

An Economic Thought over the Quality of Higher Education, Employment Generation and NIRF Ranking in India

P.Arunachalam

Professor and Head, Department of Applied Economics, Cochin University of Science and Technology, Kochi-22, Kerala

Abstract

Generally, countries are ranked according to their Gross Domestic Products (GDPs), Human Resource Developments, competitiveness index, poverty level, Per Capital Income, Industrial Development Index, Ease of Doing Business Index, etc. India is the sixth-largest economy based on its \$3 trillion GDP in nominal terms. Ranks will help countries realize/understand the status of their current positions. Accordingly, corrective measures could be adopted to reach a higher rank in the coming years to rectify those problems. Similar is the case with comparing/ranking universities and institutions within the national level to overcome the drawbacks identified by the ranking agencies. Generally, it is in practice to see that Ranking is prepared by comparing units with similar characteristics in all aspects or only among homogeneous groups. Then only the validity of the Ranking will be very high or acceptable to all to a large extent. If the Ranking is done among the inequalities, it is of no use for such Ranking and is highly unacceptable. For example, the Olympic game is conducted separately for ordinary boys and girls and the Para Olympic Games for physically challenged boys and girls. This is the standard scientific practice generally adopted anywhere.

Keywords: Quality, publications, higher education, institutions, recommendations, knowledge commission, and budget allocation

Introduction

Education plays a significant and remedial role in balancing the country's socio-economic fabric. Since citizens of India are its most valuable resource, our 1.39 billion-strong nation needs nurture and care in primary education to achieve a better quality of life. It warrants an overall development of our citizens, which can be achieved by building solid foundations in education. In pursuance of this mission, the Ministry of Education (MoE) was created on September 26, 1985, through the 174th amendment to the Government of India (Allocation of Business) Rules, 1961. The Department of Higher Education, Ministry of Education is responsible for the overall development of the basic infrastructure of the Higher Education

sector, both in terms of policy and planning. Under a planned development process, the Department looks after expansion of access and qualitative improvements in Higher Education through world-class Universities, Colleges, and other Institutions. To realize India's human resource potential to its fullest in the Higher Education sector, with equity and inclusion, has mission such as

- (a). Provide more excellent opportunities of access to Higher Education with equity to all the eligible persons and in particular to the vulnerable sections,
- (b). Expand access by supporting existing institutions, establishing new institutions, supporting State Governments and Non-Government Organisations/civil society to supplement public efforts aimed at removing regional or other imbalances that exist at present,
- (c). Initiate policies and programs for strengthening research and innovations and encourage institutions - public or private to engage in stretching the frontiers of knowledge, e. Promote the quality of Higher Education by investing in infrastructure and faculty, promoting academic reforms, improving governance, and institutional restructuring toward the inclusion of the hitherto deprived communities (education.gov.in).

Because of the continuous efforts taken by the government of India through the Ministry of Education, India reached one of the leading education providers of the world. Indian higher education system is the third-largest one in the world, next only to USA and China. According to The National Education Policy 1986, the higher education sector is viewed as, "Higher education provides people with an opportunity to reflect on the critical, social, economic, cultural, moral and spiritual issues facing humanity. It contributes to national development through the dissemination of specialized knowledge and skill. Being at the apex of the educational pyramid, it also has a key role in producing teachers for the education system".

On September 9, 2021, Education Minister of India Dharmendra Pradhan announced the National Institutional Rank Framework (NIRF) 2021, listing a group of institutions coming under the Ministry of Human Resource Development (MHRD), central universities, and some private institutions occupying the top positions with all bright highlights and the state-run universities and colleges occupying the poor ranks at the bottom level. Every year, the Ministry of Education is to prepare the National Institutional Ranking Framework (NIRF) ranking intending to promote competitive excellence in the higher educational institutions in the

country. MHRD is preparing this ranking system from 2015 onwards for students who aspire to pursue higher education in India. Generally, the following procedures are adopted in preparing the institutions'.

