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## Message from Local Partners

Annual Status of Education Report (ASER) is a citizen-led, household-based survey. It was conducted in 2019 across 155 rural and 20 urban districts of Pakistan assessing the learning outcomes of children aged 5-16. The survey gives an overview of the learning competencies (grades 2/3-lower primary) of Pakistan's children whether in-school or out of school. This is achieved by mobilizing partners (33) and volunteers to conduct the survey. This citizen-led initiative trains and mobilizes mainly youth volunteers as enumerators, holding the education system accountable. The volunteers/ enumerators are mobilized who have at least a graduate degree, have a mobile phone and a passion to highlight the challenges of the education sector as active citizens. In ASER 2019, 11,000 educated enumerators were provided three days of rigorous field based training, to conduct the oral one-to-one assessment in homes, triangulated by information from the households and visits to the local schools. In few districts, volunteers even collected the information for the first time on a tablet, providing real time information.

Through training and experience, ASER enables our ordinary-extraordinary citizens every year to assess the quality of education in Pakistan through a large body of open source evidence. We as local partners, who take part every year, reach out to randomly selected distant communities and households, have gained confidence to knock on doors to ask about a fundamental constitutional right under article 25 A .

We feel that our contribution is extremely important, not just because we provide assistance in collection of the annual data mapping children's learning progress, but because our aim is to put this information into the hands of parents and other local actors on the ground, enabling them to hold schools and local officials accountable for learning outcomes. We take immense pride in becoming an indispensable part of the ecosystem for change: both as a means to raise awareness around low learning levels and a force for bottom-up accountability and action to improve children's learning in schools.

ASER Pakistan has played a fundamental role in shifting national and global conversations to improving learning in school, by contributing to an increased focus on learning outcomes and sharing evidence highlighting the seriousness of the learning crisis. ASER Pakistan is a great example of showing how assessment data can support and lead to action towards improvements in children's learning. ITA's learning and equity initiatives that use ASER findings in different regions of the country, ensure that the learning crises can be mitigated through different interventions. These accelerated learning programs for never enrolled, drop outs and at risk in schools take cue from ASER, such as Chalo Parho Barho-CPB (let's read and grow), Right to Education, Siyani Saheli (wise friends-for adolescent girls) are large thriving service delivery programs bringing a change impacting inclusively the twin crisis of learning and access-making 12 years of education a possibility for both girls and boys.

With these successes in hand, ASER Pakistan has the potential to go to great distance from data to action. Partnerships facilitated by ITA Teams through ASER Pakistan, not only enhance learning opportunities but also provide a platform for all civil society organizations to come together and build solutions with local people at the centre. We believe, that ASER/ITA Pakistan, through solid partnerships has the capacity to bring a meaningful and positive impact for education in Pakistan in the years to come as an entitlement for each child, adolescent and youth; and we will always be there as believers and activists for such a citizen led movement-from assessment to action!

## Message from Development Partners


$\frac{\text { unicef }}{\text { for every child }}$

Pakistan faces a critical education access and learning challenge. According to latest available data from Government (Pakistan Education Statistics 20162017), about 22.8 million children are out of school and those that go to school often do not achieve even basic learning levels. The Sustainable Development Goals adopted by 193 member countries in September 2015 also represent a renewed focus for inclusive, lifelong and equitable education. In this context, the Annual Status of Education Report (ASER) provides a platform to assess where Pakistan's children lie on the spectrum of basic learning. ASER is a citizenled household based survey that assesses the literacy and numeracy levels of children aged 5-16 years, from all over Pakistan. Led by Idara-e-Taleem-oAagahi (ITA), ASER was prepared this year with the help of 33 partners, having nationwide presence and mobilizing as many as 11,000 educated volunteer/enumerators. Volunteer enumerators received three days of fieldbased training to conduct the oral one-to-one assessment in homes, triangulated by information from the households and visits to local schools.

As development partners supporting ASER Pakistan for many years, we are highly invested in promoting inclusive and equitable education to improve learning in Pakistan. We are cognizant that half of school-going children in Pakistan do not learn the basics despite having spent at least 4 years in school and therefore commend ASER for producing this very important report that continues to bring attention to the ongoing learning crisis in this country.

ASER Pakistan along with other member countries of the PAL Network (www.palnetwork.org) has advocated for the inclusion of an early grade indicator in the new set of global goals. PAL countries' - including Pakistan (represented by ASER Pakistan) - and other key stakeholders' collective insistence on the need for early grade indicators in the post-2015 framework, ensured that SDG Indicator 4.1.1 included inclusive and equitable data on the percentage of children at Grades $2 / 3$ who have learned the basics. Data from ASER Pakistan and other citizen-led assessments have contributed to the indicator being progressively upgraded by the Inter-agency and Expert Group (IAEG) from a Tier III Indicator (meaning it lacks an internationally established methodology) to a Tier II indicator (meaning there is a clear methodology in place but a lack of adequate data) in November 2018; with the indicator upgraded again from a Tier II to a Tier I indicator (meaning there is an internationally established methodology with regular data produced) in October 2019. The inclusion of citizen-led assessment data in measuring progress against SDG indicator 4.1.1 ensures that the hardest-to-reach children remain visible in education data at the sub-national, national and global levels. This includes data collected on: out-of-school children, by socioeconomic status, gender, age, language, and disability.

We believe that ASER Pakistan, already collecting information on the abovementioned indicators, makes a significant contribution in producing internationally comparable data on the acquisition of foundational skills in a process to hold national and global-level institutions accountable for delivering on the promises that are enshrined in SDG 4. The education crisis in Pakistan can only be resolved if evidence-based data is gathered and can be put to use by introducing programs that aim to provide targeted solutions. It is important to realize that ASER Pakistan does not only collect data to highlight education challenges in Pakistan; it helps us identify the most under-privileged areas and people within Pakistan, surviving under extreme poverty. This information helps the government to target better, plan better and spend better with measurable positive outcomes. The Education Sector Plans under preparation as well as all evaluations, program proposals cite ASER findings widely in all provinces of Pakistan Sindh, Balochistan, Punjab, and Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. The tools are also being used to assess learning outcomes of children by organizations/ practitioners such as Oxford Policy Management, SABAQ, TCF etc.

As development partners, we advocate for the continued expansion and diversification of data to measure learning progress early on, in order for timely corrective measures to be taken to ensure better learning gains and successful transitions. We stand by all endeavors, at local, national, regional and global levels to further the learning agenda and its tracking to inform policy and practice. We endorse citizen-led, household based assessments as an inclusive mechanism to track the learning progress for all children, regardless of their age, gender or schooling status.

Finally, we would like to recognize the efforts of ASER volunteers and the affiliated youth, the civil society and ITA for conducting ASER and disseminating the ASER data and findings. We hope the findings of the current report will also inform policy debate and reform to improve education quality.

NOTES
ON ASER


## Baela Raza Jamil

CEO, Idara-e-Taleem-o-Aagahi (ITA)

ASER 2019 (rural) Pakistan is a milestone report for several reasons; it has become a non-rivalrous global public good, as a citizen led assessment with data at scale on learning, through nationwide capacity building and large networks (Education Commission 2018). Although, Pakistan is not out of the woods with complex 'learning crises', there is evidence revealing that there are signs of the needle moving, attributable to both demand and supply side efforts at the level of household/parents and the government. ASER trends from 2014-2019 are encouraging in terms of some upward movement on learning levels and independent choices being made by households to enroll children across public and private service delivery systems in rural areas. As a tracker of age group 5-16, ASER serves as a mirror to the fundamental right to education or Article 25 a of the constitution of Pakistan and SDG 4; its goal, target 4.1 and indicators in particular, 4.1.1.

## SDG 4: Ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all

Target 4.1 By 2030, ensure that all girls and boys complete free, equitable and quality primary and secondary education leading to relevant and effective learning outcomes.

Indicator 4.1.1 Proportion of children and young people: (a) in grades 2/3; (b) at the end of primary; and (c) at the end of lower secondary achieving at least a minimum proficiency level in (i) reading and (ii) mathematics, by sex.

ASER 2019 is the first report since the SDG 4.1.1 indicator has been upgraded to Tier I or the highest classification of definition and measurement (Addis Ababa 2019). Tier I is achieved when the meaning of the indicator is conceptually clear, has an internationally established methodology and standards, and data are regularly produced by at least 50\% of countries and of the population in every region where the indicator is relevant' (UN Stats; 2019). For ASER to be a contributor to such a classification is humbling since it was launched in 2009/10 in Pakistan. The ITA/ASER teams have made relentless efforts at local and global levels to ensure that learning for grades $2 / 3$ is recognized as a vital assessment space for early detection of children at risk leading to actions for learning improvement. ASER Pakistan through its unique methodology and its first principles has been above all a call for action for primary caregivers/parents, communities and governments alike.

The ASER Tool is embedded in the principle of simplicity to be easily understood by all citizens, but by meeting rigorous requirements of capturing 'minimum proficiency levels (MPLs)' with clear descriptors for SDG 4.1 .1 agreed globally. The latter need to be embraced by all assessment /education experts and SDG tracking units. These are presented below.

[^0]
## Descriptors \& Minimum Proficiency Level Definitions for grades 2 \& 3:

Grade 2 Students read and comprehend most of written words in an instrument given to them, particularly familiar ones, and extract explicit information from sentences. Grade 3 Students read aloud written words accurately and fluently. They understand the overall meaning of sentences and short texts. Students identify the texts' topic.
Grade 2/3: Mathematics Students demonstrate skills in number sense and computation, shape recognition and spatial orientation, with an increase in proficiency between Grades 2 and 3. (UIS/Montoya 2019)

## ASER 2019 Trends

Learning Levels 2014-2019, for grade 5, mapped to lower primary assessment tools (grade 2 level), have registered an improvement of 13\% to 17\% from 2014 to 2019 respectively. This is no mean overall achievement and must be celebrated. The challenges at sub-national levels deserve an urgent attention (Sindh: 44\% children in grade 5 can read story in Urdu/Sindhi)

## National (rural) Learning Gains Recorded for Grade 5 from 2014 to 2019

| Urdu/Sindhi/Pashto (story): | from 46.4\% in 2014 to $59.1 \%$ in 2019 |
| :--- | :--- |
| English (sentences) | from $42.3 \%$ in 2014 to $55.4 \%$ in 2019 |
| Arithmetic (2 digit division) | from 40.4\% in 2014 to 56.9\% in 2019 |

ASER 2019 presents, for the first time, formal reporting on learning with comprehension and numeracy with word problems. The good news is that children who manage learning better also do it deeper - e.g. amongst $59 \%$ children of class 5 who could read a story in Urdu/Sindhi/Pashto, more than $85 \%$ could answer questions related to the story orally.

## Little room for complacency

Whilst we record and must celebrate better learning trends in Pakistan, ASER 2019 illustrates that $41 \%$ children in grade 5 cannot read simple story in Urdu/Sindhi/Pashto. More importantly if we look at learning at grade 8 or lower secondary $14 \%$ children are still unable to read a grade 2 level story in Urdu/Sindhi/Pashto. This is unacceptable, amplifying the call for action to the fundamental challenge that 'enrolment/schooling does not mean learning'!

ASER publishes and reports data on learning by grade as well that are part of the agreed global mapping for SDG 4.1.1. If we look at the learning levels in 2019 for grades 3,5 and 8 for the ASER (grade 2 level learning tools), the national rural results are as follows:

| Who can read (Class Wise \% of Children) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Class | Nothing | Letters | Words | Sentences | Story | Total |
| 3 | 10.4 | 8.9 | 35.5 | 27.0 | 18.3 | 100 |
| 5 | 9.4 | 3.4 | 9.3 | 18.8 | 59.1 | 100 |
| 8 | 3.1 | 1.3 | 2.8 | 6.6 | 86.2 | 100 |

Pakistan has made notable gains but the fact that $14 \%$ in grade 8 and $41 \%$ in grade 5 and $82 \%$ in grade 3 cannot read a story with comprehension in Urdu/Sindhi/Pashto is a major crisis. The learning crisis in these grades indicates a foundational learning gap for early years in the country education system (ECE and Grades 1 and 2)! It is time to give attention to the basics in literacy and numeracy at the right time, where children learn as much through social-emotional and cognitive nurturing reading to building of executive functions.

These trends resonate well and have been leveraged for the recent global term of "Learning Poverty" coined by the World Bank (2019) following on the heals of Human Capital Index (2018) as an attention getter to the ambition of learning targets to be achieved by 2030(SDG 4.1.1). For the ASER Pakistan team as well as all teams of the global South participating in citizen led assessments (Latin America, Africa and South Asia), the data has been well leveraged to produce the metric for 'Learning Poverty' by tracking learning for ALL 10 year olds in low and middle income countries who cannot read and understand a simple text, whether they are in school or out of school. Jamie Saavedra has raised a call for urgent attention to this "Silent Crisis" where governments have to urgently shift their focus, treating learning not as a consumption but an investment (2020).

## Gender Gaps-Learning

Gender gap in learning continues: boys outperform girls (age 5-16 overall) in literacy and numeracy skills.

- $46 \%$ of boys and $38 \%$ of girls could read at least sentences in Urdu/Sindhi/Pashto.
- $48 \%$ boys could read at least English words while 39\% of girls can do the same.
- Similarly, 43\% of boys were able to do at least subtraction whereas only $36 \%$ girls could do it.

Shifting Enrolment from Private to Public:
Enrolment choices at public and private facilities as recorded by ASER (rural) from 2014-2019, presents a clear shift in households opting for public sector schools; enrolment has increased from 70\% in 2014 to $77 \%$ in 2019 with a commensurate decrease from $30 \%$ to $23 \%$ in private sector share! This trend speaks volumes for persistent government efforts over the past few years to improve public sector facilities, ensuring teachers' presence and merit based recruitments; this focus must remain front and center to the education enterprise in Pakistan.

## Teacher Attendance Trends 2014-2019

Another nationwide effort by the public sector since the past 10 years has been of technology driven solutions for improved governance, through not just regular monitoring by third party school monitoring education assistants but also through

[^1]biometrics to ensure online capturing of who is in school and who is not! (teachers and support staff!). Technology driven and artificial intelligence driven initiatives neutralize human interpretations on accountability and transparency. The results have been encouraging sustained over the past three years with teachers presence in public sector schools overall at $89 \%$ and $89 \%$ at primary level compared to $89 \%$ overall and $89 \%$ at primary level in private schools. The closing of public private gap has been significant in teachers' presence across service providers, but must improve further.

## Mothers with Primary Education (2014-2019) a rich untapped resource

Each time ASER field teams knock on the doors of random households in villages the enthusiasm of mothers and grandmothers has been refreshing as they are very interested in learning of the next generations, even if they themselves are not so literate! They are the first port of call in ASER's citizen led household based one on one assessment methodology. Mothers are always hovering over their children as the child friendly assessment is underway, anxious, but also reassured that someone is concerned about their children's learning. Since 2014 mothers with primary education has improved from $24 \%$ to $35 \%$ in 2019! This is a positive trend as mothers are the source of sustained demand for more and better schooling with quality learning for their children, both girls and boys.

ASER 2019 responded to the call by transgenders to ensure they are counted on learning: reaching 329, of which 80\% were able to read story in Urdu/Sindhi/Pashto.

## Health and Functioning

ASER 2019 probed deeper for disability cognizance by head teachers/teachers in schools and tracking disability. ASER 2019, as part of the school level survey, included a "Health and Disability" section under which the head teachers/teachers were asked a variety of questions pertaining to Children with Disabilities and Facilities for Children with Disabilities in their respective schools.

At the national level, $22.2 \%$ of the surveyed government schools were reported to be having children with disabilities while $16.6 \%$ of the private schools reported the same. in terms of gender, more boys ( $0.2 \%$ of total enrolled boys in government schools and $0.3 \%$ of total enrolled boys in private schools) were reported to be suffering from a disability when compared with girls ( $0.1 \%$ of total enrolled girls in government schools and $0.1 \%$ of total enrolled girls in private schools).

With regards to the types of disability as a percentage of schools with children with disabilities, the highest reported type was Physical (41.4\%) followed by Behavioral (12.1\%) and Multiple (11.8\%).

Moreover, $2.1 \%$ of surveyed government schools and $2 \%$ of surveyed private schools had ramps regardless of whether these schools had any child with a disability enrolled in them. Similarly, $3.9 \%$ of surveyed government schools and $7 \%$ of surveyed private schools had disability-friendly toilets.

Hence, ASER 2019 is an unpacking, mapping and tracking instrument where the primary function is a call for action to improve learning for ALL children inclusively with equity, especially those who are most fragile by gender, geography, wealth and disability.

## There are four takeaways from ASER 2019 on learning:

- We have improved in learning in grade 5 but the lower primary assessment tool reveals that learning remains fragile at grade 3 and even at grade 8. The learning crisis persists calling for URGENT ATTENTION at foundational levels ECE and grades 1 and 2.
- There is a clear shift in enrolment share from private to public schools - revealing that when government persists with positive interventions in facilities and better teacher recruitment and presence there are positive gains in citizens' choices.
- Investing in girls' education and that of young mothers is critical in Pakistan to not only reduce gender gaps for gender equality, but investing right for generational gains in learning and livelihoods.
- Over $20 \%$ of schools have Children with Disabilities. In order for these schools to become more inclusive, there is a need to ensure trained workforce, provide adequate disability-friendly facilities and support services.



## URBANIZATION - VENTURING INTO THE UNKNOWN

## Sehar Saeed \& Monazza Aslam

Pakistan faces a critical education access and learning challenge. Even after years of investments, reforms and promises, the education sector remains weak. Data from various Pakistan Education Statistics reports, Annual Status of Education Reports (ASER 20192019), Alif Ailaan's 2014 report ${ }^{1}$ and various other sources identify key trends and challenges facing the sector. The Sustainable Development Goals adopted by 193 member countries in September 2015 also represent a renewed focus for inclusive, lifelong and equitable education. In this context, the Annual Status of Education Report (ASER), provides a platform to assess where Pakistan's children lie on the basic learning levels' spectrum, not only across all rural districts of Pakistan, but also few key urban centers.

The ASER Pakistan survey has been conducted across 21 and 20 urban districts respectively along with 155 rural districts in 2018 and 2019. The objective is to provide data to be able to draw some meaningful reflections on educational outcomes between rural and urban areas. This is important because Pakistan reportedly has the highest rate of urbanization in South Asia². According to the 2017 Population Census, $36.4 \%$ of the population lives in urban areas. As per another report "The state of Pakistan Cities Report", launched by the Ministry of Climate Change and UN Habitat on Urbanization (July, 2018), "10 major cities in Pakistan make up more than half $-54 \%$ - of the total national urban population". The report further mentioned that the share of the services economy in cities is larger than in the national economy, and Pakistan generates $95 \%$ of its federal tax revenue from its 10 major cities where Karachi contributes 55\%, Islamabad contributes $16 \%$ and Lahore contributes 15\%. The UN Population Division estimates that, by 2025 , nearly half the country's population will be living in cities.

Migration has also resulted in people shifting from rural areas to cities, leading to urban transformation that has brought about significant changes in socio-economic dynamics especially in the case of Pakistan. Major parts of the country are left with low urbanization while a handful of centers have to deal with extremely high influx of people resulting in the emergence of 'mega cities'. Unplanned and unmanaged urbanization has also led to the emergence of urban slums, environmental degradation, poverty and inequality. Migration has also resulted in huge pressure on existing facilities within urban centres as more individuals compete for limited resources. These pressures are especially apparent in the case of education. With such a host of urban challenges, there is a dire need to look into urban contexts with its own specifications and treat it as a separate category for solving problems particularly pertaining to the education sector.

ASER Pakistan, the largest citizen led survey, has been collecting primary data on key education outcomes since 2010 from across Pakistan including some major urban cities. The objective of conducting a separate survey for urban areas is twofold. Firstly, there is a clear recognition that urban areas in Pakistan (as in any other part of the world) operate as completely different entities as compared to rural areas. It is, therefore, important to understand educational outcomes of children living in urban areas. Another objective of surveying key urban centers through ASER has been to understand whether children living in select urban areas have an "urban advantage" in terms of better school facilities or better learning outcomes and whether growing urbanization has led to more problems including over-crowding within schools, insufficient infrastructure, fewer teachers for children and so on.

[^2]2. https://www.pk.undp.org/content/pakistan/en/home/library/development policy/dap-vol5-iss4-sustainable-urbanization.html

The sampling for the urban part of the survey is undertaken by Pakistan Bureau of Statistics (PBS) who provide a sample list of primary sampling units (PSUs). PBS has developed its own sampling frame for urban domains where each city/town is divided into enumeration blocks. Each enumeration block is comprised of 200 to 250 households on the average with well-defined boundaries and maps. The frame used in the ASER urban survey (2019) is the most recent one, updated through the Population and Housing Census of 2017. A two stage, stratified sampling scheme is adopted for the survey. Enumeration blocks in urban areas are selected at first stage through probability proportional to size method while households within the sample enumeration blocks are selected at second stage through systematic random sampling.

ASER 2019 has been conducted across the following 20 urban districts:Lahore, Faisalabad, Gujranwala, Bahawalpur, Rahim Yar Khan, Multan, Larkana, Sukkur, Hyderabad, Karachi South, Karachi East, Karachi Center, Korangi, Quetta, Khuzdar, Mardan, Peshawar, Swat, Rawalpindi and Islamabad. It provides us the opportunity to focus on the state of key education outcomes especially in major cities including Karachi, Lahore, Islamabad, Peshawar and Quetta. Results for all 20 urban districts have also been collated to generate a National Urban Report Card in order to compare results with National Rural Report Card (having information from all 155 rural districts where rural survey has been conducted this year). This report card is available separately.

Table 1 below presents simple statistics reporting on educational access across the entire rural district sample and the urban district sample from the 2019 data.

Table 1: Schooling access, rural versus urban sample, ASER 2019

| Table 1: Access | \% of Out of School <br> Children (age 6-16) | \% of Enrolled <br> Children (age 6-16) | \% in Government <br> Schools | \% in Private <br> Schools. |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| National Rural | $17 \%$ | $83 \%$ | $77 \%$ | $23 \%$ |
| 'National'3 Urban | $6 \%$ | $94 \%$ | $38 \%$ | $62 \%$ |

Figures from Table 1 highlight that a large majority of children( $94 \%$ of the children surveyed), were found to be going to schools across urban districts as compared to 83\% enrolled children in rural. Not only do children in urban areas have substantially better enrollment rates, a large majority of children in urban areas attend private institutions (62\%) as compared to their counterparts in rural areas where 77\% of the children aged 5-16 years who are enrolled in schools are reportedly going to government institutions.

Figure 1: Out-of-school children by gender, urban sample (2015-2019)

Out-of-school children by gender
(6-16 years)

- Boys ■ Girls


Figure 2: Enrolment by gender and type of school, urban sample (ASER 2019)

## Enrollment by gender and type of school



It is also worth noting that the urban sample is indicative of more gender equality in access to schooling (as compared to the rural sample where we report 9\% girls to be out of school against 7\% boys). Figure 1 reveals that roughly equal numbers of boy and girls (3\%) are out-of-school in the urban sample over 2015-2019. However, interestingly, amongst those children who are enrolled in school, a larger percentage of boys report going to both government and private institutions as compared to girls.

Table 2: Learning Levels (Class 5), urban sample versus rural sample (2019)

| Table 2: Learning Levels <br> (Class 5) | Urdu/Sindhi/Pashto <br> (Story) | English <br> (Sentences) | Arithmetic <br> (Division) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| National Rural | $59 \%$ | $55 \%$ | $57 \%$ |
| National Urban | $70 \%$ | $67 \%$ | $66 \%$ |

Table 2 presents some findings for the urban and rural samples in three basic competencies for grade 5 children (the end of the primary stage of education). Children residing in the urban sample appear to achieve more across all three competencies as compared to their rural counterparts. Overall, $70 \%$ of the children enrolled in grade 5 in all urban districts can read a story in the local language, $67 \%$ can read sentences in English while $66 \%$ can do division. Equivalently, only $59 \%, 55 \%$ and $57 \%$ of their counterparts in rural areas can do the same. However, as the tools are simple and designed as per grade 2 and 3 curriculum, there is still a room for improvement especially in English and Arithmetic.

Urbanization in Pakistan requires a tremendous focus on governance structures and policies, especially those that focus on equity, on the reduction of poverty, on providing education, housing, transportation, employment, public health and supplementary amenities to the large numbers of people who are now habitants of these large and everexpanding urban centres. The data from ASER 2019 show-cases the need to focus also on the quality of education within urban centres in Pakistan. If the children are not learning despite being enrolled in schools, they will drop out sooner or later. Although learning of children in urban areas is higher when compared to children in rural areas; the overall urban learning levels still remain low. Whilst efforts have focused quite extensively on improving quality of government schools in rural areas of the country, there is a need for the government to reflect on the quality of education being provided in urban areas and to observe if it is getting comprised due to growing urbanization. The current education status of Pakistan as demonstrated by ASER 2019 clearly states that quality of education is at risk, and requires targeted action and a focus on access to equitable quality education and learning for all. The challenges need to be addressed by policy makers and governing body of the country with indigenous solutions in the form of sustainable policies, leading to their effective implementation and evaluation. If our objective is to educate all children, we need to challenge the existing differences and divisions in order to provide equal set of opportunities to all children of the society.

## LEARNING POVERTY AND ASER 2019

## Koen Geven

Economist, World Bank.

Thanks in part to the enormous efforts undertaken by the team behind ASER, the world has realized that there is a learning crisis. In low- and middle-income countries, $53 \%$ of children cannot read and understand a simple text by age 10. In Pakistan, this figure is substantially higher: $75 \%$ of children in Pakistan cannot read and understand a simple text by age 10. The World Bank calls attention to this problem by calling it 'learning poverty'. 'Learning poverty' bears some resemblance to economic poverty. Being 'learning poor' (i.e. not being able to read and understand a basic text) gives you several important constraints in life. Without being able to read by age 10, a child will not be able to learn much of the curriculum, will not be able to access government services, and will not even be considered for most formal jobs.

As you can see in Figure 1 below, learning poverty in Pakistan is higher than is predicted by Pakistan's level of economic development. In fact, there are several countries at similar levels of development that have virtually eliminated learning poverty (look at Vietnam, for instance). It is also substantially higher than the average of South Asia, which is at $58 \%$.

Figure 1: 'Learning Poverty' and economic development (GDP per capita)


We should eliminate learning poverty, and I believe that we can, if only we take this issue seriously enough. Just like we aim to end hunger, stunting and extreme poverty by looking at the data and concentrating our efforts. In fact, eliminating learning poverty is a crucial step towards the broader goal of SDG 4, which aims to provide basic functional literacy and numeracy skills for all children. The World Bank has launched an agenda to at least cut the levels of learning poverty by half by 2030, and we hope that governments and civil society will join us in that effort.

I can think of at least three reasons why the 2019 data provided by ASER is invaluable towards eliminating learning poverty. First, ASER collects data on the two underlying factors of learning poverty: (a) the large out of school population, and (b) the low-quality education that children receive when they are in school. Secondly, it is the only dataset in Pakistan through which we can get a somewhat granular picture of learning poverty, considering that this covers all districts in the country. And thirdly, perhaps most importantly, the ASER team uses this data as a call to action. This is not data that is meant to sit on a hard-drive or in someone's desk drawer, it should be on the desk and in the minds of every policy-maker in Pakistan.

The data has told us that there is variation in geographies: in Punjab, learning poverty consistently hovers at around $50 \%$, while learning poverty in Balochistan hovers at around $80 \%$. But the main takeaway has been that learning levels remain consistently too low. There is little variation in learning levels between years, and where there is variation (e.g. in Sindh), there is no clear trend (see Figure 2). This means that learning levels will not improve magically: hard effort is needed to bend these figures downwards in the coming decade.

Figure 2:


Source: ASER 2012-19 (Rural Pakistan Only)

The ASER data also has shown us that most children do learn to read, given sufficient time. By age 12, just over half of Pakistani boys and girls can read a basic paragraph. By age 16 , nearly $80 \%$ of children can do so. This is a message of hope: children eventually do learn the language. Don't let anyone tell you that Pakistani children do not learn anything! The problem is that they do not receive the right instruction early enough.

Figure 3:


Source: ASER 2018
Learning to read at an appropriate age should be the core goal of education policymakers in the coming years. Policy-makers seem to be converging on just such an agenda to improve the quality of schooling. This means more support for early learning, better instructional materials, better assessments, better management of service delivery to all children, safer and more inclusive schools, and most of all, better teaching in every classroom, especially in the poorest parts of Pakistan. This is a consciously broad agenda, from which we cannot prioritize (just think of how meaningless it would be to have a great teacher in school community that excludes the poor, or suffers from violence). This is the challenge that we face as a global community: implementing this agenda will require leadership from the highest political level down to every classroom.

But there are no shortcuts to achieving a learning revolution through better schooling. Let's remember that close to half of Pakistan's children grow up in illiterate families. Under-5 mortality rates (at 7\%) and stunting (at $38 \%$ of all under 5 year-olds) are still extremely high. Even among the middle classes, Pakistani children do not learn the basics before entering schools, and do not have storybooks or picture-books to prepare them for the joy of reading. In this context, we cannot expect children to learn without first improving the schools.

In short, we desperately need the ASER data as a call to action and put it to use in our policies and programs. Researchers, policy-makers and civil society are all key users of the data. Datasets like this are generated through the generous participation of thousands (if not hundreds of thousands) of people. I would like to congratulate the ASER team for conducting another round of this invaluable survey, and will make sure to put the data to good use myself.

# BETTER INFORMATION PROVISION AND PARENT INVOLVEMENT MAY PROVIDE A PATHWAY FOR IMPROVEMENTS IN LEARNING 

 QUĀ́İT̄Y İN PĀKISTĀĀAsim Ijaz Khwaja<br>Harvard University and the Centre for Economic Research in Pakistan<br>Tiffany M. Simon<br>Princeton University

Are our children learning? This question continues to persist in Pakistan and the world over, particularly in emerging economies. Its importance has been enshrined on a global level in the UN's sustainable development goal emphasizing quality education. ASER has been one of the leaders in helping answer this question, and its annual reports give us a snapshot of the current status of education quality in Pakistan. Armed with this information, the next question we must ask ourselves is, what can we do to improve it?

Our research team has spent over 15 years examining ways to improve learning outcomes in Pakistan. Through our Learning and Achievement in Pakistan Schools (LEAPS) program based at the Centre for Economic Research in Pakistan (CERP), we have investigated how learning outcomes for children today can be improved, and what impact this may have on their future educational and life outcomes. Through LEAPS, we have also explored the growth and impact of the private education sector in Pakistan and experimented with innovative tools for school owners and education entrepreneurs.

Two areas of research and policy currently stand out to us in terms of improving education quality in Pakistan. The first is the power of information. In our team's Report Cards project ${ }^{1}$, we examined the impact of providing report cards to households and schools in a randomly selected group of villages. These report cards contained information on students' individual test scores and mean student test scores at different schools (both public and private) in each village. This experiment found that information provision increased student test scores, decreased private school fees and increased enrollment in primary schools in villages that received report cards compared to villages that did not receive report cards.

The second is the power of parent engagement. There has been extensive research that shows parental education and involvement in student learning impacts learning outcomes. As pointed out in the 2019 Pakistan ASER report, parents who have attended school are more likely to enroll their children in school than parents who have not attended school. Mothers also have a key role in learning outcomes. In a study in the United States, authors find that in low-income minority families, mothers with higher education had higher expectations for their children's academic achievement, and that these expectations were connected to their children's math and reading outcomes ${ }^{2}$.

[^3]Other research has found that maternal education influences children's cognitive and behavioral outcomes through learning stimulation in the home environment ${ }^{3}$. These results echo our findings in Pakistan - in one of our team's studies, we find that children of mothers with even very low levels of education (on average 1.34 years of schooling) from rural Punjab spend more time on educational activities in their home than the children of mothers with no education ${ }^{4}$. These findings suggest that a mother's exposure to basic schooling may lead her to acquire an understanding of education such that her children perform better academically, as they end up working more at home.

Outside of the home, parental involvement in school can also impact learning outcomes - researchers have found that parent-teacher interaction can positively affect students' academic achievement in rural China and Bangladesh ${ }^{5}$. Findings from our earlier referenced Report Cards study suggest that one of the reasons test scores improved in our treatment villages was that parents may have engaged more with teachers and schools in response to the report cards they received - parental pressure may thus play a key role in improving school performance, including in public sector schools.

ASER's methodology also speaks to the importance of both information provision and parent engagement. The direct involvement of parents and students in ASER's citizenled assessments and the subsequent local dissemination of ASER results on learning outcomes ensures community buy-in and builds parent knowledge, providing a foundation for them to engage in their children's schooling.

So why do these areas for research stand out to us in terms of ways to improve learning quality in Pakistan? Previous research from LEAPS has shown that that secondary schools are a top policy priority for citizens in rural areas (second only to jobs), and that parents rank education as a top priority for their children (compared to health, safety and diet). Given that we know parents deeply care about student learning in Pakistan and that parent involvement in education can improve learning outcomes, increasing parental engagement with schools and policymakers may be an important pathway to improving learning outcomes for students in Pakistan.

In ongoing research we are conducting in partnership with Idara-e-Taleem-o-Aagahi and with research based at CERP, we are exploring feasible ways to encourage parent engagement with government policy actors who may be able to help improve government schools and schooling outcomes. We are interested in the role parents can play in engaging with policy actors, in particular women and mothers of students. Research from LEAPS finds that mothers are more aware of school shortcomings (i.e. teacher absenteeism and weak performance) than fathers, suggesting that women might have keener insights on areas of school improvement.

[^4]While still in its early stages, our initial findings support our hypothesis that combining information and parent involvement may be a pathway to improve learning outcomes in Pakistan. In community-level meetings we conducted, participants had a sense of school problems and often cited multiple challenges in schools in their village, including issues such as teacher absenteeism, unclean water and corporal punishment. As in our LEAPS research, we also observed that women are both more aware of a wider range of problems and a greater specificity of problems in public schools than men. However, while parents may be aware of the issues facing schools in their villages, there were clear gaps of knowledge in our discussions. While participants in focus groups were well-informed about educational issues, they, and particularly women, were less knowledgeable on how to take action regarding their concerns. Thus, an important aspect of the meetings we held was simply providing information on other dimensions that they knew less about, ranging from different means of contacting school officials and bureaucrats to how political and bureaucratic chains of command worked within education. Some parents were unaware that School Management Committees existed as a venue to engage with teachers and school leadership, or that the School Education Department in Punjab had created a telephone hotline for parent complaints. Parents also expressed that they were not aware that other parents shared their concerns, and some noted this was the first opportunity they had to collectively discuss local education issues with other parents.

Women also had specific concerns. In our focus groups, women were far less knowledgeable about the structure of the educational bureaucracy and their local politicians than men. This is not surprising given that recent research shows that women's participation in politics is low in Pakistan, as is their direct engagement with government actors. Researchers have found large gender gaps in political knowledge in households, with men serving as gatekeepers to women's political engagement and indicators of women's involvement ${ }^{6}$. Similarly, in spite of parental completion of primary school increasing on average between 2014 and 2019 in ASER's reports, the gap between mother and father primary school completion rates has remained relatively constant during this same period.

In our focus groups, women were also more likely to cite challenges in engaging with school policy actors given mobility and access constraints due to prevailing social norms. This is in line with recent research that has found evidence that these norms create barriers for women to leave their village to attend vocational training7. Despite expression passion for their children's learning, women also expressed reticence in engaging with policy actors because of low education and illiteracy.

[^5]Our findings suggest that information provision may be instrumental in enabling effective parental engagement in Pakistan. Strengthening these research/policy areas also has the potential to create two virtuous cycles. One is intergenerational - by empowering parents with information to improve learning outcomes for students, we are also ensuring that these students, as the next generation of parents, will be able to both support their children's education at home and advocate for their children's education outside of the home, whether through communication with teachers, school management committees or contact with education bureaucrats and politicians. This points to other virtuous cycle - the one between the citizen and state. By empowering parents to engage with government actors (and given government responsiveness), parents as citizens will believe the state can respond to their needs and will be willing to engage more with state actors. Successful engagement can thus improve outcomes for citizens and may lead to citizens further trusting in the state and its abilities ${ }^{8}$.

While there are barriers to information provision and action for parents in Pakistan, the desire of parents to improve education for their children is clearly very strong. ASER provides a first step in providing meaningful information to parents in its local dissemination of learning outcome results, and we are excited to continue working with our partners to innovate ways to disseminate information to increase parent engagement.

[^6]
## Hamza Sarfraz

Research Associate - ITA

0ver the recent past, there has been an enhanced focus on Early Learning, or Early Childhood Education (ECE) across the globe and within Pakistan. An abundant wealth of research studies demonstrate that early childhood education and development can significantly influence future education and development trajectories for a child ${ }^{1}$ and has consequential, long-term and attestable socio-economic effects ${ }^{2}$. Among the global stakeholders, a consensus has been established that acknowledges these future gains. Consequently, ECE has been encoded into future development plans internationally including the Sustainable Development Goal 4 which sets out the larger framework for ECE for the next decade or so by enjoining governments to 'ensure by 2030 that all girls and boys have access to quality early childhood development, care and pre-primary education so that they are ready for primary education'3.

In Pakistan, intermittent reforms efforts have materialized across the country for early learning in the last half of the decade to ensure that children aged 3-5 are enrolled in quality pre-school education and well-prepared for primary education. As a signatory to SDG 4, as well as constitutionally promising quality education, Pakistan has invested a considerable amount of technical and human resources in ECE. It is worth exploring, through country-wide datasets such as ASER, on how far these reform efforts have affected progress in enrolment and school preparedness in ECE.

## Reform Situation

In Pakistan, especially within the provinces of Punjab and Sindh, ECE has gained increased system-level attention and relevance in recent years. In the three out of the five Right to Education Acts for Article 25 A (a fundamental constitutional right of all children aged 5-16 years), ECE has been included by provincial governments as a target area of support for 3-5 years. Sindh was the first province to develop a holistic ECCE policy in 2015, which focused towards establishing developmentally appropriate preprimary ECCE that will support learning preparedness for primary schools to improve child outcomes in the province. The Sindh government has also developed its official provincial ECE curriculum as well as initiated workforce reforms with a designate cadre for the subsector. Balochistan created an ECE policy framework in 2015 which addressed the main challenges facing the subsector in the province. However, there are serious challenges in ECE implementation in the province.

