




# ELEMENTARY EDUCATION IN URBAN INDIA

Where do we stand?



NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND ADMINISTRATION  
17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg, New Delhi - 110 016, INDIA

ANALYTICAL TABLES  
2006-07



# ELEMENTARY EDUCATION IN URBAN INDIA

Where do we stand?

**ANALYTICAL TABLES**  
**2006-07**



The data presented and indicators constructed in the document are entirely based upon the data as received from the States & UTs as on 30<sup>th</sup> September, 2006

*Published in 2008 by*

National University of Educational Planning and Administration

(Declared by the Government of India under Section 3 of the UGC Act, 1956)

17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg

New Delhi – 110016, INDIA

*and*

Department of School Education and Literacy

Ministry of Human Resource Development

Government of India

© NUEPA 2008

Design and Layout by Publication Department, NUEPA, New Delhi



**Prof. Ved Prakash**  
Vice-Chancellor

राष्ट्रीय शैक्षिक योजना एवं प्रशासन विश्वविद्यालय

(भारत सरकार द्वारा विश्वविद्यालय अनुदान आयोग के अधिनियम 1956 की धारा 3 के अंतर्गत घोषित)

17-बी, श्री अरविंद मार्ग, नई दिल्ली 110 016

**NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND ADMINISTRATION**

(Declared by the Govt. of India under Section 3 of the UGC Act, 1956)

17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg, New Delhi 110 016

Telephone Off. 26515472, 26853038

Fax 91-011-26861882 Email pved@nuepa.org Website www.nuepa.org

## From the Vice-Chancellor's Desk

Ever since the National University initiated the process of strengthening Educational Management Information System, it has been disseminating data collected under the District Information System for Education (DISE) both on line ([www.dpepmis.org](http://www.dpepmis.org)) as also through a series of annual district and state-specific publications. Publications based on DISE data have been found quite useful in developing District Elementary Education Plan (DEEP). In addition, they also provide a number of indicators which may safely be used for providing research based interventions under the *Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan*.

Decentralized planning and management of elementary education warrants generation of disaggregated database by location of schools, gender, social categories, focus groups, children with special needs, etc. The MIS Units set up at District and State levels are expected to generate the data in that manner besides using it for planning & monitoring processes. Under the present circumstances it is important to bring out such publications at the national level.

I am happy to present this year's publication titled "*Elementary Education in Urban India - 2006-07*". The publication, based on school records for 2006-07, provides for state-wise information on a number of important indicators. I hope this publication would enrich our understanding with regard to elementary education in India. The present publication is quite informative and would be of immense use to academia, the policy-makers, managers and other stakeholders.

I would like to place on record my appreciation for the hard work put in by the DISE team under the leadership of Prof. Arun C. Mehta, Department of Educational Management Information System (EMIS) in bringing out the publication.

New Delhi  
May, 2008



(Ved Prakash)

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

NUEPA is engaged in strengthening educational management information system for the last more than ten years. The process initiated in 42 districts across 7 DPEP phase one states in 1994-95 is now extended to all the districts of the country.

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. The state level EMIS coordinators, district level programmers and data entry operators, and BRC and CRC coordinators worked for long hours to make sure that the data becomes available at the right time. I am thankful to them all.

Shri Arun Kumar Rath, Secretary in the Department of School Education and Literacy, MHRD and his team has always been a source of great inspiration. In particular, I am thankful to Ms Vrinda Sarup, Joint Secretary and Ms Neelam S Rao, Director for playing crucial role in facilitating the implementation of DISE in various states.

I take this opportunity to thank UNICEF, Delhi, in particular Mr. Samphe Lhalungpa, Chief (Education Section) for consistently supporting EMIS activities ever since the inception of DISE.

I am thankful to Prof Ved Prakash, Vice-Chancellor, NUEPA, for his encouragement and support and my faculty colleagues for their consistent support.

The contribution of Shri Naveen Bhatia, Computer Programmer and Shri Shalender Sharma, Senior Project Systems Analyst, in database management, is gratefully acknowledged. I am also thankful to Ms Alka Mishra for efficient assistance and colleagues in the Publication Department especially Shri Pramod Rawat and Ms Sheeja Bijju for their keen interest in bringing out the publication.

I hope that the users would find the publication useful.

**Arun C. Mehta**  
arunmehta@nuepa.org



## **Disclaimer**

Raw data presented in the document or used for calculating indicators are essentially based on data provided by States and UTs through annual data collection (as on 30<sup>th</sup> September 2006) under SSA (DISE).

