International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Technology
ISSN 2582-7359, Peer Reviewed Journal, Impact Factor 6.325
www.ijmrtjournal.com

THE PARADIGM SHIFT TOWARDS AUTONOMOUS HIGHER EDUCATION: A CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK FOR ACADEMIC EXCELLENCE, INSTITUTIONAL GOVERNANCE AND SUSTAINABLE TRANSFORMATION IN INDIA

Dr. Easwaran Iyer[1], Dr. Naveen Kumar C. M.[2]

[1]Vice Chancellor, ARKA Jain University, Jamshedpur, India
[2]Principal, Jain College (Autonomous), Bengaluru, Karnataka, India
Research areas: Economics, Management and Higher Education Policy

Abstract

Institutional autonomy is increasingly recognised as an important instrument for improving the responsiveness, academic quality and governance of higher education institutions. In India, the National Education Policy (NEP) 2020 and the University Grants Commission (UGC) (Conferment of Autonomous Status upon Colleges and Measures for Maintenance of Standards in Autonomous Colleges) Regulations, 2023 provide a policy and regulatory context for greater institutional flexibility accompanied by accountability. This paper examines the meaning and dimensions of institutional autonomy, its evolution in India, its potential contribution to academic excellence, the challenges encountered during implementation and strategies for strengthening autonomous institutions. The study adopts a descriptive, conceptual and qualitative approach based on secondary sources, including NEP 2020, UGC regulations, All India Survey on Higher Education (AISHE) reports, official government publications and selected academic literature. The latest AISHE figures available for this paper show that total higher-education enrolment increased from 3.42 crore in 2014–15 to 4.50 crore in 2023–24, while the Gross Enrolment Ratio rose from 23.7 per cent to 30.0 per cent. These trends underline the need to expand institutional capacity while protecting quality, equity and relevance. The paper advances an integrated conceptual model in which autonomy produces institutional outcomes only when supported by capable governance, qualified faculty, adequate resources, academic leadership, stakeholder participation and credible quality assurance. It proposes the AUTONOMY framework—Academic flexibility, Unified governance, Teaching and learning innovation, Organisational capacity, Networks and partnerships, Outcome-based quality, Monitoring and accountability, and yielding sustainable development—as a practical institutional model. The paper argues that autonomy should not be treated merely as a regulatory status or administrative privilege; it should be exercised as a strategic responsibility to convert academic freedom into measurable educational and social value.

Keywords: Institutional autonomy; higher education; academic excellence; NEP 2020; UGC Regulations 2023; governance; quality assurance; outcome-based education; India.

1. Introduction

Higher education contributes to individual advancement, social mobility, economic development, democratic participation and nation-building. In a knowledge-driven economy, colleges and universities are expected to do more than transmit established knowledge. They are required to cultivate critical thinking, communication, digital competence, employability, entrepreneurship, research capability and responsible citizenship. These expectations are changing rapidly as technology, labour markets, demographic patterns and global academic practices evolve.

Traditional affiliation arrangements can provide common academic standards and university-level coordination. However, where decision-making is highly centralized, institutions may have limited capacity to revise curricula quickly, introduce emerging programmes, experiment with assessment, respond to local needs or build specialized partnerships. Institutional autonomy is one approach to addressing this tension. It enables eligible institutions to make defined academic and governance decisions within the national regulatory framework and the conditions of their autonomous status.

Autonomy is not equivalent to institutional independence from all regulation. It is a form of delegated self-governance. The institution remains accountable to applicable laws, UGC regulations, the affiliating or parent university where relevant, statutory bodies, students, faculty, funding authorities and quality-assurance systems. The central policy question is therefore not whether autonomy should exist in isolation, but how academic freedom, institutional capacity and public accountability can be balanced.

NEP 2020 envisages a higher education system characterized by multidisciplinary learning, institutional empowerment, curricular flexibility, research and improved governance. The UGC Regulations, 2023 provide a regulatory framework for the conferment and maintenance of autonomous status. The significance of autonomy must consequently be assessed not only by the powers formally granted to an institution, but also by the extent to which those powers improve learning, research, inclusion, institutional performance and social contribution.

2. Statement of the Research Problem

The conferment of autonomous status creates opportunities for curriculum design, assessment reform, programme innovation and more responsive governance. Yet institutions differ substantially in financial resources, faculty strength, leadership capability, digital infrastructure, research culture and administrative preparedness. Consequently, the same regulatory freedom may produce different results across institutions. Some institutions may use autonomy to strengthen academic innovation and quality, while others may experience delays, procedural confusion, resource constraints or a continuation of earlier practices under a new administrative label.

