


**Report of the Committee
Constituted by the Government of India to
Review the Functioning of ICSSR**

NUEPA DC



D14125

**New Delhi
28th June 2011**




28th June 2011

Shri Kapil Sibal
Minister for Human Resource Development
Ministry of Human Resource Development
Shasni Bhawan
New Delhi

Dear Shri Sibal,

We have pleasure in submitting herewith the report of the Committee constituted by the Government of India to review the functioning of the Indian Council of Social Science Research.



DEEPAK NAYYAR
Member



BAKUL DHOLAKIA
Member



KIRIT PARIKH
Member

Krishnendu Ghosh Dastidar
KRISHNENDU GHOSH DASTIDAR
Member Secretary

Contents

Chapter 1: The Preamble	1
Chapter 2: The Context.....	4
Chapter 3: The ICSSR: Objectives, Mandate and Organisation	7
Chapter 4: State of the ICSSR: An Analysis.....	10
Chapter 5: Problems and Issues of the ICSSR system	37
Chapter 6: Restructuring and Redesigning of ICSSR: Recommendations	44
Annexures	54

Chapter 1

The Preamble

The Government of India constituted a Committee to review the functioning of the Indian Council of Social Science Research (ICSSR), New Delhi (vide Notification No. F.No.7-42/ICSSR/2010-U.5, dated 23rd September, 2010).

The Review Committee, when it was constituted, comprised of the following members:

1. Prof. Deepak Nayyar
2. Prof. Bakul Dholakia
3. Prof. Kirit S. Parikh

Subsequently, the Review Committee members, at their meeting held on 7th February, 2011 resolved to co-opt Prof. Krishnendu Ghosh Dastidar as Member Secretary of the Committee (in accordance with Government of India Notification No. F.No.7-42/ICSSR/2010-U.5, dated 28th January, 2011).

The Terms of Reference of the Committee included a review of:

1. Performance of the Council (in the last 5 years) as well as the Research Institutes funded by ICSSR in promoting social science research in terms of its mandate in the Memorandum of Association and the impediment thereto.
2. Policies and programmes of ICSSR for research institutes, Regional Centres, research projects, fellowships, publication and support thereof, documentation services and promotion of international collaborations, especially keeping in mind the relevance of transparency, interdisciplinary nature and research evaluation – standards of research and impact factor in regard to the publication by its faculty / researchers.
3. Structure and functioning of the Council, including the Regional Centres of the Council, so that the Council becomes a relevant catalyst towards improving the quality of research in social sciences.

4. Performance with regard to inter-institutional relationships and opportunities of networking.
5. Any other matter as decided by the Committee within the realm of social science research.

Review Committee Meetings and Other Interactions

The Review Committee commenced its work formally on 6th December, 2010. The Committee members met several times to discuss issues among themselves and also had detailed interactions with other stakeholders (past and present) of the Council. In the course of the meetings the Review Committee members were apprised of the current and past activities of the Council, the problem areas, as well as ideas for improving the role of Council in fostering social science research in India.

The Review committee held ten meetings, of which nine were held in New Delhi and one was held in Hyderabad. The meetings in Delhi were held on 06.12.2010, 05.01.2011, 07.02.2011, 25.02.2011, 08.04.2011, 20.04.2011, 04.05. 2011, 04.06. 2011 and 28.06.2011. The meeting in Hyderabad was held on 25.03.2011.

Apart from the meetings of the Review Committee mentioned above, individual members of the committee also held discussions with multiple stakeholders at different points in time over the period December, 2010 to June, 2011.

The Review Committee also received letters from many directors of ICSSR institutes and from the ICSSR Professional Staff Association. The points raised in such letters were deliberated upon in great length and all the views expressed by the directors and the staff association were taken into account by the Committee in its deliberations.

Details regarding all such meetings and interactions appear in the annexure.

The plan of the Report is as follows.

1. First, we provide a snapshot of social science research in the wider context of research in India and the chronology of review committees on the ICSSR (Chapter 2)
2. Second, there is a brief discussion of the objectives, mandate and organizational structure of the ICSSR (Chapter 3).
3. Third, the report proceeds to provide a statistical analysis on various aspects of the state and performance of ICSSR and its institutes (Chapter 4).

4. This is followed by an analysis of problems and other critical issues concerning the ICSSR, drawing primarily on two main sources: (a) data made available by the ICSSR and by its various institutes; and (b) interactions with stakeholders of the ICSSR system (Chapter 5).
5. In conclusion, the report sets out the Committee's recommendations regarding restructuring and redesigning of ICSSR (Chapter 6). The Review Committee members strongly believe that its recommendations, if implemented in entirety, would go a long way towards improving the quality and quantum of social science research in India.
6. Information providing details of review committee meetings and the data used in the Report appear in the Annexure.

Acknowledgements

We would like to place on record our gratitude to all the persons (whose names appear in the annexure), who, despite their extremely busy schedule were kind enough to set aside their time for interactions with the Committee.

We would like to thank Prof. Javeed Alam (former Chairman, ICSSR), Prof. Sukhdeo Thorat (present Chairman, ICSSR) and Dr. Ranjit Sinha (Member-Secretary, ICSSR) for sharing their thoughts with us.

The Directors of ICSSR institutes and many Council members spared their valuable time and discussed at length various issues pertaining to ICSSR. We are grateful to them.

We would like to thank Prof. Ved Prakash, Acting Chairman, UGC for his help.

We would also like to thank the staff of ICSSR, New Delhi for their help. In particular, we would like to mention Mr. Rajiv Khera (Administrative Officer, ICSSR) and Mr. M.P. Madhukar (Assistant Director, Administration) for all their cooperation. Mr. Rajiv Khera was most helpful and extended all possible support to us.

Last, but not the least, we would like to thank Dr. Rittwik Chatterjee (NISTADS, New Delhi) for his research assistance.

Chapter 2

The Context

Social Science research in the wider context of research in India

The social sciences cover a range of disciplines and a wide array of complex issues. Social policy that stems out of applications of knowledge generated from research in social sciences is concerned with a range of human needs and with the social institutions created to meet these needs.

Study of the social sciences enhances our fundamental understanding of governance and institutions in economy, polity and society. In his report recommending the creation of the ICSSR, Prof. V.K.R.V. Rao suggested, “*The understanding of the social phenomena and human behavior, knowledge about the social process and its determinants, are essential for designing policies to promote social change and to produce a dynamic society capable of absorbing and utilizing the scientific and technological developments for the welfare of human beings*”.

According to the Fourth ICSSR Review Committee social science research is mainly driven by two forces: *interest in knowledge* about the functioning of society in its diverse social, cultural, political and economic aspects and in understanding the factors that shape them, and the *practical needs* of the policy-makers and managers in government, civil society and the private sector for reliable data and professional analysis.

Universities and research institutes play a key role in social science research by creating knowledge bases in concerned disciplines. This enables government agencies to access skilled social scientists capable of developing and implementing new social science policies appropriate to meet the needs of the dynamic socio-economic environment. This is particularly true for a country like India.

The ICSSR

In 1969, the ICSSR was set up as the apex body for social science research in India. It was envisaged to be a premier body for promoting social science research in India, funded by the government, with the research agenda decided primarily by social scientists themselves.

Social scientists in India would agree that the ICSSR made a significant contribution in the Indian context. The Council, at least in the initial years, made important difference to the development of social sciences. It made the state governments recognise the importance of research and drew forth financial support for the infrastructure and research funding of several institutes.

At the present conjuncture, it is widely perceived that social science research in India is in crisis. Many feel that the institutions of social science research which were established in the 1970s or 1980s have witnessed a steady decline. While there are many reasons behind the crisis in social science research in India; perhaps the single most important reason for this crisis is the shortage of assured government funding of social science research.

A preliminary analysis of government funding patterns clearly indicates that the Social Science research remains extremely underfunded in India, in comparison with research in Science and Technology. Analysing the role of the ICSSR in this context provides a glimpse of some of the issues involved. Funding for the ICSSR is quite meager, especially when seen in perspective of funding received by comparable bodies of repute like the CSIR and ICMR. During the period from 2005-06 to 2009-10, the total grant to ICSSR was just about 2.3 percent of the total grant to CSIR and about 11 percent of the total grant to ICMR.

With dwindling financial support from the government, it has become almost impossible to do research (especially applied empirical research) without funding from international agencies. However, such sponsored projects rarely contribute to serious academic research. As Chatterjee (2002)¹ notes “The sponsors are not primarily interested in a study that would stand the test of rigorous scholarship; hence, they are happy with slipshod work as long as it is completed within the prescribed deadline. Consequently, the results of sponsored research do not contribute to the stock of knowledge in the respective social science disciplines”.

Detailed interactions with several scholars reveal that the ICSSR has been unable to promote quality social science research in recent years. Some of the general complaints have been as follows.

1. The ICSSR failed to identify new and potentially significant research areas.
2. The evaluation of grant applications for research projects has been slow and often based on patronage.
3. The quantum of funds earmarked for research projects have been pitifully small.

Consequently, many serious scholars with creative research projects are now looking for other sources of funding, preferring not to approach the ICSSR at all.

A brief chronology of reviews of the ICSSR

Until now, four Review Committees have been appointed by the Council to review its performance and activities. The details are as follows.

¹ Chatterjee, P. (2002) “Institutional Context of Social Science Research in South Asia”. Economic and Political Weekly August 31, 2002.

1. "ICSSR: Social Science in India: A report: retrospective and Prospective, 1973". The review committee was chaired by Prof. Malcolm Adiseshiah
2. "ICSSR: report of Second Review Committee, 1978". The review committee was chaired by Prof. V.M. Dandekar
3. "ICSSR: report of Third Review Committee, 1986". The review committee was chaired by Prof. P.N. Dhar.
4. "Restructuring the Indian Council of Social Science Research, 2007". The review committee was chaired by Prof. A. Vaidyanathan.

It may be noted here that the present Review Committee was constituted by the Government through the Ministry of Human Resource Development and not by the Council. It is, therefore, the first ICSSR Review Committee constituted by the Government of India.

Objective and Scope of the report

In this report an attempt is made to evaluate the role of the Council in fostering social science research and to suggest ways to improve its functioning. The Review Committee believes that the Council is extremely important for social scientists in India and hence it should be re-invigorated so as to enable it to fulfill its original objectives.

Chapter 3

The ICSSR: Objectives, Mandate and Organisation

The Indian Council of Social Science Research (ICSSR) was established by the Government on 31/07/1969 as an autonomous society registered under the Registration of Societies Act 1860.

