CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Higher Education and University Governance: Global and Local Perspectives

Introduction

Higher education in India has witnessed unprecedented growth in the last few decades. Currently, it is the third largest in terms of total number of institutions and enrolment in the world followed by the U.S. and China, respectively (Sharma & Sharma, 2015). The expansion in higher education is impressive, but the system has unique challenges and opportunities. To this end, the government has made a series of proclamations to make higher education a national priority in the globalized world. The global rhetoric of world-class universities, world rankings and knowledge economy has resulted in a milieu which is characterized by undue preoccupation and anxiety of the government and institutions (especially the private universities). Indian higher education system and its universities have become part of such rhetoric and hence have been exposed to the agenda of ‘reform’ demanding appropriate policy interventions. India’s higher education policies can be categorized under three core ideals: expansion, equity and excellence (Agarwal, 2012).

Universities are one of the core units within the higher education system. Universities in India have evolved over time into diverse typologies enabling equally diverse functions and priorities. The unique manifestation of Indian higher education system is its institutional diversity and the heterogeneity of students and teachers associated with these institutions. However, the rhetoric of world-class universities and rankings has exposed these institutions to series of challenges in sustaining the ‘unique’ characteristics to adopt common ‘benchmarks’ mandated by such a rhetoric. Aligned to such shifts and emphasis, at the systemic level are the...
unprecedented policy reforms (including the drafting of the National Policy on Education-2017/18; envisioning World-class universities; providing Graded Autonomy for higher education institutions; creating Institutions of Eminence). As a result of rapid shifts envisaged for the country’s higher education system, there is a need to examine the core idea(s), functions and objectives of the system and its constituent entity, i.e., universities.

Scholarship on higher education in India has limited evidence-based analysis regarding universities and their governance. There have been some attempts to pursue in-depth institutional studies. For example, Harold Gould (1972) took account of the nature of entrepreneurship in the field of education after independence; the study of University of Mysore by Glyn Wood (1972), especially exploring the historical and communal setting during the establishment of University; I.A. Gilbert’s (1972) study of the concerns and challenges of autonomy of the institutions of higher education (in Presidency college, Kolkata; Muir Central College, Allahabad; and Mohammedan Anglo-Oriental College, Aligarh); Rudolph and Rudolph’s (1972) investigation of the problems of autonomy and politicization in the context of the functioning of MS University (Baroda); Carolyn M. Elliott’s (1972) examination of the issues of autonomy and politicization in Osmania University, Hyderabad; and Philip Altbach’s (1974) analysis of the students union in Bombay University. However, these studies illustrate the state-of-the-practice of universities and their inner world during the 1970s and the 1980s. Now, there is a need to engage in an in-depth empirical study of universities and their governance given the context of changes in the external environment in which they exist.

This thesis presents a study of the trajectory of policies in higher education and its interaction with universities and its governance forms. The study analyses the core ideals of the higher education policies and its complex meanings and practices at the level of the universities and its functions. Two universities – a Public-State (University-I) and a Private Deemed-to-be
university (University-II) are examined as the cases-in-point to pursue an in-depth empirical
analysis on the contours of university governance in India. The following sections examine the
scholarship on higher education and university governance across the globe with an emphasis
on Indian higher education system.

Review of Literature

*Key Manifestations of Higher Education: A Global Perspective*

Higher education across the globe is in a state of flux in the last few decades. It has been facing
many challenges and opportunities. The higher education sector is blemished by several
challenges - rising cost of higher education and student debt; decrease in graduation rate;
diminishing autonomy of higher education institutions; bourgeoning private sector and
retracting public expenditure. Whilst the sector is open to many opportunities in terms of
internationalisation; enhancing innovation and research; increasing use of technology and
contribution to national development and growth. To this end, most of the nation-state(s)
consider investment in higher education as a critical link to social, cultural and economic
advancements (UNESCO, 2008). As a result, the developed and the developing world have
emphasized on explicit policy interventions and investments. The global practice of
prioritization of higher education appears to a common agenda. However, there are differences
across nation-states in their implementation strategies.

