Critical Study on Assessment of Reforms and Organisational Productivity for Higher Education Institutions with Reference to NEP, 2020

Akash Ambilwade
KBVP College, Navi Mumbai, University of Mumbai
Navi Mumbai, Maharashtra, India

Dr. Harsha Goyal
KBVP College, Navi Mumbai, University of Mumbai
Navi Mumbai, Maharashtra, India

OPEN ACCESS

Volume: 13

Special Issue: 2

Month: January

Year: 2026

E-ISSN: 2582-0397

P-ISSN: 2321-788X

Citation:
Ambilwade, Akash, and Harsha Goyal. "Critical Study on Assessment of Reforms and Organisational Productivity for Higher Education Institutions with Reference to NEP, 2020." *Shanlax International Journal of Arts, Science and Humanities*, vol. 13, no. 2, 2026, pp. 176–81.

DOI:
https://doi.org/10.34293/sijash.v13iS2-i4-Jan.10600

Abstract
Improved organisational productivity via performance-driven career advancement, faculty independence and responsibility, and decentralisation are necessary for the NEP 2020 to be successful in developing a vibrant higher education system in India. The research makes many recommendations to solve this problem, including funding for teacher-led start-ups, revenue sharing in certificate programmes run by academics, and training initiatives to boost faculty motivation and raise the quality of higher education in India. The operational surplus may increase by 20% or more with improved organisational efficiency, allowing for reinvestment back into the institutions. In addition, professors and staff play a critical role in helping higher education institutions achieve their strategic goals, which include enhancing diversity and student outcomes, fostering an inclusive culture, and increasing the impact of their research. In addition to enhancing rules and catering to students' needs, NEP 2020 must prioritise these elements to achieve the necessary academic goals and compete globally.

Keywords: NEP 2020, Higher Education, Faculty, Growth, Inspiration, Autonomy

Introduction

The use of technology has brought significant changes to education, strengthening a country's ability to compete in the international arena. Despite being the world's largest democracy, India has paid little attention to higher education since gaining independence. Macaulay replaced the outdated Gurukul educational system, yet the Higher Education System (HES) has remained largely unchanged. The word "university" comes from "universitas," which means an organisation of teachers. India is currently experiencing a demographic dividend as more people are in their working years than in their dependent years. This dividend is predicted to last for 37 years, with Korea, China, and Japan's economies already reaping its benefits.

To fully realise the potential of the demographic dividend, we require a thriving higher education system (HES). However, the quality of Indian higher education falls below international standards, leading students to

leave due to its low standards. According to a report by ASSOCHAM, in collaboration with TISS, Indian students spend approximately $7 billion on higher education abroad. The introduction of private institutions has significantly changed the landscape of Indian higher education.

As stated by Dr. Manmohan Singh, the former Indian Prime Minister, far too many of India's institutions of higher learning lack quality. The current paper reviews the initiatives of the Indian government's most recent regulatory programme, NEP 2020, aimed at improving faculty motivation.

Objectives of Study

- Examining how NEP 2020 is affecting faculty motivation in Indian higher education and determining if the policy provides a road map for doing so.
- Evaluating the efficiency of Indian higher education institutions (HEIs) and the advantages ratio with an emphasis on the autonomy and empowering of faculty, decentralisation, and possibilities for development motivated by performance and enhanced skills.
- Finding strategies to boost faculty engagement, such as funding for faculty-led businesses, royalties for certificate programmes run by teachers, and training programmes to benefit both the faculty and Indian HEI.

Need of the Study

A critical analysis of organisational productivity and changes in HEI in India is required, with an emphasis on how the NEP 2020 will affect academic results and teacher motivation. A targeted plan for faculty autonomy, empowerment, and decentralisation, as well as development prospects motivated by achievement, motivation, leadership, and better skills, should all be examined in the research. It should also look at other ways to improve faculty motivation, including funding for instructor-led start-ups, profit sharing in certificate programmes run by academics, and training initiatives.

