

ISSN 2348-084X

COLLEGE POST

the higher education journal

VOL. 19, No. 2-3

April - September, 2019

Special Issue on
Draft NEP 2019

The Most Intelligent Group Photo Ever



*Participants of 5th Solvay Conference on Quantum Mechanics, 1927.
Albert Einstein, Marie S Curie, Niels Bohr and others. 20 out of the 29 in this Picture are
Nobel Prize Winners.*

seed...

DISCOVER A FUTURE UNLIMITED



MANAV RACHNA EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

NAAC ACCREDITED 'A' GRADE DEEMED TO BE UNIVERSITY & PROFESSIONAL INSTITUTIONS
APPROVED BY AICTE, MINISTRY OF HRD, GOI | COUNCIL OF ARCHITECTURE (COA) | BCI | NCTE |
DENTAL COUNCIL OF INDIA, MINISTRY OF HEALTH & FAMILY WELFARE, (GOI) GOVT. OF HARYANA

STAY WITH THE INDUSTRY BEST. GET AHEAD OF THE REST !

Mitsubishi Electric Robotics and Factory Automation Lab: First institute in North India with advanced lab, imparting automation skills for Industry 4.0.



Daikin Centre of Excellence: Latest technologies in airconditioning industry (VRV, refrigerant and inverter technology).



Altair Engineering and Design Tech Centre of Excellence: Provides opportunities to the students to train on various design and simulation software, and work on industry projects through internships.



Infineon Centre of Excellence: Projects & world-class training in semi-conductor technology with internships for select students.



Honda Motors Automotive Training & Research Centre: Specialised skills of students in two-wheeler technology



IBM: New-age technology course specialisations, access to an online Eco-system Platform, one-week Industry Interaction Programme in Bangalore, and certificates for various modules.



JBM: Industry-Integrated mechanical programme with academic delivery by experts, 6 months structured industrial training, industry engagement & integrated projects, assured placement and offer letter on admission.



Xebia: Course Specialisation in Data Science & Machine Learning, Digital Transformation Engineering, Expert Advice, Industry-Ready Learning, Internship Support and Placement Opportunities within Xebia and Client-Partner network.



Intel Internet of Things (IOT) Centre: FDPs, Events, Workshops on GALILEO and EDISON platform, covering technical/ leadership aspects.



As a leading name in higher professional education, our focus on excellence in education and research ensures our graduates are sought after and well-prepared to address complex contemporary challenges. We are dedicated to bring credit to India through the quality of our knowledge disbursement and contribution to societal transformation. Our strategic planning reflects our priorities and responsibilities to the region, the nation and the world. Yes, we're here to make your future aspirations real!

MANAV RACHNA INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE OF RESEARCH AND STUDIES

'Deemed to be University' under Section 3 of the UGC Act, 1956

MANAV RACHNA UNIVERSITY

Declared as State Private University under section 2f of the UGC act, 1956

MANAV RACHNA DENTAL COLLEGE

Recognized by Dental Council of India



IN A CLASS OF ITS OWN

- Founder Member of the Indian Alliance of the COLLEGE BOARD. Accepts SAT score for admission
- QS 5-Star rated for Teaching, Facilities, Social Responsibility and Inclusiveness - a unique hallmark of quality education
- The prestigious NIRF India Rankings 2019 by MHRD, GOI has rated Manav Rachna International Institute of Research and Studies (MRIIRS) across two categories: Engineering (rank 164) and University (rank band 151-200).
- NHRDN: Top 50 B-Schools of India as per the National HRD Network (2018-19).
- ASSOCHAM: Ranked consistently by ASSOCHAM as the best University of the country across research, social innovation, placements

Provision of Teaching Assistantship for M.Tech Programmes in MRIIRS



ENGINEERING | MANAGEMENT | ARCHITECTURE | MEDIA | HUMANITIES | HOSPITALITY & HOTEL MANAGEMENT | PSYCHOLOGY | LAW
ECONOMICS | SOCIAL WORK | VISUAL ARTS | COMPUTER APPLICATIONS | PHYSIOTHERAPY | INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY | INTERIOR DESIGN
APPLIED SCIENCES | COMMERCE | LIBERAL ARTS | EDUCATION | APPLIED GEOLOGY | BUSINESS STUDIES | NUTRITION & DIETETICS | DENTAL

MREI Campus: Sector-43, Delhi-Surajkund Road, Faridabad, Phone: 0129-4198100/4198600

E-mail: mradmissions@manavrachna.edu.in URL: www.manavrachna.edu.in

City Office: 1007, KLJ Tower (North), NSP, Pitampura, New Delhi. Phone: 011-441 10500 (30 lines), 09910244484

EDITORIAL

CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES IN THE FIELD OF HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT IN BHARAT/ INDIA



Ministry of HRD has been trying to develop a new education policy for the last five years. Lot of groundwork was done by two committees namely, Education Committee headed by Shri Subramanian and then by Policy Drafting Committee headed by Shri K. Kasturi Rangan. However, the previous government could not announce the New National Policy on Education. In fact even previous two governments UPA -1 and UPA-2 also could not announce a new education policy. The last education policy dates back to 1986 and it was revised in 1992. At the fag end of UPA-2, an attempt was made to constitute an Education Commission by then HRD Minister. Prior to these two bodies namely, National Knowledge Commission- headed by Sam Pitroda and another Committee headed professor Yaspal submitted the report. But the matter of policy of education and the Education Commission could not progress as the UPA-2 lost the election and BJP under the present leadership won the NDA-1 and now NDA-2.

It may be mentioned that the last Education Commission -comprehensively studying the system of education submitted its report in 1964-66. The gestation from the last Education Commission and the Last National Policy on Education-1986 and revised in 1992 is very long i.e. 53 and 27 years - a generation of students have passed from primary to higher education which normally takes 17 years to complete postgraduate level education and another generation have completed their schooling in the old static 1992 NPE.

The period of the 1980s was with a flurry of debate and discussion on education. First, in the early 1980s, the National Commission on Teachers was set up both for school and higher education teachers. Followed by this a nationwide debate on challenges of education was held. This was followed by the announcement of the National Policy on Education. The debate further continued when the BJP government was formed and some revision took place under the leadership of Shri Ramamurthy Committee. This was further adopted and revised in 1992 by Congress party government. As mentioned above there has been several attempts but the final view in the form of policy announcement has not yet taken place. The College Post has appealed to several governments for revision of policy without much success.

Education is a very complex subject as it deals with the making of minds, world view, character, values, skills, domain knowledge in various fields and research and development. Perhaps governments have found it difficult to grapple with and announce a focused approach towards these complex phenomenon and linked aspects of structure-function, finance and governance. The goal of six per cent GDP to be spent on the education of the citizen has never been met by any government since this goal was set up by the National Commission on Education-1964-66. It hovered around three per cent of GDP.

...contd. on page 14

CONTENTS

Editorial	1
News	2
Articles:	
1. The Draft New Education Policy, 2019): Implications for Institutional Restructuring and Governance - N.V. Varghese	3
2. Draft NEP-2019: An Out of the box Higher Education Policy Agenda - G.D. Sharma	6
3. Draft NEP-2019: Ideas Vs Reality - Sudhanshu Bhushan	13
4. Envisaging Faculty Autonomy in the Draft of the National Education Policy 2019 - Saumen Chattopadhyay	15
5. Draft New Education Policy 2019: Where is the money for Implementing the Recommendation? - M.M. Ansari	19
6. Are School Complexes - A Panacea for All School Ills? - Baldev Mahajan	25
7. National Education Policy and the Stand Alone Institutions - Furqan Qamar	28
8. Internationalization of Higher Education: Some Notes on the Draft National Education Policy, 2019 - Bikas C. Sanyal	30
9. International Education: South Asian University - Kavita Sharma	33
Researches in Education	35
Education News Analysis	37
Across the Globe	38
I Share - L.N. Bhagat	39
Book Review: Is Capitalism and Democracy Compatible? - S.C. Sharma	40

**Silver Jubilee Celebration
25th Annual National Conference of
Indian Colleges Forum
and Higher Education Summit, 2019**

**on
"Transforming Higher Education to Meet Future
Challenges" at India Habitat Centre, New Delhi, India
15-16th November, 2019**

INTRODUCTION:

The need for the transformation of higher education to meet the future challenges of human resources development and R&D has been felt very strongly for almost a decade or so. Recently submitted the Draft New Education Policy 2019 recommended for the overhaul of the system of higher education by introducing the concept of UG, PG and Research programme under the concept of socially relevant multidisciplinary and liberal education under the framework of Type 1, Type-2, universities/institutions and the Type -3 - with degree-granting status. This future model of higher education has also to respond to challenges emerging from 4.0 Industrial Revolution of AI, IoT and Blockchain Technology, Cloud Computing and Digitization. The 4.0 revolution will change the world of work, way of living and communication.

India and similarly placed developing countries have to deal with dual demand for development so far left out areas and people and grappling with fast-growing technology under 4.0 industrial revolutions. This will require the system of higher education to educate students in new knowledge, skills, the ability of analytical and critical thinking, decision making and ability to work in Team. It will require teachers and scholars to engage in innovations and development that are closely linked with the development of society.

It is, therefore, appropriate to deliberate and make recommendations on (a) issues pertaining to future and far-reaching implications of proposed policy changes and the impact of emerging technologies on institutions of higher education and their stakeholders; (b) impact on management and finances of government -central and state-managed institutions, private- aided and self-financing colleges and universities as also on the sponsoring bodies namely, trusts, foundations and Industries.

Accordingly, the theme of the 25th Annual Conference of Indian Colleges Forum and Higher Education Summit is: **"Transforming higher education to meet future challenges"**

SUB-THEMES

- (1) Transforming higher education for :
 - (a) converting autonomous colleges as type 3 universities and affiliated colleges as autonomous colleges /degree-granting institutes,
 - (b) multidisciplinary liberal arts 3 and 4-year degree programme linked with industry and society with flexible choices to students and evaluation based on the outcome of learning as proposed and life long learning
 - (c) recruitment, retention, career and professional

development of teachers for higher education transformation.

- (2) Challenges of preparing students to manage, harness and develop 4.0 technologies namely, AI, IoT, Blockchain, Cloud Computing and Digitization that are transforming the world of work and life of people.
- (3) Challenges of mobilization of financial resources for the transformation of higher education for public and private institutions of higher education
An announcement to this effect is being issued shortly. This may be viewed as advanced information about the national conference.

ICF MEMBER COLLEGES NEWS

DHSK College, Dibrugarh

The college headed by - Director Shashi Kant Saikia is setting up new standards in Swachhata Abhiyan in Dibrugarh and educational process in the colleges. Recently Guruprit Kaur Virdi a student of DHSK College Dibrugarh has been declared as Best Graduate, 2019 (Arts) of Dibrugarh University. ICF family congratulates Dr. Saikia and his team for social and academic excellence.

Jamini Kant Mahto B.Ed. College, Salboni, Jharkhand

JK Mahto group of colleges has organised several academic events during the last quarter. Among them. Language appreciation workshop by inviting people working in local organizations and speaking different languages. Through this innovative method he helped students and teachers to appreciate different languages and people coming from different states under his programme of "Bhasha Sangam" He has also organised programme for innovative teaching in schools and colleges by organizing seminar and workshops. ICF family Congratulates Dr. J.K. Mahto.

Leady Keane College, Shillong Meghalaya

Dr. C. Massar, Principal Leady Keane College Shillong has been given lifetime achievement award by Red Cross Society of India, Meghalaya State for her support and contribution in the work of the Society. ICF family congratulates her for this achievement.

Malabar College, Ven Vengara, MES College, Marampalli, Kochi, St. Therasas College, Ernakulam

Principal Dr. A. Biju of MES College and Principal Dr. U. Saidalavi have been elected as President, and General Secretary, Dr. Sajimal Augustine, Principal of St. Therasas Colleges as Treasurer of Kerala Principals Council, Kerala. ICF family Congratulate them.

Margerita College, Margerity, Tinsukhia District, Assam

Dr. Budhin Gogoi, Principal of the College visited Chinese Universities for over a month and studied Chinese higher education system very closely. He has also arranged two Chinese University to sign academic collaboration MoU with Dibrugarh University. ICF family congratulates him for his initiative in international academic collaboration.

THE DRAFT NEW EDUCATION POLICY (NEP 2019): IMPLICATIONS FOR INSTITUTIONAL RESTRUCTURING AND GOVERNANCE

PROFESSOR N.V. VARGHESE*

The paper deals with key features of Draft NEP, 2019 and brings out issues of implementation that deserve consideration at the time of finalising the NEP

THE CHANGING EDUCATION CONTEXT

India has made tremendous progress in expanding access to education. The policy, planning and public investment have, no doubt, contributed to the remarkable progress made in education. India relied on constitutional provisions and followed a Committee approach to develop education in the first two decades after independence. The first education policy was formulated in the 1960s based on the recommendations of the famous Education Commission Report of 1966. The educational policies of 1968 and 1986 played a significant role in shaping the educational development in the country in the past half a century.

These policies emphasised on the need for expanding the base of elementary education to develop a literate Indian society. The policy priorities and public investments helped increase school enrolments and literacy rates. The literacy rate increased from 16.7 per cent in 1950 to 72 per cent in 2015 and it is primarily attributed more to expansion of primary education than to adult education programmes. The enrolment in primary education increased from 19.2 million in 1950 to 123.8 million in 2017. With around 290 million students in schools and colleges, India today can claim to be one of the largest education networks in the world.

At present the development of education in India has reached a level of maturity with a saturation of school enrolments and an accelerated growth of enrolments at higher education level.

While elementary school enrolment has been declining, despite the Right to Education (RTE) Act, higher education enrolment has been fast increasing to take the country to a stage of massification in this century. The gross enrolment ratio (GER) in higher education increased by three times from 8.1 per cent to 25.8 per cent and the student enrolment increased by 4.5 times from 8.8 million to 36.6 million in this century.

These changes have redefined a new policy context for education development in India. The country has moved away from the traditional educational development model centred on state funding to a market mediated model to expand the system of education. In other words, the present stage of education development is characterised by a declining reliance on public funding and state institutions, and an increasing role of markets and private institutions to expand access. This trend is evident more in the higher education sector than in school education sector. Further, the educational discourse in India has shifted from expanding access to improving quality and learning outcomes at all levels of the system. The higher education sector is burdened with the unavoidable challenge posed by increasing rates of unemployment of the educated.

The country has moved away from the traditional educational development model centred on state funding to a market mediated model to expand the system of education. In other words, the present stage of education development is characterised by a declining reliance on public funding and state institutions, and an increasing role of markets and private institutions to expand access. This trend is evident more in the higher education sector than in school education sector.

WHAT IS NEW IN THE DRAFT NEP 2019?

The draft New Education Policy 2019 (NEP 2019) recognizes the evolving context of education while making proposals for changes in the direction of educational development in India. While the NEP 2019 provides a long term perspective, reaffirms the importance of public institutions, argues for increased public funding and granting of institutional autonomy, it also recognizes the new context of education being placed in a market place and the need for education institutions to respond to job market signals. The major orientation of the draft NEP stems from the compulsions of developing an

education system to make Indian graduates globally competitive on the one hand and to make them strongly rooted in Indian heritage on the other. Many of the proposals contained in the NEP reflect a mediation between these two forces of compulsions.

A NEW STRUCTURE OF EDUCATION:

One of the success points of the 1968 policy was creation of a unified structure of education by promoting 10+2+3 system of education. The NEP 2019 suggests changes in this structure. It recommends a new common structure

* Vice Chancellor, National Institute of Educational Planning & Administration, New Delhi

for school education - 5+3+3+4. The age group 3-8 years (fundamental stage) in which 3 years of pre-primary and grades 1 and 2 of the present pattern are included. The preparatory stage (8-11 years) that is grade 3 to 5; middle stage (11-14 years) grade 6-8 and secondary stage (14-18 years) grade 9-12. One of the important aspects of the recommendations is the introduction of a fundamental stage by extending early childhood education to all children. The ECCE will become an integral part of the Right to Education (RTE) act so that it is justiciable and it becomes obligatory for the public system to support it. Similarly, the distinction between lower and upper secondary education may disappear. The change in structure will have implications for provision of schooling facilities and teachers which may require heavy public investment in education.

Unlike the previous policies of 1968 and 1986, this draft policy makes a welcome recommendation for an expansion of the higher education sector. The NEP 2019 envisages expansion of higher education to reach a GER of 50 per cent by 2030. The pathways suggested for pursuing higher education are very flexible. The three year BA/B.Sc. with liberal arts will continue along with four year Bachelor of liberal arts (BLA/BLE) with multiple exit options. Similarly, there are several options to pursue a Master's degree. The M.Phil study Program will not continue. A PhD or a doctoral degree can be pursued after a Master's degree or a four year bachelor's degree with research.

While a unified structure with all its limitations make the graduates comparable across institutions of higher education, the new system may result in the shortening of duration of courses to attain similar degrees. It is very difficult to calculate the number of years to graduate the first university degree or post-graduate degrees under the proposed arrangements. It needs to be emphasised that the four year degree programme was a failed experiment in Delhi University. Therefore, introduction of four year degree programmes need more academic preparations and discussions with the academic community.

A four year undergraduate degree programme envisages extension of stay of students in undergraduate classes by one more year. The implications of such a restructuring for creation of facilities, appointment of additional faculty members and financial outlays will be considerable. The reorganization of colleges and the extension of the duration of the first university degree from three to four years will have challenging implications for implementation.

FOCUS ON QUALITY:

The NEP 2019 devotes a good share of its discussions on quality of education at all levels. The emphasis on learning crisis at the school level is an indication of the same. The variations in levels of learning achievement

between private and government schools are considerable. Although the argument for an equitable and inclusive quality education for all is strong in the document, the measures suggested may not be adequate to move towards equity in learning outcomes.

The policy suggestions on the National Tutors Programme (NTP) and Remedial Instructional Aides Programme (RIAP) are very helpful if they can be organized systematically as additional support to students, especially in the remote rural areas where learning opportunities and support are very scarce. In a situation where the existing schools are not functioning effectively, additional arrangements to be locally organized seem to be a difficult task. The initial and non-negotiable step needs to be to make schools functional and more effective.

All the categories of higher education institutions will be autonomous with freedom to develop their own courses and study programmes. A General Education Council (GEC) will be set up for defining expected learning outcomes or graduate attributes. The Curriculum in higher education will be reorganized to take into account the possibilities of enhancing employability skills of university graduates.

The National Higher Education Qualifications Framework (NHEQF) outlining the learning outcomes associated with degree/diploma/certification shall be the guiding document for curriculum development across all disciplines and fields of study in higher education. This framework for learning outcomes will be developed by the General Education Council (GEC). In technical and vocational subject areas the link between national skills qualifications framework (NSQF) and NHEQF will be established to develop curriculum and study programmes.

The policy document discusses the possibilities of linking research and teaching not only in research universities but also in all types of universities. To promote research, the NEP 2019 envisages setting up of a national research foundation (NRF) through an Act of the Parliament with an annual grant of Rs.20, 000/ crores. It will be an autonomous body to fund research in all disciplines in all public and private universities and colleges. The funding through NRF will be in addition to the existing funding by various agencies and will be through competitive peer - reviewed grant proposals.

The policy document emphasizes on the need for accreditation and external quality assurance mechanisms. The approach to accreditation is different from the existing arrangements. In place of a single accreditation agency such as NAAC, there will be multiple accreditation institutions to assure quality in higher education. The role of NAAC will change from accrediting institutions to accredit the multiple accreditors by issuing licenses to accreditation institutions. Further, the grading while accrediting institutions will disappear eventually from the year 2030.

INSTITUTIONAL RESTRUCTURING:

The policy envisages each education institution - whether it is a school or a college - as autonomous entity with authority to develop courses, assess students and award degrees. It is expected that the existing higher education institutions would be merged and consolidated into around 15,000 large, well-resourced, vibrant multidisciplinary institutions. This seems to be a very radical suggestion with considerable difficulties to implement. Putting an end to the existing affiliation system and organizing the existing institutions of more than 40,000/ into 15,000/ institutions is not only difficult administratively and financially but also that such a move raises questions on the academic competencies of these entities to develop courses, offer study programmes and award degrees.

