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The Punjab Rural Support Programme (PRSP) has established 100 community schools since 1999 in the province with enrollment of 5596. In December 2002, the Planning & Development, Government of the Punjab, asked the Punjab Economic Research Institute (PERI) to undertake an evaluation of the PRSP schools.

The Institute visited 19 PRSP schools, 19 Government schools and conducted interviews of 38 community members. Moreover, 187 students from community schools and 213 students from Government schools were administered a test to assess their educational attainment. Secondary data was obtained from PRSP.

The main findings of the study are:

- Community’s share in establishing and operating the PRSP schools was 5.6 per cent and 28.8 per cent respectively.
- The average monthly teacher salary in PRSP school and Govt. school was Rs. 999 and Rs. 5079 respectively.
- The extent of teacher turnover in community schools was 47.6 per cent.
- The PRSP school teachers were relatively less qualified than the Government schools.
- The quality of education imparted was assessed to be better at community schools than the Government schools. The average marks obtained by sample students in Class I, II, III, IV and V were 72.8, 61.7, 59.5, 51.9, and 54.8 per cent in community schools and 63.6, 57.6, 51.6, 30.3, and 41.3 per cent in Government schools respectively.
- The extent of teacher's absenteeism was low in case of community schools compared with the Government schools, i.e. 7.2 per cent and 21.0 per cent respectively.

It has been concluded that the concept of establishing community schools by PRSP is a cost-effective method of providing primary level education. With community’s involvement in school management, better monitoring, teachers belonging to same village, it has been possible to impart better quality education and low teacher salary and high turnover rate was not constituting impediments in giving quality education. It is recommended that the PRSP may establish more community schools.
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- In 1999, the Punjab Government and the Punjab Rural Support Programme (PRSP) explored a new mode of establishing primary schools whereby an endowment fund of Rs. 2.0 lacs per school was established and the community was mobilized to come forward and donate space for school and necessary furniture. In all, 100 schools were established.

- In September 2002, while considering a revised scheme, the PDWP decided that an independent evaluation of community schools established by PRSP be undertaken. The Planning & Development Department, Govt. of Punjab, in December 2002 asked the Punjab Economic Research Institute (PERI) to undertake this evaluation study with following TOR:
  1. Evaluation of community share in the schools.

- The Institute visited 19 PRSP schools, 19 Government schools and conducted interviews of 38 community members. Moreover, 187 students from community schools and 213 from Government schools were administered a test to assess their educational attainment. Secondary data was obtained from PRSP.
The main findings of the study are:

- Community’s share in establishing and operating the PRSP school was 5.6 per cent and 28.8 per cent respectively.
- The average monthly teacher salary in PRSP school and Govt. school was Rs. 999 and Rs. 5079 respectively.
- The extent of teacher turnover in community schools was 47.6 per cent.
- The PRSP school teachers were relatively less qualified than the Government schools.
- The quality of education imparted was assessed to be better at community schools than the Government schools. The average marks obtained by sample students in Class I, II, III, IV and V were 72.8, 61.7, 59.5, 51.9, and 54.8 per cent in community schools and 63.6, 57.6, 51.6, 30.3, and 41.3 per cent in Government schools respectively.
- The extent of teacher’s absenteeism was low in case of community schools compared with the Government schools, i.e. 7.2 per cent and 21.0 per cent respectively.

The main conclusions of this evaluation study are:

- The concept of establishing community schools by PRSP is a cost-effective method of providing primary level education. In the context of inadequate primary enrollment and the need for achieving universal primary education, this finding has considerable significance.
- Relatively better community school’s location i.e. within the village was having a favourable impact on female student’s participation.
- With community’s involvement in school management, better monitoring, teachers belonging to same village, the community schools have been able to impart better quality education. Furthermore, low teacher salary and their high
turnover rate were not impediments in imparting quality education at community schools.

- It is recommended that the PRSP may establish more community schools and thus help in achieving the goal of universal primary education.

- The Endowment Fund per school may have to be enhanced in view of recent reduction in returns from fixed investments.
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

Human resource development has occupied a pivotal position in our strategy for stimulating economic growth and poverty reduction. In this context, improving access to education and health, improving the quality of these services and imparting training are considered as essential.

Inspest of the efforts made in the past, we are lagging behind in human resource development. The adult literacy rate in developing countries, South Asia and Pakistan is 74, 54 and 43 per cent respectively. Pakistan’s gross primary enrollment rate is the second lowest amongst the South Asian countries\(^1\).

According to Pakistan Integrated Household Survey 2001-02 conducted by the Federal Bureau of Statistics, the gross and net primary enrollment rate in Punjab is 76 per cent and 45 per cent respectively.

