

**PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE
(1977-78)**

(SIXTH LOK SABHA)

SEVENTY-THIRD REPORT

UNIVERSITY GRANTS COMMISSION

**MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND SOCIAL
WELFARE**

[Paragraph 48 of the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India for the year 1975-76, Union Government (Civil)].



Presented in Lok Sabha on 18-4-1978

Laid in Rajya Sabha on

**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI**

March, 1978/Chaitra, 1900 (Saka)

Price : Rs. 14.00

**LIST OF AUTHORISED AGENTS FOR THE SALE OF LOK SABHA
SECRETARIAT PUBLICATIONS**

Sl. No.	Name of Agent	Agency No.	Sl. No.	Name of Agent	Agency No.
ANDHRA PRADESH			12.	Charles Lambert & Company, 101, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Opposite Clock Tower, Fort, Bombay.	30
1.	Andhra University General Cooperative Stores Ltd., Waltair (Visakhapatnam)	8	13.	The Current Book House, Maruti Lane, Raghunath Dalaji Street, Bombay-1.	60
2.	G.R. Lakshminpathy Chetty and Sons, General Merchants and News Agents, Newpet, Chandragiri, Chittoor District.	94	14.	Deccan Book Stall, Ferguson College Road, Poona-4	65
ASSAM			15.	M/s. Usha Book Depot, 485/A, Chira Bazar Khan House, Girgaum Road, Bombay-2 B.R.	5
3.	Western Book Depot, Pan Bazar, Gauhati.	7	MYSORE		
BIHAR			16.	M/s. Peoples Book House Opp. Jaganmohan Palace, Mysore-1	16
4.	Amar Kitab Ghar, Post Box 78, Diagonal Road, Jamshedpur	37	RAJASTHAN		
GUJARAT			17.	Information Centre Government of Rajasthan Tripolia Jaipur City	18
5.	Vijay Stores, Station Road, Anand.	35	UTTAR PRADESH		
6.	The New Order Book Company Ellis Bridge, Ahmedabad-6	63	18.	Swastik Industrial Works 59, Hosi Street, Meerut City	3
HARYANA			19.	Law Book Company Sardar Patel Marg, Allahabad-1	48
7.	M/s. Prabhu Book Service, Nai Subzimandi, Girgaon, (Haryana).	14	WEST BENGAL		
MADHYA PRADESH			20.	Granthaloka, 6/1, Ambica Mookherjee Road, Belgharia 24 Parganas	10
8.	Modern Book House, Shiv Vilas Palace Indore City	13	21.	W. Newman & Company Ltd. 3 Old Court House Street, Calcutta	44
MAHARASHTRA			22.	Firma K. L. Mukhopadhyay 6/1A Banchharam Akkur Lane Calcutta 12	87
9.	M/s. Sunderdas Granchand 601, Girgaum Road Near Princess Street, Bombay-2	6	23.	M/s. Mukherji Book House, 8B, Duff Lane, Calcutta-6	4
10.	The International Book House (Private) Limited 6 Ash Lane, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Bombay-1	22			
11.	The International Book Service Deccan Gymkhana Poona 4	26			

CORRIGENDA TO 73RD REPORT OF THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE (SIXTH LOK SABHA) PRESENTED TO LOK SABHA ON 18 APRIL, 1978.

...

<u>Page</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>For</u>	<u>Read</u>
(v)	23	17.	** 17.
2	16	he	The
59	31	reasons	reason
62	2	receiptent	receptient
63	19	improve	improvement
64	34	<u>Delete</u> 'may' after 'as to'	
75	28	pick	picks
75	31	Aril	April
77	16	veterinary	veterinary
81	18	<u>Add</u> 'which' after 'under'	
82	25	seminar	seminars
83	16	Rs.3.06 crores)	(Rs.3.06 crores)
83	17	enequitable	inequitable
85	24	every	very
105	4	intellental	intellectual
116	16	197	1972
117	6	th	the
138	last line	introduced	reproduced
148	31	more	note
152	6	<u>add</u> 'if' after	'that'
171	37	by	was
173	41	at	after, as
174	1	<u>Add</u> 'on the 12	institutions'
191	last line	Commissieon	Commission
192	15	Section	Sections
194	3	in during	including
204	16	they	there
206	26	extent	extant
219	26	eduaction	education
227	4	Sciene	Science
227	10	served	starved
232	26	Laboratories	Laboratories
242	22	it	its
256	23	loss	less
256	33	U.G.S.	U.G.C.
281	18	pregressing	progressing
293	13	<u>Delete</u> 'may' after 'as to'	
295	10	enequitable	inequitable
310	15	<u>add</u> 'if' after	'that'
321	4	U.G.S.	U.G.C.

CONTENTS

	PAGES
COMPOSITION OF THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE	(v)
INTRODUCTION	(vii)
REPORT	
Section A. Function of the University Grants Commission	1
(i) Maintenance of standards of teaching; examination and research in universities	2
(ii) Review of the functioning of the University Grants Commission	11
(iii) Proliferation of Universities/institutions	18
(iv) Rules and Regulations under the U.G.C. Act	21
Section B. Summary of Receipts and Payments	25
Section C. Non-Plan and Plan Expenditure	29
Section D. Programme wise Distribution of Allocation	36
Section E. Review of Progress of Plan Schemes	48
(i) Periodical Appraisal	48
(ii) Quality Improvement Programme	55
Section F. Development Grants	66
(a) (i) Disproportionate share to Central/Deemed Universities and Delhi Colleges	66
(ii) Expansion and Improvement of Undergraduate Education	67
(b) Disparity in grants released to State Universities	83
(c) Maintenance grants to Delhi Colleges out of Plan funds	88
(d) Affiliation of colleges to Universities	92
(e) Recognition, eligibility and actual Assistance to colleges	95
(f) Work Procedures in the Commission	101
(g) Grants to institutions in educationally backward areas	108
Section G. Visiting Committees	
(a) Role of Visiting Committees	110
(b) Implementation of reports of Visiting Committees—Specific cases pointed out by Audit	118
(i) Medicine	122
(ii) Establishment of the Institute of Basic Medical Sciences in Calcutta University	125

	Page
(iii) Construction of library building by a University	128
Section H. Grants for construction of Buildings	135
Section I. Maintenance Grants to Central and Deemed Universities and Delhi Colleges	154
Section J. Financial Control	
(i) Budget	165
(ii) Form of Accounts	174
(iii) Watch over utilisation of grants paid by the Commission	175
(iv) Maintenance of block accounts of assets	190
(v) Surplus funds	192
Section K. Selected Programmes	
(a) Correspondence Courses	196
(b) Centres of Advanced Study	208
(c) College Science Improvement Programme	219
(d) Basic Research work for Industrial Development	230
(e) Teacher and Adult Education Programme	232
(f) Scheme for preparation of University level Books by Indian Authors	236
(g) Publication of learned works and doctoral theses	244
(h) National Award of Prizes to Indian Authors	282
Section L. Organisation	250
Annual Reports of U.G.C.	257

APPENDICES

I. Note indicating <i>inter alia</i> the salient points contained in the report of the Committee on Standards of University Education and the steps taken to implement the same	260
II. Record note of the discussions held at the sitting of the University Grants Commission on the 4th May, 1967	262
III. Analysis of statement showing 22 colleges which received grants, but were not covered by any of the reasons indicated in paragraph 6.56	266
IV. Statement showing the information in respect of the scheme of assistance under development of graduate education in Arts, Science and Commerce	268

	PAGE
V. Statement showing the State-wise details of colleges which had applied for grants and those which actually received grants from the Commission	273
VI. Guidelines indicating the procedure to be followed in connection with the visits of the Visiting Committees	276
VII. Conclusions/Recommendations	279

PART II*

Minutes of the sitting of the Public Accounts Committee held on:

23-9-1977 (FN)

23-9-1977 (AN)

24-9-1977 (FN)

24-9-1977 (AN)

7-4-1978 (AN)

*Not printed. One cyclostyled copy laid on the Table of the House and five copies placed in Parliament Library.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE

(1977-78)

CHAIRMAN

Shri C. M. Stephen

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

- *2. Shri Halimuddin Ahmed
3. Shri Balak Ram
4. Shri Brij Raj Singh
5. Shri Tulsidas Dasappa
6. Shri Asoke Krishna Dutt
7. Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta
8. Shri P. K. Kodiyan
- *9. Shri Vijay Kumar Malhotra
10. Shri B. P. Mandal
11. Shri R. K. Mhalgi
12. Dr. Laxminarayan Pandeya
13. Shri Gauri Shankar Rai
14. Shri M. Satyanarayan Rao
15. Shri Vasant Sathe

Rajya Sabha

- **16. Smt. Sushila Shanker Adivarekar
17. Shri Sardar Amjad Ali
18. Shri M. Kadershah
19. Shri Piare Lall Kureel urf. Piare Lall Talib
20. Shri S. A. Khaja Mohideen
- ***21. Shri Bezawada Papireddi
- ***22. Shri Zawar Hussain.

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri B. K. Mukherjee—*Joint Secretary.*
2. Shri H. G. Paranjpe—*Chief Financial Committee Officer.*
3. Shri Bipin Behari—*Senior Financial Committee Officer.*

*Elected with effect from 21 November 1977 since Sarvashri Sheo Narain and Jagdambhi Prasad Yadav ceased to be Members of the Committee on their appointment as Ministers of State.

**Ceased to be Members of the Committee consequent on retirement from Rajya Sabha w.e.f. 2-4-1978.

***Ceased to be Members of the Committee consequent on retirement from Rajya Sabha w.e.f. 2-4-1978.

INTRODUCTION

1. I, the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee, as authorised by the Committee, do present on their behalf this Seventy-Third Report of the Public Accounts Committee (Sixth Lok Sabha) on paragraph 48 of the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India for the year 1975-76, Union Government (Civil) relating to the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare on University Grants Commission.

2. The Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India for the year 1975-76, Union Government (Civil) was laid on the Table of the House on 7 April 1977. The Public Accounts Committee (1977-78) examined the paragraph relating to University Grants Commission at their sittings held on 23 and 24 September 1977. The Public Accounts Committee (1977-78) considered and finalised this Report at their sitting held on 7 April 1978. The Minutes of the sittings of the Committee form Part II* of the Report.

3. A statement containing conclusions/recommendations of the Committee is appended to the Report (Appendix VII). For facility of reference these have been printed in thick type in the body of the Report.

4. The Committee place on record their appreciation of the assistance rendered to them in the examination of the subject by the Comptroller and Auditor General of India.

5. The Committee would also like to express their thanks to the officers of the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare and the University Grants Commission for cooperation extended by them in giving information to the Committee.

NEW DELHI:

April 14, 1978

Chaitra 24, 1900 (S)

C. M. STEPHEN,

Chairman,

Public Accounts Committee.

*Not printed. (One cyclostyled copy laid on the Table of the House and five copies placed in Parliament Library.)

REPORT

A. FUNCTION OF THE UNIVERSITY GRANTS COMMISSION

Audit Paragraph

Introductory

1.1. The University Grants Commission set up in 1953 under a resolution of the Government of India was reconstituted as a corporate body in November 1956 in accordance with the provisions of the University Grants Commission Act, 1956. According to Section 12 of the Act, "it shall be the general duty of the Commission to take, in consultation with the universities or other bodies concerned, all such steps as it may think fit for promotion and co-ordination of university education and determination and maintenance of standards of teaching, examination and research in universities". Between 1957-58 and 1975-76 the Government of India sanctioned a sum of Rs. 421 crores as grants to the Commission who in turn, disbursed a sum of Rs. 413 crores as grants to universities and colleges; expenditure of Rs. 350 crores was incurred on Commission's staff and certain direct schemes executed by the Commission leaving an unspent balance of Rs. 450 crores by the end of 1975-76.

* * * *

1.2. The Public Accounts Committee, in its 114th Report of Fourth Lok Sabha (April 1970), recommended that an appraisal of the functioning of the Commission should be conducted early and the report laid on the Table of the House. A review committee was accordingly set up by the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare in August 1974 with the following terms of reference:—

"To review the functioning of the University Grants Commission, with particular reference to co-ordination and determination of standards of higher education, and make recommendations as to measures conducive to more effective discharge of its responsibility."

The Committee submitted its report on 12th February, 1977.

1.3. One of the main functions of the Commission is the determination and maintenance of standards of teaching, examination and research in universities. In this regard Commission has been guided in its programmes by—(1) the standards committee set up by the Commission in 1961, (2) the report of the Education Com-

mission set up by the Government of India in 1964, (3) the resolution on National Policy on Education issued by the Government of India based on the Education Commission's report in 1968.

1.4. The Committee on standards submitted its report in May 1965. The Estimates Committee noted in April 1966 that action taken on the reports of expert committees had been simply to forward them to the universities and State Governments for their views and comments or for suitable action. They had felt that the Commission should pursue the recommendations of these expert committees and keep a record regarding implementation and that the powers given to the Commission under sections 12, 13 and 14 of the Act might be invoked, where necessary. The Public Accounts Committee in its 114th Report (April 1970) also took note of the reply of the Ministry of Education that some of the recommendations of the standards committee were under various stages of implementation, the recommendations of the Education Commission were considered by an implementation committee of the Commission in May 1967. The recommendations were also considered in a conference of vice-chancellors convened in September 1967. The minutes of the meeting of the implementation committee and the recommendations of the conference of vice-chancellors were placed before the Commission in October 1967 when the Commission desired that the proceedings of the vice-chancellors conference should be brought up again in the next meeting of the Commission. This, however, does not appear to have been done. The Commission stated (October, 1976) that the recommendations of the Education Commission had been taken into account in finalising the Fourth Five Year Plan.

1.5. The resolution on National Policy on Education issued by the Government of India in 1968 was considered by the Commission in 1969. The Commission took note of the fact that a panel on education set up by the Planning Commission had proposed a sum of Rs 181.00 crores as allocation for higher education in the Fourth Five Year Plan and that the matter might again be considered when the resources position became known sometime in April-May 1969.

[Paragraph 48 of the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India for the year 1975-76, Union Government (Civil) pp. 215-217, 219-220].

**(i) Maintenance of standards of teaching; examination and research in universities*

1.6. One of the important functions of the University Grants Commission is to take, in consultation with the universities or other

*Note: The replies of the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare contained in this Report have not been vetted by Audit.

bodies concerned, all such steps, as it may think fit, for the promotion and co-ordination of university education and for the determination and maintenance of standards of teaching, examination and research in universities. The functions of the Commission have been defined in Section 12 of the University Grants Commission Act 1956 as modified up-to-date, in the following words:

“It shall be the general duty of the Commission to take, in consultation with the Universities or other bodies concerned, all such steps as it may think fit for the promotion and co-ordination of University education and for the determination and maintenance of standards of teaching, examination and research in Universities, and for the purpose of performing its functions under this Act, the Committee may—

- (a) inquire into the financial needs of Universities;
- (b) allocate and disburse out of the Fund of the Commission, grants to Universities established or incorporated by or under a Central Act for the maintenance and development of such Universities or for any other general or specified purpose;
- (c) allocate and disburse, out of the Fund of the Commission, such grants to other Universities as it may deem necessary or appropriate for the development or both, of any specified activities of such Universities, or for any other general or specified purpose;
- (cc) allocate and disburse out of the Fund of the Commission, such grants to institutions deemed to be Universities in pursuance of a declaration made by the Central Government under Section 3, as it may deem necessary, for one or more of the following purposes, namely:
 - (i) for maintenance in special cases;
 - (ii) for development;
 - (iii) for any other general or specified purpose

Provided that in making any grant to such University the Commission shall give due consideration to the development of the University concerned, its financial needs, the standard attained by it and the national purposes which it may serve.”

1.7. Thus, the improvement of standards of education is the statutory responsibility of the University Grants Commission. A Committee on Standards of University Education was appointed by the University Grants Commission in August 1961 to undertake a

systematic and objective investigation of problems relating to the standards of higher education in the universities. The Committee finalised its report in October 1964.

1.8. A note indicating *inter alia* the salient points contained in the report of the Committee on Standards of University Education and the steps taken to implement the same, furnished at the instance of the Committee is reproduced as Appendix I.

1.9. The Report of the Committee on Standards is stated to have been considered by the University Grants Commission at its meeting held on the 5 May, 1965. In regard to implementation of the recommendations of the Committee, the Estimates Committee had, in their 52nd Report (Third Lok Sabha) (April 1966) observed as under:

"The Committee on Standards has made a thorough and exhaustive study of the problem and has given a useful Report. The Committee are convinced that if the suggestions and recommendations contained in Standards Committee Report are implemented, it will go a long way to effect proper co-ordination among the universities and maintenance of their standards of teaching. They, however, find that the action usually taken by the University Grants Commission on the reports of the experts committees has been simply to forward it to the universities and State Governments for their views and comments or for suitable action. The Committee realize that State Governments are required to take necessary action for implementing the recommendations of various expert committees in State universities; nevertheless they feel that the University Grants Commission should pursue the recommendations of these expert committees with the State universities and keep a record as to how many recommendations of each expert committee have been implemented. The powers given to the University Grants Commission under Section 12, 13 and 14 of the University Grants Commission Act may also be invoked when necessary to get these recommendations implemented.

The Committee consider that it will be a useful and interesting study to find out how many recommendations of expert committees appointed during each of the last three years have been implemented by the State Governments/Universities. It will be futile to appoint expert committees if their recommendations are not implemented within a specific period and if the University Grants Commission does not pursue the matter with the Universities/States."

1.10. The Public Accounts Committee (1969-70) in their 114th Report (Fourth Lok Sabha) also took note of the reply of the Ministry of Education that some of the recommendations of the Standards Committee were under various stages of implementation. The Public Accounts Committee had in paragraph 2.9 of their report *ibid* stated:

“The most important function devolving on the University Grants Commission under the U.G.C. Act, 1956 is “the determination and maintenance of standards of teaching, examination and research in universities. While the Committee recognise that something has been done in the field they feel that a lot still remains to be done. The Committee on Standards of University Education set up by the University Grants Commission had drawn attention to the general opinion in the country that while the quality of the best students is as good as ever, the average product of an Indian university does not compare favourably with his counterpart in some of the well-known universities in the world. They pointed out that course of study in many universities are not related to well-defined educational objectives and that no serious attempt is made to evaluate syllabuses in the light of modern developments. Referring to teaching facilities available they stated that conditions in which teaching and learning are carried on in the Indian universities and colleges are unsatisfactory.”

1.11. Apart from the Committee on Standards, the Commission has been guided in its programmes by (1) the Report of the Education Commission set up by the Government of India in 1964 and (2) the resolution on National Policy on Education issued by the Government of India based on the Education Commission Report in 1968. The recommendations of the Education Commission were considered by an Implementation Committee of the University Grants Commission in May 1967. The Audit paragraph points out that the recommendations were also considered in a Conference of Vice-Chancellors convened in September 1967. The minutes of the meeting of the Implementation Committee and the recommendations of the Conference of Vice-Chancellors were both placed before the University Grants Commission in October 1967 when the Commission desired that the proceedings of the Vice-Chancellor's Conference should be brought up again at the next meeting of the Commission. According to Audit this does not appear to have been done.

1.12. The Committee enquired whether the recommendations made at the Vice-Chancellor's Conference were specifically considered. The Secretary, University Grants Commission replying during evidence stated:

"It is correct—as given in the Audit Report, in 1967 it was said that it should be brought again. I regret that these old papers could not be checked up. But having been associated with the Commission my recollection is that we had considered twice. A new National Policy was going to be evolved on the recommendations. Since the Education Commission submitted it, thereafter views were taken. Then a Parliamentary Committee was set up on the basis of which the National Policy was adopted. That is why the gap has occurred in between."

He added:

"Whatever I said was from my memory and I will try to locate the file which is about ten years old. This was in 1967. A view was likely to have been taken that the educational policy was being worked out on the lines of the recommendations of the Education Commission. The Chairman of the Commission and the Chairman of the UGC was one and the same person. In regard to many of the recommendations, the UGC had already initiated the action. There was a fairly close communication between these two organisations. This is what I could remember. On the facts of the case, I will try to trace the file."

1.13. Asked to indicate the authority empowered to decide what matter need or need not come before the Commission, the Secretary, University Grants Commission, stated:

"This cannot be done without the approval of the Chairman."

1.14. Supplementing the above statement, the Education Secretary stated:

"There is no tacit decision by anybody as we know of, saying that this recommendation need not come before the UGC and so on. I will try to find out what exactly happened from the records. Regarding the Standards Committee, you have recommendations Nos. 9, 17, 94 and 101, 102 to 112 regarding improvement in quality of education. On

specific suggestions action was taken for improving the quality of education. Various instructions were issued on examination reform, development plans and so on.”.

1.15. Asked whether a record of the implementation of these recommendations as envisaged in the Estimates Committee's Report was being kept, the Education Secretary stated in reply during evidence:

“We have no clear evidence to show that this record is being maintained.”

He added:

“Standards Committee's recommendations were circulated to all universities and their replies and comments were considered. This was also commented upon in the earlier Audit reports and also by the Public Accounts Committee. Thereafter, the Standards Committee had merged with the Education Commission. Later on, that got merged into the national policy. The Standards Committee Report came; we considered that. In the meantime, the Education Commission took note of the Standards Committee's report who then made recommendations on their report. Some consideration was also done on the National Policy. This is the step which we took.”

1.16. The Secretary, U.G.C., stated during evidence:

“If you ask for recommendation No. 1 or No. 2 or No. 3, this is what they said, that is what was done, this far we have gone etc. That thing was not kept in that way. But we have worked out many schemes and with regard to implementation of the schemes we know what are the schemes which fit in with these recommendations.”

1.17. The Secretary, University Grants Commission, further added:

“The Standards Committee made a fairly large number of recommendations. We have to see what action we can take on them. Schemes are developed on the basis of that. Suppose if we accept a recommendation, it is for the 105 universities to act on that. We would never know what each university has done about it. . . . We have indicated what general action we have taken. For example we have indicated that we have started the Centres of Advanced Study. Acceptance of recommendation is one

thing. That depends upon how much we can implement and how we have been able to implement it. We only keep a watch on the schemes rather than on the original recommendations."

1.18. Since a categorical statement that the recommendations contained in the proceedings of the Vice Chancellors' Conference were actually considered by the Commission was not forthcoming during evidence, the Committee enquired the reasons therefor in writing. In a note, the Ministry of Education have stated:

"It is regretted that as the old relevant papers were not readily available the information... was given. On re-checking the papers, it is now observed that the proceedings of the Vice Chancellors' Conference held from 11th to 13th September, 1967 and the minutes of the meeting of the Implementation Committee were both placed before the Commission in October, 1967 and it was also resolved that the proceedings of the Vice-Chancellors' Conference should be brought up again in the next meeting of the Commission. In this connection, it is stated that the recommendations of the Vice-Chancellors' Conference were considered in the Commission at its meeting held on 2nd November, 1967 and it was resolved as under:

"The Commission was in general agreement with the recommendations of the Vice-Chancellors' Conference held in September, 1967 and desired that effective steps be taken to implement, as early as possible, important recommendations made by the Education Commission (1964—66) relating to examination reform including the "Credit System" of organising courses and examinations which provides a great flexibility to suit varying needs of students; improvement of curricula and teaching methods and provision of teaching aids. Several of these could be implemented without incurring much additional expenditure.

The Commission welcomed the recommendations of the Vice-Chancellors' Conference regarding setting up of "development panels" concerned with formulation of programmes of educational reform and development in the light of the recommendations made by the Education Commission (on) determination of priorities within the framework of available resources and needs of the universities.

The Commission concurred with the statement approved by the Vice-Chancellors' Conference with regard to medium of instructions and stressed that changeover in the medium should be part of a general programme of improvement of standards and its manner and pace should be left to the university system.

It was also suggested that a Committee may be appointed by the University Grants Commission to consider what action the Commission should take to ensure that the change-over in the medium of instruction was implemented in accordance with the suggestions made by the Vice-Chancellors' Conference.'"

1.19. An Implementation Committee was appointed by the University Grants Commission to consider the recommendations of the Education Commission. This Committee met in May, 1967. The Ministry of Education have at the instance of the Committee furnished to the Committee a record note of the discussions held at their sitting held on 4th May 1967 (Appendix II). The main recommendations of the Committee are contained in the following extracts from the record note:

"After considerable discussion, the Committee welcomed the recommendations of the Education Commission and the priorities laid down in the Report. The Committee agreed with the emphasis placed on improvement of quality of education, development of science, technology and agriculture and strengthening of postgraduate education and research. The Committee also emphasised that there should be better teachers and more of them should be provided in the colleges and universities, ample textbooks, reading seats, staff quarters and amenities for students like Day Centres, Health Centres, Scholarships and other financial aids etc. The Committee also endorsed the recommendations of the Education Commission with regard to student welfare and suggested that it may be emphasised on the Government to provide funds which had been asked for by the University Grants Commission for student Welfare programmes.

The Committee further decided that a note indicating the programmes of crucial importance in the light of the recommendations of the Education Commission which may be taken up for implementation may be prepared and placed before the Committee again."

1.20. The Ministry have stated that "the report of the Committee was received by the Commission at its meeting held on 4th October, 1967. This was 'noted' in view of the proceedings of the Vice-Chancellors' Conference held from September 11-13, 1967 which was also considered at the meeting held on October 4, 1967..... The Ministry of Education was informed of the views of the Commission on 24th October, 1967."

It is further stated:

"In view of the fact that the recommendations of the Implementation Committee and the Vice-Chancellors' Conference were considered in detail in the Commission as also the views intimated by the Commission in its letter dated 24th October, 1967 to the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare, it was not considered necessary to hold another meeting of the Implementation Committee."

1.21. One of the primary functions of the University Grants Commission is the determination and maintenance of standards of teaching, examination and research in universities. In pursuance of this function, a Committee on Standards of University Education was appointed by the University Grants Commission in August 1961. The Committee submitted its report in October 1964. The report of the Committee was considered by the University Grants Commission in May 1965. The University Grants Commission merely forwarded the report to the universities and the State Governments for suitable action. This perfunctory action of the University Grants Commission in regard to the report of the Committee on Standards came in for criticism by the Estimates Committee in their 52nd Report (Third Lok Sabha) (April 1966) who recommended that "the University Grants Commission should pursue recommendations of these expert committees with the State Universities and keep a record as to how many recommendations of each expert committee have been implemented." The Public Accounts Committee also, in their 114th Report (Fourth Lok Sabha) (1969-70) took note of the reply of the Ministry of Education that some of the recommendations of the Standard Committee were under various stages of implementation. Seven years after the last quoted report of the PAC, the Secretary, University Grants Commission has admitted before the Committee during evidence in September 1977 that no watch was being kept on the implementation of individual recommendations of the Standard Committee and that the University Grants Commission "only keep a watch on the schemes rather than on the original recommendations". The Committee cannot

but deplore the scant regard shown by the University Grants Commission to the specific recommendations of the Standards Committee which it had itself appointed in pursuance of its basic objectives.

1.22. The Report of the Education Commission, appointed in 1964, was submitted in June 1966. The report inter alia contained suggestions and recommendations regarding determination and maintenance of standards of teaching, examination and research in universities. The University Grants Commission appointed an implementation Committee (Kothari Committee) to process the recommendation of the Education Commission. This Committee met in May 1967. Meanwhile, a Conference of Vice-Chancellors was convened in September 1967. It also considered the implementation of the recommendations of the Education Commission. The decisions taken at the May 1967 meeting of the Implementation Committee and the recommendations of the Conference of Vice-Chancellors were placed before the University Grants Commission in October and November 1967. Thereafter neither the Implementation Committee met nor any systematic watch was kept on the implementation of the recommendations of the Education Commission. In regard to the fate of the various recommendations of the Education Commission, the Commission informed Audit in October 1976 that the recommendations of the Education Commission had been "taken into account in finalising the Fourth Five Year Plan."

1.23. The Committee take adverse notice of the slipshod manner in which the suggestions and recommendations made by the Education Commission at considerable labour and expense spread over more than 2 years, were handled by the University Grants Commission. The minutes of the meeting of the Implementation Committee in May 1967 are a vivid testimony of the perfunctory and insubstantial approach of the Commission to the report of the Education Commission. The Committee desire the Ministry of Education and the University Grants Commission to devise methods of systematic progressing of the recommendations of various expert bodies appointed by the Government to go into various aspects and problems of higher education. No doubt it is a stupendous task as the monitoring would have to be done university-wise, but this work has to be undertaken if the appointment of the various expert committees has to be purposeful and an impact has to be made on university education.

(ii) *Review of the functioning of the University Grants Commission.*

1.24. The University Grants Commission was set up in the year 1953 under a resolution of the Government of India and re-constituted as a Corporate body in November, 1956 in accordance with the

provisions of the University Grants Commission Act, 1956. As pointed out by Audit between 1957-58 and 1975-76 the Government of India sanctioned a sum of Rs. 421 crores as grants and the Commission in turn disbursed a sum of Rs. 413 crores as grants to universities and colleges. Expenditure of Rs. 3.50 crores was incurred on Commission's staff and certain direct schemes executed by the Commission leaving an un-spent balance of Rs. 4.50 crores by the end of 1975-76.

1.25. Emphasizing the need for an appraisal of the work of the Commission by qualified experts not connected with the Commission, the Public Accounts Committee (1969-70) had in paragraph 2.12 of their 114th Report stated:

“The University Grants Commission was set up in 1956. A time has now come to take stock of the work done by the Commission so far and to chart out a course of action for the future on lines which would help the Commission to cope with its responsibilities better. The Committee note that since they raised the question of evaluating the working of the Commission during oral evidence, Government are now examining the question of bringing out a comprehensive report on the working of the Commission and the manner in which this task should be undertaken. In the opinion of the Committee, this does not adequately meet the requirements. What is called for is an objective and comprehensive appraisal of the work of the Commission by qualified experts, not connected with the Commission. The Committee are not in this context convinced by the argument advanced by the Ministry of Education and Youth Services that there is no provision in the University Grants Commission Act to undertake a review of the working of the Commission. In the Committee's view the absence of a provision in the Act need not preclude Government from undertaking a review of this type. The Committee would like the appraisal to be conducted early and report laid on the Table of the House. The Committee would like an early decision to be taken on this question.”

1.26. In their Action Taken Note dated the 30 December, 1970, the Ministry had stated as follows:

“This question was discussed by the Minister of Education and Youth Services with the Chairman, University Grants Commission. It was agreed that the University

Grants Commission might set up a small group of Science, Arts and Social Science experts, of eminence to do a thorough study of the achievements of University Grants Commission since its inception and make an evaluation of the same."

1.27. A Review Committee was accordingly set up by the Ministry in August 1974, with the following terms of reference:

"To review the functioning of the University Grants Commission, with particular reference to co-ordination and determination of standards of higher education, and make recommendations as to measures conducive to more effective discharge of its responsibilities."

1.28. The Review Committee submitted its report on 12 February, 1977.

1.29. Asked about the delay in the setting up of the Committee, the Secretary, Ministry of Education and Social Welfare replied in evidence:

"Although the recommendation was made in 1970 December, the University Grants Commission had to set up the Committee later in the light of the recommendations of the Public Accounts Committee in 1971-72. It was felt that it was better to set up a Review Committee even at that stage. On the basis of that recommendation, the Committee was set up. First, the delay was only about 2-1/2 years. For that, I do not think Government has got any explanation. I took over recently."

1.30. The Report of the Review Committee was laid on the Table of Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha on 18-7-1977 and 20-7-1977 respectively.

To take a decision on the Review Committee Report an Empowered Committee with the following composition was set up in July, 1977:—

- | | |
|---|-----------|
| 1. Shri P. Sabanayagam, Secretary Ministry of Education & Social Welfare, New Delhi. | —Chairman |
| 2. Shri R.K. Chhabra, Secretary, University Grants Commission | —Member |
| 3. Shri S. N. Pandita, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Education & Social Welfare | —Member |
| 4. Shri J. A. Kalyanakrishnan, Financial Adviser, Ministry of Education & Social Welfare, | —Member |

5. Shri Anil Bordia, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Education & Social Welfare, New Delhi. —Member
6. Dr. S. N. Saraf, Chief (Education), Planning Commission, New Delhi. —Member
7. Shri V.V.R. Subba Rao, Deputy Secretary, Department of Administrative Reforms. —Member
8. Shri Triyogi Narain, Deputy Secretary, Ministry of Education & Social Welfare New Delhi. —Secretary

1.31. The Committee learnt during evidence that the Empowered Committee had covered half of the Report of the Review Committee. The Empowered Committee was expected to finalize their Report in two months time.

1.32. In a written note furnished subsequently, the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare have informed the Committee that no time-limit has been laid down for the Empowered Committee to finalise action on the various recommendations.

1.32A. In yet another note furnished on 10-4-1978, at the Committee's instance, the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare, informed that "the Empowered Committee appointed by the Ministry has completed consideration of all the recommendations of the U.G.C. Review Committee and its report is under submission to the Government for further action."

1.33. The Review Committee (1977) has observed that the 'problems have been taken up in an *ad hoc* manner, and there is little evidence of coordinated planning of university education'. Analysing the causes of non-implementation of recommendations of various committees, it has observed:

"In the working of the Commission there still appeared to be:
 (a) lack of evaluation and assessment of programmes and their impact and (b) absence of mechanisms and methods (to some extent due to absence of powers) to see good recommendations of various expert committees translated into action in universities and colleges, (c) lack of an overall perspective planning, and research in problems of higher education, and (d) absence of an adequate mechanism for coordination with other bodies concerned with overall national planning or with other sectors of education and research...

From replies to our questionnaires by the Commission's office and in his personal capacity by the present Chairman and during interviews with some of the members of the Commission, it became clear that the UGC had been inhibited by lack of powers, by considerations of infringement of university autonomy, by duality or even multiplicity of agencies dealing with different sectors of higher education and research, and could not make a meaningful impact in regard to standards and coordination. It has been gratifying to learn that the Commission has prescribed minimum qualifications for college and university teachers in revising whose scales of pay to a respectable standard, comparable to other higher services. the University Grants Commission has played a significant role."

1.34. According to the report of the Review Committee, the University Grants Commission felt 'inhibited' in the effective performance of its functions relating to coordination and determination of standards in higher education *inter alia* by the statutory position which gave the States the full authority to establish and maintain universities. It adds:

"The result was that in actual practice ingredients essential to coordination and determination of standards instead of receiving attention at national level, have remained the concern of the States."

However, as a result of the 42nd amendment to the Constitution effective from 3-1-1977 not only higher education, but the entire education has since been brought on the Concurrent List.

1.35. Asked how far the constitutional provisions stood in the way of carrying out the objectives of determination and coordination of standards, specified in the University Grants Act, the Education Secretary stated during evidence:

"Education is a State subject and for evolving a scheme the initiative has to come from colleges and universities."

He added:

"70 to 80 per cent of the schemes that are evolved by the University Grants Commission for the improvement of standards and development of college education in general have been availed of by the colleges and institutions. In the field of education, I am not quite sure if any legislative

act or any order of the Government could so ensure that education is actually imbibed by the academic world or by the students and it is for them and the teachers to accept it."

1.36. In this context, the Committee enquired how far the University Grants Commission has been able to discharge its basic function. The Chairman, University Grants Commission stated in reply, during evidence:

"The main function of the Commission is determination and coordination of standards in higher education. Although it is called Grants Commission the grant is affiliated to this basic purpose of determination and coordination of standards."

He added:

"As far as the colleges are concerned, we have had difficulty in determination and coordination of standards. Since the colleges do form 85 per cent and since it is necessary to develop the infrastructure of the colleges, we find it is here that the greatest weakness exists. For instance, we have been allocating funds to the colleges. But these colleges can lift the funds only if a certain matching share is made available to them by the State Governments. This can only be done if there is a well-coordinated and well-conceived policy of development on the part of the State Governments. It is this weakness which has got to be rectified and, I think, it is in this context that perhaps the question of changing the Constitutional provision has arisen."

1.37. The Review Committee (February 1977) had in their report also pointed out 'the absence of any major policy statement made by the University Grants Commission since its inception expounding its concept of higher education and indicating how it planned to tackle the various problems connected with determination and maintenance of standards of teaching, examination and research'.

1.38. Asked to indicate why it has not been possible for the Commission to do so in the past, the Ministry of Education have in a written note stated that recently the Commission has given a considerable thought to this problem and have prepared a paper on Development of Higher Education in India—A Policy Frame..... "This would to some extent meet the suggestions of the Review Committee." (The paper was brought out on 20-2-1978).

1.39. The main objective of the Paper on "Development of Higher Education in India—A Policy Frame" prepared by the University Grants Commission, has been indicated as perspective planning in higher education in the country over the next 10—15 years. The paper, while outlining the need to redefine the standards of education, suggests that 'these would have to be substantially improved and continually raised to suit the changing needs of the country. To attain improvement attempts would have to be made, on the basis of highest priority'. It concludes with a note of optimism that 'if all the agencies involved viz., the Centre, States, Public, teachers, students and administrators instead of trying to blame each other, work together for bringing about an educational transformation on a scale commensurate with the size and complexity of our problems, we should soon be able to create a new education system and a new society'.

1.40. Stressing the statutory responsibility of coordination and maintenance of standards in institutions of higher education cast on the University Grants Commission by the Act of Parliament, the paper sums up:

"To discharge this responsibility adequately, the University Grants Commission has to assume several roles and functions. For instance, it has a major role of providing leadership and impetus for reform and development. Towards this purpose, the Commission must continuously review the emerging problems of education, the status of teaching and research in different disciplines and the standards of teaching and research in the universities. It should through its committees and panels and other means evolve a consensus within the academic community regarding desirable changes in higher education."

1.41. The Committee find that although the PAC had recommended as far back as 1970 for the appointment of a committee to review the work done by the Commission so far and to chart out a course of action for the future and the Government intimated the acceptance of the recommendation in a note sent to the Committee in December 1970, it took the Government 3½ years to set up the Review Committee (August 1974). It took the Review Committee about 2½ years to submit its report (February 1977). It took another 5 months for the Government to lay the report before Parliament and to appoint an Empowered Committee to process the recommendations of the Review Committee (July 1977). The Committee are informed that no time-limit has been laid down for the Empowered Committee to finalise action on the various recommendations of the Review Committee. Despite the assurance given by

the Secretary, Ministry of Education and Social Welfare during evidence in September 1977 that "in two months' time the report (of the Empowered Committee) will be finalised", the Committee were informed on 10 April 1978 that the report of the Committee is still "under submission to Government." The Committee are distressed at the tardy pace of implementation of the recommendation of the Public Accounts Committee which was accepted by Government as far back as 1970. They would like Government to prescribe a time-bound programme for implementation of such of the recommendations made by the Review Committee as are accepted by Government.

(iii) *Proliferation of universities/institutions*

Audit Paragraph:

1.42. During the same period, there was considerable expansion in higher education as indicated below:—

Year	Number of universities and deemed universities	Number of colleges	Total enrolment in universities and colleges other than intermediate, pre-university and pre-professional courses (in lakhs)
1969-70	89	3,297	17.93
1970-71	93	3,604	19.54
1971-72	99	3,896	20.65
1972-73	103	4,158	21.68
1973-74	104	4,308	22.34
1974-75	111	4,388	23.67

*Out of the above, 2,973 colleges had been recognised as eligible for assistance by the Commission as on 1st December, 1975.

[Paragraph 48 of the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India for the year 1975-76 Union Government (Civil p. 218).]

1.43. The number of universities grew from 33 in 1956 to 89 in 1970 and 115 in 1976-77. The number of colleges rose from 1004 in 1956 to 4569 in 1976-77. Expressing concern at the proliferation of institutions, the Review Committee (1973) in paragraph 2.9 of its report commented:

"In practice, however, unplanned multiplication of universities and colleges prevented consideration of a coordinated national policy for promotion of higher education and the

UGC was more or less presented every year with a *fait accompli* in terms of newly established universities and colleges."

1.44. The Committee of Members of Parliament on Higher Education (Sapru Committee) had recommended as far back as in 1964 that the UGC Act should be amended to make it obligatory on the part of a State Government to consult the Commission before setting up a new University. The Committee desired to know whether this recommendation was examined by the Ministry. In a note furnished in this regard, at the Committee's instance, the Ministry have stated:

"The recommendation of the Sapru Committee was duly examined by this Ministry. As had been observed by the Sapru Committee itself, a statutory provision making it obligatory for the State Governments to consult the UGC before setting up a new University could not be made unless education was made a concurrent subject. In view of the constitutional position, it was not found possible to take any action on this recommendation. However, a provision was made by amending the UGC Act in 1972 to the effect that no grant shall be given by the Central Government, the Commission, or any other organisation receiving any funds from the Central Government to a University which is established after the commencement of the Amendment Act i.e. 17-6-1972, unless the matters as may be prescribed, declared such University to be fit for receiving such grant. It was thought that the above provision would act as a deterrent against proliferation of sub-standard universities."

1.45. Section 12A of the University Grants Commission Act, 1956 (as modified in 1972) stipulates that:—

"No grant shall be given by the Central Government, the Commission, or any other organisation receiving any funds from the Central Government, to a University Grants Commission (Amendment) Act, 1972 unless the Commission has, after satisfying itself as to such matters as may be prescribed, declared such university to be fit for receiving such grant."

1.46. According to the Ministry of Education, the new provision was made in order to check unplanned proliferation of sub-standard universities without adequate resources for their development.

1.47. Following rules have been notified by the Central Government under Section 25 read with Section 12A of the UGC Act, in September 1974, June, 1975 and August, 1975:—

1. University Grants Commission (Fitness of certain Universities for Grant) Rules, 1974, notified *vide* Ministry of Education and Social Welfare Notification No. F.9-2/74-U.2 dated 9 September, 1974.
2. University Grants Commission (Fitness of Institutions for Grant) Rules, 1975, notified *vide* Ministry of Education and Social Welfare Notification No. F.9-59/74-U.2(B) dated the 24th June, 1975.
3. University Grants Commission (Fitness of Agricultural Universities for Grants) Rules, 1975, notified *vide* Ministry of Education & Social Welfare Notification No. F.16-28/75-LU- dated 13th August, 1975.

1.48. The following amendment rules were promulgated in June, 1975 and November, 1976:

1. University Grants Commission (Fitness of certain universities for Grant) Amendment Rules, 1975, notified *vide* Ministry of Education & Social Welfare Notification No. F9-59 74-U.2(A) dated 24th June, 1975.
2. University Grants Commission (Fitness of certain Universities for Grant) Amendment Rules, 1976, notified *vide* Ministry of Education & Social Welfare Notification No. F.16-48/75 Leg. Unit dated 27th November, 1976.

1.49. Thus, the 'fitness for grant' rules are now applicable to all the universities (including Agricultural and Central Universities) and all the institutions (recognised by the Commission under clause (f) of Section 2 of the UGC Act).

1.50. However, the Commission have stated in reply to another point that they have "not so far resorted to the extreme step of withholding grants to universities under Section 14 of the U.G.C. Act." Giving the reasons therefor, the Chairman of the Committee stated during evidence that "this is a power which should be used very sparingly and only in exceptional cases."

1.51. That the amendment had little effect on checking proliferation of universities, is highlighted by the Review Committee in its report (1977) thus:

".....As subsequent events showed, political realities mattered more than the provisions added to the UGC Act

and the number of universities established during the five years, 1972 to April 1976, was exactly the same as during the five years 1967 to 1971—seventeen in each quinquennium.”

“.....Despite this provision a large number of universities came into being in the years after 1972, some of them without the concurrence of the UGC.....”

“.....It is difficult for us to understand why the Commission allowed grants, perhaps not too willingly, to the universities which came into being without its prior concurrence, or to appreciate the compelling situation which prevented it from using its powers for causing inspection to be made into the working of some obviously sick universities....”

1.52. The Committee find that despite the introduction in 1972 of Section 12A of the UGC Act, 1956, making the grants out of Central funds to any university conditional on the declaration by the UGC that such university is fit for receiving such grants and the notification of the University Grants Commission (Fitness of certain universities for grants) Rules, 1974, there does not appear to be any substantial improvement in regard to the problem of proliferation of universities and colleges. The number of universities/deemed universities and colleges has increased from 103 and 4158 in 1972-73 to 115 and 4569 respectively in 1976-77. The Committee also find that, barring temporary ban on release of further grants, the Commission has not so far withheld the grants to any university. The Committee have also noted that the Commission has not used Section 12A of the Act as an effective instrument against proliferation of sub-standard universities and colleges. The Committee are unable to understand why the UGC could not utilise the power available to them under Section 12A of the Act to prevent mushroom growth of universities and colleges without regard to facilities for and standards of teaching.

(iv) Rules and Regulations under the UGC Act.

1.53. During evidence, in the context of discussion on rules and regulations for recognition of college by the U.G.C. for the purpose of giving grants, a general question was raised regarding the issue of rules and regulations under the various section of the U.G.C. Act.

1.54. The University Grants Commission Act was enacted in 1956. Section 25 of the Act empowers the Central Government to make rules for carrying out the purposes of the Act. The U.G.C. is empowered to frame regulation on certain matters under sections

26 and 27 of the Act. The position in regard to the notification of rules and regulations is as follows:—

Rules under Section	Date of Notification
25(2)(a), (b) & (c)	1-11-1956
(d)	1-7-1958
(g)	21-1-1961
(h) & (i)	19-9-1962
(j)	28-10-1957
25 read with Sec. 5(4)	28-9-1974
<i>Regulations under Section</i>	
26(1)(a)	1959
(c)	1-4-1967
(d) read with Section 2(f)	Notified
27	Not yet issued.

1.55. Government have indicated the reasons for not issuing so far the Rules and Regulations under Section 25(2) (e) and (f), 26(1) (b), (c) and (f) and Section 27. These are summarised below:

Section 25, 2)(c) & (f)	provides for making rules empowering the Commission to perform additional functions under Clause (i) of Section 12 which requires a university to furnish such information as may be needed relating to its financial position etc. together with rules and regulations relating to the standards of teaching and examination maintained in that university.	The draft rules proposed in 1974 are stated to be under discussion between the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare the Ministry of Law and the University Grants Commission.
Section 26(1)(b) ¶	read with Section 9 provides for temporary association of persons with the Commission for particular purposes.	A Committee appointed has suggested that regulations may be framed for determining the nature of the Committees, their duration, period of appointment of members of the Committee and their functions. The question of framing these regulations is stated to be under consideration of the Commission in consultation with the Government of India.
Section 26(1)(e)	requires defining the qualifications; that should ordinarily be required of any person to be appointed to the teaching staff of the university.	The regulations promulgated in 1959 <i>vide</i> Gazette Notification No. F. 87-170/58 (CUP) were withdrawn by issue of a circular letter to all the universities on 7-8-61. The

question was taken up by Commission recently at its meeting held on 26-9-77. It is proposed to invite the views of the universities before including these in the regulations.

Section 26(1)(f) & (g)	defining the minimum standards of instruction for the grant of any degree and regulating the maintenance of standards and coordination of work of facilities in universities.	According to UGC it may not be practicable to frame regulations on account of certain difficulties.
Section 27	provides for regulations delegating certain powers to its Chairman, Vice-Chairman or any of its officers.	No regulations have been framed so far.

1.56. Asked whether the State Governments had been consulted while framing the Rules under Section 26(d), the Secretary, UGC stated during evidence:—

“I do not think that the State Governments have been consulted.”

He added:

“The rules which would have affected the different Universities or colleges, where the involvement of States is there, are still at the discussion stage. They have not yet been notified. For example, you would see that, under Clause 25, there is nothing in which the State Government is really involved.

But under Clause 26 where we have defining of qualifications of the teaching staff, etc., the regulations have not yet been notified for the reasons that we are thinking as to what would happen to an institution if we laid down that they should have so many class-rooms, equipment, and so on and so forth and the State Government is not able to provide assistance. Therefore, rules under these have not been notified. Similarly, the decision on 10 plus 2 plus 3. In all these matters, when the regulations are finalised, I think, the Universities will be consulted.”

Supplementing the above statement, the Education Secretary stated in evidence:—

“Under Section 26, there are certain aspects which concern other Universities and State Governments. As far as the regulations of UGC regarding the minimum standard and’

other things, the Suggestion of the hon. Member that State Governments could perhaps be with advantage consulted is a suggestion which the UGC can take into consideration before finalising those regulations."

1.57. The Committee find that the University Grants Commission has been functioning without rules and regulations on some of the very important aspects of its working. For instance, the Committee find that the draft rules under Section 25(2)(e)&(f) requiring the universities to furnish returns and information relating to (i) financial position of the university; (ii) studies undertaken in the university; and (iii) all the rules and regulations relating to the standard of teaching and examination in that university in respect of the various branches of learning, proposed by the Commission as far back as in 1974, are still under discussion between the various Ministries and have not yet been notified. The Committee are surprised that even though this power was available to the Central Government right from 1956, the proposal to frame rules was mooted only in 1974 and that the rules are yet to take a concrete shape. The Committee would like Government to finalise and notify these rules without further delay.

1.58. The Committee also note that although the Commission is being assisted from time to time by outside experts on specified matters and Section 26(1)(b) read with Section 9 authorises the Commission to make regulations regulating the manner in which and the purposes for which persons may be associated with the Commission, no regulations have yet been framed and notified in this regard. It is stated that the question of framing these regulations is under consideration of the Commission in consultation with the Government of India. The Committee desire that these regulations should be framed and notified without further delay.

1.59. The Committee would also like the Central Government/Commission to examine the need and feasibility of issuing regulations under Section 26(1)(e)&(f) of the Act defining qualifications for appointment as university teachers and minimum standard of instructions for the grant of a degree. The Committee have dealt with the question of notification of regulations under Section 27 of the Act separately.

1.60. The Committee also find that some of the rules and regulations issued by the Central Government/UGC are more than 10 years old. They would like the Central Government/Commission to examine these rules in the light of experience and amend or revise them, if necessary.

B. SUMMARY OF RECEIPTS AND PAYMENTS

Audit Paragraph

2.1. Under section 19(2) of the Comptroller and Auditor General's (Duties, Powers and Conditions of Service) Act, 1971, read with section 19 of the University Grants Commission Act 1956, the accounts of the Commission are audited by the Comptroller and Auditor General and the accounts so audited together with the Audit Report thereon are forwarded to the Central Government who cause the same to be laid before both Houses of Parliament. Significant points noticed in the course of audit are also included in Comptroller and Auditor General's Report on Union Government (Civil). Such mention was made in the reports for the year 1967, 1968, 1969, 1970 and 1970-71. The succeeding paragraphs indicate some of the important points noticed in the course of audit of the accounts of the Commission conducted in 1976.

2.2. The receipts and payments of the Commission have been steadily increasing, as would be seen from the following table:—

(in lakhs of rupees)

Year	Receipts			Payments		
	Non Plan	Plan	Total	Non Plan	Plan	Total
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1969-70	870.00	1477.07	2347.07	905.78	1494.64	2400.42
1970-71	984.82	2186.33	3171.15	982.55	1910.14	2892.69
1971-72	1038.46	2308.92	3347.38	1036.78	2405.08	3441.86
1972-73	1092.61	2750.00	3842.61	1089.62	2827.99	3917.61
1973-74	1157.98	2249.00	3406.98	1181.51	2425.95	3607.46
1974-75	2088.00	2636.50	4724.50	2190.10	2510.68	4700.78
1975-76	3072.84	3095.00	6167.84	2984.62	2860.60	3845.22

(Source: Annual Accounts of the respective years)

[Paragraph 48 of the Report of the C&AG of India for the year 1975-76, Union Government (civil) p. 217].

2.3. With the expansion of higher education; the receipts and payments of the Commission have also been steadily increasing, as would be seen from the following table:—

Year	Receipts			Payments		
	Non Plan	Plan	Total	Non Plan	Plan	Total
	(in lakhs of rupees)					
1969-70	870.00	1477.07	2347.07	905.78	1494.64	2400.42
1970-71	984.82	2186.33	3171.15	982.55	1910.14	2892.69
1971-72	1038.46	2308.92	3347.38	1036.78	2405.08	3441.96
1972-73	1092.61	2750.00	3842.61	1089.62	2827.99	3917.69
1973-74	1157.98	2249.00	3406.98	1181.51	2425.95	3607.46
1974-75	2088.00	2636.50	4724.50	2190.10	2510.68	4700.78
1975-76	3072.84	3095.00	6167.84	2984.62	2860.60	5845.22
1976-77	3293.55	3915.74	7209.29	3269.66	3849.65	7119.31

(Source: Annual Accounts of the respective years).

2.4. It is seen from the above table that the payments under 'non-plan' increased from Rs. 11.82 crores in 1973-74 to Rs. 21.90 crores in 1974-75, 29.85 crores in 1975-76 and to Rs. 32.70 crores in 1976-77.

2.5. The Committee, therefore, desired to know reasons for a sizable and disproportionate increase in payments under 'non-plan' since 1973. The Ministry of Education and Social Welfare stated in reply:

“The Commission with the approval of the Government of India generally allows an increase of 5 per cent on the maintenance (block) grant to Central Universities fixed for the previous year to accommodate the normal increase in expenditure by way of increments, rise in cost of materials while fixing the amount of maintenance grant for the succeeding year. The year 1973-74 being the last year of the 4th five year plan, the expenditure on teaching and non-teaching posts sanctioned as also other items of recurring nature which were met out of the plan grants upto 31-3-1974 was merged in the non-plan expenditure from the first year of the 5th Plan i.e. from 1974-75 onwards as committed expenditure. This is one of the main factors for the major increase in the maintenance grant of Central Universities from 1974-75 onwards.

Prior to 1973-74, separate grants under non-plan were paid to meet the additional cost of interim reliefs and additional dearness allowance sanctioned from time to time to the staff employed in the Central Universities. This expenditure which was not part of the maintenance grant during 1973-74 was merged into the maintenance (block) grant in the subsequent years.

The grants for maintenance to hospitals attached to the Medical Colleges of Aligarh Muslim University and Banaras Hindu University were paid from the plan funds upto the end of the 4th five year plan but *w.e.f.* 1974-75 these grants were merged into the maintenance (block) grant under non-plan.

Upto 1973-74, the non-plan expenditure in respect of Jawaharlal Nehru University was only in respect of the erstwhile School of International Studies and Institute of Russian Studies which were made part of the Jawaharlal Nehru University. The recurring and non-recurring expenditure of the University was met from the plan funds during the 4th Plan. From the first year of the 5th Plan *i.e.* from 1974-75, onwards, the recurring items have been included under non-plan items leading to further increase in the maintenance grant.

Expenditure on account of implementation of revised scales of pay and grant of additional 5 slabs of dearness allowance to Central Universities and Delhi Colleges has also been paid from the non-plan account.

There has been increase in the provisions for non-plan items in respect of the Delhi Colleges from 1974-75 onwards as from that year onwards, the entire maintenance expenditure is being met from the non-plan funds. A sum of Rs. 181.41 lakhs was paid to meet such needs during 1973-74 from the plan funds. This requirement has now been included in the non-plan provisions from 1974-75....

Another major factor that has contributed to considerable increase in the non-plan expenditure has arisen out of the decision taken by the Government to transfer the work relating to the payment of maintenance grant to some of the deemed universities to the UGC. During 1975-76, a sum of Rs. 176.77 lakhs was paid from non-plan to Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore and Indian School of Mines, Central Institute of English and Foreign Languages,

Tata Institute of Social Sciences and Jamia Millia rose to Rs. 366.90 lakhs during 1976-77. This explains the further increase in 1976-77 over 1975-76 under non-plan head."

2.6. It is seen from the figures indicated in the Audit paragraph that there has been, over the years, a considerable distortion in the proportion between non-plan and plan payments. Whereas in 1969-70, the non-plan and plan payments were of the order of roughly Rs. 9 crores and Rs. 15 crores respectively, in 1975-76 these had risen to Rs. 30 crores and Rs. 29 crores respectively. The Ministry of Education and Social Welfare have, *inter alia* explained the phenomenon of distortion, in a written, note thus:

"In view of the distinct different purposes for which funds are provided under Non-plan and Plan, it would not, it is submitted, be correct to compare the expenditure under these two separate heads...."

2.7. In the written note dated 16 December, 1977, furnished by the Ministry it is further stated:

"From the figures indicated in the Audit Report it would be observed that the yearly plan expenditure rose from Rs. 1494 lakhs in 1969-70 to Rs. 3849 lakhs in 1976-77 and is expected to rise to Rs. 4400 lakhs in 1977-78. It may also be added that the Plan expenditure has to be adjusted within the allocation that be provided by the Government of India from time to time depending upon the resources position. Further it generally happens that the expenditure under plan is less in the first two years of a plan period and picks up from the third year onwards. During the current plan starting from Rs. 2510 lakhs during 1974-75 (first year of the plan), it is likely to go upto Rs. 4400 lakhs during 1977-78."

2.8. The Committee find that whereas in 1969-70, the non-plan and plan payments of the Commission were of the order of roughly Rs. 9 crores and Rs. 15 crores respectively, in 1975-76, these have risen to Rs. 30 crores and Rs. 29 crores respectively. There has been thus over the years a disproportionate increase in non-plan expenditure vis-a-vis the plan payments. The Committee recommend that the Commission should examine how best to reduce the non-plan expenditure to keep it to the minimum.

C. NON-PLAN & PLAN EXPENDITURE

Audit Paragraph

3.1. Separate funds are provided by Government for meeting the Non-plan and Plan expenditure of the Commission. A summary of the expenditure as per the accounts of the Commission relating to Non-Plan and Plan items for the three years 1973-74, 1974-75 and 1975-76 is given in the table below:

	1973-74 (in	1974-75 lakhs of rupees)	1975-76
Non plan:			
1. Administration charges	46.23	58.69	63.62
2. (i) Block grants to central universities	759.17	1200.00	1721.00
(ii) Block grants to deemed universities	176.77
3. Maintenance grants to constituent and affiliated colleges of Delhi University	285.10	617.17	824.27
4. Grants to central universities for schemes not covered under block grants	91.01	314.24	198.98
TOTAL	1181.51	2190.10	2924.62
Plan:			
1. Grants to central/state universities for humanities	295.75	327.91	306.82
2. Grants for science	473.97	609.07	781.88
3. Grants for engineering and technology	194.98	271.02	393.64
4. Grants to constituent/affiliated colleges	680.28	381.16	277.63
5. Grants for miscellaneous schemes (Examination Reforms, Correspondence Courses, Adult Education, etc.)	769.86	905.29	11077.2
6. Miscellaneous expenditure (incurred by the Commission)	13.11	16.23	23.42
TOTAL	2425.95	2510.68	2860.60

3.2. It is seen from the above table that out of the plan funds, a sum of Rs. 23.42 lakhs was spent during 1975-76 under the head

'Miscellaneous expenditure' (incurred by the Commission). The types of expenditure incurred under this head are indicated below:

	Rs.
(i) Summer Institute	2,26,117.67
(ii) Cultural and Bilateral Exchange Programme	11,98,560.56
(iii) Centre of Advanced Study Projects	2,970.35
(iv) T.A. & D.A. to Non-Official members	7,38,570.08
(v) Additional Staff for implementation of Fifth Plan schemes	6,546.70
(vi) Publication	62,630.29
(vii) Capital Expenditure on UGC Building	12,457.55
(viii) National Lecturers ?	83,771.75
(ix) Status Report	10,720.36
TOTAL	23,42,345.31

It is noted that an expenditure of Rs. 11.98 lakhs was incurred on 'cultural and bilateral exchange programmes.'

3.3. Asked to elaborate on the expenditure under this head, the Secretary, University Grants Commission informed the Committee during evidence:

"These are the programmes which are negotiated between the two governments, the Central Government and the other government and they include provisions of either research between the departments or exchange of teachers. This is a part of the programmes."

3.4. Elaborating further the Secretary, University Grants Commission stated in evidence:

"I will furnish the details of this but I would only mention this. The word used is 'Delegation' but invariably it is the individual professors and teachers going in connection with their research work and exchange programme between India and other countries and this expenditure also covers the expenditure incurred by us for the foreign professors coming to India and visiting our Universities. So, it is in both ways. Under the programme the air fare is provided by the sending country and the hospitality is

provided by the receiving country. So, this expenditure includes the items covered under cultural agreements the Government of India has with different countries and the programme as far as it relates to the University system is handled by the University Grants Commission. This covers a large number of professors, lecturers and teachers going to other countries and more than an equal number coming to our country."

He added:

"In this connection, if a cultural programme is to be negotiated in the formal delegation constituted by the Ministry of Education, the officer of University Grants Commission, sometimes joins in the delegation."

He further added:

"We have not sent any formal delegations but certain officers of the Commission might have been selected under the Queen Elizabeth's scholarship scheme which covers not only the UGC officers but the officers of Government of India as well out of whom an officer of the Commission might be selected and he might be going for a course with a particular University mainly the Oxford University. In addition to this, it may be that some officers who may be working in connection with UNESCO Schemes might have gone to the Headquarters of the UNESCO."

3.5. Asked to categorically state whether in the course of discharge of normal functions statutorily entrusted to the Commission their officers have not to undertake foreign tours, the Secretary, University Grants Commission stated in reply in evidence:

"I cannot say 'Yes' to that straightaway....."

3.6. In reply to another question whether any evaluation of these programmes has ever been done, the Education Secretary stated in evidence:

"At this point of time, to hazard an answer would mean basically a personal opinion. It is for the Commission to go into this question."

3.7. A statement furnished by the Ministry at the Committee's instance showing the details about visits abroad by the officers of the University Grants Commission during 1973-74 to 1977-78 (upto December 1977) indicates the following position.

Details of visits abroad by Officers of the University Grants Commission

	Country visited	Dates & Duration	Expenditure Rs.
Vice-Chairman 1973-74	1. Poland	3-5-1973 to 14-5-1973	8,355.75
	Moscow	25-5-1973	
Do.	2. France	26-9-1973 to	8,510.90
	East Germany Hungary	12-10-1973	
1974-75	1. USSR	20-4-1974 to 29-4-1974	7,114.84
	2. UK, Jamaica, USA	4-6-1974 to 22-6-1974	217.95
	3. France	15-10-1974 to 3-11-1974	61.25
1975-76	1. Switzerland	24-2-1975 to 10-9-1975	10,323.10
	2. U.S.S.R. ¶	7-10-1975 to 18-10-1975	25.00
	1. Belgium]	28-1-76 to 8-2-1976	13,522.40
Chairman 1976-77	2. Mexico	31-7-1976 to 18-8-1976	¶ 31,831.86
	3. Iran, Turkey & Italy	4-9-1976 to 14-9-1976	17,728.20
	4. France	18-12-76 to 18-12-1976	2,591.28
	1. Bangladesh ¶	10-4-1977 to 15-4-1977	2,225.40
1977-78	2. Canada ¶	9-9-1977 to 21-9-1977	300.00*

*Advance to be adjusted.

