Published by

British Journal of Contemporary Research

BEXFORD PUBLISHING

From Accreditation to Institutional Excellence: A Comparative Policy Analysis of NIRF, NAAC, and NAAC 2.0 in Bhartiya Higher Education

Original Research Article | Volume 1 | Issue 2 | 2026 | Article Number: 023

Accepted: 30 June 2026 | Published: 10 July 2026 | ISSN: 2979-8582 (Online)

: https://doi.org/10.67693/BJCR-AIUTLH6C

Prof. Dr. Harendra Singh

D.P.M. (P.G.) Institute of Education, Behsuma, Chaudhary Charan Singh University, Meerut, U P, India

Correspondence: Prof. Dr. Harendra Singh, harendra_2k@yahoo.com

Abstract

The landscape of quality assurance in Bhartiya higher education has undergone a significant transformation over the past three decades, evolving from periodic accreditation to continuous, evidence-based institutional quality enhancement. This transition has been driven by the establishment of the National Assessment and Accreditation Council (NAAC), the introduction of the National Institutional Ranking Framework (NIRF), and the proposed reforms under the NAAC 2.0 framework aligned with the objectives of the National Education Policy (NEP) 2020. While NAAC has traditionally emphasized institutional quality through criterion-based accreditation, NIRF evaluates comparative institutional performance using standardized indicators related to teaching, research, graduation outcomes, outreach, and perception. The emerging NAAC 2.0 framework represents a paradigm shift by introducing a Binary Accreditation Framework, Maturity-Based Graded Levels, artificial intelligence-enabled assessment, continuous monitoring, and evidence-driven evaluation. This paper critically examines the evolution, objectives, methodologies, and policy implications of these three quality assurance mechanisms and analyses their complementary roles in fostering institutional excellence. Adopting a qualitative comparative policy analysis based on official policy documents, accreditation manuals, and recent scholarly literature, the study explores how these frameworks collectively promote accountability, governance, innovation, research productivity, learner-centric education, and global competitiveness. The paper argues that Bharat's quality assurance ecosystem is transitioning from compliance-oriented evaluation towards a culture of continuous improvement, institutional maturity, and measurable societal impact. It concludes that the effective integration of NIRF, NAAC, and NAAC 2.0 has the potential to strengthen higher education governance, enhance institutional resilience, and position Bhartiya universities more competitively within the global knowledge economy while supporting the transformative vision of NEP 2020.

© 2026 The Authors. Published by Bexford Publishing Ltd

Keywords: National Institutional Ranking Framework (NIRF), National Assessment and Accreditation Council (NAAC), NAAC 2.0, Quality Assurance, Higher Education, Accreditation, Institutional Ranking, National Education Policy 2020 (NEP 2020), Institutional Governance, Outcome-Based Education, Artificial Intelligence, Maturity-Based Graded Levels

1. Introduction

Higher education has emerged as a critical driver of economic growth, social transformation, scientific innovation, and sustainable development in the twenty-first century. Universities are no longer confined to their traditional roles of imparting knowledge and awarding degrees; rather, they are expected to generate high-quality research, foster innovation and entrepreneurship, promote social inclusion, contribute to regional and national development, and compete within an increasingly interconnected global knowledge economy. Consequently, the quality of higher education institutions has become a central concern for governments, policymakers, employers, students, and international stakeholders. Across the world, quality assurance systems have evolved from periodic regulatory inspections to comprehensive mechanisms emphasizing institutional accountability, continuous improvement, evidence-based decision-making, and measurable educational outcomes.

Bharat possesses one of the world's largest and most diverse higher education systems. According to the All India Survey on Higher Education (AISHE) 2021-22**,** Bharat has 1,168 universities, 45,473 colleges, and 12,002 standalone institutions**,** enrolling 43.3 million students**.** The sector has witnessed remarkable expansion, improving access, equity, and inclusion while supporting the objectives of the National Education Policy (NEP) 2020. However, rapid growth has also intensified concerns regarding academic quality, governance, research productivity, employability, infrastructure, digital readiness, and institutional effectiveness. These challenges underscore the need for a transparent, evidence-based quality assurance and accreditation framework that promotes accountability, continuous improvement, and global competitiveness in higher education.

Recognizing these challenges, the Government of Bharat has introduced several policy initiatives to strengthen quality assurance in higher education. Among the most influential are the establishment of the **National Assessment and Accreditation Council (NAAC)** in 1994, the launch of the **National Institutional Ranking Framework (NIRF)** in 2015, and the proposed reforms under the **NAAC 2.0 accreditation framework**, developed in alignment with the transformative vision of the **National Education Policy (NEP) 2020**. Although these initiatives share the common objective of improving institutional quality, they differ substantially in their conceptual foundations, evaluation methodologies, assessment indicators, and intended outcomes. Together, they represent successive stages in the evolution of Bharat's higher education quality assurance architecture, from accreditation and quality certification to competitive performance benchmarking and, ultimately, continuous institutional maturity and excellence.

The National Assessment and Accreditation Council has played a pioneering role in institutional quality assurance by evaluating higher education institutions against multidimensional criteria encompassing curricular design, teaching-learning processes, research, infrastructure, governance, student support, and institutional values. Accreditation under NAAC has enabled institutions to establish internal quality assurance mechanisms, enhance transparency, and align academic practices with nationally accepted standards. However, the traditional accreditation process has also been criticized for its heavy dependence on documentation, periodic assessment cycles, subjective peer review, and limited emphasis on measurable outcomes and long-term institutional impact.

The introduction of the National Institutional Ranking Framework marked another significant milestone by

© 2026 The Authors. Published by Bexford Publishing Ltd

shifting attention toward comparative institutional performance using quantitative indicators such as teaching and learning resources, research productivity, graduation outcomes, outreach and inclusivity, and stakeholder perception. NIRF has encouraged institutions to improve research output, faculty quality, innovation, employability, and strategic planning while fostering healthy competition among universities. Nevertheless, ranking systems primarily emphasize relative institutional performance rather than holistic quality enhancement, and therefore cannot substitute for comprehensive accreditation mechanisms.

