Chapter 2
Organizational & Management System of Higher Education Institutes of India

2.1 Indian Higher Education Scenario

Indian higher education system is one of the largest in the world. There were only 20 universities and 500 colleges with 0.1 million students at the time India attained independence. This has increased to 611 universities and university-level institutions and 31,324 colleges as on August 2011 as shown in Table 2.1.

Table 2.1: Number, Nature and Category of Institutions (as on August, 2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of institution</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Universities</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Universities</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Private Universities</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deemed to be Universities</td>
<td>130 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutes of National Importance plus *Other Institutes</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutions established under State Legislature Acts</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Total Colleges</td>
<td>611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>31,935</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Other Institutes include Indian Institutes of Science Education and Research (IISERs) (5), National Institute of Fashion Technology (NIFT), Rajiv Gandhi Institute of Petroleum Technology (RG IPT) and Jawaharlal Nehru Institute of Post-Graduate Medical Education and Research (JIPMER).

** Now 129, as Deemed to be University status of one university has been withdrawn.

The region-wise distribution of colleges vis-a-vis the population in the age group 18-23, from 2000-01 to 2004-05 has revealed that one-third of the colleges (33%) are located in the southern, followed by central (22%), western (19%) eastern (11.5%) and northern (10.5%) regions. The north-eastern region accounts for only 3.5% of the colleges in India. Eastern region serves a student population in the age group 18-23.
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of about 3.56 crores. This data reveals a skewed pattern of distribution of institutions of higher education in India. In addition to such a regional imbalance, there is also a skewed development of professional disciplines compared to humanities, social sciences and basic sciences. Expansion efforts seem to have been largely concentrated in the private sector leading to non-affordability of higher education by large sections of the society thus making higher education as an enterprise rather than long term social and economic good.

Even though there is a significant growth in student enrolment in higher education system, especially in the last two decades, the GER in higher education in India is still about half the world's average GER (24%) and about two thirds that of the developing countries (18%) and much lower than that of developed nations (58%)\(^3\). There is a considerable debate in the country about the precise level of GER and the actual position may become clear after the findings of the All India Higher Education Survey being conducted by the National University of Educational Planning and Administration (NUEPA) become available. In the mean time, the 12\(^{th}\) FYP may consider the level of incremental expansion in GER by 10%. The targeted GER in higher education was fixed at 15% by the end of the 11\(^{th}\) FYP and was accordingly required to grow by 8.9% annually. In technical education, the enrolment growth was targeted at 15% per annum. The expansion objectives were to be achieved through a multi-pronged strategy, namely (a) targeted increase in the intake capacity of the existing universities and colleges, strengthening of 200 state engineering institutions, upgrading 7 technical institutions, and (b) establishment of new universities and colleges, including setting up of 16 new Central Universities, 14 Innovation Universities, 374 Model Colleges, 8 Indian Institutes of Technology (IITs), 7 Indian

\(^3\) Mid-Term Appraisal of the 11\(^{th}\) FYP
Institutes of Management (IIMs), 10 National Institutes of Technology (NITs), 3 Indian Institutes of Science Education and Research (IISERs), 20 Indian Institutes of Information Technology (IIITs), 2 Schools of Planning and Architecture (SPAs) and 50 Centers for Training and Research in frontier areas. These new institutions were planned to be established through government funding and also under the PPP mode.

Another parameter of the size of the Indian higher education system is reflected in the current enrolment of students in the institutions of higher learning. The number of students enrolled in the universities and colleges (formal system) has increased since independence to 13,642 million in the beginning of the academic year 2009-10, with 1,669 million (12.24%) in the university departments and 11.973 million (87.76%) in the affiliated colleges. This does not include enrolment in higher education offered through Open and Distance Learning (ODL). In West Bengal, the student enrolments in University Departments were 95,427, while that of Affiliated Colleges were 8,18,295 which amounts to 89.5% of the total enrolments\(^4\). Affiliated colleges enroll about 86.7% of all students. They enroll 90% of the undergraduate students, over 70% postgraduates and 17% of doctoral students. From the perspective of the state university, affiliation system is a lucrative option of raising funds as it bring affiliation and examination fees. However, the rampant rise in number of colleges affiliated to universities has deteriorated the quality of higher education significantly. The active university resources and systems are diverted towards management and conduction of exams with consequent dilution of focus on academic quality and research. Moreover, since a typical affiliating university has to cater hundreds of colleges, it cannot provide customized support to meet the local needs of colleges, but instead offers the same curriculum to all.

