REPORT ON THE INTERNATIONAL SEMINAR

MASSIFICATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN LARGE ACADEMIC SYSTEMS

N.V. Varghese

Jinusha Panigrahi

Jointly organised by

CPRHE/NUEPA & British Council

NUEPA

BRITISH COUNCIL

New Delhi 2015

BRITISH COUNCIL

NUEPA

MASSIFICATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN LARGE ACADEMIC SYSTEMS

A REPORT ON THE INTERNATIONAL SEMINAR (10-11 November 2014)

N.V. Varghese
Jinusha Panigrahi

Jointly organised by

Centre for Policy Research in Higher Education (CPRHE)
National University of Educational Planning and Administration
and
British Council

New Delhi 2015

© National University of Educational Planning and Administration, New Delhi, 2015
(Declared by the Government of India under Section 3 of the UGC Act, 1956)

First Published July 2015 (3H)

Disclaimer: The views in the publication are those of the Authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the National University of Educational Planning and Administration, New Delhi.

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, electronic, magnetic tape, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without permission in writing from NUEPA.

Published by the Registrar, National University of Educational Planning and Administration, 17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg, New Delhi-110016. Designed and Printed by M/s Anil Offset and Packaging, New Delhi 110060

Table of Contents

Page No.

- **Introduction** 1

- **Summary of discussions** 3

  - ¤ The rapidly expanding higher education sector 3
  - ¤ Importance of private sector as a partner in expansion of Higher Education 6
  - ¤ Widening disparities accompanying expansion 7
  - ¤ Major concern over quality in large system countries 9
  - ¤ Diversification of funding sources across countries 12
  - ¤ Move by institutions towards autonomy in governance and management 16
  - ¤ Increasing demand for highly qualified teachers 19
  - ¤ Serious issue of graduate unemployment in most countries 21
  - ¤ Highly uneven internationalisation 22

- **Concluding observations** 24

- **Papers presented at the seminar by participating countries** 26

- **Appendix I**
  Detailed Programme 27

- **Appendix II**
  List of Participants 30

International Seminar on the Massification of Higher Education in Large Academic Systems

10–11 November 2014, Jaypee Vasant Continental, New Delhi

Introduction

This international seminar was the second in a series of dialogues bringing together policy- makers and experts from the largest higher education systems in the world. The countries involved are India, China, Brazil, Indonesia, Nigeria, Pakistan, Russia, USA and the UK. Together, they represent over half of the world's tertiary enrolment. While all these systems are unique in their histories and development, they share a common set of circumstances and challenges related to their scale. These meetings aim at enabling these countries to share experiences, paths and strategies for the reform and evolution of their large-scale academic systems.

The series of dialogues was initiated by the newly- formed Centre for Policy Research in Higher Education (CPRHE), part of the National University of Educational Planning and Administration, India, and the British Council. The first dialogue took place at the British Council's Going Global conference in Miami in May 2014, wherein consensus was reached among all participant countries on specific areas affecting higher education that would benefit from cooperation and knowledge-exchange among countries with large systems. The meeting concluded with a proposal to organise a seminar in Delhi in November 2014 to discuss in more detail the challenges facing higher education in large systems.

The Delhi seminar on the massification of higher education in large system countries was jointly organised by CPRHE and the British Council and held on 10 and 11 November 2014 at the Hotel Jaypee Vasant Continental, New Delhi.

The objectives of the seminar were as follows:

i) To share experiences in organising and managing large academic systems
ii) To discuss strategies to improve quality while expanding access to increasingly diverse student populations
iii) To discuss governance and management of large academic systems to ensure effectiveness and wider participation
iv) To discuss strategies of financing massified systems of higher education.

The participants of the seminar were scholars and policy-makers from the nine large system countries, plus representatives from international organisations/agencies and a larger number of academics and policy- makers from India.

The seminar started with a welcome address by Professor N.V. Varghese, Director of the CPRHE/NUEPA, India, and was followed by opening statements by Ms. Gill Caldicott of the British Council and Mr. Pawan Agarwal of the Ministry of DSDE, India; Professor Ved Prakash, Chairman, University Grants Commission of India, delivered the inaugural address. Dr Jinusha Panigrahi of the CPRHE/NUEPA proposed a vote of thanks at the end of the inaugural session.

Each country representative prepared a detailed paper on the challenges of massification of higher education on the following themes: implications of massification, governance and management, modes of financing, the academic profession and quality assurance. These themes were taken up for detailed discussions during the seminar. What is presented below is based on these papers, their presentation and discussions in the seminar.

Summary of Discussions

The rapidly expanding higher education sector

Global enrolment in higher education increased from 100 million in 2000 to 177.6 million in 2010, an average annual increase of around 7.6 million students. The papers prepared for the seminar, and the presentations made, highlighted the fact that the higher education system has expanded at an unprecedented rate in the first decade of the present century in all the participating countries barring the Russian Federation. The participating countries, together, accounted for more than half of the total global higher education enrolment.

The participating countries varied in terms of the level of expansion of their higher education systems. The Russian Federation, UK and USA have universalised their higher education systems. While Brazil, China, India and Indonesia have massified their higher education systems, the higher education sectors in Nigeria and Pakistan are quickly expanding but have not yet reached a stage of massification. At the same time, while most countries face the challenges of expanding the system, Russia has to address the problems stemming from a declining trend in higher education enrolment.

The rapid expansion of the higher education system is a recent phenomenon in most countries; it is a phenomenon of the 1990s and 2000s. Brazilian higher education experienced a period of fast and steady expansion from the mid-1990s.Enrolment in higher education increased from1.66 million in 1994 to 7.40 million in 2013 –adding an average of 0.3 million students to the system every year. The expansion of enrolment in federal public institutions accelerated from 2008 onwards, primarily due to a programme called REUNI (university for all), initiated by the federal government which provided funds for existing institutions to establish new campuses and

for expansion of the system. Public technological colleges have played a growing role in providing vocational programmes, mostly in the federal system in the states of São Paulo and Rio de Janeiro. Nearly 90 per cent of the students enrolled in public institutions are in federal and state universities, with the remaining enrolled in 4-year colleges and in technological colleges, which grant 3-year vocational degrees (ISCED Type 5B programmes).The private sector accounts for nearly three-quarters of enrolment in Brazil.

The fast expansion of the higher education sector in India is a phenomenon of the present century. The Gross Enrolment Ratio (GER) more than trebled from 5.9 to 21.1 per cent during the period between 2001–02 and 2011–12. Enrolment in higher education increased from 8.8 million in 2001–02 to 29.6 million in 2012–13, an addition of around 1.89 million students annually to the sector, making it the highest expansion for any decade. Enrolment in higher education in India grew at a rate of 12.5 per cent during the decade of the 2000s, implying thereby that India accounts for nearly a quarter of the global expansion in enrolment. With around 29.6 million students, 0.70 million teachers and 36,000 institutions, the higher education sector in India is not only extremely large but is, in fact, the second largest in the world after China.

As in Brazil, the private sector played an important role in the rapid expansion of the sector in India. At present more than three-fifths of enrolment is in private institutions. This trend will continue since from the perspective of the Twelfth Five Year Plan (2012–17), the majority of the expected increase in enrolment (by around 10 million) during the Plan period will also be accounted for by private institutions. Further, around 10 to 12 per cent of enrolment is in distance education programmes. It seems that the massification of higher education in India relies more on market forces and private institutions than on public institutions and public funding.

