I-IV/V |  |  |  | Std I-IV/V |  |  |  |
|  | No. of schs | Yes | No | Don't know | No. of schs | Yes | No | Don't know |
| New classroom | 305 | 12.8 | 83.0 | 4.3 | 248 | 8.9 | 83.5 | 7.7 |
| Maintenance grant | 320 | 77.8 | 15.6 | 6.6 | 282 | 75.9 | 14.9 | 9. |
| Development grant | 282 | 57.8 | 33.3 | 8.9 | 253 | 54.9 | 34.4 | 10 |
| Teacher grant (TLM grant)* | 248 | 10.1 | 84.3 | 5.7 | 225 | 6.2 | 85.8 | 8.0 |
| Other grants | 194 | 10.3 | 79.9 | 9.8 | 181 | 9.4 | 76.8 | 13.8 |

[^29] NOTE : No grant information was available for 32 schools out of 385 primary schools that were visited. This could be because the head teacher was not present, register was not available or the surveyors could not obtain the information. Therefore, the above table is based on schools for which information was available for at least one indicator.

## TABle 18:

 \% Upper primaryschools receiving different grants

## New classroom

Maintenance grant
Development grant
Teacher grant
(TLM grant)*
Other grants

April 2008-March 2009 April 2009-October 2009
Std I-VII/VIII Std I-VII/VIII
$\begin{gathered}\text { No. of } \\ \text { schs }\end{gathered}$ Yes No $\begin{gathered}\text { Don't } \\ \text { know }\end{gathered} \begin{gathered}\text { No. of } \\ \text { schs }\end{gathered}$ Yes No $\begin{gathered}\text { Don't }\end{gathered}$

| 220 | 32.7 | 62.7 | 4.6 | 163 | 14.1 | 79.8 | 6.1 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

* No TLM is given in schools where Activity Based Learning is being implemented.

NOTE : No grant information was available for 16 schools out of 261 upper primary schools that were visited. This could be because the head teacher was not present, register was not available or the surveyors could not obtain the information. Therefore, the above table is based on schools for which information was available for at least one indicator.

PERFORMANCE OF DISTRICTS

| Table 19: | $\begin{gathered} \text { ANGANWADI } \\ \text { OR } \\ \text { BALWADI } \end{gathered}$ | OUT OF SCHOOL | Private <br> SCHOOL | TuItion | Mothers' Reading | Std I-II : Learning levels |  |  | Std III-V : Learning levels |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Districts | \% Children <br> (Age 3-4) <br> in <br> anganwadi <br> or <br> pre-school | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) <br> out of school | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) <br> in private school | \% Children (Std IV-VIII) attending tuition classes | \% Mothers <br> (Age: 17-55) <br> who <br> CAN READ | \% Children <br> (Std I-II) who CAN READ letters, words or more | \% Children <br> (Std I-II) <br> who CAN <br> RECOGNIZE <br> NUMBERS <br> 1 to 9 <br> or more | \% Children <br> (Std I-II) <br> who CAN <br> READ <br> LETTERS or more in ENGLISH | \% Children <br> (Std III-V) who CAN READ Level 1 (Std 1 Text) or more | \% Children <br> (Std III-V) who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more | \% Children (Std III-V) who CAN READ sentences in ENGLISH |
| Ariyalur | 96.5 | 0.9 | 14.8 | 23.8 | 57.6 | 43.2 | 45.2 | 37.6 | 49.7 | 41.2 | 7.4 |
| Coimbatore | 87.3 | 1.1 | 21.3 | 28.4 | 73.5 | 83.7 | 87.5 | 77.1 | 72.3 | 63.9 | 30.1 |
| Cuddalore | 96.3 | 0.1 | 20.8 | 27.2 | 59.3 | 60.1 | 75.0 | 61.7 | 64.7 | 44.4 | 16.6 |
| Dharmapuri | 96.9 | 0.5 | 17.2 | 13.3 | 62.6 | 59.8 | 65.7 | 60.0 | 58.0 | 33.5 | 10.6 |
| Dindigul* |  | 1.0 | 19.4 | 19.6 | 90.4 | 65.0 | 73.6 | 58.1 | 53.2 | 48.9 | 7.8 |
| Erode* |  | 2.2 | 10.1 | 8.3 | 55.0 | 51.1 | 55.4 | 51.7 | 36.7 | 39.8 | 10.1 |
| Kancheepuram | 85.7 | 0.2 | 20.9 | 17.3 | 70.3 | 61.8 | 78.9 | 56.9 | 65.0 | 38.3 | 26.5 |
| Kanniyakumari | 93.6 | 0.6 | 47.2 | 59.7 | 89.5 | 88.7 | 96.3 | 90.6 | 65.1 | 56.7 | 37.6 |
| Karur | 95.1 | 0.2 | 28.6 | 17.3 | 56.3 | 57.8 | 63.9 | 47.0 | 65.9 | 44.2 | 14.7 |
| Madurai | 92.4 | 1.8 | 20.6 | 29.7 | 81.1 | 59.0 | 57.3 | 49.2 | 47.3 | 54.1 | 13.4 |
| Nagapattinam | 80.6 | 0.9 | 19.9 | 21.7 | 75.4 | 36.7 | 41.2 | 36.5 | 31.0 | 28.7 | 12.0 |
| Namakkal | 93.0 | 0.3 | 18.6 | 21.7 | 70.5 | 62.6 | 69.6 | 57.0 | 49.0 | 32.5 | 23.8 |
| Perambalur | 87.9 | 2.2 | 24.3 | 19.8 | 72.0 | 57.3 | 73.3 | 60.0 | 60.5 | 42.3 | 16.7 |
| Pudukkottai | 98.4 | 0.9 | 13.5 | 10.7 | 82.5 | 60.2 | 58.8 | 46.6 | 45.3 | 16.3 | 7.5 |
| Ramanathapuram | 93.5 | 0.9 | 23.5 | 22.6 | 69.7 | 61.2 | 65.4 | 51.5 | 65.1 | 55.6 | 12.3 |
| Salem | 98.1 | 2.1 | 15.0 | 23.0 | 42.9 | 38.4 | 55.0 | 39.6 | 18.6 | 18.1 | 5.8 |
| Sivagangai | 91.1 | 0.4 | 25.5 | 33.3 | 67.8 | 62.8 | 68.2 | 58.8 | 60.5 | 53.6 | 7.2 |
| Thanjavur | 89.9 | 0.8 | 12.9 | 6.2 | 62.5 | 67.5 | 72.4 | 52.2 | 51.5 | 19.7 | 4.4 |
| Theni | 95.9 | 0.7 | 7.9 | 47.0 | 55.0 | 73.3 | 69.3 | 51.0 | 73.3 | 65.9 | 10.4 |
| The Nilgiris | 52.3 | 0.2 | 46.3 | 25.9 | 95.0 | 67.0 | 62.1 | 64.2 | 67.5 | 75.2 | 26.1 |
| Thiruvallur | 93.7 | 0.8 | 26.6 | 29.7 | 75.5 | 73.3 | 79.0 | 76.0 | 50.0 | 39.4 | 21.7 |
| Thiruvarur | 81.9 | 1.3 | 18.4 | 25.9 | 57.6 | 54.7 | 64.6 | 51.6 | 37.3 | 34.1 | 9.8 |
| Thoothukkudi | 91.7 | 1.1 | 31.7 | 38.1 | 58.2 | 67.2 | 76.0 | 63.1 | 66.1 | 44.4 | 23.0 |
| Tiruchirappalli | 87.8 | 0.6 | 22.8 | 40.4 | 75.1 | 79.9 | 79.7 | 53.6 | 83.3 | 63.3 | 25.8 |
| Tirunelveli | 96.0 | 0.6 | 29.4 | 34.8 | 80.2 | 67.4 | 83.3 | 67.6 | 58.7 | 45.7 | 13.8 |
| Tiruvannamalai | 89.5 | 1.2 | 21.5 | 20.1 | 76.6 | 63.5 | 70.4 | 61.4 | 48.3 | 28.8 | 10.1 |
| Vellore | 92.4 | 0.7 | 22.2 | 19.7 | 66.0 | 78.1 | 87.0 | 80.9 | 49.7 | 34.0 | 18.7 |
| Viluppuram | 99.1 | 0.7 | 6.9 | 18.6 | 66.5 | 58.2 | 68.7 | 53.5 | 28.5 | 19.5 | 14.2 |
| Virudhunagar | 88.5 | 1.8 | 20.7 | 32.4 | 47.4 | 64.9 | 72.2 | 54.1 | 64.8 | 42.9 | 6.7 |
| Total | 92.6 | 0.9 | 19.7 | 24.0 | 66.6 | 62.4 | 70.0 | 57.5 | 53.0 | 39.7 | 14.9 |

*Blank cells indicate insufficient data.

## SCHOOL ENROLLMENT AND OUT OF SCHOOL CHILDREN

| Table 1: \% Children in different types of schools 2009 |  |  |  | \% Out of school |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in School |  |
| AgE: 6-14 ALL | 93.5 | 4.3 | 0.3 | 1.9 | 100 |
| Age: 7-16 ALL | 93.1 | 3.4 | 0.3 | 3.2 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 93.3 | 5.8 | 0.3 | 0.6 | 100 |
| AGE: 7-10 BOYS | 93.5 | 5.6 | 0.2 | 0.8 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 GIRLS | 93.0 | 6.2 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 ALL | 94.3 | 2.1 | 0.3 | 3.3 | 100 |
| AGE: 11-14 BOYS | 94.5 | 1.7 | 0.4 | 3.4 | 100 |
| AGE: 11-14 GIRLS | 94.2 | 2.4 | 0.1 | 3.4 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 ALL | 90.3 | 1.6 | 0.3 | 7.8 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 BOYS | 89.5 | 2.1 | 0.4 | 8.1 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 GIRLS | 91.3 | 0.9 | 0.2 | 7.7 | 100 |


note : 'отнer' includes chidren going to madarssa and EGS.
'от IN SCHool' = dropped out + never enrolled.


| Std. | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 4.7 | 45.0 | 35.7 | 6.3 | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.3 |  |  |  | 100 |
| II | 2.1 | 3.8 | 24.7 | 59.0 | 4.8 | 1.3 |  |  |  | 4.3 |  |  | 100 |
| III |  | . 0 | 4.3 | 18.5 | 60.5 | 10.9 |  |  |  | 4.7 |  |  | 100 |
| IV |  |  | 2 |  | 10.0 | 64.1 | 9.0 | 7.4 | 0.8 |  | 4.5 |  | 100 |
| V |  |  | . 5 |  | 3.8 | 19.2 | 44.0 | 19.6 | 4.8 | 4.5 | 2. | 6 | 100 |
| VI |  |  |  | . 1 |  |  | 9.9 | 59.1 | 15.0 | 6.9 | 3.5 | 2.5 | 100 |
| VII |  |  |  | 1.6 |  |  |  | 14.4 | 45.9 | 23.6 | 10.7 | 3.8 | 100 |
| VIII |  |  |  |  | . 0 |  |  |  | 12.1 | 50.8 | 21.3 | 8.8 | 100 |

How to read the table: In Std III, 90.0\% (18.5+60.5+10.9) children are in age group 8 to 10 .

## Young CHILDREN IN PRE-SCHOOL AND SCHOOL

|  |  |  |  | In Scho |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | anganwadi | UKG | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | io त |  |
| Age 3 | 23.9 | 46.7 |  |  |  | 29.4 | 100 |
| Age 4 | 32.7 | 48.0 |  |  |  | 19.3 | 100 |
| Age 5 | 17.3 | 31.3 | 24.5 | 9.5 | 0.9 | 16.5 | 100 |
| Age 6 | 9.3 | 12.4 | 64.4 | 6.6 | 0.8 | 6.6 | 100 |

Chart 3: Trends over time
\% Children age 3-4 not attending Pre-school (ICDS OR OTHER) 2006-2009


Of the villages visited, Anganwadi/Pre-School presence has been recorded in 98.3 \% villages.

## Reading in own language

NOTE : Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. Thus a child who can read Std II level text can read letters, words, and Std 1 level text.

Table 4: Class-wise \% children who CAN READ (All Schools) 2009

| StD. | Nothing | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (STd 1 Text) | Level 2 <br> (Std 2 Text) | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| I | 7.0 | 62.3 | 20.2 | 8.8 | 1.7 | 100 |
| II | 7.9 | 40.2 | 30.4 | 12.5 | 9.0 | 100 |
| III | 2.5 | 28.4 | 33.4 | 25.1 | 10.7 | 100 |
| IV | 0.8 | 15.9 | 24.0 | 35.3 | 23.9 | 100 |
| V | 1.1 | 12.3 | 24.6 | 34.6 | 27.4 | 100 |
| VI | 0.6 | 7.4 | 20.7 | 39.9 | 31.4 | 100 |
| VII | 0.9 | 3.0 | 9.1 | 34.7 | 52.2 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.3 | 2.0 | 5.7 | 38.7 | 53.4 | 100 |
| TOTAL | 2.7 | 22.0 | 21.4 | 28.6 | 25.4 | 100 |


| Std. | Nothing | Letter | Word | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Level } 1 \\ \text { (STd } 1 \text { Text) }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Level 2 } \\ \text { (STd } 2 \text { Text) }\end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | Total



NOTE : The test was also available in Bengali and English.
CHART 5: TRENDS OVER TIME
\% Children who CAN READ Std II level text (in govt schools in Std IV - VII) 2006-2009


Chart 4: TRENDS OVER TIME
\% Children who CANNOT EVEN IDENTIFY LETTERS (IN GOVt Schools in Std I - IV) 2006-2009


## ARITHMETIC

| Std. | Nothing | Recognize Numbers |  | Subtract | Divide | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1-9 | 11-99 |  |  |  |
| I | 5.5 | 36.6 | 45.3 | 11.6 | 1.0 | 100 |
| II | 4.7 | 24.3 | 42.9 | 24.0 | 4.1 | 100 |
| III | 1.9 | 16.0 | 37.8 | 37.0 | 7.3 | 100 |
| IV | 0.8 | 11.2 | 28.9 | 40.7 | 18.4 | 100 |
| V | 0.5 | 6.9 | 22.0 | 46.5 | 24.1 | 100 |
| VI | 0.8 | 6.6 | 18.6 | 42.5 | 31.6 | 100 |
| VII | 0.4 | 3.0 | 8.5 | 39.2 | 48.9 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.3 | 0.5 | 8.7 | 30.7 | 59.8 | 100 |
| Total | 1.9 | 13.3 | 26.9 | 34.1 | 23.8 | 100 |

NOTE : Each cell shows the highest level of arithmetic achieved by a child. Thus a child who can do division, can also recognize numbers 1-9, 11-99 and do subtraction.

Chart 6: Trends over time
\% Children who CANNOT EVEN RECOGNIZE NUMBERS UPTO 9 (IN GOVT SCHOOLS IN STD I - IV) 2007-2009



Chart 7: Trends over time
\% Children who CAN DO DIVISION (in govt schools in Std IV - VII) 2007-2009


## TUITION

Table 8: Class-wise \% children ATTENDING TUITION CLASSES. BY SCHOOL TYPE 2007 AND 2009

| Year | School | I | II | III | IV | V | VI | VII | VIII |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | Govt | 57.4 | 62.8 | 64.8 | 67.2 | 73.7 | 75.0 | 73.2 | 80.0 |
|  | PVT. | 45.8 | 31.4 | 48.9 | 13.7 | 33.3 | 100.0 | 100.0 | No <br> Data |
| 2009 | Govt | 65.3 | 64.2 | 71.2 | 74.1 | 65.0 | 72.7 | 83.2 | 85.6 |
|  | PVT. | 96.0 | 42.6 | 65.3 | 100.0 | 74.1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

NOTE : The ASER survey in 2007 and 2009 recorded information about tuition. In both years, the question asked was the following: "Does the child take any paid additional class currently?" Therefore, these numbers do not include any supplemental help in learning that children may have received from parents or siblings or from anyone else that did not require payment.


## TRIPURA <br> RURAL

## LEARNING LEVELS IN GOVERNMENT AND PRIVATE SCHOOLS : TRENDS OVER TIME

Chart 8: \% Children in Std III who CAN AT LEAST READ Std I LEVEL TEXT. BY SCHOOL TYPE 2006-2009


Chart 9: \% Children in Std V who CAN DO DIVISION.
BY SCHOOL TYPE 2006-2009


Learning levels by gender : Trends over time

Chart 10: \% Boys and girls in Std III who CAN READ AT LEAST StD I LEVEL TEXT 2007-2009


Chart 11: \% Boys and girls in Std V who CAN DO DIVISION 2007-2009


## EDUCATION : FATHERS AND CHILDREN

|  |  |  |  | Of these father |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fathers' <br> Education | \% <br> Fathers | Girls 6 to 14 out of school | \% Children (Std III-V) who can read level 1 (Std 1 Text) or more | \% Children (Std III-V) who can do subtraction or more | \% Children (Std III-V) who can read words or more in English | \% Children (Std IV-VIII) attending tuition |
| No Schooling | 19.1 | 4.5 | 46.1 | 54.7 | 43.7 | 64.1 |
| Std I-V | 23.3 | 2.0 | 46.1 | 54.3 | 47.5 | 75.2 |
| Std VI-VIII | 17.2 | 1.0 | 59.6 | 63.7 | 53.0 | 79.4 |
| Std IX-X | 27.0 | 0.0 | 55.4 | 68.6 | 58.7 | 81.2 |
| Above Std X | 13.5 | 2.1 | 67.9 | 69.6 | 66.6 | 93.6 |

NOTE : ASER 2009 recorded information about mothers' education. Similar analyses can be done with mothers and children.


## SCHOOL ENROLLMENT AND ATTENDANCE : TRENDS OVER TIME



| TABLE 11: ChILDREN'S ATtENDANCE 2005 | 2007 | 2009 | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Type of school | Std I-IV/V |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |
| \% Enrolled children attending <br> (average) | 68.3 | 75.9 | 76.2 | 87.4 | 84.5 | 71.1 |
| \% Schools with less than 50\% <br> enrolled children attending | 26.7 | 4.8 | 6.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 12.5 |
| \% Schools with 75\% or more <br> enrolled children attending | 53.3 | 52.4 | 53.4 | 100 | 86.7 | 42.5 |

\% Enrolled children attending
\% Schools with less than 50\% enrolled children attending Schools with 75\% or more

Table 13: Multigrade classes
200520072009200520072009
\% Of schools in which:
Std II class sitting with another class
Std IV class sitting with another class

Std I-IV/V Std I-VII/VIII


## School facilities : TRENDS OVER TIME

| Table 14: Facilities in school |  | 200520072009200520072009 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \% Schools with: |  | Std I-IV/V |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\#} \\ & \stackrel{N}{0} \\ & \vdots \end{aligned}$ | No facility | 0.0 | 32.3 | 30.9 | 50.0 | 22.7 | 37.5 |
|  | Facility but water not available | 20.0 | 12.9 | 16.4 | 50.0 | 13.6 | 12.5 |
|  | Available | 80.0 | 54.8 | 52.7 | 0.0 | 63.6 | 50.0 |
|  | No facility | 0.0 | 15.6 | 3.3 | 0.0 | 27.3 | 9.1 |
|  | Facility but toilet not usable | 0.0 | 6.3 | 20.0 | 100 | 18.2 | 6.8 |
|  | Usable | 100 | 78.1 | 76.7 | 0.0 | 54.5 | 84.1 |
| Midday meal served on day |  | 78.6 | 90.0 | 92.5 | 100 | 100 | 92.5 |


| TABLE 16: GIRLS ToILETS | 2009 | Std I-IV/V | Std I-VII/VIII |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No of schools visited | 44 | 37 |  |
| \% Schools with no separate provision <br> for girls toilets | 52.3 | 37.8 |  |
| Of schools where there are separate girls toilets, \% schools where: |  |  |  |
| Toilet locked | 4.5 | 5.4 |  |
| Toilet not usable | 11.4 | 13.5 |  |
| Usable | 31.8 | 43.2 |  |

Table 15: School improvement \& construction since April 2008

| School improvement \& Construction | Std I-IV/V |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. of schs | \% schools |  | No. of schs | \% schools |  |
|  |  | Yes | No |  | Yes | No |
| Whitewash | 57 | 36.8 | 63.2 | 43 | 41.9 | 58.1 |
| Construction of new classroom | 57 | 14.0 | 86.0 | 41 | 19.5 | 80.5 |
| Construction of boundary wall | 58 | 12.1 | 87.9 | 42 | 2.4 | 97.6 |

ASER survey was carried out in Oct-Nov 2009. One govt school with primary grades was visited in each sampled village. If there was more than one govt school in a village, then the school with the highest enrollment was visited. Hence the schools visited in the ASER survey do not represent a random sample of schools of the district. The school visits were generally done either on a Saturday or a Monday.

| School Grants |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| classrooms | Rs 2 lacs per <br> additional room |
| Maintenance | Rs. 5000 pa upto 3 <br> grant <br> classrooms. Upto <br> Rs 10000 pa for <br> more than 3 <br> classrooms |
| Development |  |
| grant | Rs. 5000 pa for <br> primary schs \& Rs <br> 7000 pa for upper <br> primary schs |
| TLM grant | Rs. 500 pa per <br> teacher |

## School Grants

| TABLE 17: <br> \% Primary <br> SCHOOLS RECEIVING <br> DIFFERENT GRANTS | April 2008-March 2009 |  |  |  | April 2009-October 2009 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Std I-IV/V |  |  |  | Std I-IV/V |  |  |  |
|  | No. of schs | Yes | No | Don't know | No. of schs | Yes | No | Don't <br> know |
| New classroom | 54 | 20.4 | 61.1 | 18.5 | 39 | 10.3 | 61.5 | 28.2 |
| Maintenance grant | 45 | 40.0 | 42.2 | 17.8 | 32 | 18.8 | 53.1 | 28.1 |
| Development grant | 48 | 54.2 | 31.3 | 14.6 | 33 | 18.2 | 48.5 | 33.3 |
| Teacher grant (TLM grant) | 48 | 54.2 | 29.2 | 16.7 | 35 | 25.7 | 45.7 | 28.6 |
| Other grants | 23 | 26.1 | 47.8 | 26.1 | 21 | 19.1 | 52.4 | 28.6 |

NOTE : No grant information was available for 8 schools out of 60 primary schools that were visited. This could be because the head teacher was not present, register was not available or the surveyors could not obtain the information. Therefore, the above table is based on schools for which information was available for at least one indicator.

| TABLE 18: |
| :--- |
| \% UPPER PRIMARY |
| SCHOOLS RECEIVING |
| DIFFERENT GRANTS |
| New classroom |
| Maintenance grant |
| Development grant |
| Teacher grant |
| (TLM grant) |
| Other grants |

April 2008-March 2009 April 2009-October 2009 Std I-VII/VIII Std I-VII/VIII

| No. of <br> schs | Yes | No |  | Don't <br> know | No. of <br> schs | Yes | No |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 31 | 25.8 | 67.7 | 6.5 | 24 | 20.8 | 62.5 | Don't <br> know |
| 31 | 61.3 | 32.3 | 6.5 | 24 | 45.8 | 41.7 | 12.5 |
| 27 | 81.5 | 14.8 | 3.7 | 18 | 61.1 | 27.8 | 11.1 |
| 30 | 76.7 | 20.0 | 3.3 | 17 | 52.9 | 35.3 | 11.8 |
| 12 | 58.3 | 33.3 | 8.3 | 8 | 37.5 | 50.0 | 12.5 |

## Performance of districts

| Table 19: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ANGANWADI } \\ & \text { OR } \\ & \text { BALWADI } \end{aligned}$ | Out of SCHOOL | Private SCHOOL | TUITION | Mothers' Reading | Std I-II : Learning levels |  |  | Std III-V : Learning levels |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Districts | \% Children <br> (Age 3-4) <br> in anganwadi or pre-school | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) <br> out <br> of <br> school | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) in private school | \% Children (Std IV-VIII) attending tuition classes | \% Mothers <br> (Age: 17-55) who CANREAD | \% Children <br> (Std I-II) who CAN READ letters, words or more | \% Children (Std I-II) who CAN RECOGNIZE NUMBERS 1 to 9 or more | \% Children (Std I-II) who CAN READ LETTERS or more in ENGLISH | \%Children (Std III-V) who CAN READ Level 1 (Std 1 Text) or more | \%Children (Std III-V) who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more | \% Children (Std III-V) who CAN READ sentences in ENGLISH |
| Dhalai | 59.7 | 2.7 | 4.1 | 73.5 | 61.1 | 76.8 | 85.6 | 67.0 | 50.7 | 50.7 | 15.4 |
| North Tripura | 63.5 | 3.0 | 4.1 | 78.3 | 81.2 | 92.3 | 92.0 | 78.7 | 51.1 | 57.1 | 24.9 |
| South Tripura | 81.4 | 1.5 | 5.0 | 74.6 | 77.6 | 97.1 | 96.0 | 89.7 | 56.8 | 61.7 | 24.8 |
| West Tripura | 85.4 | 1.4 | 4.0 | 76.3 | 65.7 | 93.8 | 97.7 | 85.6 | 49.4 | 57.4 | 9.2 |
| Total | 75.6 | 1.9 | 4.3 | 76.0 | 72.4 | 92.7 | 94.9 | 83.2 | 52.1 | 58.1 | 17.9 |



# Uttar Pradesh UtTARAKHAND West Bengal Dadra and Nagar Haveli Daman and Diu Puducherry 



## SCHOOL ENROLLMENT AND OUT OF SCHOOL CHILDREN

| Table 1: \% Children in different types of sChools 2009 |  |  |  | \% Out of school |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in School |  |
| Age: 6-14 ALL | 72.4 | 24.7 | 1.6 | 1.4 | 100 |
| Age: 7-16 ALL | 73.5 | 22.6 | 1.4 | 2.5 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 70.4 | 27.2 | 1.8 | 0.6 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 BOYS | 67.9 | 30.0 | 1.6 | 0.6 | 100 |
| AGE: 7-10 GIRLS | 73.2 | 24.1 | 2.2 | 0.6 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 ALL | 76.3 | 20.1 | 1.3 | 2.3 | 100 |
| AgE: 11-14 BOYS | 75.3 | 21.6 | 1.4 | 1.8 | 100 |
| AgE: 11-14 GIRLS | 77.2 | 18.5 | 1.4 | 3.0 | 100 |
| AgE: 15-16 ALL | 75.1 | 15.9 | 0.8 | 8.3 | 100 |
| AgE: 15-16 BOYS | 75.9 | 16.8 | 0.9 | 6.3 | 100 |
| AgE: 15-16 GIRLS | 72.6 | 15.8 | 0.5 | 11.2 | 100 |


note : 'отнек' includes chidren going to madarssa and EGS.
'№т in school' = dropped out + never enrolled.



