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I. Foreword

Education was made a fundamental right by the 86th Constitutional Amendment, 2002 and implemented through the Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act (RTE), 2009. However, what is tragic is that this act was aimed to benefit the weakest and marginalised sections of our society and they are the ones who are bearing the brunt of an unaccountable and inefficient education department- education has been orphaned by the Mumbai corporation’s education department. Total enrolments in Mumbai’s municipal corporation (MCGM) schools have fallen by 23% from 4,04,251 in 2013-14 to 3,11,663 in 2017-18.

A time series analysis shows that if the current trend of fall in enrolments continues, MCGM will have no students by the year 2027-28. As of 2017-18, 426 MCGM schools had student strength of upto 100, which is 35% of the total MCGM schools. Further, in the last 10 years (2008-09 to 2017-18), 229 schools have closed due to no enrolment or students getting transferred to another school, of which 48.5% were Marathi medium schools and 39.7% were other mediums such as Gujarati, Tamil, Telugu and Kannada.

These indicators clearly show that the MCGM is unable to retain students in its Municipal Schools.

In the same time period, municipal budgets have grown by 36% from Rs. 1540 crores in 2013-14 to Rs. 2094 crores in 2017-18. Inspite of an increase in the budget, in a household survey commissioned to Hansa research, 94% of total respondents said that they would want to shift their children to private schools.

This trend is also visible in the district profile of U-DISE, where there has been a fall in MCGM enrolments from 4,01,367 in 2013-14 to 2,97,076 in 2017-18 and a fall in private aided school enrolments (from 1,58,500 in 2013-14 to 1,33,136 in 2017-18) whereas there is a corresponding rise in enrolments of private unaided schools (from 3,14,931 in 2013-14 to 3,26,507 in 2017-18) and unrecognised schools (from 24,155 in 2013-14 to 40,095 in 2017-18).

The RTE act made special provisions to provide an opportunity for the parents of the students, experts, service providers (teachers) and local elected representatives (municipal councillors) to participate jointly in school level decision making and improve the quality of education which would enable a bottom-up approach in suggesting improvements and budgeting at the school level. However, a sample data collected on SMC attendance shows that in 85% of schools in 2016-17 and 83% schools in 2017-18, municipal councillors did not attend even one SMC meeting.

One of the important functions of the SMC is to prepare a School Development Plan (SDP) which includes a demand for infrastructural, financial and other resource requirements of the school (Action Plan). A sample of 24 SDPs however showed that no ‘Action Plan’ making demands or proposals for school improvements, was submitted by those schools.
If school level decision-making is to be made a reality, awareness, training and powers of the SMC would need to be strengthened and active participation of the elected representatives and administration would need to be ensured.

Further, unless the timely reporting, maintenance and monitoring of education outcomes is not taken seriously, the MCGM would not be able to analyse and predict the status of municipal education and on how and where it can take corrective measures.

PRAJA has been asking the MCGM to appoint an independent third party auditor to monitor the learning outcomes which will give the Education department a true picture of what is happening and also give suggestions on how to improve its functioning to deliver better quality education. If it continues to adopt an ostrich like approach towards this situation, in less than 10 years we will not have any children going to MCGM schools.

**NITAI MEHTA**

**Managing Trustee, Praja Foundation**
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### Section I: Status of Municipal Education in Mumbai

#### A. Outcome Indicators

Table 1: Total number of students (Enrolments) in Mumbai’s MCGM, Private Aided, Private Unaided And Unrecognised Schools from 2013-14 to 2017-18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of School</th>
<th>2013-14</th>
<th>2014-15</th>
<th>2015-16</th>
<th>2016-17</th>
<th>2017-18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCGM</td>
<td>4,01,367</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>3,92,008</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>3,77,337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private aided</td>
<td>1,58,500</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>1,53,058</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>1,47,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private unaided</td>
<td>3,14,931</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>3,15,877</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>3,22,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrecognised</td>
<td>24,155</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>14,401</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>16,321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>8,98,953</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>8,75,344</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>8,64,013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Inference:**

- Total enrolment in all types of schools in Mumbai has fallen by -11% in the last 5 years, which shows lesser student enrolment in Mumbai MCGM city limits.
- Among the types of schools in Mumbai, percentage share of MCGM and private aided schools has fallen from 45% and 18% in 2013-14 to 37% and 17% in 2017-18, respectively.
- Whereas the percentage share of private unaided and unrecognised schools has risen from 35% and 3% in 2013-14 to 41% and 5% in 2017-18.

---

1 Data based upon District Profile of U-DISE. (Unified District Information System for Education) Total Student numbers are different from RTI data since UDISE does not include Jr. and Sr. Kg. Data.
Table 2: Total No. of Students (Enrolments) in Mumbai’s Municipal Schools from 2013-14 to 2017-18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Students</td>
<td>4,04,251</td>
<td>3,97,085</td>
<td>3,83,485</td>
<td>3,43,621</td>
<td>3,11,663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change in Enrolments Year on Year</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>-10%</td>
<td>-9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Medium-wise Change in Enrolments Year on Year (%) |
|---------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Marathi No. & % | 91,919 & -10.80% | 73,992 & -19.50% | 71,454 & -3.43% | 62,692 & -12.26% | 56,969 & -9.13% |
| Hindi No. & % | 1,25,120 & -8.90% | 1,16,111 & -7.20% | 1,19,384 & 2.82% | 1,00,700 & -15.65% | 85,756 & -14.84% |
| English No. & % | 57,915 & 1.20% | 66,467 & 14.77% | 71,260 & 7.21% | 74,035 & 3.89% | 75,918 & 2.54% |
| Urdu No. & % | 1,10,776 & -3.30% | 1,06,918 & -3.48% | 1,05,307 & -1.51% | 92,746 & -11.93% | 82,349 & -11.21% |
| Gujarati No. & % | 5,686 & -19.20% | 5,299 & -6.81% | 4,956 & -6.47% | 4,086 & -17.55% | 3,020 & -26.09% |
| Kannada No. & % | 2,828 & -21.50% | 2,549 & -9.87% | 2,526 & -0.90% | 2,106 & -16.63% | 1,721 & -18.28% |
| Tamil No. & % | 7,161 & -10.60% | 6,065 & -15.31% | 5,954 & -1.83% | 5,010 & -15.85% | 4,146 & -17.25% |
| Telugu No. & % | 2,280 & -23.40% | 2,062 & -9.56% | 1,870 & -9.31% | 1,454 & -22.25% | 983 & -32.39% |

Inference:

- Total number of students enrolled in MCGM schools has fallen by 9% in the past year, and the highest fall is in Hindi medium, followed by Urdu and Marathi among major languages.
- MCGM English medium schools have seen a marginal rise of 2.54% in enrolments from 2016-17 to 2017-18.
- MCGM has 92,588 students less in 2017-18 as compared to 2013-14, a fall in total number of students by 23% in the last 5 years.

---

2 Data for total enrolments as of 30th September, 2017 was collected through online available data of primary schools. Since online data did not include secondary school data, medium wise, and did not have Jr. and Sr. Kg. data, these were taken from data collected through RTIs filed in each ward.

3 In 2014-15, data presented does not include enrolment from 49 secondary schools of 14 wards, as medium wise data was not provided by the respective Public Information Officers.
### Table 3: Total Dropouts in Mumbai’s Municipal Schools from 2013-14 to 2017-18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dropouts</td>
<td>47,218</td>
<td>51,741</td>
<td>57,788</td>
<td>29,186</td>
<td>15,978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropouts (per 100)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Medium-wise Dropouts Year on Year (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marathi</td>
<td>6,817</td>
<td>7,724</td>
<td>9,320</td>
<td>5,143</td>
<td>2,739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindi</td>
<td>21,283</td>
<td>21,744</td>
<td>27,343</td>
<td>12,036</td>
<td>6,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>3,346</td>
<td>3,543</td>
<td>3,986</td>
<td>3,017</td>
<td>1,303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td>14,496</td>
<td>15,731</td>
<td>15,834</td>
<td>8,341</td>
<td>5,149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gujarati</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kannada</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamil</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telugu</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Inference:
- Number of dropouts has been falling from 2015-16 to 2017-18. However, the figure of 15,978 (in 2017-18) is still considerable for number of students dropping out annually.
- The dropout of 5% in 2017-18 however can also be attributed to the lack of complete data. The secondary department of the MCGM did not provide the said data even after 6 months of filing of RTI and therefore the above data does not include information of 120 schools.
- A fall in dropout rates is witnessed across all mediums in 2017-18. The highest dropout percentage among major languages is in Hindi medium (7.20%), which also has the most number of enrolments.

---

4 G/N ward has provided nil data of dropouts in their Primary schools in 2016-17.
5 2017-18 dropout data does not include 120 secondary schools.
6 From 2008, Praja Foundation has been collecting data on number of dropouts in MCGM schools, through RTI applications to the A.O. School’s Office. In 2011, in response to our RTI application on number of dropouts, we were given data on number of students ‘continuously absent’ (सततगैरहजर) and informed that the Department no longer maintains numbers of dropouts. As per the Right to Education Act, the Department maintains data on students continuously absent. Hence, since the 2011-12 academic year, we are using numbers of ‘continuously absent’ students as an indicator of dropouts.
7 In 2013-14 data presented does not include dropouts from secondary schools of 12 wards, as incomplete data was provided by the respective Public Information Officers.
8 In 2014-15 data presented does not include dropout from 49 secondary schools of 14 wards, as medium wise data was not provided by the respective Public Information Officers.
Table 4: Transition Rate of Students from Class 7 in 2016-17 to Class 8 in 2017-18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Total Enrolment</th>
<th>Transition Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>42,348</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>28,709</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inference:
The Transition Rate\(^9\) of students studying in Class 7 in 2016-17 to Class 8 in 2017-18 in MCGM schools was 68%. This means that 32% students enrolled in Class 7 did not continue their secondary education (from Class 8) in an MCGM school.

Table 5: Change in Total Students (Enrolment) 2009-10 to 2017-18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Enrolments</th>
<th>% Change Year on Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>455,900</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>437,863</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>439,153</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>434,523</td>
<td>-1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>404,251</td>
<td>-7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>397,085</td>
<td>-1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>383,485</td>
<td>-3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>3,43,621</td>
<td>-10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>3,11,663</td>
<td>-9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-19*</td>
<td>2,77,105</td>
<td>-11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-20*</td>
<td>2,43,402</td>
<td>-12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-21*</td>
<td>2,09,418</td>
<td>-14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021-22*</td>
<td>1,75,526</td>
<td>-16.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022-23*</td>
<td>1,41,604</td>
<td>-19.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inference:
- Through a time-series analysis, in our last year report, we had predicted that in 2017-18 the total number of students will be 3,21,288. The actual figure of academic year 2017-18 was lesser at 3,11,663 students.
- (*) Using a time-series regression we have tried to estimate the year on year trend in enrolment rates extrapolating this to the next five academic years, 2018-19 to 2022-23.\(^10\) If the fall in enrolments in MCGM schools continues at the same rate, by 2022-23 the number of total enrolments would fall to more than half (68.9%) of the total enrolments of 2009-10.

