The views of the University Grants Commission's Chairperson on Grants Formulae for Universities*

Formulae for computing the quantum of grants to be given to Indian universities will be implemented all over the country from the financial year commencing April 1997, to put an end to the existing ad hoc system. According to the University Grants Commission (UGC) Chairperson, Dr. Armaiti Desai this was being done in view of the financial crunch being faced by universities in the recent years. Dr. Desai was addressing the Vic Chancellors and other delegates at the UGC-sponsored round-table meet on "University Management" in Mysore recently. She said the UGC had been getting less fund with the result that it could no longer meet its commitment to the universities.

Initially, while the Government accounted for only 57 per cent of the total income of these institutions it had gone up to 81.50 per cent in 1983-84. On the other hand, funds for education by local bodies had gone down from 10.90 per cent to 5.60 per cent. The share of fees had also declined from 20.40 per cent to 7.50 per cent and the share of endowments and other sources had decreased from 11.60 per cent to 3.80 per cent. This indicates that the educational system heavily depended on the Government funds and had failed in resource mobilisation therefore compromising its own autonomy.
Given such a scenario, the UGC had realised that the method of computing the quantum had never been worked out, resulting in computing the grant in an ad hoc manner.

The process of working out a formula had been initiated by the UGC based on the recommendations of the Punnaya Committee. The brunt of work had been taken by the Association of Indian Universities (AIU). The aim was to work out unit costs which reflect the basic requirements of recurring expenditure of universities - Central, State and Deemed.

On enabling institutions to raise their own resources, the UGC Chairperson said while the funding requirement for day-to-day maintenance and salary would have to remain with the Government - Central or State - as recommended by the Punnaya Committee and accepted by the UGC, there were many things which educational institution wanted to do and for which they required cess.

She conceded that many universities and institutions wanted to mobilise resources, but had not been given the time to do so. She felt that the universities should mobilise resources from business houses, philanthropists and the alumni.

Dr. Desai said the atmosphere could be created if both the quality and the relevance of education was
improved and education made more responsive to the needs of the industry and the community.

Appendix II

Model Criteria for Fixation of Grants-in-aid with Reference to Uttar Pradesh*

The model criteria for fixation of the grants-in-aid to the higher educational sub-sector in general and in Uttar Pradesh's higher educational sub-sector in particular is suggested as under:

i) The fixation of block grant for maintenance (non-plan) should coincide with the duration of the period covered by the recommendations of the Finance Commission of the Government of India and development assistance (plan) should coincide with the Five Year Plans, based on the recommendations of the Planning Commissions to the Government of India. This is desirable because the quantum of grants to state governments under Non-plan and plan is determined by the Finance Commission and Planning Commission to the Government of India in terms of guidelines 5 (iv) (a) of the Finance Commission and instructions of the central government. The quantum of grants under non-plan and plan should be determined after discussing the proposals/requirement of the university institutions at the government/University Grants Commission level thereafter with these two national bodies;
ii) The expenditure for determining the grants should be taken for the year preceding the base year;

iii) The requirement of the university institutions under non-plan should be based on the items of expenditure, viz., (1) Salaries including Travelling Allowance; (2) Filling-up of the posts essentially required during the period for which the grant is to be fixed; (3) Revision of pay-scales of university staff (inclusive of arrears and normal increase) during the currency of the period for fixation of grants; (4) Transfer of plan scheme to non-plan; (5) Contingent expenditure like laboratory equipment, chemicals, wages etc., (6) Maintenance of buildings, roads, water, electricity, etc., (7) Scholarships and stipends to students; (8) Replacement of obsolete or broken equipments; and (ix) Retiring benefits to employees i.e., pension, gratuity, Contributory Provident Fund, leave encashment, ex-gratia grants, etc.;

iv) The domestic income of the University Institutions should not be deducted from the total expenditure while fixing grants-in-aid so as to provide to University Institutions to generate more income and to help in improving their financial position;

v) The amount of grants so fixed should be provided to the University Institutions as block grants and not deficit grants;
vi) Annual growth of 10.00 percent to meet expenditure on account of grant of annual increments, rise in wages of labour, general rise in price-index should be allowed;

vii) The interest on overdraft, repayment of loans etc.; should not be deducted from the total expenditure at the time of fixation of grants-in-aid as in the case of most of the universities, these facilities are availed of with the prior approval of the government as per provision of the Act and Statutes of the university concerned; and

viii) The plan grants should include the requirement of the university for raising infrastructures and other physical facilities, starting of new schemes, programmes of teaching, research etc., and matching grants for claiming development assistance from the University Grants Commission and other funding agencies, based on the future development programmes of the University Institutions.