How to read the table: In Std III, $75.5 \%(43.3+21.6+10.6)$ children are in age group 8 to 10 .

## Young children in pre-school and school

|  |  |  |  | In Scho |  | $\stackrel{\text { mo }}{=}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | anganwadi |  | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | 을 추 |  |
| Age 3 | 68.1 | 11.5 |  |  |  | 20.4 | 100 |
| Age 4 | 67.0 | 21.5 |  |  |  | 11.5 | 100 |
| Age 5 | 18.4 | 5.9 | 39.1 | 29.2 | 2.4 | 5.0 | 100 |
| Age 6 | 3.6 | 4.6 | 58.6 | 29.9 | 1.6 | 1.7 | 100 |

Chart 3: Trends over time
\% Children age 3-4 not attending pre-school (ICDS or other) 2006-2009


Of the villages visited, Anganwadi/Pre-School presence has been recorded in $86.5 \%$ villages.

## Reading in own language

Table 4: Class-wise \% Children who CAN READ (All Schools) 2009

| STD. | Nothing | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (STD 1 Text) | Level 2 <br> (STD 2 Text) | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| I | 24.5 | 44.5 | 19.5 | 6.7 | 4.8 | 100 |
| II | 7.1 | 27.3 | 38.0 | 17.5 | 10.1 | 100 |
| III | 3.8 | 16.4 | 22.0 | 32.2 | 25.6 | 100 |
| IV | 2.0 | 8.7 | 14.5 | 28.0 | 46.8 | 100 |
| V | 0.9 | 3.7 | 7.9 | 19.5 | 68.1 | 100 |
| VI | 0.8 | 2.7 | 4.7 | 12.8 | 79.1 | 100 |
| VII | 0.6 | 1.7 | 2.5 | 8.9 | 86.5 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.3 | 0.8 | 1.6 | 6.3 | 91.0 | 100 |
| TOTAL | 5.1 | 13.6 | 14.3 | 17.3 | 49.8 | 100 |

NOTE : Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. Thus a child who can read Std II level text can read letters, words, and Std 1 level text.

| Reading Tool |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
| Std ELevel <br> विमला और अण्य मेला देलने गये। उन्हें मेले में तरह-तरह की दुकाने दिर्जी। मेले मों बहुत झूले थे। वही नरम-णरम हलवा और जलेबियौं भी बिक रही थी। जलेखी डेबकर दोनों के मुँह में पानी आने लगा। उन्छें जलेबी खाने का मन करने लगा। विमला ने जलेवी खरीडी। दोरों ने निलकर जलेवी खाई। शाम को दोनों घर लीट आये। | सीता पदन लता भी स ये शास को धर आका च य ₹ शः ह श च न क प | avel <br> जाती <br> जराती <br> स $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ <br> खा <br> गाना <br> Q <br> आतू <br> आय |  |

Chart 4: Trends over time
\% Children who CANNOT EVEN IDENTIFY LETTERS (IN GOVt Schools in Std I - IV) 2006-2009


CHART 5: TRENDS OVER TIME
\% Children who CAN READ Std II level text (in govt schools in Std IV - VII) 2006-2009


## Reading and comprehension in english

## TABLE 5: CLASS-WISE \% CHILDREN WHO CAN READ

ENGLISH (All Schools) 2009

Cannot Can readCan readCan read Can read Total Std. | read | capital | small | simple | easy |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| capital | letters | letters | words sentences |  | letters

| I | 38.3 | 33.3 | 14.8 | 9.4 | 4.3 | 100 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| II | 22.3 | 30.8 | 24.9 | 14.6 | 7.4 | 100 |
| III | 11.6 | 23.7 | 27.3 | 23.5 | 13.9 | 100 |
| IV | 8.3 | 16.9 | 19.8 | 34.8 | 20.3 | 100 |
| V | 5.8 | 9.2 | 16.3 | 34.2 | 34.5 | 100 |
| VI | 3.1 | 7.2 | 11.4 | 27.7 | 50.6 | 100 |
| VII | 2.5 | 3.7 | 6.8 | 26.3 | 60.7 | 100 |
| VIII | 1.5 | 1.9 | 4.6 | 22.1 | 69.8 | 100 |
| TOTAL | 12.0 | 16.3 | 16.3 | 24.4 | 31.0 | 100 |


| TABLE 6: CLASS-WISE \% CHILDREN WHO |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| COMPREHEND ENGLISH |  |
| StD.Of those who <br> can read words, <br> \% who can tell | Of those who <br> can read <br> meaning of the <br> words |
| sentences, \% who |  |
| can tell meaning |  |
| of the sentences |  |$|$



## ARITHMETIC

| Std. | Nothing | Recognize Numbers |  | Subtract | Divide | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1-9 | 11-99 |  |  |  |
| I | 26.1 | 43.9 | 21.8 | 6.0 | 2.2 | 100 |
| II | 7.6 | 32.7 | 40.9 | 14.9 | 3.9 | 100 |
| III | 3.6 | 19.9 | 33.6 | 32.5 | 10.3 | 100 |
| IV | 2.3 | 11.9 | 19.9 | 41.0 | 24.8 | 100 |
| V | 0.9 | 6.2 | 15.9 | 31.3 | 45.7 | 100 |
| VI | 1.3 | 4.3 | 8.6 | 22.5 | 63.3 | 100 |
| VII | 0.9 | 2.0 | 6.9 | 21.8 | 68.4 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.5 | 1.5 | 5.0 | 16.1 | 76.8 | 100 |
| Total | 5.5 | 15.8 | 19.8 | 24.0 | 35.0 | 100 |

NOTE : Each cell shows the highest level of arithmetic achieved by a child. Thus a child who can do division, can also recognize numbers 1-9, 11-99 and do subtraction.

Chart 6: Trends over time
\% Children who CANNOT EVEN RECOGNIZE NUMBERS UPTO 9 (IN GOVt schools in Std I - IV) 2007-2009



Chart 7: Trends over time
\% Children who CAN DO DIVISION (in govt schools in Std IV - VII) 2007-2009


## TUITION

Table 8: Class-wise \% children ATTENDING TUItion CLASSES. BY SCHOOL TYPE 2007 AND 2009

| Year | School | 1 | II | III | IV | V | VI | VII | VIII |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2007 | Govt | 3.6 | 4.8 | 3.7 | 4.8 | 4.2 | 5.1 | 3.5 | 8.8 |
|  | Pvt. | 13.2 | 17.9 | 21.3 | 18.5 | 19.3 | 20.7 | 26.4 | 24.6 |
| 2009 | Govt | 4.8 | 2.8 | 5.5 | 5.2 | 6.5 | 7.3 | 7.5 | 8.4 |
|  | Pvt. | 17.5 | 22.4 | 28.0 | 36.4 | 35.0 | 41.5 | 28.4 | 42.7 |

NOTE : The ASER survey in 2007 and 2009 recorded information about tuition. In both years, the question asked was the following: "Does the child take any paid additional class currently?" Therefore, these numbers do not include any supplemental help in learning that children may have received from parents or siblings or from anyone else that did not require payment.


## LEARNING LEVELS IN GOVERNMENT AND PRIVATE SCHOOLS : TRENDS OVER TIME

Chart 8: \% Children in Std III who CAN AT LEAST READ Std I LEVEL TEXT. BY SCHOOL TYPE 2006-2009


Chart 9: \% Children in Std V who CAN DO DIVISION. BY SCHOOL TYPE 2006-2009


Learning levels by gender : Trends over time

Chart 10: \% Boys and girls in Std III who Can read at least Std I LEVEL text 2007-2009


Chart 11: \% Boys and girls in Std V who CAN do division 2007-2009


## EDUCATION : FATHERS AND CHILDREN

|  |  | Of these fathers : |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fathers' <br> Education | $\%$ <br> Fathers | 6 to 14 out of school | \% Children (Std III-V) who can read level 1 (Std 1 Text) or more | \% Children (Std III-V) who can do subtraction or more | \% Children (Std III-V) who can read words or more in English | \% Children (Std IV-VIII) attending tuition |
| No Schooling | 15.8 | 5.4 | 56.8 | 41.9 | 35.4 | 6.5 |
| Std I-V | 13.0 | 3.8 | 70.0 | 55.6 | 43.5 | 7.9 |
| Std VI-VIII | 17.7 | 0.3 | 75.0 | 61.3 | 51.4 | 7.3 |
| Std IX-X | 27.3 | 0.2 | 75.9 | 65.1 | 58.2 | 13.3 |
| Above Std X | 26.3 | 0.1 | 83.1 | 75.9 | 69.1 | 24.0 |

NOTE : ASER 2009 recorded information about mothers' education. Similar analyses can be done with mothers and children.


## SCHOOL ENROLLMENT AND ATTENDANCE : TRENDS OVER TIME

| TABLE 10: ToTAL SCHools visited |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Type of school | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 |
| Std I-IV/V : Primary | 187 | 316 | 345 |
| Std I-VII/VIII : Primary + Upper Primary | 13 | 16 | 8 |
| Total schools | 200 | 332 | 353 |


| TABLE 12: Teacher attendance | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Type of school | Std I-IV/V |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |
| \% Teachers attending (average) | 75.6 | 91.6 | 94.5 | 91.8 | 93.7 | 77.1 |
| \% Schools with no teacher present | 8.7 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \% Schools with all teachers present | 54.1 | 81.3 | 84.7 | 76.9 | 78.6 | 50.0 |

TABle 11: Children's attendance

200520072009200520072009
Type of school Std I-IV/V Std I-VII/VIII
\% Enrolled children attending (average)
\% Schools with less than 50\% enrolled children attending \% Schools with 75\% or more enrolled children attending

Std I-IV/V Std I-VII/VIII
$\begin{array}{llllll}85.7 & 85.6 & 84.2 & 86.2 & 86.6 & 76.3\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llllll}2.7 & 4.8 & 0.9 & 0.0 & 6.3 & 12.5\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllllll}83.0 & 78.8 & 79.3 & 92.3 & 75.0 & 62.5\end{array}$

## Table 13: Multigrade classes

200520072009200520072009
\% Of schools in which:
Std II class sitting with another class
Std IV class sitting with another class

## School facilities : TRENDS OVER TIME

| Table 14: Facilities in school |  | 200520072009 |  |  | 2005 | 20072009 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \% Schools with: |  | Std I-IV/V |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{ \pm} \\ & \stackrel{\text { N}}{3} \end{aligned}$ | No facility | 24.5 | 15.4 | 14.6 | 23.1 | 0.0 | 42.9 |
|  | Facility but water not available | 6.5 | 10.5 | 13.4 | 7.7 | 6.3 | 0.0 |
|  | Available | 69.0 | 74.1 | 72.0 | 69.2 | 93.8 | 57.1 |
|  | No facility | 25.3 | 6.6 | 6.8 | 16.7 | 0.0 | 33.3 |
|  | Facility but toilet not usable | 19.4 | 15.9 | 31.2 | 25.0 | 18.8 | 33.3 |
|  | Usable | 55.4 | 77.4 | 62.0 | 58.3 | 81.3 | 33.3 |
| Midday meal served on day of visit |  | 84.7 | 97.8 | 89.2 | 69.2 | 93.8 | 71.4 |


| TABLE 16: GIRLS ToILeTS $\mathbf{2 0 0 9}$ | Std I-IV/V | Std I-VII/VIII |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| No of schools visited <br> \% Schools with no separate provision <br> for girls toilets | $\mathbf{2 4 5}$ | 4 |
| Of schools where there are separate girls toilets, $\%$ schools where: |  |  |
| Toilet locked | 11.0 | 50.0 |
| Toilet not usable | 26.5 | 25.0 |
| Usable | 23.3 | 0.0 |

Table 15: School improvement \& construction since April 2008

| School improvement \& Construction | Std I-IV/V |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. of schs | \% schools |  | No. of schs | \% schools |  |
|  |  | Yes | No |  | Yes | No |
| Whitewash | 301 | 84.1 | 16.0 | 5 | 80.0 | 20.0 |
| Construction of new classroom | 289 | 21.5 | 78.6 | 5 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Construction of boundary wall | 291 | 29.2 | 70.8 | 5 | 40.0 | 60.0 |

ASER survey was carried out in Oct-Nov 2009. One govt school with primary grades was visited in each sampled village. If there was more than one govt school in a village, then the school with the highest enrollment was visited. Hence the schools visited in the ASER survey do not represent a random sample of schools of the district. The school visits were generally done either on a Saturday or a Monday.

| School Grants |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| New | Rs 2 lass per <br> classrooms <br> additional room |
| Maintenance <br> grant | Rs. 5000 pa upto 3 <br> classrooms. Upto <br> Rs 10000 pa for <br> more than 3 <br> classrooms |
| Development |  |
| grant | Rs. 5000 pa for <br> primary schs \& Rs <br> 7000 pa for upper <br> primary schs |
| TLM grant | Rs. 500 pa per <br> teacher |

## School Grants

| Table 17: <br> \% Primary <br> SCHOOLS RECEIVING <br> DIFFERENT GRANTS | April 2008-March 2009 |  |  |  | April 2009-October 2009 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Std I-IV/V |  |  |  | Std I-IV/V |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No. of } \\ & \text { schs } \end{aligned}$ | Yes | No | Don't know | No. of schs | Yes | No | Don't know |
| New classroom | 267 | 23.2 | 70.8 | 6.0 | 215 | 11.2 | 76.7 | 12.1 |
| Maintenance grant | 292 | 81.9 | 12.7 | 5.5 | 236 | 61.0 | 29.7 | 9.3 |
| Development grant | 282 | 80.5 | 15.3 | 4.3 | 237 | 64.6 | 27.4 | 8.0 |
| Teacher grant (TLM grant) | 301 | 93.0 | 3.7 | 3.3 | 250 | 80.4 | 13.2 | 6.4 |
| Other grants | 96 | 31.3 | 57.3 | 11.5 | 80 | 18.8 | 66.3 | 15.0 |

[^30]| Table 18: |
| :--- |
| \% UPPER PRIMARY |
| SCHOOLS RECEIVING |
| DIFFERENT GRANTS |
| New classroom |
| Maintenance grant |
| Development grant |
| Teacher grant <br> (TLM grant) |
| Other grants |

April 2008-March 2009 April 2009-October 2009 Std I-VII/VIII Std I-VII/VIII

| Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. of <br> schs | Yes | No | Don't <br> know | No. of <br> schs | Yes | No | Don't <br> know |
| 5 | 0.0 | 80.0 | 20.0 | 4 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| 5 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 |
| 6 | 83.3 | 0.0 | 16.7 | 6 | 83.3 | 16.7 | 0.0 |
| 7 | 85.7 | 14.3 | 0.0 | 7 | 71.4 | 28.6 | 0.0 |
| 2 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 2 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 |

NOTE : No grant information was available for 1 schools out of 8 upper primary schools that were visited. This could be because the head teacher was not present, register was not available or the surveyors could not obtain the information. Therefore, the above table is based on schools for which information was available for at least one indicator.

## Performance of districts

| Table 19: | ANGANWADI OR BALWADI | Out of SCHOOL | Private SCHOOL | TUITION | Mothers' Reading | Std I-II : Learning levels |  |  | Std III-V : Learning levels |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Districts | \% Children (Age 3-4) in anganwadi or pre-school | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% Children } \\ \text { (Age: 6-14) } \\ \text { out } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { school } \end{gathered}$ | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) in private school | \% Children (Std IV-VIII) attending tuition classes | \% Mothers <br> (Age: 17-55) who CAN READ | \%Children (Std I-II) who CAN READ letters, words or more | \% Children (Std I-II) who CAN RECOGNIZE NUMBERS 1 to 9 or more | \% Children (Std I-II) who CAN READ LETTERS or more in ENGLISH | \%Children (Std III-V) who CANREAD Level 1 (Std 1 Text) or more | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% Children } \\ & \text { (Std III-V) } \\ & \text { who } \\ & \text { CAN DO } \\ & \text { SUBTRACTION } \\ & \text { or more } \end{aligned}$ | \% Children (Std III-V) who CAN READ sentences in ENGLISH |
| Almora | 96.7 | 1.2 | 23.8 | 14.4 | 82.3 | 93.2 | 90.3 | 76.7 | 82.6 | 79.8 | 20.9 |
| Bageshwar | 96.8 | 0.8 | 15.4 | 16.4 | 73.9 | 83.7 | 84.8 | 76.7 | 66.1 | 57.8 | 10.5 |
| Chamoli | 82.0 | 0.9 | 9.0 | 11.6 | 67.7 | 84.9 | 86.9 | 67.8 | 77.6 | 68.2 | 10.5 |
| Champawat | 98.7 | 0.5 | 15.2 | 6.6 | 64.7 | 98.1 | 98.6 | 95.8 | 84.6 | 67.4 | 36.7 |
| Dehradun | 78.7 | 3.5 | 46.2 | 26.6 | 85.5 | 73.2 | 72.1 | 68.2 | 64.1 | 50.8 | 28.6 |
| Garhwal | 79.4 | 0.1 | 12.5 | 12.4 | 84.4 | 81.8 | 79.4 | 49.6 | 77.4 | 66.8 | 19.9 |
| Haridwar | 69.1 | 1.8 | 41.1 | 19.5 | 54.1 | 75.0 | 77.5 | 71.0 | 64.0 | 53.4 | 33.8 |
| Nainital | 69.7 | 1.8 | 19.9 | 7.3 | 77.4 | 89.6 | 88.1 | 79.9 | 86.8 | 76.3 | 23.1 |
| Pithoragarh | 92.1 | 0.3 | 13.5 | 7.6 | 83.3 | 95.8 | 86.8 | 74.4 | 90.3 | 84.4 | 23.8 |
| Rudraprayag | 90.5 | 0.0 | 11.7 | 5.7 | 73.7 | 80.0 | 73.8 | 53.7 | 73.1 | 56.7 | 14.5 |
| Tehri Garhwal | 78.4 | 0.0 | 15.9 | 3.6 | 77.1 | 89.0 | 87.3 | 77.3 | 72.0 | 53.2 | 28.9 |
| Udham Singh Nagar | 87.1 | 3.3 | 36.8 | 13.3 | 54.1 | 77.9 | 79.9 | 61.3 | 58.3 | 41.6 | 20.6 |
| Uttarkashi | 92.5 | 1.0 | 29.1 | 14.2 | 78.5 | 81.9 | 80.2 | 69.1 | 69.2 | 46.9 | 19.2 |
| Total | 84.2 | 1.4 | 24.7 | 12.8 | 72.2 | 83.9 | 82.7 | 69.4 | 73.8 | 62.2 | 23.2 |



## SCHOOL ENROLLMENT AND OUT OF SCHOOL CHILDREN

| Table 1: \% Children in different types of SCHOOLS 2009 |  |  |  | \% Out of school |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in School |  |
| Age: 6-14 ALL | 57.3 | 35.8 | 1.9 | 4.9 | 100 |
| Age: 7-16 ALL | 53.7 | 36.8 | 1.7 | 7.9 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 61.5 | 33.6 | 2.0 | 2.9 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 BOYS | 58.3 | 37.2 | 1.8 | 2.7 | 100 |
| AgE: 7-10 GIRLS | 65.0 | 29.4 | 2.4 | 3.3 | 100 |
| AgE: 11-14 ALL | 50.9 | 39.6 | 1.5 | 8.1 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 BOYS | 49.0 | 42.7 | 1.3 | 7.0 | 100 |
| AGE: 11-14 GIRLS | 53.2 | 35.6 | 1.7 | 9.5 | 100 |
| AgE: 15-16 ALL | 37.8 | 39.5 | 1.0 | 21.6 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 BOYS | 38.2 | 40.6 | 1.1 | 20.1 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 GIRLS | 37.7 | 37.8 | 1.1 | 23.5 | 100 |


note : 'отнек' includes chidren going to madarssa and EGS.
'№т in school' = dropped out + never enrolled.


| Std. | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 23.9 | 40.6 | 17.2 | 10.5 | 7.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| II | 3.0 | 14.6 | 31.5 | 29.6 | 7.7 | 8.1 | 5.6 |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| III |  | . 3 | 10.1 | 37.7 | 20.7 | 15.8 | 3.9 | 4.7 | 2.8 |  |  |  | 100 |
| IV |  | . 6 | 3.7 | 14.6 | 25.5 | 31.6 | 7.8 | 9.3 | 6.0 |  |  |  | 100 |
| V |  | 1.8 |  | 5.8 | 7.5 | 36.3 | 18.6 | 17.0 | 5.8 | 7.3 |  |  | 100 |
| VI | 5.0 |  |  |  |  | 15.3 | 22.5 | 35.2 | 11.1 | 6.9 | 4.0 |  | 100 |
| VII | 8.2 |  |  |  |  |  | 7.3 | 36.1 | 24.9 | 14.4 | 7.1 | 2.0 | 100 |
| VIII | 6.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 15.1 | 28.6 | 28.8 | 13.6 | 7.5 | 100 |

How to read the table: In Std III,74.2\% (37.7+20.7+15.8) children are in age group 8 to 10.

