To
Shri M. K. Kaw, IAS
Chairman, AICTE Review Committee 2014
All India Council for Technical Education (AICTE)
Chanderlok Building, Janpath, New Delhi 110001

<div align="right">23th January, 2014
IIT Bombay.</div>

From
Milind Sohoni
Professor, CSE and CTARA, IIT Bombay

Dear Shri Kaw and Profs. Desai, Jhunjhunwala and Aggarwal

This is in connection with the AICTE Review Committee formed on 22nd October 2014, to review all aspects of the functioning of AICTE, including the provisions of the AICTE Act of 1987.

I would like to make the following submissions under various items (i), (iv) and (viii) of the Terms of Reference and also under various sections of the AICTE Act itself, especially Item 10(1) of the Act. As I understand, the Act empowers AICTE to be the custodian of the important area of technical education in India, and includes (i) admissions of students and measuring performance of institutions (ii) curriculum design for meeting societal needs (iii) guidance on the conduct of research and development.

In my opinion, this review serves as an important opportunity to:

(i) strengthen AICTE through better knowledge gathering mechanisms which informs students, administrators and institutions, the industry and the population at large. To design better testing, admission and certification mechanisms which create the right incentives for all-round development of the individual as well as Indian society.

(ii) enable a more federal approach to the subject thereby setting up a closer coordination between regional needs and regional institutions in terms of knowledge production. To identify and separate national and strategic needs and make arrangements for the same.

(iii) re-orient the conduct of research and pedagogy in Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics at all levels, especially at elite institutions, to meet the knowledge requirements of society. To bring the interdisciplinarity required in the modern engineer, esp. for a developing country such as ours.

My submission is in the form of some background material on specific topics followed by concrete recommendations.

1. **Placements.** This is the first job that a graduate obtains, typically through a campus office, and is an important outcome of engineering education. Standard formats for reporting campus placements should be mandatory for aided institutions. This will help AICTE in assessing colleges, programs and outcomes. The report should indicate the sector (NIC code) and the ownership structure (such as PSU, Public Ltd, Multi-national, Pvt. Ltd.), the customer base (e.g., Indian market, global markets) of the company, position offered (design, marketing, management trainee, etc.) salary and academic details such as branch of engineering and academic performance index. Such a uniform format should be recommended from the IITs down to the

local engineering colleges. An example analysis of 2013 IITB placements are attached. Some snippets appear in the table below for 2013 placements for IIT Bombay and VNIT, Nagpur.

GG refers to global company serving a global market (e.g., Bank America or General Electric), while II refers to an Indian company serving Indian markets (e.g., Ambuja Cement or Tata Motors). IG and GI are similarly explained (e.g., Infosys and Hindustan Unilever respectively). Super-GG are placements abroad. The number, e.g., 116 (7.9) indicates the number placed and the average annual salary in Rs. Lakhs.

Table 1: Placements (2013) of UG and PG students of major departments in IIT Bombay.				
Sector	Engineering	Finance	Consulting	IT
Super-GG	25 (27.7)	10 (35.0)	7 (54.0)	42 (51.3)
GG	116 (7.9)	82 (11.7)	110 (9.6)	102 (10.0)
IG	54 (6.5)	19 (7.2)	11(5.8)	28 (7.2)
GI	24 (9.3)	10 (14.2)	10 (5.2)	5 (9.3)
II	64 (6.5)	13 (9.5)	8 (5.8)	22 (7.9)

Table 2: Placements (2013) of all students at VNIT Nagpur.				
Sector	Engineering	Finance	Consulting	IT
GG	16 (7.2)	11 (10.1)	36 (5.0)	30 (5.0)
IG	6 (4.8)	0	0	37 (4.0)
GI	43 (4.7)	0	0	0
II	207 (4.5)	2 (4.8)	0	0

Such an analysis will help the institutions, administrators, the ministry and students considerably. It will also (i) identify successful curricula, pedagogy and practices, and (ii) guide the funding of R&D so that existing linkages are strengthened. For example, from the above data, IIT Bombay is well advised to focus on the problem of placing its graduates into engineering for national needs. On the other hand, VNIT will see the opportunity of using its own graduates to develop a sound R&D collaboration with key industries and also analyse and strengthen its curricula.