Soon after Sindh, the Punjab government finalized its first ECE Policy in 2017, which clearly incorporated a systems-based approach to the subsector. This was followed up by provisions and plans for ECE in New Deal 2018-23 ${ }^{4}$ which has a dedicated section on improving and scaling high-quality pre-primary education across Punjab as well as the introduction of a provincial scheme of studies for ECE.

[^7]ECE features as a key priority area in education sector plans of all provinces. Sindh's most recent provincial education sector plan (2013-18) had specific objectives and improvement areas for early learning. Similarly, Punjab's latest five-year Education Sector Plan 2019-23 also pinpoints specific gaps in ECE throughout the province including 1) low enrolment in multiple ECE grades with significant variation in age of children as well as intra-regional and rural-urban differences, 2) low parental engagement which serves as a significant impediment to child learning outcomes, and 3) service-delivery and institutional challenges particularly with workforce recruitment and ECE financing ${ }^{5}$.

Moreover, the monitoring mechanism in Punjab has been further strengthened through the Assistant Education Officers (AEOs) stationed at district level, responsible for school clusters. The AEOS provide monthly reporting on ECE classrooms to their respective deputy district education officers (DDEOs) and provide advice to head teachers. A monitoring app has been developed based on MELQO by the Punjab Information Technology Board (PITB) and PMIU which is now fully operational and collects continuous data on early childhood in each school.

To address major gaps in the subsector, the provincial government has planned key priority programs relevant to ECE including scaling-up of ECE in low-enrolment districts through a mixture of improvement in infrastructure, enrolment campaigns, reducing school costs for parents' through social protection measures, and partnerships with the private sector. There is also a growing realization, in both Punjab and Sindh, that School Committees or Councils (SCs) can play an effective role in overseeing ECE serviceprovision at the local level and bringing out-of-school children into classrooms.

Conversely, despite the flurry of activity in the sub-sector, there are very few initiatives in Pakistan that provide evidence on the cognitive and/or psychosocial development outcomes of children in early years. Whilst the governments in Punjab and Sindh have adopted commendable measures (such as the monthly monitoring of ECE classrooms) to improve the quality of data and for tracking learning assessment, the current data collection system is not designed to fully measure the quality of the ECE program and development outcomes of children. There is also limited data on enrolment \& transition rates and clarity on ECE terminology. With multiple pre-primary streams (the traditional grades of katchi/nursery/pakki and a more recent introduction of a better provisioned ECE) running concurrently in government primary schools, there exists ambiguity around what constitutes an ECE provision. There is lack of data for distribution of age patterns of children enrolled in ECE as well information on the proportion of out-of-school children.

The Annual Status of Education Report-ASER survey (2008-2019) and Multiple Index Cluster Survey (MICS) conducted by ITA and UNICEF respectively attempt to generate data on early years but each of these initiatives has its own limitations; ASER uses Grade 1 as a proxy for pre-primary learning whilst MICS is an indirect assessment of children in that it collects information from parents/teachers on child development outcomes in selected domains.

However, ASER data captures information on enrolment for all types of preschool grade before grade 1, which have different terminologies such as katchi, pakki, nursery etc. Moreover, ASER's large sample spread across all provinces and touching upon far-off districts offers us a coherent evidence-based on ECE. ASER is a particularly relevant evidence-base for the provinces of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa and Balochistan where early learning reforms and activities have only recently started materializing.

## Progress Evidence from ASER 2015-19

## Enrolment

At the national level, ECE enrolment has improved slightly during 2015-19 from its previously static figures- it is $2 \%$ up. There has been a steady increase in enrolment figures for the province of Balochistan as ECE enrolment has improved by almost $10 \%$ in this four-year period. Sindh has also registered incremental improvement in enrolment figures from $37 \%$ enrolled in ECE classrooms in 2015 to $44 \%$ in 2018 and 2019. Khyber Pakhtunkhwa has shown a slight recovery in enrolment figures from 2018 when the figure drastically fell to a mere $30 \%$.

On the other hand, the enrolment figures from Punjab- otherwise a pioneer in ECE reform efforts- have shown remained static and hovering in the same range. Although overall, Punjab still leads all the other provinces in the percentage of children enrolled in ECE, there has been limited upwards progress.

Figure 1: ECE Enrolment (2015-19)


## School Preparedness

School preparedness as a result of ECE can be gauged via learning levels for children who've transitioned from pre-school and are enrolled in Grade 1. The ASER data has a specifically designed tool that quantifies learning levels for children in all grades within three specific domains:
i. local language reading skills
ii. english reading skills
iii. arithmetic skills

These three domains are also comparable to and coherent with the national and provincial curriculums. According to the National Curriculum Framework 2006, there are certain competencies children are expected to have by the end of Grade 1 including, but not limited to:
i. ability to read and understand basic sentences, and short stories in a local language
ii. ability to read letters, words, sentences and short stories that the student is familiar with
iii. recognize numbers up to 100 , add and subtract two-digit numbers, and be familiar with abstract concepts like time and date.

For local language reading skills, there have been uneven changes but with overall improvement at the national level. The percentage of children with completely beginner/no level of reading skills has gone down from 31\% in 2015 to $27 \%$ in 2019. However, it is slightly up from 2018 when the percentage had gone down to $24 \%$.

However, the most significant progress in the last year has occurred with higher level of skills as almost $36 \%$ of children can read words, sentences and stories (up from $27 \%$ in the previous three years).

Figure 2: Local Language Reading Skills


There has also been uneven improvement in English reading skills across the country. While the percentage of children who can read words or sentences in the English language has incrementally moved up to $15 \%$ from a mere $9 \%$ in 2016. However, in 2019, children who have no/beginner-level skills in English reading has gone up to $34 \%$ from a 28\% in 2018.

Figure 3: English Reading Skills


Over the years, there has been an overall increase in the percentage of grade 1 students who can recognize numbers and do subtraction and division with 2-digits. However, some gains in from 2018 do not show up in 2018 as the percentage of students who have no arithmetic skills has increased by $26 \%$ and proportion of students who can do subtraction and division has reduced by almost 10\%, indicating a regression in learning outcomes across the country.

Figure 4: Arithmetic Skills


Overall, enrolment and school preparedness figures have indicated progress but there is still a need for further mobilization in this area. However, 2019 figures show slightly decreased learning levels compared to the last year. It is worth investigating the specific reasons for this lower performance across the country to understand why reforms towards learning levels are not producing required outcomes. Additionally, the lowenrolment districts in all provinces- also pinpointed in some of the latest sector plansshould be targeted for increased enrolment. However, this provides limited data on early learning in Pakistan, and particularly with regards to out-of-school children, transition rates, gender, and specific learning environments. To inform better policy, there is a need to collect data and figures on these themes.

There are upcoming research initiatives that address these data gaps including the Early Learning Partnership (ELP) Phase II household survey which will gather information on household conditions, learning and development outcomes, and program quality in several districts of Punjab and Sindh.

# DRAWING LINKAGES BETWEEN ECONOMIC STATUS AND EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES FROM ASER 2019 

M. Afzan Munir<br>Senior Research Analyst - ITA/ASER

Economic well-being affects a child's educational achievement through multiple pathways. Studies have shown that family's socioeconomic status positively contributes not only towards a child's educational attainment, but towards their academic performance as well. ${ }^{12}$ ASER Pakistan 2019 survey has further explored this relationship in the setting of rural areas across Pakistan and has collected information on multiple educational and household indicators. Using this data, an assets-based wealth index was generated through ${ }^{3}$ Principal Component Analysis method which was then employed to disaggregate the national household level data into four wealth quartiles.

Learning Level (Highest Competency - \%)


Figure 1: Learning Levels (Highest Competency) by Wealth Status
Figure 1 depicts that children from the highest wealth quartile i.e. Wealth Quartile 4 have outperformed children from the lower quartiles in all three subjects. The differences in the learning outcomes are more profound between the children from the richest households and the poorest households with $40.26 \%$ children (Wealth Quartile 4) and $21.7 \%$ children (Wealth Quartile 1) being able to read Urdu story, 38.21\% children (Wealth Quartile 4) and 19.85\% children (Wealth Quartile 1) being able to read English sentences, and $35.76 \%$ children (Wealth Quartile 4) and $19.15 \%$ children (Wealth Quartile 1) being able to solve 2-digit division questions. Hence, learning achievement increases as household's wealth status increases. Moreover, children from the same wealth quartile have been found to be performing better in the assessment of Urdu relative to the assessment of other subjects.

[^8]This trend continues for other higher-level competencies such as General Knowledge, Urdu Comprehension and Arithmetic Word Problems as well. More children from the households in wealth quartile 4 have answered all questions in respective domains correctly when compared with children from households in other quartiles: 31.06\%, $29.51 \%$ and $29.02 \%$ children (Wealth Quartile 4) compared with $15.79 \%, 15.08 \%$ and 13.75 \% children (Wealth Quartile 1) for General Knowledge, Urdu Comprehension and Word Problem respectively. Figure 2 has captured this information.


Figure 2: Percentage of Children who have answered all questions correctly
With regards to the enrolment status, a higher percentage of children belonging to the households from wealth quartile 4 (79.6\%) was reported to be currently enrolled in an educational institution in comparison to the $67.52 \%$ children from wealth quartile 1 , $70.93 \%$ children from wealth quartile 2 and $75.41 \%$ children from wealth quartile 3. Likewise, households from wealth quartile 4 had a lower number of out of school children relative to other households. Furthermore, children from lower wealth quartiles (1 \& 2) are more likely to be out of school than those from upper wealth quartiles (3 \& 4). When asked about the reason for a child not enrolled in a school (never enrolled or dropped out), 57.35\% of OOSC from wealth quartile 1 and 53.84\% of OOSC from wealth quartile 2 were reported to be out of school due to poverty. This shows the impact that economic status has on enrolment decisions for children.

Enrolment Status (\%)


Figure 3: Enrolment Status by Wealth Status

Lastly, the breakdown of enrolled children by institute type reveals that as the wealth status of a household improves, private schools are preferred over the government ones. Nonetheless, majority of the students from all wealth quartiles are still enrolled in a government school: 81.73\% (Wealth Quartile 1), 77.08\% (Wealth Quartile 2), 71.05\% (Wealth Quartile 3) and 66.52\% (Wealth Quartile 4).


Figure 4: Institute Type for Currently Enrolled Children by Wealth Status

To summarize, the data from ASER 2019 survey lends support to the existing literature on the positive impact that economic status has towards the educational outcomes of children. Therefore, while education is a channel through which a level-playing field can be provided for all children, getting a quality education may not be possible without adequate resources at the household level. In this regard, the government can focus on devising targeted social security programs as a mechanism for facilitating equitable, quality and inclusive education for "All" children.

# UNDERSTANDING DISABILITY AND THE PATH TO INCLUSIVE EDUCATION IN PAKISTAN 

Mehr Asma Javed and Dr. Faisal Bari<br>Institute of Development and Economic Alternatives (IDEAS)

nclusive education is the "process of addressing and responding to the diversity of needs of all learners... [by] increasing participation in learning, cultures, and communities, and reducing exclusion from education and from within education." ${ }^{1}$ In practice, it represents the most fundamental implementation of the basic human right to education. The Sustainable Development Goals of 2030 have reaffirmed the importance of universal and inclusive access to education and learning through SDG 4 and its Targets 4A: "Build and upgrade inclusive and safe schools" and 4.5: "Eliminate all discrimination in education" ${ }^{2}$.

Before any measures can be taken to resolve barriers to education, it is imperative to identify the nature and scale of these barriers i.e. what are the factors keeping children out of school, and how many children are affected by them? Perhaps one of the most poorly understood of these barriers in Pakistan is that of disability. The World Health Organization describes disability as an umbrella term covering "impairments, activity limitations, and participation restrictions"3. An impairment is a "problem in body function or structure"; an activity limitation is a difficulty encountered in "executing a task or action"; and a participation restriction is a problem experienced in "involvement in life situations" ${ }^{\prime 4}$. The reasons disability in Pakistan is so poorly understood are twofold. First, Pakistan has yet to define a holistic mechanism to protect the rights of people with disability on a constitutional level, and second, there is a lack of data to quantify the magnitude of the issue. As a response to the latter, ASER Pakistan piloted an initiative to document disability prevalence in Pakistan for the first time in 2014 through its household level survey. 2019 marks the sixth year running that ASER has continued building on this initiative and has included questions on disabilities in the school level survey which is one of the ways through which ASER captures data. This allows disability prevalence to be measured by the number of students with disability enrolled in schools.

Table 1 shows the proportion of schools reporting children with disability in their student population, and the number of children with disabilities as a proportion of the total number of children enrolled. By these estimates, $0.29 \%$ of the students enrolled at schools have some kind of disability. This proportion is the highest in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa at 0.53\% and the lowest in Sindh at 0.11\%.

Table 1: Province-wise Breakdown of Disability in Pakistan

| Province | Proportion of Schools Reporting <br> Children with Disabilities | Proportion of Enrolled <br> Students that Have A Disability |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| AJK | $19.4 \%$ | $0.23 \%$ |
| Balochistan | $11.5 \%$ | $0.28 \%$ |
| FATA | $23.7 \%$ | $0.42 \%$ |
| GB | $28.4 \%$ | $0.40 \%$ |
| KP | $30.6 \%$ | $0.53 \%$ |
| Punjab | $20.8 \%$ | $0.24 \%$ |
| Sindh | $10.5 \%$ | $0.11 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{2 0 . 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 2 9 \%}$ |

Source: ASER 2019

Prior to ASER, the only national initiative to collect data on disability was through the Pakistan Population Census of 1998, which found only $2.49 \%$ of the population to have some kind of disability. The 2017 Population Census found this number to be even lower at $0.48 \%$. If we contrast the results from the population census and the ASER school survey to other measures of disability, including ASER's own results from 2018, interesting points of comparison emerge (Table 2).

The primary reason for these differences is the way in which the questions in these surveys are framed. Historically, asking a yes/no question on disability has resulted in underreporting. This is possibly because binary questions do not capture any nuance in the severity and types of disability. Responders may be inclined to report only the most severe cases of disability, or they may choose to disclose disability only if they have visible impairments. This is made worse by the fact that disability still carries a level of stigma, and responders may not choose to identify as disabled if they can avoid it.

In recognition of the limitations of binary questions, ASER Pakistan and TEACh (Teaching Effectively All Children) used a more functional approach to collecting data on disability by using the full set of questions from the Washington Group on Disability Statistics for 'Child Functioning' for children aged 5-16 years and 8-12 years respectively. These questions cover a range of functioning including; seeing, hearing, walking, self-care, understanding speech, remembering, controlling behaviour, focusing, accepting changes, making friends, being worried, and being sad ${ }^{5}$. In addition to these, the questionnaire allows parents and caregivers to report the level of difficulty faced for each impairment to account for the degree of severity. The TEACh survey was conducted in three districts in Punjab, and ASER 2018 administered the full set of the questions from the Child Functioning Module (CFM) to a sample of five districts across Punjab and Sindh. Simultaneously, a shorter set of questions focusing only on physical impairments and cognitive functioning was administered to a larger sample across Pakistan. Table 2 captures the results from these surveys.

Table 2: Measuring Disability Prevalence in Pakistan

| Measure | Prevalence | Details |
| :--- | :---: | :--- |
| Population Census 1998 | $2.49 \%$ | Total Population |
| World Report on Disability 2011 | $13.4 \%$ | Pakistan |
| Disability Evaluation Report <br> Pakistan Poverty Alleviation <br> Fund 2012 | $8 \%$ | 7 Districts <br> 80000 households |
| TEACh 2017 | $\mathbf{1 1 . 2 \%}$ | $8-12$ Years Old in three districts of <br> Central Punjab |
| Pakistan Population Census <br> $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 4 8 \%}$ | Total Population |
| ASER 2018 | $3.56 \%$ | $3-16$ Years Old <br> (Washington Group's Short Set of Questions) |
| ASER 2019 | $15.2 \%$ | $5-16$ Years Old in five districts of Punjab and Sindh <br> (Washington Group's Child Functioning Module) |

[^9]The results from the TEACh survey and the ASER 2018 find disability prevalence to be much higher than measures using binary approaches. At approximately $11.2 \%$ and $15.2 \%$ respectively, these estimates are much closer to the World Health Organization's global estimate which finds about $15 \%$ of the world's population to be living with some kind of disability ${ }^{6}$.

No household or school level questionnaire in Pakistan currently probes responders beyond simple yes/no answers. This represents in a critical gap in understanding disability. The findings from Table 2 indicate that deeper probing is required not only to understand the magnitude of prevalence, but also to produce the type of granularity and depth needed to develop a robust and meaningful policy response to reducing barriers to education.

Implicit in the phrasing of the Washington Group's Child Functioning Module is the understanding that disability can refer to a diverse range of experiences, each distinguished by type in addition to severity. Having disaggregated data on each type will not only prevent underreporting but will also represent an institutional shift towards understanding disability as a multi-faceted condition. Comparing the two approaches used in ASER 2018, it is clear that even using the short set of questions provides insufficient depth in understanding disability prevalence in Pakistan. More importantly, it is not enough to simply have more accurate estimates of the magnitude of disability prevalence. In order to make tailored recommendations to improve accessibility, it is imperative to understand who these children with disability are, but beyond that, the specific challenges they face in attending school, and participating in society in general.

Critical to inclusive education is removing any barriers children might face in attending school. While one factor that contributes to these barriers is the difficulty and stigma associated with disability, another factor is that of gender. Girls in Pakistan already face greater barriers to schooling than boys due to a lack of mobility, and independence, and the data suggests that these barriers may be compounded by disability. Table 3 explores how disability and gender interact by showing the gender breakdown of children with disabilities enrolled in schools. While we would expect the number of girls with disability and the number of boys with disability to be balanced, the data shows a disproportionately higher number of boys than girls. This is true of all provinces except Punjab, where the breakdown appears to be closer to an even split.

Table 3: Gender-wise Breakdown of Disability Prevalence

| Province | Percentage of Children with <br> Disabilities that are Girls | Percentage of Children with <br> Disabilities that are Boys |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| AJK | $34.8 \%$ | $65.2 \%$ |
| Balochistan | $29.2 \%$ | $70.8 \%$ |
| FATA | $29.5 \%$ | $70.5 \%$ |
| GB | $33.5 \%$ | $66.5 \%$ |
| KP | $21.6 \%$ | $78.4 \%$ |
| Punjab | $47.9 \%$ | $52.1 \%$ |
| Sindh | $36.2 \%$ | $63.8 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 2 . 9 \%}$ | $\mathbf{6 7 . 1 \%}$ |

Source: ASER 2019

It is important to stress that reducing barriers to attending school is only one aspect of inclusive education. Just because children are in school does not mean that their path to learning is not beset with challenges. While 20\% of schools in Pakistan report children with disabilities enrolled as students (Table 1), only $2.06 \%$ report having ramps, and only $4.85 \%$ report being fitted with toilets specifically for children with disabilities. The lack of such facilities at schools has two implications. First, it creates a layer of exclusion that prevents students from enrolling in schools in the first place, and second, it makes schools a difficult environment to navigate for currently enrolled children with disability.

In order to facilitate learning for children with disabilities, it is important to ensure that schools are welcoming environments where they are able to participate in a wide range of activities alongside their peers without difficulty or stigma. This involves taking steps to ensure that all schools are required to maintain a basic set of infrastructural facilities to improve accessibility, regardless of whether or not children with disability are current enrolled, and additionally ensuring that children have access to facilities that ease the specific hinderances associated with their disability. For example, using high contrast colours on signage for colour-blind children, and ensuring pathways and halls are wide enough for the easy passage of a wheelchair. These efforts should be complemented by more robust data collection efforts on, not only the functional aspects of disability but, the learning outcomes of children with disabilities as well. This will allow for an understanding of how well children with disabilities are learning, and how teachers can respond to their specific learning challenges.

Finally, while SDG 4's Target 4A emphasizes making schools a safe and inclusive space, it is also important to recognize that schools are only one aspect of the environment a child with disability interacts with in the process of learning. Children who walk to school require footpaths with accessibility ramps to safely reach their destination, and children who take the bus should be able to board it without aid. It is only by holistically transforming local infrastructure to promote accessibility can we truly aim to remove all barriers to education and learning, and ensure inclusive education for all.

1 "Interview with the UNESCO-IBE Director, Clementina Acedo", UNESCO, Accessed January 17, 2020,
http://unesco.org.pk/education/icfe/resources/res41.pdf
2 "Quality Education", National Initiative for Sustainable Development Goals, Accessed January 17, 2020,
https://www.sdgpakistan.pk/web/goals/goal4
3 "Disabilities", World Health Organization, Accessed January 17, 2020, https://www.who.int/topics/disabilities/en/
4 lbid .
5 "Module for Child Functioning: Questionnaires", UNICEF, October 2016, Accessed January 17, 2020,
https://data.unicef.org/resources/module-child-functioning/
6 "World Report on Disability", World Health Organization, 2011, Accessed January 17, 2020,
https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/70670/WHO_NMH_VIP_11.01_eng.pdf;jsessionid=D991D4E2BB8E214C4FC5533B08BF9F 9C?sequence=1


ABOUT THE SURVEY

## SAMPLE DESIGN - RURAL (Villages)

Total Population: The total population of this survey consists of 155 rural districts of Pakistan.
Sampling Frame: Each district is provided with
$\square$ A village list.
$\square$ Data from the Population Census 2017 on the total number of households.
$\square$ Total population of each village in the list.

## Sample size and its Allocation:

] Keeping in view the variability of the key variables, population distribution and field resources, a total sample of 600 households pertaining to 20 households from each village is being used.
$\square$ Sample primary sampling units (PSUs) have been considered sufficient to produce reliable estimates with 5\% margin of errors at $95 \%$ level of confidence.
$\square$ The detailed allocation plan is shown below:

| Number of Districts | Number of Villages per District | Number of Households per Village |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 155 | 30 | 20 |

Sample Design: A two stage sample design was adopted:
( First stage: 30 villages selected using the provisional village directory of the 2017 census $^{1}$.
Cecond stage: 20 households are selected in each of the 30 selected villages.
Selection of Primary Sampling Units (PSUs): Villages of districts have been taken as PSUs:
] Sample PSUs have been selected using probability proportional to size (PPS) method.
— Every year, 20 villages from the previous year are retained and 10 new villages are added. Ten villages are dropped from the previous year's list and 10 new villages are added from the population census village directory. The 10 new villages are also chosen using PPS.
— The 20 old villages and the 10 new villages give us a" rotating panel" of villages, which generates better estimates of changes.

Selection of Secondary Sampling Units (SSUs): Households have been treated as secondary sampling units (SSUs).
— Based on actual households in each sample PSUs, 20 households have been selected.
$\square$ We divide the village into four parts:

- In each of the four parts, started from the central location and pick every $5^{\text {th }}$ household on the left hand-side in a circular fashion till 5 households are selected from each part.


## Selection of School

- 1 government school from each selected village (Mandatory)
- 1 private school from each selected village (Optional)
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## SURVEY METHODOLOGY

## WHAT TO DO IN THE VILLAGE

] Contact Village Elder: Introduce yourself to the village elder, councilor and/or to other senior members of the Panchayat. As you walk to reach the village elder, Panchayat or Councilor, talk to different people and ask about the village. Tell them about ASER. This initial walking and talking may take more than an hour. Get the approximate number of households in the village from the Councilor.

## HOW TO INTRODUCE ASER

It is important that ASER is introduced clearly and simply to the villagers. Following is a suggested way of explaining your purpose of visiting the village and the ASER survey: Our team is doing a survey on quality of education in Pakistan called Annual Status of Education Report (ASER). We want to know if the children of age 3-16 are learning anything in the school or outside of it i.e. in home. We are conducting this research in more than 4,500 villages and in 155 rural districts of Pakistan and your village has been selected as one of them. We will also go to one government school here and one private school (if there is one in the area) to look at their standard. We will select 20 households in your village and ask children to read and do mathematic sums etc. This way you will also know the standard of education, and as we ask the government, the village should also come together to improve educational standards.

The next step is to identify the households:

- Talk to people: How many different hamlets/sections are in the village? Where are they loca ted? What is the social composition of the households in each hamlet/section? What is the estimate of households in each hamlet/section? How many government and private schools are in the village? Tell them about ASER.

It is often helpful to first draw all the roads or paths coming into the village and going out of the village. It helps to first draw a rough sketch on the ground so that people around you can see what is being done. Mark hamlets, schools, households etc. with landmarks. With the help of the community members, identify different hamlets and their center point.

## HOW TO SELECT HOUSEHOLDS

In the entire village, information will be collected for 20 randomly selected households.

Go to each hamlet/section. Try to find the central point in that habitation. Stand facing the houses in the center of the habitation. Visit every 5th house from the left-hand side in the habitation (e.g. 1st house, 11th house, 16th house, etc.). Get information about the household and children following instructions in the next section.

- House 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. Move to the next/adjacent open house. Continue until you have 5 households in each hamlet/section in which there were inhabitants.
- No Response: If a household refuses to participate, note that down on your compilation sheet as "No Response". However, as above, this household DOES NOT count as a surveyed household. Move on to the next house. Continue until you have 5 households in each hamlet/section in which not only were the inhabitants present, but they also participated in the survey.
- No Children: If there are no children or no children in the age group of 3-16 years in a household but there are inhabitants, INCLUDE THAT HOUSEHOLD. Take all the relevant information like the name of the family head, age and education related informat ion of the mothers, if any. Such a household WILL COUNT as one of the 5 surveyed households in each hamlet/section.

Stop after you have completed 5 households in each hamlet/section. If you have reached the end of the section before 5 households are sampled, go around again using the same every 5th household on the left-hand side rule. If a surveyed household gets selected again, then go to the next household. Continue the survey till you have 5 households in the section.

Now move to the next selected hamlet/section. Follow the same process.
— Make sure that you go to households ONLY WHEN children are likely to be at home. This means that the day of the household survey should be a Sunday or holiday.

If every house is turning out to be a No Response house, think about your team and strategy. It may be because there are two male members going to the houses hence refused permission.


## Instructions:

1. Find central point in a hamlet. Stand facing the dwellings.
2. Survey every 5th HH (household) occurring on the Left Hand Side.
3. In case of a locked HH or if there is nobody at home, note that down as 'House Closed' and move to the next open house.
4. If a HH refuses to participate, note that down as 'No Response' and move to the next HH.
5. If there are no children or no children in the age group of $3-16$ years in a HH but there are inhabitants, include that HH .
6. If you reach the end of the hamlet before five (5) HHs are sampled, go around again using the "every 5th HH rule".


In the 5th HH ask how many 'chulhas/kitchens' are there? If there are more than 1, then randomly select any one of the 'chulhas/kitchens'. After completing survey in this house proceed to the next 5th HH.

## WHAT TO DO IN EACH HOUSEHOLD

Basics of the household sheet: Following is some basic information required to be filled in the household sheet before the start of the survey.
] Household ID: Write the household number (e.g. 1, 2, 3,........20)
( Name of Family: write down the name of Family head.
$\square$ Total household members: Write down the number of male and female members eating from the same kitchen. This should include children also.
$\square$ Date and Time: Write down the date, day, start \& end time on the day of the survey visit.
$\square$ Surveyors: Write down the names of the surveyors.
$\square$ Village identification: Carefully fill out the relevant name of the village, tehsil/taluka, district and province.
In Each Sampled Household: We will note information about the household and all the children (3-16 years), their mother and father who live in the household on a regular basis.

Household with multiple kitchens: If there is more than one kitchen (chulhas) in the selected household, then randomly select any one of the kitchens in the household and record the total number of family members who eat from that chosen kitchen.

Children 3 to 4: On the household sheet, note down child's name, age, whether they are attending Kachi or any other form of pre-school centre. We will NOT test children who are under 5 years of age.

- Ask all children in this age group their current schooling status, meaning whether the child is currently enrolled in kachi or any other school, dropped out of school or was never enrolled in any school.
- Ask all (enrolled and dropped out) children if they take any private supplementary tuition (paid classes in addition to regular school).
- Also ask the enrolled children if they go to the specific school which you have/will be surveying.
$\square$ Children 5 to 16: On the Household sheet, note down child's name, age, gender and all other details.
- Ask the current schooling status of each child, i.e. whether the child is currently enrolled in school, dropped out of school or was never enrolled in any school.
- If the child is enrolled then note down the class which the child is attending at the time of the survey and the type of school each child is going to, i.e. government, private, madrassah or any other type of school.
- Ask all (enrolled and dropped out) children if they take any private supplementary tuition (paid classes in addition to regular school).
- Also ask the enrolled children if they go to the specific school which you have/will be surveying.
- All children in this age group ( 5 to 16) will be tested in basic reading, arithmetic and English. (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). Ensure that the child is comfortable before and during the test and that sufficient time is given to each child.
- Parents' Education: Following information regarding parents education will also be recorded
- Total number of Children (0-16)
- Whether mother and/or father have gone to school?
- Mother and/or father's education (Highest class completed)
- Do not take information if the father is dead.


## Out of school children (drop outs and never enrolled children)

- Ask the child if $s /$ he has dropped out and the last class that was passed. Also ask for the reason of dropping out or being never enrolled (such as law and order, poverty, flood, school building shifted by government or others).
- Even the dropped out and never enrolled children aged 5 to 16 have to be tested.


## OTHER THINGS TO REMEMBER:

- Non-resident children: Do not survey children who are visiting their relatives and friends in the sampled village.
- 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 and therefore avoid using words like "children".
- Children out of the village: If there are children in the family but who are not present in the village during the survey, do not take their details.
- Mothers under or $\mathbf{1 6}$ years of age: Often in villages, you can come across mothers who are less than 16 years of age. Information on them will be collected as a mother as well as a child between the age 5 to 16 years, and they will also be tested in all three assessments.

Many children may come up to you and want to be included in the process out of curiosity. Do not discourage these children. You can interact with them. But concentrate on the fact that data must be noted down ONLY for children from households that have been randomly selected.

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 the household. This information is being collected in order to link education status of the child with household economic conditions.

Type of house the child lives in: Types of houses are defined as follows:
] Kutcha House: The walls and/or roof of which are made of material other than those mentioned here, such as un-burnt bricks, bamboos, mud, grass, reeds, thatch, loosely packed stones, etc.

- Semi -Pucca house: A house that has fixed walls made up of pucca material but roof is made up of the material other than those used for pucca house.
- 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) and tim ber etc.

House Ownership: Mark yes or no regarding the ownership of the house.

Electricity Connection: Mark yes or no by observing if the household has wires/electric meters and fittings or not.
Television - TV in the household: Mark yes if the household has a TV set otherwise mark No.
Computer/Tablet/Laptop: Mark yes if the household has Computer/Tablet/Laptop otherwise mark No.
Mobile/Smart Phone in the household: Mark yes if the household has a mobile/smart phone. We are only collecting information on functional mobile/smart phones and not looking at PTCL telephone, landline or V-phones.

Internet Connection: Mark yes or no by observing if the household has internet connection.

Do you use: Mark yes if the household is using SMS or WhatsApp services and no if otherwise.

Solar Panel: Mark yes if the household has a solar panel otherwise mark no.
Vehicle owned by the households (Mention in numbers): Mention the number under the label "car" and "motorbike" if it is owned by the household.

## HOW TO TEST READING?
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## Subtraction

## Start Here

$\square$ Show the child the subtraction problems. $S /$ he can choose, if not you can point.
Ask her/him to write and solve the problems. Observe to see if $s / h e$ does it in the correct written numerical form.
$\square$ Ask her/him to do a second one.

If $s /$ he cannot do both subtraction problems, then give her/him the number recognition (100-200) task.

## Number Recognition (100-200)

$\square$ Point one by one to at least 5 numbers. Child can also choose.
$\square$ Ask her/him to identify the numbers.
$\square$ If $s /$ he can correctly identify at least 4 out of 5 numbers then mark her/him as a child who can 'recognize numbers from 100-200.

If $s /$ he cannot recognize 4 out of 5 numbers from 100-200, then
give her/him the number recognition 10-99 task.

## Number Recognition (10-99)

$\square$ Point one by one to at least 5 numbers. Child can also choose.
$\square$ Ask her/him to identify the numbers.
— If s/he can correctly identify at least 4 out of 5 numbers then mark her/him as a child who can 'recognize numbers from 10-99.

If s/he cannot recognize 4 out of 5 numbers from 10-99,then give her/him the number recognition 1-9 task.

## Number Recognition (1-9)

Point one by one to at least 5 numbers. Child can also choose.
$\square$ Ask her/him to identify numbers.
$\square$ If s/he can correctly identify at least 4 out of 5 numbers then mark her/him as a child who can 'recognize numbers from 1-9' $\square$ If not then mark her/him at the level 'nothing'.

## Word Problems

Show word problems to all children (5-16 years). S/he has to answer all three questions.
$\square$ Ask her/him to tell the time in the clock, if $S /$ he answers correctly then mark as "can tell" otherwise mark as "cannot tell".
— Ask her/him to solve the problem \# 2 and \#3 on a piece of paper.
$\square$ Watch what s/he does.
$\square$ If $s / h e$ is able to follow the right method and solve with the right answer, then mark her/him as a "can do" for each word problem otherwise mark her/him as "cannot do".
$\square$ Ask at least one child from each household to do at least one word-problem at the back of the household sheet.

Point one by one to at least 5 letters. Ask the child to identify the letters.
$\square$ If $s /$ he correctly recognizes 4 out of 5 capital letters then show her/him the list of small letters.
$\square$ If $s /$ he reads capital letters but is struggling with identifying small letters, then mark her/him as a child who can read 'capital letters'.

If $s /$ he is unable to recognize 4 out of
5 capital letters from the list, then mark her/him under the category 'nothing'.

## Small Letters

Point one by one to at least 5 letters. Ask her/him to identify the letters.
If $s /$ he can recognize 4 out of 5 small letters with ease, then show her/him the list of words.

## Words

Point one by one to at least 5 words. Ask her/him to identify words.

If $s /$ he correctly reads 4 out of 5 words, then show her/him the list of sentences.

If $s /$ he reads $s m a l l$ letters but is struggling with words, then mark her/him as a child who can read 'small letters'

## Sentences

Ask her/him to read the 4 sentences. If s/he reads all 4 correctly, then mark her/him at the 'sentence level'.

## Bonus Questions

Meaning of the words are only to be asked from children who are at word or sentence level. If the child is able to tell the meanings of 4 out of 5 words $s$ /he has read, mark the child as "yes" ; if not, mark as "no".
Meaning of the sentences should only be asked from children who a re at sentence level. If the child can read at least 2 out of the 4 sentences fluently, than ask the child to translate the sentence into his/her local language. If the child can trans late the sentences, mark him/her as a "yes", otherwise mark him/her as a "no".

## How to test General Knowledge?

## ENGLISH

This section should only be asked from children who are at "Word" level on English Tool.
a) Ask the child to see the picture and then ask two questions from the child. Mark "yes" if the child answer correctly, otherwise mark as "no".
b) Ask the child to complete the sentences by identifying the picture of the items drawn on the sample. If a child answers any two correctly, mark him/her "yes", otherwise "no".

## WHAT TO DO IN A SCHOOL

## GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS:

## Mention the name of the Target Village on the top.

$\square$ Take permission from Head Masters/Mistress or Teacher of respective Class before observing the class.
$\square$ Visit any government school in the village with classes from Class 1 to 10 or High School. If there is no High school in the village, then go to a middle school, in case middle school is not available than go to a primary school. In the top box of the Observation Sheet, tick according to the school type. If there is no government school in the village, than go to the nearest Government School located in a nearby village.
$\square$ If there a village has a Boy's High School and a Girl's High School, preference should be given to the girl's school.
] Meet the Head Master/Head Mistress (if the Head Master/Mistress (HM) is absent, then meet the senior most teacher of the school) and take the following information:
$\square$ Record the name of the School, name of the village, name of Tehsil/Taluka, District/Agency and the Province.
$\square$ Tick the respective box for type of school i.e. High, Middle, Primary or Others.
$\square$ Tick type of school (by enrollment):

- Boys and Girls School
- Boys only School
- Girls only School
$\square$ Tick Medium of School
- English
- Urdu
- Pashto
- Sindhi
- Arabic
- Or any other medium
$\square$ EMIS/BEMIS/SEMIS Code: write the EMIS/BEMIS/SEMIS code of the school.
$\square$ Write down school since (Establishment Year).
$\square$ If it is a private school, as if the school is affiliated with any NGO.
$\square$ Note the Time of Entry into the school and Time of Exit from School.
$\square$ Date of visit: write the date of survey
Day of visit: write the day of survey
Dame of surveyors: write the names of both surveyors

When at the school, ask the Head Master for the enrollment register or any official document on the enrollment in that school.

## What to do in Government/Private School?

## Children's Enrollment \& Attendance: (Section I)

1. ASK for the registers of all the Classes and fill in the enrollment. If there is more than one section for same class, add the enrollment of all the sections and write accordingly.
2. Make sure the HM has introduced you to the teacher. If not, introduce yourself and ASER. Request for his/her permission to collect information on the classroom.
3. MOVE AROUND the class/area 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 you should only COUNT those children who are physically present in the class.
4. You can fill this information after you have collected all information from school records and registers. But make sure you do the head count of children enrolled in the school yourself also.
5. Ask head teacher about school fee, separately for each class and record it in the relevant box.

## Class Room Observations (Observe and Ask if required): (Section II)

1. This section is to be filled for Class 2 and Class 8 only (in case of a primary school, do class 2 only). If there is more than one section for a class, then randomly choose any one. Write down the Class with whom these classes are sitting.
2. Is there a usable black/white board in the class? Yes/No - write yourself on the black/white board to find out.
3. OBSERVE if children have their textbooks at least of one subject, ask the children to show English textbook or that of Urdu to make a correct assessment.
4. Apart from the textbooks, OBSERVE if there is any other supplementary material (e.g. books, charts on the wall, board games, etc.) in the room. Mark accordingly for each class you observe.
5. OBSERVE where the Class is sitting (room, verandah, outdoor) and fill accordingly.

