

# **Higher Education in India**

## **Emerging Issues Related to Access, Inclusiveness and Quality**

**Sukhadeo Thorat  
Chairman  
University Grant Commission  
New Delhi**

**Nehru Memorial Lecture**

**University of Mumbai ,Mumbai**

November ,24,2006

# **Higher Education in India**

## **Emerging Issues Related to Access, Inclusiveness and Quality**

**Sukhadeo Thorat**

### **Introduction**

It is little more than half a century ever since the government initiated a planned development of higher education in the country particularly with the establishment of University Grants Commission in 1953. Thus early 1950's is an important reference points from which we could look back at our progress of higher education.

An Approach to the 11<sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan is being formulated. Currently the issue of higher education is being discussed at various level .In this context in this Nehru Memorial Lecture I, wish reflect on the progress of higher education in the country. Several issues have figured in the discussion on the higher education but among those relating to Access, Equity and Quality are the most important which have prominently figured in the current discussion. Given the importance of these issues I wish to deal with these three issues.

In doing so I take a review of achievement ; discuss the emerging need of higher education and ponder over the possible directions for further advancement of the higher education in the country.

### **Governing Goals of Higher education**

It is necessary to recognized that the present approach towards higher education is governed by the "National policy on Education" of 1986 and Program of Action of 1992, .The 1986 policy and Action Plan of 1992 was based on the two land marks report namely ,the "University Education Commission" of 1948-49 (popularly known as Radhakrishnan Commission ), and the "Education Commission" of 1964-66,( popularly known as Kothari Commission Report).These two landmark reports in fact laid down the basic framework for the National policy for higher education in the country.

The University Education Report had set goals for development of higher education in the country. While articulating these goals Radakrishnan Commission on University Education, 1948-49 put it in following words :

***"The most important and urgent reform needed in education is to transform it, to endeavor to relate it to the life, needs and aspirations of the people and thereby make it the powerful instrument of social, economic and cultural transformation necessary for the realization of the national goals. For this purpose, education should be developed so as to increase productivity, achieve social and national integration, accelerate the process of modernization and cultivate social, moral and spiritual values."***<sup>2</sup>

The National Policy on higher education of 1986 translate this vision of Radhakrishnan and Kothari Commission in five principles goals for higher education which include Greater Access, Equal access (or equity), Quality and excellence, Relevance and promotion of social Values .

The policy directions and actions covered in 1992 "Program of Action "have been developed in a manner such that it translate these goals in to practice.

Given the importance of first three goals, namely Access, Equal Access and quality. I confine the discussion to these three issues. But before I do let us take the over view of the created institutional capacity for higher education since the establishment of University Grant commission in 1953.

### **Expansion in Higher education Institutional Capacity**

Since the early 1950's higher education has been diversified and extended its reach and coverage quite significantly.

At the time of independence, 1947, the size of higher education system in terms of number of educational institutions, and teachers was meager but since that time there has been an exponential increase in three indicators of higher education, namely the number of educational institutions, teachers and students .

The number of universities has increased from 20 in 1947 to about 357 in 2005 indicating a thirteen-fold increase.

There are now 20 Central Universities, 217 State Universities, 106 Deemed to be Universities, and 13 Institutes of National Importance established through Central legislation and .5 Institutions established through State legislation,

The number of colleges increased from 500 in 1947 to 17,625 in 2005, indicating twenty-six-fold increase.

In the spheres of technical education by 2004 we had about 1265 engineering and technology collages, 320 pharmacies, 107 Architecture, 40 hotel management, making a total about 1749 institutions. In respect of post graduate educational institutions there are 958 MBA/PGDM and 1034 MCA in 2004.

Similarly the number of teachers has increased from 700 in 1950 to 4.72 Lakhs in 2005.

Thus there has been several fold increase in the educational institutions and number of teachers. With this progress in the educational infrastructure in terms of institutions and faculty, we expect improvement in the level of higher education in terms of aggregate access, access to disadvantage groups and the quality of higher education.

Let us discuss the progress with respect to these indicators of higher education development.

## **Present Status with respect to Access -Enrolment at Aggregate level**

The extent of higher education is generally measured by enrolment ratio in higher education.

Three alternative methods are used to estimate the extend of access to higher education namely Gross Enrolment ratio (GER),Net enrolment ratio (NER) and Enrolment of Eligible ( EER)

The GER measure the access level by taking the ratio of persons in all age group enrolled in various programs to total population in age group of 18 to 23. The NER measures the level of enrolment for age specific groups namely those in age group of 18 to 23. While the EER measure the level of enrolment of those who completed higher secondary level education. These three concepts thus look at the access to higher education from three different angles.

Three alternative sources namely Selected Education Statistics, (SES) National sample Survey (NSS) and Population Census (PC) provides data on number of student enrolment.

In 1950-51 the enrolment rate was 0.7%, which increased to 1.4% in 1960-61.

For the early 2000 the GER based on the SES is 8. % .The NSS and PC arrived at enrolment ratio of about 10% and 14% respectively. Thus the SES data under reports gross enrolment rate by 4-5%. For 2003/4 the GER work out to 9% ,13.22% and 14.48% respectively .

The SES under estimates enrolment rates because of the under-reporting of enrolment in unrecognized institutions and also due to non-reporting of enrolment data on an annual basis by some of the State governments. Extrapolations are used to fill the gaps arising from non-reporting by some of the States. The problem with the NSS and also census data is that as it is collected from households, it is likely to over estimate the student enrolment in colleges and universities as it might include those who are doing diploma or training programmes (e.g. computer training) in unrecognized institutions also. A further problem with the population Census data is that it does not distinguish between enrolment in professional degree and diploma programmes.

The population in the age group of 18-23 and number of students enrolled in Colleges and Universities (graduate and above) and vocational institutions (Diploma/certificate) are given in table In 2003/4 the enrolment in graduate and above (degree) level is 104.9 lakhs from SES and 161.1 lakhs from NSS AND 182.3 lakhs from population census . The higher estimates from the Census may be due to the inclusion of enrolment in vocational and professional courses, which include both degree, diploma and certificate. The vocations and professions include engineering (ITI, polytechnic), agriculture, medicine, management, law, teaching etc.

A wide variation is observed in the estimates of enrolment in diploma/certificate courses from the three sources. The enrolment at the certificate/diploma (vocational, teacher training etc.) level is 10 lakhs, 25 lakhs and 17 lakhs respectively from SES, NSS and

Census sources. The coverage of SES in the case of degree/diploma would have been limited as it excludes enrolment in unrecognized institutions. Both NSS and Census sources include enrolment in unrecognized vocational institutions and hence the estimates turn out to be higher than the SES. As mentioned above, Census data included vocational diploma along with professional degree yielding a figure lower than the NSS.

