



# Content Analysis Of Objectives Of Rashtriya Uchchatar Shiksha Abhiyan (Rusa): A Study

Noni Rajkhowa  
Associate Professor  
Department of Education  
Jhanji Hemnath Sarma College

## Abstract

This study examines the vision and objectives of the Rashtriya Uchchatar Shiksha Abhiyan (RUSA), a national initiative aimed at transforming the state higher education system in India. Using descriptive research design and content analysis, the research analyses three key RUSA documents to explore its strategic framework. The findings reveal that RUSA envisions enhancing access, equity, and excellence in higher education through transparency, accountability, and performance-based reforms. Sixteen objectives outlined in the RUSA guidelines address issues such as Gross Enrolment Ratio (GER), quality enhancement, accreditation, structural reforms, inclusive education, faculty development, research and innovation, and infrastructural improvement. The study also highlights RUSA's emphasis on institutional autonomy—academic, administrative, and financial—as essential for quality assurance and effective governance. By aligning with earlier commissions and policy bodies, RUSA aims to modernize higher education in India and promote equitable development. This research underscores the policy's potential to drive systemic reforms and sustainable educational progress across states.

**Keywords:** RUSA, vision, Objective, Analysis

## 1.0 Introduction:

Education plays a pivotal role in shaping both individual growth and the overall progress of society, especially in today's knowledge-based world. Recognized as a fundamental right, it serves as a powerful means to harness and refine human potential into productive resources. It equips individuals to navigate and adapt to a rapidly evolving world. A nation's socio-economic development is deeply influenced by its educational standards. Education also serves as an empowering force for women, the rural population, and marginalized communities, driving social transformation and modernization. Among all levels of education, higher education is particularly critical for national development. It fulfills the need for skilled professionals in various sectors and is essential for addressing key concerns like inequality, access, quality, and value-based learning. India has a rich legacy of higher education, with major reforms since independence, including those recommended by the Radhakrishnan and Kothari Commissions, aiming to modernize education and promote knowledge, skills, values, and national progress.

## Review of Relevant Literature:

Parasuraman and colleagues (1985) carried out a research investigation focusing on the different aspects of quality in higher education across several Asian nations, including India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, China, and Singapore. Their findings indicated that while India's higher education curriculum is broad and well-structured, it lacks a strong alignment with industrial needs compared to its counterparts in the region. Additionally, the criteria and standards used for accreditation varied significantly from one country to another. Sanyal and Martin (2006) examined China's higher education reforms alongside its economic changes. The study highlighted major shifts such as diversification of funding sources, rapid growth in student enrolment, rise of private institutions, enhanced accountability measures, and efforts to minimize

disparities in access to higher education opportunities. Largosen et al. (2004) explored how higher education institutions adopt quality practices, addressing concerns like academic freedom and superficial implementation. Their study concluded that effective quality management in higher education depends primarily on two key elements: quality control and long-term sustainability. Kumar (2004) investigated the funding mechanisms in higher education and found that government institutions primarily rely on state grants, whereas private institutions generate revenue mainly through donations, student fees, and returns from endowments or other privately managed financial sources.

The National Knowledge Commission (2006) examined the higher education framework and suggested several key improvements, including strengthening research activities, fostering academic partnerships, ensuring equal opportunities and transparent evaluations, revising fee structures, encouraging private sector involvement, promoting public-private collaborations, and building global confidence to attract international students to Indian institutions. Pande (2006) examined the status of higher education in Uttaranchal within the modern context. The study emphasized that limited access to higher education remains a significant issue in the region, calling for urgent attention and appropriate measures to improve inclusivity and reach. Gupta (2012) analyzed quality assurance in Indian higher education and the involvement of various stakeholders. The study emphasized that in today's competitive environment, ensuring quality and societal relevance is crucial. It highlighted that national progress is strongly linked to the standard of education, with higher education playing a central role.