The Organisation of Economic Cooperation and Development’s (OECD) report on ‘Education
at a Glance’ (2017) suggests that most of the Scandinavian countries consider the provision of
higher education as a ‘public good’ with adequate public funding (Antikainen, 2006). Whereas,
for a few countries, higher education constitutes a commodity exposed to the market forces,
espousing an ecosystem conducive to the private sector (OECD, 2017). The rest of the countries
have adopted a mixed model of governing higher education, i.e., the state funding
public universities amidst mushrooming private institutions per appropriate regulations (Naidoo, 2007). There are more pronouncements of the crisis in higher education today than ever before, coming from both within and outside of the sector (Birnbaum, 2000). Because of several challenges, opportunities and differentiated modes of governance mechanisms globally, higher education currently is one of the most dynamic sectors seeking utmost attention by policy makers and actors associated with the sector. There are four major dynamics of change that are of global significance in higher education (Shattock, 2014: xi):

1. Massification in higher education is a universal phenomenon.

2. National systems that find themselves located in an increasingly global market place that has particular significance for their more prestigious institutions.

3. Higher education institutions that have acquired (or have been obliged to acquire) a wider range of obligations, often under pressure from governments prepared to use state power to secure their policy goals.

4. The shifting balance between the public and the private financing of higher education –markedly in some cases, in favour of the latter.

Such dynamics have been instrumental in changing the discourse and the practice of higher education in many parts of the world, India is one of them. Arguably, such shifts have espoused critical insights on transformations across the system and institutions of higher education. The following section illustrates the case of Indian higher education system substantiating the aforementioned dynamics of change in higher education.
Higher education in India has undergone substantial expansion and has increased its institutional capacity since independence. Currently, 35.7 million students are enrolled in 864 universities and 40026 colleges (AISHE, 2017) as compared to 0.2 million students and up to 20 universities in 1950-51 (Altbach & Chitnis, 1993). The higher education system has undergone a remarkable transition from an elite system, having deep colonial roots to an egalitarian system striving to meet the aspirations of a vibrant democracy (Powar, 1997). The growth of the Indian higher education system is a result of the nation’s policies espoused to promote education among the masses in the post-Independence era. Chapter-III of the thesis provides a detailed illustration of the vision of the policies and its linkages with expansion, equity and excellence in higher education.

Aligned to the four major dynamics of change at the global level the Indian higher education system has been identified with major challenges. Indian higher education sector suffers from many dysfunctionalities, and the system overall is characterized by “pinnacles of excellence in a sea of mediocrity, it does reasonably well by some international comparisons” (Altbach & Agarwal, 2013). The sense of mediocrity finds its roots in the context of dysfunctionalities in the governance of the higher education system in the country. Some of the major challenges espoused hitherto are: first, inadequate access to higher education institutions especially for the marginalised sections of the society (Hasan and Mehta, 2006); second, variable quality of higher education as result of differentiated typology of institutions (Agarwal, 2009) ; third, the inflexibility (limited autonomy) in academic structures that inhibits innovation and promotes mediocrity (Altbach, 1972); finally, inadequate (and diminishing) public expenditure promoting privatization in higher education (Tilak, 2013). These challenges have been addressed by several committees and policies of the government. However, there has been limited change
Several reforms to streamline the system have been initiated to address issues related to Indian higher education and its governance. The Sargent Report (1944) was one of the first attempts to formulate a national system of education in India (Chitnis, 1993). The report suggested constituting the University Grants Committee (UGC), which was initially formed in 1945 (Chitnis, 1993). The UGC of 1945 was to oversee the work of the three Central Universities Aligarh, Banaras and Delhi. Later in 1947, the same Committee was assigned with the responsibility of dealing with all the then existing Universities (Powar, 2000).

Soon after Independence, the University Education Commission of 1948 was commissioned “to report on Indian university education and suggest improvements and extensions that might be desirable to suit the present and future needs and aspirations of the country” (Naik, 1982). According to the recommendations of the University Education Commission, the Union Government in 1951 drafted a Bill entitled ‘The Universities (Regulation of Standards) Bill’.

The subtitle of the Bill was ‘to Regulate Certain Matters Relating to the Coordination and Determination of Standards\(^1\) in Universities’ (Singh, 2004), making it one of the unique governance propositions. However, the draft Bill was opposed by the universities. The universities, in particular, opposed constituting the UGC. They advanced three main arguments:

- It is for the universities themselves to regulate, maintain and coordinate their own academic standards;
- For any outside agency to seek to undertake this job would amount to violating university autonomy; and

\(^1\) “In no other country of the world does the grant-giving agency have the power to sit in judgment upon the quality of performance of a university” (Singh, 2004). This appears to be a strangely unique combination of determining and coordinating standards.
• If the standards were low, it was mainly for lack of funds. Once adequate funds were made available, there would be hardly any problems (Vice-Chancellors Conference, 1952 cited in Singh, A. 2004:34).

