

---

## Suggestions to UGC with regard to 2018 Guidelines- As requested by UGC

S.Venkataraman<sup>1</sup>

*Assistant Professor, Department of Education, Annamalai University, Tamilnadu, India*

---

**Abstract:** *This paper contains the suggestion as requested by UGC by Dec, 15, 2018. Various features of the guideline taken for consideration and reviewed with issues and realities. The matters for which guideline does not gave clarification also discussed.*

**Keywords:** *UGC, Guidelines-2018, Suggestions*

### 1. INTRODUCTION

UGC has circulated the latest Guidelines [1] of higher Education to be followed by Universities and Colleges. Since, frequently amendments are made and various issues are not at all addressed, many associations and stake holders of Higher Education have raised for changes in the declared guidelines too. Hence, the UGC has made announcement for suggestions from the public with regard to the Guidelines 2018. The suggestion for various issues pertaining to Guidelines 2018 are listed here..

#### 1.1 Regarding listing of journals

Regarding listing of journals, an online-networked regulatory body with volunteer experts should be derived and a single window portal for uploading or linking of all the publications in a dynamic mode should be evolved. Country wide open criticism and evaluation system should be called and the papers and journals should be ranked or marked on the basis of citations and such open evaluation. A separate mechanism should be evolved with carefully verified procedures. The present process is against the establishment of journals from India, and this will lead to monopoly of publication agencies. All the competitors should be allowed to publish, but their articles should be placed by UGC to public through a special website for the above mentioned open critic and citations. On the basis of expert opinion, and global citations articles can be ranked automatically and the journals also.

UGC should enforce qualify norms to the journals and may recognize if they satisfy them. The application for consideration should be to a regulatory agency, with specific vigilance over it's functioning. Without doing such a process for regulation, listing and insisting the institutions to recommend the journals cannot be considered as foresighted and wise idea.

#### 1.2 Regarding counting of service of Ph.D., duration

Regarding counting of service of Ph.D., duration, that is, earlier, the time taken for Ph.D., degree was excluded from calculating the teaching experience. Later, a UGC resolution circulated that "the time taken for the Ph.D., degree need not be excluded if the degree undergone simultaneously without taking any kind of leave".

Indeed this interpretation is essential one, but this resolution was not included in the 2018 guidelines. Further, there is a misconception arouse and many who got their Ph.D., before joining into service also made request to add that time period to their teaching experience. Hence, this should be included into the UGC guidelines with more clarity.

Regarding API score, for projects in the Arts and Humanities subject, the grant value cannot be treated on par with science and engineering, because, Arts and Humanities are getting only around 5-15 lakhs for major research projects while Science and Engineering faculties are getting more than 20 lakhs, hence the score should be reverted as of the earlier guidelines, above 5 lakhs itself should be given higher score.

#### 1.3 Regarding CAS

For every five years of teaching service there should be a CAS. Presently in 4/5/6, 5, 3 and 3 years, CAS promotions are given. In total if the institutions conduct CAS process in regular interval, one can achieve professor stage at the

15th year and in direct recruitment in the 10th and 11th year itself. Afterwards, he / she doesn't have any compulsion to be competitive, indeed there is no evaluation to them and there is no career advancement too. The senior professor stage is not that much recognized and not popular too. This will spoil the quality to the worst core.

Hence, even after 15 years there should be some stages at every 2/3 years and suitable Norms and designations should be created to keep the professors target oriented.

Paragraph comes content here. Paragraph comes content here. Paragraph comes content here. Paragraph comes content here. Paragraph comes content here. Paragraph comes content here. Paragraph comes content here.

#### **1.4 Regarding Ph.D., Registration and Research work**

There is no scientific procedure adopted for the selection and allotment of candidates to the Guides and scholars. Many powerful guides and candidates are getting candidates and guides according to their wish. When situations arouse for a change guide, when the candidates are requesting change of guides due to various reasons, the 2,3 years matured candidates are allotted to other guides, then they just sign and add guided number to their fame without any their contribution towards that candidates research work.. In this way many have completed more than 10/20 candidates within in 3-4 years itself. Such allotment are purely on personal relationship with authorities oron the basis of unlawful activities only. Suitable guidelines should be evolved in this regard.

There should be restriction with regard to candidate allotment to the guides too. The existing number of 4-6-8 numbers for Assistant Professors, Associate Professors and Professors should be revised to 2-4 and 5 only. Further, maximum of 2 candidates only should be allotted in each academic year, many institutes are allotting even 8 candidates in a single academic year itself. A guide cannot extend his guidance beyond 2/3 candidates in a year, practically guiding 8 candidates is not at all possible. Further, Supervisors should be asked for a report on their guidance about area of research, their contribution, their impact on the academic community etc at every 5th year to a open forum in the UGC portal, only on the basis of satisfactory contribution candidates should be allotted to them, otherwise a five year ban for allotment may be imposed, this period may give time to the supervisors to strengthen their research potential. Merely signing in the certificate page without having any accountability to their wards research is the present situation among many of the faculties. This practice should be curbed.

Ph.D., viva voce should be made in a national open forum through online portal and an online video conference based viva voce examination should be conducted to strengthen the quality. Regarding the external examiner valuation of thesis (with foreign examiners), a special global level forum for each subject should be created and they may be utilized for valuation of thesis. A time frame for this external valuation process should be enforced to eradicate unwanted waste of time for this procedure.

