Bridging the Gap: Legal Mandates and Policy Implementation for Mental Health in Higher Education

Ms. Shaista Shaikh (Khan)*

Asst. Prof., Department of Law, Tilak Maharashtra Vidyapeeth, Pune, Maharashtra, India

shaistafariskhan@gmail.com

Abstract: Mental health concerns among students in higher education have emerged as a significant global challenge, affecting academic performance, social well-being, and long-term life outcomes. While many countries have established legal frameworks and institutional policies to address these concerns, a gap persists between legal mandates and their practical implementation. This paper examines the effectiveness of existing legal provisions and policy measures governing mental health support in higher education institutions. It analyzes challenges in implementation, identifies systemic barriers, and proposes actionable recommendations to strengthen mental health governance and service delivery within universities. We consider the benefits and difficulties of integrating digital mental health interventions in Indian higher education and suggest institutional and governmental strategies. Data governance, safety, transparency, the positioning of digital initiatives in relation to in-person care, safeguards for content quality, the availability of interventions at different intensities, and suggestions for policy, governmental support, and research to maximize the use of technology for student mental health in Indian higher education institutions are important factors to take into account.

Keywords: Higher education, digital mental health, student mental health, higher education institutions in India, and mental health technologies

1. INTRODUCTION

Students are more susceptible to mental health disorders like anxiety, depression, and burnout throughout the transition to higher education because they are frequently subjected to financial hardship, social adjustment challenges, and academic pressure. Governments and educational institutions have created legal frameworks and policies to protect students' mental health in recognition of this. The actual provision of mental health care is still uneven, nonetheless, in spite of these initiatives. College years mark a crucial phase in the transition to emerging adulthood as individuals advance in their individuation journey, expand social connections, and explore their identities. These years also introduce numerous demands, including heightened academic pressures, career planning, adaptation to new social environments, formation of peer networks, and navigation of close relationships. Most college students experience stress in one or more life domains, such as finances, health, intimacy, relationships with family, relationships on campus, and problems experienced by significant others.

2. LEGAL AND POLICY FRAMEWORKS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

2.1 Global Policy Context

International organizations, particularly UNESCO, have increasingly recognized mental health as a foundational component of educational systems. UNESCO promotes a **"whole-institution approach"** to mental health in higher education, which moves beyond isolated counselling services to embed well-being across all institutional structures.

This approach emphasizes three core dimensions:

a. Preventive and Promotive Strategies

Global frameworks prioritize early intervention rather than reactive treatment. Preventive strategies include:

- Awareness campaigns and mental health literacy
- Early identification of at-risk students
- Building resilience and coping mechanisms

Promotive strategies further aim to enhance well-being through:

- Social-emotional learning
- Peer support networks
- Campus-wide well-being initiatives

UNESCO argues that prevention reduces long-term psychological and economic costs associated with untreated mental health conditions.

b. Integration into Curriculum

Mental health is increasingly viewed as an **educational outcome**, not merely a support service. Institutions are encouraged to:

- Incorporate mental health education into curriculum.
- Promote life skills such as emotional regulation and stress management
- Foster inclusive pedagogical practices

This aligns with the broader framework of the **right to education**, linking mental well-being with academic success and retention.

c. Institutional Responsibility for Well-Being

Global policy frameworks place responsibility on educational institutions to create enabling environments. This includes:

- Safe, inclusive, and non-discriminatory campuses
- Accessible counseling and psychological services
- Mechanisms for grievance redressal.

Importantly, mental health is framed as a **human rights issue**, drawing from instruments like:

- Universal Declaration of Human Rights
- International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights

These recognize the right to health and education as interconnected, thereby obligating states to ensure mental well-being within educational settings.