Subsequently, there exist two conflicting point-of-views regarding higher education governance. On the one hand, the Ministry of Education, at the macro level, has been keen to coordinate and regulate standards. On the other hand, the system has witnessed criticism from the universities at the micro level, particularly with the concern that it could hinder their autonomy, thereby resulting in tensions between the government and the universities in creating a conducive environment for higher education governance. Consequently, after a period of long silence on these conflicting positions, the UGC was constituted as a non-statutory agency in 1953. The UGC was established only in November 1956 as a statutory agency of the Government for maintenance of standards, coordination and determination of university education in India (Singh, 1981). Since then, the role of the UGC has been amended under the UGC Act of 1970, which is considered to be the logical culmination of the 1964 Report of the Committee of Members of Parliament on Higher Education (under the chairmanship of P.N. Sapru) suggesting a review of the UGC and its core functions. With regard to the Central/Union and State/Provincial governance mechanisms, the Government of India Act of 1935 states that: ‘the provinces had handled university education and, the central government had only played a supporting role’. The University Education Commission (1949) recommended inclusion of university education in the concurrent list. The Constitution Assembly did not choose to accept that recommendation and inserted a few entries relating to education in the Seventh Schedule of the Constitution. One of these entries, Entry 66 of List 1,

---

2 The UGC in India (1956) was a selection from the UGC modeled in Britain in 1919. The UGC in the Britain acted as a buffer between the government and the universities. The UGC in Britain was just a grant making and advisory body, unlike the present form in India where the UGC is not only grant making and advisory body but also manages the co-ordination and determination of standards among the institutions of higher education.
vests in the Central Government powers in related to the overall coordination and determination of standards in institutions for higher education or research and scientific and technical institutions (Singh, 2004). The same committee tabled a proposal to the Parliament to make education a concurrent subject. Later in 1976 education was made a concurrent subject\(^3\) altering the existing practice of education being a state subject. Sen (2009) suggests that the constitutional amendments imposed from 1976 onwards, is not new in fact it goes back to the system as it existed in the 1950s, where the Central Government played a proactive role in governing the higher education system.

It is evident that post-Independence the issue of governance in higher education suggests a complex relationship between the government and the universities. Currently, the situation has not changed whilst the core functions of the universities are fast evolving as result of national and global demands. In India the relationship between governments (Central and the State) and universities are conditioned by three major factors: (1) that universities are established by statutes of the central and state legislatures or, in some cases, are recognized as ‘deemed-to-be-universities’ under provisions of the UGC Act, 1956; (2) that universities depend to a certain extent for their budgets on the government; and (3) that there is an absence of a tradition of fostering and supporting the autonomy of legally constituted ‘autonomous’ universities. Hence, there is a tendency for the relationship between government and universities to develop along the lines of a patron-client relationship (Gore, 1994). Along these lines, the country in the last few decades has made attempts to revisit such a relationship and its influence on universities and their governance.

\(^3\) According to the Constitution there are two lists of subjects, one to be handled by the central government and the other by the states. There is also an intermediate list where a particular subject is regarded as concurrent. In terms of it, any law framed by the central government has precedence over any law passed by the state government.
Discussion on global challenges and opportunities in higher education across the globe and in India necessitates insights on universities and their transformations. In this section, the thesis provides a brief overview of the evolution of universities in the present century with special emphasis on universities in India.

