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Abstract
Privatization of higher education is not a new concept in India. While on one hand, expenditure for higher education is gradually increasing day by day, on the other government is gradually decreasing its financial support to the higher education in public sector. As a result, profit making higher education institution is growing rapidly in private sector. How far the rapid growth of higher education institutions in private sector affect various dimension of higher education in India more specifically equity and quality of higher education is the subject matter of discussion of this paper.
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Introduction

Privatization is a matter of big discussion in the present day state of higher education in India. Obviously, question may arise, what is the meaning of privatization of higher education? To get answer of this question in Indian context it can be said that privatization of higher education means withdrawal of the government’s support to the task of financing and managing higher education. The basic issues of privatization of higher education, however, would always be considered as the formation of commercial hubs under the head higher education in a brutally competitive market which solely aiming at their survival through cost recovery system. In terms of economics, would it not be the regime of shifting from the free access to the fee access as in India money and morality are rarely compatible? Would it not be aimed at to hit our the best and the brightest poor students? To focus on these problems, the objective of this paper is to elaborate the issue why the government is gradually withdrawing its support to the higher education. To what extent private initiative in higher education would provide scientific and technical skills, values and social behaviours for a sustainable future development in India. All these are linked to quality.
Historical Background of the Higher Education in India

In ancient India, Nalanda, Takshila, Vikramshila etc. were the reputed centers for higher education (Khemani, Tulika and Narayan, Jayaprakash - 2006). The scholars from different parts of the world used to come to these centers for the sake of knowledge. Some of these centers were residential in nature and may be to some extent compared with the universities of modern line. Later on, when Muslim rulers consolidated their rules in India, they converted most of these centers into madrasas.

The higher education in India in modern line started its journey with the establishment of Hindu College in 1817 by Raja Ram Mohan Roy. In 1824, East India Company established Sanskrit College in Kolkata. This establishment was opposed by some social reformers on the ground that Indian masses should receive education of modern science through the medium of European languages. This controversy gave rise to the famous minutes of Macaulay in 1835. Macaulay suggested that medium of imparting higher education in India should be European Languages which encouraged the British Government in India to introduce English as the medium of imparting higher education (Naik & Nurullah 1974).

However, the universities in India started their journey as a milestone of higher education, holding the model of London University (i.e., a university of affiliating type) since the beginning of nineteenth century. According to the "Magna Carta of English Education in India", three universities like Calcutta, Bombay, and Madras University were established in 1857 (Ved Prakash 2007). Mention may be made that 'Magna Carta of English Education in India' described the aim of Indian as the diffusion of arts, science, philosophy and literature of Europe and the study of Indian languages (Naik & Nurullah 1974). At the end of the nineteenth century, another two universities namely Lahore University (1882) and Allahabad University (1857) were founded. On the other hand, during the period of 25 years from 1857, there was an increase in the number of colleges from 27 to 75. This increasing trend of colleges raised demand for the establishment of more universities in India. As a result, the number of universities increased from 3 to 12.

To know the problems faced by the Calcutta University, Government of British India appointed the Calcutta University Commission (1917 – 1919). Mention may be made that the problems faced by the other universities in India at that time were as like as the Calcutta university. The report of the Calcutta University Commission had far-reaching effect on the development of the university education in India. Thus, on the eve of independence in 1947, there were 20 universities in the country and most of them were teaching universities.

Present Day Scenario of Higher Education in India.

Since independence, the higher education in India has undergone a major transformation in spite of severe resource constraints. This expansion was because of the social demand as well as of the political compulsion. In 1947 the year of independence, total number of universities and colleges in India was 20 and 500 respectively with total enrolment of over 2 lakh students. During the first two decades of post independence there was a remarkable growth in higher education in India. This rapid growth was because of the implementation of the recommendation of the University Education Commission (1948) and the Education Commission (1964 – 66). This period was denoted as an "era of higher education in India". The growth rate in terms of the number of higher education institution and total enrolment, which was 13 – 14 percent in 1950 – 60, declined to 4–5 percent in 1980. Thereafter, the average annual growth rate of universities and the trend of enrolment saw an increase again from 1991 which was the result of private sector’ s participation in higher education.

