

# 5 % SAMPLE CHECKING OF DISE DATA OF 2008-09 IN ORISSA

**Sponsored by**

**ORISSA PRIMARY EDUCATION PROGRAMME AUTHORITY  
SHIKSHA SOUDHA, BHUBANESWAR**

*Prepared by:*

Dr . P.K.Acharya

Dr . Rashmi Mishra



**NABAKRUSHNA CHOUDHURY CENTRE FOR  
DEVELOPMENT STUDIES, ORISSA  
BHUBANESWAR-13**

Tel: (0674) 2301094, 230471, Fax: (0674) 2300471  
e-mail : [n cds\\_bsr@dataone.in](mailto:n cds_bsr@dataone.in)

**March, 2009**

## FOREWORD

The major goals identified under SSA are (i) universal enrollment by the end of 2003, (ii) universal retention up to class viii by 2010, (iii) bridging up the gender as well as social gaps in elementary education and (iv) promoting quality education. In order to achieve these targets in a planned way Annual Work Plan and Budget is prepared at District and State levels. In order to facilitate the preparation of Annual Work Plan and Budget, information relating to child population, school facilities, infrastructure, enrollment, learning achievement etc. are needed which we gather through child census, Child Tracking System and DISE data collection. The Head Teachers, CRCCs and BRCCs are given training on collection of DISE data for ensuring the correctness of data. To make DISE data more authentic and genuine, the GOI has decided to take up Post Enumeration Survey (PES) from 5 % of Sample Schools where DISE data have already been collected so as to cross check these data. This would identify the main reasons for defective data entry so that the extent of such defective data entry can be reduced in future. As a result the corrected data would give a true picture of infrastructure and learning achievement and thus would help in prioritizing the SSA activities.

The present research study on 5% sample checking of DISE data 2008-09 in Orissa attempts to identify the reasons for possible errors in DISE data collection and to find out measures to ensure correctness of data. This study was conducted during January-February 2009 in Angul, Mayurbhanj and Rayagada Districts of Orissa in 5% sample schools where DISE data had already been collected. Thus it becomes possible to know the sources of error in gathering DISE data and recommend changes in improving both DISE and PES operations, and in making DISE data more relevant for preparing Annual Work Plan and Budget. The findings of this study will certainly be helpful to improve the quality of DISE data. It would help the planners and policy makers in designing appropriate policy interventions for ensuring quality in elementary education.

The responsibility of conducting the study was entrusted to Nabakrushna Choudhury Centre for Development Studies, Orissa, the Lead Monitoring Institute of SSA for Orissa State.

Dr. P.K. Acharya and Dr. Rashmi Mishra as Project Directors of the research study have done commendable job and put in a lot of hard work in executing the project. They have very efficiently organized a team of sincere dedicated and trained field staff. They have successfully completed the study due to their competence and expertise in this critical area of educational research. I thank and congratulate them for completing the study within the stipulated time.

(Prof. S. P. Padhi)  
Director I/C

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan aims at providing universal access to schools, improved school environment and relevant elementary education for all children of 6 to 14 years of age by 2010. To realise the objectives of SSA, development of useful indicators, existence of reliable data and dissemination of available evidence are necessary for policy formulation and implementation. Availability of updated information on schools, teacher and children and analysis of the data to generate different useful educational indicators play a vital role to achieve the goals of Universisation of Elementary Education (UEE). DISE (District Information System for Education) is the valuable source of data that carries detail information of each school, on the students, teachers and school infrastructure. DISE has been accepted as the unique source of educational data in which detailed educational scenario in a computerized form is available. Updating the data every year and maintaining the updated information in the data base is a regular activity that not only provides the current status of educational indicators, but also gives a compared figure on the indicators in support of the achievement for UEE.

The information/ data collected through DISE play a key role for preparation of Annual Work Plan and Budget for the Districts and State. Filling the Data Capturing Format is a crucial activity for each school that provides DISE data. The reliability of the data depends on the type of training imparted to all the functionaries involved in the process of data collection. The present study "5% Random Sample Checking of DISE Data of 2008-09" seeks to know the strengths and weaknesses in the process of DISE data collection and the deviation level through various indicators.

This Post Enumeration Survey (PES) would help to know the major shortcomings in the DISE data collection and to suggest measures that can reduce the variation and increase the reliability and correctness of data.

We are thankful to OPEPA, Govt. of Orissa for assigning Nabakrushna Choudhury Centre for Development Studies, Bhubaneswar to undertake the study and for providing the financial assistance.

Our esteemed Chairman Prof. R.K. Mishra is a constant source of inspiration and encouragement during the entire period of study. We sincerely express our heartfelt gratitude to him for his continuous academic support to us despite his deep engagement in developing the overall image of the Centre and his active involvement in making the Centre more vibrant in research and academic activities.

We are especially grateful to our Director, Prof. S. P. Padhi for giving us the responsibility to undertake the study. He has rendered all kinds of support for completing the work in time. We express our sincere thanks to him for writing the foreword of this report.

We are indebted to OPEPA authorities and staff members for sharing the findings of the report with us and for giving some valuable suggestions. We are also thankful to the District Project Co-ordinators, Programmers and other staffs of the District Project Offices of SSA of Angul, Rayagada and Mayurbhanj Districts for their unstinted co-operation and support extended to us during the process of data collection.

We acknowledge with thanks the co-operation and support provided by Head Teachers, BRCCs, CRCCs and other staffs of sample schools located in Angul, Rayagada and Mayurbhanj Districts. We are grateful to the teachers and students of the sample schools of the above Districts for their wholehearted co-operation during the study. We are especially thankful to our field staffs for their sincerity and co-operation for timely completion of fieldwork.

Our thanks are due to Dr. R.K Mahapatra, Asst. Librarian for his assistance during literature survey. We are equally thankful to Shri S. Rath, Administrative Officer, Shri, D. Sahu, P.A. to Director, Shri P. K. Mishra, Shri P. K. Mohanty and Mrs. A.P Panda of our office for extending all support for conducting the study.

We are also thankful to Shri Biswamitra Parida for taking up all the responsibility for data entry and typing work. Our thanks are due to Shri S. Sahu for xeroxing the report.

We hope the findings of this report will be useful to the teachers, schools, SSA functionaries, OPEPA, academicians, researchers and those having interest in spreading quality education in the State. It will help both the planners and the policy makers in designing appropriate policy interventions to improve the quality of elementary education in the State and country in general and to improve the quality DISE data collection in particular.

Dr. P. K. Acharya  
Dr. Rashmi Mishra

# CONTENTS

Chapters	Items	Page No.
	Foreword	i
	Acknowledgement	ii-iii
	List of Tables	v-vi
	List of Annexures	vii
	List of Abbreviations	viii
	Executive Summary	ix-xiii
	Maps	xiv-xvii
<b>Chapter-1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1-18</b>
1.1	Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan and DISE Data	
1.2	Importance of DISE Data	
1.3	Authenticity of DISE Data and the Need of PES	
1.4	Process of Undertaking the Study	
1.5	Study Area and the Sample	
1.6	Objectives of the Study	
1.7	Problems Encountered During the Study	
1.8	Limitation of the Study	
1.9	Chapter Arrangement	
<b>Chapter-2</b>	<b>DISE Data and PES Data Comparison</b>	<b>19-40</b>
<b>Chapter-3</b>	<b>Findings of Field Level Observations</b>	<b>41-58</b>
<b>Chapter-4</b>	<b>Major Lacunae in Conducting the DISE Activities and the Formats used for both DISE Data Collection and PES</b>	<b>59-63</b>
<b>Chapter-5</b>	<b>Policy Recommendations for Reducing Defects in DISE Data and Improving the PES and DISE Operations as Well as Quality of DISE Data</b>	<b>64-66</b>
	Bibliography	67
	List of Sample Schools Covered for PES, 2008-09	68-79

## LIST OF TABLES

Table No.	TITLE	Page No.
<b>CHAPTER-1</b>		
1.1	Percentage of Schools Covered for PES, 2008-09 Across the Blocks and ULBs	8-9
1.2	Percentage of Schools Covered for PES, 2008-09 Across School Management Categories	10
1.3	Distribution of Sample Schools of PES, 2008-09 as per their Location Predominantly in SC/ ST / Minority/ Others Areas	11
<b>CHAPTER-2</b>		
2.1	Comparison of PES data with DISE data on School Particulars	30
2.2	Comparison of PES data with DISE data on Teachers in Position	31
2.3	Comparison of PES data with DISE data on Status of School Building	31
2.4	Comparison of PES data with DISE data on Number of Classrooms	32
2.5	Comparison of PES data with DISE data on Children Enrollment	32
2.6	Comparison of PES data with DISE data on SC Children Enrollment	33
2.7	Comparison of PES data with DISE data on ST Children Enrollment	33
2.8	Comparison of PES data with DISE data on Number of Repeaters	34
2.9	Comparison of PES data with DISE data on Enrollment of Children with Disabilities	34
2.10	Comparison of PES data with DISE data on Annual Examination Results in Grade V & VII of the year 2007-08	35
2.11	Comparison of PES data with DISE data on School Particulars in Angul District	36
2.12	Percentage Deviation and Percentage Precision of DISE data in respect of PES data on Selected Comparable Items in Angul District	36
2.13	Comparison of PES data with DISE data on School Particulars in Rayagada District	37
2.14	Percentage Deviation and Percentage Precision of DISE data in respect of PES data on Selected Comparable Items in Rayagada District	37
2.15	Comparison of PES data with DISE data on School Particulars in Mayurbhanj District	38

2.16	Percentage Deviation and Percentage Precision of DISE data in respect of PES data on Selected Comparable Items in Mayurbhanj District	38
2.17	Comparison of PES data with DISE data on School Particulars in Sample Districts	39
2.18	Percentage Deviation and Percentage Precision of DISE data in respect of PES data on Selected Comparable Items in Sample Districts	39

### CHAPTER-3

3.1	Quality of Initial Response of P/HT to the Investigators During PES, 2008-09	52
3.2	Quality of Initial Response of P/HT to Provide Information During PES, 2008-09	52
3.3	Extent of Availability of Records at Schools on the Day of PES, 2008-09	53
3.4	Quality of Conditions of Records Maintained at Schools on the Day of PES, 2008-09	53
3.5	Quality of Updation of Records Maintained at Schools on the Day of PES, 2008-09	54
3.6	Extent of Principal / Head Teacher Received Training on DISE in 2008-09	54
3.7	Level of Organization of DISE Training in 2008-09	55
3.8	Duration of DISE Training in 2008-09	55
3.9	Category of Trainers giving Training on DISE in 2008-09	56
3.10	Extent of Explanation of DCF during DISE Training in 2008-09	56
3.11	Extent of Doubts Removed During DISE Training in 2008-09	57
3.12	Extent of Schools Where the DISE DCF had been filled up by the Same Teacher Who had got DISE Training in 2008-09	57
3.13	Extent of Schools Received School Summary Report (SSR) of 2008-09	57
3.14	Extent of Schools Having DISE Format with Filled in Data of 2008-09	58
3.15	Extent of Schools Having School Display Board	58
3.16	Extent of Schools Mentioned DISE Data in School Display Board (SDB) on the Day of Visit of PES Study Team in 2008-09	58

---

## LIST OF ANNEXURES

Annexure No.	TITLE	Page No.
1.1	District Information System for Education Special DCF for Post Enumeration Survey	12-13
1.2	Investigator's Feedback Schedule	14-16
1.3	School Observation Schedule	17-18
2.1	List of Schools of Mayurbhanj District whose Head Teachers have made no entry of Data against the item, Status of School Building, in the DISE DCF of 2008-09	40

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

BRC	:	Block Resource Centre
CRC	:	Cluster Resource Centre
BRCC	:	Block Resource Centre Coordinator
CRCC	:	Cluster Resource Centre Coordinator
DCF	:	Data Capture Format
DI of schools	:	District Inspector of schools
DISE	:	District Information System for Education
DPEP	:	District Primary Education Programme
DPC	:	District Project Coordinator
DRP	:	District Resource Person
EMIS	:	Education Management Information System
HM	:	Head Master
HT	:	Head Teacher
HS	:	High School
MIS	:	Management Information System
MDM	:	Mid Day Meal
MPL	:	Municipality
NUEPA	:	National University of Educational Planning and Administration
NAC	:	Notified Area Council
OPEPA	:	Orissa Primary Education Programme Authority
PES	:	Post Enumeration Survey
PS	:	Primary School
SPO	:	State Project Office
SSA	:	Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan
SC	:	Scheduled Caste
ST	:	Scheduled Tribe
UEE	:	Universalization of Elementary Education
UP	:	Upper Primary
VEC	:	Village Education Committee

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan aims to provide quality elementary education to all children of 6-14 years age. The strategy of SSA covers universal access and enrolment, retention of children upto 14 years of age and universal improvement in the achievement level/ quality of education. In order to achieve these objectives in a planned way, Annual Work Plan and Budget is prepared at District and State levels. Availability of updated information on School, Teacher and Children and analysis of data to generate different useful educational indicators plays a vital role to achieve the goals of Universalisation of Elementary Education. District Information System for Education (DISE) is the valuable and unique source of educational data and through OPEPA, it is generated in Orissa since the inception of SSA. DISE data contain detailed educational scenario in a computerized form for Cluster, Block, District and State and carry complete information of each school, student, teacher and school infrastructure. In view of the importance of DISE data, updating the data every year and maintaining the updated information in the data base is a regular activity which not only provides the current status of educational indicators, but also gives a compared figure on indicators in support of achievements for UEE. DISE data are equally required to prepare the Annual Work Plan and Budget each year and thus help in prioritizing the activities of SSA. The Head Teachers, CRCCs and BRCCs are given training on collection of DISE data for ensuring correctness of data. Against this backdrop, the present Post Enumeration Survey (PES) on 5% of Sample Checking of DISE data of 2008-09 in Orissa has been undertaken to identify the sources of possible errors in DISE data collection and to find out measures to ensure correctness of data. The specific objectives of the study are:

1. To cross-check the DISE data with the PES data and to find out the deviation as well as the precision levels.
2. To make field level observations on:
  - a) Cooperation of Principal/Head Teacher in providing data.
  - b) Status of records of schools.
  - c) Training of Principal / Head Teacher in filling-up of DISE data.
  - d) Availability of infrastructure and computer professionals in the District MIS unit.
  - e) Data feeding arrangement made at District level.

- f) Feedback to schools in terms of School Report Cards.
  - g) Availability of DISE data at all levels.
  - h) Evidence of sharing workshops at all levels for dissemination and awareness about DISE data.
  - i) Display of key information on the School Display / Information Board.
  - j) Use of DISE data in planning.
3. To identify the major lacunae in conducting the DISE activities and in the formats used for both DISE and PES that caused for (i) occurrence of variations between DISE data and PES data and for (ii) collection of some data through the PES that are irrelevant for cross-checking the DISE data.
  4. To suggest measures to reduce the extent of deviation between DISE data and PES data.
  5. To recommend the changes to be made in improving the DISE and PES operations as well as formats especially to make them more effective for cross-checking and for making the DISE data more relevant for preparing Annual Work Plan and Budget by improving its quality.

The study is confined to 3 Districts viz. Angul, Mayurbhanj and Rayagada of Orissa. As per PES guidelines, out of these 3 sample Districts, one District (Mayurbhanj) has the literacy rate below the State literacy rate, one District (Angul) has the literacy rate above the State literacy rate and another District (Rayagada) is one among the Special Focus Districts. For the purpose of PES, 401 schools were selected randomly covering 217 schools, 91 schools and 93 schools of Mayurbhanj, Angul and Rayagada Districts respectively and the total sample schools of each District represented about 5% of schools belonging each Block and ULB which included all types of schools across school management. While selecting schools due consideration has been given to rural and urban category and schools predominantly located in SC, ST and minority areas.

Three prescribed data collection formats provided by SPO were used for data collection. Besides, a few CRCCs and BRCCs were interviewed to elicit their views on their role in DISE activity and on the difficulties faced by the Head Teachers during training, data collection and data entry. Their suggestions were also taken on how to overcome these difficulties so as to make the DISE data more authentic in the subsequent years. In the next stage the DCFs filled in with DISE data of sample schools covered under PES were

collected from the DPOs of Angul, Mayurbhanj and Rayagada Districts and then processed in computers. Comparison between DISE and PES data was made to identify the number of schools showing variations on selected items. The percentage deviation and percentage precision were calculated and the reasons for such deviations were identified so as to suggest corrective measures to improve the qualitative aspects of the DISE activity in future.

The comparison of DISE and PES data 2008-09 has revealed that the DISE data differ from PES data in 7.23 per cent schools in case of year of establishment, 4.99 per cent schools in case of school category, 2.00 per cent in type of school, 1.5 per cent on lowest class, 3.74 per cent on highest class and 4.99 per cent on 'school management'. Further, it reveals that the percentage deviation of DISE data from PES data is 2.36 per cent on Teachers in position, 5.24 per cent on status of school building, 6.64 per cent on number of classrooms, 0.50 per cent on children enrollment, 0.43 per cent on SC children enrollment, 0.67 per cent on ST children enrollment, 28.70 per cent on number of repeaters, 29.84 per cent on enrollment of children with disabilities and 0.82 per cent on last year annual examination results. Inter District variations show a mixed trend on the above items. At aggregate level the percentage deviation of the DISE data from PES data is found to be highest in Rayagada District followed by Mayurbhanj and Angul District. In many cases, due care has not been taken by the Head Teacher in filling up the DISE data and proper verification of DISE data has not been made by the CRCCs and BRCCs. The high level mismatch on items like number of repeaters and enrollment of children with disabilities have occurred due to wrong or no entry of data in DISE format and improper cross-checking of DISE data by the concerned CRCC, BRCC and other supervising personnel.

A positive mindset of Principal / Head Teacher is required for accurate and timely DISE data collection. At aggregate level, 61.10 per cent of sample Head Teachers/ Principals have shown very good initial response to the PES study team. Inter District variation exists with substantially higher percentage of sample Head Teachers / Principals of Mayurbhanj and Angul exhibiting very good initial response than their counterparts in Rayagada District. Again, 11.72 per cent of sample schools showed a very good status on maintaining the records of the schools as compared to 68.08 per cent in good category. The extent of availability of records is relatively better in Mayurbhanj District than in Angul and Rayagada Districts. With regard to training aspect of Principal / Head Teacher in filling up of DISE data, 78.30 per

cent of Head Teachers have received the training either at Cluster or at Block level. All the sample Districts have the requisite softwares for DISE data entry and these softwares have been provided by State MIS Unit. The prescribed arrangements have been made in the sample Districts to provide computerized School Report Card.

In Mayurbhanj District substantially lower proportion of sample schools (39.17 %) showed the school copy of the DISE DCF data to the PES team on the day of visit whereas all the sample schools in Rayagada and Angul did not have their own copy. It was made available at the concerned DPO. The PES team further found that the compiled DISE data of 2008-09 were not available at any of the CRC and BRC of Angul, Rayagada and Mayurbhanj Districts. However, DPOs have planned to provide Block level and Cluster level compiled DISE data to BRCs and CRCs respectively later on. In Mayurbhanj and Rayagada Districts, DPOs had conducted District level sharing workshop with BRCCs and CRCCs. VEC and MTA members had not been invited at CRC level to make an effort to disseminate and create awareness on DISE data. This activity was yet to start in Angul District till the completion of PES. Further, it is revealed that 76.06 per cent of the sample schools have School Display Board/ Information Board. The data on students' enrollment, students' attendance, teachers in position and grants received have been displayed in 82.30 per cent, 51.48 per cent, 83.93 per cent and 41.97 per cent of sample schools respectively even though all schools are required to display such information. Despite organization of DISE training and sufficient consciousness of Principals/ Head Teachers on the DISE activity, mismatch between DISE and PES data has been found on almost all items of comparable data.

