India

IDinsight, Authoring entity
Andrew Faker, Principal Investigator
Neil Buddy Shah, Principal Investigator
Ronald Abraham, Co - Principal Investigator
Sangeeta Dey, Co - Principal Investigator
Sangeeta Goyal, Co - Principal Investigator
Lant Prichett, Co - Principal Investigator

Quantitative assessment of teacher motivation, classroom practices, and student learning; Delhi and Uttar Pradesh, India; November 2016

Study Documentation

November 26, 2016

Metadata Production

Metadata Producer(s)	IDinsight

Table of Contents

Quantitative assessment of teacher motivation, classroom practices, and student learning; Delhi and Uttar Pradesh, India; November 2016

Overview

Identification	20161126_STiRIDinsightSIEFMidline
Version	Midline report

Abstract

This report summarizes the findings from the midline survey of the impact evaluation conducted by IDinsight for STiR Education in Delhi and Uttar Pradesh in India, funded by a World Bank Strategic Impact Evaluation Fund (SIEF) grant. STiR works with teachers in low-cost and government school in order to improve student learning by empowering teachers to act as change-makers and to innovate to overcome challenges in the classroom.

This study seeks to evaluate the impact of STIR's purely motivational, pedagogically neutral, teacher-focused model on the student learning levels. IDinsight is conducting two three-armed randomized control trials. The study will look at outcomes from 180 Affordable Private Schools (APS) in Delhi and 270 government schools in Rae Barely and Varanasi districts of Uttar Pradesh. The study began in early 2015, and will last two academic years. In addition to measuring STIR's impact in two different contexts, the study will simultaneously test two iterations of STIR's model in these two contexts.

The midline survey collected information on teacher motivation levels, student learning levels, teachers' activities in the classroom, teacher observed attendance in schools, teacher observed presence in classrooms, school level infrastructural data and reported student attendance.

Unit of Analysis	For student learning the basic unit of analysis are students. For classroom practices the basic unt of analysis are teachers. For teacher motivation the basic unit of analysis are teachers.

Scope & Coverage

Keywords	Randomized Trial, Education, India, Non- financial incentives
Topics	Analysis of education, Education and economic development, General, Government Policy, Other
Countries	India

Geographic Coverage

Delhi, India (Code "1" in region variables)
Uttar Pradesh, India (Code "2" in region variables)

Universe

180 Affordable Private Schools in Delhi, 540 teachers amongst these schools and 5400 students
270 Government Schools in Delhi, 810 teachers amongst these schools and 8100 students

Producers & Sponsors

Primary Investigator(s)	IDinsight, Authoring entity Andrew Faker, Principal Investigator Neil Buddy Shah, Principal Investigator Ronald Abraham, Co - Principal Investigator Sangeeta Dey, Co - Principal Investigator Sangeeta Goyal, Co - Principal Investigator Lant Prichett, Co - Principal Investigator
Other Producer(s)	IDinsight , Research and Evaluation

Funding Agency/ies	Strategic Impact Evaluation Fund -- The World Bank (SIEF)

Sampling

Sampling Procedure

Baseline respondent identification and sampling strategy:
Delhi:
Teacher motivation:
STIR initially did a search process of several hundred APS schools in east Delhi. From these schools, STIR passed school names onto IDinsight where the teachers might be interested in working with IDinsight. IDinsight attempted to sample all schools for the TM survey. In total, IDinsight interviewed 1259 teachers for the teacher motivation survey.
Classroom observation
From these 1259 teachers, STIR did an additional round of screening to determine which teachers were the most interested and returned a list of 810 teachers to IDinsight. This list formed the basis of the classroom observation. However, due to attrition and refusals at the school level we were unable to meet our target of teachers and ended up surveying only 342 teachers.
Student testing
For sampling students in the classroom, IDinsight sampled 10 students per classroom in classes (of all teachers covered for the classroom observation) with more than 10 students using the attendance register for the day the enumerator came to the class. In classes with fewer than 10 students, all children sampled.

Uttar Pradesh:
Teacher motivation:
In UP, IDinsight obtained a list of all clusters in Raebareli and Varanasi districts that STIR was working in. From this list, IDinsight selected all clusters with more than 16 schools. This was done to ensure that there would be enough schools in the cluster to assign some to the control group while also maintaining enough treatment schools for STIR to form a network. For the TM survey, IDinsight surveyed all teachers in the school, yielding 1145 teachers.
Classroom observation:
For the CO IDinsight sampled roughly 2/3 of the teachers who completed the TM questionnaire, to get a final list of roughly 810 teachers. Teachers were added to this list due to teachers dropping out and the final number was 838 teachers.
Student testing:
For sampling students in the classroom, IDinsight sampled 10 students per classroom in classes with more than 10 students using the attendance register for the day the enumerator came to the class. In classes with fewer than 10 students, all children sampled.

Midline respondent identification and sampling strategy:
For midline, which took place at the beginning of the second academic year, we followed up with teachers and students surveyed at baseline. Teachers were added only in the case where the number of teachers still teaching in the school from our baseline lists fell below a certain number. In Delhi, teachers were added if less than two teachers from our list in a given school were available and in U.P, new teachers were added only if all teachers from our baseline lists in a given school dropped out. The sampling strategy had two clear advantages:
1) It helped us target teachers and students that have been exposed to STIR for as long as possible since the timeline for the overall evaluation is relatively short
2) The evaluations are already quite complex and this helped have a clear interpretation and narrative surrounding the results

Delhi:
Teacher motivation:
From the list of 1259 teachers surveyed at teacher motivation baseline, 453 teachers dropped out of schools during the academic year and hence were not available for surveying during midline. A further 65 teachers refused to participate and 84 teachers were not available during the data collection period. Given this, the total number of teachers surveyed at teacher motivation midline was 657. These teachers formed the sample for analyses.
Classroom observation:
For classroom observations, we attempted to collect data for all 811 teachers on the Delhi original list. For those schools where the number of teachers available from our 811 list fell below two, 148 new teachers were added based on a random

selection from those teachers employed at that school as of 1 July 2015. A total of 459 teachers were surveyed as part of the classroom observation midline.
Student testing:
For testing of student learning levels, all students surveyed at baseline formed the potential sample at midline. Among the 3367 students from baseline, 1956 students were tracked and surveyed at midline. 1127 students had dropped out from the schools. 40 students were absent throughout the course of the data collection, and were not found in schools during any of the five revisits. The remaining 244 students were in schools where we could not survey.

Uttar Pradesh:
Teacher motivation:
From the 1145 teachers surveyed at baseline, 288 teachers dropped out of schools during the course of the academic year and were hence not available for data collection. An additional 61 refused to participate in the data collection and 41 were not available through the course of the data collection. The final number of teachers surveyed at midline were 755. This was the sample for analysis.
Classroom observation:
From the list of 838 teachers surveyed at baseline, we successfully observed the classrooms of 734 these teachers at midline. Another 13 teachers were added in schools where all teachers from our 838 had dropped out. 12 of these 13 were in Rae Bareli and 1 was in Varanasi. In total, 747 teachers were surveyed. 82 teachers dropped out of the schools in our sample. 13 teachers refused to participate in the data collection and 14 teachers were absent throughout the survey period and were not available on either of our visits.
Student testing:
Of the 7386 students tested at baseline, a total of 4560 students were also tested at midline. 615 students were absent all days of visits to the schools16. 149 students were in the four schools that refused data collection. 2062 dropped out of the schools in our sample.

Data Collection

Data Collection Mode	All stages of data collection was with informed consent. Teachers gave written consent for the Teacher Motivation survey, oral consent for the classroom observation survey, and in loco parentis consent for students. Students were also given the chance to refuse. The teacher motivation survey was paper based in which teachers filled out a questionnaire themselves. Enumerators would describe the questionnaires to the teachers and explain any doubts that came up while the teachers were filling out their responses. The student learning and classroom observation survey was conducted electronically using surveyCTO, an offline data collection software on mobile phones. The student testing tool was printed as a booklet which was used for testing the reading ability of the students. The math test was printed on paper to provide students with space to attempt the questions. The answers of the students were then recorded by the enumerators (surveyors) on the mobile phones. Based on the answers recorded they would automatically be directed to the next question to be provided to the students. Similarly in the class room observation the enumerators would record what they observed in the class rooms on the mobile phones. The surveyCTO form automatically directed the enumerators to the next questions and also provided instructions to the enumerators with regards to timing of each observation round.

Files Description

Dataset contains 9 file(s)

DDISTiRMidlineClassroomObs	
# Cases	4824
# Variable(s)	24

Notes

STiR (http://www.stireducation.org/) Midline Survey Dataset
Domain:STiR works in the education sector and seeks to empower teachers to impact student learning positively. STiR seeks to boost teacher motivation and improve teaching practices and classroom culture in order to boost student learning outcomes in government and private schools. STiR provides opportunities for teachers to share their experiences, challenges, and learnings with each other, as well as prospects for special recognition.

Theory of change: STiR emphasizes the inherent ability of teachers, regardless of the pedagogies they choose: they are the experts in their classrooms, experienced with the types of issues teachers in similar schools may face. STiR seeks to improve teachersâ€™ motivation by organizing them as part of local collaborative teacher â€˜changemakerâ€™ networks. By inculcating among teachers the mindset to collaborate with peers and find localized solutions to overcome the challenges they face, STiR believes they can motivate teachers to bring about a change in their classrooms. This positive motivation, coupled with the pedagogical techniques teachers share with each other, will adjust the ways in which teachers spend their time in the classroom. In turn, with improvements to teaching, student learning outcomes are expected to improve.

Background: This dataset represents the midline data for the STiR SIEF evaluation conducted in two contexts: Government Schools in Varanasi and Rae Barely districts of Uttar Pardesh; and Affordable Private schools in East Delhi. The evaluation has been designed and conducted by IDinsight (http://www.idinsight.org). This survey is conducted as part of the SIEF grant by the World Bank. The survey has three broad components: Teacher motivation, learning level of Students and classroom practices of teachers.

Evaluation Design: The evaluation design for this study is a Randomized Control Trial in both geographies. Treatment is allocated at the school level ie all teachers of a particular school have a particual 'treatment' assignment. The sample size in U.P. was 270 schools and in Delhi was 180 schools. The three treatment arms are: STiRs base model (Intrinsic; hereafter 1.0), STiRs advanced model (Extrinsic; hereafter 2.0) and a control (pure in UP; placebo in Delhi). The study is currently 18 months into the two-year evaluation.

Midline Sample identification strategy: For midline we tracked back teachers and students who were part of our sample at baseline (Please see baseline report for details on baseline sampling). New students were not added. Teachers were added to the list in Uttar Pradesh only if all teachers in a school who were surveyed at baseline dropped out. In Delhi, we had to resample teachers since we were unable to reach required sample numbers at baseline. If there were less than two teachers in a school from our baseline lists, we added teachers on the spot.

Details of the randomization: Delhi A.P.S 1. In Delhi, the STiR team undertook a large search exercise for APS schools in east Delhi. APS schools were defined as schools with monthly tuition fee below a certain threshold. The team touched around 500 schools. 2. STiR identified 200 APSâ€™s that were interested in working with and formally invited them to participate in their program. 3. 180 of these schools said yes. 4. The 180 schools were then divided into 7 (roughly) equally sized strata based on geography. Each stratum was assigned to a single STiR education leader 5. Within each stratum, one third schools were randomly assigned to control and two thirds to treatment 6. Within each stratum, the schools assigned to treatment were divided into 4 clusters based on geography a. Within each stratum, two of these clusters were randomly assigned to the intrinsic treatment arm (STiR 1.0) b. Within each stratum, we randomly assigned the remaining two clusters to the four extrinsic treatment flavors (STiR 2.0) using sampling without replacement (i.e. within each stratum, there is at most two flavors of treatment 2.0)

Details of the randomization: U.P. Govt. 1. In Uttar Pradesh, schools are organized into administrative units called â€œclustersâ€#. (Note: We call these clusters but they were the strata within which we randomized.) 2. Within

the two districts (Rae Bareli and Varanasi), â€œclustersâ€# with less than 15 schools were dropped from consideration. 3. From among the remaining â€œclustersâ€#, we randomly selected 16 clusters. 4. Within each â€œclusterâ€#, we randomly assigned one third of schools to control and two thirds to treatment. All treatment schools in a â€œclusterâ€# received the same treatment. 5. Note: For a few schools, we didnâ€™t actually randomize at the individual school level. In some cases, two schools shared the same building or grounds (mostly the case where PS and UPS schools of the same village are very close to one another). Thus, we assured that schools with close proximity or sharing the same buildings had the same â€˜treatment statusâ€™ to minimize the risk of contamination. In practice, around 30 schools in all were randomized at this level.

Details of the survey: The baseline data collection took place in two rounds -- the teacher motivation survey from February to April 2015 and the classroom observation, student testing survey conducted from July to November 2015. Similarly the midline data collection also took place in two rounds -- the teacher motivation survey in April and May 2016 and the classroom observation, student testing survey from July to September 2016. The second round of midline survey looked at a few indicators -- teacher observed attendance (attempted as a proxy for teacher motivation), teacher observed presence in class (also attempted as a proxy for teacher motivation), school level infrastructure (including reported student enrollment and attendance numbers), classroom level information, classroom observation information and student learning level information. Details will follow on each of the individual datasets.

Classroom Observation Data Set

Purpouse: In order to gauge classroom practices, we 'observe' teacher activities in a classroom. For this enumerators sit in on classrooms and observe teachers teaching and their interaction with students. Each observation lasts for 25 minutes. The enumerators would not start the actual observation for the first five minutes to help teachers to 'get used' to them in class. During this time they collect the classroom level 'classroom scan' information. After the first five minutes, there are four (identical) sections of the observation. Each section lasts five minutes -- where the first four minutes is the observation window and the final minute is used by enumerators to code. This data set is in long format where each teacher has four rounds of data collection. Hence the dataset is unique at the combination of the teacher and observation (variable: obsNumber) level.

Data collection: The classroom observation tool used was adapted from the Stallings Classroom Snapshot, a tool developed by Jane Stallings in 1977. The snapshot captures how classroom inputs are employed to improve learning. This includes how a teacher spends his or her time and what physical resources, materials are used in the classrooms. We adapted this code by making it smaller and easier to code. We also added to it sections of the ASER child friendliness matrix which we felt would be closer mapped to STiRs TOC. We thought of the snapshot to assess teachersâ€™ behavior and practices within the classroom and the changes that may develop as a result of STiRâ€™s program. Enumerators â€˜sit-inâ€™ in classrooms and code student and teacher activities, four times every five minutes. The Stallings tool is a well-established and widely renowned observational tool used to gauge classrooms which has especially been extensively used in classrooms in Latin America.

Data cleaning: The data set here is generated after data cleaning. Data cleaning included the following steps: 1) Keeping relevant variables: Only those variables required for analyses were kept. Other variables (eg: constraints/ validations built into the surveyCTO form) are dropped. 2) Renaming variables: Our raw files from surveyCTO are in .csv form. The variables are named as in the surveyCTO form. These were renamed more intuitively to make it easier to understand. Variables were renamed using a camelCase convention. 3) Adding variable lables: Variable labels were added for each of the variables. These provide a description of the questions as part of the surveyCTO form. 4) Adding value lables: For 'select options' (categorical variables) in the surveyCTO form, values have been labeled. 5) Reshaping the data as required 6) Creating teacher codes as required: New teachers were added at midline in some schools due to high levels of attrition at and from baseline. Only classroom observation was done for these newly added teachers. On the day the name of a pre-existing teacher was selected. Now, new codes have been created for these teachers to ensure that through the entire two year evaluation all teachers have a 'unique' code. 7) Correcting false coding during data collection: Enumerators also selected the wrong code by mistake. While some amount of such human error is unavoidable, we prevented/ corrected for this in two ways: a) Have enumerators select teacher name twice: If different names were selected between the two times, the form would not go ahead unless it is corrected. b) Reconcile our field status sheet with our data set: SurveyCTO allows us to import and use the data almost as soon as it is uploaded. This helped identifying errors Eg: If teacher A says done in the status sheet but not in the data it means that the wrong code has been selected. Then we would talk with the enumerator concerned and look at the data to define how this should be corrected.

Unique level: This dataset is unique at the combination of the teacher and observation (variable: obsNumber) level. Each teacher has four rounds of data collection

---

Variable level notes: Variable level notes have been prefixed with VL. Hence they can be identified by the same.

DDISTiRMidlineClassroomScan

# Cases	1206
# Variable(s)	22

Notes

STiR (http://www.stireducation.org/) Midline Survey Dataset
Domain:STiR works in the education sector and seeks to empower teachers to impact student learning positively. STiR seeks to boost teacher motivation and improve teaching practices and classroom culture in order to boost student learning outcomes in government and private schools. STiR provides opportunities for teachers to share their experiences, challenges, and learnings with each other, as well as prospects for special recognition.

Theory of change: STiR emphasizes the inherent ability of teachers, regardless of the pedagogies they choose: they are the experts in their classrooms, experienced with the types of issues teachers in similar schools may face. STiR seeks to improve teachersâ€™ motivation by organizing them as part of local collaborative teacher â€˜changemakerâ€™ networks. By inculcating among teachers the mindset to collaborate with peers and find localized solutions to overcome the challenges they face, STiR believes they can motivate teachers to bring about a change in their classrooms. This positive motivation, coupled with the pedagogical techniques teachers share with each other, will adjust the ways in which teachers spend their time in the classroom. In turn, with improvements to teaching, student learning outcomes are expected to improve.

Background: This dataset represents the midline data for the STiR SIEF evaluation conducted in two contexts: Government Schools in Varanasi and Rae Barely districts of Uttar Pardesh; and Affordable Private schools in East Delhi. The evaluation has been designed and conducted by IDinsight (http://www.idinsight.org). This survey is conducted as part of the SIEF grant by the World Bank. The survey has three broad components: Teacher motivation, learning level of Students and classroom practices of teachers.

Evaluation Design: The evaluation design for this study is a Randomized Control Trial in both geographies. Treatment is allocated at the school level ie all teachers of a particular school have a particual 'treatment' assignment. The sample size in U.P. was 270 schools and in Delhi was 180 schools. The three treatment arms are: STiRs base model (Intrinsic; hereafter 1.0), STiRs advanced model (Extrinsic; hereafter 2.0) and a control (pure in UP; placebo in Delhi). The study is currently 18 months into the two-year evaluation.

Midline Sample identification strategy: For midline we tracked back teachers and students who were part of our sample at baseline (Please see baseline report for details on baseline sampling). New students were not added. Teachers were added to the list in Uttar Pradesh only if all teachers in a school who were surveyed at baseline dropped out. In Delhi, we had to resample teachers since we were unable to reach required sample numbers at baseline. If there were less than two teachers in a school from our baseline lists, we added teachers on the spot.

Details of the randomization: Delhi A.P.S 1. In Delhi, the STiR team undertook a large search exercise for APS schools in east Delhi. APS schools were defined as schools with monthly tuition fee below a certain threshold. The team touched around 500 schools. 2. STiR identified 200 APSâ€™s that were interested in working with and formally invited them to participate in their program. 3. 180 of these schools said yes. 4. The 180 schools were then divided into 7 (roughly) equally sized strata based on geography. Each stratum was assigned to a single STiR education leader 5. Within each stratum, one third schools were randomly assigned to control and two thirds to treatment 6. Within each stratum, the schools assigned to treatment were divided into 4 clusters based on geography a. Within each stratum, two of these clusters were randomly assigned to the intrinsic treatment arm (STiR 1.0) b. Within each stratum, we randomly

assigned the remaining two clusters to the four extrinsic treatment flavors (STiR 2.0) using sampling without replacement (i.e. within each stratum, there is at most two flavors of treatment 2.0)

Details of the randomization: U.P. Govt. 1. In Uttar Pradesh, schools are organized into administrative units called â€œclustersâ€#. (Note: We call these clusters but they were the strata within which we randomized.) 2. Within the two districts (Rae Bareli and Varanasi), â€œclustersâ€# with less than 15 schools were dropped from consideration. 3. From among the remaining â€œclustersâ€#, we randomly selected 16 clusters. 4. Within each â€œclusterâ€#, we randomly assigned one third of schools to control and two thirds to treatment. All treatment schools in a â€œclusterâ€# received the same treatment. 5. Note: For a few schools, we didnâ€™t actually randomize at the individual school level. In some cases, two schools shared the same building or grounds (mostly the case where PS and UPS schools of the same village are very close to one another). Thus, we assured that schools with close proximity or sharing the same buildings had the same â€˜treatment statusâ€™ to minimize the risk of contamination. In practice, around 30 schools in all were randomized at this level.

Details of the survey: The baseline data collection took place in two rounds -- the teacher motivation survey from February to April 2015 and the classroom observation, student testing survey conducted from July to November 2015. Similarly the midline data collection also took place in two rounds -- the teacher motivation survey in April and May 2016 and the classroom observation, student testing survey from July to September 2016. The second round of midline survey looked at a few indicators -- teacher observed attendance (attempted as a proxy for teacher motivation), teacher observed presence in class (also attempted as a proxy for teacher motivation), school level infrastructure (including reported student enrollment and attendance numbers), classroom level information, classroom observation information and student learning level information. Details will follow on each of the individual datasets.

Classroom Scan Data Set

Purpouse: During this round of data collection we added a new section as part of the classroom observation. This new section was filled out by enumerators before the â€˜main observationâ€™. This included classroom level information â€“ number of students; number of girls and boys; if the classroom is affected by outside noise etc. This we felt would be useful in providing context to our analysis of how classrooms are functioning and a bit of contexts about the classrooms where STiR operate and our evaluation take place

---

Data collection: The data collection for these data was done during the main classroom observation. As part of the observation enumerators were told to 'leave' out the first five minutes after they enter the classrooms before starting the classroom observation. These questions were answered during those five minutes. As compared to the other questions part of the 'main observation', these questions were asked only once during the start of the observation. These data were collected once for each teacher (classroom)

Data cleaning: The data set here is generated after data cleaning. Data cleaning included the following steps: 1) Keeping relevant variables: Only those variables required for analyses were kept. Other variables (eg: constraints/ validations built into the surveyCTO form) are dropped. 2) Renaming variables: Our raw files from surveyCTO are in .csv form. The variables are named as in the surveyCTO form. These were renamed more intuitively to make it easier to understand. Variables were renamed using a camelCase convention. 3) Adding variable lables: Variable labels were added for each of the variables. These provide a description of the questions as part of the surveyCTO form. 4) Adding value lables: For 'select options' (categorical variables) in the surveyCTO form, values have been labeled. 5) Reshaping the data as required 6) Creating teacher codes as required: New teachers were added at midline in some schools due to high levels of attrition at and from baseline. Only classroom observation was done for these newly added teachers. On the day the name of a pre-existing teacher was selected. Now, new codes have been created for these teachers to ensure that through the entire two year evaluation all teachers have a 'unique' code. 7) Correcting false coding during data collection: Enumerators also selected the wrong code by mistake. While some amount of such human error is unavoidable, we prevented/ corrected for this in two ways: a) Have enumerators select teacher name twice: If different names were selected between the two times, the form would not go ahead unless it is corrected. b) Reconcile our field status sheet with our data set: SurveyCTO allows us to import and use the data almost as soon as it is uploaded. This helped identifying errors Eg: If teacher A says done in the status sheet but not in the data it means that the wrong code has been selected. Then we would talk with the enumerator concerned and look at the data to define how this should be corrected.

Unique level: This dataset is unique at the teacher level ie for each teacher's classroom these data would be collected once.

Variable level notes: Variable level notes have been prefixed with VL. Hence they can be identified by the same.

DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

# Cases	401
# Variable(s)	59

Notes

STiR (http://www.stireducation.org/) Midline Survey Dataset

Domain:STiR works in the education sector and seeks to empower teachers to impact student learning positively. STiR seeks to boost teacher motivation and improve teaching practices and classroom culture in order to boost student learning outcomes in government and private schools. STiR provides opportunities for teachers to share their experiences, challenges, and learnings with each other, as well as prospects for special recognition.

Theory of change: STiR emphasizes the inherent ability of teachers, regardless of the pedagogies they choose: they are the experts in their classrooms, experienced with the types of issues teachers in similar schools may face. STiR seeks to improve teachersâ€™ motivation by organizing them as part of local collaborative teacher â€˜changemakerâ€™ networks. By inculcating among teachers the mindset to collaborate with peers and find localized solutions to overcome the challenges they face, STiR believes they can motivate teachers to bring about a change in their classrooms. This positive motivation, coupled with the pedagogical techniques teachers share with each other, will adjust the ways in which teachers spend their time in the classroom. In turn, with improvements to teaching, student learning outcomes are expected to improve.

Background: This dataset represents the midline data for the STiR SIEF evaluation conducted in two contexts: Government Schools in Varanasi and Rae Barely districts of Uttar Pardesh; and Affordable Private schools in East Delhi. The evaluation has been designed and conducted by IDinsight (http://www.idinsight.org). This survey is conducted as part of the SIEF grant by the World Bank. The survey has three broad components: Teacher motivation, learning level of Students and classroom practices of teachers.

Evaluation Design: The evaluation design for this study is a Randomized Control Trial in both geographies. Treatment is allocated at the school level ie all teachers of a particular school have a particual 'treatment' assignment. The sample size in U.P. was 270 schools and in Delhi was 180 schools. The three treatment arms are: STiRs base model (Intrinsic; hereafter 1.0), STiRs advanced model (Extrinsic; hereafter 2.0) and a control (pure in UP; placebo in Delhi). The study is currently 18 months into the two-year evaluation.

Midline Sample identification strategy: For midline we tracked back teachers and students who were part of our sample at baseline (Please see baseline report for details on baseline sampling). New students were not added. Teachers were added to the list in Uttar Pradesh only if all teachers in a school who were surveyed at baseline dropped out. In Delhi, we had to resample teachers since we were unable to reach required sample numbers at baseline. If there were less than two teachers in a school from our baseline lists, we added teachers on the spot.

Details of the randomization: Delhi A.P.S 1. In Delhi, the STiR team undertook a large search exercise for APS schools in east Delhi. APS schools were defined as schools with monthly tuition fee below a certain threshold. The team touched around 500 schools. 2. STiR identified 200 APSâ€™s that were interested in working with and formally invited them to participate in their program. 3. 180 of these schools said yes. 4. The 180 schools were then divided into 7 (roughly) equally sized strata based on geography. Each stratum was assigned to a single STiR education leader 5. Within each stratum, one third schools were randomly assigned to control and two thirds to treatment 6. Within each stratum, the schools assigned to treatment were divided into 4 clusters based on geography a. Within each stratum, two of these clusters were randomly assigned to the intrinsic treatment arm (STiR 1.0) b. Within each stratum, we randomly assigned the remaining two clusters to the four extrinsic treatment flavors (STiR 2.0) using sampling without replacement (i.e. within each stratum, there is at most two flavors of treatment 2.0)

Details of the randomization: U.P. Govt. 1. In Uttar Pradesh, schools are organized into administrative units called â €œclustersâ€#. (Note: We call these clusters but they were the strata within which we randomized.) 2. Within the two districts (Rae Bareli and Varanasi), â€œclustersâ€# with less than 15 schools were dropped from consideration. 3. From among the remaining â€œclustersâ€#, we randomly selected 16 clusters. 4. Within each â€œclusterâ€#, we randomly assigned one third of schools to control and two thirds to treatment. All treatment schools in a â€œclusterâ€# received the same treatment. 5. Note: For a few schools, we didnâ€™t actually randomize at the individual school level. In some cases, two schools shared the same building or grounds (mostly the case where PS and UPS schools of the same village are very close to one another). Thus, we assured that schools with close proximity or sharing the same buildings had the same â€˜treatment statusâ€™ to minimize the risk of contamination. In practice, around 30 schools in all were randomized at this level.

Details of the survey: The baseline data collection took place in two rounds -- the teacher motivation survey from February to April 2015 and the classroom observation, student testing survey conducted from July to November 2015. Similarly the midline data collection also took place in two rounds -- the teacher motivation survey in April and May 2016 and the classroom observation, student testing survey from July to September 2016. The second round of midline survey looked at a few indicators -- teacher observed attendance (attempted as a proxy for teacher motivation), teacher observed presence in class (also attempted as a proxy for teacher motivation), school level infrastructure (including reported student enrollment and attendance numbers), classroom level information, classroom observation information and student learning level information. Details will follow on each of the individual datasets.

Facility Assessment Data Set

Purpouse: The facility assessment is done at the school level -- ie one data point per school. The basic purpose of the data collection was to provide context of the schools where STiR works and our evaluation takes place. The broad themes covered are what were the activities which the enumerators observed (teachers arriving, morning class, afternoon class, lunch etc) and if so; at what time they started and ended. We also collected infrastructural information (eg do schools have walls, toilets, kitchens, electricity etc, number of classrooms); information on which grades are taught in a particular school, reported enrollment by grade and reported total attendance of students in the school.

Data collection: Theses data were collected using a combination of enumerators observing the school around them and asking principals or head teachers. Information of whether schools have walls, toilets, number of classrooms etc were collected by observation. Other information such as student attendance, teacher attendance, what grades are being taught etc were collected by asking head teachers. NOTE: We did not follow up or validate these in any way. The time stamps associated with the start and end of a particualr activity eg: lunch were imported directly from surveyCTO. In some of the phones; the date-time was not correct from the very beginning. Before these were corrected manually, the associated time stamps may be wrong. Finally, we find these data to be more reliable for U.P. than Delhi, since collecting these data from private schools was particularly tough. In private schools, head teachers act as gatekeepers and hence enumerators found it tough to observe freely.

Data cleaning: The data set here is generated after data cleaning. Data cleaning included the following steps: 1) Keeping relevant variables: Only those variables required for analyses were kept. Other variables (eg: constraints/ validations built into the surveyCTO form) are dropped. 2) Renaming variables: Our raw files from surveyCTO are in .csv form. The variables are named as in the surveyCTO form. These were renamed more intuitively to make it easier to understand. Variables were renamed using a camelCase convention. 3) Adding variable lables: Variable labels were added for each of the variables. These provide a description of the questions as part of the surveyCTO form. 4) Adding value lables: For 'select options' (categorical variables) in the surveyCTO form, values have been labeled. 5) Reshaping the data as required 6) Creating teacher codes as required: New teachers were added at midline in some schools due to high levels of attrition at and from baseline. Only classroom observation was done for these newly added teachers. On the day the name of a pre-existing teacher was selected. Now, new codes have been created for these teachers to ensure that through the entire two year evaluation all teachers have a 'unique' code. 7) Correcting false coding during data collection: Enumerators also selected the wrong code by mistake. While some amount of such human error is unavoidable, we prevented/ corrected for this in two ways: a) Have enumerators select teacher name twice: If different names were selected between the two times, the form would not go ahead unless it is corrected. b) Reconcile our field status sheet with our data set: SurveyCTO allows us to import and use the data almost as soon as it is uploaded. This helped identifying errors Eg: If teacher A says done in the status sheet but not in the data it means that the wrong code has been selected. Then we would talk with the enumerator concerned and look at the data to define how this should be corrected.

Unique level: This dataset is unique at the school level ie for each school these data would be collected once.

Variable level notes: Variable level notes have been prefixed with VL. Hence they can be identified by the same.

DDISTiRMidlineObservedAttendance

# Cases	16800
# Variable(s)	10

Notes

STiR (http://www.stireducation.org/) Midline Survey Dataset
Domain:STiR works in the education sector and seeks to empower teachers to impact student learning positively. STiR seeks to boost teacher motivation and improve teaching practices and classroom culture in order to boost student learning outcomes in government and private schools. STiR provides opportunities for teachers to share their experiences, challenges, and learnings with each other, as well as prospects for special recognition.

Theory of change: STiR emphasizes the inherent ability of teachers, regardless of the pedagogies they choose: they are the experts in their classrooms, experienced with the types of issues teachers in similar schools may face. STiR seeks to improve teachersâ€™ motivation by organizing them as part of local collaborative teacher â€˜changemakerâ€™ networks. By inculcating among teachers the mindset to collaborate with peers and find localized solutions to overcome the challenges they face, STiR believes they can motivate teachers to bring about a change in their classrooms. This positive motivation, coupled with the pedagogical techniques teachers share with each other, will adjust the ways in which teachers spend their time in the classroom. In turn, with improvements to teaching, student learning outcomes are expected to improve.

Background: This dataset represents the midline data for the STiR SIEF evaluation conducted in two contexts: Government Schools in Varanasi and Rae Barely districts of Uttar Pardesh; and Affordable Private schools in East Delhi. The evaluation has been designed and conducted by IDinsight (http://www.idinsight.org). This survey is conducted as part of the SIEF grant by the World Bank. The survey has three broad components: Teacher motivation, learning level of Students and classroom practices of teachers.

Evaluation Design: The evaluation design for this study is a Randomized Control Trial in both geographies. Treatment is allocated at the school level ie all teachers of a particular school have a particual 'treatment' assignment. The sample size in U.P. was 270 schools and in Delhi was 180 schools. The three treatment arms are: STiRs base model (Intrinsic; hereafter 1.0), STiRs advanced model (Extrinsic; hereafter 2.0) and a control (pure in UP; placebo in Delhi). The study is currently 18 months into the two-year evaluation.

Midline Sample identification strategy: For midline we tracked back teachers and students who were part of our sample at baseline (Please see baseline report for details on baseline sampling). New students were not added. Teachers were added to the list in Uttar Pradesh only if all teachers in a school who were surveyed at baseline dropped out. In Delhi, we had to resample teachers since we were unable to reach required sample numbers at baseline. If there were less than two teachers in a school from our baseline lists, we added teachers on the spot.

Details of the randomization: Delhi A.P.S 1. In Delhi, the STiR team undertook a large search exercise for APS schools in east Delhi. APS schools were defined as schools with monthly tuition fee below a certain threshold. The team touched around 500 schools. 2. STiR identified 200 APSâ€™s that were interested in working with and formally invited them to participate in their program. 3. 180 of these schools said yes. 4. The 180 schools were then divided into 7 (roughly) equally sized strata based on geography. Each stratum was assigned to a single STiR education leader 5. Within each stratum, one third schools were randomly assigned to control and two thirds to treatment 6. Within each stratum, the schools assigned to treatment were divided into 4 clusters based on geography a. Within each stratum, two of these clusters were randomly assigned to the intrinsic treatment arm (STiR 1.0) b. Within each stratum, we randomly assigned the remaining two clusters to the four extrinsic treatment flavors (STiR 2.0) using sampling without replacement (i.e. within each stratum, there is at most two flavors of treatment 2.0)

Details of the randomization: U.P. Govt. 1. In Uttar Pradesh, schools are organized into administrative units called â€œclustersâ€#. (Note: We call these clusters but they were the strata within which we randomized.) 2. Within the two districts (Rae Bareli and Varanasi), â€œclustersâ€# with less than 15 schools were dropped from consideration. 3. From among the remaining â€œclustersâ€#, we randomly selected 16 clusters. 4. Within each â€œclusterâ€#, we randomly assigned one third of schools to control and two thirds to treatment. All treatment schools in a â€œclusterâ€# received the same treatment. 5. Note: For a few schools, we didnâ€™t actually randomize at the individual school level. In some cases, two schools shared the same building or grounds (mostly the case where PS and UPS schools of the same village are very close to one another). Thus, we assured that schools with close proximity or sharing the same buildings had the same â€˜treatment statusâ€™ to minimize the risk of contamination. In practice, around 30 schools in all were randomized at this level.

Details of the survey: The baseline data collection took place in two rounds -- the teacher motivation survey from February to April 2015 and the classroom observation, student testing survey conducted from July to November 2015. Similarly the midline data collection also took place in two rounds -- the teacher motivation survey in April and May 2016 and the classroom observation, student testing survey from July to September 2016. The second round of midline survey looked at a few indicators -- teacher observed attendance (attempted as a proxy for teacher motivation), teacher observed presence in class (also attempted as a proxy for teacher motivation), school level infrastructure (including reported student enrollment and attendance numbers), classroom level information, classroom observation information and student learning level information. Details will follow on each of the individual datasets.

