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## They reached the remotest villages of India

## Andhra pradesh

District Institute of Education and Training, Adilabad District Institute of Education and Training, Anantapur District Institute of Education and Training, Chittoor District Institute of Education and Training, East Godavari District Institute of Education and Training, Guntur
District Institute of Education and Training, Kadapa
District Institute of Education and Training, Karimnagar
District Institute of Education and Training, Khammam
District Institute of Education and Training, Krishna
District Institute of Education and Training, Kurnool
District Institute of Education and Training, Mahbubnagar
District Institute of Education and Training, Medak
District Institute of Education and Training, Nalgonda
District Institute of Education and Training, Nellore
District Institute of Education and Training, Nizamabad
District Institute of Education and Training, Prakasam
District Institute of Education and Training, Rangareddy
District Institute of Education and Training, Srikakulam District Institute of Education and Training, Visakhapatnam
District Institute of Education and Training, Vizianagaram
District Institute of Education and Training, Warangal
District Institute of Education and Training, West Godavari

## ARUNACHAL PRADESH

Banggo Women Welfare Association, Yingkiong
Guminloi Foundation, Along
Indira Gandhi Government College Student Union, Lohit
Tarhuk Samaj, Itanagar
Local Volunteers of Changlang, East Kameng, Upper Subansiri and West Kameng

## Assam

Eight Brothers Social Welfare Society, Tezpur
Kalang Kapili Integrated Development Society, Rajagaon
Parijat Self Help Group, Hawajan
Rung Cheng Foundation, Old Amolapatty
Sankalpa, Margherita
Simultala Coaching Centre, Ratabari
Social Team for Empowering People (STEP), Haibargaon
Social Unity Keepers Association For All (SUKAFA), Changsari
Society for Progressive Implementation and Development (SPID), Silchar
Socio-Economic and Health Development Organisation (SEHDO), Bordoulguri
Sukafa Social Development, Goalchapari
Udayan, Ghagrapar
Vo-Ak, The Crow, Diphu
Vox-Populi, Golaghat town
West Goalpara Development Society, Baguan
Wodichee, Lakhirband
Pratham Volunteers of Dibrugarh

## BIHAR

A Unit of Research, Gaya
Aastha International, Nalanda
AID India, Arwal
Akhil Bhartiya Gramin Vikas Parishad, Katihar
Akhil Bhartiya Shikshit Berojgar Yuva Kalyan Sansthan, Rohtas
Akriti Samajik Sansthan, Vaishali
All India Centre for Urban \& Rural Development, Supaul
Chhatra Chhaya, Lakhisarai
Disha Vihar, Munger
Gram Swaraj Seva Sansthan, Kaimur
Harijan Adiwasi Shikshan Prashikshan Kalyan Sansthan, Purnea
Human Rights Organisation, Bhagalpur
Jawahar Jyoti Bal Vikas Kendra, Samastipur
Lalit Kala Prashikshan Evam Jan Kalyan Samiti, Gopalganj
Log Pragati Seva Sansthan, Araria
Nav Jeevan Ambedkar Mission, Saharsa
Popular Organization Women Empowerment \& Research, Khagaria
Pragati Bharti (Tulbul), Aurangabad
Pragatisheel Samaj, Muzaffarpur
Pratham Samvedna, Patna
Prerna Development Foundation, Patna
Ram Kripal Seva Sansthan, Darbhanga

Rohtas Lok Seva Samiti, Rohtas
Sadbhavana Vikas Mandal, Saran
Samagra Manav Seva Samiti, Bhojpur
Samagra Shikshan evam Vikas Sansthan, West Champaran
Samgra Raja Salhesh Vikas Manch, Madhubani
Sarvshree Seva Sadan, Sheohar
Sarvoday Yuva Kalyan Sangh, Begusarai
Shankar Human Advance Society For Initiative Mission, Lakhisarai
The Message Welfare Foundation, Kishanganj
Uday Kisan Jagruti Samiti, Banka
Vidyapati Jan Vikas Samiti, Patna
Vikas Puram, Sitamarhi
Vikas Sarthi, Siwan

## Chhattisgarh

Chhattisgarh Janjati Vikas Parishad, Ambikapur
District Institute of Education and Training, Bemetra
District Institute of Education and Training, Dhamtari
District Institute of Education and Training, Janjgir Champa
District Institute of Education and Training, Jashpur
District Institute of Education and Training, Kanker
District Institute of Education and Training, Kawardha
District Institute of Education and Training, Khairagarh
District Institute of Education and Training, Mahasamund
District Institute of Education and Training, Raipur
Jeevan Jashoda Society, Korea
Maa Sharda Lok Kala Manch, Jagdalpur
Nicchay Seva Samiti, Raigarh
Prakriti Seva Sansthan, Bilaspur
Social Revival Group for Urban Rural Tribal (SROUT), Korba

## DADRAAND NAGAR HAVELI

Com. Godavari Shamrao Parulekar College, Talasari

## GOA

District Institute of Education and Training, Goa
Khemraj Memorial New English School, Banda
Pragati Manch, Ponda

Daman and diu
Local Volunteers of Daman and Diu

## Gujarat

Area Networking And Development Initiatives (ANANDI), Godhra
Krantiguru Shyamji Krishna Verma Kachchh University, Bhuj
M.A. Parikh Fine Arts \& Arts College, Palanpur

Mahila Samakhya, Ahwa
Manav Kalyan Seva Trust, Vansda
Manekchowk Co-op. Bank Arts and Mahemdavad Urban People's
Co-op. Bank Commerce College, Mahemdabad
Salal M.S.W. College, Himatnagar
Samarpan Foundation, Vadodara
Saraswati B.S.W. College, Bharuch
Sarvajanik M.S.W. College, Mehsana
Shikshan Ane Samaj Kalyan Kendra, Amreli
Shree Kedareshvar Education \& Charitable Trust, Patan
Shree N.S. Patel Institute of Social Work, Anand
Shree Sahajanand M.S.W. College, Bhavnagar
Siddharth Charitable Education Trust, Junagadh
Smt. Laxmiben \& Shri Chimanlal Mehta Arts College, Ahmedabad
Surbhi M.S.W. College, Rajkot
Local Volunteers of Rajkot and Valsad

## Haryana

Arya College of Education, Jojhu Kalan
Bhagat Phool Singh Mahila Vishwavidyalaya, Khanpur Kalan, Sonipat
Baba Mohan Das College of Education, Motla Kalan
Chaudhary Devi Lal University, Sirsa
Dyal Singh College, Karnal
Government Degree College, Barwala
Government P.G. College, Jind
Guru Nanak Khalsa College, Yamuna Nagar

Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra
Manohar Memorial College, Fatehabad
Masters' Cultural Group J.L.N College, Faridabad
Pratham, Haryana
Radha Krishan Sanatan Dharam (P.G.) College, Kaithal
Ravindra Bharti College of Education, Jhajjar
Sanatan Dharma College, Ambala
Local Volunteers of Hisar

Himachal pradesh
General Jorawar Singh College, Dhaneta, Nadaun
District Institute of Education and Training, Jukhala, Bilaspur
District Institute of Education and Training, Nahan
District Institute of Education and Training, Recong Peo
District Institute of Education and Training, Shamlaghat, Shimla
District Institute of Education and Training, Solan
Government P.G. College, Kullu
Government P.G. College, Seema Rohru
Government P.G. College, Una
Lahaul Spiti Kala Sanskriti Manch, Keylong
ZCA Centum College, Chamba

JAMMU AND KASHMIR
Government Degree College, Budgam
Government Degree College, Damhal Hanjipora
Government Degree College, Ganderbal
Government Degree College, Kargil
Government Degree College, Naushera
Government Degree College, Poonch
Government Degree College, Ramban
Government G.L. Dogra Memorial Degree College, Hiranagar
Government P.G. College, Bhaderwah
Government P.G. College, Pulwama
Government P.G. College, Udhampur
Government Degree College, Billawar
Jehlum Education Trust (JET) College of Education, Baramulla
M.A.M. College, Jammu

Sheikh-ul-Alam College of Education, Kupwara
The Students' Educational and Cultural Movement Of Ladakh (SECMOL), Leh

JHARKHAND
Abhiyan, Sahibganj
Badlao Foundation, Jamtara
Chetna Vikas, Deoghar
Diya Seva Sansthan, Ranchi
Foundation for Awareness Counselling and Education (FACE), Pakur
Gram Jyoti Kendra, Gumla
Lohardaga Gram Swarajya Sansthan, Lohardaga
Lok Hit Sansthan (Simla Gandhi Ashram), Saraikela
Lok Prerna Kendra, Chatra
Mahila Samagra Utthan Samiti, Palamu
Nav Bharat Jagriti Kendra, Hazaribagh
Rural Outright Development Society, East Singhbhum
Sahyogini, Bokaro
Samajik Parivartan Sansthan, Giridih
Santhal Pargana Gram Rachna Sansthan, Godda
Sarwangin Gramin Vikas Samiti, Garhwa
SREYA, Dumka
Srijan Mahila Vikas Manch, West Singhbhum
Vedic Society, Garhwa
Veer Jharkhand Vikas Seva Manch, Koderma
Vikas Bharti, Gumla
Voluntary Blood Donors Association, Dhanbad

Karnataka
Society for Public Education Environment Cultural and Health (SPEECH), Chitradurga
Aa Foundation for Community Development, Bangalore
Akshara Foundation, Bangalore
Centre for Rural Studies, Manipal University, Manipal
Centre for Rural Development (CORD), Bellary
Development Resource Centre (DRC), Dharwad
EMBARK Youth Association®, Kodagu
Malenadu Education and Rural Development Society (MEARDS), Sirsi
Navachetana Rural Development Society, Gadag
Navodaya Educational and Environment Development Service (NEEDS), Ranebenur

Niranthara Social Welfare Society, Tumkur
PADI - Value Oriented Education Program (VALORED), Mangalore
Parivarthana, Chikkamagalur
People Organisation for Waste Land and Environment Regeneration (POWER), Bijapur
Pragathi Urban and Rural Development Seva Society, Ghataprabha
Pratham, Mysore
Sajjalshri SKA and GAS, Lingasguru, Raichur
Sarvodaya Integrated Rural Development Society, Koppal
Spoorthi Samsthe, Davangere
Sri Basaveshwara Education Society (Basaveshwara Vidya Vardhaka Sangha), Bidar
Sri Balaji Sarvodaya Central Rural and Urban Development Trust, Mandya
Sri Kantha Vidhya Samsthe, Hassan
Suprabha Charitable and Educational Trust, Shimoga
Yashaswi Swayam Seva Samsthe, Bangalore Rural

Kerala
Centre for Applied Geography and Environmental Sciences (CAGES), Thiruvananthapuram

Madhya Pradesh
Bread for Tribal Village, Jhabua
Darshna Mahila Kalyan Samiti, Chhatarpur
Dhara Vikas Samiti, Khargone
Dharti Gramothan evam Sahbhagi Gramin Vikas Samiti, Morena
Disha Samajik Vikas Sansthan Samiti, Shivpuri
Dr. Bhimrao Ambedkar Seva Parishad, Bhind
Gopal Kiran Samaj Sevi Sanstha, Gwalior
Government Arts and Commerce College, Indore
Gram Seva Trust, Paraswada, Balaghat
Gramin Bal Swasthya, Shiksha, Shodh evam Vikas Sansthan (RICHERD), Panna
Gramin Swablamban Samiti, Tikamgarh
Diksha Shaikshanik Samajik Seva Sansthan, Indore
Jaynarayan Sarvodaya Vidyalaya Samiti, Betul
Kalptaru Vikas Samiti, Guna
Kalyani Welfare Society, Umaria
Kanchan Welfare and Education Society, Shajapur
Lok Rujhan evam Manav Vikas Soudh Sansthan, Barwani
M.P. Jansevi Sangathan, Khandwa
M.P. Paryavaran Sudhar Sangathan, Rajgarh

Manav Foundation, Sheopur
Narmadanchal Education and Welfare Society (NEWS), Jabalpur
Nav Jyoti Shiksha Samiti, Chhindwara
Nav Parivartan Samaj Sevi Sangathan, Dhar
Omkar Krishak avam Samaj Kalyan Samiti, Sidhi
Organisation for Children Education Animals Welfare and Nature Care (OCEAN), Dewas
Path Pragati Samaj Kalyan Samiti, Shahdol
Prakash Yuva Mandal Itora Samiti, Rewa
Rang Welfare Society, Damoh
Sahara Manch, Bhopal
Sahara Manch, Katni
Sahara Manch, Mandla
Samanjasya Research and Training Organisation, Raisen
Samarpan Care Awareness and Rehabilitation Centre, Ratlam
Sankalp Samajik Vikas Sansthan, Shivpuri
Saress Welfare Society, Seoni
Shiva Gramin Vikas Sansthan, Mehuti, Satna
Shram Shakti Mahila Sewa Sansthan, Sagar
Social Advancement and Resource Foundation (SARF), Vidisha
Swadesh Gramotthan Samiti, Datia
Swami Vivekanand Shiksha Samiti (SVSS), Sehore
Synergy Sansthan, Harda
Tirupati Vinayak Mahila Samaj Kalyan Samiti, Ujjain
Udit Prakash Yuva Samarpan Samiti, Dindori

## MaHarashtra

Abhinav Vidya Mandir Junior College, Bhainder
Adhyapak Vidyalaya, Sangudvadi
Annapurna Bahuuddeshiya Sanskrutik Seva Mandal, Pachkhedi
Avhan Bahuuddeshiya Sanstha, Akot
Bhairavnath Adhyapak Vidyalaya, Kalam
College of Social Work, Kusumba
Com. Godavari Shamrao Parulekar College, Talasari
D.S.P. College, Dahivel Sakri

Dnyandeep Adhyapak Vidyalaya, Pune
Dnyanganga Samajik Shaikshanik Sanstha, Babalgaon
District Institute of Education and Training, Ratnagiri

District Institute of Education and Training, Sindhudurg
Gulam Nabi Azad Samajkarya Mahavidyalaya, Pusad
Jaisingh Mahavidyalaya, Pathrod
Jijamata Sevabhavi Sanstha, Ahmadpur
K.M.S. Adhyapak Vidyalaya, Mithbav

Kasturba Gandhi Adhyapak Vidyalaya, Solapur
L.S.I.N. Adhyapak Vidyalaya, Kankavali

Mahavir Mahavidyalaya, Kolhapur
Mukundrao Swami Kala Vanijya Mahavidyalaya, Pachkhedi
N.J. Patel Arts and Commerce College, Mohadi

National Child Labour Project, Aurangabad
Navjyot Bahuuddeshiya Sevabhavi Sanstha, Shrirampur
Parvatibai Adhyapak Vidyalaya, Pune
Prahar Samajik Kalyankari Sanstha, Goregaon
Pratham Open School, Alibaug
Pratham Pune Shikshan Mandal, Pune
Raje Bahuuddeshiya Sanstha, Ambad
Raje Bahuuddeshiya Sanstha, Shahada
Rajmudra Pratishthan, Asti
Sainath Education Trust-H.B. College of Education Excellence, Vashi
Samruddhi Education Organization, Aurangabad
Sanchar Infotech Foundation, Khamgaon
Sanchar Infotech Foundation, Nashik
Sanjivan Gramin Vaidyakiya ani Samajik Sahayata Sanchalit College, Vikramgad
Sankalp Bahuuddeshiya Prakalp, Ralegaon
Sanmitra Mahila Adhyapak Vidyalaya, Kolhapur
Sant Gadgebaba Gram Vikas Pratishthan, Dingi
Sevarth Bahuuddeshiya Sanstha, Aurangabad
Shri Gurudev Sevashram Samiti, Karanja
Tararani D.Ed College, Kolhapur
Voluntary Organisation for Integrated Community Empowerment (VOICE), Satara
Wanchit Vikas Sevabhavi Sanstha, Nanded
Pratham Volunteers of Solapur

## Manipur

Community Development Society (CDS), Sikhong Sekmai
International Ministry Centre, Sagang
Komlathabi Development Club, Komlathabi
Kumbi Kangjeibung Mapal Fishermen Association, Kumbi
Manipur North Economic Development Association (MANEDA), Senapati
Ngachon Society, Ukhrul
People's Endeavour for Social Change (PESCH), Jiribam
The Youth Goodwill Association, Uripok

Meghalaya
Capt. Williamson Memorial Government College, Baghmara
Martin Luther Christian University, Shillong
Sngap Syiem College, Mawkyrwat
Ribhoi Youth Federation (RBYF), Nongpoh
Tura Government College Student Union, Tura
Williamnagar Government College Student Union, Williamnagar
Local Volunteers of Jaintia Hills

## Mizoram

Hmar Students' Association (HSA), Kolasib Headquarter Hmar Students' Association (HSA), Sinlung Headquarter Young Mizo Association (YMA), Electric Veng Branch, Serchhip Local Volunteers of Lawngtlai, Mamit and Saiha

NaGALAND
Changkikong Students' Conference, Mokokchung
Friends Club, Tuensang
Government Higher Secondary School, Zunheboto
Hill's Club, Kiphire
Kohima Baptist Youth Fellowship (KBYF), Kohima
Kyong Team, Wokha
Mount Mary College, Chumukedima
Nanglang Comprehensive Society, Longleng
People's Agency for Development, Peren
Walo Organisation, Mon
Local Volunteers of Phek

All Odisha Martial Arts Academy (AOMAA), Malkanagiri
Anchalika Mahavidyalaya, Natha Sahi
Bhawanipatna Autonomous College, Bhawanipatna
Bhairav Mahavidyalaya, Dabugan
Bhaskar Multi Action Sewa Samiti, Bhingarpur
Birabhadra ITI College, Narendrapur
Biswa Gyana Chetana Samaj, Salapada
Biswa Vikas, Sanadunguriguda
Damanjodi ITI, Similiguda
DIET, Government Certified Teacher (C.T) College, Narsinghpur, Cuttack
Friend's Club, Madhipur
District Institute of Education and Training, Anugul
District Institute of Education and Training, Baragarh
District Institute of Education and Training, Deogarh
District Institute of Education and Training, Nayagarh
Jiral College, Jiral
Khaira College, Khaira
Mahabir Youth Association,Tikabali
Mahima College, Panchagaon, Jharsuguda
Nature's Club, Kendrapada
National Institute for Rural Motivation, Awareness and Training Activity (NIRMATA), Berhampur
Parsuram Gurukula Mahavidyalaya, Sevakpur
Research Academy for Rural Enrichment (RARE), Sonepur
Rourkela Municipal College, Rourkela
Rural Organization For People's Empowerment (ROPE), Kuchinda
Social Integrity Programme for Health and Education (SIPHAE), Basta
Tukula College, Tukula
Utkal Bharati Mahavidyalaya (Mahila College, Mahila)
Local Volunteers of Rayagada

## Punjab

Indo-Global College of Education, Abhipur, Mohali
Aklia College of Education for Women, Goniana Mandi, Bathinda
B.K.M. College of Education, Balachaur, SBS Nagar

Brilliant Group of Institutes, Jalalabad, Ferozpur
D.M. College of Education, Moga

District Institute of Education and Training, Gurdaspur
Guru Teg Bahadur Khalsa College of Education, Hoshiarpur
Gurukul Academy, Ropar
J.D. College of Education, Muktsar
M.M.B. Polytechnic College, Fatta Maloka, Mansa

Malwa Central College of Education for Women, Ludhiana
Mehr Chand Polytechnic College, Jalandhar
N.J.S.A. Government College, Kapurthala

Punjabi University, Patiala
RIMT-IET, Mandi Gobindgarh
School of Social Sciences, G.N.D.U., Amritsar
Shaheed Bhagat Singh College of Education, Patti, Tarn Taran
Shivam College of Education, Sangrur

Rajasthan
Basic Teacher's Training College, Gandhi Vidyamandir, Sardar Shahar
Consumer Unity and Trust Society (CUTS), Chittorgarh
Doosra Dashak, Pindwara
Doosra Dashak, Bhanwargarh
E.I.I.T. Computer Institute, Bundi

Foundation to Educate Girls Globally, Bali
Gramin Yuva Vikas Samiti, Dhaulpur
Gramothan Vidyapeeth College Of Education, Sangaria
Institute of Rural Management, Jaipur
Jain Vishva Bharati Institute, Ladnun
Jiwan Path Samiti, Kolayat
JSS Development Society, Bharatpur
Kanchan Devi T.T. College, Bhilwara
Lok Jan Jagrati Shikshan Sansthan, Jodhpur
Lok Vikas Shikshan Sansthan, Alwar
Mamta Punarvas evam Samajik Sansthan, Beenjhbayala, Padampur
Neha Education and Welfare Society, Jhalawar
Operation For Social Work Society, Sawai Madhopur
Pratibha Shiksha Samiti, Sunel
Shekhawati B.Ed. College, Dundlod
Shiv Shiksha Samiti, Ranoli
Society to Uplift Rural Economy (SURE), Barmer
Udaipur School of Social Work, Udaipur
University of Kota, Kota
Vageshwari Gyan Peeth Sansthan, Jhadol

Veena Memorial SSEEWA Society, Karauli
Vidya Bharti Sansthan, Sikar
Voluntary Association of Agriculture, General Development, Health and
Reconstruction Alliance (VAAGDHARA), Banswara
Local Volunteers of Ajmer and Dausa
Pratham Volunteers of Dungarpur

Sikkim
Rhenock Government College, Rhenock
Tadong Government College, Tadong, Gangtok
Namchi Government College, Upper Kamrang
Tamil nadu
Award Trust, Thoothukudi
Council for Integrated Development (CID Trust), Dharmapuri
Foundation of His Sacred Majesty, Chennai
Gramodhaya Social Service Society, Tirunelveli
Grassroots Foundation, Kancheepuram
Guru Nanak College, Chennai
Institute of Human Rights Education, Madurai
Jeeva Anbalayam Trust, Trichy
Manitham Charitable Trust, Sivagangai
Nether's Economic and Educational Development Society (NEEDS), Virudhunagar
New Life - District Differently Abled People Federation, Villupuram
News Trust, Trichy
Nilam Trust, Nilgiris
Press Trust, Thoothukudi
Raise India Trust, Ramanathapuram
Rights Education And Development Centre (READ), Erode
Rights Trust, Pudukkottai
Rural Women Development Trust (RWDT), Salem
Society for Development of Economically Weaker Section (SODEWS), Vellore
S.T. Hindu College, Kanyakumari

Udhavum Manasu Trust, Thiruvallur
Valarum Vandavasi Trust, Tiruvannamalai
Village People Education for Rural Development Association (VPERDA), Karur World Trust, Thiruvallur

## Tripura

Agragati Social Organization, Khilpara, Udaipur
Chetana Social Organization, Kolai
Kasturba Gandhi National Memorial Trust, Durga Chowdhury Para
Pushparaj Club, Kailashahar

UTTAR PRADESH
Akhil Bhartiya Shrawasti Gramodyog Seva Sansthan, Bahraich
Amar Jyoti Society, Dargah, Mau
Anuragini, Jalaun
Bharat Uday Education Society, Muzaffarnagar
Bhartiya Gramotthan Seva Vikas Sansthan, Pilibheet
Disha Seva Samiti, Lalitpur
Gramodaya Seva Ashram, Shahjahanpur
Gyan Seva Samiti, Sant Ravidas Nagar
Indian Medical Practitioner Welfare Association, Saharanpur
Jankalyan Shikshan Prasar Samiti, Chitrakoot
Mahila Utthan Seva Samiti, Kannauj
Manav Seva Kendra, Chandauli
Manav Vikas Samaj Seva Samiti, Jalaun
Navoday Lok Chetana Jan Kalyan Samiti, Baghpat
Navonmesh, Siddharthnagar
Nehru Yuva Mandal, Etawah
Nehru Yuva Mandal, Ballia
Nehru Yuva Mandal, Moradabad
Nehru Yuva Mandal, Amethi
Nehru Yuva Sangathan Fatehpur, Fatehpur
Open Sky Welfare Society, Ghazipur
Paramlal Seva Samiti, Hamirpur
Rashtriya Jagriti Seva Samiti, Jaunpur
Sadbhawana Grameen Vikas Sansthan, Sant Kabir Nagar
Saptrang Vikas Sansthan, Mahoba
Sarvjan Seva Sansthan, Hathras
Savera, Kushinagar
Shiv Nadar University, Gautam Buddh Nagar
Shradha Jan Kalyan Shikshan Seva Sansthan, Maharajganj
Shrawasti Grameen Vikas Seva Sansthan, Shrawasti
Shree Geeta Jan Kalyan Shiksha Samiti, Firozabad

Social Welfare Organization, Bulandshahar
Sri Jan Kalyan Sansthan, Badaun
Youth Upliftment Voluntary Association (YUVA), Deoria
Yuva Vikas evam Prashikshan Sansthan, Banda
Local Volunteers of Etawah, Ghaziabad, Jhansi, Lucknow, Mirzapur, Muzaffarnagar, Sonbhadra and Unnao
Pratham Volunteers of Agra, Aligarh, Allahabad, Ambedkar Nagar, Azamgarh, Barabanki, Bareilly, Basti, Bijnour, Etah, Faizabad, Firozabad, Gonda, Gorakhpur, Hardoi, Kaushambi, Lakhimpur Kheri, Mathura, Moradabad, Pratapgarh, Raebareli, Sitapur and Varanasi

## UTTARAKHAND

Bal Ganga Mahavidyalaya P.G. College Sendul, Ghansali
Dolphin (P.G.) Institute of Bio Medical \& Natural Sciences, Dehradun
Dr. B.Gopal Reddy Campus, Pauri Garhwal
Dr. P.D.B. Government P.G. College, Kotdwar, Pauri Garhwal
Government P.G. College, Augustyamuni
Government Polytechnic College, New Tehri
Government Degree College, Barkot
Government Degree College, Gangolihat
Government Girls Inter College, Haldwani
Government P.G. College, Champawat
Government P.G. College, Gopeshwar
Government P.G. College, Karanprayag
Government P.G. College, Ranikhet
Government Polytechnic College, Kashipur
Government Polytechnic Shaktifarm, Sitarganj
Gramya Udhoyg Samiti, Almora
Jai Bharat Sadhu Mahavidyalaya, Haridwar
Kanhaiyalal Polytechnic College, Roorkee
Lilavati Pant Rajkiya Inter College, Bhimtaal
L.S.M. P.G. College, Pithoragarh

Pannalal Bhalla Municipal Inter College, Haridwar
Ramchandra Uniyal Government P.G. College, Uttarkashi
Swami Vivekanand P.G. College, Lohaghat

## Westbencal.

Baharampur Krishnath College, Murshidabad
Department of Sociology, Bankura Christian College, Bankura
Burdwan Sanjog Human and Social Welfare Society, Barddhaman
Chhatra Kalyan Samiti, North 24 Parganas
Child In Need Institute (CINI), South 24 Parganas
Dakshin Dinajpur Foundation for Rural Integration Economic and Nature Development (FRIEND), Dakshin Dinajpur
Dantan Manav Kalyan Kendra, Paschim Medinipur
Gour Mahavidyalaya, Maldah
Jagannath Kishore College, Purulia
Kajla Janakalyan Samity, Purba Medinipur
Mathabhanga College, Cooch Behar
Parimal Mitra Smriti Mahavidyalaya, Jalpaiguri
Raiganj University College, Uttar Dinajpur
Siliguri Government College, Darjeeling
St. Joseph College, Darjeeling
Turku Hansda Lapsa Hembrom Mahavidyalaya, Birbhum
Department Of Rural Development \& Management, University of Kalyani, Kalyani
Vivekananda College, Jalpaiguri
Local Volunteers of Hooghly
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Notes on ASER 2012


# Uphill battle ahead as outcomes go downhill... 

Madhav Chavan, CEO-President, Pratham Education Foundation
Many years ago, before we amended our Constitution, it was common to say that political will was needed to give India's children their fundamental right to education. The Constitutional amendment in 2002, imposition of education cess in 2004 leading to increasing financial allocation for elementary education, and finally the passage and enforcement of the Right to Education Act after a long wait were all step-wise demonstrations of increasing political desire, although not quite the will. For a country that is undergoing huge economic, social, and demographic changes, education requires a much more resolute political direction. As Carol Bellamy, former Executive Director of Unicef 1995-2005 said in Doha recently, " ...education is too important to be left to educationalists". It is important for political leaders to realize that education has been in a deep crisis. We are chasing ideals while practical realities limit what is possible on the ground. As often happens, the best is turning out to be the enemy of the good as we pour in more and more money without deciding or focusing on what needs to be achieved.

In some ways, the Planning Commission has already taken a step in the right direction by emphasizing goalsetting and achievement of learning outcomes by states in its 12th Plan document now ratified by the National Development Council. This is a welcome change at a time when learning levels in government schools are declining and private school enrollment is rising at almost $10 \%$ per year. It remains to be seen how seriously the Department of School Education, SSA, and the states align with this change in policy direction to change practice in schools. The crisis in mass education is far deeper at every level than most people imagine. Officials often confide that the situation is grimmer than the picture ASER paints but we do not as yet see energy leading to action that comes from a sense of urgency.

Like previous years, ASER2012 has a lot of compelling information to persuade people that we are looking at a deepening crisis in education that is like an unseen and quiet killer disease.

## Learning levels started dropping in many states since RTE came into effect. Coincidence? Correlation? Or, causation?

We noted for the first time in ASER2011 that levels of reading and math at every level were not only poor but declining in many states. With one more year of data, this observation is strengthened.

The charts below tell the story. Fewer and fewer children in successive batches reaching 3rd and 5th standard are learning basics of reading and math. Unless someone can show that children are learning something else better, this indicates an alarming degeneration. In 2008, the proportion of children in Std 3 who could read a Std 1 text was under $50 \%$, which has dipped about 16 percentage points to nearly $30 \%$. A child in Std 3 has to learn to do two digit subtraction, but the proportion of children in government schools who can even recognize numbers up to 100 correctly has dropped from $70 \%$ to near $50 \%$ over the last four years with the real downward turn distinctly visible after 2010, the year RTE came into force. These downward trends are also reflected in Std 5 where a child would be expected to be able to at least read a Std 2 text and solve a division sum. Private schools are relatively unaffected by this decline but a downturn is noticeable, especially in math beyond number recognition.





There has been a feeling that RTE may have led to relaxation of classroom teaching since all exams and assessments are scrapped and no child is to be kept back. Continuous Comprehensive Evaluation is now a part of the law and several states are attempting to implement some form of CCE as they understand it. Does CCE catch this decline? Are teachers equipped to take corrective action as the law prescribes? Is corrective action going to be taken? Given the magnitude of the problem, it will be a good idea to focus just on basics at every standard and not treat it as a "remedial " measure. At this stage, teaching-learning of basic foundational skills should be the main agenda for primary education in India.

One of the problems of governmental systems is that the individual teacher feels that he has to wait for the highest authority to say what is to be done. If stage-wise achievement of goals of basic learning of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and problem solving become a part of state policy and not just another "program", the school calendar and teaching plans can be altered accordingly without the teacher having to look for instructions from higher ups. Focus on learning of basic skills can be applied to private schools as well - although these seem to be relatively better off. It is important for all to adhere to a policy of achieving basic learning outcomes rather than "completing the syllabus" as the RTE Act says. In fact, this is one modification that is definitely required in the RTE Act.

The states' contribution to the overall decline in learning levels is not uniform either for government or for private schools. In some states, the situation is unchanged or steady, which may be good news under the circumstances. The reasons for deterioration of learning outcomes in other states need to be explored by leaders and officials of each state. Whatever the cause, this trend has to be reversed urgently.

The big states where the learning levels are low and unchanged but DO NOT contribute significantly to the overall decline in government schools, are Karnataka, Tamil Nadu and Andhra Pradesh. There are three other states that have high learning levels on the ASER scale and are largely steady. These are Himachal, Punjab, and Kerala. Other big states contribute heavily to the overall declining learning levels. However, the contrast between government and private school performance is easily visible in every state and can be seen in the state pages of this report. It should be stated again that private school education is not great and socio-economic-educational background of children's families, parental aspirations and additional support for learning contribute majorly to their better performance. Yet, fact remains that the learning gap between government and private school children is widening. This widening gap may make the private schools look better, but in an absolute sense it is important to note that less than $40 \%$ of Std 5 children in private schools could solve a simple division sum in 2012.

It must be acknowledged that there is a national crisis in learning that permeates all schools. So, it is critical to improve the performance not only of government schools but also of private schools, because those children deserve better education for the money their parents spend. Governments must ensure this through regulation and not through control.

## Decline is cumulative

Learning declines do not happen in one year. They are the result of a cumulative effect of neglect over the years. If we follow three cohorts that started Std 1 in 2006, 2007, and 2008 respectively this should become clear as they grow to reach Std 5 in 2010, 2011, and 2012. Their "rate of learning" declines after 2010. The dotted lines in Charts 5-8 represent the cohort that entered Std 1 in 2008. In 2010 this cohort is in Std 3, by which time it is slightly lower than the previous two cohorts in government schools. By the time it is in Std 4 in 2011, significantly fewer percent children have learned to read or solve math in this cohort than the previous two did in Std 4. The subsequent cohorts entering Std 1 in 2009 and 2010 are even lower than the 2008 cohort, even in Std 3. Unless something is done immediately to improve the learning of these cohorts, it is predictable that their learning levels in Std 5 and beyond will not exceed the 2008 cohort and more likely will be worse. The cohorts of children who entered Std 1 the year RTE was passed and in the year it was enforced respectively, will be much worse off than children before them.

While the learning outcomes in government schools in many states decline rapidly, the private school performance in most states has remained steady as Charts 5 to 8 indicate. A decline in learning of basic math in private schools, as indicated in Chart 8 is visible but the basic reading levels (Chart 6) seem to remain largely steady. In Maharashtra, where a large majority of private schools are not only aided but largely controlled by the state government, there is a big decline as compared to states of the North where the private schools are mostly unaided and not under government control.


People are aware of the difference between government and private schools, with or without assessment. It drives the demand for private schools and results in an exodus from government schools. Like it or not.

Of course, all this is about very basic indicators and education is much more than just basic skills. At the same time, if we can get these basics right, much more can be done, but not without them. Government and private, both types of schools have a long way to go. In the mean time, private school enrollment is growing rapidly at the primary stage.

## In a country of $\mathbf{1 . 4}$ billion, over $\mathbf{5 0 \%}$ children will pay for their PRIMARY education by $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ ?

Recently, a friend said at a seminar that government schools provide education to $80 \%$ of India's children. This friend who has been in the middle of the RTE implementation machinery should have checked the government's own District Information System of Education (DISE) statistics published in 2012. It is time to wake up and take note of the rapidly changing situation. We have believed for a long time -and this is the logic of RTE- that governments will provide or provide for education of a large majority of children. This premise is likely not to be valid ten years from now.

DISE indicates that 29.8\% of India's children in Std I-V (urban and rural) attended private schools in 2010-11. As shown in Table 1, ASER 2010 estimated two years ago, that $22.56 \%$ of rural children in Std I-V attended private schools and ASER2012 says that the proportion has risen to $28.39 \%$ over two years. An increase of 5.8 percentage points in just two years after RTE came into force is astonishing to say the least. Looking at these trends, It is therefore reasonable to assume that in 2012 about $35 \%$ or more of India's primary school children in both urban and rural areas are attending private schools.

The trend is unmistakable. Private school enrollment in rural India is increasing at about $10 \%$ every year or about 3 percentage points per year. In the election year of 2014, about $41 \%$ of all of India's primary age children will be in private schools, and by the time 2019 elections come around, private sector will be the clear major formal education provider in India. Some say that RTE will take a decade to show its impact. Perhaps so. By that time, if all goes well (?), a further $25 \%$ of private school enrollment will be supported by governments through the quota for economically weaker sections and only the remaining poorest (by all measures) will send their children to government-run schools.

In the early days of this third millennium, shanty "affordable" schools started coming up in rural and urban areas. Gradually investors have done their math and gauged the demand for education. It appears that big "international " schools are coming up in rural areas that bus children from distant villages for economic viability. This model will probably start to dominate rural landscapes as India's wealth increases. On the urban side, the Municipal Corporation of Greater Mumbai came up with a proposal to hand over management of at least some of its schools to private education providers and a few other governments seem to be considering similar approaches. Such ideas known as PPP are opposed on purely ideological grounds by some, while schools run by governments in many states (especially in urban areas) are emptying out.

The best example of this may be Tamil Nadu, which is now $48 \%$ urbanized according to Census 2011. DISE reports that in 2010-11, 59.4\% of all (urban and rural) children in Std I-V attended private schools in Tamil Nadu. Only a third of these were in aided private schools. ASER 2010 estimated that the rural private enrollment in Std I-V in the same state was around $28.5 \%$, and is up to $34.8 \%$ in 2012. A simple back of the envelope estimation says that anywhere between 80 and $100 \%$ children in Std I-V in urban Tamil Nadu are in private schools and less than a fifth of these are government aided.

A glance at the DISE 2010-11 private school enrollment figures in Table 1 will show that in the southern part of India- Kerala, Tamil Nadu, Puducherry, and Goa have $60 \%$ or more private school enrollment in primary schools. Andhra, Maharashtra, and Karnataka are all above 40\% and moving up. All these states are highly urbanized and urbanizing further. Madhya Pradesh and Gujarat are at around 30\%. Rajasthan, Haryana, Punjab, J\&K and Uttarakhand are between 40 and $50 \%$. Uttar Pradesh rural is already at about $50 \%$ and it is quite likely that urban Uttar Pradesh is not far behind. Of the North-Eastern states, Tripura has low private school enrollment but nearly $70 \%$ of government primary school children go to tutors. Assam and Arunachal are at about 25\% private enrollment and Meghalaya, Mizoram, Manipur, and Nagaland are between 30 and $50 \%$. Of the most rural states, Bihar and West Bengal have low private school enrollment but $40 \%$ and $60 \%$ government school

Table 1: Comparison of DISE 10-11 (rural+urban), Rural ASER 2010, and Rural ASER 2012 for enrollment in
private schools

| State | Urban + Rural, ALL Pvt schools 2010 Std I-V | Rural <br> ASER <br> 2010 <br> Std I-V | Rural <br> ASER <br> 2012 <br> Std I-V | State | Urban + Rural, ALL Pvt schools 2010 Std I-V | $\begin{gathered} \text { Rural } \\ \text { ASER } \\ 2010 \\ \text { Std I-V } \end{gathered}$ | Rural <br> ASER <br> 2012 <br> Std I-V |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Andhra Pradesh | 45.47 | 40.08 | 39.26 | Maharashtra | 42.9 | 12.4 | 19.97 |
| Arunachal Pradesh | 18.58 | 15.18 | 24.42 | Manipur | 56.21 | 65.01 | 66.53 |
| Assam | 24.63 | 14.72 | 17.36 | Meghalaya | 45.58 | 49.17 | 50.59 |
| Bihar | 0.39 | 5.37 | 7.09 | Mizoram | 34.54 | 10.25 | 23.98 |
| Chandigarh | 29.95 |  |  | Nagaland | 50.37 | 32.19 | 36.9 |
| Chhattisgarh | 18.16 | 10.79 | 16.23 | Odisha | 10.16 | 5.37 | 6.99 |
| Delhi | 39.26 |  |  | Puducherry | 66.94 | 43.9 | 46.11 |
| Goa | 64.55 | 28.67 | 46.11 | Punjab | 46.43 | 38.08 | 47.61 |
| Gujarat | 26.47 | 8.87 | 9.8 | Rajasthan | 38.4 | 35.82 | 43.81 |
| Haryana | 38.71 | 43.07 | 52.16 | Sikkim | 19.93 | 21.13 | 28.94 |
| Himachal Pradesh | 31.52 | 29.78 | 33.08 | Tamil Nadu | 59.43 | 28.51 | 34.77 |
| Jammu \& Kashmir | 40.31 |  | 46.75 | Tripura | 8.98 | 2.77 | 3.5 |
| Jharkhand | 16.23 | 8.18 | 15.94 | Uttar Pradesh | 35.64 | 37.36 | 50.05 |
| Karnataka | 40.49 | 19.95 | 22.01 | Uttarakhand | 41.73 | 31.24 | 40.17 |
| Kerala | 68.17 | 57.95 | 61.82 | West Bengal | 8.9 | 7.02 | 9.43 |
| Madhya Pradesh | 29.74 | 16.11 | 19.9 | All States | 29.82 | 22.56 | 28.39 |

children in Std. I-V respectively go to tutors. That leaves the highly rural Odisha and somewhat urban Chhattisgarh among the bigger states which have low private school enrollment of about 10\% and 20\%.

It appears that no matter who is in power, private school enrollment will go on increasing till it hits family budget constraints. As this happens, unless the quality of government schools improves substantially, the gap between children who attend one and the other will create a big divide in every aspect of life and opportunity.

Much of our developmental planning is rural focused and in education the tendency in government is to think of government-run schools as 'our' schools. It is time to start looking at private schooling more carefully and understand problems of urban education planning as also to regulate private schooling without taking away the essential strengths of the private school. Government funded and regulated, but not controlled, private schools- like the aided or "charter schools" - replacing government-run schools seems to be the way of the future. RTE has already introduced the concept of funding private schools on a per child cost basis. There is no reason why this cannot be extended further. Aided schools exist in large numbers in Kerala, Tamil Nadu, Maharashtra, Goa, and Meghalaya. Existing practices can be looked into to create new governance mechanisms so that there is a right balance of freedom and accountability.

In short, big changes are happening in education and they are happening rapidly. Any long term plans of building or strengthening institutions must take these changes into account or else we will end up creating more dysfunctional white elephants all over the country that are not suitable for the next half a century and longer. There is a need to keep a close watch and have a vision of the future with feet firmly planted on the ground today.

The story of ASER has roots in experiences that began more than fifteen years ago in the slums of Mumbai. Pratham had just begun; we were young but we were ambitious. In 1996 we set ourselves a goal: by 2000 every child in Mumbai would be in school and learning. At first, our focus was on pre-schools. Why pre-schools? Because Mumbai did not have enough pre-schools, especially not in the large slums where most people were migrants. Families came to Mumbai in search of a better life, but the dislocation, the daily search for livelihoods - all this meant that families did not have the time and were not sure how to get their children ready for school. So we started community based "balwadis" - small pre-school centres run by local young women for the young children who lived in their neighbourhood. We felt that universal access to preschool would lead to universal enrolment in in Std 1. This could be one way to ensure that every child was in school.

In 1996, we had 150 balwadis. But the demand for neighbourhood pre-schools was high, and the number grew quickly. Pratham offered very little money, but gave training and some basic materials. Very soon there were over 3,500 balwadis spread out across all of Mumbai's slums. Bubbling up from this vast network came other needs and queries from communities. "What about children of school age who are not in school? What about the children who are going to school but are not doing well?" Soon we began to work with two kinds of children - children who were "left out" and children who were "left behind". The "left out" children were visible; they could be seen working, taking care of their siblings and many were simply just playing around. But the "left behind" children were almost invisible. In very large numbers they were in school, often going to class every day. Although parents and others had a sense that many were not doing well, it was not clear what the "not doing well" meant.

In November 1996, we did a small study of arithmetic in some municipal schools in Andheri. The focus was on Std 3 and 4. Children came one by one. We asked them to name numbers and do basic addition, subtraction, multiplication and division. The results were shocking - a large number of children could not do the basics. And this was in an area where almost all children were coming to school. ${ }^{1}$

By 1998-1999, there were Pratham volunteers in all municipal primary schools across Mumbai. Community volunteers or "balsakhis" worked to help academically weak children improve. Outside school, local youth collected out-of-school children in small groups in their community and taught them basic language and math skills to get them ready for school. The Pratham model of large scale collaboration with the government schools was held up as model and people from across the country came to see and understand this partnership. Some invited Pratham to come and work in their cities or their states. Soon there was activity in Vadodara, Patna, Lucknow, Jaipur, and Delhi - in government schools and in communities.

But as our work spread to other places, our frustration with what we were doing intensified. We worked hard, but the pace of progress was not fast enough for children to have a meaningful shot at completing elementary education. To get a ten year old girl who had never been to school "ready" for school meant that we had to get her up to speed to handle what was expected of her in Std 5. If a boy was in Std 4 but could not read, we had to get him not only reading but able to deal with text of varying difficulty, think critically and voice his own views. We needed to be able to do more with children and we needed to do it faster. The speed was necessary so that they could "catch up" with others in a meaningful way.
In 2002, all across Pratham we stopped doing what we were doing and each worked with a group of 20 to 25 children who could not read. These children were either enrolled in school in Std 3, 4 or 5 or they were not in school but at least eight years old. Our goal was to see how far we could bring these children in one month. Some worked with children in the community, others in school; there were different languages and different parts of the country. Even within Pratham we needed a common vocabulary and a common understanding to be able to share our learnings with each other.
A basic reading tool (which is now called the ASER reading tool) evolved during this time. It served several purposes. First, it clearly articulated the goal, which was to enable children to read a "story" fluently. ${ }^{2}$ Next, we grouped the children by level for instruction and used appropriate activities and materials to work with the children from the level at which they were to bring them towards the goal. The simple tool helped us think

[^0]about these things. Before starting to teach, every child sat with the instructor and tried to read the four line paragraph. ${ }^{3}$ If she could read the paragraph with ease then she attempted to read the "story" . ${ }^{4}$ If she could not read the paragraph then she tried to tackle the simple everyday words. If the words were too difficult, then she moved to letters. The reading levels were like a ladder, a child could
 move up or down and settle where she felt comfortable. Using a common vocabulary - "letter", "word", "para", "story" we could communicate with each other and share learnings. The reading tool was very helpful in developing our instructional methodology. Assessment was the first step to thinking about the right action.

During this time we noticed that the reading tool could have other uses. For example, when classes were being conducted in the neighbourhood, parents or siblings would ask us what we were doing. We could point to the tool and show them the goal and we could point to somewhere else on the tool to indicate where their child was currently. Listening to children trying to read helped parents see what had to be done. Even if they were not literate themselves, the tool demystified many things for them. They began to understand what was expected of children in school. The tool helped to carry parents along, as they saw and understood what was being attempted.

Our journey from assessment to action had begun.
I remember a summer morning in a village in Sultanpur district in Uttar Pradesh. We were making a village report card. Every household was asked if their children were enrolled in school. Every child in the village was asked to read a simple paragraph and do a simple subtraction problem. As was customary, we went to the pradhan to tell him what we were doing. The pradhan took a cursory look at us and said " achcha ... survey hai? Kariye, kariye" (Oh... it's a survey? Please go ahead). Accustomed to numerous surveys, he was not even interested in finding out what the survey was about.

We moved systematically household by household, hamlet by hamlet, talking to parents, interacting with children. Questions like, "do your children go to school" got quick and sometimes disinterested answers. But asking children to read grabbed everyone's attention. Children would flock around, wanting to try. Parents would stop working and come to observe. Children who were playing in the fields put on shirts before coming to read. Mothers and fathers called their children back from wherever they were in the village to be "tested". In hamlet after hamlet, the exercise was suddenly transformed from a "survey" collecting data for someone else into an information gathering exercise that everyone wanted right now.

The curiosity was immense. What was striking was that many parents had no idea whether their children could read or do arithmetic. This was true of both illiterate and literate parents. Young people who were watching with the proceedings with interest were requested to help. Within minutes, the whole business turned into a hugely absorbing exercise with people participating in asking children to read or in discussing why children could or could not read. Finally, the hamlet results were declared. People waited for the "count". "There are 40 households, 75 children. 70 children go to school but only 35 of those who go to school can read or do sums". Even as results were being digested, there was intense discussion on how this was not okay and what could be done to improve things. Clearly the situation would not sort itself out. Urgent and rapid change was needed. In hamlet after hamlet, people agreed that schools must work, teachers must teach effectively but that parents or someone at home or in the neighbourhood too had to help. Only then would children's learning begin to change.

[^1]Stepping back, and looking at the unfolding scene, you could very definitively say that information mattered. It mattered because it was about children community members knew and cared about. It mattered because the information generated was new: they had not known about children's learning or how to look at it in this simple way. It mattered because people had seen the information being generated before their own eyes. The simplicity of the tool and the method enabled people to participate. And it was easy to digest the results - for their own children and for all the children in the neighbourhood. Whether people were literate or illiterate, it was obvious to all that their own school going children should be able to do these basic tasks.

In a few days, the village report card was ready. We went back to the pradhan. Without looking up from what he was doing he asked me where he should sign. There was nowhere on the report card for a signature. Pradhanji thought this was very odd. He looked up at me and said, "Numbers have to be sent up and that needs me to sign." I tried to explain what the report card exercise had found. At the end of my explanation, he stated loudly, "The figures have to be wrong. How can it be that children are going to school and they cannot read?" The numbers and the explanation had upset him; the data went contrary to his assumptions.

Armed with the reading tool, Pradhanji walked into the village. Every child he met was asked to read. By the tenth child, Pradhanji sat down, put his head in his hands and said, "yeh to mere izzat ka sawal hai. (This is a question of my honour). How can this be the situation with children in my village and I not know about it?"

The entire exercise now known as ASER was based on experiences like the one in Sultanpur. For eight years, it has been a nationwide citizens' initiative to understand the status of children's schooling and learning in every rural district in the country. Using a common set of simple tools and a common sampling frame, in each district there is a local organization that conducts ASER and then disseminates its findings. Like the exercise of village report cards, ASER too is fundamentally based on participation and involvement of ordinary people. If we do not know, we cannot act. Only when we understand, can we think of what to do next. Waiting for the government alone to improve things will take a long time. Like Pradhanji and the parents in the village, it is essential that we get involved in measuring, then understanding, and then acting to improve the future of our children. This is how ASER was born.



## 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: Ask how many different hamlets/sections are there in the village? Where are they located? Ask the children to take you around the village. Tell people about ASER. This initial process of walking and talking may take more than an hour.


## Map:

- Rough map : The purpose of a rough map is to understand the habitations pattern of the village. 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.
- 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, make sections in the map as follows:
- How to mark and number sections on the map you have made?

1. CONTINUOUS VILLAGE


## If it is a village with continuous habitations:

- Divide the entire village into 4 sections geographically.
- Assign each section a number. Write the number on the map.
- We will select 5 households from each section.


## 2. VILLAGE WITH HAMLETS/SECTIONS

- Assign each section a number. Write the number on the map.



## IF THE VILLAGE HAS:

- 2 Hamlets/Sections: Divide each hamlet/section in 2 parts \& take 5 households from each part.
- 3 Hamlets/Sections: Take 7,7 and 6 households from the 3 hamlets respectively.
- 4 Hamlets/Sections: Select 5 households from each hamlet/ section.
- More than 4 Hamlets/Sections: Randomly pick 4 hamlets/ sections and then select 5 households from each one. On the map, tick the hamlets/sections chosen for the survey.


## What to do in each hamlet/section

- If the hamlet/section has less than 5 households - then survey all the households in the hamlet/section and survey the remaining households from other hamlets/sections.
- If the village has less than 20 households- then survey all the households in the village.

You need to pick 5 households from each of the 4 hamlets/sections that you have selected. Use the following procedure:

- Go to each selected hamlet/section. Try to find the central point in that hamlet/section and start household selection from the left.
- You must select every 5th household. Begin from the first household on your left. After you have surveyed this household, skip the next 4 households and select the 5th one. While selecting households, count only those dwellings that are residential. "Household" refers to every 'door or entrance to a house from the street'.
- If you have reached the end of the hamlet/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 till you have 5 households from the hamlet/section.


## What to do if:

1. The household has multiple kitchens: In each house ask how many kitchens or 'chulhas' there are? If there is more than one kitchen in a household, then select the kitchen which the respondent's family ${ }^{1}$ eats from. You will survey only those individuals who eat from the selected kitchen. After completing the survey in this house proceed to the next $5^{\text {th }}$ house (counting from the next house on the street, not from the next 'chulha').
2. The household has no children: If there are no children in the age group $3-16$ in the selected household but there are inhabitants, include that household. Take the information about the name of head of the household, total number of members of the household, household assets, name of the respondent, mobile number of the household. Also, write the number of the hamlet/section from which the house has been selected from the map. Such a household will be counted as one of the 5 surveyed households in each hamlet/section but no information about mothers or fathers will be collected.
3. The house is closed: If the selected house is closed or if there is nobody at home, note that down on your village compilation sheet (at the end of the survey booklet) 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 house.
4. No response: If a household refuses to participate, record the house on your village compilation sheet in the "no response" box. This household will also not count as a surveyed household. Do not include this household in the survey sheet. Move to the next/adjacent house.

- Stop after you have completed 5 households in the hamlet/section. Now move to the next selected hamlet/ section.
- Follow the same process using the $5^{\text {th }}$ household rule.
- Ensure that you go to households only when children are likely to be at home. This means that you will go to households after school hours and/or on a holiday/Sunday.

How to sample households in a hamlet


What to do in a house with multiple kitchens?


## 1. General information

- Household Number: Write down the household number in every sheet. Write 1 for the first household surveyed, 2 for the second household surveyed and so on till the $20^{\text {th }}$ household.
- Total number of members in the household who eat from the same kitchen: Ask the adults present and write down the total number. If there are multiple kitchens/'chulhas' in the household, remember to include only those who eat regularly from the same kitchen.


## - Note down the following:

o Respondent name : Respondent = An adult who is present in the household during the survey and providing you with information.
o Hamlet/Section no. (from the map) and/or name of hamlet/section

## 2. Information about children and adults living in the household

## No information will be written in the household format about any individual who does not regularly live in the household.

## CHILDREN:

We will collect information from the sample household about all children age 3-16 who regularly live in the household and eat from the same kitchen. Ask members of the household as well as neighbours to help you identify these children. All such children should be included, even if their parents live in another village or if they are the children of the domestic help in the household.

## What to do if:

1. There are older children: Often older girls and boys (in the age group of 11 to 16 years) may not be thought of as children. 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. Be sensitive about this issue.
2. Children are not at home during the time of the survey: Often children are busy in the household or in the fields. If the child is somewhere nearby, but not at home, take down information about the child, like name, age, and 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. But if there are children out of the village on the day of the survey who do regularly live in the household, for e.g. a child has gone to visit her relatives, we will include them even if we cannot test them.
3. There are children who are relatives but live in the sampled household on a regular basis: We will include these children because they live in the same household on a regular basis. But we will not take information about their parents if parents do not live in this household.
4. Children not living in the household: DO NOT INCLUDE children of this family who do not regularly live in the household, for e.g. children who are studying in another village or children who got married and are living elsewhere.
5. Visiting children: DO NOT INCLUDE children who have come to visit their relatives or friends in the sampled household. They do not regularly live in the sampled 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 data must be noted down ONLY for children living in the 20 households that have been randomly selected.

## Children aged 3-16 years

- Child's name, age, sex: The child's name, age and sex should be filled for all children selected for the survey. For female children write ' F ' and for male children write ' M '.


## Children aged 3-6:

The first block, "Pre-School children (age 3-6)", is to be asked only for children aged 3 to 6 . On the household sheet, note down whether they are attending anganwadi (ICDS), balwadi, or nursery/LKG/UKG, etc. If the child is not going to any anganwadi/preschool, etc., mark 'Not going' in the section of 'Pre-school children'.

## Children aged 5-16:

The remaining blocks of information are ONLY to be filled for children aged 5 to 16 .

- In school children (currently enrolled in school): The child's current schooling status and class.
- Out of school children
o If the child has never been enrolled in school, then mark it under 'Never Enrolled'.
o If the child has dropped out, then mark it under 'Drop out'.
Write the class in which the child was studying when she dropped out irrespective of whether she passed or failed in that class. Probe carefully to find out these details.

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 '2012'.

## - All children aged 5-16 years

o Ask all children in the age group 5-16, if they take any tuition, meaning paid classes outside school.
o Also ask children if they attend the specific government school which you have/will be surveying. Do not ask this to children who are not currently enrolled in school.
o All children in this age group will be tested in basic reading, 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).

## Mother and father: Background information

Mother's background information: At the beginning of the entry for each child, ask for the name of the child's mother. Note down her name only if she is alive and regularly living in the household. If the child's mother is dead or not living in the household do not write her name. If the mother has died or has been divorced and the child's stepmother (father's present wife) is living in the household, we will include her as the child's mother. Note down the mother's age and schooling information in the box.

Father's background information: At the end of the entry for each child, ask for the age and schooling information of the child's father. Only write this information if the father is alive and regularly living in the household. If the father is dead or not living in the household do not ask for this information. If the father has died or has been divorced and the child's stepfather (mother's present husband) is living in the household, we will include him as the child's father.

## 3. Household indicators

All information on household indicators is to be recorded, based as much as possible, on observation. However, if for some reason you cannot observe it note down what is reported by household members only and not by others. In case of assets like TV, mobile phone, ask whether it is there in the household and whether it is owned by the household or not. This information is being collected in order to link education status of the child with household economic conditions.

- Type of house: Types of houses are categorized as follows:
- 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.
- Kutcha House: The walls and roof are made of material other than those mentioned above, such as un-burnt bricks, bamboos, mud, grass, reeds, thatch, loosely packed stones, etc.
- 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 houses.
- Motorized two wheelers: Ask the respondent and mark yes if the household owns a motorized two wheeler like a motorcycle/scooter, otherwise mark no.
- Electricity in the household:
- Mark yes or no by observing if the household has wires/electric meters and fittings or not.
- If there is an electricity connection, ask whether the household had electricity any time on the day of your visit, not necessarily when you are doing the survey.
- Toilets: Mark yes or no by observing if there is a constructed toilet in the house. If you are not able to observe, then ask whether there is a constructed toilet or not.
- Television: Mark yes or no by observing if the house has a television or not. If you don't see one, ask. It does not matter if the television is in working condition or not.
- Cable TV: If there is a TV in the household, ask whether there is cable TV. This includes any cable facility which is paid for by the household (include Direct To Home (DTH) facility). Mark "Yes" if there is cable. If not, mark under No.
- Reading material
- Newspaper: Mark yes if the household gets a newspaper every day.
- Other reading material: This includes story books, magazines, religious books, comics etc. but does not include calendars and textbooks. Mark Yes or No accordingly.
- Other questions for the household:
- Mark yes if anyone in the household knows how to use a computer. This question should be asked to the family members. Do not observe.
- If the household has a mobile phone mark yes and note the mobile number. The mobile number will solely be used for the re-check process and not for any other purpose. Tell household members that this is the reason for taking the mobile number.

If you do not get an answer for a question in the household sheet, leave the appropriate columns blank.
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 2012 : Reading tasks



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

- Letters: Set of commonly used 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 having no more than 4-5 words. These words or their equivalent are in the Std 1 textbook of the states.
- Level 2 (Std 2) text: "Short" story with 7-10 sentences. Sentence construction is straightforward, words are common and the context is familiar to children. These words (or their equivalent) are in the Std 2 textbook of the states.

|  |  |  | Sample: <br> Hindi <br> basic <br> reading <br> test* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| बहत दिनों से वारिश हो रही |  |  |  |
| थी। गाँच में सभी जगह गंदा | मों ने हलवा बनाया। |  |  |
| पानी भर गया था। सभी बारिश | उसे सोनी ने खाया। |  |  |
| के रुपने की राह देख रहे थे। | खाने के वाद वह सो गई। |  | Similar tests developed in all languages |
|  |  |  |  |
| अचानक एक दिन बारिश रुक |  |  |  |
|  | , | मोत |  |
| डने लर्मी। लोग अप | श | पेर इकोला | hild |
|  | d | आतू पूप |  |
|  |  | T | langu |
|  |  | आग म | w |
|  |  |  | read |

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

- Comparability with the previous years' tools 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 states.
- Familiarity with words and context through extensive field piloting.


## How to test reading?

## PARAGRAPH

Ask the child to read either of the 2 paragraphs.
Let the child choose the paragraph herself. If the child does not choose give her any one paragraph to read. Ask her to read it. Listen carefully to how she reads.

The child is not at 'Paragraph Level' if the child:

- Reads the text like a string of words, rather than a sentence.
- Reads the text haltingly and stops very often.
- Reads the text fluently but with more than 3 mistakes.

If the child is not at 'Paragraph Level' then ask the child to read 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 5 words to her.
The child is at 'Word Level' if the child:

- Reads at least $\mathbf{4}$ out of the $\mathbf{5}$ words with ease.

If the child is at Word Level', then ask her to try to read the paragraph again and then follow the instructions for paragraph level testing.
If she can correctly and comfortably read words but is still struggling with the paragraph, then mark the child at 'Word Level'.
If the child is not at word level (cannot correctly read at least $\mathbf{4}$ out of the $\mathbf{5}$ words chosen), then show her the list of letters.

The child can read a paragraph, if the child:

- Reads the text like she is reading sentences, rather than a string of words.
- Reads the text fluently and with ease, even if she is reading slowly.
- Reads the text with $\mathbf{3}$ or less than $\mathbf{3}$ mistakes.

If the child can read a paragraph, then ask the child to read the story.

## STORY

Ask the child to read the story.
The child is at 'Story Level' if the child:

- Reads the text like she is reading sentences, rather than a string of words.
- Reads the text fluently and with ease. The child may read slowly.
- Reads the text with $\mathbf{3}$ or less than $\mathbf{3}$ mistakes.

If the child can read the story then mark the child at 'Story Level'.

If the child is not at 'Story Level', then mark the child at 'Paragraph Level'.

## 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.
The child is at 'Letter level' if the child:

- Correctly recognizes at least $\mathbf{4}$ out of $\mathbf{5}$ letters with ease.

If the child can read letters, then ask her to try reading the words again and then follow the instructions for word level testing.
If she can read $\mathbf{4}$ out of $\mathbf{5}$ letters but cannot comfortably read words, then mark the child at 'Letter Level'. If the child is not at letter level (cannot recognize 4 out of 5 letters chosen), then mark the child at 'Beginner Level'.

## ASER 2012 : Arithmetic tasks



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

- Number recognition 1 to 9: randomly chosen numbers between 1 to 9 .
- Number recognition 11 to 99: randomly chosen numbers between 11 to 99 .
- Subtraction: 2 digit numerical problems with borrowing.
- Division: 3 digit by 1 digit numerical problems.

| 1 | 4 | 92 | 23 | $\begin{array}{r}84 \\ -49 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | - 36 | 6) $758($ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 47 | 72 |  |  |  |
| 8 | 9 |  |  | $\begin{array}{r}56 \\ -37 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | -13 | $7 \longdiv { 8 6 5 }$ |
|  |  | 56 | 87 |  |  |  |
| 5 | 2 | 29 | 11 | $\begin{gathered} 45 \\ -18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 43 \\ -\quad 24 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 4) 658 |
|  |  |  | - | *- |  |  |

Sample:
Arithmetic test

## Similar tests developed in all languages

## How to test arithmetic?

## SUBTRACTION 2 digit with borrowing

## START HERE:

Show the child the subtraction problems. Ask her to solve any two problems, one at a time. She can choose a problem, if not you can point.
Ask the child what the numbers are and then ask the child to identify the subtraction sign.
If the child is able to identify the numbers and the sign, ask her to write and solve the problem. Observe to see if the answer is correct.
Even if the first subtraction problem is answered wrong, still ask the child to solve the second question with the same method. If the second problem is correct ask the child to try and do the first problem again. If the child makes a careless mistake, then give the child another chance with the same question.

If the child cannot do both subtraction problems correctly, then ask the child to recognise numbers from 10-99.

Even if the child does just one subtraction problem wrong, give her the number recognition (10-99) task.

## NUMBER RECOGNITION (10-99)

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

If she can correctly identify at least $\mathbf{4}$ out of $\mathbf{5}$ numbers then mark her at 'Number Recognition (10-99) level'.

If the child cannot recognize numbers from 10-99, then ask the child to recognise numbers from 1-9.

## NUMBER RECOGNITION (1-9)

Ask the child to identify any 5 numbers from the list. Let the child choose the numbers herself. If she does not choose, then point out 5 numbers to her.
If she can correctly identify at least 4 out of 5 numbers then mark her at 'Number Recognition
(1-9) level'.
If the child is not at 'number recognition (1-9)' level (Cannot recognize numbers 1-9) mark her at 'Beginner Level'.

If the child 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 problem. If not, then you pick one. Ask her to write and solve the problem.

Observe what she does. If she is able to correctly solve the problem, then mark the child at 'Division
Level'. Note: The quotient and the remainder both have to be correct.

If the child makes a careless mistake, then give the child another chance with the same question.

If the child is unable to solve a division problem correctly, mark the child at 'Subtraction level'.

NOTE: ASK THE CHILD TO SOLVE THE MATH PROBLEMS AT THE BACK OF THE HOUSEHOLD SURVEY SHEET.

## ASER 2012 : English tasks



## All children were assessed in English reading and comprehension using a simple tool. The test has 4 categories:

- Capital letters: Set of commonly used capital letters.
- Small letters: Set of commonly used small letters.
- Words: Common familiar 3 letter words. After reading, the child is asked to say the meaning of the read words in the child's local language.
- Simple sentences: Set of 4 simple sentences, each having no more than 4-5 words. These words or their equivalent are in the textbooks of the class English is introduced in the states. After reading, the child is asked to say the meaning of the read sentence in the child's local language.


In developing these tools in English, care is taken to ENSURE:

- Comparability with the previous years' tools with respect to word count, sentence count and type of word.
- Compatibility with the vocabulary and sentence construction used in the introductory English textbooks of the states.
- Familiarity with words and context through extensive field piloting.
- Meanings of the words are easy in all regional languages.


## How to test English?

There are 2 sections in the tool: Reading and Comprehension.

- First administer the reading section and mark the highest reading level of the child.
- Then administer the comprehension section.


## PART 1: READING

## CAPITAL LETTERS

The child is not at 'Capital Letters Level' if the child cannot read 4 out of the 5 letters.

If the child is not at 'Capital Letters Level', mark the child at 'Nothing Level'.

The child is at 'Capital Letters Level' if the child can read at least 4 out of the 5 letters with ease.

If the child is at 'Capital Letters Level', then ask the child to read the small letters.

## SMALL LETTERS

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

The child is not at 'Small Letters Level' if the child cannot read 4 out of the 5 letters.

If the child is not at 'Small Letters Level', mark the child at 'Capital Letters level'.

The child is at 'Small Letters Level' if the child can read at least 4 out of the 5 letters.

If the child is at 'Small Letters Level', then ask the child to read the words.

## SIMPLE 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 any 5 words to her.

The child is not at 'Word Level' if the child cannot read 4 out of the 5 words.

## If the child is not at 'Word Level', mark the child at 'Small Letters Level'.

## EASY SENTENCES

Ask the child to read all four of the given sentences.

## The child is not at 'Sentence Level' if the child:

- Cannot read even 2 out of the 4 sentences fluently
- Reads the sentences like a string of words,rather than a sentence
- Reads the sentences haltingly or stops very often

The child is at 'Word Level' if the child can read at least 4 out of the 5 words.

If the child is at 'Word Level', then ask the child to read the sentences.

If the child is not at 'Sentence Level', then Mark the child at 'Word Level'
AND
Ask the child to tell you the meanings of the words she has read

## PART 2 : COMPREHENSION

## For WORD LEVEL CHILD

## WORD MEANINGS

Ask the child to tell the meaning of the words she has read, in her local language.

The child knows the meaning of the words, if the child can tell the meaning of at least 4 of the read words. She can tell the meanings of the words by:

- Saying the correct meaning in her local language OR
- Pointing to an object, which explains the meaning of a word. For eg. pointing to her father while explaining the meaning of 'man'; pointing to something red to explain the meaning of 'red'.

If the child can correctly tell the meaning of at least 4 of the words, then mark the child as 'can say'.

If the child cannot, then mark the child as 'cannot say'.

If the child is at 'Sentence Level', then Mark the child at 'Sentence Level'
AND
Ask the child to tell you the meaning of the sentences she has read.

## For SENTENCE LEVEL CHILD

## SENTENCE MEANING

Ask the child to tell you the meaning of the sentences she has read, in her local language.

The child knows the meaning of the sentences, if the child can tell the meaning of at least 2 of the read sentences. She can tell the meanings of the sentences by:

- Saying the correct meaning in her local language

OR

- At least explain the meaning of the main underlined words in the sentence. For eg. For a sentence like 'What is the time?' the child should at least be able to say 'kya' and 'samay/ waqt'.

If the child can correctly tell the meaning of at least 2 of the sentences, then mark the child as 'can say'.

If the child cannot, then mark the child as 'cannot say'.

## GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

- Visit any government Upper Primary School in the village with classes from Std 1 to $7 / 8$. If there is no school in the village which has classes from Std 1 to $7 / 8$, then visit a government primary school (Std 1 to $4 / 5$ ). If there is more than one government primary school then visit the government primary 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.
- Meet the Head Master. Explain the purpose and history of ASER and give the letter. Be very polite. Assure the HM and teachers that the name of the school will not be shared with anybody.
- Note the time of entry, date and day of visit to the school.
- Ask the HM for the enrollment register or any official document for the enrollment figures in that school.


## 1. Children's Enrollment \& Attendance

- Ask for the registers of all the standards and fill in the enrollment from them. If a standard/class has many sections, then take total enrollment.
- Now go to where each class is sitting and do a headcount of children present. If more than one class is sitting together, ask children from each class 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.
- Attendance of class with many sections: Take headcount of the individual sections, add them up and then write down the total attendance.


## 2. Official language

Note the official language used as the medium of instruction.

## 3. Teachers

- Ask the HM and note down the number of teachers appointed. Acting HM will be counted as a regular teacher. HM on deputation will be counted under the HM category. The number of regular government teachers does not include the Head Master.
- Observe how many HMs/teachers are present and note the information.
- If the school has para-teachers, mark them separately. (Para teacher is a contract teacher with a different pay scale than that of a regular teacher). In many states para-teachers are called by different names such as Shiksha Mitra, Panchayat Shikshak, Vidya Volunteer etc.
- Do not include any NGO volunteer in the list of teachers.


## 4. Classroom Observations- ONLY FOR STD 2 and STD 4

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 to observe. You may need to seek help from the teachers to distinguish children class-wise as more than one class may be seated together.
Observe the following and fill accordingly:

- The seating arrangement of children (are two/more classes sitting together in the same class or is a single class sitting alone)?
- Is there is a blackboard where the children are sitting? if yes, could you write on it easily?
- Was there any teaching material other than textbooks available like charts on the wall, board games etc.? (Material painted on the walls of the classroom does not count as teaching material.)
- Where are children sitting (in classroom, in the verandah or outside)?


## 5. Mid Day Meal (MDM)

- Ask the Headmaster/any other teacher whether the mid-day meal was served in the school today.
- Observe if there is a kitchen/shed for cooking the mid-day meal.
- Observe if any food is being cooked in the school today.
- Observe whether the mid day meal was served in the school today (Look for the evidence of the mid-day meal in the school like dirty utensils or meal bought from outside). Mark accordingly.


## 6. Facilities

- Observe and count the total number of pucca rooms (excluding toilets). Also observe and count the total number of pucca rooms used for teaching today.
- Observe if there is an office/store/office cum-store. Tick under "Yes" if even one is present.
- Observe if there is a play ground (Definition of Playground: it should be within the school premises with a level playing field and/or school playing equipment eg: slide, swings etc).
- Observe if there are library books in the school (even if kept in a cupboard).
- Observe if library books are being used by children.
- Observe if there is a hand pump/tap. If yes, whether you could drink water from it. If there is no handpump/ tap or you could not drink water from it, check whether any other form of drinking water is available.
- Observe if the school has a complete boundary wall or complete fencing. It can be with or without a gate.
- Observe if there are computers for children's use in the school. If yes, then did you see children using computers.


## 7. School Grant Information (SSA)

Assure the HM and others that the name of the school will not be shared with anybody.

- The Head Master should be asked this section. In the absence of the Head Master, ask the senior most teacher present. Tick the designation of the person being asked for grants information (Head Master/ Regular teacher/ Para teacher).
- In schools with standards 1-7/8, there may be separate Headmasters and separate SSA passbooks for the primary and upper primary sections. Ask whether the school has two or more SSA passbooks and tick the appropriate response (Yes/No/Don't know).


## 8. SSA Annual School Grant

Ask the person answering this section about the grants 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 Section 9.
If the school has two or more SSA passbooks, information in this section should be taken only for the primary section (Std 1-4/5).

We will ask for information about four SSA grants - School Maintenance Grant (SMG), School grant or School Development Grant (SDG), Teachers Grant or Teacher Learning Material (TLM) and new classroom grant. For each grant, we want information for two separate time periods: Financial year 2011-12 (1st April 2011-31st March 2012) and financial year 2012-13 (1st April 2012 till today).

- For each grant, first ask if the school received the grant for 2011-12 (April 2011- March 2012). Mark the appropriate column (Yes/No/Don't know).
- If YES (the school received the grant), then ask if the full amount was spent, and answer as follows:
o Mark 'Yes' only if the full amount was spent.
o Mark 'No' if nothing was spent or if less than the full amount was spent.
o Mark 'Don't know' if the person answering the question is not aware of whether the money was spent or not.
- Now ask the same questions for the remaining three grants.

Once you have asked about all four grants for FY 2011-12, repeat this entire process for the period $1^{\text {st }}$ April 2012 till the date of the survey.

## 9. Activities carried out in the school since April 2011

This section has 2 parts. First we want to know whether the following activities have taken place. Then, if the activity has taken place, we want to know which grant was used to undertake the activity.

- Ask if each of the activities listed has been done since April 2011 (whitewash/plastering, painting blackboard/ display board, building repairs, etc), and tick the appropriate box (Yes/No/Don't know).
- If YES, then ask funds from which grant paid for the activity. If either SDG or SMG was used, tick 'SMG or SDG or both' column. If TLM grant was used, then tick 'TLM grant'. If none of these 3 grants but some other grant/source was used, then tick on 'Any other grant/source'. If the respondent says that the activity happened but he doesn't know where the funds came from, then tick 'Don't know'.


## 10. Toilet

- Observe whether the school has a common toilet, a separate toilet for girls, a separate toilet for boys and a separate toilet for teachers.
- Ask the HM, any teacher, any child if you cannot tell who the toilets are for.
- For each type of toilet facility that you find at the school, note whether it is locked or not. If it was unlocked, note whether it was usable or not. A usable toilet is a toilet with water available for use (running water/ stored water) and a basic level of cleanliness.
- If 2 common toilets or other type of toilets are there in the school then take information about the toilet which is in a better condition.



## Sample household survey sheet - Hindi




+int






|  | 3 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 0 | $\frac{7}{4}$ |
| 1 | 4 |
| 1 | $\frac{1}{4}$ |


| muinimin |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| = | ane | it | $=$ | Fixis | $\underline{4}$ |
| 1 | गत्यी |  | 17 |  | 147 |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 |  |  |  |  |  |

## Sample village information sheet - English

## VILLAGE INFORMATION SHEET




| Hiter Nume |  | Punjab | Hoct Name | VEREA |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Didethame |  | AMRUTSAR | Vliope Name | VERKA |
| Namei of Altil limwen |  |  | RANANI |  |
| Date el lury |  | 16-09-12 | Day elluwer | Funtuy |
| Hegae lek me relwan box |  |  |  smabremand |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 4 \\ & y \\ & \frac{4}{3} \\ & 4 \\ & 4 \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ | hata mod leadry to the tlopel |  | 0 | Ho |
|  | Encholyconvetionil lievtopet? |  | (1) | 10 |
|  | Ped fllor in tie dinger |  | 4 | 10 |
|  | Saraling havil |  | ter | W\% |
|  |  |  | U | no |
|  | Gort Mmarna hwath Cernet |  | 地 | Un |
|  | muterememinct |  | m | $4{ }^{\prime}$ |
|  |  |  | T 15 | 4 |
|  |  IFriotilyoubic\| |  | +18 | $v$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 8 \\ & 8 \\ & 9 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | Ho |
|  |  |  | 45 | 5 |
|  |  |  | 淂 | 5 |
|  |  |  | H | 4 |
|  | Nirate Scrovil |  | \% | N0 |
|  | Auphrigeil <br>  |  | N | No |

## Sample village information sheet - Hindi



## Sample school observation sheet - English



## 






TEHV II AEFAA


 Hin HiHHOL CHEW DHEANL
 Him Hinhol On DHENKANHL Hin OHISHA

y spikta
ygriciti
ulverubit
Min


HipMHAT




|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Funin |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | \|14 |  | H14 |  |
|  |  | -14 | Hi | Itir | \# |
|  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |
|  |  | 1 |  |  |  |
|  Linnelkity |  | prer |  |  |  |
|  |  | 1 |  |  |  |
|  <br>  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 17 |  |  |  |  |



| 1 tointimy obumplan uni\| |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \|lath |  Eurt |  |  wrent |  |  in bill in trefori |  |
|  | 74 | Hie | Hetelat | liximati | 1 | 4il |
| 101 |  | y |  |  |  |  |
| ha |  | $v$ |  |  |  |  |
| Cimat | $\checkmark$ |  |  | Pr | $p$ |  |
| hath | $Y$ |  |  | v | $\mu$ |  |


|  | 14 | H1 | $\begin{aligned} & n=1 \\ & 2-r n i t \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  | la | H4 | Pix |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { 4itu } \\ \text { nitin } \\ \text { in } \end{array}$ | 44 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 04 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Rnm } \\ & 1 i_{n}= \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  | + |  |  |  |  |  | Hivinimulitinumin | \# |  |  | $p$ |  |  |  |
|  | $p$ |  |  | m |  |  |  |  |  | $p$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | , |  |  | 12 |  |  |  | Fuitumatul | 120 |  |  | 12 |  |  |  |
|  | 2 |  |  | W |  |  |  |  | + |  |  |  | m |  |  |
| Fethurinitingin |  |  |  | \% |  |  |  |  |  | p |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $v^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 토표 밴II, |  |  |  | pr |  |  |  |  | + |  |  |  |  |  | m |
|  | pr |  |  | +2 |  |  |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  | mir |

## Sample school observation sheet - Hindi

##  <br> 


要丽亩




Age group 6-14
Children were asked

- Enrollment status
- Type of school

Children also did:

- Reading tasks
- Arithmetic tasks

School visits

## Sampling :

Randomly selected
20 ASER 2005 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

Mother's education
Father's 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 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

Mother's education
Mothers were also asked to read a simple text

## Sampling :

Randomly selected
20 ASER 2005 villages
10 new ASER 2006 villages

## ASER 2010

Age group 3-16
Children were asked

- Enrollment status
- Type of school
- Tuition status

Children 5-16 also did:

- Reading tasks
- Arithmetic tasks
- Everyday math tasks

Mother's education
Father's education
Mothers were also asked to
dial a mobile number
Household characteristics
Village information
School visits

## Sampling:

Randomly selected
10 ASER 2008 villages
10 ASER 2009 villages
10 new ASER 2010 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
- Comprehension tasks
- Problem solving tasks
- English tasks

Mother's education
School visits

## Sampling :

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

## ASER 2011

Age group 3-16
Children were asked

- Enrollment status
- Type of school
- Tuition status

Children 5-16 also did:

- Reading tasks
- Arithmetic tasks

Mother's education
Father's education

Household characteristics
Village information
School visits

## Sampling :

Randomly selected
10 ASER 2009 villages
10 ASER 2010 villages
10 new ASER 2011 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

Mother's education
Household characteristics
Village information
Sampling:
Randomly selected
10 ASER 2006 villages
10 ASER 2007 villages
10 new ASER 2008 villages

## ASER 2012

Age group 3-16
Children were asked

- Enrollment status
- Type of school
- Tuition status

Children 5-16 also did:

- Reading tasks
- Arithmetic tasks
- English tasks

Mother's education
Father's education

Household characteristics
Village information
School visits

## Sampling:

Randomly selected
10 ASER 2010 villages
10 ASER 2011 villages
10 new ASER 2012 villages

## What's new in ASER 2012

The purpose of ASER'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); and (ii) to measure the change in these basic learning and school statistics over time. Every year a core set of questions regarding schooling status and basic learning levels remains the same. However new questions are added for exploring different dimensions of schooling and learning at the elementary stage. The latter set of questions is different each year.

ASER 2012 brings together elements from various previous ASERs. The core questions on school status and basic reading in the child's local language and arithmetic remain. From 2009-11, we retain questions on paid tuition, parent's education, household and village characteristics. For the first time, ASER 2007 introduced testing in basic English. English testing was repeated in ASER 2009 and this year we tested children once again in English. ASER 2012 also visited one government primary school in every sampled village, as has been done every year since 2009.

## Sampling Strategy (Household sample - children's learning and enrollment 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, the sample size is 600 households per district. The sample is obtained by selecting 30 villages per district and 20 households per village.

The villages were randomly selected using the village directory of the 2001 Census. The sampling was 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 2011, we retained 10 villages from 2009 and 2010 and added 10 new villages. In ASER 2012 we dropped the 10 villages from ASER 2009, kept the 10 villages from 2010 and 2011 and added 10 more villages from the Census village directory. The 10 new villages were also chosen using PPS. The 20 old villages and the 10 new villages gives us a "rotating panel" of villages, which generates more precise estimates of change. Since one of the objectives of ASER is to measure the change in learning, creating a panel is a more appropriate sampling strategy. Each district receives a village list with appropriate block information along with the data from the 2001 Census on total number of households and total population in the village. The village list also specifies which villages are from 2010, from 2011 and which are new villages.

Like past ASERs, the village list is final and cannot be replaced. This is to maintain randomness of the sample to obtain reliable estimates.

## For further information

The ASER team has consulted with national level sampling experts including those at NSSO and ISI. For more information, please contact contact@asercentre.org.

ASER is conducted in every rural district of India by volunteers from a local organization in the district - these are colleges and universities, NGOs, youth groups, women's organizations and others. About 25,000 young people volunteer to do ASER each year, reaching about 3,00,000 households and 7,00,000 children annually. Training is critical to equipping our volunteers with the skills needed to survey a village and assess children's learning outcomes.

ASER follows a 3-tier training structure. The National Workshop is followed by a state level training in every state. This is followed by district level training where volunteers are trained to conduct the ASER survey.

National Workshop. During this workshop the ASER state teams are oriented on the tools, procedures and processes to be used. Every step of the survey is reviewed in theory and carried out in practice prior to finalizing survey materials. The workshop is also used to plan for state level trainings and partner selection. Each ASER state team comprises anywhere between 2 and 6 full time people, depending on the size and complexity of the state.

In addition to a detailed review of each step in the ASER process, key features of the National Workshop included:

- Mock Trainings- Participants were informed in advance about the topics that they had to train on and thus had an opportunity to plan both content and delivery. Based on their performance in the mock training session, participants were provided with feedback on weak spots in their training.
- Game Sessions- Receiving intensive training for long hours often leads to loss of focus by participants. Hence, short sessions of simple games and fun activities were planned in order to help participants rejuvenate and refocus.
- Field Pilot- All formats used for the ASER survey were piloted during the National Workshop. Subsequent discussions enabled doubts to be clarified and instructions to be fine-tuned.

State Level Training Workshop. These workshops prepare Master Trainers who will then take charge of rolling out ASER in their districts. Master Trainers are usually a combination of participants from the district local partners and Pratham team members. More than 1,000 Master Trainers participated in ASER 2012.

In the past, most state level trainings were organized for 4 days; this year they were 5 day workshops. This was done primarily because many of our Master Trainers were participating in ASER for the first time.

State level trainings have five main components:

- Classroom sessions- To orient participants on the ASER process. Simple presentations and case studies help state teams conduct these sessions.
- Field practice sessions- Every element of ASER is practiced extensively in the field. During the workshop, participants and trainers visit nearby villages to practice every aspect of ASER that needs to be carried out by volunteers.
- Mock Training- These sessions are intended to improve the training capabilities of participants and thus prepare them to impart training at the district level.
- Quiz- A quiz is administered towards the end of each state level training and immediate feedback is provided to participants. This helps to ensure that all participants have understood the ASER process and to identify participants who may not have obtained the minimal understanding required to conduct ASER.
- Game sessions- To provide short interludes between intensive work sessions.

Performance in mock trainings, field visits and the quiz results were analyzed to identify weak Master Trainers, who were either eliminated or provided with additional support during district trainings. Also, it was mandatory for all participants to be present on all days of the training. Any participant who did not attend all days of the training was asked to discontinue participation in the ASER survey.

District Level Training Workshops. Training in most districts comprised a 3 day workshop. Like state level trainings, the key elements of district trainings included classroom sessions, field practice sessions and a quiz. Typically, in most districts, volunteers scoring low on the quiz were either asked to discontinue or were paired with strong volunteers to carry out the survey.

At the district level, because of erratic electricity supply and unavailability of laptops with every Master Trainer, it is difficult to use a projector while training. To deal with this problem, survey formats were printed on large flex banners that could be displayed while explaining how to fill survey formats to volunteers. These banners are portable, easy to use and an effective low cost substitute for projectors.

Monitoring of trainings. Specific steps were taken to ensure that key aspects of training were implemented across all state and district training workshops. These included:

- Most state trainings were attended by the respective Pratham State Head and a member of the Central ASER team.
- Call Centre- In most states, a person was assigned to interact with the Master Trainers on a daily basis and ensure that they completed all basic processes in trainings, survey and recheck.
- District Compilation Sheet- Survey results for every village in a district were compiled in a district compilation sheet. The sheet also had quiz marks and attendance records for volunteers. A lot of emphasis was placed on this sheet during monitoring and recheck.



## ASER 2012 - Monitoring \& Recheck

Every year, ASER procedures to ensure data quality are reviewed and tightened. In ASER 2012 about half of all surveyed villages were either monitored or rechecked. Monitoring and recheck processes for ASER 2012, described below, followed a multi-layer communication strategy which enabled team members to identify potential qualityrelated concerns in a timely manner and implement corrective actions as needed.

## Monitoring

In most districts ASER 2012 was conducted over two consecutive weekends, which allowed ASER Master Trainers to personally monitor the survey in 3-4 villages - more than $10 \%$ of the sample. In addition, a call centre was set up in every state to monitor the progress of the survey and the activities of the Master Trainers on a daily basis. These procedures helped to identify areas requiring corrective action.

In ASER 2012, approximately 28\% of all villages surveyed were monitored by the Master Trainers.

## Recheck

Four different types of recheck processes were implemented for ASER 2012.

## SMS Recheck

An important feature of ASER 2012 was the instant transmission of the summary of the district level data via SMS. 9 states took part in this effort. These data were uploaded on a common portal, enabling ASER Centre staff to assess the quality of the survey in real time and identify locations where additional measures were required.

## Phone and desk recheck

For the first time, in ASER 2012 contact telephone numbers of respondent households were recorded. These were used by the Master Trainers to contact the household for a phone recheck, a procedure which enabled the quick identification of villages which were not surveyed correctly. These villages were then rechecked in person by the Master Trainer.

In addition, on the completion of the survey in a district, Master Trainers conducted a desk recheck of the survey formats received for all surveyed villages.

## Master Trainer Field recheck

Based on the information obtained from the desk and phone recheck, villages were identified for field recheck. In each such village, $50 \%$ of all surveyed households were rechecked. This process involved verifying key parameters of the survey: sampling, selection of children and testing.

In ASER 2012, approximately 28\% of all villages surveyed were rechecked by the Master Trainers.*

## Cross-State Field recheck

Finally, in order to further strengthen the quality control process, ASER State team members switched states and conducted a cross-state recheck in which a mix of purposive and randomly selected districts were rechecked. The process utilized was the same as the Master Trainer field recheck. A total of 318 villages across 69 districts were rechecked using this procedure.

In most cases, rechecked villages where problems were found were re-surveyed. If for any reason this was not possible, the data for that village was dropped.

In ASER 2012, approximately 6\% of surveyed villages were resurveyed.*

## Process Audit

To understand the adherence to core ASER processes in ASER state trainings, district trainings and during the actual village surveys, an external process audit was conducted across 6 states. In each state, the audit team observed the state training and later the district trainings in 2 randomly sampled districts. Finally, the survey was observed in 2 villages in each sampled district. The information obtained from the audit will help identity gaps in implementation and plan ways to address them.

[^2]



Statewise map showing \% of children who are enrolled in private schools in Std I-IVN (primary classes)
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Statewise map showing \% of children In Std V who can read Std II text
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Statewise map showing \% of children in Std $V$ who can do division

\% of children in Std $V$ who can do division


ANDAMAN \& NICOBAR ISLANDS


0
$\because 0^{\circ}$
$\therefore$


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


## Enrollment in the 6-14 age group continues to be very high. But the proportion of out of school children has increased, especially among girls in the age group of 11 to 14.

- Overall, enrollment numbers remain very high. Over $96 \%$ of all children in the age group 6 to 14 years are enrolled in school. This is the fourth consecutive year that enrollment levels have been $96 \%$ or more.
- Nationally, the proportion of children (age 6 to 14 ) who are not enrolled in school has gone up slightly, from $3.3 \%$ in 2011 to $3.5 \%$ in 2012. A slight increase is seen for all age groups and for both boys and girls.
- Girls in the age group of 11 to 14 years are often the hardest to bring to school and keep in school. In 2006, in eight major states, more than $11 \%$ girls in this age group were not enrolled in school. By 2011, this figure had dropped to less than $6.5 \%$ in 3 of these states (Jharkhand, Gujarat and Odisha) and less than $5 \%$ in 3 others (Bihar, Chhattisgarh and West Bengal). The situation in these states remained more or less unchanged in 2012. However in Rajasthan and Uttar Pradesh, the proportion of out of school girls (age 11-14) has increased from 8.9\% and 9.7\% respectively in 2011 to more than 11\% in 2012.


## Private school enrollment continues to rise in almost all states.

- At the All India level private school enrollment has been rising steadily since 2006. The percentage of 6 to 14 year olds enrolled in private schools rose from $18.7 \%$ in 2006 to $25.6 \%$ in 2011. This year this number has further increased to $28.3 \%$. The increase is almost equal in primary (Std. I-V) and upper primary (Std. VIVIII) classes. In 2012, among all private school children (age 6-14), 57.9\% were boys.
- In 2012, more than $40 \%$ of children (age 6-14 years) in Jammu \& Kashmir, Punjab, Haryana, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh and Meghalaya are enrolled in private schools. This percentage is $60 \%$ or more in Kerala and Manipur.
- Increase in private school enrollment is seen in almost all states, with the exception of Kerala, Nagaland, Manipur and Meghalaya (where private school enrollment was over $40 \%$ even last year) and Tripura.
- Since 2009, private school enrollment in rural areas has been rising at an annual rate of about $10 \%$. If this trend continues, by 2018 India will have $50 \%$ children in rural areas enrolled in private schools.


## Reading levels continue to be a cause for serious concern. More than half of all children in Std. V are at least three grade levels behind where they should be.

- In 2010 nationally, 46.3\% of all children in Std. V could not read a Std. II level text. This proportion increased to $51.8 \%$ in 2011 and further to $53.2 \%$ in 2012. For Std. V children enrolled in government schools, the percentage of children unable to read Std. II level text has increased from $49.3 \%$ (2010) to $56.2 \%$ (2011) to 58.3\% (2012).
- For all children in Std. V, the major decline in reading levels (of 5 percentage points or more) between 2011 and 2012 is seen in Haryana, Bihar, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra and Kerala. Even private schools in Maharashtra and Kerala, with a large proportion of aided schools, show a decline in reading ability for Std. V.
- The percentage of all children enrolled in Std. III who cannot read a Std. I level text has increased steadily from $53.4 \%$ (2009) to $54.4 \%$ (2010) to $59.7 \%$ (2011) to $61.3 \%$ in 2012. For children enrolled in government schools, this figure has increased from 57.6\% in 2010 to 64.8\% in 2011 to 67.7\% in 2012.


## 2012 was the year of mathematics. But it has been a bad year for basic arithmetic for children in India.

- In 2010, of all children enrolled in Std. V, 29.1 \% could not solve simple two-digit subtraction problems with borrowing. This proportion increased to $39 \%$ in 2011 and further to $46.5 \%$ in 2012. Barring Andhra Pradesh, Karnataka and Kerala, every major state shows signs of a substantial drop in arithmetic learning levels.
- Comparing the cohort of children who were in government schools in Std. V in 2011 with the cohort in Std. $V$ in 2012, there is evidence of a more than 10 percentage point drop in the ability to do basic subtraction in almost all states. Exceptions are Bihar, Assam and Tamil Nadu where the drop is less; and Andhra Pradesh, Karnataka and Kerala where there has been either improvement or no change from 2011.
- The proportion of all children enrolled in Std. V who could not do division problems has increased from 63.8\% in 2010 to $72.4 \%$ in 2011 to $75.2 \%$ in 2012. In rural India as a whole, two years ago about two thirds of all children in Std. V could not do simple division. In 2012 this number is close to three fourths.
- Himachal Pradesh, Punjab, Haryana, Chhattisgarh, Madhya Pradesh, Gujarat and Maharashtra are all states where the cohort in Std. V in 2012 seems to be substantially weaker than the cohort in Std. V in 2011. In the southern states, the situation is unchanged from 2011 except in Kerala where there is a significant improvement.


## ASER 2012 assessed basic English.

- In ASER 2012, children were given a set of simple English reading and comprehension tasks. Across rural India, $48.9 \%$ children enrolled in Std. V could read English words or more, and $22.5 \%$ could read simple English sentences. Among all children enrolled in Std. VIII, 47\% could read sentences. Of those who could read words or sentences, well above $60 \%$ could convey the meaning in their own language.

Private inputs into children's education, such as private schooling and private tutoring, are widespread. And their influence on children's learning outcomes is substantial.

- Whether enrolled in government schools or private schools, across rural India in the elementary grades (Std. I-VIII) about a quarter of all children also go to paid private tutors.
- Another way to think about private inputs into education is to categorize children into four groups:

1. Children in government schools who do not go to private tutors;
2. Children in government schools who go to private tutors;
3. Children in private schools who do not go to private tutors; and
4. Children in private schools who go to private tutors.

In 2012, the above four groups comprised 54.5\%, 18.8\%, 20.7\% and 6\% of all students in Std. V. Children in categories 2, 3 and 4 - amounting to about $45 \%$ of all children in Std. V in rural India - receive some form of private input into their education, either in the form of schooling or tuition.

- The influence of additional inputs in the form of tuition on children's ability to read or to do arithmetic is clear. Whether enrolled in government schools or in private schools, children receiving this additional support have better learning outcomes than those who do not.


## The proportion of small schools is rising in India.

- A total of 14,591 schools were visited during ASER 2012. Of these about $60 \%$ were government primary schools with classes up to Std. IV or V and the rest were upper primary schools which had primary sections.
- The proportion of government primary schools with enrollment of 60 or fewer students has increased over time. In the last 3 years, this figure has increased from $26.1 \%$ in 2009 to $32.1 \%$ in 2012.
- The proportion of children in primary grades who sit in multigrade classrooms is also rising. For Std. II, this number has gone up from 55.8\% in 2009 to $62.6 \%$ in 2012. For Std. IV, it has risen from $51 \%$ in 2010 to 56.6\% in 2012.


## School facilities show improvement over time.

- Based on RTE norms, the pupil teacher ratio shows improvement. In 2010, the proportion of schools meeting these norms was 38.9\%. This number has risen to 42.8\% in 2012.
- $73 \%$ of all schools visited had drinking water available. However, just under $17 \%$ did not have drinking water facility at all. A water facility was available, though not usable in the remaining schools.
- The proportion of schools without toilets has reduced from $12.2 \%$ in 2011 to $8.4 \%$ in 2012 and the proportion of schools with useable toilets has increased from $47.2 \%$ in 2010 to $56.5 \%$ in 2012 . Approximately $80 \%$ of schools visited had separate provision for girls' toilets. Of schools which had this separate provision, close to half had useable girls' toilets, as compared to a third in 2010.
- The mid-day meal was observed being served in $87.1 \%$ schools that were visited.



## ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM HOUSEHOLDS. 567 OUT OF 585 DISTRICTS

## School enrollment and out of school children

Table 1: \% Children in different types of schools 2012

| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in <br> school | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age: 6-14 ALL | 67.0 | 28.3 | 1.2 | 3.5 | 100 |
| Age: 7-16 ALL | 64.8 | 28.2 | 1.1 | 5.9 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 68.1 | 28.5 | 1.3 | 2.2 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 BOYS | 65.2 | 31.7 | 1.2 | 1.9 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 GIRLS | 71.0 | 25.3 | 1.3 | 2.4 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 ALL | 65.6 | 28.0 | 1.0 | 5.4 | 100 |
| Age: $11-14$ BOYS | 63.0 | 31.3 | 1.0 | 4.8 | 100 |
| Age: $11-14$ GIRLS | 68.2 | 24.8 | 1.1 | 6.0 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 ALL | 54.2 | 28.1 | 0.8 | 17.0 | 100 |
| Age: $15-16$ BOYS | 53.6 | 29.6 | 0.7 | 16.2 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 GIRLS | 54.7 | 26.5 | 1.0 | 17.9 | 100 |

Note: 'Other' includes children going to madarsa and EGS.
'Not in school' = dropped out + never enrolled.

Chart 2: Trends over time
\% Children enrolled in private schools by class 2008-2012


## Young children in pre-school and school

Table 3: \% Children age 3-6 who are enrolled in different types
of pre-school and school 2012

|  | In balwadi or anganwadi | In LKG/ UKG | In School |  |  | Not in school or preschool | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Govt. | Pvt. | Other |  |  |
| Age 3 | 56.8 | 7.7 |  |  |  | 35.4 | 100 |
| Age 4 | 55.5 | 21.2 |  |  |  | 23.3 | 100 |
| Age 5 | 21.0 | 12.2 | 35.4 | 20.3 | 1.1 | 10.1 | 100 |
| Age 6 | 5.4 | 6.6 | 57.4 | 24.5 | 1.3 | 4.8 | 100 |



Chart 1: Trends over time
\% Children out of school by age group and gender 2006-2012


How to read this chart: Each line shows trends in the proportion of children out of school for a particular subset of children. For example, the proportion of girls (age 1114) not in school has changed from $10.3 \%$ in 2006 to $7.3 \%$ in 2007 to $7.2 \%$ in 2008 $6.8 \%$ in 2009 and to $5.7 \%$ in 2010 to $6.0 \%$ in 2012.

Table 2: Sample description
\% Children in each class by age 2012

| Std. | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 24.7 | 42.1 | 20.1 | 7.9 | 5.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| II | 3.6 | 13.7 | 39.4 | 27.9 | 6.7 | 5.3 | 3.5 |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| III |  | . 0 | 12.6 | 41.5 | 23.3 | 11.5 | 7.1 |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| IV | 4.9 |  |  | 14.2 | 34.1 | 31.2 | 6.7 | 5.9 | 3.1 |  |  |  | 100 |
| V | 5.4 |  |  |  | 8.6 | 43.0 | 23.5 | 13.0 | 6.5 |  |  |  | 100 |
| VI | 4.0 |  |  |  |  | 13.0 | 33.4 | 35.1 | 8.5 | 6.0 |  |  | 100 |
| VII | 5.1 |  |  |  |  |  | 8.8 | 45.4 | 26.8 | 9.2 | 4.7 |  | 100 |
| VIII | 4.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 16.3 | 39.6 | 27.7 | 8.5 | 3.6 | 100 |

How to read this table: If a child started school in Std I at age 6, she should be of age 8 in Std III. This table shows the age distribution for each class. For example, in Std III, $41.5 \%$ children are 8 years old but there also $12.6 \%$ who are $7,23.3 \%$ who are 9 , $11.5 \%$ who are 10 and $7.1 \%$ who are older.

Chart 3: Trends over time
\% Children age 3, 4 and 5 not enrolled in school or pre-school 2006-2012*


## Reading

Table 4: \% Children by class and READING level All schools 2012

| Std. | Not even <br> letter | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (Std I Text) | Level 2 <br> (Std II Text) | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 43.4 | 37.6 | 12.0 | 3.8 | 3.3 | 100 |
| II | 20.3 | 35.9 | 22.8 | 10.9 | 10.1 | 100 |
| III | 11.9 | 26.2 | 23.2 | 17.2 | 21.4 | 100 |
| IV | 7.0 | 17.6 | 19.9 | 20.9 | 34.7 | 100 |
| V | 4.6 | 12.0 | 15.3 | 21.4 | 46.8 | 100 |
| VI | 2.9 | 8.3 | 10.8 | 18.9 | 59.2 | 100 |
| VII | 1.7 | 5.6 | 7.8 | 15.8 | 69.1 | 100 |
| VIII | 1.6 | 4.1 | 5.6 | 12.4 | 76.4 | 100 |
| Total | 12.8 | 19.5 | 15.0 | 15.0 | 37.7 | 100 |

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level in reading achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, 11.9\% children cannot even read letters, $26.2 \%$ can read letters but not more, $23.2 \%$ can read words but not Std I text or higher, $17.2 \%$ can read Std I text but not Std II level text, and $21.4 \%$ can read Std II level text. For each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is $100 \%$.

Chart 4: Trends over time
\% Children in Std III who CAN READ Std I level text
By school type 2009-2012


## Reading Tool

की
Fet


Chart 5: Trends over time
\% Children in Std V who CAN READ Std II level text By school type 2009-2012


## Reading and comprehension in English

Table 5: \% Children by class and READING level in ENGLISH All schools 2012

| Std. | Not <br> even <br> capital <br> letters | Capital <br> letters | Small <br> letters | Simple <br> words | Easy <br> sen- <br> tences | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 57.3 | 20.1 | 12.7 | 7.5 | 2.4 | 100 |
| II | 36.6 | 24.1 | 20.4 | 12.7 | 6.2 | 100 |
| III | 25.6 | 22.6 | 23.4 | 18.4 | 10.1 | 100 |
| IV | 17.3 | 18.6 | 24.1 | 24.4 | 15.6 | 100 |
| V | 12.5 | 16.0 | 22.7 | 26.4 | 22.5 | 100 |
| VI | 8.1 | 12.4 | 20.5 | 28.4 | 30.6 | 100 |
| VIII | 5.7 | 9.0 | 17.7 | 28.0 | 39.7 | 100 |
| VIII | 4.3 | 7.0 | 15.4 | 26.3 | 47.0 | 100 |
| Total | 22.3 | 16.6 | 19.6 | 21.0 | 20.5 | 100 |

Table 6: \% Children by class who CAN COMPREHEND ENGLISH All schools 2012

| Std. | Of those who <br> can read words, <br> \% who can tell <br> meanings of <br> the words | Of those who <br> can read <br> sentences, \% who <br> can tell meanings <br> of the sentences |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| I | 63.1 | 43.4 |
| III | 63.4 | 54.5 |
| III | 63.9 | 60.8 |
| IV | 65.0 | 64.5 |
| V | 62.6 | 66.8 |
| VI | 64.2 | 68.0 |
| VII | 64.0 | 69.9 |
| VIII | 65.0 | 72.0 |
| Total | 64.0 | 67.5 |

English Tool



Facilitated by PRATHAM

## Arithmetic

Table 7: \% Children by class and ARITHMETIC level All schools 2012

| Std. | Not even <br> $1-9$ | Recognize numbers |  | Can <br>  <br>  <br> subtract | Can divide | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 39.4 | 16.8 | 3.2 |  | 100 |
| II | 16.3 | 39.3 | 31.3 | 10.3 | 2.8 | 100 |
| IIII | 8.7 | 30.3 | 34.7 | 19.6 | 6.7 | 100 |
| IV | 4.9 | 20.8 | 32.0 | 27.1 | 15.1 | 100 |
| V | 3.2 | 14.7 | 28.6 | 28.7 | 24.8 | 100 |
| VI | 2.0 | 10.2 | 26.2 | 28.6 | 33.1 | 100 |
| VII | 1.3 | 6.6 | 22.7 | 27.8 | 41.5 | 100 |
| VIII | 1.3 | 5.1 | 20.0 | 25.7 | 48.1 | 100 |
| Total | 10.7 | 22.0 | 26.6 | 20.7 | 20.0 | 100 |

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level in arithmetic achieved by a child. For example, in Std 3, $8.7 \%$ children cannot even recognize numbers 1-9, $30.3 \%$ can recognize numbers up to 9 but not more, $34.7 \%$ can recognize numbers to 99 but cannot do subtraction, $19.6 \%$ can do subtraction but not division, and $6.7 \%$ can do division. For each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is $100 \%$.

Chart 6: Trends over time
\% Children in Std III who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more
By school type 2009-2012



## Type of school and paid tuition classes

The ASER survey recorded information about tuition by asking the following question: "Does the child take any paid tuition class currently?" Therefore the numbers given below do not include any unpaid supplemental help in learning that children may have received.

| Table 8: Trends over time \% Children attending paid tuition classes By school type 2009-2012 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Children in Std I-VIII | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| Govt. schools: \% Children attending paid tuition classes | 23.9 | 22.5 | 23.2 | 23.3 |
| Private schools: \% Children attending paid tuition classes | 26.9 | 22.5 | 21.8 | 22.2 |
| All schools: \% Children attending paid tuition classes | 24.5 | 22.5 | 22.9 | 23.0 |

Table 9: Trends over time
\% Children by school type and tuition 2009-2012

| Year | Category |  | Std II | Std V | Std VIII | Std I-VIII |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2009 | Govt. | No tuition | 62.5 | 59.6 | 50.4 | 59.5 |
|  |  | Tuition | 15.9 | 20.2 | 22.3 | 18.7 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 15.9 | 14.5 | 19.8 | 16.0 |
|  |  | Tuition | 5.7 | 5.7 | 7.5 | 5.9 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 2010 | Govt. | No tuition | 62.2 | 58.1 | 50.8 | 59.3 |
|  |  | Tuition | 13.9 | 19.6 | 20.8 | 17.2 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 18.9 | 17.1 | 22.1 | 18.2 |
|  |  | Tuition | 5.0 | 5.3 | 6.4 | 5.3 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 2011 | Govt. | No tuition | 57.8 | 56.4 | 51.6 | 56.6 |
|  |  | Tuition | 14.0 | 19.2 | 20.4 | 17.1 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 22.2 | 18.8 | 21.8 | 20.5 |
|  |  | Tuition | 5.9 | 5.6 | 6.3 | 5.7 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 2012 | Govt. | No tuition | 55.3 | 54.5 | 51.9 | 54.9 |
|  |  | Tuition | 13.8 | 18.8 | 19.5 | 16.7 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 24.1 | 20.7 | 22.6 | 22.1 |
|  |  | Tuition | 6.9 | 6.0 | 6.1 | 6.3 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Chart 9: Trends over time
\% Children in Std III-V who CAN READ a Std I level text or more By school type and tuition 2009-2012



Chart 8: Trends over time
\% Children in Std I-VIII by school type and tuition 2009-2012


How to read this chart: This chart is a visual representation of the last column of Table 9. For a given year, the width of each colour band represents the \% of children in the corresponding category. For each year, these four categories add upto $100 \%$.

Chart 10: Trends over time
\% Children in Std III-V who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more By school type and tuition 2009-2012

facilitated by PRATHAM

## Performance of states

Table 10: School enrollment and learning levels 2012

| State | Out of school | Private school | Tuition | Std I-II: Learning levels |  | Std III-V : Learning levels |  | Std VI-VIII : Learning levels |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% Children (Age 6-14) out of school | \% Children (Age 6-14) in private school | \% Children (Age 6-14) who attend paid tuition classes | \% Children (Std I-II) who CAN READ letters, words or more | \% Children (Std I-II) who CAN RECOGNIZE numbers (1-9) or more | \% Children (Std III-V) who CAN READ Std I level text or more | \% Children (Std III-V) who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more | \% Children (Std VI-VIII) who CAN READ ENGLISH sentences | \% Children (Std VI-VIII) who CAN DO DIVISION |
| Andhra Pradesh | 2.6 | 36.5 | 15.0 | 83.9 | 88.9 | 66.1 | 66.8 | 67.9 | 58.7 |
| Arunachal Pradesh | 2.7 | 21.7 | 21.1 | 86.6 | 88.6 | 61.6 | 68.7 | 80.6 | 68.1 |
| Assam | 4.4 | 16.0 | 16.9 | 71.0 | 75.6 | 46.9 | 33.3 | 37.9 | 23.7 |
| Bihar | 3.7 | 6.4 | 50.2 | 55.9 | 61.7 | 47.8 | 43.4 | 35.8 | 56.0 |
| Chhattisgarh | 2.6 | 13.5 | 2.8 | 73.0 | 75.3 | 53.6 | 26.8 | 22.5 | 24.7 |
| Dadra \& Nagar Haveli | 3.1 | 12.3 | 11.0 | 67.5 | 66.3 | 55.8 | 15.8 | 19.0 | 10.1 |
| Daman \& Diu | 0.4 | 14.9 | 31.0 | 71.2 | 73.9 | 50.6 | 38.0 | 22.0 | 33.6 |
| Goa | 0.1 | 49.2 | 23.2 | 95.3 | 97.0 | 65.3 | 58.4 | 71.8 | 45.4 |
| Gujarat | 3.1 | 11.8 | 12.6 | 73.1 | 71.7 | 59.0 | 32.6 | 23.5 | 30.0 |
| Haryana | 1.5 | 49.2 | 13.4 | 79.6 | 84.8 | 67.0 | 58.8 | 58.2 | 56.9 |
| Himachal Pradesh | 1.0 | 28.9 | 7.6 | 89.6 | 94.0 | 79.0 | 64.8 | 72.0 | 64.5 |
| Jammu \& Kashmir | 2.3 | 43.7 | 15.8 | 89.5 | 91.1 | 59.6 | 48.7 | 64.2 | 31.4 |
| Jharkhand | 4.4 | 15.5 | 31.5 | 66.1 | 68.3 | 44.8 | 36.2 | 36.6 | 46.8 |
| Karnataka | 1.9 | 21.9 | 11.6 | 82.8 | 81.9 | 59.3 | 48.6 | 40.9 | 39.9 |
| Kerala | 0.2 | 59.6 | 30.7 | 96.3 | 96.4 | 78.3 | 67.9 | 78.5 | 64.2 |
| Madhya Pradesh | 3.1 | 18.2 | 9.4 | 65.0 | 63.5 | 39.3 | 23.1 | 18.5 | 27.2 |
| Maharashtra | 1.5 | 35.4 | 10.5 | 77.4 | 79.8 | 71.1 | 38.6 | 40.2 | 37.3 |
| Manipur | 1.5 | 67.3 | 40.6 | 96.0 | 96.4 | 63.1 | 62.4 | 81.0 | 67.2 |
| Meghalaya | 5.3 | 47.9 | 14.3 | 92.4 | 91.0 | 67.3 | 45.0 | 78.7 | 41.3 |
| Mizoram | 1.7 | 24.8 | 5.5 | 96.2 | 96.8 | 70.9 | 76.4 | 76.5 | 72.3 |
| Nagaland | 1.7 | 38.5 | 21.4 | 97.0 | 96.9 | 67.7 | 67.9 | 84.0 | 66.9 |
| Odisha | 4.1 | 6.2 | 46.6 | 64.3 | 63.0 | 56.9 | 36.6 | 40.9 | 37.3 |
| Puducherry | 0.4 | 38.8 | 34.6 | 58.9 | 71.3 | 46.4 | 29.4 | 34.7 | 18.8 |
| Punjab | 1.3 | 45.1 | 19.7 | 86.3 | 88.7 | 73.4 | 63.1 | 66.3 | 61.2 |
| Rajasthan | 5.1 | 41.1 | 5.0 | 59.2 | 64.5 | 47.7 | 33.1 | 32.6 | 39.2 |
| Sikkim | 2.7 | 28.7 | 28.9 | 98.5 | 97.4 | 76.1 | 71.5 | 90.5 | 63.5 |
| Tamil Nadu | 0.6 | 29.0 | 19.1 | 58.6 | 68.0 | 48.9 | 38.6 | 39.5 | 29.4 |
| Tripura | 0.6 | 3.0 | 70.3 | 86.2 | 92.3 | 56.3 | 47.5 | 39.0 | 36.7 |
| Uttar Pradesh | 6.4 | 48.5 | 11.5 | 57.5 | 62.9 | 44.8 | 29.2 | 25.5 | 30.6 |
| Uttarakhand | 1.8 | 36.6 | 17.0 | 74.5 | 77.6 | 63.3 | 49.7 | 45.4 | 51.9 |
| West Bengal | 3.3 | 6.9 | 73.0 | 77.4 | 84.1 | 59.6 | 43.9 | 33.5 | 36.9 |
| All India | 3.5 | 28.3 | 23.3 | 67.5 | 71.4 | 54.1 | 40.7 | 38.8 | 40.6 |

facilitated by PRATHAM

## School observations

In each year's ASER, from 2009 onwards, in each sampled village, the largest government school with primary sections was visited on the day of the survey. Information about schools in this report is based on these visits.

Table 11: Number of schools visited 2009-2012

| Type of school | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std I-IVN: Primary | 9389 | 8419 | 8516 | 8718 |
| Std I-VIIINIII: Primary + <br> Upper primary | 5359 | 5821 | 5857 | 5873 |
| Total schools visited | 14748 | 14240 | 14373 | 14591 |

Table 12: Student and teacher attendance on the day of the visit 2009-2012

| Type of school | Std I-IVN |  |  |  | Std I-VIINIII |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| \% Enrolled children <br> present (Average) | 74.3 | 72.9 | 71.0 | 71.3 | 77.0 | 73.4 | 72.0 | 73.1 |
| \% Teachers present <br> (Average) | 89.1 | 87.1 | 87.2 | 85.2 | 88.6 | 86.4 | 86.7 | 85.4 |

Table 13: Small schools and multigrade classes 2009-2012

| School characteristics | Std I-IVN |  |  |  | Std I-VIINIII |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| \% Schools with total enrollment of 60 or less | 26.1 | 27.3 | 30.0 | 32.1 | 4.5 | 2.7 | 5.3 | 6.3 |
| \% Schools where Std II children observed <br> sitting with one or more other classes | 55.8 | 55.2 | 58.2 | 62.6 | 53.1 | 54.0 | 57.4 | 58.8 |
| \% Schools where Std IV children observed <br> sitting with one or more other classes | 51.0 | 49.0 | 53.0 | 56.6 | 43.9 | 41.6 | 45.4 | 46.1 |

## RTE indicators

Table 14: Schools meeting selected RTE norms 2010-2012

| \% Schools meeting the following RTE norms: |  | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pupil-teacher \& classroomteacher norms | Pupil-teacher ratio | 38.9 | 40.8 | 42.8 |
|  | Classroom-teacher ratio | 76.2 | 74.3 | 73.7 |
| Building | Office/store/office cum store | 74.1 | 74.1 | 73.5 |
|  | Playground | 62.0 | 62.8 | 61.1 |
|  | Boundary wall/fencing | 51.0 | 53.9 | 54.7 |
| Drinking water | No facility for drinking water | 17.0 | 16.7 | 16.6 |
|  | Facility but no drinking water available | 10.3 | 9.9 | 10.4 |
|  | Drinking water available | 72.7 | 73.5 | 73.0 |
| Toilet | No toilet facility | 11.0 | 12.2 | 8.4 |
|  | Facility but toilet not useable | 41.8 | 38.9 | 35.1 |
|  | Toilet useable | 47.2 | 49.0 | 56.5 |
| Girls toilet | \% Schools with no separate provisions for girls toilets | 31.2 | 22.7 | 21.3 |
|  | Of schools with separate girls toilets, \% schools with |  |  |  |
|  | Toilet locked | 18.7 | 15.0 | 14.1 |
|  | Toilet not useable | 17.2 | 18.7 | 16.4 |
|  | Toilet useable | 32.9 | 43.7 | 48.2 |
| Library | No library | 37.4 | 28.7 | 23.9 |
|  | Library but no books being used by children on day of visit | 24.7 | 29.1 | 32.2 |
|  | Library books being used by children on day of visit | 37.9 | 42.2 | 43.9 |
| Mid-day meal | Kitchen shed for cooking mid-day meal | 82.1 | 83.7 | 84.4 |
|  | Mid-day meal served in school on day of visit | 84.6 | 87.5 | 87.1 |



The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act, 2009 specifies a series of norms and standards for a school.

Norms for number of teachers vary according to the level of the school (primary or upper primary) and total student enrollment.

Norms for classrooms require the school to have at least one classroom for every teacher.

Norms for facilities require schools to provide each of the facilities mentioned in Table 14, among others.

RTE norms regulate provision of facilities but not their useability. ASER school observations also include whether facilities could be used. This information is included in Table 14.

