

# Latest Trends in Enrolment

June 2015



پڑھو پنجاب  
بڑھو پنجاب

August 12, 2015

# Agenda

**Detailed Nielsen analysis**


**Observations from the field**

# Agenda

**Detailed Nielsen analysis**

**Observations from the field**

## Enrolment for 5-9 year olds has increased by 1.1%




SOURCE: Nielsen Household Survey– November 2011 to June 2015

# Enrolment ( Nov 2011 - Jun 2015)


## School participation rate – Urban Areas

5-9 year olds (%)



## School participation rate – Rural Areas

5-9 year olds (%)



# Enrolment has increased significantly over the last 4 years, with a proportionate increase observed for across all age groups

## Enrolment

Percent

100%

90%

80%

70%

60%

50%

40%

30%

20%

10%

0%

0

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13



14

15

16

Age


No. of years



SOURCE: Nielsen Household Survey November 2011; June 2015

Margin of Error < 3.1% with a 95 % confidence interval

# 35 districts in Punjab show improvement since November 2011




SOURCE: Nielsen Household Survey November 2011; June 2015;

Margin of Error < 3.1% with a 95 % confidence interval

# Enrolment by District – (Jun 2015)

Participation rate of 5-9 year olds, %  
June 2015

95%< 90<95% 85-<90% <85%



SOURCE: Nielsen Household Survey – June 2015


Margin of Error < 3.1% with a 95 % confidence interval



# Enrolment by District – (Nov 2014)

Participation rate of 5-9 year olds, %  
November 2014


95%< 90<95% 85-<90% <85%



SOURCE: Nielsen Household Survey – November 2014

Margin of Error < 3.1% with a 95 % confidence interval


## 24 Districts across Punjab show improvement since November 2014



SOURCE: Nielsen Household Survey November 2014; June 2015;

Margin of Error < 3.1% with a 95 % confidence interval


## Male – Female Split ( Nov 2011 - Jun 2015)



# Enrolment by Gender


## School participation rate

5-9 year olds (%), Male



## School participation rate


5-9 year olds (%), Female



# Enrolment by District – Male (Jun 2015)

Participation rate of 5-9 year olds – Male , %  
June 2015


95%< 90<95% 85-<90% <85%



SOURCE: Nielsen Household Survey – June 2015

Margin of Error < 4% with a 95 % confidence interval

# Only a few districts have shown improvements greater than the margin of error




SOURCE: Nielsen Household Survey November 2014; June 2015;

4 Margin of Error

# Enrolment by District – Female (Jun 2015)

Participation rate of 5-9 year olds – Female , %  
June 2015


95%< 90-95% 85-<90% <85%



SOURCE: Nielsen Household Survey – June 2015

Margin of Error < 4% with a 95 % confidence interval


# Change in Female Enrolment since November 2014



SOURCE: Nielsen Household Survey November 2014; June 2015;



## Public – Private Split ( Nov 2011 - Jun 2015)




Footnote :- Excluding Madrassas

SOURCE: Nielsen Household Survey– November 2011 to June 2015

Margin of Error < 3.1% with a 95 % confidence interval

# Public – Private Split ( Nov 2011 - Jun 2015)




Footnote :- Excluding Madrassas

# Public – Private Split (Jun 2015)

District Public – Private split of 5-9 year olds, %  
June 2015


60%< 50<60% 40-<50% <40%



SOURCE: Nielsen Household Survey – June 2015

Margin of Error < 4% with a 95 % confidence interval


## Rural – Urban Split ( Nov 2011 - Jun 2015)



# Enrolment by District – Urban Areas (Jun 2015)

Participation rate of 5-9 year olds, %  
June 2015

95%< 90<95% 85-<90% <85%




SOURCE: Nielsen Household Survey – June 2015

Margin of Error < 4% with a 95 % confidence interval

# Enrolment by District – Rural Areas (Jun 2015)

Participation rate of 5-9 year olds, %  
June 2015


95%< 90<95% 85-<90% <85%



**Punjab Rural Participation Rate (June 2015) is 88.7 %**

# Enrolment by District – Urban Areas (Jun 2015)

Participation rate of 5-9 year olds, Males/Females %  
June 2015




SOURCE: Nielsen Household Survey – June 2015

Margin of Error < 5% with a 95 % confidence interval

# Enrolment by District – Rural Areas (Jun 2015)

Participation rate of 5-9 year olds, Males/Females %

June 2015



SOURCE: Nielsen Household Survey – June 2015


Margin of Error < 5% with a 95 % confidence interval



# Households with a higher monthly income are more likely to send their children to school

## Enrolment


Percent




SOURCE: Nielsen Household Survey – June 2015

Margin of Error < 3.1% with a 95 % confidence interval


# Top three reasons for not enrolling a child in school ( Jun 2015)




## Enrolment Trend Lines - ( Nov 2011 – Jun 2015)



## Enrolment Trend Lines - ( Nov 2011 – Jun 2015)



## Enrolment Trend Lines - ( Nov 2011 – Jun 2015)



# Agenda


**Detailed Nielsen analysis**

**Observations from the field**

## Our approach

- In order to understand the difference in enrolment between districts, we selected the following set of districts from the Nielsen June 2015 survey :
  - 5 districts with increase in enrolment of 3%<sup>1</sup> or greater, and
  - 3 control districts with no significant change or decrease in enrolment
- DFCs conducted detailed interviews with the EDOs and AEOs in these districts to determine the differences in enrolment strategies (if any)

Change in enrolment %, 5-9 age group



<sup>1</sup> Margin of error at district level is 3%

## Following areas were explored in discussion with district officials

### Areas explored

- Any specific activities that were used and worked in the enrolment campaign
- Any focused strategies for improving enrolment in rural or urban areas
- Any focused strategies for improving enrolment for males or females
- Any intervention by NGO, community service organisation or external parties
- Any extra reward or punishment for teachers imposed by the district for enrolment work



## Interviews reveal the following set of activities were carried out during the enrolment drive

District officials	External parties	Teachers
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Began the enrolment drives with an inauguration event at district and tehsil level</li><li>▪ Assigned focal persons at cluster or Markaz level</li><li>▪ Assigned targets at Tehsil, Markaz and school level</li><li>▪ Involved politicians and other notable figures to increase impact</li><li>▪ Mobilised school councils in local communities</li><li>▪ Followed-up on regular basis</li><li>▪ Issued appreciation letter for high performers and show-cause for low performers</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ NCHD<sup>1</sup> arranged district level meeting of education officials at regular basis</li><li>▪ NCHD provided training to teachers in some districts</li><li>▪ UNICEF provided funds to teachers to carry out door-to-door survey in RYK</li><li>▪ Other organisations printed pamphlets and arranged walks at school or Markaz level</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Led door-to-door campaign and made efforts to enrol children</li><li>▪ Collected information on out of school children</li><li>▪ Engaged with local community to convince parents</li></ul>