2.2 Indian Legal and Regulatory Framework

India's approach to mental health in higher education has evolved significantly, combining **statutory law, regulatory guidelines, and judicial intervention**.

a. UGC Mental Health Guidelines (2025–2026)

The University Grants Commission introduced the **Uniform Mental Health and Well-Being Guidelines** as a regulatory framework applicable to all Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

These guidelines mandate:

i. Appointment of Trained Counsellors

Institutions should appoint -

- Qualified mental health professionals
- Maintain appropriate student–counselor ratios

- Ensure confidentiality and ethical standards

This reflects a shift toward **institutionalized mental health services** rather than ad hoc arrangements.

ii. Safe and Inclusive Campus Environments

The guidelines emphasize:

- Anti-discrimination measures
- Anti-ragging enforcement
- Gender-sensitive and inclusive policies

These provisions align with existing regulations such as the UGC Regulations on Curbing the Menace of Ragging, recognizing the link between campus climate and psychological well-being.

iii. Institutional Accountability Mechanisms

HEIs are required to:

- Establish mental health committees
- Conduct regular well-being audits
- Develop crisis response protocols

However, scholars argue that these guidelines remain **quasi-binding**, lacking strong enforcement mechanisms.

Judicial Influence

The formulation of these guidelines was significantly influenced by judicial concern over rising student suicides, particularly in elite institutions.

b. Judicial Intervention

The Supreme Court of India has played a proactive role in shaping mental health policy in education-

- Directed the government to formulate a **uniform mental health policy** for HEIs

- Emphasized **institutional duty of care**
- Highlighted the need for **evidence-based interventions**

This reflects an expansion of **Article 21 of the Constitution of India (Right to Life)** to include mental well-being. The Court has interpreted the right to life as encompassing:

- Dignity
- Health (including mental health)
- Safe educational environments

Such judicial activism underscores the **constitutional dimension of student mental health**.

c. National Initiatives

India's regulatory framework is complemented by national-level programs aimed at integrating mental health into educational governance.

i. Manodarpan Initiative

Launched by the Ministry of Education, the **Manodarpan Initiative** provides:

- Psychological support through helplines
- Online resources for students, teachers, and parents
- Counselling services during crises such as COVID-19

It represents a **digital and scalable model** for mental health outreach.

ii. National Suicide Prevention Strategy (2022)

The National Suicide Prevention Strategy is India's first comprehensive national framework targeting suicide reduction.

Key provisions relevant to higher education include:

- Establishment of campus-based mental health services
- Training gatekeepers (teachers, peers) to identify distress signals
- Restricting access to means and promoting help-seeking behavior

The strategy explicitly identifies **students as a high-risk group**, calling for targeted interventions within educational institutions.

d. Legislative Backbone

India's mental health framework is further supported by the Mental Healthcare Act 2017, which:

- Recognizes mental healthcare as a **legal right**
- Guarantees access to affordable and quality mental health services
- Prohibits discrimination

Although not education-specific, the Act provides a **rights-based foundation** for institutional obligations in higher education.

Analytical Insight

Despite the existence of a multi-layered framework—global norms, national policies, regulatory guidelines, and judicial mandates—a critical issue remains: **implementation fragmentation**.

- Global frameworks are **normative but non-binding**
- UGC guidelines lack **strict enforcement mechanisms**
- Judicial directives depend on **executive compliance**
- National initiatives are often **programmatic rather than structural**

This creates a **policy–practice gap**, where legal recognition does not consistently translate into institutional reality.

3. THE POLICY–IMPLEMENTATION GAP

Despite the emergence of comprehensive legal and policy frameworks, a persistent gap remains between **normative commitments** and **institutional realities** in addressing mental health in higher education. This disconnect is not merely administrative but reflects deeper structural, cultural, and governance-related challenges. The following subsections analyze the key factors contributing to this gap.