\(^4\) MHRD, Annual Report, 2009-10
2.2 Organization Structure of Indian Higher Education System

2.2.1 General Overview of Organizational Set-up

In India at present, there are Central Universities, Universities aided by the State Government through the Department of Higher Education, and also Universities aided by the State Government through other Departments. Under the academic jurisdiction of the Universities, there are Colleges and Educational Institutes of different categories under the administrative jurisdiction of the Higher Education Department of the State Government. These colleges are broadly classified as Government Colleges and Non-Government Colleges, which include General Degree Colleges, Colleges of Education, Colleges of Physical Education, Art Colleges, Law Colleges, Engineering & Technological Colleges, etc.

The involvement of the university system is, by and large, at the level of postgraduate teaching and research while the affiliated colleges bear the maximum obligation of teaching at the undergraduate level, though some of them are also sharing the responsibility of providing postgraduate education in certain disciplines. The Yaspal Committee Report talks about the urgent need for improving the condition and quality of affiliated institutions as they have a bulk of enrollments. It is pointed out that good affiliated colleges sometimes suffer due to the bureaucracy at the university level while some good universities suffer because of the limited vision of affiliated colleges and their inability to accept change. The committee suggested that better colleges be allowed to function separately from the university to ‘lighten the load’ of the university in general administrative and examination work for colleges. The National Knowledge Commission recommended reforms in the system of affiliated undergraduate colleges. It put forth the ideas of creating department-based universities and giving greater autonomy to existing colleges. As a part of his report...
on higher education submitted on behalf of National Knowledge Commission, Sam Pitroda argued for higher education reforms, adoption of course credit system, decentralization of examination system, internal assessments as well as criteria based resource allocation for strategic growth in higher education. Another important suggestion was the setting up of the central and state boards of undergraduate education to control quality, conduct examinations and reduce the administration burden of universities in terms of affiliated colleges.

There can be multiple ways of improving the affiliation system, as observed by the National Knowledge Commission. The first option is to reduce the total number of affiliating colleges by encouraging the better performing colleges to become autonomous. The better affiliating colleges could be encouraged, with additional support as necessary, to become approved as autonomous by the University Grants Commission. By becoming ‘autonomous’, a college would gain academic autonomy and so become responsible for curriculum and assessment aspect as well as administrative autonomy over its budget, as also becoming eligible to receive funds directly from UGC. An autonomous college does not, however, have the right to award a degree. Hence, autonomous colleges must be encouraged to develop into University. In 2011, there were about 371 autonomous colleges in the country; such colleges can be groomed over time into Universities that share resources and expertise with the colleges surrounding them. A good example of the same is the Presidency College, Kolkata that was granted the University status. The bigger task, however is to improve the quality of education provided in the larger number of colleges. One option as recommended by NKC is to establish a specific unit of the proposed State Higher Education Councils or the affiliating University to monitor and build capacity in these colleges. Another option is to establish one university exclusive for
affiliations, (or a Dual Model for University as being proposed in Karnataka) with the remaining become exclusively teaching/research institutions. However, such initiatives should not defeat the very concept of university, as laid down by the Radhakrishnan Commission. One of the other models is to have the University divided into several campuses with each having colleges around its vicinity affiliated to those campuses. This model is under preview in Maharasthra (University of Mumbai). Such a model may help in ensuring that colleges are regularly monitored for quality. A possible suggestion that the more advanced colleges ‘mentor’ the newer ones may be another model.