The term ‘university’ is derived from the Latin word *universitas* meaning ‘an organised body of individuals (community), or a corporation (Powar, 2000). Traditionally universities have been accessible to the elite. It was during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries social and economic awakening and development gradually transformed the universities from elite centred to the masses. The modern concept of a university was envisioned by Cardinal Newman, in 1852, in a series of discourses on the ‘Scope and Nature of University Education’ and the ‘the Idea of a University’. According to Newman, ‘a university should be dedicated to the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake’ (1852). The university for him should be an institution protecting the power of all sciences and knowledge, principle and fact, and inquiry and speculation. Subsequent to the conception of such an idea of the university, the nature, scope and functions of the universities have evolved across varied contexts and expectations. Today, a university has new and several roles: first, to foster a spirit of free enquiry, and promote independent and critical thinking; second, to be a repository of knowledge, responsible for its transmission through teaching and extension; third, to the place for the pursuit, generation and application of new knowledge, and for the ‘search for truth’; fourth to be the training ground for competent professionals in society; fifth, to render service to society, anticipating its needs and assisting in the fulfilment of social and economic objectives; sixth, to facilitate the formulation, development and implementation of national policies and programmes; and seventh, to promote values and assist in the preservation of culture and traditions (UNESCO, 1995). With new roles and scope, universities have taken several forms
or models. In the international arena, in which universities have evolved from a traditional ‘Humboldtian university’ characterised by an emphasis on teaching and research to an ‘entrepreneurial university’ model (Clark, 1998). Clark (1998) indicates that entrepreneurialism in universities was inevitable, as result of declining public expenditure and market-led higher education sector. Hence, universities are under constant pressure from the external world to become self-sustained, they are forced transform from their traditional character. The idea of the university proposed by Cardinal Newman and the Humboldtian research university model is exposed to several challenges and criticisms with the upsurge of ‘enterprise universities’. Clark (2001:6) explains that such transformation in the idea of the university has been strongly influenced by new discourses on ‘knowledge economy’, the market and a certain vision of globalization, as a result of this:

- **University systems across the globe are undergoing radical reforms due to problems like** – the public budget crisis, massification\(^4\) of/in the higher education sector and increasing internationalization and competitive pressures on the universities to meet the need of the global knowledge economy discourse.

- **The organizational crisis of the universities** – new management structures leading to a shift from the traditional governance mechanisms within the university sector.

The review of literature characterizes varied nomenclatures that capture the complexity of the university as an organization across several types and contexts over the decades, especially in the context of increasing global competitiveness for a robust knowledge economy (Marginson, 2006). University and their governance are characterized as - Goodman (1962) *The Community*

\(^4\)Altbach (1993) described massification as “the most critical contemporary force pressing on universities”. Bennich-Björkman (1997) referred to it as a modern-day “revolution” in higher education.
Similarly, universities in India have evolved into modern institutions over several years. The main thrust in establishing university education system during the colonial period came with the Wood’s Education Despatch in 1854. The key agenda of the Despatch was “creating a properly articulated system of education, from the primary school to the University” (Basu, 2002). The Despatch in its recommendation highlighted the need for establishing universities in the country (Thakur & Berwal, 2008). Having concluded the need for universities, it was further recommended by the Despatch, to establish universities on the model of London University. Thus, one university was to be established in each of the (then) presidencies of Bombay, Calcutta and Madras in 1857. The university system was transplanted from Britain and for the colonial powers in India; the overall structure of the universities within the higher education system was created to cater to the colonial needs and power (Jayaram, 2004). In fact, Altbach (1972) states “universities were not supposed to train intellectual class which would eventually drive the British from the subcontinent, but to provide the middle level human resource necessary for the clerical work of the Raj”. Thus, universities in India during this period had a limited objective as defined by the colonial rulers.

Post-independence, one could argue that the structure of the Indian higher education system still reflected the colonial past in many ways. The three universities established by the British in 1857 and the institutions that emerged since then have retained a similar organizational pattern. Eric Ashby has pointed out, “India’s higher education institutions are patterned on western models and are not truly indigenous institutions, and they have nonetheless become
integral to contemporary India” (Ashby, 1966 in Altbach & Chitnis, 1993). Institutions might have been modelled according to London University; the context(s) in which these institutions thrive is very much indigenous. Thus, universities had to be transformed to contextualize them to local needs and aspirations. The first Prime Minister of Independent India envisioned a holistic role for universities by asking them to lay stress on ‘those standards of thoughts and action which make an individual and a nation’.

