DOI - 10.68648/ijte-q-2026-49-03-018

Massification of Technical Education in India: Implications for Quality and Academia–Industry Alignment

Keshav Kant
Retired Professor
Department of Mechanical Engineering
Indian Institute of Technology Kanpur
✉ keshav@iitk.ac.in

ABSTRACT

Over the past three decades, India has experienced one of the world's largest expansions of higher and technical education, substantially increasing institutional capacity and access to engineering education. While this massification has broadened educational opportunities and supported socio-economic development, improvements in educational quality have not always kept pace with quantitative growth. This review examines the implications of massification for educational quality, faculty development, research ecosystems, laboratory infrastructure, graduate employability, and academia–industry alignment. It argues that rapid institutional expansion, particularly during the period of intensive private-sector growth, often outpaced the development of the academic ecosystems required to sustain high-quality technical education. The review also examines how Artificial Intelligence is reshaping engineering curricula, pedagogical practices, and future graduate competencies. Drawing upon national policy documents, international literature, and recent developments in engineering education, the paper argues that the next phase of reform should emphasize institutional differentiation, continuous faculty development, curriculum modernization, stronger academia–industry collaboration, sustainable funding mechanisms, and outcome-based quality assurance. Having successfully expanded access to technical education, India must now consolidate these gains by strengthening educational quality, innovation capacity, graduate employability, and workforce relevance.

KEYWORDS *: Technical education; Massification; Engineering education; Academia–industry alignment; Artificial Intelligence.*

INTRODUCTION

The expansion of higher education from elite to mass participation has been recognized as one of the defining transformations of modern societies. Trow's seminal framework describes this transition as a progression from elite to mass and ultimately universal access, accompanied by profound changes in institutional missions, governance, curriculum, and quality assurance [1]. India's higher and technical education system provides one of the world's largest contemporary examples of this transformation.

India's higher and technical education system has undergone an unprecedented phase of expansion over the past two decades [2,4]. Driven by demographic pressures, rising aspirations of a growing middle class, and policy emphasis on increasing the Gross Enrolment Ratio (GER), the country witnessed a rapid proliferation of universities, engineering colleges, and technical institutions. This expansion was considered essential for harnessing India's demographic dividend and supplying the skilled human resources required for a rapidly growing economy [2,3]. The rapid expansion of technical institutions was not always accompanied by proportional investments in laboratory infrastructure, faculty development, technical support staff, and institutional governance. Consequently, capacity expansion often outpaced the development of academic ecosystems necessary to sustain educational quality. This imbalance between quantitative expansion and qualitative development has emerged as one of the defining challenges of India's technical education system.

Between the mid-2000s and late 2010s, the number of engineering institutions increased sharply, with private participation accounting for a substantial share of this growth [4,5]. Enrolment capacity expanded correspondingly, extending access to technical education across a wider geographical and socio-economic spectrum. In quantitative terms, the system achieved an unprecedented scale. The long-term strength of India's technological capability and its aspirations for innovation-led development will depend on how effectively this expanding technical education system reconciles growth with quality.

Recent reforms, particularly the National Education Policy (NEP) 2020, seek not only wider access, but also improvements in quality, equity, multidisciplinary education, research and innovation, and graduate employability [2].

However, numerical expansion alone cannot guarantee educational quality [4–6]. The institutional capacity required to sustain standards—qualified faculty, research culture, laboratory infrastructure, effective governance, and meaningful industry engagement—often evolves more slowly than physical infrastructure or sanctioned intake. As a result, concerns have emerged regarding uneven academic standards, graduate employability, and the depth of industry–academia collaboration [4].

