CHAPTER-TWO
2.1 Context:

The Pay scales, and qualifications including service condition of the teachers in universities and colleges have been receiving attention of the Government of India, which prompted the Government, to the U.G.C., as the case may be to appoint various Commissions and Committees like the Radhakrishnan Commission, the Kothari Commission, the Sen Committee, National Commission on Teacher in Higher Education, and the Mehrotra Commission mainly.

In view of the fact that the recommendations of the Mehrotra Committee (as implemented due to the acceptance of the Government of India) are the basic framework—the impact of which created a career stagnancy among a substantial group of professionally accomplished teachers, initiated the present investigator to undertake this study and accordingly recommendations of the Mehrotra Committee were discussed separately, in details, at the end of this chapter.

2.2 Qualifications of Teachers:

The Radhakrishnan Commission was appointed in 1948 by the Government of India to report on “Indian University Education and suggest improvements and extensions that may be desirable to suit the present and future requirements of the country”. In doing so, the Commission also dealt with qualifications of teachers.

According to the commission, the gradation of university teachers should be based on experience, scholarship, research and teaching ability. A Professor who was given the highest grade among the academics was expected to have a
combination of all these at the highest level. In the opinion of the Commission, a Professor should have taught the higher classes for a considerable number of years and established reputation for scholarship. Not just that, he should have wide interest and broad outlook to inspire and stimulate his colleagues in the department and effectively contribute to the solution of academic problems of the university. It was pointed out that the expected age when these qualifications are fulfilled is likely to be 48 years.

For the post of the Reader, the Radhakrishnan Commission recommended a research degree and published research work in recognized and well-established journals as the required qualifications. A person of about 35 years should be able to fulfill these conditions. For the post of the Lecturer, the Commission recommended a first-class academic record as necessary qualification with some teaching experience as a desirable qualification. Further, a Lecturer should have started as a research scholar or as a fellow and preferably should have completed his / her Ph.D. He should be able to command the respect of his / her pupils and should have empathy, tact and sense of vocation.

Although the Education Commission appointed in 1964 under the Chairmanship of Prof. D.S.Kothari, who held similar views of the Radhakrishnan Commission in this respect, the Sen Committee (1973) recommended that, "a Master's degree alone would not suffice for the selection of a Lecturer." It therefore, recommended higher teaching / research / advanced study beyond the Master's degree as essential qualifications for recruitment. This was considered basic for the improvement of standards. An M.Phil or a Ph.D. was, therefore, recommended for appointment.

The National Commission on Teachers for Higher Education (NCT, 1983) under the chairmanship of Prof. Rais Ahmed endorsed the minimum qualifications of teachers prescribed by the UGC in 1973, on the basis of the Sen Committee recommendations with further insistence on a good academic record, evidence of research capabilities in addition to research degree and pedagogic skills to be added to the qualifications for appointment. The NCT was of the view
that the candidates' academic performance should be given greater weightage than any other factor at the time of their first appointment.

The Mehrotra Committee, constituted in 1983 by the UGC was specifically asked to examine and recommend a structure of emoluments and conditions of service of university and college teachers "keeping in view the necessity of attracting and retaining talented persons in the teaching profession." The Committee found that the stipulation of M.Phil / Ph.D. as an essential qualification for Lecturers had neither been followed faithfully nor did it necessarily contribute to the raising of teaching and research standards. In fact, it was of the view that, if at all, it had led to the dilution of research standards on account of the rush to get a research degree in the shortest possible time. In view of this as well as of the fact that 10+2 pattern of schooling had led to an additional year of college study, the Committee recommended a good M.A / M.Sc. / M.Com. or equivalent degree as the minimum qualification for a Lecturer. A research degree should be necessary only for career development.

2.3 Process of Recruitment:

The process of recruitment and selection is a crucial aspect of ensuring the appointment of competent persons as teachers. Implicit in the recommendations of the Radhakrishnan Committee is the view that all appointments will be through a process of selection laid down by the universities.

