

University News 53,07, February 16-22, 2015

**IS THERE A NEED TO MODIFY AUTONOMOUS COLLEGE SCHEME OF  
THE UNIVERSITY GRANTS COMMISSION?**

**Sunil Behari Mohanty**

**Editor, Journal of All India Association for Educational Research, Flat 1, Beatitude  
Apartment 2, 61 B Selvaraj Chettiar Street, Vaithikuppam, Puducherry-605 012**

**INTRODUCTION**

Institutions of learning, in order to be innovative and excellent, require to be autonomous. Hence national, regional, and international bodies focus the attention of individuals, institutions, and governments of nations on the issues related to autonomy to institutions, especially higher education institutions. In 1992, the *Sinaia* International Conference on Academic Freedom and University Autonomy (CEPES 1992, p. 4) stated that

All institutions of society, and especially universities, are affected by the social, political, and economic upheavals surrounding them. Indeed, universities have a singular opportunity and obligation to contribute to the development of society and to play an active role in shaping the societies they serve.

History has shown that violations of academic freedom and institutional autonomy have high costs in intellectual regression, social alienation, and economic stagnation. In light of profound social changes and new demands placed on universities, there is a need to forge a new understanding between universities and society. A reaffirmation and revitalization of the principles of academic freedom and university autonomy are imperative.

European Universities Association (2014, Dec 14) referred to four dimensions of autonomy and also stated possible indicators of each dimension. The dimensions are: organisational autonomy (7 indicators) financial autonomy (11 indicators), staffing autonomy (8 indicators) and academic autonomy (12 indicators). In India, autonomy generally covers academic autonomy. The academic indicators pointed out by the European Universities Association were: 1. Overall student numbers; 2. Admissions procedures at Bachelor level; 3. Admissions procedures at Master's level; 4. Introduction of programmes at Bachelor level; 5. Introduction of programmes at Master's level; 6. Introduction of programmes at doctoral level; 7. Termination of degree programmes; 8. Language of instruction at Bachelor level; 9. Language of instruction at Master's level; 10. Selection of quality assurance mechanisms; 11. Selection of quality assurance providers; and 12. Capacity to design content of degree programmes. National governments directly and indirectly, through their higher education regulatory bodies, decide the nature and quantum of autonomy to their universities. Estermann and Nokkala (2009) reported that majority of European universities were relatively free to decide their own structure and the minority had their structures shaped to a greater or lesser extent by law. According to them, the nations generally awarded block-grant funding and in certain cases, line-item budgets were used, with universities having no possibility to shift funding between budget lines. In most

countries Staff were directly paid and/or employed by the university instead of the government and in a few small countries the finance related to staffing is controlled by the government. There was no correlation between certain elements of financial autonomy and academic autonomy. The universities face limitations in starting new courses as it is tied to funding and thus reduces the level of academic autonomy of the universities. In case of academic autonomy, in European universities, Raza (2009, p. 31) in a study for the World Bank stated that

“Governments across the world are experimenting with reform of the tertiary sector which inevitably involves deregulating tertiary education and offering TEIs increased levels of autonomy. However, increased autonomy is accompanied with more explicit accountability as governments seek to hold TEIs accountable for public resources which continue to be directed to the tertiary sector even under greater deregulation.”

Estermann, Nokkala and Steinel (2011, p. 68 ) stated that “With regard to academic autonomy, recent reforms of quality assurance processes in particular have had a strong impact. Most countries impose some regulations on the overall number of students.” They also reported that overly resource and tie intensive bureaucratic measures prevented universities from achieving their full potential. While university associations are making efforts for increased autonomy for universities from the national governments and their regulatory mechanisms, colleges are making effort to get more autonomy from universities. Steinel (2012) reported the findings of a research study by the European University Association on university autonomy in Europe. In a score card for autonomy of universities in different European nations, developed by EUA, organisational autonomy ranged from 100% (UK) to 31% (Luxembourg); financial autonomy ranged from 91% (Luxembourg) to 23% (Cyprus); staffing autonomy ranged from 100% (Estonia) to 14% (Greece); and academic autonomy ranged from 100% (Ireland) to 37% (France).