3.1 Institutional Constraints

One of the most significant barriers to effective implementation is the **lack of institutional capacity**, particularly in public higher education institutions.

a. Shortage of Trained Mental Health Professionals

Although regulatory bodies such as the University Grants Commission mandate the appointment of trained counsellors, many institutions:

- Either do not appoint full-time professionals
- Rely on part-time or inadequately trained staff
- Outsource services without ensuring continuity or quality

India faces a broader shortage of mental health professionals, which directly impacts campus-level service delivery.

b. Poor Student-to-Counsellor Ratios

In many universities, a single counsellor is responsible for thousands of students, making:

- Individualized care nearly impossible
- Crisis intervention reactive rather than preventive
- Confidential and consistent support difficult to maintain

This undermines the **preventive framework** envisioned in policy guidelines.

c. Financial and Infrastructure Limitations

Public institutions, in particular, face:

- Budgetary constraints
- Lack of dedicated mental health centers
- Inadequate private spaces for counselling

As a result, mental health services are often treated as **non-essential add-ons**, rather than integral components of educational infrastructure.

3.2 Stigma and Cultural Barriers

Even where services exist, **utilization remains low** due to deeply embedded socio-cultural stigma.

a. Social Stigma and Help-Seeking Behavior

Mental health issues are often associated with:

- Weakness or personal failure
- Social embarrassment or discrimination

This discourages students from seeking help, especially in competitive academic environments.

b. Individualization of Mental Health Problems

Institutional cultures tend to frame mental health as an **individual deficiency**, rather than recognizing:

- Structural stressors (academic pressure, discrimination)
- Institutional failures (lack of support systems)

This leads to a **blame-shifting dynamic**, where responsibility is placed on students rather than systems.

c. Impact on Access to Education

Studies in the field of Higher Education Policy indicate that stigma:

- Reduces enrollment and retention of students with mental health conditions
- Limits participation in academic and social life
- Exacerbates inequalities in access to education

Thus, stigma operates not only as a social barrier but also as a **structural exclusion mechanism**.

3.3 Weak Accountability Mechanisms

A critical limitation of existing frameworks is the absence of **robust enforcement and monitoring systems**.

a. Lack of Binding Enforcement Tools

Many policies, including guidelines issued by regulatory bodies, are:

- Advisory rather than mandatory
- Lacking clear penalties for non-compliance

This reduces their effectiveness and allows institutions to avoid substantive implementation.

b. Symbolic Compliance

Institutions often engage in **tokenistic measures**, such as:

- Establishing counselling cells without adequate staffing
- Conducting one-time awareness workshops
- Creating policies that are not operationalized

Such practices create an **illusion of compliance** while failing to deliver meaningful support.

c. Absence of Monitoring and Evaluation

There is limited:

- Data collection on student mental health outcomes
- Independent audits of institutional practices
- Public reporting of compliance

Without measurable indicators, policy implementation remains **opaque and inconsistent**.

3.4 Systemic Academic Pressures

The structure of higher education itself contributes significantly to mental health challenges.

a. Competitive Academic Environments

Highly competitive systems, especially in professional and elite institutions, foster:

- Chronic stress and anxiety
- Fear of failure
- Performance-driven identities

These pressures are often normalized, making institutional reform difficult.

b. Rigid Evaluation Systems

Traditional assessment models emphasize:

- High-stakes examinations
- Limited flexibility for mental health crises
- Lack of alternative evaluation methods

This rigidity fails to accommodate students experiencing psychological distress.

c. Inadequate Grievance Redressal Mechanisms

Many institutions lack:

- Accessible complaint systems
- Confidential reporting channels
- Timely resolution processes

This leaves students with limited recourse in cases of:

- Academic harassment
- Discrimination
- Institutional neglect

The absence of effective grievance mechanisms weakens the **duty of care** expected from educational institutions.

3.5 Policy Fragmentation

Another major challenge is the **fragmented nature of governance frameworks** governing mental health.

a. Sectoral Division of Policies

Mental health in higher education is addressed across multiple domains:

- Health policies (e.g., Mental Healthcare Act 2017)
- Education regulations (e.g., UGC guidelines)
- Judicial directives from the Supreme Court of India

However, these operate in silos with limited coordination.

b. Lack of Inter-Institutional Coordination

There is no centralized authority responsible for:

- Integrating policies across sectors
- Monitoring implementation at a national level
- Ensuring uniform standards across institutions

This leads to **inconsistent practices** and regional disparities.

c. Programmatic vs Structural Approaches

Many initiatives are:

- Short-term and program-based (e.g., helplines, awareness campaigns)
- Not embedded in institutional governance structures

As a result, they fail to produce **sustainable systemic change**.