Observed Attendance Data Set

Purpouse: As part of the midline data collection, we also tried to look at teacher attendance. The literature suggests that one of the indicators of a motivated teacher is higher attendance and presence in classrooms. This is also an important channel through which STiR looks to improve classroom practices (and eventually student learning) via higher teacher motivation. Over previous rounds of surveys we have tried to look at collecting 'reported' attendance. This time around we looked to capture observed attendance defined as whether or not a teacher was present in schools and classrooms during the enumerators 'random' school visits. Since enumerators would typically visit schools multiple times during the course of the suvey, we had multiple data points per teachers in most cases.

Data collection: Enumerators answered two questions, twice (once while entering and once while leaving) everytime they visited a particular school. They had a prepopulated list of teachers as part of their surveyCTO form. (Note: These teachers may be more than our current sample; eg: there may be teachers in the school who were not part of our sample list for this round of data collection.) For each of the teachers enumerators would have to code 'Is the teacher in the school (at this moment)?' and if yes 'Is the teacher in the class (at this moment)?'. Note: It was tougher for us to accurately answer the second question in a meaningful way just by observing eg: if a teacher is in a particular class we do not know if they were actually supposed to be in that class or not. Hence analysis for that particular indicator should be done keeping in mind this caveat. Again important to note is that, by virtue of the fact that our school visits were random only in Uttar Pradesh we rely on only the Uttar Pradesh data. In Delhi, schools have prior information of us coming and hence takes away from the surprise nature we were hoping to capture.

Data cleaning: The data set here is generated after data cleaning. Data cleaning included the following steps: 1) Keeping relevant variables: Only those variables required for analyses were kept. Other variables (eg: constraints/ validations built into the surveyCTO form) are dropped. 2) Renaming variables: Our raw files from surveyCTO are in .csv form. The variables are named as in the surveyCTO form. These were renamed more intuitively to make it easier to understand. Variables were renamed using a camelCase convention. 3) Adding variable lables: Variable labels were added for each of the variables. These provide a description of the questions as part of the surveyCTO form. 4) Adding value lables: For 'select options' (categorical variables) in the surveyCTO form, values have been labeled. 5) Reshaping the data as required 6) Creating teacher codes as required: New teachers were added at midline in some schools due to high levels of attrition at and from baseline. Only classroom observation was done for these newly added teachers. On the day the name of a pre-existing teacher was selected. Now, new codes have been created for these teachers to ensure that through the entire two year evaluation all teachers have a 'unique' code. 7) Correcting false coding during data collection: Enumerators also selected the wrong code by mistake. While some amount of such human error is unavoidable, we prevented/ corrected for this in two ways: a) Have enumerators select teacher name twice: If different names were selected between the two times, the form would not go ahead unless it is corrected. b) Reconcile our field status sheet with our data set: SurveyCTO allows us to

import and use the data almost as soon as it is uploaded. This helped identifying errors Eg: If teacher A says done in the status sheet but not in the data it means that the wrong code has been selected. Then we would talk with the enumerator concerned and look at the data to define how this should be corrected.

Unique level: This dataset is unique at the combination of the teacher and observation (variable: observationNumber) level. Each teacher has multiple (and potentially unequal) data points.

Variable level notes: Variable level notes have been prefixed with VL. Hence they can be identified by the same.

DDISTiRMidlineStudentTesting.dta

# Cases	6516
# Variable(s)	16

Notes

STiR (http://www.stireducation.org/) Midline Survey Dataset

Domain:STiR works in the education sector and seeks to empower teachers to impact student learning positively. STiR seeks to boost teacher motivation and improve teaching practices and classroom culture in order to boost student learning outcomes in government and private schools. STiR provides opportunities for teachers to share their experiences, challenges, and learnings with each other, as well as prospects for special recognition.

Theory of change: STiR emphasizes the inherent ability of teachers, regardless of the pedagogies they choose: they are the experts in their classrooms, experienced with the types of issues teachers in similar schools may face. STiR seeks to improve teachersâ€™ motivation by organizing them as part of local collaborative teacher â€˜changemakerâ€™ networks. By inculcating among teachers the mindset to collaborate with peers and find localized solutions to overcome the challenges they face, STiR believes they can motivate teachers to bring about a change in their classrooms. This positive motivation, coupled with the pedagogical techniques teachers share with each other, will adjust the ways in which teachers spend their time in the classroom. In turn, with improvements to teaching, student learning outcomes are expected to improve.

Background: This dataset represents the midline data for the STiR SIEF evaluation conducted in two contexts: Government Schools in Varanasi and Rae Barely districts of Uttar Pardesh; and Affordable Private schools in East Delhi. The evaluation has been designed and conducted by IDinsight (http://www.idinsight.org). This survey is conducted as part of the SIEF grant by the World Bank. The survey has three broad components: Teacher motivation, learning level of Students and classroom practices of teachers.

Evaluation Design: The evaluation design for this study is a Randomized Control Trial in both geographies. Treatment is allocated at the school level ie all teachers of a particular school have a particual 'treatment' assignment. The sample size in U.P. was 270 schools and in Delhi was 180 schools. The three treatment arms are: STiRs base model (Intrinsic; hereafter 1.0), STiRs advanced model (Extrinsic; hereafter 2.0) and a control (pure in UP; placebo in Delhi). The study is currently 18 months into the two-year evaluation.

Midline Sample identification strategy: For midline we tracked back teachers and students who were part of our sample at baseline (Please see baseline report for details on baseline sampling). New students were not added. Teachers were added to the list in Uttar Pradesh only if all teachers in a school who were surveyed at baseline dropped out. In Delhi, we had to resample teachers since we were unable to reach required sample numbers at baseline. If there were less than two teachers in a school from our baseline lists, we added teachers on the spot.

Details of the randomization: Delhi A.P.S 1. In Delhi, the STiR team undertook a large search exercise for APS schools in east Delhi. APS schools were defined as schools with monthly tuition fee below a certain threshold. The team touched around 500 schools. 2. STiR identified 200 APSâ€™s that were interested in working with and formally invited them to participate in their program. 3. 180 of these schools said yes. 4. The 180 schools were then divided into 7 (roughly) equally sized strata based on geography. Each stratum was assigned to a single STiR education leader 5. Within each stratum, one third schools were randomly assigned to control and two thirds to treatment 6. Within each stratum,

the schools assigned to treatment were divided into 4 clusters based on geography a. Within each stratum, two of these clusters were randomly assigned to the intrinsic treatment arm (STiR 1.0) b. Within each stratum, we randomly assigned the remaining two clusters to the four extrinsic treatment flavors (STiR 2.0) using sampling without replacement (i.e. within each stratum, there is at most two flavors of treatment 2.0)

Details of the randomization: U.P. Govt. 1. In Uttar Pradesh, schools are organized into administrative units called â€œclustersâ€#. (Note: We call these clusters but they were the strata within which we randomized.) 2. Within the two districts (Rae Bareli and Varanasi), â€œclustersâ€# with less than 15 schools were dropped from consideration. 3. From among the remaining â€œclustersâ€#, we randomly selected 16 clusters. 4. Within each â€œclusterâ€#, we randomly assigned one third of schools to control and two thirds to treatment. All treatment schools in a â€œclusterâ€# received the same treatment. 5. Note: For a few schools, we didnâ€™t actually randomize at the individual school level. In some cases, two schools shared the same building or grounds (mostly the case where PS and UPS schools of the same village are very close to one another). Thus, we assured that schools with close proximity or sharing the same buildings had the same â€˜treatment statusâ€™ to minimize the risk of contamination. In practice, around 30 schools in all were randomized at this level.

Details of the survey: The baseline data collection took place in two rounds -- the teacher motivation survey from February to April 2015 and the classroom observation, student testing survey conducted from July to November 2015. Similarly the midline data collection also took place in two rounds -- the teacher motivation survey in April and May 2016 and the classroom observation, student testing survey from July to September 2016. The second round of midline survey looked at a few indicators -- teacher observed attendance (attempted as a proxy for teacher motivation), teacher observed presence in class (also attempted as a proxy for teacher motivation), school level infrastructure (including reported student enrollment and attendance numbers), classroom level information, classroom observation information and student learning level information. Details will follow on each of the individual datasets.

Student Testing Data Set

Purpouse: Student testing data was collected to gauge if STiRs program has had an impact on student learning levels. For this purpose we conducted two tests for students -- hindi reading and math. A students learning level is the highest level they acheive in each of the tests. This data set contains the maximum level of students in hindi and math during the midline data collection.

Data collection: For the student testing we used the ASER student testing tool. This includes questions on Hindi (the local language in Delhi and Uttar Pradesh) and Math. We added to the base ASER tool a few questions (details mentioned below). The Hindi component tests the reading ability of students. Questions progress from recognizing letters to reading stories. A studentâ€™s â€˜Hindi levelâ€™ is defined as the highest level (question) s/he correctly reads. The math questions range from identifying one digit numbers to solving fraction questions. A studentâ€™s math level is defined as the highest question s/he correctly answers. The ASER tools are designed keeping in mind primary school students (grade 1 to 5). Given that our evaluation in both Delhi and U.P. comprised grades 1 to 8 (i.e., our sample includes upper primary) we were worried about ceiling effects. To minimize ceiling effects, new levels were added to both the Hindi and math section of the â€˜baseâ€™ ASER tool. ï‚· Hindi: At baseline, two new stories were added to have a total of three stories, each with an increased level of difficulty to the previous. At midline an additional story was added to have a total of four story levels. ï‚· Math: At baseline, the fractions section was added to the existing ASER math tool to help limit ceiling effects. ASER is well established in education research and evaluation in India. Their testing tools are widely used and are well designed and piloted to cater to evaluations similar to ours. As part of the midline data collection we also added two new questions which we asked students. This was done more as a trial moving towards endline and was not used for analyses. These were 'Do you like to come to school?' and 'Do you want to become like your teacher when you grow up?'

Data cleaning: The data set here is generated after data cleaning. Data cleaning included the following steps: 1) Keeping relevant variables: Only those variables required for analyses were kept. Other variables (eg: constraints/ validations built into the surveyCTO form) are dropped. 2) Renaming variables: Our raw files from surveyCTO are in .csv form. The variables are named as in the surveyCTO form. These were renamed more intuitively to make it easier to understand. Variables were renamed using a camelCase convention. 3) Adding variable lables: Variable labels were added for each of the variables. These provide a description of the questions as part of the surveyCTO form. 4) Adding value lables: For 'select options' (categorical variables) in the surveyCTO form, values have been labeled. 5) Reshaping the data as required 6) Creating teacher codes as required: New teachers were added at midline in some schools due to high levels of attrition

at and from baseline. Only classroom observation was done for these newly added teachers. On the day the name of a pre-existing teacher was selected. Now, new codes have been created for these teachers to ensure that through the entire two year evaluation all teachers have a 'unique' code. 7) Correcting false coding during data collection: Enumerators also selected the wrong code by mistake. While some amount of such human error is unavoidable, we prevented/ corrected for this in two ways: a) Have enumerators select teacher name twice: If different names were selected between the two times, the form would not go ahead unless it is corrected. b) Reconcile our field status sheet with our data set: SurveyCTO allows us to import and use the data almost as soon as it is uploaded. This helped identifying errors Eg: If teacher A says done in the status sheet but not in the data it means that the wrong code has been selected. Then we would talk with the enumerator concerned and look at the data to define how this should be corrected.

Unique level: This dataset is unique at the student level. Each student has one row

---

Variable level notes: Variable level notes have been prefixed with VL. Hence they can be identified by the same.

DDISTiRMidlineTeacherMotivation

# Cases	1412
# Variable(s)	92

Notes

STiR (http://www.stireducation.org/) Midline Survey Dataset

Domain:STiR works in the education sector and seeks to empower teachers to impact student learning positively. STiR seeks to boost teacher motivation and improve teaching practices and classroom culture in order to boost student learning outcomes in government and private schools. STiR provides opportunities for teachers to share their experiences, challenges, and learnings with each other, as well as prospects for special recognition.

Theory of change: STiR emphasizes the inherent ability of teachers, regardless of the pedagogies they choose: they are the experts in their classrooms, experienced with the types of issues teachers in similar schools may face. STiR seeks to improve teachersâ€™ motivation by organizing them as part of local collaborative teacher â€˜changemakerâ€™ networks. By inculcating among teachers the mindset to collaborate with peers and find localized solutions to overcome the challenges they face, STiR believes they can motivate teachers to bring about a change in their classrooms. This positive motivation, coupled with the pedagogical techniques teachers share with each other, will adjust the ways in which teachers spend their time in the classroom. In turn, with improvements to teaching, student learning outcomes are expected to improve.

Background: This dataset represents the midline data for the STiR SIEF evaluation conducted in two contexts: Government Schools in Varanasi and Rae Barely districts of Uttar Pardesh; and Affordable Private schools in East Delhi. The evaluation has been designed and conducted by IDinsight (http://www.idinsight.org). This survey is conducted as part of the SIEF grant by the World Bank. The survey has three broad components: Teacher motivation, learning level of Students and classroom practices of teachers.

Evaluation Design: The evaluation design for this study is a Randomized Control Trial in both geographies. Treatment is allocated at the school level ie all teachers of a particular school have a particual 'treatment' assignment. The sample size in U.P. was 270 schools and in Delhi was 180 schools. The three treatment arms are: STiRs base model (Intrinsic; hereafter 1.0), STiRs advanced model (Extrinsic; hereafter 2.0) and a control (pure in UP; placebo in Delhi). The study is currently 18 months into the two-year evaluation.

Midline Sample identification strategy: For midline we tracked back teachers and students who were part of our sample at baseline (Please see baseline report for details on baseline sampling). New students were not added. Teachers were added to the list in Uttar Pradesh only if all teachers in a school who were surveyed at baseline dropped out. In Delhi, we had to resample teachers since we were unable to reach required sample numbers at baseline. If there were less than two teachers in a school from our baseline lists, we added teachers on the spot.

Details of the randomization: Delhi A.P.S 1. In Delhi, the STiR team undertook a large search exercise for APS schools in east Delhi. APS schools were defined as schools with monthly tuition fee below a certain threshold. The team touched around 500 schools. 2. STiR identified 200 APSâ€™s that were interested in working with and formally invited them to participate in their program. 3. 180 of these schools said yes. 4. The 180 schools were then divided into 7 (roughly) equally sized strata based on geography. Each stratum was assigned to a single STiR education leader 5. Within each stratum, one third schools were randomly assigned to control and two thirds to treatment 6. Within each stratum, the schools assigned to treatment were divided into 4 clusters based on geography a. Within each stratum, two of these clusters were randomly assigned to the intrinsic treatment arm (STiR 1.0) b. Within each stratum, we randomly assigned the remaining two clusters to the four extrinsic treatment flavors (STiR 2.0) using sampling without replacement (i.e. within each stratum, there is at most two flavors of treatment 2.0)

Details of the randomization: U.P. Govt. 1. In Uttar Pradesh, schools are organized into administrative units called â€œclustersâ€#. (Note: We call these clusters but they were the strata within which we randomized.) 2. Within the two districts (Rae Bareli and Varanasi), â€œclustersâ€# with less than 15 schools were dropped from consideration. 3. From among the remaining â€œclustersâ€#, we randomly selected 16 clusters. 4. Within each â€œclusterâ€#, we randomly assigned one third of schools to control and two thirds to treatment. All treatment schools in a â€œclusterâ€# received the same treatment. 5. Note: For a few schools, we didnâ€™t actually randomize at the individual school level. In some cases, two schools shared the same building or grounds (mostly the case where PS and UPS schools of the same village are very close to one another). Thus, we assured that schools with close proximity or sharing the same buildings had the same â€˜treatment statusâ€™ to minimize the risk of contamination. In practice, around 30 schools in all were randomized at this level.

Details of the survey: The baseline data collection took place in two rounds -- the teacher motivation survey from February to April 2015 and the classroom observation, student testing survey conducted from July to November 2015. Similarly the midline data collection also took place in two rounds -- the teacher motivation survey in April and May 2016 and the classroom observation, student testing survey from July to September 2016. The second round of midline survey looked at a few indicators -- teacher observed attendance (attempted as a proxy for teacher motivation), teacher observed presence in class (also attempted as a proxy for teacher motivation), school level infrastructure (including reported student enrollment and attendance numbers), classroom level information, classroom observation information and student learning level information. Details will follow on each of the individual datasets.

Teacher Motivation Data Set

Overview: The teacher motivation survey was conducted as a first round of midline in April and May 2016. To measure teacher motivation a self-administered questionnaire was created inhouse which was based on two prominent behavioral economic theories: 1. Different people value different things and 2. Positive and negative experiences matter differently.

The teacher motivation survey: To capture motivation levels teachers were requested to fill out a teacher motivation survey. Based on an extensive review of the literature, 15 categories that influenced teacher motivation were identified. These were: 1. Recognition by supervisor / colleagues 2. Student performance 3. Availability of good teaching learning material 4. Job security 5. Creative environment 6. Potential for learning new skills 7. Bearing responsibilities related to school 8. Support from studentsâ€™ parents 9. Own family support 10. Student involvement 11. Colleague support 12. Knowledge about policies 13. Salary 14. Supervisor support 15. Sense of mastery of one's job Based on piloting, and keeping in mind the time burden to respondents, the first 10 categories were included in the final questionnaire used in the impact evaluation . For each of 10 categories, two types of questions were asked â€“ statement questions which helped capture teachers current situation along the categories and situational questions which helped gauge how teachers value these categories. Within each category, each of the different question types were framed in two ways â€“ positively and negatively. The final questionnaire had a total of 40 questions. Note: Based on experience from the baseline and further piloting 1 of the category from the baseline was dropped and a new category (colleague support) was added to the final 10 category list. The 40 question questionnaire was then used to collect data which was then collapsed to create one single number which has been called the Teacher Motivation Index.

New section added at midline: As part of the midline data collection a new section was added. This section had a combination of both statement (Likert) and situation (vignette) questions. The broad themes touched upon in this section were growth mindset, benefit to students, self-reported motivation and additional administrative paperwork (only in Uttar Pradesh). These themes we felt were closer to what STiR looks to influence through their program and other important themes that

emerged from our process evaluation. This section was added purely for descriptive statistics. The computation of the teacher motivation index did not change from baseline in any way.

Computation of the Index: As mentioned, there were two broad types of questions in the teacher motivation questionaire which encompassed 10 broad themes. The first kind of questions were where teachers had to either agree or disagree with a variety of statements. These include statements on job security, family support etc. There were also questions which were used to gauge how teachers value parameters such as distance, support from colleagues etc. The same questions were asked both positively and negatively. This resulted in 40 total questions. The sum of answers to all the positively framed questions were added up. From this the sum of all answers to the negatively framed questions were subtracted. The resulting value was divided by 20 to arrive at the index value.

Data entry and checks: The teacher motivation survey was a self administered paper survey. After the survey data was entered. For dataentry CSPro was used and each survey was double entered. A third entry of 10% of the sample was done by IDinsight staff as an additional level of checks. Acceptable level of errors were 0 in case of teacher or school codes and .5% in case of all other fields. Our final error rate was much below even the .5% threshold.

Final variables: The final variables include school code, teacher code, answers to all the individual questions, and the final index value, which has been called the teacher motivation index. Apart from this answers to the individual questions added this time have also been added. As noted these were not used in computing the index. These are q1232 q1231 q1133 q1233 q1131 q1132 q2133 q2132 q2233 q2231 q3134 q3135 q3136 q1338 q3138 q1238 q1138 q2238 q_3_19_A_2 q_3_19_A_3 q_3_19_A_4 q_3__19_A_4_2 and q_3_19_B. Finally some basic information on teachers has also been given -- age, experience, sex, classes and subjects taught etc. We have used a few of these as covariates (controls) in our impact analysis.

Naming of the final variables: The variables representing the individual questions have been named following an ABCC convention. A is 1 if it is a statement question with which teachers had to agree or disagree and 2 if it is a question on how teachers value different parameters. B is 1 if it is a positively framed statement or a question on how teachers value positive parameters and 2 if it is negatively framed statements and pertaining negative values. CC represents the category number. Note: All of these are prefixed with 'q'. There are 10 broad categories. They are however not serially numbered ie do not go frop 01 to 10. Eg: 06,09,12,13,14 are missing. The orignal teacher motivation questionaire was across 15 broad categories (60 questions). This was reduced to make it less time consuming. The most relevant 10 categories were preserved. These 10 can be identified from the note above.

Labels with question variables: The labels associated with the questions of the Teacher Motivation survey (named with prefix q) follow a fixed convention. For each of the questions named using the ABCC convention (see note above), the variable note has 3 parts divided by two semi-colo ns. Eg: "x;y;z". X will represent the family, Y the type of question (statement or situation) and Z the tone (positive or negative)

Unique level: This dataset is unique at the teacher level.

Variable level notes: Variable level notes have been prefixed with VL. Hence they can be identified by the same.

DDISTiRSchoolTreatmentAssignment

# Cases	453
# Variable(s)	6

Notes

In Delhi specifically since multiple enumerators surveyed one teacher, many ST cases have been dummy coded. These are identified by Student name.

{hilite: Complete Data set}

{hilite: Description:} This is the first dataset being saved which has all the variables (For CO as well as ST).

{hilite: Variable Naming Convention:} The naming of the variable is still as in the raw data (and SurveyCTO).This will be renamed as appropriate later.
{hilite: Data Cleaning:} The Data Cleaning part has been initiated in this file. 1. Manual coding errors by the enumerators relating to teacher and school code have been corrected here. Since this is generic it has been done at the very beggining. 2. Identifiers have been created for dummy coded data which will be used later.
{hilite: Further Steps:} This dataset will now be divided into three datasets for anaysis. 1. Student testing dataset 2. Classroom Observation dataset and 3. Flanders dataset. Only the relevant variables to each will be kept and specific changes will be made for each dataset.
{hilite: Variable notes:} All changes made have been recorded as variable notes. They have a common string of ED. To view all notes please type notes search ED.
ED- The student name is used to identify the cases where there has been dummy coding in Delhi. This was done before saving the complete dataset in the previous section. That identifier has been used here to drop after reshaping long. What we are left with are those students for whom the survey was actually conducted.
ED- In U.P. for 2 teachers(164007,207307)student grade coded as pre-primary. Edited here
ED- Grades have been edited for a few teachers in Delhi. The reason for this in some cases is coding errors on the part of the enumerators The majority cases are due to the constraints with respect to the SurveyCTO form. These were cases where the actual grade was above 5th grade (6,7,8) but was coded as 5th or actual grade was UKG but was coded as 1st due to how the SurveyCTO form was defined. This has been edited using the status sheet which is updated everyday after field visits based on de-briefing with enumerators.
ED- In Delhi initially suverys were also conducted in pre-primary grades and grades above 8th. These have been dropped.
{ul:{hilite:{browse "http://www.stireducation.org/":STIR} Baseline Survey Dataset}}
{hilite: Domain:}STIR works in the education sector and seeks to empower teachers to impact student learning positively.
{hilite: Background:} This dataset represents the baseline data for the STIR SIEF evaluation conducted in two contexts: Government Schools in Varanasi and Rae-Bareily districts of Uttar Pardesh; and Affordable Private schools in East Delhi. The evaluation has been designed and conducted by {browse "http://www.idinsight.org":IDinsight}. This survey is conducted as part of the SIEF grant by the World Bank. The survey has 2 broad components: Testing the learning level of Students and Observing the classroom practices of teachers.
{hilite: Evaluation Design:} The evaluation design for this study is a Randomized Control Trial in both geographies. The Randomization has been done at the school level. The sample size in U.P. was 270 schools and in Delhi was 180 schools. The three treatment arms are: STIRs base model, STIRs advanced model and a control (pure in UP; placebo in Delhi). The project is still in the first year of the two-year evaluation. On average the teaching practices of 3 teachers are observed per school and 10 students on average are selected for each teacher for testing. Prior to this a first round of baselines were conducted in which teacher motivation level was looked at.
{hilite: Tools for Surveying:} The Student Testing tool is based on the ASER Student testing tool. The ASER tool has two sections - Hindi and Math. There are 5 questions for each section, the difficulty of which increases ordinally. One question of additional difficulty was added in each section to prevent maxing out by a large proportion of students. The Classroom Observation tool is based on an activity based tool to which a 6 point child friendliness ASER matrix was added and also a section to code verbal interactions between teachers and students within the classroom.
{hilite: Variables:} The variables in the clean dataset have been named following the camelCase convention. The raw as well as the clean data set have variable labels which are either same as the questions in the questionairre or some subset of the questions' text. All variable level notes documenting the changes made have a common string of ED. Hence typing notes search ED will present all the notes associated to the variables of that particular dataset.
{hilite: Student Testing Data Set}
{hilite: Purpouse:} The student testing tool is used to compute student learning levels. The tool has two main sections - Hindi Reading and math. Hindi Reading ranges from Letters to Story. A student progresses to the next question if he/she reads the paragraph/story/collection of words with 3 or less than 3 mistakes. A students' hindi level is denoted by the maximum level he/ she has succedfully answered. At the end of each story the student is asked two questions. While the answer of the question has no direct bearing on whether or not he/she moves forward, it is an interesting data-point which captures the comprehension ability of the student. Similarly the math section ranges from single digit numbers to fractions. If a student gets at least one of the two sub-questions for each question correct he/she moves to the next question. A students math level is computed using the same logic as in Hindi.
{hilite: Data Cleaning:} The Data Cleaning specific to the Student testing data file serves the following requirements:
1. Reshaping the data from the csvs which are in a wide form to the long format. 2. Correcting coding mistakes by enumerators where all students of the same class do not have the same grade. 3. Correcting for those cases where the grade coded is different than actual grades: In Delhi the initial target grades were 1st to 5th However this

was later expanded to 1st to 8th. Before the surveyCTO form was updated grades beyond 5th were coded as 5th and grades below 1st were coded as 1st. 4. Dropping those cases of dummy coding: In Delhi the 10 students' testing for each teacher was divided among multiple enumerators. Given that the SurveyCTO form was designed for complete 10 Students, a number of forms had to be completed as dummy data. These are identifiable by Student names. These have been dropped.
{hilite: Final Variables:} The variables kept in the final dataset are identifiers for region (Delhi or UP), grade, enumerator, school teacher. It also has variables denoting Hindi Level, Math level (generated using logic mentioned above) comprehension questions and time elapsed (where a student is unable to answer).
{hilite: Variable notes:} All changes made have been recorded as variable notes. They have a common string of ED. To view all notes please type notes search ED.
{hilite: Classroom Observation Data Set}
{hilite: Overview:} The classroom observation tool has 4 sections. Amongst these 4 sections, Sections 1,2 and 4 are similar in content and structure. These three sections are activity based with a few questions on child - friendliness. Section 3 has a different structure. This section captures verbal interactions between students and teachers in the classroom by asking a series of questions 30 times every 5 seconds. From an analysis stand-point it is best to deal with Sections 1,2 and 4 as one chunk and section 3 separately.
{hilite: Purpouse:} This data set has to do with Sections 1, 2 and 4. This part of the class room observation tool has questions on the activities of the teacher and students in the classroom, what materials are used in teaching as well as child-friendliness questions which are related to if the teacher smiles/jokes, if the student asks atleast one question, if the students' work is displayed and if local information is used. This data set also has a variable which captures topics covered in class. This question can act as an important link between the Student teating tool and Class room observation tool and help us look at interesting relations between what is being taught in relation to the level of students.
{hilite: Data Cleaning:} The Data Cleaning specific to the Classroom Observation data file serves the following requirements: 1. Reshaping the data from the csvs which are in a wide form to the long format. 2. Using grades corrected in the Student testing part in the classroom observation part as well. 3. Dropping those cases of dummy coding: In Delhi one teacher was surveyed by multiple enumerators. Hence a few of the forms have no CO part. These are dropped.
{hilite: Final Variables:} The variables kept in the final dataset are identifiers for region (Delhi or UP), grade, enumerator, school teacher. It also has variables denoting classroom activities, child-friendliness and content being taught. All variables have been renamed to make it easier to understand and have been labeled as per the question.

School Cluster Dataset:

Overview: This data set gives all the schools mapped to the various treatment arms. As mentioned before, both RCT's (in Delhi and UP), 3 treatment arms: Intrinsic motivators, Extrinsic motivators and control (Pure in U.P., placebo in Delhi). The extrinsic motivators are then classified into various bundles based on the kind of motivators provided to teachers eg: Local recognition as a motivator or exposure as a motivator. This data set is unique at the school level. It can be used individually as well as by merging it back in to the other data files using school (schoolcode) to undertake treatment arms wise analysis.

Final variables: The final variables in this data file are indicators for geography, school, tratment status, which extrinsic bundle a school belongs to and what cluster a school belongs to. Note that the extrinsicPackage variable will have data only if a school is in the extrinsic motivator arm. If the school is a control or intrinsic motivator school this data will not be applicable. This has been replaced by -999. Hence if positive values are kept in this column then one would have a list of all the etrinsic motivators school.

STiR (http://www.stireducation.org/) Midline Survey Dataset
Domain:STiR works in the education sector and seeks to empower teachers to impact student learning positively. STiR seeks to boost teacher motivation and improve teaching practices and classroom culture in order to boost student learning outcomes in government and private schools. STiR provides opportunities for teachers to share their experiences, challenges, and learnings with each other, as well as prospects for special recognition.

Theory of change: STiR emphasizes the inherent ability of teachers, regardless of the pedagogies they choose: they are the experts in their classrooms, experienced with the types of issues teachers in similar schools may face. STiR seeks to improve teachersâ€™ motivation by organizing them as part of local collaborative teacher â€˜changemakerâ€™ networks. By inculcating among teachers the mindset to collaborate with peers and find localized solutions to overcome the challenges

they face, STiR believes they can motivate teachers to bring about a change in their classrooms. This positive motivation, coupled with the pedagogical techniques teachers share with each other, will adjust the ways in which teachers spend their time in the classroom. In turn, with improvements to teaching, student learning outcomes are expected to improve.

Background: This dataset represents the midline data for the STiR SIEF evaluation conducted in two contexts: Government Schools in Varanasi and Rae Barely districts of Uttar Pardesh; and Affordable Private schools in East Delhi. The evaluation has been designed and conducted by IDinsight (http://www.idinsight.org). This survey is conducted as part of the SIEF grant by the World Bank. The survey has three broad components: Teacher motivation, learning level of Students and classroom practices of teachers.

Evaluation Design: The evaluation design for this study is a Randomized Control Trial in both geographies. Treatment is allocated at the school level ie all teachers of a particular school have a particual 'treatment' assignment. The sample size in U.P. was 270 schools and in Delhi was 180 schools. The three treatment arms are: STiRs base model (Intrinsic; hereafter 1.0), STiRs advanced model (Extrinsic; hereafter 2.0) and a control (pure in UP; placebo in Delhi). The study is currently 18 months into the two-year evaluation.

Midline Sample identification strategy: For midline we tracked back teachers and students who were part of our sample at baseline (Please see baseline report for details on baseline sampling). New students were not added. Teachers were added to the list in Uttar Pradesh only if all teachers in a school who were surveyed at baseline dropped out. In Delhi, we had to resample teachers since we were unable to reach required sample numbers at baseline. If there were less than two teachers in a school from our baseline lists, we added teachers on the spot.

Details of the randomization: Delhi A.P.S 1. In Delhi, the STiR team undertook a large search exercise for APS schools in east Delhi. APS schools were defined as schools with monthly tuition fee below a certain threshold. The team touched around 500 schools. 2. STiR identified 200 APSâ€™s that were interested in working with and formally invited them to participate in their program. 3. 180 of these schools said yes. 4. The 180 schools were then divided into 7 (roughly) equally sized strata based on geography. Each stratum was assigned to a single STiR education leader 5. Within each stratum, one third schools were randomly assigned to control and two thirds to treatment 6. Within each stratum, the schools assigned to treatment were divided into 4 clusters based on geography a. Within each stratum, two of these clusters were randomly assigned to the intrinsic treatment arm (STiR 1.0) b. Within each stratum, we randomly assigned the remaining two clusters to the four extrinsic treatment flavors (STiR 2.0) using sampling without replacement (i.e. within each stratum, there is at most two flavors of treatment 2.0)

Details of the randomization: U.P. Govt. 1. In Uttar Pradesh, schools are organized into administrative units called â€œclustersâ€#. (Note: We call these clusters but they were the strata within which we randomized.) 2. Within the two districts (Rae Bareli and Varanasi), â€œclustersâ€# with less than 15 schools were dropped from consideration. 3. From among the remaining â€œclustersâ€#, we randomly selected 16 clusters. 4. Within each â€œclusterâ€#, we randomly assigned one third of schools to control and two thirds to treatment. All treatment schools in a â€œclusterâ€# received the same treatment. 5. Note: For a few schools, we didnâ€™t actually randomize at the individual school level. In some cases, two schools shared the same building or grounds (mostly the case where PS and UPS schools of the same village are very close to one another). Thus, we assured that schools with close proximity or sharing the same buildings had the same â€˜treatment statusâ€™ to minimize the risk of contamination. In practice, around 30 schools in all were randomized at this level.

Details of the survey: The baseline data collection took place in two rounds -- the teacher motivation survey from February to April 2015 and the classroom observation, student testing survey conducted from July to November 2015. Similarly the midline data collection also took place in two rounds -- the teacher motivation survey in April and May 2016 and the classroom observation, student testing survey from July to September 2016. The second round of midline survey looked at a few indicators -- teacher observed attendance (attempted as a proxy for teacher motivation), teacher observed presence in class (also attempted as a proxy for teacher motivation), school level infrastructure (including reported student enrollment and attendance numbers), classroom level information, classroom observation information and student learning level information. Details will follow on each of the individual datasets.

Treatment Allocation Data Set

Overview: The treatment allocation of the STiR program is at the school level. This dataset is at the school level and helps identify the treatment assignment of schools and by extention teachers in the schools. To run any impact analyses this file would have to be 'merged in' using school code (named school here).

Final variables: The final variables kept here are region, district, school (code) and three variables which indicate treatment assignment. This evaluation has three treatment arms -- Control(pure in Uttar Pradesh, Placebo in Delhi), STiR base model (Intrinsic) and a STiR advanced model (Extrinsic). There are also different flavors of the Extrinsic arm. The three variables have three different interpretations and usage. The first variable named "treatment" purely indicates if the school is treatment or control (ie clubbing both Intrinsic and Extrinsic together). The second variable named "treatmentStatus" indicates whether the school is a control, intrinsic or extrinsic school. Finally "extrinsicPackage" helps identify which extrinsic package an extrinsic school belongs to.

How to use: To run any impact analysis, this file would have to be merged into the data using school code (varname: school). Note: Not all schools will merge due to refusals during data collection. If school code is not present in any of the files, it can be created easily using the first four characters of teacher code.

DDISTiRStudentMapping

# Cases	10390
# Variable(s)	8

Notes

In Delhi specifically since multiple enumerators surveyed one teacher, many ST cases have been dummy coded. These are identified by Student name.

Complete Data set

Description: This is the first dataset being saved which has all the variables (For CO as well as ST).

Variable Naming Convention: The naming of the variable is still as in the raw data (and SurveyCTO).This will be renamed as appropriate later.

Data Cleaning: The Data Cleaning part has been initiated in this file. 1. Manual coding errors by the enumerators relating to teacher and school code have been corrected here. Since this is generic it has been done at the very beggining. 2. Identifiers have been created for dummy coded data which will be used later.

Further Steps: This dataset will now be divided into three datasets for anaysis. 1. Student testing dataset 2. Classroom Observation dataset and 3. Flanders dataset. Only the relevant variables to each will be kept and specific changes will be made for each dataset.

Variable notes: All changes made have been recorded as variable notes. They have a common string of ED. To view all notes please type notes search ED.

