

Published by National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration, New Delhi on behalf of Department of Elementary Education and Literacy, Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India.
2006

PROJECT TEAM

This publication is the outcome of the collaborative activities of the Department of Elementary Education and Literacy, MHRD, National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration (NIEPA), MIS Unit at the Technical Support Group and State and District level MIS Units. The key officials involved in the collection and implementation of the DISE activities are as under:

State EMIS Unit In-charges

State/UT	MIS In-charge	E-mail
Arunachal Pradesh	Mr. R. N. Shah	-
Andhra Pradesh	Mr. Tulasi Das	apssa@vsnl.net
Assam	Mr. Ibrahim Nafis Islam	apsapassam@yahoo.com
Bihar	Mr. Deepak Tiwary	dpepbihar@hotmail.com
Chandigarh	Mr. Ashwani Baghel	baghelashwani@yahoo.com
Chhattisgarh	Mr. Deepak Dubey	spo_chhattisgarh@hotmail.com
Delhi	Mr. Jang Bhadhwar Singh	uee_mission@rediffmail.com
Gujarat	Mr. Deepak Chauhan	dpepgujarat@yahoo.com
Haryana	Mr. Yoginder Kumar	hpsppchd@yahoo.co.in
Himachal Pradesh	Mr. Satish Kaushal	spodpephp2@rediffmail.com
Jammu & Kashmir	Mr. M. L. Tikku	-
Jharkhand	Mr. Sachin Kumar	jepcranchi@rediffmail.com
Karnataka	Mr. N. Prabhakar	sarvashiksha@yahoo.co.in
Kerala	Mr. Franklin Jose	dpepke@md2.vsnl.in
Madhya Pradesh	Mr. Deepak Verma	rgpsm@sancharnet.in
Maharashtra	Mr. Unmesh Girgaonkar	mppsmah@vsnl.com
Meghalaya	Mr. S. R. Jyrwa	ssasmam@yahoo.com
Mizoram	Mr. Lalzarzova Khiangte	zara_khiangte@rediffmail.com
Nagaland	Mr. I Akum Aier	ia_aier@yahoo.com
Orissa	Mr. Pinaki Mohanthy	pinakimohanty@yahoo.com
Pondicherry	Mr. N. Haridhass	sodharidhass@yahoo.co.in
Punjab	Mr. Rajvir	ssapunjab@yahoo.co.in
Sikkim	Mr. Sunil Giri	sunil_giri@yahoo.com
Rajasthan	Mr. K. K. Gupta	dpepgroup@rediffmail.com
Tamil Nadu	Mr. N. Murugesan	dpeptn@vsnl.com
Tripura	Mr. Subir Roy Chaudhury	ssatripura@rediffmail.com
Uttar Pradesh	Mr. Rajiv Mehra	updpep@lu1.vsnl.net.in
Uttaranchal	Mr Mukesh Dhyani	uadpep@vsnl.net
West Bengal	Mr Sanjit Das	wbdpep@cal2.vsnl.net.in

Ministry of Human Resource Development (MHRD), New Delhi

Ms. Vrinda Sarup, Joint Secretary, Department of Elementary Education & Literacy, MHRD, New Delhi
Shri Dhir Jhingran, Director, Department of Elementary Education & Literacy, MHRD, New Delhi

Technical Support Group (Educational Consultants India Limited), New Delhi

Shri M.K. Talukdar, Chief Consultant, MIS

NIEPA, New Delhi

Dr. Arun C. Mehta, Fellow, ORSM Unit
Dr. R. S. Thakur, Consultant
Shri Naveen Bhatia, Computer Programmer
Shri Shalender Sharma, Project Associate Fellow
Shri S. A. Siddiqui, Project Assistant
Ms. Alka Mishra, Project Assistant

Contact Information: arunmehta@niepa.org

Website : <http://www.dpepmis.org>
<http://www.niepa.org>

Software Development Supported by UNICEF, Delhi

Design, Layout and Printing

Brijbasi Art Press Limited, A-81, Sector-5, NOIDA-201301 (Uttar Pradesh)
Phone: 0120-2423846/47/48, Fax: 0120-2420324, E-mail: brijbasi@bol.net.in



