



INTER STATE DISPARITY IN INCLUSIVE GROWTH IN EDUCATION IN INDIA

L.Sundar¹

¹Research Scholar in Economics (Part Time), Annamalai University, Annamalai Nagar, Chidambaram, Tamil Nadu, India.

Dr.I.Sundar²

²Associate Professor and Economics Wing Head, Directorate of Distance Education, Annamalai University, Annamalai nagar, Chidambaram, Tamil Nadu, India

ABSTRACT

The concept of inclusive growth is very important to achieve the goal of social justice along with economic justice. This paper deals with inclusive growth of elementary education in India. It outlines the Interstate disparity in achievement of inclusive growth with respect to growth of schools, target population coverage, school facilities and student enrolment during the period 2005-06 to 2014-15. This paper concludes with some interesting findings along with policy suggestions.

KEYWORDS: inclusive growth, Inclusive education, economic diversification

INTRODUCTION

Inclusive growth is a concept that advances equitable opportunities for economic participants during economic growth with benefits incurred by every section of society. The definition of inclusive growth implies direct links between the macroeconomic and microeconomic determinants of the economy and economic growth. The microeconomic dimension captures the importance of structural transformation for economic diversification and competition, while the macro dimension refers to changes in economic aggregates such as the country's gross national product (GNP) or gross domestic product (GDP), total factor productivity and aggregate factor inputs.

Inclusion is one of the most important words spoken with regard to diversity. But the most frequent spoken words among them could be inclusive growth. Inclusive growth basically means making sure everyone is included in growth, regardless of their economic class, gender, sex, disability and religion. Inclusive growth

approach takes on long term perspective and the focus is on productive employment rather than merely direct income redistribution as a means of increasing income for excluded groups. Thus inclusive growth approach took a long term perspective of development. According to World Bank, the growth said to be inclusive when the growth to be sustainable in long run and it should be broad based across the sector and inclusive of large part of countries labour force. Inclusiveness should understand in the sense and focusing on equality of opportunity in terms access to markets, resources and unbiased regulatory environment for business and individual.

CONCEPT OF INCLUSIVE EDUCATION

Inclusive education is not merely about providing access into mainstream school for pupils who have previously been excluded. It is not about closing down an unacceptable system of segregated provision and



dumping those closing down an unacceptable system of segregated provision and dumping those pupils in an unchanged mainstream system. Existing school systems in terms of physical factors, curriculum aspects, teaching expectations and styles, leadership roles; will have to change. This is because inclusive education is about the participation of all children and young people and the removal of all forms of exclusionary practice. Inclusive Education is a Process of strengthening the capacity of the education system to reach out to all learners. It involves restructuring the culture, policies and practices in schools so that they can respond to the diversity of students in their locality. Schools should be improved in all dimensions to address the educational needs of all children

Inclusive Education is accepted as an integral part of general education. Training regular classroom teacher in the area of integrated education, curriculum modification, parental education, awareness to parents and developing positive attitude towards the disability are the key point of successful inclusive education. To open up the regular school system to disabled children is not an easy task. The policy on inclusion and mainstreaming can easily get failure if not implemented carefully. There is an urgent need for interventions for equipping general teachers with special skills, making general curricula, teaching methods. Evaluation procedures, learning material disability-sensitive and addressing the attitudes /needs of other children in the school to ensure such interventions benefit to all children. As a system, inclusive education should be flexible.

This need for flexibility must be reflected in the methods and materials used to give these children the widest possible access to the regular curriculum. When discussing the kind of service needed, the starting point should always be what is best for the particular child. Emphasising inclusive education does not rule out special schools or centres. They would still be required to cater to children with profound and complex difficulties in need of more specialised and extensive help, including e.g. many deaf children. This alternative should, however, not be considered, unless classroom placement cannot meet their needs.

METHODS AND MATERIALS

This paper examines the interstate disparity in the performance of inclusive growth in education. The inclusive growth performance has been computed during the period 2005-2006 to 2014-15. The relevant data are collected from the district information system for education. The analysis has been carried out in two points of time. The growth of inclusive growth has been computed on the basis of compound annual growth rate analysis.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The first part analysis deals with inclusive growth of schools and students enrolment during the period 2005-2006 to 2014-15. The second part of the analysis examines the inclusive growth in school facilities and amenities during the 2005-2006 to 2014-15. The third part of the analysis deals with inclusive growth in students' enrolment covering the period 2007-2008 to 2014-15. The area coverage is considered as inclusiveness in the present study.