<sup>1</sup> National commission for human development

**With the exception of Rahim Yar Khan where teachers were paid Rs 5/house by UNICEF to identify<sup>1</sup> out of school children, and assignment of teachers to non-functional schools in Bahawalpur, the set of activities carried out during the enrolment drive are largely the same as previous years, for districts showing an increase and for control districts**

<sup>1</sup> Despite identification, enrolment remained a challenge  
SOURCE: Team, survey results

## EDO interview details (1/2)

Question	Khushab	Bahawalnag-ar	R.Y. Khan	Multan	Bahawalpur	Khanewal	Sahiwal	D.G. Khan
<b>Enrolment % change</b>	<b>+5.0%</b>	<b>+7.0%</b>	<b>+4.2%</b>	<b>+4.2%</b>	<b>+3.4%</b>	<b>-0.1%</b>	<b>-0.6%</b>	<b>-4.8%</b>
<b>Specific list of activities performed during the campaign</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ District level inauguration ceremony,</li> <li>▪ Tehsil level seminars.</li> <li>▪ Banners near every school.</li> <li>▪ Publicity by AEOs and teachers by door-to-door visits</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Show-cause notice for teachers who did not meet enrolment target</li> <li>▪ Follow-up with Head Teachers and parents.</li> <li>▪ Awareness through print media</li> <li>▪ Enrolment rallies in Marakaz and meetings with local community.</li> <li>▪ Involved MPAs and met with the local Namabardaars</li> <li>▪ <b>Sent teachers to areas where schools were non-functional</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ No special intervention other than <b>UNICEF providing funds to teachers for door-to-door survey</b></li> <li>▪ Inauguration event at district level with DCO, MNAs and MPAs as part of the event.</li> <li>▪ Door-to-door campaign focused on enrolling children to school</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Cluster and school wise target</li> <li>▪ The only thing new was that the teachers were reminded that enrolment is part of their contract</li> <li>▪ Punjab Barho Punjab also played a vital role</li> <li>▪ DCO and MNA played a small role</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Targets were given at school level based on last year survey</li> <li>▪ Enrolment walks were conducted in all the Tehsils</li> <li>▪ MNAs, MPAs and NGOs were involved in the process.</li> <li>▪ Local communities and school Councils were sensitized.</li> <li>▪ Weekly meetings of officials were conducted and progress was tracked</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ In every UC a focal person was made collecting new data, following up with old data and arranging events</li> <li>▪ Walks were organized and NGO/Ullema also helped in this process</li> <li>▪ MNAs were also invited but none participated.</li> <li>▪ Enrolment data was verified by literacy schools, focal person and DEO</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ District and Division level inauguration ceremony, chaired by the DCO and the Commissioner</li> <li>▪ Banners in schools and offices</li> <li>▪ District and school wise targets</li> <li>▪ Daily reporting of enrolment number on daily basis</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Teachers have been sensitized to effectively execute the campaign</li> <li>▪ NGOs and NCHD have been asked to support</li> <li>▪ Ceremonies at district level</li> <li>▪ Awareness through print media</li> <li>▪ AEOs regularly contacted influential people for support in villages</li> </ul>
<b>Did you try anything different for females or males? (specific strategies)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ We used the same strategy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ No specific strategy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ No, we did not have any targeted strategy.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Nothing was different between them, same instructions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ No specific strategy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Separate targets for male and female DEOs, and similarly for male and female AEOs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ A similar strategy was adopted for both males and females.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Overall same strategy was adopted.</li> </ul>

## EDO interview details (2/2)

Question	Khushab	Bahawalnag-ar	R.Y. Khan	Multan	Bahawalpur	Khanewal	Sahiwal	D.G. Khan
<b>Enrolment % change</b>	<b>+5.0%</b>	<b>+7.0%</b>	<b>+4.2%</b>	<b>+4.2%</b>	<b>+3.4%</b>	<b>-0.1%</b>	<b>-0.6%</b>	<b>-4.8%</b>
<b>Did private schools play any role in enrolment campaign?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Role of private schools is limited. They campaign for themselves.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DEO elementary male held meeting with private school association for support</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Private school associations were called for support.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>They provided some data regarding enrolment of children in private schools.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Private schools claim they have registered more enrolment than compared to previous years.</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>They provided officials with enrolment data.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>They supported the education officials.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Private schools provided officials with enrolment data, and held meetings.</li> </ul>
<b>What do you think about enrolment? Has the enrolment increased?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Nothing can be confirmed at the moment, but it might have increased.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is increasing and number is greater in government schools.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes, the enrolment is definitely increasing. However, the main challenge is not enrolling students, it's controlling the dropout rate.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Teachers were asked to attract people by telling them the government school teachers are new and qualified.</b></li> <li>Fake enrolment was also controlled.</li> <li>Nothing definite about results</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes it is increasing significantly</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It has increased.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes, significantly.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overall the enrollment remained stable and neither increased nor decreased drastically.</li> <li>We have controlled fake enrolment in our registers</li> </ul>

## AEO interview details (1/2)

Question	Khushab	Bahawalnag-ar	R.Y. Khan	Multan	Bahawalpur	Khanewal	Sahiwal	D.G. Khan
<b>Enrolment % change</b>	<b>+5.0%</b>	<b>+7.0%</b>	<b>+4.2%</b>	<b>+4.2%</b>	<b>+3.4%</b>	<b>-0.1%</b>	<b>-0.6%</b>	<b>-4.8%</b>
<b>How did you execute the enrolment campaign? (list of activities)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ We were assigned a target of 10 students per teacher per Markaz.</li> <li>▪ Teachers conducted door-to-door campaign</li> <li>▪ Teachers contacted parents of children who were absent for 3 days</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ We were assigned targets based on the last year survey.</li> <li>▪ We used to check enrolment numbers on daily basis.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ A target of 3800 students were assigned</li> <li>▪ Targets were then cascaded down to teachers</li> <li>▪ School council meetings were regularly held</li> <li>▪ We focused on younger siblings of children already going to schools</li> <li>▪ Banners were placed in school</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Public meetings by headmaster, SC and numberdar</li> <li>▪ Ullema urged to encourage the people of society</li> <li>▪ Survey children from the previous years for OSC were contacted</li> <li>▪ Meeting parents of children in the community.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Nothing new. Routine banners, walks, meetings with local communities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Banners in schools, walks and seminars at UC level</li> <li>▪ Influentials and numberdars took part in the events</li> <li>▪ Ulemas were also approached</li> <li>▪ Aghai Mohims with the help of NGOs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Distributed markaz wise targets among teachers;</li> <li>▪ Accounted for population this time - higher targets for high population areas and vice versa</li> <li>▪ Also monitored the door-to-door campaigns and enrolment figures.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Survey is carried out and OSC list is compiled.</li> <li>▪ After data collection, teachers contact the parents of children for enrollment</li> <li>▪ We call members of school council to convince parents</li> </ul>
<b>Any major intervention by NGO or other major community mobilization ?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ No NGOs or other parties were involved.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ No NGOs or other parties were involved in my Markaz but some were active in other Markaz</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ No NGOs were involved in running the enrolment campaign.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ STAR engaged in a media/radio/new spapers</li> <li>▪ <b>Awaz foundation &amp; SPO also created awareness.</b></li> <li>▪ Teacher were trained by the NGO, they trained SC, how to get parents involvement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ No NGOs were involved</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ NCHD awareness events; they worked very closely with the schools throughout the process</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ No NGOs were involved</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ NCHD and Sudhar working but they have a limited impact in enrolling out of school children</li> </ul>

