BRITISH COUNCIL

cprhe
Centre for Policy Research in Higher Education

Report on the International Seminar on Diversity and Inclusion in Higher Education

Nidhi S. Sabharwal
Pradeep Kumar Misra

Jointly Organized by
Centre for Policy Research in Higher Education (CPRHE)
National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration (NIEPA)
and
British Council

Report on the International Seminar on Diversity and Inclusion in Higher Education

Nidhi S. Sabharwal
Pradeep Kumar Misra

Jointly Organized by
Centre for Policy Research in Higher Education (CPRHE)
National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration (NIEPA)
and
British Council, India
New Delhi, 2023

© National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration, 2023
(Deemed to be University)

Published – December 2023 (2 H)

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronics, magnetic tape, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without permission in writing from NIEPA.

Published by the Registrar
National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration
17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg, New Delhi and Designed at Digital Expressions, Shahpur Jat, New Delhi & Printed at M/s Archna Printers, Okhla, New Delhi-110020.

Acknowledgements

The Centre for Policy Research in Higher Education (CPRHE) of the National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration (NIEPA), New Delhi, and the British Council, India, jointly organised an "International Seminar on Diversity and Inclusion in Higher Education," on 16-17 February 2023, at the India Habitat Centre, New Delhi. The seminar brought together more than 110 participants, including international participants, from seven countries. The seminar could not have been organised without the generous support received from various sources and agencies.

We express our gratitude to the Ministry of Education (MOE) and the Ministry of External Affairs (MEA) for their help in facilitating visas for the participants. We are also grateful to our Vice Chancellor, Professor Sudhanshu Bhushan (I/C), for his guidance and support at every stage of the international seminar. We are most thankful to our current Vice-Chancellor, NIEPA, Professor Shashikala Wanjari for her continuing guidance & support.

We thank Dr. Rittika Chanda Parruck, Ms. Vishu Sharma, and other colleagues from the British Council for their collaboration and support.

Grateful acknowledgements are due to the NIEPA administration headed by Sandeep Chatterjee, the Registrar, and his team consisting of D. S. Thakur, Administrative Officer, Nishant Sinha, Finance Officer and his team, Ms. Sonam Anand (Training Cell) and her team, Mr. Chander Prakash (General Administration), and their colleagues for their logistical support in organising the seminar. We thank Amit Singhal (Publication Officer) and the team in the Publication Unit for their support in bringing out this report and other documents related to the seminar.

We are also grateful to all the session rapporteurs — Dr. Garima Malik, Dr. Sangeeta Angom, Mr. Eldho Mathews, Dr. Binay Prasad, Dr. Jinusha Panigrahi, Dr. Santwana G. Mishra, and Dr. Anupam Pachauri. We are also thankful to all our colleagues at the CPRHE for their consistent support. Research scholars of NIEPA deserve a wholehearted thanks for their excellent voluntary assistance at the various stages of the seminar.

Last but not the least, we would like to thank Ms. Aqsa for her comprehensive support and assistance in preparing the report. Thanks are due to Ms Chetna Chawla, Ms. Monica Joshi, Mr. Mayank Rajput and our research scholars for their invaluable help at every stage in the preparation and organisation of the seminar.

Nidhi S. Sabharwal and Pradeep Kumar Misra

Contents

1. Introduction 1-3

2. Inaugural Session 3-7

3. Resume of Discussions 8-26

   3.1 State, Market, and Equity in Higher Education 8-15

   3.2 Higher Education Access, Diversity and Social Inclusion 15-18

   3.3 Equity and Excellence in Higher Education 18-22

   3.4 Higher Education and Equitable Employment Outcomes 22-24

   3.5 Future Perspective on Strategies for Equity in Higher Education: Institutional Leadership, Equity Policies, and Institutional Practices to Support Student Success 25-26

Appendix 1: Detailed Programme 27-31

Appendix 2: List of Participants 32-44

International Seminar on Diversity and Inclusion in Higher Education

16-17 February, 2023

1. Introduction

Fast expansion of higher education is a global phenomenon in this century. The worldwide enrolment in higher education doubled from 100 million to 220 million between 2000 and 2017. The increase in school enrolment as a result of "Education for All" initiatives and enhanced demand for higher skills in the knowledge economy are, no doubt, influencing factors promoting an increased social demand and the resultant expansion of higher education. Higher education has been massified, if not universalised, in a majority of the countries in the world.

This expansion of the higher education system has been accompanied by a diversification of the sector. This diversification took place in terms of institutional arrangements for provision, study programmes, funding sources, and students. The empirical evidence shows that those systems which were more diversified have expanded faster than others. The expansion of higher education in most developed countries offers a scope for institutional diversification. The binary and ternary systems in the United Kingdom, the University Institutes of Technology (IUTs) of France, and the Community Colleges in the USA are examples of institutional diversification.

Higher education attainment is one of the significant determinants of inter- and intra-generational equity and advancement of human well-being. Therefore, how higher education opportunities are distributed across the population and to what extent the underprivileged and marginalised population can access and succeed in higher education are crucial for achieving the goals of sustainable equity and inclusion in the future. Affirmative action policies and incentive schemes are the most commonly found policy interventions across countries to promote equity and inclusion in higher education. Among these measures, the quota system for disadvantaged students is widely relied on for ensuring equity in access in many societies.

The reservation policy has a long history in India and is part of its Constitutional provisions. The quota for disadvantaged groups in admissions to higher

education is close to 50 per cent. To expand the access, India also followed a policy of establishing institutions in under-served regions that have, very often, a high concentration of people belonging to disadvantaged groups. In addition to creating facilities, various incentive schemes such as scholarships, hostel schemes, financial assistance, and remedial courses are in operation to promote students from marginalised socio-economic and cultural backgrounds. These measures have, indeed, helped many disadvantaged students to overcome social, economic, emotional, and academic barriers to entry and excel in higher education.

Evidence suggests that while diversification can facilitate a faster expansion of the system, it can also lead to increased inequalities in the nature and quality of higher education received by different segments of the population. Therefore, it is argued that diversification is a process of diversion to channel the children from disadvantaged backgrounds to lower-status post-secondary education institutions and programmes. In other words, while increasing the access to higher education, diversification may contribute to widening inequalities in success in higher education and the employment market. It is also essential to understand how technological advancement and the emergence of new frameworks and modalities for credit accumulation can contribute to achieving equity and inclusion.

The National Education Policy 2020 (NEP 2020) placed significant emphasis on equity and inclusion and is committed to Sustainable Development Goal 4 (SDG 4), which promotes "inclusive and equitable quality education and lifelong learning opportunities for all." The NEP 2020 aims to increase the GER to 50 per cent by 2035. Along with structural transformation in academic programmes, such as four-year degree courses, one-year master's, and new credit accumulation frameworks such as Academic Bank of Credits, NEP 2020 emphasised the education of the socio-economically disadvantaged groups (SEDGs). More flexibility in learning and credit accumulation, integration of curricular and co-curricular activities, and promotion of Indian languages are expected to promote equity and inclusion in higher education.

Many empirical studies, including the studies by the CPRHE/NIEPA, indicate the need for further empirical analysis and designing of intervention strategies to make higher education and employment markets more inclusive. This formed the context for organising an International Seminar on Diversity and Inclusion in higher education. The seminar was jointly organised by CPRHE/NIEPA and the British Council. The seminar brought together academics, policymakers, and administrators from India and abroad to discuss and debate issues of diversity and inclusion in the changing landscape of higher education globally and India.

Objectives of the Seminar

The international seminar had the following objectives:

1. To advance the understanding of student diversity and inclusion issues in higher education.
2. To provide a platform for researchers and practitioners to share and learn from their experiences.
3. To deliberate upon equity policies and intervention strategies to widen access to and enable student success in higher education.

The seminar brought together educationists, key experts, policymakers and policy analysts from seven countries, viz the United Kingdom, Australia, Malaysia, Nepal, New Zealand, Philippines, Spain, and India. Around 100 plus delegates from these countries, along with representatives from different organisations, participated in the seminar. Overall, the seminar provided to the academics, researchers, experts, policymakers and members of various institutions engaged in research and policy an occasion to network with each other and share a common platform for discussing several issues related to the diversity and inclusion of higher education.

2. Inaugural Session

The international seminar commenced with the welcome address by Professor Pradeep Kumar Misra, Director of the CPRHE/NIEPA, followed by Programme Introduction by Dr. Nidhi S. Sabharwal, Associate Professor, CPRHE/NIEPA. In the welcome address, the Director CPRHE/NIEPA set the context of the deliberations and expressed his happiness over the 7th year of the successful organisation of the series of international seminars in collaboration with the British Council. He informed the audience that the CPRHE/NIEPA has large-scale multi-institutional studies and the International Seminar on diversity is the outcome of the research on diversity and making higher education more inclusive. It was highlighted that the seminar will generate discussions on practical ways to engage with diversity in higher education (HE) and provide a platform to learn from experiences.

In his opening remarks by Michael Houlgate, Regional Director HE, British Council thanked the CPRHE for being the driving force of the collaboration with the British Council. The speaker emphasised on the significance of promoting diversity and inclusion within the higher education sector. It was pointed out

by the speaker that we gather here today because there is a recognition that universities have not always been the most inclusive spaces. Historically, they have been preserves for subsets of the population, with others excluded based on economic background, class, gender, race, nationality, and more. While significant progress has been made in recent decades, but there's still much work to be done to foster diversity and inclusion. The critical role of higher education in nation-building and fostering social cohesion was highlighted. It was elaborated that higher education isn't just about universities; it plays a crucial role in nation-building, shaping societies, and forming the future. The research and innovation that will fuel future economy is happening right now at universities. The leaders of the future, who will guide governments, businesses, cultural organizations, future teachers, and doctors, are all educated at universities at this moment.

