## Sikkim rubal

ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM HOUSEHOLDS. 4 OUT OF 4 DISTRICTS
Data for 2006 is not available. Data has not been presented where sample size was insufficient.

## School enrollment and out of school children

Table 1: \% Children in different types of schools 2013

| Age group | Govt. | Pvt. | Other | Not in <br> school | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age: 6-14 ALL | 75.4 | 23.1 | 0.2 | 1.3 | 100 |
| Age: 7-16 ALL | 79.7 | 18.2 | 0.2 | 1.9 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 ALL | 71.0 | 27.7 | 0.1 | 1.2 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 BOYS | 67.9 | 30.4 | 0.2 | 1.4 | 100 |
| Age: 7-10 GIRLS | 74.1 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 ALL | 83.2 | 15.2 | 0.3 | 1.4 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 BOYS | 81.3 | 16.7 | 0.4 | 1.6 | 100 |
| Age: 11-14 GIRLS | 84.9 | 13.8 | 0.2 | 1.1 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 ALL | 87.8 | 7.8 | 0.2 | 4.2 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 BOYS | 87.3 | 6.8 | 0.4 | 5.5 | 100 |
| Age: 15-16 GIRLS | 88.1 | 8.7 | 0.0 | 3.3 | 100 |

Note: 'Other' includes children going to madarsa and EGS.
'Not in school' = dropped out + never enrolled.

```
Chart 2: Trends over time
\% Children enrolled in private schools in Std I-V and Std VI-VIII 2009, 2011 and 2013
```



## Young children in pre-school and school

Table 3: \% Children age 3-6 who are enrolled in different types of pre-school and school 2013


Note: For 3 and 4 year old children, only pre-school status is recorded.

Chart 1: Trends over time
\% Children out of school by age group and gender 2006-2013


How to read this chart: Each line shows trends in the proportion of children out of school for a particular subset of children. For example, the proportion of girls (age 11-14) not in school was $1.8 \%$ in 2007, 1.3\% in 2010, 2.7\% in 2012 and is $1.1 \%$ in 2013.

| Table 2: Sample description \% Children in each class by age 2013 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Total |
| I | 22.6 | 42.9 | 22.4 | 5.5 | 6.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| II | 4.1 | 24.6 | 37.1 | 20.9 | 7.9 | 5.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| III | 5 | . 0 | 13.7 | 35.3 | 25.8 | 11.7 | 8.5 |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| IV | 5.1 |  |  | 13.2 | 21.4 | 34.5 | 12.5 | 8.7 | 4.7 |  |  |  | 100 |
| V | 4.5 |  |  |  | 7.0 | 25.6 | 29.4 | 19.9 | 8.6 | 5.0 |  |  | 100 |
| VI | 2.8 |  |  |  |  | 9.0 | 12.3 | 30.6 | 26.4 | 14.2 |  | 4.7 | 100 |
| VII | 2.6 |  |  |  |  |  | 5.7 | 17.7 | 30.1 | 23.6 | 13.4 | 7.0 | 100 |
| VIII | 3.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5.7 | 20.1 | 25.7 | 27.7 | 17.9 | 100 |

How to read this table: If a child started school in Std I at age 6, she should be of age 8 in Std III. This table shows the age distribution for each class. For example, in Std III, 35.3\% children are 8 years old but there are also $13.7 \%$ who are $7,25.8 \%$ who are $9,11.7 \%$ who are 10 and $8.5 \%$ who are older.

## Sikkim fuall

Data has not been presented where sample size was insufficient.

## Reading

Table 4: \% Children by class and READING level All schools 2013

| Std | Not even <br> letter | Letter | Word | Level 1 <br> (Std I Text) | Level 2 <br> (Std II Text) | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 8.9 | 32.1 | 34.8 | 14.1 | 10.1 | 100 |
| II | 3.6 | 20.8 | 35.8 | 27.1 | 12.7 | 100 |
| III | 1.1 | 11.1 | 30.2 | 37.9 | 19.8 | 100 |
| IV | 0.0 | 3.7 | 20.7 | 42.3 | 33.3 | 100 |
| V | 0.3 | 1.3 | 8.4 | 42.0 | 48.0 | 100 |
| VI | 0.0 | 1.6 | 5.9 | 34.0 | 58.5 | 100 |
| VII | 0.0 | 0.8 | 2.0 | 14.8 | 82.4 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 9.8 | 89.6 | 100 |
| Total | 1.3 | 7.3 | 15.8 | 28.4 | 47.2 | 100 |

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level in reading achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, 1.1\% children cannot even read letters, $11.1 \%$ can read letters but not more, $30.2 \%$ can read words but not Std I level text or higher, $37.9 \%$ can read Std I level text but not Std II level text, and 19.8\% can read Std II level text. For each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is $100 \%$.