One of the major lacunae in conducting DISE activities this year was delay in its execution, which affected the smooth and timely initiation of DISE data filling at school points. This has ultimately resulted in no preparation of plan at Habitation, Cluster and Block levels this year. Discussion on DCF guideline was partially done in Angul, Rayagada and Mayurbhanj Districts during the DISE training. Detailed explanation and doubt clarification of the DCF guidelines and concepts were not done during the training. Owing to short duration of time for data filling and cross-checking, some BRCCs and CRCCs could not properly rectify the mistakes done by the Head Teachers in the DCFs of some schools. The CRCCs had also not collected DISE data from a few private aided, private unaided, unrecognized and other categories of schools because of non-co-operation of Head Teachers of these schools. Lack of

requisite number of regular Data Entry Operators in Mayurbhanj District also resulted in a delay in computerization of DISE data. Some defects were noticed in the PES as well as DISE formats. For instance, the PES format does not have space to collect data on enrollment up to High School as has been obtained through the DISE DCFs. The data relating to water supply to toilet, school dress grant, availability of pucca kitchen shed-cum-store cannot be collected in the DISE format for 2008-09 even though such information are necessary for planning. Data pertaining to the items namely, number of computers available and used by children, number of untrained teachers not received refresher training for 60 days and number of newly recruited teachers not obtained 30 days induction training, which are also relevant for planning, are not obtained in the DISE DCF. Further, data on students' attendance and enrollment of the day of visit of the PES team and examination data of Class I, II, III, IV, VI and VIII collected through PES became irrelevant to cross-check the DISE data, because these has not been collected the DISE DCF used this year.

## **Recommendations**

All the preparatory activities pertaining to DISE data filling and entry should be completed prior to the end of September every year. DISE data filling should be completed by second week of October. The data entry activity is to be completed by the end of November each year. The school copy of DISE DCF should be returned to schools immediately after completion of the Custer level data compilation. SPO may instruct the DPOs to utilize the TDP meetings of April/ May for the teachers to clarify their doubts relating to data filling. The DISE training should be conducted for one full day each for BRCCs, CRCCs, Data Entry Operators and Head Teachers. The CRCCs and BRCCs should be instructed to certify the DCFs only after verifying the correct entry of data on all items. The conceptual explanations given in the PES guidelines should be same as those of DISE DCF guidelines. The PES format should be redesigned to collect the required data from High Schools having Upper Primary level of education and to avoid collection of data that would be irrelevant for cross-checking the DISE data. The DISE DCF should be restructured to collect data which are relevant for planning, pertaining to the items namely, number of computers available and used by children, number of untrained teachers not received refresher training for 60 days, number of newly recruited teachers not obtained 30 days induction training, water supply to toilet, school dress grant, civil work grant, availability of kitchen shed-cum-store and some items on MDM activity.







# Location of Orissa in India and Sample Districts in Orissa



# CHAPTER-1

## INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan and DISE Data:

During the last decade of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century, the Government of India gave special emphasis on promoting education for all at primary level. In view of this, some innovative programmes like Lok Jumbish, DPEP, Janshala, Bihar Education Programme, Operation Black Board etc. were launched to experiment their impact as well as efficacy. The findings of such programmes gave a boost to the Government of India who then launched the Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan programme in 2001-02 all over the country to provide elementary education to all children of 6 to 14 years of age. The major goals were identified as (i) universal enrollment by the end of 2003, (ii) universal retention up to Class VIII by 2010, (iii) bridging up the gender as well as social gaps in elementary education, and (iv) promoting quality education. In order to achieve these targets in a planned way, every year each State / UT prepares an Annual Work Plan and Budget. Each District of every State/UT also prepares it. These plans are then appraised and approved at national level by the Project Approval Board and thereafter funds are released accordingly to the State /UT Governments to carry out activities as approved by the Project Approval Board.

In order to facilitate the preparation of the Annual Work Plan and Budget, certain data are required especially relating to child population, schooling facilities, infrastructure availability at schools, different categories and extents of enrollment, examination performances etc. These data are gathered by 02 methods, namely child census/ child tracking system and DISE data collection. Like the Annual Work Plan and Budget, the DISE data are collected every year and utilized for Annual Work Plan preparation. Needless to say, the DISE data are collected prior to preparation of the Annual Work Plan and Budget.

The DISE data collection process begins at school level and are then compiled at Cluster, Block, District and State levels. Each level of DISE data are utilized for preparation of the Annual Work Plan of that level. Basically the DISE data are collected in a structured format, furnished with a detailed guideline of data entry and explanation of the terms used in the format. The data are of different categories, such as (i) location related, (ii) enrollment

related, (iii) staff position related, (iv) infrastructure related, (v) examination related, (vi) grants related, (vii) textbook distribution related etc. The DISE data collection no doubt is an important but mandatory activity of Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan programme.

### **1.2 Importance of DISE Data:**

In India DISE data are the only nation-based data-base to assess the quantity of both infrastructure and quality education facilities available and the progress achieved at different spatial as well as temporal levels. As stated in the previous para, these data are absolutely required to prepare the Annual Work Plan and Budget every year. These data give a picture of the infrastructure and learning achievement and thus help in prioritizing the activities of Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan.

The DISE data are also very useful in monitoring the implementation of activities of Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan. To the researchers, these data are helpful to make a comparative analysis of different aspects of elementary education across both Districts and States and find out the reasons for differential degrees of progress of these aspects. Further, these data are sound source to analyze the efficacy of the Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan programme at various spatial levels.

### **1.3 Authenticity of DISE Data and the Need of PES:**

Success of Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan programme greatly depends upon the credibility of Annual Work Plan and Budget which in turn largely depends on the authenticity of the DISE data. Thus one of the prime objectives of the Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan is to collect true and dependable DISE data. This certainly would become possible when the Data Capture Formats would be properly filled in with correct data. In order to make it possible, every DISE Data Capture Format has been structurally designed as far as possible with closed questions and each concept has been explained in an attached guidelines. Further, the data entry personnels at different levels, such as the Head Teachers, CRCCs and BRCCs are given training on DISE data entry. Besides, after the completion of the DISE data entry at school level, the CRCCs, BRCCs and DIs of schools supervise and certify the correctness of the data. Despite all precautionary measures taken at different levels, it had been pointed out by different studies that some of the DISE data were not authentic and hence were

questionable. The Government of India then decided to take up a Post Enumeration Survey of some selected school level data from 5% sample schools with a purpose to cross-check these data that have already been collected in the school level DISE DCF. It is now mandatory for all states and UTs to check the DISE data on sample basis.

Post Enumeration Survey is not just concerned with the cross-checking of the DISE data for unraveling the areas of defective data entry. It also aims at identifying the main reasons that caused for defective data entry in DISE DCFs and to find out the possible measures that can reduce the extent of such defective data entry in future. Like the DISE data collection, the Post Enumeration Survey has now become an activity of every year undertaken not by the agency that implements Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan in different States / UTs but by an external agency not involved in implementation of SSA.

#### **1.4 Process of Undertaking PES:**

The whole process of PES involved 03 stages. In the stage 1, preparatory activities were conducted. The first activity of this stage was a discussion between the PES team with the SPO authorities, especially those concerned with the DISE activity, on the strategy, concepts, sampling, data collection, data analysis, report design, draft report presentation and submission of the final report. Although it was initially proposed to complete PES by 03 months but it was decided to complete the work by 02 months, i.e. by the end of February, 2009. It was a much difficult task especially because in 2008-09 in the State, the DISE data collection at school level took place in December 2008 and data compilation process at District level was not over when PES was started. Despite such situation, the PES team conducted its second preparatory activity, i.e. training to the PES team members on the data collection strategy and concepts used in the PES formats for 02 days. At the same time, letters were communicated to the DPOs of the Districts, namely Mayurbhanj, Rayagada and Angul, for making necessary arrangements to facilitate smooth operation of PES and for providing the Block / ULB wise and management wise school list. During this time, the printing work of the PES formats and guidelines as provided by the SPO was made over.

The stage 2 of PES involved data collection at different levels. Three prescribed formats (Annexures 1.1 to 1.3) provided by the SPO were

used for collection of data at school level. Besides, from a few CRCCs and BRCCs data were collected especially relating to their role in PES, capacity building for PES, difficulties faced by Head Teachers in data collection, problems faced while training the Head Teachers on DISE data entry and finally relating to their suggestions to overcome these difficulties so as to make the DISE data more authentic in the subsequent years. The District Programmers as well as the District Project Coordinators of the sample Districts were also interacted to know about the DISE data collection process, about availability of adequate staffs, softwares and hardwares for conducting DISE activity etc.

During the stage 3 of PES, the DCFs filled in with DISE data of the sample schools covered under PES were brought from the DPOs of Mayurbhanj, Rayagada and Angul. The data collected through PES and by DISE activities were entered into computers and then compared to identify the number of schools showing variations for the comparable items of PES. The percentage deviation and the percentage precision for each comparable item were then calculated and the nature of such deviation was then explained. The major reasons of such deviation were then identified and the opinions of various levels of personnel concerned with DISE activity were gathered to know the major weakness in the DCFs and the process of DISE operation. Finally, some measures were identified basing upon the opinion of DISE activity operating personnel as well as our own observation and analysis and then suggested to improve the qualitative aspects of the DISE activity in future. The draft PES report was presented and discussed at State level and then the final PES report was prepared.

### **1.5 Study Area and the Sample:**

The DISE data collection has been done all over the State covering all management categories of schools and in view of this, all schools imparting elementary level of education covering Class I to Class VIII students have been covered in 2008-09. But to cross-check the correctness of the DISE data collected at schools, all schools are not required to be visited. As already decided by the Government of India, only a sample of the total schools is to be covered for PES and the sample schools need not be covered from all Districts of the State. As a matter of fact, the Government of India has delineated since 2006-07 onwards to cover only 10% of the total Districts of the

State and only 5% schools of each sample Districts for PES. But the District sample should include 5% schools of total schools of each Block / ULB. Further, at District level, the sample schools should include all types of schools across school management.

In the context of Orissa, 03 Districts were selected by the SPO (i.e. OPEPA) for PES since the State has 30 Districts. As per the PES guidelines, 01 of these Districts should be from among the Districts that have literacy rate below the State Literacy Rate, the 2<sup>nd</sup> being one among the Districts having Literacy Rate above the State literacy rate, and the 3<sup>rd</sup> being one among the Special Focus Districts. Keeping this principle in view, the SPO had identified Mayurbhanj (1<sup>st</sup> Category), Rayagada (3<sup>rd</sup> Category) and Angul (2<sup>nd</sup> Category) for the PES of 2008-09. Hence, the data collection activity for PES was conducted in these 03 Districts. For the purpose of PES, all total 401(5.01%) schools were covered selecting them from 7919 schools by purposive random sampling method after classifying them into different Blocks / ULBs. Random sampling was operated in such a way that the total sample schools in each District represented about 05% of schools belonging to each Block and ULB and also to each category of school management. The details of sample schools are reflected in the Tables 1.1 and 1.2. Further, care has been taken to take sample schools from both rural and urban areas. While selecting the schools, due consideration has also been given to schools predominantly located in SC, ST and minority areas. The sample includes 238 schools (59.35 %) from these areas out of the total 401 sample schools (Table 1.3).

## **1.6 Objectives of Study:**

The study has been conducted with the following objectives:

1. To cross-check the DISE data with the PES data and to find out the deviation as well as the precision levels.
2. To make field level observations on:
  - a) Cooperation of Principal/Head Teacher in providing data.
  - b) Status of records of schools.
  - c) Training of Principal / Head Teacher in filling-up of DISE data.

- d) Availability of infrastructure and computer professionals in the District MIS unit.
  - e) Data feeding arrangement made at District level.
  - f) Feedback to schools in terms of School Report Cards.
  - g) Availability of DISE data at all levels.
  - h) Evidence of sharing workshops at all levels for dissemination and awareness about DISE data.
  - i) Display of key information on the School Display / Information Board.
  - j) Use of DISE data in planning.
3. To identify the major lacunae in conducting the DISE activities and in the formats used for both DISE and PES that caused for (i) occurrence of variations between DISE data and PES data and for (ii) collection of some data through the PES that are irrelevant for cross-checking the DISE data.
  4. To suggest measures to reduce the extent of deviation between DISE data and PES data.
  5. To recommend the changes to be made in improving the DISE and PES operations as well as formats especially to make them more effective for cross-checking and for making the DISE data more relevant for preparing Annual Work Plan and Budget by improving its quality.

### **1.7 Problems Encountered During the Study:**

The PES activity was conducted simultaneously by 03 study teams; one in each of the 03 sample Districts with the support provided by the SPO and the 03 DPOs. Virtually no problem was faced by the study teams, while conducting the PES. The only one problem faced was that the PES formats was not adequately prepared to collect data from High Schools with upper primary classes and to classify teachers taking equal number of classes in primary and upper primary sections.

### **1.8 Limitations of the Study:**

The Study has the following limitations:

1. The cross-checking of all categories of DISE data collected in the school level DCF has not been made. For instance, the data relating to school funds, school equipment and furniture, teachers' qualification and

- training, free uniforms, MDM etc. have not been cross-checked by PES. It is because the prescribed PES format has not included these items.
2. The data reflected in the report pertain only to the period of PES conducted in the sample Districts. The findings relating to some items like availability of school summary report and school copy of DISE DCF, sharing of DISE data with VEC members, reflection of DISE data in School Information Board collected during PES may differ from the data collected on same items after PES. Hence these data are time-specific and do not reveal an all-time situation.
  3. The PES is a sample survey and not a total survey of data. Hence, its findings give an overall picture and not exact picture about the qualitative and quantitative defects of DISE data.

### **1.9 Chapter Arrangement:**

The data collected by PES have been tabulated, cross-checked with the DISE data, analyzed and then presented in all total 05 chapters. The Chapter 1, an introductory chapter has delineated a discussion on 09 items, such as (i) Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan and DISE data, (2) importance of DISE data, (3) authenticity of DISE data and the need of PES, (4) process of undertaking the study, (5) study area and the sample, (6) objectives of the study, (7) problems encountered during the study, (8) limitations of the study and (9) chapter arrangement. The details of findings of comparison between the DISE and PES data have been presented in Chapter-2. In Chapter-3, the findings of field level observations made by the study team relating to various aspects as delineated in the objective 3 have been described. The Chapter-4 throws a light on the major lacunae in conducting the DISE operation and PES. In Chapter 5, policy recommendations have been suggested for reducing defects in DISE data and for improving the quality of PES.

**Table 1.1: Percentage of Schools Covered for PES, 2008-09 Across the Blocks and ULBs**

Sl. No.	Name of the Districts	Name of Block / ULB	Total No. of Schools in Position as per DPO	No. of Schools Covered for PES	% of Schools Covered for PES	
A	ANGUL	1	ANGUL	231	12	5.19
		2	ATHAMALLIK	223	11	4.93
		3	BANARPAL	193	10	5.18
		4	CHHENDIPADA	240	12	5.00
		5	KANIHA	229	11	4.80
		6	KISHORENAGAR	188	9	4.79
		7	PALLAHARA	256	13	5.08
		8	TALCHER	168	8	4.76
		9	ANGUL NAC	33	2	6.06
		10	ATHAMALLIK NAC	14	1	7.14
		11	TALCHER NAC	33	2	6.06
				12	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1808</b>
B	RAYAGADA	1	BISSAMCUTTACK	202	11	5.45
		2	CHANDRAPUR	99	5	5.05
		3	GUDARI	109	5	4.59
		4	GUNUPUR	163	8	4.91
		5	K.SINGPUR	140	7	5.00
		6	KASIPUR	225	11	4.89
		7	KOLNARA	160	8	5.00
		8	MUNIGUDA	160	8	5.00
		9	PADAMPUR	125	6	4.80
		10	RAMANAGUDA	143	7	4.90
		11	RAYAGADA	227	11	4.85
		12	GUDARI NAC	14	1	7.14
		13	RAYAGADA MPLT	57	3	5.26
		14	GUNUPUR NAC	37	2	5.41
				15	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1861</b>

Source: DPO data of Angul, Rayagada and Mayurbhanj Districts and PES, 2008-09

Contd....

Sl. No.	Name of the Districts	Name of Block / ULB	Total No. of Schools in Position as per DPO	No. of Schools Covered for PES	% of Schools Covered for PES	
C	MAYURBHANJ	1	KARANJIA	157	8	5.10
		2	KUSUMI	164	8	4.88
		3	SAMAKHUNTA	124	8	6.45
		4	MORADA	193	10	5.18
		5	BIJATOLA	132	6	4.55
		6	BARIPADA	103	7	6.80
		7	TIRINGI	92	4	4.35
		8	RAIRANGPUR	116	6	5.17
		9	BISOI	141	7	4.96
		10	G.B.NAGAR	157	8	5.10
		11	JAMADA	111	6	5.41
		12	RASGOBINDPUR	173	8	4.62
		13	KULIANA	157	8	5.10
		14	BARASAH	247	12	4.86
		15	SULIAPADA	159	8	5.03
		16	BANGIRIPOSI	193	10	5.18
		17	KAPTIPADA	235	12	5.11
		18	BETNOTI	216	11	5.09
		19	THAKURMUNDA	190	9	4.74
		20	SUKURULI	117	6	5.13
		21	RARUAN	137	7	5.11
		22	SARASKANA	172	9	5.23
		23	UDALA BLOCK	142	8	5.63
		24	KHUNTA	138	7	5.07
		25	JOSHIPUR	188	9	4.79
		26	BAHALADA	142	7	4.93
		27	KARANJIA (NAC)	24	1	4.17
		28	BARIPADA (MPLT)	81	4	4.94
		29	RAIRANGPUR( NAC)	32	2	6.25
		30	UDALA (NAC)	17	1	5.88
		31	<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>4250</b>	<b>217</b>

Source: DPO data of Angul, Rayagada and Mayurbhanj Districts and PES, 2008-09

**Table 1.2: Percentage of Schools Covered for PES, 2008-09 Across School Management Categories**

Sl. No.	School Management Category	Angul District			Rayagada District			Mayurbhanj District			Total		
		No. of Schools in Position as Per DPO data	No. of Schools Covered for PES		No. of Schools in Position as Per DPO data	No. of Schools Covered for PES		No. of Schools in Position as Per DPO data	No. of Schools Covered for PES		No. of Schools in Position as Per DPO data	No. of Schools Covered for PES	
			N	(%)		N	(%)		N	(%)		N	(%)
1	Department of Education	1492	76	5.09	1627	75	4.61	3707	188	5.07	6826	339	4.96
2	Tribal/ Social Welfare Department	46	2	4.35	129	7	5.43	137	7	5.10	312	16	5.12
3	Local Body	14	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	77	0	0.00	91	0	0.00
4	Private Aided	66	3	4.55	30	0	0.00	145	7	4.82	241	10	4.14
5	Private Unaided	130	6	4.62	41	7	17.07	134	12	8.95	305	25	8.19
6	Others	38	2	5.26	28	3	10.71	30	2	6.67	96	7	7.29
7	Un-recognized	22	2	9.09	6	1	16.67	20	1	5.00	48	4	8.33
8	<b>Total</b>	<b>1808</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>5.03</b>	<b>1861</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>5.00</b>	<b>4250</b>	<b>217</b>	<b>5.10</b>	<b>7919</b>	<b>401</b>	<b>5.06</b>

Source: DPO data of Angul, Rayagada and Mayurbhanj Districts and PES, 2008-09

**Table 1.3: Distribution of Sample Schools of PES, 2008-09 as per their Location Predominantly in SC/ ST / Minority / Others Areas**

Sl. No.	Name of Districts	No. of Sample schools covered for PES	No. of sample schools located Predominantly in							
			SC area		ST area		Minority area		Other area	
			<b>N</b>	<b>(%)</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>(%)</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>(%)</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>(%)</b>
1	Angul	91	7	7.69	14	15.38	1	1.10	69	75.82
2	Rayagada	93	20	21.51	52	55.91	1	1.08	20	21.51
3	Mayurbhanj	217	4	1.84	136	62.67	3	1.38	74	34.10
<b>4</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>401</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>7.73</b>	<b>202</b>	<b>50.37</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1.25</b>	<b>163</b>	<b>40.65</b>