## Young children in pre-school and school

|  |  |  |  | n Scho |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | anganwadi | UKG | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | $\underset{\sim}{\circ} \underset{\pi}{~}$ |  |
| Age 3 | 41.7 | 6.2 |  |  |  | 52.1 | 100 |
| Age 4 | 44.4 | 14.9 |  |  |  | 40.7 | 100 |
| Age 5 | 17.4 | 8.9 | 33.6 | 20.0 | 2.1 | 18.0 | 100 |
| Age 6 | 4.3 | 4.6 | 54.2 | 28.1 | 2.5 | 6.3 | 100 |

Chart 3: Trends over time
\% Children age 3-4 not attending Pre-school (ICDS OR Other) 2006-2009


Of the villages visited, Anganwadi/Pre-School presence has been recorded in $89.5 \%$ villages.

## Reading in own language

Table 4: Class-wise \% Children who CAN READ (All Schools) 2009

| StD. | Nothing | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (STd 1 Text) | Level 2 <br> (Std 2 Text) | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| I | 43.5 | 41.5 | 10.2 | 2.8 | 2.0 | 100 |
| II | 18.7 | 40.1 | 25.7 | 9.9 | 5.8 | 100 |
| III | 9.9 | 29.6 | 29.1 | 19.3 | 12.1 | 100 |
| IV | 5.6 | 19.3 | 24.1 | 27.0 | 24.0 | 100 |
| V | 3.6 | 13.4 | 19.3 | 26.0 | 37.7 | 100 |
| VI | 2.1 | 7.7 | 11.7 | 24.9 | 53.6 | 100 |
| VII | 1.4 | 5.4 | 8.0 | 19.7 | 65.4 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.9 | 4.2 | 5.1 | 14.8 | 75.0 | 100 |
| TOTAL | 13.2 | 23.1 | 17.7 | 17.2 | 28.8 | 100 |

NOTE : Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. Thus a child who can read Std II level text can read letters, words, and Std 1 level text.

| Reading Tool |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
| विमला और अजय मेला डेखने गये। उन्हें मेले में वरह-तरह की डुकाने दिसी। मेले में बहुत हूले ये। वहाँ गरम-गरम हलया और जलेखियाँ थी बिक रही र्षा। जलेबी वेसकर दोनों के मुँह में पानी आने लगा। उन्हें जलेबी खाने का मन करने लगा। विसला ने जलेबी खरीदी। दोनों ने मिलकर जलेबी खाई। शाम को दोनों धर लौट आये। | Std नीतू के घर उसका घंग गाय हरी धा वह बहुत च का च व ल थ ह ता न च | गाय सेद है। बाती देती हीरा गानी कण दिन |  |

Chart 4: Trends over time
\% Children who CANNOT EVEN IDENTIFY LETTERS (IN GOVt Schools in Std I - IV) 2006-2009


CHART 5: TRENDS OVER TIME
\% Children who CAN READ Std II level text (in govt schools in Std IV - VII) 2006-2009


## Reading and comprehension in english

## TABLE 5: CLASS-WISE \% CHILDREN WHO CAN READ

ENGLISH (All Schools) 2009

Cannot Can readCan readCan read Can read Total Std. | read |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| capital | capital | small | simple |
| letters | letters | words | sentences | letters

| I | 65.2 | 23.2 | 7.8 | 3.0 | 0.8 | 100 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| II | 42.0 | 32.9 | 15.8 | 7.2 | 2.1 | 100 |
| III | 31.9 | 32.0 | 19.9 | 12.0 | 4.2 | 100 |
| IV | 21.3 | 28.6 | 23.0 | 18.6 | 8.4 | 100 |
| V | 15.5 | 24.3 | 23.3 | 22.9 | 14.0 | 100 |
| VI | 8.6 | 18.0 | 21.5 | 28.7 | 23.2 | 100 |
| VII | 6.4 | 13.0 | 18.5 | 29.7 | 32.4 | 100 |
| VIII | 5.3 | 10.5 | 14.8 | 27.6 | 41.9 | 100 |
| TOTAL | 28.5 | 24.2 | 17.7 | 16.7 | 12.9 | 100 |


| Std. | Of those who can read words, \% who can tell meaning of the words | Of those who can read sentences, \% who can tell meaning of the sentences |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 67.1 | 71.4 |
| II | 63.7 | 76.5 |
| III | 65.3 | 72.5 |
| IV | 68.8 | 74.5 |
| V | 68.2 | 78.6 |
| VI | 71.5 | 76.0 |
| VII | 70.5 | 80.1 |
| VIII | 72.0 | 82.1 |
| Total | 69.2 | 78.8 |



## ARITHMETIC

| Std. | Nothing | Recognize Numbers |  | Subtract | Divide | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1-9 | 11-99 |  |  |  |
| I | 45.3 | 39.9 | 11.8 | 2.1 | 0.9 | 100 |
| II | 20.4 | 43.6 | 26.4 | 6.9 | 2.7 | 100 |
| III | 11.1 | 34.0 | 34.5 | 15.2 | 5.4 | 100 |
| IV | 6.1 | 23.3 | 33.7 | 23.9 | 13.0 | 100 |
| V | 4.1 | 16.2 | 29.8 | 28.8 | 21.1 | 100 |
| VI | 2.3 | 10.5 | 22.5 | 31.9 | 32.8 | 100 |
| VII | 1.5 | 7.6 | 18.1 | 29.6 | 43.2 | 100 |
| VIII | 1.1 | 5.5 | 13.8 | 26.5 | 53.2 | 100 |
| Total | 14.1 | 25.4 | 24.3 | 18.7 | 17.6 | 100 |

NOTE : Each cell shows the highest level of arithmetic achieved by a child. Thus a child who can do division, can also recognize numbers 1-9, 11-99 and do subtraction.

Chart 6: Trends over time
\% Children who CANNOT EVEN RECOGNIZE NUMBERS UPTO 9 (IN GOVT SCHOOLS IN STD I - IV) 2007-2009



NOTE : The test was also available in Hindi.
Chart 7: Trends over time
\% Children who CAN DO DIVISION (in govt schools in Std IV - VII) 2007-2009


## TUITION

Table 8: Class-wise \% children ATTENDING TUItion CLASSES. BY SCHOOL TYPE 2007 AND 2009

| Year | School | I | II | III | IV | V | VI | VII | VIII |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | Govt | 3.8 | 4.1 | 4.6 | 5.8 | 6.4 | 7.3 | 9.0 | 11.5 |
|  | Pvt. | 11.6 | 15.1 | 17.0 | 17.3 | 19.5 | 20.1 | 21.9 | 24.5 |
| 2009 | Govt | 5.2 | 5.9 | 5.9 | 6.4 | 7.3 | 8.4 | 9.4 | 11.8 |
|  | Pvt. | 12.8 | 15.4 | 18.6 | 19.6 | 21.0 | 19.2 | 20.7 | 24.8 |

NOTE : The ASER survey in 2007 and 2009 recorded information about tuition. In both years, the question asked was the following: "Does the child take any paid additional class currently?" Therefore, these numbers do not include any supplemental help in learning that children may have received from parents or siblings or from anyone else that did not require payment.


## LEARNING LEVELS IN GOVERNMENT AND PRIVATE SCHOOLS : TRENDS OVER TIME

Chart 8: \% Children in Std III who CAN AT LEAST READ Std I LEVEL TEXT. BY SCHOOL TYPE 2006-2009


Chart 9: \% Children in Std V who CAN DO DIVISION.
BY SCHOOL TYPE 2006-2009


Learning levels by gender : Trends over time

Chart 10: \% Boys and girls in Std III who Can read at least Std I LEVEL text 2007-2009


Chart 11: \% Boys and girls in Std V who CAN do division 2007-2009


## EDUCATION : FATHERS AND CHILDREN

Table 9: Fathers and children 2009


[^31] and children.

## SCHOOL ENROLLMENT AND ATTENDANCE : TRENDS OVER TIME

| TABLE 10: TOTAL SCHools visited |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Type of school | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 |
| Std I-IV/V : Primary | 786 | 1885 | 1796 |
| Std I-VII/VIII : Primary + Upper Primary | 395 | 99 | 101 |
| Total schools | 1181 | 1984 | 1897 |


| TABLE 12: Teacher attendance | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Type of school | Std I-IV/V |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |
| \% Teachers attending (average) | 79.5 | 92.0 | 89.3 | 67.1 | 90.8 | 86.6 |
| \% Schools with no teacher present | 5.3 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 15.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \% Schools with all teachers present | 56.1 | 75.8 | 69.7 | 42.7 | 70.7 | 63.9 |

## TABle 11: Children's attendance

Type of school
\% Enrolled children attending (average)
\% Schools with less than 50\% enrolled children attending \% Schools with 75\% or more enrolled children attending

## Table 13: Multigrade classes

200520072009200520072009
\% Of schools in which:
Std II class sitting with another class
Std IV class sitting with another class

200520072009200520072009
Std I-IV/V Std I-VII/VIII
$\begin{array}{llllll}66.2 & 64.4 & 59.8 & 62.2 & 64.5 & 60.9\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llllll}19.9 & 19.8 & 26.8 & 24.1 & 22.7 & 22.2\end{array}$

| 38.2 | 31.0 | 20.5 | 33.5 | 35.1 | 18.2 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

## School facilities : trends over time

Table 14: Facilities in school
200520072009200520072009

|  | Schools with: | Std I-IV/V |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No facility | 8.8 | 5.1 | 4.4 | 7.9 | 4.1 | 4.0 |
| ¢ | Facility but water not available | 12.5 | 9.2 | 10.5 | 13.7 | 10.3 | 8.1 |
|  | Available | 78.7 | 85.7 | 85.0 | 78.4 | 85.6 | 87.9 |
|  | No facility | 24.3 | 13.3 | 10.4 | 25.9 | 12.9 | 6.0 |
| $\stackrel{\overline{0}}{\overline{0}}$ | Facility but toilet not usable | 33.7 | 29.9 | 42.8 | 40.2 | 32.3 | 47.0 |
|  | Usable | 42.0 | 56.7 | 46.7 | 33.9 | 54.8 | 47.0 |
|  | dday meal served on day | 56.9 | 95.2 | 77.2 | 52.7 | 92.8 | 75.0 |

## Table 16: Girls Toilets 2009

Std I-IV/V Std I-VII/VIII
No of schools visited
\% Schools with no separate provision
for girls toilets

| 1674 | 94 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 27.2 | 22.3 |

Of schools where there are separate girls toilets, \% schools where:

| Toilet locked | 17.2 | 20.2 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Toilet not usable | 23.4 | 25.5 |
| Usable | 32.2 | 31.9 |

Table 15: School improvement \& construction since April 2008

|  <br> Construction | Std I-IV/V |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. of <br> schs | Yes schools |  | No. of <br> schs | Y schools |  |
| Whitewash | 1729 | 81.0 | 19.0 | 96 | 76.0 | 24.0 |
| Construction of new <br> classroom | 1701 | 21.4 | 78.6 | 95 | 25.3 | 74.7 |
| Construction of boundary <br> wall | 1702 | 19.4 | 80.6 | 95 | 20.0 | 80.0 |

ASER survey was carried out in Oct-Nov 2009. One govt school with primary grades was visited in each sampled village. If there was more than one govt school in a village, then the school with the highest enrollment was visited. Hence the schools visited in the ASER survey do not represent a random sample of schools of the district. The school visits were generally done either on a Saturday or a Monday.

| School Grants |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| New classrooms | Rs 2 lacs per addl room |
| Maintenance grant | Rs. 5000 pa upto 3 classrooms. Upto Rs 10000 pa for more than 3 classrooms |
| Development grant | Rs. 5000 pa for primary schs \& Rs 7000 pa for upper primary schs |
| TLM grant | Rs. 500 pa per teacher |

## School Grants

| TABLE 17: <br> \% Primary <br> SChools receiving <br> different grants | April 2008-March 2009 |  |  |  | April 2009-October 2009 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Std I-IV/V |  |  |  | Std I-IV/V |  |  |  |
|  | No. of schs | Yes | No | Don't know | No. of schs | Yes | No | Don't |
| New classroom | 1625 | 18.3 | 58.9 | 22.8 | 1487 | 9.4 | 64.6 | 26. |
| Maintenance grant | 1641 | 63.9 | 12.6 | 23.5 | 1464 | 37.4 | 34. | 28 |
| Development grant | 1595 | 56.4 | 17.6 | 26.0 | 1441 | 32.0 | 38.4 | 29 |
| Teacher grant (TLM grant) | 1629 | 72.5 | 11.5 | 16.0 | 1465 | 45.1 | 34 | 20 |
| Other grants | 699 | 16.5 | 52.1 | 31.5 | 649 | 10.0 | 55. | 34.4 |

[^32] table is based on schools for which information was available for at least one indicator.

## TABLE 18: <br> \% UPPER PRIMARY schools receiving different grants New classroom Maintenance grant <br> Development grant <br> Teacher grant <br> (TLM grant) <br> Other grants

April 2008-March 2009 April 2009-October 2009
Std I-VII/VIII Std I-VII/VIII

| No. of |
| :---: |
| schs | Yes $\quad$ No | Don't |
| :---: |
| know | | No. of |
| :---: |
| schs | Yes $\quad$ No | Don't |
| :---: |
| know |

NOTE: No grant information was available for 14 schools out of 101 upper primary schools that were visited. This could be because the head teacher was not present, register was not available or the surveyors could not obtain the information. Therefore, the above table is based on schools for which information was available for at least one indicator.

| Table 19: | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { ANGANWADI } \\ \text { OR } \\ \text { BALWADI } \end{gathered}$ | Out of SCHOOL | Private SCHOOL | Tuition | Mothers' Reading | Std I-II : Learning levels |  |  | Std III-V : Learning levels |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Districts | \% Children <br> (Age 3-4) <br> in anganwadi or pre-school | \%Children <br> (Age: 6-14) <br> out of school | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) <br> in private school | \% Children (Std IV-VIII) attending tuition classes | \% Mothers (Age: 17-55) who CAN READ | \% Children <br> (Std I-II) <br> who <br> CAN READ letters, words or more | \% Children <br> (Std I-II) <br> who CAN <br> RECOGNIZE <br> NUMBERS <br> 1 to 9 <br> or more | \% Children <br> (Std I-II) <br> who CAN <br> READ LETTERS or more in ENGLISH | \% Children <br> (Std III-V) who CAN READ Level 1 (Std 1 Text) or more | \% Children <br> (Std III-V) who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more | \% Children <br> (Std III-V) <br> who CAN <br> READ <br> sentences <br> in ENGLISH |
| Agra | 52.8 | 4.8 | 45.4 | 19.6 | 31.1 | 63.9 | 63.1 | 38.9 | 38.8 | 37.2 | 5.5 |
| Aligarh | 61.6 | 8.4 | 45.5 | 15.9 | 26.3 | 73.8 | 72.9 | 52.9 | 52.8 | 43.8 | 12.8 |
| Allahabad | 63.1 | 2.2 | 34.1 | 12.1 | 23.0 | 68.8 | 67.4 | 49.0 | 56.9 | 43.5 | 9.8 |
| Ambedkar Nagar | 35.6 | 2.5 | 49.5 | 5.5 | 33.5 | 68.8 | 67.4 | 41.5 | 43.2 | 33.3 | 8.1 |
| Auraiya | 75.0 | 1.9 | 38.3 | 16.2 | 50.7 | 68.7 | 64.4 | 50.2 | 46.7 | 39.1 | 9.6 |
| Azamgarh | 48.5 | 5.6 | 49.4 | 9.0 | 24.9 | 65.1 | 64.4 | 38.6 | 46.1 | 28.7 | 6.0 |
| Baghpat | 74.6 | 2.0 | 35.0 | 23.6 | 39.7 | 86.5 | 84.4 | 72.2 | 83.6 | 72.8 | 32.9 |
| Bahraich | 42.7 | 12.5 | 18.0 | 9.4 | 15.2 | 40.8 | 37.6 | 15.8 | 30.1 | 14.6 | 2.3 |
| Ballia | 49.4 | 2.5 | 34.9 | 19.8 | 38.3 | 67.7 | 64.0 | 44.7 | 45.2 | 33.6 | 10.0 |
| Balrampur | 18.6 | 8.6 | 17.1 | 15.3 | 18.2 | 78.1 | 77.3 | 54.3 | 57.2 | 47.1 | 17.7 |
| Banda | 46.8 | 3.2 | 25.3 | 3.8 | 66.5 | 71.3 | 69.6 | 42.4 | 42.9 | 28.1 | 2.8 |
| Barabanki | 51.7 | 9.1 | 30.2 | 3.8 | 24.5 | 52.1 | 54.4 | 36.9 | 41.9 | 22.4 | 7.5 |
| Bareilly | 50.0 | 6.5 | 36.7 | 10.1 | 31.8 | 66.2 | 65.1 | 55.6 | 47.0 | 27.8 | 7.6 |
| Basti | 23.6 | 5.0 | 38.4 | 10.1 | 24.8 | 64.7 | 62.6 | 38.1 | 46.6 | 34.9 | 5.4 |
| Bijnor | 63.3 | 2.4 | 50.0 | 21.4 | 37.6 | 81.1 | 82.3 | 66.1 | 63.1 | 46.7 | 14.1 |
| Budaun | 19.8 | 14.1 | 24.3 | 8.9 | 13.0 | 55.2 | 58.1 | 39.2 | 18.6 | 18.0 | 1.8 |
| Bulandshahar | 80.1 | 2.2 | 33.8 | 25.9 | 57.6 | 75.5 | 70.9 | 54.9 | 65.0 | 47.9 | 17.8 |
| Chandauli | 72.9 | 3.5 | 33.9 | 10.1 | 64.4 | 71.3 | 67.9 | 33.6 | 54.8 | 40.5 | 5.2 |
| Chitrakoot | 59.8 | 4.5 | 13.1 | 6.9 | 34.2 | 71.4 | 66.2 | 42.7 | 27.5 | 16.4 | 1.8 |
| Deoria | 63.1 | 2.1 | 46.8 | 17.8 | 36.7 | 80.8 | 79.7 | 59.1 | 68.7 | 51.9 | 12.5 |
| Etah | 54.6 | 6.0 | 40.6 | 11.6 | 30.0 | 59.0 | 60.9 | 35.8 | 41.9 | 31.8 | 3.9 |
| Etawah | 61.3 | 3.7 | 38.4 | 13.1 | 55.5 | 74.8 | 76.8 | 57.6 | 53.2 | 36.9 | 7.7 |
| Faizabad | 89.0 | 0.4 | 26.0 | 11.1 | 78.1 | 92.5 | 92.2 | 72.5 | 66.8 | 61.4 | 27.1 |
| Farrukhabad | 64.9 | 4.5 | 22.4 | 7.6 | 25.7 | 34.0 | 29.2 | 19.4 | 21.9 | 10.7 | 3.3 |
| Fatehpur | 78.3 | 3.2 | 29.8 | 13.7 | 27.5 | 66.2 | 61.2 | 40.0 | 39.6 | 28.2 | 7.4 |
| Firozabad | 36.8 | 5.5 | 44.3 | 11.0 | 27.6 | 53.1 | 55.7 | 35.5 | 29.5 | 22.9 | 3.8 |
| Gautam Buddha Nagar | 43.5 | 2.2 | 64.2 | 27.7 | 52.3 | 70.9 | 71.7 | 64.6 | 65.4 | 54.0 | 18.0 |
| Ghaziabad | 59.9 | 4.4 | 43.5 | 24.8 | 57.8 | 72.7 | 75.2 | 62.1 | 64.9 | 49.2 | 21.7 |
| Ghazipur | 74.6 | 0.7 | 44.6 | 29.5 | 47.9 | 78.4 | 75.4 | 40.5 | 64.4 | 47.4 | 14.1 |
| Gonda | 16.8 | 4.4 | 28.7 | 8.6 | 11.8 | 59.6 | 56.3 | 40.6 | 29.5 | 17.6 | 4.8 |
| Gorakhpur | 49.1 | 3.6 | 47.1 | 9.4 | 34.1 | 70.1 | 69.9 | 54.9 | 48.0 | 33.3 | 7.2 |
| Hamirpur | 56.0 | 4.6 | 29.3 | 21.8 | 78.2 | 75.4 | 71.2 | 54.2 | 51.4 | 46.5 | 7.6 |
| Hardoi | 60.7 | 6.4 | 30.4 | 14.8 | 25.8 | 47.3 | 47.9 | 30.4 | 36.0 | 19.2 | 4.6 |
| Hathras | 59.1 | 4.0 | 41.3 | 11.5 | 37.8 | 70.2 | 71.1 | 57.5 | 45.9 | 38.2 | 18.0 |
| Jalaun | 69.3 | 2.6 | 22.6 | 17.4 | 42.9 | 76.7 | 74.3 | 57.0 | 49.6 | 43.9 | 7.2 |
| Jaunpur | 56.0 | 1.7 | 37.3 | 12.5 | 43.8 | 79.8 | 74.8 | 46.2 | 59.4 | 38.6 | 8.3 |
| Jhansi | 65.4 | 2.3 | 11.4 | 30.1 | 41.6 | 78.1 | 77.2 | 46.1 | 58.7 | 55.6 | 9.0 |
| Jyotiba Phule Nagar | 81.6 | 3.0 | 53.6 | 6.1 | 28.8 | 80.1 | 79.3 | 57.1 | 63.8 | 53.2 | 14.0 |
| Kannauj | 58.3 | 5.4 | 49.3 | 4.8 | 88.6 | 73.0 | 67.0 | 41.0 | 42.5 | 21.4 | 4.2 |
| Kanpur Dehat | 52.6 | 3.1 | 27.9 | 17.8 | 47.6 | 69.0 | 69.9 | 54.9 | 47.6 | 39.6 | 5.4 |