## AEO interview details (2/2)

Question	Khushab	Bahawalnag-ar	R.Y. Khan	Multan	Bahawalpur	Khanewal	Sahiwal	D.G. Khan
<b>Enrolment % change</b>	<b>+5.0%</b>	<b>+7.0%</b>	<b>+4.2%</b>	<b>+4.2%</b>	<b>+3.4%</b>	<b>-0.1%</b>	<b>-0.6%</b>	<b>-4.8%</b>
<b>What role did teachers play in the enrolment campaign?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teachers do all the work, we just guide them.</li> <li>They involved local influencers and also used their personal contacts to convince parents</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teachers played a significant role. Most of the teachers have met the target</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The teachers carried out the door-to-door activity</li> <li>They mobilized the school council meetings.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teachers focused more on enrolling students, compared to collecting data.</li> <li>Meetings and social mobilizations by teachers.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teachers do have a major role to play in the enrolment campaign.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teacher-wise targets were given and teachers tried to meet these targets</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Each teacher was assigned his/her own specific target to achieve.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teacher compiles the out of school children data</li> <li>Teacher tries to enrol out of school children</li> </ul>
<b>Any penalties or rewards for teachers for doing enrolment work or for increasing enrolment in school?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appreciation letters to the outperformers.</li> <li>Warnings, show cause etc. for defaulters, but there hasn't been any such case in my experience.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Just appreciated teachers verbally.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No reward for outperformers</li> <li>Show cause notices for low performers</li> <li>Schools with enrolment less than 30 have been given warning notice, and asked to increase enrolment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Those who could not meet the target have been asked to meet the target in second phase</li> <li>Letter of appreciation for those who met the targets</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Few teachers were penalized for not achieving the targets but no rewards were given</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>They have been pushed and asked to meet the targets in 2<sup>nd</sup> phase</li> <li>Appreciation letter for those who completed the targets.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No such incentive/penalty has been imposed so far although there is a plan to give out certificates to teachers who have met their targets, once the summer vacations end.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No reward for high performance</li> <li>Penalties for low performance</li> </ul>

# Backup

## Backup Sub-district Level Data on Enrolment - Attock

5-9 year olds (%),

LEVEL	TITLE	MADRASAH	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PARTICIPATION RATE (5 -9)
DISTRICT	ATTOCK	0.11%	40.26%	56.23%	96.59%
TEHSIL	ATTOCK	0.00%	22.84%	68.53%	91.37%
TEHSIL	FATEH JANG	0.00%	53.57%	44.90%	98.47%
TEHSIL	HASAN ABDAL	0.00%	31.40%	68.60%	100.00%
TEHSIL	JAND	0.00%	34.42%	64.29%	98.70%
TEHSIL	PINDI GHEB	0.83%	39.67%	58.68%	99.17%
CITY	CITIES	0.00%	54.05%	41.08%	95.14%
CITY	ATTOCK MC	0.00%	70.59%	23.53%	94.12%
CITY	FATEH JANG MC	0.00%	35.29%	58.82%	94.12%
CITY	GHUR GHUSHTI TC	0.00%	26.32%	68.42%	94.74%
CITY	HASAN ABDAL MC	0.00%	39.29%	46.43%	85.71%
CITY	HAZRO MC	0.00%	58.33%	41.67%	100.00%
CITY	JAND TC	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%
CITY	KAMRA CANTT.	0.00%	70.97%	29.03%	100.00%
CITY	PINDI GHEB TC	0.00%	12.50%	87.50%	100.00%



## Backup Sub-district Level Data on Enrolment - Bahawalnagar

5-9 year olds (%),

LEVEL	TITLE	MADRASAH	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PARTICIPATION RATE ( 5 -9)
DISTRICT	BAHAWALNAGAR	3.61%	22.91%	65.87%	92.39%
TEHSIL	118	0.94%	14.15%	78.30%	93.40%
TEHSIL	BAHAWALNAGAR TEHSIL	3.07%	18.09%	69.28%	90.44%
TEHSIL	CHISHTIAN TEHSIL	7.63%	20.61%	64.12%	92.37%
TEHSIL	HAROONABAD TEHSIL	1.60%	25.53%	64.89%	92.02%
TEHSIL	MINCHINABAD TEHSIL	5.84%	18.30%	67.37%	91.51%
CITY	CITIES	0.97%	41.75%	53.88%	96.60%
CITY	BAHAWALNAGAR MC	1.47%	30.88%	63.24%	95.59%
CITY	CHISHTIAN MC	2.17%	50.00%	45.65%	97.83%
CITY	DONGA BONGA TC	0.00%	36.84%	63.16%	100.00%
CITY	FAQIRWALI TC	0.00%	57.89%	42.11%	100.00%
CITY	FORTABBAS TC	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	100.00%
CITY	HAROONABAD MC	0.00%	41.18%	50.00%	91.18%

## Backup Sub-district Level Data on Enrolment - Bahawalpur

5-9 year olds (%),

LEVEL	TITLE	MADRASAH	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PARTICIPATION RATE ( 5 -9)
DISTRICT	BAHAWALPUR	7.88%	31.83%	47.89%	87.60%
TEHSIL	AHMADPUR EAST TEHSIL	11.23%	27.15%	43.86%	82.25%
TEHSIL	BAHAWALPUR TEHSIL	6.37%	36.27%	46.08%	88.73%
TEHSIL	HASILPUR TEHSIL	5.59%	37.76%	50.35%	93.71%
TEHSIL	KHAIRPUR TAMEWALI TEHSIL	27.03%	12.16%	37.84%	77.03%
TEHSIL	YAZMAN TEHSIL	0.63%	25.16%	67.30%	93.08%
CITY	CITIES	5.02%	39.81%	45.45%	90.28%
CITY	AHMADPUR EAST MC	0.00%	41.67%	50.00%	91.67%
CITY	BAHAWALPUR M.CORP.	7.45%	36.17%	46.28%	89.89%
CITY	HASILPUR MC	0.00%	39.47%	50.00%	89.47%
CITY	KHAIRPUR TAMEWALI TC	0.00%	56.25%	37.50%	93.75%
CITY	UCH SHARIF TC	16.67%	41.67%	25.00%	83.33%
CITY	YAZMAN MC	0.00%	58.82%	35.29%	94.12%

