

DEVELOPMENT OF PRIMARY EDUCATION IN NORTH EASTERN REGION OF INDIA

Dr. Dinesh Chander Sharma*

ABSTRACT

Primary education means schools education from standard I to V level in India. The quality of primary education has always been a matter of concern. Primary education is the foundation of entire education up gradation. The education environment has seen many changes in the curriculum of primary education due to various developments in the field of science and technology. Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) launched in 2001 mandated for having a community own and transparent Educational Management Information System (EMIS). This was brought out by National University of Planning and Administration (NUEPA) in the form of District Information System for Education (DISE). This resulted in having class-wise performance data in all the subjects of all the children in India providing state and union territory wise break up.

Based on the DISE data, Educational Development Index (EDI) is prepared which is helpful in deciding future course of investment on elementary education in the country. EDI is an index to measure the status of elementary education in the country. The EDI basically helps in computing the comparative status of a state vis-à-vis other states with regard to different aspects of universalisation of education and the various processes associated with providing education. The index also brings out inter-state and inter-district disparities.

*** Deputy Director, Planning and Development Division, Indira Gandhi National Open University, New Delhi**

North Eastern region of India, comprising of 8 states, is one of the most backward areas of the country. Development of primary education is the crucial for any developmental approach towards any region.

Key words: Primary education; North-East; Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan(SSA); Education Management Information System; National University of Planning and Administration (NEUPA); Education Development Index (EDI); District Information System for Education (DISE).

Introduction

Primary education conventionally refers to the studies from standard me to V level in India. Despite the increase in enrolment as well as number of schools in Tripura, the performance of many schools in term of providing quality education at primary level is not always up to the expectation. The quality of primary education has become a matter of concern for all, because primary education is the foundation of the entire educational experience, and its weakness leads to adults who are not clear with concepts and their subject knowledge, thus leading to loss of interest in higher education and professional development. Inadequate responsiveness to changing environment created by factors like information explosion, advancement in science and technology is also the result of no or minimal exposure during primary education. Thus result a generation of adults, who are ‘unemployable’ and frustrated, the system being unable to help them. There is a huge gap between the quality of education delivered and quality desired particularly in remote, rural and backward areas. North Eastern region of India, comprising of 8 states, is one of the most backward areas of the country. Development of primary education is the crucial for any developmental approach towards any region. In this background the present discourse is prepared.

National University of Planning and Administration (NUEPA) developed District Information System for Education (DISE). Importance of an Educational Management Information System (EMIS) was reiterated when Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) was launched in 2001. SSA guidelines envisage development of a community-owned and transparent EMIS, and preparatory activities of the programme included substantial strengthening of MIS infrastructure in all the

States and Union Territories of the country. Thus SSA projects have provided class-wise performance data in all subjects for all children in the entire country, providing break-ups separately for every state and union territory.

It perhaps requires no mention that measuring development has been one of the important segments in social science research. Since development is multidimensional, a significant part of such research is also devoted to understanding the relationships between various dimensions as well as in constructing composite indices. Based on the DISE data, Educational Development Index (EDI) is prepared which is helpful in deciding future course of investment on elementary education in the country. EDI is simply an index to measure the status of elementary education in the country. The EDI basically helps in computing the comparative status of a state vis-à-vis other states with regard to different aspects of universalisation of education and the various processes associated with providing education. The index also brings out inter-state and inter-district disparities.

1. The Present Study

The objective of the present discourse is to analyse the development of primary education in general and the quality of primary education in particular, of north eastern states of India. The development of primary education is analysed in terms of 'Access, Infrastructure, Teacher and outcomes' as considered by NUEPA while preparing EDI, by making a comparative study of the schools of north eastern states of India. As the discourse is an analytical one, secondary data are used only. Dealing with the multitude of issue concerning the primary education, naturally entails a thorough study of the educational scenario of the north eastern states, educational development index, educational policy of the governments and so on. In the course of analyzing the issue, a number of research studies, reference books, government publications, notifications, reports, publications of National University of Educational Planning and Administration (NUEPA), SSA, other published and unpublished documents relating to the study are considered. The basic databases of the analysis are the data released by National University of Educational Planning and Administration based on District Information of School Education (DISE). There are certain limitations of DISE data in terms of sample size, the coverage of schools, inadequate

or incomplete response from the respondents, etc. The analyses are judged in the context of these limitations of data.

