Journal of Advances and Scholarly Researches in Allied Education
Vol. 15, Issue No. 8, (Special Issue) September-2018, ISSN 2230-7540

Performance of States with Respect to Facilities Provided in Schools of India

Tanu Sharma*

Research Scholar, Department of Education, Panjab University, Chandigarh

DOI: 10.29070/15/57867

Abstract – This paper provides an overview of school education in India. First, it gives an overview of policies made for the betterment of the education system. Second, the paper examines school quality in terms of school infrastructure and teacher in-service training inputs. The paper presents a composite model which shows the rank of states of India based on combined scores of infrastructure facilities and teacher in-service training and also presents state wise growth rate from 2011-12 to 2015-16. Result gives way to evidence-based policy-making as states with high rank have already achieved the goal of schools with hundred per cent boundary wall, drinking water facilities, electricity and nearly hundred per cent schools with toilet and are working on other facilities like computers, ramps etc. Other states should also follow the same pattern and start working primarily on these basic facilities like drinking water, electricity and toilets. The growth rate of teachers' in-service training is declining in maximum states which are a topic of major concern for educationists, policymakers as it may be a factor behind the low performance of students in exams.

Key words: Infrastructure Facility, In-Service Training, Growth Rate of States, Composite Rank of States.

----------X----------

INTRODUCTION

Literacy is the first step in achieving the goal of education. Educational Institute is the place which is obliged to not only literate people but also educates them and turn them into worthy citizens of society. So, the priority of every educational institution is to provide quality education and retention of students. In India, Government policies provide free Primary education, Mid-day meal which ensures maximum enrolment but it also warrants overcrowded classes with fewer teachers and fewer infrastructure facilities as a consequence. It has been seen that quality of education got degraded if infrastructure and teachers quality were not being upgraded as per enrolment ratio. Free primary education is initiating quality deprivation in the form of lack of staff in schools, overcrowded classrooms, inadequate classrooms, inadequate instructional materials, inadequate syllabus coverage and inadequate lesson preparations (Anekeya, 2015, p. 45). Moreover, the outcome in schools like students' achievement (Taylor, 2009, pg. 117; Earthman, 2017, pg. 4), enrolment and retention depend upon input like infrastructure, school buildings, administration, teacher training, educational materials and teaching. That's why it is important to check the quality of schools of states of India to ensure universalization of quality primary education. Policies on education are increasing the number of schools for more enrolment but to ensure quality, there are limited researches conducted in India. This paper examines school quality of states in terms of school infrastructure and teacher's in-service training where data was taken from U-DISE which has covered 13, 62,324 schools in 2010-11 and 1, 49,078 schools in 2015-16 and out of total schools, about 85.38 per cent schools were located in the rural areas (NUEPA, 2016, pg. xii) which depict real picture of schools located in rural area. State wise growth rate on each facility provided in schools portray work done by states during the last five years (2010-2016) for schools' improvement. It is important to understand which state is progressing or declining in provision of which facility so that the outcome of a state can be compared in the context of input of that state. This paper also looks into a pattern for the provision of facilities in schools of those states having a high rank in composite sores which may be used as examples to guide other states.

LITERATURE REVIEW

According to the census (2011), literacy rate for men in India is 80.90% whereas for women is 64.60% (MHA, 2018, C-10). There are many factors which hinder hundred per cent literacy rates. As India is a developing the country and a vast population is illiterate, the first priority of India is to literate all.