1	2	3	4
Vice-Chairman	1. Sri Lanka	29-6-76 to 6-7-1976	1,573.00
1976-77	2. USSR	11-8-1976 to 21-8-1976	4,012.00
	3. USSR	13-12-1976 to 17-12-1976	964.80
1977-78	Malaysia	13-5-1977 to 25-5-1977	8,738.65
Secretary	1. Yugoslavia, GDR & FRG	22-5-1973 to 10-6-1973	9,284.99
1973-74	2. U.K.	7-8-1973 to 23-8-1973	9,819.53
1974-75	3. G.D.R. F.R.G.	22-8-1974 to 4-9-1974	Not paid by U.G.C.
	4. Jamaica, U.S.A. & U.K.	10-1-1975 to 26-1-1975	2,475.75
1975-76	5. Belgium, Turkey FRG	29-2-1976 to 4-3-1976	11,673.95
	6. Czechoslovakia, GDR	24-7-1976 to 6-8-1976	11,960.17
	7. Mexico	15-8-1976 to 21-8-1976	19,245.82
1976-77	8. Poland & Egypt	5-12-1976 to 15-12-1976	12,787.95
1977-78	9. Bangladesh	10-4-1977 to 15-4-1977	1,974.05
	10. F.R.G.	22-5-1977 to 27-5-1977	15,274.49
	11. Trieste	20-6-77 to 25-8-1977	20,405.92

1	2	3	4
Addl. Secretary 1975-76	1. Bulgaria	16-6-1975 to 29-6-1975	No expenditure from UGC except that he was on deputation abroad and paid salary under the rules.
1976-77	2. France and U.K.	6-12-1976 to 19-12-1976	
1977-78	3. Syria	14-3-1977 to 23-4-1977	On extraordinary leave
Secretary 1973-74	U.K.	6-10-1973 to 25-6-1974	No expenditure from UGC except that he was on deputation abroad and paid salary under the rules.
Education Officer	U.K.	6-10-1974 to 24-6-1975	Do.
1974-75			
Dy. Secretary	France	16-9-1976 to 1-6-1977	Do.
Dy. Secretary 1977-78	U.K.	6-10-1977	Do.
Dy. Secretary	U.K.	8-12-1976 to 28-6-1977	Do.

3.8. The Committee were informed during evidence that the expenditure under the cultural and bilateral exchange programmes was intended to cover foreign tours of "individual professors and teachers going in connection with their research work and exchange programme between India and other countries" as also that "incurred by us for the foreign professors coming to India and visiting our universities." It was further stated during evidence that "this

expenditure includes the items covered under the cultural agreements the Government of India has with different countries and the programmes as far as it relates to the university system is handled by the University Grants Commission." From the information furnished to the Committee, they observe that Chairman and Secretary as also Deputy Secretary and Administrative Officers of the University Grants Commission have been regularly undertaking tours under this programme. The Chairman of the University Grants Commission has, since 1973-74 and upto December 1977, undertaken as many as 13 tours, varying from 2 to 4 per year. During the same period, the Secretary, UGC has been on foreign tours on as many as 11 times. The Committee expresses its disapproval to the frequent tours undertaken by the University Grants Commission Secretariat officers at Commission's expense. The Committee would like the Ministry of Education to lay down guidelines for the professors and teachers undertaking foreign tours under the cultural and bilateral exchange programmes ensuring that no single person is allowed to take undue advantage under the programme at the cost of other equally, if not more, qualified and competent persons. In so far as the non-academics are concerned the tours should be drastically curtailed. The Committee desire that the details of tours should be appended in the Annual Report of the Commission.

D. PROGRAMME-WISE DISTRIBUTION OF ALLOCATION

Audit Paragraph:

4.1. The resolution on National Policy on Education issued by the Government of India in 1968 was considered by the Commission in 1969. The Commission took note of the fact that a panel on education set up by the Planning Commission had proposed a sum of Rs. 181.00 crores as allocation for higher education in the Fourth Five Year Plan and that the matter might again be considered when the resource position became known sometime in April-May 1969.

4.2. The plan outlay of the Commission was fixed in May 1970 at Rs. 115.00 crores. This included a sum of Rs. 8.50 crores specifically for teacher education and adult education. The Commission, while considering this allocation in July 1970, desired that the scheme-wise allocation should be worked out within the ceiling of Rs. 115 crores. In doing so, the provision for teacher education and adult education was restricted to Rs. 3.00 crores. Later the plan outlay of the Commission was increased to Rs. 120.15 crores due to increase in provision for technology and for the Jawaharlal Nehru University. A final *inter se* allocation as between the various schemes within the ceiling of Rs. 120.15 crores was not, however, specifically approved by the Commission.

4.3. In March 1971 the Commission considered a suggestion of the Planning Commission that it should restore the cut made in the allocation for teacher education and adult education. The Commission observed that it recognised the importance of the development of teacher education and desired that a note on the progress so far made and development programmes to be undertaken in the Fourth Plan period might be placed before it. Though the allocation for teacher education and adult education was subsequently increased to Rs. 4.00 crores, the Commission does not appear to have specifically considered this allocation.

[Paragraph 48 of the Report of the Comptroller & Auditor General of India for the year 1975-76, Union Government (Civil), pp. 220-221.]

4.4. The Resolution on National Policy of Education was issued by the Government of India in 1968. It was considered by the Com-

mission, in 1969. The Audit para states that the Commission, taking note of the fact that Panel on Education, set up by the Planning Commission, had proposed a sum of Rs. 181 crores for higher education in the Fourth Plan period, desired that reallocation of funds for higher education in the Fourth Five Year Plan might be placed before the Commission again when the resources position became known some time in April-May, 1969. The plan outlay of the Commission was fixed in May, 1970 at Rs. 115.00 crores. This included a sum of Rs. 850 crores specifically for teacher education and adult education.

4.5. The Ministry was asked to state whether the final scheme-wise allocation was considered and formally approved by the Commission and if so, when and with what results. According to the reply furnished by the Ministry, the following sequence of events took place:

- (i) On 26th October 1968, the Ministry of Education informed the Commission that as per the report of the Steering Committee of the Central Planning Group, as revised by the Planning Group on Education, the total outlay for UGC schemes will be Rs. 181 crores. The details of the schemes were indicated in the report of the Steering Committee.
- (ii) There is no indication that this fact was formally brought to the notice of the Commission as a body. It is stated that on 16th November, 1968, with the approval of Chairman, UGC, a communication was sent to the Ministry of Education indicating the Commission's broad agreement with the distribution of requirements indicated in the report of the Steering Committee, as revised by the Planning Group on Education.
- (iii) On 6th March 1969, the Commission considered a note from the Planning Commission on the likely allocation of the UGC for the Fourth Plan period. The Planning Commission had indicated the distribution of Rs. 115 crores for the schemes of UGC. This included provisions for Rs. 8 crores and Rs. 50 lakhs for teacher education and adult education respectively. The Commission felt that the allocation made for UGC was inadequate and desired that Government of India be approached to increase the allocation suitably. On 7th May 1969, the

Ministry of Education was accordingly requested that the provision for the UGC for the Fourth Plan may appropriately be increased.

- (iv) On 3rd October 1969, the Commission further considered the likely allocation for the UGC (Rs. 115) crores for the Fourth Plan period. This was noted.
- (v) On 1st July 1970, a note was placed by the Secretariat of the Commission on the requirements of the UGC for the Fourth Plan period within an allocation of Rs. 139 crores. The Commission desired that a statement indicating the allocation for different purposes within the sum of Rs. 115 crores provided for the UGC for 1969—74 might be prepared and forwarded to the Government of India along with the note placed before the Commission. In pursuance of the decision of the Commission the distribution of allocation of Rs. 115 crores was prepared by the Secretariat of the Commission. It was approved by the Chairman of the Commission and sent to the Ministry of Education on 20th July 1970. There is no indication that this revised distribution of allocation of Rs. 115 crores prepared by the Secretariat of the Commission and approved by its Chairman was formally placed before the Commission for approval before its transmission to the Ministry of Education. The revised scheme-wise distribution indicated an allocation of Rs. 2.50 crores for teacher education and Rs. 50 lakhs for adult education.
- (vi) On 3rd March 1971, a note was placed by the Secretariat of the Commission before the Commission regarding the provision of teacher education and adult education in the allocation of the UGC for the Fourth Plan period. This was done in pursuance of the suggestion of the Planning Commission to the Government of India that the UGC may be requested to restore the provisions of teacher education and adult education to Rs. 8 crores and Rs. 50 lakhs respectively and adjustment made within the overall allocation to provide for these amounts. It was stated in the note placed before the Commission that "the requirements of the various programmes were assessed again in the light of allocation of Rs. 120.15 crores and the follow-

ing provisions were made for teacher allocation and adult education:

<i>Teacher allocation</i>	<i>Adult Allocation</i>
Rs. 2.50 crores	Rs. 40 lakhs

It was not found possible to provide more amount at this stage for these two projects in view of the requirements of other schemes included in the Fourth Plan of the UGC." A statement indicating the distribution of Rs. 120.15 crores for various programmes of the Commission was enclosed to the note placed before the Commission. The Commission desired that a note on the progress so far made and development programmes to be undertaken in the Fourth Plan may be placed before it.

- (vii) On 5th July 1971, the synopsis of action taken by the Commission to develop teacher education programme in universities and colleges was placed before the Standing Advisory Committee on Teacher Education. This was noted by the Standing Advisory Committee.
- (viii) On 4th August 1971, the minutes of the meeting of the Standing Advisory Committee on Teacher Education held on 5th July 1971 were placed before the Commission. As per the minutes of the meeting the Commission did not give any further directions in this regard.
- (ix) On 20th July 1971, the matter was again considered in a meeting in the Planning Commission to discuss the Fourth Plan/Annual Plan programme of the UGC. Paras 6 and 7 of the minutes of the meeting are reproduced below:

"About teacher education, it was again emphasised that the earlier allocation of Rs. 8 crores should be adhered to. The progress of the scheme had been slow in the first three years. The Secretary, UGC, desired to have the details of Rs. 8 crores allocated for teacher education by the Planning Commission and the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare. It was stated that these details were not available since the overall programmes recommended by the Steering Committee of the Planning Commission amounted to a very high figure which was subsequently reduced to only Rs. 8 crores to be financed through the agency of the UGC. As such, the details as given in the report of the Steering Committee, which was circulated earlier, could be utilised as broad guidelines for formulating the programmes to be undertaken in the Fourth Plan. It was also noted that a Sub-Committee of the UGC was already looking

into this problem. The Secretary, UGC, assured the Group that the Commission would make available all the necessary assistance to the teachers colleges/departments in relation to their assessed needs.

The Group was informed that some programmes had been chalked out in respect of the development of adult education departments in certain Universities. The UGC was requested to send a note about those programmes giving the physical targets and financial allocations made to the universities during the first two years of the Fourth Plan."

- (x) On 6th September 1971, the Commission wrote to the Planning Commission that at the July 1971 meeting held in the Planning Commission, the Adviser, Planning Commission had agreed to the UGC making a provision of Rs. 3.50 crores within the ceiling of Rs. 120.15 crores and suggested that the minutes could be modified accordingly. In the absence of any communication received from the Planning Commission to the contrary, it was presumed by the UGC that the Planning Commission had agreed to the allocation of Rs. 3.50 crores for the purpose. There is no indication that the proposal to increase the allocation for teacher and adult education from Rs. 2.90 crores to Rs. 3.50 crores was placed before the Commission for approval.
- (xi) On 5th April 1972, the UGC considered a note informing that in view of "the time that is taken in processing" the proposals of universities regarding teacher education, the Commission's assistance will be available to the universities only for about 1½ years of the Fourth Plan. The question posed for the consideration of the Commission was whether the Commission's assistance for teacher education should end with the Fourth Plan or continue for a period of 5 years or up to the end of the Fifth Plan. The Commission agreed that its assistance should be provided for the period ending the Fifth Plan, i.e., 1978-79.
- (xii) At some stage, the provision for teacher education and adult education was revised to Rs. 4 crores "keeping in view the likely expenditure to be incurred." There is no indication that this increase in the allocation from Rs. 3.50 crores to Rs. 4 crores was made after the approval of the UGC.

- (xiii) At its meeting held in October 1972, the final, programme-wise, distribution of Rs. 120.15 crores was reported to the Commission.
- (xiv) In December 1972, the Commission wrote to the universities that they should give high priority to the teacher education programme requesting them to send proposals along with financial implications for the consideration of the Commission.
- (xv) It is stated that "despite various measures taken by the Commission towards the implementation of teacher education an expenditure of Rs. 118.87 lakhs was incurred during the period 1969-70 to 1973-74 on this programme."

4.6. It is thus clear that the allocation for different schemes within the ceiling of Rs. 115 crores provided for the UGC for the Fourth Plan period (1969—74) was drawn up by the Secretariat of the Commission and after approval of the Chairman of the Commission forwarded to the Ministry of Education on 20th July 1970. The specific approval of the Commission for this scheme-wise distribution of allocation was not formally obtained. This distribution of allocation was in many respects at variance with the distribution of Rs. 115 crores indicated by the Planning Commission earlier.

4.7. It is also clear that the allocation for teacher education and adult education underwent changes quite a few times. In the communication sent to the Ministry of Education on 1st July 1970, the allocation was reduced from Rs. 8.50 crores (as suggested by the Planning Commission) to Rs. 3 crores. In a note placed before the University Grants Commission at their meeting on 3rd March, 1971, it was indicated as Rs. 2.90 crores. At a meeting held in the Planning Commission on 20th July 1971, an allocation of Rs. 3.50 crores was purported to have been suggested by the representative of the University Grants Commission and agreed to by the Adviser, Planning Commission. The allocation was finally increased to Rs. 4 crores. At none of these stages, specific approval of the University Grants Commission was obtained before effecting changes in the allocation.

4.8. During evidence, the representative of the University Grants Commission was asked to indicate the reasons for not obtaining the specific approval of the Commission for changes in the allocation

for teacher education and adult education during the Fourth Plan period. He replied:

“According to the records available with us, in March 1971—item No. 39—we placed before the Commission the scheme of distribution of Rs. 120.15 crores under different heads which included teacher education (Rs. 2.50 crores) and adult education (Rs. 0.40 lakhs). Later on the Planning Commission had been suggesting that we should stick to an allocation of Rs. 8.0 crores for the teacher education within this amount of Rs. 120.00 crores which had not been possible for us because, as we would give later, even what we have provided had not been spent for the purpose for which it was intended. Later on while placing before the Commission, the amount of Rs. 2.5 crores was raised to Rs. 3.5 crores, but it was not done in the form of resolution. For other items also where there are changes, a resolution to this effect will have to be passed. Later on in September, the item was placed before the Commission and when the 5th Plan was framed, they had increased the figure. But what the audit said was that we raised this amount of Rs. 2.5 crores to Rs. 3.5 crores. The Commission did not pass a specific resolution, but the statement placed before the Commission included this and not only this was included but a change in this particular item was also made. In other items also, there were changes as compared to the one placed in March 1971. But the Commission has said that it will be still Rs. 3.50 crores and the teacher education is not suffering on that point.”

The Chairman, University Grants Commission, added:

“Specific approval does not seem to have been obtained from the Commission. The procedure that had been adopted was in drawing up the plan proposal to identify the scheme. It arrived at a figure of Rs. 181.00 crores; this had been cut down to Rs 115.00 crores and in proportion to that, they had allocated the amount to the various schemes. The procedure is that in every monthly statement, we showed the funds provided and the decision was taken, but no specific approval of this scheme allocation was there. But it was already available to the Members, no doubt. This is the correct position.”

Corroborating the statement of the Chairman, the Education Secretary stated in evidence:

"That conclusion of which you came, I don't think we can doubt. We have to agree to what you have said. We have tried to explain the basis as to how the report of the working group is placed on the table. But the specific noting or the records that ~~these~~ were brought to the notice of the Commission for consideration and then given a specific approval, that aspect is lacking."

4.9. Asked whether specific approval of the Commission was obtained, the Secretary, Ministry of Education stated during evidence:

"The Commission consists of so many Members. About the reduction of the total allocation that has not been done."

4.10. Asked to indicate the exact point of time when the scheme-wise allocation was brought to the notice of the Members of the Commission, the Secretary, University Grants Commission, stated in reply in evidence:

"The first was on 3rd March, 1971, when Rs. 120.15 crores allocations were brought to the notice of the Commission."

He added:

"As far as the point of Rs. 3.5 crores is concerned, it was not specifically considered by the Commission. We placed before the Commission a note in October, 1972 indicating the development programme and progress during three years. This included allocation under different schemes."

4.11. Conceding that the changes in the allocations were not specifically approved by the Commission the Secretary, University Grants Commission, stated:

"This change of allocation would not have been done by any individual. But the Commission specifically did not do it. They took note of what was suggested in the paper."

4.12. The Committee enquired whether the approval of the Commission was obtained for finally fixing the allocation at Rs. 4 crores, the Secretary, University Grants Commission, stated in reply during evidence:

"I have a note here on the development of teacher education. When it was suggested to us that a special importance should be given to this, we had some conferences of

principals of colleges and also some seminars. Then, we started sending visiting committees to various universities to assess the requirements. At that time, it appeared that about Rs. 3.5 crores or Rs. 4 crores or so would be the liability which the Commission may be entering into. At the time of the appraisal we thought that this was the amount to be required. After getting the reports of the visiting committees—there were about 35 universities involved—we looked into the requirements of each Department of the universities. Apart from 3 or 4 centres which we set up, one in Bangalore, one in Orissa, one in Bombay and one more, we had to assess the requirements of various universities. On the basis of the spending capacity of the universities, we put the figure at Rs. 3.5 crores to Rs. 4 crores. Now, we find that the actual payment is of the order of Rs. 1.18 crores because the universities have not drawn the money. Most of it is a spill-over in the Fifth Plan. I find, the spill-over is now of the order of about Rs. 2.5 crores. That is the spill-over which we are carrying forward in the Fifth Plan. Since there was a slight delay in accepting the proposals of the universities for teacher education, we did one thing more. Normally, we say, after the end of the Plan period, the committed expenditure on staff and other things will be treated as a committed expenditure by the State Government. In view of the importance given to teacher education, the Commission decided that the assistance will be continued as a Plan expenditure till the end of the Fifth Plan."

4.13. The foregoing facts and evidence bring into sharp focus the role of the Chairman and the Secretariat of the Commission *vis-a-vis* the functions of the University Grants Commission as a body.

4.14. Section 27 of the University Grants Commission Act, 1956, provides that the Commission may, with the previous approval of the Central Government, make regulations delegating to its Chairman, Vice-Chairman or any of its officers, its power of general superintendence and direction over the business transacted by, or in the Commission, including the power with regard to the expenditure incurred in connection with the maintenance of the office and internal administration of the Commission. The Committee were informed in a written note that no formal regulations under Section 27 of the University Grants Commission Act, 1956, have been made and notified with the previous approval of the Central Government.

4.15. Asked how, in the circumstances the Chairman and the officers of the Commission had so far been exercising the powers vested in the Commission the Ministry have in a written note, furnished a copy of a resolution passed by the University Grants Commission at its meeting held on 14 November 1956. In regard to the powers exercisable by the Chairman, the resolution says as follows:

"It was resolved that in order to enable the work of the Commission to be carried out smoothly and without delay, the Chairman be authorised to exercise the powers of general superintendence and direction of the affairs and the business of the Commission and may exercise all powers and do all acts and things which may be exercised or done by the Commission. This will include the specific powers delegated to him by the previous resolutions of the Commission. All action taken by the Chairman in accordance with this delegation should be reported to the Commission for information."

4.16. The resolution also provides for the Chairman delegating to the Secretary and other officers of the Commission of the powers and functions exercisable by him or under the University Grants Commission Act as follows:

"The Chairman may, by general or special order, delegate to Secretary or such other officer of the Commission, he may consider necessary, subject to such conditions and limitations, if any, as may be specified in the order, such of the powers and the functions exercisable by him or under the University Grants Commission Act as he may deem necessary for the efficient administration and the functions of the Commission."

4.17. At the same meeting the Commission delegated to the Secretary certain powers as per the following resolution:

"The Commission agreed to delegate to the Secretary powers similar to those ordinarily exercised by a Head of a Department and to the Assistant Secretary powers similar to those of the Head of an office in a Department of Government, subject to such limitations as the Chairman may place on the powers of the Secretary and the Chairman and Secretary may place on the powers of the Assistant Secretary."

4.18. It is further stated that apart from the powers derived by the above quoted resolution, "the Chairman by general or special order has from time to time delegated to Secretary or such other officers of the Commission such of the powers and the functions exercisable by him or under the University Grants Commission Act as deemed necessary for the efficient administration and functions of the Commission."

4.19. Powers have also been delegated to various officers of the Commission in relation to functions of the Commission, e.g., release of grants, signing the utilisation certificates etc.

4.20. It has been admitted during evidence and in written replies by the representatives of the Ministry of Education and of the University Grants Commission that the initial scheme-wise allocation (within the ceiling of Rs. 115 crores provided to the University Grants Commission for the Fourth Plan period) drawn up by the Secretariat of the Commission at the instance of the Commission was not formally approved by the Commission before being transmitted to the Ministry of Education on 1 July 1970. It is also a fact that subsequent changes in the allocation for teacher education and adult education for the Fourth Plan period were also not specifically approved by the Commission. The Committee consider that in such important matters as the allocation of funds for different schemes during the Plan period, specific approval of the Commission should have been taken not only at the initial stage but also every time it was proposed to effect a change in the allocation for individual schemes in the light of the progress of the scheme and its capacity for absorption of funds during the remaining part of the Plan period.

4.21. The Committee note that although the University Grants Commission Act, 1956, has been in operation for more than 20 years, the Commission has not made and notified regulations under Section 27 of the Act delegating its powers to the Chairman, Vice-Chairman or any of its officers. They also note that in the absence of these regulations, the Chairman, the Secretary and other officers of the Commission are exercising the powers under delegation by a resolution of the Commission adopted way back in 1956. An interesting feature of this resolution of 1956 is that the Commission has, by means of this resolution, authorised the Chairman to exercise "all powers and do all acts and things which may be exercised or done by the Commission." The resolution also provides that the Chairman may delegate to Secretary or other officers of the Commission "such of the powers and the functions exercisable by him or under the University Grants Commission Act as he may deem

necessary.' The Committee are informed that the Chairman has from time to time, delegated to the Secretary and other officers of the Commission Powers and functions exercisable by him or under the University Grants Commission Act. The Committee feel that by means of resolution of 1956, the University Grants Commission have, by and large, abdicated their statutory powers, functions and responsibility in favour of Chairman and, under his delegation, the Secretary and other officers of the Commission. The Committee feel that this position is not only far from satisfactory but also against the express intentions of the University Grants Commission Act. The Committee would like the Ministry of Education and the University Grants Commission to carefully frame and notify regulations under Section 27 of the Act ensuring proper exercise by the Commission themselves of the powers and functions assigned to them under the Act.

E. REVIEW OF PROGRESS OF PLAN SCHEMES

(i) Periodical Appraisal

Audit Paragraph

5.1. The progress of Fourth Five Year Plan schemes was reviewed by the Commission only once during the Fourth Plan period in October 1972. An appraisal of performance on the Fourth Five Year Plan was forwarded to the Government and the Planning Commission in October 1974 but this appraisal was not specifically considered by the Commission.

5.2. The Commission stated (January 1977) that the progress of plan schemes is reviewed every year at the time of proposing and revising the annual budget requirements and that the budget estimates including annual outlays for plan schemes are invariably put up before the Commission every year. It was also stated that in view of uncertainties of the final allocations and in the light of advice received from expert committees, the Commission had revised the individual outlay of various such schemes from time to time.

[Paragraph 48 of the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India for the year 1975-76. Union Government (Civil) p. 221]

5.3. Asked to state whether the review of performance of the Fourth Five Year Plan conducted in October 1972 was specifically considered by the Commission; the Ministry have, in a written note, stated:

"It may be clarified at the outset that the information about the progress of implementation of various projects included in the Fourth Plan (1969-74), compiled in September 1972 was in the format and proforma prescribed by the Planning Commission. This was made available to the Planning Commission in September 20/25, 1972 and covered the implementation of the plan projects during the three years: 1969-70 to 1971-72. If it could be termed as an appraisal of the performance of the Fourth Plan, then such information on a similar format was also compiled for the first two years 1969-70 and 1970-71 and sent to the Planning Commission and the Ministry of Education in June 1971. Also, information covering the period 1969

—73 was prepared and supplied to the Planning Commission and the Ministry of Education in May 1973 with the approval of the Chairman, University Grants Commission. This was made available to the members of the University Grants Commission, simultaneously. This information was further consolidated for the Fourth Plan (1969—74) and sent to the Planning Commission and Ministry of Education in October, 1974. Though this final document was not formally placed before the Commission, copies were made available to the members of the Commission while discussing the Fifth Plan (1974—79) programme, as the final document was prepared on the same basis as was done for the first two years, three years and four years of the Fourth Plan. The revised proforma was suggested by the Planning Commission in March, 1970. Prior to that the information on the progress of implementation of plan project was compiled according to budget heads. The information for 1969-70 was sent to Planning Commission in February 1971 as per budget heads."

5.4. In another written note furnished to the Committee, it was stated:

"An evaluation of its programme was undertaken by the Commission when it was reconstituted under the Amended Act at its meeting held in February 1973 with a view to identifying the procedure and the impact of the various activities undertaken so far and to give necessary directions in which these could be made more effective. This review was undertaken particularly with regard to opportunities for higher education, enrolment at different levels, facilities for research and opportunities for socially and economically backward sections of the society. The question of development of facilities for postgraduate education and development of colleges were also reviewed at this meeting."

5.5. From the summary of discussions held on 7th/8th February, 1973, it is seen that the meeting was convened to acquaint the reconstituted commission "with various programmes and procedures so far followed in the evolution of the work of the University Grants Commission and attempt at a critical evaluation of what has been done."

5.6. The Committee desired to know whether there was any system of periodical appraisal or review of the Fourth Five Year Plan schemes by the Members of the Commission to critically review

the achievements with reference to the targets, if any, laid down so as to enable the Commission to take timely corrective measures. In a written note, the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare have replied:

“There remained a wide gap between resources required by the Commission on the basis of its thinking and exercises made for meaningful educational targets, and what was actually made available by the Planning Commission. The concept of targets, therefore, did not seem realistic/usefulThe Commission did not lay down any physical targets to be achieved in the fourth plan period, within the resources made available, either university-wise or State-wise. It may be mentioned that no targets can be laid down in advance for the number of books, items of equipment. The visiting committees recommend the number of additional staff positions and types of buildings. Number of seats in universities/colleges can be fixed approximately only.”

5.7. It may be mentioned in this context that in the meeting held on 20 July 1971 in the Planning Commission to discuss further the Fourth Plan/Annual Plan programmes of the University Grants Commission, the Adviser, Planning Commission specifically asked for requisite data about the achievement/targets of the UGC schemes. An extract from the minutes of the said meeting is given below:

“* * * * *

The Chairman (Adviser, Planning Commission) also pointed out that the Planning Commission was engaged in the re-appraisal of the Fourth Plan which was to be completed within the next two months. For this purpose, it was necessary to have the requisite data about the achievement/targets of the UGC schemes. He said that the Planning Commission had no intention of requesting the UGC to seek any elaborate information from the University institutions. Information available with the UGC may be made available to the Planning Commission.

* * * * *

The Chairman also pointed out that in respect of Hostels, staff quarters, student amenities etc. some physical achievements/targets linked with the financial progress might be given.....

* * * * *

The Chairman suggested that the notes and data pertaining to physical achievements/targets wherever available might be sent to the Planning Commission by the 15th August 1971 so that the same could be made use of in the papers to be prepared in the Planning Commission about the re-appraisal of the Fourth Plan and the advance action programmes for the Fifth Plan."

5.8. During evidence, attention of the representatives of the UGC was invited to the observation of the Audit that the progress of Fourth Five Year Plan schemes was reviewed by the Commission only once in October 1972. Giving his reactions to the observation, the Secretary, University Grants Commission, explained:

"That was the first time when the Planning Commission prescribed certain forms in which information was to be supplied to the Planning Commission. The first set of information was supplied in 1972-73. It was placed before the Commission in October 1972. Next year it was not formally placed before the Commission because it only contained figures—how many hostels had been constructed, how many this thing was done and so on and so forth. Therefore, it was circulated to the members of the Commission on 21st May 1973, by a letter. Earlier, the material up to 1972-73 was placed before the Working Group which was constituted by the Commission consisting of the Chairman and the other members of the Commission to see what had happened during the four years of the Fourth Plan. They took note of that before making suggestions for the Fifth Plan. At the end of the 4th Plan, the complete thing... was brought to the notice of the Commission. They did not specifically consider it, but they took note of it along with the 5th Plan proposals."

He added:

"It was taken note of by the Working Group, which consisted of five Members of the Commission, Chairman and the Vice-Chairman. Then it was taken note of along with the report of the working group which was considered by the Commission."

5.9. Clarifying the position further, the Secretary, Ministry of Education stated during evidence:

“Specific consideration by the Commission, all its members sitting together and this finding a place in the minutes is, no doubt, absent, but these things do come up for consideration by the members of the Commission in the course of their normal business every month. These items do come up for discussion, criticism etc. At the time of formulation of the budget, revised estimates etc., these things do come up.”

5.10. The Audit Paragraph further states that the University Grants Commission informed Audit in January 1977 that the progress of Plan schemes is reviewed every year at the time of proposing and revising the annual budget requirements and that the budget estimates including annual outlays for plan schemes are invariably put up before the Commission every year. It was also stated that in view of uncertainties of the final allocations and in the light of advice received from expert committees, the Commission had revised the individual outlay of various such schemes from time to time.

5.11. The Ministry of Education were requested to indicate whether there was any system of the review of the performance of the plan schemes by the University Grants Commission during the operation of the Five Year Plans. They have, in reply, stated as follows:

“The Commission follows a system of schemewise review of all important programmes with the help of standing committees. . . . The Commission also appoints review committee/working groups to review the working of individual schemes from time to time as for example the scheme for preparation of university level books and student welfare programmes.

The Commission also undertook a Mid-Term Appraisal to consider the status of implementation of the Fifth Plan programmes approved by it for the universities. . . .

A similar review was also undertaken regarding the development of colleges both by the Standing Committee on Development of Colleges and the Commission in October 1976 and in July/August 1977. Keeping in view the need for development of colleges in different parts of the country, the Commission has further reviewed the eligibility conditions and laid down a body of principles to help the improvement of colleges located in backward areas and serving the needs of weaker sections of the society.”

5.12. Asked whether there was any system of periodical appraisal of the Five Year Plans collectively by the Members of the Commission, the Secretary, UGC stated in evidence:

"That is why, now apart from the annual appraisal, the Commission took a mid-term appraisal of the proposals sanctioned by it on 29 December 1976 and took certain decisions to modify the original thinking."

The Chairman, UGC added:

"I fully agree with you and that is what we are doing now. I cannot say what was the practice earlier, but since I have been connected with the Commission from the beginning of 1973, we have been following the practice of having an annual review. This annual review is done with the help of sub-committees and the work of the sub-committees is placed before the Commission. We have had also a mid-term appraisal this year. Sometimes, we have also meetings without any agenda, when we discuss the entire programme of the Commission."

5.13. In reply to a question whether the annual review is in the nature of annual budget formulations or is it in the nature of annual review of plan schemes, the Chairman, UGC stated in evidence:

"It is both. We take note of how the schemes have been functioning and what is the experience, whether it is necessary to modify them in any way etc."

5.14. Asked to indicate how many sittings of the Commission were held for formulation of the budget and for considering the annual review of the Plan schemes, the Chairman, UGC stated, in reply, in evidence:

"As I said, many of these programmes are looked by the standing committees. Their reports are available. The Commission as a whole has generally adopted the practice of allocating two days without any agenda for discussing the implementation of the programmes and review of what has been done. They met for two days. The normal functioning of the Commission is one day but for such reviews we are always allocating two days."

5.15. In a subsequent written note, the Ministry have described the mode of yearly appraisals of the progress of plan schemes thus:

"It may also be added that the Commission now reviews every year the progress of various Plan schemes while

adopting the annual budget for plan schemes. The annual outlay for plan schemes for a particular year is adopted on the basis of the progress as ascertained to the possible extent in the preceding years of the plan. A sub-committee of the Commission examines them in detail before the Commission adopts the estimates. The amount of expenditure in the form of grants released to the universities and colleges depends upon the basis of progress of implementation of various projects in the form of expenditure incurred by the universities and colleges, and not on the basis of the provision made by plan/annual budget even though it is kept in view while releasing the grants. Also, the progress of expenditure on the major heads of the plan schemes is reported to the Commission, at its meeting every month under item No. 4. The Commission is thus kept informed of the implementation of the plan project."

5.16. The Committee desired to know whether any specific recommendations were made at those meetings to speed up programmes **lagging behind and what action was taken thereon** and whether this system of review of plan schemes was considered satisfactory. In a written note, the Ministry have, *inter alia*, stated:

"It is evident from the foregoing note that estimates are invariably referred to a committee for their recommendations. On receipt of the report of the committee/sub-committee, the recommendations are placed before the Commission for their consideration and the progress made in the implementation of the schemes by the institutions on the basis of the expenditure incurred by them on various projects is kept in view while framing the estimates for a particular financial year. With the review of the budget the plan projects are also reviewed."

5.17. From the foregoing information and evidence, it is clear that during the Fourth Plan period, the UGC did not have a system of periodical appraisal of the progress of the Plan schemes in the sense of a critical review of achievements in regard to various plan schemes with reference to targets, whether firm or notional. The Commission's/Secretariat has been, on the request of the Planning Commission, compiling and forwarding to the Planning Commission data and information on the progress of plan schemes from time to time on the format suggested by the Planning Commission. At no

stage the Commission had an opportunity to formally consider and discuss these 'reviews'. The Committee also note the position taken by the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare that the concept of targets "did not seem realistic/useful", that the Commission did not lay down any physical targets to be achieved in the Fourth Plan period and that "no targets can be laid down in advance for the number of books, items of equipment etc." The Committee regret that the UGC did not care to evolve a regular system of appraisals of the various schemes launched during the Fourth Plan period, so as to inform itself of the impediments in the way of the implementation of the schemes for taking corrective measures. The Committee have, later in this report, pointed out the shortfalls in the achievement of targets on the basis of which funds were made available to the Commission. At this stage the Committee would only like to point out that had the Commission kept a firmer grip on the implementation of the various programmes undertaken during the Fourth Five Year Plan, the achievements would have been far more impressive than what actually have been.

5.18. The Committee are informed that during the Fifth Plan period the Commission have introduced the system of appraisals of the Plan schemes and one such appraisal was done in December 1976. They are also informed that each year the budget estimates are considered by a sub-committee of the Commission which considers them with reference to the progress of the scheme and recommends the budget estimates therefor. The estimates, as approved by the sub-committee, are thereafter considered and adopted by the UGC formally. The Committee trust that a sub-committee of the UGC which examines these estimates with reference to the process of the schemes, would apply its mind to the progress of the schemes and report to the Commission any laxity in physical performance for timely corrective action.

(ii) QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMMES

Audit Paragraph:

5.19. It will be noted that the schemes of the Commission fall under four broad categories:—

- (1) General development programmes such as provision of additional academic and residential accommodation, additional teaching and technical staff, equipment, books and journal, workshop facilities and the like;

- (2) Quality improvement and other special programmes like Centres of Advanced Study, College Science Improvement Programme, College Humanities Improvement Programme, Restructuring of Courses, Examination Reforms, Faculty Improvement Programmes, Correspondence Courses and other similar programmes;
- (3) Students Welfare Programmes including Student Aid Fund, scholarships, fellowships and hostels; and
- (4) Other schemes.

5.20. The following table indicates the progress of the Fourth Five Year Plan schemes with reference to the allocations:—

Sl. No.	Name of the Scheme	Allocation approved by the Commission in March, 1971	Allocation shown in appraisals (October 1972 and October 1974)	Actual expenditure shown in appraisal (October 1974)
		(in crores of rupees)		
<i>Category A</i>				
1	Expansion and Improvement of Undergraduate Education	15.00	16.83	24.84
2	Expansion and Improvement of Postgraduate Education and Research and legal Education	39.50	30.00	36.53
3	New Universities and University Centres	8.65	8.65	6.35
4	Technical Education	11.00	11.00	10.41
5	Medical Colleges and Attached Hospitals of Aligarh, Banaras and Delhi Universities	3.82	4.73
		74.15	70.30	82.86
<i>Category B</i>				
1	Correspondence Courses	1.00	1.00	0.12
2	Special Schemes of promotion of Science Education	2.00	3.00	1.66
3	Centres of Advanced Study	8.00	8.00	4.01
4	Special Assistance to Selected Colleges	1.00	3.00	1.61
5	Faculty Improvement Programmes	6.10	6.10	4.42
6	Teacher Education	2.50	3.50	1.18
7	Adult Education	0.40	0.50	0.02
TOTAL: B		21.00	25.10	13.02

<i>Category C</i>				
1	Student Amenities	8.00	6.00	4.75
2	Scholarships/Fellowships	5.00	5.75	3.88
3	Hostels	2.00	5.00	4.86
TOTAL: C		15.00	16.75	13.49
<i>Category D</i>				
1	Other schemes	10.00	8.00	4.21
GRAND TOTAL:		120.15	120.15	113.58

5.21. An analysis of the figures in the table above shows that in the allocations approved by the Commission a sum of Rs. 25.10 crores was provided for quality improvement and other special programmes while for schemes for general development programmes a sum of Rs. 70.30 crores was provided. Against the above allocations the actual expenditure incurred was Rs. 13.02 crores (shortfall: 49.2 per cent), and Rs. 82.86 crores (excess: 17.9 per cent) respectively. There was also shortfall in respect of students welfare programmes to the extent of 19.5 per cent. The proportionately lower allocation given for the quality improvement and other special programmes and the lack of adequate implementation of these programmes are particularly significant considering the fact that in the total Plan outlay for the country as a whole including Central and State Governments for university education (Rs. 183.52 crores) a predominant share (Rs. 123.00 crores) was earmarked for the University Grants Commission.

5.22. The Commission stated (December, 1976) that "in the context of inadequate resources the bulk of the universities and colleges are still not having minimum required physical infra-structure facilities. Within the resources made available to the Commission, a major portion is, therefore made available to these institutions to build up physical facilities. The Commission, at the same time, is also sponsoring quality improvement programmes in selected universities and colleges". It was stated that it had deliberately refrained from invoking provisions under different sections of the Act as they would not help to bring about the required changes and these provisions were bound to be ineffective in the context of overall inadequacy everywhere. It was also stated that the additional expenditure incurred on general development programme was unavoidable because of the inevitable requirements and general development which included creation of additional facilities for

classrooms, libraries laboratories, equipments, books, hostels and staff quarters. The rise in prices in construction and even in procuring books and equipments was responsible for this.

[Paragraph 48 of the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India for the year 1975-76, Union Government (Civil), pp. 222—224].

5.23. It is seen from the categorised scheme-wise statement showing the progress of Fourth Five Year Plan Schemes that there were wide variations between the initial allocation and the actual expenditure. The Committee, therefore, desired to know whether the variations were considered by the Commission from time to time. The Ministry have, in reply stated in a written note:

“It may be stated that the amount of expenditure in the form of grant released to the universities and colleges depends upon the basis of the progress of implementation of the various projects in the form of expenditure incurred by the universities/colleges and not on the basis of the provision made by plan/annual budget even though this is kept in view while releasing the grants.”

5.24. The Ministry was asked to state whether the Commission considered the quality improvement and other special programmes to be of lower priority as against general development programmes. They have in reply stated:

“In the background of the resources made available to the Commission for the implementation of the programmes of higher education in the Fourth Five Year Plan, the Commission did not accord a lower priority to the quality improvement and other special programmes. The basic minimal requirements for the development of the various departments in the universities, colleges etc. could not be neglected, since many of the programmes for the regular development of the various departments in the universities and colleges etc. also lead to the improvement of quality and standards of education at the university stage. Out of the total allocation of Rs. 120.15 crores made available to the Commission, a sum of Rs. 26 crores was made available for quality programme. The Commission reviewed the progress of these programmes from time to time, through various expert/standing committees and took necessary measures for effective implementation of the various programmes. In fact, within an overall allo-

cation of Rs. 120.15 crores available for the fourth plan period, the allocation for quality improvement programmes etc. was increased from Rs. 26 crores to Rs. 30.85 crores. However, the expenditure on these schemes could not keep pace with the allocations made, as first noticed in October, 1972, due to various factors... The shortfall in expenditure under these programmes may also be due to the fact that though the sanctions for a far greater amount had been issued and TR bills for these sanctions had been received in majority of the cases, the actual payment could not be made due to the fact that the funds were not made available by the Government for making these payments by March, 1974. These payments were actually made during 1974-75."

5.25. The Chairman, UGC, analysing the reasons for excess expenditure on development schemes at the cost of quality improvement schemes taken up during the Fourth Plan period, stated in evidence:

"The reason is that the Commission carried out a careful review of all these special programmes and, therefore, some time was taken in reformulation some of these programmes. For instance, with regard to the programme of developing the Departments of Special Assistance into Centres of Advanced Studies, committees were sent to all those universities where the centres functioned and the Commission went into the matter and in some cases, the existing centres of advanced studies were discontinued and new sets of guidelines were worked out. In almost every case the old programmes were reviewed and in some cases new guidelines were sent out and this is the reasons why there has been some delay in the expenditure on quality improvement programmes but, I think in subsequent years the situation has been different."

5.26. Asked whether the Commission had concurrently evaluated the quality improvement and special programmes with a view to identifying the reasons for slow progress in this vital field, the Education Secretary stated in evidence:

"I think hon. Members will appreciate that to improve quality is extremely difficult but to expand is quite easy. Therefore, you will find the allocation is only Rs. 25 crores for quality improvement and Rs. 70 crores for general

development. Although it is Rs. 70 crores for general development, it is not at all indicative of the demands for additional seats, additional facilities particularly physical all over the country. But in spite of the heavy demand, the maximum that could be thought of was only Rs. 70 crores. So we find that on the one hand, Rs. 70 crores itself is an amount which is less than what should have been allocated and we find that it is easily spent and probably exceeded but when it comes to quality improvement, it is a question of improving quality in every field whether it is advanced studies in humanities or sciences or restructuring the course or examination reforms and a lot of involvement of the teachers is required and they have to play a vital part in identifying the schemes and implementing them. Therefore, in spite of our expectation that it will take time, the volume of work involved was rather such that although there was an allocation of Rs. 25 crores, not even Rs. 13 crores could be utilised and as mentioned by the Chairman, we are now identifying the difficulties so that we can take remedial steps to see how we can further improve in the direction of quality improvement. This is the real explanation we have to submit to you."

5.27. Asked to specifically indicate whether demands for acquisition of capital assets, i.e. more buildings and infrastructural facilities were more pressing and the quality improvement programme was relegated to lower priorities, the Chairman, UGC replied in evidence:—

"We have generally said that for any allocation to the colleges, the component for building should not be more than one-third and we have laid down the proportion for the other activities such as appointment of staff, purchase of equipment and books and miscellaneous programmes. The idea is that if we have more allocation for books and equipment the staff can use them and we will be able to raise the quality rather than if we go in for buildings which, in our opinion, will not be a primary factor in raising standards."

5.28. Conceding during evidence that the progress on quality improvement programme was slow in the earlier plan, as reflected in the statement separately furnished, the Secretary, UGC stated in evidence:

"....the progress on the quality programme is not as slow as it was in the earlier Plan but, naturally, in the case of general development the progress is always quicker because a large number of institutions are doing it....the quality programme happens to be in selected (colleges)."

5.29. The Vice-Chairman, UGC supplementing the above statement, stated during evidence:—

"...the quality improvement programmes take a little time for the various committee to formulate, to be communicated, for the teachers to assimilate and send proposals. What I am saying is there is delay between the initiation and the response from the universities and colleges."

5.30. The broad category making for 'general development programmes' has the following four broad components:

- (i) buildings;
- (ii) staff;
- (iii) equipment;
- (iv) books and journals.

5.31. Asked to indicate approximate break-up under the first component, viz., buildings, the Secretary, University Grants Commission stated in reply, during evidence:

"If you kindly see the annual report that we present to Parliament, under different heads in that particular year and the previous year we do indicate staff so much, equipment grants paid so much, books and journals so much, buildings so much except in the case of projects for the centres of advanced studies and the departments of special assistance where for the booking of these components one has to work out separately, otherwise, under the development programmes sanctioned to the universities it should be possible for us to furnish that information."

He added:

"In the earlier Plans it was fairly high but now as I mentioned yesterday, it is limited to 25 per cent. For the newly established universities it will be more. I would say roughly—it is a very rough guess—I do not think that taking an overall picture, it should exceed 25 or 30 per cent (of the total grants). Roughly one-third. This is my guess at the moment."

5.32. In reply to another question whether specific approval of the Commission by recipient institutions for individual schemes is necessary, the Secretary, UGC stated during evidence:

“They have only to refer in the case of buildings, the plans and estimates for concurrence. For others they have not to approach the Commission. For purchase of books and equipment, they can go on purchasing them without consulting us. The equipment they can go on ordering and purchasing them without consulting us. For appointment of staff, they can go and advertise and recruit.”

5.33. The Review Committee has made an attempt to classify the allocation of development grants during the Fourth Five Year Plan (1969-70 to 1973-74) under broad categories, as summarised in the following table:

Broad categories of Plan expenditure* during the Fourth Plan are given below:

Head	Grant (in lakhs of Rs.)	Per- centage of Plan expendi- ture
1. Capital expenditure on buildings and hardwares	5951.76	52.92
2. Staff including revision of salary scales	1252.99	11.14
3. Support for research	1250.97	11.12
4. Other promotional schemes	2790.68	24.82
TOTAL	11246.40	100.00

5.34. It would be seen from the Table that nearly 53 per cent of the grant given by the Commission was spent on capital expenditure like buildings and hardware, about 11 per cent was spent on salaries of teachers, about 11 per cent (rough calculation) on support for research, and nearly 25 per cent on other promotional schemes like teacher training programmes, examination reforms, books and journals and student welfare schemes, correspondence courses, adult education, college science improvement programme, development of university centres for post-graduate studies and other miscellaneous activities.

*Approximate indication.

Source: Review Report (Table VII)

5.35. The Ministry have sought to explain to the Committee the sizeable shortfall in expenditure during the Fourth Plan period (1969—74) against plan allotations on Quality improvement and other special programmes" (49.2 per cent) differently at different points of time. They informed Audit in December, 1976 that since "the bulk of the universities and colleges are still not having minimum required physical infrastructure facilities..... a major portion is..... made available to these institutions to build up physical facilities." During evidence given before the Committee in September, 1977, it was stated by the Chairman, UGC that the reasons for "some delay in the expenditure on quality improvement programmes" was that "the Commission carried out a careful review of all these special programmes and therefore, some time was taken in reformulating some of these programmes". The Secretary of the Commission attributed the delay during evidence, to "delay between the initiation and response from the universities and colleges". In a subsequent written note received in January, 1978, the Ministry have, justifying the excess expenditure on general development programme at the expense of quality improve and other special programmes, stated that "the basic minimal requirements for the development of the various departments in the universities colleges etc. could not be neglected" and explained further that "the expenditure on these (quality improvement etc.) schemes could not keep pace with the allocations made due to various factors." It is also stated in the note that the fact of the shortfall in expenditure on quality improvement etc. programmes came to notice first in October, 1972. As regard action taken thereafter, the note says that "the Commission reviewed the progress of these programmes from time to time through various expert standing committees and took necessary measures for effective implementation of the various programmes."

5.36. The Committee are unable to appreciate the plea advanced by the Ministry that excess expenditure on general development programme at the expense of quality improvement programme was due to the need to build up physical infrastructure facilities in universities and colleges. The Committee feel that the higher allocation for general development programmes already reflected this need and in any case, if further emphasis was to be placed on the building up of infrastructural facilities in universities and colleges the allocation therefor should have been revised upwards at the time of plan appraisal in 1972.

5.37. The Committee are also unable to appreciate the position taken by the Ministry that the expenditure in the form of grants released to universities and colleges "depends upon the progress of

implementation of various projects and not on the provision made in the plan/annual budget", as this view would make the entire system of planning and budgeting, not only in respect of higher education but of all developmental programmes, nugatory. The implementation of the various projects and schemes has to be oriented to achieve the plan targets and budgetary provisions therefor.

5.38. The real reason for the neglect of the quality improvement and other special programmes appears to the Committee to be the lack of systematic progressing of these programmes by the UGC and delays in its appraisals and reformulation in the light of experience. Another important reason for excess expenditure on general development programmes, the Committee feel, was that the money given for buildings, staff, equipment, books and journals could be easily spent without much scrutiny at the Commission's level, whereas appropriation of grants for quality improvement and other programmes needed expertise and effort on the part of the Commission, the universities and the colleges to formulate and implement the schemes. The admission by the Secretary, Ministry of Education that "to improve quality is extremely difficult but to expand is quite easy" is quite significant in this connection. The Committee also take note of the analysis made by the Review Committee in their report that the percentage of grants made by the UGC during the Fourth Plan period for "capital expenditure on buildings and hardwares" against the total UGC grants was as high as 53 per cent.

5.39. The Committee need hardly emphasise the importance of quality improvement and other special programmes as it is through these programmes that the UGC can accomplish its object of promoting and coordinating university education and disseminating and maintaining standards of teaching and examination and research in the universities. The Committee, therefore, recommend that at least from now on the Commission should appreciate better their responsibility in this regard and so direct its activities as to may make for accelerated effort by universities and colleges in the field of quality improvement and other special programmes. The Committee were glad to hear from the Chairman, UGC that now the UGC has decided that in any allocation to colleges the components for buildings should not be more than one third and that proportions have also been laid down for other activities. The Committee would like the Commission to ensure that the universities and colleges are given clear-cut guidelines in regard to each of these schemes and

afforded all assistance and expertise needed by them to formulate concrete programmes under the various schemes. After these programmes are received by the Commission, expeditious action should be taken to process, scrutinise and sanction these programmes. A contemporaneous watch should be kept on the implementation of the programmes and there should be a system of high level periodical appraisals to review the progress of these programmes. Timely action should be taken to remove difficulties in the implementation of the programme, if any, found during periodical appraisals.

F. DEVELOPMENT GRANTS

(a) (i) *Disproportionate share to Central/Deemed Universities and Delhi Colleges.*

Audit paragraph.

6.1. The development grants were distributed to various universities and colleges between 1969-70 and 1975-76 to the extent indicated below for execution of various schemes of development approved by the Commission from time to time:

	1969-70 to 1973-74	1974-75	1975-76	Total	Per- centage to total grants	Per- centage of grants released during 1969-70 to 1973-74	Per- centage to student enrol- ment in 1973-74
(Amount in lakhs of rupees)							
Central universities	2214.32	628.98	756.25	3599.55	21.8	19.9	1.7
Deemed universities	475.50	176.60	232.13	884.23	5.4	4.3	0.3
State universities	4907.60	1259.46	1507.39	7674.45	46.0	44.1	12.4
Delhi colleges	815.32	411.01	371.16	1607.49	5.4	7.3	2.8
Other colleges	2719.49	412.01	354.86	3486.36	21.4	24.4	82.8
TOTAL	11132.23	2519.05	2881.79	16533.07			

The share of grants to other colleges decreased from 24.4 per cent during the Fourth Five Year Plan period to 16.4 per cent in 1974-75 and 12.4 per cent in 1975-76.

6.2. The larger proportionate share of grants to Central and Deemed universities was attributed by the Commission to the following:—

- (i) grants to central universities not only included development grants which were normally paid to other universities but also grants paid for the medical colleges and hospitals attached to two Central universities;

- (ii) grants for campus development were paid only to Central universities as grants for State universities were provided by the State Governments; and
- (iii) assistance to the Central universities for all the schemes was on cent per cent basis, whereas in the case of the State universities, in certain cases e.g., construction of hostels and staff quarters, the same was provided on a matching basis.

(ii) *Expansion and Improvement of Undergraduate Education*

6.3. A sum of Rs. 16.83 crores was earmarked for the scheme in the Fourth Five Year Plan and a sum of Rs. 26.00 crores has been earmarked in the Fifth Plan. During the Fourth Plan the sum actually utilised was Rs. 24.84 crores. This amount included a basic grant of Rs. 5.39 crores sanctioned to various colleges for books and equipments and Rs. 8.15 crores sanctioned for the development of Delhi colleges. The balance of Rs. 11.30 crores was disbursed to other colleges under the scheme of Expansion and Improvement of Undergraduate Education. Under this programme assistance is provided in the following manner:

Assistance is provided to colleges on requests for specific purposes such as hostels, library and laboratory facilities, books, etc. subject to a prescribed pattern of assistance under which the Commission meets 50 to 100 per cent of expenditure depending on the item concerned and subject again to a ceiling of Rs. 3 lakhs for the period 1966-67 to 1973-74. In special cases, however, an additional grant of Rs. 1 lakh was available to a college on the usual sharing basis. Special book grant ranging from Rs. 4500 to Rs. 6500 per annum was also given to all colleges, in addition to grant ranging from Rs. 5000 to Rs. 10,000 to certain colleges for purchase of equipments in accordance with the norms and ceilings. The assistance is given after scrutiny of the applications received from individual colleges provided the colleges concerned have given an undertaking in regard to meeting the matching grants required for various purposes. The assistance was not provided on the basis of any assessed needs of the colleges or on the basis of norms related to students enrolment etc.

[Paragraph 48 of the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India for the year 1975-76, Union Government (Civil), 224—226]

6.4. The grants given by the University Grants Commission are mainly for two purposes, viz.,

- (a) For development, and
- (b) For maintenance.

Plan assistance in the form of grants for development are given to Central, Deemed and State universities and those for maintenance (non-plan) given to Central universities. However, since the amendment of University Grants Act, in 1972, maintenance grants can be given to (i) State universities also for any specific activities'; and (ii) Deemed universities 'in special cases'.

6.5. The following table indicates the extent of development grants distributed to various universities and colleges between 1969-70 and 1975-76 for execution of various schemes of development approved by the University Grants Commission from time to time.

	1969-70 to 1973-74	1974-75	1975-76	Total	Percentage to total grants	Percentage of grants released during 1969-70 to 1973-74	Percentage to student enrolment in 1973-74	Percentage to student enrolment in 1974-75	Percentage to student enrolment in 1975-76
(Amount in lakhs of rupees)									
Central universities	2214.32	628.98	756.25	3599.55	21.8	12.9	1.7	2.0	1.9
Deemed universities.	475.50	176.69	232.13	884.32	5.4	4.3	0.3	0.3	0.3
State Universities.	4907.60	1259.46	1507.39	7674.45	46.0	44.1	12.4	12.7	13.0
Delhi Colleges.	815.32	41.91	37.16	894.39	5.4	7.3	2.8	4.2	2.4
Other Colleges	2719.49	412.01	354.86	3486.36	21.4	24.4	12.8	11.6	8.4
Total :	11132.23	2519.05	2887.79	16539.07					

6.6. According to the Audit paragraph, the larger proportionate share of grants to Central and Deemed universities was attributed by the Commission to the following:

- (i) grants to Central universities not only included development grants which were normally paid to other universities but also grants paid for the medical colleges and hospitals attached to two Central universities;
- (ii) grants for campus development were paid only to Central universities as grants for State universities were provided by the State Governments; and
- (iii) assistance to the Central universities for all the schemes was on cent per cent basis, whereas in the case of the State universities, in certain cases, e.g., construction of hostels and staff quarters, the same was provided on a matching basis.

6.7. A statement showing the extent of grants, paid to Central and Deemed universities on account of the three factors enumerated in the preceding paragraph during 1969-70 to 1973-74, 1974-75 and 1975-76 and also grants paid to State Universities furnished by the Ministry at the instance of the Committee is reproduced below:

Statement showing the extent of grant paid to Central and Deemed Universities on account of the factors during 1969-70 to 1973-74, 1974-75 and 1975-76.

Central Universities.	Grants paid	Factor I* Medical College and Hospitals	Factor II* Campuses Develop- ment	Student Amenities	Factor III* Develop- ment sche- mes having sharing basis.	Total (I-III) factors) (Cols. 3+4 +5+6)	Balance after elimi- nating these factors	Grants paid to the State Uni- versities.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
(In lakhs of Rupees)								
I. 1969-70 to 1973-74	2414.32	491.37	63.72	36.11	129.29	720.49	1493.83	4507.60
II. 1974-75	628.98	92.58	17.66	12.44	32.88	155.56	473.42	1259.46
III. 1975-76	756.25	60.32	93.80	7.42	13.04	174.58	581.67	1507.39
<i>Deemed to be Institutions.</i>								
I. 1969-70 to 1973-74	475.59	39.88	39.88	435.62	
II. 1974-75	176.69	0.73	0.73	175.96	
III. 1975-76	232.13	2.13	2.13	230.00	

*NOTE : Factor I : grants to Central Universities not only included development grants were normally paid to other universities but also grants paid for the medical colleges and hospitals attached to two Central universities;
 Factor II : grants for campus development were paid only to Central Universities as grants for State Universities were provided by the State Governments; and
 Factor III : assistance to the Central Universities for all the schemes was on cent per cent basis, whereas in the case of the State Universities, in certain cases, e.g. construction of hostels and staff quarters, the same was provided on a matching basis.

6.8. The distribution of grants as between Central and deemed universities and State universities, after elimination of the three factors mentioned in the preceding paragraph (i.e. allowing the margin of deduction therefor), does not show any variable trend, as may be seen from the following table:

	1969-70 to 1973-74	1974-75	1975-76	total	Percentage to total grants
Central Universities	1493.83	473.42	581.67	2548.92	34
Deemed Universities	435.62	175.96	230.00	841.58	7
State Universities	4907.60	1259.46	1507.39	7674.45	59
TOTAL	6837.05	1908.84	2319.06	11064.95	100

6.9. The special role assigned to Central Universities has been indicated in the following words, in a written note, by the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare:

“Broadly speaking the Central universities are required to provide courses which need facilities ordinarily beyond the reach of the State universities or for which the demands would be too small if limited only to the requirements of State.

There is also a special role for Central universities. Just as some areas are economically backward, so also are some areas educationally backward and one of the special functions of the Central universities will be to contribute towards removal of imbalances from the academic life of our country and to take suitable action to help deserving students from educationally backward areas. In order to achieve this objective, it is the responsibility of the Central universities to provide for adequate facilities.

The Central universities have also generally been able to encourage good teaching at all levels. Concentration of post-graduate studies and research in these universities helps them to develop their areas to higher levels.

They have been able to function as Centres of Advanced Studies in a number of disciplines. It has also been possible for many departments of these universities to acquire and use sophisticated and expensive equipment rationally and economically for the benefit of researches for themselves and for the neighbouring institutions and research centres.

Research programmes organised are also at higher levels, in many cases comparable to international standards. These institutions are in the best position to introduce interdisciplinary and multi-disciplinary courses for restructuring courses. They should be in a position to provide leadership to restructure courses in terms of national objectives. In view of the above, the comparison of resources given for plan programmes in terms of student enrolment is neither realistic nor scientific. The requirements for development have to be analysed in terms of the number of departments, number of courses, level of courses, level of researches and other relevant factors."

6.10. The rationale behind giving cent per cent grants to Central Universities for their all-round development and maintenance, as indicated by the Ministry is summed up in the following paragraphs:

"The Commission gives cent per cent grants to Central Universities for their developments in terms of their present academic standard, stage of development and their requirements. The facilities provided vary with each university as some of them provide facilities for medical, engineering and agricultural education while some other universities may only provide for some or part of such sectors of higher education. Further, some of these universities are residential to a great extent and other affiliating with arrangement of sharing of teaching and research at Post-graduate level as in Delhi.

The Commission plays the same role as State Governments for State Universities in the case of Central universities. It provides 100 per cent assistance for campus development of Central universities. i.e. for electricity supply, sewage disposal, approach roads etc. It is also required to provide assistance to newly set up Central universities for their establishment both for physical facilities and other items.

Comparison of resources merely in terms of student enrolment might give a misleading picture as for example, Aligarh Muslim University has 52 departments accounting for nearly 10,000 students; Banaras Hindu University has 93 departments accounting for over 12,000 students and is perhaps the only university in the world having almost all disciplines and courses at different levels under one umbrella; Delhi University has 54 departments accounting for nearly 20,000 students; and Jawaharlal Nehru University has 23 departments|schools|Centres accounting for more than 2000 students. The-North

Eastern Hill University has been set up especially to help the development of higher education in hill areas; and Visva Bharati which has also 28 departments has certain special courses as envisaged by Rabindra Nath Tagore. Viewed in this context the funds utilised by the Central Universities might not be considered disproportionately large. The needs of the departments of the Central Universities have been assessed in identical manners as for State universities. Only in the case of new Central universities of Hyderabad and North Eastern Hill University and Jawaharlal Nehru University more funds had to be envisaged as were considered necessary for their establishment as distinct from the development of the established universities.

In the case of Central Universities, the expenditure on establishment is also to be met by the Commission. For Jawaharlal Nehru University which functions more at research levels, a conscious effort is being made to encourage new courses and areas related to national needs and to make them comparable to similar courses obtaining anywhere in the world."

6.11. The following table indicating the allocation of development grants as between Delhi Colleges and other colleges during the Fourth Five Year Plan period and for the years 1974-75 and 1975-76, shows that although the Delhi colleges had student enrolment of between 2 and 3 per cent, an allocation of Rs. 305.92 lakhs (being 9.78 per cent of the total grants to colleges during this period) was made to them, whereas the other colleges accounting for between 82 and 83 per cent of the total enrolment got Rs. 3486.36 lakhs representing 90.22 per cent:

	1969-70 to 1973-74	1974-75	1975-76	Total	Percent- age of grants to colle- ges
Delhi Colleges	226.85*	41.91	37.16	305.92	9.78
Other Colleges	2719.49	412.01	354.86	3486.36	90.22
TOTAL					100.00

*Excluding maintenance grant of Rs. 588.47 lakhs.