2. Educational Development Index (EDI) – Computation Methodology Used by NUEPA

To understand the developments in education taking place across the country, the National University of Educational Planning and Administration (NUEPA) and the Government of India under the Ministry of Human Resource Development (MHRD), Department of School Education and Literacy has been preparing state wise EDI separately for Primary and Upper Primary levels of education and also a composite index for the entire Elementary education which is exclusively based on the DISE data. The first such attempt was made in 2005-06.

The authors (Jana & Sar, 2016) mentioned that “A set of 24 indicators (Initially 23) are used in computing EDI which are re-grouped into the four sub-groups, namely Access, Infrastructure, Teachers and Outcome indicators. The Indicators used for constructing EDI were pre-determined by a Working Group on EDI constituted by the MHRD during 2005-06 of which NUEPA was also one of the institutional members”. The different indicators used for constructing the EDI were pre- determined by working group on EDI constituted by the MHRD. Indicator is not an elementary item of information but it is a composite body of knowledge created by investigation and processing of information. Indicators are often compared to a ‘norm’ or a ‘standard’ or to a previous score. Indicators reflect the way in which an objective can be achieved as well as to what degree approximately the objective has been achieved at any stage.

A set of 23 identified indicators were used initially, now 24 indicators, used for computing the EDI which are further regrouped in to four sub-groups, namely Access, Infrastructure, Teacher and outcomes. DISE provides information in case of most of these indicators that have been used to compute the EDI at Primary and Upper Primary levels of education. Under the access indicators, two indicators namely, percentage of un-served habitations and availability of schools per thousand child population (6-11) have been used. The projected child population provided by the Office of the Registrar General of India has been used while the percentage of unserved habitations has been obtained from the All-India Education Survey. However, in view of the

absence of other independent source of data on coverage of habitations, except state reports, EDI continues to use the same data source.

While computing the ratio, Primary schools and Primary wings of Secondary and Higher Secondary schools have been considered. The Working Group on Educational Development Index constituted (EDI,2008) identified five indicators under infrastructure set of indicators. These are average student classroom ratio, percentage of schools with student classroom 60 and above, percentage of schools without drinking water facility and percentage of schools with common and girls' toilet are such indicators.

The third set of indicators is teacher related indicators and are six in numbers. These are “*pupil-teacher ratio, percentage of female teachers, schools with PTR 60 and above, percentage of single-teacher schools, percentage of schools with less than 3 teachers and percentage of teachers without professional qualifications*” are indicators under this category(EDI,2008).

In the last set of indicators which is related to outcome of gross enrolment ratio (overall, SC and ST) is the most important one. While computing GER, projected population provided by the Office of the Registrar General of India have been used to work out 6-11 year population. The GER for SC and ST population has been obtained from the Selected Education Statistics of the Ministry of HRD. Gender Parity Index (enrolment) is another important indicator which shows the extent of participation of girls compared to their counterpart boys in educational programmes. One of the other important outcome indicators is ratio of exit class over Class I enrolment which has been used only at Primary level(EDI,2008).

There are minor changes in the indicators used for preparing EDI from time to time. The indicators like percentage of habitations not served, percentage of schools with less than 2 teachers (in schools with more than 15 students) (Primary schools only), percentage of schools with < 3 teachers (Upper Primary schools/sections), repetition rate and ratio of exit class over Class I enrolment (Primary stage) have been removed and new indicators used are density of schools per 10 Sq. Km., percentage of classroom-teacher ratio 1:1, percentage of schools with kitchen-shed (Government and Aided School), percentage of single-teacher schools, average

number of instructional days, average working hours for teachers, percentage change in enrolment in Government schools over the previous year and participation of Muslim children. Percentage of schools with ramp has been modified to percentage of schools required and have ramp (EDI,2008).