Source: PES, 2008-09

## Annexure-1.1

### District Information System for Education Special DCF for Post Enumeration Survey

Academic Year  School Code

District Code

**A. School Location Particulars**

1. Village Name / Ward No. \_\_\_\_\_
2. Block /Municipality/ NAC Name \_\_\_\_\_
3. Rural / Urban (1/2)
4. School pre dominantly located in SC (1) / ST (2) / Minority (3)/ Others (4) area

**B. School Particulars**

1. School Name \_\_\_\_\_
2. Year of Establishment of School
3. School Category 
  - Primary (1)/ Primary with upper primary (2)/Primary with Upper Primary and Secondary or Higher Secondary (3)/ Upper Primary Only (4) /Upper Primary with Secondary or Higher Secondary (5)/ Others (6)
4. Type of School 
  - School for Boys only (1) /School for Girls only (2)/ Co-educational (3)
5. Lowest class in the school
6. Highest class in the school
7. Managed by

Education Department (1)/ Tribal Welfare Department (2) / Local body (3) / Private Aided (4) / Private Unaided (5) / Others (6)/ Unrecognized (7) / No response (9)

	Primary	Upper Primary
8. Total Students	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>
9. Total SC Students in Classes	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>
10. Total ST Students in Classes	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>
11. Total Students with disabilities	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>

**C. Teacher in Position**

Category (for teacher in position only)

	Primary		Upper Primary	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
a. Principal /Head teacher	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
b. Teachers (excluding head teacher)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

**D. VEC / SMC Composition**

	Total	Male		Female	
Total members (including HT)	_____	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
SC members	_____	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
ST members	_____	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
No. of VEC meetings held in the last three months (dt.01/07/08 to 30/09/08)		<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

**E. Facilities**

1. Type of school building [Pucca (1))/ Partially Pucca (2) / Kuccha (3)/ Tent (4)/ No Building (5)]
2. Status of school building [Private (1)/ Rented (2)/ Government (3)]
3. Number of class-rooms

**F. Enrollment (All students) as on 30.09.08**

Class	Class 1		Class 2		Class 3		Class 4		Class 5		Class 6		Class 7		Class 8	
	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G
No. of Section																
Total Enrollment																
Total repeaters																
SC Children enrolled																
ST Children enrolled																
Students given free textbooks																
Children with disabilities enrolled																

B: Boys  
G: Girls

## Annexure -1.2

### Investigator's Feedback Schedule

School Code:

1. Date of visit to the school: \_\_\_\_\_
2. Was the school open on the day of the visit      Yes       No
3. If no when was the school visited second time (Date) \_\_\_\_\_
4. Was the school open on the second visit      Yes       No

*(In case the school was closed on both the days, contact the supervisor for replacement of the school to be surveyed. Replacement should be resorted only in exceptional cases.)*

**5. Attribute/s pertaining to the Principal (P) Head Teacher (HT) and the investigator:**

Attribute	Responses from the school				
	Very good	Good	Average	Poor	Very poor
Initial reaction of the P/HT					
Response of the P/HT to provide information					
Availability of records					
Condition of records maintained					
Updation of records maintained					

**6A. Children enrolled/ attending School on the day of the Survey (Dt. \_\_\_\_\_)**

Class	Enrolment					
	Total		SC		ST	
	B	G	B	G	B	G
Class I						
Class II						
Class III						
Class IV						
Class V						
Class VI						
Class VII						
Class VIII						

B: Boys

G: Girls

**'Enrolment'** means, the number of the children on roll as entered in the school register on the day of survey.



8. Number of teachers present on the day of visit (dt. \_\_\_\_\_)

--	--

9. Grades for which annual examination is conducted (take details w.r.to the annual examination held on March 2008)

No. of Students	Class 1		Class 2		Class 3		Class 4		Class 5		Class 6		Class 7		Class8	
	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G
Enrolled at the time of Annual Exam of 2008																
Appeared at exam *																
Passed																

\* If the examination is not conducted at the end of a grade, write “NA” in the appropriate column. School following ‘no detention policy’ should indicate “NA” for grades for which examinations are not held.

**Write the reason for not conducting annual exam. in 2008.**

**Signature of FI**

**Signature of the HM  
with Seal and date**

## Annexure-1.3

### School Observation Schedule

School Code:

Activities conducted in connection with DISE implementation i.e, for data collection corresponding to dt.30.09.2008

#### Q1.

1.1 Where was the training of HTs organized?   
Cluster (1) Block (2) District (3) No training (4)

1.2 Duration of training   
One day (1) / Two days (2) / More than two days (3)

1.3 Training conducted by   
BRCC (1)/ CRCC (2)/ District resource person (3)

1.4 Whether DCF/ Concept was explained clearly   
Yes (1) No (2) Partially (3)

1.5 Whether the doubts were fully removed   
Yes (1) No (2) Partially (3)

1.6 Whether the same teacher who obtained training provided the data for 2008-09 DISE data Capture Format for this School Yes (1) No (2)   
If no, then who did it and why she/ he did it?

**Q2.**

2.1 Did the school receive the School Summary Report Yes (1) No (2)   
If no, why ?

2.2 If yes, was it shared with the VEC? Yes (1) No (2)  if no, why ?

2.3 Did the school summary report reflect the real situation in the school?  
Yes (1) No (2)

If no, which items are not properly / correctly reflected in the report? Find out the reason for not reflecting correctly.

**Q3.**

3.1 No. of visits by CRC coordinator to the school in the last three months  
July 08  Aug.08  Sept.08  Total

3.2 No. of teachers who received in-service training under SSA and DPEP in 2007-08

**Q4.**

Did the school have the DISE format with filled in data of 2008-09 ?   
Yes (1) No (2)

If no, why ?

**Q5.**

Does the school have a school display board ?   
Yes (1) No (2)

If Yes, does the school display board have data on Yes (1) No (2)

- (a) Students' enrollment
- (b) Students' daily attendance
- (c) Teachers' in position
- (d) Grants received

# **CHAPTER-2**

## **DISE AND PES DATA COMPARISON**

During the Post Enumeration Survey (PES) in 2008-09, data relating to the preparedness to DISE activity, to the use of DISE data and to some aspects of schools have been collected in the data capturing schedules/formats prescribed especially for the PES. In view of this, the PES and DISE data have become comparable only to some aspects of school. The comparison of the two categories of data has been delineated in this chapter highlighting the extent of deviation between them. This has been made in Section-I of this chapter. In Section-II of this chapter, a revelation has been made on the overall deviation on different items at District and aggregate levels.

### **Section – I**

#### **2.1 Extent of Deviation between DISE and PES data**

In this study the DISE and PES data of 2008-09 have been compared in respect of some selected items as prescribed for the study. These include: (1) year of establishment (2) school category, (3) type of school, (4) lowest class, (5) highest class, (6) management status, (7) teachers in position, (8) status of school building, (9) number of classroom, (10) children enrollment, (11) SC children enrollment, (12) ST children enrollment, (13) number of repeaters, (14) enrollment of children with disabilities and (15) examination results. The deviation on School code, District code, Village name /Ward number and Block name between the PES data and DISE data are not compared because these are made fixed for each school as communicated by OPEPA. Similarly the Block, MPL/ NAC name, School name, Rural / Urban parameters are fixed as per School Master List. Thus no further investigation is required to find out any deviation during DISE survey and PES survey. The item viz. type of school building in PES has no corresponding similarity in the DISE format. So, the data obtained on this item are not comparable.

### **2.1.1 Year of Establishment:**

The Head Teachers have in 29 (7.23%) out of 401 schools made wrong / no entry of the data relating to year of establishment of school in the DISE format. This has happened especially in some very old schools that do not have any authentic evidence regarding the year of establishment. In some UGME schools the Head Teacher has mentioned the year when the school got UGME status but not the year when the school was first established. For example, the Ashram School of Munikhol, Muniguda Block was first established in 1954 as a Sevashram School imparting only primary level education but in 1986, it was upgraded to Ashram School to impart upper primary level of education. In view of this, the Head Teacher has mentioned 1986 against the item of year of establishment, considering the school as an Ashram school. There is no entry of any data against the year of establishment of the school in the DISE formats of some schools, such as (1) Tulashi Chaura UGUP School of Baripada Municipality, (2) Shri Jagannath Nodal UP School of Bansali Block and (3) Bansthali Bidyapitha of Baripada Municipality.

The District wise disaggregated data (Table 2.1) reveal that the wrong / no entry of the year of establishment in the DISE format has occurred more in Mayurbhanj District (11.06 % schools) than in Angul District (2.20 % schools) and Rayagada District (3.23% schools).

### **2.1.2 School Category:**

As regard the data entry in the item of School Category is concerned, in 20 (4.99 %) out of 401 schools, there is mismatch between DISE data and PES data (Table 2.1). In Angul District, this mismatch has been very less, limited to only 1.10 per cent schools. In Rayagada and Mayurbhanj Districts, this mismatch has been marked in a little higher percentages; viz. 6.45 per cent and 5.99 per cent respectively. This has occurred primarily because of careless / no data entry in DISE formats by the Head Teacher and irresponsible cross-checking of the DISE formats by the concerned CRCCs and BRCCs. This is evident from the following cases.

- The Anagarpur Primary School in Bissamcuttack Block of Rayagada District has only Class I to Class V level of education and hence in PES format, category 1 (i.e. primary only) status has been marked

against this school. But in DISE format, the Head Teacher has placed this school in category 3 (i.e. primary with secondary or higher secondary) and the concerned CRCC as well as the BRCC have not rectified it while cross-checking the DISE format.

- In Swami Vivekananda Sisu Mandira School of K. Singpur Block in Rayagada District, children have been enrolled from Class I to Class VI and hence the school should belong to category 2 (i.e. primary with upper primary). In PES format, the school has been placed in category 2 whereas in DISE format, it has been placed in category 1. Exactly in the same manner, the Lotus Day School of Rayagada Municipality in Rayagada District, which has Class I to Class VI level of enrollment of children, has been placed in category 2 in PES format but in category 1 in DISE format.
- In Malihata UGUP School in Morada Block of Mayurbhanj District, children have been enrolled from Class I to Class VII and hence the school should belong to category 2 (i.e. primary with upper primary). In PES format the school has therefore been placed in category 2 whereas in DISE format, it has been placed in category 3 (i.e. primary with secondary or higher secondary). The same mistake has also been noticed in Jharpokharia Project UP School of Saraskana Block in Mayurbhanj District.
- In some schools like Silda Primary School of Morada Block and Jawahar Navodaya Vidyalaya of Betnoti Block in Mayurbhanj District, no data have been entered against the item of school category in the respective DISE formats although correct entry has been made in the corresponding PES formats.

### **2.1.3 Type of School:**

The data entry relating to type of school has been correctly done in both the PES and DISE formats in all sample schools of Angul District as well as Rayagada District and hence no evidence of mismatch between DISE data and PES data has been found in these 02 Districts (Table 2.1). However, in Mayurbhanj District the mismatch has been reported in 08 (3.69%) out of 217 schools. This has occurred again due to wrong entry of

data in DISE format and improper cross-checking of DISE data by the concerned CRCC, BRCC and the DI of schools. Some cases are cited below.

- In Bahalda Government High School of Bahalda Block and Matiagarh New Government High School of Joshipur Block in Mayurbhanj District, only boys have been enrolled and hence these schools have been placed in category 1 under the item of school category in the PES format. In the DISE formats they have been placed in category 3 (i.e. coeducation).
- In Banadungri Primary School of Bahalada Block in Mayurbhanj District, both boys and girls have been enrolled as revealed from the enrollment data. Hence the school has been placed under category 3 (i.e. coeducation) in the PES format but in DISE format this school has been placed under category 2 (i.e. girls only).
- In case of Government High School of Joshipur Block in Mayurbhanj District, both boys and girls have been enrolled and hence it has been placed under category 3 (i.e. coeducation) in PES format. In the DISE format, the school has not been placed in any category.

#### **2.1.4 Lowest Class:**

The mismatch between DISE data and PES data relating to the item 'lowest class' is limited to only 06 (1.50%) out of 401 schools (Table 2.1). In each of the 03 sample Districts, this mismatch has been reported from 02 schools. Again, primarily due to careless data entry and superficial cross checking of the DISE format such mismatch has occurred. Some evidences are given below.

- In Government Girls High School of Chandrapur Block in Rayagada District, children have been enrolled from Class IV to Class X. Therefore the lowest class has been mentioned as Class IV in the PES format but in the DISE format the lowest class has been mentioned as Class II. On further investigation it has been revealed that the Head Teacher has made such entry in DISE format because the Class II children enrolled in the nearby Ashram School are now staying in the hostel of this school.

- In the NCLP School of Chandrapur Block in Rayagada District, enrollment has been made only for Class III children. Hence in the PES format, the lowest class has been mentioned as Class III whereas in the DISE format, the lowest class has been mentioned as Class I. Similar mistake has been done in case of Budasada Nuasahi NCLP Special School of Pallahara Block and Special Child Labour School of Balipatta in Chhendipada Block of Angul District.

#### **2.1.5 Highest Class:**

The Head Teachers have made more mistakes in entering data on highest class than the lowest class taught in their schools while filling up of the DISE formats. Therefore, the mismatch between DISE data and PES data on this item has been noticed in 15 (3.74 %) out of the 401 schools covered under PES (Table 2.1). The District wise disaggregated data indicate that in Mayurbhanj District this mismatch is restricted to less (1.84 %) schools than in Angul (5.49%) and Rayagada Districts (6.45%). The mismatch has occurred again because of careless data entry made by the Head Teacher and improper cross-checking by CRCC, BRCC and DI of schools. The following examples unravel it.

- In the Government Girls High School of Chandrapur Block in Rayagada District, children have been enrolled in Class X which is also revealed in both the DISE format and PES format. Hence, the highest class has been entered in PES format as Class X whereas in the DISE format, Class IX has been entered as highest class.
- In the Chandrapur NCLP school of Chandrapur Block in Rayagada District, Children have been enrolled only in Class III, which is also revealed from the enrollment data of DISE format and PES format. Hence in PES format, Class III has been entered as the highest Class whereas in the DISE format, Class V has been entered as the highest Class.
- In the Nischintapur Project UP School of Tiring Block in Mayurbhanj District, children have been enrolled up to Class VI as revealed by both DISE and PES data but in the DISE format, Class VII has been entered as the highest Class. On further investigation, it has been revealed that, the concerned Head Teacher had entered Class VII as highest class because the school is an upper primary school. This

indicates that he had no clarity regarding the guideline pertaining to entry of the highest class. The CRCC and BRCC have also not rectified it.

- In case of Sakiladihi NCLP of Rairangpur Block and Sri Sri Haribaladev Jew Sishu Mandira School of Baripada Municipality in Mayurbhanj District, no data entry has been made in the DISE format against the item of highest class and hence the mismatch between DISE data and PES data has occurred. This has occurred because DISE data have not at all been collected from these 02 schools.

#### **2.1.6 Managed by :**

The item 'managed by' indicates the category of management of school. In respect of this item, the mismatch between DISE data and PES data has occurred in 20 (4.99%) out of 401 schools (Table 2.1). In Mayurbhanj District, this mismatch has been reported from 15 (6.91 %) out of 217 schools. This is a little higher than that of Angul and Rayagada Districts, where the mismatch has been noticed only in 2.20 per cent (02 out of 91 schools) and 3.23 per cent (03 out of 93 schools) of schools respectively (Table 2.1). The main reasons of such mismatch are: (i) no data entry against the item, (2) wrong data entry against the item due to wrong understanding about different categories of management, and (3) careless data entry. The following cases indicate it.

- No data entry has been made against this item in the DISE format in some schools of Mayurbhanj District, such as (1) Raghunathganj Nodal Upper Primary School of Kuliana Block, (2) Basantpur Primary School of Joshipur Block, (3) Banadungri Primary School of Bahalda Block, (4) Silda Primary School of Morada Block, (5) Sakiladihi NCLP School of Rairangpur Block and (6) Tulasi Choura UGUP School of Baripada Municipality. This mistake has occurred because the CRCC, BRCC and DI of schools have not properly scrutinized the DISE format.
- The conceptual difference between the terms "private aided" and "private unaided" as defined in the DISE DCF guidelines has not been adequately clear and properly clarified during the DISE training. Hence, the Head Teacher of Sovamani UP (ME) School of Barasahi Block in Mayurbhanj District has categorized the school as "private

aided” in the DISE format although the school does not receive any regular maintenance grant from the government and hence truly belong to “private unaided” category. This has not been corrected by CRCC or BRCC, hopefully they need clarification. The case of Gadadhar Bidyapitha of Udala Block, Lal Mohan Upper Primary ME School of Shamakhunta Block in Mayurbhanj District and Nalini Vidya Mandir of Bissamcuttack Block in Rayagada District is also same as that of this school.

- The term ‘local body’ as defined in the DISE guidelines has not been properly explained to Head Teachers during the DISE training in 2008-09 and hence some Head Teachers have done mistake in categorizing their schools. The Head Teacher of St. Mary’s Primary School of Baripada Block has categorized the school as ‘Local Body” managed in the DISE format, thinking that the school management has been constituted of local members. The school actually is not at all managed by any Rural/ Urban Local Body like Municipality / NAC/ Gram Panchayat. It is truly, as mentioned in PES format, a private aided school. For the same reason, the Head Teacher of Anchalika Sahajoga High School of Rasgobindpur Block in Mayurbhanj District has categorized the school in the DISE format under ‘Local Body’ but truly as mentioned in the PES format, it should be kept under ‘private unaided’ category of management.
- The Jawahar Navodaya Vidyalaya of Bissamcuttack Block in Rayagada District and the Jawahar Navodaya Vidyalaya of Betnoti Block in Mayurbhanj District have been placed under the management category 1, i.e. ‘Education Department’ in the respective DISE formats by the Principal and certified by the CRCCs and BRCCs, whereas as per the DISE DCF guidelines, they should be placed under management category 6, i.e. ‘others’, as has been done in the PES format.

### **2.1.7 Teachers in Position**

Table 2.2 points out that the deviation of DISE data in this item is only 2.36 per cent from PES data. This happened because of the incorrect reporting of data by the Head Teacher of the concerned school.

### **2.1.8 Status of School Building:**

In this item, the deviation of DISE data from PES data has been 21, i.e. 5.24 per cent deviation (Table 2.3). The extent of deviation has been reported comparatively higher in Mayurbhanj District (6.91%) than in Angul District (3.30%) and Rayagada District (3.23%). The major cause of this deviation in Mayurbhanj District is that the Head Teachers have made no entry of data in 11 out of 15 schools against this item and the concerned CRCC / BRCC has not rectified it (Annexure 2.1).

### **2.1.9 Number of Classrooms:**

As regard the number of classrooms, the deviation of the DISE data is 106 (6.64%) of the PES data. This deviation exists in all the 03 Districts (Table 2.4). This deviation has occurred mainly because the Head Teachers have made entry of data arbitrarily in the DISE formats and these have not been properly corrected by the CRCCs and BRCCs.

### **2.1.10 Children Enrollment and Repeaters:**

The figures relating to enrollment of children and number of repeaters among children as on 31-9-08 in different classes with sex variation have been collected in the DISE DCFs in 2008-09 from each school in the sample Districts. During the PES, 2008-09, these figures have also been collected in the PES formats from 5% sample schools for cross-checking of data. It is revealed from Table 2.5 that the percentage of deviation for total children enrolled varies from 0.51 to 0.96 per cent in the 03 sample Districts. The percentage of deviation between DISE and PES data is found to be substantially less than 1 per cent at aggregate level. The percentage of deviation in Angul District (0.96 %) is comparatively more than Mayurbhanj (0.70%) and Rayagada (0.51%) Districts. It is noteworthy to mention here that the deviation of DISE data from PES data on children enrollment is minimal.

Relating to the item, SC children enrolled, the percentage of deviation varies from 0.34 to 1.12 per cent across the sample Districts whereas such magnitude is 0.43 per cent at aggregate level (Table 2.6). The deviation of DISE data from PES data relating to ST children enrolled has been assessed across the sample Districts (Table 2.7). The extent of deviation ranges from 0.34 per cent (Mayurbhanj District) to 1.48 per cent (Angul District).

