Chapter - VI

Findings

1. The higher educational Institutes have shown a considerable growth from 1950 till 2013. The Universities in India were only 25 in the period 1950-51, now more than 614 Universities are functioning. The Colleges were 700 in 1951 and in 2013 more than 33,023 colleges are functioning in India. (Table No. 3.1).

2. The Lecturers are the backbone of the Higher Education. In 1955 only 15000 lecturers were working in HEI. In 2013 more than 8, 17000 faculty members are working in higher education sector. (Table No. 3.2).

3. The number of students pursuing higher studies has grown to a large extent. In 1951 only 100000 students were taking higher studies. In 2013 more than 169,75000 students are pursuing higher studies. (Table No. 3.3).

4. The Universities accredited by NAAC till 2013 are 172 and more than 442 Universities still are not accredited. (Table No. 3.4)

5. The highest CGPA score in NAAC accreditation for Universities is of Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi with CGPA 3.91 on four scale value. (Table No. 3.5)

6. The status of accreditation for Colleges is. Out of 33023 only 5156 Colleges have been accredited and 27867 colleges are still to be accredited. (Table 3.6).
7. Tamilnadu state has highest number of Colleges accredited by NBA with 
Maharashtra on second place with 184 and 137 Programmes accredited 
respectively. (Table No. 3.8).

8. Maharashtra State is having maximum number of colleges (1046) accredited 
by NAAC. (Table No. 3.10).

9. Tata Institute of Social Sciences Mumbai has highest score (3.88 CGPA) 
accorded NAAC. (Table No. 3.11)

10. The 84% of the respondents have considered NAAC as more reliable and 
integrated in accrediting the Institutes as compared with NBA and ISO. 
(Table No 4.2).

11. The 92% of the respondents agree and have accepted that their is a role of 
advanced software systems like expert systems in quality assessment and 
enhancement of Institutes in higher education. (Table No 4.3).

12. The 95% respondents agree that their is awareness among stakeholders of 
the Higher education. 95% respondents have given response as there is 
awareness to a large extent about quality in higher educational 
institutes. (Table No 4.4).

13. The 56% respondents have opted for and feel that Institutes are going 
voluntarily for accreditation process but still 44% percent do not find it 
necessary or lucrative to go for accreditation therefore many Institutes still 
are not accredited by any of the accreditation bodies. (Table No 4.5).

14. The 81% respondents feel that there is more similarity in quality parameters 
followed by accrediting bodies. (Table No 4.6).
15. The 80% of respondents feel that Good grade is a measure of quality. Some also have doubt on this grade system. (Table No 4.7).

16. The 92% of the respondents have shown satisfaction over 7 criteria evaluation of quality parameters in higher educational Institutes. The 8% respondents feel still some more improvement in these criteria’s can be done. (Table No 4.8).

17. The 85% of respondents have given preference to same weightage to the NAAC Marking scheme. (Table No 4.9).

18. The 90% of respondents feel that peer team should visit without prior notice to improve the system and get better output. (Table No 4.11).

19. The 88% respondents have given importance to all seven criteria of NAAC. (Table No 4.12).

20. The 96% respondents feel that moving with global trend is the main reason to go for accreditation (Table No 4.13).

21. The 57% respondents feel no special treatment should be given to rural colleges. 43% respondents had given preferences to infrastructural facilities can not be created and it can not be compared with urban Institutes facilities. (Table No 4.14).

22. The 80% of respondents feel that the accreditation process and its work have negative impact on their teaching load in the year of accreditation application year. (Table No 4.15).
23. The 85% of experts in academics feel faculty development, deputing faculty for various quality improvement activities and encouragement to stakeholders are the important steps before going for accreditation process (Table No 4.16).

24. The 88% of respondents feel that accreditation helps to tackle the problems like admissions, curriculum design and academic related problem. Some of them do not consider it as problem solver. (Table No 4.17).

25. The 72% of respondents are satisfied with the members of peer team and they feel they give proper justice to their task. 20% respondents also feel that the peer team does not get enough time to evaluate the Institute. (Table No 4.18).

26. The 93% of the respondents feel that accreditation is healthy practice and are satisfied with the process. (Table No 4.19).

27. The 97% of the respondents feel that NAAC Quality parameters are good and it should be followed as system throughout the year. (Table No 4.20).

28. Frequency of monitoring of Institutes through NAAC has mixed reactions from respondents. The 58% respondents feel there should be half yearly monitoring, 18% respondents feel quarterly and 24% prefer yearly monitoring to maintain and manage quality in HEI. (Table No 4.21).

29. The 76% of respondents have experienced increase in students taking admissions to their Institutes. 24% of them feel no effect on admission which includes Govt. and Grantable Institutes. No one feels that there is decrease in admissions after accreditation. (Table No 4.22).
30. The 72% of respondents feel that stakeholders have taken note of the accreditation. (Table No 4.23).

