MANAGEMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION: A CONCEPTUAL ANALYSIS

Dr. M.Yadagiri
Professor of Commerce, Telangana University,
Nizamabad-503002, Andhra Pradesh.
E-mail - dr.yadagiri@yahoo.co.in

N.Sreenivas,
Lecturer, Department of Business Management,
St.Joseph's PG College, Rampur,
Warangal, Andhra Pradesh.
Email- asksreenivas@gmail.com

Abstract:

Higher education is in a quandary all over the world and it occupies a prestigious place even in the modern context of contemporary society. India is still lagging behind in higher education as compared to the advanced countries and many of the developing countries in the world. Higher education system in India is faced with diversity, ambiguity and complexity.

The Government of India is projected to spend 6 per cent of the G.D.P. on education, half of this on primary and secondary education alone. To fund this ambitious project the Government imposed education cess on all central taxes. But this avenue was not available to states to meet their incremental requirements, and therein lies the crux of the debate whether education should be treated as an industry and be opened to Foreign Direct Investment.

INTRODUCTION:

Higher education has undergone enormous changes in recent times. Since the formation of universities, around 1500 years ago, it has seen many transformations. However, the last decade of the 20th century brought into picture several challenges that were not anticipated either by the people in the business of higher education or by the society. The main reasons for these new challenges are the revolutions that have taken place in the field of education in the last two decades, mainly because of advancement in the technologies, namely information, broadcasting and communication.

We have witnessed interesting relationship between Education-Knowledge-Health-Economy of a nation. Therefore, education has become the prime agenda for both developed and developing nations. There are two dimensions of education that have emerged at a global level.

The first dimension is that of *"Academics"*, which is concerned with ethical and moral values. These are linked with the training of minds, which in turn is linked with education. Therefore, education becomes an entity to be looked as a non-profitable activity. The other dimension is that of *"Trade in Education"*, which has emerged in recent times. It is linked with economy. Thus, people and nations consider education as a *"Service Industry"* and it is included in the *General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS).*

In India private and Government academic institutions are actively engaged in providing educational programmes. Higher education has always had an international dimension, with more than million students studying overseas and with many collaborative arrangements among universities. This multinational thrust is a new development. There is a huge market for offshore academic programmes, since in many countries the demand for post-secondary education is much higher than the supply. The export of higher education depends on the ability to deliver programmes worldwide through offshore campuses, collaboration with overseas institutions, or via distance education. These initiatives are needed in the context of expansion.

The universal agreements need to provide useful and effective educational programmes through new technologies and international collaborations. We must understand all the implications of these innovations if they are to serve the interests of students and teachers and not simply become a vehicle for profit making corporations. We are in the midst of a revolution in the delivery of academic programmes of all kinds internationally. So far, the educationalists have focused largely on the positive aspects of the revolution. Increased access, lower costs, and the advent of a truly global market for higher education are all cited as favorable trends especially when governments are cutting back on higher education's spending.

There has been a very rapid expansion of higher education in India. The expansion, according to critics is not effectively planned, as the major objective was access to higher education. The motive for establishing multinational higher education enterprises is almost always to make money. This of course is the aim of the growing number of profit institutions, but it is also the case with most traditional non-profit universities. British and Australian Institutions have been especially active internationally as a way of making up for budget cuts at home.

The multinational and distance movement does not really contribute to the internationalization of higher education, worldwide, because they operate in a largely unregulated environment. Accreditation systems are trying to catch up with new developments, and government agencies, both in the sponsoring and in the receiving countries are concerned. The rationale for interest in export of higher education emerged in the Indian context very forcefully in view of India's need for multinational education approach that specifically focuses on concepts of anti-bias education, prejudice reduction and social reconstruction.

EXPOSURE TO GLOBAL EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM:

For centuries, from the time of *Nalanda and Taxasila*, foreign scholars used to come to *India* for higher education. Even today students from neighboring *Asian and African* Countries seek higher education in India. India's leadership in university education enhanced its image and influence abroad. This requires to be strengthened and developed further. It will help the country to earn a considerable amount of foreign exchange.

In this era of information technology, every alternate institution wants to register its presence in the cyber space by launching one or the other programme through the worldwide web. In many cases, it has been reported that the same matter is pasted on the server without bothering much about the institutional commitments; infrastructure, instructional design, interactivity and usability related issues. Their absence has contributed to the deterioration of academic and support services.