There have been many concerns regarding the internal governance and administration of universities. There are multiple points of influence by external agencies in internal bodies of the university, notable in the Executive Council and the Finance Committee. The Chancellor or representatives of the State Government nominate the external people that undermine the administrative power of the Vice Chancellor in two critical bodies, notably the Executive Council and the Finance Committee, thus hindering smooth functioning of the university. Further, it creates multiple points where consensus between external stakeholders (Chancellor and Government) needs to be reached. While the universities currently have some level of administrative and academic autonomy, there is a need to devolve more authority to the universities in the areas of finance and human resources.

2.2.2 State Scenario

In the State education scenario, the Higher Education Department is the successor to the erstwhile Department of Education. The Department of Mass Education Extension was carved out of the Department of Education to deal with, among other things, the
Department of Technical Education & Training was similarly created in terms of
Notification No. 16129-A.R. dtd. 29.06.1991. The Polytechnic institutions, which
had so long functioned under the Higher Education wing of the erstwhile Education
Department, were taken over by the newly created department. Finally, the Education
Department was abolished and in its place were created two departments, namely, the
School Education Department and the Higher Education Department (Notification
No. 670-Home (Cons) dtd. 08.11.1995).

The Department of Higher Education is comprised of a number of branches and cells,
namely Establishment Branch, Budget Branch, University Branch & Chancellor’s
Secretariat, Non-Government College Branch, Government College Branch,
Appointment Branch, N.C.C. Branch, Technical Education Branch, Archives Branch,
Miscellaneous & Social Education Branch, Pension Cell, N.S.S. Cell, Vigilance Cell,
Audit Cell and Computer Cell. All the financial matters of the Colleges and institutes
(both Govt. and Non-Govt.) are regulated through these branches and cells of the
Department of Higher Education; more specifically through the Education Directorate
headed by the Director of Public Instruction (DPI), who is also an Ex-Officio
Secretary to the Government of West Bengal. The Sections of the Education
Directorate, which deal with various matters related to the Colleges, include
Appointment, Pay Packet (PPS), UGC, Accounts, Planning & Statistics, Social
Education and Law. These sectional activities are monitored under the supervision of
different Deputy and Assistant Directors of Public Instruction (DDPI’s and ADPI’s).
Besides, there are Accounts & Administrative Officers who supervise functions like
release of pay packet, grants, pension, withdrawal of salaries etc. Figure 2.1 show the
overview of hierarchical setup of higher education system as present in West Bengal.
States such as Karnataka are devising strategies of addressing the affiliation issue through a single university managing both the affiliated colleges and the post graduate and research programmes through separate units. Kerala, Andhra Pradesh, West Bengal have robust and effective buffer body, the State Council for Higher Education, to assist the states’ higher education departments. The very significant issues that the state higher education departments are facing at present are the lack of mobility, differentials in salary, retirement age and benefits between affiliated colleges and state universities in relation to centrally funded universities and booming private sector institutions (Kumar & S. Parasuraman 2011). Significant developments in the higher education sector in West Bengal is the emergence of private university, private colleges, autonomous college and autonomous college turned university. However, the age-old ‘affiliating colleges-university’ clusters continue to exist, where the affiliated public colleges stand at the bottom of this academic caste hierarchy. The general version of ‘affiliated colleges-university’ structure as present in West Bengal is shown in Figure 2.2.
Figure 2.2
Overall Academic Administration Hierarchy showing University-College relationship