## School funds and activities (PAISA)

Table 15: \% Schools that report receiving SSA grants - Full financial year

| SSA school grants | April 2009 to <br> March 2010 |  |  |  | April 2010 to March 2011 |  |  |  | April 2011 to March 2012 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { No. } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { Sch. } \end{gathered}$ | \% Schools |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No. } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Sch. } \end{aligned}$ | \% Schools |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No. } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Sch. } \end{aligned}$ | \% Schools |  |  |
|  |  | Yes | No | Don't know |  | Yes | No | Don't know |  | Yes | No | Don't know |
| Maintenance grant | 12277 | 84.9 | 5.3 | 9.9 | 13854 | 83.7 | 9.3 | 7.0 | 14235 | 86.5 | 7.3 | 6.2 |
| Development grant | 11763 | 80.5 | 8.7 | 10.8 | 13586 | 76.8 | 15.3 | 8.0 | 14100 | 79.1 | 13.9 | 7.1 |
| TLM grant | 11658 | 87.3 | 5.9 | 6.8 | 13737 | 85.2 | 9.6 | 5.2 | 14252 | 89.2 | 6.6 | 4.2 |

Table 16: \% Schools that report receiving SSA grants - Half financial year

| SSA school grants | April 2010 to date of survey (2010) |  |  |  | April 2011 to date of survey (2011) |  |  |  | pril 2012 to date of survey (2012) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No. } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Sch. } \end{aligned}$ | \% Schools |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { No. } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { Sch. } \end{gathered}$ | \% Schools |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { No. } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { Sch. } \end{gathered}$ | \% Schools |  |  |
|  |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |  | Yes | No | Don't |
| Maintenance grant | 11563 | 59.3 | 26.5 | 14.2 | 13202 | 55.1 | 35.2 | 9.7 | 13742 | 56.1 | 35. | 8. |
| Development grant | 11082 | 57.3 | 28.2 | 14.5 | 12933 | 50.9 | 38.6 | 10.5 | 13598 | 51.3 | 40 |  |
| TLM grant | 10879 | 60.5 | 27.6 | 12.0 | 13042 | 53.2 | 38.3 | 8.5 | 13678 | 54.8 | 38.7 | 6. |

Table 17: \% Schools carrying out different activities since April 2011

| Type of Activity |  | \% Schools |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Yes | No | Don't know |
| Const. | New Classroom | 23.2 | 73.5 | 3.3 |
| Repairs | Repair of building (roof, floor, wall etc.) | 49.3 | 47.6 | 3.1 |
|  | Repair of doors \& windows | 46.6 | 50.2 | 3.2 |
|  | Repair of boundary wall | 22.0 | 74.8 | 3.2 |
|  | Repair of drinking water facility | 43.7 | 53.2 | 3.2 |
|  | Repair of toilet | 36.5 | 60.3 | 3.3 |
| Painting <br> \& white- <br> wash | White wash/plastering | 66.7 | 30.6 | 2.6 |
|  | Painting blackboard/Display board/Painting on wall | 70.5 | 27.0 | 2.5 |
|  | Painting of doors \& walls | 57.4 | 40.0 | 2.7 |
| Purchase | Purchase of furniture (cupboard etc.) | 45.6 | 50.7 | 3.7 |
|  | Purchase of electrical fittings | 32.9 | 63.9 | 3.3 |
|  | Purchase of chalk, duster, register etc. | 89.8 | 7.8 | 2.4 |
|  | Purchase of sitting mats/Tat patti | 49.2 | 47.9 | 2.9 |
|  | Purchase of charts, globes \& other teaching material | 77.1 | 20.2 | 2.7 |
| Other | Expenditure on school events | 70.2 | 26.1 | 3.7 |
|  | Payment of bills (electricity, water, cleaning etc.) | 39.4 | 56.2 | 4.4 |

The PAISA section of ASER tracks receipt and spending of Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) grants at the school level. This information is collected from schools visited during the survey. This page reports proportion of schools receiving the grants and carrying out specified activities in the schools. More detailed analysis of the PAISA data will be available in the PAISA 2012 report which will be released in March $2013 .{ }^{1}$

## EVERY RURAL GOVERNMENT PRIMARY/UPPER PRIMARY SCHOOL IS ENTITLED TO EACH OF THESE SSA GRANTS EVERY YEAR.

| How much goes to |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| each school | For what purposes |

SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT GRANT / SCHOOL GRANT
Rs. 5000 per year per primary school

Rs. 7000 per year per upper primary school

## Rs 5000 + Rs $7000=$

 Rs 12000 if the school is Std I-VIIIVIII.Note: Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same premises.

## SCHOOL MAINTENANCE GRANT

Rs. 5000 - Rs 7500 per school per year if the school has upto 3 classrooms.

Rs 7500 - Rs. 10000 per year if the school has more than 3 classrooms.

Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same building.

This grant can be used for maintenance of school building, including whitewashing; beautification; and repair of toilets, hand pump, boundary wall, playground etc.

The grant amount depends on number of classrooms (excluding Headmaster room and office room)

## TLM GRANT

Rs. 500 per teacher per year in primary and upper primary schools.

This grant can be used by teachers to buy teaching aids, such as charts, globes, posters, models etc.
Table 18: Performance of schools with respect to selected Right to Education indicators

| State |  |  |  | PTR \& Classrooms |  |  |  |  |  | School Facilities |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | \% Schools complying with | \% Schools that have |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Pupil teacher ratio | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Teacher } \\ & \text { classroom ratio } \end{aligned}$ |  |  | Office/ Store/ Office cum store |  |  | Playground |  |  | Boundary wall |  |  | Drinking water provision \& available |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Toilet available } \\ \text { and } \\ \text { useable } \end{gathered}$ |  |  | Girls toilet available and useable |  |  | Kitchen shed for cooking midday meal |  |  |
|  |  |  | 2010 | 2011 | 12012 | 2010 | 2011 | 12012 | 2010 | 2011 | 12012 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2010 | 20112 | 2012 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2010 | 201 | 2012 |
| Andhra Pradesh | 632 | 642 |  | 649 | 49961.7 | 56.4 | 564 | 53.4 | 66.5 | 61.1 | 645 | 70.5 | 61.6 | 70.5 | 68.9 | 67.7 | 52. | 49.3 | 499 | 64.8 | 60.8 | 66.3 | 38.6 | 33.4 | 47.7 | 25.4 | 28.1 | 38.2 | 7.0 | 62.8 |  |
| Arunachal Prades | 259 | 250 |  |  | 7398.0 | 70.2 | 77.1 | 79.8 | 73.3 | 74.6 | 77.7 | 729 | 80.0 | 58.9 | 66.4 | 58.5 | 245 | 34.9 | 40.4 | 53.2 | 58.1 | 46.0 | 25.3 | 27.2 | 40. | 12.2 | 192 | 26.9 | 64.0 | 63.1 |  |
| Assam | 519 | 510 |  | 492 | 23.36 | 29.0 | 35.2 | 67.7 | 649 | 64.4 | 57.5 | 542 | 49.3 | 61.5 | 56. | 59.3 | 19.1 | 23.3 | 27.8 | 60.9 | 646 | 65.4 | 33.1 | 37.8 | 52.8 | 13.7 | 27.4 | 40.4 | 80.2 | 81.7 | 84 |
| Bihar | 967 | 1022 | 1057 | 858 | 53 | 8.5 | 48.2 | 54.2 | 56.7 | 69.0 | 66.0 | 69.0 | 483 | 49.1 | 43.1 | 48.1 | 47. | 47.9 | 78.7 | 83.8 | 85.4 | 33.6 | 45.7 | 51.2 | 18.1 | 35.4 | 42.0 | 640 | 71.6 |  |
| Chhatisgarh | 425 | 392 | 430 | 30396 | 51.3 | 483 | 642 | 59.6 | 70.2 | 79.0 | 76.0 | 80.9 | 45.0 | 46.3 | 49.2 | 488 | 48.7 | 50.5 | 77.6 | 73.3 | 79.2 | 29.6 | 26.8 | 51.4 | 20.0 | 20.7 | 41.6 | 86.1 | 86.8 | 89 |
| Gujarat | 62 | 650 | 692 | 62.7 | 62.0 | 553 | 842 | 87.6 | 74.7 | 802 | 828 | 79.0 | 75.5 | 83.4 | 79.7 | 84. | 91.0 | 87.4 | 79.4 | 83. | 823 | 648 | 69.5 | 70.0 | 49.7 | 67.7 | 65.8 | 88. | 92.2 |  |
| Haryana | 528 | 389 | 513 | 40.3 | 41.2 | 403 | 75.1 | 70.9 | 76.7 | 858 | 80.6 | 84.0 | 79.7 | 78.9 | 82.3 | 82. | 83. | 889 | 74.6 | 783 | 75.7 | 67.9 | 70.1 | 73.5 | 52.8 | 68.0 | 70.8 | 51.0 | 60.5 | 68 |
| Himachal Pradest | ${ }^{261}$ | 274 | 239 | 60.6 | 65.3 | 68.0 | 76.7 | 77.4 | 78.4 | 75.9 | 77. | 74.8 | 75.6 | 70.0 | 743 | 37. | 42. | 49.4 | 83.2 | 81.8 | 83. | 56.0 | 68.5 | 74.2 | 38.7 | 649 | 70.4 | 82.5 | 39.5 |  |
| Jammu \& Kashmi |  | 357 | 387 |  | 87. | 84.2 |  | 498 | 50.0 |  | 81.8 | 79.5 |  | 52.5 | 48.2 |  | 288 | 26.7 |  | 46. | 50.5 |  | ${ }^{363}$ | 49.0 |  | 224 | 30.6 |  | 70.6 |  |
| Jharkhand | 547 | 537 | 438 | 8811.2 | 153 | 15.0 | 81.2 | 77.3 | 76. | 849 | 844 | 85.0 | 37.9 | 34.0 | 37.5 | 27. | 25. | 21.6 | 73.8 | 80.6 | ${ }^{8.1}$ | 26.8 | 37.5 | 37.0 | 20.9 | 366 | 32.0 | 73.5 | 6.2 |  |
| Karnataka | 769 | 781 | 756 | 5694 | 71.2 | 669 | 828 | 85.0 | 83.2 | 72.1 | 74.0 | 76.2 | 66.0 | 70.8 | 73.1 | 593 | 69.0 | 70.2 | 75.8 | 81. | 81.3 | 38.4 | 44.2 | 59.5 | 31.8 | 41.1 | 54. | 92. | 94.0 |  |
| Kerala | 275 | 328 | 347 | 89.2 | 94.1 | 92. | 80.3 | 77.6 | 89.5 | 884 | 90.2 | 91.3 | 76.3 | 79.1 | 66.5 | 81.8 | 86 | 72.9 | 85 | 938 | 85.1 | 58. | 71.6 | 75.7 | 43. | 68.6 | 73 | 98.1 | 97.8 |  |
| Madhya Pradesh | 1219 | 1195 | 1211 | 19.4 | 21.5 | 32.9 | 81.4 | 75.0 | 68.9 | 69.5 | 64.2 | 67.2 | 61.1 | 55.4 | 56.6 | 37.3 | 36. | 37.8 | 78.5 | 68.6 | 70.5 | 50.3 | 319 | 46.7 | 28.9 | 23.4 | 34 | 89.9 | 869 | 88. |
| Maharashtra | 902 | 829 | 823 | 58. | 62. | 632 | 87.6 | 81.9 | 83.4 | 343 | 33.3 | 27.0 | 84.7 | 82.9 | 84.0 | 57. | 58. | 52.8 | 69.0 | ${ }^{73 .}$ | 69.6 | 53.0 | 44.9 | 57.3 | 43.2 | 42.6 | 53. | 8.2 | 74.8 |  |
| Manipur | 125 | 133 | 185 | 743 | 88. | 86.3 | 62. | 41.4 | 41.0 | 67. | 67.2 | 66. | 71.8 | 41.5 | 50.0 | 11.3 | 6.6 | 68 | 5.1 | 6.4 | 7.2 | 40.2 | 35.2 | 41.1 | 8.4 | 153 | 23.1 | 58.4 | 42.9 |  |
| Meghalaya | 110 | ${ }^{85}$ | $5 \quad 129$ | 543 | 51.4 | 554 | 842 | 62. | 72.7 | 346 | 42.1 | 41.6 | 45.8 | 40.0 | 37.1 | 142 | 14.1 | 12.7 | 23.9 | 9.9 | 13.6 | 24.5 | 24.4 | 30.9 | 14.8 | 186 | 19.3 | 60.6 | 70.5 |  |
| Mizoram | 174 | 148 | 192 | 89.1 | 75.2 | 86.6 | 57.6 | 94.8 | 75.0 | 78. | 92.1 | 77.5 | 39.0 | 70.7 | 45.3 | 37. | 47.8 | 45.3 | 48.5 | 71.0 | 64. | 55.6 | 52.1 | 44.2 | 30.8 | 33.1 | 29.9 | 96.2 | 98.6 |  |
| Nagaland | 223 | 217 | 272 | 2721.9 | 85.5 | 93.0 | 78.6 | 61.1 | 63.3 | 838 | 923 | 86.9 | 64.2 | 65.6 | 41.6 | 428 | 34.5 | 52.9 | 37.0 | 23.4 | 22.2 | 53.9 | 60.0 | 52.5 | 30.6 | 497 | 32.7 | 81.7 | 91.8 |  |
| Odisha | ${ }^{741}$ | 769 | 809 | 22.5 | 25.7 | 28.0 | 74.0 | 79.1 | 78.2 | 74.7 | 83.0 | 80.4 | 44.4 | 36.5 | 31.4 | 40.8 | 46.1 | 44.9 | 70.3 | 74.5 | 78.7 | 44.4 | 51.8 | 493 | 34.7 | 468 | 41.4 | 74.4 | 78.4 |  |
| Punjab | 449 | 489 | 525 | 349 | 30.4 | 34.6 | 769 | 82. | 80.3 | 785 | 793 | 80.0 | 693 | 71.2 | 71.0 | 828 | 83. | 83.0 | 83. | 82. | 828 | 61.2 | 58.7 | 70.5 | 49.4 | 562 | 65.6 | 94.7 | 93.9 |  |
| Rajasthan | 896 | 872 | 87 | 46.4 | 47.4 | 51.1 | 820 | 83. | 80. | 91.2 | 894 | 89.0 | 51.7 | 57.4 | 57.7 | 70.1 | 72.7 | 77. | 68.0 | 69.5 | 67.1 | 65.4 | 69.9 | 72.0 | 50.3 | 663 | 65.1 | 838 | 84.7 |  |
| Tami Nadu | 662 | ${ }^{683}$ | 630 | 47. | 523 | 493 | 75. | 75.0 | 81.7 | 548 | 493 | 50.1 | 68.7 | 67.7 | 69.7 | 60.7 | 58.9 | 66.1 | 80.5 | 77.6 | 80.8 | 44.6 | 48.4 | 689 | 35.1 | 42. | 62.2 | 96.7 | 96.7 |  |
| Tripura | 98 | 4 | 102 | 12268.5 | 75.0 | 82.6 | 60.0 | 46.2 | 63.6 | 89.6 | 76.6 | 83.7 | 89.5 | 78.7 | 92.0 | 19.4 | 25.3 | 20.0 | 40.0 | 40.2 | 48. | 43.0 | 30.8 | 50.0 | 30.3 | 21.9 | 33.0 | 882 | 90.4 | 95. |
| Uttar Pradesh | 1896 | 190 | 1888 | 1888 16.1 | 16.5 | 15.6 | 81.6 | 80.3 | 78.3 | 88.6 | 88.1 | 88.4 | 608 | 71.1 | 66.9 | 44.4 | 57.9 | 58.5 | 82.2 | 34.4 | 81.3 | 47.4 | 53.9 | 52.5 | 33.9 | 47.4 | 43.7 | 893 | 94.7 |  |
| Uttarakhand | 337 | 297 | 287 | 87 | 163 | 23.2 | 87.4 | 84.7 | 89.1 | 87. | 83.0 | 84.9 | 67.0 | 67.5 | 65.0 | 668 | 61.1 | 56.9 | 68.3 | 682 | 71.0 | 53.4 | 59.7 | 64.4 | 24.0 | 53. | 52.9 | 96.3 | 94.1 |  |
| West Bengal | 408 | 401 | 408 | 826.2 | 34.4 | 332 | 648 | 64.5 | 67.4 | 79.0 | 80.9 | 78.3 | 42.1 | 50.5 | 54.3 | 345 | 42.2 | 44.0 | 67.2 | 63.4 | 71.9 | 52.1 | 49.5 | 58.8 | 23.7 | 41.2 | 44.0 | 86.3 | 86.8 |  |
| ndia | 1420 | 14 | 11459 | 389 | 40.8 | 428 | 76.2 | 74.3 | 13.7 | 4.1 | 74.1 | 73.5 | 2.0 | 62.8 | 61.1 | 51.0 | 53.9 | 54.7 | 72.7 | 73.5 | 73.0 | 47.2 | 49.0 | 56.5 | 329 | 43.7 | 48.2 | 82.1 | 83.7 |  |

Table 19: Other selected indicators in schools




## Andhra Pradesh rural

## ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM HOUSEHOLDS. 22 OUT OF 22 DISTRICTS <br> Data has not been presented where sample size was insufficient.

## School enrollment and out of school children

Table 1: \% Children in different types of schools 2012

| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in <br> school | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age: 6-14 ALL | 60.3 | 36.5 | 0.6 | 2.6 | 100 |
| Age: 7-16 ALL | 59.8 | 34.5 | 0.6 | 5.1 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 57.6 | 40.9 | 0.4 | 1.2 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 BOYS | 52.8 | 45.8 | 0.4 | 1.0 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 GIRLS | 62.3 | 36.1 | 0.4 | 1.3 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 ALL | 65.3 | 29.3 | 0.8 | 4.5 | 100 |
| Age: $11-14$ BOYS | 61.3 | 34.6 | 0.7 | 3.4 | 100 |
| Age: $11-14$ GIRLS | 69.4 | 24.1 | 0.9 | 5.6 | 100 |
| Age: $15-16$ ALL | 51.5 | 31.3 | 0.4 | 16.8 | 100 |
| Age: $15-16$ BOYS | 49.8 | 33.6 | 0.4 | 16.2 | 100 |
| Age: $15-16$ GIRLS | 53.4 | 28.7 | 0.5 | 17.4 | 100 |

Note: 'Other' includes children going to madarsa and EGS
'Not in school' $=$ dropped out + never enrolled.

Chart 2: Trends over time
\% Children enrolled in private schools by class 2008-2012


## Young children in pre-school and school

Table 3: \% Children age 3-6 who are enrolled in different types of pre-school and school 2012

|  | In balwadi or anganwadi | In LKG/ UKG | In School |  |  | Not in school or preschool | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Govt. | Pvt. | Other |  |  |
| Age 3 | 68.9 | 9.1 |  |  |  | 22.0 | 100 |
| Age 4 | 56.6 | 35.8 |  |  |  | 7.5 | 100 |
| Age 5 | 16.7 | 4.2 | 29.9 | 46.8 | 0.2 | 2.2 | 100 |
| Age 6 | 2.2 | 1.9 | 47.3 | 46.7 | 0.3 | 1.6 | 100 |

Chart 1: Trends over time
\% Children out of school by age group and gender 2006-2012


How to read this chart: Each line shows trends in the proportion of children out of school for a particular subset of children. For example, the proportion of girls (age 1114) not in school has changed from $8.6 \%$ in 2006 to $8.1 \%$ in 2007 to $6.6 \%$ in 2008 , $10.8 \%$ in 2009 and to $6.6 \%$ in 2010 to $5.6 \%$ in 2012.

Table 2: Sample description
\% Children in each class by age 2012

| Std. | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 21.2 | 48.5 | 20.4 | 7.1 | 2.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| \|| | 1.6 | 10.2 | 49.7 | 25.0 | 9.7 | 3.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| III |  | 1.7 | 14.1 | 51.0 | 22.6 | 7.7 | 3.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| IV | 2.1 |  |  | 13.5 | 49.1 | 24.6 | 7.1 | 3.6 |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| V | 2.7 |  |  |  | 8.6 | 55.0 | 22.8 | 8.2 | 2.7 |  |  |  | 100 |
| VI | 1.8 |  |  |  |  | 9.4 | 47.9 | 31.4 | 7.7 | 1.8 |  |  | 100 |
| VII | 2.4 |  |  |  |  |  | 10.3 | 57.8 | 23.7 | 5.8 |  |  | 100 |
| VIII | 2.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 16.2 | 54.0 | 22.3 |  | . 5 | 100 |

How to read this table: If a child started school in Std I at age 6, she should be of age 8 in Std III. This table shows the age distribution for each class. For example, in Std III, $51.0 \%$ children are 8 years old but there also $14.1 \%$ who are $7,22.6 \%$ who are 9 and $7.7 \%$ who are 10 years old and $3.0 \%$ who are older.

Chart 3: Trends over time
\% Children age 3, 4 and 5 not enrolled in school or pre-school 2006-2012*


[^3]
## Andhra Pradesh rural

## Reading

Table 4: \% Children by class and READING level All schools 2012

| Std. | Not even <br> letter | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (Std I Text) | Level 2 <br> (Std II Text) | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 25.1 | 50.6 | 19.5 | 3.4 | 1.5 | 100 |
| II | 6.6 | 28.6 | 42.1 | 14.2 | 8.5 | 100 |
| III | 4.5 | 13.7 | 33.1 | 23.0 | 25.7 | 100 |
| IV | 2.4 | 8.2 | 22.4 | 25.3 | 41.8 | 100 |
| V | 1.3 | 4.5 | 12.6 | 22.2 | 59.4 | 100 |
| VI | 1.2 | 2.8 | 9.8 | 19.4 | 66.8 | 100 |
| VII | 0.8 | 2.0 | 5.6 | 12.4 | 79.2 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.3 | 0.9 | 3.3 | 8.5 | 87.0 | 100 |
| Total | 5.4 | 14.3 | 18.9 | 16.3 | 45.1 | 100 |

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level in reading achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, $4.5 \%$ children cannot even read letters, $13.7 \%$ can read letters but not more, 33.1 \% can read words but not Std I text or higher, $23 \%$ can read Std I text but not Std II level text, and $25.7 \%$ can read Std II level text. For each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is $100 \%$.

Chart 4: Trends over time
\% Children in Std III who CAN READ Std I level text By school type 2009-2012


## Reading Tool



Chart 5: Trends over time
\% Children in Std V who CAN READ Std II level text By school type 2009-2012


## Reading and comprehension in English

Table 5: \% Children by class and READING level in ENGLISH All schools 2012

| Std. | Not <br> even <br> capital <br> letters | Capital <br> letters | Small <br> letters | Simple <br> words | Easy <br> sen- <br> tences | Total <br> I <br> 28.4 <br> 26.7 <br> 18.1 <br> 18.3 <br> II <br> 7.6 <br> 19.7 <br> 26.9 <br> 28.0 <br> 17.9 |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| III | 6.2 | 12.2 | 20.3 | 34.2 | 27.2 | 100 |
| IV | 4.6 | 7.3 | 15.3 | 37.9 | 34.9 | 100 |
| V | 2.5 | 4.8 | 13.3 | 32.2 | 47.2 | 100 |
| VI | 0.9 | 2.5 | 7.8 | 29.9 | 59.0 | 100 |
| VII | 1.1 | 1.4 | 7.7 | 20.9 | 68.8 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.4 | 0.9 | 5.1 | 16.7 | 76.9 | 100 |
| Total | 6.7 | 9.7 | 14.5 | 27.6 | 41.5 | 100 |

Table 6: \% Children by class who CAN COMPREHEND ENGLISH All schools 2012
$\left.\begin{array}{l|c|c}\hline \text { Std. } & \begin{array}{c}\text { Of those who } \\ \text { can read words } \\ \text { \% who can tell } \\ \text { meanings of } \\ \text { the words }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Of those who } \\ \text { can read }\end{array} \\ \hline \text { sentences, \% who } \\ \text { can tell meanings } \\ \text { of the sentences }\end{array}\right]$

## English Tool



## Andhra Pradesh rural

## Arithmetic

Table 7: \% Children by class and ARITHMETIC level
All schools 2012

| Std. | Not even 1-9 | Recognize numbers |  | Can subtract | Can divide | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1-9 | 10-99 |  |  |  |
| I | 19.0 | 38.9 | 37.1 | 4.1 | 0.8 | 100 |
| \\| | 2.8 | 16.8 | 57.8 | 19.9 | 2.8 | 100 |
| III | 1.6 | 7.6 | 40.5 | 42.4 | 8.0 | 100 |
| IV | 0.9 | 3.8 | 27.7 | 43.9 | 23.8 | 100 |
| V | 0.6 | 1.7 | 16.4 | 40.3 | 41.1 | 100 |
| VI | 0.2 | 0.7 | 12.7 | 34.2 | 52.3 | 100 |
| VII | 0.2 | 0.9 | 11.5 | 28.6 | 58.8 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.1 | 0.1 | 9.0 | 25.0 | 65.9 | 100 |
| Total | 3.3 | 9.0 | 27.0 | 30.0 | 30.7 | 100 |

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level in arithmetic achieved by a child. For example, in Std 3, 1.6\% children cannot even recognize numbers 1-9, 7.6\% can recognize numbers up to 9 but not more, $40.5 \%$ can recognize numbers to 99 but cannot do subtraction, $42.4 \%$ can do subtraction but not division, and $8.0 \%$ can do division. For each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is $100 \%$.

Chart 6: Trends over time
\% Children in Std III who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more By school type 2009-2012



## Math Tool



Chart 7: Trends over time
\% Children in Std V who CAN DO DIVISION
By school type 2009-2012


## Andhra Pradesh rural

## Type of school and paid tuition classes

The ASER survey recorded information about tuition by asking the following question: "Does the child take any paid tuition class currently?" Therefore the numbers given below do not include any unpaid supplemental help in learning that children may have received.

Table 8: Trends over time
\% Children attending paid tuition classes

## By school type 2009-2012

| Children in Std I-VIII | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Govt. schools: \% Children <br> attending paid tuition classes | 22.9 | 13.9 | 14.5 | 10.5 |
| Private schools: \% Children <br> attending paid tuition classes | 36.7 | 26.3 | 26.8 | 23.1 |
| All schools: \% Children <br> attending paid tuition classes | 27.3 | 18.3 | 18.8 | 15.0 |

Table 9: Trends over time
\% Children by school type and tuition 2009-2012

| Year | Category |  | Std II | Std V | Std VIII | Std I-VIII |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2009 | Govt. | No tuition | 47.3 | 56.3 | 62.1 | 52.7 |
|  |  | Tuition | 14.0 | 18.4 | 15.3 | 15.7 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 23.0 | 15.9 | 13.7 | 20.0 |
|  |  | Tuition | 15.7 | 9.4 | 8.9 | 11.6 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 2010 | Govt. | No tuition | 49.4 | 57.3 | 64.7 | 55.6 |
|  |  | Tuition | 7.8 | 8.3 | 9.6 | 9.0 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 31.5 | 25.4 | 19.4 | 26.1 |
|  |  | Tuition | 11.3 | 9.1 | 6.3 | 9.3 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 2011 | Govt. | No tuition | 48.4 | 56.7 | 67.1 | 56.0 |
|  |  | Tuition | 8.4 | 12.8 | 7.3 | 9.5 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 32.4 | 20.9 | 18.1 | 25.2 |
|  |  | Tuition | 10.8 | 9.6 | 7.6 | 9.2 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 2012 | Govt. | No tuition | 48.8 | 61.0 | 68.0 | 57.9 |
|  |  | Tuition | 6.6 | 7.7 | 6.9 | 6.8 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 34.0 | 24.2 | 19.1 | 27.2 |
|  |  | Tuition | 10.6 | 7.2 | 6.0 | 8.2 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Chart 9: Trends over time
\% Children in Std III-V who CAN READ a Std I level text or more By school type and tuition 2009-2012



Chart 8: Trends over time
\% Children in Std I-VIII by school type and tuition 2009-2012


## ■Govt+No Tuition ■ Govt+Tuition $\quad$ Pvt+No Tuition $\quad$ Pvt+Tuition

How to read this chart: This chart is a visual representation of the last column of Table 9 For a given year, the width of each colour band represents the \% of children in the corresponding category. For each year, these four categories add upto $100 \%$.

## Chart 10: Trends over time

\% Children in Std III-V who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more By school type and tuition 2009-2012


## Andhra Pradesh rural

## School observations

In each year's ASER, from 2009 onwards, in each sampled village, the largest government school with primary sections was visited on the day of the survey. Information about schools in this report is based on these visits.

Table 10: Number of schools visited 2009-2012

| Type of school | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| Std I-IVNV: Primary | 477 | 475 | 510 | 523 |
| Std I-VIIINIII: Primary + <br> Upper primary | 156 | 157 | 132 | 126 |
| Total schools visited | 633 | 632 | 642 | 649 |

Table 12: Small schools and multigrade classes 2009-2012

| School characteristics | Std I-IVN |  |  |  | Std I-VIINIII |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| \% Schools with total enrollment of 60 or less | 33.5 | 30.1 | 34.3 | 31.4 | 10.3 | 12.2 | 10.1 | 9.6 |
| \% Schools where Std II children observed <br> sitting with one or more other classes | 66.3 | 62.9 | 63.6 | 62.6 | 59.9 | 55.6 | 48.8 | 55.4 |
| \% Schools where Std IV children observed <br> sitting with one or more other classes | 58.6 | 53.9 | 58.7 | 57.2 | 52.5 | 48.7 | 44.1 | 43.6 |

## RTE indicators

Table 13: Schools meeting selected RTE norms 2010-2012

| \% Schools meeting the following RTE norms: |  | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pupil-teacher \& classroomteacher norms | Pupil-teacher ratio | 61.7 | 56.4 | 56.4 |
|  | Classroom-teacher ratio | 53.4 | 66.5 | 61.1 |
| Building | Office/store/office cum store | 64.5 | 70.5 | 61.6 |
|  | Playground | 70.5 | 68.9 | 67.7 |
|  | Boundary wall/fencing | 52.9 | 49.3 | 49.9 |
| Drinking water | No facility for drinking water | 22.8 | 23.1 | 18.7 |
|  | Facility but no drinking water available | 12.4 | 16.2 | 15.0 |
|  | Drinking water available | 64.8 | 60.8 | 66.3 |
| Toilet | No toilet facility | 23.4 | 24.6 | 15.6 |
|  | Facility but toilet not useable | 38.1 | 42.0 | 36.8 |
|  | Toilet useable | 38.6 | 33.4 | 47.7 |
| Girls toilet | \% Schools with no separate provisions for girls toilets | 53.1 | 39.9 | 32.6 |
|  | Of schools with separate girls toilets, \% schools with |  |  |  |
|  | Toilet locked | 9.2 | 10.2 | 12.2 |
|  | Toilet not useable | 12.3 | 21.8 | 17.0 |
|  | Toilet useable | 25.4 | 28.1 | 38.2 |
| Library | No library | 8.0 | 5.4 | 5.3 |
|  | Library but no books being used by children on day of visit | 14.4 | 20.8 | 20.3 |
|  | Library books being used by children on day of visit | 77.6 | 73.9 | 74.4 |
| Mid-day meal | Kitchen shed for cooking mid-day meal | 67.0 | 62.8 | 62.8 |
|  | Mid-day meal served in school on day of visit | 99.2 | 99.1 | 98.3 |

Table 11: Student and teacher attendance on the day of the visit 2009-2012

| Type of school | Std I-IVN |  |  |  | Std I-VIINIII |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| \% Enrolled children <br> present (Average) | 76.1 | 72.4 | 75.2 | 75.5 | 76.9 | 72.6 | 74.4 | 78.0 |
| \% Teachers present <br> (Average) | 80.1 | 83.0 | 85.5 | 84.8 | 81.2 | 82.7 | 77.0 | 79.6 |



The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act, 2009 specifies a series of norms and standards for a school.

Norms for number of teachers vary according to the level of the school (primary or upper primary) and total student enrollment.

Norms for classrooms require the school to have at least one classroom for every teacher.

Norms for facilities require schools to provide each of the facilities mentioned in Table 13, among others.

RTE norms regulate provision of facilities but not their useability. ASER school observations also include whether facilities could be used. This information is included in Table 13.

## Andhra Pradesh rural

## School funds and activities (PAISA)

Table 14: \% Schools that report receiving SSA grants - Full financial year

| SSA school grants | April 2009 to <br> March 2010 |  |  |  | April 2010 to March 2011 |  |  |  | April 2011 to <br> March 2012 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No. } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Sch. } \end{aligned}$ | \% Schools |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { No. } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { Sch. } \end{gathered}$ | \% Schools |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { No. } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { Sch. } \end{gathered}$ | \% Schools |  |  |
|  |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | Yes | No | Don't know |
| Maintenance grant | 601 | 91.4 | 2.7 | 6.0 | 631 | 92.4 | 4.0 | 3.7 | 644 | 97.2 | 0.8 | 2.0 |
| Development grant | 589 | 87.8 | 5.6 | 6.6 | 623 | 88.4 | 7.5 | 4.0 | 637 | 92.0 | 5.7 | 2.4 |
| TLM grant | 595 | 92.1 | 3.7 | 4.2 | 623 | 91.0 | 5.8 | 3.2 | 641 | 91.6 | 5.9 | 2.5 |

Table 15: \% Schools that report receiving SSA grants - Half financial year

| SSA school grants | April 2010 to date of survey (2010) |  |  |  | April 2011 to date of survey (2011) |  |  |  | April 2012 to date of survey (2012) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { No. } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { Sch. } \end{array}$ | \% Schools |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { No. } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { Sch. } \end{gathered}$ | \% Schools |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No. } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Sch. } \end{aligned}$ | \% Schools |  |  |
|  |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |  | Yes | No | Don't know |
| Maintenance grant | 576 | 62.2 | 21.7 | 16.2 | 606 | 64.9 | 26.6 | 8.6 | 616 | 79.6 | 15.8 | 4.7 |
| Development grant | 552 | 58.2 | 26.3 | 15.6 | 598 | 62.7 | 28.3 | 9.0 | 607 | 77.8 | 17.5 | 4.8 |
| TLM grant | 545 | 54.3 | 31.0 | 14.7 | 600 | 58.3 | 33.0 | 8.7 | 604 | 41.9 | 53.2 | 5.0 |

Table 16: \% Schools carrying out different activities since April 2011

| Type of Activity |  | \% Schools |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Yes | No | Don't know |
| Const. | New Classroom | 25.9 | 71.9 | 2.2 |
| Repairs | Repair of building (roof, floor, wall etc.) | 41.6 | 56.7 | 1.7 |
|  | Repair of doors \& windows | 47.7 | 50.4 | 1.9 |
|  | Repair of boundary wall | 14.4 | 83.2 | 2.4 |
|  | Repair of drinking water facility | 43.4 | 54.2 | 2.4 |
|  | Repair of toilet | 43.2 | 54.9 | 1.9 |
| Painting \& whitewash | White wash/plastering | 64.9 | 33.5 | 1.6 |
|  | Painting blackboard/Display board/Painting on wall | 76.1 | 22.5 | 1.4 |
|  | Painting of doors \& walls | 43.4 | 55.3 | 1.3 |
| Purchase | Purchase of furniture (cupboard etc.) | 47.9 | 49.9 | 2.2 |
|  | Purchase of electrical fittings | 66.1 | 32.0 | 1.9 |
|  | Purchase of chalk, duster, register etc. | 96.8 | 2.1 | 1.1 |
|  | Purchase of sitting mats/Tat patti | 37.3 | 60.5 | 2.3 |
|  | Purchase of charts, globes \& other teaching material | 91.9 | 6.9 | 1.3 |
| Other | Expenditure on school events | 79.3 | 17.7 | 3.1 |
|  | Payment of bills (electricity, water, cleaning etc.) | 82.2 | 15.6 | 2.2 |

The PAISA section of ASER tracks receipt and spending of Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) grants at the school level. This information is collected from schools visited during the survey. This page reports proportion of schools receiving the grants and carrying out specified activities in the schools. More detailed analysis of the PAISA data will be available in the PAISA 2012 report which will be released in March 2013. ${ }^{1}$

## EVERY RURAL GOVERNMENT PRIMARY/UPPER

 PRIMARY SCHOOL IS ENTITLED TO EACH OF THESE SSA GRANTS EVERY YEAR.How much goes to each school

For what purposes

## SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT GRANT / SCHOOL GRANT

Rs. 5000 per year per primary school

Rs. 7000 per year per upper primary school

Rs 5000 + Rs $7000=$ Rs 12000 if the school is Std I-VIINIII.

Note: Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same premises.

This grant can be used for buying school equipment such as blackboard, sitting mats etc. Also for buying chalk, duster, registers and other office equipment.

The grant amount varies by type of school: whether it is a primary or upper primary school.

## SCHOOL MAINTENANCE GRANT

Rs. 5000 - Rs 7500 per school per year if the school has upto 3 classrooms.

Rs 7500 - Rs. 10000 per year if the school has more than 3 classrooms.

Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same building.

This grant can be used for maintenance of school building, including whitewashing; beautification; and repair of toilets, hand pump, boundary wall, playground etc.

The grant amount depends on number of classrooms (excluding Headmaster room and office room)

TLM GRANT

| Rs. 500 per teacher per |
| :--- | :--- |
| year in primary and upper |
| primary schools. | | This grant can be used by |
| :--- |
| teachers to buy teaching |
| aids, such as charts, globes, |
| posters, models etc. |

${ }^{1}$ For more information see www.accountabilityindia.in

# Arunachal Pradesh rural 

## ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM HOUSEHOLDS. 10 OUT OF 13 DISTRICTS

Data has not been presented where sample size was insufficient.

## School enrollment and out of school children

Table 1: \% Children in different types of schools 2012

| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in <br> school | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age: 6-14 ALL | 75.3 | 21.7 | 0.3 | 2.7 | 100 |
| Age: 7-16 ALL | 77.0 | 18.1 | 0.3 | 4.6 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 74.2 | 23.5 | 0.4 | 2.0 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 BOYS | 75.3 | 22.2 | 0.3 | 2.2 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 GIRLS | 72.3 | 25.2 | 0.5 | 1.9 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 ALL | 79.2 | 16.5 | 0.1 | 4.2 | 100 |
| Age: $11-14$ BOYS | 77.3 | 18.0 | 0.2 | 4.5 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 GIRLS | 81.2 | 15.1 | 0.0 | 3.7 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 ALL | 80.2 | 6.9 | 0.4 | 12.5 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 BOYS | 78.3 | 7.5 | 0.0 | 14.2 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 GIRLS | 81.9 | 6.7 | 1.0 | 10.4 | 100 |

Note: 'Other' includes children going to madarsa and EGS.
'Not in school' = dropped out + never enrolled.

## Chart 2: Trends over time

\% Children enrolled in private schools by class 2008-2012


## Young children in pre-school and school

Table 3: \% Children age 3-6 who are enrolled in different types of pre-school and school 2012

|  | In balwadi <br> or <br> anganwadi | In LKG/ <br> UKG | In School |  |  | Not in <br> school <br> or pre- <br> school | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Pvt. | Other |  |  |  |
| Age 3 |  |  |  |  |  | 50.2 | 100 |
| Age 4 | 19.3 | 52.8 |  |  |  | 27.8 | 100 |
| Age 5 | 4.2 | 9.6 | 53.2 | 23.5 | 0.0 | 9.6 | 100 |
| Age 6 | 2.2 | 7.2 | 58.8 | 26.3 | 0.4 | 5.2 | 100 |

Chart 1: Trends over time
\% Children out of school by age group and gender 2006-2012


How to read this chart: Each line shows trends in the proportion of children out of school for a particular subset of children. For example, the proportion of girls (age 1114) not in school has changed from $8.7 \%$ in 2006 to $6.9 \%$ in 2007 to $5.6 \%$ in 2008, $5.7 \%$ in 2009 and to $4.0 \%$ in 2010 to $3.7 \%$ in 2012.
Table 2: Sample description
\% Children in each class by age 2012

| Std. | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 39.1 | 34.8 | 11.1 | 6.7 | 8.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| II | 10.6 | 28.6 | 26.4 | 17.6 | 7.9 | 5.4 | 3.6 |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| III | 6.1 | 10.3 | 17.3 | 35.9 | 11.9 | 10.3 | 8.2 |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| IV |  | 5.9 | 10.5 | 15.5 | 23.9 | 21.5 | 6.2 | 8.9 | 7.5 |  |  |  | 100 |
| V | 3.9 |  |  | 9.8 | 12.3 | 34.7 | 10.0 | 11.0 | 4.6 | 7.3 | 6.5 |  | 100 |
| VI | 6.6 |  |  |  | 5.8 | 14.1 | 20.6 | 23.3 | 13.3 | 10.0 | 6.3 |  | 100 |
| VII | 7.4 |  |  |  |  |  | 9.1 | 36.6 | 20.0 | 11.9 | 7.2 | 7.8 | 100 |
| VIII | 4.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8.9 | 33.1 | 24.8 | 16.1 | 12.5 | 100 |

How to read this table: If a child started school in Std I at age 6, she should be of age 8 in Std III. This table shows the age distribution for each class. For example, in Std III, $35.9 \%$ children are 8 years old but there are also $17.3 \%$ who are $7,11.9 \%$ who are $9,10.3 \%$ who are 10 years old and $8.2 \%$ who are older.

Chart 3: Trends over time
\% Children age 3, 4 and 5 not enrolled in school or pre-school 2006-2012*


[^4]
## Arunachal Pradesh rubal

## Reading

Table 4: \% Children by class and READING level All schools 2012

| Std. | Not even <br> letter | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (Std I Text) | Level 2 <br> (Std II Text) | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 21.2 | 42.8 | 26.9 | 5.1 | 4.1 | 100 |
| II | 7.4 | 28.5 | 39.2 | 19.0 | 6.0 | 100 |
| III | 3.3 | 13.3 | 36.2 | 25.2 | 22.1 | 100 |
| IV | 2.5 | 9.8 | 24.6 | 24.4 | 38.7 | 100 |
| V | 2.2 | 4.8 | 16.0 | 25.2 | 51.8 | 100 |
| VI | 0.0 | 4.0 | 8.5 | 23.1 | 64.5 | 100 |
| VII | 0.7 | 0.9 | 5.4 | 14.9 | 78.1 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.0 | 0.7 | 3.9 | 8.0 | 87.4 | 100 |
| Total | 4.8 | 13.9 | 22.4 | 19.2 | 39.8 | 100 |

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level in reading achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, 3.3\% children cannot even read letters, 13.3\% can read letters but not more, $36.2 \%$ can read words but not Std I text or higher, $25.2 \%$ can read Std I text but not Std II level text, and $22.1 \%$ can read Std II level text. For each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is $100 \%$.

## Chart 4: Trends over time

\% Children in Std III who CAN READ Std I level text By school type 2009-2012


Reading Tool

## inbalienuloodingotiln <br>  Oun dor el ind camen ond inf en it tha nind hatd a <br> innd howei it bepped <br>  <br>  <br> Lasn ther =ete nary montenethebgherw leppy



Chart 5: Trends over time
\% Children in Std V who CAN READ Std II level text By school type 2009-2012


## Reading and comprehension in English

Table 5: \% Children by class and READING level in ENGLISH All schools 2012

| Std. | Not <br> even <br> capital <br> letters | Capital <br> letters | Small <br> letters | Simple <br> words | Easy <br> sen- <br> tences | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 19.4 | 28.5 | 31.1 | 15.8 | 5.3 | 100 |
| II | 7.0 | 16.8 | 30.9 | 35.0 | 10.4 | 100 |
| III | 3.4 | 7.0 | 22.2 | 40.2 | 27.3 | 100 |
| IV | 2.3 | 6.9 | 12.1 | 32.7 | 46.0 | 100 |
| V | 1.9 | 2.9 | 8.0 | 27.6 | 59.7 | 100 |
| VI | 0.1 | 1.2 | 1.5 | 25.1 | 72.1 | 100 |
| VIII | 1.5 | 0.8 | 1.0 | 14.3 | 82.5 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.1 | 0.5 | 1.3 | 9.6 | 88.5 | 100 |
| Total | 4.5 | 8.4 | 15.0 | 27.1 | 44.9 | 100 |

Table 6: \% Children by class who CAN COMPREHEND ENGLISH All schools 2012

| Std. | Of those who <br> can read words <br> \% who can tell <br> meanings of the <br> words | Of those who <br> can read <br> sentences, \% who <br> can tell meanings <br> of the sentences |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| I |  |  |
| III | 61.5 | 72.7 |
| IIII | 55.5 | 73.0 |
| IV | 75.5 | 78.5 |
| V | 69.7 | 87.0 |
| VI |  | 86.2 |
| VIII |  | 90.2 |
| VIII |  | 81.6 |

## English Tool



## Arunachal Pradesh ruaal

## Arithmetic

Table 7: \% Children by class and ARITHMETIC level All schools 2012

| Std. | Not even 1-9 | Recognize numbers |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Can } \\ \text { subtract } \end{gathered}$ | Can divide | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1-9 | 10-99 |  |  |  |
| I | 17.6 | 29.7 | 42.2 | 6.1 | 4.5 | 100 |
| 11 | 6.6 | 14.0 | 52.3 | 21.9 | 5.2 | 100 |
| III | 3.3 | 7.2 | 37.6 | 36.7 | 15.3 | 100 |
| IV | 2.3 | 4.7 | 21.9 | 36.3 | 34.8 | 100 |
| V | 2.1 | 0.7 | 11.2 | 41.3 | 44.7 | 100 |
| VI | 0.8 | 1.0 | 5.6 | 37.6 | 55.0 | 100 |
| VII | 0.8 | 0.2 | 3.0 | 23.4 | 72.7 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.3 | 0.1 | 1.4 | 19.0 | 79.1 | 100 |
| Total | 4.3 | 7.5 | 24.5 | 29.1 | 34.7 | 100 |

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level in arithmetic achieved by a child. For example, in Std 3, 3.3\% children cannot even recognize numbers 1-9, 7.2\% can recognize numbers up to 9 but not more, $37.6 \%$ can recognize numbers to 99 but cannot do subtraction, $36.7 \%$ can do subtraction but not division, and $15.3 \%$ can do division. For each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is $100 \%$.

Chart 6: Trends over time
\% Children in Std III who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more By school type 2009-2012



## Arunachal Pradesh rural

## Type of school and paid tuition classes

The ASER survey recorded information about tuition by asking the following question: "Does the child take any paid tuition class currently?" Therefore the numbers given below do not include any unpaid supplemental help in learning that children may have received.

| Table 8: Trends over time \% Children attending paid tuition classes By school type 2009-2012 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Children in Std I-VIII | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| Govt. schools: \% Children attending paid tuition classes | 11.9 | 9.3 | 8.5 | 13.6 |
| Private schools: \% Children attending paid tuition classes | 48.3 | 35.0 | 26.5 | 47.8 |
| All schools: \% Children attending paid tuition classes | 16.9 | 12.6 | 11.2 | 21.0 |

Table 9: Trends over time
\% Children by school type and tuition 2009-2012

| Year | Category |  | Std II | Std V | Std VIII | Std I-VIII |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2009 | Govt. | No tuition | 74.6 | 77.6 | 76.1 | 76.0 |
|  |  | Tuition | 7.9 | 9.5 | 15.0 | 10.3 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 9.0 | 7.0 | 5.1 | 7.1 |
|  |  | Tuition | 8.5 | 5.8 | 3.9 | 6.6 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 2010 | Govt. | No tuition | 77.1 | 80.7 | 81.2 | 79.0 |
|  |  | Tuition | 7.2 | 8.9 | 7.7 | 8.1 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 11.4 | 6.8 | 8.3 | 8.4 |
|  |  | Tuition | 4.2 | 3.6 | 2.9 | 4.5 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 2011 | Govt. | No tuition | 76.2 | 81.3 | 80.2 | 77.9 |
|  |  | Tuition | 6.2 | 7.5 | 10.3 | 7.3 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 13.2 | 8.2 | 7.1 | 10.9 |
|  |  | Tuition | 4.4 | 3.0 | 2.5 | 3.9 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 2012 | Govt. | No tuition | 62.8 | 70.0 | 72.7 | 67.7 |
|  |  | Tuition | 7.3 | 9.4 | 13.0 | 10.6 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 13.9 | 10.1 | 7.5 | 11.3 |
|  |  | Tuition | 16.0 | 10.6 | 6.8 | 10.4 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Chart 9: Trends over time
\% Children in Std III-V who CAN READ a Std I level text or more By school type and tuition 2009-2012



Chart 8: Trends over time
\% Children in Std I-VIII by school type and tuition 2009-2012


How to read this chart: This chart is a visual representation of the last column of Table 9. For a given year, the width of each colour band represents the \% of children in the corresponding category. For each year, these four categories add upto 100\%.

Chart 10: Trends over time
\% Children in Std III-V who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more By school type and tuition 2009-2012


## Arunachal Pradesh rubal <br> $\overline{\text { Annual Status of Education Report }}$ <br>  <br> Facilitated by PRATHAM

## School observations

In each year's ASER, from 2009 onwards, in each sampled village, the largest government school with primary sections was visited on the day of the survey. Information about schools in this report is based on these visits.

Table 10: Number of schools visited 2009-2012

| Type of school | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Std I-IVN: Primary | 138 | 152 | 169 | 75 |
| Std I-VIINIII: Primary + <br> Upper primary | 138 | 107 | 81 | 64 |
| Total schools visited | 276 | 259 | 250 | 139 |

Table 11: Student and teacher attendance on the day of the visit 2009-2012

| Type of school | Std I-IVN |  |  |  | Std I-VIINIIII |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 |
| 2012 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Enrolled children <br> present (Average) | 86.6 | 82.8 | 78.7 | 83.9 | 88.1 | 82.0 | 82.4 |
| 84.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% Teachers present <br> (Average) | 82.7 | 86.1 | 76.9 | 82.0 | 80.9 | 84.2 | 79.6 |

Table 12: Small schools and multigrade classes 2009-2012

| School characteristics | Std I-IVN |  |  |  | Std I-VIINIII |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| \% Schools with total enrollment of 60 or less | 43.7 | 52.1 | 46.7 | 52.7 | 6.0 | 7.1 | 12.5 | 6.3 |
| \% Schools where Std II children observed <br> sitting with one or more other classes | 54.1 | 35.4 | 28.6 | 28.4 | 44.7 | 23.7 | 19.7 | 17.7 |
| \% Schools where Std IV children observed <br> sitting with one or more other classes | 46.1 | 28.6 | 23.1 | 27.9 | 38.5 | 23.9 | 21.4 | 12.1 |

## RTE indicators

Table 13: Schools meeting selected RTE norms 2010-2012

| \% Schools meeting the following RTE norms: | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Pupil-teacher ratio | Classroom-teacher ratio | 78.0 | 70.2 |
| Building | Office/store/office cum store | 79.1 |  |  |
|  | Playground | 77.7 | 73.3 | 74.6 |
|  | Boundary wall/fencing | 58.9 | 66.4 | 50.0 |
| Drinking water | No facility for drinking water | 24.5 | 34.9 | 40.4 |
|  | Facility but no drinking water available | 36.9 | 33.6 | 47.5 |
|  | Drinking water available | 9.9 | 8.3 | 6.5 |
| Toilet | No toilet facility | 53.2 | 58.1 | 46.0 |
|  | Facility but toilet not useable | 20.8 | 31.1 | 16.3 |
|  | Toilet useable | 53.9 | 41.7 | 43.4 |
|  | \% Schools with no separate provisions for girls toilets | 25.3 | 27.2 | 40.3 |
|  | Of schools with separate girls toilets, \% schools with |  | 55.7 | 41.9 |
|  | Toilet locked | 11.3 | 15.8 | 21.5 |
|  | Toilet not useable | 16.2 | 9.4 | 9.7 |
|  | Toilet useable | 12.2 | 19.2 | 26.9 |
| Library | No library | 87.0 | 82.1 | 82.6 |
|  | Library but no books being used by children on day of visit | 6.7 | 9.2 | 13.8 |
|  | Library books being used by children on day of visit | 6.3 | 8.8 | 3.6 |
| Mid-day meal | Kitchen shed for cooking mid-day meal | 64.0 | 63.1 | 53.7 |
|  | Mid-day meal served in school on day of visit | 47.1 | 50.2 | 54.6 |

The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act, 2009 specifies a series of norms and standards for a school.

Norms for number of teachers vary according to the level of the school (primary or upper primary) and total student enrollment.

Norms for classrooms require the school to have at least one classroom for every teacher.

Norms for facilities require schools to provide each of the facilities mentioned in Table 13, among others.

RTE norms regulate provision of facilities but not their useability. ASER school observations also include whether facilities could be used. This information is included in Table 13.

## Arunachal Pradesh rural

Facilitated by PRATHAM

## School funds and activities (PAISA)

Table 14: \% Schools that report receiving SSA grants - Full financial year

| SSA school grants | April 2009 to March 2010 |  |  |  | April 2010 to March 2011 |  |  |  | April 2011 to <br> March 2012 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { No. } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { Sch. } \end{gathered}$ | \% Schools |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No. } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Sch. } \end{aligned}$ | \% Schools |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No. } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Sch. } \end{aligned}$ | \% Schools |  |  |
|  |  | Yes | No | Don't know |  | Yes | No | Don't know |  | Yes | No | Don't know |
| Maintenance grant | 225 | 80.4 | 8.0 | 11.6 | 242 | 67.8 | 16.1 | 16.1 | 131 | 59.5 | 20.6 | 19.9 |
| Development grant | 215 | 67.0 | 2.6 | 20.5 | 237 | 63.7 | 18.6 | 17.7 | 128 | 52.3 | 27.3 | 20. |
| TLM grant | 223 | 82.5 | 11.2 | 6.3 | 237 | 70.0 | 16.0 | 13.9 | 130 | 60.8 | 22.3 | 16.9 |

The PAISA section of ASER tracks receipt and spending of Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) grants at the school level. This information is collected from schools visited during the survey. This page reports proportion of schools receiving the grants and carrying out specified activities in the schools. More detailed analysis of the PAISA data will be available in the PAISA 2012 report which will be released in March $2013 .{ }^{1}$

## EVERY RURAL GOVERNMENT PRIMARY/UPPER PRIMARY SCHOOL IS ENTITLED TO EACH OF THESE SSA GRANTS EVERY YEAR.

| How much goes to <br> each school | For what purposes |
| :---: | :--- |

SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT GRANT / SCHOOL GRANT
Rs. 5000 per year per This grant can be used for primary school

Rs. 7000 per year per upper primary school
Rs $5000+$ Rs $7000=$
Rs 12000 if the school is
Std I-VIIINIII.

Note: Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same premises.

## SCHOOL MAINTENANCE GRANT

Rs. 5000 - Rs 7500 per school per year if the school has upto 3 classrooms.

Rs 7500 - Rs. 10000 per year if the school has more than 3 classrooms.

Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same building.

This grant can be used for maintenance of school building, including whitewashing; beautification; and repair of toilets, hand pump, boundary wall, playground etc.

The grant amount depends on number of classrooms (excluding Headmaster room and office room)

## TLM GRANT

Rs. 500 per teacher per year in primary and upper primary schools.

This grant can be used by teachers to buy teaching aids, such as charts, globes, posters, models etc.

Facilitated by PRATHAM
ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM HOUSEHOLDS. 19 OUT OF 23 DISTRICTS
Data has not been presented where sample size was insufficient.

## School enrollment and out of school children

Table 1: \% Children in different types of schools 2012

| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in <br> school | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age: 6-14 ALL | 75.4 | 16.0 | 4.2 | 4.4 | 100 |
| Age: 7-16 ALL | 72.9 | 15.7 | 4.4 | 7.0 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 77.6 | 17.1 | 3.0 | 2.3 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 BOYS | 76.1 | 18.5 | 3.3 | 2.1 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 GIRLS | 79.3 | 15.6 | 2.7 | 2.5 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 ALL | 72.5 | 14.5 | 5.8 | 7.3 | 100 |
| Age: $11-14$ BOYS | 70.1 | 16.4 | 4.8 | 8.7 | 100 |
| Age: $11-14$ GIRLS | 75.1 | 12.3 | 6.8 | 5.8 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 ALL | 59.9 | 15.1 | 4.9 | 20.1 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 BOYS | 55.5 | 14.7 | 5.0 | 24.8 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 GIRLS | 64.1 | 15.9 | 5.1 | 14.9 | 100 |

Note: 'Other' includes children going to madarsa and EGS.
'Not in school' = dropped out + never enrolled

Chart 2: Trends over time \% Children enrolled in private schools by class 2008-2012


## Young children in pre-school and school

Table 3: \% Children age 3-6 who are enrolled in different types of pre-school and school 2012

|  | In balwadi or anganwadi | In LKG/ UKG | In School |  |  | Not in school or preschool | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Govt. | Pvt. | Other |  |  |
| Age 3 | 73.2 | 4.7 |  |  |  | 22.1 | 100 |
| Age 4 | 77.4 | 10.6 |  |  |  | 12.1 | 100 |
| Age 5 | 27.2 | 7.3 | 44.8 | 14.2 | 2.0 | 4.6 | 100 |
| Age 6 | 6.3 | 3.1 | 69.3 | 15.9 | 2.7 | 2.7 | 100 |

Chart 1: Trends over time
\% Children out of school by age group and gender 2006-2012


How to read this chart: Each line shows trends in the proportion of children out of school for a particular subset of children. For example, the proportion of girls (age 1114) not in school has changed from $5.0 \%$ in 2006 to $9.9 \%$ in 2007 to $8.3 \%$ in 2008, $6.4 \%$ in 2009 and to $7.4 \%$ in 2010 to $5.8 \%$ in 2012.

Table 2: Sample description
\% Children in each class by age 2012

| Std. | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 25.8 | 41.5 | 22.3 | 6.9 | 3.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| \\| | 3.5 | 13.1 | 38.6 | 30.6 | 8.2 | 6.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| III | 2. | . 4 | 13.5 | 38.8 | 26.7 | 12.8 | 5.8 |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| IV | 2.9 |  |  | 13.7 | 30.5 | 37.4 | 8.1 | 5.1 | 2.3 |  |  |  | 100 |
| V | 4.4 |  |  |  | 8.0 | 38.7 | 28.2 | 15.3 | 5.4 |  |  |  | 100 |
| VI | 3.7 |  |  |  |  | 12.4 | 26.9 | 41.9 | 9.0 | 6.1 |  |  | 100 |
| VII | 4.2 |  |  |  |  |  | 8.6 | 39.0 | 33.0 | 11.2 | 4.1 |  | 100 |
| VIII | 3.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 15.4 | 35.7 | 34.0 | 8.2 | 3.4 | 100 |

How to read this table: If a child started school in Std I at age 6, she should be of age 8 in Std III. This table shows the age distribution for each class. For example, in Std III, $38.8 \%$ children are 8 years old but there also $13.5 \%$ who are $7,26.7 \%$ who are 9 , $12.8 \%$ who are 10 years old and $5.8 \%$ who are older.

ASER 2012

Chart 3: Trends over time
\% Children age 3, 4 and 5 not enrolled in school or pre-school 2006-2012*


* Data for 2011 is not comparable and therefore excluded here.


## Reading

Table 4: \% Children by class and READING level
All schools 2012

| Std. | Not even <br> letter | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (Std I Text) | Level 2 <br> (Std II Text) | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 37.5 | 43.9 | 13.0 | 3.5 | 2.2 | 100 |
| II | 18.8 | 38.8 | 26.1 | 9.5 | 6.9 | 100 |
| IIII | 13.6 | 26.6 | 27.7 | 17.7 | 14.3 | 100 |
| IV | 7.0 | 17.2 | 26.0 | 22.0 | 27.8 | 100 |
| V | 4.6 | 13.8 | 22.3 | 23.1 | 36.3 | 100 |
| VI | 3.5 | 7.2 | 18.3 | 24.2 | 46.7 | 100 |
| VII | 1.3 | 5.4 | 11.5 | 21.8 | 60.0 | 100 |
| VIII | 1.3 | 4.1 | 10.4 | 16.8 | 67.4 | 100 |
| Total | 12.9 | 22.0 | 19.7 | 16.3 | 29.0 | 100 |

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level in reading achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, $13.6 \%$ children cannot even read letters, $26.6 \%$ can read letters but not more, $27.7 \%$ can read words but not Std I text or higher, $17.7 \%$ can read Std I text but not Std II level text, and $14.3 \%$ can read Std II level text. For each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is $100 \%$.

Chart 4: Trends over time
\% Children in Std III who CAN READ Std I level text By school type 2009-2012


## Reading Tool



Chart 5: Trends over time
\% Children in Std V who CAN READ Std II level text By school type 2009-2012


## Reading and comprehension in English

Table 5: \% Children by class and READING level in ENGLISH All schools 2012

| Std. | Not <br> even <br> capital <br> letters | Capital <br> letters | Small <br> letters | Simple <br> words | Easy <br> sen- <br> tences | Total |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| I | 61.3 | 22.5 | 9.3 | 5.4 | 1.5 | 100 |
| II | 39.7 | 27.7 | 17.2 | 11.7 | 3.8 | 100 |
| III | 27.6 | 27.7 | 19.3 | 19.3 | 6.1 | 100 |
| IV | 16.1 | 23.5 | 22.8 | 26.6 | 11.0 | 100 |
| V | 11.1 | 18.1 | 22.9 | 31.6 | 16.3 | 100 |
| VII | 6.8 | 14.5 | 16.4 | 35.5 | 26.9 | 100 |
| VII | 3.1 | 8.6 | 14.8 | 34.6 | 38.8 | 100 |
| VIII | 3.2 | 5.6 | 10.9 | 31.4 | 48.9 | 100 |
| Total | 24.4 | 19.5 | 16.6 | 22.8 | 16.7 | 100 |

Table 6: \% Children by class who CAN COMPREHEND ENGLISH All schools 2012

| Std. | Of those who <br> can read words, <br> \% who can tell <br> meanings of <br> the words | Of those who <br> can read <br> sentences, \% who <br> can tell meanings <br> of the sentences |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| I | 61.9 |  |
| II | 59.6 | 54.0 |
| III | 57.8 | 58.8 |
| IV | 60.5 | 57.5 |
| V | 58.3 | 59.6 |
| VI | 59.7 | 61.4 |
| VII | 61.9 | 58.2 |

English Tool


| A | J Q |  | p |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| R | E |  |  |  |
| Y | N 0 | d | g | t |
| cat red |  | What | the |  |
|  |  | This is | larg | house. |
|  | fan | Ilike | read |  |
|  | bus | She ha | man | books. |
| \% |  | $\pm$ | - | $\pm=$ |

## Assam rural

## Arithmetic

Table 7: \% Children by class and ARITHMETIC level
All schools 2012

| Std. | Not even 1-9 | Recognize numbers |  | Can subtract | Can divide | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1-9 | 10-99 |  |  |  |
| I | 33.6 | 48.4 | 15.3 | 2.3 | 0.4 | 100 |
| II | 13.4 | 45.6 | 31.1 | 9.0 | 0.9 | 100 |
| III | 9.2 | 35.6 | 35.7 | 17.0 | 2.5 | 100 |
| IV | 5.5 | 22.1 | 35.2 | 29.9 | 7.3 | 100 |
| V | 3.7 | 18.2 | 34.6 | 32.1 | 11.4 | 100 |
| VI | 2.5 | 11.4 | 29.8 | 39.4 | 16.9 | 100 |
| VII | 1.1 | 7.3 | 27.2 | 40.7 | 23.8 | 100 |
| VIII | 1.6 | 5.5 | 22.4 | 39.5 | 31.1 | 100 |
| Total | 10.5 | 26.9 | 28.5 | 23.9 | 10.2 | 100 |

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level in arithmetic achieved by a child. For example, in Std 3, 9.2\% children cannot even recognize numbers 1-9, $35.6 \%$ can recognize numbers up to 9 but not more, $35.7 \%$ can recognize numbers to 99 but cannot do subtraction, $17 \%$ can do subtraction but not division, and 2.5\% can do division. For each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is $100 \%$.

## Chart 6: Trends over time

\% Children in Std III who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more
By school type 2009-2012



## Math Tool



Chart 7: Trends over time
\% Children in Std V who CAN DO DIVISION
By school type 2009-2012



## Type of school and paid tuition classes

The ASER survey recorded information about tuition by asking the following question: "Does the child take any paid tuition class currently?" Therefore the numbers given below do not include any unpaid supplemental help in learning that children may have received.

| Table 8: Trends over time <br> \% Children attending paid tuition classes <br> By school type 2009-2012 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Children in Std I-VIII | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| Govt. schools: \% Children attending paid tuition classes | 18.0 | 15.2 | 15.0 | 13.1 |
| Private schools: \% Children attending paid tuition classes | 29.6 | 28.2 | 30.6 | 32.8 |
| All schools: \% Children attending paid tuition classes | 19.8 | 17.2 | 17.4 | 16.4 |

Table 9: Trends over time
\% Children by school type and tuition 2009-2012

| Year | Category |  | Std II | Std V | Std VIII | Std I-VIII |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2009 | Govt | No tuition | 73.6 | 65.6 | 58.3 | 69.2 |
|  |  | Tuition | 10.9 | 17.1 | 24.3 | 15.2 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 11.0 | 12.0 | 12.6 | 11.0 |
|  |  | Tuition | 4.5 | 5.3 | 4.9 | 4.6 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 2010 | Govt | No tuition | 77.6 | 67.6 | 61.6 | 72.1 |
|  |  | Tuition | 7.9 | 14.6 | 22.2 | 13.0 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 10.1 | 12.7 | 11.3 | 10.8 |
|  |  | Tuition | 4.4 | 5.1 | 5.0 | 4.2 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 2011 | Govt | No tuition | 74.3 | 73.4 | 65.2 | 72.2 |
|  |  | Tuition | 10.6 | 12.7 | 21.0 | 12.8 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 10.7 | 9.1 | 8.7 | 10.4 |
|  |  | Tuition | 4.5 | 4.8 | 5.1 | 4.6 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 2012 | Govt | No tuition | 72.9 | 73.4 | 67.0 | 72.2 |
|  |  | Tuition | 7.3 | 11.3 | 18.7 | 10.9 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 13.4 | 10.4 | 7.6 | 11.4 |
|  |  | Tuition | 6.4 | 5.0 | 6.7 | 5.6 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Chart 9: Trends over time
\% Children in Std III-V who CAN READ a Std I level text or more By school type and tuition 2009-2012



Chart 8: Trends over time
\% Children in Std I-VIII by school type and tuition 2009-2012


How to read this chart: This chart is a visual representation of the last column of Table 9. For a given year, the width of each colour band represents the \% of children in the corresponding category. For each year, these four categories add upto 100\%.

Chart 10: Trends over time
\% Children in Std III-V who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more By school type and tuition 2009-2012


Facilitated by PRATHAM

## School observations

In each year's ASER, from 2009 onwards, in each sampled village, the largest government school with primary sections was visited on the day of the survey. Information about schools in this report is based on these visits.

Table 10: Number of schools visited 2009-2012

| Type of school | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Std I-IVN: Primary | 527 | 503 | 483 | 468 |
| Std I-VIINIII: Primary + <br> Upper primary | 26 | 16 | 27 | 24 |
| Total schools visited | 553 | 519 | 510 | 492 |

Table 11: Student and teacher attendance on the day of the visit 2009-2012

| Type of school | Std I-IVN |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| \% Enrolled children <br> present (Average) | 70.8 | 69.0 | 71.1 | 71.0 |
| \% Teachers present <br> (Average) | 88.1 | 90.8 | 92.8 | 90.5 |

Table 12: Small schools and multigrade classes 2009-2012

| School characteristics | Std I-IVN |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| \% Schools with total enrollment of 60 or less | 41.8 | 41.6 | 33.1 | 35.2 |
| \% Schools where Std II children observed <br> sitting with one or more other classes | 55.9 | 44.1 | 53.4 | 57.5 |
| \% Schools where Std IV children observed <br> sitting with one or more other classes | 49.0 | 41.5 | 50.6 | 56.4 |

## RTE indicators

Table 13: Schools meeting selected RTE norms 2010-2012

| \% Schools meeting the following RTE norms: |  | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pupil-teacher \& classroomteacher norms | Pupil-teacher ratio | 33.6 | 29.0 | 35.2 |
|  | Classroom-teacher ratio | 67.7 | 64.9 | 64.4 |
| Building | Office/store/office cum store | 57.5 | 54.2 | 49.3 |
|  | Playground | 61.5 | 56.6 | 59.3 |
|  | Boundary wall/fencing | 19.1 | 23.3 | 27.8 |
| Drinking water | No facility for drinking water | 23.2 | 23.8 | 23.5 |
|  | Facility but no drinking water available | 16.0 | 11.7 | 11.0 |
|  | Drinking water available | 60.9 | 64.6 | 65.4 |
| Toilet | No toilet facility | 19.1 | 13.1 | 8.6 |
|  | Facility but toilet not useable | 47.8 | 49.2 | 38.6 |
|  | Toilet useable | 33.1 | 37.8 | 52.8 |
| Girls toilet | \% Schools with no separate provisions for girls toilets | 52.2 | 34.3 | 30.1 |
|  | Of schools with separate girls toilets, \% schools with |  |  |  |
|  | Toilet locked | 18.5 | 19.3 | 14.1 |
|  | Toilet not useable | 15.6 | 19.0 | 15.3 |
|  | Toilet useable | 13.7 | 27.4 | 40.4 |
| Library | No library | 79.2 | 71.9 | 60.4 |
|  | Library but no books being used by children on day of visit | 10.3 | 14.5 | 18.6 |
|  | Library books being used by children on day of visit | 10.5 | 13.6 | 21.0 |
| Mid-day meal | Kitchen shed for cooking mid-day meal | 80.2 | 81.7 | 84.1 |
|  | Mid-day meal served in school on day of visit | 67.3 | 59.9 | 67.4 |



The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act, 2009 specifies a series of norms and standards for a school.

Norms for number of teachers vary according to the level of the school (primary or upper primary) and total student enrollment.

Norms for classrooms require the school to have at least one classroom for every teacher.

Norms for facilities require schools to provide each of the facilities mentioned in Table 13, among others.

RTE norms regulate provision of facilities but not their useability. ASER school observations also include whether facilities could be used. This information is included in Table 13.

Facilitated by PRATHAN

## School funds and activities (PAISA)

Table 14: \% Schools that report receiving SSA grants - Full financial year

| SSA school grants | April 2009 to <br> March 2010 |  |  |  | April 2010 to <br> March 2011 |  |  |  | April 2011 to <br> March 2012 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No. } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Sch. } \end{aligned}$ | \% Schools |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { No. } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { Sch. } \end{gathered}$ | \% Schools |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { No. } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { Sch. } \end{gathered}$ | \% Schools |  |  |
|  |  | Yes | No | Don't know |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |  | Yes | No | Don't know |
| Maintenance grant | 487 | 87.7 | 5.8 | 6.6 | 484 | 78.7 | 14.1 | 7.2 | 482 | 77.6 | 15.6 | 6.9 |
| Development grant | 442 | 81.9 | 0.6 | 7.5 | 474 | 70.9 | 21.3 | 7.8 | 475 | 63.4 | 28.4 | 8.2 |
| TLM grant | 466 | 90.3 | 4.5 | 5.2 | 484 | 87.0 | 8.5 | 4.6 | 482 | 85.9 | 9.8 | 4.4 |

Table 15: \% Schools that report receiving SSA grants - Half financial year

| SSA school grants | April 2010 to date of survey (2010) |  |  |  | April 2011 to date of survey (2011) |  |  |  | April 2012 to date of survey (2012) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No. } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Sch. } \end{aligned}$ | \% Schools |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No. } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Sch. } \end{aligned}$ | \% Schools |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No. } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Sch. } \end{aligned}$ | \% Schools |  |  |
|  |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | Yes | No | Don't know |  | Yes | No | Don't know |
| Maintenance grant | 413 | 46.0 | 40.0 | 14.0 | 452 | 42.0 | 46.5 | 11.5 | 456 | 41.7 | 50.2 | 8. |
| Development grant | 367 | 43.9 | 42.8 | 13.4 | 440 | 40.0 | 47.3 | 12.7 | 453 | 35.8 | 57.2 |  |
| TLM grant | 379 | 50.1 | 39.3 | 10.6 | 449 | 55.0 | 36.3 | 8.7 | 458 | 51.3 | 43.0 | 5. |

Table 16: \% Schools carrying out different activities since April 2011

| Type of Activity |  | \% Schools |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Yes | No | Don't know |
| Const. | New Classroom | 22.2 | 75.1 | 2.7 |
| Repairs | Repair of building (roof, floor, wall etc.) | 32.4 | 64.5 | 3.2 |
|  | Repair of doors \& windows | 34.1 | 62.3 | 3.6 |
|  | Repair of boundary wall | 14.1 | 82.1 | 3.8 |
|  | Repair of drinking water facility | 25.0 | 71.9 | 3.2 |
|  | Repair of toilet | 21.2 | 75.8 | 3.0 |
| Painting <br> \& whitewash | White wash/plastering | 32.8 | 63.6 | 3.6 |
|  | Painting blackboard/Display board/Painting on wall | 37.5 | 59.3 | 3.2 |
|  | Painting of doors \& walls | 32.2 | 65.0 | 2.8 |
| Purchase | Purchase of furniture (cupboard etc.) | 38.8 | 57.4 | 3.8 |
|  | Purchase of electrical fittings | 12.3 | 84.7 | 3.0 |
|  | Purchase of chalk, duster, register etc. | 82.9 | 14.4 | 2.7 |
|  | Purchase of sitting mats/Tat patti | 25.3 | 70.5 | 4.2 |
|  | Purchase of charts, globes \& other teaching material | 62.2 | 34.8 | 3.0 |
| Other | Expenditure on school events | 45.7 | 50.0 | 4.3 |
|  | Payment of bills (electricity, water, cleaning etc.) | 10.0 | 85.6 | 4.4 |

The PAISA section of ASER tracks receipt and spending of Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) grants at the school level. This information is collected from schools visited during the survey. This page reports proportion of schools receiving the grants and carrying out specified activities in the schools. More detailed analysis of the PAISA data will be available in the PAISA 2012 report which will be released in March 2013.

## EVERY RURAL GOVERNMENT PRIMARY/UPPER PRIMARY SCHOOL IS ENTITLED TO EACH OF THESE SSA GRANTS EVERY YEAR.

| How much goes to |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| each school | For what purposes |

SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT GRANT / SCHOOL GRANT
Rs. 5000 per year per primary school

Rs. 7000 per year per upper primary school

## Rs 5000 + Rs $7000=$

 Rs 12000 if the school is Std I-VIINIII.Note: Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same premises.

## SCHOOL MAINTENANCE GRANT

Rs. 5000 - Rs 7500 per school per year if the school has upto 3 classrooms.

Rs 7500 - Rs. 10000 per year if the school has more than 3 classrooms.

Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same building.

This grant can be used for maintenance of school building, including whitewashing; beautification; and repair of toilets, hand pump, boundary wall, playground etc.

The grant amount depends on number of classrooms (excluding Headmaster room and office room)

## TLM GRANT

Rs. 500 per teacher per year in primary and upper primary schools.

This grant can be used by teachers to buy teaching aids, such as charts, globes, posters, models etc.

ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM HOUSEHOLDS. 37 OUT OF 38 DISTRICTS
Data has not been presented where sample size was insufficient.

## School enrollment and out of school children

Table 1: \% Children in different types of schools 2012

| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in <br> school | Total |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age: 6-14 ALL | 88.3 | 6.4 | 1.5 | 3.7 | 100 |
| Age: 7-16 ALL | 87.2 | 5.9 | 1.5 | 5.5 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 88.2 | 7.3 | 1.6 | 2.9 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 BOYS | 87.2 | 8.9 | 1.5 | 2.5 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 GIRLS | 89.2 | 5.5 | 1.9 | 3.4 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 ALL | 88.9 | 4.8 | 1.2 | 5.1 | 100 |
| Age: $11-14$ BOYS | 88.0 | 6.0 | 1.1 | 5.0 | 100 |
| Age: $11-14$ GIRLS | 89.9 | 3.5 | 1.4 | 5.2 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 ALL | 78.6 | 3.5 | 1.6 | 16.3 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 BOYS | 77.4 | 3.8 | 1.1 | 17.7 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 GIRLS | 80.3 | 3.0 | 2.1 | 14.6 | 100 |

Note: 'Other' includes children going to madarsa and EGS. 'Not in school' = dropped out + never enrolled.

Chart 2: Trends over time \% Children enrolled in private schools by class 2008-2012


## Young children in pre-school and school

Table 3: \% Children age 3-6 who are enrolled in different types of pre-school and school 2012

|  | In balwadi or anganwadi | In LKG/ UKG | In School |  |  | Not in school or preschool | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Govt. | Pvt. | Other |  |  |
| Age 3 | 64.6 | 1.2 |  |  |  | 34.2 | 100 |
| Age 4 | 74.2 | 3.7 |  |  |  | 22.2 | 100 |
| Age 5 | 33.0 | 2.7 | 45.1 | 5.6 | 2.1 | 11.5 | 100 |
| Age 6 | 11.2 | 2.2 | 72.2 | 7.2 | 1.8 | 5.4 | 100 |

Chart 1: Trends over time
\% Children out of school by age group and gender 2006-2012


How to read this chart: Each line shows trends in the proportion of children out of school for a particular subset of children. For example, the proportion of girls (age 1114) not in school has changed from $17.6 \%$ in 2006 to $9.7 \%$ in 2007 to $8.8 \%$ in 2008 , $6.0 \%$ in 2009 and to $4.6 \%$ in 2010 to $5.2 \%$ in 2012.

Table 2: Sample description
\% Children in each class by age 2012

| Std. | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 24.4 | 38.3 | 20.2 | 10.4 | 6.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| \|| | 5.1 | 15.6 | 27.7 | 30.2 | 7.1 | 9.5 | 4.8 |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| III | 1.3 | 5.0 | 12.8 | 31.9 | 19.7 | 18.6 | 3.7 | 5.0 | 2.0 |  |  |  | 100 |
| IV | 3. | 2 | 5.0 | 16.3 | 16.6 | 34.1 | 8.2 | 11.4 | 5.3 |  |  |  | 100 |
| V | 2.1 |  |  | 6.9 | 8.1 | 31.4 | 17.6 | 21.4 | 6.3 | 6.3 |  |  | 100 |
| VI | 6.5 |  |  |  |  | 18.7 | 17.2 | 34.7 | 10.5 | 7.6 | 4.9 |  | 100 |
| VII | 2.0 |  |  |  |  | 7.5 | 8.0 | 35.1 | 23.4 | 14.6 | 6.7 | 2.8 | 100 |
| VIII | 6.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 19.1 | 23.2 | 30.2 | 13.5 | 7.2 | 100 |

How to read this table: If a child started school in Std I at age 6, she should be of age 8 in Std III. This table shows the age distribution for each class. For example, in Std III, $31.9 \%$ children are 8 years old but there are also $12.8 \%$ who are $7,19.7 \%$ who are $9,18.6 \%$ who are 10 years old, etc.

ASER 2012

Chart 3: Trends over time
\% Children age 3, 4 and 5 not enrolled in school or pre-school 2006-2012*


* Data for 2011 is not comparable and therefore excluded here.


## Bihar rubal

## Reading

Table 4: \% Children by class and READING level
All schools 2012

| Std. | Not even <br> letter | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (Std I Text) | Level 2 <br> (Std II Text) | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 55.4 | 30.9 | 7.7 | 2.6 | 3.4 | 100 |
| II | 30.9 | 35.8 | 17.5 | 7.5 | 8.4 | 100 |
| IIII | 16.6 | 30.4 | 21.8 | 14.3 | 16.8 | 100 |
| IV | 9.7 | 20.9 | 21.6 | 19.9 | 28.0 | 100 |
| V | 5.9 | 13.5 | 15.4 | 20.8 | 44.4 | 100 |
| VII | 3.3 | 9.6 | 9.9 | 17.6 | 59.6 | 100 |
| VII | 2.1 | 5.5 | 7.2 | 13.3 | 72.0 | 100 |
| VIII | 2.4 | 3.5 | 4.2 | 9.2 | 80.8 | 100 |
| Total | 18.9 | 21.0 | 13.8 | 12.8 | 33.5 | 100 |

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level in reading achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, $16.6 \%$ children cannot even read letters, $30.4 \%$ can read letters but not more, $21.8 \%$ can read words but not Std I text or higher, $14.3 \%$ can read Std I text but not Std II level text, and $16.8 \%$ can read Std II level text. For each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is $100 \%$.

## Chart 4: Trends over time

\% Children in Std III who CAN READ Std I level text By school type 2009-2012


## Reading Tool



Chart 5: Trends over time
\% Children in Std V who CAN READ Std II level text By school type 2009-2012


## Reading and comprehension in English

Table 5: \% Children by class and READING level in ENGLISH All schools 2012

| Std. | Not <br> even <br> capital <br> letters | Capital <br> letters | Small <br> letters | Simple <br> words | Easy <br> sen- <br> tences | Total |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 71.2 | 16.0 | 7.1 | 3.8 | 1.9 | 100 |
| II | 53.3 | 21.6 | 13.3 | 8.2 | 3.6 | 100 |
| III | 34.8 | 24.2 | 19.6 | 15.2 | 6.2 | 100 |
| IV | 22.9 | 21.6 | 23.5 | 22.7 | 9.4 | 100 |
| V | 15.2 | 16.4 | 22.0 | 30.1 | 16.3 | 100 |
| VII | 9.0 | 12.6 | 17.8 | 35.3 | 25.3 | 100 |
| VII | 5.7 | 7.7 | 14.1 | 35.9 | 36.7 | 100 |
| VIII | 4.4 | 5.5 | 11.3 | 30.0 | 48.9 | 100 |
| Total | 31.3 | 16.7 | 16.0 | 20.6 | 15.3 | 100 |

Table 6: \% Children by class who CAN COMPREHEND ENGLISH All schools 2012

| Std. | Of those who <br> can read words, <br> \% who can tell <br> meanings of <br> the words | Of those who <br> can read <br> sentences, \% who <br> can tell meanings <br> of the sentences |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| I | 63.0 |  |
| III | 62.8 | 69.7 |
| IIII | 68.5 | 57.0 |
| IV | 67.5 | 72.7 |
| V | 65.6 | 70.5 |
| VI | 67.1 | 69.0 |
| VII | 66.7 | 70.2 |
| VIII | 71.6 | 71.3 |
| Total | 67.1 | 69.5 |

English Tool


## Bihar rural

## Arithmetic

Table 7: \% Children by class and ARITHMETIC level All schools 2012

| Std. | Not even 1-9 | Recognize numbers |  | Can subtract | Can divide | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1-9 | 10-99 |  |  |  |
| I | 50.5 | 33.2 | 10.8 | 3.4 | 2.0 | 100 |
| II | 24.1 | 39.6 | 22.7 | 9.0 | 4.6 | 100 |
| III | 11.0 | 32.6 | 28.3 | 18.6 | 9.5 | 100 |
| IV | 6.7 | 21.7 | 28.6 | 24.9 | 18.1 | 100 |
| V | 4.0 | 13.9 | 22.4 | 28.3 | 31.4 | 100 |
| VI | 2.2 | 8.7 | 18.0 | 25.8 | 45.3 | 100 |
| VIII | 1.3 | 4.8 | 12.9 | 22.2 | 58.9 | 100 |
| VIII | 2.0 | 3.2 | 8.3 | 19.5 | 67.0 | 100 |
| Total | 15.4 | 22.2 | 19.6 | 18.0 | 24.8 | 100 |

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level in arithmetic achieved by a child. For example, in Std 3, $11 \%$ children cannot even recognize numbers 1-9, 32.6\% can recognize numbers up to 9 but not more, $28.3 \%$ can recognize numbers to 99 but cannot do subtraction, $18.6 \%$ can do subtraction but not division, and $9.5 \%$ can do division. For each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is $100 \%$.

## Chart 6: Trends over time

\% Children in Std III who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more
By school type 2009-2012



## Math Tool



Chart 7: Trends over time
\% Children in Std V who CAN DO DIVISION
By school type 2009-2012



## Bihar rural

## Type of school and paid tuition classes

The ASER survey recorded information about tuition by asking the following question: "Does the child take any paid tuition class currently?" Therefore the numbers given below do not include any unpaid supplemental help in learning that children may have received.

| Table 8: Trends over time <br> \% Children attending paid tuition classes <br> By school type 2009-2012 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Children in Std I-VIII | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| Govt. schools: \% Children attending paid tuition classes | 46.1 | 47.7 | 46.7 | 48.6 |
| Private schools: \% Children attending paid tuition classes | 64.0 | 54.8 | 60.8 | 63.8 |
| All schools: \% Children attending paid tuition classes | 46.9 | 48.0 | 47.5 | 49.5 |

Table 9: Trends over time
\% Children by school type and tuition 2009-2012

| Year | Category |  | Std II | Std V | Std VIII | Std I-VIII |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2009 | Govt | No tuition | 58.3 | 46.9 | 37.7 | 51.4 |
|  |  | Tuition | 36.5 | 49.2 | 58.9 | 43.9 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 1.9 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.7 |
|  |  | Tuition | 3.3 | 2.7 | 2.3 | 3.0 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 2010 | Govt | No tuition | 56.7 | 42.7 | 35.0 | 49.7 |
|  |  | Tuition | 35.9 | 53.3 | 61.1 | 45.3 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 4.6 | 1.5 | 1.4 | 2.3 |
|  |  | Tuition | 2.8 | 2.6 | 2.5 | 2.8 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 2011 | Govt | No tuition | 57.5 | 46.7 | 35.5 | 50.3 |
|  |  | Tuition | 35.7 | 48.4 | 60.4 | 44.1 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 2.7 | 1.7 | 1.5 | 2.2 |
|  |  | Tuition | 4.2 | 3.3 | 2.6 | 3.4 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 2012 | Govt | No tuition | 56.0 | 45.6 | 33.6 | 48.4 |
|  |  | Tuition | 35.9 | 50.0 | 63.1 | 45.7 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 3.2 | 1.5 | 1.3 | 2.2 |
|  |  | Tuition | 4.9 | 2.9 | 2.0 | 3.8 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Chart 9: Trends over time
\% Children in Std III-V who CAN READ a Std I level text or more By school type and tuition 2009-2012


Chart 8: Trends over time
\% Children in Std I-VIII by school type and tuition 2009-2012


How to read this chart: This chart is a visual representation of the last column of Table 9. For a given year, the width of each colour band represents the \% of children in the corresponding category. For each year, these four categories add upto 100\%.

Chart 10: Trends over time
\% Children in Std III-V who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more By school type and tuition 2009-2012


## Bihar rural

## School observations

In each year's ASER, from 2009 onwards, in each sampled village, the largest government school with primary sections was visited on the day of the survey. Information about schools in this report is based on these visits.

Table 10: Number of schools visited 2009-2012

| Type of school | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Std I-IVN: Primary | 353 | 265 | 252 | 284 |
| Std I-VIINIII: Primary + <br> Upper primary | 607 | 702 | 770 | 773 |
| Total schools visited | 960 | 967 | 1022 | 1057 |

Table 11: Student and teacher attendance on the day of the visit 2009-2012

| Type of school | Std I-IVN |  |  |  | Std I-VIINIII |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
|  | 57.0 | 56.1 | 50.0 | 58.3 | 57.9 | 55.9 | 49.1 | 55.5 |
| \% Teachers present <br> (Average) | 81.7 | 84.6 | 85.1 | 78.1 | 82.8 | 80.6 | 85.2 | 82.4 |

Table 12: Small schools and multigrade classes 2009-2012

| School characteristics | Std I-IVN |  |  |  | Std I-VIINIII |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| \% Schools with total enrollment of 60 or less | 0.9 | 0.4 | 1.2 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.3 |
| \% Schools where Std II children observed <br> sitting with one or more other classes | 66.7 | 67.6 | 72.3 | 75.5 | 55.4 | 53.0 | 57.3 | 60.1 |
| \% Schools where Std IV children observed <br> sitting with one or more other classes | 67.0 | 63.7 | 67.3 | 72.5 | 51.7 | 43.4 | 50.5 | 52.0 |

## RTE indicators

Table 13: Schools meeting selected RTE norms 2010-2012

| \% Schools meeting the following RTE norms: |  | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pupil-teacher \& classroomteacher norms | Pupil-teacher ratio | 8.8 | 5.3 | 8.5 |
|  | Classroom-teacher ratio | 48.2 | 54.2 | 56.7 |
| Building | Office/store/office cum store | 69.0 | 66.0 | 69.0 |
|  | Playground | 48.3 | 49.1 | 43.1 |
|  | Boundary wall/fencing | 48.1 | 47.5 | 47.9 |
| Drinking water | No facility for drinking water | 9.6 | 6.8 | 7.5 |
|  | Facility but no drinking water available | 11.7 | 9.4 | 7.1 |
|  | Drinking water available | 78.7 | 83.8 | 85.4 |
| Toilet | No toilet facility | 19.3 | 19.0 | 12.6 |
|  | Facility but toilet not useable | 47.2 | 35.3 | 36.2 |
|  | Toilet useable | 33.6 | 45.7 | 51.2 |
| Girls toilet | \% Schools with no separate provisions for girls toilets | 49.9 | 37.6 | 26.9 |
|  | Of schools with separate girls toilets, \% schools with |  |  |  |
|  | Toilet locked | 15.1 | 8.2 | 11.4 |
|  | Toilet not useable | 16.9 | 18.9 | 19.7 |
|  | Toilet useable | 18.1 | 35.4 | 42.0 |
| Library | No library | 47.1 | 38.9 | 25.4 |
|  | Library but no books being used by children on day of visit | 24.7 | 29.3 | 29.3 |
|  | Library books being used by children on day of visit | 28.2 | 31.8 | 45.3 |
| Mid-day meal | Kitchen shed for cooking mid-day meal | 64.0 | 71.6 | 74.1 |
|  | Mid-day meal served in school on day of visit | 57.2 | 54.6 | 75.0 |



The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act, 2009 specifies a series of norms and standards for a school.

Norms for number of teachers vary according to the level of the school (primary or upper primary) and total student enrollment.

Norms for classrooms require the school to have at least one classroom for every teacher.

Norms for facilities require schools to provide each of the facilities mentioned in Table 13, among others.

RTE norms regulate provision of facilities but not their useability. ASER school observations also include whether facilities could be used. This information is included in Table 13.

Facilitated by PRATHAN

## School funds and activities (PAISA)

Table 14: \% Schools that report receiving SSA grants - Full financial year

| SSA school grants | April 2009 to <br> March 2010 |  |  |  | April 2010 to <br> March 2011 |  |  |  | April 2011 to <br> March 2012 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No. } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Sch. } \end{aligned}$ | \% Schools |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { No. } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { Sch. } \end{gathered}$ | \% Schools |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No. } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Sch. } \end{aligned}$ | \% Schools |  |  |
|  |  | Yes | No | Don't know |  | Yes | No | Don't know |  | Yes | No | Don't know |
| Maintenance grant | 686 | 86.7 | 5.1 | 8.2 | 990 | 79.2 | 14.8 | 6.1 | 1018 | 78.7 | 14.8 | 6.5 |
| Development grant | 690 | 85.9 | 6.2 | 7.8 | 986 | 82.7 | 11.6 | 5.8 | 1014 | 83.3 | 10.9 | 5.8 |
| TLM grant | 698 | 88.7 | 5.6 | 5.7 | 988 | 85.2 | 10.8 | 4.0 | 1021 | 84.6 | 11.4 | 4.0 |

Table 15: \% Schools that report receiving SSA grants - Half financial year

| SSA school grants | April 2010 to date of survey (2010) |  |  |  | April 2011 to date of survey (2011) |  |  |  | April 2012 to date of survey (2012) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No. } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Sch. } \end{aligned}$ | \% Schools |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No. } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Sch. } \end{aligned}$ | \% Schools |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No. } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Sch. } \end{aligned}$ | \% Schools |  |  |
|  |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | Yes | No | Don't know |  | Yes | No | Don't know |
| Maintenance grant | 634 | 59.5 | 28.6 | 12.0 | 963 | 28.4 | 63.6 | 8.1 | 998 | 22.1 | 70.1 | 7.7 |
| Development grant | 631 | 59.6 | 29.6 | 10.8 | 966 | 29.3 | 62.7 | 8.0 | 992 | 23. | 69. | 7.7 |
| TLM grant | 638 | 61.0 | 29.2 | 9.9 | 966 | 32.4 | 61.2 | 6.4 | 993 | 25.5 | 68.7 | 5.8 |

Table 16: \% Schools carrying out different activities since April 2011

| Type of Activity |  | \% Schools |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Yes | No | Don't know |
| Const. | New Classroom | 33.7 | 62.7 | 3.6 |
| Repairs | Repair of building (roof, floor, wall etc.) | 41.1 | 55.7 | 3.2 |
|  | Repair of doors \& windows | 41.6 | 55.4 | 3.1 |
|  | Repair of boundary wall | 17.8 | 79.2 | 3.0 |
|  | Repair of drinking water facility | 58.4 | 38.7 | 2.9 |
|  | Repair of toilet | 33.9 | 63.0 | 3.1 |
| Painting <br> \& white- <br> wash | White wash/plastering | 74.2 | 23.1 | 2.7 |
|  | Painting blackboard/Display board/Painting on wall | 64.7 | 33.0 | 2.3 |
|  | Painting of doors \& walls | 58.3 | 38.8 | 2.9 |
| Purchase | Purchase of furniture (cupboard etc.) | 41.8 | 54.6 | 3.6 |
|  | Purchase of electrical fittings | 5.3 | 91.7 | 3.1 |
|  | Purchase of chalk, duster, register etc. | 86.8 | 10.9 | 2.4 |
|  | Purchase of sitting mats/Tat patti | 32.9 | 64.5 | 2.7 |
|  | Purchase of charts, globes \& other teaching material | 73.6 | 23.6 | 2.9 |
| Other | Expenditure on school events | 77.1 | 19.7 | 3.2 |
|  | Payment of bills (electricity, water, cleaning etc.) | 12.9 | 83.6 | 3.5 |

The PAISA section of ASER tracks receipt and spending of Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) grants at the school level. This information is collected from schools visited during the survey. This page reports proportion of schools receiving the grants and carrying out specified activities in the schools. More detailed analysis of the PAISA data will be available in the PAISA 2012 report which will be released in March 2013.'

## EVERY RURAL GOVERNMENT PRIMARY/UPPER PRIMARY SCHOOL IS ENTITLED TO EACH OF THESE SSA GRANTS EVERY YEAR.

| How much goes to |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| each school | For what purposes |

SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT GRANT / SCHOOL GRANT
Rs. 5000 per year per primary school

Rs. 7000 per year per upper primary school

## Rs 5000 + Rs $7000=$

 Rs 12000 if the school is Std I-VIIINIII.Note: Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same premises.

## SCHOOL MAINTENANCE GRANT

Rs. 5000 - Rs 7500 per school per year if the school has upto 3 classrooms.

Rs 7500 - Rs. 10000 per year if the school has more than 3 classrooms.

Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same building.

This grant can be used for maintenance of school building, including whitewashing; beautification; and repair of toilets, hand pump, boundary wall, playground etc.

The grant amount depends on number of classrooms (excluding Headmaster room and office room)

## TLM GRANT

Rs. 500 per teacher per year in primary and upper primary schools.

This grant can be used by teachers to buy teaching aids, such as charts, globes, posters, models etc.

# Chhattisgarh rubal 

ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM HOUSEHOLDS. 15 OUT OF 16 DISTRICTS
Data has not been presented where sample size was insufficient.

## School enrollment and out of school children

Table 1: \% Children in different types of schools 2012

| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in <br> school | Total |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age: 6-14 ALL | 83.8 | 13.5 | 0.1 | 2.6 | 100 |
| Age: 7-16 ALL | 82.4 | 11.9 | 0.1 | 5.6 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 82.8 | 15.9 | 0.1 | 1.3 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 BOYS | 80.4 | 18.1 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 GIRLS | 85.2 | 13.6 | 0.1 | 1.2 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 ALL | 86.0 | 9.9 | 0.1 | 4.1 | 100 |
| Age: $11-14$ BOYS | 84.2 | 11.2 | 0.2 | 4.4 | 100 |
| Age: $11-14$ GIRLS | 87.7 | 8.5 | 0.0 | 3.8 | 100 |
| Age: $15-16$ ALL | 73.9 | 8.1 | 0.0 | 18.0 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 BOYS | 73.0 | 9.1 | 0.1 | 17.8 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 GIRLS | 74.7 | 7.3 | 0.0 | 18.1 | 100 |

Note: 'Other' includes children going to madarsa and EGS. 'Not in school' $=$ dropped out + never enrolled.

Chart 2: Trends over time \% Children enrolled in private schools by class 2008-2012


Chart 1: Trends over time
\% Children out of school by age group and gender 2006-2012


How to read this chart: Each line shows trends in the proportion of children out of school for a particular subset of children. For example, the proportion of girls (age 1114) not in school has changed from $13.6 \%$ in 2006 to $8.5 \%$ in 2007 to $8.7 \%$ in 2008, $4.9 \%$ in 2009 and to $3.2 \%$ in 2010 to $3.8 \%$ in 2012.

Table 2: Sample description
\% Children in each class by age 2012

| Std. | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 16.5 | 58.1 | 19.5 | 5.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| \|| | 1.5 | 7.0 | 49.9 | 35.8 | 5.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| III | 1. | . 2 | 9.7 | 44.3 | 35.5 | 7.3 | 2.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| IV | 1.3 |  |  | 7.6 | 38.3 | 44.9 | 7.9 |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| V | 1.7 |  |  |  | 5.1 | 42.9 | 38.2 | 9.2 | 3.0 |  |  |  | 100 |
| VI | 1.4 |  |  |  |  | 6.8 | 33.2 | 47.8 | 7.4 | 3.4 |  |  | 100 |
| VII | 1.6 |  |  |  |  |  | 5.8 | 39.1 | 42.3 | 8.1 | 3.1 |  | 100 |
| VIII | 1.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8.6 | 33.9 | 43.6 | 9.1 | 2.9 | 100 |

How to read this table: If a child started school in Std I at age 6, she should be of age 8 in Std III. This table shows the age distribution for each class. For example, in Std III, $44.3 \%$ children are 8 years old but there also $9.7 \%$ who are $7,35.5 \%$ who are 9 , $7.3 \%$ who are 10 years old and $2.0 \%$ who are older.

## Young children in pre-school and school

Table 3: \% Children age 3-6 who are enrolled in different types of pre-school and school 2012

|  | In balwadi or anganwadi | In LKG/ UKG | In School |  |  | Not in school or preschool | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Govt. | Pvt. | Other |  |  |
| Age 3 | 82.3 | 3.6 |  |  |  | 14.1 | 100 |
| Age 4 | 79.8 | 10.9 |  |  |  | 9.3 | 100 |
| Age 5 | 34.7 | 9.1 | 34.9 | 15.3 | 0.0 | 6.1 | 100 |
| Age 6 | 5.4 | 2.7 | 69.4 | 18.9 | 0.0 | 3.6 | 100 |

Chart 3: Trends over time
\% Children age 3, 4 and 5 not enrolled in school or pre-school 2006-2012*


* Data for 2011 is not comparable and therefore excluded here.


# Chhattisgarh rubal 

Facilitated by PRATHAM

## Reading

Table 4: \% Children by class and READING level
All schools 2012

| Std. | Not even <br> letter | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (Std I Text) | Level 2 <br> (Std II Text) | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 39.6 | 45.8 | 8.0 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 100 |
| II | 14.5 | 52.7 | 17.0 | 7.4 | 8.3 | 100 |
| IIII | 6.9 | 33.9 | 21.7 | 17.7 | 19.9 | 100 |
| IV | 3.5 | 22.7 | 19.6 | 21.3 | 33.0 | 100 |
| V | 3.0 | 13.6 | 15.4 | 21.8 | 46.1 | 100 |
| VI | 1.1 | 10.0 | 10.8 | 18.1 | 60.0 | 100 |
| VII | 1.3 | 6.1 | 6.7 | 13.9 | 72.1 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.8 | 4.7 | 5.3 | 11.7 | 77.5 | 100 |
| Total | 8.8 | 23.7 | 13.2 | 14.5 | 39.9 | 100 |

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level in reading achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, $6.9 \%$ children cannot even read letters, 33.9\% can read letters but not more, $21.7 \%$ can read words but not Std I text or higher, 17.7\% can read Std I text but not Std II level text, and 19.9\% can read Std II level text. For each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is $100 \%$.

Chart 4: Trends over time
\% Children in Std III who CAN READ Std I level text By school type 2009-2012


## Reading Tool


#### Abstract

较।         chet चr fer sat




Chart 5: Trends over time
\% Children in Std V who CAN READ Std II level text
By school type 2009-2012


## Reading in English

Table 5: \% Children by class and READING level in ENGLISH All schools 2012

| Std. | Not <br> even <br> capital <br> letters | Capital <br> letters | Small <br> letters | Simple <br> words | Easy <br> sen- <br> tences | Total |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 59.1 | 23.4 | 12.6 | 3.1 | 1.9 | 100 |
| II | 39.7 | 33.7 | 20.0 | 4.4 | 2.3 | 100 |
| III | 25.2 | 34.2 | 30.5 | 8.0 | 2.1 | 100 |
| IV | 20.0 | 28.1 | 36.3 | 11.5 | 4.1 | 100 |
| V | 14.3 | 23.6 | 35.9 | 19.1 | 7.2 | 100 |
| VII | 8.9 | 17.7 | 34.3 | 24.7 | 14.4 | 100 |
| VII | 6.2 | 13.7 | 32.3 | 26.1 | 21.7 | 100 |
| VIII | 4.5 | 11.4 | 28.9 | 24.0 | 31.2 | 100 |
| Total | 22.2 | 23.3 | 28.9 | 15.1 | 10.5 | 100 |

Table 6: \% Children by class who CAN COMPREHEND ENGLISH All schools 2012

| Std. | Of those who can read words, \% who can tell meanings of the words | Of those who can read sentences, \% who can tell meanings of the sentences |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I |  |  |
| \\| |  |  |
| III |  | - ien $>$ |
| IV |  |  |
| V | $<0^{\text {a }}$ |  |
| VI |  |  |
| VII |  |  |
| VIII |  |  |
| Total |  |  |

English Tool

| - |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & 4 k 5 \\ & 4 y \\ & 4 a^{4} x \end{aligned}$ |  |
| $\lim _{\text {ing }}^{\text {ine }}$ |  <br>  <br>  <br>  |
| Frumer | I |

## Chhattisgarh rural

## Arithmetic

Table 7: \% Children by class and ARITHMETIC level
All schools 2012

| Std. | Not even 1-9 | Recognize numbers |  | Can subtract | Can divide | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1-9 | 10-99 |  |  |  |
| I | 38.2 | 48.7 | 10.3 | 2.4 | 0.5 | 100 |
| \\| | 11.5 | 59.3 | 24.7 | 3.8 | 0.7 | 100 |
| III | 4.4 | 44.7 | 36.3 | 12.0 | 2.6 | 100 |
| IV | 2.7 | 31.6 | 39.3 | 20.2 | 6.2 | 100 |
| V | 1.7 | 22.9 | 36.7 | 24.6 | 14.1 | 100 |
| VI | 0.4 | 14.9 | 36.6 | 28.3 | 19.9 | 100 |
| VII | 0.7 | 9.3 | 33.8 | 33.3 | 22.9 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.7 | 6.1 | 30.9 | 30.9 | 31.4 | 100 |
| Total | 7.5 | 29.8 | 31.2 | 19.4 | 12.2 | 100 |

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level in arithmetic achieved by a child. For example, in Std 3, 4.4\% children cannot even recognize numbers 1-9, $44.7 \%$ can recognize numbers up to 9 but not more, $36.3 \%$ can recognize numbers to 99 but cannot do subtraction, $12.0 \%$ can do subtraction but not division, and $2.6 \%$ can do division. For each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is $100 \%$.

## Chart 6: Trends over time

\% Children in Std III who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more
By school type 2009-2012



## Math Tool



Chart 7: Trends over time
\% Children in Std V who CAN DO DIVISION
By school type 2009-2012



## Chhattisgarh ruвal

## Type of school and paid tuition classes

The ASER survey recorded information about tuition by asking the following question: "Does the child take any paid tuition class currently?" Therefore the numbers given below do not include any unpaid supplemental help in learning that children may have received.

| Table 8: Trends over time <br> \% Children attending paid tuition classes <br> By school type 2009-2012 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Children in Std I-VIII | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| Govt. schools: \% Children attending paid tuition classes | 3.1 | 1.7 | 1.2 | 1.5 |
| Private schools: \% Children attending paid tuition classes | 12.8 | 9.9 | 8.5 | 10.6 |
| All schools: \% Children attending paid tuition classes | 4.0 | 2.5 | 2.0 | 2.7 |

Table 9: Trends over time
\% Children by school type and tuition 2009-2012

| Year | Category |  | Std II | Std V | Std VIII | Std I-VIII |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2009 | Govt. | No tuition | 85.2 | 89.4 | 89.7 | 87.7 |
|  |  | Tuition | 2.8 | 2.8 | 3.0 | 2.8 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 11.0 | 6.7 | 5.9 | 8.3 |
|  |  | Tuition | 1.1 | 1.2 | 1.4 | 1.2 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 2010 | Govt. | No tuition | 87.3 | 90.7 | 89.0 | 88.5 |
|  |  | Tuition | 1.3 | 1.8 | 2.4 | 1.5 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 10.1 | 6.8 | 7.7 | 8.9 |
|  |  | Tuition | 1.4 | 0.7 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 2011 | Govt. | No tuition | 82.4 | 89.4 | 89.0 | 87.0 |
|  |  | Tuition | 0.4 | 1.8 | 1.4 | 1.0 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 15.9 | 7.4 | 8.6 | 10.9 |
|  |  | Tuition | 1.4 | 1.4 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 2012 | Govt. | No tuition | 81.6 | 87.9 | 89.2 | 84.8 |
|  |  | Tuition | 0.9 | 1.5 | 1.3 | 1.3 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 15.7 | 9.3 | 9.4 | 12.4 |
|  |  | Tuition | 1.9 | 1.3 | 0.2 | 1.5 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Chart 9: Trends over time
\% Children in Std III-V who CAN READ a Std I level text or more By school type and tuition 2009-2012



Chart 8: Trends over time
\% Children in Std I-VIII by school type and tuition 2009-2012


How to read this chart: This chart is a visual representation of the last column of Table 9. For a given year, the width of each colour band represents the \% of children in the corresponding category. For each year, these four categories add upto 100\%.

Chart 10: Trends over time
\% Children in Std III-V who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more By school type and tuition 2009-2012

facilitated by PRATHAM

## School observations

In each year's ASER, from 2009 onwards, in each sampled village, the largest government school with primary sections was visited on the day of the survey. Information about schools in this report is based on these visits.

Table 10: Number of schools visited 2009-2012

| Type of school | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Std I-IVN: Primary | 336 | 301 | 351 | 388 |
| Std I-VIINIII: Primary + <br> Upper primary | 25 | 124 | 41 | 42 |
| Total schools visited | 361 | 425 | 392 | 430 |

Table 11: Student and teacher attendance on the day of the visit 2009-2012

| Type of school | Std I-IVN |  |  |  | Std I-VIINIIII |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
|  | 76.5 | 69.7 | 73.1 | 75.1 | 77.0 | 72.5 | 78.1 | 75.9 |
| \% Teachers present <br> (Average) | 82.4 | 86.6 | 84.5 | 84.0 | 70.5 | 86.5 | 82.9 | 89.1 |

Table 12: Small schools and multigrade classes 2009-2012

| School characteristics | Std I-IVN |  |  |  | Std I-VIINIII |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| \% Schools with total enrollment of 60 or less | 19.3 | 22.5 | 28.9 | 32.0 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 7.5 | 4.8 |
| \% Schools where Std II children observed <br> sitting with one or more other classes | 62.9 | 66.6 | 75.3 | 76.1 | 60.0 | 60.3 | 82.1 | 73.8 |
| \% Schools where Std IV children observed <br> sitting with one or more other classes | 48.6 | 56.1 | 62.9 | 55.2 | 52.4 | 38.9 | 65.8 | 45.2 |

Note: In Chhattisgarh, the official policy in govt. schools is to have mixed groups in std. I-II.

## RTE indicators

Table 13: Schools meeting selected RTE norms 2010-2012

| \% Schools meeting the following RTE norms: |  | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pupil-teacher \& classroomteacher norms | Pupil-teacher ratio | 39.6 | 51.3 | 48.3 |
|  | Classroom-teacher ratio | 64.2 | 59.6 | 70.2 |
| Building | Office/store/office cum store | 79.0 | 76.0 | 80.9 |
|  | Playground | 45.0 | 46.3 | 49.2 |
|  | Boundary wall/fencing | 48.8 | 48.7 | 50.5 |
| Drinking water | No facility for drinking water | 12.9 | 13.0 | 9.8 |
|  | Facility but no drinking water available | 9.6 | 13.8 | 11.0 |
|  | Drinking water available | 77.6 | 73.3 | 79.2 |
| Toilet | No toilet facility | 28.9 | 34.7 | 15.9 |
|  | Facility but toilet not useable | 41.5 | 38.5 | 32.7 |
|  | Toilet useable | 29.6 | 26.8 | 51.4 |
| Girls toilet | \% Schools with no separate provisions for girls toilets | 46.2 | 51.8 | 34.7 |
|  | Of schools with separate girls toilets, \% schools with |  |  |  |
|  | Toilet locked | 16.3 | 11.5 | 8.4 |
|  | Toilet not useable | 17.5 | 16.0 | 15.3 |
|  | Toilet useable | 20.0 | 20.7 | 41.6 |
| Library | No library | 27.1 | 21.3 | 11.7 |
|  | Library but no books being used by children on day of visit | 36.5 | 40.3 | 55.4 |
|  | Library books being used by children on day of visit | 36.5 | 38.4 | 32.9 |
| Mid-day meal | Kitchen shed for cooking mid-day meal | 86.1 | 86.8 | 89.0 |
|  | Mid-day meal served in school on day of visit | 94.6 | 93.9 | 91.8 |

Facilitated by PRATHAN

## School funds and activities (PAISA)

Table 14: \% Schools that report receiving SSA grants - Full financial year

| SSA school grants | April 2009 to <br> March 2010 |  |  |  | April 2010 to March 2011 |  |  |  | April 2011 to March 2012 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No. } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Sch. } \end{aligned}$ | \% Schools |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No. } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Sch. } \end{aligned}$ | \% Schools |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No. } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Sch. } \end{aligned}$ | \% Schools |  |  |
|  |  | Yes | No | Don't know |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |  | Yes | No | Don't know |
| Maintenance grant | 373 | 85.5 | 6.7 | 7.8 | 379 | 85.5 | 7.1 | 7.4 | 426 | 93.2 | 3.5 | 3.3 |
| Development grant | 360 | 83.3 | 8.1 | 8.6 | 379 | 81.8 | 10.6 | 7.7 | 424 | 90.6 | 5.0 | 4.5 |
| TLM grant | 355 | 88.2 | 6.2 | 5.6 | 380 | 90.5 | 4.7 | 4.7 | 424 | 93.9 | 3.1 | 3.1 |

The PAISA section of ASER tracks receipt and spending of Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) grants at the school level. This information is collected from schools visited during the survey. This page reports proportion of schools receiving the grants and carrying out specified activities in the schools. More detailed analysis of the PAISA data will be available in the PAISA 2012 report which will be released in March 2013.1

## EVERY RURAL GOVERNMENT PRIMARY/UPPER PRIMARY SCHOOL IS ENTITLED TO EACH OF THESE SSA GRANTS EVERY YEAR.

| How much goes to |
| :---: | :--- |
| each school |$\quad$ For what purposes

SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT GRANT / SCHOOL GRANT
Rs. 5000 per year per primary school

Rs. 7000 per year per upper primary school

## Rs 5000 + Rs $7000=$

 Rs 12000 if the school is Std I-VIINIII.Note: Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same premises.

## SCHOOL MAINTENANCE GRANT

Rs. 5000 - Rs 7500 per school per year if the school has upto 3 classrooms.

Rs 7500 - Rs. 10000 per year if the school has more than 3 classrooms.

Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same building.

This grant can be used for maintenance of school building, including whitewashing; beautification; and repair of toilets, hand pump, boundary wall, playground etc.

The grant amount depends on number of classrooms (excluding Headmaster room and office room)

## TLM GRANT

Rs. 500 per teacher per year in primary and upper primary schools.

This grant can be used by teachers to buy teaching aids, such as charts, globes, posters, models etc.

ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM HOUSEHOLDS. 26 OUT OF 26 DISTRICTS Data has not been presented where sample size was insufficient.

## School enrollment and out of school children

Table 1: \% Children in different types of schools 2012

| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in <br> school | Total |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age: 6-14 ALL | 85.0 | 11.8 | 0.2 | 3.1 | 100 |
| Age: 7-16 ALL | 80.4 | 13.4 | 0.3 | 5.9 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 88.9 | 9.8 | 0.2 | 1.1 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 BOYS | 88.0 | 10.9 | 0.2 | 0.9 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 GIRLS | 89.9 | 8.6 | 0.3 | 1.2 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 ALL | 80.6 | 13.7 | 0.2 | 5.5 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 BOYS | 80.1 | 15.5 | 0.2 | 4.2 | 100 |
| Age: $11-14$ GIRLS | 81.3 | 11.6 | 0.1 | 7.1 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 ALL | 52.7 | 24.0 | 0.7 | 22.6 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 BOYS | 56.0 | 26.7 | 1.0 | 16.4 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 GIRLS | 48.8 | 20.7 | 0.4 | 30.1 | 100 |

Note: 'Other' includes children going to madarsa and EGS.
'Not in school' = dropped out + never enrolled.

Chart 2: Trends over time
\% Children enrolled in private schools by class 2008-2012


Chart 1: Trends over time
\% Children out of school by age group and gender 2006-2012


How to read this chart: Each line shows trends in the proportion of children out of school for a particular subset of children. For example, the proportion of girls (age 1114) not in school has changed from $11.7 \%$ in 2006 to $7.6 \%$ in 2007 to $10.9 \%$ in 2008 , $10.2 \%$ in 2009 and to $8.0 \%$ in 2010 to $7.1 \%$ in 2012.

Table 2: Sample description
\% Children in each class by age 2012

| Std. | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 27.5 | 62.1 | 8.0 | 2.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| \|| | 1.9 | 10.5 | 71.0 | 10.8 | 5.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| III |  | 2.6 | 11.0 | 72.4 | 11.0 | 3.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| IV | 2.9 |  |  | 7.9 | 69.9 | 15.6 | 3.7 |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| V | 2.1 |  |  |  | 6.2 | 71.4 | 14.5 | 5.8 |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| VI | 2.1 |  |  |  |  | 6.0 | 67.9 | 18.5 | 5.4 |  |  |  | 100 |
| VII | 6.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 69.5 | 17.1 | 6.5 |  |  | 100 |
| VIII | 2.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9.9 | 70.3 | 12.7 | 4.6 |  | 100 |

How to read this table: If a child started school in Std I at age 6, she should be of age 8 in Std III. This table shows the age distribution for each class. For example, in Std III, $72.4 \%$ children are 8 years old but there also $11.0 \%$ who are $7,11.0 \%$ who are 9 and $3.1 \%$ who are older.

## Young children in pre-school and school

Table 3: \% Children age 3-6 who are enrolled in different types of pre-school and school 2012

|  | In balwadi or anganwadi | In LKG/ UKG | In School |  |  | Not in school or preschool | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Govt. | Pvt. | Other |  |  |
| Age 3 | 76.2 | 4.4 |  |  |  | 19.4 | 100 |
| Age 4 | 77.0 | 12.5 |  |  |  | 10.5 | 100 |
| Age 5 | 23.3 | 4.2 | 55.1 | 10.3 | 0.2 | 6.8 | 100 |
| Age 6 | 1.5 | 1.0 | 84.4 | 11.1 | 0.3 | 1.7 | 100 |

Chart 3: Trends over time
\% Children age 3, 4 and 5 not enrolled in school or pre-school 2006-2012*


* Data for 2011 is not comparable and therefore excluded here.


## Reading

Table 4: \% Children by class and READING level
All schools 2012

| Std. | Not even <br> letter | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (Std I Text) | Level 2 <br> (Std II Text) | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 40.7 | 43.4 | 11.9 | 2.3 | 1.9 | 100 |
| II | 15.2 | 39.5 | 26.9 | 10.8 | 7.6 | 100 |
| III | 7.7 | 21.7 | 30.8 | 18.9 | 20.9 | 100 |
| IV | 3.1 | 12.9 | 24.8 | 25.8 | 33.5 | 100 |
| V | 2.1 | 8.2 | 13.6 | 28.6 | 47.6 | 100 |
| VI | 1.2 | 4.4 | 11.1 | 26.1 | 57.3 | 100 |
| VII | 1.1 | 3.3 | 7.0 | 18.1 | 70.6 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.8 | 1.5 | 3.6 | 13.2 | 80.9 | 100 |
| Total | 8.1 | 16.0 | 16.2 | 18.5 | 41.2 | 100 |

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level in reading achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, $7.7 \%$ children cannot even read letters, $21.7 \%$ can read letters but not more, $30.8 \%$ can read words but not Std I text or higher, $18.9 \%$ can read Std I text but not Std II level text, and 20.9\% can read Std II level text. For each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is $100 \%$.