Table 1- Interstate Disparity in the Performance of Inclusive Growth in School Development during the Five Year Plan Period

State	Total schools		Primary schools per 1000 children population age group in the rage of 6-11 years		Upper primary schools per 1000 children population age group in the rage of 11-14 years	
	2005-06	2014-15	2005-06	2014-15	2005-06	2014-15
Andhra Pradesh	94984	105754 (1.08)	10	22 (8.20)	7	17 (9.28)
Arunachal Pradesh	3070	3903 (2.43)	24	22 (-0.87)	9	19 (7.76)
Assam	40215	65141 (4.94)	10	15 (4.14)	5	9 (6.05)
Bihar	53778	79196 (3.95)	4	5 (2.26)	2	5 (9.60)
Chandigarh	185	197 (0.63)	2	2 (0.00)	2	3 (4.14)
Chhattisgarh	51347	53299 (0.37)	15	14 (-0.69)	10	11 (0.96)
Goa	1345	1478 (0.95)	7	10 (3.63)	4	7 (5.76)
Gujarat	37256	38472 (0.32)	7	7 (0.00)	7	9 (2.54)
Haryana	13559	21791 (4.86)	4	6 (4.14)	3	8 (10.31)
Himachal Pradesh	16013	17956 (1.15)	20	23 (1.41)	13	18 (3.31)
Jammu and Kashmir	19451	28543 (3.91)	17	19 (1.12)	11	16 (3.82)
Jharkhand	36211	46773 (2.59)	10	11 (0.96)	4	9 (8.45)
Karnataka	54085	61628 (1.31)	10	11 (0.96)	8	11 (3.24)
Kerala	11381	16419 (3.73)	3	6 (7.18)	3	5 (5.24)
Madhya Pradesh	121335	142512 (1.62)	13	13 (0.00)	8	11 (3.24)
Maharashtra	84286	97084 (1.42)	6	8 (2.92)	6	7 (1.55)
Manipur	3849	4858 (2.36)	14	17 (1.96)	8	15 (6.49)
Meghalaya	8128	13175 (4.95)	25	25 (0.00)	11	22 (7.18)
Mizoram	2521	3067 (1.98)	16	16 (0.00)	17	28 (5.12)
Nagaland	2514	2963 (1.66)	9	11 (2.03)	6	13 (8.04)
Odisha	51881	68305 (2.79)	12	14 (1.55)	7	13 (6.39)
Punjab	20298	29023 (3.64)	7	9 (2.54)	4	10 (9.60)

Table 1 continued

State	Total schools		Primary schools per 1000 children population age group in the range of 6-11 years		Upper primary schools per 1000 children population age group in the range of 11-14 years	
	2005-06	2014-15	2005-06	2014-15	2005-06	2014-15
Rajasthan	94319	106254 (1.20)	9	13 (3.75)	8	14 (5.76)
Sikkim	1097	1274 (1.51)	17	21 (2.14)	8	18 (8.45)
Tamil Nadu	51574	57153 (1.03)	9	9 (0.00)	5	6 (1.84)
Tripura	3548	4818 (3.11)	9	14 (4.52)	7	13 (6.39)
Uttar Pradesh	161869	243014 (4.15)	6	6 (0.00)	3	6 (7.18)
Uttarakhand	18907	23665 (2.27)	14	16 (1.34)	8	12 (4.14)
West Bengal	59223	95572 (4.90)	6	10 (5.24)	2	4 (7.18)
India	1124033	1445807 (2.55)	8	9 (1.18)	5	8 (4.81)

Source: District Information System for Education

Figures in Parentheses indicates the annual compound growth rate

Table 1 presents data on the interstate disparity in inclusive growth in elementary school in India. It could be observed that India had 1124033 elementary schools in 2005-2006 and it rose to 1445807 in 2014-15, indicating a 2.55 per cent of annual compound growth during the period. However, the growth in number of elementary schools is not uniform throughout the country. It is noted that a more than 4 per cent annual growth of elementary schools has been observed in Haryana state, Meghalaya state, Uttar Pradesh state and West Bengal state. The annual growth rate of elementary schools is found to be less than 1 per cent in Chandigarh state, Chhattisgarh state and Gujarat state. The annual growth rate of elementary schools is observed in the range of 2-3 per cent in Arunachal Pradesh state, Jharkhand state, Manipur state, Odisha state and Uttarakhand state.