In response to emerging challenges and guided by the recommendations of NEP 2020, Bharat is now transitioning toward the proposed **NAAC 2.0** framework, which seeks to redefine quality assurance through digital governance, continuous assessment, artificial intelligence-enabled verification, outcome-based evaluation, and institutional maturity assessment. The introduction of the **Binary Accreditation Framework (BAF)**, **Maturity-Based Graded Levels (MBGL)**, automated data validation, and continuous monitoring reflects a shift from compliance-oriented accreditation toward a dynamic model of quality enhancement that prioritizes measurable institutional impact, learner outcomes, research excellence, innovation, sustainability, and societal engagement. This transformation aligns Bhartiya quality assurance practices with international trends emphasizing transparency, accountability, institutional autonomy, and evidence-based governance.

Despite the growing significance of these frameworks, existing scholarship has generally examined NIRF, NAAC, and NAAC 2.0 independently, with limited attention to their interrelationships, complementarities, and collective contribution to institutional transformation. A comprehensive comparative analysis is therefore essential to understand how these mechanisms interact to strengthen governance, improve academic quality, support policy implementation, and enhance the global competitiveness of Bhartiya higher education institutions. Against this backdrop, the present study critically examines the evolution, objectives, methodologies, strengths, limitations, and policy implications of NIRF, NAAC, and NAAC 2.0. Through a qualitative comparative analysis of policy documents, accreditation frameworks, and contemporary literature, the paper argues that Bharat's higher education quality ecosystem is undergoing a paradigm shift from periodic compliance-based evaluation toward a continuous, technology-enabled, outcome-oriented, and maturity-driven model of institutional excellence. Such a transformation has significant implications not only for quality assurance but also for governance reforms, research capacity, internationalization, and the realization of the ambitious goals envisioned under the National Education Policy 2020.

2. Research Gap

Quality assurance has become one of the most widely discussed themes in higher education research, particularly in the context of institutional accountability, academic excellence, and global competitiveness. Existing studies have extensively examined the role of the National Assessment and Accreditation Council (NAAC) in promoting quality culture, institutional governance, and academic reforms, while numerous researchers have analysed the National Institutional Ranking Framework (NIRF) as a mechanism for benchmarking institutional performance based on measurable indicators such as teaching, research, graduation outcomes, outreach, and perception. More recently, scholarly discussions have focused on the proposed reforms under NAAC 2.0, particularly its emphasis on digital governance, continuous accreditation, Artificial Intelligence (AI)-enabled verification, and outcome-based assessment.

Despite this growing body of literature, significant research gaps remain. First, most studies investigate NAAC, NIRF, or NAAC 2.0 independently, without examining their complementary roles within Bharat's evolving quality assurance ecosystem. Second, limited research has explored the conceptual transition from traditional accreditation towards institutional maturity and continuous quality enhancement envisaged

© 2026 The Authors. Published by Bexford Publishing Ltd

under NAAC 2.0. Third, comparative analyses that critically evaluate the philosophical foundations, assessment methodologies, governance implications, and policy objectives of these three frameworks remain scarce. Fourth, there is inadequate scholarly attention to the alignment of these quality assurance mechanisms with the transformative objectives of the National Education Policy (NEP) 2020, particularly regarding multidisciplinary education, digital transformation, research excellence, internationalization, institutional autonomy, and learner-centric education. Finally, while policy documents highlight the potential of AI-driven assessment and continuous monitoring, empirical and conceptual discussions regarding their implications for institutional governance, transparency, accountability, and sustainable quality enhancement are still emerging.

Addressing these gaps, the present study provides a comprehensive comparative policy analysis of NIRF, NAAC, and NAAC 2.0, demonstrating how these frameworks collectively represent a progressive shift from compliance-based accreditation towards an integrated model of institutional excellence, evidence-based governance, and continuous quality improvement in Bhartiya higher education.

3. Objectives of the Study

The study is guided by the following objectives:

1. To examine the evolution of quality assurance mechanisms in Bhartiya higher education with particular reference to NIRF, NAAC, and NAAC 2.0.
2. To analyse the conceptual foundations, objectives, methodologies, and evaluation parameters of NIRF, NAAC, and NAAC 2.0.
3. To compare the three frameworks in terms of institutional governance, quality assurance, research performance, learner outcomes, digital transformation, and continuous quality improvement.
4. To evaluate the alignment of these quality assurance mechanisms with the vision and recommendations of the National Education Policy (NEP) 2020.
5. To identify the opportunities, challenges, and policy implications associated with the implementation of NAAC 2.0 in Bhartiya higher education institutions.
6. To propose a conceptual framework for integrating ranking, accreditation, and institutional maturity into a holistic quality assurance ecosystem capable of enhancing global competitiveness and sustainable institutional excellence.

4. Research Questions

The study seeks to answer the following research questions:

RQ1: How has the quality assurance framework in Bhartiya higher education evolved from traditional accreditation to continuous institutional quality enhancement?

RQ2: What are the conceptual and methodological differences between NIRF, NAAC, and the proposed NAAC 2.0 framework?

RQ3: In what ways do these frameworks complement each other in improving institutional governance, accountability, research productivity, teaching quality, and learner outcomes?

RQ4: How does NAAC 2.0 address the limitations of earlier accreditation models through digital technologies, Artificial Intelligence, and continuous monitoring?

RQ5: What policy measures are necessary to ensure the successful implementation of an integrated quality assurance system aligned with the objectives of NEP 2020?