## Table 5: Trends over time

\% Children in Std III and V at different READING levels by school type 2009-2013

| Year | \% Children in Std III who can <br> read at least Std I level text |  | \% Children in Std V who can <br> read Std II level text |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Govt. | Govt. \& Pvt.* | Govt. | Govt. \& Pvt.* |
| 2009 | 52.4 | 61.2 | 49.3 | 54.9 |
| 2010 | 62.1 | 65.2 | 45.8 | 49.3 |
| 2011 | 52.9 | 53.2 | 53.4 | 53.4 |
| 2012 | 48.8 | 55.7 | 56.9 | 61.6 |
| 2013 | 51.8 | 57.6 | 44.6 | 48.0 |

* This is the weighted average of govt. and pvt. schools only.

Chart 4: Trends over time
\% Children who can READ Std II level text by class
All schools 2009, 2011 and 2013


## Reading Tool

 दिदीले मलाई सर्कस देखाउनलाई लग्यो। त्यहॉ मैले धेरै घोडाँ, बाँदरहरू देखे। त्यहाँ एउटा बाघ र भालु पनि थियो। हाथी आफ्नो दुइवटा खुट्टामा उभिए। सुन्दरी सुन्दरी केटीहरूले खेल-तमाशा देखाए। मलाई सबै भन्दा बेसी जोकरलाई मन पर्यो। उसले सबै मानिसहरूलाई खुब हसाँए। एउटा जोकर ता दुइफुट अग्लो मात्र थियो। सर्कस् सकेर हामीहरूले मोमो खायौं।

अनुच्छेद
हिज मेरो जन्मदिन थियो। यसबारे कसैलाई थाहै थिएन। मेरी आमाले मलाई नयाँ जुत्ता किनीदिए।
आज नयाँ जुत्तामा म स्कूल गएँ।



To interpret the chart alongside (Chart 4), several things need to be kept in mind:
The highest level in the ASER reading tool is the ability to read a Std II level text. ASER is a "floor" level test. All children (age 5 to 16) are assessed using the same tool; grade-level tools are not used in ASER.

We can see that the proportion of children who can read at least Std II level text increases in successive standards. This is true for every year for which data is shown.

By Std VIII, when children have completed eight years of schooling, a high proportion of children are able to read the Std II level text. It is possible that many children in Std VIII are reading at higher levels, but ASER reading tests do not assess higher than Std II level.
This chart allows us to compare proportions of children reading at least Std II level texts in different standards across years. For example, see Std V in 2009, 2011 and 2013.

Data has not been presented where sample size was insufficient.

## Arithmetic

| Table 6: \% Children by class and ARITHMETIC level <br> All schools 2013 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std | Not even <br> $1-9$ | Recognize numbers | Can <br> subtract | Can <br> divide | Total |  |
| I | 8.6 | 29.0 | $10-99$ | 44.5 | 11.7 | 6.3 |
| II | 3.8 | 14.2 | 55.6 | 23.4 | 3.0 | 100 |
| III | 2.5 | 6.4 | 36.9 | 45.7 | 8.5 | 100 |
| IV | 0.5 | 3.3 | 20.5 | 52.2 | 23.5 | 100 |
| V | 0.0 | 1.0 | 14.9 | 50.8 | 33.3 | 100 |
| VI | 0.0 | 2.0 | 12.5 | 36.8 | 48.8 | 100 |
| VII | 0.0 | 0.8 | 3.8 | 31.8 | 63.6 | 100 |
| VIII | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.6 | 21.0 | 76.4 | 100 |
| Total | 1.5 | 5.8 | 21.6 | 35.8 | 35.3 | 100 |