As far as the figures relating to number of repeaters are concerned, the deviation of the DISE data from PES data ranges from 0.36 per cent to 49.12 per cent across the sample Districts (Table 2.8). The magnitude of such variation is found to be highest (49.12%) in Mayurbhanj District.

In case of the item, enrollment of children with disabilities, there exists substantially higher level of deviation (29.84 %) at aggregate level of DISE data from PES data (Table 2.9). This percentage of deviation ranges from minimum 11.36 per cent (Mayurbhanj District) to maximum 48.24 per cent (Angul District)

All the above findings indicate that the Head Teachers have become very careless about filling up the DISE data especially on items like number of repeaters and enrollment of children with disabilities.

#### **2.1.11 Examination Results:**

During the PES 2008-09, data have been gathered relating to the 2007-08 Annual Examination for different classes especially on 03 items, namely:(1) total enrollment at the time of examination, (2) total children appeared the examination and (3) total children passed in the examination. In the present study, these data have been compared with the corresponding DISE data only to the children of Class V and Class VII because in DISE format only these data have been collected. The findings have been presented in Table 2.10 which reveals that there exists deviation to the extent of 1.38, 0.84 and 0.23 per cent on children enrolled, appeared and passed respectively at aggregate level between the DISE and PES data.

The District wise disaggregated data reveal that there exists deviation between DISE and PES data in all the 03 sample Districts. Such deviation on children enrolled, appeared and passed are found to be highest (13.42%) in Rayagada District. Incorrect reporting of data by the Head Teachers has contributed to such deviation.

## Section – II

### 2.2 Percentage Deviation and Percentage Precision of DISE data vis-à-vis PES data on Comparable items

It is highly required to identify the items of DISE DCF in which more number of Head Teachers make mistakes in data filling. Accordingly, policy measures should be taken, on priority, to check the repetition of such mistakes next year. In this section the findings of the extent of deviation of DISE data from PES data on comparable items have been delineated. The comparable items include: (1) year of establishment, (2) school category, (3) type of school (4) lowest class, (5) highest class, (6) managed by, (7) teachers in position, (8) status of school building, (9) number of class rooms, (10) children enrollment, (11) SC children enrollment, (12) ST children enrollment, (13) repeater children enrollment (14) enrollment of children with disabilities and (15) examination results and the analysis has been made in 02 ways. The first way of analysis has been made on the percentage of schools showing variation between DISE data and PES data. This analysis has been made on 06 school particulars (from 1 to 6 above mentioned items) for each District and at the aggregate level. The second way of analysis has been made on the percentage of deviation of DISE data from PES data. This analysis has been made on 09 selected comparable items (from 7 to 15 above mentioned items).

The findings of comparison between DISE and PES data in Angul District reveals that the percentage of school showing difference is 2.20 per cent at aggregate level (Table 2.11). It varies from 1.10 to 5.49 per cent on 06 school characteristics. Analysis made on 09 comparable items shows that the deviation is in the range of 0.36 to 3.70 per cent excepting the enrollment of children with disabilities (48.24%). The percentage precision between PES and DISE survey at aggregate level is found to be 99.04 per cent.

In case of Rayagada District, the comparison of DISE data with PES data on 06 school characteristics indicates that the percentage of school showing difference varies from 2.15 to 6.45 per cent with 3.58 per cent at aggregate level (Table 2.13). Analysis made on percentage deviation on 09 selected comparable items indicates that the percentage deviation ranges

from 0.00 to 8.49 per cent except in case of examination results (13.42%), number of repeaters (20.16%) and enrollment of children with disabilities (43.80 %). At aggregate level, the percentage deviation is found to be 4.48 per cent with 95.52 per cent of precision (Table 2.14).

In Mayurbhanj District, it is revealed from the Table 2.15 that the percentage of school showing difference between PES and DISE data varies from 0.92 to 6.91 per cent except year of establishment (11.06%) in case of 06 school characteristics. With regard to 09 selected comparable items, it is revealed that the percentage deviation between DISE and PES data ranges from 0.34 to 9.43 per cent except in case of enrollment of children with disabilities (29.84%) and number of repeaters (49.12%). At the aggregate level, the percentage deviation is found to be 2.69 per cent with 97.31 per cent precision.

Analysis made on 06 school characteristics between the DISE and PES data taking all the 03 sample Districts together shows (Table 2.17) that the percentage of school showing difference varies from 1.50 to 7.23 per cent with 4.07 per cent at aggregate level. The analysis made on 09 comparable items indicates that the percentage deviation of DISE data from PES data ranges from 0.43 to 6.64 per cent except in case of number of repeaters (28.70 %) and enrollment of children with disabilities (29.84%). The overall deviation on these selected comparable items is limited to 0.79 per cent with 99.21 per cent precision.

### **Concluding remarks:**

From the above discussion, it may be concluded that the deviation between DISE and PES data exists in almost all items of comparable data. In the next chapter some field level observations made by the PES study team have been presented which may throw some light on the process of operation of DISE data collection and compilation.

However, the magnitude of such deviation is found to be higher on items viz. number of repeaters and enrollment of children with disabilities in all the sample Districts. At aggregate level the extent of deviation between the DISE and PES data is found to be highest in Rayagada District followed by Mayurbhanj and Angul Districts. In many cases, due care has not been taken by the Head Teacher in filling up the DISE data and proper verification has not been made of these data by the CRCCs and BRCCs.

**Table 2.1: Comparison of PES data with DISE data on School Particulars**

<b>Item of Comparison</b>	<b>Name of Districts</b>	<b>No. of sample schools</b>	<b>No. of Schools in which DISE data differed from PES data</b>	<b>Percentage of School showing difference</b>
<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Year of Establishment</b>	Angul	91	02	2.20
	Rayagada	93	03	3.23
	Mayurbhanj	217	24	11.06
	<b>Total</b>	<b>401</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>7.23</b>
<b>School Category</b>	Angul	91	01	1.10
	Rayagada	93	06	6.45
	Mayurbhanj	217	13	5.99
	<b>Total</b>	<b>401</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>4.99</b>
<b>Type of School</b>	Angul	91	00	0.00
	Rayagada	93	00	0.00
	Mayurbhanj	217	08	3.69
	<b>Total</b>	<b>401</b>	<b>08</b>	<b>2.00</b>
<b>Lowest class</b>	Angul	91	02	2.20
	Rayagada	93	02	2.15
	Mayurbhanj	217	02	0.92
	<b>Total</b>	<b>401</b>	<b>06</b>	<b>1.50</b>
<b>Highest class</b>	Angul	91	05	5.49
	Rayagada	93	06	6.45
	Mayurbhanj	217	04	1.84
	<b>Total</b>	<b>401</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>3.74</b>
<b>Managed by</b>	Angul	91	02	2.20
	Rayagada	93	03	3.23
	Mayurbhanj	217	15	6.91
	<b>Total</b>	<b>401</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>4.99</b>

Source: DISE, 2008-09 and PES, 2008-09 of Angul, Rayagada and Mayurbhanj Districts.

**Table 2.2: Comparison of PES data with DISE data on Teachers in Position**

Sl. No.	District Name	Sample Schools	Teachers in Position											
			Male				Female				Total			
			PES	DISE	Deviation	%	PES	DISE	Deviation	%	PES	DISE	Deviation	%
1	Angul	91	235	256	21	8.94	225	221	4	1.78	460	477	17	3.70
2	Rayagada	93	248	281	33	13.31	202	201	1	0.50	450	482	32	7.11
3	Mayurbhanj	217	488	439	49	10.04	509	464	45	8.84	997	903	94	9.43
4	<b>Total</b>	<b>401</b>	<b>971</b>	<b>976</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0.51</b>	<b>936</b>	<b>886</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>5.34</b>	<b>1907</b>	<b>1862</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>2.36</b>

Source: DISE, 2008-09 and PES, 2008-09 of Angul, Rayagada and Mayurbhanj Districts.

- Note: i) Quantitative value of items as per DISE data = 1862  
 ii) Quantitative value of items as per PES data = 1907  
 iii) Quantitative value of deviations ignoring ± signs = 55  
 iv) %age deviation of DISE data from PES data = 2.36%  
 v) Precision level of DISE data with relation to PES data = 97.64%

**Table 2.3: Comparison of PES data with DISE data on Status of School Building**

Sl. No.	District Name	Sample School	Status of School Building															
			Private				Rented				Government				Total			
			PES	DISE	Deviation	%	PES	DISE	Deviation	%	PES	DISE	Deviation	%	PES	DISE	Deviation	%
1	Angul	91	11	10	1	9.09	2	1	1	50.00	78	77	1	1.28	91	88	3	3.30
2	Rayagada	93	8	5	3	37.50	2	3	1	50.00	83	82	1	1.20	93	90	3	3.23
3	Mayurbhanj	217	12	10	2	16.67	6	3	3	50.00	199	189	10	5.03	217	202	15	6.91
4	<b>Total</b>	<b>401</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>19.35</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>30.00</b>	<b>360</b>	<b>348</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>3.33</b>	<b>401</b>	<b>380</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>5.24</b>

Source: DISE, 2008-09 and PES, 2008-09 of Angul, Rayagada and Mayurbhanj Districts.

- Note: i) Quantitative value of items as per DISE data = 380  
 ii) Quantitative value of items as per PES data = 401  
 iii) Quantitative value of deviations ignoring ± signs = 21  
 iv) %age deviation of DISE data from PES data = 5.24%  
 v) Precision level of DISE data with relation to PES data = 94.76%

**Table 2.4: Comparison of PES data with DISE data on Number of Classrooms**

Sl. No.	District Name	Sample School	No. of Classrooms			
			PES	DISE	Deviation	%
1	Angul	91	393	403	10	2.54
2	Rayagada	93	377	409	32	8.49
3	Mayurbhanj	217	826	890	64	7.75
4	<b>Total</b>	<b>401</b>	<b>1596</b>	<b>1702</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>6.64</b>

Source: DISE, 2008-09 and PES, 2008-09 of Angul, Rayagada and Mayurbhanj Districts.

- Note:
- i) Quantitative value of items as per DISE data = 1702
  - ii) Quantitative value of items as per PES data = 1596
  - iii) Quantitative value of deviations ignoring ± signs = 106
  - iv) %age deviation of DISE data from PES data = 6.64%
  - v) Precision level of DISE data with relation to PES data = 93.36%

**Table 2.5: Comparison of PES data with DISE data on Children Enrollment**

Sl. No.	District Name	Sample School	Total Enrollment			
			PES	DISE	Deviation	%
1	Angul	91	13506	13376	130	0.96
2	Rayagada	93	11809	11869	60	0.51
3	Mayurbhanj	217	29394	29188	206	0.70
4	<b>Total</b>	<b>401</b>	<b>54709</b>	<b>54433</b>	<b>276</b>	<b>0.50</b>

Source: DISE, 2008-09 and PES, 2008-09 of Angul, Rayagada and Mayurbhanj Districts.

- Note:
- i) Quantitative value of items as per DISE data = 54433
  - ii) Quantitative value of items as per PES data = 54709
  - iii) Quantitative value of deviations ignoring ± signs = 276
  - iv) %age deviation of DISE data from PES data = 0.50%
  - v) Precision level of DISE data with relation to PES data = 99.50%

**Table 2.6: Comparison of PES data with DISE data on SC Children Enrollment**

Sl. No.	District Name	Sample School	SC Enrollment			
			PES	DISE	Deviation	%
1	Angul	91	3042	3008	34	1.12
2	Rayagada	93	2524	2531	7	0.28
3	Mayurbhanj	217	2979	2969	10	0.34
4	<b>Total</b>	<b>401</b>	<b>8545</b>	<b>8508</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>0.43</b>

Source: DISE, 2008-09 and PES, 2008-09 of Angul, Rayagada and Mayurbhanj Districts.

- Note:
- i) Quantitative value of items as per DISE data = 8508
  - ii) Quantitative value of items as per PES data = 8545
  - iii) Quantitative value of deviations ignoring ± signs = 37
  - iv) %age deviation of DISE data from PES data = 0.43%
  - v) Precision level of DISE data with relation to PES data = 99.57%

**Table 2.7: Comparison of PES data with DISE data on ST Children Enrollment**

Sl. No.	District Name	Sample School	ST Enrollment			
			PES	DISE	Deviation	%
1	Angul	91	2023	2053	30	1.48
2	Rayagada	93	5306	5376	70	1.32
3	Mayurbhanj	217	15797	15851	54	0.34
4	<b>Total</b>	<b>401</b>	<b>23126</b>	<b>23280</b>	<b>154</b>	<b>0.67</b>

Source: DISE, 2008-09 and PES, 2008-09 of Angul, Rayagada and Mayurbhanj Districts.

- Note:
- i) Quantitative value of items as per DISE data = 23280
  - ii) Quantitative value of items as per PES data = 23126
  - iii) Quantitative value of deviations ignoring ± signs = 154
  - iv) %age deviation of DISE data from PES data = 0.67%
  - v) Precision level of DISE data with relation to PES data = 99.33%

**Table 2.8: Comparison of PES data with DISE data on Number of Repeaters**

Sl. No.	District Name	Sample School	No. of Repeaters			
			PES	DISE	Deviation	%
1	Angul	91	845	848	3	0.36
2	Rayagada	93	258	310	52	20.16
3	Mayurbhanj	217	1820	926	894	49.12
4	<b>Total</b>	<b>401</b>	<b>2923</b>	<b>2084</b>	<b>839</b>	<b>28.70</b>

Source: DISE, 2008-09 and PES, 2008-09 of Angul, Rayagada and Mayurbhanj Districts.

- Note:
- i) Quantitative value of items as per DISE data = 2084
  - ii) Quantitative value of items as per PES data = 2923
  - iii) Quantitative value of deviations ignoring ± signs = 839
  - iv) %age deviation of DISE data from PES data = 28.70 %
  - v) Precision level of DISE data with relation to PES data = 71.30 %

**Table 2.9: Comparison of PES data with DISE data on Enrollment of Children with Disabilities**

Sl. No.	District Name	Sample School	Disability Enrollment			
			PES	DISE	Deviation	%
1	Angul	91	85	126	41	48.24
2	Rayagada	93	121	174	53	43.80
3	Mayurbhanj	217	176	196	20	11.36
4	<b>Total</b>	<b>401</b>	<b>382</b>	<b>496</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>29.84</b>

Source: DISE, 2008-09 and PES, 2008-09 of Angul, Rayagada and Mayurbhanj Districts.

- Note:
- i) Quantitative value of items as per DISE data = 496
  - ii) Quantitative value of items as per PES data = 382
  - iii) Quantitative value of deviations ignoring ± signs = 114
  - iv) %age deviation of DISE data from PES data = 29.84 %
  - v) Precision level of DISE data with relation to PES data = 70.16%

**Table 2.10: Comparison of PES data with DISE data on Annual Examination Results in Grade V & VII of the year 2007-08**

Sl. No.	District Name	Sample School	Annual Examination Results of the year 2007-08															
			Enrolled				Appeared				Passed				Total			
			PES	DISE	Deviation	%	PES	DISE	Deviation	%	PES	DISE	Deviation	%	PES	DISE	Deviation	%
1	Angul	91	3828	3815	13	0.34	3757	3658	99	2.64	3707	3576	131	3.53	11292	11049	243	2.15
2	Rayagada	93	2396	2701	305	12.73	2354	2664	310	13.17	2314	2647	333	14.39	7064	8012	948	13.42
3	Mayurbhanj	217	7584	7102	482	6.36	7379	7055	324	4.39	7216	6984	232	3.22	22179	21141	1038	4.68
4	<b>Total</b>	<b>401</b>	<b>13808</b>	<b>13618</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>1.38</b>	<b>13490</b>	<b>13377</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>0.84</b>	<b>13237</b>	<b>13207</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>0.23</b>	40535	40202	333	0.82

Source: DISE, 2008-09 and PES, 2008-09 of Angul, Rayagada and Mayurbhanj Districts.

- Note:
- i) Quantitative value of items as per DISE data = 40202
  - ii) Quantitative value of items as per PES data = 40435
  - iii) Quantitative value of deviations ignoring ± signs = 333
  - iv) %age deviation of DISE data from PES data = 0.82 %
  - v) Precision level of DISE data with relation to PES data = 99.18 %

**Table 2.11: Comparison of PES data with DISE data on School Particulars in Angul District**

Sl. No.	Description of Comparable items	Quantitative Value under		No. of Schools in which DISE data differed from PES data	Percentage of school showing difference
		PES	DISE		
1	Year of Establishment	91	91	02	2.20
2	School Category	91	91	01	1.10
3	Type of School	91	91	-	0.00
4	Lowest Class	91	91	02	2.20
5	Highest Class	91	91	05	5.49
6	Managed by	91	91	2	2.20
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>546</b>	<b>546</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>2.20</b>

Source: DISE, 2008-09 and PES, 2008-09 of Angul District.

**Table 2.12: Percentage Deviation and Percentage Precision of DISE data in respect of PES data on Selected Comparable Items in Angul District**

Sl. No.	Description of Comparable items	Quantitative Value under			Percentage	
		PES	DISE	Deviation ignoring $\pm$ with sub items	Deviation	Precision
1	Teachers in Position	460	477	17	3.70	96.30
2	Status of School Building	91	91	0	0.00	100.00
3	No. of Classrooms	393	403	10	2.54	97.46
4	Children Enrollment	13506	13376	130	0.96	99.04
5	SC Children Enrollment	3042	3008	34	1.12	98.88
6	ST Children Enrollment	2023	2053	30	1.48	98.52
7	No. of Repeaters	845	848	3	0.36	99.64
8	Enrollment of Children with Disabilities	85	126	41	48.24	51.76
9	Examination Results 2007-08	11292	11049	243	2.15	97.85
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>31737</b>	<b>31431</b>	<b>306</b>	<b>0.96</b>	<b>99.04</b>

Source: DISE, 2008-09 and PES, 2008-09 of Angul District.

**Table 2.13: Comparison of PES data with DISE data on School Particulars in Rayagada District**

Sl. No.	Description of Comparable items	Quantitative Value under		No. of Schools in which DISE data differed from PES data	Percentage of school showing difference
		PES	DISE		
1	Year of Establishment	93	93	03	3.23
2	School Category	93	93	06	6.45
3	Type of School	93	93	0	0.00
4	Lowest Class	93	93	02	2.15
5	Highest Class	93	93	06	6.45
6	Managed by	93	93	03	3.23
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>558</b>	<b>558</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>3.58</b>

Source: DISE, 2008-09 and PES, 2008-09 of Rayagada District.

**Table 2.14: Percentage Deviation and Percentage Precision of DISE data in respect of PES data on Selected Comparable Items in Rayagada District**

Sl. No.	Description of Comparable items	Quantitative Value under			Percentage	
		PES	DISE	Deviation ignoring $\pm$ with sub items	Deviation	Precision
1	Teachers in Position	450	482	32	7.11	92.89
2	Status of School Building	93	93	0	0.00	100.00
3	No. of Classrooms	377	409	32	8.49	91.51
4	Children Enrollment	11809	11869	60	0.51	99.49
5	SC Children Enrollment	2524	2531	7	0.28	99.72
6	ST Children Enrollment	5306	5376	70	1.32	98.68
7	No. of Repeaters	258	310	52	20.16	79.84
8	Enrollment of Children with Disabilities	121	174	53	43.80	56.20
9	Examination Results 2007-08	7064	8012	948	13.42	86.58
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>28002</b>	<b>29256</b>	<b>1254</b>	<b>4.48</b>	<b>95.52</b>

Source: DISE, 2008-09 and PES, 2008-09 of Rayagada District.

**Table 2.15: Comparison of PES data with DISE data on School Particulars in Mayurbhanj District**

Sl. No.	Description of Comparable items	Quantitative Value under		No. of Schools in which DISE data differed from PES data	Percentage of school showing difference
		PES	DISE		
1	Year of Establishment	217	217	24	11.06
2	School Category	217	217	13	5.99
3	Type of School	217	217	08	3.69
4	Lowest Class	217	217	02	0.92
5	Highest Class	217	217	04	1.84
6	Managed by	217	217	15	6.91
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>1302</b>	<b>1302</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>5.07</b>

Source: DISE, 2008-09 and PES, 2008-09 of Mayurbhanj District.