The following are some of the arguments favoring globalization of higher education:

- Search for new centers of revenue in global markets.
- Empowerment of learners who can now choose courses from a range of institutions previously closed to them.
- Benefits to students participating in a course with colleagues drawn from across the world.
- The provision of access to quality education wherever a student lives.
- Availability of scarce top quality expertise to students anywhere in the world.
- Provision of access to curricular activities that embraces a broader spectrum of knowledge than any one institution might accomplish.

The approach to the development of a global educational pursuit is based on franchising arrangements. In a franchise arrangement the course content remains the same but the material is adopted by translating it in the local language incorporating local case studies and by customerising the length or degree of difficulty of material, which would demonstrate the quality. But globalization raises some crucial issues in the light of which the higher educationists have to review and modify their practices to fit to the new frame. Thus conditions may vary from location to location across the borders. This allows full mobility to the students and gives them maximum benefit of specialized programmes run by different institutions globally. International agencies like the *UNESCO* can help to a great extent in internationalization of education and forming a mechanism to globally recognizing the programmes of different institutions and evolving a viable mechanism of credit transfer for the benefit of international students.

QUALITY ASSESSMENT AND ACCREDITATION OF ACADEMIC PROGRAMMES:

Another important aspect of today's education is quality assurance by the educational providers. With the accreditation for quality becoming a national and international norm, the higher education institutions in India must gear towards quality in order to attract students from overseas; otherwise, we may be left behind in the competition. With the opening up of the low cost global opportunities, students have become more cost-conscious and expect quality from the providers of education.

In India the *NAAC (National Assessment and Accreditation Council) and NBA (National Board of Accreditation)* are playing a crucial role in assessing and accreditation educational institutions so that they can meet global competition. Apart from this, it is also necessary to have accredition by external agencies in order to assess the performance of the educational institutions with regard to the quality of teaching, infrastructure and placement. In recent times, the distance education institutions have been playing a pioneering role developing and implementing schemes of instructional partnership and collaboration.

The process of internationalization of higher education raises the following crucial issues among others, which need to be resolved before an institution enters the global fray;

- Improving quality of teaching-learning and making it available to culturally, educationally, geographically and linguistically diverse student body.
- Becoming sensitive to local issues while being globally competitive and preventing commercialization and westernization in the name of globalization.
- Need to understand the range of requirement of old and new clients to concretize the same with academic understanding for developing of a curriculum, which recognizes globalization and universal interdependence.
- Preventing commodification of education to protect the dwindling status of educational institutions to that of business houses.
- Increasing and maintaining acceptability and desirability of cross-border education.
- Helping teachers in updating their knowledge to adopt to new role by adding new competencies to their existing scientific and pedagogical backgrounds.
- In global framework, service management is a gray area, which hampers the smooth functioning of the system and requires utmost serious attention. The institutions in developing countries like India are not able to improve the deteriorating student support services in their own land.
- Establishing, maintaining and monitoring the student support services network since the development of *Information and Communication Technology (ICT)* is not uniform across the world and providing quality services alike in all parts of the world will be very difficult.

STATE WISE COMPARISON OF ATTAINMENT IN PRIMARY EDUCATION

As per information provided to the *Rajya Sabha* in the winter session of 2007, an *Educational Development Index (EDI)* has been developed by the *National University of Educational Planning and Administration (NUEPA)* to assess progress of States & Union Territories towards the goal of *Universalisation of Elementary Education*. The EDI takes into account four broad parameters of access, infrastructure, and teacher related indicators and elementary education outcomes.

Ranking of states on a composite index for primary and upper primary levels of education based on 2005-06 data

Rank	State	EDI Value	Rank	State	EDI Value
1	Kerala	0.708	19	Rajasthan	0.583
2	Delhi	0.707	20	A&N Islands	0.566
3	Tamil Nadu	0.701	21	Manipur	0.564
4	Puducherry	0.7	22	Chattisgarh	0.559
5	Chandigarh	0.69	23	Haryana	0.556
6	Karnataka	0.674	24	D&N Haveli	0.538
7	Himachal	0.668	25	Tripura	0.535
8	Andhra Pradesh	0.654	26	Meghalaya	0.534
9	Mizoram	0.65	27	Nagaland	0.533
10	Lakshadweep	0.65	28	Orissa	0.512
11	Sikkim	0.635	29	Madhya Pradesh	0.512
12	Maharashtra	0.635	30	Assam	0.49
13	Gujarat	0.63	31	Uttar Pradesh	0.482
14	Punjab	0.608	32	West Bengal	0.467
15	Uttarakhand	0.605	33	Arunachal	0.458
16	J&K	0.597	34	Jharkhand	0.435
17	Daman&Diu	0.592	35	Bihar	0.327
18	Goa	0.586	Source: Rajya Sabha Unstarred Question #654		

