

NITI Aayog releases School Education Quality Index (SEQI)

School Education Quality Index (SEQI) was developed by NITI Aayog to evaluate the performance of States and Union Territories (UTs) in the school education sector. The index aims to bring an 'outcomes' focus to education policy by providing States and UTs with a platform to identify their strengths and weaknesses and undertake requisite course corrections or policy interventions.

The first edition of SEQI was released by Dr Rajiv Kumar, Hon'ble Vice-Chairman, NITI Aayog, in the presence of Hon'ble NITI Aayog Member Dr Vinod Paul, Hon'ble CEO Mr Amitabh Kant and Ms Rina Ray, Hon'ble Secretary, Department of School Education and Literacy, Ministry of Human Resource and Development and representatives from the World Bank.

Of the 20 Large States, 10 perform better on the Outcomes category, with the most noticeable performance differences observed in the cases of Karnataka, Jharkhand and Andhra Pradesh. The other Large States perform better on the Governance Processes Aiding Outcomes category, with the most noticeable performance differences observed in the cases of Odisha, Punjab and Haryana.

Of the eight Small States, seven perform better on the Outcomes category, with the most noticeable performance differences observed in the cases of Manipur, Tripura and Goa. Sikkim is the only Small State that performs better on the Governance Processes Aiding Outcomes category.

Of the seven UTs, four perform better on the Outcomes category, with the most noticeable performance differences observed in Dadra & Nagar Haveli. Delhi, Daman & Diu and Lakshadweep perform better on the Governance Processes Aiding Outcomes category

Among the 20 Large States, 18 improved their overall performance between 2015-16 and 2016-17. The average improvement in these 18 states is 8.6 percentage points although there is a lot of variation around that average in terms of the fastest and slowest improving States. Due to

this variation, many States that improved their overall performance score still show a decline in rank.

Five Small States have shown an improvement in their overall performance score between 2015-16 and 2016-17, with the average improvement being around nine percentage points. However, as in the case of Large States, there is considerable variation between the fastest and slowest improving States. States such as Meghalaya, Nagaland and Goa outpaced the others, improving by 14.1, 13.5 and 8.2 percentage points respectively, thus improving their ranks in the process.

All seven UTs have shown an improvement in their overall performance scores. The average improvement is 9.5 percentage points. Daman & Diu, Dadra & Nagar Haveli and Puducherry improved their overall performance scores by 16.5, 15.0 and 14.3 percentage points respectively, which enabled them to improve their ranking on incremental performance.

A brief snapshot of the top and bottom performing States and Union Territories is as follows.

States/UTs	Overall Performance Ranking (2016-17)	
Large States	1. Kerala 2. Rajasthan 3. Karnataka	18. Punjab 19. Jammu & Kashmir 20. Uttar Pradesh
Small States	1. Manipur 2. Tripura 3. Goa	6. Sikkim 7. Meghalaya 8. Arunachal Pradesh
Union Territories	1. Chandigarh 2. Dadra & Nagar Haveli 3. Delhi	4. Daman & Diu 5. Andaman & Nicobar Islands 6. Lakshadweep

Source: PHD Research Bureau, PHDCCI, PIB

States/UTs	Annual Incremental Performance (Between Base Year: 2015-16 and Reference Year: 2016-17)	
Large States	1. Haryana 2. Assam 3. Uttar Pradesh	18. Jharkhand 19. Uttarakhand 20. Karnataka
Small States	1. Meghalaya 2. Nagaland 3. Goa	6. Sikkim 7. Mizoram 8. Arunachal Pradesh
Union Territories	1. Daman & Diu 2. Dadra & Nagar Haveli	4. Lakshadweep 5. Chandigarh

	3. Puducherry	6. Andaman & Nicobar Islands
--	---------------	------------------------------

Source: PHD Research Bureau, PHDCCI, PIB

States and UTs are ranked on their overall performance in the reference year 2016-17, as well as on their annual incremental performance (difference in the overall performance) between the reference year and base year (2015-16). The rankings present incredible insights on the status of school education across States/UTs and their relative progress over time.

