Annual Status of Education Report
असर ASER 2011 RURAL
Facilitated by PRATHAM

Annual Status of Education Report (Rural) 2011

Provisional

January 16, 2012

They reached the remotest villages of India

Andhra pradesh

Government DIET College, Adilabad
Government DIET College, Anantapur
Government DIET College, Chittor
Government DIET College, East Godavari
Government DIET College, Guntur
Government DIET College, Kadapa
Government DIET College, Karimnagar
Government DIET College, Khammam
Government DIET College, Krishna
Government DIET College, Kurnool
Government DIET College, Mahbubnagar
Government DIET College, Medak
Government DIET College, Nalgonda
Government DIET College, Nellore
Government DIET College, Nizamabad
Government DIET College, Prakasam
Government DIET College, Ranga Reddy
Government DIET College, Srikakulum
Government DIET College, Vishakhapatnam
Government DIET College, Vizianagaram
Government DIET College, Warangal
Government DIET College, West Godavari

Arunachal pradesh

NSS Unit of Government Higher Secondary School, Tawang
Rupa Town Club, West Kameng
Students of Lohit College
Students of Tirap College
Tarhuk Samaj
Local Volunteers of Changlang, Dibang Valley, East Kameng, East Siang, West Siang, Upper Siang and Upper Subansiri

Assam

All India Student's Federation (AISF), Golaghat
All India Student's Federation (AISF), Jorhat
Assam Mahila Samata Society (AMSS), Nagaon
Assam Valley Academy (AVA)
Bhawanipur Cultural Society
Bordaulguri Socio-Economic and Health Development Organisation (SEHDO)
Daogaphu Youth Club
Goalpara Cultural Society
Integrated Community Development Society
Kalang Kapili Integrated Development Society
Klirdap Welfare Society
Nabarun Shangha Community Centre
North East Educational Social Forum
North East Society for the Promotion of Youth and Masses
Parijat Self Help Group
Sankalpa
Sishu Adhikar Suraksha Samiti
Social Unity Keeper's Association for All
Society for Progressive Implementation and Development
Udayan
Uttaran
Wodiwichee

Bihar

Aid India
Akhil Bharatiya Gramin Vikas Parishad
Akhil Bhartiya Shikshit Berojgar Yuva Kalyan Sansthan
Akriti Samajik Sansthan
All India Centre For Urban And Rural Development An Unit Of Research
Chhatrachhaya
Dalit Mukti Mission
Disha Bihar
Garima Samaj Vikas Sansthan
Harijan Sewa Samiti
Islahe Ummat
Jan Kalyan Kendra
Jawahar Jyoti Bal Vikas Kendra
Nav Jeevan Ambedkar Mission
Nav Jivan Manav Uthan Kendra
Pandit Shree Ram Sharma Seva Sansthan
Parivesh Purn Jagran Sansthan
Popular Organization Women Empowerment & Research Sanhauli
Pragati Bharti (Tulbul)
Prerna Development Foundation
Ram Kripal Sewa Sansthan
R-Teach Commuication
Sadbhavana Vikash Mandal
Sahyoginee
Samagra Manav Seva Samiti
Samagra Vikas evam Shikshan Sansthan
Sarv Shree Seva Sadan
Sarvodaya Yuva Kalyan Sangh
Shankar Human Advance Society for Initiative Mission
Shanti Shilp Kala Kendra
The Message Welfare Foundation
Trishna
Vidhyapati Jan Vikas Samiti
Vikash Sarthi
Local Volunteers of Madhepura

Chhattisgarh

Adhar Svansevi Sansthan
Chhattisgarh Janjati Vikas Parishad
Government DIET College, Dhamtari
Government DIET College, Durg
Government DIET College, Janjgir Champa
Government DIET College, Kawardha
Government DIET College, Mahasamund
Gramin Vikas Seva Sansthan
Lalit Kala Manch
Nav Jivan Jankalyan Sewa Samiti
Nicchay Seva Samiti
Pahela Kadam Sewa Sansthan
Prakruti Sewa Sansthan
SROTH
Pratham Volunteers of Jashpur

Dadra and nagar haveli

Dadra Nagar Haveli Education Department
Govt. HHS Khanvel
Govt. HHS Golonda
Govt. HHS Naroli
Govt. HHS Rakholi
Govt. HHS Silvassa
Govt. HHS Dudhani

Goa

D M C College, Mhapasa
Khemrag Memorial New English School, Bandha
Sridoracaculo college, Korli, Mhapasa, Goa

Gujarat

Anandi, Dahod
Anandi, Panchmahal
GLS College
Gram Seva Trust
Hina & Friends Group
Innovative BSW college
J.M. Patel Institute of Social Work
K.R. Doshi MSW College
KSKSV University
Mahila Samakhya
Manav Ekta Charitable Trust
Memdabad Co-operative College
Navbharti Vikas Trust
Navratri Yuvak Mandal
Nootanbharti Gramseva Mahavidhyalay
Salal MSW College
Samarpan Foundation
Sarswati BSW College
Sarvajanik MSW College
Satkariya Seva Trust
Shikshan & Samaj Kalyan Kendra
Shree Kedareshvar Education & Charitable Trust (MSW College)
Surbhi MSW College
Yogeshvar Yuvak Mandal
Local Volunteers of Valsad

Haryana

All Indian Jat Heroes' Memorial College, Rohtak
Chandan Mal Karnani College
Chaudhari Devi Lal College for Women, Murthal
DN College, Hisar
Dronacharya Govt. College
Dyal Singh College, Karnal
Government College, Barwala
Government College, Kalka
Government College, Narnaul
Government PG College, Bhiwani
Government PG College, Jind
Maharaja Agrasen Girls College, Jhajjar
MM College, Fatehabad
Mukund Lal National College
Nehru Yuva Kendra, Faridabad
Nehru Yuva Kendra, Kurukshetra
PRS Legislative Research, New Delhi
Radha Krishan College
RDS College (Girls), Rewari
Sanathan Dharam College, Ambala
SD College, Panipat
Yasin Meo College, Mewat

Himachal pradesh

General Jorawar Singh College, Nadaun (Hamirpur)
Govt. PG College, Kullu
Govt. College, Balav, Mandi
Govt. Degree College, Nahan
Govt. Degree College, Una
Govt. Degree Collage, Kinnaur
Govt. PG College Seema (Rohru)
Govt. Degree College, Theog
Gyan Vigyan Samiti, Dharamshala
Santosh Industrial Training Centre Ghumarawin
Society For Human Interest and Rural Advancement
Yuva Vikas Mandal, Jabli
ZCA Academy, Chamba

Jammu and kashmir

Govt. Degree College, Ramban
Government Degree College, Udhampur
Government DIET College, Kargil
Government PG College, Bhaderwah
Govt. Degree College, Kistwar
Govt. Degree College, Pulwama
Jehlum Education Trust College of Education, Baramulla
Kamariya B Ed College, Srinagar
Naushera Degree College,Rajouri
Nehru Yuva Centre, Poonch
The Student's Educational and Cultural Movement of Ladakh
Shah-i-Hamdan College of Education, Siligam
Sheikh-ul-Alam College of Education, Kupwara
Syed Ali Memorial Educational Trust, Beerwah
Pratham Volunteers of Jammu and Kathua

Jharkhand

Abhiyan
Chetna Vikas
Child Fund India
Diya Seva Sansthan
Gram Jyoti Kendra
Jal Swaraj
Jan Shabagi Kendra
Jana Kalyan Parisad, Pattbari
Lohardagga Gram Swaraj Sansthan
Lok Hit Sansthan
Lok Prerna Kendra
Mahila Samagra Utthan Samiti
Nav Bharat Jagriti Kendra
Rural Outright Development Society
Sahyogini
Samaj Pragati Kendra
Samajik Parivartan Sansthan
Santhal Pargana Gram Rachna Sansthan
Veer Jharkhand Vikas Seva Manch
Vikash Bharti, Bishunpur
Youth Welfare Committee

Karnataka

Akshara Foundation
Basaveshwara Vidya Vardhaka Sangha Rural Development Foundation
Center for Rural Development, Bellary
Centre for Rural Studies, Manipal University
Development Association Reconstruction for Institute DRC, Dharwad
EMBARK Youth Association, Virajapet
Institute of Social Studies And Research (ISSAR)
Janaprayathna
Malenadu Education And Rural Development Society
Navachetana Rural Development Society
Navodaya Educational and Environment Development Service (NEEDS)
Nirantara Social Welfare Society
PADI, Mangalore
Parivarthan
People's Organisation for Waste Land and Environment Regeneration
Pragathi Urban and Rural Development
Priyadashini Grameen Abhivruddi Sanste
Sajjalashree SKA & GAS Lingasgur
Sarvodaya Integrated Rural Development Society
SCOPE Dharwad
Seva Society Gataprabha
SPOORTHI Samsthe
Sri Balaji Sarvodaya Central Rural & Urban Development Trust
Sri Kantha Vidya Samsthe
Vishwabharati Trust, Anavatti
Yashaswi Swayam Seva Samsthe
Yashaswini Vividhodhesha Samaja Seva Samsthe
Pratham Volunteers of Mysore

Kerala

Government DIET College, Kollam
Government DIET College, Kozhikode
Government DIET College, Palakkad
Government DIET College, Pathanamitta
Government DIET College, Thrissur
Government DIET College, Wayanad
Government DIET College, Kannur
Kudumbashree

Madhya pradesh

Bahi Parshavnath Balkalyan Shikshan Samiti
Bal Pragati evam Mahila Shikshan Sansthan, Datia
Betul Upkar Gramin Vikas Sansthan, Betul
Bhimrao Jagruk Vikas Samiti
Bread For Tribal Village
Darshna Mahila Kalyan Samiti
Dhara Vikas Samiti
Dharti Gramothan evam Shabhagi Gramin Vikas Samiti
Diksha Shaikshanik Samajik Seva Sansthan
Disha Samajik Vikas Sansthan Samiti, Shivpuri
Dr. Bhimrao Ambedkar Seva Parishad
GD Public Society, Sheopur
Gram Seva Trust, Paraswada
Gramin Swalamban Samiti
Gramin Vikas Mandal, Chhindwara
Gramm Vikash Prasfutan Samiti Pindrukhi
Gramm Vikash Prasfutan Samiti Silua
Human and culture Society (Hans), Sidhi
Jan Abhiyan Parishad
Jan Sansadhan Vikas Evam Jiv Kalyan Samiti
Jan Vikas Sansthan
Jati Yuva Mandal, Gwalior
Khandwa Mahak Education Society
Krushna Vikas evam Prakuti Prabhandhan Santhan
Lok Rujhan evam Manav Vikas Soudh Sansthan
M.P. Paryavaran Sudhar Sangathan
Ma Pitambara Lok Hit Sewa Sansthan
Matrubhumi Manav Vikas Sansthan
Narmada Welfare Society
Path Pragati Samaj Kalyan Samiti, Shahdol
Prakash Yuva Mandal Itora Samiti
Pritam Shiksha evam Samaj Kalyan Sewa Samiti
Rang Welfare Society
Reform Activities by Youth Society
Sahara Manch
Sankalp Samajik Vikas Sansthan, Shivpuri
Saress Welfare Society, Seoni
Sharda Shiksha Samiti, Shahjapur
Sharda Yog evam Prakrutik Shodh Sansthan, Umaria
Shri Atal Behari Vajpayee Govt. Art & Commerce College
Smt Susheel Gayan Shiksha Prachar Prasar Samitee, Guna
Swadesh Gramotthan Samiti, Datia
Swami Prakashand Samajik Sanshthan
Swar Bharti Devi Samaj Kalyan Yuva Mandal, Sagar
Synergy Sansthan
The Initiative Educational and Welfare Society

Maharashtra

Sanchar Infotech Foundation
AVHAN Bahuudeshiya Santha
Disha Foundation
Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Smajkarya Mahavidyalaya
Gulbnabi Azad Samjkarya Mahavidyalaya
Jagat Art. Comm & IHP Science College, Goregaon
Mahatma Foundation
Model Arts & Commerce College
Nirmik Samajik Sanshodhan Va Vikas Kendra
NSS Unit, Ahmadnagar
NSS Unit, Akola
NSS Unit, Aurangabad
NSS Unit, Beed
NSS Unit, Bhandara
NSS Unit, Buldhana
NSS Unit, Dhule
NSS Unit, Hingoli
NSS Unit, Jalgaon
NSS Unit, Jalna
NSS Unit, Kolhapur
NSS Unit, Latur
NSS Unit, Nagpur
NSS Unit, Nandurbar
NSS Unit, Nashik
NSS Unit, Osmanabad
NSS Unit, Ratnagiri
NSS Unit, Sangli
NSS Unit, Satara

NSS Unit, Sindhudurg
NSS Unit, Solapur
NSS Unit, Washim
Prahar Samajik Kalyankari Sanstha
R.C. Bidkar Mahavidyalaya
Saibaba Mahavidyalaya
Sankalp Bahuudeshiya Prakalp
Uday Bahuudesiya Sanstha
Vanchit Vikas Loksanstha Nanded
Yash Bahuudeshiya Sanstha
Pratham Volunteers of Amravati, Pune, Raigad and Thane

Manipur

Action for Women and Child Development
Chingri Society
Community Development Society
Komlathabi Development Club
Kumbi Kangjeibung Mapal Fishermen Association
Our Carrom Club
People's Development for Social Change
The Youth Goodwill Association

Meghalaya

Khasi Student's Union
Local Volunteers of Jaintia Hills
Martin Luther Christian University
Ri-Bhoi Youth Federation
Williamnagar College Student's Union

Mizoram

Hmarveng Football Club
HS Adventure Club
JF Sporting Club
Kristian Thalai Pawl, Aizwal Branch
Kristian Thalai Pawl, Dinthar Branch, Mamit
Thalai Kristian Pawl, Kolasib Unit
Thalai Kristian Pawl, Moria Unit, Lunglei
Young Mizo Association, Kahrawt Branch, Champhai

Nagaland

Confederation of Chang Student's Union
Govt Primary School Teachers of Mokukchung District
Hills Club
Lesiema Student's Union
Lotha Student's Union
Nagaland Society
People's Agency for Development
Walo Organisation
Working Brigade
Zunheboto Range Student's Union
Pratham Volunteers of Dimapur

Odisha

Abha Mahila Mandal
AMCS College
Anchalika Mahavidyala, Natha Sahi
AOMA,Malkangiri
Basudevpur ITI College
Bhairav Mahavidyalaya, Dabugan
Bhaskar Multi Action Seva Samity
Biswa Vikas
Dakhina Rourkela Unnayana Parisada
Deogarh Govt City School
Gatiswar College
Gopabundhu ITC College
Govt. Autonomous College, Bhabanipatna
Jiral College
Khaira College
Khambeswripali Mahabidyala
Khyama Meher Degree College
Maa Bhagabati Mahavidyalaya, Konark, Puri
Mahima College, Panchan Gan
Panchayat college, Baragarh
Parsuram Gurukula Mahavidyalay
Patitapaban Degree College
Phulmatin Hemram Mahavidyalay
Rural Organisation for People's Empowerment
SADBHABANA,Keonjhar
Sailandra Narayan College
Science College, Polosara
Sidheswar Baba Anchalika Vidyalaya
Sri Ugratara College, J.K. Pur, Rayagada
Swami Arupananda Mahavidyalaya.

Punjab

Akalia College of Education, Faridkot
Bhramchari Club, Balachaour
D. M College of Education, Moga
Government DIET College, Sangrur
Govt Senior Secondary School, Gurdaspur
Govt Sr. Sec School, Kapurthala
Innocent B.Ed College, Jalandhar
J.D College of Education, Muktsar
Jeevan Jyoti Polytechnical College, Ferozpur
Malwa Central College of Education, Ludhiana
Mata Sahib Kaur Girls College, Tarn Taran
Nehru Yuva Kendra, Mansa
Punjabi University Campus, Mour
Regional Institute of Management and Technology, Mandi Gobindgarh
Sahara Trust, Rajpura
Sajri Saver Club, Ropar
Shaheed Bhagat Singh Youth Club, Hoshiarpur
Sidhana Institute of Education, Amritsar
Winner Cultural and Sports Club, Mohali

Rajasthan

Shiv Arogya Sansthan
AIMT College
CUTs
Diamond Shikshan Prashikshan Avam Shodh Sansthan, Makarana
Doosra Dashak
Educate Girls, Globally
Gramin Yuva Vikas Samiti
IIRM, Jaipur
LUPIN
M. L. V. PG College
Mahant Shri Ragunandan Das T.T. College
Matashree Gomati Devi Jan Sewa Nidhi
Modi Institute of Management and Technology
Parivartan Sansthan
Prashafvi B Ed College
Pratap Sansthan
Rajasthan T.T. College
Ranthambhore PG College
Sahaj Sansthan
Shekhawati B.Ed. College
Shiv Shiksha Samiti
Society for Agriculture and Rural Dovelopmet (SARD)
Society to Uplift Rural Economy
Suratgarh Educational and Social Welfare Trust
The Ankur B.Ed College
Udaipur School of Social Work
VAAGDHARA
Veena Group
Vidhya Bharti Sansthan
Pratham Voulnteers of Ajmer, Hanumangarh and Jhalawar

Sikkim

Govt College, Namchi
Govt College, Rhenock
Govt College, Tadong

Tamil nadu

Aid-et-action
AVVAI Village Welfare Society
Award Trust
Council for Integrated Development (CID Trust)
Gramodhaya Social Service Society
GrassRoot
Institute of Human Rights Education
Jeeva Anbalayam Trust
Leaf Society
Manitham Charitable Trust
Needs Trust
New life for Differently Disabled Fedaration
News Trust
PRESS Trust
Raise India Trust
READ
Rights Trust
Rural Women Development Trust
SODEWS
Tamil Nadu Green Movement (TNGM Trust)
Valarum Vandavasi
VEPAGA
WORLD Trust

Tripura

Agragati Social Organisation
Chetna Social Organisation
Kasturba Gandhi National Memorial Trust, Tripura
Pushparaj Club

Uttar pradesh

Akhil Bhartiya Shrawasti Gramodyog Sewa Sansthan Anuragini
Bhartiya Gramotthan Seva Vikash Sansthan
Devlopment of Human Enviroment and Study of Human Activities
Disha Sewa Samiti
Grameen Development Society

Gramin Mahila Kalyan Sansthan
Gramin Manav Seva evam Paryavaran Sudhar Samiti
Gramoday Seva Asharm
Gyan Sewa Samiti
Indian Gospel Charitable Society
Indian Medical Practioner Welfare Association
Jadaun Gramodhyog Seva Sansthan
Jan Kalyan Samiti
Jankalyan Shikshan Prasar Samiti
Janta Sewa Samiti
Lakshya Gramin Vikas Society
Manav Sewa Kendra
Nehru Yuva Sansthan
Nehru Yuva Mandal
New Public School Samiti
Open Sky Welfare Society
Paramlal Seva Samiti
Parmarth Gramodyog Janseva Sansthan
Saptrang Vikas Sansthan
Sarvangeen Grameen Vikas Sansthan
Sarvjan Sewa Sansthan
Savera
Sharaddha Jan Kalyan Sikshan Sewa Sansthan
Social Welfare Organization
The Help Jan Kalyan Samiti
Yuva Vikash Evam Prasikshan Sansthan
Local Volunteers of Jhansi, Devoria, Ghaziabad, Bijnore, Etah, Mirzapur, Lucknow, J.P. Nagar, Kannauj and Ramabai Nagar
Pratham Volunteers of Etawah, Mainpuri, Aligarh, Agra, Mathura, Firozabad, Varanasi, Ambedkar Nagar, Azamgarh, Jaunpur, Basti, Gorakhpur, Bareilly, Moradabad, Meerut, Rampur, Gautam Budh Nagar, Gonda, Bahraich, Sitapur, Pratapgarh, Kaushambi, Rae Bareilly, Hardoi and Barabanki

Uttarakhand

Association for Rural Planning & Action
Dolphin (PG) Institute of Bio Medical and Natural Sciences
Faculty of Management Studies Gurukul Kangri University
Government Polytechnic, Kashipur, U.S. Nagar
Gram Suraxa Samiti, Manjiyali Naugaon, Uttarkashi
Gram Vikas Sansthan, Dhali
Kumaun Seva Samiti, Sitarganj, U.S.Nagar
Manav Kalyan Samiti, Ukhimath, Rudraprayag
Nav Jyoti Jan Kalyan Samiti, Kandikhal, Tehri
Omkarananda Institute of Management & Technology, Rishikesh
P.G.College, Bageshwar
Prakhar Yuva evam Grameen Jan Jagrati Samiti
R.N.I Inter College, Bhagwanpur (Haridwar)
Society For Agriculture and Administrative Research
Swami Vivekanand Samaj Sevi Sanstha
Yuvak Mangal Dal (Samiti)

West bengal

Baharampur Krishnath College, History Department, Baharampur, Murshidabad.
Bankura Christian College, Department of Sociology
Barddhaman Sanjog Human Social Welfare Society
Chatrya Kalyan Samity
Dakshin Dinajpur Foundation for Rural Integration Economic and Nature Development
Gour Mahavidyalay, NSS in Charge Unit -3
Jaganath Kishore College, NSS Unit
Kajla Jana Kalyan Samity
Mainaguri College, NCC Unit
Vivekananda College, NSS UNIT
Mathabhanga College, NCC Unit
Matri O Shishu Bikash Kendra
Raiganj University College
Ramnarayanpur Kalika Sangha
St Joseph's College
Turku Halasda Lapsa Hembrom Mahavidyalaya
University of Kalyani, Department Of Rural Development & Management.

Supporters of ASER 2011

Abhijit Banerjee
Abhimanyu Banerji
Accountability Initiative
Akhilesh Richhariya
Amit Kaushik
Amita Chudgar
Anant Prakash Vyas
Arvind Amin
Ganesh Tak
Gita Rao & Bhaskar Chakravorti
Iqbal Dhaliwal
ITC
Kabir Bogra
Maya Mitra
Michael Walton
Pratham UK
Rishi Rajvanshi
Rohini Mukherjee
Rukmini Banerji
Salimah Samji
Shantanu Banerji
Shobhini Mukerji
Siddharth Jain
Uttarayan Trust
V.B Bewtra
Viplow Shivhare

Special thanks to

A.P.M Mohammed Hanish
Ankur Vaja
Bendang
Bommo Kamchi
Bremil M. Sangma
C. Vanengmawei
Chow Nakasang
D.W. Wangza
Dilbag Singh
Dimasahau Student's Union
Dipak Sharma
Dr Jayaprakash Narayan
Dr. O.P Verma, NSS Coordinator, Himachal Pradesh University
Dr. S.S. Rajagopalan, Kalvi Network
Dr. Vasanthi Devi, Kalvi Network
Dwidengra Brahma
Grace Zamnu
H. Pauchen Phom
H. Lalrinfeh
Haigam Kauring
Hopeful Khongstia
Japinder Singh, Regional Institute of Management & Technology
K.R. Variusmauii
Kalaveni Srinivas
Kelouzie Keisiezie
Kerala Shasthra Sahithya Parishad
Khrawboklang Tansong
Khukheto Y Yepthomi
Kripendra Das
L. C. Somoranjit Meitei
Lalhlinpuii
Madhusudhanan, SCERT
Manoranjan Mondal
Manosh Kumar
Mary Lalrunruati
Mary Sada
Mr. Ejanthang Ngullie
Mr. Kelouzie
Mr. Muzzamil Ahmed, Secretary to Dean College Development Council, Kashmir University
Mr. Subor Rangslang
Mr. Yapangchang
Mr. Baikuntha Pandey, State Pedagogy, SSA
Mr. Harishwar Dayal, Prof. St. Xavier's College
Mr. Pashupati Nath Singh, Director-ADRI
MTs of Dreams Foundation
MTs of Loksatta
MTs of Pragati Marg Kendra
MTs of Sankranti Foundation
MTs of Vasavya Mahila Mandali
Namkhinlung Pamei
Ngorum Besterday Moyon
Nongmeithem Shyamjoy Singh
P. Setsacho
P. Subash Singh
Padam Rai
Pangarsenba Jamir
Pangloi Konyak
Pradip Tanti, President, Kumbha Panchayat, Cachar
Priyadarsini Nair
Prof. Nandeibam Mohendro
Professor Mushtaq A. Kaw, Dean, College Development Council, Kashmir University
Professor Talat Ahmad, Vice Chancellor, Kashmir University
Punuto Aye
R Lalchhingpuii
R. Adeno Nguillie
Binay Pattanayak, Education Officer, UNICEF Ranchi
Remdorness Sunn
Reshmi Thapa
Rijiedstar Marbaniang
Robert C Paoboi
Roluk Buii
Roshan Rai
Satish G, DRC Dharwad
Shankar Singh Yadav
Showrish Kudkuli, Manipal University, Manipal
Shri M Shivshanker, Secretary General Education, Government of Kerala
Smt Saumya Gupta, DM, North District
Suraj Sharma
T. Chuba Chang
Taba Anjum, Journalist, Arunachal Times
Takar Bagan
Tamal Chakraborty
Tatro Sawin
Tenzing Lepcha
Tobom Dai
Tokyo Mida
Trilok Bandhu, Malwa Central College of Education
Tumpe Basar
Vanlalrualfela Hlondo
Wasim Raja
Yaben Tapak
Yambem Chingshang Singh
Zakaria Choudhury
Zhoto Tunyi
All Pratham State Heads, MTs and Accountants

Contents

- List of partners ii
- Supporters of ASER 2011 vi

1. Notes on ASER 2011

- The unseen change ..... Madhav Chavan 1
- ASER and learning profiles: The pace of learning is too slow... Lant Pritchett 11
- Bringing hard evidence to the table ..... M.R. Madhavan 13
- From a Right to Schooling to a Right to Learning: Rethinking education finance ..... Yamini Aiyar 14
- Taking mothers along ..... Rukmini Banerji 17
- 1,902 ASER partners ..... Suman Bhattacharjea 19
- From Mumbai, Multan to Mombasa or Karachi, Kanyakumari to Kilimanjaro ..... Baela Raza Jamil 21
- Addressing inequalities: Breaking the cycles of illiteracy ..... John Mugo 22

2. About the survey

- Note on Sampling: ASER 2011 Rural ..... Wilima Wadhwa 24
- ASER 2011 Training 25
- ASER 2011 Monitoring & Recheck 27
- How to make a map and make sections 28
- What to do in each section/ hamlet 29
- How to sample households in a hamlet in a village 30
- What to do in each household 31
- From 2005 to 2011: Evolution of ASER 35
- ASER 2011: Reading tasks 36
- How to test reading? 37
- ASER 2011: Arithmetic tasks 38
- How to test arithmetic? 39
- What to do in a school? 40
- School and home language information in ASER 2011 43

3. Sample survey formats 44

4. Maps

- Private schools 6-14 year olds 54
- Attendance in Primary School 55
- Reading: Std III & V 56
- Math: Std III & V 58
- Multigrade classrooms: Std II 60

5. ASER 2011 (Rural) Findings 61

6. India 65

7. Andhra Pradesh, Arunachal Pradesh, Assam, Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Gujarat 75

8. Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Jammu and Kashmir, Jharkhand, Karnataka, Kerala 113

9. Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Manipur, Meghalaya, Mizoram, Nagaland 151

10. Odisha, Punjab, Rajasthan, Tamil Nadu, Tripura, Uttarakhand 189

11. Uttar Pradesh, West Bengal, Daman & Diu, Puducherry 227

12. Divisional estimates

- Divisional estimates of learning outcomes and schooling status: Precision of ASER estimates..... Wilima Wadhwa..... 246
- Divisional estimates for states 2007-2011 250

Annexures

- Sample description 275
- Village infrastructure and household characteristics 276
- Class-wise distribution of children in sample 2007-2011 277
- Age-class composition in sample 2011 282
- Sample design of rural ASER 2011 ..... Wilima Wadhwa 287

Notes on ASER 2011



The unseen change

Madhav Chavan [1]

I

The first news of 2012 based on ASER 2011 is that private school enrollment in most states is increasing although the Right to Education Act for free and compulsory education is in place. Over 25% of rural India's children go to private schools and the numbers will rise in coming years as education and wealth increase. ASER covers rural districts. The urban numbers are probably changing more rapidly towards private education.

The second piece of news is that not only are India's learning levels very poor on an international absolute scale, the levels in government schools in the North have steadily declined with the exception of Punjab and Himachal Pradesh. The decline is quite alarming and we expect that the results will be discussed, debated and perhaps even contested in some states. At first glance the decline of reading levels by 10-20 percentage points can seem shockingly impossible but I think there is enough in the data gathered over the years that indicates that this has been gradually building up possibly due to multiple factors, and something like Census 2011 has caused a major dip in the less functional state systems. It is noteworthy that private schools by and large everywhere, and the states of the South plus Gujarat and Maharashtra do not show a decline of reading levels as measured by ASER. In fact, some states show steady improvement over the years. On another note, a recent study by Education Initiatives concludes that scores on common questions in tests given five years apart have declined about 7-10% among Std 4 children of elite schools of India.[2] There is an urgent need to find out why learning levels are declining and to at least arrest the decline and improve the learning levels.

II

When we started seven years ago, many doubted that we could do the first survey successfully and yet we called it the ANNUAL Status of Education Report from the very first year. Later there were questions raised if there was a need to do this massive survey every year. Those who do this year after year also wondered when not much change was observed year after year, whether all this annual business was worthwhile. But in 2011, the efforts in doing the annual survey seem to be even more justifiable at least for some time to come.

This article attempts to explore the trends as seen from ASER measurements and observations over the last half a dozen years, or over a whole Plan period of India. I am sure the issue is more complex and many factors can be studied. We will be more than happy if researchers feel inspired to use our data to explore this fascinating phase of gradual but big, measurable but unseen changes in elementary education.

Ever since we launched ASER, our focus has been on two simple key points. First; are all children enrolled in school? What kind of school? Second; are the children learning at least the very basics of reading and numeracy? While ASER has won many friends and admirers, we have had our share of critics. We have chosen to focus on some very basic outcomes of education. If these outcomes improve, there is reason to believe that inputs are working. When they decline, it is a sure sign that inputs are not working.

Before we did the first survey, it was difficult for us to believe that over 90% rural children of this vast country were enrolled in schools. But once we had done the survey, we believed it. Many others including some eminent people did not, and said it was not consistent with their experience. A government sponsored independent survey around the same time came up with practically the same proportion of enrolled children. Every subsequent ASER threw up self-consistent numbers and trends at state and national level to further emphasize the validity and utility of the survey. Subsequently we also measured attendance, which showed that while enrollment was increasing in the Northern states, attendance of children in schools, which should be the real measure of enrollment, remained poor.

The increase in enrollment was an intended clear goal of the system and the system responded to the signals coming from Delhi and state capitals. Large centralized systems respond to simple and clear instructions or goals and not fine print. In a centralized but ill-functioning system with huge gaps of knowledge and skill-sets, a complex message is lost in the game of Chinese whispers. Worse, it may lead to a dysfunctional system becoming worse. A few months ago a senior government official was heard explaining to a gathering of head teachers the essence of the Right to Education Act. "Enroll all children. Do not beat them. Promote them to the next class. Make sure they do not drop out. Once you have done all this, you will have achieved RTE". But will learning happen simply if children stay in school?

[1] Madhav Chavan is CEO and President, Pratham Education Foundation.
[2] See http://www.ei-india.com/wp-content/uploads/Executive_Summary.pdf

The Government of India has not emphasized improvement in learning goals. The results framework of the ministry that goes with the annual plan guidelines gives learning outcomes a late and vague mention - all this in spite of all the evidence pointing towards dismal learning by every measure.

The ASER survey of children's reading and arithmetic levels has its critics and admirers. Our admirers like its simplicity and the fact that it has been tested and proven to be robust. The tools and techniques have been replicated and found to work in other parts of the world. But, the detractors have other views ranging from doubting the very integrity of the exercise to whether it is correct to measure outcomes at all and everything in between. Unfortunately, surveys, their potential, their meaning, and their limitations are not well-understood. Subsequent to ASER, other higher level and more sophisticated studies have been undertaken by Education Initiatives. NCERT studies have been published, and many state governments have been measuring learning levels using different methods, some of which are close to the ASER approach. Often these results do not match thanks to different approaches, methods, and tools. However, broadly all indicate that learning is poor in Indian schools.

ASER has followed the same basic procedures and has made sure that basic testing tools and methods of sampling and testing are the same every year for the core tests. As a result, although some of our findings may be inconsistent with other studies, they are self consistent year after year indicating good precision of the method and the techniques used.

The massive data gathered over the last years are showing some interesting trends that deserve the attention of policy-makers and researchers alike. The right to free and compulsory education is now on the ground. How are people reacting to it? How is it impacting schools? We cannot merely look at its impact every five years. In five years a Std 1 child will complete primary education and a Std 6 child will either drop out or go on to complete secondary schooling. But, if we let things go on the way they are, demographic disaster awaits us at the end of the decade if not sooner.

III

Private school enrollment is increasing. So, what's new?

There is plenty new. The RTE act, if seriously implemented, will make it impossible for 'low cost' or 'affordable' schools to operate. But over the last six years private school enrollment in rural India has gone up by 5.5 percentage points, which translates into an increase of just over 25%. It is quite likely that many, if not most, of the rural private schools do not meet RTE norms. So unless these children are all enrolled in RTE-compliant private schools, nearly 40 million rural children will have to be provided place in government schools. But, will the parents want to put their children in government schools even if they are 'good'? Can they be compelled to do so? What information do we have relevant to this question?


As far as private school enrollment is concerned, India can be divided into some broad regions. In the North-West, states like Punjab, Rajasthan, Haryana have had high enrollment in private schools. Since 2006, these enrollment numbers have gone up by 5-7 percentage points- that is a 15-20% increase. The North-East shows mixed ratios with Assam and Arunachal being moderate, Tripura low, and Meghalaya, Mizoram, Nagaland and Manipur on the high side of private enrollment. In the East, states have traditionally had low enrollment in private schools, and these have gone up by about 1-3 percentage points- also a 20% increase. In this region Bihar has the unique distinction of actually decreasing the proportion enrolled in private school which is a likely reflection of the massive efforts to open schools, bring out of school children into school and appointing large numbers of teachers. But we also know that children's attendance in Bihar is the lowest in the country and nearly 60% elementary school children in this state go to private tutors. Bihar's immediate neighbors are also high tutor states. Maharashtra and AP show under 10% increase over their previous level of about 29% private school enrollment. But, the rest of the South is increasingly sending children to private schools.


The major enrollment story is in Tamil Nadu, Kerala, Maharashtra, and Uttar Pradesh. Each story is different in these extremely diverse states.


In Tamil Nadu, there are several strong reasons for attracting children to government schools - mid-day meal is said to be a major success over many years in bringing children to government schools. A few years ago a new child-centric, joyful, print-rich ABL methodology was introduced across the state. Yet, there is an overall increase of about 8 to 12 percentage points in private enrollment between Std 1 and 8 over five years. But a look at the charts below makes it obvious that the major increase is in Std 1-5 amounting to about 16 percentage points or


almost a doubling of private school enrollment. In Std 6-7-8 the increase is about 7 percentage points. It appears that the government schools in Tamil Nadu are not able to convince the parents that government schools are better. Is this only because parents associate some kind of a status with private schools and are not concerned with what goes on in the classroom? If so, is there not a need to reach out to parents and convince them?

Chart 1. Tamil Nadu, Kerala, Uttar Pradesh and Maharashtra: Trends in percentage of children enrolled in private schools, Std 1-8









In Uttar Pradesh, which could be seen as the exact opposite of Tamil Nadu as far as government school functioning is concerned, private school enrollment in Std 1-5 has jumped up almost 20 percentage points to double the original number; while in upper primary segments, which had a high private enrollment, the increase is small but still substantial at 5 percentage points. The data suggest that in earlier cohorts private school enrollment in the early grades was relatively low and it rose as we moved to higher grades. Now it looks like private school enrollment starts high from as early as Std 1. Perhaps, upper primary private schools are expanding to include primary segments and those who can afford it are sending their children to private schools.

What is common between UP and Tamil Nadu apart from this big move towards private education? Serious research is needed to understand why parents in these two very different states are behaving similarly in massive numbers.

In Kerala, where there was already more than 50% enrollment in private schools, there is still an eight percentage point increase in private enrollment. In the North-Western states, private school enrollment seems to have remained steady around 35-40% or inched up slowly, indicating a saturation effect. But Kerala seems to be breaking through any such saturation. It must be remembered that a very large proportion of private schools in Kerala are government aided, which are largely absent in the North-Western states. It is not clear if the existing private schools in Kerala are expanding, or more unaided private schools are opening.

The RTE Act offers 'per child cost' to unaided schools to accept 25% children of weaker sections. In Kerala, where only 40% are now in government schools and the number is going down, would it not make more sense to convert all government schools into 'aided schools' rather than keeping them under a centralized government control? Why not opt for a 'government funded locally managed school' model with either private groups or

Panchayats running the schools? Or, Kerala, with a very high proportion of private schools, may be ready for vouchers even though there will be political question marks.

Maharashtra presents a different case in contrast. Its private enrollment in primary segments has hardly gone up and the enrollments in upper primary segment, which are largely government aided schools, show no major increase either. The secondary segment in Maharashtra is largely private and aided, which is reflected in the chart. Why is the Maharashtra response to private schools like that of the Eastern states, which are poorer economically and educationally and not like Kerala?

These four states in some ways represent the variation among education systems in different states of India. Is there one "Indian education system"?

These questions present good research opportunities. However, it is almost predictable that unless regulation prevents it or unless suddenly a large population starts believing in neighborhood/common schools run by the government, the proportion of children going to private schools will go on increasing. The question is, how far? Based on previous ASERs and other studies, it is quite obvious that with increasing income and education of parents, people want to send their children to a private school if one is available nearby. Can government schools alone convince parents to do otherwise? Is there a need for greater social and political mobilization? Can it succeed?

IV

How effective are Bihar schools? What helps learning?

When we published ASER2005 (the first one) many people were shocked (as were we), and some actually angry that the proportion of government school children in Bihar who could read was higher than in many other economically better off states. "Bihar, of all the places!" was an exclamation full of contempt often heard. But no one seemed to object that the ability to read in Bihar government schools was much higher than in UP or Rajasthan government schools.

As gurus of surveys say, what surveys provide are measurements and observations. These give estimates upon processing, which are perceptions of reality through the lenses of the survey tools. There are statistical methods available to measure how good these are (and ASER passes these tests quite well[3]). ASER methods and tools have been replicated successfully by different groups in African countries and in Pakistan. What they mean or might mean is another thing. It is up to individuals to decide what comparisons to draw and what interpretations and inferences to make.

So, let us try to unravel the mystery of why Bihar children do better in reading. I will leave it to the economists to do detailed work and test a primary hypothesis that emerges from the table below.

Table 1. Percent children in different states and systems who can read at least a Std 1 text in Std 3, 2006-11; and % going to tutors in 2011

State and school type *	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	% going to tutors in 2011
Bihar (Govt)	51.7	52.6	49.7	42.3	43.9	29.9	42.0
Bihar (Pvt)	69.6	71.4	73.4	72.5	65.9	72.7	67.2
W Bengal (Govt)	X	X	47.9	49.3	51.7	46.8	67.9
Rajasthan(Govt)	31.6	28.7	31.5	25.8	27.2	22.6	4.7
Rajasthan(Pvt)	53.9	53.8	60.2	52.1	50.3	53.2	9.4
UP (Govt)	23.5	25.8	24.5	23.3	26.5	18.0	1.2
UP (Pvt)	50.3	53.2	56.3	48.7	51.3	50.7	13.5

* W Bengal private school data not included due to small observation numbers. Bihar private school data points are also small.

Note that the estimated percentage of children who can at least read a Std 1 text in Std 3 in Bihar and West Bengal lies in between private schools and government schools of Rajasthan and UP. There is a dip in 2011 in all these government schools. We shall deal with the decline in 2011 a bit later. For the moment let us work only

[3] See http://images2.asercentre.org/ASER_survey_/ASER-Reliability-Validity-Evaluation.pdf

with numbers up to 2010. We know that there are many household factors that affect the learning levels of a child. Once these are controlled, as Dr. Wilima Wadhwa has shown in ASER 2009, the contribution of the private schools to the child's learning seems negligible in several states. In the present case, does tutoring represent all these factors to equalize?

Table 2. Percent government school children who can read depending upon whether they go to tutor or not

Based on ASER2011	W Bengal Government school		Odisha Government school		Bihar Government school		Jharkhand Government school	
	with tutor	without tutor	with tutor	without tutor	with tutor	without tutor	with tutor	without tutor
% Std 3 who can read at least a Std 1 text	53.9	32.9	55.9	27.6	35.5	27.9	38.1	24.0
% Std 5 who can read at least a Std 2 text	44.1	35.0	52.8	31.3	53.8	44.1	52.9	33.1

In all of the above states large but varied proportions of children go to private tutors. In other states the corresponding data points are low. The percentage of readers among government school children who go to tutors is unmistakably high in these high tutor and low private school states.

If the effectiveness of a school system was measured by the proportion of children without tutors who can read texts of Std 1 and 2 respectively at Std 3 or Std 5, we see an even worse picture. In fact, for those who wish to compare states, once the tutor effect is removed, most states excepting Kerala, Maharashtra, Punjab, and Himachal Pradesh start looking very similar.

It is observed in states where learning levels are declining that while the same proportion of children go to tutors year after year, their contribution to the child's learning level diminishes. This may mean that the tutor is a complementary factor and if the school functioning declines, the effectiveness of tutoring is lower too. This should make sense. It is noticeable that the impact of tutors is not the same in every state and in every class. It is as though tutoring is also a 'system', that functions well in some states and not in others.

In other words, the learning level of a child in a government school results from many factors. School is an important factor but it is only one of the factors.

Let us come to the observation that in 2011 the learning levels of government schools drop substantially. In fact, in government schools in Rajasthan, UP, and Bihar there is a continuous decline in learning levels over time until it drops sharply in 2011. It is noteworthy at the same time that the private school learning levels remain more or less unchanged.

What is going on? One likely contributing factor for big a drop in 2011 is that there was Census in early 2011 and teachers were pulled out of classrooms right in the most productive part of the school year after the October-November festive season. But there are other factors changing as well.

The school observation data from ASER can be used to track trends.[4] The school attendance observed in UP and Bihar over the last five years is down from 67% in 2007 to 57% in UP and from 59% to 50% in Bihar. The drop between 2010 and 2011 is sharp. Rajasthan shows no such drop but W Bengal does so in 2011. Teacher attendance in Bihar and Rajasthan remains at around 85-90% but has declined in UP from 92% to 82%.

Another important observation is that in Rajasthan, which remained unchanged in terms of children's or teachers' attendance, the proportion of multigrade classrooms has gone up from 52% to 62%. In UP it has gone up from 43% to 52%. In Kerala it has gone up from 2% to 9%. Note that all these are states with high proportions of children moving to private schools. With the exception of Maharashtra, Karnataka, and Tamil Nadu, the proportion of multigrade classes has increased in most states. Whether this is a consequence of a consciously adopted pedagogy or whether this reflects rationalization of teachers is not clear.

[4] ASER is a household survey with sampling done to ensure a representative sample of children at the district level. However for every village that is sampled for the survey, one government school with primary sections is also visited. The ASER school data is based on these school observations.

Just to be clear, I am not at all opposed to multigrade classrooms. In fact, I would prefer grouping children according to their current level rather than age alone. But the classroom management techniques and teacher preparation required in such situations is very high. If these are weak, as they today are, a multigrade classroom can prove to be a disaster. If ASER school observations over the years are correct, we are witnessing a quiet disaster.

V

Learning levels declining? Where? Why?

The declining levels of learning and other factors are not unique to Rajasthan, UP, and Bihar. But there are exceptions as well.


The effectiveness of a system can be increased or decreased by changing a variety of factors. But to clearly identify these, we first need to have a measure of effectiveness of the system. This is only possible if the system defines the outcomes it wants and works towards achieving them. If construction of toilets and ensuring that they function is the desired outcome that the system is aiming for, then the system will respond accordingly as long as there are no other conflicting factors such as lack of water. If the idea is to ensure that children learn reading, writing, arithmetic, a focused system can achieve this. If we further want the child to be free of fear, able to think and express, that can be done. But for all this, the system must function and it should be capable of receiving messages and translating them effectively into appropriate action.


The exact opposite is also possible. In other words, the estimates of declining percentage of readers in every class may lead us to infer that the message being interpreted is that learning is not important.

Below are some charts of learning levels of government school systems as measured by ASER in different states over the years. A quick look at these charts makes it evident that as they move from one class to the next, a higher proportion of children can read Std 1 level text or more. This is what one would expect, given that some children do acquire the very basic skills measured by ASER with every additional year in school – although many do not. In Karnataka in 2011, for example, about 5.3% of children can read Std 1 level text in Std 1. This number grows to 41.5% by Std 3, and 70% in Std 5. In Tamil Nadu in 2011, 3.9% in Std 1, 26.1 in Std 3, and 67.5% in Std 5 can read a Std 1 level text.

But to assess whether the system is becoming more effective at teaching children to read, we need to compare the proportion of children who could read Std 1 level text in 2006 with the same proportion in successive years at the same Std. If the ability of the system to teach basic reading is improving, this should be reflected in an increase in the proportion of children in (say) Std 3 who could read from 2006 to 2011.

Chart 2. Tamil Nadu and Karnataka: Percent government schools children able to read at least Std 1 text in respective Std and year





A look at Std 4 in Karnataka and Std 5 in Tamil Nadu suggests that the effectiveness of the classroom as per the measure of "% children who can read at least a Std 1 text" is improving year after year. Although the proportion of children able to read a Std 1 text remains low in absolute terms at every Std in Tamil Nadu, the levels appear to be rising slowly year after year. At least they are not deteriorating for certain. In both states about 60-65% children can read at this level by the time they are in Std 5. However, in getting there, more Karnataka children


learn to read in Std 2 and 3, while more Tamil Nadu children become readers with a jump as they move from Std 3 and 4.


In Kerala, Andhra, and Maharashtra there is no observed improvement nor loss of effectiveness of schools by the same measure.[5]

Gujarat should be mentioned as a state that has also started showing a steady although slow improvement in reading levels over the last three years. One major initiative in the state for the last three years is that government officers visit randomly chosen schools to assess performance of children around November and cross check teachers' evaluations.

Children's attendance, teacher attendance, and the proportion of multigrade classrooms in these states are largely unchanged or have improved and remain at high levels.


Chart 3. Punjab and Haryana: Percent children in government schools able to read at least a Std 1 text in respective Std and year






Here is an interesting case: Haryana and Punjab - neighbours who share a common capital - show opposing trends. The two states are almost identical with respect to private school enrollment, student and teacher attendance, and multigrade classrooms. Outwardly, they should function with the same effectiveness. Yet, one is getting better while the other is in decline. While Punjab shows year after year improvement especially after Std 2, Haryana seems to show deterioration especially when children reach Std 5. In other words, the Punjab system has been converting non-readers into readers at Std 3 and 4 with increasing effectiveness year after year so far. In contrast, in Haryana, although more children learn to read as they go from say Std 2 to 3 or Std 3 to 4, each year fewer children are learning to read at each step and this shows up as a cumulative decline in the percentage of children reading at the same Std when compared across years. In Haryana, the proportion of children who can read in Std 5 was around 85% in 2006 while it has steadily declined to 75% in 2011. The increase in Punjab and the decline in Haryana are both obvious and statistically significant.

Chart 4. Odisha and Jharkhand: Percent children in government schools able to read at least a Std 1 text in respective Std and year.





[5] I have used only reading at Std 1 text level as a measure. It could look different if we used another measure, say ability to solve division sums.


The estimated decline in learning levels at Std 3 in UP, W. Bengal, Rajasthan, and Bihar was already shown in a table above. The decline in Odisha and Jharkhand is sharper at all grade levels especially after 2008. Particularly noteworthy is the sharp decline at every Std in 2011. It may be noted that average attendance of children in these states is observed to be around 90%, and teacher attendance is also higher than the average among Northern and Eastern states. However, the main common factor is that multigrade classrooms have gone up by 7 to 10 percentage points. We are not aware of what else may have changed in the system. The sharp decline in 2011 is common with other Northern states and might be due to the additional Census factor laid over already poorly functioning systems.


It should be reiterated that private schools systems in the North do not show a similar decline in these basic learning levels.

These examples provide sufficient evidence that ASER can capture positive changes, negative changes, and note status quo in school systems over years.

This brings us to a major negative change in two states of Madhya Pradesh and Chhattisgarh. In Madhya Pradesh, according to ASER 2005 36% government school children in Std 3 could read at least a Std 1 text. By 2006 this had jumped to 65%. There was a further jump in 2008 to 81% after stability for one year. However, in subsequent years the Std 3 classes had lesser and lesser proportion of children who could read. The conversion to readers after Std 3 also slowed down. As a result we see that by 2011 the proportion of basic readers has fallen way below what it was in Std 3 and Std 5 in 2005-2006.

Chart 5. MP and Chhattisgarh: Percent children in government school able to read at least a Std 1 text in respective Std and year.





In neighbouring Chhattisgarh, the decline is observed after academic year 2008. The Chhattisgarh decline looks relatively smaller than in MP today. However, it is comparable to what MP had seen in 2010. In other words, it is more than likely that unless corrective action is taken, the Chhattisgarh chart of the next ASER in 2012 will look like the MP chart of 2011.

How are the two states doing on other parameters observed by ASER?

Table 3. MP and Chhattisgarh: School indicators, 2007 and 2011

Data for primary schools (1-5) %	Madhya Pradesh		Chhattisgarh	
	2007	2011	2007	2011
Children's attendance	67.0	54.5	72.0	73.1
Teachers' attendance	91.3	87.7	92.7	84.6
Multigrade classrooms	61.8	70.8	48.1	62.5
Water provision and functioning	78.5	69.1	77.6	73.4
Private school enrollment	13.0	19.0	9.0	12.5

It appears that there is a general decline. The increase in multigrade classrooms combined with increased teacher absenteeism and lower attendance of children (not in Chhattisgarh) from already low levels could cause a decline in reading levels like in other states. There is no documentation available for any other negative factors creeping into the MP and Chhattisgarh systems that could lead to additional negative effects.

The drops in learning levels are very high compared to other states because the baseline of learning levels in 2007-2008 for these two states was very high. How can such huge drops in the learning levels be explained? The answer may lie in why the learning levels might have gone up in the first place.

We have seen above that in Punjab and Tamil Nadu, although to varying extents, the proportion of children able to read has gone up steadily. In Punjab, the government took up a specific program to improve basic reading and numeracy for three years. The whole system was oriented towards achievement of goals that would be measured. The campaign had intended consequences as the State Project Director of SSA provided from-the-front leadership. The learning levels were quite high to begin with and they went up in small jumps over the years. In Tamil Nadu, the SSA provided similar leadership for about 4 years to establish the ABL methodology. The explicit and primary goal of ABL is not improvement of reading, which may be an outcome of an overall change in pedagogy that allows children to learn at their own pace rather than being encouraged to achieve reading skills as a priority. Hence, a slower pace of change may be expected. It is important to note that gains in reading levels due to both are captured by ASER over the years.

In Madhya Pradesh in 2005-06, and then again in 2007-08, the SSA took up very strong focused campaigns to improve reading and basic literacy with the involvement of teachers and village volunteers. In both years the respective State Project Directors provided leadership. Goals were set, officers and teachers were involved to achieve specific learning goals. In Chhattisgarh, there was a similar campaign for just one year, 2007-08. Once again, an energetic State Project Director of SSA led from the front, the school system was geared towards achieving set goals of basic reading and numeracy and there was a massive mobilization of volunteers in practically each village. In MP too, there was a massive volunteer campaign with volunteers working with children in each village.

The impact that a systemic momentum can have is easy to believe. What is missed is the impact that volunteers can have on such a large scale when working with the system.

Some individuals question our integrity and say that ASER cooks up figures to show Pratham's work in good light. There are others more kind in questioning our integrity. In our defence we can point out that similar campaigns taken up in UP or in Assam failed to show improvement although the government was involved and there were volunteers mobilized. In Uttarakhand, learning levels hardly moved. In Maharashtra and Gujarat the respective governments took certain steps without Pratham involvement and reading levels went up. It is our experience that when the government leadership took up something energetically and when volunteers also participated, learning levels showed improvements. With the momentum of the school system missing or weak, learning levels did not show improvement. In other words in the period 2007-2009, any large scale volunteer-based campaign without the government's involvement yielded no noticeable improvement. This is noted in various Pratham reports.

Fortunately, the world renowned MIT-based research group J-PAL has conducted rigorous randomized evaluations of Pratham's work with volunteers.[6] These large scale studies conducted in varied places such as Mumbai, Baroda, Jaunpur (UP) and West Champaran (Bihar) all point to the impact volunteers have on learning levels of children at the very basic level that ASER measures. There is also a large scale study involving school teachers in Bettiah in West Champaran in summer camps, where children were grouped according to their learning levels rather than by grade or age and taught basic reading and literacy with focus. This study showed that not only did children who attended camps make progress, but they retained their advantage over other children for at least two years.[7]

We have already seen the impact tutors have on learning levels of children in government schools although the school attendance in Bihar is recorded at about 60%. If the school system was more effective, learning levels would probably be higher (unless parents stop sending their children to tutors because schools are more effective, but this does not seem to happen in private schools and in advanced states such as Kerala).

[6] http://www.povertyactionlab.org/search/apachesolr_search/pratham?filters=type:evaluation

[7] See Abhijit Banerjee and Esther Duflo's recent book Poor Economics, published in 2011.

The volunteers who helped children in massive numbers can be thought of as tutors focusing on certain tasks of reading. With this it is entirely possible to see the kind of jumps at the basic level of learning that are noted by ASER.

The effect of the campaigns in MP and Chhattisgarh is reflected in the measurement of their intended outcomes. The effect of campaigns of the previous year(s) is seen in ASER measurements which happen in October-November of the following academic year. The 2006 measurement in MP is a reflection of the campaign in 2005-2006 academic year and the 2008 measurement in Chhattisgarh is a reflection of the campaign of 2007-2008. The low learning levels jumped tremendously with the boost that came from the energetic campaigns. After 2008/2009, the campaigns were simply switched off by the new State Project Directors in the two states. The momentum was completely lost. Now, we see that not only are the focused learning improvement efforts off but other parameters are also going downhill.

The impact of school summer vacations on children's loss of learning has been studied in the United States and is said to impact socioeconomically disadvantaged children much more. Similar studies related to regular disruptions and vacations are badly needed in India. What happens if school and classroom functioning deteriorates? Is it possible that the fragile reading and numeracy skills acquired by a disadvantaged child in Std 2-3 will be forgotten or become rusty enough to once again classify the child as a non-reader? Our data suggests that this is what is happening in several states and needs to be studied further in depth.

In short, the rise in learning levels is a combination of an energised school system which would enhance its effectiveness as compared to other neighbouring states and the volunteer/tutor effect would be added on to this. Once these effects are switched off, and other parameters also deteriorate, the consequences can be dramatically observed in falling of learning levels as seen above.

VI

In summary

The ASER data over the years are self consistent and have thrown up trends in enrollment and changes in learning levels that require more research to be done but even as they are, they deserve close attention.

There are two clear trends observable around the country.

One is that private school enrollment is increasing in most states and where there are few private schools, private tutoring is a surrogate for private schooling that seems to have an equalizing impact to some extent in several backward states in the East. Should tutoring be seen as a harmful nuisance or a necessary support system in a society that is semi-literate with low skills and knowledge all around? At a time when the government has put in place an act for free and compulsory education with planned increase in spending on government schools and curbs on private schools, there is a need to understand why and how the private sector is expanding now that it caters to nearly half the rural children in several states, and a possibly larger share of urban children in many large states.

The second is that while there are differences in the effectiveness of systems in different states in teaching children at different stages of schooling, the general level of effectiveness is scattered in a narrow band around a poor mean. Fortunately, everyone agrees with this! Trends over the last five-six years indicate that learning levels are gradually dropping in most large Northern and Eastern states while they are steady or improving slowly in the Southern and Western states. Private school effectiveness varies from state to state but ASER cannot detect a decline in private school effectiveness at the level of its measurement. These observations of learning level changes in government schools are correlated to other school observations that might affect the teaching-learning process. In addition, the special efforts undertaken by different state systems or the absence or reversal of these have to be taken into account to understand why the outcome measurements show changes. If this is done, a more practical strategy to improve learning levels in the more backward states can be evolved.

ASER and learning profiles: The pace of learning is too slow

Lant Pritchett [1]

One of the big advantages of the ASER approach of testing children out of school is that it can assess the performance of children at a wide variety of grade (and age) levels. Rather than seeing just a snapshot of how children at one grade do against some grade-based standard, the ASER approach shows the entire *learning profile* of what fraction of children in each grade are in which level of performance on literacy and numeracy. In the case of ASER this is easiest to interpret at the highest and lowest categories of performance, for instance what fraction of children can read a level 2 story and what fraction of children can do division of a one digit into a three digit number. The point I want to make about these learning profiles is that the differences across grades reveal important facts about the dynamics of learning, in particular the fact that progress is so slow that 4 out of 5 children who do not have mastery will fail to acquire mastery in an entire year of schooling. Let me explain using the overall rural results from 2010.

Table 1 starts from the numbers from last year's report on the fraction of children who can read at level 2 or do subtraction, both grade 2 curricular objectives. Many children finish grade 2 not having mastered these simple skills, which is not perhaps shocking. What *is* shocking is the bottom line for reading, which is that 75 percent of children (3 out of every 4) who do not acquire reading or arithmetic mastery at the "grade appropriate" level don't acquire it in the following year either, and 3 out of 4 of those who still don't master these skills won't get it even after another entire year of schooling. This implies that only 1 in 4 students is making progress across these very low thresholds of literacy and numeracy per year of schooling.

I'll explain this simple calculation using reading from grade 4 to 5. The fraction of students that could read Level 2 text in grade 4 was 38.1 percent and in grade 5 was 53.4 percent, so the proportion that could read increased by 15.3 percentage points. But many children already could read, so if we want to see what fraction of those who could not read acquired this ability, let's adjust this gain by the fraction who could not read in grade 4 which was 61.9 percent (100-38.1). So the gain from grade 5 over grade 4 as a percent of those who could not read

Table 1. Children gain slowly in skills even as they progress through grades—three out of four children who enter grade 3 or higher without a grade 2 skill leave without gaining mastery

Grade	Reading			Arithmetic		
	Can read level 2 text [a]	Gain from grade to grade	Fraction of those who did not learn [b]	Can subtract (or above) [a]	Gain from grade to grade	Fraction of those who did not learn [b]
1	3.4%			5.5%		
2	9.1%	5.7%	94.1%	17.1%	11.6%	87.7%
3	20.0%	10.9%	88.0%	36.4%	19.3%	76.7%
4	38.1%	18.1%	77.4%	57.4%	21.0%	67.0%
5	53.4%	15.3%	75.3%	70.3%	12.9%	69.7%
6	67.5%	14.1%	69.7%	80.1%	9.8%	67.0%
7	76.2%	8.7%	73.2%	84.3%	4.2%	78.9%
8	82.9%	6.7%	71.8%	85.4%	1.1%	93.0%
Total gain from Grade 3 to Grade 8		62.9%			49.0%	
Average gain, Grades 3 to 8		12.3%	75.9% (3 of 4 do not gain mastery in a year of instruction)		11.4%	75.4% (3 of 4 do not gain mastery in a year of instruction)

a. Data from ASER 2010 (Rural) report tables 4 and 6.
b. Formula is 100-((gain from previous grade)/(100-fraction that could do in previous grade))*100.

[1] Lant Pritchett is Professor of the Practice of International Development, Harvard Kennedy School. He is a member of ASER Centre's advisory board.

in grade 4 was 24.7 percent (=15.3/61.9). This implies that one of each four children who entered grade 4 not able to read at Level 2 passed that threshold of literacy during that year. But it also means that three out of four children who came into grade 4 not reading at a Standard 2 level progressed on to grade 5 without having learned how to read.

Overall this problem is exactly the same in arithmetic, with a slightly different pattern. More children pick up basic arithmetic quickly, so that by grade 3, 36.4 percent of children can do subtraction. But in the five additional years from grade 3 to grade 8 only 49 percent gain that level of arithmetic capability. This is because progress peters out and by grade 8, even though 15 percent still cannot do subtraction, there is almost no progress at all.

This formulation of the learning problem in Indian rural basic education comes from seeing the entire learning profile and has been a contribution of the ASER approach. The flat learning profile which is the result of most students making no progress in answering particular questions has now been replicated in studies in Andhra Pradesh by the APRest study and in the work of Education Initiatives which have asked common questions across grades (see Beatty and Pritchett 2012).

I also find this formulation of the learning problem—that three out of four don't learn enough to pass a low threshold in a year—the most stark and striking. Imagine you are a child who came to school with the hope and promise that getting an education could transform your and your family's future by opening up the opportunities that *learning* enables. You perhaps weren't "school ready" and so in grade 3 you still cannot read a simple (level 2) paragraph but you still have hope. But the odds are 3 out of 4 against you learning in grade 3. So now you are passed along to grade 4 as one of the 62 percent still not reading. You come again hoping that someone will notice, someone will help. Again the odds are against your hope, 3 out of 4 that you don't learn in grade 4 either. The result is that you could easily be one of the one in three children who complete lower primary schooling, passed through five entire years of schooling, having spent roughly 5,000 hours in school, still lacking the most fundamental of skills. And so, year after year, a dream deferred becomes a dream denied.



Bringing hard evidence to the table

M R Madhavan [1]

The ASER reports have performed a remarkable feat: bringing hard evidence to the table to measure outcomes of our elementary education system. To see the importance of this achievement, just look at the public discourse in various fields.

Most government schemes and budgets track allocation and utilisation of funds. A department that has utilised a large proportion of its allocated funds in a year is judged to have performed well, and gets further funding for the next year. This frequently results in significant spending towards the end of the financial year, as departments want to show "performance".

In some cases, outputs are measured. For example, in a child immunisation programme, the measure may include (in addition to spending targets), the number of children who have been vaccinated. However, even this metric only measures the means to the end target of less disease or lower child mortality. Rarely is the desired outcome measured and even rarer is the link made with financial outlays.

Another example can be used to illustrate the lack of outcome measures. The MNREGS is one of the key poverty alleviation schemes of the government. The central government publishes periodic data on the funds transferred to each state and the amount utilised. There is some further measurement – the number of person-days of employment generated. However, the idea that the scheme is designed to be a safety net has been lost. Low utilisation can be interpreted in two ways: the government is unable to provide sufficient jobs to the job-seekers (bad result), or that there is sufficient availability in the economy for alternate jobs leading to low demand for the scheme (good result). The way to answer this is by asking whether potential NREGS job seekers are able to get jobs in the scheme. This can be obtained only by surveying people on whether they needed to access the scheme and whether they obtained jobs. The answer to this question is not available.

Indeed, data on many social and economic indicators are not even collected or reported at annual intervals. India must be one of the few large economies which have no idea of their employment levels – the only data comes from the National Sample Survey every five years; most countries provide such data on a quarterly basis. Most health statistics – such as child and maternal mortality, malnutrition, use of family planning methods – are collected in the NFHS surveys, at approximately five year intervals. Poverty levels are estimated every five years.

It is in this context that the ASER reports have become invaluable. These reports measure the learning levels of children across the country at annual intervals. There are two main contributions. First, time-series and cross-sectional (district-wise) data is available to researchers who can link this data to various inputs and see the effect of various policy interventions. More importantly, ASER has changed the discourse in the field of education from that of measuring outlays (money spent) and outputs (teachers hired, schools built) to that of outcomes (ability of children to read and do arithmetic).

This change has not been reflected in some policies, though. The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act was passed in 2009 and brought into effect in April 2010. The Act guarantees access to schools – yesterday's problem that has been solved as evidenced by the 90% plus enrollment rates of children in first grade. The Act also requires all schools to have certain minimum norms – which are measured as physical infrastructure (building, library, kitchen, toilets), teacher-student ratio, teaching hours. What the Bill misses is a focus on whether the students are actually learning. Indeed, the Bill prohibits schools from holding back students in the same class if they do not perform adequately, but it does not provide for any special measures to be taken to ensure that no child is left behind. Hopefully, the data from the ASER reports will indicate the gaps and motivate policy implementers to deliver quality education to children. This means a shift of focus from inputs to outcomes such as ensuring that children in elementary schools are learning basic skills of the 3 R's, and developing the ability to think and create. Such skills will be essential for them to prosper in tomorrow's knowledge economy.

ASER has done an impressive job of measuring education outcomes. The skills built by the team in collating, assessing and evaluating data can be used to measure outcomes in areas such as health, livelihoods, and the effect of various government schemes. Perhaps, it is time for ASER Centre to expand to other socio-economic sectors.

[1] MR Madhavan co-founded and heads research at PRS Legislative Research. He is a member of ASER Centre's advisory board.

From a Right to Schooling to a Right to Learning: Rethinking education finance

Yamini Aiyar [1]

India's elementary education system is at a crossroads. In 2009, the Indian Parliament passed the Right to Education (RTE) Act guaranteeing the provision of free and compulsory education to all children between the ages of 6 to 14 years. At the heart of the law is a guarantee to ensure 'age-appropriate mainstreaming' for all children. In other words, the Act is a guarantee that every child in India acquires skills and knowledge appropriate to her age. Now, as efforts to deliver on this guarantee gain ground, the country faces an important choice: should elementary education be delivered through the current model that focuses on the expansion of schooling through a top-down, centralized delivery system? Or should we use the RTE as an opportunity to fundamentally alter the current system and create a bottom-up delivery model that builds on an understanding of children's learning needs and privileges accountability for learning rather than schooling?

For decades, the primary goal of the Indian government's elementary education policy has been to create a universal elementary education system by expanding schooling through inputs. Substantial finances have been provided to meet this goal. Between 2007-08 and 2009-10, India's elementary education budget increased from Rs. 68,710 to Rs. 97,255 crore in 2009-10.[2]

Most of this money has been used to build school-level inputs through a large education bureaucracy controlled and managed by state and central governments. To illustrate, PAISA analyzed the elementary education budgets of 7 states in the country for 2009-10 and 2010-11 (see Table 1 below for a state by state analysis). According to PAISA, on average, 77% of the education budget is invested in teachers and management costs. All critical teacher-related decision-making, for instance hiring or salary payment, lies with the state administration.[3] Following teachers, the next largest investment is on the creation of school infrastructure - 15% of the budget. Funds for infrastructure development are often channeled to schools; however, key decisions related to sanctions and procurement are taken by the district. Importantly, while a school can demand infrastructure funds, it has no decision-making power over the timing of receipt of these funds and de-facto funds have to be spent based on priorities set by the state and district administration. Interventions aimed directly at children, such as the provision of free textbooks and uniforms and addressing the problem of out of school children, account for just 7% of the total investment.

Table 1. Breakdown of elementary education budgets in 7 states

	Andhra Pradesh	Bihar	Himachal Pradesh	Madhya Pradesh	Maharashtra	Rajasthan	West Bengal
Teachers	72%	59%	79%	64%	86%	83%	67%
School	13%	25%	9%	21%	5%	9%	19%
Children	4%	10%	1%	8%	5%	1%	10%
Quality	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%	2%	1%
Management	9%	4%	9%	5%	4%	4%	4%
Misc	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	1%	0%

Interwoven in this top-down system is an intent to involve parents in decision-making. In 2001, the Government of India (GOI) launched the Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan ((SSA), now the programmatic vehicle for the delivery of the RTE) with a mandate that expenditure decisions be taken based on plans made at the school level through Village Education Committees (VEC). These plans are then aggregated at the district and state levels. Drawing on this model, the RTE mandates the creation of School Management Committees (SMCs) tasked with similar responsibilities. Despite this bottom-up planning structure, the centralized delivery system has disempowered these committees and in fact created disincentives for parental participation in a number of ways:

[1] Director, Accountability Initiative, Centre for Policy Research. This is a summary version of a longer introduction to the PAISA District Studies, 2011. For those interested, the study is available on the following link: www.accountabilityindia.in

[2] Ministry of Human Resource Development (2011) 'Analysis of Budgeted Expenditure on Education 2007-08 to 2009-10', Statement No. 7, Plan and Non-Plan Budgeted Expenditure on Elementary Education (Revenue Account), www.education.nic.in/planbudget/ABE-2007-10.pdf

[3] Some states like Bihar and Madhya Pradesh experimented with decentralizing the hiring process to local governments, who were empowered only to hire contract teachers. However, even here all critical decisions related to salaries and regularization remained with the administration.

First, teachers, as pointed out already, are not accountable to SMCs.

Second, committees have spending powers over very little money. In 2010-11, committees had spending powers over just about 5% of SSA funds. Even these funds are expected to be spent based on norms set by GOI. So, if a school wants to spend more than the norm on, say, purchasing teacher material or if a school wants to invest more in improving children's reading capabilities by dipping in to its maintenance fund - it can't. Table 2 below offers an illustrative example from Hyderabad of the different activities over which an SMC can actually take decisions.

Third, governance inefficiencies further curtail SMC powers. As PAISA has repeatedly pointed out, school grants rarely reach schools before October (the PAISA district studies found that on average school grants reach school bank accounts toward the end of September/early October). These delays in fund flows mean that needs at the school often remain unmet owing to lack of money. More worryingly, PAISA found that in many districts, expenditures even for school grants are based on formal or informal orders received from district and block officials. Consequently, often monies are spent without adequate consideration to school needs.

In essence, SSA has promoted a bottom-up delivery system with no bottom-up control or decision-making power. The result is thus a de-facto centralized, top-down system.

Table 2. Activities for which SMCs in Hyderabad city can take decisions

Activity	Is SMC resolution sufficient?	Is any additional approval needed?	From whom?	How long will it take?	Who can do the procurement or appointment	What documents and other things will be needed?
Desks and Chairs	No	Yes	SSA Planning	2 months	SSA office	Approval of design; Three quotatiions from local suppliers
Sintex Water Tank	Yes	No		2 weeks	SMC	Local purchase at PWD rates
Roof Repairs	No	Yes	SSA Civil / JE	1 month	SMC + SSA	Approval of work and measurements; Materials bought locally as per PWD rates; vouchers of payments maintained
Ayah	Yes	No		1 week	SMC	Interview Notice with Date and Time

The shift towards enhancing learning requires that the system focus on the needs of individual schools and children. GOI has argued that implementing the RTE requires a system that recognizes 'the need for the creation of capacity within the education system and the school for addressing the diversified learning needs of different groups of children who are now in the school system.'[4]

School Management Committees hold the key to implementing such a decentralized structure. The first and most critical step therefore in the shift from schooling to learning will be to empower school management committees. There are three immediate reform measures that could be implemented to achieve this goal:

[4] Ministry of Human Resource Development (2011), ' Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan: Framework of Implementation'

1. Moving away from the current norm-based funding system for SMCs to an untied block grant structure that would enable the school to take spending decisions based on its own felt needs. The quantum of the grant could be determined on the basis of per-child enrollment in schools, thus linking grant amounts with school-specific characteristics.

2. Strengthening planning capacity through focused community level trainings. With the launch of RTE, budgets for community training have been significantly enhanced. However, for the moment, much of this money remains unspent as training is not priority. Prioritizing training and developing innovative methods to build planning capacity at the SMC level is essential.

3. Strengthening transparency and monitoring. A transparent tracking system holds the key to a strong, accountable, decentralized system of delivery. Building structures to ensure real time tracking of finances is thus critical.

Will this lead to more learning for school children? At the very least, such a system will serve to strengthen parent engagement and ownership with the school and encourage accountability to parents. This is a critical first step.



Taking mothers along

Rukmini Banerji [1]

Not far from the village primary school, there was a group of women. I started chatting with them. "How is the education in this school?" I asked. "I send my children to school" said one lady. "I even send my son and daughter to tuition and buy them books." Several women joined the conversation. "How do you know if your child is learning well?" I wanted to know. "How can we tell?" they said. "We are not literate. But we send our children to school and we send them to tuition also. So they must be learning."

It was a mild November day in Rohtas district in south-western Bihar. Rohtas is known as the rice bowl of the state. Canals criss-cross the district. The rice fields were green and stretched in all directions. Our village was in the Dehri block. It was afternoon. School was over. Children had come home, left their books and bags and were playing outside. Women sat in the sun cleaning rice and talking to each other. It felt good to sit in the afternoon sunshine. It was a good time for conversations.

I had been asking children to come and read. What I had were several sets of reading tasks - letters, words, simple paragraphs and a short 8-10 line story - all in big black font, printed on white paper. Children were curious. I had been sitting on the edge of the women's group. Children crowded around me, some looking over my shoulder, some from the side. All of the texts contained basic, simple and familiar words that are easy to spell, everyday words, sentences and contexts that children could relate to. Nothing more than what is in the Std II textbook. Everyone tried to read. Many could read the letters and some could read the words, only a few managed to read the paragraph and the story.

The women watched their children's attempts. There was a woman in a blue sari. Her daughter was in Std 4 and could not read. "Do you know if your child can read this?" I asked the blue sari mother. "How am I supposed to know?" she argued back. "I myself cannot read." "Which of these are the hardest to read, do you think?" I continued, pointing to the letters, words and sentences. "I don't know. I am illiterate," she answered, somewhat irritated. "Look at the paper, look at these things, what seems easy and what seems difficult?" Now my blue sari mother became adamant. "Why are you forcing me? I told you I cannot read." On the sidelines, her eight year old daughter was enjoying the interaction. Perhaps she was enjoying it because the tables were turned. She began to persuade her mother to focus on the paper. With some hesitation on her side and much encouragement from her daughter, the lady adjusted her pallu on her head and leaned over. "This one must be easy", she said, pointing to the letters, "because many children could do it. That one (pointing to the story) is not easy because even bigger children could not do it."

"Okay", I persisted. "Do you know when your child has a fever?" "Of course!!!" She looked at me in surprise; all mothers know when their child is sick. "What do you do when your child has a fever?" I asked her. The blue sari mother replied instantly. "That's simple. I feel her forehead. If it is hot then I know she has a fever. I do some simple things at home. If in two or three days the fever does not go down, I take her to the doctor. I can even take her to a private doctor. I ask the doctor for some medicine. After another few days if the fever does not go down then I will take her back to the same doctor and fight with him....." "So you have an MBBS degree" I said. "What is that?" she asked suspiciously. "That is a medical degree" I replied. "Oh no no" she laughed. "Remember I told you that I am illiterate!"

"I am very puzzled," I continued. 'Why is that even though you are illiterate you know exactly what you need to do when a child has fever but when it comes to her schooling you don't do anything when she cannot read?" Now the blue sari mother was ready with her answer. "That is very simple" she explained. "We go to the doctor only sometimes when there is problem. He cannot come to my house to cook and feed and take care of my children. I have to do it. But the teacher is with my child every day. My job is to send my child to school and teacher-ji's job is to teach my child. I am doing my job and so she should do her job".

India's Parliament passed the Right to Education Act in 2009, thereby guaranteeing quality free and compulsory education to all children in the age group six to fourteen across the country. While most of the provisions of the Act are concerned with ensuring adequate inputs to schools, there are four key elements that have the potential to fundamentally transform the landscape of elementary education in India.

[1] Rukmini Banerji is Director, ASER Centre


First, in spirit the goal of the RTE Act is to ensure that every child (whether currently out of school or presently enrolled in school) has the opportunity to reach grade level competencies/educational levels appropriate to his or her age all the way up to age fourteen.

Second, continuous, comprehensive evaluation of children's progress through the elementary years means that teachers need to understand where the children are today, and plan for where to take them next based on that understanding.

Third, efforts have to be made to explain children's progress to parents.

Fourth, every school has to develop a School Development Plan with the help of the local School Management Committee. By design, many members of these committees will be parents.

Today, almost all of India's children are enrolled in school. The journey to ensure schooling for all has needed efforts from both sides - governments and communities. The credit goes to governments who provided schooling and to parents who send their children to school. The next journey must be that of ensuring learning for all. Taking parents along on this journey is critical, urgent and long overdue. ASER 2011 shows that 46% of mothers of children who are in school today have not been to school themselves. At a rough estimate, there are probably 100 million mothers who are like our blue sari mother in Rohtas. New methods and mechanisms need to be innovated on scale to allow mothers to meaningfully participate in discussions and actions related to how children's learning can be improved. Simple tools like those used in ASER are a good starting point. Without real participation of parents, especially mothers, the key objectives of RTE cannot be effectively translated from policy into practice.



1,902 ASER partners

Suman Bhattacharjea [1]

"Namaste, I am [name] from [organization] in [district], and I am xx ASERs old".

Every year, the ASER roll out in the field begins around September with state level training workshops for master trainers, one or two from each district in the state. Some come from ASER partner organizations and others from Pratham. There's usually a mix of those who are four, five, or six "ASERs old" and those who are brand new, and this novel way of introducing themselves quickly separates the veterans from the 'freshers'.

So where do all these people – around 1,000 master trainers and 25,000 volunteers each year – actually come from? An incredible variety of partner organizations conduct ASER each year. From the Department of Sheep Husbandry in Kargil to Google in Gurgaon; from IIT Rourkee to Our Carrom Club in Manipur; from District Institutes for Education and Training (DIETs) in Chhattisgarh to the Tejas Mahila Mandal in Nagpur; from Deutsche Bank staff in Hyderabad to high school students all across Arunachal Pradesh. These are the institutions that visit 300,000 households and meet 700,000 children each year. Year after year, they make ASER possible.

Given the basic calculation of close to 600 districts x 7 years, one might expect the total number of partners to date to be higher still. But ASER has been fortunate to partner with organizations with a steady presence across multiple districts and even multiple states. For example, Kudumbashree in Kerala has participated in ASER from its inception in 2005, and 'did' ASER in the entire state single handedly for six consecutive years. Then there's Nehru Yuva Kendra, the network of youth clubs whose huge presence across rural India has facilitated ASER every year in multiple districts across ten states.

Many organizations have participated in ASER more than once, and more than 10% - 200 organizations –are veterans of four or more ASERs. Of these, 18 have been ASER partners every single year, from 2005 to 2011 (see box). More than a third of these are located in Jharkhand.

ASER has found twice as many partners in Maharashtra than in any other state, testimony in part to the vibrant presence of colleges and non government organizations, but also due to Pratham's long history and extensive network in the state. On the flip side, there are states and districts where every year there's a long struggle to find partners, and state ASER teams have on occasion come up with creative solutions. In Kargil, the only people willing to travel extensively around the district were personnel from the Department of Sheep Husbandry, who were pressed into service three years in a row. In Arunachal Pradesh, where colleges and NGOs are few and far between, students from government secondary schools have been regular ASER volunteers.

Across India, some fascinating patterns emerge in terms of the type of organizations that do ASER. In Haryana, the ASER partner lists are heavily populated by colleges, and NGOs are sparse; whereas in Jharkhand, the situation is exactly the reverse. In Nagaland and Meghalaya, ASER is conducted mainly by students' unions, and in Rajasthan, large numbers of B.Ed colleges have joined in.

The increasing participation of DIETs across the country is a very welcome trend. In 2007, all DIETs in Andhra Pradesh were instructed by the State Project Director (SPD) to participate in ASER, but since 2008, they have voluntarily chosen to do so – and have conducted the survey across the entire state for five years in a row now.

Veteran ASER partners

Institutions that have participated in ASER every year, from 2005 to 2011:

Abhiyan, Jharkhand

Akshara Foundation, Karnataka

Consumer Unity and Trust Society, Rajasthan

EMBARK Youth Association, Karnataka

Gram Jyoti Kendra, Jharkhand

Grassroot, Tamil Nadu

Jawahar Jyoti Bal Vikas Kendra, Bihar

Jiral College, Odisha

Khaira College, Odisha

Kudumbashree, Kerala

Lohardaga Gram Swaraj Sansthan, Jharkhand

Lok Prerna Kendra, Jharkhand

Mahima College, Odisha

Malenadu Education and Rural Development Society, Karnataka

Nav Bharat Jagriti Kendra, Jharkhand

Sahyogini, Jharkhand

Samajik Parivartan Sansthan, Jharkhand

Sankalp Bahuuddeshiya Prakalp, Maharashtra

[1] Suman Bhattacharjea is Director (Research), ASER Centre

Other states, too, have seen increased participation by DIETs over time, with a total of 48 of them in 9 states taking part in ASER 2011. Given that the ASER exercise is about engaging citizens in producing and thinking about evidence related to outcomes, getting current and future teachers to participate in an assessment of basic learning outcomes may contribute more towards improving 'quality' in elementary education than centrally mandated policy directives ever could.

In the coming years, a major challenge for ASER Centre will be to find ways to systematically build on these relationships with partners, not an easy task given their number and geographical spread, but a critical one if assessment is to lead to action. From 2012, we hope to engage in deeper collaborations with at least some of these institutions in the core areas of capacity building, research and assessment.

Table 1. ASER partners 2005-11, by state and type of institution

State	Type of partners who participated						TOTAL
	DIET	TTC	Univ / College	School	NGO	Other	
Himachal Pradesh	4	1	23	2	14	5	49
Haryana	0	0	38	3	10	3	54
Punjab	1	6	13	11	15	15	61
Uttarakhand	0	0	20	0	33	0	53
Jammu&Kashmir	1	4	14	0	2	3	24
Tamil Nadu	0	0	12	0	64	0	76
Kerala	7	0	0	0	1	0	8
Andhra Pradesh	22	0	0	0	2	1	25
Karnataka	0	0	5	0	58	1	64
Gujarat	0	0	22	0	116	3	141
Rajasthan	0	16	17	0	51	14	98
Odisha	3	1	82	1	23	2	112
Chhattisgarh	8	0	0	0	40	0	48
Madhya Pradesh	0	0	2	1	153	3	159
Maharashtra	0	11	83	5	281	3	383
Uttar Pradesh	1	0	13	2	148	2	166
Bihar	0	0	0	0	117	0	117
Jharkhand	0	0	0	0	43	0	43
West Bengal	0	0	24	0	21	2	47
Assam	1	0	7	0	39	5	52
Arunachal Pradesh	0	0	6	13	14	0	33
Manipur	0	0	6	4	12	6	28
Meghalaya	0	0	7	0	6	2	15
Nagaland	0	0	2	0	11	19	32
Tripura	0	0	1	0	9	1	11
Sikkim	0	3	0	0	0	0	3
ALL INDIA	**48**	**42**	**397**	**42**	**1283**	**90**	**1902**
	3%	**2%**	**21%**	**2%**	**67%**	**5%**	**100%**

From Mumbai, Multan to Mombasa or Karachi, Kanyakumari to Kilamanjaro…!

Baela Raza Jamil [1]

In Lahore today (January 2, 2012), we kicked off our week-long training of 35 ASER district and provincial associates from all 9 regions of the country to build capacity for disseminating the results of ASER 2011. The spirit of ASER was buzzing with a unique chemistry of a youthful group. We decided to begin with personal statements on '*aser ne kya aser kiya'* (how did ASER impact me?) followed by names and backgrounds in that order. These confessional or declaratory identity markers are vital for the growing global ASER community, for defining ourselves in this unique program of citizen-led surveys. ASER is, after all, about citizens' voices on learning and accountability. It can only be captured through an extension of the personal and the public voice as one, and we at ASER Pakistan are practicing that art of expression that commits to the challenges of learning and improvement - from parents and teacher union members to elected representatives. ASER truly bridges the public and private divide, merging field, theory and practice to address the crises in and opportunities for education.

A journey that began perhaps as education tourism for the Pakistani civil society organizations in the summer of 2006-7 just outside Jaipur, Rajasthan and Delhi through open source sharing, truly hallmarked as the Pratham Way, has now been mainstreamed as an annual ritual for the measuring of education systems in Pakistan for the third year running. UWEZO in East Africa and ASER India are comrades in arms for informing and taking action for the EFA movement. With almost one million children surveyed in 5 countries annually, the methodology for literacy and numeracy measurement in ASER is neither 'quick nor dirty' but very rigorous. As the countdown to 2015 gets underway, the local, national and global community has come to expect that this survey will provide information about progress made and challenges remaining.

Dialogues are intensifying on: whole system/whole school reforms; what assessments tell us about learning gaps across gender and geographies; how to bridge inequality gaps; whether consensus is possible on the theme of 'quality' exacerbating the inequality and transition gaps at all levels of the education spectrum. The ever-widening relevance gap due to knowledge obsolescence in a world inhabited by 7 billion people compels us towards perennial renewal of 'learning' interfaced with local contexts and accessible technologies in classrooms and outside. While the centrality of the teacher as the universal *provocateur* and innovator cannot be minimized, what does this mean for countries diverse in terrain, practices and resources?

Like ASER India, or UWEZO in East Africa, we are deeply cognizant that ASER Pakistan is not about naming and shaming governments but really about calling citizens to action as the primary stakeholders – what is to be done for OUR children and what can we do NOW? On a popular note the India-Pakistan exchanges for ASER and *Chalo Parho Barho* (let's read and grow) initiatives are affectionately termed as the learning caravans 'from Mumbai to Multan'. As teams navigate the spectrum of emergent relationships from South Asia to Africa in 2012 these could be from Mumbai, Multan to Mombasa or from Karachi, Kanyakumari to Kilamanjaro! Either way, the collaborations for people-led research will generate new genres of monitoring and sharing of learning resources. We love them at ITA/SAFED and are proud of the emergent multiple and distributed centers of leadership triggered by ASER India in 2008, and would be happy to support other South Asian countries in this much needed people's enterprise of claiming their fundamental rights to quality education.

[1] Baela Raza Jamil is Director, Programs for Idara-e-Taleem-o-Aagahi (ITA) and Coordinator for the South Asian Forum for Education Development (SAFED), Pakistan

Addressing inequalities: Breaking the cycles of illiteracy

John Mugo [1]

In August 2011, Zippora, Grace and I visited ASER from Uwezo East Africa. The experience in Delhi was refreshing, providing a taste of what Pratham and ASER are doing to promote learning in the various states in India. But besides the walk through Safdarjung, or the night train ride to Lucknow, or even the breath-taking visit to the Taj Mahal, one memory lingers vivid - the contrast I experienced in one rural village, around 30 kilometers from Delhi.

As I cowardly walked behind my ASER friends to test children in this village, unsure whether the buffaloes would attack (the Kenyan buffalo is extremely wild), some children and mothers disappeared behind doors, not sure what our mission was. Getting them to direct us to a certain household took time as they could not understand well, nor could they read the list of names we attempted to present to them. But anyhow, we always got our feet into the right households. The encounter with so many non-literate parents openly revealed the hard time their children had, trying to break the chains of illiteracy in households without role models. Adults and children looked curiously at me, wondering perhaps which state of India I was from, but lacking the confidence to ask. On a number of occasions, I volunteered, through a translator, to reveal that I came from Africa, a country called Kenya. More often than not, this was followed by plain nods of appreciation, with no further discussion.

But a little bit later, we walked into a well-built home, met a neatly-dressed father. Before I could sit down, he requested his daughter to offer me a glass of water. Hardly did I know the hospitality awaiting me. As we rose to proceed to the next household, the man quickly called in Hindi - ask this visitor to remain with us, and tell us more about Africa! This caught me off-guard, after the rhythm of under-confident and non-literate parents. I was confused, since I wanted to experience a little bit more of households and children. But my colleagues were quick to come to a decision - you remain, we will come back to collect you. I sat down again, the man disappeared behind the curtains and reappeared with a bowl of sweets and more water. I learned that he was an advocate. We held discussions in English (with translations for the daughter) comparing learning in India and in Kenya, and analyzing the various challenges related to poor quality of education. The confident and brilliant daughter informed me that she wanted to be a world badminton star, but her priority was also to get good grades in school.

The contrast between these families was very familiar to me, as this is often the inequality between the urban and rural, the poor and the wealthy in most parts of Kenya. But the most disturbing observation relates to the extent to which these inequalities are affecting learning. In Kenya, we have established that children of educated mothers and fathers are by far more likely to remain in school and acquire basic learning competences, as compared to their counterparts whose parents have not completed the primary school cycle. Indeed, girls whose mothers have no schooling are 7 times more likely to be out of school than their peers whose mothers have completed primary education. Yet, the Uwezo Kenya findings reveal that 15% of fathers and 19% of mothers had never been to school. This is truly the biggest challenge of literacy. In both Kenya and India, a certain cycle is definitely prevailing - recycling illiteracy down the generations.

My thought is that just as we consider orphans, children with disability and girls as vulnerable children and children with special learning needs, I would argue that children of non-literate parents need to be included in this category. Only if we focus on breaking the illiteracy cycles within these households, can we truly break the illiteracy cycles in our countries.

But thanks for the water and the sweets!

[1] John Mugo is Country Coordinator, Uwezo Kenya. Adapted from the ASER model, Uwezo is a four year initiative that aims to improve competencies in literacy and numeracy among children aged 6-16 in Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda, by using an innovative approach to social change that is citizen driven and accountable to the public.


About the survey

Note on sampling : ASER 2011 Rural

Wilima Wadhwa

What's new in ASER 2011

The purpose of ASER 2011's rapid assessment survey in rural areas is twofold: (i) to get reliable estimates of the status of children's schooling and basic learning (reading and arithmetic level) at the district level; and (ii) to measure the change in these basic learning and school statistics from last year. Every year a core set of questions regarding schooling status and basic learning levels remains the same. However a set of new questions are added for exploring different dimensions of schooling and learning in the elementary stage. The latter set of questions is different each year.

ASER 2011 brings together elements from various previous ASERs. The core questions on school status and basic reading and arithmetic remain. From 2009-10, we retain questions on paid tuition, parents' education, household and village characteristics. ASER 2011 once again visited one government primary school in every sampled village.

Sampling Strategy (Household sample - children's learning and enrollment data)

The sampling strategy used helps to generate a representative picture of each district. All rural districts are surveyed. The estimates obtained are then aggregated (using appropriate weights) to the state and all-India levels. Like last year, the sample size is 600 households per district. The sample is obtained by selecting 30 villages per district and 20 households per village.

The villages were randomly selected using the village directory of the 2001 Census. The sampling was done using the PPS (Probability Proportional to Size) sampling technique. PPS is a widely used standard sampling technique and is the appropriate technique to use when the sampling units are of different sizes. In our case, the sampling units are the villages. This method allows villages with larger populations to have a higher chance of being selected in the sample.

In ASER 2010, we retained 10 villages from 2008 and 2009 and added 10 new villages. In ASER 2011 we dropped the 10 villages from ASER 2008, kept the 10 villages from 2009 and 2010 and added 10 more villages from the Census village directory. The 10 new villages were also chosen using PPS. The 20 old villages and the 10 new villages will give us a "rotating panel" of villages, which generates more precise estimates of changes. Since one of the objectives of ASER is to measure the change in learning, creating a panel is a more appropriate sampling strategy.

Each district receives a village list with appropriate block information along with the data from the 2001 Census on total number of households and total population. The village list also specifies which villages are from 2009, from 2010 and which are new villages.

Like past ASERs, the village list is final and cannot be replaced. This is to maintain randomness of the sample to obtain reliable estimates.

For further information

The ASER team has consulted with national level sampling experts including those at NSSO and ISI. For more information, please email contact@asercentre.org.

ASER 2011 – Training

Each year since 2005, ASER has been done in practically every rural district in the country. In every district, ASER is conducted by volunteers from a local organization in the district; these are colleges and universities, NGOs, youth groups, women's organizations and others. We estimate that close to 25,000 young people volunteer to do ASER each year. This is how we are able to reach close to 3,00,000 households and meet more than 7,00,000 children annually. ASER is the largest annual effort to understand the status of schooling and learning of children in India. For such an effort to sustain itself year after year, it is critical to focus on strengthening and improving its internal processes. Training is one of the most important processes that help us to equip our volunteers with skills necessary for surveying a village and assessing children.

Typically, ASER follows a 3 tier training structure. The National Workshop is followed by a state level training in every state. This is followed by district level training where volunteers are trained to conduct the ASER survey.

National Workshop: During this workshop ASER state teams are oriented on ASER processes and survey material for the year is finalized. The workshop is also used to plan for state level trainings and partner selection. Each ASER state team comprises anywhere between 2 to 5 full time people, depending on the size and complexity of the state.[1]

New features this year:

- An important feature of the National Workshop this year was the emphasis given to mock trainings. Members were informed in advance about the topics they had to train on and thus had an opportunity to plan their content and delivery.
- An elaborate recheck process was designed this year. The formats were piloted in the National Workshop and subsequent discussions during the workshop helped to crystallize the process.

State level training workshops: These workshops prepare Master Trainers who will then take charge of rolling out ASER in their districts. Master Trainers are usually a combination of participants from the district local partners and Pratham team members. Close to 800 Master Trainers from partner organizations participated in ASER 2011.

Usually, state level trainings are organized for 4 days and have four main components:

- **Classroom sessions**: To orient the participants on ASER process. Simple presentations and case studies help state teams carry out these sessions.
- **Field practice sessions**: Every element of ASER is practised extensively in the field. During the workshop, participants and trainers go to nearby villages.
- **Mock Training**: These sessions are intended to improve the training capabilities of participants and thus prepare them to impart training at the district level.
- **Quiz:** A quiz is administered towards the end of each state level training and immediate feedback is provided to participants. This helps to ensure that all participants have understood the ASER process and to identify participants who may not have obtained the minimal understanding required to conduct ASER.

Performance in mock trainings, field visits and the quiz was analyzed to identify weak Master Trainers, who were either eliminated or provided with additional support during district trainings.

District level training workshops: In the past, these trainings were generally held for 2 days. However, in order to improve the quality of training, the time for training was increased for ASER 2011. Trainings in most districts were organized for 3 days this year. Like state level trainings, the key elements of district trainings included classroom sessions, field practice sessions, and a quiz. Typically, in most districts, volunteers scoring low on the quiz were either eliminated or paired with strong volunteers to carry out the survey.

[1] ASER state team members are called ASER Associates or ASER Regional Team members. They are "fellows" with ASER Centre for a period of 2 -3 years. In addition to leading all ASER related activities in their state, they also participate in a course run by ASER Centre on assessment, survey, evaluation, research and communication. This course has recently received certification from Indira Gandhi National Open University.

Some useful and effective innovations this year included the use of large flex banners. At the district level it is difficult to have a projector to show the survey formats to the whole group while training. To deal with this problem, we printed our survey formats on large flex banners that could be displayed easily while explaining how to fill survey formats to volunteers. These banners are quite portable, easy to use and an effective low cost substitute for projectors.

Another innovation implemented in most states for ASER 2011 was the establishment of a "call centre" to support master trainers and volunteers in the field.

Monitoring of trainings: A few processes were instated to ensure that the important aspects of trainings were implemented across all state and district trainings. Some of these were:

- Call Centre: In most states, a person was assigned to interact with the Master Trainers on a daily basis and ensure that they have taken care of the basic processes in trainings, survey and recheck
- District Compilation Sheet: Survey results for every village in a district were compiled in a district compilation sheet. The sheet also had quiz marks and attendance records for volunteers. A lot of emphasis was given on this sheet for monitoring and recheck and it was ensured that quiz scores and daily attendance of volunteers are entered.
- In addition, most state trainings were attended by the respective Pratham State Head and a member of the Central ASER team.

Our effort each year is to improve our training processes. We have been able to substantially improve the quality of trainings this year. However, there is still scope to improve the training skills of our master trainers as well the quality of trainings at the district level. The detailed feedback received from ASER staff as well as from an external consultant will be instrumental in enabling us to make further improvements next year.



ASER 2011 – Monitoring & Recheck

The credibility of any survey rests on the validity of its data. Over the past 6 years, many measures have been taken to ensure that the ASER survey is done as well as possible. In 2011, we went one step further. Keeping in mind the cost and time constraints, and drawing on the extensive field experiences of our ASER team from past years, we instituted some new processes with a view to provide more support to the survey in the field and to further strengthen the survey.

Some of the major changes were:

- Training Duration – Training for volunteers was extended to 3 days in most districts instead of the usual 2 days as in past years.
- Survey Duration – In most districts, the survey was conducted on two consecutive weekends instead of one. This allowed increased amount of monitoring and recheck of villages between the two weekends.
- Purposive Monitoring & Recheck – Almost everywhere, villages to be monitored and rechecked were selected on the basis of certain predefined criteria. This ensured that poorly surveyed villages could be identified and resurveyed immediately. In previous years, villages to be rechecked were selected randomly
- Documentation – For the first time in ASER 2011, we recorded contact numbers, attendance information and quiz performance of all 25,000 surveyors. These data will be used for further analyses and dissemination purposes.

In ASER 2011, approximately 41% of all villages surveyed were either monitored or rechecked by Master Trainers.

Some new features in ASER 2011 for supporting ASER in the field:

- Call Centre – In many states, an ASER call centre was set up at the state level. An ASER team member was responsible for regularly telephoning Master Trainers in every district to monitor the progress of the survey. This ensured instant troubleshooting of problems and prompt support to remote or problematic districts.
- Monitoring and Recheck – This year's process had several new elements and operated at different levels:[1]
    - Master Trainers visited at least four villages per district during the weekends when the survey was in the field.
    - Master Trainers visited 4-8 villages out of the 30 villages in the district to recheck. These villages were selected based on examining the survey formats that were handed back by the volunteers and a district summary sheet compiled by Master Trainers.
    - A recheck was also done across 14 states and 43 districts by a central team of ASER staff. These were cross-state visits by ASER team members from other states.
    - SMS Recheck – In Rajasthan, Gujarat, Chhattisgarh and Himachal Pradesh, Master Trainers texted testing data to a designated phone number. All the SMSs could be viewed on and downloaded from a website. These numbers were then analyzed by members of the ASER Central team and recheck villages chosen. This also enabled us to get a sense of the quality of the survey in these states at a very early stage.

In most cases, rechecked villages where problems were found were re-surveyed. If for any reason this was not possible, the data for that village was dropped.

[1] At ASER Centre, we lay great emphasis on piloting all formats before they are finalized. The extremely detailed recheck format which was used this year was extensively piloted by all ASER team members who have many years of experience in the field. More importantly, the monitoring and recheck process was explained to and practiced by all master trainers in state trainings. Close to 25% of the time at these trainings was devoted to understanding and practising these processes.

How to make a map and make sections

To start MAKING A MAP — walk & talk:

- To get to know the village, **walk around** the whole village first before you start mapping. **Talk to people:** How many different hamlets/sections are there in the village? Where are they located? What is the estimated number of households in each hamlet/section? Ask the children to take you around the village. Tell them about ASER. This initial process of walking and talking may take more than an hour.

Map:


- **Rough map :** It is often helpful to first draw all the roads or paths leading to the village. It helps to first draw a map on the ground so that people around you can see what is being done. Use the help of local people to show the **main landmarks –** temples, mosques, river, road, school, bus-stop, panchayat bhavan, shop etc. Mark the main roads/streets/paths through the village prominently on the map. If you can, mark the directions – north, south, east, west.
- **Final map :** Once everyone agrees that this map is a good representation of the village, and it matches with your experience of having walked around the whole village, copy it on to the map sheet that has been given to you.

ONCE THE MAP IS MADE, WE NEED TO PICK 4 SECTIONS OF IT. WE WILL SURVEY 5 HOUSEHOLDS IN EACH SECTION.

- **How to mark and number sections on the map you have made?**

1. VILLAGE WITH HAMLETS


If the village is divided into hamlets:



- Mark the hamlets on the map and indicate approximate number of households in each hamlet.
- If the village consists of **more than 4 different hamlets, then make chits with numbers for each hamlet. Randomly pick 4 chits.**
- **On the map, indicate which hamlets were randomly picked for surveying. If there are 4 or less hamlets, then go to all of these hamlets.**
- Do not worry if there are more people in one hamlet than in another. We will survey a hamlet as long as there are households in it.
- **Note: Marking selected hamlets on the map is very important. It helps in re-check.**

2. VILLAGE WITH LESS THAN 4 HAMLETS

- **2 hamlets:** Divide each hamlet in 2 parts and take 5 households from each section.
- **3 hamlets:** Take 7,7 and 6 households from the 3 hamlets respectively.



WHAT TO DO IF :

- The hamlet has less than 5 households - then survey all the households in the hamlet and survey the remaining households from other hamlets.
- The village has less than 20 households- then survey all the households in the village.

3. CONTINUOUS VILLAGE

If it is a village with continuous habitations:

- **Divide the entire village into 4 sections geographically.**
- For each section, **note the estimated number of households.**
- **We will survey all 4 sections of the village.**

What to do in each section/hamlet

In the entire village, information will be collected from a total of **20 randomly selected households.**

To do this, you need to select 5 households from each of the 4 previously selected hamlets/sections, regardless of the total number of households in each hamlet or section. Use the following procedure:


- Go to each selected hamlet/section. Try to **find the central point** in that hamlet/section. Stand facing dwellings in the center of the habitation and start household selection from the left.
- Select households to survey using the **every 5th household rule.** While selecting households count only those dwellings that are residential.
- Household in this case refers to every 'door or entrance to a house from the street'.

WHAT TO DO IF :

- **The household has multiple kitchens:** In each house ask how many kitchens or 'chulhas' there are? If there is more than one kitchen in a household, then **randomly select any one of the kitchens** in that household. You will survey only those individuals who eat from the selected kitchen. After completing survey in this house proceed to next 5th house (counting from the next house on the street, NOT from the next 'Chulha').
- **The household has no children:** If there are no children at all or no children in the age group 3 - 16 in the selected household but there are inhabitants, INCLUDE THAT HOUSEHOLD. Take the information about the name of head of the household, total number of members of the household and household assets. Such a household WILL COUNT as one of the 5 surveyed households in each hamlet/section but NO information about mothers or fathers will be collected.
- **The house is closed:** If the selected house is closed or if there is nobody at home, note that down on your compilation sheet as "house closed". **THIS HOUSEHOLD DOES NOT COUNT AS A SURVEYED HOUSEHOLD.** DO NOT INCLUDE THIS HOUSEHOLD IN THE SURVEY SHEET. Move to the next/adjacent open house.
- **There is no response:** If a household refuses to participate, record the house on your compilation sheet in the "No response" box. However, as above, **THIS HOUSEHOLD DOES NOT COUNT AS A SURVEYED HOUSEHOLD.** DO NOT INCLUDE THIS HOUSEHOLD IN THE SURVEY SHEET. Move on to the next adjacent house.

- Continue until you have 5 households in that hamlet/section in which the inhabitants were present, and they participated in the survey. Remember that you need to survey 5 households, regardless of the number of children you find.
- If you have reached the end of the section before 5 households are sampled, **go around again** using the same every 5th household rule. If a surveyed household gets selected again then go to the next household. Continue till you have 5 households in the section.
- **Stop** after you have completed **5 households in the hamlet/section.** Now move to the next selected hamlet/section. Follow the same process using the 5th household rule.
- Make sure that you go to households **ONLY** when children are likely to be at home. This means that it should be on a **Sunday.**

How to sample households in a hamlet in a village?