KUMUD BANSAL
SECRETARY

भारत सरकार
मानव संसाधन विकास मंत्रालय
प्रारम्भिक शिक्षा और साक्षरता विभाग
नई दिल्ली - 110 001
Government of India
Ministry of Human Resource Development
Department of Elementary Education & Literacy
124 'C' Wing, Shastri Bhavan, New Delhi - 110 001
Tel.: 23382587, 23381104, Fax:23387859
E-mail: secy.eel@hub.nic.in


Foreword

Development of a sound information system is critical for successful monitoring and implementation of any programme, particularly in social sectors. Design of a school information system was, therefore, accorded priority from the very beginning of the District Primary Education Programme (DPEP) in 1994, as a result of which the District Information System for Education (DISE) was developed by the National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration (NIEPA).

Importance of an Educational Management Information System (EMIS) was reiterated when *Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan* (SSA) was launched in 2001. SSA guidelines envisage development of a community-owned and transparent EMIS, and preparatory activities of the programme included substantial strengthening of MIS infrastructure in all the States & UTs of the country.

Twenty-nine States & UTs have now adopted DISE and it is proposed to cover all States and UTs completely in a year or so. The present volume presents the State Report Cards on more than four hundred variables for the year 2004-05. Most of the indicators are presented according to school category. Information presented in the volume is particularly valuable for implementing educational programmes like SSA in the decentralized context. Transition, graduation, survival and average promotion, drop-out and repetition rates are also being made available through the publication. I am confident that this data will be used in planning for good quality elementary education at different levels, and that data users, researchers and development planners interested in the Indian education system will find the volume useful. I am sure that users will find the State Report Cards more user friendly.

I must take this opportunity to thank UNICEF, Delhi for consistently supporting EMIS activities since 1994, as well as NIEPA, especially Dr. Arun C. Mehta, Fellow, and his team, for bringing out the present publication.


(Kumud Bansal)

राष्ट्रीय शैक्षिक योजना और प्रशासन संस्थान
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATIONAL
PLANNING AND ADMINISTRATION



17-बी, श्री अरविंद मार्ग, नई दिल्ली - 110016
17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg, New Delhi-110 016
Tel. : Off.: 26515472, 26853038
Fax : +91-11-26853041, 26865180
E mail: pved@niepa.org

Prof. Ved Prakash
Director

From the Director's Desk

I am happy to present Elementary Education in India: Where Do We Stand: State Report Cards, which is based upon the DISE 2004-05 data. In January last, NIEPA brought out Elementary Education in India: Where Do We Stand: District Report Cards 2005 which contains a large number of indicators encompassing different aspects of universalisation of elementary education. I have been given to understand that the amount of data which is being disseminated through the present publication is enormous and very rich in contents. The State Report Cards 2005 present a variety of state-specific indicators, many of which are being made available for the first time.

NIEPA is committed to provide professional and technical support to all the States and UTs. We have been conducting workshops on DISE across the country. This has helped in improving the capacity of both the state and district level MIS officers substantially. We plan to further intensify our capacity building activities in the year that follows.

I am confident that all the remaining States would be covered under DISE in a year or two. This is important as it serves a number of purposes and is being increasingly appreciated across the country.

I would like to place on record my appreciation for all the hard work put in by the DISE team led by Dr Arun C. Mehta in bringing out the publication. I am certain that the researchers, policy makers, administrators and planners will find the publication both informative and useful.

(Ved Prakash)

New Delhi
March 2006

Acknowledgements

*F*or the last several years, NIEPA has been actively involved in strengthening Educational Management Information System (EMIS) in the country. The year 2005 State Report Cards are based on the data received from twenty-nine states. The publication presents not only the data up to elementary level but also brings in many new dimensions of elementary education into focus, including data on teachers in terms of their age, academic and professional qualifications, experience and type of in-service training obtained by them. It also incorporates data on children with disabilities, examination results, mediums of instruction, students' flow including transition and retention rates, utilization of school development and TLM grants, and many other parameters on which not much information was available so far.

The State Report Cards are based on the data received from about 1.04 million schools spread over 581 districts across 29 States & UTs. The study of this magnitude cannot be completed without the active involvement and participation of the EMIS professionals at the national and sub-national levels. I am extremely thankful to all the State Project Directors, the state level EMIS coordinators and district level programmers & data entry operators for timely supply of data.