Based on this premise, university education system started expanding gradually catering to the project of national development. Higher education institutions in India were created as a two-tier system – on the one hand; there are pockets of excellence in teaching and research institutions and on the other is a sea of substandard institutions with limited interventions in research and innovation. The latter, however, contributed to reaching out to the ‘first generation’ learners, addressing the issue of equity. Based on the standards of universities measured in terms of contribution to research and innovation they are characterised as ‘sub-standard’. For example, the Indian Institute of Technology (IITs) was established with the aim of providing top quality education in engineering and related fields. On a similar note, Indian Institute of Managements (IIMs) were established to excel in contributing to management and allied areas. The central government, on the recommendation of the UGC, granted the status ‘deemed university’ to higher education institutions through executive orders. This provision was used to declare premier institutions are offering programs at an advanced level in a particular field or specialization as a deemed university in order to enable it to award degrees. The state universities largely continued with the London model of education. The universities ensured that they provided affiliations and conducted examinations, with the very minimal level of teaching and research particularly at the post-graduate level only. The state universities are the bigger players in the Indian higher education system as compared to the IITs; IIMs and others. Thus, the higher education system in India represents the heterogeneity of institutions
across two tiers, i.e., advanced research institutes and affiliating ‘mass’ universities. The higher education system in the country today constitutes of: “Research Centres”, "Institution of National Importance", "Open university", "Deemed universities", and the State private universities, in addition to the conventional public universities - Central and State universities and autonomous and professional institutions. With such an expansion in number and type of institutions, the system of higher education in its present form has evolved into a complex structure accompanied by multi-level processes and challenges.

Cuthbert (1996:20) notes that literature on the nature of academic work is scarce arguing that we need to know more about working in the university setup. Higher education scholarship is limited in its approach to studying government and its association with universities (Carnoy & Levin, 1986; Ordorika, 2003). Reed, Meek and Jones (2002) suggest that any adjustments between the state and the higher education has direct influence on university governance. This is the case especially in contexts where reforms in governance are executed agencies external to the universities. Hence, causing a potential source of conflict and tensions regarding the idea of the university and its autonomy. The following section maps the literature on university governance with special reference to India.

*University Governance: Conceptual Underpinnings*

Historically, the government has been a primary source of finance and as an external intrusive power intervening in the pursuit of research and innovation in universities (Slaughter, 1988). In the higher education sector, traditional governance arrangements were based on the university as a professional state institution (Enders, 2004). For instance, the University was viewed as a key institution for developing the nation-state and its project of modernization, and the State played the central role in coordinating and governing the universities. The transition
from a ‘democratic’ and ‘Humboldtian’\textsuperscript{5} university discourse towards an emerging ‘market’ and ‘efficiency’ oriented (‘economic rationalism’) university discourse (Clark, 2001) is a significant phenomenon. It is in this context the subject matter and/or the issue of university governance could be discussed or debated. Today “universities suffer from poor governance, insufficient autonomy and often perverse incentives” (Aghion, et al. 2007). The field of research in university governance has three main components: (1) international, national policies to revise the role of the Universities in the knowledge economy; (2) national policies for the same purpose, and (3) the transformation of Universities as organizations and changes in teaching and learning in higher education (Shore and Wright, 2000).

Governance refers to the “system by which decisions are taken (or not taken) at the system and/or institutional levels, which covers the bodies concerned, their composition and competences, and the formal as well as actual decision-making processes” (Jayasuriya, 2001:15). In the university, setting governance is “…based upon a separation of powers among its faculty, administrators, and legislative bodies. This separation of power is the university’s central organizing idea and the universities version of an unwritten constitutional principle” (Pardy, 2008:373).

University governance within the higher education discourse has many approaches. The two different forces or sources of change typically noted by scholars are (1) external environment and (2) internal environment (Burnes, 1996). In addition to this, there are political, social and economic and cultural processes in university governance. Governance encompasses the internal relationships, the external relationships, and the intersection between the inner world

\textsuperscript{5} Modern academia and scholarship trace the origin of the modern university to the idea of the Humboldtian University in the early nineteenth century. In the Indian context, scholars have observed that we have combined the liberal arts college idea from British universities like Oxford and Cambridge, with the idea of the Humboldtian research university, pioneered in Germany in the early nineteenth century, as it is in most postcolonial nations (Altbach, 1993; Jayaram, 2004).
of the university and its larger environment, including the government (Marginson & Considine, 2000). Governance structures and arrangements can cause struggles about what function a university should serve and are central to a complex and evolving relationship between internal and external stakeholders. Marginson & Considine (2000:16) points out that "any governance restructuring that diminishes autonomy is typically challenged and resisted by internal actors. Some external stakeholders advocate that public universities must be more accountable to society and that there should be more external involvement in university decision-making. These two positions create tension between the internal and external actors". Such contradictions can affect the overall meaning and practice in governance mechanisms, both at the macro and micro level.

From the aforementioned literature, it is important to note that the internal environment of the university and its governance characterizes the nature of the external political-economy in which universities operate. In other words, the external pressures and beliefs shape the internal mechanisms and processes of the university, hence universities are often obligated to adhere to certain form of governance that reflects the external environment (Salter & Tapper, 2002). This is an important consideration for the thesis. The thesis provides insights into understanding the operations within the university in consonance or contradiction with the external environment i.e., the core ideals of the higher education policies.