Objectives and Mandate

As per the Council's Memorandum of Association, the aims and objectives are²:

- (a) To review the progress of social science research and to give advice to its users in Government or outside
- (b) To sponsor social science research programmes as well as research projects, and administer grants to institutions and individuals for research in social sciences and to give financial support to learned associations, standard journals and institutions or organisations engaged in the conduct or sponsoring of social science research
- (c) To provide technical assistance for the formulation of social science research programmes and designing of research projects by individuals or institutions, and to organise and support institutional arrangements for training in research methodology.
- (d) To indicate periodically areas and topics on which social science research is to be promoted and to adopt special measures for the development of research in neglected or new areas
- (e) To coordinate research activities in the field of social sciences and to encourage programmes of interdisciplinary research
- (f) To develop and support centres for documentation service, maintenance and supply of data, inventory of current social science research and preparation of a national register of social scientists
- (g) To organise, sponsor and finance seminars, workshops, study circles, working groups/parties, and conferences for promoting research or utilisation of social science research

² The list of objectives is taken from the ICSSR Memorandum of Association and Rules.

- (h) To give grants for publication of social science research work and to undertake publication of digests, periodicals and journals devoted to such research
- (i) To institute and administer scholarships, fellowships and awards for social science research by students, teachers and other research workers in India or outside, and in particular, to award senior fellowships for research in social science that will enable workers in universities to complete their research work for publication or undertake whole time research for a definite period on topics in which they are specially interested and for doing research on which they are specially qualified
- (j) To advise the Government of India on all such matters pertaining to social science research as may be referred to it from time to time, including collaborative arrangements in social science research with foreign agencies
- (k) To undertake, on any agency basis, such other functions as may be entrusted to it by Government under terms and conditions, which may be mutually, agreed upon
- (l) Generally to take all such measures as may be found necessary from time to time to promote social science research and its utilisation in the country

Organization

The ICSSR has a Chairman and a Member Secretary appointed by the Government of India. Apart from the Chairman and the Member Secretary, the Council has the following members :

1. Eighteen social scientists nominated by the Government of India.
2. Six persons who represent Government and who are nominated by the Government of India and they include one representative each of the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare and the Ministry of Finance.

At present there are 25 ICSSR supported institutes. A list of all the institutes is given in Table 1 of the Annexure.

ICSSR : A Snapshot of Activities and Performance

During the 42 years of its existence the Council has tried to play a major role in fulfilling the above mentioned objectives. *However, it is widely perceived that over time there has been a deterioration in the Council's pursuit of the stated objectives.*

1. As the Fourth Review Committee appointed by the Council has noted, the most significant of the Council's achievements has been the establishment and nurturing of social science research institutes in different parts of the country. It will later be argued that there has been a significant decline and even decay over time in many of

these institutes and new ways must be found to reinvent them.

2. Since its inception the Council has funded many research projects across a variety of disciplines/areas. However, it has been observed that the quantum of funds provided by the ICSSR for such research projects has been very small. For example, as much as 83 per cent of all projects sanctioned by the ICSSR between 2006-07 and 2009-10, involved a total grant of less than Rs.5 lakhs per project. The process of project sanction is perceived to be lengthy and non-transparent, discouraging many good scholars from seeking research support from this source. Additionally, the process of granting projects is widely perceived to be influenced by patronage.
3. The Council also provides a variety of fellowships (Doctoral, General, Senior, and National) to individual researchers. While this is a laudable endeavour, the fellowship amounts for all such schemes are quite low, discouraging bright researchers. There is a serious perception of regional bias in the functioning of the ICSSR. In particular, institutes based in the South articulated a collective feeling that disbursement of ICSSR funds is far too centred in and around Delhi and Northern India. The data analysis carried out in the next chapter provides some evidence supporting this view.
4. The ICSSR also has a somewhat modest programme of international collaborations, mostly by way of exchange of scholars under various official bilateral agreements with foreign governments.
5. There are 6 regional centres that provide fora at which researchers in different regions can interact more closely with each other and bring their new ideas to the Council. Interactions with various stakeholders reveal that the regional centres have failed to live up to their stated objectives.
6. The ICSSR also provides some other facilities that include
 - i. Training courses in research methodology
 - ii. NASSDOC
 - iii. Data archive
 - iv. Preparation of surveys of the current state of research in different social science disciplines
 - v. Funding of seminars and conferences
 - vi. Financial assistance for publications of research outputs

Chapter 4

State of the ICSSR: An Analysis

This chapter provides a quantitative analysis on the following :

1. A comparative study of total government grants to ICSSR, UGC, CSIR and ICMR
2. Key features of ICSSR grants to its Institutes.
3. A quantitative report on performance of ICSSR supported institutes in terms of publication of books, journal articles, chapters in edited volumes and project reports.
4. Disbursal of the ICSSR Doctoral, General, Senior and National Fellowships (distribution by region and disciplines).
5. Disbursal of ICSSR research projects (distribution by region and disciplines).
6. A report on timely completion of ICSSR research projects.

The data analysed herein was provided to the Review Committee by the ICSSR and each of its twenty-five Institutes. Various tables compiled using this data appear in the Annexure.

A Comparison of Total Government Grants to ICSSR, UGC, CSIR and ICMR

Government support to social science research in India is very low both in absolute terms and also relative to the governmental support to natural and medical sciences.

Over the period 2005-06 to 2009-10, the total grant to ICSSR rose only by 22 percent in nominal terms from 41.8 crores to 51 crores. In real terms, over this period, the total grant *shrank* by 7 percent. This shows that not only is the support to ICSSR low, but even this meager amount has been decreasing in real terms.


Over the period 2005-06 to 2009-10, the total grant to ICSSR was only about 2.3 percent of the total grant received by CSIR and 11 percent of the total grant received by ICMR. This clearly shows that compared to the research support to natural and medical sciences, the research support to social sciences is extremely low.

Apart from ICSSR, the other major public institution which supports social science research is UGC. According to figures received from UGC, in the year 2009-10, out of total UGC expenditure incurred on research in social and basic sciences, less than 12 percent was allocated to social sciences. This demonstrates that even within the UGC, research in social sciences is underfunded relative to basic sciences.

The figure below plots the total government grants (in nominal terms) to ICSSR, UGC, ICMR and CSIR over the period 2005-06-2009-10. The figure shows that compared to other institutions, the support to ICSSR has been very low indeed³.


³ It may be mentioned here that over the period 2005-06 to 2009-10, the total grant to ICSSR was only about 1 percent of the total grant received by UGC.

Total Government grants (Rs. lakhs)



Percentage Break-Up of ICSSR Expenses

The next figure plots the percentage break-up of ICSSR expenses. It shows that an increasing proportion of the total grant to ICSSR goes into financing simply running costs (like salaries to ICSSR employees). Consequently, the proportion of funds allocated to research institutes has been steadily decreasing. Clearly, not only is the total grant to ICSSR very meager, but even this small amount is increasingly being used up to support ICSSR's own staff, rather than to support the research institutes.



ICSSR Grants to its Institutes


Table 1 below provides the amount of ICSSR grants to each of its institutes for the time period 2005-06 to 2009-10. *The average grant per institute grew by only 8 percent in nominal terms and in real terms it decreased by 17 percent.*

Table 1: ICSSR Grants To Institutes (Rs Lakhs)

	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-10
CDS	142	151	150	142	142
CESS	56	79	63	61	61
CMDR	30	43	36	57	43
CRRID	66	79	67	71	55
CSDS	134	133	137	123	115
CSSS	105	106	98	106	106
GIDR	45	42	43	50	50
ISEC	129	124	164	136	146
CSD	42	52	63	74	54
GIDS	63	81	66	102	88
IDS	59	60	57	65	65
IIE	39	40	49	46	36
IPE	63	70	96	117	60
ISID	47	44	48	60	60
MIDS	75	80	122	84	88
NKCCDS	47	62	71	83	50
OKD	50	64	55	75	92
CSS	52	54	57	61	57
CWDS	78	97	93	85	73
IEG	100	120	114	92	110
BANISS	20	20	22	32	36
CPR	65	69	50	74	50
ANISS	71	86	73	75	81
MPISSR	40	27	47	54	70
SPIESR	73	75	75	75	75
Total grant	1689	1857	1914	2000	1862
Average grant per institute	68	74	77	80	74

It is also clear from the Table 1 that in many instances, the ICSSR grant has not risen over this period even in nominal terms. In fact, in many cases there has been a decline.

To get an overall picture, the following may be noted. Over the period 2005-06 to 2009-10, the total ICSSR grant to all its institutes taken together increased only by about 10 percent (see graph below). *In real terms, the total ICSSR grant to all its institutes has gone down by 16 percent.*



All the institutes also provided estimates of total expenditures incurred. It may be noted that apart from ICSSR grants, the institutes also receive grants from state governments. These resources are supplemented with funds received from projects. Table 2 provides figures for total expenditure of the institutes, while Table 3 presents ICSSR grants as a percentage of total expenditure for each of these institutes over the period 2005-06 to 2009-10.

Table 2: Total Expenditure Of The Institutes (Rs Lakhs)


	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-10
CDS	454	558	557	612	828
CESS	570	721	548	780	810
CMDR	112	186	89	83	118
CRRID	471	447	427	403	429
CSDS	206	207	204	233	209
CSSS	263	333	373	457	577
GIDR	118	140	193	184	198
ISEC	839	951	1125	1582	1915
CSD	70	89	100	112	166
GIDS	194	187	270	284	264
IDS	337	233	262	350	323
IIE	86	79	77	79	68
IPE	314	459	630	869	1886
ISID	156	449	554	642	690
MIDS	185	229	249	256	270
NKCCDS	91	236	184	174	220
OKD	123	183	237	320	286
CSS	76	79	82	92	93
CWDS	220	238	201	208	258
IEG	557	713	627	980	1215
BANISS	181	296	269	296	470
CPR	198	230	291	406	952
ANISS	212	404	527	301	431
MPISSR	98	97	113	119	122
SPIESR	110	111	115	115	181
Total expenditure	6240	7853	8306	9938	12978
Average expenditure per institute	249.608	314.121	332.233	397.517	519.112

Table 3: ICSSR Grants As A Percentage Of Total Expenditure

	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-10
CDS	31.2	27.0	26.8	23.2	17.2
CESS	9.8	11.0	11.5	7.8	7.5
CMDR	26.8	23.1	41.0	68.9	36.4
CRRID	14.0	17.7	15.7	17.6	12.8
CSDS	64.8	64.4	67.0	52.6	55.1
CSSS	39.9	31.8	26.3	23.2	18.4
GIDR	38.3	30.0	22.3	27.2	25.2
ISEC	15.4	13.0	14.6	8.6	7.6
CSD	60.3	58.7	63.1	65.3	32.6
GIDS	32.3	43.4	24.5	35.9	33.3
IDS	17.5	25.7	21.7	18.6	20.1
IIE	45.0	50.2	62.7	58.6	53.1
IPE	20.0	15.3	15.2	13.5	3.2
ISID	30.4	9.8	8.7	9.3	8.7
MIDS	40.5	34.9	48.8	32.8	32.4
NKCCDS	51.4	26.2	38.5	47.7	22.7
OKD	40.7	35.0	23.2	23.4	32.2
CSS	68.3	68.4	69.5	66.8	61.4
CWDS	35.4	40.8	46.0	40.8	28.3
IEG	18.0	16.8	18.2	9.4	9.1
BANISS	11.0	6.8	8.2	10.8	7.7
CPR	32.8	30.0	17.2	18.2	5.2
ANISS	33.5	21.3	13.8	24.9	18.8
MPISSR	41.0	27.4	41.7	45.7	57.1
SPIESR	66.3	67.5	65.5	65.1	41.3

Table 3 clearly reveals that ICSSR grants to most of its institutes, as a percentage of total expenditure of the institutes, has been declining steadily over time. The overall picture is also the same.