In Delhi, new teachers were surveyed, who were not surveyed during the Teacher Motivation Survey. This was done since all the teachers from the list had dropped out due to one reason or the other. The status of these teachers can be seen using the teacherStatus variable. This is a categorical variable. Teachers covered during the teacher motivation survey have status "TM Data available". Those teachers who have joined STIR's network after the teacher motivation survey have status "New STIR teacher" and those teachers who are not part of STIR's network have status "Non-STIR teacher".

Based on teachers status (TM data available, New STIR teacher or non STIR teacher), schools have been classified into 4 categories. This can be seen from the variable called school status. 406 schools across both Delhi and Uttar Pradesh have all teachers surveyed for whom teacher motivation data is available. In 4 schools (3045,3139,3149,3190) all teachers who have been surveyed are those who have joined STIR's network after the teacher motivation survey. One school (3014) is such that only non-STIR teachers have been surveyed, rest have all dropped out. And in one school (3053) one STIR teacher for whom teacher motivation data is available and two non-STIR teachers have been surveyed. The reason for this was that the teacher who was part of STIR's network did not allow students to be tested.

Due to logistical constraints, 5 teachers have only CO data (These are teacher codes: 152103,157902,158403,158503,305304). Similarly 9 teachers have no CO data, (Teacher Code: 302301,304303,309203,311401,313401,314102,316001,316202,320001). These are due to teachers being absent when the team visited or were unavailable for some reason.

{hilite: Complete Data set}

{hilite: Description:} This is the first dataset being saved which has all the variables (For CO as well as ST).

{hilite: Variable Naming Convention:} The naming of the variable is still as in the raw data (and SurveyCTO).This will be renamed as appropriate later.
{hilite: Data Cleaning:} The Data Cleaning part has been initiated in this file. 1. Manual coding errors by the enumerators relating to teacher and school code have been corrected here. Since this is generic it has been done at the very beggining. 2. Identifiers have been created for dummy coded data which will be used later.
{hilite: Further Steps:} This dataset will now be divided into three datasets for anaysis. 1. Student testing dataset 2. Classroom Observation dataset and 3. Flanders dataset. Only the relevant variables to each will be kept and specific changes will be made for each dataset.
{hilite: Variable notes:} All changes made have been recorded as variable notes. They have a common string of ED. To view all notes please type notes search ED.
ED- The student name is used to identify the cases where there has been dummy coding in Delhi. This was done before saving the complete dataset in the previous section. That identifier has been used here to drop after reshaping long. What we are left with are those students for whom the survey was actually conducted.
ED- In U.P. for 2 teachers(164007,207307)student grade coded as pre-primary. Edited here
ED- Grades have been edited for a few teachers in Delhi. The reason for this in some cases is coding errors on the part of the enumerators The majority cases are due to the constraints with respect to the SurveyCTO form. These were cases where the actual grade was above 5th grade (6,7,8) but was coded as 5th or actual grade was UKG but was coded as 1st due to how the SurveyCTO form was defined. This has been edited using the status sheet which is updated everyday after field visits based on de-briefing with enumerators.
ED- In Delhi initially suverys were also conducted in pre-primary grades and grades above 8th. These have been dropped.
{ul:{hilite:{browse "http://www.stireducation.org/":STIR} Baseline Survey Dataset}}
{hilite: Domain:}STIR works in the education sector and seeks to empower teachers to impact student learning positively.
{hilite: Background:} This dataset represents the baseline data for the STIR SIEF evaluation conducted in two contexts: Government Schools in Varanasi and Rae-Bareily districts of Uttar Pardesh; and Affordable Private schools in East Delhi. The evaluation has been designed and conducted by {browse "http://www.idinsight.org":IDinsight}. This survey is conducted as part of the SIEF grant by the World Bank. The survey has 2 broad components: Testing the learning level of Students and Observing the classroom practices of teachers.
{hilite: Evaluation Design:} The evaluation design for this study is a Randomized Control Trial in both geographies. The Randomization has been done at the school level. The sample size in U.P. was 270 schools and in Delhi was 180 schools. The three treatment arms are: STIRs base model, STIRs advanced model and a control (pure in UP; placebo in Delhi). The project is still in the first year of the two-year evaluation. On average the teaching practices of 3 teachers are observed per school and 10 students on average are selected for each teacher for testing. Prior to this a first round of baselines were conducted in which teacher motivation level was looked at.
{hilite: Tools for Surveying:} The Student Testing tool is based on the ASER Student testing tool. The ASER tool has two sections - Hindi and Math. There are 5 questions for each section, the difficulty of which increases ordinally. One question of additional difficulty was added in each section to prevent maxing out by a large proportion of students. The Classroom Observation tool is based on an activity based tool to which a 6 point child friendliness ASER matrix was added and also a section to code verbal interactions between teachers and students within the classroom.
{hilite: Variables:} The variables in the clean dataset have been named following the camelCase convention. The raw as well as the clean data set have variable labels which are either same as the questions in the questionairre or some subset of the questions' text. All variable level notes documenting the changes made have a common string of ED. Hence typing notes search ED will present all the notes associated to the variables of that particular dataset.
{hilite: Student Testing Data Set}
{hilite: Purpouse:} The student testing tool is used to compute student learning levels. The tool has two main sections - Hindi Reading and math. Hindi Reading ranges from Letters to Story. A student progresses to the next question if he/she reads the paragraph/story/collection of words with 3 or less than 3 mistakes. A students' hindi level is denoted by the maximum level he/ she has succedfully answered. At the end of each story the student is asked two questions. While the answer of the question has no direct bearing on whether or not he/she moves forward, it is an interesting data-point which captures the comprehension ability of the student. Similarly the math section ranges from single digit numbers to fractions. If a student gets at least one of the two sub-questions for each question correct he/she moves to the next question. A students math level is computed using the same logic as in Hindi.
{hilite: Data Cleaning:} The Data Cleaning specific to the Student testing data file serves the following requirements:
1. Reshaping the data from the csvs which are in a wide form to the long format. 2. Correcting coding mistakes by enumerators where all students of the same class do not have the same grade. 3. Correcting for those cases where the grade coded is different than actual grades: In Delhi the initial target grades were 1st to 5th However this

was later expanded to 1st to 8th. Before the surveyCTO form was updated grades beyond 5th were coded as 5th and grades below 1st were coded as 1st. 4. Dropping those cases of dummy coding: In Delhi the 10 students' testing for each teacher was divided among multiple enumerators. Given that the SurveyCTO form was designed for complete 10 Students, a number of forms had to be completed as dummy data. These are identifiable by Student names. These have been dropped.
{hilite: Final Variables:} The variables kept in the final dataset are identifiers for region (Delhi or UP), grade, enumerator, school teacher. It also has variables denoting Hindi Level, Math level (generated using logic mentioned above) comprehension questions and time elapsed (where a student is unable to answer).
{hilite: Variable notes:} All changes made have been recorded as variable notes. They have a common string of ED. To view all notes please type notes search ED.
{hilite: Classroom Observation Data Set}
{hilite: Overview:} The classroom observation tool has 4 sections. Amongst these 4 sections, Sections 1,2 and 4 are similar in content and structure. These three sections are activity based with a few questions on child - friendliness. Section 3 has a different structure. This section captures verbal interactions between students and teachers in the classroom by asking a series of questions 30 times every 5 seconds. From an analysis stand-point it is best to deal with Sections 1,2 and 4 as one chunk and section 3 separately.
{hilite: Purpouse:} This data set has to do with Sections 1, 2 and 4. This part of the class room observation tool has questions on the activities of the teacher and students in the classroom, what materials are used in teaching as well as child-friendliness questions which are related to if the teacher smiles/jokes, if the student asks atleast one question, if the students' work is displayed and if local information is used. This data set also has a variable which captures topics covered in class. This question can act as an important link between the Student teating tool and Class room observation tool and help us look at interesting relations between what is being taught in relation to the level of students.
{hilite: Data Cleaning:} The Data Cleaning specific to the Classroom Observation data file serves the following requirements: 1. Reshaping the data from the csvs which are in a wide form to the long format. 2. Using grades corrected in the Student testing part in the classroom observation part as well. 3. Dropping those cases of dummy coding: In Delhi one teacher was surveyed by multiple enumerators. Hence a few of the forms have no CO part. These are dropped.
{hilite: Final Variables:} The variables kept in the final dataset are identifiers for region (Delhi or UP), grade, enumerator, school teacher. It also has variables denoting classroom activities, child-friendliness and content being taught. All variables have been renamed to make it easier to understand and have been labeled as per the question.

School Cluster Dataset:

Overview: This data set gives all the schools mapped to the various treatment arms. As mentioned before, both RCT's (in Delhi and UP), 3 treatment arms: Intrinsic motivators, Extrinsic motivators and control (Pure in U.P., placebo in Delhi). The extrinsic motivators are then classified into various bundles based on the kind of motivators provided to teachers eg: Local recognition as a motivator or exposure as a motivator. This data set is unique at the school level. It can be used individually as well as by merging it back in to the other data files using school (schoolcode) to undertake treatment arms wise analysis.

Final variables: The final variables in this data file are indicators for geography, school, tratment status, which extrinsic bundle a school belongs to and what cluster a school belongs to. Note that the extrinsicPackage variable will have data only if a school is in the extrinsic motivator arm. If the school is a control or intrinsic motivator school this data will not be applicable. This has been replaced by -999. Hence if positive values are kept in this column then one would have a list of all the etrinsic motivators school.

STiR (http://www.stireducation.org/) Midline Survey Dataset
Domain:STiR works in the education sector and seeks to empower teachers to impact student learning positively. STiR seeks to boost teacher motivation and improve teaching practices and classroom culture in order to boost student learning outcomes in government and private schools. STiR provides opportunities for teachers to share their experiences, challenges, and learnings with each other, as well as prospects for special recognition.

Theory of change: STiR emphasizes the inherent ability of teachers, regardless of the pedagogies they choose: they are the experts in their classrooms, experienced with the types of issues teachers in similar schools may face. STiR seeks to improve teachersâ€™ motivation by organizing them as part of local collaborative teacher â€˜changemakerâ€™ networks. By inculcating among teachers the mindset to collaborate with peers and find localized solutions to overcome the challenges

they face, STiR believes they can motivate teachers to bring about a change in their classrooms. This positive motivation, coupled with the pedagogical techniques teachers share with each other, will adjust the ways in which teachers spend their time in the classroom. In turn, with improvements to teaching, student learning outcomes are expected to improve.

Background: This dataset represents the midline data for the STiR SIEF evaluation conducted in two contexts: Government Schools in Varanasi and Rae Barely districts of Uttar Pardesh; and Affordable Private schools in East Delhi. The evaluation has been designed and conducted by IDinsight (http://www.idinsight.org). This survey is conducted as part of the SIEF grant by the World Bank. The survey has three broad components: Teacher motivation, learning level of Students and classroom practices of teachers.

Evaluation Design: The evaluation design for this study is a Randomized Control Trial in both geographies. Treatment is allocated at the school level ie all teachers of a particular school have a particual 'treatment' assignment. The sample size in U.P. was 270 schools and in Delhi was 180 schools. The three treatment arms are: STiRs base model (Intrinsic; hereafter 1.0), STiRs advanced model (Extrinsic; hereafter 2.0) and a control (pure in UP; placebo in Delhi). The study is currently 18 months into the two-year evaluation.

Midline Sample identification strategy: For midline we tracked back teachers and students who were part of our sample at baseline (Please see baseline report for details on baseline sampling). New students were not added. Teachers were added to the list in Uttar Pradesh only if all teachers in a school who were surveyed at baseline dropped out. In Delhi, we had to resample teachers since we were unable to reach required sample numbers at baseline. If there were less than two teachers in a school from our baseline lists, we added teachers on the spot.

Details of the randomization: Delhi A.P.S 1. In Delhi, the STiR team undertook a large search exercise for APS schools in east Delhi. APS schools were defined as schools with monthly tuition fee below a certain threshold. The team touched around 500 schools. 2. STiR identified 200 APSâ€™s that were interested in working with and formally invited them to participate in their program. 3. 180 of these schools said yes. 4. The 180 schools were then divided into 7 (roughly) equally sized strata based on geography. Each stratum was assigned to a single STiR education leader 5. Within each stratum, one third schools were randomly assigned to control and two thirds to treatment 6. Within each stratum, the schools assigned to treatment were divided into 4 clusters based on geography a. Within each stratum, two of these clusters were randomly assigned to the intrinsic treatment arm (STiR 1.0) b. Within each stratum, we randomly assigned the remaining two clusters to the four extrinsic treatment flavors (STiR 2.0) using sampling without replacement (i.e. within each stratum, there is at most two flavors of treatment 2.0)

Details of the randomization: U.P. Govt. 1. In Uttar Pradesh, schools are organized into administrative units called â€œclustersâ€#. (Note: We call these clusters but they were the strata within which we randomized.) 2. Within the two districts (Rae Bareli and Varanasi), â€œclustersâ€# with less than 15 schools were dropped from consideration. 3. From among the remaining â€œclustersâ€#, we randomly selected 16 clusters. 4. Within each â€œclusterâ€#, we randomly assigned one third of schools to control and two thirds to treatment. All treatment schools in a â€œclusterâ€# received the same treatment. 5. Note: For a few schools, we didnâ€™t actually randomize at the individual school level. In some cases, two schools shared the same building or grounds (mostly the case where PS and UPS schools of the same village are very close to one another). Thus, we assured that schools with close proximity or sharing the same buildings had the same â€˜treatment statusâ€™ to minimize the risk of contamination. In practice, around 30 schools in all were randomized at this level.

Details of the survey: The baseline data collection took place in two rounds -- the teacher motivation survey from February to April 2015 and the classroom observation, student testing survey conducted from July to November 2015. Similarly the midline data collection also took place in two rounds -- the teacher motivation survey in April and May 2016 and the classroom observation, student testing survey from July to September 2016. The second round of midline survey looked at a few indicators -- teacher observed attendance (attempted as a proxy for teacher motivation), teacher observed presence in class (also attempted as a proxy for teacher motivation), school level infrastructure (including reported student enrollment and attendance numbers), classroom level information, classroom observation information and student learning level information. Details will follow on each of the individual datasets.

Student Mapping Data Set

Overview: During the student testing baseline survey student codes were assigned to students at two points. 1) In the dataset used for analyses and 2) When the student information sheet was data-entered. The student information sheet was filled up by enumerators during the student testing survey and had information useful for tracking back students -- name, sex, DOB fathers name etc. During the midline survey the codes from the data entry were used since we needed identifying information to track back and identify students. Alongside the midline data collection we also undertook an exercise where we mapped this code with the codes in our dataset to ensure we can map the midline data with the baseline data. This was done manually using student name and roll number (which were present in both the data entry sheet and the data set) using microsoft excel. This dataset provides both codes to help merge the midline and baseline student datasets. While our base specification was treatment vs controls this was needed to use baseline learning levels as controls.

Final variables: The final variables kept here are region, district, school (code), teacher (code), baseline and midline student codes, student sex and age (the final two variables are student level covariates). "studentCodeBL" is the student code in the baseline student dataset. "studentCode" is the student code in the midline dataset. Note: "teacher" is the teacher code used at the baseline classroom observation and student testing survey. To map these to the unique teacher codes used at midline please use "DDISTiRTeacherMapping.dta". Please check dataset notes in the datafile for further details on this.

How to use: To merge the midline student data to the baseline data --> Merge this file into the baseline data file using studentCodeBL. Use studentCode to merge directly with the midline data. Note: The student information sheet was filled in by enumerators before starting off with the testing. So there are cases where information of a student were filled in but the student was not available for testing. Hence there information was there in the student information sheet but not the data. One of the implication of this is that on merging there will be all three cases. First students merge perfectly. Secondly where there students have baseline data but not midline data This is due to student dropouts. And finally where students have midline data but not baseline. This is due to the data entry case mentioned above The final numbers were less than 5% and were not differential across treatment arms. Since our selection strategy here was the same as all other students there is also less fear of selection biases creeping in. These can be used if needed by imputing baseline levels for them. There is no differential attrition among students between different treatment arms.

DDISTiRTeacherMapping

# Cases	2584
# Variable(s)	6

Notes

STiR (http://www.stireducation.org/) Midline Survey Dataset
Domain:STiR works in the education sector and seeks to empower teachers to impact student learning positively. STiR seeks to boost teacher motivation and improve teaching practices and classroom culture in order to boost student learning outcomes in government and private schools. STiR provides opportunities for teachers to share their experiences, challenges, and learnings with each other, as well as prospects for special recognition.

Theory of change: STiR emphasizes the inherent ability of teachers, regardless of the pedagogies they choose: they are the experts in their classrooms, experienced with the types of issues teachers in similar schools may face. STiR seeks to improve teachersâ€™ motivation by organizing them as part of local collaborative teacher â€˜changemakerâ€™ networks. By inculcating among teachers the mindset to collaborate with peers and find localized solutions to overcome the challenges they face, STiR believes they can motivate teachers to bring about a change in their classrooms. This positive motivation, coupled with the pedagogical techniques teachers share with each other, will adjust the ways in which teachers spend their time in the classroom. In turn, with improvements to teaching, student learning outcomes are expected to improve.

Background: This dataset represents the midline data for the STiR SIEF evaluation conducted in two contexts: Government Schools in Varanasi and Rae Barely districts of Uttar Pardesh; and Affordable Private schools in East Delhi. The evaluation has been designed and conducted by IDinsight (http://www.idinsight.org). This survey is conducted as part of the SIEF grant by the World Bank. The survey has three broad components: Teacher motivation, learning level of Students and classroom practices of teachers.

Evaluation Design: The evaluation design for this study is a Randomized Control Trial in both geographies. Treatment is allocated at the school level ie all teachers of a particular school have a particual 'treatment' assignment. The sample size in U.P. was 270 schools and in Delhi was 180 schools. The three treatment arms are: STiRs base model (Intrinsic; hereafter 1.0), STiRs advanced model (Extrinsic; hereafter 2.0) and a control (pure in UP; placebo in Delhi). The study is currently 18 months into the two-year evaluation.

Midline Sample identification strategy: For midline we tracked back teachers and students who were part of our sample at baseline (Please see baseline report for details on baseline sampling). New students were not added. Teachers were added to the list in Uttar Pradesh only if all teachers in a school who were surveyed at baseline dropped out. In Delhi, we had to resample teachers since we were unable to reach required sample numbers at baseline. If there were less than two teachers in a school from our baseline lists, we added teachers on the spot.

Details of the randomization: Delhi A.P.S 1. In Delhi, the STiR team undertook a large search exercise for APS schools in east Delhi. APS schools were defined as schools with monthly tuition fee below a certain threshold. The team touched around 500 schools. 2. STiR identified 200 APSâ€™s that were interested in working with and formally invited them to participate in their program. 3. 180 of these schools said yes. 4. The 180 schools were then divided into 7 (roughly) equally sized strata based on geography. Each stratum was assigned to a single STiR education leader 5. Within each stratum, one third schools were randomly assigned to control and two thirds to treatment 6. Within each stratum, the schools assigned to treatment were divided into 4 clusters based on geography a. Within each stratum, two of these clusters were randomly assigned to the intrinsic treatment arm (STiR 1.0) b. Within each stratum, we randomly assigned the remaining two clusters to the four extrinsic treatment flavors (STiR 2.0) using sampling without replacement (i.e. within each stratum, there is at most two flavors of treatment 2.0)

Details of the randomization: U.P. Govt. 1. In Uttar Pradesh, schools are organized into administrative units called â€œclustersâ€#. (Note: We call these clusters but they were the strata within which we randomized.) 2. Within the two districts (Rae Bareli and Varanasi), â€œclustersâ€# with less than 15 schools were dropped from consideration. 3. From among the remaining â€œclustersâ€#, we randomly selected 16 clusters. 4. Within each â€œclusterâ€#, we randomly assigned one third of schools to control and two thirds to treatment. All treatment schools in a â€œclusterâ€# received the same treatment. 5. Note: For a few schools, we didnâ€™t actually randomize at the individual school level. In some cases, two schools shared the same building or grounds (mostly the case where PS and UPS schools of the same village are very close to one another). Thus, we assured that schools with close proximity or sharing the same buildings had the same â€˜treatment statusâ€™ to minimize the risk of contamination. In practice, around 30 schools in all were randomized at this level.

Details of the survey: The baseline data collection took place in two rounds -- the teacher motivation survey from February to April 2015 and the classroom observation, student testing survey conducted from July to November 2015. Similarly the midline data collection also took place in two rounds -- the teacher motivation survey in April and May 2016 and the classroom observation, student testing survey from July to September 2016. The second round of midline survey looked at a few indicators -- teacher observed attendance (attempted as a proxy for teacher motivation), teacher observed presence in class (also attempted as a proxy for teacher motivation), school level infrastructure (including reported student enrollment and attendance numbers), classroom level information, classroom observation information and student learning level information. Details will follow on each of the individual datasets.

Teacher Mapping Data Set

Overview: The baseline survey was done in two rounds -- the teacher motivation survey from Feb to Apr 2015 and the classroom obsrvation students testing survey in July - Nov 2015. Between these two rounds different teacher codes were used ie code xxxx01 was a different teacher in both rounds of baseline. After the second round of baseline we felt that it was not the most efficient system to have it this way. We undertook an exercise to map teachers across both rounds and generated a 'unique' teacher code for each teacher. This has been used consistently moving forward. We have used these codes for the process evaluation and the midline survey. This will now work be the unique code moving forward. However whenever one would like to merge in the baseline dataset this dataset would need to be used. Note: While the difference in codes is only in Delhi, we have kept both Delhi and U.P here for consistency.

Final variables: The final variables kept here are region, district, school (code) and three variables which indicate different teacher codes. "teacherCodeTM" represents the teacher code used during baseline teacher motivation survey.

"teacherCodeCOST" is the code used during the baseline classroom observation, student testing survey and "teacherCode" is the new unique code that has been generated (and will be used in subsequent surveys). Note: "teacherCodeTM" and "teacherCodeCOST" will have missing values since our teacher sample list across both rounds were not common.

How to use: If merging midline teacher motivation data with baseline teacher motivation data. --> Merge baseline data with this file using teacherCodeTM (drop missings). Use teacherCode to merge with the midline data. If merging midline teacher Classroom observation data with baseline Classroom observation data. --> Merge baseline data with this file using teacherCodeCOST (drop missings). Use teacherCode to merge with the midline data. Use region to filter as needed. Note: Not all teachers will match. For the teacher motivation there are dropouts in teachers. For the classroom observation midline there are teacher drop outs as well as additions. Please see midline report for additional information.

Variables List

Dataset contains 243 variable(s)

File DDISTiRMidlineClassroomObs

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	region	Geography	discrete	numeric-13.0	4824	0	-
2	district	District	discrete	numeric-10.0	4824	0	-
3	cluster	Network	continuous	numeric-14.0	4824	0	-
4	school	School Code	continuous	numeric-8.0	4824	0	-
5	teacher	Teacher Code	continuous	numeric-12.0	4824	0	-
6	enumerator	Enumerator Code	continuous	numeric-8.0	4824	0	-
7	informed ..	Did the principal or head teacher give permission?	discrete	numeric-8.0	4824	0	-
8	obsNumber	Observation round	discrete	numeric-18.0	4824	0	-
9	teacherA ..	What is the teacher currently doing?	discrete	numeric-80.0	4824	0	-
10	studentA ..	What are students supposed to be doing?	discrete	numeric-89.0	4824	0	-
11	studentA ..	Based on instructions given by teachers which accurately describes students?	discrete	numeric-60.0	4824	0	-
12	studentA ..	To what extent are the students engaged or not engaged?	discrete	numeric-26.0	4790	34	-
13	teacherL ..	Did the teacher smile, laugh or joke with at least some students?	discrete	numeric-9.0	4824	0	-
14	atleast1Qn	Did the students ask the teacher at least one question?	discrete	numeric-9.0	4824	0	-
15	studentP ..	Did the teacher praise or showcase the work of atleast one child?	discrete	numeric-9.0	4824	0	-
16	localInf ..	Did the teacher use local or relevant information to make content relevant?	discrete	numeric-9.0	4824	0	-
17	tlm	Did the teacher use any learning aides other than the textbook?	discrete	numeric-9.0	4824	0	-
18	groupWork	Did the teacher ask children to work in small groups or pairs?	discrete	numeric-9.0	4824	0	-
19	referName	Did the teacher always refer to her students by their name?	discrete	numeric-10.0	4824	0	-
20	mainSubj ..	What was the main subject covered in this class?	discrete	numeric-8.0	4824	0	-
21	topicsCo ..	What topics were covered in this class? (Topic 1)	discrete	numeric-32.0	4512	312	-
22	topicsCo ..	What topics were covered in this class? (Topic 2)	discrete	numeric-32.0	371	4453	-

File DDISTiRMidlineClassroomObs

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
23	topicsCo ..	What topics were covered in this class? (Topic 3)	discrete	numeric-32.0	62	4762	-
24	topicsCo ..	What topics were covered in this class? (Topic 4)	discrete	numeric-32.0	22	4802	-

File DDISTiRMidlineClassroomScan

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	surveyDate	Date of the survey	discrete	character-12	1206	0	-
2	classroo ..	Time of the classroom scan	discrete	character-5	1206	0	-
3	region	Geography	discrete	numeric-13.0	1206	0	-
4	district	District	discrete	numeric-10.0	1206	0	-
5	cluster	Network	continuous	numeric-14.0	1206	0	-
6	school	School Code	continuous	numeric-8.0	1206	0	-
7	teacher	Teacher Code	continuous	numeric-12.0	1206	0	-
8	enumerator	Enumerator Code	continuous	numeric-8.0	1206	0	-
9	informed ..	Did the principal or head teacher give permission?	discrete	numeric-8.0	1206	0	-
10	numberSt ..	Number of students	continuous	numeric-8.0	1206	0	-
11	numberGi ..	Number of girls visible in the class	continuous	numeric-8.0	1206	0	-
12	numberBoys	Number of boys visible in the class	continuous	numeric-8.0	1206	0	-
13	numberTe ..	How many teachers are in present the classroom?	discrete	numeric-13.0	1206	0	-
14	classroo ..	What best describes the classroom?	discrete	numeric-30.0	1206	0	-
15	seatingD ..	How would you describe the way the students are seated?	discrete	numeric-25.0	1206	0	-
16	seatingT ..	Majority of the students are on:	discrete	numeric-26.0	1206	0	-
17	uniform	Are children wearing uniform?	discrete	numeric-9.0	1206	0	-
18	outsideN ..	Does outside noise affect communication?	discrete	numeric-9.0	1206	0	-
19	blackboa ..	Does the classroom have a blackboard or a whiteboard?	discrete	numeric-9.0	1206	0	-
20	teacherC ..	Is there a chair and/or a table for the teacher?	discrete	numeric-9.0	1206	0	-
21	posters	Are there posters, etc, on the walls or on display (other than student work)?Â	discrete	numeric-9.0	1206	0	-
22	students ..	Is student work (posters, drawings, etc) on display in the classroom?	discrete	numeric-9.0	1206	0	-

File DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	starttime	-	discrete	character-24	401	0	-
2	region	Geography	discrete	numeric-13.0	401	0	-
3	district	District	discrete	numeric-10.0	401	0	-
4	cluster	Network	continuous	numeric-14.0	401	0	-
5	school	School Code	continuous	numeric-9.0	401	0	-
6	enumerator	Enumerator Code	continuous	numeric-8.0	401	0	-
7	teacherA ..	Please select the activities that took place today? -- teacher arrived	discrete	numeric-9.0	401	0	-
8	morningC ..	Please select the activities that took place today? -- morning class	discrete	numeric-9.0	401	0	-
9	afternoo ..	Please select the activities that took place today? -- afternoon class	discrete	numeric-9.0	401	0	-
10	lunch	Please select the activities that took place today? -- lunch	discrete	numeric-9.0	401	0	-
11	schoolDay	Please select the activities that took place today? -- school day ended	discrete	numeric-9.0	401	0	-
12	other	Please select the activities that took place today? -- other	discrete	numeric-9.0	401	0	-
13	timeFirs ..	Time of first teacher arriving	discrete	character-24	401	0	-
14	timemorn ..	Time of morning class session starting	discrete	character-24	401	0	-
15	timeafte ..	Time of afternoon class session starting	discrete	character-24	401	0	-
16	timelunc ..	Time of lunch starting	discrete	character-24	401	0	-
17	timeStud ..	Time of most students arriving	discrete	character-24	401	0	-
18	timeLast ..	Time of last teacher arrived	discrete	character-24	401	0	-
19	timemorn ..	Time of morning class session ending	discrete	character-24	401	0	-
20	timeafte ..	Time of afternoon class session ending	discrete	character-24	401	0	-
21	timelunc ..	Time of lunch ending	discrete	character-24	401	0	-
22	timeStud ..	Time of most students leaving	discrete	character-24	401	0	-
23	wall	Does the school have a boundary wall?	discrete	numeric-9.0	401	0	-
24	toilet	Does the school have a toilet in working condition?	discrete	numeric-9.0	400	1	-
25	kitchen	Does the school have a separate kitchen?	discrete	numeric-9.0	401	0	-
26	desks	How many classrooms have desks for students?	discrete	numeric-9.0	401	0	-

File DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
27	electric ..	Does the school have an electric connection?	discrete	numeric-9.0	401	0	-
28	electric ..	Does the school electricity work?	discrete	numeric-9.0	401	0	-
29	noClassr ..	How many classrooms are there in this school?	continuous	numeric-8.0	398	3	-
30	numberTe ..	How many teachers does the school have?	continuous	numeric-8.0	399	2	-
31	numberTe ..	How many teachers are present today?	continuous	numeric-8.0	397	4	-
32	numberTe ..	How many teachers are absent today?	continuous	numeric-8.0	391	10	-
33	numberTe ..	How many teachers are on department duty?	discrete	numeric-8.0	261	140	-
34	numberGr ..	How many grades are taught in this school?	continuous	numeric-8.0	399	2	-
35	ukgGrade	What grades are being taught in the school?UKG	discrete	numeric-9.0	401	0	-
36	firstGrade	What grades are being taught in the school?First	discrete	numeric-9.0	401	0	-
37	secondGr ..	What grades are being taught in the school?Second	discrete	numeric-9.0	401	0	-
38	thirdGrade	What grades are being taught in the school?Third	discrete	numeric-9.0	401	0	-
39	fourthGr ..	What grades are being taught in the school?Fourth	discrete	numeric-9.0	401	0	-
40	fifthGrade	What grades are being taught in the school?Fifth	discrete	numeric-9.0	401	0	-
41	sixthGrade	What grades are being taught in the school?Sixth	discrete	numeric-9.0	401	0	-
42	seventhG ..	What grades are being taught in the school?Seventh	discrete	numeric-9.0	401	0	-
43	eightGrade	What grades are being taught in the school?Eight	discrete	numeric-9.0	401	0	-
44	ninthGrade	What grades are being taught in the school?Ninth	discrete	numeric-9.0	401	0	-
45	tenthGrade	What grades are being taught in the school?Tenth	discrete	numeric-9.0	401	0	-
46	eleventh ..	What grades are being taught in the school?Eleventh	discrete	numeric-9.0	401	0	-
47	twelfthG ..	What grades are being taught in the school?Twelfth	discrete	numeric-9.0	401	0	-
48	enrollme ..	How many students are enrolled in class 1	continuous	numeric-8.0	389	12	-
49	enrollme ..	How many students are enrolled in class 2	continuous	numeric-8.0	388	13	-
50	enrollme ..	How many students are enrolled in class 3	continuous	numeric-8.0	388	13	-

File DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
51	enrollme ..	How many students are enrolled in class 4	continuous	numeric-8.0	325	76	-
52	enrollme ..	How many students are enrolled in class 5	continuous	numeric-8.0	324	77	-
53	enrollme ..	How many students are enrolled in class 6	continuous	numeric-8.0	111	290	-
54	enrollme ..	How many students are enrolled in class 7	continuous	numeric-8.0	100	301	-
55	enrollme ..	How many students are enrolled in class 8	continuous	numeric-8.0	91	310	-
56	enrollme ..	How many students are enrolled in class 9	continuous	numeric-8.0	47	354	-
57	enrollme ..	How many students are enrolled in class 10	continuous	numeric-8.0	37	364	-
58	enrollme ..	How many students are enrolled in class 11	continuous	numeric-8.0	30	371	-
59	totalStu ..	Number of students present today across all grades?	continuous	numeric-8.0	381	20	-

File DDISTiRMidlineObservedAttendance

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	surveyDate	Date of the survey	discrete	character-12	16800	0	-
2	region	Geography	discrete	numeric-8.0	16800	0	-
3	district	District	discrete	numeric-10.0	16800	0	-
4	cluster	Network	continuous	numeric-14.0	16800	0	-
5	school	School Code	continuous	numeric-9.0	16800	0	-
6	teacher	Teacher Code	continuous	numeric-9.0	16800	0	-
7	observat ..	-	continuous	numeric-9.0	16800	0	-
8	enumerator	Enumerator Code	continuous	numeric-8.0	16800	0	-
9	attendance	Is the teacher present in the school?	discrete	numeric-9.0	16800	0	-
10	inClass	Is the teacher inside the class?	discrete	numeric-29.0	13242	3558	-

File DDISTiRMidlineStudentTesting.dta

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	surveyDate	Date of the survey	discrete	character-12	6516	0	-
2	region	Geography	discrete	numeric-13.0	6516	0	-
3	district	District	discrete	numeric-10.0	6516	0	-
4	cluster	Network	continuous	numeric-14.0	6516	0	-
5	school	School Code	continuous	numeric-9.0	6516	0	-
6	teacher	Teacher Code	continuous	numeric-9.0	6516	0	-
7	studentC ..	Student Code	continuous	numeric-10.0	6516	0	-

File DDISTiRMidlineStudentTesting.dta

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
8	grade	Students grade	discrete	numeric-8.0	6516	0	-
9	rollNumber	Roll number	continuous	numeric-8.0	6516	0	-
10	enumerator	Enumerator Code	continuous	numeric-8.0	6516	0	-
11	hindiLevel	Maximum level in Hindi	discrete	numeric-9.0	6516	0	-
12	mathLevel	Maximum level in Math	discrete	numeric-14.0	6516	0	-
13	comprehe ..	Comprehension Questions	discrete	numeric-8.0	6516	0	-
14	timeElap ..	Time elapsed	discrete	numeric-8.0	6516	0	-
15	comeSchool	Do you like coming to school?	discrete	numeric-10.0	6512	4	-
16	likeTeac ..	Do you want to be like your teacher?	discrete	numeric-10.0	6511	5	-

File DDISTiRMidlineTeacherMotivation

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	region	Geography	discrete	numeric-13.0	1412	0	-
2	district	District	discrete	numeric-9.0	1412	0	-
3	cluster	Network	discrete	numeric-8.0	1412	0	-
4	school	School Code	continuous	numeric-10.0	1412	0	-
5	teacher	Teacher Code	continuous	numeric-10.0	1412	0	-
6	enumerator	Enumerator Code	continuous	numeric-10.0	1412	0	-
7	age	Teachers age	continuous	numeric-10.0	1406	6	-
8	teaching ..	Years of total teaching experience	continuous	numeric-10.0	1405	7	-
9	teaching ..	Months of total experience (to be used only along with year)	discrete	numeric-10.0	1404	8	-
10	teaching ..	Years in current school	continuous	numeric-10.0	1395	17	-
11	teaching ..	Months in current school (to be used only along with year)	discrete	numeric-10.0	1394	18	-
12	teaching ..	Day in current school (to be used only along with year)	continuous	numeric-10.0	1394	18	-
13	gender	Teacher sex	discrete	numeric-10.0	1412	0	-
14	qualific ..	Highest academic qualification of teachers	discrete	numeric-10.0	1410	2	-
15	B_ED_M_ED	Additional teacher training	discrete	numeric-10.0	1387	25	-
16	set	Questionnaire version	discrete	numeric-10.0	1412	0	-
17	CLS_TGT_..	Do you (teachers) teach grades 1 to 5? (Y/N)	discrete	numeric-8.0	1410	2	-
18	CLS_TGT_..	Do you (teachers) teach grades 6 to 8? (Y/N)	discrete	numeric-8.0	1410	2	-
19	CLS_TGT_..	Do you (teachers) teach grades 9 and 10? (Y/N)	discrete	numeric-8.0	1410	2	-
20	CLS_TGT_..	Do you (teachers) teach grades 11 and 12? (Y/N)	discrete	numeric-8.0	1410	2	-