At its core, however, the fundamental responsibility of technical education remains the imparting of sound knowledge, the development of practical competence, and the preparation of graduates capable of contributing productively to the economy and society. The present challenge is no longer one of expansion alone, but of consolidation, alignment, and qualitative strengthening. The transition from massification to meaningful educational quality has thus become one of the defining policy challenges confronting Indian technical education. Against this background, this review examines the evolution of technical education in India, evaluates the implications of massification for educational quality, faculty development, research capacity, graduate employability, and academia–industry alignment, and discusses how emerging technologies, particularly Artificial Intelligence, are reshaping engineering education and the competencies expected of future graduates [9–17]. The paper concludes by identifying policy and institutional measures needed to reconcile expansion with excellence.

THE EXPANSION PHASE: GROWTH, ACCESS AND STRUCTURAL IMBALANCES

Policy Context and Growth in Enrolment

The rapid expansion of technical education in India must be viewed in the context of broader policy objectives aimed at increasing access to higher education [2, 3]. Over the past two decades, the Gross Enrolment Ratio (GER) in higher education has risen from low double-digit levels in the early 2000s to nearly 28–29% in the early 2020s, reflecting both demographic pressures and deliberate policy initiatives to widen participation [2, 4].

From the perspective of Trow's framework, India has undergone a transition from an elite system serving a relatively small proportion of the population to a mass system of higher and technical education. This transformation has greatly improved educational access, but has simultaneously created new challenges related to quality assurance, institutional differentiation, graduate employability, and resource allocation [1].

Engineering and technical education formed a central component of this expansion, given their perceived role in supporting industrial growth, infrastructure development, and technological advancement [2, 3]. The number of universities more than doubled during this period, and the expansion of engineering institutions was particularly pronounced between 2005 and 2015 [4,5]. This period marked the most intensive phase of massification in Indian technical education, with expansion occurring at a pace unprecedented in the country's higher education history.

A substantial proportion of these new institutions emerged in the private sector, which today accounts for the majority of engineering colleges in the country. This private-led expansion enabled rapid scaling without placing a disproportionate fiscal burden on the public exchequer and increased access in several semi-urban and rural regions. However, the expansion of physical capacity was not always matched by comparable investments in laboratory infrastructure, trained technical staff, and opportunities for meaningful hands-

on learning. Consequently, practical competencies and graduate readiness varied considerably across institutions. Similarly, the rapid expansion generated demand for qualified faculty that often exceeded supply, resulting in variability in teaching quality, mentoring, and laboratory instruction.

Intake Expansion and Market Saturation

Approved intake capacity in engineering programmes grew sharply during the expansion phase, particularly between 2005 and 2015, at times outpacing actual enrolment demand [5]. In several states—particularly those that experienced early private-sector growth—seat occupancy rates began to decline after an initial surge of enthusiasm.

This created institutional stress, with some colleges operating below capacity and others eventually closing or consolidating. The episode illustrates an important structural reality: while policy incentives can stimulate rapid institutional creation, student demand, institutional quality, and labour market absorption do not always expand at the same pace [4,6].

A structural paradox emerged. National capacity expanded significantly, yet institutional viability and academic standards in many colleges came under strain due to under-enrolment [4,5]. Persistent under-enrolment in several engineering disciplines has resulted in institutional consolidation and the closure of a number of engineering colleges in different parts of the country, indicating that expansion has entered a phase of rationalization.

Regional and Tiered Imbalances

The geographic distribution of engineering institutions has been uneven [4]. Southern and western states witnessed dense concentrations of private engineering colleges during the expansion phase, while parts of eastern and central India expanded more gradually.

Expansion also occurred unevenly across institutional tiers. Premier public institutions—such as the Indian Institutes of Technology and National Institutes of Technology—expanded cautiously while continuing to invest in faculty development and research infrastructure [5,6]. In contrast, many newly established institutions operated with limited research ecosystems and relied predominantly on teaching-focused models.

This asymmetry contributed to the emergence of a stratified technical education system characterized by significant differences in faculty quality, research capability, infrastructure, graduate outcomes, and industry engagement [4,6]. These structural imbalances created many of the quality-related challenges that are examined in the following section.