How to read this table: Each cell shows the highest level in arithmetic achieved by a child. For example, in Std III, 2.5\% children cannot even recognize numbers 1-9, 6.4\% can recognize numbers up to 9 but not more, 36.9\% can recognize numbers up to 99 but cannot do subtraction, $45.7 \%$ can do subtraction but cannot do division, and $8.5 \%$ can do division. For each class, the total of all these exclusive categories is $100 \%$.

| Table 7: Trends over time <br> \% Children in Std III and V who can do at least SUBTRACTION and DIVISION respectively by school type 2009-2013 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | \% Children in Std III who can do at least subtraction |  | \% Children in Std V who can do division |  |
|  | Govt. | Govt. \& Pvt. * | Govt. | Govt. \& Pvt.* |
| 2009 | 60.5 | 64.9 | 47.7 | 49.0 |
| 2010 | 51.3 | 53.4 | 40.1 | 42.3 |
| 2011 | 46.8 | 51.9 | 41.2 | 41.5 |
| 2012 | 49.6 | 55.0 | 43.5 | 43.8 |
| 2013 | 49.7 | 54.2 | 32.8 | 33.3 |

* This is the weighted average of govt. and pvt. schools only.

Chart 5: Trends over time
\% Children who can do DIVIsION by class
All schools 2009, 2011 and 2013


Math Tool


To interpret the chart alongside (Chart 5), several things need to be kept in mind:
The highest level in the ASER arithmetic tool is the ability to do a numerical division problem (dividing a three digit number by a one digit number). In most states in India, children are expected to do such computations by Std III or Std IV. ASER does not assess children using grade-level tools.
We can see that the proportion of children who can do this level of division increases in successive standards. This is true for every year for which data is shown.

By Std VIII, when children have completed eight years of schooling, a substantial proportion of children are able to do division problems at this level. It is possible that some children are able to do operations at higher levels too, but ASER arithmetic tests do not assess higher than this level.

This chart allows us to compare proportions of children who can do division in different standards across years. For example, see Std V in 2009, 2011 and 2013.

## Sikkim fuall

Data has not been presented where sample size was insufficient.

## Type of school and paid additional tuition classes (tutoring)

The ASER survey recorded information about paid additional private tutoring by asking the following question: "Does the child take any paid tuition class currently?" Therefore the numbers given below do not include any unpaid supplemental help in learning that the child may have received.

| Table 8: Trends over time <br> \% Children attending PAID TUITION CLASSES by school type <br> 2010-2013 |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \% Children attending paid tuition <br> classes in Std I-V | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 |
| Govt. schools | 20.5 | 18.6 | 23.0 | 23.7 |
| Pvt. schools | 47.9 | 54.4 | 49.4 | 60.6 |
| All schools | 26.6 | 29.6 | 30.4 | 33.3 |
| \% Children attending paid tuition <br> classes in Std VI-VIII | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 |
| Govt. schools | 22.5 | 20.0 | 15.5 | 17.0 |
| All schools | 26.3 | 29.7 | 21.3 | 23.2 |



Table 9: Trends over time
\% Children by school type and TUITION 2010-2013

|  | Category | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std I-V | Govt. no tuition | 61.9 | 56.3 | 55.2 | 56.4 |
|  | Govt. + Tuition | 16.0 | 12.8 | 16.4 | 17.5 |
|  | Pvt. no tuition | 11.5 | 14.1 | 14.4 | 10.3 |
|  | Pvt. + Tuition | 10.6 | 16.8 | 14.0 | 15.8 |
|  | Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Std VI-VIII | Govt. no tuition | 67.5 | 64.3 | 69.7 | 72.7 |
|  | Govt. + Tuition | 19.6 | 16.1 | 12.8 | 14.9 |
|  | Pvt. no tuition | 6.1 | 6.1 | 9.1 | 4.1 |
|  | Pvt. + Tuition | 6.8 | 13.6 | 8.5 | 8.3 |
|  | Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Chart 6: Trends over time
\% Children in Std III-V who can READ at least Std I level text
by school type and TUITION 2010-2013