The Kothari Commission made explicit recommendations about the process of recruitment/selection. It made a general suggestion about qualifications by saying that, it should search for talent among the most outstanding and promising Ph.D.s, M.A.s and M.Sc.s; it was suggested that even brilliant nascent graduates be identified and groomed for appointment as university teacher. The Commission also recommended the selection of teachers at a national level or international level instead of being limited to the state or the region and proposed advance increments for deserving candidates besides giving them assistance for research and opportunities for study-leave to enable them achieve higher professional excellence. It suggested that while making
appointments and deciding on promotions, there should be room for flexibility to take care of persons of exceptional promise and performance. It is assumed to inspire teachers and a means to reward them and thereby planted firmly in the classrooms to those teachers – who could and undoubtedly would give the Universities a new lustre, “built on the mysterious moments when mind confronts mind and a student suddenly senses the power and richness of his own intellect.”

The Sen Committee visualized the following three modes on appointment:

(a) Open recruitment where the vacancies are advertised and the selection is made on all-India basis.

(b) Appointment after at least six years of service on the basis of outstanding work.

(c) Promotion after reaching the maximum of the scale.

The selection under categories (b) and (c) above is to be made through a centralised machinery in each state, to be set up for all Universities on a statutory basis.

The Mehrotra Committee did not make any other specific recommendation in this regard excepting appointment through a process of career advancement.

2.4 Career and Professional Development:

The Radhakrishnan Commission (1948) in its recommendations emphasized that security of tenure and reasonable prospects of advancement are essential to maintain the health and tone of a service. It was of the opinion, that the ratio between the senior and junior positions of teachers viz., of Professors and Readers on one hand, and Lecturers and Instructors on the other hand should be 1:2. A teacher entering the profession at the age of 22 or 23 as an Instructor or a Fellow could become a Lecturer at the age of 25-26 after he obtained some training as a teacher and also got an opportunity for scholarship and acquired a research degree. By the time he reached the maximum of the Lecturer grade, he would have acquired sufficient experience and standing to be eligible for a Readership and could rise to a Professor's position at about 48 years of age.
provided that he accepted the challenge of open competition. In short, the view was that in the interest of the university as well as of the teacher, there should be opportunities for career advancement but only through selection in an open competition.

The Sen Committee (1973) recommended that a Lecturer, Reader after completing six years of service should be permitted to offer himself/herself for higher position on the basis of his/her qualification and work. The higher scale of a Reader/Professor should be given to him/her only after his/her assessment by a duly constituted Selection Committee of the university. The promotion in such a case should be regarded as a personal promotion. If not selected at the time of first assessment, he/she could offer himself/herself again for assessment but only after a lapse of three years. This proposal envisaged that, there should be no limit to the number of posts of Readers and Professors within the total sanctioned strength of the department. The committee, however, recommended that the work load should be so arranged that it would not involve the appointment of any additional staff while making possible the promotion of the existing staff.

Although the committee was not in favour of introducing the system of confidential report as in government services, it recommended annual evaluation of a teacher through an assessment of academic programmes proposed by a teacher himself/herself in the beginning of the session and of the work done by him/her by the end of the session. A suitable procedure for proper evaluation of the teacher would have to be evolved by the U.G.C.

The National Commission on Teachers in Higher Education (N.C.T.) while reiterating the importance of adequate and suitable opportunities for professional and career development, cautioned against using seniority as a proxy for merit. Instead, it suggested the merit of the teacher should be assessed in terms of functions defined for teachers. Accordingly a suitable proforma would be devised to maintain a continuous record of the work of a teacher in terms of teaching, research, extension and administration.
In the context of the career and professional development, the comprehensive scheme developed and recommended by the Mehrotra Committee has been presented at the end.

2.5 Quality of Education:

All the commissions/committees have stressed the need for continuously maintaining highest standards of teaching and examination. At the same time, it was required that the teacher and the academic system should be made accountable. In this context, emphasis was laid on maintaining a suitable academic calendar providing for a specified minimum number of working days.

2.6 Summary of the Principal Recommendations of the Mehrotra Committee:

The principal recommendations of the Mehrotra Committee could be summarized as under:

(i) Salaries of teachers at different levels were to be comparable to the salaries of the All India Civil Service officers. This was the underlying principal of pay revision.

(ii) Career advancement of Lecturers was provided through the recommendation to introduce two more scales: one, a senior scale; and two, a selection grade to be given after completing well defined steps in the process of professional development and after performance assessment.