2. **Accreditation**. Accreditation is something that needs due care. As of today, the accreditation documents asks colleges to compare their curricula with "American professional societies", see 3.1.3 of *Format for Self Assessment Report for Tier I Institutions*, thus in effect, requiring accreditation to the ABET institution of USA. Model curricula for some disciplines have been supplied on the AICTE site but, to the best of our knowledge, are only for information and need not to be used for accreditation. ABET engineering programs refer to US professional bodies such as ASCE, ASME and so on and are designed to suit their scientific and economic infrastructure and their social needs and chosen trajectory. This may not be suitable for us, given the nature of our industrialization and our societal needs. For example, the ASCE has come up with a document called *The Civil Engineering Body of Knowledge*, a document of 190 pages outlining the historical development of the field, its professional practices, future challenges and a list of what a modern (US) civil engineer should know. In this document, e.g., the word "sanitation" occurs once (in the chapter on Globalization) and the word "sewage" not at all! Thus, given that we have a severe need for sanitation and sewage services and active programs (e.g., *Swachh Bharat*) in the sector, accreditation to the ASCE program would be unsuitable.

Indeed, AICTE must come up with such *Body of Knowledge* documents in each branch of engineering and also the applied social sciences. These documents should realize the role of the small and medium sectors, the pending development agenda of *sadak, bijlee, paani* as well as strategic needs such as in

telecommunications or railways, as important objectives for curriculum design.

In fact, the Washington Accord recommends (see http://www.ieagreements.org/IEA-Grad-Attr-Prof-Competencies.pdf) that each signatory identify key stakeholders and create an outcome driven framework for defining engineering, stressing the role of the engineer as a societal change agent. See, for example, attribute WA3 of the Washington Accord: *"Design solutions for complex engineering problems and design systems, components or processes that meet specified needs with appropriate consideration for public health and safety, cultural, societal, and environmental considerations.".* Thus, the Washington Accord actually *recommends* a curriculum and processes suited to societal needs.

I must also point to our Hon. PM's speech at the Hon. President's meeting with the IIT directors, on 22nd August, 2014, where he said that "*science is universal, but technology is local*". This implies that there should be space for courses which have a regional flavour, e.g., in Maharashtra, irrigation may be more important, while in Himachal Pradesh, hill roads and bridges may form a full semester course. Unfortunately, neither the AICTE model curricula, nor the GATE curricula or the curricula offered at the IITs/NITs allow such regional, strategic or developmental adaptations.

3. **GATE**. In the absence of any guidance from AICTE or NBA, the GATE syllabus is the *de facto* definition of an engineer in India. This is evident from the role that GATE now plays in opening new opportunities for the fresh graduate, viz., from entrance into elite M.Tech. programs to job recruitments, esp. into PSUs. Moreover, even before this, a large fraction of engineering graduates have been writing GATE. For example, in 2010, the number of students writing GATE was about 4 lakhs which by 2013 had swelled to 9.8 lakhs. Thus, the GATE exam is already an important certification exam for engineers in India and needs to be incorporated into AICTE thinking.

However, the conduct and reporting of this exam is decided by the older IITs and IISc. This curriculum is largely based on the faculty expertise of the organizing institutions, existing UG curricula, the type of graduate students that they want for their research purposes, *and the amount of effort that they wish to put into it*. For example, consider the topic of "concurrency" in CSE, which appears in two areas, viz., Databases and Operating Systems and was a traditional research area of faculty members in these institutions. It is unclear if concurrency is industrially important, can be taught by a wide body of faculty members across our engineering colleges, and that its ramifications in both Databases and in Operating Systems are important attributes of a typical CSE graduate of the country.

Moreover, as Table I and Table II suggest, the IITs and IISc have been sending a minority of their graduates into engineering jobs and fewer still into engineering for domestic needs. The typical syllabus in GATE is what is taught at the IITs/IISc and which is largely theoretical, and needs about 12-14 core courses. For example, most graduates from IIT Bombay would not have visited a factory or a water supply system, let alone a firm in the small and medium sector, the mainstay of domestic engineering. However, most colleges do not have the requisite faculty strength and expertise to teach the above 12-14 theoretical courses (though they may be placing more students into domestic engineering) and students must take recourse to coaching classes.