### **Autonomous Colleges in India**

In India, the effort to give autonomy to colleges was initiated on the basis of the recommendations of the Report of the Education Commission 1964-66 (Kothari 1966, pp. 517-518) which stated that:

"Where there is an outstanding college (or a small cluster of very good colleges) within a large university which has shown the capacity to improve itself markedly, consideration should be given to granting it an autonomous status. This would involve the power to frame its own rules of admissions, to prescribe its courses of study, to conduct examinations, and so on. The parent university's role will be one of general supervision and the actual conferment of the degree. The privilege cannot be conferred once and for all- it will have to be continually earned and deserved-and it should be open to the university, after careful scrutiny of the position, to revoke the autonomous status if the college at any stage begins to deteriorate in its standards."

As a follow up of the above recommendations, the University Grants Commission, in its attempt to provide education of better standard outside university campuses, instituted autonomous college scheme. As per the UGC, an autonomous college will have the freedom to:

- determine and prescribe its own courses of study and syllabi, and restructure and redesign the courses to suit local needs;
- prescribe rules for admission in consonance with the reservation policy of the state government;

- evolve methods of assessment of students' performance, the conduct of examinations and notification of results; and
- use modern tools of educational technology to achieve higher standards and greater creativity; and promote healthy practices such as community service, extension activities, projects for the benefit of the society at large, neighborhood programmes, etc.

Academic autonomy covers examinations, courses of study, admission, working days, extension work and teacher workload consisting of aspects such as teaching, preparation for teaching, testing, tutorial/laboratory work, research, supervision of co-curricular activities, etc. The certificates are given by the college mentioning the name of the affiliating university. The UGC provides special funds for such colleges. Autonomous college scheme accelerates the process of qualitative improvement of a college by enabling the college to have its own courses, own examination practices with the approval of the concerned affiliating university. The scheme also reduces burden of the affiliating universities.

### **Growth in Number of Autonomous Colleges**

In 1977, Tamil Nadu became the first State to take the benefit of Autonomous college scheme. As on 2014 August 1, the nation had 487 autonomous colleges (UGC 2014a). The details are given in the table 1

**Table 1: State wise Distribution of Autonomous Colleges**

<b>State</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>Number</b>
Andhra Pradesh & Telengana	100	Jharkhand	5	Punjab	1
Arunachal Pradesh	0	Karnataka	49	Rajasthan	3
Assam	1	Kerala	9	Sikkim	0
Bihar	1	Madhya Pradesh	36	Tamil Nadu	157
Chhattisgarh	10	Maharashtra	28	Tripura	0
Goa	1	Manipur	1	Uttar Pradesh	12
Gujarat	3	Meghalaya	0	Uttarakhand	4
Haryana	1	Mizoram	0	West Bengal	9
Himachal Pradesh	5	Nagaland	2		
Jammu & Kashmir	3	Odisha	39		
A& N Island UT	0	Daman & Diu UT	0	Puducherry UT	3
Chandigarh UT	0	Delhi UT	0	TOTAL	487
Dadra & NH UT	0	Lakshadweep UT	0		

Tamil Nadu has the maximum number- 157, followed by Andhra Pradesh -100, Madhya Pradesh 56, Karnataka 49, Odisha - 39, Maharashtra 28, etc. Various State Governments have not come forward to have autonomous colleges, presumably out of fear of loss of standard. They have not even made necessary provision in the acts of their universities.

The distribution of autonomous colleges as per the nature of the courses provided in them, as

understood from the names (Table 2).