(iii) Fast-track promotions were suggested even though the details of the scheme were not worked out. Open selections for higher posts (if held regularly) could be treated as fast-track as the number of years of service required to fulfill the eligibility conditions was less than the required service under the career advancement scheme.
(iv) No promotions from Lecturer to Reader or Reader to Professor were recommended. Readers and Professors were to be appointed only after a process of all-India open selection. The Committee made critical comments on attempts being made to introduce time-bound promotions for teachers. The Merit Promotion Scheme introduced by the U.G.C. in 1983 came in for critical comments by the Committee. Incidentally, the National Commission on Teachers-II also arrived at similar conclusions. In short, the Mehrotra Committee recommended that career advancement might provide for higher scales of pay, but the higher designations might not be given without careful selection.

(v) Performance assessment was recommended as an essential component in career advancement. Other conditions were: obtaining higher degree such as M.Phil, or Ph.D. and participation in at least two Refresher courses. Evaluation of teachers in the Refresher courses was also suggested as a component of the process of performance assessment.

(vi) Qualifying in a National Eligibility Test (NET) was recommended as an essential condition for recruitment to the post of Lecturer in any university or college throughout the length and breadth of the country. This recommendation replaced the provision introduced by the Sen Committee in 1973, which had made M. Phil, or Ph. D. as essential qualification for appointment to the post of a Lecturer. The recommendation of a national eligibility Test was aimed at removing disparities in standards of evaluation and teaching that prevailed among large number of institutions.

In arriving at the above set of recommendations, the objectives of pay review spelled out explicitly or implicitly by the Committee were: first, to ensure that teachers were remunerated in keeping with their role in nation building and upgrading of human skills; to enable them to live in moderate
comfort and concentrate on teaching and research; secondly, the scales of pay and conditions of services should be such that a talented person who had to choose from a number of competing careers, might be attracted towards teaching; thirdly, merit should be rewarded; and lastly, stagnation in service should be relieved.

The above summary has been recapitulated because recommendation of Mehrotra Committee formed the basis of Government of India notifications issued in 1987 and 1988. Having regard to the first term of the reference of the present Pay Review committee, viz., revision of pay scales of teachers in universities and colleges and other measures for maintenance of standards in higher education, it is being discussed in the next section, under 2.7.

2.7 The recommendations of the Mehrotra Committee as accepted by the Government of India:

The Mehrotra Committee submitted its recommendations to the UGC on the 21st May, 1986. Thereafter, the recommendations were placed before the Commission and were then sent to the Government of India for its approval. The Government of India notified the revision of pay scales of teachers in universities and colleges and other measures for maintenance of standards of higher education with effect from the 1st January, 1986 (vide its letter dt. the 17th June, 1987). The scheme as contained in the above-mentioned letter was to be implemented in the central universities and other institutions fully financed by the Central Government. The Government of India also decided to assist the State Governments which might in their discretion decide on introducing the scheme of revision of pay scales subject to the following terms and conditions :-

(i) The Central Government would provide assistance to the State Government to the extent of 80% of the additional expenditure involved in giving effect to the revision of scales of pay.

(ii) The Central assistance to the extent indicated above would be available for the period ranging from January 1, 1986 to March 31, 1990.
(iii) The State Governments would meet the remaining 20% of the expenditure from their own resources and would not pass on the liability or any portion thereof to the universities or the managements of private colleges.

(iv) The State Governments would take over the entire responsibility for maintaining the revised scales of pay with effect from April 1, 1990.

(v) Central assistance would be restricted to the revision of pay scales of the posts which were in existence on January 1, 1986.

Some of the recommendations of the Government of India which were notified on the 17th June, 1987 were later modified (vide another notification dated the 22nd July, 1988). The main features of these two notifications are listed below:

2.8 Recruitment and Qualifications:

(i) Recruitment to the post of Lecturers, Readers and Professors in universities and colleges shall be on the basis of merit through all-India advertisement and selection, provided that a lecturer who fulfilled the criteria prescribed in this scheme would be eligible for promotion to the post of a Reader.

(ii) The minimum qualifications required for appointment to the posts of Lecturers, Readers and Professors would be those prescribed by the UGC from time to time. Generally, the minimum qualifications for appointment to the post of Lecturer in the scale of pay of Rs. 2200-4000 shall be Master's degree in the relevant subject with at least 55% marks or its equivalent grade, and good academic record.

(iii) Only those candidates who, besides fulfilling the minimum academic qualification prescribed for the post of Lecturer, had qualified in a comprehensive test to be specially conducted for the purpose, would be eligible for appointment as Lecturers. The detailed schemes for conducting the test including its design, the
agencies to be employed in the conduct of tests, content, administration, etc., would be worked out by the UGC, keeping in view the requirement of the media of instruction as followed by the different states, universities and colleges, as also other relevant considerations.

