

The RUSA Story – Journey so far

I. Introduction

Rashtriya Uchchatar Shiksha Abhiyan (RUSA) is a comprehensive, overarching, Centrally Sponsored Scheme (CSS) of the Department of Higher Education, Ministry of Human Resource Development, for strategically funding the State Higher Education system in order to achieve the objectives of equity, access, excellence and employability. The funding is based on well defined, transparent norms and linked to certain key academic, administrative and governance reforms.

With over 96% of the students enrolled in the state higher education system (both public and private), there is a felt need for State Universities to be strengthened through adequate funding to usher much needed reforms. A major cause of concern has been the declining investments (Plan) of the State Governments in higher education. States, therefore, must be incentivized to step up investments in higher education.

II. Key Features

The key features of the Scheme are as follows

- RUSA is an umbrella scheme operated in mission mode for ushering reforms in the state higher education sector.
- The central funding would flow from the Ministry of Human Resource Development (MHRD) to institutions, through the State Governments and State Higher Educational Councils.
- The funding to states is required to be made on the basis of critical appraisal of State Higher Education Plans. The plans would address each state's strategy to address issues of equity, access and excellence in higher education.
- All funding under RUSA is norm based and future grants would be performance based and outcome dependent.
- Commitment by States and institutions to certain academic, administrative and governance reforms will be a precondition for receiving funding under RUSA.

- The objectives of RUSA would be to achieve the target of GER of 25% by 2017 and 32% by the year 2022 (end of 13th Plan), which the Central Government has set for itself. Government of India aims to improve the quality of State Universities and colleges and enhance their existing capacities.

The salient objectives of the scheme can be enumerated as follows:

- Improve the overall quality of existing state institutions by ensuring that all institutions conform to prescribed norms and standards and adopt accreditation as a mandatory quality assurance framework.
- Usher transformative reforms in the state higher education system by creating a facilitating institutional structure for planning and monitoring at the state level, promoting autonomy in State Universities and improving governance in institutions.
- Ensure academic and examination reforms in the higher educational institutions.
- Enable conversion of some of the universities into research universities at par with the best in the world.
- Create opportunities for states to undertake reforms in the affiliation system in order to ensure that the reforms and resource requirements of affiliated colleges are adequately met.
- Ensure adequate availability of quality faculty in all higher educational institutions and ensure capacity building at all levels of employment.
- Create an enabling atmosphere in the higher educational institutions to devote themselves to research and innovations.
- Expand the institutional base by creating additional capacity in existing institutions and establishing new institutions, in order to achieve enrolment targets.

- Correct regional imbalances in access to higher education by facilitating access to high quality institutions in urban & semi-urban areas, creating opportunities for students from rural areas to get access to better quality institutions and setting up institutions in underserved areas.
- Improve equity in higher education by providing adequate opportunities of higher education to the SC/STs and socially and educationally backward classes; promote inclusion of women, minorities, and differently abled persons.

III. Scope

All State Universities and colleges (Both 12B and 2f compliant and non-12B and non-2f) from all States and Union Territories (UTs) across the country are eligible to be covered under RUSA. Subject to eligibility, an estimated 306 state universities and 8500 colleges will be covered under this initiative to improve the learning outcomes and employability of graduates and to scale-up research, development and innovations. RUSA will also support these institutions to improve their policy, academic and management practices. Each institution will have to prepare an Institution Development Plan, which will be then aggregated at the state level, after imposing a super layer of state relevant components. This would then be developed into the State Higher Education Plan which would be further broken down into annual plans. These annual plans will constitute the basis for determining the funding to states. Preparation of these plans is preceded by a Baseline Survey by the states.

IV. Approach

The yardstick for deciding the quantum of funds under RUSA for the states and institution will be norms that will reflect the key result areas; access, equity and excellence. The State Higher Education Plans will capture the current position of the states and institutions on the basis of these norms as well as the targets that need to be achieved.

In order to realize the intended outcomes, certain a-priori commitments towards reform process have to be made by the states as well as institutions, for them to become eligible

for funding under RUSA. These prerequisites include academic, sectoral and institutional governance reforms, creation of State Higher Education Councils, funding commitments by states, filling faculty positions (or a commitment to do so within a fixed time frame) etc. Under the scheme an initial, preparatory amount will also be provided to the state government to prepare them for complying with prerequisites. Once eligible for funding under RUSA after fulfilling the prerequisites, the states will receive funds on the basis of their current status and the targets they set for themselves. An entitlement matrix has been developed for the purpose, which would be applied for determining the quantum of funds for states. Future funds flows would be determined based on outcomes and achievements against the targets.

V. Prerequisites

The prerequisites would be at two levels; commitment given by States to the Central Government and the commitment given by institutions to the States. The states are expected to fulfil the a-priori requirements and also honour the commitments made towards certain conditions which must be fulfilled during the course of RUSA implementation.

Prerequisites

For the States	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• State Higher Education Council• State Perspective Plan• State contribution to higher education as a % of GSDP• Filling faculty vacancies• Accreditation reforms• Affiliation reforms• Governance and administrative reforms
For the Institutions	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Governance and administrative reforms at Institute level• Academic and examination reforms• Examination reforms• Separate project management teams• Equity commitment (especially in aided sector)• Commitments on research and innovation efforts• Mandatory faculty recruitment and improvement• Regulatory compliance

VI. Strategic Focus of RUSA

Strategic funding of state institutions must ensure that the issues of quality and access are addressed in an equitable manner. This would entail encouraging the states to prepare State Higher Education Plan duly keeping the following aspects in mind:

- Spatial and regional planning after due mapping
- Programme and discipline planning

- Mandatory accreditation and quality improvement
- Reforms – governance and academic
- Infrastructure saturation
- Review of the affiliation system
- Transparent and norm-based funding
- Outcome-based reimbursements
- Faculty planning and support
- Equity interventions
- Focus on research and innovation

VII. Components

RUSA is envisaged as a prime vehicle for strategic funding of state institutions so as to ensure that issues of access, equity and quality are addressed in an equitable manner with the state as a composite unit of planning.

