DATA INTERPRETATION / CONCLUSIONS

After conducting the research and analyzing the results using SPSS, the following conclusions have been drawn (For Reference, kindly see the appendices):

FROM HEADS’ POINTS OF VIEW

(REFER APPENDIX 2.1)

NULL HYPOTHESIS (H₀) ₁: From heads point of view there is no significant difference between the working conditions of staff of Self Financing / Private Institutes and Government/Aided Institutes

ALTERNATE HYPOTHESIS (H₁) ₁: From heads point of view there is a significant difference between the working conditions of staff of Self Financing / Private Institutes and Government/Aided Institutes

On making a comparison between both types of institutes, we see that:

1. Job - Heads of Government/Aided Institutes are more satisfied with their job as compared to heads of Private/Self- Financing Institutes.

2. Salary - Heads of Government/Aided Institutes are more satisfied with their present salary as compared to heads of Private/Self- Financing Institutes.

3. Balance between the salary and work of Heads is better in Government/Aided Institutes as compared to heads of Private/Self- Financing Institutes.

4. Utilization of professional knowledge and skills of heads is greater in Private/Self- Financing Institutes as compared to Government/Aided Institutes

After performing the factor analysis it can be analyzed that there is a significant difference between the working conditions of staff of Self Financing / Private Institutes and Government/Aided Institutes. It is clear from the following:
1. **Respect and freedom for the staff**

- **Academic & Non Academic Staff are involved in decisions regarding policy matters:** better in Government Institutes

- **Academic & Non Academic Staff are treated with respect:** better in Private

- **Academic & Non Academic Staff are given freedom to decide the methodology of their work:** better in Private

- **Staff are given regular and informative feedbacks regarding their performance:** more frequent in Private

- **Management decisions are transparent:** more often in Government

- **Staff are recognized for every single effort they put in their job:** more in Private

- **Staff members get opportunity to showcase their professional abilities and achievements:** more in Private

- **Staff are mentally relaxed and calm:** highly satisfied in Government

- **Promotions are performance based:** more in Private

- **There is a culture of trust in the institute (school/college):** more in Private

2. **Friendly atmosphere**

- **Colleagues are very friendly and cooperative:** more in Private

- **Management makes efforts to keep the staff updated with the latest information in their field:** lot more in Private

- **The head is friendly, considerate and supportive:** more in Private

- **The institute (school/college) provides opportunity to learn and grow professionally:** more in Private
3. Work load and management pressure

- Management keeps a close watch over the activities of the Staff: same in both

- There are exercises and fun breaks during the work: more in Private

- There is lot of work pressure and stringent deadlines: more in Private

- Institute (school/college) sponsors learning and development programmes: more in Private

4. Job security and salary as per norms

- Academic & Non Academic Staff have a say in the matters related in their job: better in Government Institutes

- Staff are assured of job security: better in Government Institutes

- Salary is as per Govt. Norms/ Norms of Regulatory Bodies: far better in Government Institutes

5. Dominance by top leadership

- Top management/Leadership is dominating: more in Private

FROM FACULTIES’ POINTS OF VIEW

(REFER APPENDIX 2.2)

NULL HYPOTHESIS (H₀) 1: From faculties point of view there is no significant difference between education provided by Self Financing / Private Institutes and Government/Aided Institutes.

ALTERNATE HYPOTHESIS (H₁) 1: From faculties point of view there is a significant difference between education provided by Self Financing / Private Institutes and Government/Aided Institutes.
SATISFACTION LEVEL OF FACULTIES

- **Job** - Faculties in Private/Self Financing Institutes are less satisfied with their job as compared to Government/Aided Institutes

- **Salary** - Faculties in Private/Self Financing Institutes are less satisfied with their salary as compared to Government/Aided Institutes

- **Balance between the salary and work** - Salary and workload are less balanced in Private/Self Financing Institutes

2. **Professional knowledge and skills** - Faculties of Private/Self Financing Institutes are more satisfied with their Professional knowledge and skills

1. **Job Context**

   - **Involves ideas and intellectual activity** - more in Private/Self Financing Institutes

   - **Is done only within the scheduled timings** - faculties in Private/Self Financing Institutes are not able to complete their work in the stipulated time and have to carry loads of work after working hours

   - **Requires a lot of studying/ learning** - more required in Private/Self Financing Institutes

   - **Requires creativity** - more required in Private/Self Financing Institutes

   - **Requires a lot of solo effort** - more required in Private/Self Financing Institutes

2. **Personal Engagements And Relationship With Colleagues**

   - **Faculties prefer to spend more time in learning new things** - more in Private/Self Financing Institutes

   - **Faculties share their knowledge with their colleagues** - more in Private/Self Financing Institutes
3. **Freedom and opportunities to faculties**

- **Faculties get chance to work on novel and challenging tasks** - less chances are provided in Private/Self Financing Institutes

- **Faculties are involved in decisions regarding policy matters** - involvement of faculties is more prominent in Government/Aided Institutes.

