

REVIEW AND MODERATION OF THE CRITERIA OF NURSERY & KG ADMISSION IN THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS

Chapter - I

Introduction

1. The Hon'ble High Court of Delhi had passed order dated 4th September, 2006 in LPA No. 196/2004, constituting a committee of experts in the field of education to recommend a common procedure of admission of children to nursery class in the private schools of Delhi. The terms of reference stipulated by the court required the committee to suggest ways and means to eliminate the system of interview, bring about complete transparency and minimize the discretion of the management/principal in the process of admission of children to the nursery class. Accordingly, after holding wide consultations and examining suggestions and views from different stakeholders, the committee evolved a common procedure of admission to the nursery class with specifically identified criteria and weightage points and submitted its report in the month of October, 2006.
- 1.1 The Court passed an order dated 17th October, 2006 notifying that the recommendations of the committee for admission to nursery class would be given a trial for the academic session 2007-08. In subsequent orders dated 3rd and 21st November, 2006 the Court had directed the schools to file objections to the report incorporating suggestions keeping in view the overarching guidelines that the Court had fixed. The Court reiterated its position in its order dated 8th December, 2006 stating that while the recommendations of the committee could be given a trial on an experimental basis during the academic session 2007-08, Government of NCT of Delhi, various schools and other stakeholders should submit their suggestions and objections for further consideration. Pursuant to this order, the Directorate of Education, Delhi had filed an affidavit. On examining the affidavit and considering the representations made before the Court by some of the schools, the Court passed an order dated 8th March, 2007 directing the committee to review its recommendations in the light of the suggestions and views received from different stakeholders and submit its report to the Court for its consideration and appropriate orders. The Secretary of Education, Government of NCT, Delhi was asked to collect the suggestions and opinions from various stakeholders and hand over all the papers to the Convener of the Committee. The Court directed the committee to discuss and examine the suggestions and fine tune the methodology and moderate the criteria for nursery admission. While emphasizing the need to ensure a fair, transparent, and just admission process, the Court also asked the committee to give its opinion regarding the nature of formal interaction with the parents.

1.2 This introduction will be incomplete without a brief mention of the orders of the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi prior to the constitution of the committee to go into the entire gamut of issues relating to nursery admission in the private schools of Delhi. The Court had asked the private schools of Delhi in its orders dated 9th December, 2005, 31st January, 2006 and 28th February, 2006 to evolve a methodology where the admission at the entry level to 3+ and 4+ children is not based on interview of the child or of the parents. The Court had directed, at the request of association of schools, that they themselves should evolve certain parameters so as to bring about transparency. In response to this direction the committee appointed by the Action Committee of unaided Private Schools had submitted a report for the consideration of the Court. After perusing the report the Court in its order dated 5th April, 2006 observed that the Action Committee had not addressed the basic issue as to how the discretion of the management can be minimized and transparency is ensured in the nursery admission. Since no concrete proposals were brought forward by the schools, the Court, in its wisdom, felt it necessary to constitute a committee of experts in the field of education (order dated 4th September, 2006) and it was thus, that what has now been referred to as the 'Ganguly Committee' came to be set up. For the sake of record the details of the committee are given below:

1.	Shri Ashok Ganguly	-	Chairman
2.	Dr. Shyama Chona	-	Convener
3.	Father T.V. Kunnunkal	-	Member
4.	Shri Ved Vyas	-	Member
5.	Dr. Anil Wilson	-	Member

1.3 In its order dated 8th March, 2007, the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi appointed Dr. Krishna Kumar, Director, NCERT as a member of the committee in place of Dr. Anil Wilson since Dr. Wilson had left Delhi to take up the post of the Vice Chancellor of Himachal University at Shimla.

1.4 From this account it becomes clear that the private schools and the associations of such schools of Delhi had been given the opportunity to evolve the parameters of nursery admission through mutual consultations and arrive at a consensus. Since they were unable to come up with a satisfactory solution, it has resulted in the intervention of the Court to introduce a regulatory mechanism in the larger public interest of both the children and society. It may be noted that the Committee constituted for the purpose has taken the concerns and suggestions received from schools, parents and other stakeholders into consideration and has endeavoured to review, fine-tune and moderate its recommendations without making any compromise on the three core principles that the Court has repeatedly advocated:

- No interview be conducted for tiny tots at the time of admission.
- There be total transparency in the admission system
- Discretionary power of the management of schools be minimized.

1.5 In order to understand the feedback and suggestions received from the stakeholders in proper context it is necessary to briefly look at the salient recommendations that Ganguly Committee made earlier:

- Schools shall completely eliminate interview of and interaction with children and parents.
- There would be no overall lottery system adopted to select/short list children for admission. Limited use of lottery system would be adopted at the last stage to break any tie.
- A common admission procedure with a standardized registration form and time schedule shall be followed by all the schools.
- A hundred point matrix for calculation of weightage for different criteria as detailed below shall be followed by schools

Criterion	Maximum Points
Neighbourhood	20
Sibling	20
Alumni	10
Children with special needs	05
Educational Qualifications of Parents	20
Girl Child	05
School-specific parameters	20

- The Committee had recommended that 10% of the total seats may be allotted to the discretion of the management.

Apart from giving the rationale for the above recommendations, the committee had also suggested that the procedure and criteria may be reviewed after a trial period. By implementing the common admission procedure with the 100 point matrix for specific criteria, the committee felt that the entire admission process would become more fair, transparent, just and hassle free and would thus promote the cardinal values that should underpin all our educational endeavours in the country. It is against this background that the committee examined the feedback and suggestions from different quarters.

In a related development the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi passed an order dated 7th March, 2007 while disposing of a Writ Petition (C) No. 12490/2006. The order directed Ganguly Committee to try and find out a viable and all comprehensive policy for pre-primary education in Delhi so

that admission to the pre-primary education class/classes as the case may be is made homogeneous and uniform. The main issues figuring in the Court's directive are as follows:

- What should be the minimum age for a child to be eligible for admission to pre-primary class at the entry level?
- What should be the cut off date for determining the age of a child for the purpose of admission to pre-primary class keeping Section 16 of Delhi School Education Act in view?
- What should be the duration of pre-primary class?

The Ganguly committee has since submitted its report to the Government of NCT, Delhi as directed by the Court. Though the issue of age is very closely linked to the common procedure and criteria of nursery admission, the committee feels that the two issues should not be combined at this stage lest the picture should get blurred. So, for the sake of focused deliberation and clarity, the committee has restricted its present report to the aspect of finetuning and moderation of its earlier recommendations pertaining to the 100 point scale with allotment of weightage points for different eligibility criteria, while maintaining a uniform admission procedure. This clarification, it is felt, is necessary to establish a proper perspective to the ensuing recommendations of the committee in the fourth chapter of this report. Hence the report consistently uses the term 'nursery class' to denote the entry level class in a school. Other terms such as 'pre-primary' and 'pre-school' class have been omitted to avoid confusion.