BUDGETARY ALLOCATION FOR EDUCATION:

Now, it is proposed to analyze the budgetary allocation for education according to state-wise expenditure on education and budgetary share of education in state's total expenditure. The relevant data of state-wise expenditure on education and state's share in total expenditure on education is presented in Table-I & II.

The data reveals that the total expenditure on education in the country increased by 75 percent to Rs. 1,05,618.8 crore during the year 2007-08 from Rs.60,267.30 crore in 2000-01. The actual allocation for education in *Maharashtra* has declined marginally by 2.1 percent from Rs. 12,653.34 crore in 2006-07 to Rs.12,391.9 crore in 2007-08. *Arunachal Pradesh, Mizoram, Manipur and Goa* are four other states, which too have witnessed a decline in actual allocation under this head during this period, whereas, the budgetary allocation for education in *Meghalaya* has abnormally increased by 31.6 per cent from Rs.390.86 crores in 2006-07 to Rs.514.48 crore in 2007-08. *National Capital Territory, Delhi* has increased by 24.3 percent from Rs. 1997.25 Crores in 2006-07 to Rs.2,482.5 crores in 2007-08. Similarly, *Haryana, Uttaranchal, Tamilnadu and Karnataka* are four other states, which have witnessed a sharp increase in actual allocation for education during the period under review. The states still have .their responsibilities to improve the general living standard by improving the standards of higher education.

In order to analyze the budgetary share of education in state's total expenditure, the relevant data of state-wise budgetary share of education in state's total expenditure is presented in Table-III. The data reveals that the twenty-nine major states together have allocated just about 13.86 percent of their aggregate budgetary expenses on education in 2007-08. This was 3.54 percent points lower than what they allocated seven years ago in 2000-01.In 2007-08 the allocation under education increased by 9.9 per cent over the previous year compared to 22 percent rise in 2006-07, which was for the country as a whole. At the individual level, many states did even worse. For example, In *Madhya Pradesh* it has accounted for a paltry 3.87 percent in total budgetary expenses of the state in 2007-08. The share was 8.4 per cent in *Arunachal Pradesh* and 8.61 percent in *Sikkim* during the same period — substantially lower than the national average. In fact, the share of education in total budgetary allocation was lower than the national average in as many as 14 of the 29 states in 2007-08. Worse, most of these states have, witnessed a decline in the share of education in their total budgetary allocation during the last seven years. Among the major states, *Maharashrta* has witnessed the sharpest decline of 15.0 percent from 22.3 per cent in 2000-01 to 7.3 percent in 2007-08. At 7.3 percent the share of education in total budgetary allocation in *Maharashrta* was lower than that of the national average. This is surprising considering the state's record in literacy drive.

Assam has witnessed the second biggest decline–the share of education in the state's total budgetary allocation has declined by a massive 18.68 percent percentage from 25.5 percent in 2000-01 to 6.82 percent in 2007-08. Education's share in total budgetary allocation has fallen by 6.76 percent in Bihar, 4.75 percent in *Uttaranchal* and 4.62 percent in *Tripura.*

NEED FOR PRIVATE PARTICIPATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION:

Despite the role education plays in the growth of an economy, *India's* spending on education at a percentage of *GDP* is very low at 3.2 percent compared to *Sweden's* 8.0 percent, *USA's* 5.4

percent and *UK's* 5.3 percent. Presently, the *Government of India* proposes to spend 6 percent of the GDP on education, half of this on primary and secondary education alone. To fund this ambitious project the government imposed *education cess* on all central taxes. The collection from *education cess* has met part of the additional funds requirements of the Union Government. But this avenue was not available to states to meet their incremental requirements and therein lies the crux of the debate whether education should be treated as an industry and be open to *Foreign Direct Investment*. As such, the fund-starved states have been actively encouraging private participation in technical education of late, as they were unable to increase allocation under this head to meet the growing needs.