The total ICSSR grant to all its institutes, as a percentage of the total expenditure of all these institutes taken together, decreased steadily from about 27 percent in 2005-06 to just about 14 percent in 2009-10. The graph below depicts this.



Average Number of Faculty Members

Table 4 provides figures on average faculty size of each of the institutes over the period 2005-06 to 2009-10. Figures on number of faculty members in each institute, in each of the five years, was provided by all institutes, from which the average faculty size per institute was calculated.

It is clear that many institutes do not have adequate number of faculty members. About one-third of the institutes have less than 10 faculty members. While we realize that the optimum faculty size may vary from institute to institute, depending on their range of activities, but there is a critical minimum size of the faculty required to conduct research upto desirable levels. The faculty size of a large number of the institutes seems to be below this critical minimum and consequently research output have suffered.

Table 4: Average faculty size (2005-06 to 2009-10)

CDS	28.0
CESS	26.4
CMDR	6.4
CRRID	25.8
CSDS	18.6
CSSS	26.6
GIDR	13.4
ISEC	42.6
CSD	11.8
GIDS	13.2
IDS	15.0
IIE	7.6
IPE	36.4
ISID	21.8
MIDS	21.0
NKCCDS	9.0
OKD	6.0
CSS	9.4
CWDS	37.0
IEG	28.0
BANISS	9.2
CPR	22.8
ANISS	7.0
MPISSR	6.0
SPIESR	18.8

Performance of the ICSSR Supported Institutes in Terms of Publications

Table 5 below provides a snapshot of productivity of the faculty members of all ICSSR institutes, measured by their publication record over the period 2005-06 to 2009-10. The figures have been rounded off to one decimal point.

If we take all the institutes together, on an average, a faculty member takes about 5 years to write a book, one year to write a paper in a journal and more than a year and half to write a chapter in an edited volume.

These numbers vary greatly among institutes. For example, on an average, a faculty member in CDS takes a little more than three years to write a book. On the other hand, in CRRID, a faculty member takes about ten years to write a book. In IPE, on an average, a faculty member writes more than two papers per

year in journals whereas a faculty member in CRRID or CMDR takes nearly two years to contribute a paper in a journal. A faculty member in CDS or CESS or CMDR writes about one chapter per year in an edited volume. On the other hand, a faculty members in IIE or BANISS contribute virtually nothing to edited volumes.

It may be noted here that these conclusions, simply based on number of publications, capture a quantitative aspect of productivity and are not a reflection of quality in any way.

Table 5: Publication Per Faculty Member Per Year (average for the period 2005-06 to 2009-10)

	Books	Paper in Journals	Articles/Chapters in Edited Volumes
CDS	0.3	1.0	1.0
CESS	0.1	1.1	1.1
CMDR	0.4	0.6	1.0
CRRID	0.1	0.6	0.2
CSDS	0.7	1.1	1.1
CSSS	0.2	1.0	0.8
GIDR	0.1	0.9	0.7
ISEC	0.2	1.0	0.8
CSD	0.2	1.1	0.4
GIDS	0.2	1.2	0.7
IDS	0.2	1.2	0.9
IIE	0.3	0.2	0.0
IPE	0.3	2.2	0.3
ISID	0.2	0.8	0.2
MIDS	0.2	1.1	0.6
NKCCDS	0.2	1.3	0.5
OKD	0.5	0.4	0.3
CSS	0.1	1.8	0.4
CWDS	0.1	0.3	0.2
IEG	0.2	1.1	0.8
BANISS	0.1	0.8	0.0
CPR	0.4	1.4	0.7
ANISS	0.3	0.2	0.2
MPISSR	0.3	1.4	1.3
SPIESR	0.3	0.3	0.7
Overall average	0.2	1.0	0.6

Table 6 below provides information on publication productivity per crore rupees spent by each institute. For example, if CPR spends one crore per year, then on an average, its faculty members will write more than 13 books per year. On the other hand, if ANSISS spends one crore per year, then on an average, its faculty members will write less than 3 books per year. Broadly speaking, Table 6 gives a snapshot of how well the funds are being utilized for publication purposes. Again, it must be mentioned here that these are quantitative indicators only and does not take into account any quality parameter.

Table 6: Publications Per Crore Per Year

	Books	Paper in Journals	Articles/Chapters in Edited Volumes
CDS	6.1	18.7	20.0
CESS	5.3	46.0	43.8
CMDR	6.2	9.6	15.3
CRRID	3.8	21.3	8.0
CSDS	9.8	15.8	15.6
CSSS	4.6	24.8	20.5
GIDR	3.5	26.1	21.7
ISEC	7.2	30.2	23.0
CSD	3.5	22.8	8.1
GIDS	2.8	19.8	10.8
IDS	4.2	30.1	20.9
IIE	5.7	4.3	0.5
IPE	12.1	97.0	12.1
ISID	6.6	35.1	8.5
MIDS	4.7	26.1	14.7
NKCCDS	3.5	18.2	7.3
OKD	4.2	3.6	2.4
CSS	2.5	30.3	6.4
CWDS	4.9	11.3	7.8
IEG	5.0	27.4	20.7
BANISS	3.8	26.9	0.8
CPR	13.3	53.3	25.7
ANSISS	2.6	2.1	2.1
MPISSR	4.2	18.1	16.8
SPIESR	7.5	7.8	16.9
Average per institute	5.5	25.1	14.0

Disbursal of Doctoral, General, Senior and National Fellowships: Distribution by Region and Disciplines

The distribution pattern (region-wise and discipline-wise) of fellowships (doctoral, general, senior and national) awarded by ICSSR over the period 2000-01 to 2009-10 is analysed below.

The following regional classification was adopted for this exercise:

1. Delhi
2. North (other than Delhi): comprising Jammu and Kashmir, Himachal Pradesh, Punjab, Haryana, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh and Uttarakhand.
3. Central: comprising Madhya Pradesh, Chhattisgarh and Jharkhand
4. East: comprising Bihar, West Bengal and Orissa
5. South: comprising Karnataka, Kerala, Andhra Pradesh, Tamil Nadu and Pondicherry
6. West: comprising Maharashtra, Gujrat and Goa.
7. North East: comprising Assam, Arunachal Pradesh, Meghalaya, Tripura, Nagaland, Manipur, Mizoram and Sikkim.


We have the following categories of disciplines and interdisciplinary areas:

1. Economics
2. Political Science
3. Psychology
4. Sociology
5. Women's Studies
6. Others (including, *inter alia*, Defence Studies, Geography, Music, Home Science, Linguistics, Management, Education and Public Administration).

In this section we intend to do the following. First we will provide pie-charts and bar-diagrams to portray regional and discipline-wise distribution of all fellowships (doctoral, general, senior and national). Thereafter, we proceed to provide an analysis of these figures.


Doctoral Fellowships

The following pie-chart provides a snapshot of the regional distribution of all Doctoral Fellowships awarded by ICSSR during 2000-01 to 2009-10.



A more disaggregated picture is apparent from the figure below which gives a year-wise and region-wise distribution of doctoral fellowships. It may be noted here that no doctoral fellowships were awarded in 2005-06.

Percentage Distribution Of Doctoral Fellowships: Year-wise And Region-wise




The following pie-chart provides a discipline-wise distribution of all the Doctoral Fellowships awarded by ICSSR during 2000-01 to 2009-10.

Doctoral Fellowships From 2000-01 To 2009-10: Distribution By Discipline




A more disaggregated picture is apparent from the figure below which provides a year- and discipline-wise distribution of Doctoral Fellowships. It may be noted here that in 2005-06 no doctoral fellowships were awarded.




General Fellowships


The following pie-chart provides a regional distribution of all the general fellowships awarded by ICSSR during 2000-01 to 2009-10.




A more disaggregated picture is apparent from the figure below which provides a year- and region-wise distribution of general fellowships.



The following pie-chart provides a discipline-wise distribution of all the general fellowships awarded by ICSSR during 2000-01 to 2009-10.




A more disaggregated picture is apparent from the figure below which provides a year- and discipline-wise distribution of general fellowships.



Senior Fellowships


The following pie-chart provides a regional distribution of all the senior fellowships awarded by ICSSR during 2000-01 to 2009-10.

Senior Fellowship From 2000-01 To 2009-10: Distribution By Region




A more disaggregated picture is apparent from the figure below which provides a year- and region-wise distribution of senior fellowships. It may be noted that in 2006-07 no senior fellowships were awarded.


Percentage Distribution Of Senior Fellowship: Year-wise And Region-wise



The following pie-chart provides a discipline-wise distribution of all the senior fellowships awarded by ICSSR during 2000-01 to 2009-10.




A more disaggregated picture is apparent from the figure below which provides a year- and discipline-wise distribution of senior fellowships. It may be noted that in 2006-07 no senior fellowships were awarded.




National Fellowships

The following pie-chart provides a regional distribution of all the national fellowships awarded by ICSSR during 2001-02 to 2009-10.




A more disaggregated picture is apparent from the figure below which provides a year- and region-wise distribution of national fellowships. It may be noted that in some years no national fellowships were awarded.




The following pie-chart provides a discipline-wise distribution of all the national fellowships awarded by ICSSR during 2001-02 to 2009-10.

National Fellowships From 2000-01 To 2009-10: Distribution By Discipline



A more disaggregated picture is apparent from the figure below which provides a year- and discipline-wise distribution of national fellowships. It may be noted that in some years no national fellowships were awarded.