File DDISTiRMidlineTeacherMotivation

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
21	SUB_TGT_..	Do you (teachers) teach english? (Y/N)	discrete	numeric-8.0	1412	0	-
22	SUB_TGT_..	Do you (teachers) teach hindi? (Y/N)	discrete	numeric-8.0	1412	0	-
23	SUB_TGT_..	Do you (teachers) teach math? (Y/N)	discrete	numeric-8.0	1412	0	-
24	SUB_TGT_..	Do you (teachers) teach social studies? (Y/N)	discrete	numeric-8.0	1412	0	-
25	SUB_TGT_SC	Do you (teachers) teach science? (Y/N)	discrete	numeric-8.0	1412	0	-
26	SUB_TGT_..	Do you (teachers) teach urdu? (Y/N)	discrete	numeric-8.0	1412	0	-
27	SUB_TGT_..	Do you (teachers) teach sanskrit? (Y/N)	discrete	numeric-8.0	1412	0	-
28	SUB_TGT_..	Do you (teachers) teach any other subject? (Y/N)	discrete	numeric-8.0	1412	0	-
29	q1105	Creative environment; Statement; Positive	discrete	numeric-17.0	1408	4	-
30	q1111	Additional responsibility; Statement; Positive	discrete	numeric-17.0	1391	21	-
31	q1208	Student parent support; Statement; Negative	discrete	numeric-17.0	1402	10	-
32	q1207	Job mastery; Statement; Negative	discrete	numeric-17.0	1389	23	-
33	q1215	Own family support; Statement; Negative	discrete	numeric-17.0	1405	7	-
34	q1210	Student involvement; Statement; Negative	discrete	numeric-17.0	1404	8	-
35	q1205	Creative environment; Statement; Negative	discrete	numeric-17.0	1405	7	-
36	q1101	Supervisor recognition; Statement; Positive	discrete	numeric-17.0	1389	23	-
37	q1102	Student performance; Statement; Positive	discrete	numeric-17.0	1407	5	-
38	q1104	Job security; Statement; Positive	discrete	numeric-17.0	1393	19	-
39	q1103	TLM; Statement; Positive	discrete	numeric-17.0	1406	6	-
40	q1211	Additional responsibility; Statement; Negative	discrete	numeric-17.0	1393	19	-
41	q1107	Job mastery; Statement; Positive	discrete	numeric-17.0	1406	6	-
42	q1201	Supervisor recognition; Statement; Negative	discrete	numeric-17.0	1396	16	-
43	q1108	Student parent support; Statement; Positive	discrete	numeric-17.0	1409	3	-
44	q1110	Student involvement; Statement; Positive	discrete	numeric-17.0	1406	6	-
45	q1203	TLM; Statement; Negative	discrete	numeric-17.0	1407	5	-

File DDISTiRMidlineTeacherMotivation

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
46	q1202	Student performance; Statement; Negative	discrete	numeric-17.0	1392	20	-
47	q1115	Own family support; Statement; Positive	discrete	numeric-17.0	1393	19	-
48	q1204	Job security; Statement; Negative	discrete	numeric-17.0	1365	47	-
49	q2104	Job security; Situation; Positive	discrete	numeric-8.0	1409	3	-
50	q2208	Student parent support; Situation; Negative	discrete	numeric-8.0	1407	5	-
51	q2103	TLM; Situation; Positive	discrete	numeric-8.0	1404	8	-
52	q2205	Creative environment; Situation; Negative	discrete	numeric-8.0	1404	8	-
53	q2215	Own family support; Situation; Negative	discrete	numeric-8.0	1405	7	-
54	q2111	Additional responsibility; Situation; Positive	discrete	numeric-8.0	1407	5	-
55	q2201	Supervisor recognition; Situation; Negative	discrete	numeric-8.0	1402	10	-
56	q2207	Job mastery; Situation; Negative	discrete	numeric-8.0	1402	10	-
57	q2210	Student involvement; Situation; Negative	discrete	numeric-8.0	1409	3	-
58	q2211	Additional responsibility; Situation; Negative	discrete	numeric-8.0	1409	3	-
59	q2115	Own family support; Situation; Positive	discrete	numeric-8.0	1410	2	-
60	q2203	TLM; Situation; Negative	discrete	numeric-8.0	1409	3	-
61	q2202	Student performance; Situation; Negative	discrete	numeric-8.0	1410	2	-
62	q2105	Creative environment; Situation; Positive	discrete	numeric-8.0	1409	3	-
63	q2110	Student involvement; Situation; Positive	discrete	numeric-8.0	1409	3	-
64	q2204	Job security; Situation; Negative	discrete	numeric-8.0	1404	8	-
65	q2102	Student performance; Situation; Positive	discrete	numeric-8.0	1411	1	-
66	q2101	Supervisor recognition; Situation; Positive	discrete	numeric-8.0	1408	4	-
67	q2107	Job mastery; Situation; Positive	discrete	numeric-8.0	1409	3	-
68	q2108	Student parent support; Situation; Positive	discrete	numeric-8.0	1411	1	-
69	index	Teacher Motivation Index	continuous	numeric-9.0	1412	0	-
70	q1232	Growth mindset student; Statement; Negative	discrete	numeric-17.0	1401	11	-
71	q1231	Growth mindset teacher; Statement; Negative	discrete	numeric-17.0	1403	9	-

File DDISTiRMidlineTeacherMotivation

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
72	q1133	Student benefit; Statement; Positive	discrete	numeric-17.0	1407	5	-
73	q1233	Student benefit; Statement; Negative	discrete	numeric-17.0	1401	11	-
74	q1131	Growth mindset teacher; Statement; Positive	discrete	numeric-17.0	1398	14	-
75	q1132	Growth mindset student; Statement; Positive	discrete	numeric-17.0	1401	11	-
76	q2133	Student benefit; Situation; Positive	discrete	numeric-8.0	1411	1	-
77	q2132	Growth mindset student; Situation; Positive	discrete	numeric-8.0	1406	6	-
78	q2233	Student benefit; Situation; Negative	discrete	numeric-8.0	1406	6	-
79	q2231	Growth mindset teacher; Situation; Negative	discrete	numeric-8.0	1406	6	-
80	q3134	If my principal gives me other work instead of teaching, I willÂ be:	discrete	numeric-8.0	1399	13	-
81	q3135	How motivated have you been in the past week as a teacher?	discrete	numeric-8.0	1385	27	-
82	q3136	Do you feel as motivated as a teacher could be?	discrete	numeric-8.0	1384	28	-
83	q1338	Paperwork; Statement; Negative (Only U.P.)	discrete	numeric-17.0	748	664	-
84	q3138	Paperwork; Statement; Positive (Only U.P.)	discrete	numeric-10.0	743	669	-
85	q1238	Paperwork; Statement; Positive (Only U.P.)	discrete	numeric-17.0	743	669	-
86	q1138	Paperwork; Statement; Positive (Only U.P.)	discrete	numeric-17.0	746	666	-
87	q2238	Paperwork; Situation; Positive (Only U.P.)	discrete	numeric-8.0	745	667	-
88	q_3_19_A_2	Number of public holidays in the last 14 days	discrete	numeric-10.0	1402	10	-
89	q_3_19_A_3	Number of days school was closed due to any other reasons	discrete	numeric-10.0	1400	12	-
90	q_3_19_A_4	Number of days you had to stay outside the school due to administrative works	discrete	numeric-10.0	1400	12	-
91	q_3__19_..	How many days could you have attended school over the past 14 days	discrete	numeric-10.0	1401	11	-
92	q_3_19_B	Of those days you could attend, how many days have you attended the school?	discrete	numeric-10.0	1401	11	-

File DDISTiRSchoolTreatmentAssignment

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	region	Geography	discrete	numeric-13.0	453	0	-
2	district	District	discrete	numeric-10.0	453	0	-
3	school	School Code	continuous	numeric-10.0	453	0	-
4	treatment	Broad treatment assignment	discrete	numeric-9.0	453	0	-
5	treatmen ..	Finer treatment assignment	discrete	numeric-9.0	453	0	-
6	extrinsi ..	Details on extrinsic package	discrete	numeric-32.0	453	0	-

File DDISTiRStudentMapping

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	region	Geography	discrete	numeric-13.0	10390	0	-
2	district	District	discrete	numeric-10.0	10390	0	-
3	school	School Code	continuous	numeric-8.0	10390	0	-
4	teacher	Teacher Code used during baseline COST	continuous	numeric-12.0	10390	0	-
5	studentC ..	Student code midline	continuous	numeric-12.0	10390	0	-
6	studentC ..	Student code baseline	continuous	numeric-10.0	10390	0	-
7	sex	Student sex	discrete	numeric-10.0	10207	183	-
8	age	Student age	discrete	numeric-10.0	9950	440	-

File DDISTiRTeacherMapping

#	Name	Label	Type	Format	Valid	Invalid	Question
1	region	Geography	discrete	numeric-13.0	2584	0	-
2	district	District	discrete	numeric-10.0	2584	0	-
3	school	School Code	continuous	numeric-10.0	2584	0	-
4	teacherC ..	Unique teacher code used at midline	continuous	numeric-9.0	2584	0	-
5	teacherC ..	Teacher code baseline classroom observation, student testing	continuous	numeric-12.0	2077	507	-
6	teacherC ..	Teacher code baseline teacher motivation	continuous	numeric-10.0	2503	81	-

Variables Description

Dataset contains 243 variable(s)

File : DDISTiRMidlineClassroomObs

region: Geography

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-2] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=4824 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]
Notes	VL - 1 for Delhi (Affordable Private Schools) and 2 for Uttar Pradesh (Govt. Schools)

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	Delhi	1836	38.1%
2	Uttar Pradesh	2988	61.9%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

district: District

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-3] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=4824 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	Delhi	1836	38.1%
2	Rae Bareli	1364	28.3%
3	Varanasi	1624	33.7%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

cluster: Network

Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-26] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=4824 /-] [Invalid=0 /-] [Mean=12.611 /-] [StdDev=7.895 /-]
Notes	VL - For STiR's programming schools have been organized/ grouped into networks. In Delhi, each Education Leader leads one network and in Uttar Pradesh it is based on an administrative unit. This variable represents the 'clusters' or groups into which schools fall.

school: School Code

Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1501-3198] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=4824 /-] [Invalid=0 /-] [Mean=2319.789 /-] [StdDev=640.217 /-]

teacher: Teacher Code

Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 150102-319804] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=4824 /-] [Invalid=0 /-] [Mean=231985.032 /-] [StdDev=64025.098 /-]
Notes	VL - Teacher codes in this data set are now unique ie all teachers part of this two year study now have a 'unique' teacher code. For new teachers added, new unique codes have been provided. In U.P. 16 teachers were added at midline; and in Delhi 248 teachers were added. These teachers will not 'match' when merged with baseline data.

enumerator: Enumerator Code

Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 5-42] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=4824 /-] [Invalid=0 /-] [Mean=24.055 /-] [StdDev=11.353 /-]

informedConsent: Did the principal or head teacher give permission?

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=4824 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	No	0	
1	Yes	4824	100.0%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

File : DDISTiRMidlineClassroomObs

obsNumber: Observation round

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=4824 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	First observation	1206	25.0%
2	Second observation	1206	25.0%
3	Third observation	1206	25.0%
4	Fourth observation	1206	25.0%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

teacherActivity: What is the teacher currently doing?

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-3] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=4824 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	Teaching students (discussing academic material)	4034	83.6%
2	Classroom management (discipline, attendance, or other non-academic interaction)	634	13.1%
3	Out of classroom or off task	156	3.2%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

studentActivity1: What are students supposed to be doing?

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-6] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=4824 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	Listening to, watching the teacher or repeating what the teacher says	3485	72.2%
2	Working or discussing in pairs, groups or as a class	623	12.9%
3	Working quietly (individually)	596	12.4%
4	Sitting or standing quietly for non-academic purposes (such as uniform distribution etc.)	43	0.9%
5	No particular instructions on what they are supposed to be doing	59	1.2%
6	Unclear	18	0.4%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

studentActivity2: Based on instructions given by teachers which accurately describes students?

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-3] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=4824 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	Students are engaged in whatever they are supposed to do	4584	95.0%
2	Students are not engaged in whatever they are supposed to do	206	4.3%
3	Unclear	34	0.7%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

studentActivity3: To what extent are the students engaged or not engaged?

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-2147483634] [Missing=*/11]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=4790 /-] [Invalid=34 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	Somewhat	1225	25.6%

File : DDISTiRMidlineClassroomObs

studentActivity3: To what extent are the students engaged or not engaged?

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
2	Very much	3565	74.4%
2147483634	Student activities unclear	0	
11	.M	34	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

teacherLaughSmile: Did the teacher smile, laugh or joke with at least some students?

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-3] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=4824 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	Yes	1151	23.9%
2	No	3664	76.0%
3	Dont know	9	0.2%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

atleast1Qn: Did the students ask the teacher at least one question?

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-3] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=4824 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	Yes	919	19.1%
2	No	3894	80.7%
3	Dont know	11	0.2%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

studentPraisedShowcased: Did the teacher praise or showcase the work of atleast one child?

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-3] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=4824 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	Yes	648	13.4%
2	No	4161	86.3%
3	Dont know	15	0.3%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

localInformation: Did the teacher use local or relevant information to make content relevant?

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-3] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=4824 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	Yes	1001	20.8%
2	No	3808	78.9%
3	Dont know	15	0.3%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

tlm: Did the teacher use any learning aides other than the textbook?

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-3] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=4824 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]

File : DDISTiRMidlineClassroomObs

tlm: Did the teacher use any learning aides other than the textbook?

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	Yes	2407	49.9%
2	No	2406	49.9%
3	Dont know	11	0.2%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

groupWork: Did the teacher ask children to work in small groups or pairs?

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-3] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=4824 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	Yes	175	3.6%
2	No	4639	96.2%
3	Dont know	10	0.2%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

referName: Did the teacher always refer to her students by their name?

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-3] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=4824 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	Yes	3238	67.1%
2	No	1531	31.7%
3	Dont know	55	1.1%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

mainSubject: What was the main subject covered in this class?

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-5] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=4824 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	Math	1132	23.5%
2	Hindi	1339	27.8%
3	English	718	14.9%
4	Other	1345	27.9%
5	None	290	6.0%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

topicsCovered1: What topics were covered in this class? (Topic 1)

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 101-2147483634] [Missing=*/1001]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=4512 /-] [Invalid=312 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
101	Single-digit numbers	98	2.2%
102	Double-digit (or higher) numbers	137	3.0%
103	Addition	273	6.1%
104	Subtraction	91	2.0%
105	Multiplication	125	2.8%
106	Division	78	1.7%

File : DDISTiRMidlineClassroomObs

topicsCovered1: What topics were covered in this class? (Topic 1)

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
107	Other math	326	7.2%
108	Letters	287	6.4%
109	Words	246	5.5%
110	Sentences	86	1.9%
111	Stories	473	10.5%
112	Vocabulary	23	0.5%
113	Other Hindi	216	4.8%
114	Letters	133	2.9%
115	Words	138	3.1%
116	Sentences	50	1.1%
117	Stories	137	3.0%
118	Vocabulary	8	0.2%
119	Other English	250	5.5%
120	Other topic	1337	29.6%
2147483634	Topic not recorded	0	
1001	.M	312	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

topicsCovered2: What topics were covered in this class? (Topic 2)

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 101-2147483635] [Missing=*/1001/1001]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=371 /-] [Invalid=4453 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
101	Single-digit numbers	0	
102	Double-digit (or higher) numbers	27	7.3%
103	Addition	11	3.0%
104	Subtraction	81	21.8%
105	Multiplication	20	5.4%
106	Division	14	3.8%
107	Other math	26	7.0%
108	Letters	0	
109	Words	50	13.5%
110	Sentences	24	6.5%
111	Stories	18	4.9%
112	Vocabulary	12	3.2%
113	Other Hindi	17	4.6%
114	Letters	0	
115	Words	15	4.0%
116	Sentences	19	5.1%
117	Stories	3	0.8%
118	Vocabulary	2	0.5%
119	Other English	32	8.6%
120	Other topic	0	
2147483634	Topic not recorded	0	
2147483635	Only one topic taught	0	

File : DDISTiRMidlineClassroomObs

topicsCovered2: What topics were covered in this class? (Topic 2)

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1001	.N	4453	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

topicsCovered3: What topics were covered in this class? (Topic 3)

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 101-2147483637] [Missing=*/1001/1001/1001]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=62 /-] [Invalid=4762 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
101	Single-digit numbers	0	
102	Double-digit (or higher) numbers	0	
103	Addition	0	
104	Subtraction	4	6.5%
105	Multiplication	29	46.8%
106	Division	6	9.7%
107	Other math	4	6.5%
108	Letters	0	
109	Words	0	
110	Sentences	2	3.2%
111	Stories	0	
112	Vocabulary	2	3.2%
113	Other Hindi	9	14.5%
114	Letters	0	
115	Words	0	
116	Sentences	2	3.2%
117	Stories	0	
118	Vocabulary	1	1.6%
119	Other English	3	4.8%
120	Other topic	0	
2147483634	Topic not recorded	0	
2147483635	Only one topic taught	0	
2147483637	Only two topics taught	0	
1001	.P	4762	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

topicsCovered4: What topics were covered in this class? (Topic 4)

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 101-2147483638] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=22 /-] [Invalid=4802 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
101	Single-digit numbers	0	
102	Double-digit (or higher) numbers	0	
103	Addition	0	
104	Subtraction	0	
105	Multiplication	0	
106	Division	15	68.2%
107	Other math	6	27.3%

File : DDISTiRMidlineClassroomObs

topicsCovered4: What topics were covered in this class? (Topic 4)

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
108	Letters	0	
109	Words	0	
110	Sentences	0	
111	Stories	1	4.5%
112	Vocabulary	0	
113	Other Hindi	0	
114	Letters	0	
115	Words	0	
116	Sentences	0	
117	Stories	0	
118	Vocabulary	0	
119	Other English	0	
120	Other topic	0	
2147483634	Topic not recorded	0	
2147483635	Only one topic taught	0	
2147483637	Only two topics taught	0	
2147483638	Only three topics taught	0	
1001	.Q	4802	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

File : DDISTiRMidlineClassroomScan

surveyDate: Date of the survey

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=character] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1206 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]
Notes	VL - Date of the survey. Stored as a string. Imported directly from surveyCTO this way.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1-Aug-16		19	1.6%
1-Jan-14		2	0.2%
1-Sep-16		40	3.3%
10-Aug-16		20	1.7%
10-Sep-16		27	2.2%
11-Aug-16		16	1.3%
12-Aug-16		21	1.7%
12-Sep-16		33	2.7%
13-Aug-16		9	0.7%
14-Sep-16		18	1.5%
16-Aug-16		37	3.1%
16-Sep-16		7	0.6%
17-Aug-16		44	3.6%
17-Sep-16		2	0.2%
19-Aug-16		42	3.5%
19-Sep-16		9	0.7%
2-Aug-16		52	4.3%
2-Sep-16		40	3.3%
20-Aug-16		35	2.9%
22-Aug-16		14	1.2%
23-Aug-16		22	1.8%
24-Aug-16		9	0.7%
25-Jul-16		25	2.1%
26-Aug-16		9	0.7%
26-Jul-16		46	3.8%
27-Aug-16		4	0.3%
27-Jul-16		33	2.7%
28-Jul-16		44	3.6%
29-Aug-16		10	0.8%
29-Jul-16		38	3.2%
3-Aug-16		36	3.0%
3-Sep-16		49	4.1%
30-Aug-16		29	2.4%
30-Jul-16		28	2.3%
31-Aug-16		28	2.3%
4-Aug-16		46	3.8%
5-Aug-16		52	4.3%
5-Sep-16		1	0.1%
6-Aug-16		35	2.9%
6-Sep-16		49	4.1%

File : DDISTiRMidlineClassroomScan

surveyDate: Date of the survey

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
7-Sep-16		20	1.7%
8-Aug-16		22	1.8%
8-Sep-16		34	2.8%
9-Aug-16		25	2.1%
9-Sep-16		25	2.1%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

classroomScanTime: Time of the classroom scan

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=character] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1206 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]
Notes	VL - Time of the survey. Stored as a string (hh:mm format). Imported directly from surveyCTO this way.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
08:51		1	0.1%
09:15		1	0.1%
09:22		1	0.1%
09:24		1	0.1%
09:27		2	0.2%
09:28		1	0.1%
09:49		2	0.2%
10:00		5	0.4%
10:02		11	0.9%
10:04		10	0.8%
10:05		7	0.6%
10:07		9	0.7%
10:09		9	0.7%
10:10		15	1.2%
10:12		11	0.9%
10:13		3	0.2%
10:15		7	0.6%
10:17		5	0.4%
10:18		9	0.7%
10:20		4	0.3%
10:21		1	0.1%
10:23		3	0.2%
10:25		2	0.2%
10:26		5	0.4%
10:28		8	0.7%
10:29		3	0.2%
10:31		5	0.4%
10:33		2	0.2%
10:34		6	0.5%
10:36		3	0.2%
10:37		3	0.2%
10:39		1	0.1%

File : DDISTiRMidlineClassroomScan

classroomScanTime: Time of the classroom scan

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
10:41		2	0.2%
10:42		3	0.2%
10:44		1	0.1%
10:45		1	0.1%
10:47		2	0.2%
10:49		4	0.3%
10:54		2	0.2%
10:55		1	0.1%
10:57		2	0.2%
10:58		3	0.2%
11:00		1	0.1%
11:02		1	0.1%
11:03		8	0.7%
11:05		7	0.6%
11:06		8	0.7%
11:08		12	1.0%
11:10		5	0.4%
11:11		12	1.0%
11:13		8	0.7%
11:14		8	0.7%
11:16		19	1.6%
11:18		7	0.6%
11:19		9	0.7%
11:21		9	0.7%
11:22		3	0.2%
11:24		12	1.0%
11:26		2	0.2%
11:27		6	0.5%
11:29		9	0.7%
11:30		6	0.5%
11:32		10	0.8%
11:34		6	0.5%
11:35		10	0.8%
11:37		11	0.9%
11:39		8	0.7%
11:40		19	1.6%
11:42		7	0.6%
11:43		6	0.5%
11:44		1	0.1%
11:45		15	1.2%
11:47		4	0.3%
11:48		15	1.2%
11:50		13	1.1%

File : DDISTiRMidlineClassroomScan

classroomScanTime: Time of the classroom scan

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
11:51		3	0.2%
11:53		8	0.7%
11:55		7	0.6%
11:56		8	0.7%
11:58		9	0.7%
11:59		6	0.5%
12:01		8	0.7%
12:03		3	0.2%
12:04		6	0.5%
12:06		6	0.5%
12:07		6	0.5%
12:09		11	0.9%
12:11		3	0.2%
12:12		12	1.0%
12:14		15	1.2%
12:15		3	0.2%
12:17		8	0.7%
12:19		4	0.3%
12:20		5	0.4%
12:22		8	0.7%
12:24		2	0.2%
12:25		9	0.7%
12:27		3	0.2%
12:28		2	0.2%
12:30		10	0.8%
12:32		4	0.3%
12:33		6	0.5%
12:35		7	0.6%
12:36		4	0.3%
12:38		4	0.3%
12:40		1	0.1%
12:41		3	0.2%
12:43		3	0.2%
12:54		1	0.1%
13:02		1	0.1%
14:18		1	0.1%
14:29		1	0.1%
15:24		1	0.1%
18:26		1	0.1%
18:54		1	0.1%
20:56		1	0.1%
21:25		1	0.1%
21:32		1	0.1%

File : DDISTiRMidlineClassroomScan

classroomScanTime: Time of the classroom scan

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
23:40		1	0.1%
8:13		1	0.1%
8:19		3	0.2%
8:21		4	0.3%
8:22		1	0.1%
8:24		1	0.1%
8:26		3	0.2%
8:27		2	0.2%
8:29		3	0.2%
8:30		2	0.2%
8:32		8	0.7%
8:34		7	0.6%
8:35		1	0.1%
8:37		10	0.8%
8:39		3	0.2%
8:40		13	1.1%
8:42		10	0.8%
8:43		5	0.4%
8:45		7	0.6%
8:47		6	0.5%
8:48		7	0.6%
8:50		12	1.0%
8:51		9	0.7%
8:53		10	0.8%
8:55		9	0.7%
8:56		10	0.8%
8:58		9	0.7%
8:59		6	0.5%
9:01		13	1.1%
9:03		5	0.4%
9:04		12	1.0%
9:06		12	1.0%
9:07		2	0.2%
9:09		19	1.6%
9:11		8	0.7%
9:12		11	0.9%
9:14		15	1.2%
9:15		12	1.0%
9:17		17	1.4%
9:19		15	1.2%
9:20		10	0.8%
9:22		9	0.7%
9:24		4	0.3%

File : DDISTiRMidlineClassroomScan

classroomScanTime: Time of the classroom scan

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
9:25		18	1.5%
9:27		12	1.0%
9:28		8	0.7%
9:30		12	1.0%
9:32		7	0.6%
9:33		18	1.5%
9:35		14	1.2%
9:36		8	0.7%
9:38		10	0.8%
9:40		7	0.6%
9:41		11	0.9%
9:43		10	0.8%
9:44		2	0.2%
9:46		12	1.0%
9:48		7	0.6%
9:49		11	0.9%
9:51		7	0.6%
9:52		2	0.2%
9:54		6	0.5%
9:56		6	0.5%
9:57		17	1.4%
9:59		13	1.1%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

region: Geography

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-2] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1206 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]
Notes	VL - 1 for Delhi (Affordable Private Schools) and 2 for Uttar Pradesh (Govt. Schools)

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	Delhi	459	38.1%
2	Uttar Pradesh	747	61.9%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

district: District

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-3] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1206 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	Delhi	459	38.1%
2	Rae Bareli	341	28.3%
3	Varanasi	406	33.7%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

cluster: Network

Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-26] [Missing=*]

File : DDISTiRMidlineClassroomScan

cluster: Network

Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1206 /-] [Invalid=0 /-] [Mean=12.611 /-] [StdDev=7.898 /-]
Notes	VL - For STiR's programming schools have been organized/ grouped into networks. In Delhi, each Education Leader leads one network and in Uttar Pradesh it is based on an administrative unit. This variable represents the 'clusters' or groups into which schools fall.

school: School Code

Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1501-3198] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1206 /-] [Invalid=0 /-] [Mean=2319.789 /-] [StdDev=640.417 /-]

teacher: Teacher Code

Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 150102-319804] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1206 /-] [Invalid=0 /-] [Mean=231985.032 /-] [StdDev=64045.02 /-]
Notes	VL - Teacher codes in this data set are now unique ie all teachers part of this two year study now have a 'unique' teacher code. For new teachers added, new unique codes have been provided. In U.P. 16 teachers were added at midline; and in Delhi 248 teachers were added. These teachers will not 'match' when merged with baseline data.

enumerator: Enumerator Code

Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 5-42] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1206 /-] [Invalid=0 /-] [Mean=24.057 /-] [StdDev=11.353 /-]

informedConsent: Did the principal or head teacher give permission?

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1206 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	No	0	
1	Yes	1206	100.0%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

numberStudents: Number of students

Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-54] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1206 /-] [Invalid=0 /-] [Mean=19.467 /-] [StdDev=9.405 /-]

numberGirls: Number of girls visible in the class

Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-34] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1206 /-] [Invalid=0 /-] [Mean=9.073 /-] [StdDev=5.577 /-]

numberBoys: Number of boys visible in the class

Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-37] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1206 /-] [Invalid=0 /-] [Mean=10.394 /-] [StdDev=6.679 /-]

numberTeachers: How many teachers are in present the classroom?

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-3] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1206 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	One	1137	94.3%
2	Two	63	5.2%
3	Three or more	6	0.5%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

File : DDISTiRMidlineClassroomScan

classroomDescription: What best describes the classroom?

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-3] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1206 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	Open/Outdoor class	16	1.3%
2	Roofed but open from the sides	68	5.6%
3	Covered with wall	1122	93.0%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

seatingDescription: How would you describe the way the students are seated?

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-3] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1206 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	In rows	1147	95.1%
2	In groups	51	4.2%
3	No particular arrangement	8	0.7%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

seatingType: Majority of the students are on:

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-5] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1206 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	Bare floor	4	0.3%
2	Mats	695	57.6%
3	Seats with tables or desks	490	40.6%
4	Seats without tables	17	1.4%
5	Not seated	0	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

uniform: Are children wearing uniform?

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-3] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1206 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	Yes	1004	83.3%
2	No	201	16.7%
3	Dont know	1	0.1%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

outsideNoise: Does outside noise affect communication?

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-3] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1206 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	Yes	132	10.9%
2	No	1074	89.1%
3	Dont know	0	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

File : DDISTiRMidlineClassroomScan

blackboardWhiteboard: Does the classroom have a blackboard or a whiteboard?

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-3] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1206 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	Yes	1174	97.3%
2	No	32	2.7%
3	Dont know	0	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

teacherChairTable: Is there a chair and/or a table for the teacher?

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-3] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1206 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	Yes	1153	95.6%
2	No	53	4.4%
3	Dont know	0	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

posters: Are there posters, etc, on the walls or on display (other than student work)?Â

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-3] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1206 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	Yes	675	56.0%
2	No	529	43.9%
3	Dont know	2	0.2%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

studentsWork: Is student work (posters, drawings, etc) on display in the classroom?

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-3] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1206 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	Yes	337	27.9%
2	No	868	72.0%
3	Dont know	1	0.1%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

starttime

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=character] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=401 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 1, 2016 10:27:57 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 1, 2016 11:06:24 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 1, 2016 12:48:51 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 1, 2016 9:02:05 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 10:05:59 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 10:18:14 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 10:22:14 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 10:42:58 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 10:46:57 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 10:57:32 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 11:16:42 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 11:41:15 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 12:09:10 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 12:10:07 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 12:28:34 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 12:40:56 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 1:03:18 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 1:11:19 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 9:18:36 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 9:29:35 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 11, 2016 10:17:57 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 11, 2016 10:48:36 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 11, 2016 11:36:34 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 11, 2016 11:40:06 AM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

starttime

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 11, 2016 11:48:57 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 11, 2016 11:53:41 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 11, 2016 12:28:38 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 11, 2016 12:39:30 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 11, 2016 8:59:28 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 12, 2016 10:54:11 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 12, 2016 1:05:21 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 12, 2016 8:46:35 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 13, 2016 11:58:32 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 13, 2016 12:45:41 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 16, 2016 10:38:37 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 16, 2016 10:49:57 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 16, 2016 11:56:10 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 16, 2016 12:34:21 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 16, 2016 12:37:34 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 16, 2016 12:52:11 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 16, 2016 12:52:19 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 16, 2016 12:53:25 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 16, 2016 12:55:09 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 16, 2016 12:57:46 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 16, 2016 9:31:11 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 16, 2016 9:57:03 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 10:07:01 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 12:26:31 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 12:34:23 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 12:47:35 PM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

starttime

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 17, 2016 12:50:09 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 12:51:26 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 12:55:11 PM		2	0.5%
Aug 17, 2016 1:00:14 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 1:02:50 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 1:10:25 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 1:14:34 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 1:29:42 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 1:45:30 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 8:56:20 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 10:36:45 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 10:43:49 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 10:52:30 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 11:10:04 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 11:21:16 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 11:42:56 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 12:01:55 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 12:12:27 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 12:20:08 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 12:43:28 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 12:43:30 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 12:50:02 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 12:50:50 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 12:57:57 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 1:03:16 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 1:13:37 PM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

starttime

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 19, 2016 9:58:55 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 10:17:28 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 10:20:50 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 10:26:22 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 10:28:14 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 10:47:52 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 11:00:21 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 11:48:15 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 11:48:16 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 12:07:34 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 12:18:18 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 12:30:07 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 12:39:28 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 12:41:58 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 12:44:18 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 12:45:11 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 12:49:11 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 1:09:34 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 1:42:29 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 4:14:29 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 9:39:26 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 20, 2016 10:20:29 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 20, 2016 10:30:56 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 20, 2016 11:53:58 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 20, 2016 12:00:16 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 20, 2016 12:17:32 PM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

starttime

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 20, 2016 12:44:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 20, 2016 12:50:04 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 20, 2016 12:50:41 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 20, 2016 12:58:40 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 20, 2016 1:03:41 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 20, 2016 9:35:37 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 20, 2016 9:42:17 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 22, 2016 10:18:54 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 22, 2016 10:48:08 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 22, 2016 12:06:51 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 22, 2016 12:26:26 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 22, 2016 12:35:48 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 22, 2016 9:19:27 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 23, 2016 11:04:34 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 23, 2016 11:27:13 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 23, 2016 12:08:32 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 23, 2016 12:17:56 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 23, 2016 1:16:05 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 23, 2016 8:46:10 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 23, 2016 9:21:48 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 24, 2016 10:17:47 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 24, 2016 12:55:31 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 24, 2016 9:55:02 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 24, 2016 9:58:26 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 26, 2016 10:36:11 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 26, 2016 12:01:08 PM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

starttime

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 26, 2016 12:12:32 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 27, 2016 9:56:30 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 29, 2016 11:38:53 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 10:14:37 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 10:35:06 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 10:48:06 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 10:49:08 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 10:56:24 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 11:37:18 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 11:49:45 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 11:53:13 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 11:57:05 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 12:02:35 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 12:16:44 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 12:27:56 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 12:42:58 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 12:43:33 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 12:46:08 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 12:55:29 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 12:59:19 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 1:05:06 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 1:11:07 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 1:22:36 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 9:11:41 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 9:56:27 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 11:00:54 AM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

starttime

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 30, 2016 11:25:03 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 11:45:24 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 11:48:17 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 12:22:17 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 12:35:19 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 12:44:58 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 12:46:26 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 12:48:17 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 12:49:01 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 12:50:18 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 12:52:06 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 12:56:09 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 12:58:46 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 1:02:21 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 1:03:17 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 8:35:50 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 9:43:56 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 31, 2016 10:46:28 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 31, 2016 12:07:58 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 31, 2016 12:11:50 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 31, 2016 12:19:51 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 31, 2016 12:39:36 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 31, 2016 12:46:07 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 31, 2016 1:06:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 10:13:05 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 10:21:02 AM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

starttime

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 4, 2016 10:24:17 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 10:32:46 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 11:07:20 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 11:21:22 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 11:33:06 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 11:37:38 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 11:58:43 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 12:12:09 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 12:16:43 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 12:19:48 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 12:37:03 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 12:48:31 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 12:51:18 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 12:54:18 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 12:55:34 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 1:26:49 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 2:41:52 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 9:23:56 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 9:40:31 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 10:07:48 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 10:30:03 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 10:48:29 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 10:58:13 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 11:03:51 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 12:10:11 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 12:41:21 PM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

starttime

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 5, 2016 12:41:42 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 12:44:14 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 12:44:17 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 12:55:40 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 12:58:56 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 12:59:24 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 1:00:41 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 1:26:06 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 9:09:36 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 9:26:15 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 11:29:53 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 11:38:31 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 11:38:41 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 11:59:13 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 12:24:52 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 12:24:55 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 12:31:26 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 8:32:04 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 9:25:06 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 9:35:02 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 9:40:11 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 9:43:41 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 9:45:49 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 9:53:23 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 8, 2016 10:36:51 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 8, 2016 11:08:47 AM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

starttime

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 8, 2016 11:09:03 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 8, 2016 1:09:27 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 8, 2016 9:34:16 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2016 10:15:56 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2016 10:15:59 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2016 10:48:13 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2016 11:55:55 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2016 12:21:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2016 12:34:34 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2016 12:35:24 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2016 12:36:23 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2016 12:46:19 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2016 12:54:50 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2016 1:00:04 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2016 1:00:14 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2016 8:54:53 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2016 8:59:08 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2016 9:01:37 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2016 9:21:14 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2016 9:23:03 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2016 9:25:05 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2016 9:40:56 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2016 9:54:25 AM		1	0.2%
Jan 1, 2014 6:08:34 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 10:21:24 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 10:39:23 AM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

starttime

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Jul 25, 2016 10:45:15 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 10:58:55 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 11:00:06 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 11:31:45 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 11:49:36 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 12:04:16 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 12:28:30 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 12:39:39 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 1:22:27 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 1:27:01 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 3:35:22 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 9:07:49 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 9:12:08 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 27, 2016 10:51:02 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 27, 2016 11:36:40 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 27, 2016 12:20:07 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 27, 2016 12:56:01 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 27, 2016 1:03:23 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 10:07:48 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 10:44:30 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 10:49:07 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 10:49:41 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 11:20:46 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 11:40:29 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 12:10:49 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 12:17:54 PM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

starttime

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Jul 28, 2016 12:24:49 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 12:25:10 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 12:32:39 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 12:33:47 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 12:40:44 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 12:50:24 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 8:26:06 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 9:35:35 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 9:53:04 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 10:08:54 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 10:27:11 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 10:43:27 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 10:56:02 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 11:29:18 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 12:07:06 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 12:08:19 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 12:08:23 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 12:15:41 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 12:15:51 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 12:20:16 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 12:20:40 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 12:23:02 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 12:24:09 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 8:29:57 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 9:04:12 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 9:10:32 AM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

starttime

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Jul 29, 2016 9:53:32 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 9:58:29 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 10:15:55 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 10:19:46 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 10:24:55 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 10:39:31 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 10:45:42 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 11:37:40 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 11:45:33 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 12:13:34 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 12:24:48 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 12:34:28 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 12:41:55 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 12:47:07 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 1:10:04 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 2:41:34 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 9:28:30 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 9:35:25 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 9:54:58 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 9:59:09 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 1, 2016 12:17:12 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 1, 2016 12:18:36 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 1, 2016 12:35:47 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 1, 2016 12:39:49 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 1, 2016 12:43:43 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 1, 2016 12:57:13 PM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

starttime

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Sep 1, 2016 12:59:42 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 1, 2016 1:00:50 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 1, 2016 1:08:45 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 10, 2016 12:40:16 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 10, 2016 12:46:30 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 10, 2016 12:53:33 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 10:11:27 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 11:31:03 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 11:53:21 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 12:59:49 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 8:37:09 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 8:49:09 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 9:17:56 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 9:26:52 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 9:27:30 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 9:32:03 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 9:56:39 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 14, 2016 12:44:54 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 2, 2016 10:42:55 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 2, 2016 10:50:21 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 2, 2016 10:51:32 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 2, 2016 12:27:08 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 2, 2016 12:40:53 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 2, 2016 12:56:45 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 2, 2016 1:06:14 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 2, 2016 1:07:28 PM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

starttime

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Sep 2, 2016 9:41:09 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 3, 2016 11:46:57 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 3, 2016 12:13:30 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 3, 2016 12:23:39 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 3, 2016 12:36:49 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 3, 2016 12:42:11 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 3, 2016 12:56:47 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 3, 2016 1:01:50 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 10:16:43 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 10:17:32 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 11:42:32 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 12:31:02 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 12:37:45 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 12:41:10 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 12:49:25 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 12:52:51 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 12:54:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 12:55:45 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 12:59:46 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 1:04:07 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 1:05:10 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 7, 2016 11:45:39 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 7, 2016 12:34:17 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 7, 2016 12:42:12 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 7, 2016 12:47:28 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 7, 2016 12:54:22 PM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

starttime

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Sep 7, 2016 1:01:37 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 8, 2016 12:07:10 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 8, 2016 12:09:20 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 8, 2016 12:35:28 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 8, 2016 12:54:28 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 9, 2016 10:27:14 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 9, 2016 12:31:42 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 9, 2016 12:34:42 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 9, 2016 12:43:06 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 9, 2016 12:55:34 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 9, 2016 9:58:19 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 9, 2016 9:59:35 AM		1	0.2%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

region: Geography

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-2] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=401 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]
Notes	VL - 1 for Delhi (Affordable Private Schools) and 2 for Uttar Pradesh (Govt. Schools)