(iv) In order to encourage research, in continuation of post-graduate studies, candidates who, at the time of their recruitment as Lecturers, possessed Ph.D. or M. Phil. degree would be sanctioned three and one advance increments respectively, in the scale of Rs.2200-4000 along with the benefit of corresponding years of service for purposes of promotion. The existing Lecturers without research degrees and those similarly situated, and recruited in future would be eligible for a similar benefit in service for purposes of promotion as and when they acquired research degrees but would not be eligible for advance increments. Existing lecturers with research degrees would also be eligible for a similar benefit.

2.9 Career Advancement:

(i) Every Lecturer would be placed in the senior scale of Rs.3000-5000 if he or she had:

(a) Completed eight years of service after regular appointment;

(b) Participated in two Refresher courses or summer institutes, each of which approximately of four weeks duration or engaged in other appropriate continuing education programmes of comparable quality as might be specified by the UGC; and

(c) Consistently satisfactory performance appraisal reports.

(ii) Every Lecturer in the senior scale would be eligible for promotion to the post of Reader in the scale of pay Rs. 3700-5700 if he or she had:
(a) Completed eight years of service in the senior scale, provided that the requirement of eight years would be relaxed if the total service of the Lecturer was not less than 16 years;
(b) Obtained a Ph. D. degree, or an equivalent published work;
(c) Made some mark in the areas of scholarship and research as evidenced by self-assessment, reports of referees, quality of publications, contribution to educational innovation, design of new courses and curricula, etc.;
(d) Participated in two Refresher courses or summer institutes each of approximately four weeks' duration or engaged in other appropriate continuing education programmes of comparable quality as might be specified by the UGC, after placement in the Senior scale; and
(e) Consistently good performance appraisal reports.

(iii) The existing teachers in universities and colleges where the Merit Promotion Scheme formulated by the UGC in 1983, or any other similar schemes were in operation would have an option to continue to be governed by the provisions of those schemes provided that they exercised their option in writing, prior to the pay fixation under the scheme. They would also be entitled to the designations envisaged for various categories of those schemes provided that they exercise their option in writing, prior to the pay fixation under this scheme. They would also be entitled to the designations envisaged for various categories of teachers in those schemes. The scales of pays would be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Pay Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>Rs. 2200-4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reader / Lecturer</td>
<td>Rs. 3700-5700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(selection grade)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Rs. 4500-5700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Promotions made before the announcement of the revised scale on June 17, 1987, would not be reopened. However, in such cases, the benefit of revision would be available to teachers only from the date of their promotion.

2.10 Other Conditions of Service:

2.10.1 Probation:

The period of probation of a teacher would not exceed a period of 24 months. A Lecturer appointed on probation would ordinarily be confirmed only after he or she has completed appropriate short-term Orientations Programmes and his or her performance appraisal reports are satisfactory. The UGC was requested to make arrangements to ensure that facilities were available for organising Orientation Programmes to cover all Lecturers appointed in and after 1988-89.

2.10.2 Superannuation and Re-employment:

The age of superannuation for teachers would be 60 years and thereafter no extension in service would be given. However, it would be open to all university or college to re-employ a superannuated teacher according to the existing guidelines framed by the UGC up to the age of 65 years.

2.10.3 Grievance Readressal Mechanism:

Appropriate mechanism for the readressal of teachers’ grievances would be established in all universities and colleges in respect of which guidelines would be issued separately.
2.10.4 Code of Professional Ethics:

The UGC would prepare a code of professional ethics for teachers in consultation with the representatives of national level associations of teachers (e.g. AIFUCTO) and all concerned should see that this code was observed.

2.11 Implementation of Recommendations (benefits and problems):

The Report of the Mehrotra Committee was accepted by the UGC. The Government of India, while accepting the recommendations announced its implementation with effect from January 1, 1986. Along with the revision of pay scales, opportunities for professional and career development were also announced.

Accordingly, almost all university and college teachers were not only benefited while receiving the revised pay scales but also a great majority of them, as senior teachers, availed of the opportunity of the Merit Promotion Scheme (MPS) and thereby some Lecturers were promoted to either Senior Lecturers or Readers on the basis of the stipulated criteria; similarly concerned experienced and competent Readers were promoted to Professors. Such procedures continued upto 1987 and after that the Career Advancement under the said M.P.S. (Reader to Professor only) was suddenly withdrawn by the UGC. However, the teachers are undoubtedly benefited by that scheme.