It was emphasised that if it can be ensured that universities are diverse and inclusive environments, it can help ensure that the future world and societies are also inclusive and diverse. Conversely, if universities become the preserve of one subset or if they become exclusive places, then that will significantly impact the future world. The speaker pointed out that this is seen playing out in real time where gender gaps in higher education are mirrored in the workforce and job market. When higher education isn't inclusive, it results in professional fields that lack diversity and fail to represent the whole of society. Thus, the fight for diversity, equity and inclusion in higher education is not just about fairness; it's about shaping a future that reflects the full spectrum of human potential. It was emphasised that to make universities more diverse and inclusive spaces, instead of working in isolation, all need to work together to achieve significant, impactful, lasting change. Towards this effort the vital role of British Council was highlighted. It was pointed out that the strength of the British Council lies in its ability to bring people together, to convene groups, to provide spaces for sharing ideas and knowledge, and to provide platforms for voices that might otherwise go unheard. It creates spaces where people can come together to develop solutions to the global challenges collaboratively. The overall message emphasised the importance of collective efforts to create more inclusive universities and a better future world.

In his keynote address, Professor Graeme Atherton, Director, National Education Opportunities Network, United Kingdom, focussed on the global picture of equity, access and success in HE. He delved into the pressing challenges and the roles of various entities, including policymakers and universities, in addressing them. The global picture showed significant challenges in terms of inequalities in access and participation in higher education. It was highlighted that policymakers and universities need to address these challenges and make progress toward equitable

access. Drawing on comprehensive global surveys and studies, he showcased significant concerns regarding the pandemic's lasting impact on higher education's equity and inclusion goals. It was highlighted that the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic has set back progress in this area, particularly for equity groups. The research showed potential decreases in applications, degree completion rates, and performance, particularly among economically disadvantaged groups. In the current scenario, five big global issues were highlighted as major challenges for achieving global equity in higher education. The first challenge identified was the scale of inequality in higher education participation across the world. Over 90 per cent of countries have unequal participation, making this a global issue. An analysis of over 130 different individual country surveys in over 100 countries worldwide indicated that among the least wealthy quintile, higher education attendance is 18 per cent. In the wealthiest quintile, it's 41 per cent. This reveals substantial global disparities in higher education participation.

Secondly, policymakers' commitment to addressing this challenge needs improvement, with only 12 per cent of countries having a specific higher education equity strategy.

The third issue discussed was what universities are doing to meet this challenge, with the University of the Free State in South Africa cited as a case study. The University of the Free State which is a public university with over 40,000 students, 80 per cent of whom are black face significant challenges, particularly

in ensuring successful degree completion by black students. The dropout rate for black students in higher education in South Africa reaches 50 per cent in certain parts of the South African system. Yet, the rate of participation and completion among black students is nearly 75 per cent. It was highlighted that the university has prioritised 13 high-impact practices, with four of them scaled, resulting in an increase in the number of black students completing their courses. By focussing on the unique needs of these students and recognising their individual challenges, it was emphasised to realise that the system itself, not the students, needs to change. This understanding was pointed out as a major step toward addressing the global inequities in higher education

However, despite these efforts, the global situation may not improve, as evidence shows that access, retention, attainment, and employment rates are likely to fall for equity groups by 2025. Five focal areas were highlighted as crucial to address these challenges effectively: leadership, internationalisation, collaboration, investment, and advocacy. The speaker emphasised the need for shared responsibility, the importance of embedding equity in international partnerships, the benefits of best practice exchange, the necessity for targeted investment, and the role of data-driven advocacy. Furthermore, the speaker shared initiatives in the UK, specifically pointing to the World Access to Education Day and a global equity map, both of which aim to foster global discussions and actions for inclusive access to higher education.

The Chair, Professor Sudhanshu Bhushan, Vice Chancellor (I/C), NIEPA, began by expressing his gratitude to various individuals and organisations present at the seventh international seminar organised by CPRHE/NIEPA in collaboration with the British Council. He congratulated the CPRHE/NIEPA for its meticulous planning. The topic of the seminar: diversity, and inclusion in higher education, was highlighted as significant and challenging topic in today's context. It was highlighted that development can be conceptualised from three distinct perspectives or models. The first model views development primarily as GDP-led growth, focussing on the overall economic expansion of a country. The second model emphasises the importance of distribution alongside growth. While it recognises the necessity for economic growth, it posits that any goods produced must be distributed equitably among the populace. The third model centres on an equitable production structure, arguing that if the production process is equitable, distribution will naturally follow suit. It was pointed out that both the GDP-led model and the distribution-centric model have exhibited problems despite contributing to development. These models have led to significant disparities

on multiple fronts, resulting in wealth inequality, income inequality, sectoral disparities, and notably, inequality in higher education.

As was pointed out, the evidence suggests that capital-intensive developmental processes have resulted in a more inequitable society. For instance, these processes have led to a digital divide and a knowledge divide among different socioeconomic groups. The current situation in higher education is complex. Market forces are leading to exclusion due to the high costs of higher education, making it unaffordable for many. On the other hand, the role of the state in making higher education inclusive through its various policies is still a matter of discussion. Additionally, there are challenges at the institutional level as well. It was highlighted that institutions must evaluate their practices to ensure they are inclusive and representative of all sections of society, including all classes, castes, and social groups. This is even more challenging in the context of private higher education, where resources for promoting equity and inclusion may be lacking. This complex situation creates a need for extensive discussion and debate. Consequently, it was highlighted that it is of utmost importance to engage in thorough discussions about how to effectively address the challenges of equity and inclusion. The speaker emphasised the importance of achieving equity in higher education as a crucial step towards a more equitable society.

The eighth issue of the Indian Higher Education Report 2021 (IHER 2021) published by Routledge in 2022 was released on the first day of the International Seminar. The inaugural session ended with vote of thanks, by Dr. Sandeep Chatterjee, Registrar, NIEPA.

3. Resume of Discussions

The following sections delineate the primary issues that constituted the discussion and discourse at the seminar.

3.1 State, Market and Equity in Higher Education

Higher education is a crucial factor in promoting economic growth and ensuring equitable distribution of national income through employment opportunities and earnings. The level of education attained by individuals significantly influences their chances of job prospects and their potential earnings. However, when educational opportunities and attainment are unevenly distributed, they become a major source of inequality, and it calls for appropriate public policies to rectify the situation.

Inequities in society are, therefore, not predetermined. It is a choice that society can make. This choice involves addressing inequalities and providing equal access to resources and opportunities. Given that it is a choice, it opens up alternatives and options where the state can intervene to influence outcomes. According to a comprehensive OECD study, which analysed data from 1973 to 2008, education has emerged as a singularly crucial factor in creating and accelerating inequalities, especially in developed countries. This finding could likely extend to developing and less developed countries. Among different levels of education, higher education plays a notably significant role, particularly in the context of knowledge economies. While the influence of higher education was somewhat limited in non-knowledge economies and before its massification and universalisation, its role has become increasingly important as it expands. The bulk of decision-making and influential roles in contemporary society are played by those involved in higher education research and the generation of knowledge within universities. Variations in opportunities provided to people, along with disparities in access to present and future resources, pose significant challenges for those investing in creating a socially inclusive society for the future.

Historically, the idea of inherited merit was the foundational assumption underpinning social and economic development, and it contributed to the perpetuation of inequalities over time. However, this trend is changing. Changes in public policy and the role of the state have played a considerable part in this shift over time. Progressive actions by the state in social sectors, particularly in education, have been instrumental in reducing intergenerational inequalities. Evidence of intergenerational mobility across various countries highlights a

significant trend: studies show that the influence of parental education and social status on the educational progress of the next generation has declined over time.

Progressive actions by states have been critical in this process. The progressive role of the State involves its social and political commitments as well as adherence to democratic principles. For effective equity policies, accurate targeting is necessary. This is because, during development, a process of cumulative marginalisation can occur, magnifying the extent of enduring inequalities. When assets like land are distributed, it may or may not generate lasting inequalities. However, when higher education is distributed unequally, inequalities are not only created in the present; they are also perpetuated into the next generation.

Therefore, the role of who provides and benefits from higher education, who accesses and graduates from higher education, and what the learning outcomes and employment outcomes are from the higher education sector, becomes crucial. Targeting is a key policy intervention, and this targeting should be based on regional, economic, and social factors.

A study on Equity Policies in HE in South Asia conducted by N.V. Varghese and Nidhi S. Sabharwal showed that those countries with higher levels of ethnic fractionalisation, where a coefficient closer to zero indicates a more equal society and one closer to one indicates a highly diverse society, tend to employ social indicators and dimensions to address equity issues. Countries not fitting these categories, such as those in South Asia, which are more diverse, and Southeast Asia, which is more homogeneous, including countries like Japan and Korea, exhibit a different trend in public and collective action. Thus, targeting is crucial in such contexts.

In India, affirmative action measures have mostly followed a social criterion to identify the equity groups. The constitutionally mandated 49.5 per cent of seats in higher education are reserved for population groups such as the scheduled castes, scheduled tribes and other backward classes. In 2019, economic categories were added, bringing the reservation to 59 per cent. This change indicates an increasing embrace of diversity. In fact, the biggest revolution occurring in higher education in India, mirroring trends in many other countries, is this shift in student composition and the introduction of more diversity.

However, the elite institutional structure often struggles to interact effectively with first-generation learners and those from regionally and socially disadvantaged groups. A significant challenge for educators, from Vice-Chancellors and department heads to the students themselves, is figuring out how to foster an

inclusive society within the campus and the university. This is not solely the responsibility of education administrators or managers, but rather a collective effort.

In terms of institutional changes, equity measures can be incorporated in four ways. Globally, equity interventions can be categorised into four groups: The first is nationally determined equity measures implemented at the institutional level. The second is nationally determined equity measures that incentivise institutions. For example, if an institution admits 50 per cent or 40 per cent of its students from disadvantaged groups, it receives additional benefits in terms of allocations and grants. The third category of equity interventions includes nationally and internationally accepted strategies regarding provisions for disadvantaged groups. Additionally, in some countries, equity interventions have been donor-sponsored or propelled by non-governmental organisations (NGOs). This approach was present in India at certain points in time as well.