Ranking of States

States	Base Year Ranks (2015-16)	Reference Year Ranks (2016-17)	Change in Base Year to Reference Year Rankings
Kerala	1	1	-
Tamil Nadu	2	2	-
Haryana	8	3	Up by 5
Gujarat	6	4	Up by 2
Himachal Pradesh	4	5	Down by 1
Maharashtra	3	6	Down by 3
Odisha	13	7	Up by 6
Rajasthan	7	8	Down by 1
Punjab	9	9	-
Assam	15	10	Up by 5
Andhra Pradesh	11	11	-
Chhattisgarh	12	12	-
Karnataka	5	13	Down by 8
Uttarakhand	10	14	Down by 4
Madhya Pradesh	14	15	Down by 1
Jammu & Kashmir	16	16	-
Uttar Pradesh	18	17	Up by 1
Telangana	17	18	Down by 1
Bihar	19	19	-
Jharkhand	20	20	-

Source: PHD Research Bureau, PHDCCI, NITI Aayog Report

SEOI is envisioned as a dynamic instrument that will continue to evolve. Over time, the relevance of the existing indicators and the availability of data for new indicators will be

factored into the index design. In particular, the linkages between policy actions and SEQI indicators will be analyzed to reflect the efforts made by States and UTs to improve school education.

Methodology

In line with NITI Aayog's mandate to foster the spirit of competitive and cooperative federalism, SEQI strives to facilitate the sharing of knowledge and best practices across States and UTs. Developed through a collaborative process, including key stakeholders such as Ministry of Human Resource and Development (MHRD), the World Bank and sector experts, the index consists of 30 critical indicators that assess the delivery of quality education. These indicators are categorized as below:

Category 1: Outcomes

Domain 1: Learning outcomes

Domain 2: Access outcomes

Domain 3: Infrastructure and facilities for outcomes

Domain 4: Equity outcomes

Category 2: Governance processes aiding outcomes

To ensure the system is geared towards learning, SEQI assigns almost half its weight to learning outcomes. This sends a strong signal across the nation to ensure the focus remains centred on learning outcomes. To facilitate a like-for-like comparison, States and UTs have been grouped as Large States, Small States and UTs. Within each of these groups, the indicator values have been appropriately scaled, normalized and weighted to generate an overall performance score and ranking for each State and UT. States' overall performance may hide variations in their performance on the underlying categories.

The NITI Aayog report " School Education Quality Index 2019" is attached for your kind reference.

Please contact for any query related to this mail Ms Shivani Mehrotra, Research Associate at shivani.mehrotra@phdcci.in with a cc to Dr. S P Sharma, Chief Economist at spsharma@phdcci.in and Ms Megha Kaul, Economist at megha@phdcci.in, PHD Chamber of Commerce & Industry.

Regards,

Dr S P Sharma

Chief Economist



PHD Chamber of Commerce and Industry
PHD House, 4/2 Siri Institutional Area
August Kranti Marg, New Delhi-110016, India

Tel: +91 49545454

Fax: +91 11 26855450

Email: spsharma@phdcci.in

Website: www.phdcci.in

Follow us on



"Towards an Inclusive & Prosperous India"



PHD CHAMBER OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY

PHD House, 4/2 Siri Institutional Area, August Kranti Marg, New Delhi - 110 016 (India) • Tel. : +91-11-2686 3801-04, 49545454, 49545400
Fax : +91-11-2685 5450 • E-mail : phdcci@phdcci.in • Website : www.phdcci.in, CIN: U74899DL1951GAP001947

Connect with us:



COPYRIGHT: All rights reserved. No part of this publication/Release may be reproduced, distributed, or transmitted in any form or by any means, without the prior written permission of the publisher. For permission requests, write to the publisher.

DISCLAIMER: This message and its attachments contain confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient, you are strictly prohibited to disclose, copy, distribute or take any action in reliance on the contents of this information. E-mail transmission cannot be guaranteed to be secure or error-free, as information could be intercepted, corrupted, lost, destroyed, arrive late or incomplete, or contain viruses. The sender therefore does not accept liability for any errors or omissions in the contents of this message, which arise as a result of e-mail transmission. If verification is required please request a hard-copy version.