## Chart 4: Trends over time

\% Children in Std III who CAN READ Std I level text By school type 2009-2012


## Reading Tool

મારા મામાનાં ગામ પાસે દરિયો છે. દરિયો એટલે પાણી જ પાણી. એમાં હોડી તરે, જહાજ તરે. દરિયામાં મોજાં આવે. મોટાં મોજાં આવે. નાહવાની મજા પડે. છીપલાં વીણવાની મજા પડે. ભીની રેતીમાં પગલાં પાડવાં વધારે ગમે. રાતે દીવાદાંડી અને જહાજ જોવાની મજા પડે. કિનારે સરસ નારિયેળી હોય. લીલા નારિયેળનું પાણી મીઠું મીઠું. દરિયાનું પાણી તો ખારું, ખારું.

## Chart 5: Trends over time

\% Children in Std V who CAN READ Std II level text By school type 2009-2012


## Reading and comprehension in English

Table 5: \% Children by class and READING level in ENGLISH All schools 2012

| Std. | Not <br> even <br> capital <br> letters | Capital <br> letters | Small <br> letters | Simple <br> words | Easy <br> sen- <br> tences | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 55.8 | 22.0 | 14.7 | 6.3 | 1.2 | 100 |
| II | 38.8 | 28.4 | 16.3 | 12.0 | 4.5 | 100 |
| III | 28.2 | 27.9 | 21.6 | 20.8 | 1.6 | 100 |
| IV | 24.1 | 22.9 | 23.2 | 19.3 | 10.6 | 100 |
| V | 18.5 | 28.9 | 26.1 | 20.0 | 6.5 | 100 |
| VI | 11.1 | 24.2 | 28.2 | 23.6 | 13.0 | 100 |
| VII | 7.0 | 15.7 | 23.8 | 31.1 | 22.4 | 100 |
| VIII | 3.9 | 9.7 | 19.7 | 31.6 | 35.1 | 100 |
| Total | 12.6 | 20.3 | 24.0 | 25.4 | 17.7 | 100 |

Table 6: \% Children by class who CAN COMPREHEND ENGLISH All schools 2012

| Std. | Of those who <br> can read words, <br> \% who can tell <br> meanings of <br> the words | Of those who <br> can read <br> sentences, \% who <br> can tell meanings <br> of the sentences |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| I |  |  |
| III |  |  |
| III | 66.8 | 65.1 |
| IV | 61.8 | 64.2 |
| V | 64.9 | 69.1 |
| VI | 67.9 | 66.4 |

English Tool



Note: In Gujarat govt. schools, English as a subject is introduced in std. V

## Gujarat rural

## Arithmetic

Table 7: \% Children by class and ARITHMETIC level All schools 2012

| Std. | Not even 1-9 | Recognize numbers |  | Can subtract | Can divide | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1-9 | 10-99 |  |  |  |
| 1 | 41.6 | 48.8 | 8.2 | 1.3 | 0.2 | 100 |
| 11 | 17.0 | 50.7 | 27.3 | 4.3 | 0.7 | 100 |
| III | 9.1 | 35.3 | 41.6 | 12.0 | 2.0 | 100 |
| IV | 4.0 | 23.8 | 39.5 | 26.2 | 6.6 | 100 |
| V | 2.2 | 15.6 | 33.1 | 35.3 | 13.9 | 100 |
| VI | 1.7 | 10.9 | 33.8 | 35.0 | 18.5 | 100 |
| VII | 1.8 | 7.5 | 23.8 | 36.4 | 30.4 | 100 |
| VIII | 1.2 | 3.9 | 20.6 | 32.9 | 41.3 | 100 |
| Total | 8.9 | 23.7 | 29.0 | 23.7 | 14.7 | 100 |

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level in arithmetic achieved by a child. For example, in Std 3, 9.1\% children cannot even recognize numbers 1-9, $35.3 \%$ can recognize numbers up to 9 but not more, $41.6 \%$ can recognize numbers to 99 but cannot do subtraction, $12.0 \%$ can do subtraction but not division, and 2.0\% can do division. For each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is $100 \%$.

Chart 6: Trends over time
\% Children in Std III who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more
By school type 2009-2012



## Math Tool



Chart 7: Trends over time
\% Children in Std V who CAN DO DIVISION
By school type 2009-2012


## Type of school and paid tuition classes

The ASER survey recorded information about tuition by asking the following question: "Does the child take any paid tuition class currently?" Therefore the numbers given below do not include any unpaid supplemental help in learning that children may have received.

| Table 8: Trends over time <br> \% Children attending paid tuition classes <br> By school type 2009-2012 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Children in Std I-VIII | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| Govt. schools: \% Children attending paid tuition classes | 8.3 | 9.3 | 10.5 | 9.0 |
| Private schools: \% Children attending paid tuition classes | 33.2 | 35.3 | 47.8 | 42.0 |
| All schools: \% Children attending paid tuition classes | 10.6 | 11.9 | 14.3 | 12.4 |

Table 9: Trends over time
\% Children by school type and tuition 2009-2012

| Year | Category |  | Std II | Std V | Std VIII | Std I-VIII |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2009 | Govt | No tuition | 86.5 | 83.8 | 60.4 | 83.0 |
|  |  | Tuition | 6.7 | 8.5 | 8.2 | 7.5 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 4.6 | 4.3 | 24.0 | 6.3 |
|  |  | Tuition | 2.3 | 3.4 | 7.5 | 3.2 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 2010 | Govt | No tuition | 83.0 | 81.5 | 70.2 | 81.5 |
|  |  | Tuition | 8.1 | 8.5 | 7.6 | 8.3 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 5.6 | 5.9 | 15.8 | 6.6 |
|  |  | Tuition | 3.3 | 4.1 | 6.4 | 3.6 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 2011 | Govt | No tuition | 81.8 | 81.3 | 72.9 | 80.5 |
|  |  | Tuition | 8.6 | 9.5 | 12.1 | 9.5 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 4.6 | 4.2 | 8.9 | 5.3 |
|  |  | Tuition | 5.0 | 5.0 | 6.1 | 4.8 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 2012 | Govt | No tuition | 83.0 | 83.4 | 77.5 | 81.6 |
|  |  | Tuition | 6.8 | 9.2 | 10.2 | 8.1 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 6.0 | 3.6 | 7.5 | 6.0 |
|  |  | Tuition | 4.2 | 3.8 | 4.8 | 4.3 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Chart 9: Trends over time
\% Children in Std III-V who CAN READ a Std I level text or more By school type and tuition 2009-2012



Chart 8: Trends over time
\% Children in Std I-VIII by school type and tuition 2009-2012


How to read this chart: This chart is a visual representation of the last column of Table 9. For a given year, the width of each colour band represents the \% of children in the corresponding category. For each year, these four categories add upto 100\%.

Chart 10: Trends over time
\% Children in Std III-V who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more By school type and tuition 2009-2012


Facilitated by PRATHAM

## School observations

In each year's ASER, from 2009 onwards, in each sampled village, the largest government school with primary sections was visited on the day of the survey. Information about schools in this report is based on these visits.

Table 10: Number of schools visited 2009-2012

| Type of school | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Std I-IVN: Primary | 73 | 66 | 67 | 70 |
| Std I-VIINIII: Primary + <br> Upper primary | 591 | 557 | 583 | 622 |
| Total schools visited | 664 | 623 | 650 | 692 |

Table 11: Student and teacher attendance on the day of the visit 2009-2012

| Type of school | Std I-IVN |  |  |  | Std I-VIINIII |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
|  | 83.9 | 87.4 | 85.0 | 84.1 | 83.1 | 84.4 | 84.9 | 83.9 |
| \% Teachers present <br> (Average) | 95.4 | 94.7 | 95.6 | 90.9 | 94.8 | 95.9 | 94.4 | 91.1 |

Table 12: Small schools and multigrade classes 2009-2012

| School characteristics | Std I-IVN |  |  |  | Std I-VIINIII |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| \% Schools with total enrollment of 60 or less | 36.1 | 33.3 | 39.4 | 43.1 | 2.8 | 1.3 | 2.0 | 1.5 |
| \% Schools where Std II children observed <br> sitting with one or more other classes | 76.8 | 56.1 | 64.2 | 85.1 | 38.2 | 33.6 | 32.8 | 40.4 |
| \% Schools where Std IV children observed <br> sitting with one or more other classes | 69.0 | 51.7 | 62.7 | 78.8 | 36.6 | 30.7 | 28.6 | 36.0 |

## RTE indicators

Table 13: Schools meeting selected RTE norms 2010-2012

| \% Schools meeting the following RTE norms: |  | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pupil-teacher \& classroomteacher norms | Pupil-teacher ratio | 62.7 | 62.0 | 55.3 |
|  | Classroom-teacher ratio* | 84.2 | 87.6 |  |
| Building | Office/store/office cum store | 80.2 | 82.8 | 79.0 |
|  | Playground | 75.5 | 83.4 | 79.7 |
|  | Boundary wall/fencing | 84.4 | 91.0 | 87.4 |
| Drinking water | No facility for drinking water | 14.2 | 10.3 | 11.1 |
|  | Facility but no drinking water available | 6.5 | 5.9 | 6.6 |
|  | Drinking water available | 79.4 | 83.9 | 82.3 |
| Toilet | No toilet facility | 2.6 | 2.1 | 1.3 |
|  | Facility but toilet not useable | 32.6 | 28.4 | 28.6 |
|  | Toilet useable | 64.8 | 69.5 | 70.0 |
| Girls toilet | \% Schools with no separate provisions for girls toilets | 12.7 | 5.2 | 5.5 |
|  | Of schools with separate girls toilets, \% schools with |  |  |  |
|  | Toilet locked | 20.7 | 8.0 | 11.3 |
|  | Toilet not useable | 16.7 | 19.1 | 17.4 |
|  | Toilet useable | 49.9 | 67.7 | 65.8 |
| Library | No library | 16.2 | 17.0 | 14.4 |
|  | Library but no books being used by children on day of visit | 35.2 | 38.8 | 44.3 |
|  | Library books being used by children on day of visit | 48.5 | 44.2 | 41.4 |
| Mid-day meal | Kitchen shed for cooking mid-day meal | 88.3 | 92.2 | 88.7 |
|  | Mid-day meal served in school on day of visit | 96.2 | 98.1 | 95.1 |



The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act, 2009 specifies a series of norms and standards for a school.

Norms for number of teachers vary according to the level of the school (primary or upper primary) and total student enrollment.

Norms for classrooms require the school to have at least one classroom for every teacher.

Norms for facilities require schools to provide each of the facilities mentioned in Table 13, among others.

RTE norms regulate provision of facilities but not their useability. ASER school observations also include whether facilities could be used. This information is included in Table 13.

School funds and activities (PAISA)

Table 14: \% Schools that report receiving SSA grants - Full financial year

| SSA school grants | April 2009 to March 2010 |  |  |  | April 2010 to March 2011 |  |  |  | April 2011 to March 2012 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { No. } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { Sch. } \end{gathered}$ | \% Schools |  |  | No. of Sch. | \% Schools |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { No. } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { Sch. } \end{gathered}$ | \% Schools |  |  |
|  |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |
| Maintenance grant | 440 | 87.5 | 5.7 | 6.8 | 609 | 79.3 | 17.1 | 3.6 | 662 | 85.8 | 10.9 | 3.3 |
| Development grant | 443 | 87.6 | 5.0 | 7.5 | 604 | 82.6 | 14.6 | 2.8 | 658 | 88.6 | 8.8 | 2.6 |
| TLM grant | 453 | 94.5 | 1.6 | 4.0 | 613 | 91.2 | 8.0 | 0.8 | 671 | 94.2 | 4.3 | 1.5 |

Table 15: \% Schools that report receiving SSA grants - Half financial year

| SSA school grants | April 2010 to date of survey (2010) |  |  |  | April 2011 to date of survey (2011) |  |  |  | April 2012 to date of survey (2012) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. of Sch. | \% Schools |  |  | No. of Sch. | \% Schools |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No. } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Sch. } \end{aligned}$ | \% Schools |  |  |
|  |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |
| Maintenance grant | 415 | 81.9 | 9.2 | 8.9 | 544 | 65.3 | 30.2 | 4.6 | 626 | 82.8 | 12.3 | 5.0 |
| Development grant | 421 | 85.5 | 7.4 | 7.1 | 540 | 67.0 | 29.1 | 3.9 | 627 | 84.4 | 10.9 | 4.8 |
| TLM grant | 423 | 89.1 | 5.0 | 5.9 | 542 | 70.1 | 26.8 | 3.1 | 633 | 90.5 | 6.5 | 3.0 |

Table 16: \% Schools carrying out different activities since April 2011

| Type of Activity |  | \% Schools |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Yes | No | Don't know |
| Const. | New Classroom | 52.2 | 45.4 | 2.3 |
| Repairs | Repair of building (roof, floor, wall etc.) | 62.3 | 35.7 | 2.0 |
|  | Repair of doors \& windows | 52.1 | 45.5 | 2.4 |
|  | Repair of boundary wall | 31.5 | 65.9 | 2.6 |
|  | Repair of drinking water facility | 58.0 | 39.9 | 2.1 |
|  | Repair of toilet | 50.1 | 47.4 | 2.5 |
| Painting <br> \& white- <br> wash | White wash/plastering | 61.3 | 36.5 | 2.2 |
|  | Painting blackboard/Display board/Painting on wall | 67.9 | 30.2 | 1.9 |
|  | Painting of doors \& walls | 52.5 | 45.4 | 2.1 |
| Purchase | Purchase of furniture (cupboard etc.) | 44.4 | 52.7 | 3.0 |
|  | Purchase of electrical fittings | 68.3 | 29.0 | 2.6 |
|  | Purchase of chalk, duster, register etc. | 86.7 | 11.3 | 2.0 |
|  | Purchase of sitting mats/Tat patti | 47.0 | 50.8 | 2.2 |
|  | Purchase of charts, globes \& other teaching material | 81.0 | 16.9 | 2.1 |
| Other | Expenditure on school events | 81.2 | 16.5 | 2.2 |
|  | Payment of bills (electricity, water, cleaning etc.) | 61.9 | 34.9 | 3.2 |

The PAISA section of ASER tracks receipt and spending of Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) grants at the school level. This information is collected from schools visited during the survey. This page reports proportion of schools receiving the grants and carrying out specified activities in the schools. More detailed analysis of the PAISA data will be available in the PAISA 2012 report which will be released in March $2013 .{ }^{1}$

## EVERY RURAL GOVERNMENT PRIMARY/UPPER PRIMARY SCHOOL IS ENTITLED TO EACH OF THESE SSA GRANTS EVERY YEAR.

| How much goes to |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| each school | For what purposes |

SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT GRANT / SCHOOL GRANT
Rs. 5000 per year per primary school

Rs. 7000 per year per upper primary school

## Rs 5000 + Rs $7000=$

 Rs 12000 if the school is Std I-VIINIII.Note: Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same premises.

## SCHOOL MAINTENANCE GRANT

Rs. 5000 - Rs 7500 per school per year if the school has upto 3 classrooms.

Rs 7500 - Rs. 10000 per year if the school has more than 3 classrooms.

Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same building.

This grant can be used for maintenance of school building, including whitewashing; beautification; and repair of toilets, hand pump, boundary wall, playground etc.

The grant amount depends on number of classrooms (excluding Headmaster room and office room)

## TLM GRANT

Rs. 500 per teacher per year in primary and upper primary schools.

This grant can be used by teachers to buy teaching aids, such as charts, globes, posters, models etc.



## ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM HOUSEHOLDS. 20 OUT OF 20 DISTRICTS

Data has not been presented where sample size was insufficient.

## School enrollment and out of school children

Table 1: \% Children in different types of schools 2012

| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in <br> school | Total |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age: 6-14 ALL | 48.8 | 49.2 | 0.5 | 1.5 | 100 |
| Age: 7-16 ALL | 50.8 | 46.2 | 0.5 | 2.6 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 46.6 | 52.0 | 0.6 | 0.9 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 BOYS | 40.7 | 58.3 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 GIRLS | 54.0 | 44.0 | 0.8 | 1.2 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 ALL | 53.8 | 43.6 | 0.4 | 2.1 | 100 |
| Age: $11-14$ BOYS | 48.8 | 49.8 | 0.4 | 1.1 | 100 |
| Age: $11-14$ GIRLS | 60.0 | 36.1 | 0.4 | 3.5 | 100 |
| Age: $15-16$ ALL | 53.7 | 37.8 | 0.4 | 8.1 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 BOYS | 48.5 | 44.0 | 0.5 | 7.0 | 100 |
| Age: $15-16$ GIRLS | 59.5 | 30.9 | 0.4 | 9.3 | 100 |

Note: 'Other' includes children going to madarsa and EGS.
'Not in school' = dropped out + never enrolled.

Chart 2: Trends over time
\% Children enrolled in private schools by class 2008-2012


## Young children in pre-school and school

Table 3: \% Children age 3-6 who are enrolled in different types of pre-school and school 2012

|  | In balwadi <br> or anganwadi | $\begin{aligned} & \text { In LKG/ } \\ & \text { UKG } \end{aligned}$ | In School |  |  | Not in school or preschool | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Govt. | Pvt. | Other |  |  |
| Age 3 | 46.2 | 21.4 |  |  |  | 32.4 | 100 |
| Age 4 | 25.1 | 55.9 |  |  |  | 19.1 | 100 |
| Age 5 | 3.4 | 5.9 | 26.0 | 58.7 | 0.4 | 5.6 | 100 |
| Age 6 | 1.0 | 2.9 | 33.8 | 59.3 | 0.5 | 2.5 | 100 |

Chart 1: Trends over time
\% Children out of school by age group and gender 2006-2012


How to read this chart: Each line shows trends in the proportion of children out of school for a particular subset of children. For example, the proportion of girls (age 1114) not in school has changed from $8.4 \%$ in 2006 to $7.0 \%$ in 2007 to $5.1 \%$ in 2008, $4.3 \%$ in 2009 and to $1.8 \%$ in 2010 to $3.5 \%$ in 2012.

Table 2: Sample description
\% Children in each class by age 2012

| Std. | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 29.1 | 38.3 | 22.3 | 7.0 | 3.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| \|| | 5.5 | 20.1 | 37.1 | 25.7 | 6.9 | 4.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| III |  | 4.5 | 17.7 | 39.9 | 21.4 | 11.2 | 5.3 |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| IV | 5.1 |  |  | 19.7 | 31.1 | 28.9 | 9.2 | 6.0 |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| V | 0.8 |  |  | 5.1 | 16.6 | 36.8 | 21.6 | 14.0 | 5.2 |  |  |  | 100 |
| VI | 5.1 |  |  |  |  | 19.0 | 30.7 | 30.4 | 10.0 | 4.9 |  |  | 100 |
| VII | 5.4 |  |  |  |  |  | 15.8 | 42.1 | 21.1 | 10.5 | 5.2 |  | 100 |
| VIII | 5.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 24.4 | 33.3 | 24.4 | 9.8 | 3.2 | 100 |

How to read this table: If a child started school in Std I at age 6, she should be of age 8 in Std III. This table shows the age distribution for each class. For example, in Std III, $39.9 \%$ children are 8 years old but there are also $17.7 \%$ who are $7,21.4 \%$ who are $9,11.2 \%$ who are 10 years old and $5.3 \%$ who are older.

Chart 3: Trends over time
\% Children age 3, 4 and 5 not enrolled in school or pre-school 2006-2012*


* Data for 2011 is not comparable and therefore excluded here.


## Reading

Table 4: \% Children by class and READING level
All schools 2012

| Std. | Not even <br> letter | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (Std I Text) | Level 2 <br> (Std II Text) | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 27.7 | 35.4 | 20.5 | 9.5 | 6.9 | 100 |
| II | 13.0 | 26.4 | 23.6 | 17.1 | 19.9 | 100 |
| IIII | 8.0 | 20.0 | 17.4 | 20.5 | 34.1 | 100 |
| IV | 4.4 | 11.7 | 14.9 | 21.1 | 47.9 | 100 |
| V | 2.9 | 8.4 | 11.8 | 17.1 | 59.8 | 100 |
| VI | 2.0 | 5.9 | 7.3 | 15.5 | 69.3 | 100 |
| VII | 1.2 | 4.1 | 3.9 | 10.2 | 80.7 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.7 | 1.8 | 2.7 | 7.4 | 87.4 | 100 |
| Total | 7.6 | 14.4 | 12.9 | 14.9 | 50.3 | 100 |

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level in reading achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, 8.0\% children cannot even read letters, 20.0\% can read letters but not more, $17.4 \%$ can read words but not Std I text or higher, $20.5 \%$ can read Std I text but not Std II level text, and $34.1 \%$ can read Std II level text. For each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is $100 \%$.

Chart 4: Trends over time
\% Children in Std III who CAN READ Std I level text
By school type 2009-2012


## Reading Tool

 - Hipunturnalmen










Chart 5: Trends over time
\% Children in Std V who CAN READ Std II level text By school type 2009-2012


## Reading and comprehension in English

Table 5: \% Children by class and READING level in ENGLISH All schools 2012

| Std. | Not <br> even <br> capital <br> letters | Capital <br> letters | Small <br> letters | Simple <br> words | Easy <br> sen- <br> tences | Total |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 31.4 | 19.2 | 21.9 | 21.2 | 6.2 | 100 |
| II | 17.4 | 15.7 | 26.1 | 24.9 | 15.9 | 100 |
| III | 12.8 | 14.3 | 23.3 | 24.4 | 25.3 | 100 |
| IV | 7.8 | 10.7 | 20.2 | 24.9 | 36.3 | 100 |
| V | 6.3 | 8.2 | 19.8 | 23.8 | 41.9 | 100 |
| VII | 3.8 | 6.6 | 17.1 | 24.1 | 48.4 | 100 |
| VII | 2.2 | 4.5 | 13.7 | 21.1 | 58.6 | 100 |
| VIII | 1.4 | 2.5 | 8.8 | 18.3 | 69.0 | 100 |
| Total | 10.5 | 10.3 | 19.0 | 22.9 | 37.3 | 100 |

Table 6: \% Children by class who CAN COMPREHEND ENGLISH All schools 2012

| Std. | Of those who <br> can read words, <br> \% who can tell <br> meanings of <br> the words | Of those who <br> can read <br> sentences, \% who <br> can tell meanings <br> of the sentences |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| I | 56.9 | 46.4 |
| II | 61.3 | 44.8 |
| III | 60.8 | 55.0 |
| IV | 57.2 | 63.9 |
| V | 57.1 | 61.4 |
| VI | 56.9 | 62.5 |
| VII | 58.9 | 65.1 |
| VIII | 57.4 | 59.4 |

English Tool

| Cive his lest to Aut ahtioen. Hecerd she Niphast reading lievel. <br> ary of me child to teil the masning of nords off |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| D L T | $\mathbf{y}$ f i |
| K G | $\mathrm{S} \quad \mathrm{v}$ |
| $\mathbf{X} \quad \mathbf{P} \quad \mathbf{N}$ | m a h |
|  |  |
| dog fat | What is the time? |
| cup | This is asmall door. |
| boy out | I like to sleep. |
| box | He has a blue shirt. |
|  |  |

## Haryana rural

## Arithmetic

Table 7: \% Children by class and ARITHMETIC level All schools 2012

| Std. | Not even | Recognize numbers |  | Can <br> subtract | Can divide | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $1-9$ | $1-9$ | $10-99$ |  |  |  |
| I | 22.7 | 33.8 | 32.8 | 9.3 | 1.5 | 100 |
| II | 7.8 | 29.2 | 33.7 | 23.1 | 6.3 | 100 |
| III | 3.3 | 25.0 | 25.7 | 27.2 | 18.9 | 100 |
| IV | 2.6 | 15.0 | 21.5 | 28.4 | 32.5 | 100 |
| V | 1.5 | 11.0 | 18.4 | 26.1 | 42.9 | 100 |
| VI | 1.1 | 6.7 | 17.6 | 26.8 | 47.8 | 100 |
| VII | 0.9 | 3.6 | 14.5 | 24.0 | 57.1 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.4 | 1.7 | 13.5 | 17.3 | 67.2 | 100 |
| Total | 5.1 | 16.0 | 22.3 | 22.8 | 33.8 | 100 |

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level in arithmetic achieved by a child. For example, in Std 3, 3.3\% children cannot even recognize numbers 1-9, 25\% can recognize numbers up to 9 but not more, $25.7 \%$ can recognize numbers to 99 but cannot do subtraction, $27.2 \%$ can do subtraction but not division, and $18.9 \%$ can do division. For each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is $100 \%$.

## Chart 6: Trends over time

\% Children in Std III who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more
By school type 2009-2012



## Math Tool

| $4$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \pi=1 \\ & i \pi \end{aligned}$ |  | $\underline{=}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4 | 7 | 7 | 14 | $4$ | $\begin{array}{r} 41 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $1{ }^{\text {स4 }}$ |
| 4 | 4 | 4 | \# | $\begin{array}{r} 44 \\ -4 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 71 \\ -31 \end{array}$ | d) 84 |
| 1 | + | 1 | 7 | $\begin{array}{r} 41 \\ -34 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 14 \\ -\quad 11 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 1) H |
| 1 | $\square$ | 4 | 11 | $\frac{1}{2 n}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 44 \\ -\quad 17 \end{array}$ | )187 |
| E- | 12- | $=$ | $=$ | +1-1 | +1= | -7-0\% |

Chart 7: Trends over time
\% Children in Std V who CAN DO DIVISION
By school type 2009-2012



## Type of school and paid tuition classes

The ASER survey recorded information about tuition by asking the following question: "Does the child take any paid tuition class currently?" Therefore the numbers given below do not include any unpaid supplemental help in learning that children may have received.

| Table 8: Trends over time <br> \% Children attending paid tuition classes <br> By school type 2009-2012 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Children in Std I-VIII | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| Govt. schools: \% Children attending paid tuition classes | 13.6 | 11.0 | 8.0 | 6.6 |
| Private schools: \% Children attending paid tuition classes | 25.3 | 21.6 | 20.1 | 19.7 |
| All schools: \% Children attending paid tuition classes | 18.5 | 15.5 | 13.1 | 13.0 |

Table 9: Trends over time
\% Children by school type and tuition 2009-2012

| Year | Category |  | Std II | Std V | Std VIII | Std I-VIII |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2009 | Govt | No tuition | 49.4 | 50.9 | 51.7 | 50.7 |
|  |  | Tuition | 6.1 | 9.1 | 12.2 | 8.0 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 35.4 | 27.9 | 24.4 | 30.8 |
|  |  | Tuition | 9.2 | 12.1 | 11.7 | 10.5 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 2010 | Govt | No tuition | 45.0 | 51.8 | 53.3 | 51.5 |
|  |  | Tuition | 5.0 | 7.6 | 7.9 | 6.4 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 41.3 | 30.4 | 29.0 | 33.0 |
|  |  | Tuition | 8.8 | 10.2 | 9.7 | 9.1 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 2011 | Govt | No tuition | 46.4 | 54.1 | 59.5 | 53.3 |
|  |  | Tuition | 3.9 | 5.8 | 5.1 | 4.6 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 40.7 | 31.5 | 28.7 | 33.6 |
|  |  | Tuition | 9.0 | 8.6 | 6.7 | 8.5 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 2012 | Govt | No tuition | 37.6 | 48.7 | 54.9 | 47.4 |
|  |  | Tuition | 3.0 | 4.7 | 3.0 | 3.3 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 46.6 | 37.4 | 35.5 | 39.6 |
|  |  | Tuition | 12.8 | 9.2 | 6.6 | 9.7 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Chart 9: Trends over time
\% Children in Std III-V who CAN READ a Std I level text or more By school type and tuition 2009-2012



Chart 8: Trends over time
\% Children in Std I-VIII by school type and tuition 2009-2012


How to read this chart: This chart is a visual representation of the last column of Table 9 For a given year, the width of each colour band represents the \% of children in the corresponding category. For each year, these four categories add upto 100\%.

Chart 10: Trends over time
\% Children in Std III-V who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more By school type and tuition 2009-2012


## School observations

In each year's ASER, from 2009 onwards, in each sampled village, the largest government school with primary sections was visited on the day of the survey. Information about schools in this report is based on these visits.

Table 10: Number of schools visited 2009-2012

| Type of school | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Std I-IVN: Primary | 361 | 302 | 244 | 352 |
| Std I-VIINIII: Primary + <br> Upper primary | 167 | 226 | 145 | 161 |
| Total schools visited | 528 | 528 | 389 | 513 |

Table 11: Student and teacher attendance on the day of the visit 2009-2012

| Type of school | Std I-IVN |  |  |  | Std I-VIINIIII |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| \% Enrolled children <br> present (Average) | 83.6 | 82.9 | 76.4 | 77.2 | 85.0 | 81.7 | 78.8 | 77.8 |
| \% Teachers present <br> (Average) | 86.4 | 89.8 | 84.9 | 85.5 | 84.7 | 87.8 | 85.9 | 83.4 |

Table 12: Small schools and multigrade classes 2009-2012

| School characteristics | Std I-IVN |  |  |  | Std I-VIINIII |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| \% Schools with total enrollment of 60 or less | 7.6 | 10.3 | 8.8 | 12.8 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 2.8 | 1.3 |
| \% Schools where Std II children observed <br> sitting with one or more other classes | 36.6 | 33.0 | 46.1 | 40.1 | 29.4 | 31.3 | 35.7 | 44.6 |
| \% Schools where Std IV children observed <br> sitting with one or more other classes | 25.7 | 30.1 | 35.7 | 32.5 | 25.2 | 28.9 | 26.9 | 36.7 |

## RTE indicators

Table 13: Schools meeting selected RTE norms 2010-2012

| \% Schools meeting the following RTE norms: |  | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pupil-teacher \& classroomteacher norms | Pupil-teacher ratio | 40.3 | 41.2 | 40.3 |
|  | Classroom-teacher ratio | 75.1 | 70.9 | 76.7 |
| Building | Office/store/office cum store | 85.8 | 80.6 | 84.0 |
|  | Playground | 79.7 | 78.9 | 82.3 |
|  | Boundary wall/fencing | 82.7 | 83.9 | 88.9 |
| Drinking water | No facility for drinking water | 17.7 | 14.6 | 13.9 |
|  | Facility but no drinking water available | 7.7 | 7.1 | 10.4 |
|  | Drinking water available | 74.6 | 78.3 | 75.7 |
| Toilet | No toilet facility | 2.0 | 3.2 | 3.0 |
|  | Facility but toilet not useable | 30.1 | 26.8 | 23.6 |
|  | Toilet useable | 67.9 | 70.1 | 73.5 |
| Girls toilet | \% Schools with no separate provisions for girls toilets | 10.0 | 6.1 | 5.9 |
|  | Of schools with separate girls toilets, \% schools with |  |  |  |
|  | Toilet locked | 13.4 | 4.3 | 3.0 |
|  | Toilet not useable | 23.9 | 21.6 | 20.3 |
|  | Toilet useable | 52.8 | 68.0 | 70.8 |
| Library | No library | 35.4 | 21.8 | 15.5 |
|  | Library but no books being used by children on day of visit | 33.0 | 35.5 | 45.8 |
|  | Library books being used by children on day of visit | 31.6 | 42.6 | 38.7 |
| Mid-day meal | Kitchen shed for cooking mid-day meal | 51.0 | 60.5 | 68.3 |
|  | Mid-day meal served in school on day of visit | 93.7 | 94.2 | 91.7 |



The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act, 2009 specifies a series of norms and standards for a school.

Norms for number of teachers vary according to the level of the school (primary or upper primary) and total student enrollment.

Norms for classrooms require the school to have at least one classroom for every teacher.

Norms for facilities require schools to provide each of the facilities mentioned in Table 13, among others.

RTE norms regulate provision of facilities but not their useability. ASER school observations also include whether facilities could be used. This information is included in Table 13.
facilitated by PRATHAM

## School funds and activities (PAISA)

Table 14: \% Schools that report receiving SSA grants - Full financial year

| SSA school grants | April 2009 to March 2010 |  |  |  | April 2010 to March 2011 |  |  |  | April 2011 to March 2012 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { No. } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { Sch. } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | \% Schools |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { No. } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { Sch. } \end{gathered}$ | \% Schools |  |  | No. of Sch. | \% Schools |  |  |
|  |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |
| Maintenance grant | 456 | 92.8 | 4.8 | 2.4 | 377 | 91.3 | 6.4 | 2.4 | 503 | 95.8 | 1.4 | 2.8 |
| Development grant | 415 | 87.0 | 8.9 | 4.1 | 365 | 83.6 | 12.6 | 3.8 | 494 | 84.0 | 12.2 | 3.9 |
| TLM grant | 409 | 92.7 | 5.4 | 2.0 | 375 | 92.0 | 6.7 | 1.3 | 504 | 93.1 | 5.0 | 2.0 |

Table 15: \% Schools that report receiving SSA grants - Half financial year

| SSA school grants | April 2010 to date of survey (2010) |  |  |  | April 2011 to date of survey (2011) |  |  |  | April 2012 to date of survey (2012) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. of Sch. | \% Schools |  |  | No. of Sch. | \% Schools |  |  | No. of Sch. | \% Schools |  |  |
|  |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |
| Maintenance <br> grant | 418 | 65.6 | 29.4 | 5.0 | 347 | 62.8 | 32.3 | 4.9 | 485 | 84.5 | 12.6 | 2.9 |
| Development grant | 381 | 62.5 | 32.0 | 5.5 | 334 | 48.8 | 43.7 | 7.5 | 477 | 73.6 | 23.1 | 3.4 |
| TLM grant | 392 | 65.6 | 30.1 | 4.3 | 342 | 61.7 | 34.8 | 3.5 | 470 | 58.9 | 37.9 | 3.2 |

Table 16: \% Schools carrying out different activities since April 2011

| Type of Activity |  | \% Schools |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Yes | No | Don't know |
| Const. | New Classroom | 31.2 | 66.7 | 2.2 |
| Repairs | Repair of building (roof, floor, wall etc.) | 59.5 | 38.7 | 1.9 |
|  | Repair of doors \& windows | 47.2 | 51.3 | 1.4 |
|  | Repair of boundary wall | 30.0 | 68.3 | 1.7 |
|  | Repair of drinking water facility | 52.4 | 46.2 | 1.5 |
|  | Repair of toilet | 43.0 | 55.7 | 1.3 |
| Painting \& whitewash | White wash/plastering | 60.2 | 38.1 | 1.7 |
|  | Painting blackboard/Display board/Painting on wall | 62.1 | 36.2 | 1.7 |
|  | Painting of doors \& walls | 45.9 | 52.9 | 1.3 |
| Purchase | Purchase of furniture (cupboard etc.) | 39.1 | 59.1 | 1.9 |
|  | Purchase of electrical fittings | 46.0 | 52.6 | 1.4 |
|  | Purchase of chalk, duster, register etc. | 83.8 | 14.5 | 1.7 |
|  | Purchase of sitting mats/Tat patti | 43.7 | 54.8 | 1.5 |
|  | Purchase of charts, globes \& other teaching material | 65.6 | 32.5 | 1.9 |
| Other | Expenditure on school events | 86.2 | 11.5 | 2.3 |
|  | Payment of bills (electricity, water, cleaning etc.) | 82.0 | 15.2 | 2.8 |

The PAISA section of ASER tracks receipt and spending of Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) grants at the school level. This information is collected from schools visited during the survey. This page reports proportion of schools receiving the grants and carrying out specified activities in the schools. More detailed analysis of the PAISA data will be available in the PAISA 2012 report which will be released in March 2013.'

## EVERY RURAL GOVERNMENT PRIMARY/UPPER PRIMARY SCHOOL IS ENTITLED TO EACH OF THESE sSA GRANTS EVERY YEAR.

| How much goes to |
| :---: | :---: |
| each school |$\quad$ For what purposes

SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT GRANT / SCHOOL GRANT
Rs. 5000 per year per primary school

Rs. 7000 per year per upper primary school

## Rs 5000 + Rs $7000=$

 Rs 12000 if the school is Std I-VIIINIII.Note: Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same premises.

## SCHOOL MAINTENANCE GRANT

Rs. 5000 - Rs 7500 per school per year if the school has upto 3 classrooms.

Rs 7500 - Rs. 10000 per year if the school has more than 3 classrooms.

Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same building.

This grant can be used for maintenance of school building, including whitewashing; beautification; and repair of toilets, hand pump, boundary wall, playground etc.

The grant amount depends on number of classrooms (excluding Headmaster room and office room)

## TLM GRANT

Rs. 500 per teacher per year in primary and upper primary schools.

This grant can be used by teachers to buy teaching aids, such as charts, globes, posters, models etc.

# Himachal Pradesh rubal 

ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM HOUSEHOLDS. 10 OUT OF 12 DISTRICTS
Data has not been presented where sample size was insufficient.

## School enrollment and out of school children

Table 1: \% Children in different types of schools 2012

| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in <br> school | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age: 6-14 ALL | 70.0 | 28.9 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 100 |
| Age: 7-16 ALL | 73.2 | 25.3 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 66.6 | 32.7 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 BOYS | 63.4 | 36.0 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 GIRLS | 69.9 | 29.1 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 ALL | 76.3 | 22.2 | 0.1 | 1.4 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 BOYS | 73.4 | 25.6 | 0.1 | 1.0 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 GIRLS | 79.5 | 18.6 | 0.1 | 1.8 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 ALL | 83.8 | 12.7 | 0.0 | 3.5 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 BOYS | 82.6 | 14.2 | 0.0 | 3.3 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 GIRLS | 84.8 | 11.4 | 0.0 | 3.8 | 100 |

Note: 'Other' includes children going to madarsa and EGS 'Not in school' = dropped out + never enrolled.

Chart 2: Trends over time \% Children enrolled in private schools by class 2008-2012


## Young children in pre-school and school

Table 3: \% Children age 3-6 who are enrolled in different types of pre-school and school 2012

|  | In balwadi or anganwad | In LKG/ UKG | In School |  |  | Not in school or preschool | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Govt. | Pvt. | Other |  |  |
| Age 3 | 68.5 | 15.3 |  |  |  | 16.2 | 100 |
| Age 4 | 54.8 | 40.5 |  |  |  | 4.7 | 100 |
| Age 5 | 7.6 | 3.5 | 30.0 | 52.7 | 0.0 | 6.2 | 100 |
| Age 6 | 0.6 | 0.9 | 54.8 | 42.4 | 0.0 | 1.3 | 100 |

ASER 2012

Chart 1: Trends over time
\% Children out of school by age group and gender 2006-2012


How to read this chart: Each line shows trends in the proportion of children out of school for a particular subset of children. For example, the proportion of girls (age 1114) not in school has changed from $2.7 \%$ in 2006 to $2.2 \%$ in 2007 to $1.0 \%$ in 2008 , $1.1 \%$ in 2009 and to $0.4 \%$ in 2010 to $1.8 \%$ in 2012.

Table 2: Sample description
\% Children in each class by age 2012

| Std. | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 30.8 | 54.8 | 11.9 | 2.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| \|| | 1.9 | 23.2 | 57.3 | 15.0 | 2.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| III | 2 | . 3 | 22.3 | 56.7 | 15.7 | 3.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| IV | 1.9 |  |  | 21.7 | 52.2 | 19.6 | 4.7 |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| V | 2.1 |  |  |  | 17.0 | 55.3 | 19.6 | 6.0 |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| VI | 2.3 |  |  |  |  | 20.1 | 49.3 | 23.9 | 4.4 |  |  |  | 100 |
| VII | 1.3 |  |  |  |  |  | 20.4 | 54.1 | 19.3 | 4.9 |  |  | 100 |
| VIII | 3.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 28.8 | 44.6 | 19.1 | 4. |  | 100 |

How to read this table: If a child started school in Std I at age 6, she should be of age 8 in Std III. This table shows the age distribution for each class. For example, in Std III, $56.7 \%$ children are 8 years old but there are also $22.3 \%$ who are $7,15.7 \%$ who are 9 years old and $3 \%$ who are older.

Chart 3: Trends over time
\% Children age 3, 4 and 5 not enrolled in school or pre-school 2006-2012*


* Data for 2011 is not comparable and therefore excluded here.


## Himachal Pradesh rubal

Facilitated by PRATHAM

## Reading

Table 4: \% Children by class and READING level
All schools 2012

| Std. | Not even <br> letter | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (Std I Text) | Level 2 <br> (Std II Text) | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 13.6 | 45.6 | 25.4 | 9.6 | 5.8 | 100 |
| II | 7.3 | 26.4 | 27.5 | 18.6 | 20.3 | 100 |
| III | 3.5 | 13.8 | 16.2 | 27.8 | 38.7 | 100 |
| IV | 2.6 | 6.6 | 9.8 | 26.1 | 54.8 | 100 |
| V | 0.8 | 3.8 | 6.0 | 16.6 | 72.8 | 100 |
| VI | 0.4 | 3.4 | 3.3 | 14.2 | 78.8 | 100 |
| VII | 0.4 | 2.3 | 1.8 | 6.7 | 88.9 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.2 | 2.2 | 0.8 | 6.8 | 90.1 | 100 |
| Total | 3.4 | 12.4 | 11.2 | 16.3 | 56.7 | 100 |

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level in reading achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, 3.5\% children cannot even read letters, $13.8 \%$ can read letters but not more, $16.2 \%$ can read words but not Std I text or higher, $27.8 \%$ can read Std I text but not Std II level text, and $38.7 \%$ can read Std II level text. For each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is $100 \%$.

Chart 4: Trends over time
\% Children in Std III who CAN READ Std I level text
By school type 2009-2012


## Reading Tool
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Chart 5: Trends over time
\% Children in Std V who CAN READ Std II level text
By school type 2009-2012


## Reading and comprehension in English

Table 5: \% Children by class and READING level in ENGLISH All schools 2012

| Std. | Not <br> even <br> capital <br> letters | Capital <br> letters | Small <br> letters | Simple <br> words | Easy <br> sen- <br> tences | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| I | 16.3 | 26.8 | 27.1 | 22.4 | 7.4 | 100 |
| II | 9.4 | 20.5 | 29.5 | 24.6 | 16.0 | 100 |
| III | 4.1 | 10.4 | 25.5 | 36.8 | 23.1 | 100 |
| IV | 2.8 | 8.3 | 16.0 | 34.5 | 38.5 | 100 |
| V | 2.2 | 4.1 | 10.5 | 28.5 | 54.7 | 100 |
| VI | 1.8 | 3.5 | 8.7 | 23.5 | 62.6 | 100 |
| VII | 0.4 | 1.6 | 5.7 | 20.2 | 72.1 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.4 | 2.3 | 2.1 | 13.9 | 81.3 | 100 |
| Total | 4.5 | 9.4 | 15.6 | 26.1 | 44.5 | 100 |

Table 6: \% Children by class who CAN COMPREHEND ENGLISH All schools 2012

| Std. | Of those who <br> can read words, <br> \% who can tell <br> meanings of <br> the words | Of those who <br> can read <br> sentences, \% who <br> can tell meanings <br> of the sentences |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| I |  |  |
| II | 59.8 | 54.4 |
| III | 65.6 | 62.7 |
| IV | 70.3 | 68.2 |
| V | 65.8 | 73.4 |
| VI |  | 79.4 |
| VII |  | 81.6 |
| VIII |  | 71.6 |

English Tool


## Himachal Pradesh rural

## Arithmetic

Table 7: \% Children by class and ARITHMETIC level All schools 2012

| Std. | Not even 1-9 | Recognize numbers |  | Can subtract | Can divide | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1-9 | 10-99 |  |  |  |
| 1 | 9.2 | 36.9 | 43.4 | 7.8 | 2.8 | 100 |
| II | 3.1 | 23.8 | 44.7 | 23.8 | 4.7 | 100 |
| III | 1.6 | 14.0 | 34.2 | 33.4 | 16.9 | 100 |
| IV | 0.7 | 8.4 | 23.6 | 35.5 | 31.9 | 100 |
| V | 0.5 | 3.6 | 19.3 | 27.9 | 48.7 | 100 |
| VI | 0.0 | 3.0 | 14.6 | 25.5 | 57.0 | 100 |
| VII | 0.0 | 1.2 | 10.2 | 23.7 | 64.8 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.2 | 0.8 | 8.8 | 18.5 | 71.8 | 100 |
| Total | 1.8 | 11.0 | 24.7 | 25.1 | 37.4 | 100 |

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level in arithmetic achieved by a child. For example, in Std 3, 1.6\% children cannot even recognize numbers 1-9, $14.0 \%$ can recognize numbers up to 9 but not more, $34.2 \%$ can recognize numbers to 99 but cannot do subtraction, 33.4\% can do subtraction but not division, and $16.9 \%$ can do division. For each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is $100 \%$.

## Chart 6: Trends over time

\% Children in Std III who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more By school type 2009-2012



## Math Tool

| $\begin{gathered} \text { in } \\ \hline 1+1 \end{gathered}$ |  |  | $\underline{\square}$ | = |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 11 | II | 11 | $\begin{array}{r} 41 \\ 814 \end{array}$ | 1754 |
| 1 + | \# | 1 | $\begin{array}{rr} 14 & 11 \\ -i n & -1 \end{array}$ | 4)TH4 |
|  | 17 | 71 |  |  |
| 11 |  |  | $\begin{array}{rr} 19 & 11 \\ -11 & -15 \end{array}$ | +195 |
|  | \# | $\underline{\square}$ | 5 Br | 1 |
| 1 1 | 27 | 11 | $\begin{array}{cc} 4 & 41 \\ 4 & -14 \end{array}$ | -1454 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $1=$ |  | $4=-4+8$ | -6turn= |

Chart 7: Trends over time
\% Children in Std V who CAN DO DIVISION
By school type 2009-2012



## Himachal Pradesh rural

Facilitated by PRATHAM

## Type of school and paid tuition classes

The ASER survey recorded information about tuition by asking the following question: "Does the child take any paid tuition class currently?" Therefore the numbers given below do not include any unpaid supplemental help in learning that children may have received.

| Table 8: Trends over time \% Children attending paid tuition classes By school type 2009-2012 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Children in Std I-VIII | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| Govt. schools: \% Children attending paid tuition classes | 7.6 | 5.6 | 3.5 | 3.8 |
| Private schools: \% Children attending paid tuition classes | 21.6 | 20.1 | 15.3 | 15.8 |
| All schools: \% Children attending paid tuition classes | 10.5 | 9.5 | 6.8 | 7.4 |

Table 9: Trends over time
\% Children by school type and tuition 2009-2012

| Year | Category |  | Std II | Std V | Std VIII | Std I-VIII |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2009 | Govt | No tuition | 71.9 | 74.5 | 78.0 | 73.2 |
|  |  | Tuition | 3.7 | 6.9 | 8.6 | 6.0 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 19.6 | 14.5 | 10.4 | 16.3 |
|  |  | Tuition | 4.8 | 4.1 | 3.1 | 4.5 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 2010 | Govt | No tuition | 61.1 | 68.8 | 75.9 | 69.0 |
|  |  | Tuition | 3.6 | 6.4 | 6.1 | 4.1 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 30.0 | 19.3 | 14.0 | 21.5 |
|  |  | Tuition | 5.4 | 5.6 | 4.0 | 5.4 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 2011 | Govt | No tuition | 60.9 | 70.6 | 79.7 | 69.4 |
|  |  | Tuition | 1.5 | 2.1 | 5.1 | 2.5 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 33.0 | 21.8 | 12.2 | 23.8 |
|  |  | Tuition | 4.6 | 5.6 | 3.1 | 4.3 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 2012 | Govt | No tuition | 64.9 | 69.5 | 75.8 | 67.5 |
|  |  | Tuition | 1.0 | 2.9 | 3.3 | 2.7 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 30.4 | 22.2 | 16.5 | 25.1 |
|  |  | Tuition | 3.7 | 5.5 | 4.4 | 4.7 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Chart 9: Trends over time
\% Children in Std III-V who CAN READ a Std I level text or more By school type and tuition 2009-2012



Chart 8: Trends over time
\% Children in Std I-VIII by school type and tuition 2009-2012


How to read this chart: This chart is a visual representation of the last column of Table 9. For a given year, the width of each colour band represents the \% of children in the corresponding category. For each year, these four categories add upto 100\%.

Chart 10: Trends over time
\% Children in Std III-V who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more By school type and tuition 2009-2012


## Himachal Pradesh rural

Facilitated by PRATHAM

## School observations

In each year's ASER, from 2009 onwards, in each sampled village, the largest government school with primary sections was visited on the day of the survey. Information about schools in this report is based on these visits.

Table 10: Number of schools visited 2009-2012

| Type of school | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Std I-IVN: Primary | 310 | 195 | 224 | 222 |
| Std I-VIINIII: Primary + <br> Upper primary | 22 | 66 | 50 | 17 |
| Total schools visited | 332 | 261 | 274 | 239 |

Table 11: Student and teacher attendance on the day of the visit 2009-2012

| Type of school | Std I-IVN |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| \% Enrolled children <br> present (Average) | 90.4 | 90.1 | 90.7 | 89.9 |
| \% Teachers present <br> (Average) | 90.8 | 89.4 | 86.6 | 85.1 |

Table 12: Small schools and multigrade classes 2009-2012

| School characteristics | Std I-IVN |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| \% Schools with total enrollment of 60 or less | 58.1 | 61.1 | 67.4 | 71.5 |
| \% Schools where Std II children observed <br> sitting with one or more other classes | 57.4 | 58.7 | 50.7 | 63.3 |
| \% Schools where Std IV children observed <br> sitting with one or more other classes | 53.7 | 54.0 | 44.8 | 55.6 |

## RTE indicators

Table 13: Schools meeting selected RTE norms 2010-2012

| \% Schools meeting the following RTE norms: | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Pupil-teacher ratio | Classroom-teacher ratio | 60.6 | 65.3 |
| Building | Office/store/office cum store | 76.7 | 77.4 | 78.4 |
|  | Playground | 75.9 | 77.0 | 74.8 |
|  | Boundary wall/fencing | 75.6 | 70.0 | 74.3 |
| Drinking water | No facility for drinking water | Facility but no drinking water available | 12.5 | 11.5 |
|  | Drinking water available | 10.6 |  |  |
|  | No toilet facility | 4.3 | 6.7 | 6.0 |
|  | Facility but toilet not useable | 83.2 | 81.8 | 83.4 |
|  | Toilet useable | 10.8 | 7.9 | 5.1 |
| Girls toilet | \% Schools with no separate provisions for girls toilets | 31.2 | 23.6 | 20.8 |
|  | Of schools with separate girls toilets, \% schools with |  | 12.5 | 10.8 |
|  | Toilet locked | 10.6 | 2.4 | 4.0 |
|  | Toilet not useable | 19.6 | 20.2 | 14.8 |
|  | Toilet useable | 38.7 | 64.9 | 70.4 |
| Library | No library | 19.7 | 11.4 | 3.4 |
|  | Library but no books being used by children on day of visit | 39.0 | 46.1 | 53.4 |
|  | Library books being used by children on day of visit | 41.3 | 42.4 | 43.2 |
| Mid-day |  |  |  |  |
|  | Kitchen shed for cooking mid-day meal | 82.5 | 89.5 | 94.5 |
|  | Mid-day meal served in school on day of visit | 98.0 | 99.2 | 97.0 |



The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act, 2009 specifies a series of norms and standards for a school.

Norms for number of teachers vary according to the level of the school (primary or upper primary) and total student enrollment.

Norms for classrooms require the school to have at least one classroom for every teacher.

Norms for facilities require schools to provide each of the facilities mentioned in Table 13, among others.

RTE norms regulate provision of facilities but not their useability. ASER school observations also include whether facilities could be used. This information is included in Table 13.

## School funds and activities (PAISA)

Table 14: \% Schools that report receiving SSA grants - Full financial year

| SSA school grants | April 2009 to March 2010 |  |  |  | April 2010 to March 2011 |  |  |  | April 2011 to March 2012 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. of Sch. | \% Schools |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { No. } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { Sch. } \end{gathered}$ | \% Schools |  |  | No. of Sch. | \% Schools |  |  |
|  |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |
| Maintenance grant | 245 | 93.9 | 2.5 | 3.7 | 263 | 94.3 | 3.0 | 2.7 | 236 | 95.8 | 1.7 | 2.5 |
| Development grant | 235 | 93.6 | 3.4 | 3.0 | 259 | 92.3 | 3.9 | 3.9 | 235 | 86.8 | 8.5 | 4.7 |
| TLM grant | 231 | 97.4 | 0.9 | 1.7 | 263 | 98.9 | 0.0 | 1.1 | 239 | 97.1 | 1.7 | 1.3 |

Table 15: \% Schools that report receiving SSA grants - Half financial year

| SSA school grants | April 2010 to date of survey (2010) |  |  |  | April 2011 to date of survey (2011) |  |  |  | April 2012 to date of survey (2012) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. of Sch. | \% Schools |  |  | No. of Sch. | \% Schools |  |  | No. of Sch. | \% Schools |  |  |
|  |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |
| Maintenance grant | 236 | 84.3 | 10.6 | 5.1 | 252 | 84.5 | 11.9 | 3.6 | 230 | 60.0 | 35.7 | 4.4 |
| Development grant | 225 | 85.8 | 9.8 | 4.4 | 247 | 81.8 | 14.6 | 3.6 | 224 | 54.5 | 39.7 | 5.8 |
| TLM grant | 228 | 88.2 | 8.8 | 3.1 | 249 | 87.2 | 11.2 | 1.6 | 229 | 61.6 | 35.4 | 3.1 |

Table 16: \% Schools carrying out different activities since April 2011

| Type of Activity |  | \% Schools |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Yes | No | Don't know |
| Const. | New Classroom | 13.9 | 84.3 | 1.9 |
| Repairs | Repair of building (roof, floor, wall etc.) | 51.5 | 47.2 | 1.3 |
|  | Repair of doors \& windows | 40.3 | 58.4 | 1.3 |
|  | Repair of boundary wall | 22.2 | 76.0 | 1.8 |
|  | Repair of drinking water facility | 32.8 | 65.1 | 2.2 |
|  | Repair of toilet | 34.7 | 62.5 | 2.8 |
| Painting \& whitewash | White wash/plastering | 63.4 | 36.6 | 0.0 |
|  | Painting blackboard/Display board/Painting on wall | 56.8 | 42.7 | 0.4 |
|  | Painting of doors \& walls | 59.3 | 38.9 | 1.8 |
| Purchase | Purchase of furniture (cupboard etc.) | 45.3 | 52.1 | 2.6 |
|  | Purchase of electrical fittings | 44.4 | 53.9 | 1.7 |
|  | Purchase of chalk, duster, register etc. | 83.9 | 16.1 | 0.0 |
|  | Purchase of sitting mats/Tat patti | 23.2 | 74.6 | 2.3 |
|  | Purchase of charts, globes \& other teaching material | 70.6 | 28.1 | 1.3 |
| Other | Expenditure on school events | 54.0 | 42.9 | 3.1 |
|  | Payment of bills (electricity, water, cleaning etc.) | 66.8 | 31.4 | 1.8 |

The PAISA section of ASER tracks receipt and spending of Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) grants at the school level. This information is collected from schools visited during the survey. This page reports proportion of schools receiving the grants and carrying out specified activities in the schools. More detailed analysis of the PAISA data will be available in the PAISA 2012 report which will be released in March $2013 .{ }^{1}$

## EVERY RURAL GOVERNMENT PRIMARY/UPPER PRIMARY SCHOOL IS ENTITLED TO EACH OF THESE SSA GRANTS EVERY YEAR.

| How much goes to |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| each school | For what purposes |

SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT GRANT / SCHOOL GRANT
Rs. 5000 per year per primary school

Rs. 7000 per year per upper primary school

## Rs 5000 + Rs $7000=$

 Rs 12000 if the school is Std I-VIIINIII.Note: Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same premises.

## SCHOOL MAINTENANCE GRANT

Rs. 5000 - Rs 7500 per school per year if the school has upto 3 classrooms.

Rs 7500 - Rs. 10000 per year if the school has more than 3 classrooms.

Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same building.

This grant can be used for maintenance of school building, including whitewashing; beautification; and repair of toilets, hand pump, boundary wall, playground etc.

The grant amount depends on number of classrooms (excluding Headmaster room and office room)

## TLM GRANT

Rs. 500 per teacher per year in primary and upper primary schools.

This grant can be used by teachers to buy teaching aids, such as charts, globes, posters, models etc.

## Jammu and Kashmir rural كisi 2012

ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM HOUSEHOLDS. 14 OUT OF 14 DISTRICTS
Data for 2010 is not available. Data has not been presented where sample size was insufficient.

## School enrollment and out of school children

Table 1: \% Children in different types of schools 2012

| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in <br> school | Total |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age: 6-14 ALL | 51.4 | 43.7 | 2.6 | 2.3 | 100 |
| Age: 7-16 ALL | 54.5 | 38.8 | 2.6 | 4.1 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 47.6 | 48.3 | 2.6 | 1.5 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 BOYS | 44.1 | 52.2 | 3.0 | 0.7 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 GIRLS | 51.4 | 44.2 | 2.1 | 2.3 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 ALL | 56.8 | 37.3 | 2.6 | 3.3 | 100 |
| Age: $11-14$ BOYS | 53.6 | 42.1 | 2.6 | 1.7 | 100 |
| Age: $11-14$ GIRLS | 60.1 | 32.4 | 2.5 | 5.0 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 ALL | 64.2 | 22.0 | 2.7 | 11.1 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 BOYS | 63.8 | 25.6 | 2.4 | 8.2 | 100 |
| Age: $15-16$ GIRLS | 64.6 | 18.5 | 2.9 | 13.9 | 100 |

Note: 'Other' includes children going to madarsa and EGS.
'Not in school' = dropped out + never enrolled.

Chart 2: Trends over time
\% Children enrolled in private schools by class 2008-2012


## Young children in pre-school and school

Table 3: \% Children age 3-6 who are enrolled in different types of pre-school and school 2012

|  | In balwadi or anganwadi | In LKG/ UKG | In School |  |  | Not in school or preschool | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Govt. | Pvt. | Other |  |  |
| Age 3 | 45.8 | 18.5 |  |  |  | 35.8 | 100 |
| Age 4 | 31.6 | 43.4 |  |  |  | 25.0 | 100 |
| Age 5 | 6.6 | 5.1 | 31.8 | 48.1 | 1.7 | 6.8 | 100 |
| Age 6 | 1.9 | 2.7 | 40.7 | 48.8 | 2.6 | 3.4 | 100 |

Chart 1: Trends over time
\% Children out of school by age group and gender 2006-2012


How to read this chart: Each line shows trends in the proportion of children out of school for a particular subset of children. For example, the proportion of girls (age 1114) not in school has changed from $8.3 \%$ in 2006 to $5.8 \%$ in 2007 to $5.0 \%$ in 2008, $3.1 \%$ in 2009 and to $3.7 \%$ in 2011 to $5.0 \%$ in 2012.
Table 2: Sample description
\% Children in each class by age 2012

| Std. | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 15.9 | 30.6 | 32.0 | 14.2 | 7.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| \|| | 2.2 | 10.4 | 28.5 | 40.3 | 10.9 | 7.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| III |  | 2.4 | 8.5 | 28.0 | 37.2 | 16.4 | 7.5 |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| IV | 4.0 |  |  | 12.5 | 23.2 | 42.0 | 10.1 | 6.2 | 1.9 |  |  |  | 100 |
| V | 3.7 |  |  |  | 8.5 | 30.8 | 35.6 | 15.7 | 5.7 |  |  |  | 100 |
| VI | 3.5 |  |  |  |  | 12.7 | 23.0 | 44.0 | 10.8 | 5.9 |  |  | 100 |
| VII | 3.3 |  |  |  |  |  | 9.6 | 31.6 | 40.4 | 10.2 | 5.0 |  | 100 |
| VIII | 4.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 13.7 | 25.4 | 42.8 | 9.0 | 5.0 | 100 |

How to read this table: If a child started school in Std I at age 6, she should be of age 8 in Std III. This table shows the age distribution for each class. For example, in Std III, $28 \%$ children are 8 years old but there are also $8.5 \%$ who are $7,37.2 \%$ who are 9 , $16.4 \%$ who are 10 years old and $7.5 \%$ who are older.

## Jammu and Kashmir rural 2012

## Reading

Table 4: \% Children by class and READING level
All schools 2012

| Std. | Not even <br> letter | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (Std I Text) | Level 2 <br> (Std II Text) | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 15.4 | 41.1 | 22.1 | 14.7 | 6.7 | 100 |
| II | 4.6 | 31.0 | 27.8 | 21.7 | 14.8 | 100 |
| IIII | 2.7 | 23.3 | 24.6 | 23.1 | 26.3 | 100 |
| IV | 1.7 | 15.3 | 23.5 | 25.5 | 33.9 | 100 |
| V | 1.6 | 11.0 | 16.8 | 29.6 | 41.0 | 100 |
| VI | 1.0 | 6.5 | 13.6 | 29.1 | 49.8 | 100 |
| VII | 0.9 | 6.7 | 10.4 | 26.9 | 55.2 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.8 | 3.3 | 8.6 | 22.6 | 64.7 | 100 |
| Total | 3.9 | 17.9 | 18.5 | 23.8 | 35.9 | 100 |

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level in reading achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, 2.7\% children cannot even read letters, $23.3 \%$ can read letters but not more, $24.6 \%$ can read words but not Std I text or higher, $23.1 \%$ can read Std I text but not Std II level text, and $26.3 \%$ can read Std II level text. For each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is $100 \%$

## Chart 4: Trends over time

\% Children in Std III who CAN READ Std I level text
By school type 2009-2012


## Reading Tool



Chart 5: Trends over time
\% Children in Std V who CAN READ Std II level text By school type 2009-2012


## Reading and comprehension in English

Table 5: \% Children by class and READING level in ENGLISH All schools 2012

| Std. | Not <br> even <br> capital <br> letters | Capital <br> letters | Small <br> letters | Simple <br> words | Easy <br> sen- <br> tences | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 14.3 | 26.5 | 19.7 | 26.6 | 12.9 | 100 |
| II | 5.2 | 15.0 | 21.5 | 33.9 | 24.4 | 100 |
| III | 2.8 | 11.2 | 16.7 | 34.0 | 35.2 | 100 |
| IV | 2.2 | 7.4 | 13.9 | 34.0 | 42.6 | 100 |
| V | 1.5 | 5.9 | 9.5 | 30.4 | 52.7 | 100 |
| VI | 1.0 | 3.0 | 7.6 | 31.0 | 57.4 | 100 |
| VII | 1.2 | 3.7 | 5.1 | 25.0 | 64.9 | 100 |
| VIII | 1.3 | 3.4 | 2.2 | 23.2 | 69.9 | 100 |
| Total | 4.0 | 10.0 | 12.2 | 29.6 | 44.2 | 100 |

Table 6: \% Children by class who CAN COMPREHEND ENGLISH All schools 2012

| Std. | Of those who <br> can read words, <br> \% who can tell <br> meanings of <br> the words | Of those who <br> can read <br> sentences, \% who <br> can tell meanings <br> of the sentences |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| I | 52.9 |  |
| II | 54.7 | 50.4 |
| III | 55.4 | 49.6 |
| IV | 53.4 | 53.8 |
| V | 64.0 | 60.8 |
| VI | 59.8 | 64.2 |
| VII | 62.6 | 65.8 |
| VIII | 61.2 | 71.1 |
| Total | 57.6 | 61.2 |



## 

## Arithmetic

Table 7: \% Children by class and ARITHMETIC level All schools 2012

| Std. | Not even 1-9 | Recognize numbers |  | Can subtract | Can divide | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1-9 | 10-99 |  |  |  |
| I | 13.3 | 33.2 | 43.8 | 8.9 | 1.0 | 100 |
| II | 3.6 | 21.5 | 49.2 | 21.8 | 3.8 | 100 |
| III | 1.8 | 14.2 | 44.5 | 32.6 | 6.8 | 100 |
| IV | 1.6 | 9.7 | 38.2 | 35.6 | 15.0 | 100 |
| V | 1.5 | 7.0 | 34.8 | 35.8 | 20.9 | 100 |
| VI | 0.7 | 5.3 | 27.1 | 41.0 | 26.0 | 100 |
| VII | 1.1 | 3.3 | 27.7 | 37.1 | 30.8 | 100 |
| VIII | 1.1 | 2.8 | 26.4 | 33.0 | 36.8 | 100 |
| Total | 3.4 | 12.7 | 36.7 | 30.1 | 17.3 | 100 |

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level in arithmetic achieved by a child. For example, in Std 3, 1.8\% children cannot even recognize numbers 1-9, $14.2 \%$ can recognize numbers up to 9 but not more, $44.5 \%$ can recognize numbers to 99 but cannot do subtraction, $32.6 \%$ can do subtraction but not division, and 6.8\% can do division. For each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is $100 \%$.

## Chart 6: Trends over time

\% Children in Std III who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more
By school type 2009-2012



## Math Tool



Chart 7: Trends over time
\% Children in Std V who CAN DO DIVISION
By school type 2009-2012



## Jammu and Kashmir rural <br> facilitated by PRATHAM

## Type of school and paid tuition classes

The ASER survey recorded information about tuition by asking the following question: "Does the child take any paid tuition class currently?" Therefore the numbers given below do not include any unpaid supplemental help in learning that children may have received.
Table 8: Trends over time
\% Children attending paid tuition classes
By school type 2009-2012

Table 9: Trends over time
\% Children by school type and tuition 2009-2012

| Year | Category |  | Std II | Std V | Std VIII | Std I-VIII |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2009 | Govt. | No tuition | 61.2 | 55.6 | 58.5 | 58.6 |
|  |  | Tuition | 5.7 | 13.3 | 16.5 | 10.0 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 28.6 | 20.6 | 18.0 | 24.2 |
|  |  | Tuition | 4.5 | 10.5 | 7.0 | 7.2 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 2010 | Govt. | No tuition |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Tuition |  |  |  |  |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Tuition |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2011 | Govt. | No tuition | 54.1 | 56.3 | 63.9 | 57.4 |
|  |  | Tuition | 2.2 | 3.8 | 6.8 | 4.1 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 34.8 | 32.3 | 20.6 | 30.2 |
|  |  | Tuition | 9.0 | 7.6 | 8.7 | 8.2 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 2012 | Govt. | No tuition | 47.7 | 52.7 | 56.6 | 51.2 |
|  |  | Tuition | 3.1 | 3.2 | 8.8 | 4.5 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 37.5 | 33.7 | 22.7 | 33.0 |
|  |  | Tuition | 11.7 | 10.3 | 11.9 | 11.3 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Chart 9: Trends over time
\% Children in Std III-V who CAN READ a Std I level text or more By school type and tuition 2009-2012



Chart 8: Trends over time
\% Children in Std I-VIII by school type and tuition 2009-2012


■ Govt+No Tuition ■ Govt+Tuition $\quad$ Pvt+No Tuition $\quad$ Pvt+Tuition
How to read this chart: This chart is a visual representation of the last column of Table 9. For a given year, the width of each colour band represents the \% of children in the corresponding category. For each year, these four categories add upto 100\%.

Chart 10: Trends over time
\% Children in Std III-V who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more By school type and tuition 2009-2012


## Jammu and Kashmir rural

## School observations

In each year's ASER, from 2009 onwards, in each sampled village, the largest government school with primary sections was visited on the day of the survey. Information about schools in this report is based on these visits.

Table 10: Number of schools visited 2009-2012

| Type of school | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Std I-IVN: Primary | 81 |  | 76 | 86 |
| Std I-VIIINIII: Primary + <br> Upper primary | 276 |  | 281 | 301 |
| Total schools visited | 357 |  | 357 | 387 |

Table 11: Student and teacher attendance on the day of the visit 2009-2012

| Type of school | Std I-IVN |  |  |  | Std I-VIINIII |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
|  | 86.4 |  | 80.3 | 79.5 | 89.8 |  | 76.5 | 79.5 |
| \% Teachers present <br> (Average) | 92.1 |  | 90.1 | 85.2 | 91.2 |  | 83.4 | 81.9 |

Table 12: Small schools and multigrade classes 2009-2012

| School characteristics | Std I-IVN |  |  |  | Std I-VIINIII |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| \% Schools with total enrollment of 60 or less | 84.8 |  | 90.4 | 95.4 | 30.5 |  | 33.0 | 38.7 |
| \% Schools where Std II children observed <br> sitting with one or more other classes | 77.5 |  | 84.7 | 80.3 | 46.9 |  | 63.8 | 62.4 |
| \% Schools where Std IV children observed <br> sitting with one or more other classes | 72.2 |  | 79.7 | 78.9 | 42.2 |  | 55.6 | 58.1 |

## RTE indicators

Table 13: Schools meeting selected RTE norms 2010-2012

| \% Schools meeting the following RTE norms: |  | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pupil-teacher \& classroomteacher norms | Pupil-teacher ratio |  | 87.5 | 84.2 |
|  | Classroom-teacher ratio |  | 49.8 | 50.0 |
| Building | Office/store/office cum store |  | 81.8 | 79.5 |
|  | Playground |  | 52.5 | 48.2 |
|  | Boundary wall/fencing |  | 28.8 | 26.7 |
| Drinking water | No facility for drinking water |  | 47.2 | 38.7 |
|  | Facility but no drinking water available |  | 6.2 | 10.7 |
|  | Drinking water available |  | 46.6 | 50.5 |
| Toilet | No toilet facility |  | 33.4 | 26.0 |
|  | Facility but toilet not useable |  | 30.3 | 25.0 |
|  | Toilet useable |  | 36.3 | 49.0 |
| Girls toilet | \% Schools with no separate provisions for girls toilets |  | 61.0 | 52.5 |
|  | Of schools with separate girls toilets, \% schools with |  |  |  |
|  | Toilet locked |  | 6.9 | 10.2 |
|  | Toilet not useable |  | 9.8 | 6.8 |
|  | Toilet useable |  | 22.4 | 30.6 |
| Library | No library |  | 49.3 | 50.1 |
|  | Library but no books being used by children on day of visit |  | 23.9 | 26.1 |
|  | Library books being used by children on day of visit |  | 26.8 | 23.8 |
| Mid-day meal | Kitchen shed for cooking mid-day meal |  | 70.6 | 73.8 |
|  | Mid-day meal served in school on day of visit |  | 76.5 | 87.9 |



The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act, 2009 specifies a series of norms and standards for a school.

Norms for number of teachers vary according to the level of the school (primary or upper primary) and total student enrollment.

Norms for classrooms require the school to have at least one classroom for every teacher.

Norms for facilities require schools to provide each of the facilities mentioned in Table 13, among others.

RTE norms regulate provision of facilities but not their useability. ASER school observations also include whether facilities could be used. This information is included in Table 13.

## Jammu and Kashmir rural

## School funds and activities (PAISA)

Table 14: \% Schools that report receiving SSA grants - Full financial year

| SSA school grants | April 2009 to <br> March 2010 |  |  |  | April 2010 to <br> March 2011 |  |  |  | April 2011 to March 2012 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No. } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Sch. } \end{aligned}$ | \% Schools |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No. } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Sch. } \end{aligned}$ | \% Schools |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { No. } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { Sch. } \end{gathered}$ | \% Schools |  |  |
|  |  | Yes | No | Don't know |  | Yes | No | Don't know |  | Yes | No | Don't know |
| Maintenance grant |  |  |  |  | 351 | 86.0 | 12.3 | 1.7 | 381 | 87.4 | 10.0 | 2.6 |
| Development grant |  |  |  |  | 346 | 77.2 | 19.9 | 2.9 | 381 | 77.4 | 19.2 | 3.4 |
| TLM grant |  |  |  |  | 354 | 91.5 | 7.3 | 1.1 | 379 | 91.3 | 6.3 | 2.4 |

Table 15: \% Schools that report receiving SSA grants - Half financial year

| SSA school grants | April 2010 to date of survey (2010) |  |  |  | April 2011 to date of survey (2011) |  |  |  | April 2012 to date of survey (2012) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. of Sch. | \% Schools |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { No. } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { Sch. } \end{gathered}$ | \% Schools |  |  | No. of Sch. | \% Schools |  |  |
|  |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |
| Maintenance grant |  |  |  |  | 334 | 61.1 | 35.0 | 3.9 | 369 | 61.8 | 34.4 | 3.8 |
| Development grant |  |  |  |  | 329 | 56.5 | 39.5 | 4.0 | 367 | 57.2 | 38.4 | 4.4 |
| TLM grant |  |  |  |  | 336 | 67.0 | 31.0 | 2.1 | 367 | 64.6 | 31.9 | 3.5 |

Table 16: \% Schools carrying out different activities since April 2011

| Type of Activity |  | \% Schools |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Yes | No | Don't know |
| Const. | New Classroom | 15.7 | 83.3 | 1.1 |
| Repairs | Repair of building (roof, floor, wall etc.) | 48.7 | 50.3 | 1.1 |
|  | Repair of doors \& windows | 40.4 | 58.8 | 0.8 |
|  | Repair of boundary wall | 14.7 | 83.7 | 1.6 |
|  | Repair of drinking water facility | 34.0 | 65.0 | 1.1 |
|  | Repair of toilet | 30.8 | 68.1 | 1.1 |
| Painting \& whitewash | White wash/plastering | 57.4 | 41.5 | 1.0 |
|  | Painting blackboard/Display board/Painting on wall | 59.4 | 39.6 | 1.1 |
|  | Painting of doors \& walls | 47.8 | 50.9 | 1.3 |
| Purchase | Purchase of furniture (cupboard etc.) | 67.9 | 31.3 | 0.8 |
|  | Purchase of electrical fittings | 15.9 | 82.5 | 1.6 |
|  | Purchase of chalk, duster, register etc. | 92.9 | 6.6 | 0.5 |
|  | Purchase of sitting mats/Tat patti | 71.8 | 26.9 | 1.3 |
|  | Purchase of charts, globes \& other teaching material | 84.9 | 14.6 | 0.5 |
| Other | Expenditure on school events | 52.4 | 45.5 | 2.1 |
|  | Payment of bills (electricity, water, cleaning etc.) | 13.1 | 83.5 | 3.5 |

The PAISA section of ASER tracks receipt and spending of Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) grants at the school level. This information is collected from schools visited during the survey. This page reports proportion of schools receiving the grants and carrying out specified activities in the schools. More detailed analysis of the PAISA data will be available in the PAISA 2012 report which will be released in March $2013 .{ }^{1}$

## EVERY RURAL GOVERNMENT PRIMARY/UPPER PRIMARY SCHOOL IS ENTITLED TO EACH OF THESE SSA GRANTS EVERY YEAR.

| How much goes to |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| each school | For what purposes |

SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT GRANT / SCHOOL GRANT
Rs. 5000 per year per primary school

Rs. 7000 per year per upper primary school

## Rs 5000 + Rs $7000=$

 Rs 12000 if the school is Std I-VIIINIII.Note: Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same premises.

## SCHOOL MAINTENANCE GRANT

Rs. 5000 - Rs 7500 per school per year if the school has upto 3 classrooms.

Rs 7500 - Rs. 10000 per year if the school has more than 3 classrooms.

Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same building.

This grant can be used for maintenance of school building, including whitewashing; beautification; and repair of toilets, hand pump, boundary wall, playground etc.

The grant amount depends on number of classrooms (excluding Headmaster room and office room)

## TLM GRANT

Rs. 500 per teacher per year in primary and upper primary schools.

This grant can be used by teachers to buy teaching aids, such as charts, globes, posters, models etc.

## Jharkhand rubal

Facilitated by PRATHAN
ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM HOUSEHOLDS. 22 OUT OF 23 DISTRICTS
Data has not been presented where sample size was insufficient.

## School enrollment and out of school children

Table 1: \% Children in different types of schools 2012

| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in <br> school | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age: 6-14 ALL | 78.5 | 15.5 | 1.7 | 4.4 | 100 |
| Age: 7-16 ALL | 76.5 | 15.6 | 1.5 | 6.4 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 79.8 | 15.4 | 1.7 | 3.1 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 BOYS | 77.7 | 17.5 | 1.7 | 3.2 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 GIRLS | 82.0 | 13.1 | 1.8 | 3.1 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 ALL | 76.8 | 15.4 | 1.4 | 6.4 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 BOYS | 75.2 | 16.8 | 1.6 | 6.4 | 100 |
| Age: $11-14$ GIRLS | 78.4 | 13.9 | 1.3 | 6.3 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 ALL | 65.4 | 16.5 | 1.3 | 16.8 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 BOYS | 65.5 | 14.7 | 1.1 | 18.7 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 GIRLS | 65.0 | 18.2 | 1.4 | 15.5 | 100 |

Note: 'Other' includes children going to madarsa and EGS. 'Not in school' $=$ dropped out + never enrolled

Chart 2: Trends over time \% Children enrolled in private schools by class 2008-2012


Chart 1: Trends over time
\% Children out of school by age group and gender 2006-2012


How to read this chart: Each line shows trends in the proportion of children out of school for a particular subset of children. For example, the proportion of girls (age 1114) not in school has changed from $13.0 \%$ in 2006 to $8.0 \%$ in 2007 to $9.4 \%$ in 2008, $7.5 \%$ in 2009 and to $4.9 \%$ in 2010 to $6.3 \%$ in 2012.

Table 2: Sample description
\% Children in each class by age 2012

| Std. | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 28.6 | 36.0 | 18.5 | 10.5 | 6.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| II | 5.8 | 16.1 | 30.5 | 27.7 | 7.2 | 8.5 | 4.3 |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| III | 6.1 |  | 13.6 | 36.8 | 16.9 | 15.3 | 3.4 | 5.9 | 2.1 |  |  |  | 100 |
| IV | 6.1 | 4.5 | 5.2 | 15.3 | 19.4 | 28.5 | 6.7 | 9.7 | 4.7 |  |  |  | 100 |
| V | 2.4 |  |  | 7.6 | 8.9 | 34.3 | 16.0 | 21.6 | 5.6 | 3.7 |  |  | 100 |
| VI | 6.6 |  |  |  |  | 17.7 | 22.7 | 33.2 | 12.2 | 5.0 | 2.6 |  | 100 |
| VII | 2.6 |  |  |  |  | 7.3 | 8.3 | 37.4 | 21.8 | 13.2 | 6.7 | 2.7 | 100 |
| VIII | 6.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 18.0 | 30.0 | 27.8 | 12.4 | 5.2 | 100 |

How to read this table: If a child started school in Std I at age 6, she should be of age 8 in Std III. This table shows the age distribution for each class. For example, in Std III, $36.8 \%$ children are 8 years old but there also $13.6 \%$ who are $7,16.9 \%$ who are 9 , $15.3 \%$ who are 10 years old, etc.

## Young children in pre-school and school

Table 3: \% Children age 3-6 who are enrolled in different types of pre-school and school 2012

|  | In balwadi or anganwadi | $\begin{gathered} \text { In LKG/ } \\ \text { UKG } \end{gathered}$ | In School |  |  | Not in school or preschool | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Govt. | Pvt. | Other |  |  |
| Age 3 | 67.7 | 3.6 |  |  |  | 28.7 | 100 |
| Age 4 | 64.8 | 8.8 |  |  |  | 26.4 | 100 |
| Age 5 | 20.4 | 3.5 | 53.3 | 12.2 | 1.3 | 9.4 | 100 |
| Age 6 | 5.9 | 2.6 | 68.2 | 13.8 | 2.0 | 7.5 | 100 |

Chart 3: Trends over time
\% Children age 3, 4 and 5 not enrolled in school or pre-school 2006-2012*


* Data for 2011 is not comparable and therefore excluded here.


## Jharkhand ${ }_{\text {rubal }}$

## Reading

Table 4: \% Children by class and READING level
All schools 2012

| Std. | Not even <br> letter | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (Std I Text) | Level 2 <br> (Std II Text) | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 46.8 | 37.8 | 8.9 | 3.2 | 3.3 | 100 |
| II | 19.1 | 44.1 | 20.8 | 8.0 | 8.1 | 100 |
| IIII | 11.9 | 30.9 | 26.6 | 16.4 | 14.3 | 100 |
| IV | 9.0 | 23.4 | 22.5 | 19.3 | 25.8 | 100 |
| V | 4.1 | 15.4 | 20.0 | 22.6 | 37.8 | 100 |
| VI | 2.8 | 11.1 | 12.4 | 21.6 | 52.2 | 100 |
| VII | 1.7 | 5.7 | 9.4 | 14.9 | 68.3 | 100 |
| VIII | 1.5 | 4.0 | 6.4 | 12.3 | 75.8 | 100 |
| Total | 14.5 | 23.9 | 16.3 | 14.1 | 31.2 | 100 |

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level in reading achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, 11.9\% children cannot even read letters, 30.9\% can read letters but not more, $26.6 \%$ can read words but not Std I text or higher, $16.4 \%$ can read Std I text but not Std II level text, and $14.3 \%$ can read Std II level text. For each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is $100 \%$.

## Chart 4: Trends over time

\% Children in Std III who CAN READ Std I level text By school type 2009-2012


## Reading Tool



Chart 5: Trends over time
\% Children in Std V who CAN READ Std II level text By school type 2009-2012


## Reading and comprehension in English

Table 5: \% Children by class and READING level in ENGLISH All schools 2012

| Std. | Not <br> even <br> capital <br> letters | Capital <br> letters | Small <br> letters | Simple <br> words | Easy <br> sen- <br> tences | Total |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 60.8 | 21.9 | 10.6 | 4.7 | 2.0 | 100 |
| II | 35.1 | 32.4 | 18.2 | 10.3 | 4.0 | 100 |
| III | 21.4 | 29.5 | 25.7 | 15.2 | 8.2 | 100 |
| IV | 16.1 | 20.7 | 28.8 | 21.3 | 13.1 | 100 |
| V | 10.6 | 17.9 | 26.4 | 26.3 | 18.8 | 100 |
| VII | 6.1 | 12.7 | 22.3 | 31.7 | 27.2 | 100 |
| VII | 3.4 | 7.8 | 16.7 | 33.6 | 38.6 | 100 |
| VIII | 2.3 | 6.4 | 14.3 | 31.9 | 45.1 | 100 |
| Total | 22.7 | 19.9 | 20.2 | 20.1 | 17.1 | 100 |

Table 6: \% Children by class who CAN COMPREHEND ENGLISH All schools 2012

| Std. | Of those who <br> can read words, <br> \% who can tell <br> meanings of <br> the words | Of those who <br> can read <br> sentences, \% who <br> can tell meanings <br> of the sentences |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| I | 59.9 |  |
| III | 59.5 | 59.5 |
| III | 56.0 | 60.9 |
| IV | 57.8 | 56.0 |
| V | 63.3 | 65.4 |
| VI | 62.5 | 65.5 |
| VII | 62.3 | 60.9 |

English Tool

| - |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{array}{ccc} A & J & Q \\ R & E \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { h } \quad \text { p } \quad{ }^{x} \\ \text { u } \end{gathered}$ |
| Y $\quad \mathbf{N}$ | d g |
| cat red | What is the time? <br> This is a large house |
| ${ }^{\text {new }} \text { fan }$ | I like to read. <br> She has many books |
| $\pm$ | $\underline{\square}$ |

## Jharkhand fueal

## Arithmetic

Table 7: \% Children by class and ARITHMETIC level All schools 2012

| Std. | Not even 1-9 | Recognize numbers |  | Can subtract | Can divide | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1-9 | 10-99 |  |  |  |
| 1 | 44.8 | 38.3 | 12.5 | 3.0 | 1.3 | 100 |
| \\| | 16.6 | 44.4 | 26.9 | 8.0 | 4.1 | 100 |
| III | 8.1 | 34.6 | 33.5 | 15.7 | 8.2 | 100 |
| IV | 7.2 | 25.2 | 30.9 | 20.3 | 16.5 | 100 |
| V | 2.8 | 17.3 | 30.4 | 25.4 | 24.2 | 100 |
| VI | 2.0 | 10.1 | 23.8 | 29.4 | 34.8 | 100 |
| VII | 1.2 | 5.0 | 19.1 | 25.0 | 49.7 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.9 | 3.8 | 15.8 | 22.2 | 57.4 | 100 |
| Total | 12.7 | 24.8 | 24.1 | 17.3 | 21.2 | 100 |

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level in arithmetic achieved by a child. For example, in Std 3, 8.1\% children cannot even recognize numbers 1-9, $34.6 \%$ can recognize numbers up to 9 but not more, $33.5 \%$ can recognize numbers to 99 but cannot do subtraction, $15.7 \%$ can do subtraction but not division, and $8.2 \%$ can do division. For each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is $100 \%$.

## Chart 6: Trends over time

\% Children in Std III who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more
By school type 2009-2012




Chart 7: Trends over time
\% Children in Std V who CAN DO DIVISION
By school type 2009-2012


## Jharkhand rural

## Type of school and paid tuition classes

The ASER survey recorded information about tuition by asking the following question: "Does the child take any paid tuition class currently?" Therefore the numbers given below do not include any unpaid supplemental help in learning that children may have received.

| Table 8: Trends over time <br> \% Children attending paid tuition classes <br> By school type 2009-2012 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Children in Std I-VIII | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| Govt. schools: \% Children attending paid tuition classes | 25.1 | 27.5 | 25.1 | 27.8 |
| Private schools: \% Children attending paid tuition classes | 37.7 | 40.1 | 38.6 | 45.8 |
| All schools: \% Children attending paid tuition classes | 26.3 | 28.6 | 26.8 | 30.6 |

Table 9: Trends over time
\% Children by school type and tuition 2009-2012

| Year | Category |  | Std II | Std V | Std VIII | Std I-VIII |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2009 | Govt | No tuition | 72.0 | 67.6 | 54.2 | 67.8 |
|  |  | Tuition | 18.5 | 24.7 | 34.1 | 22.8 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 5.7 | 4.8 | 6.8 | 5.9 |
|  |  | Tuition | 3.8 | 3.0 | 4.9 | 3.5 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 2010 | Govt | No tuition | 70.9 | 64.7 | 53.6 | 66.1 |
|  |  | Tuition | 18.9 | 28.0 | 34.3 | 25.0 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 6.9 | 4.0 | 5.9 | 5.3 |
|  |  | Tuition | 3.2 | 3.3 | 6.2 | 3.6 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 2011 | Govt | No tuition | 68.6 | 63.7 | 54.8 | 65.3 |
|  |  | Tuition | 16.2 | 24.0 | 33.4 | 21.8 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 9.0 | 7.8 | 7.2 | 7.9 |
|  |  | Tuition | 6.2 | 4.5 | 4.6 | 5.0 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 2012 | Govt | No tuition | 63.0 | 61.5 | 53.8 | 60.9 |
|  |  | Tuition | 19.3 | 25.1 | 31.9 | 23.5 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 10.2 | 7.3 | 7.6 | 8.5 |
|  |  | Tuition | 7.5 | 6.1 | 6.8 | 7.2 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Chart 9: Trends over time
\% Children in Std III-V who CAN READ a Std I level text or more By school type and tuition 2009-2012



Chart 8: Trends over time
\% Children in Std I-VIII by school type and tuition 2009-2012


How to read this chart: This chart is a visual representation of the last column of Table 9. For a given year, the width of each colour band represents the \% of children in the corresponding category. For each year, these four categories add upto 100\%.

Chart 10: Trends over time
\% Children in Std III-V who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more By school type and tuition 2009-2012


## Jharkhand rubal

facilitated by PRATHAM

## School observations

In each year's ASER, from 2009 onwards, in each sampled village, the largest government school with primary sections was visited on the day of the survey. Information about schools in this report is based on these visits.

Table 10: Number of schools visited 2009-2012

| Type of school | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Std I-IVN: Primary | 190 | 188 | 164 | 121 |
| Std I-VIINIII: Primary + <br> Upper primary | 336 | 359 | 373 | 317 |
| Total schools visited | 526 | 547 | 537 | 438 |

Table 11: Student and teacher attendance on the day of the visit 2009-2012

| Type of school | Std I-IVN |  |  |  | Std I-VIIINIII |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| \% Enrolled children <br> present (Average) | 62.7 | 62.3 | 59.1 | 58.0 | 63.6 | 58.7 | 55.1 | 52.8 |
| \% Teachers present <br> (Average) | 90.8 | 89.4 | 91.1 | 78.3 | 86.3 | 81.8 | 85.1 | 62.1 |

Table 12: Small schools and multigrade classes 2009-2012

| School characteristics | Std I-IVN |  |  |  | Std I-VIINIII |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| \% Schools with total enrollment of 60 or less | 21.3 | 20.0 | 30.8 | 38.8 | 0.6 | 1.2 | 1.6 | 2.6 |
| \% Schools where Std II children observed <br> sitting with one or more other classes | 78.1 | 76.9 | 84.8 | 87.4 | 65.3 | 59.7 | 65.0 | 69.5 |
| \% Schools where Std IV children observed <br> sitting with one or more other classes | 76.3 | 75.3 | 82.5 | 86.7 | 58.3 | 52.4 | 61.8 | 64.8 |

## RTE indicators

Table 13: Schools meeting selected RTE norms 2010-2012

| \% Schools meeting the following RTE norms: | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Pupil-teacher ratio | Classroom-teacher ratio | 11.2 | 15.3 |
| Building | Office/store/office cum store | 81.2 | 77.3 | 76.9 |
|  | Playground | 84.9 | 84.4 | 85.0 |
|  | Boundary wall/fencing | 37.9 | 34.0 | 37.5 |
| Drinking water | No facility for drinking water | 27.0 | 25.0 | 21.6 |
|  | Facility but no drinking water available | 15.8 | 11.1 | 9.5 |
|  | Drinking water available | 10.4 | 8.3 | 12.5 |
| Toilet | No toilet facility | 73.8 | 80.6 | 78.1 |
|  | Facility but toilet not useable | 18.0 | 19.1 | 16.4 |
|  | Toilet useable | 55.2 | 43.5 | 46.6 |
| Girls toilet | \% Schools with no separate provisions for girls toilets | 26.8 | 37.5 | 37.0 |
|  | Of schools with separate girls toilets, \% schools with | 23.4 | 25.3 |  |
|  | Toilet locked | 24.6 | 18.3 | 19.3 |
|  | Toilet not useable | 24.8 | 21.8 | 23.4 |
|  | Toilet useable | 20.9 | 36.6 | 32.0 |
| Library | No library | 38.4 | 26.5 | 21.0 |
|  | Library but no books being used by children on day of visit | 33.2 | 35.4 | 33.9 |
|  | Library books being used by children on day of visit | 28.4 | 38.2 | 45.1 |
| Mid-day | Kitchen shed for cooking mid-day meal | 73.5 | 76.2 | 77.0 |
|  | Mid-day meal served in school on day of visit | 92.6 | 88.8 | 84.2 |



The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act, 2009 specifies a series of norms and standards for a school.

Norms for number of teachers vary according to the level of the school (primary or upper primary) and total student enrollment.

Norms for classrooms require the school to have at least one classroom for every teacher.

Norms for facilities require schools to provide each of the facilities mentioned in Table 13, among others.

RTE norms regulate provision of facilities but not their useability. ASER school observations also include whether facilities could be used. This information is included in Table 13.

## Jharkhand rubal

facilitated by PRATHAM

## School funds and activities (PAISA)

Table 14: \% Schools that report receiving SSA grants - Full financial year

| SSA school grants | April 2009 to March 2010 |  |  |  | April 2010 to March 2011 |  |  |  | April 2011 to March 2012 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. of Sch. | \% Schools |  |  | No. of Sch. | \% Schools |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { No. } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { Sch. } \end{gathered}$ | \% Schools |  |  |
|  |  | Yes | No | Don't know |  | Yes | No | Don't know |  | Yes | No | Don't know |
| Maintenance grant | 400 | 90.5 | 3.0 | 6.5 | 512 | 83.8 | 10.2 | 6.1 | 413 | 88.4 | 7.0 | 4.6 |
| Development grant | 393 | 89.8 | 3.6 | 6.6 | 504 | 84.5 | 10.1 | 5.4 | 414 | 89.1 | 5.6 | 5.3 |
| TLM grant | 401 | 93.3 | 3.2 | 3.5 | 503 | 86.5 | 9.5 | 4.0 | 416 | 91.8 | 5.8 | 2.4 |

Table 15: \% Schools that report receiving SSA grants - Half financial year

| SSA school grants | April 2010 to date of survey (2010) |  |  |  | April 2011 to date of survey (2011) |  |  |  | April 2012 to date of survey (2012) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. of Sch. | \% Schools |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No. } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Sch. } \end{aligned}$ | \% Schools |  |  | No. of Sch. | \% Schools |  |  |
|  |  | Yes | No | Don't know |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |
| grant | 369 | 72.6 | 17.6 | 9.8 | 501 | 28.1 | 62.9 | 9.0 | 398 | 43.7 | 48.0 | 8.3 |
| Development grant | 354 | 70.9 | 20.3 | 8.8 | 495 | 29.9 | 60.6 | 9.5 | 392 | 43.9 | 48.2 | 7.9 |
| TLM grant | 355 | 74.7 | 19.4 | 5.9 | 497 | 32.4 | 59.6 | 8.1 | 392 | 44.6 | 48.2 | 7.1 |

Table 16: \% Schools carrying out different activities since April 2011

| Type of Activity |  | \% Schools |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Yes | No | Don't know |
| Const. | New Classroom | 24.4 | 72.2 | 3.3 |
| Repairs | Repair of building (roof, floor, wall etc.) | 51.3 | 45.2 | 3.4 |
|  | Repair of doors \& windows | 47.5 | 49.3 | 3.3 |
|  | Repair of boundary wall | 12.5 | 84.3 | 3.1 |
|  | Repair of drinking water facility | 47.4 | 49.6 | 3.0 |
|  | Repair of toilet | 28.2 | 68.8 | 3.0 |
| Painting \& whitewash | White wash/plastering | 77.8 | 19.5 | 2.7 |
|  | Painting blackboard/Display board/Painting on wall | 64.1 | 33.9 | 2.0 |
|  | Painting of doors \& walls | 70.2 | 27.6 | 2.2 |
| Purchase | Purchase of furniture (cupboard etc.) | 41.9 | 55.3 | 2.7 |
|  | Purchase of electrical fittings | 9.7 | 87.6 | 2.7 |
|  | Purchase of chalk, duster, register etc. | 91.4 | 7.1 | 1.5 |
|  | Purchase of sitting mats/Tat patti | 50.9 | 47.0 | 2.1 |
|  | Purchase of charts, globes \& other teaching material | 79.0 | 18.8 | 2.2 |
| Other | Expenditure on school events | 78.7 | 18.1 | 3.3 |
|  | Payment of bills (electricity, water, cleaning etc.) | 24.3 | 70.9 | 4.8 |

The PAISA section of ASER tracks receipt and spending of Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) grants at the school level. This information is collected from schools visited during the survey. This page reports proportion of schools receiving the grants and carrying out specified activities in the schools. More detailed analysis of the PAISA data will be available in the PAISA 2012 report which will be released in March $2013 .{ }^{1}$

## EVERY RURAL GOVERNMENT PRIMARY/UPPER PRIMARY SCHOOL IS ENTITLED TO EACH OF THESE sSA GRANTS EVERY YEAR.

| How much goes to |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| each school | For what purposes |

SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT GRANT / SCHOOL GRANT
Rs. 5000 per year per primary school

Rs. 7000 per year per upper primary school

## Rs 5000 + Rs $7000=$

 Rs 12000 if the school is Std I-VIIINIII.Note: Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same premises.

## SCHOOL MAINTENANCE GRANT

Rs. 5000 - Rs 7500 per school per year if the school has upto 3 classrooms.

Rs 7500 - Rs. 10000 per year if the school has more than 3 classrooms.

Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same building.

This grant can be used for maintenance of school building, including whitewashing; beautification; and repair of toilets, hand pump, boundary wall, playground etc.

The grant amount depends on number of classrooms (excluding Headmaster room and office room)

## TLM GRANT

Rs. 500 per teacher per year in primary and upper primary schools.

This grant can be used by teachers to buy teaching aids, such as charts, globes, posters, models etc.

ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM HOUSEHOLDS. 27 OUT OF 27 DISTRICTS
Data has not been presented where sample size was insufficient.

## School enrollment and out of school children

Table 1: \% Children in different types of schools 2012

| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in <br> school | Total |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age: 6-14 ALL | 75.9 | 21.9 | 0.3 | 1.9 | 100 |
| Age: 7-16 ALL | 73.6 | 22.7 | 0.3 | 3.5 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 76.4 | 22.5 | 0.3 | 0.7 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 BOYS | 74.2 | 24.8 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 GIRLS | 78.8 | 20.1 | 0.2 | 0.9 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 ALL | 75.3 | 21.3 | 0.2 | 3.1 | 100 |
| Age: $11-14$ BOYS | 74.0 | 23.4 | 0.2 | 2.4 | 100 |
| Age: $11-14$ GIRLS | 76.7 | 19.3 | 0.2 | 3.8 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 ALL | 60.9 | 27.1 | 0.1 | 11.9 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 BOYS | 59.2 | 28.2 | 0.1 | 12.5 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 GIRLS | 62.7 | 26.0 | 0.1 | 11.2 | 100 |

Note: 'Other' includes children going to madarsa and EGS.
'Not in school' $=$ dropped out + never enrolled.

Chart 2: Trends over time \% Children enrolled in private schools by class 2008-2012


## Young children in pre-school and school

Table 3: \% Children age 3-6 who are enrolled in different types of pre-school and school 2012

|  | In balwadi or anganwadi | In LKG/ UKG | In School |  |  | Not in school or preschool | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Govt. | Pvt. | Other |  |  |
| Age 3 | 83.0 | 6.0 |  |  |  | 11.0 | 100 |
| Age 4 | 77.7 | 19.0 |  |  |  | 3.3 | 100 |
| Age 5 | 60.7 | 29.9 | 5.6 | 2.1 | 0.1 | 1.6 | 100 |
| Age 6 | 12.7 | 12.9 | 56.2 | 16.1 | 0.7 | 1.3 | 100 | -

Age 6

Chart 1: Trends over time
\% Children out of school by age group and gender 2006-2012


How to read this chart: Each line shows trends in the proportion of children out of school for a particular subset of children. For example, the proportion of girls (age 11 14) not in school has changed from $8.0 \%$ in 2006 to $6.2 \%$ in 2007 to $5.9 \%$ in 2008 , $6.1 \%$ in 2009 and to $5.9 \%$ in 2010 to $3.8 \%$ in 2012.
Table 2: Sample description
\% Children in each class by age 2012

| Std. | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 4.6 | 59.4 | 30.7 | 5.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| II |  | 7 | 38.1 | 52.0 | 6.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| III | 4.6 |  |  | 34.1 | 52.8 | 7.0 | 1.5 |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| IV | 0.4 |  |  | 6.0 | 31.8 | 54.7 | 5.2 | 1.9 |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| V | 5.1 |  |  |  |  | 34.6 | 52.6 | 6.8 | 0.9 |  |  |  | 100 |
| VI | 6.4 |  |  |  |  |  | 25.3 | 61.4 | 5.9 | 1.1 |  |  | 100 |
| VII | 5.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 36.4 | 48.7 | 8.5 | 0. | 9 | 100 |
| VIII | 1.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8.9 | 32.8 | 52.3 | 4. | 5 | 100 |

How to read this table: If a child started school in Std I at age 6, she should be of age 8 in Std III. This table shows the age distribution for each class. For example, in Std III, $34.1 \%$ children are 8 years old but there also $4.6 \%$ who are younger, $52.8 \%$ who are 9 and $7.0 \%$ who are 10 years old and $1.5 \%$ who are older.

Chart 3: Trends over time
\% Children age 3, 4 and 5 not enrolled in school or pre-school 2006-2012*


* Data for 2011 is not comparable and therefore excluded here.


## Karnataka rubal

## Reading

Table 4: \% Children by class and READING level
All schools 2012

| Std. | Not even <br> letter | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (Std I Text) | Level 2 <br> (Std II Text) | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 24.3 | 51.7 | 18.1 | 3.8 | 2.1 | 100 |
| II | 10.1 | 33.4 | 34.4 | 12.4 | 9.8 | 100 |
| IIII | 5.3 | 21.2 | 31.3 | 19.6 | 22.6 | 100 |
| IV | 3.6 | 10.9 | 23.3 | 26.8 | 35.3 | 100 |
| V | 3.0 | 8.6 | 16.4 | 23.6 | 48.5 | 100 |
| VI | 2.6 | 5.5 | 11.0 | 21.0 | 59.9 | 100 |
| VII | 1.8 | 4.0 | 7.5 | 15.3 | 71.5 | 100 |
| VIII | 2.2 | 2.8 | 6.5 | 13.9 | 74.6 | 100 |
| Total | 6.6 | 17.2 | 18.6 | 17.2 | 40.3 | 100 |

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level in reading achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, 5.3\% children cannot even read letters, $21.2 \%$ can read letters but not more, $31.3 \%$ can read words but not Std I text or higher, $19.6 \%$ can read Std I text but not Std II level text, and $22.6 \%$ can read Std II level text. For each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is $100 \%$.

## Chart 4: Trends over time

\% Children in Std III who CAN READ Std I level text By school type 2009-2012


## Reading Tool



Chart 5: Trends over time
\% Children in Std V who CAN READ Std II level text By school type 2009-2012


## Reading and comprehension in English

Table 5: \% Children by class and READING level in ENGLISH All schools 2012

| Std. | Not <br> even <br> capital <br> letters | Capital <br> letters | Small <br> letters | Simple <br> words | Easy <br> sen- <br> tences | Total |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 57.2 | 22.0 | 13.3 | 6.6 | 1.0 | 100 |
| II | 37.1 | 27.8 | 20.6 | 10.0 | 4.4 | 100 |
| IIII | 25.7 | 30.5 | 25.2 | 11.8 | 6.9 | 100 |
| IV | 15.2 | 21.9 | 31.5 | 20.0 | 11.4 | 100 |
| V | 10.0 | 21.0 | 24.9 | 26.8 | 17.4 | 100 |
| VI | 5.9 | 13.6 | 19.9 | 29.3 | 31.3 | 100 |
| VII | 5.9 | 8.9 | 14.0 | 27.4 | 43.8 | 100 |
| VIII | 4.0 | 7.8 | 14.5 | 24.8 | 48.9 | 100 |
| Total | 20.0 | 19.3 | 20.7 | 19.7 | 20.3 | 100 |

Table 6: \% Children by class who CAN COMPREHEND ENGLISH All schools 2012
Std. $\left.\begin{array}{c|c|c}\text { Of those who } \\ \text { can read words, } \\ \text { \% who can tell } \\ \text { meanings of } \\ \text { the words }\end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c}\text { Of those who } \\ \text { can read } \\ \text { sentences, \% who } \\ \text { can tell meanings } \\ \text { of the sentences }\end{array}\right]$

## English Tool



Note: In Karnataka govt. schools, English as a subject is introduced in std. V

## Karnataka rubal

## Arithmetic

Table 7: \% Children by class and ARITHMETIC level All schools 2012

| Std. | Not even 1-9 | Recognize numbers |  | Can subtract | Can divide | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1-9 | 10-99 |  |  |  |
| 1 | 25.8 | 46.0 | 24.4 | 3.2 | 0.6 | 100 |
| II | 10.4 | 26.6 | 49.4 | 12.1 | 1.5 | 100 |
| III | 5.4 | 16.1 | 47.8 | 27.7 | 3.0 | 100 |
| IV | 2.3 | 9.7 | 35.7 | 41.1 | 11.3 | 100 |
| V | 2.8 | 5.7 | 30.3 | 41.5 | 19.9 | 100 |
| VI | 1.8 | 3.8 | 23.0 | 39.3 | 32.1 | 100 |
| VII | 1.8 | 2.7 | 18.2 | 34.7 | 42.5 | 100 |
| VIII | 2.0 | 1.5 | 21.4 | 29.1 | 46.1 | 100 |
| Total | 6.5 | 14.0 | 31.3 | 28.9 | 19.4 | 100 |

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level in arithmetic achieved by a child. For example, in Std 3,5.4\% children cannot even recognize numbers 1-9, $16.1 \%$ can recognize numbers up to 9 but not more, $47.8 \%$ can recognize numbers to 99 but cannot do subtraction, $27.7 \%$ can do subtraction but not division, and $3.0 \%$ can do division. For each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is $100 \%$.

## Chart 6: Trends over time

\% Children in Std III who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more By school type 2009-2012



## Math Tool



Chart 7: Trends over time
\% Children in Std V who CAN DO DIVISION
By school type 2009-2012



## Karnataka fubal

## Type of school and paid tuition classes

The ASER survey recorded information about tuition by asking the following question: "Does the child take any paid tuition class currently?" Therefore the numbers given below do not include any unpaid supplemental help in learning that children may have received.

| Table 8: Trends over time <br> \% Children attending paid tuition classes <br> By school type 2009-2012 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Children in Std I-VIII | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| Govt. schools: \% Children attending paid tuition classes | 7.7 | 6.7 | 7.7 | 8.9 |
| Private schools: \% Children attending paid tuition classes | 21.1 | 17.7 | 18.9 | 21.0 |
| All schools: \% Children attending paid tuition classes | 10.0 | 8.8 | 10.0 | 11.6 |

Table 9: Trends over time
\% Children by school type and tuition 2009-2012

| Year | Category |  | Std II | Std V | Std VIII | Std I-VIII |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2009 | Govt | No tuition | 72.9 | 79.7 | 72.2 | 76.3 |
|  |  | Tuition | 5.9 | 8.0 | 4.8 | 6.4 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 16.6 | 9.8 | 19.8 | 13.7 |
|  |  | Tuition | 4.6 | 2.6 | 3.3 | 3.7 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 2010 | Govt | No tuition | 72.4 | 75.8 | 69.1 | 75.1 |
|  |  | Tuition | 5.5 | 5.6 | 4.2 | 5.4 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 18.3 | 14.4 | 23.4 | 16.1 |
|  |  | Tuition | 3.9 | 4.2 | 3.3 | 3.5 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 2011 | Govt | No tuition | 72.3 | 74.3 | 69.7 | 73.6 |
|  |  | Tuition | 4.5 | 7.9 | 4.9 | 6.2 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 19.1 | 14.1 | 21.7 | 16.4 |
|  |  | Tuition | 4.1 | 3.8 | 3.7 | 3.8 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 2012 | Govt | No tuition | 68.7 | 73.0 | 65.6 | 71.0 |
|  |  | Tuition | 6.7 | 7.3 | 6.0 | 6.9 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 19.2 | 15.1 | 25.0 | 17.5 |
|  |  | Tuition | 5.4 | 4.6 | 3.4 | 4.6 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Chart 9: Trends over time
\% Children in Std III-V who CAN READ a Std I level text or more By school type and tuition 2009-2012



Chart 8: Trends over time
\% Children in Std I-VIII by school type and tuition 2009-2012


How to read this chart: This chart is a visual representation of the last column of Table 9. For a given year, the width of each colour band represents the \% of children in the corresponding category. For each year, these four categories add upto 100\%.

Chart 10: Trends over time
\% Children in Std III-V who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more By school type and tuition 2009-2012

facilitated by PRATHAM

## School observations

In each year's ASER, from 2009 onwards, in each sampled village, the largest government school with primary sections was visited on the day of the survey. Information about schools in this report is based on these visits.

Table 10: Number of schools visited 2009-2012

| Type of school | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| Std I-IVN: Primary | 133 | 113 | 106 | 117 |
| Std I-VIIINII: Primary + <br> Upper primary | 625 | 656 | 675 | 639 |
| Total schools visited | 758 | 769 | 781 | 756 |

Table 11: Student and teacher attendance on the day of the visit 2009-2012

| Type of school | Std I-IVN |  |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| \% Enrolled children <br> present (Average) | 88.0 | 81.7 | 90.4 | 89.1 | 79.6 | 70.9 | 85.2 | 83.1 |
| \% Teachers present <br> (Average) | 94.5 | 92.9 | 92.6 | 93.7 | 91.7 | 88.9 | 88.6 | 87.9 |

Table 12: Small schools and multigrade classes 2009-2012

| School characteristics | Std I-IVN |  |  |  | Std I-VIINIII |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| \% Schools with total enrollment of 60 or less | 75.0 | 84.6 | 84.8 | 84.5 | 5.3 | 6.3 | 7.0 | 9.9 |
| \% Schools where Std II children observed <br> sitting with one or more other classes | 87.6 | 85.9 | 89.4 | 93.0 | 69.1 | 73.5 | 81.4 | 82.9 |
| \% Schools where Std IV children observed <br> sitting with one or more other classes | 82.5 | 71.7 | 66.3 | 69.4 | 42.4 | 31.2 | 29.9 | 35.2 |

Note: In Karnataka, the official policy in govt. schools is to have mixed groups in std. I-III.

## RTE indicators

Table 13: Schools meeting selected RTE norms 2010-2012

| \% Schools meeting the following RTE norms: |  | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pupil-teacher \& classroomteacher norms | Pupil-teacher ratio | 69.4 | 71.2 | 66.9 |
|  | Classroom-teacher ratio | 82.8 | 85.0 | 83.2 |
| Building | Office/store/office cum store | 72.1 | 74.0 | 76.2 |
|  | Playground | 66.0 | 70.8 | 73.1 |
|  | Boundary wall/fencing | 59.3 | 69.0 | 70.2 |
| Drinking water | No facility for drinking water | 17.3 | 11.7 | 12.8 |
|  | Facility but no drinking water available | 7.0 | 6.5 | 6.0 |
|  | Drinking water available | 75.8 | 81.9 | 81.3 |
| Toilet | No toilet facility | 5.6 | 6.0 | 2.3 |
|  | Facility but toilet not useable | 56.0 | 49.9 | 38.3 |
|  | Toilet useable | 38.4 | 44.2 | 59.5 |
| Girls toilet | \% Schools with no separate provisions for girls toilets | 18.2 | 10.9 | 8.2 |
|  | Of schools with separate girls toilets, \% schools with |  |  |  |
|  | Toilet locked | 31.1 | 32.8 | 28.3 |
|  | Toilet not useable | 18.9 | 15.2 | 9.5 |
|  | Toilet useable | 31.8 | 41.1 | 54.0 |
| Library | No library | 7.6 | 7.4 | 5.8 |
|  | Library but no books being used by children on day of visit | 27.6 | 34.8 | 38.9 |
|  | Library books being used by children on day of visit | 64.8 | 57.8 | 55.3 |
| Mid-day meal | Kitchen shed for cooking mid-day meal | 92.9 | 94.0 | 94.1 |
|  | Mid-day meal served in school on day of visit | 96.0 | 97.9 | 98.5 |



The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act, 2009 specifies a series of norms and standards for a school.

Norms for number of teachers vary according to the level of the school (primary or upper primary) and total student enrollment.

Norms for classrooms require the school to have at least one classroom for every teacher.

Norms for facilities require schools to provide each of the facilities mentioned in Table 13, among others.

RTE norms regulate provision of facilities but not their useability. ASER school observations also include whether facilities could be used. This information is included in Table 13.

## School funds and activities (PAISA)

Table 14: \% Schools that report receiving SSA grants - Full financial year

| SSA school grants | April 2009 to March 2010 |  |  |  | April 2010 to March 2011 |  |  |  | April 2011 to March 2012 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{array}{r} \text { No. } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { Sch. } \end{array}$ | \% Schools |  |  | No. of Sch. | \% Schools |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No. } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Sch. } \end{aligned}$ | \% Schools |  |  |
|  |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |
| Maintenance grant | 669 | 91.2 | 1.1 | 7.8 | 771 | 95.1 | 2.2 | 2.7 | 745 | 93.4 | 4.0 | 2.6 |
| Development grant | 654 | 89.9 | 2.5 | 7.7 | 764 | 89.9 | 7.1 | 3.0 | 745 | 87.4 | 10.2 | 2.4 |
| TLM grant | 664 | 94.3 | 1.4 | 4.4 | 765 | 95.0 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 746 | 95.2 | 3.5 | 1.3 |

Table 15: \% Schools that report receiving SSA grants - Half financial year

| SSA school grants | April 2010 to date of survey (2010) |  |  |  | April 2011 to date of survey (2011) |  |  |  | April 2012 to date of survey (2012) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { No. } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { Sch. } \end{gathered}$ | \% Schools |  |  | No. of Sch. | \% Schools |  |  | No. of Sch. | \% Schools |  |  |
|  |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |
| Maintenance grant | 654 | 84.4 | 6.6 | 9.0 | 761 | 75.6 | 21.0 | 3.4 | 734 | 85.0 | 12.1 | 2.9 |
| Development grant | 637 | 83.7 | 6.3 | 10.1 | 752 | 70.0 | 26.2 | 3.9 | 733 | 80.4 | 16.8 | 2.9 |
| TLM grant | 648 | 87.4 | 5.1 | 7.6 | 753 | 74.2 | 22.6 | 3.2 | 737 | 89.0 | 8.8 | 2.2 |

Table 16: \% Schools carrying out different activities since April 2011

| Type of Activity |  | \% Schools |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Yes | No | Don't know |
| Const. | New Classroom | 26.9 | 71.5 | 1.6 |
| Repairs | Repair of building (roof, floor, wall etc.) | 53.4 | 44.7 | 1.9 |
|  | Repair of doors \& windows | 53.0 | 45.1 | 1.9 |
|  | Repair of boundary wall | 23.6 | 74.7 | 1.8 |
|  | Repair of drinking water facility | 54.7 | 43.6 | 1.8 |
|  | Repair of toilet | 57.1 | 41.0 | 1.9 |
| Painting <br> \& white- <br> wash | White wash/plastering | 73.1 | 25.8 | 1.1 |
|  | Painting blackboard/Display board/Painting on wall | 81.9 | 16.8 | 1.3 |
|  | Painting of doors \& walls | 64.6 | 33.9 | 1.5 |
| Purchase | Purchase of furniture (cupboard etc.) | 43.1 | 55.3 | 1.6 |
|  | Purchase of electrical fittings | 40.0 | 57.9 | 2.2 |
|  | Purchase of chalk, duster, register etc. | 94.1 | 5.0 | 0.9 |
|  | Purchase of sitting mats/Tat patti | 32.8 | 65.9 | 1.2 |
|  | Purchase of charts, globes \& other teaching material | 78.4 | 20.5 | 1.1 |
| Other | Expenditure on school events | 84.0 | 14.6 | 1.4 |
|  | Payment of bills (electricity, water, cleaning etc.) | 77.5 | 20.5 | 2.0 |

The PAISA section of ASER tracks receipt and spending of Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) grants at the school level. This information is collected from schools visited during the survey. This page reports proportion of schools receiving the grants and carrying out specified activities in the schools. More detailed analysis of the PAISA data will be available in the PAISA 2012 report which will be released in March 2013.1

## EVERY RURAL GOVERNMENT PRIMARY/UPPER PRIMARY SCHOOL IS ENTITLED TO EACH OF THESE sSA GRANTS EVERY YEAR.

| How much goes to |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| each school | For what purposes |

SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT GRANT / SCHOOL GRANT
Rs. 5000 per year per primary school

Rs. 7000 per year per upper primary school

## Rs 5000 + Rs $7000=$

 Rs 12000 if the school is Std I-VIIINIII.Note: Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same premises.

## SCHOOL MAINTENANCE GRANT

Rs. 5000 - Rs 7500 per school per year if the school has upto 3 classrooms.

Rs 7500 - Rs. 10000 per year if the school has more than 3 classrooms.

Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same building.

This grant can be used for maintenance of school building, including whitewashing; beautification; and repair of toilets, hand pump, boundary wall, playground etc.

The grant amount depends on number of classrooms (excluding Headmaster room and office room)

## TLM GRANT

Rs. 500 per teacher per year in primary and upper primary schools.

This grant can be used by teachers to buy teaching aids, such as charts, globes, posters, models etc.

## Kerala rubal

ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM HOUSEHOLDS. 14 OUT OF 14 DISTRICTS Data has not been presented where sample size was insufficient.

## School enrollment and out of school children

Table 1: \% Children in different types of schools 2012

| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in <br> school | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age: 6-14 ALL | 40.0 | 59.6 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 100 |
| Age: 7-16 ALL | 41.8 | 57.6 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 38.3 | 61.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 BOYS | 39.0 | 60.6 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 GIRLS | 37.6 | 61.9 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 ALL | 42.5 | 57.1 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 BOYS | 42.3 | 57.4 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 GIRLS | 42.8 | 56.9 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 ALL | 48.1 | 50.6 | 0.3 | 1.0 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 BOYS | 44.6 | 54.1 | 0.1 | 1.3 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 GIRLS | 51.7 | 47.1 | 0.5 | 0.7 | 100 |

Note: 'Other' includes children going to madarsa and EGS. 'Not in school' $=$ dropped out + never enrolled.