© 2026 The Authors. Published by Bexford Publishing Ltd

5. Research Methodology

This study adopts a **qualitative, descriptive, and comparative policy analysis** approach to examine the evolution of quality assurance in Bhartiya higher education. It relies exclusively on **secondary data** collected from authoritative sources, including the **National Education Policy (2020)**, NIRF methodology documents, NAAC manuals, the proposed NAAC 2.0 framework, University Grants Commission (UGC) reports, All India Survey on Higher Education (AISHE) reports, and publications by UNESCO and the OECD, complemented by peer-reviewed literature (2020-2026). Using **document analysis** and **thematic content analysis**, the study compares NIRF, NAAC, and NAAC 2.0 across five dimensions: philosophy, assessment methodology, governance, quality enhancement, and alignment with global best practices. The findings provide a conceptual framework for understanding Bharat's evolving quality assurance ecosystem and identify policy directions for future empirical research.

6. Literature Review

Quality assurance has become a fundamental component of higher education governance, driven by the growing demand for institutional accountability, academic excellence, and global competitiveness. Harvey and Green (1993) conceptualized quality as a multidimensional construct comprising excellence, fitness for purpose, value for money, transformation, and stakeholder satisfaction. Building on this framework, Dill (2007) and Stensaker (2008) argued that quality assurance should move beyond regulatory compliance to promote continuous institutional improvement, innovation, and evidence-based governance. International quality assurance agencies, including the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA, UK), the Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency (TEQSA, Australia), and the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA, USA), increasingly emphasize learner outcomes, institutional effectiveness, digital governance, and continuous quality enhancement.

In the Bhartiya context, Stella and Gnanam (2004) identified NAAC as a catalyst for fostering quality culture through Internal Quality Assurance Cells (IQACs), academic planning, and institutional reforms. Agarwal (2009) and Singh (2011) observed that NAAC accreditation strengthened governance, curriculum development, faculty quality, and student support services, although concerns regarding documentation-intensive procedures, periodic assessments, and subjective peer review persisted. The introduction of the National Institutional Ranking Framework (NIRF) in 2015 shifted the focus towards performance-based evaluation, encouraging improvements in research productivity, innovation, graduate outcomes, and institutional benchmarking. Studies by Bhushan and Pandey (2021) and reports of the Ministry of Education (2024) acknowledge NIRF's positive impact while cautioning against excessive reliance on quantitative indicators and institutional disparities.

The National Education Policy (NEP) 2020 further redefined quality assurance by advocating multidisciplinary education, institutional autonomy, digital transformation, and outcome-based learning. In response, the proposed NAAC 2.0 framework introduces the Binary Accreditation Framework (BAF), Maturity-Based Graded Levels (MBGL), Artificial Intelligence-enabled assessment, and continuous accreditation to enhance transparency, accountability, and evidence-based decision-making. Despite the growing body of literature, most studies examine NAAC, NIRF, or NAAC 2.0 in isolation. Comparative analyses integrating these three frameworks within a unified quality assurance ecosystem remain limited. This study addresses this gap by critically examining their complementary roles in advancing institutional governance, continuous quality enhancement, and the global competitiveness of Bhartiya higher education.

7. Evolution of Quality Assurance in Bhartiya Higher Education

Quality assurance has emerged as one of the most influential pillars of higher education governance in the

© 2026 The Authors. Published by Bexford Publishing Ltd

twenty-first century. The expansion of higher education, increasing public investment, internationalization of universities, technological advancement, and growing expectations from students, employers, and society have transformed the understanding of educational quality from a regulatory concern into a strategic imperative. In Bharat, the evolution of quality assurance reflects the country's broader educational reforms aimed at enhancing institutional accountability, academic excellence, research productivity, innovation, and global competitiveness.

Following independence, Bharat's higher education system experienced rapid quantitative expansion. While the establishment of universities and colleges substantially improved access to education, concerns gradually emerged regarding declining academic standards, inadequate infrastructure, faculty shortages, weak governance, and uneven institutional performance. During the initial decades, quality regulation largely depended upon statutory bodies such as the University Grants Commission (UGC), professional councils, and periodic government inspections. These mechanisms primarily focused on regulatory compliance and financial oversight rather than comprehensive evaluation of institutional effectiveness.

Recognizing the necessity for systematic quality assessment, the University Grants Commission established the **National Assessment and Accreditation Council (NAAC)** in 1994 as an autonomous institution dedicated to promoting quality assurance in higher education. NAAC introduced a comprehensive accreditation framework based on institutional self-study, peer review, and criterion-based evaluation. Unlike earlier regulatory approaches, accreditation sought to encourage continuous quality improvement rather than merely ensuring minimum standards. Institutions were evaluated across multiple dimensions including curriculum, teaching-learning processes, research, infrastructure, governance, student support, and institutional values, thereby promoting holistic institutional development.

The first phase of quality assurance in Bharat was therefore characterized by **quality certification** through accreditation. Accreditation encouraged institutions to establish Internal Quality Assurance Cells (IQACs), formulate strategic development plans, improve documentation practices, and institutionalize quality enhancement initiatives. Over time, NAAC accreditation became an important prerequisite for institutional funding, autonomy, academic expansion, and public credibility.

The second phase began with the launch of the **National Institutional Ranking Framework (NIRF)** by the Ministry of Education in 2015. While NAAC focused on evaluating institutions against predetermined quality standards, NIRF introduced a competitive performance-based ranking system. This represented a significant philosophical shift from institutional certification to comparative benchmarking. Universities were now assessed using standardized indicators relating to teaching and learning resources, research productivity, graduation outcomes, outreach and inclusivity, and stakeholder perception. NIRF stimulated healthy competition among institutions while encouraging improvements in research publications, patents, faculty quality, employability, innovation, and academic visibility.

