



शिक्षा का अधिकार



सर्व शिक्षा अभियान  
सब पढ़ें सब बढ़ें

# Post Enumeration Survey of DISE Data

*Findings of the Study  
2011-12*

*A Compilation*

*By*

*Dr. Y.Sreekanth*



**Department of Educational Management Information System  
National University of Educational Planning and  
Administration**

**17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg, New Delhi  
110016**



## FOREWORD

DISE is a well developed educational management information system for systematic and scientific collection of data related to elementary education. Under the process districts are identified as a nodal point for aggregation, compilation, computerization, analysis and use of data. DISE has undergone continuous reviews and modifications since its inception in 1995 and recently U-DISE was launched. Over the years it has not only extended its scope and coverage but has also adapted to the changing needs and requirements. The data is collected from all the schools having I to VIII standard. DISE has inbuilt system of continuous monitoring at each step. At the school level CRC need to cross check the data. Besides data entry, consistency check-up and compilation of data is done at block/district level, where the validation of data is done on a sample basis. To monitor the accuracy and reliability of data and also identifying the gaps and loopholes in the data collection and compilation, it has been made mandatory by the government to get 5% sample checking of data by an external agency. The purpose of this Post Enumeration Survey is to examine the veracity of data given in DCF under DISE as well as to identify and estimate the discrepancy in the DISE data, NUEPA made it obligatory for the States to get the PES done by an external agency and to send the report.

Dr. Sreekanth Yagnamurthy, Associate Professor, Department of Educational Management Information System, NUEPA has undertaken the task of collating and analyzing the reports received from these States/UTs. The finding of the report discusses the precision level of data collected by different states on different items. I hope that the findings of this report will be useful for the states officials to improve the method of data collection, compilation and analysis which would further be helpful in the formulation of District Elementary Education Plan.



Arun C. Mehta  
Professor & Head Department  
of Educational  
Management information System

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

High quality data is essential to at various levels of educational administration to plan, execute and monitor various interventions to achieve universal elementary education and right to education. Through the DISE the data on elementary education has been collected and disseminated for the last several years. The DISE data is being increasingly used to prepare annual work plans, monitor the progress and also to undertake research by different individuals/institutions. The DISE is used quite extensively in popular discussions on education. In this background it is essential that the quality of data is examined from time to time and necessary steps are taken for improvement.

The DISE has introduced a mechanism to ascertain the reliability of DISE data through Post Enumeration Surveys (PES) that are to be carried by all states since 2006-07. A large number of states have been carrying out PES every year since then. An overall summary of findings of PES of various states is being prepared each year. The present report critically examines the PES of over 16 states for the year 2010-11. It is hoped the report provides useful insights on reliability of DISE data and PESs carried out by various states.

I wish to express my gratitude to Prof. Arun.C. Mehta for giving an opportunity to critically examine the PES reports for the year 2011-12. I am immensely thankful to Ms. Rajni Gill for providing necessary support in the preparation of this document.

(Y.Sreekanth)  
Associate Professor  
Department of Educational Management  
Information System, NUEPA

## **LIST OF ABBREVIATION**

BRC	Block Resource Center
BRCC	Block Resource Center Coordinator
CRC	Cluster Resource Center
CRCC	Cluster Resource Center Coordinator DISE District Information System of Education
DPEP	District Primary Education Programme DCF Data Collection Format
EMIS	Educational Management Information System
HM/HT	Head Master/ Head Teacher
MHRD	Ministry of Human Resource Development
NUEPA	National University of Educational Planning and Administration
PES	Post Enumeration Survey
RTE	Right to Free and Compulsory Education Act

# CONTENTS

Foreword	ii
Acknowledgement	iii
List of abbreviation	iv
1. The Context	1
2. States conducted Post Enumeration Survey	3
3. Objectives of Five Percent Post Enumeration Survey of DISE data 2011-12	4
4. Objectives of the Present Study	4
5. Methodology of PES Survey	6
6. Reference Period	11
7. Comparison of DISE Data Capture Format and Special DCF for Post Enumeration Survey	12
<i>A. Overall deviation of DISE data from PES data on all comparable items</i>	
<i>B. Comparison of PES data to DISE DCF with regard to Maintenance of School Records</i>	
<i>C. Comparison of PES data to DISE DCF with regard to Type of School</i>	
<i>D. Comparison of PES data to DISE DCF with regard to Establishment year of School</i>	
<i>E. Comparison of PES data to DISE DCF on School related indicators like classrooms, boundary walls, etc.</i>	
<i>F. Comparison of PES data to DISE DCF with regard to School Related facilities like toilet, drinking water, etc</i>	
<i>G. Comparison of PES data to DISE DCF with regard to incentives like mid-day meals, free books, uniforms</i>	
8. Deviation related to Enrolment of Children	18
<i>Comparison of DISE and PES data regarding Enrollment</i>	
<i>Comparison of DISE and PES data regarding Repetition</i>	
9. Comparison of DISE and PES data on Staff Position	20
10. Presence of teachers on the day of visit	21
11. Information related to Teacher training	22
12. Attendance of Children on the day of Visit	22

13. Reasons for Deviation as given by various states are as follows:	23
14. Problems in filling DISE Data capture format and PES	24
15. Recommendations by the States	24
a. Training	
b. Awareness	
c. DCF format, PES and its uses	
d. MIS for Quality improvement	
e. Suggested schedule for administration of DCF/PES	

16. Summary	28
-------------	----

***Annexure I***

List of the Sample Districts of Selected States	32
---	----

## **Post Enumeration Survey of DISE Data (2011-12)**

### **1. The Context**

Sound policy and good planning require reliable and timely data. There is always a need for consistent and accurate data in the ever increasing need to monitor the progress made over a period of time. Also the need to monitor progress towards Education for All (EFA) goals and the implementation of Right to Free and Compulsory Education Act 2009 puts pressure on reliable, accurate and up to date statistics. India is one of the few countries, which has been collecting economic and social statistics since the middle of nineteenth century and several sets of time series data are available on large number of indicators. With the passage of time, the data requirements increased for the preparation of educational plans. To overcome the problem of inordinate delay, inaccuracy and unreliability of data an initiative was taken under District Primary Education Project (DPEP, 1994) to establish Educational Management Information System at the district level to create and maintain educational database. The task of developing a school based statistical system was initiated by NUEPA during 1995 and District Information System for Education (DISE) was established. The basic data is collected at the school level in the prescribed format. This data is sent to the block level which is verified by the Block Education Officer/ Block Resource Coordinator and further sent to EMIS in charge in the District Project Office where the data entry takes place. The validated data is stored at district level and also sent to the State Project Office. At state level the data is aggregated and sent to NUEPA for further analysis.

Under DISE, time series data are available on students enrolment, location of school, infrastructure of school, teacher profile etc for each school in the district. The scope and coverage of data collection has been extended to all the districts and all the recognized schools till elementary level of education. DISE is considered as a viable system for revitalization of school level educational statistics in the country.

Presently, DISE collates data from over 1.4 million schools imparting elementary education across the country on a variety of variables ranging from facilities in schools, profile of teachers, enrolment, information on various interventions like school grants, mid day meal, teacher grant to repeaters and examination results, etc. The range of variables include location, type (by gender, shift, level, management, etc.) of school, receipt and expenditure of school development

funds and incentives, infrastructure (building, classrooms and their condition, room for headmaster, kitchen, library, laboratory, etc), facilities (from water, toilet to ramp), enrolment (by class, gender, caste, religion (Muslim), age), teachers (by age, educational and professional qualifications, gender, caste, etc.), examination results (by gender, caste, etc), incentives (by class, gender, caste), physical disability of children by type to mention some. In addition to the core variables, the states can add supplementary variables at their discretion to meet their specific needs.