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	Delhi	135	33.7%
2	Uttar Pradesh	266	66.3%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

district: District

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-3] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=401 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	Delhi	135	33.7%
2	Rae Bareli	157	39.2%
3	Varanasi	109	27.2%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

cluster: Network

Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-26] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=401 /-] [Invalid=0 /-] [Mean=13.394 /-] [StdDev=8.015 /-]

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

cluster: Network

Notes	VL - For STiR's programming schools have been organized/ grouped into networks. In Delhi, each Education Leader leads one network and in Uttar Pradesh it is based on an administrative unit. This variable represents the 'clusters' or groups into which schools fall.

school: School Code

Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1501-3198] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=401 /-] [Invalid=0 /-] [Mean=2218.571 /-] [StdDev=653.21 /-]

enumerator: Enumerator Code

Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 6-42] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=401 /-] [Invalid=0 /-] [Mean=24.686 /-] [StdDev=11.051 /-]

teacherArrived: Please select the activities that took place today? -- teacher arrived

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=401 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	No	143	35.7%
1	Yes	258	64.3%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

morningClass: Please select the activities that took place today? -- morning class

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=401 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	No	84	20.9%
1	Yes	317	79.1%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

afternoonClass: Please select the activities that took place today? -- afternoon class

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=401 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	No	133	33.2%
1	Yes	268	66.8%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

lunch: Please select the activities that took place today? -- lunch

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=401 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	No	142	35.4%
1	Yes	259	64.6%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

schoolDay: Please select the activities that took place today? -- school day ended

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=401 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

schoolDay: Please select the activities that took place today? -- school day ended

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	No	247	61.6%
1	Yes	154	38.4%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

other: Please select the activities that took place today? -- other

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=401 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	No	396	98.8%
1	Yes	5	1.2%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

timeFirstTeacher: Time of first teacher arriving

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=character] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=401 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]
Notes	VL - These timestamps have been imported directly from surveyCTO. In some of the phones; the date-time was not correct from the very beginning. Before these were corrected manually, the associated time stamps may be wrong.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 1, 2016 10:28:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 1, 2016 8:15:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 1, 2016 8:31:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 1, 2016 9:03:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 10:00:00 PM		3	0.7%
Aug 10, 2016 10:47:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 11:52:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 12:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 12:36:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 7:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 7:30:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 7:45:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 10, 2016 8:00:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 10, 2016 8:07:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 8:16:00 AM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timeFirstTeacher: Time of first teacher arriving

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 10, 2016 9:19:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 11, 2016 10:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 11, 2016 10:18:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 11, 2016 11:40:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 11, 2016 11:54:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 11, 2016 12:00:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 11, 2016 12:29:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 11, 2016 6:55:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 11, 2016 7:55:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 11, 2016 8:27:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 12, 2016 10:54:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 12, 2016 7:15:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 12, 2016 7:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 13, 2016 8:15:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 13, 2021 12:12:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 16, 2016 10:00:00 PM		2	0.5%
Aug 16, 2016 10:38:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 16, 2016 10:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 16, 2016 12:52:00 PM		2	0.5%
Aug 16, 2016 12:53:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 16, 2016 12:55:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 16, 2016 12:58:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 16, 2016 7:40:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 16, 2016 8:00:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 17, 2016 10:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 10:07:00 AM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timeFirstTeacher: Time of first teacher arriving

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 17, 2016 12:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 12:35:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 12:56:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 1:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 1:30:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 1:45:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 7:40:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 7:45:00 AM		5	1.2%
Aug 17, 2016 8:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 10:00:00 PM		6	1.5%
Aug 19, 2016 11:21:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 12:00:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 19, 2016 12:20:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 7:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 7:45:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 19, 2016 7:50:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 7:55:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2015 1:43:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 10:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 10:17:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 10:18:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 11:49:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 12:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 12:08:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 12:40:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 1:09:00 PM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timeFirstTeacher: Time of first teacher arriving

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 2, 2016 7:25:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 7:45:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 2, 2016 7:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 7:55:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 8:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 8:05:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 8:08:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 8:25:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 8:45:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 9:40:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 20, 2016 10:00:00 PM		2	0.5%
Aug 20, 2016 10:20:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 20, 2016 7:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 20, 2016 7:05:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 20, 2016 7:45:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 20, 2016 7:45:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 20, 2016 7:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 20, 2016 8:00:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 20, 2016 8:06:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 20, 2016 9:35:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 22, 2016 10:19:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 22, 2016 12:07:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 22, 2016 7:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 22, 2016 7:55:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 22, 2016 8:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 22, 2016 8:15:00 AM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timeFirstTeacher: Time of first teacher arriving

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 22, 2016 9:19:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 23, 2016 12:18:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 23, 2016 1:16:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 23, 2016 7:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 23, 2016 7:45:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 23, 2016 7:52:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 23, 2016 8:10:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 23, 2025 7:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 24, 2016 7:20:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 24, 2016 7:30:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 24, 2016 8:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 24, 2016 9:58:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 26, 2016 10:36:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 26, 2016 12:01:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 26, 2016 7:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 27, 2016 9:56:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 29, 2016 8:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 10:00:00 PM		3	0.7%
Aug 3, 2016 10:11:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 10:48:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 10:49:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 10:57:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 11:37:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 11:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 11:54:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 12:44:00 PM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timeFirstTeacher: Time of first teacher arriving

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 3, 2016 7:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 7:45:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 8:02:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 8:10:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 8:30:00 AM		3	0.7%
Aug 3, 2016 8:30:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 8:45:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 9:56:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 10:00:00 PM		3	0.7%
Aug 30, 2016 11:25:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 12:00:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 30, 2016 12:47:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 7:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 7:03:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 7:45:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 7:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 7:55:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 30, 2016 8:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 8:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 8:36:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 8:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 9:44:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 31, 2016 10:00:00 PM		2	0.5%
Aug 31, 2016 12:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 31, 2016 7:15:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 31, 2016 7:45:00 AM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timeFirstTeacher: Time of first teacher arriving

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 31, 2016 8:05:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 31, 2016 8:24:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 10:00:00 PM		2	0.5%
Aug 4, 2016 10:02:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 10:33:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 11:07:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 11:33:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 12:56:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 7:45:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 7:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 8:00:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 4, 2016 8:02:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 8:08:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 8:20:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 8:22:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 8:28:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 8:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 9:41:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2019 7:45:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 10:00:00 PM		2	0.5%
Aug 5, 2016 10:08:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 10:48:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 11:04:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 1:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 1:26:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 7:20:00 AM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timeFirstTeacher: Time of first teacher arriving

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 5, 2016 7:40:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 7:45:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 5, 2016 7:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 8:10:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 8:15:00 AM		3	0.7%
Aug 5, 2016 8:29:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 10:00:00 PM		3	0.7%
Aug 6, 2016 11:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 7:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 7:55:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 8:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 8:03:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 8:10:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 6, 2016 8:12:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 8:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 8:32:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 8:46:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 8, 2016 10:37:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 8, 2016 11:09:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 8, 2016 1:10:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 8, 2016 7:45:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 8, 2016 8:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2016 10:00:00 PM		6	1.5%
Aug 9, 2016 10:16:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 9, 2016 12:35:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2016 1:00:00 PM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timeFirstTeacher: Time of first teacher arriving

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 9, 2016 7:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2016 7:45:00 AM		3	0.7%
Aug 9, 2016 8:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2016 8:41:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2016 8:55:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2016 9:25:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2017 8:15:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2018 10:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jan 1, 2014 8:11:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 12, 2016 7:35:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 10:41:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 10:46:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 12:00:00 AM		3	0.7%
Jul 25, 2016 12:05:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 12:29:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 1:23:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 2:14:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 3:35:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 7:41:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 7:45:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 8:58:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 9:01:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 9:12:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 27, 2016 10:00:00 PM		2	0.5%
Jul 27, 2016 1:04:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 27, 2016 8:00:00 AM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timeFirstTeacher: Time of first teacher arriving

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Jul 28, 2016 10:00:00 PM		2	0.5%
Jul 28, 2016 10:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 12:00:00 AM		5	1.2%
Jul 28, 2016 12:25:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 2:25:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 7:45:00 AM		2	0.5%
Jul 28, 2016 8:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 8:01:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 8:32:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 9:36:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 9:53:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 10:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 10:22:00 PM		3	0.7%
Jul 29, 2016 11:29:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 12:00:00 AM		2	0.5%
Jul 29, 2016 12:08:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 12:16:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 6:08:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 7:45:00 AM		3	0.7%
Jul 29, 2016 7:48:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 8:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 8:06:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 8:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 9:59:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 10:00:00 PM		3	0.7%
Jul 30, 2016 10:20:00 AM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timeFirstTeacher: Time of first teacher arriving

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Jul 30, 2016 10:25:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 12:00:00 AM		2	0.5%
Jul 30, 2016 7:45:00 AM		2	0.5%
Jul 30, 2016 7:55:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 8:05:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 8:13:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 8:15:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 8:16:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 8:18:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 8:26:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 9:28:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 6, 2016 7:54:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 1, 2016 10:00:00 PM		4	1.0%
Sep 1, 2016 7:30:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 1, 2016 7:45:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 1, 2016 8:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 1, 2016 8:05:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 1, 2017 8:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 10, 2016 10:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 10, 2016 8:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 10:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 10:11:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 1:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 7:43:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 8:45:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 8:49:00 AM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timeFirstTeacher: Time of first teacher arriving

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Sep 12, 2016 9:18:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 9:27:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 9:27:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 9:32:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 9:57:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 14, 2016 12:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 19, 2016 12:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 2, 2016 10:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 2, 2016 10:43:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 2, 2016 10:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 2, 2016 7:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 2, 2016 7:40:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 2, 2016 7:50:00 AM		2	0.5%
Sep 2, 2016 8:00:00 AM		2	0.5%
Sep 29, 2016 10:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 3, 2016 10:00:00 PM		2	0.5%
Sep 3, 2016 12:14:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 3, 2016 12:37:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 3, 2016 7:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 3, 2016 8:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 3, 2016 8:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 30, 2016 1:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 4, 2016 7:35:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 10:00:00 PM		3	0.7%
Sep 6, 2016 10:17:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 11:42:00 AM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timeFirstTeacher: Time of first teacher arriving

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Sep 6, 2016 12:38:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 1:05:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 1:11:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 7:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 7:15:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 7:45:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 7:50:00 AM		2	0.5%
Sep 7, 2016 11:45:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 7, 2016 12:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 7, 2016 12:00:00 PM		2	0.5%
Sep 7, 2016 12:42:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 7, 2016 7:45:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 8, 2016 10:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 8, 2016 10:36:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 8, 2016 12:09:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 8, 2016 8:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 9, 2016 10:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 9, 2016 12:00:00 AM		2	0.5%
Sep 9, 2016 12:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 9, 2016 7:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 9, 2016 7:55:00 AM		2	0.5%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

timemorningClassStart: Time of morning class session starting

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=character] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=401 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]
Notes	VL - These timestamps have been imported directly from surveyCTO. In some of the phones; the date-time was not correct from the very beginning. Before these were corrected manually, the associated time stamps may be wrong.

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timemorningClassStart: Time of morning class session starting

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 1, 2016 10:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 1, 2016 10:28:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 1, 2016 12:49:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 1, 2016 9:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 1, 2016 9:03:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 10:00:00 PM		3	0.7%
Aug 10, 2016 10:47:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 11:41:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 12:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 12:28:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 1:11:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 7:45:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 8:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 8:15:00 AM		3	0.7%
Aug 10, 2016 8:46:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 9:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 9:19:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 11, 2016 10:18:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 11, 2016 11:40:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 11, 2016 11:54:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 11, 2016 12:00:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 11, 2016 12:29:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 11, 2016 7:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 11, 2016 8:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 11, 2016 8:52:00 AM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timemorningClassStart: Time of morning class session starting

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 12, 2016 10:54:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 12, 2016 7:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 12, 2016 8:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 13, 2016 12:12:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 13, 2016 9:03:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 16, 2016 10:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 16, 2016 10:38:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 16, 2016 10:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 16, 2016 12:52:00 PM		2	0.5%
Aug 16, 2016 12:58:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 16, 2016 8:15:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 16, 2016 8:30:00 AM		4	1.0%
Aug 16, 2016 9:53:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 10:07:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 12:35:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 12:56:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 1:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 1:30:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 1:45:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 8:00:00 AM		3	0.7%
Aug 17, 2016 8:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 8:15:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 17, 2016 8:15:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 8:20:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 8:25:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 10:00:00 PM		2	0.5%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timemorningClassStart: Time of morning class session starting

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 19, 2016 10:18:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 11:21:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 12:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 12:20:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 8:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 8:05:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 8:15:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 19, 2016 8:15:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 8:20:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 8:28:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 8:35:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 8:42:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 9:00:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 2, 2016 10:00:00 PM		2	0.5%
Aug 2, 2016 10:18:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 11:49:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 12:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 12:08:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 12:30:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 12:40:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 1:09:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 1:43:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 8:07:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 8:20:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 8:30:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 2, 2016 8:40:00 AM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timemorningClassStart: Time of morning class session starting

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 2, 2016 8:45:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 2, 2016 8:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 9:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 9:40:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 20, 2016 10:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 20, 2016 11:54:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 20, 2016 7:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 20, 2016 7:45:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 20, 2016 8:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 20, 2016 8:05:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 20, 2016 8:15:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 20, 2016 8:30:00 AM		3	0.7%
Aug 20, 2016 8:36:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 20, 2016 9:35:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 22, 2016 10:19:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 22, 2016 10:48:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 22, 2016 12:07:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 22, 2016 8:30:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 22, 2016 9:19:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 23, 2016 12:18:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 23, 2016 1:16:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 23, 2016 8:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 23, 2016 8:15:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 23, 2016 8:30:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 23, 2016 8:45:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 24, 2016 7:50:00 AM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timemorningClassStart: Time of morning class session starting

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 24, 2016 8:00:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 24, 2016 9:58:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 26, 2016 10:36:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 26, 2016 12:01:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 26, 2016 8:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 27, 2016 9:56:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 29, 2016 11:39:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 10:00:00 PM		3	0.7%
Aug 3, 2016 10:48:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 10:49:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 10:57:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 11:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 11:54:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 1:11:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 8:15:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 3, 2016 8:30:00 AM		4	1.0%
Aug 3, 2016 8:35:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 3, 2016 8:45:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 3, 2016 9:00:00 AM		3	0.7%
Aug 30, 2016 11:25:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 12:47:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 8:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 8:13:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 8:15:00 AM		4	1.0%
Aug 30, 2016 8:30:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 30, 2016 8:30:00 PM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timemorningClassStart: Time of morning class session starting

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 30, 2016 8:35:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 8:36:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 8:45:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 9:00:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 30, 2016 9:44:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2020 8:19:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 31, 2016 10:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 31, 2016 12:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 31, 2016 7:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 31, 2016 8:35:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 31, 2016 8:40:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 31, 2016 8:55:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 10:00:00 PM		2	0.5%
Aug 4, 2016 10:33:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 11:07:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 11:33:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 12:56:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 8:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 8:10:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 4, 2016 8:15:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 8:20:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 8:30:00 AM		3	0.7%
Aug 4, 2016 8:30:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 8:39:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 8:45:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 8:56:00 AM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timemorningClassStart: Time of morning class session starting

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 4, 2016 9:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 9:41:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 10:00:00 PM		2	0.5%
Aug 5, 2016 10:08:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 10:48:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 11:04:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 1:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 1:26:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 7:45:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 8:15:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 8:20:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 5, 2016 8:25:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 8:30:00 AM		3	0.7%
Aug 5, 2016 8:45:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 8:58:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 10:00:00 PM		3	0.7%
Aug 6, 2016 11:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 11:38:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 8:15:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 6, 2016 8:20:00 AM		3	0.7%
Aug 6, 2016 8:30:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 6, 2016 8:32:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 8:35:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 8, 2016 10:37:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 8, 2016 1:10:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 8, 2016 7:30:00 AM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timemorningClassStart: Time of morning class session starting

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 8, 2016 8:29:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 8, 2016 8:45:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2016 10:00:00 PM		7	1.7%
Aug 9, 2016 10:16:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 9, 2016 1:00:00 PM		2	0.5%
Aug 9, 2016 7:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2016 7:45:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2016 8:10:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2016 8:15:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 9, 2016 8:20:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2016 8:22:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2016 8:55:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2016 9:25:00 AM		1	0.2%
Dec 4, 2019 9:55:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jan 1, 2014 8:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 21, 2016 8:40:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 10:23:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 10:41:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 10:46:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 11:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 12:00:00 AM		2	0.5%
Jul 25, 2016 12:05:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 12:41:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 1:23:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 3:35:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 8:15:00 AM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timemorningClassStart: Time of morning class session starting

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Jul 25, 2016 8:20:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 9:08:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 9:12:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 9:45:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 27, 2016 10:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 27, 2016 1:04:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 27, 2016 8:05:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 27, 2016 9:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 10:00:00 PM		2	0.5%
Jul 28, 2016 12:00:00 AM		4	1.0%
Jul 28, 2016 12:25:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 12:50:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 2:25:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 8:20:00 AM		2	0.5%
Jul 28, 2016 8:33:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 8:45:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 8:48:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 9:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 9:36:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 9:53:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 10:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 10:01:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 10:22:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 11:29:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 12:00:00 AM		2	0.5%
Jul 29, 2016 12:08:00 PM		2	0.5%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timemorningClassStart: Time of morning class session starting

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Jul 29, 2016 12:16:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 8:15:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 8:20:00 AM		2	0.5%
Jul 29, 2016 8:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 8:40:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 8:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 9:00:00 AM		2	0.5%
Jul 29, 2016 9:59:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 10:00:00 PM		3	0.7%
Jul 30, 2016 10:20:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 10:25:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 12:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 8:10:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 8:20:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 8:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 8:32:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 8:40:00 AM		2	0.5%
Jul 30, 2016 8:45:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 9:00:00 AM		4	1.0%
Jul 30, 2016 9:28:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 5, 2016 10:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 1, 2016 8:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 1, 2016 8:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 1, 2016 8:10:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 1, 2016 8:15:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 1, 2016 8:25:00 AM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timemorningClassStart: Time of morning class session starting

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Sep 1, 2016 8:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 1, 2016 8:35:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 1, 2016 8:37:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 10, 2016 10:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 10, 2016 8:35:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 10, 2016 8:40:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 10:00:00 PM		2	0.5%
Sep 12, 2016 10:11:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 8:10:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 8:15:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 8:27:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 8:49:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 9:18:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 9:27:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 9:32:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 9:57:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 14, 2016 9:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 2, 2016 10:43:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 2, 2016 10:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 2, 2016 8:00:00 AM		2	0.5%
Sep 2, 2016 8:20:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 2, 2016 8:30:00 AM		3	0.7%
Sep 2, 2016 8:40:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 3, 2016 10:00:00 PM		2	0.5%
Sep 3, 2016 12:14:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 3, 2016 12:37:00 PM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timemorningClassStart: Time of morning class session starting

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Sep 3, 2016 8:10:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 3, 2016 8:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 3, 2016 8:30:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 30, 2016 8:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 10:17:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 11:42:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 8:00:00 AM		3	0.7%
Sep 6, 2016 8:03:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 8:15:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 8:20:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 8:25:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 8:30:00 AM		3	0.7%
Sep 6, 2016 8:30:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 7, 2016 11:45:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 7, 2016 12:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 7, 2016 12:42:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 7, 2016 8:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 7, 2016 8:20:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 7, 2016 8:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 8, 2016 8:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 8, 2016 8:30:00 AM		2	0.5%
Sep 8, 2016 8:30:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 9, 2013 12:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 9, 2016 12:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 9, 2016 12:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 9, 2016 8:00:00 AM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timemorningClassStart: Time of morning class session starting

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Sep 9, 2016 8:15:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 9, 2016 8:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 9, 2016 8:55:00 AM		1	0.2%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

timeafternoonClassStart: Time of afternoon class session starting

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=character] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=401 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]
Notes	VL - These timestamps have been imported directly from surveyCTO. In some of the phones; the date-time was not correct from the very beginning. Before these were corrected manually, the associated time stamps may be wrong.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Apr 6, 2019 9:54:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 1, 2016 10:28:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 1, 2016 11:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 1, 2016 12:49:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 1, 2016 9:03:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 10:00:00 PM		5	1.2%
Aug 10, 2016 10:08:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 10:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 10:47:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 11:00:00 AM		3	0.7%
Aug 10, 2016 12:41:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 12:45:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 1:11:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 9:19:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 9:29:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 11, 2016 10:18:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 11, 2016 11:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 11, 2016 11:40:00 AM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timeafternoonClassStart: Time of afternoon class session starting

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 11, 2016 11:54:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 11, 2016 12:00:00 AM		3	0.7%
Aug 11, 2016 12:29:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 11, 2016 1:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 12, 2016 10:54:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 12, 2016 11:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 12, 2016 12:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 13, 2016 11:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 13, 2016 12:12:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 16, 2016 10:00:00 PM		3	0.7%
Aug 16, 2016 10:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 16, 2016 10:38:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 16, 2016 10:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 16, 2016 11:10:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 16, 2016 12:52:00 PM		2	0.5%
Aug 16, 2016 1:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 16, 2016 9:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 16, 2017 11:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 10:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 10:07:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 10:56:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 11:00:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 17, 2016 11:05:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 11:10:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 11:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 12:35:00 PM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timeafternoonClassStart: Time of afternoon class session starting

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 17, 2016 12:56:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 1:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 1:30:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 1:45:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 8:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 10:00:00 PM		2	0.5%
Aug 19, 2016 11:00:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 19, 2016 11:05:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 11:10:00 AM		3	0.7%
Aug 19, 2016 11:15:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 11:20:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 11:21:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 12:00:00 AM		3	0.7%
Aug 19, 2016 12:20:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 1:15:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 10:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 10:18:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 10:21:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 10:28:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 11:00:00 AM		4	1.0%
Aug 2, 2016 11:10:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 11:15:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 11:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 11:49:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 12:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 12:08:00 PM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timeafternoonClassStart: Time of afternoon class session starting

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 2, 2016 12:30:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 12:40:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 1:09:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 1:43:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 9:40:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 20, 2016 10:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 20, 2016 10:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 20, 2016 11:00:00 AM		3	0.7%
Aug 20, 2016 11:10:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 20, 2016 11:15:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 20, 2016 11:54:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 20, 2016 12:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 20, 2016 12:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 20, 2016 12:10:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 20, 2016 9:35:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 22, 2016 10:19:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 22, 2016 10:48:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 22, 2016 11:25:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 22, 2016 12:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 22, 2016 12:07:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 22, 2016 9:19:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 23, 2016 11:46:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 23, 2016 11:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 23, 2016 12:00:00 PM		2	0.5%
Aug 23, 2016 12:18:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 23, 2016 1:16:00 PM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timeafternoonClassStart: Time of afternoon class session starting

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 23, 2016 8:20:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 24, 2016 10:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 24, 2016 12:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 24, 2016 9:55:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 24, 2016 9:58:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 25, 2016 12:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 26, 2016 10:36:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 26, 2016 12:01:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 26, 2016 12:05:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 27, 2016 9:56:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 29, 2016 11:39:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 10:00:00 PM		3	0.7%
Aug 3, 2016 10:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 10:35:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 10:45:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 10:48:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 10:49:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 10:57:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 11:00:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 3, 2016 11:05:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 3, 2016 11:06:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 11:15:00 AM		3	0.7%
Aug 3, 2016 11:25:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 11:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 11:40:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 11:50:00 AM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timeafternoonClassStart: Time of afternoon class session starting

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 3, 2016 11:54:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 9:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 10:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 10:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 11:00:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 30, 2016 11:10:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 11:15:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 11:15:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 11:20:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 30, 2016 11:22:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 11:25:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 11:30:00 AM		4	1.0%
Aug 30, 2016 11:30:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 12:47:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 8:36:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 9:44:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 31, 2016 10:57:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 31, 2016 11:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 31, 2016 11:10:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 31, 2016 11:16:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 31, 2016 11:18:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 31, 2016 7:45:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 10:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 10:13:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 10:33:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 11:00:00 AM		3	0.7%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timeafternoonClassStart: Time of afternoon class session starting

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 4, 2016 11:07:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 11:09:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 11:10:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 11:15:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 4, 2016 11:20:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 11:22:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 11:25:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 11:33:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 11:52:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 12:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 12:51:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 12:56:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 9:41:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2018 10:38:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 10:08:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 10:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 10:45:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 5, 2016 10:48:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 10:58:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 11:00:00 AM		4	1.0%
Aug 5, 2016 11:01:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 11:04:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 11:25:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 12:44:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 1:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 1:26:00 PM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timeafternoonClassStart: Time of afternoon class session starting

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 6, 2016 10:00:00 PM		4	1.0%
Aug 6, 2016 10:45:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 10:59:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 11:02:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 11:06:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 11:15:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 11:30:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 6, 2016 11:38:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 8:32:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 8, 2016 10:20:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 8, 2016 10:37:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 8, 2016 11:09:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 8, 2016 1:10:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 8, 2016 8:45:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2016 10:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2016 10:00:00 PM		9	2.2%
Aug 9, 2016 10:16:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 9, 2016 11:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2016 11:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2016 12:35:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2016 1:00:00 PM		2	0.5%
Aug 9, 2016 8:55:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2016 9:22:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2016 9:25:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jan 1, 2014 6:09:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jan 6, 2021 11:50:00 AM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timeafternoonClassStart: Time of afternoon class session starting

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Jul 19, 2016 11:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 10:23:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 10:41:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 10:46:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 11:00:00 AM		2	0.5%
Jul 25, 2016 11:05:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 11:15:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 11:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 12:05:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 12:41:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 1:23:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 3:35:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 9:08:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 9:14:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 27, 2016 10:13:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 27, 2016 11:10:00 AM		2	0.5%
Jul 27, 2016 11:35:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 27, 2016 1:04:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 10:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 10:09:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 10:39:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 10:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 11:00:00 AM		3	0.7%
Jul 28, 2016 11:10:00 AM		2	0.5%
Jul 28, 2016 11:20:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 12:00:00 AM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timeafternoonClassStart: Time of afternoon class session starting

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Jul 28, 2016 12:25:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 12:51:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 8:26:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 8:35:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 9:36:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 9:53:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 10:22:00 PM		3	0.7%
Jul 29, 2016 10:39:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 11:00:00 AM		4	1.0%
Jul 29, 2016 11:29:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 11:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 12:00:00 AM		3	0.7%
Jul 29, 2016 12:08:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 12:16:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 8:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 9:07:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 9:11:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 9:59:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 10:00:00 PM		3	0.7%
Jul 30, 2016 10:20:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 10:25:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 10:30:00 AM		3	0.7%
Jul 30, 2016 11:00:00 AM		2	0.5%
Jul 30, 2016 11:05:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 11:10:00 AM		2	0.5%
Jul 30, 2016 11:30:00 AM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timeafternoonClassStart: Time of afternoon class session starting

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Jul 30, 2016 11:35:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 11:46:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 9:28:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 9:55:00 AM		1	0.2%
Nov 16, 2019 12:53:00 PM		1	0.2%
Oct 4, 2016 11:35:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 1, 2016 10:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 1, 2016 11:00:00 AM		2	0.5%
Sep 1, 2016 11:14:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 1, 2016 11:15:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 1, 2016 11:20:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 1, 2016 11:30:00 AM		3	0.7%
Sep 10, 2016 11:03:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 10, 2016 11:20:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 10:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 10:11:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 11:00:00 AM		2	0.5%
Sep 12, 2016 11:25:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 8:49:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 9:18:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 9:27:00 AM		2	0.5%
Sep 12, 2016 9:32:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 9:57:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 14, 2016 11:15:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 2, 2016 10:40:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 2, 2016 10:43:00 AM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timeafternoonClassStart: Time of afternoon class session starting

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Sep 2, 2016 10:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 2, 2016 11:00:00 AM		2	0.5%
Sep 2, 2016 11:15:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 2, 2016 11:20:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 2, 2016 11:25:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 2, 2016 12:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 3, 2016 10:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 3, 2016 10:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 3, 2016 10:55:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 3, 2016 11:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 3, 2016 11:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 3, 2016 12:14:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 3, 2016 12:37:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 10:17:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 10:40:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 10:45:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 11:00:00 AM		3	0.7%
Sep 6, 2016 11:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 11:05:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 11:15:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 11:20:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 11:40:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 11:42:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 7, 2016 10:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 7, 2016 11:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 7, 2016 11:00:00 PM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timeafternoonClassStart: Time of afternoon class session starting

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Sep 7, 2016 11:20:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 7, 2016 11:28:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 7, 2016 11:45:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 8, 2016 11:00:00 AM		2	0.5%
Sep 8, 2016 11:15:00 AM		2	0.5%
Sep 9, 2016 10:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 9, 2016 11:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 9, 2016 11:05:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 9, 2016 11:14:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 9, 2016 12:00:00 AM		2	0.5%
Sep 9, 2021 11:15:00 AM		1	0.2%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

timelunchStarting: Time of lunch starting

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=character] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=401 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]
Notes	VL - These timestamps have been imported directly from surveyCTO. In some of the phones; the date-time was not correct from the very beginning. Before these were corrected manually, the associated time stamps may be wrong.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 1, 2010 11:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 1, 2016 10:20:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 1, 2016 10:28:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 1, 2016 12:49:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 10:00:00 PM		4	1.0%
Aug 10, 2016 10:15:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 10:29:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 10:30:00 AM		3	0.7%
Aug 10, 2016 10:47:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 10:55:00 AM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timelunchStarting: Time of lunch starting

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 10, 2016 11:20:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 12:28:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 1:11:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 9:19:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 9:29:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 11, 2016 10:18:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 11, 2016 10:20:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 11, 2016 10:42:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 11, 2016 11:40:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 11, 2016 11:54:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 11, 2016 12:00:00 AM		3	0.7%
Aug 11, 2016 12:29:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 12, 2016 10:10:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 12, 2016 10:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 12, 2016 10:54:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 13, 2021 10:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 16, 2016 10:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 16, 2016 10:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 16, 2016 10:30:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 16, 2016 10:38:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 16, 2016 10:40:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 16, 2016 10:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 16, 2016 11:05:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 16, 2016 12:52:00 PM		2	0.5%
Aug 16, 2016 12:53:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 16, 2016 12:58:00 PM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timelunchStarting: Time of lunch starting

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 17, 2016 10:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 10:07:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 10:12:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 10:20:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 10:30:00 AM		4	1.0%
Aug 17, 2016 10:40:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 10:45:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 12:35:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 12:56:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 1:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 1:30:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 1:45:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 10:25:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 10:27:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 10:30:00 AM		9	2.2%
Aug 19, 2016 10:32:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 10:45:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 11:21:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 12:00:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 19, 2016 12:20:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 10:00:00 PM		2	0.5%
Aug 2, 2016 10:18:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 10:21:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 10:26:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 10:28:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 10:30:00 AM		4	1.0%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timelunchStarting: Time of lunch starting

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 2, 2016 10:45:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 11:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 11:49:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 12:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 12:08:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 12:30:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 12:40:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 1:09:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 1:43:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 9:40:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 20, 2016 10:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 20, 2016 10:20:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 20, 2016 10:25:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 20, 2016 10:30:00 AM		4	1.0%
Aug 20, 2016 10:40:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 20, 2016 10:55:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 20, 2016 11:54:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 20, 2016 9:35:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 22, 2016 10:19:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 22, 2016 10:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 22, 2016 10:48:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 22, 2016 11:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 22, 2016 12:07:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 22, 2016 9:19:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 23, 2016 10:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 23, 2016 10:40:00 AM		2	0.5%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timelunchStarting: Time of lunch starting