Among the 24 indicators some of the indicators are in ratios and some in percentage. For the sake of parity, each indicator has been normalized using the following formula:

$$NV_{ij} = \frac{1 - (\text{Best } X_i - \text{Observed } X_{ij})}{(\text{Best } X_i - \text{Worst } X_i)}$$

Where NV_{ij} represents normalized index of i th indicator of j th state and X_i is the original value of the i th indicator. Upon receiving normalized values, Principal Component Analysis (PCA) was applied to decide the factor loading and weights. In case of a few variables, policy options were explored to identify the best values instead of based on the observed values. Some of these variables are: percentage of schools with pupil-teacher and student-classroom ratio above 30 and 35 (best value, zero), percentage of teachers without professional qualification (best value, zero) etc. In view of different sizes and geographical locations of different States and UTs, the EDI ranks are regrouped under major states (21 states), states from the north-eastern region. All the three groups and states in each group are at different level of education development. Within each state group, EDI in case of each state was used to assign fresh rankings based on each set of indicators as well as separately for Primary, Upper Primary and composite Elementary levels of education. The present analysis deals only with the primary level data of EDI in north eastern states. The focus of present study has been on primary education as it has been viewed that primary education provides the basis for better higher education and is instrumental in creating a fully literate society. The status of Tripura among the north eastern states in terms of primary education is analysed. However, in the present study Assam is also taken into consideration in the group of north eastern states for the analysis of primary education.

3. Discussion and Analysis

Access indicator is one of the important indicators used in computing Educational Development Index (EDI). Table 1 indicates the statistics for the sub-category Access, for all the north eastern states of India. Meghalaya consistently ranks topmost among north eastern states and also among top 5 states of India itself. Index of Meghalaya is more than 0.75 for the study period and it ranked first among the Indian states from 2005-06 to 2007-08 after that its position started reducing every year. Mizoram is next highly ranked states in this region as well the country as a whole. Tripura and Manipur are the low ranked among the North Eastern states. However Arunachal Pradesh is showing sharp improvement as it ranked top among country itself. Assam is showing good improvement in 2006-07 to 2008-09 but in 2009-10 its index again slashed to 0.524. Nagaland is almost all years hold the top 10 rank among the country and top three in the region. Table 1 shows the detailed statistics of Access index and rank of all primary level schools.

It shows that the position of Meghalaya, Mizoram and Sikkim has slightly better in comparisons to other states, it may be noted here that these states are the most peaceful states of the country in recent years. Earlier the growth of primary education in remote areas of north eastern region was disturbed due to some unpleasant situation prevailing there. Now the policy makers are taking necessary action in this regard. As a result some improvement in terms of access category of EDI is visible. It may also be remembered that other north eastern states are also improving in this regard during the same period. Question here is the rate of improvement.

Thus it is encouraging to see that due to the SSA intervention, more schools have been made available to the students of some north eastern states but not all of them. One can draw an inference here that various factors such as climatic disasters, backwardness, poor economic condition, topography, insurgency and social upheavals are all detrimental to the overall EDI of any particular state. North east region being a sensitive area of the country, these factors get further magnified and impact access of children to schools and teachers.

If we see the Infrastructure index indicated in table 2. Meghalaya, Assam and Arunachal Pradesh are the states standing very backward and these states are not showing any kind of

improvement during the period of reference. Nagaland has shown a lot of improvement and thus, is ranked high in the entire north eastern region as well. Only Sikkim having good infrastructure, in almost all years it is ranked well and topmost among all the north eastern states, and is also ranked better on all India basis. The position of Tripura in Infrastructure Index and Rank for Primary Level is consistent during the study period. So far as index is concern it has improved from 0.546 in 2005-06 to 0.568 in 2010-11. All the other states too are lacking in infrastructure and fare quite poorly on this particular index and rank. This is a very worrisome feature as these rural areas with harsh weather conditions and non-provision of basic amenities such as a proper building, toilet, and drinking water will lead to massive attrition particularly with the girls. Even meritorious students will be unable to perform to their potential and an important motivation factor for the average performers will be lost. The serving of mid-day meals, which are of massive help in increasing enrolment, would also be a problem. Without basic infrastructure, it would be almost impossible to retain good teachers. Even local educated youth would not want to work in such conditions.