What to do in a house with mutiple kitchens?



What to do in each household

1. General information

Household Number: Write down the household number in every sheet. Write **1** for the first household surveyed, **2** for the second household surveyed and so on till the **20th** household.

Total number of members in the household who eat from the same kitchen: Ask the adults present and write down the total number. If there are multiple kitchens/'chulhas' in the household, **include only those household members who eat from the same kitchen**.

2. Information about children aged 3-16 years

We will collect information from the sample household about **all children age 3-16 who regularly live in the household and eat from the same kitchen.** Ask members of the household as well as neighbours to help you identify these children. **ALL** such children should be included, **even if their parents live in another village or if they are the children of the domestic help in the household.**

WHAT TO DO IF:

- **There are older children**: Often older girls and boys (**in the age group 11 to 16) may not be thought of as children. Be sensitive** to this issue. Avoid saying "children". Probe about who all live in the household to make sure that nobody in this age group gets left out. Often older children who cannot read are very shy and hesitant about being tested.
- **Children not at home**: *Sometimes children may not be at home during your visit to the house. They may be in the market, fields or even visiting a nearby town/village.*If the child is somewhere nearby, but not at home, take down information about the child, like name, age, and schooling status. Ask family members to call the child so that you can speak to her/him directly. If she does not come immediately, **mark that household and revisit** it once you are done surveying the other households. *In case you are unable to meet with the child directly, because she/he may be outside the village, leave the testing information blank.*
- **There are relatives' children who live in the sample household on regular basis:** Sometime you will find children of relatives who live in the sample household. We will include these children because they live in the same household on a regular basis. But we will NOT take information about their parents because they do not live in this household.
- **Children not living in the household**: If there are children in the family who do not regularly live in the household, for e.g. children who are studying in another village or children who got married and are living elsewhere, we **will not** include them
- **There are visiting children: Do not include** children who have come to visit their relatives or friends in the sampled village or household. They do not regularly live in the sample household.

Many children may come up to you and want to be included out of curiosity. Do not discourage children who want to be tested. You can interact with them. But data must be noted down **ONLY** for children living in the 20 households that have been randomly selected.

Now that we have identified which children to survey, let us review what information to collect about each child. One row of the household format will be used for each child.

- **Mother's name:** At the beginning of the entry for each child, we will write the name of the child's mother. Note down her name ONLY if she is alive and regularly living in the household. If the child's mother is dead or not living in the household we will NOT write her name.

  If the mother has died or has been divorced and the child's stepmother (father's present wife) is living in the household, we will include her as the child's mother.

- **Father's background information:** At the end of the entry for each child, we ask for the age and schooling information of the child's father. As in the case of the mother, we will only write this information if the father is alive and regularly living in the household. If the father is dead or not living in the household we will not ask for this information.

If the father has died or has been divorced and the child's stepfather (mother's present husband) is living in the household, we will include him as the child's father.

Child's name, age, sex and schooling status:

The child's name, age and sex should be filled for all children aged 3 to 16 from the sample household selected for the survey.

After noting down these details, there are two main blocks of information about each child.

Children aged 3-16 years

The first block **"For age 3-16"** is to be asked for **ALL children aged 3 to 16 in the household.** On the household sheet:

- Note down if the child is attending anganwadi (ICDS), balwadi, or nursery/LKG/UKG, etc. This information will be recorded in the first column **"Anganwadi or Pre-School Status"**.
- **If the child goes to school,** this information will be noted in the **"Schooling Status"** column. Note down their Std., whether they go to government/ private school, madarsa, EGS/AIE or any other school.
- If the child has never been to any anganwadi/preschool or school etc., record it in the **"Out of School children (Never enrolled)"** column**.**
- For children who have dropped out of/left school, note this information in the **"Out of School (Drop out)"** column.
    - Probe carefully to find out the class the child was in when she/he left/dropped out of school. Note the class in which the child was studying when she/he dropped out irrespective of the fact whether the child passed or failed in that class.
    - Record the actual year when the child left school. E.g. if the child dropped out in 2002 write '2002'. Similarly if the child dropped out in the last few months write '2011'.

Children aged 5-16 years

The remaining blocks of information **"For age 5-16"** are to be filled ONLY for **children aged 5 to 16**.

- Ask all children if they take any tuition, meaning **paid** classes in addition to regular school and note the response in **"Tuition"** column. If yes, ask if **any school teacher** takes the tuition class attended by the child. The school teacher could be teaching in ANY school, not necessarily the school where the child studies. If the child does not take tuition, do not ask this question.
- Also ask children if they attend the specific school which you have/will be surveying and note it in the **"Does child go to the surveyed school"** section.
- Askthe child/ parent what the official **'medium of instruction'** in the child's school is.
- **All children in this age group will be tested** in basic reading and basic math. (We know that younger children will not be able to read much or do sums but still follow the same process for all children so as to keep the process uniform).

3. Mother's background information

We will ask some additional questions about the mother of each child in the age group 3-16 years who has been surveyed. We will ONLY ask this information about mothers whose names have been recorded earlier, against individual children's name. **No other mothers will be included.**

If the mother is not present in the household at the time of the survey, ask other adults/members in the family and note down the information .

For each mother, we will ask her age, whether she has attended school or not and if yes, up to what class has she studied. Note down the class that she has successfully completed/passed. For example, if she has gone to school but says that she did not complete Std 1, enter 0 under **'Std. completed'.**

4. Children living outside the village (10-16 years)

Ask the child/adult the names of **all children of the sampled household** in the age group of 10-16 who **live outside the village. (More than 6 months in a year)**

- The child from the sampled household means that if the child had been staying in the household, she would have eaten from the same kitchen/chulha.
- Living outside means

1. The child has been living away from home for more than 6 months a year, or
2. The child left home in the last 6 months and will be living away for more than 6 months a year in the future.

5. Household indicators

All information on household indicators is to be recorded based, as much as possible, on observation and evidence. However, if for some reason you cannot observe it note down what is reported by household members only and not by others.

- **Type of house the child lives in**: Types of houses are defined as follows:
  - Pucca House: A pucca house is one which has walls and roof made of the following material:
    - Wall material: Burnt bricks, stones (packed with lime or cement), cement concrete, timber, ekra etc
    - Roof Material: Tiles, GCI (Galvanised Corrugated Iron) sheets, asbestos cement sheet, RBC (Reinforced Brick Concrete), RCC (Reinforced Cement Concrete), timber etc.
  - Kutcha House: A Kutcha house is one which has walls and/or roof which are made of material other than those mentioned above, such as un-burnt bricks, bamboos, mud, grass, reeds, thatch, loosely packed stones, etc.
  - Semi-Pucca house: A house that has fixed walls made of pucca material but the roof is made of material other than those used for pucca house.
- **Electricity in the household:**
  - Mark yes or no by observing if the household has wires/electric meters and fittings or not.
  - If there is an electricity connection, ask whether the household had electricity **any time on the day** of your visit, not necessarily when you are doing the survey.
- **Toilets:** Mark yes or no by observing if there is a constructed toilet in the house. If you are not able to observe, then ASK whether there is a constructed toilet or not.
- **Television:** Mark yes or no by observing if the house has a television or not. If you don't see one, ASK. It does not matter if the television is in working condition or not.
- **Cable TV:** If there is a TV in the household, ask whether there is cable TV. This includes any cable facility which is paid for by the household (including Direct To Home (DTH) facility).
- **Mobile phone:** Mark yes if any member of the household owns a mobile phone.
- **Reading material**
  - **Newspaper:** Mark yes if the household gets a newspaper every day.
  - **Other reading material:** This includes story books, magazines, religious books, comics etc. but does not include calendars.


6. <u>Other Questions for the household:</u>

Computer skills in the household: Mark yes if anyone in the household knows how to use a computer. This question should be asked to the family members. Do not observe.

Language spoken in the household: Ask the child which language is spoken at home by the family members. Please refer to the list of languages and put the appropriate code in the given box.

Write down the code of the language told by the respondent, regardless of what you may think the household speaks at home. If the language mentioned by the respondent is not in the Language Code List, then write 999. For eg., if the respondent says 'Avadhi' is the language spoken at home, and 'Avadhi' is not in the Language Code List, then write 999.

If the family says they speak more than one language in the household, then find out which is the main language spoken at home. Accordingly, record **ONLY 1 LANGUAGE CODE** in the household format.



From 2005 to 2011: Evolution of ASER

ASER 2005

Age group 6 – 14

Children were asked
- Enrollment status
- Type of school

Children also did:
- Reading tasks
- Arithmetic tasks

School visits

Sampling :
Randomly selected
20 ASER 2005 villages

ASER 2006

Age group 3 – 16

Children were asked
- Enrollment status
- Type of school

Children 5-16 also did:
- Reading tasks
- Arithmetic tasks
- Comprehension tasks
- Writing tasks

Mother's education
Mothers were also asked to read a simple text

Sampling :
Randomly selected
20 ASER 2005 villages
10 new ASER 2006 villages

ASER 2007

Age group 3 – 16

Children were asked
- Enrollment status
- Type of school
- Tuition status

Children 5-16 also did:
- Reading tasks
- Arithmetic tasks
- Comprehension tasks
- Problem solving tasks
- English tasks

Mother's education
School visits

Sampling :
Randomly selected
10 ASER 2005 villages
10 ASER 2006 villages
10 new ASER 2007 villages

ASER 2008

Age group 3-16

Children were asked
- Enrollment status
- Type of school

Children 5-16 also did:
- Reading tasks
- Arithmetic tasks
- Telling time
- Currency tasks

Mother's education

Household characteristics
Village information

Sampling :
Randomly selected
10 ASER 2006 villages
10 ASER 2007 villages
10 new ASER 2008 villages

ASER 2009

Age group 3-16

Children were asked
- Enrollment status
- Type of school
- Tuition status
- Pre-school status (Age 5-16)

Children 5-16 also did:
- Reading tasks
- Arithmetic tasks
- English tasks

Mother's education
Father's education
Mothers were also asked to read a simple text

Household characteristics
Village information
School visits

Sampling :
Randomly selected
10 ASER 2007 villages
10 ASER 2008 villages
10 new ASER 2009 villages

ASER 2010

Age group 3-16

Children were asked
- Enrollment status
- Type of school
- Tuition status

Children 5-16 also did:
- Reading tasks
- Arithmetic tasks
- Everyday math tasks

Mother's education
Father's education
Mothers were also asked to dial a mobile number

Household characteristics
Village information
School visits

Sampling :
Randomly selected
10 ASER 2008 villages
10 ASER 2009 villages
10 new ASER 2010 villages

ASER 2011

Age group 3-16

Children were asked
- Enrollment status
- Type of school
- Tuition status

Children 5-16 also did:
- Reading tasks
- Arithmetic tasks

Mother's education
Father's education

Household characteristics
Village information
School visits


Sampling :
Randomly selected
10 ASER 2009 villages
10 ASER 2010 villages
10 new ASER 2011 villages

ASER 2011 : Reading tasks



All children were assessed using a simple reading tool. The reading test has 4 categories:

- Letters : Set of commonly used letters.
- Words: Common familiar words with 2 letters and 1 or 2 matras.
- Level 1 (Std 1) text: Set of 4 simple linked sentences, each having no more than 4-5 words. These words or their equivalent are in the Std 1 textbook of the state.
- Level 2 (Std 2) text: "Short" story with 7-10 sentences. Sentence construction is straightforward, words are common and the context is familiar to children. These words or their equivalent are in the Std 2 textbook of the state.



Sample: Hindi basic reading test

Similar tests developed in all languages

Child can choose the language in which she wants to read.

In developing these tools in each state language, care is taken to ENSURE

- Comparability with the previous years' tools with respect to word count, sentence count, type of word and conjoint letters in words
- Compatibility with the vocabulary and sentence construction used in Std 1 and Std 2 language textbooks of the state
- Familiarity with words and context through extensive field piloting

How to test reading?

PARAGRAPH

START HERE:

Ask the child to read either of the 2 paragraphs.
Let the child choose the paragraph herself. If the child does not choose give her any one paragraph to read. Ask her to read it. Listen carefully to how she reads.

The child is **not at 'Paragraph Level'** if she:
- Reads the text like a string of words, rather than a sentence.
- Reads the text haltingly and stops very often.

OR

- Reads the text fluently but with **more than 3 mistakes**.

If the child is not at 'Paragraph Level' then ask the child to read words.

The child can read a paragraph**,** if she:
- Reads the text like she is reading a sentence, rather than a string of words.
- Reads the text fluently and with ease, even if she is reading slowly.
- Reads the text with **not more than 3 mistakes.**

If the child can read a paragraph, then ask the child to read the story.

WORDS

Ask the child to read any 5 words from the word list.
Let the child choose the words herself. If she does not choose, then point out words to her.
The child can read words, if she:
- Reads at least **4 out of the 5** words with ease.

If the child is at 'Word Level', then ask her to try to read the paragraph again and then follow the instructions for paragraph level testing.
If she can correctly and comfortably read words but is still struggling with the paragraph, then mark the child at 'Word Level'.
If the child is not at word level (cannot correctly read at least 4 out of the 5 words chosen), then show her the list of letters.

STORY

Ask the child to read the story.
The child is at 'Story Level' if she:
- Reads the text like she is reading a sentence, rather than a string of words.
- Reads the text fluently and with ease. The child may read slowly.
- Reads the text with **not more than 3 mistakes.**

If the child is at 'Story Level' then mark the child at story level.
If the child is not at 'Story Level', then mark the child at 'Paragraph Level'.

LETTERS

Ask the child to read any 5 letters from the letters list.
Let the child choose the letters herself. If she does not choose, then point out letters to her.
The child can read letters, if she:
- Correctly recognizes at least **4 out of 5** letters with ease.

If the child can read letters, then ask her to try reading the words again and then follow the instructions for word level testing.
*If she can read **4 out of 5** letters but cannot comfortably read words , then mark the child at 'Letter Level'.*
If the child is not at letter level (cannot recognize 4 out of 5 letters chosen), then mark the child at 'Nothing Level'.


IN THE SURVEY SHEET, MARK THE CHILD AT THE HIGHEST LEVEL SHE CAN REACH.

ASER 2011 : Arithmetic tasks



All children were assessed using a simple arithmetic tool. The arithmetic test has 4 categories:

- Number recognition 1 to 9: randomly chosen numbers between 1 to 9
- Number recognition 11 to 99: randomly chosen numbers between 11 to 99
- Subtraction: 2 digit numerical problems with borrowing
- Division: 3 digit by 1 digit numerical problems.



MATH TEST/गणित SAMPLE(2)

अंक पहचान 1–9	संख्या पहचान 11–99	घटाव	भाग
2 7	76 58	73 - 56 = ___ ; 83 - 34 = ___	4) 653 (
3 5	69 99	46 - 29 = ___ ; 54 - 35 = ___	8) 859 (
9 8	34 61	33 - 15 = ___ ; 24 - 17 = ___	6) 862 (
4 1	46 84	56 - 18 = ___ ; 48 - 29 = ___	7) 498 (
पाँच चूकें, जिनमें 4 सही होनी चाहिए।	पाँच चूकें, जिनमें 4 सही होनी चाहिए।	दो करो। दोनों ही सही होने चाहिये।	एक करवाओ जो सही होना चाहिए।

Sample: Arithmetic test

Similar tests developed in all languages

How to test arithmetic?

SUBTRACTION: 2 DIGIT WITH BORROWING

START HERE:

Show the child the subtraction problems. She can choose a problem, if not you can point.

Ask the child what the numbers are and then ask her to identify the subtraction sign.

If the child is able to identify the numbers and the sign, ask her to write and solve the problem. Observe to see if the answer is correct.

Even if the first subtraction problem is answered wrong, still ask the child to solve the second question with the same method.

If the child makes a careless mistake, then give her another chance with the same question.

*If she cannot do **both** subtraction problems correctly, then give her the number recognition (11-99) task. Even if the child can do one subtraction problem correctly, give her the number recognition (11-99) task.*

*If she does **both** the subtraction problems correctly, ask her to do a division problem.*

NUMBER RECOGNITION (11-99)

Point one by one to 5 numbers. Child can also choose.

Ask her to identify the numbers.

If she can correctly identify at least **4 out of 5** numbers then mark her as a child who can "recognize numbers from 11-99."

If she cannot recognize numbers from 11-99, then give her the number recognition (1-9) task.

NUMBER RECOGNITION (1-9)

Point one by one to 5 numbers. Child can also choose.

Ask her to identify numbers.

If she can correctly identify at least **4 out of 5** numbers then mark her as a child who can "recognize numbers from 1-9."

If not, mark her as a child who "cannot recognize numbers" or "nothing".

DIVISION 3 digit by 1 digit

Show the child the division problems. She can choose one to try. If not, then you pick one.

Ask her to write and solve the problem.

Observe what she does. If she is able to correctly solve the problem, then mark her as a child who can do "division". Note: The quotient and the remainder both have to be correct.

If the child makes a careless mistake, then give her another chance with the same question.

If the child is unable to solve a division problem correctly, mark her as a child who can do "subtraction".

IN THE SURVEY SHEET, MARK THE CHILD AT THE HIGHEST LEVEL SHE CAN REACH.

What to do in a school?

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

- Visit any **government school** in the village with classes from Std 1 to 7/8. If there is no school in the village which has classes from 1 to 7/8, then visit the government school with the highest enrollment in Std 1 to 4/5. If the village does not have a government school with primary classes, do not visit any school.
- In the top box of the School Observation Sheet, put a tick according to the school type.
- Note the **time of entry, date and day of visit to** the school.
- Meet the Head Master(HM). If the HM is absent, then meet the senior most teacher of the school. Explain the purpose and history of ASER and give the 'Letter to the HM'. Be very polite. Assure the HM and teachers that the **name of the school will not be shared with anybody**.
- **Ask** the HM for the enrollment registers or any official document on the enrollment in that school.

Section 1: Children's Enrollment & Attendance

- **Ask** to see the registers of all the standards and fill in the **enrollment.** If a standard/class has many sections, then take total enrollment.
- Then **move around** to the classes/areas where children are seated and take down their attendance **class-wise** by **counting** them **yourself**. **You may need to seek help from the teachers to distinguish children class-wise as they are normally found seated in mixed groups**. In such a case, ask children from each standard to raise their hands. Count the number of raised hands and accordingly fill the same in the observation sheet, class – wise. Please note that **only** children who are physically present in the class while you are counting should be included.
- **Attendance of class with many sections:** Take headcount of the individual sections, add them up and then write down the total attendance.

Section 2: Note the official language used as the medium of instruction

Section 3: Teachers

- **Ask** the HM and note down the **number of teachers appointed.** The number of regular government teachers does not include the Head Master. Acting HM will be counted as a regular teacher. HM on deputation will be counted under the regular HM category.
- If the school has para-teachers, mark them separately. In many states para-teachers are called by different names such as Shiksha Mitra, education volunteer etc.
- **Observe** and count how many HMs/teachers are present and note the information.

Section 4: Classroom Observations- ONLY FOR STD 2 and STD 4

- This section is for **Std. 2** and **Std. 4** only. If there is more than one section for a class, then randomly choose any one to observe. You may need to seek help from the teachers to distinguish children class-wise as they are normally found seated in mixed groups.
- **Observe** the **seating arrangement** of children. See whether children of each class are sitting alone or with children of other classes.
- **Observe** where children are **sitting** (in classroom, in the verandah or outside) and fill accordingly.
- **Observe** whether there is a **blackboard** where they are sitting and what is the condition of the blackboard (write on the blackboard) and fill accordingly.
- **Observe** if there was any other **teaching material** available like charts on the wall, board games etc. where they are sitting. (Material painted on the walls of the classroom **does not** count as teaching material.)

Section 5: Mid Day Meal (MDM)

- **Ask** the HM/any other teacher whether the **MDM** was served in the school on the day of the visit today.

- **Observe** if there is a **kitchen/shed** for cooking the MDM.
- **Observe** whether the **MDM** was **served** in the school on the day of the visit. (Look for the evidence of the MDM in the school like dirty utensils or meal bought from outside). Mark accordingly.

Section 6: Facilities in the school

- **Count** the total number of **pucca rooms** in the school excluding toilets and kitchen shed. Then **count** the number of rooms being used for **teaching purposes.**
- **Observe** if there is an **office/store/office** cum store. Mark yes if you observe **any one of these.**
- **Observe** if there is a **play ground** (Definition of Playground: it should be within the school premises with a level playing field and/or school playing equipment eg: slide, swings etc).
- **Observe** if there are **library books** in the school (Even if kept in a cupboard).
- **Observe** if **library books** are being **used by children**.

  Observe if there is a **hand pump/tap** which can be used for drinking water and if so, whether you could drink the water. If not, check whether any other drinking water facility is available.
- **Observe** if the school has a complete **boundary wall** or complete fencing.
- **Observe** if there are **computers** in the school to be used by children and if yes, then did you see children using computers.

Section 7: School Grant Information (SSA)

Assure the HM and others that the name of the school will not be shared with anybody. Ask the person answering this section about the grants very politely. If the person refuses to answer or is hesitant to answer this section, then do not force the person and move on to the next section.

- For this section, note down information separately for **financial year 2010-11 (1st Apr 2010 – 31st March 2011) and financial year 2011-12 (1st Apr 2011 – until the date of the survey).**
- The **HM** should be asked this section (In the absence of the Head Master, ask the senior most teacher present). Tick the type of school/standard and the designation of the person being asked (Head Master/ Regular teacher/ Para teacher).
- In case of school with Std. 1-7/8 with 2 separate HMs, and **with separate SSA bank accounts**, please take the grants information for the primary section (Std. 1-4/5) only.

Section 8: SSA Annual Grants

This section is divided into two parts – **one for financial year 2010-11 (1st Apr 2010 – 31st Mar 2011) and one for financial year 2011-12 (1st Apr 2011 – until the date of the survey).**

For each time period, ask if the school got four grants viz. **School Maintenance Grant (SMG), School grant or School Development Grant (SDG), Teachers Grant/ Teacher Learning Material (TLM) and new classroom grant.**

If yes, then put a tick under **'Yes'** column

Otherwise:

- If the HM/ the respondent says that he/she has not received the grant or says that he/she is going to receive the grant in the future, then mark under **'No'** column.
- If the HM/ respondent has no knowledge of whether or not the school has received the grant, then mark under **'Don't know'** column.

If school has received the grant, then ask whether the entire amount was spent or not. Keep the following points in mind while marking this question:

- **Did you spend the full amount:** Mark 'Yes' only if the **full** amount was spent. Mark 'No' if nothing has been spent or any amount less than full has been spent. Mark 'Don't know', if the HM is not aware of whether the money has been spent or not.

Please Note: If there is a school with standards 1-7/8, and there are 2 HM's and 2 SSA bank accounts for section 1-4/5 and 5/6 -7/8, then note the grant information only for the primary section (Standard 1-4/5).

Section 9: Activities carried out in the school (Since April 2010)

This section has two parts. **First we want to know whether the listed activities have taken place. Second we want to know which grant was used to undertake the activity.**

Ask if the school has done white wash /plastering, painting blackboard/ display board, building repairs (roof, floor, wall) etc, since April 2010. Then tick the appropriate box and then mark the grant under which this activity was undertaken.

Note: There can be 3 different answers to this question. First option is SDG and/or SMG. If either SDG or SMG was used, then please tick 'SDG/SMG or both'. If TLM was used, then please tick 'TLM'. If its neither of these 3 grants but some other grant/source, then please tick on 'Any other grant' and if the respondent says that the activity has happened but he doesn't remember the grant, then please tick on 'Don't know'.

Section 10: Meeting with officials

Take information for this section **only from the HM**. If the HM is not available, then skip this section.

How often does the HM meet the officials at the Block, Cluster and District level: Mark accordingly.

- If the HM says once in 14-15 days or twice a month or fortnightly, please mark '2 times a month'.
- If the HM says once in 29-30 days or once in a month, please mark under 'monthly'.
- If the HM says once in 2-3 months or 4 times a year or quarterly, please mark 'Once in 2-3 months'.
- If the HM says twice a year, or once in 6 months, please mark 'Once in 6 months'.
- If the HM does not meet the particular official at all, please mark 'Never'.

Section 11: Toilet facility in the school

- **Observe** whether the school has a **common toilet, a separate toilet for girls, a separate toilet for boys and a separate toilet for teachers.** Ask the HM/ any teacher/ any child if you cannot tell who the toilets are for.
- For each type of toilet facility that you find in the school, note whether it is **locked or not.** If it was not locked, note whether it was usable or not.
- If 2 common toilets or other type of toilets are there in the school then take information about the toilet which is in a **better condition.**

IMPORTANT:

After filling out the School Observation sheet, get the HM's name and contact number. Write this information in the relevant box given on the top right of pg 2 in the format. This is essential for recheck purposes.

School and home language information in ASER 2011

The Right to Education Act recommends that the child's "*medium of instruction shall, as far as practicable, be in the child's mother tongue*" (Chapter V, Section 29, Clause 2 (f)). Several studies have indicated that children whose home language is different from the school language have lower attendance and learning levels.[1]

Given this background, for the first time in ASER, in 2011 we recorded the child's home language. This enables us to see how many children have a home language background that is different from the medium of instruction in school.

Given the multiplicity of Indian languages and dialects, finalising a list of languages that could be used for the survey was a mammoth task in itself. As a starting point, we took into consideration the list of 22 scheduled languages mentioned in Census 2001.[2] We also consulted experts at the Central Institute of Indian Languages, Mysore. Their suggestion was that in addition to the list of scheduled languages list, we could also include a list of 100 non-scheduled languages. A further list of 234 mother-tongue languages was also suggested.[3] (In the Mother tongue list, Hindi is listed in 49 different ways!)

Including all three lists would have given us a list with over 350 languages. While this would have made the survey much more comprehensive, it posed quite a few problems for our volunteers and for data analysis. All these languages would have to be coded and extreme care would have to be taken in the field to fill in the codes correctly, which would have proved to be a cumbersome and complicated process in the field. Hence, given that this was our first attempt to engage with the question of language, we decided to use the list of 22 scheduled and 100 non-scheduled languages from Census 2001.

For data collection, ASER volunteers were given the following instructions:

- Ask the child or any adult in the household which language is spoken at home, by the family members. Refer to the list of languages and put in the appropriate code in the given box.
- If the family says they speak more than one language in the household, then find out which is the main language spoken at home. Accordingly, write ONLY ONE LANGUAGE CODE in the household format.
- Write down the code of the language mentioned by the respondent, regardless of what you may think the household speaks at home. If this language is not in the 'Language Code List', then write 999. For eg., if the respondent says 'Avadhi' is the language spoken at home, and 'Avadhi' is not coded in the 'Language Code List', then write 999.



[1]See for example: Mohanty et al (eds) 2009), *Just Multilingual Education,* New Delhi: Orient Longman; Heugh, Kathleen et al (2007), *Study on Medium of Instruction in Primary Schools in Ethiopia*; Bhattacharjea, Wadhwa and Banerji (2011), *Inside Primary schools*, New Delhi: ASER Centre.
[2]http://censusindia.gov.in/Census_Data_2001/Census_Data_Online/Language/parta.htm
[3]http://censusindia.gov.in/Census_Data_2001/Census_Data_Online/Language/Statement1.htm?q=mother+tongue&drpQuick=&drpQuickSelect=

Sample household survey sheet - English

ASER 2011 SURVEY - HOUSEHOLD SURVEY SHEET

Name of Surveyors	
	BHARTI
	SAVINDRA

Date of Survey	10/10/2011
Day of Survey	Sunday
Start Time	10:45
End Time	11:10

State	RAJASTHAN
District	JAIPUR
Block	CHAKSU
Village	KOT KHAJDA

HH No.: 05

Full Name of family head: RAJA RAM

Total Number of members in the HH who eat from the same kitchen: 07

Serial No.	Mother's name	Child Information (for 3-16): Name of Child (Children of 3-16 age group regularly living in the household)	Age	Sex	For age 3-16: Anganwadi or Pre-School status: Anganwadi/ Balwadi	UKG/LKG/Nursery	Schooling Status: Std	Govt	Pvt	Madarsa	EGS/AIE other	Out of School children (Currently not enrolled): Never Enrolled	Drop Out	Drop Out: Std which you left school	Drop Out: which year did you drop out (approx)	For age 5-16: Tuition: Does child take any paid additional class currently (Age 5-16)	Tuition: If yes, is the tuition conducted in any school/madrasa?	Does child go to the surveyed school?	What is official medium of instruction in child's school?	Basic Learning Levels (Test all children between the ages of 5-16 only): Reading (✓ the highest level ONLY): Nothing	Letter	Word	Para	Story	Math (✓ the highest level ONLY): Nothing	Num Recg 1-9	Num Recg 11-99	Subtraction	Division	Bonus Tool (From Std 5 onwards; If out of school then for children from 10 years to 16 years): Write Y if the child answers correctly, N if he/she answers incorrectly & leave it blank if he/she doesn't answer: Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5a (Right Country): Pakistan	Kerala	Bangladesh	Mumbai	Nepal	Delhi	Kolkata	Chennai	Mumbai	Q5b (Right City)	Q6: 60	60	6<	60	60	6<	Language in which the child was tested	Father's background information: Age	If Never attended school (-)	If never attended school (+)	If attended school, then which std completed
1	PUSHPA	VARSHA	4	F	✓																																					H	47		✓	
2	PUSHPA	LADO	7	F			I	✓								✓			✓	H	✓					✓																H	47		✓	
3	PUSHPA	JEEVAN	11	M			III	✓								✓			✓	H					✓			✓														H	47		✓	
4																																																
5																																																
6																																																
7																																																
8																																																
Total																																																

MOTHER'S BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Sl. no.	Mother's Name	Age	If attended school (+)	If never attended school (-)	If attended school, then which std completed
1.	PUSHPA	42		✓	
2.					
3.					
4.					

CHILDREN LIVING OUTSIDE VILLAGE (For age 10-16)

Children of this HH living outside village (more than 6 months a year)

Sl. No.	Child name	Is she/he outside the village to study? Yes	No

HOUSEHOLD INDICATORS (Tick the appropriate column)

Type of House: Kutcha	Semi Kutcha	Pucca (with walls, ceiling, floor of brick and cement)	Electricity connection (Look for wires and fittings): Yes	No	If electricity in household, was there electricity today? Yes	No	Toilet in the household: Yes	No	TV in household: Yes	No	If TV in household is there cable TV? (paid facility) Yes	No	Mobile phone: Yes	No	Reading material (other than school textbooks): Daily Newspaper (Ask): Yes	No	Other (Books/magazine/religious books etc.): Yes	No
	✓			✓				✓		✓				✓		✓		✓		

Does anyone in the household know how to use a computer?

Yes	No
	✓


What is the language spoken at home by family members?

999

See list+Write code

*For the compilation of Q1-Q4 in the bonus tool, please only total the number of 'Y' responses

Sample household survey sheet - Hindi



Sample village information sheet - English

VILLAGE INFORMATION SHEET

State Name	RAJASTHAN	Block name	JALORE
District Name	JAIPUR	Village Name	BARGAON
Names of ASER Surveyors		ARJUN SANGEETA	
Date of Survey	9/10/2011	Day of Survey	SUNDAY

	Please tick the relevant box	Did You See/Observe yourself?(Mark these answes based on your own observation)	
BASIC SERVICES	Pucca road leading to the village?	YES ✓	NO
	Electricity connection in the village?	YES	NO ✓
	Post office in the village?	YES	NO ✓
	Phone/STD Booth?	YES ✓	NO
	Bank? (Any type)	YES	NO ✓
	Govt Ration/PDS Shop in the village?	YES ✓	NO
	Primary/Sub Health Centre?(Govt.)	YES	NO ✓
	Private Health Clinic?	YES	NO ✓
	Computer Centre (Internet Café)	YES	NO ✓
	Equipment Facility using Solar Energy	YES	NO ✓
SCHOOLS	Govt Primary School (Std. 1 to 4/5)	YES ✓	NO
	Govt Middle School(Std. 1 to 7/8)	YES	NO ✓
	Govt Secondary School(Std. 1 to 10)	YES	NO ✓
	Private School	YES	NO ✓
	Anganwadi/Pre-School	YES ✓	NO

Sample village information sheet - Hindi

गाँव की जानकारी

असर ASER 2011

राज्य का नाम	हिमाचल प्रदेश	ब्लॉक/तालुका का नाम	कुल्लू
ज़िले का नाम	शिमला	गाँव का नाम	रामशी
सर्वेक्षकों का नाम		सुजीत पाण्डे गुरमीत सिंह	
सर्वे की दिनांक	16-10-11	सर्वे का दिन	रविवार

उचित खाने में सही का निशान लगाएं		क्या आपने गाँव में निम्नलिखित सुविधाओं को खुद देखा/अवलोकन किया (अपने अवलोकन के आधार पर निशान लगाएं)	
बुनियादी सेवाएं	क्या गाँव में जाने के लिये पक्का रोड है?	✓ हाँ	नहीं
	क्या गाँव में बिजली कनेक्शन है?	हाँ ✓	नहीं
	क्या गाँव में डाकघर है?	हाँ	✓ नहीं
	फोन/STD बूथ है?	हाँ	✓ नहीं
	बैंक है? (किसी भी प्रकार का)	हाँ	✓ नहीं
	क्या गाँव में सरकारी राशन/PDS की दुकान है?	✓ हाँ	नहीं
	सरकारी स्वास्थ्य/उप स्वास्थ्य केंद्र (PHC/Sub Centre)	हाँ	✓ नहीं
	निजी स्वास्थ्य केंद्र	हाँ	✓ नहीं
	कम्प्यूटर सेंटर (इंटरनेट कैफे)	हाँ	✓ नहीं
	Solar Energy का प्रयोग करने वाले उपकरण/सुविधा	✓ हाँ	नहीं
स्कूल	सरकारी प्राथमिक विद्यालय (कक्षा 1 से 4/5 तक)	हाँ	✓ नहीं
	सरकारी उच्च प्राथमिक विद्यालय (कक्षा 1 से 7/8 तक)	✓ हाँ	नहीं
	सरकारी माध्यमिक विद्यालय (कक्षा 1 से 10 तक)	हाँ	✓ नहीं
	निजी विद्यालय (Pvt.)	हाँ	✓ नहीं
	आंगनवाड़ी/बालवाड़ी	✓ हाँ	नहीं

SCHOOL OBSERVATION SHEET - ASER 2011

INSTRUCTIONS : Visit any government school (Std 1 to 7/8). If there is no school in the village which has classes from 1 to 7/8, then visit the government school in the village which has the highest enrollment in Std 1 to 4/5. Do not visit a government school if it has no classes from Std 1 to 5. Meet Head Master (in absence of the HM, meet the senior most teacher of the school). Documents required: Register with enrollment details of children.

Name of school	Name of Village	Block	District	State
UPS MIRZAPUR	MIRZAPUR	HILSA	NALANDA	BIHAR

From which Std. to which Std. (Tick any one): Std: 1 to 4/5 | Std: 1 to 7/8 ✓ | Others

Date of visit	Day of visit	Name of Surveyors	Arrival time	Departure time
8/10/2011	Saturday	1 SUMAN 2 ANAND	10:00	12:30

1. CHILDREN'S ENROLLMENT & ATTENDANCE	Std.1	Std.2	Std.3	Std.4	Std.5	Std.6	Std.7	Std.8
Children's enrollment (Take from register yourself)If more than 1 section write the total	35	40	38	20	22	18	15	
Children's attendance today*	28	25	30	16	12	09	07	

2. OFFICIAL MEDIUM OF INSTRUCTION IN THE SCHOOL
HINDI

3. TEACHERS	No. Appointed (Ask HM)	Number Present (Observe yourself)
Head Teacher	01	01
Regular Govt. Teachers (Doesn't include Head Teacher)	02	02
Para-teachers	05	04

*Note: Take a headcount of children in the room. If more than one class is seated together, ask the children of each class to raise their hands separately and then count accordingly. If more than 1 section, do headcount in all sections and write the total.

4. CLASSROOM OBSERVATIONS		Std. 2		Std. 4	
Observe (If more than 1 section, choose any 1)		Yes	No	Yes	No
Are the children of this Std. sitting with children from any other Std.?		✓		✓	
Where were they seated (tick one)	Classroom	✓		✓	
	Verandah				
	Outdoors				
Is there a blackboard for this class?		✓		✓	
Could you easily write on the blackboard?		✓		✓	
Apart from text books, did you see any other supplementary material (e.g. Books, Charts on the wall, Board Games etc.) available in the room?		✓		✓	

5. MID-DAY MEAL		
Tick relevant box	Yes	No
Was mid-day meal served in the school today? (Ask HM/Teacher)	✓	
Is food cooked in the schools? (observe)	✓	
Is there a kitchen/shed for cooking mid-day meal?(observe)	✓	
Did you see any evidence of the meal being served to the children today(Look for the evidence like dirty utensils or meal bought from outside)? (observe)	✓	

6. FACILITIES OBSERVATION		
Total number of pucca rooms in the school excluding toilets (count yourself)	05	
Total number of rooms being used for teaching today (count yourself)	04	
Tick relevant box	Yes	No
Did you see a office /store/ office-cum store?	✓	
Did you see a play ground?		✓
Did you see library books in the school?		✓
If yes, did you see library books being used by children?		
Did you see a handpump or a tap?	✓	
If there is a handpump/tap, could you use it to drink water?	✓	
If there is no handpump/tap or it is not useable, did you see drinking water available?		
Did you see a complete boundary wall or fencing?		✓
Did you see computers in the school to be used by children ?		✓
If yes, did you see children using computers?		

NEW

SCHOOL OBSERVATION SHEET - ASER 2011

Annual Status of Education Report
असर ASER 2011
Facilitated by PRATHAM

7. School Grant Information (SSA) *(Ask the Head Master, if the HM is absent then ask the next senior most teacher)*

I got the grant information from (Tick the applicable)

Head Master	Regular Teacher	Para-teacher
✓		

Does the school have 2 or more SSA passbooks?

Yes	No	Don't know
	✓	

Head Master Information

Name	SHAMBHUNATH
Phone no.	9431742809

8. SSA Annual School Grant

Note: If there are 2 separate HMs with separate SSA bank accounts, please take the information for 1-4/5 section

	Apr 2010 - Mar 2011						Apr 2011 to Date of Survey					
	Did you get the grant?			If yes, did you spend the full amount?			Did you get the grant?			If yes, did you spend the full amount?		
	Yes	No	Don't know	Yes	No	Don't know	Yes	No	Don't know	Yes	No	Don't know
School Maintainance Grant	✓			✓			✓			✓		
School Development Grant		✓					✓			✓		
Teacher Grant(TLM) (for all teachers)	✓			✓			✓			✓		
New Classroom Grant		✓						✓				

10. OFFICIALS' VISIT TO SCHOOL

(Ask the HM. If the HM is absent then ask the next senior most teacher)

In the last three months, did any	Yes	No	Don't know
Cluster level official visit the school?	✓		
Block level official visit the school?	✓		
District level official visit the school?		✓	

11. TOILETS (by observation only)

Toilets	Is there a toilet?		If there is a toilet, was it locked?		If unlocked, was it in a usable condition?	
	Yes	No	Locked	Not Locked	Yes	No
Girl		✓				
Boy		✓				
Common	✓			✓	✓	
Teacher	✓		✓			

9. ACTIVITIES CARRIED OUT IN SCHOOL

*Which of the following activities were undertaken since **April 2010**? (Tick wherever applicable)*

	Yes	No	Don't know	IF YES, THEN FROM WHICH GRANT? SDG/ SMG/ both	TLM	Any other grant/ source	Don't know
New classroom	✓					✓	
Purchase of furniture (cupboard etc.)		✓					
Purchase of electrical fittings		✓					
Repair of building (roof, floor, wall etc.)	✓			✓			
Repair of doors & windows	✓			✓			
Repair of boundary wall		✓					
Repair of drinking water facility	✓			✓			
Repair of toilet	✓			✓			

*Which of the following activities were undertaken since **April 2010**? (Tick wherever applicable)*	Yes	No	Don't know	IF YES, THEN FROM WHICH GRANT? SDG/ SMG/ both	TLM	Any other grant/ source	Don't know
White wash/plastering	✓			✓			
Painting Blackboard/Display Board/ Painting on wall	✓			✓			
Painting of doors & windows		✓					
Purchase of chalk, duster, register etc.	✓				✓		
Purchase of sitting Mats/Tat Patti		✓					
Purchase of charts, globes & other teaching material	✓				✓		
Expenditure on school events	✓					✓	
Payment of bills (electricity, water, cleaning etc.)		✓		✓			

SCHOOL OBSERVATION SHEET - ASER 2011

निर्देश : गाँव के किसी एक सरकारी विद्यालय (कक्षा 1–7/8) में जायें । यदि गाँव में कक्षा 1–7/8 तक कोई विद्यालय ना हो तो उस सरकारी विद्यालय में जायें जहाँ कक्षा 1–4/5 के बच्चों का नामांकन सबसे अधिक हो। उन सरकारी विद्यालय में न जाएं जहां कक्षा 1 से 5 न हों। मुख्य अध्यापक से मिलें (उनके न होने पर विद्यालय के वरिष्ठ शिक्षक से मिलें)। आवश्यक प्रवेश : रजिस्टर जिसमें नामांकन दर्शाया गया है।

विद्यालय का नाम	गाँव का नाम	ब्लॉक का नाम	जिला	राज्य
राजकीय प्रा. वि. बैरोटगढ़	हीरा-नगर	भोरा	शिमला	हिमाचल प्रदेश

किस कक्षा से किस कक्षा तक? (किसी एक पर निशान लगायें): कक्षा 1 से 4/5 ☐ | कक्षा 1 से 7/8 ☑ | अन्य ☐

सर्वे की दिनांक	सर्वे का दिन	सर्वेक्षक का नाम	पहुंचने का समय	वहां से जाने का समय
17/10/11	सोमवार	1 इफ़रां परवीन 2 मोहित मिश्रा	10:30 AM	2:00 PM

1. बच्चों का नामांकन एवं उपस्थिति

	कक्षा 1	कक्षा 2	कक्षा 3	कक्षा 4	कक्षा 5	कक्षा 6	कक्षा 7	कक्षा 8
बच्चों का नामांकन (खुद रजिस्टर से लें) अगर एक से ज्यादा सेक्शन हों तो कुल लिखें।	41	26	34	46	51	56	41	43
सर्वे के दिन उपस्थित बच्चे*	39	25	34	42	50	55	41	43

*नोट : बच्चों की हाज़िरी : उपस्थित बच्चों की संख्या लिखें। यदि एक से अधिक कक्षा के बच्चे एक साथ बैठे हैं तो प्रत्येक कक्षा के अनुसार बच्चों को झंडा उठाने को कहें। इसके आधार पर प्रत्येक कक्षा में उपस्थित बच्चों की संख्या लिखें। अगर एक से ज्यादा सेक्शन हों तो सभी सेक्शन की हाज़िरी गिने और फिर कुल लिखें।

2. विद्यालय में पढ़ाई का माध्यम

हिन्दी

3. शिक्षक

	कुल नियुक्ति (मुख्य अध्यापक से पूछें)	कुल उपस्थित (अवलोकन करें)
मुख्य अध्यापक	1	1
नियमित सरकारी शिक्षक (मुख्याध्यापक को न गिनें)	12	11
पैरा शिक्षक (Para Teacher)	0	–

4. कक्षा की जानकारी

अवलोकन करें (अगर एक से ज्यादा सेक्शन हों तो कोई एक चुनें)		कक्षा 2		कक्षा 4	
		हाँ	नहीं	हाँ	नहीं
क्या इस कक्षा के बच्चे किसी और कक्षा के बच्चों के साथ बैठे हुए हैं?			✓	✓	
इस कक्षा के बच्चे कहाँ बैठे हुए थे? (एक पर निशान लगाएं)	कमरे में	✓		✓	
	बरामदे में				
	खुली जगह पर				
क्या कक्षा में ब्लैक बोर्ड है?		✓		✓	
क्या आप ब्लैक बोर्ड पर आसानी से लिख सकें?		✓		✓	
पुस्तकों के अलावा क्या कक्षा में आपने कोई भी शिक्षण सामग्री देखी? (जैसे किताबें, चार्ट, बोर्ड खेल आदि।)		✓		✓	

5. मध्यान भोजन

उचित स्थान पर निशान लगायें।	हाँ	नहीं
क्या आज विद्यालय में मध्यान भोजन दिया गया? (मुख्याध्यापक/अध्यापक से पूछें)	✓	
क्या विद्यालय में मध्यान भोजन पकाया जाता है? (अवलोकन)	✓	
क्या मध्यान भोजन पकाने के लिए कोई रसोई घर है? (अवलोकन)	✓	
क्या आपने सर्वे के दौरान बच्चों को मध्यान भोजन खाते हुए या मध्यान भोजन का कोई सबूत देखा? (मध्यान भोजन से जुड़े सबूत देखें जैसे : झूठे बर्तन या बाहर से मंगाया गया भोजन आदि)	✓	

6. विद्यालय की सुविधाओं पर जानकारी (अवलोकन के अनुसार)

विद्यालय में कुल कितने पक्के कमरे हैं? (खुद गिनकर लिखें)	8	
सर्वे के दिन कुल कितने कमरे पढ़ाने के लिए इस्तेमाल किये जा रहे थे? (खुद गिनकर लिखें)	7	
उचित स्थान पर निशान लगायें।	हाँ	नहीं
क्या विद्यालय में ऑफिस/स्टोररूम/Office cum store है?	✓	
क्या विद्यालय में खेल का मैदान है?		✓
क्या विद्यालय में पुस्तकालय किताबें है?		✓
क्या आपने बच्चों को पुस्तकालय की किताबें पढ़ते हुए देखा?		
क्या विद्यालय में नल/हैंडपंप है?	✓	
यदि हाँ, तो क्या आप उस नल/हैंडपंप से पानी पी सकें?	✓	
यदि नल/हैंडपंप नहीं है तो क्या पीने के पानी की व्यवस्था है?		
क्या विद्यालय की पूरी सीमा दीवार या Fencing है?		✓
क्या विद्यालय में बच्चों के प्रयोग के लिए कम्प्यूटर है?		✓
अगर हाँ, तो क्या आपने बच्चों को कम्प्यूटर का इस्तेमाल करते हुए देखा?		

Sample school observation sheet - Hindi

NEW

SCHOOL OBSERVATION SHEET - ASER 2011

7. विद्यालय अनुदान जानकारी (SSA) (मुख्य अध्यापक से पूछें, अगर मुख्य अध्यापक अनुपस्थित हो तो दूसरे किसी वरिष्ठ अध्यापक से पूछें)

नीचे दी गई सूचनाओं की जानकारी किससे प्राप्त हुई?	मुख्य अध्यापक	शिक्षक	Para-टीचर	क्या स्कूल के पास 2 या उससे अधिक SSA पासबुक हैं? हाँ	नहीं	पता नहीं
	✓				✓	

मुख्य अध्यापक की जानकारी

नाम	सत्यम सिंह
फोन नं.	0-9816017432

Annual Status of Education Report (Rural) असर ASER 2011 Facilitated by PRATHAM

PAGE 2 of 2

8. SSA का वार्षिक अनुदान नोट: अगर स्कूल में 2 अलग मुख्य अध्यापक और उनके अलग SSA बैंक खाते हों तो कृपया कक्षा 1-4/5 की जानकारी लीजिए	अप्रैल 2010 से मार्च 2011 तक						नोट: अगर स्कूल में 2 अलग मुख्य अध्यापक और उनके अलग SSA बैंक खाते हों तो कृपया कक्षा 1-4/5 की जानकारी लीजिए	अप्रैल 2011 से सर्वेक्षण के दिन तक					
	क्या आपको यह अनुदान प्राप्त हुआ?			अगर हाँ तो क्या आपने पूरी राशि खर्च की?				क्या आपको यह अनुदान प्राप्त हुआ?			अगर हाँ तो क्या आपने पूरी राशि खर्च की?		
	हाँ	नहीं	पता नहीं	हाँ	नहीं	पता नहीं		हाँ	नहीं	पता नहीं	हाँ	नहीं	पता नहीं
स्कूल रखरखाव अनुदान (SMG)	✓			✓			स्कूल रखरखाव अनुदान (SMG)		✓				
स्कूल अनुदान/स्कूल विकास अनुदान (SDG)	✓			✓			स्कूल अनुदान/स्कूल विकास अनुदान (SDG)		✓				
शिक्षक अनुदान TLM (सभी शिक्षकों के लिए)	✓			✓			शिक्षक अनुदान TLM (सभी शिक्षकों के लिए)		✓				
नई कक्षा अनुदान		✓					नई कक्षा अनुदान		✓				

10. अधिकारियों का स्कूल विज़िट (मुख्य अध्यापक से पूछें, अगर मुख्य अध्यापक अनुपस्थित हो तो दूसरे किसी वरिष्ठ अध्यापक से पूछें) पिछले तीन महीने में, क्या	हाँ	नहीं	पता नहीं
संकुल स्तर के अधिकारी ने स्कूल में दौरा किया है?	✓		
प्रखंड स्तर के अधिकारी ने स्कूल में दौरा किया है?		✓	
जिला स्तर के अधिकारी ने स्कूल में दौरा किया है?		✓	

11. शौचालय (सिर्फ अवलोकन के लिए)

शौचालय	क्या शौचालय था?		अगर हाँ तो क्या वो बंद था?		अगर खुला था तो क्या वो प्रयोग करने योग्य था?	
	हाँ	नहीं	बंद था	बंद नहीं था	हाँ	नहीं
लड़कियों	✓			✓	✓	
लड़कों	✓		✓			
सामुदायिक		✓				
शिक्षक		✓				

9. विद्यालय में की गयी गतिविधियां निम्नलिखित गतिविधियों में से कौन सी गतिविधियां अप्रैल 2010 से की गयी?	हाँ	नहीं	पता नहीं	यदि हाँ, तो किस अनुदान के तहत				निम्नलिखित गतिविधियों में से कौन सी गतिविधियां अप्रैल 2010 से की गयी?	हाँ	नहीं	पता नहीं	यदि हाँ, तो किस अनुदान के तहत			
				SDG/ SMG/ दोनों	TLM	कोई अन्य अनुदान/ स्रोत	पता नहीं					SDG/ SMG/ दोनों	TLM	कोई अन्य अनुदान/ स्रोत	पता नहीं
नई कक्षा		✓						पुताई/लेप चढ़ाना	✓			✓			
कम्पीयर की खरीद/आलमारी इत्यादि)		✓						ब्लैक बोर्ड /प्रदर्शन बोर्ड की पेंटिंग तथा दीवारों पर चित्रकारी	✓			✓			
बिजली के फिटिंग की खरीद/मरम्मत		✓						दीवार और खिड़कियों की पेंटिंग		✓					
इमारत की मरम्मत (छत, फर्श, दीवार इत्यादि)	✓			✓				चाक, डस्टर, रजिस्टर इत्यादि की खरीद	✓			✓			
दरवाजों और खिड़कियों की मरम्मत	✓			✓				चटाई, टाट–पट्टी की खरीद	✓					✓	
चारदीवारी की मरम्मत		✓						खेल, ग्लोब व अन्य शैक्षिक सामग्री की खरीद	✓				✓		
पीने के पानी की सुविधा की मरम्मत		✓						स्कूली समारोह/ कार्यक्रमों पर खर्च		✓					
शौचालय की मरम्मत	✓			✓				बिजली का भुगतान (पानी,बिजली)/ सफाई कर्मचारी वेतन		✓					

Village map





The National Picture

INDIA RURAL

Private schools 6 to 14 year-olds

Statewise map showing % of 6 to 14 year-olds who are enrolled in private schools




Maps may not be accurate or to-scale. These are mere representations.


Annual Status of Education Report
असर ASER 2011 RURAL
Facilitated by PRATHAM

INDIA RURAL

Attendance in primary school

Statewise map showing % enrolled children attending primary school (Std I-IV/V) on the day of the survey








Maps may not be accurate or to-scale. These are mere representations.

INDIA RURAL

Std III Reading

Statewise map showing % of children in Std III who can read Std I text or more





Maps may not be accurate or to-scale. These are mere representations.

INDIA RURAL

Std V Reading

Statewise map showing % of children in Std V who can read Std II text







Maps may not be accurate or to-scale. These are mere representations.

INDIA RURAL

Std III Math

Statewise map showing % of children In Std III who can do subtraction or more






Maps may not be accurate or to-scale. These are mere representations.

Annual Status of Education Report
असर ASER 2011 RURAL
Facilitated by PRATHAM

INDIA RURAL

Std V Math


Statewise map showing % of children in Std V who can do division







Maps may not be accurate or to-scale. These are mere representations.



Maps may not be accurate or to-scale. These are mere representations.

ASER 2011 (Rural) Findings

The proportion of children currently not enrolled in school is declining

- In ASER 2011, the proportion of children in the 6-14 age group not currently enrolled in school is 3.3%, down from 6.6% in 2006. In 2010, this number was 3.4%.
- 11 to 14 year old girls are the hardest to keep in school. Rural India shows substantial progress on this front. The figure for out of school girls (11-14) was 10.3% in 2006. It has declined to 5.2% in 2011.
- Many of the states that had a high proportion (over 10%) of 11-14 year old girls out of school in 2006 have made significant progress. In 2011, this proportion was lower than the All India average of 5.2% in states like Bihar (4.5%), West Bengal (4.3%) and Chhattisgarh (4.3%). Uttar Pradesh has shown the least progress with 11.1% girls in this age group out of school in 2006 and 9.7% in 2011.
- Substantial numbers of five year old children are enrolled in school. The All India figure stands at 57.8% for 2011. This proportion varies across states, ranging from 87.1% in Nagaland to 18.8% in Karnataka.

Private school enrollment is rising in most states

- Nationally, private school enrollment has risen year after year for the 6-14 age group, increasing from 18.7% in 2006 to 25.6% in 2011.
- Two states in the country, Kerala and Manipur, have more than 60% of children enrolled in private schools. In both these states the proportion of aided private schools is high. According to ASER 2011 data, between 30 to 60% of children in rural areas of Haryana, Uttar Pradesh, Nagaland, Meghalaya, Punjab, Jammu & Kashmir, Rajasthan, Uttarakhand, Maharashtra and Andhra Pradesh are enrolled in private schools.
- Tamil Nadu shows an increase of 11.6 percentage points in private school enrollment between 2007 and 2011. In Uttar Pradesh, private school enrollment has increased from 39.3% in 2010 to 45.4% in 2011.

Reading levels showing decline in many states

- Nationally, reading levels have declined in many states across North India. The All India figure for the proportion of children in Std V able to read a Std 2 level text has dropped from 53.7% in 2010 to 48.2% in 2011. However, in a few states there is good news. In Gujarat, Punjab and Tamil Nadu the numbers for 2011 are better than for 2010. Several states in the north-eastern region of India also show positive change. Karnataka and Andhra Pradesh numbers remain unchanged from last year.
- Similar trends are observed in the proportion of Std III children able to read at least a Std I level text. In addition to the states mentioned above, Himachal Pradesh does not show any decline in Std III reading levels.

Arithmetic levels also show a decline across most states

- Basic arithmetic levels also show a decline. Nationally, the proportion of Std III children able to solve a 2 digit subtraction problem with borrowing has dropped from 36.3% in 2010 to 29.9% in 2011. This decline is visible in almost every state; only Andhra Pradesh, Karnataka and Tamil Nadu show improvements from 2010 to 2011. Several states in the north-eastern region of India also show positive change. There is no change in arithmetic levels for Std III in Gujarat.
- Among Std V children the ability to do the same task has dropped from 70.9% in 2010 to 61.0% in 2011.

A quarter of all rural children attend primary schools where the medium of instruction is different from their home language[1]

- ASER 2011 recorded children's home and school language for the first time. The data indicates that children's home language was different from the school's medium of instruction for one out of four children surveyed. This figure does not include most states of the North East or Jammu & Kashmir.[2]

Incidence of tuition is higher in Eastern states

- In both government and private schools, between 20 to 25% of all children attend paid tuition classes outside school. This number varies considerably by state and by grade level. The proportion of children going to paid tutors remains high in the Eastern states of Odisha, Bihar and West Bengal, where private school enrollment is very low. Kerala is another state with a high incidence of tuition.

School observations

The school information reported in ASER is collected during a visit to one government school with primary sections in each sampled village.

Teachers' attendance is high

- In ASER 2011, an average of about 87% of all appointed teachers were observed to be in school on the day of the visit. Gujarat stands out with 95.6% teachers attending in primary schools. Ten major states had teacher attendance figures that were 90% or higher.

Children's attendance of concern in some states

- At the All India level, children's attendance shows a decline from 73.4% in 2007 to 70.9% in 2011 in rural primary schools. The decline is slightly steeper in upper primary schools, where it decreased from 75.6% in 2007 to 71.9% in 2011. In some states, children's attendance shows a sharp decline over time: for example in primary schools of Bihar, average attendance of children was 59.0% in 2007 and 50.0% in 2011. In Madhya Pradesh this figure has fallen from 67.0% in 2007 to 54.5% in 2011; in Uttar Pradesh from 64.4% (2007) to 57.3% (2011) and in Manipur from 76.7% in 2007 to 52.3% in 2011.

More than half of all Std 2 and Std 4 classes are multigrade

- For Std 2 and Std 4, ASER observes whether children in these classes are sitting together with children from other classes. Nationally, for rural primary schools, more than half of all classes visited were multigrade. For example Std 2 was sitting with one or more other classes in 58.3% of primary schools and 57.6% of schools with upper primary sections. In Jammu and Kashmir, Jharkhand and Meghalaya, more than 80% of observed Std 2 and 4 classrooms in primary schools were multigrade.

Computers increasingly available in upper primary schools

- Almost a third of upper primary schools visited had computers (30.8%). In addition, in several states, the proportion of schools where children were observed using computers was high – for example Kerala (78.7%), Tamil Nadu (51.1%), Gujarat (31.0%) and Maharashtra (30.6%).
- In contrast, only 7.9% of all government primary schools visited had computers. Kerala is a noteworthy exception, with 78.5% of primary schools having computers and 52.3% primary schools where children were observed using them.

[1] The Right to Education Act states that "medium of instructions shall, as far as practicable, be in child's mother tongue" (Chapter V:29:f).
[2] Please consult the respective state pages for the language tables in these states.

Schools get their grants, but not on time

- Between FY 2008-9 and FY 2010-11 the flow of SSA grants to schools improved significantly. However, this improvement occurred largely between FY 2008-9 and 2009-10. In fact a marginal decrease in the proportion of schools receiving grants is observed between FY 2009-10 and 2010-11.
- The data suggest that schools tend to get their grants during the second half of the fiscal year. There is a slight drop in the proportion of schools receiving grants in the first half of the fiscal year between 2010-11 and 2011-12.

RTE Indicators

Not much change in compliance on PTR and CTR

- At the All India level, there has been a marginal improvement in the proportion of schools complying with RTE norms on pupil-teacher ratio, from 38.9% in 2010 to 40.7% in 2011. In 2011, Kerala stands out with 94.1% of schools in compliance, and in Jammu & Kashmir, Nagaland and Manipur, more than 80% schools are in compliance with these norms.
- At the All India level, there has been a marginal decline in the proportion of schools with at least one classroom per teacher, from 76.2% in 2010 to 74.3% in 2011. In Mizoram, 94.8% of schools comply with the teacher-classroom norms and in Punjab, Uttarakhand, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh, Gujarat and Maharashtra more than 80% of schools are in compliance.

No major changes in building, playground and boundary wall provision

- All India figures for 2011 show no significant improvement in the proportion of schools with an office cum store. This figure remains at 74%. Similarly, for the country has a whole, about 62% of visited schools had a playground, both in 2010 and in 2011. However, there has been an increase in the proportion of all schools that have a boundary wall, from 50.9% in 2010 to 54.1% in 2011.

Drinking water provision unchanged

- Nationally, the proportion of schools with no provision for drinking water remained almost the same – 17.0% in 2010 and 16.6% in 2011. In the North East, the proportion of schools with no water provision ranged from 23.8% in Assam to 87.3% in Manipur in 2011.
- The proportion of schools with a useable drinking water facility has remained steady at about 73%. Kerala has the best record with 93.8% schools that have a useable drinking water facility.

Better provision of girls' toilets

- The All India proportion of schools with working toilets has increased marginally from 47.2% in 2010 to 49.1% in 2011.
- The proportion of schools where there was no separate girls' toilet has declined from 31.2% in 2010 to 22.6% in 2011. Also, there has been a substantial improvement in the proportion of schools that have separate girls' toilets that are useable. This figure has risen from 32.9% in 2010 to 43.8% in 2011.

More libraries in schools, and more children using them

- The proportion of schools without libraries has declined from 37.5% in 2010 to 28.6% in 2011. Children were seen using the library in more schools as well – up from 37.9% in 2010 to 42.3% in 2011.



ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM HOUSEHOLDS. 558 OUT OF 583 DISTRICTS


School enrollment and out of school children

Table 1: % Children in different types of schools 2011

Age group	Govt.	Pvt.	Other	Not in School	Total
Age: 6-14 ALL	69.9	25.6	1.1	3.3	100
Age: 7-16 ALL	68.0	25.7	1.0	5.3	100
Age: 7-10 ALL	71.5	25.3	1.3	1.9	100
Age: 7-10 BOYS	69.3	27.8	1.2	1.8	100
Age: 7-10 GIRLS	74.1	22.5	1.4	2.1	100
Age: 11-14 ALL	68.7	25.6	0.9	4.8	100
Age: 11-14 BOYS	66.8	28.0	0.9	4.4	100
Age: 11-14 GIRLS	70.8	23.1	0.9	5.2	100
Age: 15-16 ALL	57.0	27.0	0.8	15.3	100
Age: 15-16 BOYS	56.8	27.9	0.7	14.6	100
Age: 15-16 GIRLS	57.2	25.9	0.8	16.1	100

Note: 'OTHER' includes children going to madarssa and EGS.
'NOT IN SCHOOL' = dropped out + never enrolled.

Chart 1: Trends over time
% Children out of school by age group and gender 2006-2011



How to read this chart: For example, the proportion of girls (age 11-14) not in school has changed from 10.3% in 2006 to 7.3% in 2007 to 7.2% in 2008 to 6.8% in 2009 to 5.7% in 2010 to 5.2% in 2011

Chart 2: Trends over time
% Children enrolled in private school by class 2007, 2009 & 2011




Table 2: Sample description
% Children in each class by age 2011

Std.	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	Total
I	26.5	43.0	17.5	7.5	5.5								100
II	4.1	14.6	38.8	28.0	6.3	5.0	3.3						100
III	4.1		12.0	41.8	23.6	11.3	2.7	4.5					100
IV	4.3			13.8	34.7	30.9	7.1	5.8	3.4				100
V	5.5				8.3	42.9	24.0	12.1	3.5	3.8			100
VI	3.7					12.5	35.0	33.3	8.8	6.8			100
VII	4.9						9.5	42.5	27.2	10.3	5.6		100
VIII	4.5							13.8	39.1	28.7	9.9	4.1	100


How to read this table: If a child started school in Std I at age 6, she should be age 8 in Std 3. This table shows the age distribution for each class. For example, in Std III, 41.8% children are 8 years old but there are also 12.0% who are 7, 23.6% who are 9, 11.3% who are 10 years old, etc.

Young children in pre-school and school

Table 3: % Children age 5-6 who are enrolled in different types of pre-school & school 2011

	In balwadi or anganwadi	In LKG/ UKG	In School			Not enrolled anywhere	Total
			Govt	Pvt	Other		
Age 5	25.9	10.3	36.8	19.8	1.3	6.0	100
Age 6	5.9	5.0	60.3	24.3	1.5	3.0	100

Chart 3: Trends over time
Five year olds in pre-school & school 2007, 2009 & 2011



Reading

Table 4: % Children by class and READING level
All schools 2011

Std.	Nothing	Letter	Word	Level 1 (Std 1 Text)	Level 2 (Std 2 Text)	Total
I	38.4	39.4	15.3	3.9	3.0	100
II	16.6	34.6	28.3	11.8	8.7	100
III	8.5	22.9	28.4	21.5	18.8	100
IV	4.7	14.4	21.2	25.7	34.2	100
V	3.5	9.7	14.6	24.1	48.2	100
VI	1.7	5.8	9.3	20.5	62.8	100
VII	1.2	4.0	6.3	16.2	72.4	100
VIII	1.0	2.6	4.3	12.7	79.4	100
Total	10.4	17.8	16.6	16.9	38.3	100

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, 8.5% children cannot even read letters, 22.9% can read letters but not more, 28.4% can read words but not Std 1 text or higher, 21.5% can read Std 1 text but not Std 2 level text, and 18.8% can read Std 2 level text. In sum, for each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is 100%.

Reading Tool




Chart 4: Trends over time
% Children in Std III who CANNOT READ Std I LEVEL TEXT
By school type 2008-2011





Chart 5: Trends over time
% Children in Std V who CANNOT READ Std II LEVEL TEXT
By school type 2008-2011



Home language and school language

Table 5: School language and home language*

% Children whose :	%
Home language is the same as school language	74.7
Home language is different from school language	25.4
Total	100.0

Note : In ASER 2011 for every state, reading tools were provided in the main medium of instruction in government schools. Children and their families were also asked about the language they speak at home. For home languages, a list of 122 languages was provided to all survey teams. This list includes 22 Scheduled languages and 100 Non-Scheduled languages. The data in this table is for children for whom we have information for both school language and home language.

* This table does not include data for Jammu and Kashmir, Manipur, Assam, Nagaland, Tripura, Meghalaya, Mizoram & Arunachal Pradesh. Please consult the respective state pages for the language tables.



Arithmetic

Table 6: % Children by class and ARITHMETIC level
All schools 2011

Std.	Nothing	Recognize Numbers		Subtract	Divide	Total
		1-9	11-99			
I	36.5	42.2	16.9	3.2	1.2	100
II	15.0	38.5	32.8	11.0	2.7	100
III	7.5	26.9	35.7	23.2	6.7	100
IV	3.8	17.2	30.6	32.3	16.1	100
V	2.9	12.0	24.1	33.5	27.6	100
VI	1.6	7.4	18.8	32.8	39.4	100
VII	1.3	5.0	15.4	30.0	48.3	100
VIII	1.1	3.4	12.5	26.3	56.8	100
Total	9.5	20.3	23.8	23.4	22.9	100

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level of arithmetic achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, 7.5% children cannot even recognize numbers 1-9, 26.9% can recognize numbers up to 9 but not more, 35.7 % can recognize numbers to 99 but cannot do subtraction, 23.2% can do subtraction but not division, and 6.7% can do division. In sum, for each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is 100%.

Math Tool



Chart 6: Trends over time
% Children in Std III who CANNOT RECOGNISE NUMBERS upto 100. By school type 2008-2011





Chart 7: Trends over time
% Children in Std V who CANNOT DO DIVISION
By school type 2008-2011



Tuition

Table 7: Class-wise % children attending PAID TUITION CLASSES
By school type 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Year	School	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	Total
2007	Govt	12.0	15.7	19.1	21.3	23.3	23.5	24.3	26.1	20.0
	Pvt	19.5	23.0	25.0	25.9	26.2	24.1	25.0	24.8	23.9
2009	Govt	17.1	20.3	22.3	23.4	25.4	27.6	28.1	30.7	23.9
	Pvt	23.3	26.5	28.6	29.8	28.2	26.1	26.4	27.4	26.9
2010	Govt	15.0	18.2	20.7	22.2	25.2	26.0	26.6	29.0	22.5
	Pvt	18.1	20.9	23.4	25.3	23.7	24.0	23.9	22.4	22.5
2011	Govt	15.8	19.5	21.2	24.0	25.4	25.8	27.7	28.4	23.3
	Pvt	18.9	21.1	23.2	23.3	23.1	21.6	22.2	22.4	21.8

Note: In 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011 the ASER survey recorded information about tuition. In all 4 years, the question asked was the following: "Does the child take any paid additional class currently?" Therefore, these numbers do not include any supplemental help in learning that children may have received from parents, siblings or from anyone else who did not require payment.



Performance of states

Table 8: School enrollment and learning levels 2011

State	Out of school	Private school	Std I-II : Learning levels		Std III-V : Learning levels	
	% Children (Age: 6-14) out of school	% Children (Age: 6-14) in private school	% Children (Std I-II) who CAN READ letters, words or more	% Children (Std I-II) who CAN RECOGNIZE numbers (1-9) or more	% Children (Std III-V) who CAN READ Level 1 (Std 1) text or more	% Children (Std III-V) who CAN DO SUBTRACTION or more
Andhra Pradesh	2.8	34.7	87.3	89.7	70.9	64.5
Arunachal Pradesh	3.8	17.0	87.9	89.8	65.4	65.2
Assam	4.2	14.5	73.0	75.5	50.3	35.7
Bihar	3.0	5.5	59.7	62.5	52.1	48.4
Chhattisgarh	2.4	11.0	75.8	75.0	52.5	39.9
Daman & Diu	0.0	22.3	88.4	86.2	59.4	41.9
Gujarat	2.7	10.8	79.7	79.0	63.4	43.4
Haryana	1.4	43.4	81.3	83.8	69.8	64.5
Himachal Pradesh	0.6	26.6	92.3	95.4	82.1	75.5
Jammu & Kashmir	2.5	37.7	89.9	91.5	56.7	50.9
Jharkhand	4.7	12.8	63.5	64.0	48.4	41.0
Karnataka	2.8	20.0	85.3	85.8	59.7	47.5
Kerala	0.1	60.8	97.1	96.9	82.2	67.5
Madhya Pradesh	2.2	17.2	65.7	63.9	44.2	30.1
Maharashtra	1.1	30.3	91.2	91.6	77.9	56.0
Manipur	1.1	71.1	97.0	96.4	77.1	73.1
Meghalaya	5.8	54.3	86.2	89.6	61.6	43.5
Mizoram	0.6	13.7	96.2	97.1	85.6	85.1
Nagaland	2.0	40.9	96.6	97.7	70.7	70.8
Odisha	3.7	5.0	67.7	66.0	56.6	43.5
Puducherry	0.0	45.0	72.5	82.8	51.7	49.0
Punjab	1.6	39.6	87.2	90.5	74.9	73.6
Rajasthan	4.5	35.1	65.5	66.5	52.7	40.4
Tamil Nadu	0.9	27.0	62.8	69.3	50.0	41.9
Tripura	1.3	5.0	89.0	92.9	71.8	67.9
Uttar Pradesh	6.1	45.4	63.6	66.0	47.8	34.5
Uttarakhand	1.1	31.3	78.1	76.6	64.2	50.9
West Bengal	4.3	6.3	84.8	88.3	61.1	53.8
All India	**3.3**	**25.6**	**72.1**	**73.8**	**57.5**	**46.5**

As part of ASER 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011, in each sampled village, one government school with primary sections was visited on the day of the survey. Information about schools in this report is based on these visits.

School observations

Table 9: Total schools visited 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Type of school	2007	2009	2010	2011
Std I-IV/V: Primary	9230	9389	8419	8473
Std I-VII/VIII: Primary + Upper primary	4836	5359	5821	5810
Total schools visited	14066	14748	14240	14283



Student and teacher attendance

Table 10: Student attendance 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Type of school	2007	2009	2010	2011	2007	2009	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V				Std I-VII/VIII			
% Enrolled children present (average)	73.4	74.3	72.9	70.9	75.6	77.0	73.4	71.9
% Schools with less than 50% enrolled children present (average)	12.3	11.4	13.2	17.1	11.8	8.9	12.6	16.1
% Schools with 75% or more enrolled children present (average)	53.5	55.3	52.8	49.6	60.6	61.8	53.5	52.3

Table 11: Teacher attendance 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Type of school	2007	2009	2010	2011	2007	2009	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V				Std I-VII/VIII			
% Teachers present (average)	90.9	89.1	87.1	87.2	87.3	88.6	86.4	86.7
% Schools with no teachers present (average)	0.2	0.4	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.2
% Schools with all teachers present (average)	73.7	69.2	63.9	65.2	53.7	57.1	52.0	51.5

Other school information

Table 12: Headteachers 2010 & 2011

% Schools with:	2010	2011	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V		Std I-VII/VIII	
No Headteacher appointed	2.9	3.6	2.2	2.0
Headteacher appointed but not present at time of visit	12.2	9.7	9.6	9.0
Headteacher appointed & present at time of visit	84.9	86.7	88.3	89.0
Total	100	100	100	100

Table 13: Computers 2010 and 2011

% Schools with:	2010	2011	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V		Std I-VII/VIII	
No computer	92.4	92.1	72.1	69.2
Computers but no children using them on day of visit	3.2	4.3	13.0	15.1
Computers & children using them on day of visit	4.3	3.6	14.9	15.7
Total	100	100	100	100

Table 14: Multigrade classes 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

% Schools with	2007	2009	2010	2011	2007	2009	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V				Std I-VII/VIII			
Std II children sitting with one or more other classes	54.0	55.8	55.2	58.3	50.4	53.1	54.0	57.6
Std IV children sitting with one or more other classes	47.6	51.0	49.0	53.1	42.0	43.9	41.6	45.6

School funds and activities (PAISA)

Table 15: % Schools who report receiving SSA grants - Full financial year

SSA school grants	2008-2009				2009-2010				2010-2011			
	No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools		
		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know
Maintenance grant	13169	77.0	13.7	9.3	12277	84.9	5.3	9.9	13764	83.7	9.3	7.0
Development grant	12601	69.7	20.3	10.0	11763	80.5	8.7	10.8	13496	76.7	15.3	8.0
TLM grant	13172	83.4	10.2	6.5	11658	87.3	5.9	6.8	13649	85.2	9.7	5.2

Table 16: % Schools who report receiving SSA grants - Half financial year

SSA school grants	April 2009 to October 2009				April 2010 to October 2010				April 2011 to October 2011			
	No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools		
		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know
Maintenance grant	11381	57.9	30.4	11.7	11563	59.3	26.5	14.2	13125	55.0	35.2	9.8
Development grant	10941	53.5	34.2	12.3	11082	57.3	28.2	14.5	12856	50.8	38.7	10.5
TLM grant	11330	64.4	26.7	8.9	10879	60.5	27.6	12.0	12966	53.1	38.4	8.5

Table 17: % Schools carrying out different activities since April 2011

Type of Activity		% schools		
		Yes	No	Don't know
Const.	New Classroom	26.2	70.0	3.9
Repairs	Repair of building (roof, floor, wall etc.)	50.4	46.4	3.3
	Repair of doors & windows	47.7	49.0	3.3
	Repair of boundary wall	26.4	70.1	3.5
	Repair of drinking water facility	47.8	49.2	3.0
	Repair of toilet	38.6	58.2	3.2
Painting & White Wash	White wash/plastering	68.4	28.9	2.7
	Painting Blackboard/Display Board/Painting on wall	71.5	26.0	2.5
	Painting of doors & walls	59.8	37.4	2.8
Purchase	Purchase of furniture (cupboard etc.)	46.1	50.2	3.8
	Purchase of electrical fittings	36.2	60.4	3.4
	Purchase of chalk, duster, register etc.	89.1	8.5	2.4
	Purchase of sitting Mats/Tat Patti	55.5	41.3	3.2
	Purchase of charts, globes & other teaching material	76.5	20.7	2.7
Other	Expenditure on school events	68.7	27.4	3.9
	Payment of bills (electricity, water, cleaning etc.)	38.8	56.3	4.9

The PAISA section of ASER tracks receipt and spending of Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) grants at the school level. This information is collected from schools visited during the survey. This page reports proportion of schools receiving the grants and carrying out specified activities in the schools. More detailed analysis of the PAISA data will be available in the PAISA 2011 report which will be released in March 2012.[1]

EVERY RURAL GOVERNMENT PRIMARY SCHOOL IS ENTITLED TO EACH OF THESE SSA GRANTS EVERY YEAR.

How much goes to each school	For what purposes
SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT GRANT / SCHOOL GRANT	
Rs.5000 per year per primary school	This grant can be used for buying school equipment such as blackboard, sitting mats etc. Also for buying chalk, duster, registers and other office equipment.
Rs.7000 per year per upper primary school	
Rs 5000 + Rs 7000 = Rs 12000 if the school is Std I-VII/VIII.	The grant amount varies by type of school: whether it is a primary or upper primary school.
Note: Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same premises.	
SCHOOL MAINTENANCE GRANT	
Rs.5000 - Rs 7500 per school per year if the school has upto 3 classrooms.	This grant can be used for maintenance of school building, including whitewashing; beautification; and repair of toilets, hand pump, boundary wall, playground etc. The grant amount depends on number of classrooms (excluding Headmaster room and office room)
Rs 7500 - Rs.10000 per year if the school has more than 3 classrooms.	
Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same building.	
TLM GRANT	
Rs.500 per teacher per year in primary and upper primary schools.	This grant can be used by teachers to buy teaching aids, such as charts, globes, posters, models etc.

[1] For more information see www.accountabilityinitiative.in

Right to Education indicators

As part of ASER 2010 and 2011, in each sampled village, one government school with primary sections was visited on the day of the survey. During this school visit, RTE indicators were observed and are reported here.

Table 18: Schools by total enrollment 2010 and 2011

School enrollment	2010		2011	
	No. of schools	% of schools	No. of schools	% of schools
1-60	2412	17.3	2790	19.8
61-90	1759	12.6	1844	13.1
91-120	1689	12.1	1841	13.1
121-150	1511	10.8	1533	10.9
151-200	2045	14.6	1853	13.2
> 200	4557	32.6	4209	29.9
TOTAL	13973	100.0	14070	100.0

Table 19: RTE norms: Pupil-teacher ratio 2010 and 2011

School enrollment	RTE Teacher Norms	2010	2011
		% Schools that do not meet PTR norms	
1-60	2	43.4	39.8
61-90	3	49.9	47.5
91-120	4	60.6	58.2
121-150	5	68.7	66.7
151-200	5 + HM	61.2	58.9
> 200	see note	71.0	73.7
TOTAL		61.1	59.4

Note : For schools with enrollment above 200 children the PTR shall not exceed 40 excluding the Head Teacher

Table 20: Schools by number of teachers 2010 and 2011

Number of teachers	2010		2011	
	No. of schools	% of schools	No. of schools	% of schools
1	1478	11.9	1561	12.4
2	2198	17.6	2394	19.0
3	2008	16.1	2111	16.7
4	1678	13.5	1652	13.1
5	1295	10.4	1269	10.1
6	1005	8.1	937	7.4
>=7	2796	22.4	2704	21.4
TOTAL	12458	100.0	12628	100.0

Table 21: RTE norms: Teacher - classroom ratio 2010 and 2011

RTE norm: At least one classroom per teacher	2010	2011
Number of teachers	% Schools that do not meet classroom to teacher norms	
1	1.3	2.2
2	7.4	11.8
3	19.7	22.8
4	30.7	32.2
5	37.2	35.8
6	43.6	48.0
>=7	34.8	38.8
TOTAL	23.8	25.8

Extracts from the Schedule of The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act 2009 Norms and standards for a School (Sections 19 and 25)

Number of teachers in Std 1-5:

- Admitted children — No. of teachers
  - <= 60 — 2
  - 61-90 — 3
  - 91-120 — 4
  - 121-200 — 5
  - > 150 — 5 + 1 Headteacher
  - > 200 — Pupil-Teacher Ratio (excluding Headteacher) shall not exceed 40

School facilities:
All weather building with:

- At least one classroom for every teacher
- Office cum store cum headteacher's room
- Separate toilets for boys and girls
- Safe and adequate drinking water facility to all children
- A kitchen where mid-day meal is cooked in the school
- Playground
- Arrangements for securing the school building by boundary wall or fencing.

Teaching learning equipment
shall be provided to each class as required.

Library
There shall be a library in each school providing newspaper, magazines and books on all subjects, including story-books.

Table 22: % Schools meeting selected RTE norms on facilities 2010 & 2011

% of schools with		2010	2011
Building	Office/Store/Office cum store	74.0	74.1
	Playground	62.0	62.6
	Boundary Wall	50.9	54.1
Drinking Water	No facility for drinking water	17.0	16.6
	Facility but no drinking water available	10.3	9.9
	Drinking water available	72.7	73.5
Toilet	No toilet facility	10.9	12.2
	Facility but toilet not useable	41.8	38.8
	Toilet useable	47.2	49.1
Girls Toilet	% Schools with no separate provisions for girls toilets	31.2	22.6
	Of schools with separate girls toilets, % schools where		
	Toilet locked	18.7	15.0
	Toilet not useable	17.2	18.7
	Toilet useable	32.9	43.8
TLM	Teaching learning material in Std 2	80.7	82.1
	Teaching learning material in Std 4	76.4	78.2
Library	No library	37.5	28.6
	Library but no books being used by children on day of visit	24.6	29.1
	Library being used by children on day of visit	37.9	42.3
MDM	Kitchen shed for cooking midday meal	82.1	83.7
	Midday meal served in school on the day of visit	84.4	87.4

Note: School observations for ASER 2011 looked at TLM for Std II and Std IV only.



Table 23: Performance of states on Right to Education indicators 2010 and 2011

State	Number of schools visited 2010	Number of schools visited 2011	PTR & Classrooms				School Facilities														Library & Teaching-Learning Materials							
			% Schools complying with:				% Schools that have:														% Schools that have:							
			Norms for pupil teacher ratio		Norms for teacher classroom ratio		Office/ Store/ Office Cum Store		Playground		Boundary wall		Drinking water provision & available		Toilet available and useable		Girls toilet available and useable		Kitchen shed for cooking midday meal		Library books available		Library books in use by children		TLM observed in Std 2		TLM observed in Std 4	
			2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011
Andhra Pradesh	632	642	61.7	56.4	53.4	66.5	64.7	69.9	70.3	68.6	52.7	49.2	64.8	60.8	38.6	33.4	25.4	28.1	66.9	62.8	92.0	94.7	77.6	73.9	90.2	88.3	87.6	87.2
Arunachal Pradesh	259	207	78.0	70.4	79.8	70.7	77.0	78.3	59.2	67.3	25.1	36.7	53.2	60.7	25.3	30.3	12.2	22.0	64.0	63.7	13.0	19.7	6.3	9.1	39.4	52.1	34.4	48.8
Assam	519	510	33.6	29.0	67.7	64.9	57.3	54.1	61.5	56.5	19.3	23.3	60.9	64.6	33.1	37.8	13.7	27.4	80.0	81.5	20.8	28.1	10.5	13.6	71.4	71.1	67.1	72.2
Bihar	967	1022	8.8	5.3	48.2	54.2	68.6	66.1	48.0	48.9	47.5	47.0	78.7	83.8	33.6	45.7	18.1	35.4	63.6	71.4	52.9	61.2	28.2	31.8	70.8	72.1	64.1	66.3
Chhattisgarh	425	392	39.6	51.3	64.2	59.6	78.6	76.3	44.7	46.0	48.5	49.1	77.6	73.3	29.6	26.8	20.0	20.7	86.2	87.0	72.9	78.7	36.5	38.4	88.5	86.1	83.2	78.9
Gujarat	623	650	62.7	62.0	84.2	87.6	80.2	82.8	75.4	83.2	84.5	91.1	79.4	83.9	64.8	69.5	49.9	67.7	88.4	92.0	83.8	83.0	48.5	44.2	95.6	97.0	94.8	96.2
Haryana	528	389	40.3	41.2	75.1	70.9	85.9	80.3	79.9	79.1	82.4	84.0	74.6	78.3	67.9	70.1	52.8	68.0	51.0	61.0	64.6	78.2	31.6	42.6	72.2	73.7	67.6	67.1
Himachal Pradesh	261	274	60.6	65.3	76.7	77.4	75.5	76.9	76.0	70.0	37.3	42.4	83.2	81.8	56.0	68.5	38.7	64.9	82.0	89.3	80.3	88.6	41.3	42.4	91.5	89.8	87.5	89.0
Jammu & Kashmir		357		87.5		49.8		82.0		52.7		28.7		46.6		36.3		22.4		70.9		50.7		26.8		71.7		68.8
Jharkhand	547	537	11.2	15.3	81.2	77.3	84.1	84.2	38.5	33.8	26.8	24.7	73.8	80.6	26.8	37.5	20.9	36.6	73.4	75.7	61.6	73.5	28.4	38.2	82.9	78.6	76.1	74.3
Karnataka	769	781	69.4	71.2	82.8	85.0	71.8	74.3	66.2	71.1	59.0	69.1	75.8	81.9	38.4	44.2	31.8	41.1	92.8	94.0	92.4	92.6	64.8	57.8	97.3	95.8	92.6	90.4
Kerala	275	328	89.2	94.1	80.3	77.6	88.3	90.4	76.7	78.8	82.1	86.0	85.7	93.8	58.2	71.6	43.9	68.6	98.1	97.8	83.1	98.1	62.4	70.8	98.5	98.8	96.6	94.1
Madhya Pradesh	1219	1195	19.4	21.5	81.4	75.0	69.4	64.3	61.0	55.6	37.4	37.1	78.5	68.6	50.3	31.9	28.9	23.4	89.8	86.7	56.3	58.7	29.1	31.5	83.9	82.3	81.0	77.2
Maharashtra	902	829	58.9	62.9	87.6	81.9	34.2	33.4	85.0	82.5	57.6	58.2	69.0	73.1	53.0	44.9	43.2	42.6	78.3	74.9	86.1	83.8	66.5	54.3	97.2	96.4	94.7	95.9
Manipur	125	133	74.3	88.1	62.5	41.4	68.1	66.4	72.3	41.7	11.1	6.4	5.1	6.4	40.2	35.2	8.4	15.3	59.2	43.9	9.2	7.1	5.9	1.6	48.7	23.0	38.4	20.6
Meghalaya	110	85	54.3	51.4	84.2	62.9	33.6	41.6	45.5	39.5	13.8	13.9	23.9	9.9	24.5	24.4	14.8	18.6	59.4	69.6	22.0	36.3	15.6	31.3	40.0	51.3	26.8	46.5
Mizoram	174	148	89.1	75.2	57.6	94.8	80.1	92.1	40.7	70.7	35.5	47.8	48.5	71.0	55.6	52.1	30.8	33.1	96.5	98.6	6.4	27.1	1.7	12.1	40.2	53.3	36.0	51.0
Nagaland	223	217	91.9	85.5	78.6	61.1	83.6	92.6	63.8	65.6	43.3	35.9	37.0	23.4	53.9	60.0	30.6	49.7	81.9	92.1	13.3	9.0	9.2	3.3	48.3	51.7	43.5	48.9
Odisha	741	769	22.5	25.7	74.0	79.1	74.6	83.0	44.5	36.8	40.7	46.4	70.3	74.5	44.4	51.8	34.7	46.8	74.3	78.5	65.3	84.7	46.8	66.5	81.3	84.2	76.9	81.8
Punjab	449	489	34.9	30.4	76.9	82.2	78.9	79.5	69.1	71.4	82.8	84.0	83.1	82.9	61.2	58.7	49.4	56.2	94.6	93.9	96.0	94.4	66.0	70.4	91.8	95.0	89.2	90.6
Rajasthan	896	872	46.4	47.4	82.0	83.1	91.2	89.2	51.9	57.2	70.1	72.6	68.0	69.5	65.4	69.9	50.3	66.3	83.8	84.5	63.7	67.1	23.3	31.7	76.1	80.0	72.1	74.7
Tamil Nadu	662	683	47.0	52.3	75.2	75.0	55.0	49.4	68.7	67.6	60.9	58.7	80.5	77.6	44.6	48.4	35.1	42.7	96.7	96.5	79.1	76.8	57.8	55.2	95.4	92.8	93.3	92.5
Tripura	98	94	68.5	75.0	60.0	46.2	88.8	76.6	89.7	78.7	19.0	25.3	40.0	40.2	43.0	30.8	30.3	21.9	88.4	90.4	35.4	28.3	19.8	23.9	52.7	35.6	32.3	35.9
Uttar Pradesh	1896	1900	16.1	16.5	81.6	80.3	88.6	88.1	60.8	71.1	44.4	57.9	82.2	84.4	47.4	53.9	33.9	47.4	89.3	94.7	48.7	77.1	22.9	37.2	73.5	79.0	69.6	74.2
Uttarakhand	337	297	13.7	16.3	87.4	84.7	87.9	83.0	67.4	67.8	67.0	61.1	68.3	68.2	53.4	59.7	24.0	53.3	96.3	94.2	47.7	82.3	20.4	40.5	82.4	87.3	79.1	82.1
West Bengal	408	401	26.2	34.4	64.8	64.5	79.3	81.3	42.0	50.6	34.1	42.3	67.2	63.4	52.1	49.5	23.7	41.2	86.0	87.0	49.5	60.8	31.8	42.0	71.7	78.0	65.3	71.6
All India	**14240**	**14283**	**38.9**	**40.7**	**76.2**	**74.3**	**74.0**	**74.1**	**62.0**	**62.6**	**50.9**	**54.1**	**72.7**	**73.5**	**47.2**	**49.1**	**32.9**	**43.8**	**82.1**	**83.7**	**62.5**	**71.4**	**37.9**	**42.3**	**80.7**	**82.1**	**76.4**	**78.2**


Andhra Pradesh
Arunachal Pradesh
Assam
Bihar
Chhattisgarh
Gujarat



Andhra Pradesh RURAL

Annual Status of Education Report
असर ASER 2011 RURAL
Facilitated by PRATHAM

ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM HOUSEHOLDS. 22 OUT OF 22 DISTRICTS


School enrollment and out of school children

Table 1: % Children in different types of schools 2011

Age group	Govt.	Pvt.	Other	Not in School	Total
Age: 6-14 ALL	62.3	34.7	0.3	2.8	100
Age: 7-16 ALL	61.1	32.9	0.2	5.7	100
Age: 7-10 ALL	59.9	38.7	0.3	1.1	100
Age: 7-10 BOYS	54.9	44.1	0.2	0.8	100
Age: 7-10 GIRLS	64.8	33.5	0.3	1.4	100
Age: 11-14 ALL	66.4	28.3	0.3	5.1	100
Age: 11-14 BOYS	63.1	32.5	0.2	4.2	100
Age: 11-14 GIRLS	69.5	24.2	0.3	6.0	100
Age: 15-16 ALL	50.7	28.4	0.2	20.7	100
Age: 15-16 BOYS	48.9	31.9	0.1	19.1	100
Age: 15-16 GIRLS	52.4	25.2	0.2	22.2	100

Note: 'OTHER' includes children going to madarssa and EGS.
'NOT IN SCHOOL' = dropped out + never enrolled.

Chart 1: Trends over time
% Children out of school by age group and gender 2006-2011



How to read this chart: For example, the proportion of girls (age 11-14) not in school has changed from 8.6% in 2006 to 8.1% in 2007 to 6.6% in 2008 to 10.8% in 2009 to 6.6% in 2010 to 6.0% in 2011

Chart 2: Trends over time
% Children enrolled in private school by class 2007, 2009 & 2011




Table 2: Sample description
% Children in each class by age 2011

Std.	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	Total
I	24.2	44.2	20.1	8.0	3.5								100
II	2.4	14.1	49.1	22.7	8.3	3.5							100
III	1.6		13.8	47.6	24.0	9.0	4.0						100
IV	2.5			14.9	48.8	22.1	8.2	3.5					100
V	2.7				7.9	55.7	21.9	9.2	2.5				100
VI	1.6					11.8	48.7	30.3	6.4	1.3			100
VII	1.8						10.7	54.5	24.6	6.7	1.8		100
VIII	2.9							13.0	55.3	21.9	6.8		100


How to read this table: If a child started school in Std I at age 6, she should be age 8 in Std 3. This table shows the age distribution for each class. For example, in Std III, 47.6% children are 8 years old but there are also 13.8% who are 7, 24.0% who are 9, 9.0% who are 10 years old, etc.

Young children in pre-school and school

Table 3: % Children age 5-6 who are enrolled in different types of pre-school & school 2011

	In balwadi or anganwadi	In LKG/ UKG	In School			Not enrolled anywhere	Total
			Govt	Pvt	Other		
Age 5	16.4	18.8	33.0	30.0	0.1	1.8	100
Age 6	1.3	9.6	49.0	39.2	0.2	0.8	100

Chart 3: Trends over time
Five year olds in pre-school & school 2007, 2009 & 2011



Reading

Table 4: % Children by class and READING level
All schools 2011

Std.	Nothing	Letter	Word	Level 1 (Std 1 Text)	Level 2 (Std 2 Text)	Total
I	19.6	48.7	25.1	4.2	2.4	100
II	5.7	27.7	40.4	15.5	10.8	100
III	2.8	11.9	31.1	29.9	24.3	100
IV	1.7	5.9	18.0	31.1	43.3	100
V	1.3	3.9	11.1	23.7	60.1	100
VI	0.5	1.8	6.8	20.0	70.9	100
VII	0.3	1.9	4.4	13.4	80.0	100
VIII	0.4	0.8	2.5	10.2	86.1	100
Total	4.4	13.8	18.5	18.9	44.5	100

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, 2.8% children cannot even read letters, 11.9% can read letters but not more, 31.1% can read words but not Std 1 text or higher, 29.9% can read Std 1 text but not Std 2 level text, and 24.3% can read Std 2 level text. In sum, for each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is 100%.

Reading Tool




Chart 4: Trends over time
% Children in Std III who CANNOT READ Std I LEVEL TEXT
By school type 2008-2011





Chart 5: Trends over time
% Children in Std V who CANNOT READ Std II LEVEL TEXT
By school type 2008-2011



Home language and school language

Table 5: School language and home language

% Children whose :	%
Home language is the same as school language	69.2
Home language is different from school language	30.8
Total	100.0

Note : In ASER 2011 for every state, reading tools were provided in the main medium of instruction in government schools. Children and their families were also asked about the language they speak at home. For home languages, a list of 122 languages was provided to all survey teams. This list includes 22 Scheduled languages and 100 Non-Scheduled languages. The data in this table is for children for whom we have information for both school language and home language.



Arithmetic

Table 6: % Children by class and ARITHMETIC level
All schools 2011

Std.	Nothing	Recognize Numbers		Subtract	Divide	Total
		1-9	11-99			
I	16.5	42.1	37.3	3.4	0.7	100
II	4.0	21.1	54.9	17.5	2.4	100
III	1.9	7.6	44.5	39.9	6.1	100
IV	1.0	2.8	27.6	44.7	23.9	100
V	1.0	2.3	18.3	40.1	38.2	100
VI	0.6	0.6	11.5	35.2	52.2	100
VII	0.4	0.9	10.9	29.0	58.8	100
VIII	0.4	0.4	9.2	24.6	65.4	100
Total	3.5	10.5	28.0	29.4	28.7	100

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level of arithmetic achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, 1.9% children cannot even recognize numbers 1-9, 7.6% children can recognize numbers up to 9 but not more, 44.5% can recognize numbers to 99 but cannot do subtraction, 39.9% can do subtraction but not division, and 6.1% can do division. In sum, for each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is 100%.

Math Tool




Chart 6: Trends over time
% Children in Std III who CANNOT RECOGNISE NUMBERS upto 100. By school type 2008-2011





Chart 7: Trends over time
% Children in Std V who CANNOT DO DIVISION
By school type 2008-2011



Tuition

Table 7: Class-wise % children attending PAID TUITION CLASSES
By school type 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Year	School	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	Total
2007	Govt	11.0	16.4	17.0	18.6	20.8	17.3	24.6	13.5	17.8
	Pvt	24.8	29.0	33.1	31.5	37.6	31.7	36.7	28.5	30.9
2009	Govt	21.2	22.9	24.7	22.3	24.7	22.4	24.1	19.8	22.9
	Pvt	31.6	40.6	36.7	37.4	37.1	40.4	35.3	39.2	36.7
2010	Govt	12.0	13.7	14.7	14.7	12.6	17.3	13.2	13.0	13.9
	Pvt	23.5	26.3	25.0	29.8	26.4	32.9	22.9	24.4	26.3
2011	Govt	11.6	14.8	16.7	16.2	18.4	12.6	14.6	9.8	14.5
	Pvt	20.0	25.1	27.6	29.0	31.5	29.8	26.4	29.5	26.8

Note: In 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011 the ASER survey recorded information about tuition. In all 4 years, the question asked was the following: "Does the child take any paid additional class currently?" Therefore, these numbers do not include any supplemental help in learning that children may have received from parents, siblings or from anyone else who did not require payment.



Andhra Pradesh RURAL

Annual Status of Education Report
असर ASER 2011 RURAL
Facilitated by PRATHAM

As part of ASER 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011, in each sampled village, one government school with primary sections was visited on the day of the survey. Information about schools in this report is based on these visits.

School observations

Table 8: Total schools visited 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Type of school	2007	2009	2010	2011
Std I-IV/V: Primary	379	477	475	510
Std I-VII/VIII: Primary + Upper primary	229	156	157	132
Total schools visited	608	633	632	642



Student and teacher attendance

Table 9: Student attendance 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Type of school	2007	2009	2010	2011	2007	2009	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V				Std I-VII/VIII			
% Enrolled children present (average)	75.9	76.1	72.4	75.2	77.4	76.9	72.6	74.4
% Schools with less than 50% enrolled children present (average)	4.5	5.3	8.5	4.8	2.6	3.2	9.0	3.1
% Schools with 75% or more enrolled children present (average)	58.0	59.3	50.0	55.5	62.7	61.9	49.4	50.4

Table 10: Teacher attendance 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Type of school	2007	2009	2010	2011	2007	2009	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V				Std I-VII/VIII			
% Teachers present (average)	86.4	80.1	83.0	85.5	84.0	81.2	82.7	77.0
% Schools with no teachers present (average)	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
% Schools with all teachers present (average)	59.9	43.6	49.7	56.1	33.5	30.4	30.4	24.4

Other school information

Table 11: Headteachers 2010 & 2011

% Schools with:	2010	2011	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V		Std I-VII/VIII	
No Headteacher appointed	1.1	0.3	0.0	0.0
Headteacher appointed but not present at time of visit	15.5	9.8	13.7	10.3
Headteacher appointed & present at time of visit	83.4	90.0	86.3	89.7
Total	100	100	100	100

Table 12: Computers 2010 and 2011

% Schools with:	2010	2011	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V		Std I-VII/VIII	
No computer	92.3	95.2	85.8	84.5
Computers but no children using them on day of visit	2.1	2.2	5.8	4.7
Computers & children using them on day of visit	5.5	2.6	8.4	10.9
Total	100	100	100	100

Table 13: Multigrade classes 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

% Schools with	2007	2009	2010	2011	2007	2009	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V				Std I-VII/VIII			
Std II children sitting with one or more other classes	54.4	66.3	62.9	63.6	50.5	59.9	55.6	48.8
Std IV children sitting with one or more other classes	46.9	58.6	53.9	58.7	37.1	52.5	48.7	44.1

School funds and activities (PAISA)

Table 14: % Schools who report receiving SSA grants - Full financial year

SSA school grants	2008-2009				2009-2010				2010-2011			
	No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools		
		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know
Maintenance grant	604	86.8	6.5	6.8	601	91.4	2.7	6.0	631	92.4	4.0	3.7
Development grant	586	77.5	15.2	7.3	589	87.8	5.6	6.6	623	88.4	7.5	4.0
TLM grant	600	89.3	5.7	5.0	595	92.1	3.7	4.2	623	91.0	5.8	3.2

Table 15: % Schools who report receiving SSA grants - Half financial year

SSA school grants	April 2009 to October 2009				April 2010 to October 2010				April 2011 to October 2011			
	No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools		
		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know
Maintenance grant	466	18.7	74.0	7.3	576	62.2	21.7	16.2	606	64.9	26.6	8.6
Development grant	455	15.4	76.7	7.9	552	58.2	26.3	15.6	598	62.7	28.3	9.0
TLM grant	454	18.7	74.5	6.8	545	54.3	31.0	14.7	600	58.3	33.0	8.7

Table 16: % Schools carrying out different activities since April 2011

Type of Activity		% schools		
		Yes	No	Don't know
Const.	New Classroom	23.6	73.9	2.5
Repairs	Repair of building (roof, floor, wall etc.)	37.9	59.3	2.8
	Repair of doors & windows	44.8	51.9	3.3
	Repair of boundary wall	15.4	81.0	3.6
	Repair of drinking water facility	41.1	55.8	3.2
	Repair of toilet	37.7	58.8	3.5
Painting & White Wash	White wash/plastering	61.8	36.0	2.2
	Painting Blackboard/Display Board/Painting on wall	73.9	23.2	2.9
	Painting of doors & walls	39.8	57.2	3.0
Purchase	Purchase of furniture (cupboard etc.)	43.0	53.7	3.3
	Purchase of electrical fittings	72.3	24.7	3.1
	Purchase of chalk, duster, register etc.	93.8	4.0	2.2
	Purchase of sitting Mats/Tat Patti	40.3	56.4	3.3
	Purchase of charts, globes & other teaching material	87.5	10.4	2.0
Other	Expenditure on school events	69.2	26.4	4.4
	Payment of bills (electricity, water, cleaning etc.)	72.3	24.9	2.8

The PAISA section of ASER tracks receipt and spending of Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) grants at the school level. This information is collected from schools visited during the survey. This page reports proportion of schools receiving the grants and carrying out specified activities in the schools. More detailed analysis of the PAISA data will be available in the PAISA 2011 report which will be released in March 2012.[1]

EVERY RURAL GOVERNMENT PRIMARY SCHOOL IS ENTITLED TO EACH OF THESE SSA GRANTS EVERY YEAR.

How much goes to each school	For what purposes
SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT GRANT / SCHOOL GRANT	
Rs.5000 per year per primary school	This grant can be used for buying school equipment such as blackboard, sitting mats etc. Also for buying chalk, duster, registers and other office equipment.
Rs.7000 per year per upper primary school	
Rs 5000 + Rs 7000 = Rs 12000 if the school is Std I-VII/VIII.	The grant amount varies by type of school: whether it is a primary or upper primary school.
Note: Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same premises.	
SCHOOL MAINTENANCE GRANT	
Rs.5000 - Rs 7500 per school per year if the school has upto 3 classrooms.	This grant can be used for maintenance of school building, including whitewashing; beautification; and repair of toilets, hand pump, boundary wall, playground etc. The grant amount depends on number of classrooms (excluding Headmaster room and office room)
Rs 7500 - Rs.10000 per year if the school has more than 3 classrooms.	
Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same building.	
TLM GRANT	
Rs.500 per teacher per year in primary and upper primary schools.	This grant can be used by teachers to buy teaching aids, such as charts, globes, posters, models etc.

