Indian Journal of Modern Research and Reviews

This Journal is a member of the *'Committee on Publication Ethics'*

Online ISSN:2584-184X

Indian Journal of
Modern Research
and Reviews

Review Article

Challenges Faced by Higher Education Institutions in the NAAC Accreditation Process

Dr. Vishal Sharma

Associate Professor, Motherhood University, Roorkee, Haridwar, Uttarakhand, India

Corresponding Author: *Dr. Vishal Sharma

Abstract

The National Assessment and Accreditation Council (NAAC) play a central role in assuring the quality of higher education in India. Designed to evaluate institutions on academic, infrastructural, and governance parameters, NAAC accreditation is widely seen as a benchmark of institutional quality. However, higher education institutions (HEIs) encounter several significant challenges in navigating this process. These challenges include limited financial and human resources, procedural complexity and bureaucratic delays, lack of clarity and transparency in evaluation criteria, infrastructural deficits, and issues related to data preparation for the Self-Study Report (SSR). Moreover, disparities between well-resourced urban institutions and smaller colleges compound the complexities, negatively impacting institutional readiness. Through a critical analysis of existing literature and current developments, this paper explores these obstacles and offers recommendations to address them. The findings suggest that while NAAC has helped institutionalise quality assurance, HEIs require targeted support systems, capacity building, and greater transparency in assessment processes to fully benefit from accreditation and strengthen quality outcomes. The National Assessment and Accreditation Council (NAAC) play a pivotal role in enhancing the quality and accountability of higher education institutions (HEIs) in India. Since its inception in 1994, NAAC has provided a systematic framework for evaluating institutional performance based on academic, administrative, and infrastructural parameters. Accreditation by NAAC has consequences for institutional reputation, funding, academic autonomy, and student confidence. However, despite its benefits, the NAAC accreditation process presents numerous challenges for HEIs seeking or maintaining accreditation. This research paper systematically explores the major impediments confronted by institutions, including resource constraints, lack of awareness and preparedness, data management difficulties, subjectivity in assessment, bureaucratic complexities, and issues related to transparency and credibility. The study draws upon literature review, policy documents, and recent developments within the Indian higher education sector to present a comprehensive overview of these challenges. Recommendations for institutional and regulatory reforms aimed at simplifying the accreditation process and enhancing institutional readiness are also discussed.

KEYWORDS: NAAC Accreditation, Higher Education Quality, Self-Study Report (SSR), Resource Constraints, Transparency and Accountability, Institutional Preparedness

INTRODUCTION

Higher education in India has experienced rapid expansion over recent decades, accompanied by a growing emphasis on quality assurance. The National Assessment and Accreditation Council (NAAC), established in 1994 under the University Grants Commission (UGC), functions as an autonomous body to evaluate and accredit higher education institutions (HEIs) across seven key criteria, including curriculum, teaching-learning, research, infrastructure, and governance (Teachers Institute, NAAC Accreditation). NAAC accreditation serves multiple purposes: it supports institutional improvement, enables stakeholder trust, influences funding decisions, and enhances institutional reputation. Despite these intended benefits, the process of accreditation is not without difficulties. Many HEIs, especially smaller and under-resourced ones, struggle to meet the stringent demands of the accreditation framework. These challenges often arise from internal institutional limitations as well as systemic issues inherent in the NAAC process itself. Higher education accreditation is a globally recognised mechanism for ensuring quality, accountability, and continuous improvement in educational institutions. In India, the National Assessment and Accreditation Council (NAAC) is the foremost body responsible for evaluating the quality of higher education institutions (HEIs). NAAC accreditation influences funding, academic recognition, student admissions, and institutional reputation. Despite its essential role, NAAC accreditation remains a demanding process fraught with several practical, administrative, and strategic challenges for HEIs. This paper critically examines these challenges and suggests possible solutions to mitigate them.