The gross and net primary enrollment rate for female is lower than the male. The information provided by the Education Department revealed that 18.2 per cent of the children aged 5-9 were out of school.

Recently, some new approaches have been tried to improve the student enrollment rate. These include establishment of community schools by the Punjab Rural Support Programme and introduction of evening classes with the help of private sector in the existing Government schools.

In view of the state of primary education in the province, the Punjab Government and PRSP joined hands in April 1999, with the objective of extending quality primary education by establishing 100 community schools. The
information made available by the PRSP indicates that 5596 students (2936 girls and 2660 boys) were enrolled in these 100 schools, which 150 teachers.

In a PDWP meeting held on 24-9-2002, a revised scheme was considered. It was decided that an independent evaluation of 100 community schools already established through provision of Rs. 20.0 million by the Punjab Government would be carried out. It may be added here that these 100 community schools were established with an endowment fund of Rs. 2.0 lacs for each school.

Under the PRSP – community partnership, the school management was entrusted to the community itself. Communities put forth the demand for schools, selected the teachers, used profit on endowment and applied it for school expenses including payment of salaries. The Community Organization (CO) is also responsible for the formation of the Village Education Committee for financial and administrative management of schools.

In a meeting held on 3-12-2002 under the chairmanship of Secretary, P&D Department, it was decided that the Punjab Economic Research Institute would carry out a separate / independent evaluation of the community schools already established by the PRSP and functioning in Punjab.

1.2 Objectives of the Evaluation Study

The terms of reference (TOR) specified by the P&D Department for this evaluation study were:

1. Evaluation of community share in the schools.

1.3 Organization of the Report

The methodology adopted for this evaluation study has been given in Chapter-II. Findings and conclusions of the evaluation study have been presented in Chapter-III.
CHAPTER - II
METHODOLOGY

2.1: Sampling Design
As already indicated in Chapter-I, 5596 students were enrolled in 100 community schools established by the PRSP in their 8 regions of the Punjab. The region-wise number of community schools and their respective student enrollment is given in Table 2.1.

2.1.1: Sample Schools
In order to give proper representation to community schools a sample size of one-fifth of such schools was decided. The selected sample i.e. 19 schools was proportionately allocated amongst various regions. The number of sample schools in various regions is also indicated in Table 2.1.

Table 2.1: Number of Schools, Student Enrollment and the Number of Sample Schools by Regions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Regions</th>
<th>Number of Schools</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Sample Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Muzaffargarh</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Multan</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1567</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Sargodha</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Sahiwal</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Lahore</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1019</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Faisalabad</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Narowal</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Gujranwala</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5596</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To assess the quality of education in community schools viz-a-viz Government schools, a control group i.e. 19 Government schools – one for each community
School in its vicinity was also selected. The list of sample PRSP schools and Government schools visited by PERI survey teams is given in Annexure 2.1.

Due to time constraint, it was decided that from each class operated under Community and Government schools, 2-3 students would be randomly selected and tested for their educational accomplishment in the subjects of Mathematics, English and Urdu. The test papers were designed in consultation with experts in the Education Department. Copies of Test Papers used are given in Annexure 2.2.

2.2: Sample of Students Tested

The details of sample students selected for test in each region are given in Table 2.2.

Table 2.2: Sample Students Tested by Regions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Regions</th>
<th>PRSP Schools</th>
<th>Government Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visited</td>
<td>Students Tested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Muzaffargarh</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Multan</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Sargodha</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Sahiwal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Lahore *</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Faisalabad</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Narowal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Gujranwala</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* In Lahore region one of the two sample Government primary school visited was found closed.

Note: In some of the PRSP community schools, the number of classes was less than 5, hence the number of students tested per school varies.
2.3. Survey Instruments
In order to undertake the "Evaluation of PRSP Community Schools, the following questionnaires were designed, pre-tested and finalized

1- Questionnaire for community schools
2- Questionnaire for community members
3- Questionnaire for Government primary schools

2.4. Quality of Education
In order to compare the quality of education provided to students from class-I to class – V in community schools viz-a-viz Government controlled schools, an oral as well as written test was administered to sample students in Mathematics, English and Urdu, depending on the subjects taught. Then the average marks obtained by students of each class of community schools were compared with those from the Government controlled primary schools.

2.5. Teacher’s Turnover
To find out the extent of turnover of teachers in community schools, the total number of teachers who had left the school divided by the total number of existing strength of teachers.

2.6. Extent of Community Share
The Government provided an endowment fund of Rs. 200,000/- per school. The community contributed in the form of providing building / space for the school, meeting utility bills, furniture or donations. The extent of community share has been worked out on two basis i.e.