The publication of the **National Education Policy (NEP) 2020** marked the beginning of a third phase of quality assurance emphasizing continuous institutional improvement rather than periodic evaluation. NEP 2020 advocates multidisciplinary education, institutional autonomy, digital governance, research excellence, internationalization, and learner-centred education. Consistent with these objectives, the proposed **NAAC 2.0 framework** seeks to transform accreditation through continuous monitoring, Artificial Intelligence-enabled verification, Binary Accreditation Framework (BAF), and Maturity-Based Graded Levels (MBGL). This transition reflects an international movement towards evidence-based governance and continuous quality enhancement, where institutional maturity and societal impact become more significant than one-time accreditation outcomes.

Thus, the evolution of quality assurance in Bharat demonstrates a progressive transformation across three

© 2026 The Authors. Published by Bexford Publishing Ltd

interconnected stages. The first stage emphasized accreditation and quality certification through NAAC; the second introduced institutional benchmarking through NIRF; and the third, represented by NAAC 2.0, seeks to establish a dynamic ecosystem of continuous institutional excellence supported by digital technologies, data-driven governance, and measurable educational outcomes. Together, these reforms reflect Bharat's aspiration to develop globally competitive universities capable of contributing to national development and the knowledge economy.

8. National Institutional Ranking Framework (NIRF): Philosophy, Methodology and Institutional Significance

The **National Institutional Ranking Framework (NIRF)** was introduced by the Ministry of Education in 2015 to establish a transparent, objective, and evidence-based mechanism for evaluating the comparative performance of higher education institutions in Bharat. Prior to its introduction, Bhartiya universities participated primarily in international ranking systems such as QS World University Rankings and Times Higher Education Rankings, whose methodologies often favoured older research-intensive universities and did not adequately reflect Bharat's diverse higher education landscape. NIRF was therefore designed as a nationally relevant framework that considers Bharat's educational priorities while simultaneously encouraging institutions to improve their global competitiveness.

The philosophy underlying NIRF is rooted in the principle that institutional excellence should be assessed through measurable academic performance rather than reputation alone. Unlike accreditation, which determines whether an institution satisfies predefined quality standards, ranking differentiates institutions based on comparative performance across standardized indicators. Consequently, NIRF promotes excellence through competition while encouraging universities to continuously improve teaching quality, research productivity, graduate employability, inclusivity, and institutional reputation.

NIRF evaluates institutions using five broad parameters, each reflecting an important dimension of higher education quality:

1. **Teaching, Learning and Resources (TLR)** assesses faculty strength, faculty qualifications, student-faculty ratio, financial resources, and learning infrastructure.
2. **Research and Professional Practice (RP)** measures publications, citations, patents, sponsored research projects, consultancy, and overall research productivity.
3. **Graduation Outcomes (GO)** evaluates graduation rates, placement performance, progression to higher education, and professional success of graduates.
4. **Outreach and Inclusivity (OI)** examines regional diversity, gender equity, representation of socially disadvantaged groups, and facilities for differently abled students.
5. **Perception (PR)** captures academic reputation, employer confidence, and broader public recognition.

One of the major strengths of NIRF lies in its emphasis on objective and quantifiable indicators. Institutions are required to submit verifiable data, enabling greater transparency and encouraging evidence-based institutional planning. Annual rankings also motivate universities to continuously improve their performance rather than relying solely on periodic accreditation cycles.

The introduction of NIRF has significantly influenced institutional behaviour. Universities have invested more heavily in research infrastructure, faculty recruitment, innovation ecosystems, entrepreneurship development, patent generation, industry partnerships, and international collaborations. Many institutions have established dedicated ranking cells responsible for monitoring performance indicators, collecting institutional data, and formulating strategic initiatives aimed at improving rankings.

© 2026 The Authors. Published by Bexford Publishing Ltd

Despite these achievements, scholars have identified certain limitations of NIRF. The framework predominantly relies on quantitative indicators, which may not adequately capture qualitative aspects such as institutional culture, ethical leadership, community engagement, pedagogical innovation, and long-term societal impact. Additionally, institutions with greater financial resources and established research ecosystems often enjoy competitive advantages over smaller or rural institutions. Consequently, while NIRF effectively measures comparative institutional performance, it should be viewed as complementary to rather than a substitute for comprehensive quality assurance mechanisms such as accreditation.

9. National Assessment and Accreditation Council (NAAC): Institutional Quality Assurance and Accreditation

The **National Assessment and Accreditation Council (NAAC)** was established by the University Grants Commission in 1994 with the objective of promoting quality assurance and continuous improvement in Bhartiya higher education institutions. Unlike ranking systems, which compare institutions against one another, NAAC evaluates whether an institution meets nationally accepted standards of academic quality and institutional effectiveness. Accreditation therefore focuses on quality enhancement rather than competitive positioning.

The NAAC accreditation framework is founded upon the principle that institutional quality is multidimensional and cannot be assessed solely through research output or academic reputation. Consequently, NAAC evaluates institutions through a holistic framework encompassing seven interrelated criteria:

- Curricular Aspects
- Teaching–Learning and Evaluation
- Research, Innovations and Extension
- Infrastructure and Learning Resources
- Student Support and Progression
- Governance, Leadership and Management
- Institutional Values and Best Practices

These criteria collectively assess the academic, administrative, financial, research, and social dimensions of institutional functioning. Institutions undertake an extensive self-study report, followed by quantitative data validation, peer team visits, stakeholder interactions, and comprehensive evaluation before receiving accreditation grades ranging from A++ to C.

One of NAAC's most significant contributions has been the institutionalization of quality culture through the establishment of **Internal Quality Assurance Cells (IQACs)**. IQACs function as permanent quality management units responsible for planning, monitoring, documenting, and reviewing institutional performance. They facilitate curriculum revision, faculty development, student support services, research promotion, community engagement, and administrative reforms, thereby embedding quality assurance into everyday institutional practices rather than treating accreditation as a one-time exercise.

NAAC has also encouraged universities to adopt learner-centred pedagogies, strengthen governance structures, improve infrastructure, enhance transparency, promote extension activities, and align institutional development with stakeholder expectations. Accreditation has become closely associated with institutional credibility, eligibility for government funding, academic autonomy, collaborative partnerships, and public trust.

