

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%




**Punjab Urban
Participation Rate
(June 2015) is 94.7 %**

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%¹ 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)



¹ 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">▪ Began the enrolment drives with an inauguration event at district and tehsil level▪ Assigned focal persons at cluster or Markaz level▪ Assigned targets at Tehsil, Markaz and school level▪ Involved politicians and other notable figures to increase impact▪ Mobilised school councils in local communities▪ Followed-up on regular basis▪ Issued appreciation letter for high performers and show-cause for low performers | <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ NCHD¹ arranged district level meeting of education officials at regular basis▪ NCHD provided training to teachers in some districts▪ UNICEF provided funds to teachers to carry out door-to-door survey in RYK▪ Other organisations printed pamphlets and arranged walks at school or Markaz level | <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Led door-to-door campaign and made efforts to enrol children▪ Collected information on out of school children▪ Engaged with local community to convince parents |

¹ National commission for human development

With the exception of Rahim Yar Khan where teachers were paid Rs 5/house by UNICEF to identify¹ 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

¹ 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 |
|---|--|---|---|--|--|---|--|---|
| Enrolment % change | +5.0% | +7.0% | +4.2% | +4.2% | +3.4% | -0.1% | -0.6% | -4.8% |
| Specific list of activities performed during the campaign | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ District level inauguration ceremony, ▪ Tehsil level seminars. ▪ Banners near every school. ▪ Publicity by AEOs and teachers by door-to-door visits | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Show-cause notice for teachers who did not meet enrolment target ▪ Follow-up with Head Teachers and parents. ▪ Awareness through print media ▪ Enrolment rallies in Marakaz and meetings with local community. ▪ Involved MPAs and met with the local Namabardaars ▪ Sent teachers to areas where schools were non-functional | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No special intervention other than UNICEF providing funds to teachers for door-to-door survey ▪ Inauguration event at district level with DCO, MNAs and MPAs as part of the event. ▪ Door-to-door campaign focused on enrolling children to school | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Cluster and school wise target ▪ The only thing new was that the teachers were reminded that enrolment is part of their contract ▪ Punjab Barho Punjab also played a vital role ▪ DCO and MNA played a small role | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Targets were given at school level based on last year survey ▪ Enrolment walks were conducted in all the Tehsils ▪ MNAs, MPAs and NGOs were involved in the process. ▪ Local communities and school Councils were sensitized. ▪ Weekly meetings of officials were conducted and progress was tracked | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In every UC a focal person was made collecting new data, following up with old data and arranging events ▪ Walks were organized and NGO/Ullema also helped in this process ▪ MNAs were also invited but none participated. ▪ Enrolment data was verified by literacy schools, focal person and DEO | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ District and Division level inauguration ceremony, chaired by the DCO and the Commissioner ▪ Banners in schools and offices ▪ District and school wise targets ▪ Daily reporting of enrolment number on daily basis | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Teachers have been sensitized to effectively execute the campaign ▪ NGOs and NCHD have been asked to support ▪ Ceremonies at district level ▪ Awareness through print media ▪ AEOs regularly contacted influential people for support in villages |
| Did you try anything different for females or males? (specific strategies) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ We used the same strategy | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No specific strategy | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No, we did not have any targeted strategy. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Nothing was different between them, same instructions | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No specific strategy | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Separate targets for male and female DEOs, and similarly for male and female AEOs | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A similar strategy was adopted for both males and females. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Overall same strategy was adopted. |

EDO interview details (2/2)

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

AEO interview details (1/2)

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

AEO interview details (2/2)

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

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 | MUZAFFARGARH 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 | MUZAFFARGARH 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% |