[1] For more information see www.accountabilityinitiative.in

Andhra Pradesh RURAL

Right to Education indicators

Table 17: Schools by total enrollment 2010 and 2011

School enrollment	2010		2011	
	No. of schools	% of schools	No. of schools	% of schools
1-60	161	25.6	186	29.3
61-90	122	19.4	131	20.7
91-120	115	18.3	106	16.7
121-150	97	15.5	91	14.4
151-200	77	12.3	68	10.7
> 200	56	8.9	52	8.2
TOTAL	628	100.0	634	100.0

Table 18: RTE norms: Pupil-teacher ratio 2010 and 2011

School enrollment	RTE Teacher Norms	2010	2011
		% Schools that do not meet PTR norms	
1-60	2	53.2	59.2
61-90	3	43.0	48.8
91-120	4	32.1	35.0
121-150	5	40.4	41.6
151-200	5 + HM	16.9	13.7
> 200	see note	24.1	36.0
TOTAL		38.3	43.6

Note : For schools with enrollment above 200 children the PTR shall not exceed 40 excluding the Head Teacher

Table 19: Schools by number of teachers 2010 and 2011

Number of teachers	2010		2011	
	No. of schools	% of schools	No. of schools	% of schools
1	82	14.2	97	16.8
2	88	15.3	97	16.8
3	65	11.3	88	15.2
4	89	15.4	83	14.3
5	88	15.3	84	14.5
6	63	10.9	49	8.5
>=7	102	17.7	81	14.0
TOTAL	577	100.0	579	100.0

Table 20: RTE norms: Teacher - classroom ratio 2010 and 2011

RTE norm: At least one classroom per teacher	2010	2011
Number of teachers	% Schools that do not meet classroom to teacher norms	
1	0.0	1.4
2	18.0	11.5
3	34.3	32.1
4	66.7	42.6
5	63.0	49.0
6	76.2	64.3
>=7	73.2	68.1
TOTAL	46.7	33.5

Table 21: % Schools meeting selected RTE norms on facilities 2010 & 2011

% of schools with		2010	2011
Building	Office/Store/Office cum store	64.7	69.9
	Playground	70.3	68.6
	Boundary Wall	52.7	49.2
Drinking Water	No facility for drinking water	22.8	23.1
	Facility but no drinking water available	12.4	16.2
	Drinking water available	64.8	60.8
Toilet	No toilet facility	23.4	24.6
	Facility but toilet not useable	38.1	42.0
	Toilet useable	38.6	33.4
Girls Toilet	% Schools with no separate provisions for girls toilets	53.1	39.9
	Of schools with separate girls toilets, % schools where		
	Toilet locked	9.2	10.2
	Toilet not useable	12.3	21.8
	Toilet useable	25.4	28.1
TLM	Teaching learning material in Std 2	90.2	88.3
	Teaching learning material in Std 4	87.6	87.2
Library	No library	8.0	5.4
	Library but no books being used by children on day of visit	14.4	20.8
	Library being used by children on day of visit	77.6	73.9
MDM	Kitchen shed for cooking midday meal	66.9	62.8
	Midday meal served in school on the day of visit	99.1	99.1

Note: School observations for ASER 2011 looked at TLM for Std II and Std IV only.

As part of ASER 2010 and 2011, in each sampled village, one government school with primary sections was visited on the day of the survey. During this school visit, RTE indicators were observed and are reported here.

Extracts from the Schedule of The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act 2009 Norms and standards for a School (Sections 19 and 25)

Number of teachers in Std 1-5:

Admitted children	No. of teachers
<= 60	2
61-90	3
91-120	4
121-200	5
> 150	5 + 1 Headteacher
> 200	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (excluding Headteacher) shall not exceed 40

School facilities:
All weather building with:

- At least one classroom for every teacher
- Office cum store cum headteacher's room
- Separate toilets for boys and girls
- Safe and adequate drinking water facility to all children
- A kitchen where mid-day meal is cooked in the school
- Playground
- Arrangements for securing the school building by boundary wall or fencing.

Teaching learning equipment
shall be provided to each class as required.

Library
There shall be a library in each school providing newspaper, magazines and books on all subjects, including story-books.



Arunachal Pradesh RURAL

Annual Status of Education Report
ASER 2011 RURAL
Facilitated by PRATHAM

ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM HOUSEHOLDS. 11 OUT OF 13 DISTRICTS


School enrollment and out of school children

Table 1: % Children in different types of schools 2011

Age group	Govt.	Pvt.	Other	Not in School	Total
Age: 6-14 ALL	78.9	17.0	0.3	3.8	100
Age: 7-16 ALL	79.3	15.3	0.4	5.0	100
Age: 7-10 ALL	78.3	18.2	0.3	3.2	100
Age: 7-10 BOYS	77.9	19.3	0.4	2.4	100
Age: 7-10 GIRLS	79.0	16.7	0.2	4.2	100
Age: 11-14 ALL	81.9	13.6	0.2	4.3	100
Age: 11-14 BOYS	81.3	14.8	0.4	3.5	100
Age: 11-14 GIRLS	82.6	12.1	0.0	5.3	100
Age: 15-16 ALL	77.2	10.3	0.7	11.8	100
Age: 15-16 BOYS	76.2	11.3	0.9	11.6	100
Age: 15-16 GIRLS	78.4	9.0	0.6	12.1	100

Note: 'OTHER' includes children going to madarssa and EGS.
'NOT IN SCHOOL' = dropped out + never enrolled.

Chart 1: Trends over time
% Children out of school by age group and gender 2006-2011



How to read this chart: For example, the proportion of girls (age 11-14) not in school has changed from 8.7% in 2006 to 6.9% in 2007 to 5.6% in 2008 to 5.7% in 2009 to 4% in 2010 to 5.3% in 2011

Chart 2: Trends over time
% Children enrolled in private school by class 2007, 2009 & 2011




Table 2: Sample description
% Children in each class by age 2011

Std.	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	Total
I	34.1	32.4	15.8	8.7	9.0								100
II	10.1	16.0	34.0	18.3	9.5	6.6	5.5						100
III	2.6	9.2	14.8	26.4	20.2	16.9	9.9						100
IV	2.7		6.5	14.2	22.6	23.2	10.4	11.1	9.2				100
V	8.7				10.0	32.4	12.8	16.1	8.2	5.8	5.9		100
VI	6.8					13.5	15.2	27.9	17.4	8.9	5.2	5.1	100
VII	8.1						6.4	23.3	22.5	17.5	13.3	9.1	100
VIII	4.0							12.6	18.4	26.5	22.4	16.1	100


How to read this table: If a child started school in Std I at age 6, she should be age 8 in Std 3. This table shows the age distribution for each class. For example, in Std III, 26.4% children are 8 years old but there are also 14.8% who are 7, 20.2 % who are 9, 16.9% who are 10 years old, etc.

Young children in pre-school and school

Table 3: % Children age 5-6 who are enrolled in different types of pre-school & school 2011

	In balwadi or anganwadi	In LKG/ UKG	In School			Not enrolled anywhere	Total
			Govt	Pvt	Other		
Age 5	7.6	8.3	52.1	21.8	0.3	10.0	100
Age 6	4.0	3.8	66.7	20.8	0.2	4.6	100

Chart 3: Trends over time
Five year olds in pre-school & school 2007, 2009 & 2011



Arunachal Pradesh RURAL

Reading

Table 4: % Children by class and READING level
All schools 2011

Std.	Nothing	Letter	Word	Level 1 (Std 1 Text)	Level 2 (Std 2 Text)	Total
I	17.5	41.4	32.2	6.2	2.7	100
II	6.8	26.4	42.3	15.7	8.8	100
III	3.8	13.0	35.6	27.0	20.6	100
IV	1.1	8.2	20.8	31.9	38.0	100
V	1.6	5.6	11.6	26.0	55.2	100
VI	1.4	3.1	6.7	19.0	69.7	100
VII	0.4	3.8	5.3	15.7	74.8	100
VIII	0.7	2.4	3.9	13.3	79.7	100
Total	4.8	14.9	22.8	20.0	37.5	100

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, 3.8% children cannot even read letters, 13% can read letters but not more, 35.6% can read words but not Std 1 text or higher, 27% can read Std 1 text but not Std 2 level text, and 20.6% can read Std 2 level text. In sum, for each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is 100%.

Reading Tool




Chart 4: Trends over time
% Children in Std III who CANNOT READ Std I LEVEL TEXT
By school type 2008-2011





Chart 5: Trends over time
% Children in Std V who CANNOT READ Std II LEVEL TEXT
By school type 2008-2011



Home language and school language

Table 5: School language and home language

%Children who took the reading test in:	%
English	95.6
Hindi	4.4
Total	100.0

Of the % Children who tested in:	% Children whose home language was:					
	Adi	Mishmi	Monpa	Miri/Mishing	Other *	Total
English	25.0	13.7	6.0	4.4	50.8	100

* 'Other' includes all languages from the list of scheduled and non-scheduled languages except those specified above. Data for home language of children tested in Hindi has not been reported here due to small cell sizes.

Note: In ASER 2011 for every state, reading tools were provided in the main medium of instruction in government schools. Even though English is the primary language of instruction in government schools, children were given the choice of reading either in English or Hindi. For home languages, a list of 122 languages was provided to all survey teams. This included 22 Scheduled languages and 100 Non-Scheduled languages. The data in this table is for children for whom we have information for both school language and home language.

Arunachal Pradesh RURAL

Arithmetic

Table 6: % Children by class and ARITHMETIC level
All schools 2011

Std.	Nothing	Recognize Numbers		Subtract	Divide	Total
		1-9	11-99			
I	14.8	35.7	43.5	4.1	2.0	100
II	5.7	21.0	52.6	16.1	4.7	100
III	4.2	12.7	37.7	35.4	10.0	100
IV	1.8	6.9	18.0	49.1	24.3	100
V	1.1	6.5	12.9	39.3	40.2	100
VI	1.3	2.7	7.7	30.9	57.4	100
VII	1.4	2.4	6.9	24.3	65.0	100
VIII	0.7	1.3	3.5	20.5	73.9	100
Total	4.4	12.8	26.2	27.9	28.7	100

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level of arithmetic achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, 4.2% children cannot even recognize numbers 1-9, 12.7% children can recognize numbers up to 9 but not more, 37.7% can recognize numbers to 99 but cannot do subtraction, 35.4% can do subtraction but not division, and 10% can do division. In sum, for each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is 100%.

Math Tool




Chart 6: Trends over time
% Children in Std III who CANNOT RECOGNISE NUMBERS upto 100. By school type 2008-2011





Chart 7: Trends over time
% Children in Std V who CANNOT DO DIVISION
By school type 2008-2011



Tuition

Table 7: Class-wise % children attending PAID TUITION CLASSES
By school type 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Year	School	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	Total
2007	Govt	7.8	8.2	8.9	11.1	11.9	13.1	10.8	17.9	10.5
	Pvt	37.1	40.5	48.6	54.6	50.1	55.4	34.3	43.3	45.5
2009	Govt	9.4	9.5	11.5	12.1	10.9	12.8	15.4	16.5	11.9
	Pvt	50.3	48.5	50.7	51.7	45.4	49.1	37.1	43.3	48.3
2010	Govt	8.6	8.6	8.4	10.6	10.0	10.0	10.4	8.6	9.3
	Pvt	51.0	26.9	28.5	36.3	34.4	42.1	38.9	25.8	35.0
2011	Govt	7.8	8.1	7.3	10.0	8.8	9.8	9.5	10.7	8.8
	Pvt	30.1	25.8	28.9	21.9	28.0	27.1	27.1	26.3	27.0

Note: In 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011 the ASER survey recorded information about tuition. In all 4 years, the question asked was the following: "Does the child take any paid additional class currently?" Therefore, these numbers do not include any supplemental help in learning that children may have received from parents, siblings or from anyone else who did not require payment.



Arunachal Pradesh RURAL

As part of ASER 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011, in each sampled village, one government school with primary sections was visited on the day of the survey. Information about schools in this report is based on these visits.

School observations

Table 8: Total schools visited 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Type of school	2007	2009	2010	2011
Std I-IV/V: Primary	135	138	152	136
Std I-VII/VIII: Primary + Upper primary	105	138	107	71
Total schools visited	240	276	259	207



Student and teacher attendance

Table 9: Student attendance 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Type of school	2007	2009	2010	2011	2007	2009	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V				Std I-VII/VIII			
% Enrolled children present (average)	80.9	86.6	82.8	77.9	79.7	88.1	82.0	82.5
% Schools with less than 50% enrolled children present (average)	7.0	0.7	5.5	6.7	9.2	1.5	5.1	1.4
% Schools with 75% or more enrolled children present (average)	71.1	89.6	86.3	65.7	73.5	94.0	78.8	74.3

Table 10: Teacher attendance 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Type of school	2007	2009	2010	2011	2007	2009	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V				Std I-VII/VIII			
% Teachers present (average)	91.3	82.7	86.1	76.2	82.3	80.9	84.2	79.4
% Schools with no teachers present (average)	1.0	2.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.6
% Schools with all teachers present (average)	77.0	54.1	57.0	44.0	39.0	30.3	36.7	32.8

Other school information

Table 11: Headteachers 2010 & 2011

% Schools with:	2010	2011	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V		Std I-VII/VIII	
No Headteacher appointed	2.5	0.0	1.5	0.0
Headteacher appointed but not present at time of visit	6.3	16.7	1.5	13.3
Headteacher appointed & present at time of visit	91.3	83.3	97.1	86.7
Total	100	100	100	100

Table 12: Computers 2010 and 2011

% Schools with:	2010	2011	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V		Std I-VII/VIII	
No computer	99.3	96.3	66.4	67.7
Computers but no children using them on day of visit	0.0	3.7	15.4	17.7
Computers & children using them on day of visit	0.7	0.0	18.3	14.5
Total	100	100	100	100

Table 13: Multigrade classes 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

% Schools with	2007	2009	2010	2011	2007	2009	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V				Std I-VII/VIII			
Std II children sitting with one or more other classes	40.0	54.1	35.4	27.1	32.0	44.7	23.7	18.5
Std IV children sitting with one or more other classes	41.5	46.1	28.6	24.8	23.7	38.5	23.9	21.9

School funds and activities (PAISA)

Table 14: % Schools who report receiving SSA grants - Full financial year

SSA school grants	2008-2009				2009-2010				2010-2011			
	No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools		
		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know
Maintenance grant	256	55.1	32.4	12.5	225	80.4	8.0	11.6	199	63.8	17.6	18.6
Development grant	253	49.8	36.0	14.2	215	67.0	12.6	20.5	194	60.3	18.6	21.1
TLM grant	255	69.0	20.0	11.0	223	82.5	11.2	6.3	194	65.5	18.0	16.5

Table 15: % Schools who report receiving SSA grants - Half financial year

SSA school grants	April 2009 to October 2009				April 2010 to October 2010				April 2011 to October 2011			
	No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools		
		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know
Maintenance grant	226	34.5	41.2	24.3	185	30.8	49.7	19.5	188	34.0	42.0	23.9
Development grant	222	30.2	42.8	27.0	184	29.9	50.0	20.1	185	30.3	44.3	25.4
TLM grant	218	46.8	31.7	21.6	184	31.0	50.0	19.0	183	27.9	48.6	23.5



The PAISA section of ASER tracks receipt and spending of Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) grants at the school level. This information is collected from schools visited during the survey. This page reports proportion of schools receiving the grants and carrying out specified activities in the schools. More detailed analysis of the PAISA data will be available in the PAISA 2011 report which will be released in March 2012.[1]

EVERY RURAL GOVERNMENT PRIMARY SCHOOL IS ENTITLED TO EACH OF THESE SSA GRANTS EVERY YEAR.

How much goes to each school	For what purposes
SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT GRANT / SCHOOL GRANT	
Rs.5000 per year per primary school	This grant can be used for buying school equipment such as blackboard, sitting mats etc. Also for buying chalk, duster, registers and other office equipment.
Rs.7000 per year per upper primary school	
Rs 5000 + Rs 7000 = Rs 12000 if the school is Std I-VII/VIII.	The grant amount varies by type of school: whether it is a primary or upper primary school.
Note: Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same premises.	
SCHOOL MAINTENANCE GRANT	
Rs.5000 - Rs 7500 per school per year if the school has upto 3 classrooms.	This grant can be used for maintenance of school building, including whitewashing; beautification; and repair of toilets, hand pump, boundary wall, playground etc. The grant amount depends on number of classrooms (excluding Headmaster room and office room)
Rs 7500 - Rs.10000 per year if the school has more than 3 classrooms.	
Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same building.	
TLM GRANT	
Rs.500 per teacher per year in primary and upper primary schools.	This grant can be used by teachers to buy teaching aids, such as charts, globes, posters, models etc.

[1] For more information see www.accountabilityinitiative.in

Arunachal Pradesh RURAL

Right to Education indicators

As part of ASER 2010 and 2011, in each sampled village, one government school with primary sections was visited on the day of the survey. During this school visit, RTE indicators were observed and are reported here.

Table 17: Schools by total enrollment 2010 and 2011

School enrollment	2010		2011	
	No. of schools	% of schools	No. of schools	% of schools
1-60	83	33.9	66	32.4
61-90	48	19.6	41	20.1
91-120	27	11.0	36	17.7
121-150	20	8.2	20	9.8
151-200	32	13.1	17	8.3
> 200	35	14.3	24	11.8
TOTAL	245	100.0	204	100.0

Table 18: RTE norms: Pupil-teacher ratio 2010 and 2011

School enrollment	RTE Teacher Norms	2010	2011
		% Schools that do not meet PTR norms	
1-60	2	18.5	13.7
61-90	3	23.8	33.3
91-120	4	23.1	23.5
121-150	5	20.0	50.0
151-200	5 + HM	11.5	37.5
> 200	see note	42.9	52.6
TOTAL		22.0	29.6

Note : For schools with enrollment above 200 children the PTR shall not exceed 40 excluding the Head Teacher

Table 19: Schools by number of teachers 2010 and 2011

Number of teachers	2010		2011	
	No. of schools	% of schools	No. of schools	% of schools
1	15	6.9	11	6.4
2	29	13.4	34	19.9
3	24	11.1	27	15.8
4	29	13.4	22	12.9
5	24	11.1	12	7.0
6	18	8.3	4	2.3
>=7	78	35.9	61	35.7
TOTAL	217	100.0	171	100.0

Table 20: RTE norms: Teacher - classroom ratio 2010 and 2011

RTE norm: At least one classroom per teacher	2010	2011
Number of teachers	% Schools that do not meet classroom to teacher norms	
1	0.0	0.0
2	0.0	9.1
3	0.0	25.0
4	0.0	0.0
5	50.0	0.0
6	71.4	0.0
>=7	33.3	56.3
TOTAL	20.3	29.3

Extracts from the Schedule of The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act 2009 Norms and standards for a School (Sections 19 and 25)

Number of teachers in Std 1-5:

Admitted children	No. of teachers
<= 60	2
61-90	3
91-120	4
121-200	5
> 150	5 + 1 Headteacher
> 200	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (excluding Headteacher) shall not exceed 40

School facilities:
All weather building with:

- At least one classroom for every teacher
- Office cum store cum headteacher's room
- Separate toilets for boys and girls
- Safe and adequate drinking water facility to all children
- A kitchen where mid-day meal is cooked in the school
- Playground
- Arrangements for securing the school building by boundary wall or fencing.

Teaching learning equipment
shall be provided to each class as required.

Library
There shall be a library in each school providing newspaper, magazines and books on all subjects, including story-books.

Table 21: % Schools meeting selected RTE norms on facilities 2010 & 2011

% of schools with		2010	2011
Building	Office/Store/Office cum store	77.0	78.3
	Playground	59.2	67.3
	Boundary Wall	25.1	36.7
Drinking Water	No facility for drinking water	36.9	30.4
	Facility but no drinking water available	9.9	9.0
	Drinking water available	53.2	60.7
Toilet	No toilet facility	20.8	30.8
	Facility but toilet not useable	53.9	39.0
	Toilet useable	25.3	30.3
Girls Toilet	% Schools with no separate provisions for girls toilets	60.4	51.2
	Of schools with separate girls toilets, % schools where		
	Toilet locked	11.3	17.9
	Toilet not useable	16.2	8.9
	Toilet useable	12.2	22.0
TLM	Teaching learning material in Std 2	39.4	52.1
	Teaching learning material in Std 4	34.4	48.8
Library	No library	87.0	80.3
	Library but no books being used by children on day of visit	6.7	10.6
	Library being used by children on day of visit	6.3	9.1
MDM	Kitchen shed for cooking midday meal	64.0	63.7
	Midday meal served in school on the day of visit	47.2	47.5

Note: School observations for ASER 2011 looked at TLM for Std II and Std IV only.



Assam RURAL

Annual Status of Education Report
असर ASER 2011 RURAL
Facilitated by PRATHAM

ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM HOUSEHOLDS. 22 OUT OF 23 DISTRICTS


School enrollment and out of school children

Table 1: % Children in different types of schools 2011

Age group	Govt.	Pvt.	Other	Not in School	Total
Age: 6-14 ALL	77.8	14.5	3.5	4.2	100
Age: 7-16 ALL	75.4	14.4	3.5	6.7	100
Age: 7-10 ALL	80.1	14.8	3.0	2.2	100
Age: 7-10 BOYS	78.7	15.7	2.9	2.6	100
Age: 7-10 GIRLS	81.6	13.7	3.1	1.6	100
Age: 11-14 ALL	75.0	13.8	4.1	7.1	100
Age: 11-14 BOYS	73.2	14.3	3.9	8.6	100
Age: 11-14 GIRLS	76.9	13.4	4.3	5.5	100
Age: 15-16 ALL	62.0	14.9	3.4	19.6	100
Age: 15-16 BOYS	60.3	13.5	3.1	23.1	100
Age: 15-16 GIRLS	63.9	16.5	3.9	15.7	100

Note: 'OTHER' includes children going to madarssa and EGS.
'NOT IN SCHOOL' = dropped out + never enrolled.

Chart 1: Trends over time
% Children out of school by age group and gender 2006-2011



How to read this chart: For example, the proportion of girls (age 11-14) not in school has changed from 5% in 2006 to 9.9% in 2007 to 8.3% in 2008 to 6.4% in 2009 to 7.4% in 2010 to 5.5% in 2011

Chart 2: Trends over time
% Children enrolled in private school by class 2007, 2009 & 2011




Table 2: Sample description
% Children in each class by age 2011

Std.	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	Total
I	26.1	40.6	21.2	7.6	4.4								100
II	3.8	14.0	39.2	29.7	7.4	5.9							100
III	3.2		14.1	39.2	28.2	9.9	5.4						100
IV	3.3			14.8	30.1	36.5	7.5	7.8					100
V	5.6			7.8	39.7	28.1	12.0	6.7					100
VI	3.9				11.6	27.7	39.3	11.4	6.1				100
VII	4.1					7.2	36.5	32.3	13.2	6.6			100
VIII	3.6							13.4	31.8	37.4	9.8	4.0	100


How to read this table: If a child started school in Std I at age 6, she should be age 8 in Std 3. This table shows the age distribution for each class. For example, in Std III, 39.2% children are 8 years old but there are also 14.1% who are 7, 28.2% who are 9, 9.9% who are 10 years old, etc.

Young children in pre-school and school

Table 3: % Children age 5-6 who are enrolled in different types of pre-school & school 2011

	In balwadi or anganwadi	In LKG/ UKG	In School			Not enrolled anywhere	Total
			Govt	Pvt	Other		
Age 5	35.6	2.9	45.1	12.5	1.4	2.6	100
Age 6	6.5	2.5	70.9	14.8	3.4	2.0	100

Chart 3: Trends over time
Five year olds in pre-school & school 2007, 2009 & 2011




Reading

Table 4: % Children by class and READING level
All schools 2011

Std.	Nothing	Letter	Word	Level 1 (Std 1 Text)	Level 2 (Std 2 Text)	Total
I	36.2	40.0	17.3	4.2	2.3	100
II	16.0	34.8	30.3	13.2	5.8	100
III	8.5	22.2	33.7	20.6	14.9	100
IV	4.3	15.0	28.6	26.7	25.4	100
V	3.7	12.6	20.8	26.7	36.2	100
VI	2.6	7.0	15.9	25.4	49.2	100
VII	1.9	4.2	12.7	23.0	58.1	100
VIII	2.0	2.8	8.0	18.2	69.0	100
Total	11.0	19.4	21.7	19.1	28.9	100

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, 8.5% children cannot even read letters, 22.2% can read letters but not more, 33.7% can read words but not Std 1 text or higher, 20.6% can read Std 1 text but not Std 2 level text, and 14.9% can read Std 2 level text. In sum, for each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is 100%.

Reading Tool



Note: This tool was also available in Bodo, Bangla, English and Hindi.

Chart 4: Trends over time
% Children in Std III who CANNOT READ Std I LEVEL TEXT
By school type 2008-2011





Chart 5: Trends over time
% Children in Std V who CANNOT READ Std II LEVEL TEXT
By school type 2008-2011



Home language and school language

Table 5: School language and home language

%Children who took the reading test in:**	%	Of the % Children who tested in:**	% Children whose home language was:					
			Assamese	Bengali	Bodo	Karbi/Mikir	Other *	Total
Assamese	82.9	Assamese	44.5	17.2	2.5	3.1	32.8	100
Bengali	14.2	Bengali	1.1	89.7	5.7	0.2	3.2	100
Hindi	1.6							
English	1.3							
Total	100.0							

* 'Other' includes all languages from the list of scheduled and non-scheduled languages except those specified above. Data for home language of children tested in Hindi and English has not been reported here due to small cell sizes.

** Data in this table does not include the following districts - Bongaigaon, Darrang, Kokrajhar and Nalbari. The data for these four districts is being processed.

Note: In ASER 2011 for every state, reading tools were provided in the main medium of instruction of government schools. In Assam, children were given the choice of reading in Assamese, Bengali, Hindi, English or Bodo. Figures for Bodo have not been included as they are currently being processed. For home languages, a list of 122 languages was provided to all survey teams. This included 22 Scheduled languages and 100 Non-Scheduled languages. The data in this table is for children for whom we have information for both school language and home language.

Arithmetic

Table 6: % Children by class and ARITHMETIC level
All schools 2011

Std.	Nothing	Recognize Numbers		Subtract	Divide	Total
		1-9	11-99			
I	32.9	48.9	14.7	2.9	0.7	100
II	14.5	42.9	33.6	8.0	1.0	100
III	6.6	32.3	37.6	20.4	3.1	100
IV	4.3	21.6	37.1	28.3	8.7	100
V	3.3	17.4	33.0	32.4	14.0	100
VI	2.7	8.6	28.6	36.5	23.7	100
VII	2.2	7.0	22.3	37.6	31.0	100
VIII	1.9	4.4	18.7	36.2	38.8	100
Total	9.9	25.4	28.4	23.4	12.9	100

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level of arithmetic achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, 6.6% children cannot even recognize numbers 1-9, 32.3% children can recognize numbers up to 9 but not more, 37.6% can recognize numbers to 99 but cannot do subtraction, 20.4% can do subtraction but not division, and 3.1% can do division. In sum, for each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is 100%.

Math Tool




Chart 6: Trends over time
% Children in Std III who CANNOT RECOGNISE NUMBERS upto 100. By school type 2008-2011





Chart 7: Trends over time
% Children in Std V who CANNOT DO DIVISION
By school type 2008-2011



Tuition

Table 7: Class-wise % children attending PAID TUITION CLASSES
By school type 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Year	School	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	Total
2007	Govt	7.8	11.4	15.5	17.2	20.6	26.0	28.2	33.7	18.2
	Pvt	16.3	30.0	32.2	31.0	24.0	24.4	29.3	38.7	27.3
2009	Govt	11.0	12.9	13.8	19.0	20.7	23.0	21.6	29.4	18.0
	Pvt	24.2	29.0	31.2	40.5	30.7	27.8	30.3	27.9	29.6
2010	Govt	8.0	9.2	12.6	14.8	17.8	18.5	22.2	26.5	15.2
	Pvt	22.6	30.7	24.8	35.1	28.7	28.2	27.7	30.4	28.2
2011	Govt	6.8	12.5	12.6	15.2	14.7	18.7	21.8	24.3	15.0
	Pvt	24.4	29.5	30.2	31.5	34.3	27.9	33.3	36.9	30.6

Note: In 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011 the ASER survey recorded information about tuition. In all 4 years, the question asked was the following: "Does the child take any paid additional class currently?" Therefore, these numbers do not include any supplemental help in learning that children may have received from parents, siblings or from anyone else who did not require payment.



Assam RURAL

Annual Status of Education Report
असर ASER 2011 RURAL
Facilitated by PRATHAM

As part of ASER 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011, in each sampled village, one government school with primary sections was visited on the day of the survey. Information about schools in this report is based on these visits.

School observations

Table 8: Total schools visited 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Type of school	2007	2009	2010	2011
Std I-IV/V: Primary	513	527	503	483
Std I-VII/VIII: Primary + Upper primary	35	26	16	27
Total schools visited	548	553	519	510



Student and teacher attendance

Table 9: Student attendance 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Type of school	2007	2009	2010	2011	2007	2009	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V				Std I-VII/VIII			
% Enrolled children present (average)	71.2	70.8	69.0	71.1	72.6	65.3	69.6	69.4
% Schools with less than 50% enrolled children present (average)	13.8	12.4	15.3	11.8	8.8	16.0	12.5	7.4
% Schools with 75% or more enrolled children present (average)	48.1	49.3	45.6	48.1	47.1	36.0	31.3	33.3

Table 10: Teacher attendance 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Type of school	2007	2009	2010	2011	2007	2009	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V				Std I-VII/VIII			
% Teachers present (average)	88.3	88.1	90.8	92.8	85.4	81.6	67.7	84.6
% Schools with no teachers present (average)	0.6	1.1	0.2	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.2
% Schools with all teachers present (average)	70.5	70.6	74.4	79.0	53.9	36.4	20.0	58.3

Other school information

Table 11: Headteachers 2010 & 2011

% Schools with:	2010	2011	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V		Std I-VII/VIII	
No Headteacher appointed	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Headteacher appointed but not present at time of visit	5.9	3.7	12.5	14.3
Headteacher appointed & present at time of visit	94.1	96.3	87.5	85.7
Total	100	100	100	100

Table 12: Computers 2010 and 2011

% Schools with:	2010	2011	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V		Std I-VII/VIII	
No computer	99.0	98.5	75.0	80.8
Computers but no children using them on day of visit	1.0	0.4	18.8	7.7
Computers & children using them on day of visit	0.0	1.1	6.3	11.5
Total	100	100	100	100

Table 13: Multigrade classes 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

% Schools with:	2007	2009	2010	2011	2007	2009	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V				Std I-VII/VIII			
Std II children sitting with one or more other classes	39.0	55.9	44.1	53.4	36.7	52.0	33.3	41.7
Std IV children sitting with one or more other classes	33.3	49.0	41.5	50.6	37.5	43.5	26.7	38.1

School funds and activities (PAISA)

Table 14: % Schools who report receiving SSA grants - Full financial year

SSA school grants	2008-2009				2009-2010				2010-2011			
	No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools		
		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know
Maintenance grant	489	82.0	14.1	3.9	487	87.7	5.8	6.6	484	78.7	14.1	7.2
Development grant	469	68.4	27.1	4.5	442	81.9	10.6	7.5	474	70.9	21.3	7.8
TLM grant	504	89.3	8.1	2.6	466	90.3	4.5	5.2	484	87.0	8.5	4.6

Table 15: % Schools who report receiving SSA grants - Half financial year

SSA school grants	April 2009 to October 2009				April 2010 to October 2010				April 2011 to October 2011			
	No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools		
		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know
Maintenance grant	429	74.4	21.5	4.2	413	46.0	40.0	14.0	452	42.0	46.5	11.5
Development grant	404	63.1	31.9	5.0	367	43.9	42.8	13.4	440	40.0	47.3	12.7
TLM grant	438	82.2	15.3	2.5	379	50.1	39.3	10.6	449	55.0	36.3	8.7

Table 16: % Schools carrying out different activities since April 2011

Type of Activity		% schools		
		Yes	No	Don't know
Const.	New Classroom	19.0	74.9	6.1
Repairs	Repair of building (roof, floor, wall etc.)	38.4	58.1	3.6
	Repair of doors & windows	39.0	56.4	4.6
	Repair of boundary wall	18.5	77.4	4.1
	Repair of drinking water facility	32.8	63.7	3.5
	Repair of toilet	27.5	68.6	4.0
Painting & White Wash	White wash/plastering	36.2	59.1	4.7
	Painting Blackboard/Display Board/Painting on wall	41.6	54.3	4.1
	Painting of doors & walls	32.1	64.2	3.7
Purchase	Purchase of furniture (cupboard etc.)	45.1	50.2	4.6
	Purchase of electrical fittings	15.0	80.1	4.9
	Purchase of chalk, duster, register etc.	82.6	14.4	3.0
	Purchase of sitting Mats/Tat Patti	30.3	65.6	4.1
	Purchase of charts, globes & other teaching material	61.7	35.1	3.2
Other	Expenditure on school events	39.2	55.9	5.0
	Payment of bills (electricity, water, cleaning etc.)	16.2	79.3	4.5

The PAISA section of ASER tracks receipt and spending of Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) grants at the school level. This information is collected from schools visited during the survey. This page reports proportion of schools receiving the grants and carrying out specified activities in the schools. More detailed analysis of the PAISA data will be available in the PAISA 2011 report which will be released in March 2012.[1]

EVERY RURAL GOVERNMENT PRIMARY SCHOOL IS ENTITLED TO EACH OF THESE SSA GRANTS EVERY YEAR.

How much goes to each school	For what purposes
SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT GRANT / SCHOOL GRANT	
Rs.5000 per year per primary school	This grant can be used for buying school equipment such as blackboard, sitting mats etc. Also for buying chalk, duster, registers and other office equipment.
Rs.7000 per year per upper primary school	
Rs 5000 + Rs 7000 = Rs 12000 if the school is Std I-VII/VIII.	The grant amount varies by type of school: whether it is a primary or upper primary school.
Note: Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same premises.	
SCHOOL MAINTENANCE GRANT	
Rs.5000 - Rs 7500 per school per year if the school has upto 3 classrooms.	This grant can be used for maintenance of school building, including whitewashing; beautification; and repair of toilets, hand pump, boundary wall, playground etc. The grant amount depends on number of classrooms (excluding Headmaster room and office room)
Rs 7500 - Rs.10000 per year if the school has more than 3 classrooms.	
Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same building.	
TLM GRANT	
Rs.500 per teacher per year in primary and upper primary schools.	This grant can be used by teachers to buy teaching aids, such as charts, globes, posters, models etc.

[1] For more information see www.accountabilityinitiative.in

Right to Education indicators

As part of ASER 2010 and 2011, in each sampled village, one government school with primary sections was visited on the day of the survey. During this school visit, RTE indicators were observed and are reported here.

Table 17: Schools by total enrollment 2010 and 2011

School enrollment	2010		2011	
	No. of schools	% of schools	No. of schools	% of schools
1-60	210	40.9	160	31.9
61-90	91	17.7	94	18.7
91-120	66	12.8	79	15.7
121-150	50	9.7	45	9.0
151-200	52	10.1	49	9.8
> 200	45	8.8	75	14.9
TOTAL	514	100.0	502	100.0

Table 18: RTE norms: Pupil-teacher ratio 2010 and 2011

School enrollment	RTE Teacher Norms	2010	2011
		% Schools that do not meet PTR norms	
1-60	2	44.4	38.2
61-90	3	68.1	70.2
91-120	4	84.0	90.9
121-150	5	82.5	90.6
151-200	5 + HM	90.9	85.3
> 200	see note	90.9	90.5
TOTAL		66.4	71.0

Note : For schools with enrollment above 200 children the PTR shall not exceed 40 excluding the Head Teacher

Table 19: Schools by number of teachers 2010 and 2011

Number of teachers	2010		2011	
	No. of schools	% of schools	No. of schools	% of schools
1	137	35.9	119	33.9
2	98	25.7	99	28.2
3	64	16.8	63	18.0
4	33	8.6	30	8.6
5	15	3.9	10	2.9
6	3	0.8	7	2.0
>=7	32	8.4	23	6.6
TOTAL	382	100.0	351	100.0

Table 20: RTE norms: Teacher - classroom ratio 2010 and 2011

RTE norm: At least one classroom per teacher	2010	2011
Number of teachers	% Schools that do not meet classroom to teacher norms	
1	0.0	0.0
2	19.1	25.9
3	42.9	53.7
4	75.0	83.3
5	91.7	60.0
6	100.0	66.7
>=7	83.3	88.2
TOTAL	32.3	35.2

Extracts from the Schedule of The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act 2009 Norms and standards for a School (Sections 19 and 25)

Number of teachers in Std 1-5:

Admitted children	No. of teachers
<= 60	2
61-90	3
91-120	4
121-200	5
> 150	5 + 1 Headteacher
> 200	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (excluding Headteacher) shall not exceed 40

School facilities:
All weather building with:

- At least one classroom for every teacher
- Office cum store cum headteacher's room
- Separate toilets for boys and girls
- Safe and adequate drinking water facility to all children
- A kitchen where mid-day meal is cooked in the school
- Playground
- Arrangements for securing the school building by boundary wall or fencing.

Teaching learning equipment
shall be provided to each class as required.

Library
There shall be a library in each school providing newspaper, magazines and books on all subjects, including story-books.

Table 21: % Schools meeting selected RTE norms on facilities 2010 & 2011

% of schools with		2010	2011
Building	Office/Store/Office cum store	57.3	54.1
	Playground	61.5	56.5
	Boundary Wall	19.3	23.3
Drinking Water	No facility for drinking water	23.2	23.8
	Facility but no drinking water available	16.0	11.7
	Drinking water available	60.9	64.6
Toilet	No toilet facility	19.1	13.1
	Facility but toilet not useable	47.8	49.2
	Toilet useable	33.1	37.8
Girls Toilet	% Schools with no separate provisions for girls toilets	52.2	34.3
	Of schools with separate girls toilets, % schools where		
	Toilet locked	18.5	19.3
	Toilet not useable	15.6	19.0
	Toilet useable	13.7	27.4
TLM	Teaching learning material in Std 2	71.4	71.1
	Teaching learning material in Std 4	67.1	72.2
Library	No library	79.2	71.9
	Library but no books being used by children on day of visit	10.3	14.5
	Library being used by children on day of visit	10.5	13.6
MDM	Kitchen shed for cooking midday meal	80.0	81.5
	Midday meal served in school on the day of visit	66.6	59.6

Note: School observations for ASER 2011 looked at TLM for Std II and Std IV only.



Bihar RURAL

Annual Status of Education Report
असर ASER 2011 RURAL
Facilitated by PRATHAM

ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM HOUSEHOLDS. 37 OUT OF 37 DISTRICTS


School enrollment and out of school children

Table 1: % Children in different types of schools 2011

Age group	Govt.	Pvt.	Other	Not in School	Total
Age: 6-14 ALL	90.1	5.5	1.5	3.0	100
Age: 7-16 ALL	89.4	5.1	1.3	4.1	100
Age: 7-10 ALL	90.4	5.9	1.6	2.1	100
Age: 7-10 BOYS	89.1	7.4	1.5	2.0	100
Age: 7-10 GIRLS	92.0	4.1	1.6	2.3	100
Age: 11-14 ALL	90.3	4.7	1.1	3.9	100
Age: 11-14 BOYS	89.6	5.9	1.1	3.4	100
Age: 11-14 GIRLS	91.2	3.3	1.0	4.5	100
Age: 15-16 ALL	83.1	3.4	1.4	12.2	100
Age: 15-16 BOYS	82.8	3.7	1.3	12.2	100
Age: 15-16 GIRLS	83.7	2.9	1.5	11.9	100

Note: 'OTHER' includes children going to madarssa and EGS.
'NOT IN SCHOOL' = dropped out + never enrolled.

Chart 1: Trends over time
% Children out of school by age group and gender 2006-2011



How to read this chart: For example, the proportion of girls (age 11-14) not in school has changed from 17.6% in 2006 to 9.7% in 2007 to 8.8% in 2008 to 6% in 2009 to 4.6% in 2010 to 4.5% in 2011

Chart 2: Trends over time
% Children enrolled in private school by class 2007, 2009 & 2011




Table 2: Sample description
% Children in each class by age 2011

Std.	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	Total
I	23.4	42.0	17.1	10.4	7.0								100
II	5.1	15.3	25.2	33.8	7.0	8.9	4.9						100
III	4.8		9.6	33.7	20.2	20.1	3.4	8.3					100
IV	5.2			14.4	16.5	37.7	8.3	11.7	6.4				100
V	7.4			6.8	31.5	19.6	21.0	5.8	7.9				100
VI	4.4				14.8	16.5	37.7	13.2	8.3	5.2			100
VII	1.6				6.3	7.2	31.1	25.5	16.4	8.0	4.0		100
VIII	6.5						15.4	23.2	31.5	15.6	7.7		100


How to read this table: If a child started school in Std I at age 6, she should be age 8 in Std 3. This table shows the age distribution for each class. For example, in Std III, 33.7% children are 8 years old but there are also 9.6% who are 7, 20.2% who are 9, 20.1% who are 10 years old, etc.

Young children in pre-school and school

Table 3: % Children age 5-6 who are enrolled in different types of pre-school & school 2011

	In balwadi or anganwadi	In LKG/ UKG	In School			Not enrolled anywhere	Total
			Govt	Pvt	Other		
Age 5	46.3	2.9	40.5	4.8	1.4	4.2	100
Age 6	12.1	2.0	75.5	5.7	2.0	2.7	100

Chart 3: Trends over time
Five year olds in pre-school & school 2007, 2009 & 2011



Reading

Table 4: % Children by class and READING level
All schools 2011

Std.	Nothing	Letter	Word	Level 1 (Std 1 Text)	Level 2 (Std 2 Text)	Total
I	53.9	30.6	9.4	3.1	3.1	100
II	25.9	35.1	23.1	8.5	7.5	100
III	12.9	26.2	29.1	16.5	15.4	100
IV	7.1	17.0	21.1	24.2	30.7	100
V	4.7	10.3	13.9	21.6	49.5	100
VI	2.1	5.9	8.3	16.6	67.0	100
VII	1.6	3.2	4.8	12.4	78.0	100
VIII	1.6	1.8	3.2	9.3	84.2	100
Total	16.4	18.7	15.5	14.0	35.5	100

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, 12.9% children cannot even read letters, 26.2% can read letters but not more, 29.1% can read words but not Std 1 text or higher, 16.5% can read Std 1 text but not Std 2 level text, and 15.4% can read Std 2 level text. In sum, for each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is 100%.

Reading Tool




Chart 4: Trends over time
% Children in Std III who CANNOT READ Std I LEVEL TEXT
By school type 2008-2011





Chart 5: Trends over time
% Children in Std V who CANNOT READ Std II LEVEL TEXT
By school type 2008-2011



Home language and school language

Table 5: School language and home language

% Children whose :	%
Home language is the same as school language	47.0
Home language is different from school language	53.0
Total	100.0

Note : In ASER 2011 for every state, reading tools were provided in the main medium of instruction in government schools. Children and their families were also asked about the language they speak at home. For home languages, a list of 122 languages was provided to all survey teams. This list includes 22 Scheduled languages and 100 Non-Scheduled languages. The data in this table is for children for whom we have information for both school language and home language.



Arithmetic

Table 6: % Children by class and ARITHMETIC level
All schools 2011

Std.	Nothing	Recognize Numbers		Subtract	Divide	Total
		1-9	11-99			
I	51.0	35.0	9.1	3.3	1.6	100
II	23.2	40.5	22.7	9.3	4.4	100
III	11.2	29.5	29.7	20.7	8.9	100
IV	5.5	18.1	26.7	30.6	19.1	100
V	3.7	11.7	17.5	30.2	36.9	100
VI	2.2	6.2	11.3	26.8	53.5	100
VII	1.4	3.5	8.7	21.6	64.8	100
VIII	1.7	2.1	5.6	16.2	74.3	100
Total	14.9	21.0	17.6	19.3	27.3	100

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level of arithmetic achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, 11.2% children cannot even recognize numbers 1-9, 29.5% children can recognize numbers up to 9 but not more, 29.7% can recognize numbers to 99 but cannot do subtraction, 20.7% can do subtraction but not division, and 8.9% can do division. In sum, for each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is 100%.

Math Tool



Chart 6: Trends over time
% Children in Std III who CANNOT RECOGNISE NUMBERS upto 100. By school type 2008-2011





Chart 7: Trends over time
% Children in Std V who CANNOT DO DIVISION
By school type 2008-2011



Tuition

Table 7: Class-wise % children attending PAID TUITION CLASSES
By school type 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Year	School	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	Total
2007	Govt	23.9	31.5	37.9	39.9	42.3	44.2	51.6	54.8	37.7
	Pvt	53.3	56.5	64.1	65.1	66.6	67.2	70.3	65.8	61.6
2009	Govt	32.9	38.5	43.4	47.4	51.2	56.5	55.9	61.0	46.1
	Pvt	53.2	62.9	68.7	65.8	68.5	73.4	73.3	66.4	64.0
2010	Govt	31.8	38.8	42.3	46.9	55.5	55.9	59.8	63.6	47.7
	Pvt	41.5	37.6	62.7	66.5	63.7	66.9	67.7	65.0	54.8
2011	Govt	31.5	38.3	41.8	48.2	50.9	55.4	58.9	63.0	46.7
	Pvt	53.0	60.9	66.7	60.5	66.6	61.9	64.5	63.0	60.8

Note: In 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011 the ASER survey recorded information about tuition. In all 4 years, the question asked was the following: "Does the child take any paid additional class currently?" Therefore, these numbers do not include any supplemental help in learning that children may have received from parents, siblings or from anyone else who did not require payment.



Bihar RURAL

As part of ASER 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011, in each sampled village, one government school with primary sections was visited on the day of the survey. Information about schools in this report is based on these visits.

School observations

Table 8: Total schools visited 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Type of school	2007	2009	2010	2011
Std I-IV/V: Primary	481	353	265	252
Std I-VII/VIII: Primary + Upper primary	491	607	702	770
Total schools visited	972	960	967	1022



Student and teacher attendance

Table 9: Student attendance 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Type of school	2007	2009	2010	2011	2007	2009	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V				Std I-VII/VIII			
% Enrolled children present (average)	59.0	57.0	56.1	50.0	56.6	57.9	55.9	49.1
% Schools with less than 50% enrolled children present (average)	31.1	34.8	34.4	49.0	34.7	29.4	33.6	49.7
% Schools with 75% or more enrolled children present (average)	21.5	16.2	13.8	8.0	18.4	15.9	14.9	8.1

Table 10: Teacher attendance 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Type of school	2007	2009	2010	2011	2007	2009	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V				Std I-VII/VIII			
% Teachers present (average)	85.7	81.7	84.6	85.1	85.8	82.8	80.6	85.2
% Schools with no teachers present (average)	0.7	0.9	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.4	0.0	0.3
% Schools with all teachers present (average)	57.5	49.8	55.0	55.8	47.1	41.3	39.1	44.5

Other school information

Table 11: Headteachers 2010 & 2011

% Schools with:	2010	2011	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V		Std I-VII/VIII	
No Headteacher appointed	14.5	3.9	5.7	1.5
Headteacher appointed but not present at time of visit	9.9	8.7	10.8	10.1
Headteacher appointed & present at time of visit	75.6	87.4	83.5	88.4
Total	100	100	100	100

Table 12: Computers 2010 and 2011

% Schools with:	2010	2011	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V		Std I-VII/VIII	
No computer	96.8	98.0	91.7	93.4
Computers but no children using them on day of visit	1.2	1.6	3.6	5.1
Computers & children using them on day of visit	2.0	0.4	4.7	1.5
Total	100	100	100	100

Table 13: Multigrade classes 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

% Schools with:	2007	2009	2010	2011	2007	2009	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V				Std I-VII/VIII			
Std II children sitting with one or more other classes	70.0	66.7	67.6	72.3	55.9	55.4	53.0	57.3
Std IV children sitting with one or more other classes	65.8	67.0	63.7	67.3	52.2	51.7	43.4	50.5

School funds and activities (PAISA)

Table 14: % Schools who report receiving SSA grants - Full financial year

SSA school grants	2008-2009				2009-2010				2010-2011			
	No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools		
		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know
Maintenance grant	857	71.5	14.4	14.1	686	86.7	5.1	8.2	990	79.2	14.8	6.1
Development grant	842	72.9	13.2	13.9	690	85.9	6.2	7.8	986	82.7	11.6	5.8
TLM grant	863	75.2	13.1	11.7	698	88.7	5.6	5.7	988	85.2	10.8	4.0

Table 15: % Schools who report receiving SSA grants - Half financial year

SSA school grants	April 2009 to October 2009				April 2010 to October 2010				April 2011 to October 2011			
	No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools		
		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know
Maintenance grant	710	43.4	37.5	19.2	634	59.5	28.6	12.0	963	28.4	63.6	8.1
Development grant	692	46.0	35.0	19.1	631	59.6	29.6	10.8	966	29.3	62.7	8.0
TLM grant	695	46.9	35.8	17.3	638	61.0	29.2	9.9	966	32.4	61.2	6.4

Table 16: % Schools carrying out different activities since April 2011

Type of Activity		% schools		
		Yes	No	Don't know
Const.	New Classroom	32.9	63.9	3.2
Repairs	Repair of building (roof, floor, wall etc.)	38.1	58.9	3.0
	Repair of doors & windows	40.9	56.4	2.7
	Repair of boundary wall	18.5	79.3	2.2
	Repair of drinking water facility	58.4	39.7	2.0
	Repair of toilet	31.9	66.2	1.9
Painting & White Wash	White wash/plastering	63.1	34.3	2.6
	Painting Blackboard/Display Board/Painting on wall	59.7	38.0	2.3
	Painting of doors & walls	53.6	44.2	2.2
Purchase	Purchase of furniture (cupboard etc.)	41.5	54.9	3.7
	Purchase of electrical fittings	7.1	90.1	2.8
	Purchase of chalk, duster, register etc.	86.7	11.7	1.7
	Purchase of sitting Mats/Tat Patti	33.1	64.4	2.5
	Purchase of charts, globes & other teaching material	72.8	25.4	1.8
Other	Expenditure on school events	74.6	23.1	2.4
	Payment of bills (electricity, water, cleaning etc.)	15.7	81.0	3.3

The PAISA section of ASER tracks receipt and spending of Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) grants at the school level. This information is collected from schools visited during the survey. This page reports proportion of schools receiving the grants and carrying out specified activities in the schools. More detailed analysis of the PAISA data will be available in the PAISA 2011 report which will be released in March 2012.[1]

EVERY RURAL GOVERNMENT PRIMARY SCHOOL IS ENTITLED TO EACH OF THESE SSA GRANTS EVERY YEAR.

How much goes to each school	For what purposes
SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT GRANT / SCHOOL GRANT	
Rs.5000 per year per primary school	This grant can be used for buying school equipment such as blackboard, sitting mats etc. Also for buying chalk, duster, registers and other office equipment.
Rs.7000 per year per upper primary school	
Rs 5000 + Rs 7000 = Rs 12000 if the school is Std I-VII/VIII.	The grant amount varies by type of school: whether it is a primary or upper primary school.
Note: Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same premises.	
SCHOOL MAINTENANCE GRANT	
Rs.5000 - Rs 7500 per school per year if the school has upto 3 classrooms.	This grant can be used for maintenance of school building, including whitewashing; beautification; and repair of toilets, hand pump, boundary wall, playground etc. The grant amount depends on number of classrooms (excluding Headmaster room and office room)
Rs 7500 - Rs.10000 per year if the school has more than 3 classrooms.	
Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same building.	
TLM GRANT	
Rs.500 per teacher per year in primary and upper primary schools.	This grant can be used by teachers to buy teaching aids, such as charts, globes, posters, models etc.

[1] For more information see www.accountabilityinitiative.in

Right to Education indicators

Table 17: Schools by total enrollment 2010 and 2011

School enrollment	2010		2011	
	No. of schools	% of schools	No. of schools	% of schools
1-60	2	0.2	3	0.3
61-90	4	0.4	6	0.6
91-120	21	2.3	26	2.6
121-150	27	2.9	42	4.2
151-200	77	8.3	71	7.0
> 200	800	85.9	862	85.4
TOTAL	931	100.0	1010	100.0

Table 18: RTE norms: Pupil-teacher ratio 2010 and 2011

School enrollment	RTE Teacher Norms	2010	2011
		% Schools that do not meet PTR norms	
1-60	2	0.0	50.0
61-90	3	0.0	80.0
91-120	4	65.0	82.6
121-150	5	73.9	88.2
151-200	5 + HM	82.7	84.1
> 200	see note	93.4	96.4
TOTAL		91.2	94.7

Note : For schools with enrollment above 200 children the PTR shall not exceed 40 excluding the Head Teacher

Table 19: Schools by number of teachers 2010 and 2011

Number of teachers	2010		2011	
	No. of schools	% of schools	No. of schools	% of schools
1	26	3.1	43	4.5
2	56	6.7	81	8.5
3	71	8.5	95	10.0
4	110	13.2	124	13.1
5	106	12.7	98	10.3
6	77	9.3	96	10.1
>=7	386	46.4	412	43.4
TOTAL	832	100.0	949	100.0

Table 20: RTE norms: Teacher - classroom ratio 2010 and 2011

RTE norm: At least one classroom per teacher	2010	2011
Number of teachers	% Schools that do not meet classroom to teacher norms	
1	5.6	8.3
2	10.3	17.2
3	35.7	34.2
4	55.0	42.6
5	65.4	52.1
6	68.9	67.5
>=7	55.3	52.3
TOTAL	51.8	45.8

Table 21: % Schools meeting selected RTE norms on facilities 2010 & 2011

% of schools with		2010	2011
Building	Office/Store/Office cum store	68.6	66.1
	Playground	48.0	48.9
	Boundary Wall	47.5	47.0
Drinking Water	No facility for drinking water	9.6	6.8
	Facility but no drinking water available	11.7	9.4
	Drinking water available	78.7	83.8
Toilet	No toilet facility	19.3	19.0
	Facility but toilet not useable	47.2	35.3
	Toilet useable	33.6	45.7
Girls Toilet	% Schools with no separate provisions for girls toilets	49.9	37.6
	Of schools with separate girls toilets, % schools where		
	Toilet locked	15.1	8.2
	Toilet not useable	16.9	18.9
	Toilet useable	18.1	35.4
TLM	Teaching learning material in Std 2	70.8	72.1
	Teaching learning material in Std 4	64.1	66.3
Library	No library	47.1	38.9
	Library but no books being used by children on day of visit	24.7	29.3
	Library being used by children on day of visit	28.2	31.8
MDM	Kitchen shed for cooking midday meal	63.6	71.4
	Midday meal served in school on the day of visit	56.4	54.5

Note: School observations for ASER 2011 looked at TLM for Std II and Std IV only.

As part of ASER 2010 and 2011, in each sampled village, one government school with primary sections was visited on the day of the survey. During this school visit, RTE indicators were observed and are reported here.

Extracts from the Schedule of The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act 2009 Norms and standards for a School (Sections 19 and 25)

Number of teachers in Std 1-5:

Admitted children	No. of teachers
<= 60	2
61-90	3
91-120	4
121-200	5
> 150	5 + 1 Headteacher
> 200	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (excluding Headteacher) shall not exceed 40

School facilities:
All weather building with:

- At least one classroom for every teacher
- Office cum store cum headteacher's room
- Separate toilets for boys and girls
- Safe and adequate drinking water facility to all children
- A kitchen where mid-day meal is cooked in the school
- Playground
- Arrangements for securing the school building by boundary wall or fencing.

Teaching learning equipment
shall be provided to each class as required.

Library
There shall be a library in each school providing newspaper, magazines and books on all subjects, including story-books.



Chhattisgarh RURAL

ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM HOUSEHOLDS. 15 OUT OF 16 DISTRICTS


School enrollment and out of school children

Table 1: % Children in different types of schools 2011

Age group	Govt.	Pvt.	Other	Not in School	Total
Age: 6-14 ALL	86.4	11.0	0.2	2.4	100
Age: 7-16 ALL	84.8	10.3	0.2	4.8	100
Age: 7-10 ALL	86.4	12.3	0.2	1.1	100
Age: 7-10 BOYS	86.2	12.8	0.1	0.9	100
Age: 7-10 GIRLS	86.7	11.7	0.3	1.4	100
Age: 11-14 ALL	87.1	8.7	0.2	4.0	100
Age: 11-14 BOYS	87.4	8.6	0.3	3.8	100
Age: 11-14 GIRLS	86.9	8.8	0.1	4.3	100
Age: 15-16 ALL	75.9	9.4	0.1	14.6	100
Age: 15-16 BOYS	75.1	9.6	0.1	15.3	100
Age: 15-16 GIRLS	76.8	9.3	0.2	13.7	100

Note: 'OTHER' includes children going to madarssa and EGS.
'NOT IN SCHOOL' = dropped out + never enrolled.

Chart 1: Trends over time
% Children out of school by age group and gender 2006-2011



How to read this chart: For example, the proportion of girls (age 11-14) not in school has changed from 13.6% in 2006 to 8.5% in 2007 to 8.7% in 2008 to 4.9% in 2009 to 3.2% in 2010 to 4.3% in 2011

Chart 2: Trends over time
% Children enrolled in private school by class 2007, 2009 & 2011




Table 2: Sample description
% Children in each class by age 2011

Std.	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	Total
I	17.4	62.2	16.6	3.8									100
II	2.2	10.0	44.6	36.7	6.4								100
III	2.7		7.8	40.8	40.2	8.6							100
IV	3.1			8.6	33.1	43.8	6.3	5.1					100
V	8.4					34.0	41.4	10.6	5.7				100
VI	1.9					7.5	29.9	45.7	10.2	4.9			100
VII	3.1						6.2	30.1	43.1	12.6	4.9		100
VIII	3.8							8.6	25.7	44.7	13.0	4.2	100


How to read this table: If a child started school in Std I at age 6, she should be age 8 in Std 3. This table shows the age distribution for each class. For example, in Std III, 40.8% children are 8 years old but there are also 7.8% who are 7, 40.2% who are 9 years old, etc.

Young children in pre-school and school

Table 3: % Children age 5-6 who are enrolled in different types of pre-school & school 2011

	In balwadi or anganwadi	In LKG/ UKG	In School			Not enrolled anywhere	Total
			Govt	Pvt	Other		
Age 5	45.1	10.9	30.9	10.8	0.7	1.7	100
Age 6	4.2	3.5	76.2	14.9	0.6	0.7	100

Chart 3: Trends over time
Five year olds in pre-school & school 2007, 2009 & 2011



Chhattisgarh RURAL

Reading

Table 4: % Children by class and READING level
All schools 2011

Std.	Nothing	Letter	Word	Level 1 (Std 1 Text)	Level 2 (Std 2 Text)	Total
I	36.0	49.0	11.1	2.4	1.5	100
II	11.8	46.6	28.7	8.4	4.5	100
III	5.6	27.5	36.9	20.2	9.8	100
IV	2.9	14.5	27.9	29.5	25.2	100
V	2.3	10.1	15.5	28.2	44.0	100
VI	1.6	5.5	9.5	22.1	61.3	100
VII	1.0	5.4	7.5	16.0	70.2	100
VIII	0.7	4.0	3.7	12.4	79.2	100
Total	7.9	20.6	17.9	17.6	36.1	100

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, 5.6% children cannot even read letters, 27.5% can read letters but not more, 36.9% can read words but not Std 1 text or higher, 20.2% can read Std 1 text but not Std 2 level text, and 9.8% can read Std 2 level text. In sum, for each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is 100%.

Reading Tool




Chart 4: Trends over time
% Children in Std III who CANNOT READ Std I LEVEL TEXT
By school type 2008-2011





Chart 5: Trends over time
% Children in Std V who CANNOT READ Std II LEVEL TEXT
By school type 2008-2011



Home language and school language

Table 5: School language and home language

% Children whose :	%
Home language is the same as school language	0.6
Home language is different from school language	99.4
Total	100.0

Note : In ASER 2011 for every state, reading tools were provided in the main medium of instruction in government schools. Children and their families were also asked about the language they speak at home. For home languages, a list of 122 languages was provided to all survey teams. This list includes 22 Scheduled languages and 100 Non-Scheduled languages. The data in this table is for children for whom we have information for both school language and home language.



Arithmetic

Table 6: % Children by class and ARITHMETIC level
All schools 2011

Std.	Nothing	Recognize Numbers		Subtract	Divide	Total
		1-9	11-99			
I	36.9	52.1	7.7	2.2	1.1	100
II	12.7	53.6	27.1	5.6	1.1	100
III	4.3	37.4	38.9	16.6	2.8	100
IV	2.5	20.5	34.1	34.3	8.7	100
V	2.3	13.2	27.6	38.1	18.9	100
VI	0.9	9.8	19.4	35.7	34.3	100
VII	1.3	7.5	20.9	31.5	38.8	100
VIII	0.4	4.8	13.7	31.0	50.1	100
Total	7.8	25.2	23.9	24.3	18.8	100

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level of arithmetic achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, 4.3% children cannot even recognize numbers 1-9, 37.4% children can recognize numbers up to 9 but not more, 38.9% can recognize numbers to 99 but cannot do subtraction, 16.6% can do subtraction but not division, and 2.8% can do division. In sum, for each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is 100%.

Math Tool



Chart 6: Trends over time
% Children in Std III who CANNOT RECOGNISE NUMBERS upto 100. By school type 2008-2011





Chart 7: Trends over time
% Children in Std V who CANNOT DO DIVISION
By school type 2008-2011



Tuition

Table 7: Class-wise % children attending PAID TUITION CLASSES
By school type 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Year	School	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	Total
2007	Govt	1.1	1.2	0.7	1.6	2.1	2.0	2.1	3.8	1.7
	Pvt	7.4	4.8	8.6	5.4	17.1	4.1	9.5	9.0	8.0
2009	Govt	2.8	3.1	3.4	3.6	3.0	2.7	2.6	3.2	3.1
	Pvt	8.3	9.1	12.4	18.9	15.0	10.5	17.4	19.2	12.8
2010	Govt	0.9	1.4	0.9	1.8	1.9	1.8	2.4	2.6	1.7
	Pvt	7.4	11.9	9.8	9.2	9.4	12.5	8.3	11.0	9.9
2011	Govt	0.5	0.4	0.8	1.2	1.9	1.3	1.5	1.5	1.2
	Pvt	7.7	8.2	12.1	2.4	16.3	6.0	5.9	10.5	8.5

Note: In 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011 the ASER survey recorded information about tuition. In all 4 years, the question asked was the following: "Does the child take any paid additional class currently?" Therefore, these numbers do not include any supplemental help in learning that children may have received from parents, siblings or from anyone else who did not require payment.



Chhattisgarh RURAL

Annual Status of Education Report
असर ASER 2011 RURAL
Facilitated by PRATHAM

As part of ASER 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011, in each sampled village, one government school with primary sections was visited on the day of the survey. Information about schools in this report is based on these visits.

School observations

Table 8: Total schools visited 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Type of school	2007	2009	2010	2011
Std I-IV/V: Primary	344	336	301	351
Std I-VII/VIII: Primary + Upper primary	76	25	124	41
Total schools visited	420	361	425	392



Student and teacher attendance

Table 9: Student attendance 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Type of school	2007	2009	2010	2011	2007	2009	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V				Std I-VII/VIII			
% Enrolled children present (average)	72.0	76.5	69.7	73.1	72.5	77.0	72.5	78.1
% Schools with less than 50% enrolled children present (average)	9.1	4.8	12.4	10.4	8.0	8.3	8.9	2.5
% Schools with 75% or more enrolled children present (average)	49.3	60.4	42.6	53.0	45.3	66.7	51.6	65.0

Table 10: Teacher attendance 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Type of school	2007	2009	2010	2011	2007	2009	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V				Std I-VII/VIII			
% Teachers present (average)	92.7	82.4	86.6	84.5	83.3	70.5	86.5	82.9
% Schools with no teachers present (average)	0.0	0.7	0.7	0.3	0.0	5.3	0.0	0.0
% Schools with all teachers present (average)	80.8	64.4	63.1	57.5	54.6	47.4	56.3	55.0

Other school information

Table 11: Headteachers 2010 & 2011

% Schools with:	2010	2011	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V		Std I-VII/VIII	
No Headteacher appointed	6.5	4.3	1.1	7.1
Headteacher appointed but not present at time of visit	9.2	7.3	11.7	17.9
Headteacher appointed & present at time of visit	84.3	88.5	87.2	75.0
Total	100	100	100	100

Table 12: Computers 2010 and 2011

% Schools with:	2010	2011	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V		Std I-VII/VIII	
No computer	97.0	94.3	93.3	97.6
Computers but no children using them on day of visit	1.4	3.9	5.0	2.4
Computers & children using them on day of visit	1.7	1.8	1.7	0.0
Total	100	100	100	100

Table 13: Multigrade classes 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

% Schools with:	2007	2009	2010	2011	2007	2009	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V				Std I-VII/VIII			
Std II children sitting with one or more other classes	65.6	62.9	66.6	75.3	65.8	60.0	60.3	82.1
Std IV children sitting with one or more other classes	48.1	48.6	56.1	62.9	56.6	52.4	38.9	65.8

School funds and activities (PAISA)

Table 14: % Schools who report receiving SSA grants - Full financial year

SSA school grants	2008-2009				2009-2010				2010-2011			
	No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools		
		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know
Maintenance grant	315	76.5	8.6	14.9	373	85.5	6.7	7.8	379	85.5	7.1	7.4
Development grant	309	74.1	13.6	12.3	360	83.3	8.1	8.6	379	81.8	10.6	7.7
TLM grant	317	85.5	4.4	10.1	355	88.2	6.2	5.6	380	90.5	4.7	4.7

Table 15: % Schools who report receiving SSA grants - Half financial year

SSA school grants	April 2009 to October 2009				April 2010 to October 2010				April 2011 to October 2011			
	No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools		
		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know
Maintenance grant	285	62.1	20.0	17.9	323	31.0	55.7	13.3	364	34.9	54.1	11.0
Development grant	283	59.7	24.0	16.3	313	29.4	57.2	13.4	364	40.4	47.8	11.8
TLM grant	287	69.0	17.4	13.6	311	32.8	55.6	11.6	364	39.0	51.7	9.3

Table 16: % Schools carrying out different activities since April 2011

Type of Activity		% schools		
		Yes	No	Don't know
Const.	New Classroom	22.7	70.2	7.1
Repairs	Repair of building (roof, floor, wall etc.)	58.1	37.6	4.3
	Repair of doors & windows	45.8	50.0	4.2
	Repair of boundary wall	24.9	69.9	5.2
	Repair of drinking water facility	38.7	56.3	5.0
	Repair of toilet	22.7	73.3	4.0
Painting & White Wash	White wash/plastering	85.5	10.8	3.7
	Painting Blackboard/Display Board/Painting on wall	78.2	18.3	3.5
	Painting of doors & walls	76.1	20.4	3.5
Purchase	Purchase of furniture (cupboard etc.)	45.3	49.4	5.3
	Purchase of electrical fittings	25.4	70.2	4.4
	Purchase of chalk, duster, register etc.	91.3	5.3	3.4
	Purchase of sitting Mats/Tat Patti	69.2	27.6	3.2
	Purchase of charts, globes & other teaching material	80.9	15.6	3.5
Other	Expenditure on school events	72.9	22.2	4.9
	Payment of bills (electricity, water, cleaning etc.)	24.2	67.2	8.7

The PAISA section of ASER tracks receipt and spending of Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) grants at the school level. This information is collected from schools visited during the survey. This page reports proportion of schools receiving the grants and carrying out specified activities in the schools. More detailed analysis of the PAISA data will be available in the PAISA 2011 report which will be released in March 2012.[1]

EVERY RURAL GOVERNMENT PRIMARY SCHOOL IS ENTITLED TO EACH OF THESE SSA GRANTS EVERY YEAR.

How much goes to each school	For what purposes
SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT GRANT / SCHOOL GRANT	
Rs.5000 per year per primary school	This grant can be used for buying school equipment such as blackboard, sitting mats etc. Also for buying chalk, duster, registers and other office equipment.
Rs.7000 per year per upper primary school	
Rs 5000 + Rs 7000 = Rs 12000 if the school is Std I-VII/VIII.	The grant amount varies by type of school: whether it is a primary or upper primary school.
Note: Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same premises.	
SCHOOL MAINTENANCE GRANT	
Rs.5000 - Rs 7500 per school per year if the school has upto 3 classrooms.	This grant can be used for maintenance of school building, including whitewashing; beautification; and repair of toilets, hand pump, boundary wall, playground etc. The grant amount depends on number of classrooms (excluding Headmaster room and office room)
Rs 7500 - Rs.10000 per year if the school has more than 3 classrooms.	
Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same building.	
TLM GRANT	
Rs.500 per teacher per year in primary and upper primary schools.	This grant can be used by teachers to buy teaching aids, such as charts, globes, posters, models etc.

[1] For more information see www.accountabilityinitiative.in

Chhattisgarh RURAL

Right to Education indicators

Table 17: Schools by total enrollment 2010 and 2011

School enrollment	2010		2011	
	No. of schools	% of schools	No. of schools	% of schools
1-60	68	16.1	100	26.6
61-90	71	16.8	76	20.2
91-120	61	14.5	73	19.4
121-150	63	14.9	42	11.2
151-200	67	15.9	39	10.4
> 200	92	21.8	46	12.2
TOTAL	422	100.0	376	100.0

Table 18: RTE norms: Pupil-teacher ratio 2010 and 2011

School enrollment	RTE Teacher Norms	2010	2011
		% Schools that do not meet PTR norms	
1-60	2	23.8	18.3
61-90	3	56.1	35.2
91-120	4	70.6	69.1
121-150	5	82.5	70.7
151-200	5 + HM	61.3	64.7
> 200	see note	69.0	70.5
TOTAL		60.4	48.7

Note : For schools with enrollment above 200 children the PTR shall not exceed 40 excluding the Head Teacher

Table 19: Schools by number of teachers 2010 and 2011

Number of teachers	2010		2011	
	No. of schools	% of schools	No. of schools	% of schools
1	34	8.8	24	6.8
2	108	27.9	100	28.5
3	91	23.5	107	30.5
4	48	12.4	44	12.5
5	27	7.0	40	11.4
6	27	7.0	13	3.7
>=7	52	13.4	23	6.6
TOTAL	387	100.0	351	100.0

Table 20: RTE norms: Teacher - classroom ratio 2010 and 2011

RTE norm: At least one classroom per teacher	2010	2011
Number of teachers	% Schools that do not meet classroom to teacher norms	
1	4.0	0.0
2	4.9	16.2
3	33.3	35.3
4	52.9	65.5
5	55.0	64.3
6	85.7	88.9
>=7	79.4	94.1
TOTAL	35.8	40.4

Table 21: % Schools meeting selected RTE norms on facilities 2010 & 2011

% of schools with		2010	2011
Building	Office/Store/Office cum store	78.6	76.3
	Playground	44.7	46.0
	Boundary Wall	48.5	49.1
Drinking Water	No facility for drinking water	12.9	13.0
	Facility but no drinking water available	9.6	13.8
	Drinking water available	77.6	73.3
Toilet	No toilet facility	28.9	34.7
	Facility but toilet not useable	41.5	38.5
	Toilet useable	29.6	26.8
Girls Toilet	% Schools with no separate provisions for girls toilets	46.2	51.8
	Of schools with separate girls toilets, % schools where		
	Toilet locked	16.3	11.5
	Toilet not useable	17.5	16.0
	Toilet useable	20.0	20.7
TLM	Teaching learning material in Std 2	88.5	86.1
	Teaching learning material in Std 4	83.2	78.9
Library	No library	27.1	21.3
	Library but no books being used by children on day of visit	36.5	40.3
	Library being used by children on day of visit	36.5	38.4
MDM	Kitchen shed for cooking midday meal	86.2	87.0
	Midday meal served in school on the day of visit	94.7	93.8

Note: School observations for ASER 2011 looked at TLM for Std II and Std IV only.

As part of ASER 2010 and 2011, in each sampled village, one government school with primary sections was visited on the day of the survey. During this school visit, RTE indicators were observed and are reported here.

Extracts from the Schedule of The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act 2009 Norms and standards for a School (Sections 19 and 25)

Number of teachers in Std 1-5:

Admitted children	No. of teachers
<= 60	2
61-90	3
91-120	4
121-200	5
> 150	5 + 1 Headteacher
> 200	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (excluding Headteacher) shall not exceed 40

School facilities:
All weather building with:

- At least one classroom for every teacher
- Office cum store cum headteacher's room
- Separate toilets for boys and girls
- Safe and adequate drinking water facility to all children
- A kitchen where mid-day meal is cooked in the school
- Playground
- Arrangements for securing the school building by boundary wall or fencing.

Teaching learning equipment
shall be provided to each class as required.

Library
There shall be a library in each school providing newspaper, magazines and books on all subjects, including story-books.



Gujarat RURAL

Annual Status of Education Report
ASER 2011 RURAL
Facilitated by PRATHAM

ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM HOUSEHOLDS. 25 OUT OF 26 DISTRICTS


School enrollment and out of school children

Table 1: % Children in different types of schools 2011

Age group	Govt.	Pvt.	Other	Not in School	Total
Age: 6-14 ALL	86.1	10.8	0.4	2.7	100
Age: 7-16 ALL	82.1	12.4	0.4	5.1	100
Age: 7-10 ALL	89.3	9.1	0.3	1.3	100
Age: 7-10 BOYS	88.6	9.8	0.4	1.1	100
Age: 7-10 GIRLS	90.2	8.2	0.3	1.4	100
Age: 11-14 ALL	82.5	12.7	0.4	4.4	100
Age: 11-14 BOYS	82.8	13.7	0.5	2.9	100
Age: 11-14 GIRLS	82.1	11.5	0.3	6.1	100
Age: 15-16 ALL	58.4	21.5	0.7	19.4	100
Age: 15-16 BOYS	60.4	23.3	0.9	15.4	100
Age: 15-16 GIRLS	55.8	19.2	0.4	24.5	100

Note: 'OTHER' includes children going to madarssa and EGS.
'NOT IN SCHOOL' = dropped out + never enrolled.

Chart 1: Trends over time
% Children out of school by age group and gender 2006-2011



How to read this chart: For example, the proportion of girls (age 11-14) not in school has changed from 11.7% in 2006 to 7.6% in 2007 to 10.9% in 2008 to 10.2% in 2009 to 8% in 2010 to 6.1% in 2011

Chart 2: Trends over time
% Children enrolled in private school by class 2007, 2009 & 2011




Table 2: Sample description
% Children in each class by age 2011

Std.	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	Total
I	26.0	62.0	7.8	4.2									100
II	1.1	9.2	75.7	10.5	3.6								100
III	2.0		7.7	73.8	12.3	4.2							100
IV	3.1			8.3	69.9	14.3	4.4						100
V	2.4				5.6	71.4	14.6	6.0					100
VI	1.6					6.3	66.0	21.0	5.1				100
VII	3.1						7.6	63.5	18.8	7.0			100
VIII	1.6							7.5	67.2	17.4	6.3		100


How to read this table: If a child started school in Std I at age 6, she should be age 8 in Std 3. This table shows the age distribution for each class. For example, in Std III, 73.8% children are 8 years old but there are also 7.7% who are 7, 12.3% who are 9 years old, etc.

Young children in pre-school and school

Table 3: % Children age 5-6 who are enrolled in different types of pre-school & school 2011

	In balwadi or anganwadi	In LKG/ UKG	In School			Not enrolled anywhere	Total
			Govt	Pvt	Other		
Age 5	34.2	5.5	49.7	7.5	0.5	2.7	100
Age 6	2.4	0.9	85.5	9.8	0.5	1.0	100

Chart 3: Trends over time
Five year olds in pre-school & school 2007, 2009 & 2011



Reading

Table 4: % Children by class and READING level
All schools 2011

Std.	Nothing	Letter	Word	Level 1 (Std 1 Text)	Level 2 (Std 2 Text)	Total
I	29.5	47.2	16.9	2.9	3.6	100
II	11.4	33.7	33.8	12.3	8.8	100
III	4.2	16.3	34.5	25.0	20.1	100
IV	2.2	10.3	22.8	28.2	36.5	100
V	1.2	6.0	14.4	29.2	49.2	100
VI	1.1	2.7	6.6	25.5	64.2	100
VII	0.5	2.3	5.8	20.1	71.4	100
VIII	0.9	2.3	4.2	12.9	79.8	100
Total	5.8	14.1	17.1	20.2	42.8	100

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, 4.2% children cannot even read letters, 16.3% can read letters but not more, 34.5% can read words but not Std 1 text or higher, 25% can read Std 1 text but not Std 2 level text, and 20.1% can read Std 2 level text. In sum, for each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is 100%.

Reading Tool




Chart 4: Trends over time
% Children in Std III who CANNOT READ Std I LEVEL TEXT
By school type 2008-2011





Chart 5: Trends over time
% Children in Std V who CANNOT READ Std II LEVEL TEXT
By school type 2008-2011



Home language and school language

Table 5: School language and home language

% Children whose :	%
Home language is the same as school language	99.3
Home language is different from school language	0.8
Total	100.0

Note : In ASER 2011 for every state, reading tools were provided in the main medium of instruction in government schools. Children and their families were also asked about the language they speak at home. For home languages, a list of 122 languages was provided to all survey teams. This list includes 22 Scheduled languages and 100 Non-Scheduled languages. The data in this table is for children for whom we have information for both school language and home language.



Arithmetic

Table 6: % Children by class and ARITHMETIC level
All schools 2011

Std.	Nothing	Recognize Numbers		Subtract	Divide	Total
		1-9	11-99			
I	30.0	53.6	12.8	2.3	1.3	100
II	12.4	45.8	33.0	6.4	2.4	100
III	5.3	26.6	43.4	19.4	5.3	100
IV	2.9	15.7	36.8	30.6	14.1	100
V	1.8	9.9	29.5	36.0	22.7	100
VI	1.4	6.0	20.6	40.9	31.3	100
VII	1.1	4.7	15.7	36.4	42.1	100
VIII	1.1	3.8	12.9	29.3	53.0	100
Total	6.4	19.5	25.8	26.2	22.1	100

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level of arithmetic achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, 5.3% children cannot even recognize numbers 1-9, 26.6% children can recognize numbers up to 9 but not more, 43.4% can recognize numbers to 99 but cannot do subtraction, 19.4% can do subtraction but not division, and 5.3% can do division. In sum, for each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is 100%.

Math Tool



Chart 6: Trends over time
% Children in Std III who CANNOT RECOGNISE NUMBERS upto 100. By school type 2008-2011





Chart 7: Trends over time
% Children in Std V who CANNOT DO DIVISION
By school type 2008-2011



Tuition

Table 7: Class-wise % children attending PAID TUITION CLASSES
By school type 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Year	School	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	Total
2007	Govt	3.9	5.6	6.0	5.8	7.4	7.3	10.2	13.0	6.9
	Pvt	19.8	23.5	26.6	26.1	40.3	31.1	35.2	26.0	27.9
2009	Govt	5.5	7.1	7.1	9.0	9.2	9.0	9.1	11.9	8.3
	Pvt	29.4	33.8	39.9	40.4	44.0	38.8	31.0	23.8	33.2
2010	Govt	5.5	8.9	8.5	10.7	9.5	10.7	10.4	9.8	9.3
	Pvt	21.4	36.9	44.1	35.9	40.8	39.4	39.8	28.8	35.3
2011	Govt	6.8	9.5	9.8	11.3	10.5	10.6	11.1	14.3	10.5
	Pvt	39.7	52.4	49.8	46.3	54.4	45.7	56.2	40.7	47.8

Note: In 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011 the ASER survey recorded information about tuition. In all 4 years, the question asked was the following: "Does the child take any paid additional class currently?" Therefore, these numbers do not include any supplemental help in learning that children may have received from parents, siblings or from anyone else who did not require payment.



Gujarat RURAL

As part of ASER 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011, in each sampled village, one government school with primary sections was visited on the day of the survey. Information about schools in this report is based on these visits.

School observations

Table 8: Total schools visited 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Type of school	2007	2009	2010	2011
Std I-IV/V: Primary	76	73	66	67
Std I-VII/VIII: Primary + Upper primary	558	591	557	583
Total schools visited	634	664	623	650



Student and teacher attendance

Table 9: Student attendance 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Type of school	2007	2009	2010	2011	2007	2009	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V				Std I-VII/VIII			
% Enrolled children present (average)	81.0	83.9	87.4	85.0	85.5	83.1	84.4	84.9
% Schools with less than 50% enrolled children present (average)	5.6	0.0	0.0	1.5	2.4	3.9	3.2	1.4
% Schools with 75% or more enrolled children present (average)	68.1	77.8	85.0	87.9	85.9	76.8	81.3	86.4

Table 10: Teacher attendance 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Type of school	2007	2009	2010	2011	2007	2009	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V				Std I-VII/VIII			
% Teachers present (average)	94.7	95.4	94.7	95.6	93.0	94.8	95.9	94.4
% Schools with no teachers present (average)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
% Schools with all teachers present (average)	85.7	84.1	78.7	88.1	69.9	76.5	77.2	71.3

Other school information

Table 11: Headteachers 2010 & 2011

% Schools with:	2010	2011	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V		Std I-VII/VIII	
No Headteacher appointed	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2
Headteacher appointed but not present at time of visit	18.2	8.0	5.6	4.3
Headteacher appointed & present at time of visit	81.8	92.0	94.4	95.5
Total	100	100	100	100

Table 12: Computers 2010 and 2011

% Schools with:	2010	2011	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V		Std I-VII/VIII	
No computer	85.9	81.3	43.4	39.1
Computers but no children using them on day of visit	4.7	17.2	26.6	29.9
Computers & children using them on day of visit	9.4	1.6	30.1	31.0
Total	100	100	100	100

Table 13: Multigrade classes 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

% Schools with:	2007	2009	2010	2011	2007	2009	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V				Std I-VII/VIII			
Std II children sitting with one or more other classes	59.2	76.8	56.1	64.2	28.4	38.2	33.6	32.8
Std IV children sitting with one or more other classes	58.6	69.0	51.7	62.7	27.6	36.6	30.7	28.6

School funds and activities (PAISA)

Table 14: % Schools who report receiving SSA grants - Full financial year

SSA school grants	2008-2009				2009-2010				2010-2011			
	No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools		
		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know
Maintenance grant	541	82.4	14.6	3.0	440	87.5	5.7	6.8	609	79.3	17.1	3.6
Development grant	545	88.3	8.6	3.1	443	87.6	5.0	7.5	604	82.6	14.6	2.8
TLM grant	567	96.3	1.9	1.8	453	94.5	1.6	4.0	613	91.2	8.0	0.8

Table 15: % Schools who report receiving SSA grants - Half financial year

SSA school grants	April 2009 to October 2009				April 2010 to October 2010				April 2011 to October 2011			
	No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools		
		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know
Maintenance grant	498	74.7	20.1	5.2	415	81.9	9.2	8.9	544	65.3	30.2	4.6
Development grant	495	83.4	11.9	4.7	421	85.5	7.4	7.1	540	67.0	29.1	3.9
TLM grant	518	88.6	8.3	3.1	423	89.1	5.0	5.9	542	70.1	26.8	3.1

Table 16: % Schools carrying out different activities since April 2011

Type of Activity		% schools		
		Yes	No	Don't know
Const.	New Classroom	40.7	57.6	1.7
Repairs	Repair of building (roof, floor, wall etc.)	54.9	43.6	1.5
	Repair of doors & windows	48.8	49.3	1.9
	Repair of boundary wall	34.5	63.6	1.9
	Repair of drinking water facility	57.0	41.4	1.7
	Repair of toilet	48.9	49.1	2.0
Painting & White Wash	White wash/plastering	59.5	39.5	1.0
	Painting Blackboard/Display Board/Painting on wall	66.7	32.5	0.8
	Painting of doors & walls	51.8	47.0	1.2
Purchase	Purchase of furniture (cupboard etc.)	46.3	50.9	2.8
	Purchase of electrical fittings	63.9	34.3	1.8
	Purchase of chalk, duster, register etc.	89.3	9.9	0.8
	Purchase of sitting Mats/Tat Patti	36.6	61.6	1.8
	Purchase of charts, globes & other teaching material	75.4	23.4	1.2
Other	Expenditure on school events	73.8	24.5	1.7
	Payment of bills (electricity, water, cleaning etc.)	54.6	42.1	3.3

The PAISA section of ASER tracks receipt and spending of Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) grants at the school level. This information is collected from schools visited during the survey. This page reports proportion of schools receiving the grants and carrying out specified activities in the schools. More detailed analysis of the PAISA data will be available in the PAISA 2011 report which will be released in March 2012.[1]

EVERY RURAL GOVERNMENT PRIMARY SCHOOL IS ENTITLED TO EACH OF THESE SSA GRANTS EVERY YEAR.

How much goes to each school	For what purposes
SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT GRANT / SCHOOL GRANT	
Rs.5000 per year per primary school	This grant can be used for buying school equipment such as blackboard, sitting mats etc. Also for buying chalk, duster, registers and other office equipment.
Rs.7000 per year per upper primary school	
Rs 5000 + Rs 7000 = Rs 12000 if the school is Std I-VII/VIII.	The grant amount varies by type of school: whether it is a primary or upper primary school.
Note: Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same premises.	
SCHOOL MAINTENANCE GRANT	
Rs.5000 - Rs 7500 per school per year if the school has upto 3 classrooms.	This grant can be used for maintenance of school building, including whitewashing; beautification; and repair of toilets, hand pump, boundary wall, playground etc. The grant amount depends on number of classrooms (excluding Headmaster room and office room)
Rs 7500 - Rs.10000 per year if the school has more than 3 classrooms.	
Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same building.	
TLM GRANT	
Rs.500 per teacher per year in primary and upper primary schools.	This grant can be used by teachers to buy teaching aids, such as charts, globes, posters, models etc.

[1] For more information see www.accountabilityinitiative.in

Right to Education indicators

Table 17: Schools by total enrollment 2010 and 2011

School enrollment	2010		2011	
	No. of schools	% of schools	No. of schools	% of schools
1-60	27	4.6	37	5.9
61-90	25	4.2	37	5.9
91-120	34	5.8	33	5.2
121-150	46	7.8	47	7.5
151-200	74	12.5	85	13.5
> 200	384	65.1	391	62.1
TOTAL	590	100.0	630	100.0

Table 18: RTE norms: Pupil-teacher ratio 2010 and 2011

School enrollment	RTE Teacher Norms	2010	2011
		% Schools that do not meet PTR norms	
1-60	2	69.6	37.5
61-90	3	70.8	60.0
91-120	4	35.5	40.7
121-150	5	53.7	43.9
151-200	5 + HM	31.3	17.2
> 200	see note	32.3	39.1
TOTAL		37.3	38.0

Note : For schools with enrollment above 200 children the PTR shall not exceed 40 excluding the Head Teacher

Table 19: Schools by number of teachers 2010 and 2011

Number of teachers	2010		2011	
	No. of schools	% of schools	No. of schools	% of schools
1	20	3.6	22	4.1
2	31	5.6	33	6.2
3	25	4.5	27	5.1
4	32	5.8	29	5.4
5	39	7.1	35	6.5
6	46	8.3	54	10.1
>=7	360	65.1	335	62.6
TOTAL	553	100.0	535	100.0

Table 20: RTE norms: Teacher - classroom ratio 2010 and 2011

RTE norm: At least one classroom per teacher	2010	2011
Number of teachers	% Schools that do not meet classroom to teacher norms	
1	0.0	0.0
2	0.0	10.0
3	5.6	18.2
4	14.3	22.2
5	30.3	25.0
6	26.1	21.4
>=7	16.0	10.4
TOTAL	15.9	12.4

Table 21: % Schools meeting selected RTE norms on facilities 2010 & 2011

% of schools with		2010	2011
Building	Office/Store/Office cum store	80.2	82.8
	Playground	75.4	83.2
	Boundary Wall	84.5	91.1
Drinking Water	No facility for drinking water	14.2	10.3
	Facility but no drinking water available	6.5	5.9
	Drinking water available	79.4	83.9
Toilet	No toilet facility	2.6	2.1
	Facility but toilet not useable	32.6	28.4
	Toilet useable	64.8	69.5
Girls Toilet	% Schools with no separate provisions for girls toilets	12.7	5.2
	Of schools with separate girls toilets, % schools where		
	Toilet locked	20.7	8.0
	Toilet not useable	16.7	19.1
	Toilet useable	49.9	67.7
TLM	Teaching learning material in Std 2	95.6	97.0
	Teaching learning material in Std 4	94.8	96.2
Library	No library	16.2	17.0
	Library but no books being used by children on day of visit	35.2	38.8
	Library being used by children on day of visit	48.5	44.2
MDM	Kitchen shed for cooking midday meal	88.4	92.0
	Midday meal served in school on the day of visit	96.4	97.8

Note: School observations for ASER 2011 looked at TLM for Std II and Std IV only.

As part of ASER 2010 and 2011, in each sampled village, one government school with primary sections was visited on the day of the survey. During this school visit, RTE indicators were observed and are reported here.

Extracts from the Schedule of The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act 2009 Norms and standards for a School (Sections 19 and 25)

Number of teachers in Std 1-5:

Admitted children	No. of teachers
<= 60	2
61-90	3
91-120	4
121-200	5
> 150	5 + 1 Headteacher
> 200	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (excluding Headteacher) shall not exceed 40

School facilities:
All weather building with:

- At least one classroom for every teacher
- Office cum store cum headteacher's room
- Separate toilets for boys and girls
- Safe and adequate drinking water facility to all children
- A kitchen where mid-day meal is cooked in the school
- Playground
- Arrangements for securing the school building by boundary wall or fencing.

Teaching learning equipment
shall be provided to each class as required.

Library
There shall be a library in each school providing newspaper, magazines and books on all subjects, including story-books.




Haryana
Himachal Pradesh
Jammu and Kashmir
Jharkhand
Karnataka
Kerala



Haryana RURAL

ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM HOUSEHOLDS. 16 OUT OF 20 DISTRICTS


School enrollment and out of school children

Table 1: % Children in different types of schools 2011

Age group	Govt.	Pvt.	Other	Not in School	Total
Age: 6-14 ALL	54.9	43.4	0.3	1.4	100
Age: 7-16 ALL	56.5	41.0	0.3	2.1	100
Age: 7-10 ALL	52.9	46.0	0.3	0.8	100
Age: 7-10 BOYS	49.8	49.3	0.2	0.7	100
Age: 7-10 GIRLS	57.1	41.7	0.3	1.0	100
Age: 11-14 ALL	58.7	39.2	0.3	1.8	100
Age: 11-14 BOYS	55.2	43.2	0.1	1.5	100
Age: 11-14 GIRLS	63.0	34.4	0.4	2.1	100
Age: 15-16 ALL	60.3	32.7	0.5	6.5	100
Age: 15-16 BOYS	58.2	35.9	0.4	5.6	100
Age: 15-16 GIRLS	62.9	28.7	0.8	7.7	100

Note: 'OTHER' includes children going to madarssa and EGS.
'NOT IN SCHOOL' = dropped out + never enrolled.

Chart 1: Trends over time
% Children out of school by age group and gender 2006-2011



How to read this chart: For example, the proportion of girls (age 11-14) not in school has changed from 8.4% in 2006 to 7% in 2007 to 5.1% in 2008 to 4.3% in 2009 to 1.8% in 2010 to 2.1% in 2011

Chart 2: Trends over time
% Children enrolled in private school by class 2007, 2009 & 2011




Table 2: Sample description
% Children in each class by age 2011

Std.	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	Total
I	29.0	40.4	18.8	7.2	4.6								100
II	6.0	19.1	33.6	27.6	7.7	6.1							100
III	5.1		17.9	38.5	22.2	11.1	5.2						100
IV	6.0			20.4	31.2	28.3	7.3	6.9					100
V	7.2				14.2	39.6	21.7	11.8	5.4				100
VI	4.9					17.9	33.9	27.5	9.8	6.0			100
VII	5.2						16.2	39.1	22.4	10.5	6.6		100
VIII	7.2							20.2	33.8	24.1	11.0	3.6	100


How to read this table: If a child started school in Std I at age 6, she should be age 8 in Std 3. This table shows the age distribution for each class. For example, in Std III, 38.5 % children are 8 years old but there are also 17.9% who are 7, 22.2% who are 9, 11.1% who are 10 years old, etc.

Young children in pre-school and school

Table 3: % Children age 5-6 who are enrolled in different types of pre-school & school 2011

	In balwadi or anganwadi	In LKG/ UKG	In School			Not enrolled anywhere	Total
			Govt	Pvt	Other		
Age 5	8.9	26.0	28.1	32.7	0.5	3.8	100
Age 6	1.7	11.9	40.3	43.8	0.5	1.8	100

Chart 3: Trends over time
Five year olds in pre-school & school 2007, 2009 & 2011



Reading

Table 4: % Children by class and READING level
All schools 2011

Std.	Nothing	Letter	Word	Level 1 (Std 1 Text)	Level 2 (Std 2 Text)	Total
I	27.4	39.1	21.0	6.1	6.4	100
II	10.3	27.4	30.5	14.9	16.9	100
III	5.1	16.5	24.8	22.5	31.0	100
IV	4.0	9.1	13.6	23.5	49.9	100
V	2.0	5.5	10.9	15.6	66.0	100
VI	0.9	2.7	6.0	12.7	77.7	100
VII	1.1	1.4	3.3	9.1	85.1	100
VIII	0.4	0.7	2.8	8.4	87.7	100
Total	6.5	13.0	14.4	14.2	52.0	100

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, 5.1% children cannot even read letters, 16.5% can read letters but not more, 24.8% can read words but not Std 1 text or higher, 22.5% can read Std 1 text but not Std 2 level text, and 31% can read Std 2 level text. In sum, for each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is 100%.

Reading Tool



Chart 4: Trends over time
% Children in Std III who CANNOT READ Std I LEVEL TEXT
By school type 2008-2011





Chart 5: Trends over time
% Children in Std V who CANNOT READ Std II LEVEL TEXT
By school type 2008-2011



Home language and school language

Table 5: School language and home language

% Children whose :	%
Home language is the same as school language	78.5
Home language is different from school language	21.5
Total	100.0

Note : In ASER 2011 for every state, reading tools were provided in the main medium of instruction in government schools. Children and their families were also asked about the language they speak at home. For home languages, a list of 122 languages was provided to all survey teams. This list includes 22 Scheduled languages and 100 Non-Scheduled languages. The data in this table is for children for whom we have information for both school language and home language.



Arithmetic

**Table 6: % Children by class and ARITHMETIC level
All schools 2011**

Std.	Nothing	Recognize Numbers		Subtract	Divide	Total
		1-9	11-99			
I	24.8	38.8	28.0	6.4	2.2	100
II	7.9	29.0	34.6	22.1	6.5	100
III	3.8	18.6	27.2	32.8	17.7	100
IV	2.5	12.5	19.7	33.0	32.3	100
V	1.8	8.2	13.5	26.3	50.2	100
VI	1.1	3.7	11.4	22.6	61.3	100
VII	1.0	2.3	7.9	20.6	68.3	100
VIII	0.4	1.0	8.4	17.0	73.2	100
Total	5.5	14.4	19.0	22.7	38.5	100

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level of arithmetic achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, 3.8% children cannot even recognize numbers 1-9, 18.6% children can recognize numbers up to 9 but not more, 27.2% can recognize numbers to 99 but cannot do subtraction, 32.8% can do subtraction but not division, and 17.7% can do division. In sum, for each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is 100%.

Math Tool



**Chart 6: Trends over time
% Children in Std III who CANNOT RECOGNISE NUMBERS upto 100. By school type 2008-2011**





**Chart 7: Trends over time
% Children in Std V who CANNOT DO DIVISION
By school type 2008-2011**



Tuition

**Table 7: Class-wise % children attending PAID TUITION CLASSES
By school type 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011**

Year	School	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	Total
2007	Govt	5.1	5.2	7.2	7.3	9.6	7.6	6.3	10.6	7.3
	Pvt	11.0	11.2	14.5	14.0	17.1	16.8	16.3	19.7	14.7
2009	Govt	9.6	11.1	13.7	12.5	15.1	12.4	15.3	19.1	13.6
	Pvt	17.8	20.6	23.6	27.1	30.3	29.7	24.5	32.4	25.3
2010	Govt	8.0	9.9	8.8	10.3	12.8	12.2	11.9	13.0	11.0
	Pvt	17.9	17.6	23.3	22.1	25.0	21.7	21.9	25.1	21.6
2011	Govt	4.9	7.7	6.5	10.1	9.7	8.3	7.9	7.9	8.0
	Pvt	16.2	18.1	23.4	23.3	21.5	20.7	19.3	19.1	20.1

Note: In 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011 the ASER survey recorded information about tuition. In all 4 years, the question asked was the following: "Does the child take any paid additional class currently?" Therefore, these numbers do not include any supplemental help in learning that children may have received from parents, siblings or from anyone else who did not require payment.



Haryana RURAL

Annual Status of Education Report
असर ASER 2011 RURAL
Facilitated by PRATHAM

As part of ASER 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011, in each sampled village, one government school with primary sections was visited on the day of the survey. Information about schools in this report is based on these visits.

School observations

Table 8: Total schools visited 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Type of school	2007	2009	2010	2011
Std I-IV/V: Primary	335	361	302	244
Std I-VII/VIII: Primary + Upper primary	95	167	226	145
Total schools visited	430	528	528	389



Student and teacher attendance

Table 9: Student attendance 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Type of school	2007	2009	2010	2011	2007	2009	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V				Std I-VII/VIII			
% Enrolled children present (average)	82.1	83.6	82.9	76.4	84.4	85.0	81.7	78.8
% Schools with less than 50% enrolled children present (average)	2.3	1.4	0.3	7.1	1.2	0.6	1.4	0.7
% Schools with 75% or more enrolled children present (average)	80.7	81.4	79.7	65.8	84.9	87.3	77.6	67.6

Table 10: Teacher attendance 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Type of school	2007	2009	2010	2011	2007	2009	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V				Std I-VII/VIII			
% Teachers present (average)	91.8	86.4	89.8	84.9	90.6	84.7	87.8	85.9
% Schools with no teachers present (average)	0.0	1.5	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.6	0.0	0.0
% Schools with all teachers present (average)	72.6	56.8	63.5	50.7	62.7	32.3	44.9	45.0

Other school information

Table 11: Headteachers 2010 & 2011

% Schools with:	2010	2011	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V		Std I-VII/VIII	
No Headteacher appointed	4.8	0.7	4.4	4.2
Headteacher appointed but not present at time of visit	5.7	10.1	12.0	15.8
Headteacher appointed & present at time of visit	89.6	89.2	83.5	80.0
Total	100	100	100	100

Table 12: Computers 2010 and 2011

% Schools with:	2010	2011	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V		Std I-VII/VIII	
No computer	89.9	92.3	73.1	66.4
Computers but no children using them on day of visit	6.9	7.2	15.1	25.9
Computers & children using them on day of visit	3.1	0.4	11.9	7.7
Total	100	100	100	100

Table 13: Multigrade classes 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

% Schools with:	2007	2009	2010	2011	2007	2009	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V				Std I-VII/VIII			
Std II children sitting with one or more other classes	37.8	36.6	33.0	46.1	25.8	29.4	31.3	35.7
Std IV children sitting with one or more other classes	30.0	25.7	30.1	35.7	22.2	25.2	28.9	26.9

School funds and activities (PAISA)

Table 14: % Schools who report receiving SSA grants - Full financial year

SSA school grants	2008-2009				2009-2010				2010-2011			
	No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools		
		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know
Maintenance grant	449	82.2	12.0	5.8	456	92.8	4.8	2.4	377	91.3	6.4	2.4
Development grant	421	74.4	18.8	6.9	415	87.0	8.9	4.1	365	83.6	12.6	3.8
TLM grant	443	88.0	8.8	3.2	409	92.7	5.4	2.0	375	92.0	6.7	1.3

Table 15: % Schools who report receiving SSA grants - Half financial year

SSA school grants	April 2009 to October 2009				April 2010 to October 2010				April 2011 to October 2011			
	No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools		
		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know
Maintenance grant	403	79.2	15.9	5.0	418	65.6	29.4	5.0	347	62.8	32.3	4.9
Development grant	371	67.9	26.2	5.9	381	62.5	32.0	5.5	334	48.8	43.7	7.5
TLM grant	387	80.9	16.0	3.1	392	65.6	30.1	4.3	342	61.7	34.8	3.5

Table 16: % Schools carrying out different activities since April 2011

Type of Activity		% schools		
		Yes	No	Don't know
Const.	New Classroom	31.9	66.9	1.3
Repairs	Repair of building (roof, floor, wall etc.)	61.3	38.2	0.6
	Repair of doors & windows	49.4	50.3	0.3
	Repair of boundary wall	36.3	63.7	0.0
	Repair of drinking water facility	58.4	41.6	0.0
	Repair of toilet	47.0	52.7	0.3
Painting & White Wash	White wash/plastering	59.1	40.3	0.6
	Painting Blackboard/Display Board/Painting on wall	61.9	37.5	0.6
	Painting of doors & walls	48.4	51.3	0.3
Purchase	Purchase of furniture (cupboard etc.)	42.7	56.4	0.9
	Purchase of electrical fittings	47.5	52.0	0.6
	Purchase of chalk, duster, register etc.	85.6	13.8	0.6
	Purchase of sitting Mats/Tat Patti	46.8	53.0	0.3
	Purchase of charts, globes & other teaching material	66.4	32.5	1.2
Other	Expenditure on school events	77.3	21.3	1.4
	Payment of bills (electricity, water, cleaning etc.)	83.5	15.7	0.9

The PAISA section of ASER tracks receipt and spending of Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) grants at the school level. This information is collected from schools visited during the survey. This page reports proportion of schools receiving the grants and carrying out specified activities in the schools. More detailed analysis of the PAISA data will be available in the PAISA 2011 report which will be released in March 2012.[1]

EVERY RURAL GOVERNMENT PRIMARY SCHOOL IS ENTITLED TO EACH OF THESE SSA GRANTS EVERY YEAR.

How much goes to each school	For what purposes
SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT GRANT / SCHOOL GRANT	
Rs.5000 per year per primary school	This grant can be used for buying school equipment such as blackboard, sitting mats etc. Also for buying chalk, duster, registers and other office equipment.
Rs.7000 per year per upper primary school	
Rs 5000 + Rs 7000 = Rs 12000 if the school is Std I-VII/VIII.	The grant amount varies by type of school: whether it is a primary or upper primary school.
Note: Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same premises.	
SCHOOL MAINTENANCE GRANT	
Rs.5000 - Rs 7500 per school per year if the school has upto 3 classrooms.	This grant can be used for maintenance of school building, including whitewashing; beautification; and repair of toilets, hand pump, boundary wall, playground etc. The grant amount depends on number of classrooms (excluding Headmaster room and office room)
Rs 7500 - Rs.10000 per year if the school has more than 3 classrooms.	
Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same building.	
TLM GRANT	
Rs.500 per teacher per year in primary and upper primary schools.	This grant can be used by teachers to buy teaching aids, such as charts, globes, posters, models etc.

