



ORIGINAL RESEARCH PAPER

Economics

AN OVERVIEW OF RASTRIYA UCHCATAR SHIKSHA ABHIYAN(RUSA)

KEY WORDS: Education, Equity, Access and Excellence, Quality, strategic Approach, Ministry of Human Resource Development, Higher Education. Gross Enrolment Ratio.

Dr. Jagadeesha D.S.

Asst. Professor of Economics, Government First Grade Collage, Nanjangud, Mysore District 571301

Nandeesh B R

Senior Scale Lecturer in Mathematics, Government Polytechnic College Mirle, Saligrama Taluk, Mysore District 571603

ABSTRACT

There is a positive relationship between education and economic development. However, In this paper an attempt has been made to know the salient features, goals ,scope and approach of Rashtriya Uchchar Shiksha Abiyan. Rashtriya Uchchar Shiksha Abhiyan (RUSA) is a Centrally Sponsored Scheme (CSS), launched in 2013 aims at providing strategic funding to eligible state higher educational institutions. The central funding in the ratio of 60:40 for general category States, 90:10 for special category states and 100% for union territories would be norm based and outcome dependent. The funding would flow from the central ministry through the state governments/union territories to the State Higher Education Councils before reaching the identified institutions. The funding to states would be made on the basis of critical appraisal of State Higher Education Plans, which would describe each state's strategy to address issues of equity, access and excellence in higher education.

INTRODUCTION

There is a positive relationship between education and economic development (Chakravathy, 1981), (Amitab Kundu, 1999). However, allocation to education may not be evenly distributed to all regions and places due to various reasons (Chandan, 2010). Disparities in resource allocation lead to disparities in educational infrastructure development which result in uneven educational development of the state (Nanjundappa.D.M., 2001), (Gayathri.k., 2007), (Mishra S.N., 2001), (Gulati, 2001), (Meade, 2012). Hence, in this paper an attempt has been made to know the salient features, goals, scope and approach of Rashtriya Uchchar Shiksha Abiyan.

Review of Literature

Literature about the importance of infrastructure and its requirement in the development of an economy were presented by development economists like Albert Hirschman (A.O, 1958). Hoffman (W.G, 1958), Lewis (Lewies, 1954), Nurkse (Nurks, 1954), and Rostow who have expressed their opinion as infrastructure is a pre-condition for economic development. Isaac M Ntshoe has analyzed the political economy of access to education and equitable allocation of resources to higher education. (Ntshoe, 2003). Konstantions Angelo Poulos, Jim Malley, Apostalis, Philippoulos have analyzed the welfare implication of resource allocation and public education. It appears, according to authors it is possible to design allocation improving education policy rules (Konstantions Angelo Poulos, 2011). Mehmet Mercan, S evgi Sezer have analyzed the effect of education expenditure on economic growth. A Greater allocation of resource on education expenses could make the Turkish economy more dynamic (Mehmet Mercan, 2014). Xuejuan Su examined the endogenous determination of budget allocation and education. In developed economies, the budget allocation is more balanced (Su, 2006). Mukhopadhaya P have attempted to analyze the income disparity and equality in education in Singapore. The occupational disparity has a strong impact on overall in income equality through education resource allocation (P,2003).

D.M. Nanjundappa (Nanjundappa.D.M., 2001), P.R. Brahmananda (P.R., 2001) A.K. Bhargawa (A.K, 2001), S.K. Chopra (S.K, 2001), K. Gayathri (Gayathri.k., 2007), Jayaram M.S (Jayaram M.S, 2005), S.N. Mishra and Sweta Mishra (Mishra S.N., 2001), Nanda Dhameja (Dhameja, 2001) and Yatish Mishra (Mishra, 2001), have also traced some aspects of infrastructure and disparities. However, these studies have not examined the scheme of higher education in India and one of the schemes of RUSA and the present study will fill this gap.

Methodology

In this paper has been used to secondary source of information. Information collected from journals, books, reports and websites.

Objectives of RUSA

The objectives of RUSA would be to achieve the target of GER of 32% by the end of XIII 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 so that they become dynamic, demand-driven, quality conscious, efficient and forward looking and responsive to rapid economic and technological developments occurring at the local, state, national and international levels. 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 un-served & underserved areas. Rashtriya Uchchar Shiksha Abhiyan.
- Improve equity in higher education by providing adequate opportunities of higher education to SC/STs and

socially and educationally backward classes; promote inclusion of women, minorities, and differently abled persons.

Scope of RUSA:

All State Universities and colleges (both 12B and 2(f) compliant and non-12B and non2(f)) from all states and Union Territories (UTs) across the country would be eligible to be covered under RUSA. Subject to eligibility, an estimated 306 state universities and 850099 colleges will be covered under this initiative to improve the learning outcomes and employability of graduates and to scale-up research, development and innovations.