NEP envisages large multi-disciplinary universities and colleges in the future. The higher education institutions are classified into three categories - research universities, teaching universities and colleges. The research universities and teaching universities may have student strength of 5000-25000 while the colleges will have student strength of 5000-10000. Professional education will be part of the general education. All technical, professional colleges will be subsumed into these categories. The system of affiliated colleges will disappear slowly but certainly by 2030... Liberal Arts education will become an integral part of the higher education system.

The NEP 2019 makes a separation of functions of Standard setting, funding, accreditation and regulation by distributing these functions to separate agencies. The standard setting functions will be performed by the professional standard setting bodies (PSSBs).

GOVERNANCE OF EDUCATION:

The draft NEP notes that the poor institutional performance, weak governance and external interferences are diluting the independence and autonomy institutions. The NEP recommends for effective leadership through a Board of Management and a rigorous selection process for heads of institutions. It reinforces the idea of institutional autonomy with financial certainty and backing. This, if materialises, will be a good achievement especially since granting of autonomy in the past decades has been seen as a substitute for providing budgetary support.

The new governance structure at the national level envisages creation of a Rashtra Shiksha Ayog/National Education Commission (RSA/NEC) headed by the Prime Minister and Minister of Education as Vice Chairperson. The RSA/NEC may provide a vision for education development and institutional framework for implementation education reforms in the country. A Similar structure at the state level - Rajya Shiksha Ayog / State Education Commission (RjSA /SEC) chaired by the Chief Minister will be created in all the states. This is the first

time that the highest levels of political authorities are directly and formally involved in education decision making.

The draft policy envisages creation of a common Regulatory framework for both public and private institutions. The National Higher Education Regulatory Authority (NHERA) will be the only regulator of higher education including professional and general education. For purposes of governance and management of the higher education sector there is a division of labor between four functions by four different entities: i) PSSB for Standard setting; ii) for funding UGC will be transformed into HEGC (Grants Council) and will be responsible for grants and student fellowships; iii) for accreditation - multiple Accreditation institutions (AI) and NAAC to issue licenses to these AIs; and iv) for regulation - several bodies at the national and state levels are proposed.

If one examines closely these structures and their expected functions, one may realize that the coordination of activities by these separate but related bodies and linking them with the institutional activities will emerge as a complicated task and a major challenge. Further, it seems the new governance structures indicate a reasonably higher level of centralization of decision making than what is existing now. Although, the policy document emphasizes on the need for institutional autonomy, the new structures in reality enhances the scope for state intervention. It seems the policy envisages an increased governmental involvement and centralization of decision making in the sector even when it emphasizes on institutional autonomy at the school and higher education levels.

While retaining the need to meet the 6 per cent of the GDP as a target to finance education the NEP 2019 also suggests a new modality of 20 per cent of the public expenditure to be allocated to education. It is expected that the share of public expenditure to be invested in education will increase by one percent every year to reach 20 per cent of the public expenditure by the end of the next ten years. This is a new way of arguing for enhanced levels of public expenditure on education.

CONCLUDING REMARKS:

The NEP 2019 introduces many new elements and a considerable amount of flexibility in the education sector. It provides a long term perspective and places Indian education in the global context. It also places education in a market context and places the role of the regulatory bodies equally on public and private institutions. It may mean that the special privileges enjoyed by the public institutions from the regulatory authorities will eventually disappear.

The NEP 2019 recommends for responsive and minimalistic or 'light but tight' - regulations. However, the

...contd. on page 32

DRAFT NEP -2019: AN OUT OF THE BOX HIGHER EDUCATION POLICY AGENDA

DR. G.D. SHARMA*

Previous NDA government deliberated for almost five years and also procured a document on New Education Policy by a committee headed by TSR Subramaniam -which ran into some controversy. Followed by that, the present draft education policy of a committee headed by K. Kasturirangan has been submitted. It has been put on the public domain. It ran into little old language controversy, but seem to have settled for the time being. The paper examines various aspects of Draft NEP, 2019 and makes some suggestions for effective implementation.

THE APPROACH

The policy agenda on higher education demonstrate a bold and out of the box approach to revamping higher education to meet the challenges of the fourth industrial revolution of the 21st Century. It rightly pegs at new skills namely, critical and analytical thinking, communication skills, decision making, multidisciplinary, creative and innovative thinking and development of artistic, analytical and liberal mindsets. Incidentally, some of these skill needs are also being highlighted by those who are working at World Economic Forum to grapple with challenges of the Fourth Industrial Revolution.

IDENTIFICATION OF PROBLEMS OF HIGHER EDUCATION:

The agenda has rightly identified eight challenges namely, (1) fragmentation, (2) lack of autonomy, (3) overregulation, (4) lack of scope for meritorious teachers' progression, (5) lack of research in universities and colleges, (6) poor leadership and distorted system, (7) appointment institutional leaders and excessive control by external agencies, and finally (8) regulatory system helping fake colleges to thrive and genuine one to suffer.

THE RESPONSE:

The policy of agenda envisages the overhauling of the system to meet these challenges. These are not challenges put on a paper or a policy document attempted to tackle these challenges and create a new model of higher education on a paper. The agenda is attempting to tackle hard rock formation which has been built, in the absence of dynamic education policy, over a period of 30 years since NEP, 1986 revised 1992. One might ask what is the hard or solid rock formation?

First after 1986 / revised 1992 and in particular after

* President, SEED and former Professor NIEPA and former Secretary, UGC, New Delhi

1995 under the policy of liberalization. Education system started fragmenting in the absence of timely policy intervention. Setting up of special institutions in the domain of Engineering, Medical, Management, Architecture, stand-alone diploma granting management education institutions, Teacher Education Colleges - known as single faculty colleges occupying 40% space in higher education. The rock formation has taken place owing to the fact that the development of these institutions has been mainly in the private sector and those in the public sector has been hailed as centres of excellence.

Thereby, it gave validity to the fragmented model of higher education. The validity was reinforced by taking these subjects/ discipline out from the domain of University Grants Commission and the Universities. The setting up of All India Council of Technical Education and National Council of Teachers Education and other nearly a dozen of such bodies has facilitated this fragmentation. Therefore, to consolidate and overall them to become multidisciplinary would be resisted by the vested academic, management and commercial interests. This would be a greater challenge for NDA-2 more than economic reforms agenda, if this out of the box policy agenda is put in the final document of National Education Policy, 2019.

Draft Policy agenda is a well-knit story of overhauling the system of higher education in terms of reform at Apex, Sub-Apex, Institutional and programmes of studies level titled as Liberal Higher Education. The genesis of this concept can be seen in ancient India- Nalanda and Takshshila Universities as also the modern university system in developed countries.

Let us see how the story runs and what the challenges at every step are?

Apex Level -

Rashtriya Shiksha Aayog/ National Education Commission with the provision of the constitution of state-

The policy agenda on higher education demonstrate a bold and out of the box approach to revamping higher education to meet the challenges of the fourth industrial revolution of the 21st Century. It rightly pegs at new skills namely, critical and analytical thinking, communication skills, decision making, multidisciplinary, creative and innovative thinking and development of artistic, analytical and liberal mindsets.

level education commission.

NEP, 1986/ revised 1992 and Programme of Action had a provision of National Council of Higher Education - an inter-ministerial body to be headed by the Prime Minister of India. This Council never met. It also had the provision of State Council of Higher Education. University Grants Commission also gave guidelines for its formation and provided financial support for the development of SCHE. Only one state namely Andhra Pradesh constituted the council through state legislative Act and appointed an Academic to head it. This was followed by Tamil Nadu, where instead of Academic person, Minister of Education was made the Chairman. Other state did not constitute the councils until recently when RUSA funds were required to be routed through the State Councils. This was an apology to the concept and but for funds, these councils hardly worked for the development of higher education in the state.

RASHTRIYA SHIKSHAAYOG/ NATIONAL EDUCATION COMMISSION:

Under this agenda we have Apex level Rashtriya Shiksha Ayog patterned on Planning Commission now NITI Ayog, but not exactly like NITI Ayog. RSA has three-layered systems with Ayog, Executive Committee and Advisory Committee. Commission along with RSA Appointments Committee on the pattern of Election Commission, yet not exactly like Election Commission. Ayog is proposed to be constituted like Planning Commission, but not exactly as the National Development Council of Planning Commission. The NITI Ayog is a professional body with experts looking into various sectors of the economy. But RSA is replete with representation from Ex-Officio ministers and Secretaries along with CMs and representatives of State Education Commissions. It has an Executive Director appointed by RSAAC. It has Executive Council to be headed by Minister of Education and ED as vice chairman - a person with Minister of State Rank along with officials mainly from the administration. It has Advisory Committee to be headed by an Academic from among the Academic members of the Commission. This Advisory Committee is a poor replica of the Planning Commission.

The membership size has been made manageable in terms of 25-30 for Ayog and 15-20 for Executive Council yet sound it to be not very representative even with 50 per cent outside the membership. The concept of Rashtriya Shiksha Ayog is novel, but its Constitution and working has to be made more simple and professional. It would do well if it is patterned on the present NITI Ayog. A similar approach needs to be adopted at the State Education Commission Level. There is an urgent need for such an apex level body and NDC like the arrangement to deal with issues of education and national development more regularly and dynamically. RSA should also be dovetail

with NITI Ayog. Let me emphasise education is larger than short and long term economic reform issues. Education is always a long term issue for the nation and therefore states and central governments should be on the same page leaving aside or underplaying trivial emotive issues often arise in multiparty system or democracy.

SUB-APEX LEVEL- UGC AND OTHER BODIES

National Higher Education Regulatory Authority;- Light but tight

Policy agenda is to consolidate the sub-apex level institutions and make one National Higher Education Regulatory Authority (NHERA). A single regulatory body for all general and professional higher education institutes. It is suggested that Institutes of higher education should be regulated on three broad parameters namely Good Governance, Financial Probity and Stability, and Education Outcome. For Good Governance, it has set 10 principles and for financial probity, it relies on norms of Chartered accountants and for Educational Outcome - it focuses on the educational outcome as mentioned by the Higher Educational Institutes and assessment of their achievement. NHERA is suggested to have Quasi-Judicial Power and power to shut down, de-recognise, penalise by any other means to Higher Education Institutes that fail to comply with regulatory norms.

General Education Council: The draft policy recommends setting up of a General Education Council as an academic leadership institution. This will set the learning outcome - "Graduate Attributes" and coordinate the credit transfer based on National Higher Education Qualifications Framework developed by the GEC. The qualifications framework will be in sync with the National Skill Qualification Framework. NHEQF will be used for establishing equivalence for credit transfer as well as signing pacts with other countries for mutual recognition of their degrees.

The draft had made provisions for Higher Education Grant Council - a version of UGC. It proposes to transform bodies AICTE, NCTE, MCI, BCI and other bodies as academic standards and protocols setting bodies titled as Professional Standard Setting Bodies (PSSBs)- NAAC as National Accreditation body with scope to develop an eco-system of Independent Accreditation Institutes for accreditations of institutes of higher education. On the side of outcome of learning it has made provision for relying on Higher Education Qualification Framework and Vocational Qualification Framework and it is linked with Policy of Skills Development Corporation, Occupation Register and National Repository of Educational Data to be set up in National Education and Planning Administration Institute. All these bodies are proposed to be governed by RSA.

It may be mentioned that the University Grants Commission Act does not provide any regulatory power

but facilitating, standards setting through peer group recommendation and suggesting norms to be followed. It has, except for recommending setting up of Deemed to be Universities to Government of India has no power to approve setting up of Higher Educational Institutes. Central and State Government have the power to set up universities through an act of legislation and Act of parliament. Sub-apex bodies like AICTE, NCTE, MCI and BCI set up after fragmentation had the provision of approval of setting up their institutes and their micromanagement. This power had distorted and further fragmented the system of higher education. Therefore transforming them as Professional Standard Setting Bodies bereft of approval power is a right step in sub-apex level governance of higher education.

However, restricting the UGC as Higher Education Grant Council for development funding and separately setting up of National Research Foundation will lead to disjoint the connected functions of teaching, research and development of institutions of higher education. An institute with Institutional development plan (IDP) will have to pass through several organizations for teaching, research, innovations and development. All the sub-apex level bodies are autonomous through Act of parliament and accountable to the parliament now they will be sort of department of RSA. This would undermine the concept of autonomy of sub-apex level institutes. RSA with school and higher education, research and innovation mandate will become too unwieldy to be managed efficiently.

There is a need to arrive at clarity about role and functions of the proposed Ministry of Education - name changed from Ministry of Human Resource Development and Rashtriya Shiksha Ayog. In the absence of this clarity, the RSA concept with all its all good intention may not really take off.

National Research Foundation: There is the provision of National Research Foundation - to promote research in institutions of Higher Education. A new body constituted through Act of Parliament for promoting research and innovations in the institutions of higher education both in public and private sectors particularly in four domains under the four Divisional Councils in the areas namely, Science, Technology, Social Sciences and Arts and Humanities and along with their respective subjects committees. The recommendation is that it should have 2.1 per cent GDP or Rs. 20000 crores for funding research and innovations in universities and colleges across the country and across the disciplines and subjects in a transparent and peer-reviewed competitive way.

Presently this function is being performed by the UGC with experts drawn from respective fields in committees on the honorary basis only covering Travel stay and token meeting fees. Creation of a body with elaborate structure and membership with a very little amount of just 0.1 per cent GDP is a matter that needs reconsideration. Another

issue is relationship, vision and priorities of RSA and NRF. The third and more important issue is that there is a possibility that this elaborative structure may lead to bureaucratise research and innovations initiatives. Therefore, there is a need to reconsider the structure-function of the body and its linkage with Higher Education Grants Council and RSA.

How several bodies will be merged or transformed is a real issue? These bodies have been well cast and have operated for a long period with human resources manning them. RSA body looking after consolidation, merger and liquidation will have a gigantic task at hand. Let me add that this transformation is a must and logical, if the concept of Liberal Arts education has to be understood and believed. The only question is that the new system should be simple, sleek and manageable. Too many bodies in RSA will make the system involved and working at cross purposes.

REVAMPED NAAC

The policy agenda proposes to create a new revamped system of assessment and accreditation of institutions of higher education. It proposes to develop a new eco-system accreditation of institutions of higher education based on well laid down parameters of accreditation in consultation with PSSBs, and develop institutional Accreditation Framework for independent Institutions of accreditation. It also wants to make accreditation a lynchpin for the regulation of institutions of higher education. The draft provides for the dual role of IAF to regulate and give licence to operate and accredit institutions for self-improvement and development purpose. The draft proposes to change the present system of grading to the binary system of Accredited or not accredited latest by 2022. It also envisages that by 2030 all institutions should be accredited. Institutions not accredited should cease to operate. It gives window to institutions to opt for GA or BA till 2030. The system, process and outcome of Accreditation has to be more transparent and objective. Its parameters, system assessment, indexing of achievement should be based on hard data and facts and educational outcome. It should inspire confidence among the institutions. Present NAAC system has suffered due to a more subjective system of grading and lack of proper and benchmark based system of assessment. Therefore, Accreditation Framework should be evolved very carefully and detailed system of implementation must be outlined for every institution to understand and adhere. System of subjective evaluation should also be based on objective parameters. The system of power of licensing to institutions to operate and close should not be given to the accrediting agency. It should be left with regulatory authority only. However, relying on accreditation is a better proposition for regulation than any other method.

INSTITUTIONAL LEVEL

The institutional level reform recommended in the draft policy agenda is major reform and is a challenging task both for central and state governments and private institutes of higher education. The policy envisages three types of Higher Education Architecture, namely Universities having research orientation type-1 Universities and Institutions engaged in teaching and research -type 2 and Universities and Autonomous colleges and colleges engaged mainly in undergraduate teaching type-3. Following the concept of flexibility, it has made provision for movement to type -2 to level of type-1 and type -3 to type-2 and type-1.

The concept of Universities/ institutions of higher education under the liberal arts education is very broad and innovative concept of the university system. It completely changes the present form and characteristics of universities in India. The concept envisages a holistic form of institutional framework wherein universities engage in all the disciplines in a more flexible and innovative manner. In fact, universities in India offered education in all the disciplines namely, Engineering, Medicine, Agriculture, Sciences, Social Sciences, Teachers Education, Arts, Fine arts, culture and sports. There was no special institution in these subjects until specialised institutions namely, IITs, IIMs, Medical Universities and deemed to be universities in specialised subjects came to be recognized. Of course, some of these disciplines were offered by the constituting or affiliated colleges of universities. But they were under the university umbrella. These specialized institutions and research institutions took away the talented teachers and researchers from the universities owing to better infrastructure and research funds. The migration of faculty to these institutions and lack of funds seriously affected the quality of teaching and research in general universities. The proposed concept of Liberal University system offers to revamp university system a hub of academic research excellence in a multidisciplinary manner. It proposes to break barriers of education created through subject streaming. It also proposes to allow freedom to students to choose the subjects /disciplines of their choices in the form of Major and Minor from any discipline. It also encourages students to acquire scientific temper, arts and aesthetics, Indian heritage knowledge, engages in skill formation and social service and democratic and constitutional understanding through foundation and application of knowledge to local and socially relevant situations. Many experts have pleaded for the integration of various discipline under one university and institutions of higher education framework but it has not happened. Some inter-disciplinary streams were introduced in some universities but the flexibility to offer courses in the form of Major, Minor or foundation course has not happened. Therefore to make it happen

is a very challenging academic, administrative and financial task. Who ever may challenge this concept, it is worth trying. Policy agenda also makes recommendations with regard to its implementation of the new concept through a Mission mode approach of Nalanda and Takshshila Missions.

AUTONOMOUS DEGREE GRANTING COLLEGES - TYPE -3 IHE

Let me come to other major challenges of lack of autonomy to colleges and institutions of higher education. One of the very positive and bold policy proposals has been made by the committee is to do away with the concept of affiliation of colleges in the course of time. Give autonomy and degree-granting status to colleges. This policy proposal attempts to correct the age-old British legacy of affiliated colleges. It may be pertinent to mention that NEP 1986/92 had made a policy and programme of action for giving autonomy to colleges. The policy envisaged giving autonomy to at least 500 colleges in a period of 5 years. It also provided special funds to college for taking up new responsibility to framing curriculum, admissions of students and evaluation of students, but the degree was given by the university on the recommendation of the college concerned. The scheme met with a lot of resistance from teachers, universities and state governments. In the Rajasthan state after giving autonomy to five government colleges, it was withdrawn after a period of five years. With a lot of effects and initiatives, about 200 colleges got autonomy until the year 2000. However, after private self-financing colleges were set up in Tamil Nadu and other states several self-financing Colleges applied for autonomy and got the autonomous status. As of 2019, there are about 1300 autonomous colleges in the country. There is always a clash of interest between university and colleges and college and state government administration on account of the fact that degree is being given by the University and funds to government and aided colleges are given by the government. Both organizations resist the grant of autonomy to colleges.

There is a proposal to give degree-granting status to college and assuring adequate funds to colleges will be a major step in revamping the system of higher education as more than 86 per cent enrolment is in colleges. The government at the centre and state levels will have a great challenge in implementing this policy proposal. Personally, this author since 1986 has been pleading for autonomy to colleges and doing away with the affiliating system and giving degree-granting status to colleges. A multidisciplinary college with 3-4 thousand students would be a very good viable institution for innovations, teaching and research in higher education. It need not have the same paraphernalia as big as central and state universities

of even deemed to be universities. It can be a viable unit with academic, administrative and financial autonomy with degree-granting status.