In case of Australia for example, concerns of diversity and inclusion are deeply embedded in the country's higher education policy. This includes system regulation, quality assurance, financing, performance monitoring, and reporting. The policy statements articulating the 1988 Dawkins reforms remain the focal point of Australia's higher education equity policy. Priority groups identified in these policy statements include Indigenous, low socioeconomic status (SES), regional and remote, disability, non-English speaking background (NESB), and women in non-traditional areas. Australian higher education equity policies have played a vital role in increasing the participation of students from equity cohorts and providing a consistently high standard of education and experience. At the institution-level, Australian universities have introduced various policies and strategies to encourage increased participation, retention, and achievement by students from equity cohorts. Many of these are summarized in mandatory University Access and Participation Plans, monitored by sophisticated business intelligence and learning analytics systems, and codified in institutional policies governing admissions, credit transfer/recognition of prior learning, diversity, and student support. The primary equity funding scheme is the Higher Education Participation and Partnerships Program (HEPPP), through which the Australian Government disburses funding to institutions to support select equity cohorts (i.e., regional/remote, low SES, and Indigenous students). To provide economic support, Australia's centralised, universal funding system comprises an income-contingent loan scheme for domestic student tuition fees and needs-based scholarships for eligible domestic students covering living expenses (i.e., bursaries). Policy

implementation is monitored, with comprehensive information and evaluation systems established under the Higher Education Equity Data Collection and Student Equity in Higher Education Evaluation Framework.

Looking at the evolution of higher education in India, the Gross Enrolment Ratio (GER) has either increased or stayed consistent since 2014, the stage of massification. As of now, there are around 40 million students in Indian colleges and universities. An important shift has occurred in the student composition of universities, as in the 2010-11 academic year, nearly 48 per cent of students were from the general categories, and 28 per cent were from the Other Backward Classes (OBC) categories. However, by 2020, the general category share dropped to around 42 per cent, while the OBC category increased to 37 per cent. There have only been marginal changes in the SC, ST categories. Arguably, the OBC category has benefited the most from reservations or quota systems in India. Intriguingly, this shift is taking place even as the market dictates most of the factors, with 78 per cent of the institutions and 66 per cent of the enrolment in private institutions. This implies that even those from socially deprived groups can afford private institutions. Although there are still disparities in enrolment, there are signs of 'catch-up' by SC and ST groups, with faster growth in enrolment of OBC categories compared to other groups. Thus, the available evidence suggests that the Other Backward Classes (OBC) category has benefitted the most from the massification process that has occurred in higher education.

After the process of marketisation in higher education, the progression rates have changed significantly, where economic aspects play a key role alongside the social dimensions of educational development. In India, most policies and strategies have aimed at bringing students to colleges and universities, yet what happens to them after their admission is rarely addressed. There are two major concerns here. One is the issue of dropouts, and the other is what is referred to as "back paper syndrome," where many students from disadvantaged backgrounds struggle with the curriculum requirements of elite institutions.

While more students from diverse backgrounds in India are going to college than ever before, emerging evidence raises equity concerns about preparedness of students from diverse backgrounds to persists in their educational goals and achieve academic success. The CPRHE/NIEPA research project on College Readiness shows that majority of students going to private, unaided schools follow an English medium curriculum, making their transition to higher education easier. However, in many government schools today, where a larger number of students

from scheduled castes, scheduled tribes, and poor OBC family's study, the medium of instruction is not English. This highlights how the schooling process in India segments students and makes it challenging for some students to take advantage of the higher education opportunities in the country. While acknowledging the challenges faced by SC and ST students in classrooms and social inclusion, it is important to distinguish between academic achievement and the need for academic integration, participation, and an inclusive campus environment.

In relation to regional variations, some regions in India have seen low levels of education development and high levels of inequality, while in other regions the opposite holds true. This pattern is clearly noticeable in regions such as northeastern states and Kerala, where, despite being educationally advanced, the coefficient of inequality is low. In contrast, regions with lower levels of educational development, like Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh, and Bihar, show high levels of inequality. It's a paradox that requires attention; when people are poor, they appear more equal, but as some become rich, the inequality intensifies. This phenomenon is not simply about poverty but more specifically about educational poverty, and it's important to recognise this distinction.

Furthermore, where market mechanisms to expand HE access are dominant in India, it is clear that these have contributed substantially to increasing inequalities. This is evident by analysing disparity in the number of higher education institutions per population across different states. For instance, in Andhra Pradesh, Telangana, Karnataka, and Pondicherry, there are around 55 to 60 higher education institutions per 100,000 population. In contrast, in Bihar and West Bengal, this number is around 8 to 13. This disparity is due, in part, to the emergence of private institutions, which have contributed to regional inequalities. Furthermore, the establishment of most private institutions in urban areas creates an urban bias in development, resulting in another layer of inequalities.

In relation to achieving gender equality in higher education, many of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) are directed towards promoting gender equality in higher education and vocational technical education. These include targets for increased inclusivity, expansion of higher education scholarships, and a rise in the supply of qualified teachers. Achieving these interconnected goals under SDG 4 would mean significant strides towards improving gender equity in higher education.

Gender inequalities persist more in India compared to other BRICS countries or

our neighbours. India's ratio of female to male labour force participation rate is only 27.4 per cent, among the lowest of these countries. Various factors contribute to these outcomes, with the cost of education being a crucial determinant. A gender divide becomes apparent when assessing the components of household spending on higher education. Data shows that households are investing more in their sons compared to their daughters, particularly in the fields of STEM and technical education. The average household expenditure per student per annum in technical and professional courses reinforces this point.

While more girls are now pursuing higher education, they do not necessarily enjoy the same opportunities or benefits when it comes to subject choice. The analysis shows that there is gendering in the choice of disciplines. This discrepancy is evident in the proportion of male and female enrolments in various technical and professional courses. Men are more likely to be enrolled in market-oriented courses, including engineering, computer applications, business administration and pharmacy. On the other hand, women are more likely to enrolled in courses social sciences, humanities and nursing. While more girls are now participating in higher education, it is important to recognise that those from marginalised communities, including scheduled castes, scheduled tribes, and students with disabilities, are more vulnerable. Furthermore, spatial analysis shows that there are intersections of space with gender with rural women having least access to highly skilled professional courses. One key observation made was that girls or women tend to be more reliant on public provision of higher education.

The discrepancies are not only cost-related, but also linked to factors such as the absence of an enabling environment in higher education institutions, including the spatial distribution of these institutions, and the administrative procedures for selection and admission. The recent shift to online learning due to the COVID-19 pandemic has further exacerbated the situation, particularly due to issues of digital access.

It is crucial to note that gender equality in higher education is not just about student participation. We must also consider teachers and other human resources. There is a significant discrepancy in the number of female teachers compared to male teachers across different social and religious groups. The disparity is also seen in the ranks of teaching positions held. Furthermore, among non-teaching staff, the gender divide persists. The increase in privatisation and the role of the market seem to present an ostensibly neutral institutional arrangement that promises equal opportunities. However, this often leads to amplified inequality

due to differences in financial resources and access to information. As girls and women are more reliant on public provision, the state has a crucial role to play in promoting gender equality.

Despite many governments expressing commitment to gender equality and mainstreaming, policies often fail to translate into outcomes. This is primarily due to the lack of a gender lens in planning, budgeting, and implementation. A look at the union government budgets reveals a decreasing trend over time towards higher education, both as a percentage of the total union budget and as a percentage of GDP. This contraction of resources, especially in light of recent economic disturbances, is likely to impact gender equality in higher education. The union government has two strategies for addressing gender budgeting: setting up a gender budget cell in the Department of Higher Education and releasing a gender budget statement, which collates all expenditures specific to girls and women in higher education. However, it is important to note that the current gender budget statement follows a binary approach and does not address the needs of the transgender community. Gender-responsive budgeting and analysis could prove effective in promoting participation, creating fair conditions, addressing institutional gender-based violence, and empowering development for both men and women.

The union government's response towards ensuring equality in higher education can be improved through a more effective use of gender-disaggregated data, and the introduction of policies that provide spatially-specific protection from discrimination on the grounds of sexual orientation and gender identity in higher education institutions. Encouraging gender diversity by awarding weightage to female and transgender candidates during the interview selection process could also be a beneficial strategy. There needs to be a gender-integrated approach towards managing the various human resources within the education sector, ranging from textbooks to classroom practices. Policies that may not explicitly reference gender, such as those concerning examination and tuition fees, significantly impact the participation of girls and boys in higher education and thus should be examined with a gender lens. By creating gender-responsive policies, we can pave the way for gender-responsive budgeting, thus leading to a more equitable educational environment for all.

Finally, the dominance of market rationality presents a dilemma for policymakers in higher education. On the one hand, the introduction of a quota system is criticised based on economic rationality, arguing that it reduces the total earnings structure as those who displace others often earn less. However, from a social

viewpoint, the picture is quite different. It suggests that a social rationality needs to be applied, emphasising that the state rather than the market should apply this. Hence, market efficiency and rate of return analyses based on economic rationality may not be the best ways to address issues of equity, diversity, and inclusion.

3.2 Higher Education Access, Diversity and Social Inclusion

The Indian higher education sector witnessed significant expansion in recent decades and it has become more diversified during this period by improving the educational opportunities of students from traditionally under-represented social backgrounds. Enrolment rates in higher education have been increasing steadily over the last decade. However, disparity in enrolments among different social groups continue to be high in the country. Since higher education attainment is one of the significant determinants of inter and intra generational social mobility, understanding how opportunities are distributed across the population is crucial for achieving the goals of inclusive education.