***Corresponding Author (email:tanusharma5284@yahoo.in)**

Maximum resources are being used only for more enrolments of children on the cost of quality which is subsiding true purpose of education. Schools are producing herds to be hawked in the absence of quality. Poor school environment, no access to schools, inadequate teaching staff and condition of classrooms are some school-related factors that are harmfully affecting quality outcome and retention of students. There are other factors like economic, social, cultural factors which along with the school factors play a significant role in increasing dropout rate (Shahidul & Karim, 2015, p. 32). Singh (2015, p. 41) discussed that the poor school environment for girls is an obstruction for women education. Huisman, Rani and Smits (2010, p. 21) studied the role of characteristics of the educational infrastructure on primary school enrolment using data of 70,000 children living in 439 districts of 26 states of India and found that better primary schools ensure more educational participation of girls and investment in schools and teachers particularly in rural areas do affect positively in terms of enrolment. It also affects students' performance. Students in classrooms with natural lighting and large windows for coming skylights in classrooms, perform 19 to 26 per cent better than their peers who were taught in classrooms without provision of natural lighting (Mcgowen, 2007, pg. 24). Rao and Gupta (2006, p. 90) analysed the reasons behind low literacy of women in Andhra Pradesh and found that schools located at long distances from home, inadequate teaching staff, inadequate classrooms and teaching-learning materials, inadequate games and recreational provisions, lack of textbooks, notebooks, pencils, lack of proper seating arrangements in schools, gender disparity are some of the important factors affecting women education adversely. Fattah (2015, p. 46) evaluated that lack of infrastructure, physical learning environment conditions, political influence are some factors affecting the quality of university education in Dhaka. Anekeya (2015, p. 57) studied quality education in Kenya based on school factors and found that free primary education caused lack of teachers as compared to students, classrooms turned out to be congested, the teacher-pupil ratio in most of the schools is 1:50 ratio against the standard of 1:40. Results also showed that most of the teachers admit that their teaching workload was high and the teacher factor was found to be an impediment affecting the quality of education in primary schools. According to Jitendra (2016, p. 385), pre-service teacher's attitude, self-efficacy and skills were improved due to imparting syllabus of inclusive education along with training and providing teaching learning material. Without appropriate training and learning material, it is difficult to teach students with disability properly. A study done by Das, Kuyini and Desai (2013, pp. 31-32) examines the skill levels of regular primary and secondary school teachers of Delhi, in order to teach students with disabilities in inclusive education settings. In primary schools, reports indicated that 67.59% of teachers had not received any training in special education skills. Further, 77.88% of teachers indicated that they do not have any experience working with special needs children. In secondary schools, 32.28% indicated that they had received some training to work with students with disabilities and 62.99% teachers indicated that they also do not have any experience for teaching students with disabilities. Based on the above literature, it is found that access, infrastructure and teacher training are some factors that affect the retention of students. But teachers in India are not fully skilled to cope with classroom conditions. There are many policies in India for development of education and infrastructural support. But there is still a gap between real outcome and outcome to be. For finding reasons behind this gap, first, input with respect to investment done by government in education should be considered and then a true picture of facilities provided in schools should be analysed. It will depict that investment done by the government was thoughtless, imbalanced and improper.

INVESTMENT IN EDUCATION AND INFRASTRUCTURAL SUPPORTS

From Kothari commission (1966) to the RTE act; 2009, the government is providing a different kind of facilities to encourage enrolment, retention. Kothari Commission (1966), recommended the concept of neighbourhood schools which made school approachable for all children at the lower primary stage to attend the school in the locality. National Programme of Mid-day Meals in Schools which was launched on 15th August 1995 with a vision to increase enrolment, retention, attendance and nutritional levels among children. In this scheme, every child in every Government and Government-aided primary school for a minimum of 200 days, was to be served a cooked Mid-Day Meal containing 300 calories of energy and 8-12 gram protein per day (MHRD, 2016a). "Samagra Shiksha Abhiyan interventions include opening of new schools and alternate schooling facilities, construction of schools and additional classrooms, toilets and drinking water, provision of teachers, regular teachers' in-service training and academic resource support, free textbooks and free uniforms and support for improving learning achievement levels/outcomes"(MHRD, 2018b). The RTE Act; 2009, in which Constitution of India guarantees the Right of Free and Compulsory education to children and this act puts the responsibility of ensuring enrolment, attendance and completion of primary education on the government (Right to education, 2013). Rashtriya Madhyamik Shiksha Abhiyan (RMSA) was launched in March 2009 with the objectives of enhancing access to secondary education and improving its quality (MHRD, 2016b). National Programme for the education of Girls at Elementary Level (NPEGEL) is a holistic effort to address obstacles to girls' education at micro level through flexible, decentralized processes and decision making (Vemula, 2017). As per Nanda (2017), "Union Budget has pegged a sum of Rs.

72,394 crore in 2016-17 and Rs. 79,685.95 crore for the education sector for the financial year 2017-18. For the financial year 2017-18, out of the total outlay, Rs 46,356.25 is for the school sector and the rest for higher education." This budget is used in providing drinking water to schools, making girl's toilet, electricity, computers, mid-day meal, and infrastructure of schools which plays a vital role in more enrolments and retention of students. Accessibility of school is also considered by making schools approachable in all weathers. There are many policies for educational development in India. still, there is no hundred per cent enrolment and retention of students. So, there is a need for accessing the quality of schools and teachers.

OBJECTIVES:

1) To rank the states on the basis of composite score of school infrastructure and teacher in-service training.