The research problem addressed in this paper is the gap between the formal grant of autonomy and the institutional capacity required to exercise it effectively. The paper asks how autonomous colleges can convert regulatory flexibility into academic excellence and sustainable institutional development while maintaining transparency, equity and accountability.

3. Objectives of the Study

1. To examine the concept, significance and dimensions of institutional autonomy in higher education.
2. To analyse the evolution and emerging trends of autonomy in the Indian higher education system.
3. To evaluate the role of institutional autonomy in promoting academic excellence, innovation and quality enhancement.
4. To identify the major challenges in the implementation and effective governance of autonomous institutions.
5. To suggest strategic measures for strengthening institutional autonomy and ensuring sustainable quality in higher education.

4. Research Questions

- What are the principal dimensions of institutional autonomy, and how do they interact?
- How have Indian policy and regulatory developments shaped the movement towards autonomous higher education institutions?
- Through which institutional processes can autonomy improve curriculum relevance, teaching, assessment, research and student outcomes?
- What organisational, financial, human-resource and governance constraints may weaken the effective use of autonomy?
- What institutional framework can balance academic freedom, measurable outcomes and public accountability?

5. Review of Literature and Policy Context

5.1 Institutional autonomy and academic organisation

Institutional autonomy is best understood as the capacity for meaningful institutional self-governance in academic work, standards, management and related activities, operating alongside public accountability. UNESCO's Recommendation concerning the Status of Higher-Education Teaching Personnel (1997) links institutional autonomy with academic freedom and identifies self-governance, collegiality and appropriate academic leadership as important elements. It also makes clear that autonomy must be balanced with accountability, particularly where public funding is involved (UNESCO, 1997).

Clark's analysis of higher education systems highlights the interaction of state authority, academic-professional organisation and market coordination in shaping institutional behaviour (Clark, 1983). This perspective is useful because autonomous colleges do not operate in a vacuum. Their decisions are influenced by regulation, academic disciplines, professional standards, student demand, employers and institutional leadership. Effective autonomy therefore requires the capacity to negotiate these influences without allowing any single pressure to displace academic purpose.

5.2 National Education Policy 2020

NEP 2020 calls for a more multidisciplinary higher education system and identifies faculty and institutional autonomy as part of the broader transformation agenda. It emphasises curricular and pedagogical reform, research, institutional restructuring, quality and equitable access (Ministry of Education, 2020). The policy direction supports flexibility, but flexibility is meaningful only when institutions have the faculty, governance systems and resources necessary to implement it.

5.3 UGC autonomous college regulations

The UGC (Conferment of Autonomous Status upon Colleges and Measures for Maintenance of Standards in Autonomous Colleges) Regulations, 2023 establish the regulatory framework for colleges seeking autonomous status and for maintaining standards after conferment. The framework recognises key academic and governance structures, including the Academic Council and Boards of Studies. Autonomy is therefore a structured regulatory arrangement rather than unrestricted discretion (UGC, 2023).

5.4 Expansion, access and quality in Indian higher education

AISHE is the Ministry of Education's principal national survey of higher education institutions and collects information on enrolment, teachers, infrastructure and other institutional indicators. The 2023–24 report, released on 8 July 2026, records total enrolment of 4.50 crore and a Gross Enrolment Ratio of 30.0 per cent for the 18–23 age group. Female enrolment reached 2.24 crore and female GER reached 31.2 per cent. Total faculty/teachers were reported at 17.32 lakh (Ministry of Education, 2026). These indicators demonstrate the scale and changing composition of the system; they do not, by themselves, establish that autonomy caused improvements in access or quality.

5.5 Research gap

The policy literature establishes the importance of autonomy, flexibility and accountability. The practical challenge is to connect these principles through a coherent institutional operating model. This paper addresses that conceptual gap by integrating academic decision-making, governance, organisational capacity, partnerships, outcome measurement and continuous improvement in one framework. It does not claim to measure the causal impact of autonomy; rather, it proposes a model that can guide institutional implementation and future empirical testing.

