PERCEPTIONS OF STAKEHOLDERS ON QUALITY OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN MIZORAM IN THE CONTEXT OF RUSA

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

LALTLANZAUVI KAWLNI

MZU REGISRATION NUMBER : 1506784
Ph.D REGISTRATION NUMBER : MZU/PH. D/885 OF 19.04.2016

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION AND HUMANITIES

DECEMBER 2020

PERCEPTIONS OF STAKEHOLDERS ON QUALITY OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN MIZORAM IN THE CONTEXT OF RUSA

BY

LALTLANZAUVI KAWLNI

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

UNDER THE SUPERVISION OF

PROF. LOKANATH MISHRA

SUBMITTED

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENT OF THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY IN EDUCATION OF MIZORAM UNIVERSITY, AIZAWL.

MIZORAM UNIVERSITY

AIZAWL: MIZORAM - 796004 Post Box-190

Prof. Lokanath Mishra Email:munumishra7@gmail.com

M.Sc. (Math), M.A. (Eco), M.Ed. Ph.D. Phone No. 9457115093(M)

Department of Education

Dated: 14th December of 2020

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the work incorporated in this Thesis entitled **"Perceptions of Stakeholders on Quality of Higher Education in Mizoram in the Context of RUSA"** is a bonafied research work carried out by **Laltlanzauvi Kawlni, Ph.D. Scholar,** Department of Education, Mizoram University, Regn. No.: MZU/PH. D/885 of 19.04.2016, under my supervision for her Ph.D. Degree In preparing the thesis Laltlanzauvi Kawlni has complied with all the requirement as laid down in the Ph. D. Regulation of the University. The thesis is the original work of the scholar and has not been submitted for any degree to any other University.

(**Prof. LOKANATH MISHRA)**

Supervisor

Department of Education

Mizoram University, Aizawl

MIZORAM UNIVERSITY
December, 2020

DECLARATION

I, Laltlanzauvi Kawlni, hereby declare that the subject matter of this thesis is the record of work done by me, that the content of this thesis did not form basis of the award of any previous degree to me, or to the best of my knowledge, to anybody else, and that the thesis has not been submitted by me for any research degree in any other University/Institute.

This is being submitted to the Mizoram University for the award of Doctor of Philosophy in Education.

(LALTLANZAUVI KAWLNI)
Candidate

(Prof. H. MALSAWMI)
Head
Department of Education

(Prof. LOKANATH MISHRA)
Supervisor
Department of Education

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

First and foremost, I thank the Almighty God. Thy blessed me to complete this research.

With profound pleasure, I express my sincere gratitude to my mentor, my supervisor Prof. Lokanath Mishra for his consistent support, guidance and patience. Without his commitment and kindhearted understanding, I would not be able to bring out this thesis in its present form.

I convey my sincere thanks to the Principals and all the respondents from colleges for their kind cooperation and took their valuable time to ponder over my questionnaire and gave necessary information.

I take this opportunity to acknowledge my heartfelt gratitude to my parents, my husband, my in-laws and other family members for their countless supports, encouragement and prayers.

I would also like to express my special thanks to Lalhriattira Fanai,
C. Lalremsiami, Vasty Azyu, Vanlalchhanhimi and friends for their supports and advice.

(LALTLANZAUVI KAWLNI)

CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Introduction

Higher education plays an important role in the development of a country. It is important for economic and social development as well as an essential tool to shape human resource as it provides people with an opportunity to react on the critical, socio-economic, cultural, moral and spiritual issues facing humanity. It has always been recognized as a major instrument to achieve the objectives of social, economic and political development of a nation. Higher education is the chief instrument for ensuring the upward mobility of the people and the advancement of the country. It is rightly said that higher education holds the key to the destiny of the nation as higher education produces well informed and deeply motivated citizens, who can think critically, analyze problems of society, look for solutions to the problems of society, apply them and accept social responsibilities. Higher education provides ideas and men to give shape to the future and also sustain all the other levels of education. It has rightly been regarded as the backbone of an economy and a powerful instrument for the fulfillment of national aspirations. (Bhutia, 2005)

The report to UNESCO of the International Commission on Education for the Twenty-first Century stated, "Higher Education is at one and the same time one of the driving forces of economic development and the focal point of learning in a society. It is both repository and creator of knowledge. Moreover, it is the principal instrument for passing on the accumulated experience, cultural and scientific, of humanity. In a world where resources of knowledge will increasingly predominate over material resources as factors in development, the importance of higher education and of higher education institutions can only grow. Moreover, the effect of innovation and technological progress means that economies will increasingly demand competencies that require

high- level studies." The importance of higher education has increased several folds with the realization that in a world order based on science and technology, it is the quality of higher education that decides the country's pace of economic and social development. Being at the apex of the educational pyramid, it plays a key role in producing quality teachers for the country's education.

Higher education means education beyond the secondary level, especially education at college or university level. It refers to a level of education that is provided by universities, vocational universities, community colleges, liberal arts colleges, institutes of technology and other collegiate level institutions, such as vocational schools, trade schools and career colleges that award academic degrees or professional certifications. Higher education system in India imparts education in almost all fields of knowledge viz.: Arts, Science, Commerce/Management, Education, Teachers training, Engineering/technology/architecture, Medical, Law /Agriculture /Veterinary, music and performing arts; national and foreign languages; culture; communications etc. Higher education constitutes the topmost stage of formal education and is concerned with processes in more advanced phases of human learning. Higher education offers a unique blend of two resources essential for economic and social development; knowledge and status. Higher education provides competent leadership by supplying a well developed human resource such as scientists, engineers, doctors, teachers, managers and so on. It also supplies a wide range of increasingly sophisticated and ever changing variety of manpower needed in industry, agriculture, administration and services. Higher education is said to impart deepest understanding in the minds of students, rather than a relatively superficial grasp that must be acceptable elsewhere in the system. In higher education, nothing can be taken on trust and the students have to think for themselves so as to be able to stand intellectually on their own feet (Barnett, 1997). It is also to provide the right kind of leadership in all walks of life and identify gifted youth and help them to develop their potential to the full by cultivating physical fitness, developing the powers of mind, right interests, attitudes and values. Therefore, higher education is very crucial for national development.

The World Bank document states "Higher Education is a paramount importance for economic and social development". UNESCO (1995) in its policy paper on *"Change and development of Higher Education"* emphasizes that state and society must perceive Higher Education not as a burden, but as a long time investment in order to increase economic competitiveness, cultural development and social cohesion. Hence, expenditure on higher education has been regarded as an important investment.

1.2. Present Scenario of Higher education in India

The higher education system in India has grown in a remarkable way, particularly in the post-independence period, to become one of the largest systems of its kind in the world. It is the third largest in the world, next to the United States and China. The main governing body at the tertiary level is the University Grants Commission, which enforces its standards, advises the government, and helps coordinate between the Centre and the state. Accreditation for higher learning is overseen by 12 autonomous institutions established by the University Grants Commission. Distance learning and open education are also an essential feature of the Indian higher education system. Indira Gandhi National Open University run by the Indian government is attributed to be the largest university in the world by number of students with over 3.5 million students from across the globe. Premium institutions of India, such as the Indian Institutes of Technology (IITs), Indian Institutes of Management (IIMs), National Institute of Technology (NITs) and Jawaharlal Nehru University have attained global acclamation for their high standard of education. About 8000 students are enrolled annually by the IITs and the alumni have made significant contributions to both the growth of the private sector and the public sectors of India. The institutions of higher learning in India consist of:

(i) Central Universities established by an Act of Parliament;

(ii) State Universities established by State Legislatures;

(iii) Deemed Universities recognized as such by the Central Government on the recommendation of the UGC;

(iv) Private Universities established by various State Governments through their own legislation; and

(v) Institutes of National Importance declared as such by the Government of India by an Act of Parliament.

All these institutions are empowered to award degrees. A small number of Central and State Universities are stand-alone unitary institutions; however, the vast majority has constituent or affiliated colleges attached to them. Most colleges in India are affiliated to universities and provide undergraduate education. Some colleges also undertake post-graduate teaching and research. The affiliating universities are expected to oversee the standards of the affiliated colleges, hold examinations and award degrees to successful candidates.

Indian higher education system has expanded at a fast pace by adding more than 28,000 colleges and more than 9 million students from 2000-01 to 2018-19. As of 2019, India has 46 central universities, 371 state public universities, 304 state private universities, 114 deemed universities (Private and Government) and 127 institutes of national importance established. Indian Higher Education Institutions are categorized in 3 broad Categories; University, College and Stand-Alone Institutions. According to UGC Report 2017- 2018, there are 8358 Government colleges, 5083 Private Aided colleges and 24620 Private unaided Colleges in India. Government Colleges covers 22.2% out of the total colleges in the Country while majority of the Colleges 78%, are privately managed, of which 64.7% are private unaided &13.3% are Private aided. 60.48% colleges are located in rural areas and 11.04% colleges are exclusively for girls. According to AISHE Report 2018-2019, there are 993 Universities out of which 385 Universities are privately managed and 394 Universities are located in rural area. 16 Universities are exclusively for women, 39931 Colleges and 10725 Stand Alone

Institutions. There are 298 affiliating Universities and they have 39931 colleges. India has 1 Central Open University, 14 State Open Universities, 1 State Private Open University and there are 110 Dual mode Universities, which offer education through distance mode.

Gross Enrolment Ratio (GER) has increased during the last 5 years, from 20.8 in 2011- 12 to 24.5 in 2015-16 and further 25.8 in 2017-2018 to 26.3% in 2018-2019 in which GER for male population is 26.3% and for females, it is 26.4%. For Scheduled Castes, it is 23% and for Scheduled Tribes, it is 17.2% as compared to the national GER of 26.3%. The increase is more under SC category which has increased from 19.9 in 2015-16 to 23% in 2018-2019. In case of ST category, the GER has increased from 14.2 to 17.2% during the period. The Gender Parity Index (GPI) as of AISHE Report 2018-2019 shows that Female participation in Higher Education for All Categories is 100 per 100 male and for Scheduled Casts (SCs) and Scheduled Tribes (STs) it is 102 and 92 per 100 males respectively.

As of 2018-2019, total enrolment in higher education has been estimated to be 37.4 million with 19.2 million male and 18.2 million female. Female constitute 48.6% of the total enrolment. Out of the total enrolment of 3,73,99,388 students, a vast majority of 2,98,29,075 students are enrolled in Under Graduate that is a sweeping 79.8%. These shows that the number of student enrollment is highest at the Under Graduate level across India. There are 1,69,170 students enrolled in Ph.D. that is less than 0.5% of the total student enrolment. Maximum numbers of Students are enrolled in B.A. programme having 93.49 lakh students enrolled in it followed by B.Sc. having 46.80 lakh students enrolled and there are 40.30 lakh students enrolled under B.Com programmes. Similar situation could be observed in States/ UTs. At Undergraduate level the highest number (35.9%) of students are enrolled in Arts/Humanities/Social Sciences courses followed by Science (16.5%), Engineering and Technology (13.5%) and Commerce (14.1%).

Table1.1: Enrollment in different Courses during the last 8 years

	Ph.D.			M.Phil.			Post Graduate			Under Graduate		
Year	**Male**	**Female**	**Total**	**Male**	**Female**	**Total**	**Male**	**Female**	**Total**	**Male**	**Female**	**Total**
2011-12	49296	32134	81430	15913	18241	34154	1769276	1597914	3367190	12612513	10562437	23174950
2012-13	55654	39771	95425	13257	17117	30374	1769101	1679050	3448151	12918796	10971513	23890309
2013-14	64772	43118	107890	13632	17748	31380	1888637	1933582	3822219	13574434	11925891	25500325
2014-15	69584	47717	117301	14107	19264	33371	1867142	1986296	3853438	14467226	12705120	27172346
2015-16	74547	51904	126451	17473	25050	42523	1818443	2098713	3917156	14611603	12808847	27420450
2016-17	81795	59242	141037	16464	26803	43267	1820564	2187006	4007570	14933909	13414288	28348197
2017-18	92570	68842	161412	12287	21822	34109	1891071	2223239	4114310	15052304	13964046	29016350
2018-19	95043	74127	169170	11623	19069	30692	1761330	2281192	4042522	15203346	14625729	29829075

(Source-AISHE-2018-19, MHRD, Government of India)

The total number of teachers are increasing from13,88,732 in 2017-18 to 14,16,299 teachers in 2018-19 out of which 57.85% are male teachers and 42.15%are female teachers. At All-India level, there are merely 73 female teachers per 100 male teachers. The number of total teachers at University level is around 1.90 lakh out of which 63.35% are male and 36.65% are female. At college level, the number of teachers is 10.72 lakh with 56.81% male teachers. In Standalone institutes, total number of teachers is 1.53 lakh with 58.31% male teachers. Looking at female per 100 male teachers, there are 58 teachers at University level, 76 and 71 female teachers per100 male teachers at College and Stand-alone Institutions respectively. Taking into account all types of Institutions (University, Colleges and Stand-alone Institution), Pupil Teacher Ratio (PTR) at All India level comes out to be 26 and 24 if only regular enrollment is considered. In case of University and its Colleges, PTR is 29 for regular mode. (AISHE, 2018-2019).

For the maintenance and promotion of quality in the Indian higher education, the New Education Policy (1986) emphasized to recognize and reward of excellence in performance of institutions as well as checking of sub-standard institutions and the Programme of Action (PoA) in 1986 suggested the UGC to take the initiative to establish an Accreditation and Assessment Council as an autonomous body. The UGC, therefore, established NAAC at Bangalore as a registered autonomous body on 16th September 1994 under the Societies Registration Act of 1860 after eight years of continuous and serious deliberations. The main objectives of NAAC are to grade institutions of higher education and their programmes; stimulate the academic environment and quality of teaching and research in these institutions; help institutions realize their academic objectives; promote necessary changes, innovations and reforms in all aspects of the institutions working for the above purpose; and encourage innovations, self-evaluation and accountability in higher education. (NAAC, 2006). It is envisaged by experts that every institution should have assessment and accreditation by NAAC, for better quality and is also evident from many studies that Assessment and

Accreditation would enable institutions to follow new innovative/healthy practices. The current status of Institutions accredited by NAAC is presented in the table given under:

Table 1.2: Grade Break Up of Institutions accredited (as on 11/03/2020)

	A	**B**	**C**	**Total**
Universities	208	143	13	**364**
Colleges	1697	5478	984	**8159**
Total	**1905**	**5621**	**997**	**8523**

(Source: naac.gov.in)

1.3. Development in the Five Year Plan

For the development of higher education, the 11th Plan (2007-12) focused on many strategies ─ providing equitable access, improving quality and standards; evaluation and accreditation; expansion and strengthening of infrastructure, networking and digitization, research and development; and strengthening of the open and distance education system and of research institutions. The central objective of the 11th plan was focused on expansion of enrolment in higher education with inclusiveness, quality, and relevant education and supported by necessary Academic Reforms in the university and college system. Restructuring and reforming the higher education system to improve accessibility and quality of services offered through greater autonomy and more participative governance were also key elements of the 11th Plan‘s strategy. During this period, India, thus, moved from an elite system of higher education to a mass system when the Gross Enrolment Ratio (GER) crossed the threshold of 15%. During eleventh plan India achieved a GER of 17.9 % up from 12.3 % at the beginning of the plan period. India ranks second in the world in terms of enrollment of students in higher education institutions. But, India’s GER of 17.9% (2012) was much below the world average of 27%, as well as that of other emerging countries such as China (26%), USA (95%) and Brazil (36%) in 2010. However, the GER at 22.2% still remained below the world average of 29% (GoI, 2011).

By the end of the Plan, the country had 645 degree awarding institutions, 33,023 colleges affiliated to 174 universities and over 12,748 diploma granting institutions. The expansion of Central institutions during the 11th Plan was historic. The Central Government has never established so many institutions in a single Plan period. The Central Government established 65 new institutions during the 11th Plan period. Special financial assistance was provided by the Central Government to existing Central institutions to raise their intake capacity.

For the growth and development of India's higher education a good policy foundation was provided by the Twelfth Five Year Plan. The main objective of the XII Plan was to expand enrolment in higher education with inclusiveness, quality and relevant education alongwith necessary academic reforms in the university/college system. Thus, the main focus was on expansion and access to higher education through increasing institutional capacity and enhancement of intake capacity, promotion of inclusive education through equal access to various groups in higher education, undertaking academic and governance, reforms, etc. The 12th Plan (2013-2017) continued the focus on the Three Es'—expansion, equity and excellence. However, the Plan proposed a paradigm change in the way we achieve such goals through three new principles. First, an overriding emphasis was given to quality. Second, the Plan also strived to diversify higher education opportunities, not only to meet the needs of employers, but also to offer a wide range of paths to success for our youth. Third, this excellence in diversity was implemented through governance reforms, to enable institutions to have the autonomy to develop distinctive strengths. Hence, the 12th Plan adopted a holistic approach to the issues of expansion, equity and excellence. (Mangla, 2015). A new mission mode scheme called Rashtriya Uchchatar Shiksha Abhiyan (RUSA) has been launched for strengthening and reforming higher education which has being focusing on access, equity, quality, and innovation through creation, expansion and consolidation of institutions, research, and innovation in which funding is norm-based. All these initiatives raised the country's GER from 21.1 per cent for 2012–13 to

25.8 per cent in 2017–18 which is further raised to 26.3% in 2018-2019 and the country is striving to reach the target of 30 per cent GER by 2020–21 which would be broadly in line with world average.

During the fifth year of the XII Plan, the UGC has undertaken a number of new initiatives with a view to ensuring excellence and equity driven expansion of higher education. It highlighted the need for a strong current and comprehensive data for evidence-based policy making and effective planning. Therefore, in order to get timely and quality data in the education sector, which is having implications for human development, the Ministry of Human Resource Development initiated an All India Survey of Higher Education in 2011 to build a database and to assess the overall picture of Higher Education in the country. The survey was utmost necessary as none of the source of data on Higher education was giving complete picture of higher education in the country. The entire survey was conducted through electronic mode and a dedicated portal *http://aishe.gov.in* was developed for the purpose, thus making the exercise completely paperless. The survey intended to cover all the Institutions in the country engaged in imparting the higher education. Data is being collected on several parameters such as teachers, student enrolment, programmes, examination results, education finance, infrastructure etc. Indicators of educational development such as Institution Density, Gross Enrolment Ratio, Pupil Teacher Ratio, Gender Parity Index etc. are calculated from the data collected through AISHE. These are useful in making informed policy decisions and research for development of education sector. The survey is being conducted on annual basis. (AISHE, 2016)

The country has Institutions which have completed 100 years of their existence and have contributed tremendously not only in the field of higher education but also have been maintaining the cultural, social and moral fabric of the long history of our country. The UGC recognize and reward such heritage institutions so as to enable them to continue to inspire our younger generation and inculcate in them the true value of

education. During the XII Plan a Grant of 9.11 Crore was released to 13 Colleges under the Scheme of "Granting Special Heritage to colleges". (UGC Report 2016-2017)

During the Twelfth Five Year Plan, Rashtriya Uchchatar Shiksha Abhiyan (RUSA) seeks to achieve equity, access and excellence in State Higher Educational Institutions. The overall quality of existing State higher educational institutions is sought to be improved by ensuring their conformity to prescribed norms and standards and adoption of accreditation as a mandatory quality assurance framework. Academic, administrative and governance reforms are an essential element of RUSA. Besides these, many progressive steps are also taken in 12th, 13th and 14th Five Year Plans respectively. It has accelerated to the target and helped to produce one-fourth of all graduates in the World by the system. India, thus, becomes the single largest benefactor of global talent and it seems to have indeed entered a golden age for higher education. (Vision, 2030).

1.4. Growth in Number of Higher Educational Institutions

India now possesses a large higher education system which offers facility of education and training in almost all aspects of human creation and intellectual endeavors. India's higher education system is the third largest in the world after China and United States in terms of enrolment. (Gupta and Gupta, 2012) At the beginning of India's independence, there were 20 universities and 591 colleges with 2.1 lakhs students in higher education. The numbers now have increased 47.9 times in the case of the Degree awarding Universities, 82.02 times in the case of Colleges and the students enrolment has gone up to over 174.49 times in the system of higher education in comparison to the figures at the time of Independence. The phenomenal increase in enrolment of this order would not have been possible without the growth in the number of institutions of higher learning, both universities and colleges in particular and increase in intake capacity of courses. The number of Universities has grown from 27 in 1950-51 to 621 in 2010-11 and further to 993 in 2018-19. The increase is more than 80 times in the case of Colleges and the student enrolment has gone up to more than 140 times in the

formal system of higher education in comparison to the figures at the time of independence. The growth in the number of Private Universities established during the last Eight years is unprecedented. As on 31st March, 2018, there were 383 State Public and 295 State Private Universities set up under laws enacted by the legislatures of various states. Out of the total 295 State Private Universities, 228 Private Universities have been established after the year 2010. UGC Report 2016-2017 shows that growth of Higher Education since 1950-51 in terms of degree awarding Universities/Institutions registered 30 fold increase, number of colleges had 60.49 fold increase, students enrolment had 74.12 fold increase and teacher's strength had 61.25 fold increase as observed during 2016-17.

Increase in higher education capacity during the 11th Plan was largely achieved through the setting up of new institutions by Central and State Governments and the private sector. The number of institutions grew by 58 per cent from 29,384 to 46,430. The report of AISHE 2019 shows that the number of Universities and similar Institutions has increased from 760 in 2014-15 to 993 in 2018-19 by almost 30.7% and the number of colleges has increased from 38498 in 2014-15 to 39,931 in 2018-19 by about 3.7%. As many as 903 new colleges were established in various states during 2016-2017, thus taking the total number of colleges from 41435 in 2015-16 to 42338 in 2016-2017.

The enrolment has grown considerably during the last 5 years, which has increased from 3,42,11,673 in 2014-15 to 3,73,99,388 in 2018-19. This shows that the overall growth is 9.3% and the Compound Annual Growth Rate (CAGR) is 1.8 during the last 5 years. The growth in female enrolment is more as compared to male enrolment. Per 100 male students, number of female students has increased from 85 in 2014-15 to 95 in 2018-19. Gross Enrolment Ratio (GER) has increased during the last 5 years, from 20.8 in 2011- 12 to 24.5 in 2015-16 and further 25.8 in 2017-2018 to 26.3% in 2018-2019. The increase is more under SC category which has increased from 19.9 in 2015-16 to 23% in 2018-2019. In case of ST category, the GER has increased from 14.2

to 17.2% during the period. There is an increase in number of students enrollment at all levels.

According to AISHE Report 2018-2019, out of the total enrolment of 3,73,99,388 students, a vast majority of 2,98,29,075 students are enrolled in Under Graduate. This shows that the number of student enrollment is highest at the Under Graduate level across India. About 79.8% of the students are enrolled in Undergraduate level programme. Maximum numbers of Students are enrolled in B.A. programme having 93.49 lakh students enrolled in it 9860520 followed by B.Sc. having 46.80 lakh students enrolled and there are 40.30 lakh students enrolled under B.Com programmes. Similar situation could be observed in States/ UTs.

Table 1.3: Gross Enrolment Ratio in Higher Education, India during last 8 years

Year	SC			ST			ALL		
	M	**F**	**Total**	**M**	**F**	**Total**	**M**	**F**	**Total**
2011-12	15.8	13.9	14.9	12.4	9.7	11.0	22.1	19.4	20.8
2012-13	16.9	15.0	16.0	12.4	9.8	11.1	22.7	20.1	21.5
2013-14	17.7	16.4	17.1	12.5	10.2	11.3	23.9	22.0	23.0
2014-15	20.0	18.2	19.1	12.3	15.2	13.7	23.2	25.3	24.3
2015-16	19.0	20.8	19.9	12.9	15.6	14.2	23.5	25.4	24.5
2016-17	21.8	21.8	21.1	14.2	16.7	15.4	24.5	26.0	25.2
2017-18	21.4	22.2	21.8	14.9	17.0	15.9	26.3	25.4	25.8
2018-19	23.3	22.7	23.0	16.5	17.9	17.2	26.3	26.4	26.3

(Source-AISHE-2018-19, MHRD, Government of India)

There is also an increase in Gender Parity Index (GPI) for all the categories during the last 5 years and has increased from 0.92 in 2014-15 to 1 in 2018-19. The Gender Parity Index (GPI) as of AISHE 2018-2019 shows that Female participation in Higher Education for All Categories is 100 per 100 male and for Scheduled Casts (SCs) and Scheduled Tribes (STs) it is 102 and 92 per 100 males respectively.

The total number of teachers are increasing from 12,47,453 in 2010-11 to 14,16,299 in 2018-19 out of which 57.85% are male teachers and 42.15% are female teachers. Pupil Teacher Ratio (PTR) in Universities and Colleges is 29 if regular mode enrolment is considered whereas PTR for Universities and its Constituent Units is 18 for regular mode as compared to 22 and 15 in 2014-2015 respectively.

1.5. Colleges under section 2(f) & 12B of the UGC Act 1956

The UGC had notified Regulations for recognition of colleges under Section 2(f) of the UGC Act, 1956. The colleges are brought under the purview of UGC in terms of these Regulations as and when the proposals are received from the colleges for inclusion under the section 2(f) and they are found fit for inclusion as per the provisions contained in the Regulations. Apart from inclusion of colleges under Section 2(f), the UGC includes the Colleges under Section 12(B) of its Act in terms of Rules framed under the Act. This makes the colleges eligible for central assistance from the Government of India or any organization receiving funds from the Central Government. All the schemes/programmes relating to the college sector are being implemented through the UGC Regional Offices located at Hyderabad, Pune, Bhopal, Kolkata, Guwahati, Delhi and Bangalore. According to the report of UGC 2017-2018, 23 State Public Universities and 34 State Private Universities and one Institution Deemed to be University were included in the UGC list of universities during the reporting year 2017-2018.15 State Public Universities, 7 Deemed Universities and 2 State Private Universities were declared fit to receive Central Assistance under Section 12B of the UGC Act 1956 while there are 15 State Public and 27 State Private Universities and 4 State Public

Universities, 4 Deemed Universities and One State Private University which were declared fit to receive Central Assistance under Section 12B of the UGC Act 1956.

The focus of Development Assistance to colleges has been on supporting the teaching – learning process by upgrading basic infrastructure. Emphasis has been on the expansion and consolidation of facilities in the existing institutions, improvement of standards through modernization, rationalization and diversification of UG courses especially to relate them to career opportunities. Setting up new colleges in educationally backward areas where adequate facilities do not exist, is also one of the priorities of the Commission. As on 31st March, 2018, there were 41012 colleges (Affiliated -37977, Constituent-1550, PG/Off Campus Centres-187, Recognized Centres-1298) in the country. Out of these, at the end of the financial year 2017-2018, the total number of colleges recognized under Section 2(f) of the UGC Act, 1956 was 11515, constituting 28.08% of the total number of colleges. Out of 11515 colleges 2153 colleges were under Section 2 (f) and only 9362 colleges were eligible to receive grants from the UGC under Section 12B of the UGC Act as compared to 10966 in the previous year (1973 colleges under section 2 (f) and 8993 under section 12B). During the year 2017-18, Regional Offices released a total Grant of 32.49 crore to 401 beneficiaries (colleges) under the scheme of Development Assistance to Colleges. During 1.04.2012 to 31.03.2018 as many as 5840 eligible colleges were assisted to the extent of 783.90 crores under the College Development schemes. (UGC Report 2017-2018).

1.6. Present Scenario of Higher Education in North-East India

Quality Higher Education has proved to be the major tool for socio-economic development particularly for developing nations. Quality higher education enables empowerment by overcoming the limitations of physical resources. In a country with enormous diversity, the North Eastern region comprising seven states viz. Assam, Arunachal Pradesh, Manipur, Meghalaya, Mizoram, Nagaland and Tripura, is an important geographical entity. This region’s development is impeded by certain inherent

difficulties such as inadequate infrastructure, adverse climatic conditions and mountainous landscape. (NAAC, 2004) These states have experienced a comparatively slower pace of industrialization and socio economic growth. The region is also characterized by widespread poverty, low per capita income, high unemployment and low agricultural productivity leading to food insecurity. However, the region is blessed with rich biodiversity and abundant natural resources for industrial and social development. The literacy rate in many of these states is above the rest of the country though they have not been fully utilized to their potential. It is needless to mention that quality higher education is prerequisite for creation and development of skilled human resources so as to improve the economic progress of the region.

There were only 15 colleges in the North East Region before independence. The first college in this region was Cotton College which was established in Guwahati (Assam) on 27th May, 1901 followed by St.Edmund's college which was established in Shillong (Meghalaya) in 1924. There was no university in this region before independence so all the colleges were affiliated to Calcutta University. After Independence, the North East India witnessed perceptible change in the educational field. Number of higher education institutions has been increased rapidly. The first University in North East India was Guwahati University and was established in 1948. A Central University which is called North Eastern Hill University (NEHU) was established in Shillong, Meghalaya on19th July, 1973 by an act of the Indian Parliament. Number of colleges has been established extensively in different states of the North East India after Independence.

According to AISHE 2018- 2019, there are 10 Central University, 12 Institute of National Importance, 13 State University, 31 Private University, 1 Deemed University and 906 Colleges in North East region. Number of higher education institutions in North-east India is 1150 in which there are 67 universities, 906 colleges and 177 Stand Alone. Assam has the highest number of 644 higher educational institutions among the northeastern states. It was followed by Manipur and Meghalaya with 119 and 93 higher

educational institutions respectively. Nagaland has 88 higher educational institutes which is followed by, Tripura, Arunachal Pradesh, Mizoram with 65, 58, 50 and 33 higher educational institutions respectively and Sikkim has the lowest number of higher educational institution with 33 higher educational institutions respectively.

Table 1.4: State wise number of Universities and Colleges in North East India

Sl.No.	Name of State	University	College	Stand alone	Total
1.	Arunachal Pradesh	10	37	11	**58**
2.	Assam	22	544	78	**644**
3.	Manipur	6	92	21	**119**
4.	Meghalaya	10	63	20	**93**
5.	Mizoram	3	32	15	**50**
6.	Nagaland	5	67	16	**88**
7.	Sikkim	7	19	7	**33**
8.	Tripura	4	52	9	**65**
	TOTAL	**67**	**906**	**177**	**1150**

(Source: AISHE 2018-19, MHRD, Government of India)

Gross Enrolment Ratio in Northeastern States has increased from 18.32 of which 18.81 male and 17.81 female in 2011-2012 to 28.17 of which 28.22 male and 28.13 female in 2018-2019.It is observed from the AISHE Report 2018-2019 that among the Northeastern States, Sikkim has the highest Gross Enrollment Ratio with 53.9 while Assam and Nagaland has the least with only 18.7. The Pupil Teacher Ratio in higher education for all the northeastern states is 25.87 wherein Tripura has the highest PTR with 33 and Mizoram has the lowest PTR with only 18 among the states in North-east India. The Gender Parity Index (GPI) is 1. It is reported that a total of 538 colleges are under Section 2(f) and 12B of the UGC Act 1956.

Table 1.5: State-wise No. of Teachers, PTR and GER in Higher Education in North-East India.

States	**No. of teachers in Higher education institutes**	**Pupil Teacher Ratio in higher education institutes**	**GER in higher education**
Arunachal Pradesh	1504	31	29.7
Assam	22849	31	18.7
Manipur	5035	22	33.7
Meghalaya	3312	26	25.8
Mizoram	1868	18	25.7
Nagaland	2379	19	18.7
Sikkim	1564	27	53.9
Tripura	2494	33	19.2
Total	41005	207	28.17

(Source: AISHE 2018-2019, MHRD, Government of India)

At present, there are 67 Universities and 906 Colleges in North Eastern States as compared to 41 Universities and 787 colleges in 2011-12.Asof 2018-2019, Assam has the highest number of Colleges among the Northeastern states having 544 colleges followed by Manipur having 92 Colleges and Sikkim has the lowest number of Colleges with only 19 colleges followed by Mizoram with 32 colleges. Based on actual response of AISHE 2018-2019, number of enrolment in private colleges is 88324 while Number of enrolment in government colleges is 680975. So the total number of total enrolment in colleges is 769299.

Table 1.6: Enrolment in Private and Government Colleges in North East India (based on actual response of AISHE 2018-2019).

State	Private College	Government College	Total
Arunachal Pradesh	4950	14899	19849
Assam	23050	487601	510651
Manipur	27078	67482	94560
Meghalaya	27381	25601	52982
Mizoram	366	18941	19307
Nagaland	22389	10411	32800
Sikkim	1142	10875	12017
Tripura	4357	55576	59933
Total	**88324**	**680975**	**769299**

The progress of higher education in North East India is quite satisfactory from the statistical point of view but in the quality perspective the performance need improvement like other regions of India. Since its inception NAAC has been striving hard to inculcate the culture for continuous quality enhancement through the process of Assessment and Accreditation as quality and excellence in higher education are the major pursuits of NAAC. As regards the rate of accreditation, the North East presents a satisfactory picture. So far majority of the universities have been accredited and 538 out of 906 UGC recognized colleges (Under section 2(f) & 12(B) of UGC Act) have been accredited as of 2018. Despite some limitations, the colleges and Universities in North East have volunteered for accreditation by NAAC in a big way. (NAAC, 2004)

Table 1.7: State wise number of Colleges and Universities in North East India accredited by NAAC (as on 11/03/2020).

State	Universities	Colleges	Total
Arunachal Pradesh	3	7	**10**
Assam	6	208	**214**
Manipur	1	27	**28**
Meghalaya	1	19	**20**
Mizoram	1	24	**25**
Nagaland	1	27	**28**
Sikkim	2	8	**10**
Tripura	2	18	**20**
Total	**17**	**338**	**355**

(Source: naac.gov.in)

1.7. Present Scenario of Higher Education in Mizoram

Mizoram is one of the mountainous states of India with Aizawl as its capital. It has a total area of approximately 21,081 sq. km. It shares international boundary with Myanmar in the south and east, and Bangladesh in the west, it is also bounded in the west by Tripura and in the north by the states of Assam and Manipur. Thus, Mizoram occupies an area of great strategic importance in the north eastern corner of India. According to the Census 2011, the total population of Mizoram is 10,91,014 having the highest concentration of tribal people among all states in India. The major language spoken by the people of Mizoram is 'Lushai' (Duhlian), commonly known as 'Mizo'. For the past three decades, Mizoram has been one of the most peaceful states in the North East.

In 1895, Mizoram known earlier as 'Lushai Hills' became part of British India. Formal system of education was not existed in Mizoram before the advent of British.

Thus, the development of education in Mizoram got its initiation under the British rule particularly with the initiation and guidance of the two Christian missionaries from Great Britain. Since the attainment of statehood, Mizoram has displayed remarkable performance, with an increase in literacy from 59.90 percent in 1981 to 91.3% in 2011.Mizoram ranks second after Kerala in terms of literacy rate, as per the Census of 2011.

As far as higher education is concerned, the first college in Mizoram was opened in Aizawl on 15th August 1958 as a purely private enterprise eleventh years after independence. Later, in 1964, the second college in Mizoram was established at Lunglei. Among the colleges of Mizoram, Pachhunga University College became the first college to have science stream which was started in 1973 – 74 sessions. The first and the only Central University was opened in 2001 and is named Mizoram University.

At present, the total number of all higher education institutions in the state is 50 out of which there are 3 Universities, 32 colleges and 15 stand alone institutions. According to AISHE 2018-2019, the total number of colleges has increased from 29 in 2011-2012 to 32 in 2018-2019. There is only 1 constituent college of Mizoram University, i.e., Pachhunga University College. The Institute of Advanced Study in Education (IASE) and Hindi Training College (HTC) are the only two training institutes in the state. There is only one law college i.e. Mizoram Law College, which is offering three year LLB degree. There is a constituent college of Veterinary Sciences and Animal Husbandry of the Central Agricultural University, Imphal. Besides these, Mizoram has two polytechnic institutes at Lunglei and Aizawl. These two institutes are however, affiliated to all India Council of Technical Education, New Delhi. There are 27 Colleges under Section 2(f) and 12B of the UGC Act 1956 and 2 Colleges under Section 2(f).

Total number of students enrolled in colleges under regular mode is 19863, 10794 male and 9069 female. Based on actual response of AISHE 2018-2019, number of enrolment in private colleges is 366, 18941 in government colleges and the total number of enrolment in colleges is 19307.Gross Enrolment Ratio in Mizoram has

increased from 17.5 of which 15.3 male and 19.8 female in 2010-2011 to 25.7 of which 26.5 male and 24.8 female in 2018-2019. Number of student enrolment in general degree colleges of undergraduate level increased from 5201 to 19863 during the period 2000-01 to 2018-19. The pupil teacher ratio in higher education in Mizoram is 18 and the Gender Parity Index (GPI) is 0.94. As far as quality is concerned, there are 24 colleges and 1 University which were accredited so far by NAAC as on March, 2020. Out of 21 government colleges offering general education, only 19 of them have been so far assessed and accredited. Out of the 19 colleges, 2nd Cycle assessment of 11 colleges and 3rd cycle assessment of 1 college has also been completed and accredited. In assessment of both the cycles, the overall grades of the colleges fell within the ranges of C, C+, C++ to B, B++. As of today, there are only 17 colleges whose accreditation period is valid as shown in the table given below.