Education is like a cradle to international competitiveness and we have to invest in education on an unprecedented scale to achieve global leadership. Therefore, most economically developed countries have invested heavily in education and this is one of the key factors that has accounted for their success. In India, the education sector needs huge funds to achieve its target and to modernise higher education. Thus, the *Government of India* is planning to change the domestic regulations to attract foreign investment in the education sector. New state regulations are required to be framed in the light of Supreme Court Judgement and in view of the entry of foreign universities. Such regulations should restrict profiteering in education for betterment of promoting higher education.

CONCLUSION:

When an individual falls sick, only he and his family are affected. However, when educational institutions fall sick, the economic prosperity of the entire nation is affected. Consequently, the need of the hour is a meaningful coordination between educational goals and economic progress. Economically developed countries have invested heavily in education which has accounted for their success. In India, the education sector needs funds to achieve its target and to modernize higher education. Therefore, the Government of India is planning to change the domestic regulations to attract foreign investments in the education sector.

TABLE-I
STATE-WISE EXPENDITURE ON EDUCATION

State	State-Wise Expenditure on Education (Revenue+ Capital) Rs. In Crores								Percent Change over the previous year						
	2007-08	2006-07	2005-06	2004-05	2003-04	2002-03	2001-02	2000-01	2007-08	2006-07	2005-06	2004-05	2003-04	2002-03	2001-02
Andhra Pradesh	8158.28	7091.82	5370.49	5384.45	4667.84	4027.18	3871.04	3740.3	15.0	32.1	-0.3	15.4	15.9	4.0	3.5
Arunachal Pradesh	226.58	310.71	240.41	219.76	198.66	165.58	183.2	77.24	-27.1	29.2	9.4	10.6	20.0	-9.6	137.2
Assam	3716.11	3852.11	2518.82	3198.35	2363.78	1998.02	1872.49	1943.52	-3.5	52.9	-21.2	35.3	18.3	6.7	-3.7
Bihar	5465.79	5406.24	4423.1	4143.86	3607.36	3259.98	3076.22	4012.27	1.1	22.2	6.7	14.9	10.7	6.0	-23.3
Chattisgarh	2131.41	1821.79	1301.33	1304.46	969.45	750.47	696.59	250.32	17.0	40.0	-0.2	34.6	29.2	7.7	178.3
Goa	423.86	454.47	349.56	362.36	292.34	286.32	247.25	233.13	-6.7	30.0	-3.5	24.0	2.1	15.8	6.1
Gujarat	5109.31	4741.56	4309.29	4093.72	3692.64	3634.36	3263.55	3684.77	7.8	10.0	5.3	10.9	1.6	11.4	-11.4
Haryana	2951.54	2388.2	1992.77	1793.49	1540.68	1455.01	1479.66	1334.47	23.6	19.8	11.1	16.4	5.9	-1.7	10.9
Himachal Pradesh	1592.11	1366.08	1213.53	1072.2	1005.61	957.34	918.72	904.52	16.5	12.6	13.2	6.6	5.0	4.2	1.6
Jammu &Kashmir	1466.3	1387.99	1256.5	1080.67	977.5	955.59	936.7	866.84	5.6	10.5	16.3	10.6	2.3	2.0	8.1
Jharkhand	2614.25	2394.1	2115.33	1739.23	1379.37	1859.34	1283.06	0	9.2	13.2	21.6	26.1	-25.8	44.9	0.0
Karnataka	7109.94	5968.7	4890.07	4505.33	3771.34	3570.72	3505.88	3488.75	19.1	22.1	8.5	19.5	5.6	1.8	0.5
Kerala	5557.31	4754.54	3497.57	3645.83	3094.8	2986.22	2489.81	2635.52	16.9	35.9	-4.1	17.8	3.6	19.9	-5.5
Madhya Pradesh	455.38	488.14	375.11	2720.61	2375.77	2312.14	2125.86	2762.53	-6.7	30.1	-86.2	14.5	2.8	8.8	-23.0
Maharashtra	12391.9	12653.34	10774.13	10238.58	9440.98	8941.4	9387.91	9420.25	-2.1	17.4	5.2	8.4	5.6	-4.8	-0.3
Manipur	390.48	421.92	422.31	415.39	304.94	286.25	290.6	279.51	-7.5	-0.1	1.7	36.2	6.5	-1.5	4.0
Meghalaya	514.48	390.86	311.77	346.73	269.06	242.3	250.08	236.86	31.6	25.4	-10.1	28.9	11.0	-3.1	5.6
Mizoram	293.7	331.88	291.46	257.91	218.36	204.26	213.89	189.86	-11.5	13.9	13.0	18.1	6.9	-4.5	12.7
Nagaland	390.83	389.08	324.8	284.3	256.41	210.05	223.01	237.68	0.4	19.8	14.2	10.9	22.1	-5.8	-6.2
Orissa	3033.79	2563.01	2131.86	1967.84	1899.52	1902.44	1755.64	1760.48	18.4	20.2	8.3	3.6	-0.2	8.4	-0.3
Punjab	3227.73	2790.07	2307.76	2493.02	2080.81	2092.76	1832.93	1859.24	15.7	20.9	-7.4	19.8	-0.6	14.2	-1.4
Rajasthan	5316.34	4943.39	4694.41	4093.33	3655.09	3329.86	3455.52	3286.28	7.5	5.3	14.7	12.0	9.8	-3.6	5.1
Sikkim	264.09	261.38	222.95	210.23	174.15	161.19	152.44	134.09	1.0	17.2	6.1	20.7	8.0	5.7	13.7
Tamil Nadu	8432.94	7045.56	5273.07	4642.74	4254.13	4158.902	4299.8	4409.67	19.7	33.6	13.6	9.1	2.3	-3.3	-2.5
Tripura	652.88	629.63	506.21	553.57	504.47	485.23	459.25	411.4	3.7	24.4	-8.6	9.7	4.0	5.7	11.6
Uttaranchal	1830.1	1522.63	1318.87	1329.99	1094.04	969.31	696.92	238.63	20.2	15.4	-0.8	21.6	12.9	39.1	192.1
Uttar Pradesh	12538.88	11175.06	9112.02	7679.18	6315.77	6137.29	6088.1	6172.52	12.2	22.6	18.7	21.6	2.9	0.8	-1.4
West Bengal	6879.98	6583.4	5563.21	5246.41	4522.6	4405.72	4552.45	4581.63	4.5	18.3	6.0	16.0	2.7	-3.2	-0.6
NationalCapital Territory, Delhi	2482.5	1997.25	1661.54	1766.93	1271.74	1237.53	1184.53	1115.02	24.3	20.2	-6.0	38.9	2.8	4.5	6.2
All States	**105618.8**	**96124.91**	**78770.25**	**76790.47**	**66191.21**	**62982.78**	**60793.1**	**60267.3**	**9.9**	**22.0**	**2.6**	**16.0**	**5.1**	**3.6**	**0.9**