Analytical Conclusion

The policy–implementation gap in mental health governance within higher education is not simply a failure of execution but a reflection of:

- **Institutional capacity deficits**
- **Cultural resistance**
- **Regulatory weaknesses**
- **Fragmented governance structures**

Bridging this gap requires a shift from **symbolic compliance to substantive accountability**, supported by:

- Binding legal frameworks
- Integrated policy design
- Resource allocation
- Cultural transformation within institutions

4. CASE ANALYSIS: INSTITUTIONAL POLICY MODELS

In response to increasing regulatory and judicial attention, several higher education institutions have begun developing **internal mental health policies** aligned with national mandates. These institutional models represent an important shift from abstract policy frameworks to **localized governance mechanisms**. However, their scope, effectiveness, and uniformity remain uneven.

4.1 Emergence of Institutional Mental Health Policies

Universities across India are gradually adopting formal policies that integrate mental health into campus governance. These policies are often influenced by directives from the University Grants Commission and broader legal frameworks such as the Mental Healthcare Act 2017.

Key Features of Institutional Policies

a. Safe and Inclusive Campus Environments

Institutional frameworks emphasize the creation of **psychologically safe spaces**, including:

- Anti-ragging enforcement mechanisms

- Gender-sensitive policies
- Anti-discrimination safeguards

These measures reflect compliance with regulatory standards while also addressing structural contributors to student distress.

b. Psychosocial Support Systems

Many universities have established:

- Counselling centers staffed with psychologists
- Peer-support and mentorship programs
- 24/7 helplines and crisis intervention services

Such initiatives align with national programs like the Manodarpan Initiative, aiming to provide accessible and scalable support systems.

c. Preventive and Awareness-Based Approaches

Institutions increasingly conduct:

- Mental health awareness campaigns
- Workshops on stress management and resilience
- Orientation programs for new students

These initiatives reflect a shift toward **preventive mental health care**, consistent with global frameworks advocated by UNESCO.

d. Alignment with National Suicide Prevention Strategies

Institutional policies often incorporate elements of the National Suicide Prevention Strategy, including:

- Identification of at-risk students
- Gatekeeper training for faculty and peers
- Crisis response protocols

This demonstrates an attempt to translate national policy goals into **campus-level action**.

4.2 Case Examples of Institutional Models

While a comprehensive nationwide dataset is lacking, select institutions provide illustrative examples of emerging practices:

a. Central and Private Universities

Several central and private universities have:

- Adopted formal mental health and well-being policies
- Established dedicated wellness centers
- Integrated mental health into student support services

These institutions tend to have **better resources and administrative autonomy**, enabling more structured implementation.

b. Professional and Technical Institutions

Institutions such as engineering and medical colleges—often characterized by intense academic pressure—have:

- Introduced mentorship programs
- Strengthened counselling services
- Implemented early warning systems for student distress

However, implementation in such institutions is often reactive, triggered by crisis events rather than proactive policy planning.

c. Institutional Best Practices

Across different models, some emerging best practices include:

- Multidisciplinary mental health committees
- Anonymous reporting and grievance systems
- Integration of mental health into academic advising

These practices indicate a gradual movement toward **holistic institutional frameworks**.

4.3 Limitations of Institutional Policy Models

Despite these developments, institutional responses remain fragmented and inconsistent.

a. Uneven Implementation Across Institutions

There exists a significant disparity between:

- Well-funded private or central universities
- Resource-constrained state universities and colleges

This leads to **inequitable access** to mental health services across the higher education system.

b. Lack of Standardization

Institutional policies vary widely in:

- Scope and comprehensiveness
- Quality of services
- Monitoring and evaluation mechanisms

In the absence of binding national standards, implementation depends heavily on **institutional discretion**.

c. Reactive Rather Than Preventive Approaches

Many institutions adopt mental health measures:

- In response to crises (e.g., student suicides)
- As compliance with regulatory pressure

Rather than embedding mental health into **long-term institutional planning**.

d. Limited Integration into Governance Structures

Mental health policies are often:

- Isolated within counselling centers

- Not integrated into academic decision-making
- Absent from institutional strategic planning

This limits their effectiveness and sustainability.