State/UT	TOTAL	General (Arts, Sc.	Engineering	Education -Teacher Trg.	Management	Law	Phy Edn	Home Sc.	Costing	Fine Art	Social Work	Physically handicapped	Tech Tr Trg
Andhra Pradesh & Telengana	100	52	46	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Arunachal Pr.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Assam	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bihar	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chhattisgarh	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Goa	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gujarat	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Haryana	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Himachal Pr.	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Jammu & Kr.	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Jharkhand	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Karnataka	49	26	17	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0
Kerala	9	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Madhya Pradesh	36	30	3	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Maharashtra	28	9	10	0	2	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
Manipur	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Meghalaya	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mizoram	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nagaland	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Odisha	39	37	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Punjab	6	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rajasthan	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sikkim	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tamil Nadu	157	112	30	10	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1
Tripura	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Uttar Pradesh	12	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Uttarakhand	4	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
West Bengal	9	4	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Delhi UT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Puducherry UT	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
A&N Island UT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chandigarh UT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D&NH UT.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Daman & Diu UT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Lakshadweep UT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>INDIA Total</b>	<b>487</b>	<b>331</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>

Among the categories of colleges as the name of the college indicates, general category (consisting of arts, science, and commerce) are 331, engineering college 124, teacher education colleges 15, management colleges 9 and 1 each in case of colleges for costing, fine arts, home science, law, physical education, physically handicapped education, social work, and technical teacher training. Tamil Nadu has not only maximum number of general autonomous colleges, but also maximum number of professional autonomous colleges. In case of teacher education, The National Council of Educational Research, New Delhi has four Regional Institutes of Education at Ajmer, Bhopal, Bhubaneswar, and Mysore. Inertia in making Regional Colleges of Education autonomous works against more autonomous teacher training colleges.

As per UGC XI plan document, the ceiling of annual assistance is depicted in Table 3

**Table 3: Ceiling of Annual Financial Assistance for Autonomous colleges**

Sl. No.	Nature of the Institution	Amount (Rs.)
a	Only Undergraduate	
	1. Arts/Science/Commerce – one faculty only	Rs. 9,00,000/-
	2. Arts/science/commerce More than one faculty	Rs.15,00, 000/-
b	Both Undergraduate and Postgraduate	
	1.Single faculty	Rs. 10,00,000/-
	2.Multi-faculty	Rs.20,00,000/-

The grant is utilised for (a) recruiting additional faculty including visiting faculty, and additional administrative, library and laboratory staff, (b) redesigning of courses, (c) developing teaching and learning materials, (e) organising workshops, seminars and orientation of teachers, (f) facilitating faculty exchange and making teachers participate in conferences, etc.(g) carrying out examination reform and developing question bank, (i) having audio-visual aids (TV, VCR, Video-cassettes), (j) improving facilities in laboratories and libraries (k) improving facilities for physical education and sports and cultural activities, and (l) procuring office equipment. There could be additional grants to meet the special requirements of these colleges.

### **Recommendations of Various Government Documents on Autonomous College Scheme**

#### ***National Policy on Education 1986***

The National Policy on Education (1986, p. 25) endorsing the autonomous college scheme stated that

“In view of mixed experiences with the system of affiliation, autonomous colleges will be helped to develop in large numbers until the affiliating system is replaced by a freer and more creative association of universities with colleges. Similarly, the creation of autonomous departments within universities on a selective basis will be encouraged. Autonomy and freedom will be accompanied by accountability.”

***Report of the Review Committee on the National Policy on Education, 1986 (1990)***

The Report of the Review Committee on the National Policy on Education, 1986 (Acharya Ramamurti, 1990, p.223) made the following observations:

"The basic objectives in the establishment of autonomous colleges have been reducing the load of autonomous colleges on the university system, decentralisation of academic administration, promotion of creativity, innovations and higher standards. An autonomous college is expected to have the freedom to prescribe rules of admission, determine the courses of study and methods of teaching and evaluation, conduct of examinations, etc.