#### **1.5 Regarding API score of Lectures**

In the API score mechanism, for lectures and other activities submission of complete documents with evidences to a special forum in each University should be created and the documents should be awarded scores and should be kept in open in their websites in the form of video and image and text.

#### **1.6 Regarding NAAC accreditation**

The NAAC should create a dynamic online portal to collect self-uploaded data from the institutions 24x7. They all should be open for the common people. Their quality counts should be made in a continuous and consistent manner, instead of collecting at the end of 5th year. This will made compulsion to all the institutions to keep vigils about their quality standards.

#### **1.7 Regarding identification of experts**

In many institutes, many faculties are engaged for "expert team" visits on the very first year of inception to the Teaching Profession, This practice have spoiled the Teaching faculties to worst extend and they are awaiting for such visits 24x7. A special norm should be evolved for identification of "experts" for various quality checking activities. The corruption involved in the recognizing processes should be taken seriously and court based

sentences for corrupt practices should be enforced. If any discrepancy found in the experts activities in the assigned duties they should be treated severely. For a faculty in a year maximum of one/two such visits/ exam coordination may be given in total within the institutions and through other institutions.

### **1.7 For direct Recruitments**

For recruitment to all the Universities and colleges irrespective of Private or Government or Central or State, their application along with their qualifications and all the details submitted for recruitment should be made available to public. A digi locker type portal for maintaining the faculties' service details need to be created to ensure quality of faculty throughout the country. A country wide (For both Private and Government) portal for attendance and academic registration through biometric entry may be arrived, Every day attendance should be fetched to UGCs portal to ensure quality standards among the faculties across the country.

### **1.8 Regarding SWAYAM - MOOC**

The SWAYAM - MOOC concept is not having evolved with perfection and this is in a very budding stage with lot of lagging in quality and execution concerns. Its not even saturated with available technological standards, more care should be taken in this regard.

While allowing credit transfer offer, the students should be given more papers to select, that is for a replacement of two papers he may be permitted to undergo three or four papers and if they pass any of the two, their credit may be transferred. Students are afraid of taking risk by way of undergoing credits through SWAYAM, that if they got failed in that opted paper, their passing may got affected. Hence, more clarity should be made to make them comfortable.

### **1.9 Regarding utilization of institutional grants**

Regarding utilization of institutional grants, UGC should insist the institutions to make all the activities and purchase of materials and all the details in an online open forum in every three months, the stock registers utilization registers etc should be made available to the public. Students and parents of the institutions should be met anonymously and should check the utilization of funds by the institutions. The files of execution of various allotted funds should be placed online at each stage. This may ensure proper utilization of funds.

If, the facilities available in the institutions are not used by the faculties properly and regularly, the authorities of the institutions should be made responsible and suitable actions should be taken.

### **1.10. For the conduct of conferences, seminars etc.**

Registration fee should be banned along with paper bound publication of proceedings. Insisting for ISBN number allotment is not having any qualitative background, merely adding ISBN number by paying amount to publishers become unwanted practice now a days. Hence, the registration of academic books should be revised with other well planned procedure.

Further, API score for seminar conference participation totally spoiled the concept. The seminar conference should be video recorded and they may also be placed on air in a live portal, the certification should be strictly given to those participate and present in the events. The certificates may be uploaded with specific registration numbers for future genuineness verification. If a faculty conducts seminar conference ,workshop etc, their academic and personal justification for the conduct of such event should be ensured before granting funds and approvals.

Now days, many are conducting such events as cultural programmes without having academic intention, need and utility, this should be checked with proper guidelines.

### **1.10. Regarding Refresher courses**

The authorities of various institutions and faculties too are having confusions and not allowing the faculties to attend in regular intervals, further more clarifications and directions should be given in this regard.

### **1.11. Regarding selection of Vice Chancellors and other authorities to higher educational bodies**

A system should be evolved to places experts achievements across the country to a open forum. Their achievements and its consistency should be given recognition. By reviewing this continuous contribution and achievement only

applicants application should be scrutinized. Manipulating documents on last hour and submitting applications secretly to highest posts and getting selected through political wills should not be allowed.

Above all, the UGC should be aware of need of more and more clarifications regarding their guidelines to the academic society. A separate forum in the online domain should be allotted to provide day today request for clarifications. All should be placed online. This will check the miss interpretation of guidelines, which is a major problem among the institutions and faculties across the country.

## **2. CONCLUSIONS**

The above suggestions are very much needed steps to be adopted and executed by the UGC immediately. They are from the observation of the reality. Addressing the above issues and the remedies will place the higher education in a better way.

## **REFERENCES**

[1] [https://www.ugc.ac.in/ugc\\_notices.aspx](https://www.ugc.ac.in/ugc_notices.aspx)

## **AUTHOR'S BIOGRAPHY**



**Dr. S.Venkataraman** is working as Assistant Professor since, 2014 in the Department of education, Annamalai University, Annamalaiagar, Tamilnadu. He has published more than 20 research papers in reputed Journals and participated and submitted papers in 25 National and International Conferences and Seminars. He actively participates in discussion with stake holders of Higher Education for the quality management of Contemporary Higher Education. Presently working with one UGC Major Research Project and in one ICSSR sponsored Major Research project.