A. NIRF Ranking Categories: MHRD releases NIRF Ranking every year in nine categories. 1. Overall Ranking, 2. University Ranking, 3. Engineering Ranking, 4. College Ranking, 5. Management Ranking, 6. Pharmacy Ranking, 7. Law Ranking, 8. Architecture Ranking, 9. And Medical Ranking

B. NIRF Ranking Parameters. The NIRF Ranking is prepared based on five parameters 1. Teaching, Learning & Resources (TLR) Student Strength including Doctoral Students (SS) Faculty-student ratio with emphasis on permanent faculty (FSR) Combined metric for Faculty with PhD (or equivalent) and Experience (FQE) Financial Resources and their Utilization (FRU)

2. Research and Professional Practice (RP) Combined metric for Publications (PU) Combined metric for Quality of Publications (QP) IPR and Patents: Published and Granted (IPR) Footprint of Projects and Professional Practice (FPPP)

3. Graduation Outcomes (GO) Metric for University Examinations (GUE) Metric for PhDs. Students Graduated (GPHD) 4. Outreach and Inclusivity (OI) Percentage of Students from Other States/Countries (Region Diversity RD) Percentage of Women (Women Diversity WD) Economically and Socially Challenged Students (ESCS) Facilities for Physically Challenged Students (PCS) Perception (PR) Ranking

5. Peer Perception Academic Peers and Employers (PR) (Sahikanth Yechuri, 2021).

Nobody could question the scientific criteria designed/adopted and followed by the MHRD in ranking the universities and institutions for the competitive purpose. India has over 1003 universities, 54 central universities, and 436 state universities, 125 institutes which were granted the deemed to be university status, 388 private universities, and 130 INIs in India, as of 2021. This list includes 7 AIIMS, 23 IITs, 20 IIMs, 25 IIITs, 29 NITs, 7 IISERs, 3 NIDs, 1 NIPER; sometimes, it is claimed that there are 159 INIs in India. According to the MHRD Report 2020, about 52,627 government degree colleges, private colleges, standalone institutes, and postgraduate research institutions are functioning under these universities. One must appreciate central and state governments for creating many universities and institutions for the

past seventy-five years. Still, India lacks behind in establishing about 1500 universities as observed by the Knowledge Commission 2005 to fulfil the higher educational requirements of our present student's enrollment in the higher education sector. The New Educational Policy 2020 targeted creating opportunities for about 50 percent of students in the higher education sector by 2035.

When is everything going on very well? What is the need for this write-up? Yes, there is a need for that. What is the need for this Ranking? Who are the beneficiaries of this Ranking? Who are the losers of this Ranking? What are the advantages of this Ranking? Whether the Ranking of institutions and universities by MHRD acceptable? In this paper, just an attempt is being made to bring out the actual condition of the quality of the higher education sector in India and the failed role of the government in increasing employment opportunities for the 10 million graduates and postgraduates and 1.5 million engineering graduates coming out of our institutions in India every year. A series of policy recommendations have also been forwarded to rectify those gaps.

The Researcher need not give any secondary data to substantiate the current status of the quality of the higher education sector in India. The government presents the current status of the higher education sector constituted committee itself. According to the National Education Policy 2020, the higher education sector in India is facing the following problems (ugc.ac.in).

1. A severely fragmented higher educational ecosystem,
2. Less emphasis on the development of cognitive skills and learning outcomes,
3. A rigid separation of disciplines, with early specialization and streaming of students into narrow areas of study,
4. Limited access, particularly in socio-economically disadvantaged areas, with few HEIs that teach in local languages,
5. Limited teacher and institutional autonomy,
6. Inadequate mechanisms for merit-based career management and progression of faculty and institutional leaders,
7. Lesser emphasis on research at most universities and colleges, and lack of competitive peer-reviewed research funding across disciplines,

8. Suboptimal governance and leadership of HEIs, an ineffective regulatory system; and
9. Large affiliating universities are resulting in low standards of undergraduate education.

Some private agencies or foreign governments do not point out the above drawbacks. All these problems are pointed out by the committee constituted by the government of India to look into the issues of the higher education sector in India. To overcome the above drawbacks, the present government came with a New National Educational Policy 2020. The question here is whether the government had looked into all these problems before comparing universities, colleges, IITs, IIMs, NITs, and other central institutions on the same lines? Are they comparable with one another? That is the problem of Ranking of the institutions and universities at present. This paper is entirely based on secondary information collected from various government publications and economic dailies.