Table 1.8: List of Colleges in Mizoram accredited by NAAC whose accreditation period is valid.

Sl.No.	Name of the College	Institutional CGPA	Grade	Accreditation valid up to
1	Government Hnahthial College (Second Cycle)	1.86	C	18-01-21
2	Government J. Buana College (Second Cycle)	1.85	C	14-11-20
3	Government Zirtiri Residential Science College (Second Cycle)	2.75	B	24-05-21
4	Institute of Advanced Study in Education (First Cycle)	2.87	B	13-09-20
5	Government Aizawl College (Third Cycle)	2.55	B+	04-11-21
6	Government Champai College (Second Cycle)	2.78	B++	15-09-21

7	Government Mamit College (First Cycle)	2.08	B	04-11-21
8	Government Serchhip College (Second Cycle)	2.51	B+	15-09-21
9	Government Zawlnuam College (First Cycle)	1.63	C	15-09-21
10	J. Thankima College (Second Cycle)	1.78	C	15-09-21
11	Lunglei Government College (Second Cycle)	2.76	B++	27-03-22
12	Pachhunga University College (Second Cycle)	3.51	A+	04-11-21
13	Government Aizawl West College (Third Cycle)	2.57	B+	08-06-22
14	Government Hrangbana College (Third Cycle)	2.76	B++	25-09-23
15	Govt. Mizoram Law College (First Cycle)	1.97	C	07-02-24
16	Govt. Aizawl North College (Second Cycle)	1.99	C	27-03-24
17	Govt. Kolasib College (Second Cycle)	2.07	B	17-10-24

1.8. Concept and Issues of Quality in Higher Education

The term quality has received increasing attention in the last twenty years in higher education. Quality assessment as a mechanism of quality improvement in higher education has spread all over the world over a period of time. The quality is an industrial term commonly used to refer the degree of excellence and standard of products or goods and commodities set by the producers and manufacturers to satisfy the customer needs

and thus, to stay in business. The traditional concept of quality is associated with the idea of providing a product or service that is distinctive and special, and which confers status on the owner or user. (Pfeiffer and Coote, 1991).

The meaning of quality has been explained in relation to its dictionary meaning by various renowned authors, who are pioneers in establishing quality systems. According to Oxford Dictionary, Quality is degree, especially high degree of goodness or worth, while Webster's Dictionary defines it as Grade of Excellence. Bureau of Indian Standards, 1988 defines quality as "the totality of features and characteristics of a product or service that bear on its ability to satisfy stated or implied needs." Broadly, quality means fitness for purpose, value for money, satisfaction of the customers and conformity to standards pre-determined by an organization. As far as higher education is concerned, students are customers and staff members are producers and, education is the product or service provided by them. Green and Harvey (1993) have identified five different approaches to the viewing of quality in the field of higher education. According to them, quality may be viewed as in terms of the exceptional (highest standard), in terms of consistency (without defects and getting it right the first time), as fitness for purpose, as value for money and as a transformative process (transformation of the participants). The quality can be defined as that which best satisfies and exceeds customers' needs and wants. This is sometimes called 'quality in perception'. The quality can be said to lie in the eyes of the beholder. This is a very important and powerful definition, and one that any institution ignores at its peril. It is the consumers who make the judgement on quality, which they do by reference to the best comparable performer. Some educational economists argue that quality as defined by the customer is more important than price in determining the demand for a majority of goods and services. They expect that customers will always pay more for the best quality, regardless of the type of product. Hence, it is realized that the customers are the predominant players in the case of quality. However, the term quality cannot be the same and standard at every place, because we cannot expect the quality of education in the rural side colleges as provided in the Indian Institutes of Technology (IITs). Anyhow, it must fulfill the basic

criteria of quality higher education as they can provide. The quality education therefore, must be locally relevant and culturally appropriate (Kumar, 2008).

After independence India made various efforts to improve higher education system. Higher education in India is passing through a phase of unprecedented expansion, marked by an explosion in the volume of students, a substantial expansion in the number of institutions and a quantum jump in the level of public funding. The expansion of higher education system in India has been chaotic and unplanned. The drive to make higher education socially inclusive has led to a sudden and dramatic increase in the numbers of institutions without a proportionate increase in material and intellectual resources. As a result, academic standards have been jeopardized (Béteille, 2005). Therefore, higher education in India suffers from several systemic deficiencies. As a result, it continues to provide graduates that are unemployable despite emerging shortages of skilled manpower in an increasing number of sectors. The standards of academic research are low and declining. Some of the problems of the Indian higher education, such as the unwieldy affiliating system, inflexible academic structure, uneven capacity across various subjects, eroding autonomy of academic institutions and the low level of public funding are well known. Many other concerns relating to the dysfunctional regulatory environment, the accreditation system that has low coverage and no consequences, absence of incentives for performing well and the unjust public funding policies are not well recognized (Agarwal, 2006).

Since independence in 1947, there have been larger investments in higher education. There are serious problems which relates to the development of the tertiary education in India. India's standards of higher education compare unfavourably with the average standards in educationally advanced countries. India currently produces a solid core of knowledge workers in tertiary and scientific and technical education, although the country needs to do more to create a larger cadre of educated and agile workers who can adapt and use knowledge. Measures are also needed to enhance the quality and relevance of higher education so that the education system is more demand driven,

quality conscious and forward looking, especially to retain highly qualified people and to match the skills of a graduate or post graduate produced by our colleges and universities with the needs and expectations of the job market as well as to meet the new and emerging needs of the economy.

Therefore today's competitive environment demands better quality of education. Only those candidates who can get quality education on a continuous basis shall be in a position to compete in the global market. Therefore, improving the quality of higher education has become a primary concern of countries all over the world. It is said that, the quality of a nation depends upon the quality of its citizens, which in turn, depends on the quality of education. These words are true especially in the case of higher education. In order to compete in the global market, it is necessary to bring about qualitative improvement in the system of our higher education. To augment the quality of higher education, institutions need huge amount of funds to improve the quality of academic and physical infrastructure, modernizing the laboratory and class rooms, updating the stock of books, journals and reference materials, payment of salaries of teaching and non-teaching staff and so on. But the amount of resources allotted to the institutions should be proportionate to the quality of output. Hence, there has to be a mechanism to measure and maintain the quality of higher education on continuous basis. (Kalirajan, 2010)

1.9. Recent Measures for promotion of quality in higher education

As the aim of higher education is to realize the national goals, through the social, economic and cultural transformation, the quality of education has great importance and becomes the primary concern of all the stakeholders in education. Higher education in India has expanded very rapidly in the last five and half decades after Independence, and has emerged probably as one of the largest education system in the world. Although the increase in the number of higher education institutions and student enrolment seems to be impressive, it is no different from the experience of other nations. Quantitative

expansion resulted in the increase in expenditure on higher education and the expansion of higher education had led to deterioration of quality of higher education. Growth in numbers has thus caused concern about quality-related issues. With the number of new institutions of higher education rising each year, and with the rapid expansion of knowledge and the unprecedented scientific and technological progress world over, quality in education has become essential to attain sustainable development and standard of higher education. Therefore, quality has become the defining element of higher education in the 21st Century.

Various committees and commissions on education over the years have emphasized directly or indirectly the need for improvement and recognition of quality in Indian higher education system. The 11th plan also recognized this issue of quality, thus, it had brought a sharp focus on the promotion of quality and excellence. The Plan included a number of initiatives such as, improvement in physical infrastructure, expansion of adequate and quality faculty, and academic reforms and governance in Universities and colleges with respect to admission procedure, teaching, examination and other academic aspects. In an environment of global competitiveness unless the quality and standard of Indian higher education institutions is enhanced zealously and sustained at a high level through innovation, creativity and regular monitoring, it seems to be difficult for the Indian academics/professionals to compete in the World scene. (UGC, 2003). Thus, a focus on quality, access and relevance of higher education to achieve the required social transformation for sustainable economic development of the country has been the national priority. The University Grants Commission (UGC) with its statutory powers is expected to maintain quality in Indian higher education institutions. Section 12 of the UGC Act of 1956 requires UGC to be responsible for "the determination and maintenance of standards of teaching, examinations and research in universities". To fulfill this mandate, the UGC has been continuously developing mechanisms to monitor quality in colleges and universities directly or indirectly. In order to improve quality, it has established national research facilities, and Academic Staff Colleges to re-orient teachers and provide refresher courses in subject areas. The

UGC also conducts the National Eligibility Test (NET) for setting high standards of teaching.

Suitable assessment and accreditation in the higher education, through transparent and informed external review process, are the effective means of quality assurance in higher education to provide a common frame of reference for students and others to obtain credible information on academic quality across institutions thereby assisting student mobility across institutions, domestic as well as international. Thus, qualitative improvement in higher education, to realize the desired dimensions of human resource development necessitated the establishment of the premier Quality Assurance Agency – NAAC – by the UGC in 1994, to assess and accredit the country's HEIs, and as a measure of quality assurance in order to enhance standards of higher education. Like NAAC (which is responsible for colleges and universities), there are other statutory bodies in India to assure quality in professional education. Some of these are: All India Council for Technical Education (AICTE), National Council for Teacher Education (NCTE), Medical Council of India (MCI), Indian Nursing Council (INC), Bar Council of India (BCI), Rehabilitation Council of India (RCI),Distance Education Council (DEC),Indian Council for Agricultural Research (ICAR). The AICTE established the National Board of Accreditation (NBA) in 1994 to accredit programmes offered by technical institutions. The NBA accredits programmes and it is a voluntary process like that of NAAC. Other professional statutory bodies mostly undertake review exercises to recognize or de-recognize the institutions on the basis of their quality audit. Thus, quality issue is on the top of the agenda of Indian higher education.(NAAC, 2006).According to UGC Annual Report 2017-2018, 999 Higher Education Institutions (959 Colleges and 40 Universities) were assessed and accredited during the reported period. Out of the 40 Central Universities which are funded by UGC, 35 Central Universities have obtained the NAAC accreditation. 2 Central University had obtained the accreditation earlier, but accreditation period was over and had applied for re-accreditation. 2 central universities have applied first time for accreditation, 1 central university is newly established and not eligible for accreditation. So far, the total number

of accreditations by NAAC is 11882 and total number of Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) which have been accredited is 7725.

Recognizing the importance of standards of the Higher education institution UGC has taken a policy decision to direct all colleges to establish IQAC for which it has decided to provide 3.00 lakhs as seed money to each college to meet the expenditure establishment and strengthening of the IQAC. During the XII Plan the Regional Offices released a grant of 139.16 Crore to 4690 beneficiaries (Colleges) under the Scheme of establishment of Internal Quality Assurance Cells (IQAC). During 1.04.2012 to 31.03.2018 Regional Offices released a grant of 139.16 crore to 4690 Beneficiaries (Colleges) under the Scheme of IQAC for Colleges. In order to achieve excellence in teaching and research, the UGC has been assisting 16 identified universities for granting the status of 'University with Potential for Excellence' (UPE). During 2017-18, an amount of 55.64 crore was released to the universities. As on 31st March, 2018, 29 Centres with Potential for Excellence in Particular Areas (CPEPA) from different universities were supported under the scheme. An amount of 12.43 crore was released to the Centers during 2017-18. To achieve excellence mainly in teaching and to initiate a research culture in colleges, the UGC has initiated a scheme "College with Potential for Excellence" (CPE). Presently 295 colleges are enjoying the CPE status and 19 colleges are enjoying the College of Excellence (CE) status. During 2017-18, 314 colleges are under CPE. An amount of 88.71 crore was released to colleges during 2017-18. The Commission during the year 2001 introduced a New Scheme "Establishment of New Centres/ Institute of Excellence" in studies and Research on various inter-disciplinary areas. To provide academic freedom for potential colleges which are recognized under section 2(f) and 12B of the UGC Act, the UGC has been conferring autonomous status on them. Up to 31.03.2018, autonomous status had been given to 635 colleges spread over 105 universities of 25 states. During 2017-18, the UGC Regional Offices released grants to the extent of 21.24 crores to 182 Autonomous Colleges. A comprehensive programme for professional development of teachers through Human Resource Development Centers (HRDC) & Regional Centre of Capacity Building (RCCB),

(Academic Staff Colleges ASC) had been carried out in different disciplines. Grant of 64.05 crore had been sanctioned to these Centers functioning in various universities. During 2017-18 approx. 25000 Teachers participated in the the programmes / courses conducted by 66 UGC HRDCs. Moreover, the Institutions which have completed 100 years of their existence and have contributed tremendously not only in the field of higher education but also maintaining the cultural, social and moral fabric of the long history of our country, UGC recognize and reward such heritage institutions so as to enable them to continue to inspire our younger generation the true value of education. During 1.04.2012 to 31.03.2018 a grant of10.19 crore was released to 17 Colleges under the Scheme "Granting Special Heritage to colleges"(UGC Annual Report, 2018). NAAC also introduced a new initiative which is the "National Quality Renaissance Initiative (NQRI)" under Rashtriya Ucchatar Shiksha Abhiyan (RUSA). University-wise and State-wise Colleges popularization programmes are being organized by the NAAC. (UGC Report 2016-2017).The University Grants Commission (UGC) has launched number of initiatives to uplift the quality and standards of higher education in India. It has formulated Guidelines on Adoption of Choice Based Credit System on 12th November, 2014. It has also laid down several regulations for setting minimum standards of higher education in the country. The UGC is also implementing several numbers of schemes for providing quality skill development in the Universities and Colleges in the country.

However, the Indian higher educational institutions also suffer from large quality variation. There is also an element of intra- state differences within the states in addition to general issues about the quality of infrastructure, teaching and learning in state universities as compared to central universities, this leads to better institutions developing in urban or industrial areas and consequent neglect of rural and tribal areas. At the state level, there is a lack of vision and planning for the development of institutions and the higher education sector. Delivery of quality higher education has become a severe shortcoming in governance with several issues posing an overwhelming challenge. The Ministry of Human Resource Development (MHRD), therefore, launched

an umbrella scheme of Rashtriya Uchchatar Shiksha Abhiyan (RUSA) in 2013 as a flagship program of 12th Plan for reforming the State Higher Education System in India.

The National Institutional Ranking Framework (NIRF) was evolved during 2014-15 by a 16-member Core Committee, appointed by the Ministry of Human Resource Development, under the chairmanship of Secretary (HE). Rankings were for the first time, announced for Universities and for the specific disciplines of Engineering, Management and Pharmacy in 2016. And also for the first time, the common overall ranking, and ranking of General Degree Colleges was introduced in 2017 in addition to the rankings the previous year. NIRF India Rankings use objective criteria and metrics and are based on extensive factual data gathered from third party sources and from the institutions themselves. India Ranking continues with the consolidation process and establishes the NIRF parameters as effective benchmarks of performance for the Indian academic institutions in the Higher Education space. India Rankings have been playing a vital role in identifying top universities and institutions in areas like Engineering, Management, Pharmacy and General Degree Colleges. One of the major outcomes of India rankings is that institutions are getting into the good habit of compiling vital statistics of their institutions - about their faculty, staff and infrastructure - more carefully and meticulously. This can only bode well for the institutions, especially for assessing themselves against internal benchmarks. At the national level, the data can serve as very useful as basis for analysis of the status of Higher Education Institutions in the country. First, it may be noted that the NIRF system actually produces a panoramic view of institutions – as the rank is based on 5 major parameters and some 20 sub-parameters. A 5- dimensional view across the 5 main parameters gives a good feel for the relative strengths of the institution in teaching and learning ambience, research and industry linkages, graduation outcomes, outreach and inclusivity and perception by peers. Subrahmanyam, R., said that "NIRF is a report card of the higher educational institutions to the Nation. The metrics capture the performance of each institution in an objective manner. As such participation in India Rankings shall be mandatory, especially for those which are funded by public funds.” Prakash Javadekar, the former HRD

Minister also said "The educational institutions performing well in the India Rankings will be awarded with more funding or grants, enhanced autonomy and freedom of functioning and various other benefits"**.** (NIRF, 2018)

1.10. Rashtriya Uchchatar Shiksha Abhiyan (RUSA)

Rashtriya Uchchatar Shiksha Abhiyan (National Higher Education Mission) or RUSA is a holistic centrally sponsored scheme, launched in 2013 to revamp the higher education sector in the country. It aims at providing strategic funding to eligible state higher educational institutions for the development of higher education at the state level and enhancement of allocations for the State Universities & Colleges steered by the Ministry of Human Resource and Development. The scheme would be spread over the two plan periods (XII and XIII), and the central funding (in the ratio of 65:35 for general category States and 90:10 for special category states) would be norm based and outcome dependent. The funding would flow from the central ministry through the state governments/union territories to the State Higher Education Councils before reaching the identified institutions. The funding to states would be made on the basis of critical appraisal of State Higher Education Plans, which would describe each state's strategy to address issues of equity, access and excellence in higher education.

Objectives

The salient objectives of RUSA are to;

- Improve the overall quality of state institutions by ensuring conformity to prescribed norms and standards and adopt accreditation as a mandatory quality assurance framework.
- Usher transformative reforms in the state higher education system by creating a facilitating institutional structure for planning and monitoring at the state level, promoting autonomy in State Universities and improving governance in institutions.
- Ensure reforms in the affiliation, academic and examination systems.

- Ensure adequate availability of quality faculty in all higher educational institutions and ensure capacity building at all levels of employment.
- Create an enabling atmosphere in the higher educational institutions to devote themselves to research and innovations.
- Expand the institutional base by creating additional capacity in existing institutions and establishing new institutions, in order to achieve enrolment targets.
- Correct regional imbalances in access to higher education by setting up institutions in un-served & underserved areas.
- Improve equity in higher education by providing adequate opportunities of higher education to SC/STs and socially and educationally backward classes; promote inclusion of women, minorities, and differently-abled persons.
- Identify and fill up the critical infrastructure gaps in higher education by augmenting and supporting the efforts of the State governments.
- Promote healthy competition amongst states and institutions to address various concerns regarding quality, research and innovation.

Salient Features of RUSA 2.0

1. ***Coverage***: The scheme covers only the Government and Government aided State Higher Education institutions. Open universities and Institutions offering Medical, Agriculture, Vet nary, etc. disciplines are not covered under the ambit of RUSA. Also, uni-disciplinary institutions are given low priority under RUSA.

2. ***Prerequisites***: In order to be eligible for funding under RUSA, States have to fulfil certain prerequisites, which include the academic, administrative and governance reforms. The prerequisites are at two levels: commitments given by institutions to the States and commitments given by States to Center. Unless these commitments are fulfilled, the States and institutions are not able to avail of grants under RUSA.

3. ***Bottom-up Approach***: RUSA follows a "bottom-up" approach for planning and budgeting to address multiple and graded inequalities and promote need-based planning. States are encouraged to undertake strategic thinking and planning keeping future needs

of the higher education in mind. Both demand side and supply side challenges are required to be addressed by the SHEPs.

4. *Subsuming existing schemes*: Two Centrally Sponsored Schemes of Model Degree Colleges and the Sub-mission on Polytechnics were subsumed under RUSA in the first phase. University Grants Commission (UGC) Schemes such as development grants for State universities and colleges, one-time catch up grants, etc. are dovetailed in RUSA. However, Individual oriented schemes (for teachers, students etc) would continue to be handled by UGC. During the second phase of RUSA, the scheme on University with Potential for Excellence and Colleges with Potential for Excellence, administered by UGC have now been subsumed under RUSA 2.0, as Enhancing Quality and Excellence in select State Universities and Enhancing Quality and Excellence in select Autonomous Colleges.

5. *Preparatory Grants* (under Institutional restructuring, Capacity Building and Reform): Under the scheme, a preparatory amount is provided to the State Government to enable them to create/ strengthen necessary institutional framework for complying with the appropriate requirements and -commitments under RUSA. These funds can be utilized for setting up/ strengthening the SHECs, State Project Directorate and State Resource Centre; and undertake baseline surveys to help them in capacity building.

6. Resource Envelope: The resources allocated to a particular State for a given financial year is termed as the Resource Envelope. The allocation is based on a Fund Equalization formula. The resource envelope for a given financial year is based on a mix of norm based and performance-based funding, linked to conditionalities and adherence to reforms.

7. IDPs & SHEPs: All institutions are required to prepare their Institutional Development Plan (IDPs) for all components with financial proposals on parameters that capture their respective need-based requirements. The States aggregate the IDPs and integrate into State Higher Education Plan (SHEP) by superimposing the State relevant components. It is imperative that each State undertakes base line surveys and stakeholder consultations to constitute the basis for preparing IDPs and SHEPs. It is

imperative that SHEPs are duly approved by the State Higher Education Councils before onward submission to MHRD.

8. Appraisal of SHEPs: The funding to States is made on the basis of critical appraisal of State Higher Education Plans done by Technical Support Group (TSG) at the Centre. The prioritization of components based on the resource envelope of the State is jointly done by the State and the TSG in a collaborative exercise, based on adherence to RUSA norms and State-specific needs. The prioritized components are jointly presented before the Project Approval Board (PAB) for approval.

9. Funding under RUSA: All funding under the RUSA is norm based and future grants are outcome dependent. The central funding is strategic and based on SHEPs, which serve as a benchmark against which the performance of a State and its institutions are graded. Centre-State funding is in the ratio of 90:10 for North-Eastern States, Sikkim, J&K, Himachal Pradesh and Uttarakhand and 60:40for other States and Union Territories (UTs)with Legislature. Also, the UTs without Legislature would be 100% centrally funded under this scheme.

10. Flow of Funds: The central funding flows from MHRD to institutions, through the State Governments. The State Higher Education Council is responsible for transfer of central share along with the matching State share to the approved institutions.

11. State Higher Education Councils: SHECs is the key institution at the State level to channelize resources to the institutions from the State budget. They undertake the process of planning and evaluation, in addition to other monitoring and capacity building functions.

Guiding Principles

RUSA is structured on inviolable guiding principles for funding and decisions taking. These are performance based outlays and outcome based reimbursements, incentivizing and disincentivizing, apolitical decision making**,** disclosure based governance, autonomy**,** equity based development and, quality and research focus. The

states are expected to keep these principles as guiding posts while formulating their State Higher Education Plans and developing their strategies.

Components

RUSA is an umbrella scheme operated in mission mode that would subsume other existing similar schemes in the state higher education sector. It is norm based and performance based funding in which commitment by States and institutions to certain academic, administrative and governance reforms would be a precondition for receiving funding. Funds would flow from the MHRD to universities and colleges, through the State governments. State Higher Education Council would have to undertake planning and evaluation, in addition to other monitoring and capacity building functions. SHEC is the key institution at the state level to channelize resources to the institutions from the State budget. RUSA would create new universities through upgradation of existing autonomous colleges and conversion of colleges in a cluster. It would create new model degree colleges (general), new professional colleges and provide infrastructural support to universities and colleges. Faculty recruitment support, faculty improvements programmes and leadership development of educational administrators are also an important part of the scheme. In order to enhance skill development the existing central scheme of Polytechnics has been subsumed within RUSA. A separate component to synergize vocational education with higher education has also been included in RUSA. RUSA also supports reforming, restructuring and building capacity of institutions in participating state. Besides these, data collection & planning of the institution through Management Information System constitute the components of RUSA so as to ensure the issues of access, equity and quality of state higher education. State-wise allocations would be decided on the basis of a formulaic entitlement index which would factor in the population size of the relevant age group, GER and Gender Parity Index (GPI) across categories, State expenditure on higher education, institutional density, teacher student ratio, issues of access, equity and quality and excellence in higher education, etc. Further

allocation of funds would be dependent upon performance of the state and its demonstrated commitment to the reforms agenda.

Institutional Hierarchy

RUSA is implemented and monitored through an institutional structure comprising the National Mission Authority, Project Approval Board and the National Project Directorate at the centre and the State Higher Education Council and State Project Directorate at the state level.

Approach and Strategy

RUSA would follow a bottom-up approach for planning and budgeting to redress multiple and graded inequalities.

- States would also become equal partners in planning and monitoring. The yardstick for deciding the quantum of funds for the States and institutions under RUSA comprise the norms that reflect the performance in key result areas of access, equity and excellence.
- Access, equity, and excellence would to be the main thrust areas. Considering the inter linkages between them and taking into consideration the current realities existing in the country, these objectives would be pursued differently.
- This would necessitate reforms in governance arrangements at all levels (national, state and institutional), with suitable implementation frameworks and monitoring arrangements.
- Planning process would begin at the institutional Level, with the IDP based on inputs/ discussions with the stakeholders within the institution. These IDPs would be aggregated to form the SHEP. The SHEP would have mainly two components; State component and institutional component. The SHEP would be further broken down into annual plans, by taking the various factors under the eighteen components into consideration. These annual plans will constitute the basis for determining the funding to states.

- In order to be eligible for funding under RUSA, States will have to fulfill certain prerequisites towards reform process which include academic, sectoral and institutional governance reforms.
- Each State must undertake a baseline survey against which performance and progress would be measured.
- Once eligible for funding under RUSA, the States will receive funds on the basis of achievements and outcomes. Future funds flows would be determined based on outcomes and achievements against the targets.

All land will be provided by the State governments. The State government shall acquire and have undisputed possession of land in any case where a new institution is proposed to be set up or expanded. Central share for civil works under any component shall be restricted to either RUSA estimate or the State SSR, whichever is lower. However States would be free to enhance its own share for any component provided it is willing to bear the entire additional expenditure.

The States would be free to mobilize up to 50% of their share through private grants and donations, Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) contributions, Public Private Partnerships (PPP) etc. States, especially in the NE region, may also consider availing of Viability Gap Funding (VGF), administered by the Department of NE Region. Similarly, States located outside the NE Region may avail the VGF administered by the Department of Economic Affairs. Additionally States may make use of the Rural Infrastructure Development Fund (RIDF) for financing of infrastructure projects under RUSA in rural areas. States may engage any of the Central/State agencies for civil works or procure in accordance with the State procurement policy. Affiliation reforms and accreditation norms should be followed by States. (Rambilas, 2015).

1.11. Rationale of the study

During the last decade, the education sector has dominated economic planning. Despite many new national missions/programs and reforms agenda, by both the central and state governments with private sector intervention, the higher education sector is in a state of complete flux. While we have tremendously enhanced capacity, we lag in quality, given inadequate autonomy to our Universities. Centralized control and a standardized approach remain at the heart of regulations. We are in the 21st century with a mid-20th century regulatory architecture. During this time we have seen countries like China, Korea and Singapore, transform from developing to advanced economies in a decade due to strategic planning and a larger vision that correlated economic development to transformation in the education sector, in particular higher education and research, to become globally competitive.(FICCI, 2013)

Higher education has special value in the emerging society. There is a positive correlation between the extent of human capital and economic prosperity. So, one of the important determinants of national competitiveness in this global era is the quality of its higher education. This quality comes from the combination of excellent learning process and public satisfaction in the service delivered (Hanasya and Warokka, 2011). Quality of higher education institutions is found to be having a strong bearing on the physical and academic infrastructure. This sort of institutions can only make a student of higher education with certain capacities and skills to face the challenges in the real world, in his professional career and also facilitate his participations in national development. (Singh, 2009). Efficiency of students can be enhanced through the quality of education system. Thus, it is necessary to improve the quality of higher education. It is important that the quality of the 'Product' of the program is satisfactory and according to expectations in the field.

India has the second largest educational system in the world. A focus on quality, access and relevance of higher education to achieve the required social transformation for sustainable economic development of the country has been the national priority.

Qualitative improvement in higher education, to realize the desired dimensions of human resource development necessitated the establishment of the premier Quality Assurance Agency – National Assessment and Accreditation Council (NAAC) by the UGC, in 1994, to assess and accredit the country's higher education institution. This is the main agency which assesses the quality of the general education institutions and accredits them accordingly, so that they become dynamic, demand-driven, quality conscious, efficient and forward looking and responsive to rapid economic and technological developments occurring at the local, state, national and international levels. Government of India aims to improve the quality of State Universities and colleges and enhance their existing capacities with the help of accreditation agencies established for the purpose. Moreover, to improve access, equity and quality in higher education through planned development of higher education at the state level, the Ministry of Human Resource Development (MHRD), launched an umbrella scheme of Rashtriya Uchchatar Shiksha Abhiyan (RUSA) in which creation of new academic institutions, expanding and upgrading the existing ones, developing institutions that are self-reliant in terms of quality education, professionally managed were included in the plan and is characterized by greater inclination towards research and provide students with education that is relevant to them as well the nation as a whole.

The quality of higher education is a result of collective effort of all stakeholders in higher education, which includes the state, the society, the employer, parents, the management, teachers and students. Enhancing quality is a holistic process. The synergistic relationship among the students, teachers, management, parents, public, government and the production system are essential to achieve an enduring multiplier effect on quality enhancement. Isolated efforts in improving the quality of a few selected components of the education system such as the infrastructure, teacher training, research funding or industry participation would be of limited value (Anandakrishnan, 2007). Therefore, all the stakeholders in higher education need to pay attention in strengthening the academic and the non- academic tools, and use them in holistic manner to enhance the quality of higher education.

Tang and Hussin (2011) opined that in higher education, stakeholders' views are crucial and should be taken into consideration by the education providers in transcending cognitive skills as well as improving quality processes. Rajasingh (2009) also suggested that quality of higher education cannot be achieved without knowing the perceptions of stakeholders and their perceptual divide. Students and teachers are the largest group within any HEI, and therefore are the main stakeholders who have a much stronger voice than any other stakeholders. Therefore, the students and teachers are one of the most important stakeholders of Higher Education systems. The interest and participation of students at all levels in both internal quality assurance and external quality assurance have to play a central role. As experts put it, higher education is first and foremost about the enhancement and empowerment of students as participants in a process of learning. Even more than that, higher education is about participation in a process of learning for transformation. Any Higher Education Institution needs to ensure that students have a voice at various decision-making processes, formulating learning and teaching practices and that views of students are to be considered as the primary evidence on which the quality of teaching and learning is evaluated (NAAC). Goulden & Griffin (1995) also states that students are a central focus in assessments of educational quality. It is seldom acknowledged that they are also major stakeholders in higher education. To date, quality criteria have reflected administrators' or faculty priorities. As both the subjects of assessment and stakeholders, it is argued that students and their perceptions of quality criteria need to be incorporated into the assessment process. For example, students have a different perception of grades, a central component of assessment, than do professors**.** Student participation in terms of feedback and questionnaire survey develops a system of assessment of institutional performance. It makes the process of quality assurance and quality enhancement for the institution more reliable and credible. A clear assessment of learning outcomes and competencies acquired by the students during a particular course can be undertaken as a quality measure. This can then certainly validate the quality of educational delivery in the true sense. Thus seeking students' views on all the aspects of higher education experiences

should be regarded as essential for effective monitoring of quality in higher education.(Hill, 2003).Therefore, students' perception on quality in higher education can help in effective monitoring of quality in higher education.

However, the perceptions of all stakeholders, namely industries, faculty, student and alumni on quality of higher education were hardly studied while it was clearly shown from the review of literature that the stakeholders' perceptions on quality are very essential to improve the quality of higher education. Assessment bodies have dealt with the parameters for quality of whole institutions, but not adequately focused on the quality criteria of students and faculty. Further, currently the quality of higher education is being measured in quantitative terms such as student strength, faculty strength, the number of academic programs available, number of research papers published or the research projects completed and the like. They are looking only to numbers. These are not true indicators of quality. (Kalirajan, 2010).

As far as Mizoram is concerned, there is little research study on higher education in the state particularly on the quality of higher education with respect to Mizoram. Mizoram's higher education system has not expanded as much as like primary and secondary education. It has one Central University and a few numbers of colleges. As higher education institution which strives to provide excellent quality of education should strive to fully understand the needs of its stakeholders. One of the best ways to do so is through direct feedback from its stakeholders proportionally. The perceptions of the major stakeholders namely students and teachers on quality of higher education, hence, need to be investigated as is crucial to improve the quality of higher education. As the higher education system in Mizoram is striving to improve the overall quality of existing state higher educational institutions by ensuring conformity to prescribed norms and standards and adoption of accreditation as a mandatory quality assurance framework under RUSA, this study will aid the development of the system by bringing in suggestions to the policy makers which will enhance the quality of higher education institutions in Mizoram.

Hence, the study of perceptions of all stakeholders on quality of higher education is the need of the hour for effective quality assessment of higher education in the state as it is often said that quality of higher education cannot be achieved practically without knowing the perceptions of stakeholders. The findings of the study, based on perceptions of major stakeholders, therefore, will throw light on issues and areas that need to be strengthened and identify areas that contribute towards learning enhancement. In order to do so the researcher conducted the study.

1.12. Statement of the Problem

The problem of the study has been stated as follows:

Perceptions of stakeholders about Quality of Higher Education in Mizoram in the Context of RUSA

1.13. Objectives of the Study

The overall aim of the present study is to examine the perceptions of stakeholders (students, teachers) participating in the RUSA program. The study therefore attempts:

1. To examine the status of implementation of RUSA programs in general degree colleges of Mizoram.
2. To examine the perception of stakeholders on the quality of infrastructure and instructional facilities available in the general degree colleges of Mizoram.
3. To examine the views of stakeholders on the quality of curriculum transacted in the general degree colleges of Mizoram.
4. To elicit the views of stakeholders on the quality of student support service in the general degree colleges of Mizoram.
5. To examine the perceptions of stakeholders on the quality regarding research and innovation in general degree colleges of Mizoram.

6. To investigate the perceptions of stakeholders on the quality regarding examination and evaluation practices in the general degree colleges of Mizoram.
7. To find out the views of stakeholders on the quality regarding governance and leadership practices in the general degree colleges of Mizoram.
8. To find out the perceptions of stakeholders regarding the autonomy of general degree colleges of Mizoram.

1.14. Operational Definitions of the Key Terms

Perception

Perception means the ability to see, hear, or become aware of something through the senses. It is the way in which something is regarded, understood, or interpreted. In the present study the score on the questionnaire which will be developed by the researcher is perception of the stakeholders towards quality of higher education in the context of RUSA.

Stakeholders

Individuals or entities that have an interest in the activities of an institution or organization. In the context of higher education quality, stakeholders are those groups that have an interest in the quality of provision and standard of outcomes. In this study, stakeholders will include students and teachers.

Quality

Oxford Dictionary defines Quality as degree, especially high degree of goodness or worth. Quality is Fitness for purpose, effectiveness in achieving institutional goals, meeting customer's stated or implied needs. It can also be said that quality refers to standards of resourcing and provision, and the achievements or outputs of an institution or system.

Higher Education

The term 'higher education' is presumed as education beyond the school level. covers all studies and training activities at the tertiary level. For the purpose of this study, studies in general degree colleges which come under the purview of RUSA are higher education.

RUSA

Rashtriya Uchchatar Shiksha Abhiyan (RUSA) is a centrally sponsored scheme proposed by the Ministry of Human Resource Development to ensure holistic planning at the state level and enhancement of allocations for the State Universities & Colleges, which will spread over the two plan periods (XII and XIII).

1.15. Delimitations of the study

1. The present study was delimited to the Government general degree colleges of Mizoram only.
2. While measuring the perceptions of stakeholders on quality of higher education, only the perceptions of teachers and students were taken into account. Other stakeholders such as administrators and other parties involving in the business were not included in the study.

1.16. Organization of Thesis

The Thesis of the present study has been divided into five (5) chapters to facilitate a systematic presentation.

Chapter I: Introduction – The first chapter is an introduction which begins with the concept of Higher education and RUSA. The chapter also deals with the rationale of the study, statement of the problem, objectives, operational definitions of the terms used.

Chapter II: Review of Related Literature - The second chapter is devoted to a review of the related studies on higher education and RUSA.

Chapter III: Methodology – The method and procedure of the study has been described in this chapter. The sample, the tools used, the procedure for data collection and the statistical techniques used for the analysis of data are presented in details in this chapter.

Chapter –IV: Analysis and Interpretation –Analysis and interpretations of data of the present study has been presented in fourth chapter.

Chapter –V: Major Findings, Educational Implications, Recommendations and Suggestions - The fifth chapter which is also the last chapter of the study covers the major findings of the study, educational implications, recommendations and suggestions.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Chapter II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The review of related literature is an essential pre-requisite for actual planning and execution of any research work. It is a comprehensive study and interpretation of literature that addresses a specific topic. It surveys research and scholarly articles, books and other sources relevant to a particular area of research. If we fail to build the foundation of knowledge provided by the review of literature our work is likely to be shallow and naive. Practically all human knowledge can be found in books and libraries. Unlike other animals that must start anew with each generation, man builds upon the accumulated and recorded knowledge of the past (Best & Kahn, 2009). A careful review of the research journals, books, dissertations, theses and other sources of information on the problems to be investigated is one of the important steps in the planning of any research study. A review of the related literature must precede any well planned research study (Koul, 2009).In short, it can be said that literature review gives a theoretical base for the research and helps the researcher determine the nature of the research.