Percentage Of National Fellowships: Discipline-wise And Year-wise



An Analysis of the Fellowships: Distribution by Region and Disciplines

It seems that the disbursal of ICSSR funds is far too centred in and around Delhi and Northern India. In short there appears to be strong regional bias.

1. For example, between 2000-01 and 2009-10 Delhi's share of all the doctoral fellowships awarded was 33.2 percent and North India (other than Delhi) had a share of 27 percent.
2. Between 2000-01 and 2009-10 Delhi's share of all the general fellowships awarded was 28.5 percent and North India (other than Delhi) had a share of 38.3 percent.
3. Over the same period the share of Delhi for senior fellowships was 31.8 percent and that of North India (other than Delhi) was 26 percent.
4. The figures for national fellowships are especially stark. Over the same period Delhi's share of national fellowships was 51.5 percent and that of North India (other than Delhi) was 18 percent.
5. In short, Delhi and North India together received more than 60 percent of doctoral fellowships, 67 percent of general fellowships, 58 percent of senior fellowships and nearly 70 percent of national fellowships.

In the distribution of fellowships there does not appear to be any bias towards any particular discipline or area. However, economics, political science and sociology together seem to get a larger share of the total fellowships. We provide some figures below.

1. More than 60 percent of the doctoral fellowships went to scholars working in Economics, Political Science and Sociology.
2. About 62 percent of the general fellowships went to scholars working in Economics, Political Science and Sociology.
3. More than 62 percent of the senior fellowships went to scholars working in Economics, Political Science and Sociology.
4. About 70 percent of the national fellowships went to scholars working in Economics, Political Science and Sociology.

Remark on Completion Rate of Research Pursued with Fellowships

Data on the completion rate of research work with Doctoral Fellowships was not available. However, some data was available on the completion rate of research work supported by General, Senior and National Fellowships.

Some data was available on (i) the total number of ICSSR Fellowships (General, Senior and National) awarded between 2000-01 and 2009-10; and (ii) the number of Research Reports submitted, supported by such Fellowships. There is however, a problem of time-lag involved in these figures. For instance, a Report submitted during the period 2000-01 and 2009-10 may have been supported by a ICSSR Fellowship granted before 2000-01. That is, it is not known how many of the Reports submitted between 2000-01 and 2009-10 were actually supported by Fellowships awarded within this period.

1. Over the period 2000-01 to 2009-10 ICSSR awarded 154 General Fellowships, while only 48 Final Reports were received.
2. Over the period 2000-01 to 2009-10 ICSSR awarded 88 Senior Fellowships and received 88 final reports.
3. Over the period 2001-02 to 2009-10 ICSSR awarded 34 national fellowships and received 29 final reports.

Broadly speaking, it may be concluded that the completion rate of research work supported by Senior Fellowship is cent percent and corresponding completion rate with National Fellowships is more than 85 percent. These figures are very good indeed. However, the completion rate of research supported by General Fellowships stands at about 30 percent and this is certainly not very encouraging.


We now proceed with our analysis on research projects awarded by ICSSR.

Research Projects


The following pie-chart provides a regional distribution of all the research projects awarded by ICSSR during 2006-07 to 2009-10.





A more disaggregated picture is apparent from the figure below which provides a year- and region-wise distribution of research projects.



The following pie-chart provides a discipline-wise distribution of all the research projects awarded by ICSSR during 2006-07 to 2009-10.



A more disaggregated picture is apparent from the figure below which provides a year- and discipline-wise distribution of research projects.



Distribution of Research Projects

Unlike the case of fellowships, there does not seem to be any strong regional bias in the distribution of research projects awarded by ICSSR. We provide some illustrative figures below for all the research projects awarded between 2006-07 and 2009-10.

1. Delhi had a share of 8 percent and North India (other than Delhi) had a share of 25 percent.
2. North-East had a share of 14 percent and South had a share of 26 percent.
3. In short, the regional distribution appears to be far more equitable in case of research projects than in the case of fellowships.

In the annexure we provide the details of scale of funding of ICSSR research projects and the completion rates.

1. It may be noted that *the quantum of funds provided by the ICSSR for research projects (directly to individual researchers) is generally very small.* As much as 83 per cent of all projects sanctioned by the ICSSR between 2006-07 and 2009-10, involved a total grant of less than Rs.5 lakhs per project. In fact, about 14 percent of all projects sanctioned by the ICSSR between 2006-07 and 2009-10, involved a total grant of less than Rs.2 lakhs per project.
2. It appears that the completion rate is satisfactory. In most cases final reports were received with just a year's delay. In fact, over the period 2005-06 to 2009-10 more than two-thirds of the project reports were submitted within a year of the stipulated deadline.

Chapter 5

Problems and Issues of the ICSSR system

This Chapter provides an analysis of problems and other critical issues concerning the ICSSR, drawing primarily on two main sources: (a) data made available by the ICSSR and by various institutes under it; and (b) interaction with stakeholders of the ICSSR, its institutes as well as its staff, and consultations with concerned social scientists.

The data provided by the ICSSR and the institutes was analysed in the previous chapter. The list of all meetings is set out in the annexure.

Resources and Finance

1. A preliminary analysis of government funding patterns clearly indicates that the *social science research remains underfunded in India*, in comparison with research in Science and Technology. Funding for the ICSSR is simply inadequate, especially when seen in perspective of funding received by comparable research-support institutions of repute like the CSIR and ICMR. During the period from 2005-06 to 2009-10, the total grant to ICSSR was about 2.3 percent of the total grant to CSIR and about 11 percent of the total grant to ICMR. The extremely limited amount of funding to the only institution for social sciences research literally means that very little in terms of finance can be set aside for promoting research, after meeting pre-emptive claims on available funds for routine activities, such as payment of salaries to ICSSR employees.
2. Out of the total grant received by the ICSSR, the flow of *funding to its institutes remains woefully inadequate*, given the requirements of the institutes. In fact, the quantum of the grants has been declining over time in *real* terms and ICSSR grants to most of its institutes, as a percentage of total expenditure of the institutes, has been declining steadily over time. The total ICSSR grant to *all* its institutes, as a percentage of the total expenditure of these institutes taken together, decreased steadily from 27 percent in 2005-06 to less than 15 percent in 2009-10.
3. In addition to the quantum of funds being grossly inadequate, the *procedure for disbursement of available resources among ICSSR institutes is opaque* and not based on any clear cut objective principle. Rather, in the perception of several directors, the distribution of funds across the institutes appears to be somewhat arbitrary.

4. The above situation is indicative of a binding resource constraint, likely to affect the smooth functioning and research quality of the institutes. Further, *this tends to enhance institutes' dependence on grants from State governments and on project finance for raising necessary resources.*

Research Projects and Fellowships

1. The research opportunities provided by the ICSSR system, directly to independent scholars and indirectly via the ICSSR institutions, suffer from a few drawbacks. It was pointed out above that inadequate funding from the ICSSR to its institutes, makes them dependent on state government funds and project financing, especially for meeting running costs. As noted in the previous chapter, *in 2009-10, more than 85 percent of total expenditure of the institutes was financed from resources raised from sources other than ICSSR.*
2. *Overdependence on state governments and project finance can lead to dilution of research quality* and even a shift away from desired research priorities, compromising ability to pursue independent research. What is more, predominance of a project-driven research agenda can leave little, if any, room for carrying out basic and fundamental research in theoretical fields within the social sciences.
3. *Typically the quantum of funds provided by the ICSSR for research projects (directly to individual researchers) is very small.* As much as 83 per cent of all projects sanctioned by the ICSSR between 2006-07 and 2009-10, involved a total grant of less than Rs.5 lakhs per project. In fact, about 14 percent of all projects sanctioned by the ICSSR between 2006-07 and 2009-10, involved a total grant of less than Rs.2 lakhs per project.
4. *The number of projects sanctioned by ICSSR is also quite low.* Between 2006-07 and 2009-10 the ICSSR received exactly 1490 project applications, of which only 454 grants were sanctioned over this period.
5. The scale of ICSSR project grants is small. The number of projects sanctioned very limited. But *the process of approving research projects is perceived to be lengthy and non-transparent*, discouraging many good scholars from seeking research support from this source. Yet another problem is that *the process of approving research projects is perceived by many to be influenced by patronage*, rather than by considerations of merit alone.
6. *The ICSSR fellowship amounts for all schemes (doctoral, general and senior) are relatively low*, compared to what is provided by the UGC under similar schemes. It is no

surprise that meritorious students tend to prefer UGC fellowships to those from the ICSSR.

7. The *honorarium for ICSSR National Fellows is far too low*. It may be noted that National Fellows are supposed to be very distinguished and senior social scientists. The present emoluments provided under this scheme are certainly not commensurate with their stature.
8. There is a strong *perception that there is a regional bias* in the allocation of resources by ICSSR. In particular, institutes based in the South articulated a collective feeling that disbursal of ICSSR funds is far too centred in and around Delhi and Northern India. The data analysis carried out in the previous chapter provides some evidence supporting this view. For example, between 2000-01 to 2009-10, Delhi alone received a third of the total number of Doctoral fellowships, 28.5 percent of the General fellowships, 31.8 percent of the Senior fellowships and over half of the National fellowships. Similarly, North India (other than Delhi) also had a high share of fellowships, with the shares standing at 27 percent, 38.3 percent, 26 percent and 18 percent respectively, in each of these categories. In short, North India (along with Delhi) received more than 60 percent of Doctoral fellowships, 55 percent of General fellowships, 70 percent of Senior fellowships and nearly 70 percent of National fellowships.
9. In case of research projects, however, the scenario was somewhat different with Delhi's share at 8 percent and that of North India (other than Delhi) at 25 percent. Unlike the case of fellowships, the share of South was a healthy 26 percent and that of North East was 14 percent. The relatively low share of Delhi for the research projects may be explained by the following. Since the average grant per research project is very low and since scholars in Delhi have access to much larger scale projects from sources other than ICSSR, they do not seek ICSSR research projects as much as scholars from other regions do. Consequently, scholars from South and North-East get a relatively larger share of research projects.

Governance

1. Several issues relating to the quality of governance within the ICSSR system and to its interface with the government need urgent attention. The critical importance of appointments in key positions in a premier body like the ICSSR can hardly be overemphasized. The process and nature of such appointments directly shape institutional autonomy and quality. In this context, *several glaring lacunae in the existing structure and recruitment practices come to the fore*.