As per the latest report published by the UGC, total number of universities as well as affiliated colleges are 1000 and 40000 respectively in India with total enrolment of over 20 million students, which is equivalent to the 10 percent of total enrolment in higher education in the world. Is it a remarkable growth in higher education in comparison to the other developed and developing countries of the world? India is having 1000 universities to cater the needs of 125 crores of population while the United States of America is having 2400 universities to cater the need of only 28 crores of population. Similarly, Japan is having 690 universities for 12 crores population, Germany is possessing 330 universities to cater the needs of 8 crores of population and The United Kingdom has 104 universities to cater the need of only 6 crores of population.

It implies that India is lagging behind when the ratio between the number of universities and total population is compared with all other developed countries of the world. It is estimated that India needs at least 3000 more universities to meet the increasing demand for higher learning (Bhargava 2006).

A China based study (SJTU- 2005), ranked the Universities around the world using the several indicators like alumni and staff winning major scientific prizes, highly cited researches, articles published in prestigious journals and articles indexed in major citation indices. As per that analysis, the United States of America captures the top position in the world with 53 of the best 100 universities. In addition to this, it has pocketed 17 of the best 20 institutions. Within the range of 301 to 400 best universities in the world, India has one university i.e., Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore and within the range of 401–500 universities, India has two i.e., the University of Calcutta and the Indian Institute of Technology, Kharagpur. Even in the Asia Pacific
Unlike our country, there is no fixed pay scale for most of the academician in that country and no predetermined or annual rate of increment. Everything depends upon the performance of the teacher. Student’s judgement is not only the yardstick to evaluate the performance of the teacher. Peer judgement is also given a certain degree of weightage.

In our situation, it is completely opposite. Teacher absenteeism particularly in the public sector educational institutions is wide spread in our country. Underperformance of a teacher is not considered as an offence. On the contrary, it is lived with, day after day and year after year. As a result students are the sufferer at the cost of the tax payer’s money in the most of the public sector educational institutions in India.

Another lacklustre performance of the Indian academic institutions is due to the financial hardship that our universities in public sector are experiencing. In the one side universities dependence on the government for financial support is increasing day by day while on the other side government is encouraging them to generate financial resources for themselves by applying their own effort. According to the National Policy on Education 1986 it was suggested six percent of GDP is to be allotted as total expenditure on education, including a share of 1.5 percent for higher education.

But reality is completely different. Currently investment in public sector education institution is roughly 4 percent of GDP, including a share of higher education at 0.4 percent. When we go to see budgetary allotment in higher education it was 1.6 percent of total budget expenditure in 1990 – 91 declined to 1.3 percent in 2002 – 03 and 1.2 percent in 2015 -16. In short, currently India is spending on higher education is less than what it was before 12 years. The argument as made by the government in favour of cutting subsidy on higher education is that the social benefit as derived from elementary education is maximum and from higher education is minimum. Therefore, government should support elementary education largely and to the higher education, it should be lesser. In this relation, it can be said that the argument as made in respect of higher education is not right. Elementary education undoubtedly is our fundamental right but it should not be at the cost of the higher education.

From the table 2 it is revealed that the number of student enrolled in higher education seems to be large in absolute term, but the gross enrolment ratio is not more than nine percent, which is low compared to other developed countries of the world (Anand Krishnan M 2004). In the United States of America and Canada 60 percent of their population are enrolled in the higher education institution. This percentage is 40 percent in several European countries and more than 20 percent in many developed countries. A NIEPA study reveals that no country in the world could become an economically advanced country, if its enrolment ratio in higher education is less than 20 percent of its population (Patel, I G -2003; Dutta P. K – 2007 and Chauhan - 2000). But high enrolment ratio in higher education always does not ensure that it causes high economic growth. Latin American countries are the example to this end where enrolment ratio in higher education is high but they are economically underdeveloped. In this connection, another point should be remembered that high enrolment in higher education should not be compromised with high quality. In India there is a large gap between the demand of India's rapidly developing economy for educated quality manpower and the existence of educational institutions currently entitled to providing such manpower. This gap needs to be filling up through a remarkable increase in investment in higher education.

While the public sector must take responsibility for increasing its level of current expenditure substantially, it is unreasonable to expect from them to meet the entire funds required for building centre for excellence, high-grade educational infrastructure, and research institutions. In addition to this, political interference and too much of bureaucratic control also imperils academic freedom in public sector. Thus, a weak higher education system not only causes distress to the student community but also fails to address our national problems, which is indispensable in the era of globalization.