As the present study deals with perception of stakeholders on quality of higher education in Mizoram in the context of RUSA, so the investigator has studied reviews related to this.

The review of the related literature has been given in three parts:

1. Review of the studies related to quality of Higher Education.
2. Review of the studies related to perception of stakeholders on quality of higher education.
3. Review of the studies related to Rashtriya Uchchatar Shiksha Abhiyan (RUSA) for promoting quality.

2.1. Review of the Studies Related to Quality of Higher Education

UNESCO (1995) in its policy paper for change and development of higher education emphasized that quality had become a major concern in higher education. This was because meeting society's needs and expectations towards higher education depends ultimately on the quality of its staff, programmes and students, as well as its infrastructure and academic environment. In its view, the search for 'quality' has many facets and the principal objective of quality enhancement measures in higher education should be institutional as well as system-wide self-improvement.

Donald and Denison (2001) said that to make the assessment effective, it must meet the needs of the people whom it was intended to benefit and aid the evaluated institution to make improvements. Quality assessment was frequently undertaken in response to external authorities who expected clear, ratified criteria to be used in the accountability process. If the assessment was to be beneficial, however, change must be effected within the institution. This meant that administrators, faculty members and students also needed an understanding of the criteria that could guide and facilitate improvements in the way they function. Previously identified by a broad range of stakeholders in a national study of criteria and indicators of quality in post secondary education, it was found that student perceptions of the criteria were consistent with previous research results on input and output measures.

Cheng (2003) in *Quality Assurance in Education: Internal, Interface and Future,* discussed worldwide reforms for educational quality as experienced by three waves based on different paradigms. The first wave focused mainly on internal quality assurance, particularly the process of teaching-learning. The second wave emphasized interface quality based on ensuring satisfaction and accountability to internal and external stakeholders. The third wave has a special focus on future quality assurance concerning globalization, localization, individualization. To provide necessary knowledge and train the students in areas with multiple intelligences is an urgent need for higher education. He also added that to organize teaching - learning and make the

educational services more accountable is needed. According to the study, all the three aspects are important for educational quality improvement and they can provide a comprehensive framework. A higher education institution can struggle to provide services of high interface quality and future quality in a dynamic way governed by continuous learning and development.

Sahney, Banwet and Karunes (2003) in their paper "Enhancing Quality in Education: Application of Quality Function Deployment-an Industry Perspective", remarked that education institutes should aim to satisfy the needs of various stakeholders, through the design of an appropriate system comprising a management system, a technical system and a social system. Quality in education should be defined from an overall perspective including the quality of inputs, the quality of processes and the quality of outputs. In fact, the very concept of quality would infuse within itself the different aspects of academic life.

Lagrosen (2004) conducted a study on *Examination of the Dimensions of quality in higher education* in which he made an attempt to examine the dimensions which can constitute quality in higher education. Twenty-nine in-depth interviews were carried out responses were obtained from 448 Austrian and the Swedish students. This study could provide a practical basis for quality management efforts in higher education. The respondents were asked to mark on seven point Likert scale of the importance they attach to different quality variable. The eleven quality dimensions were identified. To find the significant difference between the Austrian and the Swedish students ANOVA was used. It was observed that the overall differences between the two countries were slightly different indicating that the quality dimensions go beyond the national borders. There was one group of students for which tangible resources were especially important and another group for which it was of little importance. The quality dimensions identified in this study could be valuable source for mangers of higher education institutions. The study suggests that a single stakeholder perspective can provide only limited view and hence it is to be complemented with other stakeholders' perspective.

Lomas (2004) reviews the challenges associated with embedding quality in the university settings in his study, *Embedding Quality: The challenges for higher education*. Embedding quality is to be considered as developing a culture within the organization where the staff should strive to improve the quality of provision leading to excellence. One needs to evaluate strategies which can successfully achieve the required outcome. A semi structured depth interviews were conducted with the senior management and academics in seven higher education institutions. The discussion covered the issues that the respondents considered to be important for the effective embedding of quality. The main issues raised were the need for quality culture, importance of high quality training for newly appointed teachers, professional development and peer review for experienced teachers. The importance of transformative leadership and creation of a favorable culture were found to be the major indicators of success. However, the culture of the institution and sub culture of the departments vary greatly, the way forward therefore depends upon the nature of particular department and the people working there.

O'Neill (2004) in *Importance -performance analysis: a useful tool for directing continuous quality improvement in higher education* explains the need to identify and implement the most appropriate measurement tools which can help in better understanding of the quality issues that can impact students' experience in higher education. Quality should be conceptualized as difference between expectation of students and their perception. The technical quality refers to the result of the service offered but the functional quality refers to the way the service has been delivered. Up till now higher education has a trend to focus on technical dimension of quality and less effort is spent in probing the functional aspect of quality that impacts students. The study has focused on attitude of students towards quality of educational service. Three focus groups were organized and discussion on the attributes that contributed to quality in the university setting was conducted. A twenty-two items refined scale was constructed and respondents were asked to rate their perception of the attributes as well as level of importance attributed to each attribute on five point Likert scale. A total of

500questionnaires were distributed and the instrument was assessed in terms of reliability and validity. The final analysis was in terms of the mean importance, mean performance and an Important Performance Analysis (IPA) matrix of service quality dimensions. This helped in quick and efficient interpretation of the results and could provide number of strategic alternatives. The final result indicated that students attach different weightages to different aspects of the administration. The study could identify consistent pattern of importance-performance rating across different categories of educational services and different categories of users within the higher education sector.

Shah (2005) said that there were no signs of improvement or growth in the Indian higher education. Solutions had been sought mainly at higher levels of funding particularly for hardware, and in minor administrative changes. Hardly any attempt was made to address the problems arising out of the long established basic structure of the university system and to deal with the changing ground realities. He pointed out that in recent days the demand for quality higher education was high. All over the country the younger generation, especially in the higher secondary levels, was being trained to demand high quality education in colleges and universities. The demand for quality education was increasing not only among the higher castes and classes but also among the lower ones, including scheduled castes and scheduled tribes. It was due to the reason that education was linked with the employment situation. A very basic hurdle in improving quality in most institutions in the country is that the very concept of good quality education is not widely understood or appreciated across the spectrum of institutions. There is very little discussion within institutions on improving the quality research or research output, far from it, even raising the levels of teaching and learning are not an area of focus. In many cases this is only a matter of exposure. While even applying for an accreditation process, an institution is forced to undergo certain processes of self-assessment that throws light on the various aspects of quality. Usually, the very process of application energizes the institution and faculty members to look at their performance critically, thus orienting them towards producing better quality output. A concerted effort is needed to ensure that quality informs every process in higher

education. Any new scheme planned by the government must ensure that accreditation becomes mandatory and sufficient incentives and disincentives are built into the system to ensure that every higher education institution obtains accreditation. More importantly, there needs to be a debate at every level in the system, about the quality of higher education that we are providing.

Swain and Niladiri (2005) discussed about dimensions of instructional input, dimensions of instructional process, and teacher competencies for quality assurance in education. They said that quality is a degree of excellence. The quality assurance is the development mechanism that is designed to maintain and enhance the institutional effectiveness as a whole. The improvement of quality is essential to enrich the dimensions like curricular aspects, teaching-learning process, research consultancy and evaluation, health practice, student's support service, extension publication and co-curricular activities of the institution.

Agarwal (2006) in his paper **"***Higher Education in India: The Need for Change"* said that higher education has several stakeholders. These include all those who have legitimate interest in what higher education institutions do and in the quality of their outputs. The stakeholders include students, and graduates, and also employers, parents, various professions and professional bodies, and government. All these stakeholders now demand greater accountability from higher education institutions. Higher education today is more competitive, more diverse in terms of students' population and less well funded. Along with increased expectations from higher education to serve the national, regional and local needs, there is a greater demand for efficiency. These developments have given prominence to quality assurance issues in policy discourse on higher education in different countries the world over. Quality now is the most talked about and the least understood issue in higher education. Over the last couple of decades, several quality assurance agencies have emerged under the pressure of greater demand for accountability. These agencies essentially convince various stakeholders that a higher education institution takes its quality control seriously, and that the quality of teaching

and quality of graduates leaves no room for concern. With the increased mobility of professionals and skilled workers and the greater need for recognition of qualifications across borders, these bodies are now required to coordinate their work and create a mechanism for quality assurance in a trans-national context.

Koslowski (2006) in his study *Quality and assessment in context* says that academic leaders should consider the context of quality and assessment as a guide to planning, learning and assessing future calls of reforms. He describes quality as a responsibility as well as a process. Quality and assessment are defined within the context of U.S. higher education. He said that assessment is a refined tangible process and end result that can improve quality. The researcher found that it is the duty of all the employees to improve regardless of their position in the organization. The resource view of quality is to be replaced by the performance view of excellence in education and added that quality is a philosophy and a responsibility.

Telford (2006) conducted a study on *The Congruence of Quality values in Higher education* in which he investigated the relationship between the congruence of the quality values held by students, teaching staff and university senior management and the level of student satisfaction. Research was carried out within a large business school in major UK University through a set of focus groups and questionnaires investigating the quality values held by three main participant stakeholders. Individual face to face interviews were conducted with the dean and other senior managers of the university. This was followed by eight focus group sessions with other stakeholders. The method of funnel thinking and critical incident technique was used. Finally quality value anecdote was numbered, summarized, indexed to produce a list of values and their frequency of use. It helped to generate a framework of quality values for higher education. The questionnaire which contained seventy questions was distributed to the respondents whom were asked to gauge relative importance on Likert five point scale. Congruence of quality values and the extent to which the three stakeholders share the same value was calculated using ANOVA. It was observed that the lack of congruence on educational

quality values is not the cause of student dissatisfaction, but better understanding of quality values is important and it has an impact on student participation in education process and student satisfaction.

Hodgkin (2007) in *Quality management and enhancement processes in UK business schools: a review* says that quality management processes depend upon understanding how people learn, interact, sustain, develop or even destroy a culture. It was suggested that quality enhancement can be achieved through the use of continuous improvement cycle based on transparency and self-evaluation. One needs to apply multi dimensional perspective for quality improvement. The author remarked that discussions and sharing information among the academic and administrative staff and accepting joint ownership of problems and solutions could help this exercise of quality enhancement.

Klamkratoke, Kanjanawasee, and Sugiva (2007) conducted a study on *Ranking and rating in higher education: The multi - dimensional quality in stakeholders' perspectives with hierarchical ranking and rating approach* in which the researchers presented a new ranking and rating approach in higher education which could provide powerful results. They suggested that for describing holistic quality, it is needed to consider ranking and rating in the three perspectives of the stakeholders, viz. the institution, students / parents and the employers. As a part of study the researchers had reviewed related literature to current ranking approaches and then the multidimensional quality perspective with hierarchical ranking and rating was developed. Ranking method is to be used in conjunction with the rating method as this could provide more accurate and useful information for quality development.

Patil (2007) in *Quality Assurance and Mass Higher education - learning from experiences* describes Indian experience of National Assessment and Accreditation Council (NAAC) over a decade in the experiment of quality assurance in huge and diverse Indian higher education system. It is a reflection on the effectiveness of maturing quality assurance mechanisms in response to quality concerns of higher education sector. The need is to address the issues of access, equity and quality. The author is keen

to suggest certain reforms in the process of quality assurance such as online assessment and accreditation, programme accreditation, developing national quality assurance framework, defining clear policy on the entry of foreign providers. The author added that it is imperative to bring all higher education institutions under the ambit of quality assurance and provide a single point of reference to international higher education community in order to benefit from the process of globalization. Thus fine tuning of quality assurance methodologies and policies should be one of the strategies for NAAC.

Srikanthan (2007) in his paper, "*A conceptual overview of holistic model for quality in higher Education"* said that quality is a natural expression of the capability at the workplace and quality assessment should lead to improve academic quality and learning outcomes. If quality improvement is addressed properly the evidence for accountability will be developed automatically. Focus of all activities in higher education institution should centre on students. He also emphasized that teaching - learning is the main key performance indicator and should not be looked upon as a routine task. It is essential to find out whether improved academic standards and learning outcomes have occurred as a result of this world wide movement of quality assessment. He said that quality management needs to be flexibly adapted to the educational processes preserving traditional values of academic freedom and collegial mode of operation.

Balasubramanian and Ananthi (2008) said that the quality of education was an important measure of productivity and prosperity of a nation. They mentioned that the variables of quality education and provided some suggestions for the enlightenment of quality in higher education which were library assignment, self-study, field study, case study, practical training, seminars, simulation, audio-visual aids, brain storming sessions, and rapid reading. They concluded that to enlighten the quality in education, the system of education needed to recognize strategic resources and ensure their long term supply.

Houston (2008) in his study *Re- thinking quality and improvement in Higher education* says that there is a need to have an alternative approach to quality in higher education which can shift the focus of quality activities from accountability and control to improvement. The "systems approach" in higher education has limitation and therefore a "systemic" approach can be developed which can be more beneficial. Quality imperative in higher education came directly from the policy makers (government) due to the shortage of funding and therefore customer focused definition of quality may not fit in the context of higher education. The concern for the growth of the students is more important to education. It is essential that the external quality assurance mechanism should assist the institution to improve their functioning. Improvement in the core process of teaching - learning should be a fundamental tenet of quality management. Teaching - learning, research, community services are not the end in themselves but rather the means to promote learning. Cultural sensitivity is extremely important in designing change strategies.

Pramod and Gupta (2008) in their article**,** *Quality and Relevance in Higher Education* emphasized that India's future economic success and social stability would largely depend on achieving highest levels of quality in higher education comparable to global standard. They discussed over internal assessment (self-assessment) and external assessment (accreditation) and mentioned that successful internal assessment presupposes that minds are open and receptive to ideas. It requires the involvement of all major stakeholders and close interaction between them. Internal assessment contains self-appraisal of the teacher, self-appraisal of department, internal review of the work of heads of departments and deans of schools and others. They concluded by saying that that the rapid growth of higher education over the years had resulted in the dilution of its quality and standard, which in turn, had affected the quality of man power produced. Thus the prime concern of the countries all over the world was improving the quality of higher education.

Kalirajan (2010) conducted a study on *"Demand for Quality Higher Education and Efficiency Inequality among Students in Salem District"*. To measure the range of quality of higher educational institutions in Salem District; and to determine the factors influencing the demand for quality higher education among the students in Salem District are among the objectives of the study. The primary sample study was restricted to Salem District, and the size of sample was restricted to 514 students due to the time and resource constraint. From the selection of sample colleges to the selection of sample students, multi stage sampling technique was adopted. Sample students were divided proportionately according to their respective stream of education say General education and Professional education. To collect the primary data, well structured and pre-tested interview schedule was framed and language Tamil was used. In order to measure the quality of higher educational institutes through the student's perception, the quality parameters were classified by the importance and the level of impact on the students' performance which were categorized as educational institution's standard, teachers' ability and activities and other sort of facilities available in the college campus. It was measured by using the 5 point Likert Scaling.

It was revealed that a wide gap persists between the student's satisfactions over their college standard. When it came to instructors' ability and activities, it was also that there was high difference in the instructors' quality in various colleges as per the students' perception. As for the range of college's quality regarding the facilities in the college assessed through the student's perception, it was known that more or less uniform facilities were available to the students pursuing their studies in different colleges. It could be said from the result that in the study area, the students were getting medium level of quality higher education. It was also found that there was much difference between the colleges' quality mainly due to the variation in the instructors' ability and activities in the colleges.

The study revealed that people are more willing to invest on higher education, if there is quality, since the quality higher education ensures high rate of return from that

investment. Hence, the researcher argued that the educational policy makers and all concerned must take care on the quality of higher education too, having in mind, the increasing number of higher educational institutes, because quite a large number of institutes produce nothing as outcome and offer low quality education and can be described as mediocre and sub-viable. He also added that to mitigate these problems regarding the quality in higher education, the Indian higher education system needs to plug several loopholes. They are: focus on knowledge education, infrastructure facility, faculty, matched syllabus, global partnership, fees structure, and social equity. It was found that most of the colleges did not have adequate physical infrastructure with academic environment - there is more to education than class attendance. There is a need to have information infrastructure and it should be a replica of corporate environment. When it comes to faculty, the study highlighted that the disparity in salaries drawn by teaching faculty and that offered by the corporate world prevented top-notch talents from entering the teaching field. So the researcher suggested that there is an immediate need to correct this mismatch and initiate measures to attract the right talents, so that the education sector is on par with if not superior to corporate sector. With regard to the syllabus, there is a need to prepare the curriculum after taking into consideration the global requirement. Through this, employability of higher education can be expanded. Indian universities and colleges should be aware of the impending threats from global counterparts. They should try and forge effective partnership that provides exchange and twinning programmes, so that the Indian students are able to see the other side of the coin.

The researcher also said that majority of the higher educational institutions were low in their quality mainly due to the restriction in the fee structure. He concluded by saying that although the government has a special responsibility regarding quality assurance, it is the institution (and especially its staff and students) that is responsible for providing and assuring quality. Therefore, it is imperative that each institution develops an efficient Internal Quality Assurance (IQA) system. There is no single model that fits

all. It is up to the institution to decide what model that fits it best. However, there are some basic conditions that have to be met.

Soomro & Ahmad (2012) studied about quality in Higher Education and wrote a paper on "Quality in Higher Education: United Arab Emirates Perspective" keeping in view of the quality in higher education in United Arab Emirates (UAE) perspectives. This paper discusses the issues of managing quality in higher education, explore current practices in UAE perspectives and the quality challenges in higher education in UAE perspectives are explored. Improving and maintaining quality in Higher Education is the main focus of all private and Government Universities in UAE. In UAE there are basically two types of accredited Universities, one accredited by Ministry of Higher Education & Scientific Research, under the umbrella of Commission for Academic Accreditation (CAA) and other types of Universities are actually foreign Universities (accredited in their own countries) located in free zoon areas of Dubai Emirate, under the umbrella of Knowledge & Human Development Authority. CAA is established to promote educational excellence across and among higher educational institutes in UAE. Its goal includes ensuring quality and academic standards; diversifying services; ensuring an effective operation; and international profile. It is the only agency in UAE, which provide licensure to higher education Institutes. Regarding the challenges, in UAE all Universities under the umbrella of CAA are applying the overlapping mapping to achieve highest quality of standards for teaching, which are mapped with the program level goals and objective and program level goals and objectives are mapped with college or departmental level goals and objectives and college or departmental level goals and objectives are mapped with University or Institute level goals and objectives. The role of CAA is to ensure that these mapping are properly adopted and implemented as per the highest standards of quality or not. This agency is cooperating and facilitating higher educational Institutes in UAE to achieve these goals. So far as research is concerned, most of the higher education Institutes in UAE are promoting research according to their own available resources and funds. Only few agencies such as, "National Research Foundation" and "Emirates Foundation" are providing funds to the

higher educational Institutes in UAE, which is not enough for all the Institutes in UAE, especially private Institutes. In the absence of external funds most of the higher educational Institutes have to rely on their own generated funds, which do not suffice the requirement of all the researchers' in these Institutes, as a result of which the quality and quantity of the research, that are produced, is not appreciable.

The need of quality in higher education is increasing to cater to the ever increasing demands of market, within the country and at international level according to Kaur (2013). He said that the issue of quality assurance--external and internal--has sought the attention of national level institutions such as UGC, NAAC, AICTE, NCTE etc. The criteria adopted by NAAC since its inception has also changed to incorporate the emerging realities and needs of market on the one hand and of student community on the other hand.

According to MHRD (2013), excellence in higher education is also a major aim of the XII Plan. The quality of our current education system leaves much to be desired. One of the best ways of ensuring quality in higher education is the system of accreditation, whereby, a central body or multiple bodies of repute accredit an institution's academic rigor and other aspects. Internationally, this system works well as the accreditation is carried on by varied peer groups of academicians, thus it is fair and acceptable. Accreditation is seen as a necessity in order to attract good students. Thus, the presence of one or many Independent quality assurance mechanisms is a sine qua non for quality and excellence. Unfortunately in India, the accreditation of higher education institutions and programs is optional and has not yet caught up as a trend. While institutional accreditation through National Assessment and Accreditation Council (NAAC) and program accreditation through National Board of Accreditation (NBA) gained momentum during the XI Plan, the coverage of institutions is still small. As of August 2013, less than one-third of all universities and only 13% of eligible colleges have been accredited so far. This means that there is effectively no standard national level monitoring in terms of quality for most of the educational institutions.

Pujar (2014) conducted a study on *"Trends in Growth of Higher Education in India".* The objectives of the study are - to study the current status of Higher education in India and to analyze the trends in Higher education in India. For this study data and information has been collected with the help of Books, Magazines, Newspapers, Research Articles, Research Journals, E-Journals, Report on Higher Education in India: Twelfth Five Year Plan (2012–2017) and beyond and ASHE - Annual Status of Higher Education in States and UTs, 2012. The field of study is divided into General and Professional institutions. The status of both the General courses and professional courses during 2007-12 in different areas are highlighted in this study. The study revealed that during eleventh plan (2007-12) India achieved a GER of 17.9 % up from 12.3 % at the beginning of the plan period. India ranks second in the world in terms of enrollment of students in higher education institutions. But, India's GER of 17.9% (2012) was much below the world average of 27%, as well as that of other emerging countries such as China (26%), USA (95%) and Brazil (36%) in 2010.The students' enrollment in higher education has grown six times in the last 30 years; the faculty strength has grown only four times, resulting in shortage of faculty and high student-teacher Ratios. General courses account for the largest share of enrollment but enrolment in professional courses (such as engineering and medicine) has witnessed a higher growth in the last five years. There is wide disparity in the Gross Attendance ratio (GAR) of higher education in urban and rural areas, and gender and community-wise**,** Urban-rural divide 30% in urban areas while 11.1% in rural areas**, t**here is significant gender disparity dividing 19% for male and 15.2% for female and differences also across communities — 14.8% for OBCs, 11.6% for SCs, 7.7% for STs and 9.6% for Muslims.

The study is concluded by saying that in spite of the significant progress made during the past few years, India's higher education sector is still in danger with several challenges with its relatively low Gross enrollment ratio (GER). According to the report on Higher Education in India: Twelfth Five Year Plan (2012–2017) and beyond, the India's higher education system faces challenges on three fronts — expansion, equity and excellence. It is also mentioned that higher education institutions should focus on

holistic development of an individual and, therefore, focus on development of multiple intelligence rather than merely linguistic and logical intelligence of an individual. All universities and colleges should be given the autonomy to start self-financing courses particularly in new and emerging areas where job opportunities exist subject to the overall framework provided by their funding and regulatory bodies.

The role of stakeholders in improving quality of university education in Nigeria was discussed by Asiyai (2015) in his research article "Improving Quality Higher Education in Nigeria: The Roles of Stakeholders". Internal and external stakeholders are identified and the various roles they could play in improving the quality of university education are discussed. The paper contends that continuous and holistic improvement in university education system requires the collaborative efforts of various stakeholders both internal and external. Collaboration will help to trigger improvement in university education system. Such collaboration could be achieved through universities establishing a close link or relationship with employers of labour and other external stakeholders such other educational institutions, non-governmental organizations, private sectors. Universities can also collaborate with firms/industries by utilization of their technologies and expertise to influence improvement through staff training. Thus, quality can only be attained in university education through cost sharing among stakeholders such as government, universities and public/private sector. University administrators and university board management committee could ensure continuous improvement in university education system by ensuring constant training and retraining of teachers and other staff via professional development programmes of high quality. In this way, excellence and high standards is attainable in university education systems in the country.

Abidin (2015) said that one of the important determinants of national competitiveness in this global era is the quality of its higher education. This quality comes from the combination of excellent learning process and public satisfaction in the service delivered. The service quality in the field of education, especially higher

education, particularly is not only essential, but it is also an important factor of educational excellence. Concept of Quality is parallel with customer satisfaction. Level of service quality can be defined as level satisfaction of its customer. Customer satisfaction is the ultimate goal of all organizations, including higher education sector. Defining quality of education as stakeholder satisfaction will help higher education development, because there are many views that quality and the perception of quality is multilateral. The educational organizations need to focus on the perspective of its stakeholders to provide the successful learning process. A higher education institution which strives to provide excellent quality of education should strive to fully understand the needs of its stakeholders.

Gaurav and Lakshmi (2015) said higher education in India reveal a system undergoing considerable transformation. There is a sense of urgency in policy makers, institution leaders and faculty to expand the system at a fast enough pace to meet the surge in demand, while increasing quality and ensuring equitable access .RUSA has recommended stepping up capacity and improvement of infrastructure which can attract and facilitate the retention of students from rural and backward areas as well as differently-abled and marginalized social groups to enhance equity and inclusion in higher education. It was also recommended to develop a quality system for conscious, consistent and catalytic programmed action to improve the academic and administrative performance of the HEIs.

Mangla (2015) conducted a study on *"Emerging Trends, Issues and Strategies in Higher Education System of India"* and said that increasing the number of institutions subjected to quality assessments would be important for lifting standards across the higher education system, while reform of recruitment and promotion mechanisms could help attract and retain talent in academia. The objectives of the study were to study the urgent need for developing the educational institutions, which should serve the entire population and not just the elite; to study the transition of Indian higher education system and to study the solutions for developing the higher education system to facilitate

sustainable economic growth. The study was descriptive in nature and the secondary data and information had been analyzed for preparing the paper, which had been collected from different scholars and researchers, published books, articles published in different journals, periodicals, conference paper and websites. The researcher said that that there has been a significant change in the approach of the Government of India towards higher education in the recent years. He observed that the recent initiatives in policy reforms had marked a transition in the history of higher education in independent India. But the absence of a clear, coherent, explicit long term policy perspective on higher education continued to be the hallmark of Indian higher education. He also said that it would take decades to build a good education system that will serve the general population, create centers of excellence and niches in the global knowledge economy.

Kundu (2016) conducted a study on *"Higher Education Quality: A Literature Review".* The purpose of this paper was to examine the quality dimensions associated with the higher education institutions as the educational institutions have realized the need for quality focus as the operating environment of higher education. The researcher opined that higher educational institutes need more effective delivery systems to address the quality issues and performance of higher education systems as the higher education institutes with varying customers and stakeholders were facing huge pressures to become more accountable and responsive to customer needs, and become more efficient, effective and customer-centric. So the objective of this paper is to address the question: What are the dimensions of quality in higher education?

The structure of this paper is designed so as to consist 4 sections. A comprehensive literature review of quality dimensions of higher education was undertaken to address the research question using the principles of deductive reasoning,. The aim of presenting review was to delineate critical dimensions of educational quality that can be utilized in future for addressing multiple and divergent quality aspects of educational institutions. From the literature review, the researcher presented the definitions of quality from different stakeholders' perspective to understand the essential

features of quality in Education. The researcher opined that this literature review gave qualitative insights on research considering quality in educational institutions and feels that this paper should guide research and practice in higher education. The author has tried to contribute to that important goal by presenting quality characteristics in education from various perspectives.

Pritam (2016) said that the issues of quantitative achievements are largely met by the government of India but problem remains in the area of quality which is alarming these days by both national demand as well as international pressures. Quality as an exclusive phenomenon appears to be the contribution of post-modern society. Few decades ago, quality used to be the integral part of any phenomenon/activity and without which there was a sense of incompleteness. There are more than twenty statutory bodies to regulate professional education sector apart from large bodies such as UGC and NAAC to ensure quality education across the institutions and states. Even though, quality of education in seventy percent of the Universities in India and almost ninety per cent colleges in India is at poor state of affairs as opined by NAAC in its report of assessment and accreditation of Indian institution of higher learning. The author envisaged that the government alone cannot check such problems unless all the concerned stake holders are involved in reforming entire education system in the country. Therefore, ensuring quality in such educational institutions can largely be a shared responsibility rather on government alone and represent the ethos of Indian democracy through shared responsibility in order to restore the quality of higher education.

A study on *"Higher Education in Mizoram in the Context of Knowledge Society: A Critical Analysis"* by Vanengmawii (2017) highlighted the status of higher education in Mizoram and said that Mizoram had already established firm foundation in the elementary and the secondary educations, yet the state had to extend facilities for higher education, general and technical education to meet the manpower requirement of the state. The sample consisted of 50 teachers from Mizoram University and 150 teachers

from colleges in Mizoram. Organizational Climate Inventory (OCI Form B) constructed by Chattopadhyay, S and Aggarwal, K.G. (1976) and office records and documents from various respective departments were used for collection of data. The quality of higher education institutions in Mizoram in the context of assessment and accreditation by NAAC was studied as well as Micro Analysis on Criterion wise Score of Colleges Assessed and accredited by NAAC from 2008-2016 was done in this study. The findings revealed that the quality of higher education in Mizoram was not satisfactory to meet the international standards and also to develop themselves into centres of excellence. It was revealed that out of the total colleges in Mizoram affiliated to Mizoram University, 75 percent of colleges had been assessed and accredited by NAAC, Bangalore so far. Out of accredited colleges only 9.52 percent were Grade 'A' and nearly half of the accredited colleges were 'B' grade, and another large amount of colleges were accredited with 'C' grade. On the other hand out of the three universities in Mizoram, only Mizoram University has been accredited with 'A-Grade'. It was suggested from the findings that colleges should give more importance to curricular aspects, research consultancy and extension, infrastructure and learning resources, governance and leadership and innovative practices. The findings also indicated that higher educational institutions in Mizoram had by and large failed in attracting students from other states of India which shows that there is a serious need to think on the quality aspects of these institutions in order to compete in a globalized world. The findings of this study also revealed that a sizeable number of faculty positions in colleges were lying vacant for quite some time. Due to the financial crunch in the state government, a large number of teachers had been hired on contractual and part time/guest basis that were paid consolidated honorarium without allowances and other benefits whereas Mizoram University, being the central university had large number of regular teacher. The findings proved that the budget allocation for higher and technical education both in plan and non-plan was too meagre and could not meet the requirement of the institutions. In all the study period covered, both in plan and non plan budget about 90 percent of the total budget is utilized for salaries. Only a minuscule amount had been used for other administrative cost. The

researcher said that the expenditure pattern indicated that the government had failed to recognize the value of higher education. The findings also clearly revealed that the infrastructure development of colleges depended largely on financial resources from central government through UGC, RUSA etc.

It revealed that the higher education has miles to go in assuring the quality education. The institutions of higher education especially colleges also need to maintain the best possible quality so as to produce quality human resources who will satisfy the needs of the society. Based on the findings of this study as well as based on NAAC accreditation, the quality of most of the colleges in Mizoram are not satisfactory in order to become a centre of excellence.

To identify the various problems of higher education in north east India as well as to study the future prospects of higher education in this region, a study on *"Problems and Future Prospects of Higher Education in North East India"* was conducted by Boruah (2018). This paper also gives some sorts of suggestions to enhance the quality of higher education in north east India. The study revealed that quality higher education, especially in north eastern region will help to circumvent the natural resource constraints and creation of knowledge infrastructure towards self-empowerment of the people. The main objectives of the study are as follows:

1. To study the current status of higher education in North East India.
2. To identify the problems of higher education in North East India.
3. To study the future prospects of higher education in North East India.
4. To give some suggestions to improve the quality of higher education in North East India

This study is qualitative in nature. Here, the investigator collected the data from different research journals, books, websites etc. The study mentioned that higher education suffers from manifold problems in North East India and discussed the chief problems of higher education in North East India which can be listed as - Inadequate physical infrastructure; Negative feelings towards full dedication of teachers towards

their service; Less focus on the establishment of excellent institutions like IITs and IIMs; Outflow of the local students to other parts of the country; Insufficient number of Institutions; Theoretical Based Syllabus; Problem of Language; Lack in Industrial Collaboration; Aimlessness; Problems of finance; Inappropriate for Research work; Problem of wastage and stagnation; Commercialization of higher education.

This study also highlighted some suggestions to improve the quality of higher education in North East India which are Job oriented courses; High tech libraries; More support and funds; Upgradation of the system of examination; Research and Technological Development. The study is concluded by saying that it is inferred from this study that North Eastern states has faced lots of problems in higher education and also the region has a lots of opportunities in relation to higher education. Paucity of financial allocation and poor administration in higher educational institutes in North East region drives the colleges and universities into disappointing condition. Therefore, some efforts need to be made by the government to minimize the weakness of higher education in north east region. In this direction Twelfth five year plan of the planning commissions has also laid emphasis on quality of education in this region. Still the North East region of India has scope for improvement in bestowing quality education.

Neihsial (2018) in his paper **"***Higher Education in Mizoram: A Perspective"* examined the progress of Higher Education in Mizoram. The main objectives of this study were to analyze the expenditure for the promotion of higher education in Mizoram and to study the enrolment of students in higher institutions in Mizoram. He highlighted the educational profile of the state tracing back from the foundation of modern education in Mizoram. The history and the current status of higher and technical education in Mizoram and the governments' expenditure on higher and technical education from the year 1990 to 2010 were also presented in the paper. The status of the Mizo people in the higher levels of Education (as on March 2010) was also given which shows that there was no good professional education in Mizoram. He said that the numbers of Science Institutions were inadequate to impart better education to the students which led most of

the students in need to go the private institution by paying a large sum of money. However, many students did not afford to pay much money for this. So the author suggested that the government should pay more attention to promote Science and Technical Education in Mizoram. The study showed that Mizoram had made rapid progress in Education. Though the Literacy rates, enrolment, teachers, institutions and public educational expenditure had increased, he added that the state was still lagging behind in higher professional and technical education. Moreover, the existing college education had been largely dominated by liberal education in Arts stream while science and commerce education was relatively neglected. Efforts should be made by government to develop science and commerce along with technical and professional education in line with the manpower requirements of the state.

It was also revealed that in Mizoram, the budgetary resources for education had been extremely limited while the demand for education greatly expanded due to various economic, socio-cultural and demographic pressures. The quantitative expansion of the educational sector along with qualitative improvement of the existing system required huge amount of public resources. Expenditure on education is universally accepted as one of the most important components of investment expenditure that contributes immensely to the growth of national and per capita income. It was argued that a reduction or slowing down of public investment on education may have adverse effects on the long run development of the state economy. Therefore, the state government needs to allocate more resources, on education. The state had witnessed rapid expansion of college education but many of these colleges were established due to popular and political considerations and little attention has been paid to whether the area or locality would attract sufficient number of students and to enable them operate at the optimal level of enrolment or not. In fact, there was no consideration for academic improvements and economic viability of the institutions. Lack of systematic educational planning had thus caused backwardness in the education.

The following steps were suggested to avoid such situation: (i) in order to remove the educational backwardness especially in the field of Higher Education, the state government may opt to subsidies higher education in terms of scholarship and stipends to students rather than through opening non-viable colleges. This policy might be more economical for the state and will also ensure better quality of education to students; (ii) hostel facilities for college students are not only poor in quality but also inadequate in quantity. The researcher also argued that there is an urgent need for expansion and improvement in the hostel facilities for attracting students from far areas. Further, concession may be given to the students from remote areas by reserving some seats for them in the college as well as in the hostels. Access to higher education needs to be widened in Mizoram, both within the formal system and through other effective innovative measures.

Ahmad (2019) studied the Indian higher education in the context of QS World University Rankings and mentioned the deficiencies of Indian higher education which are quality of teaching and research; pressure on faculty to publish certain number of papers to gain promotion that leads to put emphasis on publishing papers than on teaching; lack of basic and high-end research facilities; lack of autonomy; appointment of leadership not because they are distinguished academicians, but because they have the right political connections in the Ministry of Human Resource Development in the case of central universities, or appropriate political or caste affiliations in the concerned state; quality of student intake in which he mentioned that central or state governments have no serious attempt has been made by to open any new higher secondary level schools for the past few decades; faculty-student ratio not up to the required level in which the concern is not only on staff shortages but also the gross enrolment ratio of college-aged people in tertiary education in India. Ahmad said that in order for Indian universities to improve their ranking and become world class, the deficiencies mentioned have to be tackled and there is a need to implement an innovative and transformational approach from primary to higher education level to make the Indian educational system more

relevant and competitive globally. There is also a need to free universities and colleges in both public and private sectors from political interference.

A study on *"Issues and Challenges of Higher Education in India: With Special Reference to Mizoram"* was conducted by Singh (2019).This paper followed descriptive survey method which attempted to examine some of the issues and challenges of higher education in India with special reference to Mizoram. Data were collected from primary and secondary sources and analyzed by employing simple descriptive statistics such as percentage. The findings revealed that as per assessment of NAAC, till the end of 2nd cycle assessment of NAAC, the overall grade of the colleges in the state fell within the ranges of C, C+, C++, to B, B++ with one exception to A; library issue still persisted in more than half of the colleges of Mizoram as 52.38% of principals rated them as satisfactory only. The researcher said that majority of the college teachers used conventional method of teaching and observed that GER of higher education in Mizoram is much below the level of national average. This study found that there was lack of adequate and qualified faculty in the colleges of the state, and huge disparity was found in terms of regular faculty between city and town/district colleges in the state. The researcher suggested that the existing institutions of higher learning should be strengthened by providing adequate human and material resources by the concerned department for improvement of quality of education. Teachers in the colleges of Mizoram should be encouraged to use ICT based teaching by providing proper facilities by the department of Higher and Technical Education for effective teaching-learning. All the qualified contractual and part-time teachers should be regularized and the unqualified ones should also be encouraged to clear SLET/NET within a stipulated time. He also suggested that efforts should be made by the concerned authority to remove disparity between the city and town/district colleges by providing regular faculty to the latter and the Internal Quality Assurance Cell (IQAC) of each college needs to intensify its activities for improvement of quality education in Mizoram.