Chart 2: Trends over time \% Children enrolled in private schools by class 2008-2012


Chart 1: Trends over time
\% Children out of school by age group and gender 2006-2012


How to read this chart: Each line shows trends in the proportion of children out of school for a particular subset of children. For example, the proportion of girls (age 1114) not in school has changed from $0.6 \%$ in 2006 to $0.4 \%$ in 2007 to $0.2 \%$ in 2008, $0.2 \%$ in 2009 and to $0.1 \%$ in 2010 to $0.3 \%$ in 2012.

Table 2: Sample description
\% Children in each class by age 2012

| Std. | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 12.2 | 68.0 | 17.5 | 2.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| \|| | 1.1 | 13.9 | 61.6 | 19.3 | 4.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| III | 0 | . 5 | 11.2 | 66.4 | 18.7 | 3.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| IV | 1.3 |  |  | 12.9 | 62.5 | 20.1 | 3.2 |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| V | 1.9 |  |  |  | 9.7 | 65.3 | 19.9 | 3.3 |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| VI | 1.0 |  |  |  |  | 12.3 | 57.0 | 26.4 | 3.3 |  |  |  | 100 |
| VII | 1.8 |  |  |  |  |  | 10.6 | 67.1 | 17.7 | 2.8 |  |  | 100 |
| VIII | 1.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 16.1 | 67.8 | 12.7 | 1. | 8 | 100 |

How to read this table: If a child started school in Std I at age 6, she should be of age 8 in Std III. This table shows the age distribution for each class. For example, in Std III, $66.4 \%$ children are 8 years old but there also $11.2 \%$ who are $7,18.7 \%$ who are 9 and $3.2 \%$ who are older.

## Young children in pre-school and school

Table 3: \% Children age 3-6 who are enrolled in different types of pre-school and school 2012

|  | In balwadi or anganwadi | In LKG/ UKG | In School |  |  | Not in school or preschool | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Govt. | Pvt. | Other |  |  |
| Age 3 | 85.7 | 12.0 |  |  |  | 2.2 | 100 |
| Age 4 | 41.1 | 58.6 |  |  |  | 0.3 | 100 |
| Age 5 | 6.3 | 25.3 | 18.3 | 49.6 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 100 |
| Age 6 | 0.4 | 6.6 | 32.2 | 60.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 100 |

Chart 3: Trends over time
\% Children age 3, 4 and 5 not enrolled in school or pre-school 2006-2012*


* Data for 2011 is not comparable and therefore excluded here.


## Kerala rubal

Facilitated by PRATHAM

## Reading

Table 4: \% Children by class and READING level All schools 2012

| Std. | Not even <br> letter | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (Std I Text) | Level 2 <br> (Std II Text) | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 5.1 | 35.7 | 43.4 | 9.4 | 6.4 | 100 |
| II | 2.5 | 15.0 | 40.9 | 22.0 | 19.7 | 100 |
| IIII | 1.3 | 7.9 | 23.7 | 25.9 | 41.2 | 100 |
| IV | 1.4 | 4.8 | 14.1 | 22.0 | 57.7 | 100 |
| V | 0.6 | 2.9 | 9.8 | 21.4 | 65.2 | 100 |
| VI | 0.6 | 1.2 | 6.7 | 14.8 | 76.7 | 100 |
| VII | 1.0 | 2.5 | 5.5 | 15.8 | 75.2 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.6 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 12.1 | 84.3 | 100 |
| Total | 1.5 | 7.9 | 16.8 | 18.0 | 55.8 | 100 |

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level in reading achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, $1.3 \%$ children cannot even read letters, $7.9 \%$ can read letters but not more, $23.7 \%$ can read words but not Std I text or higher, $25.9 \%$ can read Std I text but not Std II level text, and $41.2 \%$ can read Std II level text. For each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is $100 \%$.

## Chart 4: Trends over time

\% Children in Std III who CAN READ Std I level text By school type 2009-2012


## Reading Tool



Chart 5: Trends over time
\% Children in Std V who CAN READ Std II level text By school type 2009-2012


## Reading and comprehension in English

Table 5: \% Children by class and READING level in ENGLISH All schools 2012

| Std. | Not <br> even <br> capital <br> letters | Capital <br> letters | Small <br> letters | Simple <br> words | Easy <br> sen- <br> tences | Total |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 10.9 | 26.9 | 25.2 | 29.3 | 7.8 | 100 |
| II | 4.7 | 16.9 | 23.7 | 30.2 | 24.6 | 100 |
| III | 2.8 | 10.5 | 17.1 | 31.1 | 38.4 | 100 |
| IV | 2.4 | 6.6 | 11.8 | 28.1 | 51.1 | 100 |
| V | 1.6 | 4.9 | 8.3 | 22.6 | 62.7 | 100 |
| VII | 1.1 | 2.9 | 5.1 | 18.1 | 72.8 | 100 |
| VII | 1.5 | 2.7 | 4.8 | 14.2 | 76.7 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.8 | 0.9 | 1.3 | 11.0 | 86.0 | 100 |
| Total | 2.9 | 8.2 | 11.4 | 22.5 | 55.0 | 100 |

Table 6: \% Children by class who CAN COMPREHEND ENGLISH All schools 2012

| Std. | Of those who <br> can read words, <br> \% who can tell <br> meanings of <br> the words | Of those who <br> can read <br> sentences, \% who <br> can tell meanings <br> of the sentences |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| I | 79.6 |  |
| II | 70.9 | 72.4 |
| III | 80.8 | 79.0 |
| IV | 81.9 | 82.6 |
| V | 78.9 | 83.4 |
| VI | 80.2 | 86.1 |
| VII | 71.8 | 88.4 |
| VIII | 75.7 | 82.3 |

English Tool


## Kerala rubal

## Arithmetic

Table 7: \% Children by class and ARITHMETIC level All schools 2012

| Std. | Not even 1-9 | Recognize numbers |  | Can subtract | Can divide | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1-9 | 10-99 |  |  |  |
| 1 | 5.4 | 33.2 | 52.4 | 6.8 | 2.2 | 100 |
| \\| | 2.1 | 14.5 | 52.1 | 23.7 | 7.7 | 100 |
| III | 1.2 | 7.2 | 38.9 | 35.6 | 17.1 | 100 |
| IV | 1.2 | 3.9 | 24.4 | 40.5 | 30.0 | 100 |
| V | 0.7 | 3.4 | 17.5 | 32.5 | 45.9 | 100 |
| VI | 0.7 | 1.0 | 13.9 | 29.4 | 55.0 | 100 |
| VII | 1.1 | 1.4 | 11.2 | 23.9 | 62.5 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.4 | 0.7 | 6.4 | 17.6 | 75.0 | 100 |
| Total | 1.5 | 7.2 | 25.5 | 26.8 | 39.1 | 100 |

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level in arithmetic achieved by a child. For example, in Std 3, 1.2\% children cannot even recognize numbers 1-9, 7.2\% can recognize numbers up to 9 but not more, $38.9 \%$ can recognize numbers to 99 but cannot do subtraction, $35.6 \%$ can do subtraction but not division, and $17.1 \%$ can do division. For each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is $100 \%$.

## Chart 6: Trends over time

\% Children in Std III who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more
By school type 2009-2012



## Math Tool



Chart 7: Trends over time
\% Children in Std V who CAN DO DIVISION
By school type 2009-2012


## Kerala rural

## Type of school and paid tuition classes

The ASER survey recorded information about tuition by asking the following question: "Does the child take any paid tuition class currently?" Therefore the numbers given below do not include any unpaid supplemental help in learning that children may have received.

| Table 8: Trends over time <br> \% Children attending paid tuition classes <br> By school type 2009-2012 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Children in Std I-VIII | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| Govt. schools: \% Children attending paid tuition classes | 35.0 | 39.0 | 33.6 | 29.8 |
| Private schools: \% Children attending paid tuition classes | 39.9 | 39.5 | 33.1 | 30.8 |
| All schools: \% Children attending paid tuition classes | 37.6 | 39.3 | 33.3 | 30.4 |

Table 9: Trends over time
\% Children by school type and tuition 2009-2012

| Year | Category |  | Std II | Std V | Std VIII | Std I-VIII |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2009 | Govt | No tuition | 30.7 | 28.3 | 30.0 | 30.8 |
|  |  | Tuition | 15.2 | 20.3 | 21.3 | 16.6 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 36.6 | 29.3 | 25.4 | 31.6 |
|  |  | Tuition | 17.6 | 22.1 | 23.3 | 21.0 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 2010 | Govt | No tuition | 27.4 | 25.2 | 27.1 | 26.7 |
|  |  | Tuition | 8.5 | 20.0 | 23.2 | 17.1 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 43.5 | 30.7 | 29.9 | 33.9 |
|  |  | Tuition | 20.6 | 24.2 | 19.8 | 22.2 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 2011 | Govt | No tuition | 27.0 | 23.8 | 25.6 | 25.1 |
|  |  | Tuition | 8.4 | 16.4 | 14.9 | 12.7 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 47.3 | 38.1 | 34.9 | 41.6 |
|  |  | Tuition | 17.3 | 21.8 | 24.6 | 20.6 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 2012 | Govt | No tuition | 23.2 | 28.9 | 25.5 | 27.3 |
|  |  | Tuition | 9.3 | 12.0 | 15.3 | 11.6 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 50.9 | 41.2 | 35.9 | 42.4 |
|  |  | Tuition | 16.6 | 18.0 | 23.4 | 18.8 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Chart 9: Trends over time
\% Children in Std III-V who CAN READ a Std I level text or more By school type and tuition 2009-2012



Chart 8: Trends over time
\% Children in Std I-VIII by school type and tuition 2009-2012


How to read this chart: This chart is a visual representation of the last column of Table 9. For a given year, the width of each colour band represents the \% of children in the corresponding category. For each year, these four categories add upto 100\%.

Chart 10: Trends over time
\% Children in Std III-V who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more By school type and tuition 2009-2012


Facilitated by PRATHAM

## School observations

In each year's ASER, from 2009 onwards, in each sampled village, the largest government school with primary sections was visited on the day of the survey. Information about schools in this report is based on these visits.

Table 10: Number of schools visited 2009-2012

| Type of school | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Std I-IVN: Primary | 178 | 176 | 177 | 167 |
| Std I-VIIINII: Primary + <br> Upper primary | 78 | 99 | 151 | 180 |
| Total schools visited | 256 | 275 | 328 | 347 |

Table 11: Student and teacher attendance on the day of the visit 2009-2012

| Type of school | Std I-IVN |  |  |  | Std I-VIINIII |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| \% Enrolled children <br> present (Average) | 91.9 | 93.1 | 91.9 | 94.4 | 91.8 | 91.2 | 90.8 | 93.3 |
| \% Teachers present <br> (Average) | 87.1 | 94.0 | 92.8 | 90.8 | 92.6 | 90.2 | 92.7 | 91.2 |

Table 12: Small schools and multigrade classes 2009-2012

| School characteristics | Std I-IVN |  |  |  | Std I-VIINIII |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| \% Schools with total enrollment of 60 or less | 21.8 | 29.0 | 33.7 | 48.8 | 6.5 | 4.1 | 6.7 | 6.3 |
| \% Schools where Std II children observed <br> sitting with one or more other classes | 4.6 | 7.9 | 6.7 | 6.8 | 3.9 | 6.3 | 9.4 | 7.3 |
| \% Schools where Std IV children observed <br> sitting with one or more other classes | 3.6 | 7.1 | 6.3 | 8.9 | 1.3 | 2.2 | 8.7 | 7.5 |

## RTE indicators

Table 13: Schools meeting selected RTE norms 2010-2012

| \% Schools meeting the following RTE norms: |  | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pupil-teacher \& classroomteacher norms | Pupil-teacher ratio | 89.2 | 94.1 | 92.0 |
|  | Classroom-teacher ratio | 80.3 | 77.6 | 89.5 |
| Building | Office/store/office cum store | 88.4 | 90.2 | 91.3 |
|  | Playground | 76.3 | 79.1 | 66.5 |
|  | Boundary wall/fencing | 81.8 | 86.1 | 72.9 |
| Drinking water | No facility for drinking water | 2.6 | 1.9 | 6.4 |
|  | Facility but no drinking water available | 11.7 | 4.4 | 8.5 |
|  | Drinking water available | 85.7 | 93.8 | 85.1 |
| Toilet | No toilet facility | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.3 |
|  | Facility but toilet not useable | 41.4 | 28.1 | 24.0 |
|  | Toilet useable | 58.2 | 71.6 | 75.7 |
| Girls toilet | \% Schools with no separate provisions for girls toilets | 5.1 | 0.9 | 1.5 |
|  | Of schools with separate girls toilets, \% schools with |  |  |  |
|  | Toilet locked | 8.7 | 15.4 | 3.0 |
|  | Toilet not useable | 42.3 | 15.1 | 22.1 |
|  | Toilet useable | 43.9 | 68.6 | 73.5 |
| Library | No library | 16.9 | 1.9 | 4.3 |
|  | Library but no books being used by children on day of visit | 20.7 | 27.3 | 1.7 |
|  | Library books being used by children on day of visit | 62.4 | 70.8 | 93.9 |
| Mid-day meal | Kitchen shed for cooking mid-day meal | 98.1 | 97.8 | 95.6 |
|  | Mid-day meal served in school on day of visit | 100 | 100 | 98.2 |



The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act, 2009 specifies a series of norms and standards for a school.

Norms for number of teachers vary according to the level of the school (primary or upper primary) and total student enrollment.

Norms for classrooms require the school to have at least one classroom for every teacher.

Norms for facilities require schools to provide each of the facilities mentioned in Table 13, among others.

RTE norms regulate provision of facilities but not their useability. ASER school observations also include whether facilities could be used. This information is included in Table 13.

## School funds and activities (PAISA)

Table 14: \% Schools that report receiving SSA grants - Full financial year

| SSA school grants | April 2009 to March 2010 |  |  |  | April 2010 to March 2011 |  |  |  | April 2011 to March 2012 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. of Sch. | \% Schools |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { No. } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { Sch. } \end{gathered}$ | \% Schools |  |  | No. of Sch. | \% Schools |  |  |
|  |  | Yes | No | Don't know |  | Yes | No | Don't know |  | Yes | No | Don't know |
| Maintenance grant | 218 | 94.5 | 4.1 | 1.4 | 323 | 95.1 | 4.3 | 0.6 | 335 | 93.1 | 6.0 | 0.9 |
| Development grant | 195 | 91.8 | 6.7 | 1.5 | 301 | 82.4 | 15.3 | 2.3 | 319 | 77.7 | 19.4 | 2.8 |
| TLM grant | 222 | 99.1 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 323 | 96.6 | 2.8 | 0.6 | 337 | 98.2 | 0.9 | 0.9 |

Table 15: \% Schools that report receiving SSA grants - Half financial year

| SSA school grants | April 2010 to date of survey (2010) |  |  |  | April 2011 to date of survey (2011) |  |  |  | April 2012 to date of survey (2012) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. of Sch. | \% Schools |  |  | No. of Sch. | \% Schools |  |  | No. of Sch. | \% Schools |  |  |
|  |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |
| Maintenance grant | 202 | 89.1 | 8.9 | 2.0 | 303 | 79.5 | 16.2 | 4.3 | 306 | 87.3 | 11.4 | 1.3 |
| Development grant | 188 | 86.2 | 11.7 | 2.1 | 275 | 72.0 | 22.9 | 5.1 | 283 | 76.0 | 21.6 | 2.5 |
| TLM grant | 204 | 96.6 | 2.9 | 0.5 | 299 | 89.6 | 6.7 | 3.7 | 299 | 95.3 | 3.7 | 1.0 |

Table 16: \% Schools carrying out different activities since April 2011

| Type of Activity |  | \% Schools |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Yes | No | Don't know |
| Const. | New Classroom | 14.9 | 84.5 | 0.6 |
| Repairs | Repair of building (roof, floor, wall etc.) | 81.1 | 18.6 | 0.3 |
|  | Repair of doors \& windows | 66.3 | 33.3 | 0.3 |
|  | Repair of boundary wall | 25.6 | 74.1 | 0.3 |
|  | Repair of drinking water facility | 65.1 | 34.2 | 0.7 |
|  | Repair of toilet | 65.6 | 33.8 | 0.7 |
| Painting \& whitewash | White wash/plastering | 77.5 | 22.2 | 0.3 |
|  | Painting blackboard/Display board/Painting on wall | 82.6 | 17.1 | 0.3 |
|  | Painting of doors \& walls | 68.8 | 30.9 | 0.3 |
| Purchase | Purchase of furniture (cupboard etc.) | 44.1 | 55.6 | 0.3 |
|  | Purchase of electrical fittings | 64.4 | 35.3 | 0.3 |
|  | Purchase of chalk, duster, register etc. | 93.7 | 6.0 | 0.3 |
|  | Purchase of sitting mats/Tat patti | 30.7 | 68.9 | 0.4 |
|  | Purchase of charts, globes \& other teaching material | 89.5 | 10.2 | 0.3 |
| Other | Expenditure on school events | 77.9 | 21.7 | 0.4 |
|  | Payment of bills (electricity, water, cleaning etc.) | 92.0 | 7.7 | 0.3 |

The PAISA section of ASER tracks receipt and spending of Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) grants at the school level. This information is collected from schools visited during the survey. This page reports proportion of schools receiving the grants and carrying out specified activities in the schools. More detailed analysis of the PAISA data will be available in the PAISA 2012 report which will be released in March $2013 .{ }^{1}$

## EVERY RURAL GOVERNMENT PRIMARY/UPPER PRIMARY SCHOOL IS ENTITLED TO EACH OF THESE sSA GRANTS EVERY YEAR.

| How much goes to |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| each school | For what purposes |

SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT GRANT / SCHOOL GRANT
Rs. 5000 per year per primary school

Rs. 7000 per year per upper primary school

## Rs 5000 + Rs $7000=$

 Rs 12000 if the school is Std I-VIIINIII.Note: Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same premises.

## SCHOOL MAINTENANCE GRANT

Rs. 5000 - Rs 7500 per school per year if the school has upto 3 classrooms.

Rs 7500 - Rs. 10000 per year if the school has more than 3 classrooms.

Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same building.

This grant can be used for maintenance of school building, including whitewashing; beautification; and repair of toilets, hand pump, boundary wall, playground etc.

The grant amount depends on number of classrooms (excluding Headmaster room and office room)

## TLM GRANT

Rs. 500 per teacher per year in primary and upper primary schools.

This grant can be used by teachers to buy teaching aids, such as charts, globes, posters, models etc.



# Madhya Pradesh ruall 

Facilitated by PRATHAM
ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM HOUSEHOLDS. 43 OUT OF 45 DISTRICTS
Data has not been presented where sample size was insufficient.

## School enrollment and out of school children

Table 1: \% Children in different types of schools 2012

| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in <br> school | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age: 6-14 ALL | 77.8 | 18.2 | 1.0 | 3.1 | 100 |
| Age: 7-16 ALL | 76.2 | 17.3 | 0.9 | 5.6 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 77.2 | 19.6 | 1.3 | 2.0 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 BOYS | 74.2 | 22.7 | 1.4 | 1.8 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 GIRLS | 80.6 | 16.1 | 1.1 | 2.2 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 ALL | 78.5 | 16.2 | 0.7 | 4.6 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 BOYS | 74.7 | 20.1 | 1.0 | 4.2 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 GIRLS | 82.5 | 11.9 | 0.4 | 5.2 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 ALL | 67.6 | 14.4 | 0.5 | 17.5 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 BOYS | 64.7 | 18.1 | 0.7 | 16.5 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 GIRLS | 70.9 | 10.2 | 0.3 | 18.6 | 100 |

Note: 'Other' includes children going to madarsa and EGS 'Not in school' = dropped out + never enrolled

Chart 2: Trends over time \% Children enrolled in private schools by class 2008-2012


## Young children in pre-school and school

Table 3: \% Children age 3-6 who are enrolled in different types of pre-school and school 2012

|  | In balwadi or anganwadi | In LKG/ UKG | In School |  |  | Not in school or preschool | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Govt. | Pvt. | Other |  |  |
| Age 3 | 76.9 | 6.0 |  |  |  | 17.1 | 100 |
| Age 4 | 70.5 | 16.3 |  |  |  | 13.2 | 100 |
| Age 5 | 22.3 | 6.7 | 43.5 | 19.4 | 0.8 | 7.3 | 100 |
| Age 6 | 5.2 | 2.9 | 68.8 | 18.7 | 1.1 | 3.2 | 100 |

Chart 1: Trends over time
\% Children out of school by age group and gender 2006-2012


How to read this chart: Each line shows trends in the proportion of children out of school for a particular subset of children. For example, the proportion of girls (age 1114) not in school has changed from $7.3 \%$ in 2006 to $5.0 \%$ in 2007 to $3.5 \%$ in 2008 , $3.9 \%$ in 2009 and to $3.3 \%$ in 2010 to $5.2 \%$ in 2012.

## Table 2: Sample description

\% Children in each class by age 2012

| Std. | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 33.0 | 44.5 | 14.5 | 5.0 | 3.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| \|| | 5.1 | 19.4 | 42.1 | 25.1 | 8.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| III | 5. | . 9 | 16.0 | 45.3 | 19.5 | 8.5 | 4.7 |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| IV | 1. | . 1 | 5.0 | 19.4 | 32.6 | 30.6 | 11.4 |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| V | 2.1 |  |  | 6.6 | 10.1 | 43.4 | 20.9 | 11.7 | 5.2 |  |  |  | 100 |
| VI | 5.7 |  |  |  |  | 15.9 | 31.6 | 33.1 | 8.5 | 5.3 |  |  | 100 |
| VII | 1.6 |  |  |  |  | 5.3 | 9.1 | 43.2 | 26.8 | 9.5 | 4.5 |  | 100 |
| VIII | 5.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 18.2 | 34.2 | 28.0 | 9.9 | 4.7 | 100 |

How to read this table: If a child started school in Std I at age 6, she should be of age 8 in Std III. This table shows the age distribution for each class. For example, in Std III, $45.3 \%$ children are 8 years old but there also $16.0 \%$ who are $7,19.5 \%$ who are 9 ,
$8.5 \%$ who are 10 years old and $4.7 \%$ who are older.

Chart 3: Trends over time
\% Children age 3, 4 and 5 not enrolled in school or pre-school 2006-2012*


* Data for 2011 is not comparable and therefore excluded here.


## Reading

Table 4: \% Children by class and READING level
All schools 2012

| Std. | Not even <br> letter | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (Std I Text) | Level 2 <br> (Std II Text) | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 47.1 | 41.1 | 7.4 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 100 |
| II | 21.7 | 47.6 | 16.9 | 7.3 | 6.6 | 100 |
| III | 14.7 | 38.6 | 23.3 | 11.5 | 12.0 | 100 |
| IV | 8.0 | 28.4 | 23.7 | 17.1 | 22.8 | 100 |
| V | 5.1 | 20.3 | 21.6 | 19.9 | 33.1 | 100 |
| VI | 3.0 | 13.5 | 15.5 | 20.2 | 47.9 | 100 |
| VII | 2.3 | 9.6 | 11.4 | 18.3 | 58.5 | 100 |
| VIII | 1.6 | 7.7 | 7.7 | 15.2 | 67.8 | 100 |
| Total | 13.0 | 25.8 | 16.0 | 14.0 | 31.2 | 100 |

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level in reading achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, $14.7 \%$ children cannot even read letters, $38.6 \%$ can read letters but not more, $23.3 \%$ can read words but not Std I text or higher, $11.5 \%$ can read Std I text but not Std II level text, and $12 \%$ can read Std II level text. For each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is $100 \%$.

## Chart 4: Trends over time

\% Children in Std III who CAN READ Std I level text By school type 2009-2012


## Reading Tool


#### Abstract

-  thrl will ment xa   -   -  पद्यक will




Chart 5: Trends over time
\% Children in Std V who CAN READ Std II level text By school type 2009-2012


## Reading and comprehension in English

Table 5: \% Children by class and READING level in ENGLISH All schools 2012

| Std. | Not <br> even <br> capital <br> letters | Capital <br> letters | Small <br> letters | Simple <br> words | Easy <br> sen- <br> tences | Total |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| I | 65.4 | 21.4 | 8.9 | 3.4 | 1.0 | 100 |
| II | 44.0 | 30.2 | 17.7 | 6.1 | 2.0 | 100 |
| IIII | 35.7 | 31.7 | 21.3 | 8.5 | 2.8 | 100 |
| IV | 24.8 | 30.6 | 26.1 | 13.7 | 4.8 | 100 |
| V | 18.9 | 29.7 | 25.8 | 17.4 | 8.3 | 100 |
| VII | 11.9 | 22.7 | 28.0 | 23.5 | 14.0 | 100 |
| VII | 9.1 | 17.2 | 27.0 | 29.0 | 17.8 | 100 |
| VIII | 7.6 | 14.5 | 24.9 | 29.0 | 24.1 | 100 |
| Total | 27.2 | 24.9 | 22.5 | 16.3 | 9.3 | 100 |

Table 6: \% Children by class who CAN COMPREHEND ENGLISH All schools 2012

| Std. | Of those who <br> can read words, <br> \% who can tell <br> meanings of <br> the words | Of those who <br> can read <br> sentences, \% who <br> can tell meanings <br> of the sentences |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| I |  |  |
| III | 58.5 |  |
| IIII | 51.9 | 54.0 |
| IV | 55.9 | 55.4 |
| V | 52.6 | 56.0 |
| VI | 51.0 | 57.8 |
| VII | 52.6 | 59.3 |
| VIII | 57.7 | 56.4 |

English Tool

| -- $-5 \pm$ |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\text { D } \quad \begin{gathered} \text { L } \\ \text { K } \end{gathered} \quad \text { T }$ | $\begin{gathered} y \\ s \\ s \end{gathered}$ |
| X P N | m a |
| ${ }_{\text {dog }}^{\text {fut }}$ | What is the time? <br> This is asmall door. |
| ${ }^{\text {boy }}{ }_{\text {box }} \text { out }$ | I like to sleep. <br> He has a blue shirt |
| $\underline{\square}$ | $\underline{\underline{5}}$ |

# Madhya Pradesh ruad 

## Arithmetic

Table 7: \% Children by class and ARITHMETIC level All schools 2012

| Std. | Not even 1-9 | Recognize numbers |  | Can subtract | Can divide | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1-9 | 10-99 |  |  |  |
| I | 49.5 | 39.0 | 9.1 | 1.5 | 1.0 | 100 |
| \|| | 22.2 | 49.7 | 22.2 | 4.7 | 1.3 | 100 |
| III | 14.6 | 42.7 | 30.9 | 9.2 | 2.5 | 100 |
| IV | 7.8 | 32.5 | 37.3 | 15.6 | 6.8 | 100 |
| V | 4.9 | 25.1 | 35.8 | 21.9 | 12.3 | 100 |
| VI | 3.0 | 17.3 | 33.6 | 26.1 | 20.0 | 100 |
| VII | 2.1 | 11.8 | 29.8 | 29.4 | 27.0 | 100 |
| VIII | 1.8 | 10.0 | 25.4 | 27.9 | 34.9 | 100 |
| Total | 13.3 | 28.5 | 28.2 | 17.0 | 13.1 | 100 |

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level in arithmetic achieved by a child. For example, in Std 3, 14.6\% children cannot even recognize numbers 1-9, $42.7 \%$ can recognize numbers up to 9 but not more, $30.9 \%$ can recognize numbers to 99 but cannot do subtraction, $9.2 \%$ can do subtraction but not division, and $2.5 \%$ can do division. For each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is $100 \%$.

## Chart 6: Trends over time

\% Children in Std III who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more By school type 2009-2012



## Math Tool

| $\begin{gathered} 41 \\ i n \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  | $\underline{\square}$ |  | $4 y+1$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 4 | 4 | 11 | $\begin{array}{r} \text { } 11 \\ -41 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 41 \\ -14 \end{array}$ |  |
| T | I | IT | 17 | $\begin{array}{r} 14 \\ -4 i \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 71 \\ -11 \end{array}$ | $63114$ |
| - | 1 | 3 | 21 | $\begin{array}{r} 41 \\ -14 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 14 \\ -\quad 11 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | J134 |
|  |  | - 1 | 14 |  |  |  |
| 4 | 1 |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} 14 \\ i n \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 11 \\ 17 \end{array}$ | 4 H14 |
|  |  | 4 | 11 |  |  |  |
| =anin |  | Finn |  | 4 TH |  | -7\% |

Chart 7: Trends over time
\% Children in Std V who CAN DO DIVISION
By school type 2009-2012



## Madhya Pradesh rubal

Facilitated by PRATHAM

## Type of school and paid tuition classes

The ASER survey recorded information about tuition by asking the following question: "Does the child take any paid tuition class currently?" Therefore the numbers given below do not include any unpaid supplemental help in learning that children may have received.

| Table 8: Trends over time |
| :--- |
| \% Children attending paid tuition classes |
| By school type 2009-2012 |
| Children in Std I-VIII 2009 2010 2011 2012 <br> Govt. schools: \% Children <br> attending paid tuition classes 10.0 6.9 6.5 7.7 <br> Private schools: \% Children <br> attending paid tuition classes 26.1 19.0 15.4 16.1 <br> All schools: \% Children <br> attending paid tuition classes 12.3 8.8 8.1 9.2 |

Table 9: Trends over time
\% Children by school type and tuition 2009-2012

| Year | Category |  | Std II | Std V | Std VIII | Std I-VIII |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2009 | Govt. | No tuition | 78.1 | 77.9 | 70.3 | 76.8 |
|  |  | Tuition | 5.3 | 9.4 | 13.9 | 8.5 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 13.1 | 9.3 | 10.2 | 10.9 |
|  |  | Tuition | 3.5 | 3.4 | 5.6 | 3.8 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 2010 | Govt. | No tuition | 80.0 | 80.0 | 73.2 | 78.9 |
|  |  | Tuition | 2.8 | 5.8 | 12.7 | 5.9 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 15.1 | 11.3 | 9.4 | 12.3 |
|  |  | Tuition | 2.0 | 2.9 | 4.8 | 2.9 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 2011 | Govt. | No tuition | 74.9 | 78.5 | 78.1 | 76.9 |
|  |  | Tuition | 3.8 | 6.1 | 7.4 | 5.3 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 18.7 | 12.7 | 12.0 | 15.0 |
|  |  | Tuition | 2.6 | 2.7 | 2.6 | 2.7 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 2012 | Govt. | No tuition | 71.0 | 77.7 | 76.7 | 75.1 |
|  |  | Tuition | 5.0 | 6.8 | 7.8 | 6.2 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 20.4 | 12.4 | 12.3 | 15.6 |
|  |  | Tuition | 3.6 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 3.0 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Chart 9: Trends over time
\% Children in Std III-V who CAN READ a Std I level text or more By school type and tuition 2009-2012



Chart 8: Trends over time
\% Children in Std I-VIII by school type and tuition 2009-2012


How to read this chart: This chart is a visual representation of the last column of Table 9. For a given year, the width of each colour band represents the \% of children in the corresponding category. For each year, these four categories add upto 100\%.

Chart 10: Trends over time
\% Children in Std III-V who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more By school type and tuition 2009-2012


## Madhya Pradesh rubal

Facilitated by PRATHAN

## School observations

In each year's ASER, from 2009 onwards, in each sampled village, the largest government school with primary sections was visited on the day of the survey. Information about schools in this report is based on these visits.

Table 10: Number of schools visited 2009-2012

| Type of school | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Std I-IVN: Primary | 936 | 709 | 843 | 843 |
| Std I-VIINIII: Primary + <br> Upper primary | 293 | 510 | 352 | 368 |
| Total schools visited | 1229 | 1219 | 1195 | 1211 |

Table 11: Student and teacher attendance on the day of the visit 2009-2012

| Type of school | Std I-IVN |  |  |  | Std I-VIINIII |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| \% Enrolled children <br> present (Average) | 68.0 | 65.9 | 54.5 | 60.1 | 66.4 | 67.6 | 50.9 | 59.3 |
| \% Teachers present <br> (Average) | 92.7 | 88.5 | 87.5 | 84.9 | 89.5 | 87.1 | 82.7 | 87.2 |

Table 12: Small schools and multigrade classes 2009-2012

| School characteristics | Std I-IVN |  |  |  | Std I-VIINIII |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| \% Schools with total enrollment of 60 or less | 18.1 | 17.8 | 20.9 | 26.1 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 1.2 | 1.6 |
| \% Schools where Std II children observed <br> sitting with one or more other classes | 72.5 | 68.9 | 76.3 | 76.1 | 63.4 | 63.8 | 71.8 | 66.9 |
| \% Schools where Std IV children observed <br> sitting with one or more other classes | 62.2 | 59.9 | 71.0 | 67.0 | 52.6 | 53.9 | 66.4 | 59.3 |

## RTE indicators

Table 13: Schools meeting selected RTE norms 2010-2012

| \% Schools meeting the following RTE norms: |  | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pupil-teacher \& classroomteacher norms | Pupil-teacher ratio | 19.4 | 21.5 | 32.9 |
|  | Classroom-teacher ratio | 81.4 | 75.0 | 68.9 |
| Building | Office/store/office cum store | 69.5 | 64.2 | 67.2 |
|  | Playground | 61.1 | 55.4 | 56.6 |
|  | Boundary wall/fencing | 37.3 | 36.9 | 37.8 |
| Drinking water | No facility for drinking water | 13.4 | 19.3 | 17.3 |
|  | Facility but no drinking water available | 8.1 | 12.1 | 12.2 |
|  | Drinking water available | 78.5 | 68.6 | 70.5 |
| Toilet | No toilet facility | 20.0 | 24.3 | 11.3 |
|  | Facility but toilet not useable | 29.8 | 43.9 | 42.1 |
|  | Toilet useable | 50.3 | 31.9 | 46.7 |
| Girls toilet | \% Schools with no separate provisions for girls toilets | 50.8 | 43.8 | 35.0 |
|  | Of schools with separate girls toilets, \% schools with |  |  |  |
|  | Toilet locked | 8.5 | 6.2 | 10.9 |
|  | Toilet not useable | 11.8 | 26.6 | 19.7 |
|  | Toilet useable | 28.9 | 23.4 | 34.4 |
| Library | No library | 43.7 | 41.3 | 29.1 |
|  | Library but no books being used by children on day of visit | 27.3 | 27.2 | 31.7 |
|  | Library books being used by children on day of visit | 29.1 | 31.5 | 39.3 |
| Mid-day meal | Kitchen shed for cooking mid-day meal | 89.9 | 86.9 | 88.0 |
|  | Mid-day meal served in school on day of visit | 94.7 | 92.5 | 90.2 |



The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act, 2009 specifies a series of norms and standards for a school.

Norms for number of teachers vary according to the level of the school (primary or upper primary) and total student enrollment.

Norms for classrooms require the school to have at least one classroom for every teacher.

Norms for facilities require schools to provide each of the facilities mentioned in Table 13, among others.

RTE norms regulate provision of facilities but not their useability. ASER school observations also include whether facilities could be used. This information is included in Table 13

## Madhya Pradesh ruaal

## School funds and activities (PAISA)

Table 14: \% Schools that report receiving SSA grants - Full financial year

| SSA school grants | April 2009 to <br> March 2010 |  |  |  | April 2010 to <br> March 2011 |  |  |  | April 2011 to <br> March 2012 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No. } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Sch. } \end{aligned}$ | \% Schools |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No. } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Sch. } \end{aligned}$ | \% Schools |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { No. } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { Sch. } \end{gathered}$ | \% Schools |  |  |
|  |  | Yes | No | Don't know |  | Yes | No | Don't know |  | Yes | No | Don't know |
| Maintenance grant | 1101 | 84.7 | 5.7 | 9.6 | 1118 | 77.7 | 14.0 | 8.2 | 1197 | 85.4 | 5.6 | 9.0 |
| Development grant | 1049 | 77.5 | 12.5 | 10.0 | 1077 | 65.3 | 24.2 | 0.5 | 1184 | 68.1 | 21.0 | 10. |
| TLM grant | 1071 | 87.9 | 5.5 | 6.6 | 1104 | 77.1 | 16.3 | 6.6 | 1193 | 86.4 | 6.2 | 7.4 |

The PAISA section of ASER tracks receipt and spending of Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) grants at the school level. This information is collected from schools visited during the survey. This page reports proportion of schools receiving the grants and carrying out specified activities in the schools. More detailed analysis of the PAISA data will be available in the PAISA 2012 report which will be released in March $2013 .{ }^{\text {. }}$

## EVERY RURAL GOVERNMENT PRIMARY/UPPER PRIMARY SCHOOL IS ENTITLED TO EACH OF THESE SSA GRANTS EVERY YEAR.

| How much goes to |
| :---: | :--- |
| each school |$\quad$ For what purposes

SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT GRANT / SCHOOL GRANT
Rs. 5000 per year per primary school

Rs. 7000 per year per upper primary school

## Rs 5000 + Rs $7000=$ Rs 12000 if the school is Std I-VIIINIII.

Note: Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same premises.

## SCHOOL MAINTENANCE GRANT

Rs. 5000 - Rs 7500 per school per year if the school has upto 3 classrooms.

Rs 7500 - Rs. 10000 per year if the school has more than 3 classrooms.

Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same building.

This grant can be used for maintenance of school building, including whitewashing; beautification; and repair of toilets, hand pump, boundary wall, playground etc.

The grant amount depends on number of classrooms (excluding Headmaster room and office room)

## TLM GRANT

Rs. 500 per teacher per year in primary and upper primary schools.

This grant can be used by teachers to buy teaching aids, such as charts, globes, posters, models etc.

## Maharashtra rubal

ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM HOUSEHOLDS. 33 OUT OF 33 DISTRICTS
Data has not been presented where sample size was insufficient.

## School enrollment and out of school children

Table 1: \% Children in different types of schools 2012

| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in <br> school | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age: 6-14 ALL | 62.9 | 35.4 | 0.3 | 1.5 | 100 |
| Age: 7-16 ALL | 54.1 | 43.1 | 0.2 | 2.6 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 81.8 | 16.9 | 0.3 | 1.0 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 BOYS | 79.9 | 18.7 | 0.3 | 1.0 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 GIRLS | 83.9 | 14.9 | 0.3 | 1.0 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 ALL | 42.1 | 55.8 | 0.2 | 1.9 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 BOYS | 41.1 | 57.0 | 0.2 | 1.7 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 GIRLS | 43.5 | 54.1 | 0.2 | 2.2 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 ALL | 19.0 | 72.6 | 0.2 | 8.2 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 BOYS | 19.8 | 72.0 | 0.4 | 7.8 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 GIRLS | 18.9 | 72.6 | 0.1 | 8.5 | 100 |

Note: 'Other' includes children going to madarsa and EGS. 'Not in school' $=$ dropped out + never enrolled

Chart 2: Trends over time \% Children enrolled in private schools by class 2008-2012


Chart 1: Trends over time
\% Children out of school by age group and gender 2006-2012


How to read this chart: Each line shows trends in the proportion of children out of school for a particular subset of children. For example, the proportion of girls (age 1114) not in school has changed from $6.1 \%$ in 2006 to $3.0 \%$ in 2007 to $2.6 \%$ in 2008 , $2.0 \%$ in 2009 and to $1.7 \%$ in 2010 to $2.2 \%$ in 2012.

## Table 2: Sample description

\% Children in each class by age 2012

| Std. | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 12.8 | 55.5 | 29.1 | 2.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| \|| | 4. | . 9 | 38.9 | 50.7 | 5.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| III | 5.2 |  |  | 32.4 | 56.4 | 6.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| IV | 4.1 |  |  |  | 30.1 | 59.4 | 6.5 |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| V | 3.1 |  |  |  |  | 30.6 | 55.9 | 8.3 | 2.1 |  |  |  | 100 |
| VI | 3.8 |  |  |  |  |  | 23.8 | 64.0 | 6.7 | 1.7 |  |  | 100 |
| VIII | 4.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 32.1 | 52.5 | 9.0 | 1.8 |  | 100 |
| VIII | 1.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8.1 | 34.3 | 48.7 | 5.5 | 1.5 | 100 |

How to read this table: If a child started school in Std I at age 6, she should be of age 8 in Std III. This table shows the age distribution for each class. For example, in Std III, $32.4 \%$ children are 8 years old but there are also $5.2 \%$ who are younger, $56.4 \%$ who are 9 and $6.1 \%$ who are older.

## Young children in pre-school and school

Table 3: \% Children age 3-6 who are enrolled in different types of pre-school and school 2012

|  | In balwadi or anganwadi | In LKG/ UKG | In School |  |  | Not in school or preschool | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Govt. | Pvt. | Other |  |  |
| Age 3 | 78.6 | 7.3 |  |  |  | 14.1 | 100 |
| Age 4 | 84.8 | 11.4 |  |  |  | 3.8 | 100 |
| Age 5 | 36.8 | 8.5 | 34.5 | 16.6 | 0.1 | 3.5 | 100 |
| Age 6 | 10.0 | 3.0 | 70.3 | 14.4 | 0.4 | 1.9 | 100 |

Chart 3: Trends over time
\% Children age 3, 4 and 5 not enrolled in school or pre-school 2006-2012*


* Data for 2011 is not comparable and therefore excluded here.


## Maharashtra rural

Facilitated by PRATHAM

## Reading

Table 4: \% Children by class and READING level
All schools 2012

| Std. | Not even <br> letter | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (Std I Text) | Level 2 <br> (Std II Text) | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 33.7 | 40.2 | 18.6 | 4.3 | 3.2 | 100 |
| II | 9.5 | 25.7 | 29.9 | 19.4 | 15.5 | 100 |
| III | 6.6 | 13.2 | 21.0 | 23.9 | 35.3 | 100 |
| IV | 4.2 | 8.1 | 14.9 | 22.0 | 50.9 | 100 |
| V | 2.8 | 5.5 | 11.1 | 22.2 | 58.3 | 100 |
| VI | 1.2 | 4.4 | 7.0 | 15.4 | 72.0 | 100 |
| VII | 0.8 | 2.4 | 4.9 | 13.3 | 78.7 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.9 | 1.6 | 3.7 | 10.7 | 83.2 | 100 |
| Total | 7.9 | 13.0 | 14.0 | 16.4 | 48.7 | 100 |

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level in reading achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, $6.6 \%$ children cannot even read letters, $13.2 \%$ can read letters but not more, $21 \%$ can read words but not Std I text or higher, $23.9 \%$ can read Std I text but not Std II level text, and $35.3 \%$ can read Std II level text. For each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is $100 \%$.

## Chart 4: Trends over time

\% Children in Std III who CAN READ Std I level text By school type 2009-2012


## Reading Tool



Chart 5: Trends over time
\% Children in Std V who CAN READ Std II level text By school type 2009-2012


## Reading and comprehension in English

Table 5: \% Children by class and READING level in ENGLISH All schools 2012

| Std. | Not <br> even <br> capital <br> letters | Capital <br> letters | Small <br> letters | Simple <br> words | Easy <br> sen- <br> tences | Total |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 61.7 | 21.7 | 9.9 | 5.4 | 1.3 | 100 |
| II | 38.0 | 29.8 | 20.8 | 8.7 | 2.7 | 100 |
| III | 21.8 | 26.1 | 28.0 | 18.2 | 5.9 | 100 |
| IV | 16.0 | 19.2 | 27.9 | 29.3 | 7.6 | 100 |
| V | 11.0 | 12.7 | 23.7 | 31.5 | 21.2 | 100 |
| VII | 6.1 | 10.7 | 19.3 | 31.9 | 32.0 | 100 |
| VII | 4.0 | 8.0 | 16.9 | 30.5 | 40.6 | 100 |
| VIII | 3.6 | 5.2 | 15.2 | 26.1 | 50.0 | 100 |
| Total | 20.9 | 16.9 | 20.3 | 22.6 | 19.3 | 100 |

Table 6: \% Children by class who CAN COMPREHEND ENGLISH All schools 2012

| Std. | Of those who <br> can read words, <br> \% who can tell <br> meanings of <br> the words | Of those who <br> can read <br> sentences, \% who <br> can tell meanings <br> of the sentences |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| I |  |  |
| III | 66.8 |  |
| IIII | 62.2 |  |
| IV | 67.4 | 69.4 |
| V | 64.4 | 62.0 |
| VI | 62.2 | 63.6 |
| VII | 67.2 | 64.7 |
| VIII | 69.1 | 62.4 |

English Tool


## Maharashtra rural

## Arithmetic

Table 7: \% Children by class and ARITHMETIC level All schools 2012

| Std. | Not even 1-9 | Recognize numbers |  | Can subtract | Can divide | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1-9 | 10-99 |  |  |  |
| I | 30.2 | 54.9 | 12.9 | 1.7 | 0.3 | 100 |
| \\| | 8.7 | 41.3 | 42.4 | 6.3 | 1.3 | 100 |
| III | 5.6 | 25.6 | 44.8 | 21.8 | 2.2 | 100 |
| IV | 3.5 | 19.0 | 36.8 | 28.7 | 12.1 | 100 |
| V | 2.7 | 12.8 | 34.0 | 28.0 | 22.6 | 100 |
| VI | 1.2 | 9.3 | 33.1 | 25.4 | 31.0 | 100 |
| VII | 0.9 | 5.8 | 29.8 | 25.6 | 37.9 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.9 | 4.6 | 24.9 | 25.3 | 44.4 | 100 |
| Total | 7.1 | 22.2 | 32.2 | 20.2 | 18.3 | 100 |

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level in arithmetic achieved by a child. For example, in Std 3,5.6\% children cannot even recognize numbers 1-9, $25.6 \%$ can recognize numbers up to 9 but not more, $44.8 \%$ can recognize numbers to 99 but cannot do subtraction, $21.8 \%$ can do subtraction but not division, and $2.2 \%$ can do division. For each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is $100 \%$.

## Chart 6: Trends over time

\% Children in Std III who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more By school type 2009-2012



## Math Tool

| $\stackrel{\square}{17}$ |  | \#\# |  | --- - | - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | - | 4 | 4 | $\cdots 9$ | 9) |
|  |  |  |  | 土M. M |  |
| 1 | * | 4 | * | $\begin{aligned} & n \\ & -n+p \end{aligned}$ | 1) |
| + | 1 | ${ }^{1}$ | 4 |  |  |
|  |  | * | ai | $\pm+4$ | ) $\overline{\text { al }}$ |
| - | 1 |  |  | 4 \# |  |
|  |  | (1) | $\cdots$ | $\pm \mathrm{HC}+47$ | गुण |
| 2-1 | - | E | = | = | = |

Chart 7: Trends over time
\% Children in Std V who CAN DO DIVISION
By school type 2009-2012


## Maharashtra rural

facilitated by PRATHAM

## Type of school and paid tuition classes

The ASER survey recorded information about tuition by asking the following question: "Does the child take any paid tuition class currently?" Therefore the numbers given below do not include any unpaid supplemental help in learning that children may have received.

| Table 8: Trends over time <br> \% Children attending paid tuition classes <br> By school type 2009-2012 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Children in Std I-VIII | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| Govt. schools: \% Children attending paid tuition classes | 9.6 | 6.0 | 6.7 | 6.8 |
| Private schools: \% Children attending paid tuition classes | 16.2 | 15.3 | 16.8 | 17.3 |
| All schools: \% Children attending paid tuition classes | 11.4 | 8.4 | 9.6 | 10.4 |

Table 9: Trends over time
\% Children by school type and tuition 2009-2012

| Year | Category |  | Std II | Std V | Std VIII | Std I-VIII |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2009 | Govt | No tuition | 87.8 | 55.9 | 20.1 | 66.1 |
|  |  | Tuition | 6.7 | 6.8 | 3.6 | 7.0 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 3.8 | 30.9 | 66.0 | 22.5 |
|  |  | Tuition | 1.7 | 6.4 | 10.3 | 4.4 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 2010 | Govt | No tuition | 87.8 | 61.4 | 20.6 | 70.2 |
|  |  | Tuition | 4.3 | 5.4 | 2.6 | 4.5 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 6.0 | 29.0 | 66.9 | 21.4 |
|  |  | Tuition | 1.9 | 4.3 | 9.9 | 3.9 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 2011 | Govt | No tuition | 84.4 | 59.2 | 23.3 | 65.9 |
|  |  | Tuition | 4.8 | 4.7 | 3.9 | 4.7 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 8.4 | 29.9 | 63.0 | 24.5 |
|  |  | Tuition | 2.5 | 6.2 | 9.9 | 4.9 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 2012 | Govt | No tuition | 80.0 | 52.5 | 19.2 | 61.6 |
|  |  | Tuition | 5.1 | 4.5 | 2.1 | 4.5 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 10.2 | 37.4 | 69.4 | 28.0 |
|  |  | Tuition | 4.7 | 5.6 | 9.3 | 5.8 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Chart 9: Trends over time
\% Children in Std III-V who CAN READ a Std I level text or more By school type and tuition 2009-2012



Chart 8: Trends over time
\% Children in Std I-VIII by school type and tuition 2009-2012


How to read this chart: This chart is a visual representation of the last column of Table 9. For a given year, the width of each colour band represents the \% of children in the corresponding category. For each year, these four categories add upto 100\%.

Chart 10: Trends over time
\% Children in Std III-V who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more By school type and tuition 2009-2012


## School observations

In each year's ASER, from 2009 onwards, in each sampled village, the largest government school with primary sections was visited on the day of the survey. Information about schools in this report is based on these visits.

Table 10: Number of schools visited 2009-2012

| Type of school | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Std I-IVN: Primary | 485 | 435 | 408 | 400 |
| Std I-VIINIII: Primary + <br> Upper primary | 450 | 467 | 421 | 423 |
| Total schools visited | 935 | 902 | 829 | 823 |

Table 11: Student and teacher attendance on the day of the visit 2009-2012

| Type of school | Std I-IVN |  |  |  | Std I-VIINIII |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| \% Enrolled children <br> present (Average) | 90.7 | 91.5 | 89.6 | 90.5 | 90.6 | 92.4 | 90.0 | 90.7 |
| \% Teachers present <br> (Average) | 94.9 | 93.8 | 89.8 | 92.3 | 92.8 | 91.7 | 89.0 | 91.9 |

Table 12: Small schools and multigrade classes 2009-2012

| School characteristics | Std I-IVN |  |  |  | Std I-VIINIII |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| \% Schools with total enrollment of 60 or less | 29.7 | 33.0 | 38.7 | 37.7 | 1.8 | 1.3 | 3.7 | 5.3 |
| \% Schools where Std II children observed <br> sitting with one or more other classes | 46.7 | 47.5 | 47.6 | 52.0 | 26.7 | 34.3 | 41.3 | 35.6 |
| \% Schools where Std IV children observed <br> sitting with one or more other classes | 42.9 | 46.8 | 45.6 | 46.5 | 22.7 | 26.9 | 36.0 | 30.6 |

## RTE indicators

Table 13: Schools meeting selected RTE norms 2010-2012

| \% Schools meeting the following RTE norms: |  | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pupil-teacher \& classroomteacher norms | Pupil-teacher ratio | 58.9 | 62.9 | 63.2 |
|  | Classroom-teacher ratio | 87.6 | 81.9 | 83.4 |
| Building | Office/store/office cum store | 34.3 | 33.3 | 27.0 |
|  | Playground | 84.7 | 82.9 | 84.0 |
|  | Boundary wall/fencing | 57.5 | 58.1 | 52.8 |
| Drinking water | No facility for drinking water | 18.7 | 16.7 | 17.2 |
|  | Facility but no drinking water available | 12.3 | 10.2 | 13.3 |
|  | Drinking water available | 69.0 | 73.1 | 69.6 |
| Toilet | No toilet facility | 2.9 | 3.1 | 1.9 |
|  | Facility but toilet not useable | 44.1 | 52.1 | 40.8 |
|  | Toilet useable | 53.0 | 44.9 | 57.3 |
| Girls toilet | \% Schools with no separate provisions for girls toilets | 13.7 | 9.0 | 7.2 |
|  | Of schools with separate girls toilets, \% schools with |  |  |  |
|  | Toilet locked | 32.3 | 34.4 | 26.2 |
|  | Toilet not useable | 10.8 | 14.1 | 13.6 |
|  | Toilet useable | 43.2 | 42.6 | 53.1 |
| Library | No library | 14.0 | 16.2 | 13.7 |
|  | Library but no books being used by children on day of visit | 19.6 | 29.5 | 33.2 |
|  | Library books being used by children on day of visit | 66.5 | 54.3 | 53.1 |
| Mid-day meal | Kitchen shed for cooking mid-day meal | 78.2 | 74.8 | 70.8 |
|  | Mid-day meal served in school on day of visit | 90.7 | 95.8 | 93.2 |



The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act, 2009 specifies a series of norms and standards for a school.

Norms for number of teachers vary according to the level of the school (primary or upper primary) and total student enrollment.

Norms for classrooms require the school to have at least one classroom for every teacher.

Norms for facilities require schools to provide each of the facilities mentioned in Table 13, among others.

RTE norms regulate provision of facilities but not their useability. ASER school observations also include whether facilities could be used. This information is included in Table 13.

## School funds and activities (PAISA)

Table 14: \% Schools that report receiving SSA grants - Full financial year

| SSA school grants | April 2009 to March 2010 |  |  |  | April 2010 to March 2011 |  |  |  | April 2011 to March 2012 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. of Sch. | \% Schools |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { No. } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { Sch. } \end{gathered}$ | \% Schools |  |  | No. of Sch. | \% Schools |  |  |
|  |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |
| Maintenance grant | 772 | 92.1 | 2.5 | 5.4 | 777 | 92.4 | 3.2 | 4.4 | 809 | 94.4 | 2.5 | 3.1 |
| Development grant | 747 | 89.6 | 4.3 | 6.2 | 753 | 76.1 | 17.7 | 6.2 | 787 | 82.2 | 13.7 | 4.1 |
| TLM grant | 770 | 95.2 | 1.2 | 3.6 | 765 | 93.5 | 2.9 | 3.7 | 806 | 96.5 | 1.2 | 2.2 |

Table 15: \% Schools that report receiving SSA grants - Half financial year

| SSA school grants | April 2010 to date of survey (2010) |  |  |  | April 2011 to date of survey (2011) |  |  |  | April 2012 to date of survey (2012) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. of Sch. | \% Schools |  |  | No. of Sch. | \% Schools |  |  | No. of Sch. | \% Schools |  |  |
|  |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |
| Maintenance grant | 733 | 65.4 | 27.2 | 7.5 | 734 | 65.7 | 29.3 | 5 | 782 | 60.2 | 35.3 | 4.5 |
| Development grant | 715 | 64.1 | 28.5 | 7.4 | 707 | 57.6 | 37.1 | 5.4 | 762 | 60.6 | 34.7 | 4.7 |
| TLM grant | 735 | 69.4 | 24.8 | 5.9 | 719 | 66.3 | 29.4 | 4.3 | 780 | 68.3 | 28.1 | 3.6 |

Table 16: \% Schools carrying out different activities since April 2011

| Type of Activity |  | \% Schools |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Yes | No | Don't know |
| Const. | New Classroom | 21.8 | 76.5 | 1.7 |
| Repairs | Repair of building (roof, floor, wall etc.) | 48.1 | 49.7 | 2.2 |
|  | Repair of doors \& windows | 52.9 | 45.1 | 2.0 |
|  | Repair of boundary wall | 21.7 | 76.4 | 1.9 |
|  | Repair of drinking water facility | 47.6 | 50.4 | 2.0 |
|  | Repair of toilet | 46.3 | 52.0 | 1.8 |
| Painting \& whitewash | White wash/plastering | 66.0 | 32.1 | 1.9 |
|  | Painting blackboard/Display board/Painting on wall | 75.9 | 22.2 | 1.9 |
|  | Painting of doors \& walls | 51.8 | 46.3 | 1.9 |
| Purchase | Purchase of furniture (cupboard etc.) | 29.9 | 68.1 | 2.0 |
|  | Purchase of electrical fittings | 38.1 | 59.6 | 2.3 |
|  | Purchase of chalk, duster, register etc. | 94.3 | 4.0 | 1.7 |
|  | Purchase of sitting mats/Tat patti | 33.8 | 64.0 | 2.2 |
|  | Purchase of charts, globes \& other teaching material | 83.9 | 14.0 | 2.1 |
| Other | Expenditure on school events | 76.3 | 20.9 | 2.8 |
|  | Payment of bills (electricity, water, cleaning etc.) | 38.0 | 59.0 | 3.0 |

The PAISA section of ASER tracks receipt and spending of Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) grants at the school level. This information is collected from schools visited during the survey. This page reports proportion of schools receiving the grants and carrying out specified activities in the schools. More detailed analysis of the PAISA data will be available in the PAISA 2012 report which will be released in March $2013 .{ }^{1}$

## EVERY RURAL GOVERNMENT PRIMARY/UPPER PRIMARY SCHOOL IS ENTITLED TO EACH OF THESE SSA GRANTS EVERY YEAR.

| How much goes to |
| :---: | :--- |
| each school |$\quad$ For what purposes each school

For what purposes

## SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT GRANT / SCHOOL GRANT

Rs. 5000 per year per primary school

Rs. 7000 per year per upper primary school

## Rs 5000 + Rs $7000=$

 Rs 12000 if the school is Std I-VIIINIII.Note: Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same premises.

## SCHOOL MAINTENANCE GRANT

Rs. 5000 - Rs 7500 per school per year if the school has upto 3 classrooms.

Rs 7500 - Rs. 10000 per year if the school has more than 3 classrooms.

Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same building.

This grant can be used for maintenance of school building, including whitewashing; beautification; and repair of toilets, hand pump, boundary wall, playground etc.

The grant amount depends on number of classrooms (excluding Headmaster room and office room)

## TLM GRANT

Rs. 500 per teacher per year in primary and upper primary schools.

This grant can be used by teachers to buy teaching aids, such as charts, globes, posters, models etc.

ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM HOUSEHOLDS. 9 OUT OF 9 DISTRICTS
Data has not been presented where sample size was insufficient.

## School enrollment and out of school children

Table 1: \% Children in different types of schools 2012

| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in <br> school | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age: 6-14 ALL | 30.8 | 67.3 | 0.4 | 1.5 | 100 |
| Age: 7-16 ALL | 30.3 | 66.7 | 0.4 | 2.5 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 30.9 | 67.2 | 0.5 | 1.4 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 BOYS | 30.4 | 68.0 | 0.5 | 1.1 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 GIRLS | 31.3 | 66.4 | 0.5 | 1.8 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 ALL | 30.4 | 67.3 | 0.4 | 1.9 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 BOYS | 28.5 | 69.2 | 0.5 | 1.7 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 GIRLS | 32.5 | 65.1 | 0.2 | 2.3 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 ALL | 28.0 | 63.5 | 0.5 | 8.1 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 BOYS | 25.3 | 66.8 | 0.9 | 7.1 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 GIRLS | 31.0 | 59.3 | 0.0 | 9.8 | 100 |

Note: 'Other' includes children going to madarsa and EGS.
'Not in school' = dropped out + never enrolled.

Chart 2: Trends over time
\% Children enrolled in private schools by class 2008-2012


Chart 1: Trends over time
\% Children out of school by age group and gender 2006-2012


How to read this chart: Each line shows trends in the proportion of children out of school for a particular subset of children. For example, the proportion of girls (age 1114) not in school has changed from $5.9 \%$ in 2006 to $7.1 \%$ in 2007 to $4.6 \%$ in 2008, $2.3 \%$ in 2009 and to $3.3 \%$ in 2010 to $2.3 \%$ in 2012.

Table 2: Sample description
\% Children in each class by age 2012

| Std. | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 11.4 | 24.0 | 30.0 | 19.8 | 6.2 | 6.2 | 2.4 |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| \|| | 1.9 | 8.6 | 23.6 | 27.8 | 15.2 | 13.6 | 9.3 |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| III | 1.6 |  | 6.7 | 20.1 | 26.4 | 24.7 | 10.7 | 6.7 | 3.2 |  |  |  | 100 |
| IV | 10.5 | 7.6 | 4.5 | 7.3 | 13.6 | 19.5 | 15.3 | 12.6 | 5.0 |  | 4.1 |  | 100 |
| V | 5.9 |  |  |  |  | 22.2 | 19.6 | 31.8 | 13.9 | 6.8 |  |  | 100 |
| VI | 2.3 |  |  |  |  | 8.9 | 15.9 | 32.2 | 19.1 | 13.3 | 5.9 | 2.4 | 100 |
| VII | 4.7 |  |  |  |  |  | 6.8 | 24.9 | 26.0 | 22.7 | 9.9 | 5.0 | 100 |
| VIII | 2.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.7 | 22.5 | 36.9 | 19.2 | 11.8 | 100 |

How to read this table: If a child started school in Std I at age 6, she should be of age 8 in Std III. This table shows the age distribution for each class. For example, in Std III, $20.1 \%$ children are 8 years old but there are also $6.7 \%$ who are $7,26.4 \%$ who are 9 , $24.7 \%$ who are 10 years old, etc.

## Young children in pre-school and school

Table 3: \% Children age 3-6 who are enrolled in different types of pre-school and school 2012

|  | In balwadi or anganwad | In LKG/ UKG | In School |  |  | Not in school or preschool | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Govt. | Pvt. | Other |  |  |
| Age 3 | 19.7 | 31.8 |  |  |  | 48.5 | 100 |
| Age 4 | 13.4 | 64.1 |  |  |  | 22.5 | 100 |
| Age 5 | 2.0 | 42.7 | 14.3 | 35.2 | 0.5 | 5.3 | 100 |
| Age 6 | 0.7 | 34.4 | 19.6 | 42.2 | 0.1 | 2.9 | 100 |

Chart 3: Trends over time
\% Children age 3, 4 and 5 not enrolled in school or pre-school 2006-2012*


## Reading

Table 4: \% Children by class and READING level
All schools 2012

| Std. | Not even <br> letter | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (Std I Text) | Level 2 <br> (Std II Text) | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 6.2 | 49.0 | 31.2 | 10.5 | 3.2 | 100 |
| II | 1.6 | 24.5 | 36.2 | 22.9 | 14.8 | 100 |
| IIII | 0.9 | 13.5 | 29.8 | 24.7 | 31.1 | 100 |
| IV | 5.4 | 22.1 | 17.1 | 22.1 | 33.3 | 100 |
| V | 0.4 | 5.7 | 11.6 | 18.7 | 63.6 | 100 |
| VII | 0.1 | 2.3 | 9.1 | 11.8 | 76.7 | 100 |
| VII | 0.2 | 3.7 | 4.5 | 9.6 | 82.1 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.3 | 1.6 | 6.7 | 6.2 | 85.3 | 100 |
| Total | 2.3 | 17.8 | 20.3 | 16.8 | 42.8 | 100 |

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level in reading achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, $0.9 \%$ children cannot even read letters, $13.5 \%$ can read letters but not more, $29.8 \%$ can read words but not Std I text or higher, $24.7 \%$ can read Std I text but not Std II level text, and 31.1\% can read Std II level text. For each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is $100 \%$.

## Chart 4: Trends over time

\% Children in Std III who CAN READ Std I level text
By school type 2009-2012


## Reading Tool

## 



Chart 5: Trends over time
\% Children in Std V who CAN READ Std II level text By school type 2009-2012


## Reading and comprehension in English

Table 5: \% Children by class and READING level in ENGLISH All schools 2012

| Std. | Not <br> even <br> capital <br> letters | Capital <br> letters | Small <br> letters | Simple <br> words | Easy <br> sen- <br> tences | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 6.2 | 19.0 | 37.3 | 31.6 | 5.9 | 100 |
| II | 2.2 | 7.7 | 25.2 | 44.8 | 20.1 | 100 |
| III | 1.0 | 5.5 | 13.5 | 47.7 | 32.2 | 100 |
| IV | 4.7 | 10.2 | 13.7 | 34.1 | 37.4 | 100 |
| V | 0.9 | 2.7 | 5.4 | 25.9 | 65.1 | 100 |
| VI | 0.3 | 1.9 | 2.4 | 18.7 | 76.8 | 100 |
| VII | 0.9 | 1.6 | 3.3 | 13.2 | 81.0 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.4 | 1.3 | 1.2 | 11.7 | 85.4 | 100 |
| Total | 2.4 | 7.2 | 14.7 | 30.8 | 44.9 | 100 |

Table 6: \% Children by class who CAN COMPREHEND ENGLISH All schools 2012

| Std. | Of those who <br> can read words, <br> \% who can tell <br> meanings of <br> the words | Of those who <br> can read <br> sentences, \% who <br> can tell meanings <br> of the sentences |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| I | 57.5 |  |
| III | 58.9 | 63.9 |
| III | 70.1 | 70.3 |
| IV | 71.8 | 78.5 |
| V | 78.9 | 88.2 |
| VI |  | 88.5 |
| VII |  | 90.4 |
| VIIII |  | 79.0 |

English Tool


## Arithmetic

Table 7: \% Children by class and ARITHMETIC level All schools 2012

| Std. | Not even 1-9 | Recognize numbers |  | Can subtract | Can divide | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1-9 | 10-99 |  |  |  |
| I | 5.6 | 25.0 | 60.6 | 7.4 | 1.4 | 100 |
| \|| | 1.5 | 8.8 | 58.4 | 27.1 | 4.2 | 100 |
| III | 0.1 | 4.5 | 42.1 | 40.1 | 13.3 | 100 |
| IV | 4.3 | 12.8 | 26.9 | 35.2 | 20.8 | 100 |
| V | 0.4 | 1.0 | 16.5 | 37.3 | 44.7 | 100 |
| VI | 0.0 | 0.2 | 11.5 | 27.0 | 61.2 | 100 |
| VII | 0.2 | 0.2 | 11.6 | 21.2 | 66.7 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.3 | 0.6 | 7.7 | 17.6 | 73.9 | 100 |
| Total | 1.8 | 8.0 | 32.9 | 27.1 | 30.2 | 100 |

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level in arithmetic achieved by a child. For example, in Std 3, $0.1 \%$ children cannot even recognize numbers 1-9, 4.5\% can recognize numbers up to 9 but not more, $42.1 \%$ can recognize numbers to 99 but cannot do subtraction, $40.1 \%$ can do subtraction but not division, and $13.3 \%$ can do division. For each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is $100 \%$.

## Chart 6: Trends over time

\% Children in Std III who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more By school type 2009-2012



## Math Tool



Chart 7: Trends over time
\% Children in Std V who CAN DO DIVISION
By school type 2009-2012



## Manipur rural

Facilitated by PRATHAM

## Type of school and paid tuition classes

The ASER survey recorded information about tuition by asking the following question: "Does the child take any paid tuition class currently?" Therefore the numbers given below do not include any unpaid supplemental help in learning that children may have received.

| Table 8: Trends over time <br> \% Children attending paid tuition classes <br> By school type 2009-2012 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Children in Std I-VIII | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| Govt. schools: \% Children attending paid tuition classes | 18.2 | 15.0 | 15.1 | 22.1 |
| Private schools: \% Children attending paid tuition classes | 48.5 | 49.9 | 48.8 | 47.8 |
| All schools: \% Children attending paid tuition classes | 39.9 | 38.4 | 39.3 | 40.0 |

Table 9: Trends over time
\% Children by school type and tuition 2009-2012

| Year | Category |  | Std II | Std V | Std VIII | Std I-VIII |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2009 | Govt. | No tuition | 22.8 | 23.0 | 19.5 | 23.2 |
|  |  | Tuition | 5.3 | 4.9 | 8.2 | 5.2 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 38.9 | 39.2 | 32.4 | 36.9 |
|  |  | Tuition | 33.1 | 33.0 | 39.9 | 34.8 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 2010 | Govt. | No tuition | 31.2 | 28.0 | 21.5 | 28.0 |
|  |  | Tuition | 4.7 | 5.7 | 8.2 | 4.9 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 37.6 | 34.1 | 27.0 | 33.6 |
|  |  | Tuition | 26.5 | 32.2 | 43.4 | 33.5 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 2011 | Govt. | No tuition | 29.8 | 23.0 | 18.9 | 23.9 |
|  |  | Tuition | 5.4 | 3.6 | 4.7 | 4.2 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 36.8 | 34.9 | 32.7 | 36.8 |
|  |  | Tuition | 28.0 | 38.4 | 43.7 | 35.1 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 2012 | Govt. | No tuition | 24.7 | 22.6 | 20.8 | 23.8 |
|  |  | Tuition | 8.0 | 6.1 | 9.2 | 6.7 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 36.2 | 36.2 | 35.8 | 36.2 |
|  |  | Tuition | 31.1 | 35.1 | 34.3 | 33.2 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Chart 9: Trends over time
\% Children in Std III-V who CAN READ a Std I level text or more By school type and tuition 2009-2012



Chart 8: Trends over time
\% Children in Std I-VIII by school type and tuition 2009-2012


How to read this chart: This chart is a visual representation of the last column of Table 9. For a given year, the width of each colour band represents the \% of children in the corresponding category. For each year, these four categories add upto 100\%.

Chart 10: Trends over time
\% Children in Std III-V who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more By school type and tuition 2009-2012

facilitated by PRATHAM

## School observations

In each year's ASER, from 2009 onwards, in each sampled village, the largest government school with primary sections was visited on the day of the survey. Information about schools in this report is based on these visits.

Table 10: Number of schools visited 2009-2012

| Type of school | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Std I-IVN: Primary | 107 | 97 | 99 | 128 |
| Std I-VII/VIII: Primary + <br> Upper primary | 35 | 28 | 34 | 57 |
| Total schools visited | 142 | 125 | 133 | 185 |

Table 11: Student and teacher attendance on the day of the visit 2009-2012

| Type of school | Std I-IVN |  |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| \% Enrolled children <br> present (Average) | 74.0 | 66.1 | 52.3 | 52.5 | 79.7 | 71.3 | 56.8 | 59.5 |
| \% Teachers present <br> (Average) | 82.9 | 70.8 | 78.5 | 72.9 | 71.8 | 75.1 | 72.0 | 79.6 |

Table 12: Small schools and multigrade classes 2009-2012

| School characteristics | Std I-IVN |  |  |  | Std I-VIINIII |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| \% Schools with total enrollment of 60 or less | 48.8 | 40.4 | 51.6 | 59.7 | 3.6 | 17.9 | 21.2 | 22.8 |
| \% Schools where Std II children observed <br> sitting with one or more other classes | 28.2 | 40.7 | 47.6 | 54.6 | 22.6 | 28.0 | 36.7 | 42.9 |
| \% Schools where Std IV children observed <br> sitting with one or more other classes | 26.5 | 35.2 | 37.0 | 40.0 | 21.9 | 20.0 | 26.7 | 33.9 |

## RTE indicators

Table 13: Schools meeting selected RTE norms 2010-2012

| \% Schools meeting the following RTE norms: |  | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pupil-teacher \& classroomteacher norms | Pupil-teacher ratio | 74.3 | 88.1 | 86.3 |
|  | Classroom-teacher ratio | 62.5 | 41.4 | 41.0 |
| Building | Office/store/office cum store | 67.5 | 67.2 | 66.1 |
|  | Playground | 71.8 | 41.5 | 50.0 |
|  | Boundary wall/fencing | 11.3 | 6.6 | 6.8 |
| Drinking water | No facility for drinking water | 84.6 | 87.3 | 90.1 |
|  | Facility but no drinking water available | 10.3 | 6.4 | 2.8 |
|  | Drinking water available | 5.1 | 6.4 | 7.2 |
| Toilet | No toilet facility | 21.4 | 31.3 | 28.0 |
|  | Facility but toilet not useable | 38.5 | 33.6 | 30.9 |
|  | Toilet useable | 40.2 | 35.2 | 41.1 |
| Girls toilet | \% Schools with no separate provisions for girls toilets | 78.5 | 64.7 | 55.8 |
|  | Of schools with separate girls toilets, \% schools with |  |  |  |
|  | Toilet locked | 4.7 | 5.9 | 12.2 |
|  | Toilet not useable | 8.4 | 14.1 | 8.8 |
|  | Toilet useable | 8.4 | 15.3 | 23.1 |
| Library | No library | 90.8 | 92.9 | 88.5 |
|  | Library but no books being used by children on day of visit | 3.4 | 5.5 | 8.8 |
|  | Library books being used by children on day of visit | 5.9 | 1.6 | 2.8 |
| Mid-day meal | Kitchen shed for cooking mid-day meal | 58.4 | 42.9 | 53.7 |
|  | Mid-day meal served in school on day of visit | 47.8 | 29.7 | 40.8 |



The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act, 2009 specifies a series of norms and standards for a school.

Norms for number of teachers vary according to the level of the school (primary or upper primary) and total student enrollment.

Norms for classrooms require the school to have at least one classroom for every teacher.

Norms for facilities require schools to provide each of the facilities mentioned in Table 13, among others.

RTE norms regulate provision of facilities but not their useability. ASER school observations also include whether facilities could be used. This information is included in Table 13.

## School funds and activities (PAISA)

Table 14: \% Schools that report receiving SSA grants - Full financial year

| SSA school grants | April 2009 to March 2010 |  |  |  | April 2010 to March 2011 |  |  |  | April 2011 to March 2012 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. of Sch. | \% Schools |  |  | No. of Sch. | \% Schools |  |  | No. of Sch. | \% Schools |  |  |
|  |  | Yes | No | Don't know |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |
| Maintenance grant | 107 | 66.4 | 10.3 | 23.4 | 120 | 66.7 | 10.8 | 22.5 | 172 | 80.2 | 7.0 | 12.8 |
| Development grant | 107 | 56.1 | 15.9 | 28.0 | 117 | 55.6 | 19.7 | 24.8 | 170 | 64.7 | 18.8 | 16.5 |
| TLM grant | 106 | 73.6 | 7.6 | 18.9 | 123 | 68.3 | 9.8 | 22.0 | 174 | 83.9 | 8.1 | 8.1 |

Table 15: \% Schools that report receiving SSA grants - Half financial year

| SSA school grants | April 2010 to date of survey (2010) |  |  |  | April 2011 to date of survey (2011) |  |  |  | April 2012 to date of survey (2012) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. of Sch. | \% Schools |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No. } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Sch. } \end{aligned}$ | \% Schools |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { No. } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { Sch. } \end{gathered}$ | \% Schools |  |  |
|  |  | Yes | No | Don't know |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |
| Maintenance <br> grant | 98 | 24.5 | 50.0 | 25.5 | 97 | 11.3 | 54.6 | 34.0 | 163 | 35.6 | 49.7 | 14.7 |
| Development grant | 97 | 21.7 | 51.6 | 26.8 | 94 | 9.6 | 55.3 | 35.1 | 161 | 27.3 | 55.3 | 17.4 |
| TLM grant | 95 | 24.2 | 53.7 | 22.1 | 96 | 9.4 | 57.3 | 33.3 | 162 | 37.7 | 50.0 | 12.4 |

Table 16: \% Schools carrying out different activities since April 2011

| Type of Activity |  | \% Schools |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Yes | No | Don't know |
| Const. | New Classroom | 26.4 | 65.9 | 7.8 |
| Repairs | Repair of building (roof, floor, wall etc.) | 37.4 | 55.6 | 7.0 |
|  | Repair of doors \& windows | 43.9 | 48.5 | 7.6 |
|  | Repair of boundary wall | 6.5 | 87.1 | 6.5 |
|  | Repair of drinking water facility | 19.1 | 73.2 | 7.7 |
|  | Repair of toilet | 29.8 | 63.2 | 7.0 |
| Painting \& whitewash | White wash/plastering | 28.4 | 63.9 | 7.7 |
|  | Painting blackboard/Display board/Painting on wall | 39.3 | 54.3 | 6.4 |
|  | Painting of doors \& walls | 26.5 | 66.5 | 7.1 |
| Purchase | Purchase of furniture (cupboard etc.) | 52.3 | 40.8 | 6.9 |
|  | Purchase of electrical fittings | 10.7 | 82.7 | 6.6 |
|  | Purchase of chalk, duster, register etc. | 80.8 | 12.8 | 6.4 |
|  | Purchase of sitting mats/Tat patti | 8.8 | 82.5 | 8.8 |
|  | Purchase of charts, globes \& other teaching material | 63.3 | 30.2 | 6.5 |
| Other | Expenditure on school events | 41.1 | 50.3 | 8.6 |
|  | Payment of bills (electricity, water, cleaning etc.) | 7.9 | 82.4 | 9.7 |

The PAISA section of ASER tracks receipt and spending of Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) grants at the school level. This information is collected from schools visited during the survey. This page reports proportion of schools receiving the grants and carrying out specified activities in the schools. More detailed analysis of the PAISA data will be available in the PAISA 2012 report which will be released in March 2013.1

## EVERY RURAL GOVERNMENT PRIMARY/UPPER PRIMARY SCHOOL IS ENTITLED TO EACH OF THESE SSA GRANTS EVERY YEAR.

| How much goes to |
| :---: | :--- |
| each school |$\quad$ For what purposes

SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT GRANT / SCHOOL GRANT
Rs. 5000 per year per primary school

Rs. 7000 per year per upper primary school

## Rs 5000 + Rs $7000=$

 Rs 12000 if the school is Std I-VIIINIII.Note: Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same premises.

## SCHOOL MAINTENANCE GRANT

Rs. 5000 - Rs 7500 per school per year if the school has upto 3 classrooms.

Rs 7500 - Rs. 10000 per year if the school has more than 3 classrooms.

Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same building.

This grant can be used for maintenance of school building, including whitewashing; beautification; and repair of toilets, hand pump, boundary wall, playground etc.

The grant amount depends on number of classrooms (excluding Headmaster room and office room)

## TLM GRANT

Rs. 500 per teacher per year in primary and upper primary schools.

This grant can be used by teachers to buy teaching aids, such as charts, globes, posters, models etc.

## Meghalaya rubal

Facilitated by PRATHAM
ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM HOUSEHOLDS. 7 OUT OF 7 DISTRICTS
Data has not been presented where sample size was insufficient.

## School enrollment and out of school children

Table 1: \% Children in different types of schools 2012

| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in <br> school | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age: 6-14 ALL | 45.1 | 47.9 | 1.8 | 5.3 | 100 |
| Age: 7-16 ALL | 44.1 | 46.5 | 1.8 | 7.5 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 45.4 | 48.7 | 1.6 | 4.4 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 BOYS | 45.1 | 48.3 | 1.9 | 4.7 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 GIRLS | 45.3 | 49.7 | 1.2 | 3.7 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 ALL | 44.7 | 47.0 | 2.0 | 6.3 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 BOYS | 47.0 | 43.4 | 2.0 | 7.6 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 GIRLS | 42.3 | 50.6 | 2.1 | 5.0 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 ALL | 39.4 | 39.7 | 2.1 | 18.8 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 BOYS | 40.3 | 35.6 | 1.3 | 22.9 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 GIRLS | 37.9 | 45.0 | 3.0 | 14.1 | 100 |

Note: 'Other' includes children going to madarsa and EGS. 'Not in school' = dropped out + never enrolled

Chart 2: Trends over time \% Children enrolled in private schools by class 2008-2012


## Young children in pre-school and school

Table 3: \% Children age 3-6 who are enrolled in different types of pre-school and school 2012

|  | In balwadi or anganwadi | In LKG/ UKG | In School |  |  | Not in school or preschool | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Govt. | Pvt. | Other |  |  |
| Age 3 | 22.2 | 23.1 |  |  |  | 54.8 | 100 |
| Age 4 | 23.1 | 51.9 |  |  |  | 25.1 | 100 |
| Age 5 | 6.5 | 38.8 | 18.7 | 20.2 | 0.6 | 15.2 | 100 |
| Age 6 | 5.4 | 34.9 | 24.8 | 25.8 | 0.7 | 8.5 | 100 |

Chart 1: Trends over time
\% Children out of school by age group and gender 2006-2012


How to read this chart: Each line shows trends in the proportion of children out of school for a particular subset of children. For example, the proportion of girls (age 1114) not in school has changed from $5.4 \%$ in 2006 to $6.4 \%$ in 2007 to $2.7 \%$ in 2008 , $4.4 \%$ in 2009 and to $6.8 \%$ in 2010 to $5.0 \%$ in 2012.

## Table 2: Sample description

\% Children in each class by age 2012

| Std. | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 6.0 | 16.1 | 25.7 | 23.3 | 10.7 | 9.3 | 8.9 |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| \|| |  | . 3 | 12.7 | 21.2 | 16.8 | 14.6 | 8.3 | 9.4 | 9.6 |  |  |  | 100 |
| III | 5.3 |  |  | 12.0 | 20.7 | 21.1 | 12.7 | 15.1 | 5.8 | 5.6 | 1.6 |  | 100 |
| IV | 11.1 |  |  | 5.3 | 9.7 | 17.6 | 14.3 | 20.0 | 9.3 | 7.4 | 5.3 |  | 100 |
| V | 5.4 |  |  |  |  | 16.0 | 15.6 | 23.5 | 15.5 | 11.1 | 7.7 | 5.4 | 100 |
| VI | 4.6 |  |  |  |  |  | 9.5 | 22.6 | 16.5 | 20.7 | 13.9 | 12.1 | 100 |
| VIII | 8.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 14.9 | 19.7 | 24.0 | 18.5 | 14.8 | 100 |
| VIII | 2.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6.5 | 16.1 | 29.8 | 20.6 | 24.1 | 100 |

How to read this table: If a child started school in Std I at age 6, she should be of age 8 in Std III. This table shows the age distribution for each class. For example, in Std III, $12 \%$ children are 8 years old but there also $5.3 \%$ who are younger, $20.7 \%$ who are $9,21.1 \%$ who are 10 years old, etc.

Chart 3: Trends over time
\% Children age 3, 4 and 5 not enrolled in school or pre-school 2006-2012*


* Data for 2011 is not comparable and therefore excluded here.


# Meghalaya rubal 

Facilitated by PRATHAN

## Reading

Table 4: \% Children by class and READING level
All schools 2012

| Std. | Not even <br> letter | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (Std I Text) | Level 2 <br> (Std II Text) | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 11.2 | 37.6 | 33.8 | 12.8 | 4.7 | 100 |
| II | 3.6 | 18.0 | 38.0 | 23.8 | 16.6 | 100 |
| IIII | 4.3 | 12.9 | 30.8 | 22.4 | 29.5 | 100 |
| IV | 4.1 | 12.4 | 15.6 | 29.3 | 38.6 | 100 |
| V | 0.1 | 2.6 | 11.5 | 21.1 | 64.6 | 100 |
| VII | 3.4 | 2.5 | 4.5 | 14.9 | 74.7 | 100 |
| VII | 0.0 | 1.4 | 3.6 | 7.7 | 87.4 | 100 |
| VIII | 2.2 | 2.6 | 5.9 | 11.1 | 78.3 | 100 |
| Total | 4.3 | 14.3 | 21.6 | 19.2 | 40.6 | 100 |

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level in reading achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, 4.3\% children cannot even read letters, $12.9 \%$ can read letters but not more, $30.8 \%$ can read words but not Std I text or higher, $22.4 \%$ can read Std I text but not Std II level text, and $29.5 \%$ can read Std II level text. For each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is $100 \%$.

Chart 4: Trends over time
\% Children in Std III who CAN READ Std I level text By school type 2009-2012


## Reading Tool



Chart 5: Trends over time
\% Children in Std V who CAN READ Std II level text By school type 2009-2012


## Reading and comprehension in English

Table 5: \% Children by class and READING level in ENGLISH All schools 2012

| Std. | Not <br> even <br> capital <br> letters | Capital <br> letters | Small <br> letters | Simple <br> words | Easy <br> sen- <br> tences | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 18.8 | 18.3 | 24.0 | 34.2 | 4.8 | 100 |
| II | 7.6 | 13.9 | 15.8 | 46.0 | 16.8 | 100 |
| III | 7.1 | 10.6 | 11.8 | 42.6 | 28.0 | 100 |
| IV | 5.3 | 8.0 | 9.5 | 34.7 | 42.5 | 100 |
| V | 0.6 | 4.1 | 3.3 | 26.0 | 66.0 | 100 |
| VI | 1.8 | 3.9 | 1.6 | 19.5 | 73.1 | 100 |
| VII | 0.0 | 0.6 | 1.6 | 14.2 | 83.6 | 100 |
| VIII | 1.3 | 0.8 | 1.5 | 14.8 | 81.7 | 100 |
| Total | 6.7 | 9.2 | 10.8 | 32.1 | 41.1 | 100 |

Table 6: \% Children by class who CAN COMPREHEND ENGLISH All schools 2012

| Std. | Of those who <br> can read words, <br> \% who can tell <br> meanings of <br> the words | Of those who <br> can read <br> sentences, \% who <br> can tell meanings <br> of the sentences |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| I | 54.9 |  |
| II | 51.3 |  |
| III | 57.9 | 64.2 |
| IV | 65.1 | 73.0 |
| V |  | 79.0 |
| VI |  | 85.3 |
| VII |  | 70.9 |

English Tool


## Meghalaya rubal

## Arithmetic

Table 7: \% Children by class and ARITHMETIC level All schools 2012

| Std. | Not even <br> $1-9$ | Recognize numbers |  | Can <br>  <br>  <br> subtract | Can divide | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 30.1 | 51.6 | 4.3 |  |  |
| II | 4.1 | 20.0 | 59.9 | 15.6 | 0.3 | 100 |
| III | 4.4 | 15.8 | 49.9 | 25.4 | 4.5 | 100 |
| IV | 4.5 | 12.8 | 38.6 | 35.6 | 8.5 | 100 |
| V | 0.8 | 4.6 | 29.8 | 46.3 | 18.5 | 100 |
| VI | 2.1 | 2.7 | 15.6 | 49.3 | 30.4 | 100 |
| VII | 0.0 | 1.8 | 11.6 | 38.3 | 48.4 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.9 | 3.9 | 15.8 | 29.7 | 49.8 | 100 |
| Total | 4.8 | 14.1 | 39.1 | 27.8 | 14.3 | 100 |

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level in arithmetic achieved by a child. For example, in Std 3, 4.4\% children cannot even recognize numbers 1-9, $15.8 \%$ can recognize numbers up to 9 but not more, $49.9 \%$ can recognize numbers to 99 but cannot do subtraction, $25.4 \%$ can do subtraction but not division, and $4.5 \%$ can do division. For each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is $100 \%$.

## Chart 6: Trends over time

\% Children in Std III who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more By school type 2009-2012



## Math Tool

| $\square$ |  | $=$ |  | $\underline{+}$ |  | $\underline{\square}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 7 | 4. | 14 | $\frac{51}{94}$ | $0$ | )769 |
| 1 | 4 | ¢ | 13 | $\begin{gathered} 14 \\ -4 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 12 \\ -30 \end{array}$ | Fin( |
|  |  | 4 | 17 |  |  |  |
| 1 | 1 |  |  | $-\frac{14}{4}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 11 \\ -11 \end{array}$ | ) ${ }^{\text {ater }}$ |
| $i$ | $\pm$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 3 | 11 |  | - 44 | 9 ENT |
| \#n | Itin | - | $\square$ | - | $\underline{\square}$ | -2- |

Chart 7: Trends over time
\% Children in Std V who CAN DO DIVISION
By school type 2009-2012



## Meghalaya rural

Facilitated by PRATHAM

## Type of school and paid tuition classes

The ASER survey recorded information about tuition by asking the following question: "Does the child take any paid tuition class currently?" Therefore the numbers given below do not include any unpaid supplemental help in learning that children may have received.
Table 8: Trends over time
\% Children attending paid tuition classes
By school type 2009-2012

Table 9: Trends over time
\% Children by school type and tuition 2009-2012

| Year | Category |  | Std II | Std V | Std VIII | Std I-VIII |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2009 | Govt. | No tuition | 68.7 | 52.6 | 39.2 | 60.0 |
|  |  | Tuition | 5.6 | 5.3 | 14.8 | 6.5 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 21.4 | 33.6 | 29.7 | 26.4 |
|  |  | Tuition | 4.4 | 8.6 | 16.4 | 7.1 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 2010 | Govt. | No tuition | 50.9 | 38.6 | 36.0 | 44.0 |
|  |  | Tuition | 3.1 | 6.2 | 6.2 | 4.8 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 36.5 | 47.0 | 44.9 | 41.5 |
|  |  | Tuition | 9.5 | 8.1 | 12.9 | 9.7 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 2011 | Govt. | No tuition | 47.1 | 30.9 | 18.7 | 38.7 |
|  |  | Tuition | 3.7 | 3.8 | 6.8 | 5.2 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 38.9 | 52.1 | 54.7 | 43.6 |
|  |  | Tuition | 10.3 | 13.2 | 19.8 | 12.5 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 2012 | Govt. | No tuition | 50.5 | 39.7 | 43.0 | 43.9 |
|  |  | Tuition | 3.4 | 3.8 | 2.0 | 3.3 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 36.9 | 43.9 | 45.4 | 42.3 |
|  |  | Tuition | 9.2 | 12.6 | 9.7 | 10.6 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Chart 9: Trends over time
\% Children in Std III-V who CAN READ a Std I level text or more By school type and tuition 2009-2012



Chart 8: Trends over time
\% Children in Std I-VIII by school type and tuition 2009-2012


How to read this chart: This chart is a visual representation of the last column of Table 9. For a given year, the width of each colour band represents the \% of children in the corresponding category. For each year, these four categories add upto 100\%.

Chart 10: Trends over time
\% Children in Std III-V who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more By school type and tuition 2009-2012


## Meghalaya rubal

facilitated by PRATHAM

## School observations

In each year's ASER, from 2009 onwards, in each sampled village, the largest government school with primary sections was visited on the day of the survey. Information about schools in this report is based on these visits.

Table 10: Number of schools visited 2009-2012

| Type of school | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Std I-IVN: Primary | 135 | 101 | 76 | 109 |
| Std I-VIINIII: Primary + <br> Upper primary | 9 | 9 | 9 | 20 |
| Total schools visited | 144 | 110 | 85 | 129 |

Table 11: Student and teacher attendance on the day of the visit 2009-2012

| Type of school | Std I-IVN |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| \% Enrolled children <br> present (Average) | 76.9 | 74.7 | 75.5 | 73.1 |
| \% Teachers present <br> (Average) | 88.9 | 94.4 | 94.7 | 86.8 |

Table 12: Small schools and multigrade classes 2009-2012

| School characteristics | Std I-IVN |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| \% Schools with total enrollment of 60 or less | 56.4 | 77.6 | 71.6 | 74.3 |
| \% Schools where Std II children observed <br> sitting with one or more other classes | 67.4 | 68.8 | 82.9 | 73.8 |
| \% Schools where Std IV children observed <br> sitting with one or more other classes | 63.4 | 66.7 | 81.2 | 73.2 |

## RTE indicators

Table 13: Schools meeting selected RTE norms 2010-2012

| \% Schools meeting the following RTE norms: |  | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pupil-teacher \& classroomteacher norms | Pupil-teacher ratio | 54.3 | 51.4 | 65.4 |
|  | Classroom-teacher ratio | 84.2 | 62.9 | 72.7 |
| Building | Office/store/office cum store | 34.6 | 42.1 | 41.6 |
|  | Playground | 45.8 | 40.0 | 37.1 |
|  | Boundary wall/fencing | 14.2 | 14.1 | 12.7 |
| Drinking water | No facility for drinking water | 70.6 | 77.8 | 81.6 |
|  | Facility but no drinking water available | 5.5 | 12.4 | 4.8 |
|  | Drinking water available | 23.9 | 9.9 | 13.6 |
| Toilet | No toilet facility | 34.9 | 23.1 | 24.4 |
|  | Facility but toilet not useable | 40.6 | 52.6 | 44.7 |
|  | Toilet useable | 24.5 | 24.4 | 30.9 |
| Girls toilet | \% Schools with no separate provisions for girls toilets | 64.8 | 44.1 | 47.7 |
|  | Of schools with separate girls toilets, \% schools with |  |  |  |
|  | Toilet locked | 9.1 | 33.9 | 26.1 |
|  | Toilet not useable | 11.4 | 3.4 | 6.8 |
|  | Toilet useable | 14.8 | 18.6 | 19.3 |
| Library | No library | 78.0 | 63.8 | 75.2 |
|  | Library but no books being used by children on day of visit | 6.4 | 5.0 | 9.6 |
|  | Library books being used by children on day of visit | 15.6 | 31.3 | 15.2 |
| Mid-day meal | Kitchen shed for cooking mid-day meal | 60.6 | 70.5 | 68.2 |
|  | Mid-day meal served in school on day of visit | 51.9 | 35.0 | 29.7 |



The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act, 2009 specifies a series of norms and standards for a school.

Norms for number of teachers vary according to the level of the school (primary or upper primary) and total student enrollment.

Norms for classrooms require the school to have at least one classroom for every teacher.

Norms for facilities require schools to provide each of the facilities mentioned in Table 13, among others.

RTE norms regulate provision of facilities but not their useability. ASER school observations also include whether facilities could be used. This information is included in Table 13.

## Meghalaya rubal

Facilitated by PRATHAM

## School funds and activities (PAISA)

Table 14: \% Schools that report receiving SSA grants - Full financial year

| SSA school grants | April 2009 to <br> March 2010 |  |  |  | April 2010 to March 2011 |  |  |  | April 2011 to <br> March 2012 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No. } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Sch. } \end{aligned}$ | \% Schools |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { No. } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { Sch. } \end{gathered}$ | \% Schools |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No. } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Sch. } \end{aligned}$ | \% Schools |  |  |
|  |  | Yes | No | Don't know |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |  | Yes | No | Don't know |
| Maintenance grant | 95 | 69.5 | 21.1 | 9.5 | 77 | 62.3 | 32.5 | 5.2 | 125 | 57.6 | 32.0 | 10.4 |
| Development grant | 92 | 37.0 | 47.8 | 15.2 | 76 | 46.1 | 46.1 | 7.9 | 121 | 33.1 | 52.1 | 14.9 |
| TLM grant | 96 | 78.1 | 17.7 | 4.2 | 78 | 83.3 | 10.3 | 6.4 | 125 | 72.0 | 22.4 | 5.6 |

Table 15: \% Schools that report receiving SSA grants - Half financial year

| SSA school grants | April 2010 to date of survey (2010) |  |  |  | April 2011 to date of survey (2011) |  |  |  | April 2012 to date of survey (2012) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No. } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Sch. } \end{aligned}$ | \% Schools |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { No. } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { Sch. } \end{gathered}$ | \% Schools |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No. } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Sch. } \end{aligned}$ | \% Schools |  |  |
|  |  | Yes | No | Don't know |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |
| Maintenance grant | 94 | 37.2 | 53.2 | 9.6 | 73 | 38.4 | 50.7 | 11.0 | 112 | 35.7 | 51.8 | 12. |
| Development grant | 87 | 21.8 | 69.0 | 9.2 | 69 | 24.6 | 62.3 | 13.0 | 108 | 19.4 | 66.7 | 13 |
| TLM grant | 93 | 37.6 | 58.1 | 4.3 | 72 | 47.2 | 43.1 | 9.7 | 111 | 48.7 | 39.6 | 11.7 |

Table 16: \% Schools carrying out different activities since April 2011

| Type of Activity |  | \% Schools |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Yes | No | Don't know |
| Const. | New Classroom | 12.3 | 83.6 | 4.1 |
| Repairs | Repair of building (roof, floor, wall etc.) | 20.3 | 74.0 | 5.7 |
|  | Repair of doors \& windows | 28.2 | 67.7 | 4.0 |
|  | Repair of boundary wall | 2.4 | 93.5 | 4.1 |
|  | Repair of drinking water facility | 8.3 | 87.6 | 4.1 |
|  | Repair of toilet | 15.1 | 79.8 | 5.0 |
| Painting \& whitewash | White wash/plastering | 35.3 | 58.0 | 6.7 |
|  | Painting blackboard/Display board/Painting on wall | 41.2 | 53.8 | 5.0 |
|  | Painting of doors \& walls | 30.8 | 64.1 | 5.1 |
| Purchase | Purchase of furniture (cupboard etc.) | 42.9 | 52.9 | 4.2 |
|  | Purchase of electrical fittings | 5.9 | 89.9 | 4.2 |
|  | Purchase of chalk, duster, register etc. | 74.6 | 21.2 | 4.2 |
|  | Purchase of sitting mats/Tat patti | 21.5 | 74.8 | 3.7 |
|  | Purchase of charts, globes \& other teaching material | 49.6 | 46.2 | 4.2 |
| Other | Expenditure on school events | 26.4 | 66.4 | 7.3 |
|  | Payment of bills (electricity, water, cleaning etc.) | 9.4 | 86.3 | 4.3 |

The PAISA section of ASER tracks receipt and spending of Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) grants at the school level. This information is collected from schools visited during the survey. This page reports proportion of schools receiving the grants and carrying out specified activities in the schools. More detailed analysis of the PAISA data will be available in the PAISA 2012 report which will be released in March $2013 .{ }^{1}$

## EVERY RURAL GOVERNMENT PRIMARY/UPPER PRIMARY SCHOOL IS ENTITLED TO EACH OF THESE SSA GRANTS EVERY YEAR.

| How much goes to |
| :---: | :--- |
| each school |$\quad$ For what purposes each school

For what purposes
SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT GRANT / SCHOOL GRANT
Rs. 5000 per year per primary school

Rs. 7000 per year per upper primary school

## Rs 5000 + Rs $7000=$

 Rs 12000 if the school is Std I-VIIINIII.Note: Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same premises.

## SCHOOL MAINTENANCE GRANT

Rs. 5000 - Rs 7500 per school per year if the school has upto 3 classrooms.

Rs 7500 - Rs. 10000 per year if the school has more than 3 classrooms.

Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same building.

This grant can be used for maintenance of school building, including whitewashing; beautification; and repair of toilets, hand pump, boundary wall, playground etc.

The grant amount depends on number of classrooms (excluding Headmaster room and office room)

## TLM GRANT

Rs. 500 per teacher per year in primary and upper primary schools.

This grant can be used by teachers to buy teaching aids, such as charts, globes, posters, models etc.

ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM HOUSEHOLDS. 8 OUT OF 8 DISTRICTS
Data has not been presented where sample size was insufficient.

## School enrollment and out of school children

Table 1: \% Children in different types of schools 2012

| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in <br> school | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age: 6-14 ALL | 72.4 | 24.8 | 1.2 | 1.7 | 100 |
| Age: 7-16 ALL | 71.6 | 23.8 | 1.2 | 3.4 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 71.2 | 26.9 | 1.0 | 0.9 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 BOYS | 71.7 | 26.3 | 0.9 | 1.1 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 GIRLS | 70.8 | 27.3 | 1.1 | 0.8 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 ALL | 73.7 | 22.0 | 1.5 | 2.7 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 BOYS | 73.1 | 22.6 | 1.4 | 2.9 | 100 |
| Age: $11-14$ GIRLS | 74.2 | 21.7 | 1.4 | 2.8 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 ALL | 67.6 | 19.1 | 0.9 | 12.5 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 BOYS | 66.7 | 20.1 | 0.0 | 13.2 | 100 |
| Age: $15-16$ GIRLS | 66.8 | 18.7 | 1.7 | 12.9 | 100 |

Note: 'Other' includes children going to madarsa and EGS. 'Not in school' = dropped out + never enrolled

Chart 2: Trends over time \% Children enrolled in private schools by class 2008-2012


Chart 1: Trends over time
\% Children out of school by age group and gender 2006-2012


How to read this chart: Each line shows trends in the proportion of children out of school for a particular subset of children. For example, the proportion of girls (age 1114) not in school has changed from $4.4 \%$ in 2006 to $5.4 \%$ in 2008 to $1.8 \%$ in 2009, $4.4 \%$ in 2010 and to $1.1 \%$ in 2011 to $2.8 \%$ in 2012.

## Table 2: Sample description

\% Children in each class by age 2012

| Std. | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 18.4 | 37.3 | 24.5 | 11.1 | 8.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| \|| | 2.2 | 8.6 | 27.6 | 27.2 | 14.6 | 9.6 | 10.1 |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| III |  | . 3 | 7.6 | 22.6 | 28.2 | 18.9 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 6.5 |  |  |  | 100 |
| IV | 2.4 |  |  | 11.0 | 19.0 | 28.8 | 12.6 | 12.8 | 7.5 | 6.1 |  |  | 100 |
| V | 2.7 |  |  |  | 9.1 | 25.9 | 24.6 | 19.8 | 8.8 | 5.7 | 3.4 |  | 100 |
| VI | 3.1 |  |  |  |  | 10.5 | 19.0 | 30.4 | 19.9 | 11.7 | 5.4 |  | 100 |
| VII | 3.6 |  |  |  |  |  | 6.0 | 24.9 | 28.3 | 22.7 | 10.6 | 4.0 | 100 |
| VIII | 1.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9.7 | 28.2 | 32.2 | 17.0 | 11.4 | 100 |

How to read this table: If a child started school in Std I at age 6, she should be of age 8 in Std III. This table shows the age distribution for each class. For example, in Std III, $22.6 \%$ children are 8 years old but there are also $7.6 \%$ who are $7,28.2 \%$ who are 9 , $18.9 \%$ who are 10 years old, etc.

## Young children in pre-school and school

Table 3: \% Children age 3-6 who are enrolled in different types of pre-school and school 2012

|  | In balwadi or anganwad | In LKG/ UKG | In School |  |  | Not in school or preschool | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Govt. | Pvt. | Other |  |  |
| Age 3 | 84.9 | 4.2 |  |  |  | 10.9 | 100 |
| Age 4 | 75.9 | 21.1 |  |  |  | 3.0 | 100 |
| Age 5 | 14.3 | 12.8 | 49.5 | 22.2 | 0.2 | 0.9 | 100 |
| Age 6 | 4.5 | 6.3 | 64.6 | 23.3 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 100 |

Chart 3: Trends over time
\% Children age 3, 4 and 5 not enrolled in school or pre-school 2006-2012*


* Data for 2011 is not comparable and therefore excluded here.


## Reading

Table 4: \% Children by class and READING level
All schools 2012

| Std. | Not even <br> letter | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (Std I Text) | Level 2 <br> (Std II Text) | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 5.3 | 53.9 | 33.2 | 5.3 | 2.3 | 100 |
| II | 2.2 | 20.8 | 52.3 | 18.3 | 6.4 | 100 |
| III | 0.1 | 9.5 | 35.6 | 32.7 | 22.1 | 100 |
| IV | 0.3 | 3.6 | 20.5 | 34.1 | 41.5 | 100 |
| V | 0.2 | 1.2 | 11.7 | 27.8 | 59.2 | 100 |
| VI | 0.0 | 1.6 | 4.3 | 21.8 | 72.3 | 100 |
| VII | 0.3 | 1.1 | 2.7 | 15.4 | 80.7 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.0 | 1.1 | 0.3 | 4.4 | 94.2 | 100 |
| Total | 1.4 | 15.0 | 24.3 | 20.3 | 39.0 | 100 |

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level in reading achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, $0.1 \%$ children cannot even read letters, $9.5 \%$ can read letters but not more, $35.6 \%$ can read words but not Std I text or higher, $32.7 \%$ can read Std I text but not Std II level text, and $22.1 \%$ can read Std II level text. For each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is $100 \%$.

## Chart 4: Trends over time

\% Children in Std III who CAN READ Std I level text By school type 2009-2012


## Reading Tool

Nikhat chu, Diktei chuan Chhimbal a hmu a, mawi a tita em em maia. A u chu a au va, "Ka u chhimbal ka hmu ve ta, Arawng pawh a mawi lutuk" atia. A u chuan "a mawi hle mai" a ti ve a.Diktei chuan "Rawng chi hrang hrang, a sente, a hringte, a pawle a inpawlh a nih saw!" a ti a. An unau chuan chung chhimbal rawng chi hrang hrang chu mawi ti takin an en ta a.


Chart 5: Trends over time
\% Children in Std V who CAN READ Std II level text By school type 2009-2012


## Reading and comprehension in English

Table 5: \% Children by class and READING level in ENGLISH All schools 2012

| Std. | Not <br> even <br> capital <br> letters | Capital <br> letters | Small <br> letters | Simple <br> words | Easy <br> sen- <br> tences | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 23.6 | 33.2 | 26.9 | 13.6 | 2.8 | 100 |
| II | 9.9 | 27.4 | 27.7 | 27.0 | 8.0 | 100 |
| III | 2.3 | 18.4 | 19.5 | 42.7 | 17.1 | 100 |
| IV | 1.4 | 8.8 | 9.0 | 45.5 | 35.3 | 100 |
| V | 1.0 | 3.0 | 3.6 | 38.3 | 54.1 | 100 |
| VII | 0.4 | 0.9 | 1.9 | 31.2 | 65.7 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.3 | 1.3 | 0.7 | 22.1 | 75.6 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.0 | 0.8 | 0.7 | 7.6 | 90.9 | 100 |
| Total | 6.4 | 14.8 | 14.1 | 29.2 | 35.5 | 100 |

Table 6: \% Children by class who CAN COMPREHEND ENGLISH All schools 2012

| Std. | Of those who <br> can read words, <br> \% who can tell <br> meanings of <br> the words | Of those who <br> can read <br> sentences, \% who <br> can tell meanings <br> of the sentences |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| I | 49.8 |  |
| II | 60.8 | 61.0 |
| III | 61.1 | 71.7 |
| IV | 61.9 | 78.0 |
| V |  | 80.0 |
| VI |  | 85.3 |
| VII |  | 74.3 |

English Tool


## Arithmetic

Table 7: \% Children by class and ARITHMETIC level All schools 2012

| Std. | Not even 1-9 | Recognize numbers |  | Can subtract | Can divide | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1-9 | 10-99 |  |  |  |
| I | 5.0 | 53.4 | 35.8 | 4.6 | 1.2 | 100 |
| \\| | 1.4 | 12.0 | 65.9 | 18.4 | 2.4 | 100 |
| III | 0.5 | 2.9 | 36.3 | 48.8 | 11.5 | 100 |
| IV | 0.5 | 1.3 | 15.7 | 54.7 | 27.8 | 100 |
| V | 0.7 | 0.7 | 7.7 | 47.1 | 43.8 | 100 |
| VI | 0.1 | 0.3 | 3.4 | 36.8 | 59.4 | 100 |
| VII | 0.3 | 1.3 | 2.2 | 22.2 | 74.0 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.0 | 0.6 | 0.9 | 12.3 | 86.3 | 100 |
| Total | 1.3 | 12.0 | 26.0 | 30.1 | 30.6 | 100 |

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level in arithmetic achieved by a child. For example, in Std 3, $0.5 \%$ children cannot even recognize numbers 1-9, 2.9\% can recognize numbers up to 9 but not more, $36.3 \%$ can recognize numbers to 99 but cannot do subtraction, $48.8 \%$ can do subtraction but not division, and $11.5 \%$ can do division. For each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is $100 \%$.

## Chart 6: Trends over time

\% Children in Std III who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more By school type 2009-2012



## Math Tool

| $+\min$ |  | iper |  | H-7 |  | $\underline{\square}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7 | t | 15 | 11 | M $\begin{array}{r}\text { M } \\ -4\end{array}$ | $\frac{14}{14}$ | गुII |
| $\pm$ | 4 | 轜 | 11 | $\begin{array}{r} 41 \\ -14 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 14 \\ +15 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 1) ${ }^{\text {PT }}$ |
|  |  | H | 41 |  |  |  |
| $t$ | 1 |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} 1 i \\ -1 i \end{array}$ | $=\frac{12}{11}$ | 1713 |
| 41 |  | 4 | 14 | $\begin{array}{r} 71 \\ -11 \end{array}$ |  |  |
|  |  | B | 4 |  | $\begin{array}{r} 41 \\ -41 \end{array}$ | 1) 315 |
| 르ㅍㅡㅡㅡ․ | = | $\underline{\square}$ |  | $+$ |  | $\underline{\square}$ |

Chart 7: Trends over time
\% Children in Std V who CAN DO DIVISION
By school type 2009-2012



## Type of school and paid tuition classes

The ASER survey recorded information about tuition by asking the following question: "Does the child take any paid tuition class currently?" Therefore the numbers given below do not include any unpaid supplemental help in learning that children may have received.

| Table 8: Trends over time <br> \% Children attending paid tuition classes <br> By school type 2009-2012 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Children in Std I-VIII | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| Govt. schools: \% Children attending paid tuition classes | 6.8 | 3.3 | 0.9 | 3.5 |
| Private schools: \% Children attending paid tuition classes | 28.5 | 11.5 | 12.7 | 12.8 |
| All schools: \% Children attending paid tuition classes | 10.5 | 4.4 | 2.4 | 5.8 |

Table 9: Trends over time
\% Children by school type and tuition 2009-2012

| Year | Category |  | Std II | Std V | Std VIII | Std I-VIII |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2009 | Govt | No tuition | 77.6 | 80.7 | 73.3 | 77.1 |
|  |  | Tuition | 4.3 | 5.5 | 4.9 | 5.6 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 13.8 | 9.2 | 16.5 | 12.4 |
|  |  | Tuition | 4.3 | 4.7 | 5.3 | 4.9 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 2010 | Govt | No tuition | 90.4 | 68.6 | 79.6 | 83.5 |
|  |  | Tuition | 1.9 | 3.1 | 6.3 | 2.8 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 6.3 | 25.6 | 13.7 | 12.1 |
|  |  | Tuition | 1.4 | 2.7 | 0.5 | 1.6 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 2011 | Govt | No tuition | 84.4 | 89.2 | 87.6 | 86.9 |
|  |  | Tuition | 0.3 | 0.9 | 2.1 | 0.8 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 14.3 | 8.3 | 9.3 | 10.7 |
|  |  | Tuition | 1.0 | 1.7 | 1.1 | 1.6 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 2012 | Govt | No tuition | 75.4 | 70.2 | 74.8 | 73.0 |
|  |  | Tuition | 1.1 | 2.7 | 4.8 | 2.7 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 21.1 | 23.5 | 17.4 | 21.2 |
|  |  | Tuition | 2.4 | 3.5 | 2.9 | 3.1 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Chart 9: Trends over time
\% Children in Std III-V who CAN READ a Std I level text or more By school type and tuition 2009-2012



Chart 8: Trends over time
\% Children in Std I-VIII by school type and tuition 2009-2012


How to read this chart: This chart is a visual representation of the last column of Table 9. For a given year, the width of each colour band represents the \% of children in the corresponding category. For each year, these four categories add upto 100\%.

Chart 10: Trends over time
\% Children in Std III-V who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more By school type and tuition 2009-2012


Facilitated by PRATHAM

## School observations

In each year's ASER, from 2009 onwards, in each sampled village, the largest government school with primary sections was visited on the day of the survey. Information about schools in this report is based on these visits.

Table 10: Number of schools visited 2009-2012

| Type of school | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Std I-IVN: Primary | 135 | 166 | 135 | 183 |
| Std I-VIINIII: Primary + <br> Upper primary | 17 | 8 | 13 | 9 |
| Total schools visited | 152 | 174 | 148 | 192 |

Table 11: Student and teacher attendance on the day of the visit 2009-2012

| Type of school | Std I-IVN |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| \% Enrolled children <br> present (Average) | 86.0 | 86.5 | 85.6 | 85.9 |
| \% Teachers present <br> (Average) | 93.8 | 94.5 | 91.0 | 87.9 |

Table 12: Small schools and multigrade classes 2009-2012

| School characteristics | Std I-IVN |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| \% Schools with total enrollment of 60 or less | 53.9 | 41.2 | 60.0 | 54.6 |
| \% Schools where Std II children observed <br> sitting with one or more other classes | 20.9 | 32.1 | 15.2 | 46.5 |
| \% Schools where Std IV children observed <br> sitting with one or more other classes | 19.1 | 30.1 | 14.3 | 34.6 |

## RTE indicators

Table 13: Schools meeting selected RTE norms 2010-2012

| \% Schools meeting the following RTE norms: |  | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pupil-teacher \& classroomteacher norms | Pupil-teacher ratio | 89.1 | 75.2 | 86.6 |
|  | Classroom-teacher ratio | 57.6 | 94.8 | 75.0 |
| Building | Office/store/office cum store | 78.5 | 92.1 | 77.5 |
|  | Playground | 39.0 | 70.7 | 45.3 |
|  | Boundary wall/fencing | 37.7 | 47.8 | 45.3 |
| Drinking water | No facility for drinking water | 47.3 | 25.4 | 33.0 |
|  | Facility but no drinking water available | 4.1 | 3.6 | 2.6 |
|  | Drinking water available | 48.5 | 71.0 | 64.4 |
| Toilet | No toilet facility | 7.1 | 2.1 | 7.9 |
|  | Facility but toilet not useable | 37.3 | 45.8 | 47.9 |
|  | Toilet useable | 55.6 | 52.1 | 44.2 |
| Girls toilet | \% Schools with no separate provisions for girls toilets | 43.4 | 12.4 | 25.9 |
|  | Of schools with separate girls toilets, \% schools with |  |  |  |
|  | Toilet locked | 14.5 | 44.6 | 39.1 |
|  | Toilet not useable | 11.3 | 9.9 | 5.2 |
|  | Toilet useable | 30.8 | 33.1 | 29.9 |
| Library | No library | 93.6 | 72.9 | 79.1 |
|  | Library but no books being used by children on day of visit | 4.7 | 15.0 | 10.5 |
|  | Library books being used by children on day of visit | 1.7 | 12.1 | 10.5 |
| Mid-day meal | Kitchen shed for cooking mid-day meal | 96.2 | 98.6 | 94.8 |
|  | Mid-day meal served in school on day of visit | 94.0 | 99.3 | 91.1 |



The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act, 2009 specifies a series of norms and standards for a school.

Norms for number of teachers vary according to the level of the school (primary or upper primary) and total student enrollment.

Norms for classrooms require the school to have at least one classroom for every teacher.

Norms for facilities require schools to provide each of the facilities mentioned in Table 13, among others.

RTE norms regulate provision of facilities but not their useability. ASER school observations also include whether facilities could be used. This information is included in Table 13

## School funds and activities (PAISA)

Table 14: \% Schools that report receiving SSA grants - Full financial year

| SSA school grants | April 2009 to March 2010 |  |  |  | April 2010 to March 2011 |  |  |  | April 2011 to March 2012 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. of Sch. | \% Schools |  |  | No. of Sch. | \% Schools |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { No. } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { Sch. } \end{gathered}$ | \% Schools |  |  |
|  |  | Yes | No | Don't know |  | Yes | No | Don't know |  | Yes | No | Don't know |
| Maintenance grant | 159 | 93.1 | 4.4 | 2.5 | 142 | 95.1 | 4.2 | 0.7 | 192 | 94.3 | 2.1 | 3.7 |
| Development grant | 145 | 79.3 | 17.9 | 2.8 | 133 | 78.2 | 18.8 | 3.0 | 190 | 74.2 | 19.0 | 6.8 |
| TLM grant | 158 | 93.0 | 5.1 | 1.9 | 141 | 96.5 | 2.8 | 0.7 | 192 | 94.3 | 3.1 | 2.6 |

Table 15: \% Schools that report receiving SSA grants - Half financial year

| SSA school grants | April 2010 to date of survey (2010) |  |  |  | April 2011 to date of survey (2011) |  |  |  | April 2012 to date of survey (2012) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. of Sch. | \% Schools |  |  | No of Sch. | \% Schools |  |  | No. of Sch. | \% Schools |  |  |
|  |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |
| grant | 156 | 79.5 | 18.0 | 2.6 | 126 | 78.6 | 19.1 | 2.4 | 164 | 79.9 | 15.9 | 4.3 |
| Development grant | 152 | 62.5 | 34.9 | 2.6 | 117 | 63.3 | 32.5 | 4.3 | 162 | 62.4 | 29.6 | 8.0 |
| TLM grant | 156 | 79.5 | 18.0 | 2.6 | 125 | 76.8 | 20.8 | 2.4 | 163 | 76.7 | 19.0 | 4.3 |

Table 16: \% Schools carrying out different activities since April 2011

| Type of Activity |  | \% Schools |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Yes | No | Don't know |
| Const. | New Classroom | 13.2 | 84.7 | 2.1 |
| Repairs | Repair of building (roof, floor, wall etc.) | 51.1 | 47.9 | 1.1 |
|  | Repair of doors \& windows | 56.2 | 42.8 | 1.1 |
|  | Repair of boundary wall | 18.6 | 80.3 | 1.1 |
|  | Repair of drinking water facility | 34.6 | 64.4 | 1.1 |
|  | Repair of toilet | 33.2 | 65.2 | 1.6 |
| Painting \& whitewash | White wash/plastering | 36.5 | 63.0 | 0.5 |
|  | Painting blackboard/Display board/Painting on wall | 40.6 | 58.8 | 0.5 |
|  | Painting of doors \& walls | 34.6 | 64.9 | 0.5 |
| Purchase | Purchase of furniture (cupboard etc.) | 42.3 | 55.1 | 2.7 |
|  | Purchase of electrical fittings | 42.6 | 55.3 | 2.1 |
|  | Purchase of chalk, duster, register etc. | 84.5 | 13.4 | 2.1 |
|  | Purchase of sitting mats/Tat patti | 9.4 | 89.5 | 1.1 |
|  | Purchase of charts, globes \& other teaching material | 66.1 | 32.8 | 1.1 |
| Other | Expenditure on school events | 58.9 | 33.3 | 7.8 |
|  | Payment of bills (electricity, water, cleaning etc.) | 65.1 | 31.7 | 3.2 |

The PAISA section of ASER tracks receipt and spending of Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) grants at the school level. This information is collected from schools visited during the survey. This page reports proportion of schools receiving the grants and carrying out specified activities in the schools. More detailed analysis of the PAISA data will be available in the PAISA 2012 report which will be released in March $2013 .{ }^{1}$

## EVERY RURAL GOVERNMENT PRIMARY/UPPER PRIMARY SCHOOL IS ENTITLED TO EACH OF THESE SSA GRANTS EVERY YEAR.

| How much goes to |  |
| :---: | :--- |
| each school | For what purposes |

SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT GRANT / SCHOOL GRANT
Rs. 5000 per year per primary school

Rs. 7000 per year per upper primary school

## Rs 5000 + Rs $7000=$

 Rs 12000 if the school is Std I-VIINIII.Note: Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same premises.