Chapter – II

Feedback

2. As mentioned in Chapter I, the recommendations of the Committee were put to trial during the current academic year that commenced on 1st April, 2007 in the private schools of Delhi for making admission of children to the nursery class. In the meantime some feedback in the form of objections and suggestions was received from various stakeholders through media report and also in the form of representations.
- 2.1 The suggestions received from the following stakeholders were made available to the committee by the Directorate of Education, Delhi:
 - (i) Forum for Promotion of Quality Education for All
 - (ii) Action Committee of Unaided Recognized Private Schools
 - (iii) Principal, Sardar Patel Public School, Aya Nagar, New Delhi
 - (iv) Directorate of Education, Government of NCT of Delhi
- 2.2 The committee felt that there was a need to get additional feedback particularly from the private schools of Delhi where the admission to nursery class had been carried out for the current academic year of 2007-08 on the basis of the Ganguly Committee recommendations. A simple questionnaire was devised and sent to the private schools of Delhi both by conventional mail and e-mail. The main thrust of the exercise was to find out whether the schools experienced any difficulties or problems in implementing the new criteria and norms for nursery admission this year. It also sought to obtain their suggestions for moderating the norms. Significantly the schools were also requested to indicate whether the profile of the nursery class had changed this year in terms of diversity in home background, parents' education and occupation and gender parity. Though the feedback was provided only by a few schools of Delhi, the committee considered it extremely useful, providing insight into different aspects of nursery admission in particular and management of educational change in general. The format of the questionnaire has been annexed with this report.
- 2.3 Besides the above mentioned modes of accessing feedback from the main stakeholders, i.e. schools, school associations and Directorate of Education, the committee also decided to have both formal and informal interaction with principals of schools of minority character and others who have been actively associated with the issue of nursery admission.

2.4 Shri Ashok Agarwal, Senior Advocate and activist was invited to a meeting of the committee for formal interaction. The inputs he provided were very useful for the committee in finetuning the parameters. The principals of some private schools were also invited for informal discussions and their views were also taken into consideration by the committee while making alterations in the norms for admission. A summary of the views and suggestions from the above mentioned stakeholders is given below:

2.5 **Action Committee, Unaided Private Recognized Schools:** The Action Committee had previously constituted a committee headed by Ms. Justice Usha Mehra to evolve a process of admission to nursery classes. The process involved four steps.

Step-1: An admission committee consisting of Principal, Incharge-Pre-Primary, Incharge-Primary (Vice Principal) and a Child Psychologist/Teacher having special training in Child Education would be constituted.

Step-2: Application from eligible children would be invited. The applications received would be divided into various categories on the basis of the background of the parents with eight suggested categories (illustrative, not exhaustive) consisting of professionals, businessmen, private sector employees, government servants, wards of old students, siblings, economically weaker sections, wards of teachers etc.

Step-3: The Admission Committee would allocate prorata seats among various categories referred to at step two above and a list of eligible children in each category would be prepared.

Step-4: Seats would be allocated in each category by allotting weightage points as per the following categories:

- 25% weightage for neighbourhood with differential weightage within this criteria in terms of distance from the school
- 20% weightage for educational and other achievements of the parents. (10% weightage to each parent)
- 30% weightage for interaction with parents. The committee has laid down guidelines for the manner in which the weightage points have to be allotted.
- 25% weightage for observation of the child in group activities.

The Action Committee has recommended that the above process should be adopted for making admission to the nursery class. It has also argued for maximum autonomy to private schools with regard to administration including the right of admission of students. It is not in favour of weightage given to siblings and alumni categories arguing that the student

population would then become more homogeneous on account of this. It has also advanced an argument for deleting the category of children with special needs on the ground that several schools may not have the facilities and expertise to cater to the children with special needs. The Action Committee is of the opinion that schools should be free to admit such children depending upon their capacities. It also observed that on account of the haphazard pattern of growth of educational institutions, the neighbourhood school concept would infringe upon the right of the parents to admit their children to schools of their choice. Making a strong plea for interaction with parents, the Action Committee summed up its suggestions by observing that the admission procedure in vogue for such a long time has been found to be working satisfactorily and hence questioned the need for any change.

2.6 **Forum for Promotion of Quality Education for All:**

- Distribution of private schools is uneven and unsystematic in Delhi. So it is difficult to apply the neighbourhood criterion fairly or with any element of equity. Hence it is suggested that the neighbourhood criterion should get very little weightage.
- The importance of siblings studying in the same school has to be recognized. However by reason of application of the neighbourhood criterion along with sibling criterion, several siblings have had to be denied admission in the same school. Therefore schools should be given complete discretion in relation to the admission of siblings.
- Giving weightage to the educational qualifications of parents perpetuates elitism. It also leads to discrimination and hence this criterion must be deleted.
- Without an interactive process it is impossible for the school to find out whether a child is indeed a 'special needs child'. So discretion should be given to schools to interact with parents and the children to ascertain whether the children would need special attention.
- While it is necessary to ensure that there is gender parity in classroom, weightage given to girl child has resulted in a skewed student population with a disproportionately high number of girls getting admission. Therefore this criterion has to be completely eliminated.
- Minority schools should also follow the recommendations of the Ganguly committee

- Since private unaided schools enjoy autonomy under the Delhi School Education Act, each school should be permitted to determine its own admission criteria, including interaction with parents. However the Court may, if deemed fit, identify such questions as may not be asked in any interaction.

2.7 **Principal, Sardar Patel Public School, Aya Nagar, New Delhi**

On account of the intense competition and the different criteria suggested by the Ganguly Committee, there may be a propensity for parents to give incorrect information or submit distorted information. The method suggested by the committee for scrutiny of registration forms may not be sufficient to filter out forms which contain incorrect or distorted information. So before giving admission to a child, the school may be permitted to verify the information given by the parent by an appropriate method. It would be for the schools to choose the mechanism for physically verifying the particulars.

2.8 **Directorate of Education, Delhi**

- The recommendations of Ganguly Committee are by and large useful in bringing about greater transparency in the admission process.
- Elimination of interviews and admission test is also a positive step.
- However the following reservations are made by the Delhi Directorate
- The criteria are loaded in favour of families having parents with higher educational qualifications thereby discriminating against first generation learners and parents from other occupations like factory workers, businessmen etc.
- The criteria are also loaded in favour of alumni factor thereby discriminating against parents who may not have studied in that particular school.
- The neighbourhood policy will also not be effective since there is uneven distribution of good schools in Delhi.
- The weightage given to the girl child has resulted in a skewed distribution of student population.
- In view of the above mentioned facts it is suggested that each school should have the autonomy to devise its own parameters for admission but these must be made transparent and public.

2.9 The salient points contained in the suggestions and comments received from the private schools of Delhi are summarized below:

- Some schools have suggested that the weightage given to school specific parameters may be increased to provide more scope to meet local requirements.
- Many schools are of the view that the maximum weightage of 20 points allotted to sibling category requires reconsideration because it gives an undue advantage to this group affecting the chances of other deserving cases.
- Some schools have suggested that the neighbourhood concept may be revisited and made more flexible. While children coming from the immediate neighbourhood should get preference, there should be some provision to accommodate children coming from underserved localities of Delhi even if such localities are not covered by the distance limit stipulated in the new norms.
- On the neighbourhood concept a school has recommended that the school should be given the freedom to decide its neighbourhood rather than follow a very tight 3-5-8 and 10 kilometer formula.
- The points given based on the educational qualifications of the parents have evoked a strong response. Many schools have pointed out that it is discriminatory and there should be some provision for considering even those who have not had college education or who are first generation learners.
- Though schools, by and large, agree that parents who went to a particular school might want to send their children to the same school, they have suggested that in order to claim points under this head, the parent should at least be a member of the Alumni Association of that school. Otherwise a parent who has studied for brief durations in more than one school may claim undue advantage from a string of schools. The other alternative that has been suggested is that only if the parent has passed out of a school at class X & XII – with certification from a Board of Education be given, points under alumni criterion.
- Many schools have said that though there has been a lot of criticism about giving 20 points to the sibling category, it is justified because it is easy for a parent when their children go to the same school. However, they have suggested that there could be an

Upper Limit under sibling category or the points allotted under this norm could be reduced from 20.