2.2.3 Proposed Reforms under Rashtriya Uchchatar Shiksha Abhiyan Scheme

With the development of the concept of Colleges-Universities cluster, the organization structure is gradually moving towards following a bottom up management approach, particularly in the areas of planning and budgeting. The process as proposed will begin at the institutional level, which will prepare the “Institutional Action Plan” based on input/discussions with the multiple-stakeholders within its jurisdiction and will send it to the coordinating agency of multiple
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stakeholders of the State, taking into account regional requirements as also the requirements in keeping with equity and access concerns (especially in underserved and backward districts). These action plans are then to get aggregated to form a State Higher Educational Plan (SHEP). All SHEPs, after being reviewed are to get compiled to obtain the estimates of the next year’s fund requirements for program implementation activities. These activities require setting up of planning teams and committees at various levels i.e. at underserved and backward districts, regional zones, educational institutional levels through active participation of multiple stakeholders. The states and SHEs need to function not merely as agencies to aggregate the institutional plan at state level. They are required to consider the entire state as a single unit of planning. Their role is more towards ensuring a balanced development of higher education in the entire state. The state plan must include strategies to address spatial and geographical gaps, perspective discipline planning etc. The state has to identify un-served / under –served areas and make special provision for the new institutions to come up in the areas. The plans must also address the problem of institutional congestion and have a strategy to deal with the same. These considerations lead to the idea of the formation of RUSA.

RUSA suggest that each institution will form as institutional monitoring units with appropriate representation from academic official of the institution, faculty, senior administrative officers, technical and non-technical support staff and students. The unit, headed by the Head of the institution, will be responsible for monitoring of the institutional projects. An institutional arrangement will be created separately for implementation of the project, it will be in line with the governance reforms proposed under RUSA. The Institutional Unit is expected to perform the roles that include procurement of goods, works and service; financial management; implementation of
faculty and staff development activities and programs; monitoring project implementation; keeping MIS updated; and organizing efficient conduct of monitoring. The flow chart of the governance process as suggested by RUSA is shown below in Figure 2.3.

**Dissemination of Information**
- Communication of guidelines & timelines for SHEP preparation
- Inform regarding resource
- Resource allocation based on specific norms
- Communication Resource Allocation to institutions

**Assimilation of Data**
- Conduction of Baseline Survey by SHEC
- Submission of SHEP to Center
- Action Plan through meetings with stakeholders based on SHEP
- Prepare/submit University/College Action Plan to State
- Finalized Institutional Plan

**Fig. 2.3** Preparation of State Plan as per RUSA

The regulatory set-up of governance as suggested in RUSA is presented in Figure 2.4.

**State**
- Strategic policy design
- Planting the total budget
- Transfer block grants to institutions
- Provides budget for SHEC operational costs
- Collect data & annual reports from institutions, publishes data on Universities
- Develops norms and standards
- Monitors compliance with accreditation and audit requirements
- Decisions regarding new Institutions

**State Higher Education Council**
- Receives grants from Center

**Institution**
- Board of Management/Executive Council
  - Oversee administration of the University to maintain quality & accountability
  - Approve staffing decisions
  - Student support activities

**Chancellor**
- Appoints Search Committee for Chancellor
- Chancellor on recommendation of Committee/ BOM

**Vice Chancellor**
- Appoints Committees for the post of Vice Chancellors

**Fig. 2.4** Organizational Model of Indian Higher Education System

*designed by Venkatesh Kumar B. and Mishra S., TISS as part of World Bank Project on Governance Reforms in Higher Education*
2.3 Governance in Higher Education Sector

There are in particular two strands of governance:

- Sectoral governance: Managing the higher education system with a strategic framework and appropriate accountability so that institutions achieve the state objectives.

- Institutional governance: The structures and process within which institutions are given autonomy to plan and manage their affairs so as to achieve both the state and their own local/regional objectives.

These two aspects of governance have been the subject of extensive debate since independence. Sectoral governance was discussed in the initial reports of the Radhakrishnan Commission (1948) and the Kothari Commission (1968), which laid the basic framework for the National Education Policy in 1986, signifying the five cardinal principal on the basic of which higher education in India needs to be viewed - greater access, equal and excellence relevance and value based education. More recently some committees and commission have debated around both these aspects in governance through the National Knowledge Report on Reforms in Central Institutions (2011).