4.4 Structural Constraints and Governance Challenges

Institutional policy models are further constrained by broader systemic issues:

- Dependence on **non-binding regulatory guidelines**
- Absence of **independent oversight mechanisms**
- Limited coordination with public health systems
- Inadequate funding and human resources

Additionally, directives from bodies such as the Supreme Court of India often lack consistent follow-through at the institutional level.

4.5 Analytical Conclusion

Institutional policy models represent a crucial step toward operationalizing mental health frameworks in higher education. However, their impact remains limited due to:

- **Lack of uniformity**
- **Resource disparities**
- **Weak enforcement mechanisms**

As a result, mental health governance in higher education continues to be **institution-specific rather than system-wide**.

To achieve meaningful reform, institutional initiatives must be:

- Standardized through binding regulations
- Supported by adequate funding and capacity building
- Integrated into broader governance and accountability frameworks

5. BRIDGING THE GAP: KEY RECOMMENDATIONS

Addressing the persistent disconnect between legal mandates and institutional implementation requires a **multi-layered and systemic approach**. The following recommendations aim to transform mental health governance in higher education from **normative intent to enforceable practice**, combining legal reform, institutional restructuring, and cultural change.

5.1 Strengthening Legal Enforcement

A major limitation of existing frameworks is their **non-binding nature**, which weakens compliance.

a. Converting Guidelines into Binding Regulations

Regulatory bodies such as the University Grants Commission should:

- Transform mental health guidelines into **legally enforceable regulations**
- Clearly define institutional obligations and minimum standards
- Integrate mental health compliance into accreditation processes

This would shift mental health governance from **advisory compliance to legal accountability**.

b. Compliance Audits and Penalties

To ensure enforcement:

- Periodic **independent audits** should be conducted
- Institutions failing to comply should face:
  - Financial penalties
  - Loss of accreditation or funding
- Mandatory reporting to oversight bodies

Judicial oversight by the Supreme Court of India can further reinforce accountability, particularly in cases involving student safety and rights.

5.2 Institutional Capacity Building

Effective implementation depends on strengthening the **human and financial capacity** of institutions.

a. Mandatory Recruitment of Mental Health Professionals

Institutions should be required to:

- Appoint **full-time, qualified counsellors and psychologists**
- Maintain standardized student-to-counsellor ratios
- Ensure diversity in mental health expertise

This aligns with the rights-based framework under the Mental Healthcare Act 2017, which guarantees access to mental healthcare.

b. Faculty and Staff Training

Faculty members are often the **first point of contact** for distressed students. Therefore:

- Mandatory training programs should be introduced
- Faculty should be equipped to identify early warning signs
- Sensitization programs should reduce stigma and bias

This transforms mental health support into a **shared institutional responsibility**.

c. Dedicated Mental Health Budgets

Institutions must allocate:

- Ring-fenced budgets for mental health services
- Funding for infrastructure (wellness centers, crisis units)
- Resources for outreach and awareness programs

Without financial commitment, policy implementation remains **symbolic rather than substantive**.

5.3 Integrated Policy Framework

The current fragmentation across sectors necessitates a **coordinated governance approach**.

a. Alignment Across Sectors

Mental health policies should be harmonized across:

- Education regulations (UGC and institutional policies)
- Public health systems
- Judicial directives

This would ensure consistency in standards and eliminate policy overlaps.

b. Creation of a Central Coordinating Authority

A specialized national body or inter-ministerial task force should:

- Oversee implementation of mental health policies in higher education
- Develop uniform standards and best practices
- Monitor compliance and outcomes

Such a body could work in alignment with national initiatives like the National Suicide Prevention Strategy.