Nevertheless, the traditional accreditation framework has encountered several operational challenges. Institutions have frequently reported extensive documentation requirements, lengthy accreditation cycles,

© 2026 The Authors. Published by Bexford Publishing Ltd

administrative burden, peer-review inconsistencies, and concerns regarding subjectivity in qualitative assessment. Critics have also argued that periodic accreditation may encourage short-term compliance rather than sustained institutional improvement. Furthermore, rapidly changing educational environments characterized by digital transformation, online learning, interdisciplinary education, and evolving labour market expectations require more flexible, technology-enabled, and continuously monitored quality assurance systems.

These challenges provided the policy rationale for the development of **NAAC 2.0**, which seeks to build upon the strengths of the existing accreditation framework while addressing its operational limitations through digital technologies, continuous monitoring, Artificial Intelligence-supported verification, and institutional maturity assessment. Thus, NAAC remains the foundational pillar of Bharat's quality assurance ecosystem, providing the institutional basis upon which contemporary reforms are being constructed.

10. NAAC 2.0: Transforming Bharat's Quality Assurance Ecosystem

The landscape of higher education quality assurance in Bharat is undergoing a fundamental transformation with the introduction of the proposed **NAAC 2.0** framework. Building upon nearly three decades of institutional accreditation experience, NAAC 2.0 seeks to redefine quality assurance by shifting its emphasis from periodic compliance-based accreditation to a continuous, technology-enabled, evidence-driven, and outcome-oriented quality enhancement system. This transformation is closely aligned with the vision of the **National Education Policy (NEP) 2020**, which advocates multidisciplinary education, institutional autonomy, digital governance, research excellence, innovation, internationalization, and learner-centred education.

The traditional NAAC accreditation process has significantly contributed to institutional quality improvement; however, it has also encountered several operational challenges. These include extensive documentation requirements, lengthy accreditation cycles, subjective peer-review evaluations, administrative burden on institutions, and limited mechanisms for monitoring institutional performance between accreditation cycles. Furthermore, rapid technological advancement, increasing digitalization of higher education, and the growing demand for transparent governance have highlighted the need for a more dynamic quality assurance framework capable of continuously evaluating institutional performance through reliable digital evidence.

NAAC 2.0 addresses these concerns through a comprehensive restructuring of the accreditation philosophy. Rather than viewing accreditation as a one-time certification exercise, the new framework conceptualizes quality assurance as a continuous process of institutional learning, performance monitoring, and quality enhancement. The emphasis shifts from evaluating institutional inputs and processes to assessing measurable outcomes, societal impact, innovation capacity, governance effectiveness, and institutional maturity.

10.1 Binary Accreditation Framework (BAF)

One of the most significant innovations proposed under NAAC 2.0 is the **Binary Accreditation Framework (BAF)**. Unlike the existing system, where institutions are immediately assigned grades ranging from A++ to C, BAF initially classifies institutions simply as **"Accredited"** or **"Not Accredited."**

This simplified accreditation process serves multiple objectives. First, it reduces excessive competition associated with institutional grading during the initial assessment stage. Second, it ensures that institutions first satisfy essential quality benchmarks before competing for higher levels of excellence. Third, it encourages institutions with limited resources to focus on strengthening fundamental academic and

© 2026 The Authors. Published by Bexford Publishing Ltd

governance systems without being discouraged by complex grading mechanisms.

10.2 Maturity-Based Graded Levels (MBGL)

After achieving accreditation, institutions enter the **Maturity-Based Graded Levels (MBGL)** system. This model represents a significant conceptual shift from static accreditation grades to dynamic institutional development.

Instead of assigning a permanent quality grade, institutions are evaluated according to their level of organizational maturity across multiple dimensions including governance, academic quality, research productivity, innovation, financial sustainability, digital infrastructure, internationalization, community engagement, and societal impact.

The proposed maturity model generally progresses from foundational institutional capability to global excellence, thereby encouraging continuous improvement rather than periodic compliance. This approach is consistent with internationally recognized organizational excellence frameworks that emphasize institutional learning, strategic planning, innovation management, and evidence-based governance.

10.3 Artificial Intelligence-Enabled Assessment

Another transformative feature of NAAC 2.0 is the integration of **Artificial Intelligence (AI)** and advanced digital technologies into the accreditation process. AI-supported assessment aims to improve transparency, consistency, efficiency, and objectivity by automating data validation and minimizing manual verification.

Digital dashboards, automated document verification, predictive analytics, and real-time institutional monitoring enable accreditation agencies to evaluate institutional performance more accurately while reducing opportunities for data manipulation and subjective interpretation. AI also facilitates continuous assessment by analysing large datasets related to student progression, faculty performance, research productivity, financial management, innovation, and stakeholder satisfaction.

10.4 Continuous Quality Monitoring

Unlike earlier accreditation systems based on five-year assessment cycles, NAAC 2.0 advocates **continuous quality monitoring**. Institutions will periodically update verified digital information regarding academic performance, governance indicators, research achievements, financial management, infrastructure development, innovation activities, and student outcomes.

Continuous monitoring transforms accreditation into an ongoing institutional quality management process. It encourages universities to integrate quality assurance into strategic planning, academic governance, and day-to-day administration rather than treating accreditation as a periodic regulatory requirement.

10.5 Outcome-Oriented Institutional Excellence

Perhaps the most significant philosophical contribution of NAAC 2.0 is its shift from process-oriented evaluation towards **outcome-based quality assurance**. Greater emphasis is placed on graduate employability, research impact, innovation ecosystems, patents, entrepreneurship, societal engagement, sustainability, and institutional contribution to national development. Consequently, quality is no longer measured solely by compliance with prescribed standards but by the measurable value institutions create for learners, industry, communities, and society.