Genesis of Privatization of Higher Education as an Alternative to the Public Sector Higher Education.

The concept of privatization of higher education as mentioned earlier, emerges mainly because of the unwillingness of the government of India to support the higher education
According to its need. Everywhere it is advised to the universities to generate their own resources. The governments are finding it difficult to provide adequate funds for its sustenance. The central point of the Article 14, 15, 16 of the Indian constitution is equality. However, as far as higher education is concerned, it is irony to say that on the one hand, government of India accepted the principles that access and equity would be the two important points in the ninth five-year plan period but on the other hand, it has started to cut down subsidy on higher education. Government of India has made a resolution that it is the duty of the government to pay attention towards the education of the weaker section and socially disadvantaged group of the society. However, reality is completely different when government of India open up the doors for the private education institutions where free access of students is replaced by fee access. Inclusive higher education requires equitable access to higher education by all groups of students in order to ensure barriers free access to the poor students of socially disadvantaged groups. According to the review made by UGC the gross enrolment for the poor works out to be only 2.41 percent as against non – poor 12.8 percent and the national average is 10.10 percent. It shows that only 2.41 percent of economically disadvantaged students get admission in higher education in India. While international trend in the participation of the private sector in higher education throws up a mixed picture, in Indian context it is a major concern. 

In India a couple of industrialists’ houses prepared a report namely“A policy framework for reforms in higher education that is popularly known as Ambani-Birla report 2000. The essence of this report is that the responsibility of government should be maximum in the area of school level education only and minimum should be in the area of higher education. This report clearly advocated in favour of the establishment of private university. In India, however, there is an increasing trend of both the number of privately owned higher education institutions as well as enrolment in them in recent years. In 2014–15, private unaided higher education institutions constituted 42.6 percent of the total number of higher education institutions in India which increased to 63.21 percent in 2016–17. Similarly, the share of enrolment in private unaided higher education institutions has gone up from 329 percent in 2014–15 to 51.53 percent in 2016–17.

Rumki Basu (1995) pointed out why private involvement in higher education is necessary in India. She opined:

1. A stage has come now when it is very difficult on the part of the government to meet the democratic aspiration of the people due to paucity of fund. Therefore, it is the high time to invite the private participation in higher education to share the burden of state funding in higher education sector.

2. Education or knowledge industry is no longer treated as a social service. It is considered as a necessary economic input in human resource development.

3. Private sector is considered as a major beneficiary of the knowledge industry. Higher education is now considered as a commercial product, which can be purchased and sold in the market like any other product as is dealt in the knowledge market. Therefore, private investor obviously can take part in this industry.

4. Private sector can respond to the market demand for labor more promptly than the public sector.

5. Public sector provides education more or less as free service. This has devalued education in the eyes of the recipients. On the other hand, private sector provides education service by charging full cost or cost plus some profits, which generates greater responsibilities among the recipients of education.

6. Privatization generates more resource from the students in terms of fees, which ultimately reduce fiscal burden of the government.

Thus in India, the privatization of higher education is being found in different forms. We find that the existing public universities and colleges introduce self-financing courses in various subjects for which government funds are not required. There is an instance, where public universities and colleges offer 60 to 70 percent of their academic programmes under the self-financing scheme. This hybrid system of private and public initiative is nothing but the indirect way of privatization of higher education (Ved Prakash 2007).

In many colleges/universities in India the authorities charge exorbitant fees for self-financing courses which is not affordable for most of the students. The students those who have better access to resources may enjoy these opportunities. This creates inequalities in the system (Kaul - 1993). This widen the gap of haves and have not. Since the beginning of the planning era, the government of India took decision to subscribe heavily the higher education. But reality was different when the situation started to be changed with the implementation of the education policy (1986) which keenly supported the establishment of higher education institutions in private sector. Thus the expansion of this type of institution was not only limited within the engineering and management discipline, rather expanded to all other areas of higher education. The private sector higher education institutions has become to larger and dominating in some states that the public sector has become diminutive in relative size. Statistics reveals that among the total number of colleges in the country, nearly one third are self-financing and most of them were established during the last 10 – 15 years. In Andhra Pradesh, Tamil Nadu, Karnataka and Maharashtra privately owned colleges are more in number than the public sector colleges.