Finally, the Multiple-Choice format for GATE is a reflection of the amount of time the IITs and IISc faculty members are willing to spend on screening students for their graduate student admissions. It cannot be used to measure the fairly subtle skill of engineering, which is a combination of both practical skills and theoretical competence. Moreover, the time-bound objective-type format devalues a range of other important engineering skills such as system design, field observations and field-work and also inter-disciplinary skills. It is also unsuitable for testing research abilities and many IITs now rely on an elaborate interview process as well. I must add that GRE discontinued the Engineering Subject Test in 2001 and the Computer Science Subject Test in 2013.

The insistence on such a theoretical and largely unimplementable definition of the engineer, and to test it without field context, in a computerised framework, perpetuates a dichotomy between the elite institutions and regional institutions which has proved insurmountable for over 50 years now. I think a structuring of GATE into a set of 5-6 MUSTS and 5-6 optional/regional courses would ease the pressure on engineering colleges and focus their attention on (i) getting a few basic courses right, (ii) supplement their programs with

courses which meet regional engineering requirements. Even these 5 MUSTS should be defined after a broad consultation between the broader academia and the industry, including the needs of informal sector, core development sectors. Via GATE, elite institutions and regional institutions must enter into a virtuous cycle of improvement, which must begin at the current level of competence of regional institutions. Independently, even if a time-bound objective system must be used, more thought should go into the design of the question paper and the coverage of topics. A public report on the outcomes of GATE, aggregate and question-wise statistics should be maintained and supporting research must be done so that GATE evolves into a robust certification exam. See, for example, the detailed academic analysis of the GRE and SAT suite of examinations and the important role this academic analysis has played in the US education system.

4. **Interdisciplinarity.** The engineer is now recognized as a social and cultural actor and a change-agent. Moreover, this is enshrined in the Washington Accord thinking as well. This is especially true for a developing country such as India, where engineering should be about design for a societally posed problem and solved in the socio-economic context in which the problem is posed. This needs inter-disciplinary skills of societal assessment, problem formalization and description, decomposition of a problem into disciplinary sub-components, design and synthesis, and finally deployment and outcome measurements. This requires a change in the way social sciences and the physical sciences are taught. In the social sciences, students must understand the practical structure of society, the role of the state, market and civil society. It also requires a familiarity with standard datasets such as Census, District Economic Surveys, and with flagship government programs, key private sector players, e.g., in the water sector.

In the physical sciences, core scientific areas which are developmentally important such as groundwater and cooking energy, must be incorporated into the science curricula. Moreover, the cultural moorings of science, for example the skills of description and argumentation, play an important role in the design of scientific experiments and the development of rigour. These should be recognized as part of the training in science for it to yield significant insights and progress which benefit society. The new training should also stress that most true science is far more applied and empirical and with a multitude of "right" answers. Consider, for example, the question of determining the "best" *chulha* in the village, which throws up many points which require methodological and scientific innovation.

This, of course, requires a long-term program for institutions to undertake and the development of innovative pedagogical methods, such as project-based field work and a topical case-study approach. This, in turn will require great leadership from the elite engineering institutions, i.e., the IITs, NITs, the elite science institutions such as the IISERs and IISc and elite social science institutions. In fact, the **Unnat Bharat Abhiyan** is an important framework which extends the definition of science and engineering in an important way, i.e., into the concrete development agenda and into recognizing the role of the elite institutions as leaders in creating a new curricula and methods for a developing country. Perhaps, AICTE should come up with a series of *Body of Knowledge* documents and a National Curriculum Framework under which this activity will be carried out.

5. **TEQIP and other World Bank Projects**. An important program in the recent past which impacted technical education is the World Bank funded TEQIP-I and II program of Govt. of India for selected institutions in engineering. Most of these were Tier I and II institutes and were largely the NITs or state colleges. Besides "academic excellence" and better governance, one of the core objectives of the program was *"providing service to community and economy through linkages and active interaction with industry, government, and other stakeholders, formal and informal sectors of the economy, adult learners, and all who seek or need technological assistance"*. Thus, at least in principle, it expected colleges to develop linkages with the region and with regional agencies.