The aim is to improve the access and quality of education in terms of enrolment, retention, learning achievement through data assessment and analysis. Procedures for data validation and verification of the sample data capture formats at the district level have been prescribed and the districts have been reporting that appropriate measures are taken to ensure quality and reliability of data collection. DISE software also checks for many internal inconsistencies in the data and generates report for verification by the District Project Office. The State Project Office, while transferring the data from the district to the state database ensures that the data received from the district is complete and free from any inconsistency. Further, in order to verify the accuracy of DISE data, it has been made mandatory for all States/UTs to get the DISE data 5% sample checked by an independent external agency like university department, monitoring agency, research institute, etc. The Post Enumeration Survey is a way of estimating and understanding the errors taking place at the collection of data at the school stage. The survey is also expected to report the willingness, ability, and readiness of principals and/or head teachers to provide data and the proper maintenance of records for the same. It is now mandatory to submit the data along with the report of Post Enumeration Survey.

The procedure that needs to be adopted for PES is that 10% of districts need to be selected by state authorities in each state subject to a minimum of 2 districts- not to repeat the same district in subsequent year. 5% of schools from each block of chosen district shall be selected by the agency identified to carry out the survey. For making comparisons Filled in forms of DISE need to be handed over to the agency after PES data collection. The data shall be collected on the following components:

## 2. States conducted Post Enumeration Survey

In 2011-12, 13 States and union territories have undertaken PES, the details for which are given in Table 1.

**Table 1**

**Number of Sample districts/blocks/ schools of the states and agency conducted Five Percent Random Sample Checking of Data: 2011-2012**

S. No.	State / UT	Number of Districts	Number of Sample Districts	Number of Sample Blocks	Number of Sample Schools	Agency conducted the PES
1.	Chandigarh	1	1	20	20	Foundation for Developmental Research (FDR)
2.	Mizoram	8	2	6	36	Department of Education, Mizoram University
3.	Tripura	4	2		97	Centre for the study of Social Exclusion and Inclusive Policy (CSSEIP)
4.	Himachal Pradesh	12	2	25	166	SGI Enterprises, Shimla
5.	Daman & Diu	2	1	5	10	Mahila Mandal, Daman
6.	Lakshadweep	1	1		19	Badeeuddin Thangal, U.P.
7.	Punjab	22	20	142	990	Surmount Outsourcing and Professional Consultancy Pvt. Ltd., Haryana
8.	Orissa	30	3	64	413	AMC Research Group Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi
9.	Dadra & Nagar Haveli	1	1	11	20	Centre for Market Research and Social Development, New Delhi
10.	Andhra Pradesh	23	3		480	National Institute of Rural Development, Hyderabad
11.	Assam	23	3	18	277	Scorpion (A Centre for Research, Consultancy & Training), Guwahati
12.	Sikkim	4	2		35	Infinity Care Society, Sikkim
13	Rajasthan	33	3	29	601	Directorate of Economics and Statistics, Rajasthan

It has been observed that the Quality of Survey and reporting varies significantly. Minor deviations in methodology can also be noticed which relate to selection of sample, sharing of data with state authorities, etc.

### **3. Objectives of Five Percent Post Enumeration Survey of DISE data 2011-12**

- *To verify the accuracy/correctness of collected DISE data 2011-12*
- *To assess the status of the sample schools as per the DISE information indicators*
- *To assess the authenticity of the data collected from the sample schools by the field functionaries of SSA*
- *To analyze the strengths and weaknesses of the DISE in the district right from school to district*
- *To measure the precision level as well as deviation of DISE data*
- *To assess the process of collection and analysis of DISE data as well as the use of DISE data at different level*
- *To verify and document the process adopted for DISE data collection at all level (collection, checking and compilation).*
- *To assess the data entry consistency checkup*
- *To assess the training of Head master/Teacher for filling up the DISE format*
- *To identify the gaps responsible for maintaining good quality data at all level and to suggest suitable remedial measures in order to enhance the accuracy of DISE data to be collected in future years.*

### **4. Objectives of the Present Study**

Thirteen states/UTs have carried out five percent post enumeration survey (PES) of DISE data in 2011-12. The present study makes an attempt to ascertain the level of deviation of PES data in comparison to DISE data in different states. The study also focuses on the reasons of deviation as described by different states and the difficulties encountered by them to carry out the PES survey.

**Comparison of DISE DCF and PES Data on the Selected Items**

<b>Locations</b>	<b>Rural/Urban</b>
<i>School Characteristics</i>	<i>Year of Establishment</i> <i>School Category (Primary /Upper Primary etc.)</i> <i>Type of School (Boys/Girls/Co-educational) Lowest Class in the school</i> <i>Highest Class in the school</i> <i>School Management</i> <i>Residential School</i> <i>Type of Residential School (Ashram/Private, etc.) Shift School</i>
<i>School Management</i>	<i>Type of school Management</i> <i>Composition of Management Committees</i> <i>Performance of Management Committees</i> <i>Status of School Monitoring System</i> <i>School Fund Management</i>
<i>Staff</i>	<i>Educational qualification of the Principal</i> <i>Teacher Posts sanctioned and in position</i> <i>Number of year working as principal/ head teacher in the school</i> <i>Number of teachers (excluding principal/head teacher) Para-teachers</i> <i>Non-teaching staff</i> <i>Number of staff employed for mid-day meals and cleaning</i> <i>Number of teachers present on the day of survey</i>
<i>Facilities</i>	<i>Status and Type of building</i> <i>Number of blocks in schools</i> <i>Condition of class rooms and other rooms available in school Electricity, Common toilet, Separate toilet for girls &amp; staff Conditions of boundary wall, source of drinking water, play ground</i> <i>Number of computers in good conditions, Seating Arrangement</i>
<i>Enrollment</i>	<i>Total Enrollment –Current and Previous Year-Class wise (Boys and Girls), ST and SC, OBC and children with disabilities.</i> <i>Repeaters – Current and Previous Year Class-wise</i> <i>Number of children who left school – Current and Previous Year, Class- wise</i>
<i>Enrollment and Attendance</i>	<i>Enrollment and Attendance on the day of survey class-wise, gender, total, SC and ST</i>
<i>Apart from the above items, questions on availability and maintenance of school records to provide data, field investigators' perception of cooperation extended by school headmasters in providing data are also included in the DCF for PES.</i>	

**Table 2**

## 5. Methodology of PES Survey

The states have been requested to adopt appropriate methodology to select the sample of district, block and schools to carry out the PES Survey and to calculate the deviation of PES in comparison to DISE data. However states have described the details of methodology in different ways and some of the states have not given full details. The observations related to the methodology are discussed below

**CHANDIGARH:** A representative sample of 20 schools was assigned to 'Field Agency' from a list of 182 schools by adopting stratified random sampling technique. The sample comprised primary, middle, secondary and senior secondary schools functioning under government, private aided and private unaided management. It was ensured that the surveyed schools represented both rural and urban areas and included all types of schools managements- government, private, government aided school, KVS/NVS/AFS

The data collection work was started on 3<sup>rd</sup> April 2012 and was completed on 24<sup>th</sup> April 2012. The data collection period assigned to Field Investigators was of maximum 20 days but it delayed little because all the government schools declared holidays from 6<sup>th</sup> April to 14<sup>th</sup> April 2012 and the schools re-opened on 16<sup>th</sup> April 2012. Thus, only private schools were visited for collection of data.

$$\frac{\text{PES/DISE} - \text{DISE/PES (Higher Score} - \text{Lower Score irrespective)} \times 100}{\text{Total Sample Schools (20 Schools)}}$$

**Mizoram:** Method of sample selection has been given, but the data analysis technique is not given and the list of selected schools is not provided. Detailed schedule of the data collection is not given.

**Tripura:** Sampling process has been explained but the list of school is not given.

In the South Tripura district, there were 1192 schools. Out of these 60 schools were included in the sample.

In the North Tripura district, there were 737 schools. Out of these 37 schools were included in the sample. For the 5% sample checking the data was to be collected from 97 schools.

District project office provided DCF for PES (photo copy) of only those schools that have been

visited by the field investigators and vice-versa field investigators have also provided the District project office the DCF containing 5% sample checking.