Higher education is expanding fast in Pakistan. However, the country has not yet reached a stage of massification. Higher education enrolment in Pakistan in 2012 was1.23 million and the GER was around 8 percent. The higher education GER in Indonesia has been increasing, from 18.3 per cent in 2005 to 27.1 per cent in 2011. While private sector higher education is a new phenomenon in many countries, Indonesia relied on private institutions from the very

beginning to expand its higher education system. The GER increase is mainly attributable to the private sector, which accounts for nearly 75 per cent of higher education institutions. Furthermore, public sector enrolment has been almost stagnant in the recent past. Distance learning is an important component of higher education in Indonesia, accounting for nearly 12 per cent of higher education enrolment.

The USA, UK and Russian Federation have already universalised their higher education systems. While the systems continue to expand in the USA and UK, student enrolment is on the decline in Russia due to demographic effects. The UK enrolled 2.3 million students in higher education in 2012–13.Of these, 1.5 million are studying in undergraduate courses and 500,000 are studying in postgraduate courses. A good share of students enrolled in UK higher education institutions are mature students.

Brazil experiences low GER at secondary level, which acts as a constraint in the expansion of the higher education sector. The numbers of eligible secondary education leavers seeking higher education may not be large enough to meet the expansion plans for higher education. This is one of the reasons why a large number of students (45 per cent) enrolled in higher education in Brazil are mature students. Russia experienced a decline in the age-group population and hence, as noted above, a decline in student enrolment. In fact, enrolment in higher education in Russia declined from 7.8 million in 2008 to 5.6 million in 2014.

Countries such as the USA and UK have reached a high GER and the likelihood of them experiencing a further spurt in growth rate may be limited. Therefore, higher education systems in China, India, Indonesia, Nigeria and Pakistan may be contributing more to the addition in enrolment in the coming years. Since the GER in these countries is not yet high and since the secondary education segment is growing, the potential for the higher education sector to expand is very high. For example, in the 2020s, India will have the largest tertiary education age-group population in the world.

Importance of private sector as a partner in expansion of Higher Education

Traditionally, public funding and public universities provided the most common institutional arrangement for expanding higher education in most parts of the world. This has changed, and non-public resource sources are increasingly relied on by the sector in many countries. Over a period of time, public universities in Europe became entrepreneurial, with diversified sources of funding, while the expansion of higher education in developing countries has been accelerated through private higher education institutions.

Among the participating countries, Brazil and Indonesia have relied heavily on the private sector to massify their higher education systems, while China and the Russian Federation have relied mostly on public institutions and public funding for their expansion. The USA has traditional private higher education institutions. Many of the top-ranking universities in the US are private, and in the recent past, many for-profit private institutions have arisen. However, the major share of institutions and enrolment still continues to be in state-funded institutions. The level of cost- recovery through fees is high in many of the public and not-for-profit institutions. Therefore, the USA represents a case more of privatisation than of rapid expansion of private institutions. In any case, the private sector accounts for around a quarter of total student enrolment.

The UK's public higher education institutions have followed a strategy of cost- recovery to sustain and expand higher education enrolment. While in the 1980s, cost-recovery was primarily for students from non-EU countries, in the 1990s, the cost-recovery measures were extended to domestic and EU students. In fact, the domestic student fee rates were enhanced substantially by the government to the extent that many UK students are compelled to seek admission to universities abroad for financial reasons. Private higher education institutions are not very common in the UK and, hence, it could be stated that, as in the USA, privatisation measures are more common in the UK than the promotion of private institutions.

As noted earlier, private institutions dominate the higher education sector in Brazil, accounting for 74 per cent of enrolment in 2013. Brazil has for-profit and not-for-profit private institutions.

Before the National Law of Education was approved in 1996, all private higher education institutions in Brazil were non-profit institutions. Since then, the for-profit sector has started growing fast, and, at present, it accounts for nearly half of the private sector. About 50 per cent of those enrolled in private institutions are in for-profit institutions. The federal PROUNI programme, which provided fiscal waiver benefits to for-profit HEIs, and the expansion of distance-learning programmes in the private sector aided the fast expansion of enrolment in private institutions in Brazil.

Although India traditionally relied on public institutions and public-funded private institutions (grants-in-aid), the fast expansion of enrolment in the sector in recent years owes more to non-state-funded private institutions. Private colleges were common in India, although private universities were not permitted by law till the turn of this century. The private colleges – known as capitation fee colleges – were for-profit commercial organisations. However, many state governments passed laws to establish private universities in the early 2000, and between 2002 and 2011, around 178 private universities were established in India. Many of the private universities in India are for-profit institutions.

Among the Asian countries, Indonesia traditionally relied on private higher education institutions. The private sector accounts for more than 75 per cent of institutions and enrolment in Indonesia. The increase in GER is mainly contributed by the private sector. Furthermore, enrolment in the public sector has been almost stagnant in the recent past. The private providers are proliferating in Nigeria and it becomes difficult for the poor to afford higher education in private institutions. In Pakistan too, private institutions are increasing in numbers. However, the private sector accounts for only 33 per cent of enrolment. Among the South Asian countries, India has a higher share of enrolment in private higher education institutions.

Widening disparities accompanying expansion

Access to higher education continues to be a major problem in Brazil, India, Indonesia, Nigeria and Pakistan. Although quota systems and affirmative action ensure enrolment of children from disadvantaged backgrounds, inequalities in enrolment continue to exist in all these countries. Since the expansion of higher education has been

dominated by enrolment in private institutions, economic accessibility is becoming an important concern in these countries.

One of the immediate implications of massification in Brazil has been growing inequalities challenging the notion of social inclusion. Historically disadvantaged groups, like those of African origins, needed affirmative action and programmes to get access to higher education institutions. Efforts towards outlining a legal framework led to the passing of a law in 2012 whereby the federal government is to develop quota systems for students graduating from the public secondary education system. Many studies and analyses have shown that affirmative action initiatives can help reduce inequalities in access to higher education in Brazil, and, therefore, these quota systems are expected to remain in force.

China does not have a quota system. However, equity in higher education has always been a concern. The higher education disparities in China are two-dimensional, namely regional and qualitative. Due to an imbalance in the allocation of resources, there are inequalities in the distribution of institutions by region. In 2005, higher education enrolment per 10,000 population was 1,613 at the national level but it varied between 6,580 in Beijing and 838 in Guizhou Province. It seems the economically developed provinces in eastern China were able to invest a lot more resources in higher education than their less affluent counterparts in middle and western China. Likewise, urban areas invested more resources in higher education than their rural counterparts. This led to a decline in the share of rural students in top universities besides widening disparities in terms of the social composition of students in top universities.

The expansion of higher education in India is accompanied by widening disparities –regional disparities, group disparities and disparities between the sexes. During the period between 2002–03 and 2011–12, all states improved their GERs in higher education. However, inter-state disparities in enrolment (GER) increased during this period. For example in2002–03, the GER varied between 5.0 per cent (in Jammu and Kashmir) and 28.7 per cent (in Chandigarh), while in 2011–12, the variation in GER was between 8.4 per cent (in Jharkhand) and 53.0 per cent (in Chandigarh). Women accounted for 44.4 per cent of total higher education enrolments in India in 2011–12.Although there has been progress towards gender equality, the gender parity index still remains below unity at 0.78.

In Indonesia, the gap in the share of higher education enrolment between students from the lowest quintile and the highest quintile is 62 per cent. To mitigate the alarming trends in disparity in access to higher education, the government of Indonesia introduced several programmes, such as the BidikMisi full scholarship programme targeting poor students with good academic records in their final year of high school. In 2013, the Indonesian government distributed 144,799 scholarships under this programme, covering the tuition and living expenses of children.