There is no doubt about the significant advantages of Ranking countries, industries, states from different aspects. Generally, countries are ranked according to their Gross Domestic Products (GDP), Human Resource Developments, competitiveness index, poverty level, Per Capital Income, Industrial Development Index, Ease of Doing Business Index, etc. India is the sixth-largest economy based on its \$3 trillion GDP in nominal terms. Ranks will help countries realize/understand the status of their current positions. Accordingly, corrective measures could be adopted to reach a higher rank in the coming years to rectify those problems.

Similar is the case with comparing/ranking universities and institutions within the national level to overcome the drawbacks identified by the ranking agencies. Generally, it is in practice to see that Ranking is prepared by comparing units with similar characteristics in all aspects or only among homogeneous groups. Then only the validity of the Ranking will be very high or acceptable to all to a large extent. If the Ranking is done among the inequalities, it is of no use for such Ranking and is highly unacceptable. For example, the Olympic game is conducted separately for ordinary boys and girls and the Para Olympic games for physically challenged boys and girls. This is the standard scientific practice generally adopted anywhere.

However, in the case of the National Institutional Ranking Framework, it has ultimately been ignored/avoided. Incomparable institutions and universities are being compared and ranked. Is it a scientific method to compare the highly funded central institutions like IITs, IIMs, NITs, Central Universities, and other Centrally funded intuitions with less funded state-level universities and colleges? They vary in all aspects with respect to infrastructural facilities

like lab, library, single room accommodation, canteen, opportunities for sports and physical fitness, loan and credit facilities, annual budget for the institutions, encouragement/financial support given to the faculty members in doing research and publishing research papers in highly indexed journals, financial support for participating national and international conferences/seminars/workshops to present their research findings within India and abroad, selection criteria of the faculty members, qualifications prescribed for recruitment of the teachers, salary structure or scale of pay for faculty members, implementation of reservations norms for BC, SC, ST, MBC, OEC, and socially and economically backward among the forward communities, location of the institutions, hospital facilities, availability of faculty member for 24 hours, retirement age of the faculty members, make use of after retirement service like adjunct faculty, senior fellowship programmes and emeritus professors etc, and selection of the students for UG, PG and Research programmes, etc. How can it bring all the incomparable institutions under one criterion with all these differences? Only the scientific world should provide answers to this question.

Because of this ranking system, only the students studying and the faculty members teaching in IITs and IIMs, IIC, NITs, some central universities, and some high investment private self-financing institutions will get many benefits. Their students will get perfect placement within India and abroad. They can bargain a good wage structure. The faculty members will get outstanding projects at the national and international levels. However, the percentage of students studying in these institutions is less than 3 percent. What about the remaining 97 percent of the students studying in other institutions and universities run by state governments? Is there any job guarantee for them? Are jobs available in India for those 97 percent of the students studying in government and aided colleges and universities? The ranking committee has to provide answers to these questions. According to the UK-based Times Higher Education (THE), India has just two universities/universities among Indian institutions among the world's top 400, as per World University Rankings 2021. The Indian Institute of Science (IISc in Bengaluru) and the Indian Institute of Technology (IIT), Ropar, are the two in the world's top 400. While IISc has been placed in the 301-350 groupings, IIT Ropar is in the 351-400 brackets (www.livemint.com).

Instead of creating job opportunities for the educated PG, UG, Ph.D. scholars, and engineers, we keep on finding fault with their qualifications, publications, knowledge in the subject, language, rural backgrounds, and experiences. The Employability Report 2019 has stated that over 80 percent of 1.5 million engineering graduates are unemployable for any jobs

in the knowledge economy. About 11.5 million children come out of our higher education institutions every year, but the government can create employment for less than 3.5 to 4 million students. The remaining students are unemployed. In 2019 about 40813 students completed their PhD degrees in India, but only one-third got employment opportunities. The remaining landed in self-financing and aided institutions and universities as casual workers, daily wage workers, and guest workers with a monthly salary of Rs. 5000/- to Rs. 20000/- There is no employment market for even science graduates. Out of 6000 science PhD holders, only 2000 got employments in aided institutions even though about 35 percent of the faculty positions were declared vacant in most universities and research institutions in India.