It is observed that India had 8 Primary schools per 1000 Child population in the age group 6-11 years in 2004-05 and the number rose to 9 in 2014-15, showing an annual growth of 1.18 per cent during the period. The annual compound growth rate of Primary schools per 1000 Child population in the age group 6-11 years is not uniform throughout the country. The annual compound rate growth of Primary schools per 1000 Child population is observed to be highest in Andhra Pradesh state (8.20%), followed by Kerala (7.18%), West Bengal(5.24%),

Assam(4.14%), Haryana(4.14%), Tripura(4.52%) and Rajasthan(3.75%). The annual compound rate growth of Primary schools per 1000 Child population is observed to be negative in Arunachal Pradesh state and Chhattisgarh state during the period 2005-06 to 2014-15. The annual compound rate growth of Primary schools per 1000 Child population is observed to be constant in Chandigarh state, Gujarat state, Madhya Pradesh state, Meghalaya state, Mizoram state and Uttar Pradesh state the period 2005-06 to 2014-15.

It is observed that India had 5 Upper Primary schools per 1000 Child population in the age group 11-14 years in 2004-05 and the number rose to 8 in 2014-15, showing an annual growth of 4.81 per cent during the period. The annual compound growth rate of Upper Primary schools per 1000 Child population in the age group 11-14 years is not uniform throughout the country. The annual compound rate growth of Upper Primary schools per 1000 Child population is observed to be highest in Haryana state (10.31%), followed by Bihar (9.60%), Andhra Pradesh (9.28%), Sikkim(8.45%), Jharkhand(8.45%), Nagaland (8.04%), Meghalaya(7.18%), Uttar Pradesh(7.18%)and West Bengal(7.18%). The annual compound rate growth of Upper Primary schools per 1000 Child population is observed to be less than 2 per cent in Chhattisgarh state, Maharashtra state and Tamil Nadu state the period 2005-06 to 2014-15.

Table 2- Interstate Disparity in the Performance of inclusive Growth in School Facilities during the Five Year Plan Period

State	% Schools with Drinking Water		% Schools with Girls' Toilet		% Schools with Boundary wall		% Schools with Ramp		% Schools with Computer	
	2005-06	2014-15	2005-06	2014-15	2005-06	2014-15	2005-06	2014-15	2005-06	2014-15
Andhra Pradesh	77.6	187 (1.89)	40.5	142 (5.33)	51.1	128 (1.45)	7.7	111.5 (22.16)	15.7	65.1 (5.80)
Arunachal Pradesh	69.0	80.63 (1.57)	11.7	96.1 (23.44)	41.7	53.2 (30.3)	6.9	77.2 (27.31)	7.0	24.4 (13.30)
Assam	70.6	83.0 (1.63)	9.6	53.9 (18.83)	30.3	27.8 (-0.86)	10.9	90.2 (23.53)	4.1	8.1 (7.05)
Bihar	87.7	92.5 (0.53)	11.8	71.2 (19.69)	32.7	53.8 (5.11)	11.7	66.3 (18.94)	2.4	6.7 (10.81)
Chandigarh	99.5	100.0 (0.05)	89.2	100.1 (1.16)	97.3	100.0 (0.27)	28.7	87.6 (11.81)	71.4	95.4 (2.94)
Chhattisgarh	79.7	97.1 (1.99)	9.8	74.5 (22.49)	43.8	63.8 (3.83)	16.0	75.9 (16.85)	5.7	10.4 (6.20)
Goa	94.1	99.2 (0.53)	40.7	90.9	61.0	79.4 (2.67)	4.1	61.2 (31.04)	30.0	40.7 (3.10)
Gujarat	80.9	99.9 (2.13)	50.4	98.5 (8.37)	75.3	94.0 (2.24)	44.2	90.6 (7.44)	15.8	74.1 (16.71)
Haryana	90.0	99.8 (1.04)	70.7	96.4 (3.15)	91.3	98.2 (0.73)	48.9	90.1 (6.30)	10.7	46.1 (15.73)
Himachal Pradesh	88.7	99.1 (1.11)	29.7	95.6 (12.40)	24.7	71.8 (11.26)	5.7	84.8 (30.99)	7.6	23.8 (12.09)
Jammu and Kashmir	62.0	90.7 (3.88)	17.3	66.9 (14.48)	33.8	33.4 (-0.12)	2.0	32.5 (32.16)	8.6	16.5 (6.73)
Jharkhand	71.7	91.8 (2.50)	11.6	84.2 (21.92)	28.5	30.5 (0.68)	4.3	60.1 (30.18)	4.7	9.3 (7.06)
Karnataka	79.7	99.9 (2.28)	42.6	99.8 (8.89)	56.4	78.1 (3.31)	14.2	82.5 (19.24)	9.2	33.4 (13.76)
Kerala	93.7	99.6 (0.61)	71.5	95.2 (2.90)	66.8	84.1 (2.33)	32.9	96.9 (11.41)	51.2	93.6 (6.22)
Madhya Pradesh	84.7	96.2 (1.28)	21.4	83.9 (14.64)	55.1	45.7 (-1.85)	16.7	26.3 (4.65)	10.4	14.3 (3.24)
Maharashtra	82.6	99.6 (1.89)	47.5	99.0 (7.62)	58.0	82.7 (3.61)	59.2	91.9 (4.50)	23.1	54.3 (8.92)
Manipur	73.7	88.5 (1.85)	15.7	94.4 (19.65)	28.7	31.0 (0.77)	1.5	94.0 (51.25)	11.0	24.5 (8.34)