The following are the primary components of RUSA that capture the key action and funding areas that must be pursued for the fulfilment of the targets:

- 1) Up-gradation of existing autonomous colleges to Universities
- 2) Conversion of colleges to Cluster Universities
- 3) Infrastructure grants to Universities
- 4) New Model Colleges (General)
- 5) Upgradation of existing degree colleges to model colleges
- 6) New Colleges (Professional)

- 7) Infrastructure grants to colleges
- 8) Research, innovation and quality improvement
- 9) Equity initiatives
- 10) Faculty recruitment support
- 11) Faculty improvements
- 12) Polytechnic Colleges
- 13) Vocationalisation of Higher Education
- 14) Leadership Development of Educational Administrators
- 15) Institutional restructuring & reforms
- 16) Capacity building & preparation, Data collection & planning
- 17) Capacity building of Central Institutions/Agencies

Sl. No.	Component	Unit cost (Rs Crores)	No of Universities/Colleges/States/Units	Outlay (Rs. Crores)
	Creation of Universities by way of upgradation of existing autonomous colleges	55	45	2475
	Creation of Universities by conversion of colleges in a cluster	55	35	1925
	Infrastructure grants to Universities	20	150	3000
	New Model Colleges (General)	12	60	720
	Upgradation of existing degree colleges to	4	54	216

	model colleges			
	New Colleges (Professional)	26	40	1040
	Infrastructure grants to colleges	2	3500	7000
	Research, innovation and quality improvement	120	10	1200
	Equity initiatives	5	20	100
	Faculty Recruitment Support	0.58	5000	2900
	Faculty improvements	10	20	200
	Vocationalisation of Higher Education	15	20	300
	Leadership Development of Educational Administrators			100
	Institutional restructuring & reforms	20	20	400
	Capacity building & preparation, Data collection & planning	10	20	200
	Management Information System	10	20	200
	Sub Total			21976
	4% Management, Monitoring, Evaluation & Research			879
	Total			22855
	Central Share			16227
	State Share			6628

VIII. Plan Outlay

During the 12th Plan period, RUSA was envisaged to have a financial outlay of Rs. 22,855 crores, of which Rs. 16,227 crores will be the Central share. In addition, an allocation of Rs. 1800 crores in the 12th plan for the existing scheme of “Support for the polytechnics in the States including strengthening of existing polytechnics, setting up of new polytechnics, community polytechnics and women’s hostel in polytechnics” will also be

administered through RUSA. Thus the total outlay (central share) in the 12th Plan will be Rs. 18,027 crores.

IX. Progress so far -National Achievements

The implementation of RUSA began at the right earnest in June, 2014 after the initial months were spent on getting States on board by providing them with preparatory resources to get their systems and institutional architecture in place. The following are some of the key achievements of RUSA:

1. Coverage Goals

The States and the UTs have responded very well to the MHRD's request to participate in this scheme. Though the scheme is voluntary in nature, as on date, 29 states and 6 UTs have responded to participate in RUSA. A total of 1513 institutions have been supported so far, which is 41% of the total institutions to be supported during this plan period ending 31st March, 2017.

a) Gross Enrolment Ratio (GER)

The National GER prior to the launch of RUSA was 20.8 (2012), with Male GER at 22.1 and Female GER at 19.4. The GER is now at 22.6 (2014) with Male GER- 23.7 AND Female GER at 21.4, indicating robust increase in GER and moving rapidly towards the national target of 25 by 2017. Interestingly, there has also been a remarkable improvement in Female GER from 19.4 (2012) to 21.4(2014), inching closer to the national average.

Likewise, there has been an improvement the GER among social groups. The SC GER overall has improved significantly from 14.9 (2012) to 17.4 (2014), while the ST GER has also increased slightly from 11(2012) to 12 (2014) although more concerted efforts are required in getting them to the national mainstream.

The tables below indicate the time-series changes over the last 3 years in GER (General), GER (SC) and GER (ST) among both genders.

Table 1: Gross Enrolment Ratio

Year	All Categories		
	Male GER	Female GER	Total GER
2011-12	22.1	19.4	20.8
2012-13	22.7	20.1	21.5
2013-14	23.7	21.4	22.6

(Source: AISHE 2011-12, AISHE 2012-13, AISHE 2013-14 Provisional)

Table 2: Female GER

Year	Female Total GER	SC Female GER	ST Female GER
2011-12	19.4	13.9	9.7
2012-13	20.1	15	9.8
2013-14	21.4	16.5	10.6

(Source: AISHE 2011-12, AISHE 2012-13, AISHE 2013-14 Provisional)

Table 3: SC GER

Year	SC Male GER	SC Female GER	SC Total GER
2011-12	15.8	13.9	14.9
2012-13	16.9	15	16
2013-14	18.3	16.5	17.4

Table 4: ST GER

Year	ST Male GER	ST Female GER	ST Total GER
2011-12	12.4	9.7	11
2012-13	12.4	9.8	11.1
2013-14	13.3	10.6	12

___(Source: AISHE 2011-12, AISHE 2012-13, AISHE 2013-14 Provisional)

An analysis of state level disaggregated data on Total GER (All Categories – Table 5) illustrates that almost all states have improved on their GER except Andaman Nicobar, which has seen a decline. Significantly, in the GER (SC) (Table 6) category, again, all states have shown improvements with states such as Assam, Goa, Gujarat, Kerala, Maharashtra, Punjab Rajasthan and Uttarakhand doing remarkable well. In the GER (ST) - Table7, the north eastern states have done particularly well.

In so far as GER (Female) is concerned, Table -8 clearly demonstrates that states such as Gujarat, Himachal Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Rajasthan, Telangana, Uttar Pradesh, Uttarkhand and North eastern states have made impressive progress.

Table 5: State wise growth in GER

S. No	State	All Categories								
		Male GER			Female GER			Total GER		
		2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
1	Andaman & Nicobar Islands	11	17.8	14.2	13.8	22.7	17.1	12.3	20.2	15.6
2	Andhra Pradesh	33.3	31	33	26.4	23.6	25.4	29.9	27.3	29.2
3	Arunachal Pradesh	22.5	18.3	24.3	20.2	19.8	24.7	21.3	19	24.5
4	Assam	14.6	14	16	14.8	13.7	14.9	14.7	13.8	15.4
5	Bihar	14	14.4	14.3	10.8	11.6	11.7	12.5	13.1	13.1
6	Chandigarh	33.2	51.8	46.6	54.4	58.3	64.4	42.2	54.6	54.1
7	Chhattisgarh	11	13.2	14.8	10.1	11.7	13	10.5	12.4	13.9
8	Dadra & Nagar Haveli	6.4	5.7	6.6	6.4	7.1	8.1	6.4	6.2	7.2