## Performance of districts

| Table 19: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ANGANWADI } \\ & \text { OR } \\ & \text { BALWADI } \end{aligned}$ | Out of SCHOOL | Private SCHOOL | Tuition | Mothers' Reading | Std I-II : Learning levels |  |  | Std III-V : Learning levels |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Districts | \% Children <br> (Age 3-4) <br> in <br> anganwadi <br> or pre-school | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) <br> out <br> of <br> school | \% Children (Age: 6-14) in private school | \% Children (Std IV-VIII) attending tuition classes | \% Mothers <br> (Age: 17-55) who CAN READ | \% Children <br> (Std I-II) who CAN READ letters, words or more | \% Children (Std I-II) who CAN RECOGNIZE NUMBERS 1 to 9 or more | \% Children (Std I-II) who CAN READ LETTERS or more in ENGLISH | \%Children (Std III-V) who CANREAD Level 1 (Std 1 Text) or more | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% Children } \\ & \text { (Std III-V) } \\ & \text { who } \\ & \text { CAN DO } \\ & \text { SUBTRACTION } \\ & \text { or more } \end{aligned}$ | \% Children (Std III-V) who CAN READ sentences in ENGLISH |
| Kaushambi | 79.0 | 5.9 | 33.1 | 12.1 | 24.5 | 82.3 | 80.3 | 57.7 | 48.5 | 46.9 | 10.5 |
| Kheri | 54.0 | 9.0 | 25.4 | 16.5 | 26.6 | 50.4 | 48.0 | 33.2 | 33.1 | 13.7 | 3.6 |
| Kushinagar | 54.6 | 2.9 | 49.9 | 15.8 | 29.2 | 83.4 | 76.7 | 57.0 | 68.4 | 57.6 | 10.3 |
| Lalitpur | 58.4 | 0.8 | 9.9 | 10.2 | 30.3 | 57.8 | 54.5 | 35.7 | 38.5 | 29.7 | 0.4 |
| Lucknow | 74.4 | 5.8 | 43.4 | 8.1 | 28.9 | 64.2 | 64.9 | 39.8 | 55.8 | 37.7 | 7.1 |
| Mahoba | 58.3 | 3.7 | 16.0 | 28.2 | 32.8 | 80.0 | 81.9 | 62.4 | 55.3 | 56.5 | 12.3 |
| Mahrajganj | 78.8 | 3.4 | 40.6 | 5.7 | 31.3 | 65.8 | 62.9 | 42.7 | 51.7 | 35.4 | 10.8 |
| Mainpuri | 63.3 | 4.0 | 38.8 | 4.8 | 44.8 | 71.3 | 71.3 | 46.9 | 42.1 | 30.9 | 5.9 |
| Mathura | 82.8 | 1.0 | 33.5 | 4.6 | 53.1 | 84.7 | 77.3 | 33.9 | 77.3 | 44.5 | 8.4 |
| Mau | 35.9 | 1.7 | 37.8 | 10.1 | 51.2 | 91.6 | 90.3 | 70.1 | 47.1 | 40.0 | 13.7 |
| Meerut | 48.4 | 5.4 | 39.0 | 21.2 | 44.4 | 76.9 | 79.0 | 65.2 | 69.2 | 64.6 | 13.2 |
| Mirzapur | 50.9 | 2.8 | 30.0 | 9.5 | 25.6 | 66.4 | 64.5 | 35.1 | 53.5 | 35.4 | 10.0 |
| Moradabad | 54.1 | 9.9 | 46.4 | 14.0 | 21.0 | 61.7 | 61.1 | 44.7 | 43.0 | 28.5 | 6.8 |
| Muzaffarnagar | 65.1 | 4.3 | 31.5 | 14.3 | 32.5 | 81.2 | 83.3 | 71.4 | 73.1 | 66.1 | 15.4 |
| Pilibhit | 69.5 | 7.3 | 29.0 | 14.5 | 29.3 | 60.4 | 60.5 | 46.6 | 30.8 | 19.7 | 5.5 |
| Pratapgarh | 34.1 | 3.4 | 47.8 | 13.0 | 29.4 | 71.1 | 65.5 | 41.9 | 41.9 | 33.3 | 6.3 |
| RaeBareli | 62.4 | 7.3 | 47.6 | 8.1 | 69.8 | 66.2 | 63.0 | 33.3 | 44.0 | 24.7 | 1.1 |
| Rampur | 33.1 | 12.5 | 34.9 | 6.8 | 15.1 | 57.7 | 66.2 | 37.5 | 36.3 | 28.0 | 4.4 |
| Saharanpur | 76.2 | 3.0 | 40.1 | 13.6 | 31.7 | 83.2 | 83.2 | 64.6 | 58.8 | 42.4 | 19.1 |
| Sant Kabir Nagar | 26.8 | 3.3 | 46.0 | 11.2 | 32.0 | 75.6 | 71.8 | 54.4 | 60.0 | 45.1 | 11.6 |
| Sant Ravidas Nagar | 60.3 | 1.1 | 39.7 | 20.6 | 43.2 | 74.6 | 65.3 | 52.6 | 44.2 | 31.9 | 7.4 |
| Shahjahanpur | 65.2 | 10.1 | 30.9 | 11.4 | 42.7 | 49.6 | 46.1 | 30.2 | 29.0 | 18.0 | 4.6 |
| Shrawasti | 24.5 | 6.8 | 13.5 | 8.0 | 31.6 | 63.5 | 66.4 | 44.8 | 42.4 | 30.3 | 8.5 |
| Siddharthnagar | 29.3 | 7.9 | 34.4 | 6.0 | 26.2 | 62.4 | 60.5 | 45.5 | 37.7 | 27.2 | 7.1 |
| Sitapur | 43.8 | 8.2 | 22.1 | 8.6 | 29.9 | 52.3 | 50.7 | 27.0 | 22.5 | 14.3 | 4.1 |
| Sonbhadra | 74.3 | 3.4 | 13.1 | 6.3 | 15.1 | 71.8 | 66.8 | 30.3 | 36.2 | 23.2 | 2.5 |
| Sultanpur | 20.6 | 4.2 | 39.1 | 10.3 | 26.1 | 54.4 | 44.1 | 28.9 | 45.0 | 18.5 | 5.5 |
| Unnao | 62.2 | 5.1 | 35.5 | 13.1 | 58.3 | 80.8 | 79.7 | 45.8 | 42.8 | 34.3 | 5.8 |
| Varanasi | 51.8 | 2.8 | 33.4 | 10.2 | 53.3 | 67.1 | 68.1 | 41.7 | 62.5 | 49.4 | 8.8 |
| Total | 53.5 | 4.9 | 35.8 | 13.0 | 33.4 | 68.0 | 66.3 | 45.6 | 48.6 | 35.7 | 8.9 |




## SCHOOL ENROLLMENT AND OUT OF SCHOOL CHILDREN

| Table 1: \% Children in different types of schools 2009 |  |  |  | \% Out of school |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in School |  |
| AgE: 6-14 ALL | 85.4 | 6.5 | 2.4 | 5.7 | 100 |
| AgE: 7-16 ALL | 83.5 | 4.8 | 2.3 | 9.4 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 85.8 | 8.9 | 2.3 | 3.0 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 BOYS | 85.8 | 9.0 | 2.0 | 3.2 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 GIRLS | 86.1 | 8.8 | 2.6 | 2.5 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 ALL | 86.1 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 9.1 | 100 |
| AgE: 11-14 BOYS | 85.9 | 2.4 | 2.3 | 9.5 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 GIRLS | 86.5 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 8.5 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 ALL | 72.5 | 1.1 | 2.2 | 24.1 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 BOYS | 68.0 | 1.2 | 2.1 | 28.8 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 GIRLS | 78.4 | 1.1 | 2.3 | 18.3 | 100 |


note : 'отнек' includes chidren going to madarssa and EGS.
'от IN SCHool' = dropped out + never enrolled.


| Std. | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 25.7 | 39.8 | 21.0 | 8.2 | 5.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| II | 3.0 | 15.8 | 35.3 | 27.4 | 10.5 | 8.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| III |  | . 7 | 15.1 | 36.0 | 25.0 | 13.1 | 3.6 | 4.4 |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| IV | 4.2 |  |  | 12.4 | 31.1 | 32.6 | 8.0 | 7.2 | 4.5 |  |  |  | 100 |
| V | 3.6 |  |  |  | 8.2 | 34.0 | 26.3 | 16.0 | 5.8 | 6.0 |  |  | 100 |
| VI | 2.1 |  |  |  |  | 9.8 | 24.0 | 38.3 | 16.0 | 5.8 | 4.1 |  | 100 |
| VII | 4.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 5.8 | 28.9 | 31.2 | 19.9 | 6.6 | 3.6 | 100 |
| VIII | 3.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 10.4 | 29.3 | 34.2 | 15.1 | 7.3 | 100 |

How to read the table: In Std III, 74.1\% (36.0+25.0+13.1) children are in age group 8 to 10 .

## Young children in pre-school and school



Chart 3: Trends over time
\% Children age 3-4 not attending Pre-school (ICDS OR OTHER) 2006-2009


Of the villages visited, Anganwadi/Pre-School presence has been recorded in 93.0\% villages.

## Reading in own language

Table 4: Class-wise \% children who CAN READ (All Schools) 2009

| Std. | Nothing | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (STd 1 Text) | Level 2 <br> (Std 2 Text) | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| I | 23.0 | 44.4 | 21.2 | 8.3 | 3.1 | 100 |
| II | 8.5 | 33.7 | 28.3 | 19.8 | 9.7 | 100 |
| III | 4.6 | 19.2 | 25.3 | 28.9 | 22.1 | 100 |
| IV | 1.7 | 8.7 | 18.7 | 34.4 | 36.5 | 100 |
| V | 1.7 | 6.2 | 12.6 | 33.4 | 46.0 | 100 |
| VI | 0.6 | 2.5 | 6.5 | 26.7 | 63.7 | 100 |
| VII | 0.2 | 1.4 | 4.2 | 18.9 | 75.3 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.3 | 0.9 | 1.9 | 12.9 | 84.1 | 100 |
| TOTAL | 5.4 | 15.5 | 15.5 | 23.3 | 40.4 | 100 |

NOTE : Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. Thus a child who can read Std II level text can read letters, words, and Std 1 level text.

## Reading Tool



Chart 5: Trends over time
\% Children who CAN READ Std II level text (in govt schools in Std IV - VII) 2006-2009


## Reading and comprehension in english

## TABLE 5: CLASS-WISE \% CHILDREN WHO CAN READ

ENGLISH (All Schools) 2009

Cannot Can readCan readCan read Can read Total Std. | read |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| capital | capital | small | simple |
| letters | easy |  |  |
| letters | words sentences |  |  | letters

| I | 43.1 | 30.7 | 16.3 | 8.5 | 1.4 | 100 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| II | 25.6 | 31.8 | 20.1 | 17.6 | 4.8 | 100 |
| III | 14.7 | 23.5 | 26.4 | 24.2 | 11.2 | 100 |
| IV | 9.2 | 16.6 | 22.1 | 32.2 | 19.9 | 100 |
| V | 8.1 | 12.7 | 19.2 | 33.0 | 27.1 | 100 |
| VI | 4.4 | 6.6 | 12.9 | 32.6 | 43.5 | 100 |
| VII | 2.3 | 3.6 | 9.3 | 31.5 | 53.3 | 100 |
| VIII | 1.2 | 3.0 | 5.2 | 24.9 | 65.8 | 100 |
| TOTAL | 14.3 | 16.8 | 16.9 | 25.5 | 26.6 | 100 |


| Std. | Of those who can read words, \% who can tell meaning of the words | Of those who can read sentences, \% who can tell meaning of the sentences |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 69.8 | 70.6 |
| II | 70.2 | 61.5 |
| III | 71.0 | 71.5 |
| IV | 73.4 | 75.5 |
| V | 78.1 | 81.2 |
| VI | 71.8 | 81.9 |
| VII | 80.5 | 78.9 |
| VIII | 72.6 | 84.3 |
| Total | 74.2 | 80.0 |


| English Tool |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
| $\begin{array}{llll} \mathrm{D} & \mathrm{~L} & \mathrm{~T} \\ & \mathrm{~K} & \mathrm{G} & \\ & & \end{array}$ | $x$  $f$ $i$ <br>  $s$   <br>     |
| X P N | m a h |
|  |  |
| $\underbrace{\text { dog }}$fat fat  <br>  gun  <br> boy  man | What in the time? <br> This is a blue shirt. <br> 1 Hike to sleep. <br> 1 have a beother: |
|  |  |

## ARITHMETIC

| Std. | Nothing | Recognize Numbers |  | Subtract | Divide | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $1-9$ | $11-99$ |  |  |  |
| I | 20.1 | 47.5 | 23.2 | 8.4 | 0.8 | 100 |
| II | 4.8 | 36.7 | 32.2 | 21.0 | 5.2 | 100 |
| III | 2.3 | 21.4 | 32.5 | 28.1 | 15.7 | 100 |
| IV | 0.9 | 10.7 | 25.1 | 34.0 | 29.4 | 100 |
| V | 1.0 | 7.4 | 19.9 | 35.2 | 36.5 | 100 |
| VI | 0.6 | 3.6 | 13.5 | 30.7 | 51.7 | 100 |
| VII | 0.1 | 2.3 | 10.3 | 23.4 | 63.9 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.2 | 1.2 | 5.3 | 20.1 | 73.3 | 100 |
| Total | 4.0 | 17.2 | 20.9 | 25.3 | 32.6 | 100 |

NOTE : Each cell shows the highest level of arithmetic achieved by a child. Thus a child who can do division, can also recognize numbers 1-9, 11-99 and do subtraction.

Chart 6: Trends over time
\% Children who CANNOT EVEN RECOGNIZE NUMBERS UPTO 9 (IN GOVT SCHOOLS IN STD I - IV) 2007-2009



Chart 7: Trends over time
\% Children who CAN DO DIVISION (in govt schools in Std IV - VII) 2007-2009


## TUITION

Table 8: Class-wise \% children ATTENDING TUITION CLASSES. BY SCHOOL TYPE 2007 AND 2009

| Year | School | 1 | II | III | IV | V | VI | VII | VIII |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2007 | Govt | 30.6 | 45.6 | 63.0 | 74.0 | 83.3 | 84.9 | 83.7 | 88.5 |
|  | Pvt. | 40.5 | 54.9 | 59.5 | 67.0 | 62.7 | 68.6 | 75.6 | 89.7 |
| 2009 | Govt | 51.5 | 63.9 | 68.7 | 74.2 | 75.6 | 80.8 | 85.7 | 86.6 |
|  | Pvt. | 63.9 | 71.4 | 74.4 | 83.6 | 87.7 | 79.2 | 78.9 | 71.2 |

NOTE : The ASER survey in 2007 and 2009 recorded information about tuition. In both years, the question asked was the following: "Does the child take any paid additional class currently?" Therefore, these numbers do not include any supplemental help in learning that children may have received from parents or siblings or from anyone else that did not require payment.


## WEST BENGAL rural

## LEARNING LEVELS IN GOVERNMENT AND PRIVATE SCHOOLS : TRENDS OVER TIME

Chart 8: \% Children in Std III who CAN AT LEAST READ Std I LEVEL TEXT. BY SCHOOL TYPE 2006-2009


Chart 9: \% Children in Std V who CAN DO DIVISION. BY SCHOOL TYPE 2006-2009


Learning levels by gender : Trends over time

Chart 10: \% Boys and girls in Std III who Can read at least Std I LEVEL text 2007-2009


Chart 11: \% Boys and girls in Std V who CAN do division 2007-2009


## EDUCATION : FATHERS AND CHILDREN

|  |  | Of these fathers : |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fathers' Education | $\begin{gathered} \% \\ \text { Fathers } \end{gathered}$ |  | \% Children (Std III-V) who can read level 1 (Std 1 Text) or more | \% Children (Std III-V) who can do subtraction or more | \% Children (Std III-V) who can read words or more in English | \% Children (Std IV-VIII) attending tuition |
| No Schooling | 27.7 | 9.9 | 56.4 | 50.8 | 41.6 | 70.5 |
| Std I-V | 23.7 | 4.3 | 63.2 | 56.1 | 41.5 | 81.3 |
| Std VI-VIII | 22.0 | 3.5 | 76.0 | 65.5 | 56.1 | 88.1 |
| Std IX-X | 16.3 | 1.7 | 77.0 | 71.1 | 60.8 | 85.0 |
| Above Std X | 10.3 | 1.8 | 88.5 | 86.1 | 83.6 | 81.2 |

NOTE: ASER 2009 recorded information about mothers' education. Similar analyses can be done with mothers and children.

## SCHOOL ENROLLMENT AND ATTENDANCE : TRENDS OVER TIME

| TABLE 10: TotAL schools visited |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Type of school | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 |
| Std I-IV/V : Primary | 228 | 395 | 418 |
| Std I-VII/VIII : Primary + Upper Primary | 0 | 9 | 6 |
| Total schools | 228 | 404 | 424 |


| Table 12: Teacher attendance | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| Type of school | Std I-IV/V |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |
| \% Teachers attending (average) | 72.9 | 90.6 | 87.8 | 73.1 | 81.7 |  |
| \% Schools with no teacher present | 15.9 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| \% Schools with all teachers present | 53.5 | 71.4 | 68.5 | 60.0 | 16.7 |  |


| TABLE 11: ChILDREN'S ATtendanc: 2005 | 2007 | 2009 | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Type of school | Std I-IV/V |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |
| \% Enrolled children attending <br> (average) <br> \% Schools with less than 50\% | 73.3 | 69.7 | 65.9 | 73.0 | 66.4 |
| enrolled children attending | 8.3 | 14.7 | 20.6 | 12.5 | 16.7 |
| \% Schools with 75\% or more <br> enrolled children attending | 50.7 | 50.7 | 40.0 | 62.5 | 16.7 |

Type of school
\% Enrolled children attending (average) \% Schools with less than 50\% enrolled children attending enrolled children attending

Table 13: Multigrade classes
200520072009200520072009
\% Of schools in which:
Std II class sitting with
another class
Std IV class sitting with another class
$\begin{array}{llll}2005 & 2007 & 2009 & 2005 \\ 2007 & 2009\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}73.3 & 69.7 & 65.9 & 73.0 & 66.4\end{array}$
$8.314 .7 \quad 20.6$
62.516 .7

## SCHOOL FACILITIES: TRENDS OVER TIME

| Table 14: Facilities in school |  | 200520072009200520072009 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \% Schools with: |  | Std I-IV/V |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |
|  | No facility | 16.3 | 3.9 | 12.9 | 0.0 | 16.7 |
|  | Facility but water not available | 14.5 | 5.3 | 10.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | Available | 69.2 | 90.7 | 77.0 | 100 | 83.3 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { む } \\ & \frac{\bar{O}}{2} \end{aligned}$ | No facility | 23.6 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 0.0 | 50.0 |
|  | Facility but toilet not usable | 17.8 | 13.1 | 22.3 | 14.3 | 25.0 |
|  | Usable | 58.7 | 80.8 | 71.7 | 85.7 | 25.0 |
|  | idday meal served on day | 76.1 | 98.7 | 36.6* | 87.5 | 40.0 |

of visit
76.1 98.7 36.6*
87.540 .0

* Some schools were surveyed on a Saturday when Midday meal is not served.


## Table 16: Girls Toilets 2009

Std I-IV/V Std I-VII/VIII

| No of schools visited | 324 | 4 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| \% Schools with no separate provision <br> for girls toilets | 43.8 | 75.0 |
| Of schools where there are separate girls toilets, $\%$ | schools where: |  |
| Toilet locked | 11.1 | 0.0 |
| Toilet not usable | 5.9 | 0.0 |
| Usable | 39.2 | 25.0 |

Table 15: School improvement \& construction since April 2008

| School improvement \& Construction | Std I-IV/V |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. of schs | \% schools |  | No. of schs | \% schools |  |
|  |  | Yes | No |  | Yes | No |
| Whitewash | 409 | 48.4 | 51.6 | 4 | 50.0 | 50.0 |
| Construction of new classroom | 406 | 31.5 | 68.5 | 4 | 75.0 | 25.0 |
| Construction of boundary wall | 410 | 10.0 | 90.0 | 4 | 25.0 | 75.0 |

ASER survey was carried out in Oct-Nov 2009. One govt school with primary grades was visited in each sampled village. If there was more than one govt school in a village, then the school with the highest enrollment was visited. Hence the schools visited in the ASER survey do not represent a random sample of schools of the district. The school visits were generally done either on a Saturday or a Monday.

| School Grants |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| New | Rs 2 lass per <br> classrooms <br> additional room |
| Maintenance <br> grant | Rs. 5000 pa upto 3 <br> classrooms. Upto <br> Rs 10000 pa for <br> more than 3 <br> classrooms |
| Development |  |
| grant | Rs. 5000 pa for <br> primary schs \& Rs <br> 7000 pa for upper <br> primary schs |
| TLM grant | Rs. 500 pa per <br> teacher |

## School Grants

| Table 17: <br> \% Primary <br> SCHOOLS RECEIVING <br> DIFFERENT GRANTS | April 2008-March 2009 |  |  |  | April 2009-October 200 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Std I-IV/V |  |  |  | Std I-IV/V |  |  |  |
|  | No. of schs | Yes | No | Don't know | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No. of } \\ & \text { schs } \end{aligned}$ | Yes | No | Don't know |
| New classroom | 373 | 26.8 | 70.0 | 3.2 | 337 | 9.5 | 83.1 | 7.4 |
| Maintenance | 375 | 68.8 | 24.8 | 6.4 | 313 | 34.5 | 58.2 | 7.4 |
| Development g | 356 | 57.0 | 36.8 | 6.2 | 312 | 26.0 | 66.4 | 7.7 |
| Teacher grant (TLM grant) | 363 | 73.8 | 21.8 | 4.4 | 305 | 39.3 | 55.7 | 4.9 |
| Other grants | 242 | 22.7 | 71.5 | 5.8 | 221 | 10.9 | 81.5 | 7.7 |

NOTE: No grant information was available for 21 schools out of 418 primary schools that were visited. This could be because the head teacher was not present, register was not available or the surveyors could not obtain the information. Therefore, the above table is based on schools for which information was available for at least one indicator.

| TABLE 18: <br> \% UPPER PRIMARY SCHOOLS RECEIVING DIFFERENT GRANTS |
| :---: |
| New classroom |
| Maintenance grant |
| Development grant |
| Teacher grant (TLM grant) |
| Other grants |

April 2008-March 2009 April 2009-October 2009 Std I-VII/VIII Std I-VII/VIII

| No. of <br> schs | Yes | No | Don't <br> know | No. of <br> schs | Yes | No | Don't <br> know |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4 | 75.0 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 3 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| 4 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 4 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| 4 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 3 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| 4 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 3 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| 3 | 33.3 | 66.7 | 0.0 | 3 | 33.3 | 66.7 | 0.0 |

NOTE : No grant information was available for 2 schools out of 6 upper primary schools that were visited. This could be because the head teacher was not present, register was not available or the surveyors could not obtain the information. Therefore, the above table is based on schools for which information was available for at least one indicator.