Theorist in the field of organizational behavioral studies have identified that there is “loosely coupled relationship” between the external and the internal world of the university and its governance (March and Olsen, 1975). As Cohen and March argue that universities are like ‘organized anarchies’:
“[In universities] anything that requires the co-coordinated effort of the organization in order to start is unlikely to be started. Anything that requires a co-coordinated effort of the organization in order to be stopped is unlikely to be stopped.” (1975: 206)

As already suggested, the past few decades have seen what one may call an ‘epochal shift’ in university governance, as national governments external to universities seek more directly and systematically to govern university outcomes. Universities’ roles and functions, as well as their sources of funding, are now more complex and uncertain. There has been a tightening of control over what is taught and researched through financial contractualism based on performance outcomes, new accountabilities and quality assurance; and at the same time a loosening up in terms of local structural and financial as well as academic arrangements in terms of employment and industrial relations that enable university managers to achieve desired ends. Managerialism, marketisation, privatisation and diversification have changed universities’ roles in relation to states, individuals, economies and communities. New governance forms are also emerging as public/private partnerships, and multinational companies move into education and research (Bhanji, 2008).

Universities were seen not only as the centre for a new kind of learning but also as the setting for a new kind of social life. As a result of external or/and internal pressures universities are subject to certain transformations. Universities are subject to profound changes in political management (Huisman, 1995). Most analysts of higher education systems agree that universities are in a period of profound transformation (Neave and van Vught 1991; Goedegebuure et al. 1994; Neave 1995; Dill and Sporn, 1995; Teichler 1996; Boer et al. 1998). Long-term structural challenges like "massification" (Teichler, 1996) due to rising student numbers and "diversification" caused by a growing number of higher education institutions (Huisman 1995; Hicks, 1997) are without any doubt the driving forces of this transformation.
Since the 80s, two remarkable reverse trends developed that both contest the preceding assumptions. On the one hand, universities are expected to become like any other organisation. Their specificity is denied, and managerial tools from the industrial sector (and in particular in firms) have been introduced in universities (Reed, 2001) which are supposed to become more entrepreneurial, more corporate, more accountable etc. Universities have been made less “sacred”; they are denied their exceptional character and asked to go through “economic rationalisation” and an “organisational shift”. On the other hand, this general trend should weaken the influence of the national models and therefore reduce the organizational variety among universities.

While many reforms have met surprisingly mild resistance, they have given rise to quite intense debates on issues of governance and the organising of universities. From a theoretical viewpoint, two distinct approaches of university governance can be illustrated: firstly, the ‘market’ approach wherein universities engage in stipulating their fee structures and functions internally without any interventions of the state/government. Secondly, the ‘centralist’ approach where the government determines the financial policies and regulate universities and their operations, thereby curtailing the autonomy and academic freedom of the universities. On similar lines, the literature on university governance illustrates some of the key models viz., Birnbaum (1988: 83-174) distinguished between four major models of academic organization: “collegial”, “bureaucratic”, “political”, and “anarchical”. Whereas, McNay (1995: 105-112) presented four models of university organization: “collegium”, “bureaucracy”, “corporation”, and “enterprise”. Further, Olsen (2007: 30) argued for four “stylized visions” of the university: “a rule-governed community of scholars”, “an instrument for shifting national political agendas”, “a representative democracy”, and “a service enterprise embedded in competitive markets”.
Problem Statement: The Inner World of the University

The nature of higher education governance is such that the internal and external dynamics must be considered in studying governance change (Marginson & Considine, 2000; Salter & Tapper, 2002). Some studies in higher education have explored the internal tensions and processes associated with governance change while others have focused on the external dynamics (Marcus, 1997). Few studies have examined both the internal tensions and external dynamics simultaneously. Therefore, to further improve our understanding of the dynamic nature of governance, it is necessary to focus on the interaction between the external societal, economic and political dynamics and the internal organizational processes (Ordorika, 2003).