- Welcoming the school-specific parameters, many schools have observed that these points can be used to promote the ideals, values and policies that are followed by each institution.
- There has been a mixed reaction to the girl child criterion. Some have stated that it will surely promote girl's education while certain others have said that it will lead to an imbalance in gender ratio. However almost all the schools agree that the ideal would be to move steadily towards perfect gender parity in the classroom and even if, in the initial years, girls outnumber boys by a small margin, it should not be a cause of concern.
- Some schools have pointed out that there has been a slight change in the socio-economic profile of the student population, reflecting greater diversity since discretion of the school management has been effectively curtailed.
- On the contrary some schools have said that diversity has been a casualty on account of siblings getting an overwhelming advantage.
- Some schools are still insisting that interaction with parents should be allowed to arrive at a considered judgement about views and values of parents and to ascertain whether the school should enter into a long term partnership with them.
- The feedback suggests that verification of particulars given by parents particularly under the neighbourhood criterion (residential address and educational qualifications) has proved to be difficult. The suggestion to meet this challenge is that parents should be asked to attach attested photocopies of certificates/documents with the registration form.
- A school has observed that in recent years there has been a marked change in the family structure in Delhi. Many parents are gradually veering around one child norm. Those with single boy offspring felt discriminated against because of the twin criteria of siblings and girl child.
- The feedback from a school suggests that the time schedule for common admission procedure is very lengthy and it adversely affected the routine teaching during this crucial period (from 1st December to 20th February). So it has suggested that the admission process should be curtailed to five weeks.

- There is a general consensus among the private schools of Delhi that there has been an increase in the number of registrations this year exacerbating the mismatch between demand and availability. So they have very strongly recommended that urgent steps are needed to improve the quality of education imparted in government schools.
- A school principal has written that schools that have established a reputation in the community due to their quality, stability and values face huge problems with regard to admissions. 'No matter how transparent their system, certain bigwigs would not stop short of any wisdom or rationale but force their way in'. He has pointed out that some schools have not retained seats under management quota and declared all as open seats to try to withstand such pressures. Still the pressure for admission seems never ending. So he has asked: "Could the Ganguly Committee find a solution to prevent pressure tactics at least where absolute transparency is maintained?"
- A Principal has suggested that minority schools should be given freedom to select children for admission based on their aims and objectives.
- A school principal has observed that the new admission procedure has undoubtedly brought about a transformation in the diversity of students admitted. However he has suggested that specific guidelines and clear instructions regarding educational qualifications, special needs and school-specific parameters will definitely ease the admission process further.

2.10 **Some general observations on the feedback from schools**

- To the question whether schools faced any problem in implementing the new formula for making admission to nursery class this year, schools that have received a small number of registration forms have replied in the negative.
- It has been observed that the number of girls admitted to the nursery class has not registered any huge increase though many schools have expressed their concern that the points allotted to the girl child would give the girls an unfair advantage at the expense of deserving male children.
- The alumni factor also has not resulted in too many children getting admission under this category. Even in well-established old

schools there has been no big change in the admission profile on account of alumni suggesting that these schools must have been accommodating such children in the previous years also.

2.11 **Association of Schools for Quality Education**

The Association is very critical of the 100 point framework and says that it would lead to gamble and luck and encourage elitism. The neighbourhood concept impinges on parents' right to choose the school for their children to study. The Association calls for a complete change in the system whereby 40% seats would be decided by draw of lots, 20% would go to Economically Weaker Section and 40% would be for management quota. It also argues for the inclusion of interaction with parents.

2.12 **Shri Ashok Agarwal, Senior Advocate**

Shri Agarwal said that the committee's recommendations have really brought about transparency in the admission procedure. Further the hassle-free admission has indeed made a large section of parents happy. However, wherever there has been a conflict between personal and social interest some resentment has been expressed. Criteria such as Sibling, Alumni and Educational Qualification of parents have been perceived as arbitrary by some institutions and individuals.

Shri Agarwal also pointed out that the neighbourhood school concept has really set in motion a trend towards more equitable educational opportunities. He cited the example of parents putting their children in neighbourhood schools instead of sending them to far-off schools that have so far been considered to be 'quality private schools'. This trend is healthy because even the newly-established and not so 'famous' schools are also getting talented children. In course of time most of the schools will attain comparable quality standards if this trend continues.

Shri Agarwal contended that the primary focus should be on the child and any criteria that are based on parents or other extraneous factors would be considered arbitrary. As for the applicability of the recommendations to minority institutions, Shri Agarwal argued that while minority institutions have been given the right (under Article 30 (1) of the Constitution, the Courts have also indicated that this does not include the right to mal administer. The State has a right to intervene or monitor such matters. Minority schools would retain their right to admission as per their own norms in respect of minority children but for admissions of other students the common procedure should be applied. But admission of children in the latter category should be on the basis of the recommendations of the Committee.

Shri Agarwal requested the committee to consider the suggestion of keeping neighbourhood as the only criterion for admission. He said that it would lead to social justice, equality and non-exploitative procedure in school education. He suggested that 80% of seats could be reserved for children coming from within a radius of 10 km and 20% seats could be reserved for children coming from areas beyond 10 km. This would ensure that parents are not put to any disadvantage due to the non-even distribution of good schools in different parts of Delhi. He also suggested that the 20% given for school-specific criteria should be withdrawn as this provision is not used in a transparent manner by many schools.

2.13 The Action Committee, Unaided Recognized Private Schools sent fresh feedback on the recommendations of the committee. It has stated, 'In the larger interest of the schools and community we have considered all your recommendations and suggest some changes and modifications'. These are summarized below:

- The neighbourhood concept has received the approval of most of the members of the Action Committee. It has suggested that the weightage could be increased.
- The Action Committee has suggested weightage points given to sibling and alumni category could be reduced.
- It has suggested that only children with physical handicaps should be considered under the criterion of children with special needs.
- It is of the view that in the place of educational qualifications points may be given on prorata basis for the occupations and professions of parents. It has provided a detailed list of different professions and occupations.
- The Action Committee feels that weightage given to girl child is not relevant to progressive schools where boys and girls are treated equally.
- School Specific Parameters have been received well. The Action Committee agrees with the recommendations of the committee that the parameters should be transparent and they should be announced before the admission procedure starts. It is of the view that schools should not use this parameter for including interview of the children and parents.
- The forum has suggested that the management quota may be increased to 15%.