9	Daman & Diu	3	3.3	6.1	6.2	6.9	8.6	3.9	4.3	6.7
10	Delhi	38.9	38.7	41.6	39	40.8	43.4	38.9	39.6	42.4
11	Goa	21.5	19.8	20.5	25.9	31	31.2	23.5	24.9	25.3
12	Gujarat	18.1	20.2	21.4	14.7	16.2	17.2	16.5	18.3	19.4
13	Haryana	28.3	28.8	28.3	27.7	26.6	26.9	28	27.8	27.7
14	Himachal	24.6	25.3	28.9	25.1	26.3	27.4	24.8	25.8	28.2
15	Jammu & Kashmir	21.8	24.2	23.8	24	27.1	26.4	22.8	25.6	25.1
16	Jharkhand	10.2	12.2	12.7	9.5	12	12	9.9	12.1	12.4
17	Karnataka	24.9	26.1	26.8	22.7	24.5	25.7	23.8	25.4	26.2
18	Kerala	17.8	18.5	21.2	25.6	25.8	29.1	21.8	22.1	25.1
19	Lakshadweep	6.2	6.3	6.4	17.5	17.7	18	11.5	11.8	12
20	Madhya Pradesh	22	22.7	22.8	14.6	15.2	17.6	18.5	19.2	20.4
21	Maharashtra	28.1	25	27.2	24.3	20.6	22.9	26.3	22.9	25.2
22	Manipur	30.4	30.9	36.9	29.9	29	36.8	30.2	29.9	36.8
23	Meghalaya	16.3	18.6	20.2	18.5	19.7	19.1	17.4	19.2	19.7
24	Mizoram	19.6	22.4	22.7	18.3	22	21.5	19	22.2	22.1
25	Nagaland	18.2	16.6	16.6	13.4	12.8	13.2	15.8	14.7	14.9
26	Odisha	18.3	18.6	18.9	15	14.1	14.8	16.6	16.3	16.8
27	Pondicherry	40.4	46.6	49.2	36.3	41.8	43.5	38.3	44.1	46.3
28	Punjab	22.4	22.5	22.4	23.6	25.6	26.6	23	23.9	24.3
29	Rajasthan	20.6	21.4	21.8	15.5	14.8	16.1	18.2	18.3	19.1
30	Sikkim	28.9	21.8	26	27.4	26.9	28.8	22.2	24.3	27.4
31	Tamil Nadu	43.2	54.4	44.9	36.8	38.7	39.8	40	42	42.4
32	Telengana		36.9	38.4		29.3	31.9		33.1	35.1
33	Tripura	14.6	16.6	17.5	10.2	11.7	12.7	12.4	14.1	15
34	Uttar Pradesh	17.5	18.8	20.7	17.2	20.4	21.6	17.4	19.5	21.1
35	Uttarakhand	30.1	32.6	33	32.3	34	35	31.1	33.3	34
36	West Bengal	15.4	17.1	18.1	11.8	13.2	14.4	13.6	15.1	16.2
	All India	22.1	22.7	23.7	19.4	20.1	21.4	20.8	21.5	22.6

(Source: AISHE 2011-12, AISHE 2012-13, AISHE 2013-14 Provisional)

Table 6: State wise growth in GER (SC)

S. N	State	SC GER								
		Male GER			Female GER			Total GER		
		2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
1	Andaman & Nicobar Islands									
2	Andhra Pradesh	28.2	24.8	27.4	22.9	19.8	21.9	25.6	22.3	24.7
3	Arunachal Pradesh									
4	Assam	12.8	14.4	17.3	12.2	14.1	15.9	12.5	14.3	16.6
5	Bihar	9.4	10.3	10.3	6.1	6.6	6.6	7.8	8.5	8.5
6	Chandigarh	15.3	23.6	20.5	22.5	23.8	26.9	18.5	23.7	23.4
7	Chhattisgarh	8.8	11.7	12.9	7.3	9.6	10.5	8.1	10.7	11.7
8	Dadra & Nagar Haveli	6.5	5.8	18.6	5.8	6.9	19.1	6.2	6.3	18.8
9	Daman & Diu	11.6	16.5	21.8	18.5	14.3	24.1	14.8	15.5	22.8
10	Delhi	19.7	22.5	24.2	17	20.6	23.5	18.5	21.6	23.9
11	Goa	21	23.7	23.3	24.5	25.1	26.4	22.7	24.4	24.8
12	Gujarat	18.3	22.6	25.3	15.1	17.8	21.4	16.8	20.4	23.5
13	Haryana	18.3	18.5	18.5	16.6	15.7	16.3	17.5	17.2	17.5
14	Himachal	13.9	14.6	14.3	13.9	14.1	15	13.9	14.3	14.6
15	Jammu & Kashmir	8.9	13.3	13.8	12.1	17.5	17.1	10.5	15.4	15.4
16	Jharkhand	6.5	8.6	9.4	4.9	7.2	7.8	5.8	7.9	8.6
17	Karnataka	17.5	18.3	19.2	14.2	15.6	16.4	15.8	17.9	17.8
18	Kerala	12	12.8	14.4	21.8	22.8	26.5	16.9	17.8	20.4
19	Lakshadweep									
20	Madhya Pradesh	13.7	14.1	15.4	10.9	10.8	11.2	12.4	12.6	13.5
21	Maharashtra	25.7	20.6	23.4	22	16.9	19	23.9	18.9	21.3
22	Manipur	55	45.2	66.3	54.6	45.3	55.1	54.8	45.3	60.7

23	Meghalaya	33.5	27.7	46.3	32.5	34.8	53.4	33	31	49.7
24	Mizoram	78.4	85.5	99.1	112.7	93.7	127.4	90.8	88.4	109.3
25	Nagaland									
26	Odisha	10	11.1	12.2	8.4	8.6	9.6	9.2	9.9	10.9
27	Pondicherry	31.3	32.9	41.1	26.6	28	32.2	28.8	30.4	36.6
28	Punjab	8	9.6	12.2	8.8	10.5	12.6	8.4	10	12.4
29	Rajasthan	14.1	15.6	17	9.3	9.5	11.2	11.8	12.7	14.3
30	Sikkim	28.9	18.9	61.8	26.8	17.3	58.7	27.8	18.1	60.2
31	Tamil Nadu	30.3	31.4	32.2	26.7	28.6	30.6	28.5	30.1	31.4
32	Telangana		35.2	36.2		29.1	31.8		32.2	34
33	Tripura	12.6	14.4	19.3	8.5	9.7	12.3	10.6	12.1	15.8
34	Uttar Pradesh	12.6	15.2	16.8	13.2	17.3	18.5	12.9	16.1	17.6
35	Uttarakhand	17.1	21.1	30.4	17.2	20.2	30.9	17.2	20.7	30.7
36	West Bengal	10.2	11.8	12.5	7.6	8.7	9.7	9	10.3	11.1
	All India	15.8	16.9	18.3	13.9	15	16.5	14.9	16	17.4

(Source: AISHE 2011-12, AISHE 2012-13, AISHE 2013-14 Provisional)

Table 7: State wise growth in GER (ST)

S. No.	State	ST GER								
		Male GER			Female GER			Total GER		
		2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
1	Andaman & Nicobar Islands	4.6	4.2	2.6	10	10.8	5.1	7.2	7.4	3.8
2	Andhra Pradesh	29.5	25.9	24.7	19.2	17	17.7	24.2	21.2	21
3	Arunachal Pradesh	27.1	23.6	30.7	22.7	24.4	29.7	24.8	24	30.2
4	Assam	15.7	16.7	16.2	16	16.7	16	15.9	16.7	16.1
5	Bihar	15.9	16	12.2	14	13.1	9.8	15	14.6	11
6	Chandigarh									