NUEPA is committed to provide professional and software support to all States and UTs as well as for dissemination and analysis of the data as it is provided by the individual States and UTs. In no way, NUEPA is involved in data collection as such and therefore the accuracy and truthfulness of the data rest with the States/UTs.



## CONTENTS

<i>From the Vice-chancellor's Desk</i>	<i>iii</i>
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	<i>v</i>
<i>Analytical Tables: An Overview</i>	<i>xiii</i>
<i>DISE 2006-07: Coverage</i>	<i>xxi</i>

### LIST OF TABLES

#### **PART I: SCHOOL-RELATED INDICATORS** **1-88**

Table No. 1.1: State Summary
Table No. 1.2: Number of Schools
Table No. 1.3: Ratio of Primary to Upper Primary Schools
Table No. 1.4: Average Number of Instructional Days
Table No. 1.5: Number of Schools Established since 1994
Table No. 1.6: Percentage of Schools Established Since 1994
Table No. 1.7: Number of Schools Established since 1994 and having Building
Table No. 1.8: Percentage Distribution of Schools by Type of Building
Table No. 1.9: Percentage Distribution of Schools by Number of Classrooms
Table No. 1.10: Percentage Distribution of Classrooms by Condition of Classrooms
Table No. 1.11: Average Number of Classrooms
Table No. 1.12: Percentage Distribution of Schools having Single-Classroom
Table No. 1.13: Number & Percentage of Schools having Regular Head Masters/Teachers
Table No. 1.14: Percentage Distribution of Single-Teacher School
Table No. 1.15: Percentage Distribution of Schools by Number of Teachers

Table No. 1.16: Percentage Distribution of Schools by Enrolment

Table No. 1.17: Students-Classroom Ratio (SCR)

Table No. 1.18: Percentage of Schools having SCR More than or Equal to ( $\geq$ ) 60

Table No. 1.19: Percentage Distribution of Schools with Enrolment Less than or Equal to ( $\leq$ ) 50

Table No. 1.20: Percentage of Schools having Pupil Teacher Ratio Above 100

Table No. 1.21: Percentage of Schools having Received School Development Grant

Table No. 1.22: Percentage Distribution of Schools having Received TLM Grant

Table No. 1.23: Percentage of Schools Utilized School Development Grant

Table No. 1.24: Percentage of Schools Utilized Teaching Learning Material Grant

Table No. 1.25: Percentage of Schools Visited by CRC Coordinators

Table No. 1.26: Percentage Distribution of Schools by Distance from CRC

Table No. 1.27: Percentage Distribution of Schools by Distance from Block HQ

Table No. 1.28: Percentage of Schools Inspected During the Last Academic Year

## **PART II: FACILITIES IN SCHOOLS**

**89-114**

Table No. 2.1: Percentage of Schools having Pre-Primary facilities

Table No. 2.2: Percentage of Residential Schools

Table No. 2.3: Percentage of Schools having Boundary Wall

Table No. 2.4: Percentage of Schools without Building

Table No. 2.5: Percentage of Schools having used School Building as Shift School

Table No. 2.6: Percentage Distribution of Schools by Type of Drinking Water

Table No. 2.7: Percentage of Schools having Drinking Water

Table No. 2.8: Percentage of Schools having Common Toilet

Table No. 2.9: Percentage of Schools having Girls Toilet

Table No. 2.10: Percentage of Schools having Electricity Connection

Table No. 2.11: Percentage of Schools having Ramp

Table No. 2.12: Percentage of Schools having Ground Level Blackboard

Table No. 2.13: Percentage of Schools having Playground

Table No. 2.14: Percentage of Schools having Book-Bank

Table No. 2.15: Percentage of Schools having Computers

Table No. 2.16: Percentage of Schools having Kitchen-shed in Government and Aided Schools

Table No. 2.17: Percentage of Schools having Conducted Medical Check-up Last year

### **PART III: ENROLMENT-BASED INDICATORS**

**115-164**

Table No. 3.1: Enrolment in Primary and Upper Primary Classes

Table No. 3.2: Percentage of Boys & Girls Enrolment in Primary & Upper Primary Classes