An independent review of TEQIP-I was not very positive on many of the stated objectives. Fully 59% of the institutions had less than satisfactory performance on the "key performance indicators" (KPI). One of the KPIs measuring excellence was the number papers published in national and international journals which has led to an increased focus of faculty members on "global" research to the detriment of their own capacity to innovate for regional problems. From my visits to colleges in Maharashtra, and in my opinion, this has damaged some of the regional relevance that institutions used to have. Faculty members who would have been good role models for doing relevant work have fallen behind and somewhat questionable research work

has come to the forefront and is used by administrations to allocate resources. A sampler of this is the attached Table 3 in which we collate the number of papers indexed by Scopus in which at least one of the authors was from India and the phrase was part of the title.

Table 3: Number of papers with phrase in the title, with at least one author from India (Scopus)			
Topic (Phrase)	All years preceding 2003	2003-2009 (TEQIP I)	2010 onwards (TEQIP II)
Neural Network	692	1818	2467
Fuzzy Logic	110	327	759
Wavelets	96	905	1846
Genetic Algortihms	262	989	1373

It is unclear why "Neural Networks" has become such a central area for research amongst Indian scientists. On the other hand, see Table 4 below for the number of papers with the same attributes, but in areas which are developmentally important. Thus, the KPI of "number" of publications may be hiding an essential misallocation of effort and funds into research in areas which are not relevant. Another KPI was the average salary of graduating students, which as we have already argued, can also be misleading since it does not quite capture if these students were actually placed in engineering or allied fields. TEQIP III, which is under design, must ensure that gaps of TEQIP I and II and addressed.

Table 4: Number of papers with phrase in the title, with at least one author from India (Scopus)			
Topic (Phrase)	All years preceding 2003	2003-2009 (TEQIP I)	2010 onwards (TEQIP II)
Water Supply	84	74	87
Sanitation	30	51	63
Groundwater Models	11	29	70
Public Transport	5	15	25
Power Grid	12	56	288

 Moreover, a key recommendation of the independent assessment was for institutions to engage further with their regions and work with regional agencies for their research. The World Bank itself is engaged in many sectors in India, e.g., water and electricity, and most of the work needs regional partners. Consider, for example, the World Bank Neeranchal Watershed Project of 2014, which aims to improve watershed outcomes across various states and strengthen the Integrated Watershed Management Program of Govt. of India. Neeranchal retains the National Institute of Hydrology (NIH) as a key knowledge provider at the center. However, in the states, where most of the work will be done, it does not link up with regional institutions, e.g., TEQIP colleges, but looks at NGOs as possible partners. This misses an important opportunity for capacity building of formal knowledge institutions and a partnership between these and the state agencies.

The World Bank is an important (and expensive) knowledge agency and brings many skills and practices. AICTE should ensure that such opportunities of collaboration are not lost and that a close research and practice-based relationship develops between apex institutions, multi-lateral agencies, state and regional institutions and regional agencies. Both these points may be addressed in TEQIP III.

6. **JEE Mains and JEE Advanced.** Just like GATE, the JEE exam in effect, serves to define the outcome of school education in Science and Mathematics, much to the detriment of the state board exams. The precursor of this system was the AIEEE which was used to admit students into the NITs and the IIITs and a few other

institutions. The JEE was used for admitting into the IITs. However, this system was merged in 2013 and now JEE (Mains) is the exam which is used to admit into the NITs and is used to qualify students who are permitted to write the JEE (Advanced), for the IITs. Since 2014, some states (e.g. Maharashtra) have discarded their own admission exams (CETs) and are now using the JEE (Mains) to admit students. Thus, the JEE is now increasingly important to a larger body of students and is the *de facto* measurement of preparation in science and mathematics. More than 10 lakh school students gave this exam in 2014, which is a substantial fraction of all high school students who did the Sciences in their XIIth. Given the numbers, the exam is administered in a nation-wide time-bound multiple-choice format on the CBSE high school curriculum. Moreover, it is a ranking exam as opposed to a qualifying exam, and the student's rank in the exam is usually the sole criterion in determining her admission. The preferred outcome is of course, admission into the IITs or the NITs which make up roughly 20,000 seats, i.e., about 2% of the total number of students writing the exam.