7	Chhattisgarh	4.9	6.9	8.8	4.5	5.9	7.1	4.7	6.4	7.9
8	Dadra & Nagar Haveli	2.9	3.5	5.1	0.9	1.4	3.7	1.9	2.4	4.4
9	Daman & Diu	17.4	16.5	19.6	7.5	9.5	12.1	12.5	13	15.9
10	Delhi									
11	Goa	11.8	13.2	15.5	13.6	16.9	19.6	12.7	15	17.5
12	Gujarat	9.5	11.4	12.5	8.7	10.5	11.7	9.1	11	12.1
13	Haryana									
14	Himachal	19	21.4	21.2	19.6	20.3	20.7	19.3	20.9	21
15	Jammu & Kashmir	8	9.4	9.5	5.8	6.9	7.7	6.9	8.2	8.7
16	Jharkhand	5.3	7	6.4	6	7.9	7.7	5.6	7.5	7.1
17	Karnataka	15.8	15.6	16.3	12.7	12.5	13.8	14.3	14.1	15.1
18	Kerala	12.9	12.9	13.5	15	15.2	17	14	14.1	15.3
19	Lakshadweep	1.5	1.7	1.8	4.9	5.3	5.7	3.2	3.5	3.7
20	Madhya Pradesh	8.4	7	7.9	5.8	4.9	5.6	7.1	5.9	6.7
21	Maharashtra	14.2	11.3	12.8	8.6	6.5	7.3	11.4	8.9	10.1
22	Manipur	20.5	20.8	24	18.2	18.7	24.4	19.4	19.8	24.2
23	Meghalaya	13.6	11.5	12.7	16.1	15.6	16.8	14.9	13.6	14.8
24	Mizoram	20	22.5	23.4	18.4	21.6	21.8	19.2	22.1	22.6
25	Nagaland	11.7	12.1	11.9	12.8	12.6	13.1	12.3	12.3	12.5
26	Odisha	7.2	7.1	7.7	6	5.5	5.8	6.6	6.2	6.7
27	Pondicherry									
28	Punjab									
29	Rajasthan	15.1	15.7	17	10.1	9	10.6	12.7	12.4	13.9
30	Sikkim	15.6	13.4	13	22.4	21.8	16.3	19	17.6	14.7
31	Tamil Nadu	36.1	34.4	37.8	29.1	21.1	23.7	32.5	27.6	30.6
32	Telengana		32.5	34.2		21.6	24.4		27	29.2
33	Tripura	8.3	10.2	9.5	4.8	6.3	5.6	6.4	8.1	7.4

34	Uttar Pradesh	23.6	25.2	26.2	17.2	23.6	24	20.5	24.4	25.1
35	Uttarakhand	39.1	42.5	41.9	41.4	46	49.5	40.2	44.3	45.7
36	West Bengal	7.7	8.7	9.4	5.3	6	6.6	6.4	7.3	8
	All India	12.4	12.4	13.3	9.7	9.8	10.6	11	11.1	12

(Source: AISHE 2011-12, AISHE 2012-13, AISHE 2013-14 Provisional)

Table 8: State wise growth in GER(Female)

S. No.	State	Female GER								
		SC GER			ST GER			Total GER		
		2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
1	Andaman & Nicobar Islands				10	10.8	5.1	13.8	22.7	17.1
2	Andhra Pradesh	22.9	19.8	21.9	19.2	17	17.7	26.4	23.6	25.4
3	Arunachal Pradesh				22.7	24.4	29.7	20.2	19.8	24.7
4	Assam	12.2	14.1	15.9	16	16.7	16	14.8	13.7	14.9
5	Bihar	6.1	6.6	6.6	14	13.1	9.8	10.8	11.6	11.7
6	Chandigarh	22.5	23.8	26.9				54.4	58.3	64.4
7	Chhattisgarh	7.3	9.6	10.5	4.5	5.9	7.1	10.1	11.7	13
8	Dadra & Nagar Haveli	5.8	6.9	19.1	0.9	1.4	3.7	6.4	7.1	8.1
9	Daman & Diu	18.5	14.3	24.1	7.5	9.5	12.1	6.2	6.9	8.6
10	Delhi	17	20.6	23.5				39	40.8	43.4
11	Goa	24.5	25.1	26.4	13.6	16.9	19.6	25.9	31	31.2
12	Gujarat	15.1	17.8	21.4	8.7	10.5	11.7	14.7	16.2	17.2
13	Haryana	16.6	15.7	16.3				27.7	26.6	26.9

14	Himachal	13.9	14.1	15	19.6	20.3	20.7	25.1	26.3	27.4
15	Jammu & Kashmir	12.1	17.5	17.1	5.8	6.9	7.7	24	27.1	26.4
16	Jharkhand	4.9	7.2	7.8	6	7.9	7.7	9.5	12	12
17	Karnataka	14.2	15.6	16.4	12.7	12.5	13.8	22.7	24.5	25.7
18	Kerala	21.8	22.8	26.5	15	15.2	17	25.6	25.8	29.1
19	Lakshadweep				4.9	5.3	5.7	17.5	17.7	18
20	Madhya Pradesh	10.9	10.8	11.2	5.8	4.9	5.6	14.6	15.2	17.6
21	Maharashtra	22	16.9	19	8.6	6.5	7.3	24.3	20.6	22.9
22	Manipur	54.6	45.3	55.1	18.2	18.7	24.4	29.9	29	36.8
23	Meghalaya	32.5	34.8	53.4	16.1	15.6	16.8	18.5	19.7	19.1
24	Mizoram	112.7	93.7	127.4	18.4	21.6	21.8	18.3	22	21.5
25	Nagaland				12.8	12.6	13.1	13.4	12.8	13.2
26	Odisha	8.4	8.6	9.6	6	5.5	5.8	15	14.1	14.8
27	Pondicherry	26.6	28	32.2				36.3	41.8	43.5
28	Punjab	8.8	10.5	12.6				23.6	25.6	26.6
29	Rajasthan	9.3	9.5	11.2	10.1	9	10.6	15.5	14.8	16.1
30	Sikkim	26.8	17.3	58.7	22.4	21.8	16.3	27.4	26.9	28.8
31	Tamil Nadu	26.7	28.6	30.6	29.1	21.1	23.7	36.8	38.7	39.8
32	Telangana		29.1	31.8		21.6	24.4		29.3	31.9
33	Tripura	8.5	9.7	12.3	4.8	6.3	5.6	10.2	11.7	12.7
34	Uttar Pradesh	13.2	17.3	18.5	17.2	23.6	24	17.2	20.4	21.6
35	Uttarakhand	17.2	20.2	30.9	41.4	46	49.5	32.3	34	35
36	West Bengal	7.6	8.7	9.7	5.3	6	6.6	11.8	13.2	14.4
	All India	13.9	15	16.5	9.7	9.8	10.6	194	20.1	21.4

(Source: AISHE 2011-12, AISHE 2012-13, AISHE 2013-14 Provisional)

1. Student- Teacher Ratio

One of the significant quality parameters in higher education is the Student – Teacher ratio. In 2012, before the Centrally Sponsored Scheme was initiated, the student – teacher ratio was abysmally low. Given the commitments made by the states under RUSA on removal of ban on recruitment, many states have gone ahead and started the process of filling faculty positions, except in few states where there are pending matters of litigation. It is quite remarkable to see that the STR (2012), which was at 24:1 has actually progressed well and it currently at 20:1 (2014) inching closer to the global average (14:1). Source: RUSA Document and UGC Annual Report 2013-14

Table 9: Student teacher Ratio (STR)

Year	STR
2012-13	24:1
2013-14	20:1

Source: RUSA Document and UGC Annual Report 2013-14

X. Prerequisites

1. State Higher Education Council: Prior to the formation of RUSA, 9 State Higher Education Councils were created by an Act of the legislature. The States joined RUSA with a commitment to create a State Higher Education Council within a stipulated time indicated by them. Till now, 22 additional States have already created State Higher Education Councils through an executive order. It is now incumbent on them to have these approved by their State Legislature within two years of their creation. Table 10 indicates the dates of the formation of the State Higher Education Councils.