\(^9\) The number of students admitted to the first grade of a higher level of education in a given year, expressed as a percentage of the number of pupils (or students) enrolled in the final grade of the lower level of education in the previous year.

\(^10\) Refer Annexure 1 for details.
Table 6: Retention Rate in Municipal Schools - Class 1 to Class 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Total Enrolments</th>
<th>Retention Rate (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>39,663</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>45,675</td>
<td>115.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>46,214</td>
<td>116.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>41,389</td>
<td>104.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>34,824</td>
<td>87.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2018-19*</td>
<td>26,520</td>
<td>66.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2019-20*</td>
<td>15,004</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inference:
87.8% students who enrolled in Class 1 in 2013-14 have continued their education up to Class 5 in 2017-18. (*) The time-series regression done to estimate the year on year trend in retention rates extrapolating this to the next two academic years\(^{11}\), shows that 37.8% students who had enrolled in Class 1 in 2013-14 would be retained up to Class 7.

Table 7: Change in Class I Enrolments from 2009-10 to 2017-18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No. of students enrolled in Class I</th>
<th>% Change Year on Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>67,477</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>62,587</td>
<td>-7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>53,729</td>
<td>-14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>46,913</td>
<td>-12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>39,663</td>
<td>-15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>39,214</td>
<td>-1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>34,549</td>
<td>-11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>32,218</td>
<td>-6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>30,075</td>
<td>-6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-19*</td>
<td>27,821</td>
<td>-7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-20*</td>
<td>25,633</td>
<td>-7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-21*</td>
<td>23,405</td>
<td>-8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021-22*</td>
<td>21,201</td>
<td>-9.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inference:
- Class 1 enrolments have fallen in 2017-18 when compared to 2016-17 by 6.7%.
- (*) The time-series regression done to estimate the year on year trend in Class I enrolments extrapolating this to the next four academic years, shows that if the current rate of fall in enrolment continues, only 21,201 students would have enrolled in Class 1 MCGM schools in 2021-22 compared to 67,477 in 2009-10.

\(^{11}\) Refer Annexure 1 for details.
Table 8: Medium-wise Class I Enrolments 2013-14 to 2017-18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>2013-14 (Y1)</th>
<th>2014-15 (Y2)</th>
<th>2015-16 (Y3)</th>
<th>2016-17 (Y4)</th>
<th>2017-18 (Y5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of Students</td>
<td>No. of Students</td>
<td>(%) Y1 to Y2</td>
<td>No. of Students</td>
<td>No. of Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marathi</td>
<td>7,365</td>
<td>7,131</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>6,104</td>
<td>-14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindi</td>
<td>11,232</td>
<td>10,844</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>9,141</td>
<td>-16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>8,437</td>
<td>9,226</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8,726</td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td>10,851</td>
<td>10,377</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>9,069</td>
<td>-13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gujarati</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>-14%</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>-16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kannada</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>-22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamil</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>-11%</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telugu</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>-11%</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>-7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.R.</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>39,663</td>
<td>39,214</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>34,549</td>
<td>-12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inference:
Class 1 enrolments have fallen in all language schools, except English for the academic year 2017-18.

---

12 Data presented does not include enrolment from 49 secondary schools of 14 wards, as medium wise data was not provided by the respective Public Information Officers.
Closed Schools

The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act 2009 (RTE) Maharashtra Rules\(^\text{13}\) provides that a school be there at every one kilometer with a minimum of 20 children for 1\(^{st}\) to 5\(^{th}\) and every three kilometres with a minimum of 20 children for 6\(^{th}\) to 8\(^{th}\) standards. Last year, the State Government of Maharashtra had declared that it shall close schools with less than 20 students across the state.

With falling enrolments in MCGM schools, questions arise over the sustainability of MCGM to run schools that fulfil RTE norms (that is more than 20 students.) MCGM schools have shown considerably well performing infrastructure, fulfilling RTE infrastructure norms. (Refer Section B (3)) While the resource allocation in terms of number of schools is skewed medium wise vis a vis demand for that medium (enrolments) (Refer Table 27) there is also an underutilisation evident through the falling enrolments.

**Table 9: Number of schools with students upto 100 in 2017-18**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Marathi</th>
<th>Hindi</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Urdu</th>
<th>Gujarati</th>
<th>Kannada</th>
<th>Tamil</th>
<th>Telugu</th>
<th>M.R.(^\text{14})</th>
<th>Total schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 to 20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 to 50</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 to 100</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 100</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>426</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inference:

- As of 2017-18 a total of 426 schools out of 1213, which is 35% of MCGM schools have student strength upto 100.
- 53 MCGM schools have a student strength of upto 20, and would be liable to be closed and existing students transferred to other schools, due to poor student count.
- Marathi medium has the highest count of schools with upto 100 students at 186 schools, followed by 51 Gujarati, 47 Urdu and 42 Hindi medium schools with upto 100 students.


\(^{14}\) Schools for specially-abled children.
Number of schools with zero enrolments over the years or those whose students were transferred to another school and the school was merged have been considered in calculating the schools that are closed or non-functional as shown in Table 10. In addition, an RTI was filed for list of schools that have been closed from 2008-09 upto 2017-18, however the numbers provided in the latter are understated as can be seen from Table 11. One cause of the discrepancy can be attributed to the fact that schools with zero enrolments or those that are ‘merged’ are not officially ‘closed’ until the procedures for the same are completed.

Table 10: Number of Closed Schools\textsuperscript{15} from 2008-09 to 2017-18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marathi</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other\textsuperscript{16}</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inference:
- A total of 229 schools have been closed due to being closed or merged over the past ten years from 2008-09 to 2017-18.
- Highest number of schools from Marathi medium (111) have been closed followed by other mediums such as Gujarati, Tamil, Telugu and Kannada (91).
- The number of schools closing in the last 10 years does not show any particular trend, most schools have closed in 2016-17.

\textsuperscript{15} As per reply of RTI filed for total number of students in MCGM schools. Numbers show schools that had zero students in the given years, and were confirmed closed or ‘merged’ in other schools.

\textsuperscript{16} Includes other mediums such as Gujarati, Telugu, Tamil and Kannada.
Table 11: Closed Schools as per MCGM List and Total Enrolment Data from 2013-14 to 2017-18.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>As per Closed Schools List</th>
<th>As per MCGM Enrolment Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marathi</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindi</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gujarati</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kannada</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamil</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telugu</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inference:

In the past 5 years, 142 schools have zero enrolment or have been merged into other schools and therefore practically closed. According to the list of schools provided by the MCGM as closed, 112 schools\(^{19}\) have closed in the past 5 years.

\(^{17}\) As per reply of RTI filed for list of MCGM schools closed.

\(^{18}\) As per reply of RTI filed for total number of students in MCGM schools. Numbers show schools that had zero students in the given years, and were confirmed closed or ‘merged’ in other schools.

\(^{19}\) The table shows 112 schools, in addition to which 48 more schools are mentioned in the closed school list provided by MCGM which are not included in the data since they did not give the year in which they were closed and therefore could not be mapped year-wise.
Table 12: Total Enrolments in Semi-English schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>No. of Schools</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standards</strong></td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>1st to 2nd</td>
<td>1st to 3rd</td>
<td>1st to 4th</td>
<td>1st to 5th</td>
<td>1st to 6th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No. of Students</strong></td>
<td>577</td>
<td>7,488</td>
<td>20,884</td>
<td>44,293</td>
<td>56,351</td>
<td>77,487</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marathi</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3,654</td>
<td>9,937</td>
<td>16,743</td>
<td>18,326</td>
<td>22,955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hindi</strong></td>
<td>125</td>
<td>1,837</td>
<td>9,013</td>
<td>15,323</td>
<td>23,070</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urdu</strong></td>
<td>540</td>
<td>3,527</td>
<td>8,660</td>
<td>17,464</td>
<td>21,307</td>
<td>29,648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gujarati</strong></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>397</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kannada</strong></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tamil</strong></td>
<td>82</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>1,011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Telugu</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>149</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Inference:**
- The number of schools falling under Semi-English pattern of schools, where subjects like the natural sciences and Maths are taught in English inspite of the school not being English medium, has increased in the last six years from 12 schools in 2012-13 to 678 schools in 2017-18.
- Number of students in semi-English schools has increased by 38% in 2017-18 as compared to 2016-17.
- Semi-English pattern is followed mostly in Urdu medium, followed by Hindi and Marathi mediums for academic year 2017-18.

---

20 Data for Semi-English schools provided is according to the list of semi-English schools as provided ward wise through RTI in 2017-18.
Table 13: Total Dropouts in Semi-English schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of Schools</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>1st to 2nd</td>
<td>1st to 3rd</td>
<td>1st to 4th</td>
<td>1st to 5th</td>
<td>1st to 6th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Students</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>7,488</td>
<td>20,884</td>
<td>44,293</td>
<td>56,351</td>
<td>77,487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropouts</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>1,245</td>
<td>3,432</td>
<td>4,563</td>
<td>5,828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropouts per 100</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Medium-wise Dropouts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>In no.</th>
<th>Dropouts per 100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marathi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In no.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropouts per 100</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In no.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropouts per 100</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In no.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropouts per 100</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gujarati</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In no.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropouts per 100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kannada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In no.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropouts per 100</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In no.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropouts per 100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telugu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In no.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropouts per 100</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Inference:**

- Percentage of dropouts in semi-English pattern of schools stands at 8%, higher than average dropout rate of 5% in 2017-18 (Refer to Table 3).
- Medium wise dropout percentage in 2017-18 is highest in Hindi (10%), followed by Urdu (7%) and Marathi (6%) in major languages.
### Table 14: Standards-wise Enrolment and Dropout in Semi-English schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Standards</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>Enrolments</td>
<td>577</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dropouts</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dropouts per 100</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>Enrolments</td>
<td>6,681</td>
<td>807</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dropouts</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dropouts per 100</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-2015</td>
<td>Enrolments</td>
<td>12,009</td>
<td>8,045</td>
<td>830</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dropouts</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>919</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dropouts per 100</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td>Enrolments</td>
<td>20,294</td>
<td>14,254</td>
<td>8,856</td>
<td>889</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dropouts</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>1481</td>
<td>1179</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dropouts per 100</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-2017</td>
<td>Enrolments</td>
<td>17,644</td>
<td>19,699</td>
<td>11,867</td>
<td>6,786</td>
<td>355</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dropouts</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>1863</td>
<td>1429</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dropouts per 100</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-2018</td>
<td>Enrolments</td>
<td>19,275</td>
<td>19,607</td>
<td>19,708</td>
<td>11,983</td>
<td>6,605</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dropouts</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>1,928</td>
<td>1,726</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dropouts per 100</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Inference:**

In 2017-18, more students have dropped out of semi-English school at an early stage of schooling (10% in Class 2) than in higher standards (2% in Class 6).
Table 15: Standards-wise Enrolments and Dropouts in Mumbai Public Schools (MPS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>2015-16</th>
<th>2016-17</th>
<th>2017-18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enrolments</td>
<td>Dropout</td>
<td>Dropouts per 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jr. Kg</td>
<td>3,321</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr. Kg</td>
<td>3,724</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4,097</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,156</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3,889</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3,475</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3,059</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2,501</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,809</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1,370</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31,803</td>
<td>1,231</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inference:

- Enrolments in Mumbai Public Schools have risen by 6.76% in 2017-18 as compared to 2016-17. The number of dropouts has fallen by 43.99% as compared to 2016-17.
- Dropouts in MPS (1%) are drastically lower than overall average dropout of 5%\(^{21}\) in 2017-18.
- The overall performance of MPS schools is better than other schools which shows that the format of having complete schooling (from Jr. Kg. to 10\(^{th}\)) in one school enables reduce dropout rates and sustain enrolment.