QUALITY UNDER STRAIN: FACULTY, RESEARCH AND INFRASTRUCTURE

Teaching Mandate and Academic Responsibility

Sustaining academic quality in technical education depends fundamentally on faculty competence, research engagement, laboratory infrastructure, and academic governance [4–6]. The primary mission of technical institutions remains the delivery of high-quality engineering education and the preparation of competent graduates capable of contributing effectively to the economy and society. Research excellence and external funding are important dimensions of academic progress—particularly in premier institutions—but they should complement rather than displace the central teaching mission. A balanced integration of teaching, research, innovation, and professional engagement is therefore essential for maintaining academic standards and ensuring the long-term relevance of technical education [6,7].

Faculty Availability and Academic Stability

One of the most persistent challenges confronting technical education in India has been the availability of qualified faculty [4–6]. The rapid establishment of new engineering institutions generated demand for faculty that exceeded the available supply. Consequently, many institutions relied on early-career graduates with limited teaching and industrial experience, affecting curriculum delivery, laboratory instruction, student mentoring, and industry interaction. The primary mission of technical education is to develop conceptual understanding, analytical ability, practical competence, and professional confidence rather than merely preparing students to succeed in university examinations.

While such arrangements ensured operational continuity, they often limited the development of stable academic cultures, long-term mentoring relationships, and sustained research programmes. Variability in

compensation structures, career progression, and faculty development opportunities further contributed to uneven academic capacity, particularly across segments of the private sector [4–6].

Research Concentration and Institutional Heterogeneity

Research intensity across institutions has remained highly uneven [6,7]. A relatively small cluster of nationally funded institutions accounts for a disproportionate share of publications, patents, and externally funded projects. Many teaching-oriented colleges have limited research output, owing to constrained funding, heavy teaching loads, and modest industry collaboration [6,7].

Consequently, the integration of research with undergraduate teaching—a hallmark of globally competitive technical universities—remains limited across large segments of the system, thereby constraining innovation, experiential learning, and the development of research-oriented engineering graduates [6,7].

Infrastructure and Quality Assurance

In recent years, accreditation has increasingly shifted towards Outcome-Based Education (OBE), emphasizing measurable graduate attributes, continuous improvement, curriculum relevance, and stakeholder participation. Accreditation and quality assurance mechanisms—particularly those administered by the National Assessment and Accreditation Council (NAAC) and the National Board of Accreditation (NBA)—have sought to address these concerns through periodic evaluations and outcome-based assessment frameworks [18]. While accreditation has significantly strengthened institutional accountability and promoted continuous quality improvement, the effectiveness of its implementation has varied across institutions. In some cases, greater emphasis has been placed on documentation and procedural compliance than on deeper academic transformation in teaching, research, and industry engagement [4,18].

Laboratory infrastructure constitutes a defining component of engineering education. Although physical infrastructure expanded rapidly during the massification phase, the availability of modern equipment, maintenance support, trained technical staff, and opportunities for experiential learning has varied considerably across institutions [4]. Such disparities limit opportunities for laboratory work, workshops, design projects, and industrial training, thereby affecting practical competence, engineering judgement, innovation, problem-solving ability, and graduate readiness for industry [4,18].

ACADEMIA–INDUSTRY ALIGNMENT: SKILL MISMATCH AND INNOVATION GAP

The Employability Debate

One of the most widely discussed consequences of the rapid expansion of technical education has been the gap between graduate competencies and industry expectations [3,17,20]. Employers across sectors have expressed concerns regarding practical skills, problem-solving ability, interdisciplinary exposure, workplace readiness, and the ability to adapt to rapidly evolving digital technologies and AI-assisted engineering environments [10–17]. The combined effects of uneven academic quality, inadequate practical training, and limited industry exposure have contributed to persistent concerns regarding graduate employability [3,17,20]. These concerns are reflected in national employability assessments, such as the India Skills Report, as well as in global workforce analyses including the World Economic Forum's Future of Jobs Report [17,20].