There are multiple barriers to higher education access and success. Access and performance within the Indian higher education sector are largely influenced by high-stakes testing events, both at the point of entry into institutions and by employers at the time of recruitment as well as for entry into post-graduation. The emphasis on testing has led to significant investments in specialised test preparation, encompassing both the private coaching industry and informal community-driven efforts. To genuinely understand the challenges of diversity and inclusion in higher education, there's a need to consider the interplay between formal education and the burgeoning test preparation industry. The importance

of tracking students' 'educational careers,' both within traditional academic frameworks and their parallel journeys within the private coaching sector was emphasised.

Language plays an important role in deciding the nature of HE access and academic success. Students from the privileged backgrounds from urban areas already possess a certain form of capital, especially with regard to English language skills. Medium of instruction determines the choice of subjects with students who studied in government schools where medium of instruction is in the regional language opt for subjects in social sciences. Attending high schools with regional language as their medium of instruction, negatively influence their abilities for the transition to English as a medium of instruction in higher education. There are significant differences between urban and rural students with regard to their language and communication skills and this is reflected in classroom discussions and interactions. A section of students faces difficulties in overcoming this hurdle, resulting in in-class silence in classroom interactions. In many occasions, silence from the part of a section of students make them invisible to other students and teachers. This is caused by a deeper hegemony existing in the higher education institutions.

Higher education institutions reflect both aggregation and segregation trends and contribute to the isolation of students from marginalised backgrounds. The isolation of academically fragile students reflects inequalities in the institutions. Many a time, segregation trends are visible in the participation of students in extracurricular activities as well. As a result of this kind of "ostracism" on campus, students from the marginalized backgrounds tend to withdraw to their groups. The exclusionary effects of this process would be reflected in the campus placement stage as well. Deeply entrenched caste hierarchies also play a role in shaping students' experiences and opportunities.

While prestigious institutions like the IITs provide marginalised groups access to higher education, multiple challenges hinder genuine equity post-admission. Extensive research shows that institutional practices inadvertently solidify caste-based identities, with reserved category students often stigmatized despite achieving the same academic benchmarks as their counterparts. Studies show prevalence of caste-based segregation on campuses, the lack of adequate institutional support for struggling students, and the persistent discrimination in faculty recruitment. Furthermore, even upon graduation, students from marginalized groups face disparities in job placements and salaries, even with equivalent academic performance.

Higher education institutions become sites of intellectual inequality. Intellectual inequality in India's higher education institutions presents itself as a profound issue, particularly when considering the experiences of subaltern students wherein subaltern students often feel unrecognised, even to the point of invisibility. Intellectual inequalities within the classrooms, reflects as silence from students from the disadvantaged groups. Rather than perceiving this silence as a mere absence of language or participation, it must be understood as a representation of the challenges these students face in articulating their experiences.

Intellectual inequalities are mainly manifested through unequal distribution of resources. Therefore, it is not surprising that dropout rates among students from marginalized social backgrounds are significantly higher in public universities. The ultimate question posed is: how can the education system recognise and incorporate the silence of the subaltern student to foster a more inclusive and diverse classroom environment? Autobiographies with personal experiences would be helpful in understanding different historical contexts through reflexive enquiry. Such an approach is likely to benefit subaltern students the most.

Furthermore, while institutional mechanisms are available in colleges and universities to take care of the rights and welfare of students from diverse social backgrounds. Most of the institutional mechanism exists for the sake of existence, and many of them are ineffective and less efficient in addressing the concerns of students, which in turn negatively impacts the degree of academic integration and levels of social inclusion. There were multiple reasons for the ineffectiveness of the Cells, such as limited provisions of administrative support and human resources, and limited coordination and planning. However, the limited perspective towards valuing diversity and being sensitive to the concerns of students from disadvantaged social and economic groups emerged to be a substantial challenge.

The variations existing in availing of opportunities at different levels, even after the entry into an educational institution, underline the importance of employing institutional-level diversity engagement frameworks for the academic integration of marginalised students to overcome various structural barriers. The findings from the recent study conducted by the CPRHE/NIEPA show that students from disadvantaged group experienced multiple barriers which prevent them from engaging actively in the teaching-learning processes. Therefore, such a diversity engagement approach will enable HEIs to focus on the various issues faced by students inside the classrooms and in various social spheres outside the classrooms. This is essential for realising socially inclusive campuses as the existing institutional mechanisms available in colleges and universities to take care

of the rights and welfare of students exist only for the sake of existence, and many of them are ineffective in providing a supportive learning environment.

In creating an inclusive learning environment and eliminating various structural barriers, it is important to create an institutional ecosystem that not only makes students welcome but also foster a sense of equality on campuses to make progress. As more students from diverse socio-economic groups arrive on college campuses with varying levels of academic preparedness, the process of engagement with diversity requires efforts at two levels. First, engaging with students with diverse academic backgrounds in the classrooms through acts of inclusion by teachers, and second, engaging with student diversity in the social realm through acts of inclusion by the institutional administrators. It is crucial that in the process of engaging with student diversity and realising inclusive campuses, institutional actors act with empathy and teachers practice pedagogy of care to provide a supportive learning environment. Such an approach is instrumental in achieving the objectives of inclusive campuses by addressing the needs of students from different academic and social backgrounds.

3.3 Equity and Excellence in Higher Education

Inclusion is a crucial element of achieving excellence, which is a continuous process. There has been a traditional belief that equality/equity and excellence are opposing concepts. This notion needs to be re-evaluated in the present scenario. It is also important to discuss how we define excellence and examine the way in which the concept of merit is constructed and presented in public discourse. Certainly, there can be criteria to assess excellence, but it must be flexible enough that a one-size-fits-all approach cannot be ideal. For a long time, merit has been equated with exam scores, and the ranking system based on merit has been the sole criterion for admission to higher education, ignoring the cultural and socio-economic inequalities that exist. In view of this, universities should consider incorporating diversity as a criterion for admission to their academic programmes.

It is important to see universities not only as places that provide education, but also as social institutions that foster civic engagement and democratic values among their students. The area of concern that has emerged is building linkages between excellence and equity. While the entry of marginalised groups complemented by massification is recognised as an enabling factor in access and equity, others view it as something impinging upon the quality and output of the institutions.

Further, spatial injustices faced by marginalised students, especially those from Scheduled Castes and tribal communities, have led to a new understanding of

exclusion and its prevalence within university spaces. The spatial arrangement of educational institutions contradicts their intended purpose, as certain groups tend to congregate in specific areas while others are separated through everyday negotiations. This results in campus spaces resembling neo-ghettos.

While certain institutional recommendation seeks to deal with segregated spaces and ensure social justice, the policies and norms, in general, retain caste supremacy and are interlinked to the university spaces. Such prejudices influence preferences for hostels and dormitories, seating areas in the dining halls and hostels, as well as in the university in general. Such segregation is also linked to ideological orientation, which is also largely defined by one's caste identity. Such ghettoisation is also reinforced by the administration and institutional structure of the educational institutions.

Given the heterogeneity of students and their socio-political backgrounds, these ghettos have impacted the sociology of campuses. This has resulted into community solidarity becoming an important element of the university spaces. Familial grooming plays a crucial role in fostering a sense of trust and loyalty among students, who follow these patterns to feel secure and protected. However, these factors can also contribute to the psychological violence that students experience during their time at universities. In such a scenario, disadvantaged have to negotiate for social justice. Hence, the idea of excellence with inclusivity is a 'work in progress' and the whole of idea of 'ableism' in the campus erected by neo-ghettos engendered by multiple disadvantages should be addressed.

Gender discrimination is a persistent issue that also affects the field of education. Despite the policies put in place, such as gender audits and numerical assessments of gender gaps, they are often limited. The issue goes beyond just numbers, with cases of harassment, fair employment practices for women, representation of women in leadership and STEM fields, and overall language of collaboration and inclusion need to be addressed. It is important to prioritise social change and develop a new conceptual vocabulary to truly address gender discrimination in education. It is worth noting that women make up over 49.5 per cent of the population and therefore their voices and experiences should be given equal consideration.

It was highlighted that Malaysian higher education system is also facing equity and diversity issues. Malaysia's higher education has experienced rapid expansion and consolidation over the past decade, transitioning from a system dominated by elite universities to one with a burgeoning number of private institutions that offer more flexible entry criteria and curricula. While this massification has led to

increased student enrolment and accessibility, it has also spotlighted challenges related to equity and diversity within the system. In Malaysia, ethnic community namely indigenous Malays constitute the majority. Often referred to as Bumiputra, along with other marginalised groups have been a targeted beneficiary making them eligible for all the privileges. Further, in Malaysia, the affirmative action measure takes the form of a criteria-based inclusion scheme at HEIs, which is based on the income [family incomes] named as Top 20 per cent (T20), Middle 40 per cent (M40), and Bottom 40 per cent (B40). There are existing disparities in enrolment across ethnic, socioeconomic, and geographical lines and noted underrepresentation of marginalised groups in faculty and staff positions. It was underscored that it is urgent to address equity and diversity issues to ensure the system remains inclusive, providing all students equal opportunities for success and thus benefiting Malaysia's overall development.

Online education, digital capitalism, and the issues of equity and excellence have become new and interconnected concepts. The drive for globalisation, through neo-liberal policies, has catalysed India's integration with economic activities beyond national borders. Globalisation is not just limited to economics but also encompasses the free flow of information, technology, ideas, and identities beyond national boundaries. When online education is viewed in the context of globalisation, various perspectives emerge. Scholarly investigations have categorised approaches towards online education into three different categories: instrumental (functional), model reformist, and politico-dialectical approaches.

The first approach, being referred to as an instrumental one, is the functional approach, as enumerated in India's National Education Policy (NEP 2020) which strives towards facilitating wider access to education. This also finds resonance in the institutional frameworks that look up to online education as something that would facilitate expanding the reach of education to all. The second approach that views online education in a slightly critical fashion is being framed as a model reformist approach. The model reformist approach underlines the issue of access to technology. The third approach is indeed a more sophisticated approach, which is known as the politico-dialectical approach, wherein the technology is not viewed as something that operates in a vacuum and, hence, is subjected to the conditions outlined by Marxist theories.