2. *It would seem that appointments within the ICSSR system do not follow any transparent or systematic process.* (i) For the appointment of the Chairman, there is no established due process in the public domain. It would seem that the appointment is the prerogative of, and is made by, the government. In the view of the committee, it is essential to establish a transparent due process for the selection and appointment of the Chairman. (ii) The Memorandum of Association of ICSSR does not clearly specify a process of appointing Member-Secretary. However, we understand that there has been a procedure of constituting a search committee to suggest a panel of names, from which the Government selects a person as Member-Secretary. But this practice has not always been consistently followed. It is the view of the committee that a transparent due process must be established and consistently followed to select and appoint a Member-Secretary of ICSSR. (iii) We understand that at present and since the inception of ICSSR, members of the Council are appointed for a term of three years (renewable at the discretion of the Government for another three year term). The selection of the members of the Council is entirely the discretion of Government. The committee believes that it is essential to establish a transparent, due process for selecting the members of the Council.
3. An important issue relates to the role of key ICSSR functionaries, pointing to immense structural problems within the ICSSR. *There appears to be no clear division of jurisdiction, duties and responsibilities of the ICSSR Chairman and Member Secretary.* Even the exact role of the ICSSR Council is not defined.
4. Overall, the role of the ICSSR in promoting social science research in the country has also come in for criticism. It has been pointed out by many people closely associated with ICSSR or its institutes that the ICSSR has not been very proactive in promoting and fostering social science research. It is also widely felt that the *ICSSR has a benign presence but functions merely as a post office* or simply as an intermediary for channelizing funds from the government to its institutes.
5. Apropos the functioning of the ICSSR institutes, the all important post of institute Director often lies vacant for long stretches, badly affecting their functioning. The staff strength of these institutes was fixed a long time ago, giving them very little flexibility and room for manoeuvre in this respect. Together with a funds shortage, this implies the institutes often face a situation wherein they are unable to make proper recruitments. Consequently, the institutes are often unable to pursue research in social sciences to the extent that is necessary or desirable.

Autonomy and Accountability

1. It must be emphasized that *autonomy of research institutions is of essence because academic research, particularly in social sciences, must be independent of the Government for one of its major functions is to examine and evaluate the policies and performance of the Government in an objective fashion.* ICSSR and its institutes should not be subjected to the political preferences or prejudices of any ruling party either at the centre or at the states.
2. *The ICSSR has little autonomy vis-a-vis the government.* It remains wholly dependent on the government for all its funding and experiences what can only be termed as *excessive* government interference in the general functioning and appointments at the ICSSR. But that is not all. The government is perceived to be rather unresponsive to the specific needs and problems of this premier body. The ICSSR should be given greater functional autonomy and this should be accompanied by norms for building in greater accountability.
3. In its consultations, the committee noted that the research agenda of the ICSSR institutes is often influenced and shaped by their need to mobilize resources through sponsored research or project finance. The problem arises, essentially because, of inadequate flow of funds from ICSSR. Such problems, on some occasions, may be compounded by the preferences and prejudices of the state governments, who are often a source of major project finance.

Quality of Research

1. *There is a high degree of variation in the quality of research across the ICSSR institutions.* Analysis of individual ICSSR institutes provides a glimpse of the wide variation among them on a number of parameters. This was clearly evident, for instance, from the list of publications and from the selection of ten best publications (adjudged by the Institute Directors) provided by each institute. The number of publications in the top-shot peer reviewed journals in social sciences over the period 2005-06 to 2009-10 is very low. *It must be emphasized here that there are a few exceptional individuals whose publication records are of a remarkably high order.*
2. It appears that many faculty members are often *compelled* to take up projects sponsored by various state governments and other agencies, simply to generate funds for the institute to break even. Consequently, *independent theoretical research in social sciences, which often has a long term significance research, does not receive the attention it deserves.*

3. *There is a general perception that while some institutes have performed well, there has been a steady decline in a number of institutes, while a few institutes witnessed symptoms of decay.* Very little systemic effort was observed for specifically addressing the problems faced by institutes at the bottom of the heap, let alone efforts to bring them up. The committee is of the considered view that the ICSSR should take specific measures to address this problem.
4. There seems to be *no effective institutional mechanism for evaluating quality* within the ICSSR system. From time to time, the ICSSR has constituted review committees to evaluate its individual institutes. But the outcome of such a review process has not been as effective as it should have been. Indeed, it would be no exaggeration to state that there is no adequate peer review system of the ICSSR faculty and *little incentive for quality research* seems to be in place.

Missed Opportunities:

A number of objectives have been stated in the Memorandum of Association of ICSSR. It has been observed that over the years the activities of ICSSR have not focused on some of these objectives. We give some examples below.

1. It was observed that opportunities for networking and building *synergy between ICSSR institutes were almost completely unexploited.*
2. *Also, there were very few instances of ICSSR partnerships with Universities or with the UGC.* This is particularly surprising, given the fact that most universities have a large number of faculty members in the field of social sciences.
3. *ICSSR presence has largely been missing in the policy space,* with very little policy interface especially with the Central Government. While some State Governments were seen to utilise the expertise of the faculty members of ICSSR institutes, the same was not observed at the Central Government level.
4. *ICSSR presence is also missing in emerging areas of inter-disciplinary research, within and beyond the social sciences,* involving topical issues like climate change, public health, socio economic impact of scientific discoveries and experimental studies on socio-economic issues, to just give a few examples. These areas provide promising avenues of collaboration between the social and natural sciences.

While a number of critical observations pertaining to functioning of the ICSSR are made in this Chapter, it should also be emphasized, that despite all its shortfalls, the ICSSR has never been an obstacle hindering research in the social sciences.

Chapter 6

Restructuring and Redesigning of ICSSR: Recommendations

The committee believes that ICSSR must be strengthened so as to enable it to fulfill its original role of fostering and promoting social science research in India. In this chapter, recommendations regarding the restructuring and redesigning of the ICSSR are provided. It is the considered view of the committee that, these recommendations, if implemented in entirety rather than in a selective or piece-meal manner, will go a long way in re-invigorating the ICSSR.

Architecture of ICSSR

1. The Chairman must be a distinguished academic with leadership qualities. A Search Committee, consisting of three members should be constituted for selecting the Chairman. Of these, two members should be nominated by the Council. These two members should be distinguished and eminent social scientists and they should not be members of the present or preceding Council. The Government should nominate the third member who would be the Chairman of the Search Committee. The Search Committee should prepare a panel of three names. The Chairman of ICSSR would be selected by the Government from the panel of three names prepared by the Search Committee.
2. The Chairman should be a non-executive Chairman appointed for a non-renewable term of five years.
3. The designation of Member-Secretary should be changed to Director General. The level and pay scale should be that of a Vice-Chancellor of a Central University. For appointment of the Director General, there should be a Search Committee of three persons. The Chairman of ICSSR should be its Chairman, while the other two members should be nominated by the Council. The Search Committee should prepare a panel of three names, from which the Director General would be selected and appointed by the Council.

4. The Director General to be appointed for a non-renewable term of five years should be accountable to the Chairman and the Council. The Director General should act as the Chief Executive Officer of the ICSSR.

5. The Council should consist of eighteen members, each with a term of six years, of whom one-third will retire every two years. The composition of the Council should be as follows.
 - a. **Ten** distinguished academicians, with suitable representation for social science disciplines and interdisciplinary studies, to be selected and appointed by the Council.
 - b. **Four** members to be nominated by the Government: (i) Secretary, Higher Education, MHRD (ex-officio) (ii) one Vice-Chancellor of a central university (preferably a social scientist) (iii) one director of an IIT or an IIM (iv) one eminent public personality
 - c. **Four** members made up of (i) one distinguished scientist (ii) one person from a civil society organisation (iii) one person from industry (iv) one person with an expertise in public health, to be selected and appointed by the Council.

6. When the Council is constituted for the first time, initially, one-third of the Council members (i.e. six members) should be given one non-renewable term of six-years. Another one-third should be given a four-year term and the remaining one-third should be drawn from existing members, who would be given an extension of two years. This new Council should be appointed on the basis of recommendations of a five-member search committee, to be constituted by the Government with the following composition: (i) One former Vice-Chancellor of a Central University (preferably a social scientist) (ii) One former Director of an IIM (preferably a social scientist) (iii) One former Director of an IIT or of IISC. (iv) Two distinguished social scientists drawn from economics, political science or sociology. Once the first set of members retire (after two years and after four years), then every new member should be given a full term of six years. After the constitution of the new Council, such a search committee shall cease to exist and all appointments of members shall be made by the Council in accordance with the provisions set out in (5) above.

7. Directors of Divisions of ICSSR should be at the level and in the pay scale of Professors in Central Universities. They should be selected through due process by the Chairman and Director General with the approval of the Council. The Directors of Divisions of ICSSR should be distinguished social scientists and should come from Universities or Research Institutes or other reputed organisations on deputation/contract for a period of three years (renewable for one more term of three years). Those on deputation should be provided with a suitable deputation allowance.
8. For administrative staff the following should be done.
 - a. When officers at the Group A and B levels retire from ICSSR, then as far as possible, such posts should be filled with staff on deputation. To attract competent people, some suitable incentives in addition to deputation allowance should be provided.
 - b. Group C and D staff should be employed on a permanent basis at the ICSSR.
 - c. For all administrative staff, in permanent employment but with no avenues of promotion, there should be a suitable 'Assured Career Progression' (ACP) scheme such as those that exist in the government or academic institutions.
 - d. Salaries of all administrative staff in ICSSR should be linked to Central Government scales for comparable positions.

Research

9. The Chairman should be a mentor and the guiding light of ICSSR. The Council should provide guidance and directions of research, identify themes and prioritize areas of research.
10. To improve quality and build capabilities in social science research
 - a. The Council should invite proposals from distinguished social scientists across all social science disciplines and interdisciplinary studies.
 - b. To encourage research among promising social scientists, call for submission of possible research projects should be given in leading social science journals.

Preference may be given to younger people, women and researchers from states/region where we need to strengthen research capabilities in social sciences.