Table No. 3.3: Percentage of Enrolment in Government Schools to Total Enrolment

Table No. 3.4: Percentage of Girls Enrolment to Total Enrolment

Table No. 3.5: Percentage SC and ST Enrolment to Total Enrolment

Table No. 3.6: Percentage OBC and Muslim Enrolment to Total Enrolment

Table No. 3.7: Enrolment of Children with Disability

Table No. 3.8: Percentage Share of Enrolment in Pre-primary Classes to Total Enrolment

Table No. 3.9: Percentage of Enrolment in School with SCR More than or Equal ( $\geq$ ) to 60

Table No. 3.10: Percentage of Under-age and Over-age Children

Table No. 3.11: Examination Results: Previous Academic Year

Table No. 3.12: Percentage of SC & ST Enrolment in School Managed by Government and Private Managements

Table No. 3.13: Number & Percentage of Repeaters by Classes & Reasons of Repetition

Table No. 3.14: Average Enrolment in Schools

Table No. 3.15: Percentage of Enrolment in Single-Teacher Schools

#### **PART IV: TEACHER-RELATED INDICATORS**

**165-224**

Table No. 4.1: Distribution of Teachers

Table No. 4.2: Average Number of Teachers per School

Table No. 4.3: Percentage Distribution of Female Teachers

Table No. 4.4: Percentage Distribution of Teachers Received In-service Training (including *Para*-Teachers)

Table No. 4.5: Number of Teachers by Age-group

Table No. 4.6: Teachers Profile by Caste

Table No. 4.7: Teachers Profile by Teacher Category

Table No. 4.8: Teachers Profile by Academic Qualifications & School Category

Table No. 4.9: Distribution of *Para*-Teachers

Table No. 4.10: Average Number of *Para*-Teachers per school

Table No. 4.11: Percentage Distribution of *Para*-Teachers

Table No. 4.12: Percentage of *Para*-Teachers by Professional Qualification

Table No. 4.13: Pupil-Teacher Ratio by School Category

Table No. 4.14: Average Number of Working Days Spent on Non-Teaching Assignments

Table No. 4.15: Percentage of SC and ST Teachers in All Management Schools

## **ELEMENTARY EDUCATION IN URBAN INDIA: WHERE DO WE STAND?**

### **ANALYTICAL TABLES: AN OVERVIEW**

For the last several years, NUEPA has been actively involved in strengthening Educational Management Information System (EMIS) in the country. The *Elementary Education in Urban India: 2006-07* is based on the data received from all thirty-five States & Union Territories of the country. The publication presents not only 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, utilization of school development and TLM grants, and many other parameters on which not much information is available from other sources.

*Elementary Education in Urban India: Where do we stand?* presents indicators based on data received from 1.2 million schools imparting elementary education across the country in case of schools located in the urban areas. It is for the fourth year that a variety of indicators are being disseminated separately in case of the urban areas. All the indicators presented in the document are divided into the following four parts:

- School-Related Indicators
- Facilities in Schools
- Enrolment-Related Indicators; and
- Teacher-Related Indicators.

## **Methodology and Sources of Data**

The DISE publications are based on the school level data provided by the State Project/Mission Directors to the Department of School 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 MIS Unit of TSG of SSA at the national level which in turn is then provided to NUEPA for dissemination and analysis. At the national level thorough scrutiny of state-specific data is undertaken and limitations, if any, are reported to the concerned states, district-wise. The MIS Unit at TSG also undertakes processing of data and shares the major findings with the states in the form of tables derived from the state/district level DISE data.

## **Data Limitations**

The data and indicators presented in the document are based on the information received from the State Project Offices and the District 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 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. Most of the states have engaged an independent agency for sample checking of data. 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. For these reasons, data on such variables is not reported. Needless to mention that the percentages, rates and ratios presented in the document are based on the schools that have responded to a particular question and hence may not necessarily be applicable to the entire state. Thus, schools by management, their location in rural and urban areas, type of schools, schools by category, enrolment (General, SC, ST, OBC and Muslim) pupil-teacher

ratio, student-classroom ratio, percentage of girls in enrolment in primary and upper primary classes etc. should be viewed in the light of these limitations.

Over a period of time, the number of schools covered under DISE increased significantly. During 2006-07, data has been collected from more than 1.20 million schools, with a comprehensive profile of more than 5.20 million teachers, also being maintained by DISE. Despite best efforts, it is still possible that the field agencies might have not covered all the recognised schools imparting elementary education supposed to be covered under DISE which is specifically true for schools under private managements. Despite significant increase in number of private schools covered under DISE (225 thousand in 2006-07), field level functionaries reported that data from a few private (un-aided) schools couldn't be obtained for the one or the other reason. We are trying to reach all such schools and are hopeful that these efforts will be reflected in the following year.