---

\(^{21}\) Refer to Table 3
Table 16: Comparison of performance of schools under Public Private Partnership Scheme of MCGM to other schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation/Type of school</th>
<th>2015-16</th>
<th>2016-17</th>
<th>2017-18</th>
<th>Enrolment difference from 2015-16 to 2017-18</th>
<th>Average Dropout rates from 2015-16 to 2017-18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MPS PPP schools under Full School Support</td>
<td>6,924</td>
<td>7,606</td>
<td>8,168</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aishabai Haji Abdul Latif Charitable Trust</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>-35%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akanksha</td>
<td>1,998</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>2,624</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aseema</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>1,088</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educo</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muktangan</td>
<td>2,763</td>
<td>2,912</td>
<td>3,125</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach For India</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>-22%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Scholar’s Education Trust</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>-25%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPS PPP schools under Partly School Support (Jr. and Sr. Kg. teachers are provided by Naandi Foundation)</td>
<td>17,571</td>
<td>19,173</td>
<td>20,145</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non PPP MPS schools</td>
<td>7,308</td>
<td>7,718</td>
<td>8,515</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total MPS Schools</td>
<td>31,803</td>
<td>34,497</td>
<td>36,828</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total non-MPS schools</td>
<td>3,51,682</td>
<td>3,09,124</td>
<td>2,74,835</td>
<td>-22%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22 The MCGM’s public private partnership scheme entailed NGO support of MCGM schools in various capacities. Full school support refers to support of teachers and teaching methodology for the entire school, Partly School Support and Specific Services Support refers to part support of teachers and other support such as training, materials, etc. The Scheme was operational from 2007-08 and the scheme has been subsequently extended from time to time.
Inference:

- Under the Full School Support Scheme of PPP, all the schools are of MPS format (19 schools) and show a positive enrolment of 18% and dropout rate of 2%. It cannot however be said that the performance of MPS schools is positive because they are run by private NGOs, since non-PPP MPS schools (23 schools) also show a positive performance. (Enrolment rise of 17% and dropout rate of 3%)

- The performance of all MPS schools (Enrolment rise of 16% and dropout rate of 2%) can therefore be attributed to the MPS format of schooling from Jr. Kg. to 10th more than the PPP scheme, due to which its performance is much better than other non-MPS schools. (Enrolment fall of -22% and dropout rate of 10%)
Table 17: SSC Results (Pass Percentage) from March 2012 to March 2018 Examination: Comparison between MCGM and Private Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No. of Candidates Appeared</th>
<th>Total Pass</th>
<th>Pass in (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MCGM School</td>
<td>Private School</td>
<td>MCGM School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-12</td>
<td>12,466</td>
<td>164,526</td>
<td>7,623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-13</td>
<td>12,856</td>
<td>164,010</td>
<td>7,658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-14</td>
<td>12,379</td>
<td>159,621</td>
<td>8,267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-15</td>
<td>10,779</td>
<td>159,913</td>
<td>7,809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-16</td>
<td>10,220</td>
<td>154,358</td>
<td>7,866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-17</td>
<td>11,972</td>
<td>135,392</td>
<td>8,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-18</td>
<td>12,104</td>
<td>129,767</td>
<td>8,934</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inferences:
There has been an improvement in pass percentage of students of MCGM who appeared for SSC examination, although the percentage gap of MCGM and private school students passing SSC exam is 18.65%.

Figure 1: SSC Results Grade Wise Percentage of Students Passed in March 2018 Examination: Comparison between MCGM and Private Schools

Inferences:
While 32.27% students in private schools achieved distinction, the figure was 8.91% for MCGM schools. Similarly, 26.42% students of MCGM schools passed in pass class whereas the figure was 8.09% for private schools. This shows that more students who passed from MCGM schools received a lower grade (Pass or Grade II) as compared to private schools.

23 Total SSC pass out numbers: Source [http://mahresult.nic.in/ssc2017/mumbai.htm](http://mahresult.nic.in/ssc2017/mumbai.htm)
Table 18: Comparison between Private and MCGM Schools: Scholarships<sup>24</sup>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Candidates Appeared</th>
<th>Scholarship Holders</th>
<th>Scholarship Holders in %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MCGM School</td>
<td>Private School</td>
<td>MCGM School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Middle School Scholarship Examination</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Standard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>9,637</td>
<td>21,998</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>5,426</td>
<td>21,223</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>2,621</td>
<td>20,660</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>5,634</td>
<td>19,351</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; std. Scholarship exam was not conducted in the year 2015-16&lt;sup&gt;25&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5th Standard</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17&lt;sup&gt;26&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4,668</td>
<td>16,165</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>6,998</td>
<td>15,007</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High School Scholarship Examination</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th Standard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>7,160</td>
<td>19,227</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>4,283</td>
<td>20,190</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>1,727</td>
<td>19,982</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>3,799</td>
<td>18,284</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>7&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; std. Scholarship exam was not conducted in the year 2015-16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8th Standard</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>3,276</td>
<td>14,690</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>5,285</td>
<td>13,825</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Inference:**
- The number of candidates appearing for scholarship exam in 5<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> standards has risen from 2016-17 to 2017-18, for both MCGM schools. The absolute number of candidates appearing for the exam is much higher for Private than MCGM schools.
- Only 2.6% MCGM students who appeared for the Middle School Scholarship (5<sup>th</sup>) received the scholarship whereas this figure is 12% for private school candidates. Similarly, for High School Scholarship (8<sup>th</sup>), only 0.6% candidates from MCGM schools received scholarship, whereas 11.5% candidates from private schools received scholarship.

<sup>24</sup>The scholarship exams are conducted by the Maharashtra State Council of Examinations: 1. To undertake talent search at the end of Primary Schooling i.e. at the end of 4<sup>th</sup> or 7<sup>th</sup> Standard. 2. To nurture and encourage the talented and deserving students by recognising and provide them financial support. (<Source: MAHARASHTRA STATE COUNCIL OF EXAMINATIONS - http://msce.mah.nic.in/home.htm>)

<sup>25</sup>The table does not contain scholarship for the academic year 2015-16 since scholarship exams were not conducted for standard 4<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> in the academic year 2015-16. Refer Annexure 2.

<sup>26</sup>As per the government GR for scholarship, academic year 2016-17 onwards, scholarship exams will be conducted for class 5<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup>. Scholarship data from academic year 2016-17 and 2017-18 is of standards 5<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup>. 

---
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Continuous and Comprehensive Evaluation

Continuous and Comprehensive Evaluation (CCE) refers to a system of school-based assessment of students that is designed to cover all aspects of students’ development. The new evaluation system was introduced under the Right to Education Act (2009) as a corollary to the no-detention policy. It is a developmental process of assessment which emphasizes on two fold objectives, continuity in evaluation, and assessment of broad based learning and behavioural outcomes.

The scheme is thus a curricular initiative, attempting to shift emphasis from memorizing to holistic learning. It aims at creating citizens possessing sound values, appropriate skills and desirable qualities besides academic excellence. It is the task of school based co-scholastic assessment to focus on holistic development that will lead to lifelong learning. As per the guidelines for evaluation, teachers should aim at helping the child to obtain minimum C2 grade. It will be compulsory for a teacher and school to provide extra guidance and coaching to children who score grade D or below, and help them attain minimum C2 grade.

Following is the marking scheme used under CCE:

A1 and A2 as A (marks between 100% to 81%)
B1 and B2 as B (marks between 80% to 61%)
C1 and C2 as C (marks between 60% to 40%)
D: 33% to 40%
E1: Students that have never been enrolled in a school. This is an indicator of out of school children.
E2: As per RTE norms, students continuously absent for a month or more are graded as E2 under the CCE system. This is an indicator of students who are irregular in their attendance.

27 The RTE Amendment Bill, 2019 aims to amend the no-detention policy by reintroducing examinations for upto 8th standard.
### Table 19: Percentage of students in respective CCE grades for Standards V and VIII

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CCE Grade</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>5th Standard</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Language</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Language</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Language</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maths</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8th Standard</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Language</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Language</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Language</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maths</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Inference:**
- Maximum percentage of students across subjects in 5th and 8th standards have scored in Grade B.
- An average of 16% students are in Grade C and 4% in Grade D in 5th standard, whereas this figure is 19% for Grade C and 3% for Grade D in 8th standard. This is inspite of the fact that the said sample of schools was taken based upon high dropout rates in the schools.

---

28 The sample for CCE data was taken from 24 wards, based upon schools selected according to 10% of the total number of schools in each ward, which had the highest number/percentage of dropouts’ in the previous academic year (2016-17).
## B. Input Indicators

### 1. Annual Municipal Budget\(^{29}\) for Education

**Table 20: Annual Municipal Budget Estimates for Education from 2008-09 to 2018-19**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Annual Budget Estimates (Rs. in crores)</th>
<th>Total Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>911</td>
<td>451,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>1,255</td>
<td>449,179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>1,761</td>
<td>437,863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>439,153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>2,388</td>
<td>434,523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>2,613</td>
<td>404,251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>2,773</td>
<td>397,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>2,630</td>
<td>383,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>2,567</td>
<td>343,621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>2,454</td>
<td>311,663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-19</td>
<td>2,740</td>
<td>311,663</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Inference:**

Total Annual Budget allocated for education has risen in 2018-19 as compared to 2017-18 estimates. The allocated budget for 2017-18 is Rs. 2,740 crores, 10% of MCGM’s overall budget of Rs. 27,258 crores\(^{30}\).