## Backup Sub-district Level Data on Enrolment - Bhakkar

5-9 year olds (%),

LEVEL	TITLE	MADRASAH	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PARTICIPATION RATE ( 5 -9)
DISTRICT	BHAKKAR	0.44%	25.79%	63.73%	89.96%
TEHSIL	BHAKKAR TEHSIL	0.22%	21.34%	65.30%	86.85%
TEHSIL	DARYA KHAN TEHSIL	1.03%	19.07%	69.07%	89.18%
TEHSIL	KALUR KOT TEHSIL	0.75%	19.55%	71.43%	91.73%
TEHSIL	MANKERA TEHSIL	0.56%	14.53%	78.77%	93.85%
CITY	CITIES	0.00%	63.25%	30.72%	93.98%
CITY	BHAKKAR MC	0.00%	76.92%	21.54%	98.46%
CITY	DARYA KHAN TC	0.00%	56.00%	34.00%	90.00%
CITY	DULLEWALA TC	0.00%	50.00%	35.00%	85.00%
CITY	KALUR KOT TC	0.00%	68.75%	31.25%	100.00%
CITY	MANKERA TC	0.00%	40.00%	53.33%	93.33%

## Backup Sub-district Level Data on Enrolment - Chakwal

5-9 year olds (%),

LEVEL	TITLE	MADRASAH	PRIVATE	PUBLIC PARTICIPATION RATE ( 5 -9)
DISTRICT	CHAKWAL	0.11%	44.31%	53.56% 97.98%
TEHSIL	CHAKWAL TEHSIL	0.23%	39.21%	58.70% 98.14%
TEHSIL	CHOA SAIDAN SHAH TEHSIL	0.00%	50.00%	48.57% 98.57%
TEHSIL	TALA GANG TEHSIL	0.00%	47.71%	50.00% 97.71%
CITY	CITIES	0.00%	50.00%	47.76% 97.76%
CITY	CHAKWAL MC	0.00%	37.93%	60.92% 98.85%
CITY	TALA GANG MC	0.00%	72.34%	23.40% 95.74%

## Backup Sub-district Level Data on Enrolment - Chiniot

5-9 year olds (%),

LEVEL	TITLE	MADRASAH	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PARTICIPATION RATE ( 5 -9)
DISTRICT	CHINIOT	1.08%	24.10%	62.72%	87.91%
TEHSIL	CHINIOT TEHSIL	1.04%	18.92%	67.57%	87.53%
CITY	CITIES	1.27%	45.15%	43.04%	89.45%
CITY	CHINIOT MC	1.76%	47.65%	38.82%	88.24%
CITY	LALIAN TC	0.00%	38.81%	53.73%	92.54%

## Backup Sub-district Level Data on Enrolment - DG Khan

5-9 year olds (%),

LEVEL	TITLE	MADRASAH	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PARTICIPATION RATE ( 5 -9)
DISTRICT	DG KHAN	3.85%	37.89%	37.09%	78.84%
TEHSIL	DE-EXCLUDED	0.91%	21.82%	37.27%	60.00%
TEHSIL	DERA GHAZI KHAN TEHSIL	6.27%	31.20%	38.48%	75.95%
TEHSIL	TAUNSA TEHSIL	1.75%	39.15%	41.65%	82.54%
CITY	CITIES	1.12%	70.79%	21.35%	93.26%
CITY	DERA GHAZI KHAN MC	1.59%	71.43%	20.63%	93.65%
CITY	TAUNSA TC	0.00%	69.23%	23.08%	92.31%

## Backup Sub-district Level Data on Enrolment - Faisalabad

5-9 year olds (%),

LEVEL	TITLE	MADRASAH	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PARTICIPATION RATE ( 5 -9)
DISTRICT	FAISALABAD	0.18%	49.82%	40.89%	90.89%
TEHSIL	CHAK JHUMRA TEHSIL	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	100.00%
TEHSIL	FAISALABAD CITY TEHSIL	0.00%	33.33%	61.11%	94.44%
TEHSIL	FAISALABAD SADAR TEHSIL	0.00%	54.49%	39.89%	94.38%
TEHSIL	JARANWALA TEHSIL	0.00%	17.99%	60.43%	78.42%
TEHSIL	SAMMUNDRI TEHSIL	0.00%	50.00%	48.61%	98.61%
TEHSIL	TANDLIAN WALA TEHSIL	0.53%	23.53%	55.61%	79.68%
CITY	CITIES	0.22%	69.08%	26.32%	95.61%
CITY	CHAK JHUMRA TC	0.00%	64.00%	32.00%	96.00%
CITY	FAISALABAD M.CORP.	0.29%	67.62%	28.08%	95.99%
CITY	JARANWALA MC	0.00%	78.13%	9.38%	87.50%
CITY	MAMOON KANJAN TC	0.00%	56.52%	39.13%	95.65%
CITY	SUMMUNDRI MC	0.00%	92.59%	7.41%	100.00%

## Backup Sub-district Level Data on Enrolment - Gujranwala

5-9 year olds (%),

LEVEL	TITLE	MADRASAH	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PARTICIPATION RATE ( 5 -9)
DISTRICT	GUJRANWALA	0.48%	64.75%	31.23%	96.46%
TEHSIL	GUJRANWALA TEHSIL	0.54%	69.73%	25.95%	96.22%
TEHSIL	KAMOKE TEHSIL	2.75%	47.71%	47.71%	98.17%
TEHSIL	NOWSHERA VIRKAN TEHSIL	0.00%	40.41%	56.16%	96.58%
TEHSIL	WAZIRABAD TEHSIL	0.00%	50.53%	49.47%	100.00%
CITY	CITIES	0.20%	76.23%	19.06%	95.48%
CITY	ALIPUR CHATTA TC	0.00%	82.35%	17.65%	100.00%
CITY	DHONKAL TC	0.00%	83.33%	0.00%	83.33%
CITY	GHAKKHAR TC	0.00%	43.75%	50.00%	93.75%
CITY	GUJRANWALA M.CORP	0.29%	78.24%	17.35%	95.88%
CITY	KAMOKE MC	0.00%	77.36%	18.87%	96.23%
CITY	LUDHEWALA WARRAICH TC	0.00%	93.75%	0.00%	93.75%
CITY	NOWSHERA VIRKAN TC	0.00%	75.00%	25.00%	100.00%
CITY	WAZIRABAD MC	0.00%	51.72%	41.38%	93.10%