- **Faculties have a say in the matters related to their job** - more prominent in Government/Aided Institutes.

- **Faculties are treated with respect** - better in Government/Aided Institutes.

- **Faculties are given freedom to decide the methodology of their work** - more freedom is provided in Government/Aided Institutes.

- **Faculties are given regular and informative feedbacks regarding their performance** - better in Government/Aided Institutes.

- **Faculties get opportunity to showcase their professional abilities and achievements** - more opportunities in Self Financing / Private Institutes.

- **The institute (school/college) provides opportunity to learn and grow professionally** - more opportunities in Self Financing / Private Institutes.

4. **Work Pressure**

- **There is lot of work pressure and stringent deadlines** - far more in Self Financing / Private Institutes.

3. **Management Pressure**

- **Management keeps a close watch over the activities of the employees** - more strict norms in Self Financing / Private Institutes.

- **Management decisions are transparent** - less transparency is found in Self Financing / Private Institutes.
4. **Salary structure and promotions**

- **Salary is at par** - much better in Government/Aided Institutes

- **Promotions are performance based** - more dependent on performance in Private/Self Financing Institutes and dependent on time factor in Government/Aided Institutes

5. **Work Atmosphere**

- **Colleagues are very friendly and cooperative** - more friendly in Government/Aided Institutes

- **Faculties are recognized for every single effort they put in their job** - more recognition in Government/Aided Institutes

- **Institute (school/college) sponsors learning and development programmes** - found in both but more in Government/Aided Institutes

- **Faculties are assured of job security** - hardly there’s job security in Self Financing / Private Institutes

- **There are exercises and fun breaks during the work** - found in both but more in Government/Aided Institutes

- **Faculties are mentally relaxed and calm** - less in Self Financing / Private Institutes

- **The head is friendly, considerate and supportive** - found in both but more supportive in Government/Aided Institutes
There is a culture of trust in the organization - more in Government/Aided Institutes

FROM STUDENTS’ POINTS OF VIEW

(REFER APPENDIX 2.3)

NULL HYPOTHESIS \((H_0)\): From students point of view there is no significant difference between education provided by Self Financing / Private Institutes and Government/Aided Institutes.

ALTERNATE HYPOTHESIS \((H_1)\): From students point of view there is a significant difference between education provided by Self Financing / Private Institutes and Government/Aided Institutes.

After performing the factor analysis it has been analyzed that:

1. **Regarding the quality of the institution** (Teaching pedagogy and approach to management) —
   - **Approachability to the management / institute heads** — better in self-financing/private Institutes
   - **Student Teacher ratio** — More satisfactory in Government institutions
   - **Teaching involves Real Life Situations** — better in self-financing/private institutes
   - **Concepts / Topics once taught are repeated again** — better in self-financing/private institutes
   - **Practical Knowledge is provided** — better in self-financing/private institutes
   - **Students are acknowledged for their efforts** — More satisfactory in Government institutions
   - **Curriculum is flexible as per the latest trends and requirements** — better in self-financing/private institutes
2. **Infrastructure and other facilities like human resources and their training**
   - **Infrastructure Facilities** - better in self-financing/private institutes
   - **Teaching staff is trained and up to the mark** - better in self-financing/private institutes
   - **Teachers and students are compatible with each other** - better in self-financing/private institutes

3. **Location** - better in self-financing/private institutes

4. **Admission procedure** - More satisfactory in Government institutions

5. **Fee Structure** - More satisfactory in Government institutions

6. **Fee Concessions, Scholarships and balance between fee structure and quality of work** - More satisfactory in Government institutions

7. **Courses offered** - better in self-financing/private institutes

8. Another aspect which is important from students’ point of view is the students are least bothered about the benefits given to them.