Note : In 1975-76, the total number of colleges was 1503 and of Delhi Colleges 55.

6.12. It was pointed out to the Ministry that during the Fourth Plan period the share of grants to 'other colleges' was 24.4 per cent of the total grants, whereas the colleges under this category covered as much as 82.8 per cent of the total student strength. During 1974-75 and 1975-76, the share of grants was 16.4 and 12.4 per cent respectively while the student enrolment was 82.6 and 82.4 per cent respectively. They were asked to indicate the reasons for allocating a disproportionately low percentage of grants for high percentage of student strength covered by 'other colleges'. The Ministry have, in a written note furnished to the Committee, admitted the decline in the quantum of grants to 'other colleges' during the first two years of the 5th Plan. Explaining this decline the Ministry have stated:

"The payments in 1974-75 has been mainly on on-going programmes continued as spill over items carried from the 4th plan period. New schemes could not be taken up by the colleges as the Commission could invite proposals under the scheme for the development of undergraduate education in arts, science and commerce colleges only in December 1974. The colleges were requested initially to send an integrated proposal in two priorities—I priority Rs. 3 lakhs and II priority Rs. 2 lakhs. These proposals were to be sent through the affiliating university. It was only late in 1975 that some proposals could be received in the Commission and only a few proposals were accepted by the Commission in 1975-76. This accounted for the low expenditure in the first and second year of the current plan. Generally the expenditure on different schemes is less in the first two years of the Plan and pick up in the last two years of the Plan.

Fresh proposals for improvement of post-graduate studies could be invited only in April 1975 as the norms and conditions regarding introduction of post-graduate courses were reviewed by the Commission in the meanwhile.

The main difficulty for colleges to lift assistance under these programmes is the inability in raising matching share. The Commission has consciously included in the Fifth Plan period, programmes for faculty improvement and remedial teaching courses and workshops for which assistance is made available on 100 per cent basis, under the scheme for the development of under-graduate education in arts, science and commerce colleges. This was done with a view to linking the assistance programmes with improvement of quality at under-graduate level.

Towards the end of 1973 the Government of India imposed a temporary ban on the construction of non-functional building to exercise economy in expenditure. This led to a virtual stoppage of building activity for such projects which had not gone beyond plinth level. It was only in January 1976 that the Commission in the light of the fresh instructions received from the Government of India informed the universities and colleges for lifting the temporary ban imposed on the construction of non-functional buildings. The expenditure during 1974-75 thus declined and the payments in 1975-76 were even less than the same in 1974-75 as substantial payments on on-going programmes was made in 1974-75 and payments on new programmes had not started in 1975-76. The payments on new schemes, however, has picked up in 1976-77 and an expenditure of Rs. 422.16 lakhs has been made to other colleges during this year.

During the 4th plan period, there was no restriction on utilisation of funds for building projects and it was also not necessary for colleges to prepare integrated proposals. The Commission changed its policy in the current plan according to which the assistance for buildings of colleges has been restricted to 1/3rd of the total assistance under the development of under-graduate education in arts, science and commerce colleges and 25 per cent of the assistance in the case of post-graduate colleges. But from the experience, it has been seen that the colleges generally seek assistance mainly for buildings. Even though the Commission has given priority to programmes of faculty improvement, remedial courses, workshops on 100 per cent basis in the current plan and has also allowed major portion of the assistance to be used for purchase of books and journals and equipment (UGC meets 75 per cent of the approved cost on these items), the colleges have been less enthusiastic about such quality improvement programmes and generally show a preference to seek assistance for construction projects.

During the Fourth Plan period, the Commission's share for the academic building construction project was 2/3rd of the approved cost whereas in the current plan it has been reduced to 50 per cent of the approved cost for building projects. Another reason for low rate of progress is that Commission has also revised the eligibility conditions for seeking assistance, as the colleges were required to have

minimum prescribed enrolment including PUC/Pre-Degree/Intermediate classes in the 4th Plan, whereas the minimum enrolment prescribed for the current plan excludes them."

6.13. As regards the comparison of grants released to 'other colleges' with their student enrolment, the Ministry have stated:

"Comparison of grants released to colleges with the student strength in these colleges is neither realistic nor scientific. The problem, however, has to be looked at from a different angle rather than on a mere statistical comparisons. The total referred enrolment relates to the total number of colleges in the country which are over 4500. Of these only 3267 affiliated colleges have been included under Section 2(f) of the UGC Act. This includes about 850 professional colleges like engineering and technology, agriculture, medicine, veterinary science, pharmacy etc. which are not eligible for developmental assistance from the UGC as also colleges established after 17th June 1972 and not permanently affiliated to the universities have not been declared fit to receive assistance under section 12A of the UGC Act. Of the remaining about 2200 colleges under Section 2(f) also do not *ipso facto* qualify for assistance from the Commission. The Commission has prescribed terms and conditions for availing its assistance under different programmes, i.e. minimum enrolment and faculty strength. Proposals received from such of the colleges which fulfil these conditions are considered by the Commission for assistance. Taking into account these factors the comparable student enrolment will be considerably reduced. The Commission has recently liberalised the eligibility conditions to make eligible for developmental assistance more colleges especially womens colleges and those located in backward areas. Also the pattern of assistance for colleges in backward areas has been made more liberal....

Out of the 1800 colleges which qualify for developmental assistance from the Commission on the basis of eligibility conditions, about 1400 colleges have already approached the Commission for assistance and the proposals from such of the colleges which have furnished requisite information have been accepted."

6.14. The measures taken to augment the quantum of assistance to the institutions in the category of 'other colleges' have been spelt out in the Note as follows:

"In order to have the colleges to formulate proposals according to the guidelines workshops of the principals are being held under the auspices of the different universities.

In the joint discussions arranged at the time of annual plan discussions under the auspices of the Planning Commission, the State Governments have also been requested to provide for matching share to enable the lifting of assistance available under the Commission's programme. The Commission has also decided recently that it would release its share without insisting on the matching share being spent first by the colleges.

With a view to helping the colleges to remove some of the existing inadequacies in providing essential books and equipment to support their academic programme the UGC is now releasing basic grants on 100 per cent basis to the colleges related to their student strength through the universities for the purchase of books and journals and equipment. A college with an enrolment between 150 to 400 students has been released a grant of Rs. 10,000 for books and journals, Rs. 10,000 for scientific equipment and a college having more than 1500 students has been released Rs. 40,000 for books and journals and Rs. 40,000 for scientific equipment. This is based on the student strength. The Commission hopes that in the current year the assistance to colleges will substantially increase and the tempo of expenditure will pick up and the position will improve substantially in 1977-78 and 1978-79.

It was left to the colleges to select the schemes that were urgently required and academically justified in accordance with the guidelines and norms prescribed by the Commission. The University has to recommend that there is justification and academic need for the development proposals and the college concerned has managerial ability and is functioning on sound lines. The needs of the colleges which are known to the universities to which they are affiliated were considered as assessed needs and the eligibility conditions prescribed. In the context of this procedure the Commission feels that the assistance was.

provided on the basis of needs assessed to the extent feasible and on the basis of the norms prescribed by the Commission taking into account the realities of the situation.

The Commission had also undertaken the question of surveying the position of affiliated colleges in the States. Such surveys were taken up in States like Rajasthan, Orissa, Kerala, Mysore and the remaining States had also been requested to carry on similar surveys. The response was not encouraging. The follow-up to the survey reports in the States where they were undertaken had also not been satisfactory in the absence of active collaboration of the universities and the State Governments. The Sri Venkateswara University has already undertaken such surveys with the help of district committee of experts. Recently the Commission has requested the affiliating universities to set up college development councils to take up such measures for the improvement of under-graduate education in colleges.

In the 5th plan eligible colleges providing under-graduate education in arts, science and commerce having an enrolment up to 1000 students at the degree level can claim an assistance of Rs. 5 lakhs from the Commission and those with over 1000 and below 2000 students up to Rs. 8 lakhs whereas colleges having an enrolment over 2000 students are eligible for assistance up to Rs. 10 lakhs.

The Commission has recently taken note of the problems of smaller colleges and colleges located in backward areas and requested the universities to recommend the case of one or two such colleges in a district which do not fulfil the prescribed eligibility conditions but which in their opinion deserve UGC assistance."

6.15. Assistance is provided to colleges on requests for specific purposes subject to a prescribed pattern of assistance and ceilings. The Committee enquired whether this pattern of development assistance or ceiling also applied to Delhi Colleges. In reply, the Ministry of Education have stated in a written note:

"Since the transfer of the work relating to the payment of grants to Delhi Colleges from the Ministry of Education to UGC, funds are provided for the establishment of the colleges as was done earlier by the Ministry of Educa-

tion. Assistance is also provided for development purposes, which on the average is rather small since adequate care is taken that all normal facilities required by a College, on the basis of norms prescribed, are made available in the initial stages. It may be added that, in view of the limitation of resources, the buildings of these colleges are constructed in different phases.

There has been considerable expenditure on buildings etc. of the colleges as during 1966—74, 16 colleges were started in Delhi and most of these were located in school buildings. As soon as it is practicable to provide permanent buildings for the colleges, it may be possible to work out a scheme to provide only development assistance which, as indicated above, may be of a lower level than in colleges affiliated to the State Universities in future plans.

Since 1973-74, no new Arts, Science and Commerce colleges was established in Delhi. It may also be pointed out in certain cases, e.g. transfer of teaching of under-graduate courses in science, from the University Departments to Colleges, assistance had to be provided on a different sharing basis, as the university could not share the burden of an increased enrolment and was anxious not only to shed under-graduate classes but to concentrate on post-graduate teaching where the enrolment was also increasing.

Further since the Commission is providing maintenance grants to these colleges, their requirements for buildings, books and equipment had to be viewed in a different perspective, and also keeping in view the federal structure of the University."

6.16. Replying to the question whether the release of grants to Delhi Colleges on a substantially higher scale as compared to other colleges was considered equitable in relation to student enrolment, the Ministry have stated:

"The position in the case of Delhi colleges may not be tenable in view of the fact that Rs. 5.83 crores were paid to the colleges as maintenance grants from plan funds. If this is taken away the grants given in 4th plan comes only to Rs. 2.27 crores. The position of developmental grants

paid to Delhi colleges during 1969-70 to 1976-77 is as below:

Year	No. of colleges assisted	Rupees paid (Rs. paid in lakhs)
1969-70	37	42.21
1970-71	40	42.44
1971-72	40	29.35
1972-73	43	48.55
1973-74	43	63.30
1974-75	44	35.29
1975-76	45	32.46

This shows that for the Fourth Five Year Plan the assistance per Delhi college has been Rs. 5 lakhs on an average. The colleges affiliated to the State universities could claim assistance from the Commission to the tune of Rs. 4 lakhs (Rs. 3 lakhs+Rs. 1 lakh on the merits of each case) per college in the 4th Plan. In the 5th Plan, the Commission has a scheme under its share of assistance to colleges affiliated to State Universities is Rs. 5 lakhs to a college with an enrolment between 600 and 1000 students in degree classes; Rs. 8 lakhs for students strength between 1001 and 2000 and Rs. 10 lakhs in the case of those colleges having students enrolment more than 2000 students. The 4th Plan assistance to Delhi colleges has thus not been larger than State colleges. In the case of the bulk of the colleges the assistance has been on non-comparable terms. In fact 35 colleges were given only small grants for less than Rs. 3 lakhs per college. Only in the case of a few colleges, the assistance has been more than Rs. 10 lakhs per college.

The Delhi colleges also prepare their development proposals, and in the case of extended colleges having an effective enrolment of 1500 students, the assistance is given on 100 per cent basis, for the increased strength beyond 1000 for which facilities were requisitioned. In the case of university maintained colleges and evening classes of the colleges the non-recurring grants are paid on 100 per cent basis. For these reasons a few colleges might receive more assistance but in general in respect of plan grants

the Delhi colleges have not received any advantage over the colleges affiliated to State universities. Assistance for the establishment of colleges or purchase of land for colleges is given only on a matching share basis.

Further apart from Rs. 5 lakhs scheme for which assistance is given to colleges affiliated to State universities, selected colleges also receive assistance upto Rs. 3 lakhs per college under programmes of College Science Improvement Programme, College Humanities Improvement Programme and other improvement programmes. In the case of Delhi colleges such schemes are not in operation.

The needs of the colleges located in Metropolitan cities have to be viewed differently from the needs of the colleges located in other cities. For this reason, for the current 5th year plan, the Commission has also provided assistance for inter-institutional facilities for colleges located in Metropolitan cities of Calcutta, Bombay and Madras. This assistance is available in addition to the normal assistance that is available to colleges under the scheme of the development of under-graduate education in Arts, Science and Commerce.

The Delhi Colleges and the University of Delhi collaborate in teaching programmes. While the Delhi university provides teaching for the post-graduate education, the colleges which enrol the students arrange for tutorials, seminar etc. for preparing them towards self-study. The classroom lectures for post-graduate courses are arranged in the campuses. Programmes of innovation initiated by Delhi University are, therefore, automatically implemented by colleges in Delhi.

A number of Delhi colleges sponsored by the Delhi Administration are located in school buildings and in their respect the Commission has been extending assistance for putting up permanent buildings and in such cases such institutions have received more assistance."

6.17. The Committee find that out of the development grants totalling Rs. 165.39 crores released by the UGC during the seven-year period from 1969-70 to 1975-76, the share of Central Universities and Deemed Universities was 27.2 per cent against 46 per cent share of all the State Universities put together. It was explained that excessive expenditure on Central Universities was, on account of exclusive features such as grants paid for (i) the medical colleges

and hospitals attached to two Central Universities, (ii) Campuses-development and Student amenities, and (iii) Schemes having assistance on cent per cent basis in the case of Central Universities and sharing basis in the case of State Universities. From the information furnished by Government, it is revealed that even if we exclude from the total grants paid to the Central Universities and Deemed Universities the grants on account of the above three factors, out of grants totalling Rs. 110.65 crores made to the Central Universities, Deemed Universities and State Universities, the share of Central and Deemed Universities was 41 per cent against 59 per cent of the State Universities, although the number of Central/Deemed universities was only 10 as against 104 of State Universities. Development grants made during the same period to Delhi Colleges have similarly been on the high side as compared to grants to 'other colleges'. Out of development grants totalling Rs. 37.92 crores to all the colleges, about 10 per cent (Rs. 3.06 crores) went to Delhi Colleges alone.

6.18. The Committee disapprove this inequitable distribution of grants considering the fact that the student coverage of State Universities and 'other colleges' is much wider than that of Delhi Colleges. The Committee have noted the reasons advanced by the Ministry for low intake of development grant by the State Universities and 'other colleges' during 1974-75 and 1975-76 and also the measures taken by the U.G.C. in the Fifth Five Year Plan to augment their intake. They would like UGC to play a positive role in creating conditions in which it should be possible for the State Universities and Colleges to take advantage of the facilities of development grant from the UGC in greater measure than hitherto.

(b) *Disparity in grants released to State Universities.*

Audit paragraph

6.19. It was noticed that the grants released to the various State universities varied considerably. An analysis of grants paid in the Fourth Plan period to 71 such State universities that existed at the commencement of the Plan revealed the following position:

No. of State Universities	Enrolment in 1973-74	Amount (in lakhs of Rupees)	Percentage to total grants to the State Universities
A set of 12 universities	87,469	2,069.19	42.2
A set of another 12 universities	13,274	198.86	4.1
Remaining 47 universities	2,21,518	2,639.55	53.7

The *inter se* disparity in release of grants was attributed by the Commission to (i) non-availability of matching grants from State Governments according to prescribed pattern of assistance and (ii) varying stages of development of the universities themselves.

6.20. It was noticed that there was wide diversity in the grants released to different colleges as may be seen from the table below:

Number of the universities to which the colleges were affiliated	Year	Grants released (in lacs of Rs.)	Percentage to total assistance
A set of 21	1972-73	492.47	55.4
	1973-74	301.90	43.7
	1974-75	273.52	60.3
	1975-76	215.93	60.8
Another set of 21	1972-73	47.06	5.0
	1973-74	38.50	5.6
	1974-75	48.93	10.8
	1975-76	34.26	9.7
Remaining 31	1972-73	349.77	39.6
	1973-74	350.75	50.7
	1974-75	130.90	28.9
	1975-76	104.67	29.5

Note: Grants released to the colleges affiliated to agricultural universities being negligible, have been excluded from the above table.

There were 4308 colleges out of which 2977 were recognised by the Commission as on 1st December 1974 as eligible for assistance. It was stated that several colleges could not avail of the assistance on account of difficulty in regard to requirement of matching grant. In this connection, it was noticed that the Education Commission had recommended that the University Grants Commission in consultation with State Governments should examine the question of classification of colleges in terms of level and achievement and make use of it in the allocation of grants to colleges under the Fourth Five Year Plan. The recommendation does not seem to have been specifically considered by the Commission.

[Paragraph 48 of the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India for the year 1975-76, Union Government (Civil), pp. 225—227].

6.21. The Committee desired to know the reasons for the grave *inter se* disparity that existed in the matter of distribution of funds between State Universities. The Chairman, UGC stated in reply during evidence:

"The policy of the UGC is that the funds should be made available to those colleges which are qualified and which will be able to use the funds in a proper manner. The question is how do we ensure this? We try to disseminate our programme as widely as possible. We are bringing out bulletins thrice in a year which are sent free of cost to every college principal and to the library of every college and university so that they know what are the precise schemes of the Commission. In addition to this, we have been convening meetings of the Principals in specific areas where the universities are asked to call the College principals and the representatives of the Government so that they may not only know what the schemes of the Commission are but the difficulties which the Principals face are taken into account. Conferences of this kind have been held for a number of years. The major difficulty which we have encountered is that for most of our schemes, a certain matching share has to be provided either by the management or by the management and the State Government combined and every often the difficulty is that this matching share is not available to the colleges."

6.22. Asked whether this principle does not lend to restrict grants only to those institutions which have the capacity to raise matching funds, the Chairman, UGC replied:

"To some extent it is correct but one would imagine that the developmental grant for higher education which has been allocated by the Planning Commission to the State Government, would be used for development; and not merely for expansion which tends to be the case."

He further added:

"The primary question which arises is: do we draw a line somewhere or do we say that any college which is qualified under 2(f) irrespective of standards, irrespective of its infrastructure, must receive developmental money from the UGC? It is the primary responsibility of the State Government to establish a college. Once a college is

established, then we can help to develop it but our developmental grant cannot and should not be meant for the establishment of a college.

6.23. In the context of difficulties faced by State Universities/Colleges, for want of matching share, the Secretary, UGC, stated during evidence:

“.....Chairman observed that instead of asking the colleges to come to us, we should go to the colleges. We have already started it. We are having regional conferences of the principals with the Vice-Chancellors and also wherever possible with representatives of the State Governments. We are telling them what the schemes are and how we could not accept their proposals. Now we have gone to their doors and we are persuading them to take as much as they can. But the only point is that they have to find their part of the share.”

6.24. Giving his views regarding the application of the principle of matching grants, the Chairman, UGC stated in evidence:

“I do not think, it is feasible or desirable for the Commission to give hundred per cent grant because education being essentially a State subject, the responsibility of the State Government and of the Managing Committee ought to be maintained. We have been giving as much of the share as we can with the funds available to use. Thus, it should be feasible for the management and the State Government to provide 25 per cent matching share if they consider that helping the colleges to provide for equipment and books is important enough.”

6.25. The Secretary, Ministry of Education stated during evidence:

“Out of a total sum of Rs. 94 lakhs disbursed from 1970 to 1974, there are only two or three cases where the funds could not be utilised. I do not know whether the Committee think that because of these two or three incidents, the scheme has not been a success. The scheme, on the whole, has been really welcomed.”

6.26. On the other hand, according to the information furnished by the Ministry to the Audit, several colleges could not avail of the assistance on account of difficulty in regard to requirements of matching grant. This problem was also highlighted by the Commission in its reply to the questionnaire formulated by the Review Committee, wherein it had, *inter alia*, stated that even in the case of “many universities it has not been possible to provide the basic needs.”

6.27. One of the Study Groups of the PAC during their visit to Rajasthan University learnt from the Registrar that though some of the posts (out of teaching posts of 15 Professors, 10 Readers, 20

Lecturers/Research Associates and 9 others included in the plan allocation for 4th Plan for Rajasthan University) were sanctioned in 1972, the allocation could not be fully utilised because the State Government could not give assurance for bearing committed liability in respect of any post. Consequently, one post of Professor, 7 posts of Lecturers and 5 posts of Research Associates could not be filled in and the grants amounting to Rs. 22.26 lakhs remained unpaid to the University.

6.28. As early as in 1964, the Sapru Committee had in their report observed that the system of matching grants had not worked satisfactorily and that both State Governments and Universities found it difficult to provide matching funds. They had recommended that depending upon the merits of the case the conditions of grants should be liberalised. Asked to indicate, what has been the reaction of the Government in regard to this recommendation, the Ministry of Education have, in a written note, stated:

“After careful consideration of the recommendation in consultation with the University Grants Commission, it was decided that the system of matching grants could not be entirely dispensed with under the existing conditions. However, in the University Grants Commission (Amendment) Act, 1972, provision was made empowering the Commission to give grants to the State Universities for the maintenance of any specified activities of such universities. This provision is intended to assist the Universities in exceptionally deserving cases towards maintenance of any specified activity.”

6.29. Asked how far the approach of the UGC has been ‘need-based’, the Secretary UGC stated in evidence:

“I fully agree with you that the question may not be looked from a narrow angle but from the ‘need-based’ point of view. We shall take further steps in that direction.”

6.30. As it appeared to the Committee that assistance to colleges under this scheme was not provided on the basis of any assessed needs of the colleges or on the basis of norms related to students enrolment etc., the Committee enquired as to the basis and criterion for assistance to a University/College and the ceiling for grants per University/College. In reply, the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare have, in a written note, stated:

“The Commission decides ceiling allocation for universities based on their size, stage of development, number of courses and other relevant factors. In this respect, the State Universities have more or less been treated on an equal footing with Central Universities except that in addition to the allocation made, the State Governments also provide matching share for the schemes approved. . . .”

6.31. The Committee find that there has been considerable disparity in the quantum of grants released to State universities inter se. During evidence it transpired that the main reason for the inter se disparity in the release of grants to the universities is the application of the principle of matching grants whereby the release of grants from the UGC is conditional on a certain percentage of expenditure being met by the State Governments/managements. The Committee would like Government to give a fresh look to this principle so as to modify it in such a manner that it does not act as a stumbling block for such universities and colleges in States as are less advanced educationally and economically and are unable to take advantage of the facilities of development grants available from the UGC.

(c) *Maintenance grants to Delhi Colleges out of Plan funds.*
Audit paragraph.

6.32. The Plan outlay is meant to be utilised for new programmes during a Plan period while the level of expenditure reached at the end of a particular Plan is treated as maintenance expenditure to be met from Non-Plan funds. It was noticed that a sum of Rs. 5.88 crores was paid as maintenance grants to the newly established constituent/affiliated colleges of Delhi University from the Plan funds. A test check revealed that a number of these colleges had, in fact, been in existence even in the earlier Plans.

[Paragraph 48 of the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India for the year 1975-76, Union Government (Civil), pp. 227-228].

6.33. The Committee have dealt with maintenance expenditure incurred on Delhi Colleges in a subsequent para in this report. Here they would deal with such expenditure incurred out of plan funds.

6.34. Year-wise details of the part of maintenance expenditure which was met out of Plan funds has been indicated as under:

Year	Amount paid (Rs. in lakhs)
1969-70	2.55
1970-71	95.10
1971-72	127.06
1972-73	182.34
1973-74	181.42
	588.47

6.35. The total number of Delhi Colleges which received such assistance is indicated as 44. Out of these, 38 colleges were in existence before the commencement of the Fourth Plan.

6.36. The Ministry have indicated that payment of maintenance grants partly out of Plan funds during the Fourth Plan period was due to the following reasons:

1. Setting up of new colleges.
2. Taking over of certain colleges by the Delhi University.
3. Starting of Evening classes in some colleges.
4. Certain colleges being brought under the Extended Colleges Scheme.

6.37. An analysis of the statement (reproduced as Appendix III) furnished by the Ministry, at the instance of the Committee, shows that out of a total of 44 colleges which received such grants as many as 22 colleges were not covered by any of the reasons indicated above.

6.38. Another reason advanced by the Ministry for meeting maintenance expenditure out of Plan funds is stated to be the decision of the Commission to pay grant for the hostel mess staff of the Delhi Colleges from 1971-72.

6.39. In a written note furnished at the instance of the Committee, explaining the reasons for meeting maintenance expenditure out of Plan funds the Ministry have stated:

"The maintenance grants to Delhi Colleges are paid on the basis of grant-in-aid rules prescribed for the purpose. During the Fourth Plan period, there has been an increase

in the enrolment and some new colleges were started. The maintenance grant for these would be a charge on the Plan funds. Further consequent upon additional enrolment in the existing colleges and starting of new courses, additional staff had to be appointed and there was further increase in other expenditure. Normally the grant for these items should also have been a charge on Plan funds. Since it was not administratively convenient to have separate accounts for these items, it was agreed with the concurrence of the Government of India that the expenditure on grant-in-aid to Delhi Colleges that could not be met out of the provision of non-Plan funds, may be met out of the Plan funds. This practice, however, has been in vogue during 1969—74 only."

6.40. Explaining the compulsions on account of which this unusual practice was resorted to, the Ministry of Education have, in a note, stated:

"During the Fourth Plan period, there has been an increase in the enrolment in Delhi Colleges and instead of starting new colleges some of them, therefore, were brought under the extended colleges scheme which resulted in the appointment of additional staff and increase in other expenditure. As it was not feasible to maintain separate accounts for the extended colleges scheme, it was decided by the Commission that the maintenance grants of all colleges be determined on the basis of grant-in-aid rules and the amount which could not be met out of non-Plan funds be met out of Plan funds. This was also envisaged while submitting the Commissions requirements of Plan funds."

6.41. The Committee desired to know how it was not feasible to maintain separate accounts for the extended colleges scheme, the Ministry have, in a written note, stated:

"Maintenance grant is paid to cover the establishment and other day-to-day maintenance expenditure, including items of expenditure for books, furniture and equipment/apparatus/chemicals for science laboratories etc. in accordance with the prescribed norms. From the administrative and accounting points of view, it did not seem feasible to maintain separate accounts for expenditure chargeable to plan funds for the extended college scheme introduced in some of the colleges with a view to solve the problem

of increased admissions. In view of this, it was thought appropriate, not to maintain separate accounts for the extended colleges scheme."

6.42. On the Committee enquiring whether specific approval of the Planning Commission was obtained for this arrangement, the Ministry of Education have stated:

"Since the funds to the UGC are provided by the Ministry of Education, the concurrence to the above arrangement was obtained from the Government of India in that Ministry. The Commission does not approach the Planning Commission direct for funds. It may also be pointed out that the paper submitted to the Planning Commission through the Ministry of Education for annual Plan did include the amount required for paying maintenance grant to the Delhi Colleges."

6.43. It is significant to note in this context that the Planning Commission (Education Division) had specifically brought to the notice of the UGC that normally Plan funds should not be utilised for maintenance expenditure. In the meeting held in the Planning Commission on 20 July, 1971 to discuss further the Fourth Plan Annual Plan programmes of the UGC, a request was made to the UGC to make available to the Planning Commission a note on the subject giving the magnitude of the outlays involved and the number of colleges thus assisted, as a prelude to taking up the matter further with the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare and the Ministry of Finance.

6.44. During evidence the Secretary, University Grants Commission, defending the unusual practice stated:

"There are grant-in-aid rules for paying grants to the Delhi Colleges. Money comes from the non-Plan expenditure. In addition to this during the Fourth Plan period five to six colleges were started in Delhi. Also in some colleges evening classes were started. So, the expenditure on their grant-in-aid had to be met out of Plan funds because it was a new activity undertaken during the Plan. It was decided with the approval of the Government that any expenditure for payment of the maintenance grant other than provided in the non-Plan could be met from the Plan and this was reflected in the budget itself."

6.45. The Committee consider that it was principally wrong on the part of the UGC to have appropriated Plan funds to meet part of the maintenance expenditure of Delhi Colleges during the Fourth Plan period and of the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare to have acquiesced in this. The Committee do not agree with the explanation offered by the Ministry that "from the administrative and accounting points of view it did not seem feasible to maintain separate accounts for expenditure chargeable to Plan funds for the extended colleges schemes." The Committee have no doubt that if definite instructions had been given to the Delhi Colleges to maintain separate accounts for extended colleges schemes and evening shifts introduced by them and the grants were made conditional thereto, it should have been possible for them to maintain the accounts accordingly. The Committee further note that out of a total 44 colleges which were given grants for maintenance out of Plan funds as many as 22 colleges were not covered by any of the reasons advanced by Government for adopting this practice. This shows that the Commission had indiscriminately given maintenance grants to almost all the Delhi Colleges in existence during the Fourth Plan out of Plan funds and the arguments advanced are too facile to be accepted. The Commission and the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare also did not take the Planning Commission into confidence before taking such a step. The Committee take adverse notice of this unusual practice adopted during the Fourth Plan. The Committee hope that it would not be repeated in future.

Affiliation of colleges to universities

6.46. It is part of the function of the Universities to affiliate colleges and confer degrees on their students. The requirements of affiliation vary greatly from university to university. On the basis of recommendations of the Coordination Committee considered by the University Grants Commission at its meeting held on 9th/10th February, 1959, the Commission addressed the universities on 4-5-1959 for collecting copies of rules laid down by the Universities for affiliation of colleges. The matter was considered at the Vice Chancellors Conference held in October, 1962 which recommended that the power of affiliating colleges should vest in the universities and there should not be any interference or pressure from the State Government or any other agency.

6.47. In September, 1962, the University Grants Commission appointed a Committee on Colleges which recommended:

"No college should be granted affiliation by a University unless the basic requirements relating to staff, library and laboratory equipment are provided at the very outset."

6.48. The University Grants Commission considered this and other recommendations at its meeting held on 4th September, 1963 and decided that the question of implementing these recommendations be taken up during the Fourth Plan period.

6.49. In April, 1964, the Committee on Colleges was reconstituted. The University Grants Commission considered its report and decided that it may be referred to the Education Commission for their consideration.

6.50. The Education Commission (1964—66) made the following recommendations in paragraphs 13.52 to 60 in regard to affiliation of colleges:

- “(1) Affiliation of colleges should be granted by the Universities after consultations with the State Governments have been made.
- (2) A Committee of Vice-Chancellors in the State should be set up to advise the Education Department regarding the grant-in-aid to affiliated colleges.
- (3) There should be a council of affiliated colleges in every affiliating university to advise the university on all matters relating to affiliation of colleges.
- (4) The existing machinery for the grant of affiliating to colleges and for their periodical inspection should be strengthened.
- (5) The University Grants Commission may examine the question of a small nucleus staff being sanctioned to each affiliating university for the proper organisation of an inspection programme.
- (6) Affiliation should be regarded as a privilege which is to be continually earned and deserved.
- (7) The most important reform which alone will make it possible to improve affiliated colleges is to relate enrolments to the facilities available.”

6.51. The Committee desired to know whether the University Grants Commission, have issued any guidelines to the universities in regard to affiliation of colleges over since 1959 and if not, whether the issue of any such guidelines to bring about uniformity in the matter has been examined by the University Grants Commission.

6.52. The Secretary, University Grants Commission stated in reply during evidence:

“So far the Commission has not laid down the rules for affiliation of the colleges. These are prescribed under the statutes—Act establishing the universities. We can give the guidelines for the purpose of affiliation. A few years back a suggestion was made that a college before it is affiliated should have an endowment of so much rupees. Lately, consequent upon it, a Vice-Chancellors* Committee on Governance of University had been set up. This Committee has submitted reports:

1. In regard to the governance of universities; and
2. in regard to the teachers revision of scales of pay.

The Committee is at work to indicate amongst other what should be the conditions for affiliation. The Committee is likely to give the same soon. This will be circulated to the Universities and the State Governments for their consideration.

In addition to that, in the Report of the Committee on Colleges published in 1967, broad guidelines for affiliations were indicated. These were circulated to the Universities.

The basic question of finding funds comes up.

We may lay down any conditions. As the hon. Member mentioned—there may be colleges without a library or a laboratory, and still it has been affiliated. Funds are to be provided.”

6.53. Subsequently, in a written note, the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare have stated:

“The University Grants Commission had sometime back appointed a Committee to consider issues relevant to the governance of universities and colleges. This Committee has already submitted its report on Governance of Universities and Teachers. This Committee in its Report on ‘Colleges’ is likely to deal with in a comprehensive manner the conditions of affiliation of colleges to the universities which may serve as guidelines for the universities.”

*Appointed in April, 1969.

6.54. The Committee learn that at present the affiliation of colleges is entirely the responsibility of the respective universities and the rules therefor are prescribed in the various statutes under which the universities are established and the University Grants Commission has not laid down any rules, not even guidelines. The Committee on Governance of Universities was at present studying this question. The Committee desire that the UGC should make a study of the rules for affiliation of colleges prescribed in or under different university statutes and try to evolve guidelines for affiliation which should be commended to the various State Governments and universities for observance while granting affiliation to colleges in future.

(e) *Recognition, eligibility and actual Assistance to colleges*

6.55. During 1975-76 the total number of colleges was 4508. Section 2(f) of the University Grants Commission Act, 1956, provides for recognition of Institutions by the Commission for the purposes of the Act. The Commission had as on 1-12-1976 recognised only 3267 colleges which works out to only 72 per cent of the total colleges in existence during 1975-76. Asked to state the reasons for 28 per cent of the colleges remaining unrecognised by the Commission, the Ministry have in a note furnished to the Committee stated that "the remaining colleges either did not fulfil the conditions laid down by the Commission..... or they had not approached for recognition." The Ministry have informed that "a detailed study has been taken by the Commission to determine reasons for such colleges not being included under Section 2(f) of the UGC Act."

6.56. In another communication to the Committee, the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare have stated that all of the colleges 'recognised' by the Commission "do not *ipso facto* qualify for assistance from the Commission. The Commission has prescribed terms and conditions for availing its assistance under different programmes, for example, minimum students enrolment and faculty strength. Proposals received from such all the colleges which fulfil these conditions are considered by the Commission."

6.57. The Ministry have furnished to the Committee a statement (Appendix IV) showing the information in respect of scheme of assistance under development of graduate education in Arts, Science and Commerce colleges for the year 1976-77. An analysis of the

statement indicates the following position in regard to colleges during 1976-77:

Statement showing the assistance for the development of undergraduate education in Arts, Science and Commerce colleges in 1976-77

State	No. of colleges under Section 2(f) of the UGC Act	No. of colleges eligible for* assistance for development of Undergraduate education in Arts, Science, Commerce colleges	No. of colleges which received assistance during 1976-77	No. of colleges whose proposals were received and could not be accepted in 1976-77
Uttar Pradesh	325	234	100	14
Bihar]	206	86	55	14
Assam	116	43	21	12
Delhi	56	46 [@]
Orissa	96	37	35	20
West Bengal	273	187	30	5
Madhya Pradesh	266	110	58	36
Maharashtra	450	200	96	32
Gujarat	237	124	22	19
Rajasthan	115	59	50	11
Andhra	191	120	25	6
Kerala	129	73	20	1
Tamil Nadu	207	107	25	20
Karnataka	257	80	13	5
Haryana	98	44	9	2
Himachal Pradesh	23	9	3	..
Jammu & Kashmir	28	18	9	1
Punjab	180	72	14	7
TOTA	3253	1649	585	205

*Satisfying the minimum enrolment condition. The enrolment for 1975-76 has been taken.

@Not eligible for assistance under 5 lakhs scheme. Assistance for development purposes provided separately.

6.58. It will be observed from the above Statement that during 1976-77, even out of 3253 colleges recognised by the Commission, only 1649 were eligible for Development Grant and this grant was actually released in the case of 585 colleges only.

6.59. In another statement (Appendix V) the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare, have furnished a State-wise details of colleges which had applied for grants and those which actually received grants from the Commission. The information has been given in respect of the years 1974-75, 1975-76 and 1976-77 and relates to the following schemes:

- (i) Scheme for assistance for development of under-graduate education in Arts, Science and Commerce Colleges;
- (ii) Scheme for establishment of student aid fund.
- (iii) Scheme for establishment of book banks.

6.60. A summary of the statement is given below:

- (i) *Summary of the statement showing the State-wise statistics of colleges assisted by U.G.C. under the Scheme for Development and Improvement of under-graduate education in Arts, Science and Commerce Colleges during 1974-75 to 1976-77.*

	1974-75		1975-76		1976-77	
	Applied	Assisted	Applied	Assisted	Applied	Assisted
Andhra	38	2	52	25
Assam	16	1	28	1	12	11
Bihar	48	..	61	5	11	35
Gujarat	7	1	9	2	21	16
Haryana	8	..	22	9
H. P.¶	2	..	5	3
J. & K.	12	9
Kerala	18	4	48	20
Karnataka	19	3	23	13
M. P.	8	..	39	8	76	52
Maharashtra	1	..	20	4	112	70

	1	2	3	4	5	6
Meghalaya & Mizoram	2	..	6	..	5	4
Orissa	39	..	37	1	8	24
Punjab	9	1	33	14
Rajasthan	45	34
T. N.	37	18	40	25
U. P.	127	5	48	100
N. B.	43	1	39	3	16	19
TOTAL	164	3	497	57	589	483

(ii) Summary of the statement showing the state-wise statistics of colleges assisted by UGC under the scheme for Student Aid Fund during 1974-75 to 1976-77.

	1974-75		1975-76		1976-77	
	Applied	Assisted	Applied	Assisted	Applied	Assisted
Andhra	95	70	100	74	83	63
Assam	47	49	38	38	35	38
Bihar	72	36	47	38	54	42
Gujarat	117	93	149	126	187	165
Haryana	76	69	68	60	72	62
Himachal Pradesh	6	5	6	6	11	9
Jammu & Kashmir	3	3	9	8	9	8
Kerala	85	65	75	62	94	71
Karnataka	183	97	150	119	148	123
Madhya Pradesh	152	115	178	144	200	171
Maharashtra	185	164	218	199	271	256
Meghalaya, Manipur and Mizoram	3	1	4	2	5	5
Orissa	56	31	56	40	46	42
Punjab	115	98	11	91	110	90
Rajasthan	37	37	26	26	50	50
Tamil Nadu	150	91	120	95	123	103
Uttar Pradesh	205	177	150	127	161	123
West Bengal	159	91	132	126	155	122
Delhi	39	37	31	29	40	39
TOTAL	1785	1326	2994	1410	1854	1581

(iii) *Summary of Statement showing the statistics of Colleges assisted by U.G.C. under the Scheme for Establishment of Book Bank in colleges during 1974-75 to 1976-77.*

	1974-75		1975-76		1976-77	
	Applied	Assisted	Applied	Assisted	Applied	Assisted
Andhra	37	31	100	91	53	45
Assam	20	16	64	51	16	15
Bihar	16	8	93	86	41	31
Gujarat	61	50	87	72	67	55
Haryana	34	25	46	41	60	55
H. P.	1	1	16	13	9	7
J & K	3	1	16	10	10	6
Kerala	30	25	59	50	64	55
Karnataka	97	32	140	101	150	125
M. P.	79	61	121	102	54	40
Maharashtra	118	109	83	78	149	141
Meghalya Manipur & Mizoram	3	2	10	8	1	1
Orissa	14	10	59	54	17	16
Punjab]	50	34	92	75	87	70
Rajasthan	28	28	39	39	48	48
Tamil Nadu]	86	36	105	77	105	88
Uttar Pradesh	51	46	171	161	141	123
West Bengal	58	50	122	119	50	47
Delhi]	34	33	10	11	31	27
TOTAL	816	598	1433	1239	1153	995

6.61. An analysis of the above statement indicates the following position:

Year	Development grant		Student Aid Fund		Book Bank	
	No. of colleges which applied	No. of colleges to which grants were released	No. of colleges which applied	No. of colleges to which grants were released	No. of colleges which applied	No. of colleges to which grants were released
1974-75 . . .	164	3	1785	1326	816	598
1975-76 . . .	497	57	2994	1410	1433	1239
1976-77 . . .	589	483	1854	1581	1153	995
TOTAL . . .	1250	543	6633	4317	3402	2832

6.62. The Committee note that during 1975-76, out of a total of 4508 colleges, only 3267, i.e. 72 per cent were recognised by the Commission under Section 2(f) of the UGC Act, 1956. The UGC has undertaken a detailed study to determine the reasons for all the colleges not being included under Section 2(f) of the UGC Act. The Committee observe that this study should be expedited and corrective action taken.

6.63. The Committee also note that out of 3267 colleges recognised by the Commission as on 1-12-1976, only 1649 colleges i.e. one-half were not eligible for Development Grants. The Committee would like the UGC to make a study of this aspect and take such measures as may be necessary to make a larger number of colleges eligible for development assistance from the UGC.

6.64. Out of 1250 applications for Development Grants received by the Commission during the three years from 1974-75 to 1976-77, grants were released during this period to a total of 543 colleges only. Of the 543 colleges to which grants were released, as many as 483 colleges were given grants during 1976-77 whereas during 1974-75 and 1975-76 only 60 colleges were given such grants. The Committee have elsewhere in the report recommended the rationalisation of procedures of scrutinisation of applications for grants and laying down of time-limits for disposal of applications received from the institutions. The Committee would also like the Commission to maintain an even flow of grants to the colleges and try to avoid bunching towards last years of the plan period.

6.65. In the view of the Committee no rationale or balance appears to have been observed in releasing grants to colleges as between different States or as between different universities, whereas in cer-

tain States almost all the colleges eligible for Development Grants were extended the assistance during 1976-77, in other States even one-sixth of the colleges eligible for such grants were not accommodated. Similarly, there are wide differences in the number of colleges to which grants were released during 1976-77 as between different universities to which these were affiliated. This corroborates the observations made in the Audit para that there was wide disparity in the grants released to the different colleges. The Committee would like the UGC to lay down guidelines for themselves with a view to bring in a measures of balance in release of grants to colleges as between different States and between different universities and try to minimise as far as possible, glaring disparities.

(f) Work procedures in the Commission

6.66. The Committee desired to know the procedure in the commission for examining the applications received from the colleges for assistance and the authority which takes final decision thereon. The Ministry of Education and Social Welfare stated in reply in a written note:

“Proposals from the colleges received through the universities duly forwarded and recommended by the universities along with necessary certificates are examined in the Commission, on the basis of the terms and conditions as contained in the guidelines for each scheme. If the colleges satisfies the minimum eligibility conditions in terms of student enrolment and minimum permanent teaching strength in case of development and improvement of undergraduate education in arts, science and commerce colleges, and as also supplies the necessary information as required according to the norms and specifications prescribed, the outright approval of grants for the purchase of books and equipment, additional staff, faculty improvement programme etc. In the case of building projects, in such cases where the eligibility conditions have been fulfilled and other information supplied, the approval in principle is conveyed for the building projects. Thereafter the college is requested to supply the plans and detailed estimates for the acceptance of the Commission with the necessary certificates from the PWD concerned that the rates provided in the estimates are according to the prevailing local P.W.D. schedule of rates. If the construction is not to be undertaken departmentally the details of tender information are forwarded to the Commission before the grants are released to the

college. If the information is not available then the college is requested to submit the required information/certificates.

In the case of establishment of Book Banks, a college is required to satisfy the condition of minimum student enrolment and to furnish the certificate regarding the availability of the required matching share.

For the programme of the establishment of Student-Aid-Fund, the college has to supply the information student enrolment during the preceding year and the collection made during the current year as also the utilisation certificates in respect of the grants paid during the preceding year. As soon as, this information is available the approval of the grant is conveyed to the college and necessary instalment of the grant is released along with the approval.

The procedure of processing the cases may be short, as well as, lengthy according to each scheme. In the case of book bank and Student Aid Fund, it is generally not a lengthy one. But in the case of development of under-graduate education in arts, science and commerce colleges, approval of the Commission would take a longer time because a single proposal may comprise a number of programmes for which assistance is required i.e. assistance for the purchase of books and equipment, for the construction of workshop shed and equipment, for extension of teaching accommodation, library or laboratory buildings, hostels etc. The proposal relating to each item is scrutinised in the light of the information required by the Commission and supplied by the college on the prescribed proforma. For the building projects, particularly the proposals are scrutinised and the building plans and estimates are examined in the light of the norms laid down by the Commission.

If the information is incomplete the Branch Officers concerned will write back to the college/university for necessary information/documents. After obtaining the necessary documents/information, the case is processed and the final approval to the proposal is accorded after obtaining the approval of the Vice-Chairman/Chairman for the Commission according to the distribution of work amongst them. However, in the case of small schemes such as Book Banks and the Student Aid Fund, after the schemes having

been accepted by the Commission in principle, the final approval for each college may be conveyed with the approval of the Branch Officer/Divisional heads concerned."

6.67. Asked to indicate the steps that have been taken by the Commission to ensure that the interests of the students and academic standards in the colleges which do not qualify for assistance from the Commission, do not suffer, the Ministry of Education, in a written note, stated:

"Colleges which do not qualify for assistance under the development and improvement of under-graduate education in arts, science and commerce, as also colleges providing professional/special education are provided assistance for the establishment of Student-Aid-Funds and Book Banks. A college with a student enrolment of 100 is eligible for grant under Book Bank whereas a college with 100 students (in two years degree course) and 150 students (in three years degree course) is eligible for grants for the establishment of Student Aid Fund. Recently the Commission has decided to provide more grants for the purchase of Books and equipment to arts, science and commerce colleges with a minimum enrolment of 150 students on 100 per cent basis....."

In addition the Commission provides lump sum grants to the universities for the establishment of Student-Aid-Fund for the students of the university departments and such colleges which are not eligible for assistance from the University Grants Commission or which have not been brought under Section 2(f) of the University Grants Commission Act.

The universities have been requested to recommend the cases of one or two colleges in each district where no college satisfies the qualifying conditions of enrolment and faculty strength. Such colleges are brought under the U.G.C. scheme of assistance for the development of under-graduate education in the colleges.

These above steps have been taken to ensure that the interests of the students in colleges which do not qualify for assistance from the Commission do not suffer and academic standards are maintained, to the extent possible."

6.68. The Committee note that the applications for grants from universities and colleges are scrutinised and processed in the Secretariat of the Commission at a different stages. The Committee recommend that the procedure of scrutinisation of applications for grants should be rationalised and time-limits should be laid down for the processing of applications at each stage so as to streamline the work of the Commission. Suitable control mechanisms should be devised to ensure that the time-limits are actually adhered to in individual cases. Cases of delays in release of grants of one year or more from the date of receipt of application in the Commission should be brought to the notice of the Commission with reasons therefor for their consideration.

6.69. The Committee also recommend that the Commission should have a system of centralised registration college-wise, university-wise and State-wise, of all applications received for grants from universities/colleges. The applications should be passed on to the concerned divisions only after registration. It should be the responsibility of the registration authorities to keep a watch on the progress of applications and to bring to the notice of the appropriate authorities the delays in the disposal of cases beyond a determined period.

Survey and classification of colleges

6.70. As already stated in paragraph 1.43, the number of colleges rose from 1004 in 1956 to 4569 in 1976-77. In regard to mushroom growth of colleges, the Standard Committee had, in their report, observed:

“Another aspect of the problem of sub-standard colleges is linked up with the fact that a number of colleges in India do not have adequate enrolment to make them a viable economic or intellectual unit. A recent study made of this problem in the University Grants Commission has revealed that about 15 per cent of the colleges have an enrolment of less than 300. This situation is also related to the larger question of establishment of colleges in various parts of the country without taking into account the possibility of utilising the existing institutions to admit more students. Unless we use present facilities to the fullest extent, we can hardly justify the setting up of large numbers of new colleges.”

6.71. The Estimates Committee had also suggested regulated growth of the colleges, and observed in paragraph 122 of their 102nd Report (Third Lok Sabha) as under:

“The Committee are unhappy to learn that a number of colleges have of late been set up which do not have adequate enrolment and which are ill-equipped and cannot be considered viable economic or intellectual units. The Committee suggest that establishment of such sub-standard colleges should be regulated and controlled in the interest of maintenance of academic standards.”

6.72. In their Action Taken Note furnished in June 1967, the Ministry of Education had stated:

“The University Grants Commission endorses the view expressed by the Estimates Committee that the establishment of sub-standard colleges should be regulated and controlled in the interest of maintenance of academic standards. The Commission believes the setting up of sub-standard colleges is due to pressure of numbers which is on the increase and also on account of sufficient support not being given by the State Governments. The Commission proposes requesting the State Governments to make a survey of the situation (including norms laid down by the Universities for affiliation of the colleges) in consultation with the Universities and suggest ways and means for improvement. On the basis of the survey the Commission will decide the steps to be taken to regulate the situation.”

6.73. The Estimates Committee had also expressed concern at the deterioration in the standard of education in affiliated colleges. The Ministry of Education had then informed the Committee (June 1967) that the University Grants Commission is already seized of this problem. They had further stated:

“Further steps will be considered by the University Grants Commission in the light of the recommendations made by the Education Commission which have gone into the question.”

6.74. Although the Education Commission (1964—66) had made a specific recommendation that the University Grants Commission in consultation with the State Governments should examine the question of classification of colleges in terms of level and achievement and make use of it in the allocation of grants to colleges under the Fourth Five Year Plan, the recommendation does not seem to have

been specifically considered by the University Grants Commission. The Committee desired to know whether any action had been initiated on the basis of this recommendation. The Secretary, University Grants Commission stated in reply in evidence:

“There is no specific decision of the Government. But indirectly they are being implemented in the sense that the quality programmes are in selective colleges without saying you are excellent, you are in category ‘A’, you are in category ‘B’ and you are in category ‘C’. Secondly the assistance which we have mentioned in certain schemes will go to good colleges. One of the recommendations of the Education Commission is about the autonomous colleges. Now, we are trying to see that the universities could declare colleges autonomous and they would naturally not get so much financial assistance, but they might get more academic contributions. In these 4 columns, we have not listed the colleges, but some of the schemes do lead to the conclusion that these are good colleges which require assistance.”

6.75. Asked to indicate the difficulty in categorising the colleges, the Chairman, University Grants Commission stated in evidence:

“The difficulty is that the assessment of the work of 4000 and odd colleges can only be done in close co-ordination with the universities concerned. The universities have really not geared up for this. We have asked the universities to select two colleges per district to which we will give extra assistance. We call it the lead college scheme and we have also given some money to the universities and asked them to prepare a detailed project report regarding the standards of their colleges. So, we were trying to persuade the universities to help in this process of gradation rather than the Commission sitting in Delhi trying to carry out such a gradation all over the country.”

6.76. In a written note, furnished subsequently at the Committee's instance, the Ministry have stated that the Vice-Chancellors' conference held in September 1967 had observed that 'it would be difficult to classify colleges in terms of their level and performance' and the Commission was 'in general agreement with the recommendations of the conference'. As regards the survey of the positions of affiliated colleges in different States, it has been stated:

"The Commission had in the Fourth Plan period (1969-70) taken up the question of surveying the positions of affiliated colleges in different States. Such surveys were taken up in some States like Rajasthan, Orissa, Kerala, Mysore and the remaining States had also been requested to carry on similar surveys. The response to this had not been encouraging. The follow-up of the survey reports in the States where they were undertaken has also not been satisfactory, in the absence of the active collaboration of the universities and State Governments. Recently, the Commission has requested affiliating universities to set up College Development Councils to take up such measures for improving under-graduate education. Sri Venkateswara University has already undertaken such surveys with the help of district experts."

The Ministry have further stated:

"The question of classification of colleges in terms of level and achievements and make us of some classifications for allocation of grants to colleges under successive Five Year Plans is a big task to be taken up by the Commission alone. Status reports of each college have to be prepared with the universities concerned with the help of College Development Council and then only colleges could be classified in terms of their level of achievements."

6.77. Asked to indicate whether the Commission has any monitoring machinery to ascertain the standard of improvement of colleges, the Secretary, University Grants stated in evidence:

"We do take into account the performance or the record of the college. Money is given to those colleges whose record is good. We have initiated a scheme of lead colleges where Rs. 3.00 lakhs extra will be given for the development of colleges. This again will necessarily go to the colleges whose record has been good. I would say that it is more in the nature of positive approach...."

6.78. The Committee observe that there has been lately quite a sizeable growth in the number of colleges. The number of colleges has increased from 1004 in 1956 to 3297 in 1969-70 and to 4569 in 1976-77. Some of these colleges do not have adequate facilities. This is bound to cause a deterioration in the standards of teaching. Expressing concern over the problem, the Estimates Committee had, in their 102nd Report (Third Lok Sabha), suggested that "establish-

ment of such sub-standard colleges should be regulated and controlled in the interest of maintenance of academic standards." Endorsing this view of the Estimates Committee, the UGC had informed the Estimates Committee in June 1967 that it "proposes requesting the State Government to make a survey of the situation in consultation with the universities and suggest ways and means for improvement" and that "on the basis of the survey the Commission will decide the steps to be taken to regulate the situation." The Education Commission also, in their report (1966) made a specific recommendation that the UGC should, in consultation with the State Governments, examine the question of classification of colleges in terms of level and achievement and make use of it in the allocation of grants to colleges under the Fourth Five Year Plan. The Committee find that despite the recommendations of the Estimates Committee and the Education Commission made more than 10 years back, neither the proposed survey has been completed nor colleges classified in terms of level and achievement. This Committee has been informed that the classification of colleges "is a big task to be taken up by the Commission alone" and that "status reports of each college have to be prepared with the universities concerned with the help of College Development Council." The Committee recommend that the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare should initiate action in this regard forthwith and see that the colleges are classified without undue delay and that this classification is used for guidance in allocation of grants.

(g) *Grants to institutions in educationally backward areas*

6.79. According to Rule 2 of the UGC (Fitness of Certain Universities for Grant) Rules, 1974, before a university is declared fit to receive grants from Central Government, the U.G.C. has to be satisfied that the establishment of university is justified on one or more of the specified grounds which include:

* * * * *

- (c) the University has or shall have programmes for the upliftment of backward areas or removal of regional imbalances.

* * * * *

6.80. Asked whether the impact of this provision has been significant, the Chairman, University Grants Commission stated during evidence:

"Regarding the difficulties of the colleges in the backward regions, the Commission has considered this matter and has already decided that it would give a more favourable

sharing basis to the colleges located in the backward regions. The difficulty was in defining the backward regions. To begin with, the Commission accepted the definition of backwardness given by the Planning Commission which itself had been worked out in consultation with the State Governments. Then we found that there were educationally backward States also. Therefore, we have given a separate definition of educationally backward areas also. The Commission gives a larger share to the colleges in such areas."

6.81. Supplementing the above statement, the Secretary, Ministry of Education stated during evidence:

"...as the Chairman, UGC has earlier pointed out, under the scheme as operated earlier we found that the academically backward States could not avail of the assistance in as great a measure as the advanced States. Therefore, we have made a further exercise and relaxed the rules in regard to both economically and educationally backward areas and we are hoping that with the additional facilities being given to them they will now be able to come forward. We will work this for a further year and if we find that a further relaxation is called for, we will certainly take remedial action in consultation with the State Governments and the Planning Commission."

6.82. The Committee welcome the relaxation in rules relating to grants to universities and colleges in favour of the institutions in educationally backward areas with effect from Fifth Five Year Plan. They feel that if this relaxation had been introduced earlier, it would have by now made some noticeable impact on the development of educational facilities in the educationally backward areas. The Committee recommend that these relaxations in favour of institutions in educationally backward areas should be continued and its impact assessed quinquennially.

G. VISITING COMMITTEES

(a) Role of Visiting Committees

Audit Paragraph:

7.1. For sanction of assistance under this head, the universities were required to submit their proposals for the relevant plan period within certain ceilings indicated by the Commission. On receipt of proposals from the universities, "visiting committees" were constituted, one for each university during Fourth Plan period and for a group of universities during the Fifth Plan period. The members of the visiting committees were selected by the Secretary/Chairman of the Commission from a panel available with the Commission's office, generally a month in advance of the dates proposed for visit to a university. During the Fifth Plan, a representative of the respective State Government was also associated with the visiting committee. The visiting committees were also assisted by one to three officers of the Commission. Normally a week before the visits, the ceilings prescribed and the list of points to be considered was furnished to the members of the committee. The officers of the Commission assigned for the committee were required to collect all relevant data relating to schemes already approved by the Commission and also, any other point which the Commission might desire the committee to discuss. The visiting committees were required to meet at the assigned university campus, hold discussions with the vice-chancellors, teachers and students of the universities, examine the progress made in implementation of the previous plans and reports of the committees constituted by the Commission from time to time (e.g. review committee, standards committee, examination reforms committee, etc.) and finalise their recommendations which were expected to be specific and translated in financial terms. It was seen that the visiting committees for the Fourth Plan visited various universities for very short periods as detailed below:

Number of universities	Number of days of visit by the visiting committees
10	1 day
23	2 days
8	3 days

7.2. The recommendations of the Committee were then put up to the Commission, who considered and approved the same, sometimes

with variations. Based on the Commission's decision, allocations were made for specified programmes. Before incurring any expenditure in the Plan period, the universities were, however, required to obtain specific approval of the Commission by submission of detailed plans and estimates for execution of each project.

7.3. Based on such recommendation of the visiting committees, it is reported that a sum of Rs. 64.52 crores was allocated during the period 1966-67 to 1973-74 to 70 universities and 8 deemed universities. The amount disbursed to these universities against the above allocation amounted to Rs. 47.97 crores. Grants amounting to Rs. 0.43 lakh were also released to one deemed university against which there was no allocation. An analysis of the disbursement *vis-a-vis* allocation made revealed the following position:—

Universities/deemed universities which received grants	Number	Amount allocated	Amount disbursed (in crores of rupees)
(i) Less than 25 per cent of the allocation	4	2.68	0.39
(ii) Between 25 and 50 per cent of the allocation	5	7.92	3.14
(iii) Between 50 and 75 per cent of the allocation	23	18.32	12.13
(iv) Between 75 and 100 per cent of the allocation	37	28.20	24.10
(v) More than 100 per cent of the allocation	9	7.40	8.23

[Paragraph 48 of the Report of the C&AG of India for the year 1975-76, Union Government (Civil), pp. 234-235]

7.4. The University Grants Commission considered the basis of likely allocation for development schemes during the Fourth Plan at its meeting held on 2 March, 1966. In the paper prepared for submission before the Commission, it was *inter alia* indicated:

“For the allocation of grants to the universities during the Fourth Plan period, action is being initiated for the appointment of Visiting Committees to assess their programmes as was done during the Third Plan....”.

7.5. As pointed out in the Audit paragraph, on receipt of proposals from the universities, “Visiting Committees” were constituted, one for each university during the Fourth Plan period. During the Fifth Plan period, however, these were constituted for a group

of universities. The members of the Visiting Committees were selected by the Secretary/Chairman of the Commission from a panel available with the Commission's office. During the Fifth Plan, a representative of the State Government was also associated with each of the Committees. The Visiting Committees were also assisted by one to three officers of the Commission.

7.6. Asked about the composition of the Visiting Committees, the Chairman, University Grants Commission, replied in evidence:

“Many of the Visiting Committees did not very often include any member of the Commission.”

The Secretary, University Grants Commission, however, stated in evidence:

“We have group panel Visiting Committees or other Committees. Invariably, there would be members of the Commission also.”

The Chairman, University Grants Commission, then added:

“On the Visiting Committees, we have tried that a member of the Commission should be there. In that case, he is the Chairman; presides over the sitting of the Visiting Committee. But it has not always been found possible to have a Member of the Commission as member of the Visiting Committee. While we try to do so, it is not always possible.”

7.7. Asked what is the number of the members of the Committee, the Chairman, University Grants Commission, replied in evidence:

“The number is between 9—16 and that is normal.”

7.8. The guidelines indicating the procedure to be followed in connection with the visits of the Visiting Committees, furnished by the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare at the Committee's instance are at Appendix VI.

7.9. It is pertinent to note from the guidelines that the dates for the visit of the Visiting Committees to Universities are finalised by CDN Section of the UGC and intimated to the officer assigned to the Committee, who in turn finalises the names of the experts for the Committee from the list in consultation with the Divisional Heads concerned and Secretary.

7.10. Out of 104 universities and institutions deemed to be universities (as on 31st March, 1974), the number of institutions covered under UGC Act as eligible for development assistance was 85 during the Fourth Five Year Plan. Of these, 76 were visited by the Visiting Committees for a very short period as detailed below:

No. of Universities	No. of days of visit by the Visiting Committees
10	1 day
52	2 days
11	3 days
2	4 days
1 (Jammu)	Period not indicated

7.11. The names of the universities not visited during the Fourth Plan period (along with year of the establishment in paranthis) are given below:

1. K. S. Darbhanga Sanskrit Vishwavidyalaya (1961)
2. Mithila University (1972)
3. A. P. Singh University Rewa (1968)
4. Bhopal University (1970)
5. Jammu University (1969)
6. Jawaharlal Nehru University (1969)
7. North Eastern Hill University (1973)
8. Kumaon University (1973)
9. Garhwal University (1973)
10. Central Institute of English and Foreign Languages.
(deemed to be university in 1973).

7.12. The names of universities not visited during the Fifth Plan period so far are also given below:

1. Nagarjuna University
2. Kakatiya University
3. Maharishi Dayanand University
4. Avadh University
5. Bundelkhand University

6. Rohilkhand University
7. Garhwal University
8. Mithila University
9. Gurukul Kangri Vishwavidyalaya
10. Central Institute of English and Foreign Languages (Requirements were assessed by the Ministry of Education).

7.13. Asked whether the time given to the Committees to evaluate the needs of the institutions and to formulate plan allocations was considered sufficient, the Secretary, University Grants Commission stated in evidence:

"I do not know what to say."

The Chairman, University Grants Commission, then stated:

"I particularly agree that one day would not be sufficient. Normally for a university which has had a number of post-graduate departments, one day, in my opinion, would be inadequate. In the Fifth Plan, I think, no university had less than 2-3 days. So, I would particularly agree that one day is not adequate, but 2-3 days would be adequate, because the Committee divides itself into groups which go to individual departments."