So one side, this type of Ranking helped the students of top-ranking institutions to go abroad, and on the other hand, it harmed and did nothing for the students from other universities and institutions. What does the government have to do to create employment opportunities for educated children? That is a must.

India has about 15,03 156 lakh college and university teachers as per 2019-20 data. Out of this, about 11.3 lakh teachers work in colleges, and 2.14 lakh teachers work in the university department. The entire research publications in India mainly depend on the teachers working in the university and research institutions. The "Knowledge Commission 2005" had clearly stated that about 84 percent of the teachers are working in government and aided intuitions or colleges. They have only limited publications. The remaining 16 percent of the faculty members working in universality departments and research institutions are expected to do research and publications. The college teachers publish only the required number of promotions and stop doing research and publications after getting promotions. The recent University Grant Commission has stated that even they need not supervise students and produce Ph. Ds for getting promotions as Professors. This attitude is reflected in our total number of publications. In 1990 Indian researchers published about 11563 research papers globally, and China published only about 6991 research papers in the same year. In 2005 India published 25227 research publications, and China published about 72632 publications. In 2018 India published about 1,35 788 research publications, and in the same year, China came with 5,28,263 research publications. In 1990 China published just half of India's publications, but it published 20.67 percent of the world's research publications.

On the other hand, India published only 5.31 percent of the world's publications. In the case of patents, India filed submitted about 14961 applications for getting patent rights in 2017, and at

the same time, China submitted 1.24 million applications for getting the patent rights in the same year. These data revealed where India stands among research institutions in the world.

According to the data presented by the Ministry, China had posted a GER of 25.65 in 2011 while India was at 22.76 during the same period. However, by 2017, China's GER moved to 49.07, but India's rose to only 27.4. In 2018, China's GER was 50.6, and India's was 28.06. Against 111 Chinese researchers per lakh population, India cuts a sorry figure of 15 per lakh population, as per the data from the Economic Survey of India 2016-17 (economictimes.indiatime.com). By 2040, all higher education institutions (HEIs) aim to become multidisciplinary institutions, each of which will aim to have 3,000 or more students. There shall, by 2030, be at least one oversized multidisciplinary HEI in or near every district. The aim will be to increase the Gross Enrolment Ratio in higher education, including vocational education, from 26.3% (2018) to 50% by 2035 (UGC. ac. in).

Similarly, the number of researchers per million population in India is only 216, but it is 1200 in China 4300 in the USA. Another important aspect is that the budget for research is also very limited in India. India spends 0.7 percent of budget/GDP only for research activities, and at the same time, South Korea allotted 4.23 percent, and China allotted 2.11 percent for research and development activities. Our publications and patent applications reflect this type of less allotment for research and development activities. The budget for 2021 has a proposal for the National Research Foundation with an investment of Rs. 50000/-crore for the next five years for boosting quantity and quality of research. The Researcher feared that most of these funds would be landed in IITs, NITs, IISc, and IIMs. Then how can we compare the institutions which are not going to get any share from this programme?

Why are only the top institutions getting more funds and other institutions neglected on all grounds? There is a reason for that. The recommendations of various committees for reforming India's education sector are not adequately addressed/accepted by the successive governments that ruled India. If the recommendations of the Sir John Sarjeant Committee 1944 on education were implemented scientifically, India could have become a 100 percent literate state before 1984 itself. The National Education Policy (1968), National Education Policy (1986), the Knowledge Commission 2005, and the National Education Policy 2020 also recommended about 6 percent of the GDP for education, as in the case of developed countries. Unfortunately, our allotment for education is always confined to less than 3.5 percent of the budget for education in all these years. According to the Economic Survey 2020-21, spending on

education as a percentage of GDP stagnated at 2.8 percent during 2014-2019 and increased to 3-3.5 percent in the 2019-21 period. In the budget 2021-22, the allocation for education has been reduced to Rs 93,223 crore from Rs 99,311 crore, as per the budgetary proposals and Rs 54,873 crore for school education and literacy, and Rs 38,350 crore for the higher education sector. So a high percentage of this budget is going to school education. This is the reason only 0.7 percent is allotted for research activities. It is reflected in our national and international publications and patent applications. Now, what should both central and state governments do to overcome all these hurdles to improve the quality of higher education and increase employment opportunities? To overcome the hurdles, the following suggestions are put forward. If properly accepted and implemented within two decades, India will be top in research publications and employment creations. Let us see them one by one

