Chapter 4:

Hypothesis

The norms and standards set up for infrastructure like building, equipment, books and journals, computers etc. could be and are (established) essentially to be fulfilled by these institutions. In spite of setting up Norms and Standards, procedures for accreditation etc. the industry has not been happy with the output of these institutions. NASSCOM, in its report \(^{[25]}\) openly stated (Mr. Kiran Karnik, the then Chairman) that only fifteen percent of the undergraduate output is employable. If it is assumed that all A, B, C category institutions \(^{[22]}\) run by Central and State Govt. impart good education, then, onus of not providing quality education lies with Private, self financed institutions.

As accreditation is a process for a specific program run by an institute for a minimum period of six years or more, it becomes important for the self financed institutions to attract good students and faculty. As the number of institutions is continuously increasing, it has become a challenge to attract adequate number of students, right from the inception itself. Therefore it becomes important to identify the parameters, other than accreditation, to indicate quality of education imparted by the institute as perceived by the students and faculty.

On the basis of interactions with large number of faculty and students following hypotheses are put forward for consideration:

H – 1: A good institute i.e. an institute imparting good quality of education is perceived by the students and staff on three important parameters namely availability of qualified faculty, job opportunities (placement) made available to the students and University results of the students of the institute.

H – 2: Quality of a student in terms of qualifying marks at entry level in the UG engineering program does not automatically lead to good University results.

H – 3: Model IPRinternalise™ can lead to assured success rate in terms of University results as well as job placement.