**FROM PARENTS’ POINTS OF VIEW**

(REFER APPENDIX 2.4)

**NULL HYPOTHESIS (H₀)**: From parents point of view there is no significant difference between education provided by Self Financing/Private Institutes and Government/Aided Institutes.

**ALTERNATE HYPOTHESIS (H₁)**: From parents point of view there is a significant difference between education provided by Self Financing/Private Institutes and Government/Aided Institutes.
After performing the factor analysis it can be analyzed that:

1. **Regarding the quality of the institution** –
   - **Approachability to the management / institute heads** – better in self-financing/private institutes
   - **Student Teacher ratio** – More satisfactory in Government institutions
   - **Teaching involves Real Life Situations** – better in self-financing/private institutes
   - **Concepts / Topics once taught are repeated again** – better in self-financing/private institutes
   - **Practical Knowledge is provided** – better in self-financing/private institutes
   - **Students are acknowledged for their efforts** – More satisfactory in Government institutions
   - **Curriculum is flexible as per the latest trends and requirements** – better in self-financing/private institutes

2. **Infrastructure and other facilities like human resources and their training**
   - **Infrastructure Facilities** – better in self-financing/private institutes
   - **Teaching staff is trained and up to the mark** – better in self-financing/private institutes
   - **Teachers and students are compatible with each other** – better in self-financing/private institutes
   - **Location** – better in self-financing/private institutes
   - **Admission procedure** – More satisfactory in Government institutions

3. **Fee Structure** – Significant difference. More satisfactory in Government institutions
4. **Fee Concessions, Scholarships and balance between fee structure and quality of work** - More satisfactory in Government institutions

5. **Courses offered** - better in self-financing/ private institutes

6. Another aspect which is important from parents point of view is that the students and parents are least bothered/hardly aware about the benefits given to them.

**FROM ADMINISTRATION STAFF’S POINT OF VIEW**

- According to Admin Staff, Infrastructure is the strongest point of Private/Self Financing while admissions and pay structure are the strongest points of Government/Aided institutes.

- Also, Pay Structure is the weakest point of Private/Self Financing institutes. Lack of admissions is also another weak factor of Private/Self Financing institutes.

- Infrastructure is the weakest point of Government/Aided Institutes.

- Most of the Administration staff of Private/Self Financing Institutes prefer working in Government/Aided Institutes as they are assured of job security and the pay norms are followed properly.

**CONCLUSIONS DRAWN**

**Changes and challenges for private higher education**

Education, whether focused on the most theoretical of disciplines or the most practical vocational programmes, is the most valuable resource for a nation. That is why the education provided must be of a high quality. But education is also relatively expensive. And that is why attention should consistently be given to achieving the largest possible degree of effectiveness and efficiency. This makes the challenges which education will face in the decades to come very imposing at a time of recession and extremely limited economic growth.
Educational Institutes are being viewed from different perspectives - sometimes from the perspective of threats, sometimes from the perspective of opportunities. But always from the perspective that educators are continually under pressure “to deliver”, to keep their promises, and to produce special products of high quality.

**The strength and diversity of privately funded educational institutes**

Traditionally, the provision of good-quality education was a matter for government-funded institutions. Government-funded research universities and universities of applied sciences - or other types of higher education institutions - used to be sharply focused on the group of young people who continue studying after completing secondary education: the 18 to 25 year-olds. This meant the effort they made in studying was not always at a maximum level, dropout rates were relatively high, the students took a long time to complete their studies and some were very low on commitment. For a long time, society tolerated this kind of study behaviour because it fit in with a tradition of elite higher education in which students were crammed for management positions and high-level professions in society.

But this image has changed drastically over the last fifty years. Higher education has fortunately become much more open, more democratic with respect to access and has undeniably improved in quality. But the tension that exists between quantity and quality has also become visible. Government funding has not been able to keep pace with the growth of education and research. This has led to intense discussions: can we guarantee open access to education? Can we continue to offer higher education for free or at highly subsidized rates? Should we force students to earn their diploma in the shortest possible time so that they can become productive as soon as possible?

**Quantitative growth** is one development taking place in educational institutes in Meerut – and perhaps the most important one – but there are more. Take, for example, the fast pace of change with which professions and disciplines are confronted and, which they to some extent, bring about themselves! Technological changes and research have led to revolutionary breakthroughs in recent decades. This has led to an enormous acceleration in the development of knowledge and therefore also to the necessity to adapt the education provided at an increasingly faster pace.
The changes I have just outlined have made the necessity of lifelong learning not only a wonderful buzz phrase, but also a reality. Whether it concerns the mandatory annual in-service training of lawyers, doctors, teachers and accountants or on-going company training programmes that bring employees up to date on the changes in information technology, the need to keep up with the latest developments in a trade or profession is apparent to everyone. Those that fail to do so, quickly lose their market value.