Puram (2019) opined that the impetus for improving quality of higher education and scrutiny by the accreditation agencies and the corporate employers is gaining momentum in India. There are many important quality management tools and techniques, fully tried out in the industry, which could be adopted in the field of education, to diagnose a system and identify potentials for improvement. He said that people had started realizing that there is no other activity that promises more leverage in the improvement of society than the development of a generation that understands quality and remains equipped to improve it.

Ravi, Gupta, and Nagaraj (2019) examined the enrolment trend and patterns; graduation and employment patterns; and the quality assurance framework for HEIs in India and found that despite access to higher education in India has increased, challenges remain. Low employability of graduates, poor quality of teaching and faculty shortage, weak governance, insufficient funding, and complex regulatory norms are still hindering the sector. The higher education sector in India is also crippled due to the lack of financial, academic and administrative autonomy granted to institutions. All these have resulted in the poor quality of institutions as well as education.

Sharma (2020) in his article *"Inducing quality and relevance in Indian higher education institutions - some thoughts"* said that the Indian Higher education system did not get required attention towards quality and fitness of purpose while it grew with several gaps like skill gaps, research gaps, relevance gaps etc.,which got converted into issues like access, equity, quality and employability. He suggested that quality assurance mechanisms may be implemented stringently and the role of quality management agencies need to be realigned to take care of quality monitoring as well as assurance. Institutions like National Assessment and Accreditation Council (NAAC), National Board of Accreditation (NBA) which are responsible for quality assurance and act as motivators to the institutions need to be strengthened. He also said that the HEIs should be ready with positive mindset as well as readiness to implement the recommendations of the New Education Policy as soon as it is launched.

2.2. Review of the Studies Related to Perceptions of Stakeholders on Quality of Higher Education

Donald and Denison (2001) conducted a study to examine students' perceptions of quality criteria. They emphasized that quality assessment was frequently undertaken in response to external authorities who expected clear, ratified criteria to be used in the accountability process. They said that to make the assessment beneficial change must be effected within the institution which means that administrators, faculty members and students needed an understanding of the criteria that could guide and facilitate improvements in the way they function. Previously identified by a broad range of stakeholders in a national study of criteria and indicators of quality in post secondary education, it was found that student perceptions of the criteria were consistent with previous research results on input and output measures. In addition, students viewed quality in more comprehensive terms than faculty.

Hill (2003) in his study *Students' perceptions of quality in higher education* aimed to ascertain students' perceptions of a quality experience in higher education. The empirical study involved focus groups with range of higher education students. It was revealed that quality of educational experience is influenced by teacher expertise in the classroom. Students wanted knowledgeable and enthusiastic teachers who cared about learning and knowledge. Students also valued support networks of the institution. Thus the higher education institution should aim to add value to its teachers so that they can meet the needs of the students. Discipline specific workshops encouraging sharing of ideas among the participants and in-house teaching programmes should be organized. This can help the staff to reflect upon their teaching experiences and the pedagogical issues. Thus seeking students' views on all the aspects of higher education experiences should be regarded as essential for effective monitoring of quality in higher education. The researcher emphasized that students are the primary stakeholders in higher education and therefore quality measures need to be benchmarked against the student

interests. Student participation in terms of feedback and questionnaire survey develops a system of assessment of institutional performance. It makes the process of quality assurance and quality enhancement for the institution more reliable and credible. This can then certainly validate the quality of educational delivery in the true sense. Thus seeking students' views on all the aspects of higher education experiences should be regarded as essential for effective monitoring of quality in higher education.

Anandkrishnan (2006) suggested that students' survey can provide auditable evidence on their experience about the course, physical facilities offered by the institution and the process of teaching - learning. The qualities and the teaching effectiveness of the faculty have significant impact on the perception of quality of educational provision. Students' perception about quality assurance and quality enhancement in higher education can help in effective monitoring of quality in higher education. The qualities of the faculty and the teaching effectiveness of the faculty have significant impact on the perception of quality of educational provision. The pedagogical aspects of educational services are intangible in nature. What can be measured is perceived quality which results from the comparison of the expectations of students and the actual performance they receive. Therefore, all the stakeholders in higher education need to pay attention in strengthening the academic and the non- academic tools, and use them in holistic manner to enhance the quality of students leading to their empowerment. It is observed that prominent factors that affect quality of higher education are infrastructure, financial constraints, political interference and lack of stakeholders' participation, apathy of society, non-professional management and outdated educational policy. It seems that creating quality culture in higher education institutions is a pre-condition for effective student involvement. It is essential to create awareness among all the stakeholders about the importance of student participation in quality enhancement. There is need for the institutions to make conscious efforts to associate students in their quality enhancement process.

Mishra (2006) highlighted in his book *"Quality Assurance in Higher Education: An Introduction"* that higher education institutions work as a community that takes decision to maintain standards and quality. The educational process is also based on community collaborative learning, where the students have to play an active role be it in teaching or research in HEIs. The ability of the student community in quality intervention is debatable, although given a proper environment of transparency and openness that is necessary for a quality institution, students can truly make right interventions through questioning and evaluation. In view of this, the management of quality remains a community effort and not necessarily a role of 'senior management' or the 'principal' alone. NAAC has initiated stakeholder involvement in the process of quality assurance, and has recognized student community as its major stakeholder. NAAC suggests that every HEI should prepare a 'Student Charter' to highlight the rights and obligations of the students. It advocates a student participation approach to develop a quality culture within the institution. The students in higher education should be provided with necessary knowledge about quality so that they can demand quality education. It is believed that such an initiative would help the educational institution to articulate their own obligations to the students and their expectations from them. Higher education is at the cross roads. At one end there is high demand for access to higher education, and at the other the quality is questioned. Quality is a result of collaborative process, where the provider and the user are aware of their responsibilities and behave in the expected manner. In order to survive in the competitive world of globalization, all higher education institutions should pay special attention to quality in higher education.

Petruzzellis (2006) conducted a study on *Student satisfaction and quality of service in Italian Universities* which aims to assess university performance by testing student satisfaction. Higher education institutions need to increase their capacity to understand student satisfaction. A questionnaire was developed and distributed to a sample of students in twelve faculties to analyze students' perception on various services. Data was collected over a period of two months by interviewing a random

sample of 1147 students of university of Bari and was analyzed with SPSS. Ranking was done on various items offering services on 1- 4 scale. It was observed that students' perception of service depends on their experience and it is not stable over time. It was observed that needs of students vary depending upon the geographical area where higher education institution is located. It was concluded by saying that higher education institutions need to concentrate on improvement of quality of teaching and not teaching service and strong relationship with local economies. It was also added that education system as a provider is to be developed by providing training to students.

Somaiah (2006) opined that students' feedback could serve as eye-openers to the faculty and management to understand about the weakness and the strength of the organization. Obtaining mid term and formal end term feedback to a checklist or a questionnaire is essential. Best practice of using and implementing feedback mechanism can provide quality enhancement in the functioning of the institution.

Verma (2007) opined that a venture to maintain and enhance the quality of education cannot bear fruit without active participation of the students. In the recent years, the quality consciousness, as a result of NAAC's efforts, has set the ripples for pondering on the issue of sustaining quality with the active participation of students along with other stakeholders. On the one hand, we are to understand students perspective of how to participate and contribute significantly in the education process while on the other hand, it is teachers who are to ensure student participation not only in learning process but also organization and management of education enterprise. The teachers must understand what are student's expectations and requirements and accordingly involve them in the whole process. But then their perceptions must be realistic and match with the student's expectations.

An effort had been made to critically examine the teachers' perceptions and view point about how to ensure students participation in quality enhancement. The findings were based on the responses collected during five workshops conducted by Academic

Staff College, Shimla in which 280 teachers teaching in colleges and universities of various states of India were participated. It was observed that teachers differ in their perceptions depending upon the nature of institutions, educational culture, experience etc. They felt students' participation is essential for quality assurance.

Quality in higher education could be understood in terms of satisfaction level of stakeholders'. Main stakeholders of education include students, parents, teachers, and management of the institution, prospective employers, government and politicians. Among these stakeholders, students form the focal group which should determine what should be taught and how. In fact all other stakeholders exist to bring about transformation in the students. Quality education focuses at fulfilling the expectations of the students and nurturing their potential. All educational interventions and ventures should be directed towards this objective. But unfortunately in the present education system it is the parents, teachers and educational managers who determine the contents and nature of courses. Students have hardly any say in defining the contents and having the education of their choice. This would require acceptance of the sovereignty of learners by the higher education system. Therefore, besides other tasks, it is essential to understand students' perspective of their participation in quality enhancement and teachers' perspective of student participation as well.

Qamar (2008) in his paper, **"***Status of Quality in Higher Education - Varying Perceptions"* said that there were varying perceptions about quality in higher education. Quality is said to be related to the input parameters. Among other parameters of quality is the lack of infrastructure-physical and human is closely connected with the low quality. Quality control and assurance framework believes that such mechanism will promote quality through transparency and induced actions such as internal quality assurance measures. Thus varying perceptions lay at the root of understanding on quality in higher education. Quality needs to be understood in objective terms to make necessary interventions. Besides the changing context of teaching learning process, the

technological breakthrough in communication and the new roles in the context of knowledge economy need to be taken into account to make appropriate interventions.

Rajasingh (2009) conducted a research on *"Quality Assessment in Higher Education"*. The purpose of this investigation is to examine the perceptions of quality criteria for students and faculty by a broad range of stakeholders. The stakeholders included in his study were faculty, students, alumni and industries. He said that quality of higher education cannot be achieved without knowing the perceptions of stakeholders and their perceptual divide. He pointed out Ajit Isaac's words saying India's burning issue is not that of lack of talent pool, but the lack of talent pool which is on par with quality of world class and employable. Industry leaders presume that only 15% of the people coming out of Indian colleges are employable. The rest are branded 'not employable', not for the lack of theoretical knowledge but for the lack of skills and attitude necessary for doing the job successfully. This is truly a challenge as well as a social responsibility. While the need of the hour is to produce employable and quality manpower, the quality of teaching-learning process in higher education institutions is very vital. Quality of teaching depends on the quality of faculty and the quality of students is the fruit of the quality of learning. It may not be fair to fully transfer this responsibility to the Academic Leaders alone; there must be some share of this responsibility owned by the all stakeholders as well. Hitherto only the academia are playing the vital roles in quality assessment and quality enhancement through quality assessment bodies like National Assessment and Accreditation Council (NAAC) and National Board of Accreditation (NBA).The perceptions of academia on criteria for quality of students, faculty and higher education institutions are prevailing in the process of quality assessment in higher education. However, the role of other stakeholders such as industries, students, faculty and alumni are very much limited in the quality assessment process and their perceptions on the criteria for the quality of students and faculty for better teaching-learning process are not considered. Hence, the study of perceptions of all stakeholders on the criteria for quality of faculty and students of

higher education is the need of the hour for effective quality assessment of higher education in India.

Kalirajan (2010) said that some studies argued that students are the central focus in assessments of educational quality. However, validly measuring student perceptions and expectations is not a simple matter but can be approached in a systematic way to reveal useful information. In the year 1988, the Student Satisfaction Research Unit (SSRU) at Birmingham polytechnic has produced an abundance of information related to students' perceptions of educational quality and their satisfaction with their educational experience. Hence it is strongly advocated that quality and its measurement through students' satisfaction is a recognized one. What is less frequently acknowledged is that they are also major stakeholders in higher education. To date, quality criteria have reflected administrators or faculty priorities. As both the subjects of assessment and stakeholders, students and their perceptions of quality criteria need to be incorporated into the assessment process. Whereas faculties focus on the role of grades as feedback, students see grading as including a gate keeping function. They are thus likely to assign a different value to grades than faculty do. It is also confessed that in-spite of differences between students' and other stakeholders' views, students' perceptions are rarely examined.

Palli and Mamilla (2012) conducted a study on *"Students' Opinions of Service Quality in the Field of Higher Education".* This study attempted to examine the relationship between service quality dimensions and the level of student's satisfaction with the quality of service provided in terms of reliability, assurance, tangibility, empathy and responsiveness. In public as well as in private sector the quality of education is an important factor that is considered for attracting and retaining the students who want to get higher education. This study has three specific objectives. Specifically, the study solicited the opinions and feelings of students regarding service quality provided by the university.

1) To determine the students' satisfaction (opinions) towards the facilities provided by the S.V. University.
2) To analyze the relationship between service quality dimensions attributes of Sri Venkateswara University and students opinions.
3) To evaluate the impact of service quality dimensions on the overall students' opinions in the higher education scenario of S.V. University.

Self-administered questionnaire which is close ended and having two sections was used in this study to collect the related data to establish the relationship between service quality and students satisfaction in higher education institutions. The primary as well as secondary data were used in the present study. Questionnaires were administered to a total of 140 respondents of higher education of various departments of S.V. University, out of which 120 respondents were taken. The sample consisted of 65 Arts students, 20 Science students and 35 Management students in which 62 are male and 58 are female. All the respondents' (opinions) are recorded on a model and measured by using a 5-point Likert scale. The results show that students are satisfied with services in terms of their reliability, assurance, tangibility, and empathy but not much satisfied with responsiveness. The study revealed that the respondents who had studied self supporting course were more satisfied than the respondents who had studied different courses. In the overall satisfaction, the female respondents were more satisfied with service quality attributes of S.V. University than male respondents. Recommendations are made and guidelines for future research are also provided.

Kaur (2013) conducted an evaluative study on *"Quality Assurance in Higher Education"* and found that the quality issues in higher education had various dimensions and teachers, students, parents, administrators had their own notions of viewing quality. These were to be studied and reviewed in different socio-economic contexts for further improvement in higher education for its role in the process of national development. In the face of multiple roles of teachers like teaching, research, consultancy and extension work, development of instructional resources and management of institutions etc. the skill and ability of the teachers had been recognized as a significant dimension of the

quality of education. Therefore, emphasis had been there for the proper development of teachers through teacher education programmes, orientation courses and refresher course. He said that teachers and students did not show a good level of satisfaction with regard to existing government system in the institutions. He found that both teachers and students had favourable attitude towards evaluation criteria. The measurement of quality concerns either through teachers' or students' perceptions need to be validated to conduct more comprehensive surveys for quality assurance in higher education. He also argued that from number of studies it was shown that as students are important stakeholders in higher education, therefore, it is important to ensure their participation in the processes of quality monitoring and assessment.

British Council (2014) conducted a research on *"Understanding India - The Future of Higher Education and Opportunities for International Cooperation"* using semi-structured qualitative interviews to allow the discussion to flow within the question framework in order to capture nuanced and perception-based data, and to explore emergent views, ideas and opinions. Over fifty face-to-face individual interviews were conducted between November 2012 and March 2013 with Indian policymakers and academics. The interview subjects were chosen for their knowledge and influence on national and/or state education policy, and also to include a range of institutions (private, state and central) within the sample. The purpose of these meetings was to explore in detail:

Stakeholders' views on the future of education in India (over 10+ years): the challenges, opportunities, priorities and trends, and the implications for their institution. How stakeholders would like to engage with the UK and what kind of relationships they need with UK institutions in the future

Interviews with the National Assessment and Accreditation Council (NAAC), along with the directions outlined in the 12th Five Year Plan and RUSA, confirmed that the accreditation and regulation of the higher education system is in the process of considerable reform. These changes include the expansion of NAAC's scope, acting

through the formation of multiple agencies. States will have greater responsibilities for quality assurance through state regulatory bodies. There is wide agreement at state government level and among those involved in national policy planning that, currently, universities are not held accountable to government or students, do not provide information about their operations and achievements, and that there is no effective system of performance-based control or support.

All interviewees regarded the future reform of the quality assurance system a top priority and many interviewees were generally aware of the upcoming changes to the system, but several were concerned by the size of the task ahead of them. Several interviewees expressed concern about the affiliated college system and the poor quality of teaching and learning. Some had extremely negative views on the state of teaching in the majority of engineering colleges. Most interviewees recognized the need for systemic change in the regulation, quality assurance and management of affiliated colleges, and welcomed dialogue with other countries similarly affected.

Abidin (2015) said in his paper *"Higher Education Quality: Perception Differences among Internal and External Stakeholders"* that conceptually, education quality of higher education can be determined by evaluation of their stakeholders' satisfaction level. Quality in higher education is a relative concept involving number of various stakeholders. The Purpose of this study is to describe how students as external stakeholder and lecturers as internal stakeholder, perceived their satisfaction of learning experience in the university. Therefore, the objective of this study was finding comprehensive views of quality of education services, from students and lecturer's perspective and also to find whether there are different perspective between student and lecturer. This research is a descriptive analysis to determine and analyze perception of the quality of The UIN Maliki Institution among students and lecturers. So, this study employed quantitative research method to collect, analyze and interpret data. The data was collected via questionnaire which consists of three sections. The dimension of services quality and item questionnaire was adapted from Latief and Bahroom (2010)

and Abidin (2015) studies, and modified according to the context of studies. This study employed purposive random sampling technique to collect data. The participants were graduate and postgraduate students and lecturers from UIN Maliki. The researchers distributed 500 questionnaires to students and 100 questionnaires to lecturers while a total of 361 students and 78 lecturers responded to the survey. The findings indicated that students and lecturers had different perceptions on the quality of education offered by the university. Students as a primary stakeholder of university tend to have lower satisfaction than lecturers as internal stakeholder which means lecturer perceived all dimensions of quality with a higher satisfaction level than students. On the lecturer (teaching and learning) dimension, lecturers perceived this dimension very high level satisfaction, while students perceived just moderate. This finding shows that there is a gap between perception of lecturers and students on higher education quality.

Potluri et al. (2015) conducted a research on *"Students' Perception on Quality of Higher Education in India".* The focal objective of this research is to explore the perceptual displays of students' on different facets of quality viz., tangible facilities, competence, attitudes, content, delivery, and reliability of higher education in India. The researchers employed a well structured questionnaire and conducted personal interviews with 500 students from different graduate and postgraduate programs out of which 344 are male and 156 are female. In addition to the primary methods of data collection, the researchers also relied on secondary methods like books, journals, magazines, committee reports, NAAC documents, unpublished articles, newspaper articles, websites etc. The researchers used convenience sampling and the collected data was analyzed with the support of Microsoft Excel package, frequency distribution and the test of significance for single proportion in Z-test. The required hypotheses were designed based on the literature and empirical studies. The survey was conducted in all the three regions (Coastal Andhra, Rayalaseema and Telangana) of the south Indian state of Andhra Pradesh by using stratified random as well as convenience sampling methods. It was found that 50.28 percent of the responded students expressed their satisfaction over the

facilities of the higher education while 49.88 percent of students have showed their dissent towards tangibles and competence facets of the higher education system respectively. 50.12 percent were not in high spirits with the competence of their faculty in every aspect particularly at the outset, insufficient academic staff and their theoretical, practical and updated knowledge along with teaching and interactive dexterities. Furthermore, 51.08 percent were having positive note on the attitudes of their faculty as against 48.92 negative opinions. 51.03 percent expressed their positive concern over the content of their curriculum. And finally, a staggering 44.76 and 65.20 percent of students reported negatively on delivery of lectures and reliability of the academic programs.

Kundu (2016) said that institutions has undergone changes in the last two decades in terms of increasing demand for higher education, technological advancement, evolving knowledge economy, and pressure to respond to the needs and aspiration of institutions' stakeholders. These changes have posed major challenges to higher educational institutions and long term survival of an educational institution depends on its quality education delivery system. Quality issues are now increasingly becoming relevant for the higher educational institutions and universities. The higher education institutes have realized that great benefits can be achieved by providing high quality education to the satisfaction of various customer groups. Educational institutes consider quality management initiatives as a way of responding to the challenges and as a means of improving staff and student morale, increasing productivity, and delivering higher quality services. He remarked that the educators and those being educated are the most obvious characters in an educational institution though the list of stakeholders in education system includes government and its agencies, university officials, employers, faculty, staff and students. He also added that each stakeholder places different demands on the educational institutes. The key issue is the ability of the quality concept to facilitate the perspectives of these stakeholders who have differing perception of higher

education quality as quality is fast emerging as a theme that is rapidly spreading within the higher education institutions.

Tripathee (2017) conducted a research on "*Analysis of Students' Perception on Quality of Management Education in Kathmandu"* in which he examined the students' perception on quality of MBA program and the relationship between the perceived quality and satisfaction of the students with the MBA program. For this study 250 respondents, 50 each from five universities, pursuing MBA degree were taken as sample and surveyed through structured questionnaire in the year 2016. Five variables are taken as the major quality indicators: quality of curriculum, faculty, employability, infrastructure, and reputation. For data analysis, descriptive, analytical and inferential techniques have been employed. The perceptions of the students were analyzed against the five quality dimensions where significant relationship was seen between the satisfaction of the students and faculty, employability, infrastructure and reputation. The study observed that a good brand name is often associated with quality and it is likely to think that good reputation is bound with good curriculum, faculty, employability and infrastructure. Hence, educational institutions should work on building good rapport in the market as it exerts strong effect on the overall satisfaction of students. The findings also revealed that the factors do affect the students' perception and among the selected five quality dimensions 'reputation' is seen as the most influential factor in forming students perception and 'curriculum' is seen as the least influential factor as there is not much difference in curriculum provided by different universities.

Dicker et al. (2019) conducted a project *"What does 'quality' in higher education mean? Perceptions of staff, students and employers".* They explored quality in higher education from the perspectives of 340 undergraduate students, 32 academic staff and 17 employers through questionnaires. Qualitative data were collected from students in focus groups. Results showed that the quality of teaching and learning, feedback and staff- student relationships were highly rated by staff and students.

Students were positive about the methods of teaching and learning used, however, expressed uncertainty about whether they were receiving a high-quality education. They suggested that higher education institutions and academic staff must articulate the value of the academic offer more clearly to their students.

Gorgodze , Macharashvili & Kamladze (2019) said that in the context of increasing numbers of students enrolling in higher education in the last decade, understanding student expectations of their universities becomes more important. Universities need to know what students expect if they want to keep them satisfied and continue attracting them. On the other hand, it is also important to know whether student expectations are in line with the purpose of the universities and the causes they serve. Their research explored students' expectations and perceptions of the university in post-Soviet Georgia, as well as whether these expectations were in line with the perspectives of university administrators. For the purposes of the research, over 800 bachelor level students of different academic programs were surveyed at five big public universities across Georgia. Additionally, 10 in-depth interviews were conducted with university administrators to learn about the purpose that public universities try to serve and to understand their perspectives on what should be expected of university. After the analysis of the results, two focus groups were conducted with the students in Western and Eastern Georgia to make sense of the findings obtained through the student survey. Finally, 4 in-depth interviews were conducted with experts to understand their perspectives on the actual findings of this research. The results suggest that employment is the main expectation from a university education. Moreover, there is a mismatch between what students identify as their primary expectation and what administrators believe students should expect.

2.3. Review of the studies related to RUSA for promoting Quality

Singh and Madhuri (2014) in their research article, **"***Rashtriya Uchchatar Shiksha Abhiyan (RUSA) :Current Higher Education Trends In Manipur"* briefly explained about the Rashtriya Uchchatar Shiksha Abhiyan (RUSA)/National Higher Education Mission, a Centrally Sponsored Scheme (CSS) for reforming the State Higher Education System in India. They said that this scheme is the key to reformation of State Higher Education System in the country including Manipur which is one of the North-East States of India. The end part of the article also highlighted the status and the economic impact of the scheme on the current Higher Education System of Manipur in the North-Eastern States of India.

Gaurav and Lakshmi (2015) said in their paper *"RUSA and Academic Reforms in Higher Education System of India"* that the higher education system in India at present is at a transition stage. A stage where changes have taken place for good and more transformations in thoughts and processes are desired. For India however, the problem is deep-rooted and a higher education reform is the need of the hour. The demand for higher education and the magnitude of planned reforms over the next ten years in India will provide the largest opportunity in the world for international higher education institutions and education businesses. The Indian higher education system is facing an unprecedented transformation in the coming decade. They mentioned that despite significant progress over the last ten years, Indian higher education is faced with four broad challenges which they have discussed viz. the supply-demand gap; the low quality of teaching and learning; constraints on research capacity and innovation; uneven growth and access to opportunity. The salient features of RUSA are mentioned and it is also said that for academic reforms RUSA's action plans are centered on two objectives: equity-based growth and improvements in teaching-learning and research. These two objectives are also discussed in this paper. It is also remarked that RUSA has recommended stepping up capacity and improvement of infrastructure which can attract and facilitate the retention of students from rural and backward areas as well as

differently-abled and marginalized social groups to enhance equity and inclusion in higher education. The paper is concluded by saying that it is recommended to develop a quality system for conscious, consistent and catalytic programmed action to improve the academic and administrative performance of the HEIs.

Irani (2015) the former Union Human Resource Development Minister, in a written reply to the Lok Sabha question said that improvement of quality of higher education is an on-going process and the Central Government has been making constant efforts towards this. Several initiatives have been launched for improving the quality of higher education in the country. The University Grants Commission (UGC) has formulated Guidelines on Adoption of Choice Based Credit System on 12th November, 2014. It has also laid down several regulations for setting minimum standards of higher education in the country. The UGC has informed that in order to bring about qualitative improvement in Higher Education, the UGC has initiated several measures which include introduction of Choice-Based Credit System (CBCS). The UGC has prepared mainline and specialized model syllabi for undergraduate programmes and made it available to the universities with a view to facilitating the implementation of CBCS. The UGC is implementing schemes for providing quality skill development through higher education. During the Twelfth Five Year Plan, Rashtriya Uchchatar Shiksha Abhiyan (RUSA) seeks to achieve equity, access and excellence in State Higher Educational Institutions. The overall quality of existing State higher educational institutions is sought to be improved by ensuring their conformity to prescribed norms and standards and adoption of accreditation as a mandatory quality assurance framework. Academic, administrative and governance reforms are an essential element of RUSA.

Lal et.al (2015) studied on "*Choice Based Credit System under Rashtriya Uchchatar Shiksha Abhiyan in Himachal Pradesh: A SWOT Analysis*". They found that choice based credit system if globally accepted and more student friendly, there is a need

to look at the supply side of the state colleges that they can and have capacity to offer to the students. In the absence of adequate faculty availability and various other infrastructures, geographical and other implementation bottlenecks to achieve the true spirit of the system still remains at distance. Student creativity should be kept in mind, faculty student ration should be as per the norm and proper infrastructure should be provided only then this system will be successfully implemented.

Pandiya (2015) in his paper "*A study of the Various Provisions and Challenges for RUSA"* examines the provisions and objectives of Rashtriya Uchchatar Shiksha Abhiyan (RUSA) and its implications on the status of higher education in India. The paper takes the form of an exploratory study and draws upon from the materials available in the various published papers and reports by UGC, AICTE, MHRD etc. to present an overview of the need, objectives, prescribed provisions of RUSA and the major challenges to overcome. The objectives of the study were - to study the need for RUSA; to study the main objectives and provisions of RUSA; and to study the major challenges for RUSA. RUSA introduces a significant strategic shift in the approach towards developing the higher education system, by focusing on state level institutions which have been neglected over the years in relation to centrally funded institutions. It seeks to introduce measures such as performance and norm based funding as well as governance and academic reforms at the institutional and state levels to address some of the challenges in higher education in India. If implemented swiftly and efficiently, RUSA can be a turning point for the Indian higher education system as it seeks to achieve higher enrollment rates and address access, equity and quality related concerns.

Patra and Mete (2016) in their paper **"***RUSA: The Roadmap and Future of Higher Education in India"* said that the current key challenges in higher education could be broadly encapsulated in the areas pertaining to – Access, Quality, Equity, Governance and Finance. Higher education needs to be viewed as a long-term social investment for the promotion of economic growth, cultural development, social cohesion, equity and justice. They opined that globalization era has necessitated

inculcation of competitive spirit at all levels which could be achieved only by bringing quality of higher standards to every sphere of work. They highlighted the necessities of RUSA, a national mission for promoting Higher Education which focused on all the areas of Higher Education and particularly on each state's Higher Education requirements through strategic planning & management to meet the needs of quality concern and also to get central funds & grants through RUSA. They said that the government should focus on revamping the institutions with attractive and modern infrastructure like classrooms, hostels, research laboratories, training, equipment, aids etc. They opined that RUSA has the potential of putting the higher education in India on a dynamic fast track and concluded that by fulfilling the goals of RUSA India might be reaching the highest position in higher education among the world.

Rambilas (2015) in his paper "*The National Higher Education Mission (RUSA): Challenges and Prospects"* examines the problems of universities in India with specific reference to funding, autonomy and quality, describes the guidelines of the RUSA scheme along with its opportunities, challenges, and suggestions for strengthening. He said that in order to raise funds, most universities rely heavily on the affiliation fees they receive from affiliated institutions and on self-financing courses. This kind of revenue-generation has led to further dilution of quality and perpetuation of inequity. Most affiliated institutions depend heavily upon the University for administrative, examination-related and curricular matters. The author said that this dependency of higher education institutes on the universities has deteriorated the quality of both the associated higher education institution and the universities. This dependency adds burden of the university while takes away the autonomy of affiliated institutions in teaching and conducting examinations and also does not allow its constituents any room for creativity in teaching, learning, curriculum development or research. In such a structure, quality enhancement can only be brought about by reducing the burden at the university level and giving greater autonomy and accountability to the constituents through affiliation reforms. Various types of control over state universities lead to degradation of their quality. Many of the problems in the state universities are linked to

the archaic systems and regulations that govern them. There is a lack of vision and planning for the development of institutions and the higher education sector at the state level. Given the complexities of managing the access and equity issues within and amongst states as well as the large number of institutions that already come under the state university system, there is a crying need for planning in higher education focusing on the state as the basic unit. The reforms initiated under RUSA would build a self-sustaining momentum that would push for greater accountability and autonomy of state institutions and impress upon them the need to improve the quality of education. The author envisaged that RUSA has holistic vision to revamp the higher education in an exhaustive manner in-spite of several challenges but still many areas need to be comprehensively touched requiring sincere amalgamated approaches.

Bakshi (2017) in her research article, *"Higher Education in India: RUSA and Challenges Mismatch in Supply and Demand of Productive Workforce",* she mentioned the measures and initiatives taken by the UGC towards structural, systemic as well as academic reforms. By pointing out several steps taken by the UGC, she said that capacity building and optimum utilization of land, space, and faculty have been the key concerns of the UGC. She also added that the project RUSA is being implemented for the promotion and expansion of the quality of Higher education. The paper has mentioned the advantages of RUSA being implemented for the higher education in Himachal Pradesh. Despite being significant and effective measures in attaining qualitative expansion and excellence in higher education, the paper said that these reforms suffer from many impediments at the execution part and thus debates the challenges of RUSA with special reference to Himachal Pradesh pointing out problems like Lack of infrastructural facilities; Student –Teacher Ratio; Irrelevant Subject Choices; Lack of vocational utility; Revision of the curriculum. The paper is concluded by saying that the industry – academia tie ups are necessary for achieving the ultimate goals of RUSA and the affiliating universities must guide the colleges to maintain high standards in curricula and evaluation.

Kachari and Dutta (2017) conducted a study called **"***A Study of the Prospects of Higher Education in the Context of Rastriya Uchchatar Shiksha Abhiyan (RUSA)"* which focuses on present scenario of higher education, objective, scope, prospects and major challenges for RUSA. The study is based on secondary data like: journals, books, news-letter and websites. The study revealed that homogeneous improvement in all the three areas i.e. access, equity and quality across India would be a key challenge for RUSA. Parts of India which is in the nascent stages of higher education may only be able to work on access and equity, while quality improvement may take some more time to be visible. Reaching out to rural India and socially and educationally backward class may also be another challenge. It also added the Management Information System (MIS) saying that it would be a challenge to train and align each individual to comply and feed information into MIS system.

Kumar et.al (2017) conducted a study on "*An Analytical Study of Rashtriya Uchchatar Shiksha Abhiyan (In special reference to Higher education, Uttar Pradesh)".* The objectives of the study were to explore the extent of RUSA for quality education of college students; to investigate the outcomes of RUSA in higher education; to identify the impact of RUSA on college students and faculty members; to find out the problems faced by faculty members with new policies. For this study, the researchers had purposively selected 60 faculty members belonging to different colleges and universities of Mathura district in Uttar Pradesh. By the analysis of the primary data, it was found that 70.67% respondents accepted that RUSA and new education policies might uplift the quality of higher education. Average 40% respondents accepted that RUSA and new education policies might uplift the status of education and rate of employment among backward classes, scheduled tribes and scheduled castes. 85% respondents accepted that lack of grants or delay in grants, corruption in education, political interference and lack of awareness against education among OBC's, SC's and ST's are the main challenges against the new education policies/ RUSA.

Vanengmawii (2017) said that the RUSA scheme is one of the important landmarks for higher education for an economically challenged state like Mizoram. She opined that the funds from RUSA would definitely help all the institutions for the development in terms of quantitative and qualitative growth. She also opined that the chance of improvement for higher education was very minimal before RUSA was implemented. She remarked that if the fund received from RUSA were utilized to the fullest with a thorough analysis and sound mind, there is a vast chance for colleges of Mizoram to improve in many ways, be it infrastructure, capacity building, better classrooms, better teaching aids, better libraries, laboratories etc. and different programmes for teachers for the improvement in teaching learning processes.

A study on *"Awareness and Attitude of College Teachers in Mizoram on Rashtriya Uchchatar Shiksha Abhiyan"* was conducted by Vanlalchhanhimi (2017) in which to examine the awareness and the attitude of college Teachers on RUSA in Mizoram constituted the objectives of the study. The study was confined to 8 general degree colleges of Aizawl District offering B, A, B.Sc. and B.Com courses only. The findings revealed that most of the teachers from all the streams had heard about RUSA but they were not fully aware about the programme, components and its funding pattern. It was also found that most of the teachers were not aware about RUSA as a programme for promoting quality in higher education. It was found that when it comes to the attitude of college teachers towards RUSA, the Degree college teachers irrespective of their designation, qualification and stream of study were not familiar with RUSA as a programme for improvement of quality of teaching learning process, however, almost all the teachers had favorable attitude towards the objectives of RUSA. Maximum number of teachers showed disagreement and were uncertain with RUSA having lesser impact on higher education in Mizoram and they were uncertain if RUSA would help in overcoming the obstacles faced in higher educational institutions. It was also observed from the findings that the teachers were unsure about RUSA as a means of improving the higher educational institutions and as a means for expanding and upgrading degree

colleges to model college, as a result the teachers are not fully familiarize with the programme. The researcher concluded that almost all the teachers were not showing favorable attitudes about the concept of RUSA and its components, irrespective of their designation, stream of education and qualifications.

Devi and Bushan (2018) in their paper called *"RUSA: Expansion and future of higher education in India",* said that the launching of the mission mode scheme called Rashtriya Uchchatar Shiksha Abhiyan (RUSA): National Higher: Education Mission by the MHRD is to bring certain systemic changes to improve Indian higher education system and is going to be a landmark scheme to improve higher education system. The paper pointed out and discussed briefly the Key Issues Plaguing Higher Education in the following areas pertaining to – Access, Quality, Equity, Governance and Finance. The background and overview, the key goals and objectives and the benefits of RUSA are also highlighted. The paper is concluded by saying that Higher education needs to be viewed as a long-term social investment for the promotion of economic growth, cultural development, social cohesion, equity and justice as the globalization era has necessitated inculcation of competitive spirit at all levels. This can be achieved only by bringing quality of higher standards to every sphere of work. RUSA is a national mission for promoting Higher Education. Focusing on all the areas of HE and particularly on each states HE requirements through strategic planning & management to meet the needs of quality concern and also to get central funds & grants through RUSA the govt. should now focus on revamp the institutions with attractive and modern infrastructure. RUSA has potential of putting the higher education in India on a dynamic fast track. By fulfilling the above goals we may be reached the highest position in higher education among the world.

Saini and Monikasood (2018) undertook a study on *"Effect of Implementation of Rashtriya Uchchatar Shiksha Abhiyan (RUSA) on Gross Enrollment Ratio"* to investigate the effect on gross enrolment ratio of higher education institutions in Mandi

district of Himachal Pradesh after implementation of RUSA. They said that the major issues in higher education are access, equity and quality. So they added that greater access requires an enhancement of the educational institutional capacity of higher education sector to provide opportunities to all those who deserve and desire higher education. The findings of their study revealed that the gross enrolment ratio had increased remarkably in higher education institutions after implementation of RUSA.

