

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS OF THE FIRST MEETING OF THE COMMITTEE TO DRIVE UP THE RESEARCH PERFORMANCE OF ACADEMIC INSTITUTIONS HELD ON 21ST OCTOBER, 2013 AT 12.30 PM IN THE CONFERENCE ROOM, NEW GUEST HOUSE, NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF IMMUNOLOGY, NEW DELHI

The first meeting of the Committee to drive up the Research Performance of Academic Institutions was held on 21st October, 2013 in the Conference Room, New Guest House, National Institute of Immunology under the chairmanship of Shri. K. VijayRaghavan, Secretary, Department of Biotechnology, Government of India. The following members attended the meeting:-

- 1) Shri Avinash S. Pant, Vice-Chairman,AICTE
- 2) Shri G.S.N. Raju, Vice Chancellor,Andhra University
- 3) Shri Rajeev Sanghal, Director, IIT-BHU
- 4) Shri Bijendra Nath Jain, Vice Chancellor,BITS, Pilani
- 5) Shri Jagdish Arora,Director, INFLIBNET
- 6) Shri Akhilesh Gupta, Secretary, UGC
- 7) Shri Pawan Aggarwal, Adviser(Higher Education), Planning Commission
- 8) Shri S.K. Sopory, Vice-Chancellor, JNU

2. Shri. R.P. Sisodia, Joint Secretary, Department of Higher Education, Ministry of Human Resource Development could not attend the meeting as he had to attend a meeting in Election Commission of India. He was represented by Shri. P. Sasikumar, Under Secretary, Ministry of Human Resource Development. At the outset, the chairman welcomed the participants and briefed about the background and purpose of setting-up of this Committee. He mentioned that there was a news report about 100 topmost universities in the world and in the list there was not even a single university of India. In response to this, the Government took an initiative and this Committee was formulated.

3. Further, the chairman informed about the research funding schemes in various countries. He informed that earlier German Government was providing funds for scientific research to a selected and a very few number of institutions which were institutions of excellence. But recently they have changed their funding pattern and

are following USA/UK pattern, where Government provide funds for research in addition to funds for higher education. The moot point before the committee is, how to prioritize the research work.

4. Shri Pawan Agarwal indicated that in 1980s UK Government had cut down the funding of higher educational institutions. Then they were forced to enhance the funding for research. Research assessment exercise was done by Thatcher Government. This exercise was for about six areas and peer assessment was also done. He said that in Australia there is a separate funding for academic research in addition to funding for teaching. In USA there are around 4000 higher educational institutions and out of these 180 institutions are highly scientific research institutions. UK had polytechnique system, but they upgraded the polytechniques to universities. He also informed that research assessment exercises are done by different names by different countries. As far as Indian universities are concerned, they are more teaching specific and are giving very little emphasize to research work. UGC provides special assistance for research funding to specific departments of the universities. But there is no research assessment exercise as is being done in countries like USA. Their Research Council also provide funds for research; but in India, we do not have such type of system. There is a gap in funding and research output and review of the funding system is required. The Committee would not suggest to merge all kind of funding schemes, but some changes would be required in identifying and supporting the funding of education.

5. Chairman suggested that assessment should be done and there should be an additional funding system for enhancing research performance of academic institutions. There are many universities in India which have the potential to be outstanding in the field of research. Efforts should be made to provide funding to these institutions so that their potential could be converted into research output.

6. Shri Akhilesh Gupta, Secretary, UGC made a presentation before the Committee about R&D Funding System in India. National R&D expenditure and its percentage with GDP of different countries was demonstrated. It was highlighted that India is far below in R&D expenditure in relation to its GDP in comparison to several developed/developing countries. Most of the developed countries spend 2% of their GDP on research projects. Even the expenditure per researcher is very low in

comparison to other countries. India's research publications trend is increasing but in comparison to China it is very low. China's contribution in global research publications is increasing very fast.

7. Shri Akhilesh Gupta informed that out of the total funding which is being spent on research purposes, Government of India's contribution is around 55% and rest is being provided by State Governments, private industry and NGOs. Extramural R&D support by Central Government agencies has been increased during the last decade. 50% of the R&D institutions in India are in private sector; while 14% and 20% are in Central and State sector, respectively.

8. Shri Sopory, VC, JNU was of the opinion that funding should be on performance basis. Assessment mechanism has to be further refined. Research capabilities and research output of the institution/university should be assessed before providing funds.

9. Chairman agreed that the quality of research in our institutions is dismal. In spite of funding crores of rupees by MHRD, the performance of most of the CUs in terms of research output is very discouraging. Chairman informed that in Germany, they concentrate on 5 universities for research and put money in them, but before finalizing those five universities they have a proper mechanism to select these universities. Likewise, we can, after putting competitive mechanism, select potential institutions/departments where money could be spent on research purpose.

10. Shri Rajiv Sanghal suggested that research work to be developed. Different groups publish different papers, but in terms of research output we stand nowhere. He said that our research fellows concentrate on publishing papers but nothing much was done for practical research. He was also of the opinion that institutions should work together to complete the research task because no single institute can do it individually. Consortium mode of funding should also be explored. Shri G.S.N. Raju suggested that parameters like NAAC accreditation have to be taken into consideration for assessing the institutions.

11. Shri Avinash Pant mentioned that the expenditure on per researcher in India is very low. Five years back there were only 20 institutions which were producing Ph.D. candidates, but today we have around 80 such institutions. As a result, in

terms of numbers of Ph.D. scholars, there is an increase, but the quality is not as good as it was earlier. Shri Pawan Aggarwal clarified that the Committee would focus on making a mechanism. Research funding and teaching funding segregation is not necessary. He felt that State Universities and private universities have potential, but due to funding problem they are lagging behind. He suggested that as a country we will have to break this public and private difference. If a private university like BTS, Pilani can become a topmost university, why not any State or Central University can match with these private universities. There is so much variation in universities and IITs system of study.

12. Shri Jagdish Arora suggested that we should have national database of research work. He noted that, as of now, even universities are not having such a database. 60% of the assessment should be done on the basis of research publications as most of the countries are doing.

13. While conducting the meeting, the Chairman mentioned that the views of all the participants have been noted and assured that the matter would be further discussed in the next meetings of the Committee.