In the UK, nearly a quarter of full-time undergraduate acceptances are from black and minority ethnic groups (BME). Acceptance to full-time undergraduate courses from various BME groups has increased significantly between 2007–08 and 2013–14 – black students increased by 74 per cent; mixed and other ethnic backgrounds by 54 per cent and Asian ethnicity by 34 per cent. Over the same period, acceptance for students with white ethnicity increased by18 per cent. These figures indicate that the rate of growth of BME groups is higher in enrolment and may help narow down disparities in higher education enrolment in the future.

Major concern over quality in large system countries

In many instances, the massive expansion of higher education systems is accompanied by a concern over quality because many believe that massification has led to its deterioration. Most countries – both developed and developing- have instigated national qualification frameworks and have established external quality assurance (EQA) mechanisms. International experience shows that many countries created EQA mechanisms to carry out accreditation and quality audits to ensure that quality does not become a casualty of system expansion.EQA can ensure a threshold level of quality across institutions and can strengthen accountability in terms of learning outcomes in higher education.

Many countries have established internal quality assurance (IQA) mechanisms at the institutional level. IQA mechanisms help in complying with the requirements of national EQA agencies or regulatory bodies, on the one hand, and in responding to the requirements for internal quality monitoring and management on the other. More importantly, IQA systems can address issues related to

teaching–learning more effectively than an EQA system can. The IQA mechanisms today typically comprise self-assessment and evaluation of units, monitoring and review of academic programmes, carrying out student surveys on teaching effectiveness, student and staff satisfaction surveys and analysing student progress.

The new forms of accountability measures in the context of quality assurance include student engagement surveys, assessment of learning outcomes, labour market observations, rankings and benchmarking. The mechanisms employed by participating countries to assure quality vary. The National Evaluation System of Higher Education (SINAES) in Brazil was established by federal law in 2004. It is based on three main components: institutional, programme and undergraduate student proficiency evaluation. The learning outcomes assessment test (ENADE) is developed and administered by the National Institute for Educational and Pedagogical Research (INEP).The results from ENADE are used to evaluate study programmes offered in the universities. The main use of SINAES's results has been in regulatory and accreditation procedures regarding the private sector in higher education. Such regulatory process has become all the more important owing to the proliferation of for-profit private institutions.

India has multiple regulatory bodies, and each of these has its own quality assurance mechanisms. However, the most important quality assurance mechanisms –covering a large number of institutions – are the National Assessment and Accreditation Council (NAAC) and the National Board of Accreditation (NBA). The NAAC was set up by the University Grants Commission (UGC) in 1994 to accredit universities and institutions of general higher education, and the NBA was established by the All India Council of Technical Education (AICTE) in 1994 to accredit programmes in technical education. The NAAC accredits institutions and certifies their educational quality based on seven criteria. It classifies institutions on a nine-point scale.

Quality assessment by the NAAC is accomplished through a process of self-assessment and peer review using well-defined criteria, while accreditation by the NAAC is voluntary and is valid for five years. Progress in accrediting institutions is very slow in India. The Twelfth Plan showed that only about a third of universities and

about a fifth of colleges had been accredited by 2012.This trend will change as the UGC has stipulated regulations to ensure that institutions are accredited before being eligible for funds. Similarly, the AICTE has made accreditation by the NBA mandatory for all technical institutions. An increased willingness on the part of institutions to approach accreditation agencies in the coming days should be expected.

Higher education institutions in India have also established IQA cells. It seems these cells mostly collect data on various aspects related to teaching–learning and prepare reports. The effect of these IQA cells in monitoring and improving quality needs to be examined closely. There is a need to strengthen IQA cells and improve teaching–learning in higher education in India, especially since there are large and wide variations in quality between institutions.

In Pakistan, quality assurance operates through quality assurance cells established at the institutional level. Quality assurance in Russia appears to focus on attaining European standards. With the rapid expansion of the system in China, many scholars have expressed their concern about the declining quality of higher education. The government initiated several steps from 2002 onwards to strengthen higher education quality in the country. Quality assurance mechanisms are operating more effectively in the USA, UK, etc..

Debates on world university rankings are extremely lively in all countries. While the USA and UK are very favourably placed in terms of global ranking of universities, there is concern in many of the participating countries that their own universities do not appear on the list. The USA and UK lead the global rankings of universities and, among the Asian countries, China leads the list of top-ranking universities. In many countries, there are efforts to set up world-class universities. China has programmes to encourage graduate teaching and the setting up of research universities, while Brazil has a programme to establish 'universities of excellence'.

Funding bodies have a statutory obligation to ensure that the higher education they fund is of good quality. There is an independent body, the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA), which reviews and reports on how well UK universities and colleges set and maintain their academic quality and standards, and supports

these institutions through enhancement activities. All universities and higher education colleges in the UK subscribe to the QAA. Its reviews take a slightly different form in different parts of the UK, but include making regular visits to HEIs and Further Education (FE) Colleges offering higher education.

The US system of accreditation and quality assurance is characterised by decentralisation and autonomy. The primary system for institutional accreditation comprises six regional accrediting agencies established in 1885. The institutions are not required to obtain accreditation by a regional agency; it is voluntary. Institutions are subject to periodic review by their accrediting body, but they are evaluated based on goals and assessment criteria they themselves establish. Reviews are conducted by faculty and administrators from other member institutions, which means that the system as a whole is self-directed and self- administered.

Diversification of funding sources across countries

The financing of an expanding higher education system is an important and immediate concern in the participating countries. Many countries have been relying on public funding to expand their higher education system. The countries vary in terms of allocation of public funds for education and higher education. For example, among the participating countries, the UK invests the highest share (6.2 per cent) of the GDP for education. This is followed by Brazil(5.8 per cent) and the USA (5.4 per cent).India spends less than 4 per cent of its GDP on education and Pakistan and Indonesia spend less than 3 per cent of their GDP on education.

Among the participating countries, the relative share of expenditure on higher education is the highest in India. India invests 1.2 per cent of its GDP, or 36 per cent of its investments in education, on higher education. The USA invests around 1.39 per cent of the GDP or 26 per cent of the educational investment on higher education, while the same share in the UK and Indonesia is 16 per cent.

Reliance on public funding for expanding higher education has been declining over a period of time. Most of the countries have been slowly but steadily veering towards market-oriented strategies to finance higher education. Two of the most important strategies to

move towards the market and reduce reliance on state funding, as noted earlier, are privatisation of public institutions and promotion of private institutions. Cost- recovery, mainly through student fees, has become an important source of income in public institutions in many countries. Private higher education institutions have been proliferating in many of the developing countries such as Brazil, India, Indonesia, Nigeria and Pakistan. The universities in many of these countries have also initiated income-generating activities. Student loans have become a common mode of financing higher education in the participating countries.

The privatisation process is not common in Brazil. Public institutions rely on government funding and they do not levy tuition and other fees from students. In fact, the restrictions on the use of funds mobilised by the institutions act as a constraint for public universities to mobilise funds. Even those universities which created foundations to overcome these restrictions ultimately fell into the same set of restrictions as for public funds. Brazil encourages the establishment of private institutions, whose main source of funding is tuition charges and fees. In the case of for-profit HEIs, they have fiscal incentives to provide scholarships to low-income students (from PROUNI, as already described), and that has been very effective in making students' attendance possible. About 600,000 students are supported under that programme yearly. The federal loan system (FIES) now supports about one million students in both for- and non-profit HEIs.