Table -2 Continued

State	% Schools with Drinking Water		% Schools with Girls' Toilet		% Schools with Boundary wall		% Schools with Ramp		% Schools with Computer	
	2005-06	2014-15	2005-06	2014-15	2005-06	2014-15	2005-06	2014-15	2005-06	2014-15
Meghalaya	35.8	62.9 (5.80)	7.7	60.5 (22.89)	18.4	19.0 (0.32)	2.1	69.8 (41.96)	1.8	9.0 (17.46)
Mizoram	72.6	91.9 (2.39)	16.9	96.9 (19.08)	35.1	56.8 (4.93)	11.0	52.9 (17.01)	10.2	29.5 (11.20)
Nagaland	51.5	78.1 (4.25)	21.3	94.8 (16.10)	71.8	70.3 (-0.21)	3.8	71.6 (34.13)	13.9	35.6 (9.86)
Odisha	82.8	98.0 (1.70)	12.4	76.8 (20.00)	65.3	67.5 (0.33)	8.1	77.4 (25.32)	11.4	13.6 (1.78)
Punjab	93.0	100.0 (0.73)	70.0	97.2 (3.34)	89.9	85.5 (-0.50)	12.7	99.9 (22.91)	14.0	52.4 (14.11)
Rajasthan	77.1	97.1 (2.33)	34.6	97.1 (10.87)	59.4	85.0 (3.65)	12.6	60.6 (17.01)	9.6	28.4 (11.46)
Sikkim	76.9	97.2 (2.37)	34.5	97.4 (10.94)	25.2	36.3 (3.72)	4.5	26.4 (19.35)	18.1	58.6 (12.47)
Tamil Nadu	96.2	99.8 (0.37)	55.1	99.7 (6.05)	61.9	79.7 (2.56)	17.8	68.3 (14.39)	19.6	57.3 (11.32)
Tripura	73.8	89.0 (1.89)	18.0	99.4 (18.63)	14.5	19.7 (3.11)	24.0	60.7 (9.72)	6.9	15.1 (8.15)
Uttar Pradesh	94.9	98.6 (0.38)	69.4	98.0 (3.51)	43.6	71.4 (5.06)	12.4	84.7 (21.18)	3.6	12.5 (13.26)
Uttarakhand	75.4	95.4 (2.38)	41.6	94.3 (8.53)	51.8	82.5 (4.76)	6.0	77.2 (29.11)	14.2	33.0 (8.80)
West Bengal	83.0	97.9 (1.66)	30.6	86.9 (11.00)	32.9	43.1 (2.74)	8.9	90.2 (26.06)	4.5	12.1 (10.40)
India	83.1	96.1 (1.46)	37.4	87.1 (8.82)	50.7	64.5 (2.44)	17.1	77.4 (16.30)	10.7	25.2 (8.94)



Table 2 presents data on the inclusive growth of school facilities during the five year plan period in India. India had 83.1 per cent of schools with drinking water facility in 2005-06 and the number rose to 96.1 per cent, in 2014-15 showing an annual compound growth of 1.46 per cent during the period. It could be noted that the inclusive growth of drinking water facility is not uniform throughout the country during the five year plan period. It could be noted that Meghalaya state ranks the first position (5.80%) with respect to inclusive growth of drinking water facility in schools during the period 2005-06 to 2014-15. The inclusive growth of drinking water facility in schools is found to be less than 1 per cent in Bihar state, Chandigarh state, Goa state, Kerala state, Punjab state, Tamil Nadu state and Uttar Pradesh state during the period 2005-06 to 2014-15.

India had 37.4 per cent of schools with girl's toilet facility in 2005-06 and the number rose to 87.1 per cent, in 2014-15 showing an annual compound growth of 8.82 per cent during the period. It could be noted that the inclusive growth of girl's toilet facility is not uniform throughout the country during the five year plan period. It could be observed that a more than 20 per cent of annual growth rate in inclusive growth of girl's toilet facility is observed in Arunachal Pradesh state, Chhattisgarh state, Jharkhand state, Meghalaya state and Odisha state during the period 2005-06 to 2014-15.

