

**REPORT  
ON  
10% POST ENUMERATION SURVEY  
ON  
DISE 2011 – 2012  
FOR THE STATE OF MIZORAM**

**BY  
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
MIZORAM UNIVERSITY**

## **SUMMARY**

1. The Post Enumeration Survey was done randomly from 2 Districts (viz. Champhai and Saiha Districts). Two (2) Districts were selected from the state as per the latest instruction received as the state is having only 8 Districts.
2. All the blocks from both the Districts were selected for PES and 6.8% of the schools in these three blocks were selected randomly and taken as samples.
3. Comparison was made on as many as 37 similar items from both the formats.
4. Deviation is found in as many as 15(fifteen) items.
5. The schools could not provide information on the sanctioned posts of teachers for their schools. This is due to the fact that there was no specific norm related to the strength of teachers for any particular kind of school.
6. There are still large numbers of items/parameters in DCF for DISE which are not available in the Special DCF for PES and likewise, some items/parameters in the Special DCF for PES are not to be found in the DCF for DISE. As a result, comparison of all items of both the formats is not possible hence only items found in both the formats are compared and deviations calculated.
7. The sample schools for collection of information on DISE and PES are selected on the basis of Educational Blocks and not RD Blocks as is done in other states. This is as a result of the different demarcation of blocks by Education Department and Rural Development Department under the government of Mizoram.
8. The overall precision level of DISE data is found to be 97.67%

## **CHAPTER – I**

## **INTRODUCTION**

Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) had been launched in India in 2000-2001 for providing education to all children between 6-14 years of age. This is being done in partnership with the state governments and local self governments. The programme of SSA has also been taken up in toto in the state of Mizoram.

The State Project Directorate of SSA, among many other assignments, is given the responsibility of collection and compilation of DISE data using Capture Format (DCF) which was distributed to all elementary schools and collected after it was fully filled up. This is one of the information systems under Educational Management Information System and considered as a major component of SSA. The data collected from DISE proves to be very useful and serves as essential information for planners for determining future planning from the point of view of the system of Elementary Education.

Like all other states in India, the data for DISE is collected in the whole state on a regular basis every year with 30<sup>th</sup> September as reference date. This year (2011) also, the Cluster Resource Centre Coordinators (CRCCs) of all the clusters visited every schools within their respective areas with the Data Capture Format (DCF), and these are filled up with the concerned Headmasters of each school. The information obtained through these formats is entered into the computers by the Programmers and Data Entry Operators of the MIS Cell of the District Project Offices of SSA. These data are then forwarded to the State Project Office where final compilation is done.

As per instruction received from NUEPA, to determine the reliability and preciseness of DISE data, sample check using special DCF for PES was conducted in 6.8% of the schools in two Districts.

Mizoram is a state having only 8 (eight) districts (this has been increased to 11 recently). For the purpose of PES, two (2) Districts (viz. Champhai and Saiha Districts) were selected. There are four (4) blocks in Champhai District and two (2) blocks in Saiha District. As per the instruction received for the present sample checking, all the blocks under the district selected for the sample were included and out of the total population of schools of different category, at least 5% schools were again selected for PES. There are a total of 532 schools at the elementary level in these six blocks selected. Out of these, 36 schools consisting of 15 Primary schools, 6 Primary with Upper Primary schools, 14 Upper Primary schools and 1 Primary with Upper Primary and Secondary School were selected as samples which were drawn randomly. Due care was taken to ensure randomness at the same time maintaining representation of schools from rural and urban, as well as schools under different management. (See Table No.1)

**Table – I**  
**Percentage of Sample Selected from Both Districts**

<b>Sl.No</b>	<b>Particulars</b>	<b>Total Nos.</b>	<b>Sample</b>	<b>% of Sample</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>BLOCK</b>	6	6	100%
<b>2</b>	<b>PS only</b>	254	15	5.9%
<b>3</b>	<b>UPS only</b>	178	14	7.9%
<b>4</b>	<b>PS with UPS</b>	97	6	6.2%
<b>5</b>	<b>PS wt UPS &amp; HS/HSS</b>	3	1	33.3%
	<b>Total schools</b>	<b>532</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>6.8%</b>

The collection of data through Special DCF was done by a team of investigators led by a Faculty of Department of Education, Mizoram University. The team visited all the sample schools in the first and second week of November 2011. The filled in special DCF of the sample schools and copies of the filled in DCF for DISE of these sample schools were edited tabulated and analyzed.

The basic objective of PES is to determine the preciseness and reliability of DISE data, which serve as an essential tool for planners for future planning.

A careful scrutiny and analysis of the DCF for DISE and special DCF for PES however show that there were some items in both the formats which were not comparable because on non-existence of item/(s) in either one of the formats.