China's higher education system moved from a free education system to a cost-sharing one. Between 1997 and 2004, the share of public resources in total higher education funding declined from 78.3 to 45.5 per cent, and the share of funds from tuition fees increased dramatically from 14.8 to 30.4 percent during the same period. The higher education institutions are increasingly reliant upon student tuition fees. To help students from economically poor backgrounds, the government established several programmes of national scholarships, national grants, national student loans, work–study programmes and other types of financial aid, which serve as an important supplement for higher education.

Public expenditure on education has also been increasing in India. Some recent policy suggestions indicate that the higher education share will be increased from the current level of 0.91 per

cent to 2 per cent of the GDP by 2020.It needs to be noted that a major share of the expenditure on education is accounted for by state governments. In 2009–10, nearly 75 per cent of public expenditure on education was accounted for by the states while the share of the Centre was only 25 per cent. Higher education expenditure is less than 20 per cent of the budgeted expenditure in most states.

Pakistan invests 0.2 per cent of its GDP on higher education, although the country's 'Vision 2025' sets a goal of increasing higher education investment to 1.4 per cent. This target, if reached,will improve resource availability enormously.Higher education in Russia is financed primarily by the state. Financial support for Russian higher education consists of budgetary funds, extra-budgetary funds and institutions' own resources. Budgetary expenses on higher education have been growing over the last few years and it is estimated (by Discovery Research Group) that the market volume for higher education in Russia in 2011 stood at RUB 197.2 billion. Total higher professional education expenditure in 2013, including private expenses, was RUB 446 billion.

All graduate and post-graduate students, who have passed the annual certification and are studying full-time, have the right to receive the state scholarship. Since 2014, the Potanin Charity Foundation has been awarding scholarships to Master's students and professors teaching Master's programmes who have passed a competitive selection process. There is also state support in the form of educational loans for citizens enrolled in key professional educational programmes.

Some of the committees appointed by the government also strongly recommended cost- recovery in higher education in India as the fee levels in higher education in India were low. The student loan schemes, which are becoming very popular nowadays, belong to the category of financing institutions indirectly – through students rather than through direct transfer to the institutions. In 2001, the Government of India announced a new comprehensive educational loan scheme to be implemented by the public sector banks. In 2012, there was a proposal to establish a Credit Guarantee Fund Trust (CGFT) to facilitate student loans. Under this programme, it is expected that loans up to Rs. 0.4 million will be given without any collateral security, while loans from Rs. 0.4 million to Rs. 0.75 million will be given with a third-party guarantee.

Public funding has steadily been increasing in Indonesia in the last few years, particularly after the Supreme Consultative Assembly (MPR) amended the Constitution in 2005 by imposing 20 per cent of the government budget allocation for the education sector. Under the decentralisation policy, the lion's share of the education budget goes to the districts and provincial governments to support basic education. Budget allocation for MoEC is approximately 25–30 per cent of the total budget for the education sector, and the share of higher education within the MoEC budget is close to 50 per cent.

More than 70 per cent of the budget is absorbed by personnel costs, particularly allowances (incentives) for certified lecturers and active professors, as mandated by the Law on Teachers and Lecturers. In 2012, the Director General of Higher Education (DGHE) introduced a type of formula funding for public institutions whereby the operational (recurrent) budget is allocated based on enrolment, field of study, geographical location and special affirmative policy. This allocated budget aims to top up revenue from student tuition to enable public universities cover their operational expenses. Although the DGHE does not formally apply a cap on student enrolment, the proportion of poor students is set at 20 percent (minimum) in each public university's admission process.

In addition to the government budget, public universities also generate revenue from various sources, mostly from student fees. However, the Parliament inserted an article in Law 12/2012 limiting the proportion of budget acquired from students to not exceed 30 per cent in any public university. Revenue in public universities must be deposited to the State Treasury, and can only be used after acquiring MoF approval for its budget proposal.

UK universities receive funding from the Funding Council, student fees, research grants and contracts. In 2012–13, nearly a quarter of funding came from Funding Council grants; fees from UK and EU students accounted for 22.7 per cent, with 12.1 per cent from non-EU students; 16.4 per cent came from research grants and contracts, and the remaining from other sources.

Public funding for US higher education comes primarily from two levels of government: state and federal. Money from state government supports the day-to-day operations of public institutions.

Federal funding supports public and private institutions both directly, through research funding (grants, contracts and cooperative agreements) and tax support (e.g. higher education institutions are not subject to corporate tax rates), and indirectly, through student- aid programmes (grants, loans, tax incentives) that help students pay their tuition costs. State funding for institutions has remained more or less stagnant over the past 50 years, whereas federal funding has increased substantially.

Another source of income is student fees. Tuition rates vary significantly among US colleges and universities. Public institutions levy differential fees for 'in-state' students and a higher fee for 'out-of-state' students. Students receive financial support from the federal need-based grant programme (Pell Grant Program); some institutions have their own student- aid programmes. Student loans are available from the US Department of Education at a relatively low interest rate, as well as from private financial institutions, which charge higher interest rates.

Move by institutions towards autonomy in governance and management

The countries vary in terms of their structure for governing and managing the higher education sector and institutions. Brazilian public universities follow a traditional public service model of governance and management. Brazil does not have buffer organisations to mediate between the higher education institutions and the Ministry. Faculty members are civil servants and are recruited based on a competition. Many feel that there is a need for higher education institutions to be more autonomous to strengthen institutional initiatives and innovations.

In China, higher education governance has traditionally been highly centralised, with central government having total control over the establishment of institutions, recruitment of staff, enrolment of students and employment of higher education graduates. From the 1980s, when China made the transition from a planned economy to a market-oriented one, the country initiated measures to grant more autonomy to its institutions of higher education. The National Outline for Medium- and Long-term Educational Reform and Development (2010–2020) redefined the relationship between higher education institutions and government and clearly defined the responsibilities for both.

Despite these moves towards greater autonomy, governmental control continues to be strong in China. Student admissions, the award of degree certificates, study programmes, personnel transfers, faculty promotions, etc. still need the approval of relevant government agencies. Higher education institutions are still considered as auxiliary institutions to the government. The role of central government includes all issues relating to legislation and regulation, the formulation of national higher education and enrolment plans, fiscal appropriations and the overall supervision of the system.

At independence, higher education in India was the almost exclusive domain of the public authorities, and a state-controlled model of governance structure was in place. The government played an important role in planning, funding and managing higher education institutions. The establishment of self-financing public and private institutions permitted the market's entry into higher education decision-making. An important step focusing on state- level institutions was the creation of State Higher Education Councils (SHECs) entrusted with the responsibility for planning and coordination, and academic, advisory and administrative functions.

Universities in India have been seen as autonomous entities from the beginning. However, while they enjoyed autonomy in theory, in practice, they were controlled and regulated by the government. Most institutions of higher education in India have their own Governing Body/Board of Governors. These bodies are influential in deciding the direction of change in the management of college affairs.

At independence, universities in Indonesia were managed mostly by peers, whereby almost all decisions were taken by committees. Such a management style is no longer feasible. Universities have become large in number, and large enterprises need to be professionally managed. A university must comply with standards in accountability and transparency. The higher education system is centrally managed by the DGHE, under the MoEC. The prevailing regulations exclude institutions under MoRA jurisdiction from decentralisation. Therefore, all Islamic institutions – from basic to higher education – are centrally managed by MoRA. Public universities also have to comply with the prevailing regulations applied to all government units, including regulations on financial management issued by the MoF and regulations on personnel management issued by the National Civil Service Agency (BKN).