---

\(^{29}\) Budget figures are based upon data from Budget speech details as uploaded on the MCGM website: [link](http://www.mcgm.gov.in/irj/portal/anonymous?NavigationTarget=navurl://9c91c43a774240aef3d92878731d1daa)

Table 21: Per-child Allocation and Expenditure (In Rs. Crore)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenue Expenses</td>
<td>2,070</td>
<td>1,664</td>
<td>1,954</td>
<td>1,763</td>
<td>2,184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Project works/Capital Expenses (A)</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Primary education (i)</td>
<td>2,394</td>
<td>1,834</td>
<td>2,312</td>
<td>2,003</td>
<td>2,569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Secondary Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenue Expenses</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Project works/Capital Expenses (B)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total secondary education (ii)</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Education Budget (C) (i + ii = C)</strong></td>
<td>2,567</td>
<td>1,939</td>
<td>2,454</td>
<td>2,094</td>
<td>2,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Utilisation</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Less: Grants to Private Primary aided School (D)</strong></td>
<td>300</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (C-D)</strong></td>
<td>2,267</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>2,164</td>
<td>1,834</td>
<td>2,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total students</td>
<td>343,621</td>
<td>343,621</td>
<td>311,663</td>
<td>311,663</td>
<td>311,663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Per Capita cost for every student (in actual rupees)</strong></td>
<td>59,115</td>
<td>49,459</td>
<td>69,437</td>
<td>58,849</td>
<td>78,596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Less: Total Project works/Capital Expenses and Grants (A+B+D=E)</strong></td>
<td>656</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (C-E)</strong></td>
<td>1,911</td>
<td>1,525</td>
<td>1,792</td>
<td>1,590</td>
<td>2,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Per Capita cost for every student (in actual rupees)</strong></td>
<td>49,835</td>
<td>44,394</td>
<td>57,489</td>
<td>51,007</td>
<td>65,290</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inference:

- The MCGM spent Rs. 51,007 per student according to the actual expenditure of 2017-18 and is estimated to spend Rs. 65,290 per student in 2018-19.
- The per student budget actuals as calculated is 15% higher than in 2016-17, indicating increased spending per student, with fall in enrolments and amount of budget allocated almost the same over the years, the per student expenditure amount shows a rise.
### Table 22: Budgeted vs. Actual Expenditure Summary 2015-16 to 2017-18 for Primary Education (In Rs. Crore)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No</th>
<th>Account Head</th>
<th>Budget Estimates</th>
<th>Actual Expenditure</th>
<th>% Utilisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Establishment Expenses</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Administrative Expenses</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Operation and Maintenance</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Finance and Interest Charges</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Programme Expenses</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Revenue Grants, Contribution &amp; Subsidies</td>
<td>1,022</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Depreciation &amp; Others</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Provision for doubtful receivables/refund of tax</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Prior Period</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Revenue Expenses</strong></td>
<td>2,144</td>
<td>2,070</td>
<td>1,953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Project Works/Capital Expenses</strong></td>
<td>357</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>2,501</td>
<td>2,394</td>
<td>2,311</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Inference:**

- The average utilisation of the 2017-18 budget on primary education is 87%, a 10% rise as compared to the previous year.
- Programme expenses, such as those allocated for Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan are however dismal, with a utilisation of only 49%. Similarly, capital expenditure has a utilisation of 67% in 2017-18.
Monitoring and Evaluation

The MCGM Department of Education is broadly divided into two wings - the Administrative wing and the Academic Wing. The Municipal Commissioner is at the top of its hierarchy, followed by the Additional Municipal Commissioner (Education), the Deputy Municipal Commissioner (Education) and the Education Officer, in that order. Below is the hierarchy\(^1\) of the two wings:

\(^1\)The chart has been simplified for representation purposes. Hence, some levels of hierarchy have not been shown separately. Source: http://portal.mcgm.gov.in/irj/go/km/docs/documents/MCGM%20Department%20List/Education%20Officer/RTI%20Manuals/Education_Officer_RTI_E01.pdf

2. Teacher Inspection

In 2017, MCGM released a circular (circular number 237, dated 27.10.17) whereby teacher’s performance would now be evaluated based upon how the students in the class have performed. While this is a positive initiative in tracking how the teacher’s contribution to learning has been, the performance of the student cannot be the sole responsibility of the teacher, since there are various other factors such as the facilities available with the students for learning, the overall school environment, etc. and finally the education department of the MCGM as a whole is responsible for the performance and growth of its students. Teachers, nevertheless play a primary role in shaping the students interest and learning in the classroom environment and therefore it is important to evaluate their performance.
### Table 23: Teacher performance based upon student’s evaluation for 2017-18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Maths</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Average</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Inference:**
- On average the performance of students across standards, is positive, grading the teachers who teach these students as performing considerably well, if one looks at the numbers.
- Of the remarks of school inspectors about the teachers’ performance in addition to the above, 80% remarks suggested improvement in teacher’s performance, 19% were positive appreciation remarks and 1% were negative remarks.
- Given that the sample was based on schools which showed high dropout rates, it appears that student performance is not a main determinant of dropout.

**Enquiries conducted against Teaching staff (Teachers/HMs) and suspensions**

We filed an RTI application with the Education Department regarding enquiries conducted against teaching staff and the reasons for the same. We also asked for information on whether any staff member’s services were terminated and the reasons for the same. Our objective was to get a better understanding of the accountability mechanisms in place in the Education Department; whether teaching staff is held accountable for not performing their duties.

Enquiries were conducted against 67 staff members (headmasters, Dy. Headmasters and teacher/trainers) and 23 staff members have been terminated from services from 2011-12 to 2016-17. In 2017-18, Enquiry was done against 1 headmaster and 2 headmasters were suspended. Enquiry was done against 5 teachers and 19 teachers were suspended for various reasons such as absenteeism, and misbehaviour. Compared to 2016-17 where 3 teachers were suspended, the number has considerably increased, which shows an increase in accountability of the education department towards performance of teachers.

---

32 Performance of teachers was mapped through a sample of data taken from 24 wards, based upon schools selected according to 10% of the total number of schools in each ward, which had the highest number/percentage of dropouts’ in the previous academic year (2016-17).
### 3. Infrastructure Compliance with norms laid down under Right to Education Act

Table 24: Compliance with Infrastructure and other norms under RTE (2017-18)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator: Schools with Infrastructure Facilities Available</th>
<th>MCGM</th>
<th>Private Aided</th>
<th>Private Unaided</th>
<th>Unrecognised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Schools</td>
<td>1192</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Student</td>
<td>2,977,06</td>
<td>1,33,136</td>
<td>3,26,507</td>
<td>40,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Teacher</td>
<td>10,920</td>
<td>3,728</td>
<td>7,558</td>
<td>1,243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,192</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office cum store cum HM room</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,191</td>
<td>99.92%</td>
<td>98.67%</td>
<td>97.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One class room for every teacher</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,182</td>
<td>99.16%</td>
<td>97.57%</td>
<td>98.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramp</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,193</td>
<td>99.83%</td>
<td>94.91%</td>
<td>88.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate Toilet for Boys</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,192</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>97.35%</td>
<td>95.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate Toilet for Girls</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,191</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>99.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking Water Facility</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,192</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary Wall</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,192</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>99.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,189</td>
<td>99.75%</td>
<td>94.03%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator: Outcomes</th>
<th>MCGM</th>
<th>Private</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8,934</td>
<td>73.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School Scholarship (5th)</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>179</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Scholarship (8th)</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


34 Norms of Schools with Infrastructure facilities available, as specified under section 19 of "The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act, 2009"

35 District Profile is taken from Maharashtra Prathmik Shaikshanik Parishad (MPSP) website: http://www.ssamsp.org. Data of District Profile was not provided through RTI by the Education Department for the academic year 2017-18.
Inference:

- The number of students in private (aided, unaided and unrecognised) is 68% more than those in government schools, however the number of schools and teachers are 18% and 15% higher than government schools, respectively. This shows that although MCGM schools have the infrastructure, considerable number of teachers, their outcomes are relatively poor and it is able to retain fewer number of students than private schools.

- Infrastructure norms when compared to learning outcomes shows that although physical infrastructure of a school is an important factor in overall learning environment, a good infrastructure has not particularly translated into better outcomes in the case of MCGM schools.

Table 25: Compliance with Infrastructure norms under RTE: Comparison of 2016-17 and 2017-18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>2016-17</th>
<th>2017-18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MCGM</td>
<td>Private Aided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Schools</td>
<td>1195</td>
<td>459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Students</td>
<td>3,23,899</td>
<td>1,40,918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Teachers</td>
<td>11,369</td>
<td>3,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One class room for every teacher</td>
<td>83.85%</td>
<td>61.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil Teacher Ratio</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inference:

- The number of unrecognised schools has increased drastically from 118 schools to 222 schools in a year and the number of students in these schools has increased to more than double (by 108%)

- The fall in number of students in MCGM schools corresponds to the rise in the number of students in the unrecognised schools, indicating that shift from municipal to private schools is taking place from MCGM to unrecognised schools, as is evident from the mushrooming of unrecognised schools over the years.
Table 26: Student Classroom Ratio and Pupil Teacher Ratio in 2017-18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Govt. and Local bodies</th>
<th>Private Aided</th>
<th>Private Unaided</th>
<th>Un-recognised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of classrooms (1 to 8)</td>
<td>5,113</td>
<td>3,514</td>
<td>6,621</td>
<td>1,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of classrooms (9 to 10)</td>
<td>3,099</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student classroom ratio (SCR)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil Teacher Ratio (PTR)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary schools having SCR more than 30</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Primary /Sec./Higher Sec. schools having SCR more than 35</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools with single teacher</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary schools having PTR more than 30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Primary /Sec./Higher Sec. schools having PTR more than 35</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Inference:**

The Pupil Teacher Ratio (PTR) for MCGM schools was 27 for 2017-18, however 122 schools in MCGM have a PTR higher than the RTE norm.

---

<sup>36</sup> According to District Profile 2017-18
Table 27: Medium Wise Pupil (Student) Teacher Ratio in 2017-18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>No. of MCGM Schools</th>
<th>Students (Includes Primary, Upper Primary and Secondary)</th>
<th>Teachers (Includes HM, Vice-principal/Dy. HM, Teachers, Special Teachers)</th>
<th>Students per Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marathi</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>58,864</td>
<td>3,070</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindi</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>80,321</td>
<td>3,021</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>79,104</td>
<td>2,742</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>68,877</td>
<td>1,403</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gujarati</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>3,434</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamil</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4,016</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telugu</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>896</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kannada</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1,564</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1192</td>
<td>2,97,076</td>
<td>10,920</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inference:

- MCGM Marathi medium schools account for the highest number of schools with the most number of teachers, although the number of students in Hindi, Urdu and English medium is higher than Marathi.
- Consequently, the student teacher ratio in these mediums (Hindi, Urdu and English) is much higher than Marathi; in English MCGM schools the PTR is more than the prescribed RTE norms at 49 students per teacher, respectively.
- This highlights that the allocation of resources in the MCGM is not according to the demand, in terms of enrolments, medium wise.
Section II. Monitoring Policies

A. School Management Committees

Section 21 of the Right to Free and Compulsory Education Act 2009 (RTE), mandates the formation of School Management Committees (SMCs) in all elementary government, government-aided schools and special category schools in the country. The SMC is the basic unit of a decentralised model of governance with active involvement of parents in the school’s functioning. SMCs are primarily composed of parents, teachers, head masters and elected representatives of local authorities.