2) To examined the growth rate of states of India with respect to facilities provided in schools from the year 2011-12 to the year 2015-16.

Choice of Indicators: Access, infrastructure, teachers are input whereas enrolment, result, fewer dropout rates are outcomes in any education system. In this paper school infrastructure and teacher, in-service training is included. School infrastructure and teacher related many factors affect school education. Separate toilets, good conditions of classrooms, drinking water, playground and ramp for disables are a basic requirement of any educational institution. In this study, due to data constraints, a playground facility, boundary wall, separate girls toilets, separate boys toilets, drinking water, electricity, computer facility, ramp facility, good classroom condition and teacher in-service training are taken as indicators for composite scores and treated as variables for a growth rate of states. As school infrastructure plays a very important role in the enrolment and retention of children in schools and teacher in-service training is necessary for producing quality in education. That's why these indicators were chosen for this study.

Delimitation: All states except Telangana were taken. Data is delimited to elementary level classes and to five years from 2010-11 to 2015-16. Data is taken from UDISE only. All elementary schools with all type of management (Government, private, and aided) were taken as a sample to depict real picture of the elementary education system.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY:

The study is primarily based on secondary data and the required data is collected from reports of UDISE from NUEPA, a government agency. The study focuses on the performance of states with respect to school infrastructure and in-service training of teachers. The composite score means statistically combining individual measures into a single score to reduce the potential for information overload. Presenting one score makes it easy to assess overall quality. In this research paper, state wise sum of scores of all variables of all years from 2011-12 to 2015-16 is taken into account. For Growth rate, 2011-12 was taken as the base year. The growth rate was assessed by taking two years 2011-12 and 2015-16 with the following formula:

Growth Rate= (current year value- base year value)/ base year value*100

FINDINGS AND RESULTS

Findings are divided into two categories:

1) Composite rank order of States

2) The growth rate of states from 2011-12 to 2015-16

Table 1: Composite rank of states*

States	Total Sum	Rank
Gujarat	407	1
Chandigarh	404	2
Tamil nadu	390	3
Delhi	389	4
Puducherry	384	5
Bihar	160	31
Assam	124	32
Jammu & Kashmir	119	33
Arunachal Pradesh	109	34
Meghalaya	88	35

Source: UDISE, NUEPA (2018), Government of India.

*Computed

1) Composite rank order of States: Based on the composite score of infrastructure facilities and teacher in-service training from 2011-12 to 2015-16, Gujarat is at first rank followed by Chandigarh which is a Union territory. Tamil Nadu and Delhi are at a third and fourth place for providing above mentioned facilities in schools during 2011-12 to 2015-16. Meghalaya is at last place next to Arunachal Pradesh (34), Jammu & Kashmir (33), Assam (32) and Bihar (31) (As per Table 1).

*Corresponding Author (email:tanusharma5284@yahoo.in)

Table 2: The Growth rate of states from 2011-12 to 2015-16

State Name	Growth rate of Schools with Playground*	Growth rate of Schools with Boundary wall*	Growth rate of Schools with Girls' Toilet*	Growth rate of Schools with boys Toilet*	Growth rate of Schools with Drinking Water*	Growth rate of Schools with Electricity*	Growth rate of Schools with Computer*	Growth rate of Schools with Ramp*	Growth rate of Schools with classroom by Good Condition*	Growth rate of Schools where Teachers Received in-service Training*
JAMMU & KASHMIR	2.2	9.2	82.9	82.3	11.5	46.7	18.7	4.7	6.7	-89.2
HIMACHAL PRADESH	28.7	28.4	2.2	23.4	1.1	26.3	38.5	9.0	1.9	-78.0
PUNJAB	25.9	1.5	1.0	1.1	0.0	1.9	9.6	-73.7	3.1	-31.4
CHANDIGARH	-1.7	0.0	-0.5	-0.4	0.0	0.0	-0.1	0.5	4.7	-47.6
UTTARAKHAND	2.2	-0.3	2.7	3.8	1.0	30.1	13.2	-57.4	3.3	-61.9
HARYANA	10.1	1.8	-0.5	3.0	0.4	1.7	27.3	-48.7	-1.4	-88.6
DELHI	9.1	1.2	-17.2	-18.9	0.0	0.1	-10.2	12.1	1.2	57.1
RAJASTHAN	13.1	4.2	4.3	28.6	1.9	24.2	65.9	-49.0	3.2	-87.2
UTTAR PRADESH	-9.8	14.6	11.3	13.0	0.3	16.3	73.8	-69.0	0.2	-81.1
BIHAR	9.7	-0.3	25.0	26.4	1.3	654.8	398.7	-60.8	8.0	-36.3
SIKKIM	9.8	19.9	-4.5	-1.7	2.1	41.5	31.5	75.0	27.1	-31.6
ARUNACHAL PRADESH	19.8	57.0	76.5	83.5	4.3	51.2	29.2	234.1	9.4	46.3
NAGALAND	11.4	7.0	33.1	37.4	26.8	58.8	35.1	157.8	28.7	-81.4
MANIPUR	-6.0	-6.3	6.0	5.8	5.2	33.0	25.1	426.4	17.9	-80.6
MIZORAM	59.0	-12.6	5.3	33.7	3.0	20.5	4.0	-38.7	0.3	-71.3
TRIPURA	2.7	40.6	22.4	27.9	19.2	78.6	35.0	-72.2	-3.4	-22.7