Methodology

This manuscript investigates the policy initiatives of the NEP 2020. The policy document is critically examined in light of previous research on the motivation of Indian faculty members. The NEP 2020 can be found on the website of the Ministry of Education in India.

NEP 2020

The NEP 2020 is serious about faculty inspiration and has a number of recommendations in order to increase faculty motivation. Clause 13.3 advises institutes to improve their skills in order to upgrade faculty working conditions and provide classrooms with infrastructure for modern technology. Enhancements to the infrastructure can be made to increase the efficiency of instruction, but they will not have an important impact on faculty inspiration. Improved facilities, according to Herzberg, are a hygiene factor rather than a motivator. To at least offer bare-bones accommodations and faculty facilities, NEP 2020 must be respected. Although this will lessen disappointment, hygiene concerns cannot inspire motivation. To make higher education vibrant as well as relevant, political will and policy changes are required. In 2011, India had half as many publications as China, but China's higher education was changed by a determined strategy and political will, and in 2011, India's publications made up just 30% of China's total.

Political figures have both failed to grant academics the autonomy they deserve and turned education into a business by supporting institutions they own. Clause 13.4 forbids faculty members from moving to other institutions, in order to lighten the load on faculty members and make more time for study and student communication. This strategy is general and will not work because institutions that violate the rules governing the exchange of faculties rarely face sanctions. Truthfully, faculty data is fabricated so that institutions can apply for affiliations and accreditations by stating that they employ more faculty than they actually do. Data

from the Medical Council of India reveals that there are 4.5 times as many faculties as results of the all-India survey on higher education would suggest. India uses the practice of having ghost professors to pass inspections.

Clause 13.5 grants academic freedom to faculty, allowing them to use any pedagogy and course materials they choose. However, there is a lack of scholarly autonomy for faculty because the affiliated academy controls the curriculum and evaluation. Internal evaluations are a ruse because most privately funded institutions give lenient grades to entice students. Clause 13.6 outlines the use of rewards and recognitions to inspire faculty members and establish responsibility for subpar players. This tactic is both generic and lacking in practical orientation. Promotions at higher levels are under the control of political bosses, and promotions to senior positions have nothing to do with academic performance. Politicians, who are more driven by money, politics, and caste than by academic credentials, appoint people to high positions. To become the Vice Chancellor of a prestigious state university in India, a candidate paid INR 50 crore.

Clause 13.6 addresses faculty evaluation and career advancement. A tenure track system will be put in place to guarantee excellence. Although an impartial and open hiring procedure for faculty members is recommended, hiring decisions are actually made to minimise costs. More than 50% of the open positions are in public higher education institutions. At Delhi University, there are 4,500 temporary faculty members, and in 2020, the twelve colleges under Delhi University's umbrella did not pay their non-teaching staff.

The significance of leadership in institutions of higher learning is emphasised in clause 13.8. In NEP 2020, it is suggested that talented faculty members with leadership potential be identified and trained, utilising a hierarchical structure of positions of authority. The purpose behind such a suggestion is admirable, except in a nation where an applicant must pay INR 50 crore in order to be chosen as a vice chancellor, academic merit and management abilities are not taken into consideration. Spreading political ideology has flourished in higher education. Clause 13.8 will continue to be a myth as long as political meddling in the academic community is not eliminated.

Employee Inspiration

The NEP 2020 recognises that a university's success is most closely correlated with the calibre of its faculty. In NEP 2020, current faculty inspiration is regarded as being significantly below expectations. Private and public higher education institutions work together to meet faculty needs in both intrinsic and extrinsic ways. An educator cultivates and extends skills in a variety of work, making them significant sources of manpower for the development of a country. Male professors are drawn to growth; however, the higher education system in India does not support growth that is motivated by performance.

According to a study on the effectiveness of both the public and private higher education systems in north India, faculty members were content with pedagogy but dissatisfied with evaluation procedures. Accountability received mixed reviews from faculty. The value of teachers has diminished as a result of Western values being indoctrinated and a passion for materialism in Western education. Inorganic growth maintenance can be difficult if growth is not properly controlled. Low-ranked higher education institutions in India are a result of inadequate financial support and a lack of drive.