The functions of the School Management Committee include monitoring the working of the school, prepare and recommend school development plan, monitor the utilisation of the grants received from the appropriate Government or local authority or any other source, and perform other such functions as may be prescribed. The SMC is supposed to meet atleast once a month and the councillors in MCGM are the members of the SMC as elected representatives of the local authority.\(^\text{37}\)

Table 28: Number of meetings attended by councillors in 2016-17 and 2017-18\(^\text{38}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of meetings attended by councillors</th>
<th>Number of schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 6</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 to 12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Sample</strong></td>
<td><strong>428</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Inference:**

In 85% of schools in 2016-17 and 83% schools in 2017-18, councillors did not attend even one SMC meeting.

---


\(^{38}\) RTI for details of SMC was filed in all 24 wards. Complete data was not received and therefore only a sample of 428 schools in 2016-17 and 435 schools in 2017-18 was used to depict the status of SMC in MCGM schools. RTI was filed for School Management and Development Committee (SMDC) data in the Secondary Department (Education) however complete data has not been provided even after more than 6 months of RTI.
Table 29: Ward Wise Average number of SMC meetings and number of meetings attended by councillors in 2016-17 and 2017-18.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>2016-17</th>
<th>2017-18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of schools</td>
<td>Average number of meetings conducted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F/N</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F/S</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G/N</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G/S</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H/E</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H/W</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K/E</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K/W</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M/E</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M/W</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/N</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/S</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/C</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/N</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/S</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inference:
- On an average councillors attended less than one out of ten meetings in 2016-17 and less than one out of nine meetings in 2017-18.
- R/N, A and G/S are better performing wards as compared to K/W, M/E, P/S where the average percent of councillor attendance almost nil in 2017-18.
In a household survey commissioned by Praja Foundation to Hansa Research which was conducted in May-June 2018 across the city of Mumbai, a sample of 4212 households with school going children out of the total sample size of 24,290 households was used. According to the results of the survey 90% respondents who sent their students to private schools were aware of SMC, whereas this figure was only 45% for MCGM schools. 55% parent respondents were unaware of SMC in their child’s municipal school. However, of the respondents who were aware of SMC in Municipal schools, 90% had participated in the same; whereas in private schools 98% parents who were aware of SMC had participated.

B. School Development Plan

According to Section 22 of the RTE, every School Management Committee constituted under Section 21 shall prepare a School Development Plan (SDP) which shall be the basis for the plans and grants to be made by the appropriate Government/ local authority.

Table 30: Number of schools that prepared School Development Plan (SDP) in 2016-17 and 2017-18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of schools (sample)</th>
<th>2016-17</th>
<th>2017-18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>97.88%</td>
<td>97.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>2.12%</td>
<td>2.25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inference:

98% of the schools in 2016-17 and 2017-18 have prepared the SDP.
The Maharashtra RTE Rules provide that the School Development Plan is a plan to be prepared for every school by the School Management Committee (SMC) at least three months before the end of the financial year. The SDP elaborates on the existing status of the school and makes demands for infrastructural, financial and/or other resource requirements of the school.

The SDP is supposed to be submitted to the local authority before the close of the financial year to enable school wise planning and appropriate allocation in the budget, based upon requirements from the school.

The SDP is submitted to the respective Urban Resource Cluster (URC) set up under the Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan which are supposed to act as monitoring agencies for the functioning of the schools, but also perform various administrative functions. The URC then analyses the SDP for demand for further requirements made and prepares the budget for the URC’s jurisdictional area and submits the same to the Education Department.

Although the administration of the MCGM is such that the SDP is submitted from schools to URCS, the councillor who is the member of the SMC and a representative of the electorate, can play a role in determining and taking forward school level proposals during budget discussions in the ward committee and can enable effective planning by participating in the SMC to improve quality of education.
Sample Study of 24 SDPs

- A random sample of 24 SDPs (A, B, D, E, G/S, H/E, H/W, K/E, M/E, M/W, S and T\(^{39}\)) was collected from wards to study how the schools have been preparing the plan.

- In all the SDP samples the initial requirements of existing status of school have been filled however the agenda and plan for requirements proposed for the next year has been left blank. This is a primordial requirement for enabling school level governance, which is not being done. This probably reflects a lack of knowledge or awareness about the use of the SDP and lack of training for SMC members.

- Further, as the councillor attendance shows, councillors are not taking interest in attending the SMC and are often not aware that they are supposed to attend the SMC, and are therefore not constructively participating in making the SDP.

- In fact, within the administration as well, the Administrative Officer (Schools) of Secondary Education Department was not aware of what the School Management Committees are, R/C and P/S wards were to transfer the RTI for SDP to the MCGM head office assuming the data to be related to the city’s Development Plan. This indicates the need for better awareness among the administrative staff regarding the role and functioning of SMCs.

\(^{39}\) Of the remaining wards, C, G/N, K/W, N, R/N and R/S did not provide a sample SDP, and F/N, F/S, L, P/N, P/S and R/C wards provided incomplete SDPs and the ‘action plan’ pages were either not included or not complete.
C. Pragat Shaala

Pragat Shaikshanik Maharashtra was a scheme introduced by the Government of Maharashtra through a government resolution (GR) dated 22\textsuperscript{nd} April, 2015 with the aim of improving outcome indicators of students in schools across the state. The scheme is based upon evaluation of schools through inspection of 25 criteria (nikash) used to measure the proficiency of the school. Each indicator is given specific marks and the school based on marks is given grades depending upon the number of criteria completed. Schools in this way are provided incentive to perform well and schools which have completed 20-25 criteria are declared as ‘Pragat’ schools.

The indicators used to measure student performance in the 25 criteria (Annexure 5) are vague, for example ‘If any student from any classroom or all students able to solve 1 sum of division without any mistake with the help of standard wise educational material’- the range is wide and not dependent upon number of students in a class who are proficient in the indicator, furthermore the indicators are common for all the classes from 1st to 8th and therefore do not provide an efficient measurement of learning outcomes. Further, the criteria only measure basic understanding, reading and math and does not look at learning outcomes in a detailed manner based upon level of attainment. In comparison to the 25 nikash under Pragat Shaala, the new criteria used by MCGM for measuring teacher performance through student outcome indicators, is better, using stand-wise criteria and measuring percentage of students in a class who have achieved the particular learning outcomes.
Figure 2: Percentage of schools declared Pragat Shaala in 2016-17 and 2017-18 based upon number of criteria\textsuperscript{40} met by schools.\textsuperscript{41}

\begin{figure}[h]
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\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure2.png}
\end{figure}

Inference:

- Average nikash completed by the sample MCGM schools is less than 20 in both 2016-17 and 2017-18.
- While 32\% of the sample schools were ‘Pragat’ in 2016-17, this rose to 51\% in 2017-18.

\textsuperscript{40} According to data received through RTI on the number of Pragat schools in Mumbai, there is a discrepancy in the number of schools which are given as Pragat, according to the ward vis vis those according to the scheme (i.e. completed 20-25 nikash) Calculation of Pragat schools has therefore been done solely based upon the criteria.

\textsuperscript{41} The RTI for Pragat Shaala was filed in 24 wards, however data from F/S, K/W and L wards has not been received and data from other wards has been incomplete, or not provided. Therefore, the above data consists of a sample size of 582 schools in 2016-17 and 644 schools in 2017-18.
Table 31: Schools which have completed 25 Nikash compared to their Enrolment and Dropout rates for 2016-17 and 2017-18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>School name</th>
<th>Enrolment rates comparison from 2016-17 to 2017-18</th>
<th>2016-17</th>
<th>2017-18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nikash Grade</td>
<td>Dropouts %</td>
<td>Nikash Grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H/W</td>
<td>Laxmi Nagar M.P.S</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>P.K. Road Marathi</td>
<td>-6.8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Jayantilal Hindi</td>
<td>-11.2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/N</td>
<td>Bharucha Marathi No.1</td>
<td>-14.9</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/N</td>
<td>Tare Marg Hindi No.1</td>
<td>-6.5</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/N</td>
<td>Tare Marg Marathi No.2</td>
<td>-48.2</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Goshala English</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N/A indicates that data for that year was not provided through RTI.

Inference:

- Two schools in 2016-17 and five schools in 2017-18 were declared Pragat with all 25 indicators achieved.
- Laxmi Nagar MPS of H/W ward and Goshala English of T ward, show along with completion of 25 nikash, corresponding positive indicators of rise in enrolment from 2016-17 to 2017-18 and zero dropouts.
- It is also surprising how both the schools which completed 25 nikash in 2016-17 fell to 22 (for Laxmi Nagar M.P.S) and 20 (for P.K. Road Marathi) nikash respectively.
- Further, in schools such as Tare Marg Marathi No.2 and Bharucha Marathi No.1 in R/N ward which achieved 25 nikash in 2017-18 have shown poor enrolment and dropout indicators. Tare Marg Marathi No. 2 received 25 nikash in 2017-18 although its enrolments fell by 48% from 2016-17 to 2017-18 and had high dropout rates of 21% in 2016-17 and 42% in 2017-18. This raises questions over the proficiency of the criteria that determine the school as ‘Pragat’.
Table 32: Ward Wise comparison of performance in Pragat Shaala Scheme to Enrolment and Dropout indicators in 2016-17 and 2017-18: Schools which achieved 20-25 Nikash.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Enrolment rates comparison fall from 2016-17 to 2017-18</th>
<th>2016-17</th>
<th></th>
<th>2017-18</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ward</td>
<td>Nikash Grade</td>
<td>Dropouts %</td>
<td>Nikash Grade</td>
<td>Dropouts %</td>
<td>Nikash Grade</td>
<td>Dropouts %</td>
<td>Nikash Grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>-13.29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12.18%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18.10%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>-16.66</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>-2.34</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8.63%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>-0.93</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.54%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13.22%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F/S</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G/N</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9.85%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G/S</td>
<td>-4.38</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11.27%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H/E</td>
<td>-18.40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9.58%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11.27%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H/W</td>
<td>-10.77</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.56%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10.06%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K/E</td>
<td>-7.76</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.88%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.11%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K/W</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M/E</td>
<td>-28.81</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19.22%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11.25%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M/W</td>
<td>-35.02</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28.48%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.02%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>-7.41</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.11%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.29%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/N</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11.43%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7.99%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/S</td>
<td>14.32</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9.88%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.64%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/C</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/N</td>
<td>-13.44</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.93%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18.06%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/S</td>
<td>-15.05</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.65%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.39%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.66%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.60%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>-4.93</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.71%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.13%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Average</td>
<td>-8.65</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7.61%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7.66%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inference:
- The average Nikash of schools which have been declared ‘Pragat’ in 2016-17 is 20 and in 2017-18 is 21. However, in terms of enrolment and dropout indicators the schools have not performed well inspite of being declared Pragat as can be seen from the overall average of fall in enrolment by -8.65% and dropout rate of 7.6%.
- H/E and M/E wards are the most stark in terms of poor enrolment and dropout inspite of being ‘Pragat’ schools. This raises questions over the proficiency of the criteria that determine the school as ‘Pragat’.