## Backup Sub-district Level Data on Enrolment - Gujrat

5-9 year olds (%),

LEVEL	TITLE	MADRASAH	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PARTICIPATION RATE ( 5 -9)
DISTRICT	GUJRAT	0.58%	39.65%	56.59%	96.82%
TEHSIL	GUJRAT TEHSIL	0.80%	34.48%	61.80%	97.08%
TEHSIL	KHARIAN TEHSIL	0.00%	31.25%	66.12%	97.37%
TEHSIL	SARAI ALAMGIR TEHSIL	0.00%	29.49%	70.51%	100.00%
CITY	CITIES	1.07%	58.57%	35.36%	95.00%
CITY	GUJRAT MC	1.54%	59.23%	34.62%	95.38%
CITY	JALALPUR JATTAN MC	0.00%	38.46%	50.00%	88.46%
CITY	KHARIAN	0.00%	56.76%	35.14%	91.89%
CITY	KUNJAH TC	0.00%	56.00%	36.00%	92.00%
CITY	LALA MUSA MC	0.00%	75.86%	24.14%	100.00%
CITY	SARAI ALAMGIR MC	3.03%	60.61%	36.36%	100.00%

## Backup Sub-district Level Data on Enrolment - Hafizabad

5-9 year olds (%),

LEVEL	TITLE	MADRASAH	PRIVATE	PUBLIC PARTICIPATION RATE ( 5 -9)
DISTRICT	HAFIZABAD	1.00%	31.93%	59.76% 92.70%
TEHSIL	HAFIZABAD TEHSIL	0.40%	25.25%	66.87% 92.53%
TEHSIL	PINDI BHATTIAN TEHSIL	1.95%	24.68%	66.88% 93.51%
CITY	CITIES	1.02%	50.85%	40.27% 92.15%
CITY	HAFIZABAD MC	0.00%	71.79%	24.36% 96.15%
CITY	KALEKE TC	2.27%	34.09%	47.73% 84.09%
CITY	PINDI BHATTIAN TC	0.00%	20.00%	68.00% 88.00%
CITY	SUKHEKE TC	4.65%	27.91%	58.14% 90.70%

## Backup Sub-district Level Data on Enrolment - Jhelum

5-9 year olds (%),

LEVEL	TITLE	MADRASAH	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PARTICIPATION RATE ( 5 -9)
DISTRICT	JHELUM	0.61%	45.83%	50.00%	96.44%
TEHSIL	JHELUM TEHSIL	0.00%	43.88%	53.96%	97.84%
TEHSIL	PIND DADAN KHAN TEHSIL	0.38%	38.85%	57.31%	96.54%
TEHSIL	SOHAWA TEHSIL	0.00%	35.51%	61.59%	97.10%
CITY	CITIES	1.62%	58.12%	35.06%	94.81%
CITY	DINA MC	6.52%	52.17%	41.30%	100.00%
CITY	JEHLUM	1.09%	62.30%	31.69%	95.08%
CITY	KHEWRA TC	0.00%	46.15%	42.31%	88.46%
CITY	PIND DADAN KHAN TC	0.00%	37.04%	48.15%	85.19%
CITY	SOHAWA TC	0.00%	73.08%	26.92%	100.00%

## Backup Sub-district Level Data on Enrolment - Jhang

5-9 year olds (%),

LEVEL	TITLE	MADRASAH	PRIVATE	PUBLIC PARTICIPATION RATE ( 5 -9)	
DISTRICT	JHANG	0.33%	30.43%	60.53%	91.29%
TEHSIL	JHANG TEHSIL	0.54%	21.30%	67.69%	89.53%
TEHSIL	SHORKOT TEHSIL	0.00%	27.73%	63.47%	91.20%
CITY	CITIES	0.36%	52.35%	42.24%	94.95%
CITY	BAGH TC	0.00%	42.22%	57.78%	100.00%
CITY	GARH MAHARAJA TC	0.00%	58.33%	27.78%	86.11%
CITY	JHANG MC	0.61%	58.54%	36.59%	95.73%
CITY	SHORKOT	0.00%	28.13%	65.63%	93.75%

## Backup Sub-district Level Data on Enrolment - Kasur

5-9 year olds (%),

LEVEL	TITLE	MADRASAH	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PARTICIPATION RATE ( 5 -9)
DISTRICT	KASUR	1.67%	49.96%	42.16%	93.78%
TEHSIL	CHUNIAN TEHSIL	2.87%	40.50%	49.46%	92.83%
TEHSIL	KASUR TEHSIL	0.79%	48.55%	42.74%	92.08%
TEHSIL	PATTOKI TEHSIL	1.19%	46.83%	46.03%	94.05%
CITY	CITIES	2.16%	67.10%	28.14%	97.40%
CITY	CHUNIAN TC	0.00%	51.52%	42.42%	93.94%
CITY	KASUR MC	1.01%	79.80%	19.19%	100.00%
CITY	KOT RADHA KISHAN TC	0.00%	61.29%	35.48%	96.77%
CITY	PATTOKI MC	0.00%	75.00%	21.43%	96.43%
CITY	RAJA JANG TC	10.00%	47.50%	37.50%	95.00%

## Backup Sub-district Level Data on Enrolment - Khanewal

5-9 year olds (%),

LEVEL	TITLE	MADRASAH	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PARTICIPATION RATE ( 5 -9)
DISTRICT	KHANEWAL	1.98%	30.32%	52.71%	85.01%
TEHSIL	JAHANIAN TEHSIL	5.00%	33.13%	53.13%	91.25%
TEHSIL	KABIRWALA TEHSIL	3.24%	27.84%	51.08%	82.16%
TEHSIL	KHANEWAL TEHSIL	0.71%	21.43%	61.43%	83.57%
TEHSIL	MIAN CHANNU TEHSIL	0.33%	26.33%	54.00%	80.67%
CITY	CITIES	0.52%	45.55%	47.12%	93.19%
CITY	ABDUL HAKIM TC	4.55%	45.45%	50.00%	100.00%
CITY	KABIRWALA TC	0.00%	56.00%	44.00%	100.00%
CITY	KHANEWAL MC	0.00%	49.30%	42.25%	91.55%
CITY	MIAN CHANNU MC	0.00%	33.33%	40.74%	74.07%
CITY	SARAI SIDHU TC	0.00%	52.63%	47.37%	100.00%
CITY	TULAMBA TC	0.00%	33.33%	66.67%	100.00%