(i) Share in establishing the school

(ii) Share in school operation

(i) The community schools were established with the help of endowment fund of Rs. 2.0 lacs per school provided by the Government. The PRSP mobilized the community to provide building / space for school, furniture for students and physical
improvement of premises. During the survey requisite data was collected and community’s share in establishing the school was worked out.

(ii) The actual operation of the community school was made possible by monthly return on endowment fund, which was mainly used for paying teachers salaries financial support from PRSP. The community’s share came in the form of imputed rent of office building, depreciation of furniture (assumed to be 33 per cent per annum) and donations for meeting utility bills and miscellaneous expenses. Relevant information was collected during the survey and community’s share in school operation was worked out.

2.7 Community Perception

For each community school, 2-3 members of the community were randomly selected and their views regarding the quality of education, in Community Schools viz-a-viz Government controlled Primary schools were obtained. The total number of community members interviewed was 38.

2.8 Survey Team’s Perceptions

Three survey teams of the Institute covered 8 regions of the PRSP. They had interaction with RGM’s of PRSP, Social Organizers in the field, teachers and students in community and Government schools and community members. The list of PRSP staff with whom PERI survey teams had interaction is given at Annexure 2.3. Their perceptions about the functioning of community and Government schools have also been presented.
CHAPTER – III
SURVEY RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS

The Punjab Economic Research Institute, constituted three survey teams to collect data from the field during January 2003. In this chapter the survey results and conclusions of the evaluation study have been presented. The average student enrollment at community and Government controlled primary schools was 73 and 127 respectively. The teacher student ratio was 1:33 and 1:29 respectively.

3.1. Community Share in the Schools

The community schools were established by the PRSP with the active involvement of the community. The Government provided an endowment fund of Rs. 200,000 per school. The PRSP in some cases also provided additional funds. The community contributed in the form of providing building / space for the school, meeting utility bills, furniture or donations.

The extent of community share has been worked out on following two basis:

- Share in establishing the school
- Share in schools operation

3.1.1. Community’s Share in Establishing the School

The data regarding Government and community contribution in establishing a community school are presented below:

i. Endowment fund by the Government = Rs. 200,000

ii. Contribution by PRSP = Rs. 500

\[ \text{200500} \]

iii. Community Share

a. Furniture = Rs. 4958
b. Annual Rent / Imputed Rent of School Building = Rs. 6126

c. Donation = Rs. 921

12005

It is evident that the community contribution in establishing a community school was Rs. 12005 and the Government / PRSP contribution was Rs. 200500. Thus the community share in establishing a school was 5.6 per cent.

3.1.2. Community’s Share in School Operation

The data regarding extent of Government and community participation in operating a community school is presented below:

(Rs.)
i. Annual Return on Endowment Fund = 25800
   Total 25800

ii. Community Share
   - Annual Imputed Rent of School Building = 6126
   - Annual Cost (Depreciation) of Furniture * = 1653
   - Donations = 2642
   Total 10421

It has been estimated that community share in operating a community school was 28.8 per cent.

It is worth pointing out that the Endowment Fund provides a regular flow of income, while the original amount remains intact. Recently, the Government has reduced return on fixed investments, which may create some difficulties for the community schools management. In addition to return on Endowment Fund and donations, another source of income for the community school was the tuition fee. Our
* A depreciation rate of 33 per cent per annum has been used to compute the annual cost of furniture.

survey revealed that the average amount received per school on this account was Rs. 8115 per year. It was also noted that 23.5 per cent of the students were exempted from tuition fee and the average monthly tuition fee per student was Rs. 11.

### 3.2. Teacher Salary and Turnover Rate

The data regarding the average teacher salary in community schools by the year of establishment, the number of existing teachers and the number of teachers who have left are presented in Table 3.1.

**Table 3.1: Teacher Salary and Turnover Rate in PRSP Community Schools**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Establishment</th>
<th>No. of Schools</th>
<th>Existing Teachers (No.)</th>
<th>Average Salary of Existing Teachers (Rs.)</th>
<th>Teachers Left</th>
<th>Teachers Turnover (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1033</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>868</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>42</strong></td>
<td><strong>999</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>47.6</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average teacher salary in PRSP schools was Rs. 999 per month and the overall teacher turnover rate was 47.6 per cent. In Government controlled primary schools, the average salary of a teacher was Rs. 5079 per month. In addition the Government has to meet their pension liability as well. There is no doubt that the salary level in PRSP schools was considerably low, compared with Government schools and their turnover rate was high.

### 3.3. Qualification / Training of Teachers
During the survey, data regarding teachers qualifications and training was collected and is presented in Table 3.2.