Table 3 shows the primary level Teacher index and rank of North East India. Assam and Arunachal is ranked low in this region at the same time Sikkim and Mizoram is ranked among the top respectively but both these states index is declining every year. Nagaland, Meghalaya, Tripura and Manipur ranked between 4, 5 and 6 respectively with some fluctuation in some years. As is obvious from the overall dismal figures, teacher quality needs a lot of work and improvement. Firstly, number of teachers vis-a-vis number of students i.e. teacher pupil ratio is something that needs immediate attention. At least, it has to be ensured that adequate number of teachers is there in schools. Then their subject knowledge, teaching qualifications, training etc. too are very essential. Teachers are the backbone of the educational process and good teachers elevate quality of teaching even when the other factors are adverse. The percentage of Female teachers in the schools is also needs to be looked into.

Table 4 indicates educational Outcomes under which nine indicators have been used. These indicators essentially point out the number of students in various categories who enrol in school and pass out their classes successfully. The overall score of the nine indicators have been used for developing the outcome index and rank. Table 4 shows index and rank of each states of North

Eastern region for the study period. Last two years of study period Tripura is showing good index, Mizoram is also improved in 2009-10 period. Arunachal Pradesh is ranked lowest among the region. All other states in the region showing mixed result every year they are showing different rank and there is hardly any improvement.

Table 4 indicates how the north eastern states are faring in educational achievement and development at the primary level. The rank column shows 2 figures, the first indicating the state's rank among north eastern states and the bracketed number indicating the all India rank of the state. Among the 8 North Eastern States, Sikkim and Mizoram consistently hold good. But Sikkim is showing much better index than Mizoram from 2005-06 to 2008-09 Mizoram is having more than 0.6 indexes but in 2009-10 it has been reduced below 0.6. However Sikkim is showing mixed response in different years in ranking but it keeps its indexes above 0.6. Thus as far as the composite educational development index as is concerned, Sikkim performs better than any other state of North East. Arunachal Pradesh and Assam are the least ranked in the entire region as well these states are ranked among the least category in the country as well. Nagaland shows little improvement in the year 2009-10. In case of Meghalaya the rank and index has been reducing every year sharply. Tripura is almost consistent in EDI index and rank among the north eastern states. The states among this region showed fluctuations in rank as well as index in different years. So for the better understanding the details regarding rank and index of each state we have analysed the four sub category in detail, for knowing where the states require more attention for development. The composite EDI of many states of north eastern region is not satisfactory and the data clearly indicates that there is scope for development of primary education. The desired approach towards quality improvement of primary education of north eastern region may be initiated by analysing the data of EDI of the respective states in a comparative way. The recent initiatives of the Governments must have improved the situation as opined by the Educationists and Administrators.

4. Conclusion

This is a sad state of affairs because in the long run, if the various programmes for the education of children is not leading to larger number of children completing at least class 8 or preferably class 10 with reasonable success, then that means complete wastage of a very large quantity of

resources and the creation of a human resource that is not employable. In these less developed states educational outcomes are more critical.

Thus the study of EDI for the entire north east indicates poor to average educational development with some positive cues provided wherever some determined interventions are made, though the results have not always matched the efforts put in. All in all though, SSA provides a lot of hope and determination to many marginalised populations in the country, north eastern states in particular. The position of many states of north eastern region in composite EDI is not satisfactory if compared with other states. In the category of Teacher index and Access index the region needs to prepare the strategy so that the composite index is increased resulting overall improvement in quality of primary education. The educational policy makers of the respective states and region as a whole should prepare the appropriate action plan keeping in mind the indicators of educational development as identified in preparing EDI. Other indicators or index may also be prepared and considered if found relevant for the region or states. In that case the comparability of data of the state may not be possible; however said data or index of the state over the years may be used to understand the development of education at primary level at a given point of time. District-wise comparative picture may also be available if such kind of state specific index is prepared.

References

1. Barrett, A. (2007). "Initiatives to improve the quality of teaching and learning A review of recent literature", working paper no.2008/ED/EFA/MRT/PI/12, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, accessed from [http:// www.ceppe.cl/images/stories/recursos/publicaciones](http://www.ceppe.cl/images/stories/recursos/publicaciones)
2. Chakraborty, K.S. (1997): TQM Concept in Higher Education of India, Vidyasagar University Journal of Commerce, Vol.2, March.
3. Chakraborty. K.S. (2017), Primary Education in Tripura- A major Research Project, SCERT, Govt. of Tripura.