Grant of autonomy to colleges is a process of decentralisation. However, this process will not materialise into tangible results unless there is unreserved participation on the part of the entire academic community." (Acharya Ramamurti, 1990, p.223)

***UGC Committee 1991***

The recommendations given by the UGC Committee (1991) which are yet to be fulfilled are: 1. Having an appropriate mechanism at the State level for effective monitoring of the scheme; and 2. Ending practice of transfer teachers from state government autonomous colleges

***Programme of Action 1992***

The POA of 1992(MHRD, 1992, p.64) stated causes for non-acceptance of autonomous system in the following manner.

"It would appear that the initial enthusiasm for this scheme has waned due to the opposition of a few States to the scheme on the ground that it is elitist, apprehensions expressed by the teaching community regarding increase in their workload, arbitrariness by managements, irregularities in conduct of internal examinations, paucity of funds, and operational difficulties in implementing the scheme, (p.64)

Some of the suggested strategies were:

- \* Early implementation of the recommendations of the UGC Expert Committee on autonomous colleges
- \* Increasing number of autonomous colleges.
- \* Establishing a Council of Autonomous Colleges in every State in 1991-92 to review the progress of the scheme and to resolve the operational difficulties in its implementation and instituting separate mechanism for evaluation of the performance of autonomous colleges.
- \* Review of the functioning of Autonomous Departments during 1992-93.
- \* Autonomy for Departments receiving financial assistance from the Commission under the Special Assistance Programme (SAP) and the Scheme of Strengthening of Infrastructure Facilities in Science and Technology (COSIST) phased manner by 1997.
- \* Autonomy for Departments offering professional and technical courses, such as, Engineering, Technology, Computer, Management, Law, etc. and other emerging areas.
- \* The progress of the scheme of autonomous departments should also be reviewed by the Cell established in UGC for review of the scheme of autonomous colleges.

***Report of the Central Advisory Board of Education (CABE) Committee on Autonomy in Higher Education Institutions 2005***

Report of the Central Advisory Board of Education (CABE) Committee on Autonomy in Higher

Education Institutions (Biswas 2005, p. ix) stated that

“There is a need to grant autonomy to individual institutions for designing curriculum. Universities may provide a broad framework within which individual faculty member both within the university and in the colleges should be encouraged to innovate and experiment to transform teaching and learning into a fascinating and rewarding experience.”

### **National Knowledge Commission 2009**

The National Knowledge Commission 2009 (Govt. of India, 2009 p.70) recommended autonomy to clusters of colleges, selected on the basis of criteria such as similar standards or geographical proximity, which could then form a group, complementing each other, offering different courses between them and in time, could be upgraded to universities. Such autonomous colleges, or clusters of colleges, would constitute a part of the Knowledge Commission proposed 1500 universities by 2015 .

### ***Rashtriya Uchchatar Shiksha Abhiyan (RUSA) National Higher Education Mission***

Rashtriya Uchchatar Shiksha Abhiyan (RUSA) (MHRD 2013, p. 71) stated that:

“There can be multiple ways of improving the affiliation system. The first option is to reduce the total number of affiliated colleges by encouraging the better performing colleges to become autonomous. The better performing affiliated colleges could be encouraged, with additional support as necessary, to become approved as autonomous by the University Grants Commission. By becoming ‘autonomous’, a college would gain academic autonomy – and so become responsible for curriculum and assessment aspects – as well as administrative autonomy over its budget, and also becoming eligible to receive funds directly from UGC. An autonomous college does not, however, have the right to award a degree. Hence, autonomous colleges must be encouraged to develop into universities.”

This document (p.68) mentioned that due to systemic problems for which inadequate number of colleges had been autonomous.

### **Autonomous Colleges and Colleges with Potential for Excellence**

The University Grants Commission introduced this scheme of colleges with potential for excellence in for non agricultural, medical, dental, nursing and pharmacy colleges. Table 4 compiled from UGC(2014a) and UGC(2014b) gives a comparative picture of colleges with potential for excellence and autonomous colleges.