The items/parameters on which information has been collected in the special DCF for PES but are not existent in the DISE format are listed below:

1. Different particulars related to Principal/Head of the Institution.

2. No. of cooks employed for MDM
3. Number of personnel employed for cleaning Toilet/Lavatories.
4. Number of teachers present on the day of survey.
5. Status of School building.
6. Number of blocks in school.
7. Availability of separate toilet for staff.
8. Seating arrangement of students.
9. Children enrolled in the last academic year.
10. Enrolment and attendance details of children on the day of survey.

Likewise, in the latest compilation of DCF, there were still quite a good number of items/parameters on which information is sought, which were not included in the previous DCF as well as the Special DCF for PES. This also made it impossible to find out the accuracy and preciseness of several information using the sample check through Special DCF. The lists of such items which the investigators felt are important, but were not included in PES are as follows:

1. Habitation name (for rural area) or equivalent urban unit for planning.
2. Village Council (V/C) name.
3. Name of Cluster Resource Centre.
4. Revenue Block name.
5. Educational Block name.
6. Assembly Constituency.
7. Geographical Information of the school.
8. Phone/Mobile No.
9. Distance of school in kilometers (from BRC & CRC).
10. Whether school is approachable by all-weather roads.
11. Year of recognition of school (if school is recognised).
12. Year of upgradation from Primary to Upper Primary (if applicable).
13. Pre-Primary section attached to school.
14. Anganwadi Centre in or adjacent to school.
15. Whether this is a special school for CWSN

16. Last academic year details.
17. School funds (last completed financial year) excluding MDM
18. Details of instructional days and school hours.
19. In CCE being implemented in school?
20. Information required from only private unaided school.
21. Information required from only aided school.
22. Information require only from Govt./Aided schools.
23. Details of Special Training (only for Govt. school).
24. Number of classrooms under construction.
25. Land available for additional classrooms.
26. Separate room for Head teacher/Principal.
27. Number of blackboards (including green/whiteboards).
28. Number of toilet seats constructed/available
29. Number of toilet seats functional.
30. Whether school has a library and the number of books.
31. Does the school subscribe for magazine/newspaper?
32. Availability of land for playground.
33. Total number of computers.
34. Does the school have CAL lab?
35. Medical checkup of students.
36. Ramps/with handrails for disabled students.
37. Furniture for teachers.
38. Furniture for students.
39. Whether measured campus plan prepared.
40. Information related to teachers and part-time instructors.
41. New admission during previous academic year.
42. New admission in Grade - I
43. Enrollment in current academic session (by social category).
44. Enrollment in current academic session (by age).
45. Enrollment in current academic session (by medium of instruction).
46. Repeaters in current academic session (by social category).
47. Facilities provided to children (last academic year, PS & UPS).
48. Children with Special Needs.
49. Facilities provided to CWSN (Last academic year).
50. Attendance (Previous academic year).

## **CHAPTER – II**

## COMPARATIVE TABLES

After carefully sifting, editing and scrutinizing of the filled in special DCF for PES and the DCF for DISE format of all the schools selected as sample from both the districts, the following comparative tables were prepared and analysis and deviation were worked out on the basis of the tabulated data.

**Table No.2**  
**Comparison on Category of Schools**

Sl.no.	School Status	Sample	No. reported under each Category		
			PES	DISE	Deviation
1	Primary only	15	15	15	0
2	Upper Primary only	14	14	14	0
3	PS with UPS	6	6	6	0
4	PS wt UPS and HS/HSS	1	1	1	0
<b>TOTAL :</b>		<b>36</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>0</b>

The above table (table no.2) shows a comparison of Schools according to their category as verified through special DCF in PES and as reported in the DCF for DISE. The table shows that there was no deviation between the information collected through special DCF for PES and DCF for DISE in relation to the category of schools.

**Table No.3**  
**On Location**

Sl. No.	School Status	Sample	No. Reported under each Category					
			RURAL			URBAN		
			PES	DISE	Deviation	PES	DISE	Deviation
1	Primary only	15	8	8	0	7	7	0
2	Upper Primary only	14	7	7	0	7	7	0
3	PS with UPS	6	3	3	0	3	3	0
4	PS wt UPS and HS/HSS	1	0	0	0	1	1	0
<b>TOTAL :</b>		<b>36</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>0</b>

Table No.3 shows a comparison of PES and DISE data on the location of the sample Schools. As per the findings from PES, there are 18 schools from rural areas and 18 schools from urban areas. At the same time, report from the DCF for DISE shows 18 schools from rural areas and 18 schools from urban areas. This resulted in no deviation of data of DCF from PES.