I would like to point out another development: that is the increasing diversity in our population and therefore also in our student population. Not only age constraints, within the age cohorts, increasing attention is being given to diversity: namely, differences in talent, differences in social-economic and cultural backgrounds, as well as differences in learning styles. In recent years we have begun, understandably and appropriately so, to focus attention on the enormous diversity in the student population in Meerut. Students are coming from different backgrounds and families.

In the midst of these developments, education needs to be updated continually and each institution has its own role to play in this, including education that is not funded by government.

1. It can focus on specific target groups that cannot be reached by government-funded educational institutions or only so to a limited degree. I’m referring to older students, the working student, second-chance students and, for example, women returning from a career break for whom government-funded, full-time education does not have a lot to offer. These target groups are often looking for made-to-measure coursework and they are more likely to find it at private educational institutions than at public institutions;

2. The private sector can respond quicker to specific demands from the labour market. Government-funded educational institutions often find it rather difficult to continually adapt the education they offer to the innovations in the professional fields and disciplines. This is one of the reasons that trade and industry regularly complain about the level of graduates being turned out. Sometimes the complaints concern a lack of skills and attitude, but just as often they concern deficient
knowledge. That is why the business community often points to the strengths of private education.

3. The private sector is probably also more focused on technological innovations. The government-funded education sector tends to “stumble on” from behind trying to catch up. Sometimes the financial resources are lacking, sometimes technological ingenuity is missing, and sometimes there is simply resistance to something new.

4. Private Institutes probably have the opportunity to conduct a type of staff policy that is different from the staff policy at government-funded educational institutions. These latter institutions are also often hindered by a wide range of rules and regulations that make it virtually impossible to get rid of teachers that perform less well. Of course these rules and regulations also have many positive effects, but letting go of employees that perform at substandard levels is virtually impossible. In Private Institutes, a close tie has been found between the assessment of teachers and the extension of their employment contract, which acts as an incentive for high performance on their part.

5. Finally, Private Institutes are very sharply focused on meeting the demands for effectiveness and efficiency. Students at government-funded institutions are often dissatisfied and disappointed with what is often called the “small-scale quality”: timetables are delivered too late, lessons are dropped, examinations are not graded on time, and teachers are difficult to reach. The institutions underestimate the importance of these complaints: they consider them to be subordinate to the substantive quality of their programmes, but students see things differently. The total picture that they have of the education they are receiving is greatly determined by their level of satisfaction with the organizational aspects of this education.

**Pitfalls for private educational institutions**

In the last two years, I have learnt to be extremely cautious about making statements concerning “the private education sector”. Defining the sector is a complex matter, because “private” does not always mean that the government does not contribute or subsidize these institutions. Neither can the sector be considered to be uniform in terms of organization and substance.
Everything has to be revised: **content, accessibility, education systems, the qualifications of teachers, infrastructure.** Everything had to change, and at a rapid pace. It is clear now that the new national governments had insufficient resources and possibilities to manage and control this enormous, yet necessary transformation. So it is absolutely understandable that, **in our district, dozens of private institutions have been created.** The quality of some of these institutions is very much up to standard. Others are lousy. Some of these institutions have absolute integrity and conduct themselves according to transparent rules. Others tend to fall outside the legal system and are unreliable. Some institutions are led by expert, dedicated people. Others are led by “gold diggers” whose only focus is to earn as much money as quickly as possible to the detriment of their students.

These observations make it clear that the way in which private institutions should be viewed depends on location and time. From this perspective, it is also understandable why, in some education systems, the quality of the “underside” of the sector should be viewed with considerable suspicion and why **strict accreditation systems should be established** there. In other education systems, in which a sound quality foundation has already been laid, the **assessment system** can focus more on improving the quality of education than on removing “wreckage” and “swindlers” from the sector.

**THREATS**

Due to the great diversity present, as well as wide ranging patterns of expectations, the Private Educational Institutions run a number of risks. I would now like to discuss a few of them:

1. The first and biggest risk is the fact that private education **focuses too much on the satisfaction of students and employers.** I think that many of the employers are not able to determine whether the education provided delivers the necessary level of quality. To my mind, they give much too much credence to the reproduction of knowledge they themselves have and which they value highly, and to the attitude of students.