Under the prevailing regulations in Indonesia, institutional autonomy can only be granted to a university when it changes its legal status. In 2009, a bill allowing public universities to convert their status into a legal entity was passed. This law was questioned in court and was overturned. A new Law on Higher Education12/2012 was enacted in 2012, which provides greater autonomy to institutions of higher education.

In autonomous universities, the Board of Trustees is the highest authority. The responsibility of the Board includes, but is not limited to, overseeing the general operation, budgetary control and appointment of the Rector. The Rector appoints Deans after considering nominations from the respective Faculty's Senate. Institutions with BLU and PTN status do not have such Trustees, and the Rector is appointed by, and reports to, the Minister of Education and Culture after nominations from the respective University Senate has been considered.

The higher education system in Pakistan is governed through a 'Commission'–the Higher Education Commission (HEC) – which has 18 members. The Commission works through the support of different expert committees having members of international eminence and repute in higher education, representatives from the private sector, representatives of Vice- Chancellors, etc.. The Commission reports to the Prime Minister of Pakistan. The HEC has developed transparent procedures for the selection of Vice-Chancellors; Registrars and Treasurers have developed transparent and unbiased procedures for the selection of university leaders.

In the UK, the higher education governance is guided by the Committee of University Chairs (CUC) code of good governance. The framework of this governance is underpinned by a self- and co-regulatory structure, which has developed accountability mechanisms to help ensure that an institution's own financial governance and quality assurance regimes meet the necessary standards to award degrees or access public funds through grants or the student support system. The universities are autonomous and faculty members are recruited by the university; they are not civil servants.

The governance and regulation of the US higher education system is characterised by decentralisation and autonomy. Institutions

enjoy substantial autonomy for decision- making in nearly all aspects of their operation. There is no central agency specifically designated to regulate higher education in the US. The Department of Education is the agency which implements policies and initiatives. It also administers federal student financial aid, as well as various grant programmes that fund particular systems and enhance their own. There are several agencies to fund research in the US. The National Science Foundation, National Endowment for the Humanities, and other federal agencies provide direct funding for university research.

Increasing demand for highly qualified teachers

Universities in the participating countries indicated that several changes are taking place in terms of the design of new courses, the introduction of credit and semester systems and changes in the teaching–learning processes. Some of the federal universities in Brazil have developed 'Inter-disciplinary Bachelor' (IB) programmes since 2007 by dividing undergraduate courses into the initial general education component (3 years), followed by either a professional or academic specialisation (2 years) and ending with a post-graduate programme (3 years). The University of Campinas introduced another type of inter-disciplinary programme called 'Inter-disciplinary Higher Education Program'. Another development is the MOOC (massive open online course) adopted by the universities. The state of São Paulo has created a 'Virtual University', actually an institution to develop and organise such courses, as well as helping to develop and publicise full online programmes via the state universities.

After the Cultural Revolution in China ended in the late 1970s, new policies were adopted concerning intellectuals – including university faculty – and their political status, as part of the ruling class, was identified. Reforms led to the academic community having more opportunities to carry out international exchanges. Statistics show that 78 per cent of university presidents attached to Ministry of Education and 62 per cent of doctorate supervisors have either study or research experience overseas. There was once a significant outflow of faculty to the business sector owing to the salary gap; however, since the late 1990s, the academic profession has become attractive, with faculty working conditions improving and their income increasing. These changes can be attributed to the national strategy of 'rejuvenating the country through science and education' in general, Project 211 and Project 985.

In terms of the academic qualifications of Chinese academics, 14.3 per cent of faculty members had Doctoral degrees, 33.8 per cent had Master's degrees, half of the faculty had Bachelor's degrees, and just under 2 per cent had only diplomas. The majority of faculty members in central ministries-affiliated universities tended to have doctoral degrees.

Chinese higher education institutions have a tradition of recruiting faculty members from its own new graduates. Realising the disadvantages of this, some prestigious universities have taken measures to hire fewer of their own graduates and bring in more from other universities, both domestic and overseas. In recent years, some universities have experimented with recruiting one-third new faculty members from among its own graduates, one-third from domestic universities and one-third from overseas universities. Faculty appointments in most of the 4-year universities require a doctoral degree, while those in prestigious universities, like Project 985 institutions, prefer people with doctoral training in top overseas universities.

All teaching staff in public universities in Indonesia are civil servants. As per law, only the BKN has the authority to recruit members of staff and terminate their employment, or to transfer staff from one institution to another, and mobility across institutions requires a long bureaucratic procedure. The authority of the Rector is limited to the submission of a recommendation to the BKN. A new Law on Civil Apparatus was recently passed by the Parliament allowing some flexibility in managing teaching staff in public universities. In future, teaching staff at public universities could have contract-based employment for upto five years. The new regulation allows the Rector to exercise his/her authority and provides more flexibility in managing academic staff.

Since the proportion of permanent teaching staff is an important indicator in the accreditation process, there is strong motivation for private universities to convert their staff to permanent status. Previously, private universities tended to prefer employing teachers from public universities on part-time basis. Nowadays, many public universities have disciplined their staff and, to compensate for the salary increase, have introduced the provision of performance-based incentives, leaving small private institutions in a difficult situation. In

order to assist the private sector, the government supports private providers by providing scholarships to staff to pursue advanced degrees, and to provide civil servant status to some of its teachers.

The 2005 law requires all university teachers to hold at least a Master's degree. Nearly 28 per cent of academic staff holds a Bachelor's degree; 61 per cent have a Master's degree and fewer than 12 per cent have Doctorate degrees. Most of the Doctorate degree holders are teaching at the few elite universities.

Russian universities face difficulties due to migration – the outflow of young talent to other sectors of the national economy, as well as external migration. This issue is compounded by the fact that the average age of professors is high. Professors in the age group of 50+ account for 43 per cent of the total number of university faculty members. Since salary levels are very low, migration from the teaching staff is high and young talent is not attracted to the profession.

Serious issue of graduate unemployment in most countries

The unemployment rate among higher education graduates is on the rise. While the economic crisis may be a reason for an increase in unemployment among university graduates in the UK and USA, the major concern expressed in other countries was the education–skill mismatch. Universities are not producing graduates with the relevant skills to be readily employed in the production sectors. In other words, higher education institutions are producing 'unemployables'.

In countries such as India, Indonesia, Nigeria and Russia, the employability of university graduates is an area of major concern and a challenge to reforms. Another major issue is the structural unemployment as a result of changes in the human resources market. In China, the number of higher education graduates reached nearly 7 million in 2012. Their employment prospects are not optimistic. The long-term prediction for workforce demand shows a need for a large number of high-calibre professionals, and skilled technical talent, especially in specific fields.

Employability of higher education graduates is an issue. Many countries are trying to link skills' development programmes with the requirements of the labour market. It is not only technical skills that

are important but also communication skills, language proficiency, etc. and higher education can play an important role in developing these areas.

Highly uneven internationalisation

Internationalisation takes place through different modes, such as the mobility of programmes, students, institutions and teachers. Of these, student mobility is the most important and most traditional mode of internationalisation. Institutional mobility is of recent origin. Many countries have invited universities from developed countries to establish branch campuses to develop education hubs and to promote internationalisation, although education hubs are not very common in many of the countries represented in the seminar. Programme mobility is also a recent innovation, with MOOCs courses being followed in many countries. Of the participating countries, the USA ranks highest in terms of MOOC enrolment, followed by India, which has the second largest number of MOOCs students.

Among the large system countries, the USA and UK are more internationalised in higher education than other participating countries. The USA attracts the largest number of foreign students every year, followed by the UK. In fact, the UK hosts a higher share of foreign students to their total higher education enrolment than the USA. Nearly 13 per cent of undergraduate and 37 per cent of postgraduate students in 2012–13 in the UK were international students.