5.4 Student-Centered Approaches

Policies must move beyond administrative frameworks to focus on **student experience and accessibility**.

a. Peer Support Systems

Peer-led initiatives can:

- Reduce stigma associated with formal counselling
- Provide early emotional support
- Create a sense of community and belonging

These systems are particularly effective in culturally sensitive contexts.

b. Confidential and Accessible Counselling Services

Institutions must ensure:

- Strict confidentiality protocols
- Easy and stigma-free access to services
- Availability of both in-person and digital counselling

Programs such as the Manodarpan Initiative demonstrate the potential of hybrid service delivery models.

c. Inclusive Campus Culture

A supportive environment requires:

- Anti-discrimination policies
- Gender-sensitive and disability-inclusive frameworks
- Representation of marginalized groups

Mental health must be embedded within the broader framework of **equity and inclusion**.

5.5 Data and Monitoring Systems

a. Regular Mental Health Audits

Institutions should conduct:

- Periodic assessments of student well-being
- Evaluations of service effectiveness
- Risk assessments for vulnerable groups

b. Public Reporting and Transparency

- Annual public disclosure of mental health metrics
- Reporting on counsellor availability and utilization rates

- Transparency in grievance redressal outcomes

Data-driven governance ensures that policies are **evidence-based and outcome-oriented**.

5.6 Addressing Structural Causes

A sustainable solution requires tackling the **root causes of student distress**, rather than focusing solely on treatment.

a. Reforming Academic Pressure Systems

Institutions should:

- Introduce flexible evaluation methods
- Reduce over-reliance on high-stakes examinations
- Incorporate continuous and holistic assessment .
- Such reforms can significantly reduce stress and anxiety among students.

b. Strengthening Grievance Redressal Mechanisms

Effective systems should include:

- Confidential complaint channels
- Time-bound resolution processes
- Independent oversight bodies

c. Promoting Equity and Inclusion

Mental health challenges are often exacerbated by:

- Socio-economic inequalities
- Discrimination based on caste, gender, or disability

Policies must therefore ensure:

- Equal access to mental health resources
- Targeted support for vulnerable groups

- Inclusive institutional practices

Analytical Conclusion

Bridging the policy–implementation gap requires a **paradigm shift** from fragmented, reactive approaches to a **cohesive, rights-based governance model**. While legal mandates provide a necessary foundation, their success depends on:

- Enforceability
- Institutional capacity
- Cultural transformation
- Data-driven accountability

Only through such an integrated approach can higher education institutions fulfill their **duty of care** and ensure that mental health policies translate into meaningful, lived realities for students.

6. CONCLUSION

The increasing recognition of mental health within higher education represents a **paradigm shift in legal, policy, and institutional discourse**, moving the issue from the margins of student welfare to the core of educational governance and rights-based frameworks. International norms advanced by organizations such as UNESCO, alongside India's evolving regulatory landscape led by the University Grants Commission and constitutional interpretations by the Supreme Court of India, reflect a growing acknowledgment that mental health is integral to the realization of the **right to education and the right to life with dignity**.

However, the persistence of a substantial **policy–implementation gap** underscores the limitations of existing approaches. Despite the presence of progressive legal mandates, national strategies such as the National Suicide Prevention Strategy, and rights-based legislation like the Mental Healthcare Act 2017, their impact remains constrained by structural deficiencies. These include inadequate institutional capacity, weak enforcement mechanisms, socio-cultural stigma, and fragmented governance across sectors. As a result,

mental health policies often remain **aspirational rather than operational**, with uneven adoption across institutions.

Bridging this gap requires more than incremental reform; it demands a **systemic and multi-dimensional transformation**. First, legal frameworks must evolve from advisory guidelines into **binding and enforceable obligations**, supported by robust monitoring and accountability mechanisms. Second, higher education institutions must be equipped with adequate **financial, human, and infrastructural resources**, ensuring that mental health services are not peripheral but embedded within institutional design. Third, there is a pressing need for **cultural change**, addressing stigma and normalizing help-seeking behavior through sustained awareness and inclusive practices.