**Table 2.16: Percentage Deviation and Percentage Precision of DISE data in respect of PES data on Selected Comparable Items in Mayurbhanj District**

Sl. No.	Description of Comparable items	Quantitative Value under			Percentage	
		PES	DISE	Deviation ignoring $\pm$ with sub items	Deviation	Precision
1	Teachers in Position	997	903	94	9.43	90.57
2	Status of School Building	217	217	0	0.00	100.00
3	No. of Classrooms	826	890	64	7.75	92.25
4	Children Enrollment	29394	29188	206	0.70	99.30
5	SC Children Enrollment	2979	2969	10	0.34	99.66
6	ST Children Enrollment	15797	15851	54	0.34	99.66
7	No. of Repeaters	1820	926	894	49.12	50.88
8	Enrollment of Children with Disabilities	382	496	114	29.84	70.16
9	Examination Results 2007-08	22179	21141	1038	4.68	95.32
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>74591</b>	<b>72581</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2.69</b>	<b>97.31</b>

Source: DISE, 2008-09 and PES, 2008-09 of Mayurbhanj District.

**Table 2.17: Comparison of PES data with DISE data on School Particulars in Sample Districts**

Sl. No.	Description of Comparable items	No. of Sample Schools		No. of Schools in which DISE data differed from PES data	Percentage of School showing difference
		PES	DISE		
1	Year of Establishment	401	401	29	7.23
2	School Category	401	401	20	4.99
3	Type of School	401	401	08	2.00
4	Lowest Class	401	401	06	1.50
5	Highest Class	401	401	15	3.74
6	Managed by	401	401	20	4.99
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>2406</b>	<b>2406</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>4.07</b>

Source: DISE, 2008-09 and PES, 2008-09 of Angul, Rayagada and Mayurbhanj Districts.

**Table 2.18: Percentage Deviation and Percentage Precision of DISE data in respect of PES data on Selected Comparable Items in Sample Districts**

Sl. No.	Description of Comparable items	Quantitative Value under			Percentage	
		PES	DISE	Deviation ignoring $\pm$ with sub items	Deviation	Precision
7	Teachers in Position	1907	1862	45	2.36	97.64
8	Status of School Building	401	401	0	0.00	100.00
9	No. of Classrooms	1596	1702	106	6.64	93.36
10	Children Enrollment	54709	54433	276	0.50	99.50
11	SC Children Enrollment	8545	8508	37	0.43	99.57
12	ST Children Enrollment	23126	23280	154	0.67	99.33
13	No. of Repeaters	2923	2084	839	28.70	71.30
14	Enrollment of Children with Disabilities	382	496	114	29.84	70.16
15	Examination results 2007-08	40435	40202	233	0.58	99.42
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>134024</b>	<b>132968</b>	<b>1056</b>	<b>0.79</b>	<b>99.21</b>

Source: DISE, 2008-09 and PES, 2008-09 of Angul, Rayagada and Mayurbhanj Districts.

## Annexure - 2.1

List of Schools of Mayurbhanj District whose Head Teachers have made no entry of Data against the item, Status of School Building, in the DISE DCF of 2008-09

Sl.No.	School Name	Block/ ULB Name	School Code
1.	Bahalda Boys' P.S	Bahalda	0103904
2.	Jagannath Khunta HS	Bangiriposi	0211301
3.	Pathuri UPUG School	Bangiriposi	0216201
4.	St. Mary's PS	Baripada	0400404
5.	Banasthali Bidyapitha	Baripada	0400104
6.	Sri Sri Haribaldevjew Sishu Mandir	Baripada MPL	2700771
7.	Champagadi PS	G.B Nagar	0808901
8.	Jarada Nodal UP ME School	Kaptipada	1111601
9.	Ghodaghaguri PS	Karanjia	1214003
10.	Khajuridiha UGME School	Khunta	1305802
11.	Champrai PS	Rairangpur	1703801
12.	Sakiladihi NCLP	Rairangpur NAC	2900303
13.	Basanti Sri Ramachandra NUPS	Ras Gobindpur	1911202
14.	Juruka UGME School	Suliapada	2312505
15.	Dugudiha Nodal UPS	Udala	2600702

# CHAPTER-3

## FINDINGS OF FIELD LEVEL OBSERVATIONS

In order to make the DISE data collection more effective in terms of both time of operation and quality of data collection, each District should have adequate availability of infrastructure and computer professionals. Besides, the Head Teachers should be trained adequately on filling up of DISE data and on cooperating with the PES team. They should also keep all records relating to both DISE and PES activities properly updated and stored for immediate use as and when required for both DISE and PES activities. In the post DISE operation period, each school should have a School Report Card on DISE data and its own copy of the School DCF. The compiled data of Cluster, Block and District levels should be available at CRC, BRC and DPO levels especially for reference and use in the preparation of the Annual Work Plan and Budget every year. The DISE data for this purpose should also be shared at all levels for awareness of the people involved in plan preparation as well as implementation. Some of the DISE data are also to be mentioned in the School Information / Display Board for public awareness and for making SSA a transparent programme. In this chapter, a detailed deliberation has been made on these issues basing upon the field level observations made by the PES study teams. The findings have been reflected in different tables. The main items discussed are as follows:

### **3.1 Cooperation of Principal/ Head Teacher in Providing Data:**

Cooperation of Principal/ Head Teacher is a bare necessity in getting correct data for filling up of the DISE DCFs. A positive mindset of Principal / Head Teacher to provide the DISE data is also required to complete the DISE data collection activity in time. It has been reported by some CRCCs and BRCCs that Principals/ Head Teachers especially of the private unaided schools and unrecognized schools have shown less/ no cooperation in some cases to provide the DISE data and owing to this reason, they have failed to collect DISE data from some schools. DISE data could not be collected as the CRCCs have reported, from Sri Sri Haribaldev Jew Sishu Mandir School of Baripada Municipality and Sakiladihi NCLP school of Rairangpur Block in Mayurbhanj District for this reason. However an assessment on the extent of cooperation of Principal / Head Teacher to the PES study team had been made

during the PES, 2008-09 and the findings have been classified into 05 qualitative categories, such as (i) very good (where initial response is completely positive and immediately cooperative after getting identity of the PES study team), (2) good (where the initial response is positive and cooperative after the Principal/ Head Teacher completes his/ her own work), (3) average (where the initial response is positive and cooperative only after the Principal / Head Teacher confirms the identity of the PES study team), (4) poor (where the initial response is not positive and cooperative but data are given under compulsion) and (5) very poor (where the initial response is completely negative and non-cooperative to give data). The findings as presented in Table 3.1, indicate that 61.10% of sample Principals/ Head teachers have shown very good initial response to the PES study team. But the disaggregated data reveal that most (89.40%) of the Principals/ Head Teachers in Mayurbhanj District have shown very good initial response compared to only 31.87 per cent and 23.66 per cent of the Principal / Head Teachers of Angul and Rayagada Districts showing such initial response respectively. However, majority of the respondents of Angul and Rayagada are under good category.

As far as the initial response of the Principal / Head Teacher to provide data to the PES study team is concerned, the findings have been classified into 05 categories, such as (1) 'very good' where the Principal/ Head teacher whole heartedly and immediately provided the required data), (2) 'good' (where the Principal / Head Teacher provided the data after completing his/ her work), (3) average (where the Principal/ Head Teacher provided the data after consulting with the concerned authority), (4) 'poor' (where the Principal / Head Teacher provided the data under compulsion), (5) 'very poor' (where the Principal/ Head Teacher did not provide the data). The findings reveal that 34.66 and 58.10 per cent of the total sample Principals and Head Teachers have shown very good and good initial response respectively to provide data to the PES study team (Table 3.2). The disaggregated data show that significantly greater percentages of Principals and Head Teachers of Angul District (39.56%) and Mayurbhanj District (43.32%) have exhibited very good initial response than those of Rayagada District (9.68%).

The above findings indicate that a greater extent of the Principals / Head Teachers of Mayurbhanj, Angul and Rayagada Districts have shown 'very good' to 'good' cooperation in providing data to the PES study team.

### **3.2. Status of Records of Schools:**

A precondition to get correct DISE data is the availability of the official records in proper condition and timely updated. In the absence of such official records, the Principal/ Head Teacher is likely to provide incorrect data. Obviously, one can hypothesize that in a District where more percentage of schools have fully updated, un-torn official records with legible recording of data, there would be less percentage of mismatch between DISE data and PES data. During the PES, 2008-09, an assessment has been made in this regard taking some indicators, such as (1) availability of records on the day of visit of PES study team to school, (2) untorn and legibly written records, and (3) fully updated records that contain DISE data and the records verified are: (1) log book, (2) admission register of students, (3) students' attendance register, (4) teachers' attendance register, (5) annual examination register, (6) VEC register, (7) free textbook register, (8) visit register for CRCC and BRCC, (9) summary report card and (10) CWSN status report. In order to measure the status of school as regard availability of record, 01 mark has been given for availability of each report in school on the day of visit of the PES study team. Similarly, 01 mark has been given if the available report is found untorn and legibly written and 01 mark has again been given if the report is found fully updated with relevant data. And in this way basing on the availability of records, the schools have been classified into 05 categories such as (1) very good (where 9 or 10 number of records out of the selected 10 records are physically available), (2) good (where 7 or 8 number of records are available), (3) average (where 5 or 6 number of records are available), (4) poor (where 3 or 6 number of records are available), and (5) very poor (where < 3 number of records are available). Following the same classification model, the schools have been classified into these 05 categories relating to the quality of conditions of records and the updation of records. The findings in this regard have been presented in Table 3.3, 3.4 and 3.5.

It is evident from Table 3.3 that only 47 (11.72%) out of 401 schools belong to the very good status as far as the availability of records is concerned. This is because in rest of the schools, the school summary report of DISE data for 2008-09 had not been given to the schools by the DPO till the visit of the PES, study team. Furthermore, these schools had also not kept either the CWSN status report or visit register for CRCC and BRCC. However, in a majority (68.08%) of the schools who belong to good category, 7 or 8 out of the

10 records are available. The District wise disaggregated data show that the extent of availability of records is better in Mayurbhanj District than in Angul and Rayagada Districts.

Table 3.4 reveals that only 38 (9.48 %) out of the 401 schools belong to very good category because 9 or 10 out of 10 records are untorn and legibly written. A majority (65.34 %) of the schools however belong to 'good' category because 7 to 8 out of the 10 records are untorn and legibly written. Similarly, Table 3.5 indicates that only 26 (6.48%) out of the 401 schools fall under 'very good' category whereas a majority (60.35%) belong to 'good' category so far as the updation of records is concerned.

The above findings point out that nearly 90 per cent schools do not have all records that are relevant for DISE data collection in perfect condition and updation. Hence there is a chance of Principal/ Head Teacher making no/wrong entry of data in the DISE DCF.

### **3.3 Training of Principal/ Head Teacher in Filling up of DISE Data**

A set of guidelines has been attached with each DISE DCF and it describes the procedure to be followed for filling up of the DCFs and it explains the meaning of the terms used in the DCFs. The purpose is to enable the Principal/ Head Teacher to properly fill up the DCFs. Furthermore, it is mandatory under the DISE activities to give training to the Principals / Head Teachers adequately, clarifying all their doubts so that they would fill up the data correctly. It is hypothesized that the District, where imperfect and inadequate DISE training has been conducted, would have greater extent of mismatch between DISE data and PES data. An assessment in this regard has been made during the PES, 2008-09 especially analyzing the aspects, such as (1) extent of Principal / Head Teacher received DISE training, (2) level of organization of DISE training, (3) duration of DISE training, (4) category of trainers giving DISE training, (5) extent of explanation of DCF during DISE training, and (6) extent of doubts removed during DISE training.

The findings regarding the extent of Principal/ Head Teacher received training on DISE in 2008-09 have been presented in Table 3.6. The table reveals that 314 (78.30%) out of 401 Principals / Head Teachers have got DISE training in 2008-09. The District wise disaggregated data indicate that less percentage of Principal/ Head Teachers have got DISE training in Rayagada

District (60.22%) than in Angul District (82.42%) and Mayurbhanj District (84.33%). From the report given by the Programmers of the sample Districts, it is noticed that in Mayurbhanj District during the period from 26.11.08 to 29.11.08, DISE training programmes had been organized for the Principals/ Head Teachers. However, during the PES it has been unravelled that Principals / Head Teachers of some schools especially belonging to 'private aided', 'private unaided' 'unrecognized' and 'others' categories have not been invited for the training. In Angul District, the DISE training has been conducted in convergence with the monthly Teacher Development Programme of November 2008. Obviously, the participants have been the Head Teachers of those schools that belong to only the category of "Education Department". In Rayagada District, DISE training has not been separately organized due to lack of fund provision. But in some cases, the CRCCs have given partial training on DISE during the monthly Teacher Development Programme of November 2008. Owing to this, some Principals / Head Teachers have not been covered.

Efficacy of DISE training partly depends upon the level of its organization. It is obvious that if the training is organized at Cluster level instead of the Block / District level, the quality of trainer and trainee interaction will be better leading to greater efficacy of training and hence less mismatch between DISE data and PES data. The findings on the level at which the Principal/Head Teachers have got DISE training in 2008-09 have shown that in Angul and Rayagada Districts all Principals / Head Teachers have got DISE training at Cluster level whereas in Mayurbhanj District majority (80.33%) of them have got training at Block level (Table 3.7).

Duration of training (i.e. number of days covered for DISE training) is another significant factor that contributes to the efficacy of DISE training. It is hypothesized that a greater duration of training in terms of number of days covered would lead to more efficacy of DISE training and would cause less mismatch between DISE data and PES data. Table 3.8 reveals that in all the 03 Districts, DISE training has been given to the Principals / Head Teachers for 01 day only. In Rayagada District, the training has been merged with the Teacher's Development Programme and hence the training duration has not been a full day. Obviously in such case, the efficacy of training shall be less resulting into more mismatches between DISE data and PES data.

There are 03 categories of trainers to impart DISE training, namely BRCC, CRCC and DRP. The BRCCs and CRCCs have mostly given DISE training to the Principals/ Head Teachers. Table 3.9 shows that in Mayurbhanj District, Majority (77.05%) of them have been trained by the BRCCs whereas in Angul District, majority (78.67%) of them has been trained by the CRCCs. In Rayagada District also, majority (69.64 %) of them have been trained by the CRCCs.

Irrespective of the category of trainer, the efficacy of DISE training no doubt depends largely on the extent the trainers have explained the DCF to the trainees i.e. Principals/ Head Teachers. Accordingly it may be hypothesized that the District where more percentage of Principals/ Head Teachers have been fully explained by the trainers regarding the details of DCF, there the percentage of mismatch between DISE data and PES data will be less. Table 3.10 shows that in 128 (40.76%) out of 314 trained Principals/ Head Teachers have got full explanation of DCF by the trainers. District wise disaggregated data reveal that in Mayurbhanj District less (30.05%) percentage of Principals /Head Teachers have been fully explained than in Rayagada District (57.14 %) and Angul District (54.97%).

The job of the trainers is also to remove all kinds of doubts of the trainee Principal / Head Teacher during the training programme because partial / no removal of doubts would finally yield no/wrong entry of data by the latter in the DISE DCFs. It is therefore likely that a District, where more percentage of Principals / Head Teachers have no doubts on DCF would yield less defects in DISE DCFs and less mismatch between DISE data and PES data, A study in this regard reveals that the trainers have fully removed the doubts on DCF of only 78 (24.84%) out of 314 trained Principals/ Head Teachers (Table 3.11). The corresponding percentages in Angul, Rayagada and Mayurbhanj Districts are 45.33, 50.00 and 8.74 per cent respectively.

Another strategy to reduce defect in data filling in DCF is to ensure that the DCFs are filled up by the same teacher of the school who has got the DISE training. Table 3.12 points out that in 328 (81.79 %) out of the 401 schools the same teacher, who had got DISE training, had filled up the DISE DCF. In all the 03 Districts this percentage is quite high; i.e. > 78 per cent. The above findings relating to various aspects of DISE training indicate that each of these

aspects needs further improvement to make the DISE training more effective in reducing the percentage of defects in DISE DCFs and the percentage of mismatch between DISE data and PES data.

### **3.4 Availability of Infrastructure and Computer Professionals in the District MIS Unit:**

After completion of the data filling activities at school level, the data entry activity is to be taken up. This involves entering the data obtained in the DCFs into the computers. The data entry activity depends, largely upon the availability of requisite infrastructure and computer professionals in the District MIS Unit for smooth and timely operation.

It has been noticed during the PES that in Angul District, the MIS Unit of DPO had adequate space and furniture for conducting data entry activity. But it had 04 numbers of computers and 02 numbers of printers. Since these were not adequate to complete the data entry activity in time; it had borrowed 02 numbers of computers from other Units of DPO. Similarly, there are 02 numbers of Data Entry Operators and 01 Programmer in the District MIS Unit but for the purpose of timely entry of DISE data, 03 numbers of Data Entry Operators were borrowed from the office of DI of schools. In order to make the data entry activity uninterrupted by the power cut during office hour, 02 numbers of online (2KVA and 3 KVA)UPS had been installed for four hours of back up along with 01 (7.5 KVA) inverter. Besides, the MIS Unit also has 01 telephone, internet facility, 01 server and 01 LCD projector. However, the air-conditioner available at the MIS Unit is not functioning due to low voltage.

In the District MIS Unit of Rayagada District there were 01 Programmer and 01 Data Entry Operator. Besides, it had 03 computers with 01 server, 01 LCD projector, internet facility, 01 telephone, 01 air-conditioner, 01 scanner, 02 printers and the necessary furniture. In order to complete the DISE data entry activity in time, the DPO had hired only 01 Data Entry Operator for 01 month.

In the District MIS Unit of Mayurbhanj District, there were 02 computers, 01 heavy duty laser printer, 01 air conditioner, 01 telephone, internet facility, 01 server and the requisite furniture. Besides, it had 01 Programmer and 03 Data Entry Operators. But these facilities were not enough for data entry

activity of the entire District that has 26 Blocks. Hence, the DPO had hired 05 Data Entry Operators for 10 days and had collected 10 computes from the BRCs.

In the District MIS Unit of all the 03 Districts, there were the requisite softwares for DISE data entry and these softwares had been provided by the State MIS Unit.

### **3.5 Data Entry / Feeding Arrangement at District Level:**

In Angul District, for the purpose of effective data entry in computers at District level, the data were first fed into the computers and the print outs were given to the BRCCs to cross-check at BRC level and return to the District MIS Unit pointing out the defects. The defects were then rectified in the computes at the DPO.

In Rayagada District, during the time of data entry in computers of DPO, the DI of schools and the District Coordinators of DPO had cross-checked the DISE data at some schools and had reported the defects in the DCFs. Accordingly, the computerized data were then rectified.

Mayurbhanj being a very large District the data entry activity was first done at Educational District level and then at District level. At both levels, some selected BRCCs and CRCCs had been engaged to cross-check the data.

### **3.6 Feedback to Schools in terms of School Report Cards:**

In all the 03 Districts, the prescribed arrangement was to provide a computerized Schools Report Card furnished with relevant data to each school by the DPO. Certainly, it has to be done only after the completion of the data entry activity at DPO level. The field observation of the PES study team highlights that till the visit of the PES study team, no school of Angul and Rayagada Districts had got the School Report Card for 2008-09. On the other hand, towards last part of PES, the DPO, Mayurbhanj had provided the School Report Cards to schools. Hence the study team had noticed its availability in only 17 (7.83) out of 217 schools (Table 3.13)

### **3.7 Availability of DISE data at all levels:**

The PES study teams had observed that in Angul as well as Rayagada Districts, no school had its own copy of the DISE DCF with filled in data till the visit of the teams. It has happened because these districts had used only 01 copy instead of 2 copies of computerized DCF. Further, no CRC and BRC also had the compiled DISE data of their respective schools. It is because, the compilation of DISE data had directly been made at District level and not at Cluster and Block levels. Although District level data entry had been over, yet the Cluster and Block level disaggregated DISE data had not been given to any CRC and BRC till the completion of PES.