**Table No.4  
On Type of School**

Sl.No.	School Status	Sample	No. Reported under each Category		
			Co-education		
			PES	DISE	Deviation
1	Primary only	15	15	15	0
2	Upper Primary only	14	14	14	0
3	PS with UPS	6	6	6	0
4	PS wt UPS & HS/HSS	1	1	1	0
<b>TOTAL :</b>		<b>36</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>0</b>

The above table is a comparative data of DCF for DISE and PES on the type of school. The table reveals that all the selected samples were of a co-educational type from the report of both the data. This shows that no deviation was found in the report of both PES and DISE on the type of school.

**Table No.5**

### On Sanctioned/In Position Teachers

Sl No	School Status	Sample	No. Reported under each Category		
			Teachers in-position		
			PES	DISE	Deviation
1	Primary only	15	87	89	+2
2	Upper Primary only	14	129	132	+3
3	PS with UPS	6	54	47	-7
4	PS wt UPS and HS/HSS	1	29	29	0
<b>TOTAL :</b>		<b>36</b>	<b>299</b>	<b>297</b>	<b>+/-12</b>

Table No.5 reveals a comparison of the in-position teachers as reported in the PES and DISE. Although the actual deviation of the total number of teachers in position in the sample schools is 2 (.67%), the total deviation ignoring +/- is found to be 12 (4.01%).

**Table No.6  
On Children's Enrollment (Total & ST) in 2011**

Sl. No.	School Status	Sample	Enrollment			ST		
			PES	DISE	Devn.	PES	DISE	Devn.
1	Primary only	15	968	958	-10	968	958	-10
2	Upper Primary only	14	1338	1295	-43	1338	1295	-43
3	PS with UPS	6	679	696	+17	679	696	+17
4	PS wt UPS and HS/HSS	1	965	965	0	916	916	0
<b>TOTAL :</b>		<b>36</b>	<b>3950</b>	<b>3914</b>	<b>+/-70</b>	<b>3901</b>	<b>3865</b>	<b>+/-70</b>

According to the report from DCF, there were 3914 students enrolled in the 36 sample schools. On the other hand, as per the verified data collected through special DCF for PES, there were 3950 students enrolled in these 36 schools. The actual deviation is -36 (.91%) whereas the deviation ignoring +/- is 70 (1.77%). The number of students enrolled in the sample schools from ST category was 3865 according to DCF for DISE while it was 3901 as per the data collected using Special

DCF for PES. The actual deviation in this variable is also -36 (.91%) and 70 (1.77%) is the deviation ignoring +/-.

**Table No.7**  
**On enrollment of SC and OBC Students in 2010**

Sl. No	School Status	Sample	Scheduled Caste			Other Backward Class		
			PES	DISE	Devn.	PES	DISE	Devn.
1	Primary only	15	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil
2	Upper Primary only	14	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil
3	PS with UPS	6	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil
4	PS wt UPS and HS /HSS	1	49	49	0	Nil	Nil	Nil
<b>TOTAL :</b>		<b>36</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>0</b>	Nil	Nil	Nil

Table 7 shows the number of SC/OBC students in the sample schools. As per the report of PES, there were 49 students belonging to Scheduled Caste which is an exact figure compared to the figure reported in DCF for DISE. Thus, there is no deviation in the said variable.

**Table No.8**  
**Lowest Class**

Sl. No	School Status	Sample	No. Reported under each Category								
			KG/Nursery			Class-I			Class-V		
			PES	DISE	Devn.	PES	DISE	Devn.	PES	DISE	Devn.
1	Primary only	15	-	-	-	15	15	0	-	-	-
2	Upper Primary only	14	-	-	-	-	-	-	14	14	0
3	PS with UPS	6	0	0	0	6	6	0	-	-	-
4	PS wt UPS/HS /HSS	1	-	-	-	1	1	0	-	-	-
<b>TOTAL :</b>		<b>36</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>0</b>

The DISE formats reported no school as having KG/Nursery as the lowest class which is same as per PES, thus there is no deviation. As per the PES, 22 schools are having Class I as the lowest class which also is the same number in the report of DISE. Similarly, there were 14 schools having Class V as the lowest class which was reported by both DISE and PES. Hence there is no deviation in this category.

**Table No.9  
Highest Class**

Sl. No	School Status	Sample	No. Reported under each Category								
			CLASS-IV			CLASS-VIII			CLASS-X		
			PES	DISE	Devn.	PES	DISE	Devn.	PES	DISE	Devn.
1	Primary only	15	15	15	0	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	Upper Primary only	14	-	-	-	14	14	0	-	-	-
3	PS with UPS	6	-	-	-	6	6	0	-	-	-
4	PS wt UPS&HS /HSS	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	0
<b>TOTAL :</b>		<b>36</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>

The DISE formats reported 15 schools having Class IV as the highest class which is similar to the report of PES. There were 20 schools having Class VIII as the highest class as reported by PES while the same number has been reported as per DISE. Thus there is no deviation in this category.