ESTABLISHMENT OF NEW INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

As per earlier provisions, the draft policy agenda suggests establishment of new institutions of higher education through the Act of Parliament, Act of State Legislation and through Higher Education Charter of National Higher Education Regulatory Authority. This replaces the previous provision of Section 3 of UGC Act for the constitution of Deemed to be Universities as also provision of AICTE for recognition of diploma awarding institutions. NHERA is suggested to issue a Model act for constitution of the university. It also recommends that new colleges started after 2020 should be autonomous colleges (Type -3) and no new affiliated colleges shall be started after 2020. No affiliated colleges will exist after 2030 and all colleges should develop as degree-granting autonomous colleges or a university. Draft policy suggests for setting up a new institution in a public-spirited way and with robust finances, transparency in governance and public disclosure and credibility of persons sponsoring the institute.

Institutional Development Plan: For transformation to new concept of three types of Institutions of Higher education draft policy recommends for preparation of Institutional Development Plan. Through this plan at the centre and state level institutions will work out consolidation, multidisciplinary orientation and introduce liberal Art education programmes. It will put up IDP for receiving funds for their development under Nalanda Mission by central public institutions and Takshsila Mission for state public institutions. Private institutions have to make their own arrangements. However, they can compete with public institutions for research projects funds.

The size of students' enrolment and doing away with institutions of focused education and research needs further considerations. Some of them may not adhere to a large number of students enrollment. But the approach of multidisciplinary liberal arts vocational and professional and application orientation rooted in local and national context nature of educational institutions should not be compromised.

CHALLENGE BEFORE NATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION REGULATORY AUTHORITY

Although NEP 1986/1992 never envisaged the formation of new bodies like AICTE, NCTE and several other discipline domain oriented regulator or standard setting bodies. In fact, universities were multidisciplinary institutions having all the knowledge domain areas -liberal arts, science, commerce, engineering medicine, teacher

education and so on and incorporating new domain areas of ICT, Bio-Technology environment science and so on. UGC only worked as facilitating and funds providing a body for development and innovations in the universities and colleges. The UGC act fully respects university autonomy and autonomy of states to set up universities. It has provision for providing help if sought by the state government. But during the last two decades, owing a lot of adverse news about certain institutions of higher education focus has changed from autonomy to centralization of higher education through several guidelines, circulars.

New bodies like AICTE and NCTE had the provision in their act to approve an institution. These bodies attempted to regulate the system to the micro-management level. Thereby they made the institutions of higher education to meet just the requirement and regulations of these bodies. There is a vast gap between what academically ought to be what is in reality in particular with the opening of self-financing institutions of higher education. Some trust deficit was developed between state and institutions of higher education. As a result, the previous government attempted to bring several legislations to further centralize and control the system of higher education. However, these legislations did not see the light of the day. In general, centralization has a tendency to over-regulate the system.

Even the new system, that is being evolved tend to make the process too centralized. Centralization, therefore, need a lot of regulation and required the system to be put in a common pattern to regulate. Centralization is an enemy of innovations and change. Centralization produces prototype products as the factories do.

Therefore, the challenge of over-regulation is even bigger than the above discussed two issues. There are forces tuned to centralization in every aspect, Central level admission tests like NEET, JEE, CAT, and other tests have given rise to a new commercial industry of preparing students for admissions. Even a coaching township has come to be set up for helping students to prepare for these tests. If admissions are centralized how can one expect that system would be decentralized and it would work for innovations and change. Centralization would call for over-regulation to ensure everyone follows the same rule. As and when one finds some deviation, again it has brought a new rule to regulate. The challenge to deregulate is bigger and would need a very bold trust-based policy pronouncement.

The major structural change attempted to be suggested are: separating three functions namely academic, quality assurance and funding and setting up of one regulatory body for institutions of higher education. It is proposed to reduce the over-regulation and treating both public and private universities at par. It also envisages stopping the commercialization of higher education and

promotion of philanthropy based institutions of higher education. This statement begs a question i.e. whether self-financing institutions would be considered as a - philanthropic or commercial one? Does this also put to rest the question of private equity-based for-profit institutions of higher education? These are a few challenges before the government while finalising the policy document.

The issue of self-financing colleges, deemed to be universities, universities and university departments have not adequately dealt with in the policy particularly how this sector, which has grown substantially since 2005 proposed to be integrated with the new concept of university /HEI framework of three types? Since this sector occupies a major share in professional education namely, engineering, medicine, management, architecture, pharmacy and so on there is a need for clear policy approach so as to resolve possible conflicts and roadblocks in implementation of institutional reforms.

TEACHERS' APPOINTMENT AND PROGRESSION BASED ON MERIT

Committee has suggested for merit-based recruitment and promotion including leadership of the institutions of higher education. The National Commission for Teachers higher education has made recommendations for merit-based selection and promotion of teachers in higher education. The NEP 86/92 made provisions through UGC pay committee to ensure merit-based recruitment and promotion of teachers in higher education. But the flip side of the implementation of pay committee recommendations has been stoppage of recruitment of teachers on account of funds. As a result, there are almost 40 per cent of positions vacant in universities. A new concept of ad hoc and contract teachers have been in practice. A new concept of appraisal of the performance of teachers has been introduced under the instrument of API. The policy proposal is making a bold departure by stopping the recruitment of contract teachers. This aspect is going to be a major challenge as a good number of private self-financing universities and colleges have been in operation for the last 10 years. The question of regularity and progression of teachers is a major challenge before the government while making policy pronouncement.

Under the focused areas, the draft policy makes recommendations for use of technology in teaching, evaluation and planning and management of institutions. It also recommends that the education process should respond to disruptive technology effectively. On the aspects of vocational education, it recommends integrating vocational education at all the levels and particularly in higher education programmes. It also recommends that quality of Open Distance Learning programmes should be offered by accredited universities.

Thus it is enabling even private accredited universities to offer ODL programmes, which are presently restricted to public sector institutions.

IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

NEP 1986 revised 1992 had developed Programme of Action. NEP draft 2019 has made provision for implementation by giving a time frame for various levels action latest by 2030 or 2032. It has with RSA at the apex level with three of its bodies and newly recommended institutions at the sub apex level namely, NHERA, GEC, HEGC, NRF PSSBs and state level Education Commission patterned on NEC expected to help implementing institutional level reform through Institutional Development Plan in a mission mode approach under Nalanda and Takshila Missions. It had made provision for financial assistance for implementation by suggesting an increase in public expenditure on higher education. It has given responsibility to RSA and for review and monitoring of progress and for development vision dynamically. It has also made provision for sample-based assessment of outcome of learning of students with graduate attributes in a period of five years. Yet, the detailed blueprint of implementation in the form of Programme of Action would be needed to effectively implement the draft policy agenda.

FINANCING OF EDUCATION AND HIGHER EDUCATION

Draft Education Policy agenda is very clear and focused towards an increase in public expenditure on education and higher education slowly reaching up to 20 per cent of public expenditure by 2030 from the present 10 per cent of public expenditure. In a tabular form, the draft policy has also indicated the area of additional fund allocation and funds for one-time expenses out of this increased allocation on public expenditure on higher education.

It may be mentioned that under the self-financing system students and their wards pay for education and higher education along with their tax payments under direct and indirect taxes say, income tax, Goods and Services Tax including several surcharges. In fact, the rate of tax under the GST has almost doubled and trebled on certain items. Central Government is also expecting higher revenue under GST than it used to get in the past under central excise duty. It has lured state governments to follow GST under the garb of doubling their revenue. The draft policy states that owing to the mobilization of funds under GST central and state government are better placed to spend on public education system. Increase in public expenditure on higher education may help the expansion of higher education.

It seeks to encourage private philanthropic activity in education and higher education through not for profit institutions and even setting up of Private Grant Giving body gathering funds from CSR and another small donor

to provide grants to educational institutions. It has suggested that philanthropic bodies with adequate funds for infrastructure and ability to stay long term in education be encouraged. Policy agenda suggests several measures to encourage philanthropic contribution and laid down priority areas for education in terms of Scholarships both for needs and merit students, infrastructure development and so on.

The draft policy agenda is also very clear that "for-profit institutions should be stopped." It views many institutions which have come up after liberalization and occupies the space in higher education, in fact, are de-facto for-profit institutions. But it falls short of suggesting any specific policy measures for dealing with self-financing full cost + fee-charging institutions. However, it has laid down very clear principles for new philanthropic supported institutions. It suggests that fees from students should not be more than 25 per cent of their expenditure on education both in school and higher education. It has laid down a ratio of teachers and students of 1:30 for schools and 1:20 for higher education institutions.

On the aspect of fees for professional education, the draft policy suggests that institutions of higher education management will be left free to decide the fees both in public and private institutions. But the draft pleads for the fulfilment of social obligation by these institutions. It recommends that 50 per cent of students should be provided scholarships to students from socially and economically weaker section. It mentions that up to 50 per cent of students qualifying for admission should be provided with some degree of scholarship and a minimum of 20 per cent of these should receive full scholarships. Feasibility of such recommendations for the private self-financing institute of higher education needs to be examined.

During the years 2005-2018 most of the universities, deemed to be universities and colleges have been set up under the private sector and they are charging full cost+ fees from the students. The proportion of such institutions, (both under degree-granting and diploma-granting system) is quite substantial. Policy agenda as stated above has not clearly dealt with this aspect. This needs to be deliberated and a system of change, if any, as per principles laid down by the policy agenda has to be clearly worked out. In the absence this, the policy recommendation will meet very strong resistance from vested commercial and political interests.

The draft National Education Policy agenda is a well-knit story of reforms in higher education. It has a vision of a new concept of multidisciplinary liberal arts educational programme at undergraduate and postgraduate and research level. It has a proposal to do away with affiliating colleges system and proposes to integrate constituent colleges with universities and give autonomy to colleges to enable them to become undergraduate programme

offering type -3-degree-granting colleges under type -3 institutions of higher education. It has proposed an institutional development plan for the development of institutions as multidisciplinary liberal arts institutions of higher education with a focus on skill formation, linking contextual societal needs and making students be aware of Indian heritage knowledge under the concept of foundation courses. It proposes to develop the culture of SEWA among students at the institutional level. Changes suggested at the institutional level are very bold and covers what is needed to reform the system at the ground level. It may or may not take the shape of institutions as per vision, yet the trajectory of change is well argued. It, however falters on the constitution of apex level organization namely RSA by making it too unwieldy and involved with several layers and the lack of clarity on structure-function and relationship with the Ministry of Education. It tended to centralise sub-apex level institutions and makes them sort of department of RSA from the present autonomous system. It also falters in not dealing with self-financing full cost recovery institutions of higher education which have occupied very large space in higher education. It disconnects funding for teaching, research and innovations from Higher Education Grants Council presently UGC and research funding through the National Research Foundation. It also falters making clear projections for future of education, employment and development that is likely to be impacted by AI, IoT and digitization. It does mention about technology in education. but falls sort of making education free from structural boundaries of institutions and enabling students to learn from many sources and get their certification on the basis of the outcome of learning under a qualifications framework.

The document needs to be carefully studied, understood and appreciated by all those who are concerned with higher education, beginning from students, teachers, leaders of institutions namely, principals of colleges, vice chancellors and above all parliamentarians who are likely to make decisions in the parliament in both houses and state levels political leaders as policy agenda has far-reaching long term implications and therefore need to be attended to by one and all.

I SHARE COLUMN

College Post has introduced a new column for making achievements of Principals of Colleges known to other fellow principals in the country. Three principals have already shared their achievement. We invite all the member colleges and principals to share their achievement so that others get inspired to do new and innovative developments in their colleges.

DRAFT NEP, 2019 - IDEAS VS REALITY

PROFESSOR SUDHANSHU BHUSHAN*

The paper examines some of the aspects of Higher Education of Draft NEP, 2019 from the point of view of existing realities and the possible issues that may impede the implementation.

THE INSTITUTIONAL RESTRUCTURING:

The draft new education policy (NEP) is an imagination far away from the reality of the Indian higher education. In terms of building the architecture of 21st Century knowledge system the policy advocates for a multidisciplinary framework in the idea of a University. Therefore it advocates three types of institutions having degree granting power. They are research Universities, teaching Universities and colleges with multidisciplinary centers and departments having enrolment of students ranging from 5000 to 25,000. The present affiliating system has to be replaced by the three types of institutions noted above by 2030.

This structural change at best could be viewed as a wild imagination and has no connect with the reality. The restructuring of affiliated university into the three types will involve huge costs. Besides many colleges will have to be merged or closed down. There is no doubt that mushrooming of single discipline colleges or universities need to be stopped and the affiliating system needs to be reformed, as suggested in the Subramaniam committee report.

However, a huge restructuring as suggested in the draft NEP is impractical. How will Delhi University look like after being restructured into, say, 5 research universities, 5 teaching universities and 10 colleges independently operating and awarding degrees? Institutions evolve historically and social acceptance of institutions and its degrees is a time tested phenomenon through becoming a memory at individual or social level.

UNIFYING EDUCATIONAL PROCESS:

There is another imagination of creating a unity of all disciplines such as engineering, medical, law, teacher education, etc. into the idea of university. It also suggests that distance education be part of research, teaching universities and colleges. In practice there are: technological, medical, agricultural, law, education universities. The suggestion that medical, agriculture, law, technology, education should all be integrated is the classical idea of university. It was imagined that liberal

education should be the core along with the periphery disciplines. In modern times with the expansion there was practical compulsion. Disintegration or what one may call fragmentation could not be stopped. Can we say, why IITs, NITs, IESRs, etc. were created? Can we question the emergence of these institutions today after their successful or not so successful existence for pretty long periods? One may say, rightly or wrongly, that perhaps isolated from universities politically charged environment, they could possibly perform better. This isolation also removed them from social and developmental needs of India, whereas it served best the countries where the product migrated.

POLITICAL INTEGRATING ROLE OF UNIVERSITY:

Perhaps universities' political identity was also necessary. Universities may not be efficient in terms of rational technical organization, but it certainly served interests in terms of integrating society

within its fold, unlike perhaps IITs. An elite institution has its own benefit but a mass based organization, too, though sub optimally efficient, has its own advantage of serving the society. What I mean to say is that perhaps fragmentation may not be desirable, yet it happened out of practical compulsion in the course of expansion. Hence a grand unity is an ideal thinking in the policy - this could be viewed by some as wild imagination.

REGULATORY SYSTEM:

So far as regulatory architecture is concerned, UGC, AICTE, MCI, NCTE or BCI evolved with much of its uses and abuses. Does this mean that they be abolished? There are ways for mid course correction and rebuilding the organization for the purpose these are created.

The draft policy suggests that there will be only one National Higher Education Regulatory Authority (NHARA) as the sole regulator determining the standards of higher - general and professional - education. All other current regulatory bodies such as NCTE, MCI, BCI and AICTE may transform to PSSBs for setting standards for professions is also a grand idea of unity. The separation of setting the standards of higher education and that of respective professions is suggested in the policy draft. This functional separation, however, runs against the idea of unity as the overarching framework of the policy.

* Head, Department of Higher & Professional Education, National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration, New Delhi.

Further institutional restructuring of turning UGC into Higher Education Grants Council is suggested. The General Education Council (GEC) to set 'expected learning outcomes' for higher education programmes and National Higher Education Qualifications Framework and a further suggestion for Rashtriya Shiksha Aayog and State Shiksha Aayogs in all the states is again a suggestion in favour of large institutional restructuring.

NAAC with multiple accreditation agencies to accredit higher education institutions and National Research Foundation are further suggestions for new institutions to emerge in the future.

TOWARD CENTRALIZATION AND TIGHT CONTROL:

Understanding the implications of creating the unity of institutions and establishing new institutions is the idea that emerges from the draft new education policy. While one of the implications is in favour of centralisation and tight control on the functioning of universities and teachers, the central point is that if there is right structure of institutions perhaps everything will go right in the higher education. It is assumed that institutions will function rightly with the right behaviour of individuals. This may be called transcendental institutionalism to borrow the phrase from Amartya Sen's idea of Justice while critiquing John Rawl's theory of Justice. The policy is rightly in the spirit

of 'Niti' rather than 'Nyaya' - former referring to principles and the latter referring to realization of policy. Policy should not be looked at in terms of a blueprint or set of propositions or ideas. It must be grounded in reality. That is where it seems to fail. Unless policy has an intention to address the shortage of teachers and infrastructure and activating the agency of the teachers, it can never be transplanted in the reality.

RESOURCES FOR POLICY IMPLEMENTATION:

Indeed the policy suggests that additional resources need to be mobilized by extra 10% budgetary resources for education to the total budget, yet the past practices could not authenticate any intention to achieve the same. The funding is rather more centralized at the level of the state government. Policy does talk about the recruitment and professional development of teachers - a good idea indeed.

IMPLANTATION OF IDEA IN FEDERAL SET UP:

The last but not least, that I would like to mention is that in a federal setup, higher education being the major responsibility of state, state governments role become very important. On how many proposals of institutional restructuring, states will agree is certainly a point that cannot be overlooked. I wish the ideas to become true, yet the reality defies it time and again.

...contd. from page 1

The policy has remained static, but the practices have changed and the system has moved. Those enrolled in education has increased several folds at all levels. System of governance has moved from decentralization to centralization, System of management has moved from state exchequer management to private management at all the levels. Cost of education to students within and outside India has increased tremendously. Much more than this, the demand for and expectations from educated people in various domain area knowledge, skills and Research and Development have changed completely. These are likely to change further every year as, new technology is impacting the way we work, the way we live and way our mind work, the way we engage in agriculture, industrial production and its distribution, way we engage in services of education, health, financial system and communication. The gap between what we provide students in the system of education and what is being needed and demanded presently, in the near future and in the distant future is likely to increase further in the absence of a dynamic policy of education. Educated unemployment is two-way phenomena -one is lack of required competencies to deal with present production and

distribution demands and the second is non-availability of employment opportunities owing to slow growth of the economy. It will not help the nation by hiding data on GDP or unemployment. There are challenges but then there are opportunities to rework and respond to twin challenges.

POSTSCRIPT

This editorial was written before the Ministry of Human Resources put Dr. K. Kasturi Rangan Committee report in the public domain in June 2019. The Draft NEP, 2019 document is very elaborate covering more than 400 pages write up. It has dealt with education subject more innovatively and in an out of the box approach to education including higher education. The report needs to be widely discussed among heads of universities, colleges, schools and state level functionaries as this call for understating the new concepts, appreciating and accepting a new approach to education by all. This is also applicable to those in Parliament -seating in treasury and opposition benches, MHRD and PMO to understand and commit the financial and other implications of implementation of the policy. We hope NDA-2 will do this and will not miss the bus this time as it did last time.

ENVISAGING FACULTY AUTONOMY IN THE DRAFT OF THE NATIONAL EDUCATION POLICY 2019

PROF. SAUMEN CHATTOPADHYAY *

The paper focuses on the basic structure of regulation and governance in higher education as envisaged and proposed in the draft of the National Education Policy 2019 (DNEP 2019)

INTRODUCTION

The changes that the DNEP seeks to usher in are truly transformational in the realm of higher education. But in order to appraise and appreciate the proposed changes, we may begin with the diagnosis of the malaise that the higher education sector is afflicted with as explicated in the DNEP 2019. The DNEP 2019 begins by reminding that the Indian HE sector is the third largest in the world after the USA and China. The sector is unduly large but many HEIs are small and unviable resulting in poor quality of education.

The DNEP 2019 argues that the regulatory interventions in the functioning of the HEIs in the sphere of processes or micro-management has stifled innovation, robbed the faculty of their autonomy which has rendered a major section of the faculty demotivated and passive in their academic engagement. Though there are pockets of excellence, the system as a whole lacks vibrancy as it feels suffocated under the heavy weights of regulations.

Academic autonomy which is a hallmark of the university system stands challenged and compromised. The DNEP 2019 discusses faculty autonomy, governance structure and leadership roles and the regulatory structure to suggest possible reform measures.

We would like to begin with the diagnosis of the higher education system followed by a discussion of the regulatory structure and governance to understand how autonomy and the accountability of the faculty have been conceptualised to revive the system and improve quality of higher education.