## Backup Sub-district Level Data on Enrolment - Khushab

5-9 year olds (%),

LEVEL	TITLE	MADRASAH	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PARTICIPATION RATE ( 5 -9)
DISTRICT	KHUSHAB	0.30%	32.73%	62.31%	95.34%
TEHSIL	KHUSHAB TEHSIL	0.00%	30.83%	64.95%	95.78%
TEHSIL	NOORPUR TEHSIL	1.46%	17.56%	73.66%	92.68%
CITY	CITIES	0.00%	50.21%	46.41%	96.62%
CITY	HADALI TC	0.00%	27.59%	70.69%	98.28%
CITY	JAUHRABAD TC	0.00%	54.55%	45.45%	100.00%
CITY	KHUSHAB MC	0.00%	74.12%	22.35%	96.47%
CITY	MITHA TIWANA MC	0.00%	25.93%	62.96%	88.89%
CITY	NOORPUR THAL TC	0.00%	41.18%	52.94%	94.12%
CITY	NOWSHERA TC	0.00%	47.06%	52.94%	100.00%

## Backup Sub-district Level Data on Enrolment - Lahore

5-9 year olds (%),

LEVEL	TITLE	MADRASAH	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PARTICIPATION RATE ( 5 -9)
DISTRICT	LAHORE	0.77%	68.94%	25.22%	94.92%
TEHSIL	LAHORE CANTT TEHSIL	0.00%	52.21%	38.94%	91.15%
TEHSIL	LAHORE CITY TEHSIL	1.63%	56.91%	34.96%	93.50%
CITY	CITIES	0.74%	73.11%	21.81%	95.66%
CITY	KAHNA NAU TC	0.00%	76.92%	19.23%	96.15%
CITY	LAHORE M.CORP.	0.79%	73.85%	20.89%	95.53%
CITY	RAIWIND TC	0.00%	40.00%	60.00%	100.00%



## Backup Sub-district Level Data on Enrolment - Layyah

5-9 year olds (%),

LEVEL	TITLE	MADRASAH	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PARTICIPATION RATE ( 5 -9)
DISTRICT	LAYYAH	0.23%	32.74%	56.90%	89.87%
TEHSIL	CHOUBARA TEHSIL	0.61%	20.25%	67.48%	88.34%
TEHSIL	KAROR LAL ESAN TEHSIL	0.00%	30.67%	60.80%	91.47%
TEHSIL	LAYYAH TEHSIL	0.17%	29.54%	58.23%	87.95%
CITY	CITIES	0.64%	62.82%	31.41%	94.87%
CITY	CHOWK AZAM MC	0.00%	78.13%	18.75%	96.88%
CITY	FATEHPUR TC	0.00%	82.22%	17.78%	100.00%
CITY	LEIAH MC	1.27%	45.57%	44.30%	91.14%

## Backup Sub-district Level Data on Enrolment - Lodhran

5-9 year olds (%),

LEVEL	TITLE	MADRASAH	PRIVATE	PUBLIC PARTICIPATION RATE ( 5 -9)
DISTRICT	LODHRAN	8.64%	32.85%	43.41% 84.89%
TEHSIL	DUNYAPUR TEHSIL	5.28%	34.51%	50.35% 90.14%
TEHSIL	KAHROR PACCA TEHSIL	16.17%	26.81%	34.89% 77.87%
TEHSIL	LODHRAN TEHSIL	9.84%	28.67%	44.21% 82.73%
CITY	CITIES	1.01%	49.75%	41.21% 91.96%
CITY	DUNYAPUR TC	0.00%	49.06%	39.62% 88.68%
CITY	KAHROR PACCA TC	2.90%	40.58%	47.83% 91.30%
CITY	LODHRAN MC	0.00%	58.44%	36.36% 94.81%

## Backup Sub-district Level Data on Enrolment - Mandi Bahauddin

5-9 year olds (%),

LEVEL	TITLE	MADRASAH	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PARTICIPATION RATE ( 5 -9)
DISTRICT	MANDI BHAUDDIN	0.38%	39.52%	55.38%	95.29%
TEHSIL	MALAKWAL TEHSIL	0.00%	46.03%	47.70%	93.72%
TEHSIL	MANDI BHAUDDIN TEHSIL	0.68%	37.50%	56.76%	94.93%
CITY	PHALIA TEHSIL	0.30%	30.51%	66.47%	97.28%
CITY	CITIES	0.57%	51.15%	42.53%	94.25%
CITY	MANDI BAHUDDIN MC	0.96%	59.62%	33.65%	94.23%
CITY	PHALIA TC	0.00%	35.29%	55.88%	91.18%
CITY	QADIRABAD TC	0.00%	41.67%	55.56%	97.22%

## Backup Sub-district Level Data on Enrolment - Mianwali

5-9 year olds (%),

LEVEL	TITLE	MADRASAH	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PARTICIPATION RATE ( 5 -9)
DISTRICT	MIANWALI	0.49%	31.34%	61.41%	93.24%
TEHSIL	ISAKHEL TEHSIL	0.00%	20.00%	73.55%	93.55%
TEHSIL	MIANWALI TEHSIL	1.26%	29.90%	61.31%	92.46%
TEHSIL	PIPLAN TEHSIL	0.00%	23.14%	69.87%	93.01%
TEHSIL	TARAG QH	0.00%	52.94%	41.18%	94.12%
CITY	CITIES	0.00%	48.65%	45.95%	94.59%
CITY	DAUD KHEL TC	0.00%	66.67%	20.83%	87.50%
CITY	KAMAR MASHANI TC	0.00%	55.32%	40.43%	95.74%
CITY	LIAQUATABAD TC	0.00%	41.46%	58.54%	100.00%
CITY	MIANWALI MC	0.00%	38.37%	56.98%	95.35%

## Backup Sub-district Level Data on Enrolment - Multan

5-9 year olds (%),

LEVEL	TITLE	MADRAS AH	PRIVATE	PUBLIC PARTICIPATION RATE ( 5 -9)
DISTRICT	MULTAN	3.75%	43.05%	41.93% 88.74%
TEHSIL	JALALPUR PIRWALA TEHSIL	5.52%	8.59%	62.58% 76.69%
TEHSIL	MULTAN CITY TEHSIL	4.51%	38.35%	45.11% 87.97%
TEHSIL	MULTAN SADDAR TEHSIL	5.90%	26.55%	53.69% 86.14%
TEHSIL	SHUJABAD TEHSIL	7.55%	58.49%	24.53% 90.57%
CITY	CITIES	0.78%	63.01%	30.33% 94.13%
CITY	MULTAN M.CORP.	0.85%	63.62%	30.00% 94.47%
CITY	QADIRPUR RAN TC	0.00%	66.67%	26.67% 93.33%
CITY	SHUJABAD MC	0.00%	50.00%	38.46% 88.46%