31. The 80% of respondents feel that NAAC accreditation is really a quality improvement measure, 16% do not agree with this view and 4% respondents do not have any idea about this. (Table No 4.24).

32. The Expert system developed gives the criteria wise score total score and score obtained with the difference in the score. Also it gives remark to find out the strength and notes to improve for each criteria so that Institutes can use this information for enhancement of grade in turn enhance the quality. (Sample Reports Generated through ESQAA)
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Suggestions

====================================
1. The Growth of Higher education Institutes is not enough to meet the needs of students opting to go for higher studies, there is need to increase the number of Universities and Colleges in India.
2. Faculty strength in Higher education also needs to be increased in higher educational Institutes.
3. The Accreditation status for Universities and Colleges is also not encouraging and special efforts are to be taken to motivate the Institutions to go for accreditation in short span of time to maintain the quality in Higher education.
4. NAAC is considered as reliable and widely accepted accrediting body in India it should continue its work with accrediting more number of Institutes in India.
5. Advance Software’s like Expert System should be used in quality assessment and enhancement in higher educational Institutes. It will save the time and efforts of the faculty and staff.
6. Awareness among stakeholders is required on large scale and the various efforts from UGC and Government is required to make quality awareness in the mind of the students and parents to get maximum benefit from the higher educational Institutes.
7. Accreditation is required to bring uniformity in educational Institutes but still many Institutes are not going voluntarily for accreditation the Government and controlling bodies should make it compulsory to give grade before sanction of any grants (salary or development grants to the Institutes).
8. All accrediting bodies should follow similar parameters for accreditation of the Institutes and accord the grade. They should not have more variation in quality parameters otherwise Institutes will not keep faith in the evaluation process.

9. Grade of the Institute gives direct relationship with the quality of the Institute in academics therefore more ‘A’ grade Institutes in the Country will have positive impact on quality of education.

10. Criteria and weightages suggested by NAAC are satisfying the current needs but still they can update the key indicators as per the area and type of Institutes going for accreditation.

11. NAAC Peer team should visit without prior notice to the Institute and take the reports before visit about the Institutes various quality parameters. This will avoid some adjustments done by some Institutes during the accreditation process.

12. Accreditation and grade has become the mark of standard and quality which is seen by the response from respondents during the research study this should be maintained by the accrediting bodies. This is present global trend.

13. The Accreditation bodies should have some scale by which rural and urban area Institutes are evaluated. The problems of rural area Institutes may not be similar to urban area Institutes. The NAAC can design separate key indicators to grade the rural Institutes in India. To give justice to rural Institutes and give them chance to develop in adverse conditions.

14. More work is assigned to faculty during the NAAC peer team Visit year which affects the teaching work load of the faculty this should be avoided and separate staff should be appointed to do the accreditation process work.
15. The faculty development is most important to maintain quality of the Institutes. The Institute has to conduct faculty development programmes regularly on advance topics in the specific area.

16. The higher grade gives motivation to faculty and staff and it will create good environment in the Institute.

17. NAAC Peer team members are highly qualified and experts. They give proper justice in evaluating the Institutes and NAAC should continue this policy.

18. The accreditation is healthy practice and it should be continued in future.

19. The NAAC Quality parameters are good and it should be followed as a system throughout the year.

20. Frequency of monitoring of Institutes through NAAC should be half yearly done to get better results than the present.

21. The stakeholders have taken note of the accreditation and in future the stakeholders will ask more from the Institutes therefore the Institutes should immediately go for accreditation and get higher grade.

22. The NAAC accreditation is really a quality improvement measure and it should be followed to maintain the quality in higher educational Institutes.

23. National Board of Accreditation (NBA) should also make evaluation by giving grade in spite of only accrediting the Institutes as “Accredited and Not Accredited” which do not make the difference in the measurement of quality is concerned.
24. International Standards Organisation (ISO) is suggested to modify the parameters of quality in the respect to NAAC quality parameters and scale system can be used to differentiate the grades of the Institutes.

25. Expert System Designed developed is tested by using efficiency and consistency formula by the researcher. It is suggested to use this system before applying for NAAC accreditation and also after accreditation to improve the grade of the Institute.

26. Quality improvement can be achieved by proper involvement from all the stakeholders of higher education starting from students, parents, faculty, employers, government and society at large.
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Conclusion

The Higher Education has become the main sector which will shape the academic career of the learners and will provide qualified and skilled employees to the companies. The Quality at higher educational Institutes is an issue of concern for all stakeholders like students, parents, employees, employers and society at large. The Research outputs in the form of suggestions and implementation of Expert system to assess the Institutes of higher education will help in finding out present status of Institutes and its Grade before going for NAAC Accreditation. Competition from global Academic Institutions will also force the Indian Institutes to make positive changes in order to maintain and improve the quality of the educational process in higher educational Institutes.

The Reports generated through the expert system are useful to find out quality status and are validated by the researcher.

The researcher has found out the efficiency of the expert system and it is found efficient and consistent in generating results for NAAC quality parameters for pre and post accreditation process.

===