DIAGNOSIS OF THE PROBLEMS FACING INDIAN HIGHER EDUCATION

Despite salary increases and setting up of the HRDCs, the DNEP observes that the level of faculty motivation is far lower (Chap 13) than what should have been. Poor infrastructure, temporary appointments, huge vacancy,

heavy teaching load, complete lack of autonomy in teaching and curriculum design have left the faculty constrained in exercising their agency and excel. The energy of both the institution and the faculty have remained stifled and stymied. Career management is too often based on seniority. There is no provision of giving incentives for outstanding work by the faculty the DNEP 2019 notes. It may be noted that after all, the UGC Regulations is meant for achieving the minimum standard as per the Gazette notification.

"A shockingly high proportion lack the ethical standards, institutional commitment and public spiritedness that is a must to lead any education institution" (DNEP 2019, p. 310). This is partly a result of the selection and appointment processes. While discussing the quality of higher education, the report has made a scathing attack on the unscrupulous behaviour of the teachers. The DNEP 2019 truly notes that political interference has been a major issue.

Prevalence of corrupt practices particularly in financial matters has raised doubts about the way the financial matters of the institutions are managed. The DNEP 2019 admits that physical

infrastructure is inadequate. Vacancy in faculty positions has reached very high level which has badly affected the teaching-learning activities in the HEIs.

Academic decisions which are supposedly to be taken by the universities like starting a programme should not require permission from the UGC. Lack of accreditation bodies and the sheer number of professional bodies for various professions have added to the confusion and complexities in regulating the gigantic higher education sector in India. Result is the emergence of an inspectorial regime even though the regulatory interventions were continued to be violated.

PROPOSED CHANGES

Faculty: Given this diagnosis, the DNEP 2019 proposes something radical. It argues that the faculty instead of subjecting them to more regulations because of their substandard performances, instead they are to be treated

The DNEP 2019 argues that the regulatory interventions in the functioning of the HEIs in the sphere of processes or micro-management has stifled innovation, robbed the faculty of their autonomy which has rendered a major section of the faculty demotivated and passive in their academic engagement.

* Professor, Zakir Hussain Centre for Educational Studies, School of Social Sciences, Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi.

differently. They are to be trusted and empowered to let them decide their teaching and broadly speaking their academic activities. Instead of asking the faculty to allocate time as per the UGC Regulations, the faculty should be allowed to determine how best they should be investing time keeping in mind their interest and responsible discharge of duties they are entrusted with. A major deviation from the existing practice is to allow the HEIs to have a clear transparent recruitment process (p 258). Pay scale should be incentivised to encourage good work and reward outstanding work which entails that the HEIs have the liberty to deviate from the recommended pay scale approved by the UGC. Career management should be entirely based on merit with two additional dimensions of evaluation being proposed. These are to strengthen the peer review process and incorporation of students' assessment as part of teachers' performance during the probation period.

Governance Structure of University: From the recommendations, it appears that the entire governance structure of the HEs needs to be overhauled. The DNEP 2019 reiterates that the Chief Executive (CE) or the vice chancellor has to be a leader who would strategise and manage its activities to help the HEI achieve its stated goals. The leadership quality of the CE is more important than her academic credentials, because it is leadership which is argued to be more important in the emerging scenario. It seeks to argue that a vice chancellor may have a brilliant academic record but she may not be a good leader. Institutional leadership is crucially important to cultivate excellence and performance based culture. Lateral recruitment with field experiences should be encouraged. Institutional autonomy in recruitment means a lot given the way the system functions at present. Given that the Indian HE system is vast and complex and marked by co-existence of the Centre and the states, the implementation is a different ball game altogether. For the newly recruited teachers, the probation period will be for five years which may be reduced or increased upon evaluation. Dispositions for public service among the faculty has been emphasised upon. This would strengthen the university-society linkage and gradually an increase in the stake of the public in the university system.

The UGC Regulations has definitely led to an increase in the number of publications but quality of such publications continues to remain a matter of concern. It is in this respect that the DNEP 2019 is emphatic about the lack of correspondence between the number of points as reflected in API and quality of publications. The Report argues that the number of publications should not matter as no credence should be given to the publications in the fake journals. Future trajectory of pay rise will be the prerogative of the HEIs.

Board of Governors : A body called Independent Board of Governors (BoG) will have to be constituted which will

be the apex body of the HEI. The composition of such a body is crucial in the set of reform measures mooted by the DNEP 2019. One important underlying rationale behind this body is expected that it would ward off political interference. Setting up of this body at the apex will require that the powers and reporting structures of the existing bodies within a university will have to be revisited. But the IDP with details of educational and research outcomes, quality and capacity parameters, financial and human resource development plans and review which should be made public. All processes are to be developed and maintained by the BoG through the CE.

All publicly funded HEIs must form a BoG by 2020. The CE will be the main anchor of the formulation and implementation of the IDP and be held responsible for the performance of the HEI in its aspects. Public funding should therefore have to be provided to help the HEI to address the target as envisioned in the IDP. The funds should be given to the HEIs in the form of block grants which is a pre-requisite for granting institutional autonomy.

Neo-liberal Aspect: The neoliberal aspects as embodied in the DNEP 2019 are therefore not in terms of privatisation and marketization per se but in terms of output based funding, fostering competition within the system regulated by the regulatory bodies, the NHERA, the NAAC and HEGC and showing the exit door to the HEIs which would fail to deliver.

REGULATION

Four pillars of the regulatory structure have been identified. They are standard setting, funding, accreditation and regulation which will be separately handled and conducted by the independent bodies to avoid concentration of power, conflicts of interest and overlapping of jurisdictions resulting in confusions and ambiguities.

Regulation should focus on output and not on inputs. (P18.1.1) the DNEP 2019 alerts. The HEIs should have the freedom to determine academic and resource related decisions. Public and private HEIs are to be regulated based on the same set of criteria to create a level playing field.

NHERA: The National Higher Education Regulatory Authority (NHERA) will be the only regulator for the entire higher education sector consisting of general education and professional education. Three dimensions have been identified for the NHERA to be concerned about. They are good governance, financial probity and educational outcomes. Each HEI shall have a goal which would be made transparent and it should be subject to review (P18.1.4). This should include number of students and diversity, assessment of learning and research output. Inputs such as resources, processes conditions should not be the focus of the NHERA.

The recommendation of the DNEP 2019 is to install a common regulatory regime for the entire higher education

sector. 'Light but tight' gives importance to institutional autonomy and it should be minimalistic and at the same time the few regulations should be effectively and sincerely complied with.

Accreditation of Institutes Accreditation is given utmost importance. This requires development of an independent eco system of Accreditation Institutions (AI). Specialised institutions would set the standard or expectations in a particular field of learning and practice. HEIs will then decide how would they achieve the standards set by them. This will bestow the HEIs with autonomy in academic, administrative and financial but given the target set by the IDP and agreed upon by the regulatory body.

The NAAC will develop an ecosystem of the Accrediting Institutions (AIs). Each AI should cover 100-200 HEIs. The AIs should act as facilitators and mentors and should be treated as an important instrument for capacity building. Higher Education Grants Commission (HEGC) which will replace the UGC will disburse grants and scholarships. The basic objective of the various dimensions of regulation is not only to regulate but also to enable the institutions do well over time. There would be two systems, graded accreditation and binary accreditation. A phased accreditation is allowed for a decade. This is basically the time given to the HEIs to produce output as per their plans. There is a need for creation of a corpus of special funds to help the HEIs prepare for autonomy and succeed in the process of accreditation.

PSSBs: The tasks of the Professional Standard Setting Bodies (PSSBs) would be to set standard (P18.3.1) and the HEIs should respond to these standards. Curriculum, pedagogy and requirements of teachers should be the prerogative of the HEIs.

GEC: It has been proposed that the General Education Council (GEC) as an academic leadership institution will determine the standards of learning outcomes. The NHEQF will facilitate mobility of students across the streams of study choice, across combinations of areas of study, flexible entry into and exit from a programme.

HEGC: For the HEGC, the funding norms are to be re-examined, simplified and streamlined (P18.4.3). The Policy DNEP 2019 does not spell out how these norms will be arrived at given that there is a trajectory of past funding by each HEI. The RSA will consist of independent boards (IB).

Regulation, funding accreditation are separate functions, no overlapping and so therefore all are independent. While it has the advantage of funding independent of standard, practically funding has to meet the IDP. It is not clear whether the UGC Regulations will cease to be of any relevance if the HE system is made embrace the new system as the blueprint suggested.

AUTONOMY

In the present system, it is mainly input-based funding as the salaries of the teachers remain independent of what they teach and research on a yearly basis. The extent of autonomy is defined by the UGC Regulations and since the UGC regulation is for achieving the minimum standard, there is no accountability as such for the institution to realise as the institutional outcome is an outcome of the faculty output unless the institutional target is disseminated to the faculty for them to achieve collectively. It is basically a bottom up approach. The faculty don't face any target in consonance with the institutional output other than what they set for themselves in the course of their career advancement. University based on faculty output get accredited by the NAAC and compete in ranking, mostly at the national level. In a way the faculty has the autonomy in what they deliver. At the same time, the faculty feel suffocated by the extent of micromanagement as articulated in the UGC regulations. The allocation of the number of hours for teaching and research guidance and therefore time available for doing research is determined albeit residually.

The NEP is critical about the micromanagement in curriculum design, pedagogy which stifles innovation in teaching-learning and research, the university as such does not set any target for their faculty to achieve though the very purpose of accreditation and ranking are so,

In the proposed system, it is a top down approach. In the entire regulatory framework the NAAC is the lynchpin of the system, because they set the standard. The PSSBs set the standard for quality. The apex body of the HEI, ie, the BoG sets a target, short term, medium term and long term and they become accountable to the NHERA but the CE remains accountable to the BoG. So the neoliberal elements of market based accountability and the private sector efficiency are not the ones the Report has taken recourse to. Instead, the Report talks about strengthening the institutional framework, setting the standard by the PSSBs which has to percolate down to the faculty. But the faculty will now be required to achieve the output as set by the IDP. The pay structure will be incentivised. The CE will have to extract the best from the faculty. Faculty autonomy will therefore be seriously compromised in the proposed system. The institutions are given autonomy in what they do, how do they manage who do they recruit, how do they pay to the faculty. If the HEIs fail to live upto the standard as per the IDP, as the HEIs wind up operations, the faculty will be pushed to the wall. This is the process through which the largeness of the system is tackled as those who remain offer good quality, the sizes get consolidated and the poor performers are made to quit. If the probation of the new recruits is extended to five years, it is understandable how the new faculty will remain under tremendous pressure in their initial years of joining.

The importance of the NIRF seems unclear. Ranking measures the performance of the university in relative terms. It is therefore possible that the ranking would fluctuate while there can be improvement in the NAAC score. The NAAC on the other hand will have a mentoring role in addition to the accreditation role and the grade awarded will remain valid for 5 years. The kind of competition which will be infused in the system will be of a different type. Faculty autonomy comes with accountability defined from the top mainly by the IDP in a very explicit fashion. The kind of faculty autonomy the DNEP talks about is faculty autonomy in a very limited sense. It is the kind of autonomy a gold fish enjoys in a bowl.

PRIVATE SECTOR

The expansion of the higher education system, particularly in the realm of professional education has been driven by the increased participation of the private sectors. It has now become amply clear that privatisation has failed to be a panacea for quality education and research in contrast to what the neoliberals keep on advocating. The DNEP has stressed that private sector investment in HE should be a 'not-for-profit' activity. The Policy Document emphasizes upon philanthropic contributions from private sector and channelizing funds towards the public funded HEIs through setting up of chairs, funding of specific research areas and faculty positions. But there will be restriction on the private sector in cost recovery. They need to offer scholarship where 20% should get 100% and 40-50 % 100-25% school.

NEOLIBERAL IN IDEA BUT UTOPIAN IN IMPLEMENTATION

The reform of the entire structure of higher education in terms of regulation of the system and governance is based on certain assumptions. As the assumptions are unrealistic, pursuant of the proposed structure by the government will be difficult. It may be possible to implement on a selective basis though. With regard to implementation the following issues arise:

1. Funding: Since fiscal deficit will remain binding for years to come, would the Centre be able to dedicate an increasing budget for higher education? The DNEP 2019 proposes an increase of 1 percentage point in terms of total expenditure of the government to raise from the existing 10 percent to 20 percent of total expenditure within a span of 10 years. This will be possible only if the optimism expressed over rising tax buoyancy materialises and more importantly, the government agrees to increase HE budget. But the budget for higher education has not risen much in real terms over the years. Moreover, the setting up of the Institute of Eminence will demand a rising proportion of budget in the years to come. Since the states spend a significant part of the budget on higher

education, cooperation from the states is of utmost importance to realise the target.

2. Given the autonomy in drawing up a plan for the institution as required for the IDP for the short term and the long term, and the emerging competitive scenario, will the HEGC be able to meet the demand of all the HEIs? The DNEP 2019 talks about arriving at some norms for uniformity in the allocation of the budget. There is no discussion of norms. Moreover the average cost per student varies across the universities for a given course, how will the budget allocation take place? Any significant deviation from the latest allocation during the short run has the potential to disturb the functioning of the HEIs.
3. A complete overhauling of the higher education system. Both the private and states need to cooperate. Setting up of the new bodies will be a daunting task for the government. Some of them are discussed below:
 - I) Regulation: Setting up of the NHERA and the HEGC in place of UGC will require a massive effort. Revisit of all the professional bodies will also have to be undertaken. Can consensus be generated in absence of a blueprint for reforms?
 - II) The NAAC is set to play a major role. Since an ecology of the accrediting institutions is to be set up, privatisation is inevitable. Will the newly constituted AIs have the expertise to carry out the task. It is beyond doubt that NAAC at present is unable to cater to the huge need given the large size of the higher education sector.
 - III) Governance: By 2020, all the HEIs are required to constitute independent Board of Governors (BoG). This entails a complete revisit of the respective constitution of the HEIs. This is again a mammoth task. There exists a possibility of major resistance from not only the HEIs but also from the state governments.
 - IV) Curriculum changes to ensure multi-disciplinarity will not be easy. Willingness and competence of the faculty both are necessary.
 - V) Can the NHERA and the BoG be truly independent? Can we avoid political interference?
 - VI) This entire package is different variant of neoliberal with focus on output and accountability, incentivised pay structure and the looming threat of exit, if the HEIs are found to have failed to achieve their goals in terms of IDP and subject to the satisfaction of the NAAC and PSSBs.

To sum up: Though there are some good elements in the DNEP 2019 like increased budgetary allocation and curbing of commercial malpractices, but the proposed changes are simply non-implementable in its entirety. Faculty autonomy will get seriously circumscribed as the threat of exit will be looming large over the horizon.

DRAFT NEW EDUCATION POLICY 2019: WHERE IS THE MONEY FOR IMPLEMENTING THE RECOMMENDATION?

DR. M. M. ANSARI*

The paper in depth deals with the financial aspects of implementation of Draft NEP in the light of past experiences and indications of 2019-20 budgetary allocation on education by Government of India

Increasing application of automation and Artificial Intelligence in the workplace requires a rapid transformation of the education ecosystem to prepare a cadre of manpower to enable them to effectively function in the knowledge-intensive and technology propelled economy. The challenge of skilling the working population is daunting. In the context of India, the Global Competitiveness Report (2016-17) observed that: 'Higher education and training have shown no improvement... Huge challenges still lie ahead on India's path to prosperity'.

The Draft National Education Policy 2019 (NEP) has noted that less than 5% of the workforce in the age-group of 19-24 receives vocational education in India while the corresponding figures are as high as 52% in the USA, 75% in Germany and 96% in South Korea.

In effect, the share of the vocationally trained labour force is less than 10% of the total working population as compared to over 60% for the countries with which India has to compete in the globalised economy. A low level of participation of educated and skilled population adversely affects the productivity of resources, which tantamount to mean that the rates of return on investments in India would fetch much less than the investment made elsewhere.

- The NEP has therefore recommended inter alia for:
- " Universalising secondary level education up to the age of 18 years for all the children by 2030;
 - " Increasing the gross enrolment ratio (GER) at higher education from the current 26% to 50% by 2035;
 - " Setting up of a single regulatory authority, namely National Higher Education Regulatory Authority, while existing regulatory bodies will be redesigned as 'Professional Standard-Setting Bodies' (PSSB) for the respective disciplines;
 - " Granting full autonomy to all the private and public HEIs to have complete freedom to decide the fee of their courses;
 - " Establishment of National Research Foundation (NRF), which will be responsible for funding,

*Former UGC Member & Central Information Commissioner, GOI, New Delhi

mentoring and building the capacity for quality research in India. NRF will have four divisions: sciences, technology, social sciences, and arts and humanities, with the provision to add additional divisions. NRF with a budgetary allocation Rs 20,000 crore per annum will provide funding for research in both private and public universities.

A number of vital recommendations, such as above, have been made, which indicate increasing centralisation of educational policy planning. And, none of the recommendations is based on educational research studies and their findings. Instead, the recommendations have emerged from the feedback obtained from 65000 respondents, the lay and learned persons. We shall confine our discussion to critically examine the aspects of funding of various proposals made in NEP.

RESOURCES FOR EDUCATION:

NEP has reaffirmed the commitment of spending 6% of GDP as public investment in education. The National Education Policy 1968 had recommended that public expenditure on education must be raised to 6% of GDP, which was reiterated by the second NEP in 1986. In 2017-18, public expenditure on education in India was merely 2.7% of GDP, (which corresponds to the current 10% of the total expenditure). The corresponding ratios are very high for USA 5%, UK 5.5% and Brazil 6% of GDP.

Clearly, NEP recommends for doubling the public investment in education from the current 10% of total public expenditure (2.7% of GDP) to 20% in the next 10 years. Of the additional 10% expenditure, 5% will be utilised for universities and colleges (higher education), 2% will be utilised for additional teacher costs or resources in school education and 1.4% will be utilised for early childhood care and education. The question is: Are these proposals to enhance the level of financial allocations realisable? Consider the following:

The Central government has made off-repeated commitment to raise public expenditure on education to 6% of GDP, which has however never been realized. This allocation has hovered around 3-4% of GDP in the last

The challenge of skilling the working population is daunting. In the context of India, the Global Competitiveness Report (2016-17) observed that: 'Higher education and training have shown no improvement... Huge challenges still lie ahead on India's path to prosperity'.

six decades. And, expenditure on higher education and research has been less than one per cent of GDP.

Based on the long term trend expenditure and the current priority areas of development, mainly the financial needs for providing economic stimulus for the manufacturing industry and job creation, it seems unlikely that education budget would be doubled to implement the various recommendations of NEP for reforming the education sector.

Union Budget 2019, which makes mention of the implementation of NEP, does not make necessary provisions for implementing the major proposals, such as improvement in the quality of teaching, which is contingent on recruitment of vacant faculty positions and investments in R&D activities in HEIs.

Utilization of 'Education Cess' for Universalisation of Secondary Education:

NEP has recommended for Universalising Secondary Education (USE), up to the age of 18 years, for all the eligible children by 2030, which is consistent with the sustainable development goals (SDG) set by the United Nations. Raising the enrolment ratio at USE level from 65%, as obtaining today, to 100% is a major challenge. Reason! Lack of infrastructure, mainly trained teachers for academic programmes as well as vocational education and training. While NEP has suggested for creating 'Special Education Zone' for ensuring access to education for all, there is no clarity about sources and methods of funding quality education, especially in educationally and economically backward states that face acute resource crunch. Scepticisms arise from the fact that in the past most states have failed to provide the financial wherewithal to support quality education, which is why nearly 50% students, mainly from poor families drop out before completing secondary education.

Realising that the Central government was unable to fulfil the Constitutional obligation of ensuring 'universalization of education' for children up to fourteen years of age due in part to the paucity of financial resources, 'education cess' is collected since 2004 from the Income Taxpayers to augment additional funds for investment in school education. Evidence shows that the money collected on account of 'education cess' has never been efficiently utilized. NEP document has not made a mention of the issue of collection and utilization of the education cess.

As known, the Education Cess comprises two per cent 'Primary Education Cess' and one per cent 'Secondary and Higher Education Cess'.