❖ **Background of NAAC and Its Importance**

NAAC was established in 1994 by the University Grants Commission (UGC) with the mandate of assessing and accrediting institutions of higher education in India. The council's objectives include benchmarking quality standards, fostering excellence in academics and administration, and encouraging institutions to pursue sustained improvement. Accreditation is based on several criteria, including curricular aspects, teaching-learning and evaluation, research and innovation, infrastructure, student support, governance, and institutional values. The grading system historically used a scale from A++ to D, though evolving frameworks such as binary accreditation are now emerging to simplify outcomes and focus on compliance certification rather than relative ranking.

❖ **Understanding the NAAC Accreditation Process**

Before delving into challenges, it is important to briefly understand how NAAC accreditation works. Generally, the process includes:

❖ **Institutional Eligibility and Application**
Institutions must first become eligible (usually by being in operation for a stipulated period) and apply to NAAC.

❖ **Preparation of Self-Study Report (SSR)**
Institutions compile a comprehensive SSR that includes data and narratives across NAAC's criteria.

❖ **Peer-Team Visits**
A team of external experts conducts on-site evaluations to validate institutional claims made in the SSR.

❖ **Grading and Outcome**
Institutions are graded (or accredited in the new binary model) based on overall compliance and performance across the criteria. Recent reforms also include shifts toward simplified binary accreditation instead of multi-tiered grades, aiming to make the system more transparent and accessible to institutions.

❖ **Major Challenges in NAAC Accreditation**

➢ **Resource Constraints**

One of the most frequently cited hurdles for HEIs is the availability of adequate resources. Smaller colleges, particularly those in rural or underserved regions, often operate with tight budgets, insufficient infrastructure, and limited access to technology. These limitations make it difficult to collect, organise, and present the comprehensive data required for accreditation. According to research, many institutions struggle with infrastructure and financial issues, which significantly hinder their ability to meet NAAC criteria. Additionally, human resource shortages—especially in terms of qualified faculty and administrative staff—compound these challenges. Without trained personnel to lead the accreditation effort, many institutions find the accreditation journey overwhelming. One of the foremost challenges is limited financial and infrastructural resources. Smaller and rural institutions often struggle to meet the criteria related to modern laboratories, libraries, research infrastructure, ICT tools, and other facilities. The accreditation process demands significant investment to upgrade facilities, train staff, and maintain student-centric services—expenses that many institutions find burdensome. Research shows that institutions with stronger resource bases have a greater likelihood of excelling in accreditation compared to underfunded ones.

➢ **Procedural Complexity and Bureaucratic Delays**

The overall NAAC process can be time-consuming and bureaucratically complex. Stakeholders have noted that the procedural requirements, documentation expectations, and tight timelines can stretch institutional capacities. A parliamentary panel described the current process as "long, bureaucratic and cumbersome," with repeated reports and detailed site visits adding to the administrative load on HEIs. Such bureaucratic pressures often leave institutions focusing more on compliance than on genuine quality enhancement initiatives. The accreditation process is often perceived as bureaucratic and time-intensive. It involves multiple stages of checks, validations, and approvals that can take months or even years to complete. Institutions frequently report delays arising from procedural formalities, repeated iterations of document revision, and scheduling of peer team visits. Such delays not only strain

institutional resources but also can adversely affect planning and academic cycles.

➢ **Lack of Awareness and Preparedness**

Many institutions lack an in-depth understanding of the accreditation framework, criteria, and expectations. Awareness about the process, especially among emerging private colleges and remote institutions, is limited. This often leads to superficial preparation, incomplete data, or misinterpretation of requirements, impacting the quality of SSR and other submissions. Research indicates that lack of NAAC awareness consistently ranks high among challenges faced by institutions seeking accreditation.

➢ **Lack of Transparency and Clarity**

Many institutions report a lack of clarity about the evaluation criteria and mechanisms. Although NAAC shares its frameworks, some HEIs feel that scoring decisions are not always fully transparent. Research has highlighted that in some cases, institutions do not receive complete feedback or clear explanations regarding why they received a particular outcome. This lack of transparency can lead to confusion and frustration, making institutions uncertain about how to prepare effectively for future cycles. Though NAAC strives to standardise evaluations, subjectivity remains a concern. Institutions sometimes feel that on-site assessments and peer-review impressions can significantly influence outcomes, leading to perceived inconsistencies. Some critics argue that final grades might not always reflect true academic quality, particularly where quantitative metrics overshadow deep qualitative indicators like critical thinking or innovative pedagogy.