1. Central Government, in principle, should accept the NEP 2020 recommendations of allotting 6 percent of GDP for the education sector and at least 2.5 percent for research and development activities. About 2.1 percent of GDP for the research sector in China is reflected in their manufacturing sector revolution and publications. Nearly 45 percent of China's GDP comes from the manufacturing sector because of higher allotment for Research and innovation activities. One of the six pillars of the revival budget 2021-22 presented by the Finance Minister of India is "innovation and research and development."

2. Uniformity in the wage structure, retirement age, and retirement benefits is unavailable among India's colleges and universities. Both central and state governments should have a clear and concrete idea about the wage structure for university and college teachers and retirement age and use of retired faculty member's knowledge for research and publications purposes. Central universities, IITs, IIMs, NITs, IIC, and other central institutions have retirement age fixed at 65. They have the facilities to work even after retirement with all facilities. But this encouragement/facility/support system is not there for faculty members in state universities, colleges, and other private institutions. Though it is not considered discrimination, it is one of the de-motivating factors affecting the research interest of the faculty members working in state universities. State universities are playing a significant role in the higher education sector. If this sector is not adequately recognized and encouraged, it will affect the research publications and quality of the research programmes. UGC is formulating policies for the entire India, and at the same time, it seems that it has no power to implement the recommendations with the same spirit. Faculty members of State universities have been reasoning that an increase in retirement age, as in the case of their counterparts in Central universities, Indian Institutes of

Technology, and National Institutes of Technology, would motivate them to perform better. At the same time, UGC and NAAC are stringent to follow all the guidelines on quality which are common to both IITs and state universities. State universities are following all the criteria prescribed by the UGC in recruitment, assessing the contributions of the faculty members for promotions and publications like that of IIMs and IITs. Then why are there differences? Why is UGC not giving clear-cut directions to be followed by the state governments regarding the retirement age and utilization of after retirement services of teachers at the state level universities and colleges?. If UGC or the Government of India is not serious about implementing their regulations at the state university level, how can they adopt the same criteria for assessing and ranking the central institutions and universities with state universities? Is it acceptable for any scientific community?

3. In India, about 84 percent of the teachers work in government and aided colleges. However, their role in research works and publications is not up to the expected level. The college teachers should be encouraged to go for more publications. If a college teacher is handling four papers for a Post Graduate programme, the concerned teacher should prepare his/her study materials for the students, and then the same study materials should be converted into chapters and finally be published in the form of a book with ISBN book number. In this way, a PG faculty member could publish four books, and a UG faculty member could publish six books since they handled six papers for the degree students. UGC has to bring a new regulation on this. It should be in such a way that getting promotion as Associate Professor 20 research papers in peer-reviewed journals/UGC care journals/Scopus journals and two books in one's teaching subjects mandatory/compulsory. Similarly, for getting promotions as Professor grade, 40 research papers in peer-reviewed/UGC care journals/Scopus journals and four books in one's own teaching subject's mandatory/compulsory. This will help increase the number of research publications in India compared to China and other countries.

4. UGC provided financial support for publishing books and research articles in UGC unassigned grants up to 2014. It is not clear whether this programme is available at present or not. Government should revive this financial support programme again to encourage faculty members to go for more publications and writing books.

5. Government should prepare separate rank list for IITs, IIMs, NITs, central universities, state universities, deemed universities, and self-financing institutions. Rank should be within the homogenous groups and not among the heterogeneous groups.

6. Government should provide more liberal financial support programs for the institutions and universities that fared poorly in the rank list to create quality infrastructural facilities, lab facilities, and library facilities.