Source : State Finances - A Study of Budgets (Various Issues) - RBI
Note : Data pertaining to 2007-08 are Budget estimates.

TABLE-II

STATE'S SHARE IN TOTAL EXPENDITURE ON EDUCATION

(Percentage)

State	2007-08	2006-07	2005-06	2004-05	2003-04	2002-03	2001-02	2000-01
Andhra Pradesh	7.7	7.4	6.8	7.0	7.1	6.4	6.4	6.2
Arunachal Pradesh	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.1
Assam	3.5	4.0	3.2	4.2	3.6	3.2	3.1	3.2
Bihar	5.2	5.6	5.6	5.4	5.4	5.2	5.1	6.7
Chattisgarh	2.0	1.9	1.7	1.7	1.5	1.2	1.1	0.4
Goa	0.4	0.5	0.4	0.5	0.4	0.5	0.4	0.4
Gujarat	4.8	4.9	5.5	5.3	5.6	5.8	5.4	6.1
Haryana	2.8	2.5	2.5	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.4	2.2
Himachal Pradesh	1.5	1.4	1.5	1.4	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5
Jammu &Kashmir	1.4	1.4	1.6	1.4	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.4
Jharkhand	2.5	2.5	2.7	2.3	2.1	3.0	2.1	0.0
Karnataka	6.7	6.2	6.2	5.9	5.7	5.7	5.8	5.8
Kerala	5.3	4.9	4.4	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.1	4.4
Madhya Pradesh	0.4	0.5	0.5	3.5	3.6	3.7	3.5	4.6
Maharashtra	11.7	13.2	13.7	13.3	14.3	14.2	15.4	15.6
Manipur	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5
Meghalaya	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4
Mizoram	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.3
Nagaland	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.4	0.4
Orissa	2.9	2.7	2.7	2.6	2.9	3.0	2.9	2.9
Punjab	3.1	2.9	2.9	3.2	3.1	3.3	3.0	3.1
Rajasthan	5.0	5.1	6.0	5.3	5.5	5.3	5.7	5.5
Sikkim	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.2
Tamil Nadu	8.0	7.3	6.7	6.0	6.4	6.6	7.1	7.3
Tripura	0.6	0.7	0.6	0.7	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.7
Uttaranchal	1.7	1.6	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.5	1.1	0.4
Uttar Pradesh	11.9	11.6	11.6	10.0	9.5	9.7	10.0	10.2
West Bengal	6.5	6.8	7.1	6.8	6.8	7.0	7.5	7.6
NCT Delhi	2.4	2.1	2.1	2.3	1.9	2.0	1.9	1.9
All States	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**