4. Goswami, R. (2012). "Elementary Education in India: Quality or Quantity?", East Asia Forum, Economic, Politics and Public Policy in East Asia Pacific, accessed from <http://www.eastasiaforum.org/2012/12/25/elementary-education-inindia-quality-or-quantity/>
5. Institutes of Applied manpower Research (2001): Educational Development Parameters and the Preparation of Educational Development Index, New Delhi.
6. Jana, M., & Sar, N. (2016). Modeling of hotspot detection using cluster outlier analysis and Getis-Ord G_i^* statistic of educational development in upper-primary level, India. *Modeling Earth Systems and Environment*, 2(2), 60.
7. Kulkarni, V. (2013). "Status of Primary Education in India Strides and Challenges", Centre for Education Innovation, accessed from <http://www.educationinnovations.org/blog/status-primaryeducation>
8. Kumar, K. (2012), "The Primary Crime" India Today, accessed from <http://indiatoday.intoday.in/story/krishna-kumar-on-primaryeducation>
9. Moore, A.J. (1996) *Improving Schools: Quality Indicators used when selecting K-12 teachers*, Emporia State University, Kansas.
10. Mukhopadhyay, M (2000): *Total Quality Management in Education*, NIEPA, New Delhi.
11. Mukhopadhyay, M. (1989): *Management of Change in Education, In Search of Indian Model*, NIEPA, New Delhi.
12. National Achievement Survey Class 5, NCERT SSA, Technical Cooperation Fund
13. Sallis (1996) : *TQM in Education*, London, Kogan Page.
14. UNESCO (1996) *Learning: The Treasure within*, Report to UNESCO of the International Commission on Education in 21st Century, Paris, UNESCO.

TABLE 1
Access Index and Rank for Primary Level

<i>State</i>	<i>2005-06</i>		<i>2006-07</i>		<i>2007-08</i>		<i>2008-09</i>		<i>2009-10</i>		<i>2010-11</i>		<i>2013-14</i>		<i>2014-15</i>	
	<i>Index</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Index</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Index</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Index</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Index</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Index</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Index</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Index</i>	<i>Rank</i>
Arunachal Pradesh	0.470	7(25)	0.468	7(27)	0.500	5(21)	1.000	1(1)	1.000	1(1)	1.000	1(1)	0.432	3(5)	0.434	3(5)
Meghalaya	0.850	1(1)	0.850	1(1)	0.788	1(1)	0.794	2(2)	0.760	2(3)	0.997	2(2)	0.561	1(1)	0.557	1(1)
Mizoram	0.712	2(2)	0.716	2(2)	0.744	2(2)	0.743	3(4)	0.746	3(4)	0.758	3(4)	0.322	7(11)	0.328	6(10)
Nagaland	0.605	4(10)	0.588	5(9)	0.587	4(9)	0.582	5(11)	0.62	4(9)	0.632	5(10)	0.215	8(26)	0.211	8(26)
Assam	0.507	6(21)	0.593	4(7)	0.701	3(3)	0.696	4(5)	0.524	5(20)	0.569	6(18)	0.377	4(7)	0.375	4(7)
Sikkim	0.605	3(9)	0.601	3(5)	0.484	6(26)	0.464	6(28)	0.509	6(25)	0.652	4(6)	0.455	2(4)	0.448	2(4)
Tripura	0.413	8(31)	0.402	8(31)	0.430	8(32)	0.416	7(30)	0.505	7(26)	0.524	7(28)	0.332	6(10)	0.327	7(11)
Manipur	0.561	5(11)	0.530	6(15)	0.432	7(31)	0.404	8(32)	0.397	8(32)	0.455	8(32)	0.358	5(8)	0.368	5(8)

Source: DIES flash statistics.