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 23, 2016 10:40:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 23, 2016 11:25:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 23, 2016 12:18:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 23, 2016 1:16:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 24, 2016 10:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 24, 2016 10:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 24, 2016 10:45:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 24, 2016 9:58:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 26, 2016 10:36:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 26, 2016 11:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 26, 2016 12:01:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 27, 2016 9:56:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 29, 2016 11:39:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 10:00:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 3, 2016 10:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 10:30:00 AM		6	1.5%
Aug 3, 2016 10:35:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 10:44:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 10:45:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 10:48:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 10:49:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 10:57:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 11:00:00 AM		3	0.7%
Aug 3, 2016 11:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 11:54:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 12:00:00 AM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timelunchStarting: Time of lunch starting

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 3, 2016 9:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2017 10:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 10:10:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 10:20:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 10:30:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 30, 2016 10:35:00 AM		3	0.7%
Aug 30, 2016 10:40:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 10:45:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 10:45:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 10:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 11:00:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 30, 2016 11:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 11:25:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 12:47:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 8:36:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 9:44:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 31, 2016 10:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 31, 2016 10:17:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 31, 2016 10:20:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 31, 2016 10:30:00 AM		3	0.7%
Aug 4, 2016 10:00:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 4, 2016 10:00:00 PM		2	0.5%
Aug 4, 2016 10:08:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 10:13:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 10:15:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 10:20:00 AM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timelunchStarting: Time of lunch starting

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 4, 2016 10:25:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 10:30:00 AM		3	0.7%
Aug 4, 2016 10:33:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 10:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 11:00:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 4, 2016 11:07:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 11:33:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 12:51:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 12:56:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 9:41:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 10:00:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 5, 2016 10:08:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 10:10:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 10:28:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 10:30:00 AM		4	1.0%
Aug 5, 2016 10:45:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 10:48:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 10:56:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 10:58:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 11:04:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 12:44:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 1:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 1:26:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 10:00:00 PM		4	1.0%
Aug 6, 2016 10:30:00 AM		6	1.5%
Aug 6, 2016 11:30:00 AM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timelunchStarting: Time of lunch starting

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 6, 2016 11:38:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 8:32:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 9:54:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 8, 2016 10:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 8, 2016 10:37:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 8, 2016 11:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 8, 2016 11:09:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 8, 2016 1:10:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2016 10:00:00 PM		9	2.2%
Aug 9, 2016 10:16:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 9, 2016 10:21:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2016 10:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2016 10:45:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2016 12:35:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2016 1:00:00 PM		2	0.5%
Aug 9, 2016 8:55:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2016 9:22:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2016 9:25:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jan 1, 2014 6:09:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 2, 2024 10:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 10:23:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 10:30:00 AM		2	0.5%
Jul 25, 2016 10:35:00 AM		2	0.5%
Jul 25, 2016 10:41:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 10:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 11:11:00 AM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timelunchStarting: Time of lunch starting

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Jul 25, 2016 11:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 12:05:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 12:41:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 1:23:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 3:35:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 9:08:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 9:12:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 27, 2016 10:25:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 27, 2016 10:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 27, 2016 10:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 27, 2016 11:10:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 27, 2016 1:04:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 10:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 10:30:00 AM		5	1.2%
Jul 28, 2016 10:35:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 10:40:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 10:45:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 11:25:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 12:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 12:25:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 12:51:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 8:26:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 9:36:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 9:53:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 9:54:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 10:00:00 AM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timelunchStarting: Time of lunch starting

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Jul 29, 2016 10:01:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 10:14:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 10:22:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 10:28:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 10:30:00 AM		2	0.5%
Jul 29, 2016 11:00:00 AM		2	0.5%
Jul 29, 2016 11:29:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 12:00:00 AM		2	0.5%
Jul 29, 2016 12:08:00 PM		2	0.5%
Jul 29, 2016 12:16:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 8:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 9:07:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 9:11:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 9:59:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 10:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 10:00:00 PM		3	0.7%
Jul 30, 2016 10:01:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 10:20:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 10:25:00 AM		2	0.5%
Jul 30, 2016 10:30:00 AM		3	0.7%
Jul 30, 2016 10:40:00 AM		2	0.5%
Jul 30, 2016 10:45:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 11:05:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 11:55:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 9:28:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 9:55:00 AM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timelunchStarting: Time of lunch starting

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Nov 13, 2019 10:46:00 AM		1	0.2%
Nov 3, 2018 10:15:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 1, 2016 10:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 1, 2016 10:20:00 AM		2	0.5%
Sep 1, 2016 10:24:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 1, 2016 10:30:00 AM		3	0.7%
Sep 1, 2016 10:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 1, 2016 11:57:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 10, 2016 10:27:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 10, 2016 10:40:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 10, 2016 11:55:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 10:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 10:11:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 10:20:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 10:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 10:34:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 8:49:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 9:18:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 9:27:00 AM		2	0.5%
Sep 12, 2016 9:32:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 9:57:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 14, 2016 10:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 2, 2016 10:06:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 2, 2016 10:20:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 2, 2016 10:30:00 AM		2	0.5%
Sep 2, 2016 10:43:00 AM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timelunchStarting: Time of lunch starting

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Sep 2, 2016 10:45:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 2, 2016 10:50:00 AM		2	0.5%
Sep 3, 2016 10:02:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 3, 2016 10:20:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 3, 2016 10:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 3, 2016 11:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 3, 2016 12:14:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 3, 2016 12:37:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 10:05:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 10:17:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 10:20:00 AM		2	0.5%
Sep 6, 2016 10:30:00 AM		6	1.5%
Sep 6, 2016 10:32:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 10:42:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 11:42:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 7, 2016 10:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 7, 2016 10:22:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 7, 2016 10:28:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 7, 2016 10:42:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 7, 2016 10:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 7, 2016 11:45:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 8, 2016 10:30:00 AM		2	0.5%
Sep 8, 2016 10:45:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 8, 2016 11:09:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 9, 2016 10:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 9, 2016 10:20:00 AM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timelunchStarting: Time of lunch starting

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Sep 9, 2016 10:29:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 9, 2016 10:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 9, 2016 10:32:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 9, 2016 12:00:00 AM		2	0.5%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

timeStudentsArriving: Time of most students arriving

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=character] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=401 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]
Notes	VL - These timestamps have been imported directly from surveyCTO. In some of the phones; the date-time was not correct from the very beginning. Before these were corrected manually, the associated time stamps may be wrong.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 1, 2016 10:28:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 1, 2016 10:40:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 1, 2016 11:20:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 1, 2016 12:49:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 10:00:00 PM		6	1.5%
Aug 10, 2016 10:47:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 11:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 12:09:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 12:28:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 12:41:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 12:43:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 1:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 1:11:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 9:19:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 9:29:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 11, 2016 10:18:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 11, 2016 11:40:00 AM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timeStudentsArriving: Time of most students arriving

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 11, 2016 11:54:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 11, 2016 12:00:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 11, 2016 12:29:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 11, 2016 12:39:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 11, 2016 12:48:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 11, 2016 1:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 12, 2016 10:54:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 12, 2016 1:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 12, 2016 1:48:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 13, 2016 12:10:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 13, 2018 12:46:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 16, 2016 10:00:00 PM		3	0.7%
Aug 16, 2016 10:34:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 16, 2016 10:38:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 16, 2016 10:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 16, 2016 11:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 16, 2016 12:52:00 PM		2	0.5%
Aug 16, 2016 12:53:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 16, 2016 12:58:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 16, 2016 1:55:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 10:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 10:07:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 10:55:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 11:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 12:35:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 12:51:00 PM		2	0.5%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timeStudentsArriving: Time of most students arriving

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 17, 2016 12:56:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 1:00:00 PM		2	0.5%
Aug 17, 2016 1:03:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 1:19:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 1:30:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 1:35:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 1:45:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 10:00:00 PM		7	1.7%
Aug 19, 2016 10:53:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 11:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 11:15:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 11:21:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 12:00:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 19, 2016 12:20:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 12:55:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 1:05:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 1:58:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 10:00:00 PM		2	0.5%
Aug 2, 2016 10:15:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 10:18:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 10:19:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 10:21:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 11:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 11:49:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 12:00:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 2, 2016 12:08:00 PM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timeStudentsArriving: Time of most students arriving

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 2, 2016 12:30:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 12:40:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 12:43:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 1:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 1:09:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 1:30:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 1:43:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 8:28:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 9:40:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 20, 2016 10:00:00 PM		3	0.7%
Aug 20, 2016 11:54:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 20, 2016 12:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 20, 2016 12:35:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 20, 2016 1:00:00 PM		3	0.7%
Aug 20, 2016 1:05:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 20, 2016 1:20:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 20, 2016 9:35:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 22, 2016 10:19:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 22, 2016 10:48:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 22, 2016 12:07:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 22, 2016 12:26:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 22, 2016 1:45:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 22, 2016 9:19:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 23, 2016 11:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 23, 2016 12:18:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 23, 2016 1:05:00 PM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timeStudentsArriving: Time of most students arriving

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 23, 2016 1:09:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 23, 2016 1:16:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 23, 2016 1:20:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 23, 2016 2:28:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 24, 2016 10:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 24, 2016 1:01:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 24, 2016 1:20:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 24, 2016 9:58:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 26, 2016 10:36:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 26, 2016 12:01:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 26, 2016 2:12:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 27, 2016 9:56:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 29, 2016 11:39:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 10:00:00 PM		4	1.0%
Aug 3, 2016 10:37:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 10:48:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 10:49:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 10:56:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 10:57:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 11:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 11:02:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 11:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 11:54:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 12:00:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 3, 2016 12:44:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 12:50:00 PM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timeStudentsArriving: Time of most students arriving

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 3, 2016 1:00:00 PM		2	0.5%
Aug 3, 2016 1:02:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 1:11:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 1:58:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 10:00:00 PM		2	0.5%
Aug 30, 2016 11:10:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 11:25:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 12:47:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 12:50:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 12:52:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 12:55:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 1:00:00 AM		3	0.7%
Aug 30, 2016 1:00:00 PM		2	0.5%
Aug 30, 2016 1:02:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 1:03:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 2:35:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 8:36:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 9:44:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 31, 2016 10:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 31, 2016 10:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 31, 2016 11:00:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 31, 2016 11:08:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 31, 2016 12:45:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 31, 2016 12:55:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 10:00:00 PM		4	1.0%
Aug 4, 2016 10:13:00 AM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timeStudentsArriving: Time of most students arriving

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 4, 2016 10:20:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 10:33:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 10:35:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 10:37:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 11:07:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 11:20:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 11:22:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 11:33:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 12:00:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 4, 2016 12:07:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 12:51:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 12:56:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 1:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 1:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 9:41:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 10:00:00 PM		2	0.5%
Aug 5, 2016 10:08:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 10:10:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 10:48:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 10:58:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 11:04:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 11:09:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 12:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 12:44:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 12:45:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 12:56:00 PM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timeStudentsArriving: Time of most students arriving

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 5, 2016 1:00:00 PM		2	0.5%
Aug 5, 2016 1:26:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2019 10:42:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 10:00:00 PM		5	1.2%
Aug 6, 2016 10:32:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 10:54:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 11:30:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 6, 2016 11:38:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 11:38:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 12:25:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 12:45:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 8:32:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 8, 2016 10:37:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 8, 2016 11:09:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 8, 2016 11:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 8, 2016 1:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 8, 2016 1:10:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2016 10:00:00 PM		9	2.2%
Aug 9, 2016 10:16:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 9, 2016 12:35:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2016 1:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2016 1:00:00 PM		4	1.0%
Aug 9, 2016 8:55:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2016 9:22:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2016 9:25:00 AM		1	0.2%
Dec 1, 2016 1:00:00 AM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timeStudentsArriving: Time of most students arriving

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Jan 1, 2014 6:09:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 12, 2016 12:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 10:23:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 10:41:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 10:46:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 11:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 11:05:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 11:07:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 11:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 12:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 12:05:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 12:41:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 1:23:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 1:30:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 3:35:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 9:08:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 27, 2016 10:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 27, 2016 10:40:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 27, 2016 12:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 27, 2016 1:04:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 27, 2016 1:12:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 10:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 10:41:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 12:00:00 AM		7	1.7%
Jul 28, 2016 12:25:00 PM		2	0.5%
Jul 28, 2016 12:33:00 PM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timeStudentsArriving: Time of most students arriving

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Jul 28, 2016 12:51:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 1:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 8:26:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 9:36:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 9:53:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 10:27:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 10:43:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 11:29:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 12:00:00 AM		3	0.7%
Jul 29, 2016 12:07:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 12:08:00 PM		2	0.5%
Jul 29, 2016 12:16:00 PM		2	0.5%
Jul 29, 2016 12:21:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 12:30:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 12:35:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 1:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 8:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 9:07:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 9:11:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 9:59:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 10:00:00 PM		6	1.5%
Jul 30, 2016 10:20:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 10:25:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 12:00:00 AM		2	0.5%
Jul 30, 2016 12:55:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 1:00:00 PM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timeStudentsArriving: Time of most students arriving

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Jul 30, 2016 1:10:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 1:16:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 9:28:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 9:55:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jun 28, 2016 11:42:00 AM		1	0.2%
Nov 25, 2016 9:12:00 AM		1	0.2%
Nov 6, 2024 1:05:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 1, 2016 10:00:00 PM		2	0.5%
Sep 1, 2016 12:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 1, 2016 12:17:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 1, 2016 12:44:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 1, 2016 12:57:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 1, 2016 1:02:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 1, 2016 1:10:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 10, 2016 10:46:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 10, 2016 12:40:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 10, 2016 12:56:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 10:00:00 PM		2	0.5%
Sep 12, 2016 10:11:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 10:38:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 1:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 8:49:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 9:18:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 9:27:00 AM		2	0.5%
Sep 12, 2016 9:32:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 9:57:00 AM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timeStudentsArriving: Time of most students arriving

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Sep 14, 2016 12:45:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 2, 2016 10:43:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 2, 2016 10:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 2, 2016 12:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 2, 2016 12:55:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 2, 2016 12:57:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 2, 2016 1:06:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 2, 2016 1:08:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 2, 2016 1:41:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 2, 2016 1:51:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 3, 2016 10:00:00 PM		2	0.5%
Sep 3, 2016 11:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 3, 2016 12:14:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 3, 2016 12:37:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 3, 2016 1:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 3, 2016 1:02:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 5, 2016 11:01:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 10:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 10:17:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 11:42:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 12:00:00 PM		2	0.5%
Sep 6, 2016 12:38:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 12:55:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 12:56:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 1:00:00 PM		2	0.5%
Sep 6, 2016 1:05:00 PM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timeStudentsArriving: Time of most students arriving

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Sep 6, 2016 1:18:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 7, 2016 11:20:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 7, 2016 11:45:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 7, 2016 12:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 7, 2016 12:34:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 7, 2016 12:42:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 7, 2016 12:50:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 8, 2016 10:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 8, 2016 12:09:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 8, 2016 1:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 8, 2016 1:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 9, 2016 10:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 9, 2016 12:00:00 AM		3	0.7%
Sep 9, 2016 12:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 9, 2016 12:33:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 9, 2016 12:57:00 PM		1	0.2%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

timeLastTeacher: Time of last teacher arrived

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=character] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=401 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]
Notes	VL - These timestamps have been imported directly from surveyCTO. In some of the phones; the date-time was not correct from the very beginning. Before these were corrected manually, the associated time stamps may be wrong.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 1, 2016 10:28:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 1, 2016 11:06:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 1, 2016 12:49:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 1, 2016 7:30:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 10:00:00 PM		5	1.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timeLastTeacher: Time of last teacher arrived

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 10, 2016 10:47:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 11:44:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 12:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 12:29:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 1:11:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 7:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 7:45:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 8:00:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 10, 2016 8:20:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 8:40:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 9:19:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 11, 2016 10:18:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 11, 2016 11:40:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 11, 2016 11:51:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 11, 2016 11:54:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 11, 2016 12:00:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 11, 2016 12:29:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 11, 2016 12:43:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 12, 2016 10:54:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 12, 2016 1:08:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 12, 2016 8:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 13, 2016 12:12:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 13, 2016 12:48:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 16, 2016 10:00:00 PM		2	0.5%
Aug 16, 2016 10:38:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 16, 2016 10:50:00 AM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timeLastTeacher: Time of last teacher arrived

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 16, 2016 12:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 16, 2016 12:52:00 PM		2	0.5%
Aug 16, 2016 12:54:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 16, 2016 12:56:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 16, 2016 12:58:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 16, 2016 8:00:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 17, 2016 10:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 10:07:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 12:29:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 12:35:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 12:51:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 12:56:00 PM		2	0.5%
Aug 17, 2016 1:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 1:05:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 1:13:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 1:21:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 1:30:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 1:45:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 7:45:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 8:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 10:00:00 PM		5	1.2%
Aug 19, 2016 10:39:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 10:58:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 11:21:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 12:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 12:20:00 PM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timeLastTeacher: Time of last teacher arrived

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 19, 2016 12:45:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 12:52:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 1:17:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 7:50:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 8:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2017 7:55:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 10:00:00 PM		4	1.0%
Aug 2, 2016 10:18:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 10:22:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 11:49:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 12:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 12:08:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 12:20:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 12:32:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 12:40:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 12:48:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 1:10:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 1:43:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 7:55:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 8:05:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 8:08:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 8:45:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2017 9:40:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 20, 2016 10:00:00 PM		3	0.7%
Aug 20, 2016 10:22:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 20, 2016 12:02:00 PM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timeLastTeacher: Time of last teacher arrived

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 20, 2016 7:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 20, 2016 7:45:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 20, 2016 7:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 20, 2016 8:00:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 20, 2016 9:35:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 22, 2016 10:19:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 22, 2016 12:07:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 22, 2016 12:28:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 22, 2016 12:37:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 22, 2016 9:19:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 22, 2021 7:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 23, 2016 11:06:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 23, 2016 11:27:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 23, 2016 12:18:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 23, 2016 1:16:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 23, 2016 8:15:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 23, 2016 8:47:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 23, 2016 9:23:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 24, 2016 10:19:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 24, 2016 12:55:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 24, 2016 9:58:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 26, 2016 10:36:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 26, 2016 12:01:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 26, 2016 12:14:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 27, 2016 8:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 29, 2016 11:39:00 AM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timeLastTeacher: Time of last teacher arrived

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 3, 2016 10:00:00 PM		5	1.2%
Aug 3, 2016 10:48:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 10:49:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 10:57:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 11:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 11:54:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 12:44:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 12:57:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 1:07:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 1:14:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 1:26:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 8:10:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 8:30:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 3, 2016 8:38:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 8:40:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 8:45:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 8:57:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 10:00:00 PM		4	1.0%
Aug 30, 2016 11:25:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 12:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 12:36:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 12:58:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 1:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 1:04:00 PM		2	0.5%
Aug 30, 2016 7:45:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 7:55:00 AM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timeLastTeacher: Time of last teacher arrived

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 30, 2016 8:36:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 8:49:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 8:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 9:44:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2021 12:45:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 31, 2016 10:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 31, 2016 10:48:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 31, 2016 12:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 31, 2016 1:07:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 31, 2016 7:45:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 31, 2016 8:05:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 31, 2016 8:24:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 10:00:00 PM		4	1.0%
Aug 4, 2016 10:14:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 10:33:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 11:07:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 12:52:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 12:57:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 2:47:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 7:35:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 7:45:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 8:00:00 AM		3	0.7%
Aug 4, 2016 8:02:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 8:15:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 8:22:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 8:30:00 AM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timeLastTeacher: Time of last teacher arrived

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 4, 2016 9:41:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 10:00:00 PM		4	1.0%
Aug 5, 2016 10:08:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 10:48:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 10:59:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 11:04:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 12:43:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 12:46:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 1:26:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 7:45:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 8:10:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 8:15:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 5, 2016 9:15:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2017 8:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 10:00:00 PM		2	0.5%
Aug 6, 2016 11:31:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 11:38:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 12:25:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 12:26:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 12:33:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 7:55:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 8:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 8:10:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 8:32:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 9:26:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 9:37:00 AM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timeLastTeacher: Time of last teacher arrived

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 6, 2016 9:42:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 8, 2016 10:37:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 8, 2016 11:11:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 8, 2016 1:10:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 8, 2016 7:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2016 10:00:00 PM		8	2.0%
Aug 9, 2016 10:16:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 9, 2016 10:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2016 12:25:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2016 1:00:00 PM		2	0.5%
Aug 9, 2016 7:45:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2016 8:15:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2016 8:55:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2016 9:23:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2016 9:25:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2021 10:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Dec 11, 2021 8:27:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jan 1, 2017 8:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jan 25, 2016 11:33:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2013 1:28:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 10:24:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 10:41:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 10:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 11:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 11:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 12:00:00 AM		2	0.5%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timeLastTeacher: Time of last teacher arrived

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Jul 25, 2016 12:06:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 12:30:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 1:23:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 3:36:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 9:09:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 9:13:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 27, 2016 11:42:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 27, 2016 12:20:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 27, 2016 1:04:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 27, 2016 1:06:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 27, 2016 8:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 10:51:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 10:54:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 11:22:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 11:44:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 12:00:00 AM		3	0.7%
Jul 28, 2016 12:11:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 12:26:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 12:36:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 12:42:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 12:51:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 8:27:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 8:32:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 9:36:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 9:53:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2017 12:25:00 PM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timeLastTeacher: Time of last teacher arrived

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Jul 29, 2016 10:00:00 PM		3	0.7%
Jul 29, 2016 10:11:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 10:27:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 10:45:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 10:57:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 11:29:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 12:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 12:08:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 12:09:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 12:16:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 12:22:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 12:24:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 12:25:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 7:45:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 8:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 9:12:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 9:59:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 10:00:00 PM		5	1.2%
Jul 30, 2016 10:16:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 10:25:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 12:00:00 AM		2	0.5%
Jul 30, 2016 1:12:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 8:13:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 8:15:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 8:16:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 8:18:00 AM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timeLastTeacher: Time of last teacher arrived

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Jul 30, 2016 8:26:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 9:05:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 9:28:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 9:36:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 1, 2016 10:00:00 PM		3	0.7%
Sep 1, 2016 12:19:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 1, 2016 12:39:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 1, 2016 12:58:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 1, 2016 1:02:00 PM		2	0.5%
Sep 1, 2016 8:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 10, 2016 10:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 10, 2016 12:48:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 10, 2016 8:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 10:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 10:11:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 11:31:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 1:01:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 8:39:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 8:49:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 9:18:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 9:27:00 AM		2	0.5%
Sep 12, 2016 9:32:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 9:57:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 14, 2016 12:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 19, 2016 12:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 2, 2016 10:00:00 PM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timeLastTeacher: Time of last teacher arrived

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Sep 2, 2016 10:43:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 2, 2016 10:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 2, 2016 10:52:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 2, 2016 12:57:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 2, 2016 1:11:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 2, 2016 7:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 2, 2016 8:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 2, 2016 9:43:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 20, 2023 8:06:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 3, 2016 10:00:00 PM		2	0.5%
Sep 3, 2016 12:14:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 3, 2016 12:37:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 3, 2016 7:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 3, 2016 8:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 3, 2016 8:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 10:00:00 PM		3	0.7%
Sep 6, 2016 10:17:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 10:19:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 11:42:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 12:39:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 12:56:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 1:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 1:05:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 1:06:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 7:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 8:10:00 AM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timeLastTeacher: Time of last teacher arrived

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Sep 7, 2016 11:45:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 7, 2016 12:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 7, 2016 12:00:00 PM		2	0.5%
Sep 7, 2016 12:43:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 7, 2016 1:03:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 8, 2016 10:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 8, 2016 12:10:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 8, 2016 12:56:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 8, 2016 8:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 8, 2016 9:34:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 9, 2016 10:00:00 PM		2	0.5%
Sep 9, 2016 10:01:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 9, 2016 12:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 9, 2016 12:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 9, 2016 7:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 9, 2020 12:00:00 AM		1	0.2%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

timemorningClassEnd: Time of morning class session ending

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=character] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=401 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]
Notes	VL - These timestamps have been imported directly from surveyCTO. In some of the phones; the date-time was not correct from the very beginning. Before these were corrected manually, the associated time stamps may be wrong.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 1, 2016 10:28:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 1, 2016 11:06:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 1, 2016 12:49:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 1, 2016 8:15:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 10:00:00 PM		4	1.0%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timemorningClassEnd: Time of morning class session ending

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 10, 2016 10:29:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 10:47:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 11:20:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 11:44:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 12:29:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 1:11:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 7:45:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 8:15:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 8:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 9:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 9:19:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 9:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 11, 2016 10:18:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 11, 2016 11:40:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 11, 2016 11:51:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 11, 2016 11:54:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 11, 2016 12:00:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 11, 2016 12:29:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 11, 2016 12:43:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 11, 2016 8:52:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 12, 2016 10:54:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 12, 2016 1:08:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 12, 2016 8:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 13, 2016 12:12:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 13, 2016 12:48:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 16, 2016 10:00:00 PM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timemorningClassEnd: Time of morning class session ending

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 16, 2016 10:38:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 16, 2016 10:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 16, 2016 12:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 16, 2016 12:52:00 PM		2	0.5%
Aug 16, 2016 12:56:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 16, 2016 12:58:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 16, 2016 8:15:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 16, 2016 8:30:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 16, 2016 9:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 10:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 10:07:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 10:20:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 12:29:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 12:35:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 12:56:00 PM		2	0.5%
Aug 17, 2016 1:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 1:05:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 1:13:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 1:21:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 1:30:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 1:45:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 8:15:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 8:20:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 10:00:00 PM		2	0.5%
Aug 19, 2016 10:25:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 10:30:00 AM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timemorningClassEnd: Time of morning class session ending

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 19, 2016 10:39:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 10:58:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 11:21:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 12:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 12:20:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 12:45:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 12:52:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 1:17:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 8:15:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 8:15:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 8:42:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 9:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 9:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 10:00:00 PM		2	0.5%
Aug 2, 2016 10:18:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 10:22:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 10:30:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 2, 2016 11:49:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 12:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 12:08:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 12:20:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 12:32:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 12:40:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 12:48:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 1:10:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 1:43:00 PM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timemorningClassEnd: Time of morning class session ending

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 2, 2016 8:08:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 8:29:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 8:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 9:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 9:40:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 20, 2016 10:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 20, 2016 10:22:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 20, 2016 10:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 20, 2016 11:54:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 20, 2016 12:02:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 20, 2016 8:05:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 20, 2016 8:30:00 AM		4	1.0%
Aug 20, 2016 8:36:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 20, 2016 9:35:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 22, 2016 10:19:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 22, 2016 10:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 22, 2016 12:07:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 22, 2016 12:28:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 22, 2016 12:37:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 22, 2016 9:19:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 23, 2016 11:06:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 23, 2016 11:27:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 23, 2016 12:18:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 23, 2016 1:16:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 23, 2016 8:09:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 23, 2016 8:47:00 AM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timemorningClassEnd: Time of morning class session ending

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 23, 2016 9:23:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 24, 2016 10:19:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 24, 2016 12:55:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 24, 2016 9:58:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 26, 2016 10:36:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 26, 2016 12:01:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 26, 2016 12:14:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 27, 2016 9:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 29, 2016 11:39:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 29, 2016 8:35:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 10:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 10:00:00 PM		3	0.7%
Aug 3, 2016 10:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 10:48:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 10:49:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 10:57:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 11:38:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 11:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 11:54:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 12:44:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 12:57:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 1:07:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 1:14:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 1:26:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 8:45:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 9:00:00 AM		2	0.5%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timemorningClassEnd: Time of morning class session ending

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 3, 2016 9:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 9:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 9:57:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 10:10:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 10:20:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 10:35:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 10:45:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 11:25:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 12:36:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 12:45:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 12:49:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 1:04:00 PM		2	0.5%
Aug 30, 2016 8:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 8:13:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 8:15:00 AM		4	1.0%
Aug 30, 2016 8:36:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 9:44:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 31, 2016 10:15:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 31, 2016 10:48:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 31, 2016 12:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 31, 2016 1:07:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 31, 2016 8:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 31, 2016 8:40:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 10:00:00 PM		3	0.7%
Aug 4, 2016 10:14:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 10:33:00 AM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timemorningClassEnd: Time of morning class session ending

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 4, 2016 11:07:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 12:52:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 12:57:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 2:47:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 8:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 8:10:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 4, 2016 8:15:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 8:30:00 AM		3	0.7%
Aug 4, 2016 8:45:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 8:56:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 9:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 9:41:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 10:00:00 PM		2	0.5%
Aug 5, 2016 10:08:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 10:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 10:30:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 10:48:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 10:59:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 11:04:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 12:43:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 12:46:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 12:47:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 1:26:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 8:20:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 8:30:00 AM		3	0.7%
Aug 5, 2016 9:15:00 AM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timemorningClassEnd: Time of morning class session ending

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 6, 2016 10:00:00 PM		2	0.5%
Aug 6, 2016 11:31:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 11:38:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 12:25:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 12:26:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 12:33:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 8:15:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 6, 2016 8:20:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 8:32:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 9:26:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 9:37:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 9:42:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 8, 2016 10:37:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 8, 2016 11:10:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 8, 2016 11:11:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 8, 2016 1:10:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 8, 2016 9:34:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2016 10:00:00 PM		8	2.0%
Aug 9, 2016 10:16:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 9, 2016 10:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2016 10:59:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2016 12:25:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2016 12:35:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2016 1:00:00 PM		2	0.5%
Aug 9, 2016 8:20:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2016 8:55:00 AM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timemorningClassEnd: Time of morning class session ending

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 9, 2016 9:23:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2016 9:25:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jan 1, 2014 6:09:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 10:24:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 10:35:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 10:41:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 11:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 11:33:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 11:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 12:00:00 AM		2	0.5%
Jul 25, 2016 12:06:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 12:30:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 1:23:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 1:28:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 3:36:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 9:09:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 9:13:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 27, 2016 11:42:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 27, 2016 12:20:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 27, 2016 1:04:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 27, 2016 1:06:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 27, 2016 9:00:00 AM		2	0.5%
Jul 28, 2016 10:40:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 10:45:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 10:51:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 10:54:00 AM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timemorningClassEnd: Time of morning class session ending

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Jul 28, 2016 11:22:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 11:44:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 12:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 12:11:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 12:25:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 12:26:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 12:36:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 12:42:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 12:51:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 8:27:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 8:48:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 9:36:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 9:53:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 10:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 10:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 10:01:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 10:11:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 10:27:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 10:28:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 10:45:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 10:57:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 11:29:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 12:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 12:08:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 12:09:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 12:22:00 PM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timemorningClassEnd: Time of morning class session ending

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Jul 29, 2016 12:24:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 7:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 8:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 9:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 9:12:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 9:59:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 10:00:00 PM		3	0.7%
Jul 30, 2016 10:01:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 10:16:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 10:25:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 10:55:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 1:12:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 8:20:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 8:22:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 8:40:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 8:45:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 9:00:00 AM		3	0.7%
Jul 30, 2016 9:15:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 9:28:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 9:36:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 1, 2016 10:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 1, 2016 10:20:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 1, 2016 10:35:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 1, 2016 12:19:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 1, 2016 12:39:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 1, 2016 12:58:00 PM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timemorningClassEnd: Time of morning class session ending

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Sep 1, 2016 1:02:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 1, 2016 8:30:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 1, 2016 8:35:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 10, 2016 12:48:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 10, 2016 8:35:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 10, 2016 8:41:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 10:11:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 10:20:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 11:31:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 1:01:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 8:39:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 8:49:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 9:18:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 9:27:00 AM		2	0.5%
Sep 12, 2016 9:32:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 9:57:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 14, 2016 10:46:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 2, 2016 10:20:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 2, 2016 10:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 2, 2016 10:43:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 2, 2016 10:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 2, 2016 10:52:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 2, 2016 1:11:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 2, 2016 8:30:00 AM		2	0.5%
Sep 2, 2016 9:43:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 3, 2016 10:00:00 PM		2	0.5%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timemorningClassEnd: Time of morning class session ending

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Sep 3, 2016 12:14:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 3, 2016 4:41:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 3, 2016 8:10:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 3, 2016 8:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 3, 2016 8:30:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 10:17:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 10:19:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 10:30:00 AM		3	0.7%
Sep 6, 2016 11:42:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 12:56:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 1:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 1:05:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 1:06:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 8:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 8:15:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 8:20:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 7, 2016 10:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 7, 2016 10:37:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 7, 2016 11:46:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 7, 2016 12:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 7, 2016 12:43:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 7, 2016 8:20:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 8, 2016 10:45:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 8, 2016 12:10:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 8, 2016 12:56:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 8, 2016 8:30:00 AM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timemorningClassEnd: Time of morning class session ending

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Sep 9, 2016 10:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 9, 2016 10:01:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 9, 2016 12:00:00 AM		2	0.5%
Sep 9, 2016 12:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 9, 2016 8:15:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 9, 2016 8:50:00 AM		1	0.2%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

timeafternoonClassEnd: Time of afternoon class session ending

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=character] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=401 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]
Notes	VL - These timestamps have been imported directly from surveyCTO. In some of the phones; the date-time was not correct from the very beginning. Before these were corrected manually, the associated time stamps may be wrong.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 1, 2016 10:28:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 1, 2016 11:06:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 1, 2016 12:49:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 1, 2016 9:10:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 10:00:00 PM		4	1.0%
Aug 10, 2016 10:15:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 10:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 10:47:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 11:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 11:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 12:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 12:10:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 12:29:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 12:45:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 1:11:00 PM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timeafternoonClassEnd: Time of afternoon class session ending

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 10, 2016 9:19:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 9:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 11, 2016 10:18:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 11, 2016 11:40:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 11, 2016 11:51:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 11, 2016 11:54:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 11, 2016 12:00:00 AM		3	0.7%
Aug 11, 2016 12:29:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 11, 2016 12:43:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 12, 2016 10:54:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 12, 2016 1:08:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 12, 2016 8:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 13, 2016 12:12:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 13, 2016 12:48:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 16, 2016 10:00:00 PM		2	0.5%
Aug 16, 2016 10:38:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 16, 2016 10:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 16, 2016 11:10:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 16, 2016 11:20:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 16, 2016 12:00:00 PM		2	0.5%
Aug 16, 2016 12:52:00 PM		2	0.5%
Aug 16, 2016 12:56:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 16, 2016 12:58:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 10:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 10:07:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 11:00:00 AM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timeafternoonClassEnd: Time of afternoon class session ending

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 17, 2016 11:10:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 12:29:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 12:35:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 12:51:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 12:56:00 PM		2	0.5%
Aug 17, 2016 1:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 1:05:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 1:13:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 1:21:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 1:30:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 1:45:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 10:00:00 PM		2	0.5%
Aug 19, 2016 10:39:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 10:58:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 11:00:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 19, 2016 11:10:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 11:15:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 11:20:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 11:21:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 12:00:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 19, 2016 12:20:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 12:45:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 12:52:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 1:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 1:17:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 10:00:00 PM		3	0.7%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timeafternoonClassEnd: Time of afternoon class session ending

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 2, 2016 10:18:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 10:22:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 10:29:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 11:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 11:15:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 11:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 11:49:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 12:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 12:08:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 12:20:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 12:32:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 12:40:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 12:48:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 1:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 1:10:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 1:43:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 9:40:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 20, 2016 10:22:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 20, 2016 11:00:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 20, 2016 11:10:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 20, 2016 11:15:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 20, 2016 11:54:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 20, 2016 12:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 20, 2016 12:02:00 PM		2	0.5%
Aug 20, 2016 1:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 20, 2016 9:36:00 AM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timeafternoonClassEnd: Time of afternoon class session ending