## SCHOOL MAINTENANCE GRANT

Rs. 5000 - Rs 7500 per school per year if the school has upto 3 classrooms.

Rs 7500 - Rs. 10000 per year if the school has more than 3 classrooms.

Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same building.

This grant can be used for maintenance of school building, including whitewashing; beautification; and repair of toilets, hand pump, boundary wall, playground etc.

The grant amount depends on number of classrooms (excluding Headmaster room and office room)

## TLM GRANT

Rs. 500 per teacher per year in primary and upper primary schools.

This grant can be used by teachers to buy teaching aids, such as charts, globes, posters, models etc.

ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM HOUSEHOLDS. 11 OUT OF 11 DISTRICTS
Data has not been presented where sample size was insufficient.

## School enrollment and out of school children

Table 1: \% Children in different types of schools 2012

| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in <br> school | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age: 6-14 ALL | 59.8 | 38.5 | 0.1 | 1.7 | 100 |
| Age: 7-16 ALL | 58.5 | 37.8 | 0.1 | 3.7 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 60.2 | 38.8 | 0.1 | 1.0 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 BOYS | 59.9 | 39.2 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 GIRLS | 59.7 | 39.1 | 0.1 | 1.1 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 ALL | 59.2 | 37.8 | 0.1 | 2.9 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 BOYS | 57.8 | 38.9 | 0.0 | 3.4 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 GIRLS | 60.4 | 37.0 | 0.1 | 2.4 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 ALL | 49.9 | 34.2 | 0.2 | 15.7 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 BOYS | 46.2 | 35.7 | 0.2 | 18.0 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 GIRLS | 53.7 | 32.7 | 0.3 | 13.3 | 100 |

Note: 'Other' includes children going to madarsa and EGS. 'Not in school' $=$ dropped out + never enrolled

Chart 2: Trends over time \% Children enrolled in private schools by class 2008-2012


## Young children in pre-school and school

Table 3: \% Children age 3-6 who are enrolled in different types of pre-school and school 2012

|  | In balwadi or anganwad | In LKG/ UKG | In School |  |  | Not in school or preschool | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Govt. | Pvt. | Other |  |  |
| Age 3 | 14.9 | 17.7 |  |  |  | 67.4 | 100 |
| Age 4 | 8.6 | 69.1 |  |  |  | 22.4 | 100 |
| Age 5 | 1.5 | 36.4 | 35.7 | 21.8 | 0.0 | 4.5 | 100 |
| Age 6 | 0.1 | 17.0 | 48.6 | 32.0 | 0.0 | 2.2 | 100 |

ASER 2012

Chart 1: Trends over time
\% Children out of school by age group and gender 2006-2012


How to read this chart: Each line shows trends in the proportion of children out of school for a particular subset of children. For example, the proportion of girls (age 1114) not in school has changed from $6.4 \%$ in 2006 to $4.5 \%$ in 2007 to $5.8 \%$ in 2008, $3.7 \%$ in 2009 and to $3.2 \%$ in 2010 to $2.4 \%$ in 2012.

Table 2: Sample description
\% Children in each class by age 2012

| Std. | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 10.0 | 34.7 | 34.9 | 11.9 | 8.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| \|| | 1.3 | 9.5 | 25.5 | 36.4 | 13.1 | 7.7 | 6.5 |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| III | 3.7 |  | 9.5 | 25.7 | 29.9 | 15.6 | 7.6 | 8.0 |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| IV | 5.2 | 5.0 |  | 9.8 | 18.6 | 29.5 | 14.7 | 8.9 | 8.3 |  |  |  | 100 |
| V | 3.1 |  |  |  | 5.8 | 24.4 | 25.2 | 20.2 | 10.8 | 7.3 | 3.3 |  | 100 |
| VI | 2.3 |  |  |  |  | 10.6 | 15.7 | 33.7 | 16.0 | 13.7 | 5.0 | 3.0 | 100 |
| VII | 7.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 21.9 | 32.9 | 22.4 | 7.0 | 8.0 | 100 |
| VIII | 2.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5.5 | 20.9 | 33.0 | 19.8 | 18.9 | 100 |

How to read this table: If a child started school in Std I at age 6, she should be of age 8 in Std III. This table shows the age distribution for each class. For example, in Std III, $25.7 \%$ children are 8 years old but there are also $9.5 \%$ who are $7,29.9 \%$ who are 9 , $15.6 \%$ who are 10 years old, etc.

Chart 3: Trends over time
\% Children age 3, 4 and 5 not enrolled in school or pre-school 2006-2012*


* Data for 2011 is not comparable and therefore excluded here.


## Reading

Table 4: \% Children by class and READING level
All schools 2012

| Std. | Not even <br> letter | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (Std I Text) | Level 2 <br> (Std II Text) | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 3.9 | 43.7 | 40.6 | 9.8 | 2.0 | 100 |
| II | 2.3 | 20.4 | 44.3 | 24.2 | 8.8 | 100 |
| IIII | 1.2 | 8.8 | 37.0 | 32.4 | 20.5 | 100 |
| IV | 1.2 | 9.8 | 18.2 | 32.5 | 38.4 | 100 |
| V | 0.4 | 2.8 | 12.4 | 31.8 | 52.6 | 100 |
| VII | 0.9 | 1.3 | 5.2 | 20.0 | 72.7 | 100 |
| VII | 0.2 | 1.0 | 2.7 | 13.6 | 82.6 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.0 | 0.2 | 2.3 | 8.9 | 88.6 | 100 |
| Total | 1.5 | 13.2 | 24.1 | 22.9 | 38.3 | 100 |

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level in reading achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, $1.2 \%$ children cannot even read letters, $8.8 \%$ can read letters but not more, $37.0 \%$ can read words but not Std I text or higher, $32.4 \%$ can read Std I text but not Std II level text, and 20.5\% can read Std II level text. For each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is $100 \%$.

## Chart 4: Trends over time

\% Children in Std III who CAN READ Std I level text
By school type 2009-2012


## Reading Tool



Chart 5: Trends over time
\% Children in Std V who CAN READ Std II level text By school type 2009-2012


## Reading and comprehension in English

Table 5: \% Children by class and READING level in ENGLISH All schools 2012

| Std. | Not <br> even <br> capital <br> letters | Capital <br> letters | Small <br> letters | Simple <br> words | Easy <br> sen- <br> tences | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| I | 9.8 | 23.5 | 30.5 | 32.0 | 4.2 | 100 |
| II | 4.6 | 12.9 | 21.0 | 47.2 | 14.3 | 100 |
| III | 2.1 | 5.2 | 13.3 | 48.6 | 30.8 | 100 |
| IV | 1.5 | 5.5 | 9.4 | 34.9 | 48.8 | 100 |
| V | 0.6 | 2.2 | 3.9 | 28.5 | 64.7 | 100 |
| VII | 0.9 | 0.6 | 2.1 | 19.7 | 76.7 | 100 |
| VII | 0.0 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 11.8 | 86.7 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.5 | 0.4 | 1.0 | 7.9 | 90.3 | 100 |
| Total | 3.0 | 7.6 | 12.2 | 32.2 | 45.1 | 100 |

Table 6: \% Children by class who CAN COMPREHEND ENGLISH All schools 2012

| Std. | Of those who <br> can read words, <br> \% who can tell <br> meanings of <br> the words | Of those who <br> can read <br> sentences, \% who <br> can tell meanings <br> of the sentences |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| I | 49.7 |  |
| III | 51.1 | 70.4 |
| IIII | 57.3 | 64.4 |
| IV | 65.1 | 67.8 |
| V | 61.9 | 75.9 |
| VI |  | 85.5 |
| VII |  | 90.7 |
| VIII |  | 93.3 |
| Total | 57.9 | 79.9 |

English Tool


## Nagaland ${ }_{\text {fUBaL }}$

## Arithmetic

Table 7: \% Children by class and ARITHMETIC level All schools 2012

| Std. | Not even 1-9 | Recognize numbers |  | Can subtract | Can divide | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1-9 | 10-99 |  |  |  |
| I | 4.2 | 27.0 | 59.6 | 9.0 | 0.2 | 100 |
| \\| | 2.0 | 9.8 | 60.7 | 25.1 | 2.3 | 100 |
| III | 1.5 | 6.0 | 38.9 | 46.1 | 7.5 | 100 |
| IV | 1.0 | 5.7 | 23.2 | 50.4 | 19.7 | 100 |
| V | 0.5 | 1.7 | 13.1 | 50.0 | 34.6 | 100 |
| VI | 0.7 | 1.0 | 7.9 | 37.3 | 53.2 | 100 |
| VII | 0.2 | 0.7 | 5.6 | 24.3 | 69.4 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.0 | 0.2 | 2.5 | 15.6 | 81.7 | 100 |
| Total | 1.5 | 7.8 | 31.2 | 33.2 | 26.3 | 100 |

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level in arithmetic achieved by a child. For example, in Std 3, 1.5\% children cannot even recognize numbers 1-9, $6 \%$ can recognize numbers up to 9 but not more, $38.9 \%$ can recognize numbers to 99 but cannot do subtraction, $46.1 \%$ can do subtraction but not division, and $7.5 \%$ can do division. For each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is $100 \%$.

## Chart 6: Trends over time

\% Children in Std III who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more
By school type 2009-2012



## Math Tool

| $1+$ |  |  |  | mexter |  | $y \%$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 4 | 18 | 11 | 昂 -14 | $\begin{array}{r} 4 \\ -\frac{13}{4} \end{array}$ |  |
| 1 | 5 | 17 | 17 | $\begin{array}{r} 41 \\ -71 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { 步 } \\ -17 \end{array}$ | H147 |
| 4 | 1 | 11 | \#1 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} 11 \\ -14 \end{array}$ |  | 13 HF |
| 4 |  | 11 | 41 |  |  |  |
|  | 1 |  |  | 4 | 4 |  |
|  |  | 4 | [] |  |  | $y \mathrm{HE}$ |
| $\underline{\square}$ |  | 브플 | $\underline{+1}$ | $\underline{ }$ | $\underline{\square}$ | $\underline{+1}$ |

Chart 7: Trends over time
\% Children in Std V who CAN DO DIVISION
By school type 2009-2012



## Nagaland Rural

Facilitated by PRATHAM

## Type of school and paid tuition classes

The ASER survey recorded information about tuition by asking the following question: "Does the child take any paid tuition class currently?" Therefore the numbers given below do not include any unpaid supplemental help in learning that children may have received.

| Table 8: Trends over time \% Children attending paid tuition classes By school type 2009-2012 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Children in Std I-VIII | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| Govt. schools: \% Children attending paid tuition classes | 12.3 | 7.7 | 12.6 | 9.7 |
| Private schools: \% Children attending paid tuition classes | 43.1 | 33.3 | 40.4 | 39.9 |
| All schools: \% Children attending paid tuition classes | 23.0 | 16.8 | 24.3 | 21.2 |

Table 9: Trends over time
\% Children by school type and tuition 2009-2012

| Year | Category |  | Std II | Std V | Std VIII | Std I-VIII |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2009 | Govt | No tuition | 60.4 | 58.5 | 44.7 | 57.2 |
|  |  | Tuition | 7.3 | 10.0 | 12.4 | 8.0 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 20.4 | 18.7 | 19.5 | 19.8 |
|  |  | Tuition | 11.9 | 12.9 | 23.4 | 15.0 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 2010 | Govt | No tuition | 64.3 | 60.4 | 51.0 | 59.5 |
|  |  | Tuition | 5.0 | 5.1 | 5.9 | 4.9 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 20.9 | 23.4 | 26.0 | 23.7 |
|  |  | Tuition | 9.8 | 11.1 | 17.2 | 11.8 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 2011 | Govt | No tuition | 55.3 | 47.5 | 41.9 | 50.5 |
|  |  | Tuition | 7.1 | 5.9 | 7.1 | 7.3 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 23.9 | 26.9 | 24.1 | 25.1 |
|  |  | Tuition | 13.6 | 19.7 | 26.9 | 17.0 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 2012 | Govt | No tuition | 62.8 | 55.4 | 51.0 | 56.1 |
|  |  | Tuition | 5.0 | 6.3 | 7.9 | 6.0 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 18.1 | 25.1 | 22.6 | 22.8 |
|  |  | Tuition | 14.0 | 13.3 | 18.6 | 15.2 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Chart 9: Trends over time
\% Children in Std III-V who CAN READ a Std I level text or more By school type and tuition 2009-2012


Chart 8: Trends over time
\% Children in Std I-VIII by school type and tuition 2009-2012


How to read this chart: This chart is a visual representation of the last column of Table 9. For a given year, the width of each colour band represents the \% of children in the corresponding category. For each year, these four categories add upto 100\%.

Chart 10: Trends over time
\% Children in Std III-V who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more By school type and tuition 2009-2012

facilitated by PRATHAM

## School observations

In each year's ASER, from 2009 onwards, in each sampled village, the largest government school with primary sections was visited on the day of the survey. Information about schools in this report is based on these visits.

Table 10: Number of schools visited 2009-2012

| Type of school | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Std I-IVN: Primary | 215 | 202 | 173 | 189 |
| Std I-VIIINII: Primary + <br> Upper primary | 27 | 21 | 44 | 83 |
| Total schools visited | 242 | 223 | 217 | 272 |

Table 11: Student and teacher attendance on the day of the visit 2009-2012

| Type of school | Std I-IVN |  |  |  | Std I-VIINIII |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| \% Enrolled children <br> present (Average) | 84.4 | 81.9 | 82.3 | 81.9 | 87.3 | 83.0 | 81.6 | 81.5 |
| \% Teachers present <br> (Average) | 89.2 | 87.2 | 90.8 | 87.8 | 80.0 | 86.3 | 85.8 | 84.2 |

## Table 12: Small schools and multigrade classes 2009-2012

| School characteristics | Std I-IVN |  |  |  | Std I-VIINIII |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| \% Schools with total enrollment of 60 or less | 44.3 | 50.3 | 47.9 | 56.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 14.3 | 18.2 |
| \% Schools where Std II children observed <br> sitting with one or more other classes | 16.0 | 18.7 | 13.0 | 13.4 | 11.1 | 28.6 | 15.0 | 9.9 |
| \% Schools where Std IV children observed <br> sitting with one or more other classes | 13.6 | 17.5 | 13.3 | 9.9 | 12.0 | 28.6 | 16.7 | 7.8 |

## RTE indicators

Table 13: Schools meeting selected RTE norms 2010-2012

| \% Schools meeting the following RTE norms: |  | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pupil-teacher \& classroomteacher norms | Pupil-teacher ratio | 91.9 | 85.5 | 93.0 |
|  | Classroom-teacher ratio | 78.6 | 61.1 | 63.3 |
| Building | Office/store/office cum store | 83.8 | 92.3 | 86.9 |
|  | Playground | 64.2 | 65.6 | 41.6 |
|  | Boundary wall/fencing | 42.8 | 34.5 | 52.9 |
| Drinking water | No facility for drinking water | 56.9 | 70.3 | 73.7 |
|  | Facility but no drinking water available | 6.0 | 6.2 | 4.1 |
|  | Drinking water available | 37.0 | 23.4 | 22.2 |
| Toilet | No toilet facility | 13.8 | 6.2 | 6.8 |
|  | Facility but toilet not useable | 32.3 | 33.8 | 40.7 |
|  | Toilet useable | 53.9 | 60.0 | 52.5 |
| Girls toilet | \% Schools with no separate provisions for girls toilets | 47.8 | 22.0 | 40.7 |
|  | Of schools with separate girls toilets, \% schools with |  |  |  |
|  | Toilet locked | 9.4 | 18.4 | 16.8 |
|  | Toilet not useable | 12.2 | 9.9 | 9.7 |
|  | Toilet useable | 30.6 | 49.7 | 32.7 |
| Library | No library | 86.7 | 91.0 | 87.8 |
|  | Library but no books being used by children on day of visit | 4.1 | 5.7 | 8.2 |
|  | Library books being used by children on day of visit | 9.2 | 3.3 | 4.1 |
| Mid-day meal | Kitchen shed for cooking mid-day meal | 81.7 | 91.8 | 85.3 |
|  | Mid-day meal served in school on day of visit | 31.9 | 43.4 | 38.2 |



The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act, 2009 specifies a series of norms and standards for a school.

Norms for number of teachers vary according to the level of the school (primary or upper primary) and total student enrollment.

Norms for classrooms require the school to have at least one classroom for every teacher.

Norms for facilities require schools to provide each of the facilities mentioned in Table 13, among others.

RTE norms regulate provision of facilities but not their useability. ASER school observations also include whether facilities could be used. This information is included in Table 13.

## School funds and activities (PAISA)

Table 14: \% Schools that report receiving SSA grants - Full financial year

| SSA school grants | April 2009 to March 2010 |  |  |  | April 2010 to March 2011 |  |  |  | April 2011 to March 2012 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. of Sch. | \% Schools |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { No. } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { Sch. } \end{gathered}$ | \% Schools |  |  | No. of Sch. | \% Schools |  |  |
|  |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |
| Maintenance grant | 204 | 94.6 | 0.5 | 4.9 | 214 | 95.8 | 1.9 | 2.3 | 266 | 90.2 | 4.1 | 5.6 |
| Development grant | 200 | 92.5 | 2.0 | 5.5 | 213 | 89.2 | 5.6 | 5.2 | 262 | 73.7 | 17.6 | 8.8 |
| TLM grant | 201 | 93.0 | 2.5 | 4.5 | 214 | 94.9 | 3.3 | 1.9 | 266 | 91.4 | 4.1 | 4.5 |

Table 15: \% Schools that report receiving SSA grants - Half financial year

| SSA school grants | April 2010 to date of survey (2010) |  |  |  | April 2011 to date of survey (2011) |  |  |  | April 2012 to date of survey (2012) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No of Sch. | \% Schools |  |  | No. of Sch. | \% Schools |  |  | No. of Sch. | \% Schools |  |  |
|  |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |
| Maintenance grant | 197 | 83.3 | 8.1 | 8.6 | 181 | 76.2 | 18.8 | 5.0 | 239 | 68.6 | 22.6 | 8.8 |
| Development grant | 193 | 82.9 | 7.8 | 9.3 | 181 | 70.7 | 21.6 | 7.7 | 237 | 58.2 | 31.7 | 10.1 |
| TLM grant | 194 | 85.1 | 6.2 | 8.8 | 178 | 78.1 | 18.0 | 3.9 | 239 | 72.4 | 21.3 | 6.3 |

Table 16: \% Schools carrying out different activities since April 2011

| Type of Activity |  | \% Schools |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Yes | No | Don't know |
| Const. | New Classroom | 21.2 | 76.1 | 2.7 |
| Repairs | Repair of building (roof, floor, wall etc.) | 33.3 | 64.8 | 1.9 |
|  | Repair of doors \& windows | 47.0 | 51.5 | 1.5 |
|  | Repair of boundary wall | 21.5 | 77.3 | 1.2 |
|  | Repair of drinking water facility | 22.9 | 75.2 | 1.9 |
|  | Repair of toilet | 28.4 | 69.7 | 1.9 |
| Painting \& whitewash | White wash/plastering | 22.7 | 76.2 | 1.2 |
|  | Painting blackboard/Display board/Painting on wall | 51.5 | 47.3 | 1.2 |
|  | Painting of doors \& walls | 25.3 | 74.3 | 0.4 |
| Purchase | Purchase of furniture (cupboard etc.) | 59.0 | 38.8 | 2.2 |
|  | Purchase of electrical fittings | 14.0 | 83.3 | 2.7 |
|  | Purchase of chalk, duster, register etc. | 89.2 | 10.1 | 0.8 |
|  | Purchase of sitting mats/Tat patti | 5.7 | 92.3 | 2.0 |
|  | Purchase of charts, globes \& other teaching material | 59.3 | 39.9 | 0.8 |
| Other | Expenditure on school events | 64.8 | 34.0 | 1.2 |
|  | Payment of bills (electricity, water, cleaning etc.) | 18.5 | 78.4 | 3.2 |

The PAISA section of ASER tracks receipt and spending of Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) grants at the school level. This information is collected from schools visited during the survey. This page reports proportion of schools receiving the grants and carrying out specified activities in the schools. More detailed analysis of the PAISA data will be available in the PAISA 2012 report which will be released in March 2013.

## EVERY RURAL GOVERNMENT PRIMARY/UPPER PRIMARY SCHOOL IS ENTITLED TO EACH OF THESE SSA GRANTS EVERY YEAR.

| How much goes to |
| :---: | :--- |
| each school |$\quad$ For what purposes each school

For what purposes
SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT GRANT / SCHOOL GRANT
Rs. 5000 per year per primary school

Rs. 7000 per year per upper primary school

## Rs 5000 + Rs $7000=$

 Rs 12000 if the school is Std I-VIIINIII.Note: Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same premises.

## SCHOOL MAINTENANCE GRANT

Rs. 5000 - Rs 7500 per school per year if the school has upto 3 classrooms.

Rs 7500 - Rs. 10000 per year if the school has more than 3 classrooms.

Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same building.

This grant can be used for maintenance of school building, including whitewashing; beautification; and repair of toilets, hand pump, boundary wall, playground etc.

The grant amount depends on number of classrooms (excluding Headmaster room and office room)

## TLM GRANT

Rs. 500 per teacher per year in primary and upper primary schools.

This grant can be used by teachers to buy teaching aids, such as charts, globes, posters, models etc.



## ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM HOUSEHOLDS. 30 OUT OF 30 DISTRICTS

Data has not been presented where sample size was insufficient.

## School enrollment and out of school children

Table 1: \% Children in different types of schools 2012

| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in <br> school | Total |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age: 6-14 ALL | 89.6 | 6.2 | 0.2 | 4.1 | 100 |
| Age: 7-16 ALL | 85.3 | 6.2 | 0.1 | 8.4 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 90.9 | 6.7 | 0.2 | 2.2 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 BOYS | 90.2 | 7.7 | 0.1 | 2.1 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 GIRLS | 91.7 | 5.7 | 0.3 | 2.4 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 ALL | 88.5 | 5.0 | 0.1 | 6.4 | 100 |
| Age: $11-14$ BOYS | 88.1 | 5.7 | 0.1 | 6.2 | 100 |
| Age: $11-14$ GIRLS | 89.0 | 4.4 | 0.0 | 6.6 | 100 |
| Age: $15-16$ ALL | 65.7 | 7.7 | 0.0 | 26.6 | 100 |
| Age: $15-16$ BOYS | 67.7 | 7.3 | 0.0 | 24.9 | 100 |
| Age: $15-16$ GIRLS | 63.8 | 8.1 | 0.0 | 28.2 | 100 |

Note: 'Other' includes children going to madarsa and EGS.
'Not in school' $=$ dropped out + never enrolled.

Chart 2: Trends over time
\% Children enrolled in private schools by class 2008-2012


Chart 1: Trends over time
\% Children out of school by age group and gender 2006-2012


How to read this chart: Each line shows trends in the proportion of children out of school for a particular subset of children. For example, the proportion of girls (age 1114) not in school has changed from $13.7 \%$ in 2006 to $12.4 \%$ in 2007 to $12.0 \%$ in 2008, 9.9\% in 2009 and to $7.2 \%$ in 2010 to 6.6\% in 2012.
Table 2: Sample description
\% Children in each class by age 2012

| Std. | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 36.5 | 49.4 | 10.2 | 4.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| II | 2.6 | 14.3 | 59.8 | 14.0 | 9.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| III |  | . 3 | 13.7 | 62.6 | 13.0 | 5.6 | 2.8 |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| IV | 3.0 |  |  | 14.8 | 60.2 | 16.9 | 5.1 |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| V | 4.3 |  |  |  | 8.3 | 63.4 | 13.2 | 6.7 | 4.2 |  |  |  | 100 |
| VI | 2.6 |  |  |  |  | 9.6 | 59.6 | 21.3 | 7.0 |  |  |  | 100 |
| VII | 4.3 |  |  |  |  |  | 10.2 | 67.1 | 13.7 | 4.7 |  |  | 100 |
| VIII | 3.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 18.0 | 59.0 | 15.0 | 4.5 |  | 100 |

How to read this table: If a child started school in Std I at age 6, she should be of age 8 in Std III. This table shows the age distribution for each class. For example, in Std III, $62.6 \%$ children are 8 years old but there also $13.7 \%$ who are $7,13.0 \%$ who are 9 , $5.6 \%$ who are 10 years old and $2.8 \%$ who are older.

## Young children in pre-school and school

Table 3: \% Children age 3-6 who are enrolled in different types of pre-school and school 2012

|  | In balwadi or anganwadi | In LKG/ UKG | In School |  |  | Not in school or preschool | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Govt. | Pvt. | Other |  |  |
| Age 3 | 87.0 | 4.3 |  |  |  | 8.7 | 100 |
| Age 4 | 88.3 | 8.8 |  |  |  | 2.9 | 100 |
| Age 5 | 31.7 | 5.9 | 50.9 | 7.4 | 0.3 | 3.8 | 100 |
| Age 6 | 4.9 | 3.0 | 80.8 | 8.5 | 0.6 | 2.3 | 100 |

Chart 3: Trends over time
\% Children age 3, 4 and 5 not enrolled in school or pre-school 2006-2012*


[^5]
## Odisha fubal

## Reading

Table 4: \% Children by class and READING level All schools 2012

| Std. | Not even <br> letter | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (Std I Text) | Level 2 <br> (Std II Text) | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 47.3 | 29.8 | 11.3 | 5.1 | 6.5 | 100 |
| II | 23.2 | 28.8 | 20.0 | 12.0 | 16.1 | 100 |
| III | 15.9 | 21.2 | 21.0 | 15.3 | 26.6 | 100 |
| IV | 9.1 | 14.5 | 16.2 | 19.8 | 40.5 | 100 |
| V | 5.9 | 12.6 | 13.9 | 20.7 | 47.0 | 100 |
| VI | 4.4 | 7.3 | 10.3 | 17.0 | 61.0 | 100 |
| VII | 2.8 | 6.3 | 7.7 | 15.7 | 67.6 | 100 |
| VIII | 2.9 | 4.4 | 7.2 | 12.2 | 73.2 | 100 |
| Total | 14.8 | 16.3 | 13.7 | 14.7 | 40.6 | 100 |

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level in reading achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, 15.9\% children cannot even read letters, $21.2 \%$ can read letters but not more, 21\% can read words but not Std I text or higher, 15.3\% can read Std I text but not Std II level text, and $26.6 \%$ can read Std II level text. For each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is $100 \%$.

Chart 4: Trends over time
\% Children in Std III who CAN READ Std I level text By school type 2009-2012


## Reading Tool
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Chart 5: Trends over time
\% Children in Std V who CAN READ Std II level text By school type 2009-2012


## Reading and comprehension in English

Table 5: \% Children by class and READING level in ENGLISH All schools 2012

| Std. | Not <br> even <br> capital <br> letters | Capital <br> letters | Small <br> letters | Simple <br> words | Easy <br> sen- <br> tences | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 68.5 | 16.2 | 8.2 | 5.5 | 1.6 | 100 |
| II | 50.8 | 16.8 | 16.5 | 10.5 | 5.5 | 100 |
| IIII | 35.0 | 18.0 | 24.3 | 14.6 | 8.1 | 100 |
| IV | 21.8 | 17.3 | 23.5 | 23.6 | 13.8 | 100 |
| V | 15.8 | 15.5 | 25.9 | 22.4 | 20.4 | 100 |
| VII | 10.4 | 11.0 | 21.8 | 23.8 | 33.1 | 100 |
| VIII | 7.5 | 9.8 | 19.2 | 21.1 | 42.4 | 100 |
| VIIII | 6.3 | 7.5 | 17.3 | 20.5 | 48.4 | 100 |
| Total | 28.2 | 14.3 | 19.5 | 17.5 | 20.5 | 100 |

Table 6: \% Children by class who CAN COMPREHEND ENGLISH All schools 2012

| Std. | Of those who <br> can read words, <br> \% who can tell <br> meanings of <br> the words | Of those who <br> can read <br> sentences, \% who <br> can tell meanings <br> of the sentences |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| I |  |  |
| II |  |  |
| III | 70.8 |  |
| IV | 64.5 | 54.8 |
| V | 59.7 | 55.5 |
| VI | 61.0 | 62.6 |
| VII | 65.6 | 66.2 |
| VIII | 63.9 | 70.9 |
| Total | 65.0 | 64.4 |

English Tool


## Odisha fubal

## Arithmetic

Table 7: \% Children by class and ARITHMETIC level All schools 2012

| Std. | Not even 1-9 | Recognize numbers |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Can } \\ & \text { subtract } \end{aligned}$ | Can divide | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1-9 | 10-99 |  |  |  |
| I | 49.5 | 32.5 | 13.7 | 3.1 | 1.2 | 100 |
| ॥ | 23.7 | 34.4 | 25.6 | 12.2 | 4.2 | 100 |
| III | 15.4 | 29.6 | 28.7 | 19.4 | 6.9 | 100 |
| IV | 8.6 | 21.8 | 31.6 | 23.7 | 14.4 | 100 |
| V | 6.1 | 18.6 | 30.4 | 26.6 | 18.3 | 100 |
| VI | 4.0 | 12.3 | 26.2 | 26.9 | 30.7 | 100 |
| VII | 2.3 | 9.2 | 24.1 | 25.2 | 39.2 | 100 |
| VIII | 3.1 | 6.7 | 21.2 | 26.0 | 42.9 | 100 |
| Total | 15.0 | 21.4 | 25.2 | 20.0 | 18.6 | 100 |

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level in arithmetic achieved by a child. For example, in Std 3, 15.4\% children cannot even recognize numbers 1-9, $29.6 \%$ can recognize numbers up to 9 but not more, $28.7 \%$ can recognize numbers to 99 but cannot do subtraction, $19.4 \%$ can do subtraction but not division, and $6.9 \%$ can do division. For each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is $100 \%$

## Chart 6: Trends over time

\% Children in Std III who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more By school type 2009-2012



## Math Tool



Chart 7: Trends over time
\% Children in Std V who CAN DO DIVISION
By school type 2009-2012



## Type of school and paid tuition classes

The ASER survey recorded information about tuition by asking the following question: "Does the child take any paid tuition class currently?" Therefore the numbers given below do not include any unpaid supplemental help in learning that children may have received.

Table 8: Trends over time
\% Children attending paid tuition classes By school type 2009-2012

| Children in Std I-VIII | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Govt. schools: \% Children <br> attending paid tuition classes | 49.7 | 48.1 | 44.8 | 44.4 |
| Private schools: \% Children <br> attending paid tuition classes | 69.1 | 64.9 | 63.2 | 65.8 |
| All schools: \% Children <br> attending paid tuition classes | 50.5 | 49.0 | 45.7 | 45.7 |

Table 9: Trends over time
\% Children by school type and tuition 2009-2012

| Year | Category |  | Std II | Std V | Std VIII | Std I-VIII |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2009 | Govt. | No tuition | 52.4 | 46.4 | 41.3 | 48.2 |
|  |  | Tuition | 42.0 | 50.7 | 52.5 | 47.7 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 1.7 | 0.5 | 2.5 | 1.3 |
|  |  | Tuition | 3.8 | 2.3 | 3.8 | 2.9 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 2010 | Govt. | No tuition | 54.7 | 48.2 | 41.6 | 49.1 |
|  |  | Tuition | 38.3 | 48.1 | 51.1 | 45.5 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 2.4 | 0.8 | 3.8 | 1.9 |
|  |  | Tuition | 4.6 | 2.9 | 3.6 | 3.5 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 2011 | Govt. | No tuition | 56.4 | 52.5 | 46.6 | 52.6 |
|  |  | Tuition | 37.4 | 44.5 | 48.1 | 42.6 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 2.8 | 0.7 | 2.4 | 1.8 |
|  |  | Tuition | 3.5 | 2.3 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 2012 | Govt. | No tuition | 53.4 | 51.0 | 49.8 | 52.1 |
|  |  | Tuition | 38.4 | 44.8 | 45.6 | 41.6 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 2.8 | 1.3 | 2.4 | 2.1 |
|  |  | Tuition | 5.4 | 2.9 | 2.2 | 4.1 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

## Chart 9: Trends over time

\% Children in Std III-V who CAN READ a Std I level text or more By school type and tuition 2009-2012



Chart 8: Trends over time
\% Children in Std I-VIII by school type and tuition 2009-2012


## ■Govt+No Tuition ■ Govt+Tuition $\quad$ Pvt+No Tuition $\quad$ Pvt+Tuition

How to read this chart: This chart is a visual representation of the last column of Table 9 For a given year, the width of each colour band represents the \% of children in the corresponding category. For each year, these four categories add upto $100 \%$.

## Chart 10: Trends over time

\% Children in Std III-V who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more By school type and tuition 2009-2012


## Odisha rural

## School observations

In each year's ASER, from 2009 onwards, in each sampled village, the largest government school with primary sections was visited on the day of the survey. Information about schools in this report is based on these visits.

Table 10: Number of schools visited 2009-2012

| Type of school | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| Std I-IVN: Primary | 403 | 383 | 390 | 419 |
| Std I-VIINIII: Primary + <br> Upper primary | 344 | 358 | 379 | 390 |
| Total schools visited | 747 | 741 | 769 | 809 |

Table 12: Small schools and multigrade classes 2009-2012

| School characteristics | Std I-IVN |  |  |  | Std I-VIINIII |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| \% Schools with total enrollment of 60 or less | 33.2 | 38.2 | 44.4 | 42.6 | 7.3 | 3.9 | 4.9 | 4.2 |
| \% Schools where Std II children observed <br> sitting with one or more other classes | 70.8 | 77.0 | 80.0 | 81.8 | 71.9 | 69.4 | 73.5 | 77.7 |
| \% Schools where Std IV children observed <br> sitting with one or more other classes | 64.9 | 66.8 | 69.9 | 78.2 | 62.4 | 58.1 | 61.7 | 64.7 |

## RTE indicators

Table 13: Schools meeting selected RTE norms 2010-2012

| \% Schools meeting the following RTE norms: |  | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pupil-teacher \& classroomteacher norms | Pupil-teacher ratio | 22.5 | 25.7 | 28.0 |
|  | Classroom-teacher ratio | 74.0 | 79.1 | 78.2 |
| Building | Office/store/office cum store | 74.7 | 83.0 | 80.4 |
|  | Playground | 44.4 | 36.5 | 31.4 |
|  | Boundary wall/fencing | 40.8 | 46.1 | 44.9 |
| Drinking water | No facility for drinking water | 15.2 | 11.2 | 11.4 |
|  | Facility but no drinking water available | 14.5 | 14.3 | 10.0 |
|  | Drinking water available | 70.3 | 74.5 | 78.7 |
| Toilet | No toilet facility | 15.5 | 14.9 | 19.6 |
|  | Facility but toilet not useable | 40.1 | 33.3 | 31.2 |
|  | Toilet useable | 44.4 | 51.8 | 49.3 |
| Girls toilet | \% Schools with no separate provisions for girls toilets | 30.3 | 25.2 | 37.4 |
|  | Of schools with separate girls toilets, \% schools with |  |  |  |
|  | Toilet locked | 19.5 | 10.2 | 8.2 |
|  | Toilet not useable | 15.5 | 17.8 | 13.1 |
|  | Toilet useable | 34.7 | 46.8 | 41.4 |
| Library | No library | 34.7 | 15.3 | 11.7 |
|  | Library but no books being used by children on day of visit | 18.5 | 18.2 | 23.7 |
|  | Library books being used by children on day of visit | 46.8 | 66.5 | 64.5 |
| Mid-day meal | Kitchen shed for cooking mid-day meal | 74.4 | 78.4 | 80.2 |
|  | Mid-day meal served in school on day of visit | 88.8 | 93.6 | 96.1 |

Table 11: Student and teacher attendance on the day of the visit 2009-2012

| Type of school | Std I-IVN |  |  |  | Std I-VIINIII |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| \% Enrolled children <br> present (Average) | 74.1 | 71.9 | 77.7 | 77.5 | 73.0 | 72.3 | 72.8 | 73.7 |
| \% Teachers present <br> (Average) | 92.3 | 89.1 | 91.5 | 91.4 | 90.4 | 83.8 | 87.9 | 86.4 |



The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act, 2009 specifies a series of norms and standards for a school.

Norms for number of teachers vary according to the level of the school (primary or upper primary) and total student enrollment.

Norms for classrooms require the school to have at least one classroom for every teacher.

Norms for facilities require schools to provide each of the facilities mentioned in Table 13, among others.

RTE norms regulate provision of facilities but not their useability. ASER school observations also include whether facilities could be used. This information is included in Table 13.

## School funds and activities (PAISA)

Table 14: \% Schools that report receiving SSA grants - Full financial year

| SSA school grants | April 2009 to <br> March 2010 |  |  |  | April 2010 to March 2011 |  |  |  | April 2011 to <br> March 2012 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No. } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Sch. } \end{aligned}$ | \% Schools |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { No. } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { Sch. } \end{gathered}$ | \% Schools |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No. } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Sch. } \end{aligned}$ | \% Schools |  |  |
|  |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |
| Maintenance grant | 572 | 85.7 | 4.6 | 9.8 | 730 | 82.5 | 5.8 | 11.8 | 779 | 85.8 | 6.3 | 8.0 |
| Development grant | 540 | 86.7 | 4.1 | 9.3 | 719 | 82.2 | 6.3 | 1.5 | 774 | 85.3 | 7.1 | 7.6 |
| TLM grant | 555 | 92.3 | 2.3 | 5.4 | 718 | 84.5 | 6.3 | 9.2 | 784 | 87.4 | 7.4 | 5.2 |

Table 15: \% Schools that report receiving SSA grants - Half financial year

| SSA school grants | April 2010 to date of survey (2010) |  |  |  | April 2011 to date of survey (2011) |  |  |  | April 2012 to date of survey (2012) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No. } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Sch. } \end{aligned}$ | \% Schools |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { No. } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { Sch. } \end{gathered}$ | \% Schools |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { No. } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { Sch. } \end{gathered}$ | \% Schools |  |  |
|  |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |  | Yes | No | Don't know |
| Maintenance grant | 530 | 71.7 | 14.9 | 13.4 | 720 | 76.5 | 13.2 | 10.3 | 743 | 59.2 | 32.0 | 8.8 |
| Development grant | 495 | 72.9 | 15.0 | 12.1 | 710 | 76.2 | 13.4 | 10.4 | 732 | 57.7 | 33.7 | 8.6 |
| TLM grant | 505 | 76.6 | 13.1 | 10.3 | 693 | 60.6 | 30.3 | 9.1 | 739 | 58.2 | 34.4 | 7.4 |

Table 16: \% Schools carrying out different activities since April 2011

| Type of Activity |  | \% Schools |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Yes | No | Don't know |
| Const. | New Classroom | 34.5 | 62.9 | 2.7 |
| Repairs | Repair of building (roof, floor, wall etc.) | 66.8 | 30.3 | 2.9 |
|  | Repair of doors \& windows | 60.1 | 36.7 | 3.2 |
|  | Repair of boundary wall | 31.1 | 65.9 | 3.0 |
|  | Repair of drinking water facility | 46.6 | 50.5 | 3.0 |
|  | Repair of toilet | 28.7 | 68.4 | 3.0 |
| Painting <br> \& white- <br> wash | White wash/plastering | 91.4 | 7.1 | 1.4 |
|  | Painting blackboard/Display board/Painting on wall | 92.0 | 6.6 | 1.4 |
|  | Painting of doors \& walls | 82.2 | 16.1 | 1.8 |
| Purchase | Purchase of furniture (cupboard etc.) | 77.2 | 18.7 | 4.2 |
|  | Purchase of electrical fittings | 28.6 | 68.8 | 2.6 |
|  | Purchase of chalk, duster, register etc. | 92.0 | 6.1 | 1.9 |
|  | Purchase of sitting mats/Tat patti | 35.6 | 61.8 | 2.6 |
|  | Purchase of charts, globes \& other teaching material | 78.1 | 19.6 | 2.3 |
| Other | Expenditure on school events | 71.5 | 24.6 | 3.9 |
|  | Payment of bills (electricity, water, cleaning etc.) | 11.6 | 84.6 | 3.8 |

The PAISA section of ASER tracks receipt and spending of Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) grants at the school level. This information is collected from schools visited during the survey. This page reports proportion of schools receiving the grants and carrying out specified activities in the schools. More detailed analysis of the PAISA data will be available in the PAISA 2012 report which will be released in March 2013.'

EVERY RURAL GOVERNMENT PRIMARY/UPPER PRIMARY SCHOOL IS ENTITLED TO EACH OF THESE SSA GRANTS EVERY YEAR.

How much goes to each school

For what purposes

## SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT GRANT / SCHOOL GRANT

Rs. 5000 per year per primary school

Rs. 7000 per year per upper primary school

Rs 5000 + Rs $7000=$ Rs 12000 if the school is Std I-VIIIVIII.

Note: Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same premises.

## SCHOOL MAINTENANCE GRANT

Rs. 5000 - Rs 7500 per school per year if the school has upto 3 classrooms.

Rs 7500 - Rs. 10000 per year if the school has more than 3 classrooms.

Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same building.

This grant can be used for maintenance of school building, including whitewashing; beautification; and repair of toilets, hand pump, boundary wall, playground etc.

The grant amount depends on number of classrooms (excluding Headmaster room and office room)

## TLM GRANT

Rs. 500 per teacher per year in primary and upper primary schools.

This grant can be used by teachers to buy teaching aids, such as charts, globes, posters, models etc.

[^6]ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM HOUSEHOLDS. 19 OUT OF 19 DISTRICTS
Data has not been presented where sample size was insufficient.

## School enrollment and out of school children

Table 1: \% Children in different types of schools 2012

| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in <br> school | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age: 6-14 ALL | 53.4 | 45.1 | 0.2 | 1.3 | 100 |
| Age: 7-16 ALL | 55.7 | 41.3 | 0.2 | 2.8 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 49.1 | 50.0 | 0.3 | 0.7 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 BOYS | 46.5 | 52.5 | 0.3 | 0.8 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 GIRLS | 52.2 | 47.0 | 0.3 | 0.5 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 ALL | 60.7 | 37.1 | 0.2 | 2.1 | 100 |
| Age: $11-14$ BOYS | 56.6 | 41.1 | 0.2 | 2.2 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 GIRLS | 65.8 | 32.0 | 0.1 | 2.0 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 ALL | 59.5 | 31.2 | 0.2 | 9.0 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 BOYS | 61.0 | 31.0 | 0.2 | 7.8 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 GIRLS | 58.0 | 31.5 | 0.2 | 10.3 | 100 |

Note: 'Other' includes children going to madarsa and EGS.
'Not in school' = dropped out + never enrolled.

## Chart 2: Trends over time

\% Children enrolled in private schools by class 2008-2012


## Young children in pre-school and school

Table 3: \% Children age 3-6 who are enrolled in different types of pre-school and school 2012

|  | In balwadi or anganwadi | In LKG/ UKG | In School |  |  | Not in school or preschool | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Govt. | Pvt. | Other |  |  |
| Age 3 | 43.3 | 24.5 |  |  |  | 32.2 | 100 |
| Age 4 | 34.1 | 53.8 |  |  |  | 12.1 | 100 |
| Age 5 | 6.7 | 3.8 | 26.8 | 60.2 | 0.2 | 2.4 | 100 |
| Age 6 | 1.2 | 1.8 | 37.6 | 57.4 | 0.2 | 1.8 | 100 |

Chart 1: Trends over time
\% Children out of school by age group and gender 2006-2012


How to read this chart: Each line shows trends in the proportion of children out of school for a particular subset of children. For example, the proportion of girls (age 1114) not in school has changed from $5.0 \%$ in 2006 to $4.9 \%$ in 2007 to $4.9 \%$ in 2008 , $6.2 \%$ in 2009 and to $2.7 \%$ in 2010 to $2.0 \%$ in 2012.
Table 2: Sample description
\% Children in each class by age 2012

| Std. | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 22.6 | 32.3 | 29.9 | 11.9 | 3.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| \\| | 3.7 | 15.6 | 34.1 | 30.8 | 10.5 | 5.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| III |  | 4.5 | 14.4 | 35.3 | 28.0 | 13.0 | 4.7 |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| IV | 4.0 |  |  | 15.2 | 31.3 | 31.8 | 11.0 | 6.8 |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| V | 3.4 |  |  |  | 9.9 | 38.4 | 27.1 | 15.6 | 5.6 |  |  |  | 100 |
| VI | 3.3 |  |  |  |  | 12.3 | 31.4 | 35.5 | 12.1 | 5.3 |  |  | 100 |
| VII | 3.8 |  |  |  |  |  | 11.3 | 41.4 | 28.5 | 9.6 | 5.4 |  | 100 |
| VIII | 2.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 14.9 | 33.0 | 33.5 | 13.0 | 3.2 | 100 |

How to read this table: If a child started school in Std I at age 6, she should be of age 8 in Std III. This table shows the age distribution for each class. For example, in Std III, $35.3 \%$ children are 8 years old but there are also $14.4 \%$ who are $7,28 \%$ who are 9 , $13 \%$ who are 10 years old and $4.7 \%$ who are older.

Chart 3: Trends over time
\% Children age 3, 4 and 5 not enrolled in school or pre-school 2006-2012*


[^7]
# Punjab rural 

## Reading

Table 4: \% Children by class and READING level All schools 2012

| Std. | Not even <br> letter | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (Std I Text) | Level 2 <br> (Std II Text) | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 21.0 | 52.2 | 17.0 | 5.7 | 4.2 | 100 |
| II | 6.8 | 36.7 | 26.2 | 13.8 | 16.5 | 100 |
| III | 3.4 | 18.4 | 19.1 | 20.8 | 38.4 | 100 |
| IV | 2.5 | 8.4 | 13.6 | 22.4 | 53.1 | 100 |
| V | 1.5 | 5.7 | 6.3 | 15.3 | 71.3 | 100 |
| VI | 1.4 | 3.5 | 4.8 | 11.9 | 78.5 | 100 |
| VII | 0.6 | 2.4 | 4.2 | 8.1 | 84.8 | 100 |
| VIII | 1.4 | 2.1 | 3.6 | 6.6 | 86.3 | 100 |
| Total | 4.7 | 15.9 | 12.0 | 13.3 | 54.1 | 100 |

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level in reading achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, 3.4\% children cannot even read letters, $18.4 \%$ can read letters but not more, $19.1 \%$ can read words but not Std I text or higher, 20.8\% can read Std I text but not Std II level text, and 38.4 \% can read Std II level text. For each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is $100 \%$.

Chart 4: Trends over time
\% Children in Std III who CAN READ Std I level text By school type 2009-2012


## Reading Tool

 Fet when wis wh

䧑
 tor ita termin

 A! turne till tan - theri

Chart 5: Trends over time
\% Children in Std V who CAN READ Std II level text By school type 2009-2012


## Reading and comprehension in English

Table 5: \% Children by class and READING level in ENGLISH All schools 2012

| Std. | Not <br> even <br> capital <br> letters | Capital <br> letters | Small <br> letters | Simple <br> words | Easy <br> sen- <br> tences | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 23.0 | 26.1 | 21.2 | 24.0 | 5.8 | 100 |
| II | 10.2 | 17.6 | 27.5 | 28.6 | 16.2 | 100 |
| III | 6.5 | 10.3 | 22.1 | 31.8 | 29.4 | 100 |
| IV | 4.0 | 7.4 | 18.1 | 31.3 | 39.3 | 100 |
| V | 2.0 | 4.4 | 13.1 | 28.4 | 52.1 | 100 |
| VI | 2.3 | 2.6 | 9.7 | 23.1 | 62.2 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.8 | 3.0 | 9.4 | 21.3 | 65.5 | 100 |
| VIII | 1.7 | 4.0 | 6.6 | 17.0 | 70.8 | 100 |
| Total | 6.2 | 9.4 | 16.1 | 25.8 | 42.6 | 100 |

Table 6: \% Children by class who CAN COMPREHEND ENGLISH All schools 2012

| Std. | Of those who <br> can read words, <br> \% who can tell <br> meanings of <br> the words | Of those who <br> can read <br> sentences, \% who <br> can tell meanings <br> of the sentences |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| I | 61.8 |  |
| II | 58.3 | 58.4 |
| III | 65.9 | 62.6 |
| IV | 63.2 | 65.8 |
| V | 61.6 | 71.8 |
| VI | 68.1 | 73.4 |
| VII | 69.2 | 70.9 |
| VIII | 66.1 | 77.3 |
| Total | 64.0 | 70.6 |

English Tool


# Punjab rural 

## Arithmetic

Table 7: \% Children by class and ARITHMETIC level All schools 2012

| Std. | Not even 1-9 | Recognize numbers |  | Can subtract | Can divide | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1-9 | 10-99 |  |  |  |
| I | 17.4 | 39.4 | 35.3 | 7.2 | 0.8 | 100 |
| II | 5.6 | 28.3 | 37.9 | 25.4 | 2.7 | 100 |
| III | 1.9 | 17.4 | 28.7 | 37.6 | 14.4 | 100 |
| IV | 2.3 | 8.0 | 26.5 | 31.7 | 31.5 | 100 |
| V | 1.2 | 4.2 | 20.0 | 22.6 | 52.0 | 100 |
| VI | 1.2 | 2.8 | 12.9 | 24.1 | 59.0 | 100 |
| VII | 0.6 | 1.2 | 16.3 | 21.5 | 60.4 | 100 |
| VIII | 1.0 | 2.3 | 14.6 | 18.3 | 63.8 | 100 |
| Total | 3.8 | 12.9 | 24.1 | 23.9 | 35.4 | 100 |

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level in arithmetic achieved by a child. For example, in Std 3, 1.9\% children cannot even recognize numbers 1-9, 17.4\% can recognize numbers up to 9 but not more, $28.7 \%$ can recognize numbers to 99 but cannot do subtraction, $37.6 \%$ can do subtraction but not division, and $14.4 \%$ can do division. For each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is $100 \%$

## Chart 6: Trends over time

\% Children in Std III who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more By school type 2009-2012



## Punjab rubal

Facilitated by PRATHAM

## Type of school and paid tuition classes

The ASER survey recorded information about tuition by asking the following question: "Does the child take any paid tuition class currently?" Therefore the numbers given below do not include any unpaid supplemental help in learning that children may have received.

| Table 8: Trends over time <br> \% Children attending paid tuition classes <br> By school type 2009-2012 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Children in Std I-VIII | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| Govt. schools: \% Children attending paid tuition classes | 20.8 | 10.1 | 8.5 | 10.6 |
| Private schools: \% Children attending paid tuition classes | 35.0 | 28.7 | 23.7 | 30.4 |
| All schools: \% Children attending paid tuition classes | 25.4 | 17.1 | 14.4 | 19.2 |

Table 9: Trends over time
\% Children by school type and tuition 2009-2012

| Year | Category |  | Std II | Std V | Std VIII | Std I-VIII |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2009 | Govt | No tuition | 52.4 | 55.7 | 50.2 | 53.9 |
|  |  | Tuition | 9.3 | 16.7 | 19.6 | 14.2 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 26.6 | 16.1 | 17.0 | 20.8 |
|  |  | Tuition | 11.7 | 11.4 | 13.3 | 11.2 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 2010 | Govt | No tuition | 53.7 | 58.8 | 58.2 | 56.4 |
|  |  | Tuition | 5.4 | 6.9 | 7.6 | 6.3 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 30.1 | 23.7 | 25.9 | 26.6 |
|  |  | Tuition | 10.8 | 10.6 | 8.3 | 10.7 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 2011 | Govt | No tuition | 50.7 | 58.6 | 61.8 | 55.8 |
|  |  | Tuition | 4.7 | 6.5 | 4.6 | 5.2 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 33.9 | 27.1 | 25.7 | 29.8 |
|  |  | Tuition | 10.6 | 7.9 | 7.9 | 9.2 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 2012 | Govt | No tuition | 44.8 | 51.1 | 60.2 | 50.7 |
|  |  | Tuition | 5.3 | 6.2 | 6.0 | 6.0 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 32.8 | 28.4 | 25.9 | 30.2 |
|  |  | Tuition | 17.1 | 14.3 | 7.9 | 13.2 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Chart 9: Trends over time
\% Children in Std III-V who CAN READ a Std I level text or more By school type and tuition 2009-2012



Chart 8: Trends over time
\% Children in Std I-VIII by school type and tuition 2009-2012


- Govt+No Tuition - Govt+Tuition =Pvt+No Tuition - Pvt+Tuition

How to read this chart: This chart is a visual representation of the last column of Table 9. For a given year, the width of each colour band represents the \% of children in the corresponding category. For each year, these four categories add upto 100\%.

Chart 10: Trends over time
\% Children in Std III-V who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more By school type and tuition 2009-2012


Facilitated by PRATHAM

## School observations

In each year's ASER, from 2009 onwards, in each sampled village, the largest government school with primary sections was visited on the day of the survey. Information about schools in this report is based on these visits.

Table 10: Number of schools visited 2009-2012

| Type of school | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Std I-IVN: Primary | 431 | 391 | 457 | 469 |
| Std I-VIINIII: Primary + <br> Upper primary | 38 | 58 | 32 | 56 |
| Total schools visited | 469 | 449 | 489 | 525 |

Table 11: Student and teacher attendance on the day of the visit 2009-2012

| Type of school | Std I-IVN |  |  |  | Std I-VIINIII |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
|  | 84.4 | 82.5 | 81.7 | 80.4 | 85.6 | 84.4 | 79.6 | 82.1 |
| \% Teachers present <br> (Average) | 84.8 | 89.1 | 87.1 | 80.3 | 82.2 | 84.6 | 84.1 | 81.4 |

Table 12: Small schools and multigrade classes 2009-2012

| School characteristics | Std I-IVN |  |  |  | Std I-VIINIII |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| \% Schools with total enrollment of 60 or less | 24.4 | 19.0 | 21.0 | 18.5 | 2.7 | 5.2 | 0.0 | 8.9 |
| \% Schools where Std II children observed <br> sitting with one or more other classes | 45.6 | 53.3 | 44.2 | 53.1 | 41.7 | 47.4 | 36.7 | 59.3 |
| \% Schools where Std IV children observed <br> sitting with one or more other classes | 46.5 | 39.1 | 41.5 | 43.1 | 40.6 | 26.5 | 36.7 | 58.0 |

## RTE indicators

Table 13: Schools meeting selected RTE norms 2010-2012

| \% Schools meeting the following RTE norms: | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Pupil-teacher ratio | Classroom-teacher ratio | 34.9 | 30.4 |
| Building | Office/store/office cum store | 76.9 | 82.2 | 80.3 |
|  | Playground | 78.5 | 79.3 | 80.0 |
|  | Boundary wall/fencing | 69.3 | 71.2 | 71.0 |
| Drinking water | No facility for drinking water | 82.8 | 83.9 | 83.0 |
|  | Facility but no drinking water available | 8.9 | 8.4 | 8.0 |
|  | Drinking water available | 8.0 | 8.8 | 9.3 |
| Toilet | No toilet facility | 83.1 | 82.9 | 82.8 |
|  | Facility but toilet not useable | 0.9 | 1.9 | 0.6 |
|  | Toilet useable | 37.9 | 39.5 | 28.9 |
| Girls toilet | \% Schools with no separate provisions for girls toilets | 7.3 | 4.9 | 4.4 |
|  | Of schools with separate girls toilets, \% schools with |  |  | 70.5 |
|  | Toilet locked | 16.9 | 4.0 | 8.6 |
|  | Toilet not useable | 26.5 | 34.8 | 21.4 |
|  | Toilet useable | 49.4 | 56.2 | 65.6 |
| Library | No library | 4.1 | 5.6 | 9.4 |
|  | Library but no books being used by children on day of visit | 30.0 | 24.0 | 44.7 |
|  | Library books being used by children on day of visit | 66.0 | 70.4 | 46.0 |
| Mid-day | Kitchen shed for cooking mid-day meal | 94.7 | 93.9 | 97.7 |
|  | Mid-day meal served in school on day of visit | 97.9 | 96.4 | 95.5 |



The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act, 2009 specifies a series of norms and standards for a school.

Norms for number of teachers vary according to the level of the school (primary or upper primary) and total student enrollment.

Norms for classrooms require the school to have at least one classroom for every teacher.

Norms for facilities require schools to provide each of the facilities mentioned in Table 13, among others.

RTE norms regulate provision of facilities but not their useability. ASER school observations also include whether facilities could be used. This information is included in Table 13.

## School funds and activities (PAISA)

Table 14: \% Schools that report receiving SSA grants - Full financial year

| SSA school grants | April 2009 to <br> March 2010 |  |  |  | April 2010 to March 2011 |  |  |  | April 2011 to March 2012 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { No. } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { Sch. } \end{gathered}$ | \% Schools |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { No. } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { Sch. } \end{gathered}$ | \% Schools |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No. } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Sch. } \end{aligned}$ | \% Schools |  |  |
|  |  | Yes | No | Don't know |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |  | Yes | No | Don't know |
| Maintenance grant | 400 | 95.5 | 1.3 | 3.3 | 480 | 84.6 | 10.2 | 5.2 | 503 | 92.5 | 3.8 | 3.8 |
| Development grant | 369 | 93.5 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 480 | 78.1 | 14.0 | 7.9 | 502 | 87.5 | 8.8 | 3.8 |
| TLM grant | 378 | 96.3 | 2.7 | 1.1 | 481 | 92.5 | 4.2 | 3.3 | 506 | 94.1 | 3.6 | 2.4 |

Table 15: \% Schools that report receiving SSA grants - Half financial year

| SSA school grants | April 2010 to date of survey (2010) |  |  |  | April 2011 to date of survey (2011) |  |  |  | April 2012 to date of survey (2012) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. of Sch. | \% Schools |  |  | No. of Sch. | \% Schools |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No. } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Sch. } \end{aligned}$ | \% Schools |  |  |
|  |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |
| Maintenance grant | 374 | 88.5 | 7.5 | 4.0 | 478 | 24.5 | 58.6 | 17.0 | 477 | 73.6 | 21.6 | 4.8 |
| Development grant | 356 | 90.7 | 6.5 | 2.8 | 478 | 28.9 | 54.8 | 16.3 | 476 | 70.6 | 23.5 | 5.9 |
| TLM grant | 363 | 94.2 | 4.1 | 1.7 | 476 | 41.4 | 44.5 | 14.1 | 480 | 69.8 | 25.2 | 5.0 |

Table 16: \% Schools carrying out different activities since April 2011

| Type of Activity |  | \% Schools |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Yes | No | Don't know |
| Const. | New Classroom | 21.0 | 77.0 | 2.1 |
| Repairs | Repair of building (roof, floor, wall etc.) | 52.4 | 45.2 | 2.4 |
|  | Repair of doors \& windows | 37.6 | 59.6 | 2.8 |
|  | Repair of boundary wall | 21.7 | 75.3 | 3.0 |
|  | Repair of drinking water facility | 54.3 | 43.1 | 2.6 |
|  | Repair of toilet | 43.4 | 54.0 | 2.6 |
| Painting <br> \& white- <br> wash | White wash/plastering | 51.7 | 46.1 | 2.2 |
|  | Painting blackboard/Display board/Painting on wall | 69.2 | 28.4 | 2.4 |
|  | Painting of doors \& walls | 38.8 | 58.5 | 2.7 |
| Purchase | Purchase of furniture (cupboard etc.) | 39.8 | 57.0 | 3.2 |
|  | Purchase of electrical fittings | 51.3 | 45.7 | 3.0 |
|  | Purchase of chalk, duster, register etc. | 77.4 | 20.2 | 2.4 |
|  | Purchase of sitting mats/Tat patti | 38.4 | 59.2 | 2.4 |
|  | Purchase of charts, globes \& other teaching material | 71.1 | 26.5 | 2.4 |
| Other | Expenditure on school events | 46.0 | 50.9 | 3.1 |
|  | Payment of bills (electricity, water, cleaning etc.) | 64.4 | 32.6 | 3.1 |

The PAISA section of ASER tracks receipt and spending of Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) grants at the school level. This information is collected from schools visited during the survey. This page reports proportion of schools receiving the grants and carrying out specified activities in the schools. More detailed analysis of the PAISA data will be available in the PAISA 2012 report which will be released in March $2013 .{ }^{1}$

## EVERY RURAL GOVERNMENT PRIMARY/UPPER PRIMARY SCHOOL IS ENTITLED TO EACH OF THESE SSA GRANTS EVERY YEAR.

| How much goes to <br> each school | For what purposes |
| :---: | :--- |

SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT GRANT / SCHOOL GRANT
Rs. 5000 per year per primary school

Rs. 7000 per year per upper primary school

## Rs 5000 + Rs $7000=$

 Rs 12000 if the school is Std I-VIINIII.Note: Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same premises.

## SCHOOL MAINTENANCE GRANT

Rs. 5000 - Rs 7500 per school per year if the school has upto 3 classrooms.

Rs 7500 - Rs. 10000 per year if the school has more than 3 classrooms.

Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same building.

This grant can be used for maintenance of school building, including whitewashing; beautification; and repair of toilets, hand pump, boundary wall, playground etc.

The grant amount depends on number of classrooms (excluding Headmaster room and office room)

## TLM GRANT

Rs. 500 per teacher per year in primary and upper primary schools.

This grant can be used by teachers to buy teaching aids, such as charts, globes, posters, models etc.

## Rajasthan rubal

## ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM HOUSEHOLDS. 32 OUT OF 32 DISTRICTS

Data has not been presented where sample size was insufficient.

## School enrollment and out of school children

Table 1: \% Children in different types of schools 2012

| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in <br> school | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age: 6-14 ALL | 53.4 | 41.1 | 0.5 | 5.1 | 100 |
| Age: 7-16 ALL | 52.4 | 38.9 | 0.4 | 8.3 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 52.3 | 43.8 | 0.6 | 3.3 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 BOYS | 48.0 | 49.4 | 0.5 | 2.2 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 GIRLS | 57.5 | 37.2 | 0.8 | 4.6 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 ALL | 54.3 | 37.6 | 0.3 | 7.8 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 BOYS | 50.1 | 44.6 | 0.4 | 4.9 | 100 |
| Age: $11-14$ GIRLS | 59.2 | 29.4 | 0.2 | 11.2 | 100 |
| Age: $15-16$ ALL | 48.3 | 29.3 | 0.3 | 22.1 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 BOYS | 49.6 | 34.3 | 0.4 | 15.6 | 100 |
| Age: $15-16$ GIRLS | 46.8 | 23.3 | 0.1 | 29.8 | 100 |

Note: 'Other' includes children going to madarsa and EGS. 'Not in school' = dropped out + never enrolled

Chart 2: Trends over time \% Children enrolled in private schools by class 2008-2012


## Young children in pre-school and school

Table 3: \% Children age 3-6 who are enrolled in different types of pre-school and school 2012

|  | In balwadi or anganwad | In LKG/ UKG | In School |  |  | Not in school or preschool | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Govt. | Pvt. | Other |  |  |
| Age 3 | 27.9 | 11.9 |  |  |  | 60.2 | 100 |
| Age 4 | 21.4 | 28.0 |  |  |  | 50.6 | 100 |
| Age 5 | 7.3 | 16.8 | 33.7 | 28.8 | 0.6 | 12.9 | 100 |
| Age 6 | 2.2 | 8.2 | 45.1 | 36.2 | 0.6 | 7.8 | 100 |

Chart 1: Trends over time
\% Children out of school by age group and gender 2006-2012


How to read this chart: Each line shows trends in the proportion of children out of school for a particular subset of children. For example, the proportion of girls (age 1114) not in school has changed from $19.6 \%$ in 2006 to $14.4 \%$ in 2007 to $14.8 \%$ in 2008, 12.2\% in 2009 and to $12.1 \%$ in 2010 to $11.2 \%$ in 2012.

Table 2: Sample description
\% Children in each class by age 2012

| Std. | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 36.5 | 32.3 | 18.2 | 8.2 | 4.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| II | 9.7 | 21.9 | 30.7 | 24.0 | 6.1 | 7.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| III | 2.5 | 7.9 | 20.6 | 32.9 | 16.6 | 12.4 | 7.1 |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| IV |  | 3.5 | 8.1 | 22.0 | 23.3 | 25.4 | 8.0 | 6.8 | 2.9 |  |  |  | 100 |
| V | 2.5 |  |  | 10.0 | 14.0 | 36.6 | 16.0 | 13.1 | 7.8 |  |  |  | 100 |
| VI | 4.3 |  |  |  | 6.3 | 22.9 | 24.9 | 26.7 | 9.4 | 5.6 |  |  | 100 |
| VII | 3.6 |  |  |  |  | 9.8 | 13.9 | 37.5 | 22.2 | 7.7 | 5.3 |  | 100 |
| VIII | 4.1 |  |  |  |  |  | 5.5 | 25.2 | 30.9 | 19.9 | 10.3 | 4.1 | 100 |

How to read this table: If a child started school in Std I at age 6, she should be of age 8 in Std III. This table shows the age distribution for each class. For example, in Std III, $32.9 \%$ children are 8 years old but there are also $20.6 \%$ who are $7,16.6 \%$ who are $9,12.4 \%$ who are 10 years old and $7.1 \%$ who are older.

Chart 3: Trends over time
\% Children age 3, 4 and 5 not enrolled in school or pre-school 2006-2012*


* Data for 2011 is not comparable and therefore excluded here.


## Rajasthan rural

## Reading

Table 4: \% Children by class and READING level
All schools 2012

| Std. | Not even <br> letter | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (Std I Text) | Level 2 <br> (Std II Text) | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 53.8 | 35.9 | 5.3 | 2.3 | 2.6 | 100 |
| II | 26.8 | 42.8 | 14.7 | 7.8 | 7.9 | 100 |
| IIII | 13.8 | 36.3 | 19.5 | 13.0 | 17.5 | 100 |
| IV | 8.2 | 23.8 | 18.8 | 19.4 | 29.9 | 100 |
| V | 4.8 | 14.4 | 14.6 | 19.4 | 46.9 | 100 |
| VII | 2.4 | 8.8 | 11.4 | 17.2 | 60.2 | 100 |
| VII | 1.3 | 5.7 | 6.7 | 16.7 | 69.6 | 100 |
| VIII | 1.3 | 3.3 | 5.6 | 12.4 | 77.5 | 100 |
| Total | 15.0 | 22.5 | 12.3 | 13.3 | 36.9 | 100 |

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level in reading achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, 13.8\% children cannot even read letters, $36.3 \%$ can read letters but not more, $19.5 \%$ can read words but not Std I text or higher, $13.0 \%$ can read Std I text but not Std II level text, and $17.5 \%$ can read Std II level text. For each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is $100 \%$.

## Chart 4: Trends over time

\% Children in Std III who CAN READ Std I level text By school type 2009-2012


## Reading Tool



Chart 5: Trends over time
\% Children in Std V who CAN READ Std II level text By school type 2009-2012


## Reading and comprehension in English

Table 5: \% Children by class and READING level in ENGLISH All schools 2012

| Std. | Not <br> even <br> capital <br> letters | Capital <br> letters | Small <br> letters | Simple <br> words | Easy <br> sen- <br> tences | Total |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 65.9 | 19.6 | 9.8 | 3.5 | 1.2 | 100 |
| II | 43.9 | 26.0 | 18.8 | 7.8 | 3.6 | 100 |
| III | 31.8 | 24.9 | 22.9 | 16.2 | 4.2 | 100 |
| IV | 21.5 | 21.5 | 25.9 | 24.0 | 7.2 | 100 |
| V | 13.3 | 18.3 | 23.6 | 30.1 | 14.7 | 100 |
| VII | 7.9 | 13.0 | 22.5 | 30.8 | 25.8 | 100 |
| VII | 4.5 | 10.9 | 19.3 | 32.7 | 32.6 | 100 |
| VIII | 3.5 | 7.6 | 17.5 | 31.6 | 39.8 | 100 |
| Total | 25.4 | 18.2 | 20.0 | 21.3 | 15.1 | 100 |

Table 6: \% Children by class who CAN COMPREHEND ENGLISH All schools 2012

| Std. | Of those who <br> can read words, <br> \% who can tell <br> meanings of <br> the words | Of those who <br> can read <br> sentences, \% who <br> can tell meanings <br> of the sentences |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| I |  |  |
| III | 61.4 |  |
| III | 64.3 | 53.1 |
| IV | 64.9 | 60.4 |
| V | 64.4 | 59.4 |
| VI | 67.4 | 61.1 |
| VII | 65.4 | 68.2 |
| VIIII | 64.8 | 61.3 |

English Tool


## Rajasthan rubal

## Arithmetic

Table 7: \% Children by class and ARITHMETIC level All schools 2012

| Std. | Not even 1-9 | Recognize numbers |  | Can subtract | Can divide | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1-9 | 10-99 |  |  |  |
| I | 49.6 | 37.3 | 10.8 | 1.6 | 0.7 | 100 |
| II | 20.3 | 47.8 | 23.0 | 6.9 | 2.0 | 100 |
| III | 9.3 | 42.2 | 29.8 | 13.9 | 4.8 | 100 |
| IV | 5.7 | 28.8 | 30.6 | 22.6 | 12.3 | 100 |
| V | 2.8 | 19.1 | 30.1 | 27.0 | 21.1 | 100 |
| VI | 1.2 | 13.4 | 26.7 | 26.0 | 32.8 | 100 |
| VII | 0.9 | 9.0 | 21.4 | 28.7 | 40.1 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.8 | 5.9 | 21.4 | 26.8 | 45.1 | 100 |
| Total | 12.2 | 26.6 | 24.2 | 18.5 | 18.5 | 100 |

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level in arithmetic achieved by a child. For example, in Std 3, 9.3\% children cannot even recognize numbers 1-9, $42.2 \%$ can recognize numbers up to 9 but not more, $29.8 \%$ can recognize numbers to 99 but cannot do subtraction, $13.9 \%$ can do subtraction but not division, and $4.8 \%$ can do division. For each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is $100 \%$.

Chart 6: Trends over time
\% Children in Std III who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more By school type 2009-2012



## Math Tool



Chart 7: Trends over time
\% Children in Std V who CAN DO DIVISION
By school type 2009-2012



## Rajasthan rural

Facilitated by PRATHAM

## Type of school and paid tuition classes

The ASER survey recorded information about tuition by asking the following question: "Does the child take any paid tuition class currently?" Therefore the numbers given below do not include any unpaid supplemental help in learning that children may have received.

| Table 8: Trends over time \% Children attending paid tuition classes By school type 2009-2012 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Children in Std I-VIII | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| Govt. schools: \% Children attending paid tuition classes | 6.1 | 4.3 | 1.9 | 2.7 |
| Private schools: \% Children attending paid tuition classes | 14.7 | 12.6 | 8.5 | 7.7 |
| All schools: \% Children attending paid tuition classes | 8.9 | 7.1 | 4.3 | 4.8 |

Table 9: Trends over time
\% Children by school type and tuition 2009-2012

| Year | Category |  | Std II | Std V | Std VIII | Std I-VIII |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2009 | Govt. | No tuition | 63.0 | 66.5 | 60.8 | 64.0 |
|  |  | Tuition | 2.3 | 4.1 | 8.3 | 4.2 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 30.7 | 24.7 | 22.8 | 27.1 |
|  |  | Tuition | 4.0 | 4.7 | 8.2 | 4.7 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 2010 | Govt. | No tuition | 61.6 | 63.4 | 63.2 | 63.2 |
|  |  | Tuition | 1.7 | 3.1 | 5.5 | 2.9 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 33.3 | 29.2 | 25.5 | 29.7 |
|  |  | Tuition | 3.4 | 4.3 | 6.0 | 4.3 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 2011 | Govt. | No tuition | 60.2 | 61.9 | 66.0 | 62.3 |
|  |  | Tuition | 0.8 | 1.1 | 2.1 | 1.2 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 36.3 | 33.8 | 28.8 | 33.4 |
|  |  | Tuition | 2.7 | 3.3 | 3.1 | 3.1 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 2012 | Govt. | No tuition | 51.4 | 55.6 | 61.7 | 55.8 |
|  |  | Tuition | 0.8 | 1.9 | 2.1 | 1.5 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 44.7 | 39.1 | 32.6 | 39.4 |
|  |  | Tuition | 3.2 | 3.4 | 3.6 | 3.3 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Chart 9: Trends over time
\% Children in Std III-V who CAN READ a Std I level text or more By school type and tuition 2009-2012



Chart 8: Trends over time
\% Children in Std I-VIII by school type and tuition 2009-2012


How to read this chart: This chart is a visual representation of the last column of Table 9. For a given year, the width of each colour band represents the \% of children in the corresponding category. For each year, these four categories add upto 100\%.

Chart 10: Trends over time
\% Children in Std III-V who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more By school type and tuition 2009-2012


## Rajasthan rubal

## School observations

In each year's ASER, from 2009 onwards, in each sampled village, the largest government school with primary sections was visited on the day of the survey. Information about schools in this report is based on these visits.

Table 10: Number of schools visited 2009-2012

| Type of school | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Std I-IVN: Primary | 276 | 290 | 273 | 324 |
| Std I-VIINIII: Primary + <br> Upper primary | 594 | 606 | 599 | 553 |
| Total schools visited | 870 | 896 | 872 | 877 |

Table 11: Student and teacher attendance on the day of the visit 2009-2012

| Type of school | Std I-IVN |  |  |  | Std I-VII/VIII |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| \% Enrolled children <br> present (Average) | 72.0 | 71.2 | 69.8 | 66.3 | 74.2 | 73.6 | 70.8 | 68.0 |
| \% Teachers present <br> (Average) | 92.8 | 90.1 | 90.9 | 90.5 | 88.9 | 88.0 | 86.4 | 88.4 |

Table 12: Small schools and multigrade classes 2009-2012

| School characteristics | Std I-IVN |  |  |  | Std I-VIINIII |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| \% Schools with total enrollment of 60 or less | 30.9 | 35.9 | 36.6 | 41.3 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 2.5 | 3.5 |
| \% Schools where Std II children observed <br> sitting with one or more other classes | 60.5 | 65.6 | 77.2 | 83.5 | 65.1 | 66.0 | 67.0 | 78.7 |
| \% Schools where Std IV children observed <br> sitting with one or more other classes | 52.7 | 53.6 | 63.0 | 69.9 | 51.5 | 52.3 | 53.6 | 57.8 |

## RTE indicators

Table 13: Schools meeting selected RTE norms 2010-2012

| \% Schools meeting the following RTE norms: |  | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pupil-teacher \& classroomteacher norms | Pupil-teacher ratio | 46.4 | 47.4 | 51.1 |
|  | Classroom-teacher ratio | 82.0 | 83.1 | 80.1 |
| Building | Office/store/office cum store | 91.2 | 89.4 | 89.0 |
|  | Playground | 51.7 | 57.4 | 57.7 |
|  | Boundary wall/fencing | 70.1 | 72.7 | 77.3 |
| Drinking water | No facility for drinking water | 20.9 | 21.9 | 21.0 |
|  | Facility but no drinking water available | 11.1 | 8.5 | 11.9 |
|  | Drinking water available | 68.0 | 69.5 | 67.1 |
| Toilet | No toilet facility | 3.5 | 3.3 | 2.6 |
|  | Facility but toilet not useable | 31.1 | 26.9 | 25.3 |
|  | Toilet useable | 65.4 | 69.9 | 72.0 |
| Girls toilet | \% Schools with no separate provisions for girls toilets | 19.6 | 9.3 | 10.9 |
|  | Of schools with separate girls toilets, \% schools with |  |  |  |
|  | Toilet locked | 13.3 | 5.5 | 6.6 |
|  | Toilet not useable | 16.8 | 19.0 | 17.5 |
|  | Toilet useable | 50.3 | 66.3 | 65.1 |
| Library | No library | 36.3 | 33.0 | 23.1 |
|  | Library but no books being used by children on day of visit | 40.4 | 35.4 | 44.0 |
|  | Library books being used by children on day of visit | 23.3 | 31.7 | 32.9 |
| Mid-day meal | Kitchen shed for cooking mid-day meal | 83.8 | 84.7 | 85.6 |
|  | Mid-day meal served in school on day of visit | 94.8 | 97.1 | 93.9 |



The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act, 2009 specifies a series of norms and standards for a school.

Norms for number of teachers vary according to the level of the school (primary or upper primary) and total student enrollment.

Norms for classrooms require the school to have at least one classroom for every teacher.

Norms for facilities require schools to provide each of the facilities mentioned in Table 13, among others.

RTE norms regulate provision of facilities but not their useability. ASER school observations also include whether facilities could be used. This information is included in Table 13.

## School funds and activities (PAISA)

Table 14: \% Schools that report receiving SSA grants - Full financial year

| SSA school grants | April 2009 to <br> March 2010 |  |  |  | April 2010 to <br> March 2011 |  |  |  | April 2011 to <br> March 2012 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No. } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Sch. } \end{aligned}$ | \% Schools |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { No. } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { Sch. } \end{gathered}$ | \% Schools |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { No. } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { Sch. } \end{gathered}$ | \% Schools |  |  |
|  |  | Yes | No | Don't know |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |  | Yes | No | Don't know |
| Maintenance grant | 809 | 79.1 | 13.7 | 7.2 | 843 | 81.4 | 12.3 | 6.3 | 852 | 79.9 | 15.5 | 4.6 |
| Development grant | 759 | 73.4 | 8.2 | 8.4 | 803 | 62.5 | 30.6 | 6.9 | 843 | 70.2 | 24.4 | 5.3 |
| TLM grant | 809 | 88.8 | 6.8 | 4.5 | 847 | 86.9 | 8.2 | 5.0 | 860 | 90.8 | 7.0 | 2.2 |

Table 15: \% Schools that report receiving SSA grants - Half financial year

| SSA school grants | April 2010 to date of survey (2010) |  |  |  | April 2011 to date of survey (2011) |  |  |  | April 2012 to date of survey (2012) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. of Sch. | \% Schools |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No. } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Sch. } \end{aligned}$ | \% Schools |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { No. } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { Sch. } \end{gathered}$ | \% Schools |  |  |
|  |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |
| grant | 761 | 47.7 | 40.9 | 11.4 | 782 | 50.5 | 39.9 | 9.6 | 818 | 16.9 | 76.8 | 6.4 |
| Development grant | 714 | 47.5 | 40.3 | 12.2 | 755 | 41.9 | 47.8 | 10.3 | 819 | 12.8 | 80.6 | 6.6 |
| TLM grant | 744 | 55.9 | 34.1 | 10.0 | 791 | 57.1 | 35.0 | 7.8 | 824 | 24.4 | 70.6 | 5.0 |

Table 16: \% Schools carrying out different activities since April 2011

| Type of Activity |  | \% Schools |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Yes | No | Don't know |
| Const. | New Classroom | 11.5 | 86.5 | 2.1 |
| Repairs | Repair of building (roof, floor, wall etc.) | 41.7 | 56.4 | 2.0 |
|  | Repair of doors \& windows | 32.7 | 65.5 | 1.9 |
|  | Repair of boundary wall | 17.5 | 80.4 | 2.2 |
|  | Repair of drinking water facility | 28.2 | 69.7 | 2.1 |
|  | Repair of toilet | 23.4 | 74.3 | 2.3 |
| Painting \& whitewash | White wash/plastering | 48.8 | 49.5 | 1.8 |
|  | Painting blackboard/Display board/Painting on wall | 61.9 | 36.2 | 1.9 |
|  | Painting of doors \& walls | 36.2 | 61.9 | 1.9 |
| Purchase | Purchase of furniture (cupboard etc.) | 37.6 | 59.4 | 3.0 |
|  | Purchase of electrical fittings | 26.6 | 71.1 | 2.2 |
|  | Purchase of chalk, duster, register etc. | 93.1 | 5.3 | 1.6 |
|  | Purchase of sitting mats/Tat patti | 36.3 | 61.4 | 2.3 |
|  | Purchase of charts, globes \& other teaching material | 76.2 | 22.1 | 1.7 |
| Other | Expenditure on school events | 55.3 | 42.3 | 2.4 |
|  | Payment of bills (electricity, water, cleaning etc.) | 51.2 | 46.4 | 2.5 |

The PAISA section of ASER tracks receipt and spending of Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) grants at the school level. This information is collected from schools visited during the survey. This page reports proportion of schools receiving the grants and carrying out specified activities in the schools. More detailed analysis of the PAISA data will be available in the PAISA 2012 report which will be released in March $2013 .{ }^{1}$

## EVERY RURAL GOVERNMENT PRIMARY/UPPER PRIMARY SCHOOL IS ENTITLED TO EACH OF THESE SSA GRANTS EVERY YEAR.

| How much goes to <br> each school | For what purposes |
| :---: | :--- |

SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT GRANT / SCHOOL GRANT
Rs. 5000 per year per primary school

Rs. 7000 per year per upper primary school

## Rs 5000 + Rs $7000=$

 Rs 12000 if the school is Std I-VIINIII.Note: Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same premises.

## SCHOOL MAINTENANCE GRANT

Rs. 5000 - Rs 7500 per school per year if the school has upto 3 classrooms.

Rs 7500 - Rs. 10000 per year if the school has more than 3 classrooms.

Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same building.

This grant can be used for maintenance of school building, including whitewashing; beautification; and repair of toilets, hand pump, boundary wall, playground etc.

The grant amount depends on number of classrooms (excluding Headmaster room and office room)

## TLM GRANT

Rs. 500 per teacher per year in primary and upper primary schools.

This grant can be used by teachers to buy teaching aids, such as charts, globes, posters, models etc.

ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM HOUSEHOLDS. 28 OUT OF 29 DISTRICTS
Data has not been presented where sample size was insufficient.

## School enrollment and out of school children

Table 1: \% Children in different types of schools 2012

| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in <br> school | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age: 6-14 ALL | 70.3 | 29.0 | 0.2 | 0.6 | 100 |
| Age: 7-16 ALL | 71.8 | 26.4 | 0.2 | 1.5 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 66.5 | 32.9 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 BOYS | 64.5 | 35.0 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 GIRLS | 68.7 | 30.7 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 ALL | 76.0 | 22.9 | 0.1 | 1.0 | 100 |
| Age: $11-14$ BOYS | 73.6 | 25.1 | 0.2 | 1.2 | 100 |
| Age: $11-14$ GIRLS | 78.4 | 20.7 | 0.1 | 0.9 | 100 |
| Age: $15-16$ ALL | 74.5 | 19.1 | 0.4 | 6.0 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 BOYS | 72.8 | 20.5 | 0.5 | 6.2 | 100 |
| Age: $15-16$ GIRLS | 76.1 | 17.8 | 0.3 | 5.8 | 100 |

Note: 'Other' includes children going to madarsa and EGS. 'Not in school' = dropped out + never enrolled.

Chart 2: Trends over time \% Children enrolled in private schools by class 2008-2012


Chart 1: Trends over time
\% Children out of school by age group and gender 2006-2012


How to read this chart: Each line shows trends in the proportion of children out of school for a particular subset of children. For example, the proportion of girls (age 1114) not in school has changed from $3.9 \%$ in 2006 to $2.3 \%$ in 2007 to $1.2 \%$ in 2008 , $1.1 \%$ in 2009 and to $1.8 \%$ in 2010 to $0.9 \%$ in 2012.

Table 2: Sample description
\% Children in each class by age 2012

| Std. | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 39.5 | 52.7 | 6.7 | 1.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| \|| | 1.4 | 18.5 | 68.1 | 10.1 | 2.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| III | 1. | . 0 | 15.1 | 72.3 | 9.8 | 1.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| IV | 2.0 |  |  | 17.6 | 67.4 | 10.7 | 2.3 |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| V | 1.5 |  |  |  | 9.0 | 78.8 | 7.7 | 3.0 |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| VI | 1.3 |  |  |  |  | 8.8 | 65.9 | 21.4 | 2.6 |  |  |  | 100 |
| VII | 2.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 8.6 | 73.7 | 13.1 | 2.6 |  |  | 100 |
| VIII | 2.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 15.2 | 66.8 | 12.8 | 2.3 |  | 100 |

How to read this table: If a child started school in Std I at age 6, she should be of age 8 in Std III. This table shows the age distribution for each class. For example, in Std III, $72.3 \%$ children are 8 years old but there also $15.1 \%$ who are $7,9.8 \%$ who are 9 and $1.8 \%$ who are older.

## Young children in pre-school and school

Table 3: \% Children age 3-6 who are enrolled in different types of pre-school and school 2012

|  | In balwadi or anganwad | In LKG/ UKG | In School |  |  | Not in school or preschool | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Govt. | Pvt. | Other |  |  |
| Age 3 | 54.4 | 24.9 |  |  |  | 20.8 | 100 |
| Age 4 | 38.0 | 54.0 |  |  |  | 8.1 | 100 |
| Age 5 | 10.1 | 21.7 | 35.8 | 29.5 | 0.9 | 2.0 | 100 |
| Age 6 | 0.4 | 2.9 | 56.2 | 39.4 | 0.1 | 1.0 | 100 |

Chart 3: Trends over time
\% Children age 3, 4 and 5 not enrolled in school or pre-school 2006-2012*


* Data for 2011 is not comparable and therefore excluded here.


## Reading

Table 4: \% Children by class and READING level
All schools 2012

| Std. | Not even <br> letter | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (Std I Text) | Level 2 <br> (Std II Text) | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 56.6 | 29.6 | 9.9 | 3.0 | 0.8 | 100 |
| II | 24.8 | 31.6 | 31.6 | 9.1 | 2.9 | 100 |
| III | 10.8 | 19.6 | 39.5 | 21.9 | 8.2 | 100 |
| IV | 5.5 | 11.0 | 34.7 | 30.3 | 18.6 | 100 |
| V | 3.3 | 6.6 | 26.6 | 33.6 | 29.9 | 100 |
| VI | 2.5 | 3.8 | 16.2 | 30.9 | 46.6 | 100 |
| VII | 1.2 | 2.5 | 13.9 | 28.2 | 54.2 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.6 | 1.6 | 10.0 | 22.5 | 65.2 | 100 |
| Total | 12.6 | 12.8 | 22.7 | 23.0 | 29.0 | 100 |

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level in reading achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, $10.8 \%$ children cannot even read letters, $19.6 \%$ can read letters but not more, $39.5 \%$ can read words but not Std I text or higher, $21.9 \%$ can read Std I text but not Std II level text, and 8.2\% can read Std II level text. For each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is $100 \%$.

## Chart 4: Trends over time

\% Children in Std III who CAN READ Std I level text By school type 2009-2012


## Reading Tool



Chart 5: Trends over time
\% Children in Std V who CAN READ Std II level text
By school type 2009-2012


## Reading and comprehension in English

Table 5: \% Children by class and READING level in ENGLISH All schools 2012

| Std. | Not <br> even <br> capital <br> letters | Capital <br> letters | Small <br> letters | Simple <br> words | Easy <br> sen- <br> tences | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 58.1 | 15.8 | 19.6 | 5.6 | 0.9 | 100 |
| II | 28.2 | 22.7 | 31.0 | 13.3 | 4.9 | 100 |
| III | 15.2 | 17.6 | 36.8 | 21.2 | 9.3 | 100 |
| IV | 8.3 | 11.8 | 32.0 | 29.3 | 18.7 | 100 |
| V | 5.2 | 9.8 | 27.9 | 33.1 | 24.0 | 100 |
| VI | 3.6 | 7.3 | 21.6 | 34.7 | 32.9 | 100 |
| VII | 3.2 | 5.5 | 18.9 | 33.0 | 39.5 | 100 |
| VIII | 2.1 | 4.1 | 16.9 | 30.8 | 46.2 | 100 |
| Total | 14.9 | 11.5 | 25.5 | 25.6 | 22.5 | 100 |

Table 6: \% Children by class who CAN COMPREHEND ENGLISH All schools 2012

| Std. | Of those who <br> can read words, <br> \% who can tell <br> meanings of <br> the words | Of those who <br> can read <br> sentences, \% who <br> can tell meanings <br> of the sentences |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| I |  |  |
| III | 52.0 | 72.0 |
| III | 55.7 | 73.8 |
| IV | 60.7 | 75.9 |
| V | 58.3 | 77.0 |
| VI | 64.1 | 76.5 |
| VII | 59.4 | 82.9 |
| VIIII | 64.5 | 77.0 |

English Tool


## Tamil Nadu rural

## Arithmetic

Table 7: \% Children by class and ARITHMETIC level All schools 2012

| Std. | Not even 1-9 | Recognize numbers |  | Can subtract | Can divide | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1-9 | 10-99 |  |  |  |
| I | 46.1 | 33.8 | 17.9 | 1.9 | 0.3 | 100 |
| \\| | 16.7 | 29.1 | 47.6 | 5.7 | 0.9 | 100 |
| III | 7.5 | 16.7 | 58.5 | 16.1 | 1.3 | 100 |
| IV | 2.8 | 8.1 | 47.2 | 37.1 | 4.9 | 100 |
| V | 2.4 | 5.8 | 39.3 | 39.6 | 13.0 | 100 |
| VI | 1.5 | 2.8 | 30.4 | 43.7 | 21.6 | 100 |
| VII | 1.0 | 1.4 | 25.4 | 43.2 | 29.0 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.8 | 1.0 | 20.8 | 40.0 | 37.4 | 100 |
| Total | 9.4 | 11.8 | 35.7 | 29.2 | 13.9 | 100 |

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level in arithmetic achieved by a child. For example, in Std 3, $7.5 \%$ children cannot even recognize numbers 1-9, $16.7 \%$ can recognize numbers up to 9 but not more, $58.5 \%$ can recognize numbers to 99 but cannot do subtraction, $16.1 \%$ can do subtraction but not division, and $1.3 \%$ can do division. For each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is $100 \%$.

Chart 6: Trends over time
\% Children in Std III who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more By school type 2009-2012




## Type of school and paid tuition classes

The ASER survey recorded information about tuition by asking the following question: "Does the child take any paid tuition class currently?" Therefore the numbers given below do not include any unpaid supplemental help in learning that children may have received.

| Table 8: Trends over time \% Children attending paid tuition classes By school type 2009-2012 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Children in Std I-VIII | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| Govt. schools: \% Children attending paid tuition classes | 20.9 | 16.4 | 15.1 | 15.0 |
| Private schools: \% Children attending paid tuition classes | 33.9 | 27.8 | 24.9 | 27.1 |
| All schools: \% Children attending paid tuition classes | 23.5 | 19.3 | 17.9 | 18.7 |

Table 9: Trends over time
\% Children by school type and tuition 2009-2012

| Year | Category |  | Std II | Std V | Std VIII | Std I-VIII |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2009 | Govt. | No tuition | 58.1 | 64.8 | 69.6 | 63.3 |
|  |  | Tuition | 15.4 | 20.5 | 17.4 | 16.7 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 18.1 | 9.4 | 8.4 | 13.2 |
|  |  | Tuition | 8.5 | 5.3 | 4.6 | 6.8 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 2010 | Govt. | No tuition | 56.3 | 62.3 | 65.8 | 62.2 |
|  |  | Tuition | 8.9 | 15.4 | 13.6 | 12.2 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 25.6 | 15.6 | 14.9 | 18.5 |
|  |  | Tuition | 9.2 | 6.8 | 5.8 | 7.1 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 2011 | Govt. | No tuition | 54.4 | 62.5 | 67.4 | 61.1 |
|  |  | Tuition | 8.0 | 13.2 | 11.4 | 10.9 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 28.3 | 18.1 | 16.0 | 21.0 |
|  |  | Tuition | 9.3 | 6.2 | 5.2 | 7.0 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 2012 | Govt. | No tuition | 53.4 | 60.2 | 67.5 | 59.1 |
|  |  | Tuition | 7.7 | 11.1 | 12.9 | 10.4 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 30.0 | 19.9 | 14.1 | 22.3 |
|  |  | Tuition | 9.0 | 8.9 | 5.5 | 8.3 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Chart 9: Trends over time
\% Children in Std III-V who CAN READ a Std I level text or more By school type and tuition 2009-2012



Chart 8: Trends over time
\% Children in Std I-VIII by school type and tuition 2009-2012


How to read this chart: This chart is a visual representation of the last column of Table 9. For a given year, the width of each colour band represents the \% of children in the corresponding category. For each year, these four categories add upto 100\%.

Chart 10: Trends over time
\% Children in Std III-V who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more By school type and tuition 2009-2012

facilitated by PRATHAM

## School observations

In each year's ASER, from 2009 onwards, in each sampled village, the largest government school with primary sections was visited on the day of the survey. Information about schools in this report is based on these visits.

Table 10: Number of schools visited 2009-2012

| Type of school | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Std I-IVN: Primary | 385 | 395 | 448 | 423 |
| Std I-VIINIII: Primary + <br> Upper primary | 260 | 267 | 235 | 207 |
| Total schools visited | 645 | 662 | 683 | 630 |

Table 11: Student and teacher attendance on the day of the visit 2009-2012

| Type of school | Std I-IVN |  |  |  | Std I-VIINIII |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| \% Enrolled children <br> present (Average) | 91.7 | 89.9 | 89.7 | 91.2 | 90.1 | 90.7 | 89.2 | 89.0 |
| \% Teachers present <br> (Average) | 90.6 | 86.5 | 91.6 | 93.7 | 87.4 | 79.9 | 89.0 | 88.3 |

Table 12: Small schools and multigrade classes 2009-2012

| School characteristics | Std I-IVN |  |  |  | Std I-VIIVIIII |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| \% Schools with total enrollment of 60 or less | 33.3 | 38.4 | 45.6 | 44.9 | 2.0 | 3.8 | 4.7 | 6.3 |
| \% Schools where Std II children observed <br> sitting with one or more other classes | 77.8 | 81.8 | 71.2 | 68.7 | 71.5 | 76.2 | 67.4 | 69.3 |
| \% Schools where Std IV children observed <br> sitting with one or more other classes | 74.1 | 78.3 | 68.2 | 61.7 | 63.3 | 69.5 | 61.9 | 56.4 |

Note: In Tamil Nadu, the official policy in govt. schools is to have mixed groups in std. I-IV.

## RTE indicators

Table 13: Schools meeting selected RTE norms 2010-2012

| \% Schools meeting the following RTE norms: |  | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pupil-teacher \& classroomteacher norms | Pupil-teacher ratio | 47.0 | 52.3 | 49.3 |
|  | Classroom-teacher ratio | 75.2 | 75.0 | 81.7 |
| Building | Office/store/office cum store | 54.8 | 49.3 | 50.1 |
|  | Playground | 68.7 | 67.7 | 69.7 |
|  | Boundary wall/fencing | 60.7 | 58.9 | 66.1 |
| Drinking water | No facility for drinking water | 12.8 | 13.6 | 11.2 |
|  | Facility but no drinking water available | 6.7 | 8.9 | 8.0 |
|  | Drinking water available | 80.5 | 77.6 | 80.8 |
| Toilet | No toilet facility | 7.0 | 9.6 | 5.2 |
|  | Facility but toilet not useable | 48.5 | 42.0 | 26.0 |
|  | Toilet useable | 44.6 | 48.4 | 68.9 |
| Girls toilet | \% Schools with no separate provisions for girls toilets | 20.8 | 21.2 | 13.4 |
|  | Of schools with separate girls toilets, \% schools with |  |  |  |
|  | Toilet locked | 23.0 | 15.0 | 9.2 |
|  | Toilet not useable | 21.0 | 21.2 | 15.2 |
|  | Toilet useable | 35.1 | 42.7 | 62.2 |
| Library | No library | 20.9 | 23.2 | 16.6 |
|  | Library but no books being used by children on day of visit | 21.3 | 21.6 | 18.3 |
|  | Library books being used by children on day of visit | 57.8 | 55.2 | 65.1 |
| Mid-day meal | Kitchen shed for cooking mid-day meal | 96.7 | 96.7 | 98.5 |
|  | Mid-day meal served in school on day of visit | 99.4 | 99.4 | 99.8 |



The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act, 2009 specifies a series of norms and standards for a school.

Norms for number of teachers vary according to the level of the school (primary or upper primary) and total student enrollment.

Norms for classrooms require the school to have at least one classroom for every teacher.

Norms for facilities require schools to provide each of the facilities mentioned in Table 13, among others.

RTE norms regulate provision of facilities but not their useability. ASER school observations also include whether facilities could be used. This information is included in Table 13.

## School funds and activities (PAISA)

Table 14: \% Schools that report receiving SSA grants - Full financial year

| SSA school grants | April 2009 to <br> March 2010 |  |  |  | April 2010 to <br> March 2011 |  |  |  | April 2011 to <br> March 2012 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No. } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Sch. } \end{aligned}$ | \% Schools |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { No. } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { Sch. } \end{gathered}$ | \% Schools |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { No. } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { Sch. } \end{gathered}$ | \% Schools |  |  |
|  |  | Yes | No | Don't know |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |  | Yes | No | Don't know |
| Maintenance grant | 546 | 94.1 | 1.8 | 4.0 | 657 | 91.0 | 4.6 | 4.4 | 609 | 95.2 | 2.6 | 2.1 |
| Development grant | 498 | 90.6 | 4.6 | 4.8 | 631 | 82.9 | 11.3 | 5.9 | 604 | 88.6 | 8.4 | 3.0 |
| TLM grant | 180 | 16.1 | 76.1 | 7.8 | 601 | 53.6 | 42.1 | 4.3 | 612 | 85.6 | 11.6 | 2.8 |

Table 15: \% Schools that report receiving SSA grants - Half financial year

| SSA school grants | April 2010 to date of survey (2010) |  |  |  | April 2011 to date of survey (2011) |  |  |  | April 2012 to date of survey (2012) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No. } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Sch. } \end{aligned}$ | \% Schools |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No. } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Sch. } \end{aligned}$ | \% Schools |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No. } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Sch. } \end{aligned}$ | \% Schools |  |  |
|  |  | Yes | No | Don't know |  | Yes | No | Don't know |  | Yes | No | Don't know |
| Maintenance grant | 551 | 91.1 | 3.6 | 5.3 | 623 | 85.1 | 10.4 | 4.5 | 593 | 87.7 | 8.8 | 3.5 |
| Development grant | 491 | 91.7 | 5.3 | 3.1 | 601 | 78.4 | 16.0 | 5.7 | 588 | 79.8 | 15.5 |  |
| TLM grant | 161 | 18.0 | 72.1 | 9.9 | 586 | 72.2 | 23.7 | 4.1 | 583 | 52.1 | 42.7 | 5. |

Table 16: \% Schools carrying out different activities since April 2011

| Type of Activity |  | \% Schools |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Yes | No | Don't know |
| Const. | New Classroom | 16.7 | 79.9 | 3.4 |
| Repairs | Repair of building (roof, floor, wall etc.) | 49.1 | 47.0 | 3.9 |
|  | Repair of doors \& windows | 45.5 | 51.1 | 3.4 |
|  | Repair of boundary wall | 30.6 | 65.5 | 3.9 |
|  | Repair of drinking water facility | 63.4 | 33.9 | 2.7 |
|  | Repair of toilet | 57.1 | 40.3 | 2.7 |
| Painting \& whitewash | White wash/plastering | 51.8 | 45.2 | 3.0 |
|  | Painting blackboard/Display board/Painting on wall | 81.7 | 16.3 | 2.0 |
|  | Painting of doors \& walls | 41.6 | 55.0 | 3.4 |
| Purchase | Purchase of furniture (cupboard etc.) | 42.4 | 53.7 | 3.9 |
|  | Purchase of electrical fittings | 58.5 | 38.5 | 3.0 |
|  | Purchase of chalk, duster, register etc. | 90.6 | 7.6 | 1.8 |
|  | Purchase of sitting mats/Tat patti | 76.7 | 20.4 | 2.9 |
|  | Purchase of charts, globes \& other teaching material | 84.0 | 13.6 | 2.5 |
| Other | Expenditure on school events | 57.2 | 39.3 | 3.5 |
|  | Payment of bills (electricity, water, cleaning etc.) | 53.8 | 42.8 | 3.4 |

The PAISA section of ASER tracks receipt and spending of Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) grants at the school level. This information is collected from schools visited during the survey. This page reports proportion of schools receiving the grants and carrying out specified activities in the schools. More detailed analysis of the PAISA data will be available in the PAISA 2012 report which will be released in March $2013 .{ }^{1}$

## EVERY RURAL GOVERNMENT PRIMARY/UPPER PRIMARY SCHOOL IS ENTITLED TO EACH OF THESE SSA GRANTS EVERY YEAR.

| How much goes to <br> each school | For what purposes |
| :---: | :--- |

SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT GRANT / SCHOOL GRANT
Rs. 5000 per year per primary school

Rs. 7000 per year per upper primary school

## Rs 5000 + Rs $7000=$

 Rs 12000 if the school is Std I-VIINIII.Note: Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same premises.

## SCHOOL MAINTENANCE GRANT

Rs. 5000 - Rs 7500 per school per year if the school has upto 3 classrooms.

Rs 7500 - Rs. 10000 per year if the school has more than 3 classrooms.

Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same building.

This grant can be used for maintenance of school building, including whitewashing; beautification; and repair of toilets, hand pump, boundary wall, playground etc.

The grant amount depends on number of classrooms (excluding Headmaster room and office room)

## TLM GRANT

Rs. 500 per teacher per year in primary and upper primary schools.

This grant can be used by teachers to buy teaching aids, such as charts, globes, posters, models etc.

## ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM HOUSEHOLDS. 4 OUT OF 4 DISTRICTS

Data has not been presented where sample size was insufficient.

## School enrollment and out of school children

Table 1: \% Children in different types of schools 2012

| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in <br> school | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age: 6-14 ALL | 96.3 | 3.0 | 0.1 | 0.6 | 100 |
| Age: 7-16 ALL | 96.0 | 2.2 | 0.0 | 1.8 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 96.0 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 BOYS | 96.2 | 3.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 GIRLS | 95.6 | 4.3 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 ALL | 97.5 | 1.1 | 0.1 | 1.2 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 BOYS | 97.5 | 1.7 | 0.2 | 0.7 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 GIRLS | 97.9 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 ALL | 92.6 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 7.0 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 BOYS | 92.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 7.2 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 GIRLS | 93.3 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 5.9 | 100 |

Note: 'Other' includes children going to madarsa and EGS. 'Not in school' = dropped out + never enrolled.


## Young children in pre-school and school

Table 3: \% Children age 3-6 who are enrolled in different types of pre-school and school 2012

|  | In balwadi or anganwadi | $\begin{aligned} & \text { In LKG/ } \\ & \text { UKG } \end{aligned}$ | In School |  |  | Not in school or preschool | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Govt. | Pvt. | Other |  |  |
| Age 3 | 81.7 | 9.8 |  |  |  | 8.6 | 100 |
| Age 4 | 71.0 | 22.3 |  |  |  | 6.7 | 100 |
| Age 5 | 45.7 | 13.0 | 27.5 | 11.2 | 0.0 | 2.5 | 100 |
| Age 6 | 14.7 | 8.5 | 68.7 | 6.2 | 0.5 | 1.4 | 100 |

Chart 1: Trends over time
\% Children out of school by age group and gender 2006-2012


How to read this chart: Each line shows trends in the proportion of children out of school for a particular subset of children. For example, the proportion of girls (age 1114) not in school has changed from $7.3 \%$ in 2006 to $5.8 \%$ in 2007 to $3.8 \%$ in 2008 , $3.4 \%$ in 2009 and to $3.4 \%$ in 2010 to $1.5 \%$ in 2012.

Table 2: Sample description
\% Children in each class by age 2012

| Std. | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 2.4 | 43.4 | 49.5 | 4.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| II |  | 2.0 | 21.9 | 64.9 | 7.9 | 3.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| III | 2.9 |  |  | 19.8 | 56.3 | 16.8 | 4.2 |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| IV | 3.2 |  |  |  | 12.5 | 69.1 | 9.7 | 5.6 |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| V | 2.4 |  |  |  |  | 21.6 | 53.5 | 18.9 | 3.7 |  |  |  | 100 |
| VI | 2.4 |  |  |  |  |  | 17.3 | 65.3 | 11.4 | 3.7 |  |  | 100 |
| VII | 2.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 18.0 | 52.3 | 16.6 | 8.9 | 1.6 | 100 |
| VIII | 4.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 18.2 | 56.7 | 13.5 | 6.9 | 100 |

How to read this table: If a child started school in Std I at age 6, she should be of age 8 in Std III. This table shows the age distribution for each class. For example, in Std III, $19.8 \%$ children are 8 years old but there are also $2.9 \%$ who are younger, $56.3 \%$ who are $9,16.8 \%$ who are 10 years old and $4.2 \%$ who are older.

## Reading

Table 4: \% Children by class and READING level
All schools 2012

| Std. | Not even <br> letter | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (Std I Text) | Level 2 <br> (Std II Text) | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 20.0 | 55.0 | 18.6 | 5.3 | 1.1 | 100 |
| II | 7.7 | 39.2 | 26.2 | 14.9 | 12.0 | 100 |
| IIII | 7.2 | 22.3 | 29.8 | 23.7 | 17.0 | 100 |
| IV | 1.8 | 13.9 | 25.6 | 31.1 | 27.5 | 100 |
| V | 2.6 | 8.5 | 21.7 | 30.4 | 36.8 | 100 |
| VI | 0.7 | 4.3 | 11.5 | 31.9 | 51.7 | 100 |
| VII | 0.0 | 2.8 | 3.8 | 29.1 | 64.3 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.4 | 0.9 | 5.8 | 26.9 | 66.0 | 100 |
| Total | 5.6 | 20.2 | 18.3 | 23.4 | 32.5 | 100 |

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level in reading achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, $7.2 \%$ children cannot even read letters, $22.3 \%$ can read letters but not more, 29.8 \% can read words but not Std I text or higher, 23.7 \% can read Std I text but not Std II level text, and 17.0\% can read Std II level text. For each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is $100 \%$.

## Chart 4: Trends over time

\% Children in Std III who CAN READ Std I level text By school type 2009-2012


## Reading Tool

## प7



Chart 5: Trends over time
\% Children in Std V who CAN READ Std II level text By school type 2009-2012


## Reading in English

Table 5: \% Children by class and READING level in ENGLISH All schools 2012

| Std. | Not <br> even <br> capital <br> letters | Capital <br> letters | Small <br> letters | Simple <br> words | Easy <br> sen- <br> tences | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 28.6 | 34.1 | 28.4 | 8.3 | 0.7 | 100 |
| II | 14.1 | 25.8 | 39.4 | 17.3 | 3.4 | 100 |
| III | 7.5 | 15.9 | 43.0 | 27.1 | 6.6 | 100 |
| IV | 3.6 | 8.6 | 32.8 | 42.9 | 12.2 | 100 |
| V | 4.5 | 4.4 | 27.8 | 45.3 | 18.0 | 100 |
| VI | 1.1 | 4.7 | 17.8 | 49.5 | 27.0 | 100 |
| VII | 0.7 | 1.8 | 12.3 | 40.7 | 44.5 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.9 | 1.9 | 12.3 | 37.4 | 47.6 | 100 |
| Total | 8.5 | 13.3 | 27.2 | 32.5 | 18.5 | 100 |

## English Tool





## Arithmetic

Table 7: \% Children by class and ARITHMETIC level All schools 2012

| Std. | Not even 1-9 | Recognize numbers |  | Can subtract | Can divide | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1-9 | 10-99 |  |  |  |
| 1 | 11.3 | 55.3 | 26.4 | 6.4 | 0.6 | 100 |
| \\| | 4.1 | 35.7 | 43.2 | 14.2 | 2.7 | 100 |
| III | 3.2 | 18.0 | 49.0 | 25.3 | 4.5 | 100 |
| IV | 0.5 | 10.1 | 36.6 | 44.5 | 8.3 | 100 |
| V | 1.0 | 7.1 | 34.4 | 36.8 | 20.8 | 100 |
| VI | 0.3 | 3.8 | 21.4 | 44.3 | 30.2 | 100 |
| VII | 0.0 | 0.3 | 16.5 | 45.0 | 38.2 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.4 | 0.4 | 23.0 | 33.6 | 42.7 | 100 |
| Total | 2.9 | 18.2 | 31.6 | 30.0 | 17.3 | 100 |

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level in arithmetic achieved by a child. For example, in Std 3, 3.2\% children cannot even recognize numbers 1-9, 18\% can recognize numbers up to 9 but not more, $49 \%$ can recognize numbers to 99 but cannot do subtraction, $25.3 \%$ can do subtraction but not division, and $4.5 \%$ can do division. For each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is $100 \%$.

## Chart 6: Trends over time

\% Children in Std III who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more
By school type 2009-2012



## Type of school and paid tuition classes

The ASER survey recorded information about tuition by asking the following question: "Does the child take any paid tuition class currently?" Therefore the numbers given below do not include any unpaid supplemental help in learning that children may have received.

## Table 9: Trends over time

\% Children by school type and tuition 2009-2012

| Year | Category |  | Std II | Std V | Std VIII | Std I-VIII |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2009 | Govt. | No tuition | 34.6 | 33.9 | 14.2 | 26.7 |
|  |  | Tuition | 61.9 | 62.8 | 84.3 | 70.4 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 2.0 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 0.7 |
|  |  | Tuition | 1.5 | 2.5 | 1.5 | 2.3 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 2010 | Govt. | No tuition | 31.2 | 26.0 | 15.6 | 26.7 |
|  |  | Tuition | 65.4 | 71.7 | 83.3 | 71.0 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.2 |
|  |  | Tuition | 3.4 | 2.1 | 1.1 | 2.1 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 2011 | Govt. | No tuition | 35.1 | 27.2 | 17.0 | 26.8 |
|  |  | Tuition | 59.1 | 70.0 | 79.8 | 69.3 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 0.6 | 0.0 | 1.3 | 0.9 |
|  |  | Tuition | 5.2 | 2.7 | 1.9 | 3.1 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 2012 | Govt. | No tuition | 36.3 | 28.3 | 21.2 | 29.5 |
|  |  | Tuition | 60.5 | 69.9 | 77.9 | 68.0 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 0.1 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.3 |
|  |  | Tuition | 3.1 | 1.3 | 0.9 | 2.2 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Chart 8: Trends over time
\% Children in Std I-VIII by school type and tuition 2009-2012


How to read this chart: This chart is a visual representation of the last column of Table 9 For a given year, the width of each colour band represents the \% of children in the corresponding category. For each year, these four categories add upto 100\%.

Chart 9: Trends over time
\% Children in Std III-V who CAN READ a Std I level text or more By school type and tuition 2009-2012


Chart 10: Trends over time
\% Children in Std III-V who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more By school type and tuition 2009-2012


Facilitated by PRATHAM

## School observations

In each year's ASER, from 2009 onwards, in each sampled village, the largest government school with primary sections was visited on the day of the survey. Information about schools in this report is based on these visits.

Table 10: Number of schools visited 2009-2012

| Type of school | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Std I-IVN: Primary | 58 | 44 | 46 | 36 |
| Std I-VII/VIII: Primary + <br> Upper primary | 44 | 54 | 48 | 66 |
| Total schools visited | 102 | 98 | 94 | 102 |

Table 11: Student and teacher attendance on the day of the visit 2009-2012

| Type of school | Std I-VIINIII |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| \% Enrolled children <br> present (Average) | 73.8 | 62.4 | 63.3 | 61.9 |
| \% Teachers present <br> (Average) | 84.3 | 81.5 | 79.0 | 81.7 |

Table 12: Small schools and multigrade classes 2009-2012

| School characteristics | Std I-VIINIII |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| \% Schools with total enrollment of 60 or less | 7.5 | 0.0 | 8.3 | 7.8 |
| \% Schools where Std II children observed <br> sitting with one or more other classes | 62.5 | 44.0 | 54.6 | 33.3 |
| \% Schools where Std IV children observed <br> sitting with one or more other classes | 35.1 | 21.3 | 50.0 | 25.0 |

## RTE indicators

Table 13: Schools meeting selected RTE norms 2010-2012

| \% Schools meeting the following RTE norms: |  | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pupil-teacher \& classroomteacher norms | Pupil-teacher ratio | 68.5 | 75.0 | 82.6 |
|  | Classroom-teacher ratio | 60.0 | 46.2 | 63.6 |
| Building | Office/store/office cum store | 89.6 | 76.6 | 83.7 |
|  | Playground | 89.5 | 78.7 | 92.0 |
|  | Boundary wall/fencing | 19.4 | 25.3 | 20.0 |
| Drinking water | No facility for drinking water | 32.6 | 41.3 | 34.7 |
|  | Facility but no drinking water available | 27.4 | 18.5 | 16.8 |
|  | Drinking water available | 40.0 | 40.2 | 48.5 |
| Toilet | No toilet facility | 8.6 | 15.4 | 9.0 |
|  | Facility but toilet not useable | 48.4 | 53.9 | 41.0 |
|  | Toilet useable | 43.0 | 30.8 | 50.0 |
| Girls toilet | \% Schools with no separate provisions for girls toilets | 48.5 | 35.9 | 39.8 |
|  | Of schools with separate girls toilets, \% schools with |  |  |  |
|  | Toilet locked | 15.2 | 28.1 | 13.6 |
|  | Toilet not useable | 6.1 | 14.1 | 13.6 |
|  | Toilet useable | 30.3 | 21.9 | 33.0 |
| Library | No library | 64.6 | 71.7 | 67.7 |
|  | Library but no books being used by children on day of visit | 15.6 | 4.4 | 5.9 |
|  | Library books being used by children on day of visit | 19.8 | 23.9 | 26.5 |
| Mid-day meal | Kitchen shed for cooking mid-day meal | 88.2 | 90.4 | 95.0 |
|  | Mid-day meal served in school on day of visit | 74.7 | 96.8 | 95.0 |



The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act, 2009 specifies a series of norms and standards for a school.

Norms for number of teachers vary according to the level of the school (primary or upper primary) and total student enrollment.

Norms for classrooms require the school to have at least one classroom for every teacher.

Norms for facilities require schools to provide each of the facilities mentioned in Table 13, among others.

RTE norms regulate provision of facilities but not their useability. ASER school observations also include whether facilities could be used. This information is included in Table 13.