### **Equity in Access - Enrolment at disaggregate level -**

After having assessed the progress at aggregate level we now look at the progress with respect to certain groups and reflect on the situation with respect to inter-group disparities of multiple natures. The present allows us to study the disparities between (a) rural and urban (2) Inter-State (2) Inter-caste (3) Inter-religion (4) Male-female (5) occupation group (6) and Poor and non-poor.

#### **Rural and Urban**

There are significant disparities in enrolment ratio between rural and urban area. In 2003/4 the GER for rural and urban area was 7.76% and 27.20% respectively-GER in urban area being four times higher compared with rural area.

The population census came up with the GER of 8.99% for rural area and 24.52% for urban area in 2001 - the GER in rural area being all most three time lower compared with urban area.

The EER worked out to 51.1% for rural and 66% for urban area-latter being higher by about 15% points.

#### **Inter-State Variation**

There are considerable inter-state variation in the level of higher education. While the GER at aggregate level is about 13%, it is more than national average in state like Nagaland (38.6%), Goa (27.3%), Kerala (24.2%), Manipur ( 24.7%), H.P.(20.0%) and J&K, T.N. and Pondicherry (with 18%).

By national comparison the GER is lower than the national average in state like Tripura (3.2%), Assam (6.6%), Meghalaya (7.2%), Chattisgarh (7.6%), Orissa (8.2%) ,Jharkand (10.3%),West Bengal (9.7%), Bihar (10%), Sikkim (10.8%), and Rajasthan (11%).

The enrolment ratio based on eligible student (ERE) is useful estimate as it indicates the access to education to those who have completed the higher secondary stage. In 2003/4 about 59 % of those who completed higher secondary entered in higher education stream. These ratio is higher than the national average by substantial margin in Mizoram (87.1%), Manipur(87.7%), Nagaland (85.6%), J&K (76.6%) and Kerala (70.6%). By national comparison the ratio is much lower, in Tripura (37.8%), Chattishgarh (49.6%), Orissa (50.2%), Arunachal Pradesh (53.5%). In rest of the major states the ratio was around national average of 59%.

**Table 4 (a)**  
**Enrolment Ratio for Population Sub-Groups ( figure in %)**

Source/Year	GER			NER	EER
	SES 2006-07	Census 2001	NSS 2003	NSS 2003	NSS 2003
All	9.7	13.8	13.2	13.2	59.0
<b>Gender</b>					
Male	11.1	17.1	15.3	12.3	62.9
Female	7.9	10.2	11.0	8.7	54.1
<b>Caste</b>					
Schedule Tribes	4.6	7.5	5.0	4.0	57.4
Schedule Castes	7.0	8.4	7.5	5.9	56.4
OBC			11.34		
Others			24.89		
<b>Religion</b>					
Hindu			12.0	9.0	57.0
Muslim			8.2	6.3	58.1
Other Religion			30.9	24.3	65.8
<b>Rural/Urban</b>					
Rural		9.0	7.8	6.1	51.5
Urban		24.5	27.2	21.9	66.0
Poor ( 2000)			2.43		
Non poor			12.81		

Source : Computed from 'Employment and Unemployment Survey, 1999-2000, NSSO, GOI

### Inter-Group Disparities

After having examined the enrolment rate at the aggregate level we now look at the same by caste, religious and gender.

### Inter – caste

In 2003-04, the GER was about 13.22% at over all level. However there are significant disparities across social groups. The GER is much lower for ST, SC, and OBC as compared with others (that is non-SC/ST/OBC), its being 5%, 7.51%, 11.34% and 24.89% respectively. Thus the GER for ST was five times, of SC about three times and of OBC about two times less compare with non-SC/ST/O BC population.

Between the SC/ST and OBC, however the GER was higher for OBC. The GER of OBC was higher by six percentage point compared with ST and about four percentage points higher compared to SC. Between SC and ST, the GER was higher for the SC by about 2.51 percentage point. Thus the GER was the lowest for ST.

The estimates based on the population census for 2001 also revealed disparities across the social groups in GER. For instance, as against the GER of 15.57% for general Hindu population (non -SC/ST ), the GER for SC and ST was 8.39% and 7.46% respectively. The GER for the general Hindu population being higher by about two times compared with SC and ST.

In the case of EER the pattern is somewhat different. The EER in 2003-04 was 54.4% for ST, 57% for SC, 54.8 % for OBC and 62.5% for the other Hindu population. Thus the EER of SC, ST and OBC was lower as compare to the general Hindu population. It needs to be mentioned that the differences in the EER between SC, ST, OBC were marginal. The OBC seems to be almost on par with SC and ST with respect to EER. This implies that although the OBC managed to have higher enrolment rate, based on GER, compared with SC and ST, never the less, of those who managed to complete higher secondary stage, a small proportion of them entered into the higher education stream compared to the higher caste.

### **Caste, religion -Inter face**

It is evident that SC/ST/OBC persons belonging to Hindu religion lack far behind the higher caste Hindu population in term of access to higher education, in so far as the enrolment ratio is generally lower for these three social groups compared to the general Hindu population.

It is also necessary to mention that SC/ST/OBC from other religious back ground namely Muslim, Christian and Sikh religion also suffered from lower access to higher education as compared with their higher caste counter part from these religion.

For instance, in 2003-04 the GER of OBC Muslim was 7 % as compared with 9% for other Muslim. Similar disparities prevail in the case SC Christians and non-SC/ST Christian. In the case of Sikh SC the GER was only 7% compared with 21% for non-SC Sikh population. Similarly the GER of tribal christen was 21.73 % compared to 37.28% for non-tribal Christian.

Similar differences are observed in the case of Eligible enrolment ratio (EER) . The EER for OBC Muslim is lower (50.16%) as compared with other Muslim ( 63%).The EER is much lower for the Sikh SC as compared with non-SC Sikh – the rate being 20.60% and 52% respectively in 2003.

It is thus evident from these results that the SC from all religion suffered from a lower access to higher education as compared with their high caste counterpart .However between the various religious groups, SC from some religious groups suffer more in access to higher education than other. For instance the GER of SC Buddhist is relatively high (14%) followed by SC Christian (9.97%), SC Hindu (4.88%) and SC Sikh

(2.33%). The SC Buddhist and SC Christian seem to perform better with respect to access to higher education as compared with their counter part from Hindu and Sikh religion. However the limitation of sample size in case of SC Buddhist and Christian need to be kept in mind.