11. Academic committees should be set up for each discipline and interdisciplinary areas to decide on grant of research projects, general fellowships (PhD and Post Doctoral) and senior fellowships. Members of such committees should be active social science researchers. Directors of divisions of ICSSR should be member secretaries of such committees. One member of the Council should be the chairman of a committee. The Director General, in consultation with the Chairman, ICSSR, should recommend names of the members of such academic committees to the Council for their approval.
12. For selecting National Fellows, a separate committee should be constituted. The Chairman of ICSSR should be the chairman and the Director General of ICSSR should be the member-secretary of such a committee. There should five other members, of which two should be existing Council members. The remaining three, chosen by the Council, should be eminent social scientists who are not members of the Council. This process should ensure selection of truly deserving and senior distinguished scholars as National Fellows.
13. Ample funds must be made available for research projects so as to attract good scholars. The fellowships (PhD and Post Doctoral) should be competitive and the amount should be no less than that provided by UGC for comparable schemes. The honorarium for National Fellows should be no less than the pay received by a full Professor in a Central University. This would ensure that very distinguished and senior social scientists are provided the kind of *opportunity*, appropriate to their stature, that they deserve.
14. For decisions regarding grant of such research projects, general and senior fellowships there should a two-stage process. First, the Chairman and the Member Secretary of the academic committee should do a preliminary short-listing based on criteria laid down by the committee. After the short-listing is done, the final decision on the grant of research projects or fellowships should be taken in meetings of academic committees. To facilitate speedy decisions and disbursal of research funds the committees should meet at least three times a year.

15. To create synergies between ICSSR institutes there should be an annual ICSSR conference involving all institutes of the ICSSR. This conference may be held around a particular theme. There should be plenary and parallel sessions that include invited lectures by distinguished social scientists. There should be a conference volume based on selected papers presented at the conference. This would also act as a quality check.
16. The Regional Centres of ICSSR should also organise a conference, once in two years, on a specified theme. To organise such conferences, the regional centres should network with universities and research institutes within that region.
17. The ICSSR should initiate steps towards funding *national projects on selected themes*. To frame and execute such national projects the ICSSR should promote partnership with UGC and such an effort would create massive synergies between UGC and ICSSR. The Council must play a major role in creating such a synergy. Additionally, the ICSSR must ensure that such projects encourage collaboration among ICSSR institutes and promote partnerships between ICSSR institutes and universities located within the same region.

Finances

18. Faculty members at ICSSR Institutes and Academic Staff at ICSSR must be automatically entitled to UGC scales, with full funding from the ICSSR for the salary component. This will impart greater autonomy in functioning of the Institutes.
19. The ICSSR allocations (salaries, maintenance and capital expenditures) to its Institutes should be inflation indexed.
20. As noted earlier, over the period 2005-06 to 2009-10, the total grant to ICSSR is about 2.3 percent of the total grant to CSIR and about 11 percent of the total grant to ICMR. Therefore in an ideal world, the resources allocated to ICSSR should be twenty-five times the level of allocation in 2010-11. The committee recognizes that such an increase may not be feasible in the short-term because of absorptive capacity. Even so, it is essential that the resources allocation to ICSSR by the Central Government should be enhanced at least ten times over the next two years. Once it reaches that level at the end of two years, it should be maintained at least as a non-decreasing share of total nominal expenditure of

the Central Government with the objective of providing financial support to social science research that is at par with the financial support to research in medical sciences and natural sciences.

21. To provide some measure of financial autonomy, the ICSSR should create a corpus of about Rs. 1000 crores as a complement to funds from other sources. To begin with, the government should provide a grant of Rs. 250 crores over the next two years, followed by a matching grant, of size equivalent to funds raised by ICSSR from other sources, till such time as the proposed corpus of Rs. 1000 crores is created. It must be stated here that the corpus is in *addition* to the recurring annual grant by the Government to ICSSR as outlined in (20) above.
22. The income stream from such a corpus should be used to :
 - a. preserve the real value of the corpus and
 - b. support ICSSR activities, especially innovative activities in new research areas, for which alternate sources of funding may not be easily available.

ICSSR Institutes

23. As stated earlier, there should be adequate and predictable flow of funds for ICSSR Institutes in which the ICSSR plays a critical role. It may be noted that project finance for generating research funds may be necessary, even desirable at times. However, beyond a point, dependence on projects, especially for meeting running costs, can lead to dilution of research quality or a shift away from desired research priorities and compromises the ability to pursue independent research. To avoid this problem, every institute should *automatically receive* the critical minimum level of funds for their activities, covering the salaries (UGC scales) of academic and administrative staff and basic research infrastructure (access to online journals and databases, computers, printers and consumables).
24. *Each state in India must have an ICSSR institute*, as it is extremely important to develop quality research capabilities and opportunities in the social sciences all over the country. Therefore, ICSSR institutes should be established in every state where there is none at present.

25. Vacancies at the Director's level must be filled up at all ICSSR institutes. Additionally, all such institutes must be allowed to hire additional faculty members to ensure a *critical minimum number of academic faculty*. It may be mentioned here that the optimal size of the faculty in an institute depends on the size and scale of activities pursued by the institute. The Council, in consultation with the existing faculty members of the concerned institute, can determine such an optimal size.
26. We realise that there is a huge dispersion in quality and scale of research and other activities among ICSSR institutes. We believe that those institutes that have not been performing well should be brought up through a conscious effort and the Council should develop a concrete action plan for each such institute to raise their performance to the desired levels.
27. Beyond the critical limit (as mentioned in 23 above), additional discretionary research funding should be linked to performance.
28. A systematic and regular peer review process should be instituted to evaluate and reward well performing Institutes. The rewards may include, *inter alia*, increases in sanctioned posts (over and above the critical minimum as discussed in 25 above), in capital expenditures, in discretionary research finances and additional grants supporting basic research.
29. The evaluation should be based on academic quality, quantity, social relevance and policy interface of research output and publications. Evaluation of PhD programmes, wherever applicable, should be based on the quality of research output (e.g., publication in peer reviewed journals or publication of books by reputed publishers)
30. The allocation of discretionary research finance, based on such evaluation, would be fixed for a period of five years.
31. The ICSSR should have representation on the Governing Council of all ICSSR institutes. We would like to recommend that Governing Council of every institute should have at least one Council member with the proviso that any member of the Council should not be part of more than three such Governing Councils.

32. To improve the interactive mechanism between ICSSR and its institutes, we recommend that there should be a forum of institute Directors which meets at least once a year. The Chairman and the Director General of ICSSR should be ex-officio members of such a forum. The Chairman, ICSSR or, in his absence, the Director General should preside over the forum.

List of tables in the annexure

1. Details of Review Committee meetings
2. Table 1: List of Research Institutes
3. Table 2: Annual Grants of CSIR
4. Table 3: Annual Grants of ICMR
5. Table 4: Annual Grants of ICSSR
6. Table 5: Actual expenditure of UGC (plan and non-plan) from 2005 to 2010.
7. Table 6: Expenditure incurred by the UGC on Research during 2009-10
8. Table 7: ICSSR expenditure 2005-06 to 2009-10
9. Table 8: Number of Doctoral Fellowships: Year-wise And Region-wise
10. Table 9: Number of Doctoral Fellowships: Discipline-wise And Year-wise
11. Table 10: Number of General Fellowships: Region-wise And Year-wise
12. Table 11: Number of General Fellowships: Discipline-wise And Year-wise
13. Table 12: Number of Senior Fellowships: Region-wise And Year-wise
14. Table 13: Number of Senior Fellowships: Discipline-wise And Year-wise
15. Table 14: Number of National Fellowships: Region-wise And Year-wise
16. Table 15: Number of National Fellowships: Discipline-wise And Year-wise
17. Table 16: Number Of Research Projects: Region-wise And Year-wise
18. Table 17: Number of Research Projects: Discipline-wise And Year-wise
19. Table 18: ICSSR Awarded General Fellowships: Reports Received –Distribution by Discipline
20. Table 19: ICSSR Awarded General Fellowships: Reports Received –Distribution by States

21. Table 20: ICSSR Senior Fellowships Awarded: Reports Received - Distribution by Disciplines
22. Table 21: ICSSR Senior Fellowships Awarded: Reports Received- Distribution by States
23. Table 22: National Fellowships Awarded: Reports Received - Distribution by Discipline
24. Table 23: National Fellowships Awarded: Reports Received- Distribution by State
25. Table 24: ICSSR Research Projects: Distribution of Sanctioned Projects by Discipline/Area.
26. Table 25: ICSSR Research Projects: Distribution of Sanctioned Projects by States
27. Table 26: Scale of Funding of ICSSR Research Projects
28. Table 27: ICSSR Research Projects: Final Research Reports during the period 2005-06 to 2009-10
29. Office orders from the Government of India regarding the formation of the committee and the extension of deadline to submit the report.

Annexures

Details of Review Committee Meetings

First meeting was held on 6th December 2010 at ICSSR, New Delhi. Only Review Committee members were present.

Second meeting was held on 5th January 2011 at ICSSR, New Delhi. The Review Committee members also met the following social scientists and government officers:

1. Professor Javeed Alam, Chairman, ICSSR
2. Prof. Yogender Yadav, Council Member
3. Prof. Vasanthi Raman, Council Member
4. Prof. S.P. Singh, Council Member
5. Prof. Kamal Mitra Chenoy, Council Member
6. Shri Upamanyu Basu, Director, MHRD
7. Prof. A. Vaidyanathan, Chairman, 4th ICSSR Review Committee
8. Prof. Kariakose Mamkottam, Member Secretary 4th ICSSR Review Committee

Third meeting was held on 7th February 2011 at ICSSR, New Delhi. The Review Committee members also met the following social scientists:

1. Prof. T.C.A. Anant, former-Member Secretary, ICSSR
2. Prof. Pratap Bhanu Mehta, Director, CPR, New Delhi
3. Prof. Bina Agarwal, Director, IEG, New Delhi
4. Prof. Rajeev Bhargava, Director, CSDS, New Delh
5. Prof. Mary E. John, Director, CWDS, New Delhi
6. Prof. M.R. Murthy, Director, ISID, New Delhi

Fourth meeting was held on 25th February 2011 at ICSSR, New Delhi. The Review Committee members also met the following persons:

1. Prof. V.R. Panchmukhi, former- Chairman, ICSSR⁴
2. Prof. Mrinal Miri, Member, Review Committee, ICPR
3. Prof. Rajeev Bhargava, Member, Review Committee, ICPR
4. Prof. R. Radhakrishna, Ex-Member Secretary, ICSSR
5. Dr. B.K. Bajpai, Sr. Fellow, GIDS, Lucknow
6. Prof. D.M. Diwakar, Director, ANSISS, Patna
7. Prof. B. Devi Prasad, Director, CSS, Surat
8. Sri Anirudha Rout, Acting Director, NKCCDS, Bhubaneswar
9. Prof. S.S. Gill, Director General, CRRID, Chandigarh
10. Prof. Surjit Singh, Director, IDS, Jaipur
11. Prof. Indranee Dutta, Director, OKDISCD, Guwahati

Fifth meeting was held on 25th March 2011 at Hyderabad. The Review Committee members met the following persons:

1. Prof. C.H. Hanumantha Rao, Chairman, CESS, Hyderabad
2. Prof. P.M. Bhargava, Chairman, CSD, Hyderabad
3. Prof. Fatima Ali Khan, Council Member
4. Prof. Sharit Bhowmik, Council Member
5. Prof. Sasheej Hegde, Council Member
6. Prof. Manoj Panda, Director, CESS, Hyderabad
7. Prof. R.K. Mishra, Director, IPE, Hyderabad
8. Prof. R. Maria Saleth, Director, MIDS, Chennai
9. Prof. R.S. Deshpande, Director, ISEC, Bangalore
10. Prof. Pulapre Balakrishna, Director, CDS, Thiruvananthapuram
11. Prof. R. Venkata Ravi, Faculty, CSD, Hyderabad

Sixth meeting was held on 8th April 2011 at ICSSR, New Delhi. The Review Committee members met and discussed matters with Dr. Ranjit Sinha, Member Secretary, ICSSR.