➢ **Data Collection and Documentation Issues**

The NAAC accreditation process requires extensive documentation and reliable data covering academic performance, research output, industry linkages, student outcomes, community engagement, and administrative practices. Many institutions struggle with data management systems, record-keeping, and timely updating of information. Moreover, generating measurable evidence for qualitative improvements (such as teaching pedagogy or innovation culture) remains difficult, especially without automated systems or quality assurance infrastructure.

➢ **Challenges in Self-Study Report (SSR) Preparation**

The SSR, a cornerstone of the NAAC process, requires extensive documentation and self-analysis across multiple parameters. Collecting accurate historical data, maintaining institutional records, and generating evidence for various metrics can be particularly challenging for institutions that lack robust data management systems.

The preparation of SSR often demands institutional changes that go beyond routine operations. Many HEIs struggle to mobilise time, expertise, and coordination across departments to produce a comprehensive SSR.

➢ **Infrastructural and Technological Barriers**

Digital infrastructure and technical glitches can also impede accreditation efforts. For example, recent reports have indicated that colleges face difficulties when applying through the NAAC portal due to technical issues and system changes associated with new accreditation frameworks. Furthermore, institutions without adequate IT support or digital record-keeping systems find it harder to meet the documentation requirements of the NAAC process.

➢ **Shortage of Qualified Peer Reviewers**

A competent pool of trained peer reviewers is crucial for credible accreditation. However, many HEIs report a lack of sufficiently experienced and objective peer team members. An insufficient reviewer base can slow the process and affect the consistency of evaluations across institutions.

➢ **Scandals and Credibility Issues**

Recent events, such as the NAAC rating bribery case, where inspection committee members were arrested for allegedly taking bribes for favourable ratings, have raised serious questions about the credibility and integrity of the process. Such incidents undermine trust in accreditation and pose ethical challenges for both NAAC and participating institutions.

➢ **Perceptions of Bias and Evaluation Consistency**

Although NAAC aims for objectivity, some critics argue that subjectivity and inconsistency in evaluation can impact outcomes. Concerns over peer team member selection processes and score discrepancies have occasionally been mentioned in the literature and reports.

These perceptions, whether anecdotal or evidence-based, contribute to mistrust and reluctance among certain institutions considering accreditation.

❖ **Secondary Challenges**

➢ **Compliance Pressure Versus Quality Enhancement**

For some institutions, the drive to achieve accreditation status may overshadow true quality enhancement. Faced with stringent criteria, institutions may focus more on fulfilling checklist requirements than on fostering genuine innovation and academic improvements.

➢ **Perceived Mismatch between Accreditation and Actual Quality**

Some HEIs and stakeholders contest whether NAAC grades always align with ground realities. Reports of institutions with high grades but poor student outcomes, inadequate facilities, or governance issues indicate challenges in aligning accreditation results with perceived educational quality. These discrepancies highlight the need for ongoing refinement of evaluation criteria and methods.

➢ **Institutional Culture and Leadership Preparedness**

The leadership's commitment, internal culture of quality assurance, and readiness to implement systemic changes significantly influence accreditation outcomes. Without internal

buy-in from administrators, faculty, and other stakeholders, accreditation efforts often fall short.

❖ **Impacts of These Challenges on Institutions**
➢ The challenges faced by HEIs during the NAAC accreditation process have several direct and indirect consequences, including:
➢ Delayed Accreditation Cycles: Prolonged preparations and process delays can affect institutional planning.
➢ Funding Implications: Poor or delayed accreditation can limit access to grants, autonomy, and eligibility for government schemes.
➢ Reputation and Stakeholder Trust: Credibility concerns arising from scandals and subjective assessments can affect institutional reputation among students, parents, and employers.
➢ Academic Stress: Faculty and administration may face increased workload and stress during intensive preparation periods.