The 11th FYP laid a good deal of emphasis on the reforms agenda in the governance process of higher education sector. Guided by the recommendations of the NKC, and later as suggested by the Yashpal Committee, it prescribed a series of measures for reforming the higher education system. Some of the key focus in this regard has been the reforms in the regulatory system in higher education. Aimed at reviewing the regulatory mechanism for higher education at the national as well as state level, the major initiative was to address the issue of multiplicity of regulatory bodies and
thereby making higher education better governed and regulated. Driven by that consideration, the following five legislative proposals have been developed.

- The Educational Tribunals Bill, 2010;
- The Foreign Educational Institutions (Regulation Entry and Operations) Bill, 2010;
- The National Accreditation Regulatory Authority for Higher Educational Institutions Bill, 2010;
- The Prohibition of Unfair Practices in Technical Educational Institutions, Medical Educational Institutions and Universities Bill, 2010;

The legislations intend to address some strategic issues that influence governance, which need a critical review as elaborated below.

### 2.3.1 Accountability Framework

There is a need to put in place an accountability framework to ensure the proper usage and accountability of public funds. This accountability can take varied forms as follows:

- Establish key performance indicators such as student attrition and transport rates, graduate employment survey result etc which are reviewed on a yearly basis by the State Government and Universities.
- Put in place a system of regular monitoring and updates of the university’s development and performance, web based disclosure and a state higher education portal for students and parents may also be a welcome intervention.
- Develop and implement a Quality and Accreditation (QAA) mechanism and process to ensure the delivery of quality education, and
• Ensure information transparency by requiring key information and documents (such as the result of graduate employment surveys, summaries of the QAA reports, ranking of colleges etc) to be published.

2.3.2 Autonomy and Accountability: Recommendations of Cabe Committee
The issues of autonomy need to be addressed in terms of their implications for academic, administrative and financial autonomy governing the university system.

2.3.2.1 Academic Autonomy
• Designing of curriculum with a focus on innovation and experimentation to transfer teaching and learning into a fascinating and rewarding experience for teachers as well as students; introduction of new courses to meet local, state, national and global needs.
• Undertaking innovations for periodic revision of curriculum making the process of revision simplified less cumbersome and less time consuming.
• Autonomy to design own procedure for selection of research fellows with potential for research to enable them to utilize their talents and contribute to quality research.
• Research endeavors not to suffer for want of funds; faculty be accountable to research of acceptable standards evidenced by publication in reputed journals.
• Adoption of choice-based credit courses along with semester system.
• Switching over to internal evaluation of students over a period of time.
• Setting up an Internal Quality Assurance Cell (IQAC) to continuously assess the performance of the institution on pre-defined parameters.
• Autonomy of departments within the institutional set-up.
• Performance Appraisal of teachers with adequate weightage for research work based on quantifiable parameters.

• Internal resource generation of fund and encourage participation in national and international consultations, seminars, workshop, conferences etc.

• Programme for developing human resource for new and emerging realities in the field of higher education.

• Quality of research with the focus on use of international benchmarks such as Citation Indices, Patents etc.

• Synchronization of academic calendars, as least to begin with for institutions within a state to ensure mobility of students from one institution to another, if the need so arises.

• Institutional mechanism and infrastructure to attract international students and to enter into collaborative arrangement with their counterparts.

• Autonomy to establish linkages for academic and research collaboration with their counterpart academic and research institutions, industry and professional organizations both in India and abroad.

2.3.2.2 Administrative Autonomy

• Management system in the university to encourage best practices of governance, speedy decision making, networking team effort and collective responsibility to meet the emerging challenges.

• Head of the university/department to have autonomy to determine both the rank and the number of positions of professors, Associate Professors and Assistant Professors in accordance with the tasks envisaged in the development plan of the university.
• Outsourcing of non-academic activities to achieve better efficiency and greater effectiveness by reducing the overall burden of normal responsibility of running the administration.

• Expeditious disposal of litigations on service matters- a case for a Central/State Higher Education Tribunal; grievance redressal mechanism.

• Norms of accountability for individuals and institutions to be evolved which must be open, participative and data-based.