*Based on Sharma, M.M., op. cit., pp. 162-65.*
Cost - Benefit Analysis and Cost-Consciousness in General Higher Education*

In today's world of extreme competition, the need for the right cost-consciousness hardly requires justification. It is time, rather high time, that the cost-consciousness should appropriately be conceived and brought into practice. Success in a competitive world lies in the efficient and effective management of cost-benefit and cost-effectiveness.

Through cost-benefit analysis, it is possible to evaluate education as an investment for the individual or for the society as a whole. "A calculation of the private rate of return to investment in education shows how profitable it is for an individual student or his or her family who invest in education, whereas the social rate of return provides a yardstick for evaluating education as a social investment. In either case costs of education are measured in terms of opportunity costs. The private costs of education include expenditure on fees, books, equipment, or travel together with earnings foregone by the student whereas the social costs include all current expenditure on tuition, as well as the value of school or college buildings and equipment, and the foregone earnings of students which provide a proxy measure of the value of output foregone by the society.
when students choose to continue their education rather then join the labour market."¹

According to Mark Blaug in his paper on 'The Rate of Return on Investment in Education in Great Britain' "..... since the benefits of University-education are diffused throughout society, it is the community as a whole which derives any economic benefits and not the individual concerned."² Carter and Williams in their evidence of the Robbins Committee on Higher Education - 1966 (UK) held that the primary benefit of investment in education goes to the student and then to the Society. The truth therefore is that benefits go both to the individual and society.

1. Cost-Effectiveness

Coming to the cost-effectiveness, analysis of this was originally developed for the evaluation of public money in such fields as military defence where the objectives are clearly definable and measurable, but not in terms of money. However, more recently, it is


2. Quoted in D.M. Nanjundappa's University Finance Search for New Perspectives, presented at the National
now being used for project evaluation for other areas of public expenditure including health and education. 3

Reliability of cost-effectiveness analysis in education is however disputed. In fact some analysts argue that it is impossible to do so. According to them, cost-effectiveness analysis is an inappropriate technique for education. Fielden and Pearson (1978) define cost and while explaining two methods of applying effectiveness analysis, conclude as follows:

"Because educational outputs cannot be neatly measured..... technique is invalid.... constant or equal effectiveness is a myth. We recently undertook the evaluation of 30 projects which used computer-assisted learning in schools, universities and training establishments. We found that in no case was cost-effectiveness analysis relevant to our work." 4

While to a great extent, the above observation is true, it has to be admitted that in order to find

Seminar on University Finances organised by AIU on Oct. 5, 1989 at Srinagar.


4. Ibid.
out the most effective ways of utilisation of educational resources, it is necessary to devise some means of comparing the efficiency of different institutions of choosing between alternative methods of achieving the same or similar objectives and of identifying the most effective ways for the purpose.

2. Promoting Cost-Benefit and Cost-Effectiveness Culture

As already observed it is high time that there is appropriate cost-benefit and cost-effectiveness culture. The needs are widely accepted and they are as follows:

i) We have growing financial constraints and in that, greater constraint is on the educational sector. As compared to all developed countries and even some of the developing countries including Malaysia, Sri Lanka and Pakistan, smaller resources are allocated for education. Unfortunately, even the said scarce resources are neither properly allocated nor optimally and effectively used. There is an urgent need for that.

ii) In a poor country like ours, where education is heavily subsidised by the public money, there is a strong need to understand the cost benefit and cost effectiveness of the public money.

iii) Through the cost-effective analysis, it is possible to compare two or more educational institutions
with summer levels of cost in order to discover which achieves the highest level of output or results. The most cost-effective institute is the one which maximizes the output achieved with a given level of cost.

iv) Cost-analysis also help find alternative means for both cost-benefit and cost-effectiveness. An example is the modern educational technology through the application of which it is possible to reduce the manpower need i.e., teachers, technicians and to an extent certain facilities.

In any case, Management of any organisation - big or small - would like to know the return on the investment either by way of benefit or effectiveness. A system of cost analysis would always contribute to betterment either of the product or of the system.

3. Scope for Cost-Analysis

In the education sector, what may be the scope for cost-benefit and effectiveness and what analysis may be possible would naturally be the ultimate question. To this the following are the possibilities:

i) To decide the actual manpower need both teaching and non-teaching and then optimal utilisation of that power.

ii) Use of modern technology for teaching and for laboratory work etc. (to an extent) replacing contact
hours wherever possible without sacrificing the standard.

iii) Optimal use of space, equipment and laboratory.

iv) Constant review and control on various other operating costs, e.g. Electricity, Stationery, Transport and Travel.

v) Review the system of examinations, evaluation and curtail avoidable expenditure wherever possible.