Sahoo and Sarat (2019) studied *"Awareness of Teachers about the Academic Provisions of RUSA to Enhance the Quality of Higher Education".* They said that Rashtriya Uchchatar Shiksha Abhiyan (RUSA)-National Higher Education Mission is one of the creative evolutions which is being developed to boost higher education sector in India. The study assessed the awareness of teachers about the academic provisions of RUSA in relation to its various aspects like access, equity, faculty, reform in admission process, curriculum development and examination process, research and development etc., which are concerned to improve the quality of higher education. A mixed method approach with proper combination of both qualitative and quantitative processes was adopted as the primary design for the study and it was conducted on the rural degree college teachers of Odisha. A multi-stage sampling procedure has been adopted by the investigator to select sample and to make the sampling process more practical. The investigator selected 54 rural degree college teachers from six rural degree colleges two from each zones of Odisha. The self-developed awareness test, semi-structure interview schedule and checklist appropriate for relevant data collection were used and the collected data were analyzed by percentage analysis and thread wire discussion. The findings of the study revealed that majority of the teachers working in rural degree colleges were yet not aware about the academic provisions of RUSA in relation to its all dimensions-access, equity, faculty and research and development. Further, the stream wise (Arts, Science and Commerce) information obtained by researcher confirmed that only to some extent the Arts teachers were aware about the academic provisions of RUSA in comparison to Science and Commerce teachers.

2.4 Conclusion:

From the reviews of the related studies, it is observed that quality of higher education is the main focus in the world of today and as such there are numbers of studies about the quality of higher education. It is also revealed that the perceptions of stakeholders are very crucial for quality education. However, there are only few studies found yet in relation to perceptions of stakeholders on quality of higher education. Besides this, there is also a dearth of research studies on RUSA particularly in relation to quality. Moreover, as far as the knowledge of the researcher is concerned, there is not yet any study conducted in the state of Mizoram regarding the quality of higher education. Based on these mentioned research gaps, the researcher felt the need to take up research in this area which serves as one of the most prevailing topic in the present situation. Therefore, the researcher is studying the perceptions of stakeholders on quality of higher education in Mizoram in the context of RUSA.

CHAPTER –III

METHODOLOGY

CHAPTER –III

METHODOLOGY

Research methodology provides guidelines for investigation. It forms the basis for conducting research as it aims to give the work plan of research. Research methodology is the specific procedures or techniques used to identify, select, process, and analyze information about a topic. Research methodology can be, thus, understood as the process of arriving at dependable solutions to problems through planned and systematic collection, analysis, and understanding of data. It is essential to select the appropriate methodology for any study in order to prevent misleading or faulty results. The chapter entitled, the research methodology provides a brief picture of the method used in conducting the research, the sample and the tools used in conducting the research. It also gives the procedure adopted for the collection of the data along with the Statistical techniques used and the rationale underlined them. The ambit of the research is confined to a descriptive survey.

3.1 Design of the study

A research design answers the questions as to how one should proceed to answer his research questions and test his hypothesis. **In the words of Kerlinger, "*Research design is a plan, structure and strategy of investigations so conceived as to obtained answers and to research questions or problem".***

A descriptive survey method was used for the present study. Koul (2009) said that descriptive survey is the only means through which opinions, outlooks, perceptions, attitudes, suggestions for improvement of educational practices and instruction, and other data can be obtained. For the purpose of the study mixed methods research design was followed. Hence the study is both quantitative and qualitative in nature. It is qualitative method as observation and in-formal interviews were used for case study of

college as well as to examine the status of implementation of RUSA. The study is also quantitative as structured questions along with fixed responses were used in questionnaire to elicit the perceptions of stakeholders on quality of higher education.

The primary data were collected through questionnaire from 21 Government colleges functioning under the department of Higher and Technical Education where only general education is imparted while secondary data were gathered from the official website and reports of the MHRD, UGC, All India Survey on Higher Education (AISHE), NAAC, related research work, journals, news papers, books, etc.

3.2 Population

Population can be explained as a comprehensive group of individuals, institutions, objects and so forth with have common characteristics that are the interest of a researcher. The study is delimited to general degree colleges of Mizoram affiliating to Mizoram University. In Mizoram, there are 21 affiliated government general degree colleges. So the population for the study includes all the students and teachers in these 21 colleges. As of June 2018, there were 13039 students and 772 teachers in these colleges.

Table 3.1: Number of students and teachers in 21 government general degree colleges (2017-2018).

Sl. No	Name of the College	No. of Students	No. of Teachers
1.	Govt. Hrangbana College	1758	71
2.	Govt. Aizawl College	1069	55
3.	Govt. Aizawl North College	1299	27
4.	Govt. Aizawl West College	866	36
5.	Govt. T. Romana College	1072	38
6.	Govt. Johnson College	855	28

7.	Govt. J. Thankima College	609	24
8.	Govt. Zirtiri Residential Science College	604	59
9.	Govt. Lunglei College	774	60
10.	Govt. J. Buana College	538	31
11.	Govt. Champhai College	661	55
12.	Govt. Saitual College	232	27
13.	Govt. Khawzawl College	80	22
14.	Govt. Hnahthial College	107	26
15.	Govt. Lawngtlai College	394	36
16.	Govt. Saiha College	426	13
17.	Govt. Kolasib College	440	55
18.	Govt. Serchhip College	401	46
19.	Govt. MamitCollege	112	16
20.	Govt. Zawlnuam College	53	14
21.	Govt. Kamalanagar College	306	32
	Total	13039	772

(Source: Mizoram University Annual Report 2017-2018)

3.3 Sample

A sample is simply a subset of the population. It can be defined as the small portion elements (people or objects) chosen from the population for a particular study, or, for participation in a study. Sampling can be done through various sampling techniques in accordance with the nature of the sample as well as the subject matter of the study.

Selection of sample for the present study was simple random sampling in nature. 10 teachers and 20 students from each degree college of Mizoram i.e. 210 teachers and 420 students were selected randomly who so ever available in the college on the day of data collection as sample of the study. Further, Director of State Higher Education Council and 10 Principals of degree colleges were selected as sample of the study. Govt. Champhai

College was selected for case study, as the college has the highest grade accredited by NAAC so far among the 21 government general degree colleges.

3.4 Tools and Techniques

The selection of suitable instruments or tools and techniques is of prime importance for successful research. Different tools are essential for collecting various kinds of information and data for various purposes.

As there was no readymade questionnaire which was relevant for the present study, the investigator developed questionnaire for the students and teachers of government general degree colleges in Mizoram to examine the perceptions on quality of higher education in Mizoram. The investigator also developed Interview Schedule to collect certain information from the principals of government general degree colleges in Mizoram and Director of State Higher Education Council regarding status of implementation of RUSA.

For developing the questionnaire, the researcher reviewed the parameters set by NAAC for appraisal of colleges and the model sample student feedback questionnaires suggested by NAAC to obtain feedback from students. The issues dealing with different aspects of quality inputs in higher education from NAAC reports and RUSA along with other documents, researches and literature about quality on higher education were also thoroughly reviewed and studied for the purpose. Further, informal interactions with teachers working in colleges helped the researcher broaden the perspective. After thorough study of the related literature and informal interactions with many stakeholders, preliminary draft of the questionnaire was prepared and this preliminary draft of the questionnaire was then reviewed with the supervisor. The required modifications were made by incorporating the valuable suggestions made by the supervisor to maintain the quality of questionnaire.

The draft questionnaire was then given to veteran experts of education to seek their valuable suggestions and opinions in order to remove the ambiguity in the questions and to have content validity. Some items and some statements – in form of structural framing of items and/or statements, mutual exclusivity of items, inclusion and deletion of items were then incorporated in the questionnaire based on their feedback and suggestions. The final draft of the questionnaire was then evolved which was used for collection of data regarding the perceptions of stakeholders on quality of higher education. The final questionnaire is divided into two parts. The first section is about the basic personal profile of the respondents consisting information regarding gender, age, name of the college, subject/stream, qualification level, and experience of respondents and second section includes certain questions for examining their perceptions regarding quality of colleges. All these questions were closed type which include probable answers to tick mark the most appropriate answers out of the multiple-choice items.

Statements in the questionnaire were written on seven components/aspects which are – curriculum transacted; examination and evaluation practices; research and innovation; infrastructure and instructional facilities; student support service; governance and leadership practices; autonomy of the college. These components are framed as per blending of the quality concerns of RUSA and the criteria adopted by NAAC for assessment and accreditation of higher education institutions.

Since the knowledge level about institution and the experiences would be different for students and teachers, separate questionnaire was prepared for students and teachers. The questionnaire meant for students had 40 questions while the questionnaire meant for teachers consists of 47 questions.

Unstructured interview was done on some Principals of the colleges after careful study of the requirement of the research, in order to examine the status of implementation of RUSA programs in general degree colleges of Mizoram.

3.5. Reliability of Tool

Reliability is the second most important characteristic of a measuring device. According to Greene et.al (1955), *"Á test is said to be reliable when it functions consistently".*

After the preparation of final draft of the questionnaire for the college teachers and students as per the suggestions and remarks of the experts, the investigator first administered the questionnaire over a sample of 20 college teachers and 20 students from two colleges of Aizawl district. After getting the responses the investigator tabulated the responses. To estimate the reliability of the questionnaire the investigator again administered the previous questionnaire on the sample previously covered after one month. The responses taken from the respondents in the second time were tabulated. The investigator, thus, co-related the two sets of scores by product moment method. The statistical formula used to calculate the co-efficient of co-relation has been given by Garrett. (1971).

$$r_{xy} = \frac{\sum x^1 y^1}{N} - C^1 x C^1 y$$

$$x^1 y^1$$

Where x^1, y^1 are the deviations from the assumed mean. N is the size of the sample, C^1x, C^1y are co-relation factors. The value of r found was **0.716** which is very high. Thus, the questionnaire was very reliable.

3.6 Procedure of Data Collection

The investigator covered all colleges personally. After reaching the college the investigator met the principal of the concerned college and randomly selected teachers and students who ever available in that day from each sample college and established rapport with them. Then she gave the questionnaire and requested them to answer the

entire question. The investigator explained how to answer the questions and clarified the doubts if the sample raised any. They were given sufficient time to fill in the questionnaires and when they were finished, the filled in questionnaires were collected by the researcher. The above process was adopted for all the colleges to collect data for present study. The filled in the questionnaires collected from the samples personally were critically examined, cleaned and quantified as far as possible and tabulated systematically for further analysis. Principals were also met by the researcher and informal interviews were done in order to collect information regarding the first objective of the study which is to examine the status of implementation of RUSA programmes in government general degree colleges of Mizoram. The investigator was fully satisfied that the data collected were genuine.

As Govt. Champhai College was selected for case study, the researcher visited the college several times to collect necessary information relating to the study. Moreover, informal interactions were done with IQAC coordinator, various teachers, non-teaching staffs and students so as to obtain the necessary information relating to the study.

3.7 Mode of Analysis

Keeping in view the objectives of the study and nature of data, descriptive techniques such as percentages was employed for the analysis and interpretation of data. Tabulation of data for percentages was done manually.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

CHAPTER IV
ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

The present chapter deals with the analysis and interpretation of data. The study aims to find out about the status of implementation of RUSA programs in general degree college of Mizoram and to find out the perceptions of stakeholders, i.e., students and teachers on the Quality of colleges in Mizoram with respect to some components.

Primary data was collected from the randomly selected samples, i.e. teachers and students from the 21 government general degree colleges by administering the questionnaires to find out their perceptions on the quality of college and from principals of various colleges out of these 21 colleges by administering informal interview. For case study, primary data was collected from teachers, students, IQAC coordinator and librarian through interactions as well as from the observation of the researcher. Secondary data were collected from the official website and reports of UGC, MHRD, RUSA, NAAC, Mizoram University Annual Reports, Office Records and Reports of State Project Directorate, RUSA.

The primary data obtained from the respondents through questionnaire were scored, classified, tabulated and analyzed. The analysis of the data was carried out with the help of appropriate statistical techniques, and the findings were interpreted and presented in the present chapter in accordance with the objectives stated in chapter I.

4.1. The status of implementation of RUSA programs in general degree colleges of Mizoram.

The State Higher Education Council of Mizoram was formed by an Executive Order on 13th May 2014.The role of SHEC is to prepare the State Higher Education Plan, Perspective Plan, Annual Plan and Budget Plan. It provided State Institutions inputs for creating their plans and implementing them and coordinating between apex

bodies, regulatory institutions and government. The government of Mizoram formulated following plans and programmes for implementation of RUSA1.0 in the state.

(a) Create new universities by upgrading existing autonomous colleges and conversion of colleges in a cluster.

(b) Create new model degree colleges, new professional colleges and provide infrastructural support to universities and colleges.

(c) Faculty recruitment support, faculty improvements programmes and leadership development of educational administrators

(d) A separate component to synergize vocational education with higher education has also been included in RUSA.

(e) Besides these, RUSA also supports reforming, restructuring and building capacity of institutions in the participating state.

The following are the primary components of RUSA that the state government pursued for the fulfillment of the targets from Academic year 2013 to 2017:

(i) Upgrading existing autonomous colleges to Universities
(ii) Conversion of colleges to Cluster Universities
(iii) Infrastructure grants to colleges
(iv) New Model Colleges (General)
(v) Upgrading existing degree colleges to model colleges
(vi) New Colleges (Professional)
(vii) Infrastructure grants to colleges
(viii) Research, innovation and quality improvement
(ix) Equity initiatives
(x) Faculty Recruitment Support
(xi) Faculty improvements
(xii) Vocationalization of Higher Education
(xiii) Support to polytechnics
(xiv) Capacity building and preparation, data collection and planning

(xv) Management Monitoring Evaluation and Research

Under RUSA 2.0 a State Higher Education Plan (SHEP) for higher education in the state of Mizoram was proposed for a period of 5, 10 and 15 years on 15-05-2018, which would be reviewed by SHEC and appropriate committee constituted by the council. Under component (vii) i.e. infrastructure grant to the colleges @ 2 crores, 8 colleges of Mizoram state applied for the same as on July 2018. Subsequently, 25 colleges were also included for this component.

Under component (ix) i.e. equity initiatives for state, the council planned to construct two girls' hostels in two identified places to ensure greater inclusion of women in higher education. The colleges namely Govt. J. Thankima College and Govt. T. Romana College were included under equity initiatives.

It was resolved in the SHEC that government should apply for RUSA funding under component (v) of RUSA i.e. upgradation of existing colleges to Model degree colleges @ Rs 4 crores. Government planned to include three colleges namely Government Mamit College, located in aspiration district, Government Lawngtlai College, located in most backward district and unserved/underserved areas and government Saiha college, located in the southern part of Mizoram is an underserved area.

The council also planned that all colleges have to go for NAAC accreditation mandatorily. The government also planned to strengthen SHEC and State Project Directorate with resource centre to organize meetings, workshops, consultations and preparation of plans under component (xiv) of RUSA 2.0. Out of 32 colleges 25 colleges were included under different components of RUSA. The above discussions highlights about the plans and programmes under taken by state government of Mizoram under RUSA 1.0 and RUSA 2.0.

In RUSA 1.0, Mizoram was approved for funding under 5 Components:

1) Upgradation of Existing Degree Colleges to Model Degree Colleges (2- Colleges, viz. Govt. Hrangbana College & Govt. Residential Science College.) – Project Amount 8 crore (@Rs. 4 crore each).
2) Infrastructure Grants to Colleges (21 Govt. Colleges) – Project Amount 42 crore (@ Rs. 2 crore each).
(3) New Professional College (Mizoram Engineering College) - Project Amount Rs. 26 crore.
4) Equity Initiatives (24- Govt. Colleges) – Project Amount 5 crore for 24 Colleges.
5) Faculty Recruitment Support (72- posts of Assistant Professors).

All projects under RUSA 1.0 have been completed with the exception of activities being funded under Equity Initiatives 3rd Installment, Rs. 125/- lakh (Central share Rs 112.5 lakh and SMS 12.50 lakh). Construction of 8- buildings for Mizoram Engineering College has been completed with RUSA fund (Rs. 26 crore). Sizeable amount of fund is still required to make the College functional or start classes. It is suggested that BTech/B.E (Civil) Course be introduced first and other courses/disciplines may be gradually opened in due course. Teaching and Non-Teaching staff requirement must be worked out and sanctioned by the State Government.

New College (Professional) Mizoram Engineering College

Mizoram Engineering College was constructed at Pukpui, Lunglei. Construction of Mizoram Engineering College started on 22nd April, 2016 and was completed on 16th November, 2018. On 3rd February 2019 the Prime Minister of India digitally launched the College along with other projects under RUSA from Srinagar, J& K. The constructed buildings of MEC with total cost break up are given below:

Table - 4.1: Total cost break-up of New College (Professional) - Mizoram Engineering College

Sl. no	**Building**	**Amount (In Rs)**
1	Administrative Block	9,37,40,000.
2	Academic Block	9,71,13,000.
3	Laboratory Workshop	1,89,75,000.
4	Library	1,33,95,000.
5	Boy's Hostel	1,67,13,600.
6	Girl's Hostel	1,11,42,400.
7	Student's Common Room	66,97,000.
8	Cafeteria	22,32,000.
	Grand Total	**26,00,00,000**

Table - 4.2: Upgrading of Existing Colleges to Model Degree Colleges under RUSA 1.0 (Rs 4 crores each)

Name of College	**New Construction/Upgrade**	**REMARKS**
1.Govt. Hrangbana College	Auditorium, Seminar hall and Classrooms (Rs.140 lakhs)	Completed in March 2017
	New Construction of Classrooms for Commerce Block at Muthi (Rs.140 lakhs)	Completed in August, 2018.
2.Govt. Zirtiri Residential Science College	New Construction of Science Laboratory at Durtlang new Campus. (Rs.140 lakhs)	Completed in March 2017
	Upgradation of existing Boys and Girls Hostel at Durtlang. (Rs.140 lakhs)	Completed in May, 2018

Upgrading of existing Degree College to Model Degree Colleges under RUSA 2.0

Four (4) colleges were approved by the RUSA Project Approval Board for receiving a sum of Rs. 4,00,00,000/- each totalling Rs. 16,00,00,000/-. Proposed work are listed below-

Table - 4.3: New Construction in 4 Model Degree Colleges under RUSA 2.0

Sl. No	Name of College	Name of work
1	Govt. Saiha College	Library cum seminar room
2	Govt. Hnahthial College	Academic Block
3	Govt. J. Thankima College	Academic Block
4	Govt. Mamit College	Library cum Seminar Hall

Table - 4.4: List of new constructions in 21 colleges under Infrastructure Grants (@ 2 crores each under RUSA1.0)

Sl. No	Name of Institute	Name of Work (New Construction)
1	Govt. Aizawl College	Construction of cafeteria & Students Common room.
2	Govt. T.Romana College	Construction of administrative building
3	Govt. Aizawl North College	Construction of College building
4	Govt. Aizawl West College	Construction of Auditorium & Library.
5	Govt. Johnson College	Construction of classroom
6	Govt. J.Thankima College	Construction of classroom
7	IASE	Construction of classroom
8	Govt. Mamit College	Construction of classroom
9	Govt. Lawngtlai College	Construction of classroom
10	Govt. Kolasib College	Construction of Laboratory
11	Govt. Champhai College	Construction of computer classroom and laboratory

12	Govt. Kamalanagar College	Construction of classroom and canteen
13	Govt. Hnahthial College	Construction of students' common room and library
14	Govt. J.Buana College	Construction of multipurpose hall
15	Govt. Saiha College	Construction of administrative building
16	Govt. Saitual College	Vertical extension of college building
17	Govt. Khawzawl College	Construction of Multipurpose hall
18	Govt. Mizoram Law College	Construction of Library and cafeteria
19	Govt. Serchhip College	Construction of classroom
20	Lunglei Govt. College	Vertical extension of college building
21	Govt. Zawlnuam College	Construction of classroom

The status of implementation of RUSA in Mizoram is also presented below with respect to Access, Equity and Excellence:

Access

The objective of the RUSA 1.0 is to achieve the target of GER of 30% by the year 2020. The government of Mizoram increased the enrolment capacity at graduation and post-graduation level since 2016. Under RUSA 2.0 initiative has been taken to increase the GER by capacity enhancement of existing institutions. New professional college namely Mizoram Engineering College, Lunglei has been established by the government of Mizoram in 2016. New colleges have been opened. Government of Mizoram invited private bodies to open institutions at higher education level. As a result, four colleges have been opened during the year 2016-19.

Mizoram has only one central university and all the colleges are affiliated to this. Though the government proposed to create Universities by converting colleges into cluster under RUSA it was rejected in the PAB, because none of the colleges proposed were having CPE, NAAC's A Grade accreditation. With regards to Upgradation of

Existing Degree Colleges to Model Degree Colleges, 11 colleges were proposed, 9 colleges were approved as 7 colleges located in EBD and did meet RUSA norms, remaining 2 colleges not prioritized for funding. Government Hrangbana College, Aizawl, and Government Zirtiri Residential Science College, Aizawl were upgraded to model degree colleges in the 5th PAB on 10-12-2014. Four colleges namely Government Mamit college, Government Hnahthial college, Government Saiha college, Government J.Thankima college had received grant under RUSA 2.0 for upgradation to Model Degree Colleges. There was no plan by the state government and thus had not received any grant under RUSA 2.0 for converting existing colleges into universities, converting a cluster of colleges into universities, conversion to autonomous colleges in RUSA 2.0.

Equity

For this component the state was considered as a unit. In the 9th PAB meeting 24 government colleges were included in this component and received the funds. Under RUSA Equity Initiative Component, various activities are being undertaken: -

To address language barrier due to geographical isolation and dominance of Mizo language, 24- Govt. Colleges were equipped with Language Laboratory, Spoken Hindi and English Class were organized in all Colleges. Addition of Spoken Burmese Class is organized in Champhai college, equal opportunity cell & career and counseling cell were created and strengthened, and remedial class for weak and slow learners were organized, Gender & PWD sensitization campaign was organized and Various Personality Development Programme were also organized in different colleges. The enrolment of SC/ST/OBC/Physically challenged persons has been increased.

Total amount of Rs 5 crore for Equity Initiative was approved by PAB in 2015 and Rs 3.750 crore was released as first and second instalment for 24 Colleges/institutions in 2016 and 2017 respectively which was fully utilized. The 3rd and final instalment amounting Rs 1.125 crore, (Central Share) had been released vide F.NO.24-39/2014-U-Policy (MZEI-Gen) dated 7th December, 2018. The state matching

share of 10% i.e. Rs 12.50 lakh was also released and the central share alongwith state share was transferred to the dedicated RUSA account of 24 beneficiary Colleges vide No.G.21017/2/2016-SPD (RUSA)PT-I dated Aizawl, the 15th March, 2019. Beneficiary Colleges are still in final stage of utilizing the 3rd and final instalment due to Covid-19 crisis and nationwide lockdown which otherwise would have been fully utilized by April 2020.

Excellence

Infrastructural upgradation is a step towards creation of enabling environment or conditions in higher education system to make the system more useful, progressive, quick attractive, transparent, responsive and friendly. Under RUSA 1.0, 21 colleges of Mizoram received the grants of Rs 1.8 crore for each college for the strengthening of Infrastructure and instructional facilities. Under RUSA 2.0, 13 colleges received grants of Rs 1.8 crore for development of infrastructural facilities. Rs 4 crore each had been sanctioned to 2 colleges for upgradation of existing colleges to model degree colleges under RUSA 1.0. Under RUSA 2.0, 4 colleges had been sanctioned for upgradation of model colleges. Eight buildings were completed on 16th Nov, 2018 for new professional college i.e. Mizoram Engineering College. Total amount of Rs 5 crore for Equity Initiative was approved by PAB in 2015, of which Rs 3.750 crore released as first and second instalment for the 24 colleges/institutions in 2016 and 2017 respectively were fully utilized. Accordingly, the equity initiative grants were released to the beneficiary colleges/ institutions during April & May, 2019 and College were utilizing the fund for conduct of Spoken English and Hindi class, remedial class, organising various personality development programmes, computer training, PWD and gender sensitization, Career guidance and awareness programme, etc. With regards to faculty requirement 69 Assistant professors had been filled up out 72 posts.

4.2. Perceptions of stakeholders on the quality of infrastructure and instructional facilities available in the degree colleges of Mizoram.

The perceptions of students and teachers on the quality of infrastructure and instructional facilities available in the colleges were obtained by administering two slightly different questionnaires to the selected samples.

The data collected through the questionnaires were tabulated, arranged and analyzed separately for students and teachers which were then clubbed together to get the required results. The responses of students and teachers regarding the quality of infrastructure and infrastructural facilities available in the colleges have been analyzed through percentage analysis. The results of the analysis are presented in percentages in the following tables in accordance with the statements given in the questionnaires:

Table 4.5: Perceptions of students on quality of infrastructure and instructional facilities.

Sl.No.	Statements	Very good	Good	Poor	Very poor
1.	Use of modern teaching aids in your college	18.57	56.2	15.71	9.52
2.	College buildings and infrastructures	21.42	61.93	3.8	12.85
3.	Maintenance of physical infrastructure	30	53.82	9.04	7.14
4.	Library material and facilities	34.76	41.92	14.28	9.04
5.	Equipment and maintenance of Laboratories	18.09	39.06	24.76	18.09
6.	Classroom settings	37.14	49.54	7.61	5.71
7.	Computer facilities and internet connections	12.85	32.38	10.95	43.82
8.	Books and journals available in the	19.52	66.68	10	3.8

	college library				
9.	Recreational centers/rooms	10.95	52.39	19.52	17.14
10.	Infrastructural facilities for co-curricular activities available in your college	16.19	56.2	18.57	9.04
11.	Hostel facilities	10.95	42.87	20.47	25.71
12.	Transport facilities	21.42	21.42	18.57	38.59
	Overall Percentage	**20.98**	**47.88**	**14.44**	**16.7**

From the above table it is seen that 18.57% students perceived that Use of modern teaching aids in the college was very good, 56.2% of them perceived it as good, 15.71% students perceived as poor and 9.52% of the students opined as very poor.

The quality of College buildings and infrastructures were perceived as very good by 21.42% of the students, 61.93% of the students perceived as good while only 3.8% of the students perceived as poor and 12.85% of the students perceived as very poor.

30% of the students perceived that maintenance of physical infrastructure in the college was very good, 53.82% students perceived that it was good, 9.04% students perceived as poor and it was perceived as very poor by only 7.14% students.

It is shown from the above table that 34.76% students perceived that the quality of Library material and facilities was very good, 41.92% students perceived that it was good, 14.28% students perceived as poor and a less percentage i.e. 9.04% students perceived that it was very poor.

The students' perception on the quality of Equipments of Laboratories and their maintenance was shown in the table which indicates that 18.09% students perceived as

very good, 39.06% of them perceived as good, 24.76% of them opined as poor and 18.09% students perceived as very poor.

It is observed from the table that the quality of Classroom settings was perceived as very good by 37.14% of the students and as good by 49.54% students whereas it was perceived as poor by only 7.61% and as very poor by only 5.71% of the students.

The perceptions of the students on the quality of Computer facilities and internet connections in the college were clearly seen in table 4.1. showing that 12.85% of them opined as very good, 32.38% students perceived as good, 10.95% students perceived as poor and 43.82% of the students perceived as very poor.

Books and journals available in the college library were perceived as very good by 19.52% students and as good by majority i.e. 66.68% students while 10% students perceived that the books and journals available in the college were poor and a very few percentage i.e. 3.8% students perceived as very poor.

The table shows that the quality of Recreational centers/rooms in the college was perceived as very good by only 10.95% students and as good by 52.39% students, 19.52% students perceived as poor and 17.14% of the students perceived that the quality of recreational centers/rooms in the college was very poor.

The above table also highlights that only 9.04% of the students perceived that the infrastructural facilities for co-curricular activities available in the college were very good, 18.57% students perceived as good, a large number of students i.e. 56.2% students perceived as poor and 16.19% of them perceived as very poor.

The students' perception on the quality of Hostel facilities was also shown in the table indicating that 10.95% of them perceived as very good, 42.87% of them perceived as good, 20.47% and 25.71% of the students perceived as poor and very poor respectively.

The quality of Transport facilities in the college was perceived as very good by 21.42% of the students and as good by 21.42%students while 18.57% students perceived as poor and it was perceived as very poor by 38.59% of the students.

Thus, the above table reveals that out of 420 students, only 20.98% perceived that the quality of infrastructure and infrastructure facilities were very good, while majority 47.88% of them perceived that it was good, 14.44% perceived that it was poor and 16.7% perceived it as very poor. It is evident from the findings that majority of the students were satisfied with the quality of the infrastructure and instructional facilities. However, more number of students perceived that computer facilities and internet connections in the college were very poor. The findings also reveal that more students perceived that the transport facilities in the general degree college of Mizoram were very poor.

Table - 4.6: Perceptions of teachers on quality of infrastructure and instructional facilities.

Sl.No	Statements	Very good	Good	Poor	Very poor
1.	Use of modern teaching aids in your college	10.47	72.4	15.71	1.42
2.	College buildings and infrastructures	12.85	66.68	20.47	-
3.	Maintenance of physical infrastructure	2.38	85.73	10.47	1.42
4.	Library material and facilities	0.95	68.1	30	0.95
5.	Equipment and maintenance of Laboratories	9.52	47.14	34.76	8.58
6.	Classroom settings	5.23	75.26	18.09	1.42
7.	Computer facilities and internet connections	4.28	46.68	40.95	8.09
8.	Books and journals available in the	15.23	40.97	34.28	9.52

	college library				
9.	Recreational centres/rooms	2.85	35.23	46.21	15.71
10.	Infrastructural facilities for co-curricular activities available in your college	9.52	43.80	36.68	10
11.	Hostel facilities	8	47.87	19.42	24.71
12.	Transport facilities	35.42	16.7	28.82	19.06
13.	Overall strength of teaching faculty in your college	13.33	39.07	33.8	13.8
	Overall Percentage	**10**	**52.75**	**28.43**	**8.82**

It is observed from the above table that 10.47% teachers perceived that Use of modern teaching aids in the college was very good, majority of them i.e. 72.4% perceived it as good, 15.71% teachers perceived as poor and only 1.42% of the teachers perceived as very poor.

The quality of College buildings and infrastructures were perceived as very good by 12.85% of the teachers, majority 66.68% of the teachers perceived as good while 20.47% of the teachers perceived as poor and none of them perceived as very poor.

From the above table, it is shown that a very less number of teachers i.e. 2.38% perceived that maintenance of physical infrastructure in the college was very good and a high majority i.e. 85.73% perceived that it was good, 10.47% of the teachers perceived as poor and it was perceived as very poor by only 1.42% teachers.

The quality of Library material and facilities was perceived as very good by a very low percentage of teachers i.e. 0.95% teachers and as good by 68.1% teachers, 30% of the teachers perceived as poor and a very less percentage i.e. 0.95% teachers perceived that it was very poor.

The teachers' perception on the quality of Equipments of Laboratories and their maintenance was shown in the table which indicates that 9.52% perceived as very good, 47.14% perceived as good, 34.76% opined as poor and 8.58% perceived as very poor.

It is observed from the table that the Classroom settings was perceived as very good by 5.23% teachers and a large majority of the teachers i.e. 75.26% perceived as good, it was perceived as poor by 18.09% and as very poor by only 1.42% of the teachers.

The perceptions of the teachers on the quality of Computer facilities and internet connections in the college which is seen in table 4.1 indicates that only 4.28% of them opined as very good, 46.68% perceived as good, 40.95% perceived as poor and 8.09% perceived as very poor.

Books and journals available in the college library were perceived as very good by 15.23% teachers and as good by 40.97% teachers, 34.28% teachers perceived as poor and 9.52% of the teachers perceived that the books and journals available in the college were very poor.

The above table shows that the quality of Recreational centers/rooms in the college was perceived as very good by only 2.85% teachers and as good by 35.23% teachers, 46.21% teachers perceived as poor and 15.71% of the teachers perceived that the quality of recreational centers/rooms in the college was very poor.

The above table also highlights that only 9.52% teachers perceived that the infrastructural facilities for co-curricular activities available in the college were very good, 43.80% teachers perceived as good, 36.68% teachers perceived as poor and 10% of them perceived as very poor.

The teachers' perception on the quality of Hostel facilities was also shown in the above table indicating that only 8% of them perceived as very good, 47.87% of them perceived as good, 19.42% perceived as poor and 24.71% perceived as very poor.

The quality of Transport facilities in the college was perceived as very good by 35.42% of the teachers and as good by 16.7% teachers, 28.82% teachers perceived as poor and it was perceived as very poor by 19.06% of the teachers.

Overall strength of teaching faculty in their respective college was perceived as very good by 13.33% teachers and as good by 39.07% teachers, it was perceived as poor by 33.8% teachers and as very poor by 13.8% of the teachers.

Therefore, the above table shows that out of 210 teachers, only 10% perceived that the overall quality of infrastructure and infrastructure facilities were very good, while majority of them i.e. 52.75% perceived that it was good, 28.43% perceived that it was poor and only 8.82% perceived it as very poor. Though majority of the teachers perceived that the overall quality of infrastructure and instructional facilities were good, the findings imply that more number of the teachers perceived that recreational centres available in the degree general college of Mizoram were poor.

Table – 4.7: Perceptions of students and teachers on quality of infrastructure and instructional facilities in the colleges.

Quality of infrastructure and instructional facilities in the colleges.	**Very Good**	**Good**	**Poor**	**Very Poor**
Perceptions of students	20.98	47.88	14.44	16.7
Perceptions of Teachers	10	52.75	28.43	8.82
Perceptions of Students and Teachers	**15.5**	**50.31**	**21.43**	**12.76**

From the above table, it was shown that out of 630 respondents, majority i.e. 50.31% of the respondents perceived that the quality of infrastructure and infrastructural facilities were good, 15.5% of the respondents perceived that the quality of infrastructure and infrastructural facilities were very good, 21.43% of the respondents

perceived as poor and 12.76% perceived as very poor. Thus, majority of the respondents perceived that the overall quality of infrastructure and instructional facilities available in the government general colleges of Mizoram were good.

4.3. Perceptions of stakeholders regarding the curriculum transacted in the degree colleges of Mizoram.

The perceptions of students and teachers on the quality regarding curriculum transacted in the degree colleges of Mizoram were obtained by administering two slightly different questionnaires to the selected samples.

The data collected through the questionnaires were tabulated, arranged and analyzed separately for students and teachers which were then clubbed together to get the required results. The responses of students and teachers regarding the quality regarding curriculum transacted in the degree colleges of Mizoram have been analyzed through percentage analysis. The results of the analysis are presented in percentages in the following tables in accordance with the statements given in the questionnaires:

Table- 4.8: Perceptions of students on quality of curriculum transacted in the college.

Sl.No	Statements	Very Good	Good	Poor	Very Poor
1.	Syllabus of the course	27.14	7.16	64.28	1.42
2.	Level of understandable of the course	14.28	59.04	24.28	2.4
3.	Types of subjects provided in the college	16.2	67.6	10	6.2
4.	Coverage of the syllabus in class	57.14	30.48	12.38	-
5.	Availability of materials for the prescribed readings	34.28	51.44	7.14	7.14
6.	Choice of course offered in the	45.73	35.23	10	9.04

	college				
7.	Attitude of teachers towards extra-curricular activities	36.2	40.47	20	3.33
8.	Preparation of teachers for the classes	30.47	52.4	1.9	15.23
9.	Teachers' encouragement of student participation in the class	35.71	44.76	3.33	16.2
Overall Percentages		**33.02**	**43.18**	**17.03**	**6.77**

It is observed from the above table that the Syllabus of the course was perceived as very good by 27.14% students, only 7.16% students perceived as good, while majority students i.e. 64.28% perceived as poor and only 1.42% of the students opined as very poor.

The understandable level of the course was perceived as very good by 14.28% of the students, 59.04% of the students perceived as good, 24.28 of the students perceived as poor and only 2.4% of the students perceived as very poor.

The above table shows that the types of subjects provided in the college were perceived as very good by 16.2% of the students, majority i.e. 67.6% students perceived that it was good while only 10% and 6.2% of the students perceived as poor and as very poor respectively.

The students' perception on the quality of Coverage of the syllabus in class was shown in the table which indicates that a large percentage i.e. 57.14% perceived as very good, 30.48% of them perceived as good, 12.38% of them opined as poor and none of the students perceived as very poor.

It is shown from the above table that 34.28% students perceived that availability of materials for the prescribed readings was very good, 51.44% students perceived that it

was good, 7.14% students perceived as poor and the same percentage of 7.14% students perceived that it was very poor.

The perceptions of the students on the quality of Choice of course offered in the college as seen in the above table shows that 45.73% opined as very good, 35.23% perceived as good, only 10% students perceived as poor and 9.04% of the students perceived as very poor.