Procedure of Making report:

- (1) At the very first step information were collected from all the selected schools in the prescribed FORMATS divided by NUEPA
- (2) After collection of the data , researchers verified the data with the DISE data collected by the district itself . The data for the specific schools were provided by the by the District office.
- (3) After verification and cross checking of the two types of the data the report has been submitted to the state project Director, SSA Rajya Mission Tripura.

**Himachal Pradesh:** The method for selection of the number of schools for particular block was 5 schools or 5% of the school in a particular block, whichever is more. Further, for selection of particular schools in a block, method is as follows: -

= total number of school in a block ÷ 5 or 5% of the schools (out of total schools in a block) whichever is more.

**Daman & Diu:** Post Enumeration survey was planned to collect data from the school selected for the survey. SSA, Daman & Diu provided the list of the school. The total no. of school in Daman & Diu are 113. According to the guideline of the survey 5% school were selected for the PES Mahila Mandal, Daman has been indentified to carry out the PES of the 5% sample check of the DISE Data. The PES in the sample school was carried out between, 21<sup>st</sup> April 2012 to 2<sup>nd</sup> may 2012.

The reference period of the DISE data and the post enumeration survey are the same i.e. 30<sup>th</sup> September 2011.

**Lakshadweep;** As per DISE data (2011-12) there are 31 primary/upper primary schools distributed in 10 inhabited islands. The investigator has visited all the schools in three islands personally. The information was collected through interviews with Principal/ HM/ Acting HM by using the special DCF for the 5% PES. In some schools, the Principal asked the investigator to meet CRC co-coordinating for getting data. The data collected through the DCF of DISE were provided from the state project office of Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan.

**Punjab;** The sample schools selected were located both in rural and urban areas. The sample also included all types of schools across school managements. (Govt schools, govt. aided govt. un-aided & recognized)

The sample size was fixed as all blocks per district. Thus, the sample checking exercise was done in 142 blocks in the State, signifying a very high sampling proportion of 100 percent of block level, Identification of the sample schools in these blocks was done on random basis. In each sample block, a complete listing of all the schools was done and a sample of 5% schools was chosen through the random sampling technique. All the 142 sample blocks taken together, a total of 990 schools were selected for checking of the DISE data.

The overall deviation of data has been calculated as per following formula:

$$\frac{(d1+d2+d3+d4+d5+d6+-----+dx)}{a +b +c +d+ e +f-----+x)} *100$$

Where d1, d2, d3, d4..... Stands for deviation of items of DISE data from Post Enumeration Survey Data ignoring +or .....signs and a, b, c, d, denotes items of PESD.

**Orissa;** The study was confined to 3 Districts viz. Nuapada, Kandhamal, and Ganjam of Orissa. As per PES guidelines, out of these 3 sample Districts, one district (Nuapada) has the literacy rate below the State literacy rate, one district ( Kandhamal) has the literacy rate above the state literacy rate and other district (Ganjam) is one among the special focus districts. For the purpose of PES, 413 (5.32)schools were selected randomly covering 224schools, 111 schools and 78 schools of Districts Nuapada, Kandhamal, and Ganjam respectively and the total sample schools of each district represented about 5% of schools belonging each block and ULB and also included all types of schools across school management. While selecting schools due consideration was given to rural and urban category and schools predominantly located in SC, ST and minority areas.

The overall deviation of data has been calculated as per following formula

$$\text{Over all Deviation} = \frac{d1+d2+d3+d4+d5+d6+...+dx}{a + b + C + d + e + .....+ x} \times 100$$

**Dadra &Nagar Haveli:** The universe of this study is elementary level schools of the UT of Dadra & Nagar Haveli. The mandate under DISE is to cover schools imparting elementary level

education. Twenty schools appropriately representing schools across the UT were selected for the survey. All the eleven clusters, i.e., silvassa, Dapada, Dara, Naroli, Kilvani, Rakholi, Dudhani, Amboli, Mandoli, Khanvel, and Randha were covered for sample checking of DISE data. Schools were selected from the eleven clusters through stratified random sampling and proportion to enrolment method by considering rural and urban schools located in SC, ST and Minority areas. Finally twenty schools were selected for the purpose of checking.

**Andhra Pradesh:** The three districts chosen for five per- cent sample check of the DISE data, viz Nellore, Warangal and Kadapa represented Coastal Andhra, Telangana and Rayalseema regions of the state. While confining to the 5% sampling, care was taken to emphasis on type of schools as well management by ensuring the representation of both rural and urban areas, different types of management of schools namely Government, Private Aided and recognized etc. Due representation was also accorded to the schools located in SC/ST area. In all 480 schools from three districts were selected for the study. Out of total sample (480 schools) 170(35.4%) schools were from Warangal district, 160 (33.3) Nellore and 150 (31.3%) from Kadapa district of Andhra Pradesh, which include 284 primary schools, 87 primary with upper primary and secondary or higher secondary sections.

**Assam:** While selecting the sample blocks, due consideration was given to educational development (literacy rate), rural/urban areas and proportion of SC/ST population etc. In each block, a complete listing of all the schools was done and a sample of 5% schools was chosen through the systematic random sampling technique. All the 18 sample blocks taken together, and there are a total of 277 schools. A team of Field investigators was selected from each 4 districts namely Darrang, kokrajhar, Lakhimpur, Tinsukai. A comparative analysis of the DISE and sample checking data pertaining to various aspects has been done and presented under three heads-

- (1) Proportion of schools where in the DISE data, the concerned information is either not at all filled (the field is blank or zero) or not available.
- (2) Proportion of schools where although the concerned information is filled in the DISE data, it dose not match with the information provided to us during the sample checking survey.
- (3) Proportion of schools where the concerned information is filled in the DISE data and it matches with the information provided to us during the sample checking survey.

**Sikkim;** Sampling Methodology Adopted: The sample checking of DISE data was carried out on the basis of five percent schools randomly selected from North and South districts.

Only two districts were selected from the state as the state is having only 4 districts. The PES team was provided with special data collection format (DCF) by the State Project Office, Gangtok, for collection of requisite data from the selected districts. The sample comprised of primary, middle, high and higher secondary schools in rural and urban areas. The sample schools were from all categories of management such as Government, local body, welfare department, private aided and private unaided.

Information on 5% sample visit of the randomly selected schools was collected on the filled prescribed format of DISE. We found different information related facilities provided to the school building structure, facilities provided to the school, enrolment of the students their attendance, and grade wise examination. In the majority of the case the DISE data matches with sample survey data on a large number of parameters.

A comparative analysis of the DISE and sample checking of data pertaining to various variables has been done under three heads –

1 Proportion of schools where in the DISE and the data, the concerned information is either not filled at all (the field is blank or zero) or not available.

2 Proportion of schools where although the concerned information is filled in the DISE data and it does not match with the information provided during the sample checking survey.

3 Proportion of schools where the concerned information is filled in the DISE data and it matches with the information provided during the sample checking information.

**Rajasthan:** The study was planned to collect data from three districts covering 5 percent of the total primary and higher primary schools. The Department of School Education provided the list of schools in the three districts of Jalore, Bharatpur and Udaipur to be covered in the Post Enumeration Survey. The total number of schools in all these three districts are to the tune of 11,705 out of which 8,818 (75.34 percent) are in the Government sector and 2,887 (24.66 percent) are in the Private sector. According to the sampling guideline, all the schools were stratified into Government and Private sector schools and 5 percent of the schools were selected by systematic random sampling from these two categories of Government and Private schools. In total, 603 schools were covered in the three districts of Bharatpur, Jalore and Udaipur of Rajasthan. Out of which 452 were Government schools and 151 schools were Private.

## 6. Reference period

**Chandigarh:** No information is provided

**Mizoram:** The team visited all the sample schools in the first and second week of November 2011. The filled in special DCF of the sample schools and copies of the filled in DCF for DISE of these sample schools were edited tabulated and analyzed.