However, there are several very serious problems.

(i) **Disruption of state curricula.** A look at the statistics of JEE (Advanced) 2014 shows that 55% of those who qualified came from CBSE! Other top scores were Andhra Pradesh (17.5%) and Maharashtra (6.7%). All other state boards contributed to less than 2% of the qualified candidates. As a result of this and pressure from middle-class parents, many state boards (e.g., Maharashtra and Andhra Pradesh) feel compelled to match their curricula with CBSE, the curricula closest to that for the JEEs. This results in a global definition of science and its pedagogy for all students, rural or urban. Much material which is of local or regional relevance, e.g., the analysis of droughts, or a pedagogy of field-based science may either be absent or is de-emphasized since it does not match the JEE format or content. This is over-centralization. Even the famous *Gao Kao* exam of China is conducted on province-specific curricula.

Moreover, the students in the CBSE board have a very different socio-economic background and face a very different world as compared to students from the state boards. Thus, it is not clear that the CBSE curricula for Science or Mathematics is suited for state governments who are faced with a largely vernacular, economically stressed and possibly rural student body. The correct pedagogy and content for Science for such (if not all) students should be that which connects with the immediate material world around them and helps them probe it along with the socio-economic context, e.g., natural resources, basic services such as water and energy. Only then will they be prepared for to make correct choices for themselves and for society. Compare this with the stated rationale of the Physics NCERT curriculum for XI-XII, quoted below:

The higher secondary stage is crucial and challenging stage of school education as it is a transition from general science to discipline-based curriculum. Physics is being offered as an elective subject at the higher secondary stage of school education. At this stage, the students take up Physics, as a discipline, with a purpose of pursuing their future careers in basic sciences or professional courses like medicine, engineering, technology and studying courses in applied areas of science and technology at tertiary level. There is a need to provide the learners with sufficient conceptual background of Physics which would eventually make them competent to meet the challenges of academic and professional courses after the higher secondary stage. The present effort of reforming and updating the Physics curriculum is an exercise based on the feedback received from the school system about existing syllabus and curricular material, large expansion of Physics knowledge, and also the educational and curricular concerns and issues provided in the National Curriculum Framework-2005. The recommendations of National Curriculum Framework-2005 have been followed, keeping the disciplinary approach with rigour and depth, appropriate to the comprehension level of learners. Due care has been taken that the syllabus is not heavy and at the same time, it is comparable to the international standards. Also, it is essential to develop linkages with other disciplines for better learning of Physics concepts and establishing relationship with daily-life situations and life-skills.

Thus, we see that "daily-life situations and life skills" are the last 6 words in a rationale of 230 words. The rationale for the NCERT Mathematics curricula is similarly "transcendental". Thus, state boards are ill-advised to adopt the CBSE curricula for their own students and the JEE exams are ill-advised to adopt such a curricula and format for their exams.

(ii) **Unsuitable Format for testing Science and Mathematics.** As mentioned earlier, the JEE is a nation-

wide exam of Science and Mathematics conducted on a single curriculum, viz., the CBSE, and in the time-bound multiple-choice format. Moreover, the number of students appearing is about 10 lakhs, most of whom are nominally competing for about 20,000 seats in the IITs and NITs, i.e., with a success rate of roughly 2%. The IIT brand then establishes itself by their student festivals, celebrity academicians as visitors (such as in the newly proposed GIAN program), and primarily, the stellar "packages" (i.e., salaries) of a few IIT graduates. This makes the exam the single most competitive exam in India and one which captures the imagination of the media and most middle class parents. The main reasons for the chosen format for the JEE exam are (i) given the high stakes, a subjective exam will be difficult to correct "fairly" and will be liable to legal contestations, (ii) unavailability of faculty time in designing a question paper and correcting 10 lakh answer papers.