Chapter – III

The Rationale for Arriving at Recommendations

- 3.1 The National Curriculum Framework – 2005, in an insightful exposition of the ‘Quality Dimension’ in school education makes a significant observation: ‘The belief that quality goes with privilege is clearly irreconcilable with the vision of participatory democracy that India upholds and practices in the political sphere’. The increasing impact of consumerism on education has brought the issue of harnessing equality, quality and quantity into sharper focus. NCF-2005 states “In a system of education that is divided between a fast-growing private sector and larger state sector marked by shortages and the uneven spread of resources, the issue of quality poses complex conceptual and practical questions”. In urban areas like Delhi, the popular perception that private schools have higher quality has, inter alia, created an exceedingly excessive demand for admission to such private schools. The social context of education also plays a major role in determining access to education and participation of children in school. The sharp disparities between different social and economic groups have also led to differential access to the various grades and types of educational institutions.
- 3.2 The spread of market dynamics in these times of globalization has resulted in increasing commercialization of education on one hand and a frenetic search for ‘alternative’ schools on the other. The increasingly competitive environment into which schools are being drawn and the rising aspirations of parents have accentuated the divide between schools in terms of quality deliverables and infrastructural facilities. In this complex situation, the cost of education as reflected by the fees charged by schools seems to have become immaterial, going by the trend of parents with even moderate economic means showing readiness to make sacrifices in order to send their children to ‘good public schools’. All the above factors have contributed to the growing influence that well-established private schools wield in the urban areas of the country. However, it is important to bear in mind that just as there exists a wide range of schools in the government sector, the private schools also present a picture of extreme heterogeneity. As a consequence, the big mismatch between supply and availability of seats applies only to a small percentage of private schools in Delhi on account of the popular belief that they provide higher quality education. In the absence of a systematic school mapping with data on the facilities and achievements of private schools in Delhi, it would be difficult to state the exact number of such private schools which are in very high demand. However a rough estimate would put this figure at two or three dozen schools. So, in a sense, the question at hand is about enforcing strictly a common admission norm to all private schools of Delhi. This also would highlight

the very relevant and important issue of the urgent need to improve the quality of education across the spectrum of schools, both in the private and government sector, so that the demand becomes more evenly spread out, reducing the pressure on the few 'high profile schools'

- 3.3 Another point of debate is on the issue of providing some freedom and flexibility to private schools in administration including their right to select children for admission. While there is merit in the demand for such freedom, the private schools can not be given carte blanche powers in the context of the need to establish an admission process that is fair, transparent, just and non-exploitative. So when, in the feedback, some stakeholders have raised the question: "Where is the need for any change in the admission procedure in vogue for such a long time which has been successful and effective?", they have to be reminded that an intervention has become necessary because of the many unhealthy practices that have crept into the system over the years. That the system of *laissez-faire* has not helped private schools become more accountable and transparent to their client group, namely to the parents and this is a sad fact. The Court's intervention in this regard and its insistence on three cardinal principles of transparency, no interview and minimum discretion to the management have been considered by the committee as non negotiable norms to be enforced and it is on such a premise that the entire rationale of the moderation of its earlier recommendations is founded.
- 3.4 It is against the background outlined above the committee feels very strongly that it should espouse the recommendations that it presents in Chapter IV of this report. These have been arrived at after careful consideration of the arguments for accepting or not accepting the suggestions received from different stakeholders. The delineation of the committee's stand is presented below issue-wise. Later the admission procedure and criteria as reviewed and fine tuned have been explained with added reasons and justifications.

Major Issues Identified and the Committee's views on them:

- 3.5 **Greater or even total freedom to be given to schools to evolve and implement their own procedures or in applying the common procedure for making admission to the nursery class:**

Some stakeholders have argued that each school should have the autonomy to devise its own parameters for admission as long as these are made transparent and public. The committee discussed this suggestion at length and explored the possibility of giving broad guidelines and criteria and letting the schools have the freedom to fix their own parameters under the 100 point system depending on their context and needs. Grant of freedom to administer is what the Committee strongly

supports, both in private schools and as much in Government schools. When such freedom is exercised within a framework of accountability, we foresee many new initiatives and progress would take place in that climate of 'freedom to learn'. Rather than look at it as an academic issue, we looked at the real conditions obtaining on the ground. If the schools are left to do what they choose and decide, we would take the entire admission process back to the same old state of arbitrariness and unfair practices from which the present initiative aims to liberate the system. Even if schools are allowed to devise their own criteria, even within a set of do's and don'ts, by what mechanism can we ensure that they are being applied in a transparent and just manner unless the process is monitored in every individual school? It would require a mammoth and extremely efficient monitoring mechanism which, unfortunately, does not exist, nor can one be created in the foreseeable future. In the national capital, where power, privilege and money play key roles, a transparent external monitoring norm which would introduce a public social audit seems to us the road ahead. Even granting that we are able to monitor each individual school, what remedial or corrective action will be taken to ensure that the admission process is just, fair, transparent and non-exploitative? So it seems wiser to enforce a minimum common procedural structure with adequate inbuilt flexibilities to allow some scope to enable schools to accommodate school-specific needs. Accordingly, in the final recommendations, we have presented a balanced mix of freedom with accountability, within a common framework.

3.6 **Interaction with Parents**

School associations and some schools have made a case for including formal interaction with the parents in order to verify the authenticity and veracity of information provided by them in the registration forms. Certain others have argued that interaction with parents is necessary to ascertain whether their children have any special needs. Some schools have said that without talking to the parents, the schools would not be able to ascertain the parents' values, expectations and views on education, which would enable the schools to evaluate 'effective parenting support'. This 'bee in the bonnet syndrome' about the need for interaction with the parents before finalizing the admission is a little intriguing, to say the least. To refer back, the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi had asked the schools to come up with a credible procedure to ensure fair admission practices. Since this did not take place, the Ganguly committee was set up. To say that the committee is against all interaction with parents, who are going to be close partners in the education of their children would be grossly incorrect. The court has also asked the committee to decide on the nature of the formal interaction. Prima facie there is every reason to be concerned about the practice of holding interaction with parents before the admission process is completed.

The practice of conducting interviews with parents of nursery-age children has been going on for a long time. It is agreed that this practice permits schools to interact with parents with a view to assessing certain aspects of the family environment. Such an interaction raises basic questions about the goal of nursery education in the context of educational policy. Under the 1986 National Policy on Education, every child is a potential human resource to be harnessed for national and social development. The recent amendment made in the Constitution further reinforces the perspective that every child, irrespective of social background or economic factors affecting the circumstances in which he or she is born, has a fundamental right to elementary education. Such a perspective denies any scope for assessing the suitability of a small child for nursery education in a particular school. Nor is there any scope for selection on the basis of either the child's own or his/her parents' status, inclinations, tendencies, proclivities or capacities. The idea of interviewing parents or conducting any form of formal interaction prior to admission in nursery runs against the very basis on which India's National Policy on Education stands. Therefore, this Committee upholds the importance of avoiding any interview with parents or any other formal interaction with them or with the child prior to the completion of the admission process and the declaration of the list of selected children.

It is a matter of satisfaction that the majority of the schools have accepted the norm of 'no interview of children' and it is a healthy beginning. The committee feels that if we do not compromise on the issue of interaction with parents before the admission of the child, a conducive climate will emerge for schools and other stakeholders to perceive the merit in eliminating any sort of interaction with parents before the admission is finalized. However there is a real need to include a mechanism for verifying the particulars given by parents in the registration form. The committee had recommended in its earlier report that parents need not attach any supporting documents with the registration form. Looking into the reality situations that have emerged, (affidavits regarding residence, degrees etc.) the committee now feels that parents should attach attested photocopies of certificates and other supporting documents with the registration form so that at the time of scrutinizing the form, the admission committee can weed out those that are not authenticated or supported by documentary proof. This will circumvent the need for personal interaction before admission. However parents have to be called to the school for completing the formal admission process and at that time schools can clarify issues of authenticity and veracity. So the committee's stand is that formal interaction with parents should be allowed only after the declaration of the list of selected candidates and that too for finalizing the admission, payment of fee etc. The schools are at liberty to seek any clarification at that time and take appropriate decisions if documents are not genuine.