**Tripura:** Information is not provided.

**Himachal Pradesh:** Information is not provided

**Daman & Diu:** The reference period of the DISE data and the post Enumeration survey are the same i.e. 30<sup>th</sup> September 2011. In the present report, the data of Daman district have been presented.

**Lakshadweep:** The reference period of the DISE data and the post Enumeration survey are the same i.e. 30<sup>th</sup> September 2011.

**Punjab:** The DISE data pertains to the year 2011-12 and thus 30<sup>th</sup> September 2011 was kept as study reference period. The Post Enumeration survey was also carried out for the same period.

**Orissa:** Information is not provided.

**Dadra & Nagar Haveli:** The DISE data pertains to the year 2011-12 was used as the reference period. The PES was also of the same period.

**Andhra Pradesh:** The DISE data pertains to the year 2011 with 30<sup>th</sup> September as reference data. The Post Enumeration survey was also of the same period. Though the MoU was signed in the month of December 2011, the study was launched in January 2012, because of certain administrative reasons.

**Assam:** The team collected data from the sample schools during the period 4<sup>th</sup> April to 4<sup>th</sup> May, 2012.

**Sikkim:** Information is not provided.

**Rajasthan:** The reference period for the DISE data and the PES are same i.e. September 30, 2011 for the districts of Bharatpur, Jalore and Udaipur for the year.

## ***7. Comparison of DISE Data Capture Format and Special DCF for Post Enumeration Survey***

After analyzing the information provided in the PES format, consistency of data between the DISE format and PES could be categorized with regard to school particulars, school location, facilities in school, student enrolment, staff details, investigators feedback schedule, etc. All the states have not reported on all the indicators and the present report reflects the deviation as per the information provided by the states. Tripura, Daman & Diu and Sikkim have provided no information on the following:

### ***7. A. Overall deviation of DISE data from PES data on all comparable items***

Only few states have reported information on this aspect which is presented below:

**Chandigarh:** It has been observed that the total deviation between DISE data and PES data for all comparable items together is 0.43% in all sample school.

**Mizoram:** The overall deviation of DISE data from PES data on all comparable items is 2.33% thereby giving a precision level as high as 97.66% for DISE data in relation to PES data.

**Tripura:** No information is provided.

**Himachal Pradesh:** The overall deviation of DISE data from PES data taken on all comparable items is less than 15%.

**Daman & Diu:** No information is provided.

**Lakshadweep:** The overall deviation of DISE data from PES data for all comparable items is 10%

**Punjab:** Out of 21 comparable variables, only two variables named availability of contract teachers (2.0%) and availability of playground (13.8%) have shown deviation of 10 percent or more, which is slightly higher than the permissible percentage of deviation i.e. 10 percent and their by giving precession level of 86 percent each. Information is not provided on overall deviation.

**Orissa:** The overall deviation of DISE data from PES data on all comparable items is limited 0.41%.

**Dadra & Nagar Haveli:** The overall deviation of DISE data from PES data on all comparable items is 1.8% which is lower than the permissible percentage of deviation i.e. 10% and there by giving precision level of 98.2%.

**Andhra Pradesh:** The overall deviation of DISE data from PES data, in respect of all comparable of items, is 7.32%, which is within the range of permissible percentage of deviation i.e. 10%, and there by giving a precision level of 92.68% for DISE data in relation to PES data

**Assam:** There is no significant deviation in data between the two surveys.

**Sikkim:** no information is provided

**Rajasthan:** It has been observed that the total deviation between DISE data and PES data for all comparable items together is 0.03% in all sample school.

**Table 3**  
**Overall deviation of DISE data from PES data on all comparable items**

Deviation	States
No deviation	Assam
0-5%	Mizoram, Chandigarh, Tripura, Orissa, Punjab, Dadra & Nagar Haveli, Rajasthan
5-10%	Andhra Pradesh, Mizoram
10-15%	Lakshadweep, Himachal Pradesh
No Information	Tripura, Daman & Diu, Sikkim

### **7. B. Comparison of PES data to DISE DCF with regard to Maintenance of School Records**

On the basis of the analysis of the information provided by the states/UTS it is observed that majority of the schools do not maintain proper records and large number of schools do not possess photocopy of the DCF forms.

**Chandigarh:** Records of each school varies from school to school but 85% of the sample school (17) revealed 'Good' records of data. 10% of the sample schools (2) revealed 'Very good' and 'Average' status of records. There was only one school named Kendriya Vidayalya, Sector 47 could not find proper records at first and second visit, thus all required information was provided at third visit

**Mizoram:** Information is not provided.

**Tripura:** Records keeping and its maintenance was good

**Himachal Pradesh:** In 14% schools condition of record was found to be bad. In 15% schools records were not up-to-date. In 9% schools records were not easily available and 44% schools had not received the school reports card.

**Daman & Diu:** Information is not provided.

**Lakshadweep:** The maintenance of record is also good but still an improvement of this area is

suggested.

**Punjab:** Around 97 percent of schools had well maintained records and they could provide information on enrolment without any difficulty.

**Orissa:** 80% schools do not have all records.

**Dadra & Nagar Haveli:** 70% of schools were good availability maintenance of records in good condition, while 25% average and 5% schools very poor.

**Andhra Pradesh:** Information is not provided. The investigators faced the problem in getting the data about previous academic year as the records are not maintained properly, therefore, the headmasters need to be advised to maintain a single register which contains year wise data of the school and the required data of any year becomes easy to be supplied.

**Assam:** 100% of the schools covered under the sample survey, the records were found to be maintained up to date.

**Sikkim:** no information is provided

**Rajasthan:** Around 98% schools were found to be maintaining records properly.

### ***7. C. Comparison of PES data to DISE DCF with regard to Type of School***

**Chandigarh:** There is 0% variation between in respect to type of schools between PES and DISE data.

**Mizoram:** No deviation was found in the report of both PES and DISE on the type of school.

**Tripura:** Information is not provided.

**Himachal Pradesh:** No deviation was found with regard to type of school

**Daman & Diu;** No of schools 75% Dept. of Education, 4% Private Aided, 21% Private Un-aided(Incl. JNV)

**Lakshadweep:** No provided PES data.

**Punjab:** 0.6 % deviation was reported in PES data in comparison to DISE data.

**Orissa:** 1.93% deviation was reported in PES data in comparison to DISE data

**Dadra & Nagar Haveli:** 0% age deviation of DISE data from PES data.

**Andhra Pradesh:** 8.33 % deviation was reported in PES data in comparison to DISE data.

**Assam:** No deviation was observed.

**Sikkim:** no information is provided.

**Rajasthan:** Overall in the three districts, 95% schools are co- Ed, 1.66% schools are only for boys and 3.33% schools are only for girls.

#### **7. D. Comparison of PES data to DISE DCF with regard to Establishment year of School**

**Chandigarh:** 10% variation was found in the establishment year of schools under PES and DISE data.

**Mizoram:** No information was provided.

**Tripura:** No information was provided.

**Himachal Pradesh:** Above 11% deviation recorded in year of establishment. This was due to non availability of proper records in schools about establishment year of school.

**Daman & Diu:** No information was provided.

**Lakshadweep:** Year of establishment total discrepancy 15.79%. In Agatti 25%, Androth 11.11%, Kavaratti 25 total-15.79.

**Punjab:** No information was provided.

**Orissa:** 2.42% deviation was observed.

**Dadra & Nagar Haveli:** 0% age deviation of DISE data from PES data.

**Andhra Pradesh:** No information was provided.

**Assam:** 7.02% deviation was observed.

**Sikkim:** no information is provided.

**Rajasthan:** Out of the total 601 schools covered, in 36.27% of schools, the schools are up to 12 years old, whereas in the rest 63.73% of the schools are old more than 12 years. In case of government schools, it is 33.41% and 66.59% whereas in case of private schools, it is 44.97% and 55.63% schools respectively.