7.14. In a written note furnished subsequently at the Committee's instance, the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare have stated:

"In most of the cases, the assessment of the plan development proposals of a university was done by the Visiting Committees in two to three days. In view of the fact that the universities had made a number of exercises to formulate their proposals within the indicated allocation and the detailed background information made available by the office to the members of the Visiting Committee in advance, the time of two to three days to evaluate and discuss the proposals was considered sufficient especially keeping in view that after general discussions the Visiting Committee usually breaks into 2/3/4 groups to discuss the development programmes with various departments, faculty members, students etc., etc. It will not be possible for any committee to spend more than three days in a university for the reason that it will be difficult for experts to spare time at a stretch for this

type of voluntary work. It may be added that the experts do this job voluntary and the same Committee visits generally two to four universities in a State.

The Commission has decided that a more detailed assessment of the needs of the universities will be attempted in the 6th Plan period for which the subject panels of the Commission and other committees are already engaged in preparing status reports regarding the level of teaching and research attained by individual departments, of universities. These status reports will be consolidated subject-wise and made available to the expert committees which will be visiting the universities for assessing needs within the allocations that are likely to be made available for each university. All the data and documents relating to the university along with status reports about the level of functioning of the various departments will be compiled university-wise so that visiting committees in about two to three days' time should be in a position to make a realistic assessment of the needs and recommend programmes needing attention on a priority basis within the resources available."

7.15. The Committee desired to know how much time was taken by the Commission to examine the reports of the Visiting Committees. The Secretary, University Grants Commission, replied in evidence:

"The Commission has considered each report. There have been cases where they have not agreed to the recommendations of the Visiting Committees; they suggested variations."

Clarifying the point further, he added:

"Not all reports. The reports are circulated to the Members well in advance. They are not merely placed on the Table. It is a question how they react. Sometimes, it has taken quicker; sometimes it has taken a long time."

He further added:

"It could take half an hour; it could take three hours. I cannot say how much time they have taken."

7.16. A random analysis of the information furnished by the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare about the date(s) of consideration of the reports by the Commission during the Fourth Plan period, shows that 37 reports were placed before the Commission on one day, i.e., on July 5, 1967 and apparently finalised by it. On March 6, 1968 reports on 4 universities were considered.

7.17. The analysis of the statement furnished by the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare reveals that there is considerable time lag between the dates of the visit by the Visiting Committees and the consideration of the relevant reports of the Visiting Committees by the Commission. In the following cases, this time lag has been to the extent of nearly 5 years:

University	Date of Visit	Date of consideration of the Report
Punjab	Jan. 9-10, 1967	July 5, 1972
Indira Kala Sangeet (MP)	July 29-30, 1967	May 3, 197
Kalyani (WB)	Oct. 23-24, 1967	July 20, 1972

7.18. The time taken by the Commission in considering the reports of the Visiting Committee and thereafter in the universities forwarding proposals and schemes in accordance therewith has been explained by the Ministry thus:

"As soon as the reports of the Visiting Committees are finalised, these are placed before the Commission in the next meeting for their consideration. The dates of receipt of detailed proposals from each university against various approved projects may not be feasible to be indicated as a large number of proposals are submitted separately by the university. In fact the detailed proposals are submitted by the university, not in one lot, but from time to time depending on the nature of the proposal, availability of the matching share required, etc., etc. In the case of building proposals a considerable time is taken to formulate the plans, estimates etc., by the university, and to get the concurrence of the State Government concerned. Proposals for approved staff position are made to the Commission after the State Government gives an undertaking to fill the posts on permanent basis and that these posts will be maintained by the State Government after the UGC assistance ceases for the same."

7.19. The Committee find that during the Fourth Five Year Plan period as many as 10 Universities/Deemed to be Universities were not visited by the Visiting Committees. Similarly, during the Fifth Plan period, the Universities/Deemed to be Universities not visited by these Committees so far number 10. This shows that the Commission did not have the benefit of expert appraisals of the Visiting Committees in respect of certain universities before deciding on grants to these Universities for various schemes. The Committee would like the Commission to place the system of Visiting Committees on a more regular basis and so organise their work that the Commission has the benefit of the Reports in respect of each of the Universities for their guidance in the matter of release of grants to the University concerned.

7.20. The Committee also find that during the Fourth Plan period the Visiting Committees visited 10 Universities for only one day each. This obviously is a very short time for the Visiting Committee to assess the financial needs of the university spread over fields covering a large number of Departments. The Committee would like to emphasise that the visits of the Visiting Committees should be meaningful and their Reports should throw up assessments made by experts after a thorough examination and scrutiny of the proposals submitted by the Universities. The number of days of visit should be adequate for the purpose.

7.21 The Committee are informed that it will not be possible for any Committee to spend more than 3 days in a University for the reason that it will be difficult for experts to spare time at a stretch for this type of 'voluntary' work. The Committee recommend that in view of the important role of the Visiting Committees and the weight attached to their recommendations in finalising the quantum of grants to the Universities, the experts on the Visiting Committees need not be required to do their work on voluntary basis. It is worth examination whether the experts appointed on the Visiting Committees may be allowed some remuneration in the form of fees or honorarium for their services on the Visiting Committees on the analogy of the experts appointed by the Union Public Service Commission on the interview boards for various appointments. This would make for the experts discharging their functions as members of Visiting Committees more seriously.

7.22. The Committee also feel that the panel of names for appointment on the Visiting Committees should be drawn up in accordance with well-laid out criteria which should be brought to the notice of all the Universities. The panel should also be made a public docu-

ment so that the academic circles are aware of the names included in it or of the changes made in it from time to time. It should also have a determined life cycle. The Commission should adopt a method of rotation in the matter of associating experts with the Visiting Committees. It should not be left entirely to the Officers of the Commission attached to the Visiting Committee to finalise the names of experts on the Visiting Committees, in consultation with the Divisional Heads and/or the Secretary of the Commission.

7.23. The Committee are informed that as soon as the Reports of the Visiting Committee are finalised, these are placed before the Commission in the next meeting for their consideration. The Committee, however, note from the information furnished to them by the Ministry that in many cases the time lag between the date of the visit of the Visiting Committee and the date of consideration by the Commission of the relevant Report of the Visiting Committee, was as much as nearly 5 years. This indicates that either the report of the Visiting Committee could not be finalised earlier or it took the Commission a long time to consider the report of the Visiting Committee. In either case, the delay is indefensible. The Committee would like the Commission to lay down time limit for presentation of the report of the Visiting Committee and after it is presented, for its consideration by the Commission.

7.24. The information furnished to the Committee also reveals that the consideration of the Reports of the Visiting Committees by the Commission has been, at least on some occasions in the past, rather perfunctory. To illustrate, at its meeting held on the 5th July, 1967, the Commission considered as many as 35 Reports of the Visiting Committees. The Committee have been told during evidence that the consideration of the Reports of Visiting Committee is now a regular feature in the Commission and it takes place during the first one or two days of the meeting of the Commission well known programme is fixed for the consideration of the Commission. The Committee trust that the Commission is now according due consideration to the Reports of the Visiting Committees.

(b) *Implementation of reports of Visiting Committees—specific cases pointed out by Audit.*

Audit Paragraph:

7.25. A scrutiny of some of the recommendations of a few visiting committee reports and their implementation during the Plan period disclosed the following:

(i) *Modifications.*—Several universities submitted proposals for execution of schemes not considered or not included

in the visiting committees' recommendations in place of schemes recommended by the visiting committees and approved by the Commission. So long as such programmes were within the overall financial ceiling prescribed by the Commission for the university concerned, the modifications proposed by the universities were approved by the Commission's Office/Chairman. In this connection the Commission stated that the visiting committees had to suggest programmes within a pre-decided outlay and very often some of the schemes which the university would have liked to be included were left out as other equally urgent schemes were accommodated within the outlay available. When the university made a decision about the relative urgency of programmes, the Commission had been accepting such new programmes within the overall allocation available to universities as primarily the universities were the best judges of the urgent programmes to be implemented in a particular plan period.

- (ii) *Establishment of the Institute of Basic Medical Sciences in a University.*—In a certain university, the Commission agreed in June, 1960, on the basis of recommendations of visiting committee, to the establishment of an Institute of Basic Medical Sciences. The cost of the building with equipments, etc., was expected to about Rs. 25.7 lakhs of which Commission's share (2/3rd) worked out to Rs. 17.13 lakhs. In addition, 50 per cent of the expenditure on salaries of teaching and other staff was to be borne by the Commission. Later in 1961 it was noticed that the State concerned had established in 1955 a similar institute (Institute of Medical Sciences) and the university already had post-graduate departments in bio-chemistry and physiology. The Commission accordingly felt that there should be coordination between the various wings and the university was advised that pending consideration of the scheme by an expert committee no commitments other than those already made (which were of a minor nature) should be made under the scheme. The expert committee recommended in 1962 the integration between clinical and non-clinical subjects for execution of the scheme. However, without making any modification in the scheme, the Commission released grants of Rs. 9.85 lakhs at the rate of 2/3rd of the total cost up to March, 1971. The Commission also agreed

(February, 1972) to give further grants amounting to Rs. 11.50 lakhs for additions to buildings with cent per cent assistance as against prescribed ceiling of 2/3rd. The grants released upto August 1976 were Rs. 9.00 lakhs. The Fifth Plan visiting committee again observed in its report (September, 1975) that there was absence of a working arrangement between the Post-graduate Institute of Basic Medical Sciences and the nearby hospital/institute of the State Government which had clinical facilities. The work of the departments of pathology, microbiology and pharmacology especially was hampered due to their lack of access to hospital facilities. It had stated, "It is no use sinking in the University Grants Commission's money merely for the perpetuation of mediocrity". It had recommended that the institute should be handed over to State Government or a new hospital should be started which, it thought, was a very expensive proposition, if the scheme was to be made successful. The Commission stated that the observations of the Fifth Plan visiting committee were brought to the notice of the university with a request that a decision in this regard may be expedited in consultation with the State Government and furnished before 31st December, 1976. It had also intimated the university that all grants to it would be withheld if no settlement was brought about regarding the availability of clinical services from the Government hospitals in the nearby building of the institute so that collaboration of clinical and non-clinical activities could be brought about.

- (iii) *Construction of library building by a University.*—In September, 1970 the Commission agreed to the construction of a library building for a particular university at an estimated cost of Rs. 5.00 lakhs, the Commission's share being Rs. 3.33 lakhs. The university subsequently (February, 1972) proposed to construct a bigger library building comprising nine floors at an estimated cost of Rs. 50.00 lakhs, the total built up area being 1.22 lakhs square feet.

Considering the huge expenditure, the university decided in February, 1972 to undertake the construction of the building in two phases, the first phase to be taken up during the Fourth Plan at an estimated cost of Rs. 25 lakhs and to be completed by December, 1973. In May, 1973, the Commission agreed to provide Rs. 16.12

lakhs as its share in the first phase of construction. This provision included Rs. 3.33 lakhs as spillover of the provision for the library building made in the Third Plan and Rs. 9.79 lakhs from savings anticipated by the university by dropping the construction of social sciences block, mathematics block, printing press, women's hostel, non-resident students centre, etc. already approved, as also anticipated savings of Rs. 3.00 lakhs by non-appointment of certain staff. The balance amount was to be arranged by the university from the State Government and other sources.

Till September 1976 the university had spent Rs. 60.00 lakhs on the first phase of construction. During this period in addition to Rs. 16.05 lakhs paid by the Commission, the Ministry had paid Rs. 3.00 lakhs as *ad hoc* grants for the purpose. The university had also borrowed Rs. 22.00 lakhs from a bank, the rate of interest being 11.5 per cent. The first phase of construction has not, however, been completed so far (September 1976).

The visiting committee of the Commission while assessing the Fifth Plan requirements of the university observed (November, 1974) that the building over which Rs. 60 lakhs have already been spent, out of which Rs. 22.00 lakhs is money borrowed at a heavy rate of interest will according to university estimates need another Rs. 50 to 60 lakhs for its completion and in view of the rapidly rising cost of material, it may cost much more by the time it is actually completed. When completed the building will be completely out of tune with the other buildings on the university campus or other university campuses in India. It will also not be of great functional importance. The building had been designed with a view to accommodating 20 lakhs of books, which no university, however old, possesses in India or is likely to possess in the near future. While realising that leaving the construction of the building at this stage would involve a complete waste of Rs. 60.00 lakhs so far invested in it it was difficult for the Commission's visiting committee to understand or suggest how the additional cost involved could be met with, without allowing the basic academic needs of the university to remain unsatisfied. The Committee, however, further observed that the State authorities themselves were aware of the incongruity of building up the library block on such a grandiose plan at a time when the State as well as country were passing through economic crisis. The committee was not convinced that (1) construction of this nature would be in conformity with the present design of the building and would not completely mar its beauty, or (2) that the build-

ing would be well suited for the location of the teaching departments. The building when completed would need central heating system which would cost another Rs. 11.00 lakhs for first floor and mezzanine floor only.

With reference to the above observations of the visiting committee, it was decided by the Commission in July 1975 that the possibility of utilising a part of the library building for accommodating the social sciences department for which a provision of Rs. 12.00 lakhs was recommended by the visiting committee separately could be examined and if necessary, the amount utilised towards construction of the library building. The case is still under examination (November, 1976). The Commission stated (December, 1976) that a committee to look into the academic work of the university has been constituted and the Commission would take further steps in this respect on the basis of advice that would be tendered by this Committee.

[Paragraph 48 of the Report of the C&AG for the year 1975-76, Union Government (Civil), pp. 236—239].

(i) *Modifications*

7.26. As pointed out in the Audit paragraph, several universities sent proposals for execution of schemes not considered or not included in the recommendations of the visiting committees and considered by the Commission. So long as such programmes were within the overall financial ceiling prescribed by the Commission for the university concerned, the modifications proposed were approved by the Commission's office/Chairman. The Commission informed Audit in this connection:

“...the visiting committees had to suggest programmes within a pre-decided outlay and very often some of the schemes which the university would have liked to be included were left out as other equally urgent schemes were accommodated within the outlay available. When the university made a decision about the relative urgency of programmes, the Commission had been accepting such new programmes within the overall allocation available to universities as primarily the universities were the best judges of urgent programmes to be implemented in particular Plan period.”

7.27. According to Audit, in the case of one Deemed University, although there was no allocation, grants amounting to Rs. 0.43 lakh were released. At the instance of the Committee, the Ministry have furnished to the Committee a statement which indicates that schemes and projects outside the recommendations of the Visiting Committees have been sanctioned by the Commission.

7.28. Asked to clarify the position, the Secretary, University Grants Commission stated in evidence:

"I cannot recall; I have to check up. If your question is whether something which is neither in the original plan nor recommended by the Committee was taken up by the Commission, I cannot recall, I cannot say off-hand whether such a situation had arisen in the last 20 years or so."

7.29. The moot point that arises in this connection is whether the University Grants Commission should not have appointed a Standing Committee of experts to scrutinise the proposals of universities in cases wherein these differed from those recommended by the Visiting Committees, before such proposals were accepted by the Commission's office/Chairman. There was also a need to provide safeguards to ensure that the proposals rejected by the visiting committees did not subsequently find a place among the approved schemes.

7.30. In a written note furnished by the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare, at the instance of the Committee, it is stated:

"The Commission normally does not accept any major variations in the development proposals received from the universities which are different from those that were recommended by the Visiting Committees appointed by it to assess the development needs of the universities on plan basis. It may be mentioned that there was severe limitation of funds placed at the disposal of the Commission and the amount indicated to the universities was not such as the Commission would have desired it to be in relation to their pressing needs. Within this limitation, the visiting committees normally suggest programmes within a pre-decided outlay and very often some of the schemes which the university would have liked to be included are left out as other equally urgent schemes are accommodated within the outlay available. When a university makes a decision about the relative urgency of the programme and approaches the Commission for modi-

fications on academic considerations, giving detailed justifications, the Commission after due consideration accepts such modifications within the overall allocation available to the university, as the universities primarily are the best judges of the relative urgency of the programmes to be implemented in a particular plan period depending on urgency of emerging needs. In view of this, it was not considered desirable to appoint standing committees of experts to consider such modified or fresh development proposals received from the universities. In any case when a proposal for modification is received from the university it is examined keeping in view the recommendations made by the visiting committees earlier and the later justification provided by the university concerned and wherever considered desirable acceptance of the Commission is accorded to such proposal within the plan allocation."

7.31. Indicating the position that exists now, the note further states:

"In the current plan period all proposals in respect of changes, modifications and deviations on the recommendation made by the visiting committees are brought to the notice of the Commission and, based on its decisions, changes, wherever accepted, are indicated to the university. No significant modifications have been made by the Commission's office or the Chairman at their level in the current plan period. In one case the Commission appointed an expert committee to examine the proposal of the Madras University and instituting an M.A. course in Defence Studies and in Criminology. The Commission accepted the recommendation of the committee. Regarding the M.A. course in Criminology, the Commission decided to make available assistance to the Madras University after the course structure was reorganised in consultation with the user agencies."

7.32. The Committee have been informed that a number of projects/schemes were taken up altogether outside the recommendations of the Fifth Plan Visiting Committees. According to the Ministry, so long as programmes were within the overall financial ceiling prescribed by the Commission, the modifications sought by the Universities were approved by the Commission. The Committee consider that the recommendations of the Visiting Committees, which were made after proper assessment of financial needs of the insti-

tutions, would lose their significance if modifications in financial allocations were allowed subsequently. No doubt the universities primarily are the best judges of the relative urgency in the implementation of the programmes but the relative urgency and approaches can very well be put forward before the Visiting Committees. Priorities and quantum of assistance to institutions recommended by the Visiting Committees should normally be adhered to and altered only in rare and exceptional cases on considerations of newly emerging needs. Even in that case, the modifications sought should be considered by another Visiting/Expert Committee before the Commission takes the final decision in the matter.

(ii) *Establishment of the Institute of Basic Medical Sciences in Calcutta University.*

7.33. As pointed out in the Audit paragraph, in a certain university, the Commission agreed in June 1960, on the basis of recommendations of a Visiting Committee, to the establishment of an Institute of Basic Medical Sciences. The cost of the building with equipments etc., was expected to be about Rs. 25.7 lakhs of which Commission's share (2/3rd) worked out to Rs. 17.13 lakhs. In addition, 50 per cent of the expenditure on salaries of teaching and other staff was to be borne by the Commission. Later in 1961 it was noticed that the State concerned had established in 1955 a similar institute (Institute of Medical Sciences) and the university already had postgraduate departments in bio-chemistry and physiology. The Commission accordingly felt that there should be coordination between the various wings and the university was advised that pending consideration of the scheme by an expert committee no commitments other than those already made (which were of a minor nature) should be made under the scheme. The expert committee recommended in 1962 the integration between clinical and non-clinical subjects for execution of the scheme.

7.34. However, no modifications were made in the scheme and it is not known why those were not insisted upon before releasing further grants of about Rs. 9.85 lakhs at the rate of 2/3 of the total cost upto March, 1971. The Commission also agreed in February 1972 to give further grants amounting to Rs. 11.50 lakhs for additions to buildings as *cent per cent* assistance, against the prescribed ceilings of 2/3rd.

7.35. Asked to explain the position, the Secretary, University Grants Commission, stated in evidence:

"It is certainly an omission which I will accept. It was something which was lost sight of."

7.36. According to Audit paragraph, the Fifth Plan Visiting Committee again observed in its report (September 1975):

“The Institute of Basic Medical Sciences, Calcutta University, has in its neighbourhood a well-run and well-staffed hospital *viz.*, Institute of Medical Education and Research which has its own departments of Basic Medical Sciences and is administered by the Health Department of the State Government. However, unfortunately, there is no working arrangement between these two Institutes and the members of the staff of the Institute of Basic Medical Sciences have no access to any hospital facilities, without which the departments in the Institute cannot work efficiently. The Committee recommends that immediate steps be taken to merge the two Institutes and this matter should be taken up at the highest level on top priority basis. If this is not possible, the university may consider the possibility of handing over the Institute of Basic Medical Sciences to the State Government. The only alternative to this recommendation would be the establishment of a separate hospital for the Institute of Basic Medical Sciences of the same standard as the Institute of Medical Education and Research and since this is a very expensive proposition the Committee does not recommend it.”

7.37. The Committee desired to know when the observations of the Visiting Committee were brought to the notice of the university and what were the steps taken to see that the clinical services in the State Hospitals were available to the institute, in a written note, the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare have replied:

“In this connection, it may be pointed out that the Fifth Plan Committee of the U.G.S. visited Calcutta University from 18th to 20th September, 1975. The report of the Committee was considered by the Commission at its meeting held on 29th April 1976 and approval of various schemes was conveyed to Calcutta University on 17th June, 1976.

It may also be stated that the Fifth Plan Visiting Committee had not recommended stopping payment of grants approved during the Fourth Plan period. Whatever payments were made during the current plan period were against the Fourth Plan approved allocation for continuing schemes to be completed. For instance, construction of additional stores for the Post-graduate Institute of Basic Medical Sciences was approved during the Fourth Plan period in February 1972 at a cost of Rs. 11.50 lakhs. The First instalment of Rs. 50,000/- was released in September, 1972

and upto February, 1976 the total payment made was Rs. 9.00 lakhs. Thus, it may be seen that the last payment made in February, 1976 was well before the consideration of the Visiting Committee's report (June, 1976) by U.G.C.

Taking into account the observations made by the Fifth Plan Visiting Committee about the Institute of Basic Medical Sciences, the Commission took the following decision:

'The University and the State Government may take immediate steps to either merge the Institute of Basic Medical Sciences with the Post-graduate Institute of Medical Education and Research or provide adequate hospital facilities to the Institute of Basic Medical Sciences. The question of providing assistance to the existing departments in the Institute of Basic Medical Sciences as recommended by the Visiting Committee may be considered only after a decision is taken on this.'

The above decision of the Commission was communicated to the Calcutta University in June, 1976. The Calcutta University in September, 1977 informed the Commission that the University is at present in active discussion with the State Government regarding collaboration between the Institute of Post-graduate Medical Education Research and the Institute of Basic Medical Sciences. Several meetings were held with the previous State Government and a plan of action was decided upon. The matter is being pursued with the State Government and it is expected that the final decision taken would be available in the near future. The Commission on its part has again requested the Calcutta University on the 19th October, 1977 that the question may be settled by the University expeditiously."

7.38. The Committee note that in 1961, the University Grants Commission noticed that the State had established in 1955 on Institute of Medical Sciences and the Calcutta University already had post-graduate departments in bio-chemistry and physiology and accordingly the university was advised that pending consideration of the scheme by an expert committee, no commitments other than those already made (which were of a minor nature) should be made towards establishment of another Institute of Basic Medical Sciences agreed to earlier in June 1960 on the recommendations of a Visiting Committee. The expert committee recommended in 1962 the integration between clinical and non-clinical subjects for execution of the scheme.

It is disconcerting to note that the modifications suggested by the expert committee were not insisted upon before releasing the grants for the new Institute. Not only that, construction of additional stores for the Post-graduate Institute of Basic Medical Sciences was approved in February 1972 at a cost of Rs. 11.50 lakhs. Upto February 1976, the total payments made amounted to Rs. 9.00 lakhs. In this connection, it is pertinent to note that the Fifth Plan Visiting Committee had visited Calcutta University in September 1975 and according to information made available to the Committee, the Commission had considered the report on Calcutta University on 29 April 1976, and not in June 1976, as contended. In any case, the report was available soon after the visit in September 1975 and the payment of grant of Rs. 9 lakhs upto February 1976 was against the principles of financial prudence. The Committee recommend that the circumstances in which release of Rs. 9.00 lakhs was made despite the recommendations of the expert/visiting committees and of the Commission itself should be investigated and its outcome reported to the Committee. The proposed probe should also cover the issue as to why releases in excess of the share of 2/3rd assistance were made by the Commission in disregard of the prescribed norms.

7.39. The Committee find that the question of the merger of the Institute of Basic Medical Sciences with Post-graduate Institute of Medical Education and Research or provision of adequate hospital facilities to the Institute of Basic Medical Sciences is still under consideration. The Committee would like the question to be finally decided so that the University Grants Commission do not have to aid and maintain a truncated institution, which the Institute of Basic Medical Sciences at present is without clinical facilities.

(iii) *Construction of library building by a University.*

7.40. The construction of a Library building for Kashmir University was agreed to by the University Grants Commission in September, 1970 at an estimated cost of Rs. 5.00 lakhs, the share of the Commission being Rs. 3.33 lakhs. The project could not be taken up during the Third Plan period. The University subsequently (February, 1972) proposed to construct a bigger building at an estimated cost of Rs. 50 lakhs. Considering the huge expenditure, the University decided on making a reference to the Commission to undertake the construction in two phases. In May, 1973, the Commission agreed to provide Rs. 16.12 lakhs as its share in the first phase of construction. This provision included Rs. 3.33 lakhs as spill-over of the provision of Rs. 3.33 lakhs in the Third Plan and Rs. 12.79 lakhs from

saving anticipated by the University through dropping the following schemes:

	Rs. in lakhs
(a) Construction of Social Science and Mathematics Block	6.00
(b) Setting up of Printing Press	1.22
(c) Construction of Women's Hostel	1.87
(d) Construction of non-resident students centre	0.70
(e) Anticipated savings by non-appointment of certain staff	3.00
	12.79

The balance amount was to be arranged by the University from the State Government and other sources.

7.41. The Committee desired to know whether the composite plinth area and other phases of the building were taken into account at the time the U.G.C. agreed to provide its share Rs. 16.12 lakhs. The Secretary, UGC, replied in evidence:

“In the first place, in the Third Plan, if I remember correctly, no area had been mentioned. Rs. 5 lakhs was just the amount. When they came with this in Fourth Plan, it was for 5 lakhs, there was no area and the Visiting Committee recommended Rs. 5 lakhs.”

He added:

“ I do not have the note recorded then. The Commission in Third Plan allowed construction of the Library Building for the University of Kashmir at an estimated cost of Rs. 5 lakhs. The Commission will share, 2/3rd of the expenditure i.e. Rs. 3.3 lakhs.”

7.42. In a written note furnished subsequently at the instance of the Committee, the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare stated:

“The Commission approved the construction of library building at Kashmir University in the third plan period on the recommendation of the Visiting Committee which suggested that to start with, the Library with a stocking space of one lakh volumes and two reading rooms for 150 students each may be provided. The total built up area as per UGC norms for such a library building with the

facilities recommended by the Visiting Committee could be approximately 24,000 sq. ft. Taking into account the cost of construction as prevalent in 1963 the estimated cost for the building including furniture, equipment and other services would have been about Rs. 7 lakhs. In IV Plan the cost of construction even for the area indicated above had gone up and the university had indicated in 1968 that the total cost would be Rs. 11 lakhs. The university however, could not take up the project immediately. In 1971, it proposed the construction of Library Building at an expenditure of Rs. 50 lakhs in two phases—Rs. 25 lakhs in 1st phase. The cost in the meantime had again gone up. The Commission agreed to this proposal and indicated in 1971 that the University Grants Commission assistance for this project could be limited to Rs. 16.12 lakhs. The Commission did not agree to raise its share of assistance beyond Rs. 16.12 lakhs and expenditure incurred by the University over and above this amount has been met by the University from grants from State/Central Government and other sources.”

7.43. In this connection, it is noted that this figure of Rs. 16.12 lakhs comprised of, apart from the spill over of Rs. 3.33 lakhs in the Third Plan, savings anticipated by dropping construction of Social Sciences Block, Mathematics Block, Printing Press, Womens Hostel, non-resident students' centre, as also anticipated saving of Rs. 3.00 lakhs by non-appointment of certain staff.

7.44. Replying to a question regarding the desirability of allowing diversion of funds, the Chairman, University Grants Commission stated in evidence:

“I do not justify how and why this money was diverted. All that I would say is that the proposal of the University for having a library building worth Rs. 25 lakhs and the Commission providing Rs. 16 lakhs for the purpose does not appear to me to be a wrong decision as far as the reasonable requirements of a University are concerned. The Kashmir University was in the process of shifting to the new campus and it was apparently felt that since they were shifting to the new campus they must have a library building which would be adequate for their reasonable expansion between the next ten or fifteen years. As soon as it was brought to the notice of the Commission that if they want to have a grandiose building where not only library would be accommodated but some space will be

provided for auditorium, class room, etc. the Commission felt that this was not the responsibility of the Commission. Our share would be Rs. 16 lakhs.

I would submit that the decision of the Commission to subsequently raise its share from Rs. 3 lakhs to Rs. 16 lakhs was reasonable. But of course that could have been done by giving an extra grant, not necessarily by diverting funds. It may be that diversion was carried out because University was not in a position to spend money on these particular items. Broadly speaking, diversion from these essential items does not appear to me to be a good thing."

7.45. As pointed out in the Audit paragraph, a Review Committee had been constituted as indicated in December 1976 by the Commission to look into the academic work of the university. The Committee enquired whether this Committee had submitted its report. In a written note, the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare replied:

"The review committee appointed by the Commission to look into the academic work of the Kashmir University has not yet submitted its report."

7.46. The Fifth Plan Visiting Committee observed (November, 1974) that the building over which Rs. 60 lakhs had already been spent would be completely out of tune with the other buildings on the university campus or other university campuses in India and it would not be of great functional importance. The building had been designed with a view to accommodating 20 lakhs books, which no university, however, old possesses in India or is likely to possess in the near future.

7.47. The report of the Visiting Committee was considered by the Commission in July, 1975 when it resolved as under:

"It was noted that a provision of Rs. 12 lakhs (UGC share-Rs. 6 lakhs) had been made in the recommendations for construction of a Social Sciences block. The Commission felt that before this is done, the possibility of utilising part of the library building for accommodating the social sciences departments may be examined, and if necessary, the amount suggested could be utilised in the library for the purpose."

7.48. The Committee was further informed that the matter was discussed in December, 1975 by the Vice Chairman, University Grants Commission with the Chief Minister of Jammu & Kashmir

and the Vice-Chancellor, Kashmir University. The Commission was informed of the discussion at its meeting held on 7 January, 1976, as per the following record note:

“Arising out of the minutes, the Vice-Chairman said that he had discussed with the Vice-Chancellor, Kashmir University, the possibility of utilising the new library building for locating some social sciences departments. During the discussions, it was brought out that the architect who had designed the library building had visualised that the building would not be fully utilised for the library for quite some time and that a portion of the building could be used for class rooms, seminars, etc. In view of this, it may not be necessary for the University to construct a separate social science block at this stage; the University would send its revised proposal for utilisation of the allocation made for the construction of social science block for completing the library building.”

7.49. The University Grants Commission informed the university on 18 July, 1977 as follows:

“The University Grants Commission has accepted the proposal of the University for housing 8 social sciences departments on the ground floor and tower floor of the library building and the estimates of Rs. 7.84 lakhs intimated by the university for the purpose on 50:50 basis. The University Grants Commission assistance will not exceed the approved amount of Rs. 6 lakhs including the cost of providing a lift for the departments in the two tower floor if needed for which UGC assistance will also be available on 50:50 basis. The Commission regrets its inability to agree with the proposal of the University for assistance for central heating of the space for social sciences departments in the tower floor.”

7.50. The University reportedly informed the Ministry (October 1977) that it proposes to house departments of Political Sciences, Economics, Commerce, History, Kashmire and Library Science and Institute of Correspondence Courses, in the library building. It has also proposed an expenditure of Rs. 1.50 lakhs on the first floor by way of putting wooden paneling on RCC walls fixed on wooden joints to make it warmer in winter season. This is under examination of the Commission.

7.51. The expenditure incurred and the grants paid so far are indicated below:

Year	Expenditure reported by the University	Payment made by UGC	
	Rs.	Rs.	
Upto 31-3-74	41,68,000	12,00,000	
1974-75	12,04,000	3,90,000	against allotment of spillover of Rs. 4,12,000 in V Plan.
1975-76 & 1976-77	4,68,000	15,000	
TOTAL	58,40,000	16,05,000	

7.52. The Committee enquired whether the University Grants Commission were aware of any comparable case where they were required to finance a similarly ambitious scheme of a university. In a written note furnished by the Ministry of Education & Social Welfare, it has been stated:

“The Commission is not aware of comparable cases where it was required to finance such an ambitious scheme of a university. However, Guru Nanak Dev University is taking up construction of library building at a total cost of about Rs. 70 lakhs, the Commission’s share of which would not exceed Rs. 6 lakhs in the present plan period.”

7.53. The Committee find that the construction of a library building by Kashmir University originally estimated to cost a sum of Rs. 5 lakhs has remained incomplete although a sum of Rs. 58.40 lakhs has already been spent over this grandiose building upto September, 1976.

7.54 The Visiting Committee of the Commission while assessing the Fifth Plan requirements of the University observed in November, 1974 that the building over which Rs. 58.40 lakhs had already been spent would, according to university estimates, need another 50 to 60 lakhs for its completion and when completed the building would be completely out of tune with the other buildings on the university campus or other university campuses in the country. The Visiting Committee had also indicated that the building was designed with a view to accommodating 20 lakhs books, which no university, however old, possesses in the country or is likely to possess in the near

future and that the building would also not be of great functional importance. It also stated that the building when completed would need centrally heating system which could cost another Rs. 11 lakhs for the first floor and mezzanine floor only. On the above observation the University Grants Commission decided in July 1975 that the possibility of utilising a part of the library building for accommodating social sciences departments for which a provision of Rs. 12 lakhs was recommended by the Visiting Committee separately, could be examined and if necessary the amount utilised towards the construction of the library building. The Kashmir University agreed to this proposal.

7.55 The Committee regret that at the time of agreeing in May 1973 to make available Rs. 16.12 lakhs as its share in the construction of the library building of the Kashmir University, estimated to cost Rs. 50 lakhs, the UGC did not make a detailed examination of the need for the library building on such a grandiose scale. They also regret that despite the observations of the Fifth Plan Visiting Committee, grants totalling nearly Rs. 4 lakhs were released during the 5th Plan period to Kashmir University for the library building. Though the UGC has pegged its share at Rs. 16.12 lakhs, the fact remains that if the UGC had initially not acquiesced in the revised programme, the Kashmir University would, perhaps, not have launched this ambitious programme. The Committee are also averse to the principle of diversion of funds from one approved scheme to another, howsoever important. Now that the building is nearing completion, the Committee would like the UGC to ensure that it is fully and properly utilised.

The Committee hope that the UGC would hereafter be more cautious in extending assistance on such a large scale for building up infrastructural facilities in universities and, before agreeing to making available grants, ensure that the facilities proposed to be built up are realistic and by and large in line with similar facilities in other universities.

H. GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF BUILDINGS

Audit paragraph

8.1. A large part of assistance provided by the Commission to universities and colleges is towards the construction of educational buildings, staff quarters, hostels and campus facilities. The Commission does not, however, have any technically qualified personnel to assist it in the planning of buildings or in the scrutiny of plans and estimates, completion documents, etc., submitted by grantee institutions. Grants were approved on the basis of estimates and plans prepared by qualified architects. The Commission allows 4 per cent of building costs towards preparation of plans and estimates and for supervision of construction. A scrutiny of some of the building grants provided by the Commission disclosed that:

- in some cases there were considerable revision of costs initially estimated, within two or three years.
- there were long delays in completion of buildings.
- completion reports were awaited even in respect of many completed works.
- periodic reports on progress in construction were not insisted upon except at the time of request for the next instalment of grant.
- there was no inspection or other arrangements to see if the building constructed conformed to approved plans.

8.2. In this connection, it was observed that in December 1972 the Commission considered a note on the procedure followed in regard to proposal for construction of buildings under the scheme of assistance to colleges. It came to its notice that even though the Commission allowed 4 per cent of the building cost for preparation of plans and estimates and for supervision, the required competent supervision was not available to a number of construction works undertaken in different parts of the country. It was stated that one possible reason was the growing tendency to engage architects from outstations. For instance, many colleges in different states engaged architects from one particular station. Some of these firms were found to be supervising 90 to 100 projects at a time scattered over 5 to 6 different States even though such firms did not appear to have the necessary number of technically competent and qualified staff to undertake a required periodical and regular visits to all the construction sites. The Commission decided to constitute a committee to examine the procedure for sanction of grants to the colleges for construction of buildings.

It had also been observed that in some cases even substandard building materials were used. However, based on the recommendations of the above committee a revised procedure was adopted for colleges from February 1974. Under this procedure, a building committee, consisting of representatives of the management, local public works department, an engineer member of the locality and principal of the college, is entrusted with the responsibility of supervising the construction work. In this connection, it was noticed that the Chairman of the Commission had also ordered (January 1974) that an enquiry be made from the officers concerned as to how two firms of architects in a particular station "managed to corner" over 200 building projects (costing Rs. 3.22 crores under execution in seven or eight states) whose supervision was not considered to be "satisfactory by any standards".

8.3. The Commission stated (December 1976) that enquiries made from available officers of the college division of the Commission revealed that the selection of architects/engineers was entirely the responsibility of the grantee institutions concerned and that as soon as it came to the notice of the Commission that a few firms at a particular station were in charge of a number of construction works at long distances, the matter was taken up with the institutions and universities concerned regarding the day to day supervision of such works. The Commission had also taken up with the Vice-Chancellors of universities concerned regarding the suitability of engaging such outstation architects. The grants payable in respect of such projects were released only when the Commission was satisfied from the replies received from the universities that the supervision was satisfactory.

[Paragraph 48 of the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India for the year 1975-76, Union Government (Civil), pp. 243—245]

8.4. An analysis made by the Review Committee (1977) of the grants given by the Commission during the Fourth Plan (1969-70 to 1973-74) had revealed that "nearly 53 per cent of the grant given by the Commission was spent on capital expenditure like buildings and hardware".

8.5. As pointed out in the Audit paragraph the Commission does not have any technically qualified personnel to assist it in the planning of buildings or in the scrutiny of plans and estimates, completion documents, etc., submitted by grantee institutions. Grants were approved on the basis of estimates and plans prepared by qualified architects. The Commission allows 4 per cent of building costs towards preparation of plans and estimates and for supervision of construction.

8.6. A scrutiny by Audit of some of the building grants provided by the Commission disclosed that:

- in some cases there were considerable revision of costs initially estimated, within two or three years.
- there were long delays in completion of buildings.
- completion reports were awaited even in respect of many completed works.
- periodic reports on progress in construction were not insisted upon except at the time of request for the next instalment of grant.
- there was no inspection or other arrangements to see if the buildings constructed conformed to approved plans.

8.7. The Committee enquired whether specific approval of the Commission was required to be obtained for execution of the projects. The Secretary, U.G.C. replied in evidence:

“They have only to refer in the case of buildings, the plans and estimates for concurrence.....”

8.8. Asked whether the U.G.C. machinery was geared to have technical supervision over the execution of various building projects, the Secretary, U.G.C. replied in evidence:

“We do not do technical scrutiny.”

He added:

“Technically we do not make any contribution. The only thing is the cost of construction. What is the basis on which the cost of construction should be worked out? Cost of construction in different parts of the country for the same type of building is at a great variation. That is why it is said that you get detailed estimates certified by the PWD. We take into account that cost. Later on the tenders are invited. Some tenders may be higher as they are normally higher. On the basis of all this we estimate the cost.”

He further added:

“We do not keep supervision.”

8.9. The Committee desired to know the reasons for considerable revision of costs, in respect of the building projects during the Fourth Five Year Plan. In a written note, the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare stated:

"On the basis of the information received from the various Divisions/Sections dealing with the projects concerning building construction the following is stated:

The U.G.C. provides financial assistance to universities/colleges for the construction of various building projects as part of the development schemes on plan basis. The universities have to take up the construction of the building projects in accordance with the norms and conditions of grants laid down in respect of building projects. A copy each of the norms and the conditions of grants laid down by the Commission is enclosed.* It would be observed that the procedure laid down for starting a building project and its completion involves various formalities which takes considerable time. As there were inflationary tendencies in the country during the Fourth Plan period prices of the building material (i.e. cement, steel, and bricks etc.) the labour costs and other related items went up considerably. As a result of that the universities/colleges were forced to revise the cost of the building project. Generally the upward revision of cost is not taken into account in determining the U.G.C. share in the case of building projects undertaken by colleges affiliated to State Universities."

8.10. The main reasons for long delays in the completion of the projects according to the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare were:

1. Scarcity and rise in the cost of building material, i.e., cement, steel etc.
2. Delay/non-availability of matching share from the State Governments/College Management.
3. In the case of the construction work being executed by PWD/Construction Board etc. the colleges have no control over the progress of work.
4. Disputes with the contractors regarding executing the construction work which sometime takes very long time and even involves litigation etc.
5. Natural calamities such as floods etc.

8.11. The reasons for non-receipt of completion certificates in respect of buildings, as given by the Ministry, were (i) delay in getting the completion certificates signed by the Construction Board/

*Not introduced.

PWD Engineer (wherever the construction work is done by them) and (ii) delay in issuing utilisation certificates by the appropriate audit authorities.

8.12. The Committee desired to know the origin of the practice of charging 4 per cent of the building costs for supervision etc. The Ministry of Education and Social Welfare informed the Committee in a written note:

"The Commission provides assistance to universities colleges for the construction of building projects as part of the development schemes on plan basis. The conditions of grant in respect of buildings projects, *inter alia*, includes:

'A charge not exceeding 4 per cent of the estimates may be allowed where the Architect besides supplying the drawings and estimates also supervises the work. In case the Architect supplies only the drawings and estimates and supervision is done by the University Engineering Staff, a fee of 2-3/5 per cent would be reasonable. In case where the services of the Architect are not engaged and the drawings and estimates are prepared by the University Engineering Staff, the Commission contribution would be provided only for the supervision, i.e., an amount not exceeding 1-2/5 per cent of the cost. The architects are paid by the university/college who appoint them. It may, however, be mentioned that the Architect's fee payable out of UGC grant for a building project is restricted to the UGC's approved share and not on the total estimates of the building projects prepared by the university/colleges or the completion cost'."

The Secretary, UGC informed the Committee during evidence:

"In May 1970 there was a letter which was issued and it said: 'colleges affiliated to the University seeking assistance from the UGC for building projects have to send plans estimates by a qualified architect/engineer and also periodical reports on the progress of work and expenditure signed by a qualified architect/engineer for releasing grants approved by the Commission'."

8.13. The Audit paragraph points out that the required competent supervision was not available to a number of construction works undertaken in different parts of the country. One possible reason was the growing tendency to engage architects from outstations. Many colleges in different States engaged two architects from Delhi.

These firms were found to be supervising 90 to 100 projects at a time scattered over 5 to 6 different States even though such firms did not appear to have necessary number of technically competent and qualified staff to undertake the required periodical and regular visits to all the construction sites.

8.14. The Audit paragraph further points out that in some cases even substandard building materials were used. Asked whether proper enquiries were held to thrash out the facts in the cases which came to the notice of the Commission, the Secretary, UGC replied in evidence:

"It is possible for us to conduct these enquiries only through the Universities and not directly. This is because we have no suitable machinery for that purpose."

8.15. The Committee desired to know the exact point of time when it came to the notice of the Commission that the supervision by the two firms of architects was not considered to be satisfactory. The Secretary, UGC replied in evidence:

"The note which was placed before the Commission in December 1972, makes a reference to this. But I really cannot lay my hands on the file, because there may be a large number of files; say 700 or 800 of them. If it is recorded somewhere, I will check it up and inform you when it was actually done."

8.16. Asked to specifically indicate whether even after getting the information that the supervision by the two firms of architects was not satisfactory, any more orders were secured by the firm, the Secretary, UGC stated in evidence:

"We said that as far as possible, local architects or nearby architects should be appointed, unless the Vice-Chancellor has reason to feel that it should not be so. About these two firms, if they have got some work in Delhi, we would not have questioned it, because they are local architects."

He added:

"As I said, we have left the question of appointment of architects to the colleges. Under the law, we could not ban on architect. We have taken care to see that they take the local architect or a nearby architect."

He further added:

"... we have said 'Take local Architect'. Unless the Institute of Architects debars or black-lists somebody, how can UGC officially debar any architect?"

8.17. The Committee desired to know how many universities were involved in these 90 to 100 projects supervised by some of the firms of architects. In a written note, the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare replied:

“Twenty Universities during the Fourth Five Year Plan period and seven during the Fifth Five Year Plan period were involved in these projects.”

8.18. During evidence specific mention was made regarding the release of grants to Nehru Memorial College, Hansi for the construction of class-rooms and lecture theatres. It was pointed out that on account of the defective construction work in this College under the supervision of an architect, who had been engaged by several colleges at the same time for supervision of buildings under construction, which came to the notice of the Commission, the Commission withheld further grants to this college and the building work had since remained half finished.

8.19. In order to verify the facts of the case, the Committee called for from the Commission the file relating to Nehru Memorial College, Hansi. The file [No. F. 6-18/71 (II)/D-2b] reveals the following facts:

- (i) The approved cost of construction of class-rooms and Lecture theatres in the college was Rs. 1.64 lakhs, out of which the share of the UGC worked out to Rs. 1.09 lakhs. The expenditure already incurred on the work was Rs. 92,400 against which the UGC's share was Rs. 61,600. An amount of Rs. 30,000 was already paid to the College.
- (ii) While considering the progress report of work for release of further funds to the extent of Rs. 37,350, the following Office Note was recorded on 6 November 1972:

‘It appears that Shri Arun Kumar Aggarwal who is an employee of the Engineer/Architect of the project, is the Engineer-in-charge (Site Overseer) who supervises the work at site in Hansi. The same person (Shri A. K. Aggarwal) is performing the same duties at the construction site for the construction of Residential flats for teachers of All India Jat Heroes’ Memorial College, Rohtak vide progress report sent by the Principal, A.I.J.H. Memorial College, Rohtak in File No. F.1-44(1)/71-(CII) at pages 66-67/cor.

Taking into consideration the facts stated above, it appears that the said Engineer-in-charge is not performing his duties at one of the two places (*viz.* Hansi and Rohtak) and one of the two colleges is, perhaps, sending wrong information/documents to the UGC for obtaining grants in-aid. The signatures of Shri Arun Kumar Aggarwal, Engineer-in-Charge of both the projects also differ. The signatures on the progress report for Nehru Memorial College, Hansi are different from those on the progress report for A.I.J.H. Memorial College, Rohtak.

In view of this position, it is suggested that no further grants may be released to these two colleges and the matter may be enquired into'.

- (iii) On 13 December, 1972 the Divisional Officer concerned (Mrs. Vina Mazumdar) recorded the following Note:

“* * * * *

As pointed out in the note on pre-page the two colleges at Rohtak and Hansi had given slightly different names for the local supervisors who were both reported as employees of M.M. Gupta and Associates (Arun K. Aggarwal for Rohtak and A. K. Agarwal for Hansi). The progress reports submitted by these two colleges also carry different signatures of the Engineer-in-Charge. The College at Rohtak has also reported that the Engineer has also reported that the Engineer Incharge is living in the college campus.

This appears to be a deliberate attempt to mislead the Commission and under these circumstances I do not think we should release further grants to either of these colleges until the University's advice in the matter is available. The request to the Punjab University for investigation already decided above may perhaps be best made in the form of a confidential d.o. to the Vice-Chancellor by the Secretary. A draft letter is placed below for Secretary's approval and signature.”

- (iv) A confidential D.O. letter to Vice-Chancellor, Punjab University was sent on 27 December 1972. The reply was received from the Vice-Chancellor on 23 May 1973. According to the Vice-Chancellor, he deputed the University's senior architect to inspect both the projects. He

also referred the matter to the Executive Engineer of the University. An extract from the letter giving the main recommendations of both is given below:

- “(1) The work was got done by Delhi based Architect and the day-to-day supervision was done by Shri A. K. Aggarwal who has signed as Arun K. Aggarwal. On enquiry, it has been found that both these signatures are of the same person.
- (2) The Senior Architect has reported that the work at Hansi is not very satisfactory whereas the work at Rohtak is satisfactory although in the latter case the stipulation made by the UGC has been altered slightly.
- (3) Both the Senior Architect and X.E.N. have recommended that before the UGC allots any fund to the college, the estimates and plans of the work should be certified by the local PWD Engineer and the rates should be according to PWD Schedule.

“*

*

*

*

- (v) The following note was recorded on 8 June, 1973 by the Additional Secretary:

“The release of grants to the Nehru Memorial College, Hansi and the All India Jat Heroes Memorial College, Rohtak, had been held up pending investigation by the Punjab University with regard to the construction work in progress in these two colleges with the assistance of UGC grants. We have since received a letter from the Vice-Chancellor, Punjab University to indicate that the work at the Rohtak College is satisfactory, although the stipulation made by the UGC has been altered slightly. The Senior Architect of Punjab University has reported that the work at the Hansi College is not very satisfactory. On the basis of this report payment of further instalment of grant to the All India Jat Heroes Memorial College, Rohtak could now be revived. (Although the decision to withhold further

payments to the Rohtak College was taken in December, 1972 *vide* notes on page 20/ante and action was taken to request the Vice-Chancellor, Punjab University, to have the matter investigated, it would appear that the College was not kept informed of this decision. The letter to the Chairman.....is probably due to this reason.

The Chairman may kindly see the above note and action to release the instalment of the grant due to the Rohtak College would be taken on return of the file."

- (vi) The Chairman of the Commission recorded the following remarks on 9 June, 1973:

"Please do so and put up a draft reply to the principal."

- (ii) On 5 December, 1973. Chairman of the Commission agreed with the suggestion made by the Office that the Commission might impose a ban on payment of further grants to the College (Hansi) and also ask for clarification and information on certain points to enable the Commission to take further necessary action in the matter.

8.20. This file thereafter got misplaced in the Secretariat of the Commission and could be traced after considerable effort only when the issue was raised during the proceedings of the Public Accounts Committee in September, 1977 and the Committee specifically desired that the file should be produced.

8.21 In this connection, the Committee note that a reference was also made by Shri Bipinpal Das, M.P. during discussion in Rajya Sabha on 10 August, 1972, on the Annual Reports of the U.G.C. for 1969-70 and 1970-71. The following extract from the speech is pertinent:

'I have come across certain cases. The Education Minister may be surprised. I do not know. When I was the Principal of a College, at that time I came across such a man who said, 'You want UGC grant? Give me a contract for 5 lakhs, 3 lakhs or 2 lakhs. Give me a contract. I will get you the grant'. I was stunned. The man just came into my office, saying this. I told him: Sir: I do not need your help, if I do not get grant by the straight door, I won't take it from the backdoor or in a roundabout manner. I was surprised to find that several

neighbouring colleges took the help of this architect—the so-called ‘architect’—and got grants very easily, while a developed college like mine had to suffer a lot. Now, this is a strange thing.”

8.22. According to an article in the Indian Express of 5 December, 1973:

“In 1971-72, for instance, the UGC sanctioned about 600 building projects for colleges. What is extremely interesting is that some 205 of these were to be under the supervision of just two Delhi firms of architects who were doing buildings in Punjab, Haryana, Bihar, Rajasthan, Madhya Pradesh, Delhi and UP—as well as in some other States. All of them simultaneously. The amount of their work runs to Rs. 4 crores. To put it gently, supervising so many projects so far away from base would call for herculean effort, a very large qualified staff and a highly sophisticated organisation. The UGC, wedded to the ‘autonomy’ of universities and colleges has not concerned itself about checking such details or about inspection the nature of the supervision or of the construction. Incidentally, the same Delhi firms also have university buildings in hand, in addition to the 205 college projects—and university schemes are usually more grandiose.”

8.23. The then Chairman of the Commission in a note recorded on 7 December, 1973, desired that the points raised in the article be examined and put up to him. The Secretary of the Commission, noting on 25 December, 1973, stated:

“...it was the office itself which had pointed out that amongst other things two firms of architects had obtained contracts from the different colleges in the country for planning and supervision of construction work of buildings accepted under three lakh scheme.....The matter had been placed before a Committee. A set of papers placed before the Committee alongwith a copy of the confidential note prepared from which some of the information has been included in the article is placed below. The recommendations of the Committee have already been considered by the Commission and will now be considered by the Vice-Chancellors Advisory Committee at its next meeting on 30 January, 1974.”

On 26 December 1973, the Chairman desired to know:

"Has this been stopped completely, or are we still allowing this to continue because the recommendations of the Committee were considered by the Commission and are now going to be considered by the Vice-Chancellors Committee?"

8.24. In pursuance of this query of the Chairman, a note was prepared for the information of the Chairman of the Commission by the then Deputy Secretary (C) on 19th December, 1973. A study of this note reveals that the fact of the Delhi based Architects having taken up construction and supervision in a number of colleges and universities at the same time all over India came to the notice of the Commission for the first time in 1969 in a case relating to construction of library building at C.U. Shah Science College Ahmedabad. According to the note, "It was discovered that the college had gone ahead with the project in anticipation of UGC's approval on an assurance given by the Delhi Architect... to the effect that the proposal would be accepted by the Commission." The note further stated that "based on this a circular was issued by the office to the universities which, among other things, mentions, that the Commission does not maintain a list of approved architects/engineers and that selection of competent architect/engineer for preparation of plans and estimates and for supervision is entirely the responsibility of the institution concerned." It is, however, noted from the file that this circular was issued in May 1970.

8.25. The note indicated the following position in regard to projects with the two firms of Delhi Architects:

"Name of the Architect	Running Projects	Completed Projects	Lapsed/ Rejected	Under consideration (not yet disposed of)
M. M. Gupta	69	27	13	14 = 123
Suresh Chel	38	11	19	18 = 86
TOTAL	107	38	32	32 = 207

It may thus be seen that there are 209 projects in the colleges division of which 32 have yet to be disposed of finally. In the context of financial stringency, these proposals have no chance of being approved. We may regret all these cases. Under column 4, there are 32 cases which have been rejected after scrutiny or have lapsed due to non-implementation. Thus, 64 out of 209 (30 per cent) of the projects of the above firms, have no validity at present. Out of remaining 145 projects, 38 projects have been completed, 107 projects are running, 69 of M. M. Gupta and 38 of Suresh Goel. This is the factual position as far as the College Division is concerned."

8.26. On 4 January 1974, the then Chairman of the Commission recorded the following note:

"The note at flag 'Y' gives full information about construction projects handled by these two architects as far as the College Division is concerned.

I would like to have the same kind of information in respect of other Divisions which are handling construction project.

An inquiry may be made from officers who were in charge of the College Division as to how these two firms managed to corner so many construction projects.

I find that 107 projects, under the supervision of these two firms, are still under execution. Have we inquired from the Vice-Chancellors or Principals concerned with these 107 projects how effectively the firm concerned is supervising the construction work and as to what is the local arrangement made by the firm for day-to-day supervision? If no such inquiry has been made so far, please make such an inquiry immediately."

8.27. Subsequently, on 4 July 1974, the Chairman sent a further note reminding the Secretary about the information asked for by him in his note recorded in January 1974. The note read as follows:

"Early in January 1974, I saw a note giving full information about construction projects handled by two Architects-- Shri M. M. Gupta, Delhi and Shri Suresh Goel, Delhi-- as far as the College Division is concerned. I then record-

- 'A' { ed a note asking for the same kind of information in respect of other Divisions which were handling construction projects. This note has not yet come to me.
- 'B' { I also wanted an enquiry to be made from officers who were in charge of the College Division as to how these two firms managed to corner so many construction projects. Has such an enquiry been made? If so, please let me know about it.

I had observed then that 107 projects under the supervision of these two firms were still under execution. I wanted to know whether we had enquired from the Vice-Chancellors or Principals concerned about these 107 projects and how effectively the firm concerned was supervising the construction work and as to what local arrangement has been made by the firm for day to day supervision? The results of this enquiry from Vice-Chancellors and Principals have also not been put up to me. Occasionally, I have passed orders suggesting that the Vice-Chancellor may consider having a local Architect rather than one of these Delhi architects. Beyond this, it appears that nothing has been done to implement the orders passed by me as early as January 1974.

Will the Secretary please look into this personally and let me have an early report."

8.28. On 14 August 1974, i.e. after a lapse of more than seven months, the Secretary of the Commission submitted the following note to the Chairman:

"'A' A separate note is put up indicating the construction programme undertaken by Suresh Goel, Architect in Delhi. This firm has also a few projects of universities in U.P. and the same along with more of other divisions will be put up by 17th August 1974. The delay has been due to heavy rush of work in end of last financial year and subsequent reorganisation of work.

'B' We had requested the officers to furnish the information—the main officers dealing with these projects were Dr. R. C. Gupta (who has since retired), Dr. (Mrs.) Majumdar, Dr. Hazela, Shri Y. D. Sharma and Shri Balkrishna. I discussed with the last three officers this question, who informed me that the proposals relating to construction of

building projects were processed as per guideline circulated to universities and colleges. Attention is invited to... the guidelines. I may in support of these officers submit that we had not taken notice of the name of the firm of the Architect which prepared the plans and examined them as they came through the university concerned. It is only when it was observed that a few firms from Delhi were also doing several works at long distance that we took up this matter, particularly in relation to the day to day supervision. I may assure the Chairman that to the best of my knowledge, I have no reasons to believe any *malafide* intention on the part of these officers.

'C' I understand from Shri I. C. Menon who was then the Divisional Head of the College Division that letters were addressed, as desired by the Chairman, for 107 projects. In some cases replies had also been received. The work of these projects have been distributed to different divisions. I am asking all Divisions to put up all misc. cases to the Chairman, whether a reply has been received or not."

3.29. There are no further notings on the file. The information asked for by the Chairman of the Commission in "respect of other Divisions which were handling construction projects" in his note dated January 4, 1974 and promised to be put up by the Secretary of the Commission (in his note dated August 14, 1974) by 17 August 1974 does not appear to have been put up to the Chairman.

3.30. The Committee desired to know whether the Commission instituted any inquiry into the circumstances under which the two firms could secure orders in respect of over 200 building projects costing Rs. 3.22 crores and under execution in seven or eight States, and also whether any further orders were given to these firms after the fact of unsatisfactory supervision came to the notice of the Commission. The Ministry of Education and Social Welfare have, in a written note, stated as follows:

"According to the procedure followed during the Fourth Five Year Plan period it was for the Colleges and the Universities concerned to engage any qualified Engineer/Architect for preparation of plans and estimates and for supervision. No lists of approved Architects/Engineers are maintained by the Commission and the selection of a qualified Architect/Engineer is entirely the responsibility of the institu-

tion concerned and no communication from any Architect/Engineer engaged by the Colleges is entertained by the Commission. During March 1970, the Commission noticed that a few outstation Architects were approaching colleges and universities offering their services to prepare plans and estimates for construction projects. In order to avoid any erroneous impression, the above position was clarified through a press note and by intimating the same to all universities and through the Universities, the colleges.

The Commission while processing construction projects received from the Universities and Colleges had not accordingly taken any notice of the names of Architects who prepared the plans and estimates and such processing was done as and when such proposals were received duly recommended by the concerned Universities. It was, however, noticed during the course of the year 1972 that two firms of Architects were supervising work in a number of States.

The matter was, therefore, considered in all details by the Commission at its meeting held in December 1972. Thereafter an Expert Committee was appointed by the Commission to examine various aspects of this matter and devise a satisfactory procedure for sanctioning building projects. The recommendations of this Committee were considered by the Commission at its meeting held on 12th November 1973.

The procedure for sanctioning building projects was thereafter revised and streamlined to ensure that supervision was adequate and effective in respect of the building projects sanctioned by the Commission. According to the revised procedure followed during the 5th Five Year Plan period, colleges have been advised to engage, as far as possible, qualified local Architects and in case they are not available to engage such Architects from the nearest town. In the case of existing building projects referred to earlier, the matter was taken up with the Universities concerned to ensure that supervision arrangements were adequate and effective in such cases."

831. During evidence, the Committee desired to know the views of the Chairman, UGC on the subject. He stated:

"This matter has been dealt with almost entirely by the previous Chairman, Dr. George Jacob. I was not personally

connected with this matter; but I would share the concern of Members and say that this matter should be gone into thoroughly. so that the matter is investigated fully, to the satisfaction of all concerned. That is all that I can say."

The Education Secretary supplemented:

"...the Comptroller and Auditor General has supplied a wealth of information. The fundamental thing is, on the one hand, we have the necessity of the colleges coming to the UGC for specific approval of the project with estimates and all that. On the other hand, if two firms have grabbed 200 works, no matter how much more information we may get, there will be some suspicion attached to these two. No body can dispel this suspicion....."

8.32. Asked whether any probe had been made, the Education Secretary stated:

"It can certainly be made...."

He further added:

"I do not dispute at all that if an enquiry is made, some more answers would be coming. The Chairman of the UGC also shares the concern that an enquiry should be made."

8.33. Notwithstanding the reasons indicated and explanations offered for long delays in the completion of UGC-financed building schemes of colleges/universities leading to cost escalation involving further burdens on the Commission, the Committee would like UGC to devise a regular system of keeping a watch over the progress of such schemes until the production of an acceptable completion certificate in respect of the building project.

The Committee also desire it to be examined whether it is feasible to entrust all UGC-financed building projects of colleges/universities to the State PWDs to whom grant money may be paid by the UGC directly.

8.34. The Committee note that two Delhi-based firms of architects have managed to corner over 200 building projects costing Rs. 3.22 crores in universities and colleges spread over 7 or 8 States. The Committee suspect that such cornering of projects costing over rupees three crores by the firms would not have been possible with-

out the connivance of the officers of the Commission concerned with the distribution of building grants. According to a note prepared by the Secretariat of the Commission in pursuance of a query from the Chairman of the Commission on 7 December 1973, the fact that these firms were approaching the universities and colleges with the offer that the construction work was awarded to them they would be able to secure from the Commission building grants for the universities/colleges, came to the notice of the Commission as early as November 1969. The Secretariat of the Commission, however, could think of nothing else except issuing a press note and a circular to the universities (and that too 6 months after, in May 1970). No instructions appear to have been issued to the various divisions/sections of the Secretariat dealing with building grants to take special care to see that this situation was not allowed to continue. Even when a recurrence subsequently came to the notice of the Commission in 1972 and thereafter, the Commission was lulled into inactivity by Secretariat officers by the citation of the aforesaid circular of May 1970 as a proof of action taken in the matter and no positive steps were taken to remedy the situation and to prevent its recurrence in future.