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 22, 2016 10:19:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 22, 2016 10:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 22, 2016 12:07:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 22, 2016 12:28:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 22, 2016 12:37:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 22, 2016 9:19:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 23, 2016 11:06:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 23, 2016 11:27:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 23, 2016 12:09:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 23, 2016 12:18:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 23, 2016 1:16:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 23, 2016 8:47:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 23, 2016 9:23:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 24, 2016 10:19:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 24, 2016 12:55:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 24, 2016 9:58:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 26, 2016 10:36:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 26, 2016 12:01:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 26, 2016 12:14:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 27, 2016 11:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 28, 2019 10:35:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 29, 2016 10:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 29, 2016 11:39:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 10:00:00 PM		3	0.7%
Aug 3, 2016 10:45:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 10:48:00 AM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timeafternoonClassEnd: Time of afternoon class session ending

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 3, 2016 10:49:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 10:57:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 11:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 11:05:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 11:06:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 11:15:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 11:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 11:38:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 11:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 11:54:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 12:03:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 12:44:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 12:45:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 12:57:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 1:07:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 1:26:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 9:30:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 9:57:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 10:00:00 PM		2	0.5%
Aug 30, 2016 11:10:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 30, 2016 11:20:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 11:25:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 11:30:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 30, 2016 12:36:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 12:45:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 12:49:00 PM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timeafternoonClassEnd: Time of afternoon class session ending

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 30, 2016 12:54:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 12:55:00 PM		2	0.5%
Aug 30, 2016 1:04:00 PM		2	0.5%
Aug 30, 2016 8:36:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 9:44:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 31, 2016 10:48:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 31, 2016 10:57:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 31, 2016 11:00:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 31, 2016 11:18:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 31, 2016 12:30:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 31, 2016 1:07:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 10:00:00 PM		2	0.5%
Aug 4, 2016 10:14:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 10:33:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 11:00:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 4, 2016 11:05:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 11:07:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 11:09:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 11:10:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 11:20:00 AM		3	0.7%
Aug 4, 2016 11:23:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 11:52:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 12:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 12:52:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 12:57:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 2:47:00 PM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timeafternoonClassEnd: Time of afternoon class session ending

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 4, 2016 9:41:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 10:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 10:08:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 10:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 10:45:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 10:48:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 10:59:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 11:04:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 11:25:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 5, 2016 12:43:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 12:46:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 12:47:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 1:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 1:26:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 9:15:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 10:00:00 PM		2	0.5%
Aug 6, 2016 10:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 11:06:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 11:31:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 11:38:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 12:25:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 12:26:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 12:33:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 8:32:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 9:26:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 9:37:00 AM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timeafternoonClassEnd: Time of afternoon class session ending

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 6, 2016 9:42:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 9:55:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 8, 2016 10:37:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 8, 2016 11:10:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 8, 2016 11:11:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 8, 2016 1:10:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 8, 2016 9:34:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2016 10:00:00 PM		9	2.2%
Aug 9, 2016 10:16:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 9, 2016 11:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2016 12:25:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2016 12:35:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2016 12:59:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2016 1:00:00 PM		2	0.5%
Aug 9, 2016 8:55:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2016 9:23:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2016 9:25:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jan 1, 2014 6:09:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 10:24:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 10:41:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 10:47:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 11:05:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 11:33:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 11:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 12:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 12:06:00 PM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timeafternoonClassEnd: Time of afternoon class session ending

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Jul 25, 2016 12:30:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 1:23:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 1:28:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 3:36:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 9:09:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 9:13:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2023 11:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 27, 2016 10:15:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 27, 2016 11:42:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 27, 2016 12:20:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 27, 2016 1:04:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 27, 2016 1:06:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 10:10:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 10:51:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 10:54:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 11:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 11:22:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 11:44:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 12:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 12:11:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 12:25:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 12:26:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 12:36:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 12:42:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 12:51:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 12:55:00 PM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timeafternoonClassEnd: Time of afternoon class session ending

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Jul 28, 2016 8:27:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 9:36:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 9:53:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 10:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 10:11:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 10:27:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 10:45:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 11:29:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 11:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 12:00:00 AM		2	0.5%
Jul 29, 2016 12:08:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 12:09:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 12:16:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 12:22:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 12:24:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 12:25:00 PM		2	0.5%
Jul 29, 2016 8:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 9:07:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 9:12:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 9:59:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 10:00:00 PM		4	1.0%
Jul 30, 2016 10:16:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 10:25:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 11:00:00 AM		2	0.5%
Jul 30, 2016 11:10:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 11:30:00 AM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timeafternoonClassEnd: Time of afternoon class session ending

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Jul 30, 2016 12:44:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 12:50:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 1:05:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 1:12:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 9:28:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 9:36:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 9:56:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2019 11:10:00 AM		1	0.2%
Oct 5, 2016 11:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 1, 2016 10:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 1, 2016 11:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 1, 2016 11:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 1, 2016 12:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 1, 2016 12:19:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 1, 2016 12:39:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 1, 2016 12:58:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 1, 2016 1:02:00 PM		2	0.5%
Sep 10, 2016 11:40:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 10, 2016 12:35:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 10, 2016 12:48:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 10:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 10:11:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 11:31:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 1:01:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 8:39:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 8:49:00 AM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timeafternoonClassEnd: Time of afternoon class session ending

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Sep 12, 2016 9:18:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 9:27:00 AM		2	0.5%
Sep 12, 2016 9:32:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 9:57:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 14, 2016 12:46:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 2, 2016 10:40:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 2, 2016 10:43:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 2, 2016 10:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 2, 2016 10:52:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 2, 2016 11:25:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 2, 2016 12:55:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 2, 2016 12:57:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 2, 2016 1:11:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 2, 2016 9:43:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 3, 2016 10:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 3, 2016 10:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 3, 2016 10:55:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 3, 2016 11:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 3, 2016 11:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 3, 2016 11:10:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 3, 2016 12:14:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 10:17:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 10:19:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 11:00:00 AM		2	0.5%
Sep 6, 2016 11:20:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 11:40:00 AM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timeafternoonClassEnd: Time of afternoon class session ending

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Sep 6, 2016 11:42:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 12:50:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 12:56:00 PM		2	0.5%
Sep 6, 2016 1:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 1:05:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 1:06:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 7, 2016 10:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 7, 2016 11:14:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 7, 2016 11:20:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 7, 2016 11:46:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 7, 2016 12:43:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 7, 2016 12:50:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 8, 2016 10:45:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 8, 2016 11:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 8, 2016 12:10:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 8, 2016 12:56:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 9, 2016 10:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 9, 2016 10:01:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 9, 2016 11:00:00 AM		2	0.5%
Sep 9, 2016 11:05:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 9, 2016 12:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 9, 2016 12:00:00 PM		1	0.2%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

timelunchEnding: Time of lunch ending

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=character] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=401 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]
Notes	VL - These timestamps have been imported directly from surveyCTO. In some of the phones; the date-time was not correct from the very beginning. Before these were corrected manually, the associated time stamps may be wrong.

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timelunchEnding: Time of lunch ending

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 1, 2016 10:28:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 1, 2016 11:06:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 1, 2016 12:49:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 1, 2016 9:05:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 10:00:00 PM		4	1.0%
Aug 10, 2016 10:07:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 10:30:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 10, 2016 10:47:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 10:55:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 11:20:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 11:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 12:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 12:29:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 1:11:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 9:19:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 9:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 11, 2016 10:18:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 11, 2016 11:40:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 11, 2016 11:51:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 11, 2016 11:54:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 11, 2016 12:00:00 AM		3	0.7%
Aug 11, 2016 12:29:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 11, 2016 12:43:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 12, 2016 10:54:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 12, 2016 1:08:00 PM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timelunchEnding: Time of lunch ending

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 12, 2016 8:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 13, 2016 12:12:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 13, 2016 12:48:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 16, 2016 10:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 16, 2016 10:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 16, 2016 10:38:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 16, 2016 10:40:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 16, 2016 10:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 16, 2016 11:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 16, 2016 11:54:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 16, 2016 12:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 16, 2016 12:52:00 PM		2	0.5%
Aug 16, 2016 12:56:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 16, 2016 12:58:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 10:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 10:07:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 10:30:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 17, 2016 11:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 12:29:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 12:35:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 12:56:00 PM		2	0.5%
Aug 17, 2016 1:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 1:05:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 1:13:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 1:21:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 1:30:00 PM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timelunchEnding: Time of lunch ending

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 17, 2016 1:45:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 10:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 10:27:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 10:30:00 AM		3	0.7%
Aug 19, 2016 10:30:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 10:39:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 10:58:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 11:00:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 19, 2016 11:21:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 12:00:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 19, 2016 12:20:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 12:45:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 12:52:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 1:17:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 10:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 10:00:00 PM		3	0.7%
Aug 2, 2016 10:18:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 10:22:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 10:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 10:45:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 11:00:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 2, 2016 11:49:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 12:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 12:08:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 12:20:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 12:32:00 PM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timelunchEnding: Time of lunch ending

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 2, 2016 12:40:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 12:48:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 1:10:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 1:43:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 9:40:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 20, 2016 10:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 20, 2016 10:20:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 20, 2016 10:22:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 20, 2016 10:25:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 20, 2016 10:30:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 20, 2016 10:40:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 20, 2016 10:55:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 20, 2016 11:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 20, 2016 11:54:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 20, 2016 12:02:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 20, 2016 9:36:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 22, 2016 10:19:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 22, 2016 10:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 22, 2016 12:07:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 22, 2016 12:28:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 22, 2016 12:37:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 22, 2016 9:19:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 23, 2016 10:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 23, 2016 11:06:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 23, 2016 11:27:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 23, 2016 12:09:00 PM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timelunchEnding: Time of lunch ending

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 23, 2016 12:18:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 23, 2016 1:16:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 23, 2016 8:47:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 23, 2016 9:23:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 24, 2016 10:19:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 24, 2016 12:55:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 24, 2016 9:58:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 26, 2016 10:36:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 26, 2016 12:01:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 26, 2016 12:14:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 29, 2016 11:39:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 29, 2016 12:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 10:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 10:04:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 10:30:00 AM		4	1.0%
Aug 3, 2016 10:48:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 10:49:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 10:57:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 11:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 11:15:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 3, 2016 11:35:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 11:38:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 11:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 11:54:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 12:03:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 12:44:00 PM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timelunchEnding: Time of lunch ending

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 3, 2016 12:57:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 1:07:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 1:26:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 9:57:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 10:20:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 10:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 10:35:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 10:40:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 10:50:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 30, 2016 11:00:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 30, 2016 11:25:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 11:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 11:54:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 12:36:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 12:45:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 12:49:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 1:04:00 PM		2	0.5%
Aug 30, 2016 8:36:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 9:44:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 31, 2016 10:20:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 31, 2016 10:30:00 AM		3	0.7%
Aug 31, 2016 10:48:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 31, 2016 11:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 31, 2016 1:07:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 10:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 10:00:00 PM		2	0.5%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timelunchEnding: Time of lunch ending

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 4, 2016 10:08:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 10:14:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 10:15:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 10:25:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 10:30:00 AM		3	0.7%
Aug 4, 2016 10:33:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 10:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 10:55:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 11:00:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 4, 2016 11:07:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 12:52:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 12:57:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 2:47:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 9:41:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2019 10:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 10:00:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 5, 2016 10:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 10:02:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 10:08:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 10:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 10:48:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 10:59:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 11:00:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 5, 2016 11:04:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 11:20:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 12:43:00 PM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timelunchEnding: Time of lunch ending

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 5, 2016 12:46:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 12:47:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 1:26:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 9:15:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 10:00:00 PM		2	0.5%
Aug 6, 2016 10:30:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 6, 2016 11:31:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 11:38:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 12:25:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 12:26:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 12:33:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 8:32:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 9:26:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 9:37:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 9:42:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 9:55:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 8, 2016 10:37:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 8, 2016 11:10:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 8, 2016 11:11:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 8, 2016 1:10:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 8, 2016 9:34:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2016 10:00:00 PM		9	2.2%
Aug 9, 2016 10:16:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 9, 2016 10:45:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2016 11:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2016 12:25:00 PM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timelunchEnding: Time of lunch ending

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 9, 2016 12:35:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2016 1:00:00 PM		2	0.5%
Aug 9, 2016 8:55:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2016 9:23:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2016 9:25:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jan 1, 2014 6:09:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 10:24:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 10:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 10:41:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 11:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 11:05:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 11:33:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 11:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 12:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 12:06:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 12:30:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 1:23:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 1:28:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 3:36:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 9:09:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 9:13:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 27, 2016 10:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 27, 2016 11:42:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 27, 2016 12:20:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 27, 2016 1:04:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 27, 2016 1:06:00 PM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timelunchEnding: Time of lunch ending

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Jul 28, 2016 10:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 10:51:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 10:54:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 11:10:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 11:22:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 11:44:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 12:00:00 AM		2	0.5%
Jul 28, 2016 12:11:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 12:25:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 12:26:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 12:36:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 12:42:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 12:51:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 8:27:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 9:36:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 9:53:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 10:11:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 10:27:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 10:39:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 10:45:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 11:00:00 AM		3	0.7%
Jul 29, 2016 11:29:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 12:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 12:08:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 12:09:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 12:16:00 PM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timelunchEnding: Time of lunch ending

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Jul 29, 2016 12:22:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 12:24:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 8:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 9:07:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 9:12:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 9:59:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 10:00:00 PM		4	1.0%
Jul 30, 2016 10:16:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 10:25:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 10:30:00 AM		2	0.5%
Jul 30, 2016 10:40:00 AM		2	0.5%
Jul 30, 2016 11:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 11:05:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 11:35:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 11:38:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 1:12:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 9:28:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 9:36:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 9:56:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 1, 2016 10:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 1, 2016 10:18:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 1, 2016 10:24:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 1, 2016 11:15:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 1, 2016 11:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 1, 2016 12:19:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 1, 2016 12:39:00 PM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timelunchEnding: Time of lunch ending

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Sep 1, 2016 12:58:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 1, 2016 1:02:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 10, 2016 10:20:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 10, 2016 11:55:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 10, 2016 12:48:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 10:11:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 11:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 11:31:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 1:01:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 8:39:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 8:49:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 9:18:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 9:27:00 AM		2	0.5%
Sep 12, 2016 9:32:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 9:57:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 14, 2016 12:46:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 2, 2016 10:20:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 2, 2016 10:43:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 2, 2016 10:50:00 AM		2	0.5%
Sep 2, 2016 10:52:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 2, 2016 11:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 2, 2016 11:15:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 2, 2016 1:11:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 2, 2016 9:43:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 28, 2016 11:33:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 3, 2016 10:00:00 PM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timelunchEnding: Time of lunch ending

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Sep 3, 2016 10:02:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 3, 2016 10:15:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 3, 2016 10:20:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 3, 2016 10:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 3, 2016 10:37:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 3, 2016 12:14:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 10:17:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 10:19:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 10:20:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 10:39:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 10:40:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 11:00:00 AM		2	0.5%
Sep 6, 2016 11:15:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 11:42:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 12:56:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 1:01:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 1:05:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 1:06:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 7, 2016 10:22:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 7, 2016 10:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 7, 2016 11:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 7, 2016 11:37:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 7, 2016 11:46:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 7, 2016 12:43:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 8, 2016 10:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 8, 2016 11:15:00 AM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timelunchEnding: Time of lunch ending

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Sep 8, 2016 12:10:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 8, 2016 12:56:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 9, 2016 10:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 9, 2016 10:01:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 9, 2016 10:20:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 9, 2016 10:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 9, 2016 10:32:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 9, 2016 12:00:00 AM		1	0.2%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

timeStudentsLeaving: Time of most students leaving

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=character] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=401 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]
Notes	VL - These timestamps have been imported directly from surveyCTO. In some of the phones; the date-time was not correct from the very beginning. Before these were corrected manually, the associated time stamps may be wrong.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 1, 2016 10:28:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 1, 2016 10:40:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 1, 2016 11:06:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 1, 2016 12:49:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 10:00:00 PM		5	1.2%
Aug 10, 2016 10:07:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 10:47:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 11:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 12:29:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 12:44:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 12:46:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 12:50:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 1:00:00 PM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timeStudentsLeaving: Time of most students leaving

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 10, 2016 1:11:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 9:19:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 10, 2016 9:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 11, 2016 10:18:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 11, 2016 11:40:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 11, 2016 11:51:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 11, 2016 11:54:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 11, 2016 12:00:00 AM		3	0.7%
Aug 11, 2016 12:29:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 11, 2016 12:43:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 12, 2016 10:54:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 12, 2016 1:08:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 12, 2016 8:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 13, 2016 12:12:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 13, 2016 12:48:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 16, 2016 10:00:00 PM		4	1.0%
Aug 16, 2016 10:38:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 16, 2016 10:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 16, 2016 12:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 16, 2016 12:52:00 PM		2	0.5%
Aug 16, 2016 12:54:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 16, 2016 12:56:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 16, 2016 12:58:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 10:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 10:07:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 12:29:00 PM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timeStudentsLeaving: Time of most students leaving

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 17, 2016 12:35:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 12:51:00 PM		2	0.5%
Aug 17, 2016 12:56:00 PM		2	0.5%
Aug 17, 2016 1:00:00 PM		2	0.5%
Aug 17, 2016 1:05:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 1:13:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 1:21:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 1:30:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 17, 2016 1:45:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 10:00:00 PM		5	1.2%
Aug 19, 2016 10:39:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 10:58:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 11:15:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 11:21:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 12:00:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 19, 2016 12:20:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 12:45:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 12:52:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 1:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 1:05:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 19, 2016 1:17:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 10:00:00 PM		2	0.5%
Aug 2, 2016 10:16:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 10:18:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 10:22:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 11:01:00 AM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timeStudentsLeaving: Time of most students leaving

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 2, 2016 11:49:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 12:00:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 2, 2016 12:08:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 12:20:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 12:32:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 12:40:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 12:48:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 1:00:00 PM		2	0.5%
Aug 2, 2016 1:10:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 1:43:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 2:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 2, 2016 9:40:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 20, 2016 10:00:00 PM		2	0.5%
Aug 20, 2016 10:22:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 20, 2016 11:54:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 20, 2016 12:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 20, 2016 12:02:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 20, 2016 1:00:00 PM		3	0.7%
Aug 20, 2016 1:07:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 20, 2016 9:36:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 22, 2016 10:19:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 22, 2016 10:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 22, 2016 12:07:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 22, 2016 12:28:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 22, 2016 12:37:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 22, 2016 9:19:00 AM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timeStudentsLeaving: Time of most students leaving

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 23, 2016 11:06:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 23, 2016 11:27:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 23, 2016 12:09:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 23, 2016 12:18:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 23, 2016 1:16:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 23, 2016 8:47:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 23, 2016 9:23:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 24, 2016 10:19:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 24, 2016 12:55:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 24, 2016 9:58:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 26, 2016 10:36:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 26, 2016 12:01:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 26, 2016 12:14:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 27, 2016 1:56:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 29, 2016 11:39:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 10:00:00 PM		3	0.7%
Aug 3, 2016 10:03:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 10:48:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 10:49:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 10:57:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 11:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 11:38:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 11:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 11:54:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 12:00:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 3, 2016 12:44:00 PM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timeStudentsLeaving: Time of most students leaving

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 3, 2016 12:45:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 12:57:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 1:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 1:02:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 1:07:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 1:14:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 1:26:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 3, 2016 9:57:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 10:00:00 PM		2	0.5%
Aug 30, 2016 11:10:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 11:25:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 12:36:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 12:45:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 12:47:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 12:49:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 12:54:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 1:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 1:00:00 PM		3	0.7%
Aug 30, 2016 1:02:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 1:04:00 PM		2	0.5%
Aug 30, 2016 8:36:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 30, 2016 9:44:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 31, 2016 10:48:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 31, 2016 11:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 31, 2016 11:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 31, 2016 11:09:00 PM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timeStudentsLeaving: Time of most students leaving

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 31, 2016 12:45:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 31, 2016 1:07:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 31, 2016 8:57:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 10:00:00 PM		5	1.2%
Aug 4, 2016 10:14:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 10:33:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 10:35:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 10:38:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 11:07:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 11:20:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 11:23:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 12:00:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 4, 2016 12:52:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 12:56:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 12:57:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 1:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 2:47:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2016 9:41:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 4, 2018 10:33:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 10:00:00 PM		3	0.7%
Aug 5, 2016 10:08:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 10:48:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 10:59:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 11:04:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 12:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 12:00:00 PM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timeStudentsLeaving: Time of most students leaving

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 5, 2016 12:43:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 12:46:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 12:47:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 12:57:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 1:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 1:26:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 5, 2016 9:15:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 10:00:00 PM		2	0.5%
Aug 6, 2016 10:38:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 10:47:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 11:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 11:31:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 11:38:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 12:25:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 12:26:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 12:33:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 8:32:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 9:26:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 9:37:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 6, 2016 9:42:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 8, 2016 10:37:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 8, 2016 11:11:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 8, 2016 1:10:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 8, 2016 9:34:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2016 10:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2016 10:00:00 PM		8	2.0%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timeStudentsLeaving: Time of most students leaving

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 9, 2016 10:16:00 AM		2	0.5%
Aug 9, 2016 12:25:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2016 12:35:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2016 1:00:00 PM		3	0.7%
Aug 9, 2016 1:59:00 PM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2016 8:55:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2016 9:23:00 AM		1	0.2%
Aug 9, 2016 9:25:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jan 1, 2014 6:09:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 10:24:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 10:41:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 10:47:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 11:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 11:33:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 11:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 12:06:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 12:30:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 1:00:00 PM		2	0.5%
Jul 25, 2016 1:23:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 1:28:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 3:36:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 9:09:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 25, 2016 9:13:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 27, 2016 11:42:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 27, 2016 12:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 27, 2016 12:20:00 PM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timeStudentsLeaving: Time of most students leaving

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Jul 27, 2016 1:04:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 27, 2016 1:06:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 10:51:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 10:54:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 11:22:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 11:44:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 12:00:00 AM		3	0.7%
Jul 28, 2016 12:11:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 12:25:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 12:26:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 12:36:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 12:42:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 12:51:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 1:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 8:27:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 9:36:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 28, 2016 9:53:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 10:11:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 10:27:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 10:45:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 11:29:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 12:00:00 AM		3	0.7%
Jul 29, 2016 12:08:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 12:09:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 12:13:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 12:16:00 PM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timeStudentsLeaving: Time of most students leaving

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Jul 29, 2016 12:18:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 12:22:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 12:24:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 12:40:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 8:30:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 9:07:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 9:12:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 29, 2016 9:59:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 10:00:00 PM		3	0.7%
Jul 30, 2016 10:16:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 10:20:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 10:25:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 10:42:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 10:44:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 10:47:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 12:00:00 AM		3	0.7%
Jul 30, 2016 1:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 1:12:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 1:44:00 PM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 9:28:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 9:36:00 AM		1	0.2%
Jul 30, 2016 9:56:00 AM		1	0.2%
Oct 20, 2018 10:30:00 PM		1	0.2%
Oct 5, 2016 10:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Oct 5, 2021 10:02:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 1, 2016 12:18:00 PM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timeStudentsLeaving: Time of most students leaving

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Sep 1, 2016 12:19:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 1, 2016 12:39:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 1, 2016 12:58:00 PM		2	0.5%
Sep 1, 2016 1:02:00 PM		2	0.5%
Sep 1, 2016 1:10:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 10, 2016 12:41:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 10, 2016 12:48:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 10, 2016 12:56:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 10:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 10:11:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 11:31:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 1:01:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 8:39:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 8:49:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 9:18:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 9:27:00 AM		2	0.5%
Sep 12, 2016 9:32:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 12, 2016 9:57:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 14, 2016 12:46:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 2, 2016 10:43:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 2, 2016 10:50:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 2, 2016 10:52:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 2, 2016 12:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 2, 2016 12:55:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 2, 2016 12:57:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 2, 2016 1:06:00 AM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timeStudentsLeaving: Time of most students leaving

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Sep 2, 2016 1:11:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 2, 2016 9:43:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 3, 2016 10:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 3, 2016 11:00:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 3, 2016 12:14:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 3, 2016 12:37:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 3, 2016 1:02:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 3, 2016 1:58:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 3, 2019 10:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 10:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 10:17:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 10:19:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 11:42:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 12:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 12:39:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 12:55:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 12:56:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 12:57:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 1:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 1:01:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 1:05:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 6, 2016 1:06:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 7, 2016 11:20:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 7, 2016 11:46:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 7, 2016 12:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 7, 2016 12:37:00 PM		1	0.2%

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

timeStudentsLeaving: Time of most students leaving

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Sep 7, 2016 12:43:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 7, 2016 12:55:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 8, 2016 10:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 8, 2016 12:10:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 8, 2016 12:56:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 8, 2016 1:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 9, 2016 10:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 9, 2016 10:01:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 9, 2016 12:00:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 9, 2016 12:28:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 9, 2016 12:33:00 PM		1	0.2%
Sep 9, 2016 12:35:00 AM		1	0.2%
Sep 9, 2016 12:58:00 PM		1	0.2%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

wall: Does the school have a boundary wall?

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-3] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=401 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	Yes	306	76.3%
2	No	95	23.7%
3	Dont know	0	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

toilet: Does the school have a toilet in working condition?

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-3] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=400 /-] [Invalid=1 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	Yes	388	97.0%
2	No	12	3.0%
3	Dont know	0	
Sysmiss		1	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

kitchen: Does the school have a separate kitchen?

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-3] [Missing=*]

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

kitchen: Does the school have a separate kitchen?

Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=401 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	Yes	293	73.1%
2	No	108	26.9%
3	Dont know	0	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

desks: How many classrooms have desks for students?

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-3] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=401 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	Yes	168	41.9%
2	No	232	57.9%
3	Dont know	1	0.2%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

electricity: Does the school have an electric connection?

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-3] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=401 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	Yes	252	62.8%
2	No	147	36.7%
3	Dont know	2	0.5%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

electricityWork: Does the school electricity work?

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-3] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=401 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	Yes	202	50.4%
2	No	196	48.9%
3	Dont know	3	0.7%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

noClassrooms: How many classrooms are there in this school?

Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-87] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=398 /-] [Invalid=3 /-] [Mean=7.867 /-] [StdDev=8.537 /-]

numberTeachers: How many teachers does the school have?

Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-46] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=399 /-] [Invalid=2 /-] [Mean=8.336 /-] [StdDev=7.966 /-]

numberTeachersPresent: How many teachers are present today?

Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-45] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=397 /-] [Invalid=4 /-] [Mean=7.496 /-] [StdDev=7.559 /-]

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

numberTeachersAbsent: How many teachers are absent today?

Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-25] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=391 /-] [Invalid=10 /-] [Mean=0.808 /-] [StdDev=1.741 /-]

numberTeachersDeptDuty: How many teachers are on department duty?

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-5] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=261 /-] [Invalid=140 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		235	90.0%
1		21	8.0%
2		3	1.1%
3		1	0.4%
5		1	0.4%
Sysmiss		140	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

numberGrades: How many grades are taught in this school?

Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-35] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=399 /-] [Invalid=2 /-] [Mean=5.93 /-] [StdDev=2.842 /-]

ukgGrade: What grades are being taught in the school?UKG

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=401 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]
Notes	VL - This should be interpreted as 'is this grade being taught in this school?' Yes/ No

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	No	292	72.8%
1	Yes	109	27.2%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

firstGrade: What grades are being taught in the school?First

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=401 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]
Notes	VL - This should be interpreted as 'is this grade being taught in this school?' Yes/ No

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	No	69	17.2%
1	Yes	332	82.8%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

secondGrade: What grades are being taught in the school?Second

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=401 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]
Notes	VL - This should be interpreted as 'is this grade being taught in this school?' Yes/ No

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	No	94	23.4%
1	Yes	307	76.6%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

thirdGrade: What grades are being taught in the school?Third

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=401 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]
Notes	VL - This should be interpreted as 'is this grade being taught in this school?' Yes/ No

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	No	79	19.7%
1	Yes	322	80.3%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

fourthGrade: What grades are being taught in the school?Fourth

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=401 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]
Notes	VL - This should be interpreted as 'is this grade being taught in this school?' Yes/ No

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	No	97	24.2%
1	Yes	304	75.8%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

fifthGrade: What grades are being taught in the school?Fifth

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=401 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]
Notes	VL - This should be interpreted as 'is this grade being taught in this school?' Yes/ No

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	No	92	22.9%
1	Yes	309	77.1%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

sixthGrade: What grades are being taught in the school?Sixth

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=401 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]
Notes	VL - This should be interpreted as 'is this grade being taught in this school?' Yes/ No

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	No	277	69.1%
1	Yes	124	30.9%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

seventhGrade: What grades are being taught in the school?Seventh

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=401 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]
Notes	VL - This should be interpreted as 'is this grade being taught in this school?' Yes/ No

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	No	278	69.3%
1	Yes	123	30.7%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

eightGrade: What grades are being taught in the school?Eight

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=401 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]
Notes	VL - This should be interpreted as 'is this grade being taught in this school?' Yes/ No

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	No	270	67.3%
1	Yes	131	32.7%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

ninthGrade: What grades are being taught in the school?Ninth

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=401 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]
Notes	VL - This should be interpreted as 'is this grade being taught in this school?' Yes/ No

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	No	393	98.0%
1	Yes	8	2.0%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

tenthGrade: What grades are being taught in the school?Tenth

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=401 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]
Notes	VL - This should be interpreted as 'is this grade being taught in this school?' Yes/ No

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	No	389	97.0%
1	Yes	12	3.0%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

eleventhGrade: What grades are being taught in the school?Eleventh

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=401 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]
Notes	VL - This should be interpreted as 'is this grade being taught in this school?' Yes/ No

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	No	395	98.5%
1	Yes	6	1.5%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

twelfthGrade: What grades are being taught in the school?Twelfth

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-1] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=401 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]
Notes	VL - This should be interpreted as 'is this grade being taught in this school?' Yes/ No

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	No	398	99.3%
1	Yes	3	0.7%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

File : DDISTiRMidlineFacilityAssesment

# enrollmentClass1: How many students are enrolled in class 1	
Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-180] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=389 /-] [Invalid=12 /-] [Mean=28.918 /-] [StdDev=27.78 /-]
# enrollmentClass2: How many students are enrolled in class 2	
Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 2-200] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=388 /-] [Invalid=13 /-] [Mean=30.113 /-] [StdDev=25.528 /-]
# enrollmentClass3: How many students are enrolled in class 3	
Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-250] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=388 /-] [Invalid=13 /-] [Mean=29.879 /-] [StdDev=26.255 /-]

# **enrollmentClass4: How many students are enrolled in class 4**	
Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= -888-209] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=325 /-] [Invalid=76 /-] [Mean=24.874 /-] [StdDev=55.947 /-]
# **enrollmentClass5: How many students are enrolled in class 5**	
Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-177] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=324 /-] [Invalid=77 /-] [Mean=26.182 /-] [StdDev=22.052 /-]
# **enrollmentClass6: How many students are enrolled in class 6**	
Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-174] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=111 /-] [Invalid=290 /-] [Mean=35.955 /-] [StdDev=29.418 /-]
# **enrollmentClass7: How many students are enrolled in class 7**	
Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-170] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=100 /-] [Invalid=301 /-] [Mean=35.85 /-] [StdDev=31.451 /-]
# **enrollmentClass8: How many students are enrolled in class 8**	
Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 2-167] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=91 /-] [Invalid=310 /-] [Mean=36.209 /-] [StdDev=29.99 /-]
# **enrollmentClass9: How many students are enrolled in class 9**	
Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-164] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=47 /-] [Invalid=354 /-] [Mean=34.787 /-] [StdDev=34.979 /-]
# **enrollmentClass10: How many students are enrolled in class 10**	
Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-168] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=37 /-] [Invalid=364 /-] [Mean=36.108 /-] [StdDev=36.907 /-]
# **enrollmentClass11: How many students are enrolled in class 11**	
Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-123] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=30 /-] [Invalid=371 /-] [Mean=30.033 /-] [StdDev=28.804 /-]
# **totalStudents: Number of students present today across all grades?**	
Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 4-1300] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=381 /-] [Invalid=20 /-] [Mean=133.798 /-] [StdDev=184.611 /-]

File : DDISTiRMidlineObservedAttendance

surveyDate: Date of the survey

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=character] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=16800 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Aug 1, 2016		45	0.3%
Aug 10, 2016		287	1.7%
Aug 11, 2016		299	1.8%
Aug 12, 2016		400	2.4%
Aug 13, 2016		300	1.8%
Aug 16, 2016		315	1.9%
Aug 17, 2016		415	2.5%
Aug 19, 2016		598	3.6%
Aug 2, 2016		261	1.6%
Aug 20, 2016		458	2.7%
Aug 22, 2016		368	2.2%
Aug 23, 2016		80	0.5%
Aug 24, 2016		98	0.6%
Aug 26, 2016		113	0.7%
Aug 27, 2016		111	0.7%
Aug 29, 2016		137	0.8%
Aug 3, 2016		243	1.4%
Aug 30, 2016		477	2.8%
Aug 31, 2016		566	3.4%
Aug 4, 2016		241	1.4%
Aug 5, 2016		335	2.0%
Aug 6, 2016		274	1.6%
Aug 8, 2016		204	1.2%
Aug 9, 2016		390	2.3%
Jan 1, 2014		4	0.0%
Jan 2, 2014		8	0.0%
Jul 25, 2016		159	0.9%
Jul 26, 2016		207	1.2%
Jul 27, 2016		238	1.4%
Jul 28, 2016		221	1.3%
Jul 29, 2016		203	1.2%
Jul 30, 2016		235	1.4%
Sep 1, 2016		548	3.3%
Sep 10, 2016		458	2.7%
Sep 12, 2016		891	5.3%
Sep 14, 2016		762	4.5%
Sep 16, 2016		873	5.2%
Sep 17, 2016		2	0.0%
Sep 19, 2016		861	5.1%
Sep 2, 2016		578	3.4%
Sep 20, 2016		430	2.6%

File : DDISTiRMidlineObservedAttendance

surveyDate: Date of the survey

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Sep 3, 2016		725	4.3%
Sep 5, 2016		58	0.3%
Sep 6, 2016		577	3.4%
Sep 7, 2016		556	3.3%
Sep 8, 2016		609	3.6%
Sep 9, 2016		582	3.5%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

region: Geography

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-2] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=16800 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]
Notes	VL - 1 for Delhi (Affordable Private Schools) and 2 for Uttar Pradesh (Govt. Schools)

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	Delhi	2825	16.8%
2	UP	13975	83.2%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

district: District

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-3] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=16800 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	Delhi	2825	16.8%
2	Rae Bareli	3724	22.2%
3	Varanasi	10251	61.0%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

cluster: Network

Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-26] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=16800 /-] [Invalid=0 /-] [Mean=15.589 /-] [StdDev=6.483 /-]
Notes	VL - For STiR's programming schools have been organized/ grouped into networks. In Delhi, each Education Leader leads one network and in Uttar Pradesh it is based on an administrative unit. This variable represents the 'clusters' or groups into which schools fall.

school: School Code

Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1501-3200] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=16800 /-] [Invalid=0 /-] [Mean=2128.153 /-] [StdDev=480.49 /-]

teacher: Teacher Code

Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 150102-320004] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=16800 /-] [Invalid=0 /-] [Mean=212821.056 /-] [StdDev=48052.319 /-]
Notes	VL - These data were not collected for the newly added teachers

observationNumber

Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-40] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=16800 /-] [Invalid=0 /-] [Mean=8.376 /-] [StdDev=6.584 /-]

File : DDISTiRMidlineObservedAttendance

enumerator: Enumerator Code

Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 2-42] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=16800 /-] [Invalid=0 /-] [Mean=28.654 /-] [StdDev=9.594 /-]

attendance: Is the teacher present in the school?

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-999] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=16800 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	No	3496	20.8%
1	Yes	13242	78.8%
999	Dont know	62	0.4%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

inClass: Is the teacher inside the class?