In Mayurbhanj District, the school level DISE data had been filled up in a printed DCF. Each school had been given 02 copies of DCF, 01 for compilation at higher level and 01 as school copy. In practice, the 02 filled in DCFs had been brought by the respective CRCCs from the schools for compilation and data entry at Education District level. After completion of data entry, some CRCCs had returned the school copy of the DCF to the respective schools whereas others had not returned till the visit of the PES study team to the schools. Hence, only 85 (39.17%) out of the 217 schools could show the school copy of the DISE DCF of 2008-09 to the study team on the day of its visit (Table 3.14).

Apart from the schools, the Cluster level compiled DISE data should be available at each CRC. Similarly, the Block level compiled DISE data should be available at each BRC. But the PES study teams had found that the compiled DISE data (Cluster/ Block level) of 2008-09 were available at no CRC and BRC of Angul, Rayagada and Mayurbhanj Districts. The DPOs, have planned to provide the Block level and Cluster level compiled DISE data to BRCs and CRCs respectively later on.

### **3.8 Evidence of Sharing Workshops at all levels for Dissemination and Awareness of DISE Data.**

In Angul District, sharing workshop had not been conducted till the completion of PES. The DPO had a plan to organize it in the month of April 2009. Owing to delay in DISE data filling and entry activities and advent of the planning process, the DPO had preferred to defer the sharing workshops to April 2009 and instead got engaged in plan preparation for 2009-10.

In Rayagada District the DPO had conducted a District level sharing work shop in January 2009 to disseminate the DISE data among the participants that included the BRCCs and the Coordinators of DPO Office. However, it had not conducted similar sharing workshops at BRC level inviting the CRCCs and at CRC level inviting the VEC and MTA members along with the Head Teachers.

In Mayurbhanj District, the DPO had conducted a District level sharing workshop on 09.02.09 for the BRCCs and had handed over the School Summary Reports to them. The DPO had planned to conduct the BRC and CRC level sharing workshops by the end of February 2009. Besides, it had also planned to provide the DISE data to the DWO, Mayurbhanj; Principal, DIET of Baripada; P.D., NCLP, Mayurbhanj; DSWO, Mayurbhanj; RWSS, Mayurbhanj etc. for dissemination of DISE data in March 2009.

### **3.9 Display of Key Information on the School Display / Information Board:**

In all the 03 Districts, i.e. Angul, Rayagada, Mayurbhanj, the DPO had given instruction to the Head Teacher of each school covered under the SSA programme to prepare a School Display / Information Board in a visible place and display some key DISE data like (1) students' enrollment, (2) students' daily attendance, (3) teachers in position, and (4) grants received. During the PES, it had been observed that only 305 (76.06%) out of the 401 schools had a School Display / Information Board (Table 3.15). In Angul District, 83.52 per cent schools had this Board whereas in Rayagada and Mayurbhanj Districts 69.89 and 75.58 per cent schools have this Board respectively. This indicates that the concerned DPOs of 03 Districts had failed to ensure the formation of such a Board in all schools even after completion of 06 years of SSA activities.

The findings presented in Table 3.16 reveals that all the prescribed 04 kinds of DISE data had not been displayed in the School Display / Information Board of all schools. Out of the total 307 schools that had the School Display / Information Board, students' enrollment data had been displayed in 251 (82.30%) schools; students' daily attendance data had been displayed in 157 (51.48%) schools; teachers in position data had been reflected in 256 (83.93%) schools; and grants received data had been displayed in 128 (41.69%) schools (Table 3.16). This indicates that all these 04 key data had not been displayed in all of those schools that had the School Display / Information Board.

### **3.10 Use of DISE Data in Planning:**

The DPOs of all the 03 Districts, Angul, Rayagada and Mayurbhanj had developed 25 number of tables out of the DISE data of 2008-09 and had utilized them in preparation of the Annual Work Plan and Budget of 2009-10. Due to delay in starting as well as completion of the DISE activity, the DPOs had not been able to ensure preparation of the Annual Work Plan at BRC, CRC or habitation level and hence had not used DISE data for plan preparation at these levels.

#### **Concluding Remarks:**

It is revealed from the above discussion that majority of the Principals/ Head Teachers were fully conscious of the importance of DISE activity and hence had shown positive response of the PES work. They had therefore also kept most of their records well updated for PES activity. But there is still a scope for further improvement in this area.

All Principals/ Head Teachers had not been given DISE training. About 20 per cent of them had missed it for various reasons. All Head Teachers had been trained for 01 day. Only about 40 per cent of Principals / Head Teachers had got full explanation of DISE guidelines during training and about 25 per cent of Principals / Head Teachers had been fully clarified of their doubts on DISE guidelines during DISE training. This indicates that DISE training had not perfectly helped them to avoid doing mistakes in filling up of DISE data in the DCF.

Owing to delayed operation of DISE activity in the State, the DPOs had not been able to send the School Summary Reports and the School Copy of DISE DCF to all schools before the PES. In many schools the DISE data had been reflected in the School Display Board. But there are still some schools that did not have a School Display Board. Despite organization of DISE training and consciousness of Principals/ Head Teachers of the DISE activity, mismatch between the DISE and PES data has been found on almost all items of comparable data. The major reasons for such mismatch and the policy recommendation for reducing the extent of such mismatch have been presented in the next chapter.

**Table 3.1: Quality of Initial Response of P/HT to the Investigators  
During PES, 2008-09**

Sl. No.	Name of District	No. of schools visited	No. of schools where the initial reaction of P/HT was:									
			Very good		Good		Average		Poor		Very poor	
			N	(%)	N	(%)	N	(%)	N	(%)	N	(%)
1	Angul	91	29	31.87	47	51.65	8	8.79	7	7.69	0	0.00
2	Rayagada	93	22	23.66	61	65.59	10	10.75	0	0.00	0	0.00
3	Mayurbhanj	217	194	89.40	22	10.14	1	0.46	0	0.00	0	0.00
<b>4</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>401</b>	<b>245</b>	<b>61.10</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>32.41</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>4.74</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>1.57</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.00</b>

Source: PES, 2008-09  
N=Total number of schools

**Table 3. 2: Quality of Initial Response of P/HT to Provide Information  
During PES, 2008-09**

Sl. No.	Name of District	No. of schools visited	No. of schools where quality of response of P/HT was:									
			Very good		Good		Average		Poor		Very poor	
			N	(%)	N	(%)	N	(%)	N	(%)	N	(%)
1	Angul	91	36	39.56	38	41.76	16	17.58	1	1.10	0	0.00
2	Rayagada	93	9	9.68	75	80.64	9	9.68	0	0.00	0	0.00
3	Mayurbhanj	217	94	43.32	120	55.30	2	0.92	1	0.46	0	0.00
<b>4</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>401</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>34.66</b>	<b>233</b>	<b>58.10</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>6.74</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0.50</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.00</b>

Source: PES, 2008-09  
N=Total number of schools

**Table 3.3: Extent of Availability of Records at Schools on the Day of PES, 2008-09**

Sl. No.	Name of District	No. of schools visited	Extent of availability of records									
			Very good		Good		Average		Poor		Very poor	
			N	(%)	N	(%)	N	(%)	N	(%)	N	(%)
1	Angul	91	12	13.19	40	43.96	38	41.75	1	1.10	0	0.00
2	Rayagada	93	3	3.23	64	68.82	25	26.88	1	1.07	0	0.00
3	Mayurbhanj	217	32	14.75	169	77.88	15	6.91	1	0.46	0	0.00
<b>4</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>401</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>11.72</b>	<b>273</b>	<b>68.08</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>19.45</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0.75</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.00</b>

Source: PES, 2008-09  
N=Total number of schools

**Table 3.4: Quality of Conditions of Records Maintained at Schools on the Day of PES, 2008-09**

Sl. No.	Name of District	No. of schools visited	Quality of conditions of records maintained									
			Very good		Good		Average		Poor		Very poor	
			N	(%)	N	(%)	N	(%)	N	(%)	N	(%)
1	Angul	91	15	16.48	37	40.66	38	41.76	1	1.10	0	0.00
2	Rayagada	93	5	5.38	71	76.34	16	17.20	1	1.08	0	0.00
3	Mayurbhanj	217	18	8.29	154	70.97	38	17.51	7	3.23	0	0.00
<b>4</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>401</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>9.48</b>	<b>262</b>	<b>65.34</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>22.94</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>2.24</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.00</b>

Source: PES, 2008-09  
N=Total number of schools

**Table 3.5: Quality of Updation of Records Maintained at Schools on the Day of PES, 2008-09**

Sl. No.	Name of District	No. of schools visited	Quality of updating of records									
			Very good		Good		Average		Poor		Very poor	
			N	(%)	N	(%)	N	(%)	N	(%)	N	(%)
1	Angul	91	11	12.09	31	34.07	43	47.25	6	6.59	0	0.00
2	Rayagada	93	5	5.38	61	65.59	25	26.88	2	2.15	0	0.00
3	Mayurbhanj	217	10	4.61	150	69.12	49	22.58	8	3.69	0	0.00
<b>4</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>401</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>6.48</b>	<b>242</b>	<b>60.35</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>29.18</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>3.99</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.00</b>

Source: PES, 2008-09  
N=Total number of schools

**Table 3.6: Extent of Principal / Head Teacher Received Training on DISE in 2008-09**

Sl.No.	Name of District	No. of Principal / Head Teacher interviewed for PES	No. of them got training on DISE in 2008-09	
		N	N	(%)
1	Angul	91	75	82.42
2	Rayagada	93	56	60.22
3	Mayurbhanj	217	183	84.33
<b>4</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>401</b>	<b>314</b>	<b>78.30</b>

Source: PES, 2008-09  
N=Total number of schools

**Table 3.7: Level of Organization of DISE Training in 2008-09**

Sl. No.	Name of District	No. of Principal / Head Teacher received DISE training	No. of Principal / Head Teacher got training at					
			Cluster level		Block level		District level	
			N	(%)	N	(%)	N	(%)
1	Angul	75	75	100.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
2	Rayagada	56	56	100.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
3	Mayurbhanj	183	36	19.67	147	80.33	0	0.00
<b>4</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>314</b>	<b>167</b>	<b>53.18</b>	<b>147</b>	<b>46.82</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.00</b>

Source: PES, 2008-09

N=Total number of Head Teachers/ Principals

**Table 3.8: Duration of DISE Training in 2008-09**

Sl. No.	Name of District	No. of Principal / Head Teacher received DISE training	No. of Principal / Head Teacher got training for					
			01 day		02 day		03 day	
			N	(%)	N	(%)	N	(%)
1	Angul	75	75	100.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
2	Rayagada	56	56	100.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
3	Mayurbhanj	183	183	100.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
<b>4</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>314</b>	<b>314</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.00</b>

Source: PES, 2008-09

N=Total number of Head Teachers/ Principals

**Table 3.9: Category of Trainers giving Training on DISE in 2008-09**

Sl. No.	Name of District	No. of Principal / Head Teacher received DISE training	No. of Principal / Head Teacher that have training from					
			BRCC		CRCC		DRP	
			N	(%)	N	(%)	N	(%)
1	Angul	75	15	20.00	59	78.67	1	1.33
2	Rayagada	56	17	30.36	39	69.64	0	0.00
3	Mayurbhanj	183	141	77.05	40	21.86	2	1.09
<b>4</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>314</b>	<b>173</b>	<b>55.10</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>43.94</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0.96</b>

Source: PES, 2008-09

N=Total number of Head Teachers/ Principals

**Table 3.10: Extent of Explanation of DCF during DISE Training in 2008-09**

Sl. No.	Name of District	No. of Principal / Head Teacher received DISE training	No. of Principal / Head Teacher stated that DCF had been					
			Fully explained		Partially explained		Not at all explained	
			N	(%)	N	(%)	N	(%)
1	Angul	75	41	54.97	34	45.33	0	0.00
2	Rayagada	56	32	57.14	22	39.29	2	3.57
3	Mayurbhanj	183	55	30.05	117	63.94	11	6.01
<b>4</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>314</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>40.76</b>	<b>173</b>	<b>55.10</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>4.14</b>

Source: PES, 2008-09

N=Total number of Head Teachers/ Principals

**Table 3.11: Extent of Doubts Removed During DISE Training in 2008-09**

Sl. No.	Name of District	No. of Head Teacher /Principal got training on DISE in 2008-09	No. of Head Teacher /Principal stated that doubts on DCF were					
			Fully removed		Not removed at all		Partially removed	
			N	(%)	N	(%)	N	(%)
1	Angul	75	34	45.33	7	9.34	34	45.33
2	Rayagada	56	28	50.00	3	5.36	25	44.64
3	Mayurbhanj	183	16	8.74	8	4.37	159	86.88
4	<b>Total</b>	<b>314</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>24.84</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>5.73</b>	<b>218</b>	<b>69.42</b>

Source: PES, 2008-09

N=Total number of Head Teachers/ Principals

**Table 3.12: Extent of Schools Where the DISE DCF had been filled up by the Same Teacher Who had got DISE Training in 2008-09**

Sl. No.	Name of District	No. of schools covered for PES	No. of schools where the same trained teacher had filled up the DISE DCF	
		N	N	(%)
1	Angul	91	78	85.71
2	Rayagada	93	73	78.49
3	Mayurbhanj	217	177	81.56
4	<b>Total</b>	<b>401</b>	<b>328</b>	<b>81.79</b>

Source: PES, 2008-09

N=total number of Schools

**Table 3.13: Extent of Schools Received School Summary Report (SSR) of 2008-09**

Sl.No.	Name of Districts	No. of schools visited for PES	No. of schools received SSR of 2008-09	
			N	(%)
1	Angul	91	0	0.00
2	Rayagada	93	0	0.00
3	Mayurbhanj	217	17	7.83
4	<b>Total</b>	<b>401</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>4.24</b>

Source: PES, 2008-09

N=Total number of Head Teachers/ Principals

**Table 3.14: Extent of Schools Having DISE Format with Filled in Data of 2008-09**

Sl.No.	Name of Districts	No. of schools visited for PES	No. of schools having DISE format with filled in data 2008-09	
			N	(%)
1	Angul	91	0	0.00
2	Rayagada	93	0	0.00
3	Mayurbhanj	217	85	39.17
4	<b>Total</b>	<b>401</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>21.20</b>

Source: PES, 2008-09

N=Total number of Head Teachers/ Principals

**Table 3.15: Extent of Schools Having School Display Board**

Sl.No.	Name of Districts	No. of schools visited for PES	No. of schools having School Display Board	
			N	(%)
1	Angul	91	76	83.52
2	Rayagada	93	65	69.89
3	Mayurbhanj	217	164	75.58
4	<b>Total</b>	<b>401</b>	<b>305</b>	<b>76.06</b>

Source: PES, 2008-09

N=Total number of Head Teachers/ Principals

**Table 3.16: Extent of Schools Mentioned DISE Data in School Display Board (SDB) on the Day of Visit of PES Study Team in 2008-09**

Sl.No.	Name of Districts	No. of schools having SDB	Extent of schools mentioned DISE Data on							
			student enrollment		student daily attendance		teachers in position		grant received	
			N	(%)	N	(%)	N	(%)	N	(%)
1	Angul	76	71	93.42	68	89.47	71	93.42	33	43.42
2	Rayagada	65	50	76.92	43	66.15	50	76.92	47	72.31
3	Mayurbhanj	164	130	79.27	46	28.05	135	82.32	48	29.27
4	<b>Total</b>	<b>305</b>	<b>251</b>	<b>82.30</b>	<b>157</b>	<b>51.48</b>	<b>256</b>	<b>83.93</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>41.97</b>

Source: PES, 2008-09

N=Total number of Head Teachers/ Principals

# CHAPTER-4

## MAJOR LACUNAE IN CONDUCTING DISE ACTIVITIES AND IN DISE AS WELL AS PES FORMATS

In order to improve the authenticity of DISE data, it is essential to reduce the mismatch between the DISE and PES data. Furthermore, it is also required to identify the major lacunae conducting the DISE activities that have contributed to occurrence of such mismatch. At the same time, it is obvious to examine again the contents and guidelines of DISE and PES formats to find out the defects that have compelled for the occurrence of such mismatch in one hand and for the wastage of time, money and labour in other hand. All these aspects have been analysed in this chapter. The analysis has been broadly presented in 02 sections. In Section-I, the major lacunae in conduction of DISE activities have been delineated whereas in Section-II, the major defects of DISE and PES formats have been discussed.

### Section-I

#### 4.1. Major Lacunae in Conducting DISE Activities:

The discussion has been made under the following major lacunae:

##### 4.1.1 Delay in conducting DISE Activities:

As per the Government of India guidelines, all kinds of preparatory DISE activities, such as DCF printing, DCF distribution to schools, DISE software provision to DPOs and BRCs, DISE training and record readiness at school points should have been completed prior to 30.09.08 to facilitate the smooth and timely initiation of DISE data filling at school points during October 2008. This preparedness had grossly missed this year in the entire State. In fact, the SPO and the DPOs had organized all these preparatory activities as late as November and early December 2008 and hence activities like data filling, data

cross-checking and data entry in computer had been hurriedly carried out within a short span of time. This contributed to defective data entry in DISE DCFs by some Principals/ Head Teachers and careless cross-checking by some CRCCs and BRCCs for which the mismatch between DISE and PES data had mainly occurred.

Owing to subsequent delay in operation of DISE data entry, the School Summary Reports as well as the school copy of DISE DCF could not be provided to the schools for sharing the findings in VEC meetings and for preparing the Habitation plan before preparation of the Cluster, Block and District plans. In fact, for this delay, plan preparation at Habitation, Cluster and Block Levels could not be done this year in Orissa, although it is mandatory to do so under SSA.

#### **4.1.2 Inadequate DISE Training:**

The field level observations during PES have revealed that there had been no provision of funds with specific unit cost for organization of DISE training separately for the Principals/ Head Teachers. For this reason the DISE training for them could not be conducted in Angul and Rayagada Districts at Cluster level to specifically discuss on the DCF guidelines. In these two Districts, discussion of DCF guidelines was partially done during the monthly Teacher Development Programme conducted in November 2008. Owing to adoption of this strategy, many Head Teachers could get some knowledge on the guidelines but could not get full clarification of their doubts. The findings in this regard have been presented in Chapter-3 in detail. Besides, the Principals and Head Teachers of private aided, private unaided, unrecognized and other categories of schools could not be given DISE training since they had not been invited to the TDPs. In fact, the mismatch between the DISE and PES data has been found more in the case of these schools.

In Mayurbhanj District, the training of Head Teachers had been conducted mainly at BRC level for only 01 day. Hence the discussion could not be done for a full day since it was not of residential nature. Thus, the training could not facilitate for detailed explanation and doubt clarification on the DCF guidelines and concepts.

The inadequacy of DISE training has been expressed by many of the trained Principals/ Head Teachers during their interaction with the PES study team. The findings of Chapter 3 prove it.

#### **4.1.3 Short Duration for Data Filling and Cross-checking**

This year, only 07 days duration had been given for data filling as well as data cross-checking at school points. Owing to inadequate training, some Principals and Head Teachers largely depended on the CRCC's cooperation for data filling. The CRCCs in some areas could not give adequate time to these Principals/ Head Teachers to make correct data filling. Where this support could not be obtained, the Principals/ Head Teachers made either no entry or wrong entry of data in the DISE DCFs.

Owing to short duration of time, some CRCCs also could not properly cross-check the DCFs of some schools. Even minor mistakes of no data entry had not been rectified by the CRCCs. The BRCCs for the same reason have also could not properly cross-check the DISE DCFs.

#### **4.1.4 No Data Compilation of DISE Data at CRC and BRC levels:**

In all the 03 Districts, this year DISE data compilation at CRC and BRC levels had not been done. Rather the compilation work had been done directly at DPO level in Angul and Rayagada Districts and at Educational District level and then at DPO level in Mayurbhanj District. As a result, all CRCCs and BRCCs could not get a second chance to rectify the defects in DISE DCFs. At DPO level, correction was done by only a few BRCCs / CRCCs and hence many defects could not be rectified.