State of Municipal Education in Mumbai
Section III: Deliberation by Municipal Councillors and MLAs

Table 33: Number of questions asked on Education and Number of meetings by Councillors in all Committees from April 2013 to March 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Committee</th>
<th>2013-14</th>
<th>2014-15</th>
<th>2015-16</th>
<th>2016-17</th>
<th>2017-18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No of Questions</td>
<td>No of total Meetings</td>
<td>No of Questions</td>
<td>No of total Meetings</td>
<td>No of Questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMC General Body Meeting (GBM)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Committee</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward Committee</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Committees</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>133</strong></td>
<td><strong>611</strong></td>
<td><strong>149</strong></td>
<td><strong>817</strong></td>
<td><strong>193</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inference:
Councillors in various MCGM meetings in 2017-18 asked 205 questions on education, 12% more than 2016-17. 49% of total questions asked on education were in the Education Committee Meetings.

Table 34: Category wise number of Questions asked by Councillors on Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Questions Asked</th>
<th>No. of Councillors 2013-14</th>
<th>No. of Councillors 2014-15</th>
<th>No. of Councillors 2015-16</th>
<th>No. of Councillors 2016-17</th>
<th>No. of Councillors 2017-18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 to 4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>227</strong></td>
<td><strong>227</strong></td>
<td><strong>227</strong></td>
<td><strong>227</strong></td>
<td><strong>227</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inference:
71% councillors asked zero questions on education in 2017-18. Only 5% of all MCGM councillors asked more than 4 questions on education in 2017-18.
Table 35: Ward-wise questions asked by Councillors on Education in the year April’17 to March’18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>No. of students</th>
<th>No. of councillors</th>
<th>No. of councillors who asked question on education</th>
<th>Total questions asked on education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>6,120</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>2,088</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>2,268</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>10,031</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F/N</td>
<td>22,357</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F/S</td>
<td>7,938</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G/N</td>
<td>17,054</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G/S</td>
<td>11,409</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H/E</td>
<td>17,839</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H/W</td>
<td>6,560</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K/E</td>
<td>14,639</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K/W</td>
<td>14,445</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>28,290</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M/E</td>
<td>37,953</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M/W</td>
<td>12,311</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>17,643</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/N</td>
<td>27,230</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/S</td>
<td>11,515</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/C</td>
<td>7,671</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/N</td>
<td>5,780</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/S</td>
<td>9,827</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>12,370</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>8,028</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>311,663</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Inference:**
Councillors from B and C wards did not ask any question while those from H/E and L wards asked the most number of questions.
**Table 36: Issues raised/Questions asked by Councillors in the year April’17 to March’18**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Question asked</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anganwadi/Balwadi/Creche Related</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closure of the schools</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropout rate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources Related</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher/Technical Education</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal School Related</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New schools</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naming/Renaming of School</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground Related</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private and Trust school related</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing and fixing educational materials</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School repairs and reconstruction</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schemes/Policies in Education Related</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports related</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student issues related</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syllabus/Curriculum</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational training</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>205</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Inference:**
Most number of questions were asked on human resources (56). No questions were asked on closure of schools and only one question was asked on dropouts.
Table 37: Questions asked by MLAs on Education from Monsoon Session 2017 to Budget Session 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Political Party</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Mumbai Related Questions in Education</th>
<th>Total Questions in Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abu Asim Azmi</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>Mankhurd Shivaji Nagar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajay Vinayak Choudhari</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Shivadi</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ameet Bhaskar Satam</td>
<td>BJP</td>
<td>Andheri (West)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amin Amir Ali Patel</td>
<td>INC</td>
<td>Mumbadevi</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashish Babaji Shelar</td>
<td>BJP</td>
<td>Vandre (West)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashok Dharmaraj Patil</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Bhandup (West)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aslam Ramazan Ali Shaikh</td>
<td>INC</td>
<td>Malad West</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atul Dattatray Bhatkhalkar</td>
<td>BJP</td>
<td>Kandivali (East)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bharati Hemant Lavekar</td>
<td>BJP</td>
<td>Varsova</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalidas Nilkanth Kolambkar</td>
<td>INC</td>
<td>Wadala</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangal Prabhat Lodha</td>
<td>BJP</td>
<td>Malabar Hill</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangesh Anant Kudalkar</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Kurla (SC)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manisha Ashok Chaudhari</td>
<td>BJP</td>
<td>Dahisar</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Md. Arif Lalan Khan</td>
<td>INC</td>
<td>Chandivali</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parag Madhusudan Alavani</td>
<td>BJP</td>
<td>Vile Parle</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prakash Rajaram Surve</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Magathane</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prakash Vaikunth Phaterpekar</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Chembur</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raj Khangaraji Purohit</td>
<td>BJP</td>
<td>Colaba</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramchandra Shivaji Kadam</td>
<td>BJP</td>
<td>Ghatkopar (West)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramesh Kondiram Latke</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Andheri (East)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sadanand Shankar Sarvankar</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Mahim</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanjay Govind Potnis</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Kalina</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sardar Tara Singh</td>
<td>BJP</td>
<td>Mulund</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selvan R. Tamil</td>
<td>BJP</td>
<td>Sion Koliwada</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunil Govind Shinde</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Worli</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunil Rajaram Raut</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Vikroli</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunil Vaman Prabhu</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Dindoshi</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trupti Prakash Sawant</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Bandra (East)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tukaram Ramkrishna Kate</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Anushakti Nagar</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varsha Eknath Gaikwad</td>
<td>INC</td>
<td>178 Dharavi (SC)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waris Yusuf Pathan</td>
<td>AIMIM</td>
<td>Byculla</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yogesh Amritlal Sagar</td>
<td>BJP</td>
<td>Charkop</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>190</strong></td>
<td><strong>869</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inference:
MLA’s asked 869 questions related to education in total, out of which 22% questions were related to education in Mumbai. Highest number of questions on education were raised by MLA Aslam Ramazan Ali Shaikh (93). Highest number of questions were asked by MLA’s from INC and Shiv Sena.
### Table 38: Issue-wise questions asked by MLAs on Education from Monsoon Session 2017 to Budget Session 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Mumbai related Edu. Questions</th>
<th>Total Question in Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anganwadi/Balwadi/Creche Related</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashram School Related</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cast/Tribe education</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central/State Government and Zilla Parishad school</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closure of the schools</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropout Rate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Related</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees structure</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls Education</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government College</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher/Technical Education</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources Related</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal School Related</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary/Secondary education</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private College Related</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private and Trust school related</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing and fixing education materials</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School repairs and reconstruction</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schemes/Policies in Education Related</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syllabus / Curriculum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Issues Related</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Teacher Ratio</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>190</strong></td>
<td><strong>869</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Inference:**

Most number of questions (159) are related to higher and technical education followed by schemes and policies in education (136). Only 3 questions related to Primary and secondary education were raised showing that lesser weightage is offered to basic education at the state level. Only one question related to dropout has been asked in 3 sessions of the State Legislative Assembly, inspite of it being a serious issue for government schools. 44 questions related to closure of schools were raised of which 6 were related to the city.
Section IV. Data from Household Survey

Praja Foundation had commissioned a household survey to Hansa Research which was conducted in May-June 2018 across the city of Mumbai. The total sample size for the survey was 24,290 households. Out of the total sample size of 24,290 households, 4701 children were found to be in the age group of 6-14 years, out of which 4212 children were found to be going to school. Hence, the education questionnaire was administered further with households where these 4212 children were present. Of this number 1083 students were found to be going to municipal schools. For details on the survey methodology and Socio Economic Classification (SEC) of households, refer to Annexure 3 and 4.

Following are the key findings of the survey:

Table 39: Current Medium of Education (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>SEC A</th>
<th>SEC B</th>
<th>SEC C</th>
<th>SEC D</th>
<th>SEC E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marathi</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindi</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gujarati</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Indian Language</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inference:

- 10.4% households with children under age group 6-14 years did not send their children to school.
- Preference for Private English- medium schools increases as one moves up the affluence level\(^{42}\) whereas it falls for that of public, which shows that higher the socio-economic status greater is the preference for a Private English Medium School. However even a significant percentage (40%) from SEC E prefers sending their children to a private English school.
- Preference for Marathi, Hindi and Urdu medium public schools falls as one moves up the affluence level, although more households prefer public schools over private.

\(^{42}\) Determined by occupation and education, see Annexure 3 & 4 for details of socio-economic classification.
Table 40: Respondents from above Table whose current medium of education is other than English and would want to change to other medium (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>SEC A</th>
<th>SEC B</th>
<th>SEC C</th>
<th>SEC D</th>
<th>SEC E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marathi</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindi</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gujarati</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Languages</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inference:
A total of 30% household respondents prefer English medium as medium of instruction, whereas 31% prefer Marathi medium, 19% prefer Urdu medium and 15% prefer Hindi medium. A majority of respondents in each socio-economic classification do not want to change to English Medium.

Table 41: Respondents from MCGM schools who would want to change to private schools and hindrances for same (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Private Schools</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>SEC A</th>
<th>SEC B</th>
<th>SEC C</th>
<th>SEC D</th>
<th>SEC E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hindrances</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>SEC A</th>
<th>SEC B</th>
<th>SEC C</th>
<th>SEC D</th>
<th>SEC E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fees / Affordability</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inability to provide him / her with right support</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know much about private school</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance of school from home</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of ability to provide for school related items to child</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admission not given</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inference:
- Preference for moving from public to private schools increases as one moves up the SEC.
- 91% of respondents stated that fees act as a hindrance to shift to private schools. 29% felt the inability to provide support or school related items as a hindrance.
Table 42: Respondents taking private tuitions/coaching classes (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tuitions</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Private School</th>
<th>MCGM Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inference:
86% of households who send their students to private schools, also send them for tuitions, whereas this number is 39% in the case of those households which send their children to public schools.

Table 43: Details on source of Tuitions (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Tuitions</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Private School</th>
<th>MCGM Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Class teacher</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private tuitions</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching classes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inference:
76% Municipal school students from respondent households go for private tuitions while 6% go to coaching classes. 16% students take tuitions from their municipal school teacher.