### **Inter-religion differences**

Disparities are also evidence in enrolment ratio between religious groups in 2003-04. In general the GER is higher for the persons belonging to Jainism followed by Christians, Sikh/Buddhist, Hindus and Muslims. The GER for Jains, Christians, Sikhs/Buddhists, Hindu and Islam is 57.43%, 27.29%, and 15.0%, 13.47% and 8.19% respectively. The GER was the lowest for the Muslim followed by Hindu.

In the case of EER also similar inter-religion differences are observed. The Jain and the Christians came on the top with 74.7% and 71.3% EER respectively. Next come the Buddhist and Hindus with about 60%. The EER is the lowest for the Sikhs with 52.8%.

### **Gender Differences**

The access to higher education is also low for girls as compared with boys. The GER being 15.25% for male and 11% for female. Gender disparity in enrolment ratio is mainly because of visible differences in rural areas. In urban the gender differences are minimal.

Significant male-female disparities also exist in the enrolment ratio for the eligible student (EER). In 2003-04, the EER is 62.9% and 54.1% for male and female respectively, the female EER being lower by nine percentage points. Unlike GER the differences in the male and female EER are visible both in rural and urban areas.

### **Gender – Caste – Religion Interface**

It needs to be recognized that although the enrolment ratio are generally lower for the female compared to the male, the female belonging to the lower caste and some religious groups suffer more in access to higher education than others.

For instance in 2000, as against the overall average of 9.4% for the female, the GER was 2.4% for ST female followed by 4.7% for SC female, 7.6% for OBC female and 17.2% for other female. Thus the GER for ST female was seven times less compare to the higher caste female. Similarly, the GER of the SC female was lower by about four times compared with higher caste female.

In the case of religious group, the Muslim women suffer the most. The GER of Muslim female was 6.3% compared to 10.8% for Hindu female, 12.7% for Sikh/Buddhist female, 20% for Christian and 48% for Jain female.

In the case of enrolment ratio for eligible (EER) the inter-caste disparities in the female are particularly significant. The EER for SC/OBC female was the lowest with about 50% compared to 57% for ST /other high caste female.

Similarly, the EER was the lowest for the Muslim female compared with the female belonging to other religion. The EER was 48% for Muslim female -about 54% for Hindu/Buddhist female, 56% for Sikh and about 69% for Jain/Christian female.

### **Poor –Non poor**

There are also significant differences in enrolment rate among the poor and non-poor .In 1999-2000 the GER for the poor was 2.4 % as against 12.91 % for non-poor ,the average being 10.10% .The GER for the poor was almost twelve time lower compared with non poor.

Similar disparities are evident in rural and urban area. In rural and urban area the GER for poor was 1.30 % and 5.51%, quite low compared with 7.12% and 27.15% for non – poor respectively for rural and urban area.

With in the poor however the GER was the lowest among the poor belonging to ST and SC, followed by OBC and others. The GER for poor belonging to ST, SC, OBC and Other is 1.55%, 1.89%, 2.30%, and 3.58 respectively.

Similar pattern is observed for poor in rural and urban area .In rural area the GER is the lowest for ST with only 1.11% followed by 1.35% for SC, 1.13 for OBC and 1.66% for Others – the overall GER being 1.30% .

In urban area the GER for the urban poor is 3.86%, 4.78% 5.16% and 7% respectively for SC, ST, OBC and Others – the average being 5.51%.

Even among the non-poor the GER for the ST, SC and OBC is lower as compared with others. For instance the GER is 6.68%, 9.70%, 8.69%, and 19.73% for SC, ST, OBC and Other respectively – while all India average is 12.81%.

### **Occupation and Enrolment**

#### **Self Employed and Wage Labor**

Differences in gross enrolment rate are also equally clear across occupation groups in rural and urban area. In rural area the GER is generally higher for self employed household engaged in farm and non farm – economic activity as compared with those who worked as wage labour in farm and non farm activities. For instance the GER for those engaged in farm and non farm activities as self employed was about 5% as compared with 1.41% for farm wage labour and 3% for non farm wage labour. In 2000, the GER for Farm Wage Labour being particularly low.

Similarly, in urban area the GER is clearly much higher for those engaged in business, regular salaried and other activities as compared with casual labour. **The GER was 50%, 28%, 15.74% and only 3.26% respectively for other, self employed, regular salaried and casual wage labor.** The GER being particularly low for casual wage labor.

Thus both in rural and urban area the enrolment rate for the wage (casual) labour was the lowest as compared with self employed and regular wage earner and salaried. The GER is particularly low for Form Wage Labour.

## **Caste –Occupation interface**

It is to be noted that among the occupation group the enrolment is particularly low for ST, SC, and OBC as compared with higher caste. Thus although GER is generally lower for wage labour, it particularly low for SC/ST compared with others group. For instance as against 1.41% at over all level for wage labor in rural area, the ratio is 0.67%, 1.63%, 1.16% and 1.93% for ST, SC ,OBC and other wage labor respectively.

Similarly in urban area the GER for casual labor is 3.26% at over all level as against 1.53%, 2.61%, 3.34 and 4.30% for ST, SC, OBC and other wage labor respectively.

Similar inter-caste differences are observed in case of self – employed cultivator (farmer) in rural and urban area - the GER for SC/ST/OBC being much lower compared with others. For instance in rural area as against the GER of 5.64% at over all level for self employed in agriculture in rural area the ratio is 3.%, 3.95%, 4.21 and 8.33% for ST, SC, OBC and other respectively.

In the case of self-employed in non farm activities or business in rural and urban area also the GER is lower for the SC/ST compared with other group. In rural area the GER for self employed (or business groups) is 2.53%, 3.77%, 3.97% and 7.73% for ST,SC,OBC and Other .In urban area the GER for self employed group among the ST, SC, OBC and Other work out to 6.15%, 7.37%, 10.% and 22% respectively indicating much lower rate for SC/ST .

## **Occupation, caste and poverty interface**

Among the self employed and wage labor the enrolment is particularly low for the poor household among them. For instance the enrolment rate at over all level for self employed cultivator, self employed in non-farm sector, agriculture labour, other labour, other household in rural area is 5.17%, 1.41%, 2.99%, 5.64%, 18.55% respectively compared with 1.43%, 0.86%, 0.37%, 1.78%, 2.98%, 1.30% for poor self employed cultivator, self employed in non-farm sector, agriculture labour, other labour, other household in that order.