The globalisation process, together with a demand for graduates trained in skills meeting the requirements of the globalised labour market, has hastened the process of higher education internationalisation in all countries. India and China are the largest sending countries. Together, they send 0.76 million students, accounting for more than a fifth of cross-border students in total. Many of these students are self-financed.

In 2011, the Brazilian government started a new programme –Science Without Borders (SWB)– with the objective of sending about 100,000 students abroad by 2015. This is a large internationalisation programme funded by the government to improve the quality and relevance of Brazilian education, and in an effort to

harmonise its structure with that of other countries. The implementation of this programme was an indication of the steps required to internationalise higher education. For example, there is a need to promote international languages such as English, since many students prefer to go to English-speaking countries, notably the USA.

Indian higher education is internationalised through programme mobility, student mobility and institutional mobility. India holds second place, after the USA, for enrolment on MOOC courses, and it is second only to China for sending students abroad to study. Several institutions have collaborations with institutions abroad; however, foreign institutions are not permitted to open independent branch campuses in India. Faculty mobility from India to abroad is common. Recently, many Indian professionals have returned from abroad to work in India.

What is less known is the fact that India is a host country for overseas students, and many Indian institutions have established branch campuses abroad. India hosted 27,000 students in 2010. Of the total number of foreign students in India in 2010, nearly 19 per cent were from Nepal, followed by Bhutan, Iran, Afghanistan, Malaysia, Sudan and Iraq. Nearly 76 per cent of foreign students in India came for undergraduate studies, mostly in technology, commerce and medical studies.

Indian institutions are establishing campuses abroad either independently or in collaboration with existing national institutions. Indian private higher education institutions are active in this field and Indian institutions can be found operating in Mauritius, Malaysia, UK, USA, Singapore, China, UAE, etc. Another interesting development is that one of the southern states of India – the State of Kerala – recently decided to set up an International Academic City along the lines of that in Dubai.

China sends the largest number of students abroad. In 2010, nearly 563,000 Chinese students were studying abroad. Of these, 22.5 per cent went to the USA, 15.5 per cent to Australia, and nearly 10 per cent to the UK. The share of Chinese students travelling to the USA and UK has declined, while the number of students going to Australia, Japan and Korea has increased. China also hosts around 71,600 students from various countries, although mostly Asian countries.

Concluding Observations

A closer examination of developments in higher education in the participating countries indicates several interesting dimensions. Discussions in the seminar indicated that higher education expansion is a common phenomenon in all participating countries except the Russian Federation. The future potential for expansion of the system is greater in the developing countries, with India, perhaps, having the highest potential to expand since it will have the largest tertiary-education population in the 2020s.

While massification of higher education in developed countries was achieved mostly through public institutions, developing countries such as Brazil, India, Indonesia, Nigeria and Pakistan are increasingly reliant on private sector contributions to massify higher education. In many instances, the private institutions are for-profit institutions. In other words, the evidence is sufficiently clear that higher education development is increasingly linked to the market and its operating principles, whether the institutions are public or private.

There is a fear that expansion will be accompanied by a decline in the quality of higher education. Most countries have their own systems of external and internal quality assurance. However, doubts are being raised about the effectiveness of institutions to impact on the quality of curriculum transaction and learning outcomes in these countries.

The governance and management of large and expanding systems has become more complex, with different players in the provision of higher education, for example federal government, state governments, private for-profit and not-for profit institutions, and distance education programmes and open universities. Discussions revealed that there is an urgent need to develop a regulatory framework to ensure equity in access and quality in outcomes, and to evolve people-friendly markets in higher education.

The most evident message from the seminar was that the demand for higher education places is on the increase and countries are moving away from a total reliance on public institutions to satisfy the growing social demand for higher education. Enrolments in private institutions are significant in some countries. In other words, the future of higher education in most countries depends on the extent to which public–private partnerships can be developed through market-friendly reforms. Some private institutions are for-profit institutions. When expansion is mostly through private institutions, the need for developing regulatory and accountability measures becomes increasingly important.

Papers presented at the seminar by participating countries

Ahmed, M. (2014) ***Pakistan's National System of Higher Education***

Arzhanova, I. (2014) ***Introduction to the National System of Higher Education in Russia***

Helms, R.M. (2014) ***Higher Education in the United States***

Maiyaki, C.J. (2014) ***Challenges of Higher Education System in Sub-Saharan Africa***

Moeliodihardjo, B.Y. (2014) ***Higher Education Sector in Indonesia***

Pedrosa, R.H.D.L. (2014) ***Higher Education in Brazil: A System in Permanent Change***

Stern, V. (2014) ***Introduction to the UK's Higher Education System***

Varghese, N.V. (2014) ***Challenges of Massification of Higher Education in India***

Wang, R. (2014) ***A Brief Overview of Chinese Higher Education System***

Appendix I
Detailed Programme

International Seminar on
Massification of Higher Education in
Large Academic Systems
(10–11 November 2014)

(Monday) 10 November 2014

12.00 hrs : Registration

12.30 hrs : Lunch
Venue: *Jaypee Vasant Continental, New Delhi*

13.30 hrs : **Opening Session**
Welcome: Professor N.V. Varghese, CPRHE/NUEPA
Statement: Ms. Gill Caldicott, British Council
Statement: Mr. Pawan Agarwal, DSDE, GOI
Inaugural Address: Professor Ved Prakash, Chairman,UGC
Vote of Thanks: Dr. Jinusha Panigrahi, CPRHE/NUEPA

14.15 hrs : **Moderated conversation on critical issues in higher education of the participating countries**
: **Chairperson:** Mr. Richard Everitt, British Council
: **Rapporteur:** Dr. Savita Kaushal, NUEPA

15.45 hrs : Tea/Coffee Break

16.00 hrs : **Implications of massification of higher education**
: **Chairperson:** Mr. Amarjeet Sinha, MHRD
: **Lead Presentations:**
i) Professor Renato Hyuda De Luna Pedrosa (Brazil)
ii) Dr. Rong Wang (China)
: **Discussant:** Mr. Toby Linden, World Bank

16.40 hrs : **Discussions**
: **Rapporteur:** Dr. Malish Chirakkal, CPRHE/NUEPA

17.15 hrs : Wrap- up of the programme, close of Day 1 and evening instructions: Ms. Manjula Rao, British Council

18.00 hrs : Bus leaving for Reception

19.00 hrs : **Reception** at British Council,
17 Kasturba Gandhi Marg, New Delhi – 110001

(Tuesday) 11 November 2014

09.15 hrs : Welcome: Ms. Manjula Rao, British Council.