In 2004-05, an amount of Rs 4160 crore was collected on account of primary education cess, which

increased by ten times by 2015-16. On the basis of a written reply to a Lok Sabha question given by the then Union Human Resource Development Minister, Smt. Smriti Zubin Irani on May 9, 2016, the following is observed:

- i) Of the total collection of 'Primary Education Cess', only 61 per cent was utilized for financing elementary education, which includes Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) and Mid-Day Meal (MDM) schemes, 41 and 20 per cent, respectively. These are actual expenditure data, which reveal that as high as 39 per cent of the Cess amount has not been utilized by the Central government for the purpose for which it is was collected from the taxpayers.
- ii) The trend in the allocation of funds for primary education shows that the Central government's budgetary outlays for SSA and MDM are increasingly substituted by the collection of 'primary education cess'. In fact, rather than augmenting additional resources for primary education, the collection of cesses is substituting the normal budgetary allocation, which belies the promise made to Taxpayers while imposing the cess i.e., for improving the quality of education.

Union Budget 2019, which makes mention of the implementation of NEP, does not make necessary provisions for implementing the major proposals, such as improvement in the quality of teaching, which is contingent on recruitment of vacant faculty positions and investments in R&D activities in HEIs.

Furthermore, the utilization of one per cent of 'Secondary & Higher Education Cess' is abysmally low. Accruals from the cess were to be utilised for promotion of ongoing schemes for secondary and higher education, mainly for expansion of facilities to improve access and quality of teaching, research and innovation. But, this has not happened.

The findings of the Comptroller and Auditor General (CAG) reveal that even though Rs 7,885 crore was collected through the research and development cess during a decade of FY97 to FY17, only Rs 609 crore (7.73%) was utilised towards the objectives of levying the said cess.

In its report to the Parliament, CAG has observed that the Central government in the last ten years collected Rs 83,497 crore by way of 'secondary and higher education cess' between FY07 and FY17, but funds were not utilized for fulfilling the commitments made in the Finance Act for promotion of secondary and higher education. Clearly, the commitment of furthering the cause of secondary and higher education development, as envisaged in the Finance Act, has not been realized. All India Status of Education Report (ASER) has demonstrated, in its Annual Reports, that learning attainments of school children are abysmally low. And, the initiatives taken by the government to improve quality of education, reduce dropouts, especially among poor and rural communities are not commensurate with the task of strengthening school system to improve access

and quality of teaching. Lower learning attainments of students at secondary level adversely affects the quality of students' intake in both the types of Institutions that impart entrepreneurial education and training as well as those that offer academic courses leading to degree programmes.

The NEP has not adequately addressed the issue of financing quality teaching, including the provisions for common school facilities, such as adhering to the norms of teacher-student ratio. Deployment of untrained teachers, particularly in single teachers' schools, is the major shortcoming of the education system. The problems associated with schools' deficiencies were sought to be addressed through the establishment of 'Common School System', as recommended by the education policy of 1968 & 1992. NEP has, however, ignored this issue of equalizing educational opportunities across the socio-economic groups.

HIGHER EDUCATION FINANCING:

The responsibility for providing education and training of all types and levels is vested with both the Centre and the states as the subject matter of education is categorised in the Concurrent List of the Constitution of India. Both the levels of the governments have therefore designed policies for funding education, including the extent of subsidisation of educational services and cost-recovery measures. And, the private sector's participation in providing technical and professional education, mainly on the self-financing basis is vigorously encouraged. As a result, the government's role in higher education financing is gradually declining. NEP does not provide data and information on quantitative dimensions of public and private partnerships in education

The proliferations of a large number of private institutions, which cater to two-third of students in higher education, are operating as a family enterprise. They generate huge surpluses that indicate increasing commercialisation of higher education. NEP has not made an objective assessment of performance and accountability of such institutions nor it has made any attempt to address the issues relating to ways and measures for financing quality teaching and research in private HEIs. Consider the following:

NEP proposes to divide HEIs into three categories, namely, research universities focusing equally on research and teaching; teaching universities focusing primarily on teaching; and colleges focusing only on teaching at undergraduate levels. Moreover, all the existing educational institutes including IITs, IIMs, AIIMS, IIITs and others will have to align with any of the three categories. And, there will be at least one residential HEI in each district of India.

These classifications of HEIs sounds very well, but it ignores the fact that the activities of teaching and

research are closely related and therefore the high quality of teaching cannot be performed and assured without research and development activities in the institutions meant for carrying out teaching functions, as most affiliated colleges do today. The idea of classification of HEIs, on the basis of teaching or research or both, is ill-conceived, as most teaching institutions having very little presence of research faculty will continue to produce graduates lacking in innovative and entrepreneurial capacity to work in the modern business environment.

RESOURCES FOR NEW RESPONSIBILITIES:

In view of different role and responsibilities of HEIs to perform teaching and research functions, as classified by NEP, the sources and methods of their funding must also be spelt out, but NEP is silent on this issue. In fact, teaching and research programs in most HEIs suffer due to a shortage of faculty to the extent of 35 to 45 per cent due mainly to ineffective governance in the recruitment of staff. It may be recalled that in a meeting with the President Ram Nath Kovind on January 6, 2018, the Vice-Chancellors of seventeen Central Universities discussed teething issues faced by them, including the uneven pace of campus development and faculty shortage. All the new elite institutions like IITs/IIMs face a similar problem. Therefore, in a situation like this, how can we expect that the government will be able to operationalise the recommendation of promoting research universities and establishing a residential university in each District of the country?

INEQUITY IN FUNDING HEIS:

While the university degrees and diplomas awarded by different HEIs enjoy legal parity, there is no equity in financing various educational programmes offered by them. For instance, the University Grants Commission (UGC) disburses funds to the Central Universities and a few Deemed to be Universities to meet the committed expenditure as well as approved plan outlay. This role is also performed by the Ministry of Human Resource Development (MHRD) in respect of centrally funded institutions, mainly IITs, IIMs and some others. Under the scheme of National Higher Education Mission, also known as RUSA, MHRD also disburses funds, on matching basis, to the state universities and colleges, on the basis of a formula comprising twenty performance indicators. In addition to these sources of funding, Higher Education Financing Agency (HEFA) has been created for providing loans to accredited HEIs for the development of infrastructure. While he will have to pay back the principal amount of loans to the Bank, the interesting part is to be borne and paid by MHRD.

Most HEIs are reluctant to take Bank loans as they will have to pay back from the cost recovery from students, in which case tuition and other charges will

have to be raised exorbitantly. The purpose of this discussion is to highlight the fact that the aspects of inequity and objectivity in funding HEIs by the central agencies, namely, UGC, MHRD and HEFA has not been dealt with at all, which is disappointing.

INCOME-CONTINGENT LOAN POLICY VERSUS MORTGAGE BASED EDUCATION LOANS:

Another aspect of financing higher education relates to growing non-performance assets on account of education loans. Evidence shows that as many as nearly 3.0 million students, most of whom pursue technical, professional and management education in private universities avail of the loan facility. According to Indian Bank's Association (IBA), the Non-Performing Assets (NPAs) contributed by education loans have grown to 7.67 per cent at March-end 2017 and is currently over 11 per cent, which is attributable to the inability of graduates to pay back outstanding loans due to graduate unemployment or underemployment.

A high ratio of outstanding loans or non-recovery of students' loans is a pointer of inefficient management of loans, which has the potential for not only destabilizing the lending Banks due to rising NPAs but also to discourage eligible students to avail of loan facilities to pursue higher education and research. As a solution to such problems, most countries in the world have adopted Income Contingent Loan Policy, which has however not been examined by NEP.

In fact, the social and private benefits of higher education support the case for a continued mix of private and public funding. A successful and effective partnership between public and private sectors would, however, depend on students' friendly income-contingent loans policy, which is designed with two purposes in mind: for those students who wish to avoid up-front payments, they ensure that education can remain free during the period of study; and, entire amount of loans should be fully income-contingent, rather than mortgage based. Enhancing existing students' loans arrangements allows them to do so from the higher earnings they gain throughout their working life by virtue of having been to HEI. Income contingent loan policy is considered superior to the existing student's loan scheme, which is regressive. It is not understandable why NEP has not examined such an innovative method of financing HEIs.

'FOR-PROFIT' VERSUS 'NOT-FOR-PROFIT' HEIS:

As known, most private HEIs are operating as a family business entity and generating huge surpluses or commercialising education. The Supreme Court has noted as under:

'This Court cannot shut its eyes to the hard realities of commercialization of education and evil practices being adopted by the institutions to earn large amounts for their private or selfish ends.'

Supreme Court, PA Inamdar Vs Maharashtra State, 12.08.2005

HEIs are therefore not performing as 'not-for-profit' institutions, as NEP has endorsed. NEP could have suggested for opening a new window for augmenting private capital for investment in HEIs, as most countries in the world do. The Twelfth Five Year Plan, page 100, observed that:

The 'not-for-profit' status in higher education should be examined for pragmatic considerations so as to allow the entry of 'for-profit' institutions in select areas....'For-profit' private higher education can be taxed and the revenue from it could be channelled into large scale scholarship programme to promote equity as it is practised in Brazil and China".

Therefore, the current legal ban on 'for-profit' institutions has hardly prevented private institutions from extracting profits albeit through non-transparent and possibly illegal means. Since the quality of education suffers, can the profit-making be legitimized with sufficient safeguards?

The task of improving performance and accountability of HEIs is a major challenge, which cannot be effectively faced without mobilizing and investing huge resources from diverse sources, including beneficiary students, philanthropists, donors as well as the investors seeking reasonable profits from such occupations as educational activities. The provision for the post-graduate level of teaching and research, in select disciplines, is regarded as an economic investment for private gains, which attracts profit-seeking private investors. This is what has been observed in the cases of several HEIs under private management.

The demand for technical and professional education has been high and rising, which makes educational activities profitable. At present, private investors are hamstrung by the complex web of regulations that restrict them in hiring competent staff and mobilizing funds through equity participation, which is the simplest way to raise money. In such circumstances, the 'not-for-profit' private institutions have turned into crony-capitalist organizations that breed an unholy nexus between the institution proprietors, bureaucrats and politicians. If profit-making is allowed to incentivize investment in higher education, the demand for quality education and skills development could be met by aligning educational objectives and the fiscal incentives determined by the market forces.

A large number of private coaching and guidance institutions, which provide tutorial assistance and training for various competitive examinations, are run and managed 'for-profit'. Many of these institutions are registered as for profit-making private institutions that are covered under the normal taxation laws. The success, utility and popularity of such institutions may be gauged

from the fact that a significant majority of students join these institutions for remedial coaching to improve their learning attainments. And the beneficiary students are seemingly satisfied even though they pay much higher charges than the number of fees paid to the regular institutions, where they pursue their degree/ diploma programs.

The contemporary educational scenario in its larger part is regarded as a lucrative business. The Supreme Court, as quoted above, also acknowledges this. The fact that education is big business throughout the world, India has experienced the mushrooming of private educational institutions, which are largely financed through students' fees. The education sector has, therefore, attracted a large number of investments, from the entrepreneurs and industrialists. The unprecedented investment in the education sector, although termed as a philanthropic and charitable activity by the investors, needs careful scrutiny, because 'there is a tacit acceptance of the prevailing system of charging capitation fees by private institutions for profit-making.

In view of the foregoing, NEP should have examined the aspects of opening the new window by allowing the establishment of 'for-profit' institutions to attract additional investments in HEI, the activities of which are critical for national development.

The interface between Industry and Institutions: An equally important area that has been missed or ignored is the aspect of attracting resources from industry and business organisations, which are major beneficiaries of HEIs activities. Interaction between HEIs and industry organisations for sharing knowledge, technology and financial resources for mutual benefits have been from the viewpoints of designing policy for supporting mutually beneficial programmes, such as promoting start-ups, establishing business incubators, and other innovative activities.

Currently, the activities of industry and institutions are carried out in isolation from the requirements of each other, despite the known fact that university outputs, mainly graduates and research findings are utilized by the industry and business organisations for commercial purposes. While HEIs are required to focus on entrepreneurial education and training, the industry must provide technical assistance for designing and implementing courses. NEP may accordingly recommend the ways and measures of forging relations between HEIs and industry for mutual sharing of financial and knowledge resources.

PROMOTING RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT:

The budgetary allocation for the education sector, in terms of both magnitude of funds and the pattern of its utilisation, have a significant bearing on improvement in the quality of teaching, research and access to education by traditionally deprived groups.

India has been spending about 0.7% of GDP on R&D. An additional 0.1% of GDP (Rs 20,000 crore) per year is recommended by. Compare this level of spending with China (2.1), USA (2.8) and Israel (4.3), as quoted by NEP. Researchers per lakh of the population are 15 for India while the corresponding number is for China (111), USA (423) and Israel (825). If India has to catch up with global standards, it has to find more resources for R&D schemes, mainly from industry and business organisations, which are the major beneficiaries of HEIs activities.

The Central government plans to finalise and implement the NEP from the current Financial Year 2019, but the financial allocations in the Union Budget 2019-20 do not show any substantial improvement in the allocation of resources for education. For instance, the entire allocation of Rs 94,853 crore, with breakup for higher education getting Rs 38,317 crore and school education Rs 56,536 crore, indicates a nominal increase of nearly 10%, which may largely be absorbed for meeting expenditures on on-going activities. As discussed above, what is disappointing is the fact that the entire allocation for school education as well as higher education is met from the collection of 'education cess', which is levied at the rates of 2% and 1% for school education and higher education and research, respectively, from the income taxpayers.

This Cess is levied on Income Taxpayers since 2004 to supplement the budget allocation to raise it to the level of 6% of gross domestic product to fulfil the oft-repeated government promises and to meet the genuine requirements of the education sector. Unfortunately, the Central government is substituting regular budgetary outlays with this Cess and that a part of education cess is diverted elsewhere. Funds earmarked for the development of education are deliberately diverted to other activities while aspects of widening the reach of education among deprived groups and improvement in the quality of teaching and research are relegated to lower importance. This is indeed a serious matter, which must have been investigated for guidance, but NEP is oblivious of the issue pertaining to collection and utilisation of education cess that attracted the adverse comments of CAG while the work on NEP was in progress.

The NEP proposes to overhaul the entire regulatory structures for improving the quality of teaching by providing teachers' training and to cope with 'skills deficits' to improve earnings and employability of youths. Yet, the allocation in the Union Budget 2019 for teachers' training and adult education has been downsized to Rs 125 crore from Rs 871 crore in the last year's budget, which does not augur well for improving learning attainments.

Some of the important announcements made by the Finance Minister, in respect of NEP recommendations, are briefly discussed hereinbelow:

First, the National Research Foundation (NRF) to fund, coordinate and promote research and innovation

will be established, for which allocation of Rs 608/ crore has been made. It is not clear if NRF will be an overarching body to regulate activities of R&D organisations functioning under the auspices of CSIR, DRDO and other Institutes of National Importance. Or, it will be a standalone institution. Finance Minister has not clearly articulated the Policy because of which there may be duplication of efforts and wastage of resources. This announcement has been made without the necessary preparedness to design and implement the policy.

Second, a single higher education regulator, namely Higher Education Commission of India is proposed to be established to replace over a dozen of regulatory authorities such as University Grants Commission, All India Council for Technical Education, Medical Council of India and many others. The idea of having a single regulator of HEIs activities is being discussed in India for over two decades but it has not been operationalised for different academic and technical reasons. Is the government ready to undertake a major reform without having a detailed consultation with all the stakeholders, mainly the states and private sector operators?

Third, the idea of promoting 'World Class Institutions' for which Rs 400 crore has been allocated, is not new. Unfortunately, no worthwhile effort has been made to fill 30 to 50 per cent faculty positions that are perpetually vacant for several years in almost all IITs/IIMs and Central Universities. And, most self-financing institutions, which cater to over two-thirds students in HEIs, have become commercial entities rather than the institution of excellence.

The budgetary outlays for IITs is Rs 6410 crore, for IIMs Rs 445 crore and for IISERs Rs 899 crore, which are higher by 12 to 14 percent as compared to the previous budget. These allocations are however not sufficient to recruit the required faculty. Shortage of faculty adversely affects both excellence in research and innovation as well as global ratings of HEIs, without which foreign students cannot be attracted to make India a higher education hub, as proposed by the Finance Minister.

Moreover, the much-hyped PM fellowship scheme fund has been reduced from Rs 75 crore in 2018-19 to Rs 50 crore in this budget. Likewise, scholarships for poor minorities have also been reduced.

Fourth, the Finance Minister mentioned about an increased focus on 'new age skills' such as artificial intelligence, Big Data, 3D Printing and Robotics, which offer new job opportunities in the knowledge economy but did not indicate how to contain disruptions in the jobs market due to automation and AIs.

Due to a huge deficiency in skills development, the policy of strengthening education and employment connection should have been carefully calibrated and financial allocation should accordingly be made to improve entrepreneurial capacities and employability of educated youths to

effectively function in the modern economy.

TO SUM UP:

First, on the issue of the government's financing of education, NEP has reaffirmed the stipulation made by Education Policy 1968 and 1986 that allocation of resources must be raised to 6% of GDP from the current level of 2.7% of GDP. In spite of oft-repeated government's commitment to increase budgetary allocations to realize the above target, expenditure on education in the last six decades has hovered around 3 to 4% of GDP. It. Therefore, seem to be a challenge before the government to make funds available commensurate with requirements for implementing the proposals made in NEP.

Second, NEP has not recommended for implementation of 'Common School System' to effectively equalise educational opportunities across the socio-economic groups and to improve learning attainments at the school level. This was recommended in the Policy of 1968 and reiterated in 1992. Until the performance of feeder institutions, elementary and secondary schools significantly improves, HEIs will not get highly motivated learners to benefit from the activities of HEIs, mainly quality teaching, research and innovation.

Third, NEP proposals for the restructuring of HEIs, as discussed above, will require extensive consultation with major stakeholders, mainly states and private sector education providers, who largely share the burden of managing and funding HEIs. As the subject matter of education falls under the concurrent list of the Constitution of India, the process of sorting out legal and administrative issues as well as the Centre-state financial relations in education will retard the process of implementation of various proposals. This aspect, therefore, need to care, while designing the implementation strategy.

Fourth, less than 10% of the working population in India are vocationally and technically trained as compared to 60 to 80% of the corresponding labour force for Korea, China, Japan, USA and others. Without a strong focus on entrepreneurial education and skills development and the interface between industry and HEIs, it will not be possible to transform higher education and research to promote human capital required for national development. NEP has neither outlined an approach to transform HEIs for entrepreneurial education not has indicated sources and methods for augmenting resources commensurate with the requirements of the task.

Finally, Draft NEP's recommendation that the government support should increase from the current 2.7 to 6% of GDP is welcome, but it needs a rigours study of mobilization and allocations of funds by the state exchequer. Past experience suggests that enhancing the public expenditure on education to six per cent of GDP has remained on paper. Let it not remain on paper in future, if the state is serious about implementing the Draft NEP recommendations.

ARE SCHOOL COMPLEXES - A PANACEA FOR ALL SCHOOL ILLS?

BALDEV MAHAJAN*

The paper analyses the scheme of school complexes as operated in the past and examines the possibility of implementation of Draft NEP recommendations on School Complexes as an appropriate unit of coordination and administration of schools

The Draft New Education Policy (2019) has discovered a mantra to eradicate all the weaknesses of school education system and to improve the quality of school education. What's the panacea that would bring about the desired transformation and render school governance more effective and efficient? The prescription given by the DNEP is that all public schools, as distinguished from private institutions, will be organized into school complexes which will be the basic unit of governance and administration.

According to the recommendation made, a school complex will be a cluster of public (government) schools in a contiguous geography offering education across all stages - Foundational to Secondary. The complex will consist of one secondary school (covering Grades 9-12) and all the public schools in its neighbourhood that offer primary education from pre-primary till Grade 8. All the schools that are part of a complex will be chosen due to their proximity to each other, forming a logical geographical group. If for any reason a school complex does not have a secondary school where Grades 9-12 are being taught, then these grades must be introduced in one of the schools. The school complexes will also have pre-school centres/Anganwadi, Vocational Education facilities, an Adult Education Centre, etc. associated with them.