Table 10: Post RUSA creation of State Higher Education Council (SHEC)

S No.	Name of the State	Date of SHEC Formation
1	Arunachal Pradesh	11.07.2014
2	Assam	2014 Jan
3	Bihar	28.03.2014
4	Chhattisgarh	29.01.2014
5	Gujarat	8.12.2008

6	Goa	12.09.2014
7	Himachal	6.01.2014
8	Jharkhand	10.9.2014
9	Madhya Pradesh	14.03.2014
10	Manipur	28.10.2013
11	Mizoram	11.9.2013 reconstituted on 13 May 2014
12	Nagaland	23.05.2014
13	Odisha	09.05.2014
14	Punjab	2013
15	Pondicherry	15.12.2014
16	Rajasthan	Jun-15
17	Sikkim	14.06.2014
18	Telangana	05.08.2014
19	Tripura	20.02.2014
20	Uttarakhand	28-02-2014
21	Andaman *Nicobar (UT)	20-12-2013
22	Daman & Diu	18.11.2015

2. State Perspective Plan: Till date 34 states except Delhi and Lakshadweep out of 36 states and the UTs have submitted higher education plan. Each state has to prepare a State Higher Education Plan through a bottom-up approach in consultation with their key stakeholders. Table 11 shows the Higher Education Plans by states.

Table 11: Submission of Higher Education Plans by States

S. No	Name Of State / UT
1	Mizoram
2	Uttarakhand

3	Kerala
4	Karnataka
5	Punjab
6	West Bengal
7	Andhra Pradesh
8	Jammu & Kashmir
9	Haryana
10	Telangana
11	Jharkhand
12	Bihar
13	Madhya Pradesh
14	Rajasthan
15	Sikkim
16	Arunachal Pradesh
17	Chattisgarh
18	Manipur
19	Assam
20	Gujarat
21	Uttar Pradesh
22	Goa
23	Himachal Pradesh
24	Odisha
25	Maharashtra
26	Nagaland
27	Tripura
28	Tamil Nadu
29	Puducherry

3. State contribution to higher education as a % of GSDP: In order to ensure that States increase their contribution to higher education post-RUSA up to 2% GSDP, States were asked to give commitments, while joining the scheme to increase spending for higher education. Based on available data from states, it is encouraging to note that overall there has been an increase in states spending in higher education as a percentage of its GSDP barring few exceptions. Significantly, states like Bihar, Mizoram, Assam and Goa have made good progress and are contributing to more than 1%. Tamil Nadu continues to be an outlier with over 2% contribution. Table 12 shows expenditure on Higher Education as % of GSDP

Table 12: Expenditure on Higher Education as % of GSDP

S.No.	Region	State	Expenditure on HE as % of GSDP at the time of Joining RUSA	Expenditure on HE as % of GSDP present value
1	Eastern	West Bengal	0.34% (2013-14)	
2		Odisha	0.56% (2013-14)	0.59% (2014-15)
3		Bihar	1.33% (2013-14)	1.59% (2014-15)
4		Jharkhand	0.42% (2013-14)	
5	North Eastern	Sikkim	0.47% (2013-14)	0.52% (2014-15)
6		Mizoram	1.26% (2012-13)	1.49% (2013-14)
7		Manipur	2% (2012-13)	
8		Meghalaya	0.75% (2011-12)	0.45% (2014-15)
9		Nagaland	0.48% (2011-12)	0.66% (2013-14)
10		Tripura	0.7% (2011-12)	0.93% (2013-14)
11		Assam	0.77% (2011-12)	1.31% (2014-15)
12		Arunachal Pradesh	Not Provided	
13	North	J&K	0.6% (2012-13)	
14		Haryana	0.30%	
15		Punjab	0.28% (2012-13)	0.21% (2013-14)

16		Himachal	0.85% (2013-14)	
17		Delhi	Not Provided	
18		Chandigarh	1.83% (2012-13)	
19		Uttarakhand	0.22% (2012-13)	0.25% (2014-15)
20	Central	MP	0.35% (2013-14)	
21		Chattisgarh	0.463% (2013-14)	0.585% (2014-15)
22		Rajasthan	0.21% (2013-14)	0.23% (2014-15)
23		UP	0.256% (2011-12)	0.201% (2013-14)
24		Maharashtra	0.37% (2011-12)	0.45% (2014-15)
25		Gujarat	0.27 (2011-12)	0.28 (2014-15)
26		Goa		1.08% (2014-15)
27		Daman and Diu	1.54% (2012-13)	
28	West	Dadar and Nagar Haveli	Not Provided	
29		Tamil Nadu	2.47% (2012-13)	2.54% (2014-15)
30		Karnataka	0.41% (2012-13)	
31		Kerala	0.57% (2012-13)	
32		AP	0.32% (2013-14)	
33		Telangana	Not Provided	
34		Andaman and Nicobar Islands	0.72% (2011-12)	
35	South	Pondicherry	0.8 (2013-14)	0.72% (2014-15)

Source: State Government and SHEP

4. Filling faculty vacancies: One of the pre-conditions of RUSA has been to remove a ban on recruitment and fill up faculty positions. It is heartening to see that more than 90% of states have complied with this pre-condition, and the process of faculty recruitment, which is a time consuming process, is underway in several states.

5. Formation of the State Project Directorate (SPDs): For better implementation of RUSA at the State level, it was envisaged to set up a State Project Directorate, who could be a vital link between the State Higher Education Department and the State Higher Education Council. 25 states have made progress in setting up SPDs after the launch of RUSA.

6. Accreditation reforms, Affiliation reforms, Governance and Administrative Reforms: Several of these are reform measures which are often time consuming and also involve legislative process (for instance, Governance Reforms). Reasonable time was given to States to undertake these reforms. Many states have been working on the process of reducing affiliation and undertaking efforts to bring about changes to the University Act. States like Odisha, Maharashtra, Bihar, Madhya Pradesh, Gujarat, Chhattisgarh, Rajasthan and Uttar Pradesh have initiated the process of reforming their Public Universities' Act to address some of the Governance and Administrative Reforms at the institutional and system level.