In India, we have mostly two diametrically opposite situations. Situation one is that in a number of institutions full utilisation of the manpower and facilities are not made. In other words, there are more people and underutilised facilities than needed. Situation two is that we have quite large number of institutions which suffer because they do not have adequate manpower and the minimum facilities. Since the additional manpower is nothing but waste in the institutions of situation number one, they can be optimally utilised in institutions where there is shortage of manpower. This does not necessarily mean that the additional teachers of situation one should physically be transferred. What is envisaged is the investment needed for additional manpower which is otherwise a wastage can be diverted to the institutions which are suffering on account of the lack of manpower.

In today's context, particularly when the modern education technology has been developing fast it is necessary that full advantage of the same should be taken.
This will be cheaper than the manpower cost. However, this can be done to a limited context only.

It has generally been the complaint in many institutions that the equipment, space and library which are all costly items are not optimally utilised. Examples of the equipment having remained without use for long time and also to an extent space, are many. Even the library use is not to the desirable level. This has been complained by many academics and national level bodies time and again.

Through the review of the system of examinations and the procedure for evaluation in the traditional universities, expenditure can be curtailed to a very large extent. For example, the number of examinations for which students have to formally appear and pay fees for a particular programme say B.A. degree or B.Sc. degree need be examined. While a number of universities would have only one examination at the end of 3 years, there are many universities which hold an examination at the end of every year. In the case of the latter universities, the students have to pay fees three times as against only once in the case of former universities. Besides, administrative expenditure as also the time of the teachers involved for evaluation are all that can be avoided and public expenditure curtailed. There is hardly any cost-benefit to the students; universities may or may not earn.

Generally, the experience shows that effort in the past, although not so organised in some universities to tackle the problem with some of the suggestions as mentioned above did not lead to the desired consequence for the lack
of determination. On way to bring about cost-consciousness is to bring constraint so that the pressure is felt by everybody concerned and in tune, there is desirable exercise and solution. Universities of UK had to effect sizeable financial reductions when they did not know what else to do. In the process, while some got over the difficulties for they realised the seriousness, other did not easily realise and suffered for having failed to take quick action. But ultimately, they too were also forced to find alternative means. Today, they have all become cost-conscious and in the process they have achieved cost benefit and cost-effectiveness. They had also to find out alternative means to reduce expenditure without sacrificing the standard.

4. Limitations

Unlike other sectors, the education sector has certain limitations which are special to it. Despite sincere and right efforts the likelihood of achieving the desirable level of cost-consciousness and in turn cost-benefit and effectiveness may not be too encouraging.

Primarily, education has to be viewed as a longterm investment for it is not capable of giving quick return. For the same reason if there is a cut on education budget, the adverse result is also not seen immediately.

Besides, education as such is necessarily a welfare activity of the society through which along all that we desire to do in a modern society are being achieved.
In a number of sectors if activities are closed, there may not be irreparable loss as would be in case all educational institutions are closed. It is for this reason that education assumed greatest importance in Japan and through that alone, Japan has transformed its economy.

There is also social and political constraint in education as much as in other sectors which again comes in the way of cost-effectiveness. For example, the Zero Base Budgeting - one of the important prerequisites for successful implementation of the system is to review each activity every year before preparing the budget with reference to performance and need. Such exercises may reder hundreds of thousands of people jobless and as we cannot afford to do that, our cost-effectiveness suffers even though cost-consciousness is there.

5. Conclusion

Besides the unquestionable need of cost-consciousness and certain inherent limitations in that direction, there is a question which needs to be understood in the right perspective.

The question is while cost-consciousness is necessary to spend the minimum to achieve the maximum, should that be the approach only when we utilize the public money for they are taxpayers hard-earned money. Should we or should we not be cost-conscious when private funds
are available? For example, when we spend public money we have generally to see that we spend the minimum and generally we ignore the quality and by and large go by the lowest price. If we handle private funds which may not have constraints like one to go by the lowest price, we may decide to have good quality of material and spend more and in that there is an underlying benefit.

Precisely, the question is when the purpose is served by lower amount of money which takes care of better cost-consciousness, why to go for higher spending? From one angle it is OK, but what about the quality, durability, aesthetic aspect etc. Quality construction of a building with higher investment and building constructed on the basis of the lowest quotation could perhaps be an easy example to quote. Therefore the cost consciousness cannot be a blanket concept. It has various aspects. It has to be exercised with vision and courage for application in different situations and time.