It could be seen that a more than 10 per cent of annual growth rate of inclusive growth in girl's toilet facility is observed in Assam state, Bihar state, Jammu and Kashmir state, Himachal Pradesh state, Madhya Pradesh state, Manipur state, Mizoram state, Nagaland state, Rajasthan state, Sikkim state, Tripura state and West Bengal state during the period 2005-06 to 2014-15. It could be seen that a less than 4 per cent of annual growth rate in inclusive growth in girl's toilet facility is observed in Chandigarh state, Kerala state, Punjab state and Uttar Pradesh state during the period 2005-06 to 2014-15.

India had 50.70 per cent of schools with boundary wall facility in 2005-06 and the number rose to 64.5 per cent, in 2014-15 showing an annual compound growth in 2.44 per cent during the period. It could be noted that the inclusive growth of schools with boundary wall facility is not uniform throughout the country during the five year plan period. Arunachal Pradesh ranks the first position with respect to inclusive growth in schools with boundary wall facility and it is worked out to 30.3 per cent annual growth during the period 2005-06 to 2014-15 and Himachal Pradesh state takes the second position (11.26%). It could be observed that a more than 3 per cent of annual growth

rate of inclusive growth in boundary wall facility is observed in Bihar state, Chhattisgarh state, Karnataka state, Maharashtra state, Mizoram state, Rajasthan state, Sikkim state, Uttar Pradesh state and Uttarakhand state during the period 2005-06 to 2014-15.

It could be seen that a less than 1 per cent of annual growth rate of inclusive growth in school boundary wall facility is observed in Chandigarh state, Haryana state, Manipur state and Meghalaya state during the period 2005-06 to 2014-15. It could be seen that the annual growth in inclusive growth in school boundary wall facility becomes negative in Assam state, Jammu and Kashmir State, Madhya Pradesh State, Nagaland State and Punjab State during the period 2005-06 to 2014-15.

India had 17.1 per cent of schools with Ramp facility in 2005-06 and the number rose to 77.4 per cent, in 2014-15 showing an annual compound growth in 16.30 per cent during the period. It could be noted that the inclusive growth of schools with Ramp facility is not uniform throughout the country during the five year plan period. Maharashtra ranks the first position with respect to inclusive growth of schools with Ramp facility and it is worked out to 51.25 per cent annual growth during the period 2005-06 to 2014-15 and Meghalaya state takes the second position (41.96%). It could be observed that a more than 30 per cent of annual growth rate in inclusive growth of Ramp facility in schools is observed in Goa state, Himachal Pradesh state, Jammu and Kashmir State, Jharkhand State and Nagaland State during the period 2005-06 to 2014-15.

It could be seen that a less than 20 per cent of annual growth rate in inclusive growth in school Ramp facility is observed in Andhra Pradesh state, Arunachal Pradesh State, Assam State, Nagaland State, Punjab State, Uttar Pradesh State, Uttarakhand State and West Bengal State during the period 2005-06 to 2014-15. It could be seen that the annual growth rate of inclusive growth in school Ramp facility is found to be below 10 per cent in Gujarat state, Haryana State, Madhya Pradesh State, Maharashtra State and Tripura State during the period 2005-06 to 2014-15.

India had 10.7 per cent of schools with computer facility in 2005-06 and the number rose to 25.2 per cent, in 2014-15 showing an annual compound growth of 8.94 per cent during the period. It could be noted that the inclusive growth of schools with computer facility is not uniform throughout the country during the five year plan period. Meghalaya State ranks the first position with respect to inclusive growth of schools with computer facility and it is

worked out to 17.46 per cent annual growth during the period 2005-06 to 2014-15 and Gujarat state takes the second position (16.71%). It could be observed that a more than 10 per cent inclusive annual growth of school computer facility is observed in Arunachal Pradesh state, Bihar state, Haryana state, Himachal Pradesh state, Karnataka state, Mizoram state, Punjab state, Rajasthan state, Sikkim state, Tamil Nadu state, Uttar Pradesh state and West Bengal state during the period 2005-06 to 2014-15.

It could be seen that a less than 10 per cent of annual inclusive growth in school computer facility is observed in Andhra Pradesh state, Chandigarh state, Chhattisgarh state, Goa state, Jammu and Kashmir state, Jharkhand state, Madhya Pradesh state, Maharashtra state, Nagaland state, Odisha state, Tripura state and Uttarakhand state during the period 2005-06 to 2014-15.