7. Component Wise Support to States – Physical and Financial Targets

Table 13: Synopsis of the Physical and Financial targets

	Component Name	Physical created	Units	Financial release
1	Preparatory Grants	N.A.		₹ 95.249
2	MMER	N.A.		₹ 2.526
3	Infrastructure Grants to Universities	96		₹ 206.600
4	Infrastructure Grants to colleges	987		₹ 243.012
5	Vocationalization	101		₹ 3.670

6	Equity Initiatives	8 States	₹ 4.395
7	Upgradation of existing degree colleges into model degree colleges	24	₹ 13.506
8	Model Degree Colleges	71	₹ 205.046
9	Creation of cluster Universities	2	₹ 8.235
10	Creation of Professional Colleges	10	₹ 37.150
11	Faculty Improvement	4	₹ 1.448
	Total	-	₹ 820.836

Table 14: State wise breakup of support under various components under RUSA

Name of State	Component Total in Rupees	Number of Physical Units
Andaman & Nicobar Islands	785,85,000	1
MMER	5,85,000	
Model Degree Colleges (1)	585,00,000	1
Preparatory Grants	195,00,000	
Andhra Pradesh	3150,80,800	48
Infrastructure Grants to Colleges (43)	1075,00,000	43
Infrastructure Grants to Universities (1)	250,00,000	1
MMER Grants	28,80,800	
Model Degree Colleges (4)	1472,00,000	4
Preparatory Grants	325,00,000	
Arunachal Pradesh	700,20,000	5

Infrastructure Grants to Colleges (2)	45,00,000	2
MMER Grants	2,70,000	
New Professional College (1)	292,50,000	1
Preparatory Grants	270,00,000	
Upgradation of existing Colleges to Model Degree Colleges (2)	90,00,000	2
Assam	2007,60,000	50
Infrastructure Grants to Colleges (36)	810,00,000	36
Infrastructure Grants to Universities (2)	234,00,000	2
MMER Grants	3,60,000	
Model Degree Colleges (12)	600,00,000	12
Preparatory Grants	360,00,000	
Bihar	262,60,000	
MMER Grants	2,60,000	
Preparatory Grants	260,00,000	
Chandigarh	196,95,000	
MMER	1,95,000	
Preparatory Grants	195,00,000	
Chhattisgarh	3013,60,000	61
Equity Initiatives	62,50,000	
Infrastructure Grants to Colleges (54)	1000,00,000	54
Infrastructure Grants to Universities (7)	1688,50,000	7

MMER Grants	2,60,000	
Preparatory Grants	260,00,000	
Dadar & Nagar Havelli	196,95,000	
MMER	1,95,000	
Preparatory Grants	195,00,000	
Daman & Diu	196,95,000	
MMER	1,95,000	
Preparatory Grants	195,00,000	
Delhi	151,50,000	
MMER Grants	1,50,000	
Preparatory Grants	150,00,000	
Goa	646,95,000	9
Infrastructure Grants to Colleges (8)	200,00,000	8
Infrastructure Grants to Universities (1)	250,00,000	1
MMER Grants	1,95,000	
Preparatory Grants	195,00,000	
Gujarat	2340,84,801	47
Equity Initiatives	27,07,000	
Faculty Improvement (3)	54,27,500	3
Infrastructure Grants to Colleges (37)	618,77,651	37
Infrastructure Grants to Universities (7)	1312,47,650	7
MMER Grants	3,25,000	
Preparatory Grants	325,00,000	
Haryana	262,60,000	

MMER Grants	2,60,000	
Preparatory Grants	260,00,000	
Himachal Pradesh	5459,00,451	48
Equity Initiatives	172,90,451	
Infrastructure Grants to Colleges (48)	3047,50,000	48
Infrastructure Grants to Universities (1)	725,00,000	1
MMER Grants	3,60,000	
Preparatory Grants	360,00,000	
Professional Colleges (New) -1	985,00,000	1
Upgradation of existing Degree Colleges to Model	165,00,000	
Jammu & Kashmir	3507,85,000	51
Creation of Cluster Universities (2)	823,50,000	2
Infrastructure Grants to Colleges (22)	489,81,000	22
Infrastructure Grants to Universities (2)	450,00,000	2
MMER Grants	3,60,000	
New Professional College (2)	1170,00,000	2
Preparatory Grants	360,00,000	
Upgradation of existing Degree Colleges to Model Degree colleges (3)	135,00,000	3
Vocationalisation of Higher Education (20)	75,94,000	20
Jharkhand	1759,45,000	33

Equity Initiative	62,50,000	
Infrastructure Grants to Colleges (30)	750,00,000	30
Infrastructure Grants to Universities (3)	750,00,000	3
MMER Grants	1,95,000	
Preparatory Grants	195,00,000	
Karnataka	4455,75,000	65
Infrastructure Grants to Colleges (60)	2250,00,000	60
Infrastructure Grants to Universities (5)	1877,50,000	5
MMER Grants	3,25,000	
Preparatory Grants	325,00,000	
Kerala	1034,47,500	19
Infrastructure Grants to Colleges (15)	121,87,500	15
Infrastructure Grants to Universities (4)	650,00,000	4
MMER Grants	2,60,000	
Preparatory Grants	260,00,000	
Madhya Pradesh	1105,00,000	21
Infrastructure Grants to Colleges (18)	292,50,000	18
Infrastructure Grants to Universities (3)	487,50,000	3
Preparatory Grants	325,00,000	
Maharashtra	2703,19,951	14
Infrastructure Grants to Colleges (5)	125,00,000	5

Infrastructure Grants to Universities (9)	2250,00,000	9
MMER Grants	3,24,951	
Preparatory Grants	324,95,000	
Manipur	740,70,000	60
Infrastructure Grants to Colleges (20)	450,00,000	20
MMER Grants	2,70,000	
Preparatory Grants	270,00,000	
Vocationalization of Higher Education (40)	18,00,000	40
Meghalaya	270,00,000	
Preparatory Grants	270,00,000	
Mizoram	598,95,000	23
Infrastructure Grants to Colleges (21)	236,25,000	21
MMER Grants	2,70,000	
Preparatory Grants	270,00,000	
Upgradation of existing Degree Colleges to Model (2)	90,00,000	2
Nagaland	857,70,000	31
Infrastructure Grants to Colleges (15)	337,50,000	15
MMER Grants	2,70,000	
New Model Colleges (General) - (1)	135,00,000	1
Preparatory Grants	270,00,000	
Vocationalization of Higher Education (15)	112,50,000	15
Odisha	10847,55,000	114

Infrastructure Grants to Colleges (97)	3321,25,000	97
Infrastructure Grants to Universities (8)	4062,50,000	8
MMER Grants	33,80,000	
Model Degree Colleges (8)	3120,00,000	8
Preparatory Grants	260,00,000	
Upgradation of existing Degree Colleges to Model (1)	50,00,000	1
Puducherry	470,00,000	11
Infrastructure Grants to Colleges (11)	275,00,000	11
Preparatory Grants	195,00,000	
Punjab	6248,71,500	108
Creation of Professional Colleges (New) (2)	845,00,000	2
Equity Initiatives (47)	114,56,500	47
Erstwhile Model Degree Colleges (2nd instalment for 11 erstwhile MDCs)	1468,50,000	
Infrastructure Grants to Colleges (38)	1852,50,000	38
Infrastructure Grants to Universities (2)	975,00,000	2
MMER Grants	2,60,000	
New Model Colleges (2)	292,50,000	2
Preparatory Grants	260,00,000	
Upgradation of Existing Colleges to MDCs (4)	277,50,000	4
Vocationalisation of Higher Education (13)	160,55,000	13