6. Research Methodology

The study adopts a descriptive, conceptual and qualitative research design based entirely on secondary data. The principal sources are: (i) NEP 2020; (ii) UGC Regulations, 2018 and 2023, with emphasis on the 2023 framework; (iii) AISHE reports and Ministry of Education publications; (iv) UNESCO's 1997 Recommendation concerning higher-education teaching personnel; and (v) selected academic literature on higher education organisation and governance. The analysis proceeds by identifying the principal dimensions of autonomy, reviewing the policy and regulatory context, examining opportunities and challenges, and developing an institutional framework with practical indicators. The study does not employ surveys, interviews, econometric methods or primary institutional data.

7. Concept and Dimensions of Institutional Autonomy

Institutional autonomy refers to the recognised authority of an eligible higher education institution to make specified decisions concerning its academic programmes, internal governance, assessment, resource management and institutional development, subject to applicable laws and regulations. Its scope is determined by the relevant regulatory framework and the institution's status.

Dimension	Meaning and institutional application	Potential contribution
Academic autonomy	Design, review and update curricula; introduce programmes and electives; define learning outcomes; adopt suitable pedagogies within applicable norms.	Relevance, flexibility and multidisciplinary learning.
Administrative autonomy	Operate statutory bodies, allocate responsibilities, establish processes and make timely institutional decisions.	Responsive governance and operational efficiency.
Financial autonomy	Prepare budgets, allocate resources, monitor expenditure and mobilise permissible resources under applicable rules.	Strategic resource use and sustainability.
Research and innovation autonomy	Promote research agendas, centres, projects, publications, patents, entrepreneurship and collaborations.	Research culture, innovation and knowledge creation.
Examination and evaluation autonomy	Design assessment systems, continuous evaluation, examinations, moderation and timely result processes in accordance with regulations.	Valid assessment, transparency and student progression.

These dimensions are interdependent. Academic autonomy without qualified faculty may remain unused; financial flexibility without transparent governance may weaken trust; examination autonomy without moderation and academic integrity may undermine standards. Autonomy should therefore be assessed as an institutional system rather than as a collection of isolated powers.

8. Evolution and Progress of Autonomy in Indian Higher Education

The development of autonomy in India has been shaped by the objective of enabling institutions with demonstrated capacity to innovate while maintaining recognised academic standards. The UGC's 2018 Regulations provided an earlier framework, and the 2023 Regulations revised the regulatory architecture for conferment and maintenance of autonomous status. NEP 2020 further strengthened the policy emphasis on institutional empowerment, multidisciplinary education, flexibility and accountability.

The movement towards autonomy must be considered in the context of the expansion of higher education. AISHE 2014–15 reported total enrolment of 3.42 crore and GER of 23.7 per cent. The AISHE 2023–24 release reports total enrolment of 4.50 crore and GER of 30.0 per cent. This represents an approximate 31.6 per cent increase in total enrolment over the period, based on the reported figures. Female enrolment rose from 1.57 crore in 2014–15 to 2.24 crore in 2023–24, while female GER increased from 22.9 per cent to 31.2 per cent (Ministry of Education, 2026).

Selected indicator	2014–15	2023–24
Total higher-education enrolment	3.42 crore	4.50 crore
Gross Enrolment Ratio	23.7%	30.0%
Female enrolment	1.57 crore	2.24 crore
Female GER	22.9%	31.2%
Total faculty/teachers	Not compared here	17.32 lakh

Source: Ministry of Education, AISHE 2023–24 release and earlier official AISHE statistics. The approximate 2014–15 faculty figure in the source draft has not been retained because a directly comparable verified figure was not established for this table.

The data indicates an expanding and more inclusive higher education system. It also increases the importance of institutional capacity, academic quality and student support. Enrolment growth alone is not proof of improved learning outcomes, employability or research quality. These outcomes require separate indicators and evaluation.

9. Role of Institutional Autonomy in Promoting Academic Excellence

9.1 Curriculum development and academic flexibility

Autonomy can enable institutions to revise syllabi in response to disciplinary developments, local economic priorities and changing employment requirements. Commerce and management colleges, for example, may consider modules or programmes in business analytics, financial technology, digital accounting, logistics and supply-chain management, digital marketing, entrepreneurship and data-informed decision-making. Such additions should be supported by curriculum mapping, qualified faculty, appropriate infrastructure, stakeholder consultation and clearly stated programme outcomes.