[1] For more information see www.accountabilityinitiative.in

Right to Education indicators

Table 17: Schools by total enrollment 2010 and 2011

School enrollment	2010		2011	
	No. of schools	% of schools	No. of schools	% of schools
1-60	34	6.5	25	6.5
61-90	36	6.9	31	8.1
91-120	45	8.6	49	12.7
121-150	52	9.9	42	10.9
151-200	86	16.4	60	15.6
> 200	271	51.7	178	46.2
TOTAL	524	100.0	385	100.0

Table 18: RTE norms: Pupil-teacher ratio 2010 and 2011

School enrollment	RTE Teacher Norms	2010	2011
		% Schools that do not meet PTR norms	
1-60	2	51.7	44.4
61-90	3	69.7	48.3
91-120	4	52.4	63.0
121-150	5	56.3	60.0
151-200	5 + HM	63.2	41.9
> 200	see note	60.3	65.6
TOTAL		59.7	58.8

Note : For schools with enrollment above 200 children the PTR shall not exceed 40 excluding the Head Teacher

Table 19: Schools by number of teachers 2010 and 2011

Number of teachers	2010		2011	
	No. of schools	% of schools	No. of schools	% of schools
1	34	7.0	15	4.2
2	56	11.5	37	10.5
3	50	10.3	38	10.7
4	54	11.1	39	11.0
5	56	11.5	50	14.1
6	35	7.2	24	6.8
>=7	203	41.6	151	42.7
TOTAL	488	100.0	354	100.0

Table 20: RTE norms: Teacher - classroom ratio 2010 and 2011

RTE norm: At least one classroom per teacher	2010	2011
Number of teachers	% Schools that do not meet classroom to teacher norms	
1	0.0	0.0
2	8.7	22.9
3	23.1	37.0
4	30.8	22.2
5	29.3	26.7
6	39.1	68.8
>=7	30.6	28.9
TOTAL	24.9	29.1

Table 21: % Schools meeting selected RTE norms on facilities 2010 & 2011

% of schools with		2010	2011
Building	Office/Store/Office cum store	85.9	80.3
	Playground	79.9	79.1
	Boundary Wall	82.4	84.0
Drinking Water	No facility for drinking water	17.7	14.6
	Facility but no drinking water available	7.7	7.1
	Drinking water available	74.6	78.3
Toilet	No toilet facility	2.0	3.2
	Facility but toilet not useable	30.1	26.8
	Toilet useable	67.9	70.1
Girls Toilet	% Schools with no separate provisions for girls toilets	10.0	6.1
	Of schools with separate girls toilets, % schools where		
	Toilet locked	13.4	4.3
	Toilet not useable	23.9	21.6
	Toilet useable	52.8	68.0
TLM	Teaching learning material in Std 2	72.2	73.7
	Teaching learning material in Std 4	67.6	67.1
Library	No library	35.4	21.8
	Library but no books being used by children on day of visit	33.0	35.5
	Library being used by children on day of visit	31.6	42.6
MDM	Kitchen shed for cooking midday meal	51.0	61.0
	Midday meal served in school on the day of visit	93.5	94.0

Note: School observations for ASER 2011 looked at TLM for Std II and Std IV only.

As part of ASER 2010 and 2011, in each sampled village, one government school with primary sections was visited on the day of the survey. During this school visit, RTE indicators were observed and are reported here.

Extracts from the Schedule of The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act 2009 Norms and standards for a School (Sections 19 and 25)

Number of teachers in Std 1-5:

Admitted children	No. of teachers
<= 60	2
61-90	3
91-120	4
121-200	5
> 150	5 + 1 Headteacher
> 200	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (excluding Headteacher) shall not exceed 40

School facilities:
All weather building with:

- At least one classroom for every teacher
- Office cum store cum headteacher's room
- Separate toilets for boys and girls
- Safe and adequate drinking water facility to all children
- A kitchen where mid-day meal is cooked in the school
- Playground
- Arrangements for securing the school building by boundary wall or fencing.

Teaching learning equipment
shall be provided to each class as required.

Library
There shall be a library in each school providing newspaper, magazines and books on all subjects, including story-books.



Himachal Pradesh RURAL

Annual Status of Education Report
ASER 2011 RURAL
Facilitated by PRATHAM

ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM HOUSEHOLDS. 12 OUT OF 12 DISTRICTS


School enrollment and out of school children

Table 1: % Children in different types of schools 2011

Age group	Govt.	Pvt.	Other	Not in School	Total
Age: 6-14 ALL	72.8	26.6	0.1	0.6	100
Age: 7-16 ALL	76.0	23.2	0.0	0.8	100
Age: 7-10 ALL	69.2	30.5	0.0	0.3	100
Age: 7-10 BOYS	64.7	34.9	0.1	0.3	100
Age: 7-10 GIRLS	74.7	24.9	0.0	0.4	100
Age: 11-14 ALL	79.2	20.0	0.1	0.8	100
Age: 11-14 BOYS	78.2	21.1	0.1	0.7	100
Age: 11-14 GIRLS	81.0	18.0	0.1	1.0	100
Age: 15-16 ALL	86.7	11.5	0.0	1.9	100
Age: 15-16 BOYS	85.7	13.0	0.0	1.4	100
Age: 15-16 GIRLS	88.7	8.8	0.0	2.5	100

Note: 'OTHER' includes children going to madarssa and EGS.
'NOT IN SCHOOL' = dropped out + never enrolled.

Chart 1: Trends over time
% Children out of school by age group and gender 2006-2011



How to read this chart: For example, the proportion of girls (age 11-14) not in school has changed from 2.7% in 2006 to 2.2% in 2007 to 1% in 2008 to 1.1% in 2009 to 0.4% in 2010 to 1.0% in 2011

Chart 2: Trends over time
% Children enrolled in private school by class 2007, 2009 & 2011




Table 2: Sample description
% Children in each class by age 2011

Std.	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	Total
I	39.0	52.7	6.2	2.2									100
II	2.5	25.3	53.7	15.7	2.8								100
III	1.7		21.8	59.5	14.2	2.8							100
IV	2.2			23.5	54.6	15.7	4.1						100
V	2.0				19.7	58.4	15.6	4.3					100
VI	1.8					15.3	54.1	24.4	4.4				100
VII	1.3						19.7	54.3	20.1	4.6			100
VIII	3.1							19.1	45.7	24.9	7.1		100


How to read this table: If a child started school in Std I at age 6, she should be age 8 in Std 3. This table shows the age distribution for each class. For example, in Std III, 59.5% children are 8 years old but there are also 21.8% who are 7, 14.2% who are 9 years old, etc.

Young children in pre-school and school

Table 3: % Children age 5-6 who are enrolled in different types of pre-school & school 2011

	In balwadi or anganwadi	In LKG/ UKG	In School			Not enrolled anywhere	Total
			Govt	Pvt	Other		
Age 5	14.4	15.8	32.6	36.4	0.0	0.8	100
Age 6	0.7	3.8	56.8	38.1	0.1	0.4	100

Chart 3: Trends over time
Five year olds in pre-school & school 2007, 2009 & 2011



Reading

Table 4: % Children by class and READING level
All schools 2011

Std.	Nothing	Letter	Word	Level 1 (Std 1 Text)	Level 2 (Std 2 Text)	Total
I	12.1	51.0	27.1	5.6	4.2	100
II	3.6	19.4	43.5	20.4	13.2	100
III	2.1	8.5	22.6	35.5	31.3	100
IV	1.1	4.7	8.0	30.2	56.0	100
V	0.2	2.0	5.7	18.2	73.9	100
VI	0.0	1.4	1.5	10.8	86.3	100
VII	0.5	0.4	1.2	6.5	91.5	100
VIII	0.1	0.4	0.4	3.4	95.8	100
Total	2.4	10.5	13.6	16.5	57.0	100

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, 2.1% children cannot even read letters, 8.5% can read letters but not more, 22.6% can read words but not Std 1 text or higher, 35.5% can read Std 1 text but not Std 2 level text, and 31.3% can read Std 2 level text. In sum, for each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is 100%.

Reading Tool



Chart 4: Trends over time
% Children in Std III who CANNOT READ Std I LEVEL TEXT
By school type 2008-2011





Chart 5: Trends over time
% Children in Std V who CANNOT READ Std II LEVEL TEXT
By school type 2008-2011



Home language and school language

Table 5: School language and home language

% Children whose :	%
Home language is the same as school language	11.4
Home language is different from school language	88.7
Total	100.0

Note : In ASER 2011 for every state, reading tools were provided in the main medium of instruction in government schools. Children and their families were also asked about the language they speak at home. For home languages, a list of 122 languages was provided to all survey teams. This list includes 22 Scheduled languages and 100 Non-Scheduled languages. The data in this table is for children for whom we have information for both school language and home language.



Himachal Pradesh RURAL

Arithmetic

Table 6: % Children by class and ARITHMETIC level
All schools 2011

Std.	Nothing	Recognize Numbers		Subtract	Divide	Total
		1-9	11-99			
I	7.9	46.0	38.1	6.2	1.8	100
II	1.6	20.5	49.2	24.4	4.4	100
III	0.7	10.0	32.3	43.5	13.4	100
IV	0.6	5.2	14.4	44.0	35.8	100
V	0.3	2.0	9.5	28.4	59.8	100
VI	0.0	1.5	6.2	20.4	71.9	100
VII	0.4	0.3	7.0	13.9	78.4	100
VIII	0.5	0.4	3.3	15.7	80.1	100
Total	1.4	10.3	19.7	24.9	43.6	100

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level of arithmetic achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, 0.7% children cannot even recognize numbers 1-9, 10% children can recognize numbers up to 9 but not more, 32.3% can recognize numbers to 99 but cannot do subtraction, 43.5% can do subtraction but not division, and 13.4% can do division. In sum, for each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is 100%.

Math Tool



Chart 6: Trends over time
% Children in Std III who CANNOT RECOGNISE NUMBERS upto 100. By school type 2008-2011





Chart 7: Trends over time
% Children in Std V who CANNOT DO DIVISION
By school type 2008-2011



Tuition

Table 7: Class-wise % children attending PAID TUITION CLASSES
By school type 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Year	School	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	Total
2007	Govt	1.4	2.0	3.4	3.6	4.6	4.1	6.3	8.0	4.2
	Pvt	10.9	12.5	14.4	20.7	12.8	30.1	22.6	23.1	17.1
2009	Govt	6.2	4.8	5.7	6.1	8.5	8.4	10.2	9.9	7.6
	Pvt	16.3	19.5	17.2	19.8	22.2	35.8	23.9	22.7	21.6
2010	Govt	1.6	5.5	3.7	3.3	8.5	7.1	5.8	7.5	5.6
	Pvt	16.4	15.2	23.3	18.9	22.4	19.3	27.7	22.3	20.1
2011	Govt	0.5	2.3	2.8	3.6	2.9	3.9	4.6	6.0	3.5
	Pvt	8.3	12.3	10.9	18.6	20.3	20.4	16.8	20.1	15.3

Note: In 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011 the ASER survey recorded information about tuition. In all 4 years, the question asked was the following: "Does the child take any paid additional class currently?" Therefore, these numbers do not include any supplemental help in learning that children may have received from parents, siblings or from anyone else who did not require payment.



Himachal Pradesh RURAL

Annual Status of Education Report
असर ASER 2011 RURAL
Facilitated by PRATHAM

As part of ASER 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011, in each sampled village, one government school with primary sections was visited on the day of the survey. Information about schools in this report is based on these visits.

School observations

Table 8: Total schools visited 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Type of school	2007	2009	2010	2011
Std I-IV/V: Primary	224	310	195	224
Std I-VII/VIII: Primary + Upper primary	26	22	66	50
Total schools visited	250	332	261	274



Student and teacher attendance

Table 9: Student attendance 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Type of school	2007	2009	2010	2011	2007	2009	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V				Std I-VII/VIII			
% Enrolled children present (average)	88.6	90.4	90.1	90.7	91.6	89.9	89.4	89.0
% Schools with less than 50% enrolled children present (average)	2.4	1.0	1.6	1.4	0.0	0.0	1.6	0.0
% Schools with 75% or more enrolled children present (average)	91.3	91.6	92.8	91.4	95.7	90.5	93.8	88.0

Table 10: Teacher attendance 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Type of school	2007	2009	2010	2011	2007	2009	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V				Std I-VII/VIII			
% Teachers present (average)	88.5	90.8	89.4	86.6	89.6	85.0	83.7	81.4
% Schools with no teachers present (average)	0.5	0.0	0.0	1.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
% Schools with all teachers present (average)	70.3	73.9	70.8	68.8	68.2	61.1	47.5	44.9

Other school information

Table 11: Headteachers 2010 & 2011

% Schools with:	2010	2011	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V		Std I-VII/VIII	
No Headteacher appointed	0.0	3.1	0.0	0.0
Headteacher appointed but not present at time of visit	3.8	9.9	19.2	9.7
Headteacher appointed & present at time of visit	96.2	87.0	80.9	90.3
Total	100	100	100	100

Table 12: Computers 2010 and 2011

% Schools with:	2010	2011	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V		Std I-VII/VIII	
No computer	96.3	97.7	84.1	88.0
Computers but no children using them on day of visit	2.1	0.9	7.9	6.0
Computers & children using them on day of visit	1.6	1.4	7.9	6.0
Total	100	100	100	100

Table 13: Multigrade classes 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

% Schools with:	2007	2009	2010	2011	2007	2009	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V				Std I-VII/VIII			
Std II children sitting with one or more other classes	60.8	57.4	58.7	50.7	80.0	54.6	58.1	74.5
Std IV children sitting with one or more other classes	54.6	53.7	54.0	44.8	61.5	40.0	49.2	65.2

School funds and activities (PAISA)

Table 14: % Schools who report receiving SSA grants - Full financial year

SSA school grants	2008-2009				2009-2010				2010-2011			
	No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools		
		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know
Maintenance grant	310	90.7	7.1	2.3	245	93.9	2.5	3.7	263	94.3	3.0	2.7
Development grant	296	83.5	15.2	1.4	235	93.6	3.4	3.0	259	92.3	3.9	3.9
TLM grant	317	95.3	3.5	1.3	231	97.4	0.9	1.7	263	98.9	0.0	1.1

Table 15: % Schools who report receiving SSA grants - Half financial year

SSA school grants	April 2009 to October 2009				April 2010 to October 2010				April 2011 to October 2011			
	No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools		
		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know
Maintenance grant	278	85.6	11.2	3.2	236	84.3	10.6	5.1	252	84.5	11.9	3.6
Development grant	268	82.1	15.3	2.6	225	85.8	9.8	4.4	247	81.8	14.6	3.6
TLM grant	281	91.5	6.1	2.5	228	88.2	8.8	3.1	249	87.2	11.2	1.6

Table 16: % Schools carrying out different activities since April 2011

Type of Activity		% schools		
		Yes	No	Don't know
Const.	New Classroom	18.3	80.3	1.4
Repairs	Repair of building (roof, floor, wall etc.)	56.3	42.2	1.5
	Repair of doors & windows	47.1	51.4	1.6
	Repair of boundary wall	26.3	72.0	1.7
	Repair of drinking water facility	38.6	60.2	1.2
	Repair of toilet	34.4	64.0	1.6
Painting & White Wash	White wash/plastering	61.0	37.4	1.6
	Painting Blackboard/Display Board/Painting on wall	66.9	31.9	1.2
	Painting of doors & walls	59.5	39.3	1.2
Purchase	Purchase of furniture (cupboard etc.)	50.0	49.2	0.8
	Purchase of electrical fittings	38.8	60.0	1.2
	Purchase of chalk, duster, register etc.	79.8	17.5	2.8
	Purchase of sitting Mats/Tat Patti	32.0	65.6	2.5
	Purchase of charts, globes & other teaching material	72.9	24.4	2.7
Other	Expenditure on school events	53.9	44.1	2.0
	Payment of bills (electricity, water, cleaning etc.)	63.1	34.0	2.9

The PAISA section of ASER tracks receipt and spending of Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) grants at the school level. This information is collected from schools visited during the survey. This page reports proportion of schools receiving the grants and carrying out specified activities in the schools. More detailed analysis of the PAISA data will be available in the PAISA 2011 report which will be released in March 2012.[1]

EVERY RURAL GOVERNMENT PRIMARY SCHOOL IS ENTITLED TO EACH OF THESE SSA GRANTS EVERY YEAR.

How much goes to each school	For what purposes
SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT GRANT / SCHOOL GRANT	
Rs.5000 per year per primary school	This grant can be used for buying school equipment such as blackboard, sitting mats etc. Also for buying chalk, duster, registers and other office equipment.
Rs.7000 per year per upper primary school	
Rs 5000 + Rs 7000 = Rs 12000 if the school is Std I-VII/VIII.	The grant amount varies by type of school: whether it is a primary or upper primary school.
Note: Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same premises.	
SCHOOL MAINTENANCE GRANT	
Rs.5000 - Rs 7500 per school per year if the school has upto 3 classrooms.	This grant can be used for maintenance of school building, including whitewashing; beautification; and repair of toilets, hand pump, boundary wall, playground etc. The grant amount depends on number of classrooms (excluding Headmaster room and office room)
Rs 7500 - Rs.10000 per year if the school has more than 3 classrooms.	
Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same building.	
TLM GRANT	
Rs.500 per teacher per year in primary and upper primary schools.	This grant can be used by teachers to buy teaching aids, such as charts, globes, posters, models etc.

[1] For more information see www.accountabilityinitiative.in

Himachal Pradesh RURAL

Right to Education indicators

Table 17: Schools by total enrollment 2010 and 2011

School enrollment	2010		2011	
	No. of schools	% of schools	No. of schools	% of schools
1-60	125	48.6	160	59.0
61-90	54	21.0	61	22.5
91-120	45	17.5	18	6.6
121-150	14	5.5	21	7.8
151-200	11	4.3	6	2.2
> 200	8	3.1	5	1.9
TOTAL	257	100	271	100

Table 18: RTE norms: Pupil-teacher ratio 2010 and 2011

School enrollment	RTE Teacher Norms	2010	2011
		% Schools that do not meet PTR norms	
1-60	2	32.4	30.2
61-90	3	42.6	32.1
91-120	4	47.6	38.9
121-150	5	61.5	55.0
151-200	5 + HM	20.0	40.0
> 200	see note	57.1	100.0
TOTAL		39.4	34.7

Note : For schools with enrollment above 200 children the PTR shall not exceed 40 excluding the Head Teacher

Table 19: Schools by number of teachers 2010 and 2011

Number of teachers	2010		2011	
	No. of schools	% of schools	No. of schools	% of schools
1	37	16.7	45	18.7
2	80	36.0	98	40.7
3	39	17.6	46	19.1
4	24	10.8	20	8.3
5	17	7.7	18	7.5
6	11	5.0	5	2.1
>=7	14	6.3	9	3.7
TOTAL	222	100	241	100

Table 20: RTE norms: Teacher - classroom ratio 2010 and 2011

RTE norm: At least one classroom per teacher	2010	2011
Number of teachers	% Schools that do not meet classroom to teacher norms	
1	0.0	0.0
2	11.3	15.9
3	37.0	29.0
4	30.4	23.5
5	50.0	53.3
6	62.5	100.0
>=7	50.0	71.4
TOTAL	23.4	22.6

Table 21: % Schools meeting selected RTE norms on facilities 2010 & 2011

% of schools with		2010	2011
Building	Office/Store/Office cum store	75.5	76.9
	Playground	76.0	70.0
	Boundary Wall	37.3	42.4
Drinking Water	No facility for drinking water	12.5	11.5
	Facility but no drinking water available	4.3	6.7
	Drinking water available	83.2	81.8
Toilet	No toilet facility	10.8	7.9
	Facility but toilet not useable	33.2	23.6
	Toilet useable	56.0	68.5
Girls Toilet	% Schools with no separate provisions for girls toilets	31.1	12.5
	Of schools with separate girls toilets, % schools where		
	Toilet locked	10.6	2.4
	Toilet not useable	19.6	20.2
	Toilet useable	38.7	64.9
TLM	Teaching learning material in Std 2	91.5	89.8
	Teaching learning material in Std 4	87.5	89.0
Library	No library	19.7	11.4
	Library but no books being used by children on day of visit	39.0	46.1
	Library being used by children on day of visit	41.3	42.4
MDM	Kitchen shed for cooking midday meal	82.0	89.3
	Midday meal served in school on the day of visit	98.0	99.3

Note: School observations for ASER 2011 looked at TLM for Std II and Std IV only.

As part of ASER 2010 and 2011, in each sampled village, one government school with primary sections was visited on the day of the survey. During this school visit, RTE indicators were observed and are reported here.

Extracts from the Schedule of The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act 2009 Norms and standards for a School (Sections 19 and 25)

Number of teachers in Std 1-5:


Admitted children	No. of teachers
<= 60	2
61-90	3
91-120	4
121-200	5
> 150	5 + 1 Headteacher
> 200	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (excluding Headteacher) shall not exceed 40

School facilities:
All weather building with:

- At least one classroom for every teacher
- Office cum store cum headteacher's room
- Separate toilets for boys and girls
- Safe and adequate drinking water facility to all children
- A kitchen where mid-day meal is cooked in the school
- Playground
- Arrangements for securing the school building by boundary wall or fencing.

Teaching learning equipment
shall be provided to each class as required.

Library
There shall be a library in each school providing newspaper, magazines and books on all subjects, including story-books.



Jammu and Kashmir RURAL

Annual Status of Education Report
ASER 2011 RURAL
Facilitated by PRATHAM

ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM HOUSEHOLDS. 14 OUT OF 14 DISTRICTS


School enrollment and out of school children

Table 1: % Children in different types of schools 2011

Age group	Govt.	Pvt.	Other	Not in School	Total
Age: 6-14 ALL	59.4	37.7	0.4	2.5	100
Age: 7-16 ALL	61.6	34.1	0.4	4.0	100
Age: 7-10 ALL	55.6	42.2	0.4	1.8	100
Age: 7-10 BOYS	52.7	45.5	0.4	1.3	100
Age: 7-10 GIRLS	58.9	38.4	0.5	2.3	100
Age: 11-14 ALL	63.7	32.9	0.4	3.0	100
Age: 11-14 BOYS	60.1	37.0	0.5	2.4	100
Age: 11-14 GIRLS	67.7	28.4	0.2	3.7	100
Age: 15-16 ALL	68.5	20.9	0.4	10.1	100
Age: 15-16 BOYS	68.4	23.5	0.5	7.7	100
Age: 15-16 GIRLS	68.9	18.2	0.3	12.5	100

Note: 'OTHER' includes children going to madarssa and EGS.
'NOT IN SCHOOL' = dropped out + never enrolled.

Chart 1: Trends over time
% Children out of school by age group and gender 2006-2011



How to read this chart: For example, the proportion of girls (age 11-14) not in school has changed from 8.3% in 2006 to 5.8% in 2007 to 5% in 2008 to 3.1% in 2009 to 3.7% in 2011

Chart 2: Trends over time
% Children enrolled in private school by class 2007, 2009 & 2011




Table 2: Sample description
% Children in each class by age 2011

Std.	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	Total
I	19.8	36.9	27.1	10.0	6.2								100
II	4.0	12.3	29.8	38.4	8.1	7.4							100
III	3.4		9.7	28.9	37.8	14.7	5.4						100
IV	3.2			13.8	24.2	42.4	8.9	7.4					100
V	4.0				10.9	30.3	37.5	11.3	5.9				100
VI	2.3					11.6	25.5	44.2	10.7	5.7			100
VII	4.7						8.8	30.7	42.5	10.3	3.0		100
VIII	2.7							11.1	26.0	45.9	10.6	3.7	100

How to read this table: If a child started school in Std I at age 6, she should be age 8 in Std 3. This table shows the age distribution for each class. For example, in Std III, 28.9% children are 8 years old but there are also 9.7% who are 7, 37.8% who are 9, 14.7% who are 10 years old, etc.


Young children in pre-school and school

Table 3: % Children age 5-6 who are enrolled in different types of pre-school & school 2011

	In balwadi or anganwadi	In LKG/ UKG	In School			Not enrolled anywhere	Total
			Govt	Pvt	Other		
Age 5	14.0	24.0	27.7	24.4	0.7	9.3	100
Age 6	3.1	14.2	45.5	34.1	0.4	2.7	100

Note: Jammu and Kashmir data for 2010 not available.

Chart 3: Trends over time
Five year olds in pre-school & school 2007, 2009 & 2011



Jammu and Kashmir RURAL

Reading

Table 4: % Children by class and READING level
All schools 2011

Std.	Nothing	Letter	Word	Level 1 (Std 1 Text)	Level 2 (Std 2 Text)	Total
I	14.2	49.9	23.3	8.8	3.7	100
II	6.0	33.7	33.2	17.0	10.2	100
III	2.9	23.5	28.3	27.8	17.5	100
IV	1.6	16.6	25.4	31.2	25.1	100
V	1.4	9.7	20.0	32.8	36.2	100
VI	1.2	6.6	13.4	32.0	46.8	100
VII	0.9	5.4	9.3	28.5	56.0	100
VIII	0.6	3.9	7.2	24.8	63.6	100
Total	3.7	18.8	19.8	25.1	32.6	100

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, 2.9% children cannot even read letters, 23.5% can read letters but not more, 28.3% can read words but not Std 1 text or higher, 27.8% can read Std 1 text but not Std 2 level text, and 17.5% can read Std 2 level text. In sum, for each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is 100%.

Reading Tool




Chart 4: Trends over time
% Children in Std III who CANNOT READ Std I LEVEL TEXT
By school type 2008-2011





Chart 5: Trends over time
% Children in Std V who CANNOT READ Std II LEVEL TEXT
By school type 2008-2011



Home language and school language

Table 5: School language and home language

%Children who took the reading test in:	%
English	91.6
Urdu	6.7
Hindi	1.7
Total	100

Of the % Children tested in:	% Children whose home language was:				
	Kashmiri	Dogri	Ladakhi	Other*	Total
English	52.2	24.7	1.3	21.7	100
Urdu	32.0	5.4	0.0	62.6	100

* 'Other' includes all languages from the list of scheduled and non-scheduled languages except those specified above. Data for home language of children tested in Hindi has not been reported here due to small cell sizes.

Note: In ASER 2011 for every state, reading tools were provided in the main medium of instruction in government schools. In Jammu and Kashmir, where the medium of instruction in government schools is English, children were given the choice of reading in English, Urdu or Hindi. Hindi tools were used in only in Jammu division. For home languages, a list of 122 languages was provided to all survey teams. This list includes 22 Scheduled languages and 100 Non-Scheduled languages. The data in this table is for children for whom we have information for both school language and home language.



Arithmetic

Table 6: % Children by class and ARITHMETIC level
All schools 2011

Std.	Nothing	Recognize Numbers		Subtract	Divide	Total
		1-9	11-99			
I	12.0	42.9	36.1	8.2	0.7	100
II	4.8	27.0	45.2	19.8	3.2	100
III	3.0	17.5	40.7	33.1	5.7	100
IV	1.4	9.9	38.2	37.8	12.8	100
V	1.0	6.6	28.9	41.0	22.5	100
VI	1.0	5.7	22.3	42.3	28.8	100
VII	0.7	2.8	20.9	40.1	35.5	100
VIII	0.5	1.4	17.8	40.3	40.1	100
Total	3.1	14.3	31.0	32.6	18.9	100

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level of arithmetic achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, 3% children cannot even recognize numbers 1-9, 17.5% children can recognize numbers up to 9 but not more, 40.7% can recognize numbers to 99 but cannot do subtraction, 33.1% can do subtraction but not division, and 5.7% can do division. In sum, for each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is 100%.

Math Tool



Chart 6: Trends over time
% Children in Std III who CANNOT RECOGNISE NUMBERS upto 100. By school type 2008-2011





Chart 7: Trends over time
% Children in Std V who CANNOT DO DIVISION
By school type 2008-2011



Tuition

Table 7: Class-wise % children attending PAID TUITION CLASSES
By school type 2007, 2009 and 2011

Year	School	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	Total
2007	Govt	6.0	5.4	6.5	5.9	8.0	11.8	12.6	17.9	9.2
	Pvt	13.0	22.4	21.0	19.2	32.5	30.3	28.1	33.9	23.7
2009	Govt	3.6	8.5	11.2	14.7	19.3	14.9	20.5	22.0	14.5
	Pvt	12.5	13.7	18.4	25.7	33.8	25.0	32.8	27.9	23.1
2010	Govt									
	Pvt									
2011	Govt	4.1	3.8	7.1	6.9	6.4	7.5	7.2	9.6	6.7
	Pvt	19.3	20.5	19.2	22.7	19.1	18.8	23.6	29.8	21.4

Note: In 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011 the ASER survey recorded information about tuition. In all 4 years, the question asked was the following: "Does the child take any paid additional class currently?" Therefore, these numbers do not include any supplemental help in learning that children may have received from parents, siblings or from anyone else who did not require payment.



Jammu and Kashmir RURAL

As part of ASER 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011, in each sampled village, one government school with primary sections was visited on the day of the survey. Information about schools in this report is based on these visits.

School observations

Table 8: Total schools visited 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Type of school	2007	2009	2010	2011
Std I-IV/V: Primary	115	81		76
Std I-VII/VIII: Primary + Upper primary	176	276		281
Total schools visited	291	357		357



Student and teacher attendance

Table 9: Student attendance 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Type of school	2007	2009	2010	2011	2007	2009	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V				Std I-VII/VIII			
% Enrolled children present (average)	81.4	86.4		80.3	83.5	89.8		76.5
% Schools with less than 50% enrolled children present (average)	3.4	0.0		5.5	2.8	0.4		7.7
% Schools with 75% or more enrolled children present (average)	68.2	84.8		71.2	72.5	85.7		62.3

Table 10: Teacher attendance 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Type of school	2007	2009	2010	2011	2007	2009	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V				Std I-VII/VIII			
% Teachers present (average)	92.6	92.1		90.1	87.0	91.2		83.4
% Schools with no teachers present (average)	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0
% Schools with all teachers present (average)	80.4	73.1		74.0	51.3	61.3		38.8

Other school information

Table 11: Headteachers 2010 and 2011

% Schools with:	2010	2011	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V		Std I-VII/VIII	
No Headteacher appointed		1.8		1.3
Headteacher appointed but not present at time of visit		7.3		10.7
Headteacher appointed & present at time of visit		90.9		88.0
Total		100		100

Table 12: Computers 2010 and 2011

% Schools with:	2010	2011	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V		Std I-VII/VIII	
No computer		96.1		84.5
Computers but no children using them on day of visit		4.0		9.7
Computers & children using them on day of visit		0.0		5.8
Total		100		100

Table 13: Multigrade classes 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

% Schools with:	2007	2009	2010	2011	2007	2009	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V				Std I-VII/VIII			
Std II children sitting with one or more other classes	60.2	77.5		84.7	49.4	46.9		63.8
Std IV children sitting with one or more other classes	53.0	72.2		79.7	37.0	42.2		55.6

School funds and activities (PAISA)

Table 14: % Schools who report receiving SSA grants - Full financial year

SSA school grants	2008-2009				2010-2011			
	No. of Schools	% Schools			No. of Schools	% Schools		
		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know
Maintenance grant	351	77.8	8.8	13.4	351	86.0	12.3	1.7
Development grant	348	74.7	11.8	13.5	346	77.2	19.9	2.9
TLM grant	350	83.1	8.0	8.9	354	91.5	7.3	1.1

Table 15: % Schools who report receiving SSA grants - Half financial year

SSA school grants	April 2009 to October 2009				April 2011 to October 2011			
	No. of Schools	% Schools			No. of Schools	% Schools		
		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know
Maintenance grant	329	75.1	12.8	12.2	334	61.1	35.0	3.9
Development grant	329	74.8	11.9	13.4	329	56.5	39.5	4.0
TLM grant	329	81.8	9.7	8.5	336	67.0	31.0	2.1

Table 16: % Schools carrying out different activities since April 2011

Type of Activity		% schools		
		Yes	No	Don't know
Const.	New Classroom	18.4	81.6	0.0
Repairs	Repair of building (roof, floor, wall etc.)	48.1	51.9	0.0
	Repair of doors & windows	43.6	56.4	0.0
	Repair of boundary wall	15.0	85.0	0.0
	Repair of drinking water facility	27.3	72.8	0.0
	Repair of toilet	17.4	82.7	0.0
Painting & White Wash	White wash/plastering	60.6	39.1	0.3
	Painting Blackboard/Display Board/Painting on wall	54.4	45.6	0.0
	Painting of doors & walls	42.8	57.2	0.0
Purchase	Purchase of furniture (cupboard etc.)	69.3	30.4	0.3
	Purchase of electrical fittings	12.2	87.5	0.3
	Purchase of chalk, duster, register etc.	90.2	9.8	0.0
	Purchase of sitting Mats/Tat Patti	75.7	24.3	0.0
	Purchase of charts, globes & other teaching material	85.7	14.3	0.0
Other	Expenditure on school events	49.9	49.2	0.9
	Payment of bills (electricity, water, cleaning etc.)	13.9	85.0	1.2

The PAISA section of ASER tracks receipt and spending of Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) grants at the school level. This information is collected from schools visited during the survey. This page reports proportion of schools receiving the grants and carrying out specified activities in the schools. More detailed analysis of the PAISA data will be available in the PAISA 2011 report which will be released in March 2012.[1]

EVERY RURAL GOVERNMENT PRIMARY SCHOOL IS ENTITLED TO EACH OF THESE SSA GRANTS EVERY YEAR.

How much goes to each school	For what purposes
SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT GRANT / SCHOOL GRANT	
Rs.5000 per year per primary school	This grant can be used for buying school equipment such as blackboard, sitting mats etc. Also for buying chalk, duster, registers and other office equipment.
Rs.7000 per year per upper primary school	
Rs 5000 + Rs 7000 = Rs 12000 if the school is Std I-VII/VIII.	The grant amount varies by type of school: whether it is a primary or upper primary school.
Note: Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same premises.	
SCHOOL MAINTENANCE GRANT	
Rs.5000 - Rs 7500 per school per year if the school has upto 3 classrooms.	This grant can be used for maintenance of school building, including whitewashing; beautification; and repair of toilets, hand pump, boundary wall, playground etc. The grant amount depends on number of classrooms (excluding Headmaster room and office room)
Rs 7500 - Rs.10000 per year if the school has more than 3 classrooms.	
Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same building.	
TLM GRANT	
Rs.500 per teacher per year in primary and upper primary schools.	This grant can be used by teachers to buy teaching aids, such as charts, globes, posters, models etc.

[1] For more information see www.accountabilityinitiative.in

Jammu and Kashmir RURAL

Annual Status of Education Report
असर ASER 2011 RURAL
Facilitated by PRATHAM

Right to Education indicators

Table 17: Schools by total enrollment 2011

School enrollment	2011	
	No. of schools	% of schools
1-60	157	45.0
61-90	70	20.1
91-120	43	12.3
121-150	35	10.0
151-200	23	6.6
> 200	21	6.0
TOTAL	349	100.0

Table 18: RTE norms: Pupil-teacher ratio 2011

School enrollment	RTE Teacher Norms	2011
		% Schools that do not meet PTR norms
1-60	2	12.6
61-90	3	4.5
91-120	4	9.3
121-150	5	18.2
151-200	5 + HM	16.7
> 200	see note	35.3
TOTAL		12.5

Note : For schools with enrollment above 200 children the PTR shall not exceed 40 excluding the Head Teacher

Table 19: Schools by number of teachers 2011

Number of teachers	2011	
	No. of schools	% of schools
1	17	5.2
2	5	10.7
3	17	5.2
4	47	14.4
5	61	18.7
6	43	13.2
>=7	107	32.7
TOTAL	327	100.0

Table 20: RTE norms: Teacher - classroom ratio 2011

RTE norm: At least one classroom per teacher	2011
Number of teachers	% Schools that do not meet classroom to teacher norms
1	0.0
2	20.8
3	40.0
4	48.7
5	51.0
6	75.0
>=7	61.3
TOTAL	50.2

Table 21: % Schools meeting selected RTE norms on facilities 2011

% of schools with		2011
Building	Office/Store/Office cum store	82.0
	Playground	52.7
	Boundary Wall	28.7
Drinking Water	No facility for drinking water	47.2
	Facility but no drinking water available	6.2
	Drinking water available	46.6
Toilet	No toilet facility	33.4
	Facility but toilet not useable	30.3
	Toilet useable	36.3
Girls Toilet	% Schools with no separate provisions for girls toilets	61.0
	Of schools with separate girls toilets, % schools where	
	Toilet locked	6.9
	Toilet not useable	9.8
	Toilet useable	22.4
TLM	Teaching learning material in Std 2	71.7
	Teaching learning material in Std 4	68.8
Library	No library	49.3
	Library but no books being used by children on day of visit	23.9
	Library being used by children on day of visit	26.8
MDM	Kitchen shed for cooking midday meal	70.9
	Midday meal served in school on the day of visit	76.4

Note: School observations for ASER 2011 looked at TLM for Std II and Std IV only.

As part of ASER 2010 and 2011, in each sampled village, one government school with primary sections was visited on the day of the survey. During this school visit, RTE indicators were observed and are reported here.

Extracts from the Schedule of The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act 2009 Norms and standards for a School (Sections 19 and 25)

Number of teachers in Std 1-5:


Admitted children	No. of teachers
<= 60	2
61-90	3
91-120	4
121-200	5
> 150	5 + 1 Headteacher
> 200	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (excluding Headteacher) shall not exceed 40

School facilities:
All weather building with:

- At least one classroom for every teacher
- Office cum store cum headteacher's room
- Separate toilets for boys and girls
- Safe and adequate drinking water facility to all children
- A kitchen where mid-day meal is cooked in the school
- Playground
- Arrangements for securing the school building by boundary wall or fencing.

Teaching learning equipment
shall be provided to each class as required.

Library
There shall be a library in each school providing newspaper, magazines and books on all subjects, including story-books.



Jharkhand RURAL

Annual Status of Education Report
ASER 2011 RURAL
Facilitated by PRATHAM

ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM HOUSEHOLDS. 20 OUT OF 22 DISTRICTS


School enrollment and out of school children

Table 1: % Children in different types of schools 2011

Age group	Govt.	Pvt.	Other	Not in School	Total
Age: 6-14 ALL	81.0	12.8	1.5	4.7	100
Age: 7-16 ALL	79.5	13.1	1.3	6.1	100
Age: 7-10 ALL	82.2	12.8	1.7	3.4	100
Age: 7-10 BOYS	80.9	14.3	1.6	3.3	100
Age: 7-10 GIRLS	83.5	11.2	1.8	3.5	100
Age: 11-14 ALL	79.9	13.0	1.2	6.0	100
Age: 11-14 BOYS	79.1	13.8	1.4	5.8	100
Age: 11-14 GIRLS	80.5	12.2	1.0	6.4	100
Age: 15-16 ALL	69.3	14.3	0.8	15.6	100
Age: 15-16 BOYS	71.0	13.4	0.8	14.9	100
Age: 15-16 GIRLS	67.2	15.5	0.9	16.3	100

Note: 'OTHER' includes children going to madarssa and EGS.
'NOT IN SCHOOL' = dropped out + never enrolled.

Chart 1: Trends over time
% Children out of school by age group and gender 2006-2011



How to read this chart: For example, the proportion of girls (age 11-14) not in school has changed from 13% in 2006 to 8% in 2007 to 9.4% in 2008 to 7.5% in 2009 to 4.9% in 2010 to 6.4% in 2011

Chart 2: Trends over time
% Children enrolled in private school by class 2007, 2009 & 2011




Table 2: Sample description
% Children in each class by age 2011

Std.	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	Total
I	30.2	35.4	16.1	10.6	7.6								100
II	6.6	14.6	26.4	30.2	7.5	8.3	6.3						100
III	6.9		12.8	32.2	19.4	17.0	4.3	7.3					100
IV	6.9			14.6	20.8	33.5	8.3	10.0	5.8				100
V	2.6		7.2	9.1	32.0	17.8	19.5	5.8	5.9				100
VI	5.6			17.2	21.5	32.5	12.0	6.3	5.0				100
VII	7.8					7.9	34.9	23.4	15.7	7.8	2.5		100
VIII	5.6						16.0	27.2	29.7	14.2	7.4		100


How to read this table: If a child started school in Std I at age 6, she should be age 8 in Std 3. This table shows the age distribution for each class. For example, in Std III, 32.2% children are 8 years old but there are also 12.8% who are 7, 19.4% who are 9, 17.0% who are 10 years old, etc.

Young children in pre-school and school

Table 3: % Children age 5-6 who are enrolled in different types of pre-school & school 2011

	In balwadi or anganwadi	In LKG/ UKG	In School			Not enrolled anywhere	Total
			Govt	Pvt	Other		
Age 5	27.8	5.7	48.6	8.5	1.8	7.5	100
Age 6	10.9	4.1	68.0	10.7	1.8	4.5	100

Chart 3: Trends over time
Five year olds in pre-school & school 2007, 2009 & 2011



Reading

Table 4: % Children by class and READING level
All schools 2011

Std.	Nothing	Letter	Word	Level 1 (Std 1 Text)	Level 2 (Std 2 Text)	Total
I	49.2	34.7	10.7	2.9	2.4	100
II	22.0	39.6	23.3	8.7	6.5	100
III	10.3	29.3	29.9	17.7	12.8	100
IV	7.6	19.2	24.2	23.9	25.1	100
V	4.4	12.6	17.1	24.9	41.0	100
VI	2.0	7.6	11.0	21.8	57.5	100
VII	1.0	4.0	7.1	15.1	72.9	100
VIII	1.5	2.9	5.0	10.4	80.3	100
Total	14.5	20.9	16.8	15.3	32.5	100

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, 10.3% children cannot even read letters, 29.3% can read letters but not more, 29.9% can read words but not Std 1 text or higher, 17.7% can read Std 1 text but not Std 2 level text, and 12.8% can read Std 2 level text. In sum, for each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is 100%.

Reading Tool




Chart 4: Trends over time
% Children in Std III who CANNOT READ Std I LEVEL TEXT
By school type 2008-2011





Chart 5: Trends over time
% Children in Std V who CANNOT READ Std II LEVEL TEXT
By school type 2008-2011



Home language and school language

Table 5: School language and home language

% Children whose :	%
Home language is the same as school language	38.8
Home language is different from school language	61.2
Total	100.0

Note : In ASER 2011 for every state, reading tools were provided in the main medium of instruction in government schools. Children and their families were also asked about the language they speak at home. For home languages, a list of 122 languages was provided to all survey teams. This list includes 22 Scheduled languages and 100 Non-Scheduled languages. The data in this table is for children for whom we have information for both school language and home language.



Arithmetic

Table 6: % Children by class and ARITHMETIC level
All schools 2011

Std.	Nothing	Recognize Numbers		Subtract	Divide	Total
		1-9	11-99			
I	49.7	37.5	9.7	2.1	1.1	100
II	20.6	45.6	22.5	8.7	2.6	100
III	9.1	35.4	32.3	17.5	5.8	100
IV	5.1	23.8	29.0	30.0	12.0	100
V	2.5	16.0	23.4	34.1	24.0	100
VI	1.7	9.0	19.4	32.0	37.8	100
VII	1.3	4.9	14.4	28.8	50.7	100
VIII	1.3	4.8	11.1	24.1	58.7	100
Total	13.6	24.5	20.5	20.8	20.6	100

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level of arithmetic achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, 9.1% children cannot even recognize numbers 1-9, 35.4% children can recognize numbers up to 9 but not more, 32.3% can recognize numbers to 99 but cannot do subtraction, 17.5% can do subtraction but not division, and 5.8% can do division. In sum, for each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is 100%.

Math Tool



Chart 6: Trends over time
% Children in Std III who CANNOT RECOGNISE NUMBERS upto 100. By school type 2008-2011





Chart 7: Trends over time
% Children in Std V who CANNOT DO DIVISION
By school type 2008-2011



Tuition

Table 7: Class-wise % children attending PAID TUITION CLASSES
By school type 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Year	School	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	Total
2007	Govt	13.4	14.5	17.3	19.6	19.8	24.6	23.3	29.7	18.9
	Pvt	39.9	38.7	39.5	49.4	44.9	45.8	38.9	46.7	42.5
2009	Govt	15.3	20.4	22.1	25.3	26.7	32.3	33.2	38.7	25.1
	Pvt	38.9	39.8	35.9	40.3	38.3	32.2	30.7	42.1	37.7
2010	Govt	16.6	21.1	22.4	27.0	30.2	33.3	37.3	39.0	27.5
	Pvt	31.8	31.7	42.4	37.7	45.3	33.6	51.0	51.0	40.1
2011	Govt	13.9	19.2	22.9	23.8	27.4	30.1	32.8	37.9	25.1
	Pvt	36.5	41.0	36.6	42.1	36.4	42.6	36.0	39.1	38.6

Note: In 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011 the ASER survey recorded information about tuition. In all 4 years, the question asked was the following: "Does the child take any paid additional class currently?" Therefore, these numbers do not include any supplemental help in learning that children may have received from parents, siblings or from anyone else who did not require payment.



Jharkhand RURAL

Annual Status of Education Report
असर ASER 2011 RURAL
Facilitated by PRATHAM

As part of ASER 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011, in each sampled village, one government school with primary sections was visited on the day of the survey. Information about schools in this report is based on these visits.

School observations

Table 8: Total schools visited 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Type of school	2007	2009	2010	2011
Std I-IV/V: Primary	246	190	188	164
Std I-VII/VIII: Primary + Upper primary	300	336	359	373
Total schools visited	546	526	547	537



Student and teacher attendance

Table 9: Student attendance 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Type of school	2007	2009	2010	2011	2007	2009	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V				Std I-VII/VIII			
% Enrolled children present (average)	62.3	62.7	62.3	59.1	62.0	63.6	58.7	55.1
% Schools with less than 50% enrolled children present (average)	24.1	18.1	22.3	28.5	22.3	18.0	28.5	34.8
% Schools with 75% or more enrolled children present (average)	24.1	28.7	26.6	19.6	24.5	26.4	19.0	12.9

Table 10: Teacher attendance 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Type of school	2007	2009	2010	2011	2007	2009	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V				Std I-VII/VIII			
% Teachers present (average)	92.3	90.8	89.4	91.1	85.0	86.3	81.8	85.1
% Schools with no teachers present (average)	0.0	0.0	1.2	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.3
% Schools with all teachers present (average)	79.5	74.9	77.4	79.1	44.8	55.2	56.7	51.0

Other school information

Table 11: Headteachers 2010 & 2011

% Schools with:	2010	2011	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V		Std I-VII/VIII	
No Headteacher appointed	0.0	13.5	2.3	1.6
Headteacher appointed but not present at time of visit	12.3	6.7	3.7	13.0
Headteacher appointed & present at time of visit	87.7	79.8	94.1	85.4
Total	100	100	100	100

Table 12: Computers 2010 and 2011

% Schools with:	2010	2011	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V		Std I-VII/VIII	
No computer	96.6	97.6	91.1	93.5
Computers but no children using them on day of visit	1.7	1.2	3.6	6.0
Computers & children using them on day of visit	1.7	1.2	5.3	0.5
Total	100	100	100	100

Table 13: Multigrade classes 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

% Schools with:	2007	2009	2010	2011	2007	2009	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V				Std I-VII/VIII			
Std II children sitting with one or more other classes	82.3	78.1	76.9	84.8	62.8	65.3	59.7	65.0
Std IV children sitting with one or more other classes	74.9	76.3	75.3	82.5	51.7	58.3	52.4	61.8

School funds and activities (PAISA)

Table 14: % Schools who report receiving SSA grants - Full financial year

SSA school grants	2008-2009				2009-2010				2010-2011			
	No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools		
		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know
Maintenance grant	423	70.9	17.5	11.6	400	90.5	3.0	6.5	512	83.8	10.2	6.1
Development grant	425	75.3	12.0	12.7	393	89.8	3.6	6.6	504	84.5	10.1	5.4
TLM grant	441	82.5	9.1	8.4	401	93.3	3.2	3.5	503	86.5	9.5	4.0

Table 15: % Schools who report receiving SSA grants - Half financial year

SSA school grants	April 2009 to October 2009				April 2010 to October 2010				April 2011 to October 2011			
	No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools		
		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know
Maintenance grant	311	48.6	38.6	12.9	369	72.6	17.6	9.8	501	28.1	62.9	9.0
Development grant	306	52.0	34.6	13.4	354	70.9	20.3	8.8	495	29.9	60.6	9.5
TLM grant	310	56.1	34.2	9.7	355	74.7	19.4	5.9	497	32.4	59.6	8.1

Table 16: % Schools carrying out different activities since April 2011

Type of Activity		% schools		
		Yes	No	Don't know
Const.	New Classroom	29.4	67.1	3.5
Repairs	Repair of building (roof, floor, wall etc.)	40.9	56.7	2.5
	Repair of doors & windows	39.1	58.4	2.5
	Repair of boundary wall	14.4	82.7	2.9
	Repair of drinking water facility	55.6	41.7	2.7
	Repair of toilet	25.6	71.4	3.0
Painting & White Wash	White wash/plastering	72.8	25.9	1.2
	Painting Blackboard/Display Board/Painting on wall	57.8	40.9	1.3
	Painting of doors & walls	63.5	35.2	1.3
Purchase	Purchase of furniture (cupboard etc.)	39.6	57.3	3.1
	Purchase of electrical fittings	10.9	86.4	2.7
	Purchase of chalk, duster, register etc.	90.7	7.9	1.4
	Purchase of sitting Mats/Tat Patti	43.9	54.2	2.0
	Purchase of charts, globes & other teaching material	72.7	25.6	1.7
Other	Expenditure on school events	70.3	27.4	2.3
	Payment of bills (electricity, water, cleaning etc.)	12.3	85.6	2.1

The PAISA section of ASER tracks receipt and spending of Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) grants at the school level. This information is collected from schools visited during the survey. This page reports proportion of schools receiving the grants and carrying out specified activities in the schools. More detailed analysis of the PAISA data will be available in the PAISA 2011 report which will be released in March 2012.[1]

EVERY RURAL GOVERNMENT PRIMARY SCHOOL IS ENTITLED TO EACH OF THESE SSA GRANTS EVERY YEAR.

How much goes to each school	For what purposes
SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT GRANT / SCHOOL GRANT	
Rs.5000 per year per primary school	This grant can be used for buying school equipment such as blackboard, sitting mats etc. Also for buying chalk, duster, registers and other office equipment.
Rs.7000 per year per upper primary school	
Rs 5000 + Rs 7000 = Rs 12000 if the school is Std I-VII/VIII.	The grant amount varies by type of school: whether it is a primary or upper primary school.
Note: Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same premises.	
SCHOOL MAINTENANCE GRANT	
Rs.5000 - Rs 7500 per school per year if the school has upto 3 classrooms.	This grant can be used for maintenance of school building, including whitewashing; beautification; and repair of toilets, hand pump, boundary wall, playground etc. The grant amount depends on number of classrooms (excluding Headmaster room and office room)
Rs 7500 - Rs.10000 per year if the school has more than 3 classrooms.	
Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same building.	
TLM GRANT	
Rs.500 per teacher per year in primary and upper primary schools.	This grant can be used by teachers to buy teaching aids, such as charts, globes, posters, models etc.

[1] For more information see www.accountabilityinitiative.in

Right to Education indicators

Table 17: Schools by total enrollment 2010 and 2011

School enrollment	2010		2011	
	No. of schools	% of schools	No. of schools	% of schools
1-60	41	7.7	55	10.4
61-90	55	10.3	62	11.7
91-120	51	9.6	49	9.3
121-150	48	9.0	45	8.5
151-200	68	12.8	57	10.8
> 200	270	50.7	262	49.4
TOTAL	533	100.0	530	100.0

Table 18: RTE norms: Pupil-teacher ratio 2010 and 2011

School enrollment	RTE Teacher Norms	2010	2011
		% Schools that do not meet PTR norms	
1-60	2	55.6	42.5
61-90	3	72.1	74.1
91-120	4	87.9	80.9
121-150	5	83.3	81.8
151-200	5 + HM	86.3	81.8
> 200	see note	96.2	95.6
TOTAL		88.8	84.7

Note : For schools with enrollment above 200 children the PTR shall not exceed 40 excluding the Head Teacher

Table 19: Schools by number of teachers 2010 and 2011

Number of teachers	2010		2011	
	No. of schools	% of schools	No. of schools	% of schools
1	69	16.6	51	10.6
2	74	17.8	110	22.9
3	60	14.5	66	13.8
4	62	14.9	61	12.7
5	44	10.6	61	12.7
6	25	6.0	38	7.9
>=7	81	19.5	93	19.4
TOTAL	415	100.0	480	100.0

Table 20: RTE norms: Teacher - classroom ratio 2010 and 2011

RTE norm: At least one classroom per teacher	2010	2011
Number of teachers	% Schools that do not meet classroom to teacher norms	
1	0.0	0.0
2	3.9	10.9
3	18.4	19.2
4	30.4	30.8
5	35.3	25.5
6	13.3	62.1
>=7	26.5	29.3
TOTAL	18.8	22.7

Table 21: % Schools meeting selected RTE norms on facilities 2010 & 2011

% of schools with		2010	2011
Building	Office/Store/Office cum store	84.1	84.2
	Playground	38.5	33.8
	Boundary Wall	26.8	24.7
Drinking Water	No facility for drinking water	15.8	11.1
	Facility but no drinking water available	10.4	8.3
	Drinking water available	73.8	80.6
Toilet	No toilet facility	18.0	19.1
	Facility but toilet not useable	55.2	43.5
	Toilet useable	26.8	37.5
Girls Toilet	% Schools with no separate provisions for girls toilets	29.7	23.4
	Of schools with separate girls toilets, % schools where		
	Toilet locked	24.6	18.3
	Toilet not useable	24.8	21.8
	Toilet useable	20.9	36.6
TLM	Teaching learning material in Std 2	82.9	78.6
	Teaching learning material in Std 4	76.1	74.3
Library	No library	38.4	26.5
	Library but no books being used by children on day of visit	33.2	35.4
	Library being used by children on day of visit	28.4	38.2
MDM	Kitchen shed for cooking midday meal	73.4	75.7
	Midday meal served in school on the day of visit	92.2	89.0

Note: School observations for ASER 2011 looked at TLM for Std II and Std IV only.

As part of ASER 2010 and 2011, in each sampled village, one government school with primary sections was visited on the day of the survey. During this school visit, RTE indicators were observed and are reported here.

Extracts from the Schedule of The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act 2009 Norms and standards for a School (Sections 19 and 25)

Number of teachers in Std 1-5:

Admitted children	No. of teachers
<= 60	2
61-90	3
91-120	4
121-200	5
> 150	5 + 1 Headteacher
> 200	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (excluding Headteacher) shall not exceed 40

School facilities:
All weather building with:

- At least one classroom for every teacher
- Office cum store cum headteacher's room
- Separate toilets for boys and girls
- Safe and adequate drinking water facility to all children
- A kitchen where mid-day meal is cooked in the school
- Playground
- Arrangements for securing the school building by boundary wall or fencing.

Teaching learning equipment
shall be provided to each class as required.

Library
There shall be a library in each school providing newspaper, magazines and books on all subjects, including story-books.



Karnataka RURAL

Annual Status of Education Report
ASER 2011 RURAL
Facilitated by PRATHAM

ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM HOUSEHOLDS. 27 OUT OF 27 DISTRICTS


School enrollment and out of school children

Table 1: % Children in different types of schools 2011

Age group	Govt.	Pvt.	Other	Not in School	Total
Age: 6-14 ALL	76.5	20.0	0.7	2.8	100
Age: 7-16 ALL	74.3	20.0	0.6	5.1	100
Age: 7-10 ALL	77.2	20.8	0.8	1.2	100
Age: 7-10 BOYS	75.8	22.5	0.5	1.2	100
Age: 7-10 GIRLS	78.7	19.1	1.0	1.2	100
Age: 11-14 ALL	76.8	18.3	0.4	4.5	100
Age: 11-14 BOYS	76.2	19.6	0.2	3.9	100
Age: 11-14 GIRLS	77.3	16.9	0.7	5.1	100
Age: 15-16 ALL	60.3	22.6	0.5	16.7	100
Age: 15-16 BOYS	58.9	22.5	0.5	18.1	100
Age: 15-16 GIRLS	61.8	22.7	0.4	15.2	100

Note: 'OTHER' includes children going to madarssa and EGS.
'NOT IN SCHOOL' = dropped out + never enrolled.

Chart 1: Trends over time
% Children out of school by age group and gender 2006-2011



How to read this chart: For example, the proportion of girls (age 11-14) not in school has changed from 8% in 2006 to 6.2% in 2007 to 5.9% in 2008 to 6.1% in 2009 to 5.9% in 2010 to 5.1% in 2011

Chart 2: Trends over time
% Children enrolled in private school by class 2007, 2009 & 2011




Table 2: Sample description
% Children in each class by age 2011

Std.	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	Total
I	10.6	61.4	23.9	4.1									100
II	6.1		41.2	48.0	4.7								100
III	4.9			37.7	51.6	5.8							100
IV	0.8			6.7	34.8	52.3	5.4						100
V	5.8					38.5	48.6	6.2	1.1				100
VI	1.1					6.1	33.0	53.3	6.5				100
VII	1.6						7.4	33.0	48.0	8.9	1.2		100
VIII	2.2							7.5	35.3	49.6	4.0	1.5	100


How to read this table: If a child started school in Std I at age 6, she should be age 8 in Std 3. This table shows the age distribution for each class. For example, in Std III, 37.7% children are 8 years old but there are also 4.9% who are 7 years old or younger, 51.6% who are 9 years old, etc.

Young children in pre-school and school

Table 3: % Children age 5-6 who are enrolled in different types of pre-school & school 2011

	In balwadi or anganwadi	In LKG/ UKG	In School			Not enrolled anywhere	Total
			Govt	Pvt	Other		
Age 5	52.9	27.7	13.6	4.8	0.4	0.6	100
Age 6	10.3	9.5	57.1	21.2	1.1	1.0	100

Chart 3: Trends over time
Five year olds in pre-school & school 2007, 2009 & 2011



Reading

Table 4: % Children by class and READING level
All schools 2011

Std.	Nothing	Letter	Word	Level 1 (Std 1 Text)	Level 2 (Std 2 Text)	Total
I	21.0	52.4	20.4	3.9	2.3	100
II	8.3	31.7	37.9	14.0	8.1	100
III	3.8	19.9	33.0	24.6	18.7	100
IV	2.1	12.1	23.5	30.0	32.2	100
V	3.6	9.1	15.1	28.0	44.3	100
VI	2.6	6.0	10.8	23.3	57.4	100
VII	0.9	4.8	8.1	20.4	65.8	100
VIII	0.9	3.5	6.7	16.9	72.0	100
Total	5.4	17.3	19.4	20.3	37.6	100

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, 3.8% children cannot even read letters, 19.9% can read letters but not more, 33% can read words but not Std 1 text or higher, 24.6% can read Std 1 text but not Std 2 level text, and 18.7% can read Std 2 level text. In sum, for each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is 100%.

Reading Tool



Chart 4: Trends over time
% Children in Std III who CANNOT READ Std I LEVEL TEXT
By school type 2008-2011





Chart 5: Trends over time
% Children in Std V who CANNOT READ Std II LEVEL TEXT
By school type 2008-2011



Home language and school language

Table 5: School language and home language

% Children whose :	%
Home language is the same as school language	80.9
Home language is different from school language	19.1
Total	100.0

Note : In ASER 2011 for every state, reading tools were provided in the main medium of instruction in government schools. Children and their families were also asked about the language they speak at home. For home languages, a list of 122 languages was provided to all survey teams. This list includes 22 Scheduled languages and 100 Non-Scheduled languages. The data in this table is for children for whom we have information for both school language and home language.



Arithmetic

**Table 6: % Children by class and ARITHMETIC level
All schools 2011**

Std.	Nothing	Recognize Numbers		Subtract	Divide	Total
		1-9	11-99			
I	21.7	47.8	25.0	4.2	1.4	100
II	6.8	32.3	47.3	12.8	0.8	100
III	3.9	17.4	46.2	29.8	2.7	100
IV	2.1	10.1	40.0	38.6	9.2	100
V	2.6	7.9	28.5	41.3	19.6	100
VI	1.0	5.8	22.9	39.1	31.2	100
VII	1.2	3.3	22.9	32.4	40.3	100
VIII	1.5	2.3	17.5	32.6	46.2	100
Total	5.0	15.7	31.3	29.1	18.8	100

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level of arithmetic achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, 3.9% children cannot even recognize numbers 1-9, 17.4% children can recognize numbers up to 9 but not more, 46.2% can recognize numbers to 99 but cannot do subtraction, 29.8% can do subtraction but not division, and 2.7% can do division. In sum, for each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is 100%.

Math Tool




**Chart 6: Trends over time
% Children in Std III who CANNOT RECOGNISE NUMBERS upto 100. By school type 2008-2011**





**Chart 7: Trends over time
% Children in Std V who CANNOT DO DIVISION
By school type 2008-2011**



Tuition

**Table 7: Class-wise % children attending PAID TUITION CLASSES
By school type 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011**

Year	School	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	Total
2007	Govt	7.1	7.0	9.5	8.3	9.9	9.1	8.4	6.7	8.4
	Pvt	15.6	16.7	18.7	13.4	24.2	16.5	13.7	8.8	15.5
2009	Govt	5.0	7.5	7.4	9.2	9.1	7.6	8.5	6.2	7.7
	Pvt	20.4	21.6	26.5	20.3	20.7	26.4	21.9	14.2	21.1
2010	Govt	4.8	7.0	7.2	7.6	6.9	6.4	7.0	5.8	6.7
	Pvt	16.0	17.5	23.7	16.8	22.6	14.7	18.9	12.2	17.7
2011	Govt	4.6	5.8	7.7	6.7	9.6	10.5	8.6	6.6	7.7
	Pvt	17.5	17.6	20.5	27.0	21.0	17.3	17.2	14.6	18.9

Note: In 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011 the ASER survey recorded information about tuition. In all 4 years, the question asked was the following: "Does the child take any paid additional class currently?" Therefore, these numbers do not include any supplemental help in learning that children may have received from parents, siblings or from anyone else who did not require payment.



Karnataka RURAL

As part of ASER 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011, in each sampled village, one government school with primary sections was visited on the day of the survey. Information about schools in this report is based on these visits.

School observations

Table 8: Total schools visited 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Type of school	2007	2009	2010	2011
Std I-IV/V: Primary	168	133	113	106
Std I-VII/VIII: Primary + Upper primary	582	625	656	675
Total schools visited	750	758	769	781



Student and teacher attendance

Table 9: Student attendance 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Type of school	2007	2009	2010	2011	2007	2009	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V				Std I-VII/VIII			
% Enrolled children present (average)	78.3	88.0	81.7	90.4	75.0	79.6	70.9	85.2
% Schools with less than 50% enrolled children present (average)	10.1	1.5	5.5	1.0	16.7	8.2	19.3	1.9
% Schools with 75% or more enrolled children present (average)	66.1	84.1	67.3	90.5	64.3	70.1	52.4	81.8

Table 10: Teacher attendance 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Type of school	2007	2009	2010	2011	2007	2009	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V				Std I-VII/VIII			
% Teachers present (average)	91.6	94.5	92.9	92.6	85.0	91.7	88.9	88.6
% Schools with no teachers present (average)	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.0
% Schools with all teachers present (average)	76.1	84.3	82.5	78.4	43.3	62.2	51.8	52.0

Other school information

Table 11: Headteachers 2010 & 2011

% Schools with:	2010	2011	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V		Std I-VII/VIII	
No Headteacher appointed	3.7	0.0	0.0	0.6
Headteacher appointed but not present at time of visit	2.5	1.2	4.4	2.0
Headteacher appointed & present at time of visit	93.8	98.8	95.6	97.4
Total	100	100	100	100

Table 12: Computers 2010 and 2011

% Schools with:	2010	2011	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V		Std I-VII/VIII	
No computer	94.6	94.2	66.5	62.4
Computers but no children using them on day of visit	1.8	2.9	18.5	22.1
Computers & children using them on day of visit	3.6	2.9	15.1	15.5
Total	100	100	100	100

Table 13: Multigrade classes 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

% Schools with:	2007	2009	2010	2011	2007	2009	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V				Std I-VII/VIII			
Std II children sitting with one or more other classes	84.8	87.6	85.9	89.4	49.7	69.1	73.5	81.4
Std IV children sitting with one or more other classes	81.1	82.5	71.7	66.3	43.1	42.4	31.2	29.9

Note: In Karnataka, the official government school policy is to have mixed groups in Std. I-III.

School funds and activities (PAISA)

Table 14: % Schools who report receiving SSA grants - Full financial year

SSA school grants	2008-2009				2009-2010				2010-2011			
	No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools		
		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know
Maintenance grant	728	92.7	4.3	3.0	669	91.2	1.1	7.8	771	95.1	2.2	2.7
Development grant	700	83.0	13.4	3.6	654	89.9	2.5	7.7	764	89.9	7.1	3.0
TLM grant	723	94.7	3.0	2.2	664	94.3	1.4	4.4	765	95.0	3.0	2.0

Table 15: % Schools who report receiving SSA grants - Half financial year

SSA school grants	April 2009 to October 2009				April 2010 to October 2010				April 2011 to October 2011			
	No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools		
		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know
Maintenance grant	658	85.1	10.2	4.7	654	84.4	6.6	9.0	761	75.6	21.0	3.4
Development grant	631	75.4	19.2	5.4	637	83.7	6.3	10.1	752	70.0	26.2	3.9
TLM grant	651	82.2	13.7	4.2	648	87.4	5.1	7.6	753	74.2	22.6	3.2

Table 16: % Schools carrying out different activities since April 2011

Type of Activity		% schools		
		Yes	No	Don't know
Const.	New Classroom	30.2	67.5	2.3
Repairs	Repair of building (roof, floor, wall etc.)	54.0	44.0	2.0
	Repair of doors & windows	53.1	45.0	1.9
	Repair of boundary wall	22.4	75.9	1.7
	Repair of drinking water facility	47.6	50.6	1.8
	Repair of toilet	46.8	51.3	1.9
Painting & White Wash	White wash/plastering	71.1	27.3	1.6
	Painting Blackboard/Display Board/Painting on wall	80.3	18.4	1.3
	Painting of doors & walls	62.3	36.3	1.5
Purchase	Purchase of furniture (cupboard etc.)	37.5	60.3	2.1
	Purchase of electrical fittings	35.7	62.6	1.7
	Purchase of chalk, duster, register etc.	94.2	4.3	1.4
	Purchase of sitting Mats/Tat Patti	33.8	64.7	1.5
	Purchase of charts, globes & other teaching material	65.2	33.6	1.2
Other	Expenditure on school events	81.1	16.9	2.0
	Payment of bills (electricity, water, cleaning etc.)	35.3	62.1	2.6

The PAISA section of ASER tracks receipt and spending of Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) grants at the school level. This information is collected from schools visited during the survey. This page reports proportion of schools receiving the grants and carrying out specified activities in the schools. More detailed analysis of the PAISA data will be available in the PAISA 2011 report which will be released in March 2012.[1]

EVERY RURAL GOVERNMENT PRIMARY SCHOOL IS ENTITLED TO EACH OF THESE SSA GRANTS EVERY YEAR.

How much goes to each school	For what purposes
SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT GRANT / SCHOOL GRANT	
Rs.5000 per year per primary school	This grant can be used for buying school equipment such as blackboard, sitting mats etc. Also for buying chalk, duster, registers and other office equipment.
Rs.7000 per year per upper primary school	
Rs 5000 + Rs 7000 = Rs 12000 if the school is Std I-VII/VIII.	The grant amount varies by type of school: whether it is a primary or upper primary school.
Note: Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same premises.	
SCHOOL MAINTENANCE GRANT	
Rs.5000 - Rs 7500 per school per year if the school has upto 3 classrooms.	This grant can be used for maintenance of school building, including whitewashing; beautification; and repair of toilets, hand pump, boundary wall, playground etc. The grant amount depends on number of classrooms (excluding Headmaster room and office room)
Rs 7500 - Rs.10000 per year if the school has more than 3 classrooms.	
Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same building.	
TLM GRANT	
Rs.500 per teacher per year in primary and upper primary schools.	This grant can be used by teachers to buy teaching aids, such as charts, globes, posters, models etc.

[1] For more information see www.accountabilityinitiative.in

Right to Education indicators

Table 17: Schools by total enrollment 2010 and 2011

School enrollment	2010		2011	
	No. of schools	% of schools	No. of schools	% of schools
1-60	133	17.8	136	17.6
61-90	86	11.5	81	10.5
91-120	64	8.6	91	11.8
121-150	55	7.4	64	8.3
151-200	111	14.9	109	14.1
> 200	297	39.8	293	37.9
TOTAL	746	100.0	774	100.0

Table 18: RTE norms: Pupil-teacher ratio 2010 and 2011

School enrollment	RTE Teacher Norms	2010	2011
		% Schools that do not meet PTR norms	
1-60	2	46.4	41.3
61-90	3	8.6	10.1
91-120	4	19.7	22.5
121-150	5	19.2	23.8
151-200	5 + HM	15.5	18.0
> 200	see note	41.0	35.8
TOTAL		30.6	28.8

Note : For schools with enrollment above 200 children the PTR shall not exceed 40 excluding the Head Teacher

Table 19: Schools by number of teachers 2010 and 2011

Number of teachers	2010		2011	
	No. of schools	% of schools	No. of schools	% of schools
1	52	7.6	56	7.6
2	35	5.1	46	6.2
3	66	9.6	80	10.8
4	78	11.3	93	12.6
5	81	11.8	91	12.3
6	91	13.2	84	11.3
>=7	286	41.5	291	39.3
TOTAL	689	100.0	741	100.0

Table 20: RTE norms: Teacher - classroom ratio 2010 and 2011

RTE norm: At least one classroom per teacher	2010	2011
Number of teachers	% Schools that do not meet classroom to teacher norms	
1	0.0	0.0
2	9.7	2.3
3	8.9	4.1
4	14.5	11.0
5	17.4	14.9
6	27.8	25.0
>=7	20.4	21.5
TOTAL	17.2	15.0

Table 21: % Schools meeting selected RTE norms on facilities 2010 & 2011

% of schools with		2010	2011
Building	Office/Store/Office cum store	71.8	74.3
	Playground	66.2	71.1
	Boundary Wall	59.0	69.1
Drinking Water	No facility for drinking water	17.3	11.7
	Facility but no drinking water available	7.0	6.5
	Drinking water available	75.8	81.9
Toilet	No toilet facility	5.6	6.0
	Facility but toilet not useable	56.0	49.9
	Toilet useable	38.4	44.2
Girls Toilet	% Schools with no separate provisions for girls toilets	18.2	10.9
	Of schools with separate girls toilets, % schools where		
	Toilet locked	31.1	32.8
	Toilet not useable	18.9	15.2
	Toilet useable	31.8	41.1
TLM	Teaching learning material in Std 2	97.3	95.8
	Teaching learning material in Std 4	92.6	90.4
Library	No library	7.6	7.4
	Library but no books being used by children on day of visit	27.6	34.8
	Library being used by children on day of visit	64.8	57.8
MDM	Kitchen shed for cooking midday meal	92.8	94.0
	Midday meal served in school on the day of visit	95.2	97.9

Note: School observations for ASER 2011 looked at TLM for Std II and Std IV only.

As part of ASER 2010 and 2011, in each sampled village, one government school with primary sections was visited on the day of the survey. During this school visit, RTE indicators were observed and are reported here.

Extracts from the Schedule of The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act 2009 Norms and standards for a School (Sections 19 and 25)

Number of teachers in Std 1-5:

Admitted children	No. of teachers
<= 60	2
61-90	3
91-120	4
121-200	5
> 150	5 + 1 Headteacher
> 200	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (excluding Headteacher) shall not exceed 40

School facilities:
All weather building with:

- At least one classroom for every teacher
- Office cum store cum headteacher's room
- Separate toilets for boys and girls
- Safe and adequate drinking water facility to all children
- A kitchen where mid-day meal is cooked in the school
- Playground
- Arrangements for securing the school building by boundary wall or fencing.

Teaching learning equipment
shall be provided to each class as required.

Library
There shall be a library in each school providing newspaper, magazines and books on all subjects, including story-books.



Kerala RURAL

Annual Status of Education Report
ASER 2011 RURAL
Facilitated by PRATHAM

ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM HOUSEHOLDS. 14 OUT OF 14 DISTRICTS


School enrollment and out of school children

Table 1: % Children in different types of schools 2011

Age group	Govt.	Pvt.	Other	Not in School	Total
Age: 6-14 ALL	38.4	60.8	0.7	0.1	100
Age: 7-16 ALL	40.0	59.0	0.7	0.3	100
Age: 7-10 ALL	37.9	61.1	1.0	0.1	100
Age: 7-10 BOYS	38.0	61.1	0.8	0.0	100
Age: 7-10 GIRLS	37.7	61.2	1.1	0.1	100
Age: 11-14 ALL	40.1	59.2	0.6	0.1	100
Age: 11-14 BOYS	40.1	59.0	0.8	0.1	100
Age: 11-14 GIRLS	40.1	59.4	0.5	0.1	100
Age: 15-16 ALL	45.7	52.7	0.4	1.2	100
Age: 15-16 BOYS	45.1	53.1	0.5	1.3	100
Age: 15-16 GIRLS	46.3	52.3	0.4	1.1	100

Note: 'OTHER' includes children going to madarssa and EGS.
'NOT IN SCHOOL' = dropped out + never enrolled.

Chart 1: Trends over time
% Children out of school by age group and gender 2006-2011



How to read this chart: For example, the proportion of girls (age 11-14) not in school has changed from 3.9% in 2006 to 0.4% in 2007 to 0.2% in 2008 to 0.2% in 2009 to 0.1% in 2010 to 0.1% in 2011

Chart 2: Trends over time
% Children enrolled in private school by class 2007, 2009 & 2011




Table 2: Sample description
% Children in each class by age 2011

Std.	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	Total
I	18.1	61.2	17.9	2.8									100
II	0.6	13.5	63.5	19.6	2.8								100
III	0.8		14.3	63.1	18.5	3.4							100
IV	1.5			12.4	62.4	19.9	3.8						100
V	1.4				11.7	67.4	17.4	2.1					100
VI	1.4					13.3	63.6	19.3	2.5				100
VII	1.4						17.4	62.0	17.8	1.3			100
VIII	2.4							15.7	68.1	12.0	1.9		100


How to read this table: If a child started school in Std I at age 6, she should be age 8 in Std 3. This table shows the age distribution for each class. For example, in Std III, 63.1% children are 8 years old but there are also 14.3% who are 7, 18.5% who are 9 years old, etc.

Young children in pre-school and school

Table 3: % Children age 5-6 who are enrolled in different types of pre-school & school 2011

	In balwadi or anganwadi	In LKG/ UKG	In School			Not enrolled anywhere	Total
			Govt	Pvt	Other		
Age 5	15.7	45.4	11.4	26.0	0.8	0.8	100
Age 6	2.7	12.4	26.4	58.3	0.3	0.0	100

Chart 3: Trends over time
Five year olds in pre-school & school 2007, 2009 & 2011



Reading

Table 4: % Children by class and READING level
All schools 2011

Std.	Nothing	Letter	Word	Level 1 (Std 1 Text)	Level 2 (Std 2 Text)	Total
I	3.7	38.1	45.3	7.0	5.9	100
II	2.1	17.9	33.9	23.0	23.1	100
III	0.7	8.7	21.5	23.6	45.5	100
IV	0.5	3.2	11.8	19.4	65.1	100
V	0.4	1.8	6.9	17.0	73.9	100
VI	0.4	1.4	4.9	13.3	80.0	100
VII	0.2	1.3	3.3	9.3	85.8	100
VIII	0.4	0.9	1.3	7.3	90.1	100
Total	1.0	8.4	15.1	14.8	60.8	100

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, 0.7% children cannot even read letters, 8.7% can read letters but not more, 21.5% can read words but not Std 1 text or higher, 23.6% can read Std 1 text but not Std 2 level text, and 45.5% can read Std 2 level text. In sum, for each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is 100%.

Reading Tool



Chart 4: Trends over time
% Children in Std III who CANNOT READ Std I LEVEL TEXT
By school type 2008-2011





Chart 5: Trends over time
% Children in Std V who CANNOT READ Std II LEVEL TEXT
By school type 2008-2011



Home language and school language

Table 5: School language and home language

% Children whose :	%
Home language is the same as school language	98.5
Home language is different from school language	1.5
Total	100.0

Note : In ASER 2011 for every state, reading tools were provided in the main medium of instruction in government schools. Children and their families were also asked about the language they speak at home. For home languages, a list of 122 languages was provided to all survey teams. This list includes 22 Scheduled languages and 100 Non-Scheduled languages. The data in this table is for children for whom we have information for both school language and home language.



Arithmetic

Table 6: % Children by class and ARITHMETIC level
All schools 2011

Std.	Nothing	Recognize Numbers		Subtract	Divide	Total
		1-9	11-99			
I	4.6	33.1	54.6	6.5	1.3	100
II	1.6	11.8	58.9	24.6	3.1	100
III	1.9	5.7	40.5	44.3	7.7	100
IV	0.8	2.9	25.9	48.6	21.9	100
V	0.7	2.0	19.4	44.6	33.2	100
VI	1.1	1.5	14.7	33.4	49.3	100
VII	0.5	0.8	11.9	24.7	62.2	100
VIII	0.8	1.2	6.9	17.8	73.3	100
Total	1.4	6.8	27.6	30.8	33.5	100

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level of arithmetic achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, 1.9% children cannot even recognize numbers 1-9, 5.7% children can recognize numbers up to 9 but not more, 40.5% can recognize numbers to 99 but cannot do subtraction, 44.3% can do subtraction but not division, and 7.7% can do division. In sum, for each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is 100%.

Math Tool




Chart 6: Trends over time
% Children in Std III who CANNOT RECOGNISE NUMBERS upto 100. By school type 2008-2011





Chart 7: Trends over time
% Children in Std V who CANNOT DO DIVISION
By school type 2008-2011



Tuition

Table 7: Class-wise % children attending PAID TUITION CLASSES
By school type 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Year	School	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	Total
2007	Govt	28.2	32.7	30.3	39.0	36.8	39.6	42.0	42.4	36.7
	Pvt	20.1	28.3	29.6	35.6	39.2	38.8	35.8	41.9	33.4
2009	Govt	21.4	33.1	31.2	34.4	41.8	34.2	35.1	41.5	35.0
	Pvt	28.7	32.4	37.6	43.3	43.0	43.1	42.6	47.8	39.9
2010	Govt	26.3	23.7	36.2	35.0	44.3	40.7	45.2	46.1	39.0
	Pvt	29.4	32.1	40.2	40.7	44.1	44.5	43.3	39.9	39.5
2011	Govt	18.6	23.6	31.7	32.2	40.8	33.8	42.1	36.9	33.6
	Pvt	24.6	26.7	32.9	31.6	36.4	35.2	35.3	41.3	33.1

Note: In 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011 the ASER survey recorded information about tuition. In all 4 years, the question asked was the following: "Does the child take any paid additional class currently?" Therefore, these numbers do not include any supplemental help in learning that children may have received from parents, siblings or from anyone else who did not require payment.



Kerala RURAL

As part of ASER 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011, in each sampled village, one government school with primary sections was visited on the day of the survey. Information about schools in this report is based on these visits.

School observations

Table 8: Total schools visited 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Type of school	2007	2009	2010	2011
Std I-IV/V: Primary	127	178	176	177
Std I-VII/VIII: Primary + Upper primary	64	78	99	151
Total schools visited	191	256	275	328



Student and teacher attendance

Table 9: Student attendance 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Type of school	2007	2009	2010	2011	2007	2009	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V				Std I-VII/VIII			
% Enrolled children present (average)	90.0	91.9	93.1	91.9	91.5	91.8	91.2	90.8
% Schools with less than 50% enrolled children present (average)	3.6	0.6	0.0	0.0	3.6	1.3	1.0	1.3
% Schools with 75% or more enrolled children present (average)	93.7	96.5	97.6	97.7	92.9	96.1	94.9	97.3

Table 10: Teacher attendance 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Type of school	2007	2009	2010	2011	2007	2009	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V				Std I-VII/VIII			
% Teachers present (average)	90.2	87.1	94.0	92.8	87.7	92.6	90.2	92.7
% Schools with no teachers present (average)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
% Schools with all teachers present (average)	58.4	54.6	71.2	68.8	39.0	50.0	47.4	46.9

Other school information

Table 11: Headteachers 2010 & 2011

% Schools with:	2010	2011	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V		Std I-VII/VIII	
No Headteacher appointed	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Headteacher appointed but not present at time of visit	5.4	5.0	2.8	1.9
Headteacher appointed & present at time of visit	94.6	95.0	97.2	98.1
Total	100	100	100	100

Table 12: Computers 2010 and 2011

% Schools with:	2010	2011	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V		Std I-VII/VIII	
No computer	24.7	21.5	4.1	6.0
Computers but no children using them on day of visit	18.8	26.2	11.3	15.3
Computers & children using them on day of visit	56.5	52.3	84.5	78.7
Total	100	100	100	100

Table 13: Multigrade classes 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

% Schools with:	2007	2009	2010	2011	2007	2009	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V				Std I-VII/VIII			
Std II children sitting with one or more other classes	4.5	4.6	7.9	6.7	3.9	3.9	6.3	9.4
Std IV children sitting with one or more other classes	2.9	3.6	7.1	6.3	2.1	1.3	2.2	8.7

School funds and activities (PAISA)

Table 14: % Schools who report receiving SSA grants - Full financial year

SSA school grants	2008-2009				2009-2010				2010-2011			
	No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools		
		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know
Maintenance grant	226	89.8	7.1	3.1	218	94.5	4.1	1.4	323	95.1	4.3	0.6
Development grant	213	88.7	6.6	4.7	195	91.8	6.7	1.5	301	82.4	15.3	2.3
TLM grant	234	97.0	0.9	2.1	222	99.1	0.5	0.5	323	96.6	2.8	0.6

Table 15: % Schools who report receiving SSA grants - Half financial year

SSA school grants	April 2009 to October 2009				April 2010 to October 2010				April 2011 to October 2011			
	No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools		
		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know
Maintenance grant	175	82.3	12.6	5.1	202	89.1	8.9	2.0	303	79.5	16.2	4.3
Development grant	160	76.9	16.3	6.9	188	86.2	11.7	2.1	275	72.0	22.9	5.1
TLM grant	183	90.7	5.5	3.8	204	96.6	2.9	0.5	299	89.6	6.7	3.7

Table 16: % Schools carrying out different activities since April 2011

Type of Activity		% schools		
		Yes	No	Don't know
Const.	New Classroom	20.1	79.2	0.7
Repairs	Repair of building (roof, floor, wall etc.)	67.4	30.6	2.0
	Repair of doors & windows	54.6	42.7	2.7
	Repair of boundary wall	25.6	71.3	3.1
	Repair of drinking water facility	53.0	44.3	2.7
	Repair of toilet	55.7	41.7	2.7
Painting & White Wash	White wash/plastering	73.1	25.6	1.3
	Painting Blackboard/Display Board/Painting on wall	74.4	24.3	1.3
	Painting of doors & walls	53.9	43.5	2.7
Purchase	Purchase of furniture (cupboard etc.)	55.7	43.0	1.3
	Purchase of electrical fittings	40.5	56.9	2.6
	Purchase of chalk, duster, register etc.	92.3	7.0	0.6
	Purchase of sitting Mats/Tat Patti	32.4	65.1	2.6
	Purchase of charts, globes & other teaching material	91.0	8.0	1.0
Other	Expenditure on school events	66.7	30.2	3.2
	Payment of bills (electricity, water, cleaning etc.)	82.7	15.3	2.0

The PAISA section of ASER tracks receipt and spending of Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) grants at the school level. This information is collected from schools visited during the survey. This page reports proportion of schools receiving the grants and carrying out specified activities in the schools. More detailed analysis of the PAISA data will be available in the PAISA 2011 report which will be released in March 2012.[1]

EVERY RURAL GOVERNMENT PRIMARY SCHOOL IS ENTITLED TO EACH OF THESE SSA GRANTS EVERY YEAR.

How much goes to each school	For what purposes
SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT GRANT / SCHOOL GRANT	
Rs.5000 per year per primary school	This grant can be used for buying school equipment such as blackboard, sitting mats etc. Also for buying chalk, duster, registers and other office equipment.
Rs.7000 per year per upper primary school	
Rs 5000 + Rs 7000 = Rs 12000 if the school is Std I-VII/VIII.	The grant amount varies by type of school: whether it is a primary or upper primary school.
Note: Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same premises.	
SCHOOL MAINTENANCE GRANT	
Rs.5000 - Rs 7500 per school per year if the school has upto 3 classrooms.	This grant can be used for maintenance of school building, including whitewashing; beautification; and repair of toilets, hand pump, boundary wall, playground etc. The grant amount depends on number of classrooms (excluding Headmaster room and office room)
Rs 7500 - Rs.10000 per year if the school has more than 3 classrooms.	
Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same building.	
TLM GRANT	
Rs.500 per teacher per year in primary and upper primary schools.	This grant can be used by teachers to buy teaching aids, such as charts, globes, posters, models etc.

[1] For more information see www.accountabilityinitiative.in

Right to Education indicators

Table 17: Schools by total enrollment 2010 and 2011

School enrollment	2010		2011	
	No. of schools	% of schools	No. of schools	% of schools
1-60	53	19.9	68	21.1
61-90	31	11.6	36	11.2
91-120	34	12.7	44	13.7
121-150	15	5.6	20	6.2
151-200	40	15.0	36	11.2
> 200	94	35.2	118	36.7
TOTAL	267	100.0	322	100.0

Table 18: RTE norms: Pupil-teacher ratio 2010 and 2011

School enrollment	RTE Teacher Norms	2010	2011
		% Schools that do not meet PTR norms	
1-60	2	0.0	1.7
61-90	3	0.0	0.0
91-120	4	18.8	4.7
121-150	5	35.7	15.8
151-200	5 + HM	10.3	0.0
> 200	see note	12.5	10.6
TOTAL		10.8	5.9

Note : For schools with enrollment above 200 children the PTR shall not exceed 40 excluding the Head Teacher

Table 19: Schools by number of teachers 2010 and 2011

Number of teachers	2010		2011	
	No. of schools	% of schools	No. of schools	% of schools
1	0	0.0	3	1.0
2	2	0.8	2	0.7
3	34	14.2	40	13.3
4	31	13.0	36	12.0
5	18	7.5	24	8.0
6	18	7.5	18	6.0
>=7	136	56.9	178	59.1
TOTAL	239	100.0	301	100.0

Table 20: RTE norms: Teacher - classroom ratio 2010 and 2011

RTE norm: At least one classroom per teacher	2010	2011
Number of teachers	% Schools that do not meet classroom to teacher norms	
1	0.0	0.0
2	0.0	0.0
3	18.5	16.7
4	24.0	23.3
5	62.5	22.2
6	20.0	61.5
>=7	12.2	19.8
TOTAL	19.7	22.4

Table 21: % Schools meeting selected RTE norms on facilities 2010 & 2011

% of schools with		2010	2011
Building	Office/Store/Office cum store	88.3	90.4
	Playground	76.7	78.8
	Boundary Wall	82.1	86.0
Drinking Water	No facility for drinking water	2.6	1.9
	Facility but no drinking water available	11.7	4.4
	Drinking water available	85.7	93.8
Toilet	No toilet facility	0.4	0.3
	Facility but toilet not useable	41.4	28.1
	Toilet useable	58.2	71.6
Girls Toilet	% Schools with no separate provisions for girls toilets	5.1	0.9
	Of schools with separate girls toilets, % schools where		
	Toilet locked	8.7	15.4
	Toilet not useable	42.3	15.1
	Toilet useable	43.9	68.6
TLM	Teaching learning material in Std 2	98.5	98.8
	Teaching learning material in Std 4	96.6	94.1
Library	No library	16.9	1.9
	Library but no books being used by children on day of visit	20.7	27.3
	Library being used by children on day of visit	62.4	70.8
MDM	Kitchen shed for cooking midday meal	98.1	97.8
	Midday meal served in school on the day of visit	100.0	100.0

Note: School observations for ASER 2011 looked at TLM for Std II and Std IV only.

As part of ASER 2010 and 2011, in each sampled village, one government school with primary sections was visited on the day of the survey. During this school visit, RTE indicators were observed and are reported here.

Extracts from the Schedule of The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act 2009 Norms and standards for a School (Sections 19 and 25)

Number of teachers in Std 1-5:

Admitted children	No. of teachers
<= 60	2
61-90	3
91-120	4
121-200	5
> 150	5 + 1 Headteacher
> 200	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (excluding Headteacher) shall not exceed 40

School facilities:
All weather building with:

- At least one classroom for every teacher
- Office cum store cum headteacher's room
- Separate toilets for boys and girls
- Safe and adequate drinking water facility to all children
- A kitchen where mid-day meal is cooked in the school
- Playground
- Arrangements for securing the school building by boundary wall or fencing.

Teaching learning equipment
shall be provided to each class as required.

Library
There shall be a library in each school providing newspaper, magazines and books on all subjects, including story-books.




Madhya Pradesh
Maharashtra
Manipur
Meghalaya
Mizoram
Nagaland



Madhya Pradesh RURAL

Annual Status of Education Report
असर ASER 2011 RURAL
Facilitated by PRATHAM

ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM HOUSEHOLDS. 43 OUT OF 45 DISTRICTS


School enrollment and out of school children

Table 1: % Children in different types of schools 2011

Age group	Govt.	Pvt.	Other	Not in School	Total
Age: 6-14 ALL	79.7	17.2	0.9	2.2	100
Age: 7-16 ALL	79.0	16.3	0.7	4.0	100
Age: 7-10 ALL	79.1	18.2	1.2	1.5	100
Age: 7-10 BOYS	77.0	20.4	1.1	1.5	100
Age: 7-10 GIRLS	81.5	15.6	1.4	1.5	100
Age: 11-14 ALL	81.5	15.1	0.3	3.2	100
Age: 11-14 BOYS	78.1	18.6	0.2	3.1	100
Age: 11-14 GIRLS	85.2	11.2	0.3	3.3	100
Age: 15-16 ALL	72.3	14.4	0.1	13.3	100
Age: 15-16 BOYS	71.3	16.7	0.0	12.1	100
Age: 15-16 GIRLS	73.4	11.6	0.1	14.9	100

Note: 'OTHER' includes children going to madarssa and EGS.
'NOT IN SCHOOL' = dropped out + never enrolled.

Chart 1: Trends over time
% Children out of school by age group and gender 2006-2011



How to read this chart: For example, the proportion of girls (age 11-14) not in school has changed from 7.3% in 2006 to 5% in 2007 to 3.5% in 2008 to 3.9% in 2009 to 3.3% in 2010 to 3.3% in 2011

Chart 2: Trends over time
% Children enrolled in private school by class 2007, 2009 & 2011




Table 2: Sample description
% Children in each class by age 2011

Std.	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	Total
I	32.7	45.2	13.9	8.3									100
II	5.2	18.6	40.1	25.4	4.8	6.0							100
III	5.6		14.8	43.5	20.3	9.7	6.2						100
IV	5.2			18.0	31.7	30.8	6.3	8.0					100
V	7.2				10.5	39.2	22.7	11.8	8.6				100
VI	4.6					13.8	33.2	31.7	8.5	8.1			100
VII	6.0						11.5	38.9	26.5	10.4	6.6		100
VIII	5.4							13.9	31.5	31.7	10.9	6.7	100


How to read this table: If a child started school in Std I at age 6, she should be age 8 in Std 3. This table shows the age distribution for each class. For example, in Std III, 43.5% children are 8 years old but there are also 14.8% who are 7, 20.3% who are 9, 9.7% who are 10 years old, etc.

Young children in pre-school and school

Table 3: % Children age 5-6 who are enrolled in different types of pre-school & school 2011

	In balwadi or anganwadi	In LKG/ UKG	In School			Not enrolled anywhere	Total
			Govt	Pvt	Other		
Age 5	29.9	5.1	41.8	19.1	1.3	2.9	100
Age 6	5.0	2.1	68.9	20.3	2.3	1.4	100

Chart 3: Trends over time
Five year olds in pre-school & school 2007, 2009 & 2011



Reading

Table 4: % Children by class and READING level
All schools 2011

Std.	Nothing	Letter	Word	Level 1 (Std 1 Text)	Level 2 (Std 2 Text)	Total
I	45.3	39.3	10.1	2.9	2.4	100
II	23.6	41.7	21.6	7.7	5.4	100
III	12.7	33.8	26.3	15.7	11.4	100
IV	7.0	24.3	24.6	19.7	24.4	100
V	5.7	17.0	17.5	21.8	38.0	100
VI	2.8	11.0	13.4	19.7	53.2	100
VII	2.3	8.5	9.9	17.5	61.8	100
VIII	1.6	5.3	6.4	15.3	71.3	100
Total	12.8	23.1	16.6	15.1	32.4	100

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, 12.7% children cannot even read letters, 33.8% can read letters but not more, 26.3% can read words but not Std 1 text or higher, 15.7% can read Std 1 text but not Std 2 level text, and 11.4% can read Std 2 level text. In sum, for each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is 100%.

Reading Tool




Chart 4: Trends over time
% Children in Std III who CANNOT READ Std I LEVEL TEXT
By school type 2008-2011





Chart 5: Trends over time
% Children in Std V who CANNOT READ Std II LEVEL TEXT
By school type 2008-2011



Home language and school language

Table 5: School language and home language

% Children whose :	%
Home language is the same as school language	96.7
Home language is different from school language	3.3
Total	100.0

Note : In ASER 2011 for every state, reading tools were provided in the main medium of instruction in government schools. Children and their families were also asked about the language they speak at home. For home languages, a list of 122 languages was provided to all survey teams. This list includes 22 Scheduled languages and 100 Non-Scheduled languages. The data in this table is for children for whom we have information for both school language and home language.



Arithmetic

Table 6: % Children by class and ARITHMETIC level
All schools 2011

Std.	Nothing	Recognize Numbers		Subtract	Divide	Total
		1-9	11-99			
I	47.8	41.3	8.0	1.8	1.1	100
II	24.7	47.0	21.6	4.9	1.8	100
III	13.6	40.9	30.5	11.6	3.5	100
IV	7.1	31.5	32.3	21.3	7.8	100
V	6.0	21.3	28.1	26.9	17.7	100
VI	2.8	16.2	24.0	29.1	27.9	100
VII	2.8	12.0	21.2	29.7	34.3	100
VIII	2.1	7.4	16.8	27.9	45.9	100
Total	13.5	27.7	23.1	19.0	16.7	100

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level of arithmetic achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, 13.6% children cannot even recognize numbers 1-9, 40.9% children can recognize numbers up to 9 but not more, 30.5% can recognize numbers to 99 but cannot do subtraction, 11.6% can do subtraction but not division, and 3.5% can do division. In sum, for each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is 100%.

Math Tool



Chart 6: Trends over time
% Children in Std III who CANNOT RECOGNISE NUMBERS upto 100. By school type 2008-2011





Chart 7: Trends over time
% Children in Std V who CANNOT DO DIVISION
By school type 2008-2011



Tuition

Table 7: Class-wise % children attending PAID TUITION CLASSES
By school type 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Year	School	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	Total
2007	Govt	3.0	4.7	5.2	5.6	8.0	7.6	9.3	11.4	6.5
	Pvt	12.8	13.5	17.0	19.5	20.8	23.7	23.7	30.6	19.2
2009	Govt	4.6	6.4	8.8	9.2	10.8	11.8	13.4	16.5	10.0
	Pvt	15.7	21.0	25.1	27.6	26.9	29.5	33.3	35.4	26.1
2010	Govt	3.1	3.4	4.1	5.6	6.8	8.9	10.0	14.7	6.9
	Pvt	10.7	11.9	16.1	16.0	20.2	25.3	25.6	33.7	19.0
2011	Govt	4.1	4.9	5.6	5.8	7.2	6.9	8.1	8.6	6.5
	Pvt	12.0	12.3	14.8	11.9	17.8	21.1	19.1	17.7	15.4

Note: In 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011 the ASER survey recorded information about tuition. In all 4 years, the question asked was the following: "Does the child take any paid additional class currently?" Therefore, these numbers do not include any supplemental help in learning that children may have received from parents, siblings or from anyone else who did not require payment.



Madhya Pradesh RURAL

Annual Status of Education Report
असर ASER 2011 RURAL
Facilitated by PRATHAM

As part of ASER 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011, in each sampled village, one government school with primary sections was visited on the day of the survey. Information about schools in this report is based on these visits.

School observations

Table 8: Total schools visited 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Type of school	2007	2009	2010	2011
Std I-IV/V: Primary	921	936	709	843
Std I-VII/VIII: Primary + Upper primary	334	293	510	352
Total schools visited	1255	1229	1219	1195



Student and teacher attendance

Table 9: Student attendance 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Type of school	2007	2009	2010	2011	2007	2009	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V				Std I-VII/VIII			
% Enrolled children present (average)	67.0	68.0	65.9	54.5	64.9	66.4	67.6	50.9
% Schools with less than 50% enrolled children present (average)	14.9	11.9	15.3	38.7	19.6	14.0	10.4	48.6
% Schools with 75% or more enrolled children present (average)	37.5	36.1	33.2	19.3	34.6	30.8	30.5	15.1

Table 10: Teacher attendance 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Type of school	2007	2009	2010	2011	2007	2009	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V				Std I-VII/VIII			
% Teachers present (average)	91.3	92.7	88.5	87.5	85.5	89.5	87.1	82.7
% Schools with no teachers present (average)	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.9
% Schools with all teachers present (average)	76.9	80.0	68.9	69.6	50.7	61.9	51.4	49.5

Other school information

Table 11: Headteachers 2010 & 2011

% Schools with:	2010	2011	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V		Std I-VII/VIII	
No Headteacher appointed	0.7	4.5	0.8	5.7
Headteacher appointed but not present at time of visit	7.4	6.8	11.9	13.5
Headteacher appointed & present at time of visit	91.9	88.7	87.3	80.7
Total	100	100	100	100

Table 12: Computers 2010 and 2011

% Schools with:	2010	2011	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V		Std I-VII/VIII	
No computer	95.2	95.4	89.0	86.8
Computers but no children using them on day of visit	3.7	3.5	8.5	10.0
Computers & children using them on day of visit	1.1	1.1	2.6	3.2
Total	100	100	100	100

Table 13: Multigrade classes 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

% Schools with:	2007	2009	2010	2011	2007	2009	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V				Std I-VII/VIII			
Std II children sitting with one or more other classes	72.3	72.5	68.9	76.3	76.3	63.4	63.8	71.8
Std IV children sitting with one or more other classes	61.8	62.2	59.9	71.0	59.7	52.6	53.9	66.4

School funds and activities (PAISA)

Table 14: % Schools who report receiving SSA grants - Full financial year

SSA school grants	2008-2009				2009-2010				2010-2011			
	No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools		
		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know
Maintenance grant	1111	67.2	22.1	10.7	1101	84.7	5.7	9.6	1118	77.7	14.0	8.2
Development grant	1031	50.7	37.3	11.9	1049	77.5	12.5	10.0	1077	65.3	24.2	10.5
TLM grant	1126	82.2	10.7	7.2	1071	87.9	5.5	6.6	1104	77.1	16.3	6.6

Table 15: % Schools who report receiving SSA grants - Half financial year

SSA school grants	April 2009 to October 2009				April 2010 to October 2010				April 2011 to October 2011			
	No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools		
		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know
Maintenance grant	919	39.1	48.0	13.0	1040	56.1	26.5	17.4	1044	46.7	41.7	11.6
Development grant	862	30.1	56.4	13.6	998	51.9	29.2	18.9	1001	41.1	46.5	12.5
TLM grant	925	52.3	37.6	10.1	1012	60.9	24.0	15.1	1016	38.6	50.7	10.7

Table 16: % Schools carrying out different activities since April 2011

Type of Activity		% schools		
		Yes	No	Don't know
Const.	New Classroom	18.9	76.8	4.3
Repairs	Repair of building (roof, floor, wall etc.)	51.6	44.3	4.1
	Repair of doors & windows	44.7	51.5	3.8
	Repair of boundary wall	26.2	69.8	4.0
	Repair of drinking water facility	30.5	65.7	3.7
	Repair of toilet	31.3	65.0	3.6
Painting & White Wash	White wash/plastering	77.7	19.4	2.9
	Painting Blackboard/Display Board/Painting on wall	75.8	21.5	2.8
	Painting of doors & walls	68.1	28.8	3.1
Purchase	Purchase of furniture (cupboard etc.)	35.7	60.0	4.3
	Purchase of electrical fittings	16.5	79.3	4.2
	Purchase of chalk, duster, register etc.	89.0	8.1	2.9
	Purchase of sitting Mats/Tat Patti	82.0	15.0	3.0
	Purchase of charts, globes & other teaching material	74.4	22.3	3.3
Other	Expenditure on school events	74.1	21.8	4.1
	Payment of bills (electricity, water, cleaning etc.)	32.9	61.4	5.7

The PAISA section of ASER tracks receipt and spending of Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) grants at the school level. This information is collected from schools visited during the survey. This page reports proportion of schools receiving the grants and carrying out specified activities in the schools. More detailed analysis of the PAISA data will be available in the PAISA 2011 report which will be released in March 2012.[1]

EVERY RURAL GOVERNMENT PRIMARY SCHOOL IS ENTITLED TO EACH OF THESE SSA GRANTS EVERY YEAR.

How much goes to each school	For what purposes
SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT GRANT / SCHOOL GRANT	
Rs.5000 per year per primary school	This grant can be used for buying school equipment such as blackboard, sitting mats etc. Also for buying chalk, duster, registers and other office equipment.
Rs.7000 per year per upper primary school	
Rs 5000 + Rs 7000 = Rs 12000 if the school is Std I-VII/VIII.	The grant amount varies by type of school: whether it is a primary or upper primary school.
Note: Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same premises.	
SCHOOL MAINTENANCE GRANT	
Rs.5000 - Rs 7500 per school per year if the school has upto 3 classrooms.	This grant can be used for maintenance of school building, including whitewashing; beautification; and repair of toilets, hand pump, boundary wall, playground etc. The grant amount depends on number of classrooms (excluding Headmaster room and office room)
Rs 7500 - Rs.10000 per year if the school has more than 3 classrooms.	
Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same building.	
TLM GRANT	
Rs.500 per teacher per year in primary and upper primary schools.	This grant can be used by teachers to buy teaching aids, such as charts, globes, posters, models etc.