11. Comparative Analysis of NIRF, NAAC, and NAAC 2.0

Although NIRF, NAAC, and NAAC 2.0 pursue the common objective of strengthening higher education quality, they differ substantially in their philosophy, methodology, assessment procedures, and expected

© 2026 The Authors. Published by Bexford Publishing Ltd

institutional outcomes. Rather than functioning as competing mechanisms, these frameworks should be understood as complementary components of an integrated quality assurance ecosystem.

NIRF primarily functions as a **performance benchmarking system**. Its objective is to compare institutions using standardized quantitative indicators related to teaching, research, graduation outcomes, inclusivity, and stakeholder perception. Consequently, NIRF promotes competition, strategic planning, and performance improvement while enhancing institutional visibility at national and international levels.

In contrast, NAAC functions as a **quality certification mechanism**. Instead of comparing universities with one another, it evaluates whether an institution satisfies nationally accepted quality standards across academic, administrative, financial, research, governance, and social dimensions. The emphasis is therefore on institutional quality assurance and internal quality culture.

NAAC 2.0 extends this philosophy further by redefining accreditation as a process of **continuous institutional maturity and quality enhancement**. Rather than focusing solely on periodic assessment, it emphasizes institutional transformation supported by digital technologies, AI-enabled evidence verification, continuous monitoring, organizational learning, and measurable societal impact.

Conceptually, the progression may be understood as follows:

- **NIRF asks:** *How well does an institution perform compared with others?*
- **NAAC asks:** *Does the institution meet nationally accepted quality standards?*
- **NAAC 2.0 asks:** *How effectively is the institution continuously improving and creating measurable educational and societal impact?*

These frameworks therefore operate at different but complementary levels of institutional evaluation.

From a governance perspective, NIRF encourages strategic performance management through measurable indicators. NAAC strengthens institutional governance by promoting Internal Quality Assurance Cells (IQACs), participatory administration, and systematic quality planning. NAAC 2.0 further advances governance through digital evidence, continuous quality monitoring, institutional analytics, and data-driven decision-making.

Similarly, while NIRF places strong emphasis on research publications, patents, and graduate outcomes, NAAC provides a broader evaluation including curriculum design, student support, governance, infrastructure, and institutional values. NAAC 2.0 integrates these dimensions while adding institutional maturity, sustainability, innovation ecosystems, digital readiness, and long-term societal impact.

Rather than replacing one another, the three frameworks create comprehensive quality architecture. NIRF identifies institutional competitiveness, NAAC certifies quality assurance, and NAAC 2.0 seeks to ensure sustainable institutional excellence.

12. International Perspective

Quality assurance has become an integral component of higher education governance across the world. Although national systems differ according to historical, political, and educational contexts, most advanced quality assurance frameworks increasingly emphasize transparency, accountability, learner outcomes, institutional autonomy, research excellence, and continuous quality improvement.

The **Quality Assurance Agency (QAA)** in the United Kingdom primarily evaluates institutional quality through academic standards, student learning experiences, governance effectiveness, and enhancement-led institutional review. Unlike traditional inspection models, QAA encourages continuous quality enhancement through evidence-based institutional self-evaluation and external peer review.

© 2026 The Authors. Published by Bexford Publishing Ltd

Australia's **Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency (TEQSA)** adopts a risk-based regulatory framework that combines institutional self-assessment with continuous monitoring. TEQSA emphasizes governance, student outcomes, financial sustainability, research quality, academic integrity, and institutional risk management. Digital reporting systems and data analytics play an increasingly important role in institutional oversight.

In the United States, accreditation is conducted by regional and professional accrediting agencies recognized by the **Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA)** and the U.S. Department of Education. American accreditation systems focus on institutional mission, academic quality, governance, financial stability, student achievement, and continuous institutional improvement. Considerable emphasis is placed on evidence-based assessment and institutional autonomy.

Global university ranking systems, including **QS World University Rankings**, **Times Higher Education (THE)**, and the **Academic Ranking of World Universities (ARWU)**, evaluate institutions primarily through research productivity, citations, international outlook, employer reputation, academic reputation, and teaching performance. While these rankings significantly influence institutional prestige and international student mobility, they are often criticized for emphasizing research-intensive universities and providing limited assessment of teaching quality, community engagement, and national developmental priorities.

Against this international backdrop, Bharat's evolving quality assurance ecosystem demonstrates both convergence and contextual adaptation. NIRF provides a nationally relevant ranking framework tailored to Bharat's educational diversity. NAAC offers comprehensive institutional accreditation emphasizing academic quality and governance. The proposed NAAC 2.0 aligns closely with global trends by integrating Artificial Intelligence, digital governance, continuous monitoring, evidence-based assessment, organizational maturity, and outcome-based quality enhancement.

Consequently, Bharat's quality assurance reforms reflect a broader international transition from compliance-oriented accreditation toward continuous institutional improvement. If implemented effectively, NAAC 2.0 has the potential not only to strengthen national quality assurance but also to enhance the global credibility, international competitiveness, and academic reputation of Bhartiya higher education institutions while supporting the long-term objectives of the National Education Policy 2020.

13. Discussion

The findings of this study demonstrate that Bharat's higher education quality assurance ecosystem has evolved from a predominantly compliance-oriented accreditation model towards a comprehensive framework emphasizing institutional accountability, performance measurement, continuous quality enhancement, and organizational maturity. The introduction of the National Institutional Ranking Framework (NIRF), the sustained evolution of the National Assessment and Accreditation Council (NAAC), and the proposed reforms under NAAC 2.0 collectively signify a paradigm shift in the governance of higher education institutions. Rather than functioning as isolated quality mechanisms, these frameworks represent complementary dimensions of integrated quality assurance architecture capable of supporting the transformative objectives of the National Education Policy (NEP) 2020.