**Table No.10**  
**On School Management**

Sl. No	School Status	Sample	No. Reported under each Category								
			Government			Pvt. Unaided			Pvt. Aided		
			PES	DISE	Devn.	PES	DISE	Devn.	PES	DISE	Devn.
1	Primary only	15	15	15	0	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	Upper Primary only	14	14	14	0	-	-	-	-	-	-
3	PS with UPS	6	2	2	0	3	3	0	1	1	0
4	PS wt UPS & HS /HSS	1	-	-	-	1	1	0	-	-	-
<b>TOTAL :</b>		<b>36</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>

Table No.10 shows that the data on category of schools as collected for PES was same as the DISE data supplied through DCF. Thus, there is no deviation in the category of government schools as well as in private unaided schools and private aided schools.

**Table No.11**  
**Students with Disabilities**

Sl. No.	School Status	Sample	No. Reported under each Category		
			PES	DISE	Deviation
1	Primary only	15	0	0	0
2	Upper Primary only	14	24	26	+2
3	PS with UPS	6	25	32	+7
4	PS with UPS and HS/HSS	1	-	-	-
<b>TOTAL :</b>		<b>36</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>+9</b>

Table No.12 shows a comparative analysis of the report of PES and DISE on the number of students with disabilities enrolled in the sample schools. As per the report of PES, there were 49 students with disabilities. The report of DISE however reported 58 students with disabilities who had been enrolled in the sample schools. The deviation is +9 which is as high as 18.37%.

**Table No.12**  
**On Status of School Building**

Sl. No	School Status	Sample	No. Reported under each Category								
			Government			Rented			Private		
			PES	DISE	Devn.	PES	DISE	Devn.	PES	DISE	Devn.
1	Primary only	15	15	15	0	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	Upper Primary only	14	14	14	0	-	-	-	-	-	-
3	PS with UPS	6	1	1	0	1	1	0	4	4	0
4	PS wt UPS & HS /HSS	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	0
<b>TOTAL :</b>		<b>36</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>

Table No.13 shows a comparison of information on status of school building reported in DISE and PES. There was no deviation in the report of DISE and PES on the schools owned by government. Similarly, the report of PES as well as DCF for DISE did not show any deviation on the schools run on rented building as well as private buildings.

**Table No.13**  
**On Number of Classrooms**

Sl. No	School Status	Sample	No. of classrooms Reported under each Category								
			3 rooms			4 to 6 rooms			7 and above		
			PES	DISE	Devn.	PES	DISE	Devn.	PES	DISE	Devn.
1	Primary only	15	-	-	-	15	15	0	-	-	-
2	Upper Primary only	14	-	-	-	14	14	0	-	-	-
3	PS with UPS	6	-	-	-	1	1	0	5	5	0
4	PS wt UPS&HS /HSS	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	0
<b>TOTAL :</b>		<b>36</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>

There were 30 schools having 4 to 6 classrooms as per the report from DISE. The same number is reported in PES and hence there is no deviation. There were 6 schools having 7 or more classrooms as per the

report of DISE as well as the report from PES. The deviation in this category is also zero.

**Table No.14**  
**Availability of Electricity in the School**

Sl. No	School Status	Sample	Available			Not available		
			PES	DISE	Devn	PES	DISE	Devn
1	Primary only	15	6	7	+1	9	8	-1
2	Upper Primary	14	13	12	-1	1	2	+1
3	PS with UPS	6	4	3	-2	2	3	+1
4	PS wt UPS & HS /HSS	1	1	1	0	-	-	-
<b>TOTAL :</b>		<b>36</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>+/-4</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>+/-3</b>

The above table is a comparison of the information on availability of electricity in the sample schools. The information given in DCF for DISE reported 23 schools as having electricity connection against the report in PES which was 24. The deviation is 16.67%. Non availability of electricity as reported in DISE deviated from PES by +/-3 which is 25%. Overall deviation in this category is 19.44%.

**Table No.15**  
**Availability of Common Toilet in the School**

Sl. No	School Status	Sample	Available			Not available		
			PES	DISE	Devn	PES	DISE	Devn
1	Primary only	15	13	15	+2	2	0	-2
2	Upper Primary	14	14	14	0	0	0	0
3	PS with UPS	6	6	6	0	0	0	0
4	PS with UPS and HS /HSS	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
<b>TOTAL :</b>		<b>36</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>+2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-2</b>

The above table (table-15) gives a comparison of the information on availability of common toilet in the sample schools. The information given in DCF for DISE reported that 36 schools were having common toilet for their students while the report in PES was 34 schools thus the deviation is 5.88%. Non availability of common toilet as reported in DISE deviated from PES report by 100%. Overall deviation of DISE data from PES data is 11.11%.