But since then the cues of the problems were gradually crystallized, centering around the quantum of Readers in each of the department and of almost all universities. In a survey conducted by the present investigator (Ghosh, 1994) the findings reveal that at least 60-70 percent of the teachers in each of the departments in most universities (the survey covered four universities of West Bengal) were Readers and majority of them are not only professionally accomplished but also were pretty senior (i.e. working as Readers since the last 10-15 years). Unfortunately, they did neither avail of the gain of any promotional scheme from Reader to Professor like erstwhile Merit Promotion Scheme (such
scheme was withdrawn by the UGC in 1987), nor they were getting promoted due to the dearth of the post of Professor (in most of the universities of West Bengal, the Post-graduate departments have had only one or two substantive posts of Professor). Hence, senior university Readers were getting stagnated and it was assumed that a climate of demotivation progressively sets in among most of them.

2.12 Context that formulated the Present investigation:

During her survey (Ghosh, 1994) the present investigator came across a host of university teachers and many of them expressed their grievances, anxiety, frustration and loss of motivation in their profession due to a cluster of many precipitating factors of which their career stagnancy or occupational locking-in conditions are assumed to be one of the predominant ones. Such a negative scenario initiated the present investigator to undertake the issue as the potential subject matter of her Ph.D. work, after obtaining the M.Sc. degree in Applied Psychology. Accordingly, an outline plan of the Ph.D. dissertation was developed which was approved by the Ph.D. Committee in Applied Psychology, C.U. [Ref. No. 3934 Ph.D. (Sc.) dt. 17/02/1997]. Meanwhile, different university and college teachers' association of various states under the leadership of All India Federation of University and College Teachers Organizations (AIFUCTO) organized a number of demonstrations, cease work and token strikes with a significant cluster of their demands including the revision of the pay scales, provision of promotional scheme for the stagnated Readers, enhancement of retirement benefits, etc. It is virtually due to such amount of cumulative pressures generated by subsequent demonstrations, the UGC had to appoint another Pay Review Committee for college and university teachers under the chairmanship of Prof. R.P.Rastogi, former Vice-Chancellor, Benaras Hindu University. The Schedule tenure of that committee was up to the end of May, 1997. Again it was indeed a fact of disappointment because after receiving the Rastogi Committee recommendations the UGC remained silent for a considerable amount of period and subsequently issued a notification, after some modifications.
of the Rastogi Committee recommendations*, on the 27th July, 1998. In spite of such UGC notification, Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India did not give their clearance for its necessary implementation, although AIFUCTO had certain amount of reservation (in case of several significant aspects) to accept the recommendations as a whole. However, in spite of the utmost attempts of the AIFUCTO leadership the Union Government had shown no inclination to act upon the recommendations of the UGC. As a result, the AIFUCTO and other teachers unions had to declare for an indefinite strike from the 11th August to the 5th September, 1998. Then on the basis of the discussions held between the Union Minister of Human Resource Development and the AIFUCTO delegation comprising of the President and the General Secretary, a revised order was issued on the concerned subject. Accordingly the UGC issued the relevant notification on 29th December, 1998 after getting necessary clearance from the Union Government on 24th December, 1998. After that, AIFUCTO leadership adopted a resolution on January 4, 1999 in its meeting, to ask the State Government to make necessary arrangements for implementation of the scheme of revised scales of pay. Accordingly, necessary Government Order was sent to the universities sometime during November, 1999. Following the stipulations and other constraints, the process of implementation specially the selection process under the Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) for the promotion of Reader to Professor has just started during the later part of 2000. By this time, many of the senior stagnated Readers have reached their age of superannuation and failed to receive the enhanced benefits of the recommendation.

The present investigator started her research work during the earlier part of the year 1997 and collected data from those stagnated Readers during the period: January 1998 to May 1998, till then the UGC did not issue any notice informing the recommendations of the Pay Committee. Such was the context of the present dissertation work.

---

* Summary of the recommendations of the Rastogi Committee, as per UGC revised notification, has been presented in Appendix-I.
Hence, those stagnated but professionally accomplished Senior Readers as the subject of the present study were assumed to suffer from the deteriorated condition or state which was predominantly affected by negative consequence of Organizational stress and psychological strains.