School funds and activities (PAISA)

Table 14: \% Schools that report receiving SSA grants - Full financial year

| SSA school grants | April 2009 to March 2010 |  |  |  | April 2010 to March 2011 |  |  |  | April 2011 to March 2012 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. of Sch. | \% Schools |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No. } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Sch. } \end{aligned}$ | \% Schools |  |  | No. of Sch. | \% Schools |  |  |
|  |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |
| Maintenance grant | 72 | 76.4 | 16.7 | 6.9 | 91 | 61.5 | 28.6 | 9.9 | 102 | 76.5 | 13.7 | 9.8 |
| Development grant | 68 | 63.2 | 25.0 | 11.8 | 88 | 56.8 | 31.8 | 11.4 | 99 | 67.7 | 18.2 | 14.1 |
| TLM grant | 74 | 82.4 | 8.1 | 9.5 | 91 | 79.1 | 11.0 | 9.9 | 102 | 93.1 | 1.0 | 5.9 |

Table 15: \% Schools that report receiving SSA grants - Half financial year

| SSA school grants | April 2010 to date of survey (2010) |  |  |  | April 2011 to date of survey (2011) |  |  |  | April 2012 to date of survey (2012) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. of Sch. | \% Schools |  |  | No. of Sch. | \% Schools |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { No. } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { Sch. } \end{gathered}$ | \% Schools |  |  |
|  |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |
| Maintenance grant | 74 | 37.8 | 50.0 | 12.2 | 80 | 18.8 | 67.5 | 13.8 | 100 | 60.0 | 29.0 | 11.0 |
| Development grant | 68 | 36.8 | 51.5 | 11.8 | 78 | 23.1 | 61.5 | 15.4 | 98 | 58.2 | 28.6 | 13.3 |
| TLM grant | 74 | 48.7 | 41.9 | 9.5 | 79 | 29.1 | 57.0 | 13.9 | 101 | 77.2 | 14.9 | 7.9 |

Table 16: \% Schools carrying out different activities since April 2011

| Type of Activity |  | \% Schools |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Yes | No | Don't know |
| Const. | New Classroom | 29.0 | 69.0 | 2.0 |
| Repairs | Repair of building (roof, floor, wall etc.) | 48.5 | 47.5 | 4.0 |
|  | Repair of doors \& windows | 45.1 | 52.9 | 2.0 |
|  | Repair of boundary wall | 16.0 | 83.0 | 1.1 |
|  | Repair of drinking water facility | 35.3 | 63.7 | 1.0 |
|  | Repair of toilet | 40.6 | 57.4 | 2.0 |
| Painting \& whitewash | White wash/plastering | 44.1 | 54.9 | 1.0 |
|  | Painting blackboard/Display board/Painting on wall | 44.1 | 54.9 | 1.0 |
|  | Painting of doors \& walls | 25.7 | 73.3 | 1.0 |
| Purchase | Purchase of furniture (cupboard etc.) | 42.2 | 55.9 | 2.0 |
|  | Purchase of electrical fittings | 16.8 | 81.2 | 2.0 |
|  | Purchase of chalk, duster, register etc. | 89.2 | 9.8 | 1.0 |
|  | Purchase of sitting mats/Tat patti | 13.9 | 85.2 | 1.0 |
|  | Purchase of charts, globes \& other teaching material | 74.3 | 23.8 | 2.0 |
| Other | Expenditure on school events | 71.3 | 26.7 | 2.0 |
|  | Payment of bills (electricity, water, cleaning etc.) | 23.2 | 70.7 | 6.1 |

The PAISA section of ASER tracks receipt and spending of Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) grants at the school level. This information is collected from schools visited during the survey. This page reports proportion of schools receiving the grants and carrying out specified activities in the schools. More detailed analysis of the PAISA data will be available in the PAISA 2012 report which will be released in March $2013 .{ }^{1}$

## EVERY RURAL GOVERNMENT PRIMARY/UPPER PRIMARY SCHOOL IS ENTITLED TO EACH OF THESE SSA GRANTS EVERY YEAR.

| How much goes to |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| each school | For what purposes |

SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT GRANT / SCHOOL GRANT
Rs. 5000 per year per primary school

Rs. 7000 per year per upper primary school

Rs 5000 + Rs $7000=$ Rs 12000 if the school is Std I-VIINIII.
Note: Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same premises.

## SCHOOL MAINTENANCE GRANT

Rs. 5000 - Rs 7500 per school per year if the school has upto 3 classrooms.

Rs 7500 - Rs. 10000 per year if the school has more than 3 classrooms.

Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same building.

This grant can be used for maintenance of school building, including whitewashing; beautification; and repair of toilets, hand pump, boundary wall, playground etc.

The grant amount depends on number of classrooms (excluding Headmaster room and office room)

## TLM GRANT

Rs. 500 per teacher per year in primary and upper primary schools.

This grant can be used by teachers to buy teaching aids, such as charts, globes, posters, models etc.

# Uttarakhand rubal 

ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM HOUSEHOLDS. 12 OUT OF 13 DISTRICTS
Data has not been presented where sample size was insufficient.

## School enrollment and out of school children

Table 1: \% Children in different types of schools 2012

| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in <br> school | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age: 6-14 ALL | 60.8 | 36.6 | 0.8 | 1.8 | 100 |
| Age: 7-16 ALL | 62.9 | 33.2 | 0.7 | 3.2 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 58.3 | 39.8 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 BOYS | 52.9 | 44.8 | 1.3 | 1.0 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 GIRLS | 64.4 | 34.1 | 0.6 | 1.0 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 ALL | 64.3 | 32.4 | 0.6 | 2.8 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 BOYS | 58.7 | 39.1 | 0.4 | 1.8 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 GIRLS | 70.3 | 25.1 | 0.9 | 3.8 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 ALL | 69.8 | 21.2 | 0.3 | 8.8 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 BOYS | 66.9 | 24.2 | 0.2 | 8.7 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 GIRLS | 72.8 | 18.0 | 0.4 | 8.8 | 100 |

Note: 'Other' includes children going to madarsa and EGS 'Not in school' = dropped out + never enrolled.

Chart 2: Trends over time \% Children enrolled in private schools by class 2008-2012


Chart 1: Trends over time
\% Children out of school by age group and gender 2006-2012


How to read this chart: Each line shows trends in the proportion of children out of school for a particular subset of children. For example, the proportion of girls (age 1114) not in school has changed from $3.4 \%$ in 2006 to $4.1 \%$ in 2007 to $2.7 \%$ in 2008, $3.0 \%$ in 2009 and to $4.0 \%$ in 2010 to $3.8 \%$ in 2012.

Table 2: Sample description
\% Children in each class by age 2012

| Std. | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 28.4 | 37.1 | 19.5 | 7.2 | 7.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| \|| | 5.5 | 19.0 | 36.5 | 25.9 | 5.3 | 5.0 | 2.8 |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| III |  | 4.2 | 15.9 | 42.4 | 20.3 | 10.2 | 7.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| IV | 5.5 |  |  | 18.3 | 32.2 | 29.7 | 7.1 | 7.2 |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| V | 0.6 |  |  | 6.3 | 13.8 | 38.8 | 23.4 | 11.4 | 5.8 |  |  |  | 100 |
| VI | 4.8 |  |  |  |  | 15.9 | 30.9 | 33.0 | 9.3 | 6.2 |  |  | 100 |
| VII | 5.4 |  |  |  |  |  | 12.7 | 41.2 | 24.8 | 10.5 | 5.4 |  | 100 |
| VIII | 5.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 20.8 | 30.9 | 25.5 | 12.5 | 4.3 | 100 |

How to read this table: If a child started school in Std I at age 6, she should be of age 8 in Std III. This table shows the age distribution for each class. For example, in Std III, $42.4 \%$ children are 8 years old but there are also $15.9 \%$ who are $7,20.3 \%$ who are $9,10.2 \%$ who are 10 years old and $7 \%$ who are older.

## Young children in pre-school and school

Table 3: \% Children age 3-6 who are enrolled in different types of pre-school and school 2012

|  | In balwadi or anganwad | In LKG/ UKG | In School |  |  | Not in school or preschool | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Govt. | Pvt. | Other |  |  |
| Age 3 | 55.9 | 16.6 |  |  |  | 27.6 | 100 |
| Age 4 | 48.7 | 37.0 |  |  |  | 14.3 | 100 |
| Age 5 | 13.5 | 10.8 | 34.3 | 37.2 | 0.1 | 4.1 | 100 |
| Age 6 | 3.4 | 6.8 | 50.1 | 37.2 | 0.4 | 2.2 | 100 |

Chart 3: Trends over time
\% Children age 3, 4 and 5 not enrolled in school or pre-school 2006-2012*


* Data for 2011 is not comparable and therefore excluded here.


## Reading

Table 4: \% Children by class and READING level
All schools 2012

| Std. | Not even <br> letter | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (Std I Text) | Level 2 <br> (Std II Text) | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 31.6 | 39.2 | 14.8 | 6.3 | 8.1 | 100 |
| II | 18.9 | 29.5 | 21.4 | 12.9 | 17.3 | 100 |
| IIII | 9.0 | 22.3 | 17.0 | 20.0 | 31.8 | 100 |
| IV | 6.5 | 16.6 | 15.4 | 17.8 | 43.7 | 100 |
| V | 3.9 | 10.7 | 9.6 | 17.4 | 58.4 | 100 |
| VI | 2.8 | 5.8 | 6.6 | 15.3 | 69.5 | 100 |
| VII | 3.2 | 4.2 | 5.1 | 11.7 | 75.9 | 100 |
| VIII | 1.0 | 3.3 | 3.6 | 8.1 | 83.9 | 100 |
| Total | 10.1 | 17.0 | 11.9 | 13.7 | 47.3 | 100 |

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level in reading achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, 9.0\% children cannot even read letters, $22.3 \%$ can read letters but not more, $17.0 \%$ can read words but not Std I text or higher, 20.0\% can read Std I text but not Std II level text, and $31.8 \%$ can read Std II level text. For each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is $100 \%$.

## Chart 4: Trends over time

\% Children in Std III who CAN READ Std I level text By school type 2009-2012


## Reading Tool



Chart 5: Trends over time
\% Children in Std V who CAN READ Std II level text By school type 2009-2012


## Reading and comprehension in English

Table 5: \% Children by class and READING level in ENGLISH All schools 2012

| Std. | Not <br> even <br> capital <br> letters | Capital <br> letters | Small <br> letters | Simple <br> words | Easy <br> sen- <br> tences | Total |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 38.0 | 23.5 | 20.6 | 11.0 | 6.9 | 100 |
| II | 24.5 | 22.6 | 25.2 | 16.0 | 11.9 | 100 |
| III | 14.7 | 19.1 | 27.0 | 21.2 | 18.1 | 100 |
| IV | 12.5 | 14.8 | 24.1 | 27.2 | 21.4 | 100 |
| V | 8.2 | 13.6 | 20.9 | 27.7 | 29.6 | 100 |
| VII | 6.0 | 8.5 | 18.3 | 29.7 | 37.6 | 100 |
| VII | 4.2 | 8.6 | 14.0 | 28.2 | 45.1 | 100 |
| VIII | 2.5 | 7.3 | 10.9 | 25.5 | 53.9 | 100 |
| Total | 14.4 | 15.0 | 20.3 | 23.0 | 27.2 | 100 |

Table 6: \% Children by class who CAN COMPREHEND ENGLISH All schools 2012

| Std. | Of those who <br> can read words, <br> \% who can tell <br> meanings of <br> the words | Of those who <br> can read <br> sentences, \% who <br> can tell meanings <br> of the sentences |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| I |  |  |
| III |  |  |
| IIII | 53.3 | 68.0 |
| IV | 63.2 | 70.5 |
| V | 65.8 | 77.7 |
| VI | 61.4 | 79.9 |
| VII | 62.4 | 78.1 |
| VIIII | 59.1 | 74.8 |

English Tool


## Uttarakhand rural

## Arithmetic

Table 7: \% Children by class and ARITHMETIC level All schools 2012

| Std. | Not even 1-9 | Recognize numbers |  | Can subtract | Can divide | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1-9 | 10-99 |  |  |  |
| I | 29.3 | 35.4 | 27.5 | 5.1 | 2.8 | 100 |
| II | 15.2 | 33.6 | 33.8 | 12.4 | 5.0 | 100 |
| III | 6.9 | 25.6 | 30.6 | 22.4 | 14.6 | 100 |
| IV | 5.6 | 21.3 | 25.5 | 24.3 | 23.3 | 100 |
| V | 2.6 | 15.4 | 18.8 | 28.3 | 35.0 | 100 |
| VI | 3.2 | 8.0 | 17.8 | 25.7 | 45.3 | 100 |
| VII | 1.4 | 6.0 | 17.9 | 21.5 | 53.2 | 100 |
| VIII | 1.4 | 5.0 | 15.4 | 20.8 | 57.4 | 100 |
| Total | 8.6 | 19.4 | 23.6 | 19.9 | 28.6 | 100 |

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level in arithmetic achieved by a child. For example, in Std 3, 6.9\% children cannot even recognize numbers 1-9, 25.6\% can recognize numbers up to 9 but not more, $30.6 \%$ can recognize numbers to 99 but cannot do subtraction, $22.4 \%$ can do subtraction but not division, and $14.6 \%$ can do division. For each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is $100 \%$.

## Chart 6: Trends over time

\% Children in Std III who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more By school type 2009-2012



## Math Tool



Chart 7: Trends over time
\% Children in Std V who CAN DO DIVISION
By school type 2009-2012



## Uttarakhand RURAL

Facilitated by PRATHAM

## Type of school and paid tuition classes

The ASER survey recorded information about tuition by asking the following question: "Does the child take any paid tuition class currently?" Therefore the numbers given below do not include any unpaid supplemental help in learning that children may have received.

| Table 8: Trends over time \% Children attending paid tuition classes By school type 2009-2012 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Children in Std I-VIII | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| Govt. schools: \% Children attending paid tuition classes | 6.0 | 6.6 | 6.6 | 7.2 |
| Private schools: \% Children attending paid tuition classes | 29.5 | 26.2 | 32.3 | 32.7 |
| All schools: \% Children attending paid tuition classes | 11.7 | 12.4 | 15.3 | 16.5 |

Table 9: Trends over time
\% Children by school type and tuition 2009-2012

| Year | Category |  | Std II | Std V | Std VIII | Std I-VIII |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2009 | Govt. | No tuition | 68.5 | 74.7 | 74.7 | 71.3 |
|  |  | Tuition | 1.9 | 5.2 | 6.9 | 4.6 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 22.9 | 13.1 | 10.6 | 17.0 |
|  |  | Tuition | 6.6 | 7.0 | 7.9 | 7.1 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 2010 | Govt. | No tuition | 60.1 | 69.1 | 70.2 | 65.6 |
|  |  | Tuition | 3.9 | 5.6 | 6.8 | 4.6 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 27.1 | 18.7 | 16.0 | 22.0 |
|  |  | Tuition | 8.9 | 6.6 | 7.1 | 7.8 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 2011 | Govt. | No tuition | 58.2 | 62.7 | 67.6 | 61.8 |
|  |  | Tuition | 2.9 | 4.5 | 7.9 | 4.4 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 30.2 | 20.4 | 15.1 | 22.9 |
|  |  | Tuition | 8.7 | 12.4 | 9.4 | 10.9 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 2012 | Govt. | No tuition | 53.1 | 58.0 | 65.5 | 58.9 |
|  |  | Tuition | 3.7 | 7.0 | 5.5 | 4.6 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 29.6 | 21.6 | 18.7 | 24.6 |
|  |  | Tuition | 13.7 | 13.4 | 10.3 | 12.0 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Chart 9: Trends over time
\% Children in Std III-V who CAN READ a Std I level text or more By school type and tuition 2009-2012



Chart 8: Trends over time
\% Children in Std I-VIII by school type and tuition 2009-2012


How to read this chart: This chart is a visual representation of the last column of Table 9. For a given year, the width of each colour band represents the \% of children in the corresponding category. For each year, these four categories add upto 100\%.

Chart 10: Trends over time
\% Children in Std III-V who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more By school type and tuition 2009-2012

facilitated by PRATHAM

## School observations

In each year's ASER, from 2009 onwards, in each sampled village, the largest government school with primary sections was visited on the day of the survey. Information about schools in this report is based on these visits.

Table 10: Number of schools visited 2009-2012

| Type of school | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Std I-IVN: Primary | 347 | 321 | 285 | 280 |
| Std I-VIINIII: Primary + <br> Upper primary | 7 | 16 | 12 | 7 |
| Total schools visited | 354 | 337 | 297 | 287 |

Table 11: Student and teacher attendance on the day of the visit 2009-2012

| Type of school | Std I-IVN |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| \% Enrolled children <br> present (Average) | 84.3 | 89.5 | 82.5 | 81.9 |
| \% Teachers present <br> (Average) | 94.5 | 91.2 | 92.0 | 86.8 |

Table 12: Small schools and multigrade classes 2009-2012

| School characteristics | Std I-IVN |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| \% Schools with total enrollment of 60 or less | 64.6 | 71.3 | 72.0 | 73.2 |
| \% Schools where Std II children observed <br> sitting with one or more other classes | 60.9 | 60.5 | 71.4 | 73.7 |
| \% Schools where Std IV children observed <br> sitting with one or more other classes | 55.8 | 55.6 | 64.2 | 72.6 |

## RTE indicators

Table 13: Schools meeting selected RTE norms 2010-2012

| \% Schools meeting the following RTE norms: |  | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pupil-teacher \& classroomteacher norms | Pupil-teacher ratio | 13.7 | 16.3 | 23.2 |
|  | Classroom-teacher ratio | 87.4 | 84.7 | 89.1 |
| Building | Office/store/office cum store | 87.7 | 83.0 | 84.9 |
|  | Playground | 67.0 | 67.5 | 65.0 |
|  | Boundary wall/fencing | 66.8 | 61.1 | 56.9 |
| Drinking water | No facility for drinking water | 22.1 | 19.3 | 21.7 |
|  | Facility but no drinking water available | 9.7 | 12.5 | 7.3 |
|  | Drinking water available | 68.3 | 68.2 | 71.0 |
| Toilet | No toilet facility | 5.8 | 4.9 | 2.9 |
|  | Facility but toilet not useable | 40.9 | 35.4 | 32.7 |
|  | Toilet useable | 53.4 | 59.7 | 64.4 |
| Girls toilet | \% Schools with no separate provisions for girls toilets | 47.7 | 14.1 | 16.0 |
|  | Of schools with separate girls toilets, \% schools with |  |  |  |
|  | Toilet locked | 11.5 | 13.2 | 12.3 |
|  | Toilet not useable | 16.9 | 19.4 | 18.9 |
|  | Toilet useable | 24.0 | 53.3 | 52.9 |
| Library | No library | 52.3 | 17.7 | 17.9 |
|  | Library but no books being used by children on day of visit | 27.2 | 41.8 | 42.5 |
|  | Library books being used by children on day of visit | 20.4 | 40.5 | 39.6 |
| Mid-day meal | Kitchen shed for cooking mid-day meal | 96.3 | 94.1 | 94.1 |
|  | Mid-day meal served in school on day of visit | 95.0 | 93.1 | 94.1 |



The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act, 2009 specifies a series of norms and standards for a school.

Norms for number of teachers vary according to the level of the school (primary or upper primary) and total student enrollment.

Norms for classrooms require the school to have at least one classroom for every teacher.

Norms for facilities require schools to provide each of the facilities mentioned in Table 13, among others.

RTE norms regulate provision of facilities but not their useability. ASER school observations also include whether facilities could be used. This information is included in Table 13.

## School funds and activities (PAISA)

Table 14: \% Schools that report receiving SSA grants - Full financial year

| SSA school grants | April 2009 to <br> March 2010 |  |  |  | April 2010 to <br> March 2011 |  |  |  | April 2011 to <br> March 2012 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No. } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Sch. } \end{aligned}$ | \% Schools |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { No. } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { Sch. } \end{gathered}$ | \% Schools |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { No. } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { Sch. } \end{gathered}$ | \% Schools |  |  |
|  |  | Yes | No | Don't know |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |  | Yes | No | Don't know |
| Maintenance grant | 315 | 85.1 | 6.7 | 8.3 | 287 | 76.0 | 15.7 | 8.4 | 280 | 86.1 | 4.6 | 9.3 |
| Development grant | 291 | 82.5 | 8.9 | 8.6 | 278 | 67.3 | 21.2 | 1.5 | 275 | 79.6 | 10.6 | 9.8 |
| TLM grant | 294 | 87.1 | 6.1 | 6.8 | 284 | 86.6 | 8.8 | 4.6 | 275 | 87.6 | 5.5 | 6.9 |

Table 15: \% Schools that report receiving SSA grants - Half financial year

| SSA school grants | April 2010 to date of survey (2010) |  |  |  | April 2011 to date of survey (2011) |  |  |  | April 2012 to date of survey (2012) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. of Sch. | \% Schools |  |  | No. of Sch. | \% Schools |  |  | No. of Sch. | \% Schools |  |  |
|  |  | Yes | No | Don't know |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |
| grant | 287 | 33.1 | 52.3 | 14.6 | 267 | 59.9 | 28.1 | 12.0 | 269 | 66.9 | 19.0 | 14.1 |
| Development grant | 277 | 31.4 | 54.2 | 14.4 | 258 | 55.8 | 30.6 | 13.6 | 264 | 60.2 | 23.1 | 16.7 |
| TLM grant | 278 | 50.0 | 38.5 | 11.5 | 260 | 60.8 | 29.6 | 9.6 | 267 | 61.8 | 24.3 | 13.9 |

Table 16: \% Schools carrying out different activities since April 2011

| Type of Activity |  | \% Schools |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Yes | No | Don't know |
| Const. | New Classroom | 14.0 | 80.9 | 5.2 |
| Repairs | Repair of building (roof, floor, wall etc.) | 44.0 | 52.4 | 3.7 |
|  | Repair of doors \& windows | 46.0 | 49.6 | 4.4 |
|  | Repair of boundary wall | 17.2 | 77.7 | 5.1 |
|  | Repair of drinking water facility | 36.3 | 59.3 | 4.4 |
|  | Repair of toilet | 26.0 | 69.7 | 4.3 |
| Painting \& whitewash | White wash/plastering | 65.2 | 29.7 | 5.1 |
|  | Painting blackboard/Display board/Painting on wall | 61.8 | 33.5 | 4.7 |
|  | Painting of doors \& walls | 59.4 | 36.2 | 4.4 |
| Purchase | Purchase of furniture (cupboard etc.) | 42.8 | 51.4 | 5.8 |
|  | Purchase of electrical fittings | 42.3 | 52.9 | 4.7 |
|  | Purchase of chalk, duster, register etc. | 91.7 | 4.0 | 4.4 |
|  | Purchase of sitting mats/Tat patti | 68.1 | 25.7 | 6.2 |
|  | Purchase of charts, globes \& other teaching material | 76.0 | 18.4 | 5.6 |
| Other | Expenditure on school events | 59.1 | 31.0 | 9.9 |
|  | Payment of bills (electricity, water, cleaning etc.) | 35.6 | 54.8 | 9.6 |

The PAISA section of ASER tracks receipt and spending of Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) grants at the school level. This information is collected from schools visited during the survey. This page reports proportion of schools receiving the grants and carrying out specified activities in the schools. More detailed analysis of the PAISA data will be available in the PAISA 2012 report which will be released in March $2013 .{ }^{1}$

## EVERY RURAL GOVERNMENT PRIMARY/UPPER PRIMARY SCHOOL IS ENTITLED TO EACH OF THESE SSA GRANTS EVERY YEAR.

| How much goes to |
| :---: | :--- |
| each school |$\quad$ For what purposes

SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT GRANT / SCHOOL GRANT
Rs. 5000 per year per primary school

Rs. 7000 per year per upper primary school

## Rs 5000 + Rs $7000=$

 Rs 12000 if the school is Std I-VIINIII.Note: Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same premises.

## SCHOOL MAINTENANCE GRANT

Rs. 5000 - Rs 7500 per school per year if the school has upto 3 classrooms.

Rs 7500 - Rs. 10000 per year if the school has more than 3 classrooms.

Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same building.

This grant can be used for maintenance of school building, including whitewashing; beautification; and repair of toilets, hand pump, boundary wall, playground etc.

The grant amount depends on number of classrooms (excluding Headmaster room and office room)

## TLM GRANT

Rs. 500 per teacher per year in primary and upper primary schools.

This grant can be used by teachers to buy teaching aids, such as charts, globes, posters, models etc.



## Uttar Pradesh rubal

## ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM HOUSEHOLDS. 69 OUT OF 69 DISTRICTS

Data has not been presented where sample size was insufficient.

## School enrollment and out of school children

Table 1: \% Children in different types of schools 2012

| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in <br> school | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age: 6-14 ALL | 42.7 | 48.5 | 2.5 | 6.4 | 100 |
| Age: 7-16 ALL | 39.5 | 48.6 | 2.1 | 9.8 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 45.0 | 48.2 | 2.9 | 4.0 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 BOYS | 40.8 | 53.0 | 2.6 | 3.6 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 GIRLS | 49.9 | 42.5 | 3.2 | 4.4 | 100 |
| Age: $11-14$ ALL | 37.8 | 50.4 | 1.8 | 10.0 | 100 |
| Age: $11-14$ BOYS | 34.8 | 54.9 | 1.6 | 8.8 | 100 |
| Age: $11-14$ GIRLS | 41.2 | 45.2 | 2.1 | 11.5 | 100 |
| Age: $15-16$ ALL | 29.3 | 45.7 | 0.9 | 24.2 | 100 |
| Age: $15-16$ BOYS | 29.9 | 47.5 | 0.6 | 22.0 | 100 |
| Age: $15-16$ GIRLS | 28.5 | 43.8 | 1.2 | 26.5 | 100 |

Note: 'Other' includes children going to madarsa and EGS.
'Not in school' = dropped out + never enrolled.

Chart 2: Trends over time
\% Children enrolled in private schools by class 2008-2012


Chart 1: Trends over time
\% Children out of school by age group and gender 2006-2012


How to read this chart: Each line shows trends in the proportion of children out of school for a particular subset of children. For example, the proportion of girls (age 1114) not in school has changed from $11.1 \%$ in 2006 to $8.4 \%$ in 2007 to $10.2 \%$ in 2008 , $9.5 \%$ in 2009 and to $9.7 \%$ in 2010 to $11.5 \%$ in 2012.
Table 2: Sample description
\% Children in each class by age 2012

| Std. | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 23.9 | 32.6 | 21.1 | 12.5 | 9.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| \|| | 3.8 | 12.4 | 30.2 | 27.2 | 9.7 | 10.1 | 6.7 |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| III |  | . 1 | 11.6 | 34.1 | 18.8 | 17.5 | 5.0 | 5.9 |  |  | . 0 |  | 100 |
| IV | 5.0 |  |  | 15.6 | 24.9 | 29.0 | 9.2 | 10.5 | 5.8 |  |  |  | 100 |
| V | 1.2 |  |  | 6.1 | 9.3 | 34.2 | 18.8 | 19.0 | 5.7 | 5.7 |  |  | 100 |
| VI | 5.7 |  |  |  |  | 16.2 | 25.9 | 31.7 | 10.5 | 5.9 | 4.1 |  | 100 |
| VII | 1.9 |  |  |  |  | 5.7 | 9.6 | 41.0 | 22.8 | 11.7 | 5.4 | 1.9 | 100 |
| VIII | 6.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 18.7 | 33.1 | 25.6 | 11.5 | 4.7 | 100 |

How to read this table: If a child started school in Std I at age 6, she should be of age 8 in Std III. This table shows the age distribution for each class. For example, in Std III, $34.1 \%$ children are 8 years old but there are also $11.6 \%$ who are $7,18.8 \%$ who are $9,17.5 \%$ who are 10 years old, etc.

## Young children in pre-school and school

Table 3: \% Children age 3-6 who are enrolled in different types of pre-school and school 2012

|  | In balwadi or anganwadi | $\begin{gathered} \text { In LKG/ } \\ \text { UKG } \end{gathered}$ | In School |  |  | Not in school or preschool | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Govt. | Pvt. | Other |  |  |
| Age 3 | 15.6 | 7.6 |  |  |  | 76.8 | 100 |
| Age 4 | 19.8 | 20.7 |  |  |  | 59.5 | 100 |
| Age 5 | 9.2 | 22.2 | 26.9 | 17.4 | 2.1 | 22.2 | 100 |
| Age 6 | 3.1 | 15.6 | 39.3 | 29.3 | 2.6 | 10.2 | 100 |

Chart 3: Trends over time
\% Children age 3, 4 and 5 not enrolled in school or pre-school 2006-2012*


[^8]
## Reading

Table 4: \% Children by class and READING level All schools 2012

| Std. | Not even <br> letter | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (Std I Text) | Level 2 <br> (Std II Text) | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 53.9 | 33.7 | 6.4 | 3.1 | 3.0 | 100 |
| II | 28.1 | 40.2 | 13.5 | 8.6 | 9.6 | 100 |
| III | 18.2 | 34.1 | 16.0 | 13.1 | 18.7 | 100 |
| IV | 11.8 | 26.4 | 14.8 | 15.4 | 31.7 | 100 |
| V | 9.4 | 19.6 | 13.0 | 15.4 | 42.7 | 100 |
| VI | 5.5 | 15.1 | 10.5 | 15.5 | 53.4 | 100 |
| VII | 3.4 | 11.9 | 8.8 | 14.1 | 61.8 | 100 |
| VIII | 2.7 | 9.1 | 7.0 | 11.6 | 69.6 | 100 |
| Total | 20.7 | 26.1 | 11.2 | 11.2 | 30.8 | 100 |

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level in reading achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, $18.2 \%$ children cannot even read letters, $34.1 \%$ can read letters but not more, $16.0 \%$ can read words but not Std I text or higher, $13.1 \%$ can read Std I text but not Std II level text, and $18.7 \%$ can read Std II level text. For each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is $100 \%$.

Chart 4: Trends over time
\% Children in Std III who CAN READ Std I level text By school type 2009-2012


## Reading Tool



Chart 5: Trends over time
\% Children in Std V who CAN READ Std II level text By school type 2009-2012


## Reading and comprehension in English

Table 5: \% Children by class and READING level in ENGLISH All schools 2012

| Std. | Not <br> even <br> capital <br> letters | Capital <br> letters | Small <br> letters | Simple <br> words <br> I | Easy <br> sen- <br> tences | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| II | 42.4 | 18.5 | 11.8 | 4.2 | 1.2 | 100 |
| III | 33.7 | 24.9 | 20.3 | 23.4 | 13.2 | 3.2 |
| IV | 25.6 | 21.8 | 24.8 | 18.0 | 9.5 | 100 |
| V | 20.4 | 18.5 | 24.3 | 21.3 | 15.5 | 100 |
| VII | 14.7 | 16.3 | 26.2 | 23.3 | 19.5 | 100 |
| VII | 11.8 | 13.2 | 23.7 | 25.2 | 26.1 | 100 |
| VIII | 9.1 | 11.0 | 21.6 | 26.5 | 31.9 | 100 |
| Total | 32.2 | 19.3 | 21.2 | 15.6 | 11.7 | 100 |

Table 6: \% Children by class who CAN COMPREHEND ENGLISH All schools 2012

| Std. | Of those who <br> can read words, <br> \% who can tell <br> meanings of <br> the words | Of those who <br> can read <br> sentences, \% who <br> can tell meanings <br> of the sentences |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| I | 59.2 |  |
| II | 59.5 | 40.4 |
| IIII | 54.7 | 42.8 |
| IV | 61.7 | 51.2 |
| V | 56.8 | 47.9 |
| VI | 58.4 | 53.5 |
| VII | 62.2 | 59.6 |
| VIIII | 61.1 | 61.2 |
| Total | 59.3 | 54.0 |

English Tool


## Uttar Pradesh rural

facilitated by PRATHAM

## Arithmetic

Table 7: \% Children by class and ARITHMETIC level All schools 2012

| Std. | Not even 1-9 | Recognize numbers |  | Can subtract | Can divide | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1-9 | 10-99 |  |  |  |
| 1 | 49.0 | 37.3 | 10.9 | 2.1 | 0.7 | 100 |
| \\| | 22.2 | 47.4 | 20.7 | 7.6 | 2.2 | 100 |
| III | 13.4 | 41.0 | 26.8 | 12.4 | 6.4 | 100 |
| IV | 7.4 | 32.6 | 29.4 | 17.2 | 13.3 | 100 |
| V | 5.8 | 24.9 | 28.8 | 19.4 | 21.1 | 100 |
| VI | 3.4 | 19.4 | 30.3 | 22.3 | 24.6 | 100 |
| VII | 2.2 | 15.0 | 28.6 | 22.3 | 31.9 | 100 |
| VIII | 1.9 | 11.3 | 27.2 | 23.1 | 36.5 | 100 |
| Total | 16.9 | 31.1 | 23.9 | 14.0 | 14.1 | 100 |

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level in arithmetic achieved by a child. For example, in Std 3, 13.4\% children cannot even recognize numbers 1-9, 41\% can recognize numbers up to 9 but not more, $26.8 \%$ can recognize numbers to 99 but cannot do subtraction, $12.4 \%$ can do subtraction but not division, and $6.4 \%$ can do division. For each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is $100 \%$.

Chart 6: Trends over time
\% Children in Std III who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more
By school type 2009-2012



Math Tool

| $\begin{gathered} 1414 \\ +1 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | mint |  | $\square$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 1 | TI | 41 | $\begin{array}{r} 14 \\ -4 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 15 \\ -14 \end{array}$ |  |
| T | 1 | III | 11 | $\begin{array}{r} 41 \\ -17 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 11 \\ 11 \end{array}$ | 4141 |
|  |  | 3 | 11 |  |  |  |
| 1 | 1 |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} 11 \\ 11 \end{array}$ | $\frac{11}{11}$ | $1{ }^{1+1}$ |
|  |  | 4 | 14 |  | $-$ | 7 |
| 4 | + |  |  | -4 | H |  |
|  |  | +11 | 11 |  |  | 3134 |
| $3-1+1 m=3+7=\pi$ |  |  |  | 4 - |  | 패ำ*- |

Chart 7: Trends over time
\% Children in Std V who CAN DO DIVISION
By school type 2009-2012


## Type of school and paid tuition classes

The ASER survey recorded information about tuition by asking the following question: "Does the child take any paid tuition class currently?" Therefore the numbers given below do not include any unpaid supplemental help in learning that children may have received.

| Table 8: Trends over time \% Children attending paid tuition classes By school type 2009-2012 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Children in Std I-VIII | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| Govt. schools: \% Children attending paid tuition classes | 7.0 | 5.9 | 6.1 | 6.4 |
| Private schools: \% Children attending paid tuition classes | 18.5 | 15.0 | 14.5 | 15.9 |
| All schools: \% Children attending paid tuition classes | 11.2 | 9.5 | 10.1 | 11.2 |

Table 9: Trends over time
\% Children by school type and tuition 2009-2012

| Year | Category |  | Std II | Std V | Std VIII | Std I-VIII |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2009 | Govt | No tuition | 60.4 | 62.7 | 50.3 | 59.0 |
|  |  | Tuition | 3.8 | 4.9 | 6.8 | 4.5 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 30.4 | 25.6 | 32.3 | 29.8 |
|  |  | Tuition | 5.5 | 6.8 | 10.6 | 6.8 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 2010 | Govt | No tuition | 59.3 | 58.6 | 49.3 | 56.6 |
|  |  | Tuition | 2.8 | 4.9 | 4.9 | 3.6 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 33.2 | 30.4 | 37.2 | 33.9 |
|  |  | Tuition | 4.7 | 6.2 | 8.7 | 6.0 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 2011 | Govt | No tuition | 49.5 | 51.9 | 46.3 | 49.5 |
|  |  | Tuition | 2.4 | 3.4 | 5.2 | 3.2 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 41.9 | 37.5 | 39.2 | 40.4 |
|  |  | Tuition | 6.3 | 7.2 | 9.3 | 6.8 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 2012 | Govt | No tuition | 45.8 | 45.4 | 44.1 | 46.2 |
|  |  | Tuition | 2.4 | 3.4 | 4.6 | 3.2 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 44.1 | 42.2 | 41.4 | 42.6 |
|  |  | Tuition | 7.7 | 9.0 | 10.0 | 8.1 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Chart 9: Trends over time
\% Children in Std III-V who CAN READ a Std I level text or more By school type and tuition 2009-2012



Chart 8: Trends over time
\% Children in Std I-VIII by school type and tuition 2009-2012


How to read this chart: This chart is a visual representation of the last column of Table 9. For a given year, the width of each colour band represents the \% of children in the corresponding category. For each year, these four categories add upto 100\%.

Chart 10: Trends over time
\% Children in Std III-V who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more By school type and tuition 2009-2012

facilitated by PRATHAM

## School observations

In each year's ASER, from 2009 onwards, in each sampled village, the largest government school with primary sections was visited on the day of the survey. Information about schools in this report is based on these visits.

Table 10: Number of schools visited 2009-2012

| Type of school | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Std I-IVN: Primary | 1799 | 1633 | 1601 | 1584 |
| Std I-VIINIII: Primary + <br> Upper primary | 90 | 263 | 299 | 304 |
| Total schools visited | 1889 | 1896 | 1900 | 1888 |

Table 11: Student and teacher attendance on the day of the visit 2009-2012

| Type of school | Std I-IVN |  |  |  | Std I-VIIIVIII |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| \% Enrolled children <br> present (Average) | 59.7 | 57.6 | 57.3 | 54.9 | 61.7 | 57.6 | 57.2 | 56.7 |
| \% Teachers present <br> (Average) | 89.3 | 81.0 | 82.1 | 80.0 | 85.8 | 79.8 | 83.8 | 83.0 |

Table 12: Small schools and multigrade classes 2009-2012

| School characteristics | Std I-IVN |  |  |  | Std I-VIINIII |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| \% Schools with total enrollment of 60 or less | 4.5 | 5.3 | 6.3 | 7.6 | 1.1 | 0.4 | 2.3 | 2.0 |
| \% Schools where Std II children observed <br> sitting with one or more other classes | 50.1 | 51.4 | 53.8 | 64.0 | 43.2 | 48.4 | 55.9 | 60.3 |
| \% Schools where Std IV children observed <br> sitting with one or more other classes | 50.0 | 46.5 | 51.8 | 62.1 | 40.0 | 42.0 | 49.7 | 54.0 |

## RTE indicators

Table 13: Schools meeting selected RTE norms 2010-2012

| \% Schools meeting the following RTE norms: |  | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pupil-teacher \& classroomteacher norms | Pupil-teacher ratio | 16.1 | 16.5 | 15.6 |
|  | Classroom-teacher ratio | 81.6 | 80.3 | 78.3 |
| Building | Office/store/office cum store | 88.6 | 88.1 | 88.4 |
|  | Playground | 60.8 | 71.1 | 66.9 |
|  | Boundary wall/fencing | 44.4 | 57.9 | 58.5 |
| Drinking water | No facility for drinking water | 6.9 | 5.4 | 3.9 |
|  | Facility but no drinking water available | 10.9 | 10.2 | 14.8 |
|  | Drinking water available | 82.2 | 84.4 | 81.3 |
| Toilet | No toilet facility | 6.7 | 7.4 | 5.5 |
|  | Facility but toilet not useable | 45.9 | 38.8 | 42.0 |
|  | Toilet useable | 47.4 | 53.9 | 52.5 |
| Girls toilet | \% Schools with no separate provisions for girls toilets | 24.9 | 16.6 | 16.7 |
|  | Of schools with separate girls toilets, \% schools with |  |  |  |
|  | Toilet locked | 25.3 | 19.1 | 20.2 |
|  | Toilet not useable | 15.9 | 16.9 | 19.3 |
|  | Toilet useable | 33.9 | 47.4 | 43.7 |
| Library | No library | 51.4 | 22.9 | 17.8 |
|  | Library but no books being used by children on day of visit | 25.8 | 39.9 | 41.3 |
|  | Library books being used by children on day of visit | 22.9 | 37.2 | 40.9 |
| Mid-day meal | Kitchen shed for cooking mid-day meal | 89.3 | 94.7 | 94.2 |
|  | Mid-day meal served in school on day of visit | 71.3 | 95.0 | 85.6 |



The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act, 2009 specifies a series of norms and standards for a school.

Norms for number of teachers vary according to the level of the school (primary or upper primary) and total student enrollment.

Norms for classrooms require the school to have at least one classroom for every teacher.

Norms for facilities require schools to provide each of the facilities mentioned in Table 13, among others.

RTE norms regulate provision of facilities but not their useability. ASER school observations also include whether facilities could be used. This information is included in Table 13.

## School funds and activities (PAISA)

Table 14: \% Schools that report receiving SSA grants - Full financial year

| SSA school grants | April 2009 to <br> March 2010 |  |  |  | April 2010 to <br> March 2011 |  |  |  | April 2011 to <br> March 2012 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No. } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Sch. } \end{aligned}$ | \% Schools |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { No. } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { Sch. } \end{gathered}$ | \% Schools |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No. } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Sch. } \end{aligned}$ | \% Schools |  |  |
|  |  | Yes | No | Don't know |  | Yes | No | Don't know |  | Yes | No | Don't know |
| Maintenance grant | 1799 | 68.0 | 5.2 | 26.8 | 1884 | 80.2 | 6.2 | 13.7 | 1865 | 81.2 | 6.1 | 12.7 |
| Development grant | 1763 | 62.3 | 9.5 | 28.2 | 1880 | 72.3 | 12.8 | 14.9 | 1861 | 74.4 | 11.5 | 14. |
| TLM grant | 1733 | 74.6 | 7.0 | 18.4 | 1883 | 80.5 | 9.9 | 9.6 | 1861 | 83.8 | 8.4 | 7.8 |

Table 15: \% Schools that report receiving SSA grants - Half financial year

| SSA school grants | April 2010 to date of survey (2010) |  |  |  | April 2011 to date of survey (2011) |  |  |  | April 2012 to date of survey (2012) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { No. } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { Sch. } \end{gathered}$ | \% Schools |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { No. } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { Sch. } \end{gathered}$ | \% Schools |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No. } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Sch. } \end{aligned}$ | \% Schools |  |  |
|  |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |  | Yes | No | Don't know |
| Maintenance grant | 1759 | 37.0 | 30.2 | 32.8 | 1870 | 54.1 | 28.8 | 17.1 | 1851 | 25.3 | 59.3 | 15 |
| Development grant | 1736 | 32.8 | 32.5 | 34.7 | 1861 | 46.2 | 35.1 | 18.7 | 1846 | 21.3 | 62.8 | 15.9 |
| TLM grant | 1705 | 38.1 | 34.7 | 27.2 | 1862 | 39.3 | 45.8 | 15.0 | 1845 | 24.9 | 64.1 | 11. |

Table 16: \% Schools carrying out different activities since April 2011

| Type of Activity |  | \% Schools |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Yes | No | Don't know |
| Const. | New Classroom | 20.6 | 73.4 | 6.0 |
| Repairs | Repair of building (roof, floor, wall etc.) | 38.3 | 55.9 | 5.8 |
|  | Repair of doors \& windows | 42.5 | 51.5 | 6.0 |
|  | Repair of boundary wall | 21.9 | 72.1 | 6.1 |
|  | Repair of drinking water facility | 41.8 | 52.0 | 6.2 |
|  | Repair of toilet | 28.4 | 65.2 | 6.4 |
| Painting \& whitewash | White wash/plastering | 85.0 | 10.1 | 5.0 |
|  | Painting blackboard/Display board/Painting on wall | 80.5 | 14.5 | 4.9 |
|  | Painting of doors \& walls | 80.9 | 14.0 | 5.2 |
| Purchase | Purchase of furniture (cupboard etc.) | 44.1 | 48.6 | 7.3 |
|  | Purchase of electrical fittings | 30.7 | 62.9 | 6.4 |
|  | Purchase of chalk, duster, register etc. | 89.8 | 5.3 | 4.9 |
|  | Purchase of sitting mats/Tat patti | 81.4 | 13.7 | 4.9 |
|  | Purchase of charts, globes \& other teaching material | 76.6 | 18.1 | 5.3 |
| Other | Expenditure on school events | 72.3 | 21.8 | 5.9 |
|  | Payment of bills (electricity, water, cleaning etc.) | 17.0 | 73.7 | 9.3 |

The PAISA section of ASER tracks receipt and spending of Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) grants at the school level. This information is collected from schools visited during the survey. This page reports proportion of schools receiving the grants and carrying out specified activities in the schools. More detailed analysis of the PAISA data will be available in the PAISA 2012 report which will be released in March $2013 .{ }^{1}$

## EVERY RURAL GOVERNMENT PRIMARY/UPPER PRIMARY SCHOOL IS ENTITLED TO EACH OF THESE sSA GRANTS EVERY YEAR.

| How much goes to |
| :---: | :--- |
| each school |$\quad$ For what purposes

SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT GRANT / SCHOOL GRANT
Rs. 5000 per year per primary school

Rs. 7000 per year per upper primary school

## Rs $5000+$ Rs $7000=$ Rs 12000 if the school is Std I-VIIINIII.

Note: Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same premises.

## SCHOOL MAINTENANCE GRANT

Rs. 5000 - Rs 7500 per school per year if the school has upto 3 classrooms.

Rs 7500 - Rs. 10000 per year if the school has more than 3 classrooms.

Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same building.

This grant can be used for maintenance of school building, including whitewashing; beautification; and repair of toilets, hand pump, boundary wall, playground etc.

The grant amount depends on number of classrooms (excluding Headmaster room and office room)

## TLM GRANT

Rs. 500 per teacher per year in primary and upper primary schools.

This grant can be used by teachers to buy teaching aids, such as charts, globes, posters, models etc.

## West Bengal rural

Facilitated by PRATHAM
ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM HOUSEHOLDS. 16 OUT OF 17 DISTRICTS
Data has not been presented where sample size was insufficient.

## School enrollment and out of school children

Table 1: \% Children in different types of schools 2012

| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in <br> school | Total |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| Age: 6-14 ALL | 87.9 | 6.9 | 1.9 | 3.3 | 100 |
| Age: 7-16 ALL | 86.8 | 5.4 | 1.9 | 5.9 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 87.0 | 10.2 | 1.3 | 1.5 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 BOYS | 86.0 | 11.4 | 1.3 | 1.4 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 GIRLS | 88.2 | 9.0 | 1.3 | 1.5 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 ALL | 89.4 | 2.7 | 2.5 | 5.4 | 100 |
| Age: $11-14$ BOYS | 88.6 | 2.5 | 2.4 | 6.5 | 100 |
| Age: $11-14$ GIRLS | 90.4 | 2.7 | 2.7 | 4.2 | 100 |
| Age: $15-16$ ALL | 79.8 | 1.4 | 1.8 | 17.0 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 BOYS | 78.0 | 1.2 | 0.6 | 20.2 | 100 |
| Age: $15-16$ GIRLS | 81.9 | 1.3 | 3.0 | 13.8 | 100 |

Note: 'Other' includes children going to madarsa and EGS. 'Not in school' = dropped out + never enrolled

Chart 2: Trends over time \% Children enrolled in private schools by class 2008-2012


## Young children in pre-school and school

Table 3: \% Children age 3-6 who are enrolled in different types of pre-school and school 2012

|  | In balwadi or anganwadi | In LKG/ UKG | In School |  |  | Not in school or preschool | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Govt. | Pvt. | Other |  |  |
| Age 3 | 71.5 | 4.6 |  |  |  | 23.9 | 100 |
| Age 4 | 71.4 | 15.2 |  |  |  | 13.4 | 100 |
| Age 5 | 29.5 | 9.7 | 41.3 | 8.6 | 0.8 | 10.1 | 100 |
| Age 6 | 7.3 | 7.6 | 69.0 | 11.4 | 1.0 | 3.8 | 100 |

ASER 2012

Chart 1: Trends over time
\% Children out of school by age group and gender 2006-2012


How to read this chart: Each line shows trends in the proportion of children out of school for a particular subset of children. For example, the proportion of girls (age 1114) not in school has changed from $12.1 \%$ in 2006 to $8.3 \%$ in 2007 to $7.7 \%$ in 2008, $8.5 \%$ in 2009 and to $5.5 \%$ in 2010 to $4.2 \%$ in 2012.

Table 2: Sample description
\% Children in each class by age 2012

| Std. | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 26.5 | 39.0 | 21.8 | 7.0 | 5.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| \|| | 2.5 | 18.0 | 41.0 | 23.9 | 7.6 | 7.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| III |  | 6 | 14.1 | 38.9 | 23.0 | 12.2 | 8.3 |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| IV | 2.9 |  |  | 14.2 | 33.2 | 30.7 | 9.4 | 5.2 | 4.5 |  |  |  | 100 |
| V | 3.1 |  |  |  | 11.1 | 38.9 | 26.0 | 14.6 | 6.3 |  |  |  | 100 |
| VI | 1.4 |  |  |  |  | 12.3 | 29.2 | 35.9 | 12.5 | 5.9 | 2.7 |  | 100 |
| VII | 2.3 |  |  |  |  |  | 9.5 | 36.9 | 28.8 | 15.3 | 7.2 |  | 100 |
| VIII | 2.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 14.9 | 33.9 | 30.6 | 12.9 | 5.6 | 100 |

How to read this table: If a child started school in Std I at age 6, she should be of age 8 in Std III. This table shows the age distribution for each class. For example, in Std III, $38.9 \%$ children are 8 years old but there also $14.1 \%$ who are $7,23.0 \%$ who are 9 , $12.2 \%$ who are 10 years old and $8.3 \%$ who are older.

Chart 3: Trends over time
\% Children age 3, 4 and 5 not enrolled in school or pre-school 2006-2012*


* Data for 2011 is not comparable and therefore excluded here.


## Reading

Table 4: \% Children by class and READING level
All schools 2012

| Std. | Not even <br> letter | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (Std I Text) | Level 2 <br> (Std II Text) | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 28.3 | 38.1 | 20.1 | 6.6 | 6.9 | 100 |
| III | 15.4 | 32.7 | 24.0 | 13.0 | 14.9 | 100 |
| IIII | 11.3 | 24.3 | 18.8 | 17.7 | 27.9 | 100 |
| IV | 6.8 | 15.3 | 17.3 | 19.2 | 41.3 | 100 |
| V | 3.7 | 11.2 | 14.9 | 21.5 | 48.7 | 100 |
| VII | 4.1 | 7.7 | 11.7 | 18.2 | 58.4 | 100 |
| VII | 1.5 | 4.3 | 8.0 | 15.9 | 70.3 | 100 |
| VIII | 1.6 | 4.2 | 4.8 | 13.3 | 76.2 | 100 |
| Total | 9.7 | 17.9 | 15.3 | 15.6 | 41.6 | 100 |

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level in reading achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, $11.3 \%$ children cannot even read letters, $24.3 \%$ can read letters but not more, $18.8 \%$ can read words but not Std I text or higher, $17.7 \%$ can read Std I text but not Std II level text, and $27.9 \%$ can read Std II level text. For each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is $100 \%$.

## Chart 4: Trends over time

\% Children in Std III who CAN READ Std I level text
By school type 2009-2012


## Reading Tool



Chart 5: Trends over time
\% Children in Std V who CAN READ Std II level text
By school type 2009-2012


## Reading and comprehension in English

Table 5: \% Children by class and READING level in ENGLISH All schools 2012

| Std. | Not <br> even <br> capital <br> letters | Capital <br> letters | Small <br> letters | Simple <br> words | Easy <br> sen- <br> tences | Total |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 44.5 | 20.7 | 19.6 | 12.6 | 2.7 | 100 |
| II | 28.6 | 21.5 | 22.3 | 20.9 | 6.7 | 100 |
| III | 24.4 | 18.5 | 23.1 | 25.0 | 9.0 | 100 |
| IV | 14.9 | 15.7 | 23.0 | 30.0 | 16.5 | 100 |
| V | 10.8 | 14.5 | 24.4 | 26.4 | 23.9 | 100 |
| VII | 8.9 | 10.5 | 24.4 | 30.2 | 26.0 | 100 |
| VIII | 5.5 | 7.7 | 21.7 | 29.5 | 35.6 | 100 |
| VIII | 3.0 | 5.7 | 17.5 | 33.6 | 40.2 | 100 |
| Total | 18.4 | 14.7 | 22.1 | 25.5 | 19.3 | 100 |

Table 6: \% Children by class who CAN COMPREHEND ENGLISH All schools 2012

| Std. | Of those who <br> can read words, <br> \% who can tell <br> meanings of <br> the words | Of those who <br> can read <br> sentences, $\%$ who <br> can tell meanings <br> of the sentences |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| I |  |  |
| II | 80.9 |  |
| III | 78.8 |  |
| IV | 71.5 | 60.2 |
| V | 68.7 | 65.2 |
| VI | 70.9 | 63.6 |
| VII | 66.0 | 62.8 |
| VIII | 64.7 | 64.5 |
| Total | 72.0 | 63.0 |

English Tool


## West Bengal rural

## Arithmetic

Table 7: \% Children by class and ARITHMETIC level
All schools 2012

| Std. | Not even 1-9 | Recognize numbers |  | Can subtract | Can divide | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1-9 | 10-99 |  |  |  |
| I | 21.6 | 47.1 | 21.1 | 7.9 | 2.3 | 100 |
| 1 | 8.5 | 40.7 | 28.9 | 16.5 | 5.4 | 100 |
| III | 4.1 | 30.8 | 36.8 | 18.4 | 9.9 | 100 |
| IV | 3.9 | 18.9 | 29.0 | 27.5 | 20.6 | 100 |
| V | 1.3 | 12.9 | 33.1 | 24.2 | 28.5 | 100 |
| VI | 1.5 | 9.0 | 37.5 | 21.6 | 30.4 | 100 |
| VII | 1.1 | 3.5 | 34.8 | 21.9 | 38.7 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.7 | 4.6 | 30.4 | 21.7 | 42.7 | 100 |
| Total | 5.8 | 21.8 | 31.2 | 19.8 | 21.5 | 100 |

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level in arithmetic achieved by a child. For example, in Std 3, 4.1\% children cannot even recognize numbers 1-9, $30.8 \%$ can recognize numbers up to 9 but not more, $36.8 \%$ can recognize numbers to 99 but cannot do subtraction, $18.4 \%$ can do subtraction but not division, and 9.9\% can do division. For each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is $100 \%$.

Chart 6: Trends over time
\% Children in Std III who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more
By school type 2009-2012



## West Bengal rural

## Type of school and paid tuition classes

The ASER survey recorded information about tuition by asking the following question: "Does the child take any paid tuition class currently?" Therefore the numbers given below do not include any unpaid supplemental help in learning that children may have received.

| Table 8: Trends over time \% Children attending paid tuition classes By school type 2009-2012 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Children in Std I-VIII | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| Govt. schools: \% Children attending paid tuition classes | 73.2 | 70.8 | 72.9 | 72.0 |
| Private schools: \% Children attending paid tuition classes | 73.2 | 66.1 | 63.9 | 69.1 |
| All schools: \% Children attending paid tuition classes | 73.2 | 70.5 | 72.3 | 71.8 |

Table 9: Trends over time
\% Children by school type and tuition 2009-2012

| Year | Category |  | Std II | Std V | Std VIII | Std I-VIII |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2009 | Govt. | No tuition | 31.7 | 23.8 | 13.1 | 25.1 |
|  |  | Tuition | 56.1 | 73.7 | 84.7 | 68.6 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 3.5 | 0.3 | 0.6 | 1.7 |
|  |  | Tuition | 8.8 | 2.2 | 1.6 | 4.6 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 2010 | Govt. | No tuition | 32.9 | 23.8 | 16.8 | 27.8 |
|  |  | Tuition | 58.2 | 73.7 | 82.4 | 67.2 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 2.4 | 0.9 | 0.2 | 1.7 |
|  |  | Tuition | 6.5 | 1.7 | 0.6 | 3.4 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 2011 | Govt. | No tuition | 30.8 | 22.6 | 18.1 | 25.4 |
|  |  | Tuition | 57.8 | 75.2 | 80.9 | 68.3 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 3.5 | 1.2 | 0.4 | 2.3 |
|  |  | Tuition | 8.0 | 1.0 | 0.7 | 4.0 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 2012 | Govt. | No tuition | 32.1 | 23.5 | 18.6 | 26.1 |
|  |  | Tuition | 56.8 | 73.2 | 79.3 | 67.0 |
|  | Pvt. | No tuition | 3.4 | 1.3 | 0.7 | 2.1 |
|  |  | Tuition | 7.7 | 2.0 | 1.4 | 4.7 |
|  | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Chart 9: Trends over time
\% Children in Std III-V who CAN READ a Std I level text or more By school type and tuition 2009-2012



Chart 8: Trends over time
\% Children in Std I-VIII by school type and tuition 2009-2012


How to read this chart: This chart is a visual representation of the last column of Table 9 For a given year, the width of each colour band represents the \% of children in the corresponding category. For each year, these four categories add upto 100\%.

Chart 10: Trends over time
\% Children in Std III-V who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more By school type and tuition 2009-2012


## School observations

In each year's ASER, from 2009 onwards, in each sampled village, the largest government school with primary sections was visited on the day of the survey. Information about schools in this report is based on these visits.

Table 10: Number of schools visited 2009-2012

| Type of school | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Std I-IVN: Primary | 417 | 406 | 400 | 405 |
| Std I-VIINIII: Primary + <br> Upper primary | 7 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| Total schools visited | 424 | 408 | 401 | 408 |

Table 11: Student and teacher attendance on the day of the visit 2009-2012

| Type of school | Std I-IV/N |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| \% Enrolled children <br> present (Average) | 65.9 | 68.5 | 60.7 | 59.8 |
| \% Teachers present <br> (Average) | 87.7 | 85.6 | 86.3 | 83.9 |

Table 12: Small schools and multigrade classes 2009-2012

| School characteristics | Std I-IVN |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| \% Schools with total enrollment of 60 or less | 12.5 | 10.2 | 13.2 | 15.8 |
| \% Schools where Std II children observed <br> sitting with one or more other classes | 46.6 | 42.6 | 38.7 | 38.9 |
| \% Schools where Std IV children observed <br> sitting with one or more other classes | 38.7 | 33.8 | 30.9 | 31.0 |

## RTE indicators

Table 13: Schools meeting selected RTE norms 2010-2012

| \% Schools meeting the following RTE norms: |  | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pupil-teacher \& classroomteacher norms | Pupil-teacher ratio | 26.2 | 34.4 | 33.2 |
|  | Classroom-teacher ratio | 64.8 | 64.5 | 67.4 |
| Building | Office/store/office cum store | 79.0 | 80.9 | 78.3 |
|  | Playground | 42.1 | 50.5 | 54.3 |
|  | Boundary wall/fencing | 34.5 | 42.2 | 44.0 |
| Drinking water | No facility for drinking water | 19.3 | 21.1 | 16.9 |
|  | Facility but no drinking water available | 13.5 | 15.5 | 11.2 |
|  | Drinking water available | 67.2 | 63.4 | 71.9 |
| Toilet | No toilet facility | 7.6 | 8.6 | 6.9 |
|  | Facility but toilet not useable | 40.3 | 42.0 | 34.3 |
|  | Toilet useable | 52.1 | 49.5 | 58.8 |
| Girls toilet | \% Schools with no separate provisions for girls toilets | 44.5 | 26.1 | 33.5 |
|  | Of schools with separate girls toilets, \% schools with |  |  |  |
|  | Toilet locked | 14.5 | 19.2 | 13.6 |
|  | Toilet not useable | 17.4 | 13.4 | 8.9 |
|  | Toilet useable | 23.7 | 41.2 | 44.0 |
| Library | No library | 50.5 | 39.2 | 35.3 |
|  | Library but no books being used by children on day of visit | 17.8 | 18.8 | 24.0 |
|  | Library books being used by children on day of visit | 31.8 | 42.0 | 40.7 |
| Mid-day meal | Kitchen shed for cooking mid-day meal | 86.3 | 86.8 | 90.2 |
|  | Mid-day meal served in school on day of visit | 63.4 | 54.3 | 59.7 |



The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act, 2009 specifies a series of norms and standards for a school.

Norms for number of teachers vary according to the level of the school (primary or upper primary) and total student enrollment.

Norms for classrooms require the school to have at least one classroom for every teacher.

Norms for facilities require schools to provide each of the facilities mentioned in Table 13, among others.

RTE norms regulate provision of facilities but not their useability. ASER school observations also include whether facilities could be used. This information is included in Table 13.

## School funds and activities (PAISA)

Table 14: \% Schools that report receiving SSA grants - Full financial year

| SSA school grants | April 2009 to <br> March 2010 |  |  |  | April 2010 to March 2011 |  |  |  | April 2011 to <br> March 2012 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No. } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Sch. } \end{aligned}$ | \% Schools |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { No. } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { Sch. } \end{gathered}$ | \% Schools |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { No. } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { Sch. } \end{gathered}$ | \% Schools |  |  |
|  |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |  | Yes | No | Don't know |
| Maintenance grant | 377 | 80.4 | 10.6 | 9.0 | 380 | 72.1 | 17.9 | 10.0 | 400 | 79.3 | 13.5 | 7.3 |
| Development grant | 363 | 73.6 | 7.4 | 9.1 | 375 | 62.4 | 28.0 | 9.6 | 400 | 68.8 | 22.8 | 8.5 |
| TLM grant | 374 | 85.3 | 8.6 | 6.2 | 379 | 77.8 | 14.0 | 8.2 | 400 | 86.0 | 9.8 | 4.3 |

Table 15: \% Schools that report receiving SSA grants - Half financial year

| SSA school grants | April 2010 to date of survey (2010) |  |  |  | April 2011 to date of survey (2011) |  |  |  | April 2012 to date of survey (2012) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No. } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Sch. } \end{aligned}$ | \% Schools |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { No. } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { Sch. } \end{gathered}$ | \% Schools |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { No. } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { Sch. } \end{gathered}$ | \% Schools |  |  |
|  |  | Yes | No | Don't know |  | Yes | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Don't } \\ & \text { know } \end{aligned}$ |  | Yes | No | Don't know |
| Maintenance grant | 346 | 31.2 | 59.5 | 9.3 | 364 | 39.6 | 51.1 | 9.3 | 393 | 47.3 | 45.6 | 7. |
| Development grant | 320 | 28.1 | 62.2 | 9.7 | 353 | 33.7 | 56.1 | 10.2 | 393 | 38.9 | 51 |  |
| TLM grant | 322 | 32.3 | 59.0 | 8.7 | 363 | 42.2 | 48.8 | 9.1 | 389 | 53.5 | 40.1 | 6. |

Table 16: \% Schools carrying out different activities since April 2011

| Type of Activity |  | \% Schools |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Yes | No | Don't know |
| Const. | New Classroom | 25.8 | 71.7 | 2.5 |
| Repairs | Repair of building (roof, floor, wall etc.) | 50.8 | 47.8 | 1.5 |
|  | Repair of doors \& windows | 47.8 | 50.0 | 2.3 |
|  | Repair of boundary wall | 15.2 | 82.5 | 2.3 |
|  | Repair of drinking water facility | 41.5 | 56.0 | 2.5 |
|  | Repair of toilet | 34.3 | 63.0 | 2.8 |
| Painting \& whitewash | White wash/plastering | 47.5 | 51.0 | 1.5 |
|  | Painting blackboard/Display board/Painting on wall | 50.3 | 48.5 | 1.3 |
|  | Painting of doors \& walls | 40.1 | 58.2 | 1.8 |
| Purchase | Purchase of furniture (cupboard etc.) | 54.4 | 43.1 | 2.5 |
|  | Purchase of electrical fittings | 23.4 | 74.8 | 1.8 |
|  | Purchase of chalk, duster, register etc. | 93.7 | 5.5 | 0.8 |
|  | Purchase of sitting mats/Tat patti | 26.3 | 72.4 | 1.3 |
|  | Purchase of charts, globes \& other teaching material | 74.3 | 24.4 | 1.3 |
| Other | Expenditure on school events | 82.7 | 15.6 | 1.8 |
|  | Payment of bills (electricity, water, cleaning etc.) | 39.8 | 56.8 | 3.5 |

The PAISA section of ASER tracks receipt and spending of Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) grants at the school level. This information is collected from schools visited during the survey. This page reports proportion of schools receiving the grants and carrying out specified activities in the schools. More detailed analysis of the PAISA data will be available in the PAISA 2012 report which will be released in March $2013 .{ }^{1}$

## EVERY RURAL GOVERNMENT PRIMARY/UPPER PRIMARY SCHOOL IS ENTITLED TO EACH OF THESE SSA GRANTS EVERY YEAR.

| How much goes to |
| :---: | :--- |
| each school |$\quad$ For what purposes

SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT GRANT / SCHOOL GRANT
Rs. 5000 per year per primary school

Rs. 7000 per year per upper primary school

## Rs $5000+$ Rs $7000=$ Rs 12000 if the school is Std I-VIIINIII.

Note: Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same premises.

## SCHOOL MAINTENANCE GRANT

Rs. 5000 - Rs 7500 per school per year if the school has upto 3 classrooms.

Rs 7500 - Rs. 10000 per year if the school has more than 3 classrooms.

Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same building.

This grant can be used for maintenance of school building, including whitewashing; beautification; and repair of toilets, hand pump, boundary wall, playground etc.

The grant amount depends on number of classrooms (excluding Headmaster room and office room)

## TLM GRANT

Rs. 500 per teacher per year in primary and upper primary schools.

This grant can be used by teachers to buy teaching aids, such as charts, globes, posters, models etc.

## Dadra and Nagar Haveli rural <br> 路裉2012 <br> Facilitated by PRATHAM

## ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM HOUSEHOLDS. 1 OUT OF 1 DISTRICTS

Data has not been presented where sample size was insufficient.

## School enrollment and out of school children

Table 1: \% Children in different types of schools 2012

| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in <br> school | Total |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| Age: 6-14 ALL | 84.4 | 12.3 | 0.3 | 3.1 | 100 |
| Age: 7-16 ALL | 81.7 | 10.7 | 0.2 | 7.4 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 85.7 | 13.4 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 BOYS | 80.0 | 18.9 | 0.0 | 1.1 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 GIRLS | 91.9 | 7.5 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 ALL | 83.7 | 10.3 | 0.5 | 5.4 | 100 |
| Age: $11-14$ BOYS | 84.7 | 11.9 | 1.1 | 2.3 | 100 |
| Age: $11-14$ GIRLS | 82.6 | 9.0 | 0.0 | 8.4 | 100 |
| Age: $15-16$ ALL | 67.8 | 5.4 | 0.0 | 26.9 | 100 |
| Age: $15-16$ BOYS | 74.0 | 4.1 | 0.0 | 21.9 | 100 |
| Age: $15-16$ GIRLS | 62.7 | 6.7 | 0.0 | 30.7 | 100 |

Note: 'Other' includes children going to madarsa and EGS. 'Not in school' = dropped out + never enrolled.


## Young children in pre-school and school

Table 3: \% Children age 3-6 who are enrolled in different types of pre-school and school 2012

|  | In balwadi or anganwadi | In LKG/ UKG | In School |  |  | Not in school or preschool | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Govt. | Pvt. | Other |  |  |
| Age 3 | 58.9 | 10.7 |  |  |  | 30.4 | 100 |
| Age 4 | 62.0 | 14.1 |  |  |  | 23.9 | 100 |
| Age 5 | 51.5 | 24.2 | 4.6 | 9.1 | 0.0 | 10.6 | 100 |
| Age 6 | 13.7 | 11.8 | 56.9 | 15.7 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 100 |

Chart 1: Trends over time
\% Children out of school by age group and gender 2006-2012


How to read this chart: Each line shows trends in the proportion of children out of school for a particular subset of children. For example, the proportion of girls (age 1114) not in school has changed from $18.6 \%$ in 2006 to $9.0 \%$ in 2007 to $5.0 \%$ in 2008, $7.9 \%$ in 2009 and to $2.8 \%$ in 2010 to $8.4 \%$ in 2012.

Table 2: Sample description
\% Children in each class by age 2012

| Std. | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 13.3 | 60.0 | 26.7 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| \|| | 1.3 | 9.3 | 66.7 | 21.3 | 1.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| III |  | . 1 | 7.8 | 55.6 | 30.0 | 5.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| IV | 1.3 |  |  | 13.8 | 45.0 | 31.3 | 8.8 |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| V | 2.4 |  |  |  | 7.9 | 58.3 | 22.1 | 7.9 | 1.6 |  |  |  | 100 |
| VI | 1.3 |  |  |  |  | 5.1 | 40.5 | 43.0 | 5.1 | 5.1 |  |  | 100 |
| VII | 2.3 |  |  |  |  |  | 11.5 | 49.4 | 28.7 | 6.9 | 1.2 |  | 100 |
| VIII | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 10.6 | 45.2 | 35.6 | 7.7 | 1.0 | 100 |

How to read this table: If a child started school in Std I at age 6, she should be of age 8 in Std III. This table shows the age distribution for each class. For example, in Std III, $55.6 \%$ children are 8 years old but there also $7.8 \%$ who are $7,30.0 \%$ who are 9 and $5.6 \%$ who are older.

## Dadra and Nagar Haveli <br> RURAL <br> 路裖2012 <br> Facilitated by PRATHAM

## Reading

Table 4：\％Children by class and READING level
All schools 2012

| Std． | Not even <br> letter | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> （Std I Text） | Level 2 <br> （Std II Text） | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 55.2 | 37.9 | 6.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100 |
| II | 19.6 | 51.0 | 15.7 | 13.7 | 0.0 | 100 |
| III | 8.3 | 26.7 | 23.3 | 21.7 | 20.0 | 100 |
| IV | 7.3 | 21.8 | 20.0 | 23.6 | 27.3 | 100 |
| V | 5.0 | 8.0 | 20.0 | 32.0 | 35.0 | 100 |
| VI | 7.8 | 7.8 | 15.7 | 25.5 | 43.1 | 100 |
| VII | 1.6 | 9.8 | 11.5 | 29.5 | 47.5 | 100 |
| VIII | 1.5 | 3.0 | 9.1 | 13.6 | 72.7 | 100 |
| Total | 9.7 | 18.0 | 16.1 | 22.2 | 34.0 | 100 |

How to read this table：Each cell shows the highest level in reading achieved by a child．For example，in Std III， $8.3 \%$ children cannot even read letters， $26.7 \%$ can read letters but not more， $23.3 \%$ can read words but not Std I text or higher， $21.7 \%$ can read Std I text but not Std II level text，and $20 \%$ can read Std II level text．For each read Std I text but not Std il level text，and $20 \%$ can read
class，the total of all these exclusive categories is $100 \%$ ．

## Reading Tool

રણાં રેતીનાં મોટા ઢગલા હોય છે．બપોરે રેતી ખૂબ તપે છે． રણમાં વરસાદ ઓછો ૫ડે છે． વધારે તાપ લાગે．બહુ તરસ લાગે અને પાણીની ખૂબતંગી જોવા મળે છે．વંટોળ ચડે．રેતી ઊડે．લૂ વાય． રણમાં રાતે ઠંડી બહુ લાગે．રણાાં ખજૂરીનાં ઝાડ ઘણાં હોય છે． રણાાં ઊંટ સારું ચાલી શકે．અહી રહેવું બહુ અઘરું હોયછે．

## Reading in English

Table 5：\％Children by class and READING level in ENGLISH All schools 2012

| Std． | Not even <br> capital <br> letters | Capital <br> letters | Small <br> letters | Simple <br> words | Easy <br> sentences | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| I | 69.0 | 24.1 | 6.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100 |
| II | 41.2 | 29.4 | 11.8 | 15.7 | 2.0 | 100 |
| III | 21.7 | 36.7 | 25.0 | 11.7 | 5.0 | 100 |
| IV | 20.0 | 30.9 | 36.4 | 7.3 | 5.5 | 100 |
| V | 13.0 | 24.0 | 41.0 | 16.0 | 6.0 | 100 |
| VI | 7.8 | 13.7 | 43.1 | 17.7 | 17.7 | 100 |
| VII | 9.8 | 23.0 | 21.3 | 29.5 | 16.4 | 100 |
| VIII | 4.6 | 10.6 | 21.2 | 40.9 | 22.7 | 100 |
| Total | 19.2 | 23.9 | 28.1 | 18.8 | 9.9 | 100 |

## Arithmetic

Table 7：\％Children by class and ARITHMETIC level All schools 2012

| Std． | Not even 1－9 | Recognize numbers |  | Can subtract | Can divide | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1－9 | 10－99 |  |  |  |
| I | 48.3 | 44.8 | 6.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100 |
| 1 | 25.5 | 45.1 | 25.5 | 3.9 | 0.0 | 100 |
| III | 5.0 | 45.0 | 38.3 | 8.3 | 3.3 | 100 |
| IV | 5.5 | 25.5 | 54.6 | 12.7 | 1.8 | 100 |
| V | 2.0 | 30.0 | 49.0 | 15.0 | 4.0 | 100 |
| VI | 2.0 | 13.7 | 49.0 | 27.5 | 7.8 | 100 |
| VII | 1.6 | 23.0 | 54.1 | 14.8 | 6.6 | 100 |
| VIII | 3.0 | 9.1 | 45.5 | 27.3 | 15.2 | 100 |
| Total | 8.3 | 28.3 | 43.3 | 14.8 | 5.3 | 100 |

How to read this table：Each cell shows the highest level in arithmetic achieved by a child．For example，in Std 3，5\％children cannot even recognize numbers 1－9，45\％ can recognize numbers up to 9 but not more， $38.3 \%$ can recognize numbers to 99 but cannot do subtraction， $8.3 \%$ can do subtraction but not division，and $3.3 \%$ can do division．For each class，the total of all these exclusive categories is $100 \%$ ．

## Math Tool

| અ่ร ๗า๓ 9－6 | સંંખચા ઋોળખ 9१－Ge | ต1ยต1รา | M｜गा｜1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 26 | 654 | $\begin{array}{r} \text { 6r } \\ -43 \\ -\quad-38 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | c）$\in \in 3$ |
| $3 \quad 4$ | GE EE | $\begin{array}{rr} \text { 86 } & \text { く8 } \\ -\mathrm{ze} & -34 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | c） 64 C |
| E $C$ |  | $\begin{array}{rr} 89 & 32 \\ -94 & -94 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | c) cs |
| \％ 9 | २૫ ૬く | $\begin{array}{r} 3 c \\ -9 C \\ -9 C \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\gamma \longdiv { \text { suc } }$ |
|  | ${ }_{4}$ |  now． | की0प9 सेक पुणन．के सायो सोबो มे0 M． |

## Type of school and paid tuition classes

Chart 8：Trends over time
\％Children in Std I－VIII by school type and tuition 2009－2012


[^9]
## Daman and Diu rural

ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM HOUSEHOLDS. 2 OUT OF 2 DISTRICTS
Data has not been presented where sample size was insufficient.

## School enrollment and out of school children

Table 1: \% Children in different types of schools 2012

| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in <br> school | Total |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age: 6-14 ALL | 84.4 | 14.9 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 100 |
| Age: 7-16 ALL | 85.4 | 13.1 | 0.4 | 1.1 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 83.1 | 16.6 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 BOYS | 79.1 | 20.4 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 GIRLS | 86.7 | 13.2 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 ALL | 87.4 | 11.5 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 100 |
| Age: $11-14$ BOYS | 84.9 | 12.8 | 1.0 | 1.2 | 100 |
| Age: $11-14$ GIRLS | 89.8 | 10.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 100 |
| Age: $15-16$ ALL | 85.9 | 9.7 | 0.6 | 3.9 | 100 |
| Age: $15-16$ BOYS | 83.1 | 11.1 | 1.0 | 4.8 | 100 |
| Age: $15-16$ GIRLS | 89.3 | 7.9 | 0.0 | 2.8 | 100 |

Note: 'Other' includes children going to madarsa and EGS.
'Not in school' = dropped out + never enrolled


## Young children in pre-school and school

Table 3: \% Children age 3-6 who are enrolled in different types of pre-school and school 2012

|  | In balwadi or anganwadi | $\begin{gathered} \text { In LKG/ } \\ \text { UKG } \end{gathered}$ | In School |  |  | Not in school or preschool | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Govt. | Pvt. | Other |  |  |
| Age 3 | 58.6 | 35.1 |  |  |  | 6.3 | 100 |
| Age 4 | 53.5 | 43.5 |  |  |  | 3.0 | 100 |
| Age 5 | 19.5 | 9.3 | 44.2 | 22.5 | 1.8 | 2.7 | 100 |
| Age 6 | 1.6 | 2.0 | 69.5 | 26.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100 |

Chart 1: Trends over time
\% Children out of school by age group and gender 2006-2012


How to read this chart: Each line shows trends in the proportion of children out of school for a particular subset of children. For example, the proportion of girls (age 1114) not in school has changed from $1.7 \%$ in 2006 to $1.6 \%$ in 2007 to $0.9 \%$ in 2008, $1.0 \%$ in 2009 and to $0.4 \%$ in 2010 to $0.0 \%$ in 2012.

Table 2: Sample description
\% Children in each class by age 2012

| Std. | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 21.1 | 70.0 | 7.0 | 1.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| \|| | 3. | 2 | 89.3 | 6.7 | 0.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| III | 1. | 4 | 6.2 | 81.5 | 8.1 | 2.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| IV | 0.3 |  |  | 8.3 | 74.9 | 14.9 | 1.7 |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| V | 1.1 |  |  |  |  | 84.1 | 8.8 | 6.0 |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| VI | 1.4 |  |  |  |  |  | 77.0 | 17.5 | 4.1 |  |  |  | 100 |
| VII | 2.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 73.0 | 20.7 | 4.3 |  |  | 100 |
| VIII | 1.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5.6 | 81.5 | 8.1 | 3.6 |  | 100 |

How to read this table: If a child started school in Std I at age 6, she should be of age 8 in Std III. This table shows the age distribution for each class. For example, in Std III, $81.5 \%$ children are 8 years old but there also $6.2 \%$ who are $7,8.1 \%$ who are 9 and 2.8\% who are older

## Daman and Diu rural

## Reading

Table 4: \% Children by class and READING level
All schools 2012

| Std. | Not even <br> letter | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (Std I Text) | Level 2 <br> (Std II Text) | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 32.9 | 49.9 | 11.9 | 4.2 | 1.1 | 100 |
| II | 24.8 | 32.1 | 33.0 | 7.5 | 2.6 | 100 |
| IIII | 11.3 | 18.5 | 38.6 | 19.0 | 12.6 | 100 |
| IV | 9.8 | 12.3 | 29.7 | 27.1 | 21.1 | 100 |
| V | 4.4 | 9.1 | 15.5 | 43.2 | 27.8 | 100 |
| VII | 3.7 | 8.2 | 13.6 | 35.1 | 39.5 | 100 |
| VII | 7.4 | 4.6 | 11.1 | 28.1 | 48.7 | 100 |
| VIII | 6.3 | 5.2 | 9.0 | 20.1 | 59.3 | 100 |
| Total | 11.3 | 15.7 | 19.7 | 24.4 | 28.9 | 100 |

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level in reading achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, $11.3 \%$ children cannot even read letters, $18.5 \%$ can read etters but not more, $38.6 \%$ can read words but not Std I text or higher, 19\% can read Std I text but not Std II level text, and $12.6 \%$ can read Std II level text. For each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is $100 \%$.

## Reading Tool

## अમારા ઘરમાં દાદી સહુలી વહેલા ઊઠે છે. દાદાજી પણ ફટાફટ ઊઠે. બન્ને રોજ સવારે ચાલીન મંદિરે જય. દાદા અને દાદી મંદિરમાં જઈને રોજ પૂજ કરે છે. <br> દાદી ફૂલ ચૂંટીન તની માળા બનાव છે. દાદા અને દાદી ભગવાનની ભક્તિ કરે છે. <br> §ં પણ ઘણી વખત1 બન્નેની સાથે ચાલતો મંદિદે શાં છુ. <br> મંદિર જઈને દાદાની સાથે એક શ્લોક બોલું છું.

## Reading in English

Table 5: \% Children by class and READING level in ENGLISH All schools 2012

| Std. | Not even <br> capital <br> letters | Capital <br> letters | Small <br> letters | Simple <br> words | Easy <br> sentences | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| I | 53.6 | 20.2 | 11.8 | 10.1 | 4.3 | 100 |
| II | 47.0 | 25.3 | 14.4 | 8.9 | 4.4 | 100 |
| III | 31.2 | 25.8 | 15.4 | 18.6 | 9.0 | 100 |
| IV | 12.4 | 27.8 | 21.0 | 18.9 | 20.0 | 100 |
| V | 5.7 | 25.8 | 39.1 | 17.3 | 12.1 | 100 |
| VI | 3.2 | 19.5 | 30.2 | 27.9 | 19.3 | 100 |
| VII | 4.3 | 14.7 | 29.1 | 34.8 | 17.1 | 100 |
| VIII | 3.7 | 12.6 | 23.8 | 30.5 | 29.4 | 100 |
| Total | 10.7 | 19.7 | 27.3 | 24.8 | 17.5 | 100 |

## Arithmetic

Table 7: \% Children by class and ARITHMETIC level All schools 2012

| Std. | Not even <br> $1-9$ | Recognize numbers |  | Can <br>  <br>  <br> subtract | Can divide | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 45.7 | 21.9 | 0.4 | 0.7 | 100 |
| III | 20.9 | 35.6 | 39.2 | 4.1 | 0.4 | 100 |
| III | 11.4 | 25.0 | 41.1 | 18.9 | 3.7 | 100 |
| IV | 9.8 | 20.0 | 32.8 | 24.1 | 13.3 | 100 |
| V | 3.8 | 14.2 | 28.6 | 38.6 | 14.8 | 100 |
| VI | 3.9 | 10.2 | 25.3 | 33.5 | 27.2 | 100 |
| VII | 5.4 | 7.7 | 28.5 | 26.7 | 31.6 | 100 |
| VIII | 3.8 | 8.1 | 25.6 | 20.1 | 42.4 | 100 |
| Total | 10.1 | 19.1 | 30.2 | 22.3 | 18.3 | 100 |

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level in arithmetic achieved by a child. For example, in Std 3, $11.4 \%$ children cannot even recognize numbers 1-9 $25.0 \%$ can recognize numbers up to 9 but not more, $41.1 \%$ can recognize numbers to 99 but cannot do subtraction, $18.9 \%$ can do subtraction but not division, and $3.7 \%$ can do division. For each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is $100 \%$.

## Math Tool



## Type of school and paid tuition classes

Chart 8: Trends over time
\% Children in Std I-VIII by school type and tuition 2009-2012


## ■Govt+No Tuition ■Govt+Tuition - Pvt+No Tuition ■ Pvt+Tuition

How to read this chart: For a given year, the width of each colour band represents the \% of children in the corresponding category. For each year, these four categories add upto 100\%.

ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM HOUSEHOLDS. 2 OUT OF 2 DISTRICTS
Data has not been presented where sample size was insufficient.

## School enrollment and out of school children

Table 1: \% Children in different types of schools 2012

| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in <br> school | Total |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age: 6-14 ALL | 48.7 | 49.2 | 2.0 | 0.1 | 100 |
| Age: 7-16 ALL | 48.8 | 49.4 | 1.6 | 0.2 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 54.3 | 43.8 | 1.9 | 0.0 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 BOYS | 55.6 | 42.0 | 2.4 | 0.0 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 GIRLS | 52.8 | 46.0 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 ALL | 44.5 | 53.5 | 1.8 | 0.2 | 100 |
| Age: $11-14$ BOYS | 45.5 | 52.3 | 1.7 | 0.4 | 100 |
| Age: $11-14$ GIRLS | 43.5 | 54.6 | 1.9 | 0.0 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 ALL | 49.1 | 50.0 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 BOYS | 57.0 | 41.9 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 GIRLS | 42.1 | 57.0 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 100 |

Note: 'Other' includes children going to madarsa and EGS
'Not in school' $=$ dropped out + never enrolled.

Chart 2: Trends over time
\% Children enrolled in private schools by class 2008-2012


Chart 1: Trends over time
\% Children out of school by age group and gender 2006-2012


How to read this chart: Each line shows trends in the proportion of children out of school for a particular subset of children. For example, the proportion of girls (age 1114) not in school has changed from $2.3 \%$ in 2006 to $0.6 \%$ in 2007 to $0.5 \%$ in 2008 , $0.3 \%$ in 2009 and to $1.7 \%$ in 2010 to $0.0 \%$ in 2012.

Table 2: Sample description
\% Children in each class by age 2012

| Std. | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 2.2 | 59.9 | 33.6 | 4.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| \|| |  | . 0 | 42.6 | 51.9 | 4.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| III | 2.9 |  |  | 45.1 | 47.4 | 4.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| IV | 2.7 |  |  |  | 32.9 | 62.7 | 1.7 |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| V | 4.1 |  |  |  |  | 38.4 | 46.2 | 11.4 | 0.0 |  |  |  | 100 |
| VI | 2.9 |  |  |  |  |  | 29.5 | 58.6 | 8.4 | 0.7 |  |  | 100 |
| VII | 1.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 43.7 | 43.3 | 9.6 | 1. | 7 | 100 |
| VIII | 4.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 37.7 | 53.9 | 4. | 5 | 100 |

How to read this table: If a child started school in Std I at age 6, she should be of age 8 in Std III. This table shows the age distribution for each class. For example, in Std III, $45.1 \%$ children are 8 years old but there also 2.9 \% who are younger, $47.4 \%$ who are 9 and $4.7 \%$ who are older.

## Young children in pre-school and school

Table 3: \% Children age 3-6 who are enrolled in different types of pre-school and school 2012

|  | In balwadi or anganwad | In LKG/ UKG | In School |  |  | Not in school or preschool | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Govt. | Pvt. | Other |  |  |
| Age 3 | 48.5 | 31.8 |  |  |  | 19.7 | 100 |
| Age 4 | 42.6 | 50.9 |  |  |  | 6.5 | 100 |
| Age 5 | 17.3 | 28.2 | 13.0 | 35.2 | 1.0 | 5.4 | 100 |
| Age 6 | 5.0 | 7.2 | 41.5 | 42.1 | 3.1 | 1.2 | 100 |

## Reading

Table 4: \% Children by class and READING level
All schools 2012

| Std. | Not even <br> letter | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (Std I Text) | Level 2 <br> (Std II Text) | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 6.6 | 43.9 | 35.5 | 11.5 | 2.5 | 100 |
| II | 2.6 | 31.6 | 30.2 | 30.3 | 5.2 | 100 |
| IIII | 1.8 | 9.4 | 38.9 | 38.8 | 11.2 | 100 |
| IV | 0.0 | 9.4 | 28.4 | 22.6 | 39.6 | 100 |
| V | 0.0 | 2.1 | 17.3 | 28.0 | 52.6 | 100 |
| VII | 0.0 | 0.7 | 21.9 | 35.0 | 42.4 | 100 |
| VII | 0.0 | 1.8 | 1.5 | 28.1 | 68.7 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 36.5 | 63.0 | 100 |
| Total | 1.3 | 11.5 | 20.9 | 29.1 | 37.2 | 100 |

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level in reading achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, $1.8 \%$ children cannot even read letters, $9.4 \%$ can read letters but not more, $38.9 \%$ can read words but not Std I text or higher, $38.8 \%$ can read Std I text but not Std II level text, and $11.2 \%$ can read Std II level text. For each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is $100 \%$.

## Reading in English

Table 5: \% Children by class and READING level in ENGLISH All schools 2012

| Std. | Not even <br> capital <br> letters | Capital <br> letters | Small <br> letters | Simple <br> words | Easy <br> sentences | Total |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| I | 6.0 | 34.0 | 35.8 | 22.3 | 2.0 | 100 |
| II | 2.3 | 19.2 | 39.4 | 28.6 | 10.6 | 100 |
| IIII | 1.1 | 5.7 | 29.4 | 42.8 | 21.0 | 100 |
| IV | 0.0 | 6.1 | 17.7 | 43.4 | 32.9 | 100 |
| V | 0.0 | 0.6 | 4.4 | 44.3 | 50.7 | 100 |
| VII | 0.0 | 1.4 | 5.2 | 37.4 | 56.0 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.3 | 19.7 | 78.0 | 100 |
| VIIII | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 15.4 | 84.7 | 100 |
| Total | 1.1 | 7.8 | 15.5 | 31.5 | 44.1 | 100 |

## Reading Tool



## Arithmetic

Table 7: \% Children by class and ARITHMETIC level All schools 2012

| Std. | Not even <br> $1-9$ | Recognize numbers |  | Can <br>  <br>  <br> subtract | Can divide | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 56.5 | 32.4 |  |  |  |
| II | 1.6 | 33.6 | 52.9 | 10.9 | 1.0 | 100 |
| IIII | 1.8 | 9.4 | 49.4 | 37.7 | 1.8 | 100 |
| IV | 0.0 | 8.4 | 33.9 | 47.4 | 10.3 | 100 |
| V | 0.0 | 1.2 | 24.2 | 48.9 | 25.7 | 100 |
| VI | 0.0 | 1.2 | 23.9 | 45.2 | 29.8 | 100 |
| VII | 0.0 | 0.0 | 11.1 | 38.5 | 50.4 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.3 | 36.7 | 59.0 | 100 |
| Total | 0.9 | 12.9 | 27.8 | 34.5 | 23.9 | 100 |

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level in arithmetic achieved by a child. For example, in Std 3, 1.8\% children cannot even recognize numbers 1-9, 9.4\% can recognize numbers up to 9 but not more, $49.4 \%$ can recognize numbers to 99 but cannot do subtraction, $37.7 \%$ can do subtraction but not division, and $1.8 \%$ can do division. For each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is $100 \%$

## Type of school and paid tuition classes

The ASER survey recorded information about tuition by asking the following question: "Does the child take any paid tuition class currently?" Therefore the numbers given below do not include any unpaid supplemental help in learning that children may have received.

Table 8: Trends over time
\% Children attending paid tuition classes
By school type 2009-2012

| Children in Std I-VIII | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Govt. schools: \% Children <br> attending paid tuition classes | 27.7 | 35.1 | 22.4 | 15.3 |
| Private schools: \% Children <br> attending paid tuition classes | 54.0 | 58.7 | 43.1 | 30.5 |
| All schools: \% Children <br> attending paid tuition classes | 41.9 | 42.2 | 30.5 | 22.9 |

## Chart 8: Trends over time

\% Children in Std I-VIII by school type and tuition 2009-2012


How to read this chart: For a given year, the width of each colour band represents the \% of children in the corresponding category. For each year, these four categories add upto $100 \%$.

## Puducherry rural

ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM HOUSEHOLDS. 1 OUT OF 2 DISTRICTS
Data has not been presented where sample size was insufficient.

## School enrollment and out of school children

Table 1: \% Children in different types of schools 2012

| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in <br> school | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age: 6-14 ALL | 60.5 | 38.8 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 100 |
| Age: 7-16 ALL | 62.3 | 35.2 | 0.7 | 1.9 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 53.4 | 45.4 | 0.8 | 0.4 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 BOYS | 44.8 | 53.6 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 GIRLS | 62.1 | 37.1 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 ALL | 67.5 | 32.1 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 BOYS | 66.7 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 GIRLS | 68.3 | 30.8 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 ALL | 72.3 | 16.0 | 2.1 | 9.6 | 100 |
| Age: $15-16$ BOYS | 70.8 | 12.5 | 4.2 | 12.5 | 100 |
| Age: $15-16$ GIRLS | 73.9 | 19.6 | 0.0 | 6.5 | 100 |

Note: 'Other' includes children going to madarsa and EGS.
'Not in school' = dropped out + never enrolled.


## Young children in pre-school and school

Table 3: \% Children age 3-6 who are enrolled in different types of pre-school and school 2012

|  | In balwadi or anganwadi | $\begin{gathered} \text { In LKG/ } \\ \text { UKG } \end{gathered}$ | In School |  |  | Not in school or preschool | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Govt. | Pvt. | Other |  |  |
| Age 3 | 39.6 | 47.9 |  |  |  | 12.5 | 100 |
| Age 4 | 22.8 | 75.4 |  |  |  | 1.8 | 100 |
| Age 5 | 6.8 | 33.9 | 22.0 | 35.6 | 0.0 | 1.7 | 100 |
| Age 6 | 0.0 | 2.1 | 59.6 | 36.2 | 0.0 | 2.1 | 100 |

Chart 1: Trends over time
\% Children out of school by age group and gender 2006-2012


How to read this chart: Each line shows trends in the proportion of children out of school for a particular subset of children. For example, the proportion of girls (age 1114) not in school has changed from $0.6 \%$ in 2006 to $0.0 \%$ in 2007 to $1.2 \%$ in 2008, $0.7 \%$ in 2009 and to $0.2 \%$ in 2010 to $0.8 \%$ in 2012.

Table 2: Sample description
\% Children in each class by age 2012

| Std. | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 44.0 | 45.3 | 8.0 | 2.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| \|| | 0.0 | 18.5 | 63.0 | 16.7 | 1.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| III |  | 1.6 | 15.6 | 75.0 | 6.3 | 1.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| IV | 0.0 |  |  | 25.8 | 63.6 | 9.1 | 1.5 |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| V | 1.6 |  |  |  | 12.5 | 75.0 | 9.4 | 1.6 |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| VI | 0.0 |  |  |  |  | 13.9 | 65.3 | 19.4 | 1.4 |  |  |  | 100 |
| VIII | 1.9 |  |  |  |  |  | 7.6 | 75.5 | 13.2 | 1.9 |  |  | 100 |
| VIII | 2.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 19.6 | 64.7 | 11.8 | 2. | 0 | 100 |

How to read this table: If a child started school in Std I at age 6, she should be of age 8 in Std III. This table shows the age distribution for each class. For example, in Std III, $75.0 \%$ children are 8 years old but there also $15.6 \%$ who are $7,6.3 \%$ who are 9 and $1.6 \%$ who are older.

## Puducherry rural

## Reading

Table 4: \% Children by class and READING level All schools 2012

| Std. | Not even <br> letter | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (Std I Text) | Level 2 <br> (Std II Text) | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 56.0 | 36.0 | 8.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100 |
| II | 20.4 | 29.6 | 40.7 | 7.4 | 1.9 | 100 |
| III | 6.3 | 25.0 | 37.5 | 29.7 | 1.6 | 100 |
| IV | 1.5 | 13.6 | 39.4 | 39.4 | 6.1 | 100 |
| V | 4.7 | 4.7 | 28.1 | 31.3 | 31.3 | 100 |
| VII | 4.2 | 2.8 | 19.4 | 37.5 | 36.1 | 100 |
| VII | 0.0 | 1.9 | 18.9 | 37.7 | 41.5 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.0 | 2.0 | 17.7 | 35.3 | 45.1 | 100 |
| Total | 12.8 | 15.0 | 25.9 | 26.9 | 19.4 | 100 |

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level in reading achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, $6.3 \%$ children cannot even read letters, $25 \%$ can read letters but not more, $37.5 \%$ can read words but not Std I text or higher, $29.7 \%$ can read Std I text but not Std II level text, and $1.6 \%$ can read Std II level text. For each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is $100 \%$.

## Reading Tool



## Reading in English

Table 5: \% Children by class and READING level in ENGLISH All schools 2012

| Std. | Not even <br> capital <br> letters | Capital <br> letters | Small <br> letters | Simple <br> words | Easy <br> sentences | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| I | 53.6 | 20.2 | 11.8 | 10.1 | 4.3 | 100 |
| II | 47.0 | 25.3 | 14.4 | 8.9 | 4.4 | 100 |
| III | 31.2 | 25.8 | 15.4 | 18.6 | 9.0 | 100 |
| IV | 12.4 | 27.8 | 21.0 | 18.9 | 20.0 | 100 |
| V | 5.7 | 25.8 | 39.1 | 17.3 | 12.1 | 100 |
| VI | 3.2 | 19.5 | 30.2 | 27.9 | 19.3 | 100 |
| VII | 4.3 | 14.7 | 29.1 | 34.8 | 17.1 | 100 |
| VIII | 3.7 | 12.6 | 23.8 | 30.5 | 29.4 | 100 |
| Total | 10.7 | 19.7 | 27.3 | 24.8 | 17.5 | 100 |

## Arithmetic

Table 7: \% Children by class and ARITHMETIC level All schools 2012

| Std. | Not even$1-9$ | Recognize numbers |  | Can subtract | Can divide | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1-9 | 10-99 |  |  |  |
| 1 | 46.7 | 29.3 | 24.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100 |
| \\| | 3.7 | 18.5 | 77.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100 |
| III | 1.6 | 12.5 | 73.4 | 10.9 | 1.6 | 100 |
| IV | 0.0 | 6.1 | 66.7 | 27.3 | 0.0 | 100 |
| V | 1.6 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 40.6 | 7.8 | 100 |
| VI | 1.4 | 1.4 | 48.6 | 25.0 | 23.6 | 100 |
| VII | 0.0 | 0.0 | 37.7 | 47.2 | 15.1 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.0 | 0.0 | 35.3 | 49.0 | 15.7 | 100 |
| Total | 8.0 | 9.0 | 51.3 | 23.9 | 7.8 | 100 |

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level in arithmetic achieved by a child. For example, in Std 3,1.6\% children cannot even recognize numbers 1-9, $12.5 \%$ can recognize numbers up to 9 but not more, $73.4 \%$ can recognize numbers to 99 but cannot do subtraction, $10.9 \%$ can do subtraction but not division, and $1.6 \%$ can do division. For each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is $100 \%$.

## Math Tool



## Type of school and paid tuition classes

Chart 8: Trends over time
\% Children in Std I-VIII by school type and tuition 2009-2012


## - Govt+No Tuition Govt+Tuition $=$ Pvt+No Tuition ■ Pvt+Tuition

How to read this chart: For a given year, the width of each colour band represents the \% of children in the corresponding category. For each year, these four categories add upto $100 \%$.

## Sikkim rural

ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM HOUSEHOLDS. 4 OUT OF 4 DISTRICTS
Data has not been presented where sample size was insufficient.

## School enrollment and out of school children

Table 1: \% Children in different types of schools 2012

| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in <br> school | Total |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age: 6-14 ALL | 67.8 | 28.7 | 0.8 | 2.7 | 100 |
| Age: 7-16 ALL | 72.3 | 23.0 | 1.1 | 3.7 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 62.2 | 35.5 | 0.2 | 2.1 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 BOYS | 61.4 | 36.4 | 0.4 | 1.9 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 GIRLS | 63.3 | 34.4 | 0.0 | 2.3 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 ALL | 78.2 | 17.6 | 1.1 | 3.0 | 100 |
| Age: $11-14$ BOYS | 74.3 | 20.3 | 2.0 | 3.5 | 100 |
| Age: $11-14$ GIRLS | 81.9 | 15.0 | 0.4 | 2.7 | 100 |
| Age: $15-16$ ALL | 79.6 | 9.9 | 2.7 | 7.8 | 100 |
| Age: $15-16$ BOYS | 75.6 | 10.6 | 3.6 | 10.2 | 100 |
| Age: $15-16$ GIRLS | 84.8 | 8.6 | 1.6 | 5.0 | 100 |

Note: 'Other' includes children going to madarsa and EGS.
'Not in school' $=$ dropped out + never enrolled


## Young children in pre-school and school

Table 3: \% Children age 3-6 who are enrolled in different types of pre-school and school 2012

|  | In balwadi or anganwadi | In LKG/ UKG | In School |  |  | Not in school or preschool | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Govt. | Pvt. | Other |  |  |
| Age 3 | 50.1 | 33.9 |  |  |  | 16.0 | 100 |
| Age 4 | 32.7 | 61.5 |  |  |  | 5.8 | 100 |
| Age 5 | 12.0 | 9.9 | 23.1 | 47.7 | 3.3 | 4.2 | 100 |
| Age 6 | 4.3 | 10.4 | 32.9 | 45.3 | 2.0 | 5.2 | 100 |

Chart 1: Trends over time
\% Children out of school by age group and gender 2006-2012


How to read this chart: Each line shows trends in the proportion of children out of school for a particular subset of children. For example, the proportion of girls (age 1114) not in school has changed from $1.8 \%$ in 2007 to $4.8 \%$ in 2008 to $2.4 \%$ in 2009, $1.3 \%$ in 2010 and to $0.9 \%$ in 2011 to $2.7 \%$ in 2012.

Table 2: Sample description
\% Children in each class by age 2012

| Std. | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 13.6 | 33.8 | 35.0 | 13.4 | 4.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| \\| | 3.0 | 17.7 | 29.2 | 25.0 | 14.3 | 5.5 | 5.3 |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| III |  | . 3 | 10.4 | 21.6 | 32.4 | 19.2 | 6.9 | 7.2 |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| IV | 2.4 |  |  | 9.0 | 20.7 | 29.2 | 12.8 | 14.5 | 5.9 | 5.7 |  |  | 100 |
| V | 6.3 |  |  |  | 5.2 | 26.8 | 19.0 | 24.0 | 8.7 | 6.4 | 3.6 |  | 100 |
| VI | 4.7 |  |  |  |  | 9.4 | 13.6 | 27.1 | 24.3 | 11.0 | 6.1 | 4.0 | 100 |
| VII | 6.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 16.7 | 36.8 | 19.1 | 12.7 | 8.8 | 100 |
| VIII | 3.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6.0 | 14.5 | 25.5 | 20.7 | 29.8 | 100 |

How to read this table: If a child started school in Std I at age 6, she should be of age 8 in Std III. This table shows the age distribution for each class. For example, in Std III, $21.6 \%$ children are 8 years old but there are also $10.4 \%$ who are $7,32.4 \%$ who are 9, $19.2 \%$ who are 10 years old, etc.

## Sikkim rural

Facilitated by PRATHAM

## Reading

Table 4: \% Children by class and READING level
All schools 2012

| Std. | Not even <br> letter | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (Std I Text) | Level 2 <br> (Std II Text) | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 2.2 | 32.6 | 43.0 | 16.6 | 5.6 | 100 |
| II | 0.8 | 18.9 | 43.0 | 24.6 | 12.7 | 100 |
| IIII | 0.7 | 8.5 | 35.1 | 28.8 | 26.9 | 100 |
| IV | 0.0 | 1.5 | 15.6 | 39.0 | 43.9 | 100 |
| V | 0.0 | 1.2 | 6.5 | 30.8 | 61.6 | 100 |
| VII | 0.0 | 0.6 | 4.5 | 17.7 | 77.2 | 100 |
| VII | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 12.3 | 87.0 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.0 | 0.7 | 1.2 | 4.5 | 93.6 | 100 |
| Total | 0.4 | 6.8 | 17.9 | 22.8 | 52.0 | 100 |

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level in reading achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, $0.7 \%$ children cannot even read letters, $8.5 \%$ can read letters but not more, $35.1 \%$ can read words but not Std I text or higher, 28.8\% can read Std I text but not Std II level text, and $26.9 \%$ can read Std II level text. For each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is $100 \%$

## Reading Tool



## Reading in English

Table 5: \% Children by class and READING level in ENGLISH All schools 2012

| Std. | Not even <br> capital <br> letters | Capital <br> letters | Small <br> letters | Simple <br> words | Easy <br> sentences | Total |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| I | 5.0 | 20.6 | 24.9 | 30.6 | 18.9 | 100 |
| II | 4.7 | 10.9 | 12.9 | 43.7 | 27.8 | 100 |
| III | 0.0 | 3.8 | 8.7 | 45.9 | 41.7 | 100 |
| IV | 0.0 | 3.8 | 3.3 | 27.9 | 65.1 | 100 |
| V | 0.6 | 0.0 | 1.2 | 14.7 | 83.5 | 100 |
| VI | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 14.4 | 85.6 | 100 |
| VII | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 11.1 | 88.9 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.8 | 97.2 | 100 |
| Total | 1.0 | 4.2 | 5.6 | 24.0 | 65.2 | 100 |

## Arithmetic

Table 7: \% Children by class and ARITHMETIC level All schools 2012

| Std. | Not even 1-9 | Recognize numbers |  | Can subtract | Can divide | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1-9 | 10-99 |  |  |  |
| I | 4.4 | 21.8 | 58.2 | 14.2 | 1.4 | 100 |
| \|| | 0.8 | 17.9 | 50.7 | 25.6 | 5.1 | 100 |
| III | 0.0 | 4.2 | 40.9 | 37.6 | 17.4 | 100 |
| IV | 0.5 | 0.0 | 21.4 | 46.6 | 31.5 | 100 |
| V | 0.0 | 0.6 | 15.8 | 39.8 | 43.8 | 100 |
| VI | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.8 | 41.6 | 49.6 | 100 |
| VII | 0.0 | 0.7 | 2.0 | 33.9 | 63.4 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 20.9 | 78.1 | 100 |
| Total | 0.6 | 4.6 | 23.8 | 34.0 | 37.0 | 100 |

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level in arithmetic achieved by a child. For example, in Std 3, 0\% children cannot even recognize numbers 1-9, 4.2\% can recognize numbers up to 9 but not more, $40.9 \%$ can recognize numbers to 99 but cannot do subtraction, $37.6 \%$ can do subtraction but not division, and $17.4 \%$ can do division. For each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is $100 \%$.

## Math Tool



## Type of school and paid tuition classes

Chart 8: Trends over time
\% Children in Std I-VIII by school type and tuition 2009-2012


How to read this chart: For a given year, the width of each colour band represents the \% of children in the corresponding category. For each year, these four categories add upto 100\%.


# Divisional estimates of learning outcomes and schooling status: Precision of ASER estimates 

## Wilima Wadhwa

Every year since 2005, ASER has been presenting estimates of learning and status of schooling at the state and district level. The survey design of ASER is based on the premise of generating estimates at the sub-state district level. Having estimates of learning levels at the district level is desirable since education plans are made at this level. As a result, ASER is one of the largest surveys undertaken by a non-government organization with a sample size of approximately 700,000 children in the age group of $3-16$ years.

ASER is a household survey, undertaken in all rural districts of India. Within each district, 30 villages are randomly chosen ${ }^{2}$ and, in each village 20 households are randomly selected for a total of 600 households per district. This translates into around $900-1200$ children per district.

The statistical precision of district level estimates is an issue because of the ASER sample design - namely clustering and absence of stratification at the village level. In a design without clustering, children in the relevant age group would be directly sampled. Not only is this expensive (in terms of survey time), but it is also difficult to have a reliable population frame that could be used for sampling. Instead ASER employs a two-stage clustering design. The first stage clustering happens when villages are randomly picked. The second stage clustering is when households within a village are randomly selected and the children belonging to that household are tested.

While this is an inexpensive and practical way of sampling children, it is well known that clustering increases the variability of estimates. One way of increasing precision at the district level would have been to stratify the village sample according to age of children or school type. However, this would require a prior household listing, which is expensive in terms of both time and resources.

The ASER sample is stratified, however, at the district level. In so far as outcomes within a district are more homogenous than across districts, stratification within the district leads to more precise estimates at the state level.

Ramaswami and Wadhwa (2009)³ studied the precision of ASER state and district level estimates for a selection of states and variables for the year 2008. They find that state level averages are estimated precisely - with a margin of error of $5 \%$ or less. However, district-level estimates are less precisely estimated. The precision varies across states and districts and according to the learning outcome. In both cases, learning outcomes of children in class 3-5 are relatively less precisely estimated.

Two commonly used measures of precision are the margin of error and the $95 \%$ confidence interval.
The margin of error is the \% interval around the point estimate that almost certainly contains the population estimate (i.e., with $95 \%$ probability). For instance, if x is the margin of error then the population proportion lies within $\pm x \%$ of the sample proportion with $95 \%$ probability.

Suppose $\hat{p}$ is the estimated sample proportion and is the associated standard error. From statistical theory, it is known that the interval [ ] contains the population proportion with $95 \%$ probability - $95 \%$ confidence interval. The margin of error expresses the confidence interval in terms of the sample estimate. It is thus defined as

$$
m e=\frac{2 \hat{\sigma}}{\hat{p}}
$$

A margin of error of $10 \%$ is regarded as an acceptable degree of precision in many studies (United Nations, 2005). ${ }^{4}$ Estimates with a margin of error in excess of $20 \%$ are regarded as estimates with low precision.

[^10]Note that the margin of error depends on the standard error and the estimated proportion and the standard error itself depends on the estimated proportion. For a given sample size, therefore, a lower precision will be associated with a variable which has a lower incidence in the population and/or a higher standard error. Further, in the case of proportions, for a given sample size, the standard error is the largest for a population proportion close to 0.5 . On the other hand, for a given incidence, one way to reduce the standard error and therefore, increase precision is to increase the sample size.

In the case of ASER, as shown by Ramaswami and Wadhwa (2009), precision is not an issue at the state level. At the district level, however, since sample sizes in sub-populations of interest are often much smaller than the total sample size, precision can be an issue. However, for a national survey, increasing the sample size at the district level is extremely costly. In the past, ASER clubbed classes while presenting district level estimates, in an attempt to increase the sample size. However, precision gains from this strategy were limited, especially for variables whose estimated proportions were in the vicinity of 0.5 .

One way to provide sub-state estimates with acceptable levels of precision is to club districts within a state. ${ }^{5}$ Many states have administrative divisions, comprised of two or more districts that can be used as units of analysis. These divisions are at a level of aggregation between the state and district level. This year, we provide divisional estimates from 2008 to 2012 for the states that have administrative divisions. ${ }^{6}$ These are Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Haryana, Jammu \& Kashmir, Jharkhand, Karnataka, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Odisha, Punjab, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh and Uttarakhand. ${ }^{7}$ In addition, in Andhra Pradesh, Gujarat, Himachal Pradesh, Tamil Nadu and West Bengal, divisions were formed using geographical regions commonly used in the states. ${ }^{8}$ Divisional estimates are provided for the following 6 variables:
\% children in age group 6-14 years who are out of school
\% children in age group 6-14 years who are in private school
\% children in class 1-2 who can read letters, words or more in own language
\% children in class 1-2 who can recognize numbers (1-9) or more
\% children in class 3-5 who can read level 1 (Std 1) text or more in own language
\% children in class 3-5 who can subtract or do more


In addition to the point estimates for 2008 - 2012, the 95\% confidence interval [ $\hat{p} \pm 2 \hat{\sigma}$ ] is also presented. Apart from the divisional estimates, the point estimate as well as the confidence interval is also presented for the state as a whole.
Figure 1 presents the margin of error for the four learning outcomes in selected states in 2012. As is clear from the figure, most of these are below $5 \%$. Also, note that learning outcomes in class 35 are less precisely estimated as compared to those in class 1-2. Similar numbers are obtained for previous years.
At the division level, among the four learning outcomes the variability is the most for learning levels in class 3-5. As a result, the margin of error is the highest for this variable. In discussing the district level estimates we concentrate on this variable since this gives us the worst case scenario.

[^11]We can look at division level estimates in two ways. First, for a particular year and state, one can examine the precision of estimates across divisions; and second, for a particular state and division, we can look at the margin of error across years. Figures 2.1 and 2.2 present the margins of error, for language and math in class $3-5$, in 2012 across divisions of selected states. Language learning outcomes at divisional level in most states are

estimated with margins of under or close to $10 \%$. The exception is Madhya Pradesh. Across the board precision levels are lower for Math learning outcomes, where most states have margins of error that are closer to $15 \%$ and those for Madhya Pradesh are close to 20-25\%.

Figures 3.1 and 3.2 present the margins of error, for language and math in class 3-5, for one division in the selected states, from 2008 to 2012. Margins of error are fairly robust over time, except in MP when they spike in 2010. Again, across the board precision levels are lower for Math learning outcomes.


Why are margins of error consistently higher for math in class 3-5? Similarly, compared to learning outcomes in class 1-2, why are learning outcomes in class 3-5 less precisely estimated? First, given a sample size, the margin of error is inversely proportional to the incidence of the variable concerned. What this implies is that any variable that has a low incidence in the population will be estimated with a high margin of error. Intuitively this makes sense because if something is not observed very frequently, one would need a much larger sample size to measure it accurately. However, this is not that much of a problem if the standard error is small. To see why, consider the case of out of school children - say the point estimate is 0.04 (i.e., $4 \%$ ) with a standard error of 0.01 . The margin of error would be $50 \%(=((2$ * 0.01$) / 0.04) * 100)$ which is very high. However, note that this translates into confidence bounds of $\pm 2$ percentage points, i.e., with $95 \%$ probability the true proportion of out of school
children lie between $2 \%$ and $6 \%$. In other words, given a low incidence, a high margin of error may still translate into tight confidence bands. Another way of looking at this is by focusing on in-school children instead of out of school children. If out of school children are 0.04 then in-school children will be 0.96 or $96 \%$ with the same standard error of 0.01 giving a margin of error of only $2.1 \%$ and confidence bounds of $\pm 2$ percentage points.

Second, the margin of error is directly proportional to the standard error. For a given sample size, a large standard error, implying imprecise estimation, not surprisingly will result in a high margin of error. In the case of proportions, the standard error itself depends on the value of the proportion, and the closer the value is to 0.5 , the larger the standard error. Intuitively, the reason behind this is that the greatest uncertainty is associated with a proportion of 0.5 , requiring larger sample sizes to measure it accurately.

By and large, class 1-2 learning outcomes are high as compared to class 3-5 outcomes, resulting in lower margins of error. ${ }^{9}$ Similarly, in class 3-5, language outcomes are better than math outcomes and often math outcomes are close to 0.5 resulting in high margins of error for math.

Overall, the divisional estimates are more precisely estimated as compared to district level estimates. Clubbing districts increases the sample size and lowers the standard errors. It also smoothes the jumpiness in point estimates often observed at the district level. One of the problems associated with large standard errors and therefore wide confidence intervals is that it is difficult to identify significant changes across districts and time. That problem is to a large extent ameliorated with divisional estimates.


[^12]
## Andhra Pradesh

School enrollment and out of school children

| Division/Region | \% Children out of school (age: 6-14) |  |  |  | \% Children enrolled in private school |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (age: 6-14) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Learning levels: Std I-II

| Division/Region | \% Children in Std I-II who CAN READ letters or more |  |  |  |  | \% Children in Std I-II who CAN RECOGNIZE numbers 1 to 9 or more |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| Coastal Andhra | 88.86 | 86.47 | 85.40 | 89.66 | 85.45 | 88.80 | 87.79 | 88.72 | 91.50 | 89.57 |
|  | $\pm 2.10$ | $\pm 2.26$ | $\pm 3.39$ | $\pm 2.22$ | $\pm 3.43$ | $\pm 2.12$ | $\pm 2.04$ | $\pm 2.93$ | $\pm 2.11$ | $\pm 2.69$ |
| Rayalaseema | 89.10 | 82.71 | 85.41 | 86.91 | 79.58 | 89.75 | 85.95 | 87.58 | 90.68 | 85.29 |
|  | $\pm 3.37$ | $\pm 3.31$ | $\pm 4.25$ | $\pm 3.20$ | $\pm 4.50$ | $\pm 3.14$ | $\pm 3.18$ | $\pm 3.98$ | $\pm 2.84$ | $\pm 3.56$ |
| Telangana | 83.75 | 78.43 | 86.07 | 84.46 | 84.10 | 86.12 | 81.31 | 88.57 | 86.76 | 89.70 |
|  | $\pm 2.55$ | $\pm 3.43$ | $\pm 2.81$ | $\pm 2.98$ | $\pm 2.71$ | $\pm 2.31$ | $\pm 3.07$ | $\pm 2.42$ | $\pm 2.72$ | $\pm 2.14$ |
| State | 86.96 | 82.87 | 85.68 | 87.28 | 83.92 | 87.93 | 85.12 | 88.47 | 89.68 | 88.89 |
|  | $\pm 1.50$ | $\pm 1.77$ | $\pm 1.98$ | $\pm 1.59$ | $\pm 1.98$ | $\pm 1.41$ | $\pm 1.59$ | $\pm 1.72$ | $\pm 1.47$ | $\pm 1.57$ |

Learning levels: Std III-V

| Division/Region | \% Children in Std III-V who CAN READ <br> Level 1 (Std I) text or more |  |  |  | \% Children in Std III-V who CAN DO <br> subtraction or more |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
|  | 74.21 | 68.84 | 73.73 | 78.40 | 67.48 | 65.58 | 67.32 | 66.73 | 70.68 | 69.59 |
|  | $\pm 2.43$ | $\pm 3.10$ | $\pm 3.34$ | $\pm 2.74$ | $\pm 3.26$ | $\pm 2.94$ | $\pm 2.87$ | $\pm 3.37$ | $\pm 3.13$ | $\pm 3.20$ |
| Rayalaseema | 75.28 | 68.47 | 68.79 | 68.34 | 64.97 | 71.01 | 67.77 | 65.72 | 67.02 | 67.14 |
|  | $\pm 3.82$ | $\pm 4.78$ | $\pm 5.16$ | $\pm 4.49$ | $\pm 5.42$ | $\pm 4.38$ | $\pm 4.88$ | $\pm 5.43$ | $\pm 4.64$ | $\pm 5.35$ |
|  | 68.33 | 61.64 | 66.11 | 63.03 | 64.90 | 57.92 | 57.12 | 59.52 | 55.19 | 63.27 |
|  | $\pm 2.96$ | $\pm 3.27$ | $\pm 3.15$ | $\pm 3.24$ | $\pm 3.50$ | $\pm 3.05$ | $\pm 3.62$ | $\pm 3.38$ | $\pm 3.52$ | $\pm 3.70$ |

Note: Districts have been clubbed into divisions to produce these estimates. The grouping of districts is based on administrative divisions used in the state or by geographical regions.

The first row for each division gives the estimate of the relevant variable/year. The numbers below the estimate, in the second row, are twice the standard error of the corresponding estimate and represent the 95\% confidence interval for the estimate. For instance, in Coastal Andhra division of Andhra Pradesh, in 2012, \% of Std I-II children who could read letters or more is 85.45\%. With 95\% probability, the true population proportion lies within $\pm 3.43 \%$ points of the estimate, i.e., between $88.88 \%$ and $82.02 \%$.