### **Objectives:**

1. To analyse the contents of documents of Rashtriya Uchchatar Shiksha Abhiyan (RUSA) with special reference to vision and objectives

### **Methodology:**

The study applies descriptive research design. The study applies both qualitative and quantitative research design. Content analysis has been used as a technique to analyse different documents related to RUSA. Content analysis was applied to analyse the following documents:

- i) Rashtriya Uchchatar Shiksha Abhiyan (RUSA), DGC, 2013, MHRD, Government of India.
- ii) Hand book of RUSA.
- iii) Rashtriya Uchchatar Shiksha Abhiyan, National Higher Education Mission September, 2013, MHRD in association with Tata Institute of Social Sciences. It is also known as RUSA Document.

### **Population of the present study:**

All the above mentioned three documents frame the population of the present study. These three documents are considered in an exhaustive way.

### **Sample of the present study:**

As all the three main documents were taken for the present work, it frames the sample of the work and can be claimed that sample has covered the cent percent unit of the universe.

### **Analysis and interpretation**

#### **Content Analysis of the document of RUSA, Draft Guidelines for Consultation (DGC), 2013 related to Vision of RUSA:**

The researcher has studied the RUSA, DGC, 2013 and observed that it states about the **Vision** in the content no 2 entitled **Vision of RUSA**. The **Vision** developed by RUSA, DGC, 2013 clearly stated to attain higher level of access, equity and excellence in state higher education system with greater efficiency, transparency, accountability and responsiveness.

It has been found in the **Vision of RUSA**, DGC, 2013 that it has addressed the three issues of higher education in the country viz.; openness, fairness as well as worthiness. To achieve these three objectives of higher education, the **vision of RUSA** has given stress on performance, clarity, liability and generosity of state higher education sector.

**Content Analysis of RUSA, DGC, 2013 related to Objectives of RUSA:**

The investigator studied the RUSA, DGC, 2013 and found that it mentions its objectives in content No. 3 under the heading of **Objectives of RUSA**.

it has been observed that the **Objectives of RUSA** have been formulated for overall quality development of higher education in the country. These are further explained below:

- a. 1<sup>st</sup> objective of RUSA, formulated by RUSA, DGC, 2013 clearly states to increase the Gross Enrolment Ratio (GER) in the higher education sector of India with the target of 32% by the end of 13th FYP period (2017- 2022).
- b. 2<sup>nd</sup> objectives of RUSA mentions to ensure quality higher education in all the states of India. RUSA has recommended several norms and standards and the state higher educational institutions is expected to improve their quality and standard by following those norms within stipulated time frame.
- c. 3<sup>rd</sup> objective of RUSA states about the adoption of accreditation mechanism which is a mandatory framework for ensuring quality improvement in higher educational institutions of the country.
- d. 4th objective of RUSA has given stress on transformative reform in the state's higher education system through setting up of facilitating institutional structure.
- e. 5th objective of RUSA states to ensure reforms in the higher education system in the country in the crucial areas of academics, examination as well as evaluation aspects.
- f. 6<sup>th</sup> objective of RUSA states about expansion of state higher educational institutions by generating supplementary capacity in the existing higher educational institutions.
- g. 7<sup>th</sup> objective of RUSA, includes provisions for the states to undertake reforms in the affiliating system in the higher education sector.
- h. 8<sup>th</sup> objective of RUSA states to assure sufficient accessibility of quality faculty in all higher educational institutions and to attain the capacity building culture at all levels of higher education.
- i. 9<sup>th</sup> objective of RUSA has given stress on creating a comprehensive environment in the higher educational institutions to promote research and innovation.
- j. 10<sup>th</sup> objective of RUSA, states that incorporation of skill development endeavors with minimum interferences from the government is an inclusive step.
- k. 11<sup>th</sup> objective of RUSA states to reduce the regional disparities regarding access to higher education in the country.
- l. 12<sup>th</sup> objective of RUSA has mentioned to enhance fairness and equality in the higher education system through the creation of adequate provisions for the socially deprived communities including women, minorities, SC/ST/OBCs and differently-abled persons.
- m. 13<sup>th</sup> objective of RUSA acknowledges the infrastructural gaps in the higher education system and suggested to reduce the same through increasing endeavors from the side of state governments.
- n. 14<sup>th</sup> objective of RUSA, states to upgrade healthy competitions amongst the states and higher educational institutions to address the different issues related to quality, research, and innovation.
- o. 15<sup>th</sup> objective of RUSA, has stated about the role of state governments as well as educational institutions.
- p. 16<sup>th</sup> objective of RUSA, stated about the encouragement and formation of a State Higher Education Council (SHEC) in every state.