9.2 Innovation in teaching and learning

Academic flexibility can support experiential learning, case studies, simulations, field-based assignments, internships, live projects, problem-based learning and technology-enabled instruction. These approaches can strengthen the connection between theoretical knowledge and practical application. Their effectiveness should be assessed through student work, attainment of learning outcomes, feedback and progression data rather than by counting activities alone.

9.3 Examination and evaluation reforms

Autonomous institutions can design assessment systems that combine internal assessment, semester-end examinations, practical work, presentations, projects and internships as appropriate to the programme. Assessment reforms require transparent regulations, published rubrics, moderation, grievance redressal, secure examination processes and timely declaration of results. Academic flexibility must not dilute fairness, comparability or integrity.

9.4 Research and development

Autonomy can create space for institutional research priorities, faculty-student projects, interdisciplinary work, seminars, publications, patents and engagement with external research organisations. Research development requires mentoring, access to databases, ethical review, research methodology training, seed funding and a culture that values quality and integrity rather than publication counts alone.

9.5 Industry and international collaboration

Institutions can use autonomy to establish structured relationships with employers, professional bodies, universities and research organisations. Internships, guest lectures, joint projects, professional certifications and global academic exposure can enrich student learning. Partnerships should have defined learning objectives, quality controls, transparent agreements and mechanisms to evaluate student benefit.

10. Challenges in the Implementation of Institutional Autonomy

10.1 Financial constraints

Curriculum innovation, digital platforms, laboratories, libraries, research centres and faculty development require sustained investment. Institutions with limited financial capacity may be unable to use the flexibility available to them.

10.2 Shortage of qualified faculty

New and multidisciplinary programmes require suitably qualified teachers, research-active faculty and professionals with relevant expertise. Recruitment constraints and limited professional development can restrict implementation.

10.3 Governance and procedural complexity

Autonomous institutions must ensure that statutory bodies are properly constituted, meet regularly, receive adequate documentation and exercise their respective functions. Poor coordination can delay academic decisions.

10.4 Quality assurance and accountability

Academic freedom must be supported by transparent assessment, academic audits, programme review, student feedback and credible data. Weak monitoring can lead to inconsistent standards.

10.5 Resistance to change

Faculty, administrators and students may be accustomed to affiliated-university procedures. Changes to curricula, assessment, responsibilities and academic calendars require communication, training and participation.

10.6 Financial and academic sustainability

New programmes should be introduced only after assessing student demand, faculty availability, infrastructure, affordability and long-term viability. Revenue considerations must not displace academic purpose.

10.7 Digital and data capacity

Effective examination management, student records, learning platforms and outcome monitoring depend on reliable digital infrastructure, cybersecurity and staff capability.

10.8 Equity and student protection

Flexibility should not create arbitrary differences in student opportunity, excessive financial burdens or barriers to progression. Student support, accessibility and grievance mechanisms remain essential.

11. Practical Application: From Regulatory Autonomy to Institutional Performance

The value of autonomy is visible when it changes institutional practice and produces demonstrable improvements. The following matrix connects areas of institutional decision-making with implementation actions and possible evidence of progress.

Area	Practical application	Possible evidence / indicator
Curriculum	Industry consultation, programme revision, electives and multidisciplinary courses.	Curriculum review cycle; stakeholder inputs; programme outcome mapping.
Teaching and learning	Internships, live projects, simulations, digital learning and experiential pedagogy.	Course-level attainment; student portfolios; internship completion and feedback.
Examination	Continuous assessment, transparent rubrics, moderation and timely results.	Result timelines; moderation records; grievances; assessment reliability.
Research	Research groups, student projects, seminars, seed grants and ethical review.	Quality publications; completed projects; research participation; outputs.
Industry linkage	MoUs with defined activities, internships and professional certification pathways.	Active partnerships; student participation; employer feedback.

Internationalisation	Academic collaborations, exchange and global learning opportunities.	Verified mobility, joint activities and learning outcomes.
Governance	Effective Governing Body, Academic Council, Boards of Studies and Finance Committee.	Meeting regularity; decision tracking; compliance and action-taken reports.
Quality assurance	IQAC reviews, academic audits, feedback and corrective action.	Audit closure rate; action-taken reports; improvement in identified indicators.
Student support	Mentoring, career guidance, counselling, accessibility and grievance redressal.	Service access; resolution time; progression and student feedback.