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-2147483635] [Missing=*/1001/1001]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=13242 /-] [Invalid=3558 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	Outside	4833	36.5%
1	In class	8407	63.5%
999	Dont know if in class or now	2	0.0%
2147483634	Dont know if in school or not	0	
2147483635	Not present in school	0	
1001	.N	3558	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

File : DDISTiRMidlineStudentTesting.dta

surveyDate: Date of the survey

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=character] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=6516 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]
Notes	VL - Date of the survey. Stored as a string. Imported directly from surveyCTO this way.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1-Aug-16		70	1.1%
1-Jan-14		7	0.1%
1-Sep-16		238	3.7%
10-Aug-16		162	2.5%
10-Sep-16		124	1.9%
11-Aug-16		118	1.8%
12-Aug-16		139	2.1%
12-Sep-16		145	2.2%
13-Aug-16		72	1.1%
14-Sep-16		115	1.8%
16-Aug-16		201	3.1%
16-Sep-16		51	0.8%
17-Aug-16		282	4.3%
19-Aug-16		179	2.7%
19-Sep-16		68	1.0%
2-Aug-16		226	3.5%
2-Jan-14		2	0.0%
2-Sep-16		223	3.4%
20-Aug-16		167	2.6%
20-Sep-16		12	0.2%
22-Aug-16		58	0.9%
23-Aug-16		56	0.9%
24-Aug-16		31	0.5%
25-Jul-16		108	1.7%
26-Aug-16		58	0.9%
26-Jul-16		195	3.0%
27-Aug-16		36	0.6%
27-Jul-16		244	3.7%
28-Jul-16		222	3.4%
29-Aug-16		39	0.6%
29-Jul-16		258	4.0%
3-Aug-16		205	3.1%
3-Sep-16		166	2.5%
30-Aug-16		246	3.8%
30-Jul-16		209	3.2%
31-Aug-16		155	2.4%
4-Aug-16		231	3.5%
5-Aug-16		216	3.3%
5-Sep-16		2	0.0%
6-Aug-16		135	2.1%

File : DDISTiRMidlineStudentTesting.dta

surveyDate: Date of the survey

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
6-Sep-16		212	3.3%
7-Sep-16		175	2.7%
8-Aug-16		90	1.4%
8-Sep-16		183	2.8%
9-Aug-16		175	2.7%
9-Sep-16		210	3.2%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

region: Geography

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-2] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=6516 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]
Notes	VL - 1 for Delhi (Affordable Private Schools) and 2 for Uttar Pradesh (Govt. Schools)

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	Delhi	1956	30.0%
2	Uttar Pradesh	4560	70.0%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

district: District

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-3] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=6516 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	Delhi	1956	30.0%
2	Rae Bareli	1963	30.1%
3	Varanasi	2597	39.9%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

cluster: Network

Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-26] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=6516 /-] [Invalid=0 /-] [Mean=13.71 /-] [StdDev=7.574 /-]
Notes	VL - For STiR's programming schools have been organized/ grouped into networks. In Delhi, each Education Leader leads one network and in Uttar Pradesh it is based on an administrative unit. This variable represents the 'clusters' or groups into which schools fall.

school: School Code

Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1501-3198] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=6516 /-] [Invalid=0 /-] [Mean=2227.808 /-] [StdDev=608.042 /-]

teacher: Teacher Code

Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 150102-319802] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=6516 /-] [Invalid=0 /-] [Mean=222786.48 /-] [StdDev=60807.389 /-]
Notes	VL - Teacher codes in this data set are now unique ie all teachers part of this two year study now have a 'unique' teacher code. For new teachers added, new unique codes have been provided. In U.P. 16 teachers were added at midline; and in Delhi 248 teachers were added. These teachers will not 'match' when merged with baseline data.

studentCode: Student Code

Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 15010202-31980210] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=6516 /-] [Invalid=0 /-] [Mean=22278653.293 /-] [StdDev=6080739.067 /-]

File : DDISTiRMidlineStudentTesting.dta

grade: Students grade

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-8] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=6516 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	First	276	4.2%
2	Second	774	11.9%
3	Third	970	14.9%
4	Fourth	1147	17.6%
5	Fifth	1252	19.2%
6	Sixth	471	7.2%
7	Seventh	776	11.9%
8	Eight	850	13.0%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

rollNumber: Roll number

Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= -999-7013] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=6516 /-] [Invalid=0 /-] [Mean=11.516 /-] [StdDev=191.122 /-]

enumerator: Enumerator Code

Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 5-42] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=6516 /-] [Invalid=0 /-] [Mean=26.01 /-] [StdDev=11.145 /-]

hindiLevel: Maximum level in Hindi

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-7] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=6516 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	Nothing	361	5.5%
1	Letter	1246	19.1%
2	Word	1304	20.0%
3	Paragraph	627	9.6%
4	Story1	604	9.3%
5	Story2	932	14.3%
6	Story3	297	4.6%
7	Story4	1145	17.6%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

mathLevel: Maximum level in Math

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-7] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=6516 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0	Nothing	312	4.8%
1	Single-Digit	1867	28.7%
2	Double-Digit	962	14.8%
3	Addition	842	12.9%
4	Subtraction	826	12.7%
5	Multiplication	656	10.1%

File : DDISTiRMidlineStudentTesting.dta

mathLevel: Maximum level in Math

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
6	Division	707	10.9%
7	Fractions	344	5.3%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

comprehensionQs: Comprehension Questions

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-10] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=6516 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]
Notes	s3_q5_1_b_ s3_q5_1_c_ s3_q4_1_b_ s3_q4_1_c_ s3_q4_b_ s3_q4_c_ s3_q5_b_ s3_q5_c_ s3_q6_b_ s3_q6_c_ s3_q7_b_ s3_q7_c_ == 1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		3348	51.4%
1		687	10.5%
2		664	10.2%
3		603	9.3%
4		524	8.0%
5		353	5.4%
6		264	4.1%
7		42	0.6%
8		26	0.4%
9		3	0.0%
10		2	0.0%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

timeElapsed: Time elapsed

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-6] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=6516 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]
Notes	s3_q5_1_ s3_q5_1_b_ s3_q5_1_c_ s3_q4_1_ s3_q4_1_b_ s3_q4_1_c_ s3_q3_1_ s3_q2_1_ s3_q1_ s3_q2_2_ s3_q3_2_ s3_q4_a_ s3_q4_b_ s3_q4_c_ s3_q5_a_ s3_q5_b_ s3_q5_c_ s3_q6_a_ s3_q6_b_ s3_q6_c_ == -1

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		4817	73.9%
1		703	10.8%
2		576	8.8%
3		252	3.9%
4		122	1.9%
5		30	0.5%
6		16	0.2%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

comeSchool: Do you like coming to school?

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-2147483634] [Missing=*/11]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=6512 /-] [Invalid=4 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	Yes	6444	99.0%
2	No	44	0.7%
3	Don't know	24	0.4%

File : DDISTiRMidlineStudentTesting.dta

comeSchool: Do you like coming to school?

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
2147483634	Didn't ask	0	
11	.M	4	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

likeTeacher: Do you want to be like your teacher?

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-2147483634] [Missing=*/11]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=6511 /-] [Invalid=5 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	Yes	5643	86.7%
2	No	671	10.3%
3	Don't know	197	3.0%
2147483634	Didn't ask	0	
11	.M	5	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

File : DDISTiRMidlineTeacherMotivation

region: Geography

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-2] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1412 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]
Notes	VL - 1 for Delhi (Affordable Private Schools) and 2 for Uttar Pradesh (Govt. Schools)

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	Delhi	657	46.5%
2	Uttar Pradesh	755	53.5%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

district: District

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-3] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1412 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	Raebareli	305	21.6%
2	Varanasi	450	31.9%
3	Delhi	657	46.5%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

cluster: Network

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-16] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1412 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]
Notes	VL - For STiR's programming schools have been organized/ grouped into networks. In Delhi, each Education Leader leads one network and in Uttar Pradesh it is based on an administrative unit. This variable represents the 'clusters' or groups into which schools fall.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1		151	10.7%
2		147	10.4%
3		121	8.6%
4		153	10.8%
5		140	9.9%
6		136	9.6%
7		155	11.0%
8		78	5.5%
9		41	2.9%
10		31	2.2%
11		79	5.6%
12		58	4.1%
13		32	2.3%
14		35	2.5%
15		22	1.6%
16		33	2.3%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

school: School Code

Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1501-3198] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1412 /-] [Invalid=0 /-] [Mean=2436.339 /-] [StdDev=638.162 /-]

File : DDISTiRMidlineTeacherMotivation

teacher: Teacher Code

Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 150101-319804] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1412 /-] [Invalid=0 /-] [Mean=243638.547 /-] [StdDev=63817.57 /-]

enumerator: Enumerator Code

Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 17-999] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1412 /-] [Invalid=0 /-] [Mean=28.74 /-] [StdDev=27.187 /-]

age: Teachers age

Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-63] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1406 /-] [Invalid=6 /-] [Mean=36.006 /-] [StdDev=10.231 /-]

teachingexperienceYear: Years of total teaching experience

Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-43] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1405 /-] [Invalid=7 /-] [Mean=10.325 /-] [StdDev=7.41 /-]

teachingexperienceMonth: Months of total experience (to be used only along with year)

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-11] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1404 /-] [Invalid=8 /-]
Notes	VL - Please use this variable only in combination with teachingexperienceYear. Eg: If teachingexperienceMonth is 6 and teachingexperienceYear is 5 means the teacher has 5.5 years of experience.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		1367	97.4%
1		1	0.1%
2		3	0.2%
3		3	0.2%
4		2	0.1%
5		1	0.1%
6		13	0.9%
7		3	0.2%
8		5	0.4%
9		4	0.3%
10		1	0.1%
11		1	0.1%
Sysmiss		8	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

teachingCurrentYear: Years in current school

Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-37] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1395 /-] [Invalid=17 /-] [Mean=6.206 /-] [StdDev=5.123 /-]

teachingCurrentMonth: Months in current school (to be used only along with year)

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-12] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1394 /-] [Invalid=18 /-]
Notes	VL - Please use this variable only in combination with teachingCurrentYear and teachingCurrentDay Eg: If teachingCurrentYear is 6 and teachingCurrentMonth is 5 and teachingCurrentDay is 20 it means the teacher has been at this school for 6 years, 5 months and 20 days.

File : DDISTiRMidlineTeacherMotivation

teachingCurrentMonth: Months in current school (to be used only along with year)

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		975	69.9%
1		22	1.6%
2		45	3.2%
3		41	2.9%
4		34	2.4%
5		27	1.9%
6		66	4.7%
7		44	3.2%
8		58	4.2%
9		38	2.7%
10		29	2.1%
11		14	1.0%
12		1	0.1%
Sysmiss		18	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

teachingCurrentDay: Day in current school (to be used only along with year)

Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-31] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1394 /-] [Invalid=18 /-] [Mean=2.436 /-] [StdDev=6.587 /-]
Notes	VL - Please use this variable only in combination with teachingCurrentYear and teachingCurrentMonth Eg: If teachingCurrentYear is 6 and teachingCurrentMonth is 5 and teachingCurrentDay is 20 it means the teacher has been at this school for 6 years, 5 months and 20 days.

gender: Teacher sex

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-2] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1412 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1		397	28.1%
2		1015	71.9%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

qualification: Highest academic qualification of teachers

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-6] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1410 /-] [Invalid=2 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1		5	0.4%
2		116	8.2%
3		710	50.4%
4		557	39.5%
5		7	0.5%
6		15	1.1%
Sysmiss		2	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

File : DDISTiRMidlineTeacherMotivation

B_ED_M_ED: Additional teacher training

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-5] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1387 /-] [Invalid=25 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1		434	31.3%
2		19	1.4%
3		470	33.9%
4		441	31.8%
5		23	1.7%
Sysmiss		25	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

set: Questionnaire version

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-3] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1412 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1		515	36.5%
2		450	31.9%
3		447	31.7%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

CLS_TGT_I_V: Do you (teachers) teach grades 1 to 5? (Y/N)

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-2] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1410 /-] [Invalid=2 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	N	580	41.1%
2	Y	830	58.9%
Sysmiss		2	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

CLS_TGT_VI_VIII: Do you (teachers) teach grades 6 to 8? (Y/N)

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-2] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1410 /-] [Invalid=2 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	N	1008	71.5%
2	Y	402	28.5%
Sysmiss		2	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

CLS_TGT_IX_X: Do you (teachers) teach grades 9 and 10? (Y/N)

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-2] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1410 /-] [Invalid=2 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	N	1382	98.0%
2	Y	28	2.0%
Sysmiss		2	

File : DDISTiRMidlineTeacherMotivation

CLS_TGT_IX_X: Do you (teachers) teach grades 9 and 10? (Y/N)

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

CLS_TGT_XI_XII: Do you (teachers) teach grades 11 and 12? (Y/N)

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-2] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1410 /-] [Invalid=2 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	N	1403	99.5%
2	Y	7	0.5%
Sysmiss		2	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

SUB_TGT_ENG: Do you (teachers) teach english? (Y/N)

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-2] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1412 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	N	487	34.5%
2	Y	925	65.5%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

SUB_TGT_HIN: Do you (teachers) teach hindi? (Y/N)

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-2] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1412 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	N	416	29.5%
2	Y	996	70.5%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

SUB_TGT_MATHS: Do you (teachers) teach math? (Y/N)

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-2] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1412 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	N	486	34.4%
2	Y	926	65.6%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

SUB_TGT_SST: Do you (teachers) teach social studies? (Y/N)

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-2] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1412 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	N	697	49.4%
2	Y	715	50.6%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

SUB_TGT_SC: Do you (teachers) teach science? (Y/N)

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-2] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1412 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]

File : DDISTiRMidlineTeacherMotivation

SUB_TGT_SC: Do you (teachers) teach science? (Y/N)

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	N	733	51.9%
2	Y	679	48.1%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

SUB_TGT_URDU: Do you (teachers) teach urdu? (Y/N)

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-2] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1412 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	N	1380	97.7%
2	Y	32	2.3%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

SUB_TGT_SANS: Do you (teachers) teach sanskrit? (Y/N)

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-2] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1412 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	N	988	70.0%
2	Y	424	30.0%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

SUB_TGT_OTHER: Do you (teachers) teach any other subject? (Y/N)

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-2] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1412 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	N	1265	89.6%
2	Y	147	10.4%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

q1105: Creative environment; Statement; Positive

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1408 /-] [Invalid=4 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	STRONGLY DISAGREE	28	2.0%
2	DISAGREE	67	4.8%
3	AGREE	955	67.8%
4	STRONGLY AGREE	358	25.4%
Sysmiss		4	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

q1111: Additional responsibility; Statement; Positive

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1391 /-] [Invalid=21 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	STRONGLY DISAGREE	54	3.9%
2	DISAGREE	263	18.9%

File : DDISTiRMidlineTeacherMotivation

q1111: Additional responsibility; Statement; Positive

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
3	AGREE	825	59.3%
4	STRONGLY AGREE	249	17.9%
Sysmiss		21	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

q1208: Student parent support; Statement; Negative

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1402 /-] [Invalid=10 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	STRONGLY DISAGREE	97	6.9%
2	DISAGREE	382	27.2%
3	AGREE	688	49.1%
4	STRONGLY AGREE	235	16.8%
Sysmiss		10	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

q1207: Job mastery; Statement; Negative

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1389 /-] [Invalid=23 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	STRONGLY DISAGREE	258	18.6%
2	DISAGREE	701	50.5%
3	AGREE	345	24.8%
4	STRONGLY AGREE	85	6.1%
Sysmiss		23	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

q1215: Own family support; Statement; Negative

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1405 /-] [Invalid=7 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	STRONGLY DISAGREE	611	43.5%
2	DISAGREE	615	43.8%
3	AGREE	114	8.1%
4	STRONGLY AGREE	65	4.6%
Sysmiss		7	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

q1210: Student involvement; Statement; Negative

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1404 /-] [Invalid=8 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	STRONGLY DISAGREE	529	37.7%
2	DISAGREE	721	51.4%
3	AGREE	113	8.0%

File : DDISTiRMidlineTeacherMotivation

q1210: Student involvement; Statement; Negative

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
4	STRONGLY AGREE	41	2.9%
Sysmiss		8	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

q1205: Creative environment; Statement; Negative

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1405 /-] [Invalid=7 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	STRONGLY DISAGREE	475	33.8%
2	DISAGREE	744	53.0%
3	AGREE	136	9.7%
4	STRONGLY AGREE	50	3.6%
Sysmiss		7	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

q1101: Supervisor recognition; Statement; Positive

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1389 /-] [Invalid=23 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	STRONGLY DISAGREE	42	3.0%
2	DISAGREE	111	8.0%
3	AGREE	962	69.3%
4	STRONGLY AGREE	274	19.7%
Sysmiss		23	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

q1102: Student performance; Statement; Positive

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1407 /-] [Invalid=5 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	STRONGLY DISAGREE	45	3.2%
2	DISAGREE	388	27.6%
3	AGREE	805	57.2%
4	STRONGLY AGREE	169	12.0%
Sysmiss		5	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

q1104: Job security; Statement; Positive

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1393 /-] [Invalid=19 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	STRONGLY DISAGREE	206	14.8%
2	DISAGREE	447	32.1%
3	AGREE	549	39.4%
4	STRONGLY AGREE	191	13.7%

File : DDISTiRMidlineTeacherMotivation

q1104: Job security; Statement; Positive

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Sysmiss		19	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

q1103: TLM; Statement; Positive

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1406 /-] [Invalid=6 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	STRONGLY DISAGREE	55	3.9%
2	DISAGREE	301	21.4%
3	AGREE	835	59.4%
4	STRONGLY AGREE	215	15.3%
Sysmiss		6	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

q1211: Additional responsibility; Statement; Negative

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1393 /-] [Invalid=19 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	STRONGLY DISAGREE	349	25.1%
2	DISAGREE	724	52.0%
3	AGREE	265	19.0%
4	STRONGLY AGREE	55	3.9%
Sysmiss		19	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

q1107: Job mastery; Statement; Positive

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1406 /-] [Invalid=6 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	STRONGLY DISAGREE	19	1.4%
2	DISAGREE	38	2.7%
3	AGREE	856	60.9%
4	STRONGLY AGREE	493	35.1%
Sysmiss		6	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

q1201: Supervisor recognition; Statement; Negative

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1396 /-] [Invalid=16 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	STRONGLY DISAGREE	361	25.9%
2	DISAGREE	803	57.5%
3	AGREE	173	12.4%
4	STRONGLY AGREE	59	4.2%
Sysmiss		16	

File : DDISTiRMidlineTeacherMotivation

q1201: Supervisor recognition; Statement; Negative

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

q1108: Student parent support; Statement; Positive

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1409 /-] [Invalid=3 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	STRONGLY DISAGREE	198	14.1%
2	DISAGREE	519	36.8%
3	AGREE	526	37.3%
4	STRONGLY AGREE	166	11.8%
Sysmiss		3	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

q1110: Student involvement; Statement; Positive

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1406 /-] [Invalid=6 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	STRONGLY DISAGREE	32	2.3%
2	DISAGREE	72	5.1%
3	AGREE	937	66.6%
4	STRONGLY AGREE	365	26.0%
Sysmiss		6	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

q1203: TLM; Statement; Negative

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1407 /-] [Invalid=5 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	STRONGLY DISAGREE	216	15.4%
2	DISAGREE	739	52.5%
3	AGREE	379	26.9%
4	STRONGLY AGREE	73	5.2%
Sysmiss		5	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

q1202: Student performance; Statement; Negative

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1392 /-] [Invalid=20 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	STRONGLY DISAGREE	170	12.2%
2	DISAGREE	656	47.1%
3	AGREE	510	36.6%
4	STRONGLY AGREE	56	4.0%
Sysmiss		20	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

File : DDISTiRMidlineTeacherMotivation

q1115: Own family support; Statement; Positive

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1393 /-] [Invalid=19 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	STRONGLY DISAGREE	35	2.5%
2	DISAGREE	94	6.7%
3	AGREE	806	57.9%
4	STRONGLY AGREE	458	32.9%
Sysmiss		19	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

q1204: Job security; Statement; Negative

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1365 /-] [Invalid=47 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	STRONGLY DISAGREE	352	25.8%
2	DISAGREE	642	47.0%
3	AGREE	276	20.2%
4	STRONGLY AGREE	95	7.0%
Sysmiss		47	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

q2104: Job security; Situation; Positive

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-3] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1409 /-] [Invalid=3 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	A	41	2.9%
2	B	263	18.7%
3	C	1105	78.4%
Sysmiss		3	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

q2208: Student parent support; Situation; Negative

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-3] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1407 /-] [Invalid=5 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	A	99	7.0%
2	B	989	70.3%
3	C	319	22.7%
Sysmiss		5	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

q2103: TLM; Situation; Positive

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-3] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1404 /-] [Invalid=8 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	A	61	4.3%
2	B	174	12.4%
3	C	1169	83.3%
Sysmiss		8	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

q2205: Creative environment; Situation; Negative

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-3] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1404 /-] [Invalid=8 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	A	114	8.1%
2	B	890	63.4%
3	C	400	28.5%
Sysmiss		8	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

q2215: Own family support; Situation; Negative

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-3] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1405 /-] [Invalid=7 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	A	298	21.2%
2	B	857	61.0%
3	C	250	17.8%
Sysmiss		7	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

q2111: Additional responsibility; Situation; Positive

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-3] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1407 /-] [Invalid=5 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	A	90	6.4%
2	B	124	8.8%
3	C	1193	84.8%
Sysmiss		5	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

q2201: Supervisor recognition; Situation; Negative

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-3] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1402 /-] [Invalid=10 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	A	264	18.8%
2	B	817	58.3%
3	C	321	22.9%
Sysmiss		10	

q2201: Supervisor recognition; Situation; Negative

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

q2207: Job mastery; Situation; Negative

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-3] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1402 /-] [Invalid=10 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	A	568	40.5%
2	B	689	49.1%
3	C	145	10.3%
Sysmiss		10	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

q2210: Student involvement; Situation; Negative

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-3] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1409 /-] [Invalid=3 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	A	139	9.9%
2	B	983	69.8%
3	C	287	20.4%
Sysmiss		3	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

q2211: Additional responsibility; Situation; Negative

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-3] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1409 /-] [Invalid=3 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	A	543	38.5%
2	B	691	49.0%
3	C	175	12.4%
Sysmiss		3	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

q2115: Own family support; Situation; Positive

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-3] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1410 /-] [Invalid=2 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	A	48	3.4%
2	B	331	23.5%
3	C	1031	73.1%
Sysmiss		2	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

q2203: TLM; Situation; Negative

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-3] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1409 /-] [Invalid=3 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	A	147	10.4%
2	B	876	62.2%

q2203: TLM; Situation; Negative

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
3	C	386	27.4%
Sysmiss		3	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

q2202: Student performance; Situation; Negative

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-3] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1410 /-] [Invalid=2 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	A	41	2.9%
2	B	1055	74.8%
3	C	314	22.3%
Sysmiss		2	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

q2105: Creative environment; Situation; Positive

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-3] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1409 /-] [Invalid=3 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	A	42	3.0%
2	B	95	6.7%
3	C	1272	90.3%
Sysmiss		3	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

q2110: Student involvement; Situation; Positive

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-3] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1409 /-] [Invalid=3 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	A	180	12.8%
2	B	160	11.4%
3	C	1069	75.9%
Sysmiss		3	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

q2204: Job security; Situation; Negative

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-3] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1404 /-] [Invalid=8 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	A	126	9.0%
2	B	954	67.9%
3	C	324	23.1%
Sysmiss		8	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

q2102: Student performance; Situation; Positive

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-3] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1411 /-] [Invalid=1 /-]

q2102: Student performance; Situation; Positive

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	A	19	1.3%
2	B	72	5.1%
3	C	1320	93.6%
Sysmiss		1	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

q2101: Supervisor recognition; Situation; Positive

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-3] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1408 /-] [Invalid=4 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	A	47	3.3%
2	B	345	24.5%
3	C	1016	72.2%
Sysmiss		4	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

q2107: Job mastery; Situation; Positive

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-3] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1409 /-] [Invalid=3 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	A	190	13.5%
2	B	954	67.7%
3	C	265	18.8%
Sysmiss		3	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

q2108: Student parent support; Situation; Positive

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-3] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1411 /-] [Invalid=1 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	A	174	12.3%
2	B	212	15.0%
3	C	1025	72.6%
Sysmiss		1	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

index: Teacher Motivation Index

Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= -1.36842107772827-5.66666650772095] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1412 /-] [Invalid=0 /-] [Mean=1.814 /-] [StdDev=0.939 /-]

q1232: Growth mindset student; Statement; Negative

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1401 /-] [Invalid=11 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	STRONGLY DISAGREE	299	21.3%
2	DISAGREE	811	57.9%

q1232: Growth mindset student; Statement; Negative

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
3	AGREE	239	17.1%
4	STRONGLY AGREE	52	3.7%
Sysmiss		11	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

q1231: Growth mindset teacher; Statement; Negative

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1403 /-] [Invalid=9 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	STRONGLY DISAGREE	297	21.2%
2	DISAGREE	840	59.9%
3	AGREE	212	15.1%
4	STRONGLY AGREE	54	3.8%
Sysmiss		9	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

q1133: Student benefit; Statement; Positive

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1407 /-] [Invalid=5 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	STRONGLY DISAGREE	83	5.9%
2	DISAGREE	427	30.3%
3	AGREE	682	48.5%
4	STRONGLY AGREE	215	15.3%
Sysmiss		5	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

q1233: Student benefit; Statement; Negative

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-4] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1401 /-] [Invalid=11 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		1	0.1%
1	STRONGLY DISAGREE	218	15.6%
2	DISAGREE	727	51.9%
3	AGREE	395	28.2%
4	STRONGLY AGREE	60	4.3%
Sysmiss		11	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

q1131: Growth mindset teacher; Statement; Positive

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1398 /-] [Invalid=14 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	STRONGLY DISAGREE	28	2.0%
2	DISAGREE	109	7.8%
3	AGREE	918	65.7%

q1131: Growth mindset teacher; Statement; Positive

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
4	STRONGLY AGREE	343	24.5%
Sysmiss		14	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

q1132: Growth mindset student; Statement; Positive

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1401 /-] [Invalid=11 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	STRONGLY DISAGREE	39	2.8%
2	DISAGREE	224	16.0%
3	AGREE	840	60.0%
4	STRONGLY AGREE	298	21.3%
Sysmiss		11	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

q2133: Student benefit; Situation; Positive

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-5] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1411 /-] [Invalid=1 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	A	10	0.7%
2	B	140	9.9%
3	C	1137	80.6%
4		123	8.7%
5		1	0.1%
Sysmiss		1	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

q2132: Growth mindset student; Situation; Positive

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1406 /-] [Invalid=6 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	A	27	1.9%
2	B	171	12.2%
3	C	948	67.4%
4		260	18.5%
Sysmiss		6	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

q2233: Student benefit; Situation; Negative

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-5] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1406 /-] [Invalid=6 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	A	75	5.3%
2	B	490	34.9%
3	C	106	7.5%
4		617	43.9%

q2233: Student benefit; Situation; Negative

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
5		118	8.4%
Sysmiss		6	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

q2231: Growth mindset teacher; Situation; Negative

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-5] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1406 /-] [Invalid=6 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	A	29	2.1%
2	B	216	15.4%
3	C	74	5.3%
4		1086	77.2%
5		1	0.1%
Sysmiss		6	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

q3134: If my principal gives me other work instead of teaching, I willÂ be:

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1399 /-] [Invalid=13 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	A	123	8.8%
2	B	327	23.4%
3	C	709	50.7%
4	D	240	17.2%
Sysmiss		13	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

q3135: How motivated have you been in the past week as a teacher?

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-6] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1385 /-] [Invalid=27 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	A	315	22.7%
2	B	647	46.7%
3	C	284	20.5%
4	D	101	7.3%
5	E	34	2.5%
6	F	4	0.3%
Sysmiss		27	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

q3136: Do you feel as motivated as a teacher could be?

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-2] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1384 /-] [Invalid=28 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	A	1175	84.9%
2	B	209	15.1%

q3136: Do you feel as motivated as a teacher could be?

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Sysmiss		28	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

q1338: Paperwork; Statement; Negative (Only U.P.)

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=748 /-] [Invalid=664 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	STRONGLY DISAGREE	31	4.1%
2	DISAGREE	87	11.6%
3	AGREE	462	61.8%
4	STRONGLY AGREE	168	22.5%
Sysmiss		664	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

q3138: Paperwork; Statement; Positive (Only U.P.)

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=743 /-] [Invalid=669 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1		8	1.1%
2		174	23.4%
3		472	63.5%
4		89	12.0%
Sysmiss		669	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

q1238: Paperwork; Statement; Positive (Only U.P.)

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=743 /-] [Invalid=669 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	STRONGLY DISAGREE	43	5.8%
2	DISAGREE	311	41.9%
3	AGREE	317	42.7%
4	STRONGLY AGREE	72	9.7%
Sysmiss		669	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

q1138: Paperwork; Statement; Positive (Only U.P.)

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-4] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=746 /-] [Invalid=666 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	STRONGLY DISAGREE	66	8.8%
2	DISAGREE	299	40.1%
3	AGREE	321	43.0%
4	STRONGLY AGREE	60	8.0%
Sysmiss		666	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

q2238: Paperwork; Situation; Positive (Only U.P.)

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-3] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=745 /-] [Invalid=667 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	A	260	34.9%
2	B	328	44.0%
3	C	157	21.1%
Sysmiss		667	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

q_3_19_A_2: Number of public holidays in the last 14 days

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-7] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1402 /-] [Invalid=10 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		1	0.1%
1		1	0.1%
2		191	13.6%
3		165	11.8%
4		402	28.7%
5		456	32.5%
6		182	13.0%
7		4	0.3%
Sysmiss		10	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

q_3_19_A_3: Number of days school was closed due to any other reasons

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-4] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1400 /-] [Invalid=12 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		1341	95.8%
1		49	3.5%
2		6	0.4%
3		3	0.2%
4		1	0.1%
Sysmiss		12	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

q_3_19_A_4: Number of days you had to stay outside the school due to administrative works

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-6] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1400 /-] [Invalid=12 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		1271	90.8%
1		90	6.4%
2		22	1.6%
3		10	0.7%
4		5	0.4%
6		2	0.1%

q_3_19_A_4: Number of days you had to stay outside the school due to administrative works

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
Sysmiss		12	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

q_3__19_A_4_2: How many days could you have attended school over the past 14 days

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-12] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1401 /-] [Invalid=11 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		1	0.1%
4		2	0.1%
5		1	0.1%
6		12	0.9%
7		43	3.1%
8		200	14.3%
9		445	31.8%
10		368	26.3%
11		169	12.1%
12		160	11.4%
Sysmiss		11	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

q_3_19_B: Of those days you could attend, how many days have you attended the school?

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 0-12] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=1401 /-] [Invalid=11 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
0		2	0.1%
1		5	0.4%
2		3	0.2%
3		7	0.5%
4		9	0.6%
5		7	0.5%
6		34	2.4%
7		83	5.9%
8		251	17.9%
9		390	27.8%
10		347	24.8%
11		140	10.0%
12		123	8.8%
Sysmiss		11	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

File : DDISTiRSchoolTreatmentAssignment

region: Geography

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-2] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=453 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]
Notes	VL - 1 for Delhi (Affordable Private Schools) and 2 for Uttar Pradesh (Govt. Schools)

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	Delhi	180	39.7%
2	Uttar Pradesh	273	60.3%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

district: District

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-3] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=453 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	Delhi	180	39.7%
2	Rae Bareli	163	36.0%
3	Varanasi	110	24.3%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

school: School Code

Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1501-3200] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=453 /-] [Invalid=0 /-] [Mean=2299.634 /-] [StdDev=674.361 /-]

treatment: Broad treatment assignment

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-2] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=453 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	Control	151	33.3%
2	Treatment	302	66.7%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

treatmentStatus: Finer treatment assignment

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-3] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=453 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	Control	151	33.3%
2	Intrinsic	152	33.6%
3	Extrinsic	150	33.1%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

extrinsicPackage: Details on extrinsic package

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= -999-5] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=453 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]
Notes	VL - The extrinsic packages for Delhi and Uttar Pradesh vary. Exposure and Local recognition are common to both. Govt. and policy engagement is unique to Uttar Pradesh; Head teacher development and Career development are unique to Delhi.

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
-999	Not an extrinsic cluster school	303	66.9%

File : DDISTiRSchoolTreatmentAssignment

extrinsicPackage: Details on extrinsic package

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	Exposure	37	8.2%
2	Government and policy engagement	34	7.5%
3	Local recognition	47	10.4%
4	Head Teacher Development	20	4.4%
5	Career Development	12	2.6%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

File : DDISTiRStudentMapping

region: Geography

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-2] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=10390 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]
Notes	VL - 1 for Delhi (Affordable Private Schools) and 2 for Uttar Pradesh (Govt. Schools)

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	Delhi	3049	29.3%
2	Uttar Pradesh	7341	70.7%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

district: District

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-3] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=10390 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	Delhi	3049	29.3%
2	Rae Bareli	3287	31.6%
3	Varanasi	4054	39.0%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

school: School Code

Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1501-3200] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=10390 /-] [Invalid=0 /-] [Mean=2213.672 /-] [StdDev=606.988 /-]

teacher: Teacher Code used during baseline COST

Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 150102-320004] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=10390 /-] [Invalid=0 /-] [Mean=221372.472 /-] [StdDev=60701.572 /-]

studentCode: Student code midline

Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 15010202-32000410] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=10390 /-] [Invalid=0 /-] [Mean=22137252.485 /-] [StdDev=6070157.339 /-]

studentCodeBL: Student code baseline

Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 15010201-99991010] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=10390 /-] [Invalid=0 /-] [Mean=22495880.433 /-] [StdDev=8186434.287 /-]

sex: Student sex

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-2] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=10207 /-] [Invalid=183 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	Male	5114	50.1%
2	Female	5093	49.9%
Sysmiss		183	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

age: Student age

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 3-16] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=9950 /-] [Invalid=440 /-]

File : DDISTiRStudentMapping

age: Student age

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
3		4	0.0%
4		21	0.2%
5		286	2.9%
6		868	8.7%
7		1202	12.1%
8		1430	14.4%
9		1428	14.4%
10		1444	14.5%
11		1055	10.6%
12		1016	10.2%
13		907	9.1%
14		225	2.3%
15		57	0.6%
16		7	0.1%
Sysmiss		440	

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

File : DDISTiRTeacherMapping

region: Geography

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-2] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2584 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]
Notes	VL - 1 for Delhi (Affordable Private Schools) and 2 for Uttar Pradesh (Govt. Schools)

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	Delhi	1330	51.5%
2	Uttar Pradesh	1254	48.5%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

district: District

Information	[Type= discrete] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1-3] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2584 /-] [Invalid=0 /-]

Value	Label	Cases	Percentage
1	Delhi	1330	51.5%
2	Rae Bareli	541	20.9%
3	Varanasi	713	27.6%

Warning: these figures indicate the number of cases found in the data file. They cannot be interpreted as summary statistics of the population of interest.

school: School Code

Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 1501-3200] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2584 /-] [Invalid=0 /-] [Mean=2493.956 /-] [StdDev=643.751 /-]

teacherCode: Unique teacher code used at midline

Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 150101-320011] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2584 /-] [Invalid=0 /-] [Mean=249403.256 /-] [StdDev=64379.131 /-]

teacherCodeCOST: Teacher code baseline classroom observation, student testing

Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 150101-999913] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2077 /-] [Invalid=507 /-] [Mean=240679.152 /-] [StdDev=93775.671 /-]

teacherCodeTM: Teacher code baseline teacher motivation

Information	[Type= continuous] [Format=numeric] [Range= 150101-320011] [Missing=*]
Statistics [NW/ W]	[Valid=2503 /-] [Invalid=81 /-] [Mean=247406.203 /-] [StdDev=64425.055 /-]