Curriculum Responsiveness and Technological Acceleration

Although mechanisms for periodic curriculum revision exist, technological transformation in sectors such as artificial intelligence, semiconductor design, electric mobility, advanced manufacturing, renewable energy systems, and data-driven engineering has accelerated rapidly in recent years [8,17].

The emergence of generative artificial intelligence, digital twins, Industry 4.0, robotics, and intelligent manufacturing systems has further shortened the life cycle of technical knowledge, requiring curricula to become more agile and continuously updated rather than relying solely on periodic curriculum revision cycles [9–16].

Many nationally recognized institutions follow structured curriculum review cycles; however, the pace

of technological change increasingly challenges the adequacy of periodic curriculum revisions alone. Such institutional differentiation and responsiveness align with broader global trends in higher education reform [3,8,16].

Consequently, curriculum design must evolve from periodic revision towards a more continuous, flexible, and industry-responsive process capable of accommodating emerging technologies and rapidly changing workforce requirements [2, 9–17].

Internships, Apprenticeships and Practical Exposure

Where structured internships, apprenticeships, and industry-linked training opportunities are limited, students may graduate with sound theoretical grounding, but insufficient practical experience [2,3,8]. This gap becomes more pronounced in sectors that require familiarity with shop-floor processes, industrial safety practices, and operational troubleshooting. Industrial internships, laboratory-based learning, capstone design projects, and multidisciplinary team projects play a critical role in developing engineering judgement, professional confidence, and the ability to translate theoretical knowledge into practical solutions [2,18,19]. Comparable challenges are also evident in many diploma and vocational institutions, where constraints in laboratory infrastructure and practical training continue to affect skill development and workplace readiness [4,18]. The uneven distribution of technology transfer offices, incubation centres, innovation hubs, and start-up ecosystems further reflects disparities in institutional–industry integration [7,19].

Pedagogical Design and Soft Skills

Industry expectations extend beyond technical competence. Communication skills, interdisciplinary teamwork, adaptability, and collaborative problem-solving increasingly influence recruitment decisions [17].

The alignment challenge is therefore not merely one of curricular content, but also of pedagogy, assessment, and institutional culture. Without sustained collaboration through curriculum co-design, joint research, faculty immersion programmes, industrial internships, and long-term industry partnerships, structural gaps between technical education and industry requirements are likely to persist [3,16,19].

Innovation Ecosystem and Technology Transfer

Innovation in engineering education extends beyond classroom instruction to include research commercialization, start-up incubation, technology transfer, intellectual property creation, and industry-sponsored research [7,19]. While several leading institutions have developed vibrant innovation ecosystems supported by incubation centres and industry partnerships, many teaching-oriented institutions continue to provide limited opportunities for prototype development, technology commercialization, and entrepreneurial engagement. Strengthening these institutional ecosystems is essential for improving academia–industry alignment and supporting India's transition towards an innovation-driven economy [2,7,19].

Artificial Intelligence: Emerging Implications for Quality and Academia–Industry Alignment

Artificial Intelligence (AI), particularly Generative AI, is emerging as a transformative force in engineering education [9-16]. Unlike earlier technological advances such as computer-aided design (CAD), simulation software, and internet-based learning—which primarily enhanced existing engineering practices—Generative AI can generate text, computer code, engineering designs, and analytical solutions, fundamentally altering the teaching–learning process and the competencies expected of engineering graduates [9–12]. Consequently, AI should be viewed not merely as another digital tool, but as a catalyst for curriculum redesign, pedagogical innovation, and institutional transformation [11,12,15].

The rapid adoption of AI across engineering industries is compelling higher education institutions to re-examine curricula, assessment methods, and learning outcomes [11–17]. Future engineering graduates will require not only sound disciplinary knowledge but also AI literacy, data interpretation skills, critical thinking, ethical awareness, and the ability to evaluate and validate AI-generated outputs [9,11,12,15]. Engineering fundamentals, design capability, laboratory experience, and professional judgement will remain indispensable, while AI will increasingly serve as an enabling technology rather than a substitute for engineering competence.