## Health and Disability (Observe and Ask if required): (Section III)

Request the Head Teacher to provide information on health and disability section and tick relevant.
a) Do you have children with disability in your school?
b) If yes, how many? Ask for total number and gender wise information.
c) Type of Disability (Tick relevant)
d) Do you have special facilities / personnel available? (Tick relevant)

Teachers: (Section IV - Govt. School Sheet \& Section III -Pvt. School Sheet)

1. Request the Head Teacher to provide you information on teachers in the school. Collect and note down the information on:
a. Number of sanctioned teaching posts (Only for Government school).
b. Number of teachers appointed (male and female both).
c. Regular/Government teachers (male and female both) do not include the Head Master.
d. ECE teacher/ECE assistant: If the school has ECE teacher or assistant.
e. Contract/Para teachers: If the school has para-teachers or teachers appointed by the School Management Committee (SMC), local government, or community. Mark that separately.
f. Number of Teachers present on the day of the survey.
g. Number of Teachers living in this village, if applicable.
h. Also ask each category of teachers (Head Teacher, regular teachers, para -teachers) whether they reside in the village or a neighboring village. Count the number of teachers residing in the same visited village and write this number in the observation sheet.

No. of Qualified Teaching Staff: (Section V - Govt. School Sheet \& Section VI - Pvt. School Sheet)
Qualifications of teachers should be incorporated separately in the form of their:

- Educational Levels i.e. Below Matric, Matric, FA/F.Sc, BA, B.Sc, MA/M.Sc, M.Phil or any other. Count teachers for their respective highest educational level and mention the count in the respective boxes.
- Professional Qualification i.e. none, CT, PTC, B.Ed, M.Ed, Others etc. Count teachers for their respective professional qualifications and mention the count in the respective boxes.

Note: Total numbers of teachers must be equal to total number of appointed teachers.

This requires you to enlist number of teachers who got any training in the previous year, see the date mentioned above to count what is meant by one year. If yes, determine the time period for the training e.g. None, less than 15 days, 15-30 days, and more than 30 days.

Facilities in the School:(Section VII - Govt. School Sheet \& Pvt. School Sheet)
Count yourself and write down:
] Total numbers of rooms in the school

- Number of rooms used for classes

Tick the relevant:
— Is there a complete school boundary wall/fence?
— Drinking facility available and being used by children
T Toilet available and being used by children. You need to check the functionality and also observe if children are going to toilet present in the school or are they using staff toilet or one available in $t$ he mosque for example. Ask children.

- Are there separate toilets for girls and boys?
$\square$ Does the school have working library books?
$\square$ Is there any playground?
$\square$ Does the school has an electricity connection?
$\square$ Is there a computer lab?
$\square$ Does the school have internet connection?
D Does the school have smart boards?
$\square$ Does the school have solar panel?
I Is there a useable furniture available in this School?


## Page No 2 (Only for Government School Sheet)

— Record Name of the School, name of the village, name of Tehsil/Taluka, District/Agency and the Province.
( Record Name of Head Teacher/Principal, School phone number and Head Teacher/Principal mobile number.

- The Head Master should be requested to provide information for this section. In the absence of the Head Master, ask Senior Most teacher OR the person who is in charge of the school to provide information for this section.

SMC/SC/PTA Information: (Section VIII- Govt. School Sheet)
] Is SMC/SC/PTA/PTC/PTSMC active? Yes or No
$\square$ Write the total number of members.
W Write the number of active members.
— Write amount in bank

- Write last meeting date

1. For this section, note down information for July 2018 to June 2019.
2. Get funds information for SMC/SC/PTA/PTC/PTSMC FUNDS, FAAROG-E-TALEEM FUND, TUCK SHOP FUND, RENT FOR CYCLE STAND, AND SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION. You can write down the name of other source of funds in the additional space given if there are any.
3. Ask if the school got a fund. If yes, then note down the amount and when this fund was received, write down the month and year in which fund was received. If the person answering this section says that he/she is going to receive the fund in the future, then mark "no".
4. If the fund was received ask if the school has spent the entire fund? Yes, No, Do not know.
5. There are instructions under this section asking where the school fund was spent? Mark which is relevant.
6. Ask the person answering this section about the fund in a way that the person does not feel threatened or uncomfortable. 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. The remaining questions of this section should be left BLANK.

## School Fund Information: (Section X - Govt. School Sheet)

This section is similar to section IX other than the date by which you are required to record the information for school fund. Record the information for school fund from July 2019 to date of survey.

School Fund Information: (Section XI and Section XII - Govt. School Sheet)
Below the fund section, also mark the relevant fields that inquire whether the fund was spend on utilities such as class room construction, school uniform, repair of computer etc.

## Only for Private School Sheet

## School Fund Information: (Section V - Pvt. School Sheet)

1. For this section, note down information for July 2018 to June 2019 and July 2019 to date.
2. Write down the name of the person who provided the information.
3. If the school gets any funds from Government/ Private Individual/NGO, mark yes or no acco rdingly.
4. If the school got a fund, then note down the amount and when this fundwas received, write down the month and year in which fund was received. If the person answering this section says that he/she is going to receive the Fund in the future, then mark "no". Also write the name of the Department/Organization giving the fund.
5. If the school received a fund, then note down where that fund was spent or used.
6. Ask the person answering this section about the fund in a way that the person does not feel threatened or uncomfortable. 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. The remaining questions of this section should be left BLANK.
$\square$ Note the time of exit from the school.
ASER
nearest Covernment School. Meet Head Master (in abseros of the HMM, meet the sonier most teacher of the school). Documents required: Enroiment Attendance register. Tailage: Khaley whangel
Name of School: G. Boys Primp Schol village/Block: KhalongRenga $\mid$ Tohsilitaluka: Gambe $\mid$ DistrictiAgency: SKd
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rabilialeo by axrto Instructions :Visit any private School, first preference to High Schonl then Middle and then Primary, Meot Head Naster (In absence of the HM, meet the senior most teacher of the schooli.

HOUSEHOLD SURVEY SHEET


English Tools


## Urdu Tools

Urdu Tools


2019



Urdu Tools


## Arithmetic Tools

## Sample 2

Sample 2

Q1: What is the time in this clock?


Q2: There are 16 red pencils and 10 green pencils in a box. How many pencils are there in the box altogether?
a) $\mathbf{3 5}$
b) 26
c) $\mathbf{3 0}$
d) 36

Q3: Humera has 7 books. Rabia gave her 4 more books. How many books does Humera have altogether?

> Ask all the children (5-16 years). If a child answers the questions correctly, mark her/him as a "can do" child, otherwise mark as "cannot do" -

## General Knowledge Tool

Q1: Look at the picture and answer accordingly.
(I) What is the boy doing in the picture?
(a) Writing
(b) Reading
(c) Sleeping
(II) What is the girl doing in the playing
(b) Jumping
(c) Laughing

## Sindhi Tool



## FINDINGS NATIONAL (RURAL)

## Scale and Scope

ASER 2019 conducted across 155 rural districts of Pakistan along with 20 urban centres.

Results on urban survey are presented in a separate report


## NATIONAL - RURAL

## Children in Pre School

(Age 3-5 years)
Province/Territory wise map showing \% children

## NATIONAL - RURAL

Out of School Children
(Age 6-16 years)
Province/Territory wise map showing \% children

## NATIONAL - RURAL

## Out of School Girls

(Age 6-16 years)

Province/Territory wise map showing \% girls

## NATIONAL - RURAL

Private Schooling
(Age 6-16 years)


## NATIONAL - RURAL

Reading Language Urdu/Sindhi/Pashto (Class 5)

Province/Territory wise map showing \% children who can read story (Class 2 level Text)


## NATIONAL - RURAL



## NATIONAL - RURAL

## Arithmetic

(Class 5)

Province/Territory wise map showing \% children who can do division (Class 3) sums.
\% Children in class 5 who can do division


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

## NATIONAL - RURAL

## 1. ACCESS

1.1. School enrollment and out-of-school children

| \% Children in different types of schools |  |  |  |  | \% Out-of-school |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age | Govt. | Non-state providers |  |  | Never enrolled | Drop-out |  |
| group |  | Pvt. | Madrasah | NFE/Others |  |  |  |
| 6-10 | 65.8 | 17.7 | 1.9 | 0.5 | 11.7 | 2.4 | 100 |
| 11-13 | 65.3 | 16.9 | 1.5 | 0.4 | 6.8 | 9.0 | 100 |
| 14-16 | 56.4 | 15.6 | 1.2 | 0.2 | 9.4 | 17.3 | 100 |
| 6-16 | 64.0 | 17.1 | 1.7 | 0.4 | 10.2 | 6.5 | 100 |
| Total | 83.3 |  |  |  | 16.7 |  | 100 |
| By Type | 76.9 | 20.6 | 2.1 | 0.5 |  |  |  |
| How to read | 40.3\% (20.1+17.7+2.0+0.5) children of age group 6-10 are enrolled |  |  |  |  |  |  |




| Out-of-school children by gender |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (6-16 years) |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\square \mathrm{G}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| - 10 | 11 | 10 | 9 |
|  | 8 | 7 | 7 |
| $0$ | 2016 | 2018 | 2019 |


| Age Class Composition |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age / Class | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Total |
| 1 | 82.6 | 68.6 | 41.3 | 12.2 | 5.9 | 7.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11.5 |
| 2 | 17.4 | 31.1 | 43.9 | 33.8 | 18.6 | 7.4 | 14.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 11.3 |
| 3 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 14.5 | 37.9 | 34.8 | 17.8 |  | 17.0 | 16.6 |  |  |  | 10.1 |
| 4 |  | 0.0 | 0.2 | 12.6 | 29.4 | 31.0 | 17.1 |  |  | 16.2 | 0.0 | 10.0 | 10.3 |
| 5 |  |  | 0.0 | 3.4 | 9.6 | 33.2 | 39.4 | 24.3 |  |  |  | 10.0 | 12.9 |
| 6 |  |  |  | 0.0 | 1.8 | 8.2 | 21.6 | 29.7 | 19.9 |  |  |  | 10.5 |
| 7 |  |  |  |  | 0.0 | 2.4 | 6.2 | 20.9 | 29.1 | 19.0 |  |  | 8.7 |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.0 | 1.7 | 8.2 | 27.5 | 33.8 | 22.4 |  | 10.5 |
| 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 6.9 | 23.5 | 42.3 | 22.8 | 7.5 |
| 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 7.5 | 35.2 | 66.7 | 6.7 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

1.2. Early years schooling (Pre-schooling)

| \% Children who attend different types of pre-schools |  |  |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age group | Govt. | Non-state providers |  |  | Out-of-school |  |
|  |  | Pvt. | Madrasah | NFE/Others |  |  |
| 3 | 6.6 | 3.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 89.5 | 100 |
| 4 | 18.6 | 15.4 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 65.7 | 100 |
| 5 | 42.2 | 26.3 | 0.8 | 0.3 | 30.3 | 100 |
| 3-5 | 23.2 | 15.5 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 60.7 | 100 |
| Total | 39.3 |  |  |  | 60.7 | 100 |
| By Type | 46.0 | 52.8 | 0.9 | 0.3 |  |  |



## NATIONAL - RURAL

## 2. QUALITY

### 2.1. Learning levels (Urdu/Sindhi/Pashto)

Class-wise \% children

| Class-wise \% children |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Who can read |  |  |  |  |  |  | Who can answer *Comprehension questions about story |  |
| Class | Nothing | Letters | Words | Sentences | Story | Total |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Q. 1 | Q. 2 |
| 1 | 26.8 | 37.0 | 27.9 | 5.6 | 2.7 | 100 | 88.8 | 81.6 |
| 2 | 12.3 | 27.0 | 36.3 | 17.1 | 7.3 | 100 | 91.8 | 82.5 |
| 3 | 10.4 | 8.9 | 35.5 | 27.0 | 18.3 | 100 | 93.8 | 86.1 |
| 4 | 10.4 | 4.6 | 18.0 | 28.5 | 38.4 | 100 | 94.5 | 86.5 |
| 5 | 9.4 | 3.4 | 9.3 | 18.8 | 59.1 | 100 | 93.8 | 86.2 |
| 6 | 7.4 | 2.1 | 5.4 | 14.6 | 70.5 | 100 | 96.0 | 92.8 |
| 7 | 4.8 | 1.4 | 4.3 | 9.1 | 80.4 | 100 | 96.6 | 93.7 |
| 8 | 3.1 | 1.3 | 2.8 | 6.6 | 86.2 | 100 | 97.4 | 94.7 |
| 9 | 6.3 | 1.1 | 1.6 | 3.5 | 87.5 | 100 | 97.3 | 95.1 |
| 10 | 4.2 | 1.4 | 1.6 | 3.2 | 89.6 | 100 | 97.6 | 95.1 |

Learning levels by school type
Urdu/Sindhi/Pashto (5-16 years)

*Comprehension questions about the story, were asked only from those children who can read story in Urdu/Sindhi/Pashto.
How to read the data: Amongst 2.7 \% children of class 1 who are at story level in reading, 88.8\% can answer Q. 1 and 81.6\% can answer Q.2.

2.2. Learning levels (English)


How to read the data: *Amongst $15.5 \%$ children of class 1 who are at least at words level in english reading, $48.6 \%$ can tell word meanings.
${ }^{* *}$ Amongst $2.7 \%$ children of class 1 who are at least at sentence level in English reading, $75.4 \%$ can tell meanings of sentences.


## NATIONAL - RURAL

### 2.3. Learning levels (Arithmetic)

| Class-wise \% children |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Who can do |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Class | Nothing | Number recognition |  |  | Subtraction (2 digits) | Division (2 digits) | Total |
|  |  | 1-9 | 10-99 | 100-200 |  |  |  |
| 1 | 26.3 | 24.5 | 23.5 | 17.3 | 5.8 | 2.6 | 100 |
| 2 | 12.2 | 17.2 | 19.8 | 26.7 | 13.8 | 10.2 | 100 |
| 3 | 9.4 | 5.5 | 12.9 | 29.0 | 21.8 | 21.4 | 100 |
| 4 | 7.8 | 1.9 | 3.7 | 20.4 | 21.1 | 45.1 | 100 |
| 5 | 6.0 | 2.4 | 4.7 | 10.4 | 19.6 | 56.9 | 100 |
| 6 | 7.6 | 1.0 | 2.2 | 8.9 | 19.2 | 61.1 | 100 |
| 7 | 5.6 | 0.8 | 1.8 | 6.2 | 18.4 | 67.2 | 100 |
| 8 | 3.8 | 0.9 | 2.1 | 7.7 | 20.9 | 64.7 | 100 |
| 9 | 7.4 | 1.9 | 5.1 | 4.9 | 17.4 | 63.3 | 100 |
| 10 | 5.3 | 1.1 | 2.1 | 6.6 | 18.7 | 66.2 | 100 |

How to read: $8.4 \%(5.8+2.6)$ children of class 1 can do subraction
*Words problems are asked from all children of age $5-16$ years

| *Who can do word problems |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time <br> recognition | Word <br> problem 1 | Word <br> problem 2 |
| 7.6 | 7.6 | 5.7 |
| 15.9 | 15.9 | 12.5 |
| 28.6 | 29.7 | 23.7 |
| 43.7 | 44.6 | 38.2 |
| 59.5 | 59.9 | 52.9 |
| 66.7 | 67.0 | 60.9 |
| 72.0 | 72.2 | 66.4 |
| 75.7 | 75.9 | 70.9 |
| 74.4 | 74.4 | 70.7 |
| 72.9 | 73.4 | 69.7 |
|  |  |  |

Learning levels by school type
Arithmetic (5-16 years)

- Government $\quad$ Private


Children who can do division
Arithmetic (5-16 years)


Learning levels by gender
Arithmetic (5-16 years)


Learning levels: Out-of-school children
Arithmetic (5-16 years)

2.4. *General knowledge (English)

| Class-wise \% children <br> Who can do |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Class | Q.1 (I) | Q.1 (II) | Q.2 |
| 1 | 46.0 | 41.2 | 42.1 |
| 2 | 52.4 | 48.6 | 48.1 |
| 3 | 61.3 | 57.9 | 55.9 |
| 4 | 68.8 | 65.5 | 63.9 |
| 5 | 76.1 | 73.6 | 72.2 |
| 6 | 82.9 | 80.4 | 78.9 |
| 7 | 86.0 | 84.3 | 83.1 |
| 8 | 84.3 | 82.9 | 82.4 |
| 9 | 86.5 | 85.7 | 84.4 |
| 10 | 86.4 | 85.6 | 84.7 |


*General knowledge questions are asked only from those children who are atleast at words level in English reading

## 3. PARENTAL EDUCATION \& PAID TUITION



## NATIONAL - RURAL

4. SCHOOLS: ATTENDANCE,TEACHERS QUALIFICATION,FACILITIES \& GRANTS/FUNDS

| 4.1.Number of surveyed schools by type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Govt. schools |  |  |  | Pvt. schools |  |  |  |
|  | Boys | Girls | Boys \& Girls | Total | Boys | Girls | Boys \& Girls | Total |
| Primary | 1218 | 1240 | 412 | 2870 | 1024 | 74 | 10 | 1108 |
| Elementary | 172 | 270 | 157 | 599 | 380 | 39 | 15 | 434 |
| High | 150 | 280 | 194 | 624 | 331 | 29 | 10 | 370 |
| Others | 72 | 124 | 48 | 244 | 62 | 7 | 3 | 72 |
| Total | 1612 | 1914 | 811 | 4337 | 1797 | 149 | 38 | 1984 |


| 4.2. Attendance (\%) on the day of visit |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Govt. schools |  |  |  |  | Pvt. schools |  |  |  |  |
|  | Primary | Elementary | High | Others | Overall | Primary | Elementary | High | Others | Overall |
| Children attendance | 81.4 | 84.9 | 87.0 | 85.1 | 83.9 | 90.2 | 90.7 | 88.7 | 87.6 | 89.6 |
| Teacher attendance | 89.3 | 88.7 | 89.8 | 89.5 | 89.3 | 88.5 | 91.4 | 88.5 | 90.0 | 89.4 |


| 4.3. Teacher qualification (\% of teachers) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| General qualification |  |  | Professional qualification |  |  |
|  | Govt. schools | Pvt. schools |  | Govt.schools | Pvt. schools |
| Matriculation | 4.6 | 4.7 | PTC | 13.8 | 15.8 |
| FA/FSc | 15.0 | 20.9 | CT | 14.9 | 11.6 |
| BA/BSc | 33.2 | 39.6 | B-Ed | 45.3 | 49.6 |
| MA/MSc or above | 47.0 | 34.5 | M-Ed or above | 25.8 | 20.9 |
| Others | 0.2 | 0.2 | Others | 0.2 | 2.1 |


| 4.4. School facilities (\% schools) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Govt.schools |  |  |  | Pvt.schools |  |  |  |
|  | Primary | Elementary | High | Others | Primary | Elementary | High | Others |
| Rooms used for classes (avg.) | 4 | 7 | 11 | 9 | 6 | 9 | 13 | 11 |
| Useable drinking water | 61.4 | 77.8 | 87.2 | 82.8 | 93.2 | 92.1 | 95.1 | 91.7 |
| Useable toilets | 59.4 | 77.4 | 86.3 | 86.0 | 89.2 | 92.3 | 95.9 | 93.1 |
| Separate toilets for girls | 24.4 | 42.5 | 47.4 | 45.9 | 46.8 | 66.7 | 77.2 | 75.7 |
| Playground | 37.3 | 58.3 | 66.7 | 57.0 | 52.4 | 59.1 | 66.4 | 68.1 |
| Boundary wall | 74.7 | 81.4 | 86.8 | 84.2 | 86.8 | 83.6 | 92.0 | 85.9 |
| Electricity Connection | 56.2 | 71.5 | 78.9 | 82.0 | 81.3 | 82.8 | 86.8 | 88.7 |
| Solar panels | 16.1 | 13.9 | 23.6 | 33.2 | 20.7 | 21.4 | 31.8 | 21.1 |
| Smart Boards | - | 16.9 | 25.0 | 24.3 | 19.1 | 22.1 | 31.0 | 27.1 |
| Computer lab | - | 15.6 | 43.6 | 36.2 | 12.1 | 20.4 | 38.3 | 35.7 |
| Internet Connection | 5.7 | 13.2 | 33.0 | 32.0 | 12.4 | 18.1 | 35.0 | 38.0 |
| Useable furniture | 50.6 | 69.6 | 79.2 | 80.8 | 75.0 | 82.4 | 87.0 | 91.3 |



## NATIONAL - RURAL

| 4.5. Funds/Grants (\% schools) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Govt. schools |  |  |  | Pvt. schools |  |  |  |
|  |  | Primary | Elementary | High | Others | Primary | Elementary | High | Others |
| $\stackrel{\infty}{\stackrel{\infty}{N}}$ | \# of schools reported receiving grants | 1023 | 218 | 262 | 143 | 12 | 13 | 18 | 4 |
|  | \% of schools reported receiving grants | 43.2 | 42.3 | 49.1 | 61.4 | 1.1 | 3.0 | 4.8 | 5.6 |
|  | Average amount of grant (Rs.) | 129377.8 | 192211.8 | 367667.1 | 332729.5 | 166262.1 | 162697.2 | 157160.0 | 49250.0 |
| $\stackrel{*}{\circ}$ | \# of schools reported receiving grants | 529 | 150 | 155 | 77 | 6 | 10 | 13 | 4 |
|  | \% of schools reported receiving grants | 22.3 | 29.1 | 29.0 | 33.0 | 0.5 | 2.3 | 3.5 | 5.6 |
|  | Average amount of grant (Rs.) | 68485.7 | 109048.1 | 157572.0 | 150833.1 | 239916.7 | 414835.0 | 960672.2 | 269250.0 |

## 5. DISABILITIES \& FUNCTIONINGS

| 5.1.Schools with Children with Disabilities (by School Type) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Govt. schools (\%) |  |  |  | Pvt. Schools (\%) |  |  | Overall (\%) |  |  |
| 22.20 |  |  |  | 16.64 |  |  | 20.46 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5.2.Children with Disabilities (by School Type) as reported by the Head Teacher/School Incharge |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Govt. schools (\%) |  |  |  | Pvt. Schools (\%) |  |  | Overall (\%) |  |  |
|  | Boys | Girls | Total | Boys | Girls | Total | Boys | Girls | Total |
| Percentage of children with disabilities | 0.19 | 0.09 | 0.27 | 0.26 | 0.15 | 0.41 | 0.21 | 0.10 | 0.29 |
| Number of children with disabilities | 1595 | 720 | 2315 | 773 | 439 | 1212 | 2368 | 1159 | 3527 |


|  | Govt. schools | Pvt. schools | Overall |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Visual | 6.50 | 10.70 | 7.50 |
| Hearing | 9.17 | 7.65 | 8.78 |
| Physical | 44.79 | 31.50 | 41.41 |
| Intellectual | 9.48 | 6.42 | 8.70 |
| Behavioral | 9.69 | 19.27 | 12.12 |
| Multiple Disabilities (Children with more than one of the aforementioned types of disability) | 13.23 | 7.65 | 11.81 |
| Disability Type not reported | 7.19 | 16.82 | 9.63 |
|  |  |  |  |
| 5.4.Facilities for Children with Disabilities (by School Type) |  |  |  |
|  | Govt. schools (\%) | Pvt. Schools (\%) | Overall (\%) |
| Ramps | 2.08 | 2.01 | 2.06 |
| Toilets | 3.89 | 6.95 | 4.85 |
| Health Officer | 1.57 |  | 1.08 |
| Other Facilities | 4.70 | 4.43 | 4.61 |

0 represents insufficient data , *grants received till November 15,2019

## NATIONAL - RURAL

FINDING SUMMERY

|  |  |  |  |  |  | Childr |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Access |  |  |  |  |  | Qualit |  |  |
|  | (Age 3-5) |  | 6e 6-16 |  |  | Class 3 |  |  | Class 5 |  |
| Province/Territory |  |  |  |  |  | Who can read words (English) | 든 <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 |  |  |  |
| Azad Jammu and Kashmir | 60.4 | 3.2 | 1.0 | 46.2 | 67.2 | 71.6 | 76.9 | 79.0 | 91.0 | 73.0 |
| Islamabad - ICT | 69.1 | 8.8 | 3.0 | 46.1 | 71.5 | 52.2 | 64.3 | 75.0 | 64.0 | 57.0 |
| Punjab | 52.0 | 9.3 | 5.0 | 27.6 | 58.1 | 64.3 | 52.6 | 75.0 | 71.0 | 81.0 |
| Balochistan | 31.9 | 29.6 | 18.0 | 14.7 | 40.7 | 34.6 | 28.4 | 48.0 | 40.0 | 35.3 |
| KP-Newly Merged Districts | 20.8 | 26.8 | 13.0 | 17.2 | 48.0 | 62.9 | 61.9 | 53.0 | 39.0 | 61.0 |
| Gilgit-Baltistan | 43.7 | 7.5 | 4.0 | 31.1 | 49.5 | 61.4 | 60.8 | 60.0 | 65.0 | 66.0 |
| Khyber Pakhtunkhwa | 34.7 | 14.5 | 8.0 | 23.0 | 42.1 | 69.4 | 42.4 | 55.0 | 60.0 | 53.0 |
| Sindh | 45.6 | 13.9 | 7.0 | 12.0 | 23.5 | 26.9 | 21.7 | 44.0 | 27.0 | 31.0 |
| National-Rural | 39.3 | 16.7 | 9.0 | 23.1 | 45.3 | 52.2 | 43.2 | 59.0 | 55.0 | 57.0 |



## Sample Composition

ASER 2019 survey was conducted in 155 rural districts of Pakistan. This covered 92,008 households in 4546 villages throughout the country.

- Detailed information was collected on 25,266 children ( $56 \%$ males, $44 \%$ females) aged 3-16 years. Out of these 202,648 children aged 5-16 years were tested for language and arithmetic competencies.
- School information on public and private schools was collected. A total of 4337 government schools (66\% primary, 14\% elementary, 14\% high, 6\% others) and 1984 private schools (56\% primary, 22\% elementary, $19 \%$ high, $3 \%$ others) were surveyed.
$37 \%$ of the government schools were boys only, 44\% were girls only, and 19\% were coeducation schools. In case of private schools, 90\% were boys only, 8\% were girls only and $2 \%$ were coeducation schools.


## THEME 1: ACCESS

Proportion of out-of-school children has almost remained the same when compared to 2018.

- In 2019, 17\% of children were reported to be out-ofschool which has remained the same as compared to previous year. $10 \%$ children have never been enrolled in a school and 7\% have dropped out of school for various reasons.

83\% of all school-aged children within the age bracket of 6-16 years were enrolled in schools. Amongst these, 77\% of children were enrolled in government schools whereas $23 \%$ of children were going to non-state institutions ( $21 \%$ private schools, 2\% Madrassah, 0\% others).

- Amongst the enrolled students in government schools, $39 \%$ were girls and $61 \%$ were boys whereas in private schools 59\% enrolled children were boys and $41 \%$ were girls.
- The percentage of out of school children (boys and girls) has decreased as compared to 2018.

[^12]
## THEME 2: EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

## Proportion of enrolled children has increased in 2019 as

 compared to 2018.- $39 \%$ of all school-aged children within the age bracket of 3-5 years were enrolled in schools as compared to 37\% in 2018.

61\% children of age 3-5 are currently not enrolled in any early childhood program/schooling.

## THEME 3: CLASS WISE LEARNING LEVELS

Learning levels of children are assessed through specific language and arithmetic tools. The same approach is used for all children between the ages of 5 to 16. The literacy assessments are designed to cover up to Class 2 level competencies according to the national curriculum. The arithmetic tool covers up to Class 3 level. For the first time, in 2019, arithmetic tool also covers number recognition from 100-200 along with word problems on addition and multiplication.

Learning levels of children (in class 5 and class 3) have improved:

59\% class 5 children could read a class 2 level story in Urdu/Sindhi/Pashto compared to 56\% in 2018. Amongst 59\% children of class 5 who could read a story in Urdu/Sindhi/Pashto, more than 85\% could answer questions related to the story orally.
$18 \%$ of class 3 children could read story in Urdu/Sindhi/Pashto as compared to 17\% in 2018. Amongst 18\% children of class 3 who could read a story in Urdu/Sindhi/Pashto, more than 85\% could answer questions related to the story orally.

English learning levels (in class 5 and class 3) have improved:

55\% class 5 children could read sentences (class 2 level) compared to 52\% in 2018. Amongst 55\% of class 5 children who could read sentences in English, $84 \%$ can tell meanings of same sentences orally in local language.
$16 \%$ class 3 children could read class 2 level sentences as compared to 5\% in 2018. Amongst 16\% of class 3 children who could read sentences in English, 87\% can tell meanings of same sentences orally in local language.

## NATIONAL - RURAL

Arithmetic learning levels (in class 5) have improved while for class 3 have declined:

- $57 \%$ class 5 children could do two digit division as compared to 53\% in 2018.
- $21 \%$ children enrolled in class 3 could do two digit division in 2019 as compared to 28\% in 2018.
- New questions on time recognition along with word problems on addition and multiplication were also added for the first time. $60 \%$ of children in class 5 could recognize time correctly, $60 \%$ could solve addition word problem and $53 \%$ could solve multiplication word problem.


## THEME 4: GENERAL KNOWLEDGE TOOL (English)

General knowledge tool comprised of three questions on picture recognition and identification to test comprehension and cognitive skills of children. This tool was only asked from children who were found to be at or above word level in English. More than $70 \%$ children, enrolled in class 5, were able to answer all three questions on picture recognition in English correctly.

## THEME 5: LEARNING LEVELS BY SCHOOL TYPE (GOVERNMENT VS PRIVATE)

Children enrolled in private schools are performing better compared to their government counterparts.

- $68 \%$ children enrolled in class 5 in a private school were able to read at least story in Urdu/Sindhi/Pashto as compared to $58 \%$ class 5 children enrolled in government schools.
- $73 \%$ private school children can read at least sentences in class 5 whereas only $53 \%$ government school children can do the same.
$69 \%$ children enrolled in private schools (class 5) were able to do division when compared to only 55\% class 5 children who were enrolled in government schools.


## THEME 6: GENDER GAP

Gender gap in learning continues: boys outperform girls (age 5-16 overall) in literacy and numeracy skills.

- $46 \%$ of boys and $38 \%$ of girls could read at least sentences in Urdu/Sindhi/Pashto.
- $48 \%$ boys could read at least English words while $39 \%$ of girls can do the same.
- Similarly, $43 \%$ of boys were able to do at least subtraction whereas only $36 \%$ girls could do it.


## THEME 7: PARENTALEDUCATION

- $34 \%$ mothers and $55 \%$ fathers in the sampled households had completed at least primary education. This has improved as compared to 2018 where $33 \%$ of mothers were found to have completed at least primary education against 52\% of fathers.


## THEME 8: PAID TUITIONS

Private tuition incidence is greater in private school students. Overall paid tuition students in private schools is 22\% compared to 6\% in government schools.

Children across all classes take private tuition; however, the percentage of students taking tuition varies at different class-level. For example, in government schools, $4 \%$ children enrolled in class 1 take private tuition whereas $11 \%$ children in class 10 take tuition.

## THEME 9: MULTI-GRADE TEACHING

43\% of surveyed government schools and 23\% of surveyed private schools had Class 2 students sitting with other classes.

- The surveyors were asked to observe if Class 2 and Class 8 were sitting together with any other classes. This is referred to as multi-grade teaching, where one teacher has to teach more than one grade within the allotted time.
- It was found that $43 \%$ of the surveyed government schools and $23 \%$ of the surveyed private schools had Class 2 sitting with other classes.
- 5\% of surveyed government schools and 9\% of surveyed private schools had Class 8 sitting with other classes.


## THEME 10: TEACHER \& STUDENT ABSEENTISM

Student attendance is recorded by taking a headcount of all students present in schools on the day of visit.

Overall student attendance in surveyed government schools stood at $84 \%$ whereas it was $90 \%$ in surveyed private schools.

Teacher attendance is recorded by referring to the appointed positions in each school and the total number of teachers actually present on the day of survey.

Overall teacher attendance in surveyed government schools stood at 89\%, same as that in private school.

## THEME 11: TEACHERS' QUALIFICATION

- $40 \%$ teachers of surveyed government schools have done graduation as compared to $33 \%$ teachers of surveyed private schools.
- $45 \%$ of surveyed government school teachers had Bachelors in Education degrees as compared to 50\% teachers of surveyed private schools.


## THEME 12: SCHOOL FACILITIES

## SURVEYED GOVERNMENT SCHOOLS:

- $44 \%$ of surveyed government high schools had computer labs.
- $59 \%$ of the surveyed government primary schools have toilets.
- $61 \%$ of the surveyed government primary schools have useable drinking water
- Amongst the surveyed government primary schools, $75 \%$ had complete boundary walls
- $37 \%$ of surveyed government primary schools had playgrounds.
- $56 \%$ of surveyed government primary schools had electricity connection.
- On average, 11 rooms were being used for classroom activities in the surveyed government high schools.


## SURVEYED PRIVATE SCHOOLS:

- $38 \%$ of surveyed private high schools had computer labs.
- $89 \%$ of the surveyed private primary schools have toilets.
- $93 \%$ of the surveyed private primary schools have useable drinking water
- Amongst the surveyed private primary schools, $87 \%$ had complete boundary walls
- $52 \%$ of surveyed private primary schools had playgrounds.
- $81 \%$ of surveyed private primary schools had electricity connection.
- On average, 12 rooms were being used for classroom activities in the surveyed private high schools.


## THEME 13: SCHOOL GRANTS/FUNDS

$22 \%$ of the government primary schools and $1 \%$ private primary schools received grants.

529 surveyed government primary schools were receiving grants in 2019 as compared to 6 surveyed private primary schools.

## THEME 14: DISABILITIES \& FUNCTIONINGS

ASER 2019, as part of the school level survey, included a "Health and Disability" section under which the head teachers/teachers were asked a variety of questions pertaining to Children with Disabilities and Facilities for Children with Disabilities in their respective schools.

At the national level, $22.2 \%$ of the surveyed government schools were reported to be having children with disabilities while $16.6 \%$ of the private schools reported the same. in terms of gender, more boys ( $0.2 \%$ of total enrolled boys in government schools and $0.3 \%$ of total enrolled boys in private schools) were reported to be suffering from a disability when compared with girls ( $0.1 \%$ of total enrolled girls in government schools and 0.1\% of total enrolled girls in private schools).

With regards to the types of disability as a percentage of schools with children with disabilities, the highest reported type was Physical (41.4\%) followed by Behavioral (12.1\%) and Multiple (11.8\%).

Moreover, $2.1 \%$ of surveyed government schools and $2 \%$ of surveyed private schools had ramps regardless of whether these schools had any child with a disability enrolled in them. Similarly, 3.9\% of surveyed government schools and $7 \%$ of surveyed private schools had disability-friendly toilets.