*Based on Ghosh, D.K., "cost-consciousness in Education"

A Review of National Policy on Education - 1986 on the Question Raising Resources for Educational System*

The National Policy on Education, 1986 provides us with the policy-approach for raising resources for educational system as a whole where the higher educational sub-sector has its stake. As it mentions: "Resources, to the extent possible, will be raised by mobilising donations, asking the beneficiary communities to maintain school buildings and supplies of some consumables, raising fees at the higher levels of education and effecting some savings by efficient use of facilities. Institutions involved with research and the development of technical and scientific manpower should also mobilise some funds by levying a cess or charge on the user agencies, including government departments, and enterpreneurs. All these measures will be taken not only to reduce the burden on state resources but also for creating a greater sense of responsibility within the educational system. However, such measures will contribute marginally to the total funding."

This document further mentions: "In view of these imperatives, education will be treated as a crucial area of investment for national development and survival. The National Policy on Education, 1968, had laid down that the investment on education be gradually increased
to reach a level of expenditure of 6.00 percent of the national income as early as possible. Since the actual level of investment has remained far short of that target, it is important greater determination be shown now to find the funds for the programmes laid down in this policy."

Despite all the task of determination to find funds for investment in education, the programme of action did not deem it desirable to set-up a Task Force on the question of resource mobilisation. Obviously, it believed that the mobilisation effort will contribute only marginally to funding. This represents a defeatist attitude. The policy options need not have made the assumption about making a marginal impact; these could have resulted in a significant contribution, if, as the National Policy on Education stated, greater determination had been shown to find funds for the programmes laid down in the National Policy on Education. It did not review and put options for rationalisation of the policy of grants-in-aid, especially to the higher educational sector by different funding agencies. This could have been a concrete contribution of the National Policy on Education on the question of raising resources for this sub-sector. Finally, it should have dealt with, in detail, on the question of raising and economising
financial resources for this sub-sector, which it did not do. However, the National Policy on Education paved a way for rethinking on the question of raising financial resources for the educational system, which is a need of the day.

Duties and Responsibilities of the
Directorate of Higher Education,
Uttar Pradesh, Allahabad*

1. Duties and responsibilities for management, control and development for regional offices of the state, higher education and all the government colleges.

2. Salary distribution in all the aided non-government colleges through the government machinery and administrative works related to them and fixation of salaries from time to time.

3. To receive information from the colleges relating to the current vacancies and in-coming vacancies during in an educational session and to send the subject-wise integrated-list to the Uttar Pradesh Higher Education Commission for advertisement and selection.

4. To send the name of the selected candidate by the Uttar Pradesh Higher Education Commission to the management of the colleges.

5. Sanctioning of advances from General Provident Fund.

6. Payment of the amount of GPF and granting of pension.

7. The legal and court works related to the higher education.

8. To perform the responsibility of implementation of the laws, by-laws and acts of higher education by co-ordinating with the universities.
9. To get audited the records of the government and non-government colleges by the audit unit of the head quarter.

*Based on Government of Uttar Pradesh, Lucknow : Higher Education Department - Karyapurti Digdarshak 1994-95, Aay - Vyak, p. 35.
Appendix VI


Regional Officer 4
Asstt. Accounts Officer 4

Statistical Research Officer 3

Director 1
Joint Director 2
Deputy Director 2
Asstt. Director 5
Senior Administrative Officer 1
Administrative Officer 1

Finance Controller 1
Accounts Officer 2
Asstt. Accounts Officer 2
Senior Accounts Auditor 5
Accounts Auditor 40

Superintendent Grade-2 10
Steno 11
Senior Asstt. 28
Senior Clerk 29
Junior Clerk 30
Driver 1
Daftari 2
Ordely/Peon 17

Yearwise List of the Non-government Colleges
Brought on Grants-in-aid*

1985-86

1. Pt. Sunder Lal Memorial Degree College, Kannauj, Farrukhabad.
2. Ganna Krashak Mahavidyalaya, Takha, Shahganj, Jaunpur.
3. Sri Shalig Ram Sharma Smarak Degree College, Rasna, Meerut.
4. Dhodhe Ram Mahavidyalaya, Sevra, Faizabad.
5. Ram Nagar Degree College, Ram Nagar, Barabanki.
7. Indira Gandhi Degree College, Gauriganj, Sultanpur.