3.7 **Neighbourhood as the sole criterion for deciding the admission**

There has been a plea at least from one stakeholder for keeping neighbourhood as the only criterion to decide nursery admission. There were also representations that the neighbourhood criterion is inappropriate. The committee had stated in its earlier report that the neighbourhood criterion could be adopted as one of the criteria with some flexibility to provide for the uneven distribution of schools in different localities in Delhi. Further, in the absence of a systematic school mapping in the capital, it is not advisable to establish a very rigid pattern in terms of distance. So the committee had stated that a beginning could be made in this regard and in due course of time a road map for the evolution of a common school system may be developed.

Therefore, in the present circumstances it would not be fair to have neighbourhood as the sole criterion to decide admission. The changing social pattern and increased mobility away from crowded areas to the suburbs on newly developing colonies must also be kept in view. Above all, if the admission process rests on only one criterion, in schools that receive a large number of applications, discriminating between registered children and making a selection would become difficult. Moreover, in the absence of an effective discriminating yardstick, draw of lots would become necessary at the initial stage itself. The committee has already stated that it is not healthy to resort to lottery system involving a very large number of children. On account of the above reasons it is healthy to have an admission process that involves multiple criteria.

3.8 **The 100 Point Scale and Various Criteria of Admission**

It is but natural that implementing a change of this magnitude affecting a vast number of people would surely result in some teething problems. That is why the committee had suggested in its earlier report that the procedure would require review after a trial period, based on the feedback from different stakeholders. There is no doubt that certain concerns have to be addressed and certain aspects fine tuned and moderated to make the process achieve the objectives for which the initiative became necessary. It is conceded by many heads of institutions as well as parents that for the first time the common man stood a reasonable chance of admitting his child in a good private school without any hassle and without access to any extraneous 'power'. At this juncture it is necessary to point out that the committee's policy has not been school-centric or parent-centric but child-centric. While the hassle-free admission has indeed made a large section of parents happy, wherever there was conflict between personal and social interest, some resentment has surfaced.

With this brief preamble the committee presents the explanation of the rationale behind the fine-tuned criteria below:

3.9 **Neighbourhood**

Since the committee had included a detailed explanation of the neighbourhood concept in its earlier report, it is not repeated here. The feedback suggests that the majority of the stakeholders have appreciated this criterion as it provides children access to schools situated near their homes obviating long distance travel. It is not healthy for the small children to spend long hours in travel that too in the early hours of the day. It is not uncommon to see children falling asleep in buses and other modes of transport. So the distance criterion has to be rationalized to suit the needs of tender children. Parents are now willing to admit their children in neighbourhood schools instead of sending them to far-off schools that have so far been considered to be 'quality private schools'. This trend is healthy because even the newly-established and not so 'famous' schools are also getting talented children. If this trend continues, most of the schools would attain comparable quality standards in course of time.

Though the general context of the goals of education should suggest a movement towards the common school system, the committee feels that the weightage points for neighbourhood criterion can not be increased by a big margin. The reason is that Delhi, as a city, reflects the culture of homogeneous social groups and it is not healthy to give unduly high weightage for neighbourhood which might discourage intermingling of children from different social and economic backgrounds. It would go against the principle of diversity and heterogeneity. At the same time, taking into consideration the positive response to neighbourhood policy from majority of stakeholders, it would be appropriate to slightly increase the weightage to this criterion.

Another aspect that engaged the attention of the committee was the distance differentials under this parameter. There is a need to increase the upper distance limit from 10 km to 15 km in order to provide for greater opportunities to children residing in underserved areas of Delhi. The decision to consider applications from 'non- Delhi areas' (Gurgaon, Faridbad, Ghaziabad etc.) for the purpose of admission may be left to the discretion of each school. Immediate neighbourhood would be defined as areas within 3 km radius, and children coming from these areas would get the maximum weightage point of 30.

It is also suggested that children coming from areas that are beyond 15 km may also be considered but no additional points are given. Thus the

neighbourhood criterion would be fine tuned with some inbuilt flexibility and some scope for exercising discretion in the hands of the schools.

3.10 **Siblings and Alumni**

The advantages of siblings attending the same school can not be overstated. However the feedback suggests that in some schools there has been an overcrowding of siblings adversely affecting the chances of other deserving children. This necessitates a reduction in the allotment of weightage points. Simultaneously an upper limit or cap under sibling category could also be thought of. Discretion by schools should be allowed in the case of a fraternal twin who is a girl getting admission while her brother does not.

The figures received from schools do not suggest any marked change in the number of children getting admission under the alumni category over the previous year. However if too many siblings and alumni gain admission in a particular school, it would result in inbreeding and consequent denial of admission to diverse groups. So some cap can be worked out for alumni category also. The discretion to apply the cap or upper limit for both sibling and alumni category could be left to the schools.

There is also a need to define who an 'alumnus' is for claiming the weightage under this category. Feedback received from some schools suggests that parents who have studied in more than one school for brief durations have claimed the advantage from a string of schools. In order to rationalize this aspect, it has been decided that only the parents who have passed either class X or class XII Board examination from a school can be allotted the weightage points under 'Alumni' category. So parents have to attach attested copies of their class X or class XII Board Examination Certificates to claim the points under this criterion.

3.11 **Children with Special Needs**

Many respondents have pointed out that children with special needs should not be a separate category since all schools do not have the facilities or expertise to cater to them. Further, it can be part of the school-specific parameters. Though there is some merit in this suggestion, the committee, after careful consideration of all the aspects in this regard, has decided to retain the criterion of the special needs of children with disabilities. Today there is a need to promote inclusive education and all the schools have to take positive steps to provide infrastructural facilities as well as training to teachers so that children with special needs can gain admission to mainstream education. In the name of exclusive education if we keep out children with physical disabilities, the other children will never

get the opportunity in their formative years to gain an insight into the life needs of physically challenged children. When schooling becomes inclusive, the mainstreamed children learn better and the other children also cherish the experience of studying with a heterogeneous peer group. Such an experience is enriching and elevating for all children, leading to a complete and wholesome learning process. The PWD Act also aims at providing barrier-free access to education to children with disabilities. Central Board of Secondary Education to which most of the schools in Delhi are affiliated has also taken many steps to extend certain facilities and concessions to candidates with disabilities in the examinations conducted by the Board. Further, all the affiliated schools have been requested to extend these facilities to children with disabilities in the school examinations at lower classes also. Provision of ramp, separate toilet facilities and easy access to classroom are also to be part of the school infrastructure. Keeping the overall aim of inclusive education in view, the committee is of the opinion that schools can not deny admission to children with special needs on the ground that they are not equipped to do so. On the contrary, schools should take steps to prepare themselves and their teachers to discharge this very important responsibility. However, in schools that do not get any application from physically challenged children the weightage will be calculated for a total of 95 points.

3.12 **Girl Child**

Though some fears were expressed that allotting weightage for the girl child would result in more girls getting admission than boys, the figures received from schools do not conclusively establish it. Moreover, there is a need to encourage education of the girl child and many schools have endorsed it. So it could be retained with the provision that schools would have the freedom to ensure gender parity (50% boys 50% girls with plus or minus 5% deviation) in case the number of girls should exceed the limit suggested above. This applies to only co-educational institutions. Exclusive boys and girls schools can transfer 5 points under this head to school specific parameters.