Ms. Kumud Bansal, Secretary in the Department of Elementary Education and Literacy, MHRD and her team has always been a source of great inspiration. In particular, I am thankful to Ms Vrinda Sarup, Joint Secretary and Shri Dhir Jhingran, Director for playing crucial role in facilitating the implementation of DISE in various states.

I take this opportunity in thanking UNICEF, Delhi for consistently supporting EMIS activities for the last more than ten years.

I am thankful to Prof Ved Prakash, Director, NIEPA for his encouragement. I appreciate the support that I have been receiving from my faculty colleagues from time to time.

Although it is not possible to name each and every individual working at the state and district levels, their contribution is gratefully acknowledged. At the national level, the MIS Unit of the Technical Support Group (ED.CIL) led by Shri M. K. Talukdar, Chief Consultant (MIS) played a significant role in providing professional support to the states in the implementation of DISE.

The mammoth task of collecting data from 581 districts, meeting day-to-day queries of the EMIS field staff, and providing professional and software support to all the states could not have been possible without the active support from each and every member of the DISE project team located at NIEPA. The contribution of Shri Naveen Bhatia, Computer Programmer, in database management & software development and Dr. R. S. Thakur, Consultant in data scrutiny is gratefully acknowledged. Special thanks are due to Shri Shalender Sharma, Project Associate Fellow, for facilitating the preparation and design of State Report Cards.

I also express thanks to Shri Pramod Rawat, Deputy Publication Officer and his colleagues in the Publication Unit, especially Shri Sudhakar Mishra for extending all the help. I am also thankful to Shri S. A. Siddiqui and Ms Alka Mishra of the DISE project for providing useful assistance.

I hope that this publication will be of value for education planners, policy formulators, researchers and data users.

Any suggestion for improvement is most welcome.

Arun C. Mehta
arunmehta@niepa.org

Abbreviations

Avg	:	Average
BRC	:	Block Resource Center
CDR	:	Compact Disk ROM
CR	:	Completion Rate
CRC	:	Cluster Resource Center
DISE	:	District Information System for Education
DOR	:	Drop out Rate
DPEP	:	District Primary Education Programme
DRC	:	District Report Cards
EMIS	:	Educational Management Information System in India
GER	:	Gross Enrolment Ratio
Govt.	:	Government
GPI	:	Gender Parity Index
M. Phil	:	Master of Philosophy
NER	:	Net Enrolment Ratio
No.	:	Number
No Res	:	No Response
P + Sec./Hs.	:	Primary with Upper Primary & Secondary/Higher Secondary
P + UP	:	Primary with Upper Primary
P. only	:	Primary only
Pop.	:	Population
PR	:	Promotion Rate
Pr./Prim.	:	Primary
PTR	:	Pupil Teacher Ratio
Pvt.	:	Private
RR	:	Repetition Rate
Recd	:	Received
SC	:	Scheduled Castes
SCR	:	Student Classroom Ratio
SDG	:	School Development Grant
Sec.	:	Secondary
SRC	:	State Report Cards
SSA	:	Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan
ST	:	Scheduled Tribes
U. Prim./U.P	:	Upper Primary
U.P. Only	:	Upper Primary only
UP + Sec	:	Upper Primary with Secondary/Higher Secondary
Tch	:	Teachers
TLM Grant	:	Teaching Learning Material Grant
TR	:	Transition Rate

Contents

<i>Foreword</i>	<i>iii</i>
<i>From the Director's Desk</i>	<i>v</i>
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	<i>vii</i>
<i>Abbreviations</i>	<i>ix</i>
<i>Report Cards: An Overview</i>	<i>xiii</i>
STATE REPORT CARDS	
Andhra Pradesh	2
Arunachal Pradesh	4
Assam	6
Bihar	8
Chandigarh	10
Chhattisgarh	12
Delhi	14
Gujarat	16
Haryana	18
Himachal Pradesh	20
Jammu & Kashmir	22
Jharkhand	24
Karnataka	26
Kerala	28
Madhya Pradesh	30
Maharashtra	32
Meghalaya	34
Mizoram	36
Nagaland	38
Orissa	40
Pondicherry	42
Punjab	44
Rajasthan	46
Sikkim	48
Tamil Nadu	50
Tripura	52
Uttar Pradesh	54
Uttaranchal	56
West Bengal	58

Report Cards: An Overview

1. Introduction

The *Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan* Programme envisages achieving goal of universal elementary education by 2010. In order to operationalize this premise into reality, considerable amount of educational and allied data is required. It was in this context that the District Information System for Education (DISE) was designed to provide district and sub-district level school data for planning, monitoring and review of various project interventions. The DISE data received from schools are computerized at the district level and disseminated up to the school level in various ways. The data capture formats; definitions and concepts used for data collection are available at <http://www.dpepmis.org> which is being followed uniformly across states.