#### **7.E. Comparison of PES data to DISE DCF on School related indicators like classrooms, boundary walls, etc.**

**Chandigarh:** For condition of classrooms 1.85% deviation was observed, condition of boundary wall total deviation 5%. There is 5 percent variation in the PES and DISE data. One school named Government Primary School, No. 2; Manimajra reported 'no facility of playground' in this school.

**Mizoram:** The report of PES as well as DCF for DISE deviation number of classrooms High deviation (14.3%), availability of electricity deviation 16.67%.

**Tripura:** For condition of classrooms and other rooms available in school 43.3% deviation was observed. Schools having playground the deviation was 10.3%. No. of computer available 2.1%. In Tripura deviation was only 3.1% with regard to availability of electricity, condition of boundary wall 2.1%.

**Himachal Pradesh:** No deviation was found with regard to status of school building 19.28% deviation was observed with regard to number of classrooms.

**Daman & Diu:** No information was provided

**Lakshadweep:** For condition of classrooms Agatti 80%, Androth 44.44%, Kavaratti 60% total - 57.89%, Boundary wall Agatti 20%, Androth 11.11%, Kavaratti 0. total -10.53%, Computer Agatti 20%, Androth 66.67%, Kavaratti 80, total -57.89(%)

**Punjab:** Little to high variation (less than 1% to 6%) was observed in Punjab with regard to total classrooms in the schools, location of school by area, category of school, type of school management, condition of boundary wall. Around 1.35% deviation was found on total classroom in the school; location of schools by area (0.1%); category of schools (0.2%); condition of boundary wall (6%); availability of sitting arrangement (4.8%).

**Orissa:** 0.97% deviation was found with regard to status of school building 6.49%. deviation was observed with regard to number of classrooms.

**Dadra & Nagar Haveli:** Number of class room 3 .0% age deviation of DISE data from PES data and out of the surveyed 20 schools, computers are good working condition in 7 school (35%).

**Andhra Pradesh:** For condition of classrooms 2.46% deviation was observed. Schools having a playground the deviation were 5.42%. No. of computer available 3.52% In Andhra Pradesh deviation was only 2.92% with regard to availability of electricity and condition of boundary walls 13.33%.

**Assam:** It was found that in all districts of Assam that is, Darrang, Kokrajhar, Lakhimpur, Tinsukia, there was slight variation between DISE and survey data existed in boundary wall (0%) and seating arrangement in one or two categories of schools. As regards total rooms in the selected schools in all districts, very small variations were observed play ground (5.42%)

**Sikkim:** Out of full percentage 43% of school buildings are pucca, 47% of buildings are semi pucca and 10% of schools are still kuccha. For condition of classroom in most of the schools is around 67% of the class rooms is in need of minor repairs, it found 75% of the schools have been fully electrified and 25% of the school is yet to be electrified, 55% of the schools has their own playground and 43% of the schools have computer facility

**Rajasthan:** overall in the 3 districts, the average number of classrooms is 4.76%. Boundary Wall 52.88% Government schools and 67.11% Private schools.

## **7. F. Comparison of PES data to DISE DCF with regard to School Related facilities like toilet, drinking water, etc**

**Chandigarh:** source of drinking water (10%), availability of sitting arrangement (10%) and condition of computer (4.1%). Availability of common toilet in the school(15%) All the sample schools (PES) have separate toilet for girls while DISE data show for 19 schools, thus 5% variation.

**Mizoram:** The report of PES as well as DCF for DISE did not show any deviation on status of school building

**Tripura:** drinking water facility in selected schools of Tripura is concerned deviation was as high as 31.9%. DISE data shows that out of two schools, one school having no sources of drinking water and another having other source of drinking water, but PES data gives that these three schools having tap water as their drinking water sources, deviation was 29.9% seating arrangement for children in the school .

**Himachal Pradesh:** No information was provided. There was deviation of 4.22% electricity available and Library available 7.23% was found.

**Daman & Diu:** No information was provided

**Lakshadweep:** There was Girls toilet Agatti 20%, Androth 22.22%, Kavaratti 0 total-15.79%. Drinking Water Agatti 0%, Androth0%, Kavaratti 0 total-0.

**Punjab:** : Little variation was observed in Punjab with regard to source of drinking water (4.6%), availability of sitting arrangement (4.8%) and availability of toilets (6%).

**Orissa:** There was deviation of 2.92% source of drinking water.

**Dadra & Nagar Haveli:** 0% age deviation of DISE data from PES data.

**Andhra Pradesh:** Andhra Pradesh with regard to source of drinking water (8.33%), availability of sitting arrangement (4.8%) and availability of common toilets (4.58%), separate toilet for girls in schools 4.17% and availability of furniture in schools 5.00%.

**Assam:** It was found that in all districts of Assam that is, Darrang, Kokrajhar, Lakhimpur, Tinsukia, there was slight variation between DISE and survey data existed in some characteristics like common toilet (34.30%), girls' toilet (25.99%), Electricity of availability (6.52%) and drinking water facilities (0).

**Sikkim:** 92% of the schools has separate toilets for girls, drinking water facility 100% of the school have tap water connections but only 76% of the school have sufficient water 24% of the schools are still facing a problem of water source, 99% of the schools have well enough seating arrangement.

**Rajasthan:** In the 3 districts in 86.06% Government and 77.85% Private schools, girl's toilets are available, 29.20% government and 65.73% private schools electricity is available, 84.29% government and 96.69% private schools drinking water facility is available, 18.14% government and 49.67% private schools computer is available.

## **7.G. Comparison of PES data to DISE DCF with regard to incentives like mid-day meals, free books, uniforms**

**Chandigarh:** All the government and aided schools of the sample schools get mid-day-meal for children up to middle classes on school days. The quality of mid-day-meal is good and satisfactory in terms of nutrition. The menu differs day to day.

**Mizoram:** 91.67% sampled schools had reported the provision of mid- day meal programme in the schools

**Tripura:** Information is not provided.

**Himachal Pradesh:** We had collected the class wise data distribution of free text books for current academic year as the data captured the data regarding distribution of free text books for current academic year .Whereas DISE format captured the data of free text books for previous year. It was found that almost all the students had received the free text book.

**Daman & Diu:** No information is provided.

**Lakshadweep:** Information was not provided.

**Punjab:** Ninety eight percent sampled schools had reported the provision of mid- day meal programme in the schools and 89 percent schools had reported on the availability of display board.

**Orissa:** Information was not provided.

**Dadra & Nagar Haveli:** No information is provided.

**Andhra Pradesh:** Where as the provision of mid day meals were found in 86.6% schools and in 13.4% mid-day meal provision was not there.

**Assam:** Over all in three districts total mid meal provided 97.11%.Percentage of schools received text book 92.78%.

**Sikkim:** no information is provided.

**Rajasthan:** Information was not provided.

## **8. A. Deviation related to Enrolment of children**

Deviation related to Enrolment, facilities in the school etc are discussed in the ensuing section:

**Chandigarh:** The deviation is negligible with 0.31 percent.

**Mizoram:** The deviation found on total enrolment was 1.77%.

**Tripura:** information is not provided

**Himachal Pradesh:** Variation in total enrollment of student is only 0.68% only. Where as school wise deviation ranges 0% to 20%

**Daman & Diu:** Information is not provided.

**Lakshadweep:** Overall total enrollment was 1.07%.

**Punjab:** Indicators with less than 5 percent of deviation from PES data are enrollment in the present academic year, grade 1 0.5%, grade II -0.1% grade III 1.1%, grade IV 0.7%, grade V (0.5%) grade VI (1%) Grade VII (0.9%) grade VIII (0.04%), Primary 0.58%) and upper primary 0.66%

**Orissa:** The deviation found on total children enrolment was 4.99%.

**Dadra & Nagar Haveli:** 0% deviation of DISE data from PES data.

**Andhra Pradesh:** The deviation found on total enrolment was 8.03%.

**Assam:** The deviation of total number of boys enrollment in both primary and upper primary classes the deviation is 5.86% and the deviation of total number of girls enrollment in both primary and upper primary classes the deviation is 4.22%.