**Table 4: Comparative Picture of Colleges with Potential for Excellence and Autonomous Colleges**

State/UT	Autonomous colleges	Non-Technical Autonomous Colleges	No. of colleges with potential for excellence	No. of Autonomous colleges selected as colleges with potential for	No. of Non-Autonomous colleges selected as colleges with potential for excellence	No. of Non-technical Autonomous colleges NOT selected as colleges with potential for excellence
	A	B(E+G)	D(E+F)	E	F	G(B-E)
Andhra Pradesh & Telengana	100	<b>54</b>	15	<b>9</b>	6	45
Arunachal Pradesh	0	<b>0</b>	1	<b>0</b>	1	0
Assam	1	<b>1</b>	8	<b>1</b>	7	0
Bihar	1	<b>1</b>	5	<b>0</b>	5	1
Chandigarh UT	0	<b>0</b>	1	<b>0</b>	1	-
Chhattisgarh	10	<b>10</b>	6	<b>6</b>	0	4
Goa	1	<b>1</b>	1	<b>0</b>	1	1
Gujarat	3	<b>3</b>	17	<b>1</b>	16	2
Haryana	1	<b>1</b>	6	<b>0</b>	6	1
Himachal Pradesh	5	<b>5</b>	3	<b>0</b>	3	5
Jammu & Kashmir	3	<b>3</b>	1	<b>1</b>	0	2
Jharkhand	5	<b>5</b>	4	<b>1</b>	3	4
Karnataka	49	<b>32</b>	26	<b>11</b>	15	21
Kerala	9	<b>9</b>	11	<b>4</b>	7	5
Madhya Pradesh	36	<b>33</b>	5	<b>4</b>	1	29
Maharashtra	28	<b>18</b>	43	<b>4</b>	39	14
Manipur	1	<b>1</b>	2	<b>0</b>	2	1
Meghalaya	0	<b>0</b>	1	<b>0</b>	1	-
Mizoram	0	<b>0</b>	0	-	-	-
Nagaland	2	<b>2</b>	1	<b>1</b>	0	1
Odisha	39	<b>38</b>	6	<b>6</b>	0	32
Puducherry UT	3	<b>2</b>	1	<b>1</b>	0	1
Punjab	6	<b>6</b>	9	<b>2</b>	7	4
Rajasthan	3	<b>3</b>	10	<b>2</b>	8	1
Sikkim	0	<b>0</b>	0	-	-	-
Tamil Nadu	157	<b>127</b>	17	<b>9</b>	8	118
Tripura	0	<b>0</b>	0	-	-	-
Uttar Pradesh	12	<b>7</b>	17	<b>3</b>	14	4
Uttarakhand	4	<b>1</b>	2	<b>0</b>	2	1
West Bengal	9	<b>5</b>	12	<b>3</b>	9	2
Delhi UT	0	<b>0</b>	-	-	-	-
A&N Island UT	0	<b>0</b>	-	-	-	-



Chandigarh UT	0	0	-	-	-	-
D&NH UT.	0	0	-	-	-	-
Daman & Diu UT	0	0	-	-	-	-
Lakshadweep UT	0	0	-	-	-	-
<b>INDIA Total</b>	<b>487</b>	<b>368</b>	<b>231</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>299</b>

Without taking into consideration of the fact that whether a non-technical autonomous college applied for the status of college with potential excellence or not, out of 368 non-technical autonomous colleges, only 69 have the status of colleges with potential for excellence. This fact indicates that if the process of selection of colleges with potential for excellence is full proof, there is a necessity of reviewing the process of selection of autonomous colleges. Although UGC has been providing extra grants for autonomous colleges, the states of Arunachal Pradesh, Meghalaya, Mizoram, Sikkim, and Tripura do not have any autonomous colleges and states of Mizoram, Sikkim and Tripura do not have either any autonomous colleges or any college with potential for excellence. This position necessitates the establishment of central government colleges with potential for excellence in these States.

#### **Needed Modification in the Scheme of Autonomous Colleges**

Report of the Central Advisory Board of Education (CABE) Committee on Autonomy in Higher Education Institutions (Biswas 2005, p.37, Table 4.17) gave following opinion data collected in 2005, which may be still valid after 9 years.