Technology's Purpose

Higher education results may be improved by technology and faculty inspiration. Higher education must emphasise discussion, cooperation, creativity, and analytical thinking (Sharma, 2013). Agriculture and rural areas can benefit from information technology because it gives women in rural areas more power as well as remote villages (Anjum and Tiwari, 2012a; Tiwari et al., 2020). It is necessary to take a holistic approach that addresses a variety of issues, including the satisfaction of the faculty, administrative backing, teaching quality, and student assessments (Grunwald & Peterson, 2003). Utilising technology for inclusivity is now possible thanks to private sector entry (Anjum & Tiwari 2012b).

The current government has offered assistance and technological initiatives to enhance the legal system, business environment, and quality of life (Rana and Tiwari, 2014). In order to manage demanding operating conditions, dedication and financial restraint are beneficial (Choudhuri et al. 2015). When available resources and capacity are not used properly, economic sustainability is put in jeopardy (Anjum and Tiwari, 2012c). The use of technology, good governance, and autonomy can all produce better outcomes (Sharma et al. 2013).

The quality of teachers' service has an impact on students' satisfaction (Kang et al., 2002). Teachers who lack motivation cannot provide good instruction. Work with industry has a positive impact on developing skills (Khem Chand et al. 2017). Researchers Vijaya Lakshmi, Goswami, and Rao (2018) looked at faculty satisfaction in private higher education institutions with high NAAC ratings. It was discovered that the reasons why people choose to become teachers are not good pay or flexible hours. To increase faculty happiness, it was suggested that better pay, housing options, and flexible work schedules be offered.

Improving Driver Motivation in Faculty

The potential for Indian academic institutions to compete with those around the world is enormous (Reinda et al. 2011). Online learning has the potential to improve access, equity, and results (Anjum Tiwari, 2013). Relationships between students and teachers will improve if learning is worthwhile and productive (Lavy and Bocker, 2018). In order to transform higher education in India, Bloom's taxonomy must be used (Tiwari and Anjum, 2014). For teachers' satisfaction, psychological health, and self-esteem, work-life balance is crucial (Punia and Kamboj, 2013).

Simple, cost-effective methods and low overhead are helpful for generating revenue from operations (Tiwari et al. 2018). Faculty members must be encouraged to actively participate in and contribute to start-up launches and successes in the institute's entrepreneurship development cells in order to foster an entrepreneurial culture (Tiwari et al., 2017). The administration of educational institutions should provide sufficient remuneration, opportunities for specialised advancement, and favourable working conditions to meet the basic needs of the faculty (Nigam, 2017).

Institutions of higher education must be free of political meddling. Higher education must adopt industry management practices to attract talented people in order to improve student skills and life outcomes. Collaboration with business improves student innovation and economic growth. Collaboration between educational institutions and business professionals for instruction improves results and quickens the learning curve (Tiwari, Anjum, 2015). The autonomy, supervisory relationships, and growth opportunities for teachers should be prioritised in order to increase performance (Bakker and Bal, 2010).

Authorities must inspire educators so they will voluntarily work with businesses to advance skills and conduct research (Tiwari, Anjum, 2014). Faculty members are motivated by various things, depending on their hierarchy. The needs of faculties across all age groups and hierarchies are met by the skill hierarchy motivation model (Umashankar & Dutta, 2007). Higher education in India must implement the balanced scorecard. The skill hierarchy motivation model developed by Anjum and Tiwari (2018) provided a comprehensive framework for motivating faculty at various skill and hierarchical levels.