However, if one describes (following Krishna Kumar) the culture of Science as that of touching and manipulating the material world, and of personal observation and contemplation, then the JEE actually promotes quite the opposite. It measures facility and familiarity with arcane mathematical identities, highly stylized textbook models motivated by mathematical laws of physics and huge amounts of rote work and practice. Since only the top 2% are admitted to the IITs or NITs, the exam-taker must have excellent skills of question selection, elimination and informed guess-work, making the exam one of the most highly coached exam in India. This has its own socio-economic problems which are visible from the rural-urban divide and the gender distribution of the students who pass JEEs. Please see the table below which looks at the distribution by gender of students who appeared and were successful.

Table 5: Selected JEE statistics on gender.						
	JEE 2012			JEE (Advanced) 2013		
	Appeared	Qualified	Pass %-age	Appeared	Qualified	Pass %-age
Boys	337916	21226	6.28	103660	18468	17.8
Girls	168568	2886	1.71	23089	2366	10.2
%-age of Girls	33.2	11.9	-	18.2	11.4	-

Note that JEE 2012 was conducted by the IITs. The %-age of girls who wrote the exam was already a low at 33.2%. The number who succeeded was down to 11.9%. In 2013, the data on JEE (Mains) is not available online. Since most of those who qualify in JEE (Mains) would register for JEE (Advanced), we can surmise that the the fraction of girls in those who passed JEE (Mains) 2013 must be close to 18.2%. This number is again rather low. After JEE (Advanced), this number drops down to 11.4%, close to the fraction of 2012. Note that both (i) more girls opt to NOT give the JEE, and (ii) their pass percentages are also lower. We compare this to the CBSE data which we present below:

Table 6: CBSE 2013 Statistics.					
	Appeared	Secured 90% marks	%-age of total	Secured 95% marks	%-age of total
Boys	512210	22596	4.4	2855	0.56
Girls	376410	22053	5.8	3237	0.86
%-age of Girls	42.4	49.3	-	53.1	-

We see that, in the CBSE exam, a subjective exam allowing for a wider variety of questions, and of a longer duration, on the same curricula as the JEE, and one which is graded by human examiners, girls did much better than boys. Next, let us also look at the rural-urban divide as given in the Table 7 below. Note that JEE 2011 and 2012 were before the amalgamation of JEE and AIEEE while JEE (Advanced) 2014 was sourcing applicants from JEE (Mains).

Table 7: Rural-Urban statistics for JEE.						
	JEE 2011		JEE 2012		JEE (Advanced) 2014	
Cohort	Registered	Qualified	Regsitered	Qualified	Registered	Qualified
Village	19%	10%	19%	11%	13%	10%
Town	29%	25%	29%	26%	19%	14%
City	52%	65%	52%	63%	68%	76%

We thus see an increasing polarization where students from rural or small-town backgrounds are increasingly less likely to register and also to succeed in the JEEs. Fully 76% of students are now coming from cities as opposed to villages and towns.

Moreover, if we look at the "mode of preparation" for this exam, as reported in the JEE (Advanced) 2014 report, we see that fully 37% of those who qualified in JEE (Mains) reported that they had used methods other than "Self Study" (i.e., had availed of coaching). This fraction rose to 43% in those who qualified in JEE (Advanced). Another very revealing study is the composition of parents income of students who qualify in JEE (Mains) 2014 versus those who qualify in JEE (Advanced) 2014 where we see that students from the income annual income class of Rs. 8 lakh and above were about 2.7 times more likely to succeed than those with an annual income of less than Rs. 1 lakh. Note that the data on rural/urban background, preparation and parents income is as reported by students and that itself is likely to be strategic. Reporting lower incomes and self-study as the method of preparation does increase the chances of receiving scholarships.

A final piece of data is culled from the NSSO, 68th round household survey of 2011-2012. We list below, our analysis of annual household expenditure on education for a sample of states and the rural and urban sector. We only report the number of samples, the mean and the Gini coefficient for households which had either one girl or one boy who was studying. More detailed analysis is available upon request. This analysis clearly shows a sharp variation across states, across gender and across rural vs. urban backgrounds. Other than Tamil Nadu, all states show a much higher spending on boys than on girls. The higher spending on girls in Tamil Nadu may well explain the higher number of girls who pass JEE from the South Zone (administered by IIT Madras), again see the JEE (Advanced) 2014 report.