[1] For more information see www.accountabilityinitiative.in

Madhya Pradesh RURAL

Annual Status of Education Report
ASER 2011 RURAL
Facilitated by PRATHAM

Right to Education indicators

Table 17: Schools by total enrollment 2010 and 2011

School enrollment	2010		2011	
	No. of schools	% of schools	No. of schools	% of schools
1-60	126	10.4	176	15.0
61-90	144	11.9	190	16.2
91-120	161	13.3	192	16.4
121-150	154	12.7	155	13.2
151-200	218	18.0	168	14.3
> 200	406	33.6	291	24.8
TOTAL	1209	100.0	1172	100.0

Table 18: RTE norms: Pupil-teacher ratio 2010 and 2011

School enrollment	RTE Teacher Norms	2010	2011
		% Schools that do not meet PTR norms	
1-60	2	59.1	60.7
61-90	3	83.0	71.8
91-120	4	87.0	78.4
121-150	5	86.8	82.9
151-200	5 + HM	73.9	84.3
> 200	see note	84.2	87.5
TOTAL		80.6	78.5

Note : For schools with enrollment above 200 children the PTR shall not exceed 40 excluding the Head Teacher

Table 19: Schools by number of teachers 2010 and 2011

Number of teachers	2010		2011	
	No. of schools	% of schools	No. of schools	% of schools
1	185	16.7	220	20.9
2	258	23.3	261	24.8
3	190	17.2	210	20.0
4	130	11.7	134	12.8
5	113	10.2	89	8.5
6	101	9.1	53	5.0
>=7	130	11.7	84	8.0
TOTAL	1107	100.0	1051	100.0

Table 20: RTE norms: Teacher - classroom ratio 2010 and 2011

RTE norm: At least one classroom per teacher	2010	2011
Number of teachers	% Schools that do not meet classroom to teacher norms	
1	0.0	1.1
2	5.0	15.2
3	18.9	28.7
4	30.3	35.2
5	29.2	46.0
6	28.1	48.9
>=7	46.4	54.6
TOTAL	18.6	25.0

Table 21: % Schools meeting selected RTE norms on facilities 2010 & 2011

% of schools with		2010	2011
Building	Office/Store/Office cum store	69.4	64.3
	Playground	61.0	55.6
	Boundary Wall	37.4	37.1
Drinking Water	No facility for drinking water	13.4	19.3
	Facility but no drinking water available	8.1	12.1
	Drinking water available	78.5	68.6
Toilet	No toilet facility	20.0	24.3
	Facility but toilet not useable	29.8	43.9
	Toilet useable	50.3	31.9
Girls Toilet	% Schools with no separate provisions for girls toilets	50.8	43.8
	Of schools with separate girls toilets, % schools where		
	Toilet locked	8.5	6.2
	Toilet not useable	11.8	26.6
	Toilet useable	28.9	23.4
TLM	Teaching learning material in Std 2	83.9	82.3
	Teaching learning material in Std 4	81.0	77.2
Library	No library	43.7	41.3
	Library but no books being used by children on day of visit	27.3	27.2
	Library being used by children on day of visit	29.1	31.5
MDM	Kitchen shed for cooking midday meal	89.8	86.7
	Midday meal served in school on the day of visit	94.7	92.1

Note: School observations for ASER 2011 looked at TLM for Std II and Std IV only.

As part of ASER 2010 and 2011, in each sampled village, one government school with primary sections was visited on the day of the survey. During this school visit, RTE indicators were observed and are reported here.

Extracts from the Schedule of The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act 2009 Norms and standards for a School (Sections 19 and 25)

Number of teachers in Std 1-5:

Admitted children	No. of teachers
<= 60	2
61-90	3
91-120	4
121-200	5
> 150	5 + 1 Headteacher
> 200	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (excluding Headteacher) shall not exceed 40

School facilities:
All weather building with:

- At least one classroom for every teacher
- Office cum store cum headteacher's room
- Separate toilets for boys and girls
- Safe and adequate drinking water facility to all children
- A kitchen where mid-day meal is cooked in the school
- Playground
- Arrangements for securing the school building by boundary wall or fencing.

Teaching learning equipment
shall be provided to each class as required.

Library
There shall be a library in each school providing newspaper, magazines and books on all subjects, including story-books.



Maharashtra RURAL

Annual Status of Education Report
असर ASER 2011 RURAL
Facilitated by PRATHAM

ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM HOUSEHOLDS. 31 OUT OF 33 DISTRICTS


School enrollment and out of school children

Table 1: % Children in different types of schools 2011

Age group	Govt.	Pvt.	Other	Not in School	Total
Age: 6-14 ALL	68.2	30.3	0.5	1.1	100
Age: 7-16 ALL	59.5	38.4	0.4	1.8	100
Age: 7-10 ALL	85.6	13.2	0.5	0.7	100
Age: 7-10 BOYS	84.7	14.0	0.6	0.7	100
Age: 7-10 GIRLS	86.7	12.2	0.5	0.6	100
Age: 11-14 ALL	49.5	48.7	0.3	1.5	100
Age: 11-14 BOYS	49.4	49.0	0.3	1.3	100
Age: 11-14 GIRLS	50.0	48.0	0.3	1.8	100
Age: 15-16 ALL	25.1	69.6	0.4	5.0	100
Age: 15-16 BOYS	26.9	68.3	0.3	4.6	100
Age: 15-16 GIRLS	23.4	70.7	0.6	5.4	100

Note: 'OTHER' includes children going to madarssa and EGS.
'NOT IN SCHOOL' = dropped out + never enrolled.

Chart 1: Trends over time
% Children out of school by age group and gender 2006-2011



How to read this chart: For example, the proportion of girls (age 11-14) not in school has changed from 6.1% in 2006 to 3% in 2007 to 2.6% in 2008 to 2% in 2009 to 1.7% in 2010 to 1.8% in 2011

Chart 2: Trends over time
% Children enrolled in private school by class 2007, 2009 & 2011




Table 2: Sample description
% Children in each class by age 2011

Std.	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	Total
I	7.6	56.9	30.9	4.6									100
II	6.6		37.1	51.2	5.1								100
III	4.7			32.9	54.4	6.2	1.8						100
IV	4.3				31.4	54.9	7.4	2.0					100
V	3.6					30.9	54.8	8.3	2.3				100
VI	4.7						31.1	54.3	7.7	2.2			100
VII	5.6							35.1	48.6	8.7	2.0		100
VIII	2.1							6.0	33.8	48.7	7.7	1.7	100


How to read this table: If a child started school in Std I at age 6, she should be age 8 in Std 3. This table shows the age distribution for each class. For example, in Std III, 32.9% children are 8 years old but there are also 4.7% who are 7 years old or younger, 54.4% who are 9, 6.2% who are 10 years old, etc.

Young children in pre-school and school

Table 3: % Children age 5-6 who are enrolled in different types of pre-school & school 2011

	In balwadi or anganwadi	In LKG/ UKG	In School			Not enrolled anywhere	Total
			Govt	Pvt	Other		
Age 5	59.1	11.7	19.0	8.5	0.5	1.2	100
Age 6	13.6	4.7	70.3	10.0	0.7	0.8	100

Chart 3: Trends over time
Five year olds in pre-school & school 2007, 2009 & 2011



Reading

Table 4: % Children by class and READING level
All schools 2011

Std.	Nothing	Letter	Word	Level 1 (Std 1 Text)	Level 2 (Std 2 Text)	Total
I	13.1	48.6	29.7	6.3	2.4	100
II	4.5	21.9	42.2	22.6	8.8	100
III	2.7	10.8	22.9	37.4	26.2	100
IV	0.9	5.0	13.0	33.5	47.6	100
V	1.1	3.4	7.2	24.8	63.5	100
VI	0.8	2.3	5.0	18.1	73.8	100
VII	0.9	1.5	3.0	13.1	81.6	100
VIII	0.4	0.9	2.1	10.8	85.9	100
Total	3.0	11.5	15.5	21.2	48.9	100

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, 2.7% children cannot even read letters, 10.8% can read letters but not more, 22.9% can read words but not Std 1 text or higher, 37.4% can read Std 1 text but not Std 2 level text, and 26.2% can read Std 2 level text. In sum, for each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is 100%.

Reading Tool




Chart 4: Trends over time
% Children in Std III who CANNOT READ Std I LEVEL TEXT
By school type 2008-2011





Chart 5: Trends over time
% Children in Std V who CANNOT READ Std II LEVEL TEXT
By school type 2008-2011



Home language and school language

Table 5: School language and home language

% Children whose :	%
Home language is the same as school language	86.1
Home language is different from school language	13.9
Total	100.0

Note : In ASER 2011 for every state, reading tools were provided in the main medium of instruction in government schools. Children and their families were also asked about the language they speak at home. For home languages, a list of 122 languages was provided to all survey teams. This list includes 22 Scheduled languages and 100 Non-Scheduled languages. The data in this table is for children for whom we have information for both school language and home language.



Arithmetic

Table 6: % Children by class and ARITHMETIC level
All schools 2011

Std.	Nothing	Recognize Numbers		Subtract	Divide	Total
		1-9	11-99			
I	12.5	65.2	18.5	2.7	1.1	100
II	4.4	37.2	45.6	11.6	1.1	100
III	2.2	18.4	43.2	32.2	4.0	100
IV	0.9	9.1	31.3	43.2	15.5	100
V	1.3	6.0	20.7	39.2	32.9	100
VI	1.0	4.0	15.9	35.1	44.0	100
VII	0.9	3.3	11.1	32.3	52.3	100
VIII	0.6	2.0	9.9	26.3	61.2	100
Total	2.9	17.7	24.7	28.5	26.3	100

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level of arithmetic achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, 2.2% children cannot even recognize numbers 1-9, 18.4% children can recognize numbers up to 9 but not more, 43.2% can recognize numbers to 99 but cannot do subtraction, 32.2% can do subtraction but not division, and 4.0% can do division. In sum, for each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is 100%.

Math Tool




Chart 6: Trends over time
% Children in Std III who CANNOT RECOGNISE NUMBERS upto 100. By school type 2008-2011





Chart 7: Trends over time
% Children in Std V who CANNOT DO DIVISION
By school type 2008-2011



Tuition

Table 7: Class-wise % children attending PAID TUITION CLASSES
By school type 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Year	School	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	Total
2007	Govt	3.3	4.0	4.9	5.6	7.3	7.2	7.9	10.6	5.5
	Pvt	23.1	22.4	21.4	19.8	13.2	12.2	11.8	12.0	13.7
2009	Govt	7.5	7.1	9.0	10.1	10.9	11.2	11.7	15.3	9.6
	Pvt	24.8	30.6	27.4	28.7	17.2	12.7	15.3	13.5	16.2
2010	Govt	3.3	4.6	5.7	5.4	8.0	7.8	7.8	11.2	6.0
	Pvt	15.2	24.6	24.3	30.4	12.9	15.7	14.5	12.9	15.3
2011	Govt	3.9	5.3	6.7	5.5	7.3	7.7	8.9	14.2	6.7
	Pvt	23.3	22.8	25.1	23.7	17.2	13.6	17.9	13.6	16.8

Note: In 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011 the ASER survey recorded information about tuition. In all 4 years, the question asked was the following: "Does the child take any paid additional class currently?" Therefore, these numbers do not include any supplemental help in learning that children may have received from parents, siblings or from anyone else who did not require payment.



Maharashtra RURAL

Annual Status of Education Report
असर ASER 2011 RURAL
Facilitated by PRATHAM

As part of ASER 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011, in each sampled village, one government school with primary sections was visited on the day of the survey. Information about schools in this report is based on these visits.

School observations

Table 8: Total schools visited 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Type of school	2007	2009	2010	2011
Std I-IV/V: Primary	488	485	435	408
Std I-VII/VIII: Primary + Upper primary	411	450	467	421
Total schools visited	899	935	902	829



Student and teacher attendance

Table 9: Student attendance 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Type of school	2007	2009	2010	2011	2007	2009	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V				Std I-VII/VIII			
% Enrolled children present (average)	91.7	90.7	91.5	89.6	92.8	90.6	92.4	90.0
% Schools with less than 50% enrolled children present (average)	0.8	0.2	1.4	1.0	0.0	1.2	0.2	1.0
% Schools with 75% or more enrolled children present (average)	93.7	93.7	94.4	90.3	97.7	94.3	96.7	91.5

Table 10: Teacher attendance 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Type of school	2007	2009	2010	2011	2007	2009	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V				Std I-VII/VIII			
% Teachers present (average)	94.1	94.9	93.8	89.8	89.8	92.8	91.7	89.0
% Schools with no teachers present (average)	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.2	0.0	0.3
% Schools with all teachers present (average)	83.1	84.7	80.6	73.9	63.6	71.7	66.3	61.8

Other school information

Table 11: Headteachers 2010 & 2011

% Schools with:	2010	2011	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V		Std I-VII/VIII	
No Headteacher appointed	4.5	5.0	1.8	1.6
Headteacher appointed but not present at time of visit	2.7	5.9	6.9	5.8
Headteacher appointed & present at time of visit	92.8	89.1	91.3	92.6
Total	100	100	100	100

Table 12: Computers 2010 and 2011

% Schools with:	2010	2011	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V		Std I-VII/VIII	
No computer	81.8	80.3	52.5	41.9
Computers but no children using them on day of visit	6.3	10.7	20.4	27.5
Computers & children using them on day of visit	11.9	9.0	27.1	30.6
Total	100	100	100	100

Table 13: Multigrade classes 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

% Schools with:	2007	2009	2010	2011	2007	2009	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V				Std I-VII/VIII			
Std II children sitting with one or more other classes	49.5	46.7	47.5	47.6	27.7	26.7	34.3	41.3
Std IV children sitting with one or more other classes	46.2	42.9	46.8	45.6	22.8	22.7	26.9	36.0

School funds and activities (PAISA)

Table 14: % Schools who report receiving SSA grants - Full financial year

SSA school grants	2008-2009				2009-2010				2010-2011			
	No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools		
		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know
Maintenance grant	868	93.9	3.1	3.0	772	92.1	2.5	5.4	777	92.4	3.2	4.4
Development grant	778	80.3	16.7	3.0	747	89.6	4.3	6.2	753	76.1	17.7	6.2
TLM grant	896	97.9	0.8	1.3	770	95.2	1.2	3.6	765	93.5	2.9	3.7

Table 15: % Schools who report receiving SSA grants - Half financial year

SSA school grants	April 2009 to October 2009				April 2010 to October 2010				April 2011 to October 2011			
	No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools		
		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know
Maintenance grant	789	82.0	14.3	3.7	733	65.4	27.2	7.5	734	65.7	29.3	5.0
Development grant	712	73.5	23.0	3.5	715	64.1	28.5	7.4	707	57.6	37.1	5.4
TLM grant	806	88.1	9.6	2.4	735	69.4	24.8	5.9	719	66.3	29.4	4.3

Table 16: % Schools carrying out different activities since April 2011

Type of Activity		% schools		
		Yes	No	Don't know
Const.	New Classroom	21.7	76.1	2.2
Repairs	Repair of building (roof, floor, wall etc.)	50.3	47.4	2.2
	Repair of doors & windows	54.0	44.3	1.7
	Repair of boundary wall	23.6	74.1	2.3
	Repair of drinking water facility	53.2	44.5	2.2
	Repair of toilet	52.2	45.9	2.0
Painting & White Wash	White wash/plastering	66.1	31.9	2.0
	Painting Blackboard/Display Board/Painting on wall	75.6	22.7	1.7
	Painting of doors & walls	58.4	39.5	2.1
Purchase	Purchase of furniture (cupboard etc.)	35.7	62.4	2.0
	Purchase of electrical fittings	43.0	54.1	2.9
	Purchase of chalk, duster, register etc.	92.9	5.7	1.4
	Purchase of sitting Mats/Tat Patti	54.8	42.5	2.8
	Purchase of charts, globes & other teaching material	78.6	19.5	2.0
Other	Expenditure on school events	69.3	26.7	4.0
	Payment of bills (electricity, water, cleaning etc.)	39.7	54.8	5.5

The PAISA section of ASER tracks receipt and spending of Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) grants at the school level. This information is collected from schools visited during the survey. This page reports proportion of schools receiving the grants and carrying out specified activities in the schools. More detailed analysis of the PAISA data will be available in the PAISA 2011 report which will be released in March 2012.[1]

EVERY RURAL GOVERNMENT PRIMARY SCHOOL IS ENTITLED TO EACH OF THESE SSA GRANTS EVERY YEAR.

How much goes to each school	For what purposes
SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT GRANT / SCHOOL GRANT	
Rs.5000 per year per primary school	This grant can be used for buying school equipment such as blackboard, sitting mats etc. Also for buying chalk, duster, registers and other office equipment.
Rs.7000 per year per upper primary school	
Rs 5000 + Rs 7000 = Rs 12000 if the school is Std I-VII/VIII.	The grant amount varies by type of school: whether it is a primary or upper primary school.
Note: Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same premises.	
SCHOOL MAINTENANCE GRANT	
Rs.5000 - Rs 7500 per school per year if the school has upto 3 classrooms.	This grant can be used for maintenance of school building, including whitewashing; beautification; and repair of toilets, hand pump, boundary wall, playground etc. The grant amount depends on number of classrooms (excluding Headmaster room and office room)
Rs 7500 - Rs.10000 per year if the school has more than 3 classrooms.	
Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same building.	
TLM GRANT	
Rs.500 per teacher per year in primary and upper primary schools.	This grant can be used by teachers to buy teaching aids, such as charts, globes, posters, models etc.

[1] For more information see www.accountabilityinitiative.in

Right to Education indicators

Table 17: Schools by total enrollment 2010 and 2011

School enrollment	2010		2011	
	No. of schools	% of schools	No. of schools	% of schools
1-60	148	16.7	170	21.0
61-90	91	10.3	86	10.6
91-120	83	9.4	78	9.6
121-150	99	11.2	91	11.2
151-200	146	16.5	145	17.9
> 200	319	36.0	241	29.7
TOTAL	886	100.0	811	100.0

Table 18: RTE norms: Pupil-teacher ratio 2010 and 2011

School enrollment	RTE Teacher Norms	2010	2011
		% Schools that do not meet PTR norms	
1-60	2	41.4	39.3
61-90	3	45.8	36.5
91-120	4	44.9	41.3
121-150	5	47.7	50.6
151-200	5 + HM	41.8	22.3
> 200	see note	36.4	36.9
TOTAL		41.2	37.1

Note : For schools with enrollment above 200 children the PTR shall not exceed 40 excluding the Head Teacher

Table 19: Schools by number of teachers 2010 and 2011

Number of teachers	2010		2011	
	No. of schools	% of schools	No. of schools	% of schools
1	65	8.2	72	9.8
2	111	13.9	118	16.1
3	74	9.3	69	9.4
4	93	11.7	68	9.3
5	72	9.0	74	10.1
6	110	13.8	110	15.0
>=7	273	34.2	221	30.2
TOTAL	798	100.0	732	100.0

Table 20: RTE norms: Teacher - classroom ratio 2010 and 2011

RTE norm: At least one classroom per teacher	2010	2011
Number of teachers	% Schools that do not meet classroom to teacher norms	
1	0.0	0.0
2	6.2	10.0
3	14.1	12.3
4	4.9	15.0
5	10.3	30.0
6	26.8	29.4
>=7	14.9	22.2
TOTAL	12.4	18.2

Table 21: % Schools meeting selected RTE norms on facilities 2010 & 2011

% of schools with		2010	2011
Building	Office/Store/Office cum store	34.2	33.4
	Playground	85.0	82.5
	Boundary Wall	57.6	58.2
Drinking Water	No facility for drinking water	18.7	16.7
	Facility but no drinking water available	12.3	10.2
	Drinking water available	69.0	73.1
Toilet	No toilet facility	2.9	3.1
	Facility but toilet not useable	44.1	52.1
	Toilet useable	53.0	44.9
Girls Toilet	% Schools with no separate provisions for girls toilets	13.7	9.0
	Of schools with separate girls toilets, % schools where		
	Toilet locked	32.3	34.4
	Toilet not useable	10.8	14.1
	Toilet useable	43.2	42.6
TLM	Teaching learning material in Std 2	97.2	96.4
	Teaching learning material in Std 4	94.7	95.9
Library	No library	14.0	16.2
	Library but no books being used by children on day of visit	19.6	29.5
	Library being used by children on day of visit	66.5	54.3
MDM	Kitchen shed for cooking midday meal	78.3	74.9
	Midday meal served in school on the day of visit	90.7	95.8

Note: School observations for ASER 2011 looked at TLM for Std II and Std IV only.

As part of ASER 2010 and 2011, in each sampled village, one government school with primary sections was visited on the day of the survey. During this school visit, RTE indicators were observed and are reported here.

Extracts from the Schedule of The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act 2009 Norms and standards for a School (Sections 19 and 25)

Number of teachers in Std 1-5:

Admitted children	No. of teachers
<= 60	2
61-90	3
91-120	4
121-200	5
> 150	5 + 1 Headteacher
> 200	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (excluding Headteacher) shall not exceed 40

School facilities:
All weather building with:

- At least one classroom for every teacher
- Office cum store cum headteacher's room
- Separate toilets for boys and girls
- Safe and adequate drinking water facility to all children
- A kitchen where mid-day meal is cooked in the school
- Playground
- Arrangements for securing the school building by boundary wall or fencing.

Teaching learning equipment
shall be provided to each class as required.

Library
There shall be a library in each school providing newspaper, magazines and books on all subjects, including story-books.



Manipur RURAL

Annual Status of Education Report
ASER 2011 RURAL
Facilitated by PRATHAM

ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM HOUSEHOLDS. 8 OUT OF 9 DISTRICTS


School enrollment and out of school children

Table 1: % Children in different types of schools 2011

Age group	Govt.	Pvt.	Other	Not in School	Total
Age: 6-14 ALL	27.7	71.1	0.1	1.1	100
Age: 7-16 ALL	26.9	71.0	0.1	2.0	100
Age: 7-10 ALL	29.5	69.7	0.1	0.7	100
Age: 7-10 BOYS	29.4	69.8	0.0	0.8	100
Age: 7-10 GIRLS	29.6	69.7	0.1	0.7	100
Age: 11-14 ALL	24.8	73.5	0.1	1.6	100
Age: 11-14 BOYS	25.3	73.1	0.2	1.4	100
Age: 11-14 GIRLS	24.2	74.0	0.1	1.7	100
Age: 15-16 ALL	23.3	67.6	0.4	8.7	100
Age: 15-16 BOYS	21.0	67.1	0.6	11.3	100
Age: 15-16 GIRLS	25.6	68.0	0.2	6.2	100

Note: 'OTHER' includes children going to madarssa and EGS.
'NOT IN SCHOOL' = dropped out + never enrolled.

Chart 1: Trends over time
% Children out of school by age group and gender 2006-2011



How to read this chart: For example, the proportion of girls (age 11-14) not in school has changed from 5.9% in 2006 to 7.1% in 2007 to 4.6% in 2008 to 2.3% in 2009 to 3.3% in 2010 to 1.7% in 2011

Chart 2: Trends over time
% Children enrolled in private school by class 2007, 2009 & 2011




Table 2: Sample description
% Children in each class by age 2011

Std.	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	Total
I	17.0	38.5	21.8	14.4	8.3								100
II	3.3	11.3	25.9	31.3	13.9	8.9	5.4						100
III	4.2		11.0	31.1	19.0	19.3	5.8	6.3	3.4				100
IV	5.4			8.6	25.5	30.1	11.9	11.4	7.1				100
V	5.6				6.7	34.3	19.2	14.4	10.3	7.4	2.2		100
VI	4.1					11.8	20.4	31.2	18.3	8.1	6.2		100
VII	8.7							37.5	29.8	16.0	8.0		100
VIII	3.4							11.4	31.4	31.1	16.3	6.4	100


How to read this table: If a child started school in Std I at age 6, she should be age 8 in Std 3. This table shows the age distribution for each class. For example, in Std III, 31.1% children are 8 years old but there are also 11.0% who are 7, 19.0 % who are 9, 19.3% who are 10 years old, etc.

Young children in pre-school and school

Table 3: % Children age 5-6 who are enrolled in different types of pre-school & school 2011

	In balwadi or anganwadi	In LKG/ UKG	In School			Not enrolled anywhere	Total
			Govt	Pvt	Other		
Age 5	7.0	52.0	12.3	27.8	0.0	0.9	100
Age 6	1.6	26.5	22.8	48.4	0.0	0.9	100

Chart 3: Trends over time
Five year olds in pre-school & school 2007, 2009 & 2011




Reading

Table 4: % Children by class and READING level
All schools 2011

Std.	Nothing	Letter	Word	Level 1 (Std 1 Text)	Level 2 (Std 2 Text)	Total
I	4.0	46.7	33.2	8.6	7.4	100
II	1.8	16.8	43.3	21.3	16.8	100
III	0.8	8.1	24.1	31.4	35.6	100
IV	0.9	7.8	14.1	26.2	51.1	100
V	0.2	4.9	8.4	15.2	71.3	100
VI	0.6	3.1	4.8	13.4	78.1	100
VII	0.8	2.0	3.6	7.8	85.9	100
VIII	0.2	0.4	1.1	8.1	90.1	100
Total	1.3	13.1	18.7	17.3	49.6	100

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, 0.8% children cannot even read letters, 8.1% can read letters but not more, 24.1% can read words but not Std 1 text or higher, 31.4% can read Std 1 text but not Std 2 level text, and 35.6% can read Std 2 level text. In sum, for each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is 100%.

Reading Tool



Note: This tool was also available in Metei Mayek and Manipuri.

Chart 4: Trends over time
% Children in Std III who CANNOT READ Std I LEVEL TEXT
By school type 2008-2011





Chart 5: Trends over time
% Children in Std V who CANNOT READ Std II LEVEL TEXT
By school type 2008-2011



Home language and school language

Table 5: School language and home language

%Children who took the reading test in:	%
English	98.0
Manipuri	2.0
Total	100.0

Of the % Children who tested in:	% Children whose home language was:								
	Manipuri	Tangkhul	Kuki	Hmar	Kabui	Paite	Anal	Other *	Total
English	53.8	15.0	7.0	4.3	2.9	2.9	1.9	12.2	100

* 'Other' includes all languages from the list of scheduled and non-scheduled languages except those specified above. Data for home language of children tested in Manipuri has not been reported here due to small cell sizes.

Note: In ASER 2011 for every state, reading tools were provided in the main medium of instruction in government schools. In Manipur, where the medium of instruction in government schools is English or Manipuri, children were given the choice of reading in English, Manipuri or Meitei Mayek. Figures of Meitei Mayek have not been included due to insufficient data. For home languages, a list of 122 languages was provided to all survey teams. This includes 22 Scheduled languages and 100 Non-Scheduled languages. The data in this table is for children for whom we have information for both school language and home language.

Arithmetic

**Table 6: % Children by class and ARITHMETIC level
All schools 2011**

Std.	Nothing	Recognize Numbers		Subtract	Divide	Total
		1-9	11-99			
I	5.2	33.1	53.3	7.1	1.4	100
II	2.0	10.3	57.8	24.7	5.2	100
III	0.8	4.6	38.8	39.5	16.4	100
IV	1.0	3.4	20.8	45.5	29.3	100
V	0.2	2.3	9.7	38.2	49.6	100
VI	0.5	1.2	6.9	28.5	62.9	100
VII	0.8	0.5	6.1	17.0	75.7	100
VIII	0.2	0.6	3.2	14.1	81.9	100
Total	1.5	8.3	27.7	27.5	35.0	100

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level of arithmetic achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, 0.8% children cannot even recognize numbers 1-9, 4.6% children can recognize numbers up to 9 but not more, 38.8% can recognize numbers to 99 but cannot do subtraction, 39.5% can do subtraction but not division, and 16.4% can do division. In sum, for each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is 100%.

Math Tool



**Chart 6: Trends over time
% Children in Std III who CANNOT RECOGNISE NUMBERS upto 100. By school type 2008-2011**





**Chart 7: Trends over time
% Children in Std V who CANNOT DO DIVISION
By school type 2008-2011**



Tuition

**Table 7: Class-wise % children attending PAID TUITION CLASSES
By school type 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011**

Year	School	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	Total
2007	Govt	17.2	18.0	19.5	26.0	24.1	26.6	28.9	35.3	22.3
	Pvt	43.6	52.4	53.1	53.7	58.6	53.5	59.2	59.9	54.0
2009	Govt	12.0	18.8	16.0	17.1	17.6	21.6	15.2	29.7	18.2
	Pvt	42.4	46.0	49.5	50.7	45.7	49.9	51.8	55.2	48.5
2010	Govt	9.9	13.2	11.3	14.7	16.9	16.4	15.4	27.6	15.0
	Pvt	38.9	41.3	49.2	51.9	48.6	52.9	59.3	61.7	49.9
2011	Govt	11.0	15.3	13.2	12.5	13.6	23.2	20.8	19.8	15.1
	Pvt	43.0	43.3	43.7	51.3	52.4	50.4	52.6	57.2	48.8

Note: In 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011 the ASER survey recorded information about tuition. In all 4 years, the question asked was the following: "Does the child take any paid additional class currently?" Therefore, these numbers do not include any supplemental help in learning that children may have received from parents, siblings or from anyone else who did not require payment.



Manipur RURAL

As part of ASER 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011, in each sampled village, one government school with primary sections was visited on the day of the survey. Information about schools in this report is based on these visits.

School observations

Table 8: Total schools visited 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Type of school	2007	2009	2010	2011
Std I-IV/V: Primary	111	107	97	99
Std I-VII/VIII: Primary + Upper primary	36	35	28	34
Total schools visited	147	142	125	133



Student and teacher attendance

Table 9: Student attendance 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Type of school	2007	2009	2010	2011	2007	2009	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V				Std I-VII/VIII			
% Enrolled children present (average)	76.7	74.0	66.1	52.3	80.0	79.7	71.3	56.8
% Schools with less than 50% enrolled children present (average)	13.0	14.1	17.2	42.6	11.8	7.7	11.1	27.3
% Schools with 75% or more enrolled children present (average)	62.0	64.1	38.7	13.8	73.5	76.9	44.4	15.2

Table 10: Teacher attendance 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Type of school	2007	2009	2010	2011	2007	2009	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V				Std I-VII/VIII			
% Teachers present (average)	90.2	82.9	70.8	78.5	80.4	71.8	75.1	72.0
% Schools with no teachers present (average)	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	3.1	3.5	0.0	0.0
% Schools with all teachers present (average)	63.7	50.0	27.3	42.6	28.1	17.2	30.8	20.6

Other school information

Table 11: Headteachers 2010 & 2011

% Schools with:	2010	2011	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V		Std I-VII/VIII	
No Headteacher appointed	2.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
Headteacher appointed but not present at time of visit	28.0	15.0	31.6	16.0
Headteacher appointed & present at time of visit	69.3	85.0	68.4	84.0
Total	100	100	100	100

Table 12: Computers 2010 and 2011

% Schools with:	2010	2011	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V		Std I-VII/VIII	
No computer	97.8	97.9	70.4	81.8
Computers but no children using them on day of visit	0.0	2.1	25.9	12.1
Computers & children using them on day of visit	2.2	0.0	3.7	6.1
Total	100	100	100	100

Table 13: Multigrade classes 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

% Schools with:	2007	2009	2010	2011	2007	2009	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V				Std I-VII/VIII			
Std II children sitting with one or more other classes	22.9	28.2	40.7	47.6	5.7	22.6	28.0	36.7
Std IV children sitting with one or more other classes	14.7	26.5	35.2	37.0	8.8	21.9	20.0	26.7

School funds and activities (PAISA)

Table 14: % Schools who report receiving SSA grants - Full financial year

SSA school grants	2008-2009				2009-2010				2010-2011			
	No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools		
		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know
Maintenance grant	123	65.0	34.2	0.8	107	66.4	10.3	23.4	120	66.7	10.8	22.5
Development grant	112	49.1	50.0	0.9	107	56.1	15.9	28.0	117	55.6	19.7	24.8
TLM grant	125	74.4	25.6	0.0	106	73.6	7.6	18.9	123	68.3	9.8	22.0

Table 15: % Schools who report receiving SSA grants - Half financial year

SSA school grants	April 2009 to October 2009				April 2010 to October 2010				April 2011 to October 2011			
	No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools		
		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know
Maintenance grant	106	34.0	49.1	17.0	98	24.5	50.0	25.5	97	11.3	54.6	34.0
Development grant	99	23.2	55.6	21.2	97	21.7	51.6	26.8	94	9.6	55.3	35.1
TLM grant	105	37.1	48.6	14.3	95	24.2	53.7	22.1	96	9.4	57.3	33.3

Table 16: % Schools carrying out different activities since April 2011

Type of Activity		% schools		
		Yes	No	Don't know
Const.	New Classroom	96.8	1.6	1.6
Repairs	Repair of building (roof, floor, wall etc.)	96.9	1.6	1.6
	Repair of doors & windows	98.4	0.0	1.6
	Repair of boundary wall	98.0	0.0	2.0
	Repair of drinking water facility	98.2	0.0	1.9
	Repair of toilet	96.8	1.6	1.6
Painting & White Wash	White wash/plastering	97.9	2.1	0.0
	Painting Blackboard/Display Board/Painting on wall	98.3	1.7	0.0
	Painting of doors & walls	97.7	2.3	0.0
Purchase	Purchase of furniture (cupboard etc.)	94.5	4.1	1.4
	Purchase of electrical fittings	98.0	0.0	2.0
	Purchase of chalk, duster, register etc.	100.0	0.0	0.0
	Purchase of sitting Mats/Tat Patti	100.0	0.0	0.0
	Purchase of charts, globes & other teaching material	100.0	0.0	0.0
Other	Expenditure on school events	100.0	0.0	0.0
	Payment of bills (electricity, water, cleaning etc.)	100.0	0.0	0.0

The PAISA section of ASER tracks receipt and spending of Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) grants at the school level. This information is collected from schools visited during the survey. This page reports proportion of schools receiving the grants and carrying out specified activities in the schools. More detailed analysis of the PAISA data will be available in the PAISA 2011 report which will be released in March 2012.[1]

EVERY RURAL GOVERNMENT PRIMARY SCHOOL IS ENTITLED TO EACH OF THESE SSA GRANTS EVERY YEAR.

How much goes to each school	For what purposes
SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT GRANT / SCHOOL GRANT	
Rs.5000 per year per primary school	This grant can be used for buying school equipment such as blackboard, sitting mats etc. Also for buying chalk, duster, registers and other office equipment.
Rs.7000 per year per upper primary school	
Rs 5000 + Rs 7000 = Rs 12000 if the school is Std I-VII/VIII.	The grant amount varies by type of school: whether it is a primary or upper primary school.
Note: Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same premises.	
SCHOOL MAINTENANCE GRANT	
Rs.5000 - Rs 7500 per school per year if the school has upto 3 classrooms.	This grant can be used for maintenance of school building, including whitewashing; beautification; and repair of toilets, hand pump, boundary wall, playground etc. The grant amount depends on number of classrooms (excluding Headmaster room and office room)
Rs 7500 - Rs.10000 per year if the school has more than 3 classrooms.	
Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same building.	
TLM GRANT	
Rs.500 per teacher per year in primary and upper primary schools.	This grant can be used by teachers to buy teaching aids, such as charts, globes, posters, models etc.

[1] For more information see www.accountabilityinitiative.in

Right to Education indicators

Table 17: Schools by total enrollment 2010 and 2011

School enrollment	2010		2011	
	No. of schools	% of schools	No. of schools	% of schools
1-60	43	35.3	56	43.8
61-90	22	18.0	21	16.4
91-120	22	18.0	23	18.0
121-150	15	12.3	13	10.2
151-200	11	9.0	6	4.7
> 200	9	7.4	9	7.0
TOTAL	122	100.0	128	100.0

Table 18: RTE norms: Pupil-teacher ratio 2010 and 2011

School enrollment	RTE Teacher Norms	2010	2011
		% Schools that do not meet PTR norms	
1-60	2	0.0	9.1
61-90	3	20.0	5.9
91-120	4	42.1	21.7
121-150	5	64.3	9.1
151-200	5 + HM	37.5	0.0
> 200	see note	44.4	25.0
TOTAL		25.7	11.9

Note : For schools with enrollment above 200 children the PTR shall not exceed 40 excluding the Head Teacher

Table 19: Schools by number of teachers 2010 and 2011

Number of teachers	2010		2011	
	No. of schools	% of schools	No. of schools	% of schools
1	3	2.7	6	5.0
2	12	10.9	7	5.8
3	12	10.9	13	10.8
4	15	13.6	9	7.5
5	23	20.9	25	20.8
6	12	10.9	12	10.0
>=7	33	30.0	48	40.0
TOTAL	110	100.0	120	100.0

Table 20: RTE norms: Teacher - classroom ratio 2010 and 2011

RTE norm: At least one classroom per teacher	2010	2011
Number of teachers	% Schools that do not meet classroom to teacher norms	
1	0.0	0.0
2	22.2	20.0
3	33.3	50.0
4	16.7	83.3
5	33.3	81.3
6	75.0	16.7
>=7	75.0	68.0
TOTAL	37.5	58.6

Table 21: % Schools meeting selected RTE norms on facilities 2010 & 2011

% of schools with		2010	2011
Building	Office/Store/Office cum store	68.1	66.4
	Playground	72.3	41.7
	Boundary Wall	11.1	6.4
Drinking Water	No facility for drinking water	84.6	87.3
	Facility but no drinking water available	10.3	6.4
	Drinking water available	5.1	6.4
Toilet	No toilet facility	21.4	31.3
	Facility but toilet not useable	38.5	33.6
	Toilet useable	40.2	35.2
Girls Toilet	% Schools with no separate provisions for girls toilets	78.5	64.7
	Of schools with separate girls toilets, % schools where		
	Toilet locked	4.7	5.9
	Toilet not useable	8.4	14.1
	Toilet useable	8.4	15.3
TLM	Teaching learning material in Std 2	48.7	23.0
	Teaching learning material in Std 4	38.4	20.6
Library	No library	90.8	92.9
	Library but no books being used by children on day of visit	3.4	5.5
	Library being used by children on day of visit	5.9	1.6
MDM	Kitchen shed for cooking midday meal	59.2	43.9
	Midday meal served in school on the day of visit	47.8	29.8

Note: School observations for ASER 2011 looked at TLM for Std II and Std IV only.

As part of ASER 2010 and 2011, in each sampled village, one government school with primary sections was visited on the day of the survey. During this school visit, RTE indicators were observed and are reported here.

Extracts from the Schedule of The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act 2009 Norms and standards for a School (Sections 19 and 25)

Number of teachers in Std 1-5:

Admitted children	No. of teachers
<= 60	2
61-90	3
91-120	4
121-200	5
> 150	5 + 1 Headteacher
> 200	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (excluding Headteacher) shall not exceed 40

School facilities:
All weather building with:

- At least one classroom for every teacher
- Office cum store cum headteacher's room
- Separate toilets for boys and girls
- Safe and adequate drinking water facility to all children
- A kitchen where mid-day meal is cooked in the school
- Playground
- Arrangements for securing the school building by boundary wall or fencing.

Teaching learning equipment
shall be provided to each class as required.

Library
There shall be a library in each school providing newspaper, magazines and books on all subjects, including story-books.



Meghalaya RURAL

Annual Status of Education Report
ASER 2011 RURAL
Facilitated by PRATHAM

ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM HOUSEHOLDS. 6 OUT OF 7 DISTRICTS


School enrollment and out of school children

Table 1: % Children in different types of schools 2011

Age group	Govt.	Pvt.	Other	Not in School	Total
Age: 6-14 ALL	38.6	54.3	1.3	5.8	100
Age: 7-16 ALL	38.1	52.4	1.2	8.2	100
Age: 7-10 ALL	39.8	55.0	1.3	4.0	100
Age: 7-10 BOYS	42.8	51.0	1.1	5.1	100
Age: 7-10 GIRLS	36.6	59.2	1.4	2.9	100
Age: 11-14 ALL	37.7	53.1	1.4	7.8	100
Age: 11-14 BOYS	39.7	48.0	1.3	11.0	100
Age: 11-14 GIRLS	35.7	58.1	1.5	4.7	100
Age: 15-16 ALL	35.3	45.0	0.7	19.0	100
Age: 15-16 BOYS	38.9	38.5	0.3	22.2	100
Age: 15-16 GIRLS	31.7	51.6	1.0	15.7	100

Note: 'OTHER' includes children going to madarssa and EGS.
'NOT IN SCHOOL' = dropped out + never enrolled.

Chart 1: Trends over time
% Children out of school by age group and gender 2006-2011



How to read this chart: For example, the proportion of girls (age 11-14) not in school has changed from 5.4% in 2006 to 6.4% in 2007 to 2.7% in 2008 to 4.4% in 2009 to 6.8% in 2010 to 4.7% in 2011

Chart 2: Trends over time
% Children enrolled in private school by class 2007, 2009 & 2011




Table 2: Sample description
% Children in each class by age 2011

Std.	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	Total
I	8.0	17.7	19.8	20.9	10.7	11.1	3.4	8.5					100
II	6.5		13.2	21.8	17.1	17.1	7.9	8.9	7.6				100
III	5.9			13.6	19.1	18.0	14.8	12.3	7.8	8.5			100
IV	4.8				12.7	24.4	13.7	17.4	9.6	7.6	5.7	4.2	100
V	4.3					11.9	16.9	21.8	16.3	11.1	10.7	7.0	100
VI	4.4						10.5	20.4	21.1	20.5	15.9	7.3	100
VII	4.4							17.5	21.5	27.7	16.9	12.1	100
VIII	7.0								19.1	30.4	25.3	18.2	100


How to read this table: If a child started school in Std I at age 6, she should be age 8 in Std 3. This table shows the age distribution for each class. For example, in Std III, 13.6% children are 8 years old but there are also 5.9% who are 7 years old or younger, 19.1% who are 9, 18.0% who are 10 years old, etc.

Young children in pre-school and school

Table 3: % Children age 5-6 who are enrolled in different types of pre-school & school 2011

	In balwadi or anganwadi	In LKG/ UKG	In School			Not enrolled anywhere	Total
			Govt	Pvt	Other		
Age 5	9.1	9.1	29.0	44.6	0.7	7.4	100
Age 6	4.0	10.1	31.7	48.4	1.1	4.7	100

Chart 3: Trends over time
Five year olds in pre-school & school 2007, 2009 & 2011




Reading

Table 4: % Children by class and READING level
All schools 2011

Std.	Nothing	Letter	Word	Level 1 (Std 1 Text)	Level 2 (Std 2 Text)	Total
I	17.5	33.5	36.8	8.0	4.2	100
II	9.4	18.7	39.2	19.6	13.1	100
III	6.2	7.2	38.3	20.7	27.5	100
IV	4.1	5.4	24.9	29.2	36.4	100
V	4.8	3.4	14.9	23.5	53.5	100
VI	4.2	5.4	10.2	24.2	56.0	100
VII	4.2	2.2	4.5	17.2	71.9	100
VIII	2.2	6.2	2.5	6.0	83.2	100
Total	8.1	13.3	26.7	18.7	33.3	100

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, 6.2% children cannot even read letters, 7.2% can read letters but not more, 38.3% can read words but not Std 1 text or higher, 20.7% can read Std 1 text but not Std 2 level text, and 27.5% can read Std 2 level text. In sum, for each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is 100%.

Reading Tool



Note: This tool was also available in Garo and English.

Chart 4: Trends over time
% Children in Std III who CANNOT READ Std I LEVEL TEXT
By school type 2008-2011





Chart 5: Trends over time
% Children in Std V who CANNOT READ Std II LEVEL TEXT
By school type 2008-2011



Home language and school language

Table 5: School language and home language

Of Children whose school language was Garo or Khasi:	
% Children whose :	%
Home language is the same as school language	51.7
Home language is different from school language	48.3
Total	100

% Children who took the reading test in:	%
Garo / Khasi	52.7
English	47.3
Total	100

Of the % Children who tested in:	% Children whose home language was:				
	Garo	Khasi	Maram	Other *	Total
Garo / Khasi	31.5	21.6	9.8	37.2	100
English	16.3	51.4	4.9	27.4	100

* 'Other' includes all languages from the list of scheduled and non-scheduled languages except those specified above.

Note: In ASER 2011 for every state, reading tools were provided in the main medium of instruction in government schools. In Meghalaya, where the medium of instruction in government schools is Garo, Khasi or English, children were given the choice of reading in any one of these languages. Figures for Garo and Khasi have been combined. For home languages, a list of 122 languages was provided to all survey teams. This included 22 Scheduled languages and 100 Non-Scheduled languages. The data in this table is for children for whom we have information for both school language and home language.

Arithmetic

Table 6: % Children by class and ARITHMETIC level
All schools 2011

Std.	Nothing	Recognize Numbers		Subtract	Divide	Total
		1-9	11-99			
I	13.5	43.4	39.0	3.8	0.4	100
II	6.7	32.9	47.7	11.1	1.6	100
III	6.5	20.6	41.5	28.4	3.1	100
IV	5.1	14.3	38.3	32.7	9.6	100
V	4.8	10.9	20.5	42.5	21.3	100
VI	4.7	12.1	18.0	36.6	28.7	100
VII	4.4	4.7	16.4	27.5	47.1	100
VIII	2.2	8.4	6.4	19.1	64.0	100
Total	7.0	22.8	33.4	22.8	14.1	100

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level of arithmetic achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, 6.5% children cannot even recognize numbers 1-9, 20.6% children can recognize numbers up to 9 but not more, 41.5% can recognize numbers to 99 but cannot do subtraction, 28.4% can do subtraction but not division, and 3.1% can do division. In sum, for each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is 100%.

Math Tool




Chart 6: Trends over time
% Children in Std III who CANNOT RECOGNISE NUMBERS upto 100. By school type 2008-2011





Chart 7: Trends over time
% Children in Std V who CANNOT DO DIVISION
By school type 2008-2011



Tuition

Table 7: Class-wise % children attending PAID TUITION CLASSES
By school type 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Year	School	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	Total
2007	Govt	2.7	5.7	4.3	3.9	8.4	14.9	15.7	11.0	5.8
	Pvt	23.7	28.0	25.8	29.9	24.7	29.9	37.3	34.6	28.3
2009	Govt	4.8	7.5	10.9	7.6	9.2	13.8	22.6	27.4	9.8
	Pvt	22.8	17.2	16.0	23.4	20.4	20.7	19.3	35.5	21.2
2010	Govt	4.7	5.7	7.9	10.4	13.9	13.1	21.8	14.7	9.8
	Pvt	21.1	20.6	20.6	19.2	14.8	14.7	18.8	22.3	18.9
2011	Govt	7.0	7.3	8.6	10.9	10.9	31.4	22.2	26.7	11.8
	Pvt	19.0	21.0	25.0	23.3	20.2	22.8	23.7	26.6	22.3

Note: In 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011 the ASER survey recorded information about tuition. In all 4 years, the question asked was the following: "Does the child take any paid additional class currently?" Therefore, these numbers do not include any supplemental help in learning that children may have received from parents, siblings or from anyone else who did not require payment.



Meghalaya RURAL

Annual Status of Education Report
ASER 2011 RURAL
Facilitated by PRATHAM

As part of ASER 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011, in each sampled village, one government school with primary sections was visited on the day of the survey. Information about schools in this report is based on these visits.

School observations

Table 8: Total schools visited 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Type of school	2007	2009	2010	2011
Std I-IV/V: Primary	107	135	101	76
Std I-VII/VIII: Primary + Upper primary	9	9	9	9
Total schools visited	116	144	110	85



Student and teacher attendance

Table 9: Student attendance 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Type of school	2007	2009	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V			
% Enrolled children present (average)	85.0	76.9	74.7	75.5
% Schools with less than 50% enrolled children present (average)	1.2	7.1	6.1	12.2
% Schools with 75% or more enrolled children present (average)	84.9	62.7	60.2	59.5

Table 10: Teacher attendance 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Type of school	2007	2009	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V			
% Teachers present (average)	92.5	88.9	94.4	94.7
% Schools with no teachers present (average)	1.3	0.8	0.0	1.5
% Schools with all teachers present (average)	83.5	71.7	81.7	87.0

Other school information

Table 11: Headteachers 2010 & 2011

% Schools with:	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V	
No Headteacher appointed	0.0	0.0
Headteacher appointed but not present at time of visit	3.9	3.5
Headteacher appointed & present at time of visit	96.2	96.6
Total	100	100

Table 12: Computers 2010 and 2011

% Schools with:	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V	
No computer	100.0	98.6
Computers but no children using them on day of visit	0.0	1.4
Computers & children using them on day of visit	0.0	0.0
Total	100	100

Table 13: Multigrade classes 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

% Schools with:	2007	2009	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V			
Std II children sitting with one or more other classes	56.2	67.4	68.8	82.9
Std IV children sitting with one or more other classes	47.2	63.4	66.7	81.2

School funds and activities (PAISA)

Table 14: % Schools who report receiving SSA grants - Full financial year

SSA school grants	2008-2009				2009-2010				2010-2011			
	No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools		
		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know
Maintenance grant	123	65.9	26.0	8.1	95	69.5	21.1	9.5	77	62.3	32.5	5.2
Development grant	116	38.8	52.6	8.6	92	37.0	47.8	15.2	76	46.1	46.1	7.9
TLM grant	122	83.6	8.2	8.2	96	78.1	17.7	4.2	78	83.3	10.3	6.4

Table 15: % Schools who report receiving SSA grants - Half financial year

SSA school grants	April 2009 to October 2009				April 2010 to October 2010				April 2011 to October 2011			
	No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools		
		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know
Maintenance grant	98	45.9	39.8	14.3	94	37.2	53.2	9.6	73	38.4	50.7	11.0
Development grant	95	20.0	65.3	14.7	87	21.8	69.0	9.2	69	24.6	62.3	13.0
TLM grant	98	65.3	19.4	15.3	93	37.6	58.1	4.3	72	47.2	43.1	9.7



The PAISA section of ASER tracks receipt and spending of Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) grants at the school level. This information is collected from schools visited during the survey. This page reports proportion of schools receiving the grants and carrying out specified activities in the schools. More detailed analysis of the PAISA data will be available in the PAISA 2011 report which will be released in March 2012.[1]

EVERY RURAL GOVERNMENT PRIMARY SCHOOL IS ENTITLED TO EACH OF THESE SSA GRANTS EVERY YEAR.

How much goes to each school	For what purposes
SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT GRANT / SCHOOL GRANT	
Rs.5000 per year per primary school	This grant can be used for buying school equipment such as blackboard, sitting mats etc. Also for buying chalk, duster, registers and other office equipment.
Rs.7000 per year per upper primary school	
Rs 5000 + Rs 7000 = Rs 12000 if the school is Std I-VII/VIII.	The grant amount varies by type of school: whether it is a primary or upper primary school.
Note: Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same premises.	
SCHOOL MAINTENANCE GRANT	
Rs.5000 - Rs 7500 per school per year if the school has upto 3 classrooms.	This grant can be used for maintenance of school building, including whitewashing; beautification; and repair of toilets, hand pump, boundary wall, playground etc. The grant amount depends on number of classrooms (excluding Headmaster room and office room)
Rs 7500 - Rs.10000 per year if the school has more than 3 classrooms.	
Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same building.	
TLM GRANT	
Rs.500 per teacher per year in primary and upper primary schools.	This grant can be used by teachers to buy teaching aids, such as charts, globes, posters, models etc.

[1] For more information see www.accountabilityinitiative.in

Right to Education indicators

Table 17: Schools by total enrollment 2010 and 2011

School enrollment	2010		2011	
	No. of schools	% of schools	No. of schools	% of schools
1-60	76	71.0	55	66.3
61-90	18	16.8	19	22.9
91-120	6	5.6	2	2.4
121-150	2	1.9	2	2.4
151-200	3	2.8	2	2.4
> 200	2	1.9	3	3.6
TOTAL	107	100.0	83	100.0

Table 18: RTE norms: Pupil-teacher ratio 2010 and 2011

School enrollment	RTE Teacher Norms	2010	2011
		% Schools that do not meet PTR norms	
1-60	2	52.9	52.1
61-90	3	33.3	35.3
91-120	4	33.3	50.0
121-150	5	0.0	50.0
151-200	5 + HM	0.0	0.0
> 200	see note	0.0	100.0
TOTAL		45.7	48.6

Note : For schools with enrollment above 200 children the PTR shall not exceed 40 excluding the Head Teacher

Table 19: Schools by number of teachers 2010 and 2011

Number of teachers	2010		2011	
	No. of schools	% of schools	No. of schools	% of schools
1	39	41.1	29	39.7
2	18	19.0	14	19.2
3	12	12.6	12	16.4
4	9	9.5	7	9.6
5	7	7.4	5	6.9
6	3	3.2	1	1.4
>=7	7	7.4	5	6.9
TOTAL	95	100.0	73	100.0

Table 20: RTE norms: Teacher - classroom ratio 2010 and 2011

RTE norm: At least one classroom per teacher	2010	2011
Number of teachers	% Schools that do not meet classroom to teacher norms	
1	0.0	36.4
2	25.0	42.9
3	14.3	20.0
4	0.0	50.0
5	0.0	25.0
6	100.0	100.0
>=7	50.0	33.3
TOTAL	15.8	37.1

Table 21: % Schools meeting selected RTE norms on facilities 2010 & 2011

% of schools with		2010	2011
Building	Office/Store/Office cum store	33.6	41.6
	Playground	45.5	39.5
	Boundary Wall	13.8	13.9
Drinking Water	No facility for drinking water	70.6	77.8
	Facility but no drinking water available	5.5	12.4
	Drinking water available	23.9	9.9
Toilet	No toilet facility	34.9	23.1
	Facility but toilet not useable	40.6	52.6
	Toilet useable	24.5	24.4
Girls Toilet	% Schools with no separate provisions for girls toilets	64.8	44.1
	Of schools with separate girls toilets, % schools where		
	Toilet locked	9.1	33.9
	Toilet not useable	11.4	3.4
	Toilet useable	14.8	18.6
TLM	Teaching learning material in Std 2	40.0	51.3
	Teaching learning material in Std 4	26.8	46.5
Library	No library	78.0	63.8
	Library but no books being used by children on day of visit	6.4	5.0
	Library being used by children on day of visit	15.6	31.3
MDM	Kitchen shed for cooking midday meal	59.4	69.6
	Midday meal served in school on the day of visit	50.9	35.4

Note: School observations for ASER 2011 looked at TLM for Std II and Std IV only.

As part of ASER 2010 and 2011, in each sampled village, one government school with primary sections was visited on the day of the survey. During this school visit, RTE indicators were observed and are reported here.

Extracts from the Schedule of The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act 2009 Norms and standards for a School (Sections 19 and 25)

Number of teachers in Std 1-5:

Admitted children	No. of teachers
<= 60	2
61-90	3
91-120	4
121-200	5
> 150	5 + 1 Headteacher
> 200	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (excluding Headteacher) shall not exceed 40

School facilities:
All weather building with:

- At least one classroom for every teacher
- Office cum store cum headteacher's room
- Separate toilets for boys and girls
- Safe and adequate drinking water facility to all children
- A kitchen where mid-day meal is cooked in the school
- Playground
- Arrangements for securing the school building by boundary wall or fencing.

Teaching learning equipment
shall be provided to each class as required.

Library
There shall be a library in each school providing newspaper, magazines and books on all subjects, including story-books.



Mizoram RURAL

ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM HOUSEHOLDS. 8 OUT OF 8 DISTRICTS


School enrollment and out of school children

Table 1: % Children in different types of schools 2011

Age group	Govt.	Pvt.	Other	Not in School	Total
Age: 6-14 ALL	85.6	13.7	0.1	0.6	100
Age: 7-16 ALL	85.2	12.6	0.1	2.2	100
Age: 7-10 ALL	85.3	14.5	0.1	0.1	100
Age: 7-10 BOYS	86.2	13.7	0.0	0.1	100
Age: 7-10 GIRLS	84.2	15.5	0.1	0.2	100
Age: 11-14 ALL	87.2	11.5	0.1	1.2	100
Age: 11-14 BOYS	87.4	11.1	0.2	1.3	100
Age: 11-14 GIRLS	87.0	12.0	0.0	1.1	100
Age: 15-16 ALL	79.8	8.6	0.1	11.5	100
Age: 15-16 BOYS	78.9	8.0	0.2	12.9	100
Age: 15-16 GIRLS	80.9	9.3	0.0	9.8	100

Note: 'OTHER' includes children going to madarssa and EGS.
'NOT IN SCHOOL' = dropped out + never enrolled.

Chart 1: Trends over time
% Children out of school by age group and gender 2006-2011



How to read this chart: For example, the proportion of girls (age 11-14) not in school has changed from 4.4% in 2006 to 5.4% in 2008 to1.8% in 2009 to 4.4% in 2010 to 1.1% in 2011

Chart 2: Trends over time
% Children enrolled in private school by class 2009 & 2011




Table 2: Sample description
% Children in each class by age 2011

Std.	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	Total
I	22.9	45.5	26.0	5.5									100
II	2.4	10.7	43.3	29.6	11.0	3.0							100
III	1.8		10.2	28.2	39.9	13.1	6.7						100
IV	2.3			9.7	25.5	34.2	10.9	9.6	6.3	1.4			100
V	6.9					26.7	34.3	13.4	9.0	6.2	3.5		100
VI	7.6						22.0	34.4	18.0	7.4	6.7	4.0	100
VII	8.0							23.6	31.5	20.9	10.2	5.8	100
VIII	2.3							6.4	23.0	38.4	17.4	12.6	100

How to read this table: If a child started school in Std I at age 6, she should be age 8 in Std 3. This table shows the age distribution for each class. For example, in Std III, 28.2% children are 8 years old but there are also 10.2% who are 7, 39.9 % who are 9, 13.1% who are 10 years old, etc.


Young children in pre-school and school

Table 3: % Children age 5-6 who are enrolled in different types of pre-school & school 2011

	In balwadi or anganwadi	In LKG/ UKG	In School			Not enrolled anywhere	Total
			Govt	Pvt	Other		
Age 5	36.7	13.4	37.9	11.9	0.0	0.2	100
Age 6	6.6	5.3	71.5	16.2	0.0	0.3	100

Note: Mizoram data for 2007 not available.

Chart 3: Trends over time
Five year olds in pre-school & school 2009 & 2011




Reading

Table 4: % Children by class and READING level
All schools 2011

Std.	Nothing	Letter	Word	Level 1 (Std 1 Text)	Level 2 (Std 2 Text)	Total
I	5.3	46.4	39.6	5.9	2.8	100
II	2.3	11.3	38.6	35.0	12.8	100
III	1.4	3.9	14.7	40.4	39.6	100
IV	1.0	2.7	11.0	18.9	66.4	100
V	0.0	2.8	4.8	14.1	78.4	100
VI	0.2	1.9	2.8	7.2	87.9	100
VII	0.0	1.7	1.7	3.3	93.3	100
VIII	0.4	2.4	1.1	6.2	89.9	100
Total	1.6	10.8	17.1	18.6	52.0	100

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, 1.4% children cannot even read letters, 3.9% can read letters but not more, 14.7% can read words but not Std 1 text or higher, 40.4% can read Std 1 text but not Std 2 level text, and 39.6% can read Std 2 level text. In sum, for each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is 100%.

Reading Tool



Note: This tool was also available in English and Mara.

Chart 4: Trends over time
% Children in Std III who CANNOT READ Std I LEVEL TEXT
By school type 2008-2011





Chart 5: Trends over time
% Children in Std V who CANNOT READ Std II LEVEL TEXT
By school type 2008-2011



Home language and school language

Table 5: School language and home language

%Children who took the reading test in:	%	Of the % Children who tested in:	% Children whose home language was:					
			Lushai/Mizo	Bengali	Lakher	Pawi	Other *	Total
Mizo or Mara	69.6	Mizo or Mara	87.0	1.2	6.1	2.8	3.0	100
English	30.4	English	45.7	53.0	0.1	0.1	1.1	100
Total	100.0	* 'Other' includes all languages from the list of scheduled and non-scheduled languages except those specified above.						

Note: In ASER 2011 for every state, reading tools were provided in the main medium in instruction in government schools. In Mizoram, where the medium of instruction in government schools is Mizo, Mara (only in Saiha district) or English, children were given the choice of reading in any one of these languages. Figures for Mizo and Mara have been combined. For home languages, a list of 122 languages was provided to all survey teams. This includes 22 Scheduled languages and 100 Non-Scheduled languages. The data in this table is for children for whom we have information for both school language and home language.

Arithmetic

Table 6: % Children by class and ARITHMETIC level
All schools 2011

Std.	Nothing	Recognize Numbers		Subtract	Divide	Total
		1-9	11-99			
I	4.7	44.2	45.8	3.4	2.0	100
II	1.2	12.0	50.8	28.0	8.0	100
III	0.3	4.8	18.3	50.0	26.7	100
IV	0.7	2.6	10.2	30.3	56.3	100
V	0.2	1.9	4.7	25.6	67.7	100
VI	0.1	1.5	2.7	15.3	80.4	100
VII	0.0	2.2	1.5	7.8	88.5	100
VIII	0.7	2.1	2.0	6.0	89.3	100
Total	1.1	10.5	20.4	22.8	45.1	100

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level of arithmetic achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, 0.3% children cannot even recognize numbers 1-9, 4.8% children can recognize numbers up to 9 but not more, 18.3% can recognize numbers to 99 but cannot do subtraction, 50% can do subtraction but not division, and 26.7% can do division. In sum, for each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is 100%.

Math Tool




Chart 6: Trends over time
% Children in Std III who CANNOT RECOGNISE NUMBERS upto 100. By school type 2008-2011





Chart 7: Trends over time
% Children in Std V who CANNOT DO DIVISION
By school type 2008-2011



Tuition

Table 7: Class-wise % children attending PAID TUITION CLASSES
By school type 2009, 2010 and 2011

Year	School	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	Total
2007	Govt									
	Pvt									
2009	Govt	5.3	5.3	5.8	8.9	6.4	7.6	9.7	6.3	6.8
	Pvt	17.5	23.6	35.9	29.3	33.7	38.0	37.0	24.2	28.5
2010	Govt	1.7	2.1	2.1	3.4	4.3	4.3	5.6	7.4	3.3
	Pvt	17.1	18.1	13.0	21.9	9.7	4.6	12.7	3.2	11.5
2011	Govt	0.5	0.3	0.6	0.9	0.9	1.4	1.6	2.3	0.9
	Pvt	6.5	6.7	14.9	17.2	17.3	21.8	14.5	10.4	12.7

Note: In 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011 the ASER survey recorded information about tuition. In all 4 years, the question asked was the following: "Does the child take any paid additional class currently?" Therefore, these numbers do not include any supplemental help in learning that children may have received from parents, siblings or from anyone else who did not require payment.



Mizoram RURAL

As part of ASER 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011, in each sampled village, one government school with primary sections was visited on the day of the survey. Information about schools in this report is based on these visits.

School observations

Table 8: Total schools visited 2009, 2010 and 2011

Type of school	2009	2010	2011
Std I-IV/V: Primary	135	166	135
Std I-VII/VIII: Primary + Upper primary	17	8	13
Total schools visited	152	174	148



Student and teacher attendance

Table 9: Student attendance 2009, 2010 and 2011

Type of school	2009	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V		
% Enrolled children present (average)	86.0	86.5	85.6
% Schools with less than 50% enrolled children present (average)	0.8	2.0	3.0
% Schools with 75% or more enrolled children present (average)	82.3	88.2	83.7

Table 10: Teacher attendance 2009, 2010 and 2011

Type of school	2009	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V		
% Teachers present (average)	93.8	94.5	91.0
% Schools with no teachers present (average)	0.8	0.0	0.0
% Schools with all teachers present (average)	78.7	78.2	67.8

Other school information

Table 11: Headteachers 2010 & 2011

% Schools with:	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V	
No Headteacher appointed	0.0	2.2
Headteacher appointed but not present at time of visit	3.5	5.4
Headteacher appointed & present at time of visit	96.5	92.4
Total	100	100

Table 12: Computers 2010 and 2011

% Schools with:	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V	
No computer	92.6	94.5
Computers but no children using them on day of visit	1.8	3.2
Computers & children using them on day of visit	5.5	2.4
Total	100	100

Table 13: Multigrade classes 2009, 2010 and 2011

% Schools with:	2009	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V		
Std II children sitting with one or more other classes	20.9	32.1	15.2
Std IV children sitting with one or more other classes	19.1	30.1	14.3

School funds and activities (PAISA)

Table 14: % Schools who report receiving SSA grants - Full financial year

SSA school grants	2008-2009				2009-2010				2010-2011			
	No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools		
		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know
Maintenance grant	143	85.3	11.2	3.5	159	93.1	4.4	2.5	142	95.1	4.2	0.7
Development grant	122	63.1	32.8	4.1	145	79.3	17.9	2.8	133	78.2	18.8	3.0
TLM grant	142	78.2	20.4	1.4	158	93.0	5.1	1.9	141	96.5	2.8	0.7

Table 15: % Schools who report receiving SSA grants - Half financial year

SSA school grants	April 2009 to October 2009				April 2010 to October 2010				April 2011 to October 2011			
	No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools		
		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know
Maintenance grant	126	61.9	29.4	8.7	156	79.5	18.0	2.6	126	78.6	19.1	2.4
Development grant	114	43.0	47.4	9.7	152	62.5	34.9	2.6	117	63.3	32.5	4.3
TLM grant	125	62.4	30.4	7.2	156	79.5	18.0	2.6	125	76.8	20.8	2.4

Table 16: % Schools carrying out different activities since April 2011

Type of Activity		% schools		
		Yes	No	Don't know
Const.	New Classroom	24.4	75.6	0.0
Repairs	Repair of building (roof, floor, wall etc.)	75.2	23.9	0.9
	Repair of doors & windows	78.0	21.2	0.9
	Repair of boundary wall	47.6	51.5	1.0
	Repair of drinking water facility	56.4	42.6	1.0
	Repair of toilet	68.2	31.8	0.0
Painting & White Wash	White wash/plastering	52.6	47.4	0.0
	Painting Blackboard/Display Board/Painting on wall	58.8	41.2	0.0
	Painting of doors & walls	67.2	31.9	0.9
Purchase	Purchase of furniture (cupboard etc.)	61.6	37.4	1.0
	Purchase of electrical fittings	71.2	26.9	1.9
	Purchase of chalk, duster, register etc.	80.7	17.5	1.8
	Purchase of sitting Mats/Tat Patti	48.1	51.9	0.0
	Purchase of charts, globes & other teaching material	80.7	19.3	0.0
Other	Expenditure on school events	76.0	21.0	3.0
	Payment of bills (electricity, water, cleaning etc.)	73.5	26.5	0.0

The PAISA section of ASER tracks receipt and spending of Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) grants at the school level. This information is collected from schools visited during the survey. This page reports proportion of schools receiving the grants and carrying out specified activities in the schools. More detailed analysis of the PAISA data will be available in the PAISA 2011 report which will be released in March 2012.[1]

EVERY RURAL GOVERNMENT PRIMARY SCHOOL IS ENTITLED TO EACH OF THESE SSA GRANTS EVERY YEAR.

How much goes to each school	For what purposes
SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT GRANT / SCHOOL GRANT	
Rs.5000 per year per primary school	This grant can be used for buying school equipment such as blackboard, sitting mats etc. Also for buying chalk, duster, registers and other office equipment.
Rs.7000 per year per upper primary school	
Rs 5000 + Rs 7000 = Rs 12000 if the school is Std I-VII/VIII.	The grant amount varies by type of school: whether it is a primary or upper primary school.
Note: Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same premises.	
SCHOOL MAINTENANCE GRANT	
Rs.5000 - Rs 7500 per school per year if the school has upto 3 classrooms.	This grant can be used for maintenance of school building, including whitewashing; beautification; and repair of toilets, hand pump, boundary wall, playground etc. The grant amount depends on number of classrooms (excluding Headmaster room and office room)
Rs 7500 - Rs.10000 per year if the school has more than 3 classrooms.	
Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same building.	
TLM GRANT	
Rs.500 per teacher per year in primary and upper primary schools.	This grant can be used by teachers to buy teaching aids, such as charts, globes, posters, models etc.

[1] For more information see www.accountabilityinitiative.in

Annual Status of Education Report
असर ASER 2011 RURAL
Facilitated by PRATHAM

Right to Education indicators

Table 17: Schools by total enrollment 2010 and 2011

School enrollment	2010		2011	
	No. of schools	% of schools	No. of schools	% of schools
1-60	64	39.8	83	56.1
61-90	70	43.5	34	23.0
91-120	17	10.6	18	12.2
121-150	6	3.7	10	6.8
151-200	2	1.2	3	2.0
> 200	2	1.2	0	0.0
TOTAL	161	100.0	148	100.0

Table 18: RTE norms: Pupil-teacher ratio 2010 and 2011

School enrollment	RTE Teacher Norms	2010	2011
		% Schools that do not meet PTR norms	
1-60	2	5.1	16.4
61-90	3	4.6	16.7
91-120	4	50.0	60.0
121-150	5	0.0	55.6
151-200	5 + HM	0.0	0.0
> 200	see note	100.0	0.0
TOTAL		10.9	24.8

Note : For schools with enrollment above 200 children the PTR shall not exceed 40 excluding the Head Teacher

Table 19: Schools by number of teachers 2010 and 2011

Number of teachers	2010		2011	
	No. of schools	% of schools	No. of schools	% of schools
1	4	2.7	13	10.7
2	13	8.8	29	23.8
3	40	27.0	38	31.2
4	37	25.0	19	15.6
5	20	13.5	7	5.7
6	7	4.7	7	5.7
>=7	27	18.2	9	7.4
TOTAL	148	100.0	122	100.0

Table 20: RTE norms: Teacher - classroom ratio 2010 and 2011

RTE norm: At least one classroom per teacher	2010	2011
Number of teachers	% Schools that do not meet classroom to teacher norms	
1	0.0	0.0
2	0.0	0.0
3	7.7	0.0
4	5.9	12.5
5	100.0	50.0
6	100.0	0.0
>=7	88.2	33.3
TOTAL	42.4	5.2

Table 21: % Schools meeting selected RTE norms on facilities 2010 & 2011

% of schools with		2010	2011
Building	Office/Store/Office cum store	80.1	92.1
	Playground	40.7	70.7
	Boundary Wall	35.5	47.8
Drinking Water	No facility for drinking water	47.3	25.4
	Facility but no drinking water available	4.1	3.6
	Drinking water available	48.5	71.0
Toilet	No toilet facility	7.1	2.1
	Facility but toilet not useable	37.3	45.8
	Toilet useable	55.6	52.1
Girls Toilet	% Schools with no separate provisions for girls toilets	43.4	12.4
	Of schools with separate girls toilets, % schools where		
	Toilet locked	14.5	44.6
	Toilet not useable	11.3	9.9
	Toilet useable	30.8	33.1
TLM	Teaching learning material in Std 2	40.2	53.3
	Teaching learning material in Std 4	36.0	51.0
Library	No library	93.6	72.9
	Library but no books being used by children on day of visit	4.7	15.0
	Library being used by children on day of visit	1.7	12.1
MDM	Kitchen shed for cooking midday meal	96.5	98.6
	Midday meal served in school on the day of visit	94.4	99.3

Note: School observations for ASER 2011 looked at TLM for Std II and Std IV only.

As part of ASER 2010 and 2011, in each sampled village, one government school with primary sections was visited on the day of the survey. During this school visit, RTE indicators were observed and are reported here.

Extracts from the Schedule of The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act 2009 Norms and standards for a School (Sections 19 and 25)

Number of teachers in Std 1-5:


Admitted children	No. of teachers
<= 60	2
61-90	3
91-120	4
121-200	5
> 150	5 + 1 Headteacher
> 200	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (excluding Headteacher) shall not exceed 40

School facilities:
All weather building with:

- At least one classroom for every teacher
- Office cum store cum headteacher's room
- Separate toilets for boys and girls
- Safe and adequate drinking water facility to all children
- A kitchen where mid-day meal is cooked in the school
- Playground
- Arrangements for securing the school building by boundary wall or fencing.

Teaching learning equipment
shall be provided to each class as required.

Library
There shall be a library in each school providing newspaper, magazines and books on all subjects, including story-books.



Nagaland RURAL

ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM HOUSEHOLDS. 11 OUT OF 11 DISTRICTS


School enrollment and out of school children

Table 1: % Children in different types of schools 2011

Age group	Govt.	Pvt.	Other	Not in School	Total
Age: 6-14 ALL	57.1	40.9	0.0	2.0	100
Age: 7-16 ALL	56.6	40.1	0.0	3.2	100
Age: 7-10 ALL	58.6	40.2	0.1	1.1	100
Age: 7-10 BOYS	58.1	40.8	0.1	1.0	100
Age: 7-10 GIRLS	59.1	39.6	0.1	1.3	100
Age: 11-14 ALL	56.5	40.3	0.0	3.2	100
Age: 11-14 BOYS	55.8	40.4	0.0	3.9	100
Age: 11-14 GIRLS	57.3	40.2	0.1	2.5	100
Age: 15-16 ALL	49.1	39.4	0.0	11.5	100
Age: 15-16 BOYS	48.4	39.2	0.1	12.3	100
Age: 15-16 GIRLS	49.9	39.5	0.0	10.6	100

Note: 'OTHER' includes children going to madarssa and EGS.
'NOT IN SCHOOL' = dropped out + never enrolled.

Chart 1: Trends over time
% Children out of school by age group and gender 2006-2011



How to read this chart: For example, the proportion of girls (age 11-14) not in school has changed from 6.4% in 2006 to 4.5% in 2007 to 5.8% in 2008 to 3.7% in 2009 to 3.2% in 2010 to 2.5% in 2011

Chart 2: Trends over time
% Children enrolled in private school by class 2007, 2009 & 2011




Table 2: Sample description
% Children in each class by age 2011

Std.	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	Total
I	8.6	36.3	34.4	10.5	5.2	5.0							100
II	7.5		23.6	36.3	17.8	7.6	7.2						100
III	9.3			26.0	29.5	16.9	8.9	5.2	4.2				100
IV	2.5			6.5	21.3	30.1	15.9	13.1	7.0	3.7			100
V	8.3					25.2	24.1	22.6	12.0	7.9			100
VI	1.9					7.8	16.5	32.4	21.8	11.3	8.4		100
VII	7.2							21.9	29.6	24.2	11.2	5.9	100
VIII	6.3								20.8	40.1	21.9	10.8	100


How to read this table: If a child started school in Std I at age 6, she should be age 8 in Std 3. This table shows the age distribution for each class. For example, in Std III, 26.0% children are 8 years old but there are also 9.3% who are 7 years old or younger, 29.5% who are 9, 16.9% who are 10 years old, etc.

Young children in pre-school and school

Table 3: % Children age 5-6 who are enrolled in different types of pre-school & school 2011

	In balwadi or anganwadi	In LKG/ UKG	In School			Not enrolled anywhere	Total
			Govt	Pvt	Other		
Age 5	2.3	7.4	46.7	40.4	0.0	3.2	100
Age 6	0.3	3.0	50.9	44.1	0.0	1.7	100

Chart 3: Trends over time
Five year olds in pre-school & school 2007, 2009 & 2011



Reading

Table 4: % Children by class and READING level
All schools 2011

Std.	Nothing	Letter	Word	Level 1 (Std 1 Text)	Level 2 (Std 2 Text)	Total
I	5.1	42.9	42.4	6.8	2.8	100
II	1.7	20.3	49.8	22.5	5.7	100
III	0.9	11.7	29.8	38.1	19.6	100
IV	0.3	7.7	17.9	36.4	37.7	100
V	0.4	3.0	10.7	27.0	59.0	100
VI	0.2	2.5	5.1	20.6	71.6	100
VII	0.0	2.9	2.5	11.3	83.3	100
VIII	0.5	1.4	2.5	5.6	90.0	100
Total	1.5	14.9	25.3	22.4	35.9	100

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, 0.9% children cannot even read letters, 11.7% can read letters but not more, 29.8% can read words but not Std 1 text or higher, 38.1% can read Std 1 text but not Std 2 level text, and 19.6% can read Std 2 level text. In sum, for each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is 100%.

Reading Tool




Chart 4: Trends over time
% Children in Std III who CANNOT READ Std I LEVEL TEXT
By school type 2008-2011




Chart 5: Trends over time
% Children in Std V who CANNOT READ Std II LEVEL TEXT
By school type 2008-2011



Home language and school language

Table 5: School language and home language

% children who tested in English:			
% children whose home language was:	%	% children whose home language was:	%
Konyak	16.9	Regma	3.4
Lotha	11.4	Chang	3.3
AO	10.1	Zeliang	2.8
Angami	8.1	Khezha	2.5
Chakru/Chokri	6.3	Yimchungrey	1.9
Phom	5.6	Kuki	1.5
Sangatam	5.4	Other *	16.8
Khiemungan	4.1	Total	100.0

* 'Other' includes all languages from the list of scheduled and non-scheduled languages except those specified above.

Note: In ASER 2011 for every state, reading tools were provided in the main medium of instruction in government schools. In Nagaland, where the medium of instruction is English, children were given the reading tool only in English. For home languages, a list of 122 languages was provided to all survey teams. This included 22 Scheduled languages and 100 Non-Scheduled languages. The data in this table is for children for whom we have information for both school language and home language.



Arithmetic

Table 6: % Children by class and ARITHMETIC level
All schools 2011

Std.	Nothing	Recognize Numbers		Subtract	Divide	Total
		1-9	11-99			
I	3.4	32.4	54.7	8.6	1.0	100
II	1.1	13.4	54.4	28.3	2.9	100
III	0.7	6.9	34.9	49.9	7.6	100
IV	0.0	4.7	20.7	53.8	20.8	100
V	0.3	2.8	11.3	45.1	40.5	100
VI	0.4	1.5	5.9	36.8	55.5	100
VII	0.0	1.4	4.2	24.5	69.9	100
VIII	0.4	0.7	2.3	13.4	83.3	100
Total	1.0	10.3	29.7	33.1	25.9	100

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level of arithmetic achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, 0.7% children cannot even recognize numbers 1-9, 6.9% children can recognize numbers up to 9 but not more, 34.9% can recognize numbers to 99 but cannot do subtraction, 49.9% can do subtraction but not division, and 7.6% can do division. In sum, for each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is 100%.

Math Tool



Chart 6: Trends over time
% Children in Std III who CANNOT RECOGNISE NUMBERS upto 100. By school type 2008-2011





Chart 7: Trends over time
% Children in Std V who CANNOT DO DIVISION
By school type 2008-2011



Tuition

Table 7: Class-wise % children attending PAID TUITION CLASSES
By school type 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Year	School	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	Total
2007	Govt	15.4	14.6	19.1	19.6	27.1	12.7	16.3	23.7	18.5
	Pvt	28.5	34.3	40.2	40.1	38.5	49.9	48.5	57.7	42.0
2009	Govt	12.9	10.8	9.3	8.4	14.6	13.2	14.8	21.7	12.3
	Pvt	36.4	36.8	41.1	40.0	40.8	45.9	52.1	54.5	43.1
2010	Govt	7.6	7.2	7.1	8.7	7.8	5.8	6.8	10.3	7.7
	Pvt	26.5	31.9	34.7	32.2	32.2	30.0	40.0	39.8	33.3
2011	Govt	11.7	11.4	12.0	13.0	11.1	15.0	15.6	14.5	12.6
	Pvt	32.2	36.3	40.4	39.0	42.2	43.1	45.0	52.8	40.4

Note: In 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011 the ASER survey recorded information about tuition. In all 4 years, the question asked was the following: "Does the child take any paid additional class currently?" Therefore, these numbers do not include any supplemental help in learning that children may have received from parents, siblings or from anyone else who did not require payment.



Nagaland RURAL

Annual Status of Education Report
असर ASER 2011 RURAL
Facilitated by PRATHAM

As part of ASER 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011, in each sampled village, one government school with primary sections was visited on the day of the survey. Information about schools in this report is based on these visits.

School observations

Table 8: Total schools visited 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Type of school	2007	2009	2010	2011
Std I-IV/V: Primary	213	215	202	173
Std I-VII/VIII: Primary + Upper primary	23	27	21	44
Total schools visited	236	242	223	217



Student and teacher attendance

Table 9: Student attendance 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Type of school	2007	2009	2010	2011	2007	2009	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V				Std I-VII/VIII			
% Enrolled children present (average)	85.0	84.4	81.9	82.3	79.9	87.3	83.0	81.6
% Schools with less than 50% enrolled children present (average)	3.0	1.9	3.1	3.0	13.6	0.0	0.0	4.8
% Schools with 75% or more enrolled children present (average)	83.5	80.2	74.4	72.8	81.8	85.2	68.4	78.6

Table 10: Teacher attendance 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Type of school	2007	2009	2010	2011	2007	2009	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V				Std I-VII/VIII			
% Teachers present (average)	91.6	89.2	87.2	90.8	93.0	80.0	86.3	85.8
% Schools with no teachers present (average)	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
% Schools with all teachers present (average)	64.7	56.1	49.7	63.2	45.5	51.9	27.8	47.5

Other school information

Table 11: Headteachers 2010 & 2011

% Schools with:	2010	2011	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V		Std I-VII/VIII	
No Headteacher appointed	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Headteacher appointed but not present at time of visit	10.3	2.5	0.0	0.0
Headteacher appointed & present at time of visit	89.7	97.5	100.0	100.0
Total	100	100	100	100

Table 12: Computers 2010 and 2011

% Schools with:	2010	2011	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V		Std I-VII/VIII	
No computer	90.4	92.3	35.0	43.2
Computers but no children using them on day of visit	8.6	4.2	35.0	27.3
Computers & children using them on day of visit	1.0	3.6	30.0	29.6
Total	100	100	100	100

Table 13: Multigrade classes 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

% Schools with:	2007	2009	2010	2011	2007	2009	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V				Std I-VII/VIII			
Std II children sitting with one or more other classes	3.4	16.0	18.7	13.0	4.8	11.1	28.6	15.0
Std IV children sitting with one or more other classes	2.9	13.6	17.5	13.3	4.6	12.0	28.6	16.7

School funds and activities (PAISA)

Table 14: % Schools who report receiving SSA grants - Full financial year

SSA school grants	2008-2009				2009-2010				2010-2011			
	No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools		
		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know
Maintenance grant	217	98.2	1.8	0.0	204	94.6	0.5	4.9	214	95.8	1.9	2.3
Development grant	207	89.4	10.6	0.0	200	92.5	2.0	5.5	213	89.2	5.6	5.2
TLM grant	217	98.6	1.4	0.0	201	93.0	2.5	4.5	214	94.9	3.3	1.9

Table 15: % Schools who report receiving SSA grants - Half financial year

SSA school grants	April 2009 to October 2009				April 2010 to October 2010				April 2011 to October 2011			
	No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools		
		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know
Maintenance grant	221	78.7	18.6	2.7	197	83.3	8.1	8.6	181	76.2	18.8	5.0
Development grant	208	75.5	21.6	2.9	193	82.9	7.8	9.3	181	70.7	21.6	7.7
TLM grant	214	84.1	15.4	0.5	194	85.1	6.2	8.8	178	78.1	18.0	3.9



The PAISA section of ASER tracks receipt and spending of Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) grants at the school level. This information is collected from schools visited during the survey. This page reports proportion of schools receiving the grants and carrying out specified activities in the schools. More detailed analysis of the PAISA data will be available in the PAISA 2011 report which will be released in March 2012.[1]

EVERY RURAL GOVERNMENT PRIMARY SCHOOL IS ENTITLED TO EACH OF THESE SSA GRANTS EVERY YEAR.

How much goes to each school	For what purposes
SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT GRANT / SCHOOL GRANT	
Rs.5000 per year per primary school	This grant can be used for buying school equipment such as blackboard, sitting mats etc. Also for buying chalk, duster, registers and other office equipment.
Rs.7000 per year per upper primary school	
Rs 5000 + Rs 7000 = Rs 12000 if the school is Std I-VII/VIII.	The grant amount varies by type of school: whether it is a primary or upper primary school.
Note: Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same premises.	
SCHOOL MAINTENANCE GRANT	
Rs.5000 - Rs 7500 per school per year if the school has upto 3 classrooms.	This grant can be used for maintenance of school building, including whitewashing; beautification; and repair of toilets, hand pump, boundary wall, playground etc. The grant amount depends on number of classrooms (excluding Headmaster room and office room)
Rs 7500 - Rs.10000 per year if the school has more than 3 classrooms.	
Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same building.	
TLM GRANT	
Rs.500 per teacher per year in primary and upper primary schools.	This grant can be used by teachers to buy teaching aids, such as charts, globes, posters, models etc.

[1] For more information see www.accountabilityinitiative.in

Right to Education indicators

Table 17: Schools by total enrollment 2010 and 2011

School enrollment	2010		2011	
	No. of schools	% of schools	No. of schools	% of schools
1-60	98	45.8	87	41.2
61-90	51	23.8	51	24.2
91-120	25	11.7	34	16.1
121-150	9	4.2	10	4.7
151-200	15	7.0	11	5.2
> 200	16	7.5	18	8.5
TOTAL	214	100.0	211	100.0

Table 18: RTE norms: Pupil-teacher ratio 2010 and 2011

School enrollment	RTE Teacher Norms	2010	2011
		% Schools that do not meet PTR norms	
1-60	2	1.1	5.2
61-90	3	6.3	18.6
91-120	4	9.1	12.9
121-150	5	22.2	20.0
151-200	5 + HM	30.8	18.2
> 200	see note	28.6	50.0
TOTAL		8.1	14.5

Note : For schools with enrollment above 200 children the PTR shall not exceed 40 excluding the Head Teacher

Table 19: Schools by number of teachers 2010 and 2011

Number of teachers	2010		2011	
	No. of schools	% of schools	No. of schools	% of schools
1	2	1.0	8	4.2
2	13	6.6	11	5.8
3	11	5.6	19	10.1
4	42	21.2	22	11.6
5	54	27.3	30	15.9
6	30	15.2	26	13.8
>=7	46	23.2	73	38.6
TOTAL	198	100.0	189	100.0

Table 20: RTE norms: Teacher - classroom ratio 2010 and 2011

RTE norm: At least one classroom per teacher	2010	2011
Number of teachers	% Schools that do not meet classroom to teacher norms	
1	0.0	0.0
2	0.0	0.0
3	14.3	0.0
4	0.0	7.7
5	19.1	15.4
6	37.5	42.9
>=7	42.3	65.0
TOTAL	21.4	38.9

Table 21: % Schools meeting selected RTE norms on facilities 2010 & 2011

% of schools with		2010	2011
Building	Office/Store/Office cum store	83.6	92.6
	Playground	63.8	65.6
	Boundary Wall	43.3	35.9
Drinking Water	No facility for drinking water	56.9	70.3
	Facility but no drinking water available	6.0	6.2
	Drinking water available	37.0	23.4
Toilet	No toilet facility	13.8	6.2
	Facility but toilet not useable	32.3	33.8
	Toilet useable	53.9	60.0
Girls Toilet	% Schools with no separate provisions for girls toilets	47.8	22.0
	Of schools with separate girls toilets, % schools where		
	Toilet locked	9.4	18.4
	Toilet not useable	12.2	9.9
	Toilet useable	30.6	49.7
TLM	Teaching learning material in Std 2	48.3	51.7
	Teaching learning material in Std 4	43.5	48.9
Library	No library	86.7	91.0
	Library but no books being used by children on day of visit	4.1	5.7
	Library being used by children on day of visit	9.2	3.3
MDM	Kitchen shed for cooking midday meal	81.9	92.1
	Midday meal served in school on the day of visit	30.7	43.8

Note: School observations for ASER 2011 looked at TLM for Std II and Std IV only.

As part of ASER 2010 and 2011, in each sampled village, one government school with primary sections was visited on the day of the survey. During this school visit, RTE indicators were observed and are reported here.

Extracts from the Schedule of The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act 2009 Norms and standards for a School (Sections 19 and 25)

Number of teachers in Std 1-5:

Admitted children	No. of teachers
<= 60	2
61-90	3
91-120	4
121-200	5
> 150	5 + 1 Headteacher
> 200	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (excluding Headteacher) shall not exceed 40

School facilities:
All weather building with:

- At least one classroom for every teacher
- Office cum store cum headteacher's room
- Separate toilets for boys and girls
- Safe and adequate drinking water facility to all children
- A kitchen where mid-day meal is cooked in the school
- Playground
- Arrangements for securing the school building by boundary wall or fencing.

Teaching learning equipment
shall be provided to each class as required.

Library
There shall be a library in each school providing newspaper, magazines and books on all subjects, including story-books.




Odisha
Punjab
Rajasthan
Tamil Nadu
Tripura
Uttarakhand



Odisha RURAL

Annual Status of Education Report
असर ASER 2011 RURAL
Facilitated by PRATHAM

ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM HOUSEHOLDS. 30 OUT OF 30 DISTRICTS


School enrollment and out of school children

Table 1: % Children in different types of schools 2011

Age group	Govt.	Pvt.	Other	Not in School	Total
Age: 6-14 ALL	91.2	5.0	0.1	3.7	100
Age: 7-16 ALL	86.8	5.5	0.1	7.6	100
Age: 7-10 ALL	93.3	4.5	0.1	2.1	100
Age: 7-10 BOYS	93.8	4.4	0.1	1.7	100
Age: 7-10 GIRLS	92.8	4.6	0.1	2.5	100
Age: 11-14 ALL	89.2	4.9	0.1	5.8	100
Age: 11-14 BOYS	89.1	5.5	0.1	5.4	100
Age: 11-14 GIRLS	89.2	4.3	0.1	6.4	100
Age: 15-16 ALL	66.8	9.1	0.0	24.1	100
Age: 15-16 BOYS	68.7	9.4	0.0	22.0	100
Age: 15-16 GIRLS	64.7	8.8	0.0	26.4	100

Note: 'OTHER' includes children going to madarssa and EGS.
'NOT IN SCHOOL' = dropped out + never enrolled.

Chart 1: Trends over time
% Children out of school by age group and gender 2006-2011



How to read this chart: For example, the proportion of girls (age 11-14) not in school has changed from 13.7% in 2006 to 12.4% in 2007 to 12% in 2008 to 9.9% in 2009 to 7.2% in 2010 to 6.4% in 2011

Chart 2: Trends over time
% Children enrolled in private school by class 2007, 2009 & 2011




Table 2: Sample description
% Children in each class by age 2011

Std.	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	Total
I	40.5	46.8	7.7	5.1									100
II	3.1	15.9	61.3	14.4	5.4								100
III	3.7		11.7	65.6	12.8	6.3							100
IV	3.4			13.2	60.5	16.3	6.6						100
V	2.6				7.0	69.0	12.6	8.9					100
VI	2.4					11.3	57.6	21.7	7.1				100
VII	4.5						8.2	66.7	13.5	7.1			100
VIII	4.0							14.2	59.5	16.2	6.1		100


How to read this table: If a child started school in Std I at age 6, she should be age 8 in Std 3. This table shows the age distribution for each class. For example, in Std III, 65.6% children are 8 years old but there are also 11.7% who are 7, 12.8% who are 9 years old, etc.

Young children in pre-school and school

Table 3: % Children age 5-6 who are enrolled in different types of pre-school & school 2011

	In balwadi or anganwadi	In LKG/ UKG	In School			Not enrolled anywhere	Total
			Govt	Pvt	Other		
Age 5	28.5	2.6	61.1	6.0	0.2	1.6	100
Age 6	4.5	1.8	84.6	7.6	0.3	1.3	100

Chart 3: Trends over time
Five year olds in pre-school & school 2007, 2009 & 2011



Reading

Table 4: % Children by class and READING level
All schools 2011

Std.	Nothing	Letter	Word	Level 1 (Std 1 Text)	Level 2 (Std 2 Text)	Total
I	44.9	34.5	13.2	3.5	3.8	100
II	16.9	34.8	29.0	11.2	8.1	100
III	8.0	22.6	29.1	23.4	16.9	100
IV	4.5	13.3	24.2	29.6	28.5	100
V	3.1	8.3	19.3	30.3	39.1	100
VI	0.9	4.8	12.8	26.3	55.2	100
VII	1.3	3.9	9.2	21.5	64.1	100
VIII	0.9	2.1	5.6	15.5	75.9	100
Total	11.1	16.3	18.0	19.9	34.7	100

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, 8% children cannot even read letters, 22.6% can read letters but not more, 29.1% can read words but not Std 1 text or higher, 23.4% can read Std 1 text but not Std 2 level text, and 16.9% can read Std 2 level text. In sum, for each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is 100%.

Reading Tool




Chart 4: Trends over time
% Children in Std III who CANNOT READ Std I LEVEL TEXT
By school type 2008-2011





Chart 5: Trends over time
% Children in Std V who CANNOT READ Std II LEVEL TEXT
By school type 2008-2011



Home language and school language

Table 5: School language and home language

% Children whose :	%
Home language is the same as school language	91.9
Home language is different from school language	8.1
Total	100.07

Note : In ASER 2011 for every state, reading tools were provided in the main medium of instruction in government schools. Children and their families were also asked about the language they speak at home. For home languages, a list of 122 languages was provided to all survey teams. This list includes 22 Scheduled languages and 100 Non-Scheduled languages. The data in this table is for children for whom we have information for both school language and home language



Arithmetic

**Table 6: % Children by class and ARITHMETIC level
All schools 2011**

Std.	Nothing	Recognize Numbers		Subtract	Divide	Total
		1-9	11-99			
I	47.0	35.8	12.8	3.2	1.3	100
II	18.1	39.5	29.1	10.8	2.4	100
III	8.2	28.9	34.9	21.2	6.8	100
IV	4.3	18.7	32.5	29.5	15.1	100
V	3.0	14.4	26.7	33.7	22.2	100
VI	1.4	8.9	20.9	33.7	35.1	100
VII	1.7	6.8	18.0	31.4	42.1	100
VIII	1.3	5.3	11.3	29.3	52.9	100
Total	11.6	20.4	23.3	23.6	21.1	100

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level of arithmetic achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, 8.2% children cannot even recognize numbers 1-9, 28.9% children can recognize numbers up to 9 but not more, 34.9% can recognize numbers to 99 but cannot do subtraction, 21.2% can do subtraction but not division, and 6.8% can do division. In sum, for each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is 100%.

Math Tool



**Chart 6: Trends over time
% Children in Std III who CANNOT RECOGNISE NUMBERS upto 100. By school type 2008-2011**





**Chart 7: Trends over time
% Children in Std V who CANNOT DO DIVISION
By school type 2008-2011**



Tuition

**Table 7: Class-wise % children attending PAID TUITION CLASSES
By school type 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011**

Year	School	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	Total
2007	Govt	32.9	45.5	43.7	50.3	50.8	51.5	51.0	52.1	46.7
	Pvt	57.0	60.8	40.1	52.6	62.3	42.3	55.3	36.8	50.5
2009	Govt	35.6	44.5	51.6	50.2	52.2	55.3	55.8	56.0	49.7
	Pvt	64.9	68.7	81.9	67.9	81.2	66.1	68.1	60.9	69.1
2010	Govt	36.2	41.2	49.1	48.8	49.9	54.7	52.0	55.2	48.1
	Pvt	54.4	65.7	81.1	68.7	78.3	72.9	67.5	48.4	64.9
2011	Govt	29.6	39.9	43.6	48.6	45.9	50.4	51.8	50.8	44.8
	Pvt	62.0	55.5	63.7	61.2	75.2	75.0	69.5	55.4	63.2

Note: In 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011 the ASER survey recorded information about tuition. In all 4 years, the question asked was the following: "Does the child take any paid additional class currently?" Therefore, these numbers do not include any supplemental help in learning that children may have received from parents, siblings or from anyone else who did not require payment.



Odisha RURAL

As part of ASER 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011, in each sampled village, one government school with primary sections was visited on the day of the survey. Information about schools in this report is based on these visits.

School observations

Table 8: Total schools visited 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Type of school	2007	2009	2010	2011
Std I-IV/V: Primary	406	403	383	390
Std I-VII/VIII: Primary + Upper primary	306	344	358	379
Total schools visited	712	747	741	769



Student and teacher attendance

Table 9: Student attendance 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Type of school	2007	2009	2010	2011	2007	2009	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V				Std I-VII/VIII			
% Enrolled children present (average)	72.4	74.1	71.9	77.7	70.1	73.0	72.3	72.8
% Schools with less than 50% enrolled children present (average)	12.9	8.3	11.9	4.7	13.2	9.1	9.6	8.1
% Schools with 75% or more enrolled children present (average)	51.6	54.8	51.5	61.9	44.7	50.5	51.4	47.0

Table 10: Teacher attendance 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Type of school	2007	2009	2010	2011	2007	2009	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V				Std I-VII/VIII			
% Teachers present (average)	91.1	92.3	89.1	91.5	87.2	90.4	83.8	87.9
% Schools with no teachers present (average)	0.4	0.0	1.3	0.3	0.0	0.4	0.7	0.7
% Schools with all teachers present (average)	77.9	80.1	74.3	77.7	62.3	71.1	56.0	61.9

Other school information

Table 11: Headteachers 2010 & 2011

% Schools with:	2010	2011	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V		Std I-VII/VIII	
No Headteacher appointed	5.8	3.9	8.1	4.9
Headteacher appointed but not present at time of visit	6.2	8.5	10.8	9.3
Headteacher appointed & present at time of visit	88.0	87.6	81.2	85.8
Total	100	100	100	100

Table 12: Computers 2010 and 2011

% Schools with:	2010	2011	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V		Std I-VII/VIII	
No computer	97.5	95.1	88.1	87.8
Computers but no children using them on day of visit	1.7	3.5	3.8	5.5
Computers & children using them on day of visit	0.8	1.4	8.2	6.7
Total	100	100	100	100

Table 13: Multigrade classes 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

% Schools with:	2007	2009	2010	2011	2007	2009	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V				Std I-VII/VIII			
Std II children sitting with one or more other classes	72.1	70.8	77.0	80.0	65.1	71.9	69.4	73.5
Std IV children sitting with one or more other classes	59.1	64.9	66.8	69.9	48.8	62.4	58.1	61.7

School funds and activities (PAISA)

Table 14: % Schools who report receiving SSA grants - Full financial year

SSA school grants	2008-2009				2009-2010				2010-2011			
	No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools		
		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know
Maintenance grant	606	65.2	20.6	14.2	572	85.7	4.6	9.8	730	82.5	5.8	11.8
Development grant	598	72.1	14.1	13.9	540	86.7	4.1	9.3	719	82.2	6.3	11.5
TLM grant	610	86.6	5.3	8.2	555	92.3	2.3	5.4	718	84.5	6.3	9.2

Table 15: % Schools who report receiving SSA grants - Half financial year

SSA school grants	April 2009 to October 2009				April 2010 to October 2010				April 2011 to October 2011			
	No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools		
		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know
Maintenance grant	529	52.2	31.0	16.8	530	71.7	14.9	13.4	720	76.5	13.2	10.3
Development grant	518	59.3	24.9	15.8	495	72.9	15.0	12.1	710	76.2	13.4	10.4
TLM grant	523	76.5	13.2	10.3	505	76.6	13.1	10.3	693	60.6	30.3	9.1

Table 16: % Schools carrying out different activities since April 2011

Type of Activity		% schools		
		Yes	No	Don't know
Const.	New Classroom	35.5	59.5	5.0
Repairs	Repair of building (roof, floor, wall etc.)	65.8	29.0	5.2
	Repair of doors & windows	54.6	40.6	4.8
	Repair of boundary wall	33.8	61.7	4.6
	Repair of drinking water facility	47.7	47.9	4.4
	Repair of toilet	36.5	58.7	4.7
Painting & White Wash	White wash/plastering	79.0	16.7	4.3
	Painting Blackboard/Display Board/Painting on wall	76.5	20.2	3.3
	Painting of doors & walls	67.3	29.3	3.5
Purchase	Purchase of furniture (cupboard etc.)	49.4	44.7	6.0
	Purchase of electrical fittings	25.3	69.6	5.1
	Purchase of chalk, duster, register etc.	85.9	10.8	3.3
	Purchase of sitting Mats/Tat Patti	32.9	62.9	4.3
	Purchase of charts, globes & other teaching material	78.2	17.7	4.1
Other	Expenditure on school events	76.7	17.7	5.6
	Payment of bills (electricity, water, cleaning etc.)	26.8	67.7	5.5

The PAISA section of ASER tracks receipt and spending of Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) grants at the school level. This information is collected from schools visited during the survey. This page reports proportion of schools receiving the grants and carrying out specified activities in the schools. More detailed analysis of the PAISA data will be available in the PAISA 2011 report which will be released in March 2012.[1]

EVERY RURAL GOVERNMENT PRIMARY SCHOOL IS ENTITLED TO EACH OF THESE SSA GRANTS EVERY YEAR.

How much goes to each school	For what purposes
SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT GRANT / SCHOOL GRANT	
Rs.5000 per year per primary school	This grant can be used for buying school equipment such as blackboard, sitting mats etc. Also for buying chalk, duster, registers and other office equipment.
Rs.7000 per year per upper primary school	
Rs 5000 + Rs 7000 = Rs 12000 if the school is Std I-VII/VIII.	The grant amount varies by type of school: whether it is a primary or upper primary school.
Note: Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same premises.	
SCHOOL MAINTENANCE GRANT	
Rs.5000 - Rs 7500 per school per year if the school has upto 3 classrooms.	This grant can be used for maintenance of school building, including whitewashing; beautification; and repair of toilets, hand pump, boundary wall, playground etc. The grant amount depends on number of classrooms (excluding Headmaster room and office room)
Rs 7500 - Rs.10000 per year if the school has more than 3 classrooms.	
Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same building.	
TLM GRANT	
Rs.500 per teacher per year in primary and upper primary schools.	This grant can be used by teachers to buy teaching aids, such as charts, globes, posters, models etc.

[1] For more information see www.accountabilityinitiative.in

Right to Education indicators

As part of ASER 2010 and 2011, in each sampled village, one government school with primary sections was visited on the day of the survey. During this school visit, RTE indicators were observed and are reported here.