Similarly in urban area while the enrolment rate at over all level is 15.74%, 28.10%, 3.26%, 50.15% for self employed, regular salaried, casual labour and other household respectively, the same for the poor household belonging to self employed, regular salaried, casual labour and other household is 4.59%, 8.60%, 2.38% and 14.39% respectively.

In other word although the enrolment is lowest among the poor casual wage labour household in rural and urban area (agriculture labour, other labour in rural and urban area – .86%, .37% and 2.38 respectively), it is particularly low among the same poor group from the ST/ST/OBC. The enrolment rate being 0.9%, .01% and .93% for agricultural labour for ST, SC and OBC respectively. Similarly it is nil for ST and SC .52 % for OBC Casual non-farm wage labour in rural area.

In Urban area the enrolment rate for poor casual labour is .66% for ST ,2.61 % for SC and 3.92% for OBC.

**To sum** up the pattern relating to enrolment following pattern emerged fairly clearly in 2003-4 and in some cases for 1999-2000.

**1) Aggregate**-While the GER based on population census and NSS is about, 13%, during 2000/01. The GER based on the education statistics is 9.39%. The educational statistics estimate of GRE are on lower side compared with population census and NSS estimate probably because latter two sources include both public and private institutions, while former covered only public institutions .

**2) Rural –Urban**-There are significant disparities in enrolment ratio between rural and urban area .The GER for rural and urban area in 2003/4 are 7.76 % and 27.20% respectively. The GER in urban area was about four times higher compared with rural area.

**3) Inter-state** - Similarly there are considerable inter-regional variation in the level of higher education. The GER and NER were more than national average in state like Nagaland, Goa Kerala, Manipur, H.P and J&K, T.N. and Pondchary and lower than national average in Tripura, Assam, Meghalaya, Chattisgarh, Orissa, Jharkand, West Bengal, Bihar, Sikkim and Rajasthan.

**4) Inter-caste differences** -The GER of SC, ST and OBC is lower as compared with the general Hindu population. Between them however the GER is lowest for ST ,followed by SC and OBC . In the case of EER the difference between SC, ST, OBC are marginal and the OBC are almost on par with SC and ST.

It is also necessary to mention that SC/ST/OBC from other religion such as Muslim, Christian and Sikh religion also suffered from lower access to higher education as compared with their higher caste counter part from these religions. In general the SC Buddhist and SC Christian seem to be doing better as compared with their Hindu, Muslim and Sikh counterpart.

**5) Inter-religion difference** - In general the GER is higher for the persons belonging to Jainism (57%) followed by Christians (27.29%), Sikh/Buddhist (15%), Hindus (13.47%) and Muslims (8.19%). Thus the GER is the lowest for the Muslim.

**6) Male-female** -Gender disparities in the enrolment ratio are also clearly visible. The gender differences in gross enrolment ratio are mainly due to disparities in the rural area as the gender gap is insignificant in urban area.

It need to be recognized that although the enrolment ratio are generally lower for the female compared to the male, the female belonging to the ST /SC and those from Islam and Hindu religion suffer more in access to higher education than female from other religious groups.

## **Poor- Non poor**

The GER is generally lower for poor compared with non - poor household. Among the poor, however the GER is much lower for SC /ST followed by OBC and Other.

## **Self employed and Casual Labor**

The GER is also generally higher for self employed (business group) and regular salaried household as compared with casual wage labour engaged in farm or non farm activities in rural and urban area. The GER is the lowest among the poor casual labour household engaged in farm activities in rural area and in non-form activities in both rural and urban areas.

## **Quality and Excellence**

The improvement in the enrolment rate has been made possible due to significant expansion of higher education institutions in India. The question is about the quality of outcome in terms of academic standard of student, quality of research, innovativeness and creativity.

What is the quality and excellence level of our educational system?

There is limited literature on the estimate of quality and excellence of our university and colleges system. In the absence of the studies I wish to present the status of quality and excellence with the help of conceptual and methodological framework developed and used by UGC to quantify the quality and excellence of the universities and colleges engaged in higher education – a sector which is the backbone of our higher education system. As we will see this provides only partial picture of the quality of university and college sector.

To regulate and promote the quality and excellence, the UGC has made distinction between quality and an excellence in conceptual terms. And therefore separate indicators are used to measure quality and excellence. The UGC's measures for excellence are in the nature of addition to the measures the quality ..

## **Quality of University and College education system**

As far as the quality is concerned the UGC has laid down indicators under provision of what it called, 2(f) and 12 (b). These two together assess the minimum quality requirement to provide the grants to the universities and colleges. The college is recognized under 2(f) if it is a register body with a temporary affiliation and carrying under graduate program. The recognition under 12(b) is granted provided the college has a permanent affiliation with university. The university provides permanent affiliation after satisfying the required minimum conditions.

Thus 2(f) & 12(b) is the initial and presumably the minimum framework of regulation of quality for the colleges.

Beside the UGC has set up National Assessment and Accreditation Council (NAAC) to assess the quality of higher education institutions, which used fairly expanded criteria of quality for universities and colleges in the country.

Let us discuss the quality of university and college sector.

### **College Sector**

Let us first discuss the college sector. As on today (February, 2006), there are about 17625 colleges in the country. Out of these, about 14000 come under purview of UGC's system. This account for about 80% of the total colleges in the country.

Out of this, about 5589 are included under Section 2(f) and of them 5273 have recognized under Section 12(B) of the UGC Act - making them eligible for UGC assistance. Thus of about total of 14000 colleges about 40% are recognized under 2(f) and about 38% under 12(b).

Alternatively, it means that about 60% of colleges (equivalent to 8411) in the country are not assessed even with the minimum criterion of 2(f) and 12 (b) (equivalent to 8727). Therefore, we cannot comment on the quality of almost 60% of the colleges coming under the purview of UGC.

The NAAC is involved in the assessment of quality and accreditation of these colleges, recognized under 2(f) & 12(b). The NAAC used an expanded criterion of quality measurement. In 2006 of the total colleges which come under 2(f) & 12(b) about 2780 have been assessed and accredited by the NAAC.

The percentage of accredited colleges thus account about 57% of the colleges covered under 2(f) & 12(b).

But accredited colleges account only 18% of the total colleges (i.e. 14000), which fall under the purview of UGC. Thus we don't have much idea about 82% of the 14000 in the country with the elaborated criterion of measurement of quality of NAAC . .