<b>Issue: Should the autonomous status to a college be limited to:</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>
1 College with Potential for excellence	901(86%)	202 (18%)
2. NAAC Accredited System	852(62%)	517(38%)
3. Should grading be fixed at B Level	443 (81%)	101 (19%)
4 National Board of Accreditation (NBA) Accredited Institutions	100%	

The effort to revise the National Policy on Education 1986(with modification undertaken in 1992) may need to conduct such opinion surveys and then decide the criteria for conferring autonomy. Functioning of autonomy studied by AIU (1988) had reported problems in functioning of autonomy. If a study is undertaken, even after twenty-five years of this study, similar results are bound to surface. The colleges which are not effective at non-autonomous stage will continue to be ineffective even after getting autonomy. The scheme of autonomous colleges can be effective only when it is implemented in true spirit by the state governments and a central body cannot monitor day to day implementation of the scheme. The staff members of government autonomous colleges are transferrable to non-autonomous government colleges. At the time of the visit of the UGC team, the concerned state government may fill up the posts in autonomous colleges on deployment basis and may transfer these teachers back to the colleges from which they had been deployed, soon after the visit. There has been instance of a college getting autonomous status, not because of merit, but because of the fact that the parent university wanted to get rid of the responsibility of conducting examination, as the college students were found indulging in destruction of university physical infrastructure when they were taken to task for malpractice. The University Grants Commission spends huge amount of money for inspection of colleges, which get wasted. Such types of tricks and wastage of central government

funds by the University Grants Commission can be stopped, if only the state governments can be given the authority to grant autonomy and the central government, instead of giving project wise grants, give grants keeping in view the population of the individual states.

There have been cases of submission of facts and figures which are not correct. Perhaps these errors happen for getting funds from the UGC. Functioning of autonomy is not really linked with extra funding. Preparing syllabus, conducting examinations, and warding results are the extra activities that come after award of autonomous status. Since in ideal autonomous colleges, examinations are to be completely internal, extra funding may not be necessary. Rather the scheme should get rid of this evil.

Many autonomous colleges get their autonomy sanctioned by filling up desired number of teaching posts. After autonomy is awarded, they do not bother to maintain regular staff position. For instance, the data submitted by Fakir Mohan College, Balasore (2013 August 31, p.30) indicate that in this autonomous college had 79 sanctioned strength out of which less than 50% (30) posts were filled up and the college managed with 30 (Regular) and 36 (Guest faculty). This is the situation of a government college. In case of a private college- Banki College in the same state, its data available in its web site accessed on 2014 December 13 indicated that the college had PG in Education having only four teachers – 1 reader and 3 lecturers and a lecturer was head of the department. Two decades ago, Mohanty (1992 a & b) reported that in a state, autonomous colleges failed to have complete internal evaluation, semester system, flexibility in combination of courses and continuous and comprehensive evaluation. Some of the problems faced by these colleges during autonomous stage, were same even after getting autonomy were large numbers of vacancies, opposition to examination reform, lack of incentives to teachers to attend seminars, conferences, etc.

If the scheme does not function properly, it may reduce the standard. For instance, in certain autonomous colleges mass malpractice continued even after the autonomy was awarded. Afraid of the problems caused by the students of that college, the affiliating university did not bother about lowering of standards. One of the main reasons for mass malpractice of that college was teacher shortage, teacher lethargy and teacher truancy and reduction in number of teaching days. A central regulatory body like university cannot control such situation. While government colleges can have control over the number of students admitted, private colleges may not get restricted. They follow the example of poor performing universities. For instance, a few years ago one private university admitted two thousand M.Ed. students in an academic session and the UGC did not bother about it.

## **CONCLUSION**

There need not be separate selection process for autonomous colleges. Colleges getting at least B+ grade by NAAC may be made autonomous. There should not be any target for achieving a certain number of autonomous colleges. Autonomy to a college should be the decision of the university. It need not be a Financial Assistance Scheme of the UGC.