Placing the framework of the politico-dialectical approach demonstrates the manner in which communication and culture are material practices and how labour and language are mutually constituted. Communication has always been intertwined with structures of inequality in class societies. Therefore, any

ideas related to the use of technology and communication, particularly in the dissemination of information and education, are also influenced by this structure. The idea also endorses that the educational policy and institutions in any given society are, in fact, an organic outgrowth of the social structure existing there.

The implications of the digital divide during the COVID-19 pandemic have been that in online classrooms, students have experienced all kinds of learning difficulties. These difficulties were a result of social variations in the preparedness of their living spaces merging with learning spaces. The introduction of new technology in the field of education demands a review of the educational policy, at the same time, in view of the technological disruption. Interestingly, the pandemic has served as an opportunity for tech-utopians to advance the move towards online education as a permanent recourse to various problems pertaining to the field of education. Contextually, as reiterated, the National Education Policy (NEP 2020) also endorses this view as far as access is concerned. It may require a mention that newer realities posed by the pandemic demanded new initiatives, however, in no way these temporary shifts should define the norm for a longer period.

At a broad level, the new technologies that has emerged from the existing system is a product of digital capitalism. Though the intention to resolve the ongoing learning crisis is noble, it is fraught with inequalities and is likely to deteriorate further if new technologies continue to dominate. It is, hence, essential that the debate on online education is situated beyond the context of the digital divide and better, if examined under the framework of capitalism. In fact, the basis of digital learning and digital capitalism resulting from it is interesting. It is no coincidence that the term knowledge economy and not knowledge society is used, attributing to the fact that the purpose of this is intricately linked to the market.

In the given scenario, higher education institutions (HEIs) play a crucial role in preparing individuals to develop a sense of civic and social consciousness. HEIs are seen as a space of aspirations, but at the same time, it is also a place where diverse ideas and perspectives may collide. Inclusion is often seen as a solution, but it's important to approach it with caution. The focus is often on integrating disadvantaged students into the mainstream. However, the concept of "mainstream" can be subjective, and it is important to avoid a patronising attitude and create a welcoming environment.

A prestigious college in Delhi launched an experimental initiative called REACH, which stands for Reaffirming Equity, Access, Capacity, and Humanism. The initiative aimed to promote social equality and address the structural values of exclusion that perpetuate disparity, discrimination, and stigmatisation. It serves as the Equal Opportunity Cell of the college and aims to remove the stigma associated with quotas. Its philosophy is to move away from the conventional piecemeal and top-down approach and instead focus on quality, agency, ownership, potential discovery, and new discourse. This shift is reflected in the approach to students, who are no longer seen as mere beneficiaries but rather as contributors to a new narrative. This involves creating a narrative where quotas are seen as empowering leadership rather than compensation for deprivation, from receiving applications to seeking out potential. The emphasis shifted from victimhood to agency, appreciating the resilience and spirit of those whose growth trajectories convey a unique ability to overcome adversity. The idea of success and leadership is reformulated within the frame of who has travelled the farthest. The initiative is centred around social justice, taking into account students' trajectory, where students come from, and where they have gone, not just how well they perform on certain parameters. Learning from this experience, it was advocated that higher education institutions have a responsibility to promote social justice, human rights and create an ecosystem where inclusive excellence thrives.

3.4 Higher Education and Equitable Employment Outcomes

Economic status and access to educational opportunities is positively correlated as is educational attainment and earnings. The human capital theory (HCT) argues that access to education benefits both the individual as well as the society. Education increases the productivity of individuals and opens the path for better employment opportunities for individuals and economic growth for society. Besides, education increases the earnings of the individuals and decreases the waiting period for jobs, decreasing the unemployment rate and periods of unemployment. Access to education reduces the propensity to enter manual employment with educated

workers more in formal employment with social security. However, employment and earning depends on the quality of education. In the Indian context, while there is diversity in society, but within diversities there are caste-based disparities. Lower caste and women continue to face discrimination. The larger impact of the caste system has several consequences. The economic outcome and labour market outcomes are unequal.

There are intergroup inequalities in employment levels resulting largely from unequal access to wealth and income and persistent caste-based discrimination. The lower caste and women are denied educational rights and continue to face discrimination in the labour market. While, the employment level increases with increased education but for lower castes it decreases with the unemployment rate higher for SC, ST, OBC and Muslims. Further, education has an impact on access to type of occupations. Increase in levels of education increase chances of getting better occupation. However, with the similar education qualification chances of disadvantaged for getting better occupation is low. Overall, discrimination against reserved category leads to unequal labour market outcomes. The need of the hour is to have a dual policy in addition to the endowment policy. The gap between privileged and nonprivileged can be reduced by strengthening certain provisions such as scholarships and coaching schemes and rigorous implementation of reservation policies for the deprived groups in the private sector.

Furthermore, gender remains a persistent factor driving inequalities in India, especially within the labour market. These inequalities manifest as low female labour force participation, significant wage disparities, and insecure employment, all rooted in entrenched patriarchal norms. Despite global advancements, wage discrimination against women persists, with females earning approximately 80 per cent of what their male counterparts earn, a trend consistent in India. Intriguingly, while India has experienced economic growth and improvements in female literacy, the female labour force participation rate (FLPR) has been declining. Various theories attempt to explain this trend. Some posit that increased female enrolment in higher education is leading to a temporary dip in FLPR, while others dispute this. Notably, recent data suggests that higher education levels might not guarantee better labour market outcomes for women in terms of FLPR. Both supply side and demand side factors are responsible for such variations. This is a clear indication of measurement errors where there is an increase in enrolment rate by female in higher education but an income shift towards men getting better jobs. This indicates that female workers are less valued and therefore paid less resulting in wage discrimination.

Southeast Asia is a region that boasts of its rich diversity in terms of language, culture, economy, and human capital. With a large population of young and working-age people, the region is rapidly growing and emerging as a major player in the global market. The region has also witnessed a rise in intra-regional student and labour mobility, which is further propelled by increased access to higher education. This presents a unique opportunity for the region to harness its resources and improve the individual and collective well-being of its people.

Despite an overall increase in tertiary enrolment in the region, the CLMV countries, namely Cambodia, Lao PDR, and Myanmar, continue to have the lowest enrolment ratios in Southeast Asia. The privatisation of higher education has resulted in unequal access, especially for students from rural and remote areas who come from less affluent backgrounds, and has raised concerns regarding the quality of education. Governments need to capitalise on the policy momentum provided by the UN 2030 Agenda on Sustainable Development and the Roadmap on the ASEAN Higher Education Space 2025, and intensify their efforts to develop and implement fair higher education policies at both national and local levels. They should invest in targeted financial support such as scholarships, in collaboration with private entities, philanthropists, and NGOs. Additionally, non-monetary measures such as establishing special support centres and outreach programmes that promote aspirations and readiness among vulnerable groups should be considered.

Promoting people-to-people connectivity is crucial, especially through virtual and hybrid mobility programs within Southeast Asia and other regions. The Master Plan on ASEAN Connectivity 2025 and the ASEAN Socio-cultural Community Blueprint 2025 have made it clear that intra-regional mobility and people-to-people connectivity are essential for community building in Southeast Asia. Efforts to support student mobility in the region have been in progress for decades, leading to the formation of networks of sending and host universities and providing scholarships for short-term academic exchange. However, access to student mobility remains limited, especially for underprivileged students. Exchange mainly occurs along mobility corridors, and other forms of mobility such as cross-border internships, research visits, and service learning are ad-hoc and disjointed, limiting their potential to foster skills development and labour mobility in the region. Importantly, collecting data and research on Southeast Asian higher education, including on issues of Equity, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI), mobility, and post-graduation trajectories, is crucial.

3.5 Future Perspective on Strategies for Equity in Higher Education: Institutional Leadership, Equity Policies, and Institutional Practices to Support Student Success

The two-day international seminar discussed and debated various issues related to student diversity and inclusion in higher education. It was recognized that higher education is the only resource that has the potential to be distributed equally in today's world, especially in India, as other resources like capital and land cannot be distributed equally. In Nepal, it was highlighted that neo-liberalization and privatization have implications for increasing social inequalities. Affirmative action measures, including provisions of subsidies and freeships, are important means to facilitate equitable access in a massifying system. However, the massification of higher education does not necessarily lead to upward social mobility and equity in many countries, including India. The reason for this is that the massification of higher education is not accompanied by quality. The lower quality of learning among deprived students is due to the lack of a nurturing environment provided by the institution and teacher, and students from marginalised sections more often leave institutes with only degrees in their hands.

There are still barriers that prevent deprived students from accessing quality higher education, which allows the old elite to maintain a grip on elite institutions. The classroom environment is changing due to the massification of HE. Previously, the classrooms mostly comprised elite students and a minority of students from disadvantaged groups. Now, however, the classrooms have a majority of students from disadvantaged groups and a minority of elite students. Unfortunately, many of these disadvantaged students are not prepared for the course work they are entering, and they often face discrimination from the elite students and administration who believe they are not deserving. Discrimination and unequal treatment exist at the classroom level, and students who are already facing social challenges are more likely to struggle with academic challenges. This can result in non-participation in classroom transactions.

Intervention at the institutional level is crucial for promoting equity in addition to national-level policies. In order to advance diversity and inclusion in their institutions, institutional leaders must transit from a compliance-based model to a proactive model. While the reservation policy ensures access for students from disadvantaged groups, what happens to them afterwards when they enter HEIs is often unclear. In order to address this, there are some key steps that can be taken to make sure that students from such groups can be included in elite institutions.