## Information \& Communication Technology

- $66.2 \%$ of households across all rural districts of Pakistan have mobile phones.
- Amongst mobile users, $89.8 \%$ use Whatsapp service for communication.
- Amongst mobile users, 59.0\% use SMS facility for communication.
- $14.1 \%$ of households have computers/laptops


## Alternate Energy

- Across all rural districts of Pakistan, $34.3 \%$ of the sampled households use solar panels as an alternate energy resource.
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## Children in Pre School

(Age 3-5 years)
District wise map showing \% children


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

## BALOCHISTAN - RURAL

## Out of School Children

(Age 6-16 years)

District wise map showing \% children


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

Private Schooling
(Age 6-16 years)

District wise map showing \% children


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

Reading Language Urdu
(Class 5)

District wise map showing \% children who can read story (Class 2 level text)


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

## Reading English

(Class 5)
District wise map showing \% children
who can read sentences (Class 2 level text)


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

## Arithmetic

(Class 5)
District wise map showing \% children who can do division (Class 3) sums


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

## 1. ACCESS

1.1. School enrollment and out-of-school children

| \% Children in different types of schools |  |  |  |  | \% Out-of-school |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age group | Govt. | Non-state providers |  |  | Never |  |  |
|  |  | Pvt. | Madrasah | NFE/Others |  | Drop-out |  |
| 6-10 | 65.0 | 8.0 | 4.8 | 0.2 | 18.8 | 3.2 | 100 |
| 11-13 | 61.4 | 3.4 | 4.3 | 0.2 | 14.1 | 16.7 | 100 |
| 14-16 | 42.0 | 1.8 | 2.8 | 0.1 | 18.2 | 35.1 | 100 |
| 6-16 | 60.1 | 5.9 | 4.3 | 0.2 | 17.6 | 11.9 | 100 |
| Total |  |  | 70.4 |  |  |  | 100 |
| By Type | 85.3 | 8.3 | 6.2 | 0.2 |  |  |  |
| How to read: $78.9 \%$ ( $65.0+8.0+4.8+0.2$ ) children of age group $6-10$ are enrolled |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Enrollment by gender and type of school




| Age Class Composition |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age / Class | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Total |
| 1 | 76.1 | 66.3 | 44.3 | 13.7 | 4.9 | 6.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11.5 |
| 2 | 23.9 | 33.3 | 41.7 | 35.0 | 28.6 | 6.7 | 20.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 11.3 |
| 3 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 13.5 | 37.4 | 30.9 | 30.6 |  | 14.9 | 18.9 |  |  |  | 10.1 |
| 4 |  | 0.0 | 0.5 | 11.1 | 27.4 | 26.3 | 25.4 |  |  | 16.2 | 0.0 |  | 10.3 |
| 5 |  |  | 0.0 | 2.8 | 7.3 | 30.7 | 29.7 | 33.7 |  |  |  |  | 12.9 |
| 6 |  |  |  | 0.0 | 0.8 | 4.6 | 21.3 | 28.7 | 29.1 |  |  |  | 10.5 |
| 7 |  |  |  |  | 0.0 | 1.2 | 2.6 | 18.8 | 27.3 | 27.5 |  |  | 8.7 |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.0 | 1.1 | 3.9 | 21.6 | 34.2 | 29.4 |  | 10.5 |
| 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 16.6 | 40.3 | 22.4 | 7.5 |
| 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.4 | 30.3 | 65.8 | 6.7 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

1.2. Early years schooling (Pre-schooling)

| \% Children who attend different types of pre-schools |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age group | Govt. | Non-state providers |  |  | Out-of-school | Total |  |  |
|  |  | Pvt. | Madrasah | NFE/Others |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | 6.1 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 93.2 | 100 |  |  |
| 4 | 21.1 | 6.4 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 72.4 | 100 |  |  |
| 5 | 40.1 | 20.5 | 2.3 | 0.0 | 37.1 | 100 |  |  |
| $\mathbf{3 - 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 2 . 1}$ | $\mathbf{9 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 8}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{6 8 . 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |  |  |
| Total |  |  | $\mathbf{3 1 . 9}$ |  | $\mathbf{6 8 . 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |  |  |
| By Type | $\mathbf{6 9 . 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 8 . 4}$ | $\mathbf{2 . 4}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0}$ |  |  |  |  |
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## 2. QUALITY

### 2.1. Learning levels (Urdu)

| Class-wise \% children |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Class | Nothing | Letters | Words | Sentences | Story | Total |  |
| 1 | 27.7 | 38.2 | 25.1 | 6.8 | 2.1 | 100 |  |
| 2 | 11.6 | 31.1 | 33.3 | 20.1 | 3.8 | 100 |  |
| 3 | 9.5 | 9.0 | 40.7 | 29.1 | 11.6 | 100 |  |
| 4 | 9.6 | 4.7 | 27.5 | 31.0 | 27.2 | 100 |  |
| 5 | 9.3 | 3.3 | 11.5 | 28.1 | 47.7 | 100 |  |
| 6 | 13.8 | 3.0 | 4.1 | 20.0 | 59.1 | 100 |  |
| 7 | 8.3 | 2.2 | 3.3 | 10.8 | 75.5 | 100 |  |
| 8 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 2.6 | 5.2 | 85.6 | 100 |  |
| 9 | 1.3 | 0.2 | 1.4 | 3.0 | 94.1 | 100 |  |
| 10 | 0.9 | 1.7 | 2.2 | 1.3 | 93.9 | 100 |  |





Who can read at least sentences

2.2. Learning levels (English)

| Class-wise \% children |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Class | Notho can read |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Letters |  | Words | Sentences | Total |
|  | Capital | Small |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 43.1 | 27.5 | 18.8 | 8.9 | 1.8 | 100 |
| 2 | 16.9 | 30.6 | 31.5 | 15.8 | 5.1 | 100 |
| 3 | 14.4 | 10.7 | 40.3 | 24.5 | 10.1 | 100 |
| 4 | 13.8 | 6.3 | 30.2 | 31.6 | 18.0 | 100 |
| 5 | 11.6 | 3.5 | 14.9 | 30.4 | 39.6 | 100 |
| 6 | 22.5 | 1.4 | 4.4 | 27.9 | 43.8 | 100 |
| 7 | 21.0 | 1.4 | 6.9 | 20.9 | 49.7 | 100 |
| 8 | 7.6 | 1.2 | 1.8 | 13.7 | 75.7 | 100 |
| 9 | 3.4 | 0.1 | 12.3 | 5.6 | 78.6 | 100 |
| 10 | 2.7 | 0.3 | 6.3 | 5.7 | 85.0 | 100 |
| How to read: $10.7 \% ~(8.9+1.8) ~ c h i l d r e n ~ o f ~ c l a s s ~ 1 ~ c a n ~ r e a d ~ w o r d s ~$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Children who can read sentences | Learning levels by gender |
| :---: | :---: |
| English (5-16 years) | English (5-16 years) |
| $100 — 2016-2018 \backsim 2019$ | 100 |
| 80 | 80 |
|  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { O } \\ & \text { ®๐ } \end{aligned}$ | か゚ 20 - |
|  | Boys Girls Who can read at least words |



## BALOCHISTAN - RURAL

### 2.3. Learning levels (Arithmetic)




## 3. PARENTAL EDUCATION AND PAID TUITION

| Class-wise \% children attending paid tuition |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Type | 1 | 11 | III | IV | V | VI | VII | VIII | IX | X |
| Govt. | 0.8 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 1.2 | 1.1 | 1.3 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 2.1 |
| Pvt. | 11.4 | 10.5 | 14.9 | 12.8 | 16.9 | 10.1 | 22.4 | 11.3 | 9.7 | 33.3 |




## 4. SCHOOLS: ATTENDANCE,TEACHERS QUALIFICATION,FACILITIES \& GRANTS/FUNDS

| 4.1.Number of surveyed schools by type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Govt. schools |  |  |  | Pvt. schools |  |  |  |
|  | Boys | Girls | Boys \& Girls | Total | Boys | Girls | Boys \& Girls | Total |
| Primary | 204 | 395 | 84 | 683 | 196 | 10 | 1 | 207 |
| Elementary | 16 | 87 | 19 | 122 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 8 |
| High | 25 | 78 | 16 | 119 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Others | 11 | 8 | 6 | 25 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Total | 256 | 568 | 125 | 949 | 207 | 11 | 1 | 219 |


| 4.2. Attendance (\%) on the day of visit |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Govt. schools |  |  |  |  | Pvt. schools |  |  |  |  |
|  | Primary | Elementary | High | Others | Overall | Primary | Elementary | High | Others | Overall |
| Children attendance | 76.7 | 78.5 | 84.1 | 87.7 | 80.2 | 83.1 | 88.0 | 87.7 | 93.5 | 85.3 |
| Teacher attendance | 93.8 | 89.9 | 89.8 | 93.1 | 91.4 | 87.3 | 100.0 | 88.9 | 100.0 | 91.2 |


| 4.3. Teacher qualification (\% of teachers) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| General qualification |  |  | Professional qualification |  |  |
|  | Govt. schools | Pvt. schools |  | Govt.schools | Pvt. schools |
| Matriculation | 10.6 | 20.5 | PTC | 22.6 | 17.5 |
| FA/FSc | 37.5 | 39.0 | CT | 35.2 | 36.5 |
| BA/BSc | 35.0 | 29.8 | B-Ed | 31.5 | 34.9 |
| MA/MSc or above | 16.6 | 10.2 | M-Ed or above | 10.5 | 11.1 |
| Others | 0.3 | 0.5 | Others | 0.2 | 0.0 |


| 4.4. School facilities (\% schools) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Govt.schools |  |  |  | Pvt.schools |  |  |  |
|  | Primary | Elementary | High | Others | Primary | Elementary | High | Others |
| Rooms used for classes (avg.) | 3 | 5 | 11 | 10 | 5 | - | - | - |
| Useable drinking water | 24.2 | 48.4 | 79.7 | 60.0 | 90.3 | - | - | - |
| Useable toilets | 15.4 | 47.5 | 78.8 | 83.3 | 77.4 | - | - | - |
| Separate toilets for girls | 6.4 | 17.4 | 36.8 | 36.0 | 12.9 | - | - | - |
| Playground | 12.9 | 26.4 | 39.8 | 44.0 | 12.9 | - | - | - |
| Boundary wall | 57.2 | 82.0 | 93.2 | 84.0 | 80.6 | - | - | - |
| Electricity Connection | 25.1 | 48.4 | 59.3 | 64.0 | 67.7 | 25.0 | - | - |
| Solar panels | 4.7 | 0.8 | 22.0 | 24.0 | 0.0 | - | - | - |
| Smart Boards | - | 12.7 | 21.7 | 39.1 | 12.9 | - | - | - |
| Computer lab | - | 1.6 | 12.0 | 16.7 | 0.0 | - | - | - |
| Internet Connection | 0.5 | 1.6 | 4.8 | 16.7 | 0.0 | - | - | - |
| Useable furniture | 24.5 | 47.0 | 65.5 | 79.2 | 64.5 | - | - | - |
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|  | 4.5. Funds/Grants (\% schools) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Govt. schools |  |  |  | Pvt. schools |  |  |  |
|  |  | Primary | Elementary | High | Others | Primary | Elementary | High | Others |
|  | \# of schools reported receiving grants | 37 | 15 | 25 | 11 | - | - | - | - |
| $\frac{\infty}{0}$ | \% of schools reported receiving grants | 7.7 | 17.0 | 31.6 | 44.0 | - | - | - | - |
|  | Average amount of grant (Rs.) | 7858.1 | 9580.0 | 104255.4 | 73000.0 | - | - | - | - |
|  | \# of schools reported receiving grants | 23 | 6 | 11 | 10 | - | - | - | - |
| $\stackrel{\square}{\circ}$ | \% of schools reported receiving grants | 4.8 | 6.8 | 13.9 | 40.0 | - | - | - | - |
|  | Average amount of grant (Rs.) | 8654.3 | 45283.3 | 176561.8 | 89500.0 | - | - | - | - |

## 5. DISABILITIES \& FUNCTIONINGS

| 5.1.Schools with Children with Disabilities (by School Type) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Govt. schools (\%) |  |  |  | Pvt.schools (\%) |  |  | Overall (\%) |  |  |
| 14.01 |  |  |  | 0.46 |  |  | 11.47 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5.2.Children with Disabilities (by School Type) as reported by the Head Teacher/School Incharge |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Govt. schools (\%) |  |  |  | Pvt. Schools (\%) |  |  |  | erall ( |  |
|  | Boys | Girls | Total | Boys | Girls | Total | Boys | Girls | Total |
| Percentage of children with disabilities | 0.20 | 0.08 | 0.28 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.04 | 0.19 | 0.27 | 0.28 |
| Number of children with disabilities | 203 | 83 | 286 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 204 | 84 | 288 |


|  | Govt. schools | Pvt. schools | Overall |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Visual | 2.26 | 100.00 | 2.99 |
| Hearing | 9.02 | 0.00 | 8.96 |
| Physical | 33.08 | 0.00 | 32.84 |
| Intellectual | 6.77 | 0.00 | 6.72 |
| Behavioral | 9.77 | 0.00 | 9.70 |
| Multiple Disabilities (Children with more than one of the aforementioned types of disability) | 31.58 | 0.00 | 31.34 |
| Disability Type not reported | 7.52 | 0.00 | 7.46 |
| 5.4.Facilities for Children with Disabilities (by School Type) |  |  |  |
|  | Govt. schools (\%) | Pvt. Schools (\%) | Overall (\%) |
| Ramps | 1.37 | 0.00 | 1.11 |
| Toilets | 0.11 | 0.00 | 0.09 |
| Health Officer | . | . | . |
| Other Facilities | 6.32 | 0.46 | 5.22 |
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## Sample Composition

- ASER 2019 survey was conducted in 34 rural districts of Balochistan. This covered 20,014 households in 1,004 villages throughout the province.

Detailed information was collected on 64,535 children ( $54 \%$ males, $46 \%$ females) aged 3-16 years. Out of these 50,767 children aged 5-16 years were tested for language and arithmetic competencies.

- School information on public and private schools was collected. A total of 949 government schools (72\% primary, 13\% elementary, 12\% high, 3\% others) and 219 private schools (95\% primary, 4\% elementary, $1 \%$ high, $0 \%$ others) were surveyed.
- $27 \%$ of the government schools were boys only, $60 \%$ were girls only, and $13 \%$ were coeducation schools. In case of private schools, 95\% were boys only, 5\% were girls only and $0 \%$ were coeducation schools.


## THEME 1: ACCESS

Proportion of out-of-school children has increased when compared to 2018.

In 2019, 30\% of children were reported to be out-ofschool which has increased as compared to previous year (28\%). 18\% children have never been enrolled in a school and $12 \%$ have dropped out of school for various reasons.

- $70 \%$ of all school-aged children within the age bracket of 6-16 years were enrolled in schools. Amongst these, $85 \%$ of children were enrolled in government schools whereas 15\% of children were going to non-state institutions ( $8 \%$ private schools, 6\% Madrassah, 1\% others).
- Amongst the enrolled students in government schools, $39 \%$ were girls and $61 \%$ were boys whereas in private schools $62 \%$ enrolled children were boys and $38 \%$ were girls.

The percentage of out of school children (for girls) has increased as compared to 2018.

## THEME 2: EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

Proportion of enrolled children has increased in 2019 as compared to 2018.

- $32 \%$ of all school-aged children within the age bracket of 3-5 years were enrolled in schools as compared to 28\% in 2018.
- $68 \%$ children of age 3-5 are currently not enrolled in any early childhood program/schooling.


## THEME 3: CLASS WISE LEARNING LEVELS

Learning levels of children are assessed through specific language and arithmetic tools. The same approach is used for all children between the ages of 5 to 16. The literacy assessments are designed to cover up to Class 2 level competencies according to the national curriculum. The arithmetic tool covers up to Class 3 level. For the first time, in 2019, arithmetic tool also covers number recognition from 100-200 along with word problems on addition and multiplication.

Learning levels of children (in class 5 and class 3) have improved:

- $48 \%$ class 5 children could read a class 2 level story in Urdu compared to 40\% in 2018.
- $12 \%$ of class 3 children could read story in Urdu as compared to 4\% in 2018.

English learning levels (in class 5 and class 3) have improved:

- $40 \%$ class 5 children could read sentences (class 2 level) compared to 34\% in 2018
- $10 \%$ class 3 children could read class 2 level sentences as compared to $1 \%$ in 2018.

Arithmetic learning levels (in class 5 and class 3) have decreased:

- $35 \%$ class 5 children could do two digit division as compared to 43\% in 2018.

[^16]9\% children enrolled in class 3 could do two digit division in 2019 as compared to 11\% in 2018.

New questions on time recognition along with word problems on addition and multiplication were also added for the first time. $45 \%$ of children in class 5 could recognize time correctly, $46 \%$ could solve addition word problem and $34 \%$ could solve multiplication word problem.

## THEME 4: LEARNING LEVELS BY SCHOOL TYPE (GOVERNMENT VS PRIVATE)

Children enrolled in private schools are performing better
compared to their government counterparts.

- $58 \%$ children enrolled in class 5 in a private school were able to read at least story in Urdu as compared to $49 \%$ class 5 children enrolled in government schools.
. $62 \%$ private school children can read at least sentences in class 5 whereas only $42 \%$ government school children can do the same.
- $48 \%$ children enrolled in private schools (class 5) were able to do division when compared to only $36 \%$ class 5 children who were enrolled in government schools.


## THEME 5: GENDER GAP

Gender gap in learning continues: boys outperform girls (age 5-16 overall) in literacy and numeracy skills.

- $39 \%$ of boys and $26 \%$ of girls could read at least sentences in Urdu.
- $36 \%$ boys could read at least English words while $23 \%$ of girls can do the same.
- Similarly, $33 \%$ of boys were able to do at least subtraction whereas only $22 \%$ girls could do it.


## THEME 6: PARENTAL EDUCATION

. $18 \%$ mothers and $43 \%$ fathers in the sampled households had completed at least primary education.

## THEME 7: PAID TUITIONS

Private tuition incidence is greater in private school students. Overall paid tuition students in private schools is $5 \%$ compared to $1 \%$ in government schools.

- Children across all classes take private tuition; however, the percentage of students taking tuition varies at different class-level. For example, in government schools, $1 \%$ children enrolled in class 1 take private tuition whereas $2 \%$ children in class 10 take tuition.


## THEME 8: MULTI-GRADE TEACHING

77\% of surveyed government schools and 26\% of surveyed private schools had Class 2 students sitting with other classes.

- The surveyors were asked to observe if Class 2 and Class 8 were sitting together with any other classes. This is referred to as multi-grade teaching, where one teacher has to teach more than one grade within the allotted time.
- It was found that 77\% of the surveyed government schools and $26 \%$ of the surveyed private schools had Class 2 sitting with other classes.
- $34 \%$ of surveyed government schools and $14 \%$ of surveyed private schools had Class 8 sitting with other classes.


## THEME 9: TEACHER \& STUDENT ABSEENTISM

Student attendance is recorded by taking a headcount of all students present in schools on the day of visit.

- Overall student attendance in surveyed government schools stood at $80 \%$ whereas it was $85 \%$ in surveyed private schools.

Teacher attendance is recorded by referring to the appointed positions in each school and the total number of teachers actually present on the day of survey.

Overall teacher attendance in surveyed government schools stood at 91\%, same as that in private school.

## THEME 10: TEACHERS' QUALIFICATION

- 35\% teachers of surveyed government schools have done graduation as compared to $30 \%$ teachers of surveyed private schools.
- 32\% of surveyed government school teachers had Bachelors in Education degrees as compared to 35\% teachers of surveyed private schools.


## THEME 11:SCHOOL FACILITIES

## SURVEYED GOVERNMENT SCHOOLS:

- $12 \%$ of surveyed government high schools had computer labs.
- $15 \%$ of the surveyed government primary schools have toilets.
- $24 \%$ of the surveyed government primary schools have useable drinking water
- Amongst the surveyed government primary schools, $57 \%$ had complete boundary walls
- $13 \%$ of surveyed government primary schools had playgrounds.
- $25 \%$ of surveyed government primary schools had electricity connection.
- On average, 11 rooms were being used for classroom activities in the surveyed government high schools.


## SURVEYED PRIVATESCHOOLS:

- $33 \%$ of surveyed private high schools had computer labs.
- $77 \%$ of the surveyed private primary schools have toilets.
- $90 \%$ of the surveyed private primary schools have useable drinking water
- Amongst the surveyed private primary schools, $81 \%$ had complete boundary walls
- $13 \%$ of surveyed private primary schools had playgrounds.
$68 \%$ of surveyed private primary schools had electricity connection.
- On average, 9 rooms were being used for classroom activities in the surveyed private high schools.


## THEME 12: SCHOOL GRANTS/FUNDS

5\% of the government primary schools and 0\% private primary schools received grants.

23 surveyed government primary schools were receiving grants in 2019 as compared to 0 surveyed private primary schools.

## THEME 13: DISABILITIES \& FUNCTIONINGS

ASER 2019, as part of the school level survey, included a "Health and Disability" section under which the head teachers/teachers were asked a variety of questions pertaining to Children with Disabilities and Facilities for Children with Disabilities in their respective schools.

In Balochistan, $14.01 \%$ of the surveyed government schools were reported to be having children with disabilities while $0.46 \%$ of the private schools reported the same. in terms of gender, more boys $(0.20 \%$ of total enrolled boys in government schools and $0.02 \%$ of total enrolled boys in private schools) were reported to be suffering from a disability when compared with girls ( $0.08 \%$ of total enrolled girls in government schools and $0.02 \%$ of total enrolled girls in private schools).

With regards to the types of disability as a percentage of schools with children with disabilities, the highest reported type was Physical ( $32.8 \%$ ) followed by Multiple ( $31.3 \%$ ) and Behavioral (9.7\%).

Moreover, $1.37 \%$ of surveyed government schools and $0.11 \%$ had disability friendly toilets regardless of whether these schools had any child with a disability enrolled in them.

## BALOCHISTAN - RURAL

## Information \& Communication Technology

- $59.2 \%$ of households across all rural districts of Balochistan have mobile phones.
- Amongst mobile users, 96.4\% use Whatsapp service for communication.
- Amongst mobile users, $67.2 \%$ use SMS facility for communication.
- $9.4 \%$ of households have computers/laptops


## Alternate Energy

- Across all rural districts of Balochistan, $34.1 \%$ of the sampled households use solar panels as an alternate energy resource.


## HOUSEHOLD



## SCHOOLS




## GILGIT-BALTISTAN (RURAL)



## Children in Pre School

(Age 3-5 years)
District wise map showing \% children


Out of School Children
(Age 6-16 years)

District wise map showing \% children

\% Children (6-16 years)
who are not in schools


Private Schooling
(Age 6-16 years)

District wise map showing \% children

\% Children (6-16 years) enrolled in private schools

|  | $1-5$ |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | $6-10$ |
|  | $11-20$ |
| $21-30$ |  |
|  | $31-40$ |
|  | Above 40 |

Reading Language Urdu
(Class 5)

District wise map showing \% children who can read story (Class 2 level text)

\% Children in class 5
who can read story

|  | Below 33 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $33-40$ |  |
| $41-50$ |  |
| $51-60$ |  |
|  | $61-70$ |
|  | Above 70 |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## Reading English

(Class 5)
District wise map showing \% children who can read sentences (Class 2 level text)

\% Children in class 5
who can read sentences

| $\square$ | Below 33 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $33-40$ |  |
|  | $41-50$ |
| $51-60$ |  |
|  | $61-70$ |
| Above 70 |  |

## Arithmetic

(Class 5)
District wise map showing \% children who can do division (Class 3) sums

\% Children in class 5 who can do division


## 1. ACCESS

1.1. School enrollment and out-of-school children

| \% Children in different types of schools |  |  |  |  | \% Out-of-school |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age group | Govt. | Non-state providers |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Pvt. | Madrasah | NFE/Others | enrolled |  |  |
| 6-10 | 62.2 | 26.1 | 0.9 | 1.0 | 7.4 | 2.3 | 100 |
| 11-13 | 66.8 | 28.7 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.5 | 3.7 | 100 |
| 14-16 | 64.3 | 30.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 5.5 | 100 |
| 6-16 | 63.8 | 27.6 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 4.2 | 3.3 | 100 |
| Total |  |  | 92.5 |  |  |  | 100 |
| By Type | 68.9 | 29.8 | 0.6 | 0.7 |  |  |  |
| How to read: $90.2 \%$ ( $62.2+26.1+0.9+1.0$ ) children of age group 6-10 are enrolled |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Enrollment by gender and type of school




| Age Class Composition |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age / Class | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Total |
| 1 | 73.4 | 62.2 | 47.2 | 22.7 | 12.1 | 14.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11.5 |
| 2 | 26.6 | 37.8 | 28.6 | 31.9 | 24.2 | 14.4 | 23.9 | 28.4 |  |  |  |  | 11.3 |
| 3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 24.2 | 24.2 | 30.3 | 23.1 |  |  | 22.1 | 25.1 |  |  | 10.1 |
| 4 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 16.1 | 19.0 | 28.4 | 20.7 |  |  | 25.1 | 0.0 |  | 10.3 |
| 5 |  |  | 0.0 | 5.1 | 12.4 | 21.8 | 25.9 | 23.5 |  |  |  |  | 12.9 |
| 6 |  |  |  | 0.0 | 2.1 | 9.6 | 18.6 | 26.9 | 24.8 |  |  |  | 10.5 |
| 7 |  |  |  |  | 0.0 | 2.7 | 9.2 | 13.1 | 29.5 | 22.1 |  |  | 8.7 |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.0 | 1.7 | 8.0 | 16.0 | 27.3 | 33.1 |  | 10.5 |
| 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 7.6 | 15.4 | 37.3 | 24.0 | 7.5 |
| 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 10.2 | 29.6 | 63.2 | 6.7 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

1.2. Early years schooling (Pre-schooling)

| \% Children who attend different types of pre-schools |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age group | Govt. | Non-state providers |  |  | Out-of-school | Total |  |  |  |
|  |  | Pvt. | Madrasah | NFE/Others |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | 2.6 | 12.1 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 84.9 | 100 |  |  |  |
| 4 | 20.8 | 27.8 | 0.9 | 1.1 | 49.4 | 100 |  |  |  |
| 5 | 33.3 | 29.1 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 36.3 | 100 |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{3 - 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 . 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 3 . 2}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 6}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 6}$ | $\mathbf{5 6 . 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |  |  |  |
| Total | $\mathbf{4 3 . 7}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{5 6 . 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |
| By Type | $\mathbf{4 4 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{5 3 . 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
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## GILGIT-BALTISTAN - RURAL

## 2. QUALITY

2.1. Learning levels (Urdu)

| Class-wise \% children |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Class | Nothing | Letters | Words | Sentences | Story | Total |  |
| 1 | 23.0 | 42.4 | 24.2 | 7.3 | 3.2 | 100 |  |
| 2 | 14.9 | 23.3 | 40.0 | 14.0 | 7.8 | 100 |  |
| 3 | 10.9 | 8.2 | 31.4 | 29.8 | 19.7 | 100 |  |
| 4 | 10.5 | 2.2 | 15.5 | 26.9 | 44.9 | 100 |  |
| 5 | 10.6 | 1.2 | 7.2 | 21.4 | 59.6 | 100 |  |
| 6 | 3.2 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 18.1 | 77.4 | 100 |  |
| 7 | 2.5 | 0.7 | 2.0 | 12.6 | 82.2 | 100 |  |
| 8 | 5.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 5.5 | 88.6 | 100 |  |
| 9 | 2.9 | 0.1 | 1.0 | 3.2 | 92.6 | 100 |  |
| 10 | 0.7 | 0.1 | 0.4 | 2.5 | 96.3 | 100 |  |
| How to read: $10.5 \% ~(7.3+3.2)$ children of class 1 can read sentences |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



| Children who can read story |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Urdu (5-16 years) |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\sim 2016$ - 2018 -2019 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |



Who can read at least sentences


### 2.2. Learning levels (English)

| Class-wise \% children |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Who can read |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Class | Nothing | Letters |  | Words | Sentences | Total |
|  |  | Capital | Small |  |  |  |
| 1 | 27.0 | 28.3 | 25.2 | 16.8 | 2.7 | 100 |
| 2 | 14.2 | 21.1 | 37.5 | 23.2 | 4.0 | 100 |
| 3 | 12.9 | 4.5 | 21.1 | 47.3 | 14.1 | 100 |
| 4 | 12.5 | 1.3 | 9.8 | 29.2 | 47.2 | 100 |
| 5 | 11.8 | 0.4 | 3.8 | 19.1 | 64.8 | 100 |
| 6 | 5.4 | 0.3 | 4.5 | 12.2 | 77.7 | 100 |
| 7 | 2.6 | 0.4 | 1.5 | 13.5 | 82.0 | 100 |
| 8 | 6.4 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 10.8 | 82.2 | 100 |
| 9 | 5.0 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 9.0 | 85.0 | 100 |
| 10 | 1.5 | 1.4 | 2.9 | 5.6 | 88.6 | 100 |
| How to read: $19.5 \%$ (16.8+2.7) children of class 1 can read words |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Children who can read sentences | Learning levels by gender |
| :---: | :---: |
| English (5-16 years) | English (5-16 years) |
|  |  <br> Who can read at least words |

## GILGIT-BALTISTAN - RURAL

2.3. Learning levels (Arithmetic)

| Class-wise \% children |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Class | Nothing | Number recognition |  |  | Subtraction (2 digits) | Division (2 digits) | Total |
|  |  | 1-9 | 10-99 | 100-200 |  |  |  |
| 1 | 21.3 | 23.8 | 27.1 | 18.3 | 6.4 | 3.2 | 100 |
| 2 | 14.2 | 9.7 | 18.2 | 23.0 | 13.0 | 21.8 | 100 |
| 3 | 10.5 | 2.2 | 9.5 | 17.0 | 14.4 | 46.4 | 100 |
| 4 | 9.1 | 0.3 | 4.0 | 10.5 | 11.8 | 64.2 | 100 |
| 5 | 8.2 | 1.3 | 3.4 | 7.4 | 13.5 | 66.3 | 100 |
| 6 | 6.2 | 0.3 | 1.3 | 8.7 | 14.6 | 68.9 | 100 |
| 7 | 2.7 | 0.4 | 1.0 | 3.5 | 16.1 | 76.3 | 100 |
| 8 | 2.6 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 1.7 | 18.4 | 76.9 | 100 |
| 9 | 3.5 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 1.8 | 15.2 | 79.1 | 100 |
| 10 | 2.1 | 1.1 | 0.7 | 3.6 | 2.7 | 89.7 | 100 |

How to read: $9.6 \%(6.4+3.2)$ children of class 1 can do subtraction
*Words problems are asked from all children of age 5 -16 years


| *Who can do word problems |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time <br> recognition | Word <br> problem 1 | Word <br> problem 2 |
| 9.0 | 9.2 | 7.9 |
| 18.4 | 18.5 | 16.8 |
| 35.0 | 35.1 | 30.8 |
| 56.1 | 56.1 | 52.0 |
| 68.2 | 68.4 | 65.7 |
| 69.1 | 69.1 | 66.2 |
| 85.3 | 85.3 | 80.8 |
| 90.1 | 90.2 | 87.1 |
| 90.0 | 90.0 | 88.3 |
| 88.8 | 89.2 | 85.2 |
|  |  |  |

## 3. PARENTAL EDUCATION AND PAID TUITION



## GILGIT-BALTISTAN - RURAL

4. SCHOOLS: ATTENDANCE,TEACHERS QUALIFICATION,FACILITIES \& GRANTS/FUNDS

| 4.1.Number of surveyed schools by type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Govt. schools |  |  |  | Pvt. schools |  |  |  |
|  | Boys | Girls | Boys \& Girls | Total | Boys | Girls | Boys \& Girls | Total |
| Primary | 97 | 94 | 14 | 205 | 137 | 9 | 3 | 149 |
| Elementary | 41 | 30 | 9 | 80 | 40 | 2 | 3 | 45 |
| High | 32 | 44 | 21 | 97 | 43 | 2 | 1 | 46 |
| Others | 15 | 11 | 3 | 29 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Total | 185 | 179 | 47 | 411 | 227 | 13 | 7 | 247 |


| 4.2. Attendance (\%) on the day of visit |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Govt. schools |  |  |  |  | Pvt. schools |  |  |  |  |
|  | Primary | Elementary | High | Others | Overall | Primary | Elementary | High | Others | Overall |
| Children attendance | 86.5 | 85.8 | 91.0 | 91.6 | 88.5 | 90.6 | 92.5 | 91.2 | 91.4 | 91.3 |
| Teacher attendance | 87.3 | 88.3 | 90.2 | 88.3 | 88.6 | 90.5 | 85.7 | 82.8 | 89.0 | 87.0 |

4.3. Teacher qualification ( $\%$ of teachers)

| General qualification |  |  | Professional qualification |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Govt. schools | Pvt. schools |  | Govt.schools | Pvt. schools |
| Matriculation | 2.1 | 2.5 | PTC | 14.1 | 23.7 |
| FA/FSc | 11.6 | 18.2 | CT | 1.6 | 2.6 |
| BA/BSc | 43.9 | 42.2 | B-Ed | 61.1 | 58.4 |
| MA/MSc or above | 42.4 | 37.1 | M-Ed or above | 23.2 | 14.7 |
| Others | 0.0 | 0.0 | Others | 0.0 | 0.6 |


| 4.4. School facilities (\% schools) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Govt.schools |  |  |  | Pvt.schools |  |  |  |
|  | Primary | Elementary | High | Others | Primary | Elementary | High | Others |
| Rooms used for classes (avg.) | 5 | 8 | 10 | 11 | 6 | 9 | 12 | 11 |
| Useable drinking water | 49.5 | 80.8 | 84.5 | 86.2 | 85.2 | 82.2 | 88.9 | 71.4 |
| Useable toilets | 52.7 | 81.0 | 89.7 | 79.3 | 82.4 | 86.7 | 93.3 | 85.7 |
| Separate toilets for girls | 22.5 | 56.4 | 45.3 | 51.7 | 47.2 | 71.1 | 80.0 | 71.4 |
| Playground | 36.1 | 73.4 | 70.1 | 75.9 | 56.2 | 71.1 | 80.0 | 57.1 |
| Boundary wall | 68.5 | 82.1 | 84.4 | 92.9 | 78.7 | 77.8 | 82.2 | 57.1 |
| Electricity Connection | 54.9 | 75.9 | 76.3 | 93.1 | 69.2 | 84.4 | 80.0 | 85.7 |
| Solar panels | 11.3 | 16.5 | 20.6 | 17.2 | 15.7 | 11.1 | 20.5 | 14.3 |
| Smart Boards | - | 14.5 | 12.3 | 25.0 | 12.0 | 14.0 | 26.7 | 28.6 |
| Computer lab | - | 17.7 | 23.5 | 35.7 | 13.0 | 18.6 | 40.9 | 14.3 |
| Internet Connection | 9.3 | 9.7 | 14.6 | 25.0 | 15.7 | 17.8 | 35.6 | 28.6 |
| Useable furniture | 73.0 | 72.7 | 78.4 | 82.8 | 80.4 | 86.4 | 84.4 | 71.4 |



Playground and boundary wall facility
Primary schools
$■ 2018-2019$


## Water and toilet facility

Primary schools

- 2018 ■ 2019
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| 4.5. Funds/Grants (\% schools) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Govt. schools |  |  |  | Pvt. schools |  |  |  |
|  |  | Primary | Elementary | High | Others | Primary | Elementary | High | Others |
| $\stackrel{\infty}{\stackrel{\infty}{N}}$ | \# of schools reported receiving grants | 90 | 34 | 51 | 21 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 4 |
|  | \% of schools reported receiving grants | 50.3 | 46.6 | 57.3 | 72.4 | 2.7 | 8.9 | 2.2 | 57.1 |
|  | Average amount of grant (Rs.) | 82122.4 | 97549.1 | 249546.7 | 75966.7 | 112500.0 | 42500.0 | 33000.0 | 49250.0 |
| $\stackrel{*}{\circ}$ | \# of schools reported receiving grants | 21 | 13 | 16 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 4 |
|  | \% of schools reported receiving grants | 11.7 | 17.8 | 18.0 | 20.7 | 2.0 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 57.1 |
|  | Average amount of grant (Rs.) | 85671.4 | 108435.1 | 180906.3 | 105000.0 | 152333.3 | 10000.0 | 18000.0 | 269250.0 |

## 5. DISABILITIES \& FUNCTIONINGS

| 5.1.Schools with Children with Disabilities (by School Type) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Govt. schools (\%) |  |  |  | Pvt.schools (\%) |  |  | Overall (\%) |  |  |
| 33.58 |  |  |  | 19.84 |  |  | 28.42 |  |  |
| 5.2.Children with Disabilities (by School Type) as reported by the Head Teacher/School Incharge |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Govt. schools (\%) |  |  |  | Pvt. Schools (\%) |  |  | Overall (\%) |  |  |
|  | Boys | Girls | Total | Boys | Girls | Total | Boys | Girls | Total |
| Percentage of children with disabilities | 0.32 | 0.16 | 0.48 | 0.17 | 0.08 | 0.24 | 0.27 | 0.14 | 0.40 |
| Number of children with disabilities | 214 | 111 | 325 | 56 | 25 | 81 | 270 | 136 | 406 |


|  | Govt. schools | Pvt. schools | Overall |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Visual | 8.70 | 6.25 | 8.06 |
| Hearing | 13.04 | 8.33 | 11.83 |
| Physical | 40.58 | 37.50 | 39.78 |
| Intellectual | 15.22 | 12.50 | 14.52 |
| Behavioral | 10.87 | 8.33 | 10.22 |
| Multiple Disabilities (Children with more than one of the aforementioned types of disability) | 7.25 | 2.08 | 5.91 |
| Disability Type not reported | 4.35 | 25.00 | 9.68 |
|  |  |  |  |
| 5.4.Facilities for Children with Disabilities (by School Type) |  |  |  |
|  | Govt. schools (\%) | Pvt. Schools (\%) | Overall (\%) |
| Ramps | 0.49 | 1.62 | 0.91 |
| Toilets | 4.14 | 5.26 | 4.56 |
| Health Officer | 1.70 | 0.00 | 1.06 |
| Other Facilities | 7.06 | 3.64 | 5.78 |

0 represents insufficient data , *grants received till November 15,2019
paristan
Facilitated by SAFED

## Sample Composition

ASER 2019 survey was conducted in 14 rural districts of Gilgit-Baltistan. This covered 8,213 households in 417 villages throughout the province.

Detailed information was collected on 26,103 children ( $53 \%$ males, $47 \%$ females) aged 3-16 years. Out of these 20,584 children aged 5-16 years were tested for language and arithmetic competencies.

- School information on public and private schools was collected. A total of 411 government schools (50\% primary, 19\% elementary, 24\% high, 7\% others) and 247 private schools (60\% primary, 18\% elementary, $19 \%$ high, $3 \%$ others) were surveyed.
- $45 \%$ of the government schools were boys only, $44 \%$ were girls only, and $11 \%$ were coeducation schools. In case of private schools, 92\% were boys only, 5\% were girls only and $3 \%$ were coeducation schools.


## THEME 1: ACCESS

Proportion of out-of-school children has decreased when compared to 2018.

In 2019, 8\% of children were reported to be out-ofschool which has decreased as compared to previous year (9\%). 5\% children have never been enrolled in a school and $3 \%$ have dropped out of school for various reasons.
$92 \%$ of all school-aged children within the age bracket of 6-16 years were enrolled in schools. Amongst these, $69 \%$ of children were enrolled in government schools whereas $31 \%$ of children were going to non-state institutions (30\% private schools, 0\% Madrassah, 1\% others).

- Amongst the enrolled students in government schools, $37 \%$ were girls and $63 \%$ were boys whereas in private schools 57\% enrolled children were boys and $43 \%$ were girls.

The percentage of out of school children (boys) has decreased as compared to 2018.
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## THEME 2: EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

Proportion of enrolled children has increased in 2019 as compared to 2018.

- $44 \%$ of all school-aged children within the age bracket of 3-5 years were enrolled in schools as compared to 40\% in 2018.
- $56 \%$ children of age 3-5 are currently not enrolled in any early childhood program/schooling.


## THEME 3: CLASS WISE LEARNING LEVELS

Learning levels of children are assessed through specific language and arithmetic tools. The same approach is used for all children between the ages of 5 to 16. The literacy assessments are designed to cover up to Class 2 level competencies according to the national curriculum. The arithmetic tool covers up to Class 3 level. For the first time, in 2019, arithmetic tool also covers number recognition from 100-200 along with word problems on addition and multiplication.

Learning levels of children (in class 5 and class 3) have improved:

- 60\% class 5 children could read a class 2 level story in Urdu compared to 58\% in 2018.
- $20 \%$ of class 3 children could read story in Urdu as compared to $18 \%$ in 2018.

English learning levels (in class 5 and class 3) have improved:

- $65 \%$ class 5 children could read sentences (class 2 level) compared to 63\% in 2018.
- $14 \%$ class 3 children could read class 2 level sentences as compared to $12 \%$ in 2018.