   This gives one pause to think and prompts me to stress that you should be very critical of the manner in which you involve the profession concerned in determining the quality level achieved in your programmes. I understand the tension that exists
between meeting the demands of the market and the necessity of meeting external quality requirements, but you must unreservedly choose the latter: quality should take priority;

2. The same is true for the satisfaction of students. Students often have to make big personal and financial sacrifices in order to earn the diploma that means so much to them. But that should never mean that a programme accommodates them too much. Students should be provided help only up to an extent. They should have enough opportunities to explore the real world and gather in-depth knowledge of concepts, rather than merely collecting and compiling degrees and diplomas. Students and institutions that wish to function at the level of a Master’s programme should realize this and conduct themselves accordingly;

3. A third possible risk is found in the cohesion of the curricula. This risk is caused by the fact that a significant number of private institutions work with a relatively small permanent staff. The so-called “flying faculty” they employ is sometimes very large; these are many relatively small appointments for teachers who, one for one, are good lecturers, but who have little contact with one another. Often in this case, one or two coordinators are appointed who must try to guarantee cohesion in the curriculum and the collaboration between the teachers. This often works well, but sometimes it does not. What remains in the latter case is a collection of relatively individual, unconnected modules that show insufficient cohesion to continue as a coherent programme. Also, there is inconsistency in the teaching staff.

4. I would like to give a little more attention to a fourth and last risk, and that is the educational approach taken. I have already stated that private institutions seem to be better able to handle innovations. In itself, this is good news, but I would like to make one crucial comment on this: almost no reform in education is “evidence-based”. This is true both for new educational approaches and for technological innovation. Educators often argue for changes based on typical ideal assumptions or based on the actions of a rational, diligent and clever student. So I must warn you about fashionable developments that seem to be designed for a particular type of student that seldom exists in the real world.
But obviously there is still one constant element and that is the relationship between the teacher and the student. Increasingly, I am becoming convinced that we cannot do without the direct relationship between the teacher and student.

I have tried to think and reason along three lines: the possibilities and the potential power of private education, the pitfalls that one can encounter as a result and the opportunities that a network offers for profiling and quality improvement.

**The 5 greatest challenges faced by private school administrators**

Challenges facing private schools make it extremely difficult to keep them thriving and competitive. The 5 greatest challenges facing private school administrators:

1. **Competition**

2. **Parental Engagement**

3. **Communication**

4. **Pitfalls of Technology**

5. **Inefficiencies**

**Challenge 1: Competition**

Competition is beneficial to a school or a college and to students in ensuring that all schools/colleges strive to improve student outcomes, advance technology, and maintain facilities. However, it can make an administrator’s job even more stressful and demanding as they try to maintain a competitive edge.

**Challenge 2: Parental Engagement**

The parents of private school students tend to be extremely committed to having a say in their child’s education. 75% of teachers say they often come across parents who need ‘constant reassurance’. Interacting with faculty, students, the community, policymakers, and parents can be stressful and demanding for administrators.
**Challenge 3: Communication**

Parents were asked what type of communication they needed to feel more in touch and involved with the school and their child’s learning process. Participants wanted a better understanding of:

- The grading system
- Homework assignments and ways to help with homework
- Progress reports or early warnings of academic difficulties
- Test dates and results
- Extracurricular activities

**Challenge 4: Pitfalls of Technology**

Rampant viruses, malware, human error, and other technology issues are prevalent in institutes. Parents and students are more demanding for latest Information and Communication Technology resources which change at a very fast pace. Time to time updations are required which lead to high costs and large amount of capital to be put in. Also, the professional development of faculties is consistently required which adds to the cost factor.

**Challenge 5: Inefficiencies**

The lack of effective continued training makes it difficult for faculties to find a place for integrative technology in their classrooms. Office staff continue to be burdened with paper-work and retyping data. Faculties complain they do not have the support personnel or training they need to take advantage of current technologies. Investments in technology don’t promise the returns and benefits expected.

**Opportunities**

One plus point in favour of a self-financed college is that it can have an admission process based strictly on merit & not bother about the reservation system. Strictly on
the basis of marks students can be admitted to the institute. The institute also need not necessarily have an entrance exam at all, which would be a relief to many who despite getting good marks in a qualifying Board exam are unable to deal with the tough questions of an entrance exam.