The successful integration of AI into technical education depends critically on faculty preparedness [9,14]. Although there is considerable interest and institutional intent to incorporate AI into engineering curricula, faculty preparedness and training have yet to reach the level required for its effective implementation [14]. Sustained faculty development, curriculum innovation, and closer collaboration with industry will therefore be essential if AI is to strengthen educational quality and improve academia–industry alignment rather than merely introduce another technological layer into engineering education [10,14]. Artificial Intelligence should therefore be viewed as a catalyst for transforming engineering education, provided that institutions adopt appropriate pedagogical practices, ethical safeguards, and regulatory frameworks [11,12].

STRUCTURAL AND REGULATORY FACTORS

Regulatory Complexity and Institutional Diversity

Technical education in India operates within a multi-layered regulatory architecture involving central agencies, state authorities, professional councils, and accreditation bodies [2,5,6,18]. While regulation is essential to ensure minimum standards and public accountability, procedural complexity and regulatory rigidity can sometimes constrain institutional innovation and responsiveness to emerging educational needs.

Uniform regulatory norms applied across highly diverse institutions may not sufficiently account for variations in institutional scale, mission, regional context, and capacity [4–6]. A small rural engineering college and a nationally funded institute of technology often operate within broadly similar compliance frameworks despite vastly different capacities. Such standardization can unintentionally encourage a compliance-driven or "checklist" approach, in which meeting prescribed norms becomes the primary institutional objective rather than fostering continuous academic improvement, institutional distinctiveness, and innovation.

Evaluation Metrics and Academic Incentives

An increasing emphasis on research funding, publication metrics, and institutional rankings—reflecting broader global trends—has reshaped academic incentive structures [7,8]. When evaluation systems disproportionately reward research income, publication counts, or ranking indicators, excellence in teaching, curriculum development, and student mentoring may receive comparatively less recognition. Balanced academic ecosystems therefore require evaluation frameworks that recognize excellence in teaching, research productivity, innovation, and industry engagement [4,7,8].

Financial Sustainability and Institutional Stability

Financial architecture constitutes another critical structural determinant of educational quality [4–6]. Public institutions depend substantially on government grants, which may vary according to fiscal priorities and policy shifts. Private institutions rely largely on tuition revenue, making them sensitive to fluctuations in enrolment and seat occupancy.

During periods of declining admissions, financial pressures may influence faculty recruitment, research investment, laboratory modernization, and infrastructure maintenance [4,5]. Sustainable educational quality therefore requires funding models that provide stability and predictability while encouraging institutional performance, accountability, and continuous quality improvement.

Faculty Development and Capacity Building

Opportunities for research collaboration, industry immersion, pedagogical training, and exposure to emerging technologies remain unevenly distributed across institutions [2,7,8]. As these activities are essential for maintaining academic quality and curricular relevance, faculty members must continually update both their disciplinary expertise and pedagogical skills. Without systematic faculty upskilling, continuous professional development, and institutional support for adopting emerging technologies, curricular reform alone cannot ensure academic relevance or meaningful academia–industry alignment.

Reform Initiatives and Implementation Challenges

Recent policy initiatives—including those articulated in the National Education Policy 2020—have emphasized multidisciplinary education, academic autonomy, credit mobility, and outcome-based frameworks [2]. However, policy intent does not automatically

translate into academic transformation. Implementation capacity varies considerably across institutions [4–6]. Structural reform must therefore be accompanied by targeted capacity-building, governance reform, sustained institutional support, and periodic evaluation of outcomes to achieve lasting improvements in educational quality and academia–industry alignment.