Arithmetic learning levels (in class 5 and class 3) have improved:

- $66 \%$ class 5 children could do two digit division as compared to 63\% in 2018.
- $47 \%$ children enrolled in class 3 could do two digit division in 2019 as compared to $45 \%$ in 2018.
- New questions on time recognition along with word problems on addition and multiplication were also added for the first time. $68 \%$ of children in class 5 could recognize time correctly, $68 \%$ could solve addition word problem and $66 \%$ could solve multiplication word problem.


## THEME 4: LEARNING LEVELS BY SCHOOL TYPE (GOVERNMENT VS PRIVATE)

Children enrolled in private schools are performing better compared to their government counterparts.

- $63 \%$ children enrolled in class 5 in a private school were able to read at least story in Urdu as compared to $58 \%$ class 5 children enrolled in government schools.
- $74 \%$ private school children can read at least sentences in class 5 whereas only 61\% government school children can do the same.
- $72 \%$ children enrolled in private schools (class 5) were able to do division when compared to only $64 \%$ class 5 children who were enrolled in governmentschools.


## THEME 5: GENDER GAP

Gender gap in learning continues: boys outperform girls (age 5-16 overall) in literacy and numeracy skills.

- $50 \%$ of boys and $37 \%$ of girls could read at least sentences in Urdu.
- $53 \%$ boys could read at least English words while $39 \%$ of girls can do the same.
- Similarly, $51 \%$ of boys were able to do at least subtraction whereas only $38 \%$ girls could do it.


## THEME 6: PARENTALEDUCATION

- $35 \%$ mothers and $62 \%$ fathers in the sampled households had completed at least primary education.


## THEME 7: PAID TUITIONS

Private tuition incidence is greater in private school students. Overall paid tuition students in private schools is $26 \%$ compared to $5 \%$ in government schools.

Children across all classes take private tuition; however, the percentage of students taking tuition varies at different class-level. For example, in government schools, $3 \%$ children enrolled in class 1 take private tuition whereas $7 \%$ children in class 10 take tuition.

## THEME 8: MULTI-GRADE TEACHING

$35 \%$ of surveyed government schools and $28 \%$ of surveyed private schools had Class 2 students sitting with other classes.

- The surveyors were asked to observe if Class 2 and Class 8 were sitting together with any other classes. This is referred to as multi-grade teaching, where one teacher has to teach more than one grade within the allotted time.
- It was found that $35 \%$ of the surveyed government schools and $28 \%$ of the surveyed private schools had Class 2 sitting with other classes.
- $16 \%$ of surveyed government schools and $15 \%$ of surveyed private schools had Class 8 sitting with other classes.


## THEME 9:TEACHER \& STUDENT ABSEENTISM

Student attendance is recorded by taking a headcount of all students present in schools on the day of visit.

- Overall student attendance in surveyed government schools stood at $89 \%$ whereas it was $91 \%$ in surveyed private schools.

Teacher attendance is recorded by referring to the appointed positions in each school and the total number of teachers actually present on the day of survey.

Overall teacher attendance in surveyed government
schools stood at $89 \%$, whereas it was $87 \%$ in
surveyed private schools.

## THEME 10: TEACHERS' QUALIFICATION

- $44 \%$ teachers of surveyed government schools have done graduation as compared to $42 \%$ teachers of surveyed private schools.
- 61\% of surveyed government school teachers had Bachelors in Education degrees as compared to 58\% teachers of surveyed private schools.


## THEME 11: SCHOOL FACILITIES SURVEYED GOVERNMENT SCHOOLS:

- $24 \%$ of surveyed government high schools had computer labs.
- $53 \%$ of the surveyed government primary schools have toilets.
- $50 \%$ of the surveyed government primary schools have useable drinking water
- Amongst the surveyed government primary schools, 69\% had complete boundary walls
- $36 \%$ of surveyed government primary schools had playgrounds.
- 55\% of surveyed government primary schools had electricity connection.
- On average, 10 rooms were being used for classroom activities in the surveyed government high schools.


## SURVEYED PRIVATE SCHOOLS:

- $41 \%$ of surveyed private high schools had computer labs.
- $82 \%$ of the surveyed private primary schools have toilets.
$85 \%$ of the surveyed private primary schools have useable drinking water

Amongst the surveyed private primary schools, 77\% had complete boundary walls

- $56 \%$ of surveyed private primary schools had playgrounds.
$69 \%$ of surveyed private primary schools had electricity connection.
- On average, 12 rooms were being used for classroom activities in the surveyed private high schools.


## THEME 12: SCHOOLGRANTS/FUNDS

12\% of the government primary schools and 2\% private primary schools received grants.

- 21 surveyed government primary schools were receiving grants in 2019 as compared to 3 surveyed private primary schools.


## THEME 13: DISABILITIES \& FUNCTIONINGS

ASER 2019, as part of the school level survey, included a "Health and Disability" section under which the head teachers/teachers were asked a variety of questions pertaining to Children with Disabilities and Facilities for Children with Disabilities in their respective schools.

In Gilgit Baltistan, 34\% of the surveyed government schools were reported to be having children with disabilities while $20 \%$ of the private schools reported the same. in terms of gender, more boys $\mathbf{~} 0.32 \%$ of total enrolled boys in government schools and $0.17 \%$ of total enrolled boys in private schools) were reported to be suffering from a disability when compared with girls ( $0.16 \%$ of total enrolled girls in government schools and 0.08\% of total enrolled girls in private schools).

With regards to the types of disability as a percentage of schools with children with disabilities, the highest reported type was Physical (39.8\%) followed by Intellectual (14.5\%) and Hearing (11.8\%).

Moreover, $0.49 \%$ of surveyed government schools and $1.62 \%$ of the surveyed private schools had ramps regardless of whether these schools had any child with a disability enrolled in them. Similarly, 4.1\% of surveyed government schools and $5.3 \%$ of surveyed private schools had disabilityfriendly toilets.

## GILGIT-BALTISTAN - RURAL

## Information \& Communication Technology

- $70.8 \%$ of households across all rural districts of Gilgit-Baltistan have mobile phones.
- Amongst mobile users, $62.4 \%$ use SMS facility for communication.
- 22.0\% of households have computers/laptops


## Alternate Energy

- Across all rural districts of Gilgit-Baltistan, 27.3\% of the sampled households use solar panels as an alternate energy resource.


## HOUSEHOLD



## SCHOOLS




## ISLAMABAD (RURAL)



## ISLAMABAD - RURAL

1. ACCESS
1.1. School enrollment and out-of-school children

| \% Children in different types of schools |  |  |  |  | \% Out-of-school |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age group | Govt. | Non-state providers |  |  | Never enrolled | Drop-out |  |
|  |  | Pvt. | Madrasah | NFE/Others |  |  |  |
| 6-10 | 47.3 | 41.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.1 | 8.8 | 100 |
| 11-13 | 52.3 | 42.4 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 3.8 | 100 |
| 14-16 | 55.7 | 37.7 | 3.3 | 0.0 | 1.6 | 1.6 | 100 |
| 6-16 | 49.2 | 41.5 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 1.8 | 7.0 | 100 |
| Total | 91.2 |  |  |  | 8.8 |  | 100 |
| By Type | 53.9 | 45.5 | 0.5 | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| How to read: $89.1 \%(47.3+41.8+0.0+0.0)$ children of age group 6 -10 are enrolled |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Enrollment by gender and type of school




| Age Class Composition |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age / Class | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Total |
| 1 | 57.4 | 76.4 | 7.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11.5 |
| 2 | 42.6 | 23.6 | 85.7 | 41.9 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 11.3 |
| 3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.7 | 23.8 | 39.4 | 24.6 |  |  | 16.0 | 7.4 |  |  | 10.1 |
| 4 |  | 0.0 | 1.4 | 34.3 | 48.5 | 38.6 | 9.1 |  |  |  | 9.0 |  | 10.3 |
| 5 |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 12.1 | 31.6 | 69.7 | 50.0 |  |  |  |  | 12.9 |
| 6 |  |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.3 | 15.2 | 29.4 | 12.0 |  |  |  | 10.5 |
| 7 |  |  |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 6.1 | 11.8 | 72.0 | 37.0 |  |  | 8.7 |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 33.3 | 0.0 |  | 10.5 |
| 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 22.2 | 81.8 | 5.9 | 7.5 |
| 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 9.1 | 94.1 | 6.7 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

1.2. Early years schooling (Pre-schooling)

| \% Children who attend different types of pre-schools |  |  |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age group | Govt. | Non-state providers |  |  | Out-of-school |  |
|  |  | Pvt. | Madrasah | NFE/Others |  |  |
| 3 | 9.0 | 6.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 84.5 | 100 |
| 4 | 57.1 | 40.0 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 2.1 | 100 |
| 5 | 10.5 | 86.2 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 2.6 | 100 |
| 3-5 | 24.6 | 44.1 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 30.9 | 100 |
| Total | 69.1 |  |  |  | 30.9 | 100 |
| By Type | 35.6 | 63.8 | 0.6 | 0.0 |  |  |
| How to read: $15.5 \%(9.0+6.5+0.0+0.0)$ children of age 3 are enrolled |  |  |  |  |  |  |



## ISLAMABAD - RURAL

## 2. QUALITY

2.1. Learning levels (Urdu)

| Class-wise \% children |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Who can read |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Class | Nothing | Letters | Words | Sentences | Story | Total |  |
| 1 | 20.8 | 32.5 | 15.0 | 26.7 | 5.0 | 100 |  |
| 2 | 6.5 | 26.8 | 28.1 | 14.4 | 24.2 | 100 |  |
| 3 | 5.4 | 3.6 | 19.6 | 30.4 | 41.1 | 100 |  |
| 4 | 3.6 | 1.2 | 19.0 | 20.2 | 56.0 | 100 |  |
| 5 | 2.4 | 1.2 | 17.6 | 3.5 | 75.3 | 100 |  |
| 6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.1 | 9.4 | 87.5 | 100 |  |
| 7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.3 | 10.5 | 84.2 | 100 |  |
| 8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 11.1 | 88.9 | 100 |  |
| 9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 12.5 | 87.5 | 100 |  |
| 10 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.9 | 0.0 | 94.1 | 100 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |





Who can read at least sentences


### 2.2. Learning levels (English)

| Class-wise \% children |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Class | Nothing can read |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Letters |  | Words | Sentences | Total |
|  | Capital | Small |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 21.6 | 26.7 | 20.7 | 27.6 | 3.4 | 100 |
| 2 | 11.3 | 13.2 | 33.8 | 32.5 | 9.3 | 100 |
| 3 | 10.9 | 13.0 | 23.9 | 26.1 | 26.1 | 100 |
| 4 | 7.2 | 0.0 | 16.9 | 21.7 | 54.2 | 100 |
| 5 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 12.0 | 22.9 | 63.9 | 100 |
| 6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.1 | 18.8 | 78.1 | 100 |
| 7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 10.8 | 13.5 | 75.7 | 100 |
| 8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 11.1 | 88.9 | 100 |
| 9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 6.3 | 12.5 | 81.3 | 100 |
| 10 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.9 | 11.8 | 82.4 | 100 |
| How to read: $31.0 \% ~(27.6+3.4)$ | children of class 1 can read words |  |  |  |  |  |






## ISLAMABAD - RURAL

2.3. Learning levels (Arithmetic)





## 3. PARENTAL EDUCATION AND PAID TUITION



## ISLAMABAD - RURAL

## 4. SCHOOLS: ATTENDANCE,TEACHERS QUALIFICATION,FACILITIES \& GRANTS/FUNDS

| 4.1.Number of surveyed schools by type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Govt. schools |  |  |  | Pvt. schools |  |  |  |
|  | Boys | Girls | Boys \& Girls | Total | Boys | Girls | Boys \& Girls | Total |
| Primary | 2 | 1 | 5 | 8 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 8 |
| Elementary | 0 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| High | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 6 |
| Others | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Total | 2 | 3 | 9 | 14 | 13 | 2 | 2 | 17 |


| 4.2. Attendance (\%) on the day of visit |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Govt. schools |  |  |  |  | Pvt. schools |  |  |  |  |
|  | Primary | Elementary | High | Others | Overall | Primary | Elementary | High | Others | Overall |
| Children attendance | 87.4 | 89.2 | - | - | 88.5 | 92.2 | 93.3 | 88.9 | 91.7 | 90.9 |
| Teacher attendance | 88.9 | 62.5 | - | - | 80.8 | 81.8 | - | 64.1 | 0.0 | 72.6 |


| 4.3. Teacher qualification (\% of teachers) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| General qualification |  |  | Professional qualification |  |  |
|  | Govt. schools | Pvt. schools |  | Govt.schools | Pvt. schools |
| Matriculation | 0.0 | 0.0 | PTC | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| FA/FSc | 4.0 | 33.8 | CT | 8.7 | 0.0 |
| BA/BSc | 96.0 | 37.8 | B-Ed | 52.2 | 57.7 |
| MA/MSc or above | 0.0 | 28.4 | M-Ed or above | 39.1 | 34.6 |
| Others | 0.0 | 0.0 | Others | 0.0 | 7.7 |


| 4.4. School facilities (\% schools) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Govt.schools |  |  |  | Pvt.schools |  |  |  |
|  | Primary | Elementary | High | Others | Primary | Elementary | High | Others |
| Rooms used for classes (avg.) | - | - | - | - | 10 | - | 11 | - |
| Useable drinking water | 62.5 | 83.3 | - | - | 100.0 | - | 100.0 | - |
| Useable toilets | 87.5 | 100.0 | - | - | 100.0 | - | 100.0 | - |
| Separate toilets for girls | - | - | - | - | 87.5 | - | 100.0 | - |
| Playground | 62.5 | 50.0 | - | - | 87.5 | - | 83.3 | - |
| Boundary wall | 62.5 | 83.3 | - | - | 100.0 | - | 83.3 | - |
| Electricity Connection | 25.0 | 66.7 | - | - | 100.0 | - | 83.3 | - |
| Solar panels | - | - | - | - | 0.0 | - | 66.7 | - |
| Smart Boards | - | 0.0 | - | - | 75.0 | - | 50.0 | - |
| Computer lab | - | 100.0 | - | - | 37.5 | - | 66.7 | - |
| Internet Connection | 50.0 | 16.7 | - | - | 50.0 | - | 83.3 | - |
| Useable furniture | - | - | - | - | 75.0 | - | 50.0 | - |



[^19]| 4.5. Funds/Grants (\% schools) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Govt. schools |  |  |  | Pvt. schools |  |  |  |
|  |  | Primary | Elementary | High | Others | Primary | Elementary | High | Others |
|  | \# of schools reported receiving grants | 4 | 3 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| $\stackrel{\infty}{\circ}$ | \% of schools reported receiving grants | 80.0 | 50.0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
|  | Average amount of grant (Rs.) | 50300.0 | 63333.3 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
|  | \# of schools reported receiving grants | 4 | 3 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 운 | \% of schools reported receiving grants | 100.0 | 75.0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
|  | Average amount of grant (Rs.) | 30500.0 | 31333.3 | - | - | - | - | - | - |

## Information \& Communication Technology

- 79.5\% of households across all rural areas of Islamabad have mobile phones.
- Amongst mobile users, $94.6 \%$ use Whatsapp service for communication.
- Amongst mobile users, $\mathbf{8 7 . 4 \%}$ use SMS facility for communication.
- $\mathbf{2 5 . 5 \%}$ of households have computers/laptops


## Alternate Energy

- Across all rural areas of Islamabad, $6.8 \%$ of the sampled households use solar panels as an alternate energy resource.


## HOUSEHOLD




SOLAR PANELS


COMPUTER/LAPTOP
pakistan
Facilitated by SAFED

## Sample Composition

ASER 2019 survey was conducted in 1 rural district of Islamabad. This covered 562 households in 30 villages throughout the region.

Detailed information was collected on 1,146 children ( $56 \%$ males, $44 \%$ females) aged 3-16 years. Out of these 851 children aged 5-16 years were tested for language and arithmetic competencies.

- School information on public and private schools was collected. A total of 14 government schools (57\% primary, 43 elementary, 0\% high, 0\% others) and 17 private schools (47\% primary, 6\% elementary, $35 \%$ high, $12 \%$ others) were surveyed.
$14 \%$ of the government schools were boys only, 22\% were girls only, and 64\% were coeducation schools. In case of private schools, 76\% were boys only, 12\% were girls only and $12 \%$ were coeducation schools.


## THEME 1: ACCESS

Proportion of out-of-school children has remained the same when compared to 2018.

In 2019, 9\% of children were reported to be out-ofschool has remained the same as compared to previous year (9\%). 2\% children have never been enrolled in a school and 7\% have dropped out of school for various reasons.

- $91 \%$ of all school-aged children within the age bracket of 6-16 years were enrolled in schools. Amongst these, 54\% of children were enrolled in government schools whereas 46\% of children were going to non-state institutions (45\% private schools, 1\% Madrassah, 0\% others).
- Amongst the enrolled students in government schools, $45 \%$ were girls and $55 \%$ were boys whereas in private schools 60\% enrolled children were boys and $40 \%$ were girls.
- The percentage of out of school children (boys and girls) has decreased slightly for girls as compared to 2018.


## THEME 2: EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

Proportion of enrolled children has increased when compared to 2018.

- $69 \%$ of all school-aged children within the age bracket of 3-5 years were enrolled in schools in 2019 as compared to 62\% in 2018.
- $31 \%$ children of age 3-5 are currently not enrolled in any early childhood program/schooling.


## THEME 3: CLASS WISE LEARNING LEVELS

Learning levels of children are assessed through specific language and arithmetic tools. The same approach is used for all children between the ages of 5 to 16. The literacy assessments are designed to cover up to Class 2 level competencies according to the national curriculum. The arithmetic tool covers up to Class 3 level. For the first time, in 2019, arithmetic tool also covers number recognition from 100-200 along with word problems on addition and multiplication.

## Learning levels of children (in class 3) have improved:

- $75 \%$ class 5 children could read a class 2 level story in Urdu compared to 75\% in 2018.
- $41 \%$ of class 3 children could read story in Urdu as compared to 39\% in 2018.

English learning levels (in class 5 and class 3) have improved:

- $64 \%$ class 5 children could read sentences (class 2 level) compared to 63\% in 2018.
- $26 \%$ class 3 children could read class 2 level sentences as compared to $24 \%$ in 2018.

Arithmetic learning levels (in class 5 and class 3) have remained the same:

- $57 \%$ class 5 children could do two digit division as compared to 57\% in 2018.
- $48 \%$ children enrolled in class 3 could do two digit division in 2019 as compared to $48 \%$ in 2018.
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- New questions on time recognition along with word problems on addition and multiplication were also added for the first time. $37 \%$ of children in class 5 could recognize time correctly, $37 \%$ could solve addition word problem and $29 \%$ could solve multiplication word problem.


## THEME 4: LEARNING LEVELS BY SCHOOL TYPE (GOVERNMENT VS PRIVATE)

Children enrolled in private schools are performing better in Arithmetic only compared to their government counterparts.

76\% children enrolled in class 5 in a private school were able to read at least story in Urdu as compared to $75 \%$ class 5 children enrolled in government schools.

- $61 \%$ private school children can read at least sentences in class 5 whereas only $68 \%$ government school children can do the same.

62\% children enrolled in private and 55\% children enrolled in government schools (class 5) were able to do division.

## THEME 5: GENDER GAP

Gender gap in learning continues: boys outperform girls (age 5-16 overall) in literacy and numeracy skills.

- $58 \%$ of boys and $57 \%$ of girls could read at least sentences in Urdu.
- $62 \%$ boys could read at least English words while $59 \%$ of girls can do the same.
- Similarly, $47 \%$ of boys were able to do at least subtraction whereas only $48 \%$ girls could do it.


## THEME 6: PARENTALEDUCATION

- $85 \%$ mothers and $81 \%$ fathers in the sampled households had completed at least primary education.


## THEME 7: PAIDTUITIONS

Private tuition incidence is greater in private school students. Overall paid tuition students in private schools is $18 \%$ compared to $17 \%$ in government schools.

Children across all classes take private tuition; however, the percentage of students taking tuition varies at different class-level. For example, in government schools, $16 \%$ children enrolled in class 1 take private tuition whereas $9 \%$ children in class 10 take tuition.

## THEME 8: MULTI-GRADE TEACHING

$21 \%$ of surveyed government schools and $35 \%$ of surveyed private schools had Class 2 students sitting with other classes.

- The surveyors were asked to observe if Class 2 and Class 8 were sitting together with any other classes. This is referred to as multi-grade teaching, where one teacher has to teach more than one grade within the allotted time.

It was found that $21 \%$ of the surveyed government schools and $35 \%$ of the surveyed private schools had Class 2 sitting with other classes.

- $17 \%$ of surveyed government schools and $17 \%$ of surveyed private schools had Class 8 sitting with other classes.


## THEME 9: TEACHER \& STUDENT ABSEENTISM

Student attendance is recorded by taking a headcount of all students present in schools on the day of visit.

- Overall student attendance in surveyed government schools stood at $89 \%$ whereas it was $91 \%$ in surveyed private schools.

Teacher attendance is recorded by referring to the appointed positions in each school and the total number of teachers actually present on the day of survey.

- Overall teacher attendance in surveyed government schools stood at $\mathbf{8 1 \%}$ whereas it was $\mathbf{7 3 \%}$ in surveyed private schools.


## THEME 10: TEACHERS' QUALIFICATION

- $96 \%$ teachers of surveyed government schools have done graduation as compared to $34 \%$ teachers of surveyed private schools.
- $52 \%$ of surveyed government school teachers had Bachelors in Education degrees as compared to 58\% teachers of surveyed private schools.


## THEME 11: SCHOOL FACILITIES

 SURVEYED GOVERNMENT SCHOOLS:- $88 \%$ of the surveyed government primary schools have toilets.
- $63 \%$ of the surveyed government primary schools have useable drinking water
- Amongst the surveyed government primary schools, $63 \%$ had complete boundary walls
- $63 \%$ of surveyed government primary schools had playgrounds.
- $25 \%$ of surveyed government primary schools had electricity connection.
- On average, 17 rooms were being used for classroom activities in the surveyed government middle schools.


## SURVEYED PRIVATE SCHOOLS:

- $67 \%$ of surveyed private high schools had computer labs.
- $100 \%$ of the surveyed private primary schools have toilets.
- $100 \%$ of the surveyed private primary schools have useable drinking water
- Amongst the surveyed private primary schools, $100 \%$ had complete boundary walls
- $88 \%$ of surveyed private primary schools had playgrounds.
. $100 \%$ of surveyed private primary schools had electricity connection.
- On average, 11 rooms were being used for classroom activities in the surveyed private high schools.


## THEME 12: SCHOOL GRANTS/FUNDS

$100 \%$ of the government primary schools and 0\% private primary schools received grants.

- 4 surveyed government primary schools were receiving grants in 2019 as compared to 0 surveyed private primary schools.


# KHYBER PAKHTUNKHWA (RURAL) 



## Children in Pre School

(Age 3-5 years)
District wise map showing \% children

\% Children (3-5 years) attending pre school


## Out of School Children

(Age 6-16 years)

District wise map showing \% children

\% Children (6-16 years) who are not in schools


Private Schooling
(Age 6-16 years)

District wise map showing \% children

\% Children (6-16 years) enrolled in private schools

|  | $1-5$ |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | $6-10$ |
| $11-20$ |  |
| $21-30$ |  |
|  | $31-40$ |
|  | Above 40 |

Reading Language Urdu/Pashto
(Class 5)
District wise map showing \% children who can read story (Class 2 level text)

\% Children in class 5 who can read story

|  | Below 33 <br> $33-40$ <br>  <br> $41-50$ <br> $51-60$ <br> $61-70$ <br>  <br> Above 70 |
| :--- | :--- |
|  |  |

## Reading English

(Class 5)
District wise map showing \% children who can read sentences (Class 2 level text)

\% Children in class 5 who can read sentences


## Arithmetic

(Class 5)
District wise map showing \% children who can do division (Class 3) sums

\% Children in class 5 who can do division


## KHYBER PAKHTUNKHWA - RURAL

1. ACCESS
1.1. School enrollment and out-of-school children

| \% Children in different types of schools |  |  |  |  | \% Out-of-school |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age group | Govt. | Non-state providers |  |  | Never enrolled | Drop-out |  |
|  |  | Pvt. | Madrasah | NFE/Others |  |  |  |
| 6-10 | 69.0 | 18.4 | 0.8 | 0.2 | 8.5 | 3.1 | 100 |
| 11-13 | 64.9 | 19.2 | 0.8 | 0.1 | 7.4 | 7.6 | 100 |
| 14-16 | 54.9 | 19.0 | 0.9 | 0.1 | 14.3 | 10.9 | 100 |
| 6-16 | 65.9 | 18.7 | 0.9 | 0.1 | 9.2 | 5.3 | 100 |
| Total |  |  | 85.5 |  |  |  | 100 |
| By Type | 77.0 | 21.8 | 1.0 | 0.1 |  |  |  |
| How to read: | 88.4\% | . $0+18.4$ | .8+0.2) child | of age group | 0 are enro |  |  |

Enrollment by gender and type of school




| Age Class Composition |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age / Class | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Total |
| 1 | 84.3 | 74.2 | 37.2 | 9.0 | 4.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11.5 |
| 2 | 15.7 | 25.8 | 54.2 | 34.3 | 13.8 | 5.0 | 8.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 11.3 |
| 3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.7 | 45.6 | 41.0 | 14.3 |  | 13.0 | 13.4 | 190 |  |  | 10.1 |
| 4 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.6 | 32.6 | 42.2 | 15.6 |  |  | 19.0 | 0.0 |  | 10.3 |
| 5 |  |  | 0.0 | 2.4 | 6.6 | 29.9 | 53.1 | 23.1 |  |  |  | 11.0 | 12.9 |
| 6 |  |  |  | 0.0 | 1.4 | 6.3 | 18.1 | 31.5 | 18.5 |  |  |  | 10.5 |
| 7 |  |  |  |  | 0.0 | 2.4 | 4.2 | 25.2 | 32.6 | 15.3 |  |  | 8.7 |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.0 | 1.0 | 7.3 | 29.3 | 36.0 | 21.1 |  | 10.5 |
| 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 6.1 | 25.8 | 47.3 | 22.1 | 7.5 |
| 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 31.6 | 67.0 | 6.7 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

1.2. Early years schooling (Pre-schooling)

| $\%$ Children who attend different types of pre-schools |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age group | Govt. | Non-state providers |  |  | Out-of-school | Total |  |
|  |  | Pvt. | Madrasah | NFE/Others |  |  |  |
| 3 | 1.8 | 4.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 93.6 | 100 |  |
| 4 | 9.0 | 15.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 75.8 | 100 |  |
| $\mathbf{5}$ | 37.0 | 28.4 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 34.1 | 100 |  |
| $\mathbf{3 - 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 . 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 2}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{6 5 . 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |  |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 4 . 7}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| By Type | $\mathbf{5 0 . 5}$ | $\mathbf{4 8 . 8}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 6}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{6 5 . 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |  |
| How to read: $6.4 \%(1.8+4.6+0.0+0.0)$ | children of age 3 are enrolled |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | ildren not attending any pre-school |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { (3-5 years) } \\ \longrightarrow 2016-2018 \backsim{ }^{-}-2019 \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  |  |
|  | Age $3 \quad$ Age $4 \quad$ Age 5 |

## 2. QUALITY

2.1. Learning levels (Urdu/Pashto)

| Class-wise \% children |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Class | Nothing | Letters | Words | Sentences | Story | Total |  |
| 1 | 22.1 | 31.0 | 38.5 | 5.0 | 3.4 | 100 |  |
| 2 | 11.0 | 27.5 | 37.2 | 17.3 | 6.9 | 100 |  |
| 3 | 11.6 | 5.6 | 40.6 | 23.6 | 18.5 | 100 |  |
| 4 | 11.7 | 3.6 | 14.3 | 32.4 | 37.9 | 100 |  |
| 5 | 16.3 | 2.7 | 10.4 | 15.8 | 54.8 | 100 |  |
| 6 | 8.3 | 1.9 | 10.2 | 16.3 | 63.3 | 100 |  |
| 7 | 5.1 | 1.2 | 6.9 | 12.8 | 74.0 | 100 |  |
| 8 | 3.4 | 1.2 | 5.8 | 9.0 | 80.5 | 100 |  |
| 9 | 1.6 | 0.5 | 2.8 | 4.5 | 90.7 | 100 |  |
| 10 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 3.7 | 3.6 | 92.1 | 100 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |




Learning levels: Out-of-school
Urdu/Pashto (5-16 years)

Who can read at least sentences

### 2.2. Learning levels (English)

| Class-wise \% children |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Class | Nothing can read |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Letters |  | Words | Sentences | Total |
| 1 | 22.2 | 21.1 | 32.7 |  | 4.5 | 100 |
| 2 | 12.0 | 20.7 | 26.4 | 30.8 | 10.1 | 100 |
| 3 | 13.3 | 5.0 | 12.3 | 48.1 | 21.3 | 100 |
| 4 | 13.5 | 2.5 | 4.8 | 30.7 | 48.4 | 100 |
| 5 | 15.5 | 1.9 | 4.8 | 18.0 | 59.8 | 100 |
| 6 | 9.7 | 1.5 | 4.0 | 17.1 | 67.7 | 100 |
| 7 | 8.8 | 1.0 | 3.3 | 12.9 | 74.0 | 100 |
| 8 | 4.2 | 1.2 | 4.2 | 12.6 | 77.7 | 100 |
| 9 | 3.2 | 0.6 | 2.4 | 6.9 | 86.9 | 100 |
| 10 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 2.2 | 10.4 | 86.5 | 100 |
| 4 | Capitall | Small |  |  |  |  |

How to read: $23.9 \%(19.4+4.5)$ children of class 1 can read words


2.3. Learning levels (Arithmetic)

| Class-wise \% children |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Learning levels by school type |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Who can do |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | *Who can do word problems |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Class | Nothing | Number recognition |  |  | Subtraction (2 digits) | Division <br> (2 digits) | Total | Time recognition | Word problem 1 | Word problem 2 | Arithmetic (5-16 years) <br> Government $\quad$ Private |  |  |  |
|  |  | 1-9 | 10-99 | 100-200 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 18.7 | 21.4 | 31.2 | 20.8 | 4.6 | 3.4 | 100 | 10.4 | 10.4 | 7.0 | 100 |  |  |  |
| 2 | 9.5 | 21.0 | 19.1 | 28.5 | 16.2 | 5.7 | 100 | 19.4 | 19.3 | 14.0 | 80 |  |  |  |
| 3 | 8.4 | 4.2 | 10.0 | 35.1 | 26.0 | 16.4 | 100 | 31.3 | 31.2 | 23.1 | $\text { ¢ } 60$ | 6062 | 54 | 3 |
| 4 | 7.6 | 0.9 | 2.4 | 15.2 | 34.7 | 39.2 | 100 | 45.3 | 44.8 | 36.3 | 흧 40 |  | 40 |  |
| 5 | 8.9 | 1.3 | 4.6 | 11.0 | 21.1 | 53.0 | 100 | 61.9 | 61.5 | 54.7 | ¢ |  |  |  |
| 6 | 7.1 | 0.2 | 3.1 | 11.7 | 19.6 | 58.3 | 100 | 65.5 | 64.7 | 60.6 |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | 6.0 | 0.2 | 1.8 | 9.5 | 16.4 | 66.0 | 100 | 68.2 | 67.8 | 63.9 |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | 5.0 | 0.8 | 1.8 | 13.5 | 16.0 | 62.8 | 100 | 70.1 | 69.4 | 65.0 |  | Can recognize | Can at | Can at |
| 9 | 2.2 | 4.2 | 5.7 | 7.5 | 14.6 | 65.8 | 100 | 73.2 | 72.7 | 70.1 |  | at least | least do subtraction | least do division |
| 10 | 0.7 | 0.2 | 1.5 | 14.2 | 17.2 | 66.2 | 100 | 75.8 | 75.2 | 72.0 |  | (10-99) |  |  |
| How to | read: 8.0\% | (4.6+3 | )children | of class 1 c | an do subtraction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Children who can do division | Learning levels by gender | Learning levels: Out-of-school |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Arithmetic (5-16 years) | Arithmetic (5-16 years) | Arithmetic (5-16 years) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\left.\begin{array}{c} 100 \\ 80 \end{array}\right]$ | $\left.\begin{array}{r} 100 \\ 80 \end{array}\right]$ | $\begin{array}{r} 100 \\ 80 \end{array}$ | 85 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{array}{ll} \text { 든 } & 60 \\ \text { 흥 } & 40 \end{array} \quad 44$ | 듳 60 <br> 흘  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $20$ | $0$ |  |  | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 |
| 0 Class $3 \quad$ Class $4 \quad$ Class $5 \quad$ Class 6 | Who can at least do subtraction |  | Beginner | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Number } \\ & \text { recognition } \\ & 1-9 \end{aligned}$ | Number recognition $10-99$ 10-99 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Number } \\ & \text { recognition } \\ & 100-200 \end{aligned}$ | Subtraction | Division |

## 3. PARENTAL EDUCATION AND PAID TUITION



## ) KHYBER PAKHTUNKHWA - RURAL

## 4. SCHOOLS: ATTENDANCE,TEACHERS QUALIFICATION,FACILITIES \& GRANTS/FUNDS

| 4.1.Number of surveyed schools by type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Govt. schools |  |  |  | Pvt. schools |  |  |  |
|  | Boys | Girls | Boys \& Girls | Total | Boys | Girls | Boys \& Girls | Total |
| Primary | 236 | 298 | 55 | 589 | 201 | 32 | 3 | 236 |
| Elementary | 4 | 4 | 2 | 10 | 63 | 12 | 1 | 76 |
| High | 5 | 13 | 9 | 27 | 86 | 12 | 2 | 100 |
| Others | 14 | 57 | 8 | 79 | 18 | 5 | 1 | 24 |
| Total | 259 | 372 | 74 | 705 | 368 | 61 | 7 | 436 |


| 4.2. Attendance (\%) on the day of visit |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Govt. schools |  |  |  |  | Pvt. schools |  |  |  |  |
|  | Primary | Elementary | High | Others | Overall | Primary | Elementary | High | Others | Overall |
| Children attendance | 84.2 | 88.2 | 83.7 | 86.9 | 84.7 | 91.6 | 90.5 | 88.7 | 85.5 | 89.6 |
| Teacher attendance | 90.6 | 100.0 | 92.4 | 88.4 | 90.3 | 88.9 | 90.0 | 85.6 | 91.9 | 88.1 |


| 4.3. Teacher qualification (\% of teachers) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| General qualification |  |  | Professional qualification |  |  |
|  | Govt. schools | Pvt. schools |  | Govt.schools | Pvt. schools |
| Matriculation | 2.9 | 3.1 | PTC | 19.5 | 19.0 |
| FA/FSc | 12.9 | 17.9 | CT | 20.2 | 28.4 |
| BA/BSc | 25.6 | 34.0 | B-Ed | 34.9 | 39.3 |
| MA/MSc or above | 58.5 | 44.3 | M-Ed or above | 25.2 | 11.3 |
| Others | 0.1 | 0.6 | Others | 0.2 | 2.0 |


| 4.4. School facilities (\% schools) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Govt.schools |  |  |  | Pvt.schools |  |  |  |
|  | Primary | Elementary | High | Others | Primary | Elementary | High | Others |
| Rooms used for classes (avg.) | 4 | 6 | 9 | 9 | 8 | 11 | 14 | 11 |
| Useable drinking water | 81.7 | 90.0 | 88.9 | 89.9 | 98.5 | 97.4 | 97.0 | 100.0 |
| Useable toilets | 84.6 | 80.0 | 96.3 | 97.5 | 96.2 | 96.1 | 98.0 | 100.0 |
| Separate toilets for girls | 33.6 | 33.3 | 56.5 | 50.0 | 63.8 | 78.9 | 81.0 | 82.6 |
| Playground | 39.1 | 40.0 | 59.3 | 41.0 | 54.5 | 64.0 | 68.0 | 83.3 |
| Boundary wall | 88.3 | 70.0 | 92.6 | 89.7 | 98.5 | 100.0 | 98.0 | 100.0 |
| Electricity Connection | 73.6 | 90.0 | 70.4 | 86.1 | 90.8 | 90.8 | 86.0 | 91.3 |
| Solar panels | 26.9 | 40.0 | 40.7 | 48.1 | 26.7 | 35.5 | 40.0 | 30.4 |
| Smart Boards | - | 12.5 | 26.1 | 14.9 | 24.0 | 26.3 | 37.8 | 13.0 |
| Computer lab | - | 0.0 | 30.4 | 31.5 | 17.7 | 30.3 | 36.7 | 31.8 |
| Internet Connection | 2.4 | 0.0 | 26.1 | 25.7 | 16.0 | 26.3 | 32.3 | 43.5 |
| Useable furniture | 46.7 | 60.0 | 85.2 | 89.7 | 77.9 | 89.5 | 91.9 | 95.5 |



## KHYBER PAKHTUNKHWA - RURAL

| 4.5. Funds/Grants (\% schools) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Govt. schools |  |  |  | Pvt. schools |  |  |  |
|  |  | Primary | Elementary | High | Others | Primary | Elementary | High | Others |
| $\stackrel{\infty}{\stackrel{\infty}{N}}$ | \# of schools reported receiving grants | 344 | 6 | 16 | 58 | 1 | - | - | - |
|  | \% of schools reported receiving grants | 64.1 | 66.7 | 69.6 | 78.4 | 0.4 | - | - | - |
|  | Average amount of grant (Rs.) | 136935.4 | 37088.5 | 135963.1 | 460864.4 | 500.0 | - | - | - |
| $\stackrel{*}{\circ}$ | \# of schools reported receiving grants | 197 | 5 | 4 | 22 | - | - | - | - |
|  | \% of schools reported receiving grants | 36.7 | 55.6 | 17.4 | 29.7 | - | - | - | - |
|  | Average amount of grant (Rs.) | 57631.2 | 44260.0 | 311251.0 | 165543.9 | - | - | - | - |

## 5. DISABILITIES \& FUNCTIONINGS

| 5.1.Schools with Children with Disabilities (by School Type) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Govt. schools (\%) |  |  |  | Pvt.schools (\%) |  |  | Overall (\%) |  |  |
| 35.65 |  |  |  | 22.6 |  |  | 30.65 |  |  |
| 5.2.Children with Disabilities (by School Type) as reported by the Head Teacher/School Incharge |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Govt. schools (\%) |  |  |  | Pvt. Schools (\%) |  |  | Overall (\%) |  |  |
|  | Boys | Girls | Total | Boys | Girls | Total | Boys | Girls | Total |
| Percentage of children with disabilities | 0.37 | 0.11 | 0.49 | 0.49 | 0.11 | 0.61 | 0.41 | 0.11 | 0.53 |
| Number of children with disabilities | 579 | 177 | 756 | 389 | 89 | 478 | 968 | 266 | 1234 |


|  | Govt. schools | Pvt. schools | Overall |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Visual | 9.16 | 8.37 | 2.04 |
| Hearing | 8.37 | 2.04 | 6.59 |
| Physical | 49.00 | 37.76 | 45.85 |
| Intellectual | 7.57 | 3.06 | 6.30 |
| Behavioral | 6.37 | 17.35 | 9.46 |
| Multiple Disabilities (Children with more than one of the aforementioned types of disability) | 14.74 | 11.22 | 13.75 |
| Disability Type not reported | 4.78 | 15.31 | 7.74 |


| 5.4.Facilities for Children with Disabilities (by School Type) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Govt. schools (\%) | Pvt. Schools (\%) | Overall (\%) |
| Ramps | 3.12 | 1.83 | 2.62 |
| Toilets | 10.78 | 15.30 | 12.51 |
| Health Officer | 1.84 | . | 1.14 |
| Other Facilities | 6.67 | 10.50 | 8.14 |

[^21]
## KHYBER PAKHTUNKHWA - RURAL

## Sample Composition

- ASER 2019 survey was conducted in 25 rural districts of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. This covered 14,306 households in 727 villages throughout the province.