The project will also support these institutions to improve their policy, academic and management practices. While public funded colleges and universities would be eligible for all the components, the private aided colleges would be entitled to some components (including infrastructure support) but the funding ratio would be 50:50. Funding to such colleges would be decided based on their antiquity and relevance. Funds would be provided both for infrastructure and quality improvement. Each institution will have to prepare a perspective plan (Institutional Development Plan) for all the components, which will be then aggregated at the state level, after imposing a super layer of state relevant components.

Approach

RUSA will fund the institutions under a few key components. The yardstick for deciding the quantum of funds for the states and institution will be the norms that will reflect the key result of 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. The State Higher Education Council undertake this process of planning and evaluation, in addition to other monitoring and capacity building functions.

The State Higher Education Councils will be the key institution at the state level to channelize resources to the institutions from the state budget. In order to realize the intended outcomes, certain a priori commitments towards reform process have to be made by the states. These conditions will be non-negotiable prerequisites, i.e., commitments 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. Under the scheme an initial, preparatory amount will also be provided to the state government to prepare them for complying with the a-priori requirements will be required to indicate their interest to participate in RUSA. This will allow them to receive the preparatory amount to undertake all required activities as a part of the a priori commitments. Once eligible for funding under RUSA after fulfilling these prerequisites, the states will receive funds based on their SHEPs limited to the resource envelope for the state under RUSA to be decided by the PAB. Future fund flows would be determined based on outcomes and achievements against the targets. The emphasis would be not only on physical output, but also on the intended outcomes.

CONCLUSION

Education is an important means of achieving development in general and human development in particular. Knowing the fact, government of India has been given considerable importance to higher education and its one of the scheme of Rashtriya Uchchar Shiksha Abhiyan is to achieve the target of Gross Enrolment Ratio of 32% by the end of twelfth plan. Government of India aims to improve the quality of state universities and colleges and enhance their capacities.

REFERENCES

1. A.K, B. (2001). Infrastructure development in India. Journal of public administration 3, 427-433.
2. A.O.H. (1958). The new strategy of Economic development. New Haven Conn: Yale University press.
3. Amitab Kundu, S. B. (1999). Regional distribution of infrastructure and basic amenities in urban India. Economic and political weekly July 10, 1893.
4. Chakravathy. (1981). Planning commission draft report of chakravathy committee on backward areas development. New Dehli: Government of India publication 41.
5. Chandan, K. (2010). Infrastructure Development in India Current Issues and Future options. Southern Economist August 1, 9-13.
6. Dhameja, N. (2001). Power sector reform governance. The Indian journal of public administration, 359-365.
7. Gayathri.k. (2007). District level analysis of role of infrastructure in industrial development of Karnataka. Economic development of India, 237-239.
8. Gulati, R.i. (2001). Inter state disparities in India. New Delhi.
9. Jayaram M.S, G. G. (2005). Irrigation development in Karnataka key issues. Southern economist, 25-32.
10. Konstantions Angelo Poulos, J. M. (2011). The Welfare Implication of Resource allocation Policies under Uncertainty; The case of Public Education Spending. The journal of Macro Economics, 176-192.
11. Lewies, W. (1954). Economic development with unlimited supplies of labour. Manchester: Manchester school.
12. Meade, B. (2012). A Mixed Methods analysis of achievement Disparities in Guatemalen Primary schools. International Journal of Educational Development 32, 575-589.
13. Mehmet Mercan, S. S. (2014). The effect of Education expenditure on Economic Growth; The case study of Turkey. Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences 109, 925-930.
14. Mishra S.N., S. M. (2001). Development of rural infrastructure with special reference to rural roads. The Indian journal of public administration, 359.
15. Mishra, Y. (2001). Telecom Infrastructure in rural India. The Indian journal of public administration, 427-433.
16. Nanjundappa.D.M. (2001). Karnataka Economic Retrospect and Prospect economic development of Karnataka leading issues. Economic development of India, 427-433.
17. Nishoe, I.M. (2003). The Political Economy of access and Equitable Allocation of Resource to Higher Education. International Journal of Educational Development, 381-398.
18. Nurks, R. (1954). Problems of capital formation under developed countries. Manchester: Manchester school.
19. P, M. (2003). Trends in Income Disparity and Equality enhancing; Education on Policies in the Development stages of Singapore. International Journal of Educational Development, 453-465.
20. P.R., B. (2001). Some aspects of growth in Karnataka; economic development of Karnataka leading issues. Economic development of India, 237-248.
21. S.K, C. (2001). Sustainable energy development in India in the 21st century man and development. Economic development of India 41, 27-31.
22. Su, X. (2006). Endogenous Determination of Budget allocation across Education Stages. Journal of Development Economics 81, 438-456.
23. W.G, H. (1958). The growth of industrial economics. Manchester: Manchester university press.
24. University Grants Commission Annual Report, 2011-2012, New Delhi.
25. <http://rusa.nic.in>