For the most part of the history, dominant ideals about governance and organization of universities have changed greatly over the last few decades (Altbach, 2004). The changes in the ideals are central to how the organization of the university is structured or sometime restructured and governed. The changes are characterized by a move from the "republic of scholars" ideal toward the "stakeholder organization" ideal, across the globe (Bleiklie & Kogan, 2007). In the former case, institutional autonomy and academic freedom are seen as two sides of the same coin - which means that leadership and decision-making are consensual, decentralized among the scholars who are independent. In the latter case, institutional autonomy is considered as a basis for strategic decision making by leaders who see it as their primary task to satisfy the interests of major stakeholders, and decision-making is taking place within more hierarchical structures designed to provide leaders authority to make and enforce strategic decisions within the organization. Such transition has been observed and discussed upon by a number of observers (Becher & Kogan, 1992; Dill & Sporn, 1995; Slaughter & Lesile, 1997; Neave, 2000; Enders & Fulton, 2002; Trowler, 2002; Clark, 2001; Teichler, 2004). Observations of these global trends have been made in the Indian context as well (Saxena, 1990; Jayaram, 2004; Tilak, 2005; Agarwal, 2006, 2009; Kishan, 2009; Singh, 2004,
2005). It is interesting to note that these observations are contributions towards situating changes/reforms in the larger context of higher education governance in the country. The scholars focus on the system of higher education or higher education governance, but not the institution/university that operates under the gamut of higher education. Some of the earliest insights on the dimensions of the university and its governance was illustrated by Harold Gould (1972) took account of the nature of entrepreneurship in the field of education after independence; study of University of Mysore by Glyn Wood (1972), especially exploring the historical and communal setting during the establishment of University; I.A. Gilbert (1972) studied the concerns and challenges of autonomy of the institutions of higher education (in Presidency college, Kolkata; Muir Central College, Allahabad; and Mohammedan Anglo-Oriental College, Aligarh); Rudolph and Rudolph (1972) investigated the problems of autonomy and politicization in the context of the functioning of MS University (Baroda); Carolyn M. Elliott (1972) examined the issues of autonomy and politicization in Osmania University, Hyderabad and Philip Altbach (1974) analysing students union in Bombay University. Subsequent to such interventions with regard to examining governance or related domains in universities in India there is a major void, enabling a dire need for such interventions in the contemporary context.

In other words, there exists a whole range of studies that engage with reforms in the national and/or regional/provincial perspectives in higher education governance, i.e., from the macro perspective, but such changes have seldom been dealt from the prism of universities, i.e. micro perspective in the last few decades.

Hence, the core argument of the thesis is as follows: the ideals of expansion, equity and excellence have been the foundation of Indian higher education system. However, the interpretation and priorities of these ideals have been evolving. Some of the evolutionary changes are a natural response to the changing environment, and some are due to the changing
governance structures and practices of higher education institutions. The latter has been further compounded by the emergence of new types of higher education institutions. The shifts (arguably) in the profile of these ideals could be attributed to changes in the meaning and practice of governance across distinct types of higher education institutions and vice-versa. The profile of ideals and the governance and practices of higher education institutions are deeply intertwined.

- The contemporary higher education set-up with diverse institutional objectives/roles – typologies of universities – provides complex interpretations and practices in implementing the ideals of expansion, equity and excellence in higher education.

- For instance, the interpretation and implementation of expansion could vary across private and public universities. Similarly, the meaning and practice of equity and excellence, are situated in the system of governance within the university.

**Objectives of the study**

Drawing on the literature survey discussed above, the study engages with the following research objectives:

- Analyze the relationship between national policy documents and its linkages with higher education reforms.
- Identify university governance mechanisms in the context of policy reforms in higher education.
- Examine the internal and external processes influencing governance in distinct types of universities.
Research Questions

The key questions guiding the study and its overall design are as follows: Considering the great diversity of institutions in India, how have the institutions have responded to reforms? What have been their governance practices and strategies? These questions are addressed in the relevant data-led chapters. Their purpose is to explore and analyse the participant’s current situation within higher education, with reference to each of the study’s primary concerns. Core questions of the thesis:

• Considering the diversity of institutions in India, how have the universities responded to the objectives and ideals of higher education reforms?

• What have been the major debates regarding shifts (expansion, equity and excellence) in higher education policies since Independence?

• What have been their governing strategies in the Public-State and Private-Deemed universities?

The following section illustrates the methodology adopted by the study to engage with issues related to interlinkages between the higher education system and its policies with university governance in India. The section provides an overview on the approach and the methods used to collect and analyse data from the field – from University-I (Public-state university) and University-II (Private Deemed-to-be-university) in the state of Karnataka as case-in-point.