• Charter of responsibility and devolution and delegation of authority to be defined for different levels within the university system.

2.3.2.3 Financial Autonomy

• Provision of funds to individual universities in united manner to ensure greater degree of freedom.

• Mechanisms for deciding the fee structure.

• Scholarships to meritorious and deserving students coming from lower economic strata of the society.

• Undertaking consultancy assignments and sponsored research projects.

• Inducing user agencies of the Central and State Governments to contribute to development and growth of the university system by earmarking certain parentage in their respective budgets for such purposes.

2.3.3 Reforms in the Regulatory Environment

A major structural issue relates to the control of universities by regulatory councils and lack of co-ordination among the regulatory councils. Sometimes universities have to manage the conflicting mandate from the UGC, the National Council for Teacher Education (NCTE) and the UGC, the All India Council for Technical Education
(AICTE) and the State governments, the UGC and the Distance Education Council (DEC), and so on. Universities find it difficult to manage conflicting mandates. The issue was addressed during the 11th FYP through the proposal to create an apex regulatory institutional mechanism, the National Commission on Higher Education and Research (NCHER). A related issue is the autonomy of all stakeholders in the higher education system, which calls for norms of accountability and self-regulation. These issues shall receive focused attention in the 12th FYP.

2.3.4 Reforms in the Accreditation System and Ratings

The 11th FYP made accreditation mandatory for all institutions of higher education. It envisaged the setting up of multiple accreditation agencies with a National Body to rate the accrediting agencies. Beside institutional accreditation, departmental and programme accreditation was also recommended. The National Accreditation Regulatory Authority for Higher Educational Institutions Bill, 2010 was introduced in the Parliament with a view to achieving reforms in accreditation.

2.3.5 Integration of Technology in Teaching-Learning and Management

Another challenge to development is to integrate technology in a manner that it supports development without displacement. Higher education institutions need to be generating knowledge in all walks of life and with the help of technology, relate knowledge to the needs of the society. Knowledge generation in the age of information revolution requires a new kind of institutional re-engineering in governance, teaching learning process, evaluation practices that could address the learners' need much more effectively. During the 12th FYP the institutions need to focus on knowledge generation from learners' perspective and with a view to addressing the needs of the society, National Mission in Education through
Information and Communication Technology (NMEICT) was launched to cover 378 universities and 18,064 colleges, with the aim of digitization and networking of all educational institutions, develop low cost and low power consuming access to ICT, making larger bandwidth available for educational purposes. Expected outcome of the Mission was supposed to be e-book including digitization of video contents of teaching-learning materials, EduSat Teaching Hub, 2,000 broadband internet nodes in 200 central institutions, and the satellite interactive terminal for network connectivity to all 18,000 colleges. The National Knowledge Network (NKN) was also simultaneously launched to cover 1,000 institutions besides providing digital campuses, video-conference classrooms, wireless hotspots, laptops/desktops to all students of professional/science courses, and Wi-Fi connectivity in hostels.

2.4 The Vision of the 12th Five Year Plan on Indian Higher Education

The vision of the 12th FYP for Indian higher education is to achieve further access to higher education through a mission mode national programme of creating new universities and increasing the intake capacity of the existing universities and colleges. This calls for efforts to generate data and can be noted as a concern for the 12th FYP.

(a) Innovative Approaches to Access: The 12th FYP shall continue with innovative approaches to provide access to higher education so as to increase the GER by 10% during the 12th FYP from the current GER of the 11th FYP (based on the MHRD initiated All India Higher Education Survey). Thus, with this approach to planning, the GER in higher education, by the end of the 12th FYP, may be expected to be either 23.5% or 27%.

(b) Correcting Regional, Disciplinary and Gender Imbalances: The growth of the higher education institutions is not uniform across the country in regional, disciplinary
and gender perspectives. The 12th FYP shall aim at correcting such imbalances in tune with the national move of providing equal opportunities in higher education to the eligible population.