Firstly, pedagogical practices based on the remedial model should be introduced as most of these students come from weaker sections. Secondly, one of the main reasons for low performance and non-participation is the language used in higher education programmes. English is the medium of instruction in most higher education courses, which can be different from the medium of instruction used in their previous qualifications. This issue is also faced by students in Nepal, who may come from different dialects and struggle with English as the medium of instruction. To overcome this language barrier, academic English writing and reading courses should be introduced in every coursework. It is important to teach English due to its advantages, but regional languages should not be ignored or undermined. Furthermore, allowing students to undertake exams in a bilingual fashion will help to address this language barrier. It is also increasingly realised now that the ensuring equity future of higher education will depend on the sector's acceptability of flexible pathways to higher learning.

Promoting social inclusion requires avoiding separate hostel provisions based on students' social backgrounds, as this reinforces social divisions and leads to the creation of ghettos. Universities and colleges are not just places of education but also resources for promoting the health and well-being of students. There are links between psychological and academic difficulties, making it necessary to protect the mental health and well-being of students from socially and economically disadvantaged groups. This is a major issue as students face immense pressure, which can lead to extreme actions and undesirable health outcomes.

It is essential for every higher educational institution's website to include a statement emphasising inclusivity and diversity. During the seminar, the value of programs such as Unnat Bharat Abhiyan was highlighted, which provides value education and encourages students to engage in social and public welfare activities. These activities not only empower students with professional, soft, and management skills but also promote multidisciplinary learning. The international seminar brought together various stakeholders in higher education to initiate a crucial discussion on student diversity and inclusion. Overall, the seminar was successful in achieving its objective.

Appendix-1

PROGRAMME

International Seminar on Diversity and Inclusion in Higher Education

India Habitat Centre, New Delhi, India

16-17 February 2023

Day 1: Thursday, 16 February (Venue: Jacaranda Hall)	
9:00	Registration
9:30 - 10:45	**Inaugural Session** **Chairperson:** Professor Sudhanshu Bhushan, Vice Chancellor I/C, Professor and Head, Department of Higher & Professional Education, National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration, India **Welcome Address:** Professor Pradeep Kumar Misra, Director, CPRHE/NIEPA, India **Opening Remarks:** Mr. Michael Houlgate, Deputy Director, British Council, India **Keynote Address:** Professor Graeme Atherton, Director, National Education Opportunities Network, United Kingdom **Release of CPRHE/NIEPA Publications** India Higher Education Report 2021, Routledge **Programme Highlights:** Dr. Nidhi Sabharwal, Associate Professor, Centre for Policy Research in Higher Education, NIEPA, India **Vote of Thanks:** Dr. Sandeep Chatterjee, Registrar, National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration, India **Rapporteur:** Dr. Garima Malik, CPRHE/NIEPA, India
10:45 - 11:15	**Coffee and Networking** (Venue: Pre-Function Area)

International Seminar on Diversity and Inclusion in Higher Education

11:15 - 13:00	**Plenary Session 1:** State, Market, and Equity in Higher Education **Chairperson:** Amitabh Kundu, Distinguished Fellow, Research and Information System for Developing Countries, India
11:15 - 11:30	**Keynote Address:** N. V. Varghese, Former Vice Chancellor, NIEPA, India
11:30 - 12:30	**Speakers** 1. Brigid Freeman, Australia India Institute, University of Melbourne and Matt Brett, Deakin University, Australia 2. Suma Scaria, Central University of Karnataka, India 3. Protiva Kundu, Centre for Budget and Governance Accountability, India 4. Manika Bora, O. P. Jindal Global University, India **Discussant:** Mousumi Mukherjee, Associate Professor & Deputy Director, IIHEd, O. P. Jindal Global University, India
12:30 - 13:00	**Open for Discussion** **Rapporteur:** Sangeeta Angom, Department of Higher & Professional Education, NIEPA, India
13:00 - 14:00	**Lunch** (Venue: Pre-Function Area)
14:00 - 15:45	**Plenary Session 2:** Higher Education Access, Diversity, and Social Inclusion **Chairperson:** Pankaj Mittal, Secretary General, Association of Indian Universities, India
14:00 - 14:15	**Keynote Address:** Odile Henry, Director, Centre de Sciences Humaines (CSH), India
14:15 - 15:15	**Speakers** Jakob Williams Ørberg, Novo Nordisk Foundation, India Surajit Deb, Aryabhatta College, India Ankit Kawade, Jawaharlal Nehru University, India Nidhi S. Sabharwal, Centre for Policy Research in Higher Education, NIEPA, India

International Seminar on Diversity and Inclusion in Higher Education

15:15 - 15:45	**Discussant:** Sachidanand Sinha, Professor, Jawaharlal Nehru University, India **Open for Discussion** **Rapporteur:** Eldho Mathews, Unit for International Cooperation, NIEPA, India
15:45 - 16:00	**Coffee and Networking** (Venue: Pre-Function Area)
16:00	**Heading to British Council for the Session on Gender Equality in Higher Education and Reception Dinner (Venue: British Council India, 17 Kasturba Gandhi Marg, New Delhi – 110001)**
Day 2: Friday, 17 February (Venue: Jacaranda Hall)	
9:30 - 11:00 9:30 - 9:45 9:45 - 10:30	**Plenary Session 3:** Equity and Excellence in Higher Education **Chairperson:** Anita Rastogi, Professor, Department of Educational Studies, Jamia Millia Islamia, India **Keynote Address:** Meenakshi Gopinath, Director, Women in Security Conflict Management and Peace, India **Speakers** 1. Muhammad Muftahu, Universiti Sains Malaysia, Malaysia 2. N. Sukumar, Delhi University & Vidyasagar Sharma, University of Delhi, India 3. Ramdas Rupavath, University of Hyderabad, India 4. Dilip Vasantrao Chavan, Swami Ramanand Teerth Marathwada University, India **Open for Discussion** **Rapporteur:** Binay Prasad, Unit for International Cooperation, NIEPA, India
11:00 - 11:15	**Coffee and Networking** (Venue: Pre-Function Area)

International Seminar on Diversity and Inclusion in Higher Education

11:15 - 13:00	**Plenary Session 4:** Higher Education and Equitable Employment Outcomes
11:15 - 11:30	**Chairperson:** Sudhanshu Bhushan, Vice Chancellor I/C, Professor and Head, Department of Higher & Professional Education, National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration, India **Keynote Address:** Sukhadeo Thorat, Professor Emeritus, Jawaharlal Nehru University, India
11:30 - 12:30	**Speakers** 1. Miguel Antonio Lim, The University of Manchester, United Kingdom, Icy Fresno Anabo, Deusto University, Anh Ngoc Quynh Phan, University of Auckland, Mark Andrew Elepaño, Far Eastern University, Gunjana Kuntamarat, Deusto University 2. Nivedita Sarkar, Dr. B. R. Ambedkar University, India & Anuneeta Mitra, USA **Discussant:** Neetha N., Professor, Centre for Women's Development Studies, India **Open for Discussion**
12:30 - 13:00	**Rapporteur:** Jinusha Panigrahi, CPRHE/NIEPA, India
13:00 - 14:00	**Lunch**
14:00 - 15:30	**Plenary Session 5:** Institutional Leadership, Equity Polices, and Institutional Practices to Support Student Success **Chairperson:** Kumar Suresh, Professor, National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration, India
14:00 - 14:15	**Keynote Address:** Satish Deshpande, Professor, Delhi University, India
14:15 - 15:00	**Speakers** 1. Smriti Singh, Indian Institute of Technology Patna, India 2. Rabi Narayan Kar and Kusha Tiwari, Shyam Lal College, India

International Seminar on Diversity and Inclusion in Higher Education

	3. Kamal Raj Devkota, Tribhuvan University, Nepal **Discussant:** M. H. Qureshi, Former Professor, Jawaharlal Nehru University, India **Open for Discussion**
15:00 - 15:30	**Rapporteur:** Santwana G. Mishra, Department of Educational Planning, NIEPA, India
15:30 - 15:45	**Coffee and Networking** (Venue: Pre-Function Area)
15:45 - 17:30	**Open Panel and Valedictory Session:** Future Perspective on Strategies for Equity in Higher Education **Chairperson:** N. V. Varghese, Former Vice Chancellor, NIEPA, India
15:45 - 16:45	**Panelists** 1. K. Ramachandran, Senior Advisor, UIC, NIEPA, India 2. Geetha Venkataraman, Professor, Ambedkar University Delhi, India 3. Jose-Luis Alvarez-Galvan, Programme Specialist-Head of Policy and Advocacy, UNESCO MGIEP, India 4. Graeme Atherton, Director, National Education Opportunities Network, United Kingdom
16:45 - 17:15	**Open for Discussion**
17:15 - 17:30	**Concluding Remarks:** Sudhanshu Bhushan, Vice Chancellor I/C, Professor and Head, Department of Higher & Professional Education, National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration, India **Vote of Thanks:** Nidhi S. Sabharwal, Associate Professor, CPRHE/NIEPA, India **Rapporteur:** Anupam Pachauri, CPRHE/NIEPA, India
Departure	

Appendix-2

List of Participants

International Seminar on Diversity and Inclusion in Higher Education

India Habitat Centre, New Delhi, India

16-17 February 2023

International Participants

1. Brigid Freeman
Senior Researcher (Education)
Australia India Institute
University of Melbourne
147-149 Barry Street
Victoria 3010
Australia
Email: brigid.freeman@unimelb.edu.au

2. Jakob Williams Ørberg
Senior Consultant
Novo Nordisk Foundation
2nd Floor, B29 West End Colony
New Delhi-110021
India
Email: jwo@novo.dk

3. Muhammad Muftahu
Acting Director
National Higher Education Research Institute (IPPTN)
Universiti Sains Malaysia
Block C, Level 2, sains@usm
no. 10, Persiaran Bukit Jambul
11900 Bayan Lepas, Penang
Malaysia
Email: muftahu@usm.my