Seventh meeting was held on 20th April 2011 at ICSSR, New Delhi. The Review Committee members also met and discussed matters with Bhaskar Chatterjee, former member-secretary, ICSSR, at present Secretary to Government of India.

Eight meeting was held on 4th May 2011 at ICSSR, New Delhi. The Review Committee members met for deliberation and discussion.

Ninth meeting was held on 4th June 2011 at ICSSR, New Delhi; The Review Committee members met for deliberation and discussion.

⁴ It may be mentioned here that the members of the Review Committee spoke to Prof. V.R. Panchmukhi via SKYPE. The others were physically present.

Tenth meeting was held on 28th June, 2011 at ICSSR, New Delhi. Review Committee members met to finalize the report.

Apart from the meetings of the Review Committee mentioned above, individual members of the Committee also had discussions with multiple stakeholders. Details appear below:

1. On 14th February 2011, Prof. Kirit S. Parikh visited the Centre for Studies in Social Sciences, Kolkata and held a meeting with Prof. Sugata Marjit, Director, CSSS, Kolkata and other faculty members of the institute.
2. On 22nd February 2011, Prof. Bakul Dholakia visited the Gujrat Institute of Development Research, Ahmedabad and held a meeting with Prof. Amita Shah, Director, GIDR, Ahmedabad and other faculty members of the institute.
3. On 11th April, 2011, Prof. Deepak Nayyar and Prof. Krishnendu Ghosh Dastidar had a meeting with Prof. S. K. Thorat, Chairman, ICSSR at Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi.
4. On 18th April, 2011 Prof. Bakul Dholakia visited Sardar Patel Institute of Economic and Social research, Ahmedabad and held a meeting with Prof. Niti Mehta, Acting Director, SPIESR and other faculty members of the institute.
5. On 19th April, 2011, Prof. Deepak Nayyar and Prof. Krishnendu Ghosh Dastidar had a meeting with Prof. Ravi Srivastava, Council Member, ICSSR, at Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi.

In addition to these formal meeting, Members of the Review Committee held several informal consultations and discussions with concerned social scientists and stakeholders.

Table 1: List of the Research Institutes

S. No.	Short Title of the Research Institute	Full Name of the Research Institute	Address of the Research Institute
1.	ISEC	Institute for Social and Economic Change	Post Nagarbhavi, Bangalore - 560 072, Karnataka
2.	CDS	Centre for Development Studies	Prasanthanagar Road, Ulloor, Thiruvananthapuram - 695 011, Kerala
3.	CSSS	Centre for Studies in Social Sciences	R-1, Baishnabghata, Patuli Township, Kolkata-700 094, West Bengal
4.	ANSISS	A.N. Sinha Institute of Social Studies	Patna-800 001 Bihar
5.	IPE	Institute of Public Enterprise	Osmania University Campus Hyderabad – 500007 Andhra Pradesh
6.	IEG	Institute of Economic Growth	University Enclave, Delhi-110 007
7.	CSDS	Centre for the Study of Developing Societies	29, Rajpur Road, Delhi-110 054
8	CSS	Centre for Social Studies	Veer Narmad South Gujarat, University Campus Udhna - Magdalla Road, Surat-395 007 Gujarat
9.	MIDS	Madras Institute of Development Studies	79, Second Main Road (P.O. Box-948), Gandhinagar, Adyar, Chennai-600 020, Tamil Nadu
10.	IIE	Indian Institute of Education	128/2, J.P. Naik Road, Kothrud, Pune-411 029 Maharashtra
11.	GIDS	Giri Institute of Development Studies	Sector “O” Aliganj Housing Scheme, Lucknow-226 024, Uttar Pradesh

12.	CPR	Centre for Policy Research	Dharma Marg, Chanakyapuri, New Delhi – 110 021
13.	SPIESR	Sardar Patel Institute of Economic and Social Research	Thaltej Road, Ahmedabad-380 054, Gujarat.
14.	CSD	Council for Social Development	Southern Regional Centre, 5-6-151, Rajendranagar, Near NIRD Gate, Hyderabad-500 030
15.	IDS	Institute of Development Studies	8-B, Jhalana Institutional Area, Jaipur-302 004, Rajasthan
16.	CRRID	Centre for Research in Rural and Industrial Development	2-A, Sector, 19-A, Madhya Marg, Chandigarh-160 019, Punjab
17.	CWDS	Centre for Women's Development Studies	25, Bhai Vir Singh Marg, New Delhi – 110 001
18.	CESS	Centre for Economic and Social Studies	Nizamia Observatory Campus, Begumpet Hyderabad-500 016, Andhra Pradesh
19.	NKCCDS	NKC Centre for Development Studies	Plot No.A, Chandrasekharpur, Bhubaneswar-751 013, Orissa
20.	GIDR	Gujarat Institute of Development Research	Sarkhej, Gandhinagar Highway, Gota Char Rasta, P.O. High Court, Gota, Ahmedabad-380 060, Gujarat
21.	ISID	Institute of Studies in Industrial Development	4, Vasant Vihar Institutional Area, P.B.No.7513, Vasant Kunj, Near Hotel the Grand, New Delhi – 110 070
22.	OKDISCD	O.K.D. Institute of Social Change and Development	VIP Road, Upper Hengraban, (Near Lawn Tennis Court), Guwahati-781 036

23.	CMDR	Centre for Multi-Disciplinary Development Research	R.S.No.9A2, Plot No.82, Dr. B.R. Ambedkar Nagar, Near Yalakki Shettar Colony, Lakamanahali, Dharwad -580 004
24.	BANISS	Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar National Institute of Social Sciences	Dongargaon A.B. Road, Mhow Cantonment, Mhow-453 441, Madhya Pradesh
25.	MPISSR	Madhya Pradesh Institute of Social Science Research	6, Bharatpuri Administrative Zone, Ujjain-456 010, Madhya Pradesh

Table 2: Annual Grant of CSIR

CSIR	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
	Rs. in Crores	Rs. in Crores	Rs. in Crores	Rs. in Crores	Rs. in Crores
Govt. Plan Allocation	713	940	1035	1154	1256
Govt. Non Plan Allocation	740.49	770	826.21	1201.20	1410.44
Total	1453.49	1710	1861.21	2355.20	2666.44

Table 3: Annual Grant of ICMR (In Rs. Lakhs)

Year	Non-Plan	Plan	NRE	Total
2005-06	7,600.00	23,900.00	1,600.00	33,100.00
2006-07	8,700.00	28,600.00	2,100.00	39,400.00
2007-08	9,000.00	14,415.00	3,250.00	26,665.00
2008-09	17,400.00	35,018.00	4,000.00	56,418.00
2009-10	18,400.00	35,950.00	4,000.00	58,350.00
Total	61,100.00	1,37,883.00	14,950.00	2,13,933.00

Table 4: Annual grant of ICSSR (Rs. In Lakhs)

S.NO.	YEAR	PLAN	NON-PLAN	Total
1.	2005-06	1780.00	2400.00	4180
2.	2006-07	2050.00	2400.00	4450
3.	2007-08	2220.00	2400.00	4620
4.	2008-09	2500.00	2802.00	5302
5.	2009-10	2500.00	2600.00	5100

Table 5: Actual Expenditure of UGC, Plan & Non-plan, from 2005 to 2010 (Rs. in lakh)

<u>YEAR</u>	<u>PLAN</u>	<u>NON-PLAN</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
2005-06	80874.33	138981.86	219856.197
2006-07	125025.08	159767.16	284792.24
2007-08	188495.28	189354.05	377849.33
2008-09	315768.34	272296.21	588064.55
2009-10	391787.34	382312.46	774099.80
TOTAL	1829819.41	1142711.74	2972531.15

Table 6: Expenditure incurred by the UGC on Research during 2009-10

S. No.	Year	Expenditure incurred on Research Rs. In Crore		Total Rs. In Crore
		Social Science	Basic Science	
1.	2009-10	31.58	256.75	288.33

Table 7: ICSSR expenditure 2005-06 to 2009-10 (Rs. Lakhs)

I. Programmes / Schemes	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
Research grants for projects	172	111	132	356	432
Research fellowship	224	185	205	305	333
Research Institutes	1846	2077	2149	2218	1756
Regional centers	393	332	542	465	477
International collaborations	122	74	112	144	153
Others like Documentation	407	423	321	418	488
Sub Total: I	3163	3202	3461	3905	3639
II. ICSSR's expenses on itself					
Salary	591	517	711	1033	1220
Non-salary	477	319	292	382	336
Sub Total: II	1068	836	1003	1415	1556
Total	4231	4038	4464	5320	5195

Table 8: Number Of Doctoral Fellowships: Year-wise And Region-wise

	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
Delhi	12	20	16	18	21		11	5	6	1
North East			1							
Central			1	1					3	4
North	2	7	7	11	4	0	6	26	12	15
South	2	8	8	5	12	0	5	8	13	12
East	1	3	3	2	0	0	1	4	3	3
West	4	0	3	3	3	0	1	6	3	5

Table 9: Number Of Doctoral Fellowships: Discipline-wise And Year-wise

	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
Economics	3	8	12	8	12		9	7	8	9
Political Science	4	3	6	1	4		5	6	2	5
Psychology	2	10	8	3	1			4	3	6
Sociology	6	11	3	15	7		5	12	10	10
Women's Studies	3	2	1	1					4	1
Others	3	4	9	12	16	0	5	11	13	9

Table 10: Number Of General Fellowships: Region-wise And Year-wise

	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
Delhi	1	1	5	11	2	1	1	4	7	11
North East	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
Central	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	1	0	1
North	3	4	6	7	9	7	1	4	9	9
South	1	0	1	3	4	0	0	2	1	5
East	0	1	3	6	5	1	0	0	1	1
West	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	1