## Backup Sub-district Level Data on Enrolment - Muzaffargarh

5-9 year olds (%),

LEVEL	TITLE	MADRASAH	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PARTICIPATION RATE ( 5 -9)
DISTRICT	MUZZAFARGARGH	4.86%	31.66%	45.07%	81.59%
TEHSIL	ALIPUR TEHSIL	0.53%	38.42%	37.37%	76.32%
TEHSIL	JATOI TEHSIL	11.52%	29.84%	36.13%	77.49%
TEHSIL	KOT ADDU TEHSIL	4.95%	28.65%	51.04%	84.64%
TEHSIL	MUZZAFARGARH TEHSIL	5.25%	21.92%	50.23%	77.40%
CITY	CITIES	0.65%	60.65%	36.13%	97.42%
CITY	JATOI TC	0.00%	81.48%	18.52%	100.00%
CITY	KHANGARH TC	2.94%	50.00%	44.12%	97.06%
CITY	KOT ADDU MC	0.00%	54.90%	41.18%	96.08%
CITY	MUZZAFARGARH MC	0.00%	62.79%	34.88%	97.67%

## Backup Sub-district Level Data on Enrolment - Nankana Sahib

5-9 year olds (%),

LEVEL	TITLE	MADRAS AH	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PARTICIPATION RATE ( 5 -9)
DISTRICT	NANKANA SAHIB	0.70%	36.39%	54.01%	91.10%
TEHSIL	NANKANA SAHIB TEHSIL	0.76%	35.11%	54.77%	90.65%
CITY	CITIES	0.00%	50.00%	45.92%	95.92%
CITY	NANKANA SAHIB MC	0.00%	54.35%	41.30%	95.65%
CITY	WARBURTON TC	0.00%	46.15%	50.00%	96.15%

## Backup Sub-district Level Data on Enrolment - Narowal

5-9 year olds (%),

LEVEL	TITLE	MADRASAH	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PARTICIPATION RATE ( 5 -9)
DISTRICT	NAROWAL	0.16%	55.94%	40.66%	96.77%
TEHSIL	NAROWAL TEHSIL	0.00%	48.93%	46.80%	95.73%
TEHSIL	SHAKARGARH TEHSIL	0.33%	62.00%	35.67%	98.00%
CITY	CITIES	0.00%	55.74%	39.34%	95.08%
CITY	NAROWAL MC	0.00%	57.45%	40.43%	97.87%
CITY	QILA SOBHA SINGH TC	0.00%	35.48%	48.39%	83.87%
CITY	SHAKARGARH MC	0.00%	68.18%	31.82%	100.00%



## Backup Sub-district Level Data on Enrolment - Okara

5-9 year olds (%),

LEVEL	TITLE	MADRASAH	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PARTICIPATION RATE ( 5 -9)
DISTRICT	OKARA	1.13%	39.05%	51.09%	91.27%
TEHSIL	DEPALPUR	0.70%	27.92%	61.43%	90.05%
TEHSIL	OKARA TEHSIL	1.23%	41.80%	49.18%	92.21%
TEHSIL	RENALA KHURD TEHSIL	0.00%	41.89%	50.68%	92.57%
CITY	CITIES	2.57%	58.46%	31.25%	92.28%
CITY	BASIRPUR TC	2.86%	57.14%	34.29%	94.29%
CITY	HAVELI LAKHA WASAWEWALA TC	0.00%	57.89%	34.21%	92.11%
CITY	HUJRA SHAH MUQEEM TC	6.38%	51.06%	40.43%	97.87%
CITY	OKARA MC	2.56%	64.10%	22.22%	88.89%
CITY	SADDAR GOGERA TC	0.00%	51.43%	42.86%	94.29%

## Backup Sub-district Level Data on Enrolment - Pakpattan

5-9 year olds (%),

LEVEL	TITLE	MADRASAH	PRIVATE	PUBLIC PARTICIPATION RATE ( 5 -9)
DISTRICT	PAKPATTAN	2.09%	27.84%	61.37% 91.30%
TEHSIL	ARIF WALA TEHSIL	2.21%	21.18%	69.24% 92.63%
TEHSIL	PAKPATTAN TEHSIL	1.92%	23.65%	63.65% 89.23%
CITY	CITIES	2.26%	71.43%	20.30% 93.98%
CITY	ARIF WALA MC	0.00%	70.21%	27.66% 97.87%
CITY	PAKPATTAN MC	3.49%	72.09%	16.28% 91.86%

## Backup Sub-district Level Data on Enrolment - Rahimyar Khan

5-9 year olds (%),

LEVEL	TITLE	MADRASAH	PRIVATE	PUBLIC PARTICIPATION RATE ( 5 -9)	
DISTRICT	RAHIMYAR KHAN	3.85%	24.46%	53.77%	82.08%
TEHSIL	KHANPUR TEHSIL	5.85%	16.59%	60.00%	82.44%
TEHSIL	LIAQUAT PUR TEHSIL	6.09%	14.34%	62.01%	82.44%
TEHSIL	RAHIM YAR KHAN TEHSIL	3.66%	17.75%	56.06%	77.46%
TEHSIL	SADIQABAD TEHSIL	3.11%	23.53%	52.94%	79.58%
CITY	CITIES	0.80%	52.80%	37.20%	90.80%
CITY	KHANPUR MC	1.64%	57.38%	31.15%	90.16%
CITY	KOT SAMABA TC	0.00%	71.88%	28.13%	100.00%
CITY	LIAQUAT PUR TC	0.00%	37.50%	46.88%	84.38%
CITY	RAHIM YAR KHAN MC	1.06%	51.06%	36.17%	88.30%
CITY	ZAHIRPUR TC	0.00%	45.16%	51.61%	96.77%

## Backup Sub-district Level Data on Enrolment - Rajanpur

5-9 year olds (%),

LEVEL	TITLE	MADRASAH	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PARTICIPATION RATE ( 5 -9)
DISTRICT	RAJANPUR	4.17%	22.43%	38.07%	64.67%
TEHSIL	DE-EXCLUDED	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
TEHSIL	JAMPUR TEHSIL	4.08%	20.66%	40.69%	65.43%
TEHSIL	RAJANPUR TEHSIL	7.33%	21.33%	41.00%	69.67%
TEHSIL	ROJHAN TEHSIL	3.76%	4.23%	30.99%	38.97%
CITY	CITIES	0.99%	53.96%	37.62%	92.57%
CITY	FAZILPUR TC	1.89%	58.49%	20.75%	81.13%
CITY	JAMPUR MC	1.37%	47.95%	46.58%	95.89%
CITY	KOT MITHAN TC	0.00%	61.90%	38.10%	100.00%
CITY	RAJANPUR MC	0.00%	54.55%	41.82%	96.36%