It is observed from the table that the perceptions of students on the attitude of teachers towards extra-curricular activities were that 36.2% perceived as very good, 40.47% perceived as good, it was perceived as poor by 20% and as very poor by only 3.33% of the students.

The above table also highlights that 30.47% of the students perceived that the quality of teachers' preparation for the classes was very good, 52.4% students perceived as good, a few number of students i.e. 1.9% students perceived as poor and 15.23% of them perceived as very poor.

The students' perception on the quality of teachers' encouragement of student participation in the class shown in the table indicates that 35.71% of them perceived as very good, 44.76% of them perceived as good, only 3.33% of the students perceived as poor and 16.2% students perceived as very poor.

Thus, regarding the perception of students on quality of curriculum transacted in the college, it was revealed that 33.02% perceived that it was very good, 43.18% perceived as good, 17.03% perceived as poor and 6.77% perceived as very poor. These findings reveal that majority of them perceived that the syllabus of the course were poor, on the contrary, majority of them perceived that coverage of the syllabus in class and choice of course offered in the college were very good. However, more students perceived that the overall quality of curriculum transacted in the college were good.

Table - 4.9: Perceptions of teachers on quality of curriculum transacted in the college.

Sl.No	Statements	Very Good	Good	Poor	Very Poor
1.	Syllabus of the course	63.8	18.57	15.73	1.9
2.	Level of understandable of the course	2.85	93.80	3.35	
3.	Types of subjects provided in the college	9.52	58.09	27.14	5.25
4.	Effectiveness of the courses for students to stand on their own	9.04	69.05	18.58	3.33
5.	Existing semester	55.72	9.04	35.24	-
6.	Preparation for the classes	42.38	55.71	1.91	-
7.	Encouragement of student's participation in the class	20.48	47.62	31.43	0.47
	Overall Percentages	**29.12**	**50.27**	**19.05**	**1.56**

From the above table it is shown that 63.8% teachers perceived that the quality of syllabus of their respective course was very good, 18.57% perceived it as good, 15.73% teachers perceived as poor and only low percentage i.e. 1.9% of the teachers perceived as very poor.

It is also observed that the level of understandable of the course was perceived as very good by 2.85% of the teachers, a very high percentage i.e. 93.80% of the teachers perceived as good while only 3.35% of the teachers perceived as poor and none of them perceived as very poor.

Types of subjects provided in the college were perceived as very good by 9.52% teachers and 58.09% teachers perceived as good, 27.14% of the teachers perceived as poor and 5.25% teachers perceived as very poor.

The teachers' perception on the effectiveness of the courses for students to stand on their own is shown in the above table which indicates that 9.04% perceived as very good, majority of them i.e. 69.05% perceived as good, 18.58% opined as poor and only 3.33% perceived as very poor.

It is also observed from the table that the existing semester was perceived as very good by 55.72% teachers, 9.04% perceived as good, it was perceived as poor by 35.24% and there was no teacher who responded as very poor.

The perceptions of the teachers on the quality of their preparation for the classes is seen in the table which indicates that 42.38% of them opined as very good, 55.71% perceived as good, only 1.91% perceived as poor and none of the teachers who responded perceived as very poor.

Their encouragement of student's participation in the class was perceived as very good by 20.48% teachers and as good by 47.62% teachers, 31.43% teachers perceived as poor and only a less percentage of the teachers i.e. 0.47% perceived that their encouragement of student's participation in the class was very poor.

The above table shows that 29.12% teachers perceived that the quality of curriculum transacted in the college was very good, majority i.e. 50.27% of them perceived it as good, 19.05% of them perceived that it was poor and only 1.56% perceived it as very poor. Therefore, the findings imply that majority of the teachers perceived that the overall quality of curriculum transacted in the government general degree college were good and an overwhelming low percentage of the teachers perceived as very poor. The findings also reveal that majority of the teachers perceived that the syllabus of the course and the existing semester were very good.

Table - 4.10: Perceptions of students and teachers on quality of curriculum transacted in the college.

Quality of curriculum transacted in the colleges.	**Very Good**	**Good**	**Poor**	**Very Poor**
Perceptions of students	33.02	43.18	17.03	6.77
Perceptions of Teachers	29.12	50.27	19.05	1.56
Perceptions of Students and Teachers	**31.07**	**46.73**	**18.04**	**4.16**

From the above table, it is revealed that a large number of respondents, i.e., 46.73% opined that the quality of curriculum transacted in the college was good, 31.07% perceived that it was very good, 18.04% perceived that quality of curriculum transacted in the college was poor and only 4.16% of the respondents opined it as very poor. Thus, it can be said that more number of the respondents perceived that the quality of curriculum transacted in the government general degree college were good and only a very low percentage of the respondents perceived as very poor.

4.4. Perceptions of stakeholders regarding student support service in the degree colleges of Mizoram.

The perceptions of students and teachers on the quality regarding student support service in the degree colleges of Mizoram were obtained by administering two slightly different questionnaires to the selected samples.

The data collected through the questionnaires were tabulated, arranged and analyzed separately for students and teachers which were then clubbed together to get the required results. The responses of students and teachers regarding the quality of student support service in the degree colleges of Mizoram have been analyzed through

percentage analysis. The results of the analysis are presented in percentages in the following tables in accordance with the statements given in the questionnaires:

Table - 4.11: Perceptions of students on quality regarding student support services in the college.

Sl.No	Statements	Very Good	Good	Poor	Very poor
1.	Student-teacher relationship	36.2	58.57	1.43	3.8
2.	Employment of participatory activities by the teachers to make the learning process more student-centred	38.09	23.80	31.42	6.69
3.	Ability of communication with teachers	47.14	33.8	11.92	7.14
4.	Provision of information regarding admission and completion requirements for any courses in the college.	22.38	70	5.71	1.91
5.	Provision of information regarding fees, financial aid and student support service available in the college	20	69.52	9.52	0.96
6.	Monitoring of student progression in the college	11.42	70.47	13.33	4.78
7.	Provision of guidance provided by the teachers to students	28.58	60	8.57	2.85
8.	Student's union as a tree representative of the student community	9.04	61.92	13.33	15.71
9.	Helpfulness of teachers in advising	58.09	39.04	0.49	2.38
	Overall Percentages	**30.1**	**54.12**	**10.64**	**5.14**

The students' perception on the student-teacher relationship is shown in the table which shows that 36.2% of them perceived as very good, a large percentage i.e. 58.57% of them perceived as good, while only 1.43% and 3.8% of them opined as poor and as very poor.

It is shown from the above table that 38.09% students perceived that the employment of participatory activities by the teachers to make the learning process more student-centred was very good, 23.80% students perceived that it was good, 31.42% students perceived as poor and a less percentage i.e. 6.69% students perceived that it was very poor.

It is observed from the table that the ability of communication with teachers was perceived as very good by 47.14% of the students and 33.8% students viewed as good, it was perceived as poor by 11.92% and as very poor by 7.14% of the students.

Provision of information regarding admission and completion requirements for any courses in the college was perceived as very good by 22.38% students and as good by a large percentage i.e. 70% students while only 5.71% students perceived that it was poor and a very few percentage i.e. 1.91% students perceived as very poor.

The above table shows that the quality of provision of information regarding fees, financial aid and student support service available in the college was perceived as very good by 20% students, majority of the students i.e. 69.52% perceived as good, 9.52% students perceived as poor and only a few students i.e. 0.96% of the students perceived that it was very poor.

The above table also highlights that only 11.42% of the students perceived that the quality of monitoring of student progression in the college was very good whereas it was perceived as good by majority students i.e. 70.47%, a 13.33% students perceived as poor and a less percentage i.e. 4.78% of them perceived as very poor.

Provision of guidance provided by the teachers to students was perceived as very good by 28.58% of the students and as good by a large percentage i.e. 60%students while only 8.57% students perceived as poor and it was perceived as very poor by a lesser number of students i.e. 2.85%.

The students' perception on the Student's union so as to represent the student community is also shown in the above table showing that 9.04% of them perceived as very good, 61.92% of them perceived as good, 13.33% and 15.71% of them perceived as poor and as very poor respectively.

Helpfulness of teachers in advising was perceived as very good by 58.09% of the students and as good by 39.04% students, it was perceived as poor by a very less percentage i.e. 0.49% students and it was opined as very poor by 2.38% of the students.

Therefore, Perceptions of students on quality regarding student support service in the college which is shown in the above table reveals that 30.1% of the students perceived that it was very good, majority i.e. 54.12% of them perceived it as good, 10.64% students perceived that it was poor and only 5.14% students perceived that the quality regarding student support service in the college was very poor. Most of the components of student support service were perceived by the students as good while some of the components such as employment of participatory activities by the teachers to make the learning process more student-centred; ability of communication with teachers and helpfulness of teachers in advising were perceived by the students as very good. It may, thus, be concluded by saying that the overall quality of student support services in the government general degree colleges was perceived as good.

Table - 4.12: Perceptions of teachers on quality regarding student support service in the colleges

Sl.No	Statements	Very Good	Good	Poor	Very poor
1.	Student-teacher relationship	24.28	70.47	3.83	1.42
2.	Employment of participatory activities by the teachers to make the learning process more student-centred	23.8	60	13.35	2.85
3.	Provision of information regarding admission and completion requirements for any courses in the college.	14.76	80	5.23	-
4.	Provision of information regarding fees, financial aid and student support service available in the college	16.67	75.71	7.62	-
5.	Monitoring of student progression in the college	9.52	72.38	15.72	2.38
6.	Provision of guidance by teachers to students	24.28	72.85	2.87	-
	Overall Percentages	**18.89**	**71.91**	**8.10**	**1.10**

The above table shows that teachers' perception on the student-teacher relationship is that 24.28% of them perceived as very good, a large percentage i.e. 70.47% of them perceived as good, while only 3.83% and 1.42% of them opined as poor and as very poor.

23.8% teachers perceived that the employment of participatory activities by the teachers to make the learning process more student-centred was very good, 60% teachers perceived as good, 13.35% teachers perceived as poor and a less percentage i.e. 2.85% teachers perceived that it was very poor. .

It is observed from the table that the provision of information regarding admission and completion requirements for any courses in the college was perceived as very good by 14.76% teachers and most of the teachers i.e. 80% perceived as good while only 5.23% teachers perceived that it was poor.

The above table also indicates that the quality of provision of information regarding fees, financial aid and student support service available in the college was perceived as very good by 16.67% teachers, majority of the teachers i.e. 75.71% perceived as good and only a few teachers i.e. 7.62% of the teachers perceived that it was very poor.

The teachers' perception on the monitoring of student progression in the college is that 9.52% of them perceived as very good, majority teachers i.e. 72.38% perceived as good, 15.72% perceived as poor and a less percentage i.e. 2.38% of them perceived as very poor

Provision of guidance provided by the teachers to students was perceived as very good by 24.28% of the teachers and as good by a large percentage i.e. 72.85% teachers while only 2.87% teachers perceived as poor.

The above table thus, shows that a high percentage of the teachers, i.e., 71.91% perceived that the quality regarding student support service in the college was good, 18.89% of them perceived it as very good, 8.10% of them perceived that it was poor and only 1.10% teachers perceived that the quality regarding student support service in the college was very poor.

Table - 4.13: Perceptions of students and teachers on quality regarding student support service in the college.

Quality regarding student support service in the colleges.	**Very Good**	**Good**	**Poor**	**Very Poor**
Perceptions of students	30.1	54.12	10.64	5.14
Perceptions of Teachers	18.89	71.91	8.10	1.10
Perceptions of Students and Teachers	**24.5**	**63.01**	**9.37**	**3.12**

The Perceptions of the total respondents on quality regarding student support service in the college is shown in the above table and it implies that majority of them, i.e., 63.01% perceived it as good, 24.5% of them perceived that it was very good, only 9.37% and 3.12% respondents perceived it as poor and very poor.

4.5. Perceptions of stakeholders regarding research and innovation in degree colleges of Mizoram.

The perceptions of students and teachers on the quality regarding research and innovation in the degree colleges of Mizoram were obtained by administering two slightly different questionnaires to the selected samples.

The data collected through the questionnaires were tabulated, arranged and analyzed separately for students and teachers which were then clubbed together to get the required results. The responses of students and teachers regarding the quality of research and innovation in the degree colleges of Mizoram have been analyzed through percentage analysis. The results of the analysis are presented in percentages in the following tables in accordance with the statements given in the questionnaires:

Table - 4.14: Perceptions of students on quality regarding research and innovation in the college.

Sl.No	Statements	Very Good	Good	Poor	Very Poor
1.	Institution regarding responsiveness to community needs and any relevant extension programmes	13.80	70.95	12.86	2.39
2.	Extension activities in the college	22.38	58.09	3.33	16.2
	Overall Percentages	**18.09**	**64.52**	**8.09**	**9.3**

It is observed from the above table that the institution's responsiveness to community needs and any relevant extension programmes was perceived as very good by 13.80% students, a large percentage of students i.e. 70.95% perceived as good, 12.86% students perceived as poor and only few students i.e. 2.39% perceived as very poor.

The students' perception on the quality of extension activities of the college as seen in the above table indicated that 22.38% of them perceived as very good, 58.09% were responded as good while only 3.33% of them perceived as poor and it was perceived as very poor by 16.2%.

The above table therefore shows the Perceptions of students on quality regarding research and innovation in the college and it is observed that 18.09% of them opined that it was very good, 64.52% of them perceived it as good while 8.09% and 9.3% of the students perceived that the quality regarding research and innovation in the college was poor and very poor.

Table - 4.15: Perceptions of teachers on quality regarding research and innovation in the college.

Sl.No	Statements	Very Good	Good	Poor	Very Poor
1.	Opportunities of teachers for continued academic progress and professional development	48.09	14.76	35.72	1.43
2.	Promotion of research culture by the college among faculty and students	1.42	39.52	50.48	8.58
3.	Encouragement of faculty to publish in academic forums by the college	4.28	38.09	51.43	6.2
4.	Promotion of faculty participation in consultancy work by the college	2.85	69.05	21.9	6.2
5.	Responsiveness of the college to community needs and relevant extension programmes	13.8	64.77	21.43	-
6.	Extension activities of the college	42.38	52.38	4.28	0.96
7.	Number of research activities done by the teachers of your college	22.85	31.9	36.67	8.58
8.	Professional development of faculty through participation in research activities	6.67	69.52	21.42	2.39
	Overall Percentages	**17.8**	**47.5**	**30.4**	**4.3**

From the above table it is shown that 48.09% teachers perceived that their opportunities to continue their academic progress and professional development was very good, only 14.76% of them perceived as good, while 35.72% teachers opined that it was poor and only 1.43% of them opined as very poor.

The teachers' perception on promotion of research culture by the college among faculty and students as shown in the above table is that only 1.42% perceived as very good, 39.52% perceived as good, 50.48% perceived as poor and 8.58% of them perceived as very poor.

4.28% teachers perceived that the encouragement of faculty to publish in academic forums by the college was very good, 38.09% teachers perceived as good, 51.43% teachers perceived as poor and 6.2% teachers perceived that it was very poor. .

It is seen from the table that the promotion of faculty participation in consultancy work by the college was perceived as very good by only 2.85% teachers and majority of the teachers i.e. 69.05% perceived as good, 21.9% teachers perceived that it was poor and it was opined as very poor by 6.2% teachers.

The above table also highlights that the responsiveness of the college to community needs and relevant extension programmes was perceived as very good by 13.8% teachers, majority of the teachers i.e. 64.77% perceived as good and 21.43% of the teachers perceived that it was very poor.

The quality of extension activities of the college was perceived as very good by 42.38% of the teachers and as good by 52.38% teachers while only 4.28% teachers perceived as poor and only few teachers i.e. 0.96% teachers perceived that it was very poor.

22.85% teachers perceived that the number of research activities done by the teachers of their respective college was very good, 31.9% teachers thought that it was good, 36.67 teachers responded as poor and 8.58% perceived as very poor.

The above table also shows that only 6.67% teachers perceived that professional development of faculty through participation in research activities was very good, majority of the teachers, i.e., 69.52% perceived that it was good, 21.42% teachers perceived as poor and only 2.39% teachers perceived that it was very poor.

The Perceptions of teachers on quality regarding research and innovation in the college is presented in the above table and it is observed that 17.8% of them opined that it was very good, 47.5% of them perceived it as good, 30.4% teachers perceived that it was poor and 4.3% of the teachers perceived that the quality regarding research and innovation in the college was very poor. The findings presented in the above table reveals that while a small majority of the teachers perceived that opportunities of teachers for continued academic progress and professional development were very good, the encouragement of faculty to publish in academic forums by the college and the promotion of research culture by the college among faculty and students were perceived as poor by a small majority of the teachers. Yet again, a small majority of the teachers perceived that the number of research activities done by the teachers of government general degree college as poor. Though there are some sub-components under the component of research and innovation which were perceived by majority teachers as poor the perception of the teachers on the overall quality regarding research and innovation in the government general degree colleges were good.

Table - 4.16: Perceptions of students and teachers on quality regarding research and innovation in the college.

Quality regarding research and innovation in the colleges.	**Very Good**	**Good**	**Poor**	**Very Poor**
Perceptions of students	18.09	64.52	8.09	9.3
Perceptions of Teachers	17.8	47.5	30.4	4.3
Perceptions of Students and Teachers	**17.94**	**56.01**	**19.24**	**6.8**

The above table shows the Perceptions of the 630 respondents on quality regarding research and innovation in the college and it was observed that 17.94% of them opined that it was very good, 56.01% of them perceived it as good, 19.24% of the respondents perceived that the quality regarding research and innovation in the college was poor and 6.8% of them perceived it as very poor. Therefore, the table implies that

majority of the respondents perceived that the overall quality regarding research and innovation in the government general degree colleges were good.

4.6. Perceptions of stakeholders regarding examination and evaluation practices of the degree colleges of Mizoram.

The perceptions of students and teachers on the quality regarding examination and evaluation practices in the degree colleges of Mizoram were obtained by administering two slightly different questionnaires to the selected samples.

The data collected through the questionnaires were tabulated, arranged and analyzed separately for students and teachers which were then clubbed together to get the required results. The responses of students and teachers regarding the quality of examination and evaluation practices in the degree colleges of Mizoram have been analyzed through percentage analysis. The results of the analysis are presented in percentages in the following tables in accordance with the statements given in the questionnaires:

Table - 4.17: Perceptions of students on quality regarding examination and evaluation practices in the college.

Sl.No	Statements	Very Good	Good	Poor	Very Poor
1.	Internal assessment procedures and systems	14.28	76.67	6.67	2.38
2.	Effectiveness of internal assessment on course grade	82.39	8.09	6.19	3.33
3.	Discussion of assignments with respective teachers	28.1	37.61	23.34	10.95
4.	Existing quality of external evaluation system	77.61	14.77	7.62	-

5.	Regularity of conducting internal assessment	84.77	4.77	9.04	1.42
6.	Returning of evaluated written assignments with helpful comments	26.19	60.48	8.09	5.24
	Overall Percentages	**52.22**	**33.73**	**10.16**	**3.89**

The students' perception on the quality of internal assessment procedures and systems is seen in the above table and it is understood that 14.28% of them perceived as very good, a large percentage i.e. 76.67% of them perceived as good, while only 6.67% perceived as poor and a low percentage of them i.e. 2.38% opined as very poor.

It is also shown from the above table that a high percentage of students i.e. 82.39% perceived that the effectiveness of internal assessment on course grade was very good, 8.09% students perceived that it was good, 6.19% students perceived as poor and only 3.33% students perceived that it was very poor.

Regarding discussion of assignments with their respective teachers it is observed from the table that 28.1%students responded as very good, 37.61% students viewed as good, it was perceived as poor by 23.34% and as very poor by 10.95% students.

The above table shows that the quality of existing external evaluation system was perceived as very good by majority i.e.77.61% students, 14.77% students perceived as good and only 7.62% students perceived that it was very poor.

Regularity of conducting internal assessment was perceived as very good by a large percentage i.e. 84.77% of the students, only 4.77%students perceived as good, 9.04% students perceived as poor and it was perceived as very poor by a few number of students i.e. 1.42%.

The above table also highlights that 26.19% students perceived that returning of evaluated written assignments by their teachers with helpful comments as very good and

it was responded as good by majority students i.e. 60.48%, 8.09% students perceived as poor and only 5.24% students perceived as very poor.

The Perceptions of students on quality regarding examination and evaluation practices in the college is presented in the above table and it is observed that 52.22% of the students perceived that it was very good, 33.73% of them perceived that it was good, 10.16% students perceived it as poor and only a low percentage i.e. 3.89% of the students opined that it was very poor. Interestingly, the table implies that a great percentage of the students perceived that effectiveness of internal assessment on course grade; existing quality of external evaluation system and regularity of conducting internal assessment were very good. It also indicates that majority of the students perceived that the overall quality regarding examination and evaluation practices in the government general degree college were very good.

Table - 4.18: Perceptions of teachers on quality regarding examination and evaluation practices in the college.

Sl.No	Statements	Very Good	Good	Poor	Very Poor
1.	Internal assessment procedures and systems	28.09	66.67	5.24	-
2.	Current weightage of internal assessment	74.78	11.42	8.57	5.23
3.	Existing quality of external assessment procedures and systems	21.9	69.05	9.05	-
	Overall Percentages	**41.6**	**49.04**	**7.62**	**1.74**

From the above table, the perception of teachers on the quality of internal assessment procedures and systems is shown that 28.09% of them perceived as very

good, a large percentage i.e. 66.67% of them perceived as good while only 5.24% perceived as poor.

It is also shown that a high percentage of teachers i.e. 74.78% perceived that the current weightage of internal assessment was very good, 11.42% teachers perceived that it was good, 8.57% teachers perceived as poor and only 5.23% teachers responded that it was very poor.

The existing quality of external assessment procedures and systems was perceived as very good by 21.9% of the teachers, a high percentage i.e. 69.05% teachers perceived as good and 9.05% teachers perceived as poor and none of the teachers responded as very poor.

The Perceptions of teachers on quality regarding examination and evaluation practices in the college is presented in the above table and it is observed that 41.6% of the teachers perceived that it was very good, 49.04% of them perceived that it was good, 7.62% of the teachers perceived it as poor and only 1.74% teachers opined it as very poor. It is observed from the above table that a high majority of the teachers perceived that the current weightage of internal assessment was very good. Therefore, from the findings presented in the above table, it can be said that a small majority of the teachers perceived that the overall quality of examination and evaluation practices in the government general degree college was good.

Table - 4.19: Perceptions of students and teachers on quality regarding examination and evaluation practices in the college.

Quality regarding examination and evaluation practices in the colleges.	**Very Good**	**Good**	**Poor**	**Very Poor**
Perceptions of students	52.22	33.73	10.16	3.89
Perceptions of Teachers	41.6	49.04	7.62	1.74
Perceptions of Students and Teachers	**46.91**	**41.39**	**8.9**	**2.80**

The Perceptions of the total respondents on quality regarding examination and evaluation practices in the college is presented in the above table and it is observed that 46.91% of the respondents perceived that it was very good, 41.39% of them perceived that it was good, 8.9% respondents perceived it as poor and 2.80% of the respondents opined that it was very poor. Though the findings reveal that the total respondents' perceptions on the quality regarding examination and evaluation practices in the government general degree colleges were positive, yet the findings also reveal that there exist a difference in the perception of students and teachers on the same. While majority of the students perceived it as very good, majority of the teachers perceived as good.

4.7. Perceptions of stakeholders about governance and leadership practices in the college.

The perceptions of students and teachers on the quality regarding governance and leadership practices in the degree colleges of Mizoram were obtained by administering two slightly different questionnaires to the selected samples.

The data collected through the questionnaires were tabulated, arranged and analyzed separately for students and teachers which were then clubbed together to get the required results. The responses of students and teachers regarding the quality of governance and leadership practices in the degree colleges of Mizoram have been analyzed through percentage analysis. The results of the analysis are presented in percentages in the following tables in accordance with the statements given in the questionnaires:

Table - 4.20: Perceptions of students on quality regarding governance and leadership practices in the college.

Sl.No	Statements	Very Good	Good	Poor	Very Poor
1.	Helpfulness of Students' organization/Union in your college	65.23	14.76	14.29	5.72
2.	Activities of Students' organization/Union	31.42	53.33	10.96	4.29
	Overall Percentages	**48.32**	**34.05**	**12.63**	**5**

The above table shows the students' perception regarding the helpfulness of Students' body in their respective college indicating that majority of them i.e. 65.23% responded as very good, 14.76% responded that it was good, 14.29% perceived as poor and only 5.72% responded that it was very poor.

It is also observed that 31.42% students perceived that the activities of Students' organization/Union was very good, 53.33% perceived as good, 10.96% perceived as poor and only 4.29% perceived that it was very poor.

The perceptions of students on quality regarding governance and leadership practices in the college shown in the above table revealed that out of 420 students, 48.32% perceived that it was very good, 34.05% perceived it as good, 12.63% perceived it as poor and only 5% of them perceived as very poor. Therefore, these findings reveal that a small majority of the students perceived that the quality regarding governance and leadership practices in the government general degree college was very good.

Table - 4.21: Perceptions of teachers on quality regarding governance and leadership practices in the college.

Sl.No	Statements	Very Good	Good	Poor	Very Poor
1.	Mechanism to use students' feedback for quality enhancement	43.80	42.38	5.24	8.58
2.	Helpfulness of Students' organization/Union in your college	84.29	10.48	3.8	1.43
3.	Activities of Students' organization/Union	22.85	75.72	0.48	0.95
4.	Governance of office and departments of the institution on the principles of participation and transparency	41.43	53.81	1.9	2.86
5.	Grievance redressal mechanism at all levels of the institution's functioning	16.19	66.19	13.34	4.28
6.	Utilization of funds/finances	25.72	53.34	9.52	11.42
7.	Faculty involvement in decision-making regarding the functioning of the college	45.24	43.8	7.62	3.34
8.	Functioning of IQAC	29.53	60.47	8.1	1.9
9.	Coordination between RUSA authority and respective authority of the college	29.04	64.28	6.68	-
10.	Relationship between Principal and staffs	33.8	62.38	3.34	0.48
	Overall Percentages	**37.19**	**53.29**	**6**	**3.52**

From the above table, it is revealed that 43.80% teachers perceived that the quality of their college mechanism to use students' feedback for quality enhancement was very good, 42.38% teachers perceived that it was good while only 5.24% teachers perceived as poor and 8.58% teachers responded that it was very poor.

The perception of teachers on the helpfulness of Students' organization/Union in the college is also shown in the table which indicates that a high percentage i.e. 84.29% of them perceived as very good, 10.48% of them perceived as good while only 3.8% perceived as poor and a low percentage i.e.1.43% of them responded as very poor.

The activities of Students' organization/Union was perceived as very good by 22.85% of the teachers, a high percentage i.e. 75.72% teachers perceived as good and a very low percentage i.e. 0.48% and 0.95% teachers perceived as poor and as very poor respectively.

The above table also highlights that the governance of office and departments of the institution on the principles of participation and transparency was perceived as very good by 41.43% teachers, 53.81% teachers perceived as good, only 1.9% of the teachers perceived that it was poor and it was responded as very poor by 2.86% teachers.

The quality of grievance redressal mechanism at all levels of the institution's functioning was perceived as very good by 16.19% of the teachers, it was responded as good by majority of the teachers i.e. 66.19%, 13.34% teachers perceived as poor and only 4.28% teachers perceived that it was very poor.

The above table also shows that 25.72% teachers perceived that utilization of funds/finances by their college was very good, 53.34% of the teachers perceived that it was good, 9.52% teachers perceived as poor and 11.42% teachers perceived that it was very poor.

45.24% teachers perceived that the faculty involvement in decision-making regarding the functioning of the college was very good, 43.8% teachers viewed as good, 7.62% teachers responded as poor and only 3.34% teachers perceived as very poor.

The functioning of IQAC in their respective college was perceived as very good by 29.53% teachers and as good by 60.47% teachers whereas it was perceived as poor by 8.1% teachers and as very poor by only 1.9%.

The teachers' perception regarding the coordination between RUSA authority and respective authority of the college was also observed in the above table showing that 29.04% responded as very good and it was perceived as good by majority of the teachers i.e. 64.28% while only 6.68% of them responded as poor.

From the above table, it is also revealed that the relationship between Principal and staffs was perceived as very good by 33.8%, majority teachers i.e. 62.38% viewed as good, only 3.34% teachers perceived as poor and a few teachers i.e. 0.48% perceived as very poor.

From the above table, it is observed that 37.19% of the teachers opined that the quality regarding governance and leadership practices in the college was very good, 53.29% teachers perceived that it was good, while 6% teachers opined it as poor and only 3.52% teachers perceived that the quality regarding governance and leadership practices in the college was very poor. It is observed from the above table that a small majority of the teachers perceived that mechanism to use students' feedback for quality enhancement and faculty involvement in decision-making regarding the functioning of the college as very good. A large percentage of the teachers perceived that sub-component which is helpfulness of Students' organization/Union in the government general degree colleges as very good. It can be concluded from the findings that majority of the teachers perceived that the overall quality regarding governance and leadership practices in the government general degree colleges was good.

Table - 4.22: Perceptions of students and teachers on quality regarding governance and leadership practices in the college.

Quality regarding governance and leadership practices in the colleges.	**Very Good**	**Good**	**Poor**	**Very Poor**
Perceptions of students	48.32	34.05	12.63	5
Perceptions of Teachers	37.19	53.29	6	3.52
Perceptions of Students and Teachers	**42.76**	**43.67**	**9.31**	**4.26**

From the above table, it is observed that 42.76% of the respondents opined that the quality regarding governance and leadership practices in the college was very good, 43.67% of them perceived that it was good, while 9.31% of them opined it as poor and only 4.26% of the respondents perceived the quality regarding governance and leadership practices in the college as very poor. Therefore, a small majority of the respondents perceived that the overall quality regarding governance and leadership practices in the government general degree colleges was good though there is a slight difference in the perceptions between students and teachers while a small majority of the students perceived it as very good, majority of the teachers perceived it as good.

4.8. Perceptions of stakeholders regarding the autonomy of degree colleges of Mizoram.

Regarding the autonomy of degree colleges, data was not collected from students as majority of the students were unaware about it. So the data was collected from the teachers only by administering questionnaires to the selected samples.

The data collected through the questionnaires were tabulated, arranged and analyzed to get the required results. The responses of teachers regarding the quality of autonomy in the degree colleges of Mizoram have been analyzed through percentage

analysis. The results of the analysis are presented in percentages in the following tables in accordance with the statements given in the questionnaires:

Table - 4.23: Perceptions of teachers on quality regarding autonomy in the college.

Sl.No	Statements	Very Good	Good	Poor	Very Poor
1.	Autonomy of the college to run course independently	11.43	22.86	63.81	1.9
2.	Autonomy of the staff to attend any refresher course/seminar/workshop/conference etc.	27.62	59.04	6.67	6.67
3.	Autonomy to procure any materials for the betterment of the college	27.15	34.29	12.85	25.71
	Overall percentages	**22.06**	**38.73**	**27.78**	**11.43**

The above table shows the perceptions of teachers on the autonomy of the college to run course independently indicating that 11.43% of them perceived it as very good, 22.86% of them perceived it as good while majority of them i.e. 63.81% perceived it as poor and only 1.9% of them perceived that it was very poor.

The autonomy of the staff to attend any refresher course/seminar/workshop/conference etc. was perceived as very good by 27.62% teachers, 59.04% teachers opined as good, 6.67% teachers responded as poor and as very poor.

From the above table, it is also observed that 27.15% of the teachers opined that the autonomy to procure any materials for the betterment of the college was very good, 34.29% teachers perceived that it was good, 12.85% teachers opined it as poor and 25.71% teachers perceived that it was very poor.

The perceptions of teachers on quality regarding autonomy in the college is thus presented in the above table which reveals that out of 210 teachers, 22.06% of them perceived it as very good, 38.73% of them perceived it as good, 27.78% of them perceived it as poor and 11.43% of them perceived that it was very poor. Thus, the findings indicate that there exist different perceptions among the teachers on the quality regarding autonomy in the government general degree colleges. Majority of the teachers perceived that the autonomy of the college to run course independently was poor, whereas majority of the teachers perceived that the autonomy of the staff to attend any refresher course/seminar/workshop/conference etc. was good and the perceptions of teachers on the autonomy to procure any materials for the betterment of the college were scattered. However, it may be concluded from the findings that a small majority of the respondents perceived that the overall quality regarding autonomy in the government general degree colleges was good.

4.9. CASE STUDY ON GOVERNMENT CHAMPHAI COLLEGE

Government Champhai College was selected for case study because it has the highest NAAC grade points among the affiliated colleges in Mizoram and also it is one of the few colleges in Mizoram which has offered four streams namely arts, science, commerce and computer application. The institution was established in 1971 and was awarded "B" grade by NAAC in 2004 first cycle accreditation. The college was reaccredited for the 2nd cycle in 2016 and was awarded "B^{++}" grade with 2.78 points which is the highest NAAC grade points among the affiliated colleges in Mizoram. The study is done with respect to the objectives of the present study which is presented in Chapter I.

1. Status of implementation of RUSA programs

The college received the first Infrastructure grants under RUSA amounting Rs.12,50,000/- in 2015-2016. In 2016-2017 the college received Infrastructure grants amounting Rs. 93,75,000/- and Equity grants which amounts Rs.10,41,667/- .Thus a

Total of Rs. 1,04,16,667/- was received by the college under RUSA. In 2017-2018, a total grants of Rs.98,95,785/- was received by the college in which Rs.93,74,952/- as Infrastructure grants and Rs.5,20,833/- as Equity.

Therefore during the reported period the Total grants received by Government Champhai College under RUSA was 2,15,62,452 in which Total Infrastructure grants was RS.1,99,99,952/- and Equity was Rs. 15,62,500/-.

The following items were purchased and installed during the reporting period from fund received through RUSA (RashtriyaUcchatar Shiksha Abhiyan) amounting to Rs 1.15 crore, out of which Rs 70 lakhs was being utilized for vertical extension of Arts Classroom.

i)	Colour Xerox machine	=	1 no.
ii)	Server Computer	=	1 no.
iii)	Tables and benches set	=	150 nos.
iv)	Chairs for Multipurpose Hall	=	300 nos.
v)	Almirah for Boys Hostel	=	18 nos.
vi)	Bookshelf for Library	=	5nos
vii)	Laboratory tables	=	11 nos.
viii)	Computer set	=	10 nos.
ix)	Mahindra Genset 20 kvA	=	1 no.
x)	Language Laboratory	=	1 no.

ix) Water connection for canteen and sanitary fittings at Seminar Hall.

2. Infrastructure and instructional facilities available in the college.

Government Champhai College campus covers an area of 31.46 bighas in breadth and the number of buildings she has at current are:

1) Administrative & Library building
2) Science& BCA building
3) Arts &Commerce building

4) Multipurpose Hall building
5) Boys' Hostel building
6) Girls' Hostel building
7) Seminar Hall
8) NEDP classroom building
9) Examination Hall
10) Gym building
11) Recreation Centre
12) Canteen
13) Principal's Quarter
14) 5 Staff's Quarter
15) Basketball cum Volleyball Court.

Besides these, rooms for examination cell, S.U. office, NSS office, NCC office, Women Cell, IGNOU office and library, Legal Aids Clinic and Drivers' rest room are provided within the campus.

The library is equipped with, reading rooms, computerized facilities and is under CCTV surveillance. It has 10 computers and internet connection is available for free to be used by students and staffs. There are about 17775 books which are recorded with bar code and reference section and question banks are available in the library. The number of subscription of journal is 8 and all the local newspaper and a number of magazines are subscribed. However, there is no photocopier in the library.

The college has 12 laboratories which include science laboratories, geography laboratories, computer laboratories and it also has 1 language laboratory.

Most of the classrooms are equipped with projectors. As of March, 2019 there were 32 teaching faculty in the college. It was reported by the college that there was 10 vacant faculty posts out of the sanctioned faculty.

3. Curriculum transacted.

The college has different streams viz. Arts, Science, Commerce, B.C.A. The courses it offers are Bachelor of Arts in Economics, Education, English, History, Geography, Mizo and Political Science, Bachelor of Science in Botany, Chemistry, Mathematics, Physics, Zoology, Bachelor of Commerce in Finance, Marketing and E-commerce and Bachelor of Computer Application.

Apart from these, add-on courses and skill development courses are available in the college. Certificate Course on Computer Concept (CCC) was made compulsory for I and II semester students to provide basic knowledge on computer applications and its applications. Separate certificate has been issued to the successful candidates which is a valid certificate for other purposes while Diploma in Computer Application (DCA) was also available which can be studied optionally. With increasing competition among prospective students in employment opportunities the college introduced Spoken English as a compulsory course. Moreover, the College also introduced spoken Hindi and spoken Burmese languages for the interested students from the academic session 2016 - 17. This was done in order to help the students in communicating with other parts of the country and the bordering Myanmar which is an important route for trade through South East Asia.