Table 11: Number Of General Fellowships: Discipline-wise And Year-wise

	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
Economics	3	1	3	8	4	3		3	4	6
Political Science			1	4	3	1	2		3	8
Psychology			5	5	1	1			4	3
Sociology		5	2	8	9	2		3	7	4
Women's Studies	1		1	1	1					1
Others	1	0	4	3	6	2	0	6	5	6

Table 12: Number Of Senior Fellowships: Region-wise And Year-wise

	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
Delhi		2	7	4	3			4	3	4
North East	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Central	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0
North	4	3	5	5	1	1	0	2	0	2
South	1	0	2	4	5	0	0	0	1	2
East	1	2	0	2	1	0	0	2	0	2
West	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1

Table 13: Number Of Senior Fellowships: Discipline-wise And Year-wise

	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
Economics		5	6	4	1			3	3	3
Political Science	1		1	1	1	1		1	2	1
Psychology			1		2			1		
Sociology	3	2	2	6	3			1	2	2
Women's Studies					1					3
Others	3	1	6	6	4	0	0	3	0	2

Table 14: Number Of National Fellowships: Region-wise And Year-wise

	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
Delhi		5				2	2	3	5
North East	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Central	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
North	0	4	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
South	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
East	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
West	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0

Table 15: Number Of National Fellowships: Discipline-wise And Year-wise

	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
Economics		1				1	1	2	2
Political Science		4					1	2	
Psychology		1							1
Sociology		4					3	1	2
Women's Studies									
Others	0	4	0	0	0	3	1	0	0

Table 16: Number Of Research Projects: Region-wise And Year-wise

	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	Total
Delhi		5	7	20	32
North East	6	13	18	18	55
Central	2	2	6	9	19
North	11	24	32	35	102
South	7	17	41	39	104
East	6	11	20	12	49
West	3	11	6	18	38

Table 17: Number Of Research Projects: Discipline-wise And Year-wise

	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
Economics	18	13	15	18
Political Science	3	9	4	9
Psychology		4	12	22
Sociology	6	11	5	12
Women's Studies		7	7	11
Others	11	49	99	109

Table 18: ICSSR Awarded General Fellowships: Reports Received –Distribution by Discipline

S.No.	Discipline-wise	Years										Total
		2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	
1.	Economics		2			2		2	2	1		9
2.	Education							2		3		5
3.	Geography										1	1
4.	International Relation									1		1
5.	Law								1			1
6.	Linguist									1		1
7.	Management								2		1	3
8.	Political Science					1		2		1		4
9.	Psychology							4	1	3		8
10.	Sociology		1			1		3	2	2	1	10
11.	Women's Studies					1		2		1		4
12.	Home Science							1				1
	Total		3			5		16	8	13	3	48

Table 19: ICSSR Awarded General Fellowships: Reports Received –Distribution by States

S. No.	Name of State	Years										
		2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	Total
1)	Andhra Pradesh									1		1
2)	Bihar		1			1		1	1			4
3)	Chandigarh							2				2
4)	Delhi					1		1	3	6		11
5)	Jammu & Kashmir					1						1
6)	Kerala		1						1			2
7)	Madhra Pradesh							2				2
8)	Maharashtra										1	1
9)	Nagaland								1			1
10)	Rajasthan					1		1	1	1		4
11)	TamilNadu							2	1	1		4
12)	Uttar Pradesh		1			1		7		1	1	11
13)	Uttarakhand										1	1
14)	West Bengal									3		3
	Total		3			5		16	8	13	3	48

Table 20: ICSSR Senior Fellowships Awarded: Reports Received - Distribution by Disciplines

S. No.	Disciplines	Years								
		2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
1	Commerce				1					
2	Economics	4	2	3	2	6	2	1	4	
3	Education				1			2		1
4	Geography	1			1	2			1	
5	History								1	
6	International Relation			1		1			1	
7	Interdisciplinary								1	1
8	Journalism							1		
9	Law	1							1	
10	Linguistics				2	1				
11	Management	1		1		2			1	
12	Political Science	2	3		1	1	3		1	1
13	Psychology						1	1	1	
14	Sociology	1	2	1	2	2		2	4	1
15	Statistics									
16	Women Studies		1	2			1		1	
	Total	10	8	8	10	15	8	7	18	4

Table 21: ICSSR Senior Fellowships Awarded: Reports Received- Distribution by States

S. No	Name of State	Years								
		2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
1	Andhra Pradesh	1	1	1			1	1	2	
2	Assam		1							
3	Bangladesh	1								
4	Bihar	2						1		
5	Chandigarh								1	
6	Gujarat		1							
7	Haryana			1	1	1				
8	J & K					1				
9	Karnataka		1		1			1	1	
10	Kerala		1					1		
11	Maharashtra	1	1		1		1	2	1	
12	Madhya Pradesh					1				
13	New Delhi	3	1	3	4	4	2	1	6	3
14	Punjab						1			
15	Rajasthan		1		1	1	1		1	
16	Tamil Nadu					1			1	
17	Uttar Pradesh			1	2	4	1		3	
18	Uttarakhand					1			1	
19	West Bengal	2		2		1	1		1	1
	Total	10	8	8	10	15	8	07	18	4

Table 22: National Fellowships Awarded: Reports Received - Distribution by Discipline

S. No.	Name of State	Years								
		2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2008-09	2008-09	2009-10
1	Economics	2			2			2	1	1
2	Education							1		
3	Political Science	1			1		1		3	3
4	Psychology						1	1	1	1
5	Sociology				2			2	1	1
6	Women Studies							1		
	Total	3			5		2	7	6	6

Table 23: National Fellowships Awarded: Reports Received- Distribution by States

S. No.	Name of State	Years									
		2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2008-09
1	Andhra Pradesh									1	1
2	Chandigarh							1			
3	Chattisgarh										1
4	Haryana		1							1	
5	Karnataka		2			2					
6	Maharashtra										1
7	New Delhi					2		1		5	2
8	Rajasthan					1					
9	West Bengal										1
	Total		3			5		2		7	6

Table 24: ICSSR Research Projects: Distribution of Sanctioned Projects by Discipline/Area

S.No.	Discipline/Area	2005-06 *	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
1.	Economics		18	13	15	18
2.	Sociology		6	11	5	12
3.	Political Science		3	9	4	9
4.	Inter-Disciplinary			10	14	22
5.	Psychology			4	12	22
6.	Women's Studies			7	7	11
7.	Commerce		5	12	13	9
8.	Geography			7	3	10
9.	Public Administration				6	2
10.	Anthropology		1	1	13	11
11.	History			1	1	
12.	Education		1	6	12	12
13.	Law				3	3
14.	Linguistics			2	2	5
15.	Management		2	6	7	5
16.	Statistics				4	3
17.	Home Science				1	1
18.	Criminology		1			1
19.	Military Science/Defence Studies					1
20.	Regional Planning			2	5	9
21.	Music					-
22.	Demography				6	3
23.	Social Work			2	2	5
24.	Environment		1		5	5
25.	Library Science				1	-
26.	Mass Communication				1	2
	Total	0	38	93	142	181

*Due to over commitment in the financial year 2004-05, no project was sanctioned in the financial year 2005-06.

Table 25: ICSSR Research Projects: Distribution of Sanctioned Projects by States

S.No.	Name of the State	2005-06 *	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
1.	Andhra Pradesh		-	5	7	20
2.	Arunachal Pradesh		1	3	3	1
3.	Assam		3	8	9	13
4.	Bihar		-	-	2	1
5.	Chhattisgarh		-	-	-	-
6.	Goa		-	1	-	1
7.	Gujarat		3	5	1	10
8.	Haryana		-	1	2	1
9.	Himachal Pradesh		1	1	-	1
10.	Jammu & Kashmir		3	2	-	2
11.	Jharkhand		-	1	1	1
12.	Karnataka		-	5	7	13
13.	Kerala		4	5	10	10
14.	Madhya Pradesh		2	1	5	8
15.	Maharashtra		-	5	5	7
16.	Manipur		-	1	1	2
17.	Meghalaya		2	1	2	2
18.	Mizoram		-	-	3	-
19.	Nagaland		-	-	-	-
20.	Orissa		1	2	6	3
21.	Punjab		1	1	4	1
22.	Rajasthan		2	4	6	3
23.	Sikkim		-	-	-	-
24.	Tamil Nadu		3	7	23	15

25.	Tripura		-	-	-	-
26.	Uttar Pradesh		3	9	13	23
27.	Uttarakhand		1	4	4	3
28.	West Bengal		5	9	12	8
29.	Delhi		3	10	12	30
30.	Chandigarh		-	2	3	1
31.	Puduchery		-	-	1	1
32.	Andaman and Nicobar Islands		-	-	-	-
33.	Dadra and Nagar Haveli		-	-	-	-
34.	Daman and Diu		-	-	-	-
35.	Lakshadweep		-	-	-	-
	Total	0	38	93	142	181

* No project was sanctioned in the financial year 2005-06


Table 26: Scale of Funding of ICSSR Research Projects

		2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
1.	Number of Projects Sanctioned	*-	38	93	142	181
2.	Average Grant per Project	-	Rs.2,77,131/-	Rs.3,14,516/-	Rs.3,39,669/-	Rs.4,22,823/-
3.	Range of Grant	-	Rs.25,000/- to Rs.8,96,550/-	Rs.25,000/- to Rs.6,57,900/-	Rs.25,000/- to Rs.7,13,800/-	Rs.98,900/- to Rs.9,72,825/-
4.	Number of Projects Sanctioned (below 2 lakhs)	-	15	21	19	8
5.	Number of Projects Sanctioned (between 2 lakhs - 5 lakhs)	-	21	62	107	132
6.	Number of Projects Sanctioned (above 5 lakhs)	-	2	10	16	41
7.	Number of Projects Completed	66	95	57	35	54
8.	Total No. of applications/proposals received	0	218	339	462	471

*Due to over commitment in the financial year 2004-05, no project was sanctioned in the financial year 2005-06.

Table 27: ICSSR Research Projects: Final Research Reports during the period 2005-06 to 2009-10

Year	Completion on Time	Delayed by					Total Reports Received
		One year	Two years	Three years	Four years	Five years & above	
2005-06	07	39	09	03	02	06	66
2006-07	08	55	22	06	02	02	95
2007-08	06	23	19	07	01	01	57
2008-09	06	14	09	04	-	02	35
2009-10	20	23	05	06	-	-	54
Total	47	154	64	26	05	11	307



NUEPA DC



D14125