**Table No.16**  
**Availability of Separate Toilet for Girls**

Sl. No	School Status	Sample	Available			Not available		
			PES	DISE	Devn	PES	DISE	Devn
1	Primary only	15	11	11	0	4	4	0
2	Upper Primary only	14	11	13	+2	3	1	-2
3	PS with UPS	6	1	2	+1	5	4	-1
4	PS wt UPS & HS /HSS	1	1	1	0	-	-	-
<b>TOTAL :</b>		<b>36</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>+3</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>-3</b>

Table – 16 depicts a comparison of the information on availability of separate toilet for girls in the sample schools. The information given in DCF for DISE reported availability of separate toilet for girls in 27 of the sample schools which is 3 schools more than the report in PES. The deviation is 12.5%. As per the DISE data, there were 9 schools without separate toilet for girls. The report in DISE deviated from the report of PES by -3 schools which is 25%. The deviation of DISE data from PES in this category is found to be 16.67%.

**Table No.17**  
**Condition of Boundary Wall**

Sl. No	School Status	Sample	Pucca			Pucca but broken		
			PES	DISE	Devn	PES	DISE	Devn
1	Primary only	15	-	-	-	1	1	0
2	Upper Primary only	14	1	1	0	1	1	0
3	PS with UPS	6	1	1	0	-	-	-
4	PS wt UPS & HS /HSS	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>TOTAL :</b>		<b>36</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>

Cont...

Barbed Wire Fencing			No Boundary Wall			Others		
PES	DISE	Devn	PES	DISE	Devn	PES	DISE	Devn
6	7	+1	6	5	-1	2	2	0
8	8	0	3	4	+1	1	0	-1
-	-	-	4	4	0	1	1	0
-	-	-	1	1	0	-	-	-
<b>14</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>+1</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>+/-2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>-1</b>

The above table reveals the condition of boundary walls in the sample schools. The information given in DCF for DISE reported 8 schools as having pucca boundary, 1 school had a broken pucca boundary wall, barbed wire fencing was reported by 13 of the sample schools while 18 schools had on boundary or fencing for their school. At the same time, 2 schools were reported to have other than what is being specified. Since the report of DISE and PES is same in relation to condition of boundary wall, hence no deviation is found.

**Table No.18**  
**Availability of Playground**

Sl. No	School Status	Sample	Available			Not Available		
			PES	DISE	Devn.	PES	DISE	Devn.
1	Primary only	15	10	13	+3	5	2	-3
2	Upper Primary only	14	12	12	0	2	2	0
3	PS with UPS	6	3	3	0	3	3	0
4	PS wt UPS & HS /HSS	1	1	1	0	-	-	-
<b>TOTAL :</b>		<b>36</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>+3</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>-3</b>

As per the report of PES, there were 23 schools having playground. The data collected through DCF for DISE however reported 31 schools as having playground. This results in a deviation as high as 34.78%. There were 13 schools not having playground as per the report of PES which is 8 schools more than the data submitted in DISE. The deviation in this category is as high as 61.54%.

**Table No.19**  
**Source of Drinking Water Facility**

Sl. No	School Status	Sample	Hand Pump			Well		
			PES	DISE	Devn.	PES	DISE	Devn.
1	Primary only	15	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	Upper Primary only	14	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	PS with UPS	6	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	PS with UPS and HS /HSS	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>TOTAL :</b>		<b>36</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

Contd...

Tap Water			Others			No Drinking Water		
PES	DISE	Devn.	PES	DISE	Devn.	PES	DISE	Devn.
10	10	0	4	4	0	1	1	0
9	8	-1	4	5	+1	1	1	0
2	2	0	2	2	0	2	2	0
-	-	-	1	1	0	-	-	-
<b>21</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>-1</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>+1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>

The above table shows a comparison of the information related to the source of drinking water available in the schools. The comparison was made on the basis of the information provided by the schools using DCF for DISE and the information collected through Special DCF for PES. A perusal of the table reveals that there was no deviation related to Hand Pump and Well as a source of drinking water. However, there is a deviation of 4.76% on the information related to Tap Water as a source of drinking water. There were 11 schools having other source of drinking water as per the report of PES. The data of DISE on the other hand reported 12 schools as having other source of drinking water resulting in the deviation of 9.09%. Four (4) schools did not have drinking water facilities as per PES as well as DISE. Thus there was no deviation. The overall deviation related to source of drinking water is 5.56%.