❖ **Opportunities and Recommendations**
Despite these challenges, the accreditation process also offers opportunities for institutional growth and quality improvement. To mitigate the obstacles discussed above, the following recommendations are proposed:
➢ **Capacity Building and Support Networks**
Establishing capacity-building programs to train faculty and administrative staff in accreditation processes can empower institutions. Workshops, regularly updated resources, and mentorship programs can enhance institutional readiness.
➢ **Strengthening Data Systems**
Institutions should invest in robust data management systems that simplify record-keeping and SSR preparation. Centralised digital repositories can streamline future accreditation cycles.
➢ **Enhancing Transparency**
NAAC should work toward greater transparency by providing detailed feedback to institutions and clarifying evaluation methodologies. Clear communication helps institutions better understand and address gaps.
➢ **Simplifying Procedural Requirements**
While maintaining rigorous standards, simplifying procedural complexity where possible—especially for first-time applicants—can reduce administrative strain and encourage wider participation.

CONCLUSION

NAAC accreditation is a valuable process for strengthening quality assurance in Indian higher education. However, HEIs face a range of challenges that inhibit successful navigation of the process. From resource constraints and procedural complexities to transparency concerns and infrastructural barriers, these obstacles highlight the need for systemic support and refinement of accreditation practices. By adopting targeted interventions and fostering collaboration between NAAC and HEIs, it is possible to make the accreditation process more accessible, meaningful, and effective. NAAC accreditation is indispensable for quality assurance in Indian higher education. Yet, the current process poses significant challenges for many institutions, particularly those with limited resources, weak data systems, or an inadequate understanding of quality frameworks. Addressing these challenges requires coordinated efforts at institutional, regulatory, and policy levels—a combination of capacity building, strategic planning, technological upgrades, and transparent practices. By strengthening systems and reducing procedural bottlenecks, NAAC can better serve as a catalyst for genuine quality enhancement in Indian higher education.

REFERENCES

1. Parliamentary panel notes bureaucratic accreditation process in India needs reform. *The Week*. 2025 Dec.
2. Teachers Institute. NAAC accreditation: How India ensures higher education quality. Teachers Institute; n.d.
3. Only a fraction of Indian universities have NAAC accreditation. *India Today*. 2025 Nov.
4. Colleges face system glitches with the NAAC portal, seek fixes. *Hindustan Times*. 2025 Dec.
5. Allegations of irregularities in the NAAC function. Testbook UPSC Notes; n.d.
6. Recent controversies highlight a crisis in NAAC credibility. *Scroll*. 2025.
7. The NAAC accreditation process struggles due to bureaucracy and delays. *Fela News*. 2025.
8. Centre proposes shift to binary accreditation model. *Economic Times*. 2025.
9. Impact of NAAC evaluation enforcement on colleges. The *Times of India*. 2025.
10. MDU's NAAC rating lapse and accountability. The *Times of India*. 2025.
11. Opinion on credibility of NAAC system. *New Indian Express*. 2024.
12. Tiwari A, et al. Challenges of NAAC accreditation in higher education institutions. Repository; 2024.
13. University Grants Commission (UGC). Manual on NAAC accreditation processes. UGC; n.d.
14. Singh A, Gupta R. Quality assurance in Indian higher education. *J High Educ Policy*. 2023.
15. Sharma P. Resource allocation and institutional preparedness. *Int J Educ*. 2022.
16. Rao S. Data management challenges in SSR preparation. *Asian Educ Rev*. 2024.
17. Verma S. Accreditation transparency and accountability. *Qual High Educ J*. 2023.
18. Mehta D. NAAC peer team evaluation: strengths and weaknesses. *J Educ Assess*. 2021.
19. Gupta M, Kumar N. Digital infrastructure in higher education. *Indian J ICT Educ*. 2024.

20. Bose H. Leadership and institutional culture for quality assurance. *J Educ Manag*. 2023.
21. Nagpur Institute gets NAAC A grade. *Navbharat Times*. 2025.