ANALYSIS BASED ON DATA FROM GOVERNMENT SCHOOLS. 4 OUT OF 4 DISTRICTS
Data has not been presented where sample size was insufficient.
School observations
In each sampled village, the largest government school with primary sections is visited on the day of the survey. Information about schools in this report is based on these visits.

| Table 11: Number of schools visited 2010-2013 |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Type of school | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 |
| Std I-IVN: Primary | 28 | 9 | 14 | 42 |
| Std I-VIINIII: Primary + <br> Upper primary | 41 | 29 | 31 | 56 |
| Total schools visited | 69 | 38 | 45 | 98 |


| Table 12: Student and teacher attendance on the day of visit 2010-2013 |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Std I-IVN and Std I-VIINIIII |  |  |  |
|  | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 |
| \% Enrolled children <br> present (Average) | 83.7 | 82.2 | 81.7 | 83.8 |
| \% Teachers present <br> (Average) | 80.4 | 86.6 | 83.7 | 87.6 |


| Table 13: Small schools and multigrade classes 2010-2013 |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Std I-IVN and Std I-VIINIII |  |  |  |
|  | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 |
| \% Schools with total enrollment of 60 or less | 23.2 | 10.8 | 23.3 | 26.5 |
| \% Schools where Std II children observed <br> sitting with one or more other classes | 9.0 | 18.9 | 15.9 | 7.2 |
| \% Schools where Std IV children observed <br> sitting with one or more other classes | 9.2 | 18.8 | 17.5 | 7.9 |

## RTE indicators

The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education (RTE) Act, 2009 specifies a series of norms and standards for a school. Data on selected measurable indicators of RTE are collected in ASER.

| Table 14: Schools meeting selected RTE norms 2010-2013 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \% Schools meeting the following RTE norms: |  | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 |
|  <br> CTR | Pupil-teacher ratio (PTR) | 93.4 | 85.7 | 95.0 | 92.7 |
|  | Classroom-teacher ratio (CTR) | 61.3 | 68.8 | 62.5 | 59.1 |
| Building | Office/store/office cum store | 92.7 | 88.6 | 88.1 | 95.7 |
|  | Playground | 79.7 | 86.1 | 83.7 | 83.2 |
|  | Boundary wall/fencing | 14.5 | 25.7 | 27.9 | 31.6 |
| Drinking water | No facility for drinking water | 11.6 | 24.3 | 23.3 | 21.1 |
|  | Facility but no drinking water available | 11.6 | 8.1 | 7.0 | 8.4 |
|  | Drinking water available | 76.8 | 67.6 | 69.8 | 70.5 |
|  | Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Toilet | No toilet facility | 1.5 | 5.3 | 0.0 | 2.1 |
|  | Facility but toilet not useable | 39.1 | 63.2 | 40.0 | 32.0 |
|  | Toilet useable | 59.4 | 31.6 | 60.0 | 66.0 |
|  | Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Girls' toilet | No separate provision for girls' toilet | 17.2 | 16.7 | 7.3 | 8.2 |
|  | Separate provision but locked | 26.6 | 27.8 | 19.5 | 11.8 |
|  | Separate provision, unlocked but not useable | 18.8 | 27.8 | 19.5 | 17.7 |
|  | Separate provision, unlocked and useable | 37.5 | 27.8 | 53.7 | 62.4 |
|  | Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Library | No library | 55.9 | 36.1 | 52.3 | 49.0 |
|  | Library but no books being used by children on day of visit | 17.7 | 36.1 | 18.2 | 27.1 |
|  | Library books being used by children on day of visit | 26.5 | 27.8 | 29.6 | 24.0 |
|  | Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Mid-day meal | Kitchen shed for cooking mid-day meal | 95.7 | 94.4 | 93.0 | 98.0 |
|  | Mid-day meal served in school on day of visit | 98.6 | 94.6 | 81.4 | 98.0 |



In each visited school, we asked a teacher/HM a few questions about Continuous \& Comprehensive Evaluation (CCE).

Chart 8: Continuous \& Comprehensive Evaluation (CCE) in schools 2013


- Had not heard about CCE
- Had heard about CCE but did not report receiving manuals/formats
- Had heard about CCE \& reported receiving manuals/formats but could not show them
- Had heard about CCE \& reported receiving manuals/formats and were able to show them