Source: UDISE, NUEPA (2014), Government of India. *Computed

Table 3: The Growth rate of states from 2011-12 to 2015-16

State Name	Growth rate of Schools with Playground*	Growth rate of Schools with Boundary wall*	Growth rate of Schools with Girls' Toilet*	Growth rate of Schools with boys Toilet*	Growth rate of Schools with Drinking Water*	Growth rate of Schools with Electricity*	Growth rate of Schools with Computer*	Growth rate of Schools with Ramp*	Growth rate of Schools with classroom by Good Condition*	Growth rate of Schools where Teachers Received in-service Training*
MEGHALAYA	-7.7	-4.2	42.3	45.5	4.6	45.2	29.6	10.1	12.5	-75.1
ASSAM	7.6	13.5	26.5	46.4	11.0	60.1	33.9	-16.5	12.1	-55.5
WEST BENGAL	25.0	20.1	10.2	12.8	1.3	128.5	43.3	-28.9	12.8	-69.1
JHARKHAND	35.1	7.7	24.6	27.3	3.8	45.5	21.7	-43.4	3.8	-56.4
ODISHA	2.2	7.9	21.2	22.0	5.4	39.4	60.3	-24.9	21.7	-30.0
CHHATTISGARH	41.1	14.3	69.0	77.5	6.2	153.0	51.6	-13.8	1.7	-39.5
MADHYA PRADESH	15.5	-1.0	8.2	4.2	-1.7	9.3	33.1	-43.0	1.2	-80.2
GUJARAT	4.0	4.6	-2.3	27.2	0.0	0.8	23.0	-38.0	-2.3	-30.8
DAMAN & DIU	-10.3	1.5	-1.6	-1.6	0.0	0.0	4.8	-27.3	8.5	-39.0
DADRA & NAGAR HAVELI	47.0	35.8	32.3	31.9	1.3	21.8	41.8	218.6	8.7	50.9
MAHARASHTRA	37.6	37.7	21.8	6.1	5.7	13.2	27.9	-7.7	1.1	-73.6
ANDHRA PRADESH	-4.8	6.9	24.4	33.0	7.0	13.2	8.8	14.0	-0.2	-65.4
KARNATAKA	-2.4	7.8	0.6	1.5	0.5	3.1	3.3	-58.6	0.0	-48.1
GOA	-3.3	6.5	6.4	14.2	0.6	1.3	13.3	-40.4	3.9	-21.2
LAKSHADWEEP	2.0	34.6	12.2	12.2	0.0	0.0	2.2	-39.9	11.8	1.2
KERALA	10.3	1.4	7.0	10.6	4.0	9.8	7.5	-35.1	7.1	-76.0
TAMIL NADU	-0.8	6.7	7.2	15.8	0.0	2.2	16.1	-38.1	-1.9	-38.9
PUDUCHERRY	9.5	5.4	-3.2	-2.3	0.0	0.1	4.4	-8.4	2.7	57.4
A & N ISLANDS	0.6	39.5	13.2	15.4	3.1	1.6	-4.7	-3.4	-8.1	-76.9

Source: UDISE, NUEPA (2014), Government of India. *Computed

2) The growth rate of states: Variable wise growth rate is shown in Table 2 and Table 3 and present scenario (2015-16) of states with low and high growth rate regarding the provision of facilities is discussed below.