Table 17: Schools by total enrollment 2010 and 2011

School enrollment	2010		2011	
	No. of schools	% of schools	No. of schools	% of schools
1-60	155	21.4	187	24.9
61-90	120	16.6	113	15.1
91-120	111	15.3	91	12.1
121-150	78	10.8	94	12.5
151-200	103	14.2	110	14.7
> 200	158	21.8	156	20.8
TOTAL	725	100.0	751	100.0

Table 18: RTE norms: Pupil-teacher ratio 2010 and 2011

School enrollment	RTE Teacher Norms	2010	2011
		% Schools that do not meet PTR norms	
1-60	2	60.4	58.0
61-90	3	73.3	73.0
91-120	4	79.8	74.7
121-150	5	91.5	78.6
151-200	5 + HM	78.2	79.8
> 200	see note	84.6	84.0
TOTAL		77.5	74.3

Note : For schools with enrollment above 200 children the PTR shall not exceed 40 excluding the Head Teacher

Table 19: Schools by number of teachers 2010 and 2011

Number of teachers	2010		2011	
	No. of schools	% of schools	No. of schools	% of schools
1	121	22.6	132	22.9
2	131	24.4	141	24.4
3	93	17.4	92	15.9
4	75	14.0	88	15.3
5	45	8.4	46	8.0
6	37	6.9	32	5.6
>=7	34	6.3	46	8.0
TOTAL	536	100.0	577	100.0

Table 20: RTE norms: Teacher - classroom ratio 2010 and 2011

RTE norm: At least one classroom per teacher	2010	2011
Number of teachers	% Schools that do not meet classroom to teacher norms	
1	9.2	8.7
2	25.0	17.7
3	32.0	20.8
4	29.4	31.0
5	38.9	35.3
6	40.0	35.7
>=7	38.9	38.9
TOTAL	26.0	20.9

Extracts from the Schedule of The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act 2009 Norms and standards for a School (Sections 19 and 25)

Number of teachers in Std 1-5:

Admitted children	No. of teachers
<= 60	2
61-90	3
91-120	4
121-200	5
> 150	5 + 1 Headteacher
> 200	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (excluding Headteacher) shall not exceed 40

School facilities:
All weather building with:

- At least one classroom for every teacher
- Office cum store cum headteacher's room
- Separate toilets for boys and girls
- Safe and adequate drinking water facility to all children
- A kitchen where mid-day meal is cooked in the school
- Playground
- Arrangements for securing the school building by boundary wall or fencing.

Teaching learning equipment
shall be provided to each class as required.

Library
There shall be a library in each school providing newspaper, magazines and books on all subjects, including story-books.

Table 21: % Schools meeting selected RTE norms on facilities 2010 & 2011

% of schools with		2010	2011
Building	Office/Store/Office cum store	74.6	83.0
	Playground	44.5	36.8
	Boundary Wall	40.7	46.4
Drinking Water	No facility for drinking water	15.2	11.2
	Facility but no drinking water available	14.5	14.3
	Drinking water available	70.3	74.5
Toilet	No toilet facility	15.5	14.9
	Facility but toilet not useable	40.1	33.3
	Toilet useable	44.4	51.8
Girls Toilet	% Schools with no separate provisions for girls toilets	30.3	25.2
	Of schools with separate girls toilets, % schools where		
	Toilet locked	19.5	10.2
	Toilet not useable	15.5	17.8
	Toilet useable	34.7	46.8
TLM	Teaching learning material in Std 2	81.3	84.2
	Teaching learning material in Std 4	76.9	81.8
Library	No library	34.7	15.3
	Library but no books being used by children on day of visit	18.5	18.2
	Library being used by children on day of visit	46.8	66.5
MDM	Kitchen shed for cooking midday meal	74.3	78.5
	Midday meal served in school on the day of visit	88.6	93.5

Note: School observations for ASER 2011 looked at TLM for Std II and Std IV only.



Punjab RURAL

Annual Status of Education Report
ASER 2011 RURAL
Facilitated by PRATHAM

ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM HOUSEHOLDS 19 OUT OF 19 DISTRICTS


School enrollment and out of school children

Table 1: % Children in different types of schools 2011

Age group	Govt.	Pvt.	Other	Not in School	Total
Age: 6-14 ALL	58.4	39.6	0.4	1.6	100
Age: 7-16 ALL	59.7	37.0	0.4	2.9	100
Age: 7-10 ALL	56.8	42.4	0.3	0.5	100
Age: 7-10 BOYS	52.9	46.1	0.4	0.6	100
Age: 7-10 GIRLS	61.6	37.8	0.2	0.4	100
Age: 11-14 ALL	62.4	34.3	0.5	2.8	100
Age: 11-14 BOYS	60.7	36.1	0.3	2.9	100
Age: 11-14 GIRLS	64.6	32.0	0.8	2.6	100
Age: 15-16 ALL	60.7	28.6	0.4	10.3	100
Age: 15-16 BOYS	61.1	28.9	0.4	9.6	100
Age: 15-16 GIRLS	60.2	28.2	0.5	11.2	100

Note: 'OTHER' includes children going to madarssa and EGS.
'NOT IN SCHOOL' = dropped out + never enrolled.

Chart 1: Trends over time
% Children out of school by age group and gender 2006-2011



How to read this chart: For example, the proportion of girls (age 11-14) not in school has changed from 5% in 2006 to 4.9% in 2007 to 4.9% in 2008 to 6.2% in 2009 to 2.7% in 2010 to 2.6% in 2011

Chart 2: Trends over time
% Children enrolled in private school by class 2007, 2009 & 2011




Table 2: Sample description
% Children in each class by age 2011

Std.	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	Total
I	29.0	37.6	20.5	8.8	4.0								100
II	4.6	15.6	34.6	30.9	9.2	5.0							100
III	4.0		15.8	35.9	25.7	12.9	5.7						100
IV	2.9			13.7	30.0	33.1	13.4	6.9					100
V	3.6				11.3	38.9	27.2	13.1	5.9				100
VI	3.4					12.5	29.9	36.4	12.2	5.4			100
VII	3.3						10.5	31.5	34.8	14.4	5.6		100
VIII	2.6							11.4	31.3	34.0	16.4	4.3	100


How to read this table: If a child started school in Std I at age 6, she should be age 8 in Std 3. This table shows the age distribution for each class. For example, in Std III, 35.9% children are 8 years old but there are also 15.8% who are 7, 25.7% who are 9, 12.9% who are 10 years old, etc.

Young children in pre-school and school

Table 3: % Children age 5-6 who are enrolled in different types of pre-school & school 2011

	In balwadi or anganwadi	In LKG/ UKG	In School			Not enrolled anywhere	Total
			Govt	Pvt	Other		
Age 5	10.0	10.8	30.1	47.2	0.2	1.7	100
Age 6	2.0	5.8	44.8	45.8	0.5	1.2	100

Chart 3: Trends over time
Five year olds in pre-school & school 2007, 2009 & 2011



Reading

Table 4: % Children by class and READING level
All schools 2011

Std.	Nothing	Letter	Word	Level 1 (Std 1 Text)	Level 2 (Std 2 Text)	Total
I	21.9	50.6	19.9	3.8	3.9	100
II	4.8	29.1	39.8	15.4	10.9	100
III	1.7	12.3	27.5	29.9	28.7	100
IV	1.0	6.7	11.8	26.1	54.4	100
V	0.8	4.7	7.6	15.1	71.9	100
VI	0.9	2.9	5.4	11.5	79.3	100
VII	0.8	2.0	2.7	8.8	85.7	100
VIII	0.8	1.8	2.6	6.1	88.7	100
Total	4.2	14.6	15.8	15.2	50.2	100

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, 1.7% children cannot even read letters, 12.3% can read letters but not more, 27.5% can read words but not Std 1 text or higher, 30.0% can read Std 1 text but not Std 2 level text, and 28.7% can read Std 2 level text. In sum, for each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is 100%.

Reading Tool




Chart 4: Trends over time
% Children in Std III who CANNOT READ Std I LEVEL TEXT
By school type 2008-2011





Chart 5: Trends over time
% Children in Std V who CANNOT READ Std II LEVEL TEXT
By school type 2008-2011



Home language and school language

Table 5: School language and home language

% Children whose :	%
Home language is the same as school language	81.4
Home language is different from school language	18.6
Total	100.0

Note : In ASER 2011 for every state, reading tools were provided in the main medium of instruction in government schools. Children and their families were also asked about the language they speak at home. For home languages, a list of 122 languages was provided to all survey teams. This list includes 22 Scheduled languages and 100 Non-Scheduled languages. The data in this table is for children for whom we have information for both school language and home language.



Arithmetic

**Table 6: % Children by class and ARITHMETIC level
All schools 2011**

Std.	Nothing	Recognize Numbers		Subtract	Divide	Total
		1-9	11-99			
I	17.2	41.4	31.0	7.3	3.1	100
II	2.8	22.0	41.0	30.9	3.3	100
III	1.8	11.3	25.4	45.1	16.4	100
IV	1.1	5.9	16.4	33.1	43.5	100
V	0.7	5.1	10.4	22.5	61.3	100
VI	0.6	2.6	10.4	20.3	66.1	100
VII	0.6	1.2	8.9	19.7	69.6	100
VIII	0.9	1.2	8.8	15.6	73.5	100
Total	3.3	12.0	20.0	25.1	39.7	100

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level of arithmetic achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, 1.8% children cannot even recognize numbers 1-9, 11.3% children can recognize numbers up to 9 but not more, 25.4% can recognize numbers to 99 but cannot do subtraction, 45.1% can do subtraction but not division, and 16.4% can do division. In sum, for each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is 100%.

Math Tool




**Chart 6: Trends over time
% Children in Std III who CANNOT RECOGNISE NUMBERS upto 100. By school type 2008-2011**





**Chart 7: Trends over time
% Children in Std V who CANNOT DO DIVISION
By school type 2008-2011**



Tuition

**Table 7: Class-wise % children attending PAID TUITION CLASSES
By school type 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011**

Year	School	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	Total
2007	Govt	9.1	11.7	13.8	13.6	16.2	14.6	12.6	20.4	14.4
	Pvt	22.8	20.9	23.0	30.9	28.7	20.7	26.2	29.6	25.1
2009	Govt	13.3	15.1	23.8	19.7	23.1	17.6	21.4	28.1	20.8
	Pvt	29.3	30.4	37.6	30.8	41.5	31.5	35.6	43.9	35.0
2010	Govt	8.5	9.1	11.5	9.4	10.5	10.8	9.2	11.6	10.1
	Pvt	25.4	26.5	29.4	32.0	31.0	32.9	29.8	24.3	28.7
2011	Govt	6.2	8.5	8.7	9.0	9.9	10.4	7.3	7.0	8.5
	Pvt	19.4	23.8	25.7	26.4	22.5	25.7	23.5	23.5	23.7

Note: In 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011 the ASER survey recorded information about tuition. In all 4 years, the question asked was the following: "Does the child take any paid additional class currently?" Therefore, these numbers do not include any supplemental help in learning that children may have received from parents, siblings or from anyone else who did not require payment.



Punjab RURAL

Annual Status of Education Report
असर ASER 2011 RURAL
Facilitated by PRATHAM

As part of ASER 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011, in each sampled village, one government school with primary sections was visited on the day of the survey. Information about schools in this report is based on these visits.

School observations

Table 8: Total schools visited 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Type of school	2007	2009	2010	2011
Std I-IV/V: Primary	383	431	391	457
Std I-VII/VIII: Primary + Upper primary	61	38	58	32
Total schools visited	444	469	449	489



Student and teacher attendance

Table 9: Student attendance 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Type of school	2007	2009	2010	2011	2007	2009	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V				Std I-VII/VIII			
% Enrolled children present (average)	80.6	84.4	82.5	81.7	82.6	85.6	84.4	79.6
% Schools with less than 50% enrolled children present (average)	3.8	1.7	0.0	2.2	1.8	0.0	0.0	0.0
% Schools with 75% or more enrolled children present (average)	72.3	82.5	78.1	77.7	82.1	86.5	87.9	75.0

Table 10: Teacher attendance 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Type of school	2007	2009	2010	2011	2007	2009	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V				Std I-VII/VIII			
% Teachers present (average)	85.6	84.8	89.1	87.1	87.3	82.2	84.6	84.1
% Schools with no teachers present (average)	0.0	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
% Schools with all teachers present (average)	57.9	54.7	64.2	60.2	46.2	41.9	54.0	48.3

Other school information

Table 11: Headteachers 2010 & 2011

% Schools with:	2010	2011	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V		Std I-VII/VIII	
No Headteacher appointed	3.5	1.2	0.0	0.0
Headteacher appointed but not present at time of visit	3.5	3.6	7.1	11.8
Headteacher appointed & present at time of visit	92.9	95.2	92.9	88.2
Total	100	100	100	100

Table 12: Computers 2010 and 2011

% Schools with:	2010	2011	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V		Std I-VII/VIII	
No computer	94.0	93.1	57.9	56.3
Computers but no children using them on day of visit	3.7	4.9	17.5	21.9
Computers & children using them on day of visit	2.4	2.0	24.6	21.9
Total	100	100	100	100

Table 13: Multigrade classes 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

% Schools with:	2007	2009	2010	2011	2007	2009	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V				Std I-VII/VIII			
Std II children sitting with one or more other classes	47.4	45.6	53.3	44.2	35.0	41.7	47.4	36.7
Std IV children sitting with one or more other classes	37.4	46.5	39.1	41.5	33.9	40.6	26.5	36.7

School funds and activities (PAISA)

Table 14: % Schools who report receiving SSA grants - Full financial year

SSA school grants	2008-2009				2009-2010				2010-2011			
	No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools		
		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know
Maintenance grant	383	83.6	13.6	2.9	400	95.5	1.3	3.3	480	84.6	10.2	5.2
Development grant	377	87.0	9.8	3.2	369	93.5	3.5	3.0	480	78.1	14.0	7.9
TLM grant	422	96.2	1.7	2.1	378	96.3	2.7	1.1	481	92.5	4.2	3.3

Table 15: % Schools who report receiving SSA grants - Half financial year

SSA school grants	April 2009 to October 2009				April 2010 to October 2010				April 2011 to October 2011			
	No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools		
		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know
Maintenance grant	286	63.3	31.8	4.9	374	88.5	7.5	4.0	478	24.5	58.6	17.0
Development grant	310	79.4	15.8	4.8	356	90.7	6.5	2.8	478	28.9	54.8	16.3
TLM grant	373	94.1	3.2	2.7	363	94.2	4.1	1.7	476	41.4	44.5	14.1

Table 16: % Schools carrying out different activities since April 2011

Type of Activity		% schools		
		Yes	No	Don't know
Const.	New Classroom	21.5	64.5	14.0
Repairs	Repair of building (roof, floor, wall etc.)	41.5	50.2	8.3
	Repair of doors & windows	32.7	58.5	8.8
	Repair of boundary wall	22.8	66.5	10.7
	Repair of drinking water facility	48.2	45.1	6.7
	Repair of toilet	35.4	55.0	9.6
Painting & White Wash	White wash/plastering	50.9	42.2	6.9
	Painting Blackboard/Display Board/Painting on wall	63.6	29.7	6.7
	Painting of doors & walls	40.0	49.8	10.2
Purchase	Purchase of furniture (cupboard etc.)	32.9	56.9	10.2
	Purchase of electrical fittings	46.5	45.8	7.7
	Purchase of chalk, duster, register etc.	71.9	21.0	7.1
	Purchase of sitting Mats/Tat Patti	39.6	47.2	13.2
	Purchase of charts, globes & other teaching material	66.5	26.7	6.9
Other	Expenditure on school events	46.3	42.9	10.8
	Payment of bills (electricity, water, cleaning etc.)	50.4	38.5	11.1

The PAISA section of ASER tracks receipt and spending of Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) grants at the school level. This information is collected from schools visited during the survey. This page reports proportion of schools receiving the grants and carrying out specified activities in the schools. More detailed analysis of the PAISA data will be available in the PAISA 2011 report which will be released in March 2012.[1]

EVERY RURAL GOVERNMENT PRIMARY SCHOOL IS ENTITLED TO EACH OF THESE SSA GRANTS EVERY YEAR.

How much goes to each school	For what purposes
SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT GRANT / SCHOOL GRANT	
Rs.5000 per year per primary school	This grant can be used for buying school equipment such as blackboard, sitting mats etc. Also for buying chalk, duster, registers and other office equipment.
Rs.7000 per year per upper primary school	
Rs 5000 + Rs 7000 = Rs 12000 if the school is Std I-VII/VIII.	The grant amount varies by type of school: whether it is a primary or upper primary school.
Note: Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same premises.	
SCHOOL MAINTENANCE GRANT	
Rs.5000 - Rs 7500 per school per year if the school has upto 3 classrooms.	This grant can be used for maintenance of school building, including whitewashing; beautification; and repair of toilets, hand pump, boundary wall, playground etc. The grant amount depends on number of classrooms (excluding Headmaster room and office room)
Rs 7500 - Rs.10000 per year if the school has more than 3 classrooms.	
Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same building.	
TLM GRANT	
Rs.500 per teacher per year in primary and upper primary schools.	This grant can be used by teachers to buy teaching aids, such as charts, globes, posters, models etc.

[1] For more information see www.accountabilityinitiative.in

Right to Education indicators

Table 17: Schools by total enrollment 2010 and 2011

School enrollment	2010		2011	
	No. of schools	% of schools	No. of schools	% of schools
1-60	76	17.2	95	19.6
61-90	86	19.5	71	14.6
91-120	61	13.8	71	14.6
121-150	45	10.2	51	10.5
151-200	62	14.0	69	14.2
> 200	112	25.3	128	26.4
TOTAL	442	100.0	485	100.0

Table 18: RTE norms: Pupil-teacher ratio 2010 and 2011

School enrollment	RTE Teacher Norms	2010	2011
		% Schools that do not meet PTR norms	
1-60	2	41.9	46.1
61-90	3	66.2	64.4
91-120	4	57.1	75.0
121-150	5	71.8	68.2
151-200	5 + HM	74.0	70.0
> 200	see note	76.6	85.7
TOTAL		65.1	69.6

Note : For schools with enrollment above 200 children the PTR shall not exceed 40 excluding the Head Teacher

Table 19: Schools by number of teachers 2010 and 2011

Number of teachers	2010		2011	
	No. of schools	% of schools	No. of schools	% of schools
1	42	10.8	51	12.2
2	94	24.1	96	22.9
3	65	16.7	70	16.7
4	66	16.9	65	15.5
5	38	9.7	60	14.3
6	25	6.4	31	7.4
>=7	60	15.4	46	11.0
TOTAL	390	100.0	419	100.0

Table 20: RTE norms: Teacher - classroom ratio 2010 and 2011

RTE norm: At least one classroom per teacher	2010	2011
Number of teachers	% Schools that do not meet classroom to teacher norms	
1	4.2	0.0
2	5.2	10.9
3	19.5	10.6
4	33.3	26.2
5	29.6	20.5
6	61.5	35.0
>=7	45.2	33.3
TOTAL	23.1	17.8

Table 21: % Schools meeting selected RTE norms on facilities 2010 & 2011

% of schools with		2010	2011
Building	Office/Store/Office cum store	78.9	79.5
	Playground	69.1	71.4
	Boundary Wall	82.8	84.0
Drinking Water	No facility for drinking water	8.9	8.4
	Facility but no drinking water available	8.0	8.8
	Drinking water available	83.1	82.9
Toilet	No toilet facility	0.9	1.9
	Facility but toilet not useable	37.9	39.5
	Toilet useable	61.2	58.7
Girls Toilet	% Schools with no separate provisions for girls toilets	7.3	4.9
	Of schools with separate girls toilets, % schools where		
	Toilet locked	16.9	4.0
	Toilet not useable	26.5	34.8
	Toilet useable	49.4	56.2
TLM	Teaching learning material in Std 2	91.8	95.0
	Teaching learning material in Std 4	89.2	90.6
Library	No library	4.1	5.6
	Library but no books being used by children on day of visit	30.0	24.0
	Library being used by children on day of visit	66.0	70.4
MDM	Kitchen shed for cooking midday meal	94.6	93.9
	Midday meal served in school on the day of visit	98.0	96.4

Note: School observations for ASER 2011 looked at TLM for Std II and Std IV only.

As part of ASER 2010 and 2011, in each sampled village, one government school with primary sections was visited on the day of the survey. During this school visit, RTE indicators were observed and are reported here.

Extracts from the Schedule of The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act 2009 Norms and standards for a School (Sections 19 and 25)

Number of teachers in Std 1-5:

Admitted children	No. of teachers
<= 60	2
61-90	3
91-120	4
121-200	5
> 150	5 + 1 Headteacher
> 200	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (excluding Headteacher) shall not exceed 40

School facilities:
All weather building with:

- At least one classroom for every teacher
- Office cum store cum headteacher's room
- Separate toilets for boys and girls
- Safe and adequate drinking water facility to all children
- A kitchen where mid-day meal is cooked in the school
- Playground
- Arrangements for securing the school building by boundary wall or fencing.

Teaching learning equipment
shall be provided to each class as required.

Library
There shall be a library in each school providing newspaper, magazines and books on all subjects, including story-books.



Rajasthan RURAL

ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM HOUSEHOLDS. 31 OUT OF 32 DISTRICTS


School enrollment and out of school children

Table 1: % Children in different types of schools 2011

Age group	Govt.	Pvt.	Other	Not in School	Total
Age: 6-14 ALL	60.2	35.1	0.2	4.5	100
Age: 7-16 ALL	59.7	33.4	0.2	6.7	100
Age: 7-10 ALL	59.8	36.9	0.3	3.0	100
Age: 7-10 BOYS	56.7	41.0	0.3	2.0	100
Age: 7-10 GIRLS	63.9	31.5	0.3	4.3	100
Age: 11-14 ALL	61.6	32.0	0.1	6.3	100
Age: 11-14 BOYS	59.6	36.2	0.1	4.2	100
Age: 11-14 GIRLS	64.3	26.7	0.1	8.9	100
Age: 15-16 ALL	55.4	27.6	0.1	16.8	100
Age: 15-16 BOYS	56.4	30.3	0.1	13.2	100
Age: 15-16 GIRLS	54.1	23.5	0.1	22.3	100

Note: 'OTHER' includes children going to madarssa and EGS.
'NOT IN SCHOOL' = dropped out + never enrolled.

Chart 1: Trends over time
% Children out of school by age group and gender 2006-2011



How to read this chart: For example, the proportion of girls (age 11-14) not in school has changed from 19.6% in 2006 to 14.4% in 2007 to 14.8% in 2008 to 12.2% in 2009 to 12.1% in 2010 to 8.9% in 2011

Chart 2: Trends over time
% Children enrolled in private school by class 2007, 2009 & 2011




Table 2: Sample description
% Children in each class by age 2011

Std.	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	Total
I	38.6	34.8	15.1	6.8	4.8								100
II	11.3	22.7	30.7	23.2	5.3	6.9							100
III	2.7	7.7	18.2	36.5	16.6	11.2	7.1						100
IV	2.7		8.1	22.2	24.9	26.6	6.1	6.2	3.2				100
V	3.0			9.4	12.9	38.8	17.0	11.9	7.1				100
VI	9.1					22.0	24.7	27.2	10.0	7.0			100
VII	2.8					8.7	13.5	37.2	22.4	9.4	6.2		100
VIII	9.4							22.2	29.4	22.4	10.9	5.7	100


How to read this table: If a child started school in Std I at age 6, she should be age 8 in Std 3. This table shows the age distribution for each class. For example, in Std III, 36.5% children are 8 years old but there are also 18.2% who are 7, 16.6 % who are 9, 11.2 % who are 10 years old, etc.

Young children in pre-school and school

Table 3: % Children age 5-6 who are enrolled in different types of pre-school & school 2011

	In balwadi or anganwadi	In LKG/ UKG	In School			Not enrolled anywhere	Total
			Govt	Pvt	Other		
Age 5	12.3	4.6	42.5	34.4	0.3	6.0	100
Age 6	2.6	2.8	52.9	37.9	0.2	3.5	100

Chart 3: Trends over time
Five year olds in pre-school & school 2007, 2009 & 2011



Reading

Table 4: % Children by class and READING level
All schools 2011

Std.	Nothing	Letter	Word	Level 1 (Std 1 Text)	Level 2 (Std 2 Text)	Total
I	51.3	34.8	9.1	2.2	2.7	100
II	19.6	41.6	24.1	8.7	6.0	100
III	8.1	28.7	31.5	18.0	13.8	100
IV	3.8	15.5	24.4	26.3	30.1	100
V	2.4	9.7	18.2	27.0	42.7	100
VI	1.0	4.1	8.8	22.3	63.9	100
VII	0.5	2.9	4.7	16.0	75.9	100
VIII	0.8	1.9	3.1	11.9	82.3	100
Total	11.3	18.3	16.1	16.5	37.9	100

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, 8.1% children cannot even read letters, 28.7% can read letters but not more, 31.5% can read words but not Std 1 text or higher, 18% can read Std 1 text but not Std 2 level text, and 13.8% can read Std 2 level text. In sum, for each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is 100%.

Reading Tool




Chart 4: Trends over time
% Children in Std III who CANNOT READ Std I LEVEL TEXT
By school type 2008-2011





Chart 5: Trends over time
% Children in Std V who CANNOT READ Std II LEVEL TEXT
By school type 2008-2011



Home language and school language

Table 5: School language and home language

% Children whose :	%
Home language is the same as school language	23.1
Home language is different from school language	76.9
Total	100.0

Note : In ASER 2011 for every state, reading tools were provided in the main medium of instruction in government schools. Children and their families were also asked about the language they speak at home. For home languages, a list of 122 languages was provided to all survey teams. This list includes 22 Scheduled languages and 100 Non-Scheduled languages. The data in this table is for children for whom we have information for both school language and home language.



Arithmetic

Table 6: % Children by class and ARITHMETIC level
All schools 2011

Std.	Nothing	Recognize Numbers		Subtract	Divide	Total
		1-9	11-99			
I	50.3	37.3	9.3	1.9	1.1	100
II	18.7	46.9	25.6	6.6	2.2	100
III	7.7	35.8	34.9	16.1	5.5	100
IV	3.0	21.3	33.3	28.3	14.2	100
V	2.3	13.2	27.7	33.2	23.7	100
VI	1.0	6.5	18.5	31.9	42.2	100
VII	0.5	4.0	12.3	31.0	52.3	100
VIII	0.8	2.7	8.7	25.2	62.7	100
Total	10.8	21.9	21.8	21.4	24.1	100

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level of arithmetic achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, 7.7% children cannot even recognize numbers 1-9, 35.8% children can recognize numbers up to 9 but not more, 34.9% can recognize numbers to 99 but cannot do subtraction, 16.1% can do subtraction but not division, and 5.5% can do division. In sum, for each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is 100%.

Math Tool




Chart 6: Trends over time
% Children in Std III who CANNOT RECOGNISE NUMBERS upto 100. By school type 2008-2011





Chart 7: Trends over time
% Children in Std V who CANNOT DO DIVISION
By school type 2008-2011



Tuition

Table 7: Class-wise % children attending PAID TUITION CLASSES
By school type 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Year	School	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	Total
2007	Govt	1.5	2.1	2.5	3.0	3.6	3.9	5.8	8.9	3.8
	Pvt	6.8	8.8	9.2	11.2	11.1	13.6	13.1	19.6	11.2
2009	Govt	3.3	3.6	4.7	4.8	5.8	7.4	7.5	12.0	6.1
	Pvt	12.0	11.4	13.1	11.5	16.1	14.0	13.8	26.5	14.7
2010	Govt	1.5	2.6	3.3	4.0	4.6	4.8	5.3	7.9	4.3
	Pvt	7.6	9.3	10.5	12.4	12.9	15.9	15.3	18.9	12.6
2011	Govt	0.9	1.4	1.1	1.5	1.7	2.4	2.9	3.1	1.9
	Pvt	7.1	6.9	9.1	8.6	8.9	8.7	9.8	9.7	8.5

Note: In 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011 the ASER survey recorded information about tuition. In all 4 years, the question asked was the following: "Does the child take any paid additional class currently?" Therefore, these numbers do not include any supplemental help in learning that children may have received from parents, siblings or from anyone else who did not require payment.



Rajasthan RURAL

As part of ASER 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011, in each sampled village, one government school with primary sections was visited on the day of the survey. Information about schools in this report is based on these visits.

School observations

Table 8: Total schools visited 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Type of school	2007	2009	2010	2011
Std I-IV/V: Primary	393	276	290	273
Std I-VII/VIII: Primary + Upper primary	488	594	606	599
Total schools visited	881	870	896	872



Student and teacher attendance

Table 9: Student attendance 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Type of school	2007	2009	2010	2011	2007	2009	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V				Std I-VII/VIII			
% Enrolled children present (average)	67.8	72.0	71.2	69.8	72.6	74.2	73.6	70.8
% Schools with less than 50% enrolled children present (average)	14.4	9.8	9.1	11.6	8.8	6.9	5.8	8.5
% Schools with 75% or more enrolled children present (average)	41.0	48.4	46.3	45.7	53.4	56.6	50.2	41.3

Table 10: Teacher attendance 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Type of school	2007	2009	2010	2011	2007	2009	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V				Std I-VII/VIII			
% Teachers present (average)	91.3	92.8	90.1	90.9	85.3	88.9	88.0	86.4
% Schools with no teachers present (average)	0.3	0.0	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.0	0.2	0.2
% Schools with all teachers present (average)	74.9	79.5	73.9	75.9	50.7	58.2	53.5	50.3

Other school information

Table 11: Headteachers 2010 & 2011

% Schools with:	2010	2011	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V		Std I-VII/VIII	
No Headteacher appointed	0.9	3.2	2.8	1.7
Headteacher appointed but not present at time of visit	8.0	7.8	8.3	11.3
Headteacher appointed & present at time of visit	91.1	89.0	88.9	87.1
Total	100	100	100	100

Table 12: Computers 2010 and 2011

% Schools with:	2010	2011	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V		Std I-VII/VIII	
No computer	96.5	97.4	78.5	66.5
Computers but no children using them on day of visit	1.8	1.9	14.5	16.9
Computers & children using them on day of visit	1.8	0.7	7.0	16.6
Total	100	100	100	100

Table 13: Multigrade classes 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

% Schools with:	2007	2009	2010	2011	2007	2009	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V				Std I-VII/VIII			
Std II children sitting with one or more other classes	67.9	60.5	65.6	77.2	63.9	65.1	66.0	67.0
Std IV children sitting with one or more other classes	52.6	52.7	53.6	63.0	46.3	51.5	52.3	53.6

School funds and activities (PAISA)

Table 14: % Schools who report receiving SSA grants - Full financial year

SSA school grants	2008-2009				2009-2010				2010-2011			
	No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools		
		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know
Maintenance grant	771	70.7	23.7	5.6	809	79.1	13.7	7.2	843	81.4	12.3	6.3
Development grant	720	57.6	36.7	5.7	759	73.4	18.2	8.4	803	62.5	30.6	6.9
TLM grant	781	87.5	8.6	4.0	809	88.8	6.8	4.5	847	86.9	8.2	5.0

Table 15: % Schools who report receiving SSA grants - Half financial year

SSA school grants	April 2009 to October 2009				April 2010 to October 2010				April 2011 to October 2011			
	No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools		
		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know
Maintenance grant	645	39.4	53.6	7.0	761	47.7	40.9	11.4	782	50.5	39.9	9.6
Development grant	619	39.9	53.5	6.6	714	47.5	40.3	12.2	755	41.9	47.8	10.3
TLM grant	650	55.4	39.1	5.5	744	55.9	34.1	10.0	791	57.1	35.0	7.8

Table 16: % Schools carrying out different activities since April 2011

Type of Activity		% schools		
		Yes	No	Don't know
Const.	New Classroom	16.4	79.7	3.9
Repairs	Repair of building (roof, floor, wall etc.)	46.7	50.1	3.3
	Repair of doors & windows	38.9	58.0	3.0
	Repair of boundary wall	20.7	75.8	3.5
	Repair of drinking water facility	37.1	59.9	3.1
	Repair of toilet	28.7	67.8	3.5
Painting & White Wash	White wash/plastering	49.5	46.9	3.6
	Painting Blackboard/Display Board/Painting on wall	63.5	33.5	3.0
	Painting of doors & walls	43.1	53.9	3.1
Purchase	Purchase of furniture (cupboard etc.)	42.3	54.0	3.7
	Purchase of electrical fittings	34.5	62.6	2.9
	Purchase of chalk, duster, register etc.	88.7	9.3	2.1
	Purchase of sitting Mats/Tat Patti	44.5	52.9	2.6
	Purchase of charts, globes & other teaching material	76.9	20.8	2.4
Other	Expenditure on school events	55.8	41.3	2.9
	Payment of bills (electricity, water, cleaning etc.)	49.4	47.1	3.5

The PAISA section of ASER tracks receipt and spending of Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) grants at the school level. This information is collected from schools visited during the survey. This page reports proportion of schools receiving the grants and carrying out specified activities in the schools. More detailed analysis of the PAISA data will be available in the PAISA 2011 report which will be released in March 2012.[1]

EVERY RURAL GOVERNMENT PRIMARY SCHOOL IS ENTITLED TO EACH OF THESE SSA GRANTS EVERY YEAR.

How much goes to each school	For what purposes
SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT GRANT / SCHOOL GRANT	
Rs.5000 per year per primary school	This grant can be used for buying school equipment such as blackboard, sitting mats etc. Also for buying chalk, duster, registers and other office equipment.
Rs.7000 per year per upper primary school	
Rs 5000 + Rs 7000 = Rs 12000 if the school is Std I-VII/VIII.	The grant amount varies by type of school: whether it is a primary or upper primary school.
Note: Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same premises.	
SCHOOL MAINTENANCE GRANT	
Rs.5000 - Rs 7500 per school per year if the school has upto 3 classrooms.	This grant can be used for maintenance of school building, including whitewashing; beautification; and repair of toilets, hand pump, boundary wall, playground etc. The grant amount depends on number of classrooms (excluding Headmaster room and office room)
Rs 7500 - Rs.10000 per year if the school has more than 3 classrooms.	
Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same building.	
TLM GRANT	
Rs.500 per teacher per year in primary and upper primary schools.	This grant can be used by teachers to buy teaching aids, such as charts, globes, posters, models etc.

[1] For more information see www.accountabilityinitiative.in

Right to Education indicators

Table 17: Schools by total enrollment 2010 and 2011

School enrollment	2010		2011	
	No. of schools	% of schools	No. of schools	% of schools
1-60	115	13.0	113	13.1
61-90	110	12.4	109	12.6
91-120	150	16.9	148	17.1
121-150	112	12.6	115	13.3
151-200	163	18.4	168	19.4
> 200	237	26.7	213	24.6
TOTAL	887	100.0	866	100.0

Table 18: RTE norms: Pupil-teacher ratio 2010 and 2011

School enrollment	RTE Teacher Norms	2010	2011
		% Schools that do not meet PTR norms	
1-60	2	46.3	58.1
61-90	3	44.0	45.8
91-120	4	48.2	44.6
121-150	5	59.2	55.1
151-200	5 + HM	49.3	42.9
> 200	see note	63.9	64.5
TOTAL		53.7	52.7

Note : For schools with enrollment above 200 children the PTR shall not exceed 40 excluding the Head Teacher

Table 19: Schools by number of teachers 2010 and 2011

Number of teachers	2010		2011	
	No. of schools	% of schools	No. of schools	% of schools
1	81	10.4	105	13.3
2	97	12.4	89	11.3
3	101	13.0	90	11.4
4	114	14.6	116	14.7
5	163	20.9	147	18.7
6	94	12.1	92	11.7
>=7	130	16.7	149	18.9
TOTAL	780	100.0	788	100.0

Table 20: RTE norms: Teacher - classroom ratio 2010 and 2011

RTE norm: At least one classroom per teacher	2010	2011
Number of teachers	% Schools that do not meet classroom to teacher norms	
1	3.0	2.4
2	3.8	4.4
3	9.9	18.2
4	13.5	15.1
5	22.5	18.8
6	32.4	32.0
>=7	32.7	24.3
TOTAL	18.0	16.9

As part of ASER 2010 and 2011, in each sampled village, one government school with primary sections was visited on the day of the survey. During this school visit, RTE indicators were observed and are reported here.

Extracts from the Schedule of The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act 2009 Norms and standards for a School (Sections 19 and 25)

Number of teachers in Std 1-5:

Admitted children	No. of teachers
<= 60	2
61-90	3
91-120	4
121-200	5
> 150	5 + 1 Headteacher
> 200	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (excluding Headteacher) shall not exceed 40

School facilities:
All weather building with:

- At least one classroom for every teacher
- Office cum store cum headteacher's room
- Separate toilets for boys and girls
- Safe and adequate drinking water facility to all children
- A kitchen where mid-day meal is cooked in the school
- Playground
- Arrangements for securing the school building by boundary wall or fencing.

Teaching learning equipment
shall be provided to each class as required.

Library
There shall be a library in each school providing newspaper, magazines and books on all subjects, including story-books.

Table 21: % Schools meeting selected RTE norms on facilities 2010 & 2011

% of schools with		2010	2011
Building	Office/Store/Office cum store	91.2	89.2
	Playground	51.9	57.2
	Boundary Wall	70.1	72.6
Drinking Water	No facility for drinking water	20.9	21.9
	Facility but no drinking water available	11.1	8.5
	Drinking water available	68.0	69.5
Toilet	No toilet facility	3.5	3.3
	Facility but toilet not useable	31.1	26.9
	Toilet useable	65.4	69.9
Girls Toilet	% Schools with no separate provisions for girls toilets	19.6	9.3
	Of schools with separate girls toilets, % schools where		
	Toilet locked	13.3	5.5
	Toilet not useable	16.8	19.0
	Toilet useable	50.3	66.3
TLM	Teaching learning material in Std 2	76.1	80.0
	Teaching learning material in Std 4	72.1	74.7
Library	No library	36.3	33.0
	Library but no books being used by children on day of visit	40.4	35.4
	Library being used by children on day of visit	23.3	31.7
MDM	Kitchen shed for cooking midday meal	83.8	84.5
	Midday meal served in school on the day of visit	94.8	97.0

Note: School observations for ASER 2011 looked at TLM for Std II and Std IV only.



Tamil Nadu RURAL

ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM HOUSEHOLDS. 29 OUT OF 29 DISTRICTS


School enrollment and out of school children

Table 1: % Children in different types of schools 2011

Age group	Govt.	Pvt.	Other	Not in School	Total
Age: 6-14 ALL	71.5	27.0	0.6	0.9	100
Age: 7-16 ALL	72.7	24.8	0.6	2.0	100
Age: 7-10 ALL	68.6	30.6	0.6	0.2	100
Age: 7-10 BOYS	66.3	32.9	0.6	0.2	100
Age: 7-10 GIRLS	71.0	28.2	0.6	0.2	100
Age: 11-14 ALL	76.1	21.8	0.6	1.6	100
Age: 11-14 BOYS	73.8	23.8	0.6	1.9	100
Age: 11-14 GIRLS	78.3	19.9	0.5	1.3	100
Age: 15-16 ALL	73.8	19.2	0.6	6.4	100
Age: 15-16 BOYS	73.0	19.5	0.9	6.7	100
Age: 15-16 GIRLS	74.5	18.9	0.4	6.2	100

Note: 'OTHER' includes children going to madarssa and EGS.
'NOT IN SCHOOL' = dropped out + never enrolled.

Chart 1: Trends over time
% Children out of school by age group and gender 2006-2011



How to read this chart: For example, the proportion of girls (age 11-14) not in school has changed from 3.9% in 2006 to 2.3% in 2007 to 1.2% in 2008 to 1.1% in 2009 to 1.8% in 2010 to 1.3% in 2011

Chart 2: Trends over time
% Children enrolled in private school by class 2007, 2009 & 2011




Table 2: Sample description
% Children in each class by age 2011

Std.	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	Total
I	44.4	49.7	5.9										100
II	1.1	21.6	67.0	8.3	2.0								100
III	1.9		17.8	71.0	8.3	1.0							100
IV	2.5			18.2	67.4	10.3	1.7						100
V	2.8				8.0	78.0	9.0	2.4					100
VI	2.2					10.4	68.8	16.7	1.9				100
VII	2.2						10.7	69.0	14.3	3.8			100
VIII	3.1							14.2	67.9	11.7	3.1		100


How to read this table: If a child started school in Std I at age 6, she should be age 8 in Std 3. This table shows the age distribution for each class. For example, in Std III, 71.0% children are 8 years old but there are also 17.8% who are 7, 8.3% who are 9 years old, etc.

Young children in pre-school and school

Table 3: % Children age 5-6 who are enrolled in different types of pre-school & school 2011

	In balwadi or anganwadi	In LKG/ UKG	In School			Not enrolled anywhere	Total
			Govt	Pvt	Other		
Age 5	8.2	14.3	42.1	34.6	0.7	0.1	100
Age 6	0.9	2.0	59.5	36.7	0.6	0.3	100

Chart 3: Trends over time
Five year olds in pre-school & school 2007, 2009 & 2011



Reading

Table 4: % Children by class and READING level
All schools 2011

Std.	Nothing	Letter	Word	Level 1 (Std 1 Text)	Level 2 (Std 2 Text)	Total
I	54.2	31.3	10.5	3.0	1.1	100
II	20.3	35.6	30.4	9.4	4.3	100
III	9.7	21.9	40.9	20.5	7.1	100
IV	5.3	11.9	32.2	31.5	19.0	100
V	3.5	7.7	20.8	35.7	32.3	100
VI	1.4	3.8	14.8	31.3	48.8	100
VII	1.2	2.5	9.5	26.0	60.8	100
VIII	0.6	1.5	8.5	22.7	66.8	100
Total	11.0	13.6	20.7	23.3	31.4	100

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, 9.7% children cannot even read letters, 21.9% can read letters but not more, 40.9% can read words but not Std 1 text or higher, 20.5% can read Std 1 text but not Std 2 level text, and 7.1% can read Std 2 level text. In sum, for each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is 100%.

Reading Tool




Chart 4: Trends over time
% Children in Std III who CANNOT READ Std I LEVEL TEXT
By school type 2008-2011





Chart 5: Trends over time
% Children in Std V who CANNOT READ Std II LEVEL TEXT
By school type 2008-2011



Home language and school language

Table 5: School language and home language

% Children whose :	%
Home language is the same as school language	92.2
Home language is different from school language	7.8
Total	100.0

Note : In ASER 2011 for every state, reading tools were provided in the main medium of instruction in government schools. Children and their families were also asked about the language they speak at home. For home languages, a list of 122 languages was provided to all survey teams. This list includes 22 Scheduled languages and 100 Non-Scheduled languages. The data in this table is for children for whom we have information for both school language and home language.



Arithmetic

Table 6: % Children by class and ARITHMETIC level
All schools 2011

Std.	Nothing	Recognize Numbers		Subtract	Divide	Total
		1-9	11-99			
I	45.9	33.8	17.1	2.5	0.8	100
II	15.7	28.6	46.2	7.6	1.9	100
III	7.8	18.5	51.7	20.2	1.8	100
IV	4.9	9.6	45.0	34.2	6.4	100
V	3.7	5.5	31.6	44.9	14.2	100
VI	1.7	3.1	24.0	46.4	24.8	100
VII	1.1	1.8	16.8	45.4	34.9	100
VIII	0.5	0.9	14.6	38.8	45.1	100
Total	9.3	11.8	30.5	31.3	17.0	100

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level of arithmetic achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, 7.8% children cannot even recognize numbers 1-9, 18.5% children can recognize numbers up to 9 but not more, 51.7% can recognize numbers to 99 but cannot do subtraction, 20.2% can do subtraction but not division, and 1.8% can do division. In sum, for each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is 100%.

Math Tool



Chart 6: Trends over time
% Children in Std III who CANNOT RECOGNISE NUMBERS upto 100. By school type 2008-2011





Chart 7: Trends over time
% Children in Std V who CANNOT DO DIVISION
By school type 2008-2011



Tuition

Table 7: Class-wise % children attending PAID TUITION CLASSES
By school type 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Year	School	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	Total
2007	Govt	10.8	12.9	13.8	16.0	16.7	18.3	17.5	17.1	15.7
	Pvt	26.5	29.5	33.5	37.5	39.9	30.9	29.5	30.8	32.1
2009	Govt	16.3	20.9	19.5	22.3	24.1	22.5	19.6	20.0	20.9
	Pvt	28.6	31.9	37.2	41.4	36.1	29.4	33.1	35.2	33.9
2010	Govt	12.7	13.6	16.0	14.8	19.8	17.6	16.7	17.1	16.4
	Pvt	22.4	26.4	29.9	31.3	30.3	29.4	25.9	28.0	27.8
2011	Govt	11.6	12.8	14.6	16.3	17.5	15.2	16.4	14.5	15.1
	Pvt	19.4	24.6	30.7	24.4	25.3	29.5	20.5	24.7	24.9

Note: In 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011 the ASER survey recorded information about tuition. In all 4 years, the question asked was the following: "Does the child take any paid additional class currently?" Therefore, these numbers do not include any supplemental help in learning that children may have received from parents, siblings or from anyone else who did not require payment.



Tamil Nadu RURAL

As part of ASER 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011, in each sampled village, one government school with primary sections was visited on the day of the survey. Information about schools in this report is based on these visits.

School observations

Table 8: Total schools visited 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Type of school	2007	2009	2010	2011
Std I-IV/V: Primary	388	385	395	448
Std I-VII/VIII: Primary + Upper primary	213	260	267	235
Total schools visited	601	645	662	683



Student and teacher attendance

Table 9: Student attendance 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Type of school	2007	2009	2010	2011	2007	2009	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V				Std I-VII/VIII			
% Enrolled children present (average)	91.2	91.7	89.9	89.7	90.2	90.1	90.7	89.2
% Schools with less than 50% enrolled children present (average)	0.5	0.0	1.0	1.4	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
% Schools with 75% or more enrolled children present (average)	94.2	94.5	93.9	91.4	93.2	93.3	97.7	92.7

Table 10: Teacher attendance 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Type of school	2007	2009	2010	2011	2007	2009	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V				Std I-VII/VIII			
% Teachers present (average)	96.3	90.6	86.5	91.6	91.3	87.4	79.9	89.0
% Schools with no teachers present (average)	0.0	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
% Schools with all teachers present (average)	88.8	70.0	61.6	75.1	74.0	48.5	34.0	54.9

Other school information

Table 11: Headteachers 2010 & 2011

% Schools with:	2010	2011	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V		Std I-VII/VIII	
No Headteacher appointed	0.0	0.6	0.0	0.6
Headteacher appointed but not present at time of visit	10.5	5.6	13.4	5.6
Headteacher appointed & present at time of visit	89.6	93.9	86.6	93.9
Total	100	100	100	100

Table 12: Computers 2010 and 2011

% Schools with:	2010	2011	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V		Std I-VII/VIII	
No computer	70.3	66.9	27.5	21.8
Computers but no children using them on day of visit	11.9	14.3	26.0	27.1
Computers & children using them on day of visit	17.8	18.9	46.6	51.1
Total	100	100	100	100

Table 13: Multigrade classes 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

% Schools with:	2007	2009	2010	2011	2007	2009	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V				Std I-VII/VIII			
Std II children sitting with one or more other classes	76.1	77.8	81.8	71.2	77.8	71.5	76.2	67.4
Std IV children sitting with one or more other classes	69.3	74.1	78.3	68.2	70.1	63.3	69.5	61.9

Note: In Tamil Nadu, the official government school policy is to have mixed groups in Std. I-IV.

School funds and activities (PAISA)

Table 14: % Schools who report receiving SSA grants - Full financial year

SSA school grants	2008-2009				2009-2010				2010-2011			
	No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools		
		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know
Maintenance grant	555	82.5	12.1	5.4	546	94.1	1.8	4.0	657	91.0	4.6	4.4
Development grant	499	62.7	30.5	6.8	498	90.6	4.6	4.8	631	82.9	11.3	5.9
TLM grant	394	12.2	83.0	4.8	180	16.1	76.1	7.8	601	53.6	42.1	4.3

Table 15: % Schools who report receiving SSA grants - Half financial year

SSA school grants	April 2009 to October 2009				April 2010 to October 2010				April 2011 to October 2011			
	No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools		
		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know
Maintenance grant	504	80.2	12.7	7.1	551	91.1	3.6	5.3	623	85.1	10.4	4.5
Development grant	450	62.2	29.8	8.0	491	91.7	5.3	3.1	601	78.4	16.0	5.7
TLM grant	350	10.0	82.6	7.4	161	18.0	72.1	9.9	586	72.2	23.7	4.1

Table 16: % Schools carrying out different activities since April 2011

Type of Activity		% schools		
		Yes	No	Don't know
Const.	New Classroom	19.3	79.3	1.3
Repairs	Repair of building (roof, floor, wall etc.)	53.3	44.8	1.9
	Repair of doors & windows	51.0	47.0	2.1
	Repair of boundary wall	29.1	68.8	2.1
	Repair of drinking water facility	60.5	37.6	1.9
	Repair of toilet	51.0	46.9	2.1
Painting & White Wash	White wash/plastering	57.8	40.8	1.4
	Painting Blackboard/Display Board/Painting on wall	85.1	13.8	1.1
	Painting of doors & walls	50.0	48.7	1.3
Purchase	Purchase of furniture (cupboard etc.)	52.4	45.7	1.9
	Purchase of electrical fittings	63.0	34.5	2.6
	Purchase of chalk, duster, register etc.	92.7	6.2	1.1
	Purchase of sitting Mats/Tat Patti	82.8	16.1	1.1
	Purchase of charts, globes & other teaching material	83.9	14.4	1.7
Other	Expenditure on school events	58.7	38.7	2.6
	Payment of bills (electricity, water, cleaning etc.)	53.5	43.6	2.9

The PAISA section of ASER tracks receipt and spending of Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) grants at the school level. This information is collected from schools visited during the survey. This page reports proportion of schools receiving the grants and carrying out specified activities in the schools. More detailed analysis of the PAISA data will be available in the PAISA 2011 report which will be released in March 2012.[1]

EVERY RURAL GOVERNMENT PRIMARY SCHOOL IS ENTITLED TO EACH OF THESE SSA GRANTS EVERY YEAR.

How much goes to each school	For what purposes
SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT GRANT / SCHOOL GRANT	
Rs.5000 per year per primary school	This grant can be used for buying school equipment such as blackboard, sitting mats etc. Also for buying chalk, duster, registers and other office equipment.
Rs.7000 per year per upper primary school	
Rs 5000 + Rs 7000 = Rs 12000 if the school is Std I-VII/VIII.	The grant amount varies by type of school: whether it is a primary or upper primary school.
Note: Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same premises.	
SCHOOL MAINTENANCE GRANT	
Rs.5000 - Rs 7500 per school per year if the school has upto 3 classrooms.	This grant can be used for maintenance of school building, including whitewashing; beautification; and repair of toilets, hand pump, boundary wall, playground etc. The grant amount depends on number of classrooms (excluding Headmaster room and office room)
Rs 7500 - Rs.10000 per year if the school has more than 3 classrooms.	
Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same building.	
TLM GRANT	
Rs.500 per teacher per year in primary and upper primary schools.	This grant can be used by teachers to buy teaching aids, such as charts, globes, posters, models etc.

[1] For more information see www.accountabilityinitiative.in

Tamil Nadu RURAL

Annual Status of Education Report
ASER 2011 RURAL
Facilitated by PRATHAM

Right to Education indicators

Table 17: Schools by total enrollment 2010 and 2011

School enrollment	2010		2011	
	No. of schools	% of schools	No. of schools	% of schools
1-60	160	24.4	213	31.5
61-90	95	14.5	97	14.4
91-120	76	11.6	90	13.3
121-150	73	11.1	75	11.1
151-200	101	15.4	95	14.1
> 200	151	23.0	106	15.7
TOTAL	656	100.0	676	100.0

Table 18: RTE norms: Pupil-teacher ratio 2010 and 2011

School enrollment	RTE Teacher Norms	2010	2011
		% Schools that do not meet PTR norms	
1-60	2	69.6	63.4
61-90	3	58.0	55.6
91-120	4	67.1	47.6
121-150	5	52.9	42.4
151-200	5 + HM	32.1	25.6
> 200	see note	39.1	33.3
TOTAL		53.0	47.8

Note : For schools with enrollment above 200 children the PTR shall not exceed 40 excluding the Head Teacher

Table 19: Schools by number of teachers 2010 and 2011

Number of teachers	2010		2011	
	No. of schools	% of schools	No. of schools	% of schools
1	107	18.6	126	21.1
2	86	14.9	88	14.7
3	72	12.5	77	12.9
4	61	10.6	78	13.0
5	61	10.6	55	9.2
6	55	9.6	60	10.0
>=7	134	23.3	114	19.1
TOTAL	576	100.0	598	100.0

Table 20: RTE norms: Teacher - classroom ratio 2010 and 2011

RTE norm: At least one classroom per teacher	2010	2011
Number of teachers	% Schools that do not meet classroom to teacher norms	
1	0.0	1.0
2	8.5	14.3
3	22.7	31.8
4	44.9	33.9
5	37.0	30.6
6	31.9	36.0
>=7	35.9	39.8
TOTAL	24.8	25.1

Table 21: % Schools meeting selected RTE norms on facilities 2010 & 2011

% of schools with		2010	2011
Building	Office/Store/Office cum store	55.0	49.4
	Playground	68.7	67.6
	Boundary Wall	60.9	58.7
Drinking Water	No facility for drinking water	12.8	13.6
	Facility but no drinking water available	6.7	8.9
	Drinking water available	80.5	77.6
Toilet	No toilet facility	7.0	9.6
	Facility but toilet not useable	48.5	42.0
	Toilet useable	44.6	48.4
Girls Toilet	% Schools with no separate provisions for girls toilets	20.8	21.2
	Of schools with separate girls toilets, % schools where		
	Toilet locked	23.0	15.0
	Toilet not useable	21.0	21.2
	Toilet useable	35.1	42.7
TLM	Teaching learning material in Std 2	95.4	92.8
	Teaching learning material in Std 4	93.3	92.5
Library	No library	20.9	23.2
	Library but no books being used by children on day of visit	21.3	21.6
	Library being used by children on day of visit	57.8	55.2
MDM	Kitchen shed for cooking midday meal	96.7	96.5
	Midday meal served in school on the day of visit	99.4	99.4

Note: School observations for ASER 2011 looked at TLM for Std II and Std IV only.

As part of ASER 2010 and 2011, in each sampled village, one government school with primary sections was visited on the day of the survey. During this school visit, RTE indicators were observed and are reported here.

Extracts from the Schedule of The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act 2009 Norms and standards for a School (Sections 19 and 25)

Number of teachers in Std 1-5:

Admitted children	No. of teachers
<= 60	2
61-90	3
91-120	4
121-200	5
> 150	5 + 1 Headteacher
> 200	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (excluding Headteacher) shall not exceed 40

School facilities:
All weather building with:

- At least one classroom for every teacher
- Office cum store cum headteacher's room
- Separate toilets for boys and girls
- Safe and adequate drinking water facility to all children
- A kitchen where mid-day meal is cooked in the school
- Playground
- Arrangements for securing the school building by boundary wall or fencing.

Teaching learning equipment
shall be provided to each class as required.

Library
There shall be a library in each school providing newspaper, magazines and books on all subjects, including story-books.



Tripura RURAL

Annual Status of Education Report
असर ASER 2011 RURAL
Facilitated by PRATHAM

ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM HOUSEHOLDS. 4 OUT OF 4 DISTRICTS


School enrollment and out of school children

Table 1: % Children in different types of schools 2011

Age group	Govt.	Pvt.	Other	Not in School	Total
Age: 6-14 ALL	92.9	5.0	0.9	1.3	100
Age: 7-16 ALL	93.1	4.1	0.9	1.9	100
Age: 7-10 ALL	92.7	6.0	0.9	0.4	100
Age: 7-10 BOYS	92.6	6.0	1.1	0.3	100
Age: 7-10 GIRLS	92.7	6.0	0.7	0.6	100
Age: 11-14 ALL	94.0	3.1	0.9	2.0	100
Age: 11-14 BOYS	93.9	3.2	0.8	2.1	100
Age: 11-14 GIRLS	94.0	3.0	1.0	2.0	100
Age: 15-16 ALL	92.1	2.6	0.6	4.7	100
Age: 15-16 BOYS	91.5	3.3	0.5	4.7	100
Age: 15-16 GIRLS	93.0	1.7	0.7	4.7	100

Note: 'OTHER' includes children going to madarssa and EGS.
'NOT IN SCHOOL' = dropped out + never enrolled.

Chart 1: Trends over time
% Children out of school by age group and gender 2006-2011



How to read this chart: For example, the proportion of girls (age 11-14) not in school has changed from 7.3% in 2006 to 5.8% in 2007 to 3.8% in 2008 to 3.4% in 2009 to 3.4% in 2010 to 2.0% in 2011

Chart 2: Trends over time
% Children enrolled in private school by class 2007, 2009 & 2011




Table 2: Sample description
% Children in each class by age 2011

Std.	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	Total
I	8.3	34.1	43.8	7.9	5.9								100
II	5.3		22.3	55.9	8.4	8.1							100
III	1.3		7.3	15.4	54.2	14.1	7.8						100
IV	3.4				12.0	58.9	14.2	8.2	3.4				100
V	4.9					21.0	45.8	21.5	6.8				100
VI	6.4						12.0	64.8	9.0	7.8			100
VII	4.8							17.5	47.0	21.4	9.3		100
VIII	6.4								15.9	48.2	22.7	6.7	100


How to read this table: If a child started school in Std I at age 6, she should be age 8 in Std 3. This table shows the age distribution for each class. For example, in Std III, 15.4% children are 8 years old but there are also 7.3% who are 7, 54.2% who are 9, 14.1% who are 10 years old, etc.

Young children in pre-school and school

Table 3: % Children age 5-6 who are enrolled in different types of pre-school & school 2011

	In balwadi or anganwadi	In LKG/ UKG	In School			Not enrolled anywhere	Total
			Govt	Pvt	Other		
Age 5	56.6	14.8	21.9	5.1	0.3	1.3	100
Age 6	26.5	7.3	55.8	8.7	0.4	1.3	100

Chart 3: Trends over time
Five year olds in pre-school & school 2007, 2009 & 2011




Reading

Table 4: % Children by class and READING level
All schools 2011

Std.	Nothing	Letter	Word	Level 1 (Std 1 Text)	Level 2 (Std 2 Text)	Total
I	16.0	39.3	25.5	11.3	7.9	100
II	7.0	27.8	36.2	18.2	10.8	100
III	3.5	12.3	27.0	35.6	21.6	100
IV	1.8	4.3	18.0	38.4	37.5	100
V	2.4	5.3	10.9	26.2	55.3	100
VI	1.9	4.2	8.2	13.1	72.7	100
VII	0.6	2.2	5.9	6.6	84.8	100
VIII	0.0	1.4	4.9	9.9	83.8	100
Total	4.0	11.9	17.5	20.8	45.9	100

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, 3.5% children cannot even read letters, 12.3% can read letters but not more, 27% can read words but not Std 1 text or higher, 35.6% can read Std 1 text but not Std 2 level text, and 21.6% can read Std 2 level text. In sum, for each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is 100%.

Reading Tool



Note: This tool was also available in Kok Borok and English.

Chart 4: Trends over time
% Children in Std III who CANNOT READ Std I LEVEL TEXT
By school type 2008-2011





Chart 5: Trends over time
% Children in Std V who CANNOT READ Std II LEVEL TEXT
By school type 2008-2011



Home language and school language

Table 5: School language and home language

Of children who tested in Bengali	
% Children whose home language was:	%
Bengali	66.1
Other *	33.9
Total	100.0

* 'Other' includes all languages from the list of scheduled and non-scheduled languages except those specified above.

Note: In ASER 2011 for every state, reading tools were provided in the main medium of instruction in government schools. In Tripura, where the medium of instruction in government schools is Bengali or Kok Borok, children were given the choice of reading in Bengali, Kok Borok or English. Figures for Kok Borok and English have not been included due to insufficient data. For home languages, a list of 122 languages was provided to all survey teams. This included 22 Scheduled languages and 100 Non-Scheduled languages. The data in this table is for children for whom we have information for both school language and home language.



Arithmetic

Table 6: % Children by class and ARITHMETIC level
All schools 2011

Std.	Nothing	Recognize Numbers		Subtract	Divide	Total
		1-9	11-99			
I	9.0	39.5	33.5	16.1	2.0	100
II	5.7	25.7	39.0	25.7	4.0	100
III	3.2	10.9	31.2	40.9	13.8	100
IV	0.4	6.9	19.3	47.1	26.3	100
V	2.5	5.2	17.3	37.2	37.7	100
VI	2.3	4.2	13.0	33.9	46.6	100
VII	1.0	3.1	8.2	33.4	54.4	100
VIII	0.8	0.8	7.2	24.8	66.5	100
Total	3.0	11.7	21.3	33.1	30.8	100

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level of arithmetic achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, 3.2% children cannot even recognize numbers 1-9, 10.9% children can recognize numbers up to 9 but not more, 31.2% can recognize numbers to 99 but cannot do subtraction, 40.9% can do subtraction but not division, and 13.8% can do division. In sum, for each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is 100%.

Math Tool




Chart 6: Trends over time
% Children in Std III who CANNOT RECOGNISE NUMBERS upto 100. By school type 2008-2011





Chart 7: Trends over time
% Children in Std V who CANNOT DO DIVISION
By school type 2008-2011



Tuition

Table 7: Class-wise % children attending PAID TUITION CLASSES
By school type 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Year	School	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	Total
2007	Govt	57.4	62.8	64.8	67.2	73.7	75.0	73.2	80.0	69.3
	Pvt	45.8	31.4	48.9	13.7	33.3	100.0	100.0	0.0	45.6
2009	Govt	65.3	64.2	71.2	74.1	65.0	72.7	83.2	85.6	72.5
	Pvt	96.0	42.6	65.3	100.0	74.1	100.0	100.0	100.0	77.5
2010	Govt	56.9	67.7	70.2	69.8	73.4	77.9	80.2	84.2	72.7
	Pvt	75.2	100.0	100.0	100.0	88.7	100.0	100.0	100.0	93.6
2011	Govt	61.0	62.7	69.2	73.9	72.0	75.0	79.7	82.5	72.1
	Pvt	79.5	89.4	66.3	45.5	100.0	100.0	73.8	58.5	78.6

Note: In 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011 the ASER survey recorded information about tuition. In all 4 years, the question asked was the following: "Does the child take any paid additional class currently?" Therefore, these numbers do not include any supplemental help in learning that children may have received from parents, siblings or from anyone else who did not require payment.



Tripura RURAL

As part of ASER 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011, in each sampled village, one government school with primary sections was visited on the day of the survey. Information about schools in this report is based on these visits.

School observations

Table 8: Total schools visited 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Type of school	2007	2009	2010	2011
Std I-IV/V: Primary	36	58	44	46
Std I-VII/VIII: Primary + Upper primary	26	44	54	48
Total schools visited	62	102	98	94



Student and teacher attendance

Table 9: Student attendance 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Type of school	2007	2009	2010	2011	2007	2009	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V				Std I-VII/VIII			
% Enrolled children present (average)	75.9	75.3	67.8	67.2	84.5	73.8	62.4	63.3
% Schools with less than 50% enrolled children present (average)	4.8	7.1	17.1	17.4	0.0	7.5	25.9	27.1
% Schools with 75% or more enrolled children present (average)	52.4	51.8	36.6	41.3	86.7	47.5	24.1	27.1

Table 10: Teacher attendance 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Type of school	2007	2009	2010	2011	2007	2009	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V				Std I-VII/VIII			
% Teachers present (average)	85.1	88.8	88.3	86.9	79.5	84.3	81.5	79.0
% Schools with no teachers present (average)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
% Schools with all teachers present (average)	53.6	48.2	52.4	57.8	47.8	41.9	25.5	29.8

Other school information

Table 11: Headteachers 2010 & 2011

% Schools with:	2010	2011	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V		Std I-VII/VIII	
No Headteacher appointed	3.7	14.3	2.4	2.8
Headteacher appointed but not present at time of visit	3.7	8.6	12.2	16.7
Headteacher appointed & present at time of visit	92.6	77.1	85.4	80.6
Total	100	100	100	100

Table 12: Computers 2010 and 2011

% Schools with:	2010	2011	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V		Std I-VII/VIII	
No computer	95.2	93.3	88.5	89.6
Computers but no children using them on day of visit	2.4	6.7	3.9	6.3
Computers & children using them on day of visit	2.4	0.0	7.7	4.2
Total	100	100	100	100

Table 13: Multigrade classes 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

% Schools with:	2007	2009	2010	2011	2007	2009	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V				Std I-VII/VIII			
Std II children sitting with one or more other classes	33.3	30.2	34.2	35.7	30.8	62.5	44.0	54.6
Std IV children sitting with one or more other classes	32.1	28.6	23.5	33.3	28.6	35.1	21.3	50.0

School funds and activities (PAISA)

Table 14: % Schools who report receiving SSA grants - Full financial year

SSA school grants	2008-2009				2009-2010				2010-2011			
	No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools		
		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know
Maintenance grant	79	55.7	34.2	10.1	72	76.4	16.7	6.9	91	61.5	28.6	9.9
Development grant	78	66.7	24.4	9.0	68	63.2	25.0	11.8	88	56.8	31.8	11.4
TLM grant	79	69.6	21.5	8.9	74	82.4	8.1	9.5	91	79.1	11.0	9.9

Table 15: % Schools who report receiving SSA grants - Half financial year

SSA school grants	April 2009 to October 2009				April 2010 to October 2010				April 2011 to October 2011			
	No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools		
		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know
Maintenance grant	57	35.1	45.6	19.3	74	37.8	50.0	12.2	80	18.8	67.5	13.8
Development grant	52	38.5	38.5	23.1	68	36.8	51.5	11.8	78	23.1	61.5	15.4
TLM grant	54	42.6	37.0	20.4	74	48.7	41.9	9.5	79	29.1	57.0	13.9



The PAISA section of ASER tracks receipt and spending of Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) grants at the school level. This information is collected from schools visited during the survey. This page reports proportion of schools receiving the grants and carrying out specified activities in the schools. More detailed analysis of the PAISA data will be available in the PAISA 2011 report which will be released in March 2012.[1]

EVERY RURAL GOVERNMENT PRIMARY SCHOOL IS ENTITLED TO EACH OF THESE SSA GRANTS EVERY YEAR.

How much goes to each school	For what purposes
SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT GRANT / SCHOOL GRANT	
Rs.5000 per year per primary school	This grant can be used for buying school equipment such as blackboard, sitting mats etc. Also for buying chalk, duster, registers and other office equipment.
Rs.7000 per year per upper primary school	
Rs 5000 + Rs 7000 = Rs 12000 if the school is Std I-VII/VIII.	The grant amount varies by type of school: whether it is a primary or upper primary school.
Note: Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same premises.	
SCHOOL MAINTENANCE GRANT	
Rs.5000 - Rs 7500 per school per year if the school has upto 3 classrooms.	This grant can be used for maintenance of school building, including whitewashing; beautification; and repair of toilets, hand pump, boundary wall, playground etc.
Rs 7500 - Rs.10000 per year if the school has more than 3 classrooms.	
Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same building.	The grant amount depends on number of classrooms (excluding Headmaster room and office room)
TLM GRANT	
Rs.500 per teacher per year in primary and upper primary schools.	This grant can be used by teachers to buy teaching aids, such as charts, globes, posters, models etc.

[1] For more information see www.accountabilityinitiative.in

Right to Education indicators

Table 17: Schools by total enrollment 2010 and 2011

School enrollment	2010		2011	
	No. of schools	% of schools	No. of schools	% of schools
1-60	9	9.4	17	18.1
61-90	11	11.5	17	18.1
91-120	8	8.3	12	12.8
121-150	20	20.8	10	10.6
151-200	16	16.7	15	16.0
> 200	32	33.3	23	24.5
TOTAL	96	100.0	94	100.0

Table 18: RTE norms: Pupil-teacher ratio 2010 and 2011

School enrollment	RTE Teacher Norms	2010	2011
		% Schools that do not meet PTR norms	
1-60	2	14.3	0.0
61-90	3	36.4	25.0
91-120	4	42.9	25.0
121-150	5	15.0	40.0
151-200	5 + HM	21.4	30.8
> 200	see note	46.7	31.8
TOTAL		31.5	25.0

Note : For schools with enrollment above 200 children the PTR shall not exceed 40 excluding the Head Teacher

Table 19: Schools by number of teachers 2010 and 2011

Number of teachers	2010		2011	
	No. of schools	% of schools	No. of schools	% of schools
1	4	4.5	1	1.1
2	7	7.9	9	10.0
3	7	7.9	13	14.4
4	3	3.4	7	7.8
5	15	16.9	10	11.1
6	15	16.9	9	10.0
>=7	38	42.7	41	45.6
TOTAL	89	100.0	90	100.0

Table 20: RTE norms: Teacher - classroom ratio 2010 and 2011

RTE norm: At least one classroom per teacher	2010	2011
Number of teachers	% Schools that do not meet classroom to teacher norms	
1	0.0	0.0
2	0.0	0.0
3	25.0	33.3
4	50.0	66.7
5	20.0	37.5
6	50.0	83.3
>=7	56.5	64.5
TOTAL	40.0	53.9

As part of ASER 2010 and 2011, in each sampled village, one government school with primary sections was visited on the day of the survey. During this school visit, RTE indicators were observed and are reported here.

Extracts from the Schedule of The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act 2009 Norms and standards for a School (Sections 19 and 25)

Number of teachers in Std 1-5:

Admitted children	No. of teachers
<= 60	2
61-90	3
91-120	4
121-200	5
> 150	5 + 1 Headteacher
> 200	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (excluding Headteacher) shall not exceed 40

School facilities:
All weather building with:

- At least one classroom for every teacher
- Office cum store cum headteacher's room
- Separate toilets for boys and girls
- Safe and adequate drinking water facility to all children
- A kitchen where mid-day meal is cooked in the school
- Playground
- Arrangements for securing the school building by boundary wall or fencing.

Teaching learning equipment
shall be provided to each class as required.

Library
There shall be a library in each school providing newspaper, magazines and books on all subjects, including story-books.

Table 21: % Schools meeting selected RTE norms on facilities 2010 & 2011

% of schools with		2010	2011
Building	Office/Store/Office cum store	88.8	76.6
	Playground	89.7	78.7
	Boundary Wall	19.0	25.3
Drinking Water	No facility for drinking water	32.6	41.3
	Facility but no drinking water available	27.4	18.5
	Drinking water available	40.0	40.2
Toilet	No toilet facility	8.6	15.4
	Facility but toilet not useable	48.4	53.9
	Toilet useable	43.0	30.8
Girls Toilet	% Schools with no separate provisions for girls toilets	48.5	35.9
	Of schools with separate girls toilets, % schools where		
	Toilet locked	15.2	28.1
	Toilet not useable	6.1	14.1
	Toilet useable	30.3	21.9
TLM	Teaching learning material in Std 2	52.7	35.6
	Teaching learning material in Std 4	32.3	35.9
Library	No library	64.6	71.7
	Library but no books being used by children on day of visit	15.6	4.4
	Library being used by children on day of visit	19.8	23.9
MDM	Kitchen shed for cooking midday meal	88.4	90.4
	Midday meal served in school on the day of visit	75.3	96.8

Note: School observations for ASER 2011 looked at TLM for Std II and Std IV only.



Uttarakhand RURAL

Annual Status of Education Report
ASER 2011 RURAL
Facilitated by PRATHAM

ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM HOUSEHOLDS. 12 OUT OF 13 DISTRICTS


School enrollment and out of school children

Table 1: % Children in different types of schools 2011

Age group	Govt.	Pvt.	Other	Not in School	Total
Age: 6-14 ALL	66.5	31.3	1.1	1.1	100
Age: 7-16 ALL	68.6	28.5	1.1	1.8	100
Age: 7-10 ALL	62.9	35.2	1.2	0.7	100
Age: 7-10 BOYS	58.5	39.5	1.1	0.8	100
Age: 7-10 GIRLS	67.9	30.2	1.3	0.6	100
Age: 11-14 ALL	71.3	26.2	1.0	1.5	100
Age: 11-14 BOYS	66.1	31.2	1.0	1.8	100
Age: 11-14 GIRLS	77.0	20.7	1.1	1.2	100
Age: 15-16 ALL	76.9	16.8	0.9	5.4	100
Age: 15-16 BOYS	74.2	20.5	0.6	4.7	100
Age: 15-16 GIRLS	79.8	12.9	1.2	6.2	100

Note: 'OTHER' includes children going to madarssa and EGS.
'NOT IN SCHOOL' = dropped out + never enrolled.

Chart 1: Trends over time
% Children out of school by age group and gender 2006-2011



How to read this chart: For example, the proportion of girls (age 11-14) not in school has changed from 3.4% in 2006 to 4.1% in 2007 to 2.7% in 2008 to 3% in 2009 to 4% in 2010 to 1.2% in 2011

Chart 2: Trends over time
% Children enrolled in private school by class 2007, 2009 & 2011




Table 2: Sample description
% Children in each class by age 2011

Std.	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	Total
I	31.2	37.8	19.5	7.6	3.9								100
II	5.6	19.2	36.8	24.2	8.4	5.8							100
III	6.7		15.3	37.2	23.0	10.6	7.1						100
IV	5.2			18.6	33.7	26.3	8.7	7.4					100
V	7.3				9.5	37.4	25.7	11.9	8.2				100
VI	6.8					13.0	34.4	30.9	8.6	6.3			100
VII	5.3						12.0	37.1	27.7	12.0	5.8		100
VIII	4.4							14.6	36.0	25.6	12.6	6.9	100


How to read this table: If a child started school in Std I at age 6, she should be age 8 in Std 3. This table shows the age distribution for each class. For example, in Std III, 37.2% children are 8 years old but there are also 15.3% who are 7, 23.0 % who are 9, 10.6 % who are 10 years old, etc.

Young children in pre-school and school

Table 3: % Children age 5-6 who are enrolled in different types of pre-school & school 2011

	In balwadi or anganwadi	In LKG/ UKG	In School			Not enrolled anywhere	Total
			Govt	Pvt	Other		
Age 5	17.9	13.5	36.0	29.1	1.2	2.3	100
Age 6	3.2	7.3	55.9	31.9	0.7	1.1	100

Chart 3: Trends over time
Five year olds in pre-school & school 2007, 2009 & 2011



Reading

Table 4: % Children by class and READING level
All schools 2011

Std.	Nothing	Letter	Word	Level 1 (Std 1 Text)	Level 2 (Std 2 Text)	Total
I	29.7	40.8	19.0	4.9	5.6	100
II	12.5	34.5	28.6	10.7	13.6	100
III	5.7	18.0	28.9	21.4	26.1	100
IV	3.5	12.0	18.8	23.1	42.7	100
V	2.4	5.9	11.5	22.2	58.0	100
VI	1.0	3.4	4.6	17.7	73.3	100
VII	0.2	3.2	2.9	10.6	83.1	100
VIII	0.3	0.8	2.7	8.3	87.9	100
Total	7.4	15.7	15.4	15.1	46.4	100

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, 5.7% children cannot even read letters, 18% can read letters but not more, 28.9% can read words but not Std 1 text or higher, 21.4% can read Std 1 text but not Std 2 level text, and 26.1% can read Std 2 level text. In sum, for each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is 100%.

Reading Tool




Chart 4: Trends over time
% Children in Std III who CANNOT READ Std I LEVEL TEXT
By school type 2008-2011





Chart 5: Trends over time
% Children in Std V who CANNOT READ Std II LEVEL TEXT
By school type 2008-2011



Home language and school language

Table 5: School language and home language

% Children whose :	%
Home language is the same as school language	33.5
Home language is different from school language	66.6
Total	100.0

Note : In ASER 2011 for every state, reading tools were provided in the main medium of instruction in government schools. Children and their families were also asked about the language they speak at home. For home languages, a list of 122 languages was provided to all survey teams. This list includes 22 Scheduled languages and 100 Non-Scheduled languages. The data in this table is for children for whom we have information for both school language and home language.



Arithmetic

Table 6: % Children by class and ARITHMETIC level
All schools 2011

Std.	Nothing	Recognize Numbers		Subtract	Divide	Total
		1-9	11-99			
I	31.6	40.3	22.4	4.8	1.0	100
II	12.6	37.7	33.8	12.4	3.7	100
III	5.3	23.7	40.0	21.6	9.4	100
IV	2.6	15.7	28.6	32.5	20.6	100
V	2.0	8.3	20.6	35.4	33.9	100
VI	1.1	5.0	16.7	32.0	45.2	100
VII	0.4	3.3	14.1	21.5	60.7	100
VIII	0.4	1.7	9.7	22.5	65.7	100
Total	7.5	17.8	23.9	22.7	28.1	100

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level of arithmetic achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, 5.3% children cannot even recognize numbers 1-9, 23.7% children can recognize numbers up to 9 but not more, 40% can recognize numbers to 99 but cannot do subtraction, 21.6% can do subtraction but not division, and 9.4% can do division. In sum, for each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is 100%.

Math Tool



Chart 6: Trends over time
% Children in Std III who CANNOT RECOGNISE NUMBERS upto 100. By school type 2008-2011





Chart 7: Trends over time
% Children in Std V who CANNOT DO DIVISION
By school type 2008-2011



Tuition

Table 7: Class-wise % children attending PAID TUITION CLASSES
By school type 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Year	School	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	Total
2007	Govt	3.6	4.8	3.7	4.8	4.2	5.1	3.5	8.8	4.6
	Pvt	13.2	17.9	21.3	18.5	19.3	20.7	26.4	24.6	18.9
2009	Govt	4.8	2.8	5.5	5.2	6.5	7.3	7.5	8.4	6.0
	Pvt	17.5	22.4	28.0	36.4	35.0	41.5	28.4	42.7	29.5
2010	Govt	3.9	6.1	5.7	6.9	7.5	5.3	8.2	8.8	6.6
	Pvt	19.1	24.8	26.0	27.7	26.1	35.0	26.5	30.9	26.2
2011	Govt	4.8	4.8	5.3	5.9	6.7	7.5	6.9	10.5	6.6
	Pvt	25.5	22.4	31.1	36.3	37.9	31.0	44.7	38.4	32.3

Note: In 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011 the ASER survey recorded information about tuition. In all 4 years, the question asked was the following: "Does the child take any paid additional class currently?" Therefore, these numbers do not include any supplemental help in learning that children may have received from parents, siblings or from anyone else who did not require payment.



Uttarakhand RURAL

As part of ASER 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011, in each sampled village, one government school with primary sections was visited on the day of the survey. Information about schools in this report is based on these visits.

School observations

Table 8: Total schools visited 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Type of school	2007	2009	2010	2011
Std I-IV/V: Primary	316	347	321	285
Std I-VII/VIII: Primary + Upper primary	16	7	16	12
Total schools visited	332	354	337	297



Student and teacher attendance

Table 9: Student attendance 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Type of school	2007	2009	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V			
% Enrolled children present (average)	85.6	84.3	89.5	82.5
% Schools with less than 50% enrolled children present (average)	4.8	0.9	1.6	5.4
% Schools with 75% or more enrolled children present (average)	78.8	79.4	89.3	76.0

Table 10: Teacher attendance 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Type of school	2007	2009	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V			
% Teachers present (average)	91.6	94.5	91.2	92.0
% Schools with no teachers present (average)	0.4	0.3	0.0	0.0
% Schools with all teachers present (average)	81.3	84.8	77.9	82.0

Other school information

Table 11: Headteachers 2010 & 2011

% Schools with:	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V	
No Headteacher appointed	2.3	0.5
Headteacher appointed but not present at time of visit	12.6	10.0
Headteacher appointed & present at time of visit	85.1	89.5
Total	100	100

Table 12: Computers 2010 and 2011

% Schools with:	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V	
No computer	93.6	94.2
Computers but no children using them on day of visit	5.1	4.4
Computers & children using them on day of visit	1.3	1.5
Total	100	100

Table 13: Multigrade classes 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

% Schools with:	2007	2009	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V			
Std II children sitting with one or more other classes	67.7	60.9	60.5	71.4
Std IV children sitting with one or more other classes	60.9	55.8	55.6	64.2

School funds and activities (PAISA)

Table 14: % Schools who report receiving SSA grants - Full financial year

SSA school grants	2008-2009				2009-2010				2010-2011			
	No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools		
		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know
Maintenance grant	316	84.5	10.4	5.1	315	85.1	6.7	8.3	287	76.0	15.7	8.4
Development grant	314	83.8	12.1	4.1	291	82.5	8.9	8.6	278	67.3	21.2	11.5
TLM grant	333	94.3	2.7	3.0	294	87.1	6.1	6.8	284	86.6	8.8	4.6

Table 15: % Schools who report receiving SSA grants - Half financial year

SSA school grants	April 2009 to October 2009				April 2010 to October 2010				April 2011 to October 2011			
	No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools		
		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know
Maintenance grant	275	69.8	22.9	7.3	287	33.1	52.3	14.6	267	59.9	28.1	12.0
Development grant	275	72.7	20.7	6.6	277	31.4	54.2	14.4	258	55.8	30.6	13.6
TLM grant	294	86.4	8.5	5.1	278	50.0	38.5	11.5	260	60.8	29.6	9.6

Table 16: % Schools carrying out different activities since April 2011

Type of Activity		% schools		
		Yes	No	Don't know
Const.	New Classroom	17.5	79.4	3.2
Repairs	Repair of building (roof, floor, wall etc.)	41.9	55.9	2.2
	Repair of doors & windows	42.1	55.8	2.1
	Repair of boundary wall	24.6	73.2	2.2
	Repair of drinking water facility	37.3	60.5	2.2
	Repair of toilet	36.2	61.6	2.2
Painting & White Wash	White wash/plastering	55.0	41.6	3.4
	Painting Blackboard/Display Board/Painting on wall	54.5	42.7	2.9
	Painting of doors & walls	49.8	46.5	3.7
Purchase	Purchase of furniture (cupboard etc.)	46.5	50.4	3.2
	Purchase of electrical fittings	24.6	73.6	1.8
	Purchase of chalk, duster, register etc.	82.1	14.3	3.6
	Purchase of sitting Mats/Tat Patti	63.1	33.2	3.7
	Purchase of charts, globes & other teaching material	68.0	28.4	3.6
Other	Expenditure on school events	58.5	36.0	5.5
	Payment of bills (electricity, water, cleaning etc.)	24.1	69.7	6.1

The PAISA section of ASER tracks receipt and spending of Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) grants at the school level. This information is collected from schools visited during the survey. This page reports proportion of schools receiving the grants and carrying out specified activities in the schools. More detailed analysis of the PAISA data will be available in the PAISA 2011 report which will be released in March 2012.[1]

EVERY RURAL GOVERNMENT PRIMARY SCHOOL IS ENTITLED TO EACH OF THESE SSA GRANTS EVERY YEAR.

How much goes to each school	For what purposes
SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT GRANT / SCHOOL GRANT	
Rs.5000 per year per primary school	This grant can be used for buying school equipment such as blackboard, sitting mats etc. Also for buying chalk, duster, registers and other office equipment.
Rs.7000 per year per upper primary school	
Rs 5000 + Rs 7000 = Rs 12000 if the school is Std I-VII/VIII.	The grant amount varies by type of school: whether it is a primary or upper primary school.
Note: Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same premises.	
SCHOOL MAINTENANCE GRANT	
Rs.5000 - Rs 7500 per school per year if the school has upto 3 classrooms.	This grant can be used for maintenance of school building, including whitewashing; beautification; and repair of toilets, hand pump, boundary wall, playground etc. The grant amount depends on number of classrooms (excluding Headmaster room and office room)
Rs 7500 - Rs.10000 per year if the school has more than 3 classrooms.	
Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same building.	
TLM GRANT	
Rs.500 per teacher per year in primary and upper primary schools.	This grant can be used by teachers to buy teaching aids, such as charts, globes, posters, models etc.

[1] For more information see www.accountabilityinitiative.in

Right to Education indicators

Table 17: Schools by total enrollment 2010 and 2011

School enrollment	2010		2011	
	No. of schools	% of schools	No. of schools	% of schools
1-60	229	69.0	202	69.4
61-90	41	12.4	28	9.6
91-120	15	4.5	15	5.2
121-150	14	4.2	13	4.5
151-200	12	3.6	14	4.8
> 200	21	6.3	19	6.5
TOTAL	332	100.0	291	100.0

Table 18: RTE norms: Pupil-teacher ratio 2010 and 2011

School enrollment	RTE Teacher Norms	2010	2011
		% Schools that do not meet PTR norms	
1-60	2	84.3	78.8
61-90	3	90.9	94.7
91-120	4	84.6	100.0
121-150	5	92.3	83.3
151-200	5 + HM	100.0	100.0
> 200	see note	84.2	88.9
TOTAL		86.3	83.7

Note : For schools with enrollment above 200 children the PTR shall not exceed 40 excluding the Head Teacher

Table 19: Schools by number of teachers 2010 and 2011

Number of teachers	2010		2011	
	No. of schools	% of schools	No. of schools	% of schools
1	155	62.5	120	60.6
2	47	19.0	42	21.2
3	18	7.3	10	5.1
4	9	3.6	12	6.1
5	5	2.0	2	1.0
6	5	2.0	3	1.5
>=7	9	3.6	9	4.6
TOTAL	248	100.0	198	100.0

Table 20: RTE norms: Teacher - classroom ratio 2010 and 2011

RTE norm: At least one classroom per teacher	2010	2011
Number of teachers	% Schools that do not meet classroom to teacher norms	
1	2.9	3.4
2	9.1	12.0
3	28.6	50.0
4	37.5	55.6
5	100.0	0.0
6	100.0	0.0
>=7	66.7	100.0
TOTAL	12.6	15.3

Table 21: % Schools meeting selected RTE norms on facilities 2010 & 2011

% of schools with		2010	2011
Building	Office/Store/Office cum store	87.9	83.0
	Playground	67.4	67.8
	Boundary Wall	67.0	61.1
Drinking Water	No facility for drinking water	22.1	19.3
	Facility but no drinking water available	9.7	12.5
	Drinking water available	68.3	68.2
Toilet	No toilet facility	5.8	4.9
	Facility but toilet not useable	40.9	35.4
	Toilet useable	53.4	59.7
Girls Toilet	% Schools with no separate provisions for girls toilets	47.7	14.1
	Of schools with separate girls toilets, % schools where		
	Toilet locked	11.5	13.2
	Toilet not useable	16.9	19.4
	Toilet useable	24.0	53.3
TLM	Teaching learning material in Std 2	82.4	87.3
	Teaching learning material in Std 4	79.1	82.1
Library	No library	52.3	17.7
	Library but no books being used by children on day of visit	27.2	41.8
	Library being used by children on day of visit	20.4	40.5
MDM	Kitchen shed for cooking midday meal	96.3	94.2
	Midday meal served in school on the day of visit	95.1	93.2

Note: School observations for ASER 2011 looked at TLM for Std II and Std IV only.

As part of ASER 2010 and 2011, in each sampled village, one government school with primary sections was visited on the day of the survey. During this school visit, RTE indicators were observed and are reported here.

Extracts from the Schedule of The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act 2009 Norms and standards for a School (Sections 19 and 25)

Number of teachers in Std 1-5:

Admitted children	No. of teachers
<= 60	2
61-90	3
91-120	4
121-200	5
> 150	5 + 1 Headteacher
> 200	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (excluding Headteacher) shall not exceed 40

School facilities:
All weather building with:

- At least one classroom for every teacher
- Office cum store cum headteacher's room
- Separate toilets for boys and girls
- Safe and adequate drinking water facility to all children
- A kitchen where mid-day meal is cooked in the school
- Playground
- Arrangements for securing the school building by boundary wall or fencing.

Teaching learning equipment
shall be provided to each class as required.

Library
There shall be a library in each school providing newspaper, magazines and books on all subjects, including story-books.




Uttar Pradesh
West Bengal
Daman and Diu
Puducherry



Uttar Pradesh RURAL

Annual Status of Education Report
असर ASER 2011 RURAL
Facilitated by PRATHAM

ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM HOUSEHOLDS. 68 OUT OF 69 DISTRICTS


School enrollment and out of school children

Table 1: % Children in different types of schools 2011

Age group	Govt.	Pvt.	Other	Not in School	Total
Age: 6-14 ALL	46.0	45.4	2.5	6.1	100
Age: 7-16 ALL	43.2	45.9	2.2	8.6	100
Age: 7-10 ALL	48.9	44.7	2.9	3.5	100
Age: 7-10 BOYS	44.8	49.5	2.3	3.4	100
Age: 7-10 GIRLS	53.8	38.9	3.6	3.7	100
Age: 11-14 ALL	42.1	47.5	1.9	8.5	100
Age: 11-14 BOYS	39.0	51.9	1.7	7.4	100
Age: 11-14 GIRLS	45.7	42.4	2.2	9.7	100
Age: 15-16 ALL	31.3	45.7	1.1	21.9	100
Age: 15-16 BOYS	31.4	47.4	0.9	20.3	100
Age: 15-16 GIRLS	31.2	43.7	1.4	23.7	100

Note: 'OTHER' includes children going to madarssa and EGS.
'NOT IN SCHOOL' = dropped out + never enrolled.

Chart 1: Trends over time
% Children out of school by age group and gender 2006-2011



How to read this chart: For example, the proportion of girls (age 11-14) not in school has changed from 11.1% in 2006 to 8.4% in 2007 to 10.2% in 2008 to 9.5% in 2009 to 9.7% in 2010 to 9.7% in 2011

Chart 2: Trends over time
% Children enrolled in private school by class 2007, 2009 & 2011




Table 2: Sample description
% Children in each class by age 2011

Std.	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	Total
I	27.0	35.0	17.7	11.1	9.2								100
II	4.3	13.7	30.9	26.4	9.2	9.6	6.0						100
III	5.4		11.6	35.0	18.7	16.0	5.0	5.5	2.9				100
IV	6.0			15.0	26.7	27.4	9.8	9.7	5.5				100
V	1.7			6.2	9.3	35.1	19.7	16.6	5.3	6.1			100
VI	5.6					15.7	27.9	30.4	10.3	6.3	3.9		100
VII	1.8					6.5	10.3	38.5	22.2	13.4	5.4	1.8	100
VIII	6.1							17.3	33.3	25.5	13.0	4.9	100


How to read this table: If a child started school in Std I at age 6, she should be age 8 in Std 3. This table shows the age distribution for each class. For example, in Std III, 35% children are 8 years old but there are also 11.6% who are 7, 18.7 % who are 9, 16.0% who are 10 years old, etc.

Young children in pre-school and school

Table 3: % Children age 5-6 who are enrolled in different types of pre-school & school 2011

	In balwadi or anganwadi	In LKG/ UKG	In School			Not enrolled anywhere	Total
			Govt	Pvt	Other		
Age 5	7.9	8.2	33.9	31.1	2.7	16.2	100
Age 6	2.4	5.9	44.4	37.0	2.8	7.7	100

Chart 3: Trends over time
Five year olds in pre-school & school 2007, 2009 & 2011



Uttar Pradesh RURAL

Reading

Table 4: % Children by class and READING level
All schools 2011

Std.	Nothing	Letter	Word	Level 1 (Std 1 Text)	Level 2 (Std 2 Text)	Total
I	47.4	37.3	9.4	3.3	2.7	100
II	22.5	39.7	20.0	8.7	9.1	100
III	13.7	30.6	22.4	15.1	18.3	100
IV	8.3	22.7	19.9	17.9	31.2	100
V	6.3	16.1	15.2	19.2	43.3	100
VI	2.8	11.1	10.1	17.5	58.5	100
VII	2.3	8.2	7.2	15.2	67.1	100
VIII	1.8	5.6	5.0	11.3	76.4	100
Total	16.5	24.1	14.1	12.7	32.6	100

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, 13.7% children cannot even read letters, 30.6% can read letters but not more, 22.4% can read words but not Std 1 text or higher, 15.1% can read Std 1 text but not Std 2 level text, and 18.3% can read Std 2 level text. In sum, for each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is 100%.

Reading Tool




Chart 4: Trends over time
% Children in Std III who CANNOT READ Std I LEVEL TEXT
By school type 2008-2011





Chart 5: Trends over time
% Children in Std V who CANNOT READ Std II LEVEL TEXT
By school type 2008-2011



Home language and school language

Table 5: School language and home language

% Children whose :	%
Home language is the same as school language	93.9
Home language is different from school language	6.1
Total	100.0

Note : In ASER 2011 for every state, reading tools were provided in the main medium of instruction in government schools. Children and their families were also asked about the language they speak at home. For home languages, a list of 122 languages was provided to all survey teams. This list includes 22 Scheduled languages and 100 Non-Scheduled languages. The data in this table is for children for whom we have information for both school language and home language.



Arithmetic

Table 6: % Children by class and ARITHMETIC level
All schools 2011

Std.	Nothing	Recognize Numbers		Subtract	Divide	Total
		1-9	11-99			
I	45.0	40.9	11.1	2.3	0.7	100
II	20.1	45.2	24.2	8.5	2.0	100
III	11.5	36.8	29.8	15.5	6.4	100
IV	6.5	28.5	30.1	21.8	13.2	100
V	4.3	21.1	27.0	26.3	21.4	100
VI	2.3	14.2	24.1	29.6	29.8	100
VII	1.9	10.3	21.2	29.7	36.8	100
VIII	1.4	7.1	19.0	27.5	45.0	100
Total	14.8	28.4	22.8	17.9	16.1	100

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level of arithmetic achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, 11.5% children cannot even recognize numbers 1-9, 36.8% children can recognize numbers up to 9 but not more, 29.8% can recognize numbers to 99 but cannot do subtraction, 15.5% can do subtraction but not division, and 6.4% can do division. In sum, for each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is 100%.

Math Tool



Chart 6: Trends over time
% Children in Std III who CANNOT RECOGNISE NUMBERS upto 100. By school type 2008-2011





Chart 7: Trends over time
% Children in Std V who CANNOT DO DIVISION
By school type 2008-2011



Tuition

Table 7: Class-wise % children attending PAID TUITION CLASSES
By school type 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Year	School	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	Total
2007	Govt	3.8	4.1	4.6	5.8	6.4	7.3	9.0	11.5	5.8
	Pvt	11.6	15.1	17.0	17.3	19.5	20.1	21.9	24.5	18.0
2009	Govt	5.2	5.9	5.9	6.4	7.3	8.4	9.4	11.8	7.0
	Pvt	12.8	15.4	18.6	19.6	21.0	19.2	20.7	24.8	18.5
2010	Govt	3.8	4.5	5.1	5.0	7.6	7.3	8.4	9.0	5.9
	Pvt	10.1	12.4	14.5	16.2	16.8	16.4	17.9	18.9	15.0
2011	Govt	3.7	4.6	4.8	5.8	6.2	8.1	9.2	10.1	6.1
	Pvt	11.5	13.0	13.5	14.8	16.1	15.4	15.6	19.2	14.5

Note: In 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011 the ASER survey recorded information about tuition. In all 4 years, the question asked was the following: "Does the child take any paid additional class currently?" Therefore, these numbers do not include any supplemental help in learning that children may have received from parents, siblings or from anyone else who did not require payment.



Uttar Pradesh RURAL

Annual Status of Education Report
असर ASER 2011 RURAL
Facilitated by PRATHAM

As part of ASER 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011, in each sampled village, one government school with primary sections was visited on the day of the survey. Information about schools in this report is based on these visits.

School observations

Table 8: Total schools visited 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Type of school	2007	2009	2010	2011
Std I-IV/V: Primary	1885	1799	1633	1601
Std I-VII/VIII: Primary + Upper primary	99	90	263	299
Total schools visited	1984	1889	1896	1900



Student and teacher attendance

Table 9: Student attendance 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Type of school	2007	2009	2010	2011	2007	2009	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V				Std I-VII/VIII			
% Enrolled children present (average)	64.4	59.7	57.6	57.3	64.5	61.7	57.6	57.2
% Schools with less than 50% enrolled children present (average)	19.8	27.0	30.5	33.2	22.7	20.2	26.6	28.1
% Schools with 75% or more enrolled children present (average)	31.0	20.4	17.4	16.7	35.1	20.2	11.8	13.4

Table 10: Teacher attendance 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Type of school	2007	2009	2010	2011	2007	2009	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V				Std I-VII/VIII			
% Teachers present (average)	92.0	89.3	81.0	82.1	90.8	85.8	79.8	83.8
% Schools with no teachers present (average)	0.1	0.1	0.6	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
% Schools with all teachers present (average)	75.8	69.9	53.1	55.7	70.7	60.5	46.9	54.0

Other school information

Table 11: Headteachers 2010 & 2011

% Schools with:	2010	2011	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V		Std I-VII/VIII	
No Headteacher appointed	5.4	7.6	4.8	7.4
Headteacher appointed but not present at time of visit	26.0	18.7	24.7	17.0
Headteacher appointed & present at time of visit	68.6	73.7	70.6	75.6
Total	100	100	100	100

Table 12: Computers 2010 and 2011

% Schools with:	2010	2011	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V		Std I-VII/VIII	
No computer	98.8	98.8	97.0	97.0
Computers but no children using them on day of visit	0.8	1.1	3.0	2.4
Computers & children using them on day of visit	0.4	0.1	0.0	0.7
Total	100	100	100	100

Table 13: Multigrade classes 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

% Schools with:	2007	2009	2010	2011	2007	2009	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V				Std I-VII/VIII			
Std II children sitting with one or more other classes	42.7	50.1	51.4	53.8	44.4	43.2	48.4	55.9
Std IV children sitting with one or more other classes	43.1	50.0	46.5	51.8	42.6	40.0	42.0	49.7

School funds and activities (PAISA)

Table 14: % Schools who report receiving SSA grants - Full financial year

SSA school grants	2008-2009				2009-2010				2010-2011			
	No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools		
		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know
Maintenance grant	1750	66.0	11.6	22.4	1799	68.0	5.2	26.8	1884	80.2	6.2	13.7
Development grant	1715	59.1	16.2	24.7	1763	62.3	9.5	28.2	1880	72.3	12.8	14.9
TLM grant	1759	75.0	10.0	15.0	1733	74.6	7.0	18.4	1883	80.5	9.9	9.6

Table 15: % Schools who report receiving SSA grants - Half financial year

SSA school grants	April 2009 to October 2009				April 2010 to October 2010				April 2011 to October 2011			
	No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools		
		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know
Maintenance grant	1592	42.6	31.0	26.4	1759	37.0	30.2	32.8	1870	54.1	28.8	17.1
Development grant	1567	37.1	34.8	28.1	1736	32.8	32.5	34.7	1861	46.2	35.1	18.7
TLM grant	1608	51.6	29.4	19.0	1705	38.1	34.7	27.2	1862	39.3	45.8	15.0

Table 16: % Schools carrying out different activities since April 2011

Type of Activity		% schools		
		Yes	No	Don't know
Const.	New Classroom	15.5	78.2	6.3
Repairs	Repair of building (roof, floor, wall etc.)	38.4	55.7	5.9
	Repair of doors & windows	41.1	53.1	5.8
	Repair of boundary wall	26.3	67.9	5.8
	Repair of drinking water facility	43.1	51.7	5.2
	Repair of toilet	28.0	66.5	5.5
Painting & White Wash	White wash/plastering	83.7	11.8	4.5
	Painting Blackboard/Display Board/Painting on wall	78.2	17.2	4.6
	Painting of doors & walls	79.7	15.8	4.5
Purchase	Purchase of furniture (cupboard etc.)	44.8	48.8	6.4
	Purchase of electrical fittings	34.5	59.7	5.8
	Purchase of chalk, duster, register etc.	88.4	7.0	4.6
	Purchase of sitting Mats/Tat Patti	80.2	15.0	4.8
	Purchase of charts, globes & other teaching material	73.7	21.0	5.4
Other	Expenditure on school events	65.8	27.3	6.9
	Payment of bills (electricity, water, cleaning etc.)	16.9	72.9	10.2

The PAISA section of ASER tracks receipt and spending of Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) grants at the school level. This information is collected from schools visited during the survey. This page reports proportion of schools receiving the grants and carrying out specified activities in the schools. More detailed analysis of the PAISA data will be available in the PAISA 2011 report which will be released in March 2012.[1]

EVERY RURAL GOVERNMENT PRIMARY SCHOOL IS ENTITLED TO EACH OF THESE SSA GRANTS EVERY YEAR.

How much goes to each school	For what purposes
SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT GRANT / SCHOOL GRANT	
Rs.5000 per year per primary school	This grant can be used for buying school equipment such as blackboard, sitting mats etc. Also for buying chalk, duster, registers and other office equipment.
Rs.7000 per year per upper primary school	
Rs 5000 + Rs 7000 = Rs 12000 if the school is Std I-VII/VIII.	The grant amount varies by type of school: whether it is a primary or upper primary school.
Note: Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same premises.	
SCHOOL MAINTENANCE GRANT	
Rs.5000 - Rs 7500 per school per year if the school has upto 3 classrooms.	This grant can be used for maintenance of school building, including whitewashing; beautification; and repair of toilets, hand pump, boundary wall, playground etc. The grant amount depends on number of classrooms (excluding Headmaster room and office room)
Rs 7500 - Rs.10000 per year if the school has more than 3 classrooms.	
Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same building.	
TLM GRANT	
Rs.500 per teacher per year in primary and upper primary schools.	This grant can be used by teachers to buy teaching aids, such as charts, globes, posters, models etc.

[1] For more information see www.accountabilityinitiative.in

Uttar Pradesh RURAL

Annual Status of Education Report
असर ASER 2011 RURAL
Facilitated by PRATHAM

Right to Education indicators

As part of ASER 2010 and 2011, in each sampled village, one government school with primary sections was visited on the day of the survey. During this school visit, RTE indicators were observed and are reported here.

Table 17: Schools by total enrollment 2010 and 2011

School enrollment	2010		2011	
	No. of schools	% of schools	No. of schools	% of schools
1-60	87	4.6	108	5.7
61-90	188	9.9	215	11.3
91-120	300	15.9	334	17.6
121-150	306	16.2	316	16.6
151-200	404	21.4	346	18.2
> 200	606	32.1	580	30.5
TOTAL	1891	100.0	1899	100.0

Table 18: RTE norms: Pupil-teacher ratio 2010 and 2011

School enrollment	RTE Teacher Norms	2010	2011
		% Schools that do not meet PTR norms	
1-60	2	19.8	19.6
61-90	3	50.3	51.9
91-120	4	77.6	81.4
121-150	5	93.8	95.5
151-200	5 + HM	89.9	91.5
> 200	see note	97.7	96.7
TOTAL		83.9	83.5

Note : For schools with enrollment above 200 children the PTR shall not exceed 40 excluding the Head Teacher

Table 19: Schools by number of teachers 2010 and 2011

Number of teachers	2010		2011	
	No. of schools	% of schools	No. of schools	% of schools
1	132	7.1	130	7.0
2	556	29.9	625	33.6
3	620	33.4	603	32.4
4	345	18.6	324	17.4
5	112	6.0	93	5.0
6	50	2.7	44	2.4
>=7	44	2.4	40	2.2
TOTAL	1859	100.0	1859	100.0

Table 20: RTE norms: Teacher - classroom ratio 2010 and 2011

RTE norm: At least one classroom per teacher	2010	2011
Number of teachers	% Schools that do not meet classroom to teacher norms	
1	0.0	2.5
2	5.0	6.7
3	15.4	18.1
4	33.4	35.0
5	37.6	37.2
6	60.5	76.9
>=7	65.9	72.2
TOTAL	18.4	19.7

Extracts from the Schedule of The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act 2009 Norms and standards for a School (Sections 19 and 25)

Number of teachers in Std 1-5:

- Admitted children — No. of teachers
  - <= 60 — 2
  - 61-90 — 3
  - 91-120 — 4
  - 121-200 — 5
  - > 150 — 5 + 1 Headteacher
  - > 200 — Pupil-Teacher Ratio (excluding Headteacher) shall not exceed 40

School facilities:
All weather building with:

- At least one classroom for every teacher
- Office cum store cum headteacher's room
- Separate toilets for boys and girls
- Safe and adequate drinking water facility to all children
- A kitchen where mid-day meal is cooked in the school
- Playground
- Arrangements for securing the school building by boundary wall or fencing.