## List of districts under each division

## Coastal Andhra

Srikakulam

| Vizianagaram |
| :--- |
| Visakhapatnam |
| East Godavari |
| West Godavari |
| Krishna |
| Guntur |
| Prakasam |
| Sri Potti Sriramulu Nellore |

## Rayalaseema

| Chittoor |
| :--- |
| Cuddapah (Y.S.R.) |
| Kurnool |
| Anantapur |
| Telangana |
| Adilabad |
| Nizamabad |
| Karimnagar |
| Medak |
| Rangareddy |
| Mahbubnagar |
| Nalgonda |
| Warangal |
| Khammam |

## Divisional Estimates

## Bihar

School enrollment and out of school children

| Division/Region | \% Children out of school (age: 6-14) |  |  |  |  | \% Children enrolled in private school (age: 6-14) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| Bhagalpur | 6.32 | 4.75 | 5.94 | 5.90 | 3.85 | 5.85 | 3.46 | 4.26 | 2.98 | 6.10 |
|  | $\pm 2.96$ | $\pm 1.82$ | $\pm 3.71$ | $\pm 2.23$ | $\pm 1.08$ | $\pm 2.83$ | $\pm 1.82$ | $\pm 2.69$ | $\pm 1.95$ | $\pm 1.98$ |
| Darbhanga | 5.49 | 5.46 | 3.25 | 2.63 | 3.90 | 6.34 | 3.79 | 3.23 | 5.26 | 5.72 |
|  | $\pm 1.47$ | $\pm 2.98$ | $\pm 1.12$ | $\pm 0.97$ | $\pm 1.06$ | $\pm 1.65$ | $\pm 1.65$ | $\pm 1.27$ | $\pm 1.49$ | $\pm 1.85$ |
| Kosi | 6.45 | 5.13 | 5.39 | 2.36 | 5.76 | 6.61 | 1.74 | 2.92 | 1.68 | 1.77 |
|  | $\pm 4.35$ | $\pm 1.21$ | $\pm 1.73$ | $\pm 0.85$ | $\pm 1.65$ | $\pm 5.22$ | $\pm 0.78$ | $\pm 1.49$ | $\pm 0.72$ | $\pm 0.76$ |
| Magadh | 4.18 | 5.01 | 4.79 | 2.98 | 1.74 | 11.91 | 5.47 | 8.83 | 7.63 | 10.03 |
|  | $\pm 1.37$ | $\pm 1.45$ | $\pm 2.34$ | $\pm 1.07$ | $\pm 0.57$ | $\pm 3.44$ | $\pm 1.69$ | $\pm 2.31$ | $\pm 1.62$ | $\pm 2.68$ |
| Munger | 5.03 | 3.46 | 3.64 | 3.40 | 3.13 | 7.05 | 4.82 | 3.19 | 4.82 | 7.27 |
|  | $\pm 1.09$ | $\pm 0.93$ | $\pm 1.00$ | $\pm 0.99$ | $\pm 0.91$ | $\pm 1.90$ | $\pm 1.55$ | $\pm 1.05$ | $\pm 1.26$ | $\pm 1.33$ |
| Patna | 2.97 | 2.82 | 1.43 | 3.00 | 1.94 | 11.15 | 8.85 | 5.28 | 9.58 | 6.09 |
|  | $\pm 0.81$ | $\pm 0.90$ | $\pm 0.54$ | $\pm 0.84$ | $\pm 0.52$ | $\pm 2.79$ | $\pm 2.12$ | $\pm 1.35$ | $\pm 1.90$ | $\pm 1.22$ |
| Purnia | 7.50 | 5.86 | 3.08 | 4.37 | 5.31 | 3.92 | 2.47 | 4.63 | 1.46 | 2.93 |
|  | $\pm 1.86$ | $\pm 1.34$ | $\pm 1.22$ | $\pm 1.60$ | $\pm 1.12$ | $\pm 1.25$ | $\pm 0.87$ | $\pm 2.60$ | $\pm 0.59$ | $\pm 0.88$ |
| Saran | 4.14 | 1.72 | 3.21 | 2.47 | 1.94 | 15.03 | 8.35 | 9.44 | 10.04 | 13.51 |
|  | $\pm 1.55$ | $\pm 0.71$ | $\pm 1.08$ | $\pm 1.13$ | $\pm 0.58$ | $\pm 3.10$ | $\pm 2.92$ | $\pm 2.22$ | $\pm 2.58$ | $\pm 2.63$ |
| Tirhut | 7.71 | 2.95 | 3.40 | 1.87 | 5.02 | 7.06 | 4.48 | 5.25 | 4.65 | 5.91 |
|  | $\pm 1.54$ | $\pm 0.76$ | $\pm 0.91$ | $\pm 0.63$ | $\pm 0.88$ | $\pm 1.70$ | $\pm 1.32$ | $\pm 1.39$ | $\pm 1.19$ | $\pm 1.14$ |
| State | 5.65 | 4.03 | 3.48 | 2.95 | 3.74 | 8.26 | 4.96 | 5.16 | 5.50 | 6.44 |
|  | $\pm 0.58$ | $\pm 0.54$ | $\pm 0.45$ | $\pm 0.37$ | $\pm 0.34$ | $\pm 0.84$ | $\pm 0.61$ | $\pm 0.62$ | $\pm 0.56$ | $\pm 0.59$ |

Learning levels: Std I-II

| Division/Region | \% Children in Std I-II who CAN READ letters or more |  |  |  |  | \% Children in Std I-II who CAN RECOGNIZE numbers 1 to 9 or more |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| Bhagalpur | 69.38 | 67.54 | 75.01 | 55.34 | 54.50 | 68.98 | 64.01 | 76.32 | 56.93 | 62.90 |
|  | $\pm 5.95$ | $\pm 8.00$ | $\pm 5.90$ | $\pm 6.10$ | $\pm 7.22$ | $\pm 6.20$ | $\pm 9.43$ | $\pm 5.57$ | $\pm 6.17$ | $\pm 7.12$ |
| Darbhanga | 58.52 | 71.91 | 56.28 | 55.90 | 53.56 | 61.90 | 70.88 | 56.69 | 58.35 | 60.44 |
|  | $\pm 5.60$ | $\pm 6.58$ | $\pm 6.76$ | $\pm 5.79$ | $\pm 5.43$ | $\pm 5.29$ | $\pm 6.37$ | $\pm 6.62$ | $\pm 5.81$ | $\pm 5.11$ |
| Kosi | 75.15 | 65.90 | 55.61 | 53.85 | 56.27 | 75.70 | 66.78 | 52.94 | 55.28 | 59.30 |
|  | $\pm 6.18$ | $\pm 5.87$ | $\pm 7.38$ | $\pm 5.94$ | $\pm 6.47$ | $\pm 7.01$ | $\pm 5.06$ | $\pm 7.53$ | $\pm 5.22$ | $\pm 6.21$ |
| Magadh | 76.60 | 73.27 | 72.13 | 54.12 | 65.82 | 77.48 | 75.21 | 72.94 | 61.23 | 72.85 |
|  | $\pm 4.48$ | $\pm 4.25$ | $\pm 4.91$ | $\pm 5.33$ | $\pm 6.27$ | $\pm 4.68$ | $\pm 4.39$ | $\pm 4.75$ | $\pm 4.82$ | $\pm 4.83$ |
| Munger | 71.30 | 70.06 | 67.88 | 59.99 | 59.71 | 71.04 | 73.43 | 70.30 | 69.41 | 70.08 |
|  | $\pm 4.82$ | $\pm 4.71$ | $\pm 4.55$ | $\pm 4.60$ | $\pm 5.16$ | $\pm 4.78$ | $\pm 4.46$ | $\pm 4.35$ | $\pm 4.26$ | $\pm 4.85$ |
| Patna | 79.49 | 80.45 | 78.66 | 66.69 | 61.10 | 79.25 | 81.46 | 77.80 | 71.37 | 68.17 |
|  | $\pm 4.61$ | $\pm 4.23$ | $\pm 4.12$ | $\pm 4.56$ | $\pm 4.47$ | $\pm 5.09$ | $\pm 4.41$ | $\pm 4.25$ | $\pm 4.35$ | $\pm 4.04$ |
| Purnia | 70.96 | 74.13 | 79.89 | 62.55 | 49.50 | 70.05 | 74.23 | 80.45 | 66.65 | 56.92 |
|  | $\pm 4.90$ | $\pm 4.44$ | $\pm 3.90$ | $\pm 4.69$ | $\pm 5.11$ | $\pm 4.47$ | $\pm 4.43$ | $\pm 3.89$ | $\pm 4.76$ | $\pm 4.78$ |
| Saran | 68.48 | 67.18 | 68.78 | 64.50 | 56.96 | 69.49 | 70.80 | 67.81 | 65.38 | 58.88 |
|  | $\pm 5.61$ | $\pm 8.47$ | $\pm 7.29$ | $\pm 6.85$ | $\pm 5.15$ | $\pm 5.47$ | $\pm 8.33$ | $\pm 7.36$ | $\pm 6.34$ | $\pm 5.63$ |
| Tirhut | 62.69 | 66.04 | 66.59 | 59.97 | 52.17 | 67.68 | 68.14 | 65.28 | 58.28 | 55.53 |
|  | $\pm 3.77$ | $\pm 4.01$ | $\pm 3.90$ | $\pm 4.50$ | $\pm 4.24$ | $\pm 3.25$ | $\pm 4.17$ | $\pm 4.03$ | $\pm 4.51$ | $\pm 3.71$ |
| State | 68.22 | 71.00 | 68.45 | 59.66 | 55.91 | 69.96 | 72.17 | 68.21 | 62.49 | 61.66 |
|  | $\pm 1.84$ | $\pm 1.86$ | $\pm 1.96$ | $\pm 1.87$ | $\pm 1.85$ | $\pm 1.72$ | $\pm 1.85$ | $\pm 1.98$ | $\pm 1.84$ | $\pm 1.73$ |

Note: Districts have been clubbed into divisions to produce these estimates. The grouping of districts is based on administrative divisions used in the state or by geographical regions.

The first row for each division gives the estimate of the relevant variable/year. The numbers below the estimate, in the second row, are twice the standard error of the corresponding estimate and represent the 95\% confidence interval for the estimate. For instance, in Bhagalpur division of Bihar, in 2012, \% of Std I-II children who could read letters or more is $54.50 \%$. With $95 \%$ probability, the true population proportion lies within $\pm 7.22 \%$ points of the estimate, i.e., between $61.72 \%$ and $47.28 \%$.

## List of districts under <br> each division <br> Bhagalpur

| Bhagalpur |
| :--- |
| Banka |
| Darbhanga |
| Madhubani |
| Darbhanga |
| Samastipur |
| Kosi |

Supaul

| Madhepura |
| :--- |
| Saharsa |
| Magadh |

Jehanabad

| Aurangabad |
| :--- |
| Arwal |
| Gaya |
| Nawada |
| Munger |
| Begusarai |
| Khagaria |
| Munger |
| Lakhisarai |
| Sheikhpura |
| Jamui |

## Divisional Estimates

## Bihar

Learning levels: Std III-V

| Division/Region | \% Children in Std III-V who CAN READ <br> Level 1 (Std I) text or more |  |  |  | \% Children in Std III-V who CAN DO |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



List of districts under
each division

| Patna |
| :--- |
| Nalanda |
| Patna |
| Bhojpur |
| Buxar |
| Kaimur (Bhabua) |
| Rohtas |
| Purnia |
| Araria |
| Kishanganj |
| Purnia |
| Katihar |
| Saran |

Gopalganj
Siwan
Saran

## Tirhut

Pashchim Champaran
Purba Champaran
Sheohar
Sitamarhi

## Muzaffarpur

Vaishali

## Divisional Estimates

Facilitated by PRATHAN

## Chhattisgarh

School enrollment and out of school children

| Division/Region | \% Children out of school (age: 6-14) |  |  |  |  | \% Children enrolled in private school (age: 6-14) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| Bastar | 4.31 | 5.61 | 1.83 | 1.72 | 3.5 | 6.27 | 2.11 | 3.37 | 4.45 | 6.96 |
|  | $\pm 1.66$ | $\pm 2.25$ | $\pm 1.06$ | $\pm 1.21$ | $\pm 2.21$ | $\pm 3.77$ | $\pm 1.30$ | $\pm 2.03$ | $\pm 2.41$ | $\pm 3.00$ |
| Bilaspur | 3.95 | 3.01 | 2.59 | 2.86 | 3.05 | 13.06 | 10.33 | 11.46 | 10.79 | 13.81 |
|  | $\pm 0.94$ | $\pm 1.01$ | $\pm 1.01$ | $\pm 0.85$ | $\pm 0.77$ | $\pm 3.63$ | $\pm 3.02$ | $\pm 3.14$ | $\pm 2.79$ | $\pm 2.84$ |
| Raipur | 4.73 | 2.59 | 1.73 | 2.63 | 1.83 | 9.35 | 9.48 | 8.74 | 10.96 | 13.28 |
|  | $\pm 1.08$ | $\pm 1.06$ | $\pm 0.72$ | $\pm 0.76$ | $\pm 0.69$ | $\pm 2.12$ | $\pm 2.26$ | $\pm 2.03$ | $\pm 2.74$ | $\pm 2.49$ |
| Surguja | 5.70 | 4.08 | 1.01 | 1.60 | 3.13 | 10.84 | 12.30 | 14.98 | 15.59 | 16.75 |
|  | $\pm 1.72$ | $\pm 1.34$ | $\pm 0.64$ | $\pm 0.89$ | $\pm 1.21$ | $\pm 3.27$ | $\pm 3.99$ | $\pm 4.35$ | $\pm 4.73$ | $\pm 4.59$ |
| State | 4.64 | 3.34 | 1.86 | 2.40 | 2.60 | 10.33 | 9.41 | 10.09 | 11.01 | 13.52 |
|  | $\pm 0.65$ | $\pm 0.64$ | $\pm 0.46$ | $\pm 0.45$ | $\pm 0.49$ | $\pm 1.56$ | $\pm 1.51$ | $\pm 1.52$ | $\pm 1.68$ | $\pm 1.66$ |

Learning levels: Std I-II

| Division/Region | \% Children in Std I-II who CAN READ letters or more |  |  |  |  | \% Children in Std I-II who CAN RECOGNIZE numbers 1 to 9 or more |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| Bastar | 94.09 | 92.33 | 83.16 | 75.01 | 68.84 | 94.40 | 93.44 | 83.47 | 70.00 | 66.32 |
|  | $\pm 3.63$ | $\pm 5.07$ | $\pm 6.56$ | $\pm 10.26$ | $\pm 8.38$ | $\pm 2.85$ | $\pm 4.12$ | $\pm 6.96$ | $\pm 10.35$ | $\pm 8.90$ |
| Bilaspur | 92.97 | 90.46 | 88.96 | 75.81 | 70.12 | 92.69 | 90.00 | 90.02 | 73.53 | 72.34 |
|  | $\pm 2.98$ | $\pm 3.04$ | $\pm 3.66$ | $\pm 5.36$ | $\pm 5.44$ | $\pm 3.04$ | $\pm 3.40$ | $\pm 2.89$ | $\pm 5.72$ | $\pm 5.27$ |
| Raipur | 94.38 | 89.12 | 89.32 | 76.90 | 76.05 | 94.97 | 88.81 | 89.23 | 78.59 | 77.50 |
|  | $\pm 1.79$ | $\pm 2.70$ | $\pm 2.74$ | $\pm 4.61$ | $\pm 4.43$ | $\pm 1.59$ | $\pm 2.56$ | $\pm 2.74$ | $\pm 4.12$ | $\pm 4.40$ |
| Surguja | 93.62 | 89.67 | 83.95 | 74.17 | 72.36 | 95.40 | 90.45 | 81.75 | 72.90 | 77.79 |
|  | $\pm 2.54$ | $\pm 3.97$ | $\pm 4.61$ | $\pm 6.67$ | $\pm 8.50$ | $\pm 2.26$ | $\pm 3.62$ | $\pm 4.87$ | $\pm 7.00$ | $\pm 6.90$ |
| State | 93.82 | 89.97 | 87.56 | 75.82 | 73.02 | 94.36 | 90.03 | 87.43 | 74.97 | 75.24 |
|  | $\pm 1.28$ | $\pm 1.70$ | $\pm 1.91$ | $\pm 2.98$ | $\pm 3.18$ | $\pm 1.20$ | $\pm 1.65$ | $\pm 1.86$ | $\pm 3.00$ | $\pm 2.97$ |

Learning levels: Std III-V

| Division/Region | \% Children in Std III-V who CAN READ <br> Level 1 (Std I) text or more |  |  |  |  | \% Children in Std III-V who CAN DO |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Note: Districts have been clubbed into divisions to produce these estimates. The grouping of districts is based on administrative divisions used in the state or by geographical regions.

The first row for each division gives the estimate of the relevant variable/year. The numbers below the estimate, in the second row, are twice the standard error of the corresponding estimate and represent the $95 \%$ confidence interval for the estimate. For instance, in Bastar division of Chhattisgarh, in 2012, \% of Std I-II children who could read letters or more is $68.84 \%$. With $95 \%$ probability, the true population proportion lies within $\pm 8.38 \%$ points of the estimate, i.e., between 77.22\% and 60.46\%.

| List of districts under |
| :--- |
| each division |
| Bastar |
| Uttar Bastar Kanker |
| Bastar |
| Dakshin Bastar Dantewada |
| Bilaspur |
| Raigarh |
| Korba |
| Janjir-Champa |
| Bilaspur |
| Raipur |
| Kabeerdham |
| Rajnandgaon |
| Durg |
| Raipur |
| Mahasamund |
| Dhamtari |
| Surguja |
| Koriya |
| Surguja |
| Jashpur |

## Divisional Estimates

Facilitated by PRATHAM

## Gujarat

| Division/Region | \% Children out of school (age: 6-14) |  |  |  |  | \% Children enrolled in private school (age: 6-14) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| Central | 5.21 | 4.17 | 3.53 | 2.73 | 2.39 | 10.22 | 9.93 | 9.90 | 11.22 | 10.92 |
|  | $\pm 1.54$ | $\pm 0.74$ | $\pm 0.84$ | $\pm 0.73$ | $\pm 0.58$ | $\pm 2.76$ | $\pm 2.07$ | $\pm 2.15$ | $\pm 2.50$ | $\pm 2.05$ |
| North | 3.81 | 5.23 | 3.78 | 3.51 | 3.40 | 5.49 | 11.74 | 8.25 | 8.79 | 13.39 |
|  | $\pm 1.26$ | $\pm 1.17$ | $\pm 1.12$ | $\pm 1.05$ | $\pm 0.95$ | $\pm 1.44$ | $\pm 2.44$ | $\pm 2.35$ | $\pm 2.11$ | $\pm 3.25$ |
| Saurashtra | 3.94 | 3.74 | 5.35 | 1.91 | 3.09 | 10.37 | 8.23 | 15.02 | 12.81 | 10.71 |
|  | $\pm 0.96$ | $\pm 0.81$ | $\pm 1.13$ | $\pm 0.57$ | $\pm 0.67$ | $\pm 2.51$ | $\pm 1.62$ | $\pm 2.37$ | $\pm 2.91$ | $\pm 1.96$ |
| South | 3.42 | 4.00 | 2.71 | 2.88 | 4.02 | 5.17 | 12.65 | 7.52 | 8.20 | 13.89 |
|  | $\pm 0.93$ | $\pm 1.15$ | $\pm 0.81$ | $\pm 0.93$ | $\pm 0.95$ | $\pm 1.41$ | $\pm 2.99$ | $\pm 2.16$ | $\pm 2.94$ | $\pm 3.28$ |
| State | 4.22 | 4.26 | 4.00 | 2.66 | 3.06 | 8.28 | 10.22 | 10.71 | 10.84 | 11.76 |
|  | $\pm 0.65$ | $\pm 0.47$ | $\pm 0.52$ | $\pm 0.41$ | $\pm 0.38$ | $\pm 1.22$ | $\pm 1.09$ | $\pm 1.19$ | $\pm 1.40$ | $\pm 1.23$ |

Learning levels: Std I-II

| Division/Region | \% Children in Std I-II who CAN READ letters or more |  |  |  |  | \% Children in Std I-II who CAN RECOGNIZE numbers 1 to 9 or more |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| Central | 69.26 | 73.82 | 78.52 | 80.55 | 73.34 | 69.31 | 72.13 | 77.91 | 78.71 | 72.36 |
|  | $\pm 4.58$ | $\pm 4.18$ | $\pm 3.45$ | $\pm 4.20$ | $\pm 4.63$ | $\pm 4.77$ | $\pm 4.54$ | $\pm 3.49$ | $\pm 4.25$ | $\pm 4.32$ |
| North | 69.21 | 72.01 | 83.59 | 76.03 | 67.66 | 71.09 | 75.39 | 83.08 | 73.93 | 63.57 |
|  | $\pm 6.07$ | $\pm 4.85$ | $\pm 3.74$ | $\pm 5.03$ | $\pm 5.53$ | $\pm 5.79$ | $\pm 4.95$ | $\pm 3.73$ | $\pm 5.06$ | $\pm 6.11$ |
| Saurashtra | 72.91 | 78.11 | 83.55 | 85.52 | 77.52 | 71.58 | 76.43 | 77.98 | 85.19 | 75.76 |
|  | $\pm 4.06$ | $\pm 3.54$ | $\pm 3.76$ | $\pm 3.16$ | $\pm 3.59$ | $\pm 4.02$ | $\pm 3.90$ | $\pm 4.01$ | $\pm 3.44$ | $\pm 3.53$ |
| South | 82.38 | 81.25 | 81.78 | 71.11 | 69.94 | 81.75 | 79.80 | 81.15 | 75.29 | 72.92 |
|  | $\pm 4.91$ | $\pm 4.15$ | $\pm 3.97$ | $\pm 5.75$ | $\pm 5.33$ | $\pm 5.45$ | $\pm 4.93$ | $\pm 4.24$ | $\pm 5.00$ | $\pm 5.26$ |
| State | 72.53 | 75.77 | 81.64 | 79.71 | 73.14 | 72.59 | 75.39 | 79.60 | 78.95 | 71.70 |
|  | $\pm 2.58$ | $\pm 2.16$ | $\pm 1.89$ | $\pm 2.26$ | $\pm 2.38$ | $\pm 2.56$ | $\pm 2.32$ | $\pm 1.96$ | $\pm 2.30$ | $\pm 2.39$ |

Learning levels: Std III-V

| Division/Region | \% Children in Std III-V who CAN READ Level 1 (Std I) text or more |  |  |  |  | \% Children in Std III-V who CAN DO subtraction or more |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| Central | 56.04 | 52.73 | 57.48 | 59.26 | 51.38 | 37.94 | 34.97 | 43.14 | 35.03 | 27.13 |
|  | $\pm 4.49$ | $\pm 4.07$ | $\pm 3.78$ | $\pm 4.51$ | $\pm 4.86$ | $\pm 4.46$ | $\pm 4.45$ | $\pm 4.04$ | $\pm 4.48$ | $\pm 4.04$ |
| North | 62.88 | 60.95 | 65.73 | 63.92 | 64.53 | 52.45 | 42.96 | 50.83 | 44.15 | 33.05 |
|  | $\pm 5.26$ | $\pm 5.24$ | $\pm 4.91$ | $\pm 4.75$ | $\pm 4.30$ | $\pm 5.61$ | $\pm 5.60$ | $\pm 5.07$ | $\pm 4.58$ | $\pm 3.85$ |
| Saurashtra | 58.05 | 58.50 | 68.94 | 68.22 | 62.03 | 38.67 | 43.53 | 45.94 | 52.33 | 37.11 |
|  | $\pm 4.14$ | $\pm 3.90$ | $\pm 3.35$ | $\pm 3.93$ | $\pm 3.63$ | $\pm 4.23$ | $\pm 4.05$ | $\pm 3.78$ | $\pm 4.56$ | $\pm 3.66$ |
| South | 65.06 | 58.56 | 59.70 | 60.46 | 62.50 | 48.67 | 45.87 | 49.40 | 40.66 | 34.08 |
|  | $\pm 4.92$ | $\pm 4.69$ | $\pm 4.60$ | $\pm 5.24$ | $\pm 4.58$ | $\pm 4.56$ | $\pm 5.67$ | $\pm 5.36$ | $\pm 5.42$ | $\pm 5.02$ |
| State | 59.83 | 57.29 | 63.00 | 63.34 | 58.97 | 43.62 | 41.05 | 46.61 | 43.36 | 32.58 |
|  | $\pm 2.37$ | $\pm 2.26$ | $\pm 2.05$ | $\pm 2.32$ | $\pm 2.35$ | $\pm 2.43$ | $\pm 2.45$ | $\pm 2.23$ | $\pm 2.48$ | $\pm 2.12$ |

Note: Districts have been clubbed into divisions to produce these estimates. The grouping of districts is based on administrative divisions used in the state or by geographical regions.

The first row for each division gives the estimate of the relevant variable/year. The numbers below the estimate, in the second row, are twice the standard error of the corresponding estimate and represent the 95\% confidence interval for the estimate. For instance, in Central division of Gujarat, in 2012, \% of Std I-II children who could read letters or more is $73.34 \%$. With $95 \%$ probability, the true population proportion lies within $\pm 4.63 \%$ points of the estimate, i.e., between $77.97 \%$ and $68.71 \%$.

| List of districts under <br> each division <br> Central <br> Ahmadabad <br> Anand <br> Kheda <br> Panch Mahals <br> Dohad <br> Vadodara <br> Narmada <br> North <br> Banas Kantha <br> Patan <br> Mahesana <br> Sabar Kantha <br> Gandhinagar <br> Saurashtra <br> Kachchh <br> Surendranagar <br> Rajkot <br> Jamnagar <br> Porbandar <br> Junagadh <br> Amreli <br> Bhavnagar <br> South <br> Bharuch <br> The Dangs <br> Navsari <br> Valsad <br> Tapi <br> Surat |
| :--- |

## Divisional Estimates

## Haryana

School enrollment and out of school children

| Division/Region | \% Children out of school (age: 6-14) |  |  |  |  | \% Children enrolled in private school (age: 6-14) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| Ambala | 1.72 | 1.44 | 0.71 | 1.07 | 1.61 | 35.34 | 38.07 | 30.19 | 37.38 | 45.21 |
|  | $\pm 0.51$ | $\pm 0.48$ | $\pm 0.29$ | $\pm 0.72$ | $\pm 1.18$ | $\pm 3.97$ | $\pm 4.36$ | $\pm 3.97$ | $\pm 4.16$ | $\pm 3.83$ |
| Gurgaon | 6.53 | 5.70 | 2.17 | 2.46 | 3.18 | 38.19 | 34.87 | 37.18 | 38.33 | 45.49 |
|  | $\pm 2.05$ | $\pm 2.22$ | $\pm 0.85$ | $\pm 1.03$ | $\pm 1.10$ | $\pm 4.28$ | $\pm 5.00$ | $\pm 5.16$ | $\pm 5.26$ | $\pm 5.36$ |
| Hisar | 2.00 | 2.06 | 0.49 | 0.77 | 0.57 | 43.24 | 38.40 | 46.13 | 43.14 | 45.96 |
|  | $\pm 0.85$ | $\pm 1.02$ | $\pm 0.24$ | $\pm 0.39$ | $\pm 0.28$ | $\pm 3.95$ | $\pm 4.20$ | $\pm 4.02$ | $\pm 5.20$ | $\pm 4.10$ |
| Rohtak | 1.24 | 3.46 | 1.05 | 0.62 | 0.72 | 42.59 | 52.90 | 49.90 | 58.36 | 60.42 |
|  | $\pm 0.56$ | $\pm 2.69$ | $\pm 0.65$ | $\pm 0.38$ | $\pm 0.53$ | $\pm 4.08$ | $\pm 4.03$ | $\pm 4.62$ | $\pm 4.61$ | $\pm 4.02$ |
| State | 2.90 | 3.14 | 1.10 | 1.37 | 1.45 | 40.34 | 40.78 | 41.84 | 43.39 | 49.24 |
|  | $\pm 0.65$ | $\pm 0.91$ | $\pm 0.30$ | $\pm 0.41$ | $\pm 0.41$ | $\pm 2.08$ | $\pm 2.31$ | $\pm 2.35$ | $\pm 2.63$ | $\pm 2.34$ |

Learning levels: Std I-II

| Division/Region | \% Children in Std I-II who CAN READ letters or more |  |  |  |  | \% Children in Std I-II who CAN RECOGNIZE numbers 1 to 9 or more |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| Ambala | 77.29 | 86.31 | 83.98 | 77.95 | 79.04 | 80.23 | 86.99 | 84.21 | 83.33 | 83.42 |
|  | $\pm 4.55$ | $\pm 3.73$ | $\pm 4.26$ | $\pm 4.56$ | $\pm 4.41$ | $\pm 4.14$ | $\pm 3.35$ | $\pm 4.20$ | $\pm 4.06$ | $\pm 4.12$ |
| Gurgaon | 70.73 | 83.58 | 88.33 | 77.45 | 71.29 | 73.06 | 84.01 | 89.55 | 81.04 | 79.69 |
|  | $\pm 3.99$ | $\pm 3.91$ | $\pm 2.94$ | $\pm 6.02$ | $\pm 5.76$ | $\pm 3.82$ | $\pm 3.87$ | $\pm 2.90$ | $\pm 5.79$ | $\pm 4.74$ |
| Hisar | 78.79 | 84.09 | 89.20 | 84.28 | 81.23 | 79.03 | 84.21 | 90.44 | 84.83 | 85.25 |
|  | $\pm 3.78$ | $\pm 4.05$ | $\pm 2.90$ | $\pm 5.30$ | $\pm 3.53$ | $\pm 4.06$ | $\pm 3.68$ | $\pm 2.67$ | $\pm 5.45$ | $\pm 2.89$ |
| Rohtak | 83.69 | 88.05 | 88.79 | 87.90 | 86.44 | 83.50 | 89.39 | 89.18 | 87.72 | 90.18 |
|  | $\pm 3.24$ | $\pm 4.00$ | $\pm 3.26$ | $\pm 5.11$ | $\pm 2.79$ | $\pm 3.10$ | $\pm 4.11$ | $\pm 3.39$ | $\pm 6.00$ | $\pm 2.45$ |
| State | 77.24 | 85.26 | 87.95 | 81.27 | 79.63 | 78.45 | 85.81 | 88.81 | 83.77 | 84.77 |
|  | $\pm 2.04$ | $\pm 2.01$ | $\pm 1.62$ | $\pm 2.88$ | $\pm 2.25$ | $\pm 1.99$ | $\pm 1.91$ | $\pm 1.60$ | $\pm 2.83$ | $\pm 1.86$ |

Learning levels: Std III-V

| Division/Region | \% Children in Std III-V who CAN READ Level 1 (Std I) text or more |  |  |  |  | \% Children in Std III-V who CAN DO subtraction or more |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| Ambala | 67.79 | 63.69 | 61.74 | 62.35 | 66.91 | 58.30 | 60.11 | 56.59 | 53.10 | 55.35 |
|  | $\pm 4.32$ | $\pm 5.35$ | $\pm 4.92$ | $\pm 4.75$ | $\pm 4.14$ | $\pm 4.53$ | $\pm 5.15$ | $\pm 5.57$ | $\pm 4.22$ | $\pm 4.17$ |
| Gurgaon | 71.82 | 70.11 | 75.92 | 71.89 | 58.23 | 60.68 | 67.81 | 71.61 | 65.66 | 48.71 |
|  | $\pm 3.37$ | $\pm 4.95$ | $\pm 3.99$ | $\pm 5.00$ | $\pm 6.19$ | $\pm 4.31$ | $\pm 5.31$ | $\pm 4.05$ | $\pm 5.71$ | $\pm 5.85$ |
| Hisar | 76.18 | 71.68 | 75.08 | 69.41 | 66.27 | 70.42 | 68.81 | 72.48 | 67.54 | 59.93 |
|  | $\pm 3.72$ | $\pm 4.37$ | $\pm 3.72$ | $\pm 5.72$ | $\pm 3.92$ | $\pm 4.24$ | $\pm 4.51$ | $\pm 3.71$ | $\pm 4.79$ | $\pm 4.27$ |
| Rohtak | 75.64 | 73.59 | 74.06 | 75.30 | 76.20 | 70.64 | 73.21 | 73.34 | 71.96 | 69.36 |
|  | $\pm 4.53$ | $\pm 4.75$ | $\pm 4.62$ | $\pm 5.28$ | $\pm 3.81$ | $\pm 4.84$ | $\pm 5.00$ | $\pm 4.75$ | $\pm 5.02$ | $\pm 4.29$ |
| State | 73.33 | 70.17 | 72.37 | 69.79 | 66.96 | 65.69 | 67.85 | 69.29 | 64.46 | 58.77 |
|  | $\pm 2.01$ | $\pm 2.43$ | $\pm 2.19$ | $\pm 2.66$ | $\pm 2.44$ | $\pm 2.31$ | $\pm 2.54$ | $\pm 2.30$ | $\pm 2.67$ | $\pm 2.52$ |

Note: Districts have been clubbed into divisions to produce these estimates. The grouping of districts is based on administrative divisions used in the state or by geographical regions.

The first row for each division gives the estimate of the relevant variable/year. The numbers below the estimate, in the second row, are twice the standard error of the corresponding estimate and represent the 95\% confidence interval for the estimate. For instance, in Ambala division of Haryana, in 2012, \% of Std I-II children who could read letters or more is $79.04 \%$. With $95 \%$ probability, the true population proportion lies within $\pm 4.41 \%$ points of the estimate, i.e., between $83.45 \%$ and $74.63 \%$.

List of districts under each division

| Ambala |
| :--- |
| Ambala |
| Kaithal |
| Kurukshetra |
| Panchkula |
| Yamunanagar |

## Gurgaon

Mahendragarh
Rewar
Mewat
Faridabad
Gurgaon

| Hisar |
| :--- |
| Bhiwani |
| Fatehabad |
| Hisar |
| Jind |
| Sirsa |
| Rohtak |
| Jhajjar |
| Karnal |
| Panipat |
| Rohtak |
| Sonipat |

## Divisional Estimates

## Himachal Pradesh

| School enrollment and out of school children |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Division/Region | \% Children out of school (age: 6-14) |  |  |  |  | \% Children enrolled in private school (age: 6-14) |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| Kangra | 0.81 | 0.83 | 0.33 | 0.85 | 1.77 | 28.53 | 23.62 | 27.37 | 26.59 | 26.41 |
|  | $\pm 0.53$ | $\pm 0.65$ | $\pm 0.27$ | $\pm 1.22$ | $\pm 1.40$ | $\pm 6.79$ | $\pm 5.29$ | $\pm 5.86$ | $\pm 5.80$ | $\pm 6.67$ |
| Mandi | 0.40 | 0.38 | 0.09 | 0.42 | 0.34 | 23.44 | 22.81 | 26.40 | 28.37 | 32.92 |
|  | $\pm 0.27$ | $\pm 0.28$ | $\pm 0.10$ | $\pm 0.27$ | $\pm 0.27$ | $\pm 4.86$ | $\pm 4.69$ | $\pm 4.97$ | $\pm 5.41$ | $\pm 5.40$ |
| Shimla | 0.61 | 0.83 | 0.64 | 0.30 | 1.00 | 19.23 | 18.33 | 20.54 | 24.45 | 27.69 |
|  | $\pm 0.33$ | $\pm 0.43$ | $\pm 0.45$ | $\pm 0.22$ | $\pm 1.08$ | $\pm 3.91$ | $\pm 4.32$ | $\pm 4.29$ | $\pm 5.26$ | $\pm 5.25$ |
| State | 0.62 | 0.67 | 0.33 | 0.55 | 1.01 | 24.26 | 21.97 | 25.30 | 26.63 | 28.92 |
|  | $\pm 0.24$ | $\pm 0.30$ | $\pm 0.16$ | $\pm 0.47$ | $\pm 0.61$ | $\pm 3.36$ | $\pm 2.88$ | $\pm 3.13$ | $\pm 3.22$ | $\pm 3.32$ |

Learning levels: Std I-II

| Division/Region | \% Children in Std I-II who CAN READ letters or more |  |  |  |  | \% Children in Std I-II who CAN RECOGNIZE numbers 1 to 9 or more |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| Kangra | 86.88 | 87.23 | 92.91 | 91.67 | 84.20 | 89.72 | 87.15 | 93.15 | 95.42 | 89.26 |
|  | $\pm 4.42$ | $\pm 4.78$ | $\pm 2.72$ | $\pm 4.29$ | $\pm 6.12$ | $\pm 3.33$ | $\pm 4.54$ | $\pm 3.10$ | $\pm 2.29$ | $\pm 4.99$ |
| Mandi | 92.96 | 95.44 | 90.18 | 94.25 | 92.36 | 94.83 | 97.68 | 90.24 | 96.24 | 95.22 |
|  | $\pm 3.03$ | $\pm 3.09$ | $\pm 4.30$ | $\pm 3.60$ | $\pm 3.54$ | $\pm 2.87$ | $\pm 1.12$ | $\pm 4.40$ | $\pm 2.43$ | $\pm 3.00$ |
| Shimla | 89.59 | 92.08 | 92.85 | 90.80 | 90.92 | 90.37 | 91.31 | 94.57 | 94.19 | 95.91 |
|  | $\pm 3.83$ | $\pm 3.75$ | $\pm 3.06$ | $\pm 3.80$ | $\pm 5.80$ | $\pm 3.32$ | $\pm 3.73$ | $\pm 2.76$ | $\pm 2.83$ | $\pm 2.80$ |
| State | 89.71 | 91.52 | 92.05 | 92.33 | 89.60 | 91.61 | 92.10 | 92.64 | 95.38 | 93.95 |
|  | $\pm 2.25$ | $\pm 2.33$ | $\pm 1.95$ | $\pm 2.31$ | $\pm 3.19$ | $\pm 1.87$ | $\pm 2.08$ | $\pm 2.04$ | $\pm 1.43$ | $\pm 2.05$ |

Learning levels: Std III-V

| Division/Region | \% Children in Std III-V who CAN READ Level 1 (Std I) text or more |  |  |  |  | \% Children in Std III-V who CAN DO subtraction or more |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| Kangra | 84.59 | 78.19 | 83.08 | 80.33 | 68.90 | 75.97 | 79.62 | 79.24 | 76.30 | 58.17 |
|  | $\pm 4.78$ | $\pm 6.02$ | $\pm 3.70$ | $\pm 4.36$ | $\pm 7.13$ | $\pm 5.48$ | $\pm 6.65$ | $\pm 4.77$ | $\pm 4.73$ | $\pm 7.87$ |
| Mandi | 85.14 | 84.39 | 76.77 | 82.02 | 87.48 | 83.18 | 84.17 | 71.65 | 73.26 | 72.78 |
|  | $\pm 3.19$ | $\pm 3.99$ | $\pm 5.28$ | $\pm 6.81$ | $\pm 3.77$ | $\pm 3.98$ | $\pm 3.83$ | $\pm 5.85$ | $\pm 7.75$ | $\pm 5.16$ |
| Shimla | 83.02 | 85.95 | 84.79 | 84.95 | 79.72 | 73.34 | 82.06 | 81.37 | 77.26 | 63.68 |
|  | $\pm 3.96$ | $\pm 3.76$ | $\pm 3.90$ | $\pm 3.50$ | $\pm 4.98$ | $\pm 5.24$ | $\pm 5.28$ | $\pm 4.16$ | $\pm 4.45$ | $\pm 6.65$ |
| State | 84.33 | 82.36 | 81.63 | 82.13 | 78.97 | 77.60 | 81.80 | 77.51 | 75.51 | 64.81 |
|  | $\pm 2.41$ | $\pm 2.87$ | $\pm 2.55$ | $\pm 3.03$ | $\pm 3.33$ | $\pm 2.95$ | $\pm 3.21$ | $\pm 3.06$ | $\pm 3.48$ | $\pm 4.01$ |

Note: Districts have been clubbed into divisions to produce these estimates. The grouping of districts is based on administrative divisions used in the state or by geographical regions.

The first row for each division gives the estimate of the relevant variable/year. The numbers below the estimate, in the second row, are twice the standard error of the corresponding estimate and represent the 95\% confidence interval for the estimate. For instance, in Kangra division of Himachal Pradesh, in 2012, \% of Std I-II children who could read letters or more is $84.20 \%$. With $95 \%$ probability, the true population proportion lies within $\pm 6.12 \%$ points of the estimate, i.e., between $90.32 \%$ and 78.08\%.

List of districts under each division

| Kangra |
| :--- | :--- |
| Chamba |
| Kangra |
| Una |
| Mandi |
| Bilaspur |
| Hamirpur |
| Kullu |
| Lahul \& Spiti |
| Mandi |
| Shimla |
| Kinnaur |
| Shimla |
| Sirmaur |
| Solan |

## Divisional Estimates

## Jammu and Kashmir

| School enrollment and out of school children |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Division/Region | \% Children out of school (age: 6-14) |  |  |  |  | \% Children enrolled in private school (age: 6-14) |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| Jammu | 2.95 | 2.27 |  | 2.68 | 2.63 | 36.33 | 27.03 |  | 32.65 | 41.93 |
|  | $\pm 1.80$ | $\pm 2.27$ |  | $\pm 1.17$ | $\pm 1.23$ | $\pm 4.94$ | $\pm 4.09$ |  | $\pm 5.53$ | $\pm 6.10$ |
| Kashmir Valley | 2.64 | 1.46 |  | 2.29 | 1.94 | 38.69 | 36.76 |  | 43.31 | 45.63 |
|  | $\pm 0.78$ | $\pm 0.80$ |  | $\pm 0.73$ | $\pm 0.51$ | $\pm 4.00$ | $\pm 4.13$ |  | $\pm 4.37$ | $\pm 4.00$ |
| Ladakh | 0.17 | 0.89 |  | 0.59 | 0.39 | 35.16 | 31.80 |  | 39.51 | 43.40 |
|  | $\pm 0.23$ | $\pm 0.81$ |  | $\pm 0.55$ | $\pm 0.40$ | $\pm 8.13$ | $\pm 6.23$ |  | $\pm 7.98$ | $\pm 7.70$ |
| State | 2.74 | 1.84 |  | 2.46 | 2.25 | 37.51 | 31.96 |  | 37.72 | 43.73 |
|  | $\pm 0.94$ | $\pm 1.16$ |  | $\pm 0.70$ | $\pm 0.67$ | $\pm 3.10$ | $\pm 2.89$ |  | $\pm 3.63$ | $\pm 3.60$ |

Learning levels: Std I-II

| Division/Region | \% Children in Std I-II who CAN READ letters or more |  |  |  |  | \% Children in Std I-II who CAN RECOGNIZE numbers 1 to 9 or more |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| Jammu | 87.30 | 81.37 |  | 87.40 | 87.83 | 89.46 | 84.05 |  | 90.54 | 89.69 |
|  | $\pm 4.09$ | $\pm 6.42$ |  | $\pm 3.33$ | $\pm 3.64$ | $\pm 3.90$ | $\pm 3.58$ |  | $\pm 3.35$ | $\pm 3.54$ |
| Kashmir Valley | 90.61 | 89.15 |  | 92.36 | 91.12 | 90.73 | 87.32 |  | 92.49 | 92.65 |
|  | $\pm 2.23$ | $\pm 4.36$ |  | $\pm 2.38$ | $\pm 2.86$ | $\pm 2.68$ | $\pm 3.87$ |  | $\pm 2.48$ | $\pm 2.47$ |
| Ladakh | 97.33 | 87.07 |  | 97.53 | 92.52 | 97.04 | 89.39 |  | 96.37 | 92.77 |
|  | $\pm 1.65$ | $\pm 6.74$ |  | $\pm 2.34$ | $\pm 4.33$ | $\pm 1.66$ | $\pm 5.33$ |  | $\pm 2.87$ | $\pm 4.28$ |
| State | 89.01 | 85.40 |  | 89.85 | 89.48 | 90.18 | 85.81 |  | 91.54 | 91.14 |
|  | $\pm 2.37$ | $\pm 3.82$ |  | $\pm 2.12$ | $\pm 2.30$ | $\pm 2.37$ | $\pm 2.58$ |  | $\pm 2.10$ | $\pm 2.15$ |

Learning levels: Std III-V

| Division/Region | \% Children in Std III-V who CAN READ Level 1 (Std I) text or more |  |  |  |  | \% Children in Std III-V who CAN DO subtraction or more |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| Jammu | 56.28 | 39.55 |  | 54.23 | 54.97 | 56.72 | 38.47 |  | 49.78 | 46.52 |
|  | $\pm 4.45$ | $\pm 4.92$ |  | $\pm 5.76$ | $\pm 5.77$ | $\pm 5.34$ | $\pm 5.76$ |  | $\pm 5.17$ | $\pm 5.42$ |
| Kashmir Valley | 53.06 | 55.59 |  | 58.55 | 64.50 | 51.21 | 50.75 |  | 51.17 | 50.65 |
|  | $\pm 4.66$ | $\pm 4.66$ |  | $\pm 4.76$ | $\pm 4.13$ | $\pm 4.62$ | $\pm 5.66$ |  | $\pm 5.28$ | $\pm 4.84$ |
| Ladakh | 70.06 | 51.99 |  | 77.93 | 76.61 | 62.32 | 56.23 |  | 70.55 | 62.77 |
|  | $\pm 8.03$ | $\pm 8.79$ |  | $\pm 5.99$ | $\pm 6.82$ | $\pm 9.02$ | $\pm 6.98$ |  | $\pm 6.30$ | $\pm 6.26$ |
| State | 55.00 | 48.62 |  | 56.70 | 59.55 | 54.19 | 45.69 |  | 50.86 | 48.66 |
|  | $\pm 3.16$ | $\pm 3.54$ |  | $\pm 3.74$ | $\pm 3.67$ | $\pm 3.49$ | $\pm 4.07$ |  | $\pm 3.63$ | $\pm 3.63$ |

[^13]Note: Districts have been clubbed into divisions to produce these estimates. The grouping of districts is based on administrative divisions used in the state or by geographical regions.

The first row for each division gives the estimate of the relevant variable/year. The numbers below the estimate, in the second row, are twice the standard error of the corresponding estimate and represent the 95\% confidence interval for the estimate. For instance, in Jammu division of Jammu \& Kashmir, in 2012, \% of Std I-II children who could read letters or more is $87.83 \%$. With $95 \%$ probability, the true population proportion lies within $\pm 3.64 \%$ points of the estimate, i.e., between $91.47 \%$ and 84.19\%.

## List of districts under

 each division| Jammu |
| :--- |
| Doda |
| Jammu |
| Kathua |
| Punch |
| Rajouri |
| Udhampur |
| Kashmir Valley |
| Anantnag |
| Badgam |
| Baramula |
| Kupwara |
| Pulwama |
| Srinagar |
| Ladakh |
| Kargil |
| Leh (Ladakh) |

## Divisional Estimates

## Jharkhand

| School enrollment and out of school children |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Division/Region | \% Children out of school (age: 6-14) |  |  |  |  | \% Children enrolled in private school (age: 6-14) |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| Kolhan | 12.98 | 7.64 | 7.18 | 8.53 | 5.95 | 3.54 | 6.44 | 6.62 | 9.10 | 9.49 |
|  | $\pm 3.91$ | $\pm 2.14$ | $\pm 2.28$ | $\pm 2.18$ | $\pm 1.80$ | $\pm 1.40$ | $\pm 2.22$ | $\pm 2.29$ | $\pm 3.21$ | $\pm 3.00$ |
| North Chotanagpur | 3.28 | 3.33 | 1.55 | 1.81 | 2.29 | 13.83 | 14.13 | 11.28 | 17.20 | 20.56 |
|  | $\pm 0.98$ | $\pm 1.20$ | $\pm 0.48$ | $\pm 0.70$ | $\pm 0.71$ | $\pm 2.78$ | $\pm 2.51$ | $\pm 2.08$ | $\pm 3.61$ | $\pm 3.65$ |
| Palamu | 3.73 | 2.86 | 3.13 | 3.69 | 3.63 | 3.30 | 3.05 | 2.44 | 7.31 | 7.17 |
|  | $\pm 1.44$ | $\pm 1.73$ | $\pm 1.54$ | $\pm 1.01$ | $\pm 1.32$ | $\pm 1.36$ | $\pm 2.15$ | $\pm 1.20$ | $\pm 2.69$ | $\pm 2.75$ |
| Santhal Pargana | 7.89 | 8.72 | 5.86 | 6.61 | 7.80 | 7.67 | 3.96 | 4.29 | 5.84 | 9.11 |
|  | $\pm 1.84$ | $\pm 2.13$ | $\pm 1.78$ | $\pm 1.25$ | $\pm 1.48$ | $\pm 2.68$ | $\pm 1.31$ | $\pm 1.54$ | $\pm 2.04$ | $\pm 2.32$ |
| South Chotanagpur | 3.15 | 4.66 | 3.61 | 5.15 | 3.69 | 17.12 | 17.51 | 15.97 | 21.79 | 24.11 |
|  | $\pm 0.89$ | $\pm 1.52$ | $\pm 1.01$ | $\pm 1.50$ | $\pm 0.84$ | $\pm 4.08$ | $\pm 4.48$ | $\pm 3.99$ | $\pm 4.00$ | $\pm 4.79$ |
| State | 5.61 | 5.40 | 3.77 | 4.65 | 4.43 | 9.94 | 9.98 | 8.80 | 12.83 | 15.45 |
|  | $\pm 0.84$ | $\pm 0.82$ | $\pm 0.61$ | $\pm 0.60$ | $\pm 0.56$ | $\pm 1.39$ | $\pm 1.34$ | $\pm 1.18$ | $\pm 1.64$ | $\pm 1.82$ |

Learning levels: Std I-II

| Division/Region | \% Children in Std I-II who CAN READ letters or more |  |  |  |  | \% Children in Std I-II who CAN RECOGNIZE numbers 1 to 9 or more |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| Kolhan | 84.99 | 72.94 | 65.46 | 64.79 | 59.40 | 82.70 | 78.71 | 69.20 | 68.13 | 61.62 |
|  | $\pm 4.66$ | $\pm 7.77$ | $\pm 8.52$ | $\pm 7.83$ | $\pm 7.94$ | $\pm 4.41$ | $\pm 6.67$ | $\pm 8.10$ | $\pm 6.63$ | $\pm 7.49$ |
| North Chotanagpur | 71.54 | 77.38 | 70.99 | 69.17 | 75.84 | 72.87 | 77.88 | 72.66 | 68.21 | 77.46 |
|  | $\pm 3.58$ | $\pm 4.17$ | $\pm 4.71$ | $\pm 5.41$ | $\pm 3.71$ | $\pm 3.31$ | $\pm 4.30$ | $\pm 4.83$ | $\pm 5.64$ | $\pm 3.79$ |
| Palamu | 50.89 | 69.55 | 56.76 | 55.42 | 66.12 | 47.89 | 65.61 | 56.33 | 51.69 | 61.50 |
|  | $\pm 7.24$ | $\pm 7.88$ | $\pm 8.34$ | $\pm 6.02$ | $\pm 8.15$ | $\pm 7.25$ | $\pm 7.77$ | $\pm 8.36$ | $\pm 6.00$ | $\pm 9.14$ |
| Santhal Pargana | 70.02 | 82.64 | 81.46 | 60.22 | 54.34 | 68.45 | 81.48 | 82.05 | 61.59 | 59.61 |
|  | $\pm 4.29$ | $\pm 3.54$ | $\pm 3.60$ | $\pm 5.80$ | $\pm 4.91$ | $\pm 4.23$ | $\pm 3.56$ | $\pm 3.75$ | $\pm 5.48$ | $\pm 4.51$ |
| South Chotanagpu | 67.15 | 76.98 | 72.28 | 64.08 | 67.75 | 68.99 | 76.97 | 73.03 | 67.46 | 71.84 |
|  | $\pm 5.85$ | $\pm 4.46$ | $\pm 6.77$ | $\pm 5.03$ | $\pm 5.00$ | $\pm 5.79$ | $\pm 4.20$ | $\pm 7.19$ | $\pm 5.11$ | $\pm 4.52$ |
| State | 68.85 | 77.08 | 71.45 | 63.50 | 66.06 | 68.43 | 77.21 | 72.62 | 63.97 | 68.29 |
|  | $\pm 2.40$ | $\pm 2.30$ | $\pm 2.72$ | $\pm 2.74$ | $\pm 2.54$ | $\pm 2.40$ | $\pm 2.25$ | $\pm 2.78$ | $\pm 2.74$ | $\pm 2.53$ |

Learning levels: Std III-V

| Division/Region | \% Children in Std III-V who CAN READ Level 1 (Std I) text or more |  |  |  |  | \% Children in Std III-V who CAN DO subtraction or more |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| Kolhan | 58.29 | 55.19 | 45.30 | 41.87 | 41.20 | 51.24 | 52.81 | 44.90 | 30.45 | 31.36 |
|  | $\pm 7.02$ | $\pm 7.50$ | $\pm 8.05$ | $\pm 6.43$ | $\pm 6.78$ | $\pm 6.96$ | $\pm 7.52$ | $\pm 7.72$ | $\pm 5.59$ | $\pm 5.78$ |
| North Chotanagpur | 66.35 | 65.66 | 64.53 | 58.68 | 53.88 | 55.22 | 58.13 | 58.06 | 52.59 | 43.39 |
|  | $\pm 3.91$ | $\pm 4.38$ | $\pm 3.92$ | $\pm 4.98$ | $\pm 4.36$ | $\pm 4.67$ | $\pm 4.87$ | $\pm 4.77$ | $\pm 4.73$ | $\pm 4.34$ |
| Palamu | 58.77 | 58.30 | 57.68 | 40.17 | 40.20 | 45.16 | 45.95 | 50.04 | 36.86 | 33.08 |
|  | $\pm 6.48$ | $\pm 10.49$ | $\pm 6.56$ | $\pm 5.87$ | $\pm 8.52$ | $\pm 6.09$ | $\pm 7.34$ | $\pm 6.54$ | $\pm 5.67$ | $\pm 8.30$ |
| Santhal Pargana | 59.24 | 48.60 | 56.78 | 45.18 | 32.74 | 50.06 | 48.99 | 58.55 | 41.75 | 28.99 |
|  | $\pm 4.60$ | $\pm 4.80$ | $\pm 5.12$ | $\pm 4.46$ | $\pm 4.50$ | $\pm 5.29$ | $\pm 4.85$ | $\pm 4.75$ | $\pm 4.73$ | $\pm 4.04$ |
| South Chotanagpur | 63.06 | 55.96 | 59.76 | 45.71 | 47.61 | 44.44 | 44.25 | 47.58 | 29.62 | 36.21 |
|  | $\pm 5.06$ | $\pm 4.99$ | $\pm 6.42$ | $\pm 6.82$ | $\pm 6.13$ | $\pm 5.66$ | $\pm 5.28$ | $\pm 6.46$ | $\pm 6.56$ | $\pm 6.99$ |
| State | 62.05 | 57.58 | 58.93 | 48.40 | 44.80 | 50.11 | 51.41 | 53.81 | 41.03 | 36.23 |
|  | $\pm 2.30$ | $\pm 2.68$ | $\pm 2.51$ | $\pm 2.68$ | $\pm 2.69$ | $\pm 2.57$ | $\pm 2.64$ | $\pm 2.67$ | $\pm 2.74$ | $\pm 2.59$ |

Note: Districts have been clubbed into divisions to produce these estimates. The grouping of districts is based on administrative divisions used in the state or by geographical regions.

The first row for each division gives the estimate of the relevant variable/year. The numbers below the estimate, in the second row, are twice the standard error of the corresponding estimate and represent the 95\% confidence interval for the estimate. For instance, in Kolhan division of Jharkhand, in 2012, \% of Std III children who could read letters or more is $59.40 \%$. With $95 \%$ probability, the true population proportion lies within $\pm 7.94 \%$ points of the estimate, i.e., between $67.34 \%$ and $51.46 \%$.

List of districts under each division

## Kolhan

Pashchimi Singhbhum
Purbi Singhbhum
Saraikela-Kharswan

## North Chotanagpur

Chatra
Hazaribagh
Kodarma
Giridih
Dhanbad
Bokaro

| Palamu |
| :--- |
| Garhwa |
| Palamu |
| Latehar |
| Santhal Pargana |
| Deoghar |
| Godda |
| Sahibganj |
| Pakur |
| Dumka |
| Jamtara |
| South Chotanagpur |
| Ranchi |
| Lohardaga |
| Gumla |
| Simdega |
| Khunti |

## Divisional Estimates

## Karnataka

| School enrollment and out of school children |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Division/Region | \% Children out of school (age: 6-14) |  |  |  |  | \% Children enrolled in private school (age: 6-14) |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| Bangalore | 1.11 | 1.51 | 1.57 | 1.03 | 1.36 | 20.50 | 17.78 | 21.62 | 24.38 | 26.52 |
|  | $\pm 0.35$ | $\pm 0.41$ | $\pm 0.43$ | $\pm 0.41$ | $\pm 0.55$ | $\pm 2.66$ | $\pm 2.57$ | $\pm 2.93$ | $\pm 2.98$ | $\pm 3.65$ |
| Belgaum | 2.69 | 2.21 | 2.40 | 2.70 | 1.47 | 13.51 | 14.21 | 16.72 | 15.74 | 18.78 |
|  | $\pm 0.54$ | $\pm 0.57$ | $\pm 0.78$ | $\pm 0.76$ | $\pm 0.52$ | $\pm 2.75$ | $\pm 2.70$ | $\pm 3.11$ | $\pm 2.43$ | $\pm 3.57$ |
| Gulbarga | 10.24 | 8.52 | 7.70 | 6.35 | 4.41 | 12.82 | 13.70 | 13.82 | 13.30 | 16.07 |
|  | $\pm 2.74$ | $\pm 1.89$ | $\pm 1.52$ | $\pm 1.67$ | $\pm 1.06$ | $\pm 2.61$ | $\pm 3.09$ | $\pm 2.69$ | $\pm 2.95$ | $\pm 2.80$ |
| Mysore | 1.16 | 1.33 | 1.69 | 1.20 | 0.45 | 25.08 | 21.08 | 26.60 | 26.51 | 26.56 |
|  | $\pm 0.35$ | $\pm 0.40$ | $\pm 0.47$ | $\pm 0.39$ | $\pm 0.24$ | $\pm 3.11$ | $\pm 2.95$ | $\pm 3.08$ | $\pm 3.33$ | $\pm 3.30$ |
| State | 3.57 | 3.17 | 3.13 | 2.79 | 1.88 | 18.10 | 16.77 | 19.98 | 20.04 | 21.91 |
|  | $\pm 0.73$ | $\pm 0.52$ | $\pm 0.47$ | $\pm 0.51$ | $\pm 0.35$ | $\pm 1.45$ | $\pm 1.41$ | $\pm 1.52$ | $\pm 1.53$ | $\pm 1.71$ |

Learning levels: Std I-II

| Division/Region | \% Children in Std I-II who CAN READ letters or more |  |  |  |  | \% Children in Std I-II who CAN RECOGNIZE numbers 1 to 9 or more |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| Bangalore | 88.68 | 91.46 | 89.08 | 91.21 | 88.12 | 87.17 | 87.49 | 88.16 | 91.49 | 85.02 |
|  | $\pm 2.69$ | $\pm 2.09$ | $\pm 2.91$ | $\pm 2.58$ | $\pm 3.81$ | $\pm 3.05$ | $\pm 2.81$ | $\pm 3.22$ | $\pm 2.66$ | $\pm 4.02$ |
| Belgaum | 80.00 | 85.09 | 83.72 | 83.96 | 82.08 | 81.23 | 82.87 | 82.93 | 84.91 | 80.02 |
|  | $\pm 3.15$ | $\pm 3.26$ | $\pm 3.90$ | $\pm 3.42$ | $\pm 4.06$ | $\pm 3.51$ | $\pm 3.73$ | $\pm 3.92$ | $\pm 3.13$ | $\pm 4.68$ |
| Gulbarga | 75.88 | 75.30 | 73.69 | 75.52 | 71.84 | 77.87 | 73.61 | 77.45 | 76.26 | 74.40 |
|  | $\pm 3.78$ | $\pm 3.83$ | $\pm 4.50$ | $\pm 4.63$ | $\pm 4.52$ | $\pm 3.58$ | $\pm 4.17$ | $\pm 4.50$ | $\pm 4.76$ | $\pm 4.25$ |
| Mysore | 89.99 | 91.53 | 93.99 | 91.03 | 90.59 | 85.94 | 89.46 | 90.99 | 90.56 | 89.55 |
|  | $\pm 2.30$ | $\pm 2.19$ | $\pm 1.87$ | $\pm 2.78$ | $\pm 2.96$ | $\pm 2.72$ | $\pm 2.68$ | $\pm 2.40$ | $\pm 2.60$ | $\pm 2.83$ |
| State | 83.39 | 85.74 | 85.59 | 85.34 | 82.80 | 82.96 | 83.29 | 85.20 | 85.75 | 81.88 |
|  | $\pm 1.62$ | $\pm 1.66$ | $\pm 1.82$ | $\pm 1.84$ | $\pm 2.08$ | $\pm 1.68$ | $\pm 1.83$ | $\pm 1.79$ | $\pm 1.81$ | $\pm 2.13$ |

Learning levels: Std III-V

| Division/Region | \% Children in Std III-V who CAN READ Level 1 (Std I) text or more |  |  |  |  | \% Children in Std III-V who CAN DO subtraction or more |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| Bangalore | 64.28 | 66.37 | 59.39 | 65.24 | 60.18 | 49.76 | 54.25 | 54.57 | 53.60 | 49.18 |
|  | $\pm 3.79$ | $\pm 3.62$ | $\pm 4.23$ | $\pm 4.16$ | $\pm 4.90$ | $\pm 4.37$ | $\pm 4.36$ | $\pm 4.36$ | $\pm 4.48$ | $\pm 4.64$ |
| Belgaum | 58.78 | 66.82 | 60.42 | 57.09 | 62.59 | 40.57 | 45.36 | 47.40 | 45.33 | 52.57 |
|  | $\pm 3.93$ | $\pm 3.71$ | $\pm 4.86$ | $\pm 4.95$ | $\pm 4.73$ | $\pm 4.37$ | $\pm 4.19$ | $\pm 4.94$ | $\pm 5.42$ | $\pm 5.41$ |
| Gulbarga | 48.41 | 43.84 | 42.12 | 44.87 | 44.35 | 24.51 | 26.29 | 22.48 | 33.29 | 35.99 |
|  | $\pm 3.93$ | $\pm 4.54$ | $\pm 4.64$ | $\pm 4.84$ | $\pm 4.01$ | $\pm 3.40$ | $\pm 4.20$ | $\pm 3.86$ | $\pm 4.26$ | $\pm 4.00$ |
| Mysore | 68.74 | 75.32 | 72.50 | 71.15 | 67.65 | 46.12 | 54.19 | 47.70 | 57.39 | 54.65 |
|  | $\pm 3.12$ | $\pm 3.38$ | $\pm 3.43$ | $\pm 3.64$ | $\pm 3.61$ | $\pm 3.59$ | $\pm 4.11$ | $\pm 4.20$ | $\pm 4.19$ | $\pm 4.00$ |
| State | 60.59 | 63.99 | 59.56 | 59.66 | 59.25 | 41.09 | 46.02 | 44.53 | 47.49 | 48.61 |
|  | $\pm 1.95$ | $\pm 2.08$ | $\pm 2.35$ | $\pm 2.39$ | $\pm 2.30$ | $\pm 2.17$ | $\pm 2.34$ | $\pm 2.46$ | $\pm 2.48$ | $\pm 2.41$ |

Note: Districts have been clubbed into divisions to produce these estimates. The grouping of districts is based on administrative divisions used in the state or by geographical regions.

The first row for each division gives the estimate of the relevant variable/year. The numbers below the estimate, in the second row, are twice the standard error of the corresponding estimate and represent the 95\% confidence interval for the estimate. For instance, in Bangalore division of Karnataka, in 2012, \% of Std III children who could read letters or more is $88.12 \%$. With $95 \%$ probability, the true population proportion lies within $\pm 3.81 \%$ points of the estimate, i.e., between $91.93 \%$ and $84.31 \%$.

| List of districts under |
| :--- |
| each division |
| Bangalore |
| Chitradurga |
| Davanagere |
| Shimoga |
| Tumkur |
| Kolar |
| Bangalore |
| Bangalore Rural |
| Belgaum |
| Belgaum |
| Bagalkot |
| Bijapur |
| Gadag |
| Dharwad |
| Uttara Kannada |
| Haveri |
| Gulbarga |
| Gulbarga |
| Bidar |
| Raichur |
| Koppal |
| Bellary |
| Mysore |
| Udupi |
| Chikmagalur |
| Mandya |
| Hassan |
| Dakshina Kannada |
| Kodagu |
| Mysore |
| Chamarajanagar |

## Divisional Estimates

## Kerala

| School enrollment and out of school children |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Division/Region | \% Children out of school (age: 6-14) |  |  |  |  | \% Children enrolled in private school (age: 6-14) |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| Central Kerala | 0.27 | 0.12 | 0.03 | 0.00 | 0.25 | 55.19 | 51.19 | 61.26 | 68.70 | 63.91 |
|  | $\pm 0.20$ | $\pm 0.14$ | $\pm 0.05$ | $\pm 0.00$ | $\pm 0.30$ | $\pm 6.78$ | $\pm 7.36$ | $\pm 5.88$ | $\pm 4.97$ | $\pm 6.91$ |
| North Kerala | 0.15 | 0.05 | 0.12 | 0.00 | 0.24 | 46.53 | 44.28 | 44.50 | 52.20 | 53.28 |
|  | $\pm 0.11$ | $\pm 0.06$ | $\pm 0.12$ | $\pm 0.00$ | $\pm 0.21$ | $\pm 6.54$ | $\pm 5.85$ | $\pm 6.14$ | $\pm 5.67$ | $\pm 5.74$ |
| South Kerala | 0.17 | 0.11 | 0.11 | 0.00 | 0.14 | 49.97 | 57.74 | 57.39 | 62.67 | 62.11 |
|  | $\pm 0.14$ | $\pm 0.11$ | $\pm 0.13$ | $\pm 0.00$ | $\pm 0.14$ | $\pm 5.02$ | $\pm 4.94$ | $\pm 4.83$ | $\pm 5.04$ | $\pm 4.62$ |
| State | 0.20 | 0.10 | 0.09 | 0.08 | 0.20 | 50.48 | 51.46 | 54.21 | 60.79 | 59.59 |
|  | $\pm 0.09$ | $\pm 0.06$ | $\pm 0.06$ | $\pm 0.06$ | $\pm 0.12$ | $\pm 3.54$ | $\pm 3.49$ | $\pm 3.34$ | $\pm 3.10$ | $\pm 3.29$ |

Learning levels: Std I-II

| Division/Region | \% Children in Std I-II who CAN READ letters or more |  |  |  |  | \% Children in Std I-II who CAN RECOGNIZE numbers 1 to 9 or more |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| Central Kerala | 98.88 | 94.44 | 97.22 | 93.92 | 94.76 | 97.21 | 93.04 | 98.92 | 94.96 | 95.33 |
|  | $\pm 1.02$ | $\pm 2.41$ | $\pm 2.47$ | $\pm 2.80$ | $\pm 2.53$ | $\pm 1.62$ | $\pm 3.40$ | $\pm 1.13$ | $\pm 2.54$ | $\pm 2.74$ |
| North Kerala | 97.60 | 96.64 | 98.37 | 97.67 | 96.12 | 97.06 | 96.85 | 97.93 | 96.40 | 95.48 |
|  | $\pm 1.45$ | $\pm 2.00$ | $\pm 1.13$ | $\pm 1.39$ | $\pm 1.89$ | $\pm 1.54$ | $\pm 1.66$ | $\pm 1.54$ | $\pm 1.73$ | $\pm 1.82$ |
| South Kerala | 99.04 | 98.53 | 98.65 | 98.72 | 97.63 | 98.77 | 97.55 | 97.62 | 98.50 | 98.10 |
|  | $\pm 0.78$ | $\pm 1.18$ | $\pm 1.19$ | $\pm 0.95$ | $\pm 1.43$ | $\pm 0.97$ | $\pm 1.58$ | $\pm 1.82$ | $\pm 1.24$ | $\pm 1.32$ |
| State | 98.49 | 96.73 | 98.15 | 97.10 | 96.28 | 97.67 | 96.01 | 98.09 | 96.88 | 96.39 |
|  | $\pm 0.65$ | $\pm 1.07$ | $\pm 0.92$ | $\pm 0.99$ | $\pm 1.13$ | $\pm 0.82$ | $\pm 1.28$ | $\pm 0.92$ | $\pm 1.03$ | $\pm 1.14$ |

Learning levels: Std III-V

| Division/Region | \% Children in Std III-V who CAN READ Level 1 (Std I) text or more |  |  |  |  | \% Children in Std III-V who CAN DO subtraction or more |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| Central Kerala | 85.70 | 78.76 | 83.29 | 82.96 | 74.21 | 77.51 | 74.48 | 79.69 | 67.68 | 65.84 |
|  | $\pm 2.89$ | $\pm 4.83$ | $\pm 3.72$ | $\pm 3.59$ | $\pm 6.61$ | $\pm 4.80$ | $\pm 5.30$ | $\pm 4.26$ | $\pm 4.71$ | $\pm 6.10$ |
| North Kerala | 82.22 | 84.80 | 83.99 | 83.85 | 78.70 | 68.88 | 69.46 | 73.99 | 62.70 | 58.22 |
|  | $\pm 3.23$ | $\pm 2.83$ | $\pm 3.30$ | $\pm 3.59$ | $\pm 3.32$ | $\pm 3.88$ | $\pm 4.58$ | $\pm 4.19$ | $\pm 5.15$ | $\pm 4.94$ |
| South Kerala | 88.53 | 84.65 | 91.98 | 80.28 | 80.66 | 79.65 | 81.42 | 83.41 | 71.07 | 77.44 |
|  | $\pm 2.42$ | $\pm 3.70$ | $\pm 2.11$ | $\pm 2.97$ | $\pm 3.48$ | $\pm 3.39$ | $\pm 3.22$ | $\pm 3.17$ | $\pm 3.75$ | $\pm 3.69$ |
| State | 85.50 | 82.99 | 86.86 | 82.15 | 78.33 | 75.31 | 75.54 | 79.23 | 67.46 | 67.87 |
|  | $\pm 1.72$ | $\pm 2.23$ | $\pm 1.80$ | $\pm 1.93$ | $\pm 2.54$ | $\pm 2.43$ | $\pm 2.56$ | $\pm 2.27$ | $\pm 2.63$ | $\pm 3.02$ |

Note: Districts have been clubbed into divisions to produce these estimates. The grouping of districts is based on administrative divisions used in the state or by geographical regions.

The first row for each division gives the estimate of the relevant variable/year. The numbers below the estimate, in the second row, are twice the standard error of the corresponding estimate and represent the 95\% confidence interval for the estimate. For instance, in Central Kerala division of Kerala, in 2012, \% of Std I-II children who could read letters or more is $94.76 \%$. With $95 \%$ probability, the true population proportion lies within $\pm 2.53 \%$ points of the estimate, i.e., between 97.29\% and 92.23\%.

## List of districts under each division <br> Central Kerala

| Palakkad |
| :--- |
| Thrissur |
| Ernakulam |
| Idukki |


| North Kerala |
| :--- |
| Kasaragod |
| Kannur |
| Wayanad |
| Kozhikode |
| Malappuram |
| South Kerala |
| Kottayam |
| Alappuzha |
| Pathanamthitta |
| Kollam |
| Thiruvananthapuram |

## Divisional Estimates

## Madhya Pradesh

| School enrollment and out of school children |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Division/Region | \% Children out of school (age: 6-14) |  |  |  |  | \% Children enrolled in private school (age: 6-14) |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| Bhopal | 1.46 | 1.96 | 2.07 | 2.16 | 2.77 | 17.11 | 17.64 | 19.20 | 22.25 | 23.01 |
|  | $\pm 0.78$ | $\pm 0.66$ | $\pm 0.84$ | $\pm 1.05$ | $\pm 0.78$ | $\pm 3.61$ | $\pm 3.54$ | $\pm 3.39$ | $\pm 4.10$ | $\pm 3.48$ |
| Chambal | 2.01 | 1.33 | 2.54 | 2.11 | 1.81 | 10.55 | 17.51 | 12.95 | 13.27 | 12.45 |
|  | $\pm 1.08$ | $\pm 0.68$ | $\pm 1.26$ | $\pm 0.76$ | $\pm 0.76$ | $\pm 3.38$ | $\pm 3.73$ | $\pm 3.11$ | $\pm 3.57$ | $\pm 3.65$ |
| Gwalior | 1.54 | 0.87 | 1.34 | 2.02 | 3.15 | 8.25 | 6.74 | 7.72 | 12.18 | 13.35 |
|  | $\pm 0.75$ | $\pm 0.46$ | $\pm 0.66$ | $\pm 0.77$ | $\pm 0.90$ | $\pm 2.30$ | $\pm 2.04$ | $\pm 2.61$ | $\pm 2.87$ | $\pm 3.04$ |
| Hoshangabad | 2.01 | 2.25 | 1.27 | 2.86 | 2.08 | 14.11 | 16.04 | 12.31 | 17.96 | 24.43 |
|  | $\pm 0.99$ | $\pm 0.95$ | $\pm 0.64$ | $\pm 1.56$ | $\pm 0.81$ | $\pm 4.17$ | $\pm 4.27$ | $\pm 2.83$ | $\pm 6.14$ | $\pm 6.16$ |
| Indore | 3.01 | 6.00 | 4.81 | 4.48 | 7.65 | 16.07 | 16.67 | 23.58 | 20.23 | 23.69 |
|  | $\pm 1.26$ | $\pm 2.52$ | $\pm 1.22$ | $\pm 1.47$ | $\pm 1.59$ | $\pm 3.08$ | $\pm 3.19$ | $\pm 3.44$ | $\pm 3.02$ | $\pm 4.06$ |
| Jabalpur | 1.88 | 1.74 | 1.57 | 0.98 | 2.40 | 16.08 | 12.49 | 14.98 | 14.26 | 13.12 |
|  | $\pm 0.50$ | $\pm 0.51$ | $\pm 0.60$ | $\pm 0.38$ | $\pm 0.85$ | $\pm 2.86$ | $\pm 2.47$ | $\pm 2.62$ | $\pm 2.45$ | $\pm 2.54$ |
| Rewa | 1.56 | 1.97 | 1.13 | 2.21 | 2.45 | 19.39 | 10.71 | 12.29 | 17.65 | 19.45 |
|  | $\pm 0.56$ | $\pm 0.88$ | $\pm 0.55$ | $\pm 0.91$ | $\pm 1.15$ | $\pm 4.62$ | $\pm 2.77$ | $\pm 3.57$ | $\pm 4.12$ | $\pm 3.83$ |
| Sagar | 1.25 | 1.46 | 0.36 | 1.73 | 1.84 | 12.18 | 12.00 | 9.11 | 8.84 | 11.55 |
|  | $\pm 0.49$ | $\pm 0.53$ | $\pm 0.20$ | $\pm 0.53$ | $\pm 0.56$ | $\pm 2.98$ | $\pm 2.80$ | $\pm 1.97$ | $\pm 2.22$ | $\pm 2.52$ |
| Shahdol | 1.58 | 1.15 | 1.36 | 1.22 | 1.25 | 8.94 | 3.24 | 6.20 | 12.35 | 12.79 |
|  | $\pm 0.57$ | $\pm 0.57$ | $\pm 0.50$ | $\pm 0.65$ | $\pm 0.70$ | $\pm 3.46$ | $\pm 1.72$ | $\pm 1.95$ | $\pm 3.64$ | $\pm 3.55$ |
| Ujjain | 2.02 | 1.90 | 0.88 | 2.23 | 2.07 | 31.51 | 30.54 | 26.78 | 30.05 | 26.04 |
|  | $\pm 0.62$ | $\pm 0.56$ | $\pm 0.32$ | $\pm 0.68$ | $\pm 0.63$ | $\pm 4.06$ | $\pm 4.04$ | $\pm 3.44$ | $\pm 4.14$ | $\pm 4.41$ |
| State | 1.87 | 2.31 | 1.81 | 2.23 | 3.08 | 16.18 | 14.81 | 15.43 | 17.17 | 18.16 |
|  | $\pm 0.27$ | $\pm 0.44$ | $\pm 0.26$ | $\pm 0.32$ | $\pm 0.37$ | $\pm 1.20$ | $\pm 1.10$ | $\pm 1.07$ | $\pm 1.17$ | $\pm 1.22$ |

Learning levels: Std I-II

| Division/Region | \% Children in Std I-II who CAN READ letters or more |  |  |  |  | \% Children in Std I-II who CAN RECOGNIZE numbers 1 to 9 or more |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| Bhopal | 97.57 | 97.10 | 79.50 | 60.01 | 62.03 | 97.10 | 96.18 | 78.64 | 62.12 | 60.23 |
|  | $\pm 1.08$ | $\pm 1.05$ | $\pm 4.84$ | $\pm 6.37$ | $\pm 6.26$ | $\pm 1.10$ | $\pm 1.27$ | $\pm 4.92$ | $\pm 6.36$ | $\pm 6.00$ |
| Chambal | 97.87 | 97.71 | 80.88 | 47.74 | 62.49 | 97.67 | 97.91 | 81.95 | 50.80 | 61.44 |
|  | $\pm 1.31$ | $\pm 1.72$ | $\pm 6.00$ | $\pm 6.71$ | $\pm 7.10$ | $\pm 1.60$ | $\pm 1.41$ | $\pm 5.46$ | $\pm 6.45$ | $\pm 7.00$ |
| Gwalior | 96.56 | 97.28 | 74.91 | 56.97 | 55.78 | 94.96 | 95.60 | 72.44 | 58.69 | 56.48 |
|  | $\pm 1.61$ | $\pm 1.70$ | $\pm 5.47$ | $\pm 7.01$ | $\pm 5.38$ | $\pm 2.55$ | $\pm 2.60$ | $\pm 7.00$ | $\pm 7.07$ | $\pm 5.80$ |
| Hoshangabad | 96.60 | 97.76 | 80.48 | 64.87 | 60.20 | 95.43 | 96.10 | 80.30 | 65.23 | 60.95 |
|  | $\pm 1.54$ | $\pm 1.44$ | $\pm 5.50$ | $\pm 9.11$ | $\pm 10.15$ | $\pm 2.52$ | $\pm 1.73$ | $\pm 5.84$ | $\pm 9.49$ | \#10.22 |
| Indore | 98.92 | 94.89 | 82.01 | 64.04 | 59.21 | 98.45 | 92.72 | 82.79 | 60.14 | 62.79 |
|  | $\pm 0.90$ | $\pm 2.56$ | $\pm 3.58$ | $\pm 4.72$ | $\pm 4.98$ | $\pm 0.94$ | $\pm 2.97$ | $\pm 3.76$ | $\pm 4.41$ | $\pm 5.25$ |
| Jabalpur | 96.36 | 91.70 | 84.72 | 68.88 | 72.32 | 95.35 | 90.73 | 82.51 | 66.41 | 69.09 |
|  | $\pm 1.08$ | $\pm 2.84$ | $\pm 3.05$ | $\pm 4.51$ | $\pm 4.20$ | $\pm 1.31$ | $\pm 2.54$ | $\pm 3.51$ | $\pm 4.55$ | $\pm 4.27$ |
| Rewa | 95.39 | 95.51 | 93.42 | 75.53 | 67.22 | 94.36 | 93.49 | 91.27 | 69.56 | 60.65 |
|  | $\pm 1.93$ | $\pm 2.02$ | $\pm 2.87$ | $\pm 6.31$ | $\pm 5.73$ | $\pm 1.93$ | $\pm 2.47$ | $\pm 3.33$ | $\pm 7.05$ | $\pm 6.47$ |
| Sagar | 94.49 | 93.77 | 93.44 | 60.46 | 61.70 | 93.13 | 94.56 | 94.25 | 61.00 | 60.49 |
|  | $\pm 1.87$ | $\pm 2.38$ | $\pm 2.70$ | $\pm 5.03$ | $\pm 5.47$ | $\pm 2.27$ | $\pm 1.92$ | $\pm 2.06$ | $\pm 4.85$ | $\pm 5.18$ |
| Shahdol | 93.99 | 96.05 | 93.96 | 68.35 | 71.85 | 93.23 | 95.37 | 93.38 | 61.27 | 67.31 |
|  | $\pm 2.27$ | $\pm 3.09$ | $\pm 3.18$ | $\pm 6.81$ | $\pm 5.66$ | $\pm 2.47$ | $\pm 2.74$ | $\pm 3.65$ | $\pm 7.12$ | $\pm 5.93$ |
| Ujjain | 96.91 | 97.40 | 85.99 | 75.61 | 75.28 | 96.21 | 96.28 | 85.57 | 73.36 | 73.13 |
|  | $\pm 1.45$ | $\pm 1.13$ | $\pm 3.31$ | $\pm 4.20$ | $\pm 4.68$ | $\pm 1.55$ | $\pm 1.71$ | $\pm 3.48$ | $\pm 4.48$ | $\pm 5.14$ |
| State | 96.57 | 95.44 | 85.44 | 65.69 | 64.96 | 95.67 | 94.36 | 84.73 | 63.92 | 63.53 |
|  | $\pm 0.49$ | $\pm 0.75$ | $\pm 1.35$ | $\pm 1.94$ | $\pm 1.85$ | $\pm 0.58$ | $\pm 0.79$ | $\pm 1.46$ | $\pm 1.93$ | $\pm 1.89$ |

Note: Districts have been clubbed into divisions to produce these estimates. The grouping of districts is based on administrative divisions used in the state or by geographical regions.

The first row for each division gives the estimate of the relevant variable/year. The numbers below the estimate, in the second row, are twice the standard error of the corresponding estimate and represent the 95\% confidence interval for the estimate. For instance, in Bhopal division of Madhya Pradesh, in 2012, \% of Std I-II children who could read letters or more is $62.03 \%$. With $95 \%$ probability, the true population proportion lies within $\pm 6.26 \%$ points of the estimate, i.e., between 68.29\% and $55.77 \%$.

## List of districts under each division <br> Bhopal

| Rajgarh |
| :--- |
| Vidisha |
| Bhopal |
| Sehore |

Raisen

| Chambal |
| :--- |
| Sheopur |
| Morena |
| Bhind |
| Gwalior |
| Gwalior |
| Datia |
| Shivpuri |
| Guna |

Hoshangabad
Betul

Harda
Hoshangabad

| Indore |
| :--- |
| Jhabua |
| Dhar |
| Indore |
| West Nimar |
| Barwani |
| East Nimar |

## Divisional Estimates

## Madhya Pradesh



List of districts under each division

## Jabalpur

Narsimhapur

## Mandla

## Chhindwara

Seoni

| Balaghat |
| :--- |
| Jabalpur |
| Katni |
| Rewa |

Satna

| Rewa |
| :--- |
| Sidhi |
| Sagar |

Tikamgarh

Panna
Sagar
Damoh

## Shahdol

## Umaria

## Shahdol

## Dindori

## Ujjain

| Neemuch |
| :--- |
| Mandsaur |
| Ratlam |
| Ujjain |
| Shajapur |
| Dewas |

## Divisional Estimates

## Maharashtra

| School enrollment and out of school children |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Division/Region | \% Children out of school (age: 6-14) |  |  |  |  | \% Children enrolled in private school (age: 6-14) |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| Amravati | 1.66 | 1.08 | 0.85 | 0.73 | 1.53 | 30.08 | 34.78 | 26.92 | 33.60 | 34.15 |
|  | $\pm 0.65$ | $\pm 0.44$ | $\pm 0.46$ | $\pm 0.40$ | $\pm 0.63$ | $\pm 3.94$ | $\pm 3.90$ | $\pm 4.07$ | $\pm 4.39$ | $\pm 4.44$ |
| Aurangabad | 1.71 | 0.83 | 1.23 | 1.14 | 2.17 | 23.63 | 21.00 | 23.01 | 28.51 | 29.30 |
|  | $\pm 0.51$ | $\pm 0.30$ | $\pm 0.40$ | $\pm 0.38$ | $\pm 0.60$ | $\pm 2.86$ | $\pm 2.26$ | $\pm 2.36$ | $\pm 3.13$ | $\pm 2.89$ |
| Konkan | 1.19 | 1.54 | 1.54 | 2.35 | 2.28 | 19.36 | 27.57 | 12.10 | 14.56 | 22.63 |
|  | $\pm 0.76$ | $\pm 0.99$ | $\pm 0.98$ | $\pm 1.31$ | $\pm 1.26$ | $\pm 3.92$ | $\pm 6.21$ | $\pm 3.99$ | $\pm 4.65$ | $\pm 5.94$ |
| Nagpur | 1.80 | 0.51 | 0.63 | 0.43 | 0.33 | 30.28 | 31.08 | 30.67 | 34.76 | 34.92 |
|  | $\pm 0.79$ | $\pm 0.30$ | $\pm 0.34$ | $\pm 0.25$ | $\pm 0.24$ | $\pm 3.65$ | $\pm 3.62$ | $\pm 3.37$ | $\pm 3.75$ | $\pm 3.96$ |
| Nashik | 2.03 | 1.56 | 1.66 | 1.35 | 1.83 | 24.50 | 30.98 | 32.61 | 35.79 | 45.94 |
|  | $\pm 0.69$ | $\pm 0.77$ | $\pm 0.53$ | $\pm 0.58$ | $\pm 0.71$ | $\pm 3.99$ | $\pm 4.13$ | $\pm 3.99$ | $\pm 4.20$ | $\pm 3.94$ |
| Pune | 0.92 | 0.52 | 0.77 | 0.71 | 0.52 | 28.56 | 28.21 | 28.39 | 29.74 | 37.48 |
|  | $\pm 0.33$ | $\pm 0.22$ | $\pm 0.39$ | $\pm 0.46$ | $\pm 0.28$ | $\pm 3.81$ | $\pm 3.41$ | $\pm 3.88$ | $\pm 4.28$ | $\pm 4.14$ |
| State | 1.53 | 0.98 | 1.12 | 1.08 | 1.47 | 25.92 | 28.19 | 26.43 | 30.31 | 35.42 |
|  | $\pm 0.25$ | $\pm 0.22$ | $\pm 0.21$ | $\pm 0.24$ | $\pm 0.27$ | $\pm 1.57$ | $\pm 1.60$ | $\pm 1.56$ | $\pm 1.77$ | $\pm 1.79$ |

Learning levels: Std I-II

| Division/Region | \% Children in Std I-II who CAN READ letters or more |  |  |  |  | \% Children in Std I-II who CAN RECOGNIZE numbers 1 to 9 or more |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| Amravati | 84.28 | 94.40 | 95.38 | 86.25 | 76.12 | 83.01 | 95.07 | 94.46 | 87.12 | 75.61 |
|  | $\pm 4.05$ | $\pm 3.32$ | $\pm 1.92$ | $\pm 4.06$ | $\pm 5.03$ | $\pm 4.55$ | $\pm 3.08$ | $\pm 2.74$ | $\pm 4.14$ | $\pm 4.91$ |
| Aurangabad | 91.25 | 90.80 | 94.26 | 89.93 | 72.35 | 90.53 | 91.99 | 93.78 | 91.98 | 76.19 |
|  | $\pm 1.98$ | $\pm 2.34$ | $\pm 1.80$ | $\pm 2.78$ | $\pm 3.51$ | $\pm 2.07$ | $\pm 2.13$ | $\pm 1.83$ | $\pm 2.10$ | $\pm 3.30$ |
| Konkan | 97.21 | 92.88 | 97.07 | 91.41 | 82.21 | 94.85 | 93.27 | 96.53 | 90.03 | 82.10 |
|  | $\pm 1.42$ | $\pm 3.56$ | $\pm 3.16$ | $\pm 4.12$ | $\pm 5.97$ | $\pm 3.04$ | $\pm 3.05$ | $\pm 3.09$ | $\pm 4.09$ | $\pm 5.46$ |
| Nagpur | 87.54 | 96.62 | 90.57 | 88.69 | 73.64 | 88.09 | 96.30 | 88.41 | 87.71 | 75.11 |
|  | $\pm 3.39$ | $\pm 1.79$ | $\pm 2.50$ | $\pm 2.96$ | $\pm 4.58$ | $\pm 3.53$ | $\pm 1.82$ | $\pm 2.99$ | $\pm 3.05$ | $\pm 4.46$ |
| Nashik | 87.81 | 92.86 | 95.95 | 94.33 | 78.91 | 86.87 | 91.45 | 95.09 | 94.10 | 81.63 |
|  | $\pm 3.53$ | $\pm 2.92$ | $\pm 1.77$ | $\pm 2.11$ | $\pm 4.38$ | $\pm 3.50$ | $\pm 2.80$ | $\pm 2.03$ | $\pm 2.03$ | $\pm 3.83$ |
| Pune | 96.25 | 93.27 | 94.87 | 92.98 | 81.65 | 95.07 | 94.09 | 94.10 | 93.65 | 84.67 |
|  | $\pm 1.51$ | $\pm 2.28$ | $\pm 1.89$ | $\pm 3.22$ | $\pm 4.78$ | $\pm 1.63$ | $\pm 2.00$ | $\pm 2.31$ | $\pm 3.13$ | $\pm 4.02$ |
| State | 91.09 | 93.03 | 94.75 | 91.18 | 77.44 | 90.09 | 93.29 | 93.88 | 91.58 | 79.75 |
|  | $\pm 1.17$ | $\pm 1.14$ | $\pm 0.86$ | $\pm 1.29$ | $\pm 1.93$ | $\pm 1.25$ | $\pm 1.04$ | $\pm 0.98$ | $\pm 1.21$ | $\pm 1.74$ |

Note: Districts have been clubbed into divisions to produce these estimates. The grouping of districts is based on administrative divisions used in the state or by geographical regions.

The first row for each division gives the estimate of the relevant variable/year. The numbers below the estimate, in the second row, are twice the standard error of the corresponding estimate and represent the 95\% confidence interval for the estimate. For instance, in Amravati division of Maharashtra, in 2012, \% of Std I-II children who could read letters or more is $76.12 \%$. With $95 \%$ probability, the true population proportion lies within $\pm 5.03 \%$ points of the estimate, i.e., between $81.15 \%$ and 71.09\%.

## List of districts under

 each divisionAmravati
Buldana

| Akola |
| :--- |
| Washim |
| Amravati |
| Yavatmal |

Aurangabad

| Nanded |
| :--- |
| Hingoli |
| Parbhani |
| Jalna |
| Aurangabad |
| Bid |
| Latur |
| Osmanabad |
| Konkan |
| Thane |
| Raigarh |
| Ratnagiri |
| Sindhudurg |

## Divisional Estimates

## Maharashtra

| Learning levels: Std III-V |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Division/Region | \% Children in Std III-V who CAN READ Level 1 (Std I) text or more |  |  |  |  | \% Children in Std III-V who CAN DO subtraction or more |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| Amravati | 79.09 | 86.90 | 80.70 | 65.79 | 58.13 | 58.32 | 69.19 | 60.70 | 40.51 | 27.22 |
|  | $\pm 3.85$ | $\pm 3.58$ | $\pm 4.80$ | $\pm 5.43$ | $\pm 5.64$ | $\pm 5.88$ | $\pm 4.99$ | $\pm 5.46$ | $\pm 5.37$ | $\pm 4.30$ |
| Aurangabad | 84.34 | 84.28 | 83.15 | 76.43 | 65.47 | 67.09 | 70.31 | 67.44 | 56.11 | 30.96 |
|  | $\pm 2.35$ | $\pm 2.76$ | $\pm 2.55$ | $\pm 3.33$ | $\pm 3.47$ | $\pm 4.09$ | $\pm 3.93$ | $\pm 3.48$ | $\pm 4.49$ | $\pm 3.44$ |
| Konkan | 91.70 | 90.09 | 85.40 | 82.35 | 75.09 | 89.03 | 78.96 | 69.28 | 67.93 | 42.00 |
|  | $\pm 3.30$ | $\pm 3.37$ | $\pm 4.31$ | $\pm 5.16$ | $\pm 5.64$ | $\pm 3.51$ | $\pm 5.11$ | $\pm 5.60$ | $\pm 6.57$ | $\pm 6.32$ |
| Nagpur | 79.27 | 86.02 | 79.91 | 73.42 | 68.14 | 53.65 | 68.54 | 47.16 | 45.01 | 31.95 |
|  | $\pm 4.46$ | $\pm 2.76$ | $\pm 3.44$ | $\pm 3.27$ | $\pm 4.39$ | $\pm 4.93$ | $\pm 4.16$ | $\pm 4.11$ | $\pm 4.54$ | $\pm 4.35$ |
| Nashik | 84.21 | 84.94 | 88.55 | 81.39 | 72.08 | 57.81 | 73.31 | 74.89 | 52.66 | 40.60 |
|  | $\pm 3.12$ | $\pm 3.59$ | $\pm 3.14$ | $\pm 3.94$ | $\pm 3.91$ | $\pm 4.84$ | $\pm 5.10$ | $\pm 4.82$ | $\pm 5.72$ | $\pm 6.24$ |
| Pune | 89.54 | 89.65 | 90.39 | 82.19 | 82.29 | 70.13 | 79.90 | 74.66 | 67.73 | 52.39 |
|  | $\pm 2.39$ | $\pm 2.37$ | $\pm 2.05$ | $\pm 3.86$ | $\pm 3.62$ | $\pm 4.33$ | $\pm 3.90$ | $\pm 3.77$ | $\pm 5.01$ | $\pm 5.07$ |
| State | 85.31 | 86.75 | 85.48 | 77.84 | 71.11 | 66.37 | 73.70 | 67.56 | 56.03 | 38.63 |
|  | $\pm 1.29$ | $\pm 1.30$ | $\pm 1.34$ | $\pm 1.75$ | $\pm 1.84$ | $\pm 2.04$ | $\pm 1.92$ | $\pm 1.96$ | $\pm 2.35$ | $\pm 2.37$ |

List of districts under each division

| Nagpur |
| :--- |
| Wardha |
| Nagpur |
| Bhandara |
| Gondiya |
| Gadchiroli |
| Chandrapur |
| Nashik |
| Nandurbar |
| Dhule |
| Jalgaon |
| Nashik |
| Ahmadnagar |
| Pune |
| Pune |
| Solapur |
| Satara |
| Kolhapur |
| Sangli |



## Divisional Estimates

## Odisha

School enrollment and out of school children

| Division/Region | \% Children out of school (age: 6-14) |  |  |  |  | \% Children enrolled in private school (age: 6-14) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| Central | 4.72 | 3.78 | 2.45 | 2.55 | 1.65 | 4.70 | 5.49 | 5.66 | 6.00 | 7.73 |
|  | $\pm 1.45$ | $\pm 1.09$ | $\pm 0.73$ | $\pm 0.72$ | $\pm 0.47$ | $\pm 1.17$ | $\pm 1.18$ | $\pm 1.35$ | $\pm 1.03$ | $\pm 1.26$ |
| North | 7.34 | 5.29 | 2.04 | 3.21 | 3.78 | 5.19 | 4.14 | 6.87 | 5.27 | 5.65 |
|  | $\pm 1.49$ | $\pm 1.24$ | $\pm 0.58$ | $\pm 0.92$ | $\pm 0.99$ | $\pm 1.07$ | $\pm 0.96$ | $\pm 1.75$ | $\pm 1.30$ | $\pm 1.29$ |
| South | 10.53 | 10.43 | 9.55 | 5.64 | 7.38 | 3.54 | 3.11 | 3.49 | 3.60 | 4.70 |
|  | $\pm 1.56$ | $\pm 1.70$ | $\pm 2.28$ | $\pm 1.16$ | $\pm 1.30$ | $\pm 1.01$ | $\pm 0.93$ | $\pm 0.90$ | $\pm 0.78$ | $\pm 1.47$ |
| State | 7.16 | 6.27 | 4.45 | 3.71 | 4.10 | 4.48 | 4.36 | 5.35 | 5.04 | 6.17 |
|  | $\pm 0.88$ | $\pm 0.78$ | $\pm 0.80$ | $\pm 0.53$ | $\pm 0.56$ | $\pm 0.66$ | $\pm 0.62$ | $\pm 0.80$ | $\pm 0.61$ | $\pm 0.78$ |

Learning levels: Std I-II

| Division/Region | \% Children in Std I-II who CAN READ letters or more |  |  |  |  | \% Children in Std I-II who CAN RECOGNIZE numbers 1 to 9 or more |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| Central | 85.22 | 92.38 | 85.28 | 77.83 | 80.63 | 82.80 | 90.07 | 80.33 | 75.08 | 77.64 |
|  | $\pm 2.54$ | $\pm 2.22$ | $\pm 3.56$ | $\pm 3.80$ | $\pm 3.45$ | $\pm 2.59$ | $\pm 2.63$ | $\pm 3.81$ | $\pm 3.96$ | $\pm 3.84$ |
| North | 73.64 | 90.20 | 72.30 | 71.47 | 59.79 | 72.16 | 91.08 | 70.62 | 69.76 | 59.57 |
|  | $\pm 3.95$ | $\pm 2.98$ | $\pm 4.50$ | $\pm 4.32$ | $\pm 4.53$ | $\pm 4.11$ | $\pm 2.29$ | $\pm 4.43$ | $\pm 4.16$ | $\pm 4.62$ |
| South | 71.83 | 84.27 | 66.76 | 54.20 | 50.76 | 69.67 | 81.08 | 61.53 | 53.58 | 50.39 |
|  | $\pm 3.73$ | $\pm 3.04$ | $\pm 3.53$ | $\pm 4.26$ | $\pm 4.36$ | $\pm 3.72$ | $\pm 3.52$ | $\pm 3.67$ | $\pm 4.19$ | $\pm 4.51$ |
| State | 78.13 | 88.85 | 76.05 | 67.68 | 64.31 | 76.02 | 87.08 | 71.94 | 66.02 | 63.02 |
|  | $\pm 1.95$ | $\pm 1.61$ | $\pm 2.26$ | $\pm 2.59$ | $\pm 2.59$ | $\pm 1.97$ | $\pm 1.75$ | $\pm 2.34$ | $\pm 2.56$ | $\pm 2.61$ |

Learning levels: Std III-V

| Division/Region | \% Children in Std III-V who CAN READ Level 1 (Std I) text or more |  |  |  |  | \% Children in Std III-V who CAN DO subtraction or more |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| Central | 77.64 | 76.95 | 71.75 | 69.23 | 70.60 | 67.23 | 73.62 | 64.13 | 56.60 | 51.31 |
|  | $\pm 2.60$ | $\pm 3.41$ | $\pm 3.49$ | $\pm 3.72$ | $\pm 3.23$ | $\pm 3.10$ | $\pm 3.54$ | $\pm 3.67$ | $\pm 3.95$ | $\pm 3.64$ |
| North | 63.10 | 68.59 | 57.96 | 55.13 | 55.48 | 47.14 | 62.87 | 44.70 | 38.29 | 30.48 |
|  | $\pm 3.27$ | $\pm 3.48$ | $\pm 3.47$ | $\pm 4.00$ | $\pm 4.04$ | $\pm 3.52$ | $\pm 3.74$ | $\pm 3.92$ | $\pm 3.86$ | $\pm 3.53$ |
| South | 63.04 | 61.86 | 50.26 | 42.97 | 41.11 | 51.70 | 55.22 | 42.17 | 32.12 | 23.97 |
|  | $\pm 3.74$ | $\pm 3.98$ | $\pm 3.38$ | $\pm 3.75$ | $\pm 4.29$ | $\pm 4.29$ | $\pm 4.78$ | $\pm 3.98$ | $\pm 4.01$ | $\pm 3.50$ |
| State | 69.43 | 69.53 | 61.39 | 56.59 | 56.85 | 57.39 | 64.40 | 52.11 | 43.52 | 36.59 |
|  | $\pm 1.89$ | $\pm 2.15$ | $\pm 2.13$ | $\pm 2.36$ | $\pm 2.40$ | $\pm 2.19$ | $\pm 2.43$ | $\pm 2.37$ | $\pm 2.45$ | $\pm 2.28$ |

Note: Districts have been clubbed into divisions to produce these estimates. The grouping of districts is based on administrative divisions used in the state or by geographical regions.

The first row for each division gives the estimate of the relevant variable/year. The numbers below the estimate, in the second row, are twice the standard error of the corresponding estimate and represent the 95\% confidence interval for the estimate. For instance, in Central division of Odisha, in 2012, \% of Std I-II children who could read letters or more is $80.63 \%$. With $95 \%$ probability, the true population proportion lies within $\pm 3.45 \%$ points of the estimate, i.e., between $84.08 \%$ and $77.18 \%$.'

| List of districts under <br> each division <br> Central <br> Mayurbhanj <br> Baleshwar <br> Bhadrak <br> Kendrapara <br> Jagatsinghapur <br> Cuttack <br> Jajapur <br> Nayagarh <br> Khordha <br> Puri <br> North <br> Bargarh <br> Jharsuguda <br> Sambalpur <br> Debagarh <br> Sundargarh <br> Kendujhar <br> Dhenkanal <br> Anugul <br> Subarnapur <br> Balangir <br> South <br> Ganjam <br> Gajapati <br> Kandhamal <br> Baudh <br> Nuapada <br> Kalahandi <br> Rayagada <br> Nabarangapur <br> Koraput <br> Malkangiri |
| :--- |

## Divisional Estimates

## Punjab

| School enrollment and out of school children |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Division/Region | \% Children out of school (age: 6-14) |  |  |  |  | \% Children enrolled in private school (age: 6-14) |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| Doaba | 2.37 | 4.41 | 0.76 | 0.50 | 0.44 | 38.31 | 28.58 | 32.85 | 37.73 | 46.10 |
|  | $\pm 1.00$ | $\pm 2.42$ | $\pm 0.38$ | $\pm 0.35$ | $\pm 0.41$ | $\pm 4.53$ | $\pm 5.15$ | $\pm 5.18$ | $\pm 5.38$ | $\pm 5.73$ |
| Majha | 2.39 | 3.75 | 1.93 | 2.04 | 2.56 | 49.14 | 39.96 | 40.78 | 40.96 | 50.98 |
|  | $\pm 1.10$ | $\pm 1.94$ | $\pm 1.05$ | $\pm 0.86$ | $\pm 0.94$ | $\pm 6.67$ | $\pm 6.36$ | $\pm 4.74$ | $\pm 4.95$ | $\pm 4.69$ |
| Malwa | 2.90 | 6.05 | 1.88 | 1.75 | 1.14 | 40.14 | 27.65 | 38.87 | 39.83 | 42.40 |
|  | $\pm 0.54$ | $\pm 2.41$ | $\pm 0.45$ | $\pm 0.50$ | $\pm 0.37$ | $\pm 2.71$ | $\pm 3.31$ | $\pm 3.11$ | $\pm 2.85$ | $\pm 2.93$ |
| State | 2.69 | 5.23 | 1.66 | 1.56 | 1.30 | 41.65 | 30.50 | 38.03 | 39.64 | 45.06 |
|  | $\pm 0.44$ | $\pm 1.55$ | $\pm 0.36$ | $\pm 0.36$ | $\pm 0.32$ | $\pm 2.34$ | $\pm 2.64$ | $\pm 2.33$ | $\pm 2.25$ | $\pm 2.33$ |

Learning levels: Std I-II

| Division/Region | \% Children in Std I-II who CAN READ letters or more |  |  |  |  | \% Children in Std I-II who CAN RECOGNIZE numbers 1 to 9 or more |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| Doaba | 81.49 | 88.81 | 90.74 | 86.51 | 86.67 | 82.83 | 85.09 | 92.69 | 89.34 | 91.17 |
|  | $\pm 4.91$ | $\pm 5.76$ | $\pm 3.01$ | $\pm 3.19$ | $\pm 5.56$ | $\pm 4.92$ | $\pm 6.71$ | $\pm 2.98$ | $\pm 3.40$ | $\pm 4.23$ |
| Majha | 92.63 | 92.91 | 83.73 | 87.58 | 88.29 | 90.23 | 91.31 | 85.85 | 90.40 | 89.72 |
|  | $\pm 3.04$ | $\pm 3.47$ | $\pm 3.99$ | $\pm 3.34$ | $\pm 4.11$ | $\pm 3.58$ | $\pm 4.18$ | $\pm 4.01$ | $\pm 3.53$ | $\pm 4.31$ |
| Malwa | 85.83 | 90.24 | 88.26 | 87.42 | 85.38 | 83.47 | 86.91 | 87.82 | 91.06 | 87.28 |
|  | $\pm 2.08$ | $\pm 2.12$ | $\pm 2.16$ | $\pm 2.57$ | $\pm 2.54$ | $\pm 2.23$ | $\pm 2.35$ | $\pm 2.22$ | $\pm 2.17$ | $\pm 2.53$ |
| State | 86.24 | 90.48 | 87.69 | 87.22 | 86.29 | 84.55 | 87.40 | 88.35 | 90.45 | 88.66 |
|  | $\pm 1.73$ | $\pm 1.87$ | $\pm 1.67$ | $\pm 1.73$ | $\pm 2.08$ | $\pm 1.81$ | $\pm 2.16$ | $\pm 1.70$ | $\pm 1.64$ | $\pm 1.94$ |

Learning levels: Std III-V

| Division/Region | \% Children in Std III-V who CAN READ Level 1 (Std I) text or more |  |  |  |  | \% Children in Std III-V who CAN DO subtraction or more |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| Doaba | 73.25 | 75.11 | 77.97 | 80.27 | 75.62 | 66.37 | 77.77 | 83.17 | 80.30 | 61.92 |
|  | $\pm 4.33$ | $\pm 4.77$ | $\pm 4.69$ | $\pm 3.75$ | $\pm 4.76$ | $\pm 5.71$ | $\pm 4.69$ | $\pm 3.83$ | $\pm 4.48$ | $\pm 7.37$ |
| Majha | 68.11 | 70.97 | 72.83 | 71.74 | 70.06 | 65.80 | 66.00 | 75.89 | 71.86 | 56.58 |
|  | $\pm 6.76$ | $\pm 6.02$ | $\pm 4.38$ | $\pm 4.37$ | $\pm 5.11$ | $\pm 6.85$ | $\pm 6.52$ | $\pm 4.39$ | $\pm 5.11$ | $\pm 4.67$ |
| Malwa | 69.07 | 70.79 | 72.51 | 73.74 | 73.73 | 63.02 | 68.97 | 78.13 | 71.19 | 65.83 |
|  | $\pm 2.82$ | $\pm 3.04$ | $\pm 2.80$ | $\pm 2.84$ | $\pm 3.15$ | $\pm 2.95$ | $\pm 3.45$ | $\pm 2.70$ | $\pm 3.26$ | $\pm 3.22$ |
| State | 69.70 | 71.67 | 73.80 | 74.94 | 73.43 | 64.20 | 70.12 | 78.79 | 73.61 | 63.07 |
|  | $\pm 2.33$ | $\pm 2.39$ | $\pm 2.14$ | $\pm 2.06$ | $\pm 2.34$ | $\pm 2.51$ | $\pm 2.65$ | $\pm 2.00$ | $\pm 2.41$ | $\pm 2.70$ |

Note: Districts have been clubbed into divisions to produce these estimates. The grouping of districts is based on administrative divisions used in the state or by geographical regions.

The first row for each division gives the estimate of the relevant variable/year. The numbers below the estimate, in the second row, are twice the standard error of the corresponding estimate and represent the 95\% confidence interval for the estimate. For instance, in Doaba division of Punjab, in 2012, \% of Std I-II children who could read letters or more is $86.67 \%$. With $95 \%$ probability, the true population proportion lies within $\pm 5.56 \%$ points of the estimate, i.e., between $92.23 \%$ and $81.11 \%$.

## List of districts under each division <br> Doaba

| Hoshiarpur |
| :--- |
| Jalandhar |
| Kapurthala |
| SBS Nagar |
| Majha |
| Gurdaspur |
| Amritsar |
| Tarn Taran |
| Malwa |
| Bathinda |
| Faridkot |
| Fatehgarh Sahib |
| Firozpur |
| Ludhiana |
| Mansa |
| Moga |
| Muktsar |
| Sangrur |
| SAS Nagar |
| Patiala |
| Rupnagar |

## Divisional Estimates

## Rajasthan



# Divisional Estimates 

## Rajasthan

| Learning levels: Std III-V |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Division/Region | \% Children in Std III-V who CAN READ Level 1 (Std I) text or more |  |  |  |  | \% Children in Std III-V who CAN DO subtraction or more |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| Ajmer | 60.42 | 58.1 | 52.33 | 48.87 | 53.48 | 43.52 | 47.32 | 41.47 | 36.5 | 35.16 |
|  | $\pm 5.09$ | $\pm 4.94$ | $\pm 5.56$ | $\pm 5.24$ | $\pm 5.37$ | $\pm 5.35$ | $\pm 5.74$ | $\pm 5.36$ | $\pm 5.65$ | $\pm 5.10$ |
| Bharatpur | 62.68 | 58.13 | 52.66 | 56.41 | 49.06 | 54.49 | 56.19 | 47.50 | 49.23 | 39.44 |
|  | $\pm 5.05$ | $\pm 5.50$ | $\pm 5.33$ | $\pm 5.14$ | $\pm 5.68$ | $\pm 5.56$ | $\pm 5.38$ | $\pm 5.83$ | $\pm 5.75$ | $\pm 5.59$ |
| Bikaner | 75.76 | 65.48 | 68.18 | 63.14 | 57.98 | 63.67 | 59.4 | 64.72 | 55.29 | 44.49 |
|  | $\pm 4.17$ | $\pm 5.00$ | $\pm 4.68$ | $\pm 4.12$ | $\pm 5.35$ | $\pm 4.91$ | $\pm 5.22$ | $\pm 4.95$ | $\pm 4.61$ | $\pm 5.54$ |
| Jaipur | 66.85 | 62.77 | 63.23 | 60.03 | 53.75 | 53.37 | 52.81 | 54.45 | 48.71 | 40.17 |
|  | $\pm 4.29$ | $\pm 4.47$ | $\pm 4.60$ | $\pm 5.48$ | $\pm 4.38$ | $\pm 4.45$ | $\pm 4.81$ | $\pm 5.23$ | $\pm 5.17$ | $\pm 4.47$ |
| Jodhpur | 57.92 | 55.34 | 52.14 | 42.20 | 38.05 | 46.20 | 46.53 | 45.80 | 28.90 | 23.37 |
|  | $\pm 4.67$ | $\pm 5.24$ | $\pm 4.77$ | $\pm 4.46$ | $\pm 4.28$ | $\pm 4.81$ | $\pm 4.91$ | $\pm 5.25$ | $\pm 4.39$ | $\pm 3.89$ |
| Kota | 58.91 | 50.96 | 59.05 | 49.44 | 47.07 | 45.21 | 42.54 | 52.70 | 36.76 | 31.72 |
|  | $\pm 5.27$ | $\pm 5.36$ | $\pm 6.20$ | $\pm 6.13$ | $\pm 4.82$ | $\pm 5.80$ | $\pm 5.97$ | $\pm 6.08$ | $\pm 5.70$ | $\pm 4.89$ |
| Udaipur | 55.45 | 41.72 | 55.83 | 49.25 | 39.36 | 34.20 | 32.11 | 44.27 | 31.74 | 23.03 |
|  | $\pm 5.26$ | $\pm 5.69$ | $\pm 4.92$ | $\pm 4.27$ | $\pm 4.72$ | $\pm 4.99$ | $\pm 6.15$ | $\pm 4.93$ | $\pm 4.11$ | $\pm 3.82$ |
| State | 62.00 | 55.88 | 57.40 | 52.66 | 47.74 | 47.63 | 47.45 | 49.48 | 40.39 | 33.11 |
|  | $\pm 1.92$ | $\pm 2.12$ | $\pm 1.98$ | $\pm 2.06$ | $\pm 1.98$ | $\pm 2.06$ | $\pm 2.20$ | $\pm 2.11$ | $\pm 2.09$ | $\pm 1.92$ |

List of districts under each division

| Jodhpur |
| :--- |
| Barmer |
| Jaisalmer |
| Jalor |
| Jodhpur |
| Pali |
| Sirohi |
| Kota |
| Baran |
| Bundi |
| Jhalawar |
| Kota |
| Udaipur |
| Banswara |
| Chittaurgarh |
| Dungarpur |
| Rajsamand |
| Udaipur |

## Divisional Estimates

## Tamil Nadu

| School enrollment and out of school children |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Division/Region | \% Children out of school (age: 6-14) |  |  |  |  | \% Children enrolled in private school (age: 6-14) |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| Central | 0.86 | 0.89 | 0.79 | 0.63 | 0.48 | 22.16 | 19.44 | 19.35 | 25.18 | 27.43 |
|  | $\pm 0.46$ | $\pm 0.44$ | $\pm 0.36$ | $\pm 0.29$ | $\pm 0.32$ | $\pm 4.46$ | $\pm 3.06$ | $\pm 3.72$ | $\pm 3.28$ | $\pm 4.08$ |
| East | 0.48 | 0.80 | 1.38 | 0.86 | 1.03 | 18.88 | 14.95 | 20.67 | 23.91 | 25.36 |
|  | $\pm 0.21$ | $\pm 0.31$ | $\pm 0.60$ | $\pm 0.41$ | $\pm 0.63$ | $\pm 3.13$ | $\pm 2.37$ | $\pm 3.38$ | $\pm 2.92$ | $\pm 3.09$ |
| North | 0.33 | 0.69 | 0.90 | 1.06 | 0.36 | 17.59 | 21.09 | 26.11 | 26.42 | 26.76 |
|  | $\pm 0.21$ | $\pm 0.36$ | $\pm 0.46$ | $\pm 0.68$ | $\pm 0.36$ | $\pm 3.08$ | $\pm 2.73$ | $\pm 3.85$ | $\pm 3.68$ | $\pm 3.34$ |
| South | 0.89 | 1.14 | 0.94 | 0.67 | 0.40 | 26.62 | 26.25 | 34.84 | 32.30 | 36.08 |
|  | $\pm 0.36$ | $\pm 0.37$ | $\pm 0.38$ | $\pm 0.28$ | $\pm 0.25$ | $\pm 4.01$ | $\pm 4.16$ | $\pm 5.74$ | $\pm 4.95$ | $\pm 5.04$ |
| West | 0.82 | 1.25 | 0.71 | 1.00 | 0.85 | 18.17 | 17.54 | 22.90 | 26.93 | 27.96 |
|  | $\pm 0.42$ | $\pm 0.49$ | $\pm 0.33$ | $\pm 0.74$ | $\pm 0.53$ | $\pm 3.59$ | $\pm 3.96$ | $\pm 5.30$ | $\pm 4.13$ | $\pm 4.19$ |
| State | 0.63 | 0.93 | 0.98 | 0.85 | 0.59 | 20.55 | 19.69 | 25.07 | 27.04 | 28.95 |
|  | $\pm 0.14$ | $\pm 0.17$ | $\pm 0.22$ | $\pm 0.23$ | $\pm 0.19$ | $\pm 1.65$ | $\pm 1.47$ | $\pm 2.06$ | $\pm 1.79$ | $\pm 1.86$ |

Learning levels: Std I-II

| Division/Region | \% Children in Std I-II who CAN READ letters or more |  |  |  |  | \% Children in Std I-II who CAN RECOGNIZE numbers 1 to 9 or more |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| Central | 60.82 | 59.55 | 51.81 | 55.49 | 53.02 | 63.20 | 65.90 | 54.70 | 59.60 | 58.69 |
|  | $\pm 5.79$ | $\pm 5.86$ | $\pm 7.03$ | $\pm 5.51$ | $\pm 6.39$ | $\pm 7.21$ | $\pm 5.80$ | $\pm 7.29$ | $\pm 5.76$ | $\pm 6.68$ |
| East | 51.03 | 55.34 | 60.34 | 60.67 | 57.46 | 61.53 | 64.50 | 65.89 | 69.60 | 75.11 |
|  | $\pm 4.56$ | $\pm 4.97$ | $\pm 5.26$ | $\pm 4.96$ | $\pm 5.86$ | $\pm 5.19$ | $\pm 4.51$ | $\pm 5.09$ | $\pm 5.19$ | $\pm 4.22$ |
| North | 52.18 | 67.10 | 67.30 | 62.97 | 60.84 | 63.12 | 75.79 | 73.44 | 70.07 | 68.46 |
|  | $\pm 4.74$ | $\pm 5.53$ | $\pm 5.15$ | $\pm 5.43$ | $\pm 5.80$ | $\pm 5.28$ | $\pm 5.06$ | $\pm 5.61$ | $\pm 5.55$ | $\pm 5.58$ |
| South | 60.51 | 65.08 | 73.52 | 68.19 | 60.27 | 64.44 | 72.67 | 76.40 | 72.06 | 67.14 |
|  | $\pm 5.29$ | $\pm 5.15$ | $\pm 4.48$ | $\pm 5.06$ | $\pm 5.29$ | $\pm 5.04$ | $\pm 4.82$ | $\pm 4.89$ | $\pm 4.85$ | $\pm 5.10$ |
| West | 50.62 | 68.68 | 58.18 | 66.73 | 61.95 | 60.59 | 72.63 | 60.85 | 75.55 | 70.86 |
|  | $\pm 6.56$ | $\pm 6.07$ | $\pm 7.05$ | $\pm 5.12$ | $\pm 6.45$ | $\pm 7.24$ | $\pm 6.27$ | $\pm 7.51$ | $\pm 5.27$ | $\pm 5.27$ |
| State | 54.74 | 62.42 | 63.03 | 62.75 | 58.64 | 62.63 | 69.95 | 67.47 | 69.25 | 68.00 |
|  | $\pm 2.38$ | $\pm 2.49$ | $\pm 2.62$ | $\pm 2.41$ | $\pm 2.68$ | $\pm 2.62$ | $\pm 2.36$ | $\pm 2.73$ | $\pm 2.47$ | $\pm 2.52$ |

Learning levels: Std III-V

| Division/Region | \% Children in Std III-V who CAN READ Level 1 (Std I) text or more |  |  |  |  | \% Children in Std III-V who CAN DO subtraction or more |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| Central | 50.63 | 54.56 | 44.74 | 39.45 | 42.94 | 45.03 | 38.30 | 37.09 | 31.19 | 37.51 |
|  | $\pm 6.02$ | $\pm 6.29$ | $\pm 4.90$ | $\pm 5.10$ | $\pm 5.19$ | $\pm 5.54$ | $\pm 5.67$ | $\pm 5.31$ | $\pm 5.21$ | $\pm 4.98$ |
| East | 34.25 | 42.99 | 46.24 | 48.59 | 41.44 | 25.02 | 29.89 | 38.11 | 34.95 | 31.55 |
|  | $\pm 3.63$ | $\pm 4.09$ | $\pm 4.48$ | $\pm 4.50$ | $\pm 4.58$ | $\pm 3.64$ | $\pm 3.84$ | $\pm 4.74$ | $\pm 4.39$ | $\pm 4.29$ |
| North | 48.42 | 54.14 | 52.70 | 44.88 | 47.09 | 35.78 | 34.00 | 41.37 | 40.53 | 41.18 |
|  | $\pm 4.31$ | $\pm 4.56$ | $\pm 5.04$ | $\pm 5.93$ | $\pm 5.65$ | $\pm 4.75$ | $\pm 4.33$ | $\pm 3.89$ | $\pm 5.42$ | $\pm 5.26$ |
| South | 55.13 | 59.66 | 62.86 | 62.62 | 57.77 | 44.75 | 48.40 | 49.38 | 55.11 | 41.40 |
|  | $\pm 4.81$ | $\pm 4.47$ | $\pm 3.88$ | $\pm 4.09$ | $\pm 4.25$ | $\pm 4.56$ | $\pm 4.43$ | $\pm 3.94$ | $\pm 4.48$ | $\pm 4.28$ |
| West | 41.16 | 59.09 | 57.71 | 52.33 | 56.14 | 34.17 | 55.20 | 53.97 | 46.47 | 40.63 |
|  | $\pm 5.64$ | $\pm 6.14$ | $\pm 6.10$ | $\pm 4.45$ | $\pm 5.31$ | $\pm 4.57$ | $\pm 5.74$ | $\pm 6.39$ | $\pm 4.43$ | $\pm 4.97$ |
| State | 45.68 | 53.04 | 52.50 | 50.00 | 48.85 | 36.27 | 39.66 | 43.18 | 41.88 | 38.63 |
|  | $\pm 2.22$ | $\pm 2.30$ | $\pm 2.30$ | $\pm 2.33$ | $\pm 2.36$ | $\pm 2.15$ | $\pm 2.23$ | $\pm 2.20$ | $\pm 2.33$ | $\pm 2.22$ |

Note: Districts have been clubbed into divisions to produce these estimates. The grouping of districts is based on administrative divisions used in the state or by geographical regions.