The growth rate of Schools with respect to the provision of playground and boundary wall: Growth percentage rate with respect to schools with playground facility, half of the schools in Dadra and Nagar Haveli, Daman & Diu and Chhattisgarh are without playground facility. In Meghalaya situation is even worst. Maharashtra has more than eighty per cent schools with playground facility in 2015-16. With respect to a variable, 'Schools with boundary wall', the growth rate of Chandigarh is zero as it had attained the goal of hundred per cent schools with boundary wall which is maintained from 2011-12 to the year 2015-16. Growth percentage rate of Arunachal Pradesh is highest as a percentage of schools with boundary wall had been increased and approximately 52.5 per cent schools have a boundary wall. Tripura state is at second place with respect to growth rate but only 19 per cent schools have boundary wall till 2015-16. In Mizoram, the percentage of schools with boundary wall decreased from 61.6 per cent to 53.8 per cent during 2011-12 to 2015-16 which may be due to the increase in a number of schools.

The growth rate of Schools with Girls' Toilet and boys' Toilet: Jammu and Kashmir showed a vast increase in making girl's toilet with nearly 95 per cent schools having girl's toilet in 2015-16. Hundred per cent schools in Dadra and Nagar Haveli, Lakshadweep, Andaman and Nicobar Islands have separate girls' toilets in 2015-16. Above than 90 per cent schools in maximum states have separate girls' toilet in 2015-16. With respect to a variable, 'Schools with boy's toilets', a percentage increase of Arunachal Pradesh from 2011-12 to 2015-16 with respect to schools with separate boys' toilets have been approximately doubled and Jammu & Kashmir, Chhattisgarh with more than 90 per cent schools with toilets have highest growth rate. The growth rate of Delhi is declined by 18.9 per cent with 83.8 per cent schools with boys' toilet till 2015-16. Increase in a number of schools may be one reason. Only Lakshadweep has hundred per cent schools with separate boys' toilets in 2015-16.

Growth rate of Schools with Drinking Water: Schools of Chandigarh, Delhi, Daman and Diu, Dadra and Nagar Haveli, Goa, Lakshadweep, Pondicherry, and Andaman and Nicobar Islands have attained goal of hundred per cent schools with drinking water in 2015-16, but in Meghalaya, approximately thirty per cent schools do not have drinking water facility till 2015-16. All other states are approximately near to the goal of hundred per cent schools with drinking water.

The growth rate of Schools with Electricity and Computer facility: Bihar has the highest growth rate and more than sixty per cent schools are still working without electricity (2015-16). But, with this growth rate, Bihar can achieve the goal of hundred per cent schools with electricity within no time. Hundred per cent schools of Chandigarh, Daman & Diu, Lakshadweep, Pondicherry states have electricity in 2015-16. Like Bihar, Jammu & Kashmir have a long way to go for achieving the goal of hundred per cent schools with electricity. In Bihar, schools with computer facility are less than ten per cent in 2015-16 and only Lakshadweep has hundred per cent schools equipped with computer facilities in 2015-16. The growth rate of Delhi regarding computer facilities is declined by 10 per cent. In 2015-16, percentages of schools with computer facility are very low as Meghalaya, Jharkhand, Assam, Chhattisgarh, West Bengal, Utter Pradesh, Orissa and Madhya Pradesh, Tripura, Jammu & Ka ofshmir have only fifteen per cent schools with a computer facility.

The growth rate of Schools with Ramp and with classroom by Good Condition: Manipur have highest growth rate having thirty-five per cent schools with a ramp in 2015-16. Jammu, Punjab, Uttarakhand, Haryana, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Mizoram, Tripura, Assam, West Bengal, Jharkhand, Chhattisgarh, Madhya Pradesh, Karnataka, Goa, Andaman & Nicobar Island along with Andhra Pradesh, Arunachal Pradesh have less than 34 per cent schools witha ramp facility. If schools with classrooms in good conditions are discussed, then Nagaland, Sikkim and Orissa have more than 65 per cent schools with classrooms by good conditions in 2015-16 and high growth rate. None state has hundred per cent classrooms in good condition. But in all States, above than 50 per cent schools have a classroom in good condition.

The growth rate of Schools where teachers received in-service training: There is growth rate decline in maximum states with respect to teachers received in-service training. Percentage of teachers received in-service training are very low in 2015-16 as Sikkim, Nagaland, Manipur, Uttar Pradesh, Rajasthan, Haryana, Jammu & Kashmir have less than 2 per cent schools where teachers received in-service training.