09.30 hrs : Governance and management of large systems
: Chairperson: Professor Ananda Krishnan, IIT Kanpur
: Lead Presentations:
i) Ms. Vivienne Stern (UK)
ii) Professor N.V. Varghese (India)
: Discussant: Dr. Padmakumar Nair, Thapar University

10.10 hrs : **Discussions**
: **Rapporteur:** Dr. Garima Malik, CPRHE/NUEPA

10.45 hrs : Tea/Coffee Break

11.15 hrs : **National financial structures and new modes of financing of higher education**
: **Chairperson:** Professor Kavita Sharma, SAU
: **Lead Presentations:**
i) Dr. Robin Matross Helms Christopher (USA)
ii) Dr. Mukhtar Ahmed (Pakistan)
: **Discussant:** Professor J.B.G. Tilak, NUEPA

11.55 hrs : **Discussions**
: **Rapporteur:** Dr. Aarti Srivastava, NUEPA

12.30 hrs : Lunch

13.30 hrs : **Academic profession and performance measures**
: **Chairperson: Professor Karuna Chanana, JNU**
: Lead Presentations:
i) Professor BagyoYuwono Moeliodihardjo (Indonesia)
ii) Mr. Christopher Jibreel Maiyaki (Nigeria)
: **Discussant:** Professor G.D. Sharma, SEED

14.00 hrs : **Discussions**
: **Rapporteur:** Dr. Tamo Chattopadhay, CPRHE/NUEPA

14.45 hrs : **Quality assurance mechanisms**
: **Chairperson:** Professor Sukhadeo Thorat, ICSSR
: **Lead Presentations:**
i) Ms. Irina Arzhanova (Russia)
ii) Dr. Mukhtar Ahmed (Pakistan)
: **Discussant:** Professor Sudhanshu Bhushan, NUEPA

15.25 hrs : **Discussions**
: **Rapporteur:** Dr. Anupam Pachauri,CPRHE/NUEPA

16.00 hrs : Tea/Coffee Break

16.15 hrs : **Concluding Session**
to **Final discussions and reflections with authors**
17.00 hrs **Chairperson:** Ms. Lynne Heslop, British Council
Vote of Thanks: Dr. Jinusha Panigrahi, CPRHE/NUEPA

Appendix II
List of Participants

International Participants

1. Professor Renato Hyuda De Luna Pedrosa
   Coordinator
   Special Program of Indicators Sao Paulo Research Foundation
   Brazil
   E: renato.pedrosa@ige.unicamp.br

2. Dr. Rong Wang
   Director and Professor of China
   Institute for Educational Finance Research Peking University
   China
   E: rwang@ciefr.pku.edu.cn

3. Professor Bagyo Yuwono Moeliodihardjo
   Faculty of Computer Science and Former (Foundation)
   Dean University of Indonesia
   Indonesia
   E: bym@cs.ui.ac.id

4. Mr. Christopher Jibreel Maiyaki
   Deputy Director/Chief of Staff to the Executive Secretary/CEO
   National Universities Commission
   Nigeria
   E: cjmaiyaki@gmail.com

5. Mr. Anthony Uchenna Chukwuma
   Project Manager (Education & Society)
   British Council Nigeria
   Nigeria

6. Dr. Mukhtar Ahmed
   Chairman
   Higher Education Commission of Pakistan
   Pakistan
   E: mahmed@hec.gov.pk

7. Ms. Sarah Parvez
   Project Manager, British Council Pakistan
   Pakistan

8. Ms. Irina Arzhanova
   Director
   National Training Foundation
   Russia
   E: arzhanova@ntf.ru

9. Ms. Vivienne Stern
   Director
   UK Higher Education International Unit
   United Kingdom
   E: vivienne.stern@international.ac.uk

10. Ms. Liz Dempsey
    Higher Education Adviser
    British Council Manchester
    United Kingdom

11. Dr. Robin Matross Helms
    Senior Research Specialist
    Center for Internationalization and Global Engagement
    American Council on Education
    USA
    E: rhelms@acenet.edu

Participants from India

1. Mr. Pawan Agarwal
   Joint Secretary
   Department of Skill Development & Entrepreneurship
   Government of India
   New Delhi - 110033
   Ph.: 09810806606
   E: pagarawal.dsde@gmail.com

2. Ms. Shivi Anand
   Young Professional (Consultant)
   Higher Education Unit Planning Commission
   Government of India
   New Delhi – 110001
   Ph.: 08447599315
   E: shivi.anand91@gmail.com

3. Professor M. Anandakrishnan
   Chairperson
   IIT, Kanpur
   Chennai – 600020
   Ph.: 91-94440-51133/044-2491629
   E: ananda1928@gmail.com

4. Mr. S.S. Bhoi
   c/o The PRC Govt. of Odisha
   4,Bordolai Marg, Chanakyapuri
   New Delhi – 110004

5. Ms. Divya Bhutani
   University of Twente
   The Netherlands

6. Dr. Saumen Chattopadhyay
   Associate Professor, ZHCES, SSS
   Jawaharlal Nehru University
   New Delhi – 110067
   Ph.: 09873439840
   E: saumen@mail.jnu.ac.in

7. Professor Karuna Chanana
Former Professor, ZHCES, SSS
Jawaharlal Nehru University
New Delhi – 110070
Ph.: 09811224334, 91-11-41768085
E: chananak@yahoo.com

8. Mr. Aakash Chakrabarty
Assistant Commissioning Editor
Taylor & Francis Books (l) Pvt. Ltd.
New Delhi – 110001
Ph.: 91 (11) 43155160
E: aakash.Chakrabarty@tandfindia.com

9. Professor Sailabala Debi
Adjunct Professor
KIIT School of Management Odisha
Bhubaneswar 751024
Ph.: 09437182633
E: sailabala@ksom.ac.in

10. Dr. Abraham George
Former Principal
Mar Thoma College, Tiruvalla
Kerala
Ph.: 08281684800
E: soniann@rediffmail.com

11. Professor Jaya Indiresan
B-57, Hill View Apartments, Vasant Vihar
New Delhi – 110057
Ph.: 91-11-26145091, 9810402617
E: jayaindiresan@gmail.com, indiresan@bol.net.in

12. Ms. Shobha Mishra Ghosh
Senior Director FICCI
New Delhi – 110001
Ph.: 91-11-2348 7468, 9910466116
E: shobha.mishra@ficci.com

13. Professor Murzban Jal
Director, Centre for Educational Studies
Indian Institute of Education, Pune
Maharashtra – 411038
020 2543 3317/25436980 Extn-221, 09224124224
E: murzbanjal@hotmail.com

14. Professor K.J. Joseph
Centre for Development Studies
Thiruvananthapuram – 695 011
Kerala
Ph: 0471-2774220/ 0471- 2558654
E: kjjoseph@cds.ac.in

15. Ms. Namrata Jha
Director, Institute of International Education
New Delhi – 110016
Ph.: 91 11 24645321 (D); 42403120 Fax: 42403119
E: njha@iieindia.org.in

16. Professor Binod Khadria
ZHCES, SSS
Jawaharlal Nehru University
New Delhi – 110067
Ph.: 26704417/ 26741239 --09810784513
E: bkhadria@mail.jnu.ac.in / bkhadria@gmail.com

17. Ms. Reshma Chandra Khan
Young Professional (Consultant) Higher Education Unit Planning Commission Government of India
New Delhi – 110001
Ph.: 08447241307
E: reshmachandra15@gmail.com

18. Mr. Prabhakar J. Lavakare
Senior Adviser
Institute of International Education (IIE India)
Pune - 411008
Ph.: 91 20 25887226/91 9890460009
E: lavakare@vsnl.com

19. Mr. Toby Linden
Lead Education Specialist World Bank
New Delhi - 110003
Ph.: 91-11-41479301 / 49247000
E: tlinden@worldbank.org

20. Professor D. Malathy
Department of Humanities and Social Sciences
Indian Institute of Technology Madras
Chennai
Tamil Nadu - 600036
Ph.: 91 (44) 2257 4505 Fax: +91 (44) 2257 4502
E: mdurai@iitm.ac.in

21. Ms. Radhika Maloo
Young Professional (Consultant)
Higher Education Unit Planning Commission
Government of India
New Delhi – 110001
Ph.: 91 11 23042518/ +91 9899974575
E: radhikamaloo28@gmail.com