7. Most of the deemed universities and self-financing institutions are run by wealthy families directly or indirectly connected with political parties, either ruling, ruling or opposition level. Sometimes the politicians directly run the institutions with their family members. They should be encouraged to start industries under various industrialization programs such as the Make in India Programme, Startup Programme, Micro Units Development and Refinance Agency, and self-reliance programmes. If every institution has its industrial units functioning/working within or side-by-side with the institutions, they could efficiently train more practical knowledge. This will solve the problem of not having the required skills. The industry-required knowledge could be provided at the institutional level itself. This will solve the existing industry-institutional gap. Governments should sanction new institutions with the promise of starting an industrial unit within the premises simultaneously. This will help both skill development and employment. The demand for labour in India is likely to remain high and robust in the coming years, both nationally and internationally. However, this would demand skilled and qualified labor. "The employability of Indian youth has emerged as a major concern in recent years. Ironically, it is not just uneducated and untrained who lack skills but also the educated who consistently lie below the required standards. It is with this background that the study focuses on analyzing the growth and changing structure of the Indian higher education system in the light of the education profile of the Indian job seekers, labour market demands, and the employability index for India's high-growth sectors based on existing skill gaps and suggests a broad pathway to plug in the gaps and missing links. More robust demand for personnel in technical and professional services and a better employability index for the same sectors have probably led to skewed growth of the higher education sector. Therefore, the greater challenge is to prepare our larger lot of the educated graduates from the general education streams for the emerging skill needs of employable youth (Mona Khare, 2014)".

8. Language: Another critical point to be noted here is that the first-generation research scholars and scholars come from rural areas and far away from urban areas. However, they have excellent ideas and views about the general economic and social issues and the system and are interested in doing excellent research work; they could not do it due to English language problems. They cannot present them in the form of a research problem and publish them as research papers due to poor communication knowledge in English. They are not coming

forward with innovative ideas to find solutions to most existing social problems though they have innovative ideas. Most social and economic problems are area-oriented, district-oriented, and state-oriented. Those scholars from the local areas could understand their problems better and present them in the form of a research paper in a better way. Unfortunately, the language is standing as a hurdle against them. They were forced to depend on their supervisors to formulate a research problem and write a research paper. Most of the time, the supervisors might not know about the very ideas the scholar wanted to convey to society or the government? This problem also affects India's number of good and quality research publications. The Researcher would like to suggest that scholars, particularly those coming from rural areas and uneducated families, should be given an option of writing their research problems, thesis, and research papers in their mother tongue, whatever may be the language. If the scholar is good in Hindi, let him think and write in Hindi; if his mother tongue is Assamese, let him think and write his work in Assamese. If a student is given a chance to think in their mother tongue, they could think more and get an opportunity to express their ideas and views without any hindrance. Later on, those works could be translated into English—nothing wrong with this. In countries like Germany, France, Russia, China, and Japan, research works are carried out in their language only and then translated into English. If any non-German goes to German for Ph. D work, first the scholar should study the German language then write the work in German. Most of the Chinese research publications were done in the Chinese language only. When such facilities are available for scholars even in economically advanced countries, we insist that research works be carried out only in the English language is a question to be discussed and solutions to be found out. So English language should not be a hurdle in scientific writings and publications.

9. Employment for Cash: Nowadays, it is pretty common to hear that some of the aided institutions/ colleges all over India are collecting money for appointing even qualified scholars as faculty members. Whether it is true or not, both central and state governments should be vigilant on this and watch the aided institutions continuously, and a Committee should be formed to look into this issue seriously. Stringent regulations should be adopted on appointments. Those colleges and universities should be punished if they violate regulations. Quality teachers should be appointed, and then only quality research and quality publications will take place at the college level.