Source : State Finances – A Study of Budgets (Various Issues) – RBI

Note : Data pertaining to 2007-08 are Budget estimates.

TABLE-III

BUDGETARY SHARE OF EDUCATION IN STATE'S TOTAL EXPENDITURE

(Percentage)

State	2007-08	2006-07	2005-06	2004-05	2003-04	2002-03	2001-02	2000-01
Andhra Pradesh	10.4	11.7	11.1	8.7	3.4	11.7	12.5	13.3
Arunachal Pradesh	8.4	11.0	9.9	5.7	2.6	12.1	13.3	6.4
Assam	18.7	18.9	20.8	10.0	11.4	22.4	21.9	25.5
Bihar	16.9	17.5	19.6	13.9	13.8	18.4	20.7	23.7
Chattisgarh	13.4	13.2	13.4	4.5	3.1	11.0	12.4	13.1
Goa	10.0	13.7	12.3	7.7	4.4	11.9	10.5	11.9
Gujarat	12.2	12.2	12.6	4.1	5.2	13.5	12.7	13.6
Haryana	14.3	12.4	13.4	6.3	4.7	13.7	13.8	14.6
Himachal Pradesh	16.8	15.0	14.1	11.6	6.1	14.5	16.2	17.0
Jammu &Kashmir	9.2	10.0	9.3	8.9	8.9	10.9	11.6	11.1
Jharkhand	15.9	15.2	15.8	11.7	11.3	19.0	16.2	--
Karnataka	14.5	13.5	14.0	9.0	5.2	14.8	16.0	17.7
Kerala	18.1	17.2	16.6	6.3	5.8	17.6	19.0	20.1
Madhya Pradesh	3.9	4.8	3.5	3.9	4.2	12.2	12.5	16.3
Maharashtra	15.0	16.2	15.7	7.0	9.3	18.9	22.1	22.3
Manipur	12.3	12.1	15.4	9.5	7.5	13.3	13.7	20.2
Meghalaya	16.7	14.8	15.5	2.4	2.1	15.3	17.9	16.6
Mizoram	13.4	13.9	13.4	11.5	5.7	14.5	16.0	14.7
Nagaland	11.2	11.8	11.6	8.2	3.8	11.0	11.0	12.9
Orissa	12.9	12.6	13.5	6.5	6.0	14.3	14.6	15.9
Punjab	10.8	10.4	11.3	3.8	3.3	12.1	11.7	13.2
Rajasthan	14.8	15.3	17.3	5.1	4.9	15.5	18.2	18.8
Sikkim	8.6	9.8	10.4	5.1	5.6	7.6	8.0	14.2
Tamil Nadu	15.1	13.2	13.6	4.4	4.8	13.7	17.3	18.0
Tripura	14.7	16.8	15.3	8.0	7.3	19.1	18.6	19.3
Uttaranchal	16.8	16.9	17.2	9.2	3.6	20.0	21.1	21.5
Uttar Pradesh	14.0	15.2	15.2	6.5	2.9	14.6	16.0	16.8
West Bengal	14.7	15.2	13.7	4.6	3.7	15.9	16.2	17.1
NCT Delhi	13.4	9.5	14.9	12.8	10.9	12.1	13.7	15.1
All States	**13.9**	**14.0**	**14.2**	**6.2**	**5.0**	**15.0**	**16.1**	**17.4**

Source : State Finances – A Study of Budgets (Various Issues) – RBI

Note : Data pertaining to 2007-08 are Budget estimates.