Table 3- Interstate Disparity in the Performance of Inclusive Growth in School Enrolment during the Five Year Plan Period

State	Enrolment: Classes I-V		Enrolment: Classes VI-VIII		% Girls Enrolment: Primary Level		% Girls Enrolment: Upper Primary Level	
	2007-08	2014-15	2007-08	2014-15	2007-08	2014-15	2007-08	2014-15
Andhra Pradesh	7250479	7006329 (-7.71)	3787907	3847257 (-7.00)	49.3	96.8 (-0.23)	48.6	97.7 (0.00)
Arunachal Pradesh	230161	224044 (-0.34)	79310	101249 (3.10)	47.9	48.9 (0.26)	47.2	50.4 (0.82)
Assam	4193867	4049643 (-0.44)	1508568	1803635 (2.26)	49.4	49.6 (0.05)	50.1	51.8 (0.42)
Bihar	15233293	15340469 (0.09)	3475996	6792648 (8.74)	46.6	49.4 (0.73)	43.0	50.6 (2.06)
Chandigarh	86250	96367 (1.40)	48461	64376 (3.61)	44.7	46.6 (0.52)	45.2	45.2 (0.00)
Chhattisgarh	3181295	2887939 (-1.20)	1226727	1660741 (3.86)	48.9	48.9 (0.00)	48.0	49.2 (0.31)
Goa	93672	123855 (3.55)	57982	72673 (2.86)	48.5	48.0 (-0.13)	45.9	47.6 (0.46)
Gujarat	5806827	5764682 (-0.09)	1855666	3377769 (7.77)	46.7	46.8 (0.03)	44.7	45.2 (0.14)
Haryana	1969409	2493578 (2.99)	977878	1460388 (5.14)	46.1	45.6 (-0.14)	46.6	45.2 (-0.38)
Himachal Pradesh	659422	588761 (-1.41)	424618	369970 (-1.71)	47.3	47.7 (0.11)	47.2	47.4 (0.05)
Jammu and Kashmir	1089695	1243923 (1.67)	571180	609123 (0.81)	46.5	47.7 (0.32)	45.0	47.5 (0.68)
Jharkhand	5464268	4463367 (-2.50)	1255404	2077422 (6.50)	49.0	49.0 (0.00)	46.4	50.0 (0.94)
Karnataka	5617390	5374024 (-0.55)	2304878	2971724 (3.23)	48.4	48.4 (0.00)	48.3	48.3 (0.00)
Kerala	2130628	2467280 (1.85)	1395082	1582034 (1.58)	49.6	48.8 (-0.20)	48.9	48.7 (-0.05)
Madhya Pradesh	11356276	8679685 (-3.30)	4054424	4822784 (2.19)	48.9	47.4 (-0.39)	45.7	48.8 (0.82)
Maharashtra	10321392	10125716 (-0.24)	5336705	6046718 (1.57)	47.1	47.0 (-0.03)	46.8	46.5 (-0.08)
Manipur	352871	355297 (0.09)	123810	152759 (2.66)	49.7	49.4 (-0.08)	49.0	50.1 (0.28)
Meghalaya	459689	539085 (2.01)	116409	217370 (8.12)	50.2	49.9 (-0.07)	52.4	52.7 (0.07)
Mizoram	177710	145210 (-2.49)	57408	68965 (2.32)	48.6	48.2 (-0.10)	49.1	48.3 (-0.21)
Nagaland	269858	241103 (-1.40)	117179	113207 (-0.43)	49.0	48.8 (-0.05)	48.7	49.4 (0.18)
Odisha	4391968	4223628 (-0.49)	1948894	2162855 (1.31)	48.8	48.3 (-0.13)	47.6	48.6 (0.26)
Punjab	1581310	2568056 (6.25)	977648	1453523 (5.08)	46.0	45.3 (-0.19)	46.3	44.3 (-0.55)
Rajasthan	8757869	8140866 (-0.91)	3438766	3885336 (1.54)	46.7	46.3 (-0.11)	40.8	44.7 (1.15)
Sikkim	87107	66672 (-3.29)	34131	44136 (3.27)	49.5	47.3 (-0.57)	54.1	51.3 (-0.66)
Tamil Nadu	6123687	5733734 (-0.82)	3719066	3498733 (-0.76)	48.4	48.7 (0.08)	48.1	48.7 (0.16)

Table 3 Continued

State	Enrolment: Classes I-V		Enrolment: Classes VI-VIII		% Girls Enrolment: Primary Level		% Girls Enrolment: Upper Primary Level	
	2007-08	2014-15	2007-08	2014-15	2007-08	2014-15	2007-08	2014-15
Tripura	464985	374462 (-2.67)	209088	202753 (-0.38)	48.3	49.0 (0.18)	49.1	49.3 (0.05)
Uttar Pradesh	25101907	25806929 (0.35)	6974476	11031791 (5.90)	49.2	48.8 (-0.10)	48.5	50.0 (0.38)
Uttarakhand	1056943	1122802 (0.76)	476069	584655 (2.60)	48.8	47.2 (-0.42)	48.8	48.0 (-0.21)
West Bengal	9463730	8163021 (-1.83)	3807261	4852086 (3.08)	49.1	49.0 (-0.03)	49.6	51.8 (0.54)
India	134132183	130501135 (-0.34)	50911110	67165774 (3.52)	48.2	48.2 (0.00)	47.0	48.6 (0.42)