The main indicators presented in the publication 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.

$$1. \text{ \% Single-classroom schools} = \frac{\text{Primary schools having single classroom}}{\text{Total primary schools}} \times 100$$

$$2. \text{ \% Single-teacher schools} = \frac{\text{Primary schools with single teacher in position}}{\text{Total primary schools}} \times 100$$

$$3. \text{ \% Schools with SCR} \geq 60 = \frac{\text{Primary schools having student classroom ratio} \geq 60}{\text{Total primary schools}} \times 100$$

4. % Schools with pre-primary sections =  $\frac{\text{Primary schools having pre-primary sections}}{\text{Total primary schools}} \times 100$
5. % Schools with common toilet =  $\frac{\text{Primary schools having common toilet}}{\text{Total primary schools}} \times 100$
6. % Schools with girl's toilet =  $\frac{\text{Primary schools having girls toilet}}{\text{Total primary schools}} \times 100$
7. % Enrolment in Government Schools =  $\frac{\text{Enrolment in primary schools having Education Department, Local Body, Tribal Welfare Department \& Others as school management}}{\text{Total enrolment in primary schools}} \times 100$
8. % Enrolment in single-teacher schools =  $\frac{\text{Enrolment in primary schools having single teacher}}{\text{Enrolment in total number of schools having primary category}} \times 100$
9. % No female teacher schools (Teacher  $\geq 2$ ) =  $\frac{\text{Primary schools having teacher } \geq 2 \text{ but no female teacher}}{\text{Total primary schools}} \times 100$

10. % Under-age & over-age children

$$= \frac{\text{Enrolment in Grades I-V below '6' \& above '11' years}}{\text{Total enrolment in Grades I-V}} \times 100$$

11. % SC enrolment

$$= \frac{\text{Enrolment of SC in primary classes}}{\text{Total enrolment in primary classes}} \times 100$$

12. % SC girls to SC enrolment

$$= \frac{\text{Enrolment of SC girls in primary classes}}{\text{SC enrolment in primary classes}} \times 100$$

13. % ST enrolment

$$= \frac{\text{Enrolment of ST in primary classes}}{\text{Total enrolment in primary classes}} \times 100$$

14. % ST girls to ST enrolment

$$= \frac{\text{Enrolment of ST girls in primary classes}}{\text{ST enrolment in primary classes}} \times 100$$

15. Pupil-Teacher Ratio (PTR)

$$= \frac{\text{Total enrolment in schools of primary category}}{\text{Total teachers in primary schools category}}$$

(Para-teachers have been included while calculating PTR)

$$16. \text{ Student-Classroom Ratio (SCR)} = \frac{\text{Total enrolment in primary schools}}{\text{Total classrooms in primary schools}}$$

$$17. \text{ \% Schools with } \leq 50 \text{ Students in Grades I-IV/V} = \frac{\text{Number of primary schools having enrolment } \leq 50 \text{ in Grades I-IV/V}}{\text{Total primary schools}} \times 100$$

$$18. \text{ \% Schools with PTR } \geq 100 = \frac{\text{Number of primary schools having PTR } \geq 100}{\text{Total primary schools}} \times 100$$

$$19. \text{ \% Female Teachers} = \frac{\text{Total female teachers in primary schools}}{\text{Total teachers in primary schools}} \times 100$$

(*Para* teachers have been included while calculating this indicator)

$$20. \text{ \% of Primary schools established since 1994} = \frac{\text{Total primary schools established since 1994}}{\text{Total primary schools}} \times 100$$

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

21. Average number of days spent on non-teaching assignments

Presents average number of days spent on non-teaching assignments during the previous academic year in case of teachers imparting elementary education irrespective of the school type.

$$22. \text{ Gender Parity Index (GPI)} = \frac{\text{Girl's enrolment in Primary Grades in year 't'}}{\text{Boy's enrolment in Primary Grades in year 't'}}$$

23. Ratio of Primary to Upper Primary Schools/Sections

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

### **Random Checking of Data**

With an aim to further improve the quality and reliability of data, it has been made mandatory for all the States & UTs to get the DISE data sample checked by an independent agency from the year 2006-07 onwards, for which NUEPA suggested the sampling methodology and developed a special data capture format for post enumeration survey. The main objectives of sample checking were to judge the accuracy of data and to identify the gaps and weaknesses and to seek suggestions regarding remedial measures for strengthening the system and to further improve the quality of data. It is heartening to note that about 25 States initiated random sample checking of data in its very first year, most of which are conducted by the monitoring institutions (ICSSR funded institutions) identified for the states. States are advised to initiate corrective measures in the light of the findings of the five percent random sample checking of the data.