3.13 **Educational Qualifications**

The Criterion of educational qualifications has evoked a mixed response from stakeholders. Those critical of this parameter has said that it is discriminatory and elitist. However the committee believes that in the present times, when knowledge is the major driver in the world, a strong message about the importance of empowerment through education should go to the society. Encouraging first generation learners need not be seen to be in conflict with the need to provide incentives to those who have acquired educational qualifications. Further, educated parents, besides

being good role models to their children, also provide better support and guidance to their children which are of immense value in the developmental process. We would also be encouraging parents to get educated at least upto the school level. Besides, this report addresses only a part of the education providers, namely the private unaided schools. The committee does respect the concerns expressed in this regard and has drastically reduced the weightage under this head and moderated the weightage to make it more broad-based covering college and school education without resorting to fine distinction such as graduation, post graduation etc.

3.14 **Socially Disadvantaged Groups**

The committee felt that if the classroom should be a microcosm of the society outside, it should include children from all strata of society. Today in most of the well-established private schools there are hardly any children from socially disadvantaged sections. As our endeavour is to steadily move towards a common school system, every effort should be made to gradually remove the characteristics that contribute to exclusivism in schooling. Further, when children from a young age learn with a truly heterogeneous peer group, they will be better prepared to respect the diversity of our society when they emerge into adulthood. It is only when children learn in an insulated school environment that has a homogeneous student profile that they develop prejudices and preconceived notions about a number of social stereotypes. If they have not interacted with children belonging to different social groups and economic backgrounds, how can we expect them to integrate themselves with the society when they grow up?

Keeping the above mentioned points in view, the committee has decided to allocate a maximum of 5 points for socially disadvantaged group. It will initially consist of Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribe as enumerated by the Government of Delhi/Government of India. Certificates from the competent authority have to be attached with registration forms by parents to claim points under this parameter.

Though 5 points may appear to be too few to realize the goal of true inclusivity in school education, the committee has also included this category as one of the three core categories under School Specific Parameters with a provision for allocation of 10 points for any one of the three core categories. The committee is of the view that these two provisions should be adequate at this stage and in course of time such provisions could be re-examined and expanded both in terms of weightage as well as the coverage of more categories of socially disadvantaged groups.

3.15 **School Specific Parameters**

The feedback from schools and other stakeholders suggests that there is no difference of opinion regarding the advisability of school-specific parameters. However the committee has gathered that some schools have not declared the parameters in clear-cut terms to the parents prior to admission. It is essential that schools decide the school-specific parameters beforehand on the basis of their requirements and display them on the notice board, website and also in the admission form. The committee has also included a core category consisting of Socially Disadvantaged Section, Economically Weaker Section and Religious and Linguistic Minority. Instructions to schools about the method of allotting marks for the core categories and other School Specific Parameters as decided by the respective schools have been given in para 4.5 (section-g). The weightage under this head has also been slightly increased to provide greater freedom to schools to exercise their discretion.

3.16 **Admission Procedure**

The committee has received some suggestions regarding the admission procedure recommended earlier. Reducing the time span for the admission process, instructions to parents to attach attested copies of certificates with registration form, certain observations regarding minority institutions and some added instructions regarding the draw of lots etc. have been included.

3.17 Some of the public schools which receive a large number of registration forms feel that their freedom in the admission process has been curtailed on account of the common admission procedure. The committee is confident that over a period of time these schools would also appreciate the need for some self-discipline and social commitment. While there is definitely a need to periodically review and refine the admission process, reverting back to the old practice would not be in the interest of the community. Let us not throw out the baby with the bath water.

Chapter – IV

Recommendations

4.1 The committee carefully examined all the views and suggestions received from different stakeholders and discussed them at length. It also studied the particulars of admission to the nursery class in some private schools of Delhi made in 2006-07 (under the old practice) and 2007-08 (under the new norms). The present endeavour is to fine tune the methodology and criteria of nursery admission which were recommended earlier by this committee. This is now done in the light of the suggestions and views received to ensure a fair, transparent, just and hassle free admission process. The committee does not find any need to make any major changes in the earlier framework or evolve an altogether new procedure. Having decided the scope of the task at hand, the committee enumerated the issues and aspects that would not require any moderation or adjustment so that such constants would serve the committee as the underlying guiding principles. These are the following:

- The admission process should promote diversity of student population in terms of home background, socio-economic status, professions of parents and at the same time preserve gender parity.
- Schools shall completely eliminate interview of or interaction with children. There shall be no observation of children either in formal or informal conditions to decide their admission.
- Formal interaction with parents will be carried out only after the list of selected children is displayed as explained in para 3.6.
- Schools shall ensure transparency in all matters relating to admission to the nursery class.
- The seats left to the discretion of the management of a school shall not exceed 10% of the total seats.
- There would be no overall lottery system to select/shortlist children for admission.

4.2 **General**

The recommendations contained in the earlier report of the committee with regard to application of draw of lots, pre-admission procedure, standardized Registration Form, Admission Committee and its functions and Payment of Fees and Refund remain unchanged. However the committee recommends that the standardized Registration Form should have some inbuilt flexibility to enable schools to adapt it according to their specific needs. Accordingly the schools have been given the freedom to make suitable changes in the standardized registration form either by including or changing details and particulars as per their needs without making any major departure in the design and format of the form. Under School Specific Parameters, schools will have to include the

categories that they decide upon for allotment of 15 points apart from the 10 points set aside for the core categories.

4.3 **Time Schedule for Admission**

After considering the feedback from schools, the committee has decided that the Time Schedule for Admission need not be spelt out in great detail. The admission process should commence in the first week of December and schools should display the lists of selected children as well as waitlisted children by 15th February. Those schools that start the admission process by the middle of December should display the lists between 15th and 28th/29th February. The subsequent list/lists for the vacant seats can be displayed in the month of March. Collection of fees and finalizing the admission process should be completed well in time so that children can attend school from the 1st of April. This flexibility in the timeframe for the admission process is considered necessary to provide sufficient time for schools to scrutinize the registration forms and verify the supporting documents before preparing the final admission list. Since parents are now required to attach certificates and proofs to support the information provided in the registration forms, schools would need adequate time for cross-checking the particulars with the supporting documents.

4.4 Since the admission process is carried out with the help of the computer, schools should not find it difficult to prepare the entire list of registered children. In order to ensure transparency, schools are required to display the following lists on their notice board as well as on their website:

- List of selected candidates along with weightage points for different criteria and the total points allotted.
- Cut off point and the procedure and date for draw of lots at the last stage to break the tie.
- List of waitlisted children with details of weightage. Third and Fourth list of children should also be displayed, if required.
- List of all other registered children with details of weightage points.

4.5 **Admission Process**

The school would assess the applicants on a scale of 1 to 100 in the following manner:

- (a) Under the neighbourhood head, an applicant staying within a radius of 3 kms will get the maximum of 30 points. Less weightage has been proportionately assigned to those living farther off, upto the distance of 15 km. from the school and no weightage be given for those living beyond that distance. Distance under neighbourhood

head has been increased keeping in view the uneven distribution of private schools in Delhi.