8.35. The Committee also note that despite the desire of the then Chairman of the Commission expressed in his note of 1 January 1974 that "an enquiry may be made from officers who were incharge of the College Division as to how these two firms managed to corner so many constructions projects" and a reminder by him on 4 July 1974 to the Secretary of the Commission to "look into this personally" and submit to him an early report, the Secretary of the Commission "discussed" this question with only 3 available officers (out of 5 officers concerned) and recorded in the Note put up by him to Chairman more than 7 months after his query that they "informed me that the proposals relating to the construction of the building projects were processed as per guidelines circulated to universities and colleges." He further recorded: "I may in support of these officers submit that we had not taken notice of the name of the firms of the architect which prepared the plans and examined them as they came through the university concerned." He assured the Chairman that "to the best of my knowledge I have no reason to believe any malafide intention on the part of these officers." The Committee, however, consider this view of the Secretary of the Commission as a belatedly poor attempt to defend the officers concerned with the distribution of building grants in the period before 1974. In order to dispel the strong impression of collusion on the part of the officers of the Commission with the two architects leading to the situation described above, the Committee would like the

Ministry of Education and Social Welfare to set up an independent enquiry committee to investigate into the matter and if, as a result of this enquiry, any of the officers of the Commission, irrespective of whether they are in the Commission at the moment or outside, are found to be guilty of gross irregularities and collusion with the architects, suitable action should be taken against them.

I. MAINTENANCE GRANTS TO CENTRAL AND DEEMED UNIVERSITIES AND DELHI COLLEGES

Audit Paragraph

9.1. The Commission has been entrusted with the disbursement of maintenance grants to the central universities, certain deemed universities and colleges in Delhi. The number of such institutions and the grants paid to them between 1969-70 and 1975-76 are given below:

Year	Central Universities Number	Central Universities Amount	Deemed Number	University Amount	Delhi Colleges Number	Delhi Colleges Amount
(Amount in lakhs of rupees)						
1969-70	4	631.25	40	243.00
1970-71	5	711.64	40	232.06
1971-72	5	758.89	40	239.57
1972-73	5	800.21	40	247.85
1973-74	5	850.18	45	285.10
1974-75	5	1,514.24	55	617.17
1975-76	5	1,919.96	2	176.77	55	824.27

9.2. On the basis of students enrolment, the *per capita* maintenance grant for the year 1973-74 for the central universities was as under:—

	Rs.
University A	5,443
University B	2,808
University C	2,358
University D	1,174
University E	1,072

The Commission stated that the *per capita* grant was comparatively less in the case of university D as the bulk of the development and recurring expenditure was met from the Plan Funds.

[Paragraph 48 of the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India for the year 1975-76, Union Government (Civil) (pp. 245-246)].

9.3. As indicated earlier, the grants given by the Commission are meant to subserve the objectives of "promotion and coordination" of university education and "determination and maintenance of standards of teaching, examination and research". According to the Review Committee (1977), when judged in this context, the function of giving maintenance grants to central universities—i.e. grants meant for normal running of these universities may not appear to be on all fours with *raison d'etre* of the setting up of the Commission.

9.4. The Review Committee traced the origin of the provision relating to giving of maintenance grants to the Central universities and Delhi colleges as a legacy of the UGC Committee (1940). This was considered to be in accordance with the spirit underlying establishment of the UGC Committee in the UK which was regarded as a good working model.

9.5. The number of such institutions and the grants paid to them in 1976-77 are given below:

Year	Central Universities		Deemed Universities		Delhi Colleges	
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1976-77	5	1,950.00	9	366.90	55	*910.48

*Includes Rs. 32.39 lakhs by adjustment.

9.6. The student enrolment during 1974-75 and 1975-76 and its category-wise percentage is as under:

	Enrolment 1971-75	Per-centage to students enrolment	Enrolment 1975-76	Per-centage to students enrolment
A. Central Universities	46408	2.0	45178	1.9
B. Deemed Universities	6069	0.3	6161	0.3
C. State Universities	301379	12.7	316242	13.0
D. Delhi Colleges	57735	2.4	58861	2.4
E. Other Colleges	1954950	82.6	1990667	82.4
TOTAL	2366541	100.0	2426109	100.0

A. Central Universities

9.7. The Government of India was paying the maintenance grant directly to the Central Universities before the University Grants Commission Act was passed. The Act empowers the Commission to pay maintenance grants to Central Universities.

9.8. Under the provision of the Statutes of the respective Universities, the annual budget estimates are scrutinised by the Finance Committee of the University. This Committee amongst others has on it the officers of the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Finance as nominees of the Visitor of the University. In some cases, an officer of the University Grants Commission is also nominated by the Visitor as a member of the Finance Committee.

9.9. A note indicating the basis of working out the maintenance grants to Universities, furnished by the Ministry, at the instance of the Committee, is reproduced below:

"The basis for working out the maintenance grants paid to Central Universities has been reviewed generally every 5 years with the help of Review Committees to ensure that the amount fixed will reflect correctly the normal expenditure of Universities. The requirements of maintenance of each Central University are assessed in terms of approved income and expenditure.

- * * * * *

The present basis for working out the maintenance grant to Central Universities for a particular year is thus to allow with the approval of the Government a general increase of 5 per cent over the immediately preceding year's maintenance grant in order to cover normal increase in expenditure by way of increment and other recurring items. At the beginning of the plan period, the expenditure on plan posts and other recurring schemes for which expenditure during the previous plan period was met from plan funds, is generally merged into the maintenance grant payable in the succeeding plan period."

9.10. Asked to indicate whether financial commitments on new posts created in a plan period were also included in the expenditure

to be met out of maintenance grants, the Ministry have, in a written note, stated:

“The new posts created in a particular plan period are not charged to the maintenance grant payable during that plan period but their expenditure is met from the plan funds. However, after the expiry of the plan period, the expenditure on that account becomes a committed expenditure and is generally merged into the maintenance (block) grant payable in the succeeding plan period. However, it can happen, that a University may create some posts to meet the normal needs of the University from the funds available in the Revenue Budget but no such posts whose maximum of the scale is higher than Rs. 1000 can be created without the prior concurrence of the Commission. Such posts are generally very few in numbers.”

9.11. On the basis of students enrolment the *per capita* maintenance grant for the year 1973-74 as worked out by Audit for the central universities was as under:—

	Rs.
University A	5.443
University B	2.868
University C	2.358
University D	1.174
University E	1.672

9.12. Asked to indicate the reasons for wide disparity in the *per capita* maintenance grant as between the different Central Universities during the year 1973-74, the Ministry of Education stated in a written note:

“For the *per capita* expenditure per student to be compared with different universities, it is necessary to work out the figures with a common base. The facilities provided for the Central Universities vary with each university. As some of them provide facilities for medical, engineering and agricultural education whereas some others only provide for some or part of such sectors of higher education. Besides, these universities are mainly residential except one affiliating university with arrangement for sharing of teaching facilities at the postgraduate level.”

The Ministry further stated:

“In view of the varying nature of facilities provided by the Central Universities comparison of per student expenditure among the different Central Universities would not be meaningful.”

9.13. The Committee desired to know whether any comparative study had been undertaken by the Commission in respect of expenditure on maintenance, as incurred by State universities *vis-a-vis* different Central Universities. In a written note, the Ministry have replied:

“The Commission has not made any comparative study of the maintenance expenditure incurred by State Universities *vis-a-vis* Central Universities. However, while sending their development plans to the Commission for consideration, Universities were asked to indicate the maintenance expenditure paid to them by the State Governments.”

Maintenance grants to Delhi Colleges

9.14. Prior to the setting up of the University Grants Commission, the maintenance grant to private colleges affiliated to Delhi University was paid by the Ministry of Education. With the establishment of the University Grants Commission, this work was transferred to the Commission. The following was recorded in the proceedings of the Commission's meeting held on 3 April 1954:—

“The Chairman reported that the Minister for Education had directed that all work relating to grant-in-aid to the constituent colleges of Delhi dealt with by the University Grants Commission and that the University of Delhi being a University of the federal type, the teachers in the constituent colleges be treated on the same basis as teachers of the University for all purposes. This is recorded.”

The Committee desired to know whether the Commission ever considered why the colleges affiliated to Delhi University alone should be provided with maintenance grant-in-aid by the Commission. The Ministry of Education have stated in reply, in a written note:

“Prior to the setting up of the University Grants Commission, the maintenance grant to private colleges affiliated to

Delhi University was paid by the Ministry of Education, as was for the Delhi University. The Commission at its meeting held on October 8, 1973 and November 12, 1973 considered the question regarding the Commission's policy towards the Delhi Colleges and referred this to a Committee under the Chairmanship of the then Chairman, Dr. George Jacob. The Commission considered the report of this Committee on January 16, 1974 and resolved as follows:

'The Commission agreed that the University Grants Commission may continue to pay maintenance grants to Central Universities and the Colleges of Delhi University from funds specifically allocated for this purpose by the Ministry of Education.'

This is being followed and the maintenance grants are being paid out of the non-plan funds specifically provided for this. It also seems desirable that in view of the special relationship of Delhi Colleges with the University that the maintenance grants for both is paid from the same source."

9.15. The following grants were released to constituent and affiliated colleges of Delhi during the years 1973-74 to 1975-76:

	[Rupees in lakhs]		
	1973-74	1974-75	1975-76
(a) Non-Plan (Maintenance Grants)	285.10	617.17	824.27
(b) Plan (Development) Grants	680.28	381.16	277.63

9.16. The student enrolment and the percentage to total enrolment for the years 1974-75 and 1975-76 shows that 57,735 and 58,861 students were enrolled in Delhi colleges and their percentage worked out to 2.4 in both these years.

9.17. Explaining the reasons for an upward trend on maintenance grants as reflected in the Annual Accounts of the Commission in the year 1975-76, when compared to the grants released in 1973-74, the Ministry have, in a written note, stated:

"During 1973-74, in addition to Rs. 285.10 lakhs paid as maintenance grant to these colleges out of non-plan funds, an additional grant of Rs. 181.41 lakhs was paid for the same purpose from the plan provision. Thus the total maintenance grant paid to Delhi Colleges was Rs. 466.51 lakhs.

During 1974-75, the increase to Rs. 617.17 lakhs was mainly due to the following reasons:

- (a) Appointment of additional teachers consequent upon the increase in enrolment or starting of new courses.
- (b) Additional expenditure involved consequent upon the revision of scales of pay of the non-teaching staff and its consequent effect on the allowances effective from 1st January, 1973.
- (c) Expenditure on additional instalments of dearness allowance both for teaching and non-teaching staff.
- (d) Evening classes were started in 4 colleges during 1973-74. The expenditure during 1973-74 was for a period of 8 months. The expenditure during 1974-75 was not only for the full year but also for the second year of the course.

During 1975-76, the increase to Rs. 824.27 lakhs was due to the following reasons:

- (a) Appointment of additional teachers consequent upon the increase in enrolment.
- (b) Additional expenditure involved consequent upon the revision of scales of pay of the teaching staff and its consequent effect on the other allowances effective from 1st January, 1973.
- (c) Expenditure on four additional instalments of dearness allowance sanctioned to teaching and non-teaching staff.
- (d) Increase in expenditure for the third year of the evening classes started in 1973-74."

9.18. The maintenance grant to the constituent/affiliated colleges of Delhi University are paid in accordance with the grant-in-aid rules prescribed for the purpose. These grants are paid after determining the approved deficit for payment of maintenance grant on 95 per cent basis. In actual practice, however, it is on 100 per cent basis.

9.19. The Committee desired to know whether the colleges affiliated to State and other universities or those located in the Union Territories other than Delhi get maintenance grant-in-aid from the State Governments, Union Territories/other Government agencies on the same pattern as is given by the Commission in the case of

colleges affiliated to Delhi University. The Ministry of Education have, in a written note, stated:

“The Colleges affiliated to State Universities receive maintenance grants according to the provision contained in the grants-in-aid Code of the respective State Governments. The extent of assistance provided by the State Governments varies from State to State. For instance, in some States, maintenance assistance is provided on the basis of the entire net deficit; in some other cases, such assistance is provided as a percentage of the net deficit, or of the gross expenditure. The Union Territory Administrations have also formulated their own grants-in-aid Codes for providing maintenance assistance to affiliated Colleges. These Codes are generally based on the pattern of those obtaining in the neighbouring States.”

9.20. Asked to indicate whether there is any check to ascertain whether the colleges affiliated to State Universities get maintenance grants-in-aid and if so, the extent thereof, the Secretary, University Grants Commission stated in evidence:

“We do not have this specific information. Each State Government has its own grant-in-aid code and the assistance to the colleges is provided under the grant-in-aid code. Whether each college got the grant according to the grant-in-aid code or not, that information we do not have.”

9.21. Supplementing the above statement, the Chairman, UGC stated in evidence:

“I share the concern of the hon'ble Member regarding the situation in which a large number of colleges sometimes find themselves. There are two difficulties which we face. In the first instance, there does not seem to be any clear criterion on the basis of which many of these colleges have been set up. We find sometimes in the same city where colleges already exist and which could easily accommodate new students, new colleges are allowed to be set up and this obviously does mean a lot of public expenditure. That is one point. The second point is there is a separate grant-in-aid code in different States. We have set up a college review committee because we are concerned as to the manner in which these various colleges are being administered and we do hope that after

the work of this committee is over, it would be possible for us to make some recommendation to the Government and take some remedial measures and also to discuss this matter further with the State Governments so that these colleges could be helped.

We can only suggest some measures to the State Governments because the steps will have to be taken by the State Governments. We have impressed upon the State Governments that they should make legislation that no new college should be set up without the express prior approval of the State Government because when in some State a college is allowed to be set up and it becomes eligible for grant after the first batch of graduates pass the examination which means the baby is brought into existence and then the question arises who should provide sustenance. . . . if the States could legislate that no college could be set up without their express approval then that would be better."

9.22. The Committee find that the UGC's maintenance expenditure on the 5 Central universities has during the last 7 years (1970-71 to 1976-77) increased almost three-fold—from Rs. 7.12 crores in 1970-71 to Rs. 19.50 crores in 1976-77. It seems that the University Grants Commission is allowing unbridled expansion in the activities of these universities which cast a direct burden on the Central Exchequer towards their maintenance. The Committee would like UGC to exercise greater prudence in agreeing to schemes for further expansion and development of these universities so that maintenance expenditure on these universities is kept within reasonable limits.

9.23. The Committee are informed that UGC has not made any comparative study of the maintenance expenditure incurred by State universities vis-a-vis Central universities. The Committee would suggest that the Commission should compile figures of total grants received in each State university from the State Governments as well as from the Commission on an yearly basis and publish it in their Annual Report. This would enable the University Grants Commission to assess the financial resources of each university and may also help them in policy formulations.

9.24. The Committee also observe that there is a wide disparity in the per capita maintenance grants on the basis of student enrolment as between the 5 Central universities inter se. The Committee find it interesting to note that whereas in one university the per capita

maintenance grant on the basis of student enrolment for the year 1973-74 was as much as Rs. 5,443, in another university with several disciplines in Humanities and Sciences as well as professional courses like medical and engineering, it was only Rs. 1072. The explanation of the Government for this wide variation in the maintenance expenditure per student, viz. the comparison of per student expenditure among different Central universities would not be meaningful "in view of the varying nature of facilities provided", does not appear to be very convincing. The Committee would like the University Grants Commission to go into the question of maintenance grants to the various Central universities with a view to evolve a basis which, as far as possible, dilutes the glaring disparities.

9.25. From the information furnished to the Committee, they have not been able to glean out any reasonable explanation for special treatment being accorded to Delhi colleges in the Central Exchequer meeting their maintenance expenditure, except that this practice was prevalent even prior to the setting up of the Commission when the Ministry of Education was meeting the maintenance expenditure of private colleges affiliated to the Delhi University. With effect from 1954, however, this work was transferred to the Commission. The justification given for this special arrangement that "in view of the special relationship of Delhi colleges with the University" it is desirable that "the maintenance grant for both is paid from the same source" does not appear to be convincing. In this context, the Committee have noted that the maintenance expenditure during 1976-77 of 55 Delhi colleges totalling about Rs. 9 crores, working out to be about Rs. 17 lakhs per college on an average. Considering the fact that these colleges cater for only 2.4 per cent of the total student enrolment, it is on the high side. The Committee also find that the maintenance grants to the Delhi Colleges have increased from Rs. 6.17 crores in 1974-75 to Rs. 9.10 crores in 1976-77. The Committee would like the UGC to exercise greater control over the escalation in maintenance expenditure of these colleges.

9.26. The Committee are informed that at present University Grants Commission does not compile information in regard to maintenance grant-in-aid received by the colleges affiliated to the State Universities. The Committee feel that there is need for introducing a measure of uniformity in the matter of maintenance grant-in-aid from the State Governments to the colleges affiliated to the State Universities. To this end, the Committee would like the University Grants Commission to collect the grant-in-aid rules of different State Governments/Union Territories, marshal out their differing features and, in consultation with the State Governments, endeavour

to evolve a measure of uniformity in that regard. Unless the University Grants Commission takes an initiative in this matter, there would remain marked disparities in the financial viability of colleges affecting relatively their standards of teaching and research.

J. FINANCIAL CONTROL

(i) Budget

Audit Paragraph

10.1. (i) Under Section 17 of the University Grants Commission Act, 1956 the Commission is to prepare annually a budget for its direct expenditure and for grants etc. to be given by it to universities etc. The budget is to be in a prescribed form and is to be submitted to the Government. Section 12 of the Act empowers the Commission to inquire into the financial needs of the universities and allocate and distribute, out of the funds of the Commission, grants for maintenance and development of the universities and for any other general or special purpose. The requirement of finances for any year is considered by the Commission sometimes in the preceding October-November and proposals are sent to Government of India for consideration and allocation of funds.

10.2. The Government of India intimate the funds likely to be provided in their budget by February-April. It was seen that the revision of the budget was not considered in the light of the actual budget provision until October-November as indicated below:—

Year	Original estimates	Government's allocation		Revised estimates	
	Month in which commission approved annual budget estimates	Amount proposed in crores of rupees	Month in which Government of India communicated its allocation	Amount allocated in crores of rupees	Month in which revised estimates based on Government's allocation were approved by the Commission
1970-71	November 1969	35.33	February 1970	31.08	November 1970
1971-72	November 1970	37.24	February 1971	35.37	October 1971
1972-73		Not available			
1973-74	November 1972	43.27	April 1973	34.03	November 1973
1974-75	November 1973 and again in May 1974	51.42 45.71	March 1974	45.71	November 1974
1975-76	November 1974	48.01	February 1975	51.28	October 1975

It was stated by the Commission that the allocation for 1976-77 communicated by the Government (2nd March, 1976) was reported to the Commission on 22nd March, 1976.

10.3. (ii) It was noticed that there were large variations between revised estimates approved by the Commission (in October/November each year) and the final expenditure as indicated below:

Head of account	1967-70		1970-71		1971-72		1972-73		1973-74	
	Revised Estimates	Actuals	Revised Estimates	Actuals	Revised Estimates	Actuals	Revised Estimates	Actuals	Revised Estimates	Actuals
(Figures in lakhs of rupees)										
Plan										
1. Grants for humanities	142.00	171.74	170.00	209.63	226.00	254.10	303.00	304.72	328.36	293.75
2. Grants for science	311.00	360.56	350.00	345.42	330.00	401.00	650.04	674.82	441.12	473.97
3. Grants to constituent affiliated Colleges	413.00	354.93	627.10	740.35	1022.56	900.14	993.04	859.09	785.45	680.28
4. Miscellaneous schemes	563.15	334.68	670.90	422.64	775.11	646.46	1037.65	776.95	939.94	769.85
5. Seminars and Conferences	11.90	4.59	6.50	5.74	18.16	9.51	13.61	12.85	13.75	13.11
Non-Plan										
1. Grants to affiliated colleges of Delhi University	202.00	243.00	213.15	232.06	239.60	239.57	241.75	247.85	253.84	285.10

10.4. Though a monthly statement of expenditure against the budget provision is placed before the Commission for information, there was no system or procedure for analysing the causes of variations and obtaining the approval of the Commission for such variations.

[Paragraph 48 of the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India for the year 1975-76, Union Government (Civil). pp. 246—249]

10.5. From the table compiled by Audit, it is seen that the revised estimates for the year 1970-71 to 1975-76 based on Government's allocation were considered by the Commission 7 to 9 months after the receipt of intimation of the funds likely to be provided in the budget. The Committee, therefore, desired to know the reasons therefor. The Ministry of Education in a written note replied that in respect of the budgets for 1976-77 and 1977-78, the likely allocations were intimated to the Commission on 2-3-1976 and 19-2-1977 respectively and the budgets as revised in the light of the allocations were placed before the Commission in March, 1976 and June, 1977 respectively. No explanation has, however, been offered for delays pointed out by Audit during the Fourth Plan period.

10.6. As pointed out in the Audit paragraph there were large variations between revised estimates approved by the Commission and the actual expenditure during each of the years from 1969-70 to 1973-74. The Audit paragraph further pointed out that though a monthly statement of expenditure against the budget provision is placed before the Commission for information, there was no system or procedure for analysing the causes of variations and obtaining the approval of the Commission for such variations.

10.7. Asked whether the final allocation made by Government should not receive specific approval of the Government, the Education Secretary stated in reply in evidence:

“So far as reduced allocation by Government to UGC is concerned, there is no specific approval by the UGC for revised allocation to various activities of the UGC and this is the distinction which we have to keep in mind.”

10.8. The Audit Report also pointed out large variations between the revised estimates and actual expenditure during each year of the IV Plan period. In reply to the question whether the Commission proposed to evolve suitable procedures for analysing the causes of

variations and take steps to ensure that the expenditure incurred under various heads in 'Plan' as well as 'non-plan' allocations, conforms as far as possible to the allocation, the Ministry of Education have, in written note, stated:—

“The U.G.C. provides financial assistance to over 100 universities and about 3000 colleges on plan basis for their development purposes. However, in accordance with the conditions of grants laid down by the Commission the grants for each project/scheme are released on the basis of the progress report received from the university/college indicating the total expenditure incurred on each project/scheme and the expenditure likely to be incurred in the next few months. Keeping this in view the Commission makes provisions of funds in October-November every year for the budget estimates of succeeding year for various schemes/projects implemented/to be implemented by the universities and colleges with assistance from the Commission. It had, however, been observed that certain universities/colleges could not take up the implementation of the building projects due to various reasons beyond control of the university/college i.e. (i) non-availability of matching grant from the State Governments/institutions, (ii) non-availability of the building material and (iii) disputes with the contractors etc. Similarly, the universities/colleges place orders for the purchase of books and journals and scientific equipment out of the funds provided by the Commission and at times the delivery of the books and the equipment is not effected by the dealers to the universities and colleges during the said financial year. Accordingly, the amount due for payment on this account is paid to the firms in the next financial year. Also, the actual expenditure is dependent upon such factors as nature of activities and examination of actual requirements of institutions by visiting expert Committees, promptness with which the institutions prefer their schemes/proposals for final approval etc. It may, however, be mentioned that the Commission while preparing the revised estimates takes these factors into consideration and revise the estimates keeping in view amount actually released for various projects/schemes to universities and colleges during the first six months of the financial year and the likely amount to be released in the next six months.

In view of the reasons indicated above and the number of institutions with which the U.G.C. has to deal with, there is bound to be certain variations in the grants released to universities and colleges for various projects/schemes and the amount provided in the budget estimates. The Commission takes all possible precautions and steps to see that the budget is framed on the basis of the likely requirements of the universities/colleges for various projects/schemes, as also periodic review of expenditure to ensure that the actual expenditure conforms to the budget/revised estimates.

The non-plan allocations pertain mainly to the maintenance grants to Central Universities (including medical colleges of Aligarh Muslim University and Banaras Hindu University), colleges of Delhi University and the institutions deemed to be universities viz., Jamia Millia Islamia, New Delhi, Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore and CIEFL, Hyderabad. There is likelihood of actual expenditure exceeding the budget estimates, some of the reasons for this are:

- (a) Rise in cost and payment of additional dearness allowances, interim relief to employees;
- (b) Increase in the rate of maintenance of hospital beds in medical colleges;
- (c) Appointment of additional teaching staff consequent upon the increase in enrolment on starting new courses in Delhi colleges;
- (d) Transfer of teaching of honours courses in Botany and Zoology to Delhi colleges resulted in increase in laboratory expenditure."

10.9. The Review Committee have in the Report (1977) observed:

"Though by and large the percentage of release in different quarters has been evenly spread out, there is a noticeable tendency of larger releases of development grants in the last quarter and in the month of March. For example, between 1971-72 and 1974-75 the releases in the last quarter were on an average of the order of over 35 per cent and in the month of March about 17 per cent of the annual releases."

10.10. The Committee desired to know the procedure followed generally in releasing grants to the institutions. The Secretary, U.G.C., during evidence, replied:

“We (give) 1/12th in the beginning of a financial year and then in quarterly instalments.”

10.11. The Committee learnt from Audit that during the financial year 1976-77 the total disbursement under Plan funds upto 20-2-77 was Rs. 52 crores and as on 31-3-77 the disbursements jumped up to Rs. 71 crores, which shows a hurried disbursement of Rs. 19 crores during March 1977 alone. Asked whether the releases could have been more evenly planned throughout the year, the Secretary, UGC replied in evidence:

“Last year, to which you are referring, it is like this. At the Vice-Chancellors’ Conference of the Southern Universities held at Coimbatore, it was represented by the Vice-Chancellors that there was a difficulty of their ordering for books, equipments and appointment of staff if adequate funds or resources were not available in advance. It sometimes so happened that the officer may say that he is not bound by the letter of credit until the whole of the amount comes from the Commission.

* * * *

Because a large number of Universities approach in the month of January-February as they have been spending during the year, there is a large amount of expenditure incurred in the month of March. Concern was also expressed by the UGC—Review Committee—and we are looking into it. We have to see that they have adequate funds in advance. We would be having it and there should be no difficulty in meeting the expenditure.”

He further added:

“I am sorry, it was in relation to the grants approved for the Fifth Plan for books, journals, equipment and appointment of staff and not given outright for any other purpose. This was for enabling them to incur expenditure for the schemes already accepted by the Commission on the recommendations of the Visiting Committee.”

10.12. Asked whether the procedure adopted by usual, the Secretary, UGC, replied:

"This year they must give us the account. This was an advance amount. They will not get further grants unless they utilise that amount."

Supplementing the statement, the Chairman, U.G.C. stated:

"The Commission has, on various occasions, expressed its concern at the tendency of the expenditure being incurred in the last three months of a year. For this purpose we have been consulting the Vice-Chancellors of various Universities so that they themselves are able to gear up their machinery in such a way that the disbursement of funds proceeds on an even rate rather than in this uneven manner. It had been happening in the past. This matter was examined at some length with the Vice-Chancellors of the Southern Region in January, 1977. The idea was that we would be having various regional conferences. This question was examined in all seriousness and a number of suggestions were made by the Vice-Chancellors so that they would be able to help in the procedure. Whatever they recommended has been conveyed to the Vice-Chancellors of all regions. Therefore, we are hoping that the disbursement would not be as uneven though I would not say that it may not be as even as would be considered desirable."

10.13. A statement indicating the amount actually released during the month of March 1977 (i.e. from 1-3-77 to 31-3-77) under plan schemes, furnished subsequently at the instance of the Committee, is appended below:

Purpose	Amount
	Rs.
A. Grants to Central and State Universities for Humanities	5,17,92,121.25
B. Grants to Central and State Universities for Science	6,60,60,835.19
C. Grants to Central and State Universities for Engineering and Technology	2,01,51,854.42
D. Grants to constituent Affiliated Colleges	98,87,532.84
E. Grants to Central and State Universities for other schemes	5,41,99,045.16
F. Miscellaneous Schemes	5,20,500.20
TOTAL	18,23,31,892.15

10.14. The Committee note that the funds likely to be provided in the Union Budget are intimated to the U.G.C. by February/ April each year. It is seen that during the Fourth Plan the revised budget estimates based on likely allocations intimated by Government to the Commission were considered by the Commission 7 to 9 months after the receipt of such intimation from Government. Though the position has improved during 1976 and 1977, the Committee would like the Commission to evolve a self-regulatory mechanism whereby the revised budget estimates based on allocation intimated by Government to the Commission are placed before the Commission for approval not later than one month from the date of receipt of intimation from Government.

10.15. The Committee were informed during evidence that there is no system of obtaining specific approval of the Commission for revised allocation to the various activities of the U.G.C. The Committee feel that Commission should not absolve itself of its responsibility for laying down inter se priorities as between different schemes and allocating funds for each scheme during the year in the light of the final allocations made by Government. They desire that changes in allocations to various schemes during the year should be made after specific approval of the Commission.

10.16. The Committee find that there have been appreciable variations between the revised budget estimates and the actuals during each year of the Fourth Five Year Plan. While the Committee consider that the conditional nature of grants by the Commission lends itself to possibilities of variations between the budget estimates and the actual expenditure, the Committee feel that with the experience built up by the Commission during the last 24 years of its working, it should be possible for them to forecast their expenditure a little more realistically. In the case of the maintenance grants, the element of uncertainty being much less, it should be possible for the Commission to bring in a more precise estimation of expenditure. The variation to the extent of 12.6 per cent between the revised estimates and actuals during 1973-74 in respect of grants to affiliated colleges of Delhi University is hardly justifiable.

10.17 From the figures of releases made during the year 1976-77 under Plan schemes, it is seen that against the total releases during 11 months of the year amounting to about Rs. 52 crores, the releases during the month of March, 1977 totalled Rs. 18.23 crores. Financial prudence calls for even spread out of releases throughout the year to avoid last minute rush. It is particularly important at the UGC do not have adequate supervisory inspecting agency and they accept

the utilisation certificates from the recipient institutions value as conclusive proof of proper utilisation of grants. The Committee feel reassured that the UGC are seized of the problem and they hope that in future the releases of development grants would be more evenly spread out.

(ii) *Form of Accounts*

Audit Paragraph

10.18. Section 19 of the University Grants Commission Act provides that the Commission shall compile a statement of accounts in such form as may be determined by the Government of India in consultation with the Comptroller and Auditor General. The form of statement of accounts now in vogue was prescribed in consultation with the Comptroller and Auditor General and adopted from 1963-64. The form of statement of accounts then approved does not provide for programme-wise break up of plan expenditure. There are also no subsidiary registers maintained by the Commission for compiling the expenditure under Plan programmes and reconciling the same with the figures compiled in the accounts. Consequently, varied figures of expenditure on Plan programmes incurred between 1969-70 and 1973-74 were reported in different documents (Rs. 109.88 crores as per Annual Reports, Rs. 110.64 crores as per Annual Accounts and Rs. 113.58 crores as per the Fourth Five Year Plan Appraisal submitted by the Commission to the Government).

[Para 48 of the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India for the year 1975-76, Union Government (Civil), p. 249]

10.19. According to Audit paragraph, varied figures of expenditure on Plan programmes incurred between 1969-70 and 1973-74 were reported in different documents and these could not be reconciled in the absence of a programme-wise break up of expenditure.

10.20. The Committee desired to know the reasons for not compiling the scheme/programme-wise accounts. The Secretary, UGC replied during evidence:—

“From the Fifth Plan, we are maintaining scheme-wise accounts also—So, these accounts are being maintained in the forms notified under the Act and approved by the C & AG. I think it may be necessary to review them. But, we have been maintaining accounts scheme-wise. We have now got the latest 1976-77 account which we are presenting to you. So, we are maintaining accounts scheme-wise also.”

10.21 The Committee desire that the University Grants Commission should, in consultation with Comptroller & Auditor General, revise the form of statement of accounts to provide for scheme programme-wise break up of plan expenditure.

(iii) *Watch over utilisation of grants paid by the Commission*

Audit Paragraph

10.22. During the period 1958-59 to 1974-75, the Commission disbursed a sum of Rs. 34,380.13 lakhs as grants to various universities and colleges. According to the procedure adopted by the Commission till 1971-72 to watch utilisation, each grantee institution was required to submit periodic progress report and a statement of expenditure. On the expiry of the prescribed period, a statement of accounts was to be rendered by the grantee institutions followed up by a copy of audited statement of accounts. Based on these returns the various branches in the Commissions office which sanctioned the grants were to complete their records and issue certificates of utilisation to the accounts branch of the Commission. There were however, heavy arrears in the issue of utilisation certificates. The Estimates Committee stated (April 1966) that they were "inclined to take a serious view of the casual treatment given by the Commission to the issuance of the certificates." They also regretted that Ministry of Education and Social Welfare had not, under powers vested in them, issued direction even though large amounts had been given by the Commission for which the utilisation certificates had not been issued. The Committee, therefore, suggested that the whole matter should be considered at a high level and suitable measures taken. The Public Accounts Committee in its 114th Report (April 1970) reiterated, *inter alia*, the suggestions made in its earlier report (41st Report—1965-66) that in order to enforce financial discipline in case of persistent default without valid reason, the question of withholding further grants should be seriously considered. While taking note of the difficulties in furnishing the utilisation certificates, the Public Accounts Committee desired that this question should be considered in consultation with Audit in all its aspects and a suitable arrangement worked out for streamlining the procedure for issue of utilisation certificates.

10.23. Pursuant to this, it was decided by the Commission in consultation with Audit in October, 1970, that certificates of utilisation would be issued on the basis of progress reports and accounts of utilisation without waiting for audited accounts, and also that the Commission would conduct a supplementary check on the certificates after the audited accounts were received. The institutions

were also asked to furnish with effect from 1967-68 statements of unutilised grants as on 31st March each year, so as to enable the Commission to examine the position of unutilised grants and to take steps, where necessary, to withhold further grants. Besides, an officer was appointed with effect from 11th September, 1970 for visiting various universities which were in heavy arrears for taking remedial measures.

10.24. The position of outstanding utilisation certificates as on 30th September 1976 compared to the position in April 1970, when the matter was discussed by the Public Accounts Committee is indicated in the following table:—

Year	As reported to the P.A.C. in April, 1970—position as upto February 1970		Position as upto Sept. 1976	
	Number of items	Amount in lakhs of Rs.	Number of items	Amount in lakhs of Rs.
1	2 a	2 b	3 a	3 b
1953-54 to 1957-58	410	193.30	Nil	Nil
1958-59	408	175.39	88	27.47
1959-60	765	252.17	129	34.00
1960-61	1100	314.37	258	30.39
1961-62	1458	522.46	435	102.02
1962-63	2001	507.90	934	137.26
1963-64	2745	680.14	1205	200.13
1964-65	4248	762.03	1708	216.46
1965-66	5485	1083.23	2154	277.05
1966-67	5268	1268.68	1985	281.61
1967-68			2813	365.43
1968-69			3359	380.32
1969-70			5148	337.38
1970-71			6347	980.20
1971-72			7418	1724.36
1972-73			5788	2036.77
TOTAL	23888	5609.76	39862	7157.27

10.25. It would be seen that despite the simplification of procedure the number of cases of outstanding utilisation certificates has not gone down. Further 12,427 items valued at Rs. 55.38 crores in respect of grants sanctioned during 1973-74 and 1974-75 also became outstanding by 30th September, 1976. It may be noted that out of 23,888 items (Rs. 57.00 crores) reported outstanding to the Public Accounts Committee in April 1970, 8989 items (Rs. 13.24 crores) were outstanding (September 1976).

10.26. According to information obtained by the Commission from the universities, the unspent balances with the universities as on 1st April, 1975 was Rs. 6.74 crores. No break-up of these balances indicating the years from which these were outstanding was available with the Commission. No information about the unspent balances lying with the colleges was called for by the Commission (December 1976).

10.27. Some of the items pertaining to the period 1958-59 to 1962-63 for which utilisation certificates have not been issued so far (October 1976) are as under:

Grants paid to	Amount (in lakhs of Rupees)
Indian Institute of Science	48.28
Mysore University	38.75
Punjab University	36.46
Delhi University	26.56
Banaras Hindu University	20.50
Poona University	14.42
Osmania University	14.04
Aligarh Muslim University	12.92
Utkal University	12.07
Lucknow University	10.79

[Paragraph 48 of the Report of the Comptroller & Auditor General of India, for the year 1975-76, Union Government (Civil) pp. 240-252]

10.28. The Public Accounts Committee (1969-70) in its 114th Report (Fourth Lok Sabha) while taking note of the difficulties in furnishing the utilisation certificates, desired that this question should be examined in consultation with Audit in all its aspects with

a view to streamline the procedure for issue of utilisation certificates. In paragraph 2.34 of its 114th Report, the Committee stated:

"The Committee note that there are certain difficulties in taking the audited accounts as the basis for certification of expenditure incurred by the universities against various grants. The Committee suggest that this question should be examined in consultation with Audit in all its aspects and a suitable arrangement worked out. It should also be examined as to what extent the procedural requirements have stood in the way of issuing utilisation certificates so that they could be streamlined or even done away with, if they serve no essential purpose."

According to audit paragraph, despite the arrangements introduced in consultation with audit in October 1970, for streamlining the procedure for issue of utilisation certificates, the number of cases of outstanding utilisation certificates has not gone down.

10.29. The details of outstanding utilisation certificates as on 1st April 1977 have been given by the Ministry as follows:

Statement showing Utilisation Certificates pending on 1st April, 1977

Year to which pertains	Amount in lakhs of Rupees			
	Position as on 28-2-1970		Position as on 1-4-77	
	No. of Items	Amount	No. of Items	Amount
1	2	3	4	5
1953-54 to 1957-58	410	193.30	Nil	Nil
1958-59	408	175.39	67	22.63
1959-60	765	252.17	99	25.81
1960-61	1100	314.37	214	33.51
1961-62	1455	522.46	359	87.51
1962-63	2001	507.99	866	126.05
1963-64	2745	680.14	1146	200.73
1964-65	4248	762.03	1761	205.45
1965-66	5485	1083.23	2112	262.18
1966-67	5268	1208.68	1944	269.26
Sub-TOTAL	23888	5699.76	8568	1233.13

1	2	3	4	5
1967-68			2770	357.48
1968-69			3309	376.06
1969-70			5074	32.45
1970-71			6198	952.58
1971-72			7183	1129.93
1972-73			5556	164.63
1973-74			4823	1584.29
1974-75			6483	2457.09
GRAND TOTAL	23888	5699.76	49964	10056.45

10.30. It is seen from the Statement furnished to the Committee that by the end of 1974-75, the number of items in respect of which utilisation certificates were outstanding was about 50,000, involving an amount of over Rs. 100 crores. It is also noted that whereas in April, 1970 the P.A.C. was informed that the utilisation certificates were outstanding in respect of grants paid upto 1966-67 for as many as 23,888 items involving an amount of about Rs. 57 crores, by the year 1974-75 as many as 8568 items involving an amount of Rs. 12.33 crores still remained outstanding in respect of grants paid upto 1966-67.

10.31. Conceding that there has not been perceptible improvement in the liquidation of old items, the Secretary, Ministry of Education stated in evidence:

"It is taking more time for us to clear the old items as compared to the recent items. So, the UGC will spend little more time looking into the old cases and finalise them quickly hereafter."

He added:

"We have disposed of all the cases upto 1957-58. So, these cases are that of the later period. I may also add that the last two years viz., 1973-74 and 1974-75 alone account for approximately 41 crores of rupees."

10.32. Explaining the reasons for persistence of arrears in the issue of utilisation certificates despite the simplification of proce-

dures and appointment of a special officer in 1970, the Secretary, U.G.C. stated:

"I can apologise for this. We are doing our best. We have cleared some as mentioned. The situation would not look so bad now as it was before; till the end of 1974-75 the utilisation certificates pending amount to Rs. 9416 lakhs of which now only Rs. 1,587 lakhs are pending relating to the Central Universities maintenance grants. Now, we are following a simplified formula which, as you will kindly see, is agreed to by the C&AG. We are following that for the development grants—not for the non-plan grants. If we could get audited accounts available of all the central Universities quicker, then this would possibly be easier to straightway clear about Rs. 15 crores and the balance may be Rs. 78.28 crores.

With the limited manpower that we have, since we have been involved more in our day-to-day work in sanctioning schemes and the proposals, we could not give as much attention to this as it should have been. I must confess that. In fact, the Commission has expressed on more than one occasion that we should try to clear the arrears. Now, we have cleared fairly good numbers of the utilisation certificates. Since we are going to discuss this with the Chairman, we are going to suggest to him to appoint a special team for it and try to complete this within a year or so."

He added:

"As I confessed earlier, as far as colleges are concerned, there is not much of difficulty about the issue of utilisation certificates. In their case they have to get the certificate from the C.A. In the case of others, we have to send the officers for the purpose. As I mentioned earlier, due to other work, we are paying less attention to this. We pay attention to see that grants are not delayed. More attention has been given to this than that."

10.33. In a written note furnished subsequently at the instance of the Committee, the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare have indicated that the following steps have been taken to settle the outstanding items from 1958-59 onwards:

"(1) Accounts Officer has visited 15 universities to collect the actual expenditure against grants paid upto 1961-62/1968-69 from the initial accounts of the universities and

the utilisation certificates issued by the Registrars on the basis of this are helping in clearing many old items.

- (ii) The Vice-Chancellors of the defaulting universities concerned have been addressed to arrange to send utilisation certificates duly signed by the Registrar under his seal in respect of items for the years 1958-59 to 1961-62. There has been a good response and many of the old items up to the years 1961-62 are expected to be cleared in this phase.
- (iii) Having good response from the Vice-Chancellors of the universities, the list of items for the years 1962-63 to 1965-66 have also been sent to the Vice-Chancellors of the defaulting universities to arrange to send the utilisation certificates duly signed by the Registrar. A large number of items are also expected to be cleared by this method.
- (iv) The Registrars/Principals are required to send progress reports of the each scheme/project in respect of which grants are paid by the UGC in the prescribed form. A provision has been made that these forms should include the utilisation certificates of the expenditure already incurred and this is helping in issuing provisional utilisation certificates now.
- (v) In respect of grants paid for plan schemes, the universities are being addressed with the list of grants paid during the previous financial year to send the details of opening balance, grant received during the year, total grant available, expenditure against the grant and the closing balance. The Registrars are required to send list of statements duly signed by them. Provisional utilisation certificates are being issued on receipt of such statements also.
- (vi) The auditors of the universities are also being supplied with the list of grants and are being requested to send the utilisation certificates in respect of the expenditure incurred against each grant after audit of the accounts of the university. Wherever necessary, reminders are being issued to ensure audited utilisation certificates from the auditors.

The above steps are expected to reduce the outstanding items considerably in a year."

10.34. According to Audit paragraph, some of the items pertaining to the period 1958-59 to 1962-63 for which utilisation certificates

had not been issued till October, 1976, were as under:—

Grants paid to	Amount in Lakhs of Rupees
Indian Institute of Science	48·28
Mysore University	38·75
Punjab University	36·46
Delhi University	26·56
Banaras Hindu University	20·50
Poona University	14·42
Osmania University	14·04
Aligarh Muslim University	12·92
Utkal University	12·97
Lucknow University	11·79

10.35. Asked to indicate the purposes for which these grants were given and why these amounts have remained unrecovered if they have not been satisfactorily utilised, the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare have in a written note replied:—

“The purpose for which grants were released in respect of which utilisation certificates are outstanding for the period 1958-59 to 1962-63 are given below:—

3. Improvement of salary scales of college teachers.
2. Salary of additional staff for various science departments.
3. Improvement of salary scales of college teachers.
4. Purchase of science equipment (Science Department).
5. Purchase of books and journals.

In order to clear these outstanding items for which utilisation certificates are awaited, D.O. correspondence has been initiated with the Vice-Chancellors of the defaulting universities concerned requesting them to send the utilisation certificates duly signed by the Registrars under their seals. The question of recovery of balance will arise only after receiving full details of the expenditure against each grant. At this stage, it cannot be stated that the

grants have not been spent for the purpose for which they were given as details of expenditure are still awaited from the universities. After receipt of the utilisation certificates, steps will be taken to recover the balance of grants from the universities."

10.36. Asked to indicate the unspent balance from out of grants made to (i) universities, and (ii) colleges, as on 1st April, 1976, the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare in a written note replied:

"Based on the information collected from the universities, it is seen, that as on 1st April, 1976, there was an unspent balance plus of Rs. 11.44 crores and a minus balance of Rs. 5.67 crores leaving a net unspent balance of Rs. 5.77 crores. Similar information is not being collected from colleges. However, any refund required to be made by the colleges can if necessary be adjusted against future grants payable to them"

10.37. The Audit has pointed out that no break-up or unspent balances with universities indicating the years from which these were outstanding was available with the Commission. In a written note, the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare have explained:

"The universities are requested to furnish the statement of unspent balance out of the grants paid during the last financial year and the previous years. As the plan schemes are continuous, the balance of any grant in any financial year is carried forward to the next financial year. The closing balance against each grant, therefore, expresses the balance out of grant last paid and for this purpose the universities are now being requested to send the details of the closing balance. The statement of unspent balances received from the universities are showing the opening balance, grant received during the financial, total grant available, expenditure during the financial year and the closing balance. This information together with the (grant-wise) information is considered sufficient for regulating future grants and to recover the unspent balance by adjustment or by cash wherever necessary."

10.38. The Ministry of Education and Social Welfare were asked as to why this type of information was not being called for from the colleges as also to indicate the number of cases in which such adjustments had been made against future grants payable to the colleges. They have in a written note stated:

"As the number of colleges assisted by the Commission is very large, it is not possible to initiate centralised correspondence with each college to collect the details of unspent balance against each grant with each college every year. However, progress of the scheme indicating the expenditure and the utilisation certificates are called for periodically from the colleges before the further grant is released. Audited utilisation certificates are also being called for in respect of the grants paid to the colleges. Every effort is made to recover in cash or by adjustment the unspent balance in case of colleges. It may not be possible to indicate the total number of adjustments made in this regard from inception to date.

During the year 1977-78 (from 1-4-1977 to 15-10-1977) adjustments have been made for an amount of Rs. 55.64,180.74."

10.39. As obviously the U.G.C. had no effective system to check up the proper utilisation of grants by the recipient institutions, the Committee desired to know how the Commission ensured that utilisation of funds correlated to the execution of schemes. The Secretary, U.G.C. stated in reply in evidence:—

"For the latter part of the question, I would say that the certificates of the auditors on the audit accounts are the only machinery which we are using. Secondly, sometimes when the visiting committees go to assess the requirements of the next plan, they know what has been given in the previous plan and in a short period they are there they come to know that those things are physically there."

10.40. In a written note furnished subsequently, the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare, have stated:—

"The Commission calls for periodical progress reports of each scheme/project including expenditure incurred thereon, duly signed by the Registrar of the University or principal of the college. The progress report form has necessary provision for utilisation certificates of the expenditure incurred. In the case of Building projects, the progress reports of expenditure are also required to be signed by the Engineer-in-Charge/Architect of the construction work. Further audited utilisation certificates are called for to ensure that the expenditure has been incurred for the purpose for which it was meant."

10.41. In the above context, the Committee enquired whether some suitable machinery should not be evolved for the purpose of checking and verifications of proper utilisation of fund for the intended purpose. The Chairman, U.G.C. stated in reply in evidence:

"I agree with you fully. In fact as the Secretary has said, it is a matter which has been discussed in the Commission on a number of occasions and the Commission has taken initiative in this matter. These old accounts at any rate could be disposed of. We are thinking of taking action along the following lines. The format of the Utilisation Certificates has now been simplified. Therefore, we expect that the disposal will be expeditious. Secondly, now that the staff Inspection Unit of the UGC has completed its work, we hope that we shall be able to constitute a study group which will go into this matter and liquidate them. As the Secretary said, we will try to clear all the cases within a year's time. I fully agree with you that if these utilisation certificates are delayed for such a long time, then they become history and they do not really help us in the work for which we are supposed to be disbursing the grant."

10.42. In the same context, the Chairman, U.G.C. further stated in evidence:

"Unless the college provides utilisation Certificates for the previous period, normally approval for the new project is not given."

10.43. Commenting on the absence of an effective system of check up being followed by the Commission in regard to utilisation of grants by the recipient institutions, the Review Committee *inter alia* in paragraph 4.19 of their Report (1977) observed:

"...It (Commission) generally accepts utilisation certificates from the institutions as sufficient evidence of proper utilisation. Instances were brought to our notice during interviews that there are cases where utilisation is not all that perfect as utilisation certificates may indicate. It appear desirable that the Commission should sent out small teams for physical verification on a sample basis of the utilisation of grants. Of course insistence should be on major grants rather than on minor items.... In respect of grants for special projects, there is also need for a mid-

term appraisal of the progress in utilisation. For example, as one academician told us, in a particular university large sums were paid as grants for a project. The output of the project was only five volumes whereas large amounts were consumed by way of salaries to staff..”

10.44. Asked to state whether it was a fact that the utilisation certificates had not been furnished in some cases as the grants for a specific purpose had been diverted by the recipient institution to some other purpose the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare have stated in a written note that ‘no specific case has been brought to the notice of the Commission’.

10.45. The Annual Report of the University Grants Commission for the year 1975-76 in their introductory Chapter dealing with development of colleges indicated:

“.....However, there has not been any marked improvement in the general situation facing the colleges. In view of the revision of salaries of the teaching staff, in a number of cases Board of Management of private colleges are finding it difficult to run the colleges, particularly non-viable colleges. On occasions, complaints have been received by the Commission regarding malpractices in the payment of salaries to teachers. Since the Commission does not have any authority to interfere in the internal affairs of the colleges, such complaints have invariably been referred to the universities concerned for such action as they may like to take.

“* * * * *

10.46. Concern over such malpractices was expressed in the Lok Sabha on the 20 July, 1977 when the House considered the above report of the U.G.C. laid on Table of the House on 4 April, 1977. Serious concern had been expressed in a section of the Press also.

10.47. From an article in the Indian Express (5 December, 1973) under the caption ‘Pickings from Education’ by Chanchal Sarkar, it is seen that there have been complaints that ‘mobile’ libraries used to lend books to colleges shortly before they were subjected to the visit of a team of the UGC.

10.48. The Committee desired to know whether any complaints had been received by the Commission regarding the malpractices in the payments of salaries to teachers by colleges/universities and if

so, whether any action had been taken by the UGC to eliminate the possibility of such malpractices.

The Ministry of Education and Social Welfare, in a written note, replied:—

“No complaints have been received by the Commission regarding malpractices in the payment of salary to teachers by universities. However, in case of colleges, there have been vague suggestions that there are some malpractices in the payment of salary to teachers by private colleges. However, no specific cases with adequate evidence have been reported to the Commission.

10.49. Section 14 of the UGC Act empowers the Commission to withhold grants from a University which does not comply with the recommendations made by the Commission under Sections 12 and 13 or contravenes the provisions of any rules made under clauses (f) or (g) of sub-section (2) of Section 25 or any of the regulations made under clause (c) or (f) or (g) of Section 26 of the Act *ibid*.

10.50. The Committee desired to know whether the lever of withholding grants had ever been thought of in case of failure of persuasion for implementation of recommendations, advice or utilisation of funds. The Chairman, UGC giving his reactions during evidence stated:—

“As far as the other question is concerned, whether it was necessary within the armoury of the UGC to discontinue or to withhold funds if a university does not carry out a policy, I would like to say—I am quite sure you will agree—that this is a power which should be used only very sparingly and only in exceptional cases because if this was to be used freely, then its value, in my opinion would be lost. The UGC has used it very sparingly because it feels that if we were to discontinue or withhold the development grant, firstly, if it is a university, it would continue to function but it would continue at a low level and, secondly, it would affect the students more than anybody else.”

10.51. In another context, the Chairman, University Grants Commission stated during evidence:

“This is perhaps the chief lacuna in the system of higher education. The only power which the UGC has it to

withhold the grant. The UGC has no power to compel any university or college to follow the advice or the guidelines which we might give. We can try and do use our influence. In some cases our persuasion does work but in a very significant number of cases it does not work. Now some mechanism whereby the States can follow up this in a more meaningful manner is perhaps called for. There are Directorates of College education in various States. But my impression is that there is not much of coordination between them nor do they have any machinery to find out what is happening in the colleges which are affiliated to the University itself. We are trying to persuade the universities to set up college development councils so that they not merely have the right to supervise the colleges but also have the responsibility of giving help and advice in their development."

10.52. The Committee desired to know whether the Commission had ever withheld the grant of a university under Section 14 of the UGC Act. In a written note, the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare replied:—

"The Commission has not so far resorted to the extreme step of withholding grants to universities under Section 14 of the UGC Act. However, in a few cases, the Commission has imposed a temporary ban on release of further grants to universities and colleges, if they have not settled the accounts or some irregularities have been pointed out regarding utilisation of grants."

10.53. The Committee regret that despite the simplification of procedures in regard to certificate of utilisation introduced in consultation with audit in October 1970 and the appointment of an officer with effect from 11 September 1970 for undertaking visits to universities which are in heavy arrears with a view to taking remedial measures, the problem of outstanding utilisation certificates continues unabated. They note that as on 1 April, 1977, utilisation certificates for grants paid upto 1974-75 were outstanding in respect of nearly 50,000 items, involving over Rs. 100 crores. They also note that despite adverse notice of the P.A.C. in their 114th Report (Fourth Lok

Sabha), out of the outstandings reported to the P.A.C. (1969-70), as many as 8568 items involving Rs. 12.33 crores still remain outstanding even after a lapse of 7 years. It is clear that this matter has not been given the attention that it deserved. The Committee are not satisfied with the explanation that 'the Commission had limited manpower which was involved more in day-to-day work of sanctioning of schemes and proposals. They would like the Commission to draw up a crash programme for liquidating the outstanding utilisation certificates.

10.54. The Committee also find that the utilisation certificates had not been issued till October 1976 in respect of grants paid during the period 1958-59 to 1962-63 to certain universities. The purposes for which the grants were released to these universities are stated to be post-graduate scholarships, salary of additional staff, improvement of salary scales, purchase of science equipment, books and journals etc. The items for which grants were paid could have been easily accounted for. Yet, the Committee are informed that "D.O. correspondence had been initiated with the Vice-Chancellors of the defaulting universities concerned requesting them to send the utilisation certificates." Since the universities involved are well-established universities with adequate secretarial manpower, the Committee are inclined to think that the Commission had been lax in pursuing the matter with the universities at a high level which they have now done. The Committee hope that the Commission will spare no effort in getting the utilisation certificates from the universities without any further delay.

10.55. The Committee regard it as a serious matter that as on 1 April 1976, there was an unspent plus balance of Rs. 11.44 crores in respect of certain universities. Even if the minus balance in respect of these universities as on 1 April 1976 is deducted, it would leave with the universities a net unspent balance of Rs. 5.77 crores. It is surprising that the commission have no break up of these balances indicating the years from which these were outstanding. They are unable to appreciate the continuation of grants to these universities without having unspent plus balances fully accounted for and adjusted or refunded within a reasonable period. The Committee would like the U.G.C. to devise an in-built system whereby they could call for the refund of the in-spent balances if adjustments thereof against future grants are not possible within a reasonable period.

10.56. The Committee are informed that the UGC is not requiring the colleges to furnish to them the information regarding the unspent balances lying with them in respect of grants made by the

Commission as is being done by the universities. The Committee doubt the efficacy of the procedure whereby "any refund required to be made by the colleges can, if necessary, be adjusted against future grants payable to them." They would like the Commission to introduce a system whereunder colleges assisted by the Commission do forward to the Commission details of unspent balances against each grant at the end of the financial year. The procedure in regard to the refund of unspent balances by the universities should also be made applicable to the colleges.

10.57. The Committee have been informed during evidence that certificates of the Auditors is the only machinery which the Commission has for ensuring that the grant made for a particular scheme has been utilised for that purpose. This, the Committee feel, is not adequate. The Committee suggest that the Commission should not rely upon the certificate from the Auditor alone and should have, in addition, some other independent system also for ensuring that the funds released by the Commission are actually utilised for the agreed purpose.

10.58. The Commission have themselves been pointing out in their Annual Report that they have occasionally received complaints regarding mal-practices in the payment of salaries to teachers. The Committee are of the view that in its capacity as donor of development grants to the colleges, the Commission can always take active interest on complaints received by it of mal-practices in the payment of salaries to teachers by the colleges which are receiving assistance from the Commission.

10.59. The Committee learn that the U.G.C. has not so far resorted to the provision of withholding grants to institutions under Section 14 of the U.G.C. Act, even though the Commission have been finding it difficult to get information and documents such as utilisation certificates from universities and colleges. The Committee feel that for dealing with recalcitrant universities and colleges, U.G.C. should be within their right to use the power available to them under Section 14 of the Act.

(iv) *Maintenance of block accounts of assets*

Audit paragraph

10.60. Each grantee institution, other than the central universities and colleges of Delhi University, is required to maintain a block account of assets created out of financial assistance from the Commission. Annually each institution has to furnish a certificate to

the Commission in a prescribed form to the effect that proper accounts of the assets had been maintained, the assets had not been encumbered or disposed of and that they had been utilised for the object for which assistance was given. No watch over receipt of such certificates was kept in the Commission; most of the institutions did not, in fact furnish the certificates. There were no records to show that the assets were being utilised for the purpose for which the same were acquired and that the Commission had satisfied itself in this regard. The Commission stated (December 1976) that the Universities had been asked to furnish the pending certificates before the end of March 1976. The institutions had further been informed that non-submission of such certificates would result into stoppage of grant, etc. Names of institutions from which such certificates were still awaited and whether any action was taken against them by the Commission are not known (December 1976).

[Paragraph 48 of the Report of the Comptroller & Auditor General of India for the year 1975-76 Union Government (Civil), pp. 252-253]

10.61. The Audit paragraph states that each institution, other than Central Universities and Delhi Colleges, are required to maintain a block account of assets created out of financial assistance from the Commission and to furnish annually a certificate to the Commission in respect of these assets. The Commission has not been keeping a watch over the receipt of such certificates. The universities were asked to furnish the pending certificates before the end of March, 1976 failing which grants to them were to be stopped.

10.62. The Committee desired to know whether the Commission had since received the pending certificates regarding proper maintenance of accounts in respect of the assets acquired by grantee institutions from out of the UGC grants and whether any steps had been taken to ensure that such certificates were invariably furnished in time by them in future. In a written note, the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare have replied:—

The Commission has been gradually receiving the pending certificates from the grantee institutions and in other cases are pursuing the matter with the universities/colleges. Since the requisite certificate is to be signed by university/college authorities and the auditors, the universities/colleges take a considerable time in sending the certificates in view of the time taken in getting the records audited of the grants paid by the Commission to the uni-

versities/colleges. The accounts of the college are not finalised without receiving the Assets certificate in respect of building projects. The Commission also receives certificates duly signed to the effect that the terms and conditions attached to the grants are acceptable to the universities is obtained before releasing any grant to the universities/colleges. The condition in respect of maintaining a register of assets is covered under the above certificate.

In November 1975, the universities were requested to forward assets certificates in the prescribed form for each year separately by the end of March every year. The universities were further requested to send these certificates regularly to avoid any inconvenience in the matter of releasing grants. Steps have thus been taken to ensure that these certificates are received regularly by various section dealing with them by insisting on them."

10.63. The Committee note that the U.G.C. requested the Universities in November 1975 to forward certificates of assets by the end of March every year indicating that the inventories of permanent and semi-permanent assets created/acquired wholly or mainly out of the grants given by the U.G.C. were being maintained and kept upto date. As the Commission have not been able to furnish to Audit the names of institutions from which such certificates were still awaited the Committee are led to believe that no proper watch over receipt of such certificates is kept in the Commission. The Committee urge that a centralised register should be maintained for the purpose in the Commission and the proforma of the certificate should also include whether the assets are being utilised for the object for which these were acquired.

(v) Surplus Funds

Audit Paragraph

10.64. Section 16(2) of the University Grants Commission Act 1956 enjoins that all money belonging to the fund of the Commission should either be deposited in bank or invested in such manner as may be decided by the Commission with the approval of the Central Government. In November, 1972 Audit had pointed out that though on many occasions the balance with the Commission had exceeded Rs. 50.00 lakhs, the same was not invested even in short-term deposits which could have earned some interest. Cases in

which balances had exceeded the above limit during 1968-69 to 1975-76 are indicated below:

Year	Between Rs. 50 lakhs and Rs. 200 lakhs.	Between Rs. 201 lakhs and Rs. 500 lakhs	Over Rs. 500 lakhs
1968-69	3 months	7 months	..
1969-70	3 months	4 months	4 months
1970-71	2 months	2 months	7 months
1971-72	5 months	3 months	3 months
1972-73	3 months	3 months	4 months;
1973-74	3 months	6 months	1 month
1974-75	3 months	6 months	3 months
1975-76;	1 month	4 months	7 months
TOTAL	23 months	35 months	28 months

10.65. The Commission stated that various practical difficulties are encountered in estimating the cash requirements in respect of 3000 colleges and 90 universities spread over the whole country and that the cash balances commented upon by Audit were not a continuous balance existing from a single receipt of grants but were the cumulative result of subsequent receipt of grants from the Government as well as expenditure. Since the main objective of the Commission was to release grants as and when required to the universities and colleges with least delay to enable them to function efficiently and since the Commission was not a profit-making organisation required to invest funds and earn interest, it was hoped that the practical difficulties would be taken into account and the suggestion to invest surplus cash balance from time to time in short-term deposits would not be pressed.

10.66. A statement showing the position of funds of the Commission, furnished by the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare at the Committee's instance, is reproduced below:—

SURPLUS FUNDS

Rs. in lakhs

Sl. No.	Purpose	1972-73	1973-74	1974-75	1975-76	1976-77
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	Opening Balance	66.44	97.74	21.24	91.90	450.31
1	Grants received from Govt. (Plan & Non-Plan)	3842.61	3406.98	4724.50	6167.84	7209.29

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2	Receipts from other Sources in during recoveries of advances etc.	316.00	169.71	79.31	65.41	91.23
3	Total funds at the Disposal of the Commission	4255.05	3674.43	4825.05	6325.15	7750.83
4	Closing Balance	97.74	21.24	91.90	450.31	594.00

10.67. Reasons for heavy closing balances as communicated by the Ministry are as under:—

“The Commission has to deal with the considerable number of schemes relating to more than 100 universities and around 3000 colleges spread over throughout the country. The actual expenditure was dependent on various factors namely:

- (i) examination of actual requirements of institutions by Visiting Committees etc.
- (ii) promptness with which the schemes are preferred by the institutions.
- (iii) availability of matching grants from the State Governments,
- (iv) modification of Government rules relating to the increase in the rates of pay and allowances, etc.
- (v) ban on construction activities.
- (vi) non-availability of building material hampering the progress of construction of building and delays in the availability of equipment, etc., due to market conditions.”

10.68. In a written note furnished subsequently the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare have stated:—

“The matter regarding investment of surplus funds in short-term deposits was placed before the Commission at its meeting held on 17th October, 1977. The Commission has approved the proposal of investment of surplus funds subject to the approval of the Government of India.

The matter has been referred to the Ministry of Education for their concurrence as prescribed under the UGC Act.”