4. Kamal Raj Devkota
Assistant Professor
Research Centre for Educational Innovation and Development (CERID)
Tribhuvan University
G.P.O. Box: 2161, Balkhu, Kathmandu
Nepal
Email: kamalrajdevkota7@gmail.com
stuladharktm@gmail.com

5. Graeme Atherton
Director
National Education Opportunities Network (NEON)
University of West London
St Mary's Road, Ealing, London, W5 5RF
United Kingdom
Email: athertg@wmin.ac.uk

6. Miguel Antonio Lim
Senior Lecturer
Education and International Development
The Manchester Institute of Education
The University of Manchester
Oxford Road, Manchester, UK, M13 9PL
United Kingdom
Email: miguelantonio.lim@manchester.ac.uk

National Participants

7. Sangeeta Angom
Associate Professor
Department of Higher and Professional Education
National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration
17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg
New Delhi-110016
Email: sangeeta@niepa.ac.in

8. Kashyapi Awasthi
Assistant Professor
National Centre for School Leadership
National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration
17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg
New Delhi-110016
Email: kawasthi@niepa.ac.in

9. Sudhanshu Bhushan
Vice Chancellor I/C
Professor & Head
Department of Higher & Professional Education
National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration
17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg
New Delhi-110016
Email: sudhanshu@niepa.ac.in

10. Manika Bora
Assistant Professor
O. P. Jindal Global University
Narela Road Near Jagdishpur Village, Sonipat
Haryana-131001
Email: manikabora@gmail.com

11. Saumen Chattopadhyay
Chairperson
Zakir Husain Centre for Educational Studies
School of Social Sciences
Jawaharlal Nehru University
New Mehrauki Road, JNU Ring Rd
New Delhi-110067
Email: saumen@mail.jnu.ac.in
saumen@jnu.ac.in

12. Dilip Vasantrao Chavan
Professor
Department of English
School of Language, Literature and Culture Studies
Swami Ramanand Teerth Marathwada University
Vishnupuri, Nanded
Maharashtra- 431606
Email: dilipchavan@gmail.com

13. Pradeep Kumar Choudhury
Assistant Professor
Zakir Husain Centre for Educational Studies
Jawaharlal Nehru University
New Delhi – 110067
Email: pradeepchoudhury@jnu.ac.in
pradeep.hcu@gmail.com

14. Rasmita Das
Professor
Educational Management
National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration
17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg
New Delhi- 110016
Email: rasmita@niepa.ac.in

15. Satish Deshpande
Professor
Department of Sociology
Delhi School of Economic
University of Delhi
Delhi- 110007
Email: sdeshpande7@gmail.com

16. Surajit Deb
Professor
Aryabhatta College
Benito Juarez Road
New Delhi- 110021
Email: debsurajit@gmail.com

17. Ashok K Gaba
Former Director & Programme Coordinator
School of Vocational Education and Training
Indira Gandhi National Open University
New Delhi-110068
Email: akgaba@ignou.ac.in

18. Amit Gautam
Associate Professor
Department of School and Non-Formal Education
National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration
17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg
New Delhi- 110016
Email: amitgautam@niepa.ac.in

19. Meenakshi Gopinath
Director, Women in Security Conflict Management and Peace (WISCOMP)
Core 4A, Upper Ground Floor,
India Habitat Centre
Lodhi Road
New Delhi- 110003
Email: meenug11@gmail.com

20. Odile Henry
Directrice/Director
CSH - Centre de Sciences Humaines
MEAE-CNRS | UMIFRE-20, USR-3330
2, Dr. APJ Abdul Kalam Road
New Delhi- 110011
Email: odile.henry@univ-paris8.fr
odile.henry@csh-delhi.com

21. Michael Houlgate
Deputy Director
British Council India
17 Kasturba Gandhi Marg
New Delhi-110001
Email: Michael.Houlgate@britishcouncil.org

22. Madhuri Suresh Isave
Associate Professor
Tilak College of Education
Lokamanya Nagar, Sadashiv Peth
Pune
Maharashtra- 411030
Email: madhuisave@gmail.com

23. Rabi Narayan Kar
Principal
Shyam Lal College
(University of Delhi)
G.T. Road, Shahdara
Delhi- 110032
Email: principal@shyamlal.du.ac.in
rabikar.du@gmail.com
slcm@shyamlal.du.ac.in

24. Satvinder Kaur
Senior Editor (Books)
Humanities and Social Sciences
Springer Nature India Private Limited
7th Floor, Vijaya Building, 17 Barakhamba Road
New Delhi- 110001
Email: satvinder.kaur@springernature.com

25. Megha Kaushik
Deputy Secretary
University Grants Commission (UGC)
Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg
New Delhi - 110002
meghaakaushik@gmail.com

26. Ankit Kawade
Research Scholar
Centre for Political Studies
Jawaharlal Nehru University
New Mehrauli Road
New Delhi- 110067
Email: ankitkawade@hotmail.com

27. Gauri Khanna
Doctoral Candidate, IIHED
OP Jindal Global University
B-17 Sector 47
Noida- 201301
Email: gkhanna@jgu.edu.in

28. Amit Kumar
Senior Commissioning Editor
Routledge India, Taylor & Francis Group
2nd & 3rd floor, The National Council of YMCAs of India
1, Jai Singh Road
New Delhi 110001
Email: Amit.Kumar2@tandfindia.com

29. Amitabh Kundu
Distinguished Fellow
Research and Information System for Developing Countries
Core IV-B, 4th floor, India Habitat Centre
Lodhi Road
New Delhi- 110003
Email: akundu.jnu@gmail.com
amitabh.kundu@ris.org.in

30. Protiva Kundu
Thematic Lead-Social Sectors
Centre for Budget and Governance Accountability (CBGA)
B-7 Extn./110A (Ground Floor), Harsukh Marg
Safdarjung Enclave
New Delhi- 110029
Email: protiva@cbgaindia.org

31. Jose-Luis ALVAREZ-GALVAN
Programme Specialist-Head of Policy and Advocacy
UNESCO MGIEP
35 Ferozshah Road, ICSSR Building, 1st Floor
New Delhi 110001
Email: jl.alvarez-galvan@unesco.org

32. Garima Malik
Assistant Professor
Centre for Policy Research in Higher Education
National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration
17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg
New Delhi- 110016
Email: garimamalik@niepa.ac.in

33. S. K. Mallik
Assistant Professor
Department of Educational Policy
National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration
17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg
New Delhi- 110016
Email: skmallik@niepa.ac.in

34. A. Mathew
National Fellow
National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration
17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg
New Delhi- 110016
Email: mathanthony@gmail.com

35. Eldho Mathews
Deputy Advisor
Unit for International Cooperation
National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration
17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg
New Delhi- 110016
Email: eldho@niepa.ac.in

36. Santwana G. Mishra
Associate Professor
Department of Educational Planning
National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration
17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg
New Delhi- 110016
Email: sgmishra@niepa.ac.in

37. Pankaj Mittal
Secretary General
Association of Indian Universities
AIU House, 16 Comrade Indrajit Gupta Marg (Kotla Marg)
Opposite National Bal Bhawan,
Near I.T.O.
New Delhi- 110002
Email: pankajugc@gmail.com
sgoffice@aiu.ac.in

38. Madhavi Moni
Assistant Professor
Department of Economics
Hansraj College
University of Delhi
Mahatma Hansraj Marg, Malka Ganj
Delhi- 110007
Email: madhavimoni@hrc.du.ac.in

39. Mousumi Mukherjee
Associate Professor & Deputy Director
International Institute for Higher Education
Research and Capacity Building (IIHEd)
O.P. Jindal Global University
Sonipat, Narela Road Near
Jagdishpur village Sonipat
Haryana-131001
Email: mmukherjee@jgu.edu.in

40. Neetha N.
Professor
Centre for Women's Development Studies (CWDS)
25 Bhai Vir Singh Marg
New Delhi- 110001
Email: neetha@cwds.ac.in

41. Manasi Thapliyal Navani
Assistant Professor
School of Education Studies
Dr. B. R. Ambedkar University
Kashmere Gate Campus
Lothian Road, Kashmere Gate
Delhi -110006
Email: manasi@aud.ac.in

42. Anupam Pachauri
Assistant Professor
Centre for Policy Research in Higher Education
National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration
17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg
New Delhi- 110016
Email: anupampachauri@niepa.ac.in

43. Jinusha Panigrahi
Assistant Professor
Centre for Policy Research in Higher Education
National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration
New Delhi- 110016
Email: jinusha@niepa.ac.in

44. Parul
Head- Education
British Council India
17 Kasturba Gandhi Marg
New Delhi-110001

45. Binay Prasad
Deputy Advisor
Unit for International Cooperation
National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration
17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg
New Delhi- 110016
Email: binay@niepa.ac.in

46. V. P. S Raju
Assistant Professor
National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration
17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg
New Delhi- 110016
Email: vpsraju@niepa.ac.in

47. K. Ramachandran
Advisor
India-Africa Institute of Educational Planning and Administration
National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration
17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg
New Delhi- 110016
Email: kramachandran@niepa.ac.in

48. Abdul Rahman
British Council India
17 Kasturba Gandhi Marg
New Delhi-110001

49. Anita Rastogi
Professor
Department of Educational Studies
Faculty of Education
Jamia Millia Islamia
New Delhi-110025
Email: arastogi@jmi.ac.in

50. Ramdas Rupavath
Professor
Department of Political Science
University of Hyderabad
Prof. C. R. Rao Road, Gachibowli, Hyderabad
Telangana- 500046
Email: ramhcu@gmail.com

51. Nivedita Sarkar
Assistant Professor
School of Education Studies
Dr. B. R. Ambedkar University
Kashmere Gate Campus
Lothian Road, Kashmere Gate
Delhi -110006
Email: niveditasarkar@aud.ac.in

52. Suma Scaria
Assistant Professor
Department of Economics Studies and Planning
Central University of Karnataka
Kadaganchi, Aland Road,
Kalaburagi Dist.
Karnataka- 585367
Email: sumaisscaria@gmail.com