#### **4.1.5 Non-Cooperation of Private Schools in Providing Data:**

In some areas like Udala NAC, Rairangpur Block and Baripada Municipality, the CRCCs had not collected DISE data from a few private aided, private unaided, unrecognized and other categories of schools because of non-cooperation of the Principal/ Head Teacher of these schools. During the PES, data had been collected from these schools and as a result, mismatch between DISE and PES data had occurred. The DPOs had also not taken appropriate measures to obtain data from such schools.

#### **4.1.6 Delay in Computerization of DISE Data:**

This problem had been faced especially by the DPO of Mayurbhanj. Although it was a very large District having 26 Blocks it was devoid of the requisite number of regular Data Entry Operators. It had to hire the Data Entry Operators for DISE work. Being untrained and inexperienced in DISE activity, they consumed excess time in Data entry.

## Section-II

### 4.2 Major Defects in DISE and PES Formats:

There has been some mistakes in the DISE and PES formats as well as guidelines. These have contributed to occurrence of mismatch between DISE and PES data to some extent and to wastage of time and effort in conducting the PES. The defects are as follows:

#### 4.2.1 Unclear Guidelines:

- The DISE guidelines have not clearly mentioned regarding how to calculate and authenticate the number of visits of CRCC and BRCC to schools. Hence, cross-checking of the data in this case is difficult.
- The DISE guidelines have also remained silent on how to place a teacher in the category of primary/ upper primary, if he/she takes equal number of classes in both primary and upper primary levels.
- As per the DISE guidelines, a child can remain absent from school continuously for more than 03 months and comes back to school during the same academic year (say, from May to October). She/he may be a long absentee but will she/he be a repeater? The guidelines have not clarified it.
- There are several instances noticed especially in backward areas during the PES that parents had requested the Head Teachers to allow their child to study in the same class for more than one year continuously even if the child had passed in the Annual Examination. Can such a child be called a repeater ? The DISE guidelines have no answer to it.
- The DISE guidelines have also not very specifically mentioned whether long absentees and re-admission are different types of repeaters or not.
- The PES guidelines have not clearly mentioned how to categorize a school building where a school has 01 pucca building, 01 partially pucca building and 01 kuccha building.

#### **4.2.2 Defects in PES Format:**

- The PES format has spaces for enrollment up to class VIII. But the DISE format devised for High Schools have spaces up to Class –X. The PES format has also no boxes / space to collect data and teachers in position in case of High Schools. Hence, it was difficult to compare the data.
- The PES format has items like children enrollment and attendance on the day of visit of PES study team, examination results of Classes I, II, III, IV, VI, VIII and VEC composition as well as meetings but such items are not there in the DISE DCF. Hence, the data collected by PES became irrelevant for the purpose of cross-checking the DISE data. This resulted into wastage of time, money and efforts of PES.

#### **4.2.3 No Collection of Data in DISE DCF that are Relevant for Planning**

The data relating to water supply to toilet, school dress grant, number of computers available and used by children, number of untrained teachers not received 60 days refresher training, number of newly recruited teachers not received 30 days induction training, availability of pucca kitchen shed–cum-store instead of just kitchen shed and MDM activity are not collected in the DISE format.

#### **Concluding Remarks:**

The above deliberations have unraveled some key defects in the overall operation of DISE as well as PES activities. The persistence of these defects have caused for a series of unwanted defects in DISE data. On the other hand, some key data required for planning are not collected in the DISE DCFs. The next chapter has therefore delineated the policy measures to be taken to reduce the defects.

# CHAPTER-5

## **POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR REDUCING DEFECTS IN DISE DATA AND FOR IMPROVING THE DISE AS WELL AS PES OPERATIONS**

The ultimate objective of this study is to find out ways to improve the authenticity as well as reliability of the DISE data. Keeping this in view, an exhaustive and holistic discussion has been made in the earlier chapters to know the areas and reasons of defects in DISE data. Basing upon the findings in this regard, some policy measures have been suggested below to make overall improvement of both DISE and PES operations in future.

### **5.1 Policy Recommendations:**

1. All preparatory activities pertaining to DISE data filling and entry, such as (1) distribution of DISE DCFs to schools, (2) training on DCF guidelines, (3) updation and availability of all required records etc. should be completed prior to 30<sup>th</sup> September every year.
2. DISE data filling activity should be commenced and completed in the first 15 days of October and should be cross-checked by the CRCCs and BRCCs by end of October.
3. Data compilation activity should be conducted for each Cluster and Block during the 1<sup>st</sup> half of November and the data entry activity should be completed by the end of November.
4. School Summary Reports should be distributed to each school by 15<sup>th</sup> December so that in December the VEC can conduct sharing meeting.
5. The school copy of DISE DCF should be returned to schools immediately after completion of CRC level data compilation work to facilitate sharing of DISE data in VEC meeting.
6. With a view to improve the clarity of concepts and guidelines, the SPO may instruct all DPOs to utilize the TDP meeting of April/May of 2009 for discussion among teachers about the items / concepts/ instructions of

- the DCF guidelines so as to identify their doubts relating to data filling. All CRCCs should be instructed to compile their doubts in details, even citing cases/ examples, and submit to the Programmer of each DPO. At SPO level meeting, the Programmers should interact with the MIS Unit of the SPO and prepare a handout, clarifying all the doubts. The handouts then be distributed to all schools, CRCs and BRCs for future reference.
7. The DISE training should be organized at all levels (District, Block and Cluster) and for all stakeholders (BRCCs, CRCCs, Data Entry Operators and finally Principals/ head Teachers of all categories of schools) atleast for 01 full day for each level. The handouts, as suggested above, should be discussed along with the details of DCF guidelines and a copy of it be again given to each trainee. Accordingly, budget allocation should be made in the Annual Work Plan and Budget every year.
  8. The CRCCs and BRCCs should be instructed to certify the DCFs only after verifying that the data have been correctly entered in all items. No item is to be left blank by the concerned Principal/ Head Teacher. They should be made accountable if DCFs with no entry of data against any item are collected by them from the Principal/ Head Teacher. They should intimate the DI of schools/ BRCC/ DPC if any school is not cooperating in providing fully furnished DCFs. They should compile the data and submit all the DCFs to the BRCCs for final cross-checking before initiation of data entry at Block/Educational District/ District level.
  9. All CRCCs should be instructed to ensure display of DISE data, such as (1) teachers in position as on 30<sup>th</sup> September, (2) students enrollment as on 30<sup>th</sup> September, (3) amount received against school improvement grant, teacher grant, maintenance grant, school dress grant and civil work grant, and (4) daily attendance of children on the School Display/ Information Board of each school. The data are to be updated every year after receipt of the School Summary Report.
  10. The DPO may be permitted wherever required to engage regular contractual Data Entry Operators through service providers for a specific

- period of time, as per need, to facilitate smooth and timely computerization of the DISE data.
11. The explanations given in the DISE guidelines should be rechecked basing upon the doubts raised by the Principals/ Head Teachers and accordingly be made more clear and specific.
  12. The conceptual explanations given in the PES guidelines should be same as those of the DISE DCF guidelines.
  13. Items that are absolutely irrelevant from the point of cross-checking the DISE data or of ascertaining the extent of preparedness for DISE activity or of knowing the extent of utilization of DISE data should not be incorporated in the PES format.
  14. Necessary structural changes should be made in the PES format so as to make it applicable to collect the required data from the High Schools having Upper Primary level of education.
  15. The DISE DCF should be restructured to collect data on items that are relevant for planning namely, number of computers available and used by children, number of untrained teachers not received refresher training for 60 days, number of newly recruited teachers not obtained 30 days induction training, water supply to toilet, school dress grant, civil work grant, availability of pucca kitchen shed-cum-store instead of kitchen and some items on MDM activity.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Acharya P.K. (2008): '*Implementation of Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan and Mid-Day-Meal Programmes in Orissa*', NKC Centre for Development Studies, Bhubaneswar, Orissa.
2. Gol and NUEPA (2008), '*Elementary Education in India: Progress towards UEE*', New Delhi.
3. Government of India (2002), '*Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan: A Programme for Universal Elementary Education*', New Delhi: Ministry of Human Resource Development, Department of Elementary Education and Literacy.
4. Mishra, Rashmi (2008), '*Study on Effectiveness of BRCs and CRCs in Providing Academic Support and Supervision to Elementary Schools in Orissa*', NKC Centre for Development Studies, Bhubaneswar, Orissa.
5. OPEPA, Bhubaneswar (2009), '*Updating DISE Data and CTS for 2008-09*'.
6. *Overview of Quality Related Interventions under SSA*, ([www.ssa.nic.in](http://www.ssa.nic.in))
7. World Bank (1997), '*Primary Education in India*', Washington DC: the World Bank.

## List of Sample Schools Covered for PES, 2008-09

### ANGUL DISTRICT

Sl. No.	Block Name	School Name	School Code	No. of School
1	<b>ANGUL</b>	SARADHAPUR (A) UP SCHOOL	0105501	<b>12</b>
2		CHANDRABAHAL PRIMARY SCHOOL	0119101	
3		KUMURISINGHA UP SCHOOL	0113904	
4		BNTAL BAZAR PRIMARY SCHOOL	0105701	
5		BALUAKATA UP SCHOOL	0105202	
6		SABALABHANGA PS	0105301	
7		RANTALEI PROJECT PS	0120001	
8		CHANDRABAHAL UP SCHOOL	0119102	
9		PANCHAYAT HIGH SCHOOL, CHHELIAPADA	0107851	
10		BADAKERA UP SCHOOL	0102402	
11		LINGARAJODI PRIMARY SCHOOL	0119401	
12		PANCHAMAHALA PRIMARY SCHOOL	0119801	
1	<b>ATHAMALLIK</b>	THAKURGARH PS	0232602	<b>11</b>
2		KANTAPADA PS	0209702	
3		GUNDURI PROJECT UPS	0231001	
4		THAKURGARH UP SCHOOL	0232603	
5		PEDIPATHAR TO U.P. SCHOOL	0225203	
6		SANAHULLA P.S.	0227902	
7		SANAHULLA UP.SCHOOL	0227903	
8		KANTAPADA TO UP. SCHOOL	0209703	
9		BARAHAMA U.P. SCHOOL	0224701	
10		JHILLIMUNDA PROJECT U.P.SCHOOL	0225001	
11		PEDIPATHAR PRIMARY SCHOOL	0225202	
1	<b>BANARPAL</b>	BHAGABATPUR PRIMARY SCHOOL	0305001	<b>10</b>
2		SARASWATI SISHU MANDIR	0303173	
3		BUDHAPANKA UP SCHOOL	0303703	
4		PANCHAGARH BIJAY KUMAR HIGH SCHOOL	0303103	
5		BANARPAL SEB ASHRAM	0303101	
6		TENTULIHATA PS	0304001	
7		BISWANATHPUR PROJECT UP SCHOOL	0305801	
8		NALACHANDRAPUR PROJECT PRIMARY SCHOOL	0304902	
9		NUAHATA GOVT. UP SCHOOL	0310302	
10		BALISAHI PRIMARY SCHOOL	0310301	

Sl. No.	Block Name	School Name	School Code	No. of School
1	<b>CHHENDIPADA</b>	GURUNDU GOPAL HIGH SCHOOL	0409151	<b>12</b>
2		KORADA GP HIGH SCHOOL	0409651	
3		NAUPADA PS	0401701	
4		PUTAGADIA UPS	0409702	
5		PUTAGADIA SEVASHRAM	0409701	
6		KORADA UPS	0409602	
7		SPECIAL CHILD LABOUR SCHOOL, BALIPATTA	0401201	
8		PITABALI UPS	0412002	
9		JARAPADA PRIMARY SCHOOL	0406101	
10		KUMURSING PRIMARY SCHOOL	0406401	
11		TUKUDA PANAPADA PRIMARY SCHOOL	0419004	
12		TUKUDA UP SCHOOL	0419005	
<hr/>				
1	<b>KANIHA</b>	BHIMKAND PRIMARY SCHOOL	0505801	<b>11</b>
2		KANDASAR PROJECT UP. SCHOOL	0506501	
3		EKGHARIA PRIMARY SCHOOL	0512601	
4		KNIHA PRIMARY SCHOOL	0516501	
5		TAKUA PRIMARY SCHOOL	0517101	
6		BARRAGE PRIMARY SCHOOL, SAMAL	0521402	
7		SUNAKHANI P.S.	0513401	
8		HANUMANPUR UP. SCHOOL	0511902	
9		SAGADIPAL PRIMARY SCHOOL	0511904	
10		TIPPO PRIMARY SCHOOL	0521403	
11		BILINDA PRIMARY SCHOOL	0520701	
<hr/>				
1	<b>KISHORE NAGAR</b>	TRIDHARA PROJECT P.S	0618402	<b>9</b>
2		SARASWATI SISHU MANDIR, SARADA VIHAR	0618451	
3		KADALIMUNDA PROJECT UPS	0618401	
4		BANINALI PROJECT UP SCHOOL	0607702	
5		SARADHAMUDA PRIMARY SCHOOL	0618801	
6		KISHOREGANJ PRIMARY SCHOOL	0618601	
7		PARBATIPUR PROJECT PRIMARY SCHOOL	0611004	
8		BHIMADEV UP SCHOOL KHANDABARA	0611151	
9		LUHAMUNDA PRIMARY SCHOOL	0618501	

Sl. No.	Block Name	School Name	School Code	No. of School
1	<b>PALLAHARA</b>	GOVT. NODAL U.P.SCHOOL,KHAMAR	0712001	<b>13</b>
2		BAHADAPASI UP. SCHOOL	0701002	
3		BADASADA NUASAHI NCLP SPECIAL SCHOOL	0701004	
4		BIDYANATHPUR PRIMARY SCHOOL	0724601	
5		BADASADA PRIMARY SCHOOL	0701001	
6		NUTHURIPASI PROJECT PS	0712601	
7		BADASADA NUASAHI PRIMARY SCHOOL	0702101	
8		SANKHAMUR PS	0725902	
9		TOWN GIRLS UP. SCHOOL	0718203	
10		UDAYAPUR COLONY PRIMARY SCHOOL	0718205	
11		SRIRAMPUR PRIMARY SCHOOL	0704403	
12		KERJENGA PRIMARY SCHOOL	0708501	
13		BANAR PRIMARY SCHOOL	0713501	
1	<b>TALCHER</b>	CHALAGARH PRIMARY SCHOOL	0806403	<b>8</b>
2		CHATIAHATTING PROJECT PRIMARY SCHOOL	0806404	
3		GHANTAPADA PROJECT UP SCHOOL	0806407	
4		COLLIERY HIGH SCHOOL TALCHER	0804601	
5		DERA PROJECT UP SCHOOL	0804602	
6		CENTRAL COLONY PRIMARY SCHOOL	0806402	
7		SIRIGIDA PRIMARY SCHOOL	0808401	
8		BALHAR PRIMARY SCHOOL	0801201	
1	<b>ANGUL MPLT</b>	GEETAGRAM PRIMARY SCHOOL	0901601	<b>2</b>
2		ROTARY PUBLIC SCHOOL	0901451	
1	<b>ATHAMALLIK</b>	TOWN URDA PRIMARY SCHOOL	1000601	<b>1</b>
1	<b>TALCHER NAC</b>	GOVT. GIRLS HIGH SCHOOL	1100501	<b>2</b>
2		DEULABERA PRIMARY SCHOOL	1101702	

## RAYAGADA DISTRICT

Sl. No.	Block Name	School Name	School Code	No. of School
1	<b>BISSAMCUTTACK</b>	NALINEE VIDYA MANDIR	0106171	<b>11</b>
2		CHATIKONA UP SCHOOL	0106503	
3		GOTIGUDA ASHRAM SCHOOL	0118502	
4		BLOCK COLONY P.S.	0103204	
5		INDIRA COLONY P.S.	0103207	
6		N.L.E.M. U.P SCHOOL	0103252	
7		CHURCH STREET PRIMARY SCHOOL	0103205	
8		HARIJANSTREET PRIMARY SCHOOL	0103206	
9		BISSAMCUTTACK GOVT. UP.SCHOOL	0103202	
10		BISSAMCUTTACK U.P.SCHOOL	0103203	
11		JAWAHAR NAVODAYA VIDYALAYA	0103208	
1	<b>CHANDRAPUR</b>	GOVT.GIRLS HIGH SCHOOL CHANDRAPUR (K.S.)	0206702	<b>5</b>
2		ENKANAGUDA P.U.P. SCHOOL	0204101	
3		U.G.U.P. SCHOOL DANGASORADA	0210102	
4		GAJARAJASAHU PRY. SCHOOL, CHANDRAPUR	0206703	
5		NCLP, CHANDRAPUR	0206705	
1	<b>GUDARI</b>	PRIMARY SCHOOL, KINNIDI	0314001	<b>5</b>
2		PRIMARY SCHOOL BADAHUMA	0313501	
3		PRIMARY SCHOOL, CHANDILIGUDA	0307501	
4		TALATAMPA PRIMARY SCHOOL	0311401	
5		HAJARIDANGA PRIMARY SCHOOL	0308101	
1	<b>GUNUPUR</b>	CHALAKMBA HIGH SCHOOL, CHALAKAMBA	0401801	<b>8</b>
2		KHARLING PRIMARY SCHOOL	0403501	
3		PRIMARY SCHOOL OMPERA	0403601	
4		GOVT. NODAL U.P.SCHOOL, CHALAKAMBA	0401802	
5		PRIMARY SCHOOL., KHAITHAPADAR	0411001	
6		S.CHINTALIGUDA P.S	0411301	
7		NODAL U.P. SCHOOL, SIRIJHOLY	0411302	
8		PROJECT U.P.SCHOOL,KALAMA	0401901	
1	<b>K.SINGHPUR</b>	BHALUMASKA PRIMARY SCHOOL	0519301	<b>7</b>
2		CHARAPAI PRIMARY SCHOOL	0516801	
3		HARIJANSTREET UP.SCHOOL, K.SINGPUR	0504005	
4		SWAMI VIVEKANANDA SISUMANDIR	0504051	
5		GOVT.UP SCHOOL KALYAN SINGPUR	0504004	
6		ADABADI P.S	0501301	
7		PRIMARY SCHOOL, DHAMALIMA	0519601	

Sl. No.	Block Name	School Name	School Code	No. of School
1	KASHIPUR	BADAPUKEL PRIMARY SCHOOL	0630301	11
2		USHAPADA PRIMARY SCHOOL	0644601	
3		PRIMARY SEVASHRAM , THUTIBARA	0644202	
4		LELLIGUMA PRIMARY SCHOOL	0635401	
5		ANAGAR PRIMARY SCHOOL	0606401	
6		PROJECT PRIMARY SCHOOL, NUAPADA	0615703	
7		DIMUNDI PRIMARY SCHOOL	0615701	
8		KANTAMAL KARAL PRIMARY SCHOOL	0620903	
9		PADMAPUR PRIMARY SCHOOL	0605301	
10		SORISAPADAR P.U.P. SCHOOL	0628801	
11		DAMBA KARAL P.U.P.SCHOOL	0620901	
1	KOLNARA	THERUBALI SEVASRAM (PRATHAMIKA SEVASHRAM)	0719901	8
2		PRIMARY SCHOOL RELIBADIGAN	0719701	
3		KELIGUDA P.S	0711501	
4		BHUJABALA P.S.	0713401	
5		BRAMHANA SHAHI P.S.	0714301	
6		PROJECT U.P.SCHOOL, SURI	0719301	
7		ANAKABADI P.S.	0713301	
8		MINAJHOLA PRIMARY SCHOOL	0709001	
1	MUNIGUDA	U.G.U.P.SCHOOL, BHAIKABAGADA	0805201	8
2		SUNDHI STREET PUPS	0821008	
3		ASHRAM SCHOOL MUNIKHOL	0822402	
4		P.U.P.SCHOOL, BHALIAPADAR	0821301	
5		VEVEKANANDA SIKHYA KENDRA	0821053	
6		HARIJAN STREET P.S.	0821001	
7		U.G.U.P. SCHOOL MUNIGUDA	0821005	
8		NCLP SCHOOL, MUNIKHOL	0822403	
1	PADAMPUR	G.T.O.U.P.SCHOOL, PERUPANGA	0900402	6
2		PERUPANGA PRIMARY SCHOOL	0900403	
3		UPPER JUMURUGUDA P.S.	0911104	
4		HARIJAN SAHI PRIMARY SCHOOL, PADAMPUR	0911301	
5		U.G.U.P. SCHOOL, KHAMAPADAR	0906101	
6		PRIMARY SCHOOL, MARIGUDA	0906201	