*Corresponding Author (email:tanusharma5284@yahoo.in)

Table 3: Percentage of schools with facilities (2015-16)

States with high rank	Schools with Playground Facility (2015-16)*	Schools with Boundary wall (2015-16)*	Schools with Girls' Toilet (2015-16)*	Schools with boys Toilet (2015-16)*	Schools with Drinking Water (2015-16)*	Schools with Electricity (2015-16)*	Schools with Computer (2015-16)*	Schools with Ramp (where needed) (2015-16)*	Schools with Good classroom Conditions (2015-16)*
Gujarat	76.9	93.1	97.4	96.7	99.9	99.6	73.8	50.8	86.3
Chandigarh	93.0	100	99.5	98.5	100	100	94.5	46.7	95.8
Tamil nadu	76.9	79.5	98.6	97.6	99.9	98.6	57.5	38.5	90.1
Delhi	87.3	99.4	82.3	83.8	100	99.8	83.8	73.3	92
Puducherry	72.4	95.2	96.3	95.4	100	100	98.7	47.0	97

Source: UDISE, NUEPA (2014), Government of India. *Computed

The table 3 shows that states with high rank have one thing in common i.e. all states have nearly achieved goal of hundred per cent schools with basic amenities which are drinking water, electricity, toilets, boundary wall.

DISCUSSION:

The purpose of this study was two-fold: (1) infrastructure and (2) teacher in-service training. Infrastructure plays important role in enrolment while trained teachers play important role in the retention of students and quality education. As per composite score's findings, Gujarat, Chandigarh and Delhi are the top three states which are providing all facilities in schools much better than other states. Chandigarh has achieved goals of hundred per cent schools with boundary wall, drinking water, electricity and nearly hundred per cent schools with toilet. Similarly, Gujarat has above than ninety per cent schools with boundary wall, drinking water, electricity, toilets and Delhi has nearly achieved the goal of hundred per cent schools with boundary wall, drinking water, electricity till 2015-16. All three states prioritised basic amenities. All other states should follow the model of above-mentioned states and arrangements should be made regarding basic amenities like drinking water, toilets, electricity firstly. Based on growth rate findings, it can be excerpted that many states are providing facilities in schools but are insufficient. More than 40% of schools even lack boundary wall in many states. Schools are necessary for students' cognitive, affective, social development. Most of the behaviour learned directly or indirectly from schools guide students throughout the life. Provision of sanitation in schools not only directs wellbeing and health of students at present but also prepare a base for proper sanitation in the future. Especially for girls' hygiene and safety, the provision of separate toilets is necessary. Although separate girls toilets are increasing after Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) mission by UNICEF and Nirmal Bharat Abhiyaan of India, still there is lack of separate toilet for boys in many schools. Drinking water which is a basic need is provided in only 62 per cent schools in Meghalaya and approximately 81 per cent schools in Arunachal Pradesh. Majra and Gaur (2010) studied the provision of drinking water and sanitation in schools of Karnataka and found that 90 per cent of the schools were having adequate drinking water, no drainage of wastewater in 30 per cent of the schools and was a risk factor for breeding of mosquitoes, only 50 per cent schools have toilets for boys and 60 per cent schools have toilets for girls. If the status of electricity in states' schools is discussed which is an important component for ICT, only 50 per cent primary and 65 per cent upper primary government schools have electricity (UDISE, 2015). Many states have less than 30% of schools with electricity which is unfavourable to ICT oriented education. If a provision of computer facilities in schools is discussed then only Lakshadweep has hundred per cent schools equipped with computer facilities. According to MHRD (2018a), "ICT in schools have been subsumed in the Rashtriya Madhyamik Shiksha Abhiyan (RMSA) and the scheme provides support to States/UTs to establish computer labs on a sustainable basis". Still, maximum states have only 10 per cent to 30 per cent schools equipped with a computer. As per right to education, everyone has equal right to education and schools should accommodate all students regardless of their physical, intellectual, social, emotional, linguistic or other conditions (UNESCO, 2003, Pg 4) and ramp is basic necessity for children with locomotors problems but provision of ramps in schools is far less in almost all states as Sikkim has only 9 per cent schools with ramp and Jammu & Kashmir 13 per cent, Tripura has 15.6 per cent schools with ramp facility till 2015-16, which may hinder retention of disables in schools and may adversely affect goal of inclusive schools. Safe and modern school buildings increase achievement of students (Lyons, 2002) and more than fifty per cent schools in maximum states have classrooms in good conditions which is positive advancement but there is a long way to go. Study of Gouda, Das, Goli, and Pou (2013) also support results of this study and suggests an urgent need to improve the standards of primary education in government schools in terms of its basic physical facilities.