## PERFORMANCE OF DISTRICTS

| Table 19: | $\begin{gathered} \text { ANGANWADI } \\ \text { OR } \\ \text { BALWADI } \end{gathered}$ | OUt of SCHOOL | Private <br> SCHOOL | Tuition | Mothers' Reading | Std I-II : Learning levels |  |  | Std III-V : Learning levels |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Districts | \% Children (Age 3-4) in anganwadi or pre-school | \% Children <br> (Age: 6-14) <br> out <br> of <br> school | \% Children (Age: 6-14) in private school | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% Children } \\ & \text { (Std } \\ & \text { IV-VIII) } \\ & \text { attending } \\ & \text { tuition } \\ & \text { classes } \end{aligned}$ | \% Mothers (Age: 17-55) who CAN READ | \% Children <br> (Std I-II) who CAN READ letters, words or more | \% Children (Std I-II) who CAN RECOGNIZE NUMBERS 1 to 9 or more | \% Children (Std I-II) who CAN READ LETTERS or more in ENGLISH | \% Children (Std III-V) who CAN READ Level 1 (Std 1 Text) or more | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% Children } \\ & \text { (Std III-V) } \\ & \text { who } \\ & \text { CAN DO } \\ & \text { SUBTRACTION } \\ & \text { or more } \end{aligned}$ | \% Children (Std III-V) who CAN READ sentences in ENGLISH |
| Bankura | 78.7 | 6.5 | 3.8 | 72.8 | 65.4 | 77.7 | 83.5 | 64.8 | 61.3 | 57.7 | 17.9 |
| Barddhaman | 85.7 | 4.7 | 3.4 | 95.4 | 65.0 | 87.0 | 89.0 | 70.4 | 79.4 | 69.4 | 19.0 |
| Birbhum | 85.0 | 7.8 | 2.1 | 69.2 | 53.5 | 82.8 | 82.3 | 57.9 | 60.4 | 47.6 | 12.7 |
| Dakshin Dinajpur | 80.4 | 4.2 | 7.5 | 74.6 | 71.8 | 85.3 | 88.4 | 74.5 | 65.2 | 62.9 | 23.2 |
| Darjiling | 81.1 | 0.4 | 30.6 | 59.1 | 77.1 | 99.1 | 99.1 | 96.0 | 87.3 | 71.1 | 67.6 |
| Haora | 78.0 | 6.0 | 2.8 | 92.3 | 75.0 | 87.0 | 94.0 | 67.7 | 63.8 | 62.6 | 14.2 |
| Hugli * |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jalpaiguri | 58.1 | 2.6 | 12.8 | 70.5 | 60.5 | 76.6 | 80.5 | 56.2 | 72.5 | 62.1 | 21.7 |
| KochBihar | 58.8 | 2.7 | 7.1 | 76.4 | 60.8 | 71.9 | 77.9 | 47.5 | 71.8 | 56.4 | 14.1 |
| Maldah | 61.6 | 10.5 | 12.0 | 75.6 | 64.6 | 70.4 | 82.4 | 55.7 | 63.1 | 53.8 | 20.2 |
| Medinipur | 77.1 | 5.0 | 5.5 | 92.5 | 74.2 | 91.8 | 90.6 | 71.9 | 71.2 | 74.1 | 23.5 |
| Murshidabad | 68.5 | 8.0 | 5.3 | 76.1 | 56.8 | 81.5 | 84.2 | 63.6 | 68.7 | 55.1 | 19.0 |
| Nadia | 78.6 | 5.8 | 3.0 | 78.3 | 56.8 | 81.3 | 82.2 | 58.6 | 59.1 | 46.0 | 16.1 |
| North 24 Parganas | 68.7 | 4.8 | 5.9 | 86.3 | 68.9 | 96.2 | 94.9 | 84.1 | 67.9 | 52.8 | 20.3 |
| Puruliya | 72.0 | 5.4 | 9.5 | 48.9 | 55.1 | 81.1 | 81.3 | 54.5 | 57.6 | 53.7 | 18.7 |
| South 24 Parganas | 78.3 | 5.1 | 6.5 | 83.4 | 50.7 | 91.3 | 94.7 | 66.9 | 64.6 | 57.5 | 11.4 |
| Uttar Dinajpur | 53.0 | 7.1 | 7.4 | 56.6 | 31.0 | 79.5 | 79.5 | 67.7 | 55.0 | 53.5 | 20.2 |
| Total | 73.0 | 5.7 | 6.5 | 79.9 | 63.5 | 84.0 | 87.2 | 65.3 | 67.6 | 60.0 | 19.6 |

*Blank cells indicate insufficient data.


## SCHOOL ENROLLMENT AND OUT OF SCHOOL CHILDREN

| Table 1: \% Children in different types of schools 2009 |  |  |  | \% Out of school |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in School |  |
| AgE: 6-14 ALL | 93.6 | 3.5 | 0.9 | 2.1 | 100 |
| Age: 7-16 ALL | 91.7 | 3.6 | 0.9 | 3.9 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 94.9 | 4.0 | 0.9 | 0.2 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 BOYS | 93.5 | 4.4 | 1.8 | 0.4 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 GIRLS | 96.5 | 3.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 ALL | 91.6 | 3.4 | 0.7 | 4.3 | 100 |
| AGE: 11-14 BOYS | 92.4 | 4.6 | 1.3 | 1.7 | 100 |
| AGE: 11-14 GIRLS | 91.0 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 7.9 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 ALL | 83.7 | 3.0 | 1.2 | 12.1 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 BOYS | 88.0 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 9.8 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 GIRLS | 78.4 | 5.4 | 1.4 | 14.9 | 100 |


| CHART 1: TRENDS OVER TIME |
| :--- |
| \% CHILDREN OUT OF SCHOOL BY AGE GROUP AND GENDER 2006-2009 |
| 20 |

note : 'отнек' includes chidren going to madarssa and EGS.
'№т in school' = dropped out + never enrolled.


| Std. | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 35.0 | 59.0 | 6.0 |  |  |  |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| II | 1.0 | 16.2 | 55.6 | 24.2 |  |  |  | 3. | . 0 |  |  |  | 100 |
| III |  | . 8 | 13.1 | 62.3 | 20.0 |  |  |  | 3.9 |  |  |  | 100 |
| IV |  | 2.0 |  | 13.4 | 56.7 | 17.5 | 5.2 |  |  | . 2 |  |  | 100 |
| V |  | 0 | 7 |  | 7.4 | 66.9 | 14.2 | 6.8 |  | 4.1 |  |  | 100 |
| VI |  |  | 2.7 |  |  | 8.2 | 47.3 | 32.7 | 2.7 | 3.6 | 2. | . 7 | 100 |
| VII |  |  |  | . 5 |  |  |  | 54.8 | 23.5 | 12.2 | 6. | 1 | 100 |
| VIII |  |  |  | 4.8 |  |  |  | 12.6 | 55.3 | 22.3 | 4. | . 9 | 100 |

How to read the table: In Std III, $95.4 \%(13.1+62.3+20.0)$ children are in age group 7 to 9.

## Young children in pre-school and school

|  |  |  |  | In Scho |  | $\stackrel{\infty}{\infty}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | anganwadi | UKG | Govt. | Pvt. | Other |  |  |
| Age 3 | 89.5 | 1.3 |  |  |  | 9.2 | 100 |
| Age 4 | 94.6 | 2.7 |  |  |  | 2.7 | 100 |
| Age 5 | 29.0 | 4.8 | 54.8 | 8.1 | 1.6 | 1.6 | 100 |
| Age 6 | 2.6 | 0.0 | 94.8 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 100 |

Chart 3: Trends over time
\% Children age 3-4 not attending pre-school (ICDS or other) 2006-2009


Of the villages visited, Anganwadi/Pre-School presence has been recorded in $100 \%$ villages.

# DADRA AND NAGAR HAVELI rural 

## Reading in own language

TAble 4: Class-wise \% children who CAN READ (All Schools) 2009

| STD. | Nothing | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (STD 1 Text) | Level 2 <br> (STd 2 Text) | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| I | 2.1 | 84.5 | 9.3 | 4.1 | 0.0 | 100 |
| II | 1.0 | 23.2 | 54.6 | 19.2 | 2.0 | 100 |
| III | 1.6 | 5.4 | 32.6 | 50.4 | 10.1 | 100 |
| IV | 0.0 | 4.2 | 11.5 | 59.4 | 25.0 | 100 |
| V | 0.0 | 2.0 | 0.7 | 50.0 | 47.3 | 100 |
| VI | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.8 | 43.6 | 54.6 | 100 |
| VII | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 6.1 | 93.0 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.7 | 91.3 | 100 |
| TOTAL | 0.6 | 13.3 | 13.4 | 31.6 | 41.3 | 100 |

NOTE : Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. Thus a child who can read Std II level text can read letters, words, and Std 1 level text.


Chart 4: TRENDS OVER TIME
\% Children who CANNOT EVEN IDENTIFY LETTERS (IN GOVt Schools in Std I - IV) 2006-2009


CHART 5: TRENDS OVER TIME
\% Children who CAN READ Std II level text (in govt schools in Std IV - VII) 2006-2009


## Reading and comprehension in english

| Std. | Cannot read capital letters | Can read capital letters | Can read small letters | Can read simple words | Can read easy sentences | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 75.3 | 22.6 | 0.0 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 100 |
| II | 47.8 | 43.5 | 7.6 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 100 |
| III | 11.9 | 52.4 | 13.5 | 17.5 | 4.8 | 100 |
| IV | 4.2 | 27.4 | 20.0 | 39.0 | 9.5 | 100 |
| V | 0.0 | 30.6 | 11.8 | 38.2 | 19.4 | 100 |
| VI | 0.0 | 14.6 | 6.4 | 47.3 | 31.8 | 100 |
| VII | 0.0 | 5.2 | 1.7 | 33.9 | 59.1 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.0 | 4.0 | 1.0 | 29.7 | 65.4 | 100 |
| Total | 15.2 | 25.5 | 8.0 | 27.1 | 24.3 | 100 |


| TABLE 6: CLASS-wISE \% CHILDREN WHO COMPREHEND ENGLISH (AlL Schools) 2009 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std. | Of those who can read words, \% who can tell meaning of the words | Of those who can read sentences, \% who can tell meaning of the sentences |
| I | No data | 100.0 |
| II | No data |  |
| III | 66.7 | 100.0 |
| IV | 80.8 | 100.0 |
| V | 75.6 | 100.0 |
| VI | 83.3 | 97.0 |
| VII | 89.7 | 93.2 |
| VIII | 95.8 | 94.8 |
| TOTAL | 82.0 | 95.6 |



## ARITHMETIC

| Std. | Nothing | Recognize Numbers |  | Subtract | Divide | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1-9 | 11-99 |  |  |  |
| 1 | 7.2 | 82.5 | 7.2 | 2.1 | 1.0 | 100 |
| II | 0.0 | 42.9 | 50.0 | 7.1 | 0.0 | 100 |
| III | 0.0 | 10.9 | 51.6 | 31.3 | 6.3 | 100 |
| IV | 1.1 | 4.4 | 14.1 | 67.4 | 13.0 | 100 |
| V | 0.0 | 0.7 | 8.2 | 54.1 | 37.0 | 100 |
| VI | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.5 | 49.1 | 45.5 | 100 |
| VII | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 13.9 | 86.1 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 7.8 | 92.2 | 100 |
| Total | 0.9 | 15.9 | 17.2 | 30.2 | 35.9 | 100 |

NOTE : Each cell shows the highest level of arithmetic achieved by a child. Thus a child who can do division, can also recognize numbers 1-9, 11-99 and do subtraction.

Chart 6: Trends over time
\% Children who CANNOT EVEN RECOGNIZE NUMBERS UPTO 9 (IN GOVt schools in Std I - IV) 2007-2009



Chart 7: Trends over time
\% Children who CAN DO DIVISION (in govt schools in Std IV - VII) 2007-2009


## TUITION

| Year | School | I | II | III | IV | V | VI | VII | VIII |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2007 | Govt | 8.6 | 8.1 | 3.2 | 10.0 | 9.9 | 8.3 | 6.3 | 10.1 |
|  | Pvt. | 76.5 | 66.7 | 80.0 | 57.1 | 36.4 | 0.0 | 83.3 | 50.0 |
| 2009 | Govt | 3.3 | 3.4 | 9.1 | 11.1 | 12.0 | 8.5 | 26.1 | 5.2 |
|  | Pvt. | 75.0 | 40.0 | 100.0 | 33.3 | 100.0 | 75.0 | 100.0 | 66.7 |

NOTE : The ASER survey in 2007 and 2009 recorded information about tuition. In both years, the question asked was the following: "Does the child take any paid additional class currently?" Therefore, these numbers do not include any supplemental help in learning that children may have received from parents or siblings or from anyone else that did not require payment.


## DADRA AND NAGAR HAVELI rural

## LEARNING LEVELS IN GOVERNMENT AND PRIVATE SCHOOLS : TRENDS OVER TIME

Chart 8: \% Children in Std III who CAN AT LEAST READ Std I LEVEL TEXT. BY SCHOOL TYPE 2006-2009


Chart 9: \% Children in Std V who CAN DO DIVISION.
BY SCHOOL TYPE 2006-2009


LEARNING LEVELS BY GENDER : TRENDS OVER TIME

Chart 10: \% Boys and girls in Std III who CAN READ AT LEAST Std I LEVEL TEXt 2007-2009


Chart 11: \% Boys and girls in Std V who Can do division 2007-2009


EDUCATION : FATHERS AND CHILDREN

Table 9: Fathers and children 2009

| Fathers' <br> Education | $\%$ <br> Fathers | Of these fathers : |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | \% Children (Std III-V) who can read level 1 (Std 1 Text) or more | \% Children (Std III-V) who can do subtraction or more | \% Children (Std III-V) who can read words or more in English | \% Children (Std IV-VIII) attending tuition |
| No Schooling | 32.1 | 7.4 | 80.8 | 68.4 | 38.1 | 3.8 |
| Std I-V | 22.0 | 2.2 | 73.8 | 63.9 | 33.3 | 5.5 |
| Std VI-VIII | 15.1 | 3.1 | 80.7 | 68.3 | 35.6 | 12.8 |
| Std IX-X | 18.5 | 0.0 | 90.0 | 75.0 | 56.9 | 17.6 |
| Above Std X | 12.4 | 0.0 | 85.7 | 78.6 | 65.9 | 61.2 |

NOTE : ASER 2009 recorded information about mothers' education. Similar analyses can be done with mothers and children.
NOTE: 8 primary and 15 upper primary schools were visited in 2009. School data available on request.


## SCHOOL ENROLLMENT AND OUT OF SCHOOL CHILDREN

| Table 1: \% Children in different types of sCHOOLS 2009 |  |  |  | \% Out of school |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in School |  |
| Age: 6-14 ALL | 64.4 | 34.9 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 100 |
| Age: 7-16 ALL | 68.3 | 30.0 | 0.0 | 1.8 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 58.9 | 40.6 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 BOYS | 53.1 | 46.2 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 100 |
| AgE: 7-10 GIRLS | 66.3 | 33.4 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 100 |
| AgE: 11-14 ALL | 71.0 | 27.9 | 0.0 | 1.1 | 100 |
| AgE: 11-14 BOYS | 64.1 | 34.8 | 0.0 | 1.1 | 100 |
| AgE: 11-14 GIRLS | 78.9 | 20.1 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 100 |
| AgE: 15-16 ALL | 80.9 | 13.5 | 0.0 | 5.6 | 100 |
| AgE: 15-16 BOYS | 76.7 | 18.6 | 0.0 | 4.6 | 100 |
| AgE: 15-16 GIRLS | 85.5 | 7.7 | 0.0 | 6.7 | 100 |



NOTE: 'отнеR' includes chidren going to madarssa and EGS.
'от IN SCHool' = dropped out + never enrolled.



How to read the table: In Std III, $82.6 \%(64.4+13.3+4.9)$ children are in age group 8 to 10 .

## Young children in pre-school and school

|  |  |  |  | In Scho |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | anganwadi | UKG | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{2} \underset{\pi}{\pi}$ |  |
| Age 3 | 56.5 | 35.3 |  |  |  | 8.3 | 100 |
| Age 4 | 50.3 | 44.1 |  |  |  | 5.6 | 100 |
| Age 5 | 18.6 | 17.5 | 35.4 | 24.0 | 0.0 | 4.5 | 100 |
| Age 6 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 56.9 | 42.5 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 100 |

Chart 3: Trends over time
\% Children age 3-4 not attending pre-school (ICDS or other) 2006-2009


Of the villages visited, Anganwadi/Pre-School presence has been recorded in 90.9 \% villages.

## Reading in own language

TAble 4: Class-wise \% children who CAN READ (All Schools) 2009

| STD. | Nothing | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (STD 1 Text) | Level 2 <br> (STd 2 Text) | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| I | 15.3 | 52.8 | 17.4 | 14.5 | 0.0 | 100 |
| II | 4.1 | 16.5 | 33.7 | 31.0 | 14.8 | 100 |
| III | 4.1 | 11.4 | 35.2 | 34.0 | 15.3 | 100 |
| IV | 3.8 | 5.5 | 15.9 | 38.2 | 36.6 | 100 |
| V | 1.4 | 10.1 | 6.9 | 25.3 | 56.3 | 100 |
| VI | 4.1 | 4.0 | 5.3 | 20.4 | 66.3 | 100 |
| VII | 0.0 | 3.2 | 6.3 | 17.3 | 73.3 | 100 |
| VIII | 1.9 | 3.5 | 3.9 | 20.0 | 70.6 | 100 |
| TotaL | 4.3 | 13.4 | 15.6 | 24.9 | 41.7 | 100 |

NOTE : Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. Thus a child who can read Std II level text can read letters, words, and Std 1 level text.


CHART 5: TRENDS OVER TIME
\% Children who CAN READ Std II level text (in govt schools in Std IV - VII) 2006-2009


## Reading Tool



 6 63 medl nelt

c- =

Chart 4: Trends over time
\% Children who CANNOT EVEN IDENTIFY LETTERS (IN GOVt Schools in Std I - IV) 2006-2009


## Reading and comprehension in english

## TABLE 5: CLASS-WISE \% CHILDREN WHO CAN READ

ENGLISH (All Schools) 2009

Cannot Can readCan readCan read Can read Total Std. | read |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| capital | capital | small | simple |
| letters | easy |  |  |
| letters | words | sentences |  | letters

| I | 53.9 | 31.1 | 6.3 | 5.4 | 3.3 | 100 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| II | 38.7 | 25.7 | 7.2 | 18.5 | 9.9 | 100 |
| III | 30.5 | 20.4 | 13.6 | 19.4 | 16.1 | 100 |
| IV | 20.1 | 21.6 | 9.0 | 27.9 | 21.4 | 100 |
| V | 6.0 | 18.7 | 15.0 | 23.7 | 36.6 | 100 |
| VI | 7.2 | 1.6 | 12.5 | 26.3 | 52.4 | 100 |
| VII | 1.6 | 8.0 | 10.2 | 23.0 | 57.2 | 100 |
| VIII | 2.9 | 7.8 | 5.7 | 16.2 | 67.5 | 100 |
| TOTAL | 20.0 | 16.7 | 10.0 | 19.8 | 33.5 | 100 |


| Std. | Of those who can read words, \% who can tell meaning of the words | Of those who can read sentences, \% who can tell meaning of the sentences |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 39.2 | 6.5 |
| II | 65.3 | 62.2 |
| III | 45.7 | 37.9 |
| IV | 68.1 | 46.5 |
| V | 41.6 | 64.5 |
| VI | 27.3 | 72.3 |
| VII | 65.8 | 72.0 |
| VIII | 71.0 | 65.0 |
| Total | 53.2 | 63.8 |


| English Tool |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
| D L T  <br>  K  G <br>     <br> X P N  | y  $f$  $i$ <br>  5  $y$  <br>      <br> m  a  $h$ |
| - | -axeme |
|  | What ix the time? <br> This is a blue shirt. <br> I Hile te slexp. <br> 1 have a berther: |
|  |  |

## ARITHMETIC

| Std. | Nothing | Recognize Numbers |  | Subtract | Divide | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $1-9$ | 11-99 |  |  |  |
| I | 14.3 | 61.0 | 20.3 | 4.5 | 0.0 | 100 |
| II | 4.3 | 22.0 | 37.2 | 26.4 | 10.2 | 100 |
| III | 4.1 | 21.0 | 28.4 | 33.5 | 13.1 | 100 |
| IV | 3.8 | 8.0 | 23.1 | 38.0 | 27.0 | 100 |
| V | 2.8 | 10.0 | 19.0 | 24.4 | 43.9 | 100 |
| VI | 2.0 | 7.2 | 16.0 | 26.6 | 48.2 | 100 |
| VII | 1.0 | 7.6 | 10.3 | 20.8 | 60.2 | 100 |
| VIII | 1.1 | 7.1 | 19.3 | 17.0 | 55.6 | 100 |
| Total | 4.2 | 18.1 | 21.6 | 23.7 | 32.4 | 100 |

NOTE : Each cell shows the highest level of arithmetic achieved by a child. Thus a child who can do division, can also recognize numbers 1-9, 11-99 and do subtraction.

Chart 6: Trends over time
\% Children who CANNOT EVEN RECOGNIZE NUMBERS UPTO 9 (IN GOVT SCHOOLS IN STD I - IV) 2007-2009


| Maths Tool |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 패애 हas 우 |  |  |  |
| Alv wimu 15 | Whas welem $314$ | saminst |  |
| 8 \% | 6 l | $\begin{array}{rrr}\text { ar } & 53 \\ -45 & -38\end{array}$ | c) 643 |
| $3$ $4$ | Ge ee | $\begin{array}{r} 30 \\ -24 \\ -34 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | v) wase |
| $\text { E } \quad c$ | 8 8\% | $\begin{array}{r}39 \\ -44 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | 4) 654 |
| $8 \text { \& }$ | 2496 | $\begin{array}{rr} 35 & 76 \\ -15 & -85 \end{array}$ |  |
|  | sixy |  |  |

Chart 7: Trends over time
\% Children who CAN DO DIVISION (in govt schools in Std IV - VII) 2007-2009


## TUITION

Table 8: Class-wise \% children ATTENDING TUItion CLASSES. by School type 2007 AND 2009

| Year | School | I | II | III | IV | V | VI | VII | VIII |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | Govt | 25.2 | 20.8 | 35.8 | 28.1 | 34.7 | 38.4 | 25.6 | 35.7 |
|  | PVT. | 75.9 | 82.0 | 79.0 | 77.2 | 87.2 | 81.6 | 59.7 | 80.6 |
| 2009 | Govt | 12.9 | 21.2 | 30.7 | 21.4 | 36.8 | 28.7 | 27.6 | 27.2 |
|  | Pvt. | 61.0 | 76.9 | 71.5 | 70.6 | 65.3 | 79.7 | 61.4 | 57.7 |

NOTE : The ASER survey in 2007 and 2009 recorded information about tuition. In both years, the question asked was the following: "Does the child take any paid additional class currently?" Therefore, these numbers do not include any supplemental help in learning that children may have received from parents or siblings or from anyone else that did not require payment.


## LEARNING LEVELS IN GOVERNMENT AND PRIVATE SCHOOLS : TRENDS OVER TIME

Chart 8: \% Children in Std III who CAN AT LEAST READ Std I LEVEL TEXT. BY SCHOOL TYPE 2006-2009


Chart 9: \% Children in Std V who CAN DO DIVISION.
BY SCHOOL TYPE 2006-2009


## Learning levels by gender : Trends over time

Chart 10: \% Boys and girls in Std III who CAN READ AT LEAST Std I LEVEL tEXt 2007-2009


CHART 11: \% BOYS AND GIRLS IN STD V who CAN DO DIVISION 2007-2009


Table 9: Fathers and children 2009

| Fathers' Education | \% <br> Fathers | Of these fathers : |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | \% Girls 6 to 14 out of school | \% Children (Std III-V) who can read level 1 (Std 1 Text) or more | \% Children (Std III-V) who can do subtraction or more | \% Children (Std III-V) who can read words or more in English | \% Children (Std IV-VIII) attending tuition |
| No Schooling | 10.2 | 0.0 | 64.7 | 54.1 | 32.3 | 15.5 |
| Std I-V | 16.1 | 0.6 | 72.3 | 58.0 | 45.8 | 32.2 |
| Sto VI-VIII | 21.2 | 0.5 | 67.6 | 53.7 | 43.6 | 40.6 |
| Std IX-X | 31.9 | 0.2 | 67.8 | 65.3 | 51.6 | 45.9 |
| Above Std X | 20.6 | 1.8 | 62.7 | 56.6 | 55.8 | 63.4 |

NOTE: ASER 2009 recorded information about mothers' education. Similar analyses can be done with mothers and children.
NOTE: 2 primary and 4 upper primary schools were visited in 2009. School data available on request.

ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM 2 OUT OF 2 DISTRICTS

## SCHOOL ENROLLMENT AND OUT OF SCHOOL CHILDREN

| Table 1: \% Children in different types of SCHOOLS 2009 |  |  |  | \% Out of school |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in School |  |
| AgE: 6-14 ALL | 78.2 | 21.2 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 100 |
| AgE: 7-16 ALL | 80.5 | 18.3 | 0.0 | 1.2 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 75.5 | 24.2 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 BOYS | 78.9 | 20.6 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 100 |
| AgE: 7-10 GIRLS | 72.1 | 27.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100 |
| AgE: 11-14 ALL | 83.0 | 16.4 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 100 |
| AgE: 11-14 BOYS | 80.5 | 19.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 GIRLS | 85.8 | 13.5 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 ALL | 85.1 | 11.3 | 0.0 | 3.6 | 100 |
| AgE: 15-16 BOYS | 85.0 | 15.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100 |
| AGE: 15-16 GIRLS | 85.3 | 7.4 | 0.0 | 7.4 | 100 |


note : 'отнек' includes chidren going to madarssa and EGS.
'№т in school' = dropped out + never enrolled.


| Std. | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 53.4 | 39.7 | 6.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| II | 0.0 | 34.3 | 56.3 | 9.5 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| III |  | . 1 | 29.0 | 59.5 | 4.2 |  | 3.2 |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| IV | 2.0 |  |  | 35.3 | 48.6 | 14.1 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| V | 2.7 |  |  |  | 12.7 | 74.7 | 7.2 | 2.4 |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| VI | 3.5 |  |  |  |  | 15.2 | 32.9 | 35.6 | 10.7 | 2.2 |  |  | 100 |
| VII | 5.1 |  |  |  |  |  | 8.5 | 60.2 | 20.0 | 3.6 | 2.6 |  | 100 |
| VIII | 1.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 14.4 | 55.5 | 21.4 | 7.5 |  | 100 |

How to read the table: In Std III, $92.7 \%(29.0+59.5+4.2)$ children are in age group 7 to 9 .

## Young children in pre-school and school

|  |  |  |  | In Scho |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | anganwadi | UKG | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | io त |  |
| Age 3 | 49.2 | 49.0 |  |  |  | 1.9 | 100 |
| Age 4 | 17.8 | 82.3 |  |  |  | 0.0 | 100 |
| Age 5 | 4.8 | 14.7 | 47.8 | 32.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100 |
| Age 6 | 0.0 | 3.4 | 66.6 | 28.2 | 0.0 | 1.7 | 100 |

Chart 3: Trends over time
\% Children age 3-4 not attending pre-school (ICDS or other) 2006-2009


Of the villages visited, Anganwadi/Pre-School presence has been recorded in $100 \%$ villages.

## PUDUCHERRY RURAL

## Reading in own language

Table 4: Class-wise \% children who CAN READ (All Schools) 2009

| StD. | Nothing | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (Std 1 Text) | Level 2 <br> (Std 2 Text) | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| I | 20.6 | 45.1 | 27.0 | 3.5 | 3.8 | 100 |
| II | 6.7 | 36.3 | 43.5 | 11.5 | 2.1 | 100 |
| III | 1.6 | 18.6 | 40.2 | 31.2 | 8.5 | 100 |
| IV | 1.3 | 9.5 | 33.2 | 35.1 | 20.9 | 100 |
| V | 0.9 | 2.3 | 20.3 | 40.6 | 36.0 | 100 |
| VI | 0.0 | 0.0 | 14.7 | 32.0 | 53.2 | 100 |
| VII | 0.0 | 0.5 | 3.5 | 25.2 | 70.7 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.0 | 1.2 | 2.4 | 9.8 | 86.6 | 100 |
| TOTAL | 3.3 | 12.5 | 22.4 | 25.0 | 36.8 | 100 |

NOTE : Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. Thus a child who can read Std II level text can read letters, words, and Std 1 level text.


Chart 4: TRENDS OVER TIME
\% Children who CANNOT EVEN IDENTIFY LETTERS (IN GOVt Schools in Std I - IV) 2006-2009


CHART 5: TRENDS OVER TIME
\% Children who CAN READ Std II level text (in govt schools in Std IV - VII) 2006-2009


## Reading and comprehension in english

## TABLE 5: CLASS-WISE \% CHILDREN WHO CAN READ

ENGLISH (All Schools) 2009

Cannot Can readCan readCan read Can read Total Std. | read |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| capital | capital |  |
| letters | small | simple |
| letters | words | sentences | letters

| I | 23.1 | 35.1 | 30.6 | 8.3 | 2.8 | 100 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| II | 12.3 | 32.1 | 33.1 | 17.8 | 4.7 | 100 |
| III | 5.7 | 11.3 | 47.4 | 26.3 | 9.3 | 100 |
| IV | 1.3 | 7.8 | 38.7 | 37.8 | 14.3 | 100 |
| V | 0.8 | 4.0 | 26.3 | 42.3 | 26.7 | 100 |
| VI | 0.0 | 1.6 | 4.4 | 58.2 | 35.8 | 100 |
| VII | 0.5 | 2.8 | 6.8 | 45.7 | 44.2 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.0 | 1.3 | 10.0 | 18.7 | 70.0 | 100 |
| TOTAL | 4.8 | 10.6 | 24.8 | 32.6 | 27.2 | 100 |


| Std. | Of those who can read words, \% who can tell meaning of the words | Of those who can read sentences, \% who can tell meaning of the sentences |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| II | 94.2 | 100.0 |
| III | 81.0 | 100.0 |
| IV | 73.4 | 63.1 |
| V | 74.1 | 97.7 |
| VI | 74.4 | 89.3 |
| VII | 82.6 | 87.5 |
| VIII | 100.0 | 90.8 |
| Total | 79.8 | 90.5 |


| English Tool |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
| B H R  <br>  $\mathbf{L}$  $\mathbf{V}$ <br> $\mathbf{M}$ P F  |  |
| rat  hot  <br>  big   <br> cow  man  <br>  pen   | $a$ What is the time? This is an red lyall. I Hile to piag, <br> I have in fribers |
|  |  |

## ARITHMETIC

| Std. | Nothing | Recognize Numbers |  | Subtract | Divide | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1-9 | 11-99 |  |  |  |
| I | 14.9 | 34.3 | 38.9 | 7.2 | 4.8 | 100 |
| II | 5.1 | 23.5 | 56.8 | 11.8 | 2.9 | 100 |
| III | 0.5 | 15.6 | 42.6 | 32.5 | 8.8 | 100 |
| IV | 0.7 | 3.7 | 37.3 | 38.7 | 19.7 | 100 |
| V | 0.4 | 1.2 | 21.7 | 42.7 | 34.1 | 100 |
| VI | 0.0 | 0.0 | 6.6 | 47.6 | 45.8 | 100 |
| VII | 0.0 | 0.5 | 1.6 | 38.9 | 59.0 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.0 | 1.2 | 4.8 | 9.2 | 84.8 | 100 |
| Total | 2.3 | 9.0 | 25.1 | 29.6 | 34.1 | 100 |

NOTE : Each cell shows the highest level of arithmetic achieved by a child. Thus a child who can do division, can also recognize numbers 1-9, 11-99 and do subtraction.

Chart 6: Trends over time
\% Children who CANNOT EVEN RECOGNIZE NUMBERS UPTO 9 (IN GOVt schools in Std I - IV) 2007-2009



Chart 7: Trends over time
\% Children who CAN DO DIVISION (in govt schools in Std IV - VII) 2007-2009


## TUITION

Table 8: Class-wise \% children ATTENDING TUItion CLASSES. BY SCHOOL TYPE 2007 AND 2009

| Year | School | I | II | III | IV | V | VI | VII | VIII |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2007 | Govt | 33.3 | 50.9 | 56.1 | 46.9 | 55.2 | 54.7 | 55.7 | 62.2 |
|  | PVT. | 40.0 | 48.8 | 71.3 | 69.9 | 58.7 | 42.4 | 75.5 | 55.0 |
| 2009 | Govt | 36.5 | 38.3 | 46.5 | 47.1 | 41.9 | 49.0 | 52.2 | 37.2 |
|  | Pvt. | 28.1 | 42.6 | 45.4 | 43.2 | 32.7 | 58.4 | 49.2 | 18.1 |

NOTE : The ASER survey in 2007 and 2009 recorded information about tuition. In both years, the question asked was the following: "Does the child take any paid additional class currently?" Therefore, these numbers do not include any supplemental help in learning that children may have received from parents or siblings or from anyone else that did not require payment.


## PUDUCHERRY RURAL

## LEARNING LEVELS IN GOVERNMENT AND PRIVATE SCHOOLS : TRENDS OVER TIME

Chart 8: \% Children in Std III who CAN AT LEAST READ Std I LEVEL TEXT. BY SCHOOL TYPE 2006-2009


Chart 9: \% Children in Std V who CAN DO DIVISION.
BY SCHOOL TYPE 2006-2009


## Learning levels by gender : Trends over time

Chart 10: \% Boys and girls in Std III who CAN READ AT LEAST Std I LEVEL TEXt 2007-2009


CHART 11: \% Boys and girls in Std V who CAN DO DIVISION 2007-2009


EDUCATION : FATHERS AND CHILDREN

Table 9: Fathers and children 2009

| Fathers' Education | \% Fathers | Of these fathers : |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | \% Girls 6 to 14 out of school | \% <br> Children (Std III-V) who can read level 1 (Std 1 Text) or more | \% Children (Std III-V) who can do subtraction or more | \% Children (Std III-V) who can read words or more in English | \% Children (Std IV-VIII) attending tuition |
| No Schooling | 18.8 | 0.0 | 68.7 | 66.5 | 49.8 | 17.2 |
| Std I-V | 14.2 | 0.0 | 60.4 | 52.6 | 53.9 | 31.1 |
| Std VI-VIII | 16.8 | 0.0 | 48.5 | 57.1 | 50.0 | 35.5 |
| Std IX-X | 31.2 | 0.0 | 57.7 | 58.2 | 48.8 | 61.9 |
| Above Std X | 19.0 | 0.0 | 68.9 | 68.2 | 71.3 | 54.2 |

NOTE : ASER 2009 recorded information about mothers' education. Similar analyses can be done with mothers and children.


NOTE: 23 primary and 10 upper primary schools were visited in 2009. School data available on request.
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## Age - Class Composition in Sample 2009

## ALL INDIA

|  | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std I | 84.9 | 73.8 | 25.8 | 8.4 | 3.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 14.9 |
| Std II | 10.2 | 19.9 | 53.8 | 30.2 | 8.7 |  | 6.3 | 5.0 |  |  | 13.9 |
| Std III |  |  | 14.8 | 43.5 | 32.2 | 10.5 |  |  | 5.1 | 5.4 | 13.9 |
| Std IV |  |  |  | 12.5 | 42.8 | 29.3 | 9.4 | 6.2 |  |  | 13.3 |
| Std V |  |  |  |  | 10.3 | 41.4 | 35.3 | 13.3 | 6.6 | 6.0 | 14.1 |
| Std VI | 5.0 | 6.3 | 5.6 |  |  | 9.1 | 38.4 | 32.1 | 12.2 | 10.0 | 11.3 |
| Std VII |  |  |  | 5.4 | 3.0 |  | 8.5 | 33.8 | 34.3 | 22.5 | 10.2 |
| Std VIII |  |  |  |  | 3.3 | 2.1 | 9.7 | 41.9 | 56.1 | 8.6 |  |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

## ARUNACHAL PRADESH

|  | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std I | 89.8 | 76.8 | 21.1 | 7.8 | 3.0 | 1.7 |  |  |  |  | 17.6 |
| Std II | 8.7 | 18.1 | 64.0 | 21.9 | 9.3 | 6.2 |  | 8.8 | 4.2 | 2.6 | 16.6 |
| Std III |  |  | 11.4 | 51.3 | 24.4 | 8.6 | 4.9 |  |  |  | 14.5 |
| Std IV |  |  |  | 12.4 | 46.0 | 24.1 | 8.1 | 6.6 | 6.4 | 8.8 | 13.0 |
| Std V | 1.5 | 5.1 | 3.5 |  |  | 12.6 | 44.1 | 27.9 | 14.8 | 7.6 | 14.4 |
| Std VI |  |  |  | 6.6 | 4.7 |  | 11.5 | 42.5 | 26.2 | 9.5 | 17.8 |
| Std VII |  |  |  |  |  | 3.9 | 10.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Std VIII |  |  |  |  |  | 2.9 | 12.1 | 50.4 | 22.3 | 15.8 | 7.0 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

## BIHAR

|  | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std I | 78.5 | 70.4 | 32.0 | 14.7 | 6.5 | 3.3 |  |  |  |  | 18.4 |
| Std II | 15.4 | 20.6 | 44.0 | 35.3 | 16.2 | 10.9 |  |  | 6.6 | 5.1 | 17.2 |
| Std III |  |  | 17.1 | 30.4 | 36.1 | 18.8 | 11.1 | 7.7 |  |  | 16.0 |
| Std IV |  |  |  | 12.5 | 25.1 | 26.6 | 16.3 | 12.8 | 6.6 | 6.3 | 12.9 |
| Std V | 6.1 | 9.0 |  |  |  | 11.1 | 24.4 | 31.3 | 19.8 | 14.2 | 9.7 |
| Std VI |  |  | 7.0 | 7.2 |  | 11.4 | 23.3 | 25.7 | 19.1 | 16.8 | 9.9 |
| Std VII |  |  |  |  | 5.0 |  | 9.5 | 19.8 | 27.4 | 25.5 | 7.4 |
| Std VIII |  |  |  |  | 4.6 | 2.7 | 10.3 | 26.3 | 36.8 | 5.8 |  |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

## ANDHRA Pradesh

|  | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std I | 87.9 | 81.6 | 20.8 | 7.5 | 3.0 | 2.8 |  |  |  |  | 14.6 |
| Std II | 6.3 | 14.4 | 62.9 | 19.9 | 7.1 |  | 3.2 |  |  |  | 12.2 |
| Std III |  |  | 12.1 | 57.9 | 19.2 | 7.6 |  | 4.2 | 5.7 | 8.7 | 12.5 |
| Std IV |  |  |  | 11.4 | 57.8 | 17.7 | 7.9 |  |  |  | 13.1 |
| Std V |  |  |  |  | 11.0 | 61.1 | 22.4 | 8.4 |  |  | 15.0 |
| Std VI | 5.8 | 4.0 | 4.2 |  |  | 8.3 | 54.4 | 22.8 | 7.5 | 5.5 | 11.5 |
| Std VII |  |  |  |  | 1.8 |  | 11.0 | 53.1 | 24.7 | 25.4 | 11.7 |
| Std VIII |  |  |  |  | 2.5 | 1.1 | 11.5 | 62.1 | 60.3 | 9.5 |  |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

## CHHATIISGARH

|  | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std I | 88.2 | 84.3 | 29.3 | 5.3 | 1.3 | 2.4 |  |  |  |  | 14.8 |
| Std II | 7.1 | 11.6 | 58.8 | 39.0 |  |  | 2.7 |  |  |  | 12.5 |
| Std III |  |  | 8.4 | 44.2 | 46.0 | 7.1 |  | 7.1 | 3.5 |  | 13.0 |
| Std IV |  |  |  |  | 40.9 | 42.5 | 8.4 |  |  | 4.1 | 14.0 |
| Std V |  |  |  |  | 5.3 | 41.2 | 55.3 |  |  |  | 15.5 |
| Std VI | 4.8 | 4.1 | 3.6 | 9.5 |  |  | 27.7 | 49.7 | 13.5 |  | 12.0 |
| Std VII |  |  |  |  | 1.0 | 5.1 |  | 24.1 | 49.9 | 21.0 | 10.1 |
| Std VIII |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5.9 | 5.3 | 26.3 | 60.6 | 8.1 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

## GOA



Haryana

|  | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std I | 80.5 | 63.9 | 23.3 | 7.3 | 2.4 |  |  |  |  |  | 13.2 |
| Std II | 14.4 | 28.4 | 52.1 | 27.7 | 9.1 |  | 7.0 | 3.4 |  |  | 14.0 |
| Std III |  |  | 18.6 | 42.1 | 31.3 | 10.8 |  |  | 5.4 |  | 9.3 |
| Std IV |  |  |  | 16.2 | 38.5 | 26.8 | 14.2 | 7.3 |  |  | 13.8 |
| Std V | 5.1 | 7.7 |  |  | 14.7 | 40.1 | 29.3 | 14.9 | 9.3 |  | 14.4 |
| Std VI |  |  | 6.0 | 6.7 |  | 12.2 | 32.6 | 28.5 | 14.3 | 11.1 | 11.2 |
| Std VII |  |  |  |  | 4.0 |  | 13.6 | 31.5 | 32.2 | 22.4 | 10.3 |
| Std VIII |  |  |  |  | 4.9 | 3.3 | 14.4 | 38.8 | 57.3 | 9.2 |  |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

## Jammu and Kashmir

|  | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std I | 77.1 | 72.9 | 21.3 | 4.9 | 2.4 |  |  |  |  |  | 11.0 |
| Std II | 14.0 | 18.7 | 61.1 | 44.4 | 6.2 |  | 3.4 |  |  |  | 13.4 |
| Std III | 8.9 | 8.5 | 10.0 | 36.0 | 41.7 | 7.8 |  |  | 7.0 | 4.7 | 12.2 |
| Std IV |  |  | 7.6 | 11.5 | 34.5 | 44.7 | 6.6 |  |  |  | 14.2 |
| Std V |  |  |  | 3.2 | 10.8 | 33.0 | 43.2 | 9.4 |  |  | 12.9 |
| Std VI |  |  |  |  | 4.5 | 8.7 | 34.9 | 54.1 | 11.2 | 5.9 | 14.0 |
| Std VII |  |  |  |  |  | 3.6 | 8.9 | 21.7 | 53.2 | 14.1 | 10.6 |
| Std VIII |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.0 | 9.0 | 28.7 | 75.3 | 11.7 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

## GUJARAT

|  | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std I | 90.7 | 86.1 | 10.2 | 1.3 | 4 |  |  |  |  |  | 12.5 |
| Std II | 4.5 | 10.4 | 79.1 | 15.9 |  | 4.1 | 5 |  |  |  | 12.7 |
| Std III |  |  | 8.5 | 72.1 | 22.0 |  | 5.9 | 7.1 | 3.5 | 5.5 | 13.6 |
| Std IV |  |  |  | 8.8 | 67.7 | 22.2 |  |  |  |  | 13.7 |
| Std V <br> Std VI | 4.8 | 3.6 | 2.3 | 2.0 |  | 4.9 | 63.7 | 23.4 | 7.0 | 7.1 | 12.1 |
| Std VII |  |  |  |  | 1.5 |  | 5.3 | 64.8 | 32.4 | 27.9 | 13.3 |
| Std VIII |  |  |  |  |  | 1.4 | 1.1 | 4.8 | 57.2 | 59.6 | 8.2 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

## Himachal Pradesh

|  | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std I | 92.3 | 66.0 | 10.3 | 2.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12.9 |
| Std II | 7.7 | 30.1 | 66.1 | 16.8 |  | 4.6 |  |  |  |  | 13.0 |
| Std III |  | 3.9 | 21.9 | 53.7 | 19.4 |  |  | 6.6 |  |  | 12.1 |
| Std IV |  |  | 1.7 | 25.2 | 57.1 | 16.8 |  |  |  |  | 13.0 |
| Std V |  |  |  | 2.1 | 19.6 | 64.0 | 23.6 |  |  |  | 14.6 |
| Std VI |  |  |  |  | 1.1 | 12.6 | 58.2 | 28.0 |  |  | 12.1 |
| Std VII |  |  |  |  |  | 2.0 | 11.8 | 50.1 | 38.6 | 14.1 | 11.6 |
| Std VIII |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.3 | 15.4 | 52.1 | 78.2 | 10.9 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

## JHARKHAND

|  | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std I | 84.6 | 67.9 | 27.0 | 11.5 | 4.6 | 2.8 |  |  |  |  | 17.2 |
| Std II | 11.9 | 24.1 | 49.2 | 35.3 | 15.1 | 8.9 |  | 9.6 | 4.2 |  | 16.7 |
| Std III |  |  | 16.9 | 37.5 | 35.7 | 18.1 | 10.1 |  |  | 9.3 | 15.8 |
| Std IV |  |  |  | 10.0 | 30.3 | 27.2 | 18.1 | 12.8 | 6.3 |  | 13.1 |
| Std V | 3.5 | 8.0 |  |  | 11.1 | 30.2 | 32.0 | 19.4 | 13.4 | 9.8 | 13.1 |
| Std VI |  |  | 6.9 | 5.7 |  | 9.1 | 25.0 | 27.4 | 16.6 | 14.0 | 9.6 |
| Std VII |  |  |  |  | 3.2 |  | 8.8 | 22.2 | 30.1 | 23.2 | 8.0 |
| Std VIII |  |  |  |  |  | 3.7 | 2.2 | 8.7 | 29.3 | 43.7 | 6.5 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

## KARNATAKA

|  | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std I | 88.2 | 89.0 | 38.1 | 2.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11.4 |
| Std II | 8.3 | 8.7 | 52.2 | 53.9 | 4.3 | 5.2 |  |  |  |  | 12.1 |
| Std III |  |  | 6.9 | 34.3 | 55.1 |  | 4.7 | 7.1 |  |  | 12.5 |
| Std IV |  |  |  | 7.6 | 34.2 | 50.4 |  |  | 8.3 | 5.0 | 13.5 |
| Std V | 3.5 | 2.3 | 2.8 |  | 5.4 | 36.8 | 59.1 |  |  |  | 14.2 |
| Std VI |  |  |  | 2.0 | 0.9 | 6.0 | 28.5 | 55.1 |  |  | 13.0 |
| Std VII |  |  |  |  |  | 1.6 | 31.6 | 57.2 | 12.5 | 12.8 |  |
| Std VIII |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.8 | 6.2 | 34.5 | 82.6 | 10.6 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

## Madhya Pradesh

|  | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std I | 87.9 | 72.3 | 18.1 | 4.1 | 0.9 | 3.5 |  |  |  |  | 13.8 |
| Std II | 8.2 | 23.0 | 60.8 | 28.6 |  |  | 3.9 |  |  |  | 13.3 |
| Std III |  |  | 16.6 | 47.8 | 37.3 | 7.5 |  | 2.3 | 3.5 |  | 14.0 |
| Std IV |  |  |  |  | 40.9 | 31.5 | 9.0 |  |  | 6.6 | 13.1 |
| Std V | 3.9 | 4.7 | 4.6 | 14.2 |  |  | 36.5 | 40.5 | 16.1 |  | 12.5 |
| Std VI |  |  |  |  | 2.7 | 9.2 |  | 30.6 | 39.6 | 22.5 | 9.8 |
| Std VII |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6.7 | 8.0 | 34.4 | 60.6 | 8.2 |
| Std VIII |  |  |  |  |  |  | 85.5 | 42.3 |  |  |  |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

