

## **The Churn in the Higher Education Sector**

### **What is the issue?**

\n\n

\n

- Multiple court interventions like in the “IDUs case” have been dictating the scheme of things in the higher education sector.

\n

- More clarity is needed on the regulatory framework in place, for ensuring hazzle free functioning of institutions.

\n

\n\n

### **What are IDUs?**

\n\n

\n

- The need for promoting and strengthening institutions that had high standards in specialised academic fields was felt.

\n

- Indian Institute of Science (IISc), Bangalore, and Indian Agricultural Research Institute (IARI), New Delhi was some such institutions.

\n

- While it was recognized that their expertise made them deserving of university status, their classification as such was not done for historical reasons.

\n

- Hence, the concept of ‘Institutions Deemed to be Universities’ (IDU) was invented and UGC Act empowered the central government to grant this recognition to any deserving higher educational institution.

\n

\n\n

### **What was the problem?**

\n\n

\n

- IDU clause was for a targeted support for specific high-profile institutions.

\n

- But this approach was diluted by subsequent liberal conferment of IDU status.

\n

\n\n

\n

- The reason was that, this status meant, complete autonomy over admission norms and fees and in starting and closing study programmes.

\n

- Significantly, their numbers swelled from two in 1958 to 43 by 2000 and to 126 by 2009, which resulted in alarming commercialisation.

\n

- Consequently, a PIL was filed in 2006 alleging blatant commercialisation of education by IDUs and pleading for an effective regulatory mechanism.

\n

- Hence, the Ministry of Human Resource Development (MHRD) constituted the Tandon committee in 2009, to review the status of all the 126 institutions.

\n

\n\n

### **What did the Tandon Committee report say?**

\n\n

\n

- Tandon report followed a transparent and criterion based approach for its institutional review that focused on the following parameters:\n\n

\n

- Broad-based and multi-disciplinary work

\n

- Compliance with the UGC Act and guidelines

\n

- Institutionalised governance structure

\n

- Quality and innovative teaching-learning processes

\n

- Meaningful research with a societal impact

\n

- Transparency in admissions, course structure and fees

\n

\n

\n

- In its report, Tandon committee concluded that only 38 out of the 126 universities deserved IDU status and that a remaining 44 had scope for reaching there.

- \n
- For the 3<sup>rd</sup> category of 44 institutions, the stripping of IDU recognition and reverting them to the status of being affiliate colleges was suggested.
- \n

\n\n

### **What were the subsequent judicial interventions?**

\n\n

- \n
- While MHRD accepted the Tandon Committee report and proposed to delist the last 44 institutions in 200, the court had stayed such an action.
- \n
- Subsequently, the court ordered the UGC to freshly evaluate all the institutions independent of the Tandon committee report.
- \n
- This was because, the task of “coordination and maintenance of standards” in higher education was conceived to be rested solely in the UGC Act.
- \n
- The MHRD’s argument that since it had the power to approve IDU status, it could also withdraw approval if conditions aren’t met wasn’t accepted.
- \n
- Currently, only 1 institution of the 126, has been derecognized thus far and there is no clarity on the government’s power to crack down on erring IDUs.
- \n

\n\n

### **What is the way ahead?**

\n\n

- \n
- The UGC must engage itself with policy formulation alone and base its decisions regarding institutions on the ratings of the accreditation bodies.
- \n
- The National Accreditation and Assessment Council (NAAC) or any other body charged with the responsibility must be completely autonomous.
- \n
- There is also a need to regulate state private universities as their numbers are spiralling out of control ever since the tightening of the IDU route.
- \n
- Clarity is needed on who are the primary regulators for distance education, which is currently very ambiguous.
- \n
- While the Tandon Committee Report has been brushed aside on technical

grounds, they have flagged critical issues.

\n

- This calls for immediate further pondering on the regulatory structure, to weed out underperformers and incentivise good institutions.

\n

\n\n

\n\n

**Source: Indian Express**

\n