21. Average number of days spent on non-teaching assignments

Presents average number of days spent on non-teaching assignments during the previous academic year in case of teachers imparting elementary education irrespective of the school type.

$$22. \text{ Gender Parity Index (GPI)} = \frac{\text{Girl's enrolment in Primary Grades in year 't'}}{\text{Boy's enrolment in Primary Grades in year 't'}}$$

23. Ratio of Primary to Upper Primary Schools/Sections

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

### **Random Checking of Data**

With an aim to further improve the quality and reliability of data, it has been made mandatory for all the States & UTs to get the DISE data sample checked by an independent agency from the year 2006-07 onwards, for which NUEPA suggested the sampling methodology and developed a special data capture format for post enumeration survey. The main objectives of sample checking were to judge the accuracy of data and to identify the gaps and weaknesses and to seek suggestions regarding remedial measures for strengthening the system and to further improve the quality of data. It is heartening to note that about 25 States initiated random sample checking of data in its very first year, most of which are conducted by the monitoring institutions (ICSSR funded institutions) identified for the states. States are advised to initiate corrective measures in the light of the findings of the five percent random sample checking of the data.



### DISE 2006-07: Coverage

Sl. No.	State & UT	School Structure		Number of Districts			
		Primary	Upper Primary	2001 Census	Reported DISE Data		
					2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
1	Andaman & Nicobar Islands	I-V	VI-VIII	2	-	2	3
3	Andhra Pradesh	I-V	VI-VIII	23	23	23	23
2	Arunachal Pradesh	I-V	VI-VIII	13	15*	15*	16
4	Assam	I-IV	V-VII	23	23	23	23
5	Bihar	I-V	VI-VIII	37	37	37	37
6	Chandigarh	I-V	VI-VIII	1	1	1	1
7	Chhattisgarh	I-V	VI-VIII	16	16	16	16
8	Dadra & Nagar Haveli	I-IV	V-VII	1	-	1	1
9	Daman & Diu	I-IV	V-VII	2	-	2	2
10	Delhi	I-V	VI-VIII	9	9	9	9
11	Goa	I-IV	V-VII	2	-	2	2
12	Gujarat	I-IV	V-VII	25	25	25	25
13	Haryana	I-V	VI-VIII	19	19	19	20
14	Himachal Pradesh	I-V	VI-VIII	12	12	12	12
15	Jammu & Kashmir	I-V	VI-VIII	14	12 <sup>+</sup>	14	14
16	Jharkhand	I-V	VI-VIII	18	22*	22*	22
17	Karnataka	I-IV	V-VII	27	27	27	27
18	Kerala	I-IV	V-VII	14	14	14	14
19	Lakshadweep	I-IV	V-VII	1	-	1	1
20	Madhya Pradesh	I-V	VI-VIII	45	45	48*	48
21	Maharashtra	I-IV	V-VII	35	35	35	35
22	Manipur	I-V	VI-VIII	9	-	9	9
23	Meghalaya	I-IV	V-VII	7	7	7	7
24	Mizoram	I-IV	V-VII	8	8	8	8
25	Nagaland	I-V	VI-VIII	8	8	8	8
26	Orissa	I-V	VI-VII	30	30	30	30
28	Puducherry	I-V	VI-VIII	4	4	4	4
27	Punjab	I-V	VI-VIII	17	17	17	19
29	Rajasthan	I-V	VI-VIII	32	32	32	32
30	Sikkim	I-V	VI-VIII	4	4	4	4
31	Tamil Nadu	I-V	VI-VIII	30	29	30	30
32	Tripura	I-V	VI-VIII	4	4	4	4
33	Uttar Pradesh	I-V	VI-VIII	70	70	70	70
34	Uttarakhand	I-V	VI-VIII	13	13	13	13
35	West Bengal	I-IV	V-VIII	18	20*	20*	20
	<b>Total Districts</b>	-	-	<b>593</b>	<b>581*</b>	<b>604*</b>	<b>609*</b>

Note: \* : Including bifurcated districts.      + : Data for all districts not reported.