Let us take the example of Andhra Pradesh to know the growth pattern
of privately owned higher education institutions, which may indicate the general growth trend of private higher education institution all over the country. In 1956, only 50 under graduate colleges were set up in Andhra Pradesh. This number increased to 801 in 1996–97 and 989 in 2000–2001. Out of these 989 colleges, the government directly funded 176, 172 were aided (95% support from the government) and the remaining 641 were purely private colleges. It indicates that numbers of privately owned colleges in that state are more than the number of government and aided colleges put together. Likewise, the growth pattern of professional institutions like engineering colleges shows the similar trend in that state. In 1991–92 total number of private Engineering colleges in Andhra Pradesh were 27, which increased to 32 in 1995 – 96, 57 in 1996–97, 89 in 1997–98, 102 in 1998–99, 105 in 2000 – 2001 and 150 in 2014–15. Out of the 150 engineering colleges functioning in Andhra Pradesh, only 16 are government aided and the remaining 134 are privately owned.

Similarly, in Tamil Nadu, out of 409 general education colleges, 228 are government aided and the remaining 235 are privately owned. This pattern is equally applicable to other professional under graduate institutions of medicine, management, law, education etc. During the last five years period from 2011 to 2015, 15 universities were set up in West Bengal. Out of these 15 universities, 8 are in the private sector. In Karnataka out of 53 universities, the government directly funded are 15 while 16 are partially funded and remaining 15 are purely private universities. Naturally, question may arise why privatization of higher education attracts the entrepreneur as well as the other stakeholders.

It is generally believed that private involvement in higher education is more quality oriented than the public institutions do. In the present day world, quality is the ‘mantra’ to indicate whether an education institution would survive in the market for a long time or not (Singh, K – 2003 & Stella, Anthony and Gnanam, A 2004). In this juncture, it needs to focus on the term quality (Subudhi & Paltasingh, 2013, In Conference Proceeding, ASEM, USA-2013). A clear conception on quality in higher education is required to navigate our efforts and thoughts to that end. Dr. Abdul Kalam, the former president of India rightly pointed out that “Spirit of inquiry, creativity, entrepreneurial and morale leadership are the capabilities central to nation building in a democracy. Educators should develop in our children these capabilities and make them autonomous learners who are self-directed and controlled”. Similarly, according to UNESCO, education should provide the skills for “learning to know, learning to live together, learning to do, and learning to be”. Thus, education is the main criterion that helps the people to attain sustainable development by increasing their capacity and in this way it helps the people to transform their vision of society into reality. Besides these, quality has some morale imperatives also which implies that the students, teachers, parents, and the community deserve the best inputs. The professional imperative indicates that the teachers are bound to meet the demand of the students by giving them the most appropriate updated pedagogical practice. Economic imperative implies the reality of the world and to what extent the educator has to meet that reality by providing quality products like contents, courses and combinations and services like teaching and support services. It should be market friendly. Similarly, social imperative implies the total education system that to what extent is accountable to the stakeholders as a whole. Thus, quality is multifunctional, and multidimensional. Its scope is vast. Thus, question may arise how far private initiative in higher education can satisfy the quality as mentioned above.

Essentially privatization is that type of initiative where governments’ involvement is about to be absent and the objective of this type of institutions is to generate their funds through higher fees, user’s charges, and full use of recourses. They survive on the philosophy that they do not have to pay for those who cannot pay. They provide to the stakeholders that kind of opportunities what the government concern cannot. The privately owned concerns provide all kinds of courses, which are market driven and student friendly. Private universities frame curricula, which emphasizes on training on skills, improve employability and challenge the frontiers of knowledge. Otherwise, they will not be able to survive in the market. They provide wider choice to their students than those offered by the conventional state run affiliated institutions in existence. It is so happened that most of the public institutions take many years before they can alter their design of their courses and combinations to suit emerging occupational patterns where conventional courses are dealt in a conventional manner. Thus in privately own higher educational institutions the stakeholders have a better chance to receive accountability and value for their money.