Note: Rank in bracket is all India ranking

TABLE 2
Infrastructure Index and Rank for Primary Level

<i>State</i>	<i>2005-06</i>		<i>2006-07</i>		<i>2007-08</i>		<i>2008-09</i>		<i>2009-10</i>		<i>2010-11</i>		<i>2013-14</i>		<i>2014-15</i>	
	<i>Index</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Index</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Index</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Index</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Index</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Index</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Index</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Index</i>	<i>Rank</i>
Sikkim	0.76	1(10)	0.764	1(8)	0.744	1(13)	0.741	1(11)	0.882	1(4)	0.898	1(1)	0.849	1(11)	0.757	3(22)
Nagaland	0.514	5(28)	0.604	3(22)	0.658	2(22)	0.635	2(20)	0.807	2(11)	0.649	3(22)	0.686	3(26)	0.724	5(26)
Mizoram	0.663	2(18)	0.653	2(19)	0.651	3(23)	0.602	3(21)	0.679	3(19)	0.697	2(18)	0.665	4(27)	0.763	2(20)
Tripura	0.546	4(24)	0.548	5(25)	0.599	4(26)	0.482	4(27)	0.436	4(28)	0.568	4(27)	0.623	5(29)	0.754	4(24)
Manipur	0.564	3(22)	0.553	4(24)	0.562	5(27)	0.408	5(29)	0.421	5(30)	0.517	5(30)	0.712	2(23)	0.766	1(18)
Arunachal Pradesh	0.506	6(30)	0.463	6(31)	0.427	6(31)	0.221	6(33)	0.394	6(31)	0.429	6(32)	0.500	7(34)	0.707	6(28)
Assam	0.363	8(33)	0.302	8(34)	0.316	8(34)	0.164	7(34)	0.365	7(33)	0.377	7(34)	0.523	6(32)	0.477	7(34)
Meghalaya	0.367	7(32)	0.35	7(32)	0.371	7(32)	0.149	8(35)	0.219	8(35)	0.246	8(35)	0.317	8(35)	0.358	8(36)

Source: DIES flash statistics.

Note: Rank in parentheses is all India ranking.

TABLE 3
Teacher Index and Rank for Primary Level

<i>State</i>	<i>2005-06</i>		<i>2006-07</i>		<i>2007-08</i>		<i>2008-09</i>		<i>2009-10</i>		<i>2010-11</i>		<i>2013-14</i>		<i>2014-15</i>	
	<i>Index</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Index</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Index</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Index</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Index</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Index</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Index</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Index</i>	<i>Rank</i>
Sikkim	0.648	1(8)	0.78	1(7)	0.731	1(12)	0.728	1(13)	0.725	1(14)	0.797	1(12)	0.708	1(14)	0.701	1(16)
Mizoram	0.633	2(9)	0.756	2(9)	0.723	2(14)	0.725	2(14)	0.674	2(19)	0.639	2(19)	0.564	4(23)	0.590	3(24)
Nagaland	0.542	5(20)	0.662	3(18)	0.682	3(16)	0.618	3(20)	0.593	3(21)	0.607	3(21)	0.627	2(20)	0.603	2(22)
Meghalaya	0.578	3(16)	0.617	5(20)	0.521	5(26)	0.557	4(24)	0.563	4(23)	0.555	4(23)	0.452	5(29)	0.410	6(33)
Manipur	0.528	6(22)	0.603	6(22)	0.565	4(23)	0.515	5(26)	0.51	5(26)	0.535	5(25)	0.602	3(21)	0.579	4(25)
Tripura	0.550	4(19)	0.625	4(19)	0.619	3(21)	0.455	6(30)	0.467	6(29)	0.516	6(28)	0.430	6(31)	0.444	5(31)
Assam	0.500	7(23)	0.402	8(31)	0.328	7(35)	0.408	7(33)	0.454	7(32)	0.384	7(33)	0.350	7(34)	0.385	7(34)
Arunachal Pradesh	0.383	8(31)	0.464	7(28)	0.367	6(33)	0.375	8(34)	0.368	8(35)	0.351	8(35)	0.330	8(35)	0.287	8(36)

Source: DIES flash statistics.

Note: Rank in bracket is all India ranking.