**Table No.20**  
**Number of Computers Available**

Sl. No	School Status	Sample	1 to 5		
			PES	DISE	Devn.
1	Primary only	15	4	2	-2
2	Upper Primary only	14	9	6	-3
3	PS with UPS	6	4	4	0
4	PS with UPS and HS /HSS	1	-	-	-
<b>TOTAL :</b>		<b>36</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>+/-5</b>

Contd...

6-10			10 and Above			None		
PES	DISE	Devn.	PES	DISE	Devn.	PES	DISE	Devn.
-	-	-	-	-	-	11	13	+2
1	0	-1	-	-	-	4	8	+4
-	-	-	-	-	-	2	2	0
-	-	-	1	1	0	-	-	-
<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>+6</b>

The above table reveals that as per PES, there were 17 schools in the sample having 1 to 5 computers while the report of DISE gave 12 as the number of schools having 1 to 5 computers which showed a deviation of 29.41%. As per PES, 1 school was having 6 to 10 computers which was not reported in the DISE thus there was complete deviation (100%). The report of both DISE and PES showed 1 (one) school as having more than 10 (ten) computers thus showing no deviation. According to the data collected for DISE, 23 schools do not have any computer while the PES showed 17 schools as having no computer. The deviation in this category is 35.29%. The overall deviation on the number of computers available is as high as 41.67%.

## CHAPTER – III

### DEVIATION AND PRECISION LEVEL

After carefully tabulating the data collected from the sample schools using Special DCF for PES and the data collected through DCF for DISE, careful analysis was done to find out the deviation and precision level of the DISE data from PES data. The following table provides information on the deviation and precision level of all the comparable items found in both the formats.

**Table No.22**  
**Percentage Deviation and Precision Level of Different Items**

Sl. No.	Comparable Items	Quantitative Value			Percentage	
		PES	DISE	Deviation Ignoring + or -	Deviation	Precision
1	On category of school	36	36	0	0	100
2	On Location (rural)	18	18	0	0	100
3	On Location (urban)	18	18	0	0	100
4	Type of School (co-ed)	36	36	0	0	100
5	Sanctioned/In position teachers	299	297	12	4.01	95.99
6	On students Enrolment	3950	3914	70	1.77	98.23
7	ST students enrolled	3905	3865	70	1.79	98.21
8	SC/OBC students enrolled	49	49	0	0	100
9	On Lowest Class (Class I)	22	22	0	0	100
10	On Lowest Class (Class V)	14	14	0	0	100
11	On Highest Class (Class IV)	15	15	0	0	100
12	On Highest Class (Class VIII)	20	20	0	0	100
13	On Highest Class (Class X)	1	1	0	0	100
14	School Management(Govt)	31	31	0	0	100
15	Schl Mngmt (Pvt.Unaided)	4	4	0	0	100
16	Schl Mngmt (Pvt.aided)	1	1	0	0	100

18	Students with Disabilities	49	58	9	18.37	81.63
19	On status of Schl bldg (govt)	30	30	0	0	100
20	On status of Schl bldg (rented)	1	1	0	0	100
21	On status of Schl bldg (private)	5	5	0	0	100
22	Number of Classrooms (4 – 6)	30	30	0	0	100
23	Number of Classrooms (7 and above)	6	6	0	0	100
24	Availability of Electricity(Available)	24	23	4	16.67	83.33
25	Availability of Electricity(Not Available)	12	13	3	25	75
26	On Common Toilet	36	36	4	11.11	88.89
27	On Separate Toilet for Girls	36	36	6	16.67	83.33
28	Condition of Boundary Wall (Pucca)	2	2	0	0	100
29	Condition of Boundary Wall (Pucca but broken)	2	2	0	0	100
30	Condition of Boundary Wall (Barbed wire fencing)	14	15	1	7.14	92.86
31	Condition of Boundary Wall (No Boundary Wall)	14	14	2	14.28	85.72
32	Condition of Boundary Wall (Others)	4	3	1	25	75
33	On Availability of Playground	36	36	6	16.67	83.33
34	On Source of Drinking Water (Tap Water)	21	20	1	4.76	95.24
35	On Source of Drinking Water (others)	11	12	1	9.09	90.91
36	On Source of Drinking Water (No drinking water)	4	4	0	0	100
37	On no. of Computers available	36	36	15	41.67	64.71
<b>OVERALL</b>		<b>8792</b>	<b>8723</b>	<b>205</b>	<b>2.33</b>	<b>97.67</b>

The above table reveals that highest deviation was found on the category on the number of computers available in the school. The deviation, it was learnt is due to the fact that while the PES show the actual number of computers available in the school, the DISE was filled in considering only those computers received by the school through SSA and not those bought by the schools through their own resources. The rest of the deviation ranges from 0 to 25%.