Detailed information was collected on 39,342 children (62\% males, 38\% females) aged 3-16 years. Out of these 32,309 children aged 5-16 years were tested for language and arithmetic competencies.

- School information on public and private schools was collected. A total of 705 government schools (84\% primary, 1\% elementary, 4\% high, 11\% others) and 436 private schools (54\% primary, 17\% elementary, $23 \%$ high, $6 \%$ others) were surveyed.
$37 \%$ of the government schools were boys only, 53\% were girls only, and 10\% were coeducation schools. In case of private schools, $84 \%$ were boys only, $14 \%$ were girls only and $2 \%$ were coeducation schools.


## THEME 1: ACCESS

Proportion of out-of-school children has increased when compared to 2018.

- In 2019, 14\% of children were reported to be out-ofschool which has increased as compared to previous year (13\%). 9\% children have never been enrolled in a school and 5\% have dropped out of school for various reasons.

86\% of all school-aged children within the age bracket of 6-16 years were enrolled in schools. Amongst these, $77 \%$ of children were enrolled in government schools whereas $23 \%$ of children were going to non-state institutions (22\% private schools, 1\% Madrassah, 0\% others).

- Amongst the enrolled students in government schools, $33 \%$ were girls and $67 \%$ were boys whereas in private schools $64 \%$ enrolled children were boys and $36 \%$ were girls.
- The percentage of out of school children (girls) has decreased as compared to 2018.

THEME 2: EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION
Proportion of enrolled children has increased in 2019 as compared to 2018.
$35 \%$ of all school-aged children within the age bracket of 3-5 years were enrolled in schools as compared to 30\% in 2018.
$65 \%$ children of age $3-5$ are currently not enrolled in any early childhood program/schooling.

## THEME 3: CLASS WISE LEARNING LEVELS

Learning levels of children are assessed through specific language and arithmetic tools. The same approach is used for all children between the ages of 5 to 16. The literacy assessments are designed to cover up to Class 2 level competencies according to the national curriculum. The arithmetic tool covers up to Class 3 level. For the first time, in 2019, arithmetic tool also covers number recognition from 100-200 along with word problems on addition and multiplication.

Learning levels of children (in class 5 and class 3 ) have decreased:

- $55 \%$ class 5 children could read a class 2 level story in Urdu/Pashto compared to 58\% in 2018.
$19 \%$ of class 3 children could read story in Urdu/Pashto as compared to 27\% in 2018.

English learning levels (in class 5 and class 3) have improved:

- $60 \%$ class 5 children could read sentences (class 2 level) compared to $55 \%$ in 2018.
$21 \%$ class 3 children could read class 2 level sentences as compared to 5\% in 2018.

Arithmetic learning levels (in class 5 and class 3) have decreased:

53\% class 5 children could do two digit division as compared to 69\% in 2018.
$16 \%$ children enrolled in class 3 could do two digit division in 2019 as compared to $42 \%$ in 2018.
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- New questions on time recognition along with word problems on addition and multiplication were also added for the first time. $62 \%$ of children in class 5 could recognize time correctly, $62 \%$ could solve addition word problem and 55\% could solve multiplication word problem.


## THEME 4: LEARNING LEVELS BY SCHOOL TYPE (GOVERNMENT VS PRIVATE)

Children enrolled in private schools are performing better compared to their government counterparts.

59\% children enrolled in class 5 in a private school were able to read at least story in Urdu/Pashto as compared to $54 \%$ class 5 children enrolled in government schools.
$68 \%$ private school children can read at least sentences in class 5 whereas only 59\% government school children can do the same.

54\% children enrolled in private schools (class 5) were able to do division when compared to only $53 \%$ class 5 children who were enrolled in government schools.

## THEME 5: GENDER GAP

Gender gap in learning continues: boys outperform girls (age 5-16 overall) in literacy and numeracy skills.

- $46 \%$ of boys and $34 \%$ of girls could read at least sentences in Urdu/Pashto.
- $57 \%$ boys could read at least English words while $43 \%$ of girls can do the same.
- Similarly, $44 \%$ of boys were able to do at least subtraction whereas only $34 \%$ girls could do it.


## THEME 6: PARENTAL EDUCATION

- $32 \%$ mothers and $57 \%$ fathers in the sampled households had completed at least primary education.

THEME 7: PAIDTUITIONS
Private tuition incidence is greater in private school students. Overall paid tuition students in private schools is $21 \%$ compared to $3 \%$ in government schools.

Children across all classes take private tuition; however, the percentage of students taking tuition varies at different class-level. For example, in government schools, $2 \%$ children enrolled in class 1 take private tuition whereas $4 \%$ children in class 10 take tuition.

## THEME 8: MULTI-GRADE TEACHING

$42 \%$ of surveyed government schools and $13 \%$ of surveyed private schools had Class 2 students sitting with other classes.

- The surveyors were asked to observe if Class 2 and Class 8 were sitting together with any other classes. This is referred to as multi-grade teaching, where one teacher has to teach more than one grade within the allotted time.
- It was found that $42 \%$ of the surveyed government schools and $13 \%$ of the surveyed private schools had Class 2 sitting with other classes.
- $12 \%$ of surveyed government schools and $13 \%$ of surveyed private schools had Class 8 sitting with other classes.


## THEME 9: TEACHER \& STUDENT ABSEENTISM

Student attendance is recorded by taking a headcount of all students present in schools on the day of visit.

- Overall student attendance in surveyed government schools stood at 85\% whereas it was $90 \%$ in surveyed private schools.

Teacher attendance is recorded by referring to the appointed positions in each school and the total number of teachers actually present on the day of survey.

- Overall teacher attendance in surveyed government schools stood at $90 \%$, whereas it was $88 \%$ in surveyed private schools.


## THEME 10: TEACHERS' QUALIFICATION

- $26 \%$ teachers of surveyed government schools have done graduation as compared to $34 \%$ teachers of surveyed private schools.
- 35\% of surveyed government school teachers had Bachelors in Education degrees as compared to 39\% teachers of surveyed private schools.


## THEME 11:SCHOOL FACILITIES

## SURVEYED GOVERNMENT SCHOOLS:

- $30 \%$ of surveyed government high schools had computer labs.
- $85 \%$ of the surveyed government primary schools have toilets.
- $82 \%$ of the surveyed government primary schools have useable drinking water
- Amongst the surveyed government primary schools, $88 \%$ had complete boundary walls
- 39\% of surveyed government primary schools had playgrounds.
- 74\% of surveyed government primary schools had electricity connection.
- On average, 9 rooms were being used for classroom activities in the surveyed government high schools.


## SURVEYED PRIVATE SCHOOLS:

- 37\% of surveyed private high schools had computer labs.
- $96 \%$ of the surveyed private primary schools have toilets.
- $99 \%$ of the surveyed private primary schools have useable drinking water
- 55\% of surveyed private primary schools had playgrounds.
- $91 \%$ of surveyed private primary schools had electricity connection.

On average, 14 rooms were being used for classroom activities in the surveyed private high schools.

## THEME 12: SCHOOL GRANTS/FUNDS

37\% of the government primary schools and 0\% private primary schools received grants.

- 197 surveyed government primary schools were receiving grants in 2019 as compared to 0 surveyed private primary schools.


## THEME 13: DISABILITIES \& FUNCTIONINGS

ASER 2019, as part of the school level survey, included a "Health and Disability" section under which the head teachers/teachers were asked a variety of questions pertaining to Children with Disabilities and Facilities for Children with Disabilities in their respective schools.

In Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, 35.7\% of the surveyed Government Schools were reported to be having Children with Disabilities while $22.6 \%$ of the Private Schools reported the same. In terms of gender, more boys ( $0.37 \%$ of total enrolled boys in government schools and $0.49 \%$ of total enrolled boys in private schools) were reported to be suffering from a disability when compared with girls ( $0.11 \%$ of total enrolled girls in government schools and $0.11 \%$ of total enrolled girls in private schools).

With regards to the types of disability as a percentage of schools with children with disabilities, the highest reported type was Physical (45.9\%) followed by Multiple (13.8\%) and Behavioral (9.5\%).

Moreover, 3.1\% of surveyed government schools and 1.8\% of surveyed private schools had ramps regardless of whether these schools had any child with a disability enrolled in them. Similarly, $10.8 \%$ of surveyed government schools and $15.3 \%$ of surveyed private schools had disability-friendly toilets.

- Amongst the surveyed private primary schools, $99 \%$ had complete boundary walls
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## Information \& Communication Technology

- $69.5 \%$ of households across all rural districts of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa have mobile phones.
- Amongst mobile users, $84.1 \%$ use Whatsapp service for communication.
- Amongst mobile users, 52.7\% use SMS facility for communication.
- $14.9 \%$ of households have computers/laptops


## Alternate Energy

- Across all rural districts of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, $41.3 \%$ of the sampled households use solar panels as an alternate energy resource.


## HOUSEHOLD



## SCHOOLS




## KHYBER

 PAKHTUNKHWA NEWLY MERGED DISTRICTS (RURAL)

## Children in Pre School

(Age 3-5 years)
District wise map showing \% children

\% Children (3-5 years) attending pre school


## Out of School Children

(Age 6-16 years)

District wise map showing \% children

\% Children (6-16 years) who are not in schools


Private Schooling
(Age 6-16 years)
District wise map showing \% children

\% Children (6-16 years) enrolled in private schools


Reading Language Urdu/Pashto
(Class 5)

District wise map showing \% children who can read story (Class 2 level text)

\% Children in class 5 who can read story


## Reading English

(Class 5)
District wise map showing \% children who can read sentences (Class 2 level text)

\% Children in class 5 who can read sentences


## Arithmetic

(Class 5)
District wise map showing \% children who can do division (Class 3 ) sums

\% Children in class 5 who can do division
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## 1. ACCESS

1.1. School enrollment and out-of-school children

| \% Children in different types of schools |  |  |  |  | \% Out-of-school |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age group | Govt. | Non-state providers |  |  | Never enrolled | Drop-out |  |
|  |  | Pvt. | Madrasah | NFE/Others |  |  |  |
| 6-10 | 64.4 | 9.9 | 1.7 | 0.1 | 20.9 | 2.9 | 100 |
| 11-13 | 53.8 | 12.8 | 0.7 | 0.1 | 14.4 | 18.2 | 100 |
| 14-16 | 41.4 | 18.3 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 21.3 | 18.5 | 100 |
| 6-16 | 60.6 | 11.1 | 1.4 | 0.1 | 19.7 | 7.1 | 100 |
| Total | 73.2 |  |  |  | 26.8 |  | 100 |
| By Type | 82.8 | 15.2 | 1.9 | 0.1 |  |  |  |

How to read: $76.1 \%(64.4+9.9+1.7+0.1)$ children of age group 6-10 are enrolled




| Age Class Composition |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age / <br> Class | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Total |
| 1 | 85.8 | 72.3 | 55.8 | 8.2 | 4.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11.5 |
| 2 | 14.2 | 27.7 | 39.6 | 47.7 | 11.3 | 7.7 | 10.6 | 28.5 |  |  |  |  | 11.3 |
| 3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.5 | 38.9 | 61.6 | 12.9 |  | 5 | 19.0 | 3 |  |  | 10.1 |
| 4 |  |  | 0.0 | 4.1 | 19.6 | 57.9 | 9.2 |  |  | 8.3 | 0.0 | 0 | 10.3 |
| 5 |  |  | 0.0 | 1.0 | 2.4 | 18.8 | 68.6 | 24.7 |  |  |  | 11.0 | 12.9 |
| 6 |  |  |  | 0.0 | 0.6 | 2.4 | 9.5 | 27.8 | 23.7 |  |  |  | 10.5 |
| 7 |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 | 0.3 | 1.7 | 13.7 | 35.2 | 18.6 |  |  | 8.7 |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.0 | 0.4 | 5.3 | 19.5 | 29.8 | 29.2 |  | 10.5 |
| 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.6 | 20.8 | 47.5 | 27.3 | 7.5 |
| 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.5 | 23.3 | 61.3 | 6.7 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

### 1.2. Early years schooling (Pre-schooling)
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## 2. QUALITY

2.1. Learning levels (Urdu/Pashto)

| Class-wise \% children |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Class | Nothing | Letters | Words | Sentences | Story | Total |  |
| 1 | 17.3 | 37.2 | 41.9 | 3.3 | 0.2 | 100 |  |
| 2 | 8.3 | 28.0 | 38.0 | 19.5 | 6.2 | 100 |  |
| 3 | 7.1 | 6.0 | 38.8 | 32.5 | 15.5 | 100 |  |
| 4 | 9.5 | 4.1 | 14.7 | 39.1 | 32.7 | 100 |  |
| 5 | 8.4 | 2.2 | 8.3 | 27.9 | 53.2 | 100 |  |
| 6 | 5.7 | 3.7 | 10.3 | 26.8 | 53.5 | 100 |  |
| 7 | 4.9 | 3.0 | 7.5 | 13.8 | 70.9 | 100 |  |
| 8 | 4.6 | 2.7 | 7.3 | 11.5 | 73.9 | 100 |  |
| 9 | 4.2 | 2.1 | 3.1 | 5.7 | 84.9 | 100 |  |
| 10 | 3.2 | 2.4 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 86.4 | 100 |  |
| How to read: $3.5 \%(3.3+0.2)$ children of class 1 can read sentences |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |





Who can read at least sentences

2.2. Learning levels (English)

| Class-wise \% children |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Wlass | Nothing can read |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Capital | Small | Words | Sentences | Total |
| 1 | 16.8 | 22.3 | 49.8 | 9.7 | 1.4 | 100 |
| 2 | 9.3 | 27.6 | 27.8 | 31.4 | 3.8 | 100 |
| 3 | 9.1 | 11.3 | 16.8 | 57.0 | 5.9 | 100 |
| 4 | 9.5 | 3.8 | 7.3 | 59.8 | 19.6 | 100 |
| 5 | 9.5 | 2.7 | 7.1 | 42.1 | 38.6 | 100 |
| 6 | 12.6 | 1.9 | 9.1 | 17.2 | 59.2 | 100 |
| 7 | 13.5 | 0.7 | 2.1 | 14.5 | 69.1 | 100 |
| 8 | 10.6 | 1.4 | 6.0 | 12.1 | 69.9 | 100 |
| 9 | 13.8 | 0.7 | 3.9 | 5.9 | 75.7 | 100 |
| 10 | 15.7 | 1.5 | 2.2 | 6.0 | 74.6 | 100 |
| How to read: $11.1 \%(9.7+1.4)$ children of class 1 can read words |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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### 2.3. Learning levels (Arithmetic)

| Class-wise \% children |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Who can do |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Class | Nothing | Number recognition |  |  | Subtraction (2 digits) | Division (2 digits) | Total |
|  |  | 1-9 | 10-99 | 100-200 |  |  |  |
| 1 | 14.1 | 14.0 | 25.6 | 27.6 | 17.6 | 1.2 | 100 |
| 2 | 8.8 | 16.8 | 17.2 | 18.6 | 17.7 | 20.9 | 100 |
| 3 | 9.7 | 4.1 | 12.9 | 11.5 | 23.9 | 38.0 | 100 |
| 4 | 10.6 | 4.7 | 8.0 | 8.5 | 11.8 | 56.5 | 100 |
| 5 | 8.4 | 1.4 | 3.8 | 5.8 | 19.3 | 61.3 | 100 |
| 6 | 5.5 | 2.7 | 5.3 | 7.5 | 16.9 | 62.2 | 100 |
| 7 | 7.8 | 1.9 | 1.6 | 1.9 | 14.8 | 72.0 | 100 |
| 8 | 11.4 | 0.4 | 3.2 | 9.6 | 12.5 | 62.9 | 100 |
| 9 | 16.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.3 | 11.5 | 67.0 | 100 |
| 10 | 15.6 | 0.8 | 2.3 | 7.0 | 12.5 | 61.7 | 100 |


| Who can do word problems <br> Time <br> recognition |  | Word <br> problem 1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4.0 | 4.1 | Word <br> problem 2 |
| 13.1 | 13.1 | 8.5 |
| 36.2 | 50.1 | 35.2 |
| 54.2 | 74.9 | 60.5 |
| 65.9 | 72.8 | 63.5 |
| 65.5 | 67.2 | 57.6 |
| 72.0 | 76.7 | 62.6 |
| 71.4 | 72.1 | 57.9 |
| 69.9 | 71.8 | 61.2 |
| 67.2 | 75.0 | 64.8 |



How to read: $18.8 \%$ ( $17.6+1.2$ )children of class 1 can do subtraction
*Words problems are asked from all children of age 5-16 years


## 3. PARENTAL EDUCATION AND PAID TUITION

| Class-wise \% children attending paid tuition |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Type | 1 | II | III | IV | V | VI | VII | VIII | IX | X |
| Govt. | 1.0 | 1.5 | 1.7 | 1.4 | 1.9 | 7.0 | 4.6 | 6.1 | 9.6 | 8.6 |
| Pvt. | 19.6 | 42.2 | 38.1 | 39.5 | 40.1 | 37.6 | 46.3 | 43.0 | 27.9 | 48.1 |



| Children attending paid tuition |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Children attending paid tuition |  |  |  |
| ■ Government schools ■ Private schools |  |  |  |
| 100 |  |  |  |
|  | 35 | 28 | 35 |
| 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
|  | 2016 | 2018 | 2019 |

## 4. SCHOOLS: ATTENDANCE,TEACHERS QUALIFICATION,FACILITIES \& GRANTS/FUNDS

| 4.1.Number of surveyed schools by type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Govt. schools |  |  |  | Pvt. schools |  |  |  |
|  | Boys | Girls | Boys \& Girls | Total | Boys | Girls | Boys \& Girls | Total |
| Primary | 30 | 193 | 41 | 264 | 47 | 7 | 0 | 54 |
| Elementary | 4 | 14 | 7 | 25 | 7 | 5 | 1 | 13 |
| High | 0 | 11 | 9 | 20 | 15 | 7 | 0 | 22 |
| Others | 0 | 5 | 4 | 9 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| Total | 34 | 223 | 61 | 318 | 70 | 20 | 1 | 91 |


| 4.2. Attendance (\%) on the day of visit |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Govt. schools |  |  |  |  | Pvt. schools |  |  |  |  |
|  | Primary | Elementary | High | Others | Overall | Primary | Elementary | High | Others | Overall |
| Children attendance | 80.9 | 73.8 | 84.1 | 85.8 | 80.7 | 95.0 | 91.3 | 74.6 | 93.6 | 82.5 |
| Teacher attendance | 91.5 | 92.0 | 94.8 | 81.7 | 91.2 | 94.2 | 98.3 | 95.9 | 100.0 | 96.0 |


| 4.3. Teacher qualification (\% of teachers) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| General qualification |  |  | Professional qualification |  |  |
|  | Govt. schools | Pvt. schools |  | Govt.schools | Pvt. schools |
| Matriculation | 4.1 | 4.5 | PTC | 19.7 | 22.2 |
| FA/FSc | 23.3 | 23.8 | CT | 32.5 | 31.5 |
| BA/BSc | 34.1 | 35.7 | B-Ed | 28.9 | 30.0 |
| MA/MSc or above | 38.5 | 36.1 | M-Ed or above | 19.0 | 6.6 |
| Others | 0.0 | 0.0 | Others | 0.0 | 9.7 |


| 4.4. School facilities (\% schools) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Govt.schools |  |  |  | Pvt.schools |  |  |  |
|  | Primary | Elementary | High | Others | Primary | Elementary | High | Others |
| Rooms used for classes (avg.) | 3 | 6 | 9 | 8 | 8 | 11 | 13 | 11 |
| Useable drinking water | 62.6 | 62.5 | 63.2 | 44.4 | 100.0 | 84.6 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Useable toilets | 64.2 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 77.8 | 86.7 | 84.6 | 95.5 | 50.0 |
| Separate toilets for girls | 10.7 | 22.7 | 17.6 | 25.0 | 28.6 | 46.2 | 63.2 | 0.0 |
| Playground | 43.1 | 33.3 | 70.0 | 50.0 | 66.7 | 61.5 | 90.5 | 0.0 |
| Boundary wall | 87.7 | 83.3 | 90.0 | 66.7 | 93.3 | 84.6 | 100.0 | 50.0 |
| Electricity Connection | 51.0 | 45.8 | 50.0 | 55.6 | 66.7 | 76.9 | 95.5 | 50.0 |
| Solar panels | 8.8 | 8.3 | 20.0 | 22.2 | 53.3 | 61.5 | 59.1 | 50.0 |
| Smart Boards | - | 8.3 | 10.0 | 33.3 | 26.7 | 18.2 | 18.2 | 50.0 |
| Computer lab | - | 0.0 | 9.1 | 16.7 | 6.7 | 0.0 | 27.3 | 0.0 |
| Internet Connection | 1.4 | 0.0 | 18.2 | 33.3 | 13.3 | 9.1 | 9.5 | 0.0 |
| Useable furniture | 13.8 | 30.4 | 35.0 | 22.2 | 66.7 | 66.7 | 86.4 | 50.0 |
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| 4.5. Funds/Grants (\% schools) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Govt. schools |  |  |  | Pvt. schools |  |  |  |
|  |  | Primary | Elementary | High | Others | Primary | Elementary | High | Others |
| $\stackrel{\infty}{\stackrel{\infty}{N}}$ | \# of schools reported receiving grants | 82 | 5 | 2 | 4 | - | - | 1 | - |
|  | \% of schools reported receiving grants | 40.8 | 29.4 | 13.3 | 44.4 | - | - | 4.5 | - |
|  | Average amount of grant (Rs.) | 84850.0 | 47400.0 | 149000.0 | 59500.0 | - | - | 100000.0 | - |
| $\stackrel{*}{\circ}$ | \# of schools reported receiving grants | 13 | 1 | - | 4 | - | - | - | - |
|  | \% of schools reported receiving grants | 6.5 | 5.9 | - | 44.4 | - | - | - | - |
|  | Average amount of grant (Rs.) | 35261.5 | 6200.0 | - | 38800.0 | - | - | - | - |

## 5. DISABILITIES \& FUNCTIONINGS

| 5.1.Schools with Children with Disabilities (by School Type) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Govt. schools (\%) |  |  |  | Pvt.schools (\%) |  |  | Overall (\%) |  |  |
| 22.96 |  |  |  | 26.37 |  |  | 23.72 |  |  |
| 5.2.Children with Disabilities (by School Type) as reported by the Head Teacher/School Incharge |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Govt. schools (\%) |  |  |  | Pvt. Schools (\%) |  |  |  | rall (\%) |  |
|  | Boys | Girls | Total | Boys | Girls | Total | Boys | Girls | Total |
| Percentage of children with disabilities | 0.28 | 0.07 | 0.35 | 0.33 | 0.25 | 0.57 | 0.30 | 0.12 | 0.42 |
| Number of children with disabilities | 134 | 33 | 167 | 69 | 52 | 121 | 203 | 85 | 288 |


|  | Govt. schools | Pvt. schools | Overall |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Visual | 10.96 | 4.17 | 9.28 |
| Hearing | 5.48 | 0.00 | 4.12 |
| Physical | 50.68 | 33.30 | 46.39 |
| Intellectual | 5.48 | 4.17 | 5.15 |
| Behavioral | 12.33 | 29.17 | 16.49 |
| Multiple Disabilities (Children with more than one of the aforementioned types of disability) | 6.85 | 12.50 | 8.25 |
| Disability Type not reported | 8.22 | 16.67 | 10.31 |
|  |  |  |  |
| 5.4.Facilities for Children with Disabilities (by School Type) |  |  |  |
|  | Govt. schools (\%) | Pvt. Schools (\%) | Overall (\%) |
| Ramps | 0.94 | 3.30 | 1.47 |
| Toilets | 2.52 | 8.79 | 3.91 |
| Health Officer | 0.31 | 0.00 | 0.24 |
| Other Facilities | 2.20 | 4.40 | 2.69 |

"-", "0" represents insufficient data , *grants received till November 15,2019
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## Sample Composition

- ASER 2019 survey was conducted in 13 rural districts of KP-Newly Merged Districts. This covered 7,686 households in 385 villages throughout the province.

Detailed information was collected on 22,959 children ( $61 \%$ males, $39 \%$ females) aged 3-16 years. Out of these 15,464 children aged 5-16 years were tested for language and arithmetic competencies.

School information on public and private schools was collected. A total of 318 government schools (83\% primary, 8\% elementary, 6\% high, 3\% others) and 91 private schools (59\% primary, 14\% elementary, $25 \%$ high, $2 \%$ others) were surveyed.
$11 \%$ of the government schools were boys only, 70\% were girls only, and 19\% were coeducation schools. In case of private schools, $77 \%$ were boys only, $22 \%$ were girls only and $1 \%$ were coeducation schools.

## THEME 1: ACCESS

Proportion of out-of-school children has decreased when compared to 2018.

- In 2019, 27\% of children were reported to be out-ofschool which has increased as compared to previous year (28\%). 20\% children have never been enrolled in a school and 7\% have dropped out of school for various reasons.
$73 \%$ of all school-aged children within the age bracket of 6-16 years were enrolled in schools. Amongst these, $83 \%$ of children were enrolled in government schools whereas $17 \%$ of children were going to non-state institutions (15\% private schools, 2\% Madrassah, 0\% others).
- Amongst the enrolled students in government schools, $32 \%$ were girls and $68 \%$ were boys whereas in private schools $80 \%$ enrolled children were boys and $20 \%$ were girls.
- The percentage of out of school children (boys and girls) has decreased as compared to 2018.

THEME 2: EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION
Proportion of enrolled children has decreased in 2019 as compared to 2018.
$21 \%$ of all school-aged children within the age bracket of 3-5 years were enrolled in schools as compared to 23\% in 2018.
$79 \%$ children of age 3-5 are currently not enrolled in any early childhood program/schooling.

## THEME 3: CLASS WISE LEARNING LEVELS

Learning levels of children are assessed through specific language and arithmetic tools. The same approach is used for all children between the ages of 5 to 16. The literacy assessments are designed to cover up to Class 2 level competencies according to the national curriculum. The arithmetic tool covers up to Class 3 level. For the first time, in 2019, arithmetic tool also covers number recognition from 100-200 along with word problems on addition and multiplication.

Learning levels of children (in class 5 and class 3) have improved:

- $53 \%$ class 5 children could read a class 2 level story in Urdu/Pashto compared to 46\% in 2018.
- $16 \%$ of class 3 children could read story in Urdu/Pashto as compared to $15 \%$ in 2018.

English learning levels (in class 5 and class 3) have improved:

- $39 \%$ class 5 children could read sentences (class 2 level) compared to $36 \%$ in 2018.
$6 \%$ class 3 children could read class 2 level sentences as compared to 4\% in 2018.

Arithmetic learning levels (in class 5 and class 3) remains the same as previous year:
$61 \%$ class 5 children could do two digit division stands the same as in 2018 (61\%).
$38 \%$ children enrolled in class 3 could do two digit division stands the same as in 2018 (38\%).
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- New questions on time recognition along with word problems on addition and multiplication were also added for the first time. $66 \%$ of children in class 5 could recognize time correctly, $73 \%$ could solve addition word problem and 64\% could solve multiplication word problem.


## THEME 4: LEARNING LEVELS BY SCHOOL TYPE (GOVERNMENT VS PRIVATE)

Children enrolled in government schools are performing better compared to their private counterparts.

54\% children enrolled in class 5 in a private school were able to read at least story in Urdu/Pashto as compared to $48 \%$ class 5 children enrolled in government schools.

40\% private school children can read at least sentences in class 5 whereas only $30 \%$ government school children can do the same.
$62 \%$ children enrolled in government schools (class 5) were able to do division when compared to only $59 \%$ class 5 children who were enrolled in private schools.

## THEME 5: GENDER GAP

Gender gap in learning continues: boys outperform girls (age 5-16 overall) in literacy and numeracy skills.

- $37 \%$ of boys and $19 \%$ of girls could read at least sentences in Urdu/Pashto.
- $40 \%$ boys could read at least English words while $21 \%$ of girls can do the same.

Similarly, $39 \%$ of boys were able to do at least subtraction whereas only $20 \%$ girls could do it.

## THEME 6: PARENTAL EDUCATION

$15 \%$ mothers and $50 \%$ fathers in the sampled households had completed at least primary education.

THEME 7: PAIDTUITIONS
Private tuition incidence is greater in private school students. Overall paid tuition students in private schools is 35\% compared to 2\% in government schools.

Children across all classes take private tuition; however, the percentage of students taking tuition varies at different class-level. For example, in government schools, $1 \%$ children enrolled in class 1 take private tuition whereas $9 \%$ children in class 10 take tuition.

## THEME 8: MULTI-GRADE TEACHING

$38 \%$ of surveyed government schools and $15 \%$ of surveyed private schools had Class 2 students sitting with other classes.

- The surveyors were asked to observe if Class 2 and Class 8 were sitting together with any other classes. This is referred to as multi-grade teaching, where one teacher has to teach more than one grade within the allotted time.
- It was found that $38 \%$ of the surveyed government schools and $15 \%$ of the surveyed private schools had Class 2 sitting with other classes.
- $16 \%$ of surveyed government schools and $15 \%$ of surveyed private schools had Class 8 sitting with other classes.


## THEME 9: TEACHER \& STUDENT ABSEENTISM

Student attendance is recorded by taking a headcount of all students present in schools on the day of visit.

- Overall student attendance in surveyed government schools stood at 81\% whereas it was 83\% in surveyed private schools.

Teacher attendance is recorded by referring to the appointed positions in each school and the total number of teachers actually present on the day of survey.

- Overall teacher attendance in surveyed government schools stood at 91\%, whereas it was $96 \%$ in surveyed private schools.
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## THEME 10: TEACHERS' QUALIFICATION

- $34 \%$ teachers of surveyed government schools have done graduation as compared to $36 \%$ teachers of surveyed private schools.
- $29 \%$ of surveyed government school teachers had Bachelors in Education degrees as compared to 30\% teachers of surveyed private schools.


## THEME 11:SCHOOL FACILITIES

## SURVEYED GOVERNMENT SCHOOLS:

- $9 \%$ of surveyed government high schools had computer labs.
- $64 \%$ of the surveyed government primary schools have toilets.
- $63 \%$ of the surveyed government primary schools have useable drinking water
- Amongst the surveyed government primary schools, $88 \%$ had complete boundary walls
- $43 \%$ of surveyed government primary schools had playgrounds.
- $51 \%$ of surveyed government primary schools had electricity connection.
- On average, 9 rooms were being used for classroom activities in the surveyed government high schools.


## SURVEYED PRIVATE SCHOOLS:

- $27 \%$ of surveyed private high schools had computer labs.
- $87 \%$ of the surveyed private primary schools have toilets.
- $100 \%$ of the surveyed private primary schools have useable drinking water

Amongst the surveyed private primary schools, $93 \%$ had complete boundary walls

- $67 \%$ of surveyed private primary schools had playgrounds.
- $67 \%$ of surveyed private primary schools had electricity connection.
- On average, 13 rooms were being used for classroom activities in the surveyed private high schools.


## THEME 12: SCHOOL GRANTS/FUNDS

7\% of the government primary schools and 0\% private primary schools received grants.

- 13 surveyed government primary schools were receiving grants in 2019 as compared to 0 surveyed private primary schools.


## THEME 13: DISABILITIES \& FUNCTIONINGS

ASER 2019, as part of the school level survey, included a "Health and Disability" section under which the head teachers/teachers were asked a variety of questions pertaining to Children with Disabilities and Facilities for Children with Disabilities in their respective schools.

In KP-Newly Merged Districts, 22.9\% of the surveyed government schools were reported to be having children with disabilities while $26.4 \%$ of the private schools reported the same. in terms of gender, more boys ( $0.28 \%$ of total enrolled boys in government schools and $0.33 \%$ of total enrolled boys in private schools) were reported to be suffering from a disability when compared with girls ( $0.07 \%$ of total enrolled girls in government schools and $0.25 \%$ of total enrolled girls in private schools).

With regards to the types of disability as a percentage of schools with children with disabilities, the highest reported type was Physical (46.4\%) followed by Behavioral (16.5\%) and Visual (9.5\%).

Moreover, $0.9 \%$ of government schools and $3.3 \%$ of the private schools had ramps regardless of whether these schools had any child with a disability enrolled in them. Similarly, $2.5 \%$ of the government schools and $8.8 \%$ of the private schools had disability-friendly toilets.

## Information \& Communication Technology

- 70.9\% of households across all rural districts of KP-Newly Merged Districts have mobile phones.
- Amongst mobile users, $47.7 \%$ use SMS facility for communication.
- 9.4\% of households have computers/laptops


## Alternate Energy

- Across all rural districts of KP-Newly Merged Districts, $65.3 \%$ of the sampled households use solar panels as an alternate energy resource.


## HOUSEHOLD



## SCHOOLS




## PUNJAB (RURAL)



Children in Pre School
(Age 3-5 years)
District wise map showing \% children

\% Children (3-5 years)
attending pre school

|  | Below 30 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $30-40$ |  |
|  | $41-50$ |
|  | $51-60$ |
|  | $61-70$ |
|  | Above 70 |

Out of School Children
(Age 6-16 years)

District wise map showing \% children

*The whole district of Lahore has been declared as an urban district. Therefore, only urban survey was conducted in Lahore.

Private Schooling
(Age 6-16 years)

District wise map showing \% children

\% Children (6-16 years)
enrolled in private schools

|  | $1-5$ |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | $6-10$ |
| $11-20$ |  |
| $21-30$ |  |
| $31-40$ |  |
|  | Above 40 |

Reading Language Urdu
(Class 5)
District wise map showing \% children who can read story (Class 2 level text)

\% Children in class 5
who can read story

*The whole district of Lahore has been declared as an urban district. Therefore, only urban survey was conducted in Lahore.

## Reading English

(Class 5)
District wise map showing \% children who can read sentences (Class 2 level text)

\% Children in class 5 who can read sentences


## Arithmetic

## (Class 5)

District wise map showing \% children who can do division (Class 3) sums

*The whole district of Lahore has been declared as an urban district. Therefore, only urban survey was conducted in Lahore.