- (b) A sibling will get 15 points. However, schools will have the discretion to apply a cap of 20% of the total seats under this category. It has come to light that while dealing with fraternal twins schools have experienced some difficulty because a girl may qualify for admission on account of the girl child criterion while her brother may not qualify. In such cases schools may use their discretion to admit both the children. While applying the 20% cap, if the number of children getting weightage under sibling category exceeds this limit in the merit list, then the rest of the merit list will be modified/corrected by giving no weightage under sibling criteria. An illustration in this regard has been provided in Annexure – 2.
- (c) Under alumni category, a maximum of 5 points will be allotted if the father or mother or both are alumni of the school. As in the case of siblings schools will have the freedom to apply a cap of 15% on the number of children admitted under Alumni Category. Only parents who have passed class X (if the school is upto secondary level) or XII (if the school is upto senior secondary level) Board Examination from a school will be able to claim alumni status.
- (d) A child who is physically challenged will get 5 points.
- (e) Under educational qualification, a maximum of 10 points will be awarded depending on the parents' level of qualification, 5 points for the father and 5 points for the mother for graduation and above and 3 points for the father and 3 points for the mother for any educational qualification below graduation. In the case of single parent, weightage given for educational qualification will be doubled.
- f) A girl child will get 5 points.
- g) Under school specific parameters which the school will decide, 25 points will be given. The weightage under school specific parameters should, in no case, be used for any sort of interview or interactive session with parents/children. Schools should include the following three categories compulsorily as core groups for allotment of weightage points as explained below:
 - 1) Minority groups
 - a) Religious Minority
 - b) Linguistic Minority
 - 2) Socially Disadvantaged Section
 - 3) Economically Weaker Section

Schools should allot a maximum of 10 weightage points to a child belonging to any one of the above three categories. However this benefit will be given to a child under only one of the three above mentioned categories. Socially disadvantaged section will include children belonging to Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes as specified by the Government of India. Economically Weaker Section will be as per the norm established by the Government of India. The supporting documents for the above three categories will be as follows:

- Minority Groups – an Affidavit duly notarized
- Socially Disadvantaged Section – SC/ST Certificate from the competent authority as required in Government Schools
- Economically Weaker Section – Income Certificate from the competent authority or Below Poverty Line Certificate issued by the local authority.

For the remaining 15 points school should decide the parameters beforehand and mention them in the registration form. Schools may allot the 15 points under different parameters as per their needs. An illustrative list of such parameters is given below:

- Professions of parents including those who are self-employed, businessmen, artisans, craftsmen, entrepreneurs etc.
- Transferable government employees or even employees in private sector who have been recently transferred.
- Defence, para-military and police personnel

4.6 **Special Category Schools**

The committee reiterates its stand that schools catering to armed and para-military forces have the freedom to follow their own norms as laid down in their constitution for admission of the children of the personnel whom they are serving now. For the remaining general category; they will follow the above mentioned point system. For minority schools established under Article 30 (1) of the Constitution, the freedom to administer and admit children remains safeguarded. However the committee feels that while the minority schools would retain their right to admission as per their own norms in respect of minority children, with regard to admission of non-minority children, it would be advisable that these institutions also follow the norms and procedure of the common admission process as recommended by this committee.

4.7 Thus fully taking into consideration the feedback from different stakeholders the 100 point scale and criteria have been fine tuned. The matrix for calculation of weightage points is thus given as follows:

SUGGESTED CRITERIA AND SCALE

Sl. No.	Criteria	Specifications	Range of Points		Remarks
1.	Neighbourhood	0-3 km	30		Keeping in view the positive response to the neighbourhood concept, the weightage has been increased. Also the distance under this head has been increased in view of the uneven distribution of schools in Delhi.
		Above 3 and upto 6 km	24		
		Above 6 and upto 10 km	18		
		Above 10 and upto 15 km	12		
2.	Sibling		15		Schools will have the discretion to apply a cap of 20% of the total seats under this category. Schools can decide on fraternal twins in case one is a boy and the other is a girl
3.	Alumni	Father or Mother or both	05		Schools will have the discretion to apply a cap of 15% of the total seats under this category. Only parents who have passed class X or class XII Board Examination from a school can claim the status of alumni.
4.	Children who are physically challenged	Child with special needs who can be mainstreamed under inclusive education	05		Only children who are physically challenged will be considered under this head.
5.	Educational Qualifications	Graduation and above	Mother 05	Father 05	In case of single parent, the weightage allotted will be doubled.
		Below Graduation	03	03	
6.	Girl Child		05		Co- education schools will make an attempt to ensure gender parity using this parameter. Exclusive boys and girls schools can transfer 5 points under this head to school specific parameters mentioned at serial number 7 in this matrix.
7.	Socially Disadvantaged Section	Children belonging to Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribe	05		Parents should attach certificate with the registration form issued by the competent authority as decided by the Government of Delhi/Government of India.
8.	School Specific Parameters		25		Schools have to include minority groups, socially disadvantaged section and economically weaker sections as core categories and allot a maximum of 10 points to a child for any one of the above mentioned three categories. The remaining 15 points will be allotted under different parameters as decided by the schools beforehand. Instructions in this regard are contained in para 4.5 section (g)

4.8 **Director, Delhi Directorate of Education to issue instructions**

The committee feels that there must be some mechanism to issue instructions to the schools on the basis of recommendations made by it. Unless specific direction is issued by an appropriate authority, the schools may not realize the significance and finer details of the recommendations of the committee.

4.9 **Monitoring Mechanism**

There is a need for a monitoring mechanism so that the recommendations of the committee, as accepted by the Court, are implemented. The monitoring committee will not only supervise the implementation, it will also guide the schools in case of any difficulty or clarification that may arise.

4.10 **Road Ahead**

Implementation of the common admission process in the private schools of Delhi is a small beginning towards establishing a system of greater transparency and fairness in school education. The concept of neighbourhood school should slowly but steadily gain momentum and ultimately lead to the establishment of a common school system that celebrates diversity. It is absolutely essential that we provide to our children a vibrant environment in which they see a microcosm of the society outside. Thus the school will become truly inclusive inculcating in the children respect for all backgrounds, abilities, languages, faiths and cultures, strengthening the bonds needed for living together. Teachers will also, in such a setting, acquire the competence and skills to cater to heterogeneity. Our efforts to achieve this vision in school education will get a great impetus if schools under government sector are also helped to improve their overall quality. The good beginning that has been made in the national capital has to be sustained and in the days to come it may well become an example to the rest of the country.

**[Dr.(Mrs.)Shyama Chona]
Principal
Delhi Public School
R. K. Puram, New Delhi
and Convener of the
Committee**

**(Prof. Krishna Kumar)
Director
National Council for
Educational Research &
Training, New Delhi and
Member of the
Committee**

**(Shri Ashok Ganguly)
Chairman, CBSE and
Chairman of the
Committee**

**(Fr. T.V. Kunnunkal)
Former Chairman, CBSE
and Former Chairman,
National Institute of Open
Schooling and Member of
the Committee**

**(Shri Ved Vyas)
Retd. Principal,
Modern School and
Advisor, Vasant
Valley School, Delhi
and Member of the
Committee**

DATE : JULY 12, 2007

QUESTIONNAIRE ON THE ADMISSIONS MADE TO NURSERY CLASS DURING 2007-08

Name and Address of the School :

Name of the Principal :

Phone Numbers : (O) (R)

FAX:

E-mail ID :

1. Did you face any problem in implementing the new formula/methodology for making admissions to nursery class this year?