10.69. The Committee observe that the Commission have been keeping with them large funds on which they could have earned some interest. They note that at their meeting held in October 1977, the Commission have approved the proposal of investment of surplus funds and the matter is awaiting sanction of Government. The Committee would like the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare to take an early decision in the matter so that large funds at the disposal of the Commission start earning some interest.

G. SELECTED PROGRAMMES

(a) *Correspondence Courses*

Audit paragraph

11.1. The resolution on the National Policy on Education issued by the Government of India in 1968 envisaged the development of correspondence courses on a large scale at the university stage. The Estimates Committee had also noted in their report (1965-66) that correspondence courses had great advantages in a big but poor country like India and that by these means opportunities for education and training could be made available very widely at comparatively low cost. A sum of Rs. 1 crore was allocated for this purpose in the Fourth Five Year Plan. The Commission decided in July 1967 to provide support to the introduction of these courses upto a limit of Rs. 5 lakhs for a period of 4 years or the actual deficit whichever was less. The annual report of the Commission for the year 1972-73 also took note of the fact that the scheme of correspondence courses had developed certain difficulties in the course of its implementation in the past decade and that the Education Commission had suggested that one-third of the university level enrolment should be covered by correspondence courses and that this had not happened. It was further noted in the same report that sometimes courses had been started without adequate previous preparation and there were some academic and operational difficulties which had caused anxiety. It was stated that these problems were being examined by expert committees and that it should be possible to raise the standard of this method of instruction as well as cover more and more students and disciplines during the next Plan.

11.2. During 1974-75, 12 universities were offering correspondence courses at various levels and the number of students enrolled was 64,846. The total expenditure incurred by the Commission on the correspondence courses during the Fourth Plan period was only Rs. 12 lakhs against the allocation of Rs. 1 crore. Against the Fifth Plan allocation of Rs. 1 crore, expenditure of Rs. 15.60 lakhs had been incurred on this scheme in the first 2 years of the Plan. The Commission stated that guidelines had been laid down for the introduction of correspondence courses at undergraduate and post-graduate levels from 1974-75 onwards so that standards comparable

to full-time instructional programmes would be maintained by the schools and institutes of correspondence courses under the auspices of various universities in the country. The Commission had also decided that grants would be provided for core staff, preparation of reading material, contact programmes, visiting lecturers, books and journals and postal library services. It was stated that the shortfall in the Fourth Plan was due to the fact that the fees realised for correspondence courses was considerable and the income from fees, etc. was adequate to meet the major part of the expenditure. Also, only 11 universities could start a limited number of correspondence courses in the Fourth Plan as against 20 universities originally envisaged.

[Paragraph 48 of the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India for the year 1975-76, Union Government (Civil), pp. 228-229]

11.3. Correspondence courses form a part of an effective programme of adult (now non-formal) education in the Indian context. The Education Commission (1964-66) recommended widespread organisation of correspondence courses or homestudy courses in order to bring education to those who are unable even to attend part-time courses.

11.4. In paragraph 121 of their 102nd Report (Third Lok Sabha), the Estimates Committee (1965-66) had recommended expansion of home-study courses through correspondence. They stated:

“The Committee are informed that the scheme of Correspondence Courses has so far been introduced only in the University of Delhi. The working of this scheme in that university has been dealt with by the Committee in their 82nd Report (3rd L.S.). It is proposed to introduce correspondence courses in Arts and Science (first degree stage in the first instance) in three or four other selected universities located in different regions of the country during the Fourth Plan period.

The Committee note that it has not been possible for the Government to provide accommodation in colleges for all the students seeking admission. The Committee are of the opinion that organised courses through correspondence can have great advantage in a big but poor country like India. By this means opportunities for education and training can be made available very widely at a comparatively low cost. This will also relieve, to some extent, the pressure of

number on universities and colleges. The Committee understand that more than a million persons receive instructions through correspondence courses at the junior technical and higher educational level in the USSR. In the USA at least a million and a half undertake home-study courses through correspondence. The Committee consider that the scheme of correspondence courses may be expanded so as to include also science courses and technical courses at various levels. The schemes can be used very effectively for the teaching of languages and for the improvement of education in Mathematics. The Committee would also like to reiterate the recommendation made in their 82nd Report (3rd L.S.) on the Ministry of Education—University of Delhi that in selecting universities for opening these courses, preference should be given to such universities as allow large number of private students to appear in examination simply on payment of the usual examination fees. They would also suggest that the experience gained as a result of the working of the correspondence courses in the Delhi University should be taken into consideration and put to effective use so that the difficulties encountered by the Directorate of Correspondence Courses of the Delhi University are not faced by other universities where the courses are proposed to be introduced.”

11.5. The Resolution on the National Policy of Education issued by the Government of India in 1968 envisaged the development of correspondence courses on a large scale at the university stage. It embodied the following principles:

“Part-time education and correspondence courses should be developed on a large scale at the university stage. Such facilities should also be developed for secondary school students, for teachers and for agricultural, industrial and other workers. Education through part-time and correspondence courses should be given the same status as full-time education. Such facilities will smoothen transition from school to work, promote the cause of education and provide opportunities to the large number of people who have the desire to educate themselves further but cannot do so on a full-time basis.”

11.6. The University Grants Commission initiated the following action in pursuance of the resolution:

"The Commission has taken further steps by providing for more and more facilities for non-formal education in the form of correspondence courses, part-time courses etc. The Commission's present policy is to restrain expansion of full-time education at the undergraduate level while at the same time increasing facilities for non-formal education through private study, correspondence and part-time courses. This restraint will not, however, be made applicable in the case of under-privileged sections of society for whom special remedial courses to enable them to come up to the required level of attainment will also be organised with help from the Commission."

11.7. The Annual Report of the University Grants Commission for the year 1972-73 indicated:

"The scheme of correspondence courses has developed certain difficulties during the course of its implementation in the past decade. The Education Commission (1964-66) suggested that one-third of the university level enrolment should be covered by correspondence courses; this has not happened. Sometimes these courses have been started without adequate previous preparation and there are some academic and operational difficulties which have caused us anxiety. These problems are being examined by expert committees and it should be possible to raise the standard of this method of instruction as well as cover more and more students and disciplines during the next plan."

11.8. Though the programme was accorded priority in the National Policy Resolution of 1968, it had not picked up as planned. Explaining the reasons therefor, the Secretary, UGC stated in evidence:

"We had an idea that about 15-16 universities would start this course, but only four universities had started this course. Delhi University was the first university which started this course. A view was taken that to start with not more than one university in a particular State may start correspondence course unless it comes to a specific enrolment, say 10,000 students or so or another university in same State wishes to start a different course. So, we put this limitation... (and) suggested to all the universities

to send their proposals....What has happened is that in certain States, the private students' appearance has been agreed to.... But some of the States....would not start it."

11.9. It is seen from the Audit para that as against 20 universities envisaged for coverage under the Correspondence Course scheme during the Fourth Plan period, the scheme could be introduced during that period in only 11 universities. Further, as against the Fourth Plan allocation of Rs. 1 crore for this scheme, the actual expenditure during the Fourth Plan period was only Rs. 12 lakhs. The reason for the original target of introduction of the scheme in 20 universities during the Fourth Plan period not being achieved has been indicated by the Ministry, in a written note, as under:

"Proposals of the universities for the introduction of correspondence courses are examined on the merit of each case. The University concerned should have well established university departments noted for their standards. The Commission has also avoided duplication of facilities within a region, zone or State. In considering the progress of the scheme of correspondence courses, it may be pointed out that the number of universities offering correspondence courses or enrolments are not so important because universities offer correspondence courses at an All India level and there is no problem if a student with the requisite qualifications seeks admission to correspondence courses anywhere in the country."

11.10. Asked to state the difficulties in the implementation of the programme during the Fourth Plan, the Ministry have stated that there was no difficulty in so far as the number of universities and enrolments were concerned. According to them, difficulties, related to the services offered by school system institute of correspondence courses. In some cases, universities had not been able to organise properly the personal contact programmes, study centres and the evaluation of response sheets.

11.11. According to Audit para, Audit was informed that the shortfall in expenditure during the Fourth Plan period was, *inter alia*, due to the fact that the fees realised for Correspondence Courses was 'considerable' and income from fees etc. was adequate to meet the major part of the expenditure. During evidence before the Committee, however, the Secretary of the Commission denied this fact and said that the fees were "not high" though he admitted that they

“could cover” the expenditure of the universities on these schemes. It may be mentioned that the Commission had decided in July, 1967 to provide support to the introduction of these courses upto a limit of Rs. 5 lakhs for a period of four years or the actual deficit whichever was less. Since the fees could cover a major part of the expenditure, the demand from universities for replenishment to the extent of the deficit were less resulting in less expenditure by the Commission on this account.

11.12. The Committee desired to have information about the fees charged during the Fourth and Fifth Plan periods. An analysis of the statement furnished in respect of 8 universities, shows the following position:

University	1973-74	1977-78
1. Kashmir	..	167
2. Meerut	274	296
3. Andhra	557	507
4. Bhopal	..	300
5. Osmania	..	805 (For full course) 820
6. Utkal	..	579 (for BA)
7. Punjab	300	300
8. Central Institute of 'P.G. English'	300	300
English & Foreign Languages, Hyderabad, M.A. in Russian/French/German.	..	200

11.13. The allocation for the scheme of correspondence course during the Fifth Plan is again Rs. 1 crore. In number of universities covered, student enrolment and expenditure on the scheme during the first three years of the Plan is indicated as follows:

Year	Universities covered	Student enrolment	Expenditure
			(Rs. lakhs)
1974-75	12	64,846	2.89
1975-76	13	72,950	12.72
1976-77	16	81,000	9.47
	TOTAL		Rs. 25.08

11.14. It was indicated in the Annual Report of the Commission for 1972-73 that the problems encountered in the implementation of the scheme were "being examined by an Expert Committee that it should be possible to raise the standard of this method of instruction as well as to cover more and more students and disciplines during the next plan." The Committee enquired as to when was this committee expected to submit its report. The Secretary, University Grants Commission stated in evidence:

"There is a standing committee which looks into it. Recently, there was a conference of the Directors of correspondence course. They are also looking into the aspect of monitoring lessons in one particular subject."

He added:

"Whenever they go into things, they submit reports."

11.15. The Committee desired to know the number of universities which had requested for grants under the scheme during the Fourth Plan and out of those the cases which were rejected with reasons therefor. In a written note, the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare have stated that in all 13 universities had applied for grants under the scheme out of which only two proposals were not accepted for reasons given as under:

1. *Kanpur University:*

The Visiting Committee recommended that the proposal may be considered only after the University has set up teaching department.

2. *Kurukshetra University:*

The University did not have experience of running correspondence courses at the undergraduate level and it wanted to introduce correspondence courses at the post-graduate level. Moreover, the Commission felt that at the post-graduate level, correspondence courses should be limited to universities with strong postgraduate departments and after they have run undergraduate correspondence courses for about three years.

11.16. The Committee desired to know if corrective measures were taken in time towards securing meaningful implementation of

the scheme. In a written note, the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare replied:

"The Commission sent out committees to the Andhra University, Mysore University, Rajasthan University, Meerut University, Himachal Pradesh University and the University of Delhi for evaluating their ongoing programmes and or for considering fresh proposals. The Commission has also decided that instead of paying grants on a net deficit basis, grants towards the introduction of correspondence courses may be paid for quality improvement programmes, viz. preparation of instructional material, core staff, evaluation of response sheets, purchase of books and journals, the establishment of study centres and the conduct of personal contact programmes."

11.17. Asked to indicate the follow-up action taken pursuant to the reports of the Visiting Committees, the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare, in a written note, replied:

"Grants are released to the universities only after the Commission is satisfied that the recommendations of the Committee are implemented by the universities."

11.18. The Committee desired to know whether any assessment had been made of the utility of this medium of instruction in terms of raising the standards of university education. The Secretary, University Grants Commission stated in evidence:

"This assessment is judged sometimes by the students also. We made an analysis of this situation. The students of the correspondence courses of the Punjab and Delhi Universities have done better if examination as one of the end-products is one of the gauge under which you can judge. Secondly, it is more amenable to assessment because the lessons are written whereas lectures are given in a class-room, which nobody has to check. The lessons written by the teachers can be examined by anyone. In fact, in many of the colleges, the students are using these lessons."

11.19. In a written note furnished subsequently at the Committee's instance, the Ministry have stated:

"A comparison of the examination results of correspondence course students and regular students in certain years shows that generally speaking the results of correspondence course students are quite satisfactory from the comparative point of view."

11.20. The first correspondence course was started in Delhi University in 1962. Yet according to the Audit paragraph, the guidelines had been laid down for the introduction of the course at undergraduate and post-graduate level from 1974-75 onwards.

11.21. Clarifying during evidence, the Secretary, University Grants Commission stated:

“It was started in 1962 only in Delhi University. This is one of the offshoot of the recommendations of the Education Commission and the National Policy Resolution. The guidelines which we are referring to are the subsequent guidelines. The Punjabi University started this course in 1968-69, Rajasthan University in 1968-69 and the Meerut University also started it. There were different guidelines. After the experience of four-five years different and new guidelines have been prescribed. Previously, they used to be a college now it is a part of the department. These are the latest guidelines, not the ones issued earlier.”

11.22. Asked whether the programme was introduced without active planning and preparation, the Secretary, UGC stated in evidence:

“It was started in 1962 with the help of a Committee. The guidelines were laid down after the Education commission’s report had been looked into by a Committee. In 1972 the guidelines have been issued for post-graduate and under-graduate classes. As we go ahead, we would review the scheme again.”

11.23. In reply to a question why these were not provided in the original scheme, the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare have, in a written note, stated:

“The guidelines were formulated on the basis of the recommendations of a conference of Directors of Correspondence Courses in the light of actual experience.”

11.24. Asked to indicate whether any need had been felt to review the existing guidelines, the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare in reply stated in a written note:

“The Standing Committee on Part-time and Own-time Education at its meeting held on 12 November 1977 reviewed the guidelines and made a number of suggestions

regarding innovative programmes, regional coordination, preparation of instructional material and academic responsibility. The existing arrangements are to be reviewed in the light of information, reports of Committees and student's reactions."

11.25. Asked whether the service conditions of the teachers engaged on correspondence courses are comparable to the level of teaching staff engaged in formal education and the reasons for the scheme not gaining the momentum, the Secretary, UGC replied in evidence:

"As far as the pay scales are concerned, there is no difference, whether they are regular teachers or correspondence course teachers. They are all University teachers, whether they teach in the evening classes or morning classes or correspondence course. Under the new guidelines they have to be part of the University Department; there cannot be any distinction. Maybe, what has come to your notice is this: some universities, instead of calling them lecturers, call them as Assistant Directors or something like that; and also in the revised scales of pay which have been recently agreed, there are some anomalies coming up. But basically the scales of pay are the same.

Regarding employment, I do not think the correspondence courses have any special disadvantage. Even as at present when a person with a Degree goes for employment, the prospective employer finds out from which college he has taken the Degree, whether he is a product of St. Xavier, Stephen's College, and so on. So, this is a handicap which is suffered not only by the students of correspondence course but also by the others.

Anyway, this system is now picking up. You would see that it took the UGC several years before it could successfully persuade the Delhi University to start the correspondence course. Now it is picking up."

11.26. Asked whether the courses are open to residents in foreign countries, the Secretary, University Grants Commission stated in evidence:

"Delhi University is doing it."

He added:

"The other universities also can do.....Delhi started in the beginning. They have arranged centres in two or three Embassies. If the Indian Ambassador in a country gives an assurance about keeping the necessary secrecy regarding question papers, etc., they open a centre."

11.27. Since the lessons are said to be quite popular among regular students of the formal system who are taking added advantage of these correspondence course lessons, the Committee desired to know whether the University Grants Commission had initiated any action to get the lessons published. In reply, the Chairman, University Grants Commission stated in evidence:

"The idea certainly was that, at some stage or other, these lessons would be evaluated and after that, they would be published. Till they have been evaluated, it would not be desirable on the part of the UGC to associate itself with the publication of these lessons. But I would agree with you that, at some stage or other, they should be published and made available to the other students as well."

Asked whether there is any move to assist authors to promote compilation of correspondence course lessons in the form of standard books, the Chairman, University Grants Commission stated:

"Yes, we shall certainly try to move in that direction."

11.28. The Committee are distressed to note that the scheme of Correspondence Courses, conceived to overcome the extent educational and social problems facing the country, could not be implemented during the Fourth Plan period with the energy and zeal that it deserved. As against the target of introducing the scheme in 20 universities, only 11 universities could start the scheme and the UGC's expenditure by way of grants to the universities for the scheme was a bare Rs. 12 lakhs against the already paltry allocation of Rs. 1 crore. Even during the first three years of the Fifth Plan the progress of the scheme in terms of involvement of universities and student coverage as also the expenditure incurred so far by the Commission is none too impressive. The Committee would like the University Grants Commission to persuade the universities which have not so far come forward with the proposals to take steps to introduce the scheme as soon as possible. The Committee trust

that the efforts of the UGC in this direction would bear fruit and the number of universities offering these courses, student coverage and expenditure on the scheme would rise conforming to determined targets.

11.29. The Committee note that at present there are wide variations in the fees charged by different universities for Correspondence Courses at various levels. The Committee would like the UGC to compile full information in this regard from all the universities and persuade the universities to bring in a measure of uniformity in the matter of fees charged for the Correspondence Courses at various levels.

11.30. The Committee further note that the UGC had deputed expert committees to visit certain universities for evaluating their 'on-going' programmes and for considering fresh proposals. Only 6 universities were visited by these committees between the period August, 1973 and October, 1976. The Committee would like the Commission to constitute similar expert committees for visiting all other universities which have introduced Correspondence Courses so far. In fact before accepting a proposal of a university for introducing the Correspondence Courses, the schemes received from the universities should be got vetted by an expert committee.

11.31. The Committee learn that prior to 1972, different universities were having different guidelines in regard to Correspondence Courses and it was only in 1972 that guidelines were issued by the Commission for post-graduate and under-graduate courses. The current guidelines are stated to have been formulated on the basis of the recommendation of a conference of Directors of Correspondence Courses in the light of actual experience. These guidelines were again reviewed by the Standing Committee on Part-Time and Own-Time Education at its meeting held on 12 November, 1977 which had made a number of suggestions. It is thus clear that the Commission had, earlier to 1972, not paid adequate attention to formulate well thought-out guidelines for the introduction of Correspondence Courses. The Committee feel that it should have been done before introducing the scheme as far back as 1962. The Committee hope that the Commission would consider the modification suggested by the Standing Committee on Part-time and Own-time Education expeditiously.

11.32. The Committee recommend that the question of compiling Correspondence Course lessons in the form of standard books and publishing them for the use of students may be considered by the Commission.

(b) *Centres of Advanced study**Audit Paragraph:*

11.33. In 1963-64 the Commission approved the establishment of 26 Centres of Advanced Study in science, humanities and social sciences. These centres are designed to serve the urgent need in the field of higher education to strengthen the quality of teaching and research particularly at the post-graduate level by channelling the existing resources effectively on a highly selective basis. The basic purpose of the scheme of the Centres of Advanced Study is to encourage the "pursuit of excellence" and team work in studies and research and to accelerate the realisation of international standards in specific fields. In 1967-68 another 4 centres were established. The Education Commission in its report (1966) recommended that it was necessary to strengthen and expand the programme of establishment of Centres of Advanced Study and that one way of doing this would be to establish a cluster of advance studies in some of the universities as had been done in a particular university. Fifty centres, including some in modern Indian languages, were recommended to be established over the next 5 to 10 years and one of them was to concentrate on developing an inter-disciplinary approach to education. Other areas not covered at that time, such as agriculture, engineering, medicine and modern Indian languages were also to be covered. An allocation of Rs. 16 crores was envisaged by the plan on education but the final allocation provided in the Fourth Plan was Rs. 8 crores. The actual utilisation was, however, Rs. 4.01 crores.

11.34. The work of 25 centres which completed 10 years as advanced centres was reviewed by an assessment committee appointed by the Commission in 1973-74. On the basis of the report of the assessment committee and on the advice of the standing committee for this programme, the Commission decided (July, 1974) that recognition of 7 centres on which Rs. 2.09 crores had been spent in the form of fellowships, scholarships, teacher fellowships, books and equipments and additional staff, may be withdrawn from 1st April, 1974. The number of effective Centres of Advances Study during 1974-75 was 23. The Commission had decided that assistance under this programme in future should be made available only for a period of 5 years and the State Government/university should take over the recurring liability after the end of the period as committed expenditure.

[Paragraph 48 of the Report of the Comptroller & Auditor General of India for the year 1975-76, Union Government (Civil)

11.35. The Centres of Advanced Study are designed to serve the urgent need in the field of higher education to strengthen the quality of teaching and research particularly at the post-graduate level by channelling the existing resources effectively on a highly selective basis. The basic purpose of the scheme of the Centres of Advanced Study is to encourage the 'pursuit of excellence' and team-work in studies and research and to accelerate the realisation of international standards in specific fields.

11.36. The Education Commission, while expressing strong support of the concept and scheme of the Centres of Advanced Study, recommended strengthening and expansion of this institution. In paragraph 11.31 of their Report (1966), they recommended:

"Partly as a preparation and partly as a consequence of the establishment of these major universities, it is necessary to strengthen and expand the UGC programme of the establishment of centres of advanced study. One way of doing this will be to establish 'clusters' of advanced centres in some of the universities as has been done, for instance, in Delhi University. They will add strength to, and enrich, one another and be specially helpful in promoting interdisciplinary research. In other cases, a cluster of centres may not be possible and we may have to begin with a single centre. While these centres will be mainly concerned with postgraduate teaching and research, every care should be taken to see that they do not become isolated from the rest of the university and do not develop a kind of academic snobbishness towards other departments or undergraduate teaching. In fact, they are essentially meant to help in raising the standard of the departments and the university as a whole. We would recommend the establishment of about fifty such centres, including some in modern Indian languages over the next five to ten years. At least one of them should concentrate on developing an interdisciplinary approach to education. The other areas which are not covered in the scheme at present are agriculture, engineering, medicine and modern Indian languages. We recommend that the scheme should be extended to these also."

11.37. Steps taken to implement the recommendations have been indicated by the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare as under:

"The scheme of Centres of Advanced Study/Departments of Special Assistance/Departmental support for research is

one of the major quality improvement programmes of the UGC to improve the quality of postgraduate teaching and research."

11.38. The note furnished at the Committee's instance on the criteria for granting recognition to an institution as a Centre of Advanced Study is reproduced below:

"These University Departments were recognised as Centres of Advanced Study by the Commission on the advice of its Standing Advisory Committee for Centres of Advanced Study. The procedure for selection included comparative evaluation of achievements, facilities, potentials, merits of plan of work of the departments concerned by the respective subject panels. The Commission also received suggestions in this connection from reputed Scientists, Scholars and members of the Standing Advisory Committee. Under this programme no applications are invited from the universities as it is recognition for a department to be invited to participate in this programme.

The assessment of the subject panels in respect of university departments considered, was placed before the Standing Committee on Centres of Advanced Study. The recommendations of the Standing Committee were considered by the Commission. After approval of the Commission specific proposals were invited from the selected departments. Expert Committees were thereafter appointed to examine such proposals and final decision including allocation of funds was made on the basis of the reports of such committees."

11.39. In 1963-64, the Commission approved the establishment of 26 Centres of Advanced Study in Science, Humanities and Social Sciences. In 1967-68, another 4 centres were established.

11.40. For the Fourth Five Year Plan, an allocation of Rs. 16 crores was envisaged by the panel on education, but the final allocation provided was Rs. 8 crores. The actual utilisation was, however, Rs. 4.01 crores.

11.41. The Committee enquired about the reasons for stagnation between 1966 and 1972 in this field. The Chairman, U.G.C. stated in reply in evidence:

"I would personally feel that between 1966 and 1970, it might have been possible for the Commission to recognise more

centres of advanced study, because the idea of departments of special assistance came up only in 1972. Perhaps, there was a lacuna in the programme. Why precisely this happened is not clear from the records. It is clear that a large number of departments were considered, but when the discussion took place, the Commission was able to select only two. Why, the Commission was able to select only two and did not find itself in a position to select others is not clear."

11.42. Elaborating further, the Chairman, UGC stated:

"The UGC reviewed the scheme subsequently. Some of these Departments which had been recognised were really outstanding departments. It was not easy to find in the universities departments which were equally good. But there were departments which had a good potential, and that is why the Commission slightly modified the scheme and added to it the concept of 'Department of Special Assistance' and also what may be called 'Departmental Support'. The idea was that, in course of time, once these departments were brought up and then recognised as Centres of Advanced Study, then they would be able to maintain standards of equivalent level. Otherwise, if you have two or three departments which are recognised as Centres of Advanced Study but whose programmes are not of an equal standard, it creates difficulties. So, while we accept the basic philosophy, we have slightly modified it, and the difficulty which was explained by the Education Secretary was that it was easy to select initially 23 to 26 departments but later on difficulties were encountered. So, the scheme was accepted. The entire recommendation of the Estimates Committee and of the Kothari Commission was accepted, but in the light of experience it was found that it had to be slightly modified; and now it is being expanded, in that light, very considerably. I would say that the basic concern of the Commission has been to implement the scheme, but implement it in such a way that excellence is maintained all the time."

He added:

"I would like to submit that out of 26 centres selected initially, 19 were found to be excellent in their working. I would say that even percentage-wise that does show that the

initial selection was not wrong. The reason why the new centres were not added, is that the initial programme took some time to get off the ground. In fact, many of these centres started working after 3 or 4 years after they had been selected. In 1968, four centres were added; and after ten years had been completed, a review was made. At the time, new procedures were adopted for selecting departments for special assistance so that the programme was being expedited."

11.43. As pointed out in the Audit paragraph, the work of 25 Centres which completed 10 years as Advanced Centres was reviewed by an assessment committee appointed by the Commission in 1973-74. On the basis of the report of the assessment committee and on the advice of the standing committee for this programme, the Commission decided in July, 1974 that recognition of 7 centres on which Rs. 2.69 crores had been spent in the form of fellowships, scholarships, teacher fellowships, books, and equipments and additional staff, may be withdrawn from 1 April, 1974.

11.44. The Committee desired to know the precise reasons for derecognition of the 7 Centres of Advanced Study. In a written note, the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare replied:

"The following 7 centres of Advanced study were derecognised with effect from 1-4-1974:

- | | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. Madras University | — Physics |
| 2. Saugar University | — Geology |
| 3. Calcutta University | — Applied Mathematics |
| 4. Banaras Hindu University | — Philosophy |
| 5. Visva Bharati | — Philosophy |
| 6. Calcutta University | — History |
| 7. Poona University | — Linguistics. |

These Centres of Advanced Study were derecognised by the Commission on the recommendations of the Standing Advisory Committee on the basis of the evaluation reports made by the Assessment Committees which pointed out that these departments had not adequately contributed to the objectives of the scheme. This derecognition is consistent with the basic philosophy of the entire scheme that Centres of Advanced Study should continuously deserve the title.

The Centres of Advanced Study were aware of this general policy of the Commission. The Centres were also informed in January 1969 *vide* letter No. F. 5-1/68 (Sc-II) that the assistance to be provided is initially for a period of ten years from the date of recognition as C.A.S. Further assistance would be subject to satisfactory progress and assessment of work of the departments. The Centres were further informed in December 1973 that Fellowships/Scholarships for awards for 1974 onwards may be made by the centres on the basis of the decision of the Commission on the report of the assessment committees which were to visit the Centres during that financial year.

No staff was rendered surplus as a result of derecognition. The facilities already created at the C.A.S. would be available to them and also the recurring assistance provided earlier would be maintained by the concerned State Government. This would enable these departments to continue their teaching and research activities as usual, even though no further assistance would be provided to them under the scheme. So the question of staff becoming surplus does not arise."

11.45. The Ministry was asked whether considering that there are more than 111 universities with several departments for various disciplines, the number of effective centres (23) was not too small to have an impact on higher education. The Ministry have in reply stated:

"Out of 105 universities and 10 institutes deemed to be universities now functioning 19 universities and one institute deemed to be University are agricultural universities. One is Ayurveda University and one is Technological University. Some Universities have been recently established and have no teaching departments. Some are purely affiliating universities with no Post-Graduate Departments.

The number of Universities/Institutions to be considered would thus be about 65 only.

The Commission in August, 1968 accepted the recommendations of Standing Advisory Committee on Centres of Advanced Study/Department of Special Assistance that while it might not be possible and to a certain extent desirable to recognise a large number of departments as Centres of Advanced Study, it would be worthwhile to provide

special assistance to selected departments by identifying departments which have potentialities to build active schools in any particular branch as evidenced by their contributions to teaching and research in recent years. Thus 26 departments in Sciences, Humanities & Social Sciences were included in 1972, under the programme of 'Special Assistance to selected departments' which is a supplementary programme to the existing programme of Centres of Advanced Study. More and more departments are being added to this programme as Departments of Special Assistance. The total number of Centres of Advanced Study and Departments of Special Assistance is large enough to have impact on teaching and research activities in the universities.

As a result of this new programme, no new C.A.S. has been added. Subsequently it was decided by the Commission that no department could be added as C.A.S. directly but it will be assisted as D.S.A. for initial period of 5 years and after evaluation some of them could be elevated as C.A.S."

11.46. The Commission had decided that assistance under this programme in future should be made available only for a period of 5 years and the State Government/university should take over the recurring liability after the end of the period as committed expenditure. The Committee desire to know whether the above decision was likely to lead to difficulties for the Centres in maintaining their standards and facilities and in making further advance. In a written note, the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare replied:

"The Standing Advisory Committee on Centres of Advanced Study/Departments of Special Assistance for science subjects at its meeting held on 8 March, 1977 recommended that generally, no department would straightaway be recognised to participate as a Centre of Advanced Study. All departments would initially participate under the Special Assistance Programme for a period of 5 years and their work would be evaluated before the assistance is continued either under the Special Assistance Programme or they are brought under the Centres of Advanced Study Programme. This decision was accepted by the Commission. Instead of retarding the programme this procedure would ensure that only the best departments could be

selected as Centres of Advanced Studies based on their performance as Departments of Special Assistance.

This is as per general policy of the Commission to provide assistance for a period of five years (Plan period) after which the recurring liability is to be taken over by the State Government which is applicable to all the Schemes implemented by the Commission. This is not likely to lead to any difficulty for the Centres/D.S.A. Keeping in view the period where the State Government can take over such recurring liability, UGC has agreed but in case of D.S.A. recognised in April 1972, the UGC assistance would continue up to March 1979 and in case of those recognised during Fifth Plan up to 1983-84."

11.47. The Committee desired to have a statement showing the cases where the subject panels had recommended that a particular department of a college/university may be recognised as a Centre for Advanced Study/Department of Special Assistance and the recommendation was rejected by the Standing Advisory Committee, together with grounds for rejection. In a written note, the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare replied:

"Out of 33 departments recommended by the various science panels only 14 were recommended by the Standing Committee for support under the Programme of Special Assistance. The other departments were recommended for the departmental research support."

The minutes of the Standing Committee at which the above decision was taken read as follows:

"The Standing Committee considered the recommendations made by the different subject panels with regard to departments to be invited to participate in the Programme of Special Assistance (D.S.A.) and Departments which may be provided support for major research programme (D.S.A.). The Committee also took into account the relative strength of the different departments, the major trust areas of teaching and research in the departments concerned and their value, regional distribution and the observations made by the Fifth Plan Visiting Committees as well as the normal assistance available to these departments under the Fifth Plan Development Programme. On the basis of the discussions the Standing Committee recom-

mended that the following departments may be invited to participate in the Programme of Special Assistance to Selected Departments.”

11.48. The Advisory Committee for the Centres of Advanced Studies/Departments of Special Assistance in Humanities and Social Sciences is stated to have not favoured sending any Visiting Committees to the following university departments which were recommended by the various panels in the Humanities and Social Sciences to ascertain their suitability for participation in the programme:

Department	University
Psychology	Andhra
Sociology	Bangalore & Poona
Philosophy	Andhra, Karnataka, Poona, Delhi and Utkal.
Economics	Punjab & Kurukshetra
Linguistics	Punjabi & Kerala
Political Science	Poona
Teacher Education	Punjab
Commerce	Osmania

11.49. The Standing Committee, also, keeping in view of the recommendations of the Panels recommended that departments support for major research programme to be undertaken may be given to 19 Departments. It was stated in the relevant Minutes of the Standing Committee:

“Additional Departments for departmental support could be considered on the basis of recommendations to be made by the panel keeping in view that the total number of departments in this category would not be more than 5 in any subject and would not be beyond 30—35 in all Science subjects during the current Plan period.”

11.50. The Committee desired to have information about cases wherein the Standing Advisory Committee had recommended recognition to a particular department as a Centre of Advanced Study or Department of Special Assistance; but its recommendations were rejected by the Commission. In that case the ground therefor, duly supported by relevant extracts from the minutes of the sitting of the

UGC were to be furnished. In a written note, the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare replied:

“The Standing Advisory Committee recommends departments to be considered for inclusion in the programme of Special Assistance to selected departments. These recommendations are accepted by the Commission and expert committees are constituted to visit these departments. In following cases, these expert committees on the basis of their visit and examination report etc. did not recommend the departments under the Special Assistance Programme:

- (i) Andhra University .. Zoology Department (1971-72)
- (ii) Rajasthan University .. Physics Department (1977-78)

This was given Departments research support as recommended by the Committee.

The reports of these expert committees were accepted by the Commission.”

11.51. The Committee find that the Education Commission in their report (1966), considering the value of the Centres of Advanced Study, found it necessary “to strengthen and expand the UGC programme of the establishment of Centres of Advanced Study”. It recommended fifty such Centres over the next five to ten years. It also recommended that the scheme should be extended to areas which were till then not covered in the scheme, namely, Agriculture, Engineering, Medicine and Modern Indian Languages. The scheme as implemented by the UGC, however, actually got reduced to “recognition” of university departments on the basis of a “comparative evaluation of achievements, facilities, potential, merits of plan of work of the departments”. In the process of initial selection of university departments for evaluation, the universities themselves had no hand as no applications were invited. The evaluation done by the respective Subject Panels was placed before a Standing Committee whose recommendations were considered by the Commission. After approval of the Commission, specific proposals were invited from the selected departments. Expert committees were thereafter appointed to examine such proposals and final decision, including allocation of funds, was made on the basis of the reports of such committees. In the wake of these involved procedures and the several tiers of assessments providing ample scope for subjective considerations, it is hardly surprising that no new Centre of Advanced Study could be ‘recognised’ after 1968 and the number of such

Centres remained pegged at 30 and with the withdrawal of recognition in 7 cases with effect from April, 1974, it came down to 23.

11.52. The Committee also find that although in August 1968 the Commission had accepted the recommendation of the Standing Advisory Committee to replace the scheme of Centres of Advanced Study by a scheme of special assistance to selected departments having "potentialities to build active schools in a particular branch", no action was taken in pursuance of this decision until 1972 when concrete action to recognise 26 Departments as Departments of Special Assistance was taken. This in action to recognise any new Department as Centre of Advanced Study and delayed action in recognising departments of special assistance resulted in the utilisation of only Rs. 4 crores out of an allocation of Rs. 8 crores for the Fourth Plan period. In 1977, the scheme under went a further modification in that not all the departments recommended by the Panels for recognition as Departments of Special Assistance were recognised as such; some of the departments were recommended for "research support only". Thus under the original scheme of Centres of Advanced Study, apart from the Centres of Advanced Study, two more categories of departments have been included, namely, Departments of Special Assistance and departments eligible for research support.

11.53. The Committee have not been furnished the precise reasons why the Standing Advisory Committee for Centres of Advanced Study recommended in 1968 that "while it might not be possible and to a certain extent desirable, to recognise a large number of departments as Centres of Advanced Study, it would be worthwhile to provide special assistance to selected departments by identifying departments which have potentialities to build active schools in any particular branch as evidenced by their contributions to teaching and research in recent years." The considerations on which the Commission accepted this recommendation of the Standing Advisory Committee in August 1968 have also not been furnished to the Committee. Similarly, it is not known why the Standing Committee recommended (and the Commission approved) that out of 33 departments recommended by the various Science Panels, only 14 be recognised for support under the programme of Special Assistance and 19 might be considered for departmental research support.

11.54. The Committee are thus unable to appreciate the distinction made as between the different departments for the purposes of grant under the scheme, particularly when the Commission has been unable to utilise the funds earmarked for the programme, as has happened during the Fourth Plan. The Committee recommend

that the Commission should give a fresh look to the existing scheme in operation to see whether the creation of three distinct categories of departments eligible for various levels of grants from the UGC is conducive to the purposes of the scheme for Centres of Advanced Study as originally envisaged, and commended by the Education Commission.

11.55. The Committee have been told during evidence that the original allocation of Rs. 16 crores in the Fourth Plan for the scheme of Centres of Advanced Study was arrived at on the basis of a grant of Rs. 20—25 lakhs per Centre for the number of Centres assumed 'roughly'. No explanation was offered for arriving at the final allocation of Rs. 8 crores for the scheme. As regards the shortfall in utilisation of funds to the extent of 50 per cent it was stated during evidence that it was "mainly due to the fact that no new Centres came up in the Fourth Plan". The Committee have elsewhere in the report already commented upon the ad hoc manner in which allocations for new schemes have been made during the Fourth Plan period. The Committee would like to point out this as another instance of bad planning—financial as well as physical—by the Commission.

(c) *College Science Improvement Programme*

Audit Paragraph:

11.56. The College Science Improvement Programme was initiated by the Commission in 1970-71 to accelerate the development of science capabilities of predominantly undergraduate colleges. In order to improve the range of undergraduate education in the sciences and expand opportunities for undergraduates to pursue useful scientific careers, the project aimed at beneficial effects on teachers and students, subject matter and methods of instruction, syllabi, curricula and individual courses, facilities, equipments workshop, library and teaching materials. The Programme was taken up at two levels:—

- (i) In selected colleges to include the entire science faculty;
and
- (ii) University Leadership Project in any one science subject in all the colleges affiliated to a university.

11.57. During 1970-71 to 1974-75 the Commission released grants of Rs. 207.68 lakhs to 111 colleges affiliated to 42 universities under Item (i) above.

11.58. Seventynine colleges which started their activities upto 1971-72 relating to item (i) above were to complete their first phase

of the programme by March 1975 and were to be visited by regional committees for proper appraisal of the work done. The regional committees, however, had visited only 14 of these colleges in the west and north regions between July and November 1974. The Commission had not constituted any committee to visit the remaining 65 colleges. It, however, approved follow-up proposals relating to 28 out of the 65 colleges at a cost of Rs. 51.25 lakhs and grants released on this account amounted to Rs. 9.68 lakhs upto September 1976.

11.59. According to reports received by the Commission, 45 colleges could not complete the first phase of programme till September 1976; extension for completing the first phase of programme was given from time to time to these colleges.

11.60. In respect of six colleges to whom grants of Rs. 13.45 lakhs were released in the first phase, the Commission decided not to provide any further grant for the second phase on the ground that their implementation of the programme was not satisfactory.

11.61. In regard to the University Leadership Project referred to at item (ii) above, till March, 1975, 25 departments relating to 14 universities were selected for participation in the programme. For the Fifth Five Year Plan the Commission had decided that every university which had more than 20 affiliated colleges providing undergraduate studies be invited to take up a University Leadership Project in each of the major subjects where it had strong viable departments. Nevertheless, till March 1976, no new department was brought under the purview of the project. During 1970-71 to 1974-75 the Commission released grants of Rs. 93.50 lakhs for implementation of the Leadership Project.

11.62. A test check in Audit of the grants for the University Leadership Project disclosed that the Commission was releasing on account grants without taking into consideration progress of expenditure and/or large scale unutilised funds.

A few such cases are indicated below:—

University	Subject	Grants released	Expenditure incurred against grants
		Date	Amount in lakhs of Rupees
1	2	3	4
A	Mathematics	July 1970	0.10
		August 1970	0.40
Against the grant of Rs. 1.70 lakhs released upto March 1971			

1	2	3	4	5
		November 1970	1.20	Expenditure incurred was Rs. 0.67 lakh.
		November 1971	2.00	Further, grants amounting to Rs. 2.80 lakhs were paid during 1971-72 without obtaining the progress of expenditure; the university already had unspent balance of Rs. 1.03 lakhs as on 31st March, 1971.
		March 1972	0.80	
B	Mathematics	January 1971	0.80	The flow of expenditure was Rs. 0.12 lakh and Rs. 1.15 lakh during 1970-71 and 1971-72 respectively. The progress of expenditure as such did not warrant release of grant amounting to Rs. 0.40 lakhs in March, 1972.
		January 1972	0.80	
		March 1972	0.40	
C	Physics	June 1974	2.50	The progress of expenditure was not received till September, 1976. Nevertheless the second instalment of the grant of Rs. 1.50 lakhs was released in February, 1976.
		February 1976	1.50	
D	Physics	June 1974	1.00	The University spent Rs. 1.19 lakhs upto July 1975 when the unspent balance amounted to Rs. 0.81 lakhs. Grants amounting to Rs. 1.00 lakh and Rs. 0.50 lakh were re-released in October 1975 and July 1976 respectively without obtaining any further progress of expenditure.
		November 1974	0.50	
		June 1975	0.50	
		October 1975	1.00	
		July 1976	0.50	
E	Botany	September 1973	1.50	After incurring expenditure of Rs. 0.08 lakh the University held unspent balance of Rs. 1.42 lakh on 31st March 1975. The university incurred further expenditure of Rs. 1.25 lakh leaving unspent balance of Rs. 0.67 lakh as on March, 1976. The Commission, however, released another instalment of grant amounting to Rs. 3.00 lakhs in July 1976 without obtaining the progress of expenditure after March 1976.
		April 1976	0.50	
		July 1976	3.00	

11.63. A review of the performance of some of the universities under the Leadership Project as per progress reports, materials given to expert committee, etc. revealed the following position:

11.64. In one university, the committee appointed by the Commission noted in 1974 that most of the colleges were starved for lack of basic equipments and library facilities. Still the university spent only a sum of Rs. 2.76 lakhs for the purpose against an allocation of Rs. 6 lakhs. In another university, out of an allocation of Rs. 3 lakhs for books and equipment, only Rs. 0.47 lakh were spent and no affiliated college was rendered any assistance under the scheme.

[Paragraphs 48 of the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India for the year 1975-76, Union Government (civil), pp. 231—233]

11.65. The College Science Improvement Programme was initiated by the Commission in 1970-71 to accelerate the development of science capabilities of predominantly undergraduate colleges. The programme was taken up at two levels:—

- (i) In selected colleges to include the entire science faculty; and
- (ii) University Leadership Project in any one Science subject in all the colleges affiliated to a university.

(i) *Programme for Selected Colleges*

11.66. It is pointed out in the Audi Paragraph that 79 colleges which started their activities up to 1971-72 relating to item (i) above were to complete their first phase of the programme by March 1975 and were to be visited by regional committees for proper appraisal of the work done. The regional committees, however, had visited only 14 of these colleges in the west and north regions between July and November, 1974. The Commission had not constituted any committee to visit the remaining 65 colleges. It, however, approved follow-up proposals relating to 28 out of the 65 colleges at a cost of Rs. 51.25 lakhs and grants released on this account amounted to Rs. 9.68 lakhs upto September, 1976.

11.67. The Committee desired to know the reason why no committees had been constituted to visit the remaining 65 colleges. The Chairman, UGC, informed the Committee during evidence:

“The difficulties are two. Firstly, in all committees, we have to send an officer of the Commission. The Commission had serious shortage of staff. We have not been able to supplement partly because the staff Inspection Unit has been at work. Second difficulty is that Committees consist of experts on the subject who are generally drawn from uni-

versities. Sometimes academics are not free and the work of committees gets delayed. As far as College Improvement Programmes were concerned, it was decided that we would assess the work of these colleges after they have worked the scheme for three years on the basis of the reports received. These reports from colleges, soon after their receipt, were carefully checked by experts and, it was on that basis, that the programme was continued. It was also decided that inspection would be a continuous process, not something which would take place only at the end of the scheme."

The Vice-Chairman, UGC, stated:

"I would like to mention that these committees have been constituted. But, somehow, due to difficulties—may be, the members of the visiting team have not come to an agreement about the date or may be, there may be some other reason for it—I do not know why the visits did not take place. At that time, for the Southern Region, I was one of the Members of the Committee and I was in correspondence with the Chairman to fix a date for the purpose. So, the committee have been constituted. That is true. I say this because I was one of the members of the Committee at that time."

11.68. In this context, the Secretary, UGC stated in evidence:

"We did not constitute the Committees for all the regions."

He added:

"The point is this. This is a quality scheme which has to be reviewed and is quite different from the normal inspection of a college which a University does. We have set 1 lakh per year subject to a maximum of Rs. 3 lakhs for each college. The review would have two aspects. One is if the college is not doing well, then we have to guide them. Another is whether it should be allowed to go to the second phase or not after three years. As you had mentioned, some of the colleges which had completed three years and which had not fully utilised, they had been allowed to continue. The review is actually to be made before going to the second phase to help the colleges to develop during the course of implementation. I have already expressed regret that we have not consti-

tuted committees for all the regions. It does not mean that the colleges which have not been allowed to go to the second phase did not utilise the money in a proper way. They were doing it. In any case, we could not have withdrawn Rs. 3 lakhs from them and this review could only help them to improve. That is the only lacuna which has been left out. Learning from this, the standing Committee has now suggested that there should be State-level Committees."

11.69. According to Audit Paragraph, on the basis of reports received by the Commission, 45 colleges could not complete the first phase of programme till September 1976; extension for completing the first phase of programme was given from time to time to these colleges.

11.70. Asked what were the difficulties generally pointed out by 45 colleges in completing the first phase of the programme involving the entire science faculty, the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare have, in a written note, replied:

"The College Science Improvement Programme was initially approved for a period of 3 years but some of the colleges were unable to complete the first phase within this period and some of the difficulties experienced by the colleges are given below:—

- (i) In case of Government Colleges there was a delay in getting appropriate financial sanction from the State Government for utilising the funds placed at the disposal of the college.
- (ii) Some of the colleges experienced difficulty in getting the equipment in time after placing the orders.
- (iii) Since this programme was a new programme in initial stages the colleges took time to chalk out the programmes and implement it as per guidelines given by the Commission."

(ii) *University Leadership Project*

11.71. In regard to the University Leadership Project till March 1975, 25 departments relating to 14 universities were selected for participation in the programme. For the Fifth Five Year Plan the Commission had decided that every university which had more than 20 affiliated colleges providing under graduate studies be in-

vited to take up a University Leadership Project in each of the major subjects where it had strong viable departments. Nevertheless, till March 1976, no new department was brought under the purview of the project. During 1970-71 to 1974-75 the Commission released grants of Rs. 93.50 lakhs for implementation of the Leadership Project. In 1975-76 it rose to Rs. 45.10 lakhs and in 1976-77 to Rs. 66.13 lakhs.

11.72. The test check by Audit of the grants for the University Leadership Project disclosed that the Commission was releasing "on account" grants without taking into consideration progress of expenditure and/or large scale unutilised funds.

11.73. A Review of the performance of some of the universities under the Leadership Project as per progress reports, material given to expert committee etc. revealed the following position:

ULP Department		Year	Grants released	Actual expenditure
1	2	3	4	5
			Rs.	Rs.
1. Punjab Physics		1974-75	1,00,000	16,424
		1975-76	1,50,000	60,644
		1976-77	..	69,343
			<u>2,50,000</u>	<u>1,46,411</u>
2. Punjab Mathematics		1970-71	1,7,000	60,397
		1971-72	2,80,000	1,71,487
		1972-73	..	94,751
		1973-74	1,50,000	1,89,431
		1974-75	..	22,536
		1975-76	..	10,201
			<u>6,00,000</u>	<u>5,48,803</u>
3. Gujarat Mathematics		1970-71	80,000	1,249
		1971-72	1,20,000	1,15,005
		1972-73	..	59,195
		1973-74	60,000	1,69,142
		1974-75	..	11,757
			<u>2,60,000</u>	<u>2,56,348</u>

1	2	3	4	5
4.	Madras Botany	1973-74	1,50,000	..
		1974-75	..	8,164
		1975-76	50,000	1,24,374
		1976-77	4,50,000	3,61,419
			6,50,000	4,93,957
5.	Nagpur Physics	1974-75	1,50,000	1,19,070
		1975-76	1,50,000	1,88,770
		1976-77	3,50,000	32,833
			6,50,000	3,40,673

11.74. Asked to indicate whether any watch was being kept over the progress of expenditure and/or large-scale unutilised funds, the Secretary, UGC stated in evidence:

"We do get the progress report. Sometimes in the progress report, the actual expenditure shown is slightly less. The head of the department is keen to send the progress report as soon as possible and it would give the information relating to the progress of the work done. It happens that by the time the bills are passed there is a difference in the figure and the actual expenditure incurred can never be more than what has been actually mentioned in the report. Sometimes a considerable sum has been incurred for which there is no proper debit. This is a continuing process and since this grant is for three years, every amount is taken care of. We make sure that there would not be any misappropriation of these funds."

11.75. The Audit para points out that in Punjab University the Committee appointed by the Commission noted in 1974 that most of the colleges were starved for lack of basic equipment and library facilities. Still the University spent only a sum of Rs. 2.76 lakhs for the purpose against an allocation of Rs. 6 lakhs. Asked about the manner in which the university spent Rs. 2.76 lakhs if basic needs like equipments, library facilities, were not provided, the

Ministry of Education and Social Welfare *inter alia* in a written note stated:

“Against the provision of Rs. 6 lakhs to Punjab University under College Science Improvement Programme—University Leadership Programme in Chemistry for the improvement of laboratory and library facilities in the undergraduate science colleges affiliated to Punjab University, the sum of Rs. 2.76 lakhs were utilised in the following manner:

The remarks of the committee that colleges were served for lack of basic equipment and chemicals relate to general facilities which should be available with the college and not relate to the equipment etc. which was to be supplied under COSIP. The colleges could seek UGC assistance for building up their equipment facilities under general assistance programme. The grant under COSIP is mainly for such equipment as may be required for introduction of new experiments/demonstrator aids etc. developed by the ULP.”

11.76. The latest position regarding the implementation of the scheme is as follows:

- (i) Number of university departments implementing the first phase—25.
- (ii) Number of university departments implementing the follow-up programme—11.

(iii) *University Leadership Project.*

- (i) Colleges implementing the first phase—149.
- (ii) Colleges implementing the follow-up programme—35.

11.77. The Committee desired to know whether any appraisal of the effectiveness of the programme was carried out and, if so, with what result. In a written note, the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare have *inter alia* stated:

“The appraisal of the effectiveness of the College Science Improvement Programme has been made from time to time by way of the following methods:

1. Standing Committee on College Science Improvement Programme.

The Standing Committee which consist of the COSIP/ULP Coordinators and also some college Principals, meets from time to time and appraises the progress made in the various aspects of implementation of the project. The Standing Committee has had seven meetings so far. The dates of the meetings are given below:

Date of the Constitution of Ist Standing Committee	Date of the meeting of Ist Standing Committee
31-7-1969	21-8-1969 First meeting
	17-7-1971 Second meeting
Reconstitution of the Committee } 21-3-1973	14-4-1973 First meeting
	7-12-1974 Second meeting
	10-2-1975 Third meeting
13-3-1976	4-10-1976 First meeting
	8/9-9-1977 Second Meeting

2. Regional College Science Improvement Programme Committees

Regional COSIP Committees were appointed to visit COSIP Colleges in the northern, southern and western regions to evaluate the work done and suggest follow-up activities/programmes. The Northern regional committee visited 5 colleges and the Western regional committee 6 colleges.

3. Regional Conference on COSIP

4 Regional conferences were organised in 1977 to (i) Exchange of experience in implementation of the COSIP/ULP and selected colleges programmes in the region and evaluate the progress made in improvement of under-graduate science education (ii) assess progress made by COSIP colleges towards Autonomy (iii) help future participant colleges to prepare appropriate proposals and (iv) plan for future COSIP effectively. The places and dates of conferences are given in Annexure-16*. This was followed by a meeting of the Standing Committee to make a comprehensive review of the conference and its recommendations were accepted by the Commission in November, 1977."

*Not reproduced.

11.78. The Committee note that the College Science Improvement Programme initiated by the UGC in 1970-71, was taken up at two levels: (1) in selected colleges to improve the entire science faculty; and (2) university leadership projects in any one science subject in all the colleges affiliated to a university. The Committee find that in respect of the scheme at (1) above, the progress has been un-impressive. The scheme was to be implemented in phases and the first phase was to end after three years of the launching of the scheme. There were, however, as many as 45 colleges which could not complete the first phase of the programme till September, 1976 and extensions were being granted to them from time to time. The Committee recommend that the difficulties of the colleges in completing the first phase of the programme should be considered by the Commission and ways and means should be found to get over them.

11.79. The Committee also find that 79 colleges which started their activities upto 1971-72 were to complete their first phase of the programme by March, 1975 and were to be visited by Regional Committees for proper appraisal of the work done. The Regional Committees had, however, visited only 14 of these colleges in the West and North Regions between July and September, 1974. The Commission had not constituted any Committee to visit the remaining 65 colleges. It was revealed during evidence that the Commission was not able to set up Committees for proper appraisal of the work done by these 65 colleges because of "serious shortage of staff" and that it was decided to assess the work of these colleges on the basis of progress reports received from colleges. The Committee feel that the Commission should have made adequate timely preparations for constituting the requisite Regional Committees provided for in the scheme. If the assessment was to be made on the basis of reports, the original scheme should not have provided for the colleges being visited by the Regional Committees for assessment of work done under the scheme.

The Committee have been further informed during evidence that "the Standing Committee have now suggested that there should be State level Committees". The Committee recommend that the method and machinery for assessment of work done by colleges under the scheme should be clearly laid down on the basis of experience and it should be strictly adhered to.

11.80. In regard to the University Leadership Project the Committee observe that after initial selection, till March, 1975, of 25 Departments relating to 14 universities no new department was brought under its purview till March 1976. However, against the total releases of Rs. 93.50 lakhs during 1970-71 to 1974-75, a sum of Rs. 45.10 lakhs in 1975-76 was released for the im-

plementation of the Project. Further, the Audit test check reveals instances of release of "on account" grant without taking into account progress of expenditure and/or large unutilised funds. The Committee emphasise that this quality improvement programme should be given adequate attention and its progress accelerated.

11.81. The Committee hope that great financial prudence would be observed in releasing "on account" grants for implementing this scheme in future.

(d) *Basic Research Work for Industrial Development*

Audit Paragraph:

11.81. A sum of Rs. 45 lakhs was provided for a scheme of Basic Research for Industrial Development. An expert committee was appointed by the Commission in May 1971 to consider the question of collaboration and inter-linking of universities, research and development laboratories and industry. The Committee recommended (May-June 1971) the implementation of a few projects as pilot projects for achieving this collaboration. The projects were proposed to be undertaken jointly by the National Physical Laboratory, Indian Institute of Technology, New Delhi, Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore, University of Madras, Associate Instrument Manufacturers, New Delhi and Shriram Institute of Industrial Research, New Delhi. Proposals were stated to be at the formulation stage even at the time the Commission submitted its appraisal on Fourth Five Year Plan to the Government Planning Commission (October 1974).

[Paragraph 48 of the Report of the Comptroller & Auditor General of India for the year 1975-76, Union Government (Civil) p.p. 233-234]

11.82. The Audit Paragraph has pointed out that proposals under the Scheme of 'Basic Research Work for Industrial Development' were at formulation stage even at the time the Commission submitted its appraisal on Fourth Five Year Plan in October, 1974. Asked whether these proposals had since been finalised, the Vice-Chairman, UGC, stated in evidence:

"Many of the projects that have been considered by the Expert Committee appointed by the Commission in May, 1971 were approved and they were in operation. I may give a few examples of such collaborative projects, such as, the mini-computer project at the Jadavpur University, the liquifying project at the Delhi University in Collaboration with the N.P.L., etc. Recently, about a year and a half

ago, there was a collaborative project between four universities on the bubble-chamber work. This is a process which is going on continuously. It is not a work which will be done at one time. On the advice of the Science Research Council, the expert panels on the various science subjects have been formed to identify the projects of industrial relevance and to encourage them. One of the objectives is to see that at least one-third of our finance for research work is utilised for this purpose."

11.83. The Ministry of Education and Social Welfare have informed the Committee subsequently in a written note as under:

"...Many other projects to be considered under this scheme did not materialise till March 1974 as a number of committees working on individual projects for bringing about collaboration between universities, national laboratories and use for industries were still to finalise their suggestion in this regard.

A sum of Rs. 45 lakhs had been provided for this programme. No Specific scheme was sanctioned by the Commission to universities or laboratories in this connection, in the Fourth Five Year Plan. In the appraisal document a figure of Rs. 40 lakhs having been spent on the preparatory steps on this scheme by individual universities has been estimated. However, there has not been any direct expenditure by the Commission on this programme.

* * * * *

In addition to this, number of major and minor research projects have been approved by the Commission which will bring out results that could be further used for industrial development.

Subsequently since 1974 a large number of major research projects including a considerable number of them with R&D value and application potential have been approved on the recommendation of Science Panels".

11.84. The Council of Scientific Industrial Research was also concerned with basic research leading to application. Asked what safeguards are taken to avoid duplication of research efforts, the Vice-Chairman, UGC, stated in reply in evidence:

"All the CSIR's laboratories are supposed to concentrate on basic research which has some application to industry or

otherwise. That is the object of all the laboratories of the CSIR. They have got various objectives like import substitution but not basic research for its own sake; it is not pursued in the national laboratories. It is done in the universities, science departments, arts and humanity."

He added:

"I don't think that there is much of duplication of the work that is done by the universities scientists and the national laboratories scientists. As I have already mentioned, most of the universities' research work is basic research in order to advance the frontiers of knowledge and leading to R&D. It is the desire of the Commission that there should be collaboration between the CSIR national laboratories and the universities in order to utilise the talent optimally and in fact that is the very idea of the collaboration between the universities and the national laboratories because the facilities in the national laboratories are good for applied work. The basic work is done in the Universities and the reason for this collaboration to be undertaken is that the talent in both the places should be utilised in an optimal fashion."

11.85. The Committee regret that the scheme of 'Basic Research Work for Industrial Development' conceived in May 1971 did not materialise till March 1974 as a number of Committees working on individual projects for bringing about collaboration between Universities, National Laboratories and industries could not finalise their suggestion in this regard. It is, however, heartening that subsequent to 1974, a number of major research projects including a considerable number with research and development value and application potential have been launched on the recommendations of Science Panels of the Commission.

(e) *Teacher and Adult Education Programme*

Audit Paragraph:

11.86. Against an allocation of Rs. 50 lakhs for this scheme during the Fourth Plan period the actual expenditure was Rs. 2 lakhs. For the Fifth Plan grants amounting to Rs. 6.42 lakhs were released by the Commission in 1974-75 and 1975-76. A Committee appointed in October 1969 by the Commission for implementing the scheme had

made its recommendation in June 1970. In May 1971 the Commission decided the pattern of assistance as 75 per cent from the Commission and 25 per cent from the State Government, subject to a ceiling of Rs. 3 lakhs during Fourth Plan. Thereafter, the schemes were to be continued by the universities with assistance from the State Governments, For want of assurance of future assistance from the States, only a few universities and that too where the scheme was already in operation in some form or other, came forward for implementing the scheme. In August 1973, however, it was decided that assistance by the Commission would be continued in Fifth Plan as well.

[Paragraph 48 of the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India for the year 1975-76 Union Government (Civil) P. 240]

(i) *Teacher Education*

11.87. As stated in the Audit Paragraph, against the allocation of Rs. 3.50 crores, (subsequently raised to Rs. 4 crores) for Teacher Education during the Fourth Plan the actual utilisation was only Rs. 1.18 crores leaving a spill-over of about Rs. 2.5 crores. Asked to indicate the reasons for such a wide disparity between the estimates and actual expenditure and whether there was proper monitoring of the programme, the Secretary, UGC, stated in reply during evidence:

“As we have mentioned in the final Fourth Plan Appraisal, it takes time to visit the universities and give the reports. The universities have to consult the State Governments to treat the recurring liability as a committed expenditure after the Commission's assistance is received. This time-lag occurs. Since in other cases the education is continuous process, it does not affect so much. The teacher education was taken up on a big way in the Fourth Plan. Of course, we have been doing it. But it is a normal activity of the university and, therefore, such a thing will not happen.”

(ii) *Adult Education*

11.88. Similarly against an allocation of Rs. 50 lakhs earmarked for Adult Education programmes during the Fourth Plan period, the actual expenditure was only Rs. 2 lakhs.

11.89. Asked to indicate the reasons for such low expenditure on this important programme of adult and continuing education, the Ministry have in a written note stated:

"The expenditure on the implementation of the programme of adult and Continuing Education in the Universities has been rather low for the following reasons.

- (a) The first important step in the implementation of the Adult and Continuing Education Programme was the formulation of the guidelines. This took considerable time as various aspects of the programme viz., academic, financial, training of personnel etc., have to be looked into and the U.G.C. desired to have the advice of experts in the field of adult education. It was necessary that a good deal of thought and attention should go into the formulation of the guidelines as on this would have depended the success of the programme.
- (b) The involvement of universities has also not been as easy task. Traditionally, universities have been concerned with teaching and research and the extension of knowledge to the community is a new dimension. The Commission organized a number of conferences and seminars in order that the universities may be involved in this programme and also in order that they may have a better appreciation of the objectives of the schemes.
- (c) In view of the fact that the scheme was implemented towards the end of the Fourth Plan, universities desired that the period of assistance be extended up to the end of the Fifth Plan Period. Consideration of this took some-time.
- (d) Universities had to obtain the concurrence of the State Governments either for the matching contribution or for maintenance of facilities at the end of the period of UGC assistance. In a number of cases, the State Governments have been slow to respond.
- (e) Universities have also to elicit the co-operation and involvement of their faculty as also the right kind of response from the community.
- (f) In order to make the programme effective, universities were advised to first ascertain the needs of the community. A survey of needs necessarily takes time.
- (g) It is not the main objective of the Commission to achieve the financial targets alone, the main objective is the proper utilisation of the funds placed at the disposal of the Commission.