Teaching learning equipment
shall be provided to each class as required.

Library
There shall be a library in each school providing newspaper, magazines and books on all subjects, including story-books.

Table 21: % Schools meeting selected RTE norms on facilities 2010 & 2011

% of schools with		2010	2011
Building	Office/Store/Office cum store	88.6	88.1
	Playground	60.8	71.1
	Boundary Wall	44.4	57.9
Drinking Water	No facility for drinking water	6.9	5.4
	Facility but no drinking water available	10.9	10.2
	Drinking water available	82.2	84.4
Toilet	No toilet facility	6.7	7.4
	Facility but toilet not useable	45.9	38.8
	Toilet useable	47.4	53.9
Girls Toilet	% Schools with no separate provisions for girls toilets	24.9	16.6
	Of schools with separate girls toilets, % schools where		
	Toilet locked	25.3	19.1
	Toilet not useable	15.9	16.9
	Toilet useable	33.9	47.4
TLM	Teaching learning material in Std 2	73.5	79.0
	Teaching learning material in Std 4	69.6	74.2
Library	No library	51.4	22.9
	Library but no books being used by children on day of visit	25.8	39.9
	Library being used by children on day of visit	22.9	37.2
MDM	Kitchen shed for cooking midday meal	89.3	94.7
	Midday meal served in school on the day of visit	71.2	95.0

Note: School observations for ASER 2011 looked at TLM for Std II and Std IV only.



West Bengal RURAL

Annual Status of Education Report
असर ASER 2011 RURAL
Facilitated by PRATHAM

ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM HOUSEHOLDS. 17 OUT OF 17 DISTRICTS


School enrollment and out of school children

Table 1: % Children in different types of schools 2011

Age group	Govt.	Pvt.	Other	Not in School	Total
Age: 6-14 ALL	87.8	6.3	1.6	4.3	100
Age: 7-16 ALL	86.8	5.0	1.6	6.6	100
Age: 7-10 ALL	87.3	9.0	1.5	2.2	100
Age: 7-10 BOYS	86.3	9.8	1.6	2.4	100
Age: 7-10 GIRLS	88.3	8.3	1.4	2.0	100
Age: 11-14 ALL	89.6	2.4	1.7	6.3	100
Age: 11-14 BOYS	87.3	2.4	1.9	8.4	100
Age: 11-14 GIRLS	91.9	2.4	1.5	4.3	100
Age: 15-16 ALL	79.4	2.0	1.6	17.0	100
Age: 15-16 BOYS	76.5	2.0	1.8	19.7	100
Age: 15-16 GIRLS	82.6	2.0	1.3	14.2	100

Note: 'OTHER' includes children going to madarssa and EGS.
'NOT IN SCHOOL' = dropped out + never enrolled.

Chart 1: Trends over time
% Children out of school by age group and gender 2006-2011



How to read this chart: For example, the proportion of girls (age 11-14) not in school has changed from 12.1% in 2006 to 8.3% in 2007 to 7.7% in 2008 to 8.5% in 2009 to 5.5% in 2010 to 4.3% in 2011

Chart 2: Trends over time
% Children enrolled in private school by class 2007, 2009 & 2011




Table 2: Sample description
% Children in each class by age 2011

Std.	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	Total
I	30.0	37.4	19.0	7.4	6.3								100
II	4.2	17.2	40.5	24.2	6.1	7.9							100
III	3.9		15.6	39.3	24.6	10.9	5.7						100
IV	3.8			13.6	32.6	29.7	8.3	6.8	5.2				100
V	14.2					35.7	27.7	13.8	8.6				100
VI	3.8					11.4	27.7	31.9	13.9	6.8	4.5		100
VII	2.6						9.8	32.0	31.3	15.1	9.2		100
VIII	2.6							11.8	33.4	32.5	14.6	5.1	100


How to read this table: If a child started school in Std I at age 6, she should be age 8 in Std 3. This table shows the age distribution for each class. For example, in Std III, 39.3% children are 8 years old but there are also 15.6% who are 7, 24.6% who are 9, 10.9% who are 10 years old, etc.

Young children in pre-school and school

Table 3: % Children age 5-6 who are enrolled in different types of pre-school & school 2011

	In balwadi or anganwadi	In LKG/ UKG	In School			Not enrolled anywhere	Total
			Govt	Pvt	Other		
Age 5	30.4	11.1	41.6	7.6	2.1	7.1	100
Age 6	10.7	6.5	66.7	11.1	1.3	3.7	100

Chart 3: Trends over time
Five year olds in pre-school & school 2007, 2009 & 2011



West Bengal RURAL

Reading

Table 4: % Children by class and READING level
All schools 2011

Std.	Nothing	Letter	Word	Level 1 (Std 1 Text)	Level 2 (Std 2 Text)	Total
I	20.2	45.3	21.8	8.1	4.6	100
II	9.7	33.6	29.5	14.8	12.4	100
III	5.2	19.9	26.9	23.9	24.1	100
IV	3.4	13.9	22.2	26.6	33.9	100
V	2.4	8.4	15.3	25.2	48.8	100
VI	1.9	5.3	9.4	25.5	57.9	100
VII	0.9	3.3	5.5	17.1	73.2	100
VIII	0.4	1.1	3.4	14.8	80.3	100
Total	5.7	16.8	17.0	19.5	40.9	100

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, 5.2% children cannot even read letters, 19.9% can read letters but not more, 26.9% can read words but not Std 1 text or higher, 23.9% can read Std 1 text but not Std 2 level text, and 24.1% can read Std 2 level text. In sum, for each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is 100%.

Reading Tool




Chart 4: Trends over time
% Children in Std III who CANNOT READ Std I LEVEL TEXT
By school type 2008-2011





Chart 5: Trends over time
% Children in Std V who CANNOT READ Std II LEVEL TEXT
By school type 2008-2011



Home language and school language

Table 5: School language and home language

% Children whose :	%
Home language is the same as school language	91.9
Home language is different from school language	8.1
Total	100.0

Note : In ASER 2011 for every state, reading tools were provided in the main medium of instruction in government schools. Children and their families were also asked about the language they speak at home. For home languages, a list of 122 languages was provided to all survey teams. This list includes 22 Scheduled languages and 100 Non-Scheduled languages. The data in this table is for children for whom we have information for both school language and home language.



West Bengal RURAL

Arithmetic

Table 6: % Children by class and ARITHMETIC level
All schools 2011

Std.	Nothing	Recognize Numbers		Subtract	Divide	Total
		1-9	11-99			
I	15.9	48.2	27.7	5.7	2.6	100
II	7.0	35.3	35.3	16.4	6.0	100
III	4.1	22.0	33.2	27.0	13.7	100
IV	2.3	16.6	24.7	36.4	20.2	100
V	1.5	10.2	24.8	32.1	31.4	100
VI	1.7	6.3	20.9	32.1	39.0	100
VII	0.5	3.9	15.7	26.0	53.8	100
VIII	0.4	1.0	13.4	25.9	59.2	100
Total	4.3	18.4	24.6	25.1	27.5	100

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level of arithmetic achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, 4.1% children cannot even recognize numbers 1-9, 22% children can recognize numbers up to 9 but not more, 33.2% can recognize numbers to 99 but cannot do subtraction, 27% can do subtraction but not division, and 13.7% can do division. In sum, for each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is 100%.

Math Tool



Chart 6: Trends over time
% Children in Std III who CANNOT RECOGNISE NUMBERS upto 100. By school type 2008-2011





Chart 7: Trends over time
% Children in Std V who CANNOT DO DIVISION
By school type 2008-2011



Tuition

Table 7: Class-wise % children attending PAID TUITION CLASSES
By school type 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Year	School	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	Total
2007	Govt	30.6	45.6	63.0	74.0	83.3	84.9	83.7	88.5	66.9
	Pvt	40.5	54.9	59.5	67.0	62.7	68.6	75.6	89.7	55.4
2009	Govt	51.5	63.9	68.7	74.2	75.6	80.8	85.7	86.6	73.2
	Pvt	63.9	71.4	74.4	83.6	87.7	79.2	78.9	71.2	73.2
2010	Govt	50.6	63.9	69.8	68.6	75.6	76.1	80.1	83.1	70.8
	Pvt	60.7	73.1	65.0	65.1	65.4	61.3	75.4	72.9	66.1
2011	Govt	56.6	65.3	67.4	72.7	76.9	77.5	82.4	81.7	72.9
	Pvt	54.0	69.9	69.9	79.4	45.8	52.4	60.6	65.4	63.9

Note: In 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011 the ASER survey recorded information about tuition. In all 4 years, the question asked was the following: "Does the child take any paid additional class currently?" Therefore, these numbers do not include any supplemental help in learning that children may have received from parents, siblings or from anyone else who did not require payment.



West Bengal RURAL

As part of ASER 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011, in each sampled village, one government school with primary sections was visited on the day of the survey. Information about schools in this report is based on these visits.

School observations

Table 8: Total schools visited 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Type of school	2007	2009	2010	2011
Std I-IV/V: Primary	395	417	406	400
Std I-VII/VIII: Primary + Upper primary	9	7	2	1
Total schools visited	404	424	408	401



Student and teacher attendance

Table 9: Student attendance 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Type of school	2007	2009	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V			
% Enrolled children present (average)	69.7	65.9	68.5	60.7
% Schools with less than 50% enrolled children present (average)	14.7	20.9	15.8	27.9
% Schools with 75% or more enrolled children present (average)	50.7	39.8	45.7	26.9

Table 10: Teacher attendance 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Type of school	2007	2009	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V			
% Teachers present (average)	90.6	87.7	85.6	86.3
% Schools with no teachers present (average)	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.0
% Schools with all teachers present (average)	71.4	68.4	58.4	59.6

Other school information

Table 11: Headteachers 2010 & 2011

% Schools with:	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V	
No Headteacher appointed	1.1	0.8
Headteacher appointed but not present at time of visit	4.7	4.5
Headteacher appointed & present at time of visit	94.2	94.8
Total	100	100

Table 12: Computers 2010 and 2011

% Schools with:	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V	
No computer	99.0	96.4
Computers but no children using them on day of visit	0.5	2.3
Computers & children using them on day of visit	0.5	1.3
Total	100	100

Table 13: Multigrade classes 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

% Schools with:	2007	2009	2010	2011
	Std I-IV/V			
Std II children sitting with one or more other classes	36.7	46.6	42.6	38.7
Std IV children sitting with one or more other classes	24.6	38.7	33.8	30.9

School funds and activities (PAISA)

Table 14: % Schools who report receiving SSA grants - Full financial year

SSA school grants	2008-2009				2009-2010				2010-2011			
	No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools		
		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know
Maintenance grant	390	70.5	23.6	5.9	377	80.4	10.6	9.0	380	72.1	17.9	10.0
Development grant	371	59.6	34.5	5.9	363	73.6	17.4	9.1	375	62.4	28.0	9.6
TLM grant	381	74.8	21.0	4.2	374	85.3	8.6	6.2	379	77.8	14.0	8.2

Table 15: % Schools who report receiving SSA grants - Half financial year

SSA school grants	April 2009 to October 2009				April 2010 to October 2010				April 2011 to October 2011			
	No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools			No. of Sch.	% Schools		
		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know		Yes	No	Don't know
Maintenance grant	331	39.3	54.1	6.7	346	31.2	59.5	9.3	364	39.6	51.1	9.3
Development grant	329	30.4	62.3	7.3	320	28.1	62.2	9.7	353	33.7	56.1	10.2
TLM grant	327	45.0	50.5	4.6	322	32.3	59.0	8.7	363	42.2	48.8	9.1



The PAISA section of ASER tracks receipt and spending of Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) grants at the school level. This information is collected from schools visited during the survey. This page reports proportion of schools receiving the grants and carrying out specified activities in the schools. More detailed analysis of the PAISA data will be available in the PAISA 2011 report which will be released in March 2012.[1]

EVERY RURAL GOVERNMENT PRIMARY SCHOOL IS ENTITLED TO EACH OF THESE SSA GRANTS EVERY YEAR.

How much goes to each school	For what purposes
SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT GRANT / SCHOOL GRANT	
Rs.5000 per year per primary school	This grant can be used for buying school equipment such as blackboard, sitting mats etc. Also for buying chalk, duster, registers and other office equipment.
Rs.7000 per year per upper primary school	
Rs 5000 + Rs 7000 = Rs 12000 if the school is Std I-VII/VIII.	The grant amount varies by type of school: whether it is a primary or upper primary school.
Note: Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same premises.	
SCHOOL MAINTENANCE GRANT	
Rs.5000 - Rs 7500 per school per year if the school has upto 3 classrooms.	This grant can be used for maintenance of school building, including whitewashing; beautification; and repair of toilets, hand pump, boundary wall, playground etc. The grant amount depends on number of classrooms (excluding Headmaster room and office room)
Rs 7500 - Rs.10000 per year if the school has more than 3 classrooms.	
Primary and Upper Primary schools are treated as separate schools even if they are in the same building.	
TLM GRANT	
Rs.500 per teacher per year in primary and upper primary schools.	This grant can be used by teachers to buy teaching aids, such as charts, globes, posters, models etc.

[1] For more information see www.accountabilityinitiative.in

West Bengal RURAL

Annual Status of Education Report
ASER 2011 RURAL
Facilitated by PRATHAM

Right to Education indicators

Table 17: Schools by total enrollment 2010 and 2011

School enrollment	2010		2011	
	No. of schools	% of schools	No. of schools	% of schools
1-60	40	10.1	51	13.1
61-90	68	17.2	61	15.7
91-120	74	18.7	81	20.9
121-150	65	16.5	55	14.2
151-200	76	19.2	69	17.8
> 200	72	18.2	71	18.3
TOTAL	395	100.0	388	100.0

Table 18: RTE norms: Pupil-teacher ratio 2010 and 2011

School enrollment	RTE Teacher Norms	2010	2011
		% Schools that do not meet PTR norms	
1-60	2	25.8	25.0
61-90	3	69.6	57.1
91-120	4	77.5	66.7
121-150	5	87.7	73.6
151-200	5 + HM	66.7	74.6
> 200	see note	90.0	85.5
TOTAL		73.9	65.7

Note : For schools with enrollment above 200 children the PTR shall not exceed 40 excluding the Head Teacher

Table 19: Schools by number of teachers 2010 and 2011

Number of teachers	2010		2011	
	No. of schools	% of schools	No. of schools	% of schools
1	20	5.7	41	11.3
2	83	23.7	84	23.1
3	92	26.3	91	25.0
4	79	22.6	70	19.2
5	36	10.3	37	10.2
6	25	7.1	20	5.5
>=7	15	4.3	21	5.8
TOTAL	350	100.0	364	100.0

Table 20: RTE norms: Teacher - classroom ratio 2010 and 2011

RTE norm: At least one classroom per teacher	2010	2011
Number of teachers	% Schools that do not meet classroom to teacher norms	
1	0.0	0.0
2	6.9	19.7
3	25.6	22.5
4	37.1	35.1
5	86.7	75.9
6	95.0	94.1
>=7	75.0	93.8
TOTAL	35.2	35.5

Table 21: % Schools meeting selected RTE norms on facilities 2010 & 2011

% of schools with		2010	2011
Building	Office/Store/Office cum store	79.3	81.3
	Playground	42.0	50.6
	Boundary Wall	34.1	42.3
Drinking Water	No facility for drinking water	19.3	21.1
	Facility but no drinking water available	13.5	15.5
	Drinking water available	67.2	63.4
Toilet	No toilet facility	7.6	8.6
	Facility but toilet not useable	40.3	42.0
	Toilet useable	52.1	49.5
Girls Toilet	% Schools with no separate provisions for girls toilets	44.5	26.1
	Of schools with separate girls toilets, % schools where		
	Toilet locked	14.5	19.2
	Toilet not useable	17.4	13.4
	Toilet useable	23.7	41.2
TLM	Teaching learning material in Std 2	71.7	78.0
	Teaching learning material in Std 4	65.3	71.6
Library	No library	50.5	39.2
	Library but no books being used by children on day of visit	17.8	18.8
	Library being used by children on day of visit	31.8	42.0
MDM	Kitchen shed for cooking midday meal	86.0	87.0
	Midday meal served in school on the day of visit	63.0	55.6

Note: School observations for ASER 2011 looked at TLM for Std II and Std IV only.

As part of ASER 2010 and 2011, in each sampled village, one government school with primary sections was visited on the day of the survey. During this school visit, RTE indicators were observed and are reported here.

Extracts from the Schedule of The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act 2009 Norms and standards for a School (Sections 19 and 25)

Number of teachers in Std 1-5:

Admitted children	No. of teachers
<= 60	2
61-90	3
91-120	4
121-200	5
> 150	5 + 1 Headteacher
> 200	Pupil-Teacher Ratio (excluding Headteacher) shall not exceed 40

School facilities:
All weather building with:

- At least one classroom for every teacher
- Office cum store cum headteacher's room
- Separate toilets for boys and girls
- Safe and adequate drinking water facility to all children
- A kitchen where mid-day meal is cooked in the school
- Playground
- Arrangements for securing the school building by boundary wall or fencing.

Teaching learning equipment
shall be provided to each class as required.

Library
There shall be a library in each school providing newspaper, magazines and books on all subjects, including story-books.



Daman and Diu RURAL

Annual Status of Education Report
असर ASER 2011 RURAL
Facilitated by PRATHAM

ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM HOUSEHOLDS. 2 OUT OF 2 DISTRICTS


School enrollment and out of school children

Table 1: % Children in different types of schools 2011

Age group	Govt.	Pvt.	Other	Not in School	Total
Age: 6-14 ALL	77.2	22.3	0.5	0.0	100
Age: 7-16 ALL	79.4	19.6	0.5	0.4	100
Age: 7-10 ALL	77.2	22.5	0.3	0.0	100
Age: 7-10 BOYS	73.4	26.0	0.6	0.0	100
Age: 7-10 GIRLS	81.9	18.2	0.0	0.0	100
Age: 11-14 ALL	78.9	20.3	0.7	0.0	100
Age: 11-14 BOYS	74.8	23.8	1.4	0.0	100
Age: 11-14 GIRLS	83.4	16.6	0.0	0.0	100
Age: 15-16 ALL	85.3	11.9	0.5	2.3	100
Age: 15-16 BOYS	86.4	11.9	0.0	1.7	100
Age: 15-16 GIRLS	84.2	11.8	1.1	2.9	100

Note: 'OTHER' includes children going to madarssa and EGS.
'NOT IN SCHOOL' = dropped out + never enrolled.

Chart 1: Trends over time
% Children out of school by age group and gender 2006-2011



How to read this chart: For example, the proportion of girls (age 11-14) not in school has changed from 1.7% in 2006 to 1.6% in 2007 to 0.9% in 2008 to 1% in 2009 to 0.4% in 2010 to 0.0% in 2011

Chart 2: Trends over time
% Children enrolled in private school by class 2007, 2009 & 2011




Table 2: Sample description
% Children in each class by age 2011

Std.	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	Total
I	32.6	53.8	13.5	0.2									100
II	1.3	8.1	72.7	11.1	6.8								100
III	0.2		11.9	58.9	22.7	6.3							100
IV	2.7			11.0	46.4	32.0	6.9	1.1					100
V	4.5				5.8	51.6	28.7	7.7	1.6				100
VI	1.2					7.3	55.9	28.1	7.7				100
VII	2.1						8.3	52.3	26.4	7.8	3.2		100
VIII	4.3							13.8	53.9	22.4	5.6		100


How to read this table: If a child started school in Std I at age 6, she should be age 8 in Std 3. This table shows the age distribution for each class. For example, in Std III, 58.9% children are 8 years old but there are also 11.9% who are 7, 22.7% who are 9 years old, etc.

Young children in pre-school and school

Table 3: % Children age 5-6 who are enrolled in different types of pre-school & school 2011

	In balwadi or anganwadi	In LKG/ UKG	In School			Not enrolled anywhere	Total
			Govt	Pvt	Other		
Age 5	16.3	18.0	47.5	18.2	0.0	0.0	100
Age 6	0.3	10.0	60.7	29.0	0.0	0.0	100

Chart 3: Trends over time
Five year olds in pre-school & school 2007, 2009 & 2011



Daman and Diu RURAL

Annual Status of Education Report
ASER 2011 RURAL
Facilitated by PRATHAM

Reading

Table 4: % Children by class and READING level
All schools 2011

Std.	Nothing	Letter	Word	Level 1 (Std 1 Text)	Level 2 (Std 2 Text)	Total
I	15.6	54.6	20.6	6.1	3.1	100
II	6.8	36.3	41.4	8.9	6.6	100
III	1.5	18.0	41.1	34.7	4.8	100
IV	1.1	4.6	30.0	39.3	25.1	100
V	0.2	7.1	20.7	26.9	45.1	100
VI	0.3	3.8	10.6	36.2	49.0	100
VII	0.3	2.6	8.7	32.6	55.8	100
VIII	0.0	1.8	4.5	20.7	73.0	100
Total	2.9	14.8	21.8	26.4	34.1	100

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, 1.5% children cannot even read letters, 18% can read letters but not more, 41.1% can read words but not Std 1 text or higher, 34.7% can read Std 1 text but not Std 2 level text, and 4.8% can read Std 2 level text. In sum, for each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is 100%.

Reading Tool




Chart 4: Trends over time
% Children in Std III who CANNOT READ Std I LEVEL TEXT
By school type 2008-2011





Chart 5: Trends over time
% Children in Std V who CANNOT READ Std II LEVEL TEXT
By school type 2008-2011



Home language and school language

Table 5: School language and home language

% Children whose :	%
Home language is the same as school language	100.0
Home language is different from school language	0.0
Total	100.0

Note : In ASER 2011 for every state, reading tools were provided in the main medium of instruction in government schools. Children and their families were also asked about the language they speak at home. For home languages, a list of 122 languages was provided to all survey teams. This list includes 22 Scheduled languages and 100 Non-Scheduled languages. The data in this table is for children for whom we have information for both school language and home language.



Daman and Diu RURAL

Annual Status of Education Report
असर ASER 2011 RURAL
Facilitated by PRATHAM

Arithmetic

Table 6: % Children by class and ARITHMETIC level
All schools 2011

Std.	Nothing	Recognize Numbers		Subtract	Divide	Total
		1-9	11-99			
I	16.9	56.9	20.5	4.1	1.7	100
II	10.1	30.1	41.7	15.9	2.3	100
III	4.0	28.0	43.2	22.3	2.6	100
IV	2.5	22.9	39.1	31.5	4.0	100
V	1.2	15.2	21.6	40.9	21.1	100
VI	1.6	10.5	21.2	44.9	21.8	100
VII	1.9	7.5	20.1	34.8	35.8	100
VIII	0.0	4.8	8.3	34.6	52.3	100
Total	4.3	20.9	26.4	29.6	18.8	100

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level of arithmetic achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, 4.0% children cannot even recognize numbers 1-9, 28.0% children can recognize numbers up to 9 but not more, 43.2% can recognize numbers to 99 but cannot do subtraction, 22.3% can do subtraction but not division, and 2.6% can do division. In sum, for each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is 100%.

Math Tool



Chart 6: Trends over time
% Children in Std III who CANNOT RECOGNISE NUMBERS upto 100. By school type 2008-2011





Chart 7: Trends over time
% Children in Std V who CANNOT DO DIVISION
By school type 2008-2011



Tuition

Table 7: Class-wise % children attending PAID TUITION CLASSES
By school type 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Year	School	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	Total
2007	Govt	25.2	20.8	35.8	28.1	34.7	38.4	25.6	35.7	30.8
	Pvt	75.9	82.0	79.0	77.2	87.2	81.6	59.7	80.6	79.3
2009	Govt	12.9	21.2	30.7	21.4	36.8	28.7	27.6	27.2	26.6
	Pvt	61.0	76.9	71.5	70.6	65.3	79.7	61.4	57.7	68.7
2010	Govt	35.4	32.8	26.9	41.0	41.1	37.5	29.1	41.4	35.9
	Pvt	71.7	62.5	80.2	81.4	86.2	85.3	84.6	86.9	79.7
2011	Govt	28.0	26.4	35.6	33.4	30.0	34.1	28.8	24.6	30.4
	Pvt	78.8	90.8	87.3	85.3	89.6	78.0	75.0	75.0	82.8

Note: In 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011 the ASER survey recorded information about tuition. In all 4 years, the question asked was the following: "Does the child take any paid additional class currently?" Therefore, these numbers do not include any supplemental help in learning that children may have received from parents, siblings or from anyone else who did not require payment.



Puducherry RURAL

ALL ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM HOUSEHOLDS. 2 OUT OF 2 DISTRICTS


School enrollment and out of school children

Table 1: % Children in different types of schools 2011

Age group	Govt.	Pvt.	Other	Not in School	Total
Age: 6-14 ALL	54.9	45.0	0.1	0.0	100
Age: 7-16 ALL	59.2	39.7	0.6	0.5	100
Age: 7-10 ALL	44.1	55.9	0.0	0.0	100
Age: 7-10 BOYS	39.2	60.8	0.0	0.0	100
Age: 7-10 GIRLS	48.7	51.3	0.0	0.0	100
Age: 11-14 ALL	65.9	33.9	0.3	0.0	100
Age: 11-14 BOYS	63.4	36.1	0.5	0.0	100
Age: 11-14 GIRLS	68.5	31.6	0.0	0.0	100
Age: 15-16 ALL	68.7	27.0	2.1	2.3	100
Age: 15-16 BOYS	62.5	32.4	2.3	2.8	100
Age: 15-16 GIRLS	73.8	22.5	1.9	1.9	100

Note: 'OTHER' includes children going to madarssa and EGS.
'NOT IN SCHOOL' = dropped out + never enrolled.

Chart 1: Trends over time
% Children out of school by age group and gender 2006-2011



How to read this chart: For example, the proportion of girls (age 11-14) not in school has changed from 2.3% in 2006 to 0.0% in 2007 to 1.2% in 2008 to 0.7% in 2009 to 0.2% in 2010 to 0.0% in 2011

Chart 2: Trends over time
% Children enrolled in private school by class 2007, 2009 & 2011




Table 2: Sample description
% Children in each class by age 2011

Std.	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	Total
I	54.6	37.1	6.1	2.3									100
II	0.0	22.9	66.4	7.6	3.1								100
III	1.2		23.0	67.0	8.8	0.0							100
IV	0.6			14.2	67.8	11.0	6.5						100
V	0.6				10.0	77.2	10.6	1.7					100
VI	7.1						69.2	18.4	5.4				100
VII	0.0						15.7	66.7	14.8	2.9			100
VIII	1.0							10.1	72.6	14.2	2.0		100


How to read this table: If a child started school in Std I at age 6, she should be age 8 in Std 3. This table shows the age distribution for each class. For example, in Std III, 67.0% children are 8 years old but there are also 23.0% who are 7, 8.8% who are 9 years old, etc.

Young children in pre-school and school

Table 3: % Children age 5-6 who are enrolled in different types of pre-school & school 2011

	In balwadi or anganwadi	In LKG/ UKG	In School			Not enrolled anywhere	Total
			Govt	Pvt	Other		
Age 5	0.9	27.4	28.1	43.6	0.0	0.0	100
Age 6	0.0	0.0	27.0	73.0	0.0	0.0	100

Chart 3: Trends over time
Five year olds in pre-school & school 2007, 2009 & 2011



Puducherry RURAL

Annual Status of Education Report
ASER 2011 RURAL
Facilitated by PRATHAM

Reading

Table 4: % Children by class and READING level
All schools 2011

Std.	Nothing	Letter	Word	Level 1 (Std 1 Text)	Level 2 (Std 2 Text)	Total
I	35.7	37.3	23.1	4.0	0.0	100
II	19.2	25.6	30.4	16.0	8.8	100
III	11.7	27.9	29.8	19.5	11.1	100
IV	6.1	7.5	28.6	33.3	24.5	100
V	4.3	8.5	21.2	35.8	30.3	100
VI	1.7	4.9	16.5	36.2	40.7	100
VII	1.0	4.5	11.5	34.0	49.0	100
VIII	0.0	5.6	6.2	28.5	59.8	100
Total	8.4	13.7	19.9	27.2	30.8	100

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level of reading achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, 11.7% children cannot even read letters, 27.9% can read letters but not more, 29.8% can read words but not Std 1 text or higher, 19.5% can read Std 1 text but not Std 2 level text, and 11.1 % can read Std 2 level text. In sum, for each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is 100%.

Reading Tool



Chart 4: Trends over time
% Children in Std III who CANNOT READ Std I LEVEL TEXT
By school type 2008-2011





Chart 5: Trends over time
% Children in Std V who CANNOT READ Std II LEVEL TEXT
By school type 2008-2011



Home language and school language

Table 5: School language and home language

% Children whose :	%
Home language is the same as school language	100.0
Home language is different from school language	0.0
Total	100.0

Note : In ASER 2011 for every state, reading tools were provided in the main medium of instruction in government schools. Children and their families were also asked about the language they speak at home. For home languages, a list of 122 languages was provided to all survey teams. This list includes 22 Scheduled languages and 100 Non-Scheduled languages. The data in this table is for children for whom we have information for both school language and home language.



Arithmetic

Table 6: % Children by class and ARITHMETIC level
All schools 2011

Std.	Nothing	Recognize Numbers		Subtract	Divide	Total
		1-9	11-99			
I	23.7	27.8	39.8	8.0	0.8	100
II	10.5	21.8	50.7	12.1	4.9	100
III	3.3	8.5	52.6	31.6	4.0	100
IV	0.0	7.5	43.2	35.6	13.7	100
V	3.6	6.6	28.9	33.1	27.7	100
VI	1.1	4.4	28.7	41.4	24.3	100
VII	0.5	2.5	18.5	43.0	35.5	100
VIII	0.0	1.1	13.5	35.4	50.0	100
Total	4.5	8.8	32.8	31.8	22.2	100

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level of arithmetic achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, 3.3% children cannot even recognize numbers 1-9, 8.5% children can recognize numbers up to 9 but not more, 52.6% can recognize numbers to 99 but cannot do subtraction, 31.6% can do subtraction but not division, and 4.0% can do division. In sum, for each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is 100%.

Math Tool



Chart 6: Trends over time
% Children in Std III who CANNOT RECOGNISE NUMBERS upto 100. By school type 2008-2011





Chart 7: Trends over time
% Children in Std V who CANNOT DO DIVISION
By school type 2008-2011




Tuition

Table 7: Class-wise % children attending PAID TUITION CLASSES
By school type 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011

Year	School	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	Total
2007	Govt	33.3	50.9	56.1	46.9	55.2	54.7	55.7	62.2	52.6
	Pvt	40.0	48.8	71.3	69.9	58.7	42.4	75.5	55.0	55.6
2009	Govt	36.5	38.3	46.5	47.1	41.9	49.0	52.2	37.2	44.1
	Pvt	28.1	42.6	45.4	43.2	32.7	58.4	49.2	18.1	38.5
2010	Govt	21.1	20.5	29.5	30.2	28.9	25.2	28.6	26.5	27.0
	Pvt	33.6	41.8	38.4	45.5	49.7	59.9	51.5	59.4	45.4
2011	Govt	22.2	25.6	29.7	37.4	33.4	36.5	31.8	31.6	32.2
	Pvt	36.4	41.6	44.6	56.0	32.6	50.9	60.3	45.3	45.4

Note: In 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011 the ASER survey recorded information about tuition. In all 4 years, the question asked was the following: "Does the child take any paid additional class currently?" Therefore, these numbers do not include any supplemental help in learning that children may have received from parents, siblings or from anyone else who did not require payment.




Divisional Estimates

Divisional estimates of learning outcomes and schooling status: Precision of ASER estimates

Wilima Wadhwa [1]

Every year since 2005, ASER has presented estimates of learning and of schooling status at the state and district level. The survey design of ASER is based on the premise of generating estimates at the district level. Having estimates of learning levels at this level is desirable since education plans are made at the district level. As a result, ASER is one of the largest surveys undertaken by a non-government organization with a sample size of approximately 700,000 children in the age group of 3 – 16 years.

ASER is a household survey, undertaken in all rural districts of India. Within each district, 30 villages are randomly chosen[2] and in each village 20 households are randomly selected, for a total of 600 households per district. This translates into around 900 – 1200 children per district.

The statistical precision of district level estimates is an issue because of the ASER sample design – namely clustering and absence of stratification at the village level. In a design without clustering, children in the relevant age group would be directly sampled. Not only is this expensive (in terms of survey time), but it is also difficult to have a reliable population frame that could be used for sampling. Instead ASER employs a two-stage clustering design. The first stage clustering happens when villages are randomly picked. The second stage clustering is when households within a village are randomly picked and the children belonging to that household are tested.

While this is an inexpensive and practical way of sampling children, it is well known that clustering increases the variability of estimates. One way of increasing precision at the district level would have been to stratify the village sample according to age of children or school type. However, this would require a prior household listing, which is expensive in terms of both time and resources.

The ASER sample is stratified, however, at the district level. Insofar as outcomes within a district are more homogenous than across districts, stratification within the district leads to more precise estimates at the state level.

Ramaswami and Wadhwa (2009)[3] studied the precision of ASER state and district level estimates for a selection of states and variables for the year 2008. They find that state level averages are estimated precisely – with a margin of error of 5% or less. However, district-level estimates are less precisely estimated. The precision varies both across states and districts and according to the learning outcome. In both cases, learning outcomes of children in class 3-5 are relatively less precisely estimated.

Two commonly used measures of precision are the margin of error and the 95% confidence interval.

The margin of error is the % interval around the point estimate that almost certainly contains the population estimate (i.e., with 95% probability). For instance, if x is the margin of error then the population proportion lies within $\pm$ x% of the sample proportion with 95% probability.

Suppose $\hat{p}$ is the estimated sample proportion and is the associated standard error. From statistical theory, it is known that the interval [ ] contains the population proportion with 95% probability – 95% confidence interval. The margin of error expresses the confidence interval in terms of the sample estimate. It is thus defined as

$$me = \frac{2\hat{\sigma}}{\hat{p}}$$

A margin of error of 10% is regarded as an acceptable degree of precision in many studies.[4] Estimates with a margin of error in excess of 20% are regarded as estimates with low precision.

---

[1] Director (Statistics), ASER Centre
[2] Villages are chosen from the 2001 Census Directory using PPS (Probability Proportional to Size) sampling.
[3] Ramaswami, Bharat and Wadhwa, Wilima (2009), "Survey Design and Precision of ASER Estimates", mimeo.
[4] United Nations (2005), Designing Household Survey Samples: Practical Guidelines, Studies in Methods, Series F No. 98, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Statistics Division.

Note that the margin of error depends on the standard error and the estimated proportion, and the standard error itself depends on the estimated proportion. For a given sample size, therefore, a lower precision will be associated with a variable which has a lower incidence in the population and/or a higher standard error. Further, in the case of proportions, for a given sample size, the standard error is the largest for a population proportion close to 0.5. On the other hand, for a given incidence, one way to reduce the standard error and therefore increase precision is to increase the sample size.

In the case of ASER, as shown by Ramaswami and Wadhwa (2009), precision is not an issue at the state level. At the district level, however, since sample sizes in sub-populations of interest are often much smaller than the total sample size, precision can be an issue. Increasing the sample size at the district level, for a national survey, however, is extremely costly. In the past, ASER has clubbed classes while presenting district level estimates, in an attempt to increase the sample size. However, precision gains from this strategy were limited, especially for variables whose estimated proportions were in the vicinity of 0.5.

One way to provide sub-state estimates with acceptable levels of precision is to club districts within a state.[5] Many states have administrative divisions, comprised of two or more districts that can be used as units of analysis. These divisions are at a level of aggregation between the state and district level. This year, we provide divisional estimates from 2007 to 2011 for those states that have administrative divisions.[6] These are Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Haryana, Jammu & Kashmir, Jharkhand, Karnataka, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh and Uttarakhand.[7] In addition, in Andhra Pradesh, Gujarat, Himachal Pradesh, Punjab, Odisha and Tamil Nadu, divisions were created using geographical regions commonly used in the states.[8]

Divisional estimates are provided for the following 6 variables:

% children in the age group 6-14 years who are out of school

% children in the age group 6-14 years who are in private school


% children in class 1-2 who can read letters, words or more

% children in class 1-2 who can recognize numbers (1-9) or more

% children in class 3-5 who can read level 1 (Std 1) text or more

% children in class 3-5 who can do subtraction or more.

Figure 1: State Learning Levels, Margin of Error (%), 2011



In addition to the point estimates for 2007 – 2011, the 95% confidence interval [$\hat{p} \pm 2\hat{\sigma}$] is also presented. The point estimate as well as the confidence interval is presented for each division and also for the state as a whole.

Figure 1 presents the margin of error for the four learning outcomes in selected states in 2011. As is clear from the figure, most of these are below 5%. Also, note that learning outcomes in class 3-5 are less precisely estimated as compared to those in class 1-2. Similar numbers are obtained for previous years.

At the division level too, among the four learning outcomes the variability is highest for learning levels in class 3-5. As a result, the margin of error is the highest for these variables. In discussing the division level estimates we will concentrate on these variables since they give us the worst case scenario.

[5] For instance, NSS surveys are not representative at the district level. However, they are representative for NSS regions, which are formed using agro-climatic criteria.
[6] We decided to go with the state administrative divisions, rather than the NSS regions, since these are more commonly used within the state.
[7] The composition of each division was obtained from the state websites, and is reported alongside the divisional estimates presented in this report.
[8] See the section on Divisional Estimates in this report for the exact composition.

We can look at division level estimates in two ways. First, for a particular year and state, one can examine the precision of estimates across divisions; and second, for a particular state and division, we can look at the margin of error across years. Figures 2.1 and 2.2 present the margins of error for language and math in class 3-5 in 2011 across divisions of selected states. Language learning outcomes at division level in most states are estimated

Figure 2.1: Division Learning Outcomes
Language Class 3-5, Margin of Error (%), 2011





Figure 2.2: Division Learning Outcomes
Math Class 3-5, Margin of Error (%), 2011



with margins of under or close to 10%. The exceptions are Madhya Pradesh and Tamil Nadu. Across the board, precision levels are lower for math learning outcomes. Rajasthan and Tamil Nadu have margins of error that are closer to 15% and those for Madhya Pradesh are close to 20-25%.

Figure 3.1: Language Class 3-5, Margin of Error (%)
Selected Divisions, 2007 -- 2011





Figure 3.2: Math Class 3-5, Margin of Error (%)
Selected Divisions, 2007 -- 2011



Figures 3.1 and 3.2 present the margins of error, for language and math in class 3-5, for one division in the selected states, from 2007 to 2011. Margins of error are fairly robust over time, except in MP when they spike in 2011. Again, across the board precision levels are lower for math learning outcomes.

Why are margins of error consistently higher for math in class 3-5? Similarly, compared to learning outcomes in class 1-2, why are learning outcomes in class 3-5 less precisely estimated? First, for a given sample size, the margin of error is inversely proportional to the incidence of the variable concerned. What this implies is that any variable that has a low incidence in the population will be estimated with a high margin of error. Intuitively this makes sense because if something is not observed very frequently, one would need a much larger sample size to measure it accurately. However, this is not that much of a problem if the standard error is small. To see why,

consider the case of out of school children– say the point estimate is 0.04 (i.e., 4%) with a standard error of 0.01 (i.e. 1% point). The margin of error would be 50% (=((2 * 0.01)/0.04)*100) which is very high. However, note that this translates into confidence bounds of ±2 percentage points, i.e., with 95% probability the true proportion of out of school children lie between 2% and 6%. In other words, given a low incidence, a high margin of error may still translate into tight confidence bands. Another way of looking at this is by focusing on in-school children instead of out of school children. If out of school children are 0.04 then in-school children will be 0.96 or 96% with the same standard error of 0.01 giving a margin of error of only 2.1% and confidence bounds of ±2 percentage points.

Second, the margin of error is directly proportional to the standard error. For a given sample size, a large standard error, implying imprecise estimation, will not surprisingly result in a high margin of error. In the case of proportions, the standard error itself depends on the value of the proportion, and is larger the closer the value is to 0.5. Intuitively, the reason behind this is that the greatest uncertainty is associated with a proportion of 0.5, requiring larger sample sizes to measure it accurately.

By and large, class 1-2 learning outcomes (i.e. the % of children in Class 1-2 who can read letters or more/ recognize numbers 1-9 or more) are higher as compared to class 3-5 outcomes (i.e. % of children in class 3-5 who can read Std 1 level text or more/do subtraction or more), resulting in lower margins of error.[9] Similarly, in class 3-5, language outcomes are better than math outcomes and often math outcomes are close to 0.5 resulting in higher margins of error for math.[10]

Overall, the divisional estimates are more precisely estimated as compared to district level estimates. Clubbing districts increases the sample size and lowers the standard errors. It also smoothes the jumpiness in point estimates often observed at the district level. One of the problems associated with large standard errors and therefore with wide confidence intervals is that it is difficult to identify significant changes across districts and time. The use of divisional estimates resolves this problem to a large extent.

[9] Often sample sizes are also larger for class 1-2, which would result in lower margins of error.
[10] This also explains the large margins of error for Madhya Pradesh in both language and math learning outcomes in 2011. Both these learning levels fell in 2011 and the point estimates are close to 0.5.

Divisional Estimates

Annual Status of Education Report
असर ASER 2011 RURAL
Facilitated by PRATHAM

Andhra Pradesh

School enrollment and out of school children

Division/Region	% Children out of school (age: 6-14)					% Children enrolled in private school (age: 6-14)				
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Coastal Andhra	4.39	2.92	5.30	3.11	2.67	26.05	22.83	28.51	35.61	33.85
	±1.04	*±0.58*	*±1.30*	*±0.67*	*±0.63*	*±2.53*	*±2.31*	*±2.35*	*±3.10*	*±3.01*
Rayalaseema	5.14	3.71	6.08	4.81	3.42	27.29	30.98	23.88	31.40	31.87
	±1.56	*±1.12*	*±2.00*	*±1.68*	*±1.14*	*±4.55*	*±5.12*	*±3.59*	*±4.56*	*±4.24*
Telangana	3.64	3.75	7.18	2.82	2.61	34.09	31.51	33.12	38.69	37.14
	±0.69	*±0.79*	*±1.93*	*±0.64*	*±0.67*	*±3.70*	*±2.98*	*±3.06*	*±3.29*	*±3.18*
State	4.25	3.38	6.15	3.30	2.80	29.27	27.58	29.36	36.10	34.69
	±0.60	*±0.44*	*±0.99*	*±0.49*	*±0.43*	*±1.99*	*±1.80*	*±1.71*	*±2.04*	*±1.95*

Learning levels: Std I-II

Division/Region	% Children in Std I-II who CAN READ letters or more					% Children in Std I-II who CAN RECOGNIZE numbers 1 to 9 or more				
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Coastal Andhra	82.36	88.86	86.47	85.40	89.66	87.18	88.80	87.79	88.72	91.50
	±2.84	*±2.10*	*±2.26*	*±3.39*	*±2.22*	*±2.54*	*±2.12*	*±2.04*	*±2.93*	*±2.11*
Rayalaseema	84.89	89.10	82.71	85.41	86.91	88.68	89.75	85.95	87.58	90.68
	±3.85	*±3.37*	*±3.31*	*±4.25*	*±3.20*	*±3.64*	*±3.14*	*±3.18*	*±3.98*	*±2.84*
Telangana	78.29	83.75	78.43	86.07	84.46	82.16	86.12	81.31	88.57	86.76
	±3.03	*±2.55*	*±3.43*	*±2.81*	*±2.98*	*±2.67*	*±2.31*	*±3.07*	*±2.42*	*±2.72*
State	81.27	86.96	82.87	85.68	87.28	85.57	87.93	85.12	88.47	89.68
	±1.87	*±1.50*	*±1.77*	*±1.98*	*±1.59*	*±1.67*	*±1.41*	*±1.59*	*±1.72*	*±1.47*

Learning levels: Std III-V

Division/Region	% Children in Std III-V who CAN READ Level 1 (Std I) text or more					% Children in Std III-V who CAN DO subtraction or more				
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Coastal Andhra	78.22	74.21	68.84	73.73	78.40	67.59	65.58	67.32	66.73	70.68
	±2.42	*±2.43*	*±3.10*	*±3.34*	*±2.74*	*±2.90*	*±2.94*	*±2.87*	*±3.37*	*±3.13*
Rayalaseema	75.81	75.28	68.47	68.79	68.34	70.12	71.01	67.77	65.72	67.02
	±4.72	*±3.82*	*±4.78*	*±5.16*	*±4.49*	*±5.39*	*±4.38*	*±4.88*	*±5.43*	*±4.64*
Telangana	69.26	68.33	61.64	66.11	63.03	57.16	57.92	57.12	59.52	55.19
	±3.10	*±2.96*	*±3.27*	*±3.15*	*±3.24*	*±3.29*	*±3.05*	*±3.62*	*±3.38*	*±3.52*
State	74.66	72.05	66.23	69.80	70.94	64.25	63.37	63.81	63.66	64.54
	±1.81	*±1.71*	*±2.05*	*±2.12*	*±2.00*	*±2.07*	*±1.93*	*±2.10*	*±2.21*	*±2.15*

Note: Districts have been clubbed into divisions to produce these estimates. The grouping of districts is based on administrative divisions used in the state or by geographical regions.

How to read these tables: The first row for each division gives the estimate of the relevant variable/year. The numbers below the estimate, in the second row, are twice the standard error of the corresponding estimate and represent the 95% confidence interval for the estimate. For instance, In Coastal Andhra division of Andhra Pradesh, in 2007, % of Std I-II children who could read letters or more is 82.36 %. With 95% probability, the true population proportion lies within ±2.84 % points of the estimate, i.e., between 85.20 % and 79.52 %.

List of districts under each division

Coastal Andhra
Srikakulam
Vizianagaram
Visakhapatnam
East Godavari
West Godavari
Krishna
Guntur
Prakasam
Sri Potti Sriramulu Nellore
Rayalaseema
Chittoor
Cuddapah (Y.S.R.)
Kurnool
Anantapur
Telangana
Adilabad
Nizamabad
Karimnagar
Medak
Rangareddy
Mahbubnagar
Nalgonda
Warangal
Khammam

Divisional Estimates

Bihar

School enrollment and out of school children

Division/Region	% Children out of school (age: 6-14)					% Children enrolled in private school (age: 6-14)				
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Bhagalpur	4.74	6.32	4.75	5.94	5.90	3.97	5.85	3.46	4.26	2.98
	±2.43	±2.96	±1.82	±3.71	±2.23	±1.72	±2.83	±1.82	±2.69	±1.95
Darbhanga	4.78	5.49	5.46	3.25	2.63	5.69	6.34	3.79	3.23	5.26
	±1.74	±1.47	±2.98	±1.12	±0.97	±1.62	±1.65	±1.65	±1.27	±1.49
Kosi	9.80	6.45	5.13	5.39	2.36	4.62	6.61	1.74	2.92	1.68
	±2.80	±4.35	±1.21	±1.73	±0.85	±1.79	±5.22	±0.78	±1.49	±0.72
Magadh	6.15	4.18	5.01	4.79	2.98	6.69	11.91	5.47	8.83	7.63
	±1.87	±1.37	±1.45	±2.34	±1.07	±2.06	±3.44	±1.69	±2.31	±1.62
Munger	6.19	5.03	3.46	3.64	3.40	7.53	7.05	4.82	3.19	4.82
	±1.82	±1.09	±0.93	±1.00	±0.99	±1.79	±1.90	±1.55	±1.05	±1.26
Patna	4.34	2.97	2.82	1.43	3.00	12.64	11.15	8.85	5.28	9.58
	±1.05	±0.81	±0.90	±0.54	±0.84	±2.33	±2.79	±2.12	±1.35	±1.90
Purnia	9.88	7.50	5.86	3.08	4.37	3.19	3.92	2.47	4.63	1.46
	±3.96	±1.86	±1.34	±1.22	±1.60	±1.22	±1.25	±0.87	±2.60	±0.59
Saran	6.17	4.14	1.72	3.21	2.47	11.70	15.03	8.35	9.44	10.04
	±2.50	±1.55	±0.71	±1.08	±1.13	±3.01	±3.10	±2.92	±2.22	±2.58
Tirhut	6.75	7.71	2.95	3.40	1.87	7.22	7.06	4.48	5.25	4.65
	±1.61	±1.54	±0.76	±0.91	±0.63	±1.80	±1.70	±1.32	±1.39	±1.19
State	6.45	5.65	4.03	3.48	2.95	7.36	8.26	4.96	5.16	5.50
	±0.77	±0.58	±0.54	±0.45	±0.37	±0.73	±0.84	±0.61	±0.62	±0.56

Learning levels: Std I-II

Division/Region	% Children in Std I-II who CAN READ letters or more					% Children in Std I-II who CAN RECOGNIZE numbers 1 to 9 or more				
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Bhagalpur	67.73	69.38	67.54	75.01	55.34	64.00	68.98	64.01	76.32	56.93
	±8.74	±5.95	±8.00	±5.90	±6.10	±8.39	±6.20	±9.43	±5.57	±6.17
Darbhanga	74.28	58.52	71.91	56.28	55.90	67.04	61.90	70.88	56.69	58.35
	±6.10	±5.60	±6.58	±6.76	±5.79	±6.70	±5.29	±6.37	±6.62	±5.81
Kosi	69.47	75.15	65.90	55.61	53.85	68.54	75.70	66.78	52.94	55.28
	±6.94	±6.18	±5.87	±7.38	±5.94	±7.37	±7.01	±5.06	±7.53	±5.22
Magadh	68.47	76.60	73.27	72.13	54.12	70.69	77.48	75.21	72.94	61.23
	±6.20	±4.48	±4.25	±4.91	±5.33	±7.20	±4.68	±4.39	±4.75	±4.82
Munger	76.21	71.30	70.06	67.88	59.99	75.71	71.04	73.43	70.30	69.41
	±3.61	±4.82	±4.71	±4.55	±4.60	±4.04	±4.78	±4.46	±4.35	±4.26
Patna	75.39	79.49	80.45	78.66	66.69	75.39	79.25	81.46	77.80	71.37
	±3.41	±4.61	±4.23	±4.12	±4.56	±3.84	±5.09	±4.41	±4.25	±4.35
Purnia	79.14	70.96	74.13	79.89	62.55	74.11	70.05	74.23	80.45	66.65
	±4.39	±4.90	±4.44	±3.90	±4.69	±5.13	±4.47	±4.43	±3.89	±4.76
Saran	77.47	68.48	67.18	68.78	64.50	73.15	69.49	70.80	67.81	65.38
	±5.65	±5.61	±8.47	±7.29	±6.85	±6.11	±5.47	±8.33	±7.36	±6.34
Tirhut	76.58	62.69	66.04	66.59	59.97	73.43	67.68	68.14	65.28	58.28
	±4.42	±3.77	±4.01	±3.90	±4.50	±4.42	±3.25	±4.17	±4.03	±4.51
State	74.67	68.22	71.00	68.45	59.66	72.05	69.96	72.17	68.21	62.49
	±1.84	±1.84	±1.86	±1.96	±1.87	±1.96	±1.72	±1.85	±1.98	±1.84

Note: Districts have been clubbed into divisions to produce these estimates. The grouping of districts is based on administrative divisions used in the state or by geographical regions.

How to read these tables: The first row for each division gives the estimate of the relevant variable/year. The numbers below the estimate, in the second row, are twice the standard error of the corresponding estimate and represent the 95% confidence interval for the estimate. For instance, In Bhagalpur division of Bihar, in 2007, % of Std I-II children who could read letters or more is 67.73 %. With 95% probability, the true population proportion lies within ±8.74 % points of the estimate, i.e., between 76.47 % and 58.99 %.

List of districts under each division
Bhagalpur
Bhagalpur
Banka
Darbhanga
Madhubani
Darbhanga
Samastipur
Kosi
Supaul
Madhepura
Saharsa
Magadh
Jehanabad
Aurangabad
Gaya
Nawada
Munger
Begusarai
Khagaria
Munger
Lakhisarai
Sheikhpura
Jamui


Divisional Estimates

Annual Status of Education Report
ASER 2011 RURAL
Facilitated by PRATHAM

Bihar

Learning levels: Std III-V

Division/Region	% Children in Std III-V who CAN READ Level 1 (Std I) text or more					% Children in Std III-V who CAN DO subtraction or more				
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Bhagalpur	63.34	63.26	53.24	60.88	52.82	68.54	62.41	57.02	66.29	47.81
	±6.03	*±6.03*	*±8.75*	*±6.54*	*±5.85*	*±6.34*	*±6.30*	*±8.72*	*±6.32*	*±5.42*
Darbhanga	69.04	62.11	64.96	59.43	47.25	70.12	58.14	65.88	57.01	39.74
	±5.58	*±4.36*	*±5.19*	*±5.56*	*±4.57*	*±5.90*	*±4.84*	*±5.51*	*±5.60*	*±3.90*
Kosi	71.42	68.32	60.05	57.81	52.70	70.41	64.36	69.28	59.14	50.62
	±6.31	*±6.60*	*±5.71*	*±6.31*	*±5.75*	*±6.29*	*±8.03*	*±5.24*	*±5.83*	*±5.74*
Magadh	76.79	73.84	68.57	75.45	50.00	75.21	65.54	67.30	77.24	46.26
	±4.63	*±3.86*	*±4.41*	*±4.42*	*±4.72*	*±4.94*	*±4.54*	*±4.33*	*±4.20*	*±4.70*
Munger	74.50	72.36	66.53	62.27	57.01	79.09	67.49	70.55	62.36	59.31
	±3.52	*±3.98*	*±4.08*	*±4.09*	*±4.74*	*±4.00*	*±4.44*	*±4.16*	*±4.43*	*±5.06*
Patna	67.88	72.93	70.32	64.73	58.47	67.97	69.80	68.56	66.13	56.12
	±3.56	*±4.09*	*±4.22*	*±4.42*	*±4.11*	*±3.50*	*±4.44*	*±4.75*	*±4.55*	*±4.19*
Purnia	63.08	62.22	55.98	70.56	43.90	67.46	55.90	57.68	72.29	41.72
	±5.73	*±6.02*	*±4.14*	*±4.89*	*±4.77*	*±5.46*	*±6.15*	*±4.30*	*±4.49*	*±5.35*
Saran	63.02	72.27	68.63	67.83	60.91	66.23	67.57	71.11	64.96	56.33
	±6.14	*±4.95*	*±5.79*	*±6.00*	*±6.10*	*±6.41*	*±5.82*	*±6.17*	*±6.06*	*±5.99*
Tirhut	69.27	65.84	53.81	59.45	51.87	67.39	57.46	54.99	54.90	46.64
	±4.59	*±3.37*	*±4.13*	*±3.80*	*±3.76*	*±5.16*	*±3.77*	*±4.23*	*±3.79*	*±3.90*
State	68.79	67.69	62.11	63.81	52.06	69.81	62.21	63.73	63.14	48.38
	±1.78	*±1.64*	*±1.74*	*±1.74*	*±1.67*	*±1.88*	*±1.80*	*±1.80*	*±1.78*	*±1.73*



List of districts under each division

Patna
Nalanda
Patna
Bhojpur
Buxar
Kaimur (Bhabua)
Rohtas
Purnia
Araria
Kishanganj
Purnia
Katihar
Saran
Gopalganj
Siwan
Saran
Tirhut
Pashchim Champaran
Purba Champaran
Sheohar
Sitamarhi
Muzaffarpur
Vaishali

Divisional Estimates

Annual Status of Education Report
असर ASER 2011 RURAL
Facilitated by PRATHAM

Chhattisgarh

School enrollment and out of school children

Division/Region	% Children out of school (age: 6-14)					% Children enrolled in private school (age: 6-14)				
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Bastar	7.89	4.31	5.61	1.83	1.72	3.17	6.27	2.11	3.37	4.45
	±2.65	*±1.66*	*±2.25*	*±1.06*	*±1.21*	*±1.71*	*±3.77*	*±1.30*	*±2.03*	*±2.41*
Bilaspur	4.56	3.95	3.01	2.59	2.86	11.56	13.06	10.33	11.46	10.79
	±1.07	*±0.94*	*±1.01*	*±1.01*	*±0.85*	*±2.95*	*±3.63*	*±3.02*	*±3.14*	*±2.79*
Raipur	4.39	4.73	2.59	1.73	2.63	7.78	9.35	9.48	8.74	10.96
	±0.88	*±1.08*	*±1.06*	*±0.72*	*±0.76*	*±2.11*	*±2.12*	*±2.26*	*±2.03*	*±2.74*
Surguja	3.27	5.70	4.08	1.01	1.60	8.72	10.84	12.30	14.98	15.59
	±1.52	*±1.72*	*±1.34*	*±0.64*	*±0.89*	*±3.21*	*±3.27*	*±3.99*	*±4.35*	*±4.73*
State	4.61	4.64	3.34	1.86	2.40	8.54	10.33	9.41	10.09	11.01
	±0.64	*±0.65*	*±0.64*	*±0.46*	*±0.45*	*±1.40*	*±1.56*	*±1.51*	*±1.52*	*±1.68*

Learning levels: Std I-II

Division/Region	% Children in Std I-II who CAN READ letters or more					% Children in Std I-II who CAN RECOGNIZE numbers 1 to 9 or more				
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Bastar	74.90	94.09	92.33	83.16	75.01	70.61	94.40	93.44	83.47	70.00
	±6.53	*±3.63*	*±5.07*	*±6.56*	*±10.26*	*±7.01*	*±2.85*	*±4.12*	*±6.96*	*±10.35*
Bilaspur	77.20	92.97	90.46	88.96	75.81	78.15	92.69	90.00	90.02	73.53
	±4.62	*±2.98*	*±3.04*	*±3.66*	*±5.36*	*±4.48*	*±3.04*	*±3.40*	*±2.89*	*±5.72*
Raipur	82.68	94.38	89.12	89.32	76.90	83.97	94.97	88.81	89.23	78.59
	±3.47	*±1.79*	*±2.70*	*±2.74*	*±4.61*	*±2.97*	*±1.59*	*±2.56*	*±2.74*	*±4.12*
Surguja	76.21	93.62	89.67	83.95	74.17	77.75	95.40	90.45	81.75	72.90
	±5.58	*±2.54*	*±3.97*	*±4.61*	*±6.67*	*±5.97*	*±2.26*	*±3.62*	*±4.87*	*±7.00*
State	78.93	93.82	89.97	87.56	75.82	79.58	94.36	90.03	87.43	74.97
	±2.36	*±1.28*	*±1.70*	*±1.91*	*±2.98*	*±2.31*	*±1.20*	*±1.65*	*±1.86*	*±3.00*

Learning levels: Std III-V

Division/Region	% Children in Std III-V who CAN READ Level 1 (Std I) text or more					% Children in Std III-V who CAN DO subtraction or more				
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Bastar	60.53	89.63	82.23	74.96	63.68	56.80	81.21	72.25	58.47	49.62
	±8.11	*±3.51*	*±5.66*	*±8.16*	*±6.91*	*±6.69*	*±6.18*	*±7.11*	*±7.95*	*±6.78*
Bilaspur	54.04	84.01	71.14	66.14	44.72	42.20	80.28	70.02	53.39	33.73
	±4.03	*±3.52*	*±4.91*	*±5.30*	*±5.12*	*±4.39*	*±4.00*	*±4.80*	*±6.76*	*±4.91*
Raipur	67.66	85.51	71.19	70.60	52.91	53.12	78.56	64.26	58.23	39.44
	±3.70	*±2.62*	*±4.08*	*±3.90*	*±5.40*	*±4.32*	*±3.91*	*±4.30*	*±5.17*	*±5.17*
Surguja	50.89	83.46	75.57	69.70	55.18	45.56	81.66	62.94	59.82	42.81
	±4.98	*±4.65*	*±5.15*	*±5.65*	*±8.50*	*±4.99*	*±4.41*	*±5.68*	*±6.76*	*±9.08*
State	59.65	85.15	73.37	69.63	52.54	48.92	79.94	66.79	57.14	39.89
	±2.45	*±1.78*	*±2.52*	*±2.64*	*±3.21*	*±2.52*	*±2.26*	*±2.61*	*±3.30*	*±3.19*

Note: Districts have been clubbed into divisions to produce these estimates. The grouping of districts is based on administrative divisions used in the state or by geographical regions.

How to read these tables: The first row for each division gives the estimate of the relevant variable/year. The numbers below the estimate, in the second row, are twice the standard error of the corresponding estimate and represent the 95% confidence interval for the estimate. For instance, In Bastar division of Chhattisgarh, in 2007, % of Std I-II children who could read letters or more is 74.90 %. With 95% probability, the true population proportion lies within ±6.53 % points of the estimate, i.e., between 81.43 % and 68.37%.

List of districts under each division
Bastar
Uttar Bastar Kanker
Bastar
Dakshin Bastar Dantewada
Bilaspur
Raigarh
Korba
Janjgir-Champa
Bilaspur
Raipur
Kawardha (Kabeerdham)
Rajnandgaon
Durg
Raipur
Mahasamund
Dhamtari
Surguja
Koriya
Surguja
Jashpur

Divisional Estimates

Annual Status of Education Report
असर ASER 2011 RURAL
Facilitated by PRATHAM

Gujarat

School enrollment and out of school children

Division/Region	% Children out of school (age: 6-14)					% Children enrolled in private school (age: 6-14)				
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Central	3.11	5.21	4.17	3.53	2.73	5.35	10.22	9.93	9.90	11.22
	±0.80	*±1.54*	*±0.74*	*±0.84*	*±0.73*	*±1.33*	*±2.76*	*±2.07*	*±2.15*	*±2.50*
North	4.35	3.81	5.23	3.78	3.51	4.41	5.49	11.74	8.25	8.79
	±1.45	*±1.26*	*±1.17*	*±1.12*	*±1.05*	*±1.20*	*±1.44*	*±2.44*	*±2.35*	*±2.11*
Saurashtra	3.87	3.94	3.74	5.35	1.91	7.70	10.37	8.23	15.02	12.81
	±0.86	*±0.96*	*±0.81*	*±1.13*	*±0.57*	*±2.41*	*±2.51*	*±1.62*	*±2.37*	*±2.91*
South	2.70	3.42	4.00	2.71	2.88	4.10	5.17	12.65	7.52	8.20
	±1.12	*±0.93*	*±1.15*	*±0.81*	*±0.93*	*±2.13*	*±1.41*	*±2.99*	*±2.16*	*±2.94*
State	3.63	4.22	4.26	4.00	2.66	5.76	8.28	10.22	10.71	10.84
	±0.54	*±0.65*	*±0.47*	*±0.52*	*±0.41*	*±0.98*	*±1.22*	*±1.09*	*±1.19*	*±1.40*

Learning levels: Std I-II

Division/Region	% Children in Std I-II who CAN READ letters or more					% Children in Std I-II who CAN RECOGNIZE numbers 1 to 9 or more				
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Central	77.51	69.26	73.82	78.52	80.55	79.60	69.31	72.13	77.91	78.71
	±4.06	*±4.58*	*±4.18*	*±3.45*	*±4.20*	*±3.71*	*±4.77*	*±4.54*	*±3.49*	*±4.25*
North	82.19	69.21	72.01	83.59	76.03	83.80	71.09	75.39	83.08	73.93
	±4.40	*±6.07*	*±4.85*	*±3.74*	*±5.03*	*±4.51*	*±5.79*	*±4.95*	*±3.73*	*±5.06*
Saurashtra	83.44	72.91	78.11	83.55	85.52	86.19	71.58	76.43	77.98	85.19
	±2.97	*±4.06*	*±3.54*	*±3.76*	*±3.16*	*±2.93*	*±4.02*	*±3.90*	*±4.01*	*±3.44*
South	84.17	82.38	81.25	81.78	71.11	85.82	81.75	79.80	81.15	75.29
	±5.36	*±4.91*	*±4.15*	*±3.97*	*±5.75*	*±4.55*	*±5.45*	*±4.93*	*±4.24*	*±5.00*
State	81.29	72.53	75.77	81.64	79.71	83.44	72.59	75.39	79.60	78.95
	±2.06	*±2.58*	*±2.16*	*±1.89*	*±2.26*	*±1.98*	*±2.56*	*±2.32*	*±1.96*	*±2.30*

Learning levels: Std III-V

Division/Region	% Children in Std III-V who CAN READ Level 1 (Std I) text or more					% Children in Std III-V who CAN DO subtraction or more				
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Central	56.20	56.04	52.73	57.48	59.26	44.07	37.94	34.97	43.14	35.03
	±3.84	*±4.49*	*±4.07*	*±3.78*	*±4.51*	*±3.99*	*±4.46*	*±4.45*	*±4.04*	*±4.48*
North	71.65	62.88	60.95	65.73	63.92	67.73	52.45	42.96	50.83	44.15
	±4.74	*±5.26*	*±5.24*	*±4.91*	*±4.75*	*±5.50*	*±5.61*	*±5.60*	*±5.07*	*±4.58*
Saurashtra	68.52	58.05	58.50	68.94	68.22	60.61	38.67	43.53	45.94	52.33
	±3.79	*±4.14*	*±3.90*	*±3.35*	*±3.93*	*±4.16*	*±4.23*	*±4.05*	*±3.78*	*±4.56*
South	64.96	65.06	58.56	59.70	60.46	55.76	48.67	45.87	49.40	40.66
	±5.09	*±4.92*	*±4.69*	*±4.60*	*±5.24*	*±5.87*	*±4.56*	*±5.67*	*±5.36*	*±5.42*
State	64.90	59.83	57.29	63.00	63.34	56.52	43.62	41.05	46.61	43.36
	±2.26	*±2.37*	*±2.26*	*±2.05*	*±2.32*	*±2.60*	*±2.43*	*±2.45*	*±2.23*	*±2.48*

Note: Districts have been clubbed into divisions to produce these estimates. The grouping of districts is based on administrative divisions used in the state or by geographical regions.

How to read these tables: The first row for each division gives the estimate of the relevant variable/year. The numbers below the estimate, in the second row, are twice the standard error of the corresponding estimate and represent the 95% confidence interval for the estimate. For instance, In Central division of Gujarat, in 2007, % of Std I-II children who could read letters or more is 77.51 %. With 95% probability, the true population proportion lies within ±4.06 % points of the estimate, i.e., between 81.57 % and 73.45 %.

List of districts under each division
Central
Ahmadabad
Anand
Kheda
Panch Mahals
Dohad
Vadodara
Narmada
North
Banas Kantha
Patan
Mahesana
Sabar Kantha
Gandhinagar
Saurashtra
Kachchh
Surendranagar
Rajkot
Jamnagar
Porbandar
Junagadh
Amreli
Bhavnagar
South
Bharuch
The Dangs
Navsari
Valsad
Tapi
Surat

Divisional Estimates

Annual Status of Education Report
असर ASER 2011 RURAL
Facilitated by PRATHAM

Haryana

School enrollment and out of school children

Division/Region	% Children out of school (age: 6-14)					% Children enrolled in private school (age: 6-14)				
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Ambala	2.44	1.72	1.44	0.71	1.07	36.33	35.34	38.07	30.19	37.38
	±0.74	*±0.51*	*±0.48*	*±0.29*	*±0.72*	*±4.15*	*±3.97*	*±4.36*	*±3.97*	*±4.16*
Gurgaon	6.73	6.53	5.70	2.17	2.46	32.39	38.19	34.87	37.18	38.33
	±1.90	*±2.05*	*±2.22*	*±0.85*	*±1.03*	*±4.81*	*±4.28*	*±5.00*	*±5.16*	*±5.26*
Hisar	3.09	2.00	2.06	0.49	0.77	34.86	43.24	38.40	46.13	43.14
	±0.78	*±0.85*	*±1.02*	*±0.24*	*±0.39*	*±3.94*	*±3.95*	*±4.20*	*±4.02*	*±5.20*
Rohtak	2.24	1.24	3.46	1.05	0.62	40.78	42.59	52.90	49.90	58.36
	±0.70	*±0.56*	*±2.69*	*±0.65*	*±0.38*	*±4.11*	*±4.08*	*±4.03*	*±4.62*	*±4.61*
State	3.61	2.90	3.14	1.10	1.37	36.10	40.34	40.78	41.84	43.39
	±0.60	*±0.65*	*±0.91*	*±0.30*	*±0.41*	*±2.16*	*±2.08*	*±2.31*	*±2.35*	*±2.63*

Learning levels: Std I-II

Division/Region	% Children in Std I-II who CAN READ letters or more					% Children in Std I-II who CAN RECOGNIZE numbers 1 to 9 or more				
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Ambala	79.05	77.29	86.31	83.98	77.95	82.53	80.23	86.99	84.21	83.33
	±4.31	*±4.55*	*±3.73*	*±4.26*	*±4.56*	*±3.97*	*±4.14*	*±3.35*	*±4.20*	*±4.06*
Gurgaon	69.84	70.73	83.58	88.33	77.45	71.67	73.06	84.01	89.55	81.04
	±5.39	*±3.99*	*±3.91*	*±2.94*	*±6.02*	*±4.98*	*±3.82*	*±3.87*	*±2.90*	*±5.79*
Hisar	77.98	78.79	84.09	89.20	84.28	76.69	79.03	84.21	90.44	84.83
	±5.03	*±3.78*	*±4.05*	*±2.90*	*±5.30*	*±5.70*	*±4.06*	*±3.68*	*±2.67*	*±5.45*
Rohtak	84.85	83.69	88.05	88.79	87.90	85.91	83.50	89.39	89.18	87.72
	±3.44	*±3.24*	*±4.00*	*±3.26*	*±5.11*	*±3.38*	*±3.10*	*±4.11*	*±3.39*	*±6.00*
State	77.74	77.24	85.26	87.95	81.27	78.80	78.45	85.81	88.81	83.77
	±2.48	*±2.04*	*±2.01*	*±1.62*	*±2.88*	*±2.49*	*±1.99*	*±1.91*	*±1.60*	*±2.83*

Learning levels: Std III-V

Division/Region	% Children in Std III-V who CAN READ Level 1 (Std I) text or more					% Children in Std III-V who CAN DO subtraction or more				
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Ambala	68.09	67.79	63.69	61.74	62.35	70.32	58.30	60.11	56.59	53.10
	±4.00	*±4.32*	*±5.35*	*±4.92*	*±4.75*	*±4.41*	*±4.53*	*±5.15*	*±5.57*	*±4.22*
Gurgaon	73.58	71.82	70.11	75.92	71.89	69.54	60.68	67.81	71.61	65.66
	±4.30	*±3.37*	*±4.95*	*±3.99*	*±5.00*	*±5.05*	*±4.31*	*±5.31*	*±4.05*	*±5.71*
Hisar	70.55	76.18	71.68	75.08	69.41	69.57	70.42	68.81	72.48	67.54
	±5.00	*±3.72*	*±4.37*	*±3.72*	*±5.72*	*±4.70*	*±4.24*	*±4.51*	*±3.71*	*±4.79*
Rohtak	75.71	75.64	73.59	74.06	75.30	73.79	70.64	73.21	73.34	71.96
	±4.03	*±4.53*	*±4.75*	*±4.62*	*±5.28*	*±4.04*	*±4.84*	*±5.00*	*±4.75*	*±5.02*
State	72.23	73.33	70.17	72.37	69.79	70.86	65.69	67.85	69.29	64.46
	±2.25	*±2.01*	*±2.43*	*±2.19*	*±2.66*	*±2.32*	*±2.31*	*±2.54*	*±2.30*	*±2.67*

Note: Districts have been clubbed into divisions to produce these estimates. The grouping of districts is based on administrative divisions used in the state or by geographical regions.

How to read these tables: The first row for each division gives the estimate of the relevant variable/year. The numbers below the estimate, in the second row, are twice the standard error of the corresponding estimate and represent the 95% confidence interval for the estimate. For instance, In Ambala division of Haryana, in 2007, % of Std I-II children who could read letters or more is 79.05 %. With 95% probability, the true population proportion lies within ±4.31 % points of the estimate, i.e., between 83.36 % and 74.74 %.

List of districts under each division
Ambala
Ambala
Kaithal
Kurukshetra
Panchkula
Yamunanagar
Gurgaon
Mahendragarh
Rewari
Mewat
Faridabad
Gurgaon
Hisar
Bhiwani
Fatehabad
Hisar
Jind
Sirsa
Rohtak
Jhajjar
Karnal
Panipat
Rohtak
Sonipat

Divisional Estimates

Himachal Pradesh

Note: Districts have been clubbed into divisions to produce these estimates. The grouping of districts is based on administrative divisions used in the state or by geographical regions.

How to read these tables: The first row for each division gives the estimate of the relevant variable/year. The numbers below the estimate, in the second row, are twice the standard error of the corresponding estimate and represent the 95% confidence interval for the estimate. For instance, In Kangra division of Himachal Pradesh, in 2007, % of Std I-II children who could read letters or more is 90.08 %. With 95% probability, the true population proportion lies within ±3.30 % points of the estimate, i.e., between 93.38 % and 86.78%.

School enrollment and out of school children

Division/Region	% Children out of school (age: 6-14)					% Children enrolled in private school (age: 6-14)				
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Kangra	1.12	0.81	0.83	0.33	0.85	26.70	28.53	23.62	27.37	26.59
	±0.86	*±0.53*	*±0.65*	*±0.27*	*±1.22*	*±5.29*	*±6.79*	*±5.29*	*±5.86*	*±5.80*
Mandi	0.75	0.40	0.38	0.09	0.42	22.27	23.44	22.81	26.40	28.37
	±0.64	*±0.27*	*±0.28*	*±0.10*	*±0.27*	*±4.75*	*±4.86*	*±4.69*	*±4.97*	*±5.41*
Shimla	1.01	0.61	0.83	0.64	0.30	17.02	19.23	18.33	20.54	24.45
	±0.49	*±0.33*	*±0.43*	*±0.45*	*±0.22*	*±4.24*	*±3.91*	*±4.32*	*±4.29*	*±5.26*
State	0.96	0.62	0.67	0.33	0.55	22.56	24.26	21.97	25.30	26.63
	±0.42	*±0.24*	*±0.30*	*±0.16*	*±0.47*	*±2.97*	*±3.36*	*±2.88*	*±3.13*	*±3.22*

Learning levels: Std I-II

Division/Region	% Children in Std I-II who CAN READ letters or more					% Children in Std I-II who CAN RECOGNIZE numbers 1 to 9 or more				
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Kangra	90.08	86.88	87.23	92.91	91.67	92.67	89.72	87.15	93.15	95.42
	±3.30	*±4.42*	*±4.78*	*±2.72*	*±4.29*	*±2.72*	*±3.33*	*±4.54*	*±3.10*	*±2.29*
Mandi	93.44	92.96	95.44	90.18	94.25	94.50	94.83	97.68	90.24	96.24
	±2.22	*±3.03*	*±3.09*	*±4.30*	*±3.60*	*±2.35*	*±2.87*	*±1.12*	*±4.40*	*±2.43*
Shimla	92.97	89.59	92.08	92.85	90.80	93.80	90.37	91.31	94.57	94.19
	±2.67	*±3.83*	*±3.75*	*±3.06*	*±3.80*	*±2.38*	*±3.32*	*±3.73*	*±2.76*	*±2.83*
State	92.05	89.71	91.52	92.05	92.33	93.61	91.61	92.10	92.64	95.38
	±1.63	*±2.25*	*±2.33*	*±1.95*	*±2.31*	*±1.45*	*±1.87*	*±2.08*	*±2.04*	*±1.43*

Learning levels: Std III-V

Division/Region	% Children in Std III-V who CAN READ Level 1 (Std I) text or more					% Children in Std III-V who CAN DO subtraction or more				
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Kangra	80.34	84.59	78.19	83.08	80.33	71.25	75.97	79.62	79.24	76.30
	±4.09	*±4.78*	*±6.02*	*±3.70*	*±4.36*	*±5.49*	*±5.48*	*±6.65*	*±4.77*	*±4.73*
Mandi	89.02	85.14	84.39	76.77	82.02	87.68	83.18	84.17	71.65	73.26
	±2.55	*±3.19*	*±3.99*	*±5.28*	*±6.81*	*±2.96*	*±3.98*	*±3.83*	*±5.85*	*±7.75*
Shimla	85.51	83.02	85.95	84.79	84.95	82.68	73.34	82.06	81.37	77.26
	±3.78	*±3.96*	*±3.76*	*±3.90*	*±3.50*	*±3.93*	*±5.24*	*±5.28*	*±4.16*	*±4.45*
State	84.73	84.33	82.36	81.63	82.13	79.98	77.60	81.80	77.51	75.51
	±2.10	*±2.41*	*±2.87*	*±2.55*	*±3.03*	*±2.79*	*±2.95*	*±3.21*	*±3.06*	*±3.48*

List of districts under each division

Kangra
Chamba
Kangra
Una
Mandi
Bilaspur
Hamirpur
Kullu
Lahul & Spiti
Mandi
Shimla
Kinnaur
Shimla
Sirmaur
Solan

Divisional Estimates

Annual Status of Education Report
असर ASER 2011 RURAL
Facilitated by PRATHAM

Jharkhand

School enrollment and out of school children

Division/Region	% Children out of school (age: 6-14)					% Children enrolled in private school (age: 6-14)				
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Kolhan	9.42	12.98	7.64	7.18	8.53	6.11	3.54	6.44	6.62	9.10
	±2.05	*±3.91*	*±2.14*	*±2.28*	*±2.18*	*±2.23*	*±1.40*	*±2.22*	*±2.29*	*±3.21*
North Chotanagpur	2.91	3.28	3.33	1.55	1.81	14.99	13.83	14.13	11.28	17.20
	±0.80	*±0.98*	*±1.20*	*±0.48*	*±0.70*	*±3.19*	*±2.78*	*±2.51*	*±2.08*	*±3.61*
Palamu	4.01	3.73	2.86	3.13	3.69	6.44	3.30	3.05	2.44	7.31
	±1.74	*±1.44*	*±1.73*	*±1.54*	*±1.01*	*±2.75*	*±1.36*	*±2.15*	*±1.20*	*±2.69*
Santhal Pargana	6.20	7.89	8.72	5.86	6.61	5.61	7.67	3.96	4.29	5.84
	±1.45	*±1.84*	*±2.13*	*±1.78*	*±1.25*	*±2.57*	*±2.68*	*±1.31*	*±1.54*	*±2.04*
South Chotanagpur	4.98	3.15	4.66	3.61	5.15	13.50	17.12	17.51	15.97	21.79
	±1.35	*±0.89*	*±1.52*	*±1.01*	*±1.50*	*±4.22*	*±4.08*	*±4.48*	*±3.99*	*±4.00*
State	4.97	5.61	5.40	3.77	4.65	10.32	9.94	9.98	8.80	12.83
	±0.63	*±0.84*	*±0.82*	*±0.61*	*±0.60*	*±1.57*	*±1.39*	*±1.34*	*±1.18*	*±1.64*

Learning levels: Std I-II

Division/Region	% Children in Std I-II who CAN READ letters or more					% Children in Std I-II who CAN RECOGNIZE numbers 1 to 9 or more				
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Kolhan	94.61	84.99	72.94	65.46	64.79	88.05	82.70	78.71	69.20	68.13
	±2.47	*±4.66*	*±7.77*	*±8.52*	*±7.83*	*±3.44*	*±4.41*	*±6.67*	*±8.10*	*±6.63*
North Chotanagpur	75.04	71.54	77.38	70.99	69.17	74.00	72.87	77.88	72.66	68.21
	±5.17	*±3.58*	*±4.17*	*±4.71*	*±5.41*	*±5.05*	*±3.31*	*±4.30*	*±4.83*	*±5.64*
Palamu	67.88	50.89	69.55	56.76	55.42	65.81	47.89	65.61	56.33	51.69
	±5.75	*±7.24*	*±7.88*	*±8.34*	*±6.02*	*±5.86*	*±7.25*	*±7.77*	*±8.36*	*±6.00*
Santhal Pargana	79.10	70.02	82.64	81.46	60.22	78.14	68.45	81.48	82.05	61.59
	±5.13	*±4.29*	*±3.54*	*±3.60*	*±5.80*	*±5.14*	*±4.23*	*±3.56*	*±3.75*	*±5.48*
South Chotanagpur	71.60	67.15	76.98	72.28	64.08	71.14	68.99	76.97	73.03	67.46
	±5.17	*±5.85*	*±4.46*	*±6.77*	*±5.03*	*±4.86*	*±5.79*	*±4.20*	*±7.19*	*±5.11*
State	76.90	68.85	77.08	71.45	63.50	75.09	68.43	77.21	72.62	63.97
	±2.56	*±2.40*	*±2.30*	*±2.72*	*±2.74*	*±2.48*	*±2.40*	*±2.25*	*±2.78*	*±2.74*

Learning levels: Std III-V

Division/Region	% Children in Std III-V who CAN READ Level 1 (Std I) text or more					% Children in Std III-V who CAN DO subtraction or more				
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Kolhan	55.67	58.29	55.19	45.30	41.87	48.48	51.24	52.81	44.90	30.45
	±6.03	*±7.02*	*±7.50*	*±8.05*	*±6.43*	*±6.74*	*±6.96*	*±7.52*	*±7.72*	*±5.59*
North Chotanagpur	69.51	66.35	65.66	64.53	58.68	66.03	55.22	58.13	58.06	52.59
	±4.12	*±3.91*	*±4.38*	*±3.92*	*±4.98*	*±4.75*	*±4.67*	*±4.87*	*±4.77*	*±4.73*
Palamu	64.22	58.77	58.30	57.68	40.17	58.13	45.16	45.95	50.04	36.86
	±6.64	*±6.48*	*±10.49*	*±6.56*	*±5.87*	*±7.68*	*±6.09*	*±7.34*	*±6.54*	*±5.67*
Santhal Pargana	63.44	59.24	48.60	56.78	45.18	63.63	50.06	48.99	58.55	41.75
	±4.11	*±4.60*	*±4.80*	*±5.12*	*±4.46*	*±4.12*	*±5.29*	*±4.85*	*±4.75*	*±4.73*
South Chotanagpur	60.25	63.06	55.96	59.76	45.71	47.82	44.44	44.25	47.58	29.62
	±5.13	*±5.06*	*±4.99*	*±6.42*	*±6.82*	*±6.96*	*±5.66*	*±5.28*	*±6.46*	*±6.56*
State	64.10	62.05	57.58	58.93	48.40	58.94	50.11	51.41	53.81	41.03
	±2.33	*±2.30*	*±2.68*	*±2.51*	*±2.68*	*±2.79*	*±2.57*	*±2.64*	*±2.67*	*±2.74*

Note: Districts have been clubbed into divisions to produce these estimates. The grouping of districts is based on administrative divisions used in the state or by geographical regions.

How to read these tables: The first row for each division gives the estimate of the relevant variable/year. The numbers below the estimate, in the second row, are twice the standard error of the corresponding estimate and represent the 95% confidence interval for the estimate. For instance, In Kolhan division of Jharkhand, in 2007, % of Std I-II children who could read letters or more is 94.61 %. With 95% probability, the true population proportion lies within ±2.47 % points of the estimate, i.e., between 97.08 % and 92.14 %.

List of districts under each division

Kolhan
Pashchimi Singhbhum
Purbi Singhbhum
Saraikela-Kharswan
North Chotanagpur
Chatra
Hazaribagh
Kodarma
Giridih
Dhanbad
Bokaro
Palamu
Garhwa
Palamu
Latehar
Santhal Pargana
Deoghar
Godda
Sahibganj
Pakur
Dumka
Jamtara
South Chotanagpur
Ranchi
Lohardaga
Gumla
Simdega

Divisional Estimates

Annual Status of Education Report
असर ASER 2011 RURAL
Facilitated by PRATHAM

Karnataka

School enrollment and out of school children

Division/Region	% Children out of school (age: 6-14)					% Children enrolled in private school (age: 6-14)				
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Bangalore	1.57	1.11	1.51	1.57	1.03	13.34	20.50	17.78	21.62	24.38
	±0.46	*±0.35*	*±0.41*	*±0.43*	*±0.41*	*±2.01*	*±2.66*	*±2.57*	*±2.93*	*±2.98*
Belgaum	2.25	2.69	2.21	2.40	2.70	10.62	13.51	14.21	16.72	15.74
	±0.61	*±0.54*	*±0.57*	*±0.78*	*±0.76*	*±2.51*	*±2.75*	*±2.70*	*±3.11*	*±2.43*
Gulbarga	9.17	10.24	8.52	7.70	6.35	10.14	12.82	13.70	13.82	13.30
	±1.87	*±2.74*	*±1.89*	*±1.52*	*±1.67*	*±2.73*	*±2.61*	*±3.09*	*±2.69*	*±2.95*
Mysore	1.73	1.16	1.33	1.69	1.20	11.92	25.08	21.08	26.60	26.51
	±0.55	*±0.35*	*±0.40*	*±0.47*	*±0.39*	*±2.32*	*±3.11*	*±2.95*	*±3.08*	*±3.33*
State	3.46	3.57	3.17	3.13	2.79	11.58	18.10	16.77	19.98	20.04
	±0.55	*±0.73*	*±0.52*	*±0.47*	*±0.51*	*±1.19*	*±1.45*	*±1.41*	*±1.52*	*±1.53*

Learning levels: Std I-II

Division/Region	% Children in Std I-II who CAN READ letters or more					% Children in Std I-II who CAN RECOGNIZE numbers 1 to 9 or more				
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Bangalore	87.27	88.68	91.46	89.08	91.21	84.39	87.17	87.49	88.16	91.49
	±2.67	*±2.69*	*±2.09*	*±2.91*	*±2.58*	*±3.07*	*±3.05*	*±2.81*	*±3.22*	*±2.66*
Belgaum	80.43	80.00	85.09	83.72	83.96	81.40	81.23	82.87	82.93	84.91
	±3.48	*±3.15*	*±3.26*	*±3.90*	*±3.42*	*±3.32*	*±3.51*	*±3.73*	*±3.92*	*±3.13*
Gulbarga	73.00	75.88	75.30	73.69	75.52	69.98	77.87	73.61	77.45	76.26
	±3.78	*±3.78*	*±3.83*	*±4.50*	*±4.63*	*±3.72*	*±3.58*	*±4.17*	*±4.50*	*±4.76*
Mysore	93.46	89.99	91.53	93.99	91.03	93.03	85.94	89.46	90.99	90.56
	±2.17	*±2.30*	*±2.19*	*±1.87*	*±2.78*	*±1.92*	*±2.72*	*±2.68*	*±2.40*	*±2.60*
State	83.46	83.39	85.74	85.59	85.34	82.07	82.96	83.29	85.20	85.75
	±1.65	*±1.62*	*±1.66*	*±1.82*	*±1.84*	*±1.70*	*±1.68*	*±1.83*	*±1.79*	*±1.81*

Learning levels: Std III-V

Division/Region	% Children in Std III-V who CAN READ Level 1 (Std I) text or more					% Children in Std III-V who CAN DO subtraction or more				
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Bangalore	58.99	64.28	66.37	59.39	65.24	49.00	49.76	54.25	54.57	53.60
	±3.86	*±3.79*	*±3.62*	*±4.23*	*±4.16*	*±4.30*	*±4.37*	*±4.36*	*±4.36*	*±4.48*
Belgaum	57.64	58.78	66.82	60.42	57.09	39.35	40.57	45.36	47.40	45.33
	±3.58	*±3.93*	*±3.71*	*±4.86*	*±4.95*	*±3.99*	*±4.37*	*±4.19*	*±4.94*	*±5.42*
Gulbarga	43.50	48.41	43.84	42.12	44.87	30.44	24.51	26.29	22.48	33.29
	±4.19	*±3.93*	*±4.54*	*±4.64*	*±4.84*	*±4.01*	*±3.40*	*±4.20*	*±3.86*	*±4.26*
Mysore	65.37	68.74	75.32	72.50	71.15	55.58	46.12	54.19	47.70	57.39
	±3.86	*±3.12*	*±3.38*	*±3.43*	*±3.64*	*±3.83*	*±3.59*	*±4.11*	*±4.20*	*±4.19*
State	57.20	60.59	63.99	59.56	59.66	44.53	41.09	46.02	44.53	47.49
	±2.03	*±1.95*	*±2.08*	*±2.35*	*±2.39*	*±2.14*	*±2.17*	*±2.34*	*±2.46*	*±2.48*

Note: Districts have been clubbed into divisions to produce these estimates. The grouping of districts is based on administrative divisions used in the state or by geographical regions.

How to read these tables: The first row for each division gives the estimate of the relevant variable/year. The numbers below the estimate, in the second row, are twice the standard error of the corresponding estimate and represent the 95% confidence interval for the estimate. For instance, In Bangalore division of Karnataka, in 2007, % of Std I-II children who could read letters or more is 87.27 %. With 95% probability, the true population proportion lies within ±2.67 % points of the estimate, i.e., between 89.94 % and 84.60 %.

List of districts under each division

Bangalore
Chitradurga
Davanagere
Shimoga
Tumkur
Kolar
Bangalore
Bangalore Rural
Belgaum
Belgaum
Bagalkot
Bijapur
Gadag
Dharwad
Uttara Kannada
Haveri
Gulbarga
Gulbarga
Bidar
Raichur
Koppal
Bellary
Mysore
Udupi
Chikmagalur
Mandya
Hassan
Dakshina Kannada
Kodagu
Mysore
Chamarajanagar

Divisional Estimates

Annual Status of Education Report
असर ASER 2011 RURAL
Facilitated by PRATHAM

Kerala

Note: Districts have been clubbed into divisions to produce these estimates. The grouping of districts is based on administrative divisions used in the state or by geographical regions.

How to read these tables: The first row for each division gives the estimate of the relevant variable/year. The numbers below the estimate, in the second row, are twice the standard error of the corresponding estimate and represent the 95% confidence interval for the estimate. For instance, In Central Kerala division of Kerala, in 2007, % of Std I-II children who could read letters or more is 96.87 %. With 95% probability, the true population proportion lies within ±1.54 % points of the estimate, i.e., between 98.41 % and 95.33%.

School enrollment and out of school children

Division/Region	% Children out of school (age: 6-14)					% Children enrolled in private school (age: 6-14)				
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Central Kerala	0.30	0.27	0.12	0.03	0.00	58.67	55.19	51.19	61.26	68.70
	±0.23	*±0.20*	*±0.14*	*±0.05*	*±0.00*	*±7.02*	*±6.78*	*±7.36*	*±5.88*	*±4.97*
North Kerala	0.67	0.15	0.05	0.12	0.00	56.48	46.53	44.28	44.50	52.20
	±0.36	*±0.11*	*±0.06*	*±0.12*	*±0.00*	*±5.90*	*±6.54*	*±5.85*	*±6.14*	*±5.67*
South Kerala	0.22	0.17	0.11	0.11	0.00	51.06	49.97	57.74	57.39	62.67
	±0.20	*±0.14*	*±0.11*	*±0.13*	*±0.00*	*±6.23*	*±5.02*	*±4.94*	*±4.83*	*±5.04*
State	0.39	0.20	0.10	0.09	0.08	55.18	50.48	51.46	54.21	60.79
	±0.15	*±0.09*	*±0.06*	*±0.06*	*±0.06*	*±3.72*	*±3.54*	*±3.49*	*±3.34*	*±3.10*

Learning levels: Std I-II

Division/Region	% Children in Std I-II who CAN READ letters or more					% Children in Std I-II who CAN RECOGNIZE numbers 1 to 9 or more				
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Central Kerala	96.87	98.88	94.44	97.22	93.92	96.69	97.21	93.04	98.92	94.96
	±1.54	*±1.02*	*±2.41*	*±2.47*	*±2.80*	*±1.71*	*±1.62*	*±3.40*	*±1.13*	*±2.54*
North Kerala	96.36	97.60	96.64	98.37	97.67	95.14	97.06	96.85	97.93	96.40
	±1.41	*±1.45*	*±2.00*	*±1.13*	*±1.39*	*±2.20*	*±1.54*	*±1.66*	*±1.54*	*±1.73*
South Kerala	96.78	99.04	98.53	98.65	98.72	96.65	98.77	97.55	97.62	98.50
	±1.91	*±0.78*	*±1.18*	*±1.19*	*±0.95*	*±2.08*	*±0.97*	*±1.58*	*±1.82*	*±1.24*
State	96.66	98.49	96.73	98.15	97.10	96.13	97.67	96.01	98.09	96.88
	±0.95	*±0.65*	*±1.07*	*±0.92*	*±0.99*	*±1.18*	*±0.82*	*±1.28*	*±0.92*	*±1.03*

Learning levels: Std III-V

Division/Region	% Children in Std III-V who CAN READ Level 1 (Std I) text or more					% Children in Std III-V who CAN DO subtraction or more				
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Central Kerala	81.05	85.70	78.76	83.29	82.96	69.48	77.51	74.48	79.69	67.68
	±4.00	±2.89	±4.83	±3.72	±3.59	±5.54	±4.80	±5.30	±4.26	±4.71
North Kerala	79.45	82.22	84.80	83.99	83.85	65.69	68.88	69.46	73.99	62.70
	±4.48	±3.23	±2.83	±3.30	±3.59	±6.67	±3.88	±4.58	±4.19	±5.15
South Kerala	85.42	88.53	84.65	91.98	80.28	79.33	79.65	81.42	83.41	71.07
	±3.29	±2.42	±3.70	±2.11	±2.97	±4.45	±3.39	±3.22	±3.17	±3.75
State	82.15	85.50	82.99	86.86	82.15	71.89	75.31	75.54	79.23	67.46
	±2.27	±1.72	±2.23	±1.80	±1.93	±3.24	±2.43	±2.56	±2.27	±2.63

List of districts under each division
Central Kerala
Palakkad
Thrissur
Ernakulam
Idukki
North Kerala
Kasaragod
Kannur
Wayanad
Kozhikode
Malappuram
South Kerala
Kottayam
Alappuzha
Pathanamthitta
Kollam
Thiruvananthapuram

Divisional Estimates

Madhya Pradesh

School enrollment and out of school children

Division/Region	% Children out of school (age: 6-14)					% Children enrolled in private school (age: 6-14)				
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Bhopal	2.13	1.46	1.96	2.07	2.16	16.76	17.11	17.64	19.20	22.25
	±0.57	±0.78	±0.66	±0.84	±1.05	±3.28	±3.61	±3.54	±3.39	±4.10
Chambal	0.61	2.01	1.33	2.54	2.11	12.76	10.55	17.51	12.95	13.27
	±0.42	±1.08	±0.68	±1.26	±0.76	±3.72	±3.38	±3.73	±3.11	±3.57
Gwalior	1.55	1.54	0.87	1.34	2.02	6.79	8.25	6.74	7.72	12.18
	±0.75	±0.75	±0.46	±0.66	±0.77	±2.51	±2.30	±2.04	±2.61	±2.87
Hoshangabad	1.77	2.01	2.25	1.27	2.86	10.81	14.11	16.04	12.31	17.96
	±0.82	±0.99	±0.95	±0.64	±1.56	±3.52	±4.17	±4.27	±2.83	±6.14
Indore	4.10	3.01	6.00	4.81	4.48	13.69	16.07	16.67	23.58	20.23
	±1.21	±1.26	±2.52	±1.22	±1.47	±2.74	±3.08	±3.19	±3.44	±3.02
Jabalpur	1.63	1.88	1.74	1.57	0.98	11.64	16.08	12.49	14.98	14.26
	±0.48	±0.50	±0.51	±0.60	±0.38	±2.27	±2.86	±2.47	±2.62	±2.45
Rewa	2.03	1.56	1.97	1.13	2.21	16.22	19.39	10.71	12.29	17.65
	±0.67	±0.56	±0.88	±0.55	±0.91	±3.43	±4.62	±2.77	±3.57	±4.12
Sagar	1.79	1.25	1.46	0.36	1.73	10.73	12.18	12.00	9.11	8.84
	±0.47	±0.49	±0.53	±0.20	±0.53	±2.94	±2.98	±2.80	±1.97	±2.22
Shahdol	1.88	1.58	1.15	1.36	1.22	4.77	8.94	3.24	6.20	12.35
	±0.97	±0.57	±0.57	±0.50	±0.65	±1.90	±3.46	±1.72	±1.95	±3.64
Ujjain	2.50	2.02	1.90	0.88	2.23	21.38	31.51	30.54	26.78	30.05
	±0.81	±0.62	±0.56	±0.32	±0.68	±3.14	±4.06	±4.04	±3.44	±4.14
State	2.16	1.87	2.31	1.81	2.23	13.16	16.18	14.81	15.43	17.17
	±0.27	±0.27	±0.44	±0.26	±0.32	±1.00	±1.20	±1.10	±1.07	±1.17

Learning levels: Std I-II

Division/Region	% Children in Std I-II who CAN READ letters or more					% Children in Std I-II who CAN RECOGNIZE numbers 1 to 9 or more				
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Bhopal	95.44	97.57	97.10	79.50	60.01	95.15	97.10	96.18	78.64	62.12
	±1.83	*±1.08*	*±1.05*	*±4.84*	*±6.37*	*±1.70*	*±1.10*	*±1.27*	*±4.92*	*±6.36*
Chambal	93.03	97.87	97.71	80.88	47.74	92.57	97.67	97.91	81.95	50.80
	±2.97	*±1.31*	*±1.72*	*±6.00*	*±6.71*	*±2.88*	*±1.60*	*±1.41*	*±5.46*	*±6.45*
Gwalior	87.69	96.56	97.28	74.91	56.97	88.56	94.96	95.60	72.44	58.69
	±3.60	*±1.61*	*±1.70*	*±5.47*	*±7.01*	*±3.82*	*±2.55*	*±2.60*	*±7.00*	*±7.07*
Hoshangabad	96.61	96.60	97.76	80.48	64.87	96.24	95.43	96.10	80.30	65.23
	±1.47	*±1.54*	*±1.44*	*±5.50*	*±9.11*	*±1.65*	*±2.52*	*±1.73*	*±5.84*	*±9.49*
Indore	97.57	98.92	94.89	82.01	64.04	96.80	98.45	92.72	82.79	60.14
	±1.19	*±0.90*	*±2.56*	*±3.58*	*±4.72*	*±1.42*	*±0.94*	*±2.97*	*±3.76*	*±4.41*
Jabalpur	94.06	96.36	91.70	84.72	68.88	93.66	95.35	90.73	82.51	66.41
	±2.07	*±1.08*	*±2.84*	*±3.05*	*±4.51*	*±1.99*	*±1.31*	*±2.54*	*±3.51*	*±4.55*
Rewa	86.83	95.39	95.51	93.42	75.53	85.24	94.36	93.49	91.27	69.56
	±3.05	*±1.93*	*±2.02*	*±2.87*	*±6.31*	*±3.57*	*±1.93*	*±2.47*	*±3.33*	*±7.05*
Sagar	91.42	94.49	93.77	93.44	60.46	90.65	93.13	94.56	94.25	61.00
	±2.48	*±1.87*	*±2.38*	*±2.70*	*±5.03*	*±2.68*	*±2.27*	*±1.92*	*±2.06*	*±4.85*
Shahdol	87.64	93.99	96.05	93.96	68.35	86.74	93.23	95.37	93.38	61.27
	±3.32	*±2.27*	*±3.09*	*±3.18*	*±6.81*	*±3.19*	*±2.47*	*±2.74*	*±3.65*	*±7.12*
Ujjain	96.53	96.91	97.40	85.99	75.61	95.63	96.21	96.28	85.57	73.36
	±1.14	*±1.45*	*±1.13*	*±3.31*	*±4.20*	*±1.48*	*±1.55*	*±1.71*	*±3.48*	*±4.48*
State	93.01	96.57	95.44	85.44	65.69	92.40	95.67	94.36	84.73	63.92
	±0.79	*±0.49*	*±0.75*	*±1.35*	*±1.94*	*±0.85*	*±0.58*	*±0.79*	*±1.46*	*±1.93*

Note: Districts have been clubbed into divisions to produce these estimates. The grouping of districts is based on administrative divisions used in the state or by geographical regions.

How to read these tables: The first row for each division gives the estimate of the relevant variable/year. The numbers below the estimate, in the second row, are twice the standard error of the corresponding estimate and represent the 95% confidence interval for the estimate. For instance, In Bhopal division of Madhya Pradesh, in 2007, % of Std I-II children who could read letters or more is 95.44 %. With 95% probability, the true population proportion lies within ±1.83 % points of the estimate, i.e., between 97.27 % and 93.61%.