**Sikkim:** Information is not provided.

**Rajasthan:** The deviation found on total enrolment was 3.2%, In Bharatpur district Govt. 3.2%, Pvt. 2.0%, Total 2.7%. Jalore district Govt. 4.3%, Pvt. -2.9, Total 1.7%, Udaipur district Govt. 4.5%, Pvt. 5.8, Total 4.9%.

**Table 4**

**Comparison of DISE and PES data Enrolment of Children**

Deviation	States/UTS
No deviation	Dadra & Nagar Haveli
0-5%	Himachal Pradesh, Lakshadweep, Odisha, , Punjab, Mizoram, Chandigarh, Rajasthan
5-10%	Assam & Andhra Pradesh
10-15%	Nil
>15%	
No information	Daman & Diu, Sikkim, Tripura

## **8. B. Comparison of DISE and PES data regarding Repetition**

*Most of the states have provided information related to repeaters whereas few states have not given the information.*

**Chandigarh:** 7.75% deviation of DISE data from PES data.

**Mizoram:** No information is provided.

**Tripura:** Problem of definition and interpretation of repeaters.

**Himachal Pradesh:** Information is not provided.

**Daman & Diu:** There seems to be no variation between the two sets of data DISE DCF and Special Post Enumeration Survey DCF. The two sets of data have been compared on most of the indicators of schools Particulars, Infrastructure, Enrolment, Teachers information etc.

**Lakshadweep:** The school code given in DCF of DISE matches with that given in DCF of PES. But some schools were not able to give DISE schools code which increased the discrepancy to 42.11% and that is far higher than the permissible limit of discrepancy of 10%.

**Punjab:** No information is provided.

**Orissa:** The deviation of the DISE data from PES data ranges from 4.54% (Nayagarh district) to 22.89 % (Kandhamal district) across the sample districts. The magnitude of such variation is found as 15.37% at aggregate level.

**Dadra & Nagar Haveli:** 0% age deviation of DISE data from PES data.

**Andhra Pradesh:** No information

**Assam:** Some variation existed in case of repeaters in some classes within school categories but the exact figures are not given.

**Sikkim:** no information is provided.

## **9. Comparison of DISE and PES data on Staff Position**

**Chandigarh:** The DISE data shows there are 734 sanctioned posts but according to PES data total number of sanctioned posts are 716 so the deviation is of 2.45% and in case of in position teaching staff the difference between DISE and PES data is only 4.63%.

**Mizoram:** Deviation of the total number of teacher in position in the sample schools is 2 (.67%) the total deviation ignoring +/- is found to be 12(4.01%).

**Tripura:** information was not provided.

**Himachal Pradesh:** Deviation for teachers was 7.11% for males and 4.09% for females. School wise Deviation for primary class 8.41% and upper primary 40.68%. Deviation regarding 'Teacher

in position' was more in upper primary schools head master /principal not mentioned himself/herself in DCF.

**Daman & Diu:** No information was provided

**Lakshadweep:** The grand total discrepancy with regard to staff details is found as 11.47% which is higher than the permissible limit (10%) of discrepancy between DISE and PES.

**Punjab:** Deviation of 2% was found on the availability of regular teachers in sampled schools of study districts and 2.0% deviation was found on the availability of contractual teachers.

**Orissa:** Deviation related to total number of teachers in position was 3.00%.

**Dadra & Nagar Haveli:** Deviation related to total number of teacher in position 2.1%, teacher post sanctioned 46.8%, number of teaching staff 33.3%.

**Andhra Pradesh:** The DISE data shows there are 480 sanctioned posts but according to PES data total number of sanctioned posts are 480 so the deviation is of 3.50% and in case of in position teaching staff the difference between DISE and PES data is only 2.56%.

**Assam:** Number of teacher in position in 277 sample schools according to DISE Data is 561 and sample survey Data it is 744. The variation in terms of number is 183 and in terms of percentage it is 24.60.

**Sikkim:** no information is provided.

**Rajasthan:** no information is provided.

## 10. Presence of teachers on the day of visit

**Chandigarh:** 95.62% of the teacher present at the school on time.

**Mizoram:** No information is provided.

**Tripura:** Teachers' absenteeism on the day of the visit was found to be high; overall teacher absence rate was 27.3%.

**Himachal Pradesh:** Schools having 1-2 teachers, 13% schools had one teacher absent; schools having 3-5 teachers, 31% schools had one teacher absent and 26% schools had more than one teacher absent. Schools having more than 6 teachers, it was found that in 33 % schools more than one teacher was absent.

**Daman & Diu:** No information is provided.

**Lakshadweep:** Not all the teachers were present but how many were absent is not given.

**Punjab:** Sampled schools teachers (98%) found who practices regular filling-up of attendances register and almost cent-to-cent percent teachers reported arrival at schools

**Orissa:** No information is provided.

**Dadra & Nagar Haveli:** Overall teacher absence rate was 1.6%, which means that approximately two out of 100 teachers remained absent during school time on time on the visit. No absenteeism of was observed in primary schools. The rate of absenteeism was 3.0% in upper primary schools and 1.2% in upper primary with secondary or higher secondary schools.

**Andhra Pradesh:** It is found that among the sample schools 90% percentage of teachers come on time to school where as in 10% schools teachers are not attending the school in time.

**Assam:** 96.37 percent of the teachers present arrived at the school on time.

**Sikkim:** It was found that the staff of the schools is mostly 100% and in some schools it was 70 to 90%.

**Rajasthan:** 68.78% of the teachers were present on the day of survey, out of the total working teachers.

### ***11. Information related to Teacher training***

Chandigarh, Mizoram, Tripura, Daman & Diu, Lakshadweep, Punjab, Orissa, Dadra & Nagar Haveli, Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Sikkim, and Rajasthan: No information is provided.

**Himachal Pradesh:** During survey it was found there are 2 schools (i.e.1%) out of 166 schools where head teachers did not receive the training during the academic year 2010-11 for proper implementation of DISE. It was found that mostly training was conducted by BRCC.

### ***12. Attendance of Children on the day of Visit***

**Chandigarh:** The student's attendance on the day of the visit was 91.79%.

**Mizoram:** no information is provided.

**Tripura:** The student's attendance on the day of the visit was 78%.

**Himachal Pradesh:** 91.56% of students were present on the day of visit of primary and upper primary level.

**Daman & Diu:** No information is provided.

**Lakshadweep:** 99.9% students were present..

**Punjab:** Around 87 percent children were reported to be present. Highest attendance was found in Sangrur district (93%) followed by Barnala and Nawanshehar (90% each) Faridkot and Firozpur (85%).

**Orissa:** No information is provided.

**Dadra & Nagar Haveli:** The students' attendance on the day of visit was 81.8% at elementary level, 84.3% at primary level and 75.1% at upper level.

**Andhra Pradesh:** The attendance percentage in overall Boys was 85%, where as in girls 86.9%.

**Assam:** All the boy students of the selected schools, those studying in Primary schools were present in the school in highest percentage and those of Primary with Upper primary schools in lowest percentage on the day of survey. As regards the girl students, those studying in Primary schools were present in the school in highest percentage and those of Upper primary schools in lowest percentage. Around 53 to 60 percent children were present across the four districts.

**Sikkim:** 90 to 98% students were present.

**Rajasthan:** no information is provided.

### **13. Reasons for Deviation as given by various states are as follows:**

Though states have not given any specific reasons for deviation, still it appears that it has nothing to do with the date of collection of PES. As for instance in Lakshadweep and Rajasthan the PES was conducted on the same day as DISE DCF i.e., 30<sup>th</sup> September but still a large percentage of deviation was found, whereas in Assam the PES was conducted after more than six months, but still the deviation was negligible. But, it would be more appropriate for the states to fix dates for the conduct of PES every year, so that uniformity can be ensured and results become comparable. This is because at several points of time different extraneous reasons impact schooling and this can be largely controlled if the dates are the same.