YES

NO

2. If yes, please briefly mention the difficulties /problems that you faced.

3. What are your suggestions to solve such problems/remove such difficulties?

4. Do you think any of the criteria needs fine-tuning? If yes, please give your suggestions for modifications against the criteria:

CRITERIA	POINTS ALLOTTED	YOUR SUGGESTIONS
Neighbourhood	20	
Sibling	20	
Alumni	10	
Child with special needs	05	
Educational Qualification	20	
Girl Child	05	
School specific parameters	20	

5. Please give the split up of nursery admissions made according to the following categories for the years 2006-07 & 2007-08:-

Description	Year 2006-07 (Old Scheme)	Year 2007-08 (New Scheme)
Total No. of seats for which admission was made to nursery class;		
No. of seats under open quota		
No. of seats under management quota		
Total No. of registrations		
Total No. of new admissions made to nursery class under open quota		
No. of new admissions made under management quota		
Total no. of new admissions made		
Number of boys		
Number of girls		
Number of siblings		

Number of alumni		
Number of children with special needs		

6. In what manner has the profile of the nursery class changed this year? (in terms of diversity in home background, parents' education and profession)

Signature

NOTE: Please complete the questionnaire and send it by return of post to:

The Executive Officer to Chairman
Central Board of Secondary Education
2, Community Centre, Preet Vihar
Delhi - 110 092.

Email: mk_arora27@rediffmail.com
Fax No. 22515826

Deciding Admission under Sibling Category – guidelines on how to apply the 20% cap.

- All siblings will be allotted 15 weightage points. However schools will have the discretion to apply a cap of 20% of the total seats under this category. In order to facilitate the schools in this regard, some guidelines on how to prepare the list of children selected for admission after applying the cap of 20% under the sibling category are given below with the help of an illustrative example:

Total number of seats available:	100
Number of seats left to the discretion of the management (10%)	10
Number of seats in general category:	90
Total number of registered children:	300

- After applying the 100 point matrix and allocating weightage points, the list of all the 300 registered children will be prepared with allotted points for different criteria and the total weightage points that each child has been allotted.
- The cut off point will be identified at 90th position in the weightage list since the total number of seats available under general category is 90.
- Let us, for the sake of illustration, assume that at the 90th position the cut off point is 50
- At this cut off point of 50 there may be a tie i.e., more than one child may have been allotted a total of 50 weightage points. So a draw of lots will become necessary only among those children who have all been allotted 50 weightage points.
- But before resorting to draw of lots, the Sibling and Alumni categories have to be decided, if the school decides to apply the cap of 20% and 15% of the total seats respectively.
- Let us take the sibling category first. Continuing our illustration, let us assume that among the children getting total weightage point of 50 (the cut off point), and above, there are 25 children who have got points under siblings category.
- But, if the 20% cap is applied, the school can admit only 18 children (20% of 90 total seats) under sibling category, whereas 25 siblings figure above the cut off point. So 7 children (25-18) have to be deleted from the list of 90.
- After deleting the siblings on the basis of total weightage points allotted to them, now the list will have only 83 children (if there is no tie at the cut off-points). Now we should set aside the 7 siblings whom we have deleted.
- The list, now having 83 children, will be extended to 90 children and at that stage the cut off point will be identified again because after 18 students who have already been selected with sibling weightage, the rest of the merit list will be recast without any sibling weightage.
- Let us assume that the new cut off point is 48 points.

- So at 48 points if there is any tie i.e. more than one child is allotted 48 points, a draw of lots among all children with 48 points will be conducted to select the child/children for the seats still remaining vacant at the last stage.
- Among the 7 siblings who had been dropped from the list, there may be some who have 48 weightage points or above. In that case they will automatically be included in the list of selected children or for draw of lots.
- After the admission process is over, if some siblings selected for admission either do not get admitted or leave the school after getting admission, children who are in the list of sibling category can be admitted in their place on or before the last date fixed for such admissions.

Alumni Category:

- The process followed in the sibling category will also apply to Alumni category if the school decides to apply a cap of 15% of the total number of seats under this category.

Annexure - 3

Suggested Registration Form for Admission

Class

To be filled by Office Registration No.

Read Instructions overleaf before filling up the form	Name of the School						Last column to be filled by School office only (bracket portion indicates weightage points)					
	Address of the School											
	Name of the applicant											
	Date of Birth		DD	<input type="text"/>	MM	<input type="text"/>		YYYY	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
	Father's Name											
	Mother's Name											
1	Residential Address						1(30)					
			Locality Code									
			[See Locality Code Overleaf]									
			<input type="text"/>									
	Pin Code		<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>		<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>			
	Contact Phone No(s).											
Email Address												
2	Sibling <small>Real brother/sister only [Tick the appropriate]</small>		Yes <input type="text"/>		No <input type="text"/>		2(15)					
	If sibling in the same school, give details of sibling		Sibling Name									
		Class-Section										
3	School Alumni [Tick the appropriate]						3(5)					
	(A) Father		Yes <input type="text"/>		If Yes, year of passing <input type="text"/>			No <input type="text"/>				
	(B) Mother		Yes <input type="text"/>					No <input type="text"/>				
4	Gender		Boy <input type="text"/>		Girl <input type="text"/>		4(5)					
5	Child who is physically challenged [Enclose authenticated documents]		yes <input type="text"/>		No <input type="text"/>		5(5)					
6	Educational Qualification		Graduation and above		Below Graduation		6(10)					
	(A) Father											
	(B) Mother											
7	Socially Disadvantaged Section		Scheduled Caste		Scheduled Tribe		7(5)					
8	*School Specific Parameters						8(10)					
	a) Core Categories		Religious/ Linguistic Minority									
			Economically Weaker Section									
		Socially Disadvantaged Section										

b) Other School Specific Parameters			8(15)
Single Parent	Father		Mother
[Tick one, only if applicable]			

*Schools may indicate their own criteria for allocation of weightage points under this head. If parents' professions are needed for allotting appropriate weightage under school specific criteria, space may be provided for parents' profession/occupation code.

General Instructions:

1. Use only black ball pen to fill the form
2. Do not enter registration number yourself
3. Do not fill anything in the last column of the form
4. Use appropriate tick mark as in the relevant box given in the sections 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8.
5. Use the codes given below to fill in the section 1 (Locality Code).

Residence Locality Code

Code	Distance Range - Locality
O	[0-3 Km] XYZ Colony, KYZ Nagar
A	[Above 3 Km upto 6 Km] SDS Enclave, RLT Colony
B	[Above 6 Km upto 10 Km] ABC Nagar, EFG Road
C	[Above 10 Km upto 15 Km] JKL Colony, MNO Vihar

CERTIFICATE FROM THE PARENT

I/we hereby certify that the above information provided by me/us is correct and I/we understand that if the information is found to be incorrect or false, the ward shall be automatically debarred from selection/admission process without any correspondence in this regard. I/we also understand that the application / registration / short listing does not guarantee admission to my ward. I/we accept the process of admission undertaken by the school and I/we will abide by the decision taken by the school authorities.

Signature of the mother

Signature of the father

Name of the mother: _____

Name of the father: _____

Date: _____

Note: Parents should attach attested copies of certificates with the registration form to support the particulars given against the following:

- | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| 1. Residential address | 2. Sibling Status | 3. Alumni Status | 4. Physically Challenged Child (if applicable) |
| 5. Educational Qualification of Parent(s) | 6. Religious/Linguistic Minority (if applicable) | 7. Socially Disadvantaged Section (if applicable) | 8. Economically Weaker Section (if applicable) |
| 9. Any other School Specific Parameter (s) | | | |