Sl. No.	Block Name	School Name	School Code	No. of School
1	<b>RAMANAGUDA</b>	SIBARAMPUR P.S.	1000303	<b>7</b>
2		P.U.P.S. ANTARJHOLI	1000101	
3		PRIMARY SEVASHRAM PARIKHITI	1008001	
4		KHILAPADARA P.S	1008302	
5		PROJECT U.P.SCHOOL, RAMANAGUDA	1008305	
6		PRIMARY SCHOOL CHAKUNDA	1002201	
7		PROJECT U.P.S. PARLA	1002901	
1	<b>RAYAGADA</b>	SARASWATI SISHUMANDIRA J.K.PUR	1104851	<b>11</b>
2		KNDHAMALIGAM	1113702	
3		PROJECT U.P.SCHOOL, HALUA	1110502	
4		PRIMARY SCHOOL, KOMATALAPETA	1119501	
5		TOLOGURUTHI PRIMARY SCHOOL	1120502	
6		JHINJILIBADI PRIMARY SCHOOL	1124501	
7		GREEN VALLY PUBLIC SCHOOOL	1124671	
8		SINGIPUR ROAD PRIMARY SCHOOL	1114404	
9		AMALABHATTA CHAKA PRIMARY SCHOOL	1124401	
10		JAPAKHAL PRIMARY SEVASHRAM	1110901	
11		KOTHAPETA NODAL U.P.SCHOOL	1116302	
1	<b>GUDARI NAC</b>	Ex-BOARD PRIMARY SCHOOL	1200201	<b>1</b>
1	<b>RAYAGADA (MPLT)</b>	SARASWATI SISHU MANDIR R.K. NAGAR	1400551	<b>3</b>
2		DHOBI STREET P.S	1400101	
3		LOTUS DAY SCHOOL	1401471	
1	<b>GUNUPUR NAC</b>	SRI AUROBINDA PURNANGA BIDYALAYA	1301151	<b>2</b>
2		JIDICIAL COLONY P.S.	1300103	

## MAYURBHANJ DISTRICT

Sl. No.	Block name	School Name	School Code	No. of School
1	<b>KARANJIA</b>	RASAMTALA NODAL UP SCHOOL	1214702	<b>8</b>
2		KULIPOSI PRIMARY SCHOOL	1210701	
3		ASANBANI PROJECT UPPER PRIMARY SCHOOL	1204201	
4		GHODAGHAGURI PRIMARY SCHOOL	1214003	
5		KURULIA UPPER PRIMARY SCHOOL	1203401	
6		CHANCHBANI PRIMARY SCHOOL	1203701	
7		BADADEULI PROJECT UP SCHOOL	1200202	
8		TOTO PRIMARY SCHOOL	1215603	
1	<b>KUSUMI</b>	TENTAPOSI U.G.U.P. SCHOOL	1511301	<b>8</b>
2		TENTAPOSI URDU PRIMARY SCHOOL	1511302	
3		KADUANI PRIMARY SCHOOL	1503201	
4		JAMUDIHI PRIMARY SCHOOL	1505001	
5		UPARBEDA GIRISAHU PRIMARY SCHOOL	1511402	
6		JORADA UPPER PRIMARY SCHOOL	1505101	
7		RAMJALI PRIMARY SCHOOL	1505501	
8		MAHULDIHA PRIMARY SCHOOL	1505202	
1	<b>SHAMAKHUNTA</b>	BHOLA GADIA PRIMARY SCHOOL	2000401	<b>8</b>
2		DHANPUR UPPER PRIMARY SCHOOL	2009901	
3		MAHULIA PROJECT PRIMARY SCHOOL	2007602	
4		BALIDIHA U.G. SEBASHRAMA	2000302	
5		LAL MOHAN UPPER PRIMARY SCHOOL	2000402	
6		DHANPUR PRIMARY SCHOOL	2009902	
7		SALBANI PRIMARY SCHOOL	2009501	
8		JAYBILLA PROJECT UPPER PRIMARY SCHOOL	2010001	
1	<b>MORADA</b>	SILDA PRIMARY SCHOOL	1605801	<b>10</b>
2		CHITRADA GIRL'S HIGH SCHOOL	1605451	
3		BAINCHIDIHA PRIMARY SCHOOL	1600101	
4		ANANTA DAMPATI BIDYA MANDIR NODAL UP SCHOOL	1605401	
5		BALADIA PRIMARY SCHOOL	1612701	
6		MALIHATA U.G. U.P. SCHOOL	1612901	
7		G.B. GOVT. HIGH SCHOOL, MORADA	1613001	
8		LAXMI NARAYAN U.P. SCHOOL	1600103	
9		MORADA PRIMARY SCHOOL	1613003	
10		BHAIRABI PRIMARY SCHOOL	1605402	
1	<b>BIJATALA</b>	DAMBEDA PRIMARY SCHOOL	0603301	<b>6</b>
2		TULASIBANI P.U.P.S.	0611301	
3		BHALKICHUA PRIMARY SCHOOL	0603001	
4		BANKADUNGURI PRIMARY SCHOOL	0602801	
5		MUNDA THAKURA U.P.S.	0603902	
6		DAMUDIGADA PRIMARY SCHOOL	0603401	

Sl. No.	Block name	School Name	School Code	No. of School
1	<b>BARIPADA</b>	BADJOD HOGH SCHOOL	0400103	<b>7</b>
2		ST. MARY'S PRIMARY SCHOOL	0400404	
3		ST. MARY'S UPPER PRIMARY SCHOOL	0400405	
4		RANGAMATIA (B) PRIMARY SCHOOL	0400108	
5		GOHALDIHI PRIMARY SCHOOL	0400107	
6		BADJOD PRIMARY SCHOOL	0400101	
7		BANASTHALI BIDYAPITHA, BADJOD	0400104	
1	<b>TIRING</b>	PODACHAKIDI U.G.U.P. SCHOOL	2506601	<b>4</b>
2		NISCHINTA PUR PROJECT U.P. SCHOOL	2506001	
3		DUBULABEDA PRIMARY SCHOOL	2503301	
4		BAD-DALIMA PRIMARY SCHOOL	2500102	
1	<b>RAIRANGPUR</b>	NAUJODA PROJECT UPPER PRIMARY SCHOOL	1701301	<b>6</b>
2		MUSHABANI PRIMARY SCHOOL	1701101	
3		NAUGAN PROJECT UPPER PRIMARY SCHOOL	1704401	
4		BADABAIKALA U.G.U.P SCHOOL	1703602	
5		BHANJASORA PRIMARY SCHOOL	1703701	
6		CHAMPRAI PRIMARY SCHOOL	1703801	
1	<b>BISOI</b>	KUNDULIA PROJECT UPPER PRIMARY SCHOOL	0706701	<b>7</b>
2		MAJHISAH I PRIMARY SCHOOL	0705604	
3		MANDIRASAH I PRIMARY SCHOOL	0705605	
4		KUDARSAH I PRIMARY SCHOOL	0706402	
5		KATAS PRIMARY SCHOOL	0706401	
6		BLOCK COLONY ORIMARY SCHOOL	0705603	
7		BADHUNIA PRIMARY SCHOOL	0708801	
1	<b>G.B. NAGAR</b>	KISHAN NODAL UP SCHOOL	0807002	<b>8</b>
2		NIRAKAR NODAL UP (ME) SCHOOL	1206002	
3		BAPUJI HIGH SCHOOL	0807051	
4		DAMODARPUR PRIMARY SCHOOL	0808301	
5		CHAMPAGODI PRIMARY SCHOOL	0808901	
6		JAYPUR HIGH SCHOOL	0803051	
7		JAYPUR UPPER PRIMARY SCHOOL	0803002	
8		JAYPUR PRIMARY SCHOOL	0803001	
1	<b>JAMADA</b>	JAMADA PRIMARY SCHOOL	0902702	<b>6</b>
2		KANDSORE NODAL UPPER PRIMARY SCHOOL	0905701	
3		TENDRA UPPER PRIMARY SCHOOL	0907705	
4		KUDAHANSA PROJECT UPPER PRIMARY SCHOOL	0906801	
5		SANAKULEIBIRA U.G.U.P. SCHOOL	0907101	
6		DUMADIHI PRIMARY SCHOOL	0905601	

Sl. No.	Block name	School Name	School Code	No. of School
1	<b>RAS GOBIND PUR</b>	PRAHARAJ PUR NEW PRIMARY SCHOOL	1901801	<b>8</b>
2		PANDIT RAGHUNATH MEMORIAL HIGH SCHOOL	1911651	
3		NALAGAJA PRIMARY SCHOOL	1911101	
4		BASANTI SREERAM CHANDRA NODAL UPPER PRIMARY SCHOOL	1911202	
5		GOVT. HIGH SCHOOL, NALAGAJA	1911102	
6		ANCHALIKA SAHAJOGA HIGH SCHOOL	1911251	
7		BAHAGADIA PRIMARY SCHOOL	1909901	
8		KAKABANDHA U.P SEVASHRAM	1901201	
1	<b>KHUNTA</b>	ANLASULI PRIMARY SCHOOL	1302901	<b>9</b>
2		KUCHEI NODAL UPPER PRIMARY SCHOOL	1411802	
3		BHOLGADIA PRIMARY SCHOOL	1400501	
4		BADJUNABANI PROJECT UPPER PRIMARY SCHOOL	1410802	
5		GANGRAJ NODAL UPPER PRIMARY SCHOOL	1404302	
6		JAMAPADA PRIMARY SCHOOL	1403701	
7		GANGRAJ HIGH SCHOOL	1404301	
8		TUMUDA PROJECT PRIMARY SCHOOL	1405401	
9		RAGHUNATHGANJ NODAL UPPER PRIMARY SCHOOL	1404901	
1	<b>BADASAH</b>	SRI AUROBINDA INTEGRAL EDUCATION SCHOOL	0310551	<b>12</b>
2		SUBASINI JEMAMANI HIGH SCHOOL	0309201	
3		KHUNTAPAL PRIMARY SCHOOL	0301301	
4		BADASAH PRIMARY SCHOOL	0300703	
5		SHRI JAGANNATHA NODAL UP SCHOOL	0310702	
6		VIJAY HIGH SCHOOL	0309201	
7		BAGULI ASHRAM SCHOOL	0310401	
8		SOVAMANI UP(ME) SCHOOL	0301371	
9		JOGI NUAGAN SEVASHRAM	0309202	
10		DANTUNI PRIMARY SCHOOL	0302501	
11		PRATAP PUR PRIMARY SCHOOL	0315902	
12		HATIBANDHA PRIMARY SCHOOL	0310201	
1	<b>SULIAPADA</b>	BADA DHENKIA PRIMARY SCHOOL	2308502	<b>8</b>
2		KOSTHA PRIMARY SCHOOL	2312602	
3		KATHASIRSHI PRIMARY SCHOOL	2315801	
4		GOVT. HIGH SCHOOL, KIJIDIHA	2313701	
5		JURUKA U.G.U.P. SCHOOL	2312501	
6		KOSTHA NEW GOVT. HIGH SCHOOL, KOSTHA	2312601	
7		KOSTHA UP T.O. SCHOOL	2312603	
8		KUJIDIHI UPPER PRIMARY SCHOOL	2313704	

Sl. No.	Block name	School Name	School Code	No. of School
1	<b>BANGIRIPOS</b>	MOHULISOLE PRIMARY SCHOOL	0211701	<b>10</b>
2		PANISHAL PROJECT UPPER PRIMARY SCHOOL	0211901	
3		JAGANNATH KHUNTA HIGH SCHOOL	0211301	
4		KHADIASOLE PRIMARY SCHOOL	0211303	
5		KENDUDIHA PRIMARY SCHOOL	0211601	
6		UDALI PRIMARY SCHOOL	0216401	
7		UNCHADIHA NEW PRIMARY SCHOOL	0216501	
8		PATHURI UP (UG) SCHOOL	0216201	
9		DHADANGIRI PRIMARY SCHOOL	0216003	
10		KALABADIA NODAL UPPER PRIMARY SCHOOL	0211501	
1	<b>KAPTIPADA</b>	JARADA NODAL UP ME SCHOOL	1111601	<b>12</b>
2		KAPTIPADA PRYMARY SCHOOL	1108404	
3		KAPTIPADA NEW GOVT.HIGH SCHOOL	1108403	
4		NUASAH I UP ME SCHOOL	1104701	
5		NUASAH I PRIMARY SCHOOL	1104702	
6		SANA SIMULIA NEW UPPER PRIMARY SCHOOL	1108501	
7		JANAKPUR PRIMARY SCHOOL	1100502	
8		KAPTIPADA GOVT. UP (K.G.B.V) SCHOOL	1108402	
9		KARAPADA PRIMARY SCHOOL	1111701	
10		KAPTIPADA NEW GOVT. GIRL'S HIGH SCHOOL	1108401	
11		SANBISOLE PRIMARY SCHOOL	1100901	
12		KAPTIPADA UG UP SCHOOL	1108405	
1	<b>BETNOTI</b>	SUKHILAHAR NODAL UP SCHOOL	0504505	<b>11</b>
2		DHANPUR NODAL UP SCHOOL (KGBV)	0512601	
3		SATHILO NODAL UP SCHOOL	0515002	
4		BETNOTI PUBLIC SCHOOL	0504151	
5		TARAKOTHI PRIMARY SCHOOL	0513001	
6		SARADA SHIKSHA KENDRA	0504252	
7		BHOGABATI PRIMARY SCHOOL	0504201	
8		SARASWATI SHISU VIDYA MANDIR	0504153	
9		SALBANI PRYMARY SCHOOL	0512903	
10		BETNOTI PRIMARY SCHOOL	0504101	
11		JAWAHAR NOBODAYA VIDYALAYA, SALBANI, MAYURBHANJ	0512901	
1	<b>THAKURMUNDA</b>	DIGDHAR HIGH SCHOOL	2403801	<b>9</b>
2		DIGDHAR NODAL UP SCHOOL	2403803	
3		MANDIR SAHI PRIMERY SCHOOL	2416901	
4		KHAMADIHA PROJECT UP SCHOOL	2416401	
5		KHUNTAPOSI PRIMARY SCHOOL	2404301	
6		BETAJHARI PROJECT PRIMARY SCHOOL	2415901	
7		IHANGANDI NODAL UPPER PRIMARY SCHOOL	2404401	
8		KALEIJAU PRIMARY SCHOOL	2400802	
9		THAKURMUNDA PRIMARY SCHOOL	2416906	

1	<b>SUKRULI</b>	SARUBALI PRIMARY SCHOOL	2206401	<b>6</b>
2		SUKRULI PRIMARY SCHOOL	2206503	
3		PARBATIPUR PRIMARY SCHOOL	2206001	
4		KHICHINGESWARI UPPER PRIMARY SCHOOL	2205703	
5		PANDABILLA PRIMARY SCHOOL	2205801	
6		BADAMTALIA PRIMARY SCHOOL	2205501	
1	<b>RARUAN</b>	GOVT. PRUTHIBNATH M.E. (UP) SCHOOL	1810002	<b>7</b>
2		SANA RARUAN PROJECT U.P SCHOOL	1810004	
3		PALASA PRIMARY SCHOOL	1800802	
4		JHUMUKAPAL PROJECT UPPER PRIMARY SCHOOL	1809601	
5		KHUNTAPADA U.G.M.E. SCHOOL	1809701	
6		RARUAN BLOCK COLONY PRIMARY	1810001	
7		MENDHAMUNDI PRIMARY SCHOOL	1809801	
1	<b>SARASKANA</b>	JHARPOKHARIA UG UP SCHOOL	2105003	<b>9</b>
2		BALIASAHI PRIMARY SCHOOL	2104401	
3		ARJUNDIHA PROJECT PRIMARY SCHOOL	2104101	
4		JHADBEDA PROJECT PRIMARY SCHOOL	2104901	
5		JHARPOKHRIA P.U.P.S.	2105002	
6		RAJALOKA NODAL UPPER PRIMARY SCHOOL	2110602	
7		GHIAJADI PRIMARY SCHOOL	2104601	
8		DHANGUDISOLE PRIMARY SCHOOL	2102602	
9		DHANGUDISOLE UP (TO) SCHOOL	2102603	
1	<b>UDALA</b>	DUTIKADEIPUR PRIMARY SCHOOL	2603301	<b>8</b>
2		SANA KHALADI U.G.M.E. SCHOOL	2604101	
3		PANCHAYAT HIGH SCHOOL, BHIMTALI	2602601	
4		GADADHAR BIDYAPITHA	2600751	
5		DUGUDIHA NODAL UPS	2600702	
6		BHIMTALI NODAL ME SCHOOL	2601901	
7		URMAL U.P. (ME) SCHOOL	2601605	
8		BAHUBANDHA UPPER PRIMARY SEVASHRAM	2601601	
1	<b>KHUNTA</b>	DUKURA NEW GOVT. HIGH SCHOOL	1308901	<b>6</b>
2		CHUNDIHA PRIMARY SCHOOL	1308801	
3		DUKURA UPPER PRIMARY SCHOOL	1308903	
4		DUKURA PRIMARY SCHOOL	1308902	
5		PURUNA PANI PRIMARY SCHOOL	1305801	
6		KHEJURDIHA U.G.M.E. SCHOOL	1305802	

Sl. No.	Block name	School Name	School Code	No. of School
1	<b>JOSHIPUR</b>	JOSHIPUR GOVT. HIGH SCHOOL	1010303	<b>9</b>
2		BASANTAPUR PRIMARY SCHOOL	1012701	
3		JOSHIPUR PRIMARY SCHOOL	1010305	
4		MATIAGARH NEW GOVT. HIGH SCHOOL	1014701	
5		MATIAGARH PRIMARY SCHOOL	1014702	
6		MATIAGARH UPPER PRIMARY SCHOOL	1014703	
7		HOBADIHA U.G.U.P. SCHOOL	1011901	
8		MAHARDAPALASA NU PS	1013402	
9		ANUKULPUR PRIMARY SCHOOL	1011701	
1	<b>BAHALDA</b>	BAHALDA GIRL'S PROJECT UP SCHOOL	0103901	<b>7</b>
2		BAHALDA GOVT. HIGH SCHOOL	0103903	
3		KULGI UPARSAHI PRIMARY SCHOOL	0109203	
4		BANADUNGRI PRIMARY SCHOOL	0103904	
5		BAHALDA BOYS PRIMARY SCHOOL	0103902	
6		SOSO U.G.U.P. SCHOOL	0109501	
7		KICHCKISWARI NEW GOVT. GIRLS HIGH SCHOOL	0103905	
1	<b>KARANJIA NAC</b>	NIUNTI U.G.M.E. SCHOOL	2801002	<b>1</b>
1	<b>BARIPADA MUNICIPALITY</b>	BLOCK COLONY UP UG SCHOOL	2702501	<b>4</b>
2		TULASI CHOURA UG UP SCHOOL	2701404	
3		SARASWATI SISHU MANDIR, BHANJPUR	2701851	
4		SRI SRI HARIBALADEV JEW SISHU MANDIR	2700771	
1	<b>RAIRANGPUR NAC</b>	SAKILADIHI NCLP	2900303	<b>2</b>
2		AUROBINDA PRIMARY SCHOOL	2901301	
1	<b>UDALA NAC</b>	UDALA PRIMARY SCHOOL	3000501	<b>1</b>