

Unveiling the NEP 2020: A Critical Analysis of the Implications on Privatization and Potential Monopolies in Education

Pramod Kumar K V

Associate Professor and Head, Department of English, Mahatma Gandhi College, Iritty, Keezhur P O
Kannur, Kerala-670703

Abstract

This paper critically examines the transformation of higher education financing in India, particularly in light of the National Education Policy (NEP) 2020. It highlights the diminishing role of state funding and the increasing financial burden on households, analyzing the implications for privatization and monopolization within the education sector. Historical context reveals a shift towards neoliberal policies prioritizing profit over egalitarian ideals, culminating in a landscape where market dynamics intertwine with political ideologies. The paper scrutinizes key recommendations from the Ambani-Birla Report and the NEP, emphasizing the risks of commercialization and exclusion. Ultimately, it argues that NEP 2020 may undermine established educational structures and neglect constitutional values, reinforcing a corporate Hindu narrative that jeopardizes the promise of a democratic and equitable education system in India.

The financing of higher education in India has undergone significant transformation, reshaping the future of the university system. A notable aspect of this transformation is the diminishing role of state funding, which has increasingly shifted the financial burden to households. Families must now find resources to cover both living expenses and rising tuition fees (Bhushan Sudhanshu 2019).

The National Education Policy (NEP) 2020, widely recognized as a transformative and forward-looking document, has sparked extensive discourse within educational circles. While it lays out an ambitious framework for reforming the Indian education system, a critical analysis is essential to explore its potential implications for increased privatization and the risk of monopolies within the education sector. This paper seeks to unravel the complex relationship between NEP 2020 and the trends of privatization, critically examining key policy provisions and their ramifications.

Historical Context

A historical overview of educational policies in India reveals a complex interplay between public and private participation. To fully understand NEP 2020, it is crucial to analyse its predecessors and assess the evolving role of private entities in shaping the educational landscape. Contextualizing the current policy within broader trends of privatization allows for a more comprehensive understanding of its effects on accessibility, quality, and equity in education. The privatization of higher education in India has been a well-established trend, predating the widespread adoption of neoliberal policies in 1991. However, these

neoliberal principles have notably shifted the focus of higher education in India from egalitarian ideals to a more pronounced emphasis on profit maximization. (Sundaram 2020).

Current Political Landscape

India's current political landscape presents a dual challenge. We face a regime that intertwines market dynamics with the narrow-mindedness of Hindutva ideology, particularly within the realm of higher education. This dual challenge manifests in two critical ways: a systematic strangulation of resources allocated to higher education threatens the very notion of a university as a public good and a space for critical learning. Simultaneously, Hindutva nationalism seeks to reshape higher education by prioritizing myth over rational discourse (Chopra, 2021). Alarmingly, these two forces have become interdependent, reinforcing each other rather than operating independently.

Evolution of Educational Policies

The trajectory of higher education policies can be traced back to the New Policy on Education (NPE) in 1986, followed by the recommendations of the Punnayya Committee in 1993. The 1986 policy proposed addressing funding shortages by promoting donations and raising fees (Dreze & Sen, 2013). The Punnayya Committee, established by the University Grants Commission (UGC), recommended that universities derive 15 to 25 percent of their recurring expenditures from their resources, indicating a significant reduction in state funding.

In 1994, India's commitment to the World Trade Organization (WTO) agreement under the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) began to influence educational policies, leading the central government to treat higher education as a non-merit good, thus contemplating potential subsidy reductions (Rai, 2016). The Ambani-Birla report in 2000 advocated for a shift in responsibility, suggesting that the government focus on primary education while allowing the private sector to take over higher and professional education (Bhattacharya, 2018). This report called for progressively reducing government funding for higher education, urging universities to become self-sufficient through increased fees and the establishment of private universities. It also endorsed foreign direct investment (FDI) in education, marking a significant endorsement of privatization in the higher education sector.

Neoliberal Shifts

The true neoliberal shift in India's higher education landscape became evident during Kapil Sibal's tenure as Union Minister for Human Resource Development from 2009 to 2012, under the United Progressive Alliance (UPA) government. Sibal initiated significant funding cuts to higher educational institutions, marking the onset of a detrimental phase for the UGC (Sivaraman, 2018). The subsequent government led by the National Democratic Alliance (NDA) under Narendra Modi continued this neoliberal trajectory. The funding cuts initiated by the UPA were not only perpetuated but deepened with the establishment of the Higher Education Commission of India (HECI), leading to resistance from various academic bodies. Sibal's vision of establishing 14 world-class universities, often referred to as "universities of innovation," was furthered by the Modi government, which completed the project amid economic challenges. The "Jio model of excellence" emerged in this context, signifying a shift towards creating world-class educational institutions despite economic constraints.

Key Recommendations of the Ambani-Birla Report

The Ambani-Birla report outlines several key recommendations related to the privatization of higher education:

- 1. Reduction in Government Funding:** The report advocates for a gradual decrease in government funding for higher education, signaling a transition towards universities becoming less reliant on public funds.
- 2. Emphasis on Self-Sufficiency:** It encourages universities to evolve into self-sufficient entities, implying they should independently generate a significant portion of their funding.
- 3. Full Cost Recovery through Higher Fees:** The report suggests that universities should strive for full cost recovery through increased tuition fees, thereby diminishing dependence on government subsidies.
- 4. Promotion of Private Universities:** A strong advocacy for the establishment and growth of private universities positions them as crucial contributors to the expansion of higher education in India.
- 5. Endorsement of FDI in Education:** The report recommends allowing foreign universities to establish campuses or collaborate with existing institutions in India, potentially introducing additional resources and expertise.