## PUNJAB - RURAL

1. ACCESS
1.1. School enrollment and out-of-school children

| \% Children in different types of schools |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \% Out-of-school |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age group | Govt. | Non-state providers |  |  | Never <br> enrolled | Drop-out | Total |  |  |  |
|  | Pvt. | Madrasah | NFE/Others |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $6-10$ | 65.6 | 27.7 | 0.5 | 0.8 | 3.9 | 1.5 | 100 |  |  |  |
| $11-13$ | 69.7 | 20.8 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 3.6 | 4.5 | 100 |  |  |  |
| $14-16$ | 61.5 | 16.2 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 6.4 | 14.7 | 100 |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{6 - 1 6}$ | 65.7 | 23.7 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 4.4 | 4.9 | 100 |  |  |  |
| Total | $\mathbf{9 0 . 7}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| By Type | 72.4 | 26.1 | 0.7 | 0.7 |  | $\mathbf{9 . 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |  |  |  |
| How to read: $94.6 \%(65.6+27.7+0.5+0.8) ~ c h i l d r e n ~ o f ~ a g e ~ g r o u p ~ 6-10 ~ a r e ~ e n r o l l e d ~$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Enrollment by gender and type of school




| Age Class Composition |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age / Class | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Total |
| 1 | 79.7 | 59.7 | 31.8 | 10.8 | 4.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11.5 |
| 2 | 20.3 | 39.8 | 43.2 | 26.7 | 11.6 | 4.3 | 9.1 | 10.2 |  |  |  |  | 11.3 |
| 3 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 24.8 | 37.2 | 29.4 | 11.4 |  |  | 9.7 |  |  |  | 10.1 |
| 4 |  | 0.0 | 0.2 | 19.7 | 34.4 | 28.3 | 14.1 |  |  | 11.1 | 0.0 | 8.0 | 10.3 |
| 5 |  |  | 0.0 | 5.6 | 16.8 | 37.9 | 32.6 | 20.4 |  |  |  | 8.0 | 12.9 |
| 6 |  |  |  | 0.0 | 3.5 | 13.3 | 29.6 | 31.1 | 15.6 |  |  |  | 10.5 |
| 7 |  |  |  |  | 0.0 | 4.7 | 10.8 | 26.3 | 30.6 | 17.3 |  |  | 8.7 |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.0 | 3.8 | 12.0 | 34.5 | 36.7 | 22.8 |  | 10.5 |
| 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 9.6 | 27.8 | 38.7 | 26.2 | 7.5 |
| 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 7.0 | 38.4 | 65.3 | 6.7 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

### 1.2. Early years schooling (Pre-schooling)

| \% Children who attend different types of pre-schools |  |  |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age group | Govt. | Non-state providers |  |  | Out-of-school |  |
|  |  | Pvt. | Madrasah | NFE/Others |  |  |
| 3 | 5.9 | 6.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 88.1 | 100 |
| 4 | 19.5 | 31.9 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 48.4 | 100 |
| 5 | 41.3 | 46.4 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 11.6 | 100 |
| 3-5 | 23.1 | 28.7 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 48.0 | 100 |
| Total | 52.0 |  |  |  | 48.0 | 100 |
| By Type | 44.3 | 55.1 | 0.1 | 0.5 |  |  |
| How to read: $11.9 \%(5.9+6.0+0.0+0.0)$ children of age 3 are enrolled |  |  |  |  |  |  |



## PUNJAB - RURAL

## 2. QUALITY

2.1. Learning levels (Urdu)

| Class-wise \% children |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Class | Nothing | Letters | Words | Sentences | Story | Total |  |
| 1 | 24.8 | 34.7 | 28.7 | 6.9 | 4.8 | 100 |  |
| 2 | 10.7 | 18.8 | 37.9 | 18.6 | 14.1 | 100 |  |
| 3 | 8.1 | 6.8 | 26.9 | 28.7 | 29.4 | 100 |  |
| 4 | 7.1 | 3.2 | 13.8 | 23.6 | 52.2 | 100 |  |
| 5 | 3.7 | 1.4 | 5.9 | 13.8 | 75.2 | 100 |  |
| 6 | 6.4 | 1.1 | 3.3 | 7.9 | 81.3 | 100 |  |
| 7 | 4.4 | 0.6 | 2.1 | 4.5 | 88.4 | 100 |  |
| 8 | 2.7 | 0.4 | 1.1 | 3.5 | 92.3 | 100 |  |
| 9 | 2.2 | 0.4 | 0.8 | 1.6 | 95.0 | 100 |  |
| 10 | 0.7 | 0.5 | 0.7 | 1.2 | 96.8 | 100 |  |
| How to read: $11.7 \%(6.9+4.8)$ children of class 1 can read sentences |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |





Who can read at least sentences

2.2. Learning levels (English)

| Class-wise \% children |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Who can read |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Nothing | Letters |  | Words | Sentences | Total |
|  |  | Capital | Small |  |  |  |
| 1 | 28.3 | 22.7 | 28.8 | 15.9 | 4.3 | 100 |
| 2 | 13.0 | 13.3 | 27.4 | 32.0 | 14.3 | 100 |
| 3 | 11.3 | 5.3 | 19.1 | 33.2 | 31.1 | 100 |
| 4 | 8.7 | 2.7 | 10.7 | 29.1 | 48.8 | 100 |
| 5 | 4.7 | 1.1 | 5.2 | 18.0 | 71.0 | 100 |
| 6 | 7.5 | 1.0 | 1.9 | 12.1 | 77.5 | 100 |
| 7 | 5.0 | 0.5 | 3.5 | 7.9 | 83.1 | 100 |
| 8 | 2.8 | 0.2 | 1.3 | 9.6 | 86.1 | 100 |
| 9 | 3.1 | 0.3 | 2.5 | 6.2 | 87.9 | 100 |
| 10 | 7.7 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 3.2 | 88.2 | 100 |
| How to read: $20.2 \%(15.9+4.3)$ | children of class 1 can read words |  |  |  |  |  |





## PUNJAB - RURAL

### 2.3. Learning levels (Arithmetic)

| Class-wise \% children |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Who can do |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | *Who can do word problems |  |  | Learning levels by school type |  |  |  |
| Class | Nothing | Number recognition |  |  | Subtraction (2 digits) | Division <br> (2 digits) | Total | Time recognition | Word problem 1 | Word problem 2 | Arithmetic (5-16 years) <br> ■ Government ■ Private |  |  |  |
|  |  | 1-9 | 10-99 | 100-200 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 25.7 | 21.6 | 25.7 | 18.1 | 5.3 | 3.7 | 100 | 12.5 | 12.2 | 9.9 | 100 |  |  |  |
| 2 | 11.1 | 9.3 | 21.2 | 31.0 | 16.4 | 11.0 | 100 | 24.5 | 24.3 | 20.7 | 80 |  |  | 8282 |
| 3 | 7.4 | 3.8 | 12.0 | 24.2 | 27.1 | 25.5 | 100 | 40.9 | 40.6 | 35.3 |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | 2.8 | 0.8 | 2.4 | 16.5 | 13.2 | 64.3 | 100 | 56.2 | 55.8 | 51.6 | ᄃ 40 |  | 52 |  |
| 5 | 1.3 | 0.9 | 2.1 | 2.4 | 11.9 | 81.5 | 100 | 74.3 | 74.1 | 68.3 |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | 6.0 | 0.5 | 1.3 | 5.3 | 13.4 | 73.5 | 100 | 76.8 | 76.6 | 73.4 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C} \\ & \stackrel{\circ}{\circ} \mathrm{O} \end{aligned} 20$ |  |  |  |
| 7 | 4.3 | 0.1 | 1.3 | 4.4 | 11.0 | 79.0 | 100 | 81.3 | 81.1 | 77.7 |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | 2.7 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 5.8 | 23.8 | 66.8 | 100 | 84.6 | 84.4 | 80.7 |  | Class 1: <br> Can recognize | Class 3: Can at | Class 5: Can at |
| 9 | 2.5 | 0.7 | 1.1 | 2.4 | 21.7 | 71.7 | 100 | 84.1 | 83.5 | 82.2 |  | at least numbers | least do subtraction | least do division |
| 10 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 1.3 | 1.5 | 23.2 | 73.0 | 100 | 90.4 | 90.2 | 87.6 |  |  |  |  |
| How to read: $9.0 \%$ (5.3+3.7)children of class 1 can do subtraction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

*Words problems are asked from all children of age $5-16$ years


## 3. PARENTAL EDUCATION AND PAID TUITION

| Class-wise \% children attending paid tuition |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Type | 1 | II | III | IV | V | VI | VII | VIII | IX | X |
| Govt. | 13.4 | 14.4 | 17.5 | 17.9 | 19.1 | 22.2 | 21.7 | 22.0 | 24.2 | 28.1 |
| Pvt. | 29.3 | 33.9 | 34.9 | 37.3 | 38.2 | 40.2 | 39.3 | 36.9 | 43.6 | 43.0 |




## 4. SCHOOLS: ATTENDANCE,TEACHERS QUALIFICATION,FACILITIES \& GRANTS/FUNDS

| 4.1.Number of surveyed schools by type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Govt. schools |  |  |  | Pvt. schools |  |  |  |
|  | Boys | Girls | Boys \& Girls | Total | Boys | Girls | Boys \& Girls | Total |
| Primary | 242 | 135 | 129 | 506 | 277 | 14 | 2 | 293 |
| Elementary | 63 | 80 | 76 | 219 | 150 | 15 | 7 | 172 |
| High | 47 | 98 | 103 | 248 | 102 | 3 | 5 | 110 |
| Others | 10 | 27 | 17 | 54 | 16 | 1 | 2 | 19 |
| Total | 362 | 340 | 325 | 1027 | 545 | 33 | 16 | 594 |


| 4.2. Attendance (\%) on the day of visit |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Govt. schools |  |  |  |  | Pvt. schools |  |  |  |  |
|  | Primary | Elementary | High | Others | Overall | Primary | Elementary | High | Others | Overall |
| Children attendance | 83.2 | 86.4 | 87.4 | 85.2 | 85.9 | 89.3 | 89.6 | 90.7 | 93.2 | 90.1 |
| Teacher attendance | 89.3 | 88.7 | 85.2 | 91.1 | 88.6 | 84.1 | 92.0 | 91.8 | 89.7 | 89.6 |


| 4.3. Teacher qualification (\% of teachers) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| General qualification |  |  | Professional qualification |  |  |
|  | Govt. schools | Pvt. schools |  | Govt.schools | Pvt. schools |
| Matriculation | 4.9 | 7.2 | PTC | 6.6 | 5.5 |
| FA/FSc | 6.8 | 25.1 | CT | 9.9 | 6.6 |
| BA/BSc | 26.3 | 39.8 | B-Ed | 51.8 | 63.3 |
| MA/MSc or above | 61.7 | 27.8 | M-Ed or above | 31.6 | 22.5 |
| Others | 0.3 | 0.2 | Others | 0.2 | 2.1 |


| 4.4. School facilities (\% schools) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Govt.schools |  |  |  | Pvt.schools |  |  |  |
|  | Primary | Elementary | High | Others | Primary | Elementary | High | Others |
| Rooms used for classes (avg.) | 5 | 8 | 12 | 12 | 5 | 8 | 13 | 12 |
| Useable drinking water | 95.4 | 96.7 | 96.8 | 92.6 | 94.5 | 96.5 | 95.3 | 100.0 |
| Useable toilets | 94.2 | 96.3 | 94.7 | 87.0 | 88.9 | 95.3 | 96.2 | 100.0 |
| Separate toilets for girls | 54.0 | 62.7 | 59.5 | 47.1 | 45.5 | 70.8 | 80.0 | 73.7 |
| Playground | 67.1 | 77.8 | 78.1 | 79.6 | 46.8 | 53.5 | 51.9 | 68.4 |
| Boundary wall | 96.8 | 96.8 | 96.3 | 92.5 | 92.6 | 95.8 | 97.1 | 94.7 |
| Electricity Connection | 89.8 | 90.7 | 91.1 | 92.6 | 87.1 | 87.1 | 94.3 | 100.0 |
| Solar panels | 24.0 | 19.4 | 25.9 | 27.8 | 23.3 | 21.8 | 28.3 | 10.5 |
| Smart Boards | - | 22.7 | 32.5 | 32.0 | 20.2 | 24.7 | 35.5 | 33.3 |
| Computer lab | - | 20.4 | 67.1 | 69.2 | 9.8 | 18.9 | 35.8 | 47.4 |
| Internet Connection | 12.4 | 23.2 | 62.3 | 69.2 | 11.7 | 20.1 | 46.7 | 47.4 |
| Useable furniture | 87.3 | 84.9 | 90.6 | 83.3 | 75.0 | 83.3 | 86.9 | 94.4 |



## PUNJAB - RURAL

| 4.5. Funds/Grants (\% schools) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Govt. schools |  |  |  | Pvt. schools |  |  |  |
|  |  | Primary | Elementary | High | Others | Primary | Elementary | High | Others |
|  | \# of schools reported receiving grants | 341 | 149 | 160 | 40 | 5 | 8 | 12 | - |
| $\stackrel{\infty}{\Gamma}$ | \% of schools reported receiving grants | 74.6 | 73.0 | 69.6 | 76.9 | 1.7 | 4.7 | 10.9 | - |
|  | Average amount of grant (Rs.) | 195468.4 | 253616.0 | 489213.2 | 419472.1 | 302529.0 | 243070.4 | 210821.7 | - |
|  | \# of schools reported receiving grants | 257 | 121 | 120 | 34 | 3 | 9 | 11 | - |
| $\stackrel{\square}{5}$ | \% of schools reported receiving grants | 56.2 | 59.3 | 52.2 | 65.4 | 1.0 | 5.2 | 10.0 | - |
|  | Average amount of grant (Rs.) | 86072.1 | 118705.5 | 151999.9 | 184764.1 | 327500.0 | 459816.7 | 1126885.3 | - |

## 5. DISABILITIES \& FUNCTIONINGS

| 5.1.Schools with Children with Disabilities (by School Type) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Govt. schools (\%) |  |  |  | Pvt.schools (\%) |  |  | Overall (\%) |  |  |
| 22.40 |  |  |  | 18.07 |  |  | 20.82 |  |  |
| 5.2.Children with Disabilities (by School Type) as reported by the Head Teacher/School Incharge |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Govt. schools (\%) |  |  |  | Pvt. Schools (\%) |  |  |  | erall ( |  |
|  | Boys | Girls | Total | Boys | Girls | Total | Boys | Girls | Total |
| Percentage of children with disabilities | 0.10 | 0.07 | 0.18 | 0.19 | 0.24 | 0.43 | 0.12 | 0.11 | 0.24 |
| Number of children with disabilities | 317 | 231 | 548 | 198 | 243 | 441 | 515 | 474 | 989 |


|  | Govt. schools | Pvt. schools | Overall |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Visual | 5.65 | 12.26 | 7.74 |
| Hearing | 10.43 | 13.21 | 11.31 |
| Physical | 42.61 | 24.53 | 36.90 |
| Intellectual | 7.83 | 5.66 | 7.14 |
| Behavioral | 12.61 | 20.75 | 15.18 |
| Multiple Disabilities (Children with more than one of the aforementioned types of disability) | 10.00 | 7.55 | 9.23 |
| Disability Type not reported | 10.87 | 16.04 | 12.50 |
| 5.4.Facilities for Children with Disabilities (by School Type) |  |  |  |
|  | Govt. schools (\%) | Pvt. Schools (\%) | Overall (\%) |
| Ramps | 3.89 | 4.21 | 4.01 |
| Toilets | 5.26 | 5.39 | 5.31 |
| Health Officer | 4.38 | . | 2.78 |
| Other Facilities | 4.58 | 3.70 | 4.26 |

"-", "0" represents insufficient data , *grants received till November 15,2019

## Sample Composition

- ASER 2019 survey was conducted in 35 rural districts of Punjab. This covered 20,677 households in 1,031 villages throughout the province.
- Detailed information was collected on 51,952 children ( $55 \%$ males, $45 \%$ females) aged 3-16 years. Out of these 43,293 children aged 5-16 years were tested for language and arithmetic competencies.
- School information on public and private schools was collected. A total of 1,027 government schools (50\% primary, 21\% elementary, 24\% high, 5\% others) and 594 private schools (49\% primary, 29\% elementary, $19 \%$ high, $3 \%$ others) were surveyed.
$35 \%$ of the government schools were boys only, $33 \%$ were girls only, and $32 \%$ were coeducation schools. In case of private schools, $92 \%$ were boys only, $6 \%$ were girls only and $2 \%$ were coeducation schools.


## THEME 1: ACCESS

Proportion of out-of-school children has decreased when compared to 2018.

- In 2019, 9\% of children were reported to be out-ofschool which has decreased as compared to previous year (11\%). 4\% children have never been enrolled in a school and 5\% have dropped out of school for various reasons.

91\% of all school-aged children within the age bracket of 6-16 years were enrolled in schools. Amongst these, $72 \%$ of children were enrolled in government schools whereas $28 \%$ of children were going to non-state institutions (26\% private schools, 1\% Madrassah, 1\% others).

- Amongst the enrolled students in government schools, $44 \%$ were girls and $56 \%$ were boys whereas in private schools $55 \%$ enrolled children were boys and 45\% were girls.
- The percentage of out of school children (boys and girls) has remained the same as compared to 2018.


## THEME 2: EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

Proportion of enrolled children has remained the same when compared to 2018.
$52 \%$ of all school-aged children within the age bracket of 3-5 years were enrolled in schools in 2019 as well as 2018.
$48 \%$ children of age 3-5 are currently not enrolled in any early childhood program/schooling.

## THEME 3: CLASS WISE LEARNING LEVELS

Learning levels of children are assessed through specific language and arithmetic tools. The same approach is used for all children between the ages of 5 to 16. The literacy assessments are designed to cover up to Class 2 level competencies according to the national curriculum. The arithmetic tool covers up to Class 3 level. For the first time, in 2019, arithmetic tool also covers number recognition from 100-200 along with word problems on addition and multiplication.

Learning levels of children (in class 5 and class 3) have improved:

- $75 \%$ class 5 children could read a class 2 level story in Urdu compared to 69\% in 2018.
- $29 \%$ of class 3 children could read story in Urdu as compared to 28\% in 2018.

English learning levels (in class 5 and class 3) have improved:

- $71 \%$ class 5 children could read sentences (class 2 level) compared to 65\% in 2018.
$31 \%$ class 3 children could read class 2 level sentences as compared to 7\% in 2018.


## Arithmetic learning levels (in class 5) have improved while for class 3 have declined: <br> - $82 \%$ class 5 children could do two digit division as compared to 60\% in 2018. <br> $26 \%$ children enrolled in class 3 could do two digit division in 2019 as compared to $38 \%$ in 2018.

[^25]New questions on time recognition along with word problems on addition and multiplication were also added for the first time. $74 \%$ of children in class 5 could recognize time correctly, $74 \%$ could solve addition word problem and $68 \%$ could solve multiplication word problem.

## THEME 4: LEARNING LEVELS BY SCHOOL TYPE (GOVERNMENT VS PRIVATE)

## Children enrolled in private schools are performing better

 compared to their government counterparts.- $77 \%$ children enrolled in class 5 in a private school were able to read at least story in Urdu as compared to $74 \%$ class 5 children enrolled in government schools.
- $75 \%$ private school children can read at least sentences in class 5 whereas only $70 \%$ government school children can do the same.
- $82 \%$ children enrolled in both government and private schools (class 5) were able to do division.


## THEME 5: GENDER GAP

Gender gap in learning continues: boys outperform girls (age 5-16 overall) in literacy and numeracy skills.

- $60 \%$ of boys and $59 \%$ of girls could read at least sentences in Urdu.
- $63 \%$ boys could read at least English words while $62 \%$ of girls can do the same.
- Similarly, $57 \%$ of boys were able to do at least subtraction whereas only $56 \%$ girls could do it.


## THEME 6: PARENTALEDUCATION

- $50 \%$ mothers and $62 \%$ fathers in the sampled households had completed at least primary education.

THEME 7: PAID TUITIONS
Private tuition incidence is greater in private school students. Overall paid tuition students in private schools is $32 \%$ compared to $19 \%$ in government schools.

Children across all classes take private tuition; however, the percentage of students taking tuition varies at different class-level. For example, in government schools, $13 \%$ children enrolled in class 1 take private tuition whereas $28 \%$ children in class 10 take tuition.

## THEME 8: MULTI-GRADE TEACHING

$30 \%$ of surveyed government schools and $30 \%$ of surveyed private schools had Class 2 students sitting with other classes.

- The surveyors were asked to observe if Class 2 and Class 8 were sitting together with any other classes. This is referred to as multi-grade teaching, where one teacher has to teach more than one grade within the allotted time.
- It was found that $30 \%$ of the surveyed government schools and $30 \%$ of the surveyed private schools had Class 2 sitting with other classes.
- $14 \%$ of surveyed government schools and $22 \%$ of surveyed private schools had Class 8 sitting with other classes.


## THEME 9: TEACHER \& STUDENT ABSEENTISM

Student attendance is recorded by taking a headcount of all students present in schools on the day of visit.

- Overall student attendance in surveyed government schools stood at $86 \%$ whereas it was $90 \%$ in surveyed private schools.

Teacher attendance is recorded by referring to the appointed positions in each school and the total number of teachers actually present on the day of survey.

[^26]
## THEME 10: TEACHERS' QUALIFICATION

- $26 \%$ teachers of surveyed government schools have done graduation as compared to $40 \%$ teachers of surveyed private schools.
- $52 \%$ of surveyed government school teachers had Bachelors in Education degrees as compared to 63\% teachers of surveyed private schools.


## THEME 11:SCHOOL FACILITIES SURVEYED GOVERNMENTSCHOOLS:

- $67 \%$ of surveyed government high schools had computer labs.
- $94 \%$ of the surveyed government primary schools have toilets.
- $95 \%$ of the surveyed government primary schools have useable drinking water
- Amongst the surveyed government primary schools, $97 \%$ had complete boundary walls
- $67 \%$ of surveyed government primary schools had playgrounds.
- $90 \%$ of surveyed government primary schools had electricity connection.
- On average, 12 rooms were being used for classroom activities in the surveyed government high schools.


## SURVEYED PRIVATESCHOOLS:

- $36 \%$ of surveyed private high schools had computer labs.
- $89 \%$ of the surveyed private primary schools have toilets.
- $95 \%$ of the surveyed private primary schools have useable drinking water
- Amongst the surveyed private primary schools, $93 \%$ had complete boundary walls
$47 \%$ of surveyed private primary schools had playgrounds.
- $87 \%$ of surveyed private primary schools had electricity connection.
- On average, 13 rooms were being used for classroom activities in the surveyed private high schools.


## THEME 12: SCHOOL GRANTS/FUNDS

56\% of the government primary schools and $1 \%$ private primary schools received grants.

- 257 surveyed government primary schools were receiving grants in 2019 as compared to 3 surveyed private primary schools.


## THEME 13: DISABILITIES \& FUNCTIONINGS

ASER 2019, as part of the school level survey, included a "Health and Disability" section under which the head teachers/teachers were asked a variety of questions pertaining to Children with Disabilities and Facilities for Children with Disabilities in their respective schools.

In Punjab, 22.4\% of the surveyed government schools were reported to be having children with disabilities while $18.1 \%$ of the private schools reported the same. in terms of gender, more boys $(0.10 \%$ of total enrolled boys in government schools and $0.19 \%$ of total enrolled boys in private schools) were reported to be suffering from a disability when compared with girls $(0.07 \%$ of total enrolled girls in government schools and $0.24 \%$ of total enrolled girls in private schools).

With regards to the types of disability as a percentage of schools with children with disabilities, the highest reported type was Physical (36.9\%) followed by Behavioral (15.2\%).

Moreover, $3.9 \%$ of surveyed government schools and 4.2\% of surveyed private schools had ramps regardless of whether these schools had any child with a disability enrolled in them. Similarly, $5.2 \%$ of surveyed government schools and $5.4 \%$ of surveyed private schools had disability-friendly toilets.

## Alternate Energy

- Across all rural districts of Punjab, 20.7\% of the sampled households use solar panels as an alternate energy resource.


## HOUSEHOLD



## SCHOOLS




SINDH (RURAL)


Children in Pre School
(Age 3-5 years)
District wise map showing \% children

\% Children (3-5 years) attending pre school


## Out of School Children

(Age 6-16 years)

District wise map showing \% children

\% Children (6-16 years) who are not in schools

|  | Above 30 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $21-30$ |  |
|  | $11-20$ |
|  | $6-10$ |
|  | $3-5$ |
|  | Below 3 |

Private Schooling
(Age 6-16 years)
District wise map showing \% children

\% Children (6-16 years) enrolled in private schools

|  | $1-5$ |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | $6-10$ |
|  | $11-20$ |
| $21-30$ |  |
|  | $31-40$ |
|  | Above 40 |
|  |  |

Reading Language Urdu/Sindhi
(Class 5)
District wise map showing \% children who can read story (Class 2 level text)

\% Children in class 5 who can read story


## Reading English

(Class 5)
District wise map showing \% children who can read sentences (Class 2 level text)

\% Children in class 5 who can read sentences


## Arithmetic

(Class 5)

District wise map showing \% children who can do division (Class 3) sums

\% Children in class 5 who can do division

|  | Below 33 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $33-40$ |  |
|  | $41-50$ |
|  | $51-60$ |
|  | $61-70$ |
|  | Above 70 |

## 1. ACCESS

### 1.1. School enrollment and out-of-school children

| \% Children in different types of schools |  |  |  |  | \% Out-of-school |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age group | Govt. | Non-state providers |  |  | Never enrolled | Drop-out |  |
|  |  | Pvt. | Madrasah | NFE/Others |  |  |  |
| 6-10 | 75.5 | 6.6 | 1.8 | 0.8 | 13.8 | 1.6 | 100 |
| 11-13 | 79.7 | 11.6 | 0.2 | 0.7 | 0.9 | 6.8 | 100 |
| 14-16 | 72.5 | 11.5 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 2.6 | 12.9 | 100 |
| 6-16 | 75.8 | 8.4 | 1.3 | 0.7 | 9.5 | 4.4 | 100 |
| Total | 86.1 |  |  |  | 13.9 |  | 100 |
| By Type | 88.0 | 9.7 | 1.5 | 0.8 |  |  |  |
| How to read: $84.7 \%(75.5+6.6+1.8+0.8)$ children of age group 6-10 are enrolled |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Enrollment by gender and type of school




| Age Class Composition |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age / Class | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Total |
| 1 | 92.1 | 76.0 | 36.5 | 13.7 | 9.1 | 13.7 | 24.0 | 31.6 | 33.8 | 19.4 | 0.0 | 8.0 | 11.5 |
| 2 | 7.9 | 23.6 | 45.9 | 30.6 | 22.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11.3 |
| 3 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 17.3 | 40.7 | 24.2 | 16.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 10.1 |
| 4 |  | 0.0 | 0.3 | 12.1 | 34.1 | 16.9 | 18.6 |  |  |  |  |  | 10.3 |
| 5 |  |  | 0.0 | 2.8 | 8.2 | 44.1 | 29.9 | 23.3 |  |  |  |  | 12.9 |
| 6 |  |  |  | 0.0 | 1.9 | 8.2 | 19.8 | 19.6 | 16.7 |  |  |  | 10.5 |
| 7 |  |  |  |  | 0.0 | 1.0 | 6.1 | 17.6 | 12.8 | 15.3 |  |  | 8.7 |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.0 | 1.7 | 7.8 | 27.5 | 17.0 | 16.1 |  | 10.5 |
| 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 9.1 | 30.6 | 33.9 | 23.0 | 7.5 |
| 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 17.6 | 50.0 | 68.7 | 6.7 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

1.2. Early years schooling (Pre-schooling)

| \% Children who attend different types of pre-schools |  |  |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age group | Govt. | Non-state providers |  |  | Out-of-school |  |
|  |  | Pvt. | Madrasah | NFE/Others |  |  |
| 3 | 19.6 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 79.0 | 100 |
| 4 | 28.7 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 67.2 | 100 |
| 5 | 65.1 | 10.7 | 0.3 | 0.5 | 23.4 | 100 |
| 3-5 | 39.6 | 5.7 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 54.4 | 100 |
| Total |  |  | 45.6 |  | 54.4 | 100 |
| By Type | 86.8 | 12.4 | 0.3 | 0.6 |  |  |
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## 2. QUALITY

### 2.1. Learning levels (Urdu/Sindhi)

| Class-wise \% children |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Class | Nothing | Letters | Words | Sentences | Story | Total |  |
| 1 | 42.2 | 44.4 | 10.6 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 100 |  |
| 2 | 21.1 | 38.4 | 32.6 | 5.3 | 2.6 | 100 |  |
| 3 | 18.8 | 20.5 | 37.2 | 14.3 | 9.2 | 100 |  |
| 4 | 21.5 | 12.6 | 22.5 | 19.5 | 24.0 | 100 |  |
| 5 | 15.0 | 10.9 | 15.1 | 15.2 | 43.8 | 100 |  |
| 6 | 6.8 | 6.4 | 14.2 | 16.3 | 56.3 | 100 |  |
| 7 | 4.3 | 4.6 | 16.7 | 13.2 | 61.2 | 100 |  |
| 8 | 1.8 | 3.1 | 8.8 | 19.2 | 67.1 | 100 |  |
| 9 | 31.4 | 5.2 | 3.1 | 8.9 | 51.3 | 100 |  |
| 10 | 17.9 | 4.4 | 2.5 | 8.9 | 66.3 | 100 |  |
| How to read: $2.8 \%(1.4+1.4)$ children of class 1 can read sentences |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |





### 2.2. Learning levels (English)

| Class-wise \% children |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Class | Nothing can read |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Letters |  | Words | Sentences | Total |
|  | Capital | Small |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 58.0 | 31.3 | 7.5 | 2.0 | 1.2 | 100 |
| 2 | 36.2 | 34.4 | 19.3 | 8.2 | 1.9 | 100 |
| 3 | 27.5 | 24.3 | 21.2 | 20.0 | 6.9 | 100 |
| 4 | 27.3 | 14.9 | 16.6 | 23.8 | 17.4 | 100 |
| 5 | 28.8 | 14.4 | 12.7 | 17.5 | 26.6 | 100 |
| 6 | 10.9 | 5.2 | 14.6 | 21.5 | 47.9 | 100 |
| 7 | 10.8 | 6.1 | 9.9 | 22.1 | 51.1 | 100 |
| 8 | 3.3 | 2.7 | 5.3 | 28.0 | 60.7 | 100 |
| 9 | 34.0 | 3.4 | 2.3 | 10.9 | 49.4 | 100 |
| 10 | 21.9 | 2.3 | 2.0 | 11.2 | 62.6 | 100 |
| How to read: $3.2(2.0+1.2)$ children of class 1 can read words |  |  |  |  |  |  |




## SINDH - RURAL

### 2.3. Learning levels (Arithmetic)

| Class-wise \% children |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Learning levels by school type |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Who can do |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | *Who can do word problems |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Class | Nothing | Number recognition |  |  | Subtraction (2 digits) | Division (2 digits) | Total | Time recognition | Word problem 1 | Word problem 2 | Arithmetic (5-16 years) <br> ■ Government $\quad$ Private |  |  |  |
|  |  | 1-9 | 10-99 | 100-200 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 45.4 | 34.6 | 13.6 | 4.5 | 1.0 | 0.9 | 100 | 3.6 | 3.5 | 2.5 | 100 |  |  |  |
| 2 | 23.3 | 23.9 | 25.0 | 21.0 | 4.8 | 2.0 | 100 | 9.3 | 9.5 | 7.0 |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | 18.3 | 15.5 | 20.3 | 24.3 | 13.7 | 8.0 | 100 | 16.9 | 16.8 | 14.1 | ¢ ${ }^{\text {d }}$ |  |  |  |
| 4 | 20.2 | 5.7 | 5.4 | 23.5 | 20.9 | 24.3 | 100 | 26.2 | 26.0 | 21.8 |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | 17.0 | 8.3 | 14.1 | 16.5 | 13.6 | 30.5 | 100 | 30.8 | 30.7 | 27.3 | O | 35 |  | $30^{38}$ |
| 6 | 6.9 | 2.6 | 6.8 | 16.6 | 26.2 | 40.9 | 100 | 48.9 | 49.7 | 46.8 | จํ 20 | 19 | 1 |  |
| 7 | 8.0 | 3.4 | 6.9 | 18.5 | 20.9 | 42.3 | 100 | 47.8 | 48.3 | 44.2 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 8 | 3.2 | 1.8 | 2.5 | 21.3 | 28.8 | 42.4 | 100 | 53.2 | 54.3 | 50.9 |  | Class 1: <br> Can recognize | Class 3: <br> Can at | Class 5: Can at |
| 9 | 32.4 | 6.2 | 3.6 | 6.2 | 18.2 | 33.3 | 100 | 40.3 | 40.1 | 36.8 |  | at least numbers | least do subtraction | least do |
| 10 | 19.1 | 2.8 | 2.8 | 9.4 | 31.0 | 35.0 | 100 | 35.6 | 36.5 | 34.7 |  | (10-99) |  |  |
| How to read: $1.9 \%$ (1.0+0.9)children of class 1 can do subtraction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



## 3. PARENTAL EDUCATION AND PAID TUITION



## SINDH - RURAL

## 4. SCHOOLS: ATTENDANCE,TEACHERS QUALIFICATION,FACILITIES \& GRANTS/FUNDS

| 4.1.Number of surveyed schools by type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Govt. schools |  |  |  | Pvt. schools |  |  |  |
|  | Boys | Girls | Boys \& Girls | Total | Boys | Girls | Boys \& Girls | Total |
| Primary | 348 | 103 | 53 | 504 | 83 | 0 | 0 | 83 |
| Elementary | 30 | 9 | 8 | 47 | 11 | 0 | 2 | 13 |
| High | 27 | 4 | 7 | 38 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 10 |
| Others | 19 | 9 | 5 | 33 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Total | 424 | 125 | 73 | 622 | 110 | 1 | 2 | 113 |


| 4.2. Attendance (\%) on the day of visit |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Govt. schools |  |  |  |  | Pvt. schools |  |  |  |  |
|  | Primary | Elementary | High | Others | Overall | Primary | Elementary | High | Others | Overall |
| Children attendance | 76.7 | 78.1 | 80.4 | 71.8 | 76.9 | 76.7 | 84.1 | 82.6 | 65.0 | 77.9 |
| Teacher attendance | 83.2 | 69.8 | 83.6 | 88.5 | 82.2 | 92.9 | 87.3 | 75.2 | 73.0 | 82.5 |


| 4.3. Teacher qualification (\% of teachers) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| General qualification |  |  | Professional qualification |  |  |
|  | Govt. schools | Pvt. schools |  | Govt.schools | Pvt. schools |
| Matriculation | 1.3 | 3.7 | PTC | 14.0 | 15.4 |
| FA/FSc | 17.4 | 15.8 | CT | 10.8 | 10.6 |
| BA/BSc | 46.0 | 44.4 | B-Ed | 47.6 | 41.3 |
| MA/MSc or above | 35.1 | 34.9 | M-Ed or above | 27.3 | 30.8 |
| Others | 0.1 | 1.2 | Others | 0.3 | 1.9 |


| 4.4. School facilities (\% schools) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Govt.schools |  |  |  | Pvt.schools |  |  |  |
|  | Primary | Elementary | High | Others | Primary | Elementary | High | Others |
| Rooms used for classes (avg.) | 4 | 5 | 8 | 7 | 5 | 6 | 9 | 10 |
| Useable drinking water | 60.0 | 69.6 | 75.0 | 78.8 | 94.4 | 100.0 | 90.0 | 100.0 |
| Useable toilets | 55.6 | 71.7 | 70.3 | 78.8 | 94.4 | 92.3 | 90.0 | 100.0 |
| Separate toilets for girls | 18.7 | 44.4 | 47.2 | 50.0 | 55.6 | 76.9 | 90.0 | 100.0 |
| Playground | 34.9 | 60.9 | 60.5 | 51.5 | 55.6 | 69.2 | 50.0 | 71.4 |
| Boundary wall | 61.0 | 78.3 | 73.0 | 69.7 | 94.4 | 100.0 | 90.0 | 85.7 |
| Electricity Connection | 50.7 | 65.2 | 71.1 | 75.8 | 61.1 | 76.9 | 70.0 | 100.0 |
| Solar panels | 20.0 | 28.3 | 31.6 | 42.4 | 50.0 | 38.5 | 60.0 | 42.9 |
| Smart Boards | - | 16.7 | 32.3 | 25.0 | 33.3 | 27.3 | 25.0 | 71.4 |
| Computer lab | - | 9.5 | 9.7 | 10.3 | 11.1 | 23.1 | 44.4 | 42.9 |
| Internet Connection | 3.9 | 4.8 | 9.7 | 6.9 | 11.1 | 27.3 | 12.5 | 42.9 |
| Useable furniture | 62.1 | 68.2 | 70.3 | 77.4 | 64.7 | 91.7 | 75.0 | 100.0 |



[^28]
## SINDH - RURAL

| 4.5. Funds/Grants (\% schools) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Govt. schools |  |  |  | Pvt. schools |  |  |  |
|  |  | Primary | Elementary | High | Others | Primary | Elementary | High | Others |
|  | \# of schools reported receiving grants | 127 | 8 | 5 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 2 | - |
| $\stackrel{\infty}{\stackrel{\infty}{N}}$ | \% of schools reported receiving grants | 30.8 | 17.8 | 17.2 | 27.6 | 1.2 | 7.7 | 20.0 | - |
|  | Average amount of grant (Rs.) | 27165.3 | 23750.0 | 35440.0 | 178125.0 | 22000.0 | 500.0 | 38000.0 | - |
|  | \# of schools reported receiving grants | 17 | 4 | 2 | - | - | - | 1 | - |
| \% | \% of schools reported receiving grants | 4.1 | 8.9 | 6.9 | - | - | - | 10.0 | - |
|  | Average amount of grant (Rs.) | 17552.9 | 21250.0 | 36000.0 | - | - | - | 75000.0 | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## 5. DISABILITIES \& FUNCTIONINGS

| 5.1.Schools with Children with Disabilities (by School Type) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Govt. schools (\%) |  |  |  | Pvt.schools (\%) |  |  | Overall (\%) |  |  |
| 11.59 |  |  |  | 4.42 |  |  | 10.49 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5.2.Children with Disabilities (by School Type) as reported by the Head Teacher/School Incharge |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Govt. schools (\%) |  |  |  | Pvt. Schools (\%) |  |  | Overall (\%) |  |  |
|  | Boys | Girls | Total | Boys | Girls | Total | Boys | Girls | Total |
| Percentage of children with disabilities | 0.07 | 0.04 | 0.10 | 0.08 | 0.07 | 0.15 | 0.07 | 0.04 | 0.11 |
| Number of children with disabilities | 83 | 45 | 128 | 7 | 6 | 13 | 90 | 51 | 141 |


|  | Govt. schools | Pvt. schools | Overall |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Visual | 1.39 | 0.00 | 1.30 |
| Hearing | 8.33 | 0.00 | 7.79 |
| Physical | 56.94 | 20.00 | 54.55 |
| Intellectual | 9.72 | 0.00 | 9.09 |
| Behavioral | 13.89 | 40.00 | 15.58 |
| Multiple Disabilities (Children with more than one of the aforementioned types of disability) | 4.17 | 20.00 | 5.19 |
| Disability Type not reported | 5.56 | 20.00 | 6.49 |
|  |  |  |  |
| 5.4.Facilities for Children with Disabilities (by School Type) |  |  |  |
|  | Govt. schools (\%) | Pvt. Schools (\%) | Overall (\%) |
| Ramps | 1.29 | 0.00 | 1.09 |
| Toilets | 1.13 | 0.00 | 0.95 |
| Health Officer | 0.32 | 0.00 | 0.27 |
| Other Facilities | 1.13 | 1.77 | 1.22 |

[^29]pakistan
Facilitated by SAFED

## Sample Composition

- ASER 2019 survey was conducted in 23 rural districts of Sindh. This covered 13,047 households in 654 villages throughout the province.
- Detailed information was collected on 33,720 children ( $58 \%$ males, $42 \%$ females) aged 3-16 years. Out of these 27,249 children aged 5-16 years were tested for language and arithmetic competencies.
- School information on public and private schools was collected. A total of 622 government schools (81\% primary, 8\% elementary, 6\% high, 5\% others) and 113 private schools (73\% primary, 12\% elementary, $9 \%$ high, $6 \%$ others) were surveyed.

