SoTTTER Editorial Board: Review Meeting 1
14th June 2023, 5:00-6:30 PM IST

Participants:

Editorial Board:
- Amita Chudgar, Michigan State University
- Carlos Vargas/Peter Wallet, UNESCO
- Amrita Patwardhan, Tata Trusts
- Nidhi Gulati, Institute of Home Economics, Delhi University
- Harshit Mishra, NITI Aayog

TISS team: Padma Sarangapani, Mythili Ramchand, Jyoti Bawane, Kamlesh Goyal, Aditi Desai

Agenda:

1. Overall updates
2. Primary data: approach and preliminary findings
3. Secondary data: preliminary findings
4. Insights from literature review
5. Next steps

Key discussion and inputs:

Professor Dinesh Saklani from NCERT and Mr. Carlos Vargas-Tamez from UNESCO were unable to join the meeting. The meeting started with introductions and high-level updates by Padma Sarangapani.

Overall updates

Aditi Desai provided a recap of the research questions followed by overall updates on the various workstreams.

In terms of primary data collection, data collection from schools and teacher education institutions has been completed in Karnataka, Maharashtra, Telangana, Chhattisgarh, Bihar and Punjab, and ongoing in Assam and Mizoram. In terms of secondary data collection, analysis is ongoing for data from UDISE+, Teacher Eligibility Test, Periodic Labour Force Survey, and Project Approval Board, amongst others. The literature review is also ongoing.

Primary data collection

Aditi Desai provided an overview of the primary data collection approach followed by a presentation of preliminary findings by Jyoti Bawane. Jyoti mainly shared findings from the

headteacher and teacher surveys from Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Karnataka, Maharashtra and Telangana.

In terms of teacher vacancies, 14.52% of 241 schools mentioned having no vacancies, with the remaining schools having at least one vacancy. From 141 schools, 38.71% of schools said they estimated vacancies based on their requirement, 29.88% said it was based on allocation to the school, and 21.58% based on RTE/Board norms. She also highlighted data on how teacher requirements for physical education/arts/music were being met in schools, and an overview of the employment status i.e. whether regular or contract.

From teacher data of 1637 teachers, all teachers stated having experience in non-education roles. 39.6% had qualified the Teacher Eligibility Test and 21% of teachers stated that they were teaching subjects they were not qualified for. Findings were also shared on time taken for teachers to reach schools, time spent in non-teaching tasks, and proportion of teachers who had undergone ICT and special education training.

In terms of the impact of COVID, 19.18% of all teachers said they had lost their jobs during COVID, while the majority of teachers said they had not faced any pay cut in this period. 81.67% of teachers also said that they were more motivated to teach after the pandemic.

Discussion

Amita Chudgar applauded the team for the comprehensive data collection endeavor and the preliminary insights shared by Jyoti. She suggested that statistics could be generated beyond the frequency intervals used to present the data, since looking at the means and standard deviations could also help provide an overall sense of the trends. Looking at sub-categories such as gender, type of schools etc. as much as possible would also be helpful.

Harshit Mishra requested that we share the tools and preliminary findings with the Editorial Board.

Padma Sarangapani clarified that we have also gathered data on para-professionals such as lab assistants, librarians etc. and we would be relying on UDISE for infrastructure mapping.

Amita Chudgar asked if there was data on math and science teachers on the demand/supply side. Harshit Mishra reiterated the importance of looking at the supply/demand for STEM teachers given the high subject-level PTR especially at the secondary level.

Amrita Patwardhan inquired if data on socio-economic background of teachers had been collected. Nidhi Gulati suggested that the data clearly indicated the requirement in the area of special education, given the low number of teachers trained in this area and the vacancies. She also suggested further unpacking the data on teachers teaching the subjects they are qualified to teach by levels of schools (primary and secondary).

Secondary data

Aditi Desai presented early findings from the analysis of the UDISE+ data for 2021-22 in the areas of teacher profile (rural, urban, gender, caste, academic qualifications and professional qualifications). In terms of employment status, 85.45% of all teachers are regular, with 13.18% being contract teachers. About 40% of all contract teachers worked in government schools, and 48.14% worked in private schools.

In terms of schools, 83% of all schools are situated in rural areas. 7.87% of all schools are single teacher schools. The national average for Pupil-Teacher Ratio was found to be 28, with 352,354 schools with PTR>35. Many more aspects pertaining to teacher-related issues will be considered in detail in the report, as well as through the PLFS data source.

Discussion

Harshit Mishra suggested looking at primary schools as a separate category in certain areas such as single-teacher schools since these issues were more pertinent at this level.

Teacher Eligibility Test

Kamlesh Goyal presented findings from Teacher Eligibility Test microdata from one state in India. Key areas of analysis include the social profile of candidates appearing for and qualifying both paper 1 and 2 of the test and the minimum and maximum scores for both the papers, languages in which candidates have qualified (majority qualifying in regional languages), educational background of candidates appearing for paper 1 and 2,

He clarified that we would be analyzing the profile of appeared and qualified candidates in greater detail. We would also be looking at data for each section and subsection of the papers separately, and the question paper itself.

Discussion

Amita Chudgar remarked that female candidates seemed to be scoring lower than male candidates. Padma Sarangapani suggested calculating the pass percentage of candidates appearing within each category of academic/professional qualifications. There was also a suggestion on looking at the TET data analysis findings within the context of the overall findings from the UDISE+ analysis and the primary data.

Conclusion

Aditi Desai summarized the next steps leading up to the finalisation of the report. Padma Sarangapani mentioned that we would also be collecting primary data from select special teacher education institutions. She also mentioned the focused study on contract teachers that would be building on some of the analyses from this study. Key informant interviews were

planned to glean insights on the early childhood sector. Amrita Patwardhan suggested looking at a report published by Ambedkar University in this area. With that, the meeting came to a close.

Action items:

1. To share the preliminary findings with the Editorial Board
2. To focus on primary schools as a separate category to analyse single teacher schools
3. To send a request for additional teacher-level UDISE+ data to Mr. Harshit Mishra