The first row for each division gives the estimate of the relevant variable/year. The numbers below the estimate, in the second row, are twice the standard error of the corresponding estimate and represent the 95\% confidence interval for the estimate. For instance, in Central division of Tamil Nadu, in 2012, \% of Std III children who could read letters or more is $53.02 \%$. With $95 \%$ probability, the true population proportion lies within $\pm 6.39 \%$ points of the estimate, i.e., between $59.41 \%$ and $46.63 \%$.

List of districts under each division
Central

| Salem |
| :--- |
| Namakkal |
| Karur |
| Tiruchirappalli |
| Pudukkottai |
| East |
| Viluppuram |
| Perambalur |
| Ariyalur |
| Cuddalore |
| Nagapattinam |
| Thiruvarur |
| Thanjavur |
| North |
| Thiruvallur |
| Kancheepuram |
| Vellore |
| Dharmapuri |
| Tiruvannamalai |
| South |
| Sivaganga |
| Madurai |
| Virudhunagar |
| Ramanathapuram |
| Thoothukkudi |
| Tirunelveli |
| Kanniyakumari |
| West |
| Erode |
| The Nilgiris |
| Coimbatore |
| Dindigul |
| Theni |

# Divisional Estimates 

## Uttar Pradesh

| School enrollment and out of school children |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Division/Region | \% Children out of school (age: 6-14) |  |  |  |  | \% Children enrolled in private school (age: 6-14) |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| Agra | 5.86 | 3.84 | 3.85 | 5.16 | 4.75 | 45.12 | 40.81 | 51.47 | 57.38 | 59.99 |
|  | $\pm 1.12$ | $\pm 0.88$ | $\pm 0.97$ | $\pm 0.91$ | $\pm 1.07$ | $\pm 4.00$ | $\pm 3.96$ | $\pm 4.10$ | $\pm 3.70$ | $\pm 3.75$ |
| Aligarh | 5.31 | 6.58 | 6.15 | 6.27 | 5.44 | 38.70 | 42.67 | 35.80 | 44.55 | 52.22 |
|  | $\pm 1.23$ | $\pm 1.51$ | $\pm 1.76$ | $\pm 1.63$ | $\pm 1.42$ | $\pm 4.91$ | $\pm 4.70$ | $\pm 5.37$ | $\pm 5.09$ | $\pm 5.07$ |
| Allahabad | 5.04 | 3.26 | 4.16 | 5.19 | 4.29 | 39.12 | 36.76 | 42.84 | 47.77 | 53.92 |
|  | $\pm 1.13$ | $\pm 0.90$ | $\pm 1.02$ | $\pm 1.11$ | $\pm 0.87$ | $\pm 4.59$ | $\pm 5.00$ | $\pm 4.42$ | $\pm 4.05$ | $\pm 4.48$ |
| Azamgarh | 3.71 | 3.99 | 1.68 | 1.87 | 2.22 | 39.36 | 42.73 | 51.20 | 53.13 | 59.38 |
|  | $\pm 1.41$ | $\pm 1.70$ | $\pm 0.67$ | $\pm 0.79$ | $\pm 0.99$ | $\pm 5.26$ | $\pm 5.09$ | $\pm 5.61$ | $\pm 4.86$ | $\pm 4.55$ |
| Bareilly | 7.80 | 9.99 | 10.91 | 13.03 | 12.33 | 26.22 | 30.11 | 33.87 | 39.58 | 39.16 |
|  | $\pm 1.95$ | $\pm 2.16$ | $\pm 2.92$ | $\pm 1.97$ | $\pm 1.95$ | $\pm 3.87$ | $\pm 3.72$ | $\pm 4.13$ | $\pm 3.96$ | $\pm 3.78$ |
| Basti | 7.25 | 5.62 | 5.16 | 6.79 | 5.05 | 26.86 | 38.84 | 40.16 | 45.36 | 44.73 |
|  | $\pm 1.95$ | $\pm 1.79$ | $\pm 1.39$ | $\pm 1.64$ | $\pm 1.34$ | $\pm 3.58$ | $\pm 4.46$ | $\pm 4.48$ | $\pm 4.61$ | $\pm 4.79$ |
| Chitrakoot | 4.29 | 3.86 | 5.29 | 6.22 | 7.82 | 19.26 | 22.32 | 23.64 | 22.78 | 29.96 |
|  | $\pm 0.99$ | $\pm 0.85$ | $\pm 1.20$ | $\pm 1.36$ | $\pm 1.54$ | $\pm 4.08$ | $\pm 4.65$ | $\pm 4.14$ | $\pm 4.35$ | $\pm 4.60$ |
| Devipatan | 8.47 | 7.96 | 10.11 | 15.18 | 12.26 | 24.36 | 20.72 | 20.89 | 25.98 | 33.68 |
|  | $\pm 1.90$ | $\pm 1.84$ | $\pm 2.05$ | $\pm 2.56$ | $\pm 2.06$ | $\pm 4.04$ | $\pm 3.62$ | $\pm 4.08$ | $\pm 3.89$ | $\pm 4.17$ |
| Faizabad | 4.99 | 4.29 | 5.86 | 4.47 | 4.74 | 41.57 | 35.76 | 39.34 | 46.03 | 52.67 |
|  | $\pm 1.26$ | $\pm 1.19$ | $\pm 1.60$ | $\pm 1.34$ | $\pm 1.24$ | $\pm 4.06$ | $\pm 4.04$ | $\pm 3.76$ | $\pm 4.13$ | $\pm 3.75$ |
| Gorakhpur | 4.93 | 3.01 | 1.76 | 2.63 | 3.30 | 42.83 | 46.69 | 50.75 | 52.94 | 53.66 |
|  | $\pm 1.19$ | $\pm 0.77$ | $\pm 0.48$ | $\pm 0.73$ | $\pm 0.78$ | $\pm 3.78$ | $\pm 4.36$ | $\pm 4.01$ | $\pm 3.54$ | $\pm 3.45$ |
| Jhansi | 2.85 | 1.88 | 2.54 | 4.18 | 3.63 | 23.53 | 14.82 | 19.56 | 25.58 | 31.40 |
|  | $\pm 0.83$ | $\pm 0.83$ | $\pm 0.89$ | $\pm 1.27$ | $\pm 1.02$ | $\pm 5.09$ | $\pm 3.94$ | $\pm 5.28$ | $\pm 5.53$ | $\pm 5.17$ |
| Kanpur | 4.60 | 3.71 | 3.40 | 4.52 | 3.53 | 33.03 | 34.36 | 40.68 | 39.50 | 47.18 |
|  | $\pm 1.03$ | $\pm 0.79$ | $\pm 0.83$ | $\pm 1.28$ | $\pm 0.79$ | $\pm 3.50$ | $\pm 3.65$ | $\pm 3.66$ | $\pm 3.84$ | $\pm 3.79$ |
| Lucknow | 9.05 | 7.20 | 6.58 | 7.00 | 10.09 | 30.62 | 32.12 | 34.24 | 38.61 | 38.95 |
|  | $\pm 1.34$ | $\pm 1.31$ | $\pm 1.14$ | $\pm 1.45$ | $\pm 1.69$ | $\pm 3.16$ | $\pm 3.22$ | $\pm 3.23$ | $\pm 3.88$ | $\pm 3.49$ |
| Meerut | 3.06 | 3.16 | 2.95 | 3.61 | 4.45 | 46.79 | 39.70 | 52.09 | 57.55 | 62.51 |
|  | $\pm 0.80$ | $\pm 0.94$ | $\pm 0.80$ | $\pm 1.06$ | $\pm 1.15$ | $\pm 4.61$ | $\pm 4.52$ | $\pm 4.22$ | $\pm 3.60$ | $\pm 3.71$ |
| Mirzapur | 3.76 | 2.57 | 3.65 | 2.03 | 4.30 | 27.77 | 27.52 | 28.09 | 32.70 | 42.14 |
|  | $\pm 1.13$ | $\pm 1.01$ | $\pm 1.15$ | $\pm 0.76$ | $\pm 1.25$ | $\pm 4.95$ | $\pm 4.85$ | $\pm 4.73$ | $\pm 4.91$ | $\pm 5.06$ |
| Moradabad | 6.47 | 6.96 | 7.80 | 9.22 | 9.97 | 43.71 | 46.67 | 43.85 | 55.56 | 53.76 |
|  | $\pm 1.59$ | $\pm 1.74$ | $\pm 1.75$ | $\pm 1.62$ | $\pm 1.82$ | $\pm 4.07$ | $\pm 4.42$ | $\pm 4.77$ | $\pm 3.87$ | $\pm 3.79$ |
| Saharanpur | 6.31 | 3.78 | 7.34 | 8.51 | 8.57 | 42.13 | 35.04 | 35.99 | 53.17 | 54.31 |
|  | $\pm 2.21$ | $\pm 1.53$ | $\pm 2.53$ | $\pm 2.56$ | $\pm 2.25$ | $\pm 6.23$ | $\pm 6.14$ | $\pm 5.32$ | $\pm 6.22$ | $\pm 5.29$ |
| Varanasi | 2.42 | 1.79 | 1.85 | 2.56 | 2.57 | 39.36 | 38.66 | 42.21 | 54.88 | 54.43 |
|  | $\pm 0.70$ | $\pm 0.60$ | $\pm 0.66$ | $\pm 0.69$ | $\pm 0.97$ | $\pm 4.05$ | $\pm 4.40$ | $\pm 3.95$ | $\pm 4.29$ | $\pm 3.94$ |
| State | 5.63 | 4.92 | 5.22 | 6.13 | 6.36 | 35.86 | 35.83 | 39.33 | 45.36 | 48.47 |
|  | $\pm 0.36$ | $\pm 0.36$ | $\pm 0.39$ | $\pm 0.40$ | $\pm 0.41$ | $\pm 1.09$ | $\pm 1.12$ | $\pm 1.14$ | $\pm 1.13$ | $\pm 1.10$ |

Note: Districts have been clubbed into divisions to produce these estimates. The grouping of districts is based on administrative divisions used in the state or by geographical regions.

The first row for each division gives the estimate of the relevant variable/year. The numbers below the estimate, in the second row, are twice the standard error of the corresponding estimate and represent the 95\% confidence interval for the estimate. For instance, in Agra division of Uttar Pradesh, in 2012, \% of Std I-II children who could read letters or more is $61.85 \%$. With $95 \%$ probability, the true population proportion lies within $\pm 4.14 \%$ points of the estimate, i.e., between $65.99 \%$ and $57.71 \%$.,

List of districts under each division

## Agra

Mathura

## Agra

Firozabad
Mainpuri

## Aligarh

Aligarh
Mahamaya Nagar
Etah
Allahabad
Fatehpur
Pratapgarh
Kaushambi
Allahabad

## Azamgarh

Azamgarh

## Mau

| Ballia |
| :--- |
| Bareilly |
| Budaun |
| Bareilly |
| Pilibhit |
| Shahjahanpur |
| Basti |
| Siddharthnagar |
| Basti |
| Sant Kabir Nagar |

## Divisional Estimates

## Uttar Pradesh

| Division/Region | \% Children in Std I-II who CAN READ letters or more |  |  |  |  | \% Children in Std I-II who CAN RECOGNIZE numbers 1 to 9 or more |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| Agra | 61.40 | 68.04 | 67.76 | 65.30 | 61.85 | 60.41 | 66.55 | 68.07 | 67.50 | 67.57 |
|  | $\pm 4.29$ | $\pm 4.20$ | $\pm 3.94$ | $\pm 3.93$ | $\pm 4.14$ | $\pm 4.27$ | $\pm 4.23$ | $\pm 3.77$ | $\pm 3.66$ | $\pm 3.79$ |
| Aligarh | 51.95 | 66.93 | 62.07 | 54.68 | 56.77 | 50.77 | 67.50 | 59.84 | 57.10 | 62.15 |
|  | $\pm 5.44$ | $\pm 5.29$ | $\pm 5.74$ | $\pm 6.52$ | $\pm 5.38$ | $\pm 5.04$ | $\pm 4.88$ | $\pm 5.95$ | $\pm 6.33$ | $\pm 5.23$ |
| Allahabad | 61.79 | 71.04 | 62.23 | 66.93 | 56.52 | 59.69 | 67.68 | 59.85 | 67.20 | 60.32 |
|  | $\pm 4.63$ | $\pm 3.77$ | $\pm 4.63$ | $\pm 4.00$ | $\pm 4.18$ | $\pm 4.37$ | $\pm 4.26$ | $\pm 4.41$ | $\pm 4.02$ | $\pm 4.02$ |
| Azamgarh | 67.12 | 70.08 | 73.12 | 72.37 | 66.97 | 64.79 | 68.09 | 72.63 | 71.18 | 70.99 |
|  | $\pm 4.61$ | $\pm 4.96$ | $\pm 6.62$ | $\pm 4.23$ | $\pm 4.69$ | $\pm 4.89$ | $\pm 5.20$ | $\pm 6.05$ | $\pm 4.85$ | $\pm 4.12$ |
| Bareilly | 61.38 | 58.21 | 64.47 | 56.12 | 49.34 | 60.90 | 58.19 | 62.74 | 59.49 | 56.64 |
|  | $\pm 4.74$ | $\pm 5.39$ | $\pm 5.04$ | $\pm 5.38$ | $\pm 5.42$ | $\pm 4.69$ | $\pm 5.38$ | $\pm 5.33$ | $\pm 5.49$ | $\pm 4.90$ |
| Basti | 54.08 | 66.48 | 64.68 | 57.83 | 55.43 | 52.88 | 64.02 | 62.07 | 62.11 | 56.26 |
|  | $\pm 4.81$ | $\pm 5.79$ | $\pm 6.12$ | $\pm 5.35$ | $\pm 5.30$ | $\pm 5.41$ | $\pm 5.48$ | $\pm 5.93$ | $\pm 5.18$ | $\pm 5.64$ |
| Chitrakoot | 67.65 | 73.92 | 62.27 | 64.24 | 57.85 | 65.40 | 71.51 | 61.28 | 64.33 | 59.75 |
|  | $\pm 4.65$ | $\pm 4.80$ | $\pm 5.43$ | $\pm 4.52$ | $\pm 4.40$ | $\pm 4.71$ | $\pm 5.13$ | $\pm 4.81$ | $\pm 4.61$ | $\pm 4.80$ |
| Devipatan | 56.05 | 57.68 | 54.44 | 45.67 | 40.27 | 56.04 | 55.90 | 56.60 | 56.43 | 47.85 |
|  | $\pm 4.66$ | $\pm 5.39$ | $\pm 5.34$ | $\pm 4.64$ | $\pm 4.33$ | $\pm 4.74$ | $\pm 5.39$ | $\pm 5.23$ | $\pm 4.97$ | $\pm 4.25$ |
| Faizabad | 51.96 | 65.66 | 62.22 | 61.11 | 54.64 | 57.99 | 62.82 | 65.58 | 63.95 | 62.85 |
|  | $\pm 4.39$ | $\pm 5.01$ | $\pm 5.43$ | $\pm 4.26$ | $\pm 4.65$ | $\pm 4.18$ | $\pm 5.21$ | $\pm 5.57$ | $\pm 4.35$ | $\pm 3.98$ |
| Gorakhpur | 66.31 | 75.87 | 72.96 | 71.63 | 59.89 | 61.69 | 72.82 | 71.95 | 71.88 | 64.34 |
|  | $\pm 4.24$ | $\pm 3.96$ | $\pm 4.35$ | $\pm 3.88$ | $\pm 3.34$ | $\pm 4.06$ | $\pm 4.26$ | $\pm 4.31$ | $\pm 3.58$ | $\pm 3.43$ |
| Jhansi | 60.65 | 71.59 | 73.90 | 68.99 | 69.46 | 57.81 | 69.35 | 72.50 | 64.99 | 70.23 |
|  | $\pm 5.78$ | $\pm 5.20$ | $\pm 5.18$ | $\pm 5.25$ | $\pm 5.28$ | $\pm 5.88$ | $\pm 5.37$ | $\pm 5.42$ | $\pm 5.50$ | $\pm 5.24$ |
| Kanpur | 60.15 | 63.20 | 70.41 | 66.92 | 62.97 | 57.78 | 60.69 | 67.70 | 67.72 | 67.34 |
|  | $\pm 3.84$ | $\pm 4.65$ | $\pm 3.90$ | $\pm 3.98$ | $\pm 4.17$ | $\pm 3.60$ | $\pm 4.86$ | $\pm 4.05$ | $\pm 4.10$ | $\pm 4.09$ |
| Lucknow | 53.58 | 57.86 | 60.57 | 55.35 | 47.51 | 54.32 | 56.57 | 60.81 | 58.47 | 56.00 |
|  | $\pm 3.73$ | $\pm 4.23$ | $\pm 4.46$ | $\pm 5.09$ | $\pm 4.18$ | $\pm 3.56$ | $\pm 4.01$ | $\pm 4.09$ | $\pm 4.55$ | $\pm 3.70$ |
| Meerut | 77.61 | 76.40 | 79.87 | 72.06 | 69.30 | 76.29 | 75.01 | 77.65 | 77.37 | 74.85 |
|  | $\pm 3.72$ | $\pm 4.55$ | $\pm 4.30$ | $\pm 4.52$ | $\pm 3.97$ | $\pm 3.90$ | $\pm 4.69$ | $\pm 4.58$ | $\pm 4.17$ | $\pm 3.04$ |
| Mirzapur | 57.72 | 70.06 | 68.08 | 75.42 | 61.02 | 55.86 | 65.40 | 65.45 | 74.97 | 61.65 |
|  | $\pm 5.49$ | $\pm 4.85$ | $\pm 6.82$ | $\pm 4.43$ | $\pm 4.86$ | $\pm 5.60$ | $\pm 4.69$ | $\pm 6.19$ | $\pm 4.23$ | $\pm 4.82$ |
| Moradabad | 71.13 | 69.35 | 65.21 | 62.14 | 62.50 | 71.60 | 70.87 | 66.66 | 66.60 | 69.94 |
|  | $\pm 4.25$ | $\pm 5.28$ | $\pm 5.21$ | $\pm 5.18$ | $\pm 4.72$ | $\pm 3.99$ | $\pm 5.09$ | $\pm 4.69$ | $\pm 4.59$ | $\pm 4.04$ |
| Saharanpur | 75.66 | 82.00 | 77.64 | 69.58 | 68.61 | 77.48 | 83.28 | 77.68 | 70.74 | 78.96 |
|  | $\pm 5.86$ | $\pm 5.03$ | $\pm 6.26$ | $\pm 5.56$ | $\pm 6.14$ | $\pm 5.10$ | $\pm 4.98$ | $\pm 6.79$ | $\pm 4.71$ | $\pm 5.38$ |
| Varanasi | 69.30 | 75.73 | 82.90 | 69.47 | 67.05 | 64.86 | 72.65 | 78.73 | 71.25 | 69.28 |
|  | $\pm 3.69$ | $\pm 4.08$ | $\pm 4.02$ | $\pm 4.34$ | $\pm 4.48$ | $\pm 4.23$ | $\pm 3.90$ | $\pm 4.29$ | $\pm 4.36$ | $\pm 4.39$ |
| State | 62.08 | 68.00 | 67.31 | 63.56 | 57.51 | 61.07 | 66.29 | 66.59 | 65.99 | 62.89 |
|  | $\pm 1.18$ | $\pm 1.25$ | $\pm 1.35$ | $\pm 1.24$ | $\pm 1.22$ | $\pm 1.15$ | $\pm 1.25$ | $\pm 1.30$ | $\pm 1.18$ | $\pm 1.13$ |


| List of districts under |
| :--- |
| each division |
| Chitrakoot |
| Hamirpur |
| Mahoba |
| Banda |
| Chitrakoot |
| Devipatan |
| Bahraich |
| Shrawasti |
| Balrampur |
| Gonda |
| Faizabad |
| Bara Banki |
| Faizabad |
| Ambedkar Nagar |
| Sultanpur |
| Gorakhpur |
| Mahrajganj |
| Gorakhpur |
| Kushinagar |
| Deoria |
| Jhansi |
| Jalaun |
| Jhansi |
| Lalitpur |
| Kanpur |
| Farrukhabad |
| Kannauj |
| Etawah |
| Auraiya |
| Kanpur Dehat |

## Divisional Estimates

## Uttar Pradesh

| Division/Region | \% Children in Std III-V who CAN READ Level 1 (Std I) text or more |  |  |  |  | \% Children in Std III-V who CAN DO subtraction or more |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| Agra | 48.80 | 48.74 | 51.40 | 46.76 | 44.07 | 35.38 | 35.07 | 42.28 | 38.85 | 30.78 |
|  | $\pm 4.00$ | $\pm 5.55$ | $\pm 4.96$ | $\pm 4.77$ | $\pm 4.82$ | $\pm 4.21$ | $\pm 4.13$ | $\pm 4.99$ | $\pm 3.99$ | $\pm 4.29$ |
| Aligarh | 53.56 | 46.81 | 46.67 | 42.70 | 45.13 | 39.16 | 37.67 | 38.37 | 32.86 | 36.88 |
|  | $\pm 5.33$ | $\pm 6.21$ | $\pm 5.78$ | $\pm 5.43$ | $\pm 6.72$ | $\pm 5.17$ | $\pm 6.60$ | $\pm 5.66$ | $\pm 4.43$ | $\pm 6.08$ |
| Allahabad | 50.25 | 48.06 | 47.16 | 44.35 | 41.54 | 33.66 | 38.06 | 34.08 | 33.82 | 30.57 |
|  | $\pm 4.57$ | $\pm 5.19$ | $\pm 5.11$ | $\pm 4.22$ | $\pm 4.80$ | $\pm 4.60$ | $\pm 5.76$ | $\pm 4.21$ | $\pm 4.74$ | $\pm 4.78$ |
| Azamgarh | 57.47 | 45.95 | 57.08 | 59.32 | 58.69 | 45.02 | 32.01 | 49.51 | 49.50 | 44.05 |
|  | $\pm 6.14$ | $\pm 4.39$ | $\pm 6.97$ | $\pm 4.37$ | $\pm 5.07$ | $\pm 7.43$ | $\pm 4.69$ | $\pm 7.39$ | $\pm 4.15$ | $\pm 5.15$ |
| Bareilly | 45.00 | 31.46 | 38.63 | 35.86 | 32.33 | 30.21 | 21.39 | 26.16 | 24.80 | 20.90 |
|  | $\pm 4.93$ | $\pm 5.77$ | $\pm 4.85$ | $\pm 4.40$ | $\pm 4.41$ | $\pm 4.46$ | $\pm 4.44$ | $\pm 4.44$ | $\pm 4.01$ | $\pm 4.14$ |
| Basti | 45.92 | 47.27 | 52.01 | 44.07 | 42.83 | 29.77 | 35.10 | 38.42 | 26.29 | 26.93 |
|  | $\pm 4.90$ | $\pm 6.07$ | $\pm 6.00$ | $\pm 5.35$ | $\pm 5.80$ | $\pm 4.11$ | $\pm 5.41$ | $\pm 5.61$ | $\pm 4.07$ | $\pm 5.25$ |
| Chitrakoot | 47.71 | 43.75 | 42.98 | 40.20 | 38.03 | 33.81 | 34.79 | 33.28 | 30.52 | 25.71 |
|  | $\pm 5.41$ | $\pm 5.55$ | $\pm 4.50$ | $\pm 4.41$ | $\pm 5.19$ | $\pm 5.61$ | $\pm 5.60$ | $\pm 4.42$ | $\pm 4.04$ | $\pm 4.27$ |
| Devipatan | 42.89 | 38.78 | 48.85 | 38.29 | 29.52 | 28.10 | 26.37 | 31.84 | 25.31 | 16.72 |
|  | $\pm 6.09$ | $\pm 5.28$ | $\pm 5.40$ | $\pm 4.87$ | $\pm 4.21$ | $\pm 5.66$ | $\pm 4.85$ | $\pm 5.00$ | $\pm 4.46$ | $\pm 3.50$ |
| Faizabad | 45.90 | 49.32 | 49.86 | 43.76 | 43.56 | 29.02 | 32.99 | 35.96 | 29.37 | 27.53 |
|  | $\pm 4.06$ | $\pm 5.26$ | $\pm 5.72$ | $\pm 4.26$ | $\pm 4.65$ | $\pm 3.62$ | $\pm 5.49$ | $\pm 5.01$ | $\pm 3.94$ | $\pm 4.03$ |
| Gorakhpur | 51.22 | 60.21 | 66.85 | 58.57 | 53.62 | 34.99 | 46.23 | 52.41 | 36.48 | 30.35 |
|  | $\pm 4.83$ | $\pm 5.03$ | $\pm 4.36$ | $\pm 4.00$ | $\pm 4.06$ | $\pm 5.21$ | $\pm 5.84$ | $\pm 4.70$ | $\pm 4.20$ | $\pm 3.19$ |
| Jhansi | 47.49 | 48.55 | 52.46 | 48.03 | 42.40 | 37.78 | 42.66 | 42.86 | 41.10 | 30.29 |
|  | $\pm 6.07$ | $\pm 6.27$ | $\pm 6.45$ | $\pm 5.14$ | $\pm 5.80$ | $\pm 5.96$ | $\pm 6.08$ | $\pm 5.28$ | $\pm 4.68$ | $\pm 5.55$ |
| Kanpur | 42.59 | 41.32 | 51.73 | 45.78 | 40.77 | 29.46 | 29.08 | 39.20 | 37.79 | 30.41 |
|  | $\pm 3.85$ | $\pm 4.12$ | $\pm 4.80$ | $\pm 4.98$ | $\pm 4.15$ | $\pm 3.55$ | $\pm 4.02$ | $\pm 5.26$ | $\pm 4.85$ | $\pm 4.05$ |
| Lucknow | 38.01 | 36.20 | 41.39 | 40.20 | 35.53 | 22.56 | 22.02 | 30.79 | 28.85 | 18.96 |
|  | $\pm 3.93$ | $\pm 3.64$ | $\pm 4.27$ | $\pm 4.52$ | $\pm 3.68$ | $\pm 3.83$ | $\pm 3.12$ | $\pm 4.00$ | $\pm 4.18$ | $\pm 2.86$ |
| Meerut | 71.17 | 69.28 | 71.87 | 67.21 | 64.74 | 54.04 | 55.86 | 61.43 | 48.06 | 47.20 |
|  | $\pm 3.99$ | $\pm 5.66$ | $\pm 3.74$ | $\pm 4.38$ | $\pm 4.00$ | $\pm 5.38$ | $\pm 6.19$ | $\pm 4.13$ | $\pm 4.90$ | $\pm 4.71$ |
| Mirzapur | 51.47 | 46.38 | 50.50 | 55.06 | 44.53 | 32.03 | 31.13 | 32.79 | 37.77 | 27.90 |
|  | $\pm 4.94$ | $\pm 6.04$ | $\pm 5.58$ | $\pm 5.27$ | $\pm 4.76$ | $\pm 4.94$ | $\pm 5.28$ | $\pm 5.34$ | $\pm 5.44$ | $\pm 4.45$ |
| Moradabad | 56.94 | 51.63 | 50.23 | 43.09 | 40.87 | 37.87 | 38.47 | 37.16 | 29.10 | 22.40 |
|  | $\pm 4.98$ | $\pm 5.52$ | $\pm 5.54$ | $\pm 4.47$ | $\pm 5.58$ | $\pm 5.03$ | $\pm 5.46$ | $\pm 5.10$ | $\pm 3.79$ | $\pm 3.85$ |
| Saharanpur | 73.12 | 67.30 | 64.83 | 59.04 | 63.84 | 59.56 | 56.55 | 55.17 | 39.64 | 43.29 |
|  | $\pm 6.04$ | $\pm 6.20$ | $\pm 6.74$ | $\pm 6.08$ | $\pm 6.91$ | $\pm 7.95$ | $\pm 7.60$ | $\pm 8.58$ | $\pm 6.13$ | $\pm 7.07$ |
| Varanasi | 58.32 | 61.18 | 68.40 | 55.81 | 57.95 | 42.75 | 43.79 | 51.06 | 41.15 | 36.81 |
|  | $\pm 4.07$ | $\pm 4.68$ | $\pm 4.85$ | $\pm 4.39$ | $\pm 4.27$ | $\pm 4.75$ | $\pm 4.75$ | $\pm 5.37$ | $\pm 4.04$ | $\pm 4.66$ |
| State | 50.66 | 48.55 | 52.67 | 47.83 | 44.77 | 35.22 | 35.69 | 40.17 | 34.45 | 29.23 |
|  | $\pm 1.26$ | $\pm 1.42$ | $\pm 1.40$ | $\pm 1.21$ | $\pm 1.27$ | $\pm 1.31$ | $\pm 1.42$ | $\pm 1.37$ | $\pm 1.14$ | $\pm 1.14$ |


| List of districts under <br> each division |
| :--- |
| Lucknow |
| Kheri |
| Sitapur |
| Hardoi |
| Unnao |
| Lucknow |
| Rae Bareli |
| Meerut |
| Meerut |
| Baghpat |
| Ghaziabad |
| Gautam Buddha Nagar |
| Bulandshahar |
| Mirzapur |
| Sant Ravidas Nagar (Bhadohi) |
| Mirzapur |
| Sonbhadra |
| Moradabad |
| Bijnor |
| Moradabad |
| Rampur |
| Jyotiba Phule Nagar |
| Saharanpur |
| Saharanpur |
| Muzaffarnagar |
| Varanasi |
| Jaunpur |
| Ghazipur |
| Chandauli |
| Varanasi |

## Divisional Estimates

## Uttarakhand

| School enrollment and out of school children |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Division/Region | \% Children out of school (age: 6-14) |  |  |  |  | \% Children enrolled in private school (age: 6-14) |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| Garhwal | 0.65 | 1.11 | 1.25 | 0.80 | 1.67 | 30.38 | 25.69 | 28.81 | 31.12 | 37.34 |
|  | $\pm 0.34$ | $\pm 0.43$ | $\pm 0.58$ | $\pm 0.47$ | $\pm 0.82$ | $\pm 4.78$ | $\pm 4.69$ | $\pm 4.95$ | $\pm 4.86$ | $\pm 5.32$ |
| Kumaon | 1.42 | 1.64 | 2.36 | 1.58 | 2.01 | 24.51 | 23.55 | 29.32 | 31.69 | 35.45 |
|  | $\pm 0.79$ | $\pm 0.82$ | $\pm 1.28$ | $\pm 0.97$ | $\pm 0.78$ | $\pm 4.53$ | $\pm 4.21$ | $\pm 5.34$ | $\pm 5.07$ | $\pm 4.63$ |
| State | 0.98 | 1.35 | 1.73 | 1.09 | 1.80 | 27.86 | 24.72 | 29.03 | 31.33 | 36.60 |
|  | $\pm 0.39$ | $\pm 0.44$ | $\pm 0.65$ | $\pm 0.47$ | $\pm 0.58$ | $\pm 3.36$ | $\pm 3.20$ | $\pm 3.64$ | $\pm 3.59$ | $\pm 3.71$ |

Learning levels: Std I-II

| Division/Region | \% Children in Std I-II who CAN READ letters or more |  |  |  |  | \% Children in Std I-II who CAN RECOGNIZE numbers 1 to 9 or more |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| Garhwal | 79.85 | 80.49 | 80.52 | 76.53 | 70.42 | 79.67 | 79.63 | 78.26 | 74.79 | 73.86 |
|  | $\pm 4.02$ | $\pm 4.10$ | $\pm 4.01$ | $\pm 4.23$ | $\pm 4.98$ | $\pm 3.87$ | $\pm 3.98$ | $\pm 4.20$ | $\pm 5.23$ | $\pm 4.69$ |
| Kumaon | 79.76 | 87.88 | 80.47 | 80.83 | 81.53 | 78.89 | 86.30 | 79.61 | 79.87 | 83.83 |
|  | $\pm 5.63$ | $\pm 3.78$ | $\pm 3.98$ | $\pm 4.18$ | $\pm 4.58$ | $\pm 5.22$ | $\pm 3.77$ | $\pm 4.37$ | $\pm 3.74$ | $\pm 3.93$ |
| State | 79.82 | 83.88 | 80.50 | 78.09 | 74.53 | 79.36 | 82.70 | 78.85 | 76.65 | 77.55 |
|  | $\pm 3.30$ | $\pm 2.80$ | $\pm 2.85$ | $\pm 3.13$ | $\pm 3.80$ | $\pm 3.12$ | $\pm 2.73$ | $\pm 3.04$ | $\pm 3.64$ | $\pm 3.44$ |

Learning levels: Std III-V

| Division/Region | \% Children in Std III-V who CAN READ Level 1 (Std I) text or more |  |  |  |  | \% Children in Std III-V who CAN DO subtraction or more |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| Garhwal | 73.54 | 70.69 | 69.94 | 61.06 | 60.91 | 59.14 | 57.19 | 61.36 | 48.97 | 46.42 |
|  | $\pm 4.31$ | $\pm 4.00$ | $\pm 4.42$ | $\pm 4.80$ | $\pm 5.11$ | $\pm 4.88$ | $\pm 5.03$ | $\pm 4.97$ | $\pm 4.47$ | $\pm 4.99$ |
| Kumaon | 77.62 | 77.58 | 72.46 | 70.66 | 67.01 | 60.82 | 68.22 | 65.01 | 55.07 | 54.51 |
|  | $\pm 4.97$ | $\pm 4.87$ | $\pm 3.90$ | $\pm 4.50$ | $\pm 4.57$ | $\pm 6.00$ | $\pm 6.20$ | $\pm 4.64$ | $\pm 4.61$ | $\pm 5.08$ |
| State | 75.21 | 73.79 | 71.01 | 64.17 | 63.35 | 59.83 | 62.20 | 62.91 | 50.95 | 49.66 |
|  | $\pm 3.27$ | $\pm 3.08$ | $\pm 3.04$ | $\pm 3.68$ | $\pm 3.63$ | $\pm 3.78$ | $\pm 3.91$ | $\pm 3.47$ | $\pm 3.43$ | $\pm 3.69$ |

Note: Districts have been clubbed into divisions to produce these estimates. The grouping of districts is based on administrative divisions used in the state or by geographical regions.

The first row for each division gives the estimate of the relevant variable/year. The numbers below the estimate, in the second row, are twice the standard error of the corresponding estimate and represent the 95\% confidence interval for the estimate. For instance, in Garhwal division of Uttarakhand, in 2012, \% of Std I-II children who could read letters or more is $70.42 \%$. With $95 \%$ probability, the true population proportion lies within $\pm 4.98 \%$ points of the estimate, i.e., between $75.40 \%$ and 65.44\%.

| List of districts under |
| :--- |
| each division |
| Garhwal |
| Uttarkashi |
| Chamoli |
| Rudraprayag |
| Tehri Garhwal |
| Dehradun |
| Garhwal |
| Hardwar |
| Kumaon |
| Pithoragarh |
| Bageshwar |
| Almora |
| Champawat |
| Nainital |
| Udham Singh Nagar |

## Divisional Estimates

## West Bengal

| School enrollment and out of school children |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Division/Region | \% Children out of school (age: 6-14) |  |  |  |  | \% Children enrolled in private school (age: 6-14) |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| Burdwan | 6.12 | 5.38 | 3.68 | 3.44 | 3.34 | 3.47 | 4.93 | 3.68 | 4.30 | 3.97 |
|  | $\pm 1.55$ | $\pm 1.53$ | $\pm 0.92$ | $\pm 1.02$ | $\pm 1.13$ | $\pm 1.28$ | $\pm 1.44$ | $\pm 1.13$ | $\pm 1.56$ | $\pm 1.20$ |
| Jalpaiguri | 5.17 | 5.71 | 5.96 | 5.31 | 3.89 | 10.25 | 11.01 | 10.65 | 10.89 | 12.46 |
|  | $\pm 1.17$ | $\pm 1.50$ | $\pm 1.58$ | $\pm 1.26$ | $\pm 1.07$ | $\pm 2.10$ | $\pm 1.88$ | $\pm 2.40$ | $\pm 2.29$ | $\pm 2.48$ |
| Presidency | 5.60 | 6.04 | 4.61 | 4.60 | 2.79 | 3.79 | 5.13 | 4.80 | 5.33 | 6.58 |
|  | $\pm 2.03$ | $\pm 1.51$ | $\pm 1.11$ | $\pm 1.39$ | $\pm 1.01$ | $\pm 1.12$ | $\pm 1.27$ | $\pm 1.39$ | $\pm 1.42$ | $\pm 1.79$ |
| State | 5.70 | 5.68 | 4.58 | 4.32 | 3.28 | 5.29 | 6.54 | 5.86 | 6.29 | 6.94 |
|  | $\pm 0.98$ | $\pm 0.90$ | $\pm 0.69$ | $\pm 0.72$ | $\pm 0.64$ | $\pm 0.86$ | $\pm 0.90$ | $\pm 0.94$ | $\pm 1.01$ | $\pm 1.03$ |

Learning levels: Std I-II

| Division/Region | \% Children in Std I-II who CAN READ letters or more |  |  |  |  | \% Children in Std I-II who CAN RECOGNIZE numbers 1 to 9 or more |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| Burdwan | 84.39 | 86.09 | 90.06 | 89.18 | 82.08 | 84.74 | 88.13 | 90.70 | 92.07 | 87.03 |
|  | $\pm 4.57$ | $\pm 4.01$ | $\pm 3.19$ | $\pm 3.31$ | $\pm 4.46$ | $\pm 4.18$ | $\pm 3.56$ | $\pm 2.74$ | $\pm 2.66$ | $\pm 3.33$ |
| Jalpaiguri | 78.39 | 76.95 | 78.49 | 74.67 | 64.58 | 80.33 | 82.30 | 79.75 | 79.80 | 76.12 |
|  | $\pm 4.38$ | $\pm 4.18$ | $\pm 5.50$ | $\pm 4.97$ | $\pm 5.66$ | $\pm 4.37$ | $\pm 3.27$ | $\pm 5.62$ | $\pm 4.47$ | $\pm 4.78$ |
| Presidency | 88.53 | 87.69 | 88.91 | 87.15 | 82.61 | 89.04 | 90.37 | 87.21 | 90.31 | 87.50 |
|  | $\pm 3.44$ | $\pm 3.18$ | $\pm 3.81$ | $\pm 3.90$ | $\pm 4.93$ | $\pm 3.65$ | $\pm 3.30$ | $\pm 4.37$ | $\pm 3.36$ | $\pm 4.13$ |
| State | 83.96 | 84.02 | 86.62 | 84.77 | 77.35 | 84.83 | 87.20 | 86.76 | 88.33 | 84.13 |
|  | $\pm 2.46$ | $\pm 2.31$ | $\pm 2.50$ | $\pm 2.42$ | $\pm 3.02$ | $\pm 2.37$ | $\pm 2.04$ | $\pm 2.47$ | $\pm 2.08$ | $\pm 2.39$ |

Learning levels: Std III-V

| Division/Region | \% Children in Std III-V who CAN READ Level 1 (Std I) text or more |  |  |  |  | \% Children in Std III-V who CAN DO subtraction or more |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| Burdwan | 73.04 | 70.02 | 76.82 | 65.01 | 64.58 | 63.64 | 65.09 | 71.20 | 60.46 | 45.93 |
|  | $\pm 3.94$ | $\pm 5.40$ | $\pm 4.39$ | $\pm 4.53$ | $\pm 4.42$ | $\pm 4.89$ | $\pm 5.51$ | $\pm 5.28$ | $\pm 5.13$ | $\pm 4.44$ |
| Jalpaiguri | 61.53 | 66.06 | 55.05 | 52.92 | 47.35 | 49.36 | 57.51 | 47.16 | 45.19 | 32.94 |
|  | $\pm 3.86$ | $\pm 4.65$ | $\pm 5.09$ | $\pm 5.36$ | $\pm 5.13$ | $\pm 3.97$ | $\pm 4.86$ | $\pm 5.00$ | $\pm 5.93$ | $\pm 5.17$ |
| Presidency | 66.66 | 65.54 | 67.08 | 62.14 | 62.42 | 51.49 | 55.24 | 55.29 | 52.54 | 48.99 |
|  | $\pm 3.90$ | $\pm 5.03$ | $\pm 6.53$ | $\pm 5.02$ | $\pm 5.29$ | $\pm 4.17$ | $\pm 4.58$ | $\pm 6.89$ | $\pm 4.91$ | $\pm 5.51$ |
| State | 67.69 | 67.59 | 68.44 | 61.06 | 59.58 | 55.52 | 60.03 | 60.40 | 53.83 | 43.91 |
|  | $\pm 2.38$ | $\pm 3.06$ | $\pm 3.40$ | $\pm 2.92$ | $\pm 2.99$ | $\pm 2.79$ | $\pm 3.09$ | $\pm 3.85$ | $\pm 3.12$ | $\pm 3.05$ |

Note: Districts have been clubbed into divisions to produce these estimates. The grouping of districts is based on administrative divisions used in the state or by geographical regions.

The first row for each division gives the estimate of the relevant variable/year. The numbers below the estimate, in the second row, are twice the standard error of the corresponding estimate and represent the 95\% confidence interval for the estimate. For instance, in Burdwan division of West Bengal, in 2012, \% of Std I-II children who could read letters or more is $82.08 \%$. With 95\% probability, the true population proportion lies within $\pm 4.46 \%$ points of the estimate, i.e., between $86.54 \%$ and 77.62\%.

List of districts under each division
Burdwan

| Birbhum |
| :--- |
| Barddhaman |
| Hugli |
| Bankura |
| Puruliya |
| Medinipur |
| Jalpaiguri |
| Darjiling |
| Jalpaiguri |
| Koch Bihar |
| Uttar Dinajpur |
| Dakshin Dinajpur |
| Maldah |
| Presidency |
| Murshidabad |
| Nadia |
| North Twenty Four Parganas |
| Haora |
| South Twenty Four Parganas |



## Sample description

| State | Actual districts | Surveyed districts |  |  |  |  |  | 2012 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 |  | Surveyed villages | Surveyed households | Surveyed children |  |  |  | Tested children Age 5-16 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Age } \\ 3-16 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Age } \\ 3-5 \end{gathered}$ | Age <br> 6-14 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Age } \\ 15-16 \end{gathered}$ | Reading | Arithmetic | English |
| Andhra Pradesh | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 651 | 13185 | 18975 | 3339 | 13338 | 2298 | 15336 | 15332 | 15281 |
| Arunachal Pradesh | 13 | 8 | 13 | 11 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 10 | 206 | 3907 | 7281 | 1879 | 4529 | 873 | 5414 | 5407 | 5378 |
| Assam | 23 | 16 | 23 | 23 | 22 | 23 | 22 | 19 | 563 | 11251 | 18448 | 3529 | 12884 | 2035 | 14395 | 14359 | 14313 |
| Bihar | 38 | 37 | 37 | 35 | 37 | 37 | 37 | 37 | 1095 | 22168 | 55473 | 11314 | 39152 | 5007 | 41005 | 40981 | 40747 |
| Chhattisgarh | 16 | 16 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 445 | 9031 | 15485 | 2743 | 10588 | 2154 | 10970 | 10952 | 10881 |
| Dadra \& Nagar Haveli | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 28 | 600 | 1100 | 195 | 756 | 149 | 648 | 648 | 648 |
| Daman \& Diu | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 21 | 1190 | 2279 | 295 | 1630 | 354 | 1843 | 1844 | 1587 |
| Goa | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 49 | 1160 | 1668 | 252 | 1169 | 247 | 1444 | 1443 | 1440 |
| Gujarat | 26 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 26 | 26 | 25 | 26 | 755 | 15294 | 25708 | 4025 | 18894 | 2789 | 18154 | 18011 | 11151 |
| Haryana | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 16 | 20 | 575 | 11529 | 22093 | 3953 | 15452 | 2688 | 16618 | 16570 | 16498 |
| Himachal Pradesh | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 10 | 282 | 5572 | 8430 | 1576 | 5924 | 930 | 6572 | 6571 | 6558 |
| Jammu \& Kashmir | 14 | 13 | 14 | 14 | 14 |  | 14 | 14 | 368 | 7942 | 15616 | 2774 | 10543 | 2299 | 11287 | 11260 | 11163 |
| Jharkhand | 23 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 21 | 22 | 20 | 22 | 638 | 12962 | 27452 | 5927 | 18755 | 2770 | 18284 | 18307 | 18218 |
| Karnataka | 27 | 27 | 27 | 27 | 27 | 27 | 27 | 27 | 778 | 16192 | 23652 | 4344 | 16636 | 2672 | 18060 | 18054 | 17971 |
| Kerala | 14 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 349 | 8471 | 11430 | 1672 | 8252 | 1506 | 9948 | 9899 | 9822 |
| Madhya Pradesh | 45 | 45 | 45 | 45 | 45 | 45 | 43 | 43 | 1262 | 25633 | 50747 | 9255 | 35287 | 6205 | 38016 | 37913 | 37686 |
| Maharashtra | 33 | 33 | 33 | 33 | 33 | 33 | 31 | 33 | 967 | 19667 | 27834 | 5154 | 19198 | 3482 | 21782 | 21748 | 21667 |
| Manipur | 9 | 8 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 8 | 8 | 9 | 248 | 5093 | 9222 | 2018 | 6343 | 861 | 6903 | 6893 | 6881 |
| Meghalaya | 7 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 7 | 173 | 3412 | 7148 | 1528 | 4777 | 843 | 4247 | 4214 | 4029 |
| Mizoram | 8 | 7 |  | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 186 | 4318 | 7952 | 1695 | 5382 | 875 | 6778 | 6774 | 6425 |
| Nagaland | 11 | 10 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 283 | 6453 | 12611 | 2792 | 8663 | 1156 | 10524 | 10500 | 10434 |
| Odisha | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 881 | 17752 | 26035 | 4878 | 17528 | 3629 | 17760 | 17673 | 17592 |
| Puducherry | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 22 | 600 | 794 | 164 | 536 | 94 | 687 | 687 | 687 |
| Punjab | 19 | 18 | 19 | 19 | 19 | 19 | 19 | 19 | 552 | 11145 | 14622 | 2661 | 9989 | 1972 | 11002 | 10992 | 10890 |
| Rajasthan | 32 | 31 | 32 | 32 | 32 | 32 | 31 | 32 | 943 | 18975 | 39472 | 7124 | 27309 | 5039 | 26915 | 26890 | 26810 |
| Sikkim | 4 |  | 1 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 76 | 1613 | 2045 | 319 | 1395 | 331 | 1594 | 1590 | 1553 |
| Tamil Nadu | 29 | 29 | 29 | 29 | 29 | 29 | 29 | 28 | 811 | 16699 | 22844 | 3692 | 16206 | 2946 | 19712 | 19713 | 19687 |
| Tripura | 4 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 114 | 2400 | 3482 | 664 | 2350 | 468 | 2653 | 2655 | 2644 |
| Uttar Pradesh | 69 | 69 | 69 | 69 | 69 | 69 | 68 | 69 | 2034 | 41362 | 92956 | 17810 | 63511 | 11635 | 72113 | 72092 | 71852 |
| Uttarakhand | 13 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 12 | 12 | 336 | 6801 | 11373 | 2140 | 7622 | 1611 | 8983 | 8959 | 8940 |
| West Bengal | 17 | 16 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 16 | 475 | 9504 | 12619 | 2337 | 8609 | 1673 | 8898 | 8868 | 8852 |
| All India | 585 | 555 | 568 | 577 | 580 | 567 | 564 | 567 | 16166 | 331881 | 596846 | 112048 | 413207 | 71591 | 448545 | 447799 | 438285 |

## Village infrastructure and household characteristics

|  | әбеsn ıәındmo） | $\mid \underset{\ddagger}{\bullet}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l} \underline{\sim} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | ف\％ | $\stackrel{\text { ® }}{\text {－}}$ | ־－ | $\stackrel{\circ}{\underset{~}{8}}$ | $\mid \stackrel{\bullet}{\stackrel{\circ}{\mathrm{O}}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9 \\ & 0 \\ & \hline 8 \end{aligned}$ | 둠 | $\stackrel{\underset{\sim}{\mathrm{N}}}{ }$ | $\mid \underset{\sim}{\underset{\sim}{j}}$ | $\bar{\sim}$ | $\left\lvert\,\right.$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \underset{\sim}{n} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\underset{\mathrm{m}}{\underset{\sim}{\mathrm{~F}}}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\mathrm{m}}$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & \bullet \\ & \stackrel{\circ}{n} \end{aligned}\right.$ | $\stackrel{\hat{\sigma}}{\underline{-}}$ | Ņ | $\stackrel{\curvearrowleft}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{6}$ | $\underset{\sim}{m}$ | $\stackrel{\substack{9 \\ \sim}}{\substack{2}}$ | $\underset{\sim}{~}$ | $\dot{m}$ | $\stackrel{0}{\sim}$ | ${ }^{\circ}$ | $\infty$ | 인 | $\stackrel{\infty}{=}$ | $\stackrel{\text { ¢ }}{ }$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | еепәдеш <br> би！реәл дәчłО | $\bigcirc$ | $\bar{m}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\downarrow}{\ddagger} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | O- | $\stackrel{\text { ¢ }}{\bullet}$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\stackrel{\square}{=}$ | $\stackrel{\bullet}{i}$ | $\stackrel{\star}{\mathrm{N}}$ | ※ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|} \hline \underset{m}{2} \end{array}$ | m | $\stackrel{\circ}{\therefore}$ | $\stackrel{\text { ¢ }}{ }$ | $\bar{\sim}$ | $\begin{aligned} & n \\ & \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{m}{\infty}$ | $$ | $\underset{\mathrm{N}}{ }$ | $\therefore$ | $\stackrel{9}{\sim}$ | ค | $\bar{\nearrow}$ | $\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}$ | $\stackrel{\circ}{\mathrm{m}}$ | $\stackrel{\square}{6}$ | － | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\mathrm{m}}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\underset{\sim}{j}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{\sim} \end{aligned}$ | － |
|  | ıədedsmən | 守 | $\underset{\infty}{\infty}$ | $\stackrel{\bullet}{\bullet}$ | － | $\stackrel{\infty}{6}$ | N | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\bullet}{ \pm} \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline m \\ \infty \\ \infty \end{gathered}$ | $\underset{\underset{~}{\triangleleft}}{ }$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \stackrel{\bullet}{\mathrm{B}} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|} \hline \stackrel{\circ}{\mathrm{e}} \end{array}$ | $\underset{\mathcal{F}}{\hat{N}}$ | $\stackrel{n}{n}$ | $\stackrel{\square}{\wedge}$ | $\stackrel{\text { Hi }}{\mathrm{H}}$ | － | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{o} \\ & \stackrel{\mathrm{~m}}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\circ}{\mathrm{N}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\infty}{\infty} \\ & \underset{m}{n} \end{aligned}$ | $\because$ | I | ir | $\stackrel{\infty}{\circ}$ | $\stackrel{+}{\sim}$ | $\underset{\underset{\sim}{\prime}}{\underset{\sim}{2}}$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\sim}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\circ}{\mathrm{i}} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{N} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\text { nf }}{6}$ | $\stackrel{\square}{m}$ | ¢ | $\stackrel{\square}{\circ}$ |
|  | әЈ！чə＾pəs！uotow | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\circ}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{\bullet} \\ & \stackrel{\sim}{0} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{n}{m} \\ & \underset{m}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\bullet}{\underset{\sim}{+}}$ |  | $\begin{array}{c\|} \hline m \\ \infty \\ \dot{\infty} \end{array}$ | $\underset{\underset{~}{\star}}{\underset{~}{2}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 广. } \\ & \stackrel{y}{c} \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\star}{\dot{*}}$ | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{n}{\stackrel{n}{¿}}$ | $\underset{\sim}{N}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\infty}{\dot{\sim}} \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\ominus}{\sim}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{\text { I }} \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ |  | $\tilde{\sim}$ | $\propto$ | $\underset{\sim}{i}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Ň } \\ & \text { in } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{0} \\ & \hline 0 \end{aligned}$ | m | 우 | $\bar{\infty}$ | $\stackrel{m}{\underset{\sim}{2}}$ | $\underset{\sim}{N}$ | oi | $\stackrel{\circ}{\vdots}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ |
|  | ә！！90w | $\infty$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\underset{m}{\sim}}$ | $\bar{\sim}$ | $\begin{gathered} n \\ \bar{\omega} \end{gathered}$ | $\stackrel{\text { G }}{\substack{0}}$ | $\stackrel{\bullet}{\infty}$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\infty}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\wedge}$ | $\overline{\mathrm{i}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \bullet \\ & \hline \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\bar{\infty}$ | $\underset{\infty}{\infty}$ | $\frac{m}{i n}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \dot{\sigma} \end{aligned}$ | $\overline{\text { gig }}$ | $\bar{\circ}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { n } \\ & \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\varphi}{\dot{G}} \end{aligned}$ | 이 | $\bar{i}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { oे } \\ & \dot{6} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|} \hline \infty \\ \end{array}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\underset{\sim}{i}}$ | $\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{m} \\ & \underset{\sim}{2} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{m}{\wedge}$ | $\underset{\substack{m\\}}{ }$ | \％ |
|  | $\wedge \perp$ əq®） | ત | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0 \\ & \hline 6 \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\wedge}{\mathrm{m}}$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\circ}$ | $\stackrel{\grave{j}}{ }$ | $\overline{6}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { J } \\ & \text { B } \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{\substack{i n \\ \infty}}{n}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\circ}$ | $\widehat{\infty}$ | $\hat{i}$ | $\stackrel{\uparrow}{\dot{\sigma}}$ | $\stackrel{9}{\therefore}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\bullet}{6} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\overline{\hat{\infty}}$ | $\stackrel{m}{\sim}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { i } \\ & \text { in } \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\ddots}{\sim}$ | $$ | ${ }_{6}^{\circ}$ | ! | $\frac{m}{m}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \stackrel{\infty}{\sigma} \end{aligned}$ | $\bar{\circ}$ | $m$ | N | $\stackrel{\infty}{\infty}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{m} \\ & \dot{q} \end{aligned}$ | $\hat{m}$ | ơ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\dot{\sigma}}$ | in |
|  | $\wedge 1$ | $\underset{\infty}{\infty}$ | $\frac{N}{6}$ | $\overline{\underset{\sim}{j}}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \stackrel{\infty}{m} \\ \stackrel{y}{2} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \stackrel{0}{2} \\ \dot{n} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \stackrel{0}{\infty} \\ \infty \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & m \\ & \underset{\sim}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\overline{\overline{6}}$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\infty}$ | $$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \sim_{n} \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\grave{\sim}}{\underset{\sim}{2}}$ | $\stackrel{\stackrel{O}{\mathrm{~N}}}{\stackrel{1}{2}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \stackrel{\circ}{\mathrm{j}} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | M | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \stackrel{\bullet}{6} \\ & \stackrel{1}{6} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \stackrel{\circ}{i n} \\ & \stackrel{i n}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \stackrel{y}{\mid} \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \end{aligned}$ | $6$ | ண் | $\bar{\circ}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \underset{\sigma}{\prime} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \underset{\sim}{\infty} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\bar{\infty}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\circ}{i} \\ & \underset{\sim}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $$ | ஷ் | 잉 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { J } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | ก |
|  | ฉә！ | $\underset{\sim}{n}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ñ } \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\infty}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\underset{\sim}{N}}$ | $\stackrel{+}{\mathrm{O}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \dot{\sigma} \\ & \dot{\sigma} \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{\infty}{\underset{\infty}{\sim}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ơ } \\ & \text { ¢o } \end{aligned}$ | $\hat{\sim}$ | $\frac{m}{\infty}$ | $\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}$ | $\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}$ | $$ | $\begin{aligned} & \circ \\ & \stackrel{\circ}{\circ} \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{\sim}{N}$ | $\begin{gathered} \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\mathrm{G}} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\bar{\circ}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { m } \\ & \text { in } \end{aligned}$ | ®i | $\underset{\infty}{\infty}$ | $\stackrel{9}{\gtrless}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \dot{\gamma} \\ & \dot{\gamma} \end{aligned}$ | $\bar{\infty}$ | $\dot{m}$ | 囚ூ | $\begin{aligned} & \circ \\ & \hline \stackrel{N}{m} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | $\stackrel{\wedge}{n}$ | $\widehat{\infty}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { n } \\ \end{gathered}$ | ¢ |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & n \\ & \infty \\ & \infty \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{m} \\ \underset{\sim}{2} \end{gathered}$ | $\stackrel{\bullet}{\infty}$ | $\hat{\infty}$ | デ | ন্ত | $\begin{aligned} & \text { n } \\ & \text { ón } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\underset{\underset{\sim}{i}}{0}$ | ঞ̈ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ñ } \\ & \text { U } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \ddagger \\ & 寸 \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{m}{\mathrm{~m}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & n \\ & \aleph \\ & \Omega \end{aligned}$ | $\overline{\text { in }}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|} \infty \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | デ | $0$ | $\stackrel{\hat{N}}{\mathrm{~N}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \dot{\infty} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\widehat{\tilde{m}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { O} \\ & \text { à } \end{aligned}$ | Oin | $®^{\circ}$ | ஷ் | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { N } \\ \text { n } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{O} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{i} \end{aligned}$ | in | $\stackrel{\bullet}{\gtrless}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\infty}$ | 6 |
|  |  | ふ் | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \frac{0}{\infty} \end{aligned}$ | $$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { の } \\ & \text { jo } \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\underset{\infty}{\infty}}{\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{2}}$ | $\widehat{o}$ | $\stackrel{m}{\grave{n}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \infty \\ & \infty \\ & \infty \end{aligned}$ | $\overline{\mathrm{G}}$ | $\underset{\sim}{N}$ | $\underset{\sigma}{n}$ | $\begin{gathered} m \\ \text { gi } \end{gathered}$ | $$ | $\widehat{m}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\circ}$ | 市 | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \infty \\ & \infty \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|} \hline 0 \\ \infty \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\sim}$ | б் | に | $\stackrel{\bullet}{\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{n}$ | $\underset{\infty}{+}$ | N | or | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ণ} \\ & \hline \stackrel{y}{\circ} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \hline \\ & \infty \\ & \infty \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\circ}$ | $\bar{\infty}$ | $\stackrel{N}{\mathrm{~N}}$ | $\stackrel{\square}{1}$ |
|  | nd | ơ | $\stackrel{\ddots}{\underset{\sim}{r}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \stackrel{\infty}{n} \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\bullet}{\sim}$ | $\underset{\mathcal{J}}{ }$ | $\stackrel{\hat{m}}{\hat{m}}$ | $\stackrel{\bullet}{\stackrel{\infty}{\sim}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \stackrel{\circ}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{m}{\underset{\sim}{n}}$ | $\bar{\infty}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{\ddots}{6} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\text { ơ }}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \stackrel{\infty}{\bullet} \end{aligned}$ | a | $\underset{\infty}{\underset{\infty}{\infty}}$ | $\underset{\sim}{-}$ | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\infty}$ | $\stackrel{m}{n}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\sim}{m} \\ & \underset{m}{2} \end{aligned}$ | in | $\div$ | $\underset{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l} \stackrel{n}{n} \\ \text { in } \end{array}$ | $\stackrel{0}{\mathrm{i}}$ | $\underset{\sim}{n}$ | $\stackrel{\underset{\mathrm{m}}{\mathrm{~m}}}{ }$ | $\underset{\sim}{\infty}$ | $\stackrel{\bigcirc}{i}$ | $\underset{\mathrm{m}}{\underset{\mathrm{~m}}{2}}$ | $\underset{\sim}{n}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { n } \\ & \text { I } \end{aligned}$ | － |
|  | exynd ！mas | $\stackrel{0}{2}$ | $\stackrel{m}{i}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \underset{\sim}{m} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & N \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N̈ } \\ & \underset{\sim}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \infty \\ & \infty \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{o}{\sim} \\ & \stackrel{\sim}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{m} \\ & \stackrel{e}{m} \end{aligned}$ | Ni | $\stackrel{m}{\sim}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\underset{\sim}{N}}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\AA}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \mathrm{O} \\ & \mathrm{o} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\stackrel{\varphi}{\dot{-}}}{\stackrel{-}{\circ}}$ | $\stackrel{\star}{\underset{\sim}{2}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \stackrel{\circ}{\infty} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\infty} \end{aligned}$ | $\hat{F}$ | $\bar{\sim}$ | $\begin{aligned} & m \\ & \infty \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\infty}$ | $\stackrel{\text { O }}{\text { i }}$ | $\stackrel{\substack{\mathrm{o} \\ \mathrm{~m}}}{ }$ | $\underset{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{N}{\sim}$ | F | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \dot{J} \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{\sim}{N}$ | m | $\stackrel{\vdots}{\mathrm{O}}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\text { I }}$ | ลั |
|  | ецวұn | $\bar{m}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \infty \\ & \infty \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7 \\ & 80 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & m \\ & \underset{\sim}{x} \end{aligned}$ | $\widehat{\theta}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \dot{\gamma} \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\underset{\sim}{\sim}}$ | $\bar{m}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\underset{\infty}{\sim}}$ | $\overline{6}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\ominus}{\dot{\sim}}$ | $\bar{\circ}$ | $\overline{\mathrm{\sigma}}$ | $\overline{\mathrm{i}}$ | $\overline{6}$ | $\bar{\sim}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \stackrel{\circ}{\circ} \\ & \underset{\sigma}{\prime} \end{aligned}$ | in | $\widehat{\circ}$ | 守 | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & i n \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\infty}$ | $\hat{6}$ | $\stackrel{O}{\sim}$ | $\mathfrak{j}$ | $\stackrel{9}{\sim}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \hline \infty \\ & \dot{\infty} \end{aligned}$ | え | $\stackrel{m}{\circ}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N } \\ & \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{n}{m}$ |
|  | pooys әдd／！ремиебиен | $\begin{aligned} & \dot{a} \\ & \underset{\sigma}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\mathrm{i}}$ | $\overline{\text { j}}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline m \\ \infty \\ \infty \end{array}$ | \％ | $\begin{aligned} & \propto \\ & \infty \\ & \infty \end{aligned}$ | ず | யூ | ִơ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ơ } \\ & \stackrel{\sigma}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\infty}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { ñ } \\ \text { non } \end{gathered}$ | $\underset{\infty}{\infty}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \infty \\ & \infty \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{~ J}{\sigma}$ | す | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \underset{\circ}{\infty} \end{aligned}$ | নু | $\underset{\infty}{\infty}$ | ஷ் | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \infty \\ & \infty \end{aligned}$ | $\bar{m}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ò } \\ & \text { on } \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{\infty}{\underset{\infty}{\infty}}$ | ๙் | よ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \infty \\ & \infty \end{aligned}$ | $$ | © | $\infty$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ö } \\ & \text { m } \end{aligned}$ | － |
|  | ІОочวs әłел！иd | $\underset{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\underset{\mathrm{m}}{-}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\underset{\sim}{j}}$ | $\frac{m}{m}$ | $\stackrel{\wedge}{\infty}$ | $\stackrel{\circ}{\mathrm{m}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & i \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \circ \\ & \stackrel{\circ}{i} \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{n}{0} \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\stackrel{n}{\sim}}{\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { n } \\ \underset{0}{0} \end{gathered}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\underset{\sim}{2}}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\underset{\sim}{2}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \stackrel{\sim}{8} \\ & \hline 8 \end{aligned}$ | 毎 | $\stackrel{\infty}{\underset{子}{\sim}}$ | $\frac{\underset{1}{n}}{\stackrel{1}{n}}$ | $\bar{\sim}$ | in | $\dot{\text { ஷ゙ }}$ | $\underset{\infty}{\infty}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \underset{\sim}{1} \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\circ}$ | in | 犬̇ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\sim}$ | $\bar{m}$ | 罥 | $\stackrel{9}{\mathrm{~m}}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\underset{\sim}{n}}$ | $\stackrel{\text { ¢ }}{\dot{7}}$ |
|  |  | $\stackrel{\ominus}{\underset{¿}{-}}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\sim}$ | 「 | $\stackrel{\infty}{ \pm}$ | 「 | $\widehat{\mathrm{m}}$ | Oin | $\stackrel{\stackrel{0}{*}}{ }$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{N}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\circ}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\tilde{q}}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\underset{\sim}{\Sigma}}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\square}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \\ & \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\stackrel{O}{=}}{=}$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\sim}$ | － | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\text { ®n }}{n}$ | $\stackrel{m}{\wedge}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\hat{N}}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\underset{\sim}{2}}$ | m | in | $\begin{aligned} & \text { I } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{i}{i}$ | $\overline{6}$ | $\stackrel{\text { Ṅ}}{\stackrel{\text { ® }}{ }}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \stackrel{\infty}{-} \end{aligned}$ | ～ |
|  |  | $\stackrel{\varphi}{\dot{\sigma}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & i \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\circ}{\mathrm{m}}$ | $\bar{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\hat{m}}{\mathbf{m}}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\hat{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\stackrel{\infty}{\mathrm{m}}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\sim}{\infty} \\ & \infty \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{\text { i }}{\stackrel{\text { in }}{2}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { O } \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\circ}{\infty}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Ne } \\ & \text { Q } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \hline \\ & \infty \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \\ \infty \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\underset{\sim}{m}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \infty \\ \infty \\ \infty \\ \infty \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9 \\ & 9 \\ & q \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|} \substack{n \\ \sim} \end{array}$ | 戙 | $\underset{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\bullet}{\stackrel{\circ}{i n}}$ | $$ | $\underset{\sim}{\dot{J}}$ | $\infty$ | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{6}$ | $\begin{aligned} & m \\ & q \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \infty \\ \infty \\ \infty \end{array}$ | 피 | $\frac{\stackrel{n}{m}}{\mathrm{~m}}$ | $\underset{\sim}{2}$ | i |
|  |  | 囚் | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0 \\ & \infty \\ & \infty \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { } \stackrel{-}{\prime} \\ & \dot{\sigma} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \infty \\ \hat{\sigma} \end{array}$ | $\infty$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 . \\ & \stackrel{\circ}{\circ} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { oे } \\ & \text { ®. } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{m} \\ & \bar{\sigma} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Nু } \\ & \hline \text { Kn } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\sim}{\infty} \\ & \infty \end{aligned}$ | $\widehat{\infty}$ | ু | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \stackrel{\circ}{\circ} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $0$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \infty \\ & \hline \dot{\sigma} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | ু | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0 \\ & \infty \\ & \infty \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \sim \\ \infty \\ \infty \end{array}$ | $$ | $\dot{\sigma}$ | $\infty$ | ஷ் | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{\circ} \\ & \hline \infty \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \propto \\ & \infty \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\infty$ | ूু | スู | \％ | ボ | б | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \underset{\sigma}{\infty} \end{aligned}$ | ¢ |
|  | Кбıәиә дејоs | $\stackrel{\square}{\infty}$ | $\overline{\mathrm{m}}$ | $\stackrel{\underset{\sim}{\mathrm{N}}}{ }$ | $$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{0}{\mathrm{i}} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \pm \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { O. } \\ & \text { 㞧 } \end{aligned}$ | $\hat{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\mathrm{p}}$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\sim}$ | $\underset{\mathrm{m}}{\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\mathrm{~N}}}$ | $\stackrel{\hat{m}}{\dot{\sim}}$ | $\stackrel{N}{\tilde{m}}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 0 \\ \underset{q}{\circ} \end{array}$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\infty}$ | $\simeq$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { an } \\ & \text { nin } \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{n}{2}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \infty \\ \dot{\sim} \end{array}$ | $\underset{m}{\infty}$ | $\tilde{m}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\infty}$ | $\stackrel{\bullet}{\square}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Ne } \\ & \varrho \end{aligned}$ | $\dot{q}$ | $0$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.0 \\ & \hline 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{m}{\sim}$ | $\dot{m}$ |  | $\bar{\sigma}$ | \％ |
|  | әృеว ґәиぇәґи｜ | $\underset{\sim}{0}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \stackrel{\infty}{\circ} \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\text { g }}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\text { I }}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{6}{\dot{J}}$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\underset{\ddagger}{+}}$ | O- | $\overline{\mathrm{m}}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\odot}{\infty}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{m} \\ & \stackrel{0}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\circ}{\mp} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\infty}$ | $$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \bar{\sigma} \end{aligned}$ | $亡$ | $\stackrel{\mathrm{m}}{\mathrm{~N}}$ | $\underset{\underset{\text { I }}{2}}{ }$ | $\underset{\sim}{\underset{\sim}{2}}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | ${ }_{\circ}^{\circ}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{0}$ | $\stackrel{n}{\sim}$ | へু | $\infty$ | $\stackrel{\underset{\sim}{\sim}}{\sim}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{m}{m} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{N}{\sigma} \\ & \underset{\sim}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\text { ® }}{ }$ | $\stackrel{-}{-}$ | $\stackrel{+}{\circ}$ | ¢ |
|  | गu！ чдןеәч әдел！иd | ơ | $\underset{\sim}{\dot{m}}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\dot{\sim}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \stackrel{\infty}{\infty} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \stackrel{\infty}{\sim} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{\sim}{N}$ | ì | $\frac{m}{F}$ | $\stackrel{\stackrel{N}{\tau}}{\underset{\sim}{x}}$ | ত্ণ | $\overline{\underset{\sim}{\Sigma}}$ | $\stackrel{\circ}{\mathrm{o}}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\underset{\sim}{\circ}}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\underset{\sim}{2}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \stackrel{6}{\sigma} \\ & \vdots \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\infty}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \stackrel{\bullet}{\dot{G}} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\cdots$ | $\underset{\sim}{\underset{\sim}{x}}$ | $\stackrel{\text { ¢ }}{ }$ | $\ddot{\square}$ | $\stackrel{\stackrel{0}{\mathrm{~m}}}{ }$ | $$ | $\begin{aligned} & n \\ & i \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\mathrm{m}}$ | $\cdots$ | $\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}$ | $\stackrel{0}{\mathrm{O}}$ | $\underset{\mathrm{m}}{\mathrm{~m}}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{\dot{~}} \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\text { }}{\sim}$ |
|  | әдұәว <br>  | $\underset{i}{n}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\infty}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\infty}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{0}{m} \\ & \stackrel{m}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\underset{\sigma}{y}}$ | $\stackrel{0}{0}$ | O. | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \hline 0 \\ & \hline 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{0}{\infty}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\infty}$ | $\stackrel{6}{\underset{\sim}{q}}$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{0}$ | $\stackrel{\circ}{\sim}$ | $\underset{\mathrm{m}}{\mathrm{~m}}$ |  | $\stackrel{\mathrm{m}}{\mathrm{~m}}$ | $\underset{\text { İ }}{\text { İ }}$ | $\stackrel{m}{\stackrel{m}{m}}$ | $\underset{\underset{\sim}{\mathrm{M}}}{\stackrel{\mathrm{O}}{2}}$ | $\infty$ | تુ | $\stackrel{\hat{\omega}}{n}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{n} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\mathrm{u}} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\bar{\sim}$ | むु | 尔 | $\stackrel{\lambda}{\mathrm{J}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \infty \\ & \infty \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{m}{m}$ | $\dot{\sim}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\dot{m}}$ | ற் |
|  | Sold | ब | $\begin{aligned} & \text { n } \\ & \text { gi } \end{aligned}$ | Nin | $\begin{aligned} & 0 . \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\ddots}{\Gamma}$ | $\underset{\infty}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{0}{\mathrm{~B}}$ | $\bar{\circ}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { nh } \\ & \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{\infty}{\infty}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & i \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \stackrel{\infty}{\kappa} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & m \\ & \substack{m \\ \hline} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \end{aligned}$ |  | ふু | $\underset{\infty}{\stackrel{0}{\infty}}$ | $\cdots$ | $$ | $\underset{\infty}{\infty}$ | $\ddot{\sim}$ | $\overline{\breve{g}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N } \\ & \underset{\infty}{\circ} \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{n}{\wedge}$ | $0$ | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\lambda}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { O. } \\ & \underset{\sim}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\frac{\varphi}{\infty}$ | $\pm$ | $\underset{\sim}{n}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { J } \\ & \text { U } \end{aligned}$ | N |
|  | yueg | $\underset{\mathrm{m}}{\dot{\mathrm{j}}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\cdots$ | i | $\underset{\sim}{\hat{\circ}}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\underset{\sim}{2}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & i \end{aligned}$ | n | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\dot{m}}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\infty}$ | $\stackrel{\wedge}{\grave{N}}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\underset{\sim}{*}}$ | $\stackrel{9}{\Gamma}$ | $$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \stackrel{0}{\circ} \\ & \stackrel{1}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{9}{\approx}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{m} \\ & \stackrel{m}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\square}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \stackrel{\infty}{n} \end{aligned}$ | $\bar{\circ}$ | or | $\overline{\mathrm{J}}$ | $\stackrel{m}{\sim}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\underset{\sim}{\circ}}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\frac{m}{\sim}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \stackrel{n}{\mathrm{~m}} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\mathrm{O}}$ | $\stackrel{n}{\sim}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\underset{\infty}{\circ}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{m} \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\text { d }}$ |
|  | ә）！fo lsod | $\stackrel{m}{\gtrless}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\underset{N}{2}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \dot{\sim} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|c} \substack{0 \\ q} \end{array}$ | -ㅣㄴ | $\stackrel{0}{\mathrm{~m}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \dot{\mathrm{~g}} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 60 \\ & \hline 6 \end{aligned}$ | تَ0 | $\begin{aligned} & \bullet \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{i} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{m} \\ & \underset{\sim}{2} \end{aligned}$ | 둥 | $\underset{\sim}{\circ}$ | $\overline{\overline{6}}$ | $\hat{\sigma}$ | $\stackrel{0}{\mathrm{~m}}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \infty \\ i n \\ i \end{array}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\underset{\infty}{\infty}}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\overline{\mathscr{y}}$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\sim}$ | $\bar{\sim}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & i \\ & i \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{0}{\dot{a}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \bullet \\ & \dot{J} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \infty \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\overline{\ddot{6}}$ | $\underset{m}{9}$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\sim}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \infty \\ & \infty \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | ¢ |
|  | K¢！ | 囚 | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \infty \\ & \infty \end{aligned}$ | $\bar{\infty}$ | $\underset{\infty}{\tilde{\infty}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \dot{o} \\ & \dot{\circ} \end{aligned}$ | － | $\bigcirc$ | $\stackrel{\ddots}{\grave{2}}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { M } \\ \text { ুi } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { n } \\ & \text { on } \end{aligned}$ | $\bigcirc$ | 두 | $\bar{\infty}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \circ \\ & \text { बi } \end{aligned}$ | $\hat{\alpha}$ | $\Omega^{n}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \forall \\ \text { gi } \end{array}$ | $\underset{\infty}{\substack{\infty}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0 \\ & \dot{\circ} \end{aligned}$ | ふু | $\infty$ | Ň | $\begin{aligned} & \text { g} \\ & \text { ò } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \alpha \\ & \alpha \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9 \\ & \text { ò } \end{aligned}$ | $\widehat{\infty}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { or } \\ & \underset{\sim}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{\text { ন }}{\underset{\sim}{2}}$ | 内 | $\stackrel{m}{\substack{n}}$ | 嵌 | M |
|  | peoy exynd | $\infty$ | $\begin{aligned} & m \\ & 8 \\ & 8 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \infty \\ & \infty \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \infty \\ & \end{aligned}$ | － | $8$ | ふুં | $\underset{\infty}{m}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N } \\ & \text { Ǧ } \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{i}{m}$ | $\overline{\overline{6}}$ | $\overline{\underset{i}{i}}$ | $\stackrel{\varrho}{\infty}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{m} \\ & \alpha \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\bullet}{\underset{~}{~}}$ | $\underset{\infty}{\infty}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \dot{\sim} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & i \end{aligned}$ | M | in | $$ | $\grave{\lambda}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { O} \\ & \text { G } \end{aligned}$ | $\mathscr{\infty}$ | İ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l} \hline \stackrel{6}{\circ} \\ \stackrel{1}{2} \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6 \\ & \infty \\ & \infty \end{aligned}$ | ద் | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{\mathrm{q}} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { O. } \\ \text { M } \end{gathered}$ | ¢ |
|  | $\stackrel{\star}{\star}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 長 } \\ & \text { 学 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \frac{\pi}{0} \\ \frac{0}{m} \end{array}$ |  |  |  | Ơ | $$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{\pi}{V} \\ & \frac{\pi}{0} \\ & \underline{0} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{N}{N}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{10}{5} \\ & \text { 苋 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{\pi}{\frac{\pi}{2}} \\ & \frac{5}{0} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{0}{0} \\ & \stackrel{0}{5} \\ & \stackrel{2}{2} \end{aligned}$ | － |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 들 } \\ & \text { O2 } \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{5}{5}$ |  |  | － |

## Age - Class composition in sample 2012
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## Class-wise distribution of children in sample 2012

## All India

| class | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| 1 | 84.1 | 72.4 | 28.7 | 9.1 | 3.2 | 1.9 |  |  |  |  | 15.2 |
| 2 | 10.8 | 20.8 | 49.7 | 28.5 | 8.8 | 5.0 | 6.1 | 4.4 |  |  | 13.4 |
| 3 | 5.1 | 6.8 | 15.8 | 42.2 | 30.2 | 10.6 |  |  |  | 8.5 | 13.3 |
| 4 |  |  | 5.8 | 14.0 | 43.1 | 28.0 | 8.8 | 5.3 |  |  | 12.9 |
| 5 |  |  |  | 6.1 | 11.2 | 39.5 | 31.6 | 12.1 | 5.1 |  | 13.1 |
| 6 |  |  |  |  | 3.5 | 10.9 | 41.1 | 29.9 | 11.2 | 9.3 | 11.9 |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |  | 4.1 | 10.1 | 36.0 | 33.1 | 21.2 | 10.8 |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.4 | 12.3 | 46.6 | 61.0 | 9.5 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

## Arunachal Pradesh

| class | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| 1 | 60.5 | 37.7 | 12.6 | 5.7 | 5.0 | 0.7 | 3.1 | 4.2 | 2.7 | 7.1 | 12.1 |
| 2 | 20.8 | 39.4 | 38.0 | 19.1 | 12.2 | 6.4 |  |  |  |  | 15.6 |
| 3 | 14.0 | 16.5 | 29.1 | 45.5 | 21.2 | 14.0 | 6.0 | 5.6 |  |  | 18.1 |
| 4 | 4.7 | 6.5 | 13.8 | 15.3 | 33.4 | 22.8 | 13.4 | 11.3 | 6.9 |  | 13.9 |
| 5 |  |  | 6.5 | 10.6 | 19.0 | 40.7 | 23.5 | 15.4 | 8.9 | 18.4 | 14.6 |
| 6 |  |  |  | 3.7 | 6.6 | 12.2 | 35.8 | 24.2 | 19.0 | 18.5 | 10.8 |
| 7 |  |  |  |  | 2.6 | 3.4 | 13.2 | 31.7 | 23.7 | 18.3 | 8.2 |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 7.7 | 38.9 | 37.8 | 6.8 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Bihar

| class | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| 1 | 79.5 | 66.0 | 33.9 | 12.6 | 5.2 | 2.7 |  |  |  |  | 17.5 |
| 2 | 13.9 | 22.6 | 39.2 | 30.8 | 12.8 | 8.5 |  |  | 3.1 |  | 14.8 |
| 3 | 6.7 | 7.1 | 17.8 | 32.0 | 35.2 | 16.3 | 7.2 | 5.0 |  |  | 14.5 |
| 4 |  | 4.3 | 6.5 | 15.2 | 27.7 | 27.8 | 14.9 | 10.6 | 5.9 |  | 13.5 |
| 5 |  |  | 2.7 | 6.6 | 13.7 | 26.2 | 33.0 | 20.4 | 12.7 | 8.0 | 13.5 |
| 6 |  |  |  | 2.9 | 5.3 | 13.0 | 26.7 | 27.6 | 17.5 | 15.4 | 11.0 |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |  | 5.6 | 10.0 | 22.4 | 31.4 | 23.8 | 8.4 |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.7 | 11.4 | 29.4 | 46.6 | 6.9 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

## Andhra Pradesh

| class | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| 1 | 91.7 | 81.4 | 24.6 | 7.4 | 1.9 |  |  |  |  |  | 13.2 |
| 2 | 6.6 | 16.0 | 55.9 | 24.2 | 9.6 |  | 2.3 |  |  |  | 12.3 |
| 3 | 1.7 | 2.6 | 16.2 | 50.8 | 23.1 | 7.2 |  |  | 3.7 | 2.4 | 12.7 |
| 4 |  |  | 3.2 | 14.6 | 54.4 | 24.9 | 8.4 |  |  |  | 13.7 |
| 5 |  |  |  | 3.0 | 9.3 | 54.2 | 26.4 | 7.7 |  |  | 13.4 |
| 6 |  |  |  |  | 1.8 | 8.5 | 50.9 | 26.8 | 9.3 | 5.4 | 12.3 |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |  | 2.0 | 11.0 | 49.6 | 28.9 | 16.8 | 12.2 |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.1 | 12.2 | 58.1 | 75.5 | 10.3 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

## Assam

| class | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| 1 | 87.6 | 76.5 | 33.5 | 9.4 | 2.9 |  |  |  |  |  | 17.6 |
| 2 | 9.9 | 19.8 | 47.5 | 34.0 | 11.7 |  | 5.4 |  |  |  | 14.4 |
| 3 | 2.5 | 3.7 | 14.8 | 38.5 | 34.1 | 12.0 |  |  | 7.1 | 7.3 | 12.9 |
| 4 |  |  | 4.2 | 13.5 | 38.7 | 34.8 | 11.4 |  |  |  | 12.8 |
| 5 |  |  |  | 4.6 | 10.0 | 35.3 | 38.8 | 14.6 |  |  | 12.5 |
| 6 |  |  |  |  | 2.7 | 9.9 | 32.3 | 34.7 | 11.4 | 8.1 | 10.8 |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |  | 2.8 | 9.9 | 31.0 | 40.1 | 21.7 | 10.1 |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.1 | 11.7 | 41.5 | 63.0 | 8.9 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

## Chhattisgarh

| class | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| 1 | 88.9 | 87.8 | 24.1 | 3.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12.5 |
| 2 | 7.9 | 10.4 | 61.1 | 37.2 |  |  | 1.6 |  |  |  | 12.4 |
| 3 | 3.2 | 1.8 | 12.6 | 48.8 | 43.7 | 7.0 |  |  | 3.5 |  | 13.2 |
| 4 |  |  | 2.2 | 7.8 | 44.3 | 40.8 | 5.2 |  |  |  | 12.4 |
| 5 |  |  |  | 2.5 | 6.6 | 43.3 | 47.8 | 9.2 |  |  | 13.7 |
| 6 |  |  |  |  | 0.9 | 6.1 | 37.3 | 43.1 | 8.3 |  | 12.3 |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |  | 1.5 | 6.9 | 36.8 | 49.9 | 15.1 | 12.6 |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.2 | 7.7 | 38.3 | 77.8 | 10.9 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

## Gujarat

| class | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| 1 | 88.7 | 80.6 | 7.6 | 1.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11.0 |
| 2 | 6.8 | 15.4 | 76.7 | 11.1 |  | 3.1 |  |  |  |  | 12.4 |
| 3 | 4.5 | 4.0 | 12.3 | 76.7 | 12.0 |  |  | 5.8 |  | 6.4 | 12.9 |
| 4 |  |  | 3.4 | 8.2 | 75.1 | 14.9 |  |  |  |  | 12.6 |
| 5 |  |  |  | 2.9 | 7.3 | 74.3 | 16.4 |  |  |  | 13.7 |
| 6 |  |  |  |  | 1.9 | 6.1 | 74.5 | 19.0 |  | 5.6 | 13.3 |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |  | 1.5 | 5.0 | 65.4 | 17.8 | 23.7 | 12.0 |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.3 | 9.7 | 76.1 | 64.4 | 12.2 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

## Himachal Pradesh

| class | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| 1 | 91.6 | 66.9 | 11.7 | 0.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11.0 |
| 2 | 5.7 | 29.0 | 58.0 | 13.1 |  | 3.2 |  |  |  |  | 11.3 |
| 3 | 2.7 | 4.1 | 28.2 | 61.7 | 18.3 |  |  | 5.5 | 2.9 |  | 14.2 |
| 4 |  |  | 2.1 | 22.4 | 57.9 | 19.4 |  |  |  |  | 13.5 |
| 5 |  |  |  | 2.1 | 20.0 | 58.4 | 23.6 |  |  |  | 14.4 |
| 6 |  |  |  |  | 2.1 | 17.5 | 48.7 | 20.4 | 5.3 |  | 11.8 |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |  | 1.6 | 21.0 | 48.2 | 27.5 | 14.7 | 12.1 |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.3 | 25.9 | 64.3 | 80.1 | 11.9 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

## Jharkhand

| class | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| 1 | 72.2 | 62.8 | 30.0 | 12.5 | 5.3 | 3.2 | 3.7 | 2.6 | 7.2 | 5.1 | 17.3 |
| 2 | 12.4 | 24.0 | 42.4 | 28.3 | 13.1 | 8.4 |  |  |  |  | 14.8 |
| 3 | 2.9 | 6.6 | 17.8 | 35.3 | 29.0 | 14.2 | 6.3 | 5.7 |  |  | 13.9 |
| 4 | 12.2 | 6.1 | 6.7 | 14.4 | 32.6 | 25.9 | 12.4 | 9.1 |  |  | 13.5 |
| 5 | 0.3 | 0.5 | 3.1 | 6.5 | 13.6 | 28.3 | 27.0 | 18.4 | 8.8 | 5.0 | 12.2 |
| 6 |  |  |  | 3.0 | 6.5 | 13.3 | 34.7 | 25.7 | 17.6 | 11.0 | 11.0 |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 11.5 | 26.3 | 28.6 | 26.2 | 9.3 |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  | 1.8 | 4.5 | 12.2 | 37.8 | 52.8 | 8.1 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

## Haryana

| class | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| 1 | 80.9 | 61.2 | 27.3 | 7.1 | 2.2 |  |  |  |  |  | 12.9 |
| 2 | 15.0 | 31.5 | 44.5 | 25.6 | 8.3 |  | 4.7 |  |  |  | 12.7 |
| 3 | 4.1 | 5.5 | 21.9 | 41.0 | 26.4 | 10.7 |  |  |  | 4.1 | 13.1 |
| 4 |  | 1.8 | 6.3 | 19.2 | 36.5 | 26.1 | 10.4 |  |  |  | 12.5 |
| 5 |  |  |  | 5.5 | 21.3 | 36.3 | 26.4 | 12.9 | 5.1 |  | 13.5 |
| 6 |  |  |  | 1.6 | 5.3 | 18.7 | 37.5 | 28.0 | 15.9 | 9.3 | 13.4 |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |  | 4.4 | 17.0 | 34.2 | 29.7 | 26.2 | 11.4 |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4.0 | 19.8 | 46.7 | 60.4 | 10.5 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

## Jammu and Kashmir

| class | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| 1 | 85.0 | 74.0 | 48.2 | 16.9 | 5.6 |  |  |  |  |  | 15.3 |
| 2 | 9.8 | 20.7 | 35.4 | 39.4 | 12.5 |  | 6.4 | 3.4 |  |  | 12.6 |
| 3 | 5.3 | 5.4 | 11.0 | 28.5 | 44.3 | 15.6 |  |  | 6.7 | 4.9 | 13.1 |
| 4 |  |  | 5.4 | 11.6 | 25.4 | 36.5 | 11.8 | 5.3 |  |  | 12.0 |
| 5 |  |  |  | 3.6 | 9.3 | 26.8 | 41.3 | 13.4 |  |  | 12.0 |
| 6 |  |  |  |  | 3.0 | 11.0 | 26.4 | 37.0 | 12.3 | 5.6 | 11.6 |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |  | 3.6 | 11.5 | 28.0 | 48.3 | 16.2 | 11.9 |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.6 | 13.1 | 32.7 | 73.3 | 11.6 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

## Karnataka

| class | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| 1 | 85.7 | 93.3 | 42.0 | 4.0 | 0.9 |  |  |  |  |  | 12.5 |
| 2 | 7.2 | 5.0 | 51.4 | 53.5 | 5.0 |  | 1.0 |  |  |  | 12.4 |
| 3 | 7.0 | 1.7 | 5.7 | 34.5 | 54.0 | 6.3 |  |  | 1.6 |  | 12.2 |
| 4 |  |  | 0.9 | 6.5 | 34.8 | 52.7 | 5.8 |  |  |  | 13.0 |
| 5 |  |  |  | 1.6 | 5.3 | 34.0 | 59.8 | 6.0 |  |  | 13.2 |
| 6 |  |  |  |  |  | 6.2 | 28.5 | 54.1 | 7.1 |  | 13.1 |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4.9 | 31.2 | 56.7 | 15.0 | 12.7 |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6.9 | 34.5 | 82.9 | 11.0 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

## Kerala

| class | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| 1 | 83.7 | 79.7 | 17.3 | 1.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 10.3 |
| 2 | 8.5 | 18.0 | 67.5 | 18.1 |  | 2.7 |  |  |  |  | 11.4 |
| 3 | 7.8 | 2.2 | 12.7 | 64.6 | 18.1 |  |  | 3.6 |  |  | 11.8 |
| 4 |  |  | 2.4 | 14.1 | 68.0 | 19.6 |  |  |  |  | 13.2 |
| 5 |  |  |  | 1.7 | 10.7 | 64.9 | 22.3 |  |  |  | 13.5 |
| 6 |  |  |  |  | 0.6 | 11.7 | 61.1 | 21.8 |  |  | 12.9 |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |  | 1.1 | 12.5 | 60.9 | 21.1 | 14.3 | 14.0 |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.9 | 13.7 | 75.7 | 82.7 | 13.0 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Maharashtra

| class | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| 1 | 93.9 | 91.9 | 43.0 | 2.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 13.7 |
| 2 | 6.1 | 6.4 | 49.7 | 55.3 |  | 5.1 |  |  |  |  | 11.9 |
| 3 |  | 1.7 | 5.8 | 37.6 | 59.3 |  |  |  | 1.9 |  | 12.6 |
| 4 |  |  | 1.5 | 4.8 | 33.1 | 60.0 |  |  |  |  | 13.2 |
| 5 |  |  |  |  | 3.2 | 30.9 | 62.8 | 7.5 |  |  | 13.2 |
| 6 |  |  |  |  |  | 4.1 | 26.6 | 57.1 | 7.8 |  | 13.1 |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4.7 | 27.5 | 58.2 | 17.3 | 12.4 |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5.9 | 32.1 | 79.0 | 9.9 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Meghalaya

| class | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| 1 | 45.8 | 65.3 | 59.5 | 39.5 | 20.3 | 13.8 | 8.4 | 2.8 | 1.7 | 1.0 | 20.0 |
| 2 | 17.7 | 17.5 | 26.6 | 32.4 | 28.9 | 19.4 | 14.3 | 11.0 | 7.0 | 5.0 | 17.7 |
| 3 | 6.1 | 4.3 | 5.7 | 16.7 | 32.3 | 25.6 | 19.9 | 16.0 | 9.2 | 8.4 | 16.2 |
| 4 | 27.0 | 11.1 | 6.7 | 7.4 | 15.2 | 21.5 | 22.5 | 21.4 | 15.0 | 11.2 | 15.8 |
| 5 | 3.5 | 1.9 | 1.5 | 3.9 | 3.3 | 15.7 | 19.7 | 20.2 | 20.0 | 13.5 | 11.6 |
| 6 |  |  |  |  |  | 4.2 | 10.5 | 17.0 | 18.7 | 22.1 | 8.7 |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4.7 | 8.7 | 17.2 | 19.7 | 6.0 |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.0 | 11.1 | 19.3 | 3.9 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

## Madhya Pradesh

| class | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| 1 | 83.7 | 66.3 | 19.7 | 5.1 | 1.7 |  |  |  |  |  | 13.5 |
| 2 | 11.4 | 25.5 | 50.4 | 22.6 | 5.4 |  | 3.2 |  |  |  | 11.9 |
| 3 | 4.9 | 6.4 | 20.4 | 43.4 | 26.6 | 7.4 |  |  | 7.0 | 6.4 | 12.7 |
| 4 |  | 1.9 | 6.5 | 19.1 | 45.5 | 27.3 | 6.7 |  |  |  | 13.0 |
| 5 |  |  | 3.0 | 7.0 | 15.3 | 41.9 | 31.3 | 11.5 |  |  | 13.9 |
| 6 |  |  |  | 2.8 | 5.5 | 14.3 | 43.9 | 30.0 | 11.8 | 7.8 | 12.8 |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |  | 6.2 | 11.8 | 36.4 | 34.9 | 21.1 | 11.6 |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.2 | 16.0 | 46.3 | 64.7 | 10.8 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

## Manipur

| class | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| 1 | 45.6 | 57.5 | 46.4 | 26.1 | 9.6 | 6.9 | 0.9 |  |  |  | 15.7 |
| 2 | 7.3 | 19.3 | 34.4 | 34.3 | 21.9 | 14.2 | 7.1 |  | 4.8 |  | 14.8 |
| 3 | 1.9 | 2.6 | 10.3 | 26.5 | 40.6 | 27.5 | 16.9 | 7.3 |  |  | 15.7 |
| 4 | 44.3 | 19.3 | 7.3 | 10.2 | 22.2 | 23.0 | 25.5 | 14.7 | 8.5 |  | 16.5 |
| 5 | 0.9 | 1.3 | 1.6 | 3.0 | 5.7 | 19.9 | 24.8 | 28.1 | 17.9 | 6.8 | 12.4 |
| 6 |  |  |  |  |  | 6.7 | 16.8 | 23.8 | 20.6 | 16.6 | 9.7 |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |  | 1.9 | 6.5 | 16.4 | 25.0 | 25.3 | 8.1 |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.4 | 5.5 | 23.3 | 44.4 | 7.1 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

## Mizoram

| class | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| 1 | 85.6 | 77.5 | 41.3 | 16.5 | 6.3 | 3.4 | 2.1 |  |  |  | 18.1 |
| 2 | 10.0 | 17.4 | 45.0 | 39.2 | 22.1 | 12.7 | 8.4 |  | 7.6 | 4.8 | 17.5 |
| 3 | 4.4 | 5.2 | 10.7 | 28.1 | 37.0 | 21.4 | 11.5 | 8.6 |  |  | 15.0 |
| 4 |  |  | 3.1 | 13.3 | 24.2 | 31.8 | 20.2 | 15.3 | 10.9 | 7.1 | 14.4 |
| 5 |  |  |  | 2.9 | 8.5 | 21.1 | 29.0 | 17.5 | 9.3 | 8.0 | 10.5 |
| 6 |  |  |  |  | 1.8 | 8.1 | 21.2 | 25.5 | 20.1 | 15.5 | 9.7 |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |  | 1.5 | 6.8 | 21.2 | 29.1 | 30.4 | 8.9 |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.8 | 6.5 | 23.0 | 34.2 | 5.9 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Nagaland

| class | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| 1 | 56.9 | 69.7 | 47.5 | 13.4 | 5.3 | 3.2 |  |  |  |  | 16.2 |
| 2 | 7.6 | 19.2 | 34.7 | 41.2 | 18.1 | 9.3 |  |  | 5.1 |  | 16.2 |
| 3 | 6.0 | 5.9 | 13.9 | 31.5 | 44.6 | 20.4 | 13.9 | 7.4 |  |  | 17.4 |
| 4 | 28.2 | 5.2 | 3.9 | 10.6 | 24.4 | 33.8 | 23.7 | 12.1 | 7.2 |  | 15.1 |
| 5 | 1.3 |  |  | 3.4 | 6.3 | 23.2 | 33.8 | 22.8 | 15.5 | 12.0 | 12.4 |
| 6 |  |  |  |  | 1.4 | 8.4 | 17.6 | 31.8 | 19.2 | 18.8 | 9.8 |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |  | 1.7 | 5.1 | 17.4 | 33.2 | 25.9 | 7.7 |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4.1 | 19.9 | 35.9 | 5.2 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Punjab

| class | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| 1 | 79.5 | 60.1 | 34.1 | 11.1 | 2.0 | 4.3 | 4.4 | 6.2 | 7.9 | 3.4 | 11.9 |
| 2 | 13.5 | 30.5 | 41.0 | 30.4 | 11.5 |  |  |  |  |  | 12.5 |
| 3 | 5.0 | 7.3 | 19.3 | 38.8 | 34.5 | 13.2 |  |  |  |  | 14.0 |
| 4 | 2.0 | 2.1 | 5.6 | 16.4 | 37.8 | 31.6 | 13.6 |  |  |  | 13.7 |
| 5 |  |  |  | 3.3 | 11.5 | 36.7 | 32.3 | 14.3 |  |  | 13.1 |
| 6 |  |  |  |  | 2.6 | 11.0 | 35.0 | 30.2 | 14.5 | 7.2 | 12.1 |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |  | 3.3 | 12.6 | 35.4 | 34.3 | 18.7 | 11.7 |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.1 | 13.9 | 43.3 | 70.8 | 11.3 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Tamil Nadu

| class | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| 1 | 96.0 | 74.2 | 7.7 | 0.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12.0 |
| 2 | 4.1 | 24.1 | 72.4 | 9.2 |  | 1.3 |  |  |  |  | 11.2 |
| 3 |  | 1.7 | 17.1 | 70.2 | 10.5 |  |  | 3.0 |  |  | 11.9 |
| 4 |  |  | 2.8 | 17.5 | 74.3 | 8.8 |  |  |  |  | 12.2 |
| 5 |  |  |  | 2.5 | 12.5 | 81.0 | 11.2 |  |  |  | 15.3 |
| 6 |  |  |  |  | 1.1 | 7.0 | 74.3 | 17.0 |  |  | 11.9 |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |  | 2.0 | 11.3 | 67.8 | 17.7 | 15.2 | 13.8 |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.5 | 12.3 | 78.9 | 79.7 | 11.8 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

## Odisha

| class | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| 1 | 90.6 | 75.2 | 12.2 | 2.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 13.8 |
| 2 | 6.2 | 21.1 | 69.2 | 14.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12.9 |
| 3 | 3.2 | 3.7 | 15.2 | 63.4 | 15.1 | 5.3 |  |  | 4.5 |  | 12.8 |
| 4 |  |  | 3.5 | 14.4 | 67.6 | 15.4 |  |  |  |  | 12.3 |
| 5 |  |  |  | 5.0 | 10.5 | 64.8 | 16.5 | 6.5 |  | 6.8 | 13.7 |
| 6 |  |  |  |  | 2.6 | 8.7 | 66.6 | 18.5 | 5.8 | 7.9 | 12.2 |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |  | 3.4 | 11.0 | 56.9 | 17.9 | 15.2 | 11.8 |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.8 | 14.2 | 71.8 | 67.5 | 10.6 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Rajasthan

| class | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| 1 | 73.7 | 50.7 | 23.5 | 8.5 | 2.5 | 6.0 | 6.9 | 4.9 | 4.7 | 3.8 | 14.3 |
| 2 | 18.2 | 32.1 | 36.8 | 23.1 | 8.9 |  |  |  |  |  | 13.4 |
| 3 | 5.2 | 12.7 | 27.1 | 34.9 | 26.4 | 12.3 |  |  |  |  | 14.7 |
| 4 | 2.9 | 4.6 | 9.2 | 20.2 | 32.2 | 21.8 | 11.5 | 6.4 |  |  | 12.7 |
| 5 |  |  | 3.5 | 9.2 | 19.3 | 31.5 | 23.0 | 12.3 | 7.2 | 5.5 | 12.6 |
| 6 |  |  |  | 4.1 | 8.1 | 18.4 | 33.4 | 23.4 | 13.7 | 10.5 | 11.7 |
| 7 |  |  |  |  | 2.5 | 7.6 | 18.1 | 31.9 | 31.4 | 22.6 | 10.9 |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  | 2.3 | 7.1 | 21.1 | 43.1 | 57.7 | 9.8 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

## Tripura

| class | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| 1 | 82.1 | 96.6 | 67.2 | 4.3 | 1.1 |  |  |  |  |  | 15.3 |
| 2 | 17.9 | 3.4 | 29.8 | 74.8 | 12.6 |  | 0.8 |  |  |  | 15.4 |
| 3 | 0.0 |  | 3.0 | 17.3 | 68.1 | 14.2 |  |  | 3.6 |  | 11.7 |
| 4 |  |  |  | 3.6 | 15.1 | 58.7 | 10.1 |  |  |  | 11.7 |
| 5 |  |  |  |  | 3.0 | 21.6 | 65.6 | 18.0 |  |  | 13.6 |
| 6 |  |  |  |  |  | 2.0 | 20.4 | 59.8 | 14.9 |  | 13.0 |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 14.7 | 61.4 | 22.1 | 10.6 |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.2 | 20.1 | 70.9 | 8.8 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

## Uttarakhand

| class | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| 1 | 80.9 | 63.1 | 26.9 | 7.7 | 2.5 |  |  |  |  |  | 14.0 |
| 2 | 14.5 | 30.3 | 47.3 | 25.9 | 6.8 |  | 5.8 |  |  |  | 13.2 |
| 3 | 4.6 | 6.6 | 19.7 | 40.5 | 24.9 | 9.1 |  |  | 10.1 | 6.8 | 12.6 |
| 4 |  |  | 5.0 | 18.4 | 41.4 | 27.9 | 8.8 |  |  |  | 13.3 |
| 5 |  |  | 1.1 | 6.6 | 18.4 | 37.8 | 30.3 | 11.1 |  |  | 13.6 |
| 6 |  |  |  | 0.9 | 5.3 | 14.4 | 37.1 | 29.8 | 13.9 | 10.1 | 12.6 |
| 7 |  |  |  |  | 0.8 | 4.1 | 12.8 | 31.1 | 30.8 | 21.5 | 10.1 |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5.1 | 18.6 | 45.2 | 61.7 | 10.5 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

West Bengal

| class | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| 1 | 90.5 | 69.8 | 32.4 | 10.0 | 4.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 15.7 |
| 2 | 6.5 | 24.9 | 47.3 | 26.3 | 9.0 |  | 6.9 | 4.0 |  |  | 12.1 |
| 3 | 3.0 | 5.3 | 16.2 | 42.7 | 26.9 | 10.7 |  |  |  | 7.6 | 12.0 |
| 4 |  |  | 4.2 | 17.5 | 43.4 | 30.2 | 11.7 | 5.0 |  |  | 13.4 |
| 5 |  |  |  | 3.5 | 15.3 | 40.4 | 34.3 | 14.8 | 5.8 |  | 14.2 |
| 6 |  |  |  |  | 1.5 | 11.9 | 35.8 | 33.7 | 17.2 | 12.4 | 12.9 |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |  | 2.0 | 10.5 | 31.3 | 35.8 | 29.0 | 11.1 |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.8 | 11.1 | 37.0 | 51.0 | 8.6 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

## Daman and Diu

| class | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| 1 | 89.6 | 95.5 | 6.5 | 0.2 | 2.0 | 2.5 | 1.5 | 0.2 | 3.3 |  | 10.2 |
| 2 | 3.7 |  | 85.9 | 5.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 10.6 |
| 3 | 6.7 |  | 7.6 | 86.2 | 11.1 |  |  |  |  | 0.0 | 13.4 |
| 4 | 0.0 | 4.6 | 0.0 | 7.3 | 86.0 | 11.7 |  |  |  |  | 11.2 |
| 5 |  |  |  | 0.7 | 0.9 | 83.6 | 9.6 | 5.0 |  |  | 14.0 |
| 6 |  |  |  |  |  | 2.2 | 86.8 | 18.4 |  | 9.8 | 14.6 |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.2 | 71.1 | 19.8 | 25.1 | 13.3 |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5.3 | 76.9 | 65.1 | 12.8 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Uttar Pradesh

| class | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| 1 | 85.8 | 71.3 | 36.8 | 16.9 | 7.9 | 4.9 | 1.8 |  |  |  | 19.3 |
| 2 | 11.2 | 22.0 | 42.4 | 29.6 | 15.8 | 10.6 | 5.3 |  |  |  | 15.6 |
| 3 | 3.0 | 5.2 | 14.7 | 33.4 | 27.8 | 16.5 | 8.1 | 5.9 |  |  | 14.0 |
| 4 |  | 1.6 | 6.1 | 13.2 | 31.8 | 23.8 | 12.8 | 9.1 |  |  | 12.1 |
| 5 |  |  |  | 5.0 | 11.4 | 27.1 | 25.2 | 15.9 | 8.5 | 7.6 | 11.5 |
| 6 |  |  |  | 1.9 | 5.3 | 12.1 | 32.8 | 25.0 | 14.8 | 13.2 | 10.7 |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 10.4 | 27.5 | 27.2 | 22.3 | 8.8 |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.6 | 12.7 | 40.0 | 49.4 | 8.0 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

## Sikkim

| class | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| 1 | 70.0 | 55.8 | 39.2 | 13.7 | 2.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 10.4 |
| 2 | 16.9 | 31.6 | 35.5 | 27.6 | 13.4 |  |  | 6.1 | 2.2 | 1.8 | 11.3 |
| 3 | 13.1 | 5.4 | 19.9 | 37.8 | 48.0 | 23.7 | 13.3 |  |  |  | 17.9 |
| 4 |  | 7.2 | 5.5 | 14.2 | 27.7 | 32.6 | 22.5 | 17.4 | 7.6 | 7.2 | 16.1 |
| 5 |  |  |  | 6.8 | 6.7 | 28.7 | 31.7 | 27.5 | 10.8 | 11.2 | 15.1 |
| 6 |  |  |  |  | 2.3 | 8.9 | 20.2 | 27.6 | 26.8 | 17.1 | 12.6 |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |  | 1.8 | 6.4 | 16.1 | 38.4 | 28.0 | 10.4 |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.5 | 5.4 | 14.1 | 34.8 | 6.1 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

## Dadra and Nagar Haveli

| class | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| 1 | 85.7 | 77.1 | 16.9 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6.7 |
| 2 | 14.3 | 20.0 | 70.4 | 20.0 |  | 1.9 |  |  |  |  | 11.1 |
| 3 | 0.0 | 2.9 | 9.9 | 62.5 | 36.0 |  |  |  | 5.0 | 2.1 | 13.3 |
| 4 |  |  | 2.8 | 13.8 | 48.0 | 23.6 |  |  |  |  | 11.8 |
| 5 |  |  |  | 3.8 | 13.3 | 69.8 | 37.8 | 9.9 |  |  | 18.8 |
| 6 |  |  |  |  | 1.3 | 4.7 | 43.2 | 33.7 | 5.0 | 6.4 | 11.5 |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 13.5 | 42.6 | 31.3 | 12.8 | 12.7 |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.0 | 10.9 | 58.8 | 78.7 | 14.1 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

## Goa

| class | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| 1 | 69.6 | 97.5 | 44.1 | 3.9 | 0.8 |  |  |  |  |  | 12.1 |
| 2 | 0.0 | 2.5 | 52.7 | 51.3 | 5.5 | 3.9 |  |  |  |  | 11.4 |
| 3 |  |  | 3.3 | 41.2 | 52.2 |  |  |  | 0.0 |  | 10.5 |
| 4 |  |  |  | 3.6 | 38.0 | 54.4 |  |  |  |  | 11.1 |
| 5 |  |  |  |  | 3.6 | 39.0 | 53.6 | 8.6 |  |  | 13.0 |
| 6 | 30.4 |  |  |  |  | 2.7 | 42.1 | 54.5 | 10.9 |  | 15.9 |
| 7 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 3.7 | 34.2 | 47.6 | 14.9 | 13.2 |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.0 | 41.5 | 83.8 | 12.8 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Puducherry

| class | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| 1 | 100 | 75.6 | 12.0 | 2.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 15.1 |
| 2 | 0.0 | 22.2 | 68.0 | 11.7 |  | 1.5 |  |  |  |  | 10.8 |
| 3 |  | 2.2 | 20.0 | 62.3 | 7.3 |  |  | 1.5 |  |  | 12.9 |
| 4 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 22.1 | 76.4 | 9.1 |  |  |  |  | 13.3 |
| 5 |  |  |  | 1.3 | 14.6 | 72.7 | 10.2 |  |  |  | 12.9 |
| 6 |  |  |  |  | 0.0 | 15.2 | 79.7 | 21.5 |  |  | 14.5 |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |  | 1.5 | 6.8 | 61.5 | 17.1 | 14.3 | 10.6 |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.7 | 15.4 | 80.5 | 85.7 | 10.0 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

The purpose of rural ASER is twofold: (i) to get reliable estimates of the status of children's schooling and basic learning (reading and math ability); and (ii) to measure the change in these basic learning and school statistics over time. Every year a core set of questions regarding schooling status and basic learning levels remains the same. However new questions are 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, which have been repeated every year since 2009. 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. These questions were repeated in 2009 and in addition father's education was also recorded. ASER 2010, while retaining the core questions and questions on parents' education, household and village characteristics introduced for the first time higher level testing tools. Questions on critical thinking were introduced - these were based on simple mathematical operations that appear in Standard 5 textbooks. These were further refined and added to in ASER 2011.

ASER 2012 brings together elements from various previous ASERs. The core questions on school status and basic reading and arithmetic remain. In addition, parents' education, household and village characteristics continue to be surveyed. ASER 2012 brings back testing of reading and comprehension of English, that was first introduced in 2007 and repeated in 2009.

In 2005, 2007, and every year since 2009, ASER surveyors visited 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 are also reported in ASER 2012. Beginning in 2010, school information is also collected on RTE indicators.

Finally, ASER 2012 continues the process of strengthening and streamlining started in 2008. Re-check of 4 or more villages in each district was introduced in 2008. This process was further strengthened in 2009. In ASER 2010, special attention was focused on improving training. In ASER 2011, in addition, to the above, master trainers monitored the survey process in the field. ASER 2012, in addition to incorporating all of the above, used phone-recheck on a large scale during the survey. During the survey, master trainers were called from a state specific call centre to get feedback on a daily basis.

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 2011, we retained the 10 villages from 2009 and 2010 and added 10 new villages. In ASER 2012 we dropped the 10 villages from ASER 2009, kept the 10 villages from 2010 and 2011 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.
${ }^{1}$ For the rural sector we can use the estimates from a previous ASER to get an idea of the incidence in the population.

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 estimates of 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. ${ }^{5}$ 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.

ASER has a two-stage sample design. In the first stage, 30 villages are 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 are 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 preserves 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. ${ }^{9}$

[^14]The survey provides estimates at the district, state and national levels. In order to aggregate estimates up from the district level households had to 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 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 un-weighted 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 bias a 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 was 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.
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[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ The findings of the study were shared with the senior officials of the municipal corporation. Within weeks, in partnership with Pratham, the Municipal Corporation of Greater Mumbai had launched a city wide math improvement program called "Shatak Zhep".
    ${ }^{2}$ We noticed that fluency and comprehension were correlated. Fluency freed up resources to tackle text and construct meaning from what was read.

[^1]:    ${ }^{3}$ Another important learning was that the four short sentence format (now referred to as the "Level 1 (Std 1) text" in the ASER tool) was very helpful for beginning readers. After traversing the first sentence and understanding the context, many children propelled themselves forward using the context and the meaning that they extracted from the text.

    4 "Story" level in the ASER reading tool is a longer text equivalent in difficulty to what is contained in Std 2 textbooks.

[^2]:    *These figures do not include the data for Sikkim, Nagaland, Mizoram, Goa and Kerala.

[^3]:    * Data for 2011 is not comparable and therefore excluded here.

[^4]:    * Data for 2011 is not comparable and therefore excluded here.

[^5]:    * Data for 2011 is not comparable and therefore excluded here.

[^6]:    For more information see www.accountabilityindia.in

[^7]:    * Data for 2011 is not comparable and therefore excluded here.

[^8]:    * Data for 2011 is not comparable and therefore excluded here.

[^9]:    How to read this chart：For a given year，the width of each colour band represents the \％ of children in the corresponding category．For each year，these four categories add upto $100 \%$ ．

[^10]:    ${ }^{1}$ Director, ASER centre
    ${ }^{2}$ Villages are chosen from the 2001 Census Directory using PPS (Probability Proportional to Size) sampling.
    ${ }^{3}$ Ramaswami, Bharat and Wadhwa, Wilima (2009), "Survey Design and Precision of ASER Estimates", mimeo.
    ${ }^{4}$ United Nations (2005), Designing Household Survey Samples: Practical Guidelines, Studies in Methods, Series F No. 98, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Statistics Division.

[^11]:    ${ }^{5}$ For instance, NSS surveys are not representative at the district level. However, they are representative for NSS regions, which are formed using agroclimatic criteria.
    ${ }^{6}$ We decided to go with the state administrative divisions, rather than the NSS regions, since these are more commonly used within the state.
    ${ }^{7}$ The district composition was obtained from the state websites or other official sources. See the section on Divisional Estimates in this report for the exact composition.
    ${ }^{8}$ See the section on Divisional Estimates in this report for the exact composition.

[^12]:    ${ }^{9}$ Often sample sizes are also larger for class 1-2, which would also result in low margins of error.

[^13]:    Data for Jammu and Kashmir for 2010 is not available.

[^14]:    ${ }^{2}$ Stratification is discussed below.
    ${ }^{3}$ The sample size with absolute precision is given $b y^{z^{2} p q} d^{2} \quad$ 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 ( $=1.96$ ), $p$ is the incidence in the population ( 0.5 ), $q=(1-p)$ and $r$ is the degree of relative precision required ( 0.1 ).
    ${ }^{5}$ 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 2010, 10 from ASER 2011 and 10 are newly selected in 2012. 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 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+2SI; RS+3SI; .... 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.