2. State Report Cards

The State Report Cards are based on the data received from about 1.04 million schools spread over 581 districts across 29 States & UTs. Four States & UTs, namely Arunachal Pradesh, Delhi, Jammu & Kashmir and Pondicherry were added during the year. Except Jammu & Kashmir, the coverage in case of all other States & UTs in terms of number of districts is complete. Jammu & Kashmir could supply data of only 12 out of its 14 districts.

The State Report Cards 2005 incorporate information on the following important areas of elementary education:

- a) Basic data on area, population (total), decadal growth rate, urban population, 0-6 population, SC & ST population, male & female literacy rate and sex ratio and number of districts, blocks, villages, clusters and schools from which data is reported.
- b) Key data on elementary education in terms of number of schools, enrolment and teachers classified by school-category and school management (Government & Private). Details of schools and enrolment in rural areas are also made available category-wise and management-wise.
- c) Grade, level and gender-wise enrolment along with percentage of over-age and under-age children at primary and upper primary levels of education in each state.
- d) Examination results for the previous academic session for the terminal class at primary and upper primary levels of education.
- e) Classrooms categorized into good condition, requiring minor and major repairs by school category.
- f) Number of schools by category and by type of building.
- g) Distribution of regular and *para* teachers by educational and professional qualifications and by school category.
- h) Sex-wise enrolment of children with disabilities in primary and upper primary classes.
- i) Gender and caste distribution of regular and *para* teachers and proportion of teachers undergoing in-service teacher training by school category.
- j) Enrolment by mediums of instruction and by school category.
- k) Sex-wise number of students benefited by various incentive schemes at primary and upper primary levels.

- l) Grade-specific repetition rate at primary and upper primary levels of education. This has been presented for the states having at least 2 years DISE data.
- m) Apparent survival rate in primary grades, transition from primary to upper primary level and retention rate at the primary level. Transition rate is presented in case of states having at least 2 years data and retention in case of districts in a state having 4/5 years DISE data.
- n) Performance indicators in terms of school category, enrolment distribution: total, Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes, percentage of girls enrolment and schools with enrolment 50 and below, classrooms, schools with student-classroom ratio 60 and above, single teacher schools, no female teacher schools, schools with attached pre-primary classes etc.
- o) Quality indicators according to category of schools, teacher pupil ratio, average number of teachers, availability of female teachers, blackboards, school buildings, common toilets, girl's toilets, schools without building and blackboard, average number of instructional days, average number of days spent on non-teaching assignments during the previous academic year etc; and
- p) Number of schools received and utilized school development and teaching learning material grant by school category.

The following indicators/variables are added during the year:

- Enrolment in pre-primary sections
- Time-series data on key indicators
- Percentage of trained teachers
- Percentage of teachers in different age-groups
- Grade-wise girls enrolment
- Gender and grade-specific disabled children enrolled; and
- Input per Graduate

3. Methodology and Sources of Data

The Report Cards are based on the school level data provided by the State Project/Mission Directors to the Department of Elementary Education and Literacy of the MHRD. The data are first cross-checked and validated at the district and then at the state level. After the state is satisfied with the quality and reporting of the data, it is submitted to the national level for analysis, dissemination and reporting to various project management agencies. At the national level thorough scrutiny of state-specific data is undertaken and limitations, if any, are reported back to the states concerned.

3.1 Indicators and their Formulation

The Report Cards contain both absolute data and selected indicators. For the purpose of presentation and ease of understanding and interpretation, certain classificatory variables are regrouped. The following paragraphs provide information on the variables where regrouping has been done for the purpose of presentation in the Report Cards:

- a) *School management*: The State Report Cards present data on management in terms of Government and Private category. The Government category includes all schools under the management of the Government (Central/State), Tribal and Social Welfare Departments and Local Bodies. The private category includes schools classified as Private Aided and Private Unaided. It may be noted that DISE covers only recognized schools falling under the above categories. Unrecognized schools are not included in the DISE information collection system.
- b) *School buildings*: The classification of schools is also presented in terms of the number of school buildings and their type. Schools having more than one type of building structures are counted under the category of 'Multiple Type Building'.