---

43 Tuition acts as an indicator of the amount of time a child is engaged in educational activity as well as parents’ perception of the quality of education in schools, the need for tuition.
Table 44: Satisfaction with the school and facilities available in terms of School infrastructure and quality of teaching in %.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent perception on quality of schools</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>MCGM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall satisfaction with school</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Satisfaction</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of School Building</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of School Playground</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of Blackboards</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether Stationery provided by the school</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether Uniform provided by the school</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate number of Toilets</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleanliness of toilet</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of First Aid</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of Mid-day meal</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether regular Health checkups conducted</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality of Teaching/Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Satisfaction</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Communication skills</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher knowledge level</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher interaction</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher attendance</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher command over subject</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inference:

Overall satisfaction with the school is high in both public (90%) and private (98%) schools. For both infrastructure and quality of education, satisfaction is high in public and private schools, however it is relatively higher in private schools. In indicators such as provision of stationery, uniform, mid-day meal, teacher communication and command over subject, satisfaction is higher for public schools.
Table 45: SEC Wise Satisfaction with the School infrastructure and quality of teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Level</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Public</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SEC A</td>
<td>SEC B and C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Dissatisfied</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Dissatisfied</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Satisfied</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Satisfied</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality of Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Dissatisfied</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Dissatisfied</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Satisfied</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Satisfied</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Inference:**

Satisfaction varies based upon the socio-economic classification; households from higher SEC are more dissatisfied with public schools than those from lower SEC. Whereas, in private schools, those from lower SEC who have possibly moved to private schools are less satisfied with the services from private school than those from higher SEC.
Section V: Ward-wise data

Table 46: Ward-wise Total Number of Students in Municipal Schools in Mumbai from 2013-14 to 2017-18.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>7,600</td>
<td>7,548</td>
<td>7,038</td>
<td>6,844</td>
<td>6,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>2,542</td>
<td>2,626</td>
<td>2,402</td>
<td>2,378</td>
<td>2,088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>2,798</td>
<td>3,116</td>
<td>3,138</td>
<td>2,532</td>
<td>2,268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>11,432</td>
<td>11,490</td>
<td>10,580</td>
<td>10,042</td>
<td>10,031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F/N</td>
<td>32,187</td>
<td>29,713</td>
<td>27,242</td>
<td>23,644</td>
<td>22,357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F/S</td>
<td>8,486</td>
<td>8,178</td>
<td>7,829</td>
<td>8,101</td>
<td>7,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G/N</td>
<td>22,211</td>
<td>20,851</td>
<td>20,559</td>
<td>17,583</td>
<td>17,054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G/S</td>
<td>14,729</td>
<td>13,880</td>
<td>13,676</td>
<td>12,552</td>
<td>11,409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H/E</td>
<td>22,942</td>
<td>22,043</td>
<td>21,145</td>
<td>19,096</td>
<td>17,839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H/W</td>
<td>9,493</td>
<td>8,844</td>
<td>8,366</td>
<td>6,932</td>
<td>6,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K/E</td>
<td>15,234</td>
<td>17,729</td>
<td>17,860</td>
<td>15,798</td>
<td>14,639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K/W</td>
<td>17,725</td>
<td>17,226</td>
<td>16,583</td>
<td>16,530</td>
<td>14,445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>35,345</td>
<td>34,584</td>
<td>34,631</td>
<td>33,463</td>
<td>28,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M/E</td>
<td>53,394</td>
<td>54,372</td>
<td>54,147</td>
<td>49,021</td>
<td>37,953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M/W</td>
<td>16,324</td>
<td>15,564</td>
<td>15,208</td>
<td>14,670</td>
<td>12,311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>22,875</td>
<td>21,086</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>18,034</td>
<td>17,643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/N</td>
<td>35,507</td>
<td>34,917</td>
<td>33,898</td>
<td>27,141</td>
<td>27,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/S</td>
<td>15,003</td>
<td>14,858</td>
<td>14,419</td>
<td>12,108</td>
<td>11,515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/C</td>
<td>10,047</td>
<td>10,632</td>
<td>9,267</td>
<td>8,122</td>
<td>7,671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/N</td>
<td>9,420</td>
<td>9,389</td>
<td>8,921</td>
<td>6,570</td>
<td>5,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/S</td>
<td>12,610</td>
<td>12,757</td>
<td>12,170</td>
<td>10,810</td>
<td>9,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>15,719</td>
<td>15,157</td>
<td>14,694</td>
<td>12,761</td>
<td>12,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>10,081</td>
<td>9,830</td>
<td>9,280</td>
<td>8,563</td>
<td>8,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,04,251</td>
<td>3,97,085</td>
<td>3,83,485</td>
<td>3,43,621</td>
<td>3,11,663</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inference:

M/E and L wards have the most number of students while B and C wards have the least. Region wise, eastern suburbs and western suburbs have the most number of students at 37% each of total, followed by city region (26%).

44 Source: Data received from Administrative Officer (Schools) of 24 wards of Mumbai under Right to Information Act (2005).
### Table 47: Ward-wise drop in Enrolments between 2013-14 and 2017-18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>2013-14</th>
<th>2017-18</th>
<th>% Change in Enrolments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>7,600</td>
<td>6,120</td>
<td>-19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>2,542</td>
<td>2,088</td>
<td>-18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>-46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>2,798</td>
<td>2,268</td>
<td>-19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>11,432</td>
<td>10,031</td>
<td>-12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F/N</td>
<td>32,187</td>
<td>22,357</td>
<td>-31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F/S</td>
<td>8,486</td>
<td>7,938</td>
<td>-6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G/N</td>
<td>22,211</td>
<td>17,054</td>
<td>-23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G/S</td>
<td>14,729</td>
<td>11,409</td>
<td>-23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H/E</td>
<td>22,942</td>
<td>17,839</td>
<td>-22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H/W</td>
<td>9,493</td>
<td>6,560</td>
<td>-31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K/E</td>
<td>15,234</td>
<td>14,639</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K/W</td>
<td>17,725</td>
<td>14,445</td>
<td>-19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>35,345</td>
<td>28,290</td>
<td>-20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M/E</td>
<td>53,394</td>
<td>37,953</td>
<td>-29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M/W</td>
<td>16,324</td>
<td>12,311</td>
<td>-25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>22,875</td>
<td>17,643</td>
<td>-23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/N</td>
<td>35,507</td>
<td>27,230</td>
<td>-23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/S</td>
<td>15,003</td>
<td>11,515</td>
<td>-23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/C</td>
<td>10,047</td>
<td>7,671</td>
<td>-24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/N</td>
<td>9,420</td>
<td>5,780</td>
<td>-39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/S</td>
<td>12,610</td>
<td>9,827</td>
<td>-22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>15,719</td>
<td>12,370</td>
<td>-21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>10,081</td>
<td>8,028</td>
<td>-20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,04,251</td>
<td>3,11,663</td>
<td>-23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Inference:**

A percentage fall in enrolment as compared to 2013-14 is the least in F/S and K/E wards, whereas C and R/N ward have the highest fall in enrolment.
### Table 48: Ward-wise Total Number of Dropout in Municipal Schools in Mumbai from 2013-14 to 2017-18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>2013-14</th>
<th>In %</th>
<th>2014-15</th>
<th>In %</th>
<th>2015-16</th>
<th>In %</th>
<th>2016-17</th>
<th>In %</th>
<th>2017-18</th>
<th>In %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1021</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>1161</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>1083</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>893</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>731</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F/N</td>
<td>4346</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>3167</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>3792</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>2565</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>1862</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F/S</td>
<td>693</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G/N</td>
<td>2797</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>2372</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>37746</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>1709</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G/S</td>
<td>903</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>1126</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>1062</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H/E</td>
<td>1697</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>2306</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>2452</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>2935</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>1415</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H/W</td>
<td>922</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>1239</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>955</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K/E</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>1709</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>2063</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K/W</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1891</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>2085</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>1308</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>5960</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>6025</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>6042</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>926</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M/E</td>
<td>11510</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>11732</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>12787</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>9105</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>3415</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M/W</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>2067</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>2339</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>928</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>1403</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>1795</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>2088</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/N</td>
<td>4857</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>6140</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>2624</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>1569</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/S</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>2411</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>2750</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>1141</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/C</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>997</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/N</td>
<td>2033</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>2309</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>2537</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>996</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>629</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/S</td>
<td>1074</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>1863</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>2070</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>1394</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** | **47,218** | **11.7%** | **51,741** | **13%** | **57,788** | **15%** | **29,186** | **8%** | **15,978** | **5%** |

**Inference:**

B, G/N and R/N have the highest percentage of dropouts whereas, L, M/W and R/S have the least dropouts. Eleven wards have a dropout percentage higher than the overall average of 5%.

---

45Source: Data received from Administrative Officer (Schools) of 24 wards of Mumbai under Right to Information Act (2005).

46 G/N ward has provided data of dropouts only for Secondary schools.
Table 49: Ward-wise Total Number of Teachers in Municipal Schools in Mumbai from 2013-14 to 2017-18\(^{47}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>2013-14</th>
<th>Student teacher ratio</th>
<th>2014-15</th>
<th>Student teacher ratio</th>
<th>2015-16</th>
<th>Student teacher ratio</th>
<th>2016-17</th>
<th>Student teacher ratio</th>
<th>2017-18</th>
<th>Student teacher ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F/N</td>
<td>807</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>791</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F/S</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G/N</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G/S</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H/E</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H/W</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K/E</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K/W</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>896</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>909</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>958</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>943</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M/E</td>
<td>1137</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1194</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1161</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1207</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1202</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M/W</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/N</td>
<td>868</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>731</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/S</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/C</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/N</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/S</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,350</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,853</strong></td>
<td><strong>37</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,637</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,432</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,918</strong></td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Inference:**

The number of teachers working is corresponding to the total enrolments, ward wise since the wards with highest number of teachers is same as that of enrolments i.e. M/E and L wards. B and C wards have the least number of teachers.

\(^{47}\) Source: Data received from Administrative Officer (Schools) of 24 wards of Mumbai under Right to Information Act (2005). We have not taken Headmasters into account for the calculation of student teacher ratio.
Table 50: Ward-wise Total Number of Passouts\(^{48}\) in Municipal Schools in Mumbai from 2013-14 to 2017-18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>2013-14</th>
<th>In %</th>
<th>2014-15</th>
<th>In %</th>
<th>2015-16</th>
<th>In %</th>
<th>2016-17</th>
<th>In %</th>
<th>2017-18</th>
<th>In %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F/N</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>911</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F/S</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G/N</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G/S</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H/E</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H/W</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K/E</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K/W</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M/E</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M/W</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/N</td>
<td>956</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>874</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/S</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/C</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/N</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/S</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8,431</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>7,809</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>7,866</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>8,250</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>8,934</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inference:
R/N and C wards do not have a single secondary school, pointing out to the lack of opportunity available for higher education as provided by the local government. Pass percentage is lowest in M/E ward at 62%. G/S, H/W and F/S wards have the highest pass percentage.

---

\(^{48}\) C and R/N ward do not have Secondary Schools. Source: Data received from Administrative Officer (Schools) of 24 wards of Mumbai under Right to Information Act (2005).
Annexure 1 - Note on Forecasting Methodology

Extracted data for enrolments over the past few years: Praja had enrolment data of MCGM schools from 2008-09 to 2016-17. This data was extracted for forecasting values for enrolment for the next few years.