11.90. According to the Audit Paragraph, for Adult Education Programmes, during the Fifth Plan, grants amounting to Rs. 6.42 lakhs were released by the Commission in 1974-75 and 1975-76. The Committee desired to know the quantum of allocation and actual expenditure on adult education programmes during the Fifth Five Year Plan up to 1976-77. The Ministry of Education stated in reply in evidence:

“No separate provision was made for adult education and continuing education as it had been included as one of the programmes under the miscellaneous scheme for which a total provision of Rs. 1.00 crores was made within the overall outlay of Rs. 210.00 crores, which has been reduced to Rs. 178.76 crores.

The expenditure incurred during 1974-75, 1975-76 and 1976-77 is as below:

1974-75	Rs. 2.72 lakhs.
1975-76	Rs. 3.70 lakhs
1976-77	Rs. 0.60 lakhs ”

11.91. Considering that a good number of universities are not participating in the programme, the Committee enquired whether continuance of the scheme would have the desired result. In a written note, the Ministry stated in reply:

“The Commission is not giving low priority to the programme of adult education during the Fifth Plan Period. In fact, the programme of adult education is being treated as a national programme and there is no constraint of the provision of funds for the purpose during the plan period.

21 Universities including institutions deemed to be universities are presently participating in the scheme of continuing education. This is considered to be very encouraging. The impact of the programme depends not so much on the number of universities participating in the programme but on the quality of the programme, survey of community needs and the involvement of the academic community and the response of the community at large.”

11.92. Asked whether the Planning Commission had allocated the amount for adult education and teacher education without fully realising the difficulties which could be encountered, the Chairman, University Grants Commission, stated in reply in evidence:

“These are two completely separate schemes. They are not to be treated as one programme. The UGC has always treated them as separate programmes. Their entire thrust is different. As far as continuing education is concerned, made the policy that it is better to adopt a few universities all over the world, the Commission has always made by the policy that it is better to adopt a few universities for experimental purposes, see how the scheme develops and then extend it to other universities. It is for this reason that a scheme which was started in 1971 has gradually been extended.”

11.93. The Committee regard it as unfortunate that out of the final allocation of Rs. 4 crores for teacher education programme during the Fourth Plan, the actual utilisation was only Rs. 1.18 crores. The Committee are not convinced of the reasons advanced during evidence for this sizeable shortfall in utilisation that “it takes time to visit universities and give the reports” and that “universities have to consult State Governments”. The Committee consider that these are normal processes which have to be undergone in regard to utilisation of all grants from the Commission. They, however, note the assurance given during evidence that “such a thing will not happen” in future.

11.94. The Committee are constrained to learn that against an allocation of Rs. 50 lakhs for Adult Education Programme during the Fourth Plan period, the actual expenditure was only Rs. 2 lakhs. This is symptomatic of the fact that the programmes launched by the Commission are not well-planned and the implementation thereof is lax. In this context, the Committee take special note of the remarks of the Ministry given in the communication explaining the reasons for shortfall in expenditure that “it is not the main objective of the Commission to achieve the final targets alone. The main objective is the proper utilisation of funds placed at the disposal of the Commission.” The Committee need hardly point out that the objective of proper utilisation of funds could not be advanced as a valid *raison d'etre* for dismal failures in the achievements of plan objectives and programmes.

(f) *Scheme for Preparation of University Level Books by Indian Authors.*

Audit Paragraph

11.95. In connection with the availability of quality books in science and technology the Education Commission noted in 1966 that

the country had the talent and other resources required to produce first rate books but it appeared that what was lacking was determination and planned effort. They recommended that the Inter University Board and the Commission should take a lead in the matter so that by the end of the Fourth Plan, most of books required at the undergraduate level and a considerable number at the post-graduate level were produced within the country. No action on the above recommendation was taken until the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare entrusted in 1970-71 to the Commission a scheme to encourage Indian authorship in the production of manuscripts of quality books. The scheme covered not only science books but also other books in humanities and social sciences. Under this scheme the Commission was to make available opportunities and financial support to university teachers and other scholars in the preparation of books of high quality. The scheme, however, does not by itself provide for publication of the books. A committee of three persons is constituted for each title undertaken under the scheme. This committee is concerned mainly in ensuring proper standard and quality of the manuscript and may make suitable suggestions to the author in this regard. The same committee is to evaluate the final manuscript and make suitable recommendations for its publication. Only original writings are to be covered under the scheme and no translations of available books are permissible.

11.96. The Ministry of Education and Social Welfare provided a grant of Rs. 41 lakhs to the Commission during the year 1971-72 to 1975-76 out of which Rs. 30.94 lakhs including Rs. 1.18 lakhs as administrative charges were released to 53 universities and 34 colleges up to 31st March 1976. Till 30th June, 1976 the Commission had cleared 362 projects in various disciplines after screening by subject panels. Fifty-five of these projects were, however, subsequently cancelled. Of the remaining projects, the position as on 1st November, 1976 was as under:—

- 4 projects completed and books published.
- 43 manuscripts completed and evaluated as suitable for publication (including 4 for which no evaluation was considered necessary).
- 18 projects completed and awaiting evaluation.

The position in respect of the remaining projects was as under:—

— In progress for less than 3 years	105
— In progress between 3 and 4 years	52
— In progress for more than 4 years	83

11.97. As stated earlier, the scheme does not provide for the publication of the approved manuscripts. The Commission, however, recommended from 1974-75 approved manuscripts for subsidies under the scheme of the National Book Trust for subsidising university level books provided the author approached the Commission in this regard.

[Paragraph 48 of the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India for the year 1975-76, Union Government (Civil pp 240 -242)]

11.98. The Education Commission had recommended in 1966 that the Inter-University Board and the UGC should take a lead in the matter so that by the end of Fourth Plan, most of the books required at the undergraduate level and considerable number at the post-graduate level were produced within the country. The Ministry of Education and Social Welfare was asked whether the UGC had considered this recommendation of the Education Commission, and if so, with what results. They have in reply stated as follows:

“This recommendation was made by the Education Commission in para 16.38 of the report while dealing with the topic of Books in Science. The Commission considered together the recommendations relating to Higher Education and not in piecemeal. The Ministry of Education was informed of the views of the Commission in its letter No. F.1-66/66 (CDN) dated 24th October, 1967 as follows:

‘I am directed to refer to letter No. F.27-3/66-IU (EC) dated 29th August, 1966 from the Education Secretary to the Chairman, University Grants Commission, on the above subject, and to say that the recommendations made by the Education Commission with regard to higher education have been considered by the University Grants Commission.’

The Commission welcomes the recommendations of the Education Commission and the priorities laid down in the report. The Commission is in full agreement with the emphasis placed by the Education Commission on improvement of the quality of education and development of science, technology and agriculture. The Commission extends its strong support, in particular, to the recommendations pertaining to strengthening of post-graduate education and research. The Commission is of the view that in the interest of maintenance of academic standards

it is of the utmost importance to ensure that the universities and colleges have on their staff well qualified teachers in adequate numbers. Universities should also have well equipped libraries and laboratories, ample text books and reading seats, apart from sufficient residential arrangement for teachers and students day, homes, health centres etc. Another important need to be met relates to provision of adequate scholarships and other forms of financial aid to deserving students. The Commission, further endorses the recommendations of the Education Commission relating to student welfare and requests the Government of India to place at the disposal of the University Grants Commission at an early date, a separate amount, as already requested, for the implementation of "student welfare programme."

The Ministry of Education launched in 1968 a massive programme of production of university level books in Indian languages facilitating a smooth changeover of the media of instruction in higher education from English to Indian languages. Under this programme till 1976-77 grants totalling to Rs. 862.32 lakhs were released to enable the State Governments concerned to produce university level literature. The current years' budget provision for the implementation of this scheme is Rs. 125 lakhs and grants to this extent are expected to be released in favour of the State Governments during the current year. In this way more than 4,400 books including books on technical and scientific subjects by Indian authors were produced and an equal number is in the pipeline. The scheme of preparation of university level books by Indian authors was initiated by the Ministry as a supplement to the above programme and its implementation was entrusted to the UGC. This scheme took shape initially as a "Programme for creation of a code of translators for writing of books at the University level," at a meeting in May 1969 presided over by the then Minister of Education and attended to by the then Chairman, UGC. A definite proposal in this behalf had been approved by the Ministry of Education some time in August 1969 and a formal communication in this regard was received in the UGC in September, 1969. The Commission appointed a Committee to draw out the details of the scheme. This Committee met in November, 1969 and worked out detailed scheme which was circulated to various universities

in April 1970. The proposals received under this scheme were considered by another committee (appointed by the UGC) which held its first meeting in July 1970, wherein it recommended 43 teachers/experts for being invited to participate in this scheme. The formal letters in respect of these 43 projects were issued in September 1970. The selection committee made further recommendations for acceptance of another 32 proposals in November 1970.

It also formulated the detailed terms and conditions for the execution of the approved projects. The conditions were approved by the Commission at its meeting held in February 1971. The implementation of the approved projects of the 1st and 2nd batches was actually taken up by the authors concerned during/after March 1971.

The tenure of these projects as mentioned in the original scheme was 3 to 5 years. The stipulation of making available most of the books required at the undergraduate level and a considerable number at the post-graduate level at the end of Fourth Plan, obviously does not relate totally to the scheme of 'Preparation of University level Books by Indian Authors'. In fact as far as this scheme is concerned, such a stipulation was not practical. Actually by the 31st March, 1974 only ten of the projects approved under this scheme completed the minimum period of three years and the manuscripts were completed under six of the approved projects. One of the completed manuscripts was published too by the author himself by the 31st March, 1974.

By the end of November 1977, of the 406 projects approved by the UGC under the scheme 'Preparation of University level Books by Indian Authors' manuscripts of 96 books have been completed. Of the remaining, 58 projects did not materialise and had to be cancelled and the other 252 projects are under different stages of implementation. Nineteen titles of the 96 completed manuscripts have since been published."

11.99. Asked to indicate the nature of financial assistance provided for the purpose of producing quality books in science and technology, the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare have, in a written note stated:

"These are paid to the authors concerned through the universities/colleges and other institutions who sponsor the

concerned book-writing projects. The nature of financial assistance provided under this scheme is indicated in Clauses 3.2 to 3.8 of the rules of this scheme given in the enclosed brochure.*"

11.100. Asked to indicate the method of arriving at the quantum of grant-in-aid for this scheme, the Ministry, in a written note, replied:

"The quantum of assistance under this scheme is determined for individual projects on the basis of the specific provisions of the rules availed of by the authors concerned."

11.101. According to the Audit para. the progress of the projects undertaken was very slow. The reasons for delay in the completion of the projects have been furnished by the Ministry in a written note:

- (i) Suspension of work due to the author-supervisor concerned going on deputation/visits abroad or to other institutions and or non-availability of the author-supervisors concerned due to other reasons:
- (ii) Lack of time on the part of the author-supervisor due to teaching and other University/departmental duties.
- (iii) The author-supervisor being unable to secure any suitable person to work as fellow or take leave from his teaching duties and working himself in addition to his regular appointment/duties, not able to keep the required pace.
- (iv) Fellow appointed under the approved book-writing project relinquishing the project before completion of the manuscript.
- (v) Non-availability of the fellowship provisions beyond three years especially in the case of full-time authors/retired teachers working under the scheme required the remaining work under the approved projects to be completed by the authors-supervisors on their own.
- (vi) Difficulties in procurement of materials and other problems not envisaged earlier at the time of taking up the project.
- (vii) Death of the author-supervisor before completion of the manuscript.

The rules of the scheme have been revised from time to time primarily with a view to accelerate the progress of the scheme and have the greater number of manuscripts under the approved book-writing projects completed expeditiously. At times the authors have also been addressed demi-officially to ensure expeditious completion of the manuscript."

11.102. The scheme does not provide for publication of approved manuscripts. In a written note, the Ministry have explained:

"Presently the publications of the completed manuscripts have to be arranged by the authors concerned through the publishers of their choice. Of course, the UGC recommends such manuscripts to the National Book Trust for subsidy towards their publication in the light of the reports of the members of the Editorial Committee appointed by the UGC for evaluation of the concerned manuscript. Normally all the manuscripts completed under this scheme and recommended by the UGC are likely to get suitable subsidy towards their publications from the National Book Trust. The scheme as at present does not provide for the UGC either undertaking publication of the completed manuscripts itself or it providing any assistance towards publication of such manuscripts. Obviously that aspect may require huge financial investment. Moreover the question of sale of the books so published may also be involved."

11.103. The Committee desired to know how coordination is maintained with the National Book Trust in regard to publication of books sponsored under the scheme. In a written note, the Ministry have replied:

"After getting the reports from the members of the Editorial Committees appointed for evaluation of the completed manuscripts the Commission recommends such manuscripts to the National Book Trust for subsidy in the light of the reports. Copies of such letters to the National Book Trust are also endorsed to the concerned authors who have to put in the detailed application alongwith their publisher's consent and the estimates of publication, to the National Book Trust. The National Book Trust when providing subsidy ensures publication of the manuscript. Out of 96 manuscript so far completed under the scheme of 'Preparation of University level Books for the National Book Trust

we have recommended 32 books for the National Book Trust subsidy and they have already sanctioned suitable subsidy for 29 of them and the remaining three cases are under consideration by National Book Trust. Nine of these books have come in the market too.' Out of the remaining 64 completed manuscripts publication of which is being arranged by the authors themselves, ten books have come out. The UGC also keeps in touch with the authors concerned to know the progress about publication of the completed manuscripts and obtains five printed copies of such books after publication for record—four copies for the Ministry of Education and one copy for UGC. There is complete coordination between the UGC and the National Book Trust in regard to the manuscripts prepared under the scheme and recommended by the UGC for subsidy under their scheme and the National Book Trust keeps UGC informed of the development in this regard."

11.104. The objective of the scheme is to encourage Indian Authorship in the production of manuscripts of quality books. The Committee trust that the Commission have a system of evaluating the manuscripts produced under the scheme to see that the assistance extended to the author has in fact served the objectives of the scheme.

11.105. The Committee note that of the 242 projects in progress as on 1 November, 1976, as many as 52 were between 3 and 4 years old and 85 were in progress for more than 4 years. In view of the fact that the original scheme envisaged a tenure of 3 to 5 years for these projects, the Committee would like the Commission to keep a close watch on the progress of each of these projects with a view to ensure that the projects actually fructify and their completion is not unduly delayed.

11.106. The Committee find that the recommendation of the Education Commission (1966) that the Inter-University Board of the University Grants Commission should take a lead in the matter relating to preparation of university level books by Indian authors was not specifically and separately considered by the University Grants Commission. It was considered by the Commission together with other recommendations relating to higher education. In the communication from the Commission to the Ministry of Education in October 1967 in which the Commission had indicated its reaction to the recommendations of the Education Commission relating to higher education, there is no reference to the recommendation in

question. It is thus clear that, as pointed out by Audit, this recommendation of the Education Commission was not specifically considered by the University Grants Commission.

The Committee also find that the scheme of preparation of university level books by Indian authors was initiated by the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare as a supplement to the programme launched in 1968 of production of university level books in Indian languages and it was only in August 1969 that definite proposal in this behalf was approved by the Ministry of Education and formally communicated to the UGC in September 1969. The scheme itself could be implemented only after March 1971. The Committee regret that the scheme for preparation of university level books by Indian authors suggested by the Education Commission in 1966 could not be implemented until after March 1971.

(g) *Publication of learned works and doctoral theses*

Audit Paragraph:

11.107. The Commission was providing assistance since 1955 to the universities for publication of learned works and doctoral theses. During the years 1966-67 to 1973-74 the Commission allotted Rs 30.05 lakhs to 78 universities including deemed universities. Thirteen universities to which Rs. 5.35 lakhs were allotted did not, however, draw any amount. Grants claimed and paid to the remaining universities were Rs. 11.63 lakhs (i.e. 38.7 per cent of the allocation).

11.108. With a view to examining the progress of implementation of this scheme the Commission had called for (March 1973) certain information from all the universities. No information in this regard was received from nine of them. Information received from the remaining universities indicated that in all 350 titles were selected by the universities for publication. Of this, information about the print order in respect of 50 titles was not received. Of the remaining 300 titles, order was given in respect of one print for 25,333 copies. Print order in respect of 225 titles varied between 500 and 1000 copies, 41 titles between 1,000 and 1,500 copies and 20 titles between 2,000 and 3,000 copies. The remaining 13 titles were printed with less than 500 copies.

11.109. Regarding the position of unsold copies, information received by the Commission in 1974 indicated that not even one out of 500 copies of a publication brought out by a certain university in 1964-65 was sold. The same was the case with three other universi-

ties in respect of 1,000, 1,100 and 1,000 copies of their publications brought out in 1968, 1969 and 1971 respectively (January, 1975).

11.110. The Commission stated (December, 1976) that in order to overcome the deficiencies and weaknesses in the implementation of the scheme, new guidelines have been framed.

[Paragraph 48 of the Report of the Comptroller & Auditor General of India for the year 1975-76, Union Government (Civil), pp. 242-243]

11.111. Explaining the reasons why the 13 Universities did not draw the amount allotted to them and why there was a decline in the drawal of the amount by the remaining universities, the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare have, in a written note stated:—

“The Universities probably did not receive good proposals from the teachers/Research scholars for which this amount could be utilised.”

Asked to indicate the reasons for getting printed 25,333 copies of one title, the Ministry have stated in a written note:

“The book entitled “Modern English Prose” by Professor Sarup Singh was approved by the Delhi University. Out of 25,333 copies printed by the University 25,242 were sold out.”

11.112. The Audit paragraph has highlighted some deficiencies and weaknesses in the implementation of the scheme, and the Commission informed Audit in December, 1976 that in order to overcome these, new guidelines had been framed. The Committee desired to know when the guidelines were reviewed. The Ministry of Education and Social Welfare have, in a written note stated:—

“The guidelines have recently been reviewed with the help of a Committee and will be considered by the Commission.”

11.113. The Committee note that during the years 1966-67 to 1973-74, the Commission allocated Rs. 30.05 lakhs to 78 universities for the scheme of publication of learned works and doctoral theses. Whereas 13 universities to which Rs. 5.35 lakhs were allotted did not draw any amount, grants disbursed to the remaining universities were Rs. 11.3 lakhs, representing 38.7 per cent of the allocation. It is also seen that not even one out of 500 copies of a publication brought out in 1964-65 was sold. It is further noticed that the guidelines had recently been reviewed with the help of a Committee to overcome the deficiencies and weaknesses in the implementation of

the scheme and are yet to be considered by the Commission. The Committee trust that the University Grants Commission would apply itself to the difficulties coming in the way of utilising the allocations for this scheme and suitably modify the scheme, if necessary, to make it more acceptable.

(h) *National Award of Prizes to Indian Authors*

Audit Paragraph

11.114. As a part of its programme to promote Indian authorship in relation to the working of university level books, the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare provided a grant of Rs. 7.87 lakhs during 1973-74 to the Commission to be utilised by conferring recognition at the national level to Indian authors producing outstanding works in Indian languages (excluding English) and by awarding them prizes valuing Rs. 10,000 each. The maximum number of prizes to be awarded was 100 in a year for the best books published within a specified period in any of the Indian languages on subjects or branches of subjects taught at university level. The guidelines for the implementation of the scheme were formulated by the Commission in July, 1973 and entries for the first award were invited through press notification in August, 1973. In response, about 900 entries were received. The Commission stated (December, 1976) that the processing of these entries was delayed due to late appointment of staff. The assessment is expected to be completed by March, 1977 and award are likely to be announced in 1977-78.

11.115. The expenditure incurred on the implementation of the scheme between 1973-74 and 1975-76 was Rs. 0.24 lakh which worked out to 3 per cent of the grant provided.

[Paragraph 48 of the Report of the Comptroller & Auditor General of India for the year 1975-76, Union Government (Civil).]

11.116. The Commission informed Audit in December, 1976 that the processing of entries received in 1973 was delayed due to late appointment of staff and the assessment was expected to be completed by March, 1977 and awards were likely to be announced in 1977-78.

11.117. Asked to indicate the reasons contributing to delay in the processing and assessment, the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare have, in a written note, stated:—

“The magnitude of the task could be judged from the attached statement* showing the discipline-wise and language-wise

*Not reproduced.

classification of 930 entries received. All the shortcomings relating to the entries, etc., have had to be set right before the entries were classified language-wise and discipline-wise. About 4700 books received under the scheme had also to be classified accordingly.

The Panel on Modern Indian Languages, while considering a note and 227 entries received in Literature under the scheme felt that this scheme had not perhaps received wide publicity in the regional dailies and even members themselves did not know about the existence of this scheme of awards for books published during the years 1968—73. The Panel was of the view that the entries received by the Commission were generally of a low standard. The Panel recommended that this scheme may be re-advertised in regional dailies besides the national dailies, and also circulated by means of demi-official letter to the Vice-Chancellors of the Universities and Principals of the affiliated colleges. In the opinion of the Panel, a fresh advertisement and proper circulation of the scheme should attract outstanding entries.

The implementation of the scheme involved intensive labour, coordination and follow-up which was time consuming. Experts who are proficient not only in different regional languages but also in different subjects had to be identified and contacted etc. to evaluate the entries received. Based on preliminary evaluation of entries by these subject experts in different languages, final selection of the prizes winning entries was proposed to be made by a high level committee consisting of subject experts, languages experts and eminent educationists.

The question of staff required to handle this scheme was then taken up with the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare in August, 1973, but it was in February, 1974 that staff consisting of 1 Assistant, 1 LDC/Typist and 1 Peon was agreed to by the Ministry. As the staff was found inadequate to handle effectively this scheme and to cope with the increased volume of work, the question of additional staff, in order to be able to process properly approximately 930 entries received under the scheme was taken up with the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare

in August, 1974. The Ministry after protracted correspondence agreed to in August, 1975 to the upgradation of the existing posts of 1 Asstt. and 1 LDC/Typist to that of Section Officer (Grade II) and Junior Stenographer to handle the scheme as Section Officer oriented work. This staff could get into position in February, 1976."

11.118. The Committee desired to know the present position of the scheme. In a written note, the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare replied:—

"In view of the several difficulties encountered by the Commission in implementing the scheme, including the view expressed by one of the subject panels to re-advertise the scheme under the leading dailies of the country to invite entries again, the Commission felt that it should no more handle this scheme and that the scheme may be handed over to the Ministry of Education & Social Welfare to be implemented either directly or through some other agency/agencies. The matter was discussed with the Ministry of Education recently and it has since been agreed that the scheme would be taken over by the Government of India, Ministry of Education & Social Welfare."

11.119. The Committee find it distressing that the scheme of "National Award of prizes to Indian Authors" entrusted by the Ministry of Education & Social Welfare to the UGC for implementation in 1973-74 has only now been handed back by the Commission to the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare "to be implemented either directly or through some other agency/agencies." From 1973 to-date, the only action taken in pursuance of the scheme was the issue of a Press Notification by the Commission in August, 1973 and "the consideration of a note and 227 entries received in literature under the scheme" by the Panel on Modern Indian Languages. The Panel felt that "this scheme has not perhaps received wide publicity in the regional dailies and even members themselves did not know about the existence of this scheme." The Panel had recommended that this scheme might be readvertised in regional dailies besides the national dailies, and also circulated by means of demi-official letters to the Vice-Chancellor of the Universities and Principals of the affiliated colleges. The delay in the processing and assessment of the entries received in response to the advertisement of the Commission in August, 1973 is attributed mainly to the shortage of staff with the Commission. The Committee regret the Ministry entrusted this scheme to the UGC in 1973 without ascertaining whether the lat-

ter would be in a position to handle it. Later, when the Ministry was requested by the Commission to make available adequate staff to handle the scheme, the Ministry vacillated till as late as February, 1976. The Committee consider this scheme as a valuable one and desire that the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare should take concrete steps to implement the scheme without further delay.

L. ORGANISATION

Audit Paragraph

12.1. The Commission consists of a Chairman, a Vice-chairman and ten other members, all appointed by the Central Government under Section 5(1) of the Act. The Act further provides that two of the members shall be chosen from among the officers of the Central Government (at present Secretary, Ministry of Education, Social Welfare and Culture and Secretary, Department of Expenditure in the Ministry of Finance), not less than four shall be chosen from teachers of universities and the remainder from persons who have knowledge or experience in agriculture, commerce, forestry or industry or are members of the engineering, legal, medical or any other learned profession or are vice-chancellors of universities.

[Paragraph 48 of the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India for the year 1975-76, Union Government (Civil), p. 216].

12.2. The Committee desired to know the method of selection for appointment as a Member of the Commission, its Chairman and Vice-Chairman. In a written note, the Ministry of Education have stated:

“The Chairman, Vice-Chairman and Members of the Commission are appointed by the Central Government in accordance with the procedure prescribed in the Act.”

12.3. Section 6 of the Act *ibid* lays down the terms and conditions of service of members. Based on the experience of the working of the Act over the years and in the light of the recommendations of the Committee of Members of Parliament on Higher Education (Sapru Committee) and the Education Commission (1964-66), the Act was amended in 1972 bringing about the following changes:

- (i) The number of members of the Commission was increased from 8 to 12, including one Chairman and one Vice-Chairman. (Prior to the amendment of the Act, there was no Vice-Chairman.)

In the years following the passing of the Act in 1956, the field of higher education in the country had very con-

siderably enlarged with corresponding increase in the responsibilities of the Commission. The Sapru Committee and the Education Committee had accordingly recommended expansion of the Commission to cope with the increased responsibility of the University Grants Commission. The recommendations were accepted by Government, hence the increase in the strength of the Commission.

- (ii) The term of Office of the Chairman was reduced from 6 years to 5 years and of other members from 6 years to 3 years, with eligibility for re-appointment or not more than one more term, in order to provide for a greater degree of rotation and to make it possible to utilise the varied experience of learned persons.
- (iii) As against the then existing provision of a casual vacancy in the office of Chairman being filled up for the residue of the term of the outgoing Chairman, provision was made that if a casual vacancy arises in the office of Chairman by reason of his death or resignation or inability to discharge his functions owing to illness or other incapacity, the Vice-Chairman holding office as such for the time being, shall act as Chairman and shall, unless any other person is appointed earlier as the Chairman, hold the office of the Chairman for the remainder of the term of office of the person in whose place he is to act. It was also provided that in case there is no Vice-Chairman at the time when the casual vacancy occurs, the Central Government shall appoint any member of the Commission to act as Chairman for period not exceeding six months. This was done because a contingency may arise in which it may be difficult to secure the services of an eminent educationist to serve as Chairman for less than a full term. Moreover, bringing of an outsider as a Chairman for a short period also likely to create difficulties.
- (iv) Under the original Act, vacancies amongst the members of the Commission were filled for the residue of the term of the out-going members. For the reason given under (iii) above, a provision was made that such vacancies will be filled for a full term of three years. A similar provision was made in the case of casual vacancy in the office of the Vice-Chairman.

12.4. The present composition of the Commission indicates that apart from its Chairman and Vice-Chairman, the Members are eminent educationists of repute or drawn from learned profession. The present composition is given below:

	Term upto
<i>Chairman</i>	
Prof. Satish Chandra	(upto 14-1-1981)
<i>Vice Chairman</i>	
Prof. B. Ramachandra Rao	(upto 1-6-1979)
<i>Members</i>	
1. Shri P. Sabanayagam, Secretary, Ministry of Education & S. W., Govern- ment of India, New Delhi.	(upto 31-5-1980)
2. Dr. G. Ramachandran, Secretary, Ministry of Finance, Department of Expenditure, Government of India, New Delhi.	(upto 9-11-1979)
3. Prof. R. P. Bambah, Director, Centre for Advanced study in Mathematics, Punjab University, Chandigarh.	(upto 20-1-1979)
4. Prof. S. S. Saluja, Director, Institute of Technology, Banaras Hindu Univer- sity, Varanasi.	Do.
5. Prof. (Miss) A. H. Dastur, Professor of Political Science, Bombay University Bombay.	Do.
6. Prof. S. Gopal, Ex-Chairman, National Book Trust.	(upto 6-2-1979)
7. Dr. A. S. Cheema, Vice-Chancellor Punjab Agricultural University, Ludhiana.	(upto 24-1-1980)
8. Prof. Maqbool Ahmed, Head of the Department of West Asian Studies, Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh.	(upto 20-1-1979)
9. Prof. B. M. Udgaonkar, Tata Institute of Funda- mental Research, Bombay.	Do.
10. Dr. Chandran D. S. Devenesen, Vice-Chancellor North Eastern Hill University, Shillong.	Do.

12.5. Sapru Committee (1964) had recommended that U.G.C. should have 15 Members of whom at least 5 should be full-time Members. Asked to indicate the reaction of Government to this suggestion of the Committee, the Ministry have, in a written note stated:

“After careful consideration of the recommendations of the Sapru Committee and of the Education Commission (1964—66), which had also meanwhile submitted its report, Government had decided to increase the membership of the U.G.C. from nine to twelve including two whole-time members (Chairman and Vice-Chairman). The U.G.C. Act, 1956, was amended in 1972 to incorporate this change in the Act.”

12.6. The Sapru Committee had also recommended that the members of the Commission should be of the status of Vice-Chancellors and that serving Vice-Chancellors should not be appointed Members of the Commission. Asked to indicate the Government's decision on this recommendation of the Sapru Committee, the Ministry have in a written note stated:

“While the recommendations of the Sapru Committee were under examination, the Government also had the benefit of the recommendations of the Education Commission (1964—66). The Education Commission had expressed opinion that U.G.C. should not be deprived of the services of an eminent person merely on the ground that he happened to be a Vice-Chancellor. In their view, the U.G.C. should consist of 12 to 15 Members, of whom not more than 1/3rd should be officials of Government, at least 1/3rd from the Universities (including Vice-Chancellors) and the remaining should be eminent educationists. Government had ultimately decided not to debar serving Vice-Chancellors from the Membership of the U.G.C.”

12.7. During evidence, the Chairman, University Grants Commission expressed his views in the following words:

“All that I can say is this. When I was interviewed by the Review Committee on this matter, I had expressed an opinion that what is important for the Commission is to strengthen the Academic Wing by taking over for specific period experts from the universities rather than increasing the number of whole time members. In my opinion increase of whole-time members might lead to greater bureaucracy rather than strengthening the academic functioning of the Commission.”

12.8. The representative of the Ministry of Education stated during evidence:

“In the past, the view of the Government has been that after increasing the strength by one full-time person, viz., the Vice-Chairman, there was no need for yet another full-time person to add to the Commission’s non-official or rather academic staff, to oversee the whole thing. The position has not changed very substantially at present. The Review Committee was seized of the matter; but it has refrained from making any specific recommendation regarding the addition of any full-time member. Therefore, of late, at least as far as I know, Government have not considered this matter. If the hon. Committee makes any recommendation in this regard, Government would certainly give it serious consideration and come to a conclusion, but the position in the past, before the submission of the Review Committee’s report, was that there was no need for full-time members.”

12.9. In regard to composition of the Commission and the proposed organisational structure, the Review Committee (1977) had recommended in paragraph 6.17 of this Report:

“The number of members of the Commission should be increased from the present 12 (including chairman and vice-chairman) to 18 by adding six members as follows:

- (a) two college teachers (including principals) one of whom may, as far as possible, be from a women’s college.
- (b) one person from the field of secondary education.
- (c) one expert in the field of rural higher education.
- (d) one expert in the field of non-formal education.
- (e) Secretary, Planning Commission, as an ex-officio member.

The Commission’s office should have two main divisions to deal with (a) educational planning and policy and (b) administration and grants.

The planning and policy division should be headed by an academician of standing who possesses expertise in planning, and should have four senior academicians belong-

ing to different broad disciplines who should be in charge of research an evaluation in their respective fields and be allotted areas for establishing regular contact with universities and colleges.

The Secretary should head the administration division and be answerable to the Chairman. The post should be filled on a tenure basis preferably by an administrator with experience of education or an academician with administrative experience.

The Commission should involve larger number of academicians in the work of its committees and give them facilities like accommodation for short stay, for efficient functioning."

12.10. Asked to indicate whether addition of a few full-time members would be helpful to cope with the increasing volume of work in higher education, the representative of the Ministry of Education stated in evidence:

"I would draw your attention first to page 89 of the report of the Review Committee. That committee has recommended that the Commission's functions should be broadly divided into two major groups; one would be administration and grants; and the other, academic functioning, including research and evaluation of programmes. They have recommended that a number of academic people should be drawn by the Commission to head this particular group and give direction and guidance to the Commission from time to time. They have not recommended increasing the number of full-time members. Rather than having them, people with academic standing drawn from the university system might serve the purpose. This particular recommendation of the Review Committee is yet to be considered by the Empowered Committee."

12.11. A majority of members of the Commission are whole-time functionaries in their respective spheres. The Review Committee made the following observations in this Report:

"...In the U.K., the members of the University Grants Committee spend about one fifth of their time on the work of the Commission. As some eminent persons who have been members of the U.G.C. or have been associated with

its working told us, the meetings of the Commission—generally held once a month—tend to be a hurried affair and the agenda is too long, including even some routine matters. It was, therefore, not always possible to discuss in depth the important matters that should receive thought and attention of the Commission.”

12.12. In terms of the University Grants Commission (Procedure at meetings) Regulations, 1959, the commission shall meet as often as may be necessary, but shall meet at least four times a year. Asked to indicate the frequency and duration of the sittings of the Commission, the Secretary, University Grants Commission stated in evidence:

“for the last three or four years, the Commission is meeting every month. Normally, it is meeting on third Monday of every month and transacting its business. Sometimes, it has even met twice a month.”

12.13. With the rise in the number of universities from 104 in 1973-74 to 115 in 1976-77 and also in the number of colleges recognised by the Commission from 2974 as on 1-12-1973 to 3267 as on 1-12-1976, the volume of work with the Commission must have correspondingly increased. It is inconceivable that a whole-time Chairman and Vice-Chairman would be able to supervise each and every of the varied items of work entrusted to the Commission, much less professionally contribute to the academic role of the UGC. In the circumstances, the Committee recommend that Government may consider what positive steps should be taken to make the Commission a dynamic and vigorous body capable of shouldering the increasing responsibilities in the context of the enlargement of the field of higher education. One suggestion that the Committee would like to make is reorganisation of the existing pattern of composition of the Commission which, besides the whole-time Chairman and Vice Chairman, should have a few more whole-time members.

12.14. An autonomous body like U.G.S. dealing with release of huge funds as grants to institutions of higher learning should enjoy the confidence of the academic community as a whole. It is, therefore, desirable that an in-built safeguard is provided against misuse of authority by appointing a Vigilance Officer or in the alternative by exposing its functioning to periodic review by an independent agency outside the Ministry of Education.

Annual Reports of U.G.C.

12.15. Section 18 of the University Grants Commission Act, 1956, provides that:

“The Commission shall prepare once every year in such form and at such time as may be prescribed, an annual report giving a full account of its activities during the previous year, and copies thereof shall be forwarded to the Central Government and the Government shall cause the same to be laid before both Houses of Parliament.”

12.16. The Review Committee (Feb. 1977) in paragraph 6.15 of their Report recommended that:

“There is need to amend this Section to enable the Commission to give, in addition to a true and full account of its activities, an account of what it perceives as the problems and perspectives of higher education and the situation in respect of standards and coordination so that parliament and the nation know from time to time the state of affairs in the sphere of higher education and the new thinking that is called for.”

12.17. Inviting attention to the above recommendation, the Committee desired to know Government's reaction thereto. The Education Secretary replied in evidence:

“We have not yet taken up that question. But in any case, we shall put it up to the Government and we will take a final decision.”

12.18. In terms of Rule 4 of the UGC (Budget and Accounts) Rules, 1962 framed under Section 25(2)(1)(h) & (i) of the UGC Act, 1956, the Annual Report should be prepared and copies thereof forwarded to the Central Government not later than the 1st October following the year to which it relates. The report may, apart from giving true and full account of the activities of the Commission during the previous financial year, also contain such observations and suggestions, if any, relating to University education in India as the Commission may deem fit to make. During evidence, answering a question relating to communication of policy decisions of the U.G.C. to State Governments, the Secretary, U.G.C. stated that the Annual Reports of the Commission were “circulated to every College, every University and every State Government whenever there is a policy

decision." There have been delays in laying the reports of the U.G.C. before Parliament as the following particulars would show:

<i>Report</i>	<i>Date of laying on the Table of Lok Sabha</i>
1972-73	9-12-1974
1973-74	18-5-1976
1974-75	25-8-1976
1975-76	4-4-1977
1976-77	Not laid till the end of Feb. 1978

12.19. The Committee agree with the suggestion made by the Review Committee in paragraph 6.15 of their Report February, 1977 that the Annual Report of the Commission should besides giving a true and full account of its activities during the previous year, "also present to Parliament its assessment of problems and perspectives of higher education and of the state of coordination and standards in universities' and that 'the annual reports should be circulated to all universities and State Governments'. The Committee desire that the above change may be brought about as early as possible.

12.20. The Committee find that the Annual Report for the year 1972-73 was presented to Lok Sabha on 9-12-74, Report for the years 1973-74 on 18-5-76 for the year 1974-75 on 25-8-76 and for the year 1975-76 on 4-4-77. The Annual Report (1976-77) has not yet been presented. The Committee take a serious view of the considerable delays in the presentation of the reports of the Commission to Parliament and would like the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare to ensure that the Report of the Commission is presented to the Lok Sabha not later than 1st October following the year to which it relates, as required under Rule 4 of the U.G.C. (Budget & Accounts) Rules, 1962.

12.21. The Committee were informed that the Annual Report of the Commission is "circulated to every university, college and every State, whenever there is a policy decision." The Committee feel that if the Annual Reports are to include, as suggested by the Committee in an earlier paragraph, the assessment of problems and perspectives of higher education, in which the State Governments are also involved, it would be helpful if copies thereof are, as a matter of course, made available to all State Governments, universities and recognised colleges or institutions

12.22. The Committee have not been able to examine some of the aspects commented upon in the Audit paragraph included in the report of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India for the year 1975-76, Union Government (Civil). The Committee expect, however, that the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare will take due note of the observations of the Audit so as to take remedial action wherever necessary.

NEW DELHI-110001

April 14, 1978.

Chaitra 24, 1900 (S)

C. M. STEPHEN,

Chairman,

Public Accounts Committee.

APPENDIX I

(vide paragraph 1·8)

Note indicating inter alia the salient points contained in the report of the Committee on Standard of University Education and in steps taken to implement the same

Important recommendations made by standards Committee/Education Commission

1. The courses of study are not related to well defined educational objectives (Rec. 9 of S.C. and such objectives for different stages have to be specified and courses reorganised. (Rec. 123, 124, 148 EC) and a uniform pattern of education introduced in the country within 20 years (Rec. 10 EC)
2. Opportunities for part-time education (Correspondence Course/Evening Classes) should be extended widely (Rec. 17 SC, Rec. 13 and 140 EC Rec. 204 Ec).
3. There should be regular programmes of seminars, summer institutes, refresher courses and research facilities for Teachers for their professional enrichment (Rec. 27/28/29 SC).
4. Steps should be taken to bring about Examination Reforms Rec. (94-101 SC-133 E.C)
5. Assistance to colleges has been inadequate A certain number of good colleges should be given autonomous status. A number of outstanding colleges all over the country should be chosen similar to Centres of Advanced Study, colleges should be improved by relating enrolment with facilities (Rec. 102-112 S. C. 161-62 E. C. Rec. 132 E.C.)

Action taken by UGC

The National Policy on Education has broadly endorsed this and in conformity with this policy, action is in progress to specify broad objectives of various stages and to restructure degree courses. A scheme for restructuring courses in terms of the guidelines prescribed by the Commission is under implementation in the current plan.

Universities are assisted to start correspondence courses by the Commission.

The Commission is implementing a sizeable programme for faculty development through, summer institutes, workshops, refresher courses, fellowships and faculty awards like National Lecturer-ships, National Associates, National Fellowships, Visiting Professorships and career awards.

Examination Reform is an important programme under implementation.

Apart from a programme of assisting colleges for general development, the Commission is implementing two schemes:

(i) Colleges Science Improvement Programme: and

(ii) College Social Science and Humanities Programme to improve undergraduate education.

A number of colleges has been selected to function as 'Lead' Colleges in different districts to provide good higher education facilities on the district level. A number of colleges have also been selected/identified to function as autonomous colleges. The Commission is encouraging the universities to identify colleges which would be given autonomous status.

1	2	3
6.	Academic activities like setting up centres of Advanced Study should be strengthened. It is necessary to establish Centres of Advanced Study to improve postgraduate education and research (SC Rec. 117 E.C. Rec. 127).	The Scheme of Centres of Advanced Study/ Departments of Special Assistance/ Departmental support for research is one of the major quality improvement programmes of the UGC to improve the quality of postgraduate teaching and research.
7.	It is necessary to develop a rich and varied programme of student services through health services, hostels, Day Study Centres Counselling (Rec. 135 EC).	Programmes to assist universities and colleges for providing student services e.g., hostels, study centres, health centres are already being implemented.
8.	Urgent steps are necessary to develop educational research and relate it effectively to the formulation of educational policies and improvement of education (Rec. 152 E.C.).	A major programme of the Commission in the Fifth Plan is support for research projects long-term and short-term covering all areas in humanities, social sciences, sciences and engineering and technology.
9.	Inter-University collaboration at the regional and national level to take up cooperative programme should be strengthened (Rec. 147 E.C.).	Fifth Plan schemes of setting up Regional Instrumentation Centres and Regional Library Centres by the UGC would achieve this purpose.
10.	Affairs of the University of Calcutta should be examined to find away out to meet the rapidly increasing undergraduate population (Rec. 146 E.C.).	The Commission in consultation with the Govt. of India and State Govts. had appointed a committee to look into the reorganisation of Calcutta University. The report of the Committee is under consideration.
11.	Every effort should be made to build up good libraries in universities and colleges (Rec. 135 S.C.).	Priority is accorded in allocating funds for purchase of books and journals in all schemes of the Commission. Assistance to provide library accommodation is also extended to universities and colleges under general development programmes.
12.	The most urgent need is to upgrade the remuneration of teachers substantially (Rec. 16 E.C.).	The scales of pay of teachers have been revised twice on the basis of recommendations made by the UGC.
13.	Equalisation of educational development should be secured in different States and stages to reduce regional imbalances in educational development taken (Rec. 59 E.C.).	Assistance on a liberal basis is made available to colleges located in backward areas and colleges where enrolment of Scheduled Castes/Scheduled Tribes Students is more than 50%. Further details are indicated in reply to Point 4(b).
14.	The UGC should support universities to organise instrument calibration and repair service for the general use of the universities (Rec. 193 E.C.).	A scheme of setting up university service and Instrumentation Centre has been introduced by the Commission recently for universities to set up such Centres.

APPENDIX II

(Vide paragraph 1.19)

Record note of the discussions held at the sitting of the University Grants Commission on the 4th May, 1967

The meeting of the Committee appointed by the University Grants Commission to consider the recommendations made by the Education Commission was held on 4th May, 1967 in the office of the Commission, Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi. The following were present:

1. Prof. D. S. Kothari
Chairman
University Grants Commission.
2. Prof. A. R. Wadia
Member
University Grants Commission.
3. Dr. D. M. Sen
(By special invitation)
Vice-Chancellor
Burdwan University
4. Shri J. P. Naik
Adviser
Ministry of Education.
5. Shri K. L. Joshi
Secretary
University Grants Commission.
6. Shri R. K. Chhabra
Deputy Secretary
University Grants Commission.
7. Dr. D. Shankar Narayan
Development Officer
University Grants Commission.
8. Shri L. R. Mal
Assistant Education Officer
University Grants Commission.

Dr. D. C. Pavate, Vice-Chancellor, Karnatak University, Dr. D. S. Reddi, Vice-Chancellor, Osmania University, Nawab Ali Yavar Jung, Vice-Chancellor, Aligarh Muslim University and Prof. S. Dhawan, Director, Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore, could not attend the meeting.

2. It was pointed out that the Education Commission had discussed all the problems relating to higher education threadbare and further discussion may not serve any useful purpose. What was required to draw up concrete programmes for implementing the recommendations. While drawing programmes, the recommendations could be modified in the light of the local conditions and actual requirements. The problem could be approached in two ways—(i) the Government of India may give an indication to the University Grants Commission about the resources likely to be made available for implementing the recommendations and the Commission may draw the programmes in the order of priorities it considers advisable; (ii) the Commission may draw programmes according to priorities and then approach the Government for resources. In the latter case, in the context of the existing resources it may be advisable to draw programmes in away that the resources are not spread over thinly.

3. Chairman, University Grants Commission pointed out that the two alternatives indicated above were interlinked. It may not be possible to decide programmes according to the priorities unless the resources likely to be made available were known and similarly, it may not be possible to given an idea of the resources likely to be made available unless and until the programmes and their priorities were decided. In fact, both the alternatives have to be applied. He further pointed out that the general thinking of the University Grants Commission has been on the same lines as Education Commission. The University Grants Commission by and large, agrees with these priorities laid down in the report and in fact, in the guide lines, given to the Visiting Committees appointed by the Commission to assess the development needs of the Universities for the Fourth Plan the same priorities have been indicated. The Commission has already appointed the following Committees for the implementation of the recommendations of the Education Commission:

- (i) Committee on 'Autonomous Colleges'.
- (ii) Committee to consider the implementation of the scheme of Correspondence Courses.

- (iii) Committee to consider the facilities that may be provided to students appearing privately in the university examination.

4. The Committee felt that improvement of colleges was a very important measure for which resources should be made available by the Government during the Fourth Plan. If it was not possible to undertake this programme on a large scale a beginning may be made with the few colleges which should be improved substantially so that they may make an impact on the other institutions. Arising out of this, it was pointed out that the country had been having too many experiments in the field of education with the result that all along there had been a fluid state of affairs. There was a good deal to support the existence of the intermediate classes which had served a distinct purpose. Theoretically, it may look advisable to attach intermediate classes to schools. But, wherever, this had been done higher education had suffered immensely. This experiment could succeed only if we had a very sound system of school education; otherwise, it would be of no use transferring the intermediate classes to schools.

5. The Committee also discussed the question of selective admissions as recommended by the Education Commission. The Committee agreed that there should be selective approach for admission to higher education. Every student passing matriculation/higher secondary should not proceed to university and only those should go who can profit by higher education. However, this policy if enforced strictly at present was likely to lead to more social and political complications. It did not seem possible to check the demand for higher education on account of lack of alternative channels of training and employment. If the selective approach was to be implemented there should be alternative avenues for those who were not allowed to go to the universities. In this context, the Committee considered the vocationalisation of secondary education and agreed that this was a very important recommendation which should be implemented effectively.

6. The Committee also felt that there were recommendations in the Report which could be implemented by the universities without much financial cost e.g. inter-disciplinary studies etc. These would avoid duplication of efforts and result in proper utilization of the scarce resources in the country.

7. After considerable discussion, the Committee welcome the recommendations of the Education Commission and the priorities

laid down in the Report. The Committee agreed with the emphasis **placed** on improvement of quality of education, development of **science**, technology and agriculture and strengthening of **post-graduate** education and research. The Committee also emphasised **that** there should be better teachers and more of them should be **provided** in the colleges and universities. The universities should **have** well-equipped libraries and laboratories, ample textbooks, **reading** seats, staff quarters and amenities for students like Day **Centres**, Health Centres, Scholarships and other financial aids etc. **The** Committee also endorsed the recommendations of the Education **Commission** with regard to student welfare and suggested that it **may** be emphasised on the Government to provide funds which had **been** asked for by the University Grants Commission for student **welfare** programmes.

8. The Committee further decided that a note indicating the **programme** of crucial importance in the light of the **recommendations** of the Education which may be taken up for **implementation** may be prepared and placed before the Committee again.

APPENDIX III

(Vide paragraph 6.37)

Colleges affiliated to the University of Delhi receiving maintenance/development grants from the University Grants Commission

- **1. Atma Ram Sanatan Dharam College (1959) (Extended College w.e.f. 1968-69).
- **2. Zakir Hussain College (1948).
 3. Dyal Singh College (1959) (Extended College w.e.f. 1969-70).
- **4. Daulat Ram College (1960), (Extended College w.e.f. 1968-69).
 5. Gyan Devi Salwan College (1970)
- **6. Hans Raj College (1948) (Extended College w.e.f. 1966-67).
- **7. Hindu College (1922).
- **8. Indraprastha College for Women (1925) (Extended College w.e.f. 1966-67).
 9. Institute of Home Economics (1969).
- **10. Janki Devi Mahavidyalaya (1959) (Extended College w.e.f. 1966-67).
- **11. Jesus and Mary College (1968).
- **12. Kirori Mal College (1854) (Extended College w.e.f. 1977-78).
- **13. Lady Irwin College (1950).
- **14. Lady Shri Ram College (1956) for Women (Extended College w.e.f. 1966-67).
 15. Mata Sundri College for Women (1967) (Extended College w.e.f. 1971-72).
 16. P.G.D.A.V. College (1957) (Extended College w.e.f. 1973-74).
 17. Ramjas College (1822) (Extended College w.e.f. 1973-74).
 18. Rao Tula Ram College (1970).
- **19. St. Stephen's College (1922).
- **20. Shri Ram College of Commerce (1926).
 21. S.G.T.B. Khalsa College (1951) (Extended College w.e.f. 1966-67).
- **22. Sri Venkateswara College (1961).
 23. Shyam Lal College (1964) (Extended College w.e.f. 1968-69).

University Maintained Colleges

24. College of Vocational Studies (1972)
- **25. Central Institute of Education (1948).
- **26. Delhi School of Social Work (1948).

27. Deshbandhu College (1952) (Extended College w.e.f. 1973-74).
 **28. Miranda House (1948) (Extended College w.e.f. 1966-67)
 29. Ram Lal Anand College (1964).

Colleges Sponsored by Delhi Administration

30. Bhagat Singh College (1967) (Extended College w.e.f. 1970-71).
 31. Bharati Mahila College (1971)
 **32. Gargi College (1967)
 **33. Hastinapur College (1964) (Extended College w.e.f. 1970-71)
 34. Kalindi College (1967) (Extended College w.e.f. 1970-71)
 **35. Kamla Nehru College (1964) (Extended College w.e.f. 1966-67)
 **36. Lakshmi Bai College (1965) (Extended College w.e.f. 1968-69)
 37. Maitreyi College (1967) (Extended College w.e.f. 1973-74)
 **38. Rajdhani College (1964) (Extended College w.e.f. 1968-69)
 39. Swami Shradhanand College (1967) (Extended College w.e.f. 1972-74)
 40. Shayama Prasad Mukherji College for Women (1969) (Extended College w.e.f. 1971-72)
 **41. Satyawati Co-educational College (1972)
 42. Shri Aurobindo College (1972)
 43. Shivaji College (1961) (Extended College w.e.f. 1970-71)
 44. Vivekanand Mahila College (1970)

**These Colleges were not covered by any of the reasons indicated in paragraph 6.36 for payment of maintenance grants partly out of Plan funds during the Fourth Five Year Plan period, *viz.*,

1. Setting up of new Colleges.
2. Taking over of certain colleges by the Delhi University.
3. Starting of Evening Classes in some Colleges.
4. Certain Colleges being brought under the Extended Colleges Scheme.

APPENDIX IV

(Vide paragraph 6-57)

Statement Showing the Assistance for the Development of undergraduate Education in Arts, Science and Commerce Colleges in 1976-77

S. No.	State	University	No. of Colleges recognised under Section 2(f) of the UGC Act	No. of Colleges eligible for* assistance for development of Under-graduate education in Arts, Science, Commerce	No. of Colleges which received assistance during 1976-77	No. of Colleges whose proposals were received and could not be accepted in 1976-77.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	Uttar Pradesh	1. Agra	38	23	12	3
		2. Allahabad	6	3	2	..
		3. Avadh	19	17	5	1
		4. Banaras	4	3
		5. Bundelkhand	9	8	4	1
		6. Garhwal	13	10	1	1
		7. Gorakhpur	79	58	28	4
		8. Kanpur	51	36	10	3
		9. Kumaon	9	5	2	..
		10. Rohilkhand	25	18	6	..

		11. Lucknow	17	14	5	..
		12. Meerut	53	39	25	1
		13. Gurukul Kangri	1
		14. Chandra Shekhar Azad	1
2	Bihar	1. Bihar	36	16	9	1
		2. Bhagalpur	33	7	7	1
		3. Magadh	42	24	16	2
		4. Ranchi	41	22	8	5
		5. Patna	11	4	4	1
		6. L.N. Mithila	38	13	11	4
		7. Rajindra Agrl.	5
3	Assam	1. Gauhati	65	23	11	5
		2. Dibrugarh	34	13	5	6
		3. North Eastern Hill University.	17	7	5	1
4	Delhi	1. Delhi	56	46†
5	Orissa	1. B. rhanpur	18	4	5	6
		2. Sambalpur	29	12	12	10
		3. Utkal	49	21	18	4

*Satisfying the minimum enrolment condition. The enrolment for 1975-76 has been taken.

†Not eligible for assistance 5 Lakhs Sch. m. s. Assistance for development purposes provided separately.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6	West Bengal	1. Calcutta	196	133	14	2
		2. Burdwan	47	37	11	..
		3. North Bengal	28	17	4	3
		4. Jadavpur	2	..	1	..
7	Madhya Pradesh	1. A.P. Singh	40	13	5	3
		2. Bhopal	21	10	5	3
		3. Indore	19	10	5	6
		4. Jiwaji	32	17	4	7
		5. Jabalpur	24	9	3	2
		6. Saugar	42	17	8	9
		7. Ravi Shankar	46	20	10	5
		8. Vikram	38	14	18	1
		9. Indira Kala Sangeet	4
8	Maharashtra	1. Poona	103	34	15	10
		2. Shivaji	75	35	9	11
		3. Nagpur	106	44	3	7
		4. Bombay	94	49	20	..
		5. Marathwada	72	38	49	4
9	Gujarat	1. Gujarat	138	68	17	8

		8. South Gujarat	34	17	5	4
		3. Saurashtra	49	31	..	6
		4. Sardar Patel	15	8	2	3
		5. MS. Univ. of Baroda	1
10	Rajasthan	1. Rajasthan	105	52	46	16
		2. Udaipur.	7	6	3	1
		3. Jodhpur	3	1	1	..
11	Andhra	1. Andhra	74	48	11	2
		2. Osmania	81	50	9	4
		3. Sri Venkateswara	34	22	5	..
		4. Jawaharlal Nehru Techno- gical	2
12	Kerala	1. Kerala	81	45	12	..
		2. Calicut	47	28	8	1
		3. Cochin	1
13	Tamil Nadu Agri.	1. Madras	133	67	17	20
		2. Madurai	73	40	8	..
		3. Tamil Nadu Agri.	1
14	Karnataka	1. Karnataka	111	23	6	5
		2. Mysore	91	32	5	..
		3. Bangalore	55	25	2	..

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15	Haryana	1. Kurukshetra (BN Chakravarty)	88	44	8	2
		2. Rohtak	10	..	1	..
16	Himachal Pradesh	1. Himachal Pradesh	23	9	3	..
17	Jammu and Kashmir	1. Jammu	11	6	3	..
		2. Kashmir	17	12	6	1
18	Punjab	1. Punjab	75	32	6	1
		2. Punjabi	36	16	3	2
		3. Guru Nanak Dev	69	24	5	4

APPENDIX V

(Vide paragraph 6.59)

Statement showing the State-wise statistics of Colleges assisted by the University Grants Commission for the Development and Improvement of Undergraduate Education in Arts, Science and Commerce Colleges. Establishment of Students Aid Fund in Colleges and Establishment of Book Funds Bank in Colleges during 1974-75, 1975-76 and 1976-77.

S. No.	Name of the State	Name of the Scheme	No. of colleges which applied for assistance to the Commission during:			No. of colleges to whom assistance was provided during:		
			1974-75	1975-76	1976-77	1974-75	1975-76	1976-77
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1	Andhra	I*	..	38	52	..	2	25
		II	95	100	83	70	74	63
		III	37	100	53	31	91	45
2	Assam	I	16	28	12	1	1	11
		II	47	38	35	49	38	38
		III	20	64	16	16	51	15
3	Bihar	I	48	61	11	..	5	35
		II	72	47	54	36	38	42
		III	16	93	41	8	86	31
4	Gujarat	I	7	9	21	1	1	16
		II	117	149	187	93	126	165
		III	61	87	67	50	72	55
5	Haryana	I	..	8	22	9
		II	76	68	72	69	60	62
		III	34	46	60	25	41	55

*I : Represent Development and Improvement of Undergraduate Education in Arts, Science and Commerce Colleges.

II : Represent Establishment of Students Aid Fund in Colleges.

III : Represent Establishment of Book Bank in Colleges.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
6	Himachal Pradesh	I*	..	2	5	3
		II	6	6	11	5	6	9
		III	1	16	9	1	13	7
7	Jammu & Kashmir	I	12	9
		II	3	9	9	3	8	8
		III	3	16	10	1	10	6
8	Kerala	I	..	18	48	..	4	20
		II	85	75	94	65	62	71
		III	30	39	64	23	30	55
9	Karnataka	I	..	19	23	..	3	13
		II	183	150	148	97	119	123
		III	97	140	150	32	101	126
10	Madhya Pradesh	I	8	39	76	..	8	52
		II	152	178	200	115	144	171
		III	79	121	54	61	102	40
11	Maharashtra	I	1	20	112	..	4	70
		II	185	218	271	164	199	256
		III	118	83	149	109	78	141
12	Meghalaya, Manipur & Mizoram	I	2	6	5	4
		II	3	4	5	1	2	5
		III	3	10	1	2	8	1
13	Orissa	I*	39	37	8	..	1	24
		II	56	56	46	31	40	42
		III	14	59	17	10	54	16
14	Punjab	I	..	9	33	..	1	14
		II	115	111	110	98	91	90
		III	50	92	87	34	75	70
15	Rajasthan	I	45	34

		II	37	26	50	37	26	50
		III	28	39	48	28	39	48
16	Tamil Nadu	I	..	37	40	..	18	25
		II	150	120	123	91	95	103
		III	86	105	105	36	77	88
17	Uttar Pradesh	I	..	127	48	..	5	100
		II	205	150	161	177	127	142
		III	51	171	141	46	161	123
18	West Bengal	I	43	39	16	1	3	19
		II	159	132	155	91	126	122
		III	58	122	50	50	119	47
19	Delhi	II	39	31	40	37	29	38
		III	34	10	31	33	11	27

- I Represent Development and Improvement of Undergraduate Education in Arts, Science and Commerce Colleges.
- II Represent Establishment of Students Aid Fund in Colleges.
- III Represent Establishment of Book Bank in Colleges.

APPENDIX VI

(Vide paragraph 7.8)

Guidelines indicating the procedure to be followed in connection with the visits of Visiting Committees to Universities

1. The dates for the visit of the Visiting Committee to the Universities/Institutions deemed to be Universities for Fourth Plan proposals will be finalised by CDN Section and intimated to the Officer assigned for the Committee.
2. The Officer may finalise the names of the experts for the Committee from the list in consultation with the Divisional Heads concerned and Secretary.
3. He will be responsible for making all arrangements for the visit of the Committee to the University and finalisation of the report of the Committee.
4. Copies of the Fourth Plan proposals received from the University alongwith the relevant file will be sent to the Officer for further action.
5. Every member of the Committee may be supplied (i) a copy of the Commission's letter dated 30th April, 1966 (spare copies of which will be supplied by CDN Section), (ii) a copy of the Fourth Plan proposals received from the University, (iii) list of points for the guidance of members and (iv) a copy of T.A. rules.
6. The Officer may collect relevant data with regard to the development schemes of the University already approved by the Commission for Fourth Plan period from different Sections as also any other point which the Commission might desire to be discussed by the Committee.
7. During the course of the visit, the Visiting Committee would hold discussions with the Vice-Chancellor, teachers of the University and some students so as to involve them

in the process of planning for the development of University. The Committee would also hold special discussions about programmes of contact and communication between students and teachers as already intimated by the Chairman, UGC in his letter dated 28th September, 1966 to the Vice-Chancellors. The Visiting Committee would also examine the progress made by the University in the implementation of the recommendations made by the Committees appointed by the Commission from time to time, *e.g.* Review Committees, Examination Reforms Committee and Standards Committee, etc.

8. The Officer may inform the University of the programme of the Committee and the lines on which the work of the Committee would proceed in the University. He may also inform the Members of the Committee of the items which the Committee may like to discuss with the University authorities. For this purpose, a model draft letter to be addressed to the Vice-Chancellor of the University is enclosed.
9. The Officer may collect statistical data indicating the progress made by the University during the last five years as indicated in the enclosed proforma for the use of the Members of the Committee. He may also obtain a note from the University indicating the progress made by the University during the Third Plan period in its development programmes, the difficulties experienced by the University and the lines on which the development of the University is desired for the use of the Members of the Committee.
10. The recommendations of the Visiting Committee in the report should be specific and translated in financial terms. These should clearly indicate the funds required for the continuance of the programmes approved in the earlier plans as also the allocation proposed for new proposals, those already approved by the Commission, if any.
11. Officers should have coordinated information from Sections which have indicated to the Universities that particular scheme sent by them to the UGC may be placed before the Visiting Committee for consideration.

12. The report of the Committee when finalised along with the file may be sent back to the CDN Section for further action.

Sd/
Secretary.

APPENDIX VII

Conclusions/Recommendations

Sl. No.	Para No. of Report	Ministry/Department concerned	Conclusions/Recommendations
1	2	3	4
I	1.21	Education and Social Welfare	One of the primary functions of the University Grants Commission is the determination and maintenance of standards of teaching, examination and research in universities. In pursuance of this function, a Committee on Standards of University Education was appointed by the University Grants Commission in August 1961. The Committee submitted its report in October 1964. The report of the Committee was considered by the University Grants Commission in May 1965. The University Grants Commission merely forwarded the report to the universities and the State Governments for suitable action. This perfunctory action of the University Grants Commission in regard to the report of the Committee on Standards came in for criticism by the Estimates Committee in their 52nd Report (Third Lok Sabha) (April 1966) who recommended that "the University Grants Commission should pursue recommendations of these expert committees with the State Universities and keep a record as to how many recommendations of each expert committee have been implemented." The Public Accounts Committee also, in their 114th Report (Fourth Lok Sabha) (1969-70) took note of the

reply of the Ministry of Education that some of the recommendations of the Standard Committee were under various stages of implementation. Seven years after the last quoted report of the PAC, the Secretary, University Grants Commission has admitted before the Committee during evidence in September 1977 that no watch was being kept on the implementation of individual recommendations of the Standards Committee and that the University Grants Commission "only keep a watch on the schemes rather than on the original recommendations". The Committee cannot but deplore the scant regard shown by the University Grants Commission to the specific recommendations of the Standards Committee which it had itself appointed in pursuance of its basic objectives.