## **REFERENCES**

1. Acharya Ramamurti (1990) (Chairman) *Report of the Review Committee on the National*

- Policy on Education, 1986.* (1990) Govt. of India, New Delhi.
2. AIU (1988) *Report of the Task Force on Autonomous Colleges and Departments.* AIU, New Delhi.
3. Banki College, Banki, Cuttack, Odisha. Retrieved on 2014 December 13 from <http://bankicollege.org/college.php?action=Departments%20Details&dept=5>
4. Biswas, K. (2005) (Chairman) *Report of the Central Advisory Board of Education (CABE) Committee on Autonomy in Higher Education Institutions 2005.* Govt. of India, New Delhi.
5. CEPES(1992) *CEPES Papers on Higher Education: Academic Freedom and University Autonomy(Proceedings of the International Conference 5-7 May 1992, Sinaia, Romania).* Author, Bucharest.
6. Estermann, T. and Nokkala, T. (2009) *University Autonomy in Europe I: Exploratory Study.* European University Association, Brussels.
7. Estermann, T., Nokkala, T. & Steinel, M. (2011) *University Autonomy in Europe II: The Scorecard.* European University Association, Brussels.
8. European University Association (2014 Dec 4) *University Autonomy in Europe.* Downloaded from <http://www.university-autonomy.eu/dimensions/academic/>
9. Fakir Mohan College, Balasore, Odisha (2013 August 31) *Self-Study Report submitted to NAAC.* Retrieved on 2014 December 13 from <http://fmcollege.nic.in/SSR.pdf>
10. Kothari, D.S. (1966) (Chairman) *Report of the Education Commission 1964-66.* Govt. of India, New Delhi.
11. MHRD (1986a) *National Policy on Education 1986.* Govt. of India, New Delhi.
12. MHRD (1986b) *Programme of Action-National Policy on Education 1986.* Govt. of India, New Delhi.
13. MHRD (1992) *Programme of Action-National Policy on Education 1986.* Govt. of India, New Delhi.
14. MHRD (2013) *Rashtriya Uchchatar Shiksha Abhiyan (RUSA).* Govt. of India, New Delhi. [http://mhrd.gov.in/sites/upload\\_files/mhrd/files/upload\\_document/RUSA\\_final090913.pdf](http://mhrd.gov.in/sites/upload_files/mhrd/files/upload_document/RUSA_final090913.pdf)
15. National Knowledge Commission (2009) *Report to the Nation 2006 – 2009.* Govt. of India, Author.
16. Mohanty, S. B. (1992a) Improving the functioning of autonomous colleges in Orissa. *University News* 30, 18, 13 -16, May 4.
17. Mohanty, S. B. (1992b) Autonomous colleges in Orissa- a study of G. M. College, Sambalpur. *In Quest of Bharatiya Shikshan* 2, 7, 479 - 86, July
18. Raza, R. (2009) *Examining Autonomy and Accountability in Public and Private Tertiary Institutions.* World bank, Washington DC.
19. Steinel, M. (2012) *University Autonomy in Europe: A Research Study by EUA.* European University Association, Brussels.
20. UGC (2014a) *Status List of Approved 487 Autonomous Colleges as on 01.08.2014.* Author, New Delhi. Retrieved on 2014. December 9 from [http://www.ugc.ac.in/oldpdf/colleges/autonomous\\_colleges-list.pdf](http://www.ugc.ac.in/oldpdf/colleges/autonomous_colleges-list.pdf)
21. UGC (2014b) *Status of Colleges Selected Under the Scheme “Colleges with Potential for Excellence” (CPE) as on 22nd September 2014.* Author, New Delhi. Retrieved on 2014. December 9 from [http://www.ugc.ac.in/oldpdf/colleges/Press\\_release06CPE.pdf](http://www.ugc.ac.in/oldpdf/colleges/Press_release06CPE.pdf)