It is further recommended that it will be up to the individual state governments to group schools into school complexes according to the population distribution, road connectivity and other local considerations. The principal of the school will be the head of the school complex. He / she will be endowed with administrative, financial and academic powers to oversee the coordinated development of all the schools within the complex. The principals/head teachers of the other schools within the school complex will report to the head of school complex. They will form a team that will be charged with the responsibility of improving the quality of each individual school in the complex, increase enrolment, reduce dropout rates sharply, and encourage all children to stay in school until Grade 12.

* Former Jt. Secretary, MHRD, GOI and Former Director, NIEPA, New Delhi

BENEFITS THAT MIGHT ACCRUE FROM THE SCHOOL COMPLEXES

Why DNEP places such high importance on establishing school complexes? It is presumed that most of the existing ills of school education system would be taken care of by the school complexes. It is further assumed that the following benefits would accrue to the public (government) schools through school complexes:-

1) School complexes would end the isolation of small schools. The school complex will become the basic unit of educational administration of the public school system.

The school complex will be used to break the severe isolation in which teachers at small schools function today. It will create a community of teachers and principals who can meet face-to-face and work together to support each other - academically and administratively.

2) The grouping of schools across the country into school complexes will enable the sharing of resources across schools including subject teachers, sports, music and art teachers, counsellors, social

workers and so on, and also material resources such as laboratories, libraries and so on. School complexes will be used for increased, improved resources of ICT equipment, musical instruments, sports field etc. - all these resources would thus now be shared and therefore be available to a much larger number of students than possible today.

In short, school complexes will ensure availability of all resources, academic (e.g. libraries) and people (e.g. art and music teachers).

3) The school complexes will help in fostering integrated education. As the primary administrative unit of the public (government) school system, it will also be involved in integrating early childhood care and education. The school complex will provide academic, resource and administrative support to all public institutions engaged in ECCE within the geographical area of the school complex.

It is further recommended the school complex will collaborate with institutions such as ITI's, Polytechnics, etc. with local business (industry, service, agrarian, etc.) health centres and hospitals, artists and artisans, and those with expertise in local crafts and traditions, to offer a range of vocational education courses.

According to the recommendation made, a school complex will be a cluster of public (government) schools in a contiguous geography offering education across all stages - Foundational to Secondary.

Every school complex will create the infrastructure necessary to ensure that appropriate support is available to all CWSN (children with special needs) within the complex. In respect of the type of support that a child requires, she/he should be able to study at one or the other of the schools within the complex, with transport provided as needed.

4) School complexes will have 80-100 teachers each, so that a strong community of teachers can be formed. Such teacher community can support each other and work together more effectively for improving the outcomes at schools, and for their professional development.

The continuous development of teachers will be an important responsibility of the school complex. A comprehensive teacher development plan will be drawn up for the purpose, including modes of development.

In the past also efforts were made to improve the quality of education through programmes like Operation Blackboard after NPE 1986 was launched. The objective of the scheme was providing students studying in primary settings with the necessary institutional equipment and instructional material to facilitate their education. Even provision of additional teacher was made where required. A norm of at least two rooms with a verandah and toilets, and two teachers was sought to be set up. But even today we have more than a lakh of primary schools in the country which lack basic facilities, infrastructure and qualified staff.

Draft New Education Policy has stipulated certain conditions for effective governance through school complexes. It recommends that :-

(i) School complexes will be assigned an adequate number of staff to ensure smooth functioning of the school complex - this will include staff to handle accounts, general administration, etc. and arrangements for cleaning and maintenance of infrastructure. This is in addition to the appropriate numbers of teachers, social workers and counsellors.

(ii) Staff as well as teachers who work with multiple schools in the school complex will be provided with either transport or transport allowance by the head of the school complex.

In the earlier experiments with school complexes none of these conditions could be fulfilled. It remains to be seen whether in the new dispensation these pre-requisites will be made available.

THE CURRENT SCENARIO

During the past 7 decades after independence, our focus has been on access, enrolment and attendance. At last we have attained U.E.E. Nearly 96% children are attending school. But are they learning enough?

The Indian education presents a sad picture in so far as quality is concerned.

With regard to rural education, most exhaustive data

is presented by the Annual State of Education Report (ASER), published by Pratham and its associate NGO's. Ironically, these reports show significant increase in enrolment but continuous decline in achievement levels for the last 10 years or so, these reports point out that :-

- 1) Majority of children attending Class VIII can't do simple multiplication and division.
- 2) Only about 50% of children in Class V can read the text of class II.
- 3) Only 43% of children could divide 3 digit with one digit.
- 4) In last year's report, it was pointed out that 36% of children can't name the capital of India.

There is a learning crisis and there is also a teaching crisis. I believe basic literacy and numeracy can be imparted to almost every child, no matter what his or her socio-economic background. I also believe, the fundamental education can be imparted by an average teacher provided he is earnest about it. It is quite fashionable to say that teachers can excel when provided with a strong support system. It is indeed true. But it is also true that most teachers can ensure minimum learning levels if they perform their duty conscientiously. The quality is continually declining because there is no element of accountability.

NEP need to address this issue of learning crisis as well as teaching crisis. Some recommendations have been made in this direction :-

- 1) State Census Surveys of learning outcomes in Class III, V and VIII.
- 2) The other is about the school complexes which should become the basic unit of educational administration.

The educational administration as it exists to-day cannot deliver the desired results. The Block Education Officer or his equivalent functionary is too remote an entity for managing large number of primary and upper primary schools. The surveys of educational administration conducted by the National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration (NIEPA) bring out the fact that many of the primary and upper primary schools are not inspected even once a year by the concerned supervisory officer. To that extent the recommendation of NEP that these schools should be administered by a system of school complexes is welcome. The school complex has to be the basic unit of educational administration. In fact, this is not a new idea - this was also recommended by Kothari Education Commission in 1968. However, the two state-wise surveys of educational administration conducted by NIEPA has clearly shown that the concept of school complexes has had no impact on improving the quality of education. The experiment failed except for one or two states, where governance improved some what.

The idea is that school complexes should enable schools to share academic and other facilities available

in the complex. But in practice hardly any sharing takes place either of materials or human resources.

Teachers in lead schools lack the competence and motivation to organize meetings, workshops, demonstrations and seminars. The teachers of associated schools do not feel any compulsion in attending these programmes. Coordination is limited to disbursement of salaries and routine administration.

What's required is rigorous monitoring of learning levels at all stages. To that effect, NEP recommendation of regular State Census Surveys for learning outcomes in class III, V and VIII is a valuable recommendation. Schools and teachers should be held accountable if the appropriate levels are not attained. How to ensure that the average teacher puts in requisite effort to impart basic literacy and numeracy? No matter what socio-economic background of the child is, this can be done if sufficient effort is put in. The Draft New Education Policy itself highlights the fact that "if action is not taken, over the next few years the country could lose 10 crore or more

students from the learning system to illiteracy".

ISSUES THAT N.E.P. MUST RESOLVE

The continuous assessment of learning outcomes at different levels and then demanding requisite performance by the schools, is the key issue. Monitoring and accountability are the key factors for improving quality.

I believe we have learnt enough how to run successful businesses, but we are still to devise effective methods of good educational administration to improve quality. More than the issue of larger investment in education, it is important that the existing resources in education are utilized effectively.

In short the issue is of managing education effectively - this has to be addressed effectively by the NEP. How well we devise the school complexes and empower them to discharge their responsibility towards improving quality will determine the future development of the country and whether the demographic dividend will not turn into demographic disaster.

ACADEMIC FREEDOM, INSTITUTIONAL AUTONOMY AND THE FUTURE OF DEMOCRACY

The Global Forum on Academic Freedom, Institutional Autonomy, and the Future of Democracy in its June, 19-21, 2019 Council meeting co-organized by the Council of Europe; the International Consortium for Higher Education, Civic Responsibility and Democracy; the Organization of American States; the Magna Charta Observatory; and the International Association of Universities made 11 declarations. College Post brings to its reader four key declaration for deliberations and debate.

Declaration:

1. Education, including higher education, is responsible for advancing and disseminating knowledge and developing ethical and able citizens. It therefore plays an essential role in modern democratic societies. Education is key to developing, maintaining, and sustaining a culture of democracy without which democratic laws, institutions, and elections cannot function in practice: education furthers and supports a set of attitudes and behaviours that seeks resolution of conflicts through dialogue; that accepts that while majorities decide, minorities have certain inalienable rights; and that sees diversities of background and opinion as a strength rather than as a threat. Education at all levels is therefore critical in helping develop the values, ethic, and ways of thinking on which democratic societies are based and which strengthen opposition and resilience to terrorism and violent extremism.
2. Higher education can only fulfil its mission if faculty, staff and students enjoy academic freedom and institutions are autonomous; principles laid out in the Magna Charta Universitatum as well as the UNESCO Recommendation on the Status of Higher Education Teaching Personnel. Academic freedom and
3. institutional autonomy are essential to furthering the quality of learning, teaching, and research, including include artistic creative practice - quality understood as observing and developing the standards of academic disciplines and also quality as the contribution of higher education to democracy, human rights, and the rule of law. Higher education must demonstrate openness, transparency, responsiveness and accountability as well as the will and ability to work with and contribute to the communities in which colleges and universities reside.
4. The future of democracy is at risk in the absence of academic freedom and institutional autonomy, just as it is when the press, media or civil society organizations are weakened and compromised. Increasingly, these freedoms and institutions are threatened and undermined. The community of faculty, staff and students as well as higher education leaders must combine autonomy and accountability, freedom of research and teaching, and societal responsibility.
4. Faculty, staff, and students, higher education leaders, and public authorities can and should support academic freedom and institutional autonomy and contribute to its implementation. Equally, each can harm, limit and undermine these fundamental democratic values, as we see in too many instances in too many parts of the world. Countries that have counted among the established democracies are not immune to the temptations of silencing critical voices in academia: the Central European University - which provided the keynote address at our Global Forum - is but one example.

Source: <https://rm.coe.int/global-forum-declaration-global-forum-final-21-06-19-003-/16809>

NATIONAL EDUCATION POLICY AND THE STAND ALONE INSTITUTIONS

PROF. FURQAN QAMAR*

The paper analyses the issue of standalone institutions of higher education in India and makes suggestions for revamping them in the light of Draft NEP, 2019

No country in the world has as many different kinds of higher educational institutions as India does. These comprise the central universities, public funded state universities, self-financed private universities, institutions deemed to be universities, colleges the Stand-Alone Institutions (SAIs). Within each of these broad categories, there are numerous other sub-classifications based on the ownership and control, disciplines and subjects, location and gender focus.

THE STAND ALONE INSTITUTIONS (SAIs):

SAIs, like a few other types of higher educational institutions, are peculiar to India. They are neither universities with power to award degrees in their own names nor do they fall under the definition of colleges as they are not affiliated to any university. They essentially offer non-degree programmes and are, therefore, generally outside the purview of higher education. However, since many of them offer programmes and courses at the tertiary or post-senior secondary level, they can be reckoned as a part of the tertiary education. Also, some of them, particularly the PGDM and institutes under different Ministries, offer certificates or diplomas that are considered as equivalent to a university degree, of course subject to the fulfilment of certain conditions. Presented below is a summary of the number of and enrolment in such educational institutions [Table 1].

NUMBER AND DISTRIBUTION OF SAIS

Taken as whole, the Stand-Alone Institutions account for close to 20 percent of the total number of higher educational institutions in the country but since each one of them on an average enrol a little more than 200 students, they account for about 5 percent of the total

enrolment in higher education. As commented by the draft National Education Policy 2019, the average enrolment size for SAIs is no more than 219. Nearly 33% SAIs are Polytechnics which accounts for 70.73 percent of the total enrolment in the stand-alone higher educational institutions. Another 36.87 percent of the SAIs are the teacher training institutions offering non-degree programmes in teacher education and they account for about 12.73 percent of the total enrolment in the stand alone institutions. Those offering programmes in Nursing are 26.73 percent of the total SAIs in the country which

cater to 12.40 percent of the total enrolment in SAIs. No more than 2.69 percent of SAIs offer postgraduate diploma in management (PGDM) which account for 2.39 percent of the total enrolment in SAIs. The institutions under the Ministries themselves are quite varied but account for a mere 1.36 percent of the total SAIs catering to about 1.75 percent of the total enrolment in the stand alone institutions. SAIs are also not uniformly distributed across all states and union territories of the country. In fact 58 percent of SAIs or 5,762 out of 10,011 are located in five States of the country namely Maharashtra (1950), Karnataka (1250), Tamil Nadu (923), Uttar Pradesh (851) and Andhra Pradesh (788). Another

11 states which account for another 37 per cent of the total SAIs comprise Telangana (493), Rajasthan (447), West Bengal (443), Kerala (431), Punjab (374), Odisha (366), Madhya Pradesh (314), Gujarat (308), Haryana (202), Uttarakhand (153) and Bihar (136). Thus, 95 percent of the Stand Alone Institutions are located in 16 states of the country.

ENROLMENT DISTRIBUTION OF SAIS:

As mentioned above, the total enrolment in the Stand Alone Institutions (SAIs) is 21.95 Lakh with a bulk of the enrolment (70.73 percent) being in the polytechnics, which offer diploma level programmes in engineering and technology. Such programmes requires approval of the All India Council for Technical Education (AICTE). This is followed by the enrolment in the teacher training institutes

* Former Secretary General, Association of Indian Universities New Delhi, former Vice Chancellor, Himachal University, and presently Professor, Centre for Management Studies, Jamia Millia Islamia University, New Delhi

Table 1
Number of and Enrolment in the Stand Alone Higher Educational Institutions in India as in 2017-18

	Polytechnics	PGDM	Nursing	Teacher Training Under Ministries	Total
Number	3,239	269	2,676	3,691	10,011
Percentage	32.35%	2.69%	26.73%	36.87%	100.00%
Enrolment	15,52,345	52,432	2,72,176	2,79,342	21,94,615
Percentage	70.73%	2.39%	12.40%	12.73%	100.00%
Enrolment Per Institute	479	195	102	76	219

Source: Computed from: GOI (2019), All India Survey of Higher Education (AISHE) 2017-18, Ministry of Human Resource Development (MHRD)

and the institutes offering courses in nursing, which respectively account for 12.73 and 12.40 percent of the total enrolment in SAIs. Enrolment in the PGDM institutes and the institutes under ministries works out to be 2.39 and 1.75 percent respectively. As was the case with the numbers, the enrolment in SAIs too are not uniformly distributed across all states and the union territories. In fact, 82 percent enrolment or 17.99 Lakh out of 21.95 lakh in SAIs are in 10 states namely, Tamil Nadu (3.63 lakh), Maharashtra (3.04), Uttar Pradesh (2.44), Karnataka (2.00), West Bengal (1.41), Andhra Pradesh (1.39), Odisha (1.23), Telangana (1.14), Punjab (0.99) and Rajasthan (0.72).

IMPLICATIONS OF THE DRAFT NATIONAL EDUCATION POLICY:

The draft National Education Policy 2019 seems committed to change the scenario and proposes to categorize all higher educational institutions into three broad groups - Type 1: Research Universities; Type 2: Teaching Universities; and Type 3: Autonomous Colleges. In the process, the draft policy proposes to do away with the colonial legacy of the affiliation system and, thus, empower all the three types of higher educational institutions to award degrees in their own name. The policy also proposes to consolidate the existing number higher educational institutions and expand their intake capacity and enrolment size. To this effect, it proposes to reduce the number of colleges from nearly 40,0000 at the present to about 10,000 by 2040.

The draft National Education Policy 2019 is by and large silent on the fate and future of the SAIs, though they have been referred to in the context of the school education, teacher education and universities. In the context of the teacher education, the draft policy

document emphasizes that the SAIs are too small in size and are not able to provide quality education. Going by the general approach of the draft National Education Policy, all institutions of higher education have to become multi-disciplinary offering programmes of studies across wide spectrum of higher education and thereby implying that mono-disciplinary standalone institutions would have to become broad-based and multi-disciplinary.

The draft national education policy presents a huge opportunity to the stand-alone institutions as it prescribes to empower them to offer degrees in their names. However, the draft prescribes the conditions of each autonomous college to be of reasonable size and to offer broad-based higher education spanning across disciplines. Most of the stand-alone institutes might find these conditions too difficult to meet within a reasonable period of time and may face closure or merger. It may also be indicated that the impact of such consolidation would differ from type to type and from state to state. Some of the stand alone institute may actually find it difficult to either expand or to become multi-disciplinary. Polytechnics and Nursing institutes are specialised offering a niche kind of courses which have a ready market for their graduates. Even though theoretically it makes a lot of sense for the engineering diploma holders and trained nurses to also be well versed with liberal art education but that is easier said and done. Teachers training institutes are of course being already asked to become multi-disciplinary and are now being urged to become broad-based colleges. PGDM institutes, which have been concerned about their future after the enactment of the IIM Act which empowers them to award degree, would indeed find the draft national Education policy a great reprieve to their existence but they too have to become multi-disciplinary with a wide variety of subjects on offer.

INTERNATIONALIZATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION: SOME NOTES ON THE DRAFT NATIONAL EDUCATION POLICY (DNEP), 2019

DR. BIKAS C. SANYAL *

The paper analyses various phases of internationalization of higher education, reviews present status, draft NEP, 2019 recommendation and makes suggestion for successful implementation of the Policy

BACKGROUND:

Three phases of internationalization in India:

Internationalization of higher education had been the spirit of Indian culture for over thousand years (Taksheela established 700 BC, Nalanda ca700 AD)) with the attitude : Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam (World is one family; universal brotherhood).

In modern times the phenomenon has been influenced by its governance, and can be conceptualized in three phases:

- (i) Colonial Period: India leading the British empire, all British colonies have been attracted to India for adoption of a "Western outlook" to higher education.
- (ii) Post-Independence period of mid twentieth century: Recognition and creation of central systems, controls and national administration (a nationalized system) with importance of new thinking within policy frameworks adapting to changing needs and contexts. With the widening of providers with various structures, contents and modes of delivery internationalization efforts in higher education (HE) were guided by more explicit rationales and comprehensive strategies from both HE providers and the government.
- (iii) 21st Century: The introduction of the General Agreement on Trades in Services including higher education with a multi trillion dollar business, gives a new direction to internationalization of higher education in the 21st Century with its potential to generate revenue.

During this time, the main internationalization policies have been the product of regulatory measures such as the Mysore Statement, which proposed the establishment of a committee for the Promotion of Indian Education Abroad (CoPIE), and advocated to simplify, within the existing legal framework, procedures relating to

registration, entry-test requirements, 'No Objection Certificate' issuance, and visa approvals and extensions.

The "Study India Program (SIP)", the General Cultural Scholarship Scheme (GCSC); the Global Initiative for Academic Networks (GIAN); and the Connect to India program have been operating to attract foreign students and students of Indian origin to India. Many organizations have been working to promote SIP for Indian Institutions, including the Institute for International Education (IIE) in New York, the US-India Educational Foundation in New

Delhi, the Council of International Education Exchange in Hyderabad, the Nordic Centre in India, the Symbiosis International University in Pune, and Jawaharlal Nehru University in New Delhi.

The Amritsar Declaration, supported short term visits by foreign undergraduate students through study abroad programs, as well as promoting Indian education through online efforts and education fair. (Rashim Wadhwa, india's Drive for Internationalization, blog from the Center for International Higher Education, 12 November, 2017)

The recently introduced Ministry of Overseas Indian Affairs' "scholarship programs for Diaspora children" (knowindia, 2012) has also been promoting internationalization of higher education.

Additionally, the leading Indian institutions engage in student exchange programmes and academic collaborations with a number of foreign countries through programs such as UK-India Education and Research Initiative (UKIERI) the Generation UK India initiative, the Indo-US 21st Century Knowledge Initiative and the Fulbright-Nehru programme and Campus France between India and France A Consortium of Universities of India and France had been set up to facilitate the cooperation in higher education between the two countries.