**Thus as per the criterion of UGC of 2 (f), and 12(b) of total of 14000 colleges about 40% are assessed for minimum criterion of quality and hence we know little about the quality of the remaining 60% of the colleges.**

With an extended criterion of NAAC only 18% of total of 14000 colleges are assessed for quality. They account 57% of colleges recognized by UGC under 2(f) and 12 (b). What is the quality status of the colleges assessed by NAAC?

The NAAC gradation provides some idea about the quality status of the college sector. The NAAC gradation indicate that 245 colleges are in A range (A++, A+ and A), 1785 in B range (B++, B and B-) and 668 in C range (C++ C and C-). There could be respectively graded as high, medium and low quality colleges which constitute 9%, 66% and 25% respectively.

## University Sector

Before giving grant UGC assesses the quality of these universities by some measures of quality. About 164 are recognized under 12(B) and, therefore, entitled to receive grants. This means about 50% of the Universities are assessed for some academic standard and quality under 12(B) rule. The remaining half of the universities are not assessed. Therefore, we don't have much idea about the quality.

Out of 164 Universities about 128 are assessed with more elaborated indicators of quality by NAAC. Such universities account for about 78% of the universities supported by the UGC (i.e. 164) only 40% of the total universities .

To summarize the situation, thus out of total of 317 universities about 50% of them (that is 164) have been assessed for minimum quality under (12 b) and about 40% ( that is 128) have been assessed for more elaborate criteria of quality of NAAC. Thus about 50 to 60 % of the universities are not properly assessed for quality of education that they offered.

### Measurement of Excellence

For an assessment of excellence, the UGC has developed a concept of what is called "institutions with potential for "excellence". The UGC by some measurable indicators of "excellence" identifies

- (a) The universities as whole with potential for excellence.
- (b) The Centers with specialized programs in the universities with potential for excellence.
- (c) The Departments with in the universities with potential for excellence and
- (d) The Collages with potential for excellence.

The UGC has recognized 9 universities with potential for excellence accounting only 4% of total of 237 central and State universities , 12 Centers of Excellence with specific specialization in 12 universities and 477 Center /department. So far 97 colleges have been identified as those with potential for excellence ..

### Emerging Issues Related to Access, Inclusiveness and Quality

An over view of the present status of higher education bring out the situation with respect to the level of enrolment, equity (or inclusiveness) and quality but also the task ahead of us .

#### Issue Related to increase in Enrolment rate

First issue relates to the enhancement of access to higher education. There has been a considerable improvement in the enrolment from one percent in early 1950's to about 13% in the 2003. The 13 percent is little more than average for Developing countries, which is 11%. But it is too low compared to 23% of world average or 36.5% for countries in transaction or 54.6% for Developed countries.

There has been huge increase in the demand for higher education since the independence. However the increase in demand has not been matched by corresponding increase in the education infrastructure in term of educational institutions and other facilities. Due to the demand outstripping the capacity, a large number of aspirants are also denied access to higher education. This has led to a situation where institutions are required to manage more students than they afford, leading pressure on the facilities particularly the State Universities, collages –aided as well as unaided. Therefore, in addition to creating new universities and collages the strengthening and expansion of exiting institutions is equally necessary.

There are issues related to target in 11<sup>th</sup> Plan. What should be the sustainable target? . If our target is to come closer to world average of 23% we need to expand the intake capacity during the 11<sup>th</sup> Plan quite substantially. Increase from 13% to 20% will have to come both from public and private institutions and require planning for increase in institutional capacity both for public and private educational institutions. Definite target will have to be set up for government and government-aided institution.

. This will have to be done both by expansion in the capacity of existing education institutions and also by establishing the new ones. The approximate number of additional educational institutions is some thing, which will have to be worked out. Both will require substantial increase in the public expenditure on higher education.

**Enrolment in Higher Education by regions 2001-2 ( in %)**

<b>Groups of Countries</b>	<b>Gross Enrolment Ratio</b>
Developed Countries	54.6
Countries in Transition	36.5
Developing Countries	11.3
World	23.2
India	(About) 13%

Source –Higher Education in the World –

The projection made by the Study sponsored by UGC indicate that, the projected enrolment on the basis of historical growth pattern may not be sufficient to meet the growing demand and also the need of the Indian economy .As per the projection the GER will increase from 9.7% in 2006/7 to 11 % to 2011/12. For the same period projection based on NSS data suggests GER increase from 11..2% to 12.8% respectively.

Hence a higher achievable target needs to be envisaged and the 11<sup>th</sup> plan for higher education should be geared to attend this target . Thus depending on the source the target would vary from 15% to 18% by the end of 11<sup>th</sup> plan.

**Promoting Equity and Inclusiveness**

Second important issue, that confront us, relates to multiple disparities across State, rural-urban, male-female, inter-caste and inter-religious, poor-non poor and between occupation group.

The extent of enrolment is low in rural area compared with urban area and low in some States. It is particularly low among the ST, SC, OBC compared with higher caste. The enrolment is low among female compared with male. Among the religious groups, the enrolment is lower among the Muslim and Hindus compared with Jain, Sikh and Christian.

The enrolment is also low among the poor and particularly low among person engaged in some economic activities such wage labor household as compared with those engaged in business as self employed.

Thus the group which suffered most from lack of access to higher education are SC, ST, OBC and Muslim in general, but particularly the female from these group in particular, as also the those engaged as wage labour in rural and urban area. Among all them, however the poor from these groups suffered most. Among the SC, ST, Muslim, female and wage labour, those from rural area are the worst sufferers.

We thus suffered from multiple disparities. There fore there is need for comprehensive policy of inclusiveness, which will to reduce disparity among them.

Given the uniqueness of each of these groups, it is necessary that the constrains of each of these group are address separately and group specific policies and schemes are developed to bring them on part with others.

### **Promoting quality**

Third issue relates to the quality of higher education. It is important to recognize that a substantial portion of collages and universities are not assessed for quality and therefore we don't have full picture of the quality and excellence of university and college sector engaged in higher education.

- a) Of the total of 14000 colleges which falls under the purview of UGC, only 40% and 38% have been brought under 2(f) (about 5589) & 12(b) (about 5273) status, which satisfy some minimum educational standard.

This means that about 61% or equivalent to about 8500 collages are without proper assessment for quality. We do not know much about the quality of these colleges. In fact accredited collages constituted only 20% of the total collages (that is 14000). Most of these colleges are self-financing and without permanent affiliation. It is therefore necessary to bring these colleges under the fold of quality assessment to improve the standard of college education in the country.