Curricular enrichment programmes such as field trips, study tours, seminars, workshops, group discussions, students competitions on quiz, debate were organized to facilitate the students learning and development. These curricular enrichment programmes were planned, organized and devised by the Curriculum Committee of the College.

Besides these, the college had made remarkable results in co-curricular activities and had won several numbers of medal and achievements in sports, cultural activities and quiz competition.

4. Student support service.

Paper wise student analysis was done every year. Eco Club, Arts Club, Red ribbon club, and cultural club were formed to enhance the development of students. Mentor/mentee guidance under IQAC Best Practice was followed in which Mentor's diary was recorded in which there were mentee's bio-data, mentee's academic performance, non-academic record (viz. financial aid, mental status, specific area of interest, any other problem), mentor's home visit record, mentee's progress report, mentor – mentee meetings minute.

5. Research and innovation.

There were altogether 20 research personnel in the college, however, there was no research project done in the college. The college has selected Ruantlang village as Adopted Village under IQAC Best Practice in 2019. However, no steps were taken so far in this regard due to worldwide pandemic Covid – 19.

6. **Examination and evaluation practices.**

Internal and external examinations were carried out according to the Mizoram University rules and regulations. With the introduction of CBCS pattern from the Mizoram University the College had adopted the new pattern of University system which was effective from the Academic session 2016 - 17.

7. Governance and leadership practices.

Decentralization of powers has been practiced in the administrative set up with forming of various committees under the chairmanship of the Principal to facilitate the all round developmental process within the College premises. All the committees have been assigned with particular set of responsibilities which has been monitored by the College Executive council.

Financial management has been improved by way of establishing Internal Audit Committee to annually audit college financial resources and expenditures, Planning and Development Committee to prepare yearly budget allocation. This greatly promotes financial transparency and improves financial management.

There were 20 different committees to maintain and regulate the college. Each of these committees comprised of Chairman and Secretary and or coordinator and Asst. Coordinator, and members. These committees were assigned with various tasks depending upon their functions.

CHAPTER – V

MAJOR FINDINGS, EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

CHAPTER – V

MAJOR FINDINGS, EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

The present chapter deals with major findings, summary, educational implications of the study and suggestions for further research studies.

5.1 MAJOR FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

5.1.1 Findings relating to status of implementation of RUSA programs in general degree colleges of Mizoram.

- The State Higher Education Council of Mizoram was formed by an Executive Order on 13th May 2014.
- The following are the primary components of RUSA that the state government pursued for the fulfillment of the targets from Academic year 2013 to 2017:
    i. Upgrading existing autonomous colleges to Universities
    ii. Conversion of colleges to Cluster Universities
    iii. Infrastructure grants to colleges
    iv. New Model Colleges (General)
    v. Upgrading existing degree colleges to model colleges
    vi. New Colleges (Professional)
    vii. Infrastructure grants to colleges
    viii. Research, innovation and quality improvement
    ix. Equity initiatives
    x. Faculty Recruitment Support
    xi. Faculty improvements
    xii. Vocationalization of Higher Education

xiii. Support to polytechnics

xiv. Capacity building and preparation, data collection and planning

xv. Management Monitoring Evaluation and Research

- The council planned that all colleges have to go for NAAC accreditation mandatorily. The government also planned to strengthen SHEC and State Project Directorate with resource centre to organize meetings, workshops, consultations and preparation of plans under component (xiv) of RUSA 2.0. Out of 32 colleges 25 colleges were included under different components of RUSA.

- *In RUSA 1.0, Mizoram was approved for funding under 5 Components: -*
  i. Upgradation of Existing Degree Colleges to Model Degree Colleges- (2- Colleges, viz. Govt. Hrangbana College & Govt. Residential Science College.) – Project Amount 8 crore (@ Rs. 4 crore each).
  ii. Infrastructure Grants to Colleges – (21 Govt. Colleges) – Project Amount 42 crore (@ Rs. 2 Crore each).
  iii. New Professional College (Mizoram Engineering College) -Project Amount Rs. 26 crore.
  iv. Equity Initiatives (24- Govt. Colleges) – Project Amount 5 crore for 24 Colleges.
  v. Faculty Recruitment Support (72- posts of Assistant Professors).

- All projects under RUSA 1.0 have been completed with the exception of activities being funded under Equity Initiatives 3rd Installment, Rs. 125/- lakh (Central share Rs 112.5 lakh and SMS 12.50 lakh).

- Construction of 8- buildings for New professional college i.e. Mizoram Engineering College has been completed with RUSA fund (Rs. 26 crore). The College was constructed at Pukpui, Lunglei on 22nd April, 2016 and was completed on 16th November, 2018.

- Government Hrangbana College, Aizawl, and Government Zirtiri Residential Science College, Aizawl were upgraded to model degree colleges in the 5th PAB on 10-12-2014. Four colleges namely Government Mamit college, Government Hnahthial college, Government Saiha college, Government J.Thankima college had received grant under RUSA 2.0 for upgradation to Model Degree Colleges.

- In the 9th PAB meeting 24 government colleges were included in RUSA Equity Initiative Component and received the funds. Total amount of Rs 5 crore for Equity Initiative was approved by PAB in 2015, of which Rs 3.750 crore released as first and second instalment for the 24 colleges/institutions in 2016 and 2017 respectively which were fully utilized. Accordingly, the equity initiative grants were released to the beneficiary colleges/ institutions during April & May, 2019 and College were utilizing the fund for conduct of Spoken English and Hindi class, addition of Spoken Burmese Class is organized in Champhai college. The fund was also utilized for organising remedial class, various personality development programmes, computer training, PWD and gender sensitization, career guidance and awareness programme, etc. Beneficiary Colleges are still in final stage of utilizing the 3rd and final instalment amounting Rs 1.125 crore, (Central Share) and the state matching share of 10% i.e. Rs 12.50 lakh due to Covid-19 crisis and nationwide lockdown which otherwise would have been fully utilized by April 2020.

- Under RUSA, 21 colleges of Mizoram received the grants of Rs 1.8 crore for each college for the strengthening of Infrastructure and instructional facilities. Under RUSA 2.0, 13 colleges received grants of Rs 1.8 crore for development of infrastructural facilities. With regards to faculty requirement 69 Assistant professors had been filled up out 72 posts.

5.1.2. Findings on the perceptions of stakeholders on the quality of infrastructure and instructional facilities available in the degree colleges of Mizoram.

The perceptions of stakeholders on the quality of infrastructure and instructional facilities available in the degree colleges of Mizoram were analyzed as follows:

1. ***Findings on perceptions of students on quality of infrastructure and instructional facilities available in the degree colleges of Mizoram.***

- Majority (56.2%) perceived that use of modern teaching aids in the college was good.
- Majority (61.93%) perceived that the college buildings and infrastructures were good.
- A small majority (53.82%) perceived that maintenance of physical infrastructure in the college was good.
- More students (41.92%) perceived that library material and facilities available in the general degree colleges were good.
- More students (39.06%) perceived that the equipments of laboratories in the government general degree colleges were good.
- A small majority (49.54%) perceived that classroom settings in the government general degree colleges were good.
- A small majority (43.82%) perceived that Computer facilities and internet connections in the government general degree colleges were very poor.
- Majority (66.68%) perceived that the books and journals available in the colleges were good.
- Majority (52.39%) perceived that the recreational centers/rooms in the college were good.
- Majority (56.2%) perceived that the infrastructural facilities for co-curricular activities available in the college were poor.
- A small majority (42.87%) perceived that the hostel facilities available in the government general degree colleges were good.

- More students (38.59%) perceived that the transport facilities available in the government general degree colleges were very poor.

Thus, out of 420 students, majority (47.88%) perceived that the quality of infrastructure and instructional facilities was good.

2. Findings on perceptions of teachers on quality of infrastructure and instructional facilities available in the general degree colleges of Mizoram.

- A large majority (72.4%) perceived that use of modern teaching aids in the general degree colleges was good.
- Majority (66.68% %) perceived that the college buildings and infrastructures were good.
- A high majority (85.73%) perceived that maintenance of physical infrastructure in the college was good.
- Majority (68.1%) perceived that Library material and facilities were good.
- A small majority (47.14%) perceived that the equipments of laboratories and their maintenance were good.
- A large majority (75.26%) perceived that classroom settings in the government general degree colleges were good.
- A small majority (46.68%) perceived that computer facilities and internet connections in the government general degree colleges were good.
- Books and journals available in the libraries of government general degree colleges were perceived by a small majority of the teachers (40.97%) as good.
- Recreational centers/rooms in the government general degree colleges were perceived as poor by a small majority (46.21%).
- The infrastructural facilities for co-curricular activities available in the government general degree colleges were perceived as good by a small majority (43.80%).
- A small majority (47.87%) perceived that the hostel facilities in the government general degree colleges of them were good.

- The transport facilities in the government general degree colleges were perceived as very good by a small majority (35.42%).
- A small majority (39.07%) perceived that the overall strength of teaching faculty in the government general degree colleges was good.

Thus, out of 210 teachers, majority of them (52.75%) perceived that the quality of infrastructure and instructional facilities was good.

3. ***Findings on perceptions of students and teachers on the overall quality of infrastructure and instructional facilities available in the general degree colleges of Mizoram.***

Out of 630 respondents, majority (50.31%) perceived that the overall quality of infrastructure and instructional facilities in the government general degree colleges of Mizoram was good.

5.1.3. Findings on the perceptions of stakeholders on quality of curriculum transacted in the general degree colleges of Mizoram.

The perceptions of students and teachers on quality of curriculum transacted in the general degree colleges of Mizoram were analyzed as follows:

1. ***Findings on perceptions of students on quality of curriculum transacted in the general degree colleges of Mizoram.***
    - Majority (64.28%) perceived that that the syllabus of the course in the general degree colleges was poor.
    - Majority (59.04%) perceived that the understandable level of the course in the general degree colleges was good.
    - Majority (67.6%) perceived that the types of subjects provided in the general degree colleges were good.

- Majority (57.14%) perceived that coverage of the syllabus in class was very good.
- A small majority (51.44%) perceived that availability of materials for the prescribed readings was good.
- Yet again, a small majority (45.73%) perceived that the choice of course offered in the government general degree colleges was very good.
- More students (40.47%) perceived that the attitude of teachers towards extra-curricular activities was good.
- Majority (52.4%) perceived that teachers' preparations for the classes were good in the government general degree colleges.
- The teachers' encouragement of student participation in the class was perceived as good by more students (44.76%).

Thus, regarding the perceptions of students on the quality of curriculum transacted in the government general degree colleges, it was revealed that a small majority of the students (43.18%) perceived as good.

2. ***Findings on perceptions of teachers on quality of curriculum transacted in the general degree colleges of Mizoram.***
   - It is found that majority teachers (63.8%) perceived that the quality of syllabus of their respective course was very good.
   - A very high percentage (93.80%) perceived that the level of understandable of the course was good.
   - Majority (58.09%) perceived that the types of subjects provided in the general degree colleges were good.
   - Majority (69.05%) perceived that the effectiveness of the courses for students to stand on their own was good.
   - Majority (55.71%) perceived that the quality of their preparation for the classes was good.

- A small majority (47.62%) perceived that their encouragement of student's participation in the class was good.

Thus, the overall quality of curriculum transacted in the government general degree college was perceived as good by majority of the teachers (50.27%).

3. ***Findings on perceptions of students and teachers on the overall quality of curriculum transacted in the general degree colleges of Mizoram.***

More number of respondents (46.73%) perceived that the quality of curriculum transacted in the government general degree colleges was good.

5.1.4. Findings on the perceptions of stakeholders on the quality of student support services in the degree colleges of Mizoram.

The major findings on perceptions of stakeholders on the quality of student support services in the degree colleges of Mizoram were presented as follows:

1. ***Findings on perceptions of students on the quality of student support services in the degree colleges of Mizoram.***
   - The student-teacher relationship in the government general degree colleges is perceived as good by majority (58.57%).
   - A small majority (38.09%) students perceived that the employment of participatory activities by the teachers to make the learning process more student-centred as very good.
   - More students (47.14%) perceived that the ability of communication with teachers was perceived as very good.
   - Provision of information regarding admission and completion requirements for any courses in the government general degree colleges was perceived as good by a large majority (70%).

- Majority (69.52%) perceived that provision of information regarding fees, financial aid and student support service available in the government general degree colleges was good.
- The monitoring of student progression in the government general degree colleges was perceived as good by majority students (70.47%).
- More students (60%) perceived that the guidance provided by the teachers to students in the government general degree colleges was good.
- Student's union was perceived as good by majority (61.92%) so as to represent the student community.
- Majority (58.09%) perceived that helpfulness of teachers in advising was perceived as very good.

Therefore, the quality regarding student support service in the government general degree colleges was perceived as good by majority of the students (54.12%).

2. ***Findings on perceptions of teachers on the quality of student support services in the degree colleges of Mizoram.***
    - A large majority (70.47%) perceived that the student-teacher relationship was good.
    - Majority (60%) perceived that the employment of participatory activities by the teachers to make the learning process more student-centred was good.
    - A high majority (80%) perceived that the provision of information regarding admission and completion requirements for any courses in the college was good.
    - Provision of information regarding fees, financial aid and student support service available in the college was perceived as good by a large majority (75.71%).
    - Monitoring of student progression in the college was perceived by a high majority (72.38%) as good.

- A large percentage (72.85%) perceived that the guidance provided by teachers to students in the government general degree colleges was good.

Thus a high majority of the teachers (71.91%) perceived that the overall quality regarding student support services in the government general degree colleges was good.

3. ***Findings on perceptions of students and teachers on the overall quality of student support services in the degree colleges of Mizoram.***

Majority (63.01%) perceived that the overall quality regarding student support services in the government general degree colleges was good.

5.1.5. Findings on the perceptions of stakeholders on the quality regarding research and innovation in degree colleges of Mizoram.

The major findings on the perceptions of stakeholders regarding research and innovation in the degree colleges of Mizoram were presented as follows:

1. ***Findings on the perceptions of students on the quality regarding research and innovation in the degree colleges of Mizoram***
   - A large majority (70.95%) perceived that the institution's responsiveness to community needs and any relevant extension programmes was good.
   - The extension activities of the college were perceived as good by majority (58.09%).

   Therefore, majority of the students (64.52%) perceived that the overall quality regarding research and innovation in the government general degree colleges was good.

2. ***Findings on the perceptions of teachers on the quality regarding research and innovation in the degree colleges of Mizoram***

- A small majority (48.09%) perceived that the opportunities of teachers to continue their academic progress and professional development were very good.
- Majority (51.43%) perceived that the encouragement of faculty to publish in academic forums by the college was poor.
- Promotion of faculty participation in consultancy work by the college was perceived as good by majority (69.05%).
- Majority (64.77%) perceived that the responsiveness of the college to community needs and relevant extension programmes were good.
- Majority (52.38%) perceived that the extension activities of the college were good.
- A small majority (36.67) perceived that the number of research activities done by the teachers of government general degree colleges was poor.
- Majority (69.52%) perceived that the professional development of faculty through participation in research activities was good.

Thus, a small majority of the teachers (47.5%) perceived that the overall quality regarding research and innovation in the college was good.

3. ***Findings on the perceptions of students and teachers on the overall quality regarding research and innovation in the degree colleges of Mizoram.***

   Out of 630 respondents, majority (56.01%) perceived that the overall quality regarding research and innovation in the government general degree colleges of Mizoram was good.

5.1.6. Findings on the perceptions of stakeholders on the quality regarding examination and evaluation practices of the degree colleges of Mizoram.

The major findings on the perceptions of students and teachers on the quality regarding examination and evaluation practices in the general degree colleges of Mizoram were presented as follows:

1. ***Findings on the perceptions of students on the quality regarding examination and evaluation practices of the degree colleges of Mizoram.***

- A large majority (76.67%) perceived that the quality of internal assessment procedures and systems was good.
- A high majority (82.39%) perceived that the effectiveness of internal assessment on course grade was very good.
- A small majority (37.61%) of the students perceived that discussion of their assignments with the teachers was good.
- A high majority (77.61%) perceived that the existing external evaluation system was very good.
- A high majority (84.77%) perceived that regularity of conducting internal assessment was very good.
- Majority (60.48%) perceived that the returning of evaluated written assignments by teachers with helpful comments was good.

Thus, majority of the students (52.22%) perceived that the overall quality regarding examination and evaluation practices in the government general degree colleges was very good.

2. ***Findings on the perceptions of teachers on the quality regarding examination and evaluation practices of the degree colleges of Mizoram.***

- Majority (66.67%) perceived that the quality of internal assessment procedures and systems was good.
- A high majority (74.78%) perceived that the current weightage of internal assessment was very good.
- The existing quality of external assessment procedures and systems was perceived as good by majority (69.05%).

Thus, a small majority of the teachers (49.04%) perceived that the overall quality regarding examination and evaluation practices in the government general degree colleges was good.

3. ***Findings on the perceptions of students and teachers on the overall quality regarding examination and evaluation practices of the degree colleges of Mizoram.***

   A small majority out of the total respondents (46.91%) perceived that the overall quality regarding examination and evaluation practices in the government general degree colleges was very good.

5.1.7. Findings on the perceptions of stakeholders on the quality regarding governance and leadership practices in the college.

The major findings on the perceptions of students and teachers on the quality regarding governance and leadership practices in the general degree colleges of Mizoram were presented as follows:

1. ***Findings on the perceptions of students on the quality regarding governance and leadership practices in the college.***

- Majority (65.23%) perceived that the helpfulness of Students' body in the government general degree colleges was very good.
- Majority (53.33%) perceived that the activities of students' organization/Union were good.

Thus, out of 420 students, a small majority (48.32%) perceived that the quality regarding governance and leadership practices in the college was very good.

2. ***Findings on the perceptions of teachers on the quality regarding governance and leadership practices in the general degree colleges.***

- A small majority (43.80%) perceived that the college's mechanism to use students' feedback for quality enhancement was very good.
- A high majority (84.29%) perceived that the helpfulness of Students' organization/Union in the college was very good.
- A high majority (75.72%) perceived that the activities of Students' organization/Union were good.
- Majority (53.81%) perceived that the governance of office and departments of the institution on the principles of participation and transparency as good.
- Majority (66.19%) perceived that the quality of grievance redresser mechanism at all levels of the institution's functioning was good.
- Majority (53.34%) perceived that the utilization of funds/finances by the college was very good.
- A small majority (45.24%) perceived that the faculty involvement in decision-making regarding the functioning of the college was very good,
- Majority (60.47%) perceived that the functioning of IQAC in the government general degree colleges was good.

- Majority (64.28%) perceived that the coordination between RUSA authority and respective authority of the college authority was good.
- Majority (62.38%) perceived that the relationship between Principal and staffs of the colleges was good.

Therefore, majority of the teachers (53.29%) perceived that the overall quality regarding governance and leadership practices in the government general degree colleges of Mizoram was good.

3. Findings on the perceptions of students and teachers on the overall quality regarding governance and leadership practices in the general degree colleges.

A small majority of the respondents (43.67%) perceived that the overall quality regarding governance and leadership practices in the college was good.

5.1.8. Findings on the perceptions of stakeholders regarding the autonomy of degree colleges of Mizoram.

Regarding the autonomy of degree colleges, data was not collected from students as majority of the students were unaware about it. So the data was collected from the teachers only by administering questionnaires to the selected samples.

- Majority (63.81%) perceived that the autonomy of the college to run course independently was poor.
- Majority (59.04%) perceived that the autonomy of the staff to attend any refresher course/seminar/workshop/conference etc. was good.
- A small majority (34.29%) perceived that it was good that the autonomy to procure any materials for the betterment of the college was very good.

Thus, out of 210 teachers, a small majority (38.73%) perceived that the overall quality regarding autonomy in the government general degree colleges was good.

5.2. EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY

The quality of human resources in a country depends largely on the quality of higher education institutions and the quality of higher education largely depends on all the stake holders. Though there has been increase in enrolment, institutions, and human resources, the expansion and quality of higher education in Mizoram is still low in comparison to other states in the countries which clearly depicted that the higher education in Mizoram is very far from the international standard. The grade of the colleges in Mizoram accredited by NAAC reveals that the higher education in Mizoram has a long way to go to become a centre of excellence as well as to meet the international standard. On the contrary, the present study shows that the main stakeholders of higher education viz. students and teachers perceived that the quality of higher education is good. These contrasting results may be the very concept of good quality education is not widely understood by the stakeholders or may be the awareness level of stakeholders on quality education is low. NAAC is encouraging institutions to put in place a system of student feedback particularly on teaching-learning, assessment and support services. The feedback from students will help in quality improvement of the processes and empower the student with a sense of participation and since it is always said that the stakeholders were found to be responsible and pro-active agents of change. Therefore, these contrasting results necessitated that awareness concerning quality of education must be organized frequently.

The state government should do an in-depth study of the performance of colleges on various criteria of assessment and accreditation of NAAC, and work its plan and strategies for the improvement of quality of its colleges. The present study reveals that the quality of higher education in Mizoram is not very deprived to become a centre of excellence. There are several strength areas as far as the quality of higher education in Mizoram is concerned which need to be maintained and promoted. Unfortunately, the library facilities with internet facilities need significant improvement as per student's

requirements. Teaching learning methods may be made more interactive with wide usage of electronic and internet resources. The college teachers need to take advantage of faculty development programmes of UGC to enhance their skills and knowledge. Many student support services such as career guidance cell, women's cell, human rights cell, grievance redressal cell, students counselling centre etc. must be established in every college for empowerment initiative. The functioning of various committees constituted for academic and administrative purposes may be made more effective and efficient. Transparent, participative and accountable administrative practices need to be adopted. Internal Quality Assurance Cell (IQAC) must chalk out plan for quality initiatives and also monitor all the quality enhancement programmes conducted by the institution. The language laboratories must be properly maintained and utilized optimally to acquire better communication skills. Since government colleges are totally controlled by state government and Central University, many things may be delegated. So some kind of autonomy is required for these colleges like full or more autonomy to introduce new courses may be given to the colleges based on NAAC's grade so that job-oriented courses like forestry, fisheries, farming, poultry, architecture, music, IT-oriented and Agro based courses which are relevant to the society for economic development of the state may be introduced. The state government may also introduce and monitor teacher's self-appraisal and student's feedback in all colleges more adequately.

Therefore, it can be said that expansion of higher education particularly at collegiate level needs to be carried out in a planned manner, keeping in view the requirement of human resources and also to meet the needs of the society. The implementation of RUSA is an excellent progress especially for economically backward states like Mizoram to upgrade the quality and quantity of higher education and also to upgrade educational and research ambience of infrastructure, knowledge resources and skill development expertise to produce quality manpower.

5.3. RECOMMENDATIONS

On the basis of the findings of the present study, it is recommended that:

1. The issue of autonomy is crucial to the growth and development of higher education. Autonomy has been a subject of discourse in the reports of the Commissions and Committees set up from time to time, since our independence, to review the system of education and to initiate the much needed reforms and innovations. However, the general degree colleges in the state have a very limited autonomy. Hence, the government needs to look upon the issue of autonomy for qualitative improvement of its higher education.
2. IQAC must be strengthened and made more functional as an effective pro-active body in quality enhancement.
3. Courses in higher education should be broadened by introducing locally relevant courses like IT-oriented and Agro based courses and it is also recommended that colleges must offer atleast Vocational and Job oriented certificate courses alongwith studying the current courses.
4. Authorities and experts must revise and reframe the Syllabus from time to time according to the needs and requirement of the society as well as to deal with latest knowledge.
5. Student support services must be strengthened by establishing student grievance cell in all colleges. Moreover, student's health care facilities, hostel facilities and transport facilities need to be taken care of by authorities of the colleges and the government.
6. The higher education institutions must organize seminars/workshop in academic and socially relevant areas frequently by inviting academicians from Universities and experts from industries.
7. Students' feedback mechanism must be taken seriously and students' assessment of teachers may be evaluated properly and positive suggestions may be adopted for improvement of teaching learning.

8. Vacant teaching posts are matter of serious concern. The state government must equip the higher education institutions with quality teachers for quality education.
9. Class room teaching may be made more interesting and participatory with the use of modern teaching aids.
10. Though the general infrastructural facilities are satisfactory yet considering the changing needs of the students, the facilities are inadequate. The computer facilities and internet facilities should be developed in the colleges of Mizoram
11. Teachers may be encouraged to participate in national/international seminars in their subject area conducted inside or outside the state.
12. The extension activities for community development like health camps, adult education & literacy, blood donation, AIDS awareness and environmental conservation must be enhanced in the colleges.
13. A policy on consultancy services must be encouraged. Higher educational institutions must have linkages with industries and organizations so that they can provide knowledge in latest areas of work, new methods, sharing of information, generation of funds and dimensions for research activities.

5.4. CONCLUSION

The institutions of higher education need to maintain the best possible quality so as to empower human resources and to cater the needs and requirement of society. Expansion of higher education should be in a planned manner to promote and maintain its quality. Quality is a much-debated term, however, in the case of education it may be defined as the satisfaction level of stakeholders viz, students, parents, teachers, government and the society at large for developing appropriate knowledge and skills. The quality of our current higher education system leaves much to be desired. A very basic hurdle in improving quality in most institutions in the country is that the very concept of good quality education is not widely understood or appreciated across the

spectrum of institutions. There is very little discussion within institutions on improving the quality research or research output, far from it, even raising the levels of teaching and learning are not an area of focus. Based on NAAC accreditation, the quality of most of the colleges in Mizoram is not satisfactory and there is much to be achieved. The state government needs to increase their share of public expenditure in higher education in order to plan specific interventions and innovations depending on the special needs and requirements of the higher education institutions which will in turn uplift the quality of higher education. The central funds & grants through RUSA gave the states a great opportunity to focus on revamping the institutions with attractive and modern infrastructures like classrooms, hostels, research laboratories, training equipment, aids etc. If implemented swiftly and efficiently, RUSA will be a turning point for the Indian higher education system as it seeks to achieve higher enrolment rates and address access, equity and quality related concerns.

5.5. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The investigator had tried to be scientific and objective in the process of investigation. However, the study contained the following limitations:

- The sample of the study might have been limited as the sample consisted of only 210 teachers and 420 students of government general degree colleges in Mizoram.
- For the collection of data no standardized tool was used. The tool was developed by the investigator himself which might have some defects.
- The present study was delimited to the government general degree colleges of Mizoram only.
- While measuring the perceptions of stakeholders on quality of higher education, only the perceptions of teachers and students were taken into account. Other

stakeholders such as administrator, parents and other parties involving in the business were not included in the study.

- There is no benchmark fixed for measuring the quality. Hence, the components for measuring the perceptions on the quality of the college were derived from the context of RUSA and NAAC.
- It is on the basis of students' and teachers' expectations and satisfaction. Thus, this type of quality measurement does not convey the real standard of the colleges. Hence, the wrong perception of the teachers and student regarding the college quality may lead to wrong result. Simply the quality measured in the study indicates relative form and not the absolute level of quality.
- While providing the data, some respondents were reluctant to convey the original picture of the college. Hence, the real picture of the colleges was hidden sometimes.
- Some subjects revealed that they were confused in some cases for which they had given contradictory responses which may be due to lack of awareness of the subjects or defects in the questionnaire.
- The researcher might not have gone through all relevant literature and research studies.

5.6. SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

1. Similar studies may be conducted from larger sample for better authenticity and to validate the present findings.
2. The perceptions of other stakeholders like parents, administrators, non-teaching faculty and other authorities on quality of higher education in Mizoram may be studied.
3. A comparative study of the status of implementation of Rashtriya Uchchatar Shiksha Abhiyan (RUSA) in north-eastern states of India may be carried out.

4. Critical and evaluative studies may be carried out on the patterns of utilization of grants received from RUSA.
5. An analytical study may be conducted on higher education in Mizoram in relation to access, equity and excellence.
6. Evaluative studies may be carried out on status, problems and prospects of higher educational institutions in Mizoram.
7. Qualitative and quantitative researches may be conducted in relation to innovations in higher education in India and their impact on quality enhancement.
8. A critical study may be conducted on the availability, accessibility and utilization of educational facilities in the institutes of higher education with reference to Mizoram/Northeast India.
9. Impact of NAAC on development of higher education in Mizoram may be studied.
10. The educational planning and administration in Mizoram with special reference to higher education may be studied critically.

APPENDIX - I

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR STUDENTS

Dear Participant,

I am pursing Research on "**Perceptions of Stakeholders on Quality of Higher Education in Mizoram in the Context of RUSA**" in the department of Education, Mizoram University, under the guidance of Prof. Lokanath Mishra.

For the above purpose I need your cooperation by answering the questions given below. Each question has four alternatives. Please read each question and put (√) tick mark on the appropriate opinion.

All the information provided by you will be kept strictly confidential and will be used for research purpose only.

(LALTLANZAUVI KAWLNI)

Research Scholar.

PART – A

Name of the College:_____

Age:_____ Gender: _____

Class:_____

Core Subject:_____

PART - B

1. What do you think about the syllabus of your course?
   a) Very Good b) Good
   c) Very Poor d) Poor

2. What do you think about the course in terms of difficulty?
   a) Very Good b) Good
   c) Very Poor d) Poor
3. What do you think about the different types of subjects/disciplines provided in your college/institution?
   a) Very Good b) Good
   c) Very Poor d) Poor
4. Coverage of the syllabus in the class is ?
   a) Very Good b) Good
   c) Very Poor d) Poor

5. How well did you able to get material for the prescribed readings?
   a) Very Good b) Good
   c) Very Poor d) Poor

6. The choice of courses offered was
   a) Very Good b) Good
   c) Very Poor d) Poor

7. What was the attitude of teachers towards extra-curricular activities?
   a) Very Good b) Good
   c) Very Poor d) Poor

8. What is your opinion about teachers' preparation for the classes?
   a) Very Good b) Good
   c) Very Poor d) Poor

9. How well did the teachers encourage student participation in class?
   a) Very Good b) Good
   c) Very Poor d) Poor

10. What is your opinion about the student internal assessment procedures and systems?
    a) Very Good b) Good
    c) Very Poor d) Poor

11. Use of modern teaching aids in your college is
    a) Very Good b) Good
    c) Very Poor d) Poor

12. How do you rate the student-teacher relationship in your institution as a whole?
    a) Very Good b) Good
    c) Very Poor d) Poor

13. How do you rate on employment of participatory activities as seminars, assignments, projects and fields studies by the teachers for making the learning process more student-centred.
    a) Very Good b) Good
    c) Very Poor d) Poor

14. How well was the teacher able to communicate?

a) Very Good b) Good

c) Very Poor d) Poor

15. What effect do you think the internal assessment will have on your course grade?

a) Very Good b) Good

c) Very Poor d) Poor

16. How well did the teachers discuss your assignments with you?

a) Very Good b) Good

c) Very Poor d) Poor

17. The internal evaluation system as it exists is

a) Very Good b) Good

c) Very Poor d) Poor

18. The regularity of internal assessment was

a) Very Good b) Good

c) Very Poor d) Poor

19. How well did the teachers return your corrected / evaluated written assignments with helpful comments?

a) Very Good b) Good

c) Very Poor d) Poor

20. How do you rate the institution regarding responsiveness to community needs and conducting of any relevant extension programmes?

a) Very Good b) Good

c) Very Poor d) Poor

21. The extension activities like NCC, NSS etc. in your college is

a) Very Good b) Good

c) Very Poor d) Poor

22. How well are your college buildings and infrastructures?

a) Very Good b) Good

c) Very Poor d) Poor

23. What is your opinion about maintenance of the physical infrastructures of your college?

a) Very Good b) Good

c) Very Poor d) Poor

24. What is your opinion about the library material and facilities for the course?

a) Very Good b) Good

c) Very Poor d) Poor

25. How far did the laboratories adequately equip and properly maintain?

a) Very Good b) Good

c) Very Poor d) Poor

26. What is your opinion about the class room settings?

a) Very Good b) Good

c) Very Poor d) Poor

27. Computer facilities and internet connections to promote learning in your college is

a) Very Good b) Good

c) Very Poor d) Poor

28. The library facilities available in your college in terms of books and subscription of reputed journals is

a) Very Good b) Good

c) Very Poor d) Poor

29. The recreational centres/rooms in your college is

a) Very Good b) Good

c) Very Poor d) Poor

30. The infrastructural facilities for co-curricular activities are

a) Very Good b) Good

c) Very Poor d) Poor

31. What do you think about the hostel facilities?

a) Very Good b) Good

c) Very Poor d) Poor

32. How do you find the transport facility provided by the institution?

a) Very Good b) Good

c) Very Poor d) Poor

33. What is your opinion about provision of clear information to students about admission and completion requirements for all programmes?

a) Very Good b) Good

c) Very Poor d) Poor

34. What is your opinion about provision of clear information to students about the fee-structure, financial aid and student support services?

a) Very Good b) Good

c) Very Poor d) Poor

35. How well is monitoring of Student progression in your college?

a) Very Good b) Good

c) Very Poor d) Poor

36. How well is the students' organization/union in your college?

a) Very Good b) Good

c) Very Poor d) Poor

37. In your opinion, what is the level of Provision of guidance provided by the teachers to the students?

a) Very Good b) Good

c) Very Poor d) Poor

38. What is your opinion about the activities of Students union?

a) Very Good b) Good

c) Very Poor d) Poor

39. How do you rate the Students' Union as a tree representative of the student community?

a) Very Good b) Good

c) Very Poor d) Poor

40. Helpfulness of the teachers in advising?

a) Very Good b) Good

c) Very Poor d) Poor

APPENDIX - II

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TEACHERS

Respected Sir/Madam,

I am pursing Research on "**Perceptions of Stakeholders on Quality of Higher Education in Mizoram in the Context of RUSA**" in the department of Education, Mizoram University, under the guidance of Prof. Lokanath Mishra.

For the above purpose I need your cooperation by answering the questions given below. Each question has four alternatives. Please read each question and put (√) tick mark on the appropriate opinion.

All the information provided by you will be kept strictly confidential and will be used for research purpose only.

(LALTLANZAUVI KAWLNI)

Research Scholar.

