Summary
The present study deals with assessing the role of the UGC as a regulatory body and a funding agency in higher education. The study has limited its analysis to four major aspects, namely, quality teaching, quality research, equity in access to higher education and funding while analyzing the role of the UGC. The study is based on primary and secondary data.

The findings of the study suggest that the UGC has not been fully effective in promoting and regulating quality teaching and quality research in institutions of higher learning. However, the performance of the UGC in terms of promotion and regulation of equitable access to higher education has been satisfactory. As a funding agency, the UGC has not been fully successful in the promotion and development of higher education.

For improving the role of the UGC in promoting and regulating quality teaching, the study has recommended to improve the mechanism of NET in regulating quality teaching at the entry level, abolishing non-permanence in recruiting faculty in institutions of higher learning, restructuring the API scheme in the light of various challenges and lastly to improve the tool of amendments in strengthening the UGC Regulations, 2010 in promoting and regulating quality teaching in a better way.

Further, the UGC’s role in terms of quality research can be improved by improving the performance of the UGC schemes promoting and regulating quality research and UGC Regulations, 2009 and 2016 promoting and regulating quality research in MPhil/PhD programmes.

The performance of the UGC on account of promotion and regulation of equitable access to higher education can be improved by making aware the target group about the concerned UGC schemes; increasing the number and amount of fellowships/schemes; introducing schemes for economically weaker section of the society; and ensuring full compliance of the reservation policy.

The role of the UGC as a funding agency can be made more efficient by effectively utilising the ICT applications to ensure timely disbursement of the grant; improving co-ordination between institutes and the UGC; not separating funding functions from the UGC; increasing public funding to higher education; eliminating the bias towards state institutions in the funding patterns; and linking quality parameters with funding.