12. Proposed Conceptual Framework: The AUTONOMY Model

The principal contribution of this paper is an integrated institutional model that connects the formal grant of autonomy to the capacities and practices required for meaningful outcomes. The model is expressed through the acronym AUTONOMY:

Element	Institutional focus	Illustrative actions
A – Academic flexibility	Curriculum, programmes and learning outcomes.	Curriculum review; multidisciplinary options; outcome mapping.
U – Unified governance	Clear roles, collegial decision-making and coordination.	Effective statutory bodies; documented decisions; delegated responsibilities.
T – Teaching and learning innovation	Pedagogy, assessment and student experience.	Experiential learning; digital tools; fair and varied assessment.
O – Organisational capacity	Faculty, finance, infrastructure, leadership and data systems.	Faculty development; strategic budgeting; digital and library resources.
N – Networks and partnerships	Industry, professional, research and international relationships.	Internships; joint projects; expert engagement; academic collaborations.
O – Outcome-based quality	Evidence of learning, research, progression and institutional performance.	Programme outcomes; attainment review; academic audits.
M – Monitoring and accountability	Compliance, transparency, feedback and corrective action.	IQAC monitoring; annual reviews; grievance redressal; action-taken reports.
Y – Yielding sustainable development	Long-term educational, social and institutional value.	Equity, affordability, employability, research culture and financial sustainability.

Conceptual flow: Regulatory and policy environment → Institutional autonomy → AUTONOMY implementation capacities → Academic and organisational processes → Student, research and institutional outcomes → Sustainable higher education development.

The model assumes that autonomy is an enabling condition, not a guarantee of performance. Outcomes are mediated by leadership, faculty capability, financial resources, organisational culture, student profile, external partnerships and the quality of implementation. Institutional context therefore matters. A college should adapt the model to its size, disciplines, resources and regulatory obligations rather than apply it as a uniform checklist.

13. Five-Stage Institutional Implementation Strategy

Stage 1 – Institutional diagnosis and planning

Assess institutional strengths, programme demand, faculty capacity, student needs, infrastructure, finances and regulatory obligations. Prepare a multi-year strategic autonomy plan with measurable priorities.

Stage 2 – Academic and governance readiness

Ensure statutory bodies are constituted and functioning; establish academic calendars, curriculum review processes, programme outcomes, assessment regulations and documented delegation of responsibilities.

Stage 3 – Operational implementation

Introduce approved curriculum changes, teaching innovations, examination reforms, faculty development, research support and structured industry engagement.

Stage 4 – Monitoring and evaluation

Review student learning, progression, examination performance, faculty contribution, research, stakeholder feedback, financial position and compliance through IQAC and appropriate statutory bodies.

Stage 5 – Continuous improvement and sustainability

Use audit findings and outcome data to revise programmes, allocate resources, close implementation gaps and update the strategic plan.

14. Strategic Recommendations

1 Every autonomous institution should prepare a rolling five-year strategic plan linking academic priority, faculty development, research, infrastructure, student support and financial sustainability.

2 Statutory bodies should function as substantive academic and governance forums. Their agendas, minutes, decisions and action-taken reports should demonstrate meaningful deliberation.

3 Curriculum revision should be evidence-led and involve faculty, students, alumni, employers, professional bodies and subject experts, while preserving academic depth and disciplinary integrity.

4 Institutions should establish a faculty development plan covering pedagogy, research methods, digital skills, assessment literacy, industry exposure and academic leadership.

5 Research support should include mentoring, ethics review, seed funding, access to scholarly resources and incentives that reward quality and integrity.

6 Examination systems should be transparent, secure, timely and student-centred, with clear regulations, moderation, grievance redressal and periodic review.

7 IQAC should use a balanced institutional dashboard combining input, process, output and outcome indicators rather than relying exclusively on activity counts.

8 Financial planning should connect programme approvals with cost estimates, resource availability, affordability and long-term viability.

9. Industry and international partnerships should be assessed by their educational value, student access, continuity and measurable outcomes, not merely by the number of MoUs.

10. Student participation, mentoring, accessibility, grievance redressal and feedback should be embedded in institutional decision-making.

11. Institutions should publish accessible annual reports describing major academic decisions, quality initiatives, student outcomes, research activities and improvement actions, consistent with applicable requirements.