People are more likely to exhibit modelled behaviour if it results in valued outcomes and discouraged from pursuing courses of behaviour that they have seen often result in adverse consequences (Bandura, 1989, p. 24). Social cognitive theory supports the argument that teachers with proper training feel encouraged to teach students. If they feel incapable of dealing with different type of classroom conditions, they will be demotivated. Content-based teacher training for up gradation of latest knowledge is effective in more productivity as trained teachers are significantly better than untrained teachers on the ground of conceptual understanding, procedural knowledge and problem solving (Harris & Sass, 2008; Naore, Arshad, Aslam, & Nausheen, 2011). So, students' outcome increases when they are taught by trained teachers (Gnedko, 2013). Although states are increasing schools in numbers as the government is making policies for it but policies for quality improvement like provisions for teachers' in-service training are very less. Every state in India except five (Dadra and Nagar Haveli, Puducherry, Lakshadweep, Arunachal Pradesh, Delhi) states have decreased growth rate with respect to teachers' in-service training. It is decreasing with years According to U-Dise (2015-16), "The percentage of teacher in-service training was 40.21 in 2010-11 but it decreases to 14.90 per cent by 2015-16 (NUEPA, 2016, pg. xvii)." Sending a teacher in a classroom without giving proper training of techniques and strategies of teaching is like sending an untrained person to save lives of others in massive waves of the sea which only result in loss of many lives including saviour.

That's why India is falling behind in PISA, TIMSS like test. Less provision of in-service training may have an adverse effect on the education of students. Majority of the States/UTs are performing below the overall average score in all subject areas, which indicates that there is a need for significant improvement in learning levels and teachers training (pre-service and in-service) programmes. These might be designed on the basis of NAS findings to improve pedagogical aspects in relation to different subjects (Sreekanth, Tewari, Srivastava, & Bhushan, 2015)". For better output of education, quality of input should be accessed. Students should have access to quality amenities within schools. But states of India are lacking in school-related infrastructure facilities and quality of teachers. There is a need to reconsider policies regarding education for making its quality education. This study recommends that head teachers, teachers and government need to put measures that will address quality challenges in schools.

REFERENCES

Anekeya, D. M. (2015). School based factors affecting quality of education in Primary schools in Kakamega North Sub County, Kenya. *International Journal of Recent Research in Social Sciences and Humanities (IJRRSSH), 2(2)*, 45-58.

Bandura, A. (1989). *Social Cognitive Theory*. Retrieved on May 3, 2018 from https://www.uky.edu/~eushe2/Bandura/Bandura1989ACD.pdf.

Das, A. K., Kuyini A. B., & Desai I. P. (2013). Inclusive Education in India: Are the Teachers Prepared? *International Journal of Special Education*, *28*(1).

Earthman, G. I. (2017). The relationship between school building condition and student achievement: A critical examination of the literature. *Journal of Ethical Educational Leadership, 4(3),* 1-16. Retrieved from http://cojeel.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/06/JEELVol4No3.pdf

Fattah, A. (2015). *Evaluation of factors affecting quality education: a study on university of Dhaka* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Dhaka, Dhaka, Bangladesh). Retrieved from www.academia.edu/10873739/Evaluation_of_Factors_affecting_Quality_Education_A_study_on_University_of_Dhaka

Gnedko, N. (2013). *Student achievement in middle grades: Gauging the effect of teacher training on student learning*. (Doctoral Dissertation, Loyola University, Chicago, United States). Retrieved on March 5, 2018 from https://ecommons.luc.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=https://www.google.com/&httpsredir=1&article=1665&context=luc_diss

Gouda, J., Das, K. C, Goli, S., & Pou, L. M. A. (2013). Government versus private primary schools in India: An assessment of physical infrastructure, schooling costs and performance. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, *33(11/12*), 708-724. Retrieved on July 13, 2018 from https://www.emeraldinsight.com/doi/abs/10.1108/IJSSP-12-2012-0105

Harris, D. N., Sass, T. R. (2008, March 12). *Teacher training, teacher quality and student achievement*. Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED509656.pdf

Huisman, A.H.M, Rani, U., Smits, & J.P.J.M (Eds.). (2010). *School characteristics, socio-economic status and culture as determinants of primary school enrolment in India*. Retrieved from www.ru.nl/publish/pages/516298/nice_10109.pdf

Jitendra, V.N. (2016). *Attitude, self - efficacy and skills of pre - service teachers towards*

*Corresponding Author (email:tanusharma5284@yahoo.in)

inclusive education (Doctoral Dissertation, Savitribai Phule University, Pune, India). Retrieved from http://shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in