- c) *Teachers in position*: The distribution of teachers in terms of educational qualifications has been presented separately for teachers and *para* teachers. The analysis of teachers' data for in-service training is presented for the regular teachers. *Para* teachers have been excluded from this analysis in the Report Cards.
- d) *Mediums of instruction*: The State Report Cards present the number of children studying through various mediums of instruction by category of schools. The data for four major mediums of instruction are presented in the Report Cards and if a state has more than four mediums of instruction, these have been presented under the category, 'Others'. In a few states, enrolment by mediums of instruction reported is incomplete. In such cases it will not match with the total enrolment.
- e) *Schools, villages, districts, blocks and clusters*: The number of districts, blocks, villages and schools is based on the initialized entities in the DISE software. The list of districts, blocks, villages and schools is created at the time of DISE implementation and is updated annually.

The main indicators presented in the State Report Cards have been derived by using the following illustrative formulas. The derivations are given for schools in primary category only. The same method is applied for other categories and classificatory groups.

$$\begin{aligned}
 1. \quad \% \text{ Single classroom schools} &= \frac{\text{Primary schools having single classroom}}{\text{Total primary schools}} \times 100 \\
 2. \quad \% \text{ Single teacher schools} &= \frac{\text{Primary schools with single teacher in position}}{\text{Total primary schools}} \times 100 \\
 3. \quad \% \text{ Schools with SCR} \geq 60 &= \frac{\text{Primary schools having student classroom ratio} \geq 60}{\text{Total primary schools}} \times 100 \\
 4. \quad \% \text{ Schools with pre-primary sections} &= \frac{\text{Primary schools having pre-primary sections}}{\text{Total primary schools}} \times 100 \\
 5. \quad \% \text{ Schools with common toilet} &= \frac{\text{Primary schools having common toilet}}{\text{Total primary schools}} \times 100 \\
 6. \quad \% \text{ Schools with girl's toilet} &= \frac{\text{Primary schools having girls toilet}}{\text{Total primary schools}} \times 100 \\
 7. \quad \% \text{ Enrolment in Government Schools} &= \frac{\text{Enrolment in primary schools having Education Department, Local Body, Tribal Welfare Department \& Others as school management}}{\text{Total enrolment in primary schools}} \times 100
 \end{aligned}$$

8.	% Enrolment in Private Schools	=	$\frac{\text{Enrolment in primary schools having Private Aided and Private Unaided as school management}}{\text{Total enrolment in primary schools}} \times 100$
9.	% Enrolment in single-teacher schools	=	$\frac{\text{Enrolment in primary schools having single teacher}}{\text{Enrolment in total number of schools having primary category}} \times 100$
10.	% No female teacher schools (teacher ≥ 2)	=	$\frac{\text{Primary schools having teacher } \geq 2 \text{ but no female teacher}}{\text{Total primary schools}} \times 100$
11.	% Students in schools without building	=	$\frac{\text{Enrolment in primary schools having no building}}{\text{Enrolment in primary schools}} \times 100$
12.	% Students in schools without blackboard	=	$\frac{\text{Enrolment in primary schools having no blackboard}}{\text{Enrolment in primary schools}} \times 100$
13.	% Under-age & over-age children	=	$\frac{\text{Enrolment in Grades I-V below '6' \& above '11' years}}{\text{Total enrolment in Grades I-V}} \times 100$
14.	% SC enrolment	=	$\frac{\text{Enrolment of SC in primary classes}}{\text{Total enrolment in primary classes}} \times 100$
15.	% SC girls to SC enrolment	=	$\frac{\text{Enrolment of SC girls in primary classes}}{\text{SC enrolment in primary classes}} \times 100$
16.	% ST enrolment	=	$\frac{\text{Enrolment of ST in primary classes}}{\text{Total enrolment in primary classes}} \times 100$
17.	% ST girls to ST enrolment	=	$\frac{\text{Enrolment of ST girls in primary classes}}{\text{ST enrolment in primary classes}} \times 100$

$$18. \text{ Pupil Teacher Ratio} = \frac{\text{Total enrolment in schools of primary category}}{\text{Total teachers in primary schools category}} \quad (\text{PTR})$$