Scrutiny of NEP 2020

The NEP 2020 has been scrutinized for its alignment with neoliberal principles. Key aspects include:

- 1. Emphasis on Autonomy and Choice:** NEP 2020 underscores institutional autonomy and self-regulation, resonating with neoliberal ideals of diminished government intervention.
- 2. Privatization and Public-Private Partnerships (PPP):** The policy promotes private sector involvement in education, fostering PPPs to improve infrastructure and outcomes.
- 3. Focus on Skill Development:** A strong emphasis on aligning education with market demands reflects neoliberal principles of producing a skilled and competitive workforce.
- 4. Introduction of Graded Autonomy:** NEP 2020 introduces graded autonomy for colleges, aligning with neoliberal notions of differentiation and competition.
- 5. Technology Integration:** The advocacy for technology in education aligns with market-driven approaches, emphasizing efficiency and innovation.

The Ambani-Birla report articulates a vision for the privatization of higher education, emphasizing diminished government involvement and active participation from private sectors, including foreign entities. The report states, "User pays principle to be enforced strictly for higher education supported by loan schemes as well as financial grants for economically and socially backward sections of society" (Ambani-Birla Report 2000).

Concerns and Implications

Despite differing interpretations of NEP 2020's alignment with neoliberal principles, concerns remain regarding potential commercialization and exclusionary impacts. The actual effects of these policy measures will depend on their implementation. While posing as a progressive advocate for contemporary education, the NEP subtly promotes both privatization and centralization, paying scant attention to improving the condition of public education.

In essence, NEP 2020 aligns with prevailing neoliberal and centralizing trends that have shaped higher education since the early 1990s. These trends become particularly evident in the hidden agendas that

incorporate revivalism and social insensitivity. Although the policy advocates for multidisciplinary liberal education to meet contemporary job market demands, it neglects the critical importance of constitutional values such as secularism, equality, social justice, and plurality (Kumar, 2020).

Parakala Prabhakar articulates a sentiment echoed by many: "It is close to nine years since the Narendra Modi-led BJP swept into power. A new era began in May 2014, or so we were told. But India is facing a crisis. Our polity, society, and economy are all broken. The signs are all around" (Prabhakar).

Conclusion

NEP 2020's emphasis on establishing new structures and institutions risks undermining the achievements and expertise of established educational bodies. Its centralizing approach seeks to achieve "one nation, one education," but such ambitions could lead to new problems rather than solutions. The policy's misguided prescriptions may exacerbate existing challenges rather than addressing them effectively. Amid the ongoing pandemic, there appears to be a deliberate effort by the state to commodify education, dismantling public institutions through severe funding reductions and ideological pressures.

The unilateral implementation of NEP 2020 by the Modi government, without adequately considering input from states, academia, teachers, and students, raises alarms about the commercialization of education and the erosion of the public education system.

Ultimately, neither knowledge production nor the enhancement of democratic values is prioritized within NEP 2020. The document draws inspiration from the past without acknowledging the anti-colonial struggles that laid the foundations of modern education in India. It favors traditions aligned with an upper-caste Hindu worldview, thus endangering the promise of a sovereign, socialist, secular, and democratic Republic as enshrined in the Constitution. The corporate-Hindu Rashtra project structures NEP 2020, undermining the emancipatory potential of education.

The concept of "Higher vs. Hired Education" has emerged from the prevailing scenario in the Indian higher education system. All stakeholders—students, teachers, parents, and society—express dissatisfaction over the ongoing uncertainties. The book *Higher vs. Hired Education* examines the government's role and interference in higher education policy, delving into the sector's socio-political dimensions and poor state of affairs. It offers insights into how reflexivity in higher education, qualifications, brain retention, and sustainability are critical for navigating today's educational landscape.

References

1. Ambani Birla Report. (2000).
2. Bhattacharya, S. (2018). "The Evolving Landscape of Private Higher Education in India." *Journal of Education Policy*, 33(4), 484-505.
3. Bhushan, Sudhanshu, ed. *The Future of Higher Education in India*. Springer, 2019.
4. Chopra, R. (2021). "Hindutva and the Transformation of Higher Education." *Economic and Political Weekly*, 56(12), 37-45.
5. Dreze, J., & Sen, A. (2013). *An Uncertain Glory: India and Its Contradictions*. Princeton University Press.
6. Japee, Gurudutta P., & Oza, Preeti. (2021). *Higher vs. Hired Education*.
7. Kumar, R. (2020). "NEP 2020: A New Dawn or More of the Same?" *Education Today*, 8(3), 15-22.
8. Parakala, P. (2023). *The Crooked Timber of New India*. Speaking Tiger Books LLP.

9. Rai, R. (2016). "The Impact of GATS on Higher Education in India." *Journal of Global Policy*, 7(2), 151-162.
10. Sivaraman, V. (2018). "Privatization in Indian Higher Education: A Historical Perspective." *Indian Journal of Human Development*, 12(1), 45-62.
11. Sundaram, R. (2020). "The Neoliberal Turn in Indian Education: A Critical Analysis." *Education and Society*, 38(1), 3-21.