Furthermore, a self-financed college could have a smaller batch of students per academic year and ensure individual attention to each student rather than have 1 teacher a large number of students as is generally the case. Then, of course, there is the campus infrastructure. If the self-financed college is having no dearth of funds, then there is no limit to the high quality facilities that it can offer. Students can get great labs & equipment, sports facilities and hostel rooms not to mention good food on campus.

**FINAL CONCLUSION**

The purpose of this study was to explore the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats faced by Private/Self Financing Educational Institutes of Meerut District to promote a total quality education. The study employed a qualitative design and methodology. In-depth interviews were conducted with the participation of heads, faculties, students, parents and administrative staff of different Private/Self Financing Educational Institutes and Government/Aided Institutions of Meerut District. Qualitative data were synthesized, systematized, generalized, and analyzed to clarify the research questions.

**Results:** The findings revealed that Private/Self Financing Educational Institutes with unique characteristics and services, are making great contributions overall to primary, secondary and higher level in the Meerut District by satisfying the diverse needs for education in an increasingly heterogeneous marketplace. The study obtained thoughtful insights from diverse perspectives and practices of key leaders that may provide helpful data and meaningful experiences for those who are currently working at Private/Self Financing Educational Institutes or for those who want to pursue a career in higher educational leadership and administration. Promoting high quality education has been a great challenge for key leaders at Private/Self Financing Educational Institutes. **Conclusions from the study support the belief that Private/Self Financing Educational Institutes are striving for quality with a**
focused mission, an effective strategic plan, and a persistent commitment. Recommendations for leadership practices include effective strategies for enhancing a total quality education which promote productive and meaningful lives.

With significantly less funding the question is then posed as to what unaided institutions are doing to surpass their aided counterparts and how this can ultimately be applied to aided institutions to increase their performance.

With surprisingly higher success rates in private-unaided institutions, the question is then posed as to where government and private/aided schools and colleges are failing. With an examination into each institution’s funding methods, insight can be gained. Despite the significantly higher test results at private-unaided schools throughout India, when compared to government and private-aided facilities, they remain the most poorly funded. Generating their own revenue through fees collected from students, unaided schools receive zero support from the government. By using outside resources, these unaided institutions rely most heavily upon tuition fees.

Thus, we conclude that the Heads, Faculties and administration Staff of Government/Aided Institutes are highly satisfied with their salary structure and have a greater job security as compared to Private/Self Financing institutes but the above mentioned people get better opportunities to showcase their personal knowledge and skills in Private/Self Financing Institutes. There is more work and management pressure in Private/Self Financed while the faculties are mentally relaxed in Government/Aided Institutes.

According to students and parents the Fee Structure, Fee Concessions and Admission procedure are better in Government/Aided institutes as compared to Private/Self Financing Institutes. On the other hand, Private/Self financing institutes excel in offering better courses and curriculum. Location and Infrastructure of such institutes are far better. There is more compatibility between teachers and students and the staff is more trained in Private/Self Financing Institutes. Quality teaching with more real life concepts is being delivered in Private/Self Financing Institutes.
CHAPTER 11
SUGGESTIONS
SUGGESTIONS

1. **Quality Education:**

Unless private organizations provide best of the education, admissions are extremely difficult. Each and every parent/student paying for their education will select the best of the institutions and all private institutions have tough competition amongst themselves to achieve the same.

Private Institutions have been established with lots of individual/trust/society funds which is required for Quality higher education. Without quality education private institutions cannot survive. In any society there will be Institutions providing higher education degrees for the rich.

My conclusion is, Private/Self Financing Educational Institutions in Meerut District are doing lot of good work in supporting this country. If there are few institutions doing wrong they should be tracked and appropriate action should be taken. **Strict guidelines and Accreditation Policies** should be laid down for education and research which should be sent to UGC. Frequent inspections give scope only for corruption and nothing else.

UGC instead of stabilizing higher education puts impractical qualification levels for Lecturers in colleges. It has denied opportunities for lakhs of M.Phil holders opportunities to serve in colleges. The colleges make use of these circulars to keep qualified teachers as perpetual bonded labour forcing even the most sincere to leave the profession. Then how do we 'improve' education?

2. **Provision of qualified manpower:**

Everyone knows about the shortage of faculty/qualified manpower in educational institutions yet new institutions are being granted permission.