Figure 1 Teachers in Indian Higher Education — Skill Hierarchy Motivation Model
Source: Tiwari and Anjum, 2018

Talented people will be encouraged to enter the teaching profession by greater starting pay. Faculties at the intermediate level will be strengthened by association with mentoring; while more advanced faculties will be inspired by autonomy. Teachers with medium and advanced skill levels are not given a chance for advancement under the NEP 2020. Although NEP 2020 gives students the academic freedom to select the subjects that will best advance their cross-disciplinary expertise, it ignores academic inspiration. To address the value of education, the growth of entrepreneurship, increased employability, and the positive effects of higher education on nation-building, a 360-degree evaluation must be put in place in place of performance evaluation driven by research publications (Tiwari, Anjum, 2014). To promote mentoring for expanding start-ups, the power gap between students and faculty should be narrowed. A board of governors should be used to govern universities, with only one-third of the nominees coming from the government. Members from academia, business, government, and the professional world should make up two-thirds of the group, and they should be free from any political influence (Nayyar, 2017).

Conclusion

In order to build a successful higher education structure in India that can truly meet the ambitions of the country's young people, the current reform plan NEP 2020 is crucial. To do this, however, it is crucial to concentrate on enhancing the organisational efficiency of HEIs via the provision of performance-based advancement opportunities, faculty empowerment and autonomy, and decentralised decision-making. These actions will not only motivate educators and improve their abilities, but they will also increase the international competitiveness of Indian higher education while lowering unemployment and brain drain to foreign institutions.

Although the NEP 2020 recognises the importance of having motivated faculty, it does not offer a roadmap for increasing faculty motivation. With the new education policy, the chance to address the primary issue affecting Indian higher education was lost. NEP 2020 made a token effort to improve structure and regulations, adaptability, and attention to students' needs. However, in the absence of motivated faculty, NEP 2020's desired academic outcomes will continue to be elusive. Support for faculty-led start-ups, revenue sharing in certificate programmes run by faculty, and training programmes would boost faculty morale and be beneficial to both the faculty and Indian higher education.

References

1. Anjum, B., & Tiwari, R. (2012a). Role of information technology in women empowerment. Excel International Journal of Multidisciplinary Management Studies, 2(1), 226–233.
2. Anjum, B., & Tiwari, R. (2012b). Role of private sector banks for financial inclusion. Zenith International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research, 2(1), 270–280.
3. Anjum, B., & Tiwari, R. (2012c). An exploratory study of supply side issues in Indian higher education. Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Management Review, 1(1), 14–24.
4. Anjum, B., & Tiwari, R. (2013). Online education: Opportunities and challenges. Galaxy International Interdisciplinary Research Journal, 1(1), 44–50.
5. Altback, P. (2014). India's higher education challenges. Asia Pacific Education Review, 15, 503–510. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12564-014-9335-8
6. Bakker, A. B., & Bal, M. P. (2010). Weekly work engagement and performance: A study among starting teachers. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 83(1), 189–206.
7. Choudhuri, S., Dixit, R., & Tiwari, R. (2015). Issues and challenges of Indian aviation industry: A case study. International Journal of Logistics & Supply Chain Management Perspectives, 4(1), 1557–1562.
8. Duiker, W. J., & Spielvogel, J. J. (2013). World history, Seventh Edition. Wordsworth Cengage Learning.
9. Grunwald, H., & Peterson, M. (2003). Factors that promote faculty involvement in and satisfaction with institutional and classroom student assessment. Research in Higher Education, 44(2), 15–31.

10. India Today (2013). Our higher education has hit a low: PM Manmohan Singh. https://www.indiatoday.in/india/north/story/higher-education-in-india-has-hit-a-low-prime-minsiter-manmohan-singh-153337-2013-02-06
11. Kang, G. D., James, J., & Alexandris, K. (2002). Measurement of internal service quality: Application of the SERVQUAL battery to internal service quality. Managing Service Quality, 12(5), 278–291.
12. Kapur, D. (2014). Devesh Kapur: Can India's higher education be saved from the rule of babus? Business Standard. https://www.business-standard.com/article/opinion/devesh-kapur-can-india-s-higher-education-be-saved-from-the-rule-of-babus-114062200733_1.html
13. Khem Chand, Tiwari, R., & Phuyal, M. (2017). Economic growth and unemployment rate: An empirical study of Indian economy. Pragati: Journal of Indian Economy, 4(2). http://dx.doi.org/10.17492/pragati.v4i02.11468