(Para-teachers have been included while calculating PTR)

$$19. \text{ Student-Classroom Ratio (SCR)} = \frac{\text{Total enrolment in primary schools}}{\text{Total classrooms in primary schools}}$$

$$20. \text{ \% Schools with } \leq 50 \text{ students in Grades I – IV/V} = \frac{\text{Number of primary schools having enrolment } \leq 50 \text{ in Grades I – IV/V}}{\text{Total primary schools}} \times 100$$

$$21. \text{ \% Schools with PTR } \geq 100 = \frac{\text{Total primary schools having PTR } \geq 100}{\text{Total primary schools}} \times 100$$

$$22. \text{ \% Female Teachers} = \frac{\text{Total female teachers in primary schools}}{\text{Total teachers in primary schools}} \times 100$$

(Para teachers have been included while calculating this indicator)

$$23. \text{ \% of Primary schools established} = \frac{\text{Total primary schools established since 1994}}{\text{Total primary schools}} \times 100$$

(The denominator excludes the schools for which year of establishment is not given)

24. Flow Rates

(a) Promotion Rate

$$\text{Promotion Rate (p}_g^t) = \frac{P_{g+1}^{t+1}}{E_g^t} \times 100$$

where

P_{g+1}^{t+1} = Number of students promoted to grade 'g+1' in year 't+1' and

E_g^t = Total number of students in grade 'g' in year 't'

(b) *Repetition Rate*

$$(r_g^t) = \frac{R_g^{t+1}}{E_g^t} \times 100$$

where

R_g^{t+1} = Number of repeaters in grade 'g' in year 't+1'

(c) *Dropout Rate*

$$(d_g^t) = \frac{D_g^t}{E_g^t} \times 100$$

where

d_g^t = Number of student's dropping out from grade 'g' in year 't'

(d) *Transition Rate (TR)*

$$TR = \frac{E_{g+1}^{t+1}}{E_g^t} \times 100$$

where

E_{g+1}^{t+1} = New entrants into Grade V/VI in year 't+1' and

E_g^t = Enrolment in Grade IV/V in year 't'

(e) *Retention Rate (RR)*

$$RR = \frac{\text{Enrolment in Grade IV/V in year 't' - Repeaters in Grade IV/V in year 't'}}{\text{Enrolment in Grade I in year 't-3'/'t-4'}} \times 100$$

25. Average Promotion, Repetition and Dropout rates present average of these rates in Primary Classes and is calculated by using the standard methods.

26. Gender Parity Index (GPI) = $\frac{\text{Girl's enrolment in Primary Grades in year 't'}}{\text{Boy's enrolment in Primary Grades in year 't'}}$

27. Ratio of Primary to Upper Primary Schools/Sections

$$= \frac{\text{Total number of Primary Schools/Sections in year 't'}}{\text{Total number of Upper Primary Schools/Sections in year 't'}}$$

$$28. \text{ Gross Enrolment Ratio (GER)} = \frac{\text{Total enrolment in Grades I-V}}{\text{Population of age 6-11 years}} \times 100$$

$$29. \text{ Net Enrolment Ratio (NER)} = \frac{\text{Enrolment, I-V/6-11 age group}}{\text{Population of age 6-11 years}} \times 100$$

30. Input per Graduate presents average number of years a system is taking in producing primary graduate which is based upon the Reconstructed Cohort Method by assuming that no child will repeat a grade more than three times.
31. In-service Training, School & TLM Grants received, Incentives in terms of number of beneficiaries, Examination Results etc. are presented for the previous academic year.
32. Percentage of teachers in different age-groups is presented only for teachers under Government managements.
33. Average number of days teachers spent on non-teaching assignments is applicable to only those teachers who were assigned non-teaching assignments and not to all teachers.