TEN MAJOR TRENDS FOR INTERNATIONALIZATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION

The international non-profit organization with the mission to explore, enter and expand SANNAM S4 (<https://sannams4.com/educhat-april-2019>) has recently

* Former Specialist Higher Education, IIEP, UNESCO, Paris, Former Advisor to DG, UNESCO, Paris,

identified ten trends to watch for in the phenomenon of internationalization of higher education in India as follows.

(1) With a projection of the world's largest workforce by 2027 with the current tag of largest youth population the demand for higher education is only going to rise (2) Students looking for quality foreign education will expand their coverage from USA, Canada, Australia and the UK to Newzealand, Ireland, Germany, China, France, the UAE and Russia leading to continued growth in international mobility and emerging foreign destinations (3) Lack of adequate skills and surplus labour have led the government to cater 500 million individuals by 2022 creating a national policy of skill development with various programs launched under the flagship Skill India campaign needing continued emphasis on skill development (4) The promotion of on line courses as platforms to facilitate access to education and skill development through schemes like SWAYAM for education and IndiaSkills online run by the Ministry of Skill Development and Entrepreneurship will lead to growth of online education and skill development (5) Artificial intelligence is becoming an important tool for transforming higher education around the world's leading universities measures have to be taken to make the higher education system AI ready. (6) There will be growing demand for practical, holistic and interdisciplinary curricula (7) There has to be growing emphasis on R&D and Innovation (8) Private higher education will have faster and more internationalisation because of their entrepreneurial spirit and flexibility of operation. (9) To keep pace with private higher education sector public higher education system has to streamline all the scattered efforts mentioned above and bring them under a single national strategy for improved internationalization (10) Emergence of private and government support for cooperation and provision of adequate funds in establishing ranking frameworks will help ensure that Indian institutions of higher education meet global standards to facilitate internationalisation.

The above developments suggest that the internationalization of higher education has found a place in Indian higher education policy. Still, India's policies on internationalization have had limited impact.. With the third largest higher education system after USA and China currently there are a little over 79000 foreign students enrolled against around 700000 Indian students studying abroad. (D S Aswal, Making India the global hub of higher education, the Statesman Kolkata 25 July, page 7). According to a national estimate India was the 26th ranked country among the top destinations for international student mobility. This accounted for less than 1% of global international student mobility, given that globally, nearly 5 million students were reported to be studying outside their home countries in 2014 (the Draft Educational National Policy, 2019, Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India. Section 12.4).

"ADVANTAGE INDIA" IN INTERNATIONALIZATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Based on an article of Vidya Rajiv Yeravdekar and Gauri Tiwari published in Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences 157 (2014)) I list below ten factors with potential for contribution to India's leading position in internationalization of higher education. These are as follows.

Ten Factors with Potential for Contribution to Internationalization.

1. The authors have called countries who perceive Indian higher education useful e.g., the countries of the gulf region, African and Pacific group states, East Africa and North America as "popular source" countries for promotion of internationalization.
2. The Indian Diaspora with a population of over 25 million in 130 countries promote inbound international students from high concentration countries among them
3. The students of the popular source countries are attracted to India for using English as medium of instruction and with a fraction of the cost of the industrialized countries.
4. Physical proximity of most of the popular source countries.
5. There exists some degree of socio-cultural similarity between India and the popular source countries
6. India's relative political stability and socio-cultural democratization attract international students
7. The vast majority of higher education systems of the South Asian region are based on the "London model" affiliation followed, in most universities of India.
8. The contents, structure and methods of delivery, and evaluation accreditation and examination procedures are also similar.
9. Graduates of international higher education in India are highly appreciated by source countries becoming high level position holders in government and industry., another factor of "Advantage India"
10. India's hegemonic position as the provider of International higher education amongst the popular source countries is related to its overall diplomatic and ambassadorial status and gives the possibility of improving higher education networks that strengthen India's brand standing, especially in the "South Asian Region" as provider of international higher education and leader in knowledge creation and dissemination

To meet the challenges of the major trends of internationalization and take advantage of the potential benefits mentioned above, the Draft National Educational Policy, DNEP, 2019 (ibid) gives special emphasis on internationalization of higher education building on some of the actions already undertaken by different agencies mentioned above as follows:

DNEP: summary of important policy measures

1. Providing internationally relevant education
2. Providing Courses on Indian languages, arts, culture, history, and traditions:
3. Encouraging institutional collaborations (e.g. through twinning arrangements)
4. Facilitating entry of international students and researchers
5. Facilitating stay and integration of incoming students within local communities:
6. Student exchange: experience through short-duration visits to reputed universities abroad. Tie-ups with educational institutions abroad for student exchange programmes
7. Faculty mobility :This could include exchange programmes with designated universities, deputation/lien
8. Research collaborations: : Strategic partnerships between universities in India and abroad.
9. Offshore campuses: Public and private universities that meet specified eligibility criteria will be encouraged to set up campuses in select countries particularly in the Global South
10. MOOCs and open and distance learning: : Indian HEIs will be encouraged to extend the coverage of their ODL programmes to other States and to foreign countries to meet in-country and overseas demands
11. Inviting foreign universities into India: Select universities (i.e. those from among the top 200 universities in the world) will be permitted to operate in India.
12. Outreach and branding: A systematic brand building campaign will be undertaken for attracting students from abroad.
13. Strategy to address some missing issues in the policy:

Although the Draft Policy has been quite exhaustive in promoting internationalizing higher education some important issues appear to have been missed. These are as follows.

1. To make higher education internationally relevant the policy should include use of artificial intelligence in its content and methods of delivery of training and research programs of IHEs (for the latest situation in India see the article "Next- gen AI systems won't need huge amount of data" by Sindhu Hariharan , the Times of India, Kolkata of Monday August 5, 2019)
2. The issue of climate change has become an important challenge to our societies. This should also be included in IHE programs to promote internationalization.
3. Lack of intercultural respect with religious and cultural rigidities violating the traditional Indian spirit of "Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam" recently observed in several campuses of India is an important matter of concern for internationalization of higher education (see item 5 of the DNEP policy mentioned above)
4. Lack of moral and ethical issues in the content and delivery of training in this world of rampant corruption which has invaded higher education itself is another factor inhibiting internationalization
5. Source of funding for implementing the policy issues in to-day's economic situation of the country has not been discussed fully in internationalization. Aggressive attempts of Public-Private Partnership (PPP) building will be necessary. Our investment in building human capital through health and education has been too low in recent years.
6. Let us also not forget that there is a social problem in internationalization of higher education as in any other program of innovation in higher education : increased social inequality. Affirmative actions with the use of AI could identify target groups for corrective measures (See the article on Inclusive Social Development, by the present author in College Post, forthcoming). With the above corrective measures I hope the ambitious agenda of our present government to make India one of leading global hubs of higher education can meet with reasonable success.

...contd. from page 5

scope for state intervention seems to have increased under the new policy proposals. The governance structure envisages increased role for central and state government authorities. Therefore, how autonomy will be negotiated with the multiple agencies and regulatory authorities remains a challenge for institutional leaders.

The NEP 2019 envisages too many changes in terms of restructuring of institutions, programmes of study and flexible pathways to higher education. The reorganization of schools according to the new pattern needs to be seen from the points of administrative and financial feasibilities. The financial outlays required and the new recruitments to be made will be considerable. Similarly, introduction of

four year undergraduate programmes will not only require heavy financial investment but also pose academic challenge to develop new study programmes to meet global standards.

India is getting a new policy on education after three decades. The draft document is inviting comments from various stakeholders. It is expected that a new policy document after reviewing comments from the public and taking into consideration desirability and feasibility of various suggestions will be drafted in the near future for consideration and final approval of the new and, preferably, a shorter document as the New Education Policy of India.

INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION: SOUTH ASIAN UNIVERSITY

DR. KAVITA SHARMA*

One of the important aspects of internationalization of higher education is setting up an institutional arrangement for students from other countries. Initiative of SAARC in setting up South Asian University, New Delhi, India is unique. The paper highlights the beginning and progress of this international university.

INTRODUCTION

The region of South Asia has a large population, majority of it being young with limited access to resources especially formal academic resources. This young population is aspirational and eager to avail of the opportunities that have opened up in today's world. However, this depends on the kind of educational opportunities that they get. Also, this area has the challenges of poverty, inequality, gender issues, paucity of health facilities and lack of connectivity. Knowledge and education is the key to solving these problems. Further, South Asia is conflict ridden which only increases these challenges. Its strengths however, are :its young people, its strong civilizational heritage, knowledge, traditions and an aspiration to develop and grow.

There is a lot of emphasis now-a-days on diversity on university campuses and internationalization of higher education. The ICT revolution has made us all neighbours who need to understand each other. Globalization demands that universities produce graduates who can work at different places in the world. A knowledge society has emerged globally in which creation and dissemination of knowledge happens at great speed and development and growth depends on education, innovation and entrepreneurship.

Keeping the challenges of South Asia in mind and of the new world that lies before the people with all its demands of diversity and development, the then Prime Minister, Dr. Manmohan Singh proposed the establishment of South Asian University to be founded by all the member states of SAARC. This was done by him at the 13th SAARC Summit on 12-13 November, 2005 in Dhaka, Bangladesh. This proposal was accepted by the SAARC member states and an agreement for the establishment of SAU was signed by the Foreign Ministers of all SAARC countries on April 4, 2007. After this, a project office was set up and the university started its first academic session in July, 2010.

* President, South Asian University, New Delhi, India

VISION

The concept note for the proposed University was written by Prof. Gowher Rizvi, currently adviser to the Prime Minister of Bangladesh, Sheikh Hasina. From this emerged the mandate for the South Asian University which the SAARC member states agreed to.

The mandate of the South Asian University, as set out in the Agreement of the SAARC member states under which the University is set up, envisages that the choice of the programs of studies to be offered at this University should:

- € enhance learning in the South Asian community that promotes an understanding of each others' perspectives and strengthens regional consciousness;
- € provide liberal and humane education to the brightest and the most dedicated students of South Asia so that a new class of quality leadership is nurtured; and
- € enhance capacity building of the South Asian nations in science, technology and other areas of higher learning vital for improving their quality of

life such as information technology, bio-technology and management sciences, etc.

These three elements i.e. building a culture of understanding and regional consciousness; nurturing a new class of liberal, bright and quality leadership and building the capacity of the region in science, technology and other disciplines considered vital for improving the quality of life of the people, therefore, form the core objectives of the South Asian University. It is expected that when young people study and live together, old biases and prejudices will gradually fall away and this will lead to peace, co-operation and prosperity.

FUNDING

The Government of India undertook to contribute the major share required for the establishment of the university by agreeing to provide 100 acres of land together with all the required capital costs. In addition it gives about 60% of the operational costs, the rest being shared by the other seven countries of SAARC. The University has half students from India and the other half are from the other

The region of South Asia has a large population, majority of it being young with limited access to resources especially formal academic resources. This young population is aspirational and eager to avail of the opportunities that have opened up in today's world.

seven SAARC countries the largest numbers coming from Afghanistan, Bangladesh and Nepal. Increasingly, more students from Bhutan are joining the university. There are also students from Sri Lanka and Pakistan but from Maldives, there are very few perhaps because of the small population base of Maldives. The under represented countries may have more students studying at SAU once the university has an undergraduate programmes. At the moment, the university only has Masters and Doctoral programmes.

STUDENTS

Since the students in SAU get a regional perspective of the challenges facing the region, the curriculum of the university is different from that of other central and state universities. It gives a wider perspective and provides an understanding of the entire region itself. This is unique and draws students to SAU. Of the total intake at both Masters and PhD levels only half the students are from India. The rest come from the other seven countries who are admitted according to an agreed mechanism, after the entrance exam conducted by the University simultaneously in all the eight countries.

Students in the university come together for education in its widest terms. As education is not confined to the classroom, they also learn as they work together on projects and papers, and participate in conferences and seminars. There are plenty of co-curricular and extra-curricular activities too, that bring them together. It is a transformational experience as seen from the feedback we receive from the students. Many biases and prejudices get washed away and a more realistic assessment emerges. Bonds are forged that would hopefully last for a lifetime. It is heartening to see that on their return to their countries, many non-Indian students get very good placements or pursue further education even in other countries in renowned universities, often at the doctoral or post-doctoral level. The Indian students too get absorbed in a variety of jobs and also go out of the country for further studies.

THE FUTURE

While currently there are about six hundred students at the Masters and Doctoral levels, the number of students will gradually increase as the number of faculties and departments in the university expand. Right now the construction of the campus is in full swing and 12 buildings are coming up of which at least four are expected to be ready by end of this year. In the next couple of years, as the major part of the campus gets ready the university will expand into atleast ten faculties and sixteen departments. This will lead to even greater diversity of students and faculty.

The university has done well in the short period of time since its establishment in spite of infrastructural constraints. This is evident from the growing number of students seeking admission to the university and the increasing number of offers of collaborations coming from universities outside India including some leading universities outside the region. Further, academic events at the university host a large number of scholars from South Asian countries and even beyond from western countries. The university also goes out to collaborate with universities in South Asia to hold joint conference and seminars. Conferences have been held in Dhaka, Colombo and Kathmandu in collaboration with counterparts in their respective universities. The university has taken the lead whenever required to help in curriculum formulation whenever any university in the region has asked for it.

EXPANSION

The university will finally have a student population of 5000 and faculty strength of 500. The infrastructural constraints prevent the academic expansion of the university at the moment and so it has five faculties with seven departments. These are Faculty of Social Sciences with Department of Sociology and International Relations, Faculty of Life Sciences and Biotechnology, Faculty of Economics, Faculty of Legal Studies and Faculty of Mathematics and Computer Science. A unique and innovative feature of the University is a think tank embedded in the University itself, the Institute of South Asian Studies which provides a platform for interdisciplinary research involving two or more countries. Work has already begun along these lines and some research projects have already been undertaken. This will get a huge boost once space is available in the new campus.

CONCLUSION

As the university grows, I am sure, it will rank amongst the top universities in this region and in the world. This is truly a collaborative venture with eight governments coming together to make it succeed. Given this commitment, the University aspires to produce leaders of tomorrow who will look towards ameliorating the lives of the people in this region rather than getting bogged down by past baggage. I am sure that with all stakeholders coming together, this will be possible although the conversations will always be very dynamic and vibrant as the university charts its own course through hitherto un- explored paths. Perhaps, this kind of collaborative effort is where the future of education lies, if we are all to grow and prosper together harmoniously and live peacefully.

This column brings out briefs of : Ph.D, M.Phil Researches in Education, Economics of Education, Social, Political, Psychology aspects of education conducted in University /College departments. It also brings out briefs on researches done by Research Institutions, Industry and NGOs. This column was introduced from April-June, 2016 issue of College Post. Method of reporting the researches completed and in progress was given in that issue. Interested researchers, professors and Heads of institute are requested to send their brief accordingly. Purpose of this column is to highlight the researches in education conducted in university and college departments and in any other institution /industry and NGO for the benefit of policy makers, research scholars, thinkers. Readers are welcome to encourage relevant person and institute to send briefs on research done and being done in education.

This issue brings to you briefs on following researches in Education.

PH.D THESIS

Title: Three Essays on Education and Labour Outcome in India, Researcher Jain Chandan, Guide Proferssor Ashokankur Datta, University - Shiv Nadar University, Noida , NCR , Completed 2019

This thesis consists of three different chapters that analyses educational and labour market outcomes in the Indian context. This has been done by using data from two rounds of the NSS Employment and Unemployment Survey, The thesis provide estimates for the number of individuals employed in schools and the share of schools in the total labour force in India. The thesis presents estimates separately for males and females and in addition it presents estimates for different regions in the country as well.

Key Findings:

The estimates suggest that

- (a) schools constitute a significant share in the female labour force in the country.
- (b) that schools constituted the largest share of females employed within the services sector in the country.
- (c) that despite the decline in the overall female labour force in rural areas, the number as well as the percentage of females employed in schools have rather increased over time. Thus, there is a significance of schools for the overall female labour force in the country.

The thesis also present evidence for the effectiveness of two supply side programmes (NPEGEL & KGBV) that were implemented towards raising educational outcomes for girls in rural areas of the country. Using regional variation in programme implementation.

The thesis reveals that

- (a) the programmes did lead to an increase in the likelihood of school attendance and primary school

completion for girls who were exposed to the two programmes.

- (b) That the effects of the two programmes on upper primary school completion as well.
- (c) The thesis shows the casual effect of the two programmes by using the triple difference framework. This has been done using different checks in order 98 to ensure that results are robust and besides, it provides falsification tests in order to ensure that results are not driven by any pre-existing trends.
- (d) Finally, the effect of the two programmes on female labour force participation the thesis finds that the implementation of the two programmes did lead to an increase in the likelihood of an education female being active in the labour force. Thus it provides evidence for the direct effect of educational programmes on labour force participation.
- (e) The thesis analyses changes in gender differences in learning outcomes over time. It uses data from three rounds of the ASER survey. The results indicate that gender differences in learning outcomes exist despite the various educational interventions in the recent past.
- (f) Additionally, it is found that gender differences in learning outcomes have rather increased over time and that boys continued to outperform girls.
- (g) The study also finds considerable heterogeneity in the observed differences across different level of mothers education and regions in the country.
- (h) With regard to regional variation, the study reveals that girls performed much worse in regions that are associated with low female status.

Title: Education Infrastructure and Growth: An analysis of higher education in Haryana, Researcher: Suraj Walia, Guide Professor Goel M.M., Department of Economics, University Kurukshetra University, Haryana Completion year 2017

The study has examined the nature & extent as well as the growth rate of higher education infrastructure in Haryana. Percentage method and Compound Annual Growth Rate (CAGR) have been used to analyze the higher education infrastructure in Haryana.

Key Findings

1. Over the period of time, different types of universities (State public, State private, Deemed and Central) have increased from total number 1 in 1966-67 to 43 in 2015-16 in Haryana. And Arts and Science colleges have increased from 40 in 1966-67 to 238 in 2015-16.
2. In 1991-92, the total colleges were 167 in Haryana, out of which 45 were Government and 122 were aided colleges. At that time, there was no unaided college. Over the period of time, total colleges have increased to 903, Out of which 103 were Government, 106 were aided colleges and remaining 694 were un-aided colleges.

3. Number of General colleges has increased from 132 in 1991-92 to 791 in 2012-13." To reduce the gender disparity, growth of colleges exclusively for women has also increased from 35 in 1991-92 to 112 in 2012-13
4. Enrolment of both boys and girls in Arts, Science and Home Science colleges have increased but out of the total enrolment, enrolment of girls is more than boys which indicates that participation of girls in higher education has increased over the period of time in Haryana

2. Relationship between higher education and Economic Development

- (a) The relationship, is examined by simple linear regression model. The result states that regression coefficient is 379.275 which is significant at 1% level. The standard error of regression parameter (σ_k) is also low i.e. 10.363. The value of R^2 is 0.983 which reveals the fact that higher education is capable of explaining more than 98 per cent of variations in GSDP. Value of correlation coefficient (R) is 0.992 which implies the high degree of co-variation between GSDP and HEE. The value of F-statistics is also significant. In brief, the results of regression model indicate that higher education expenditure is positively related to GSDP of Haryana
- (b) Thus expenditure on higher education infrastructure requires 14 years to make its significant contribution to the growth of Haryana economy. It can be concluded that there is a relationship between past values of HEE (higher education infrastructure) and GSDP (economic growth) and the results of this regression suggest that past values of HEE do lead to GSDP of Haryana.

Causality :

1. The results of Granger Causality test finally confirmed that there is the presence of bidirectional causality between HEE and GSDP that is HEE leads to GSDP (HEE \Rightarrow GSDP) as well as GSDP leads to HEE (GSDP \Rightarrow HEE) tells ways to know correlation between the current value of one variable and past value of others, it does not imply that movement of one variable causes movement of other variables.