Source: District Information System for Education

Figures in Parentheses indicates the annual compound growth rate

Table 3 presents data on the Interstate Disparity in the Performance of Inclusive Growth in School Enrolment during the Five Year Plan Period. It could be noted that per cent of school enrolment at the primary level was 134132183 in 2007-08 and it declined to 130501135 in 2014-15, indicating a 0.34 per cent annual growth shortfall during the period. However the inclusive growth in student enrolment at the primary level education shows interstate disparity during the period 2007-08 to 2014-15. It could be noted that a marginal annual growth in student enrolment at the primary level education has been observed in Chandigarh state, Bihar state, Goa state, Haryana state, Jammu and Kashmir state, Kerala state, Manipur state, Meghalaya state, Punjab state, Uttar Pradesh state, and Uttarakhand state and the remaining states record a marginal shortfall with respect to student enrolment at the primary level education.

It could be noted that per cent of school enrolment at the Upper primary level was 50911110 in 2007-08 and it rose to 67165774 in 2014-15, indicating a 3.52 per cent annual growth during the period. However the inclusive growth in student enrolment at the Upper primary level education shows interstate disparity during the period 2007-08 to 2014-15. It could be noted that a marginal decline in student enrolment at the Upper primary level education has been observed in Andhra Pradesh state, Nagaland state, Tamil Nadu and Tripura state during the period 2007-08 to 2014-15. A more than 5 per cent annual growth in student enrolment at the Upper primary level education has been observed in Bihar state, Gujarat state, Haryana state, Jharkhand state, Meghalaya state, Punjab state and Uttar Pradesh state during the period 2007-08 to 2014-15.

It could be noted that per cent of girls student enrolment at the primary level education was 48.2 in 2007-08 and the same level has been maintained in 2014-15. The inclusive growth in girls' student enrolment at the primary level education shows interstate disparity during

the period 2007-08 to 2014-15. It could be noted that a marginal increase in girls student enrolment at the primary level education has been observed in Arunachal Pradesh state, Assam state, Bihar state, Chandigarh state, Gujarat state, Madhya Pradesh state, Jammu and Kashmir State, and Tripura state during the period 2007-08 to 2014-15. It could be noted that girls' student enrolment at the primary level education has become negative in the remaining states during the period 2007-08 to 2014-15.

It could be noted that per cent of girls student enrolment at the Upper primary level education was 47 in 2007-08 and it rose to 48.6 in 2014-15, indicating a 0.42 per cent annual growth during the period 2007-08 to 2014-15. The inclusive growth in girls' student enrolment at the Upper primary level education shows interstate disparity during the period 2007-08 to 2014-15.

It could be noted that a negative annual growth of girls student enrolment at the Upper primary level education has been observed in Kerala state, Maharashtra state, Mizoram state, Punjab state, Sikkim state and Uttarakhand state during the period 2007-08 to 2014-15. It could be noted that girls' student enrolment at the Upper primary level education has become positive in the remaining states during the period 2007-08 to 2014-15.

CONCLUSION

It could be seen clearly from the above discussion that inclusive growth in number of schools and target child population coverage indicates a wide spread interstate disparity. The multiplication of number of schools is quite remarkable in Haryana State, Meghalaya State, Uttarakhand State and West Bengal State during the period 2005-2006 to 2014-2015. In the case of primary schools coverage per 1000 child population for the age group 6-11 years is quite remarkable in Andhra Pradesh, Kerala, West Bengal, Assam, Haryana, Tripura and Rajasthan. The inclusive growth of number of child population coverage at the upper primary level education is quite significant in Andhra Pradesh State, Bihar, Sikkim,

Jharkhand, Nagaland, Meghalaya, Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal during the period 2005-2006 to 2014-2015. Thus the prevalent of interstate disparity in the inclusive growth in schools and population coverage is very clear.

The result of inclusive growth of school facilities reveals the following facts. The inclusive growth in school facilities is not uniform throughout the India. The growth of school ramp facility ranks the first position followed by girls' toilet facility in schools, schools with computer facility, schools with boundary wall and schools with drinking water facilities during the period 2005-2006 to 2014-2015. The growth of schools with drinking water facility is quite remarkable in Meghalaya State and Nagaland State during the period 2005-2006 to 2014-2015. The inclusive growth of girls' toilet facility is quite significant in Arunachal Pradesh State, Chhattisgarh State, Jharkhand State, Meghalaya State and Odisha State during the period 2005-2006 to 2014-2015.