4. Coverage: Some Facts

- Record date : 30th September 2004
- Grades covered : 1 to 7 or 8 (depending upon the duration of elementary education cycle)
- Total states : 29
- Total districts : 581 (including bifurcated districts)
- Total schools : 10,37,813
- Total students : 156.01 million
- Total teachers : 4.17 million (including *para* teachers)
- Total *para* teachers : 3,79,385
- Number of repeaters : 11.83 million
- Number of students with disabilities : 13,98,300

5. Limitations of the Data

The analysis presented in the Report Cards is based on the information received from the State Project Offices. Procedures for the data validation and verification of sample data capture formats at the district level have been prescribed, and the districts reported the steps taken by them to ensure quality and reliability of data collection. The DISE software also checks for many internal inconsistencies in the data and generates reports for verification by the District Project Office. The State Project Office while transferring the data from the district to the state database ensures that the data received from the district is complete and free from any inconsistency. At the national level, data from the State Project Office is received to ensure compliance with various quality control measures. Despite these efforts,

some inconsistencies and missing data are observed at the national level. In some cases data on key elements is found missing.

Despite all our efforts, it is possible that the field agencies might have not covered all *Navodaya Vidyalayas*, *Sainik* Schools, *Military* Schools, *Kendriya Vidyalayas*, *Tibetan* Schools etc. under DISE. All these schools are recognized schools and are supposed to be covered under DISE but their coverage varies from state to state. A few states have collected data from these schools while others might not have covered all such schools. Similarly, field level functionaries reported that data from a few private recognized schools couldn't be obtained for one or the other reason. We are trying to reach all such schools through the highest level, and are hopeful that these efforts will be reflected in the year that follows.

In some cases data is noticed to be inconsistent. States are advised to use consistency module of DISE software to identify and remove inconsistencies in the data. In addition, CRC Coordinators are being made accountable to ensure that data is consistent and there are no missing values.

Irrespective of the school structure, enrolment ratio at the Primary level is based on Grades I-V and Upper Primary level, Grades VI-VIII. Enrolment ratio at the Upper Primary level is not reported in case of states supplied enrolment data up to Grade VII only. Because of in-migration in a few north-eastern states from surrounding countries, the NER is reported to be more than hundred.

One of the other important limitations of the data is incomplete reporting of school age population, which is crucial in assessing the progress towards universal elementary enrolment. The single-age projected population (provisional) provided by the Office of the Registrar General of India has been used in estimating child population. The GER and NER presented are based on this set of projected population and are bound to change once final projections are available.

DISE 2005: Coverage

Sl.No.	State & UT	School Structure		Number of Districts 2001 Census	Number of Districts Reported DISE Data	
		Primary	Upper Primary		2004	2005
1	Andhra Pradesh	I-V	VI-VIII	23	23	23
2	Arunachal Pradesh	I-V	VI-VIII	13	-	15
3	Assam	I-IV	V-VII	23	23	23
4	Bihar	I-V	VI-VIII	37	37	37
5	Chandigarh	I-V	VI-VIII	1	1	1
6	Chhattisgarh	I-V	VI-VIII	16	16	16
7	Delhi	I-V	VI-VIII	9	-	9
8	Gujarat	I-IV	V-VII	25	25	25
9	Haryana	I-V	VI-VIII	19	17	19
10	Himachal Pradesh	I-V	VI-VIII	12	12	12
11	Jammu & Kashmir ⁺	I-V	VI-VIII	14	-	12
12	Jharkhand	I-V	VI-VIII	18	22*	22*
13	Karnataka	I-IV	V-VII	27	27	27
14	Kerala	I-IV	V-VII	14	14	14
15	Madhya Pradesh	I-V	VI-VIII	45	45	45
16	Maharashtra	I-IV	V-VII	35	35	35
17	Meghalaya	I-IV	V-VII	7	7	7
18	Mizoram	I-IV	V-VII	8	8	8
19	Nagaland	I-V	VI-VIII	8	8	8
20	Orissa	I-V	VI-VII	30	30	30
21	Punjab	I-V	VI-VIII	17	17	17
22	Pondicherry	I-V	VI-VIII	4	-	4
23	Rajasthan	I-V	VI-VIII	32	32	32
24	Sikkim	I-V	VI-VIII	4	4	4
25	Tamil Nadu	I-V	VI-VIII	30	29**	29**
26	Tripura	I-V	VI-VIII	4	4	4
27	Uttar Pradesh	I-V	VI-VIII	70	70	70
28	Uttaranchal	I-V	VI-VIII	13	13	13
29	West Bengal	I-IV	V-VIII	18	20*	20*
	Total Districts	-	-	576	539*	581*

Note: * : Including bifurcated districts.

+ : Data for all districts not reported.

** : One district was later merged with another district.