Kothari, D. S. (1966). *Principal Recommendations of the Kothari Commission/Education Commission, 1964-66*. Retrieved on January 5, 2018 from https://www.academia.edu/30217361/RECOMMENDATIONS_OF_THE_KOTHARI_COMMISSION_EDUCATION_COMMISSION_1964-66

Shahidul, S. M., & Karim, Z. (2015). Factors contributing to school dropout among the girls: A review of literature. *European Journal of research and reflection in educational sciences*, *3*(2), 25-36. Retrieved from http://www.idpublications.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/FACTORS-CONTRIBUTING-TO-SCHOOL-DROPOUT-AMONG-THE-GIRLS.pdf

Lyons, J. B. (2002). *The learning environment: Do school facilities really affect a child's education?* Retrieved from https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED458791

Majra, J. P., Gur, A. (2010). School environment and sanitation in rural India. *Journal of Global infectious Disease, 2*(2), 109-111.

Mcgowen, R. S. (2007). *The impact of school facilities on student achievement, attendance, behavior, completion rate and teacher turnover rate in selected Texas high schools. (Doctoral Dissertation*, A&M University, Texas). Retrieved from http://oaktrust.library.tamu.edu/bitstream/handle/1969.1/ETD-TAMU-2054/MCGOWENDISSERTATION.pdf?sequence=1

MHA (2018). *C-10: Population Attending Educational Institutions By Age, Sex And Type Of Educational Institution – 2011*. Retrieved from http://www.censusindia.gov.in/2011census/population_enumeration.html, Ministry of Home affairs

MHRD (2016a). *Mid-day meal scheme*. Retrieved from http://mhrd.gov.in/mid-day-meal

MHRD (2016b). *RMSA*. Retrieved from http://mhrd.gov.in/rmsa

MHRD (2018a). *Information and communication technology: 2016*. Retrieved from http://mhrd.gov.in/ict_overview

MHRD (2018b). *Samagra Shiksha Abhiyan*. Retrieved from http://mhrd.gov.in/ssa

Nanda, P.K. (Feb.2, 2017). *Union budget 2017: Education outlay increases 9.9% to Rs79,685.95 cror.* Retrieved from http://www.livemint.com/Politics/hkjZw2CFY

9u4xGHDk6QftN/Union-budget-2017-Education-outlay-increases-99-to-Rs796.html

Naore, B., Arshad, M., Aslam, S., & Nausheen, R. (2011). Impact of in - service teacher training on students' learning achievement in Mathematics. *International Conference on Social Science and Humanity [IPEDR], 5*(2), 168-174.

NUEPA (2014). *District Report Cards*. Retrieved from http://udise.in/

NUEPA (2016). Elementary education in India: Progress towards UEE. Retrieved from

UDISE (2015) website: http://udise.in/Downloads/Publications/Documents/Analytical_Table_2015-16.pdf

Vemula, P. (2017). NPEGEL programme - NPEGEL scheme - National programme for education of girls at elementary level (2017). Retrieved from http://www.teachersbadi.in/2013/11/npegel-programme-npegel-scheme-national.html

Rao, B.S.V., Gupta, P.V. (2006). Low female literacy: factors and strategies. *Australian Journal of Adult Learning, 46(1), 85-95.*

Right to Education (2013). Retrieved from http://righttoeducation.in/know-your-rte/about

Singh, C.K. (2015). Women Literacy in India- Issues and Challenges. *Global Journal of Interdisciplinary Social Sciences, 4*(4), 41-44. Retrieved on April 10, 2018 from http://gifre.org/library/upload/volume/volume-1027.pdf.

Sreekanth, Y., Tewari A.D., Srivastava, S., & Bhushan, S. (2015). *What students know and can do: A summary of national achievement survey (NAS), Class X*. Retrieved from http://rmsaindia.gov.in/administrator/components/com_pdf/pdf/1033b7e6c4660410711f05d7f7ce2474-NAS-Class-X-Summary-Report-2016.pdf

Taylor, R. G. (2009). *School facilities in the nation's capital: An analysis of student achievement, attendance, and truancy*. (Washington, DC: Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The

George Washington University). Retrieved from http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.620.4220&rep=rep1&type=pdf

UNESCO. (2003). *Overcoming exclusion through inclusive approaches in education: A challenge & a vision conceptual paper*. Retrieved on April 10, 2018 from http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0013/001347/134785e.pdf.

***Corresponding Author (email:tanusharma5284@yahoo.in)**