### **14. Problems in filling DISE Data capture format and PES**

The field experience reveals that the headmasters/teachers feel that it is an additional burden to them and some times found it difficult in providing of the required data. Therefore, the headmasters/teachers need to be given an understanding that supplying of educational data of the school is mandatory and it is a part of their job. Therefore, they are to be serious and sincere in providing the data. Few variations were observed in comparison to PES data due to conceptual error (definition not properly understood) made during filling –up, few needed information in the conceptual clarity. The formats canvassed for Post Enumeration Survey (DCF) and the District Information System of Education (DISE) were quite different in terms of certain variables/aspects.

This has been resulting difficulty in establishing similarities or confirmation of data through Five Percent Check. The investigators faced the problem in getting the data about previous academic year as the records are not maintained properly, therefore, the headmasters need to be advised to maintain a single register which contains year wise data of the school and the required data of any

year becomes easy to be supplied. Most of the principals/head teachers are unaware about the School DISE Code Number, this usually creates problem in comparing the PES and DISE data. Thus, it is essential to make the principals/head teachers aware about their School DISE Code Number. Thus schools need to be given instruction to highlight the School DISE Code Number on Display Boards. The PES data format highlights columns covering the data for primary teachers and upper-primary teachers separately. But most of the schools have teachers teaching to primary and upper-primary classes as well as upper-primary and higher classes simultaneously. The principal may get confused in dividing the strength of teachers in fulfilling the columns of primary and upper-primary teachers. There is a need to club the columns, if data is required up to upper-primary classes. The same status needs to rectify in case of non-teaching staff.

### **15. Recommendations of States**

The following are some of the recommendations made by the states for the overall improvement and improvement at various levels.

**A. Training:** Training at BRC by competent trainer in participatory training mode with improved training methodology is needed. Period of training on DISE DCF should be third or fourth week of September. For better management of the training at each level it is further suggested that a hierarchical model right from the state to BRC level be devised.

The purpose and objectives of the data collection should always be precise and clear, not only in the minds of those who plan for these surveys but also in the minds of respondents of survey well before the launch of the study. The principal/ headmaster of the school must be given orientations on the purpose of DISE data collection.

Teachers don't take seriously the training imparted by the CRCCs. Alternatively the DIETs can also be given the responsibility of training at the district, block and CRC levels.

Training at the resource center by competent trainer in a participatory training mode with improved training on DISE DCF should be in the month of September.

DISE training should be given to all management category schools like private aided and unaided and secondary and higher secondary schools. DCF training to the head teacher of the above said category schools is also strongly recommended by the investigators.

**B.Awareness:** In most of the schools the investigator observed that principal/headmaster was not aware about the purpose and importance of the information they provided. So it is strongly recommended again that they should be informed about the need, importance and utility of the DISE data which would definitely motivate them to respond precisely and reliably.

The system of DISE needs to be popularized by the school education department by making it usable at the district administration level to identify low performing panchayats and by the schools.

It has been observed during the field work that teachers consider the DISE information as a routine one and hence do not pay desired attention while filling the DISE DCF. In such a situation the quality of DISE data is always at stake. It is, therefore suggested that headmaster/Teacher concerned should be made personally responsible for providing correct and accurate data.

**C.DCF Format, PES and its uses:** The DISE format is lengthy and hence it should be re-designed to keep it short and simple keeping in view the abilities and time available among teachers concerned.

The formats canvassed for DCF and DISE were quite different in terms of certain variables/aspects. This has been resulting difficulty in establishing similarities or confirmation of data through 5% check.

During survey we found that 17% schools under survey had not obtained the report cards from District project office. It is the lapse on the part of education management. So it is recommended that care should be taken in future.

Collection of data through DISE format may be ensured by October of each academic year so that the 5% sample check can be attempted by December of the same academic year so that the results can be appropriately utilized for planning the activities for next academic year.

In order to improve the quality of data across the district it is further suggested that optimal utilization of DISE data should be made at all levels. As such it is essential that data at each level right from the school to district level be shared and discussed in detail.

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 SMC meeting.

The information which is common for all schools like school particulars, number of sanctioned posts etc should not be included in DCFs, as it unnecessarily creates burden on teachers and at times encourage filling some false/ incorrect information as well.

Financial aspect like school grant & TLM grant should be covered in 5% sample checking format. IT was observed that in some schools even the aid received from SSA not utilized.

DISE format filled by the teacher in schools further should be properly checked by concerned CRC/ BRC so that inconsistency of data can be reduced. We have analyzed that in DISE DCF some aspects have been left blank and the format has been counter signed by concerned authority we also analyzed that many DCF were not signed by Teacher and BPEO /BEO /BRCC. So DCF should be properly checked by higher authority also and care should be taken future.

We have observed that no teaching learning aid material (TLM) available in many schools in kangra as well as Una district. There is no column in PES format for TLM. We observed that it is

compulsory to verify because huge govt. revenue involved in this mode. We have seen in many schools that only a single chart worth of Rs. 10/- hanged on wall on the account of TLM, where as every teacher getting Rs. 500/- per year for this.

Amendment in guidelines provided for repeaters- Although the DISE format require the number of repeaters to be given under sub heads(failed, absent for along period and readmission), it appears that in a school, the person filling up the DISE format have clubbed all the three categories into one. The teacher responsible for filling up of DISE formats should be given adequate time that the correct information could be filled in the format after proper checking.

Effective supervision and monitoring should be ensured at all levels for quality data cross checking of filled in DISE format may be undertaken to improve the quality of information.

To verify the DISE data, it is necessary to collect information under PES simultaneously. Thus, it becomes necessary that data collection time need to be fixed in a particular month/months for both the agencies.

The 5% sample size is too small to find out the deviation, thus the sample size needs to be increased.

**D. MIS for Quality Improvement:** It's general concept that quality of primary education has improved a lot with the implementation of SSA. It has a greater impact on infrastructure but now it's time to focus more on quality of education on ground level. We did talk to some of the parents and the some of the members of school management committee (SMC) in almost all the schools. What we found was that people are not happy with grading system and to some extent also with continuous comprehensive evaluation (CCE). We found enough voices against these two aspects. We also found that teachers are not sure about the parameters as far as CCE is concerned. So certainly its matter of great concern that parents are not satisfied with the level of education that is being provided in the school.

No. of instructional hours and instructional days as per the right to education Act, 2009 is not followed in majority of the schools covered under the study. Proper steps should be initiated to ensure that the same is strictly followed.

DISE format may also include some qualitative information about the problem of students, teacher and parents, effectiveness of teacher teaching, status of each class room (building). There should be column for writing remarks of head teachers in the DISE format.

A separate sheet consisting of the opinions of the computer personnel at the district level, their problems etc may be enquired through a schedule structured for the purpose. This will give an idea about the problem in the computer unit of EMIS, which was not possible to capture anywhere else.

Some queries about the EMIS unit and its operation at the district level should have been included in the survey schedule in order to access the overall performance of the units working for acquiring the data on various aspects of education.

CRCCs should be given the responsibility to scrutinize and verify the DCF of the schools under their jurisdiction by visiting the schools.

#### **E. Suggested Schedule for administration of DCF/PES**

1. Training of CRCC/ BRCC- August
2. Training of HMs of school- September.
3. Supply of 3 copies of DCF- September.
4. Filling in of DCF by HMs- October.
5. Scrutiny of DCF by CRCC/ BRCC- November.
6. Supply of DCF to BRCC- 1<sup>st</sup> week of December.
7. 5% sample of checking study- December to March.
8. Supply of summary report card- April.