I think Govt. of India and its agencies like UGC, AICTE and CBSE are not doing their job as expected.
Their projections are not correct. Indiscriminate permissions are given for opening Engineering/Management/Deemed Universities without knowing the real requirement of trained manpower, without having sufficient qualified teachers, permission is given to non deserving applicants who give affidavit of working for society but go in a big way in earning profit and generate and absorb black money.

There should be a restriction on opening new institutions in the absence of real manpower requirement of trained people who will be absorbed by the STATE.

3. **Proper Accreditation Policies** : State should be held responsible if students graduating from their state do not find job in their state. They should not give licenses to open institutions to XYZ without any commitment to the state. Some guidelines in evaluating an institution, other than IITs, the Indian Institute of Science, and NITs, for developing collaborative relationship for recruitment of students are as follows:

1. NAAC ranking: A or AA should be the acceptable rank

2. Research record of the faculty should be examined

3. **Admission processes** used for admitting students should also be considered.

4. **Salary norms and pay structure** : The success of any institute depends on the qualified and trained manpower which provide quality education. There will remain consistency in faculty turnover if they are satisfied with the remunerations and are assured of job security. Thus institutions should follow the pay norms recommended by the Govt. agencies like UGC, AICTE and CBSE.

5. **Fee Structure** : The fee structure of private/self financing institutions should be lowered and brought at par with the govt./aided institutions. Though, it is not much practical in the real sense as survival of institutes at such low rates is not possible. Still, extra profiteering by the private management should be avoided.

6. **Latest techniques and Authentic Curriculum Design** : The funds raised through high fee structure should be utilized for bringing latest techniques for teaching and learning. Curriculum should be revised from time to time to meet the latest needs and demands of the society. Efforts should be put in to bring learning in
the real sense of world and not merely finishing the old-age curriculum that is outdated and in longer use of the students.

7. **Effective Leadership**: It is recognized that effective leadership plays a crucial role in the transformation, advancement, and prosperity of any education institution. The brighter future of private higher education depends on the commitment and dedication of the courageous leaders who have a challenging vision, who dare to dream and dare to make strategic changes for the blossoming future of students.

8. **Abolishing Corruption**: Corruption is endemic to our life. Indian education system is not second to politics in corruption, but it has become pawn in the hands of corrupt people. They are creating sub-standard doctors and engineers with the approval of MCI and AICTE. MCI and AICTE both were involved in bribery case earlier.

We need governance through honest beaurocrats and politicians. If youth of this country is cheated, then they can revolt and demolish the ‘Institutions of Corruption’.

Most Educational Institutes are in a much worse state. Instead of developing and enforcing the quality standards in all universities, Mr. Sibal took an easy option and did a great damage. By making a hurried report without much and systematic assessment, the "learned" Tandon Committee did more harm to the Indian higher education than good. Our country gave even Kasab (which was an open and shut case) so many years to defend himself, whereas Tandon Committee took its decision about 128 universities based on 10-15 minute presentations by each of them without visiting the universities. Surprisingly one of the top lawyers of the country created this mission.

From this perspective, it is also understandable why, in some education systems, the quality of the “underside” of the sector should be viewed with considerable suspicion and why **strict accreditation systems** should be established there. In other education systems, in which a sound quality foundation has already been laid, the **assessment system** can focus more on improving the quality of education than on removing “wreckage” and “swindlers” from the sector.
In a number of private institutes, therefore, the approach should be clearly and increasingly focused on the learning outcomes. What is the goal of a programme? What does it want its students to know and to be able to do by the time they leave the programme (the intended learning outcomes)? How does a programme do this (with what curriculum, teaching methods, staff and facilities)? And does a programme keep its promises by way of examination, projects and assessments (achieved learning outcomes)? The external assessment systems should follow this line of learning outcomes, whereby the content of a programme and the level realized are decisive in the quality assessment. From this perspective, as well, cooperation within a network could give powerful boosts to improving the quality of individual programmes. I know that this takes time and energy, but it also constitutes the extra value of networks: the willingness to help one another become better.

“The optimum utilization of principals, teachers and administration staff can lead to a significant increase in productivity.”

I completely agree to the statement of Ms. Smriti Irani “…every decision that we reach upon shall be a decision which comes across through consensus, every person, every thought process, every stakeholder shall be consulted,” Very rightly said that before arriving at any decision, every relevant person should be consulted, then only we’ll arrive at best results for our future generations.