## MANIPUR

|  | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std I | 67.4 | 63.2 | 39.5 | 18.6 | 10.3 | 3.5 | 1.6 |  |  |  | 15.0 |
| Std II | 24.6 | 22.9 | 36.2 | 37.0 | 19.6 | 11.4 | 6.5 |  | 4.4 |  | 15.6 |
| Std III |  | 8.8 | 11.0 | 23.7 | 28.3 | 24.6 | 15.2 | 8.4 |  |  | 14.9 |
| Std IV |  |  | 3.4 | 10.1 | 23.9 | 27.9 | 24.4 | 12.8 | 7.0 |  | 13.8 |
| Std V | 8.0 |  | 9.4 | 6.5 | 7.1 | 20.3 | 28.3 | 23.3 | 14.4 | 10.8 | 13.8 |
| Std VI | 5.1 |  |  | 2.7 | 6.1 | 17.6 | 26.6 | 21.7 | 16.4 | 10.4 |  |
| Std VII |  | 0.6 | 4.1 | 8 |  |  | 17.1 | 27.6 | 29.2 | 9.4 |  |
| Std VIII |  |  |  | 8.1 | 6.3 | 6.5 | 9.0 | 24.8 | 35.7 | 7.6 |  |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

## Kerala

|  | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std I | 98.0 | 77.0 | 17.4 | 0.8 | 3.1 |  |  |  |  |  | 10.4 |
| Std II |  | 20.9 | 67.1 | 17.1 |  | 2.4 | 3.1 |  |  |  | 11.3 |
| Std III |  |  | 14.3 | 68.2 | 18.5 |  |  | 3.3 |  |  | 12.4 |
| Std IV <br> Std V | 2.0 |  |  | 12.1 | 63.0 | 19.8 |  |  | 5.0 | 3.6 | 13.0 |
| Std VI |  | 2.1 | 1.2 |  |  | 14.4 | 66.2 | 22.7 |  |  |  |
| Std VII |  |  | 1.9 |  | 10.9 | 60.5 | 22.8 |  |  | 14.7 |  |
| Std VIII |  |  |  |  | 0.7 | 13.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |


| MABARASMTRA |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | Total |
| Std I | 81.8 | 93.6 | 45.3 | 2.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12.3 |
| Std II | 8.9 | 4.7 | 49.2 | 56.3 |  |  | 1.3 |  |  |  | 12.5 |
| Std III |  |  |  | 36.8 | 59.3 | 4.8 |  | 2.4 | 2.9 |  | 13.0 |
| Std IV |  |  |  |  | 32.1 | 62.0 | 7.6 |  |  |  | 14.9 |
| Std V |  |  |  |  |  | 29.5 | 63.0 |  |  |  | 13.3 |
| Std VI |  |  |  | 4.2 |  |  | 25.2 | 60.4 | 9.2 |  | 12.4 |
| Std VII |  |  |  |  |  | 2.7 |  | 26.1 | 58.4 | 16.8 | 11.6 |
| Std VIII |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.4 | 29.5 | 77.6 | 10.0 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

## Meghalaya

|  | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std I | 87.9 | 78.5 | 61.8 | 45.6 | 24.8 | 15.6 | 11.7 | 8.1 |  |  | 22.8 |
| Std II | 4.8 | 19.0 | 26.7 | 37.2 | 33.8 | 30.6 | 14.6 | 13.2 |  |  | 20.4 |
| Std III |  |  | 7.7 | 12.2 | 25.2 | 21.3 | 22.6 | 21.4 | 13.4 | 9.4 | 16.4 |
| Std IV |  |  |  |  | 12.1 | 20.5 | 15.6 | 21.8 | 15.8 | 19.7 | 14.1 |
| Std V | 7.2 | 2.5 |  |  |  |  | 10.1 | 19.8 | 13.1 | 17.5 | 11.8 |
| Std VI |  |  | 3.8 | 5.0 | 4.0 |  | 11.0 | 13.4 | 15.6 | 13.1 | 6.6 |
| Std VII <br> Std VIII |  |  |  |  |  | 2.0 |  |  | 20.5 | 16.0 | 6.2 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

## Mizoram

|  | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std I | 85.4 | 68.0 | 28.9 | 10.5 | 5.7 | 1.3 |  |  |  |  | 16.3 |
| Std II | 9.0 | 26.5 | 53.5 | 31.5 | 16.7 | 6.8 |  |  | 2.7 | 1.3 | 16.5 |
| Std III | 5.6 | 5.6 | 14.1 | 41.7 | 37.0 | 19.9 | 13.1 | 9.2 |  |  | 16.8 |
| Std IV |  |  | 3.6 | 10.3 | 30.2 | 32.5 | 20.7 | 17.2 | 12.4 | 8.1 | 15.1 |
| Std V |  |  |  | 5.9 | 8.5 | 28.8 | 25.1 | 21.5 | 18.2 | 14.1 | 12.8 |
| Std VI |  |  |  |  | 2.0 | 8.8 | 26.7 | 23.4 | 18.2 | 23.2 | 9.8 |
| Std VII |  |  |  |  |  | 2.0 | 7.1 | 21.8 | 26.4 | 24.0 | 7.7 |
| Std VIII |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.3 | 5.2 | 22.1 | 29.4 | 5.0 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

## ORISSA

|  | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std I | 88.2 | 76.5 | 12.3 | 3.2 | 5.3 | 2.4 |  |  |  |  | 15.6 |
| Std II | 6.3 | 18.3 | 67.2 | 14.7 |  |  | 5.3 |  |  |  | 12.5 |
| Std III |  |  | 15.5 | 64.8 | 15.4 | 3.5 |  | 6.0 | 2.9 |  | 13.5 |
| Std IV |  |  |  |  | 65.4 | 12.8 |  |  |  | 8.0 | 11.5 |
| Std V | 5.5 | 5.2 |  |  | 11.3 | 68.7 | 21.6 |  |  |  | 15.4 |
| Std VI |  |  | 5.0 | 12.5 |  |  | 61.3 | 18.1 | 5.3 |  | 10.6 |
| Std VII |  |  |  |  | 2.7 | 9.7 | 9.5 | 58.6 | 23.6 | 19.7 | 11.8 |
| Std VIII |  |  |  |  |  | 1.9 | 10.5 | 63.6 | 56.3 | 9.2 |  |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

## RajAStHAN

|  | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std I | 73.1 | 51.9 | 18.5 | 8.3 | 2.6 |  |  |  |  |  | 13.0 |
| Std II | 20.1 | 33.8 | 41.5 | 22.9 | 10.4 |  | 7.0 | 4.8 |  |  | 13.5 |
| Std III |  | 10.3 | 28.1 | 36.3 | 25.8 | 11.5 |  |  | 6.6 | 4.2 | 14.2 |
| Std IV |  |  | 7.5 | 20.0 | 30.5 | 21.8 | 10.3 | 6.2 |  |  | 12.1 |
| Std V | 6.9 |  |  | 9.6 | 20.9 | 34.9 | 28.3 | 16.0 | 8.3 | 7.2 | 14.8 |
| Std VI |  | 4.1 | 4.6 |  | 7.4 | 17.4 | 32.9 | 26.5 | 15.0 | 11.1 | 12.1 |
| Std VII |  |  |  | 3.1 | 2.4 | 5.8 | 15.8 | 29.3 | 31.2 | 23.6 | 10.6 |
| Std VIII |  |  |  | 2.4 | 2.2 | 5.9 | 17.2 | 38.8 | 54.0 | 9.8 |  |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

## NAGALAND

|  | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std I | 86.2 | 79.5 | 42.1 | 12.2 | 6.9 | 2.9 | 1.9 |  |  |  | 13.8 |
| Std II | 7.5 | 15.7 | 47.1 | 32.0 | 18.3 | 9.4 | 5.8 |  | 6.6 | 3.9 | 15.0 |
| Std III |  |  | 8.2 | 41.8 | 26.4 | 16.4 | 15.2 | 7.2 |  |  | 15.3 |
| Std IV |  |  |  | 11.3 | 43.2 | 29.0 | 19.5 | 17.1 | 12.8 | 6.2 | 17.5 |
| Std V | 6.3 | 4.8 |  |  |  | 33.6 | 24.4 | 20.0 | 13.9 | 9.8 | 12.9 |
| Std VI |  |  | 2.6 | 2.8 | 5.2 | 7.3 | 28.8 | 28.0 | 18.5 | 16.7 | 11.1 |
| Std VII |  |  |  |  |  | 1.4 | 4.4 | 21.3 | 24.3 | 27.8 | 8.4 |
| Std VIII |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.6 | 24.0 | 35.7 | 6.0 |  |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

## Punjab

|  | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std I | 78.0 | 63.8 | 26.7 | 9.9 | 2.5 |  |  |  |  |  | 11.9 |
| Std II | 14.7 | 25.1 | 44.5 | 28.9 | 14.2 |  | 6.5 |  |  |  | 12.3 |
| Std III |  | 5.9 | 19.6 | 36.9 | 29.7 | 12.2 |  |  | 9.8 | 5.2 | 12.7 |
| Std IV |  |  |  | 17.6 | 35.8 | 33.7 | 14.8 |  |  |  | 14.4 |
| Std V | 7.4 |  |  |  | 13.9 | 39.2 | 39.5 | 18.4 |  |  | 15.5 |
| Std VI |  | 5.2 | 9.2 | 6.7 |  | 8.6 | 27.8 | 34.3 | 18.9 | 8.0 | 11.8 |
| Std VII |  |  |  |  | 3.9 |  | 9.9 | 26.9 | 35.4 | 24.0 | 10.7 |
| Std VIII |  |  |  |  |  | 2.7 | 1.5 | 12.1 | 36.0 | 62.9 | 10.7 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

## SIKKIM

|  | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std I | 80.7 | 77.0 | 46.6 | 20.1 | 11.7 | 2.6 |  |  |  |  | 14.8 |
| Std II | 16.6 | 18.0 | 37.6 | 42.6 | 24.1 | 11.1 |  |  | 6.5 | 4.4 | 14.8 |
| Std III |  |  | 8.7 | 25.2 | 37.5 | 29.3 | 14.7 | 12.4 |  |  | 16.1 |
| Std IV |  |  |  | 7.9 | 20.6 | 26.9 | 29.7 | 17.1 | 11.9 | 8.9 | 15.0 |
| Std V | 2.7 | 5.0 |  |  |  | 24.2 | 30.6 | 31.7 | 18.6 | 13.9 | 15.0 |
| Std VI |  |  | 7.1 | 4.1 | 6.1 |  | 15.3 | 22.9 | 32.2 | 26.7 | 12.8 |
| Std VII |  |  |  |  |  | 6.0 |  | 9.6 | 20.3 | 24.1 | 7.1 |
| Std VIII |  |  |  |  |  | 2.4 | 3.4 | 10.5 | 22.1 | 4.5 |  |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

TAmil NadU

|  | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std I | 96.2 | 70.4 | 5.2 | 0.8 | 0.9 |  |  |  |  |  | 10.6 |
| Std II |  | 27.3 | 72.2 | 6.2 |  | 1.1 |  |  |  |  | 10.7 |
| Std III |  |  | 19.9 | 73.1 | 6.3 |  | 1.0 | 2.1 |  |  | 11.8 |
| Std IV |  |  |  | 17.6 | 79.1 | 7.0 |  |  | 3.6 | 5.4 |  |
| Std V | 3.8 |  |  |  | 11.8 | 84.0 | 10.1 |  |  |  | 12.7 |
| Std VI |  | 2.3 | 2.8 |  |  | 6.8 | 77.0 | 19.5 |  |  | 12.5 |
| Std VII |  |  |  | 2.3 |  | 1.9 |  | 10.9 | 66.7 | 15.0 | 18.8 |
| Std VIII |  |  |  |  |  | 1.2 | 12.7 |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

## UTTARAKHAND

|  | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std I | 84.1 | 69.0 | 20.9 | 6.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Std II | 10.3 | 24.0 | 52.8 | 22.9 |  |  | 5.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Std III |  |  | 19.7 | 48.3 | 27.7 | 10.9 |  |  | 12.5 | 9.3 | 8.2 |
| Std IV |  |  |  | 17.2 | 46.7 | 26.6 | 12.1 |  |  |  | 14.4 |
| Std V | 5.6 | 7.1 |  |  | 15.8 | 45.7 | 34.4 | 14.9 |  |  | 14.0 |
| Std VI |  |  | 6.7 | 5.2 |  | 10.3 | 32.8 | 30.4 | 15.7 | 9.7 | 10.9 |
| Std VII |  |  |  |  | 2.3 |  | 13.0 | 35.9 | 36.7 | 26.1 | 11.0 |
| Std VIII |  |  |  |  | 2.6 | 2.6 | 9.4 | 38.4 | 56.1 | 8.4 |  |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

## West bengal

|  | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std I | 86.8 | 69.7 | 29.1 | 10.2 | 4.2 |  |  |  |  |  | 14.6 |
| Std II | 9.2 | 25.5 | 45.2 | 31.4 | 13.0 |  | 7.0 | 3.8 |  |  | 13.5 |
| Std III | 4.0 | 4.8 | 18.8 | 40.0 | 29.9 | 12.7 |  |  |  |  | 13.0 |
| Std IV |  |  | 6.9 | 14.6 | 39.5 | 33.6 | 11.6 | 7.5 |  |  | 13.7 |
| Std V |  |  |  | 3.8 | 10.9 | 36.5 | 39.6 | 17.5 | 8.4 | 7.1 | 14.2 |
| Std VI |  |  |  |  | 2.6 | 9.2 | 31.6 | 36.7 | 20.1 | 9.9 | 12.2 |
| Std VII |  |  |  |  |  | 2.1 | 7.3 | 26.4 | 37.1 | 32.1 | 10.8 |
| Std VIII |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.9 | 8.1 | 29.7 | 47.0 | 8.0 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
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| $\stackrel{\sim}{\dot{m}} \stackrel{n}{\bar{\omega}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ơ } \\ & \underset{\sim}{\sim} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { n} \\ & \stackrel{\circ}{\circ} \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{\sim}{J}$ | $\begin{aligned} & n \\ & \hat{0} \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | ö | $\underset{\sim}{n}$ | $\underset{\sim}{n}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\underset{\sim}{N}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { oे } \\ & \stackrel{0}{m} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { I } \\ & \underset{\sim}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \underset{\sim}{\sim} \\ \underset{\sim}{n} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} n \\ \underset{\sim}{7} \end{gathered}$ | $\stackrel{\text { ®}}{\sim}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hat{0} \\ & \stackrel{\infty}{\infty} \\ & \sim \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{N}{n}$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{i n}$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\infty}$ | $\stackrel{\text { n }}{0}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\circ} \\ & \text { on } \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\wedge}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\sim}{\infty} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\infty} \end{aligned}$ | ñ Ǹ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { on } \\ & \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{\underset{\wedge}{\lambda}}{\underset{\wedge}{2}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & n \\ & \stackrel{n}{0} \\ & \hat{y} \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{n}_{n}^{\infty}$ |  |  | 웈 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { U } \\ & \text { in } \\ & \text { in } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\mathrm{a}} \end{gathered}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \underset{\sim}{2} \\ \underset{\sim}{m} \end{gathered}$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\stackrel{\infty}{7}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\infty}{\underset{\sim}{m}} \\ & \underset{\sim}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { ò } \\ \underset{\sim}{2} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { oे } \\ & \text { م } \end{aligned}$ | io | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{7}$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\stackrel{\infty}{7}}$ | $\begin{gathered} -7 \\ \underset{\sim}{n} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N} \\ & \text { O} \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\infty}$ | $\underset{\infty}{\stackrel{\sim}{\infty}}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { J } \\ \underset{\sim}{N} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { n} \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & N \\ & \tilde{\infty} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N } \\ & \stackrel{\infty}{0} \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \end{aligned}$ | $$ | $\underset{\sim}{\infty}$ | $\underset{\sim}{n}$ | $\underset{\substack{\circ \\ \underset{\sim}{2} \\ \hline}}{ }$ | $\stackrel{\star}{\mathrm{N}}$ | $\stackrel{0}{\underset{\sim}{N}}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\circ}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \text { O } \\ & \text { O} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { in } \\ & \text { in } \\ & \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\underset{\sim}{N}}$ | $\stackrel{i}{N}$ | $\underset{\forall}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\underset{\sim}{m}}{\underset{7}{7}}$ | $\stackrel{\text { J }}{\underset{N}{\prime}}$ | N |  |
|  | $\vec{J}$ | $\stackrel{\text { a }}{\sim}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\sim}$ | 痌 | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\text { F }}$ | $\stackrel{n}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{m}{\square}$ | กn | $\stackrel{0}{n}$ | 出 | ～ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\infty}$ | ¢ | ヘ | $\stackrel{\text { ¢ }}{\text { ¢ }}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{m}$ | N | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | ¢ | $\stackrel{\star}{\wedge}$ | $\stackrel{\omega}{n}$ | $\stackrel{\circ}{\infty}$ | ～ | in | $\bar{n}$ | $\infty$ | $\underset{\infty}{\underset{\infty}{N}}$ | $\stackrel{n}{\square}$ | $\stackrel{N}{n}$ | n | 앙 |  |
|  | N | $\infty$ | N | へ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | $r$ | $\sim$ | $\sim$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\pm$ | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\sim}$ | N | $\pm$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{*}$ | m | $a$ | $\wedge$ | $\infty$ | $\vec{\square}$ | \％ | $\sim$ | $\cdots$ | n | ナ | へ | $\checkmark$ | oิ | $m$ | $\stackrel{ }{ }$ |  |

[^33]