Table 8: NSSO (2011-2012, 68th round) statistics on household expenditure on education.									
		Andhra Pradesh Urban	Andhra Pradesh Rural	Rajasthan Urban	Rajasthan Rural	Odisha Urban	Odisha Rural	Tamil Nadu Urban	Tamil Nadu Rural
Households with one studying male	Mean (Rs.)	9919	5706	19096	4362	5765	1787	11046	8493
	Number of Samples	365	373	235	263	143	291	373	293
	Gini	0.61	0.58	0.56	0.64	0.65	0.70	0.64	0.67
Households with one studying female	Mean (Rs.)	9233	3752	9369	3431	4278	2292	12653	6949
	Number of samples	281	245	98	126	94	191	321	259
	Gini	0.61	0.55	0.60	0.56	0.82	0.76	0.65	0.69

Moreover, the Gini coefficients are also exceptionally high, showing a great disparity on spending on education. This probably arises from information asymmetry across households and also access to coaching

classes from the place of residence. The disparity in the number of samples also indicates that substantially fewer households with girls are spending on their education.

On the whole, the data shows that it is unlikely that the JEE is measuring student preparation in science and mathematics and her aptitude for engineering. The format of the exam is likely to encourage coaching and discourage independent thinking or a science which is inspired by ones surroundings and of solving problems therein. We should also point out that the excessive selectivity of the JEE process is probably leading to a misallocation of IIT graduates to the global service sector as opposed to engineering for Indian needs.

7. **The role of the IITs, NITs and IISERs.** The role of and the expectations from these premier institutions in India's technical education infrastructure is not very clear. There are overlapping Acts which lead to several questions, e.g., are the IITs covered by the Washington Accord? As of now, these institutions wield substantial influence on technical education, various policy decisions and programs (as witnessed by the Preamble of the TEQIP program) and even the conduct of the AICTE (as witnessed, e.g., by the composition of the Review committee). It is only reasonable that the *locus standi* of these institutions be made clear.

More important is the connection of their research with teaching and the national agenda. Since much of the research funding from GoI goes to these institutions, AICTE should suggest clear and concrete expectations on the outcomes of this research for the benefit of its members. This is all the more important for new investments in these elite institutions, e.g., in the form of international faculty exchange (e.g., the newly proposed GIAN initiative) or in specific research programs (such as in Nanotechnology). One possibility is to require at least some of this research should lead to new courses (and matching faculty), in key sectors such as groundwater or cooking energy. Moreover, elite institutions may forge new liaisons with state and district administrations, or with companies in strategically important areas such as telecommunications or railways. These liaisons and ways-of-working may set a precedent for academia-industry-state interactions and translate to new job definitions. However, for much of this to happen, there needs to be closer collaborations between elite institutions and regional institutions on both academic programs and research.

I will close this submission with the reiteration that:

1. Technical education in India is not functioning at its best and faces from many challenges. I must add that many development outcomes such as drinking water and cooking energy are actually in the realm of engineering. These are in poor shape and need better engineering, more research and a partnership between elite and regional institutions, and public and private agencies.

2. The domination of state-funded elite institutions comes with a responsibility. With a selectivity of 2%, it is important that "losers" benefit from participation in the process, for otherwise the elite institutions will eventually lose both legitimacy and support. This should be in the form of an elite agenda for (i) a pedagogy of science and engineering which is more inclusive, and (ii) better development outcomes through research, new job definitions and better jobs. See the attached manuscript for a broader argument and a road-map.

Reviews of key institutions such as the AICTE are rare and present an important opportunity for both short-term measures and long-term course corrections. ACITE must pave the way for the broader reform which is required to move itself and its member institutions onto a new path of technical education and research. This should match student aspirations and national and regional demands with the capacities of institutions, their research and their pedagogy. AICTE should also consider expanding itself into a think-tank which will help it move to a new regime of rigorous measurement of outcomes and a broader discussion on the meaning of scientific and technical education for a diverse and developing country such as ours.

Thank you and regards,

Milind Sohoni. **CC:** as per ToR document.

P.S.: I am enclosing with this letter, a manuscript "*The University and the Development Agenda*" which will appear in the *Economic and Political Weekly*.