## Summary

This report reviews the studies on PES of DISE data carried out by 13 states for the year 2011-12. Some of the major states that carried out PES include Himachal Pradesh, Punjab, Orissa, Andhra Pradesh and Rajasthan. Some of the big states which have conducted in the previous year like Bihar, Delhi, Madhya Pradesh, Tamil Nadu and Uttar Pradesh have either not carried out or submitted the report to NUEPA. Further some other states like Chattisgarh, Jharkhand, Gujarat, Karnataka, Kerala, West Bengal have neither submitted in the earlier year nor in 2011-12. The following table provides information on the number of indicators that the states have responded. It may be observed that States like Tripura, Daman & Diu and Sikkim have not provided information in 10 out of the 14 parameters, which is highest among all the states. On the other hand Chandigarh, Himachal Pradesh, Lakshadweep and Assam have provided on most of the parameters leaving only two each.

### Parameters on which information not provided by States

S. No.	States	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	TOTAL
1.	Chandigarh	x													x	2
2.	Mizoram					x					x		x	x	x	5
3.	Tripura	x	x	x	x	x			x	x	x	x			x	10
4.	Himachal Pradesh	x									x					2
5.	Daman & Diu		x	x		x	x	x	x	x		x	x		x	10
6.	Lakshadweep				x										x	2
7.	Punjab					x					x				x	3
8.	Orissa	x							x				x	x	x	5
9.	Dadra & Nagar Haveli								x		x				x	3
10.	Andhra Pradesh					x					x				x	3
11.	Assam				x										x	2
12.	Sikkim	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x				x	10
13.	Rajasthan								x		x	x		x	x	5

### INDEX

- (1) Reference Period
- (2) Overall deviation
- (3) Maintenance of School Records
- (4) Type of School
- (5) Establishment year of School
- (6) School related indicators like classrooms, boundary walls, etc.
- (7) School Related facilities like toilet, drinking water, etc

- (8) Incentives like mid-day meals, free books, uniforms
- (9) Enrolment of Children
- (10) Repeaters
- (11) Data on Staff Position
- (12) Presence of teachers on the day of visit
- (13) Attendance of Children on the day of Visit
- (14) Information related to Teacher training

On a detailed analysis of the PES reports submitted by various states it is found that states have been addressing an important validation tool like the PES in varied manner and some of them at least are very vague in description on the methodology adopted, conventions followed. This would of course raise question on the findings of PES studies and conclusions based on PES reports. The analysis of data, tabulation plan of several PES studies ought to be improved and be made much more rigorous adhering to the set standards.

One also notices several lapses such as reports wittingly or unwittingly have not included any analysis on several variables. Whether the schools were selected based on a sample frame is not clear in many states and as a result the questions could be raised with regard to the randomness of the sample. States need to be much more serious with regard to reporting of the numbers as for instance, Rajasthan mentions the number of sample schools as 601 in many places and 603 in some places. Though the same DISE DCF and Special DCF for PES are provided to all the states/UTs but there is no uniformity in the reports of the states. Some of the smaller states need to conduct the PES and report on it on all aspects mentioned in the PES columns. Also, states are conducting the PES at different points of time and this would not show an accurate picture across different states as on a particular date or reference point of time. Some states have conducted the PES on the same day as the DISE DCF and other after a very long time i.e., after more than six months.

The overall deviation of DISE and PES data is high in Lakshadweep and Himachal Pradesh and contrastingly Assam has reported no deviation at all. Rajasthan, Chandigarh and Orissa also report negligible deviation. Most of the states fall in the range of 0-5 deviation. States like Tripura, Daman & Diu and Sikkim have provided no information on this important aspect related to the validity of the data.

In case of school records, in Orissa 80 per cent of schools do not have all records and in Himachal Pradesh 44 per cent of schools had not received school report cards. In Assam and

Rajasthan the scenario with record to schools records is highly satisfactory. Interestingly, a big state like Andhra Pradesh has provided no information on this. With regard to type of school no deviation is found in most of the states, except Andhra Pradesh where it is as high as 8.33 per cent. With regard to establishment of schools many states have not provided the information and in some states the deviation is very high.

In respect of facilities like classrooms, a moderate to high level of deviation was found between DISE DCF and PES data in most of the states that have furnished information. With regard to drinking water facility a high deviation was observed in Tripura (31.9%) and in respect of toilets in case of toilets in the state of Assam. The comparison of DISE DCF and PES is unavailable for an important facility like Mid-day Meal as seven out of the 13 states have not provided information on that. In case of enrollment the states like Andhra Pradesh (8.03) and Assam (5.86) have reported more than five per cent of deviation, which is relatively high in comparison to most of the other states. The state of Orissa has a very high level of aggregate enrollment deviation (15.37) and the deviation across different districts is also very high. The state of Tripura has observed that there is a problem of interpretation of repetition.

With regard to staff position also there are huge variations among the states. Most of the states have reported high presence of teachers on the day of visit and however a state like Tripura has 27.3 percent absence of teachers on the day of visit. Also in many states variations were found within the districts. Many states have not reported on the teacher training, which is one of the important indicators of quality. The students' attendance also seems to be quite high in many states with more than 80 per cent and however, some states have not given information on this important yardstick of active students' engagement with the educational activity.

The states have expressed largely some common concerns and to some extent and have also made several suggestions for improving the authenticity of the DISE DCF and PES. Providing information needs to be considered as vital in bringing about improvement in the system at various levels. This is the most important element of the survey and this fact has to be recognized by not only those who are collecting the data, but also those who provide the data. This suggestion is well taken at national level and for this reason every year the Department of Educational Management Information System (EMIS) conducts training through Edusat, which could be reached at the remotest and grassroot level. In addition to this state, district and sub-district level orientations/trainings have to take place for ensuring that quality data is provided,

generated and disseminated. CRC centres and BRCs are the vital decentralized agencies, which can monitor/train and act as resource points and they need to be strengthened and their efforts need to be utilized to the maximum extent in all activities related to DISE DCF/PES.

The suggestion that DISE training should be given to teachers working under all managements is noteworthy and needs attention. More and more private unaided schools are coming up and since they are also involved in the education of the children at elementary level, they should be extended necessary assistance and provided appropriate training so that the actual picture of the elementary education as a whole could be visualized by the policy makers and educational administrators. There are concerns/suggestions over the length of the DISE DCF. While this is being reviewed from time to time, the requirements of different stakeholder ranging from grassroots' level to national level make this necessary to have comprehensive information. Certainly, the information has to be useful for any of the stakeholders and this is the least that we can expect from the system. Also, instead of collection of data by multiple agencies the emphasis should be, as it is being reviewed to have a single-point collection system, which will go a long way in avoiding duplication of work and encourage people to participate whole-heartedly.

Further, there are also suggestions such as including quality-related parameters in DISE DCF/PES and having separate sheets for collecting the opinions of the stakeholders etc. These need to be paid attention, and before any activity happens in a large scale at national level, it would be desirable to conduct the same as an experiment and have a quick study to see its efficacy, before the same is scaled-up to state/national level. Also, a tentative schedule to be uniformly undertaken by different states is presented by a state and on deliberating on its pros and cons and reaching a consensus, this could be thought of for nation-wide implementation.

*Annexure I*

**List of the Sample Districts of Selected States**

<b>S.No</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>Total Districts in the State</b>	<b>Name of Sample Districts</b>
1	Andhra Pradesh	23	Kadapa Nellore Warangal
2	Assam	23	Jorhat Kamrup Bongaigaon Marigaon
3	Chandigarh	1	
4	Himachal Pradesh	12	Kinnaur Mandi
5	Lakshadweep	1	Lakshadweep
6	Mizoram	8	Aizwal Mamit
7	Odisha	30	Nayagarh Kandhamal Ganjam
8	Punjab	22	Amritsar Barnala Bathinda Faridkot Fatehgarh sahib Ferozepur Gurdaspur Hoshiarpur Jalandhar Kapurthala Ludhiana Mansa Moga Mohali Muktsar Nawanshahr Patiala Ropar Sangrur Tarn Taran
9	Tripura	4	West District Dhalai
10	Daman & Diu	2	Daman
11	Sikkim	4	Gangtok (East Sikkim) Mangan (North Sikkim)
12	Dadra & Nagar Haveli	1	Dadra & Nagar Haveli
13	Rajasthan	33	Udaipur, Bharatpur, Jalore