## **INFORMATION ON FEEDBACK SCHEDULE**

The special DCF for PES include a separate information schedule, termed as ‘Investigator’s Feedback Schedule’ which was meant to find out with the practical problems faced by the investigators in obtaining the desired information from the selected schools. It is also included a feedback schedule on various attributes pertaining to the Headmasters/Teachers and the investigators.

The usual practice in the collection of data for DISE is that it is circulated well in advance to the schools. This was necessary to ensure that the authorities of the schools will have enough time to fill in the various required information at their own comfort without any on-spot outside assistance. However, recently, due to certain problems raised by the schools as well as the district personnel associated with the task, the DISE formats were filled in with the help of CRCC’s in their respective clusters. On the other hand, collection of data for PES was done by third party investigators using Special DCF and was filled in on the spot. Thus, the feedback schedule was included in the format for PES as an attempt to know the attitude of Headmasters/Teachers towards the investigators in providing the necessary information.

The following table provides the information regarding responses from the Headmaster/(s).

**Table no.23**  
**Attributes pertaining to the Principal/Headmaster towards the investigation.**

Sl.No.	Attribute	Category of Response				
		V.Good	Good	Average	Poor	V.Poor
1	Initial Reaction	41.67%	47.22%	11.11%	-	-
2	Providing Information	33.33%	50%	16.67%	-	-
3	Availability of records		33.33%	58.33%	8.34%	-

An analysis of the feedback schedule shows that the initial reaction of the Principals/Headmasters of majority of the sample schools was satisfactory although there were few Headmasters who showed an indifferent attitude towards the investigators. Majority of the schools were able to provide the necessary information. At the same time, in keeping and updating school records, there were still some schools that were not keeping proper records on certain areas. This may be improved by imparting necessary training to them at least once in every academic year.

**Table no.24**  
**Ability of Principal/Headmaster to provide information**

Particulars	Yes	No
On enrolment and details of pass percentage	100%	0
On enrolment and details of pass percentage from single register	33.33%	66.67%
Proper maintenance of teachers attendance	94.44%	5.54%
On Year end summary details of children for all grades	83.33%	16.67%
Availability of School Report Card	0	100%
Punctuality of Teachers in School	100%	0
Availability of photocopy of filed in DISE DCF	27.78%	72.22%
Availability of Display Board	77.78%	22.22%
Provision of Mid-Day Meal in School	91.67%	8.33%

The feedback schedule also included School Observation Schedule which was related with activities conducted in connection with DISE implementation. As per information from the schools visited, no training was organized in 2011 for Headmasters for filling up of DISE data using DCF. However, DCF for DISE were filled up by the CRCC's in their respective clusters themselves to ensure that the information provided was correct and precise. None of the schools visited have received the School Summary Report; thus no feedback could be received to know whether it reflected the real situation in the school or not.

## **CHAPTER – IV**

### **SUMMARY, MAJOR FINDINGS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT**

Like all other states in India, the data for DISE is collected in the whole state on a regular basis every year with 30<sup>th</sup> September as reference date. This year (2011) also, the Cluster Resource Centre Coordinators (CRCCs) of all the clusters visited every schools within their respective areas with the Data Capture Format (DCF), and these are filled up with the concerned Headmasters of each school. The information obtained through these formats is entered into the computers by the Programmers and Data Entry Operators of the MIS Cell of the District Project Offices of SSA. These data are then forwarded to the State Project Office where final compilation is done.

As per instruction received from NUEPA, to determine the reliability and preciseness of DISE data, sample check using special DCF for PES was conducted in 6.8% of the schools in two Districts.

Mizoram is a state having only 8 (eight) districts (this has been increased to 11 recently). For the purpose of PES, two (2) Districts (viz. Champhai and Saiha Districts) were selected. There are four (4) blocks in Champhai District and two (2) blocks in Saiha District. As per the instruction received for the present sample checking, all the blocks under the district selected for the sample were included and out of the total

population of schools of different category, at least 5% schools were again selected for PES. There are a total of 532 schools at the elementary level in these six blocks selected. Out of these, 36 schools consisting of 15 Primary schools, 6 Primary with Upper Primary schools, 14 Upper Primary schools and 1 Primary with Upper Primary and Secondary School were selected as samples which were drawn randomly. Due care was taken to ensure randomness at the same time maintaining representation of schools from rural and urban, as well as schools under different management.

The collection of data through Special DCF was done by a team of investigators led by a Faculty of Department of Education, Mizoram University. The team visited all the sample schools in the first and second week of November 2011. The filled in special DCF of the sample schools and copies of the filled in DCF for DISE of these sample schools were edited tabulated and analyzed.