THE WAY FORWARD: FROM MASSIFICATION TO MEANINGFUL ALIGNMENT

Having achieved substantial expansion in access, Indian technical education must now transition from massification to meaningful alignment through consolidation, qualitative improvement, and strengthened institutional capacity. The objective is not to reverse expansion but to align future growth with institutional capacity, educational quality, academic depth, and labour market relevance. The challenges discussed in the preceding sections indicate that future reforms should focus less on quantitative expansion and more on enhancing the quality, relevance, resilience, and long-term sustainability of technical education [2,4,8]. The next stage of development must therefore emphasize institutional differentiation, academic excellence, innovation, and sustainable growth.

Institutional Differentiation and Functional Complementarity

A differentiated institutional ecosystem, based on functional complementarity rather than rigid hierarchy, can enhance systemic efficiency and improve resource utilization [3,19]. Not all institutions are expected to perform identical roles, nor should they be evaluated against uniform benchmarks. A differentiated institutional framework may therefore be envisaged.

i. Research-intensive institutions, pursuing advanced research, postgraduate education, innovation, and externally funded projects while maintaining excellence in teaching.

ii. Regionally anchored institutions, including engineering colleges affiliated to state universities and well-equipped private institutions, emphasizing strong laboratory infrastructure, applied research, and close industry integration. Structured industrial exposure, including semester-long internships or vocational engagement, could help students develop familiarity with real-world technical challenges. Strong regional linkages with local manufacturing and service industries can further enhance relevance and graduate employability.

iii. Skill- and practice-oriented institutions, including polytechnics and Industrial Training Institutes, prioritizing intensive hands-on training, technical competence, and employability. Strengthened laboratory engagement and apprenticeship models can build student confidence in executing assigned tasks while fostering problem-solving ability, innovation, and workplace readiness.

Such differentiation acknowledges varied student aspirations and labour market needs while maintaining national coherence [3,19]. Clear mission statements, aligned evaluation criteria, and performance-linked funding mechanisms may reduce unrealistic uniformity and compliance-driven functioning while strengthening graduate employability and institutional responsiveness to evolving workforce requirements [4–6,17,20].

In skill- and practice-oriented institutions, systematic integration of laboratory learning, industrial exposure, and apprenticeships remains essential. Effective apprenticeship pathways can significantly improve employment prospects and entrepreneurial readiness [17,20].

Deepening Industry Engagement

Industry engagement must evolve from sporadic interactions to sustained institutional partnerships. Such partnerships should be long-term, strategic, outcome-oriented, and mutually beneficial, extending beyond student internships to encompass curriculum co-design, faculty development, consultancy, joint research, innovation, technology transfer, and continuing professional education [19]. Curriculum co-design committees, long-term internship agreements, joint research centres, technology transfer offices, adjunct industry faculty appointments, faculty immersion programmes, and collaborative innovation hubs can substantially strengthen academia–industry alignment [15,17,20]. Such sustained academia–industry collaboration can improve curriculum relevance,

graduate employability, research translation, innovation, and the overall responsiveness of technical education to evolving industrial and societal needs.

Faculty Development and Academic Continuity

Faculty capacity remains central to meaningful reform. Continuous improvement in teaching also benefits from systematic mechanisms for formative student feedback, peer review, and reflective teaching practice, enabling faculty to refine instructional methods and enhance learning outcomes. Equally important, continuous professional development in emerging technologies, pedagogical innovation, research methodology, and industry practices is critical for sustaining instructional quality and curricular relevance [2,7,8].

Encouraging interdisciplinary collaboration, industry-supported projects, and applied research can strengthen the integration of theoretical instruction with real-world engineering practice.

In disciplines experiencing faculty shortages, the structured engagement of experienced retired faculty members and technical experts—where appropriate—can provide valuable mentorship, strengthen laboratory instruction, and ensure academic continuity [2,7,8].