One of the most significant observations emerging from the comparative analysis is that the conceptual understanding of quality itself has undergone substantial transformation. Earlier accreditation systems primarily emphasized institutional inputs, documentation, and compliance with prescribed standards. Although these processes established accountability and encouraged quality consciousness, they often remained procedural rather than transformational. Contemporary quality assurance frameworks

© 2026 The Authors. Published by Bexford Publishing Ltd

increasingly recognize that institutional excellence should be evaluated through measurable educational outcomes, research productivity, innovation, governance effectiveness, graduate employability, societal engagement, and sustainable institutional development.

The introduction of NIRF has substantially influenced institutional strategic planning. Universities increasingly invest in research infrastructure, faculty development, innovation ecosystems, patent generation, industry collaboration, and student placement mechanisms because these directly influence ranking performance. While this competitive environment has improved institutional productivity, it has also generated concerns regarding excessive dependence on quantitative indicators and unequal competition between resource-rich universities and emerging institutions. Consequently, ranking should be viewed as an instrument for benchmarking performance rather than as a comprehensive measure of educational quality.

Similarly, NAAC has played a transformative role in institutionalizing quality culture through Internal Quality Assurance Cells (IQACs), participatory governance, curriculum reform, learner-centred pedagogy, and continuous self-assessment. Nevertheless, traditional accreditation practices have also highlighted the limitations of documentation-intensive evaluation, periodic peer review, and subjective assessment processes. These limitations provided the intellectual and policy foundation for the development of NAAC 2.0.

The proposed NAAC 2.0 framework represents perhaps the most significant reform in Bharat's quality assurance landscape since the establishment of NAAC in 1994. By integrating Artificial Intelligence, digital governance, Binary Accreditation Framework (BAF), Maturity-Based Graded Levels (MBGL), and continuous institutional monitoring, the framework seeks to replace episodic accreditation with continuous quality enhancement. This transition aligns closely with international quality assurance practices emphasizing institutional learning, evidence-based governance, organizational maturity, and measurable societal impact.

The study therefore suggests that institutional excellence should no longer be understood merely as obtaining a high accreditation grade or achieving a favourable ranking position. Instead, excellence should be viewed as an institution's capacity for continuous innovation, academic leadership, effective governance, social responsibility, research impact, digital transformation, and sustainable development. In this respect, the integration of NIRF, NAAC, and NAAC 2.0 provides a holistic framework capable of strengthening both national quality assurance and international competitiveness.

14. Policy Implications

The transition towards a digitally enabled and continuously monitored quality assurance system carries important implications for policymakers, regulatory bodies, university administrators, faculty members, and other stakeholders.

First, higher education institutions must move beyond short-term accreditation preparation towards establishing permanent quality management systems integrated into institutional governance. Internal Quality Assurance Cells should function as strategic planning units responsible for continuous institutional assessment rather than merely coordinating accreditation documentation.

Second, policymakers should prioritize the development of a national digital quality assurance infrastructure capable of integrating institutional databases, accreditation records, research performance, student progression, financial management, and governance indicators. Such integration would significantly improve transparency, reduce duplication of reporting requirements, and strengthen evidence-based decision-making.

© 2026 The Authors. Published by Bexford Publishing Ltd

Third, capacity building becomes essential for the successful implementation of NAAC 2.0. Faculty members, administrators, IQAC coordinators, and institutional leaders require systematic training in digital governance, data management, outcome-based education, quality analytics, and AI-enabled institutional assessment.

Fourth, policymakers should ensure that quality assurance reforms remain inclusive. Smaller colleges, rural institutions, state universities, and newly established institutions often face resource limitations that may affect their ability to adopt advanced digital quality assurance systems. Financial assistance, technical support, and institutional mentoring should therefore accompany policy reforms to prevent widening institutional disparities.

Finally, Bharat's quality assurance ecosystem should increasingly align with global quality assurance practices while preserving national educational priorities. Such alignment would improve international recognition of Bhartiya universities, facilitate academic mobility, strengthen research collaboration, and enhance Bharat's position in the global knowledge economy.

15. Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study, the following recommendations are proposed:

1. Establish integrated digital quality management systems in all higher education institutions to support continuous accreditation and evidence-based governance.
2. Strengthen Internal Quality Assurance Cells (IQACs) by expanding their role from accreditation coordination to strategic institutional planning, monitoring, and quality analytics.
3. Promote comprehensive faculty development programmes focusing on Outcome-Based Education (OBE), digital pedagogy, Artificial Intelligence applications, research methodology, and academic leadership.
4. Encourage multidisciplinary research, innovation ecosystems, entrepreneurship, patent generation, and industry–academia collaboration to improve institutional competitiveness.
5. Develop standardized institutional data repositories integrated with national higher education databases to facilitate real-time quality monitoring.
6. Ensure equitable implementation of NAAC 2.0 by providing financial support, digital infrastructure, and technical assistance to resource-constrained institutions.
7. Promote international collaboration, student and faculty mobility, joint research programmes, and global benchmarking to enhance institutional visibility and academic excellence.
8. Integrate sustainability, environmental responsibility, social inclusion, gender equity, and community engagement as core dimensions of institutional quality assessment.
9. Encourage periodic review of accreditation indicators to ensure their continued relevance in response to technological, societal, and educational changes.
10. Develop a unified national quality assurance ecosystem in which NIRF, NAAC, and NAAC 2.0 operate as complementary mechanisms supporting institutional excellence rather than isolated evaluation systems.

16. Limitations of the Study

The present study is conceptual and policy-oriented in nature. It primarily relies upon secondary data obtained from government reports, accreditation manuals, policy documents, and published scholarly literature. Consequently, it does not include empirical institutional surveys, interviews, case studies, or statistical modelling.

Furthermore, since NAAC 2.0 is still undergoing phased implementation, certain operational aspects may

© 2026 The Authors. Published by Bexford Publishing Ltd

evolve over time. The study therefore analyses the proposed framework based on currently available policy documents and reform proposals.