The basic objective of PES is to determine the preciseness and reliability of DISE data, which serve as an essential tool for planners for future planning.

### **MAJOR FINDINGS:**

After careful scrutiny, tabulation, and an analysis of the filled in formats of both PES and DISE, following are the major findings:-

1. This year, the Data Capture Formats for DISE was distributed in the month of September only. As a result of this, in some of the schools selected as sample, information was collected for PES

before it was collected for the DISE. The DCF for DISE was filled up this year again with the CRCC of their cluster. As a result of this, some of the schools were not fully aware of its importance or the purpose for which it was collected. Moreover, there were still some items left blank by some of the schools in the DCF for DISE. This is considered to be a case of negligence by some of the schools as well as the CRCCs in filling up the formats. The investigators were of the opinion that collection of data through DCF for DISE has been done in a casual manner by the school as well as the CRCC who seem to be taking the task as a routine work and not giving due consideration of the importance of it. This can result in error at time of compiling DISE for the district as well as the whole state, which in turn can affect planning for the whole state.

2. The overall deviation of DISE data from PES data on all comparable items and sub-items is 2.33% thereby giving a precision level as high as 97.66% for DISE data in relation to PES data.
3. The highest deviation was found on the number of computers available in the school. The deviation in this category is as high as 41.67% giving the precision level of only 59.33%. A closer scrutiny of the data from both the DCF as well as clarifications from the DPO of both the districts revealed that the DCF for DISE was filled up on this category taking into consideration only those computers which were received from SSA and not those bought through their own resources. The PES was done however considering the actual available computer sets in the school.

4. Although certain modifications are found in the Special DCF for PES, there are still quite a good of items on which information is sought in the Special DCF for PES, but are excluded in the DCF for DISE. Similarly, many new items are found in the DCF for DISE for which no comparative items are found in the Special DCF for PES. This drastically brought down the number of comparable items which in turn affects the deviation and precision level of the DISE with PES.
5. Some items were still left blank in the DCF for PES in spite of many reminders on the importance of supply of data on the items included in the DCF. This is considered to be a very serious issue as this will automatically affect the DISE data for the whole state as well as the whole country.
6. As a result of interactions with the Principals/Headmasters and CRCCs, the investigators were convinced that the task of filling up of DCF for DISE is considered a routine work and not taken seriously by majority of the CRCCs while there were only a handful of CRCCs who took it more seriously.

#### **SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT:**

The stock of information collected and compiled in the DISE serve as an important and useful tool for preparing activities and programmes as well as its implementation. A sound information system provides useful data for monitoring and supervising any programme or project.

Moreover, researchers interested in having in-depth study about education at the elementary level can also make use of such information for their research. As such, it is essential that precise and reliable information is provided by each and every school. The following suggestions are therefore made so that the information provided by each and every school would be reliable, precise and valid.

1. Mandatory training regarding the importance of providing information and how precise information could be provided must be organized at the block or cluster level every year before handing out the DCF formats for DISE to the schools. This should be given priority and not regarded as a repetition of what has been done every year and neglected. It is evident from the spot visit and interaction with the Principals/Head Teachers that there were still some schools which were not aware of the importance of taking due care in filling up of the formats. Organizing orientation or training not only on a yearly basis, but also as part of a training programme should be ensured so that the task should not be done as a mere routine but with due care.
2. To make the DCF more condensed and attractive for the persons who are to fill it up, permanent status of the schools like year of establishment of school, Village name, Pin code, distance of school from BRC/CRC may be deleted from the DCF which may be collected from District or State Project Offices.
3. Every attempt should be made to ensure that no item is left blank by the school while filling up the formats. The person filling up the format should also be instructed clearly that if there is any

confusion, he/she should contact the DPO office immediately instead of leaving it blank.

4. As the formats of special DCF for PES and DCF for DISE were not similar, proper analysis could not be done as similar items are less than the non-similar items. Although some steps had been taken to modify the formats, the same problem which was faced in the previous years still recurred while preparing the present analysis.
5. All the schools must be instructed to keep and update their school records carefully. For this, training must be organized as frequently as possible with the help of external experts. Frequent training is recommended as there were lots of problems with schools having new Head Teachers.
6. As the BRCCs and CRCCs are to handle the Data Capture Formats, they must be trained intensively regarding the importance of collecting different information, the nature and objectives of various types of school data, as well as the manner in which it should be filled up.
7. All the schools must be instructed to keep a copy of the filled-in DISE data format in the schools for checking and maintaining the truthfulness of recorded data.
8. Before compiling the DISE data, careful scrutiny of the DISE formats at the cluster level should be made mandatory so that reliable and valid information is provided by all the schools.