Rajasthan	3025,00,000	72
Infrastructure Grants to Colleges (68)	1700,00,000	68
Infrastructure Grants to Universities (4)	1000,00,000	4
Preparatory Grants	325,00,000	
Sikkim	270,00,000	
Preparatory Grants	270,00,000	
Tamil Nadu	1822,50,000	43
Infrastructure Grants to Colleges (36)	585,00,000	36
Infrastructure Grants to Universities (5)	812,50,000	5
Preparatory Grants	325,00,000	
Upgradation of existing Degree Colleges to Model (2)	100,00,000	2
Telangana	2343,80,000	34
Infrastructure Grants to Colleges (30)	750,00,000	30
Infrastructure Grants to Universities (1)	250,00,000	1
Model Degree Colleges (3)	1083,80,000	3
Preparatory Grants	260,00,000	
Tripura	2012,22,000	14
Infrastructure Grants to Colleges (11)	222,50,000	11
MMER Grants	17,72,000	
Model Degree Colleges (3)	1502,00,000	3
Preparatory Grants	270,00,000	
Uttar Pradesh	13917,09,949	106

Faculty Improvement (1)	65,00,000	1
Infrastructure Grants to Colleges (66)	1462,50,000	66
Infrastructure Grants to Universities (11)	1397,50,000	11
MMER Grants	104,64,949	
Model Degree Colleges (26)	10140,00,000	26
New Professional College (2)	422,50,000	2
Preparatory Grants	324,95,000	
Uttarakhand	1673,65,000	39
Faculty Improvement to Academic Staff College (1)	25,48,000	1
Infrastructure Grants to Colleges (30)	673,20,000	30
Infrastructure Grants to Universities (3)	337,50,000	3
MMER Grants	3,60,000	
New Model Degree College(1)	105,81,000	
Preparatory Grants	360,00,000	
Upgradation of existing Degree Colleges to Model (5)	168,06,000	5
West Bengal	3047,60,000	63
Infrastructure Grants to Universities (5)	900,00,000	5
Infrastructure Grants to Colleges (58)	1885,00,000	58
MMER Grants	2,60,000	
Preparatory Grants	260,00,000	

Grand Total	82083,61,952	1190
--------------------	---------------------	-------------

XI. Progress on components

The following has been the progress made on each of the components:

- a) Up-gradation of existing autonomous colleges to Universities – 7 autonomous colleges have been approved to be converted into universities (2016).
- b) Conversion of colleges to Cluster Universities – 8 Cluster Universities have been approved to be created by identifying some of the high performing colleges within the radius of 20 km (2016). These colleges will offer inter-disciplinary and multidisciplinary courses and will provide an ecosystem for more creative, innovative and holistic learning.

The creation of Universities and Cluster University is intended to bring about a remarkable shift in providing high quality teaching and research in some of India's finest colleges, which have a traditional legacy of providing high quality education. In addition, these institutions will also be able to create a brand value for themselves and attract high quality students. These institutions are to be created in States like Jammu and Kashmir, Himachal Pradesh, Odisha, Maharashtra, Manipur and Uttar Pradesh, Pondicherry. Significantly, the University which will be created in Odisha by conversion of an Autonomous College will be a Women's University. Interestingly, 4 of such institutions are being supported in special category states. Going forward, this will also result in a process of unburdening the University system, which unfortunately, is plagued by affiliation crisis.

- c. Infrastructure grants to Universities: 115 State Universities are being supported under this component out of a target of 150 to be achieved. An impressive 77% of the target has already been achieved under this category.
- d. New Model Colleges (General) and New Colleges (Professional): 72 new model degree colleges and 25 professional colleges have been approved.

New Model Degree Colleges (General) has been a part of the erstwhile scheme during the 11th Plan (2007-2012). The purpose of creating model degree colleges is to improve access and reasonable quality consciousness in higher education. The objective has been to also address issues of backwardness by empowering youth and making higher education opportunities closer to them. Sadly, the scheme was not successful to a large extent during the 11th Plan period. Under the new scheme, a much targeted intervention and better planning has resulted in scaling up significant number of existing colleges by creating MDCs (72). This component has already surpassed its 12th Plan target of 60 and the demand for this component seems to be growing.

One of the concerns prior to RUSA was that there is a crying need to establish engineering colleges in eastern, central and north-eastern part of the country, since there is not much of engineering education available here. Consequently, these have been created. RUSA has approved a total of 25 engineering colleges.

Of the 97 new colleges created, 82 are in Educationally Backward Districts. The creation of these institutions will provide a fillip to good quality general and engineering education. In addition, this is bound to provide more access and equity opportunities in regions where there is an appetite for good quality, affordable education.

- a. Up gradation of existing degree colleges to model colleges: The erstwhile model degree college scheme envisioned to cover only 374 EBDs listed by the UGC. It was quintessentially important to create model degree colleges in all the underserved and underdeveloped parts of the country. The up gradation of existing Degree College to Model College component of RUSA envisages covering all the remaining non EBD. A total of 56 such colleges have been approved so far.

Both these above mentioned components will address issues of access, equity in very difficult parts of the country and also provide reasonable quality education hitherto missing.

- b. Infrastructure grants to colleges: 1163 colleges (33%) are being supported under this scheme so far out of a target of 3,500 colleges.
- c. Equity initiatives: One of the broad objectives of the scheme is to provide and improve opportunities for equal access. This scheme has now covered 16 (2016) states out of a target of 20 (2017). It is significant to see that this scheme has been supported in states like Chhattisgarh, Gujarat, Himachal Pradesh, Jharkhand, Punjab etc.
- d. Faculty Improvement: This component is aimed at supporting well performing academic staff colleges in the country. A review of the performance of these staff colleges was undertaken by the UGC and the list of well performing institutions are available on the UGC website. RUSA is now supporting 8 academic staff colleges for bringing about improvements in teacher training in disciplinary domain, pedagogy and soft skills for academic staff.
- e. Vocationalisation of Higher Education: Given the Central Government's emphasis on improving skilling and creating opportunities for gainful employment, this is a very important component. In order to ensure that meaningful activities are supported within the larger framework of the Government's skill priority, about 7 states have been supported under this initiative (2016), out of a target of 20 for the 12th Plan.

