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Introduction

• History of Indian HE

  Pre Independence : By Philanthropy & Private Funding
  Post Independence : Government Funding
Stakeholders in Indian HE
(Freeman Theory of Stakeholders)

• **Regulators** - governmental organizations comprising of ministries and departments at both central and state levels

• **Providers** - public institutions, deemed and private institution, International HE institutes and related organizations

• **Benificiaries** - society and nation at large; parents (the customer), students (the user), the job-market, Teachers, Entrepreneurs etc.

• An entire eco-system - tutors, HE consultants/agents, media, publishers, and recently civil society groups.
REGULATORS AND THEIR ROLE
Regulators

- Many regulatory bodies
- MHRD apex body
- State and Central governments responsible

- Central University (7%), State University (47%), Private University (16%), Deemed-to-be-University (20%), Institute of National Importance and Institute under statute legislature act (10%).
Role

• In India regulators are responsible to provide the
  • Finance
  • Guidelines
  • Legal Framework

Trend is encouraging which is evident from the growth of number of colleges and enrollment. We are able to create more and more access to HE
PROVIDERS AND THEIR ROLE
Providers and their role

- Public Provision of HE
- Private Provision of HE
- Other Providers
Public Provision of HE

• State Government shares 3/4th and Central government shares 1/4th share
• Of state’s share 85% spend on administrative and maintenance expenditures and 15% on capacity creation
• Government Budgetary Expenditure on HE as a percentage of GDP around: 1.2%
• Share of HE in the total budgetary expenditure on education: 11.8%

Concern is governance
Private Provision of HE

• Private colleges 3/4\textsuperscript{th} of total colleges:
  - Aided colleges
  - Unaided colleges
• Private HE Institutes as a % of total: 63%
• Private HE enrolments as a % of total: 52%

Concern is the Quality
Growth in privately affiliated institutes more than institutes with public affiliation that has almost stagnated by growth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Higher Education Institutes</th>
<th>Ownership</th>
<th>Financing</th>
<th>No. of Institutes</th>
<th>No. of Students</th>
<th>Growth Trends</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government Universities</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>10,00,000</td>
<td>Not growing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Universities</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>Emerging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deemed Universities (aided)</td>
<td>Any of the 2</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>Growingly slowly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deemed Universities (unaided)</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>Growingly rapidly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleges under Government</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>4,225</td>
<td>27,50,000</td>
<td>Not growing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Colleges (aided)</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>5,750</td>
<td>34,50,000</td>
<td>Not growing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Colleges (unaided)</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>7,650</td>
<td>31,50,000</td>
<td>Growingly rapidly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Institutions</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>Emerging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>18,123</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,04,68,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BENEFICIARIES AND THEIR ROLE
Beneficiaries

- GER 15%
- About 17 million enrollment of students
- HE benefits an individual himself, his family employer, society, and nation
- Influences lifestyles, customer preferences and challenges unacceptable social taboos in the society
- Treated as a tool of societal upliftment
General courses account for 81% of total students but have registered a negative growth rate.
Engineering and medicine have registered a positive growth rate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Engineering</th>
<th>Medicine</th>
<th>Law</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>1,568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>1,511</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>2,524</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Beneficiaries and their role - students

- Private rates of return on education at graduate level - 15.87%
- Students pursuing HE at various levels: Graduation – 86%, Post Graduation – 12%, Research 1% and Vocational courses – 1%
- Other beneficiaries include – parents, employers, Educational Entrepreneurs, Teachers
- Students unions both political and non-political in nature
EXTERNAL STAKEHOLDERS AND THEIR ROLE
External stakeholders

- Tutors and coaching classes as opinion leaders and performance enhancers for students
- Publishers
- Media
- Social Networking
- Civil societies
HIGHER EDUCATION AND THE SOCIAL PACT
Regulators

• Regulators regulate: opening of the institute, their infrastructural requirements, students’ intake, fees, syllabus content, evaluation, accreditation, faculty appointments and honorarium, etc.
• Overlapping of their roles is bothersome
• HE politicization
• Ex. Judicial intervention

NKC report, Educational Tribunal Bill
* Escalating population belonging to the relevant age cohort
* No. of students enrolled in secondary education

* Government lacks funding for HE
* Foreign education bill pending
  (‘Not for-Profit’ on papers but ‘For-profit’)
Quality concerns

• Objective being increased access and so massification
• Results in quality concerns
• Very few institutes to accredit the quality of HEIs like NAAC, NBA, etc.
• Not associated with rewards
• Re-accreditation not bothered with

NAAC bill in pipeline
Efficiency concerns

- Syllabus designing and delivery up gradation – lethargic and bureaucratic
- Results in educated unemployed
- A larger share of research comes from public institutions

Autonomous institute enjoy freedom
Challenge for regulators

Stringent enough policies not to allow undeserving HEIs

Liberal enough policies to allow creativity and prompt upgradations

Extremely narrow space
Providers

• Politicized public HE system
• Market forces influenced private providers
• Philanthropist (though not with all noble cause)
• Alumni
• Corporates (industry institute linkages)
• Teachers as providers...
Faculties

• Availability of faculties is a concern
• Dandekar, Adam Smith ‘ No one barring exceptions works for the pleasure of it…’
• API, Impactful Research, consultancies, field work, rare
• Administrative portfolios in Public and Private
For students..

• HE is an experience good.... May land into mistakes due to asymmetric information or bad decision making

• Concepts like manpower planning difficult

• As students (in Indian context mostly parents) share more burden they demand courses with anticipated higher returns on HE and so those professional courses demand is growing but still less.
• All in all …many challenges but processes for improvements are augmented and efforts are praiseworthy in context of the HUGE SIZE of the HE system in India
Thank you !!