## Backup Sub-district Level Data on Enrolment - Rawalpindi

5-9 year olds (%),

LEVEL	TITLE	MADRASAH	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PARTICIPATION RATE ( 5 -9)
DISTRICT	RAWALPINDI	0.92%	52.61%	42.68%	96.21%
TEHSIL	GUJAR KHAN TEHSIL	0.76%	53.79%	45.45%	100.00%
TEHSIL	KAHUTA TEHSIL	0.00%	51.61%	48.39%	100.00%
TEHSIL	KOTLI SATTIAN TEHSIL	2.63%	42.11%	52.63%	97.37%
TEHSIL	MURREE TEHSIL	0.00%	65.38%	34.62%	100.00%
TEHSIL	RAWALPINDI TEHSIL	0.00%	47.13%	45.86%	92.99%
TEHSIL	TAXILA TEHSIL	0.00%	19.05%	80.95%	100.00%
CITY	CITIES	1.35%	56.92%	36.92%	95.19%
CITY	GUJAR KHAN	0.00%	61.90%	38.10%	100.00%
CITY	JEHLUM	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%
CITY	KAHUTA	4.17%	66.67%	25.00%	95.83%
CITY	RWP/ISB	1.43%	58.10%	35.71%	95.24%
CITY	WAH CANTT	0.00%	40.74%	51.85%	92.59%

## Backup Sub-district Level Data on Enrolment - Sahiwal

5-9 year olds (%),

LEVEL	TITLE	MADRASAH	PRIVATE	PUBLIC PARTICIPATION RATE ( 5 -9)	
DISTRICT	SAHIWAL	1.06%	32.75%	56.43%	90.23%
TEHSIL	119	1.14%	28.31%	58.45%	87.90%
TEHSIL	SAHIWAL TEHSIL	0.91%	29.43%	61.97%	92.32%
CITY	CITIES	1.32%	57.62%	30.46%	89.40%
CITY	CHICHAWATNI MC	0.00%	51.85%	33.33%	85.19%
CITY	KAMIR TC	3.23%	45.16%	29.03%	77.42%
CITY	SAHIWAL MC	1.08%	63.44%	30.11%	94.62%

## Backup Sub-district Level Data on Enrolment - Sargodha

5-9 year olds (%),

LEVEL	TITLE	MADRASAH	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PARTICIPATION RATE ( 5 -9)
DISTRICT	SARGODHA	0.68%	40.53%	53.32%	94.53%
TEHSIL	BHALWAL TEHSIL	0.00%	46.39%	46.99%	93.37%
TEHSIL	SAHIWAL TEHSIL	0.00%	30.17%	65.52%	95.69%
TEHSIL	SARGODHA TEHSIL	2.54%	28.81%	61.44%	92.80%
TEHSIL	SHAHPUR TEHSIL	0.00%	29.82%	63.16%	92.98%
TEHSIL	SILLANWALI TEHSIL	0.00%	34.96%	60.98%	95.93%
CITY	CITIES	0.37%	58.74%	37.17%	96.28%
CITY	BHALWAL MC	0.00%	76.00%	24.00%	100.00%
CITY	MIANI TC	0.00%	37.04%	59.26%	96.30%
CITY	SAHIWAL TC	0.00%	42.31%	50.00%	92.31%
CITY	SARGODHA	0.62%	60.87%	34.16%	95.65%
CITY	SILLANWALI TC	0.00%	66.67%	33.33%	100.00%

## Backup Sub-district Level Data on Enrolment - Sheikhpura

5-9 year olds (%),

LEVEL	TITLE	MADRASAH	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PARTICIPATION RATE ( 5 -9)
DISTRICT	SHEIKUPURA	0.46%	55.71%	39.41%	95.58%
TEHSIL	FEROZEWALA	0.65%	43.04%	53.07%	96.76%
TEHSIL	SAFDARABAD TEHSIL	0.82%	54.92%	41.80%	97.54%
TEHSIL	SHEIKHUPURA TEHSIL	0.30%	47.58%	45.76%	93.64%
CITY	CITIES	0.31%	76.31%	19.08%	95.69%
CITY	FEROZEWALA TC	2.56%	71.79%	15.38%	89.74%
CITY	KOT ABDUL MALIK TC	0.00%	93.94%	3.03%	96.97%
CITY	MURIDKE MC	0.00%	87.18%	10.26%	97.44%
CITY	NARANG TC	0.00%	48.39%	51.61%	100.00%
CITY	SAFDARABAD TC	0.00%	80.77%	15.38%	96.15%
CITY	SANGLA HILL MC	0.00%	76.92%	19.23%	96.15%
CITY	SHAH KOT TC	0.00%	59.26%	33.33%	92.59%
CITY	SHEIKHUPURA MC	0.00%	79.81%	16.35%	96.15%



## Backup Sub-district Level Data on Enrolment - Sialkot

5-9 year olds (%),

LEVEL	TITLE	MADRASAH	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PARTICIPATION RATE ( 5 -9)
DISTRICT	SIALKOT	0.55%	62.01%	32.88%	95.43%
TEHSIL	DASKA TEHSIL	0.00%	55.06%	40.89%	95.95%
TEHSIL	PASRUR TEHSIL	0.47%	52.36%	44.34%	97.17%
TEHSIL	SIALKOT TEHSIL	0.33%	70.03%	25.73%	96.09%
CITY	CITIES	1.22%	65.96%	26.14%	93.31%
CITY	DASKA MC	0.00%	55.56%	35.19%	90.74%
CITY	JAMKE CHEEMA TC	0.00%	62.50%	33.33%	95.83%
CITY	PASRUR MC	4.35%	26.09%	65.22%	95.65%
CITY	SAMBRIAL MC	0.00%	60.00%	36.67%	96.67%
CITY	SIALKOT M.CORPORATION	1.52%	74.75%	16.67%	92.93%

## Backup Sub-district Level Data on Enrolment - Toba Tek Singh

5-9 year olds (%),

LEVEL	TITLE	MADRASAH	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PARTICIPATION RATE ( 5 -9)
DISTRICT	TOBA TEK SINGH	0.27%	34.82%	60.35%	95.44%
TEHSIL	GOJRA TEHSIL	0.00%	32.33%	64.66%	96.98%
TEHSIL	KAMALIA TEHSIL	0.28%	28.77%	64.67%	93.73%
TEHSIL	TOBA TEK SINGH TEHSIL	0.31%	24.46%	70.03%	94.80%
CITY	CITIES	0.53%	67.38%	29.95%	97.86%
CITY	GOJRA MC	0.00%	75.31%	22.22%	97.53%
CITY	KAMALIA MC	0.00%	60.71%	37.50%	98.21%
CITY	PIR MAHAL TC	0.00%	45.45%	54.55%	100.00%
CITY	TOBA TEK SINGH MC	3.57%	75.00%	17.86%	96.43%