It has been found from the Table No. 23 that autonomy is essential aspect for quality and accountability. The Radhakrishnan Commission 1948-49, Kothari Commission 1964-66, National knowledge Commission, 2005, Yash pal committee has stressed the need for universities to be an autonomous entities. RUSA is intending to execute in such a way to implement in greater autonomy of the institutions and states in relation to decision making. This guiding principles of RUSA has been included the academic, administrative and financial autonomy of higher educational institutions including college and



universities. The institutions and states are expected to be directed by the principles laid down under RUSA and it ensures attainment of the objectives of access, excellence and greater equity. The principle of autonomy clearly emphasised the freedom of each institutions to function in order to achieve academic excellence and also to administer the institution through its own rules and regulations. Regarding institutional autonomy RUSA, DGC, 2013 has stated that institutional autonomy mainly includes the areas of selection of students, appointments and promotion of teachers, determination of courses of study, pedagogy, assessment, and areas of research and use of resources etc.

### Conclusion:

The present study critically analyzed the vision and objectives of the Rashtriya Uchchatar Shiksha Abhiyan (RUSA), focusing on its strategic framework for strengthening the state higher education sector in India. By employing a descriptive research design and content analysis method, the study examined three pivotal documents—RUSA, Draft Guidelines for Consultation (DGC), 2013, RUSA Handbook, and RUSA National Higher Education Mission Report (2013). The analysis revealed that RUSA aims to address long-standing challenges in Indian higher education through a systematic approach grounded in the principles of access, equity, and excellence. It emphasizes transparency, accountability, and performance-based mechanisms to achieve inclusive and sustainable improvements across the sector. The sixteen well-defined objectives of RUSA reflect a comprehensive approach toward educational reform. These range from increasing the Gross Enrolment Ratio (GER) to implementing mandatory accreditation frameworks, reforming academic structures, reducing regional and social disparities, and enhancing faculty quality and infrastructure. Moreover, RUSA seeks to promote research, innovation, and skill development while simultaneously enabling institutional expansion and governance reforms. A key finding of the study is RUSA's strong emphasis on institutional autonomy—academic, administrative, and financial—as a foundation for ensuring quality and accountability. This aligns with the recommendations of earlier commissions such as the Radhakrishnan Commission, Kothari Commission, National Knowledge Commission, and the Yash Pal Committee, which have consistently advocated for empowering universities and colleges to manage their own affairs effectively. In essence, RUSA represents a transformative shift in India's higher education policy landscape. Its holistic framework, grounded in equity and quality enhancement, has the potential to create a more responsive, dynamic, and future-ready higher education system. The successful implementation of RUSA's vision and objectives will largely depend on sustained commitment from state governments, institutional leadership, and active participation from all educational stakeholders.

### References:

- 1) Gupta, P.K. (2012). Quality assurance in higher education : The role of stakeholders. Education : North East, 16 (2), 28-33.
- 2) Kumar, N. (2004). Private cost of Medical and Para-Medical Education in Kerala, Discussion paper, No-84, Thiruvananthapuram: KRPLLD, centre for Development studies (CDS).
- 3) Largosen, S. Seyed, Hasheni, R. and Leitner, M. (2004). Examination of dimensions of quality in higher education. Quality Assurance in Education. 12 (2). 61-69. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09684880410536431>
- 4) Pande, K.K. (2006). A study of higher education in Uttaranchal in the changed scenario. [Doctoral thesis of Kumaun University, Nainital] <http://hdl.handle.net/10603/171912> dated 22/01/2020.
- 5) Parasuraman, A. Zeithaml, V.A. and Berry, L.H. (1985). A conceptual model of service quality and its implications for future research, Journal and Marketing. 49(4), 41-50.
- 6) Report of the National Knowledge Commission, 2006.
- 7) Sanyal, C.B. and Martin M. (2006). Financing higher education: International perspectives, Higher Education in the world: the Financing of Universities. Palgrave Macmillan.