The Report of the Education Commission, appointed in 1964, was submitted in June 1966. The report *inter alia* contained suggestions and recommendations regarding determination and maintenance of standards of teaching, examination and research in universities. The University Grants Commission appointed an Implementation Committee (Kothari Committee) to process the recommendation of the Education Commission. This Committee met in May 1967. Meanwhile, a conference of Vice-Chancellors was convened in September 1967. It also considered the implementation of the recommendations of the Education Commission. The decisions taken at the May-1967 meeting of the Implementation Committee and the recommendations of the conference of Vice-Chancellors were placed be-

fore the University Grants Commission in October and November 1967. Thereafter neither the Implementation Committee met nor any systematic watch was kept on the implementation of the recommendations of the Education Commission. In regard to the fate of the various recommendations of the Education Commission, the Commission informed Audit in October 1976 that the recommendations of the Education Commission had been "taken into account in finalising the Fourth Five Year Plan."

3

1.83

—do—

The Committee take adverse notice of the slipshod manner in which the suggestions and recommendations by the Education Commission at considerable labour and expense spread over more than 2 years, were handled by the University Grants Commission. The minutes of the meeting of the Implementation Committee in May 1967 are a vivid testimony of the perfunctory and insubstantial approach of the Commission to the report of the Education Commission. The Committee desire the Ministry of Education and the University Grants Commission to devise methods of systematic pregressing of the recommendations of various expert bodies appointed by the Government to go into various aspects and problems of higher education. No doubt it is a stupendous task as the monitoring would have to be done university-wise, but this work has to be undertaken if the appointment of the various expert committees has to be purposeful and an impact has to be made on university education.

1

2

3

4

4

I. 41

Education
Welfare

and Social

The Committee find that although the PAC had recommended as far back as 1970 for the appointment of a committee to review the work done by the Commission so far and to chart out a course of action for the future and the Government intimated the acceptance of the recommendation in a note sent to the Committee in December 1970, it took the Government 3½ years to set up the Review Committee (August 1974). It took the Review Committee about 2½ years to submit its report (February 1977). It took another 3 months for the Government to lay the report before Parliament and to appoint an Empowered Committee to process the recommendations of the Review Committee (July 1977). The Committee are informed that no time-limit has been laid down for the Empowered Committee to finalise action on the various recommendations of the Review Committee. Despite the assurance given by the Secretary, Ministry of Education and Social Welfare during evidence in September 1977 that "in two months' time the report (of the Empowered Committee) will be finalised", the Committee were informed on 10th April, 1978 that the report of the Committee is still "under submission to Government." The Committee are distressed at the tardy pace of implementation of the recommendation of the Public Accounts Committee which was accepted by Government as far back as 1970. They would like Government to prescribe a time-bound programme for implementation of such of the recommendations made by the Review Committee as are accepted by Government.

5

I.52

-do-

The Committee find that despite the introduction in 1972 of Section 12A of the UGC Act, 1956, making the grants out of Central funds to any university conditional on the declaration by the UGC that such university is fit for receiving such grants and the notification of the University Grants Commission (Fitness of certain universities for grants) Rules, 1974, there does not appear to be any substantial improvement in regard to the problem of proliferation of universities and colleges. The number of universities/deemed universities and colleges has increased from 103 and 4158 in 1972-73 to 115 and 4569 respectively in 1976-77. The Committee also find that, barring temporary ban on release of further grants, the Commission has not so far withheld the grants to any university. The Committee have also noted that the Commission has not used Section 12A of the Act as an effective instrument against proliferation of sub-standard universities and colleges. The Committee are unable to understand why the UGC could not utilise the power available to them under Section 12A of the Act to prevent mushroom growth of universities and colleges without regard to facilities for and standards of teaching.

283

6

I.57

-do-

The Committee find that the University Grants Commission has been functioning without rules and regulations on some of the very important aspects of its working. For instance, the Committee find that the draft rules under Section 25(2) (e) and (f) requiring the universities to furnish returns and information relating to (i) financial position of the university, (ii) studies undertaken in the university; and (ii) all the rules and regulations relating to the stand-

ard of teaching and examination in that university in respect of the various branches of learning, proposed by the Commission as far back as in 1974, are still under discussion between the various Ministries and have not yet been notified. The Committee are surprised that even though this power was available to the Central Government right from 1956, the proposal to frame rules was mooted only in 1974 and that the rules are yet to take a concrete shape. The Committee would like Government to finalise and notify these rules without further delay.

7 I. 58 Education and Social
 Welfare

The Committee also note that although the Commission is being assisted from time to time by outside experts on specified matters and Section 26(1) (b) read with Section 9 authorises the Commission to make regulations regulating the manner in which and the purposes for which persons may be associated with the Commission, no regulations have yet been framed and notified in this regard. It is stated that the question of framing these regulations is under consideration of the Commission in consultation with the Government of India. The Committee desire that these regulations should be framed and notified without further delay.

8 I. 59 -do-

The Committee would also like the Central Government/Commission to examine the need and feasibility of issuing regulations under Section 26(1) (e) and (f) of the Act defining qualifications for appointment as university teachers and minimum standard of

instructions for the grant of a degree. The Committee have dealt with the question of notification of regulations under Section 27 of the Act separately.

9 16.0 -do-

The Committee also find that some of the rules and regulations issued by the Central Government/UGC are more than 10 years old. They would like the Central Government/Commission to examine these rules in the light of experience and amend or revise them, if necessary.

10 2.8 -do-

The Committee find that whereas in 1969-70, the non-plan and plan payments of the Commission were of the order of roughly Rs. 9 crores and Rs. 15 crores respectively, in 1975-76, these have risen to Rs. 30 crores and Rs. 29 crores respectively. There has been thus over the years a disproportionate increase in non-plan expenditure *vis-a-vis* the plan payments. The Committee recommend that the Commission should examine how best to reduce the non-plan expenditure to keep it to the minimum.

11 3.8 -do-

The Committee were informed during evidence that the expenditure under the cultural and bilateral exchange programmes was intended to cover foreign tours of "individual professors and teachers going in connection with their research work and exchange programme between India and other countries" as also that "incurred by us for the foreign professors coming to India and visiting our universities." It was further stated during evidence that "this expenditure includes the items covered under the cultural agreements the Government of India has with different countries and

the programmes as far as it relates to the university system is handled by the University Grants Commission." From the information furnished to the Committee, they observe that Chairman and Secretary as also Deputy Secretary and Administrative Officers of the University Grants Commission have been regularly undertaking tours under this programme. The Chairman of the University Grants Commission has, since 1973-74 and upto December 1977, undertaken as many as 13 tours, varying from 2 to 4 per year. During the same period, the Secretary, UGC has been on foreign tours on as many as 11 times. The Committee expresses its disapproval to the frequent tours undertaken by the University Grants Commission Secretariat officers at Commission's expense. The Committee would like the Ministry of Education to lay down guidelines for the professors and teachers undertaking foreign tours under the cultural and bilateral exchange programmes ensuring that no single person is allowed to take undue advantage under the programme at the cost of other equally, if not more, qualified and competent persons. In so far as the non-academics are concerned the tours should be drastically curtailed. The Committee desire that the details of tours should be appended in the Annual Report of the Commission.

286

It has been admitted during evidence and in written replies by the representatives of the Ministry of Education and of the University Grants Commission that the initial scheme-wise allocation (within the ceiling of Rs. 115 crores provided to the University Grants Com-

mission for the Fourth Plan period) drawn up by the Secretariat of the Commission at the instance of the Commission was not formally approved by the Commission before being transmitted to the Ministry of Education on 1 July 1970. It is also a fact that subsequent changes in the allocation for teacher education and adult education for the Fourth Plan period were also not specifically approved by the Commission. The Committee consider that in such important matters as the allocation of funds for different schemes during the Plan period, specific approval of the Commission should have been taken not only at the initial stage but also every time it was proposed to effect a change in the allocation for individual schemes in the light of the progress of the scheme and its capacity for absorption of funds during the remaining part of the Plan period.

13

4 21

-do-

The Committee note that although the University Grants Commission Act, 1956, has been in operation for more than 20 years, the Commission has not made and notified regulations under Section 27 of the Act delegating its powers to the Chairman, Vice-Chairman or any of its officers. They also note that in the absence of these regulations, the Chairman, the Secretary and other officers of the Commission are exercising the powers under delegation by a resolution of the Commission adopted way back in 1956. An interesting feature of this resolution of 1956 is that the Commission has, by means of this resolution, authorised the Chairman to exercise "all powers and do all acts and things which may be exercised or done by the Commission." The resolution also provide that the Chairman may delegate to Secretary or other officers of the Commission "such of the powers and the functions exercisable by him or under the

287

University Grants Commission Act as he may deem necessary." The Committee are informed that the Chairman has, from time to time, delegated to the Secretary and other officers of the Commission powers and functions exerciseable by him or under the University Grants Commission Act. The Committee feel that by means of resolution of 1956, the University Grants Commission have, by and large, abdicated their statutory powers, functions and responsibility in favour of Chairman and, under his delegation, the Secretary and other officers of the Commission. The Committee feel that this position is not only far from satisfactory but also against the express intentions of the University Grants Commission Act. The Committee would like the Ministry of Education and the University Grants Commission to carefully frame and notify regulations under Section 27 of the Act ensuring proper exercise by the Commission themselves of the powers and functions assigned to them under the Act.

288

From the foregoing information and evidence, it is clear that during the Fourth Plan period, the UGC did not have a system of periodical appraisal of the progress of the Plan schemes in the sense of a critical review of achievements in regard to various plan schemes with reference to targets, whether firm or notional. The Commission's Secretariat has been, on the request of the Planning Commission, compiling and forwarding to the Planning Commission

data and information on the progress of plan schemes from time to time on the format suggested by the Planning Commission. At no stage the Commission had an opportunity to formally consider and discuss these 'reviews'. The Committee also note the position taken by the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare that the concept of targets "did not seem realistic/useful", that the Commission did not lay down any physical targets to be achieved in the Fourth Plan period and that "no targets can be laid down in advance for the number of books, items of equipment etc." The Committee regret that the UGC did not care to evolve a regular system of appraisals of the various schemes launched during the Fourth Plan period, so as to inform itself of the impediments in the way of the implementation of the schemes for taking corrective measures. The Committee have, later in this report, pointed out the shortfalls in the achievement of targets on the basis of which funds were made available to the Commission. At this stage the Committee would only like to point out that had the Commission kept a firmer grip on the implementation of the various programmes undertaken during the Fourth Five Year Plan, the achievements would have been for more impressive than what actually have been.

289

15

5.18

-do-

The Committee are informed that during the Fifth Plan period the Commission have introduced the system of appraisals of the Plan schemes and one such appraisal was done in December 1976. They are also informed that each year the budget estimates are considered by a sub-committee of the Commission which considers them

with reference to the progress of the scheme and recommends the budget estimates therefor. The estimates, as approved by the sub-Committee, are thereafter considered and adopted by the UGC formally. The Committee trust that a sub-committee of the UGC which examines these estimates with reference to the progress of the schemes, would apply its mind to the progress of the schemes and report to the Commission any laxity in physical performance for timely corrective action.

16

5-35

Education and Social
Welfare

The Ministry have sought to explain to the Committee the sizeable shortfall in expenditure during the Fourth Plan period (1969—74) against plan allocations on "Quality improvement and other special programmes" (49.2 per cent) differently at different points of time. They informed Audit in December, 1976 that since "the bulk of the universities and colleges are still not having minimum required physical infrastructure facilities... a major portion is... made available to these institutions to build up physical facilities." During evidence given before the Committee in September, 1977, it was stated by the Chairman, UGC that the reasons for "some delay in the expenditure on quality improvement programmes" was that "the Commission carried out a careful review of all these special programmes and therefore, some time was taken in reformulating some of these programmes". The Secretary of the Commission attributed the delay during evidence, to "delay between the initiation and response from the universities and colleges". In a subsequent

written note received in January, 1978, the Ministry have, justifying the excess expenditure on general development programme at the expense of quality improve and other special programmes, stated that "the basic minimal requirements for the development of the various departments in the universities/colleges etc. could not be neglected" and explained further that "the expenditure on these (quality improvement etc.) schemes could not keep pace with the allocations made due to various factors." It is also stated in the note that the fact of the shortfall in expenditure on quality improvement etc. programmes came to notice first in October, 1972. As regard action taken thereafter, the note says that "the Commission reviewed the progress of these programmes from time to time through various expert/standing committees and took necessary measures for effective implementation of the various programmes."

201

17 5.56

-do-

The Committee are unable to appreciate the plea advanced by the Ministry that excess expenditure on general development programme at the expense of quality improvement programme was due to the need to build up physical infrastructure facilities in universities and colleges. The Committee feel that the higher allocation for general development programmes already reflected this need and in any case, if further emphasis was to be placed on the building up of infrastructural facilities in universities and colleges the allocation therefor should have been revised upwards at the time of plan appraisal in 1972.

Committee also take note of the analysis made by the Review Committee in their report that the percentage of grants made by the UGC during the Fourth Plan period for "capital expenditure on buildings and hardwares" against the total UGC grants was as high as 53 per cent.

20

5.3>

-do-

The Committee need hardly emphasise the importance of quality improvement and other special programmes as it is through these programmes that the UGC can accomplish its object of promoting and coordinating university education and disseminating and maintaining standards of teaching and examination and research in the universities. The Committee, therefore, recommend that at least from now on the Commission should appreciate better their responsibility in this regard and so direct its activities as to may make for accelerated effort by universities and colleges in the field of quality improvement and other special programmes. The Committee were glad to hear from the Chairman, UGC that now the UGC has decided that in any allocation to colleges the components for buildings should not be more than one third and that proportions have also been laid down for other activities. The Committee would like the Commission to ensure that the universities and colleges are given clear-cut guidelines in regard to each of these schemes and afforded all assistance and expertise needed by them to formulate concrete programmes under the various schemes. After these programmes are received by the Commission, expeditious action should be taken to process, scrutinise and sanction these programmes. A

203

contemporaneous watch should be kept on the implementation of the programmes and there should be a system of high level periodical appraisals to review the progress of these programmes. Timely action should be taken to remove difficulties in the implementation of the programme, if any, found during periodical appraisals.

31

6.17

Education and Social
Welfare

The Committee find that out of the development grants totalling Rs. 165.39 crores released by the UGC during the seven-year period from 1969-70 to 1975-76, the share of Central Universities and Deemed Universities was 27.2 per cent against 46 per cent share of all the State Universities put together. It was explained that excessive expenditure on Central Universities was on account of exclusive features such as grants paid for (i) the medical colleges and hospitals attached to two Central Universities, (ii) Campuses development and Student amenities, and (iii) schemes having assistance on cent per cent basis in the case of Central Universities and sharing basis in the case of State Universities. From the information furnished by Government, it is revealed that even if we exclude from the total grants paid to the Central Universities and Deemed Universities the grants on account of the above three factors, out of grants totalling

Rs. 110.65 crores made to the Central Universities, Deemed Universities and State Universities, the share of Central and Deemed Universities was 41 per cent against 59 per cent of the State Universities, although the number of Central/Deemed universities was only 10 as against 104 of State Universities. Development grants made during the same period to Delhi Colleges have similarly been on the high side as compared to grants to 'other colleges'. Out of development grants totalling Rs. 37.92 crores to all the colleges, about 10 per cent (Rs. 3.06 crores) went to Delhi Colleges alone.

22

6.18

do

The Committee disapprove this inequitable distribution of grants considering the fact that the student coverage of State Universities and 'other colleges' is much wider than that of Delhi Colleges. The Committee have noted the reasons advanced by the Ministry for low intake of development grant by the State Universities and 'other colleges' during 1974-75 and 1975-76 and also the measures taken by the U.G.C. in the Fifth Five Year Plan to augment their intake. They would like UGC to play a positive role in creating conditions in which it should be possible for the State Universities and Colleges to take advantage of the facilities of development grant from the UGC in greater measure than hitherto.

295

1	2	3	4
23	6.31	Education and Social Welfare	<p>The Committee find that there has been considerable disparity in the quantum of grants released to State universities <i>inter se</i>. During evidence it transpired that the main reason for the <i>inter se</i> disparity in the release of grants to the universities is the application of the principle of matching grants whereby the release of grants from the UGC is conditional on a certain percentage of expenditure being met by the State Governments/management. The Committee would like Government to give a fresh look to this principle so as to modify it in such a manner that it does not act as a stumbling block for such universities and colleges in States as are less advanced educationally and economically and are unable to take advantage of the facilities of development grants available from the UGC.</p>
24	6.45	do	<p>The Committee consider that it was principally wrong on the part of the UGC to have appropriated Plan funds to meet part of the maintenance expenditure of Delhi Colleges during the Fourth Plan period and of the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare to have acquiesced in this. The Committee do not agree with the explanation offered by the Ministry that "from the administrative and accounting points of view it did not seem feasible to maintain separate accounts for expenditure chargeable to Plan funds for the extended colleges schemes." The Committee have no doubt that if definite instructions had been given to the Delhi Colleges to maintain separate accounts for extended colleges schemes and evening shifts</p>

introduced by them and the grants were made conditional thereto, it should have been possible for them to maintain the accounts accordingly. The Committee further note that out of a total 44 colleges which were given grants for maintenance out of Plan funds as many as 22 colleges were not covered by any of the reasons advanced by Government for adopting this practice. This shows that the Commission had indiscriminately given maintenance grants to almost all the Delhi Colleges in existence during the Fourth Plan out of Plan funds and the arguments advanced are too facile to be accepted. The Commission and the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare also did not take the Planning Commission into confidence before taking such a step. The Committee take adverse notice of this unusual practice adopted during the Fourth Plan. The Committee hope that it would not be repeated in future.

The Committee learn that at present the affiliation of colleges is entirely the responsibility of the respective universities and the rules therefor are prescribed in the various statutes under which the universities are established and the University Grants Commission has not laid down any rules, not even guidelines. The Committee on Governance of Universities was at present studying this question. The Committee desire that the UGC should make a study of the rules for affiliation of colleges prescribed in or under different university statutes and try to evolve guidelines for affiliation which should be commended to the various State Governments and universities for observance while granting affiliation to colleges in future.

1	2	3	4
26	6.62	Education and Social Welfare	The Committee note that during 1975-76, out of a total of 4508 colleges, only 3267, i.e. 72 per cent were recognised by the Commission under Section 2(f) of the UGC Act, 1956. The UGC has undertaken a detailed study to determine the reasons for all the colleges not being included under Section 2(f) of the UGC Act. The Committee observe that this study should be expedited and corrective action taken.
27	6.63	-do-	The Committee also note that out of 3267 colleges recognised by the Commission as on 1-12-1976, only 1649 colleges i.e. one-half were not eligible for Development Grants. The Committee would like the UGC to make a study of this aspect and take such measures as may be necessary to make a larger number of colleges eligible for development assistance from the UGC.
28	6.64	-do-	Out of 1250 applications for Development Grants received by the Commission during the three years from 1974-75 to 1976-77, grants were released during this period to a total of 543 colleges only. Of the 543 colleges to which grants were released, as many as 483 colleges were given grants during 1976-77 whereas during 1974-75 and 1975-76 only 60 colleges were given such grants. The Committee have elsewhere in the report recommended the rationalisation of procedures of scrutinisation of applications for grants and laying down of time-limits for disposal of applications received from the institutions. The Committee would also like the Commission to

maintain an even flow of grants to the colleges and try to avoid bunching towards last years of the plan period.

29 6.65 do

In the view of the Committee no rationale or balance appears to have been observed in releasing grants to colleges as between different States or as between different universities, whereas in certain States almost all the colleges eligible for Development Grants were extended the assistance during 1976-77, in other States even one-sixth of the colleges eligible for such grants were not accommodated. Similarly, there are wide differences in the number of colleges to which grants were released during 1976-77 as between different universities to which these were affiliated. This corroborates the observations made in the Audit para that there was wide disparity in the grants released to the different colleges. The Committee would like the UGC to lay down guidelines for themselves with a view to bring in a measures of balance in release of grants to colleges as between different States and between different universities and try to minimise as far as possible, glaring disparities.

30 6.68 do

The Committee note that the applications for grants from universities and colleges are scrutinised and processed in the Secretariat of the Commission at a different stages. The Committee recommend that the procedure of scrutinisation of applications for grants should be rationalised and time-limits should be laid down for the processing of applications at each stage so as to streamline the work of the Commission. Suitable control mechanisms should be devised to ensure that the time-limits are actually adhered to in

individual cases. Cases of delays in release of grants of one year or more from the date of receipt of application in the Commission should be brought to the notice of the Commission with reasons therefor for their consideration.

31. 6.69 Education and Social Welfare

The Committee also recommend that the Commission should have a system of centralised registration college-wise, university-wise and State-wise, of all applications received for grants from universities/colleges. The applications should be passed on the concerned divisions only after registration. It should be the responsibility of the registration authorities to keep a watch on the progress of applications and to bring to the notice of the appropriate authorities the delays in the disposal of cases beyond a determined period.

32. 6.78 Do

The Committee observe that there has been lately quite a sizeable growth in the number of colleges. The number of colleges has increased from 1004 in 1956 to 3297 in 1969-70 and to 4569 in 1976-77. Some of these colleges do not have adequate facilities. This is bound to cause a deterioration in the standards of teaching. Expressing concern over the problem, the Estimates Committee had, in their 102nd Report (Third Lok Sabha), suggested that "establishment of such sub-standard colleges should be regulated and controlled in the interest of maintenance of academic standards." Endorsing this view of the Estimates Committee, the UGC had informed the

Estimates Committee in June 1967 that it "proposes requesting the State Government to make a survey of the situation in consultation with the universities and suggest ways and means for improvement" and that "on the basis of the survey the Commission will decide the steps to be taken to regulate the situation." The Education Commission also, in their report (1966) made a specific recommendation that the UGC should, in consultation with the State Governments, examine the question of classification of colleges in terms of level and achievement and make use of it in the allocation of grants to colleges under the Fourth Five Year Plan. The Committee find that despite the recommendations of the Estimates Committee and the Education Commission made more than 10 years back, neither the proposed survey has been completed nor colleges classified in terms of level and achievement. This Committee has been informed that the classification of colleges "is a big task to be taken up by the Commission alone" and that "status reports of each college have to be prepared with the universities concerned with the help of College Development Council." The Committee recommend that the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare should initiate action in this regard forthwith and see that the colleges are classified without undue delay and that this classification is used for guidance in allocation of grants.

301

The Committee welcome the relaxation in rules relating to grants to universities and colleges in favour of the institutions in educationally backward areas with effect from Fifth Five Year Plan. They feel that if this relaxation had been introduced earlier, it would

have by now made some noticeable impact on the development of educational facilities in the educationally backward areas. The Committee recommend that these relaxations in favour of institutions in educationally backward areas should be continued and its impact assessed quinquennially.

34

7.19

Education and Social Welfare

The Committee find that during the Fourth Five Year Plan period as many as 10 Universities/Deemed to be Universities were not visited by the Visiting Committees. Similarly, during the Fifth Plan period, the Universities/Deemed to be Universities not visited by these Committees so far number 10. This shows that the Commission did not have the benefit of expert appraisals of the Visiting Committees in respect of certain universities before deciding on grants to these Universities for various schemes. The Committee would like the Commission to place the system of Visiting Committees on a more regular basis and so organise their work that the Commission has the benefit of the Reports in respect of each of the Universities for their guidance in the matter of release of grants to the University concerned.

35

7.20

-do-

The Committee also find that during the Fourth Plan period the Visiting Committees visited 10 Universities for only one day each. This obviously is a very short time for the Visiting Committee to assess the financial needs of the university spread over fields covering a large number of Departments. The Committee would

like to emphasise that the visits of the Visiting Committees should be meaningful and their Reports should throw up assessments made by experts after a thorough examination and scrutiny of the proposals submitted by the Universities. The number of days of visit should be adequate for the purpose.

36 7.21 Do.

The Committee are informed that it will not be possible for any Committee to spend more than 3 days in a University for the reason that it will be difficult for experts to spare time at a stretch for this type of 'voluntary' work. The Committee recommend that in view of the important role of the Visiting Committees and the weight attached to their recommendations in finalising the quantum of grants to the Universities, the experts on the Visiting Committees need not be required to do their work on voluntary basis. It is worth examination whether the experts appointed on the Visiting Committees may be allowed some remuneration in the form of fees or honorarium for their services on the Visiting Committees on the analogy of the experts appointed by the Union Public Service Commission on the interview boards for various appointments. This would make for the experts discharging their functions as members of Visiting Committees more seriously.

303

37 7.22 Do

The Committee also feel that the panel of names for appointment on the Visiting Committees should be drawn up in accordance with well-laid out criteria which should be brought to the notice of all the Universities. The panel should also be made a public document so that the academic circles are aware of the names included

1

2

3

4

in it or of the changes made in it from time to time. It should also have a determined life cycle. The Commission should adopt a method of rotation in the matter of associating experts with the Visiting Committees. It should not be left entirely to the Officers of the Commission attached to the Visiting Committee to finalise the names of experts on the Visiting Committees, in consultation with the Divisional Heads and/or the Secretary of the Commission.

38

7.23

Education and Social
Welfare

The Committee are informed that as soon as the Reports of the Visiting Committee are finalised, these are placed before the Commission in the next meeting for their consideration. The Committee, however, note from the information furnished to them by the Ministry that in many cases the time lag between the date of the visit of the Visiting Committee and the date of consideration by the Commission of the relevant Report of the Visiting Committee, was as much as nearly 5 years. This indicates that either the report of the Visiting Committee could not be finalised earlier or it took the Commission a long time to consider the report of the Visiting Committee. In either case, the delay is indefensible. The Committee would like the Commission to lay down time limit for presentation of the report of the Visiting Committee and after it is presented, for its consideration by the Commission.

304

39

7.24

Do.

The information furnished to the Committee also reveals that the consideration of the Reports of the Visiting Committees by

the Commission has been, at least on some occasions in the past, rather purfunctory. To illustrate, at its meeting held on the 5 July 1967, the Commission considered as many as 35 Reports of the Visiting Committees. The Committee have been told during evidence that the consideration of the Reports of Visiting Committee is now a regular feature in the Commission and it takes place during the first one or two days of the meeting of the Commission well known programme is fixed for the consideration of the Commission. The Committee trust that the Commission is now according due consideration to the Reports of the Visiting Committees.

40

7.32

-do-

The Committee have been informed that a number of projects/schemes were taken up altogether outside the recommendations of the Fifth Plan Visiting Committees. According to the Ministry, so long as programmes were within the overall financial ceiling prescribed by the Commission, the modifications sought by the Universities were approved by the Commission. The Committee consider that the recommendations of the Visiting Committees, which were made after proper assessment of financial needs of the institutions, would lose their significance if modifications in financial allocations were allowed subsequently. No doubt the universities primarily are the best judges of the relative urgency in the implementation of the programmes but the relative urgency and approaches can very well be put forward before the Visiting Committees. Priorities and quantum of assistance to institutions recommended by the Visiting Committees should normally be adhered to and altered only in rare and exceptional cases on considerations

305

of newly emerging needs. Even in that case, the modifications sought should be considered by another Visiting/Expert Committee before the Commission takes the final decision in the matter.

41

7.38

Education and Social
Welfare

The Committee note that in 1961, the University Grants Commission noticed that the State had established in 1955 an Institute of Medical Sciences and the Calcutta University already had post-graduate departments in bio-chemistry and physiology and accordingly the university was advised that pending consideration of the scheme by an expert committee, no commitments other than those already made (which were of a minor nature) should be made towards establishment of another Institute of Basic Medical Sciences agreed to earlier in June 1960 on the recommendations of a Visiting Committee. The expert committee recommended in 1962 the integration between clinical and non-clinical subjects for execution of the scheme.

306

It is disconcerting to note that the modifications suggested by the expert committee were not insisted upon before releasing the grants for the new Institute. Not only that, construction of additional stores for the Post-graduate Institute of Basic Medical Sciences was approved in February 1972 at a cost of Rs. 11.50 lakhs. Upto February 1976, the total payments made amounted to Rs. 9.00 lakhs. In this connection, it is pertinent to note that the Fifth Plan Visiting Committee had visit-

ed Calcutta University in September 1975 and according to information made available to the Committee, the Commission had considered the report on Calcutta University on 29 April 1976, and not in June 1976, as contended. In any case, the report was available soon after the visit in September 1975 and the payment of grant of Rs. 9 lakhs upto February 1976 was against the principles of financial prudence. The Committee recommend that the circumstances in which release of Rs. 9.00 lakhs was made despite the recommendations of the expert/Visiting Committees and of the Commission itself should be investigated and its outcome reported to the Committee. The proposed probe should also cover the issue as to why releases in excess of the share of 2/3rd assistance were made by the Commission in disregard of the prescribed norms.

42 7.35 Do.

The Committee find that the question of the merger of the Institute of Basic Medical Sciences with Post-graduate Institute of Medical Education and Research or provision of adequate hospital facilities to the Institute of Basic Medical Sciences is still under consideration. The Committee would like the question to be finally decided so that the University Grants Commission do not have to aid and maintain a truncated institution, which the Institute of Basic Medical Sciences at present is without clinical facilities.

43 7.53 Do.

The Committee find that the construction of a library building by Kashmir University originally estimated to cost a sum of Rs. 5 lakhs has remained incomplete although a sum of Rs. 58.40 lakhs has already been spent over this grandiose building upto September, 1976.

1

2

3

4

44

7.54

Education and
Social Welfare

The Visiting Committee of the Commission while assessing the Fifth Plan requirements of the University observed in November, 1974 that the building over which Rs. 58.40 lakhs had already been spent would, according to university estimates, need another 50 to 60 lakhs for its completion and when completed the building would be completely out of tune with the other buildings on the university campus or other university campuses in the country. The Visiting Committee had also indicated that the building was designed with a view to accommodating 20 lakhs books, which no university, however old, possesses in the country or is likely to possess in the near future and that the building would also not be of great functional importance. It also stated that the building when completed would need centrally heating system which could cost another Rs. 11 lakhs for the first floor and mezzanine floor only. On the above observation the University Grants Commission decided in July 1975 that the possibility of utilising a part of the library building for accommodating social sciences departments for which a provision of Rs. 12 lakhs was recommended by the Visiting Committee separately, could be examined and if necessary the amount utilised towards the construction of the library building. The Kashmir University agreed to this proposal.

45

7.55

Do.

The Committee regret that at the time of agreeing may 1973 to make available Rs. 16.12 lakhs as its share in the construction of the library building of the Kashmir University, estimated to cost Rs

50 lakhs, the UGC did not make a detailed examination of the need for the library building on such a grandiose scale. They also regret that despite the observations of the Fifth Plan Visiting Committee, grants totalling nearly Rs. 4 lakhs were released during the 5th Plan period to Kashmir University for the library building. Though the UGC has pegged its share at Rs. 16.12 lakhs, the fact remains that the UGC had initially not acquiesced in the revised programme, the Kashmir University would, perhaps, not have launched this ambitious programme. The Committee are also averse to the principle of diversion of funds from one approved scheme to another, howsoever important. Now that the building is nearing completion, the Committee would like the UGC to ensure that it is fully and properly utilised.

The Committee hope that the UGC would hereafter be more cautious in extending assistance on such a large scale for building up infrastructural facilities in universities and, before agreeing to making available grants, ensure that the facilities proposed to be built up are realistic and by and large in line with similar facilities in other universities.

Notwithstanding the reasons indicated and explanations offered for long delays in the completion of UGC-financed building schemes of colleges/universities leading to cost escalation involving further burdens on the Commission, the Committee would like UGC to devise a regular system of keeping a watch over the progress of such schemes until the production of an acceptable completion certificate in respect of the building project.

The Committee also desire it to be examined whether it is feasible to entrust all UGC-financed building projects of colleges/universities to the State PWDs to whom grant money may be paid by the UGC directly.

47. 8.34 Education and
Social Welfare

The Committee note that two Delhi-based firms of architects have managed to corner over 200 building projects costing Rs. 3.22 crores in universities and colleges spread over 7 or 8 States. The Committee suspect that such cornering of projects costing over rupees three crores by the firms would not have been possible without the connivance of the officers of the Commission concerned with the distribution of building grants. According to a note prepared by the Secretariat of the Commission in pursuance of a query from the Chairman of the Commission on 7 December 1973, the fact that these firms were approaching the universities and colleges with the offer that the construction work was awarded to them they would be able to secure from the Commission building grants for the universities/colleges, came to the notice of the Commission as early as November 1969. The Secretariat of the Commission, however, could think of nothing else except issuing a press note and a circular to the universities (and that too 6 months after, in May 1970). No instructions appear to have been issued to the various divisions/sections of the Secretariat dealing with building grants to take special care to see that this situation was not allowed to continue.

Even when a recurrence subsequently came to the notice of the Commission in 1972 and thereafter, the Commission was lulled into inactivity by Secretariat officers by the citation of the aforesaid circular of May 1970 as a proof of action taken in the matter and no positive steps were taken to remedy the situation and to prevent its recurrence in future.

48

8.35

-do-

The Committee also note that despite the desire of the then Chairman of the Commission expressed in his note of 4 January 1974 that "an enquiry may be made from officers who were incharge of the College Division as to how these two firms managed to corner so many construction projects" and a reminder by him on 4 July 1974 to the Secretary of the Commission to "look into this personally" and submit to him an early report, the Secretary of the Commission "discussed" this question with only 3 available officers (out of 5 officers concerned) and recorded in the Note put up by him to Chairman more than 7 months after his query that they "informed me that the proposals relating to the construction of the building projects were processed as per guidelines circulated to universities and colleges." He further recorded: "I may in support of these officers submit that we had not taken notice of the name of the firms of the architect which prepared the plans and examined them as they came through the university concerned." He assured the Chairman that "to the best of my knowledge I have no reason to believe any malafide intention on the part of these officers." The Committee, however, consider this view of the Secretary of the

111

Commission as a belatedly poor attempt to defend the officers concerned with the distribution of building grants in the period before 1974. In order to dispel the strong impression of collusion on the part of the officers of the Commission with the two architects leading to the situation described above, the Committee would like the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare to set up an independent enquiry committee to investigate into the matter and if, as a result of this enquiry, any of the officers of the Commission, irrespective of whether they are in the Commission at the moment or outside, are found to be guilty of gross irregularities and collusion with the architects, suitable action should be taken against them.

49

9.22

Education and Social
Welfare

The Committee find that the UGC's maintenance expenditure on the 5 Central universities has during the last 7 years (1970-71 to 1976-77) increased at most three fold—from Rs. 7.12 crores in 1970-71 to Rs. 19.50 crores in 1976-77. It seems that the University Grants Commission is allowing unbridled expansion in the activities of these universities which cast a direct burden on the Central Exchequer towards their maintenance. The Committee would like UGC to exercise greater prudence in agreeing to schemes for further expansion and development of these universities so that maintenance expenditure on these universities is kept within reasonable limits.

50

9.23

-do-

The Committee are informed that UGC has not made any comparative study of the maintenance expenditure incurred by State

universities *vis-a-vis* Central universities. The Committee would suggest that the Commission should compile figures of total grants received in each State university from the State Governments as well as from the Commission on an yearly basis and publish it in their Annual Report. This would enable the University Grants Commission to assess the financial resources of each university and may also help them in policy formulations.

51 9.24 -do-

The Committee also observe that there is a wide disparity in the per capita maintenance grants on the basis of student enrolment as between the 5 Central universities *inter se*. The Committee find it interesting to note that whereas in one university the per capita maintenance grant on the basis of student enrolment for the year 1973-74 was as much as Rs. 5,443, in another university with several disciplines in Humanities and Sciences as well as professional courses like medical and engineering, it was only Rs. 1072. The explanation of the Government for this wide variation in the maintenance expenditure per student, viz. the comparison of per student expenditure among different Central universities would not be meaningful "in view of the varying nature of facilities provided", does not appear to be very convincing. The Committee would like the University Grants Commission to go into the question of maintenance grants to the various Central universities with a view to evolve a basis which, as far as possible, dilutes the glaring disparities.

313

52 9.25 -do-

From the information furnished to the Committee, they have not been able to glean out any reasonable explanation for special

treatment being accorded to Delhi colleges in the Central Exchequer meeting their maintenance expenditure, except that this practice was prevalent even prior to the setting up of the Commission when the Ministry of Education was meeting the maintenance expenditure of private colleges affiliated to the Delhi University. With effect from 1954, however, this work was transferred to the Commission. The justification given for this special arrangement that "in view of the special relationship of Delhi colleges with the University" it is desirable that "the maintenance grant for both is paid from the same source" does not appear to be convincing. In this context, the Committee have noted that the maintenance expenditure during 1976-77 of 55 Delhi colleges totalling about Rs. 9 crores, working out to be about Rs. 17 lakhs per college on an average. Considering the fact that these colleges cater for only 2.4 per cent of the total student enrolment, it is on the high side. The Committee also find that the maintenance grants to the Delhi Colleges have increased from Rs. 6.17 crores in 1974-75 to Rs. 9.10 crores in 1976-77. The Committee would like the UGC to exercise greater control over the escalation in maintenance expenditure of these colleges.

53

9.26

Education and
Social Welfare

The Committee are informed that at present University Grants Commission does not compile information in regard to maintenance grant-in-aid received by the colleges affiliated to the State Universities. The Committee feel that there is need for introducing a measure of uniformity in the matter of maintenance grant-in-aid

from the State Governments to the colleges affiliated to the State Universities. To this end, the Committee would like the University Grants Commission to collect the grant-in-aid rules of different State Governments/Union Territories, marshal out their differing features and, in consultation with the State Governments, endeavour to evolve a measure of uniformity in that regard. Unless the University Grants Commission takes an initiative in this matter, there would remain marked disparities in the financial viability of colleges affecting relatively their standards of teaching and research.

54 10.14 -do-

The Committee note that the funds likely to be provided in the Union Budget are intimated to the UGC by February/April each year. It is seen that during the Fourth Plan the revised budget estimates based on likely allocations intimated by Government to the Commission were considered by the Commission 7 to 9 months after the receipt of such intimation from Government. Though the position has improved during 1976 and 1977, the Committee would like the Commission to evolve a self-regulatory mechanism whereby the revised budget estimates based on allocation intimated by Government to the Commission are placed before the Commission for approval not later than one month from the date of receipt of intimation from Government.

55 10.15 -do-

The Committee were informed during evidence that there is no system of obtaining specific approval of the Commission for revised allocation to the various activities of the UGC. The Committee feel that the Commission should not absolve itself of its responsibility

for laying down *inter se* priorities as between different schemes and allocating funds for each scheme during the year in the light of the final allocations made by Government. They desire that changes in allocations to various schemes during the year should be made after specific approval of the Commission.

56

10-16

Education and
Social Welfare

The Committee find that there have been appreciable variations between the revised budget estimates and the actuals during each year of the Fourth Five Year Plan. While the Committee consider that the conditional nature of grants by the Commission lends itself to possibilities of variations between the budget estimates and the actual expenditure, the Committee feel that with the experience built up by the Commission during the last 24 years of its working, it should be possible for them to forecast their expenditure a little more realistically. In the case of the maintenance grants, the element of uncertainty being much less, it should be possible for the Commission to bring in a more precise estimation of expenditure. The variation to the extent of 12.6 per cent between the revised estimates and actuals during 1973-74 in respect of grants to affiliated colleges of Delhi University is hardly justifiable.

316

57

10-17

-do-

From the figures of releases made during the year 1976-77 under Plan schemes, it is seen that against the total releases during 11 months of the year amounting to about Rs. 52 crores, the releases during the month of March, 1977 totalled Rs. 18.23 crores. Financial

prudence calls for even spread out of releases throughout the year to avoid last minute rush. It is particularly important as the UGC do not have adequate supervisory inspecting agency and they accept the utilisation certificates from the recipient institutions on their face value as conclusive proof of proper utilisation of grants. The Committee feel reassured that the UGC are seized of the problem and they hope that in future the releases of development grants would be more evenly spread out.

58 10.21 -do-

The Committee desire that the University Grants Commission should, in consultation with Comptroller and Auditor General, revise the form of statement of accounts to provide for scheme/programme-wise break up of plan expenditure.

59 10.53 -do-

The Committee regret that despite the simplification of procedures in regard to certificate of utilisation introduced in consultation with Audit in October 1970 and the appointment of an officer with effect from 11 September 1970 for undertaking visits to universities which are in heavy arrears with a view to taking remedial measures, the problem of outstanding utilisation certificates continues unabated. They note that as on 1st April, 1977, utilisation certificates for grants paid upto 1974-75 were outstanding in respect of nearly 50,000 items, involving over Rs. 100 crores. They also note that despite adverse notice of the PAC in their 114th Report (Fourth Lok Sabha), out of the outstanding reported to the PAC (1969-70), as many as 8568 items involving Rs. 12.33 crores still remain outstanding even after a lapse of 7 years. It is clear that this matter has not been

given the attention that it deserved. The Committee are not satisfied with the explanation that the Commission had limited man-power which was involved more in day-to-day work of sanctioning of schemes and proposals. They would like the Commission to draw up a crash programme for liquidating the outstanding utilisation certificates.

60

10-54

Education and
Social Welfare

The Committee also find that the utilisation certificates had not been issued till October 1976 in respect of grants paid during the period 1958-59 to 1962-63 to certain universities. The purposes for which the grants were released to these universities are stated to be post-graduate scholarships, salary of additional staff, improvement of salary scales, purchase of science equipment, books and journals etc. The items for which grants were paid could have been easily accounted for. Yet, the Committee are informed that "D.O. correspondence had been initiated with the Vice-Chancellors of the defaulting universities concerned requesting them to send the utilisation certificates." Since the universities involved are well-established universities with adequate secretarial manpower, the Committee are inclined to think that the Commission had been lax in pursuing the matter with the universities at a high level which they have now done. The Committee hope that the Commission will spare no effort in getting the utilisation certificates from the universities without any further delay.

61 10.55 -do-

The Committee regard it as a serious matter that as on 1 April 1976, there was an unspent plus balance of Rs. 11.44 crores in respect of certain universities. Even if the minus balance in respect of these universities as on 1 April 1976 is deducted, it would leave with the universities a net unspent balance of Rs. 5.77 crores. It is surprising that the commission have no break up of these balances indicating the years from which these were outstanding. They are unable to appreciate the continuation of grants to these universities without having unspent plus balances fully accounted for and adjusted or refunded within a reasonable period. The Committee would like the UGC to devise an in-built system whereby they could call for the refund of the unspent balances if adjustments thereof against future grants are not possible within a reasonable period.

62 10.56 -do-

The Committee are informed that the UGC is not requiring the colleges to furnish to them the information regarding the unspent balances lying with them in respect of grants made by the Commission as is being done by the universities. The Committee doubt the efficacy of the procedure whereby "any refund required to be made by the colleges can, if necessary, be adjusted against future grants payable to them." They would like the Commission to introduce a system whereunder colleges assisted by the Commission do forward to the Commission details of unspent balances against each grant at the end of the financial year. The procedure in regard to the refund of unspent balances by the universities should also be made applicable to the colleges.

1	2	3	4
63	10.57	Education and Social Welfare	<p>The Committee have been informed during evidence that certificates of the Auditors is the only machinery which the Commission has for ensuring that the grant made for a particular scheme has been utilised for that purpose. This, the Committee feel, is not adequate. The Committee suggest that the Commission should not rely upon the certificate from the Auditor alone and should have, in addition, some other independent system also for ensuring that the funds released by the Commission are actually utilised for the agreed purpose.</p>
64	10.58	-do-	<p>The Commission have themselves been pointing out in their Annual Reports that they have occasionally received complaints regarding mal-practices in the payment of salaries to teachers. The Committee are of the view that in its capacity as donor of development grants to the colleges, the Commission can always take active interest on complaints received by it of mal-practices in the payment of salaries to teachers by the colleges which are receiving assistance from the Commission.</p>
65	10.59	-do-	<p>The Committee learn that the U.G.C. has not so far resorted to the provision of withholding grants to institutions under Section 14 of the U.G.C. Act, even though the Commission have been finding it difficult to get information and documents such as utilisation certificates from universities and colleges. The Committee feel</p>

that for dealing with recalcitrant universities and colleges, UGC should be within their right to use the power available to them under Section 14 of the Act.

66 10.63

-do-

The Committee note that the U.G.S. requested the Universities in November 1975 to forward certificates of assets by the end of March every year indicating that the inventories of permanent and semi-permanent assets created/acquired wholly or mainly out of the grants given by the U.G.C. were being maintained and kept upto date. As the Commission have not been able to furnish to Audit the names of institutions from which such certificates were still awaited the Committee are led to believe that no proper watch over receipt of such certificates is kept in the Commission. The Committee urge that a centralised register should be maintained for the purpose in the commission and the proforma of the certificate should also include whether the assets are being utilised for the object for which these were acquired.

521

67 10.69

-do-

The Committee observe that the Commission have been keeping with them large funds on which they could have earned some interest. They note that at their meeting held in October 1977, the Commission have approved the proposal of investment of surplus funds and the matter is awaiting sanction of Government. The Committee would like the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare to take an early decision in the matter so that large funds at the disposal of the Commission start earning some interest.

68

11-28

Education & Social Welfare

The Committee are distressed to note that the scheme of Correspondence Courses conceived to overcome the extant educational and social problems facing the country, could not be implemented during the Fourth Plan period with the energy and zeal that it deserved. As against the target of introducing the scheme in 20 universities, only 11 universities could start the scheme and the UGC's expenditure by way of grants to the universities for the scheme was a bare Rs. 12 lakhs against the already paltry allocation of Rs. 1 crore. Even during the first three years of the Fifth Plan the progress of the scheme in terms of involvement of universities and student coverage as also the expenditure incurred so far by the Commission is none too impressive. The Committee would like the University Grants Commission to persuade the universities which have not so far come forward with the proposals to take steps to introduce the scheme as soon as possible. The Committee trust that the efforts of the UGC in this direction would bear fruit and the number of universities offering these courses, student coverage and expenditure on the scheme would rise conforming to determined targets.

69

11-29

do

The Committee note that at present there are wide variations in the fees charged by different universities for Correspondence Courses at various levels. The Committee would like the UGC to compile full information in this regard from all the universities and persuade the universities to bring in a measure of uniformity in

the matter of fees charged for the Correspondence Courses at various levels.

70 11-30 -do-

The Committee further note that the UGC had deputed expert committee to visit certain universities for evaluating their 'on-going' programmes and for considering fresh proposals. Only 6 universities were visited by these committees between the period August 1973 and October 1976. The Committee would like the Commission to constitute similar expert committees for visiting all other universities which have introduced Correspondence Courses so far. In fact before accepting a proposal of a university for introducing the Correspondence Courses, the schemes received from the universities should be got vetted by an expert committee.

71 11-31 -do-

The Committee learn that prior to 1972, different universities were having different guidelines in regard to Correspondence Courses and it was only in 1972 that guidelines were issued by the Commission for post-graduate and under-graduate courses. The current guidelines are stated to have been formulated on the basis of the recommendation of a conference of Directors of Correspondence Courses in the light of actual experience. These guidelines were again reviewed by the Standing Committee on Part-Time and Own-Time Education at its meeting held on 12 November 1977 which had made a number of suggestions. It is thus clear that the Commission had, earlier to 1972, not paid adequate attention to formulate well thought-out guidelines for the introduction of Correspondence Courses. The Committee feel that it should have been done

before introducing the scheme as far back as 1962. The Committee hope that the Commission would consider the modification suggested by the Standing Committee on Part-time and Own-time Education expeditiously.

72 11-32 Education & Social Welfare

The Committee recommend that the question of compiling Correspondence Course lessons in the form of standard books and publishing them for the use of students may be considered by the Commission.

73 11-51

-do-

The Committee find that the Education Commission in their report (1966), considering the value of the Centres of Advanced Study, found it necessary "to strengthen and expand the UGC programme of the establishment of Centres of Advanced Study". It recommended fifty such Centres over the next five to ten years. It also recommended that the scheme should be extended to areas which were till then not covered in the scheme, namely, Agriculture, Engineering, Medicine and Modern Indian Languages. The scheme as implemented by the UGC, however, actually got reduced to "recognition" of university departments on the basis of a "comparative evaluation of achievements, facilities, potential, merits of plan of work of the departments". In the process of initial selection of university departments for evaluation, the universities themselves had no hand as no applications were invited. The evaluation done by the respective Subject Panels was placed before a Standing Com-

mittee whose recommendations were considered by the Commission. After approval of the Commission, specific proposals were invited from the selected departments. Expert committees were thereafter appointed to examine such proposals and final decision, including allocation of funds, was made on the basis of the reports of such committees. In the wake of these involved procedures and the several tiers of assessments providing ample scope for subjective considerations, it is hardly surprising that no new Centre of Advanced Study could be 'recognised' after 1968 and the number of such Centres remained pegged at 30 and with the withdrawal of recognition in 7 cases with effect from April, 1974, it came down to 23.

The Committee also find that although in August 1968 the Commission had accepted the recommendation of the Standing Advisory Committee to replace the scheme of Centres of Advanced Study by a scheme of special assistance to selected departments having "potentialities to build active schools in a particular branch", no action was taken in pursuance of this decision until 1972 when concrete action to recognise 26 Departments as Departments of Special Assistance was taken. This in action to recognise any new Department as Centre of Advanced Study and delayed action in recognising departments of special assistance resulted in the utilisation of only Rs. 4 crores out of an allocation of Rs. 8 crores for the Fourth Plan period. In 1977, the scheme under went a further modification in that not all the departments recommended by the Panels for recognition as Departments of Special Assistance were recognised as

such; some of the departments were recommended for "research support only". Thus under the original scheme of Centres of Advanced Study, apart from the Centres of Advanced Study, two more categories of departments have been included, namely, Departments of Special Assistance and departments eligible for research support.

75 11.53 Education & Social Welfare

The Committee have note been furnished the precise reasons why the Standing Advisory Committee for Centres of Advanced Study recommended in 1968 that "while it might not be possible and to a certain extent desirable, to recognise a large number of departments as Centres of Advanced Study, it would be worthwhile to provide special assistance to selected departments by identifying departments which have potentialities to build active schools in any particular branch as evidenced by their contributions to teaching and research in recent years." The considerations on which the Commission accepted this recommendation of the Standing Advisory Committee in August 1968 have also not been furnished to the Committee. Similarly, it is not known why the Standing Committee recommended (and the Commission approved) that out of 33 departments recommended by the various Science Panels, only 14 be recognised for support under the programme of Special Assistance and 19 might be considered for departmental research support.

76

11.54

-do-

The Committee are thus unable to appreciate the distinction made as between the different departments for the purposes

of grant under the scheme, particularly when the Commission has been unable to utilise the funds earmarked for the programme, as has happened during the Fourth Plan. The Committee recommend that the Commission should give a fresh look to the existing scheme in operation to see whether the creation of three distinct categories of departments eligible for various levels of grants from the UGC is conducive to the purposes of the scheme for Centres of Advanced Study as originally envisaged, and commended by the Education Commission.

77

11.55

-do-

The Committee have been told during evidence that the original allocation of Rs. 16 crores in the Fourth Plan for the scheme of Centres of Advanced Study was arrived at on the basis of a grant of Rs. 20—25 lakhs per Centre for the number of Centres assumed 'roughly'. No explanation was offered for arriving at the final allocation of Rs. 8 crores for the scheme. As regards the shortfall in utilisation of funds to the extent of 50 per cent it was stated during evidence that it was "mainly due to the fact that no new Centres came up in the Fourth Plan". The Committee have elsewhere in the report already commented upon the *ad hoc* manner in which allocations for new schemes have been made during the Fourth Plan period. The Committee would like to point out this as another instance of bad planning—financial as well as physical—by the Commission.

327

78

11.78

-do-

The Committee note that the College Science Improvement Programme initiated by the UGC in 1970-71, was taken up at two

levels: (1) in selected colleges to improve the entire science faculty; and (2) university leadership projects in any one science subject in all the colleges affiliated to a university. The Committee find that in respect of the scheme at (1) above, the progress has been un-impressive. The scheme was to be implemented in phases and the first phase was to end after three years of the launching of the scheme. There were, however, as many as 45 colleges which could not complete the first phase of the programme till September, 1976 and extensions were being granted to them from time to time. The Committee recommend that the difficulties of the colleges in completing the first phase of the programme should be considered by the Commission and ways and means should be found to get over them.

79 11-79 Education & Social Welfare

The Committee also find that 79 colleges which started their activities up to 1971-72 were to complete their first phase of the programme by March, 1975 and were to be visited by Regional Committees for proper appraisal of the work done. The Regional Committees had, however, visited only 14 of these colleges in the West and North Regions between July and September, 1974. The Commission had not constituted any Committee to visit the remaining 65 colleges. It was revealed during evidence that the Commission was not able to set up Committees for proper appraisal of the work done by these 65 colleges because of "serious shortage of staff" and that it was decided to assess the work of these colleges on the basis of progress reports

received from colleges. The Committee feel that the Commission should have made adequate timely preparations for constituting the requisite Regional Committees provided for in the scheme. If the assessment was to be made on the basis of reports, the original scheme should not have provided for the colleges being visited by the Regional Committees for assessment of work done under the scheme.

The Committee have been further informed during evidence that "the Standing Committee have now suggested that there should be State level Committees". The Committee recommend that the method and machinery for assessment of work done by colleges under the scheme should be clearly laid down on the basis of experience and it should be strictly adhered to.

80

11-80

do.

In regard to the University Leadership Project, the Committee observe that after initial selection, till March, 1975, of 25 Departments relating to 14 universities no new department was brought under its purview till March 1976. However against the total releases of Rs. 93.50 lakhs during 1970-71 to 1974-75, a sum of Rs. 45.10 lakhs in 1975-76 was released for the implementation of the Project. Further, the Audit test check reveals instances of release of "on account" grants without taking into account progress of expenditure and/or large unutilised funds. The Committee emphasise that this quality improvement programme should be given adequate attention and its progress accelerated.

1	2	3	4
81	11-81	Education & Social Welfare	The Committee hope that great financial prudence would be observed in releasing "on account" grants for implementing the scheme in future.
82	11-85	do.	The Committee regret that the scheme of 'Basic Research Work for Industrial Development' conceived in May 1971 did not materialise till March, 1974 as a number of Committees working on individual projects for bringing about collaboration between Universities, National Laboratories and industries could not finalise their suggestion in this regard. It is, however, heartening that subsequent to 1974, a number of major research projects including a considerable number with research and development value and application potential have been launched on the recommendations of Science Panels of the Commission.
83	11-93	do.	The Committee regard it as unfortunate that out of the final allocation of Rs. 4 crores for teacher education programme during the Fourth Plan, the actual utilisation was only Rs. 1.18 crores. The Committee are not convinced of the reasons advanced during evidence for this sizeable shortfall in utilisation that "it takes time to visit universities and give the reports" and that "universities have to consult State Governments". The Committee consider that these are normal processes which have to be undergone in regard to utilisation of all grants from the Commission. They, however, note the assurance given during evidence that "such a thing will not happen" in future.

- 84 II-94 do The Committee are constrained to learn that against an allocation of Rs. 50 lakhs for Adult Education Programme during the Fourth Plan period, the actual expenditure was only Rs. 2 lakhs. This is symptomatic of the fact that the programmes launched by the Commission are not well-planned and the implementation thereof is lax. In this context, the Committee take special note of the remarks of the Ministry given in the communication explaining the reasons for shortfall in expenditure that "it is not the main objective of the Commission to achieve the final targets alone. The main objective is the proper utilisation of funds placed at the disposal of the Commission." The Committee need hardly point out that the objective of proper utilisation of funds could not be advanced as a valid *raison d'etre* for dismal failure in the achievements of plan objectives and programmes.
- 85 II-104 do. The objective of the scheme is to encourage Indian Authorship in the production of manuscripts of quality books. The Committee trust that the Commission have a system of evaluating the manuscripts produced under the scheme to see that the assistance extended to the author has in fact served the objectives of the scheme.
- 86 II-105 do. The Committee note that of the 242 projects in progress on 1 November, 1976, as many as 52 were between 3 and 4 years old and 85 were in progress for more than 4 years. In view of the fact that the original scheme envisaged a tenure of 3 to 5 years for these projects, the Committee would like the Commission to keep a
-

close watch on the progress of each of these projects with a view to ensure that the projects actually fructify and their completion is not unduly delayed.

87 11-105 Education & Social Welfare

The Committee find that the recommendation of the Education Commission (1966) that the Inter-University Board of the University Grants Commission should take a lead in the matter relating to preparation of university level books by Indian authors was not specifically and separately considered by the University Grants Commission. It was considered by the Commission together with other recommendations relating to higher education. In the communication from the Commission to the Ministry of Education in October 1967 in which the Commission had indicated its reaction to the recommendations of the Education Commission relating to higher education, there is no reference to the recommendation in question. It is thus clear that, as pointed out by Audit, this recommendation of the Education Commission was not specifically considered by the University Grants Commission.

The Committee also find that the scheme of preparation of university level books by Indian authors was initiated by the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare as a supplement to the programme launched in 1968 of production of university level books in Indian languages and it was only in August 1969 that definite proposal in this behalf was approved by the Ministry of Education and formally

communicated to the UGC in September 1969. The scheme itself could be implemented only after March 1971. The Committee regret that the scheme for preparation of university level books by Indian authors suggested by the Education Commission in 1966 could not be implemented until after March 1971.

88

II-113

do.

The Committee note that during the years 1966-67 to 1973-74, the Commission allocated Rs. 30.05 lakhs to 78 universities for the scheme of publication of learned works and doctoral theses. Whereas 13 universities to which Rs. 5.35 lakhs were allotted did not draw any amount, grants disbursed to the remaining universities were Rs. 11.63 lakhs, representing 38.7 per cent of the allocation. It is also seen that not even one out of 500 copies of a publication brought out in 1964-65 was sold. It is further noticed that the guidelines had recently been reviewed with the help of a Committee to overcome the deficiencies and weaknesses in the implementation of the scheme and are yet to be considered by the Commission. The the scheme trust that the University Grants Commission would apply itself to the difficulties coming in the way of utilising the allocations for this scheme and suitably modify the scheme, if necessary, to make it more acceptable.

89

II-110

do.

The Committee find it distressing that the scheme of "National Award of prizes to Indian Authors" entrusted by the Ministry of Education & Social Welfare to the UGC for implementa-

tion in 1973-74 has only now been handed back by the Commission to the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare "to be implemented to-date, the only action taken in pursuance of the scheme was the issue of a Press Notification by the Commission in August 1973 and "the consideration of a note and 227 entries received in literature under the scheme" by the Panel on Modern Indian Languages. The Panel felt that "this scheme has not perhaps received wide publicity in the regional dailies and even members themselves did not know about the existence of this scheme." The Panel had recommended that this scheme might be readvertised in regional dailies besides the national dailies, and also circulated by means of demi-official letters to the Vice Chancellors of the universities and Principals of the affiliated colleges. The delay in the processing and assessment of the entries received in response to the advertisement of the Commission in August, 1973 is attributed mainly to the shortage of staff with the Commission. The Committee regret that the Ministry entrusted this scheme to the UGC in 1973 without ascertaining whether the latter would be in a position to handle it. Later, when the Ministry was requested by the Commission to make available adequate staff to handle the scheme, the Ministry vacillated till as late as February 1976. The Committee consider this scheme as a valuable one and desire that the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare should take concrete steps to implement the scheme without further delay.

90

12·13 Education & Social Welfare

With the rise in the number of universities from 104 in 1973-74 to 115 in 1976-77 and also in the number of colleges recognised by the Commission from 2974 as on 1-12-1973 to 3267 as on 1-12-1976, the volume of work with the Commission must have correspondingly increased. It is inconceivable that a whole-time Chairman and Vice-Chairman would be able to supervise each and every of the varied items of work entrusted to the Commission, much less professionally contribute to the academic role of the UGC. In the circumstances, the Committee recommend that Government may consider what positive steps should be taken to make the Commission a dynamic and vigorous body capable of shouldering the increasing responsibilities in the context of the enlargement of the field of higher education. One suggestion that the Committee would like to make is reorganisation of the existing pattern of composition of the Commission which, besides the whole-time chairman and Vice-Chairman, should have a few more whole-time members.

91

12·14

do.

An autonomous body like U.G.C. dealing with release of huge funds as grants to institutions of higher learning should enjoy the confidence of the academic community as a whole. It is, therefore, desirable that an in-built safeguard is provided against misuse of authority by appointing a Vigilance Officer or in the alternative by exposing its functioning to periodic review by an independent agency outside the Ministry of Education.

92

12·19

do.

The Committee agree with the suggestion made by the Review Committee in paragraph 6.15 of their Report February, 1977 that the Annual Report of the Commission should besides giving

a true and full account of its activities during the previous year, 'also present to Parliament its assessment of problems and perspectives of higher education and of the state of coordination and standards in universities' and that 'the annual reports should be circulated to all universities and State Governments'. The Committee desire that the above change may be brought about as early as possible.

93 12-20 Education & Social Welfare

The Committee find that the Annual Report for the year 1972-73 was presented to Lok Sabha on 9-12 74, Report for the years 1973-74 on 18-5-76 for the year 1974-75 on 25-8-76 and for the year 1975-76 on 4-4-77. The Annual Report (1976-77) has not yet been presented. The Committee take a serious view of the considerable delays in the presentation of the reports of the Commission to Parliament and would like the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare to ensure that the Report of the Commission is presented to the Lok Sabha not later than 1st October following the year to which it relates, as required under Rule 4 of the U.G.C. (Budget & Accounts) Rules, 1962.

94 12-21

do.

The Committee were informed that the Annual Report of the Commission is "circulated to every university, college and every State, whenever there is a policy decision." The Committee feel that if the Annual Reports are to include, as suggested by the Committee in an earlier paragraph, the assessment of problems and perspectives

of higher education, in which the State Governments are also involved, it would be helpful if copies thereof are, as a matter of course made available to all State Governments, universities and recognised colleges or institutions.

95

12-22

do.

The Committee have not been able to examine some of the aspects commented upon in the Audit paragraph included in the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor-General of India for the year 1975-76, Union Government (Civil). The Committee expect, however, that the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare will take due note of the observations of the Audit so as to take remedial action wherever necessary.