It is necessary to recognize that a large portion of the colleges remained outside the support of UGC because they do not fully fill the minimum quality requirement specified under 12(b).

The close examination of the sample of 1473 colleges brings out the deficiencies in the physical and academic infrastructure of the colleges – (government, private aided and un-aided) and the need for their support. Of the total colleges 8% are of high quality (A grade), 37% of medium quality (B++ and B+) about 36% of lower quality (B only and C). Thus the bulk of them is of medium to low quality.

It is striking to note that with respect to all the indicators of physical and academic infrastructure the high quality colleges are in a better position compared with low quality colleges.

For instance the percentage of colleges with library, computer center, health center, sport facilities, hostel, guest house, teacher's housing, canteen, common room, welfare scheme, Gymnasium, and auditorium. Seminar rooms is much higher in case of high quality colleges as compared with low quality colleges.

Similarly the high quality colleges are in a better place as compared with low quality colleges with respect to academic facilities, which include student teacher ratio, books per student and per colleges, journal per colleges, student per computer, and organized workshops/seminars.

It is also observed that of the temporary teacher account about one fourth of the sample colleges.

Further it is observed that in the case of high quality colleges the percentages of those with PhD and Phil permanent teacher is relatively high and that of postgraduate is low as compared with the low quality colleges. Thus the academic quality of teacher in high quality colleges is relatively better compared with the low quality colleges.

Thus if the 36% of low quality colleges and the 37% medium quality colleges are to be brought on par with high quality colleges, a substantial improvement is necessary in the physical and academic infrastructure of the low and medium quality colleges. The investment requirement for quality improvement of colleges which are under 12 (b) but suffered from quality and all those without 12 (b), about 60% of total of 14000 colleges will have to be worked out. This will require substantial public investment on existing colleges in the country.

As far as university sector is concerned, of total of 317 universities about 50% of them (that is 164) have been assessed for minimum quality under (12(B) and about 40% (that is 128) have been assessed for more elaborate criteria of quality of NAAC. Thus about 50 to 60% of the universities are not assessed with elaborated criteria of NAAC..

The sample study by the UGC of about 111 universities which are eligible to receive the UGC indicate that about 31% false under A grade, 52% under B grade and 16% under C grade. It is observed that the A grade universities generally perform better with respect to number of indicators which include number of department, sanction faculty position, filled up faculty position, number faculty with PhD, number of faculty members, per department, number of books in library . Therefore with respect to each of the indicators, there is need to improve the position of B and C grade universities and this will require substantial investment in opening of new departments, additional faculty, teacher without PhD to be supported to completed and number of new books to be acquired .

### **Promoting Excellence**

So far, the UGC has identified only 9 universities and 97 colleges with potential for excellence, and they constitute about 6% of the total universities and 2% of the colleges. Beside about 500 Department, centres and about 12 centres have been identified with potential for excellence.

We have to recognize that there is interlinkage between quality and excellence. For excellence to grow and emerge, at the base quality institutions are necessary . . Excellence may not emerged without quality education in the vast institutions of higher learning, namely the universities and colleges.

The university and college education served as a catchments area for some upper level specialized institutions to emerge as institutions of excellence. If the quality of the university and college education is neglected it will have limited potential for growth of excellence in institutions of learning. If we go by the present evidence, a vast number of colleges/state university sector is of low to medium quality by NAAC measure. Therefore, there is an urgent need to improve the physical and academic infrastructure of this institutions. This calls for a “Revival of college and state university sector”. If we have limited number of universities, departments and collages with a potential for excellence, it is because the university and college education has suffered from the lack of adequate academic and physical infrastructure.

-----

**Note** –The estimate of enrolment ratio aggregate and by social groups and some dimensions of quality are based on the on going Studies sponsored by UGC -,Under taken by Ravi Sriwastwa , S.Sinha,,Sarswati Raju, (Jawaharlal Nehru University,Delhi ) Sudhanshu Bhushan ( National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration ,Delhi )Ameresh Dubey ,( NCAER,Delhi) Dr.Draiswamy( Madras university ,Madras) and Menon ( Delhi University ),2006

- 1 The report of The University Education Commission –(December 1948-August, 1949), Ministry Of Education Govt. of India, 1962,
  - Report of the Education Commission –1964-65-Education and National development, National Council of Educational Research and training, 1970
  - National Policy on Education-1986, (With modifications undertaken in 1992), ministry of Human Resource Development, Department of Education, Delhi
  - National Education Policy on Education-1986 – Program of Action –1992, Ministry of Human Resource Development, Department of Education

2 Report of the Education Commission-1964-66, chapter I, Page 41

3 Source - figure for 1950- and 1960 are taken from “ Report of the Education Commission” 1964-65, chapter xii, page 550 table 12.1 (Enrolment in Higher Education –1950-51 to 1965-66), and 1983-84 to 2004 from Annual Report 20004-2005, UGC, New Delhi, Appendix –III PAGE 151,also from Mid Term Appraisal- 11<sup>th</sup> Plan, Planning Commission

### References

- 1) Ministry of Human Resource Development. Government of India (May 1986) “ National Policy on Education –1986
- 2) Ministry of Human Resource Development. Government of India (November 1986) “ National Policy on Education –1986—Programme of Action
- 3) University Grant Commission ( “) National Policy on Education –1986 ( With Modifications Undertaken in 1992)
- 4) Program of Action –National Policy on Education 1986 – Revised 1992

**Table 1 Educational Institutions -2006**

(a)	Central Universities	20		
(b)	State Universities	217		
(c)	Deemed Universities	106		
(d)	Private Universities	10		
	Total Universities	353		
	Institutions of National Importance	13		
	Institutions set up under State Act	5		
	Total Universities/Institutions	371		
	Total Collages	17625		

**Table 2(a)**

**Students Enrolment and Gross Enrolment Rate (GER) in Higher Education in India**

S.No.	Description	Data Source		
		SES	NSS	Census
1.	Estimates for the year	2000-01	1999-2000	2001
2.	Estimated Population aged 18-23 (in '000s)	1133,28	1026,90	1133,28
3.	Enrolment in graduate & above (in '000s)	86,26	85,70	144,30
4.	Gross Enrolment Rate (GER)	7.6%	8.3%	12.4%
5.	Enrolment in Vocational Institutes (in '000s)	9,87	25,20	16,60
6.	Total enrolment (Degree + Vocational) (in '000s)	95,13	110,90	160,90
7.	GER (Degree + Vocational)	8.5%	10.8%	13.8%