The comparative analysis also focuses primarily on Bhartiya higher education and does not undertake detailed empirical comparisons with quality assurance systems in multiple countries. Future empirical investigations may provide deeper insights into institutional experiences and implementation outcomes.

17. Future Research Directions

Several opportunities exist for extending the present research.

Future studies may conduct empirical investigations examining the implementation of NAAC 2.0 across different categories of higher education institutions, including central universities, state universities, private universities, autonomous colleges, and affiliated institutions.

Longitudinal studies may evaluate the impact of continuous accreditation on institutional governance, research productivity, and student learning outcomes, employability, innovation, and financial sustainability.

Comparative international research may analyse similarities and differences between Bharat's evolving quality assurance system and accreditation models adopted in the United Kingdom, Australia, and the United States, Singapore, and European higher education systems.

Researchers may also examine the ethical implications of Artificial Intelligence-enabled accreditation, including issues relating to data privacy, algorithmic transparency, institutional autonomy, and digital governance.

Finally, quantitative studies employing structural equation modelling, institutional performance indicators, bibliometric analysis, or policy evaluation techniques could provide robust empirical evidence regarding the effectiveness of integrated quality assurance frameworks in achieving institutional excellence.

18. Conclusion

Bharat's higher education system stands at a critical juncture where quality assurance is no longer confined to accreditation or institutional ranking but has become a strategic instrument for governance reform, academic excellence, innovation, and sustainable national development. The evolution from NAAC to NIRF and subsequently to the proposed NAAC 2.0 framework reflects a progressive transition from compliance-based evaluation towards continuous, evidence-driven, and outcome-oriented institutional transformation.

The comparative analysis undertaken in this study demonstrates that NIRF, NAAC, and NAAC 2.0 are not competing mechanisms but complementary pillars of comprehensive national quality assurance architecture. NIRF strengthens institutional competitiveness through performance benchmarking; NAAC establishes foundational quality standards through multidimensional accreditation; and NAAC 2.0 advances institutional maturity through digital governance, Artificial Intelligence-enabled assessment, continuous monitoring, and measurable societal impact. Together, these frameworks encourage universities to embrace innovation, strengthen governance, improve research productivity, enhance learner outcomes, promote inclusivity, and align institutional development with the transformative vision of the National Education Policy 2020.

The success of these reforms, however, will depend upon institutional readiness, robust digital infrastructure, faculty capacity building, transparent governance, and sustained policy support. Universities must move beyond viewing accreditation and rankings as isolated achievements and instead cultivate an enduring culture of quality, accountability, and continuous improvement. If implemented effectively, the

© 2026 The Authors. Published by Bexford Publishing Ltd

integrated quality assurance ecosystem envisioned through NIRF, NAAC, and NAAC 2.0 has the potential to enhance the global standing of Bhartiya higher education institutions and contribute significantly to Bharat's aspiration of becoming a leading knowledge society in the twenty-first century.

References

Agarwal, P. (2009). *Indian higher education: Envisioning the future.* Sage Publications.

Altbach, P. G., & Salmi, J. (Eds.). (2011). *The road to academic excellence: The making of world-class research universities.* World Bank.

Bhushan, S., & Pandey, R. (2021). National Institutional Ranking Framework (NIRF): A critical appraisal of India's ranking system for higher education institutions. *University News, 59*(24), 11–18.

Council for Higher Education Accreditation. (2023). *Accreditation and quality assurance in higher education.*https://www.chea.org

Dill, D. D. (2007). Quality assurance in higher education: Practices and issues. *Higher Education, 53*(5), 603–620. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-005-1860-1

Government of India. (2020). *National Education Policy 2020.* Ministry of Education.

Harvey, L., & Green, D. (1993). Defining quality. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 18*(1), 9–34. https://doi.org/10.1080/0260293930180102

Ministry of Education. (2024). *All India Survey on Higher Education (AISHE) 2021–22 final report.* Department of Higher Education, Government of India.

Ministry of Education. (2024). *National Institutional Ranking Framework (NIRF): India rankings 2024 methodology.*Government of India.

National Assessment and Accreditation Council. (2024). *Manual for universities.* NAAC.

National Board of Accreditation. (2023). *Outcome-based accreditation manual.* National Board of Accreditation.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2023). *Education at a glance 2023.* OECD Publishing.

Quality Assurance Agency. (2023). *UK quality code for higher education.* QAA.

Singh, P. (2011). *Indian higher education: Challenges and opportunities.* Pearson Education India.

Stella, A., & Gnanam, A. (2004). Quality assurance in Indian higher education: Issues of impact, accountability and international perspectives. *Quality in Higher Education, 10*(2), 143–156. https://doi.org/10.1080/1353832042000230637

Stensaker, B. (2008). Outcomes of quality assurance: A discussion of knowledge, methodology and validity. *Quality in Higher Education, 14*(1), 3–13. https://doi.org/10.1080/13538320802011532

Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency. (2021). *Higher education standards framework (Threshold Standards) 2021.* Australian Government.

Times Higher Education. (2024). *World University Rankings methodology.*

UNESCO. (2024). *Global education monitoring report 2024.* UNESCO Publishing.

© 2026 The Authors. Published by Bexford Publishing Ltd

University Grants Commission. (2023). *Annual report 2022–23.* University Grants Commission.

University Grants Commission. (2024). *Guidelines for internal quality assurance cells.* University Grants Commission.

World Bank. (2022). *The state of tertiary education and skills.* World Bank Publications.

(Author: Professor Dr. Harendra Singh, is a "Shikshak Shri" Samman awardee by the Government of Uttar Pradesh, a distinguished educationist, visionary academic leader, and nationalist thinker. He serves as Professor of Education and Principal Director at D.P.M. (P.G.) Institute of Education, Behsuma, Ch. Charan Singh University, Meerut,U.P., Bharat.)

©2026 by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/).