53. Mona Sedwal
Assistant Professor
Department of Training and Professional Development in Education
National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration
17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg
New Delhi- 110016
Email: monasedwal@niepa.ac.in

54. Vidyasagar Sharma
Doctoral Fellow
Department of Political Science
Faculty of Social Science
University of Delhi
New Delhi
Email: vsharma@polscience.du.ac.in
vidyasagar.jnu17@gmail.com

55. Puja Singh
Librarian
National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration
17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg
New Delhi- 110016
Email: pujasingh@niepa.ac.in
library@niepa.ac.in

56. Shailu Singh
Associate Professor
Hansraj College
University of Delhi
Mahatma Hansraj Marg, Malkaganj
Delhi- 110007
Email: shailusinghs@hrc.du.ac.in
shailusinghs@gmail.com

57. Sachidanand Sinha
Social Geographer
Centre for the Study of Regional Development
Jawaharlal Nehru University
New Mehrauli Road
New Delhi- 110067
Email: sachisinha@jnu.ac.in
sachi57sinha@gmail.com

58. Smriti Singh
Associate Dean, Student Affairs
Associate Professor
Department of Humanities and Social Sciences
Indian Institute of Technology Patna
Bhita, Patna
Bihar- 801106
Email: smriti@iitp.ac.in
adean_student@iitp.ac.in

59. Sunita Singh
Assistant Professor
Department of Education
University of Delhi
33 Chhatra Marg
New Delhi- 110007
Email: nitivasudev@gmail.com

60. Vineeta Sirohi
Chairperson, Steering Committee
Department of Educational Administration
National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration
17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg
New Delhi-110016
Email: vineetasirohi@niepa.ac.in

61. K. Srinivas
Head ICT & Project Management Unit
National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration
17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg
New Delhi- 110016
Email: ksrinivas@niepa.ac.in

62. Aarti Srivastava
Professor
Department of Higher and Professional Education
National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration
17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg
New Delhi-110016
Email: aarti@niepa.ac.in

63. Anshu Srivastava
Associate Professor
Department of Educational Administration
National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration
17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg
New Delhi- 110016
Email: asrivastava@niepa.ac.in \

64. Kumar Suresh
Head
Department of Educational Administration
National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration
17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg
New Delhi- 110016
Email: ksuresh@niepa.ac.in

65. N. Sukumar
Professor
Department of Political Science
Faculty of Social Sciences
Delhi University
Chhatra Marg, Law Faculty
Delhi- 110007
Email: skn70@yahoo.com

66. Sukhadeo Thorat
Professor Emeritus
Jawaharlal Nehru University
Plot-58 Government Press Colony
Dabha, Nagpur
Maharashtra- 440023
Email: thoratsukhadeo@yahoo.co.in
thorat1949@gmail.com

67. Kusha Tiwari
Professor
Department of English
Shyam Lal College
(University of Delhi)
G.T. Road, Shahdara
Delhi- 110032
Email: ktiwari@shyamlal.du.ac.in

68. M. H. Qureshi
Former Professor of Geography
Jawaharlal Nehru University
13-B, Pocket-A, D.D.A. Flats
Sukhdev Vihar
New Delhi- 110025
Email: profmhqureshi@gmail.com

69. Vinod Kumar Upadhyay
Head & Dean
Department of Education
Maharaj Vinayak Global University
Amer, Delhi Road, Jaipur
Rajasthan – 302028
Email: Vinodjaipur.upadhyay@gmail.com

70. Geetha Venkataraman
Professor
School of Liberal Studies
Ambedkar University Delhi
AUD Kashmere Gate Campus
Lothian Road, Kashmere Gate
Delhi -110006
Email: geethv@gmail.com
geetha@aud.ac.in, geevenkat@gmail.com

71. N. V. Varghese
Former Vice Chancellor
National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration
A010, Yamuna Apartments
Alaknanda Road (near St. George's School), Kalkaji
New Delhi- 110019
Email: nv.vargh@gmail.com

72. Nitin Verma
Assistant Professor
Bharati College
C-4, Dada Satram Mamtani Marg
Janakpuri
New Delhi- 110058
Email: nitinverma008@gmail.com

73. Lt Cdr Vinod Singh Yadav (Retd.)
Deputy Secretary
University Grants Commission (UGC)
Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg
New Delhi - 110002
Email: vinodsinghyadav.deb@gmail.com

74. Kanchan
Senior P.A. to Vice Chancellor
National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration
17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg
New Delhi- 110016

75. Rajesh
Driver
National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration
17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg
New Delhi- 110016
Email: rajesh@niepa.ac.in

Research Scholars

76. Jamshed Ahmad
Research Scholar
National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration
17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg
New Delhi- 110016

77. Shadab Anis
Research Scholar
National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration
17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg
New Delhi- 110016

78. Kaarika Das
Research Scholar
National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration
17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg
New Delhi- 110016

79. Gowhar Rashid Ganie
Research Scholar
National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration
17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg
New Delhi- 110016

80. Ganga
Research Scholar
National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration
17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg
New Delhi- 110016

81. Raj Gaurav
Research Scholar
National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration
17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg
New Delhi- 110016

82. Mohammed Ilyas
Research Scholar
National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration
17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg
New Delhi- 110016

83. Amardeep Kumar
Research Scholar
National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration
17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg
New Delhi- 110016

84. Sujit Kumar Luha
Research Scholar
National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration
17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg
New Delhi- 110016

85. Aysha Malik
Research Scholar
National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration
17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg
New Delhi- 110016

86. Bisma Manzoor
Research Scholar
National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration
17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg
New Delhi- 110016

87. Rajkumar Meena
Research Scholar
National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration
17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg
New Delhi- 110016

88. Suhail Mir
Research Scholar
National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration
17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg
New Delhi- 110016

89. Mansi Pandey
Research Scholar
National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration
17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg
New Delhi- 110016

90. Chetna Priya
Research Scholar
National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration
17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg
New Delhi- 110016

91. Govinda Kumar Shah
Research Scholar
National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration
17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg
New Delhi- 110016

92. Aishwarya Sharma
Research Scholar
National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration
17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg
New Delhi- 110016

93. Nivedita Sharma
Research Scholar
National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration
17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg
New Delhi- 110016

94. Richa Sharma
Research Scholar
National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration
17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg
New Delhi- 110016

95. Anjita Singh
Research Scholar
National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration
17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg
New Delhi- 110016

96. Ankita Singh
Research Scholar
National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration
17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg
New Delhi- 110016

97. Vandana Singh
Research Scholar
National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration
17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg
New Delhi- 110016

98. Yashmita Singh
Research Scholar
National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration
17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg
New Delhi- 110016

99. Akanksha Surelia
Research Scholar
National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration
17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg
New Delhi- 110016

100. Survi
Research Scholar
National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration
17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg
New Delhi- 110016

101. Tina Thakur
Research Scholar
National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration
17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg
New Delhi- 110016

102. Sanjay Rajendra Yadav
Research Scholar
National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration
17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg
New Delhi- 110016

103. Fatima Zahra
Research Scholar
National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration
17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg
New Delhi- 110016

NIEPA Administration

104. Sandeep Chatterjee
Registrar
National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration
17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg
New Delhi- 110016
Email: registrar@niepa.ac.in

105. Nishant Sinha
Finance Officer
National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration
17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg
New Delhi- 110016
Email: fo@niepa.ac.in

106. D. S. Thakur
Administrative Officer (I/c)
National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration
17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg
New Delhi- 110016
Email: ao@niepa.ac.in

107. Amit Singhal
Deputy Publication Officer
National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration
17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg
New Delhi- 110016
Email: amit@niepa.ac.in

108. Chander Prakash
Section Officer
General Administration
National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration
17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg
New Delhi- 110016
Email: admingen@niepa.ac.in

109. Sonam Anand
Assistant (I/c)
Training Cell
National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration
17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg
New Delhi- 110016
Email: trcell@niepa.ac.in

110. Gaurav
MTS
Training Cell
National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration
17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg
New Delhi- 110016

Organising Committee

111. Pradeep Kumar Misra
Director
CPRHE/NIEPA
17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg
New Delhi-110016
Email: pkmisra@niepa.ac.in

112. Nidhi S. Sabharwal
Associate Professor
CPRHE/ NIEPA
New Delhi- 110016
Email: nidhis@niepa.ac.in

113. Rittika Chanda Parruck
Director, Education & Society
British Council India
17 Kasturba Gandhi Marg
New Delhi-110001
Email: rittika.chandaparruck@britishcouncil.org

114. Vishu Sharma
Head Higher Education, North India
British Council India
17 Kasturba Gandhi Marg
New Delhi-110001
Email: vishu.sharma@in.britishcouncil.org

115. Aqsa
Junior Project Consultant
CPRHE/NIEPA
New Delhi- 110016
Email: aqsa.cprhe@gmail.com

116. Chetna Chawla
Junior Project Consultant
CPRHE/NIEPA
New Delhi- 110016
Email: chetna.cprhe@gmail.com

117. Monica Joshi
CPRHE/NIEPA
New Delhi- 110016
Email: monicacprhe@gmail.com

118. Mayank Rajput
CPRHE/NIEPA
New Delhi- 110016
Email: mayankcprhe@gmail.com

119. Sumit
CPRHE/NIEPA
New Delhi- 110016
Email: sumitkumar27012000@gmail.com

राष्ट्रीय शैक्षिक योजना एवं प्रशासन संस्थान
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND ADMINISTRATION
(Deemed to be University)
17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg, New Delhi – 110016, INDIA
EPABX: 91-11-26565600, 26544800 Fax: 91-11-26853041, 26865180
Email: niepa@niepa.ac.in Website: www.niepa.ac.in