TABLE 4
Outcomes Index and Rank for Primary Level

<i>State</i>	<i>2005-06</i>		<i>2006-07</i>		<i>2007-08</i>		<i>2008-09</i>		<i>2009-10</i>		<i>2010-11</i>		<i>2013-14</i>		<i>2014-15</i>	
	<i>Index</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Index</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Index</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Index</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Index</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Index</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Index</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Index</i>	<i>Rank</i>
Tripura	0.558	1(14)	0.504	4(21)	0.621	2(20)	0.777	1(8)	0.716	1(12)	0.827	1(11)	0.763	2(9)	0.727	2(17)
Mizoram	0.517	2(19)	0.525	2(17)	0.582	3(22)	0.684	4(21)	0.714	2(13)	0.693	5(28)	0.496	8(32)	0.566	6(31)
Assam	0.394	6(31)	0.557	1(13)	0.622	1(19)	0.645	5(23)	0.688	3(17)	0.754	3(22)	0.818	1(1)	0.766	1(6)
Nagaland	0.424	5(25)	0.482	5(26)	0.555	5(27)	0.751	2(11)	0.677	4(19)	0.775	2(18)	0.671	5(22)	0.474	7(34)
Sikkim	0.479	4(21)	0.511	3(20)	0.509	6(31)	0.698	3(19)	0.672	5(21)	0.678	6(31)	0.759	3(10)	0.714	3(19)
Manipur	0.496	3(20)	0.475	6(27)	0.573	4(24)	0.59	6(29)	0.647	6(28)	0.750	4(25)	0.675	4(21)	0.469	8(35)
Meghalaya	0.417	7(27)	0.402	7(32)	0.483	7(33)	0.568	7(32)	0.615	7(29)	0.665	7(32)	0.635	7(26)	0.619	5(27)
Arunachal Pradesh	0.405	8(29)	0.332	8(35)	0.405	8(35)	0.483	8(34)	0.465	8(35)	0.568	8(35)	0.648	6(23)	0.650	4(23)

Source: DIES flash statistics.

Note: Rank in bracket is all India ranking.

TABLE 5
Composite Educational Development Indexes for Primary Level

<i>State</i>	<i>2005-06</i>		<i>2006-07</i>		<i>2007-08</i>		<i>2008-09</i>		<i>2009-10</i>		<i>2010-11</i>		<i>2013-14</i>		<i>2014-15</i>	
	<i>Index</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Index</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Index</i>	<i>Index</i>	<i>Index</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Index</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Index</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Index</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Index</i>	<i>Rank</i>
Sikkim	0.611	2(10)	0.686	1(6)	0.639	2(20)	0.657	2(16)	0.608	1(10)	0.764	1(5)	0.701	1(6)	0.649	1(9)
Mizoram	0.623	1(9)	0.663	2(10)	0.679	1(14)	0.686	1(11)	0.544	3(19)	0.694	2(17)	0.527	4(29)	0.559	2(21)
Nagaland	0.510	6(28)	0.59	3(21)	0.630	3(21)	0.638	3(20)	0.549	2(18)	0.659	3(20)	0.558	3(25)	0.505	5(30)
Tripura	0.511	5(27)	0.542	5(23)	0.572	4(25)	0.501	5(30)	0.415	4(28)	0.597	5(29)	0.524	5(30)	0.542	4(26)
Manipur	0.520	3(23)	0.547	4(22)	0.537	5(29)	0.464	7(33)	0.411	5(29)	0.556	7(32)	0.592	2(17)	0.551	3(24)
Meghalaya	0.512	4(25)	0.512	6(28)	0.527	6(31)	0.498	6(31)	0.365	7(33)	0.601	4(28)	0.468	7(33)	0.473	7(34)
Assam	0.454	7(31)	0.433	7(32)	0.461	7(32)	0.448	8(35)	0.386	6(31)	0.504	8(35)	0.490	6(32)	0.473	8(35)
Arunachal Pradesh	0.417	8(34)	0.432	8(33)	0.422	8(34)	0.512	4(29)	0.328	8(35)	0.573	6(31)	0.460	8(34)	0.499	6(31)

Source: DIES flash statistics.

Note: Rank in bracket is all India ranking.