1986-87

2. Kunwar R.C. Mahila Degree College, Mainpuri.

1987-88

2. Kishan Degree College, Tamkuhi Road, Sevrahi, Deoria.
4. Sarvoday Vidyapeeth Degree College, Salon, Raibareilly.
5. Mahamatki Prannath Mahavidyalaya, Mau, Banda.
1990-91

1. Samta Mahavidyalaya, Sadat, Gazipur.
4. Arya Mahila Degree College, Shahjahanpur.
5. Lala Laxmi Narayan Degree College, Sirsa, Allahabad.
7. Janta Mahavidyalaya, Parson, Eta
8. Mahila Seva Sadan Degree College, Allahabad.

1991-92

Zero

1992-93

Zero

1993-94

Zero

*Based on the Directorate of Higher Education's Publication - Uttar Pradesh Mein Uchh Shiksha ki Pragati 1994-95, p. 27.
## General Higher Educational Outlay and Expenditure in the Fourth Plan

### (Rs. in Lakhs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Group</th>
<th>7 Social service</th>
<th>7.1 General Education (Contd...)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) University Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>710301</td>
<td>Establishment of Nanital University</td>
<td>60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>710302</td>
<td>Development Grant to the Universities</td>
<td>135.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>710303</td>
<td>Maintenance Grant to New Degree College and new faculties.</td>
<td>87.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>710304</td>
<td>Development grant to Non-government Degree College</td>
<td>134.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>710305</td>
<td>Grant for Special Facilities to the Girls-Students in Degree and Post-Graduate Classes</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>710306</td>
<td>Opening of New Government Degree Colleges and development of the present degree colleges</td>
<td>55.00 30.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Appendix VII

...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>710307</td>
<td>Ability Grant to Degree college</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>710308</td>
<td>Rural Institute</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>710309</td>
<td>Incentive to increase the Qualifications of Degree Teacher</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>710310</td>
<td>Loans to the Foreign going students for Higher Education in Science Subjects (Non-technical)</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>710311</td>
<td>Travelling Grant for studies in Foreign Countries</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>710312</td>
<td>Grant for participating in conferences etc in Foreign Countries</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>710313</td>
<td>Grant for Arrangement of Superintendent of Physical Education</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>710314</td>
<td>Grant for Arrangement of Lending Libraries an cooperative basis in universities and degree colleges</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>710315</td>
<td>Establishement of Autonomies Corporation for the Publication of university level Literature Spill-over Projects</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>710316</td>
<td>Opening of new Government Degree Colleges and strengthening of present colleges spill-over projects</td>
<td>8.51</td>
<td>8.51</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>(-)0.004</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>710317</td>
<td>Proviancialisation of Non-government Degree colleges</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**

|   | 530.51 | 41.01 | . | 59.58 | 90.38 | 158.22 | 128.44 | 132.96 | 164.20 | 5.80 | . | . |

### Itemwise Estimate of Expenditures of the Uttarakhand Vikas Vibhag on Higher Education in Different Years

(Rs in Lakhs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Assistance for Non Technical Education (Kumaon/Garhwal University)</td>
<td>62.99</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>45.23</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>40.84</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>60.49</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>82.91</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Opening of new Degree Colleges and provincialisation of Non-government Degree Colleges</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>13.38</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>34.92</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>56.33</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>03.61</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Strengthening of present Degree Colleges and opening of new subjects in them</td>
<td>21.42</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>17.20</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>28.74</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>03.86</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>02.87</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Assistant to Non-government Degree Colleges for starting new faculties</td>
<td>01.85</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>02.29</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>02.02</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>01.60</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Other Expenses</td>
<td>01.06</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>01.25</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>01.53</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>116.64</strong></td>
<td><strong>--</strong></td>
<td><strong>79.35</strong></td>
<td><strong>--</strong></td>
<td><strong>121.66</strong></td>
<td><strong>--</strong></td>
<td><strong>120.68</strong></td>
<td><strong>--</strong></td>
<td><strong>90.99</strong></td>
<td><strong>--</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cont.....
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67.19</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>49.31</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>66.85</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>341.71</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>206.49</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>07.90</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.24</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>20.02</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>02.19</td>
<td>21.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01.44</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>11.28</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>55.73</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>39.38</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>17.06</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.28</td>
<td>11.28</td>
<td>11.28</td>
<td>09.33</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>08.00</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>04.43</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>00.90</td>
<td></td>
<td>01.26</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>261.91</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69.42</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>72.77</td>
<td>10.24</td>
<td>133.17</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>409.11</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>492.08</td>
<td>21.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Note: -- Shows nil figure.
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