## Village Infrastructure And household Indicators

| STATES | \% Of villages with the following facilities |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \% Of households with the following facilities |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pukka <br> Road | Electricity | Post Office | $\begin{aligned} & \text { STD } \\ & \text { Booth } \end{aligned}$ | Bank | P.D.S | Primary Health Centre | Private <br> Health <br> Clinic | ASHA worker | Govt. Prim. School | Govt. <br> Middle <br> School | Govt. Sec. School | Private ${ }^{A}$ school | $\begin{gathered} \text { Anganwadi } \\ \text { Pred } \\ \text { School } \end{gathered}$ | Kutcha | Semi Pukka | Pukka | Electricity | T.V. | Toilet | Mobile | Vehicle |
| Andhra Pradesh | 83.5 | 99.4 | 75.8 | 77.2 | 32.9 | 92.0 | 48.8 | 59.9 | 71.1 | 89.4 | 47.1 | 53.4 | 45.0 | 97.0 | 18.9 | 27.5 | 53.6 | 95.8 | 67.8 | 49.6 | 64.3 | 59.1 |
| Arunachal Pradesh | 62.8 | 81.4 | 16.0 | 19.4 | 7.5 | 44.2 | 25.5 | 7.0 | 62.4 | 63.5 | 43.5 | 15.4 | 11.3 | 63.2 | 64.7 | 27.9 | 7.4 | 75.8 | 42.6 | 58.9 | 45.3 | 46.8 |
| Assam | 39.8 | 69.4 | 35.0 | 29.8 | 7.6 | 71.8 | 36.1 | 15.9 | 92.4 | 89.0 | 37.4 | 16.3 | 34.6 | 84.7 | 67.9 | 20.0 | 12.1 | 41.7 | 33.7 | 42.5 | 51.5 | 39.0 |
| Bihar | 50.4 | 57.4 | 43.5 | 53.0 | 17.4 | 68.5 | 29.4 | 65.4 | 87.1 | 82.3 | 66.9 | 15.0 | 37.3 | 91.8 | 45.2 | 32.3 | 22.6 | 29.3 | 16.9 | 21.0 | 52.5 | 72.3 |
| Chhattisgarh | 72.9 | 95.9 | 33.6 | 35.2 | 16.4 | 71.3 | 34.3 | 49.4 | 93.3 | 99.1 | 73.2 | 25.1 | 29.7 | 98.2 | 72.5 | 17.0 | 10.5 | 82.6 | 42.6 | 22.9 | 30.8 | 85.6 |
| Dadra \& Nagar Haveli | 95.7 | 100.0 | 50.0 | 40.9 | 4.4 | 73.9 | 39.1 | 21.7 | 45.5 | 95.5 | 40.9 | 23.8 | 22.7 | 100.0 | 51.5 | 18.3 | 30.2 | 93.6 | 49.9 | 35.4 | 52.7 | 50.4 |
| Daman \& Diu | 100.0 | 100.0 | 72.7 | 90.9 | 45.5 | 54.6 | 72.7 | 36.4 | 70.0 | 100.0 | 88.9 | 60.0 | 40.0 | 90.9 | 9.2 | 50.9 | 39.9 | 99.8 | 91.3 | 77.7 | 92.9 | 79.2 |
| Goa | 100.0 | 100.0 | 94.6 | 92.7 | 94.6 | 96.3 | 90.9 | 90.9 | 75.9 | 98.2 | 87.3 | 74.6 | 70.9 | 98.2 | 4.0 | 24.3 | 71.7 | 99.0 | 92.1 | 86.1 | 87.4 | 81.0 |
| Gujarat | 87.3 | 98.7 | 67.3 | 68.3 | 37.1 | 77.7 | 48.3 | 50.4 | 86.3 | 87.8 | 83.0 | 40.4 | 29.9 | 96.9 | 36.0 | 34.1 | 29.9 | 93.4 | 55.7 | 47.9 | 63.8 | 58.4 |
| Haryana | 94.7 | 97.9 | 65.3 | 78.6 | 45.4 | 80.9 | 58.3 | 81.3 | 74.8 | 92.6 | 74.6 | 65.3 | 72.6 | 97.3 | 10.1 | 25.0 | 65.0 | 87.9 | 73.8 | 70.8 | 78.2 | 76.2 |
| Himachal Pradesh | 59.2 | 98.8 | 54.2 | 47.2 | 28.4 | 58.4 | 51.6 | 40.7 | 33.7 | 87.9 | 57.1 | 38.1 | 37.4 | 92.5 | 26.5 | 21.6 | 52.0 | 99.3 | 90.7 | 81.4 | 88.2 | 27.0 |
| Jammu \& Kashmir | 69.7 | 95.2 | 43.2 | 43.6 | 20.6 | 77.4 | 62.1 | 39.8 | 53.1 | 86.9 | 81.8 | 35.1 | 63.1 | 80.4 | 19.6 | 44.2 | 36.2 | 94.7 | 74.1 | 68.1 | 78.5 | 27.9 |
| Jharkhand | 52.3 | 59.0 | 25.8 | 36.8 | 11.1 | 56.8 | 26.2 | 37.4 | 84.3 | 74.2 | 56.4 | 11.1 | 23.1 | 91.1 | 68.1 | 17.5 | 14.4 | 48.5 | 23.7 | 10.0 | 40.7 | 82.6 |
| Karnataka | 80.1 | 98.7 | 59.6 | 59.0 | 33.2 | 77.1 | 37.1 | 25.4 | 68.5 | 84.3 | 81.0 | 34.1 | 36.0 | 98.7 | 18.8 | 37.4 | 43.9 | 93.5 | 60.6 | 33.9 | 62.5 | 56.5 |
| Kerala | 95.4 | 99.4 | 99.4 | 98.8 | 97.2 | 98.8 | 95.1 | 83.2 | 99.1 | 93.9 | 87.3 | 83.7 | 94.8 | 99.7 | 10.1 | 33.0 | 56.9 | 95.2 | 84.6 | 94.4 | 81.5 | 49.6 |
| Madhya Pradesh | 64.6 | 92.3 | 37.1 | 40.6 | 16.6 | 61.1 | 34.9 | 46.1 | 90.4 | 99.1 | 69.9 | 23.9 | 39.3 | 95.1 | 55.9 | 28.3 | 15.8 | 75.6 | 44.8 | 27.9 | 55.3 | 74.9 |
| Maharashtra | 84.8 | 98.6 | 55.4 | 66.7 | 35.2 | 88.2 | 48.8 | 61.1 | 70.1 | 95.5 | 54.6 | 26.1 | 45.9 | 98.7 | 20.8 | 37.0 | 42.2 | 85.8 | 61.8 | 46.2 | 61.4 | 59.9 |
| Manipur | 54.0 | 87.4 | 28.5 | 31.1 | 10.6 | 30.5 | 35.9 | 10.6 | 79.1 | 74.3 | 39.8 | 21.3 | 52.6 | 79.8 | 42.2 | 51.1 | 6.7 | 90.4 | 57.8 | 87.3 | 62.6 | 63.5 |
| Meghalaya | 53.6 | 82.8 | 26.1 | 23.4 | 9.6 | 55.7 | 42.0 | 16.9 | 63.5 | 91.7 | 36.9 | 12.8 | 65.2 | 70.1 | 40.1 | 43.2 | 16.7 | 76.6 | 47.7 | 57.3 | 50.3 | 29.3 |
| Mizoram | 66.1 | 91.8 | 56.6 | 19.5 | 13.6 | 84.0 | 69.4 | 4.7 | 50.6 | 98.2 | 86.9 | 33.1 | 47.0 | 93.5 | 45.7 | 49.6 | 4.7 | 88.7 | 53.7 | 75.9 | 61.7 | 19.7 |
| Nagaland | 47.8 | 96.9 | 27.2 | 12.9 | 11.4 | 21.3 | 57.7 | 17.0 | 53.3 | 93.9 | 49.4 | 18.1 | 51.8 | 76.5 | 36.3 | 52.1 | 11.6 | 92.9 | 50.9 | 80.9 | 62.4 | 36.1 |
| Orissa | 69.4 | 82.3 | 37.9 | 33.5 | 15.6 | 43.5 | 28.9 | 23.0 | 84.2 | 93.9 | 54.8 | 32.3 | 22.1 | 88.5 | 55.0 | 18.0 | 27.1 | 48.4 | 33.1 | 22.8 | 37.8 | 81.1 |
| Puducherry | 97.6 | 100.0 | 82.5 | 100.0 | 65.0 | 95.1 | 58.5 | 39.0 | 97.5 | 89.2 | 59.0 | 64.1 | 57.5 | 100.0 | 41.7 | 24.6 | 33.7 | 98.5 | 86.5 | 40.8 | 68.1 | 76.5 |
| Punjab | 95.9 | 95.8 | 63.2 | 77.1 | 46.2 | 74.1 | 59.1 | 35.7 | 71.4 | 98.0 | 73.6 | 49.4 | 61.4 | 75.0 | 9.6 | 35.4 | 55.0 | 93.6 | 88.2 | 84.3 | 85.1 | 88.5 |
| Rajasthan | 87.7 | 95.2 | 53.8 | 58.0 | 24.7 | 64.7 | 59.6 | 49.8 | 82.8 | 78.2 | 76.5 | 51.8 | 61.0 | 93.2 | 28.8 | 24.0 | 47.2 | 68.6 | 43.0 | 31.4 | 72.4 | 60.7 |
| Sikkim | 56.5 | 100.0 | 37.7 | 25.0 | 16.7 | 72.9 | 44.2 | 6.0 | 43.2 | 68.4 | 51.3 | 39.7 | 63.4 | 83.1 | 20.9 | 46.0 | 33.2 | 96.6 | 75.5 | 93.3 | 80.8 | 15.6 |
| Tamil Nadu | 88.5 | 98.3 | 68.4 | 79.2 | 41.1 | 91.2 | 47.3 | 21.9 | 28.7 | 73.9 | 49.9 | 28.0 | 30.1 | 94.3 | 19.1 | 52.4 | 28.4 | 95.6 | 87.4 | 30.3 | 70.9 | 69.3 |
| Tripura | 75.7 | 93.8 | 67.3 | 45.9 | 19.6 | 76.3 | 58.6 | 15.9 | 95.5 | 98.2 | 90.4 | 60.4 | 29.5 | 98.3 | 79.3 | 13.3 | 7.4 | 82.0 | 61.9 | 84.9 | 55.8 | 56.2 |
| Uttar Pradesh | 83.4 | 94.1 | 34.2 | 46.9 | 14.6 | 75.6 | 26.2 | 60.6 | 88.5 | 95.1 | 60.8 | 10.8 | 54.8 | 89.5 | 28.4 | 34.5 | 37.1 | 36.4 | 33.4 | 26.1 | 63.4 | 86.5 |
| Uttarakhand | 57.5 | 96.0 | 41.4 | 35.7 | 21.0 | 61.1 | 37.1 | 36.4 | 80.4 | 92.2 | 43.3 | 27.2 | 46.3 | 86.5 | 14.3 | 23.9 | 61.8 | 88.9 | 72.6 | 68.9 | 72.7 | 37.2 |
| West Bengal | 43.7 | 86.0 | 41.7 | 52.3 | 23.8 | 58.7 | 44.6 | 45.6 | 42.1 | 93.8 | 17.2 | 32.1 | 31.4 | 93.0 | 55.3 | 21.9 | 22.8 | 57.5 | 37.1 | 56.3 | 48.1 | 76.0 |
| All India | 72.9 | 89.8 | 48.1 | 52.3 | 25.2 | 70.5 | 41.8 | 45.2 | 76.5 | 89.5 | 62.1 | 30.4 | 44.1 | 92.0 | 34.8 | 30.7 | 34.5 | 68.4 | 49.7 | 40.2 | 60.3 | 69.1 |

The purpose of rural ASER 2009 is twofold: (i) to get reliable estimates of the status of children's schooling and basic learning (reading, writing and math ability) at the district level; and (ii) to measure the change in these basic learning and school statistics from last year. Every year a core set of questions regarding schooling status and basic learning levels remains the same. However a set of new questions is added for exploring different dimensions of schooling and learning at the elementary stage. The latter set of questions is different each year.

ASER 2006 and 2007 tested reading comprehension for different kinds of readers. ASER 2007 introduced testing in English and asked questions on paid tuition. ASER 2008 for the first time had questions on telling time and oral math problems using currency. In addition, ASER 2008 incorporated questions on village infrastructure and household assets. Investigators were asked to record whether the village visited had a pukka road leading to it, whether it had a bank, ration shop, etc. In the sampled households information on assets like type of house, phone, television, etc was recorded.

ASER 2009 brings together elements from various previous ASERs. English testing and questions on tuition have been brought back from 2007. As in 2006, mothers have been tested for basic reading. As in 2008, ASER 2009 records household and village characteristics. In addition, this year ASER records education of fathers.

Every alternate year, ASER surveyors visit a government primary or upper primary school in each sampled village. The school information is recorded either based on observations (such as attendance or usability of the facilities) or with information provided by the school (such as grants information). School observations were done in 2005 and 2007 and also in ASER 2009.

Finally, ASER 2009 continues the process of strengthening and streamlining started in 2008. In each district $2-4$ villages were revisited after the survey in order to check how the survey was conducted.

Since one of the goals of ASER is to generate estimates of change in learning, a panel survey design would provide more efficient estimates of the change. However, given the large sample size of the ASER surveys and cost considerations, we adopted a rotating panel of villages rather than children. In ASER 2008, we retained the 10 villages from 2007 and 2006 and added 10 new villages. In ASER 2009 we dropped the 10 villages from ASER 2006, kept the 10 villages from 2008 and 2007 and added 10 more villages from the Census village directory.

The sampling strategy used generates a representative picture of each district. All rural districts are surveyed. The estimates obtained are then aggregated to the state and all-India levels.

Since estimates were to be generated at the district level, the minimum sample size calculations had to start at the district level. The sample size is determined by the following considerations:

- Incidence of what is being measured in the population. Since a survey of learning has never been done in India, the incidence of what we are trying to measure is unknown in the population. ${ }^{1}$
- Confidence level of estimates. The standard used is $95 \%$.
- Precision required on either side of the true value. The standard degree of accuracy most surveys employ is between 5 and 10 per cent. An absolute precision of $5 \%$ along with a $95 \%$ confidence level implies that the estimates generated by the survey will be within 5 percentage points of the true values with a $95 \%$ probability. The precision can also be specified in relative terms - a relative precision of $5 \%$ means that the estimates will be within $5 \%$ of the true value. Relative precision requires higher sample sizes.

Sample size calculations can be done in various ways, depending on what assumptions are made about the underlying population. With a $50 \%$ incidence, $95 \%$ confidence level and $5 \%$ absolute precision, the minimum sample size required in each strata ${ }^{2}$ is $384 .{ }^{3}$ This derivation assumes that the population proportion is normally distributed. On the other hand, a sample size of 384 would imply a relative precision of $10 \%$. If we were to require a $5 \%$ relative precision, the sample size would increase to $1600 .{ }^{4}$ Note that all the sample size calculations require estimating the incidence in the population. In our case, we can get an estimate of the incidence from previous ASER surveys. However, incidence varies across different indicators - so incidence of reading ability is different from incidence of dropouts. In addition, we often want to measure things that are not binary for which we need more observations. Given these considerations, the sample size was decided to be 600 households in each district. ${ }^{5}$ In each district, we have 10 villages from ASER 2007 and ASER 2008 and an additional 10 villages have been added this year to the sample, giving us a total of 30 villages per district. In each village 20 households are surveyed as in previous ASERs since 2006, giving a household sample size of 600 per district. Note that at the state level and at the all-India level the survey has many more observations lending estimates at those levels much higher levels of precision.

If we had houselists at the district level, the 600 households could be randomly selected. In the absence of these, a two-stage sample design was adopted. In the first stage, 30 villages were randomly selected using the village directory of the 2001 Census as the sample frame. ${ }^{6}$ In the second stage 20 households were randomly selected in each of the 30 selected villages in the first stage.

Villages were selected using the probability proportional to size (PPS) sampling method. This method allows villages with larger populations to have a higher chance of being selected in the sample. It is most useful when the sampling units vary considerably in size because it assures that those in larger sites have the same probability of getting into the sample as those in smaller sites, and vice verse. ${ }^{7,8}$

In the selected villages, 20 households are surveyed. Ideally, a complete houselist of the selected village should have been made and 20 households selected randomly from it. However, given time and resource constraints a procedure for selecting households was adopted that preserved randomness as much as possible. The field investigators were asked to divide the village into four parts. This was done because villages often consist of hamlets and a procedure that randomly selects households from some central location may miss out households on the periphery of the village. In each of the four parts, investigators were asked to start at a central location and pick every $5^{\text {th }}$ household in a circular fashion till 5 households were selected. In each selected household, all children in the age group of $5-16$ were tested. ${ }^{9}$

The survey provides estimates at the district, state and national levels. In order to aggregate estimates up from the district level households had to be assigned weights - also called inflation factors. The inflation factor corresponding to a particular household denotes the number of households that the sampled household represents in the population. Given that 600 households are

[^34]5 Sample size calculations assume simple random sampling. However, simple random sampling is unlikely to be the method of choice in an actual field survey. Therefore, often a "design effect" is added to the sample size. A design effect of 2 would double the sample size. At the district level a $7 \%$ precision along with a $95 \%$ confidence level would imply a sample size of 196, giving us a design effect of approximately three. However, note that a sample size of 600 households gives us approximately $1000-1200$ children per district.
${ }^{6}$ Of these 30 villages, 10 are from ASER 2007, 10 from ASER 2008 and 10 are newly selected in 2009. They were selected randomly from the same sample frame. The 10 new villages are picked as an independent sample.

7 Probability proportional to size (PPS) is a sampling technique in which the probability of selecting a sampling unit (village, in our case) is proportional to the size of its population. The method works as follows: First, the cumulative population by village is calculated. Second, the total household population of the district is divided by the number of sampling units (villages) to get the sampling interval (SI). Third, a random number between 1 and the SI is chosen. This is referred to as the random start (RS). The RS denotes the site of the first village to be selected from the cumulated population. Fourth, the following series of numbers is formed: RS; RS +SI; RS $+2 \mathrm{SI} ; \mathrm{RS}+3 \mathrm{SI} ; \ldots$.... The villages selected are those for which the cumulative population, contains the numbers in the series.
${ }^{8}$ Most large household surveys in India, like the National Sample Survey and the National Family Health Survey also use this two stage design and use PPS to select villages in the first stage.
9 In larger villages, the investigators increased the interval according to a rough estimate of the number of households in each part. For instance, if a village had 2000 households, each part in the village would have roughly 500 households. Selecting every $5^{\text {th }}$ household would leave out a large chunk of the village un-surveyed. In such situations, investigators were asked to increase the interval between selected households.
sampled in each district regardless of the size of the district, a household in a larger district will represent many more households and, therefore, have a larger weight associated with it than one in a sparsely populated district.

The advantage of using PPS sampling is that the sample is self weighting at the district level. In other words, in each district the weight assigned to each of the sampled household turns out to be the same. This is because, the inflation factor associated with a household is simply the inverse of the probability of it being selected into the sample times the number of households in the sample. Since PPS sampling ensures that all households have an equal chance of being selected at the district level, the weights associated with households in the same district are the same. Therefore, weighted estimates are exactly the same as the unweighted estimates at the district level. However, to get estimates at the state and national levels, weighted estimates are needed since states have a different number of districts and districts vary by population.

Even though the purpose of the survey is to estimate learning levels among children, the household was chosen as the second stage sampling unit. This has a number of advantages. First, children are tested at home rather than in school, allowing all children to be tested rather than just those in school. Further, testing children in school might create a bias since teachers may encourage testing the brighter children in class. Second, a household sample will generate an age distribution of children which can be cross-checked with other data sources, like the census and the NSS. Third, a household sample makes calculation of the inflation factors easier since the population of children is no longer needed.

Often household surveys are stratified on various parameters of interest. The reason for stratification is to get enough observations on entities that have the characteristic that is being studied. The ASER survey stratifies the sample by population in the first stage. No stratification is done at the second stage. Finally, if we were to stratify on households with children in the 3-16 age group, we would need the population of such households in the village, which is not possible without a complete houselist of the village.



[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ In 2009, there has been a slight drop in private school enrolments across the country. However, Punjab, a traditionally high private school state, shows a fall of about 11 percentage points.
    ${ }^{2}$ Every alternate year, ASER surveyors visit a government primary or upper primary school in each sampled village. The school information is recorded either based on observations (such as attendance or usability of the facilities) or with information provided by the school (such as grants information). School observations have been reported in 2005, 2007 and 2009. In all 3 years, teacher attendance in government schools has been in excess of $80 \%$ in most states.
    ${ }^{3}$ Since 2005, every year the ASER report presents estimates of enrolment and basic reading and arithmetic learning outcomes for every district in rural India. Every year the core set of questions regarding schooling status and basic learning levels remains the same. However a set of new questions is added for exploring different dimensions of schooling and learning in the elementary stage. ASER 2009 brings together elements from various previous ASERs. English testing and questions on tuition have been brought back from 2007. As in 2006, mothers have been tested for basic reading. As in 2008, ASER 2009 records household and village characteristics. In addition, this year ASER records education of fathers. The rapid assessment nature of the survey, along with the community involvement and the use of volunteers in the survey, has necessitated a fairly concise questionnaire. As a result, till 2008, the survey did not have information on many demographic characteristics which are often used as controls in a more detailed analysis.
    ${ }^{4}$ The basic reading test in ASER is done in the local regional language. In all, the test is done in about 16 regional languages.

[^1]:    ${ }^{5}$ Both ASER 2007 and 2009 show that a greater proportion of children in private schools avail of paid tuition, though more and more government school children are resorting to paid tuition in 2009.
    ${ }^{6}$ For more details on the exact testing instrument see the section on tools in this Report.
    ${ }^{7}$ The analysis is done for 20 major states that constitute about $91 \%$ of the ASER 2009 sample.

[^2]:    ${ }^{1}$ Mehta, Arun C (2009), Elementary Education in India, Where Do We Stand? State Report Cards 2007-08, New Delhi: National University for Educational Planning and Administration.
    ${ }^{2}$ Muralidharan, Karthik and Kremer, Michael (2006), "Public and Private Schools in India", Harvard University, Boston.
    ${ }^{3}$ ibid.
    ${ }^{4}$ Tilak, Jandhyala B.G. and Ratna M. Sudarshan (2001), Private Schooling in Rural India, NCAER Working Paper No. 76, New Delhi: National Council for Applied Economic Research.
    
    ${ }^{6}$ Tooley, James (2009), The Beautiful Tree, New Delhi: Penguin Books India

[^3]:    ${ }^{7}$ Wadhwa, Wilima (2009), "Private Schools: Do They Provide Higher Quality Education?", in Annual Status of Education Report (Rural) 2008, Mumbai: Pratham Resource Centre.
    ${ }^{8}$ Sarangpani, Padma (2009), "Quality, Feasibility and Desirability of Low Cost Private Schooling", in Economic \& Political Weekly, Vol. 44 No. 43, October 24-October 30, 2009 , New Delhi.
    ${ }^{9}$ Tooley, James (2009), op cit.

[^4]:    ${ }^{1}$ Accountability Initiative, Centre for Policy Research
    ${ }^{2}$ National Institute of Public Finance and Policy
    ${ }^{3}$ Accountability Initiative, Centre for Policy Research

[^5]:    ${ }^{4}$ For more details see A. Mukherjee and E. Satwalekar "A tale of two schools", PAISA briefs, Accountability Initiative, August 2009, www.accountabilityindia.org
     www.accountabilityindia.org

[^6]:    ${ }^{1}$ With support from Unicef and UNESCO, ASER Centre is currently administering a first set of higher level tools aiming to capture grade level competencies in reading, comprehension, and arithmetic for Std II and Std IV to about 20,000 students in five states of the country.

[^7]:    
     facilities) or with information provided by the school (such as grants information).

[^8]:    Of the villages visited, Anganwadi/Pre-School presence has been recorded in 92.0 \%

[^9]:    NOTE : No grant information was available for 497 schools out of 5258 upper primary schools that were visited. This could be because the head teacher was not present, register was not available or the surveyors could not obtain the information. Therefore, the above table is based on schools for which information was available for at least one indicator.

[^10]:    Of the villages visited, Anganwadi/Pre-School presence has been recorded in 97.0 \% villages.

[^11]:    Of the villages visited, Anganwadi/Pre-School presence has been recorded in 84.7 \%

[^12]:    NOTE : ASER 2009 recorded information about mothers' education. Similar analyses can be done with mothers

[^13]:    Of the villages visited, Anganwadi/Pre-School presence has been recorded in $91.8 \%$ villages.

[^14]:    Note: No grant information was available for 56 schools out of 333 primary schools that were visited. This could be because the head teacher was not present, register was not available or the surveyors could not obtain the information. Therefore, the above table

[^15]:    * Blank cells indicate insufficient data.

[^16]:    NOTE: No grant information was available for 8 schools out of 313 primary schools that were visited. This could be because the head teacher was not present, register was not available or the surveyors could not obtain the information. Therefore, the above table is based on schools for which information was available for at least one indicator.

[^17]:    NOTE: No grant information was available for 7 schools out of 133 primary schools that were visited. This could be because the head teacher was not present, register was not available or the surveyors could not obtain the information. Therefore, the above table is based on schools for which information was available for at least one indicator.

[^18]:    Of the villages visited, Anganwadi/Pre-School presence has been recorded in 99.7 \%

[^19]:    NOTE: No grant information was available for 103 schools out of 928 primary schools that were visited. This could be because the head teacher was not present, register was not available or the surveyors could not obtain the information. Therefore, the above table is based on schools for which information was available for at least one indicator.

[^20]:    *Blank cells indicate insufficient data.

[^21]:    NOTE: No grant information was available for 18 schools out of 486 primary schools that were visited. This could be because the head teacher was not present, register was not available or the surveyors could not obtain the information. Therefore, the above table is based on schools for which information was available for at least one indicator.

[^22]:    NOTE: No grant information was available for 2 schools out of 218 primary schools that were visited. This could be because the head teacher was not present, register was not available or the surveyors could not obtain the information. Therefore, the above table is based on schools for which information was available for at least one indicator.

[^23]:    Note : No grant information was available for 54 schools out of 414 primary schools that were visited. This could be because the head teacher was not present, register was not available or the surveyors could not obtain the information. Therefore, the above table is based on schools for which information was available for at least one indicator.

[^24]:    *Blank cells indicate insufficient data.

[^25]:    NOTE: No grant information was available for 13 schools out of 414 primary schools that were visited. This could be because the head teacher was not present, register was not available or the surveyors could not obtain the information. Therefore, the above table is based on schools for which information was available for at least one indicator.

[^26]:    Of the villages visited, Anganwadi/Pre-School presence has been recorded in 93.2 \%

[^27]:    NOTE: No grant information was available for 18 schools out of 274 primary schools that were visited. This could be because the head teacher was not present, register was not available or the surveyors could not obtain the information. Therefore, the above table is based on schools for which information was available for at least one indicator.

[^28]:    NOTE : ASER 2009 recorded information about mothers' education. Similar analyses can be done with mothers

[^29]:    * No TLM is given in schools where Activity Based Learning is being implemented.

[^30]:    NOTE: No grant information was available for 21 schools out of 345 primary schools that were visited. This could be because the head teacher was not present, register was not available or the surveyors could not obtain the information. Therefore, the above table is based on schools for which information was available for at least one indicator.

[^31]:    NOTE : ASER 2009 recorded information about mothers' education. Similar analyses can be done with mothers

[^32]:    NOTE: No grant information was available for 262 schools out of 1796 primary schools that were visited. This could be because the head teacher was not present, register was not available or the surveyors could not obtain the information. Therefore, the above

[^33]:    children

    Note：Girls and boys may not add to total children since gender has not been
    ＊These states are complete．Some districts were split in subsequent years
    ＊＊Data for 9 districts is incomplete

[^34]:    ${ }^{2}$ Stratification is discussed below.
    ${ }^{3}$ The sample size with absolute precision is given by $\frac{z^{2} p q}{d^{2}}$ where $z$ is the standard normal deviate corresponding to $95 \%$ probability ( $=1.96$ ), $p$ is the incidence in the population (0.5), $q=(1-p)$ and $d$ is the degree of precision required (0.05).
    ${ }^{4}$ The sample size with relative precision is given by $\frac{z^{2} q}{r^{2} p}$ where $z$ is the standard normal deviate corresponding to $95 \%$ probability (=1.96), pis the incidence in the
    population (0.5), $q=(1-p)$ and $r$ is the degree of relative precision required ( 0.1 ).