10. Everything brought from abroad is not a quality one, including Foreign Degrees. Another critical point is that it is pretty common to see our students go abroad for higher education in

almost all subjects and come back with foreign degrees, including research degrees. According to the Ministry of External Affairs, More than 750,000 Indian students studied in foreign schools in 2018. This number will increase shortly. At present, only those who cleared NET/JRF are eligible for appointments in our institutions, universities, and colleges. At the same time, those with foreign degrees are quickly entering into top institutions and universities without NET/JRF as teaching and researchers without many hurdles. We overestimate that they are highly qualified and quickly appoint them as faculty members. We never verified where they had their studies. We are under the impression that every foreign product is a quality one. Nevertheless, sometimes the reality may be different. Many self-financing institutions function in the USA, Australia, and European countries, offering degrees to collect a considerable amount of money. They also help publish research papers in Scopus journals. The boys and girls from wealthy families generally go abroad to take degrees from these institutions by giving them money. We never even verify whether such institutions are there or not. In a free economy, we cannot stop students from going abroad for studies—however, one thing UGC can do. Clear the NET examination is a must for even those with foreign degrees to attend Indian universities and institutions. A mere foreign degree is not the criteria for getting appointments in India's top-level institutions.

11. Uniformity in Wage and Structure and retirement age: MHRD, UGC, and state governments should follow the same criteria as prescribed by the UGC for faculty appointments at IITs, IIMs, IIC, NITs, Central Universities, state universities, colleges, aided and self-financing universities and colleges. The wage structure, retirement age, and other incentives for research activities should be the same/common to all these institutions. When we prescribe specific qualifications familiar to all institutions in appointments, the service conditions are also common to all these institutions. Different institution service criteria will de-motivate the faculty members in going for quality research and research publications. This issue comes only when we follow the same criteria for evaluating the central owned and state-owned institutions and universities on the same lines.

12. Quality of the research papers: It is observed that the research scholars generally have a false notion about the quality of a research paper. They are under the impression that is using statistical tools like t-test, F-test, ANOVA, chi-square test, multiple regression, and econometric models, the Cobb–Douglas production function and mathematical models are necessary for writing a good quality research paper. The quality of a research paper is not based on statistical/mathematical/econometric models. These models analyse and interpret the data

scientifically to get the accurate value of a research problem. Nevertheless, one could also write a good-quality research paper without such tools. Most of the Citation and index journals, impact factor journals, Scopus journals, and peer-reviewed journals publish research papers based on the type of statistical tools scholars used. They look into what problem you focused on, how many reviews reviewed, how we formulated our research problem, whether our objectives and hypotheses are based on the objectives, statement of the problem and the research questions we raised in the research work, how we substantiate our results with the support of available literature and data, how we concluded, what policy recommendations we put forwarded to the government, and what is the advantages of our study for the society, to the government, to the economy, and for the future researchers. An elementary descriptive study is more than sufficient for publishing research papers mentioned above or UGC care journals. Until students study thoroughly or have complete knowledge about statistical tools in their research work, they should not attempt to use unfamiliar tools to analyse and interpret their data.

Another critical point is that research scholars are thinking about the quality of a research paper, particularly among the social science scholars, is that more minor citations mean less quality, and more citations mean more quality of the paper. The quality of a research paper does not depend on more citations, publishing in Scopus and highly indexed journals. More citations are possible in natural science areas but not in social sciences. Citations in natural sciences may be very high because they deal with research problems universally apply in most cases. However, in social sciences, scholars deal with local issues that may be related to social and economic issues at the local level, such as caste, community, tribal economy, social groups, land issues at the local level, poverty eradication schemes at the local level, asset creations at the local level, festivals, cultural issues, language issues and other development problems at regional, district, village and state level. Our issues may not be relevant to the foreign scholars or policymakers to refer our works. In this case, the citation will be more minor. That does not mean that our work is of less quality. We have done quality research work for resolving a local problem, and the policymakers could use our work to find solutions for the existing problem based on our study. That is a credit for us. IITs and IISc get top positions because they deal with natural sciences and technology that have universal applications in testing. Another point to be noted now is that nowadays, even the citations could be manipulated by the authors and publishers.