68\% of the government schools were boys only, 20\% were girls only, and $12 \%$ were coeducation schools. In case of private schools, $97 \%$ were boys only, 1 were girls only and $2 \%$ were coeducation schools.

## THEME 1: ACCESS

Proportion of out-of-school children has remained the same when compared to 2018.

- In 2019, 14\% of children were reported to be out-ofschool which has remained the same as compared to previous year (14\%). $10 \%$ children have never been enrolled in a school and $4 \%$ have dropped out of school for various reasons.
- $86 \%$ of all school-aged children within the age bracket of 6-16 years were enrolled in schools. Amongst these, $88 \%$ of children were enrolled in government schools whereas $12 \%$ of children were going to non-state institutions (10\% private schools, 1\% Madrassah, 1\% others).
- Amongst the enrolled students in government schools, $37 \%$ were girls and $63 \%$ were boys whereas in private schools $58 \%$ enrolled children were boys and $42 \%$ were girls.
- The percentage of out of school children (boys and girls) has decreased slightly for girls as compared to 2018.


## THEME 2: EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

Proportion of enrolled children has increased when compared to 2018.
$46 \%$ of all school-aged children within the age bracket of 3-5 years were enrolled in schools in 2019 as compared to 44\% in 2018.

54\% children of age 3-5 are currently not enrolled in any early childhood program/schooling.

## THEME 3: CLASS WISE LEARNING LEVELS

Learning levels of children are assessed through specific language and arithmetic tools. The same approach is used for all children between the ages of 5 to 16. The literacy assessments are designed to cover up to Class 2 level competencies according to the national curriculum. The arithmetic tool covers up to Class 3 level. For the first time, in 2019, arithmetic tool also covers number recognition from 100-200 along with word problems on addition and multiplication.

## Learning levels of children (in class 5) have improved:

- $44 \%$ class 5 children could read a class 2 level story in Urdu/Sindhi compared to 43\% in 2018.
- $9 \%$ of class 3 children could read story in Urdu/Sindhi as compared to 11\% in 2018.

English learning levels (in class 5 and class 3) have improved:

- $27 \%$ class 5 children could read sentences (class 2 level) compared to $25 \%$ in 2018.
- 7\% class 3 children could read class 2 level sentences as compared to 3\% in 2018.

Arithmetic learning levels (in class 5 and class 3) have decreased:

- $31 \%$ class 5 children could do two digit division as compared to 32\% in 2018.

8\% children enrolled in class 3 could do two digit division in 2019 as compared to 19\% in 2018.

[^30]New questions on time recognition along with word problems on addition and multiplication were also added for the first time. $31 \%$ of children in class 5 could recognize time correctly, $31 \%$ could solve addition word problem and $27 \%$ could solve multiplication word problem.

## THEME 4: LEARNING LEVELS BY SCHOOL TYPE (GOVERNMENT VS PRIVATE)

Children enrolled in private schools are performing better in English and Arithmetic compared to their government counterparts.

- $43 \%$ children enrolled in class 5 in a private school were able to read at least story in Urdu/Sindhi as compared to $44 \%$ class 5 children enrolled in government schools.
- $35 \%$ private school children can read at least sentences in class 5 whereas only $26 \%$ government school children can do the same.
- $38 \%$ children enrolled in private and $30 \%$ children enrolled in government schools (class 5) were able to do division.


## THEME 5: GENDER GAP

Gender gap in learning continues: boys outperform girls (age 5-16 overall) in literacy and numeracy skills.

- $33 \%$ of boys and $25 \%$ of girls could read at least sentences in Urdu/Sindhi.
- $32 \%$ boys could read at least English words while $24 \%$ of girls can do the same.
- Similarly, $28 \%$ of boys were able to do at least subtraction whereas only $22 \%$ girls could do it.


## THEME 6: PARENTALEDUCATION

- $26 \%$ mothers and $44 \%$ fathers in the sampled households had completed at least primary education.


## THEME 7: PAID TUITIONS

Private tuition incidence is greater in private school students. Overall paid tuition students in private schools is $12 \%$ compared to $4 \%$ in government schools.

- Children across all classes take private tuition; however, the percentage of students taking tuition varies at different class-level. For example, in government schools, $2 \%$ children enrolled in class 1 take private tuition whereas $4 \%$ children in class 10 take tuition.


## THEME 8: MULTI-GRADE TEACHING

$42 \%$ of surveyed government schools and $43 \%$ of surveyed private schools had Class 2 students sitting with other classes.

- The surveyors were asked to observe if Class 2 and Class 8 were sitting together with any other classes. This is referred to as multi-grade teaching, where one teacher has to teach more than one grade within the allotted time.
- It was found that $42 \%$ of the surveyed government schools and $43 \%$ of the surveyed private schools had Class 2 sitting with other classes.
- $22 \%$ of surveyed government schools and $18 \%$ of surveyed private schools had Class 8 sitting with other classes.


## THEME 9:TEACHER \& STUDENT ABSEENTISM

Student attendance is recorded by taking a headcount of all students present in schools on the day of visit.

Overall student attendance in surveyed government schools stood at $\mathbf{7 7 \%}$ whereas it was $78 \%$ in surveyed private schools.

Teacher attendance is recorded by referring to the appointed positions in each school and the total number of teachers actually present on the day of survey.

- Overall teacher attendance in surveyed government schools stood at $\mathbf{8 2 \%}$ whereas it was $\mathbf{8 3 \%}$ in surveyed private schools.


## THEME 10: TEACHERS' QUALIFICATION

- $46 \%$ teachers of surveyed government schools have done graduation as compared to $44 \%$ teachers of surveyed private schools.
- $48 \%$ of surveyed government school teachers had Bachelors in Education degrees as compared to 41\% teachers of surveyed private schools.


## THEME 11:SCHOOL FACILITIES

## SURVEYED GOVERNMENT SCHOOLS:

- $10 \%$ of surveyed government high schools had computer labs.
- $56 \%$ of the surveyed government primary schools have toilets.
- $60 \%$ of the surveyed government primary schools have useable drinking water
- Amongst the surveyed government primary schools, $61 \%$ had complete boundary walls
- $35 \%$ of surveyed government primary schools had playgrounds.
- $51 \%$ of surveyed government primary schools had electricity connection.
- On average, 8 rooms were being used for classroom activities in the surveyed government high schools.


## SURVEYED PRIVATESCHOOLS:

- $45 \%$ of surveyed private high schools had computer labs.
- $95 \%$ of the surveyed private primary schools have toilets.
- $95 \%$ of the surveyed private primary schools have useable drinking water
- Amongst the surveyed private primary schools, $94 \%$ had complete boundary walls
$56 \%$ of surveyed private primary schools had playgrounds.
$61 \%$ of surveyed private primary schools had electricity connection.
- On average, 9 rooms were being used for classroom activities in the surveyed private high schools.


## THEME 12: SCHOOL GRANTS/FUNDS

4\% of the government primary schools and 0\% private primary schools received grants.

- 17 surveyed government primary schools were receiving grants in 2019 as compared to 0 surveyed private primary schools.


## THEME 13: DISABILITIES \& FUNCTIONINGS

ASER 2019, as part of the school level survey, included a "Health and Disability" section under which the head teachers/teachers were asked a variety of questions pertaining to Children with Disabilities and Facilities for Children with Disabilities in their respective schools.

In Sindh, $11.6 \%$ of the surveyed government schools were reported to be having children with disabilities while $4.4 \%$ of the private schools reported the same. in terms of gender, more boys ( $0.07 \%$ of total enrolled boys in government schools and $0.08 \%$ of total enrolled boys in private schools) were reported to be suffering from a disability when compared with girls $(0.04 \%$ of total enrolled girls in government schools and $0.07 \%$ of total enrolled girls in private schools).

With regards to the types of disability as a percentage of schools with children with disabilities, the highest reported type was Physical (54.6\%) followed by Behavioral (15.6\%).

Moreover, $1.2 \%$ of surveyed government schools had ramps and 1.1 had disability friendly toilets regardless of whether these schools had any child with a disability enrolled in them.

## SINDH - RURAL

## Information \& Communication Technology

- $50.5 \%$ of households across all rural districts of Sindh have mobile phones.
- Amongst mobile users, 78.4\% use Whatsapp service for communication.
- Amongst mobile users, $54.6 \%$ use SMS facility for communication.
- $8.9 \%$ of households have computers/laptops


## Alternate Energy

- Across all rural districts of Sindh, $45.1 \%$ of the sampled households use solar panels as an alternate energy resource.


## HOUSEHOLD



## SCHOOLS




AZAD JAMMU
\& KASHMIR (RURAL)
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## Children in Pre School

(Age 3-5 years)
District wise map showing \% children

\% Children (3-5 years)
attending pre school

|  | Below 30 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $30-40$ |  |
|  | $41-50$ |
|  | $51-60$ |
|  | $61-70$ |
|  | Above 70 |

Out of School Children
(Age 6-16 years)

District wise map showing \% children


Private Schooling
(Age 6-16 years)
District wise map showing \% children

\% Children (6-16 years) enrolled in private schools

|  | $1-5$ |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | $6-10$ |
| $11-20$ |  |
| $21-30$ |  |
|  | $31-40$ |
|  | Above 40 |

## AZAD JAMMU \& KASHMIR - RURAL

Reading Language Urdu
(Class 5)
District wise map showing \% children who can read story (Class 2 level text)

\% Children in class 5 who can read story

|  | Below 33 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $33-40$ |  |
|  | $41-50$ |
|  | $51-60$ |
|  | $61-70$ |
|  | Above 70 |

## Reading English

(Class 5)
District wise map showing \% children who can read sentences (Class 2 level text)

\% Children in class 5 who can read sentences


## Arithmetic

(Class 5)
District wise map showing \% children who can do division (Class 3) sums

\% Children in class 5 who can do division

|  | Below 33 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $33-40$ |  |
| $41-50$ |  |
| $51-60$ |  |
| $61-70$ |  |
| Above 70 |  |
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## 1. ACCESS

1.1. School enrollment and out-of-school children

| \% Children in different types of schools |  |  |  |  | \% Out-of-school |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age group | Govt. | Non-state providers |  |  | Never |  |  |
|  |  | Pvt. | Madrasah | NFE/Others | enrolled | Drop-out |  |
| 6-10 | 46.5 | 50.1 | 0.4 | 1.1 | 1.4 | 0.5 | 100 |
| 11-13 | 56.2 | 39.5 | 0.7 | 0.9 | 0.8 | 1.9 | 100 |
| 14-16 | 59.1 | 32.9 | 1.3 | 0.1 | 1.8 | 4.9 | 100 |
| 6-16 | 52.0 | 43.3 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 1.3 | 1.9 | 100 |
| Total |  |  | 96.8 |  |  |  | 100 |
| By Type | 53.8 | 44.7 | 0.7 | 0.8 |  |  |  |
| How to read: $98.1 \%$ (46.5+50.1+0.4+1.1) children of age group 6-10 are enrolled |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Enrollment by gender and type of school




| Age Class Composition |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age / Class | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | Total |
| 1 | 100.0 | 79.4 | 50.4 | 11.3 | 4.0 | 51 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11.5 |
| 2 | 0.0 | 20.6 | 38.1 | 38.2 | 15.5 | 5.1 | 6.2 | 7.6 |  |  |  |  | 11.3 |
| 3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 11.5 | 33.1 | 35.4 | 10.4 |  |  | 5.1 |  |  |  | 10.1 |
| 4 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 12.7 | 32.7 | 33.0 | 11.6 |  |  |  | 0.0 |  | 10.3 |
| 5 |  |  | 0.0 | 4.6 | 10.9 | 39.7 | 41.8 | 17.0 |  |  |  |  | 12.9 |
| 6 |  |  |  | 0.0 | 1.5 | 9.5 | 29.3 | 42.5 | 13.7 |  |  |  | 10.5 |
| 7 |  |  |  |  | 0.0 | 2.4 | 9.6 | 22.5 | 40.9 | 13.5 |  |  | 8.7 |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.0 | 1.4 | 10.4 | 33.7 | 50.0 | 12.5 |  | 10.5 |
| 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 6.6 | 23.8 | 57.2 | 12.9 | 7.5 |
| 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.7 | 30.3 | 76.0 | 6.7 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

1.2. Early years schooling (Pre-schooling)

| \% Children who attend different types of pre-schools |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age group | Govt. | Non-state providers |  |  | Out-of-school | Total |  |  |  |
|  |  | Pvt. | Madrasah | NFE/Others |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | 4.8 | 13.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 82.1 | 100 |  |  |  |
| 4 | 15.0 | 42.1 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 42.5 | 100 |  |  |  |
| 5 | 35.7 | 58.8 | 0.1 | 1.5 | 3.9 | 100 |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{3 - 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 . 8}$ | $\mathbf{3 9 . 8}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 7}$ | $\mathbf{3 9 . 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |  |  |  |
| Total | $\mathbf{6 0 . 4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{3 9 . 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |
| By Type | $\mathbf{3 2 . 8}$ | $\mathbf{6 5 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
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## 2. QUALITY

2.1. Learning levels (Urdu)

| Class-wise \% children |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Class | Nothing | Letters | Words | Sentences | Story | Total |  |
| 1 | 14.1 | 23.9 | 47.3 | 12.2 | 2.5 | 100 |  |
| 2 | 5.7 | 9.3 | 42.7 | 31.9 | 10.4 | 100 |  |
| 3 | 4.1 | 4.1 | 24.5 | 37.3 | 29.9 | 100 |  |
| 4 | 2.9 | 1.8 | 11.9 | 33.8 | 49.6 | 100 |  |
| 5 | 3.0 | 0.8 | 4.2 | 13.2 | 78.9 | 100 |  |
| 6 | 2.9 | 0.1 | 1.8 | 9.6 | 85.6 | 100 |  |
| 7 | 2.3 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 6.6 | 90.7 | 100 |  |
| 8 | 2.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 3.5 | 93.8 | 100 |  |
| 9 | 2.1 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 1.1 | 96.3 | 100 |  |
| 10 | 1.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 97.5 | 100 |  |





Who can read at least sentences


Learning levels: Out-of-school
Urdu (5-16 years)
2.2. Learning levels (English)

| Class-wise \% children |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Who can read |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Class | Nothing | Letters |  | Words | Sentences | Total |
|  |  | Capital | Small |  |  |  |
| 1 | 11.0 | 10.0 | 43.8 | 32.9 | 2.3 | 100 |
| 2 | 8.7 | 7.2 | 41.7 | 34.8 | 7.6 | 100 |
| 3 | 6.5 | 2.3 | 19.6 | 58.9 | 12.7 | 100 |
| 4 | 3.7 | 1.7 | 9.2 | 35.4 | 49.9 | 100 |
| 5 | 2.9 | 0.7 | 2.8 | 2.4 | 91.2 | 100 |
| 6 | 3.4 | 0.3 | 1.6 | 8.8 | 85.9 | 100 |
| 7 | 2.6 | 0.1 | 0.6 | 8.4 | 88.2 | 100 |
| 8 | 2.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 3.8 | 93.9 | 100 |
| 9 | 3.5 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 1.7 | 94.6 | 100 |
| 10 | 4.9 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 93.6 | 100 |

OHow to read: $35.2 \%$ ( $32.9+2.3$ ) children of class 1 can read words
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### 2.3. Learning levels (Arithmetic)

| Class-wise \% children |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Who can do |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Class | Nothing | Number recognition |  |  | Subtraction (2 digits) | Division (2 digits) | Total |
|  |  | 1-9 | 10-99 | 100-200 |  |  |  |
| 1 | 11.3 | 11.7 | 30.1 | 28.1 | 9.7 | 9.0 | 100 |
| 2 | 5.8 | 4.5 | 8.8 | 18.4 | 29.4 | 33.2 | 100 |
| 3 | 4.0 | 2.0 | 3.4 | 13.7 | 27.1 | 49.8 | 100 |
| 4 | 3.5 | 0.7 | 2.2 | 15.9 | 9.5 | 68.2 | 100 |
| 5 | 2.1 | 1.5 | 1.3 | 7.8 | 14.0 | 73.4 | 100 |
| 6 | 3.3 | 0.1 | 0.8 | 4.8 | 13.8 | 77.3 | 100 |
| 7 | 2.7 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 3.1 | 23.6 | 69.9 | 100 |
| 8 | 2.5 | 0.1 | 7.7 | 4.9 | 13.7 | 71.0 | 100 |
| 9 | 3.4 | 0.1 | 18.9 | 11.2 | 6.8 | 59.6 | 100 |
| 10 | 5.0 | 0.0 | 2.2 | 5.3 | 12.4 | 75.2 | 100 |


| *Who can do word problems |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time <br> recognition | Word <br> problem 1 | Word <br> problem 2 |
| 14.0 | 15.1 | 10.2 |
| 27.1 | 27.1 | 22.9 |
| 49.8 | 52.4 | 43.5 |
| 66.0 | 66.0 | 59.7 |
| 79.6 | 79.6 | 70.5 |
| 87.1 | 87.1 | 76.3 |
| 89.7 | 89.7 | 78.6 |
| 92.5 | 92.5 | 82.4 |
| 93.0 | 93.0 | 82.6 |
| 92.3 | 92.3 | 83.8 |
|  |  |  |



How to read: $18.7 \%(9.7+9.0)$ children of class 1 can do subtraction
*Words problems are asked from all children of age $5-16$ years



## 3. PARENTAL EDUCATION AND PAID TUITION

| Class-wise \% children attending paid tuition |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Type | 1 | 11 | III | IV | V | VI | VII | VIII | IX | X |
| Govt. | 4.3 | 6.3 | 7.0 | 7.4 | 7.4 | 6.9 | 8.3 | 7.0 | 8.1 | 10.0 |
| Pvt. | 12.8 | 14.4 | 10.1 | 13.1 | 17.9 | 11.1 | 10.8 | 12.7 | 17.3 | 14.8 |
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## 4. SCHOOLS: ATTENDANCE,TEACHERS QUALIFICATION,FACILITIES \& GRANTS/FUNDS

| 4.1.Number of surveyed schools by type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Govt. schools |  |  |  | Pvt. schools |  |  |  |
|  | Boys | Girls | Boys \& Girls | Total | Boys | Girls | Boys \& Girls | Total |
| Primary | 59 | 21 | 31 | 111 | 77 | 1 | 0 | 78 |
| Elementary | 14 | 44 | 32 | 90 | 101 | 4 | 1 | 106 |
| High | 14 | 32 | 29 | 75 | 69 | 3 | 1 | 73 |
| Others | 3 | 7 | 5 | 15 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| Total | 90 | 104 | 97 | 291 | 257 | 8 | 2 | 267 |


| 4.2. Attendance (\%) on the day of visit |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Govt. schools |  |  |  |  | Pvt. schools |  |  |  |  |
|  | Primary | Elementary | High | Others | Overall | Primary | Elementary | High | Others | Overall |
| Children attendance | 89.8 | 90.0 | 92.3 | 94.8 | 91.3 | 94.0 | 93.4 | 92.8 | 95.8 | 93.3 |
| Teacher attendance | 89.3 | 92.6 | 92.7 | 90.1 | 92.0 | 94.7 | 93.7 | 91.2 | 95.0 | 92.9 |


| 4.3. Teacher qualification (\% of teachers) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| General qualification |  |  | Professional qualification |  |  |
|  | Govt. schools | Pvt. schools |  | Govt.schools | Pvt. schools |
| Matriculation | 3.4 | 2.7 | PTC | 12.3 | 15.2 |
| FA/FSc | 11.1 | 17.3 | CT | 4.6 | 5.2 |
| BA/BSc | 40.5 | 44.6 | B-Ed | 46.2 | 45.9 |
| MA/MSc or above | 45.0 | 35.4 | M-Ed or above | 36.9 | 31.7 |
| Others | 0.0 | 0.0 | Others | 0.0 | 2.0 |


| 4.4. School facilities (\% schools) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Govt.schools |  |  |  | Pvt.schools |  |  |  |
|  | Primary | Elementary | High | Others | Primary | Elementary | High | Others |
| Rooms used for classes (avg.) | 3 | 7 | 11 | 8 | 6 | 7 | 12 | 10 |
| Useable drinking water | 53.6 | 76.7 | 82.7 | 73.3 | 90.3 | 84.8 | 94.4 | 70.0 |
| Useable toilets | 54.1 | 76.7 | 80.0 | 60.0 | 90.3 | 87.6 | 94.4 | 80.0 |
| Separate toilets for girls | 19.8 | 20.9 | 33.3 | 28.6 | 30.6 | 48.6 | 68.1 | 66.7 |
| Playground | 40.9 | 48.9 | 71.6 | 60.0 | 69.4 | 56.2 | 70.8 | 50.0 |
| Boundary wall | 54.5 | 44.3 | 53.3 | 50.0 | 57.7 | 51.4 | 80.6 | 80.0 |
| Electricity Connection | 45.0 | 61.1 | 88.0 | 60.0 | 76.4 | 75.2 | 80.6 | 70.0 |
| Solar panels | 2.7 | 7.8 | 13.3 | 6.7 | 6.9 | 9.6 | 15.5 | 10.0 |
| Smart Boards | - | 8.5 | 17.6 | 11.1 | 8.5 | 17.1 | 20.8 | 10.0 |
| Computer lab | - | 13.6 | 50.7 | 33.3 | 11.1 | 17.1 | 43.1 | 40.0 |
| Internet Connection | 2.0 | 5.1 | 5.8 | 11.1 | 4.2 | 9.5 | 28.2 | 10.0 |
| Useable furniture | 55.0 | 71.9 | 78.4 | 66.7 | 70.8 | 75.0 | 87.3 | 100.0 |
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| 4.5. Funds/Grants (\% schools) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Govt. schools |  |  |  | Pvt. schools |  |  |  |
|  |  | Primary | Elementary | High | Others | Primary | Elementary | High | Others |
| $\stackrel{\infty}{\stackrel{\infty}{N}}$ | \# of schools reported receiving grants | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | - | 2 | - |
|  | \% of schools reported receiving grants | 1.9 | 1.3 | 4.3 | 6.7 | 1.3 | - | 2.7 | - |
|  | Average amount of grant (Rs.) | 251755.0 | 3500.0 | 23600.0 | 10000.0 | 10000.0 | - | 45010.0 | - |
| $\stackrel{*}{\circ}$ | \# of schools reported receiving grants | 1 | - | 2 | 1 | - | - | - | - |
|  | \% of schools reported receiving grants | 1.0 | - | 2.9 | 6.7 | - | - | - | - |
|  | Average amount of grant (Rs.) | 80.0 | - | 15000.0 | 10000.0 | - | - | - | - |

## 5. DISABILITIES \& FUNCTIONINGS



"-", "0" represents insufficient data , *grants received till November 15,2019
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## Sample Composition

- ASER 2019 survey was conducted in 10 rural districts of Azad Jammu \& Kashmir. This covered 5,946 households in 298 villages throughout the province.
- Detailed information was collected on 15,509 children ( $52 \%$ males, $48 \%$ females) aged 3-16 years. Out of these 12,131 children aged 5-16 years were tested for language and arithmetic competencies.
- School information on public and private schools was collected. A total of 291 government schools (38\% primary, 31\% elementary, 26\% high, 5\% others) and 267 private schools (29\% primary, 40\% elementary, 27 high, $4 \%$ others) were surveyed.
$31 \%$ of the government schools were boys only, $37 \%$ were girls only, and $32 \%$ were coeducation schools. In case of private schools, $96 \%$ were boys only, $3 \%$ were girls only and 1\% were coeducation schools.


## THEME 1: ACCESS

Proportion of out-of-school children has decreased when compared to 2018.

- In 2019, 3\% of children were reported to be out-ofschool which has decreased as compared to previous year (5\%). $1 \%$ children have never been enrolled in a school and 2\% have dropped out of school for various reasons.
$97 \%$ of all school-aged children within the age bracket of 6-16 years were enrolled in schools. Amongst these, $54 \%$ of children were enrolled in government schools whereas $46 \%$ of children were going to non-state institutions (45\% private schools, 1\% Madrassah, 0\% others).
- Amongst the enrolled students in government schools, $48 \%$ were girls and $52 \%$ were boys whereas in private schools 54\% enrolled children were boys and $46 \%$ were girls.
- The percentage of out of school children (boys and girls) has decreased slightly for boys as compared to 2018.

THEME 2: EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION
Proportion of enrolled children has increased when compared to 2018.
$60 \%$ of all school-aged children within the age bracket of 3-5 years were enrolled in schools in 2019 as compared to $50 \%$ in 2018.
$40 \%$ children of age $3-5$ are currently not enrolled in any early childhood program/schooling.

## THEME 3: CLASS WISE LEARNING LEVELS

Learning levels of children are assessed through specific language and arithmetic tools. The same approach is used for all children between the ages of 5 to 16. The literacy assessments are designed to cover up to Class 2 level competencies according to the national curriculum. The arithmetic tool covers up to Class 3 level. For the first time, in 2019, arithmetic tool also covers number recognition from 100-200 along with word problems on addition and multiplication.

Learning levels of children (in class 5 and class 3 ) have improved:

- $79 \%$ class 5 children could read a class 2 level story in Urdu compared to 78\% in 2018.
- $30 \%$ of class 3 children could read story in Urdu as compared to 23\% in 2018.


## English learning levels (class 3) have improved:

- $91 \%$ class 5 children could read sentences (class 2 level) compared to $92 \%$ in 2018.
$13 \%$ class 3 children could read class 2 level sentences as compared to $11 \%$ in 2018.


## Arithmetic learning levels (in class 3 ) have improved:

- $73 \%$ class 5 children could do two digit division as compared to 73\% in 2018.
- $50 \%$ children enrolled in class 3 could do two digit division in 2019 as compared to $40 \%$ in 2018.
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New questions on time recognition along with word problems on addition and multiplication were also added for the first time. $80 \%$ of children in class 5 could recognize time correctly, $80 \%$ could solve addition word problem and $71 \%$ could solve multiplication word problem.

## THEME 4: LEARNING LEVELS BY SCHOOL TYPE (GOVERNMENT VS PRIVATE)

Children enrolled in private schools are performing better in English and Arithmetic compared to their government counterparts.

- $78 \%$ children enrolled in class 5 in a private school were able to read at least story in Urdu as compared to $81 \%$ class 5 children enrolled in government schools.

93\% private school children can read at least sentences in class 5 whereas only $90 \%$ government school children can do the same.

- $74 \%$ children enrolled in private and $73 \%$ children enrolled in government schools (class 5) were able to do division.


## THEME 5: GENDER GAP

Gender gap in learning continues: boys outperform girls (age 5-16 overall) in literacy and numeracy skills.

- $66 \%$ of boys and $66 \%$ of girls could read at least sentences in Urdu.
- $71 \%$ boys could read at least English words while $69 \%$ of girls can do the same.
- Similarly, $64 \%$ of boys were able to do at least subtraction whereas only $63 \%$ girls could do it.


## THEME 6: PARENTALEDUCATION

- $72 \%$ mothers and $83 \%$ fathers in the sampled households had completed at least primary education.

THEME 7: PAIDTUITIONS
Private tuition incidence is greater in private school students. Overall paid tuition students in private schools is 12\% compared to $7 \%$ in government schools.

- Children across all classes take private tuition; however, the percentage of students taking tuition varies at different class-level. For example, in government schools, $4 \%$ children enrolled in class 1 take private tuition whereas $10 \%$ children in class 10 take tuition.


## THEME 8: MULTI-GRADE TEACHING

$48 \%$ of surveyed government schools and $29 \%$ of surveyed private schools had Class 2 students sitting with other classes.

- The surveyors were asked to observe if Class 2 and Class 8 were sitting together with any other classes. This is referred to as multi-grade teaching, where one teacher has to teach more than one grade within the allotted time.
- It was found that $48 \%$ of the surveyed government schools and $29 \%$ of the surveyed private schools had Class 2 sitting with other classes.
- $17 \%$ of surveyed government schools and $16 \%$ of surveyed private schools had Class 8 sitting with other classes.


## THEME 9: TEACHER \& STUDENT ABSEENTISM

Student attendance is recorded by taking a headcount of all students present in schools on the day of visit.

- Overall student attendance in surveyed government schools stood at $91 \%$ whereas it was $93 \%$ in surveyed private schools.

Teacher attendance is recorded by referring to the appointed positions in each school and the total number of teachers actually present on the day of survey.

Overall teacher attendance in surveyed government schools stood at $\mathbf{9 2 \%}$ whereas it was $\mathbf{9 3 \%}$ in surveyed private schools.

## AZAD JAMMU \& KASHMIR - RURAL

## THEME 10: TEACHERS' QUALIFICATION

- $41 \%$ teachers of surveyed government schools have done graduation as compared to $45 \%$ teachers of surveyed private schools.
- $46 \%$ of surveyed government school teachers had Bachelors in Education degrees as compared to 46\% teachers of surveyed private schools.


## THEME 11:SCHOOL FACILITIES SURVEYED GOVERNMENTSCHOOLS:

- $51 \%$ of surveyed government high schools had computer labs.
- $54 \%$ of the surveyed government primary schools have toilets.
- $54 \%$ of the surveyed government primary schools have useable drinking water
- Amongst the surveyed government primary schools, $55 \%$ had complete boundary walls
- $41 \%$ of surveyed government primary schools had playgrounds.
- $45 \%$ of surveyed government primary schools had electricity connection.
- On average, 11 rooms were being used for classroom activities in the surveyed government high schools.


## SURVEYED PRIVATE SCHOOLS:

- $43 \%$ of surveyed private high schools had computer labs.
- $90 \%$ of the surveyed private primary schools have toilets.
- $90 \%$ of the surveyed private primary schools have useable drinking water
- Amongst the surveyed private primary schools, $58 \%$ had complete boundary walls
- $69 \%$ of surveyed private primary schools had playgrounds.
- $76 \%$ of surveyed private primary schools had electricity connection.
- On average, 12 rooms were being used for classroom activities in the surveyed private high schools.


## THEME 12: SCHOOLGRANTS/FUNDS

1\% of the government primary schools and 0\% private primary schools received grants.

- 1 surveyed government primary schools were receiving grants in 2019 as compared to 0 surveyed private primary schools.


## THEME 13: DISABILITIES \& FUNCTIONINGS

ASER 2019, as part of the school level survey, included a "Health and Disability" section under which the head teachers/teachers were asked a variety of questions pertaining to Children with Disabilities and Facilities for Children with Disabilities in their respective schools.

In Azad Jammu \& Kashmir, 21.6\% of the surveyed government schools were reported to be having children with disabilities while $16.9 \%$ of the private schools reported the same. in terms of gender, more boys ( $0.18 \%$ of total enrolled boys in government schools and $0.12 \%$ of total enrolled boys in private schools) were reported to be suffering from a disability when compared with girls ( $0.11 \%$ of total enrolled girls in government schools and $0.05 \%$ of total enrolled girls in private schools).

With regards to the types of disability as a percentage of schools with children with disabilities, the highest reported type was Physical (40.7\%) followed by Intellectual (16.7\%).

Moreover, $0.7 \%$ of surveyed government schools had ramps and 1.7 had disability friendly toilets regardless of whether these schools had any child with a disability enrolled in them.

## AZAD JAMMU \& KASHMIR - RURAL

## Information \& Communication Technology

- $86.4 \%$ of households across all rural districts of Azad Jammu \& Kashmir have mobile phones.
- Amongst mobile users, $66.6 \%$ use SMS facility for communication.
- 20.8\% of households have computers/laptops


## Alternate Energy

- Across all rural districts of Azad Jammu \& Kashmir, $13.1 \%$ of the sampled households use solar panels as an alternate energy resource.


## HOUSEHOLD



## SCHOOLS




ANNEXURE


## SAMPLE DESCRIPTION

| SAMPLE DESCRIPTION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | 3 to 16 Children |  |  |  | 5 to 16 Children Assessed |  |  |  |  | Schools |  |
| Province/Territory | Districts Covered | Villages | Households |  | $\frac{0}{\sum_{\Sigma}^{\pi}}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \overline{\bar{\circ}} \\ & \stackrel{\circ}{\circ} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\frac{\mathbb{0}}{\sum_{\Sigma}^{\pi}}$ |  | Total | Mothers |  |  |
| Azad Jammu and Kashmir | 10 | 298 | 5946 | 7368 | 8122 | 19 | 15509 | 5684 | 6435 | 12 | 12131 | 5964 | 291 | 267 |
| Balochistan | 34 | 1004 | 20014 | 29548 | 34914 | 73 | 64535 | 22892 | 27807 | 68 | 50767 | 20367 | 949 | 219 |
| Newly Merged District Khyber Pakhtunkhwa | 13 | 385 | 7686 | 8885 | 14038 | 36 | 22959 | 5970 | 9464 | 30 | 15464 | 7860 | 318 | 91 |
| Gilgit-Baltistan | 14 | 417 | 8213 | 12137 | 13932 | 34 | 26103 | 9471 | 11082 | 31 | 20584 | 8898 | 411 | 247 |
| Islamabad - ICT | 1 | 30 | 562 | 503 | 641 | 2 | 1146 | 373 | 476 | 2 | 851 | 563 | 14 | 17 |
| Khyber Pakhtunkhwa | 25 | 727 | 14306 | 15115 | 24159 | 68 | 39342 | 11809 | 20439 | 61 | 32309 | 14641 | 705 | 438 |
| Punjab | 35 | 1031 | 20677 | 23421 | 28465 | 66 | 51952 | 19417 | 23813 | 63 | 43293 | 20584 | 1027 | 594 |
| Sindh | 23 | 654 | 13047 | 14250 | 19439 | 31 | 33720 | 11007 | 16213 | 29 | 27249 | 13131 | 622 | 113 |
| National-Rural | 155 | 4546 | 92008 | 111227 | 143710 | 329 | 255266 | 86623 | 115729 | 296 | 202648 | 92008 | 4337 | 1986 |
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    https://heckmanequation.org/resource/4-big-benefits-of-investing-in-early-childhooddevelopment/
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    by the School Education Department (SED), Government of Punjab has dedicated a section to pre-primary education
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    3. Variables used in Wealth Index: Type of house (Kucha, Semi Pucca and Pucca), ownership status of the house, electricity connection, possession of a TV, possession of a mobile phone, availability of solar panel, availability of a personal computer and possession of at least 1 car or motorbike.
[^9]:    Source: Various Sources

[^10]:    1"Block wise provisional summary results of $6^{\text {th }}$ population and housing 2017 (as on January 03,2018)" by census division, Pakistan Bureau of Statistics www.pbscensus.gov.pk

[^11]:    If $s /$ he cannot correctly read at least 4 out of 5 words she chooses, then show her/him the list of letters.

    - Ask the child to read any 5 letters from the list. Let her /him choose the letters. If $s /$ he does not choose then point out letters to her/him.


    ## Letters

    - If $s /$ he can correctly recognize at least 4 out of 5 letters with ease, then show her/him the list of words again.
    If $\mathrm{s} / \mathrm{he}$ can read 4 out of 5 letters but cannot read words, then mark her /him as a child who 'can read letters'.
    - If $s /$ he cannot read 4 out of 5 letters correctly, then mark her as a child as a 'beginner'.

[^12]:    ${ }^{1}$ Other type of schools include classes 6-8, 1-12, 3-8, 6-10, 4-8, 5-10 etc.
    ${ }^{2}$ ITA has detailed documents on the tools development process. Tools are developed after analyzing national textbooks and in consultation with expert groups at the provincial and national level. They are then piloted intensively before use to ensure comparability, consistency and reliability across provinces and over time.

[^13]:    How to read: $6.8 \%(6.1+0.7+0.0+0.0)$ children of age 3 are enrolled

[^14]:    "-", "0" represents insufficient data

[^15]:    "-", "0" represents insufficient data , *grants received till November 15,2019

[^16]:    ${ }^{2}$ ITA has detailed documents on the tools development process. Tools are developed after analyzing national textbooks and in consultation with expert groups at the provincial and national level. They are then piloted intensively before use to ensure comparability, consistency and reliability across provinces and over time.

[^17]:    How to read: $15.2 \%(2.6+12.1+0.4+0.1)$ children of age 3 are enrolled

[^18]:    ${ }^{1}$ Other type of schools include classes 6-8, 1-12, 3-8, 6-10, 4-8, 5-10 etc.
    ${ }^{2}$ ITA has detailed documents on the tools development process. Tools are developed after analyzing national textbooks and in consultation with expert groups at the provincial and national level. They are then piloted intensively before use to ensure comparability, consistency and reliability across provinces and over time.

[^19]:    "-", "0" represents insufficient data

[^20]:    ${ }^{1}$ Other type of schools include classes 6-8, 1-12, 3-8, 6-10, 4-8, 5-10 etc

[^21]:    "-", "0" represents insufficient data , *grants received till November 15,2019

[^22]:    ${ }^{1}$ Other type of schools include classes 6-8, 1-12, 3-8, 6-10, 4-8, 5-10 etc

[^23]:    How to read: $1.7 \%(1.0+0.6+0.1+0.0)$ children of age 3 are enrolled

[^24]:    ${ }^{1}$ Other type of schools include classes 6-8, 1-12, 3-8, 6-10, 4-8, 5-10 etc

[^25]:    ${ }^{1}$ Other type of schools include classes 6-8, 1-12, 3-8, 6-10, 4-8, 5-10 etc.

[^26]:    Overall teacher attendance in surveyed government schools stood at $89 \%$ whereas it was $90 \%$ in surveyed private schools.

[^27]:    How to read: $21.0 \%(19.6+1.3+0.0+0.1)$ children of age 3 are enrolled

[^28]:    189 ASER Pakistan 2019

[^29]:    "-", "0" represents insufficient data , *grants received till November 15,2019

[^30]:    ${ }^{1}$ Other type of schools include classes 6-8, 1-12, 3-8, 6-10, 4-8, 5-10 etc.

[^31]:    How to read: $17.9 \%(4.8+13.0+0.0+0.1)$ children of age 3 are enrolled

[^32]:    ${ }^{1}$ Other type of schools include classes 6-8, 1-12, 3-8, 6-10, 4-8, 5-10 etc