22. Ms. Reena Marwah
Senior Academic Consultant
Indian Council of Social Science (ICSSR)
New Delhi - 110067
Ph.: 09810824350, 26741771
E: reenamarwah@yahoo.com

23. Professor Padmakumar Nair
Director
LM Thapar School of Management Thapar University
Punjab – 147004
Ph.: 91-175-2393021Fax: +91-175-2364498, 2393020
E: padmakumar.nair@thapar.edu

24. Professor Geetha B. Nambissan
ZHCES, SSS
Jawaharlal Nehru University
New Delhi – 110067
Ph.: 09810844575
E: gnambissan@mail.jnu.ac.in / gnambissan@gmail.com

25. Professor Amarendra Pani
Deputy Director
Association of Indian Universities (AIU) House
New Delhi - 110002
Ph.: 09818248913, 09582573719
E: research@aiuweb.org / aiuresearch@yahoo.com

26. Professor Vijaya Prakash
Vice- Chairperson
Andhra Pradesh State Council of Higher Education
Hyderabad 500028
Andhra Pradesh
Ph.: 09849334310
E: prakash.peethala@yahoo.com

27. Professor Ved Prakash
Chairman
University Grants Commission (UGC)
New Delhi– 110002
Ph.: 23234019/23236350
E: cm@ugc.ac.in / cm.ugc@nic.in

28. Professor Furqan Qamar
Secretary General
Association of Indian Universities AIU House
New Delhi-110002
E: qamar.pc@gmil.com

29. Professor K. Sudha Rao
Executive Director
Knowledge Commission Bangalore – 560094
Karnataka
Ph.: 0821 2515149, 2547300, 09972942111
E: ceoksudharao@gmail.com / ksudharao@yahoo.com

30. Professor Malayendu Saha
Vice- Chairperson
West Bengal State Council of Higher Education
West Bengal
Ph.: 09830281897
E: m_saha2@rediffmail.com / contactus@wbsche.org

31. Ambassador(Rtd.)T.P. Sreenivasan
Chairperson
Kerala State Higher Education Council
Thiruvananthapuram 695033
Kerala
Ph.: 09847721656
E: tpsreenivasan@gmail.com

32. Professor Kavita Sharma
President, South Asian University
Akbar Bhawan, Chanakyapuri
New Delhi - 110021

33. Professor G. D. Sharma
SEED
New Delhi
Ph.: 00-91- 9811557525, 09868820215
E: sharmagd@vsnl.com / seedicf@gmail.com

34. Mr. Shailendra Sigdel
Statistical Cluster Advisor
UNESCO Office in New Delhi
UNESCO House
New Delhi – 110029
Ph.: 09717625974
E: s.sigdel@unesco.org

35. Professor Sukhadeo Thorat
Chairman,
Indian Council of Social Science Research
New Delhi – 110067
Ph.: 08800388332
E: chairman@icssr.org

Participants from British Council

1. Ms. Gill Caldicott
   Director Operations
   E: gill.caldicott@britishcouncil.org

2. Mr. Richard Everitt
   Director Education and Society
   E: richard.everitt@britishcouncil.org

3. Ms. Ashima Gupta
   Project Manager
   Internationalising Higher Education
   E: ashima.gupta1@britishcouncil.org

4. Ms. Lynne Heslop
   Education Consultant
   E: lynne.heslop@britishcouncil.org

5. Ms. Manjula Rao
   Assistant Director
   Internationalising Higher Education
   E: manjula.rao@britishcouncil.org

6. Ms. Vishu Sharma
   Senior Project Manager
   Internationalising Higher Education
   E: vishu.sharma@britishcouncil.org

NUEPA Faculty Members

1. Dr. Sangeeta Angom
   Assistant Professor
   Department of Higher & Professional Education
   E: sangeeta@nuepa.org

2. Professor Sudhanshu Bhushan
   Head
   Department of Higher & Professional Education

E: sudhanshu@nuepa.org

3. Dr. Tamo Chattopadhay
   Associate Professor
   CPRHE/NUEPA
   E: tamo.chattopadhay@gmail.com

4. Dr. Malish Chirakkal
   Assistant Professor
   CPRHE/NUEPA
   E: malishcm@nuepa.org

5. Professor Nalini Juneja
   Professor and Head
   Department of School & Non-Formal Education
   E: nalinijuneja@nuepa.org

6. Professor Y. Josephine
   Department of Educational Finance
   E: yjosephine@nuepa.com

7. Professor Mona Khare
   Department of Educational Planning
   E: monakhare@nuepa.org

8. Dr. Garima Malik
   Assistant Professor
   CPRHE/NUEPA
   E: garimamalik31@gmail.com

9. Dr. S.K Mallik
   Assistant Professor
   Department of Educational Policy
   E: skmallik@nuepa.org

10. Professor A. Mathew
    National Fellow
    E: mathanthony@gmail.com

11. Dr. Anupam Pachauri
    Assistant Professor
    CPRHE/NUEPA

E: anupam.pachauri@gmail.com
12. Dr. Jinusha Panigrahi
Assistant Professor
CPRHE/NUEPA
E: jinusha@nuepa.org

13. Dr. P. Geetha Rani
Associate Professor
Department of Educational Finance
E: geetharani@nuepa.org

14. Professor K. Ramachandran
Advisor (IAIEPA Project)
E: kramachandran@nuepa.org

15. Dr. V.P.S. Raju
Assistant Professor
E: vpsraju@nuepa.org

16. Professor K. Srinivas
Professor ICT
E: ksrinivas@nuepa.org

17. Dr. Aarti Srivastava
Associate Professor
Department of Higher &
Professional Education
E: aarti@nuepa.org

18. Dr. Neeru Snehi
Assistant Professor
Department of Higher & Professional Education
E: neerusnehi@nuepa.org

19. Dr. Nidhi Sadana Sabharwal
Associate Professor
CPRHE/NUEPA
E: nidhiss.01@gmail.com

20. Dr. Savita Kaushal
Assistant Professor
Department of Training and Capacity Building in Education

E: savitakaushal@gmail.com

21. Professor K. Sujatha
    Professor and Head
    Department of Educational Administration
    E: ksujatha@nuepa.org

22. Professor Kumar Suresh
    Department of Educational Administration
    E: ksuresh@nuepa.org

23. Professor Jandhyala B.G. Tilak
    Head, Department of Educational Finance
    E: jtilak@nuepa.org

24. Professor N.V. Varghese
    Director
    CPRHE/NUEPA
    E: nv.varghese@nuepa.org

25. Dr. Kausar Wizarat
    Assistant Professor
    Department of Higher & Professional Education
    E: kausarwizarat@nuepa.org

NUEPA Administration

1. Mr. Basavaraj Swamy
   Registrar
   E: registrar@nuepa.org

2. Mr. D.S. Thakur
   Documentation Officer
   E: dsthakur@nuepa.org

3. Mr. G. Veerabahu
   Administrative Officer
   E: ao@nuepa.org

4. Mr. P.N. Tyagi
   Training Officer

E: pntyagi@nuepa.org

5. Mr. Chander Prakash
   Section Officer (Accounts)
   E: chandarprakash@nuepa.org

6. Mr. Jai Prakash Dhami
   Section Officer (General Administration)
   E: jpdhami@gmail.com

7. Ms. Anjali Arora
   Junior Steno
   CPRHE/NUEPA
   E: anjaliarora61@gmail.com

8. Ms. Aditi Gangar
   Data Entry Operator
   CPRHE/NUEPA

9. Mr. Mithilesh Rai
   Programme Attendant

10. Mr. Rajesh Kumar
    MTS
    CPRHE/NUEPA