List of districts under each division
Bhopal
Rajgarh
Vidisha
Bhopal
Sehore
Raisen
Chambal
Sheopur
Morena
Bhind
Gwalior
Gwalior
Datia
Shivpuri
Guna
Hoshangabad
Betul
Harda
Hoshangabad
Indore
Jhabua
Dhar
Indore
West Nimar
Barwani
East Nimar
Jabalpur
Katni


Divisional Estimates

Annual Status of Education Report
ASER 2011 RURAL
Facilitated by PRATHAM

Madhya Pradesh

Learning levels: Std III-V

Division/Region	% Children in Std III-V who CAN READ Level 1 (Std I) text or more					% Children in Std III-V who CAN DO subtraction or more				
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Bhopal	89.69	94.57	93.14	55.08	35.38	87.78	88.62	88.71	44.96	22.73
	±2.94	*±2.21*	*±1.63*	*±4.97*	*±4.99*	*±3.28*	*±3.05*	*±2.51*	*±5.11*	*±4.61*
Chambal	72.45	88.62	88.75	54.43	30.66	68.42	85.38	83.94	52.51	25.98
	±4.79	*±3.43*	*±3.51*	*±7.18*	*±5.20*	*±4.88*	*±3.92*	*±3.93*	*±6.32*	*±4.94*
Gwalior	75.02	90.08	86.08	55.73	36.34	68.16	83.72	81.72	35.26	26.38
	±4.39	*±2.84*	*±3.67*	*±4.28*	*±4.86*	*±4.84*	*±4.23*	*±4.20*	*±4.72*	*±4.41*
Hoshangabad	93.30	94.10	95.36	55.00	48.52	87.56	89.16	92.89	49.60	31.38
	±2.63	*±2.74*	*±1.67*	*±5.95*	*±8.81*	*±3.86*	*±3.68*	*±2.28*	*±4.90*	*±8.36*
Indore	94.04	97.48	90.06	58.70	41.36	92.66	95.91	86.32	50.49	31.71
	±1.66	*±1.05*	*±3.51*	*±4.59*	*±4.39*	*±1.79*	*±1.36*	*±4.51*	*±4.31*	*±4.00*
Jabalpur	78.60	84.76	77.36	65.97	45.19	69.75	74.58	68.85	54.29	29.16
	±3.09	*±2.79*	*±3.52*	*±4.13*	*±4.00*	*±3.58*	*±3.60*	*±3.91*	*±4.36*	*±3.64*
Rewa	73.34	94.68	91.30	85.47	51.83	64.54	89.46	83.51	73.88	30.07
	±4.16	*±1.99*	*±3.10*	*±4.08*	*±6.58*	*±4.69*	*±2.82*	*±4.38*	*±5.43*	*±5.59*
Sagar	83.94	91.57	83.16	74.84	35.57	79.48	83.88	76.70	71.10	23.20
	±2.88	*±2.03*	*±3.39*	*±5.29*	*±4.35*	*±3.63*	*±2.80*	*±4.38*	*±5.76*	*±3.51*
Shahdol	77.65	82.94	80.96	75.96	35.65	68.71	75.40	73.96	66.03	21.13
	±3.80	*±4.45*	*±4.48*	*±5.19*	*±6.00*	*±5.27*	*±4.35*	*±5.55*	*±6.47*	*±5.13*
Ujjain	85.93	95.38	94.10	78.23	64.95	82.90	91.34	90.06	66.60	47.85
	±2.93	*±1.75*	*±1.63*	*±3.73*	*±4.49*	*±3.40*	*±2.47*	*±2.54*	*±4.39*	*±5.26*
State	82.99	91.72	87.49	67.21	44.20	77.71	85.93	81.88	57.63	30.12
	±1.14	*±0.83*	*±1.13*	*±1.73*	*±1.81*	*±1.37*	*±1.10*	*±1.42*	*±1.88*	*±1.63*



List of districts under each division

Jabalpur
Narsimhapur
Mandla
Chhindwara
Seoni
Balaghat
Rewa
Satna
Rewa
Sidhi
Sagar
Tikamgarh
Chhatarpur
Panna
Sagar
Damoh
Shahdol
Umaria
Shahdol
Dindori
Ujjain
Neemuch
Mandsaur
Ratlam
Ujjain
Shajapur
Dewas

Divisional Estimates

Maharashtra

School enrollment and out of school children

Division/Region	% Children out of school (age: 6-14)					% Children enrolled in private school (age: 6-14)				
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Amravati	1.89	1.66	1.08	0.85	0.73	26.47	30.08	34.78	26.92	33.60
	±0.62	*±0.65*	*±0.44*	*±0.46*	*±0.40*	*±4.60*	*±3.94*	*±3.90*	*±4.07*	*±4.39*
Aurangabad	2.02	1.71	0.83	1.23	1.14	21.21	23.63	21.00	23.01	28.51
	±0.52	*±0.51*	*±0.30*	*±0.40*	*±0.38*	*±2.63*	*±2.86*	*±2.26*	*±2.36*	*±3.13*
Konkan	2.15	1.19	1.54	1.54	2.35	20.16	19.36	27.57	12.10	14.56
	±1.30	*±0.76*	*±0.99*	*±0.98*	*±1.31*	*±4.44*	*±3.92*	*±6.21*	*±3.99*	*±4.65*
Nagpur	1.53	1.80	0.51	0.63	0.43	29.85	30.28	31.08	30.67	34.76
	±0.71	*±0.79*	*±0.30*	*±0.34*	*±0.25*	*±3.60*	*±3.65*	*±3.62*	*±3.37*	*±3.75*
Nashik	2.36	2.03	1.56	1.66	1.35	28.05	24.50	30.98	32.61	35.79
	±0.77	*±0.69*	*±0.77*	*±0.53*	*±0.58*	*±4.07*	*±3.99*	*±4.13*	*±3.99*	*±4.20*
Pune	0.92	0.92	0.52	0.77	0.71	28.31	28.56	28.21	28.39	29.74
	±0.35	*±0.33*	*±0.22*	*±0.39*	*±0.46*	*±3.70*	*±3.81*	*±3.41*	*±3.88*	*±4.28*
State	1.78	1.53	0.98	1.12	1.08	25.78	25.92	28.19	26.43	30.31
	±0.28	*±0.25*	*±0.22*	*±0.21*	*±0.24*	*±1.59*	*±1.57*	*±1.60*	*±1.56*	*±1.77*

Learning levels: Std I-II

Division/Region	% Children in Std I-II who CAN READ letters or more					% Children in Std I-II who CAN RECOGNIZE numbers 1 to 9 or more				
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Amravati	89.04	84.28	94.40	95.38	86.25	89.85	83.01	95.07	94.46	87.12
	±3.04	*±4.05*	*±3.32*	*±1.92*	*±4.06*	*±2.71*	*±4.55*	*±3.08*	*±2.74*	*±4.14*
Aurangabad	90.16	91.25	90.80	94.26	89.93	92.79	90.53	91.99	93.78	91.98
	±2.27	*±1.98*	*±2.34*	*±1.80*	*±2.78*	*±1.98*	*±2.07*	*±2.13*	*±1.83*	*±2.10*
Konkan	97.04	97.21	92.88	97.07	91.41	97.37	94.85	93.27	96.53	90.03
	±1.58	*±1.42*	*±3.56*	*±3.16*	*±4.12*	*±1.44*	*±3.04*	*±3.05*	*±3.09*	*±4.09*
Nagpur	91.30	87.54	96.62	90.57	88.69	90.48	88.09	96.30	88.41	87.71
	±2.31	*±3.39*	*±1.79*	*±2.50*	*±2.96*	*±2.71*	*±3.53*	*±1.82*	*±2.99*	*±3.05*
Nashik	91.03	87.81	92.86	95.95	94.33	92.28	86.87	91.45	95.09	94.10
	±2.96	*±3.53*	*±2.92*	*±1.77*	*±2.11*	*±3.03*	*±3.50*	*±2.80*	*±2.03*	*±2.03*
Pune	95.27	96.25	93.27	94.87	92.98	95.18	95.07	94.09	94.10	93.65
	±1.95	*±1.51*	*±2.28*	*±1.89*	*±3.22*	*±1.89*	*±1.63*	*±2.00*	*±2.31*	*±3.13*
State	92.14	91.09	93.03	94.75	91.18	93.02	90.09	93.29	93.88	91.58
	±1.07	*±1.17*	*±1.14*	*±0.86*	*±1.29*	*±1.04*	*±1.25*	*±1.04*	*±0.98*	*±1.21*

Note: Districts have been clubbed into divisions to produce these estimates. The grouping of districts is based on administrative divisions used in the state or by geographical regions.

How to read these tables: The first row for each division gives the estimate of the relevant variable/year. The numbers below the estimate, in the second row, are twice the standard error of the corresponding estimate and represent the 95% confidence interval for the estimate. For instance, In Amravati division of Maharashtra, in 2007, % of Std I-II children who could read letters or more is 89.04 %. With 95% probability, the true population proportion lies within ±3.04 % points of the estimate, i.e., between 92.08 % and 86.00%.

List of districts under each division
Amravati
Buldana
Akola
Washim
Amravati
Yavatmal
Aurangabad
Nanded
Hingoli
Parbhani
Jalna
Aurangabad
Bid
Latur
Osmanabad
Konkan
Thane
Raigarh
Ratnagiri
Sindhudurg

Divisional Estimates


Annual Status of Education Report
असर ASER 2011 RURAL
Facilitated by PRATHAM

Maharashtra

Learning levels: Std III-V

Division/Region	% Children in Std III-V who CAN READ Level 1 (Std I) text or more					% Children in Std III-V who CAN DO subtraction or more				
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Amravati	80.81	79.09	86.90	80.70	65.79	65.96	58.32	69.19	60.70	40.51
	±3.82	*±3.85*	*±3.58*	*±4.80*	*±5.43*	*±5.06*	*±5.88*	*±4.99*	*±5.46*	*±5.37*
Aurangabad	83.55	84.34	84.28	83.15	76.43	64.49	67.09	70.31	67.44	56.11
	±2.50	*±2.35*	*±2.76*	*±2.55*	*±3.33*	*±3.66*	*±4.09*	*±3.93*	*±3.48*	*±4.49*
Konkan	90.51	91.70	90.09	85.40	82.35	77.94	89.03	78.96	69.28	67.93
	±2.80	*±3.30*	*±3.37*	*±4.31*	*±5.16*	*±4.63*	*±3.51*	*±5.11*	*±5.60*	*±6.57*
Nagpur	82.11	79.27	86.02	79.91	73.42	62.79	53.65	68.54	47.16	45.01
	±2.89	*±4.46*	*±2.76*	*±3.44*	*±3.27*	*±4.30*	*±4.93*	*±4.16*	*±4.11*	*±4.54*
Nashik	85.30	84.21	84.94	88.55	81.39	56.94	57.81	73.31	74.89	52.66
	±3.36	*±3.12*	*±3.59*	*±3.14*	*±3.94*	*±5.94*	*±4.84*	*±5.10*	*±4.82*	*±5.72*
Pune	86.88	89.54	89.65	90.39	82.19	77.12	70.13	79.90	74.66	67.73
	±3.48	*±2.39*	*±2.37*	*±2.05*	*±3.86*	*±3.75*	*±4.33*	*±3.90*	*±3.77*	*±5.01*
State	84.97	85.31	86.75	85.48	77.84	67.42	66.37	73.70	67.56	56.03
	±1.36	*±1.29*	*±1.30*	*±1.34*	*±1.75*	*±2.01*	*±2.04*	*±1.92*	*±1.96*	*±2.35*

List of districts under each division
Nagpur
Wardha
Nagpur
Bhandara
Gondiya
Gadchiroli
Chandrapur
Nashik
Nandurbar
Dhule
Jalgaon
Nashik
Ahmadnagar
Pune
Pune
Solapur
Satara
Kolhapur
Sangli



Divisional Estimates

Annual Status of Education Report
असर ASER 2011 RURAL
Facilitated by PRATHAM

Odisha

Note: Districts have been clubbed into divisions to produce these estimates. The grouping of districts is based on administrative divisions used in the state or by geographical regions.

How to read these tables: The first row for each division gives the estimate of the relevant variable/year. The numbers below the estimate, in the second row, are twice the standard error of the corresponding estimate and represent the 95% confidence interval for the estimate. For instance, In Central division of Odisha, in 2007, % of Std I-II children who could read letters or more is 86.18 %. With 95% probability, the true population proportion lies within ±2.69 % points of the estimate, i.e., between 88.87 % and 83.49 %.

School enrollment and out of school children

Division/Region	% Children out of school (age: 6-14)					% Children enrolled in private school (age: 6-14)				
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Central	4.22	4.72	3.78	2.45	2.55	3.13	4.70	5.49	5.66	6.00
	±1.07	*±1.45*	*±1.09*	*±0.73*	*±0.72*	*±0.88*	*±1.17*	*±1.18*	*±1.35*	*±1.03*
North	6.42	7.34	5.29	2.04	3.21	4.23	5.19	4.14	6.87	5.27
	±0.95	*±1.49*	*±1.24*	*±0.58*	*±0.92*	*±1.04*	*±1.07*	*±0.96*	*±1.75*	*±1.30*
South	14.48	10.53	10.43	9.55	5.64	2.69	3.54	3.11	3.49	3.60
	±2.70	*±1.56*	*±1.70*	*±2.28*	*±1.16*	*±0.80*	*±1.01*	*±0.93*	*±0.90*	*±0.78*
State	7.99	7.16	6.27	4.45	3.71	3.31	4.48	4.36	5.35	5.04
	±1.02	*±0.88*	*±0.78*	*±0.80*	*±0.53*	*±0.53*	*±0.66*	*±0.62*	*±0.80*	*±0.61*

Learning levels: Std I-II

Division/Region	% Children in Std I-II who CAN READ letters or more					% Children in Std I-II who CAN RECOGNIZE numbers 1 to 9 or more				
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Central	86.18	85.22	92.38	85.28	77.83	82.37	82.80	90.07	80.33	75.08
	±2.69	*±2.54*	*±2.22*	*±3.56*	*±3.80*	*±2.86*	*±2.59*	*±2.63*	*±3.81*	*±3.96*
North	72.92	73.64	90.20	72.30	71.47	70.75	72.16	91.08	70.62	69.76
	±3.29	*±3.95*	*±2.98*	*±4.50*	*±4.32*	*±3.46*	*±4.11*	*±2.29*	*±4.43*	*±4.16*
South	60.54	71.83	84.27	66.76	54.20	57.38	69.67	81.08	61.53	53.58
	±4.80	*±3.73*	*±3.04*	*±3.53*	*±4.26*	*±4.97*	*±3.72*	*±3.52*	*±3.67*	*±4.19*
State	73.59	78.13	88.85	76.05	67.68	70.33	76.02	87.08	71.94	66.02
	±2.31	*±1.95*	*±1.61*	*±2.26*	*±2.59*	*±2.38*	*±1.97*	*±1.75*	*±2.34*	*±2.56*

Learning levels: Std III-V

Division/Region	% Children in Std III-V who CAN READ Level 1 (Std I) text or more					% Children in Std III-V who CAN DO subtraction or more				
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Central	76.42	77.64	76.95	71.75	69.23	67.50	67.23	73.62	64.13	56.60
	±2.64	*±2.60*	*±3.41*	*±3.49*	*±3.72*	*±3.17*	*±3.10*	*±3.54*	*±3.67*	*±3.95*
North	57.58	63.10	68.59	57.96	55.13	42.65	47.14	62.87	44.70	38.29
	±3.27	*±3.27*	*±3.48*	*±3.47*	*±4.00*	*±3.67*	*±3.52*	*±3.74*	*±3.92*	*±3.86*
South	51.13	63.04	61.86	50.26	42.97	39.10	51.70	55.22	42.17	32.12
	±4.45	*±3.74*	*±3.98*	*±3.38*	*±3.75*	*±4.86*	*±4.29*	*±4.78*	*±3.98*	*±4.01*
State	63.58	69.43	69.53	61.39	56.59	52.08	57.39	64.40	52.11	43.52
	±2.16	*±1.89*	*±2.15*	*±2.13*	*±2.36*	*±2.52*	*±2.19*	*±2.43*	*±2.37*	*±2.45*

List of districts under each division
Central
Mayurbhanj
Baleshwar
Bhadrak
Kendrapara
Jagatsinghapur
Cuttack
Jajapur
Nayagarh
Khordha
Puri
North
Bargarh
Jharsuguda
Sambalpur
Debagarh
Sundargarh
Kendujhar
Dhenkanal
Anugul
Subarnapur
Balangir
South
Ganjam
Gajapati
Kandhamal
Baudh
Nuapada
Kalahandi
Rayagada
Nabarangapur
Koraput
Malkangiri

Divisional Estimates

Annual Status of Education Report
असर ASER 2011 RURAL
Facilitated by PRATHAM

Punjab

School enrollment and out of school children

Division/Region	% Children out of school (age: 6-14)					% Children enrolled in private school (age: 6-14)				
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Doaba	2.52	2.37	4.41	0.76	0.50	22.84	38.31	28.58	32.85	37.73
	±1.75	*±1.00*	*±2.42*	*±0.38*	*±0.35*	*±4.77*	*±4.53*	*±5.15*	*±5.18*	*±5.38*
Majha	1.71	2.39	3.75	1.93	2.04	38.38	49.14	39.96	40.78	40.96
	±0.89	*±1.10*	*±1.94*	*±1.05*	*±0.86*	*±6.05*	*±6.67*	*±6.36*	*±4.74*	*±4.95*
Malwa	3.59	2.90	6.05	1.88	1.75	32.42	40.14	27.65	38.87	39.83
	±0.83	*±0.54*	*±2.41*	*±0.45*	*±0.50*	*±2.83*	*±2.71*	*±3.31*	*±3.11*	*±2.85*
State	2.94	2.69	5.23	1.66	1.56	31.83	41.65	30.50	38.03	39.64
	±0.63	*±0.44*	*±1.55*	*±0.36*	*±0.36*	*±2.39*	*±2.34*	*±2.64*	*±2.33*	*±2.25*

Learning levels: Std I-II

Division/Region	% Children in Std I-II who CAN READ letters or more					% Children in Std I-II who CAN RECOGNIZE numbers 1 to 9 or more				
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Doaba	91.86	81.49	88.81	90.74	86.51	87.76	82.83	85.09	92.69	89.34
	±3.19	*±4.91*	*±5.76*	*±3.01*	*±3.19*	*±4.56*	*±4.92*	*±6.71*	*±2.98*	*±3.40*
Majha	82.92	92.63	92.91	83.73	87.58	80.23	90.23	91.31	85.85	90.40
	±6.19	*±3.04*	*±3.47*	*±3.99*	*±3.34*	*±7.59*	*±3.58*	*±4.18*	*±4.01*	*±3.53*
Malwa	87.23	85.83	90.24	88.26	87.42	84.84	83.47	86.91	87.82	91.06
	±2.50	*±2.08*	*±2.12*	*±2.16*	*±2.57*	*±2.98*	*±2.23*	*±2.35*	*±2.22*	*±2.17*
State	87.23	86.24	90.48	87.69	87.22	84.48	84.55	87.40	88.35	90.45
	±2.06	*±1.73*	*±1.87*	*±1.67*	*±1.73*	*±2.52*	*±1.81*	*±2.16*	*±1.70*	*±1.64*

Learning levels: Std III-V

Division/Region	% Children in Std III-V who CAN READ Level 1 (Std I) text or more					% Children in Std III-V who CAN DO subtraction or more				
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Doaba	70.22	73.25	75.11	77.97	80.27	66.45	66.37	77.77	83.17	80.30
	±5.49	*±4.33*	*±4.77*	*±4.69*	*±3.75*	*±5.53*	*±5.71*	*±4.69*	*±3.83*	*±4.48*
Majha	61.48	68.11	70.97	72.83	71.74	59.75	65.80	66.00	75.89	71.86
	±9.58	*±6.76*	*±6.02*	*±4.38*	*±4.37*	*±9.88*	*±6.85*	*±6.52*	*±4.39*	*±5.11*
Malwa	75.48	69.07	70.79	72.51	73.74	73.26	63.02	68.97	78.13	71.19
	±3.35	*±2.82*	*±3.04*	*±2.80*	*±2.84*	*±3.69*	*±2.95*	*±3.45*	*±2.70*	*±3.26*
State	71.35	69.70	71.67	73.80	74.94	68.93	64.20	70.12	78.79	73.61
	±3.04	*±2.33*	*±2.39*	*±2.14*	*±2.06*	*±3.22*	*±2.51*	*±2.65*	*±2.00*	*±2.41*

Note: Districts have been clubbed into divisions to produce these estimates. The grouping of districts is based on administrative divisions used in the state or by geographical regions.

How to read these tables: The first row for each division gives the estimate of the relevant variable/year. The numbers below the estimate, in the second row, are twice the standard error of the corresponding estimate and represent the 95% confidence interval for the estimate. For instance, In Doaba division of Punjab, in 2007, % of Std I-II children who could read letters or more is 91.86 %. With 95% probability, the true population proportion lies within ±3.19 % points of the estimate, i.e., between 95.05 % and 88.67 %.

List of districts under each division
Doaba
Hoshiarpur
Jalandhar
Kapurthala
SBS Nagar (Nawanshahr)
Majha
Gurdaspur
Amritsar
Tarn Taran
Malwa
Bathinda
Faridkot
Fatehgarh Sahib
Firozpur
Ludhiana
Mansa
Moga
Muktsar
Sangrur
SAS Nagar
Patiala
Rupnagar

Divisional Estimates

Rajasthan

School enrollment and out of school children

Division/Region	% Children out of school (age: 6-14)					% Children enrolled in private school (age: 6-14)				
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Ajmer	6.31	5.70	5.81	7.12	6.54	25.20	35.47	31.69	36.39	33.56
	±1.51	*±1.61*	*±1.61*	*±1.54*	*±1.77*	*±4.78*	*±5.23*	*±4.63*	*±5.26*	*±5.43*
Bharatpur	5.91	8.39	7.00	6.33	3.47	35.74	42.40	40.33	40.49	41.83
	±1.53	*±2.01*	*±3.14*	*±1.79*	*±0.87*	*±5.02*	*±5.34*	*±5.45*	*±5.18*	*±5.58*
Bikaner	7.53	5.89	5.95	4.00	2.40	34.93	42.60	36.77	40.00	45.57
	±1.56	*±1.64*	*±1.59*	*±1.16*	*±0.79*	*±4.29*	*±4.75*	*±4.78*	*±4.83*	*±5.04*
Jaipur	2.99	2.81	2.54	1.78	1.24	40.28	50.98	44.75	47.45	49.42
	±0.81	*±0.76*	*±0.95*	*±0.58*	*±0.52*	*±4.52*	*±4.32*	*±4.33*	*±3.99*	*±4.29*
Jodhpur	9.49	11.39	11.50	9.52	7.74	14.87	17.59	20.23	21.85	24.48
	±1.77	*±2.16*	*±2.00*	*±2.10*	*±1.83*	*±3.15*	*±3.52*	*±3.84*	*±3.59*	*±3.98*
Kota	6.61	7.64	6.52	5.63	2.99	25.98	31.22	30.58	33.59	34.47
	±1.70	*±1.67*	*±2.10*	*±1.50*	*±1.18*	*±4.85*	*±5.35*	*±5.21*	*±4.62*	*±5.27*
Udaipur	8.19	9.14	6.78	6.67	5.98	10.76	12.35	12.62	16.66	19.43
	±2.06	*±2.50*	*±1.54*	*±1.58*	*±1.58*	*±2.73*	*±2.95*	*±2.98*	*±3.75*	*±2.98*
State	6.53	7.14	6.56	5.81	4.49	26.72	32.68	30.38	33.42	35.09
	±0.62	*±0.75*	*±0.71*	*±0.61*	*±0.58*	*±1.82*	*±2.05*	*±1.86*	*±1.87*	*±1.95*

Learning levels: Std I-II

Division/Region	% Children in Std I-II who CAN READ letters or more					% Children in Std I-II who CAN RECOGNIZE numbers 1 to 9 or more				
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Ajmer	71.50	71.52	74.23	71.67	61.26	72.07	71.69	74.29	70.91	63.46
	±5.19	*±4.80*	*±4.81*	*±5.28*	*±5.83*	*±4.75*	*±4.66*	*±4.57*	*±5.10*	*±6.10*
Bharatpur	67.12	65.67	75.75	70.06	69.81	70.25	65.15	74.80	67.88	72.37
	±5.27	*±5.27*	*±4.94*	*±5.30*	*±6.20*	*±5.66*	*±4.81*	*±5.46*	*±5.26*	*±6.00*
Bikaner	71.06	70.51	74.14	77.24	71.60	69.29	69.24	74.48	78.29	72.54
	±5.16	*±5.01*	*±5.33*	*±4.73*	*±4.75*	*±5.14*	*±5.17*	*±5.29*	*±4.65*	*±4.56*
Jaipur	75.26	68.51	76.82	74.37	72.62	77.20	70.68	73.64	75.83	73.66
	±4.50	*±5.43*	*±6.31*	*±3.76*	*±5.38*	*±4.60*	*±4.58*	*±5.94*	*±3.91*	*±5.42*
Jodhpur	63.92	64.45	67.06	60.66	54.26	65.07	67.27	68.46	61.22	54.57
	±5.02	*±4.76*	*±5.49*	*±4.98*	*±4.79*	*±5.17*	*±4.36*	*±5.69*	*±5.12*	*±4.77*
Kota	67.74	64.86	71.31	76.21	70.08	70.04	68.64	73.03	77.30	71.56
	±4.77	*±4.79*	*±4.79*	*±5.22*	*±6.04*	*±4.77*	*±4.57*	*±4.67*	*±4.71*	*±5.82*
Udaipur	67.06	59.17	64.16	68.09	67.83	68.65	57.32	65.01	71.20	68.02
	±4.87	*±5.04*	*±5.24*	*±4.72*	*±5.15*	*±4.91*	*±5.41*	*±5.35*	*±4.67*	*±4.88*
State	69.60	65.98	71.29	70.03	65.51	70.91	66.77	71.26	70.81	66.48
	±1.94	*±2.03*	*±2.19*	*±1.94*	*±2.21*	*±1.96*	*±1.94*	*±2.18*	*±1.95*	*±2.22*

Note: Districts have been clubbed into divisions to produce these estimates. The grouping of districts is based on administrative divisions used in the state or by geographical regions.

How to read these tables: The first row for each division gives the estimate of the relevant variable/year. The numbers below the estimate, in the second row, are twice the standard error of the corresponding estimate and represent the 95% confidence interval for the estimate. For instance, In Ajmer division of Rajasthan, in 2007, % of Std I-II children who could read letters or more is 71.5 %. With 95% probability, the true population proportion lies within ±5.19 % points of the estimate, i.e., between 76.69 % and 66.31 %.

List of districts under each division
Ajmer
Ajmer
Bhilwara
Nagaur
Tonk
Bharatpur
Bharatpur
Dhaulpur
Karauli
Sawai Madhopur
Bikaner
Bikaner
Churu
Ganganagar
Hanumangarh
Jaipur
Alwar
Dausa
Jaipur
Jhunjhunun
Sikar

Divisional Estimates


Annual Status of Education Report
असर ASER 2011 RURAL
Facilitated by PRATHAM

Rajasthan

Learning levels: Std III-V

Division/Region	% Children in Std III-V who CAN READ Level 1 (Std I) text or more					% Children in Std III-V who CAN DO subtraction or more				
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Ajmer	58.04	60.42	58.10	52.33	48.87	48.96	43.52	47.32	41.47	36.50
	±5.44	*±5.09*	*±4.94*	*±5.56*	*±5.24*	*±5.49*	*±5.35*	*±5.74*	*±5.36*	*±5.65*
Bharatpur	54.22	62.68	58.13	52.66	56.41	53.63	54.49	56.19	47.50	49.23
	±4.95	*±5.05*	*±5.50*	*±5.33*	*±5.14*	*±5.14*	*±5.56*	*±5.38*	*±5.83*	*±5.75*
Bikaner	65.51	75.76	65.48	68.18	63.14	56.59	63.67	59.40	64.72	55.29
	±4.45	*±4.17*	*±5.00*	*±4.68*	*±4.12*	*±5.49*	*±4.91*	*±5.22*	*±4.95*	*±4.61*
Jaipur	67.35	66.85	62.77	63.23	60.03	63.95	53.37	52.81	54.45	48.71
	±4.14	*±4.29*	*±4.47*	*±4.60*	*±5.48*	*±4.72*	*±4.45*	*±4.81*	*±5.23*	*±5.17*
Jodhpur	55.99	57.92	55.34	52.14	42.20	49.19	46.20	46.53	45.80	28.90
	±4.63	*±4.67*	*±5.24*	*±4.77*	*±4.46*	*±4.78*	*±4.81*	*±4.91*	*±5.25*	*±4.39*
Kota	50.13	58.91	50.96	59.05	49.44	46.03	45.21	42.54	52.70	36.76
	±4.66	*±5.27*	*±5.36*	*±6.20*	*±6.13*	*±5.41*	*±5.80*	*±5.97*	*±6.08*	*±5.70*
Udaipur	48.27	55.45	41.72	55.83	49.25	35.29	34.20	32.11	44.27	31.74
	±4.83	*±5.26*	*±5.69*	*±4.92*	*±4.27*	*±4.58*	*±4.99*	*±6.15*	*±4.93*	*±4.11*
State	57.88	62.00	55.88	57.40	52.66	51.13	47.63	47.45	49.48	40.39
	±1.91	*±1.92*	*±2.12*	*±1.98*	*±2.06*	*±2.08*	*±2.06*	*±2.20*	*±2.11*	*±2.09*

List of districts under each division
Jodhpur
Barmer
Jaisalmer
Jalor
Jodhpur
Pali
Sirohi
Kota
Baran
Bundi
Jhalawar
Kota
Udaipur
Banswara
Chittaurgarh
Dungarpur
Rajsamand
Udaipur



Divisional Estimates

Tamil Nadu

School enrollment and out of school children

Division/Region	% Children out of school (age: 6-14)					% Children enrolled in private school (age: 6-14)				
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Central	1.08	0.86	0.89	0.79	0.63	14.38	22.16	19.44	19.35	25.18
	±0.52	*±0.46*	*±0.44*	*±0.36*	*±0.29*	*±3.52*	*±4.46*	*±3.06*	*±3.72*	*±3.28*
East	0.97	0.48	0.80	1.38	0.86	15.69	18.88	14.95	20.67	23.91
	±0.32	*±0.21*	*±0.31*	*±0.60*	*±0.41*	*±2.46*	*±3.13*	*±2.37*	*±3.38*	*±2.92*
North	1.94	0.33	0.69	0.90	1.06	13.50	17.59	21.09	26.11	26.42
	±0.59	*±0.21*	*±0.36*	*±0.46*	*±0.68*	*±2.52*	*±3.08*	*±2.73*	*±3.85*	*±3.68*
South	0.81	0.89	1.14	0.94	0.67	15.56	26.62	26.25	34.84	32.30
	±0.33	*±0.36*	*±0.37*	*±0.38*	*±0.28*	*±3.64*	*±4.01*	*±4.16*	*±5.74*	*±4.95*
West	0.88	0.82	1.25	0.71	1.00	19.76	18.17	17.54	22.90	26.93
	±0.44	*±0.42*	*±0.49*	*±0.33*	*±0.74*	*±4.74*	*±3.59*	*±3.96*	*±5.30*	*±4.13*
State	1.18	0.63	0.93	0.98	0.85	15.49	20.55	19.69	25.07	27.04
	±0.21	*±0.14*	*±0.17*	*±0.22*	*±0.23*	*±1.45*	*±1.65*	*±1.47*	*±2.06*	*±1.79*

Learning levels: Std I-II

Division/Region	% Children in Std I-II who CAN READ letters or more					% Children in Std I-II who CAN RECOGNIZE numbers 1 to 9 or more				
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Central	49.57	60.82	59.55	51.81	55.49	55.02	63.20	65.90	54.70	59.60
	±6.23	*±5.79*	*±5.86*	*±7.03*	*±5.51*	*±6.72*	*±7.21*	*±5.80*	*±7.29*	*±5.76*
East	55.76	51.03	55.34	60.34	60.67	63.18	61.53	64.50	65.89	69.60
	±5.16	*±4.56*	*±4.97*	*±5.26*	*±4.96*	*±4.92*	*±5.19*	*±4.51*	*±5.09*	*±5.19*
North	60.21	52.18	67.10	67.30	62.97	71.04	63.12	75.79	73.44	70.07
	±5.61	*±4.74*	*±5.53*	*±5.15*	*±5.43*	*±5.92*	*±5.28*	*±5.06*	*±5.61*	*±5.55*
South	67.97	60.51	65.08	73.52	68.19	70.53	64.44	72.67	76.40	72.06
	±4.37	*±5.29*	*±5.15*	*±4.48*	*±5.06*	*±4.61*	*±5.04*	*±4.82*	*±4.89*	*±4.85*
West	69.81	50.62	68.68	58.18	66.73	74.08	60.59	72.63	60.85	75.55
	±6.43	*±6.56*	*±6.07*	*±7.05*	*±5.12*	*±6.01*	*±7.24*	*±6.27*	*±7.51*	*±5.27*
State	60.25	54.74	62.42	63.03	62.75	66.63	62.63	69.95	67.47	69.25
	±2.57	*±2.38*	*±2.49*	*±2.62*	*±2.41*	*±2.60*	*±2.62*	*±2.36*	*±2.73*	*±2.47*

Learning levels: Std III-V

Division/Region	% Children in Std III-V who CAN READ Level 1 (Std I) text or more					% Children in Std III-V who CAN DO subtraction or more				
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Central	48.15	50.63	54.56	44.74	39.45	39.42	45.03	38.30	37.09	31.19
	±5.29	*±6.02*	*±6.29*	*±4.90*	*±5.10*	*±5.40*	*±5.54*	*±5.67*	*±5.31*	*±5.21*
East	43.59	34.25	42.99	46.24	48.59	41.15	25.02	29.89	38.11	34.95
	±4.54	*±3.63*	*±4.09*	*±4.48*	*±4.50*	*±4.60*	*±3.64*	*±3.84*	*±4.74*	*±4.39*
North	44.65	48.42	54.14	52.70	44.88	34.98	35.78	34.00	41.37	40.53
	±4.92	*±4.31*	*±4.56*	*±5.04*	*±5.93*	*±4.56*	*±4.75*	*±4.33*	*±3.89*	*±5.42*
South	56.87	55.13	59.66	62.86	62.62	51.56	44.75	48.40	49.38	55.11
	±5.04	*±4.81*	*±4.47*	*±3.88*	*±4.09*	*±4.39*	*±4.56*	*±4.43*	*±3.94*	*±4.48*
West	56.44	41.16	59.09	57.71	52.33	50.11	34.17	55.20	53.97	46.47
	±5.94	*±5.64*	*±6.14*	*±6.10*	*±4.45*	*±6.47*	*±4.57*	*±5.74*	*±6.39*	*±4.43*
State	49.24	45.68	53.04	52.50	50.00	42.92	36.27	39.66	43.18	41.88
	±2.34	*±2.22*	*±2.30*	*±2.30*	*±2.33*	*±2.31*	*±2.15*	*±2.23*	*±2.20*	*±2.33*

Note: Districts have been clubbed into divisions to produce these estimates. The grouping of districts is based on administrative divisions used in the state or by geographical regions.

How to read these tables: The first row for each division gives the estimate of the relevant variable/year. The numbers below the estimate, in the second row, are twice the standard error of the corresponding estimate and represent the 95% confidence interval for the estimate. For instance, In Central division of Tamil Nadu, in 2007, % of Std I-II children who could read letters or more is 49.57 %. With 95% probability, the true population proportion lies within ±6.23 % points of the estimate, i.e., between 55.80 % and 43.34 %.

List of districts under each division
Central
Salem
Namakkal
Karur
Tiruchirappalli
Pudukkottai
East
Viluppuram
Perambalur
Ariyalur
Cuddalore
Nagapattinam
Thiruvarur
Thanjavur
North
Thiruvallur
Kancheepuram
Vellore
Dharmapuri
Tiruvannamalai
South
Sivaganga
Madurai
Virudhunagar
Ramanathapuram
Thoothukkudi
Tirunelveli
Kanniyakumari
West
Erode
The Nilgiris
Coimbatore
Dindigul
Theni

Divisional Estimates

Uttar Pradesh

School enrollment and out of school children

Division/Region	% Children out of school (age: 6-14)					% Children enrolled in private school (age: 6-14)				
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Agra	2.65	5.86	3.84	3.85	5.16	37.54	45.12	40.81	51.47	57.38
	±0.94	*±1.12*	*±0.88*	*±0.97*	*±0.91*	*±4.22*	*±4.00*	*±3.96*	*±4.10*	*±3.70*
Aligarh	1.82	5.31	6.58	6.15	6.27	24.67	38.70	42.67	35.80	44.55
	±0.61	*±1.23*	*±1.51*	*±1.76*	*±1.63*	*±4.33*	*±4.91*	*±4.70*	*±5.37*	*±5.09*
Allahabad	3.90	5.04	3.26	4.16	5.19	35.05	39.12	36.76	42.84	47.77
	±1.02	*±1.13*	*±0.90*	*±1.02*	*±1.11*	*±3.99*	*±4.59*	*±5.00*	*±4.42*	*±4.05*
Azamgarh	2.39	3.71	3.99	1.68	1.87	33.30	39.36	42.73	51.20	53.13
	±1.14	*±1.41*	*±1.70*	*±0.67*	*±0.79*	*±4.10*	*±5.26*	*±5.09*	*±5.61*	*±4.86*
Bareilly	8.53	7.80	9.99	10.91	13.03	20.55	26.22	30.11	33.87	39.58
	±2.14	*±1.95*	*±2.16*	*±2.92*	*±1.97*	*±3.63*	*±3.87*	*±3.72*	*±4.13*	*±3.96*
Basti	3.93	7.25	5.62	5.16	6.79	26.50	26.86	38.84	40.16	45.36
	±1.19	*±1.95*	*±1.79*	*±1.39*	*±1.64*	*±4.55*	*±3.58*	*±4.46*	*±4.48*	*±4.61*
Chitrakoot	3.86	4.29	3.86	5.29	6.22	18.21	19.26	22.32	23.64	22.78
	±0.89	*±0.99*	*±0.85*	*±1.20*	*±1.36*	*±3.68*	*±4.08*	*±4.65*	*±4.14*	*±4.35*
Devipatan	3.72	8.47	7.96	10.11	15.18	15.62	24.36	20.72	20.89	25.98
	±1.31	*±1.90*	*±1.84*	*±2.05*	*±2.56*	*±3.42*	*±4.04*	*±3.62*	*±4.08*	*±3.89*
Faizabad	4.17	4.99	4.29	5.86	4.47	33.45	41.57	35.76	39.34	46.03
	±1.13	*±1.26*	*±1.19*	*±1.60*	*±1.34*	*±3.49*	*±4.06*	*±4.04*	*±3.76*	*±4.13*
Gorakhpur	2.96	4.93	3.01	1.76	2.63	37.49	42.83	46.69	50.75	52.94
	±0.71	*±1.19*	*±0.77*	*±0.48*	*±0.73*	*±4.00*	*±3.78*	*±4.36*	*±4.01*	*±3.54*
Jhansi	1.90	2.85	1.88	2.54	4.18	14.32	23.53	14.82	19.56	25.58
	±0.57	*±0.83*	*±0.83*	*±0.89*	*±1.27*	*±3.54*	*±5.09*	*±3.94*	*±5.28*	*±5.53*
Kanpur	2.05	4.60	3.71	3.40	4.52	18.22	33.03	34.36	40.68	39.50
	±0.67	*±1.03*	*±0.79*	*±0.83*	*±1.28*	*±3.27*	*±3.50*	*±3.65*	*±3.66*	*±3.84*
Lucknow	5.88	9.05	7.20	6.58	7.00	26.03	30.62	32.12	34.24	38.61
	±1.02	*±1.34*	*±1.31*	*±1.14*	*±1.45*	*±2.85*	*±3.16*	*±3.22*	*±3.23*	*±3.88*
Meerut	3.17	3.06	3.16	2.95	3.61	37.75	46.79	39.70	52.09	57.55
	±0.93	*±0.80*	*±0.94*	*±0.80*	*±1.06*	*±4.40*	*±4.61*	*±4.52*	*±4.22*	*±3.60*
Mirzapur	3.60	3.76	2.57	3.65	2.03	23.74	27.77	27.52	28.09	32.70
	±1.09	*±1.13*	*±1.01*	*±1.15*	*±0.76*	*±4.15*	*±4.95*	*±4.85*	*±4.73*	*±4.91*
Moradabad	2.98	6.47	6.96	7.80	9.22	28.12	43.71	46.67	43.85	55.56
	±1.03	*±1.59*	*±1.74*	*±1.75*	*±1.62*	*±4.34*	*±4.07*	*±4.42*	*±4.77*	*±3.87*
Saharanpur	6.43	6.31	3.78	7.34	8.51	36.91	42.13	35.04	35.99	53.17
	±3.01	*±2.21*	*±1.53*	*±2.53*	*±2.56*	*±6.33*	*±6.23*	*±6.14*	*±5.32*	*±6.22*
Varanasi	2.96	2.42	1.79	1.85	2.56	36.09	39.36	38.66	42.21	54.88
	±0.78	*±0.70*	*±0.60*	*±0.66*	*±0.69*	*±3.87*	*±4.05*	*±4.40*	*±3.95*	*±4.29*
State	3.93	5.63	4.92	5.22	6.13	29.05	35.86	35.83	39.33	45.36
	±0.31	*±0.36*	*±0.36*	*±0.39*	*±0.40*	*±1.02*	*±1.09*	*±1.12*	*±1.14*	*±1.13*

Note: Districts have been clubbed into divisions to produce these estimates. The grouping of districts is based on administrative divisions used in the state or by geographical regions.

How to read these tables: The first row for each division gives the estimate of the relevant variable/year. The numbers below the estimate, in the second row, are twice the standard error of the corresponding estimate and represent the 95% confidence interval for the estimate. For instance, In Agra division of Uttar Pradesh, in 2007, % of Std I-II children who could read letters or more is 64.67 %. With 95% probability, the true population proportion lies within ±4.56 % points of the estimate, i.e., between 69.23 % and 60.11 %.

List of districts under each division
Agra
Mathura
Agra
Firozabad
Mainpuri
Aligarh
Aligarh
Mahamaya Nagar (Hathras)
Etah
Allahabad
Fatehpur
Pratapgarh
Kaushambi
Allahabad
Azamgarh
Azamgarh
Mau
Ballia
Bareilly
Budaun
Bareilly
Pilibhit
Shahjahanpur
Basti
Siddharthnagar
Basti
Sant Kabir Nagar

Divisional Estimates

Annual Status of Education Report
असर ASER 2011 RURAL
Facilitated by PRATHAM

Uttar Pradesh

Learning levels: Std I-II

Division/Region	% Children in Std I-II who CAN READ letters or more					% Children in Std I-II who CAN RECOGNIZE numbers 1 to 9 or more				
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Agra	64.67	61.40	68.04	67.76	65.30	66.17	60.41	66.55	68.07	67.50
	±4.56	*±4.29*	*±4.20*	*±3.94*	*±3.93*	*±5.06*	*±4.27*	*±4.23*	*±3.77*	*±3.66*
Aligarh	68.32	51.95	66.93	62.07	54.68	67.58	50.77	67.50	59.84	57.10
	±7.74	*±5.44*	*±5.29*	*±5.74*	*±6.52*	*±7.11*	*±5.04*	*±4.88*	*±5.95*	*±6.33*
Allahabad	71.89	61.79	71.04	62.23	66.93	66.63	59.69	67.68	59.85	67.20
	±3.57	*±4.63*	*±3.77*	*±4.63*	*±4.00*	*±4.54*	*±4.37*	*±4.26*	*±4.41*	*±4.02*
Azamgarh	59.81	67.12	70.08	73.12	72.37	63.60	64.79	68.09	72.63	71.18
	±6.45	*±4.61*	*±4.96*	*±6.62*	*±4.23*	*±6.81*	*±4.89*	*±5.20*	*±6.05*	*±4.85*
Bareilly	67.93	61.38	58.21	64.47	56.12	67.47	60.90	58.19	62.74	59.49
	±6.32	*±4.74*	*±5.39*	*±5.04*	*±5.38*	*±6.30*	*±4.69*	*±5.38*	*±5.33*	*±5.49*
Basti	67.63	54.08	66.48	64.68	57.83	62.00	52.88	64.02	62.07	62.11
	±4.47	*±4.81*	*±5.79*	*±6.12*	*±5.35*	*±4.42*	*±5.41*	*±5.48*	*±5.93*	*±5.18*
Chitrakoot	65.47	67.65	73.92	62.27	64.24	61.54	65.40	71.51	61.28	64.33
	±5.12	*±4.65*	*±4.80*	*±5.43*	*±4.52*	*±5.66*	*±4.71*	*±5.13*	*±4.81*	*±4.61*
Devipatan	69.85	56.05	57.68	54.44	45.67	66.20	56.04	55.90	56.60	56.43
	±5.31	*±4.66*	*±5.39*	*±5.34*	*±4.64*	*±5.27*	*±4.74*	*±5.39*	*±5.23*	*±4.97*
Faizabad	68.57	51.96	65.66	62.22	61.11	70.83	57.99	62.82	65.58	63.95
	±4.34	*±4.39*	*±5.01*	*±5.43*	*±4.26*	*±3.98*	*±4.18*	*±5.21*	*±5.57*	*±4.35*
Gorakhpur	64.49	66.31	75.87	72.96	71.63	59.85	61.69	72.82	71.95	71.88
	±4.67	*±4.24*	*±3.96*	*±4.35*	*±3.88*	*±4.69*	*±4.06*	*±4.26*	*±4.31*	*±3.58*
Jhansi	72.14	60.65	71.59	73.90	68.99	66.68	57.81	69.35	72.50	64.99
	±5.07	*±5.78*	*±5.20*	*±5.18*	*±5.25*	*±4.93*	*±5.88*	*±5.37*	*±5.42*	*±5.50*
Kanpur	64.56	60.15	63.20	70.41	66.92	64.48	57.78	60.69	67.70	67.72
	±5.46	*±3.84*	*±4.65*	*±3.90*	*±3.98*	*±5.66*	*±3.60*	*±4.86*	*±4.05*	*±4.10*
Lucknow	59.95	53.58	57.86	60.57	55.35	61.72	54.32	56.57	60.81	58.47
	±4.17	*±3.73*	*±4.23*	*±4.46*	*±5.09*	*±3.86*	*±3.56*	*±4.01*	*±4.09*	*±4.55*
Meerut	76.35	77.61	76.40	79.87	72.06	77.20	76.29	75.01	77.65	77.37
	±4.62	*±3.72*	*±4.55*	*±4.30*	*±4.52*	*±3.89*	*±3.90*	*±4.69*	*±4.58*	*±4.17*
Mirzapur	74.74	57.72	70.06	68.08	75.42	66.14	55.86	65.40	65.45	74.97
	±5.51	*±5.49*	*±4.85*	*±6.82*	*±4.43*	*±5.68*	*±5.60*	*±4.69*	*±6.19*	*±4.23*
Moradabad	69.55	71.13	69.35	65.21	62.14	70.48	71.60	70.87	66.66	66.60
	±6.55	*±4.25*	*±5.28*	*±5.21*	*±5.18*	*±6.68*	*±3.99*	*±5.09*	*±4.69*	*±4.59*
Saharanpur	68.51	75.66	82.00	77.64	69.58	63.87	77.48	83.28	77.68	70.74
	±6.59	*±5.86*	*±5.03*	*±6.26*	*±5.56*	*±7.38*	*±5.10*	*±4.98*	*±6.79*	*±4.71*
Varanasi	69.43	69.30	75.73	82.90	69.47	65.47	64.86	72.65	78.73	71.25
	±4.20	*±3.69*	*±4.08*	*±4.02*	*±4.34*	*±4.13*	*±4.23*	*±3.90*	*±4.29*	*±4.36*
State	67.22	62.08	68.00	67.31	63.56	65.70	61.07	66.29	66.59	65.99
	±1.30	*±1.18*	*±1.25*	*±1.35*	*±1.24*	*±1.30*	*±1.15*	*±1.25*	*±1.30*	*±1.18*

List of districts under each division
Chitrakoot
Hamirpur
Mahoba
Banda
Chitrakoot
Devipatan
Bahraich
Shrawasti
Balrampur
Gonda
Faizabad
Bara Banki
Faizabad
Ambedkar Nagar
Sultanpur
Gorakhpur
Mahrajganj
Gorakhpur
Kushinagar
Deoria
Jhansi
Jalaun
Jhansi
Lalitpur
Kanpur
Farrukhabad
Kannauj
Etawah
Auraiya
Kanpur Dehat

Divisional Estimates

Uttar Pradesh

Learning levels: Std III-V

Division/Region	% Children in Std III-V who CAN READ Level 1 (Std I) text or more					% Children in Std III-V who CAN DO subtraction or more				
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Agra	54.36	48.80	48.74	51.40	46.76	46.77	35.38	35.07	42.28	38.85
	±4.30	*±4.00*	*±5.55*	*±4.96*	*±4.77*	*±5.24*	*±4.21*	*±4.13*	*±4.99*	*±3.99*
Aligarh	46.87	53.56	46.81	46.67	42.70	44.95	39.16	37.67	38.37	32.86
	±6.51	*±5.33*	*±6.21*	*±5.78*	*±5.43*	*±5.97*	*±5.17*	*±6.60*	*±5.66*	*±4.43*
Allahabad	51.29	50.25	48.06	47.16	44.35	39.27	33.66	38.06	34.08	33.82
	±4.96	*±4.57*	*±5.19*	*±5.11*	*±4.22*	*±5.13*	*±4.60*	*±5.76*	*±4.21*	*±4.74*
Azamgarh	55.64	57.47	45.95	57.08	59.32	37.39	45.02	32.01	49.51	49.50
	±5.27	*±6.14*	*±4.39*	*±6.97*	*±4.37*	*±5.84*	*±7.43*	*±4.69*	*±7.39*	*±4.15*
Bareilly	45.00	45.00	31.46	38.63	35.86	39.92	30.21	21.39	26.16	24.80
	±5.23	*±4.93*	*±5.77*	*±4.85*	*±4.40*	*±5.66*	*±4.46*	*±4.44*	*±4.44*	*±4.01*
Basti	49.18	45.92	47.27	52.01	44.07	36.49	29.77	35.10	38.42	26.29
	±5.62	*±4.90*	*±6.07*	*±6.00*	*±5.35*	*±5.60*	*±4.11*	*±5.41*	*±5.61*	*±4.07*
Chitrakoot	49.84	47.71	43.75	42.98	40.20	45.37	33.81	34.79	33.28	30.52
	±6.11	*±5.41*	*±5.55*	*±4.50*	*±4.41*	*±6.12*	*±5.61*	*±5.60*	*±4.42*	*±4.04*
Devipatan	58.28	42.89	38.78	48.85	38.29	52.15	28.10	26.37	31.84	25.31
	±6.25	*±6.09*	*±5.28*	*±5.40*	*±4.87*	*±6.32*	*±5.66*	*±4.85*	*±5.00*	*±4.46*
Faizabad	53.08	45.90	49.32	49.86	43.76	40.03	29.02	32.99	35.96	29.37
	±4.62	*±4.06*	*±5.26*	*±5.72*	*±4.26*	*±4.47*	*±3.62*	*±5.49*	*±5.01*	*±3.94*
Gorakhpur	54.70	51.22	60.21	66.85	58.57	40.24	34.99	46.23	52.41	36.48
	±5.01	*±4.83*	*±5.03*	*±4.36*	*±4.00*	*±5.33*	*±5.21*	*±5.84*	*±4.70*	*±4.20*
Jhansi	46.52	47.49	48.55	52.46	48.03	46.62	37.78	42.66	42.86	41.10
	±4.79	*±6.07*	*±6.27*	*±6.45*	*±5.14*	*±4.73*	*±5.96*	*±6.08*	*±5.28*	*±4.68*
Kanpur	47.80	42.59	41.32	51.73	45.78	45.70	29.46	29.08	39.20	37.79
	±4.68	*±3.85*	*±4.12*	*±4.80*	*±4.98*	*±4.54*	*±3.55*	*±4.02*	*±5.26*	*±4.85*
Lucknow	40.39	38.01	36.20	41.39	40.20	30.76	22.56	22.02	30.79	28.85
	±3.74	*±3.93*	*±3.64*	*±4.27*	*±4.52*	*±3.80*	*±3.83*	*±3.12*	*±4.00*	*±4.18*
Meerut	71.03	71.17	69.28	71.87	67.21	57.25	54.04	55.86	61.43	48.06
	±5.06	*±3.99*	*±5.66*	*±3.74*	*±4.38*	*±5.74*	*±5.38*	*±6.19*	*±4.13*	*±4.90*
Mirzapur	50.91	51.47	46.38	50.50	55.06	38.25	32.03	31.13	32.79	37.77
	±7.03	*±4.94*	*±6.04*	*±5.58*	*±5.27*	*±7.47*	*±4.94*	*±5.28*	*±5.34*	*±5.44*
Moradabad	54.00	56.94	51.63	50.23	43.09	48.08	37.87	38.47	37.16	29.10
	±6.41	*±4.98*	*±5.52*	*±5.54*	*±4.47*	*±6.58*	*±5.03*	*±5.46*	*±5.10*	*±3.79*
Saharanpur	56.81	73.12	67.30	64.83	59.04	53.02	59.56	56.55	55.17	39.64
	±8.13	*±6.04*	*±6.20*	*±6.74*	*±6.08*	*±8.67*	*±7.95*	*±7.60*	*±8.58*	*±6.13*
Varanasi	59.77	58.32	61.18	68.40	55.81	45.21	42.75	43.79	51.06	41.15
	±4.60	*±4.07*	*±4.68*	*±4.85*	*±4.39*	*±4.76*	*±4.75*	*±4.75*	*±5.37*	*±4.04*
State	52.16	50.66	48.55	52.67	47.83	42.85	35.22	35.69	40.17	34.45
	±1.35	*±1.26*	*±1.42*	*±1.40*	*±1.21*	*±1.40*	*±1.31*	*±1.42*	*±1.37*	*±1.14*

List of districts under each division
Lucknow
Kheri
Sitapur
Hardoi
Unnao
Lucknow
Rae Bareli
Meerut
Meerut
Baghpat
Ghaziabad
Gautam Buddha Nagar
Bulandshahar
Mirzapur
Sant Ravidas Nagar (Bhadohi)
Mirzapur
Sonbhadra
Moradabad
Bijnor
Moradabad
Rampur
Jyotiba Phule Nagar
Saharanpur
Saharanpur
Muzaffarnagar
Varanasi
Jaunpur
Ghazipur
Chandauli
Varanasi

Divisional Estimates

Annual Status of Education Report
ASER 2011 RURAL
Facilitated by PRATHAM

Uttarakhand

School enrollment and out of school children

Division/Region	% Children out of school (age: 6-14)					% Children enrolled in private school (age: 6-14)				
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Garhwal	1.75	0.65	1.11	1.25	0.80	27.75	30.38	25.69	28.81	31.12
	±0.75	*±0.34*	*±0.43*	*±0.58*	*±0.47*	*±4.42*	*±4.78*	*±4.69*	*±4.95*	*±4.86*
Kumaon	2.91	1.42	1.64	2.36	1.58	21.24	24.51	23.55	29.32	31.69
	±1.31	*±0.79*	*±0.82*	*±1.28*	*±0.97*	*±3.79*	*±4.53*	*±4.21*	*±5.34*	*±5.07*
State	2.24	0.98	1.35	1.73	1.09	25.00	27.86	24.72	29.03	31.33
	±0.71	*±0.39*	*±0.44*	*±0.65*	*±0.47*	*±3.07*	*±3.36*	*±3.20*	*±3.64*	*±3.59*

Learning levels: Std I-II

Division/Region	% Children in Std I-II who CAN READ letters or more					% Children in Std I-II who CAN RECOGNIZE numbers 1 to 9 or more				
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Garhwal	78.35	79.85	80.49	80.52	76.53	78.75	79.67	79.63	78.26	74.79
	±3.74	*±4.02*	*±4.10*	*±4.01*	*±4.23*	*±4.08*	*±3.87*	*±3.98*	*±4.20*	*±5.23*
Kumaon	80.37	79.76	87.88	80.47	80.83	80.29	78.89	86.30	79.61	79.87
	±3.82	*±5.63*	*±3.78*	*±3.98*	*±4.18*	*±4.06*	*±5.22*	*±3.77*	*±4.37*	*±3.74*
State	79.23	79.82	83.88	80.50	78.09	79.42	79.36	82.70	78.85	76.65
	±2.69	*±3.30*	*±2.80*	*±2.85*	*±3.13*	*±2.90*	*±3.12*	*±2.73*	*±3.04*	*±3.64*

Learning levels: Std III-V

Division/Region	% Children in Std III-V who CAN READ Level 1 (Std I) text or more					% Children in Std III-V who CAN DO subtraction or more				
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Garhwal	70.70	73.54	70.69	69.94	61.06	63.42	59.14	57.19	61.36	48.97
	±3.68	*±4.31*	*±4.00*	*±4.42*	*±4.80*	*±4.22*	*±4.88*	*±5.03*	*±4.97*	*±4.47*
Kumaon	73.27	77.62	77.58	72.46	70.66	67.55	60.82	68.22	65.01	55.07
	±4.54	*±4.97*	*±4.87*	*±3.90*	*±4.50*	*±5.31*	*±6.00*	*±6.20*	*±4.64*	*±4.61*
State	71.76	75.21	73.79	71.01	64.17	65.12	59.83	62.20	62.91	50.95
	±2.86	*±3.27*	*±3.08*	*±3.04*	*±3.68*	*±3.32*	*±3.78*	*±3.91*	*±3.47*	*±3.43*

Note: Districts have been clubbed into divisions to produce these estimates. The grouping of districts is based on administrative divisions used in the state or by geographical regions.

How to read these tables: The first row for each division gives the estimate of the relevant variable/year. The numbers below the estimate, in the second row, are twice the standard error of the corresponding estimate and represent the 95% confidence interval for the estimate. For instance, In Garhwal division of Uttarakhand, in 2007, % of Std I-II children who could read letters or more is 78.35 %. With 95% probability, the true population proportion lies within ±3.74 % points of the estimate, i.e., between 82.09 % and 74.61%.

List of districts under each division
Garhwal
Uttarkashi
Chamoli
Rudraprayag
Tehri Garhwal
Dehradun
Garhwal
Hardwar
Kumaon
Pithoragarh
Bageshwar
Almora
Champawat
Nainital
Udham Singh Nagar

Divisional Estimates

Annual Status of Education Report
असर ASER 2011 RURAL
Facilitated by PRATHAM

West Bengal

School enrollment and out of school children

Division/Region	% Children out of school (age: 6-14)					% Children enrolled in private school (age: 6-14)				
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Burdwan	5.39	6.12	5.38	3.68	3.44	1.59	3.47	4.93	3.68	4.30
	±1.07	*±1.55*	*±1.53*	*±0.92*	*±1.02*	*±0.66*	*±1.28*	*±1.44*	*±1.13*	*±1.56*
Jalpaiguri	3.58	5.17	5.71	5.96	5.31	9.19	10.25	11.01	10.65	10.89
	±0.88	*±1.17*	*±1.50*	*±1.58*	*±1.26*	*±2.94*	*±2.10*	*±1.88*	*±2.40*	*±2.29*
Presidency	4.92	5.60	6.04	4.61	4.60	4.45	3.79	5.13	4.80	5.33
	±1.11	*±2.03*	*±1.51*	*±1.11*	*±1.39*	*±1.24*	*±1.12*	*±1.27*	*±1.39*	*±1.42*
State	4.81	5.70	5.68	4.58	4.32	4.31	5.29	6.54	5.86	6.29
	±0.62	*±0.98*	*±0.90*	*±0.69*	*±0.72*	*±0.88*	*±0.86*	*±0.90*	*±0.94*	*±1.01*

Learning levels: Std I-II

Division/Region	% Children in Std I-II who CAN READ letters or more					% Children in Std I-II who CAN RECOGNIZE numbers 1 to 9 or more				
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Burdwan	92.74	84.39	86.09	90.06	89.18	91.84	84.74	88.13	90.70	92.07
	±2.31	±4.57	±4.01	±3.19	±3.31	±2.28	±4.18	±3.56	±2.74	±2.66
Jalpaiguri	76.68	78.39	76.95	78.49	74.67	80.19	80.33	82.30	79.75	79.80
	±5.46	±4.38	±4.18	±5.50	±4.97	±4.02	±4.37	±3.27	±5.62	±4.47
Presidency	90.12	88.53	87.69	88.91	87.15	92.46	89.04	90.37	87.21	90.31
	±2.57	±3.44	±3.18	±3.81	±3.90	±2.24	±3.65	±3.30	±4.37	±3.36
State	87.85	83.96	84.02	86.62	84.77	89.13	84.83	87.20	86.76	88.33
	±2.05	±2.46	±2.31	±2.50	±2.42	±1.69	±2.37	±2.04	±2.47	±2.08

Learning levels: Std III-V

Division/Region	% Children in Std III-V who CAN READ Level 1 (Std I) text or more					% Children in Std III-V who CAN DO subtraction or more				
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Burdwan	88.26	73.04	70.02	76.82	65.01	87.38	63.64	65.09	71.20	60.46
	±2.70	±3.94	±5.40	±4.39	±4.53	±2.81	±4.89	±5.51	±5.28	±5.13
Jalpaiguri	66.44	61.53	66.06	55.05	52.92	68.38	49.36	57.51	47.16	45.19
	±4.86	±3.86	±4.65	±5.09	±5.36	±4.41	±3.97	±4.86	±5.00	±5.93
Presidency	67.70	66.66	65.54	67.08	62.14	64.18	51.49	55.24	55.29	52.54
	±5.31	±3.90	±5.03	±6.53	±5.02	±4.79	±4.17	±4.58	±6.89	±4.91
State	76.95	67.69	67.59	68.44	61.06	75.87	55.52	60.03	60.40	53.83
	±2.96	±2.38	±3.06	±3.40	±2.92	±2.86	±2.79	±3.09	±3.85	±3.12

Note: Districts have been clubbed into divisions to produce these estimates. The grouping of districts is based on administrative divisions used in the state or by geographical regions.

How to read these tables: The first row for each division gives the estimate of the relevant variable/year. The numbers below the estimate, in the second row, are twice the standard error of the corresponding estimate and represent the 95% confidence interval for the estimate. For instance, In Burdwan division of West Bengal, in 2007, % of Std I-II children who could read letters or more is 92.74 %. With 95% probability, the true population proportion lies within ±2.31 % points of the estimate, i.e., between 95.05 % and 90.43%.

List of districts under each division
Burdwan
Birbhum
Barddhaman
Hugli
Bankura
Puruliya
Medinipur
Jalpaiguri
Darjiling
Jalpaiguri
Koch Bihar
Uttar Dinajpur
Dakshin Dinajpur
Maldah
Presidency
Murshidabad
Nadia
North Twenty Four Parganas
Haora
South Twenty Four Parganas



Annexures

Sample description

State	Actual cistricts	Surveyed districts					2011												
		2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	Sur-veyed districts	Sur-veyed villages	Surveyed house-holds	Age3-16	Age 3-5			Age 6-14			Age 15-16		
										All	All	Boys	Girls	All	Boys	Girls	All	Boys	Girls
Andhra Pradesh	22	22	22	22	22	22	22	649	13179	21317	3630	1870	1760	15212	7503	7709	2475	1197	1278
Arunachal Pradesh	13	8	13	10	13	13	11	285	5586	10242	2488	1326	1162	6662	3706	2956	1092	638	454
Assam	23	16	23	23	22	23	22	630	12731	23251	4658	2380	2278	16012	8362	7650	2581	1374	1207
Bihar	37	37	37	35	37	37	37	1068	21775	57504	11425	5955	5347	40718	21650	18785	5361	2974	2359
Chhattisgarh	16	16	15	15	15	15	15	446	8871	16261	3008	1536	1461	11076	5610	5456	2177	1115	1057
Dadra & Nagar Haveli	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	18	361	614	99	47	52	423	249	173	92	60	32
Daman & Diu	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	24	1191	2287	320	156	164	1650	897	753	317	165	152
Goa	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	26	540	807	202	89	113	530	290	240	75	35	40
Gujarat	26	25*	25*	25*	26	26	25	723	14747	27578	4136	2221	1915	20409	11232	9177	3033	1692	1341
Haryana	20	20	20	20	20	20	16	424	8687	18513	3318	1871	1413	12931	7261	5566	2264	1243	999
Himachal Pradesh	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	348	6933	10584	1977	1057	889	7409	3842	3473	1198	583	593
Jammu & Kashmir	14	13	14	14	14		14	375	8088	16909	2849	1521	1283	11468	5996	5326	2592	1280	1288
Jharkhand	22	22	22	22	21	22	20	583	11742	27030	5458	2777	2556	18757	9782	8681	2815	1532	1246
Karnataka	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	805	16165	24566	4432	2253	2179	17204	8727	8477	2930	1476	1454
Kerala	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	389	8400	11564	1756	894	862	8457	4222	4235	1351	675	676
Madhya Pradesh	45	45	45	45	45	45	43	1266	25368	51952	9469	5112	4256	36433	19200	16916	6050	3262	2740
Maharashtra	33	33	33	33	33	33	31	925	18504	30438	4939	2589	2315	21381	11415	9842	4118	2106	1986
Manipur	9	8	9	9	9	8	8	214	4674	8843	1643	845	798	6421	3340	3081	779	396	383
Meghalaya	7	5	6	7	7	7	6	155	3066	7070	1526	770	756	4665	2339	2326	879	443	436
Mizoram	8	7		8	8	8	8	175	4384	10375	2030	1063	967	7257	3864	3393	1088	598	490
Nagaland	11	10	11	11	11	11	11	260	6305	13001	2510	1296	1214	9284	4849	4435	1207	651	556
Odisha	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	893	17781	28724	5444	2922	2522	19440	10356	9084	3840	2023	1817
Puducherry	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	51	1121	1383	235	118	117	913	456	457	235	107	128
Punjab	19	18*	19	19	19	19	19	550	11291	16626	2948	1627	1321	11753	6482	5271	1925	1033	892
Rajasthan	32	31	32	32	32	32	31	925	18547	42258	7129	3855	3209	29435	16442	12705	5694	3355	2291
Sikkim	4		1	4	4	4	Sikkim was surveyed late and data could not be incorporated in the Provisional Report												
Tamil Nadu	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	840	17320	26350	4116	2110	2000	18318	9144	9170	3916	1965	1950
Tripura	4	2	3	4	4	4	4	109	2308	3474	650	345	305	2307	1245	1062	517	295	222
Uttar Pradesh	69	69	69	69	69	69	68	2019	40740	96215	17988	9674	8224	66100	35515	30389	12127	6486	5613
Uttarakhand	13	13	13	13	13	13	12	346	6966	13223	2526	1319	1207	9053	4795	4258	1644	873	771
West Bengal	17	16	17	17	17	17	17	496	10001	14506	2796	1438	1358	9749	5038	4711	1961	991	970
Total	**583**	**555**	**568**	**551**	**580**	**567**	**558****	**16017**	**327372**	**633465**	**115705**	**61036**	**54003**	**441427**	**233809**	**205757**	**76333**	**40623**	**35421**

Note: Girls and boys may not add to all children since gender has not been recorded for 2683 children.

* These states are complete. Some districts were split in subsequent years.


** Data for 6 districts is incomplete.

Village infrastructure and household characteristics


STATES	% of villages with the following characteristics															% of households with the following characteristics											
	Pukka Road	Electricity	Post Office	STD Booth	Bank	P.D.S	Primary Health Centre	Private Health Clinic	Internet cafe	Solar Energy	Govt Prim School	Govt Middle School	Govt Sec. School	Private School	Aanganwadi/Pre School	Kutcha	Semi Pukka	Pukka	Electricity	Electricity today	Toilet	T.V.	Cable TV	Mobile	Newspaper	Other reading material	Computer Usage
Andhra Pradesh	85.1	99.8	70.7	72.5	32.8	90.2	46.6	56.6	17.9	7.6	99.5	68.2	47.5	39.8	97.2	16.4	29.3	54.3	97.2	74.2	54.8	77.2	73.4	80.7	10.2	7.6	10.0
Arunachal Pradesh	60.8	83.8	20.5	24.2	12.2	57.2	41.6	10.5	7.2	25.6	91.0	49.2	20.1	25.6	80.6	63.5	29.6	6.9	82.7	72.8	73.7	63.3	54.5	67.7	9.3	26.5	15.0
Assam	47.6	82.4	30.0	18.9	6.6	73.8	32.3	14.5	8.4	14.5	90.0	30.9	12.6	35.3	93.1	64.6	20.1	15.3	55.9	50.5	48.7	35.3	27.7	65.9	9.1	13.6	8.5
Bihar	63.3	79.0	41.7	33.4	17.3	65.3	33.8	33.6	8.9	61.5	98.2	76.4	16.1	30.7	93.2	42.6	29.7	27.7	40.4	31.3	23.1	16.2	10.5	66.8	5.9	17.7	4.7
Chhatisgarh	79.4	95.9	32.7	17.9	15.0	68.7	38.6	29.0	11.0	9.2	98.1	41.7	16.2	27.0	97.3	70.4	16.5	13.1	83.7	78.0	24.2	45.6	30.9	48.8	6.3	14.8	4.9
Dadra & Nagar Haveli	94.1	100.0	55.6	44.4	33.3	88.9	44.4	38.9	22.2	0.0	100.0	88.2	41.2	12.5	100.0	49.4	36.8	13.8	95.2	92.4	27.5	55.9	36.6	64.2	12.3	13.7	9.2
Daman & Diu	100.0	100.0	11.8	68.8	6.7	41.2	82.4	18.8	5.9	5.9	100.0	58.8	31.3	29.4	100.0	6.1	40.6	53.3	99.5	99.0	82.9	91.2	88.7	93.6	28.0	37.8	28.1
Goa	96.0	100.0	84.0	72.0	80.0	84.0	75.0	54.2	52.2	36.4	100.0	65.0	60.0	70.8	100.0	10.2	18.8	71.0	98.5	97.6	84.2	92.5	80.1	93.5	58.8	43.1	55.1
Gujarat	88.7	99.3	66.7	43.2	29.7	78.0	52.6	44.4	17.9	21.9	99.7	91.6	34.7	24.3	97.2	26.1	34.6	39.3	95.4	92.0	48.5	61.0	51.0	80.4	14.0	25.6	17.7
Haryana	92.8	98.8	50.5	61.4	35.9	84.8	51.5	57.7	13.9	23.4	98.4	80.2	59.8	67.7	98.1	8.5	27.6	63.9	92.7	67.9	77.5	76.8	64.6	86.9	17.8	22.0	23.1
Himachal Pradesh	53.0	99.7	45.0	32.7	20.6	52.1	44.7	23.2	14.7	23.7	81.4	46.4	27.0	29.6	90.4	21.7	25.4	53.0	98.9	95.7	77.9	87.4	58.9	90.2	15.1	32.6	25.0
Jammu & Kashmir	60.9	95.1	34.7	41.9	17.7	76.0	61.6	30.1	11.1	15.3	98.9	88.3	40.3	58.1	95.9	26.5	26.8	46.7	90.3	69.2	44.0	57.1	40.0	82.1	11.0	61.5	17.9
Jharkhand	55.5	79.6	26.3	16.8	11.7	63.5	29.5	20.7	6.1	12.8	96.5	69.0	12.0	23.7	93.9	68.8	17.2	14.0	64.3	49.8	10.1	20.9	16.8	55.9	7.5	11.9	4.2
Karnataka	90.6	99.6	62.5	77.1	42.5	76.4	40.9	43.1	16.5	49.9	98.0	84.0	32.7	39.1	98.4	13.0	49.2	37.9	95.8	82.8	37.5	71.4	68.7	82.4	8.3	4.5	12.7
Kerala	92.8	99.2	98.4	98.4	97.9	99.5	95.5	83.5	87.0	51.4	93.9	83.8	75.4	94.9	99.5	8.7	29.3	62.1	97.6	95.8	96.5	89.6	80.5	92.2	52.4	21.6	61.6
Madhya Pradesh	69.2	92.8	35.5	20.7	16.7	58.7	36.2	31.3	7.7	8.5	99.4	59.0	23.2	38.1	96.4	62.6	21.7	15.6	74.8	50.0	23.9	36.0	24.4	59.8	6.4	16.7	4.7
Maharashtra	85.3	98.8	49.0	52.2	31.2	88.2	50.8	51.3	22.4	34.7	99.2	65.2	22.7	46.1	98.5	24.0	38.5	37.5	88.8	64.0	49.7	63.1	47.1	74.2	15.5	22.0	18.9
Manipur	59.2	91.0	16.3	12.3	3.3	16.6	31.9	14.3	12.4	60.6	79.6	34.7	18.7	63.2	80.8	36.9	55.1	8.0	92.1	46.4	95.8	65.5	35.5	82.2	27.4	47.3	19.4
Meghalaya	52.6	88.3	24.8	13.8	11.3	61.3	35.3	15.7	10.6	17.7	79.3	27.7	8.2	66.0	79.9	50.0	36.5	13.5	68.1	61.9	58.4	37.3	30.8	59.7	17.9	51.1	10.0
Mizoram	77.3	100.0	51.5	19.8	18.9	95.8	81.4	1.8	1.2	26.5	100.0	93.4	48.8	54.2	98.8	27.7	62.5	9.8	98.2	84.1	81.7	64.7	64.0	83.7	30.5	72.9	20.5
Nagaland	43.6	99.2	20.4	14.2	7.7	38.9	57.6	15.8	10.2	11.6	97.6	59.3	18.4	53.0	78.7	42.4	47.1	10.5	96.4	81.2	84.7	52.7	45.1	77.4	20.3	71.8	18.5
Odisha	73.9	93.3	35.9	16.2	12.0	45.3	23.6	14.3	8.9	6.5	94.1	55.8	24.0	18.4	93.8	53.3	25.0	21.7	63.4	55.4	20.4	35.1	26.0	48.8	7.1	17.9	8.2
Puducherry	85.4	100.0	56.3	70.8	64.6	83.3	66.0	54.2	31.3	27.1	85.4	63.8	46.8	58.3	87.2	12.2	20.7	67.2	98.4	97.1	48.2	93.1	91.2	84.6	17.2	9.5	28.6
Punjab	95.2	98.7	53.1	66.2	35.1	78.5	53.9	53.4	13.3	13.2	99.4	55.0	36.9	51.8	97.2	8.3	35.6	56.1	97.4	90.8	82.9	89.8	60.9	85.2	19.8	14.6	25.7
Rajasthan	85.0	96.8	52.7	42.9	28.8	66.0	62.9	33.8	16.7	15.4	98.8	83.8	49.8	61.1	94.2	25.6	25.4	49.0	77.0	56.1	34.3	46.1	31.5	81.9	14.5	18.4	10.4
Tamil Nadu	85.0	99.5	67.3	62.5	38.4	91.3	46.2	22.9	15.0	11.0	93.4	55.4	24.4	27.4	92.7	9.3	13.7	77.0	96.7	87.7	37.5	94.2	88.9	87.3	10.1	5.6	16.2
Tripura	82.2	94.4	49.1	23.4	16.5	71.0	46.7	15.9	15.9	13.5	99.0	85.6	51.9	19.1	99.1	76.9	20.6	2.5	84.8	80.4	88.6	63.9	42.1	68.3	13.2	24.8	8.7
Uttar Pradesh	85.7	94.6	33.4	22.8	15.0	77.0	33.3	35.4	7.8	14.2	94.8	42.5	7.2	55.6	91.4	28.2	44.0	27.7	45.9	48.0	28.0	31.2	26.7	78.5	5.7	25.9	7.2
Uttarakhand	52.5	97.7	33.2	27.6	17.8	66.2	26.8	22.7	10.3	27.0	89.8	31.8	14.5	43.5	89.5	17.7	25.4	56.9	89.7	81.3	66.7	69.6	48.0	77.2	12.4	31.6	17.0
West Bengal	54.2	90.0	38.0	35.6	23.6	57.0	42.6	21.0	12.8	6.1	94.2	32.4	27.7	33.2	92.1	52.4	23.1	24.5	68.6	66.9	54.8	40.8	39.0	60.3	9.4	17.8	8.8
All India	**75.6**	**93.9**	**45.0**	**38.5**	**24.1**	**71.1**	**43.3**	**33.7**	**13.9**	**21.7**	**95.9**	**61.3**	**26.7**	**42.3**	**94.0**	**33.1**	**30.3**	**36.6**	**74.5**	**65.7**	**41.8**	**51.7**	**46.9**	**73.4**	**11.3**	**17.9**	**12.6**

Class-wise distribution of children in sample 2007-2011


All India




Andhra Pradesh




Arunachal Pradesh




Assam




Bihar




Chhattisgarh




Gujarat




Haryana




Himachal Pradesh




Jammu and Kashmir




Jharkhand




Karnataka




Kerala




Madhya Pradesh




Maharashtra




Manipur




Meghalaya




Mizoram




Nagaland




Odisha




Punjab




Rajasthan




Tamil Nadu




Tripura




Uttarakhand



Uttar Pradesh



West Bengal



Age - Class composition in sample 2011

All India

	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Std 1	83.7	71.0	25.8	8.5	3.1	6.6	5.8	4.5	4.4	10.0	14.9
Std 2	11.8	22.1	52.4	29.2	8.3						13.7
Std 3	4.5	6.9	16.0	43.3	31.3	10.7					13.6
Std 4			5.8	13.3	42.8	27.2	8.7	5.6			12.6
Std 5				5.8	11.1	41.2	32.0	12.7	5.4		13.7
Std 6					3.3	10.5	40.9	30.5	11.8	9.7	11.9
Std 7						3.9	10.3	35.9	33.8	22.6	10.6
Std 8							2.4	10.8	44.7	57.7	8.9
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Andhra Pradesh

	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Std 1	90.8	74.5	24.4	8.8	2.2	2.6	3.3	4.2	4.6	7.4	14.0
Std 2	8.4	22.5	56.6	23.7	8.9						13.3
Std 3	0.7	3.0	15.7	49.0	25.5	8.7					13.2
Std 4			3.3	15.8	53.1	21.7	9.4				13.5
Std 5				2.7	8.8	55.2	25.2	9.8			13.7
Std 6					1.5	10.5	50.3	28.8	8.5		12.2
Std 7						1.4	10.1	47.6	29.9	24.5	11.1
Std 8							1.7	9.7	57.1	68.1	8.9
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Arunachal Pradesh

	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Std 1	70.7	52.5	21.1	11.5	5.3	2.8	6.7	7.3	5.6	3.8	16.0
Std 2	21.1	26.3	45.9	24.6	13.8	7.2					16.2
Std 3	5.7	15.9	21.0	37.4	31.0	19.5	10.3				16.9
Std 4	2.4	5.4	8.4	18.3	31.5	24.4	23.2	15.7	9.1	7.3	15.3
Std 5			3.7	6.1	13.2	32.1	26.8	21.4	15.5	13.7	13.8
Std 6				2.0	5.3	9.7	23.1	27.0	24.0	15.2	9.6
Std 7						4.3	8.3	19.3	26.6	25.6	7.1
Std 8							1.6	9.3	19.2	34.4	5.0
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Assam

	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Std 1	86.3	74.2	31.5	9.7	3.7	4.8	5.4	7.9	4.3	8.6	17.3
Std 2	10.1	20.7	47.3	30.7	9.8						14.0
Std 3	3.7	5.1	16.9	40.1	37.2	9.9					13.9
Std 4			4.3	13.7	35.8	32.9	10.1				12.5
Std 5				5.9	10.6	40.6	42.7	14.3	5.5		14.0
Std 6					2.9	9.1	32.1	35.7	14.8	6.6	10.6
Std 7						2.7	8.0	31.9	40.6	24.5	9.8
Std 8							1.8	10.2	34.9	60.4	7.9
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Bihar

	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Std 1	79.7	68.7	32.1	11.7	5.1	2.8	4.7	2.6	4.8	8.3	17.0
Std 2	15.9	23.0	43.7	34.8	13.5	8.2					15.7
Std 3	4.5	5.8	16.1	33.6	37.8	17.9	6.9	5.6			15.1
Std 4		2.6	5.4	13.0	27.9	30.5	15.2	11.4	5.2		13.6
Std 5			2.7	5.2	11.8	26.1	36.8	21.1	11.4	10.3	13.7
Std 6				1.8	4.0	9.8	24.9	30.3	20.6	15.5	10.8
Std 7						4.7	8.8	20.3	32.5	24.8	8.1
Std 8							2.8	8.7	25.6	41.2	6.1
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Chhattisgarh

	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Std 1	81.2	84.2	24.1	2.7	0.5	1.6	1.5	4.9	5.9	4.1	13.7
Std 2	9.7	12.7	60.3	38.8	5.2						12.9
Std 3	5.3	3.1	11.0	45.0	48.6	5.8					13.4
Std 4	3.8		4.7	9.1	38.5	45.0	7.1				12.9
Std 5				4.4	5.7	36.6	48.8	11.3			13.4
Std 6					1.5	7.9	34.6	47.8	13.5	5.3	13.0
Std 7						3.1	6.5	28.4	51.6	20.9	11.4
Std 8							1.6	7.7	29.0	69.7	9.3
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Gujarat

	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Std 1	90.9	83.3	8.0	0.9	3.3	3.0	3.7	6.4	6.6	9.5	11.1
Std 2	9.1	12.6	79.2	9.8							11.4
Std 3		4.1	9.1	78.0	13.1						12.9
Std 4			3.7	8.8	75.3	13.6					12.9
Std 5				2.5	6.7	75.2	16.7				14.3
Std 6					1.6	6.1	70.2	21.2			13.3
Std 7						2.2	8.3	66.1	23.8	22.2	13.5
Std 8							1.0	6.4	69.6	68.3	10.7
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Haryana

	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Std 1	77.8	61.8	24.2	7.2	3.3	4.2	4.7	6.9	7.5	2.2	13.0
Std 2	16.5	30.0	44.3	28.3	9.5						13.4
Std 3	5.7	5.6	23.2	38.6	27.1	10.2					13.1
Std 4		2.7	5.2	19.1	35.7	24.4	7.8				12.3
Std 5			3.1	5.5	19.0	40.0	27.3	12.9		5.2	14.3
Std 6				1.4	5.4	16.4	38.7	27.2	14.9	9.5	12.8
Std 7						4.8	16.5	34.7	30.5	24.8	10.9
Std 8							4.9	18.4	47.2	58.4	10.2
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Himachal Pradesh

	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Std 1	90.6	64.1	6.9	0.8	2.1	3.1	2.5	4.3	5.9	5.9	11.6
Std 2	6.2	33.1	64.5	15.3							12.6
Std 3	3.2	2.9	26.2	58.3	14.8						12.6
Std 4			2.3	23.9	59.3	16.4					13.1
Std 5				1.7	22.2	63.4	17.9				13.5
Std 6					1.6	15.4	57.2	24.1			12.6
Std 7						1.8	20.3	52.4	27.9	11.2	12.1
Std 8							2.1	19.3	66.3	83.0	11.9
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Jammu and Kashmir

	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Std 1	82.3	70.5	39.8	11.2	4.1	6.6	5.3	5.7	6.8	3.7	13.6
Std 2	16.2	22.8	42.7	42.0	10.1						13.3
Std 3	1.4	5.4	13.1	29.6	44.5	13.8					12.5
Std 4		1.3	4.4	13.2	26.5	36.8	9.6				11.5
Std 5				4.0	12.2	27.0	41.3	10.0			11.8
Std 6					2.6	11.4	31.1	43.5	12.6	5.3	12.9
Std 7						4.3	10.3	29.1	47.9	15.3	12.3
Std 8							2.4	11.7	32.7	75.8	12.1
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Jharkhand

	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Std 1	79.1	66.0	29.4	13.1	6.0	2.8	5.1	8.3	9.1	7.0	17.4
Std 2	14.9	23.3	41.2	31.9	12.7	8.0					14.9
Std 3	6.0	7.7	19.1	32.5	31.5	15.7	7.7				14.2
Std 4		3.0	6.6	13.1	30.1	27.5	13.2	9.2			12.6
Std 5			3.7	7.0	14.2	28.5	30.5	19.3	10.2	5.9	13.3
Std 6				2.3	5.5	12.6	30.3	26.5	17.2	12.0	10.8
Std 7						5.0	10.1	25.9	30.5	27.2	9.3
Std 8							3.0	11.0	33.0	47.8	7.5
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Karnataka

	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Std 1	92.9	90.5	34.0	3.1	3.6	5.2	4.9	1.1	1.5	3.5	12.5
Std 2	7.1	8.0	57.4	48.9							12.3
Std 3		1.5	6.6	39.7	54.8						12.7
Std 4			2.0	6.9	35.8	48.4					12.3
Std 5				1.5	5.1	38.8	51.4	6.2			13.4
Std 6					0.8	6.2	35.3	54.3	6.6		13.5
Std 7						1.3	7.6	32.2	56.6	16.8	12.8
Std 8							0.8	6.2	35.4	79.7	10.4
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Kerala

	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Std 1	91.5	80.5	18.5	1.1	1.4	3.0	3.0	3.2	2.9	7.2	11.5
Std 2	8.5	17.5	64.2	19.6							11.2
Std 3		2.1	14.7	64.4	17.9						11.5
Std 4			2.6	13.8	66.3	18.0					12.6
Std 5				1.0	13.3	65.0	17.0				13.5
Std 6					1.0	12.7	61.6	19.0			13.3
Std 7						1.3	17.4	62.7	20.8	8.2	13.7
Std 8							1.1	15.2	76.3	84.6	12.9
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Madhya Pradesh

	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Std 1	80.9	63.7	18.2	4.7	1.6	3.9	3.7	3.6	4.0	3.1	12.9
Std 2	13.1	27.0	54.0	25.2	6.6						13.3
Std 3	6.0	6.2	20.7	44.6	28.9	9.4					13.8
Std 4		3.2	7.1	17.4	42.8	28.4	7.9	5.3			13.0
Std 5				5.9	16.0	40.6	32.0	13.3	6.5	5.9	14.4
Std 6				2.2	4.1	12.5	40.6	31.2	12.7	10.5	12.4
Std 7						5.2	12.8	34.7	35.9	20.5	10.9
Std 8							2.9	11.9	40.9	60.0	9.2
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Maharashtra

	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Std 1	86.4	88.9	42.2	3.1	4.2	1.0	1.3	1.4	2.7	5.0	12.0
Std 2	6.7	9.4	50.5	54.3							12.1
Std 3	6.9	1.8	5.9	37.6	57.7	6.0					13.0
Std 4			1.4	5.0	34.1	55.2	7.2				13.3
Std 5					4.0	32.6	55.8	8.3			13.9
Std 6						5.2	30.9	53.4	9.4		13.5
Std 7							4.8	32.2	55.0	16.4	12.4
Std 8								4.7	32.9	78.6	9.9
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Manipur

	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Std 1	80.6	71.8	36.5	17.3	5.3	3.6	5.3	3.5	3.8	6.6	16.3
Std 2	14.4	19.6	40.3	34.9	20.5	8.6					15.2
Std 3	5.1	5.5	15.8	32.0	25.9	17.3	9.4	6.7			14.0
Std 4		3.2	5.2	9.1	35.7	27.6	19.8	12.6	5.7		14.2
Std 5			2.2	6.8	9.7	32.4	33.1	16.2	15.0	16.2	14.5
Std 6					2.9	8.3	26.2	26.3	19.9	13.2	10.4
Std 7						2.2	5.0	27.0	27.7	22.4	8.6
Std 8							1.3	7.8	27.8	41.6	6.9
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Meghalaya

	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Std 1	85.0	75.4	57.6	39.7	21.6	17.4	7.5	7.5	3.5	5.5	22.7
Std 2	9.3	18.9	31.4	33.8	28.3	22.0	14.1	11.6	5.9		18.4
Std 3	5.8	5.7	9.5	19.5	29.3	21.5	24.4	14.9	12.0	5.9	16.5
Std 4			1.5	5.0	17.6	26.3	20.5	19.0	13.2	11.6	14.2
Std 5				2.0	3.2	9.7	18.9	17.9	17.0	12.6	9.7
Std 6						3.1	11.5	16.4	21.5	22.9	8.9
Std 7							3.1	10.2	15.9	22.4	6.0
Std 8								2.4	11.0	19.1	3.7
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Mizoram

	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Std 1	86.2	78.4	31.2	4.6	1.5	3.1	1.2	2.6	1.3	2.7	16.2
Std 2	9.1	18.9	53.1	42.2	14.0						16.6
Std 3	4.7	2.6	12.2	39.1	49.5	17.6	7.8				16.2
Std 4			3.5	12.2	28.7	41.7	15.8	14.2	10.3		14.6
Std 5				1.8	5.0	31.0	47.1	18.9	13.9	12.8	13.5
Std 6					1.3	5.1	22.3	35.6	20.5	11.2	9.2
Std 7						1.6	5.1	23.9	35.0	31.0	8.5
Std 8							0.8	4.9	19.1	42.4	5.3
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Nagaland

	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Std 1	78.1	80.4	52.8	14.0	7.3	3.2	1.5	5.3	5.2	7.4	18.5
Std 2	12.2	12.9	34.5	45.8	23.9	10.4	6.8				17.6
Std 3	7.2	6.7	9.1	32.7	39.4	23.2	16.6	8.0			17.4
Std 4	2.6		3.7	6.4	22.4	32.6	23.4	16.0	10.5		13.6
Std 5				1.2	5.3	23.5	30.6	23.7	15.7	8.4	11.7
Std 6					1.8	5.9	16.9	27.4	22.8	14.6	8.8
Std 7						1.3	4.2	17.0	28.5	28.6	7.3
Std 8								2.7	17.3	41.0	5.1
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Odisha

	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Std 1	91.5	73.7	11.3	2.9	3.8	4.3	4.0	4.1	9.6	9.6	15.5
Std 2	5.6	20.1	71.7	14.4							12.5
Std 3	2.9	6.2	13.8	66.9	15.8						12.7
Std 4			3.2	12.4	68.4	13.3					11.7
Std 5				3.4	9.9	70.1	18.2	5.9			14.5
Std 6					2.2	9.1	66.0	18.9		10.8	11.5
Std 7						3.3	9.6	59.6	18.0	16.9	11.5
Std 8							2.2	11.6	72.4	62.7	10.2
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Punjab

	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Std 1	82.5	61.8	25.4	8.7	1.5	4.5	5.8	8.4	7.9	5.6	13.1
Std 2	15.0	29.3	49.1	35.0	12.6						15.0
Std 3	2.5	6.3	21.0	38.1	32.7	13.3					14.1
Std 4		2.7	4.5	14.4	37.6	33.4	17.1				13.8
Std 5				3.8	13.0	36.1	32.1	14.1			12.7
Std 6					2.7	10.7	32.4	35.8	14.8	6.8	11.5
Std 7						2.0	11.5	31.4	42.5	27.7	11.2
Std 8							1.1	10.4	34.9	59.9	8.6
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Rajasthan

	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Std 1	70.2	48.9	19.1	6.5	2.3	5.5	6.6	4.2	4.6	9.0	13.1
Std 2	22.8	35.5	43.2	24.5	8.6						14.6
Std 3	5.3	11.5	24.5	37.0	25.5	10.4					14.0
Std 4	1.7	4.1	9.4	19.3	33.0	21.2	8.3	5.7			12.0
Std 5			3.8	9.7	20.3	36.8	27.3	13.1	6.8		14.1
Std 6				3.0	7.5	17.4	33.3	25.0	14.7	10.2	11.7
Std 7					2.9	6.4	16.9	31.7	30.7	22.6	10.5
Std 8						2.2	7.5	20.3	43.2	58.2	10.0
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Tamil Nadu

	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Std 1	95.0	66.9	5.0	0.4	1.1	1.1	1.4	2.2	2.3	6.4	11.2
Std 2	5.0	29.0	71.0	7.6							11.2
Std 3		4.1	20.4	70.6	9.4						12.1
Std 4			3.6	18.2	76.9	8.6					12.2
Std 5				3.3	11.0	79.4	11.2				14.8
Std 6					1.6	9.1	73.3	15.4			12.6
Std 7						1.9	12.4	69.4	18.3	17.6	13.6
Std 8							1.8	13.0	79.4	76.0	12.2
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Tripura

	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Std 1	71.7	86.0	54.1	7.7	3.2	5.2	2.5	1.7	6.9	7.1	11.5
Std 2	21.4	10.2	34.3	67.4	10.7						14.1
Std 3	6.9	3.8	10.7	17.9	66.1	12.6	6.0				13.7
Std 4	0.0		0.9	7.1	15.6	56.2	17.4	7.7			14.5
Std 5					4.4	19.8	55.7	20.0			14.2
Std 6						6.1	13.2	54.6	12.4	8.1	12.9
Std 7							5.3	14.4	62.9	29.3	11.6
Std 8								1.7	17.9	55.5	7.6
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Uttarakhand

	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Std 1	80.3	61.3	26.9	8.6	2.4	4.6	5.7	4.2	2.6	5.8	14.6
Std 2	13.0	27.7	45.2	24.4	9.8						13.1
Std 3	6.8	7.6	20.5	40.9	29.3	11.6					14.3
Std 4		3.3	7.4	19.5	40.9	27.4	10.8	5.3			13.5
Std 5				5.6	12.0	40.6	33.2	14.1	8.1		14.0
Std 6				1.1	5.6	11.3	35.6	29.2	10.9	9.0	11.1
Std 7						4.5	11.8	33.4	33.2	26.3	10.2
Std 8							2.9	13.8	45.3	58.9	9.2
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Uttar Pradesh

	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Std 1	85.3	70.1	32.8	15.5	7.9	4.0	5.9	3.9	9.3	6.6	19.4
Std 2	10.9	21.6	45.1	29.1	14.7	10.1					15.3
Std 3	3.9	6.2	15.6	35.4	27.6	15.4	7.5	5.8			14.0
Std 4		2.1	6.5	12.3	31.9	21.4	11.9	8.3			11.3
Std 5				5.8	12.7	31.2	27.2	16.3	8.8	8.3	12.6
Std 6				2.0	5.2	12.2	33.8	26.1	14.9	13.8	10.9
Std 7						5.7	10.3	27.2	26.6	24.5	8.7
Std 8							3.3	12.3	40.3	46.8	7.8
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

West Bengal

	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Std 1	83.6	66.9	25.5	9.0	2.9	6.9	5.0	3.5	2.1	3.9	14.2
Std 2	10.5	27.5	48.7	26.4	7.4						12.7
Std 3	5.9	5.6	19.4	44.3	31.1	10.9					13.2
Std 4			6.4	15.7	42.4	30.6	10.9	7.3			13.2
Std 5				4.6	13.7	38.6	37.7	15.4	6.3	5.8	14.1
Std 6					2.5	10.7	32.8	31.0	16.5	11.6	11.8
Std 7						2.3	11.9	32.2	38.5	27.0	11.6
Std 8							1.8	10.6	36.6	51.7	9.2
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Sample design of rural ASER 2011

Wilima Wadhwa

The purpose of rural ASER 2011 is twofold: (i) to get reliable estimates of the status of children's schooling and basic learning (reading, writing and math ability) at the district level; and (ii) to measure the change in these basic learning and school statistics from last year. Every year a core set of questions regarding schooling status and basic learning levels remains the same. However a set of new questions are added for exploring different dimensions of schooling and learning in the elementary stage. The latter set of questions is different each year.

ASER 2006 and 2007 tested reading comprehension for different kinds of readers. ASER 2007 introduced testing in English and asked questions on paid tuition, which were repeated in 2009. ASER 2008 for the first time had questions on telling time and oral math problems using currency. In addition, ASER 2008 incorporated questions on village infrastructure and household assets. Investigators were asked to record whether the village visited had a pukka road leading to it, whether it had a bank, ration shop, etc. In the sampled households information on assets like type of house, phone, television, etc was recorded. These questions were repeated in 2009 and in addition father's education was also recorded. ASER 2010, while retaining the core questions and questions on parents' education, household and village characteristics introduced for the first time higher level testing tools. Questions on critical thinking were introduced – these were based on simple mathematical operations that appear in Standard 5 textbooks.

ASER 2011 brings together elements from various previous ASERs. The core questions on school status and basic reading and arithmetic remain. In addition, parents' education, household and village characteristics continue to be surveyed.

Every alternate year, ASER surveyors visit a government primary or upper primary school in each sampled village. The school information is recorded either based on observations (such as attendance or usability of the facilities) or with information provided by the school (such as grants information). School observations have been reported in 2005, 2007, 2009 and 2010 and are also reported in ASER 2011. Beginning in 2010, school information is also collected on RTE indicators.

Finally, ASER 2011 continues the process of strengthening and streamlining started in 2008. Re-check of 4 or more villages in each district was introduced in 2008. This process was further strengthened in 2009. In ASER 2010, special attention was focused on improving training. In ASER 2011, in addition to the above, master trainers monitored the survey process in the field.

Since one of the goals of ASER is to generate estimates of change in learning, a panel survey design would provide more efficient estimates of the change. However, given the large sample size of the ASER surveys and cost considerations, we adopted a rotating panel of villages rather than children. In ASER 2010, we retained the 10 villages from 2008 and 2009 and added 10 new villages. In ASER 2011 we dropped the 10 villages from ASER 2008, kept the 10 villages from 2009 and 2010 and added 10 more villages from the census village directory.

The sampling strategy used generates a representative picture of each district. All rural districts are surveyed. The estimates obtained are then aggregated to the state and all-India levels.

Since estimates were to be generated at the district level, the minimum sample size calculations had to start at the district level. The sample size is determined by the following considerations:

- Incidence of what is being measured in the population. Since a survey of learning has never been done in India, the incidence of what we are trying to measure is unknown in the population.[1]
- Confidence level of estimates. The standard used is 95%.
- Precision required on either side of the true value. The standard degree of accuracy most surveys employ is between 5 and 10 per cent. An absolute precision of 5% along with a 95% confidence level implies that the estimates generated by the survey will be within 5 percentage points of the true values with a 95% probability. The precision can also be specified in relative terms — a relative precision of 5% means that the estimates will be within 5% of the true value. Relative precision requires higher sample sizes.

Sample size calculations can be done in various ways, depending on what assumptions are made about the underlying population. With a 50% incidence, 95% confidence level and 5% absolute precision, the minimum sample size required in each strata[2] is 384.[3] This derivation assumes that the population proportion is normally distributed. On the other hand, a sample size of 384 would imply a relative precision of 10%. If we were to require a 5% relative precision, the sample size would increase to 1600.[4] Note that all the sample size calculations require estimating the incidence in the population. In our case, we can get an estimate

[1] For the rural sector we can use the estimates from ASER 2010 to get an idea of the incidence in the population.

[2] Stratification is discussed below.

[3] The sample size with absolute precision is given by $\frac{z^2 pq}{d^2}$ where z is the standard normal deviate corresponding to 95% probability (=1.96), p is the incidence in the population (0.5), $q = (1-p)$ and d is the degree of precision required (0.05).

[4] The sample size with relative precision is given by $\frac{z^2 q}{r^2 p}$ where z is the standard normal deviate corresponding to 95% probability (=1.96), p is the incidence in the population (0.5), $q = (1-p)$ and r is the degree of relative precision required (0.1).

of the incidence from previous ASER surveys. However, incidence varies across different indicators — so incidence of reading ability is different from incidence of dropouts. In addition, we often want to measure things that are not binary for which we need more observations.

Given these considerations, the sample size was decided to be 600 households in each district.[5] Note that at the state level and at the all-India level the survey has many more observations lending estimates at those levels much higher levels of precision.

ASER has a two-stage sample design. In the first stage, 30 villages are randomly selected using the village directory of the 2001 census as the sample frame.[6] In the second stage 20 households were randomly selected in each of the 30 selected villages in the first stage.

Villages are selected using the probability proportional to size (PPS) sampling method. This method allows villages with larger populations to have a higher chance of being selected in the sample. It is most useful when the sampling units vary considerably in size because it assures that those in larger sites have the same probability of getting into the sample as those in smaller sites, and vice verse.[7, 8]

In the selected villages, 20 households are surveyed. Ideally, a complete houselist of the selected village should have been made and 20 households selected randomly from it. However, given time and resource constraints a procedure for selecting households was adopted that preserved randomness as much as possible. The field investigators were asked to divide the village into four parts. This was done because villages often consist of hamlets and a procedure that randomly selects households from some central location may miss out households on the periphery of the village. In each of the four parts, investigators were asked to start at a central location and pick every 5th household in a circular fashion till 5 households were selected. In each selected household, all children in the age group of 5-16 were tested.[9]

The survey provides estimates at the district, state and national levels. In order to aggregate estimates up from the district level households had to assigned weights — also called inflation factors. The inflation factor corresponding to particular household denotes the number of households that the sampled household represents in the population. Given that 600 households are sampled in each district regardless of the size of the district, a household in a larger district will represent many more households and, therefore, have a larger weight associated with it than one in a sparsely populated district.

The advantage of using PPS sampling is that the sample is self weighting at the district level. In other words, in each district the weight assigned to each of the sampled household turns out to be the same. This is because the inflation factor associated with a household is simply the inverse of the probability of it being selected into the sample times the number of households in the sample. Since PPS sampling ensures that all households have an equal chance of being selected at the district level, the weights associated with households in the same district are the same. Therefore, weighted estimates are exactly the same as the un-weighted estimates at the district level. However, to get estimates at the state and national levels, weighted estimates are needed since states have a different number of districts and districts vary by population.

Even though the purpose of the survey is to estimate learning levels among children, the household was chosen as the second stage sampling unit. This has a number of advantages. First, children are tested at home rather than in school, allowing all children to be tested rather than just those in school. Further, testing children in school might create bias a since teachers may encourage testing the brighter children in class. Second, a household sample will generate an age distribution of children which can be cross-checked with other data sources, like the census and the NSS. Third, a household sample makes calculation of the inflation factors easier since the population of children is no longer needed.

Often household surveys are stratified on various parameters of interest. The reason for stratification is to get enough observations on entities that have the characteristic that is being studied. The ASER survey stratifies the sample by population in the first stage. No stratification was done at the second stage. Finally, if we were to stratify on households with children in the 3-16 age group, we would need the population of such households in the village, which is not possible without a complete houselist of the village.

---

[5] Sample size calculations assume simple random sampling. However, simple random sampling is unlikely to be the method of choice in an actual field survey. Therefore, often a "design effect" is added to the sample size. A design effect of 2 would double the sample size. At the district level a 7% precision along with a 95% confidence level would imply a sample size of 196, giving us a design effect of approximately three. However, note that a sample size of 600 households gives us approximately 1000 – 1200 children per district.

[6] Of these 30 villages, 10 are from ASER 2009, 10 from ASER 2010 and 10 are newly selected in 2011. They were selected randomly from the same sample frame. The 10 new villages are picked as an independent sample.

[7] Probability proportional to size (PPS) is a sampling technique in which the probability of selecting a sampling unit (village, in our case) is proportional to the size of its population. The method works as follows: First, the cumulative population by village calculated. Second, the total household population of the district is divided by the number of sampling units (villages) to get the sampling interval (SI). Third, a random number between 1 and the SI is chosen. This is referred to as the random start (RS). The RS denotes the site of the first village to be selected from the cumulated population. Fourth, the following series of numbers is formed: RS; RS+SI; RS+2SI; RS+3SI; … The villages selected are those for which the cumulative population contains the numbers in the series.

[8] Most large household surveys in India, like the National Sample Survey and the National Family Health Survey also use this two stage design and use PPS to select villages in the first stage.

[9] In larger villages, the investigators increased the interval according to a rough estimate of the number of households in each part. For instance, if a village had 2000 households, each part in the village would have roughly 500 households. Selecting every 5th household would leave out a large chunk of the village un-surveyed. In such situations, investigators were asked to increase the interval between selected households.