There is a common saying that university pass out students opine that they do not get job after the completion of their higher education while industrial houses say that they do not get competent manpower for their concern. It means there is a gap between two types of demand. To fill up this gap in many privately owned universities the authorities appoint corporate personnel as faculty member and the course curriculums are framed according to the requirement of the corporate house and the students are trained according to that line which help them to get job after the completion of their course. In public sector universities students do not get such type of facilities. There are many private universities in India where they have sector skill council. Industrial house of different sector are related to these council of the universities. They know what kind of expert hands they required for their concern. They take initiative to train the students in line of their requirement. As a result the
possibility of getting job on the part of the students become brighter after the completion of their higher education course.

Yet another factor that is heavily debated in the matter of privatization of higher education is the appointment of faculty member. There are some private institutions those are known to have their own tailor made rules and arbitrary procedures for the recruitment of their faculty members who are not paid at par with their counterparts in the government institutions. Such instances of professional exploitation cannot be justified at any cost. It must be remembered that a demotivated teacher is a bad human resource. He may not be in a position to deliver his best lecture to inspire his students. Such practices are repeatedly reported from different private colleges and universities in India. On the contrary, there are many examples of private higher education institutions where the faculty members are not only paid at par with their counterpart in public institutions but also allowed them to provide service to the institutions until the age of seventy years based on their remarkable past performance. KIIT in Odisha, Adamas University, Techno India University, in West Bengal are the example to this end where qualified retired corporate personnel are appointed to impart quality education to the students. In West Bengal, superannuated teachers are officially allowed to provide service to the government aided colleges as a faculty member until the age of seventy years. However, in some situation dirty politics inside the public colleges create barrier to appoint qualified retired teacher which ultimately effect the sound academic atmosphere as well as the student teacher ratio of the colleges when sufficient number of fresh faculty members are not appointed.

Enrolment of students in higher education institutions is increasing year after year but faculty size remaining stable which causing deterioration of student teacher ratio in the country. Out of 34 states and union territories in India more than half the number of states, i.e., 18, have student teacher ratio above 20. With states like Gujarat, Uttarakanchal, Uttar Pradesh and Rajasthan 1 teacher is for 40 students and surprisingly in Sikkim, this number is 1 teacher for more than 90 students (Govt. of India 2003-04) The university authorities in many places overcome the shortage of faculty by engaging teachers on ad hoc, contractual or part time basis. However, that does not guarantee to the candidate and hence there is a lack of commitment on individual’s part. Therefore, to do justice to quality it is necessary to appoint sufficient number of teachers especially at higher education level. There may be two reasons behind the shortage of faculty. One, not many students opt to join academics these days, and two, with the limited resources in UGC, and nominal pay packages offered by the central and state universities, are not being attract the academicians to join in the government aided universities rather they show their interest to join in the privately owned universities / institutions from where high pay package is offered. The authority of the private universities considers that faculty member is the lifeblood of the higher education system. Therefore, they always try to recruit competent faculty having excellent credentials in academic world to remain in the field of competition. As a result they become successful in attracting students through the quality of their faculty, programs, training and placement. It is said earlier that government do not have sufficient resources to provide fund to the higher education sector in India. In this situation, the government can adopt a policy of decentralization of higher education in which private institutions can play a remarkable role. In this way, competition will remain between Private and public educational institutions which would be good for the both. The argument is that the quality is varied between these two types of institutions. The private institutions are structurally much better suited to serve the postmodern world order than are the rigid, cash trapped government universities. Thus it cannot be denied that the career prospects of the academia at present are to some extent better in the private educational institutions in comparison to public educational institution in India (Galbraith – 2003).

Suggestion and conclusion:
1. As privatization has added a new dimension to our higher education set-up, it is posing some grave challenges to the teaching profession, which may cause increasing devaluation of quality in higher education. This cannot be permitted. To check the devaluation of higher education in private sector, it is necessary to introduce academic audit system that enjoin upon such institutions to act in a socially responsible manner. The national apex nodal agencies like the UGC, AICTE, NCTE, MCI, DCI etc., must come forward to ensure that these privately owned higher education institutions subscribe to the nationally laid down requirements. They should come out with punitive action plans to ensure quality in private institutions with emphasis on counter checks against their undue expansion.
2. The universities must ensure that the private colleges are not merely replicating run of the mill courses with their grant of affiliation being there as a notional ritual. They should remember that their prime motive is to maintain quality in education, without which they cannot survive in the education field. It is only then that the privatization can yield its desired results. Otherwise, these will result in creating social divide, teachers’ disrepute and students’ exploitation, and will eventually be yet another patchwork of good and bad governance.
3. It is evident that the self-financing institutions in the private sector do
not depend upon the government grants rather they recover their costs from the students in the form of fees. Some covered this under the heading capitation fees but this has since been stopped through the intervention of the courts. However, has it really stopped? Has it not taken some other equally dubious shapes? This is where the role of national statutory agency would come if privatization were to be supported as a viable alternative. It is the case with NCTE and other such councils.