Rationalization and Sustainable Capacity

In regions facing persistent under-enrolment, strategic rationalization of intake capacity may be necessary. Institutional consolidation, when carefully implemented, can prevent resource dilution and enable the remaining institutions to operate more efficiently and sustainably [4,5]. Sustainable educational quality requires stable enrolment, adequate faculty strength, modern infrastructure, and predictable funding—conditions that are difficult to achieve under chronic overcapacity [4–6].

Broadening the Research Base

While centres of excellence continue to perform at high levels, strengthening the research ecosystem across a broader institutional base remains important. Expanding access to competitive research funding, developing shared laboratory facilities, and fostering regional research clusters can gradually reduce the concentration of research output in a limited number of elite institutions.

Research-informed teaching enhances student engagement, innovation capability, and industry relevance. Collaborative research involving academia, industry, and government agencies through regional innovation clusters can further accelerate the translation of research into technological innovation, industrial application, and societal impact [6,7,19].

Shifting the Metric of Success

The emphasis must shift from quantitative indicators—such as the number of institutions, sanctioned seats, and enrolment figures—to qualitative measures including learning outcomes, research impact, industry collaboration, innovation output, and graduate employability and career progression.

Expansion was necessary; consolidation must now ensure depth [2,19].

International Lessons and Contextual Adaptation

Several countries have addressed the challenges of expansion through differentiated institutional missions and stronger integration between higher education and national development priorities. International experience demonstrates that scale alone does not guarantee excellence.

Germany's dual vocational–technical model emphasizes apprenticeships and structured industry participation. In the United States, research universities integrate undergraduate education with strong research ecosystems, while China's higher education expansion has been accompanied by targeted investment in research-intensive universities to strengthen national innovation capacity.

Together, these examples illustrate that differentiated institutional missions, strategic investment, and strong industry engagement are central to converting quantitative expansion into qualitative excellence. India's reform trajectory can therefore benefit from adapting these underlying principles to its own socio-economic context rather than replicating institutional models mechanically [3,8,19].

CONCLUSION

India has successfully expanded access to higher and technical education on an unprecedented scale,

representing one of the country's most significant public policy achievements in recent decades. The next phase of reform should ensure that this quantitative success is matched by sustained improvements in educational quality, institutional capacity, and meaningful academia–industry alignment [2,4].

However, expansion that is not accompanied by proportional strengthening of faculty capacity, research ecosystems, laboratory infrastructure, governance mechanisms, and sustained industry engagement inevitably leads to variations in institutional quality and graduate outcomes [3,4]. Such heterogeneity is neither unexpected nor inherently undesirable in a country of India's scale and diversity; similar structural tensions have accompanied massification in higher education systems worldwide. Nevertheless, if left unaddressed, these imbalances may constrain academic quality, innovation capacity, and graduate employability.

The present phase therefore calls not for further expansion alone, but for consolidation, differentiation, and qualitative strengthening. Clear institutional missions, stable funding mechanisms, systematic faculty development, modern laboratory infrastructure, curriculum renewal, meaningful academia–industry collaboration, and robust quality assurance together provide the foundation for sustainable improvement [2,19]. The emphasis must progressively shift from quantitative indicators of growth towards qualitative measures of learning outcomes, research relevance, innovation, graduate employability, and societal impact.

Indian technical education now stands at a critical transition—from expansion-driven massification towards institutional maturation and quality enhancement. The trajectory of the coming decade will determine whether impressive numerical growth is translated into sustained academic excellence capable of supporting innovation-led, technology-driven, and employment-oriented national development. Ultimately, the challenge is not one of scale alone, but of coherence: only when expansion is aligned with institutional capacity, educational quality, clarity of purpose, and responsiveness to societal and industrial needs can it provide a durable foundation for India's long-term technological competitiveness and inclusive economic development.