**Table 2 (b) Enrolment Ratio By alternative sources**

Years	Graduate & Above			Technical/Vocational			Total Higher Education		
	SES	NSSO	Census	SES	NSSO	Census	SES	NSSO	Census
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1983	3.77	6.66	na	0.26(0.62)	na	na	4.04	7.67	na
1987-88	4.28	7.51	na	0.41(0.87)	na	na	4.69	8.57	na
1991	4.22	na	na	0.40(0.83)	na	na	4.63	na	10.95
1993-94	4.35	6.45	na	0.45(0.90)	na	na	4.80	8.85	11.74*
1999-00	6.77	7.71	na	0.45(1.00)	na	na	7.22	10.08	13.19*
2001	7.41	7.6	12.4	0.44(1.03)	2.33(3.54)*	1.4	7.85	9.91	13.82
2003-04	8.14	na	na	0.39(1.29)	na	na	9.01	13.22	14.48*

Notes: 1. Figures in parentheses pertains to all technical & vocational both degree, diploma & certificate courses. 2. na=non available or estimated.

3. \*denotes estimated figures. 4. SES figures are provisional for years 1991 onwards

Source – Studies sponsored by UGC, Undertaken by Ravi Sriwastwa, S. Sinha, Sudhansu, Sarswati Raju, Ameresh Dubey, Duraiswamy (2006)

**Table 2 ( c ) : Enrolment by Major Streams of  
Higher Education from various sources (in lakhs)**

Years	Graduate & Above			Technical/Vocational			Total Higher Education		
	SES	NSSO	Census	SES	NSSO	Census	SES	NSSO	Census
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1983	28.7	51.1	na	2.0(4.7)	7.8	na	30.7	58.9	na
1987-88	34.6	65.0	na	3.5(7.0)	9.17	na	38.0	74.1	na
1991	43.3	na	102.2	4.0(8.2)	na	3.8@	44.7	na	106
1993-94	44.5	65.7	na	4.6(9.2)	24.55	na	49.1	90.2	115.2*
1999-00	77.3	85.7	na	5.2(11.5)	25.23	na	82.4	110.9	154.3*
2001	86.3	88.5	144.3	5.3(13.1)	27.4(41.2)	16.6**	91.4	115.3	160.9
2003-04	100.1	na	na	4.8(15.9)	na	na	104.9	161.1	182.3*

@Technical & non-technical diploma & certificate courses

Source – Studies sponsored by UGC, Undertaken by Ravi Sriwastwa, S. Sinha, Sudhansu, Sarswati Raju, Ameresh Dubey and Duraiswamy ( 2006)

**Table : 4(b)  
Groups with lower enrolment ratio in Higher Education -1999-2000  
Some stylized facts (Figure in %)**

Religion	Category	Social Groups				
		SC	ST	OBC	Non-SC/ ST. OBC	All
	Hindu	4.88	6.16	7.06	19.71	10.44
	Muslim	1.83	4.41	3.94	5.91	5.34
	Sikh	1.81	NA	NA	18.94	11.28
<b>Gender</b>	Female (Total)	3.16	5.57	4.70	16.52	8.05
	Rural (Female)	1.64	4.75	2.08	7.10	3.56
<b>Rural</b>	Rural	3.30	5.15	4.11	10.58	5.72
<b>Poor</b>	Poor	1.69	1.32	2.42	5.57	2.43
	Poor Rural	1.31	0.89	1.25	2.50	1.30
<b>Occupation</b>	Wage Labor (Rural)		0.67	1.16	1.93	1.41
	(a) Agriculture	1.63				
	(b) Non-Agril.	1.52	0.91	4.26	4.02	2.91
	Wage Labour (Urban)		1.53	3.34	4.30	3.26
	Poor Wage Labour Household (Rural)					
	(a) Agriculture	0.01	0.91	0.47	0.93	0.86
	(b) Non-agri.	00	00	.52	1.08	0.37
	Poor Wage Labour (Urban)	2.61	1.93	2.70	1.80	2.38
	Landless (Total) Rural	2.96	11.46	4.15	8.85	5.59
	Landless (Poor) Rural	1.05	1.38	.73	.85	.94
	<b>Total</b>					<b>10.00%</b>

Source: Based on Studies Sponsored by UGC ,2006

**Table : 5 (a)**  
**Quality estimates of college sector under UGC - 2006**

<b>Colleges (as on 31.3.2005)</b>	<b>Nos.</b>	<b>% of previous row</b>	<b>% to total colleges (14000) under UGC's purview</b>
Total no. of colleges	17,625		
Under UGC's purview (about)	14000	79.43%	
Included u/s 2(f) UGC Act	5589	40%	40%
Included u/s 12(B) UGC Act	5273	94.35%	38%
Funded by UGC (X Plan)	4870	92.36%	35% (65 not funded)
Accredited by NAAC	2780	57.08%	20%
Colleges with scores, 60%	2506	90.14%	17.90%

**Table 5(b)**

**Measurement of Excellence – Universities, Department & College Sector by UGC**

<b>Scheme</b>	<b>No. of Institutions</b>	
Total Central and State Universities	234	
State Universities under 12(B)	164	
University with Potential for Excellence	9	
Centres (specialized theme) with Potential for Excellence	12	
Establishment of new Centres / Institutes (Establishing during IX Plan)	5	
Special Assistance Programme	477	
Colleges with Potential for Excellence	97	

**Table : 6****NAAC Ranking - 2006**

<b>Total Colleges – 14000</b>				
1)	A++, A+, A – (A)	245	High Quality	9%
2)	B++, B, B- (B)	1785	Medium Quality	66%
3)	C++, C, C- (C)	668+	Low Quality	24 %
	Total	2698		100%
4)	Collage not assessed ( self financing and not permanently affiliated)	11302	Grade not known (presumably low quality)	

**Table 7****Universities Under 12 (b)**

	Total		<b>Under 12 (b)</b>
Total Universities	363		
(a) Central Universities	20	Under Section 12(B)	18
(b) State Universities	217	Under Section 12(B) of UGC	164
(c) Deemed Universities	106	Under Section 12(B)	24