4. Similarly, the central government should come forward to lay down the guidelines on the subject of establishment of private colleges and universities. It is necessary to save the students, parents, and teachers from undue market exploitation. It is in the absence of such clear national guidelines that the caricature private universities are established and the highest court of the country had to strike down their creation much to the discomfiture of their students. The private players with dubious credentials who are becoming national and international security problems and play with the carriers of students should be held liable.

5. Ultimately it is also debatable at the national level that there could be healthy and homogeneous mix of public private enterprise model in higher education with active partnership and guidance of the government as well as of the private sector. This kind of model could have the legal framework that could help them work jointly for preparing our youth to match the much-needed international quality, as it would be the product of the best in collaboration of the two sectors.

6. Thus, it can be seen that the virtues of the one could be combined with those of the other to get the best result. Greater collaboration with information and communication technology enabled resources can ensure greater reach and quality. The present challenges can be converted into opportunities through timely appraisal of the ground realities and positive inputs from the governments and private investors so that India may be seen as a quality destination both in teaching and research.

7. Privatization notwithstanding, to improve access to institutions of higher education only, the government should create a monitoring and support system for the economically backward students through the creation of quality review programmes, a learning fund, a hardship fund etc. This will restore faith of the common persons in the capacity of the government to check the misadventures of the private entrepreneurs in higher educations solely for the profits. For the poor students even such institutions have to be instructed to reserve seats.

### Table 1: Distribution of the World’s Leading Universities in few Chosen Countries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Top 100</th>
<th>Top 200</th>
<th>Top 300</th>
<th>Top 400</th>
<th>Top 500</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: [http://ed.situ.edu.cn/ranking.html](http://ed.situ.edu.cn/ranking.html) (collected from university news, 40 (17))

### Table 2: Growth of Higher Education in India

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Universities **</th>
<th>Enrolment (mn)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1950 - 51</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960 - 61</td>
<td>1819</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970 - 71</td>
<td>3277</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980 - 81</td>
<td>4577</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990 - 91</td>
<td>6627</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001 - 02</td>
<td>11146</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002 - 03</td>
<td>15343</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004 - 05</td>
<td>17662</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 - 20</td>
<td>40000</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: UGC annual reports and other publications.

** including deemed universities, Institute of Public Importance like AllIMs, IITs, IIMs, IISCs, NITs.

Source: [http://ed.situ.edu.cn/ranking.html](http://ed.situ.edu.cn/ranking.html)
CONCLUSION:

In a big country like India, it is not possible either on the part of only public sector or on the part of only private sector alone to bear the burden of managing the higher education. There is no country in the world where higher education is maintained completely either by the private sector or by the public sector alone. For example, in Japan, Korea, Philippine and in Latin America higher education is being maintained by the private sector in a large extent along with restricted public sector while in South Asia, Africa and Western Europe both the public and private funding maintain the higher education sector with the domination of public funding. In Netherlands and Belgium, both coexist under the public funding. In Sweden, UK, France, Spain and Thailand limited private funding exists for running the higher education sector. India is a developing country. According to our constitution, it is necessary to ensure the access and equity for masses in higher education. We cannot restrict the higher education only for the people belonging to the upper socioeconomic background. We should open up the avenue for the talented and creative but poor economic background boys and girls to enter into the arena of higher education. Considering the global trend, it would be wise decision on the part of the government of India to come forward to provide more budgetary allotment to the public sector higher education institutions so that they can compete with the private sector higher education institutions.

In other words, coexistence of both the public and private investment in higher education sector it is necessary for the wellbeing of the students in India. In this connection, it needs to be mentioned that government must keep its controlling hands not only on the public sector higher education institutions but also on the private sector higher education institutions.
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