15. Major Findings and Discussion

- Institutional autonomy provides an enabling structure for academic flexibility, responsive governance and programme innovation, but formal status alone does not guarantee quality.
- NEP 2020 and the UGC Regulations, 2023 provide a significant policy and regulatory basis for institutional empowerment accompanied by standards and accountability.
- The expansion of enrolment and improvement in GER shown in AISHE data strengthen the case for institutions to improve capacity, relevance, student support and quality assurance.
- Academic, administrative, financial, research and examination autonomy are interdependent; weakness in one area can limit the value of flexibility in another.
- Qualified faculty, effective leadership, adequate resources, functional statutory bodies and reliable data systems are essential mediating conditions.
- Industry engagement, multidisciplinary curricula and innovative pedagogy can strengthen relevance when they are academically sound and linked to programme outcomes.
- Quality assurance should function as a mechanism for learning and improvement, not merely as documentation or compliance.
- Autonomy is most sustainable when institutional freedom is balanced with transparency, equity, academic integrity and accountability.

These findings are conceptual interpretations of policy documents and secondary information. They should not be interpreted as statistical proof that autonomous colleges outperform affiliated colleges. Such a conclusion would require comparative institutional data and an appropriate research design.

16. Limitations and Scope for Further Research

The study is based entirely on secondary sources and conceptual analysis. It does not include primary surveys, interviews, institutional case studies or statistical testing. It therefore cannot establish the causal effect of autonomous status on student achievement, employability, research productivity, financial performance or institutional rankings. AISHE indicators describe the higher education system as a whole and do not isolate the performance of autonomous colleges.

Future research may compare autonomous and affiliated colleges across indicators such as curriculum revision frequency, examination result timelines, student progression, employability, research output, faculty development, financial sustainability and student satisfaction. A longitudinal design could examine institutional performance before and after the conferment of autonomy while accounting for differences in institutional size, discipline mix, location, funding and student composition. Qualitative case studies could also explore how Governing Bodies, Academic Councils, Boards of Studies, Finance Committees and IQACs influence implementation.

17. Conclusion

Institutional autonomy represents an important opportunity to transform Indian higher education. It can enable colleges to respond more effectively to changing knowledge, technology, student aspirations and labour-market requirements. Its contribution, however, depends on the quality of institutional decisions and the capacity to implement them. Autonomy without capable faculty, sound governance, adequate resources, transparent processes and continuous quality assurance may remain only a formal status.

This paper argues that autonomy should be understood as a relationship among freedom, capacity and accountability. The proposed AUTONOMY model translates this principle into eight connected institutional dimensions: Academic flexibility, Unified governance, Teaching and learning innovation, Organizational capacity, Networks and partnerships, Outcome-based quality, Monitoring and accountability, and Yielding sustainable development. The model provides a practical structure for institutional planning, implementation and review.

The future of autonomous higher education will depend not simply on how many institutions receive autonomous status, but on how effectively they use that status to improve student learning, research, inclusion, employability and social contribution. The ultimate purpose of autonomy is therefore not independence for its own sake, but responsible institutional freedom that produces measurable educational excellence and sustainable development.

References

1. Clark, B. R. (1983). The higher education system: Academic organization in cross-national perspective. University of California Press. https://doi.org/10.1525/9780520340725
2. Ministry of Education, Government of India. (2020). National Education Policy 2020. https://www.education.gov.in/sites/upload_files/mhrd/files/NEP_Final_English.pdf
3. Ministry of Education, Government of India. (2024, January 25). Ministry of Education releases All India Survey on Higher Education (AISHE) 2021–2022. Press Information Bureau. https://www.pib.gov.in/Pressreleaseshare.aspx?PRID=1999713
4. Ministry of Education, Government of India. (2026, July 8). Union Ministry for Education releases reports of the All India Survey on Higher Education (AISHE): 2022–23 & 2023–24. Press Information Bureau. https://www.pib.gov.in/PressReleasePage.aspx?PRID=2282525
5. University Grants Commission. (2018). University Grants Commission (Conferment of Autonomous Status upon Colleges and Measures for Maintenance of Standards in Autonomous Colleges) Regulations, 2018. UGC.
6. University Grants Commission. (2023). University Grants Commission (Conferment of Autonomous Status upon Colleges and Measures for Maintenance of Standards in Autonomous Colleges) Regulations, 2023. UGC. https://www.ugc.gov.in/regulations/UGC_Regulations_college
7. UNESCO. (1997). Recommendation concerning the status of higher-education teaching personnel. UNESCO. https://www.unesco.org/en/higher-education/1997recommendation