13. The Researcher already pointed out that India has about 15 lakh college and university teachers. After their retirements, their knowledge and experiences are not fully utilized for quality publications and writing subject and research books. Only very few percent of the faculty members from top institutions and living in most of the capital and first-grade cities get opportunities to continue to be involved in academic research activities after retirement. Both central and state governments should use their knowledge scientifically for quality research works publications. Retired faculty members are an asset to the country. They should be encouraged to write quality publications. The National Education Policy 2020 envisions one large multidisciplinary Higher Education Institution (HEI) in or near every district, about 718 in numbers by 2030. Establishing such higher educational institutions will boost the research and publication activities, no doubt about it. India has about 70000 thousand public libraries functioning all over the country. These libraries should also be converted into high-tech research centres under the multidisciplinary higher education programme. Monetary support and incentive packages will also be provided for the retired faculty members to write about their villages, talucks, districts, and other social-economic and cultural activities. This will help the retired faculty members do research in the place very near them without many physical problems. This will get us to increase our publications at the international level. Lab and library facilities nearby by colleges and institutions could be used on Saturdays and Sundays.

Conclusion:

The focus of the government at present is on inclusive development. The inclusive growth concept should be restricted to social development alone. Inclusive growth concept should be made applicable to institutional, university, and college-level developments and faculty level developments also such as creating infrastructural facilities for research development, the fund for research projects, the fund for world-class laboratory facilities, a fund for establishing high tech research laboratories, a fund for presenting the research findings at national and international seminars, conferences, and workshops, a fund for publishing research papers and books, placement opportunities for the highly qualified scholars, adoption of UGC regulations on service conditions including retirement age without any discrimination. Providing more funds to top institutions like IITs, IIMs, NITs, IIC, and some Central Universities is a good and welcome one at the same time the state Universities, colleges, and aided colleges and institutions also be treated on the par with top institutions in all respects for inclusive institutional development to take India to the next level of development. "According to the International Rights Group, Oxfam Report 2018, just one percent of the rich people in India

cornered about 73 percent of India's \$3 trillion GDP, and also they hold about 40 percent of the National Wealth. The Wealth of India's richest 1 percent is more than 4-times of the total for 70 percent poorest in India". When 800 million people wait in front of ration shops to get relief packets under Prime Ministers Garib Kalyan Anna Yojana, the news is coming from Dubai stating that Indians are the number one real estate investors in Dubai real estate business. As per Dubai Land Development Records 2020, "A total of 5,246 Indians have invested in the property market in the emirate followed by the 5,172 Emiratis" (www.khaleejtimes.com). Is it inclusive growth? This type of development should not take place in the academic world. Some institutions enjoy everything, and others are starving for funds in no way acceptable. Corrective measures are needed immediately based on the suggestions put forward in this work; otherwise, people will ask questions about the validity of this ranking system.

References

- Abhishek Kumar, Sanjay Tiwari, Ashish Kumar Chauhan & Ramswaroop Ahirwar. (2019). Impact of NIRF on research publications: A study on top 20 (ranked) Indian Universities", *COLLNET Journal of Scientometrics and Information Management*, 13:2, 219-229, <https://doi.org/10.1080/09737766.2020.1741194>
- Khare, Mona. (2014). Employment, Employability and Higher Education in India: The Missing Links. *Higher Education for the Future*. 1.39-62. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/2347631113518396>
- Kumar, Amit & Singh, Kuldeep & Siwach, Anil. (2021). NIRF India Rankings 2020 "Analyzing the Ranking Parameters and Score of Top 100 Universities". *DESIDOC Journal of Library & Information Technology*. 41.385-390. <http://dx.doi.org/10.14429/djlit.41.5.16452>
- Nanda, Prashant K. (2021) , "Only 2 Indian varsities among the world's top 400: THE World University Rankings", *Mint*
- Singh, Priyanka & Joorel, J & Solanki, Hitesh Kumar & Trivedi, Kruti. (2021). "Ranking of Indian Research-Intensive Higher Education Institutions using Multiple Ranking Methodologies: A Correlation Analysis". *DESIDOC Journal of Library & Information Technology*. 41. 49-53. <http://dx.doi.org/10.14429/djlit.41.1.16683>

Yadav, Mamta & Bhardwaj, Arvind & Goyal, Kapil. (2022). Data Analytics for NIRF Ranking of Indian Institutions to Check the Consistency and Validity of Ranking Framework. 10.1007/978-981-16-7059-6_19. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-981-16-7059-6_19