Title: A study of the relationship between education and economic development in Kenya, Researcher: Issack Abdirahman Ali, Guide(s): P. K Gupta, University: North-Eastern Hill University, Departments: Department of Education

The thesis examines relationship between education and economic development of Kenya covering whole of Kenya, counties of Kenya and Garisaa Town of Kenya.

Key Findings

1. Literacy Rate and Economic indicators Though not

significant, the rate of literacy does influence the economic growth rate of Kenya moderately. However, the rate of literacy substantially influences the per capita income of Kenya.

2. Gross Enrolment Ratio at Primary level of Education and Economic indicators

Though not significant, the gross enrolment ratio at primary level of education in Kenya does influence the economic growth rate at a low pace. However, the Gross enrolment ratio at primary level of education in Kenya has a substantial influence on per capita income

3. Gross Enrolment Ratio at Secondary level of Education and Economic indicators

Though not significant, the gross enrolment ratio at secondary level of education in Kenya does influence the economic growth rate moderately. However, the gross enrolment ratio at secondary level of education in Kenya has a substantial influence on per capita income.

4. National Education Budget and Economic indicators

Though not significant, the national education budget in Kenya does influence the economic growth rate moderately. However, the national education budget in Kenya substantially influences per capita income.

5. Pass Percentage at Primary level of Education and Economic indicators.

Though not significant, the pass percentage at primary level of education does influence the economic growth rate and per capita income in Kenya. Pass Percentage at Secondary level of Education and Economic indicators The pass percentage at secondary level of education substantially influences both the economic growth rate and per capita income of Kenya.

6. Gross Enrolment Ratio at Primary level of Education and Economic indicators, in respect of different Counties of Kenya.

There is a negative relationship between the gross enrolment ratio at primary level of education and average growth rate in respect of different counties of Kenya. In this case, the negative correlation 10 leads us to conclude that the relationship is false and therefore point out to the state of no relationship.

Findings of the present study at Garissa town of Kenya reveal that more general education provides people with more productive education that increase their productivity at work. The more productivity is rewarded with more earnings which in turn help to promote the economic development. Similarly, vocational education provides people with some useful skills which make them increase their productivity at work in Garissa town of Kenya. This means more-skills lead to larger-productivity and higher earnings. The productivity is rewarded with more earnings and creates more production and in turn helps to promote the economic development.

GOI BUDGET 2019-20 AND DRAFT NATIONAL EDUCATION POLICY

Draft National Education Policy report has raised a lot of hopes about the allocation of resources for school and higher education. In fact, this innovative report has suggested several structural and programme of education level reforms both in school and higher education, including vocational and adult and continuing education. The report rightly recommended that public expenditure on education and higher education has to be doubled. That is from 3 per cent GDP it should be raised to 6 per cent of GDP or the public expenditure on education may be raised from 10% to 20% of budgetary allocation. It may be mentioned that this was also recommended by Education Commission 1964-66 and often repeated by several committees during the subsequent decades. But in practice, the Government of India has not spent more than 3 per cent GDP on education.

The draft education policy has even provided a tabular form for additional allocation of funds to various sectors within education and higher education. But the Budget Speech of Finance Minister does not reflect the seriousness of the present government about the implementation of the draft National Education Policy, 2019. The budget speech of FM does mention about the likely announcement of Policy, but it hardly reflects on likely budgetary requirement in the financial year 2019-20..

The FM has of course mentioned about National Research Foundation in a "Vague" way. FM mentions that it would pool funds from various Ministries presently spending on research and give additional fund if needed. To quote "The funds available with Ministries will be integrated into NRF. This would be adequately supplemented with additional funds." The word adequate is very vague as far as the financial allocation is concerned. The draft policy has mentioned about the creation of the National Research Foundation with an allocation of Rs.20,000 crores.

BUDGET ALLOCATION ON HIGHER EDUCATION:

The budget does mention about the allocation of Rs.400 crores for creating World Class universities. Which in fact may go to select public and private universities and the rest of the system may not benefit from it.

The budgetary allocation on education and higher education has a marginal increase from revised budget on revenue account - which in fact meets committed expenditure on running the system such as salaries and other working expenses. These items have an increasing trend owing to the rise in prices. On the revenue account, there is an increase of 14 per cent on net budget outlay and 13 per cent on gross budget outlay.

Capital account allocation is less than the revised budget for the previous financial year. The revised budget was Rs.2751 crores and budget estimates in only Rs.2120 crores for the financial year 2019-20.

THE FALL OUT:

Let us guess what is possible fall out of the lack of fund allocation for implementing suggested reforms by the Draft National Education Policy. One possibility is that it may take little more time for the government to consider the draft and workout its possible financial and other implications. This process may take a little longer time than what was expected after the draft is put on the public domain. The other possibility is that there would be lot of pruning of draft policy recommendations to avoid possible financial and other implications. To avoid both these possibilities academia at large should voice their views on implementation of draft Education Policy Agenda, 2019.

TELENGANA STATE APATHY ABOUT HIGHER EDUCATION AND DRAFT NEP, 2019

Telangana state has made a history by appointing incharge Vice Chancellor of eight Universities by serving IAS personal occupying full time position their respective jobs. Although there are provisions in the Acts of universities to appoint officiating Vice Chancellor from among the academics of the University, yet government by first delaying the process of appointment as per the Acts of the University had preferred to ignore academics and appoint serving bureaucrats to head universities as incharge Vice Chancellor. Eight Universities include very old and known Osmania University, Hyderabad. The issue is how do we interpret this move particularly when Draft NEP, 2019 envisages that university should be hub of innovations and change, it should, through research contribute to the development of society. It also envisages university to be multidisciplinary, autonomous, enjoy academic freedom and accountable to the society.

Universities become world class only when it is autonomous, have academic freedom, freedom of expression and democratic values. Present trends are in opposite direction. The World Academic Community Forum has given call for three priorities in higher education in future. These are : Academic Freedom and autonomy, social accountability and democracy. It has also wished state to support higher education along with universities to attempt diversify their resources so that they enjoy more autonomy. College Post appeals every academic to have a look at these resolutions and debate on them along with debate on our own draft National Education Policy, 2019.

Higher Education Policy Institute, UK and Kaplan International Pathways, Kaplan has brought a report about the impact of restricting post graduates study work visa to foreign students. The report highlights that financial contribution from students to UK economy annually account for 3.2 Billion pounds. The report point out that contribution of foreign students other than from Europe is more than students from Europe i.e, 2. Billion pounds and 1.2 billion pounds respectively. Contrary to perception that the overseas students take away jobs from domestic students, report says that foreign students have filled the skill shortage in UK economy by Engineering, medicine and other graduates. To quote:

"The analysis additionally shows international graduates who find employment in the UK typically do so in sectors that suffer from acute skills shortages. Rather than displacing domestic graduates, international graduates are plugging skills shortages."

Report further states that Home Office Policy 2012 to restrict post studies visa has cost UK economy 150 Millian Pounds as foregone receipts annually. Over the period it has cost almost 1 Billion pounds since 2012 policy restricting post study work.

The Director of Higher Education Policy Institute, Nick Hillman, said :

"Universities firmly believe the Government's biggest mistake in higher education has been to discourage international students from coming here. A hostile environment has been in place for nearly a decade. It is a testament to the strengths of our higher education sector that the number of international students has not fallen, but it is an absolute tragedy that we have been unable to keep up with the pace of growth in other countries."

Linda Cowan, Senior Vice President, Kaplan International Pathways, said:

"We now have evidence that one of the many ways international students contribute to our economy is by filling skills shortages. Given their high level of English competency and impressive academic achievements, we should be doing everything possible to encourage them to stay and work here. To do this, we need to reinstate attractive and competitive post-study work rights for all international students. We must go further than the recommendations in the Migration Advisory Committee report, and included in the Government's recently released International Education Strategy, which would continue to place the UK behind other countries."

Source and courtesy: www.topuniversities.com

FREE TUITION FOR MEDICAL STUDENTS IN USA

New York University, USA School of Medicine has offered free tuition cost to all past and present students. This includes international students. New York University is first 5 top ranked university in medicine to make this offer. The cited concern that heavy debt on the students on account of tuition cost may put students to choose only very lucrative specialization or may put off students from

medicine studies. This scheme will benefit 443 current students and will cover tuition fee of \$55,000 per year. However students would require to self fund for room and food which comes around \$27,000 per year.

The scheme was made possible by donations from 2500 supporters and \$100 million gift from Kenneth George Longone and his wife Aliene after whom the school is named.

Source and Courtesy: www.topuniversities.com

IMPORTANCE OF RESEARCH

In a recently held G20 meeting it said that "The world's most prosperous economies are also among the most innovative ones and innovation is driven first and foremost by research." The G20 countries in recently held meeting at Osaka in 28-29 June, 2019 has brought a Research Score Card of 19 countries in the group. The score card is brought out by the Institute of Scientific information (ISI). "What happens in the G20 affects the world and the G20 group is undoubtedly a driver in the global research system," writes Professor Jonathan Adams, director of the ISI and a visiting professor at King's College London in the United Kingdom. He co-authored the report with Dr Martin Szomszor, head of research analytics at the ISI, and Gordon Rogers, an ISI senior data scientist.

The G20 is a group of 19 leading economies spread around the globe that represents more than 80% of the world's gross domestic product or GDP and two-thirds of global population.

The score card is not a concept of raking, but it is a description of the impactful research. The Research Score Card has been published for The ISI report has the following observation for India:

There is no readily available recent data on Gross Expenditure on Research and Development (GERD) for researchers, so the ISI could not index productivity, but volume output appears to be relatively low for such a large economy. International collaboration remains relatively low level and open access has been adopted only in bio-medicine. These factors all contribute to a relatively weak Impact Profile and low citation impact across all areas.

Among the G20 Countries which have relatively better score card is UK, Canada, China, Germany South Korea and USA. South Korea spent relatively very high amount i.e 4.5 of GDP on Research and Development. The figure for Japan is 3.2%, Germany 3%, USA 2.8% and China 2.1% of GDP of these respective countries.

ISI study probes key questions relevant to the health of a research enterprise. The author writes "The answers hold clues to which nations will likely be the winners and losers in the crucial process of translating research into innovation and, subsequently, into national prosperity and security."

Importance of research and innovations being so it is imperative for India and FM to commit the higher level of funding for research and development in all the areas of research.

Source and Courtesy: www.topuniversities.com

Jharkhand is stated to be the backward state with rich in natural resources and very dedicated people for development and jest for life. I grew in an environment full of challenges to develop and perform. What makes us to grapple with difficult and challenging situations is knowledge and commitment to transfer the practical and intellectual learning to our job situations and to our students.

After serving for about 23 years in academics, after my Post Graduation and PhD in economics as lecturer, Reader and Professor in several colleges and University departments, I had an opportunity to serve as Principal of several University Colleges in Ranchi University Service.

When I was in Jawaharlal Lal Nehru College, Chakradharpur I got an opportunity to be a member of the SEED and attended Seventh Principals' Conference in Pune and subsequently attended a week-long workshop on Leadership Development of Principals through IT organized by ICF, New Delhi. I was made computer - literate formally and learnt the basics of Leadership - Knowledge Smart and Vision. This was a sort of turning point for making forays in innovations and change in higher education. I prepared a proposal for starting B.Sc. I.T. course in the college and succeeded in my endeavour to introduce ICT in College and train students in this new subject by the beginning of 21st Century. In fact, these two events formed the landmark in my academic career and paved the way for further achievements.

This innovation and change brought a change in my career and I was appointed as Registrar of Ranchi University on 8th January 2003 and worked for about six years with the same motto of service and development of University. I could inculcate the sense of responsibility and learnt the intricacies of administration. I came out successfully in getting work done through team building and mentoring each and every member of the team.

I had the opportunity to work for a year as Director of the Institute of Science and Management, Punag, Ranchi. I was fortunate enough to attend AIMS Management Conventions, many international conferences and world summits during this period. I could learn the mystery of management and equipped myself with the management traits.

Destiny had another role for me to give leadership to a university as Vice-Chancellor. I was appointed Vice-Chancellor of the Ranchi University and I joined on 1st February 2012 for a tenure of three years. As a matured administrator I enjoyed my duty with great many best practices introduced during my tenures, such as the innovative programme of 'University at the Doorstep' and developmental grants/fund sanctioned and released in the

college premises itself, for which the principals had to run to the University office for long. Many educational social responsibility activities were introduced in the University. The University was recognized as one of the 'Best Regional University' by an international organization and was awarded with a certificate and well-engraved memento during the Oxford Summit of Leaders - 2013 in the campus of Oxford University, Oxford, U.K. University was also identified as the second fast-growing State universities in India during 2012 by India Today.

I was also elected as a member of AIMS Executive Board, Regional Vice-President and finally AIMS President for the year 2015-16. Here I shared my vision of management education with a larger body of management experts including scholars. I had great satisfaction in serving the cause of higher education and management education.

I would like to convey a message to the members of ICF that doing the duty for the sake of duty and doing the duty by being involved in it are two different things. The latter gives success, prosperity and satisfaction. One more thing I would like to add that in performing my duty in all elevated posts I fully complied with the sense of responsibility and treated myself, on my part as Professor of Economics and nothing else and succeeded with great satisfaction and record performance.



Prof. L. N. Bhagat

College Post invites Heads of Colleges, VC of universities and Directors of higher education to send their report in less than 1000 words about best practices and innovations in the area of academic, governance, contribution to society and achievements in sports and culture. Selected reports will be published under the proposed CP column on innovations and best practices in higher education.

IS CAPITALISM AND DEMOCRACY COMPATIBLE? Confronting Capitalism- Real Solutions for a troubled Economic System, Phillip Kotlar, American Management Association, Broadway, New York, 2015 Pp 248

In economic thought process over the last one century or so two major thought processes have dominated the literature and practices in the world. Karl Marx predicted collapse of capitalism owing to its own contradictions. On the other side were Friedrich Hayek and Milton Friedman advocated free market capitalism as the most efficient economic system. However, 1930s depression punched whole in this theory. The saviour of capitalism- John Maynard Keynes suggested state intervention to solve the problem by creating demand. Followed by him, monetary and developmental economists demonstrated that capitalism can survive and inner contradiction of capitalism can be tackled through state intervention using monetary and developmental policies. The contradiction in capitalism arises from market forces inevitably leading to rise in inequalities in the society.

In a recent issue The Economist- 15th June, 2019 carried a write up titled "Is Democracy compatible with Capitalism? The narrative tells us that "World's old democracies have begun to look more vulnerable than venerable" The argument is that the rise in inequalities may create a social unease and may lead to collapse of democracies. Other set of political economists counter the argument by stating "the fact that past century this has not happened". But no one, however, has succeeded in rebutting the obvious: inequalities naturally rise in capitalist countries and that "political power becomes concentrated alongside economic power in an unstable way" A book by Picketty "Capital in 21st Century giving historical account- mentions that inequities are rising in capitalism over the century. There is however, a counter view which shows inequalities can be corrected and that capitalism and democracies can be made compatible". Joseph Stieglitz book "Re-writing the rules of American Economy" reviewed in the College Post Vol.16 No. 3 year 2018 - was one that attempted to suggest the correction which American capitalist economy needs to do to continue to sustain itself.

A recent publication tilted above by Phillip Kotlar dealing again with American economy brings out with

piercing clarity, 14 major problems undermining capitalism including persistent poverty, job creation in the face of automation, high debt burdens, disproportionate influence of the wealthy on public policy, steep environmental costs and boom bust economic cycles, and more. Kotlar has put these problems in 14 chapters.

The fourteen shortcomings, as conventional wisdom would show; are not independent of each other. They are highly interrelated. The problem of poverty is part of the problem of income inequality, which itself ends up in low demand and too much unemployment leads to clash between austerity and stimulus as two remedies. This brings politics of vote catching, political lobbying for and against liberalization, financial regulation and protection of environment etc.,

The inter-relationship among various shortcomings mentioned above, the author tells us, that working on one problem so many other issues come into play. These issues are addressed by legislatures and is generally seen that in a democracy they tend to vote on one big issue at a time neglecting in the process the vast inter connections. This results in piece meal solutions- only short term solution, at the cost of fixing the problem which provides a lasting solution.

Not agreeing with the current state of affairs exhibited by the policy makers, he mentions solutions to each of these problems as a stimulus to thinking. He believes, that there are enough intelligent, talented and committed people who want to talk about these problems and hopefully create and agree on reasonable solutions so that capitalism work more effectively.

In sum, the book is useful reading for scholar and policy makers, who intend to understand the functioning of the market economy operating under capitalist system and their shortcomings. The book on the whole can be said to have been written in defence of capitalism.

Prof. SC Sharma

Publishers and institutions are invited to send their latest publication on education and development for review in Book Review column.



GD GOENKA UNIVERSITY

GURUGRAM, DELHI NCR INDIA

GD GOENKA UNIVERSITY

RANKED NO.1
BEST UPCOMING PRIVATE UNIVERSITY


NATIONAL EDUCATION SUMMIT 2019

25
years
 Experience in the
 field of education
GD GOENKA
SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING
RANKED NO.1
EMERGING ENGINEERING INSTITUTE 2019
THE TIMES OF INDIA
 TIMES ENGINEERING SURVEY 2019
GD GOENKA
SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT
RANKED NO.1
EMERGING BBA INSTITUTE 2019
Times 3 School
 TIMES BBA EDUCATION RANKING 2019

INSTITUTIONAL MEMBERSHIP



INDIA'S LEADING EDUCATION GROUP IMPARTING KNOWLEDGE FROM PRE-NURSERY TO Ph.D.

UNIVERSITY ADMISSIONS OPEN IN THE AREAS OF

SCHOOL OF
AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES
SCHOOL OF
HUMANITIES & SOCIAL SCIENCE
SCHOOL OF COMMUNICATION
SCHOOL OF
EDUCATION

SCHOOL OF BASIC & APPLIED SCIENCES
SCHOOL OF
ARCHITECTURE &
PLANNING

SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING

 Innovation Centre for Education
 B.Tech (CSE) programs

SCHOOL OF
FASHION &
DESIGN

SCHOOL OF
LAW

SCHOOL OF
MEDICAL &
ALLIED SCIENCES

SCHOOL OF HOSPITALITY

in academic collaboration with


SCHOOL OF
MANAGEMENT


GD GOENKA HIGHLIGHTS

3500+ Students

100+ Programmes

30+ Global Tie Ups

60+ Acres

45+ Nationalities

200+ Faculty

1:15 Student Faculty Ratio

Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.)
 in all disciplines (Full-Time/Part-Time)

HOSTEL FACILITY

 Starting from @ 70,000 onwards
 per semester inclusive of A/C room,
 4 meals a day, laundry, DTH,
 study room, sports facility etc.

98716 00045 / 98716 00054

 G D GOENKA UNIVERSITY | G D GOENKA EDUCATION CITY
 Gurugram Sohna Road, Delhi-NCR, Haryana-122103, India

Discover GD Goenka University

www.gdgoenkauniversity.com

College Post R. No. 65288/95
ISBN 978-81-929059-0-7

seed...

Society for Education and Economic Development,
Kh. No. 774/6 Village Mandi, New Delhi-110047



Centre for Higher Education Studies and Training



Indian College Forum
A Professional Body of Colleges of India

COLLEGE POST

College Post - The higher education journal
Centre for Economic Analysis and Development



International Centre for WTO and WIPO Studies



Women Empowerment through Micro Enterprise
(WEME)

Other Centers

- **Centre for Assessment of Standards in Education**
- **Centre for Public Policy and People**
- **Centre for International Cooperation and Peace**

College Post Editorial Board :

GD Sharma, Baldev Mahajan, M.M. Pant, S. Bhushan, S.C. Sharma, Kavita Sharma & Kunal Mathur

Published and Edited by Dr. G.D. Sharma on behalf of the Society for Education and Economic Development, from KH. No. 774/6, Mandi Village, Main Mandi Road, Near Mandi & Gurgaon Border, New Delhi-110047. Lasertypeset by Suvridha Computers, 86 A, Adchini, New Delhi-110017, and printed at Supreme Offset Press, K-5, Malviya Nagar, New Delhi-110017
Printed on 4th September 2019