(c) Lessening the Burden of Affiliation: The issue of burden of colleges on the universities affiliating them was discussed at different levels by the Government through the NKC and the Yashpal Committee. The UGC has also evolved "Affiliation Reform Norms" through an Expert Committee, in the year 2011. It is proposed in the 12th FYP to lessen the burden of affiliation on the universities and facilitate greater autonomy and freedom of growth to the colleges by establishment of "College Cluster Universities" by clustering a minimum of 50 colleges in the vicinity of the city or district to make a university of its own independent establishment and relevance.

(d) Working New Models of PPP: In order to achieve the goal of increased access to higher education by all sections of the society and in view of the limited financial resources with central/state governments, newer models of private sector participation may need to be evolved with well defined policies, facilitative norms and monitoring mechanisms.

The massive expansion of higher education sector in the country both by public funded colleges, universities and private funded institutions has rightly drawn the attention and concern of the MHRD and the UGC for not only maintaining high standards but to progressively enhance the quality. Contrary to this, it may also be argued that increase in quantity could dilute quality. But there is also an argument that enhancement of quality is also dependent on a number of other inter-related factors such as a critical mass requirement, major structural changes to bring in financial autonomy and academic freedom, decentralization, discouraging in-breeding, plurality and demographic diversity of Institution's faculty and students, rightful identification
of potential areas for funding, incentives for excellence and innovation, rigorous implementation of other norms of accountability, performance-based rewards and a host of other measures. The initiatives in the area of quality and excellence in higher education may thus be summed up to cover generic programmes in Quality and Excellence, Research Projects, Relevance and Value-Based Education, ICT Integration, Governance & Efficiency Improvement, and in Faculty Development.

2.5 Relevant Anticipated Deliverables

2.5.1 At present, there are 289 State funded, 94 Private, 130 Deemed and 43 Central Universities; and the total number of colleges in the country are reported to be 31,324 with an enrolment of ≈13 million and if 20,000 of them are covered under Section 12(B) of the UGC Act and included for 'special funding' for expansion and capacity-building, and are given a target of 50% increase in capacities, it can lead to increase in enrolment. Assuming the average strength of a college in India, to be 400 from the current data, a modest average increase of 200 students per College will result in an increase of about 40,00,000 students in the 20,000 colleges under Section 12 (B). The establishment of 800 new Constituent Colleges by the existing 40 central Universities in several under-represented states of central, eastern, western and north India will result in the additional enrolment of about 3.75 - 4.00 lakh students.

2.5.2 College Cluster Universities: If the present 6,800 colleges under Section 12(B) are clustered with an average of 50 colleges to share their infrastructure/expertise for optimum utilization in a region specific manner, 140 new College Cluster Universities can be created. If over the next five years 20,000 colleges are brought under Section
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12(B) then 400 new College Cluster Universities will be created with an average of 50 colleges under the purview of each College Cluster University. These are to be created through State legislation and enactment effectively supported by Government of India funding for the scheme. This effort would also result in significant increase in access to quality higher education.

2.5.3 In order to ensure that the 12th FYP implementation in the area of higher education overcomes the bottlenecks encountered during the 11th FYP, the following measures are recommended:

(a) There is need to bring in e-governance and Information and Communication Technology (ICT) as an end-to-end solution to facilitate paper-less administration and transparency. A technically competent & empowered Task Force need to be constituted to develop the new higher education management system which must be made, as the Monitoring committee to oversee the fast-track implementation of the good-governance programme.

(b) It is important to design a monitoring mechanism for timely/ effective implementation and quality evaluation of the developmental schemes of the 12th FYP. It would be ideal to constitute a National level Empowered Monitoring Committee with representatives of UGC-Chairman, Joint Secretaries at the Ministry, expert members involved in the preparation of the 12th FYP Working Papers.

(c) There is need to create an authentic database. Hence necessary steps should be undertaken to set up an integrated mechanism for collection and analysis of information relevant to education policy and the establishment of a National Monitoring Cell (NMC) under the UGC.