Converted data into time series: Extracted data was converted into time series. A time series is obtained by measuring a variable (or set of variables) regularly over a period of time. Time series data transformations assume a data file structure in which each case (row) represents a set of observations at a different time, and the length of time between cases is uniform. In this case, we were measuring the number of enrolments across years.

Checked the stationarity of the data: Stationarity of the data was checked and later this data was transformed to make it stationary wherever required. A stationary time series has properties wherein mean, variance etc. are constant over time.

ARIMA (Autoregressive Integrated Moving Average) model was used for forecasting: ARIMA was used for the forecast. ARIMA models are, in theory, the most general class of models for forecasting a time series which can be made to be “stationary” by differencing (if necessary), perhaps in conjunction with nonlinear transformations such as logging or deflating (if necessary). A random variable that in a time series is stationary if its statistical properties are all constant over time. An ARIMA model can be viewed as a “filter” that tries to separate the signal from the noise, and the signal is then extrapolated into the future to obtain forecasts.

This model considers trends and seasonality in data for forecasting values: Hence, for the forecast of enrolments in schools, this model was best suited to the data.
Annexure 2 - Scholarship Circular for 2015-16

पूर्व माध्यमिक शिक्षण महागृहा इवता ४ व ऐवजी ५ व माध्यमिक शाळा शिक्षण महागृहा इवता ७ ऐवजी ८ व मध्ये आयोजित करणे आणि "पूर्व माध्यमिक व माध्यमिक शाळा शिक्षण महागृहा योजनाचे नामांकन "उच्च प्राथमिक शाळा व माध्यमिक शाळा शिक्षण महागृहा योजना" असे करणेबाबत....

महाराष्ट्र शासन
शाळेच्या शिक्षण व क्रीडा विभाग
शासन निर्णय क्रमांक मुंबई-४०१७६६/२०१५/निर्णय २, २०१७
मंत्रालय, मुंबई-४०० ०३२
तारीख: २९ जुन, २०१५.

चाचा:-

१) शासन निर्णय शाळेच्या शिक्षण व क्रीडा विभाग क्रमांक-एससीएच-२००९/०१/सं.पु.दी., २२ जुलै, २०१०.

२) आयुक्त, महाराष्ट्र राज्य परीक्षा परिषद, पुणे, वाचे पत्र क्रमांक: नरसाहा/शिक्षण/२०१५/१२२१, दिनांक ५, फेब्रुवारी, २०१५.

प्रस्तावना:-

पूर्व माध्यमिक व माध्यमिक शाळांतरून ग्रामीण शिक्षण ज्ञान विविधानला प्रोत्साहन देण्यासाठी खुली गणवता शिक्षणीय दृष्टिकोणाने योजना सन १९५४-५५ पासून साधारणपणे अस्तित्वात आहे. सध्या महाराष्ट्र राज्य परीक्षा परिषद पुणे आयोजनासाठी ही परीक्षा अस्तित्वात येते. ही परीक्षा कानिग्राम प्राथमिक स्तरावर सार्वजनिक महागृहा इवतात मध्ये इवता ५ व मध्ये ग्रंथांचे येते तर चरिट प्राथमिक स्तरावर सार्वजनिक महागृहांतून मध्ये इवता ७ व मध्ये ग्रंथांचे येते.

केवळ शासनाच्या वाच्यांना मोफत सक्षीमत डिग्रीच्या शिक्षणाचा अभिकार अधिकार, २००९ पारित केला असून, राज्यात या कायदातील अनियमांनी दिव.१ एप्रिल, २०१० पासून सुरु होती. या कायदावरून इवता १ से इवता ४ वर्षांतरून शिक्षण प्राथमिक शिक्षण महागृहात विविध प्रकारे सादर केलेले आहे. या कायदावरून तत्काळीन चेंबूने राज्यात या कायदातील असलेली पूर्व माध्यमिक व माध्यमिक शाळा शिक्षण महागृहा सार्वजनिक अस्तित्वात इवता ५ व ऐवजी इवता ७ व मध्ये आणि इवता ८ व ऐवजी इवता ५ व मध्ये करणे आणि सदर योजनाचे नामांकन "प्राथमिक शाळा व उच्च प्राथमिक शाळा शिक्षण महागृहा योजना" असे करण्याची वाच शासनाच्या चिराचिराची होती.
State of Municipal Education in Mumbai
Annexure 3 - Survey Methodology

Praja Foundation had commissioned the household survey to Hansa Research and the survey methodology followed is as below:

- In order to meet the desired objectives of the study, we represented the city by covering a sample from each of its 227 wards. Target Group for the study was:
  - Both Males & Females
  - 18 years and above
  - Belonging to that particular ward.
- Sample quotas were set for representing gender and age groups on the basis of their split available through Indian Readership Study (Large scale baseline study conducted nationally by Media Research Users Council (MRUC) & Hansa Research group) for Mumbai Municipal Corporation Region.
- The required information was collected through face to face interviews with the help of structured questionnaire.
- In order to meet the respondent within a ward, following sampling process was followed:
  - 5 prominent areas in the ward were identified as the starting point
  - In each starting point about 20 individuals were selected randomly and the questionnaire was administered with them.
- Once the survey was completed, sample composition of age & gender was corrected to match the population profile using the baseline data from IRS. This helped us to make the survey findings more representatives in nature and ensured complete coverage.
- The total study sample was 20,317.
Annexure 4 - Socio Economic Classification (SEC) Note

SEC is used to measure the affluence level of the sample, and to differentiate people on this basis and study their behaviour / attitude on other variables.

While income (either monthly household or personal income) appears to be an obvious choice for such a purpose, it comes with some limitations:

- Respondents are not always comfortable revealing sensitive information such as income.
- The response to the income question can be either over-claimed (when posturing for an interview) or under-claimed (to avoid attention). Since there is no way to know which of these it is and the extent of over-claim or under-claim, income has a poor ability to discriminate people within a sample.
- Moreover, affluence may well be a function of the attitude a person has towards consumption rather than his (or his household’s) absolute income level.

Attitude to consumption is empirically proven to be well defined by the education level of the Chief Wage Earner (CWE*) of the household as well as his occupation. The more educated the CWE, the higher is the likely affluence level of the household. Similarly, depending on the occupation that the CWE is engaged in, the affluence level of the household is likely to differ – so a skilled worker will be lower down on the affluence hierarchy as compared to a CWE who is businessman.

Socio Economic Classification or SEC is thus a way of classifying households into groups’ basis the education and occupation of the CWE. The classification runs from A1 on the uppermost end thru E2 at the lower most end of the affluence hierarchy. The SEC grid used for classification in market research studies is given below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCCUPATION</th>
<th>EDUCATION</th>
<th>Illiterate</th>
<th>literate but no formal schooling / School up to 4th</th>
<th>School 5th – 9th</th>
<th>SSC/ HSC</th>
<th>Some College but not Grad</th>
<th>Grad/ Post-Grad Gen.</th>
<th>Grad/ Post-Grad Prof.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled Workers</td>
<td>E2</td>
<td>E2</td>
<td>E1</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop Owners</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>A2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businessmen/ Industrialists with no. of employees</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 9</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 +</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed Professional</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical / Salesman</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>B1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory level</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>A2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officers/ Executives Junior</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>A2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officers/Executives Middle/ Senior</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*CWE is defined as the person who takes the main responsibility of the household expenses.*
### Annexure 5 - 25 Criteria under Pragat Shaikshanik Maharashtra for Pragat Shaala

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Marks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>Number from School Roll:</strong> Number of Present:</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 marks should be given if the number of students present are 90% of number from school roll, otherwise 0 marks should be given.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>Out of school students:</strong> Actually Admitted students:</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 marks should be given if 90% out of school came to notice in various surveys are admitted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>If school area is very clean</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waste water, paper balls, garbage should not be observed in School premises. If the school area is clean, beautiful and pleasant at first glance then 5 marks should be granted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><strong>If material is available for the study of the minimum of the 10 components from each subject with material is Enlightening (Self-prepared material in 20 types)</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If Enlightening self-prepared in 20 types prepared by the teacher is available then 5 marks should be granted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><strong>If any student in from any class is able to read and write any 5 mathematical numbers without any mistake. (For double digits in 1st Standard and after that 1 digit should be increased)</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observer will give 5 mathematical numbers to students from classroom and check books/slates of 20% students randomly and also ask them read. If randomly selected students able to read and write it without any mistake, then 5 marks should be given.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td><strong>If any student from any classroom or all students able to solve 1 addition of sum without any mistake with the help of standard wise educational material.</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observer will give 2 to 3 sum of addition based on standard and check notebooks/slates randomly, if sums are solved without any mistake then 5 marks should be given.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td><strong>If any student from any classroom or all students able to solve 1 deduction sum without any mistake with the help of standard wise educational material.</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observer will give 2 to 3 multiplication sum based on standard and check notebooks/slates randomly, if sums are solved without any mistake then 5 marks should be given.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td><strong>If any student from any classroom or all students able to solve 1 sum of multiplication without any mistake with the help of standard wise educational material.</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observer will give 2 to 3 sum of multiplication based on standard and check notebooks/slates randomly, if sums are solved without any mistake then 5 marks should be given.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td><strong>If any student from any classroom or all students able to solve 1 sum of division without any mistake with the help of standard wise educational material.</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observer will give 2 to 3 sum of division based on standard and check notebooks/slates randomly, if sums are solved without any mistake then 5 marks should be given.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task Description</td>
<td>Marks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>If student is able to solve verbal sum based on weight/measurement/dimension/length based on the curriculum, then 5 marks will be given.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>If the student from every classroom is able to read any 5 sentences from textbooks of the concerned standard correctly when asked by randomly by the observer</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>If student from every classroom is able to write any 5 sentence from textbook randomly read by the observer</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>If student is able to answer questions related to standard asked randomly by the observer</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>If student is able to compose five words successfully from textbooks from last alphabet of the word given by the observer on random basis</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>If children is able to present poem from textbook excellently asked randomly by the observer</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>If children from any class able to do picture reading randomly asked by the observer</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>If children from the any class is able to compose 5 sentences from 3 randomly given class level words by the observer</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>If confidence is reflected in child’s speaking, answering, response and behavior when observer asks questions</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>If any child from class is able to create story from three easy class level words given by the observer</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>If children from every class able to present play of 3 to 5 minutes on subject given by observer to a group of students/class</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>If every student from each class is able to tell the time asked by the observer by moving clock hands</td>
<td>5 Bonus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>If any student from any class is able to create poem of four lines from three words at class level given by the observer</td>
<td>5 Bonus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>If student from any class is able to answer five words based on GK in English at class level asked by the answer</td>
<td>5 Bonus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>If any student from any class able to draw a picture at class level, asked by the observer</td>
<td>5 Bonus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>If any student from any class able to express his thoughts in five sentences on the subject given randomly by the observer</td>
<td>5 Bonus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>