The result of inclusive growth in student enrolment reveals the following facts. It could be noted that the student enrolment from VI-VII standard and per cent of girls enrolment at the upper primary level education have been increased during the period 2007-08 to 2014-15. However student enrolment from I-V standard primary level education has been decreased during the period 2007-08 to 2014-15. A marginal increase in girls student enrolment at the primary level education has been observed in Arunachal Pradesh state, Assam state, Bihar state, Chandigarh state, Gujarat state, Madhya Pradesh state, Jammu and Kashmir State, and Tripura state during the period 2007-08 to 2014-15. It could be noted that girls' student enrolment at the primary level education has become negative in the remaining states during the period 2007-08 to 2014-15.

SUGGESTION

There is a need to increase the computer facility in schools located in Madhya Pradesh state, Jharkhand state, Meghalaya state as they have less number of computer facility.

Efforts should be made to increase the girls student enrolment in Rajasthan state as it records less per cent of girls student enrolment at the upper primary level education.

There is a need to increase the number of primary schools in Bihar state, Chandigarh state and Haryana state according to child population coverage in the age group 6-11 years.

There is a need to increase the number of upper primary schools in Bihar state, Chandigarh state Haryana state, Kerala state, and West Bengal state according to child population coverage in the age group 11-14 years.

REFERENCES

1. G. Hornby. *Inclusive education for children with special educational needs: A critique of policy and practice in New Zealand. Journal of International and Comparative Education*, 2012, 1, (1), pp 52-60.
2. S. J. Pijl, C. J. W Meijer, S. Hegarty. *Inclusive education: a global agenda. Routledge: London, 1997.*
3. *British Psychological Society. Inclusive education. Position paper, BPS: UK, 2002. Available at www.bps.org.uk*
4. T. Booth. *A Perspective on Inclusion from England. Cambridge Journal of Education*. 1996, 26 (1), 87-99.
5. UNESCO. *Overcoming Exclusion through Inclusive Approaches in Education: a Challenge, a vision-Conceptual Paper, Spain, Paris. 2003.*
6. UNESCO. *The Salamanca World Conference on Special Needs education: Access and Quality, UNESCO and the Ministry of Education, Spain. Paris. 1994.*
7. UNESCO. *Final Report of the World Education Forum, Dakar. Paris, 26-28 April 2000.*
8. L. Barton. *Inclusive education: Romantic, subversive or realistic. International Journal of Inclusive Education*. 1997, 1(3) 231-42.
9. UNESCO. *Policy Guidelines on Inclusion in Education, Paris. 2009.*
10. Misra. *Special education in India: current status and future directions, DISES Journal*. 2000, 3, 6-11.
11. M. Alur. *Special needs policy in India, In M. Alur & S. Hegarty, Eds.; Education and children with special needs: from segregation to inclusion Sage: New Delhi, 2002, pp51-66.*
12. MHRD. *Action plan for inclusion in education of children and youth with disabilities. Government of India, New Delhi. 2005.*
13. MSJE. *Education for Differently Aabled. Government of India, New Delhi. 2015.*
14. S.K.Pathy. *The role of distance education in Inclusive Education. Learning Community-An International Journal of Educational and Social Development*. 2010, 1(1), pp84-93.
15. DFID. *Disability, Poverty and Development, Department for International Development: London, 2000.*
16. *National Sample Survey Organization. Disabled persons in India. NSS 58th round, Government of India, New Delhi. 2003.*
17. Garuba. *Inclusive education in the 21st century: Challenges and opportunities for Nigeria. Asia Pacific Disability Rehabilitation Journal*. 2003, 14(2), 191-200.
18. S.O. Okenyi. *The Enigma of Specific Learning Disability and the African School Child: Case for Programme of Counselling. Approaches in International Journal of Research Development*. 2010. (2) 2,1-16.
19. Rao. *Inclusive Education in the Indian Context. Enabling Education Network. 2003.*
20. M. Puri, G Abraham. *Handbook of Inclusive Education for Educators, Administrators and Planners- Within wall without boundaries. Sage: New Delhi, 2004.*
21. S. Hegarty, J. W Meijer, S. J. Pijl. *Inclusive Education: A Global Agenda. Routledge: London, 1997.*
22. S. Hegarty, M. Alur. *Education and Children with Special Needs: From Segregation to Inclusion, Sage: Thousand Oaks, Calif, 2002.*