**Table 8**

Some aspects of availability of facilities and quality in select institutions of Higher Education, 2002-2004						
Indicators	NAAC Grades					Total
	A & Above	B++ & B+	B only	C++, C+ & C	Non-Accredited	
No. of Sample Colleges	110	547	298	233	285	1473
STR (Student Teacher Ratio)	20.4	31.8	28.6	28.5	25.2	25.0
STR by Permanent Teachers	29.8	31.8	38.1	35.8	35.6	33.5
No. of Books per student	9.5	10.7	6.4	7.4	7.0	8.8
No. of Books per college	15215	13921	7019	6504	6748	9882
No. of Journals per college	22.2	13.0	6.1	4.4	4.0	10.0
Students per Computer	145.2	143.8	251.3	546.7	202.7	258.0
Average no. of Enrolled students per college	1603	1301	954	885	960	1140
Organised Workshops/Seminars	54.5	27.2	17.4	17.4	20.0	24.3
Facilities available (percent colleges having)						
Library	94.5	91.6	90.9	82.4	90.2	90.0
Computer Centre	86.4	83.7	76.8	64.0	74.7	77.7
Health Centre	74.5	53.7	48.7	36.4	48.1	50.4
Sports facilities	92.7	88.8	91.6	84.9	88.1	88.9
Hostels	72.7	55.9	39.6	41.9	40.4	48.7
Guest House	44.5	30.9	23.5	21.7	22.8	27.4
Teachers' Housing	47.3	36.9	19.8	18.4	20.7	28.2
Canteen	80.0	77.1	74.8	49.3	64.6	70.1
Common Room (Day Scholars)	30.9	23.8	19.1	9.7	16.1	19.7
Welfare Schemes	49.1	45.5	48.0	35.4	42.8	44.2
Gymnasium	8.2	7.1	3.0	3.6	4.2	5.3
Auditorium/Seminar Rooms	20.9	11.7	7.7	7.1	9.1	10.4

Source : Self Assessment Reports submitted with NAAC and NAAC Grades.

### Enrolment by Rural & Urban – 2003 (NSS)

<b>1. Rural</b>	<b>7.76</b>
<b>2. Urban</b>	<b>27.20</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>13.22</b>

### **Enrolment by Caste - 2003 (NSS)**

<b>1. ST</b>	<b>5.00</b>
<b>2. SC</b>	<b>7.51</b>
<b>3. OBC</b>	<b>11.34</b>
<b>4. Others</b>	<b>24.89</b>
<b>Total :</b>	<b>13.22</b>

### **Enrolment by Religious Group - 2003 (NSS)**

<b>1. Hindu</b>	<b>12.00</b>
<b>2. Muslim</b>	<b>8.19</b>
<b>3. Others</b>	<b>30.87</b>
<b>Total :</b>	<b>13.22</b>

### **Enrolment by Gender - 2003 (NSS)**

<b>1. Male</b>	<b>15.25</b>
<b>2. Female</b>	<b>11.02</b>
<b>Total :</b>	<b>13.22</b>

### Least enrolment by Religion - early 2000 (NSS)

	Social Groups (Figures in %)				
	SC	ST	OBC	Others	All
<b>Hindu</b>	4.88	6.16	7.06	19.71	10
<b>Muslim</b>	1.83	4.41	3.94	5.91	5.3
<b>Sikh</b>	1.81	NA	NA	18.94	11

### Least enrolment by Gender - 2000

	SC	ST	OBC	Others	All
<b>Female (Total)</b>	3.16	5.57	4.70	16.5	8.05
<b>Rural (Female)</b>	1.64	4.75	2.08	7.10	3.56

### Least enrolment by Poor - 2000

	SC	ST	OBC	Others	All
<b>Poor</b>	1.69	1.32	2.42	5.57	2.43
<b>Poor Rural</b>	1.31	0.89	1.25	2.50	1.30

### Least enrolment by Wage Labour - 2000

	SC	ST	OBC	Others	All
<b>Rural</b>					
<b>Agril.</b>	1.63	0.67	1.16	1.93	1.41
<b>Non-Agril.</b>	1.52	0.91	4.26	4.02	2.91
<b>Urban</b>	1.00	1.53	3.34	4.30	3.26

## Least enrolment by Poor Wage Labour - 2000

Rural	SC	ST	OBC	Others	All
Agril.	0.01	0.91	0.47	0.93	0.86
Non-Agril.	00	00	0.52	1.08	0.37
Urban	2.61	1.93	2.70	1.80	2.38

Distribution of teachers by nature of appointment and College Grades (2002-2004)						
	NAAC Grades					Total
	A & Above	B++ & B+	B only	C++, C+ & C	Non-Accredited	
No. of Colleges	110	547	298	233	285	1473
PERMANENT	68.57	76.20	74.94	79.79	70.87	74.54
TEMPORARY	22.92	15.24	15.83	11.44	16.79	16.16
PART-TIME	8.51	8.56	9.23	9.78	12.34	9.29
TOTAL	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Source : Self Assessment Reports submitted with NAAC and NAAC Grades.

Percentage distribution of teachers by qualification in various grades of colleges 2002-2004							
Nature of Appointment	Qualification	NAAC Grades					Total
		A & Above	B++ & B+	B only	C++, C+, & C	Non-Accredited	
PERMANENT	Ph.D	35.9	33.0	26.6	28.6	28.8	31.0
	M.Phil.	20.6	19.7	18.4	17.9	20.2	19.4
	PG	43.0	45.9	54.7	52.0	50.7	48.6
	Others	0.4	1.4	0.2	1.5	0.3	0.9
	Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
TEMPORARY	Ph.D	10.1	11.4	6.9	8.2	8.3	9.7
	M.Phil.	7.9	8.6	6.7	8.7	7.3	7.9
	PG	81.2	77.7	85.7	81.5	83.9	81.0
	Others	0.8	2.3	0.6	1.6	0.5	1.4
	Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
PART-TIME	Ph.D	9.3	11.5	6.8	13.2	5.8	9.4
	M.Phil.	7.0	6.6	3.5	4.3	8.0	6.2
	PG	83.2	80.6	88.8	81.9	84.1	83.2
	Others	0.6	1.2	0.9	0.6	2.0	1.2
	Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
TOTAL TEACHERS	Ph.D	28.1	28.0	21.9	24.9	22.4	25.6
	M.Phil.	16.7	17.0	15.3	15.6	16.5	16.3
	PG	54.7	53.5	62.4	58.1	60.6	57.1
	Others	0.5	1.5	0.4	1.4	0.6	1.0
	Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
No. of Sample Colleges		110	547	298	233	285	1473

Source : Self Assessment Reports submitted with NAAC and NAAC Grades.