XII. Best Practices

Odisha	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● State Tracking Cell for effective monitoring and implementation.● Robust data collection mechanism.● Over 90 % filling up faculty positions.● Merit based transparent process of appointment of Vice-Chancellors.● Judicious and outcome driven activities under the preparatory grants.
Chhattisgarh	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Balanced composition of the State Higher Education Council.● Timely transfer of States' share.● Online transfer of resources to institutions.
Goa	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Highly meritorious search process to appoint members of State Higher Education Council.● High degree of consultation in the preparation of the State Higher Education plan.
Maharashtra	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● High quality search committee for Vice-Chancellors' appointment● Pro-active State Project Directorate● High number of institutions receiving accreditation● Highly consultative process in the formulation of a new Public University Act

Madhya Pradesh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Documentation of Financial Manual for better financial management and accounting of Universities
Tamil Nadu	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Enabling ecosystem for providing autonomy to colleges ● % Expenditure on higher education as a percentage of GSDP above national average
West Bengal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Robust and highly empowered State Higher Education Council ● Emphasis on faculty recruitment drive ● Considerable autonomy to Universities ● Significant emphasis on the creation of Universities by converting high quality colleges through an act of state legislature
Andhra Pradesh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Judicious and productive utilisation of preparatory grants Large numbers of sensitisation workshops in colleges and universities on RUSA ● Organised several capacity building workshops for better understanding of the scheme ● Bottom up planning in the preparation of State Higher Education Plan ● Timely submission of utilisation certificates
Karnataka	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Highly consultative process of preparation of State Plan ● High quality data gathering technique using baseline survey ● Good institutional data repository

Kerala	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Proactive State Higher Education Council ● Almost close to achieving national requirement of filling faculty position (80%)
Mizoram	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Very robust process of implementation of RUSA ● Purposeful and effective utilisation of preparatory grants
Gujarat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Setting up of the Technical Support Group. ● Bottom up planning and comprehensive baseline surveys informing the state higher education plan. ● Implementing vocationalisation of high education is well thought through and target oriented.

A majority of the above mentioned initiatives/components have been implemented in their true spirit over the last one year. A considerable amount of interest by the States for availing a number of components have been witnessed in this period. Consequently, the impact of the implementation of many of the initiatives under various components will be visible within the next one year. With a robust implementation and effective monitoring, it is expected that RUSA will be able to achieve the goals of its objectives. It will also empower the States in the true spirit of cooperative and competitive federalism to drive the higher education policy initiatives.

XIII. Action items for the States:

1. The States have to undertake a comprehensive baseline survey through a scientifically rigorous process and assess the felt need of the state's requirement in planning for Higher Education intervention.
2. The States have to adhere to the RUSA timeline of setting up State Higher Education Councils through an Act of the State Legislature, December 2015 being the deadline. These have to be formed as per the guidelines in the RUSA document. It has also been observed that in many cases State Council of Higher Education have not met since its inception.
3. It has been observed that in many States, SPD have still not been formed and in other cases full time SPDs have not been constituted – Principal Secretaries of the Higher Education Department have been holding additional charge as SPDs. There is a need to urgently correct this anomaly and full time SPDs need to be placed at the earliest.
4. Interface of SHEC and SPD
5. States have to ensure that their contribution to the central share is shared in a timely manner and this is transferred to the beneficiary institutions in a time bound manner. This is a quintessential requirement if the States have to see progress on the ground and if they are to receive future grants under the scheme. In some cases it is deeply concerning that the preparatory grant which was given to States have either not been utilized, very little has been utilized or not even transferred to the RUSA account.
6. The Ministry is going to initiate the process of getting future fund releases to States done under the scheme through the Public Finance Management System (PFMS). This would require States and the beneficiary institutions to port this in the PFMS platform. The purpose of this is to monitor the flow of funds, timely transfer and the pace of utilization. Later this afternoon, a presentation on this is to be made by the officials from the Controller General of Accounts (CGA).

7. TSG – The purpose of providing preparatory amount up front when you joined the scheme was to put necessary system/processes in place and provide you with human resources so that the requisite infrastructural architecture was available to drive the scheme in a mission mode manner. Unfortunately, this has not happened and preparatory grants have sadly not been put to good use.
8. You will appreciate that a large amount of public resources is being channelled under the scheme. It is important that what gets done from the resources made available needs to be monitored, evaluated and well documented. We have had some challenges in getting to know the status of various components approved under the scheme. We would like to know the actual realities and performance of the scheme on ground. I would urge States to do adequate documentation of various activities projects being supported under the scheme and place them in the public domain. This will help in monitoring the progress, sharing experiences in the interest of transparency.
9. We have now decided to engage with the Indian Space Research Organization (ISRO) to help the Ministry in using technology for real time mapping, monitoring and tracking performance of all beneficiary Institutions. This move of the Ministry is in keeping with the larger project of digital India which will help us to have a repository of data, images for future planning and decision making.
10. One of the core components of RUSA, through faculty Recruitment Support, has been to give a fillip to teaching and research in the State universities by providing them with additional faculty positions. It is extremely disheartening to see that barring States of Nagaland and Arunachal Pradesh, States have either not shown enthusiasm or have not been able to fulfil the requirements to be eligible for support under this component.
11. While it is encouraging to see some States taking advantage of components 1 (Creation of University by upgradation of autonomous colleges) & 2 (Creation of university by way of conversion of colleges in cluster), we would urge the States to take advantage of these components which will help in improving the quality of teaching research and innovation in the outstanding colleges in your state and also

address the issue of affiliation which is unfortunately having a debilitating impact on the quality of our colleges and state universities.

12. The scheme attaches great importance to support marginalized and vulnerable groups of the population. There is also considerable emphasis which is being given to women centric initiatives. These are reflected under the components – Vocationalisation of higher education and Equity initiatives. While 16 states have received support under Equity initiatives and 7 States under Vocationalization of higher education, it will be interesting to hear from States on the kind of activities you have undertaken under this very critical component which again give meaning and thrust to the larger agenda of skilling India initiative of the current Government.
13. One of the core objectives of RUSA is to achieve excellence in State Higher Education System. Research and Innovation form a critical element in achieving excellence. To improve the quality and achieve excellence, the scheme provided generous support to states in scaling up research and innovation initiatives. This is one of the components which has been opened up lately and States have shown some interest in receiving support under the scheme. I am happy to share with you that the last PAB gave approvals to some States – Nagaland, Maharashtra and Tamil Nadu under this component. The component provides significant opportunity for States to be creative, innovative and carve proposals which can give a significant boost to the current initiatives of the Government like Make in India, creating ecosystems for start-ups, providing opportunities for entrepreneurs and contributing towards the digital India Initiative. I would, therefore urge the States to come up with proposals which do not only have a strong research focus but can use applied research for addressing the developmental needs of the country.

XIV. Conclusion:

As on date, RUSA has held a record number of 10 PABs in a reasonably short time. During the course of these 9 PABs, an amount of Rs. 7918 cr has been approved and an amount to the tune of Rs.1163 cr has been released to the States. This year, 2015-16, alone, an amount of Rs. 800 cr has been released to States – close to 75% of the allocation made for the current year have already been released. The purpose of such acceleration has been due to the fact that the Ministry considers this programme to be

single most important CSS that will bring about a transformative change to the higher education system in the country. It is with great concern we observe that States have not been able to respond to the pace of central government releases and the action on the ground needs to be ramped up considerably. All future releases are now going to be outcome based. We have shared with you an assessment evaluation framework which captures the essence of the reform agenda that is pivotal to the success of the scheme. We will from now onwards be very closely monitoring the performance of the States along various pre requisites & commitments that were made by the States to the Govt. of India when you voluntarily agreed to be a part of the scheme. The time for free lunches are over and the fundamental principle in Economics: “For unto every one that hath shall be given, and he shall have abundance: but from him that hath not shall be taken even that which he hath” (Matthew phenomenon) will be applied from the upcoming financial year. The States will be evaluated on their performance through assessment evaluation framework which will be self-certified.