REFERENCES

1. Trow M. Reflections on the Transition from Elite to Mass to Universal Access: Forms and Phases of Higher Education in Modern Societies. In: Forest JJ, Altbach PG (eds.), International Handbook of Higher Education. Springer, Dordrecht, 2007.
2. Government of India, National Education Policy 2020, Ministry of Education, New Delhi, 2020.
3. Altbach, P. G., Reisberg, L. and Rumbley, L. E., Trends in Global Higher Education: Tracking an Academic Revolution, UNESCO, Paris, 2009.
4. All India Survey on Higher Education (AISHE), All India Survey on Higher Education 2021–22, Ministry of Education, Government of India, New Delhi, 2023.
5. All India Council for Technical Education (AICTE), Approval Process Handbook 2023–24, AICTE, New Delhi, 2023.
6. University Grants Commission (UGC), Annual Report 2021–22, UGC, New Delhi, 2022.
7. Department of Science and Technology (DST), Research and Development Statistics 2022–23, Government of India, New Delhi, 2023.
8. OECD. Education at a Glance 2025: OECD Indicators. OECD Publishing, Paris, 2025. doi:10.1787/1c0d9c79-en.
9. Hao Y, Liu Y, Liu B, Amarantidis G, Ghannam R. Integrating AI in Engineering Education: A Comprehensive Review and Student-Informed Module Design for U.K. Students. IEEE Transactions on Education. 2025;68(2):173–185. doi:10.1109/TE.2025.3536105.
10. Rahman A, Khandakar A, Ayari MA, Naji K, Al Ali AK, Sellami AL, Alhazbi SMA. Artificial Intelligence Innovations, Challenges and Emerging Trends in Engineering Education. Discover Education. 2026;5, article 179. doi:10.1007/s44217-026-01137-1.
11. Chamola V, Dave D, Goyal I, Sharma S. Generative Artificial Intelligence in STEM Education: A Review of Applications, Benefits and Challenges. Expert Systems. 2026;43(2):e70201. doi:10.1111/exsy.70201.
12. Segura Altamirano SF, Maquen Niño GLE, Guzmán Roldán CM, Pérez Herrera A, Castro Cárdenas DM, et al. Generative Artificial Intelligence in Higher Education: A Systematic Review of Perceptions, Implementation

and Pedagogical Transformation. Review of Education. 2026;14:e70152. doi:10.1002/rev3.70152.

13. Bacalso FD, Villamor FE, Paclipan CP, Orquia CJB, Rendon IP, Albiso AT, Himang CM. Institutional Approaches to Generative AI Management in Higher Education: A Systematic Review. Frontiers in Education. 2026;11:1814426. doi:10.3389/feduc.2026.1814426

14. de Silva A, Song IHJ, Yang H, Humayoun SR. STEM Faculty Perspectives on Generative AI in Higher Education. Proceedings of the AAAI Symposium Series. 2026;8(1):640–647. doi:10.1609/aaaiss.v8i1.42600 (preprint: arXiv:2603.04001)

15. AI4SG Lab, NUS School of Computing, SoC Horizons Office, and Google. Reshaping Undergraduate Computer Science Education in the Generative AI Era (Version 1.0). White Paper, 2026. arXiv:2606.07545. doi:10.48550/arXiv.2606.07545.

16. Alenezi M. The Rise of AI Native Software Engineering: Implications for Practice, Education, and the Future Workforce. arXiv preprint, June 12, 2026. arXiv:2606.12986. doi:10.48550/arXiv.2606.12986.

17. World Economic Forum. The Future of Jobs Report 2025. World Economic Forum, Geneva, Switzerland, 2025.

18. National Board of Accreditation (NBA). Manual for Accreditation of Undergraduate Engineering Programs (Tier I). National Board of Accreditation, New Delhi, 2025.

19. UNESCO. Engineering for Sustainable Development: Delivering on the Sustainable Development Goals. UNESCO, Paris, 2021.

20. India Skills Report 2026. Wheebox, Confederation of Indian Industry (CII), AICTE, Association of Indian Universities (AIU), New Delhi, 2026.