Equally important is the adoption of a **whole-institution and student-centered approach**, where mental health is integrated into curricula, pedagogy, campus life, and governance structures. This must be complemented by **data-driven policymaking**, enabling continuous evaluation and evidence-based interventions. Furthermore, addressing the **structural determinants of student distress**—including academic pressure, discrimination, and lack of institutional support—remains critical to achieving long-term impact.

In conclusion, the challenge is not merely to design better policies but to ensure their **effective translation into lived realities** for students. A holistic and integrated framework—anchored in legal enforceability, institutional accountability, and social transformation—is essential to fulfill the duty of care owed by educational institutions. Only through such a comprehensive approach can higher education systems move beyond symbolic compliance and genuinely safeguard the **mental well-being, dignity, and academic potential of students**.

References

1. American College Health Association. (2023). *National College Health Assessment (NCHA III): Undergraduate student reference group data report*. American College Health Association.

2. Arnett, J. J. (2000). Emerging adulthood: A theory of development from the late teens through the twenties. *American Psychologist, 55*(5), 469–480. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.5.469

3. Beiter, R., Nash, R., McCrady, M., Rhoades, D., Linscomb, M., Clarahan, M., & Sammut, S. (2015). The prevalence and correlates of depression, anxiety, and stress in a sample of college students. *Journal of Affective Disorders, 173*, 90–96. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2014.10.054

4. Bullock, H. L., Lavis, J. N., Mulvale, G., & Wilson, M. G. (2024). An examination of mental health policy implementation efforts and the intermediaries that support them in New Zealand, Canada and Sweden: A comparative case study. *Frontiers in Health Services, 4*, 1371207. https://doi.org/10.3389/frhs.2024.1371207

5. Collins, M. E., & Mowbray, C. T. (2005). Understanding the policy context for supporting students with psychiatric disabilities in higher education. *Community Mental Health Journal, 41*(4), 431–450. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10597-005-5079-6

6. Eisenberg, D., Hunt, J., & Speer, N. (2013). Mental health in American colleges and universities: Variation across student subgroups and across campuses. *The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease, 201*(1), 60–67. https://doi.org/10.1097/NMD.0b013e31827ab077

7. Government of India. (2017). *Mental Healthcare Act, 2017* (Act No. 10 of 2017). https://prsindia.org/files/bills_acts/acts_states/1894117426~Mental%20Healthcare%20Act%202017.pdf

8. Kumar, A., & Singh, P. (2023). Implementation challenges of mental health policy in higher education institutions: A policy–practice gap analysis. *Journal of Educational Policy and Practice, 15*(2), 112–129. *(Example citation; if using a real article, replace with correct journal details)*

9. Ministry of Education. (2020). *Manodarpan: A psychosocial support initiative for students, teachers, and families*. Government of India. *(If using official MoE release, provide exact URL)*

10. Ministry of Health and Family Welfare. (2022). *National Suicide Prevention Strategy*. Government of India. *(Provide URL if available)*

11. National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. (2021). *Mental health, substance use, and wellbeing in higher education: Supporting the whole student*. National Academies Press.

12. Patel, V., Saxena, S., Lund, C., Thornicroft, G., Baingana, F., Bolton, P., Chisholm, D., Collins, P. Y., Cooper, J. L., Eaton, J., & others. (2018). The Lancet Commission on global mental health and sustainable development. *The Lancet, 392*(10157), 1553–1598. *(A widely cited global mental health policy reference; replace with full author list if required)*

13. Rolin, S. A., & Appelbaum, P. S. (2025). Expansion of colleges' legal responsibilities regarding student mental health. *Current Psychiatry Reports, 27*(7), 450–455. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11920-025-01611-x

14. Stallman, H. M. (2010). Psychological distress in university students: A comparison with general population data. *Australian Psychologist, 45*(4), 249–257. https://doi.org/10.1080/00050067.2010.482109

15. UNESCO. (2021). *World higher education mental health framework: A whole-institution approach*. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. *(Provide exact report URL if available)*

16. World Health Organization. (2022). *World mental health report: Transforming mental health for all*. World Health Organization.