Table 3.2: Educational Background of Teachers in Sample Community and Government Primary Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic Education</th>
<th>PRSP Schools</th>
<th></th>
<th>Government Schools</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Matric</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matric</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matric + PTC+CT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>62.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.A/ F.Sc. + PTC+CT</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.A/B.Sc. + PTC+CT+B.Ed.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A. + PTC + CT + B.Ed.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is evident that teachers of PRSP schools were relatively less qualified. It has already been mentioned that they were low paid also. However, being from the same village, they were found to be more dedicated and committed.

What impact the low teacher salary, and high turn over rate, had on the quality of education would be examined in the next section.

3.4. Quality of Education

As already mentioned, in order to assess the quality of education imparted in community schools viz-a-viz Government controlled schools, 2-3 students from each class in the sample schools administered a test (Written/oral)
in Mathematics, English and Urdu. The data regarding average marks obtained by the sample students in the community and Government schools are presented in Table 3.3. It was discovered that generally the performance of the students in community schools was better, compared with Government schools. The data given in Table 3.3 reveals that students of class 1 of community schools scored 72.8 per cent marks in aggregate in Mathematics, English and Urdu, subjects compared with Government controlled primary schools, who scored 63.6 per cent marks.

Similarly in class II, III, IV and V, students of community schools obtained 61.7, 59.5, 51.9 and 54.8 per cent marks respectively, while students of Government controlled primary schools obtained 57.6, 51.6, 30.3 and 41.3 per cent marks respectively.

Table 3.3: Average Marks Obtained by Students in Sample Community and Government Primary Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classes</th>
<th>PRSP Community Schools</th>
<th>Government Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>Subjects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Math.</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>66.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>56.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>48.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>49.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data given in Table 3.4. reveals that number / percentage of students, obtaining less than 33 per cent marks were higher in case of Government primary schools as compared with community schools.
### Table 3.4: Comparison of Student Performance in Community Schools Viz-a-Viz Government Controlled Primary Schools

(Per cent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classes</th>
<th>Grade Percentage</th>
<th>Mathematics PRSP</th>
<th>Mathematics Govt.</th>
<th>English PRSP</th>
<th>English Govt.</th>
<th>Urdu PRSP</th>
<th>Urdu Govt.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class-I</td>
<td>Below 33%</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33 – 50 %</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51 – 75 %</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above 75 %</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>48.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class-II</td>
<td>Below 33%</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33 – 50 %</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51 – 75 %</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above 75 %</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class-III</td>
<td>Below 33%</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33 – 50 %</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51 – 75 %</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above 75 %</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class-IV Below 33%</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 – 50 %</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 – 75 %</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 75 %</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class-V Below 33%</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 – 50 %</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 – 75 %</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 75 %</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5. **Teachers Absenteeism**

Quality of education imparted in the schools is also affected by extent of teacher absenteeism. During survey, data regarding teachers presence at the time of Institute’s Survey Teams visit was obtained.

It was discovered that on overall basis the teachers attendance was relatively higher in the case of community schools (92.8 per cent) as compared with Government controlled primary schools (79 per cent). This can be attributed to teachers in the community schools being from the same village and their close monitoring / supervision by the community members.

3.6. **Perception of Community Members About the Working of Community Schools**

The Institute’s Survey teams at the time of visit to each sample community school interviewed 2-3 members of the community and asked them about the management of school, teachers attendance and quality of education imparted viz-a-viz Government controlled primary schools. The survey indicated
that community members rated community schools as better than the
Government controlled schools in respect of above mentioned aspects.

3.7. Survey Team's Perceptions

PERI survey teams visited PRSP community schools and Government controlled schools and had the opportunity of interaction with PRSP field staff, teachers, students and their parents. This provided them an ideal opportunity for observing the actual working of the schools.

Although the physical facilities were found to be better in Government schools and their teachers were better educated and much better paid, the involvement of community in PRSP schools management and its close monitoring had enabled them to provide better quality education.

Better location of PRSP school and the fact that teachers were recruited from the same village had a positive effect on students (particularly female) and teachers attendance.

The school uniform in Government schools was considered to be a burden by poor parents and they preferred sending their children to community schools.

The community school concept appeared to be a cost effective method of providing primary education keeping in view the huge backlog.

3.8. Conclusions

It has been concluded that the concept of establishing community schools by PRSP is a cost-effective method of providing primary level education. In the context of inadequate primary enrollment and the need for achieving universal primary education, this finding has considerable significance.

Relatively better community school’s location i.e. within the village was having a favourable impact on female student’s participation.

With community's involvement in school management, better monitoring, teachers belonging to same village, the community schools have been able to impart better quality education. Furthermore, low teacher salary and their high turnover rate were not impediments in imparting quality education at community schools.
It is recommended that the PRSP may establish more community schools and thus help in achieving the goal of universal primary education.

The Endowment Fund per school may have to be enhanced in view of recent reduction in returns from fixed investments.
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