PART – A

Name of the College:_____

Age:_____ Gender: _____

Qualification:_____

Stream of Teaching:_____

Number of years you have been in this job:_____

PART – B

1. What do you think about the syllabus of each course?
   a) Very Good b) Good
   c) Very Poor d) Poor

2. What do you think about the courses in terms of difficulty level?
   a) Very Good b) Good
   c) Very Poor d) Poor

3. What do you think about the courses in order to enhance the students to stand on their own feet keeping in view the global demand?
   a) Very Good b) Good
   c) Very Poor d) Poor

4. What do you think about the different types of subjects/disciplines provided in your college/institution?
   a) Very Good b) Good
   c) Very Poor d) Poor

5. How well did you prepare for the classes?
   a) Very Good b) Good
   c) Very Poor d) Poor

6. How well did you encourage student participation in class?
   a) Very Good b) Good
   c) Very Poor d) Poor

7. What is your opinion about the student internal assessment procedures and systems?

   a) Very Good b) Good

   c) Very Poor d) Poor

8. Opportunities of teachers for continued academic progress and professional Development is

   a) Very Good b) Good

   c) Very Poor d) Poor

9. Use of modern teaching aids in your college is

   a) Very Good b) Good

   c) Very Poor d) Poor

10. How do you rate the student-teacher relationship in your institution as a whole?

    a) Very Good b) Good

    c) Very Poor d) Poor

11. How do you rate on employment of participatory activities as seminars, assignments, projects and fields studies by the teachers for making the learning process more student-centred.

    a) Very Good b) Good

    c) Very Poor d) Poor

12. How well did the institution promote research culture among faculty and students.

    a) Very Good b) Good

    c) Very Poor d) Poor

13. How well did the institution encourage faculty to publish in academic forums.

a) Very Good b) Good

c) Very Poor d) Poor

14. What do you think about the institution regarding promotion of faculty participation in consultancy work.

a) Very Good b) Good

c) Very Poor d) Poor

15. How do you rate the institution regarding responsiveness to community needs and conducting of any relevant extension programmes.

a) Very Good b) Good

c) Very Poor d) Poor

16. . The extension activities like NCC, NSS etc. in your college is

a) Very Good b) Good

c) Very Poor d) Poor

17. The number of research activities done by the teachers of your college is

a) Very Good b) Good

c) Very Poor d) Poor

18. Professional development of faculty through participation in seminars, workshops, research projects, research publications, presentation of papers is

a) Very Good b) Good

c) Very Poor d) Poor

19. How well are your college buildings and infrastructures?

a) Very Good b) Good

c) Very Poor d) Poor

20. The mechanisms of the institution for maintenance and optimal use of infrastructure.

a) Very Good b) Good

c) Very Poor d) Poor

21. What is your opinion about the library material and facilities for the course?

a) Very Good b) Good

c) Very Poor d) Poor

22. Were the laboratories adequately equipped and properly maintained?

a) Very Good b) Good

c) Very Poor d) Poor

23. What is your opinion about the class room settings?

a) Very Good b) Good

c) Very Poor d) Poor

24. Computer facilities and internet connections to promote learning in your college is

a) Very Good b) Good

c) Very Poor d) Poor

25. The library facilities available in your college in terms of books and subscription of reputed journals is

a) Very Good b) Good

c) Very Poor d) Poor

26. The recreational centres/rooms in your college is

a) Very Good b) Good

c) Very Poor d) Poor

27. The infrastructural facilities for co-curricular activities are

a) Very Good b) Good

c) Very Poor d) Poor

28. What is your opinion about provision of clear information to students about admission and completion requirements for all programmes?

a) Very Good b) Good

c) Very Poor d) Poor

29. What is your opinion about provision of clear information to students about the fee-structure, financial aid and student support services?

a) Very Good b) Good

c) Very Poor d) Poor

30. How well is monitoring of Student progression in your college?

a) Very Good b) Good

c) Very Poor d) Poor

31. Mechanism of the institution to use student feedback for quality enhancement is

a) Very Good b) Good

c) Very Poor d) Poor

32. How well is the students' organization/union in your college?

a) Very Good b) Good

c) Very Poor d) Poor

33. In your opinion, what is the level of Provision of guidance provided by the teachers to the students?

a) Very Good b) Good

c) Very Poor d) Poor

34. What is your opinion about the activities of Students union?

a) Very Good b) Good

c) Very Poor d) Poor

35. The offices and departments of the institution are governed on the principles of participation and transparency.

a) Very Good b) Good

c) Very Poor d) Poor

36. How do you think about grievance redressal mechanisms at all levels of the institution's functioning.

a) Very Good b) Good

c) Very Poor d) Poor

37. What do you think about Utilization of the funds/finances allocated to your college?

a) Very Good b) Good

c) Very Poor d) Poor

38. The faculty involvement in decision-making regarding the functioning of your college is

a) Very Good b) Good

c) Very Poor d) Poor

39. How well do the Internal Quality Assurance Cell (IQAC) functioning in your college?

a) Very Good b) Good

c) Very Poor d) Poor

40. What about the overall strength of teaching faculty?

a) Very Good b) Good

c) Very Poor d) Poor

41. What is your opinion about the existing internal evaluation system?

a) Very Good b) Good

c) Very Poor d) Poor

42. What is your opinion about the total weightage (i.e. 25%) of a course that the internal assessment account for?

a) Very Good b) Good

c) Very Poor d) Poor

43. What is your opinion about the student external assessment procedures and systems?

a) Very Good b) Good

c) Very Poor d) Poor

44. What is your opinion about institution's autonomy to run a course independently?

a) Very Good b) Good

c) Very Poor d) Poor

45. What about autonomy of the staff to attend any refresher course/ seminar/workshop/conference etc?

a) Very Good b) Good

c) Very Poor d) Poor

46. What do you think about your institution's autonomy to procure any materials for the betterment of your college?

a) Very Good b) Good

c) Very Poor d) Poor

47. What is your opinion about coordination between RUSA authority and the authority of your college?

a) Very Good b) Good

c) Very Poor d) Poor

48. What is your opinion about the interaction and relationship between the Principal and the staff?

a) Very Good b) Good

c) Very Poor d) Poor

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abidin, Munirul (2015). Higher Education Quality: Perception Differences among Internal and External Stakeholders. *International Education Studies*. Vol. 8, No. 12; 2015. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ies.v8n12p185

Agarwal, Pawan (2006). *Higher Education in India: The Need for Change.* Indian Council for Research on International Economic Relations (ICRIER).

Ahmad, Mukhtar (2019). *What is wrong with the Indian higher education system?* Retrieved from https://www.universityworldnews.com/post.php?story=20190129125036113

All India Survey on Higher Education (AISHE) (2016-2017). Retrieved from http://aishe.nic.in/aishe/viewDocument.action?documentId=239

All India Survey on Higher Education (AISHE) (2017-2018). Retrieved from https://epsiindia.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/AISHE-2017-18.pdf

All India Survey on Higher Education (AISHE) (2018-2019). Retrieved from http://aishe.nic.in/aishe/viewDocument.action?documentId=263

Anandkrishnan, M. (2006). Imperatives of Student Involvement in Quality Enhancement. *Proceeding of International perspectives on student participation in Quality enhancement,* 1 - 3.

Anandkrishnan, M. (2007). Regulating Indian Higher Education: Beyond NKC. *University News,* 45(48), 33 - 35.

Antony, S. (2002). External quality assurance in Indian higher education: Case study of the National Assessment and Accreditation Council (NAAC). *International Institute for Educational Planning*, Paris.

Asiyai, Romina. (2014). Improving Quality Higher Education in Nigeria: The Roles of Stakeholders. *International Journal of Higher Education.* Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/315354168_Improving_Quality_Higher_Education_in_Nigeria_The_Roles_of_Stakeholders

Balasubramanian, K and Ananthi, A (2008). Edifying Quality Improvement in Higher Education. *University News*, 46 (46):103-105.

Bakshi, Ritu (2017). Higher Education In India: RUSA And Challenges Mismatch In Supply And Demand Of Productive Workforce. *International Research Journal of Management and Commerce.* Volume 4, Issue 7, July 2017 (p: 97-105).

Barnett, R. (1997). *The Limit to competence knowledge, Higher Education and Society*. Buckingham, U.K: Society for Research in Higher Education and Open University Press.

Best, J. W., & Kahn, J. V. (2009). *Research in education (10th edition.).* New Delhi: PHI Learning Pvt. Ltd.

Béteille, A. (2005). Universities as Public Institutions. *Economic and Political Weekly, 40*(31), 3377-3381. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/4416955

Bhutia, Yodida (2005). A study of higher education in the state of Sikkim. *Ph.D Thesis.* Retrieved from http://hdl.handle.net/10603/60572

Brennan, J., & Shah, T. (2000). *Managing Quality in Higher Education. An International Perspective on Institutional Assessment and Change.* Buckingham: Open University Press.

British Council (2014). *Understanding India - The Future of Higher Education and Opportunities for International Cooperation.* British Council.

Boruah, Pallab Jyoti (2018). Problems and Future Prospects of Higher Education in North East India. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Invention (IJHSSI).* Retrieved from http://www.ijhssi.org/papers/vol7(2)/Version-1/B0702010912.pdf

Cheng, Y. (2003). Quality Assurance in Education: Internal, Interface and Future. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 11(4), 202 – 213.

Deshmukh, S. (2004). Quality Higher Education and Sustainable Development: Values and Educational Strategies. *NAAC Decennial Lectures,* 47-58. Retrieved from http://naac.gov.in/docs/Books/Quality%20Higher%20Education%20and%20Sustainable%20Development.pdf

Devi, Anita and Bushan, Bharat (2018). RUSA: Expansion and future of higher education in India. *International Journal of Advanced Educational Research.* Volume 3; Issue 1; January 2018; Page No. 39-41. Retrieved from http://www.educationjournal.org/download/453/3-1-25-716.pdf

Dicker et.al. (2019). What does 'quality' in higher education mean? Perceptions of staff, students and employers. Retrieved from https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/03075079.2018.1445987?journalCode=cshe20

Donald, Janet G and Denison, D Brian (2001). Quality Assessment of University Students- Student Perceptions of Quality Criteria. *Journal of Higher Education*, 72(4):478-502.

Douglas, J., Douglas, A., & Barnes, B. (2006). Measuring Student satisfaction at UK University. *Quality Assurance in Education,* 14 (3), 251 – 267.

Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry (FICCI) (2013). *Higher Education in India: Vision 2030*. Retrieved from http://www.ey.com/Publication/vwLUAssets/Higher-education-in-India-Vision-2030/$FILE/EY-Higher-educationin-India-Vision-2030.pdf

Garret, H. E. (2008). *Statistics in Psychology and Education (First Indian Reprint).* Kamla Nagar, Delhi: Surjeet Publications.

Gaurav, Kumar and Lakshmi, Raj (2015). RUSA and Academic Reforms in Higher Education System of India. *International Journal of Innovative Research in Engineering & Multidisciplinary Physical Sciences (IJIRMPS)*. Retrieved from http://www.ijirmps.org/papers/2018/5/334.pdf

Godbole, Vinita Vijay (2009). Quality assurance system and implementing proactive policies in higher education. *Ph.D Thesis*. Retrieved from http://hdl.handle.net/10603/110022

Gogoi, Rupam And Buragohain, Piklee (2014). Autonomous College: Studying its Relevance in the Indian Higher Education Scenario with Special Reference to the State of Assam. *European Academic Research.* Vol. II, Issue 2.

Gorgodze, Sophia, Macharashvili, Lasha and Kamladze, Anna (2019). Learning for Earning: Student Expectations and Perceptions of University. *International*

Education Studies. Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1239486.pdf

Goulden, N. R., & Griffin, C. J. G. (1995). The meaning of grades based on faculty and student metaphors. *Communication Education*, 44, 110-125. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1080/03634529509379003

Green, D and Harvey, L (1993). *Quality Assurance in Western Europe: Trends, Practices and Issues.* Retrieved from https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/09684889310046149/full/html

Gupta, Deepti and Gupta, Navneet (2012). Higher Education in India: Structure, Statistics and Challenges. *Journal of Education and Practice*. Vol 3, No 2, 2012.

Hanaysha, J., Abdullah,H. H., & Warokka, A. (2011). Service quality and students' satisfaction at higher learning institutions: The competing dimensions of Malaysian Universities' competitiveness. *Journal of Southeast Asian Research*. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.5171/2011.855931

Hegde, G. (2006), Promoting Student Participation in Quality Enhancement. *Proceeding of International perspectives on student participation in Quality enhancement,* 171 – 174. Retrieved from http://naac.gov.in/docs/Best%20Practices/Students%20Participation%20in%20Quality% 20Enhancement.pdf

Hill, Y., Lomas, L., & Macgregor, F. (2003). Students' perceptions of quality in higher education. *Quality Assurance in Education,* 11 (1), 15 – 20.

Hodgkinson, M., & Kelly, M. (2007). Quality Management and Enhancement Processes in UK Business Schools: A review. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 15 (1), 77-91.

Houston, D. (2008). Re- thinking Quality and improvement in Higher Education. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 16 (1), 61 – 79.

Indian National Commission for Cooperation (1998). Higher Education in India; Vision and Action Country Paper. Retrieved from http://docshare04.docshare.tips/files/3527/35277903.pdf

Irani, Smriti (2015). *Improvement of quality of higher education*. Retrieved from http://inbministry.blogspot.in/2015/12/improvement-of-quality-of-higher.html

Jonaki, Bhattacharya and Prasenjit, Pal (2016), Higher Education in India: Recent Issues and Trends. *Research Journal of Educational Sciences.* Vol. 4(1), 10-16, January 2016.

Kachari, Nizara and Dutta, Jadab (2017). (2015). A Study of the Prospects of Higher Education in the Context of Rastriya Uchchatar Shiksha Abhiyan (RUSA). *International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR)*. Retrieved from https://www.ijsr.net/archive/v6i8/ART20176137.pdf

Kalirajan, R. (2010). Demand for Quality Higher Education and Efficiency Inequality among Students in Salem District. *Ph.D Thesis.* Retrieved from http://hdl.handle.net/10603/27821

Kaur, Daljit (2013). Quality Assurance in Higher Education: An Evaluative Study. Ph.d Thesis. Retrieved from http://hdl.handle.net/10603/36767

Kiran and Kumari, Renu (2016). *Higher Education: Equity, Access & Exellence.* Retrieved from http://www.gangainstituteofeducation.com/september/1.pdf

Klamkratoke, T., Kanjanawasee, S., & Sugiva, S. (2007). Ranking and rating in higher education: The multi -dimensional quality in stakeholders' perspectives with hierarchical ranking and rating approach. *Proceedings of the INQAAHE 2007 Toronto Conference.*

Koslowski, F. (2006). Quality and assessment in context: A brief review. *Quality Assurance in education,* 14 (3), 277 – 288.

Koul, Lokesh (2009). *Methodology of Educational Research (Fourth Edition).*Noida, Uttar Pradesh: Vikas Publication House Pvt Ltd.

Kumar, Hem et.al. (2017). An Analytical Study of Rashtriya Uchchatar Shiksha Abhiyan (In special reference to Higher education, Uttar Pradesh). *Online International Journal of Medical and Social Sciences.* Vol 3, Issue 1. Pg: 231-235.

Kumar, Panda Sushanta (2008). Parameters of Quality in Higher Education. *University News,* 46(46):99-102.

Kundu, Goutam Kumar (2016). Higher Education Quality: A Literature Review. *ICTACT Journal on Management Studies.* Volume: 02, Issue: 02. May 2016

Lagrosen, S., et.al (2004). Examination of the Dimensions of quality in higher education. *Quality Assurance in Education,* 12 (2), 61-69.

Lal, Pyare et.al (2015) studied on "Choice Based Credit System under Rashtriya Uchchatar Shiksha Abhiyan in Himachal Pradesh: A SWOT Analysis". *Online International Interdisciplinary Research Journal*, {Bi-Monthly}. Volume-V, Sept 2015 Special Issue. Retrieved from http://www.oiirj.org/oiirj/sept2015-special-issue/16.pdf

Lomas, L. (2004). Embedding Quality: The challenges for higher education. *Quality Assurance in Education,* 12 (4), 157 – 165.

Mangla, Ashima (2015). Emerging Trends, Issues and Strategies in Higher Education System of India. *International Journal in Applied Studies and Production Management.* Volume1, Issue 2, 15 February- 15 May 2015.

Mehta, Manju (2018). A study of problems and perceptions towards continuous and comprehensive evaluation among stakeholders at secondary level. *Ph.d Thesis*. Retrieved from http://hdl.handle.net/10603/276577

Ministry of Human Resource Development (2013). *Rashtriya Uchchatar Shiksha Abhiyan National Higher Education Mission.* Retrieved from https://mhrd.gov.in/sites/upload_files/mhrd/files/upload_document/RUSA_final090913.pdf .

Ministry of Human Resource Development (2018). *India Rankings 2018 - National Institutional Ranking Framework (NIRF).* Retrieved from https://www.nirfindia.org/2018/pdf/nirf_2018_final.pdf

Mishra, Sanjaya (2006). *Quality Assurance in Higher Education: An Introduction.* Bangalore, India: National Assessment and Accreditation Council.

Mizoram University (2018). *Mizoram University Annual Report 2017-2018*. Retrieved from https://mzu.edu.in/wpcontent/uploads/Annual%20Reports/English/annual_report 2017-18_English.pdf

NAAC (2004). *Higher Education in North East – NAAC - Quality Assessment Analysis.* Bangalore: NAAC.

NAAC (2007). *International Perspectives on Student Participation in Quality Enhancement*. Bangalore: NAAC.

NAAC. *Student Participation in Quality Enhancement.* Retrieved from http://www.naac.gov.in/docs/Students%20Participation%20in%20Quality%20Enhancement.pdf

NAAC. *Student Feedback and Participation.* Retrieved from http://www.naac.gov.in/docs/Student%20Feedback%20and%20Participation.pdf

NAAC (2019). *State wise number of universities and colleges accredited.* Retrieved from *http://naac.gov.in/images/docs/STATISTICS/State-wise-number-of-universities-and- colleges-accredited-by-NAAC---as-on-20052019.xls*

Neihsial, Lalthamuan (2018). *Higher Education in Mizoram: A Perspective.* Retrieved from http://oldror.lbp.world/UploadedData/5109.pdf

O'Neill, M., & Palmer, A. (2004). Importance -performance analysis: a useful tool for directing continuous quality improvement in higher education. *Quality Assurance in Education,* 12, (1), 39 - 52.

Palli, Janardhana Gundla and Mamilla, Rajasekhar (2012). *Students' Opinions of Service Quality in the Field of Higher Education.* Creative Education. Retrieved from http://www.SciRP.org/journal/ce

Pandiya, Sudhanshu (2015). A study of the Various Provisions and Challenges for RUSA. Retrieved from http://www.ijhpdindia.com/upload/article/PDF000032.pdf

Patra, Jyoti & Mete, Jayanta. (2016). RUSA: The Roadmap and Future of Higher Education in India. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/303381587_RUSA_THE_ROADMAP_AND_FUTURE_OF_HIGHER_EDUCATION_IN_INDIA

Pawan Agarwal, (2006). *Higher Education in India: The Need for Change (ICIER Working Paper No. 180).* New Delhi: Indian Council for Research on International Economic Relations.

Petruzzellis, L., D'Uggento, A., & Romanazzi, S. (2006). Student satisfaction and quality of service in Italian Universities. *Managing Service Quality*, 16 (4), 349 - 364.

Pfeffer, N. & Coote, A. (1991). *Is Quality Good for You? A Critical Review of Quality Assurance in the Welfare Services.* London: Institute of Public Policy Research.

Potluri, Rajasekhara M., et.al. (2015). *Students' Perception on Quality of Higher Education in India.* Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/276309486

Pramod, Tandon and Gupta, P K (2008). Quality and Relevance in Higher Education. *University News,* 46(46):14-29.

Pritam, Khwaja, M Shahid and Bhanu Pratap (2016). *Indian Higher Education A Way Forward.* Retrieved from http://udayindia.in/2016/01/15/indian-higher-education-a-way-forward/

Priyanka and D.K.Giri (2014) *A comparative study on the Awareness of Students, Teachers, Principals and Policy Makers on RUSA (Rashtriya Uchchatar Shiksha Abhiyan) Project and their attitude towards its implementation in Indian Higher Education.* Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/9874487/A_comparative_study_on_the_Awareness_of_Students_Teachers_Principals_and_Policy_Makers_on_RUSA_Rashtriya_Uchchatar_Shiksha_Abhiyan_Project_and_their_attitude_towards_its_implementation_in_Indian_Higher_Education

Pujar, Uma (2014). Trends in Growth of Higher Education in India. *IOSR Journal of Economics and Finance (IOSR-JEF). Retrieved from* www.iosrjournals.org/iosr-jef/papers/vol2- issue6/A0260104.pdf

Puram, R K. (2019). *Implementing Quality in Higher Education.* Retrieved from http://www.qcin.org/nbqp/qualityindia/Vol-2-No2/specialreport.htm

Qamar, Furqan (2008). Status of Quality in Higher Education - Varying Perceptions. *In Higher Education in India -Issues related to Expansion, Inclusiveness, Quality and Finance.* New Delhi: University Grants Commission.

Rajasingh,S. (2009) . Quality Assessment in Higher Education. *Ph.d Thesis*. Retrieved from http://shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in/handle/10603/26765

Rambilas (2015). The National Higher Education Mission (RUSA): Challenges and Prospects. *International Journal of Innovative Social Science & Humanities Research*. Vol (2), Issue-3, July-Sept, 2015.

Rao, V K (2003). *Quality Education*. New Delhi: APH Publishing Corporation.

Ravi, Shamika, Gupta, Neelanjana and Nagaraj, Puneeth (2019). *Reviving Higher Education in India.* Retrieved from https://www.brookings.edu/research/reviving-higher-education-in-india/

Saini, Manish and Monikasood (2018). Effect of Implementation of Rashtriya Uchchatar Shiksha Abhiyan (RUSA) on Gross Enrollment Ratio. *ZENITH International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research.* Vol.8 (8), AUGUST (2018), Pp. 255-261.

Sahney, S., Banwet, D.K. and Karunes, S. (2003). Enhancing quality in education: application of quality function deployment – an industry perspective. *Work Study*. Vol. 52 No. 6, pp. 297-309. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1108/00438020310496569

Shah, A.M (2005). Higher Education and Research - Roots of Mediocrity. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 40(22):2234-2242.

Sharma, S.C (2020). *Inducing Quality and Relevance in Indian Higher Education Institutions - Some Thoughts.* New Delhi (India). .Association of Indian Universities.

Sidhu, Kulbir Singh (2018). *Methodology of research in education (First Edition)*. New Delhi: Sterling Publication Pvt. Ltd.

Singh, J D. *Higher education in India – issues, challenges and suggestions*. Retrieved from http://www.gvctesangaria.org/websiteimg/publications/jdarticle.pdf

Singh, Naoremromikanta and Devi, Th. Madhuri (2014). Rashtriya Uchchatar Shiksha Abhiyan (RUSA): Current Higher Education Trends In Manipur. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanities Research.* Retrieved from http://rusa.nic.in/download/239/publications/4007/publication3_current-he-trends-in-manipur.pdf

Singh, Shailja (2009). Quality Circles in Higher Education in India. *University News,* 47(07):14.

Singh, Thokchom Budha (2019). Issues and Challenges of Higher Education in India: With Special Reference to Mizoram. *International Journal of Social Sciences Arts & Humanities.* Retrieved from http://www.crdeepjournal.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/08/Vol-7-2-1-IJSSAH-.pdf

Srikanthan, G., & Dalyrymple, J. (2007). A conceptual overview of holistic model for quality in higher education. *International Journal of Educational Management,* 21 (3), 173-193.

Sahoo, Ranjan and Rout, Sarat. (2019). *Awareness of Teachers About the Academic Provisions of RUSA to Enhance the Quality of Higher Education.* Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/333802287_Awareness_of_Teachers_About_the_Academic_Provisions_of_RUSA_to_Enhance_the_Quality_of_Higher_Education/citation/download

Soomro, Tariq and Ahmad, Reyaz. (2012). *Quality in Higher Education: United Arab Emirates Perspective.* Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/236201448_Quality_in_Higher_Education_United_Arab_Emirates_Perspective

Tandon Pramod and P K Gupta (2008), "Quality and Relevance in Higher Education" *University News,* 46(46):14-29.

Tang, Siew Fun and Hussin, Sufean (2011). Quality in Higher Education: A Variety of Stakeholder Perspectives. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanity.* Vol. 1, No. 2.

Telford, R., & Masson, R. (2005). The Congruence of Quality values in Higher Education. *Quality Assurance in Education,* 13 (2), 107 - 119.

Terry, G. and T.B.Thomas, (1979). *International dictionary of education*. London: Kogan Page, P.115.

Tripathee, Aaratee (2017). Analysis of Students' Perception on Quality of Management Education in Kathmandu. *Journal of Business and Social Sciences Research (JBSSR).* Vol. 2, No. 1 & 2, pp. 15-26.

UNESCO (1995) Policy Paper for Change and Development in Higher Education. *New Frontier in Education,* 26(3), 288-334.

University Grants Commission (2003). *Higher Education in India: Issues, Concerns and New Directions.* New Delhi: University Grants Commission.

University Grants Commission (2008). *Higher Education In India - Issues Related To Expansion, Inclusiveness, Quality And Finance.* New Delhi: University Grants Commission. Retrieved from https://www.ugc.ac.in/oldpdf/pub/report/12.pdf

University Grants Commission (2013). *Indian higher education: Quest for excellence.* Retrieved from http://www.ugc.ac.in/pdfnews/7580771_Flag-ship-Programmes-of-UGC.pdf

University Grants Commission (2017). *UGC Annual Report 2016-2017*. Retrieved from https://www.ugc.ac.in/pdfnews/9764381_Complete-AR-2016-17-English.pdf

University Grants Commission (2018). *UGC Annual Report 2017-2018*. Retrieved from https://www.ugc.ac.in/pdfnews/5595965_UGC-ANNUAL-REPORT-English-2017-_18.pdf

Vanengmawii,C. (2017). Higher Education in Mizoram in the Context of Knowledge Society: A Critical Analysis. *Ph.D. thesis.* Retrieved from http://mzuir.inflibnet.ac.in:8080/jspui/handle/123456789/307

Vanlalchhanhimi (2017). Awareness and Attitude of College Teachers in Mizoram on Rashtriya Uchchatar Shiksha Abhiyan. *M.Phil dissertation*. Retrieved from http://mzuir.inflibnet.ac.in:8080/jspui/bitstream/123456789/738/1/VANLALCHHANHIMI%2C%20Edu.pdf

Verma, Yoginder (2007). Teachers Perceptions about Ensuring Students Participation in Enhancing Quality in Higher Education. *International Perspectives on Student Participation in Quality Enhancement.* Bangalore: NAAC.

Welsh, J., & Dey, S. (2002). Quality measurement and quality assurance in higher education. *Quality Assurance in Education,* 10(1), 17-25.

Wikipedia. *Higher education. Retrieved from* http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Higher_Education

BRIEF BIO-DATA OF THE CANDIDATE

NAME	:	LALTLANZAUVI KAWLNI
FATHER'S NAME	:	JOSEPH LALDUHAWMA
DATE OF BIRTH	:	14.04.1989
ADDRESS	:	H. NO. E-37, VENGTHLANG NORTH, PIN CODE- 796321, CHAMPHAI, MIZORAM
GENDER	:	FEMALE
RELIGION	:	CHRISTIANITY
MARRITAL STATUS	:	MARRIED
EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATION	:	M.A., NET, NET-JRF
PH. D. REGISTRATION NO. & DATE	:	MZU/Ph. D/885 of 19.04.2016
DEPARTMENT	:	EDUCATION, MIZORAM UNIVERSITY
TITLE OF THE THESIS	:	PERCEPTIONS OF STAKEHOLDERS ON QUALITY OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN MIZORAM IN THE CONTEXT OF RUSA

PARTICULARS OF THE CANDIDATE

NAME OF THE CANDIDATE : LALTLANZAUVI KAWLNI

DEGREE : DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT : EDUCATION

TITLE OF THESIS : PERCEPTIONS OF STAKEHOLDERS ON QUALITY OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN MIZORAM IN THE CONTEXT OF RUSA

DATE OF ADMISSION : 10.08.2015

APPROVAL OF RESEARCH PROPOSAL

1. **BOARD OF STUDIES** : 12.04.2016
2. **SCHOOL BOARD** : 19.04.2016

MZU REGISRATION NO. : 1506784

Ph.D. REGISTRATION NO. & DATE: MZU/PH. D/885 OF 19.04.2016

EXTENSION (IF ANY) : NIL

Head

Department of Education

SJIF Impact Factor : 7.001
ISI I.F Value : 1.241

ISSN:2455-7838 (Online)
DOI : 10.36713/epra2016

EPRA International Journal of RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT (IJRD)

Monthly, Peer Reviewed (Refereed) & Indexed International Journal

Volume - 5 Issue - 12 December 2020

ISSN (Online): 2455-7838
SJIF Impact Factor : 7.001
ISI I.F. Value : 1.241
DOI : 10.36713/epra2016

EPRA International Journal of

Research & Development

(IJRD)

Monthly Peer Reviewed & Indexed International Online Journal

Volume: 5, Issue:12, December 2020

Indexed By:

TOGETHER WE REACH THE GOAL

Published By
EPRA Publishing

SJIF Impact Factor: 7.001| ISI I.F.Value:1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 5 | Issue: 12 | December 2020 - Peer Reviewed Journal

PERCEPTIONS OF STAKEHOLDERS ON QUALITY OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN MIZORAM

Laltlanzauvi Kawlni
Research Scholar, Mizoram University

Lokanath Mishra
Professor, Department of Education Mizoram University

Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.36713/epra5891

ABSTRACT

The topic of "quality" has received much concern in the context of higher education all over the world. Developing countries like India are also striving forward to improve their higher education system by taking various initiatives. Experts in the respected field have been envisaged that assessment of quality must incorporated the perceptions of its stakeholders. However, with reference to India, the quality of higher education has been assessed through external bodies and the quality of higher education has been hardly studied through its internal bodies particularly the primary stakeholders views were not actually taken into account. The present study is about studying the perceptions of the primary stakeholders on the key components of the higher education. The study will aid the authorities in reflecting and planning the higher education system in order to improve and maintain the quality.

KEYWORDS: *Higher education, Quality, Perceptions of stakeholders, Mizoram.*

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Quality Higher Education has proved to be the major tool for socio-economic development particularly for developing nations. Quality higher education enables empowerment by overcoming the limitations of physical resources. Thus, quality has been a major concern in higher education all over the world. India has been taking several steps and initiatives to improve its higher education. There has been improvement and development in terms of enrollment, establishment of institutions and gross enrollment ratio. For the maintenance and promotion of quality in the Indian higher education, the National Accreditation and Assessment Council (NAAC) as an autonomous body was established in 1994. The main objectives of NAAC are to grade institutions of higher education and their programmes; stimulate the academic environment and quality of teaching and research in these institutions; help institutions realize their academic objectives; promote necessary changes, innovations and reforms in all aspects of the institutions working for the above purpose; and encourage innovations, self-evaluation and accountability in higher education. (NAAC, 2006). It is envisaged by experts that every institution should have assessment and accreditation by NAAC, for better quality and is also evident from many studies that Assessment and Accreditation would enable institutions to upgrade and achieve higher standard.

Mizoram is one of the mountainous states of India with Aizawl as its capital. It has a total area of approximately 21,081 sq. km. It shares international boundary with Myanmar in the south and east, and Bangladesh in the west, it is also bounded in the west by Tripura and in the north by the states of Assam and Manipur. Thus, Mizoram occupies an area of great strategic importance in the north eastern corner of India. According to the Census 2011, the total population of Mizoram is 10,91,014 and is the second highest among the states in terms of literacy rate with 91.3% only after Kerela.

SJIF Impact Factor: 7.001| ISI I.F.Value:1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 5 | Issue: 12 | December 2020 - Peer Reviewed Journal

Mizoram had its first college in 1958 at its capital, Aizawl and the first and the only Central University called Mizoram University was opened in 2001. At present, the total number of all higher education institutions in the state is 50 out of which there are 3 Universities, 32 colleges and 15 stand alone institutions. There is only 1 constituent college of Mizoram University, i.e., Pachhunga University College. There are 27 Colleges under Section 2(f) and 12B of the UGC Act 1956 and 2 Colleges under Section 2(f). There are 24 colleges and 1 University which were accredited so far by NAAC as on March, 2020. Out of 21 government colleges offering general education, only 19 of them have been so far assessed and accredited. Out of the 19 colleges, 2nd Cycle assessment of 11 colleges and 3rdcycle assessment of 1 college has also been completed and accredited. In assessment of both the cycles, the overall grades of the colleges fell within the ranges of C, C+, C++ to B, B++. As of today, there are only 17 colleges whose accreditation period is valid. Gross Enrolment Ratio in Mizoram is 25.7 of which 26.5 male and 24.8 female in 2018-2019. Number of student enrolment in general degree colleges of undergraduate level is 19863 during the period 2018-19. The pupil teacher ratio in higher education in Mizoram is 18 and the Gender Parity Index (GPI) is 0.94.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

The term quality has received increasing attention in the last twenty years in higher education. Quality assessment as a mechanism of quality improvement in higher education has spread all over the world over a period of time. The quality is an industrial term commonly used to refer the degree of excellence and standard of products or goods and commodities set by the producers and manufacturers to satisfy the customer needs and thus, to stay in business. The traditional concept of quality is associated with the idea of providing a product or service that is distinctive and special, and which confers status on the owner or user. (Pfeiffer and Coote, 1991). The meaning of quality has been explained in relation to its dictionary meaning by various renowned authors, who are pioneers in establishing quality systems. According to Oxford Dictionary, Quality is degree, especially high degree of goodness or worth, while Webster's Dictionary defines it as Grade of Excellence. Bureau of Indian Standards, 1988 defines quality as "the totality of features and characteristics of a product or service that bear on its ability to satisfy stated or implied needs."

The quality of higher education is a result of collective effort of all stakeholders in higher education, which includes the state, the society, the employer, parents, the management, teachers and students. Enhancing quality is a holistic process. Isolated efforts in improving the quality of a few selected components of the education system such as the infrastructure, teacher training, research funding or industry participation would be of limited value (Anandakrishnan, 2007). Therefore, all the stakeholders in higher education need to pay attention in strengthening the academic and the non-academic tools, and use them in holistic manner to enhance the quality of higher education. Tang and Hussin (2011) opined that in higher education, stakeholders' views are crucial and should be taken into consideration by the education providers in transcending cognitive skills as well as improving quality processes. Rajasingh (2009) also suggested that quality of higher education cannot be achieved without knowing the perceptions of stakeholders and their perceptual divide. Students and teachers are the largest group within any HEI, and therefore are the main stakeholders who have a much stronger voice than any other stakeholders. As such, the perceptions of students and teachers are one of the most important to know the conditions and standard of Higher Education systems. The interest and participation of students and teachers at all levels in both internal quality assurance and external quality assurance have to play a central role. It makes the process of quality assurance and quality enhancement for the institution more reliable and credible. To date in Mizoram, quality of higher education has been assessed through NAAC only and the perceptions of its stakeholders have never been reflected incorporated into the assessment process. Therefore, students' and teachers' perceptions on quality in higher education can help in effective monitoring of quality in higher education in the state and it is hoped that this study will aid the development of the system by bringing in suggestions to the policy makers which will enhance the quality of higher education institutions in Mizoram.

Hence, the study of perceptions of all stakeholders on quality of higher education is the need of the hour for effective quality assessment of higher education in the state as it is often said that quality of higher education cannot be achieved practically without knowing the perceptions of stakeholders.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The overall aim of the present study is to examine the perceptions of stakeholders (students, teachers) in general degree colleges of Mizoram. The specific objectives of the study is to examine the perception of stakeholders on the quality of infrastructure and instructional facilities available in the general degree colleges of Mizoram.

SJIF Impact Factor: 7.001| ISI I.F.Value:1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 5 | Issue: 12 | December 2020 - Peer Reviewed Journal

METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

A descriptive survey method was used for the present study. The study is also quantitative in nature as structured questions along with fixed responses were used in questionnaire to elicit the perceptions of stakeholders on quality of higher education. The study covers all the general degree colleges of Mizoram affiliating to Mizoram University. In Mizoram, there are 21 affiliated government general degree colleges. So the population for the study includes all the students and teachers in these 21 colleges. Selection of sample for the present study was simple random sampling in nature. 10 teachers and 20 students from each degree college of Mizoram i.e. 210 teachers and 420 students were selected randomly. The investigator developed questionnaire for the present study as there was no readymade questionnaire which was relevant for the present study. The questionnaire was developed for the students and teachers of government general degree colleges in Mizoram to examine the perceptions on quality of higher education in Mizoram. The developed questionnaire was validated using content validity and the reliability of the tool developed was found using test retest method .Keeping in view the objectives of the study and nature of data, descriptive techniques such as percentages was employed for the analysis and interpretation of data. Tabulation of data for percentages was done manually.

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

Findings on perceptions of stakeholders on the overall Quality of infrastructure and instructional facilities in the general degree colleges of Mizoram.

Quality of infrastructure and instructional facilities in the colleges.	Very Good	Good	Poor	Very Poor
Perceptions of students	20.98	47.88	14.44	16.7
Perceptions of Teachers	10	52.75	28.43	8.82
Perceptions of Students and Teachers	**15.5**	**50.31**	**21.43**	**12.76**

The findings reveal that majority of the students were satisfied with the quality of the infrastructure and instructional facilities. However, more number of students perceived that computer facilities and internet connections in the college were very poor. The findings also reveal that more students perceived that the transport facilities in the general degree college of Mizoram were very poor and more number of the teachers perceived that recreational centres available in the degree general college of Mizoram were poor.

From the above table, it was shown that out of 630 respondents, majority i.e. 50.31% of the respondents perceived that the quality of infrastructure and infrastructural facilities were good, 15.5% of the respondents perceived that the quality of infrastructure and infrastructural facilities were very good, 21.43% of the respondents perceived as poor and 12.76% perceived as very poor. Thus, majority of the respondents perceived that the overall quality of infrastructure and instructional facilities available in the government general colleges of Mizoram were good.

Findings on perceptions of stakeholders on the overall quality of curriculum transacted in the general degree colleges of Mizoram.

Quality of curriculum transacted in the colleges.	Very Good	Good	Poor	Very Poor
Perceptions of students	33.02	43.18	17.03	6.77
Perceptions of Teachers	29.12	50.27	19.05	1.56
Perceptions of Students and Teachers	**31.07**	**46.73**	**18.04**	**4.16**

From the above table, it is revealed that a large number of respondents, i.e., 46.73% opined that the quality of curriculum transacted in the college was good, 31.07% perceived that it was very good, 18.04% perceived that quality of curriculum transacted in the college was poor and only 4.16% of the respondents opined it as very poor. Thus, it can be said that more number of the respondents perceived that the quality of curriculum transacted in the government general degree college were good and only a very low percentage of the respondents perceived as very poor.

SJIF Impact Factor: 7.001| ISI I.F.Value:1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 5 | Issue: 12 | December 2020 - Peer Reviewed Journal

Findings on perceptions of stakeholders on the overall quality of student support services in the degree colleges of Mizoram.

Quality regarding student support service in the colleges.	Very Good	Good	Poor	Very Poor
Perceptions of students	30.1	54.12	10.64	5.14
Perceptions of Teachers	18.89	71.91	8.10	1.10
Perceptions of Students and Teachers	**24.5**	**63.01**	**9.37**	**3.12**

The Perceptions of the total respondents on quality regarding student support service in the college is shown in the above table and it implies that majority of them, i.e., 63.01% perceived it as good, 24.5% of them perceived that it was very good, only 9.37% and 3.12% respondents perceived it as poor and very poor.

Findings on the perceptions of stakeholders on the overall quality regarding research and innovation in the degree colleges of Mizoram.

Quality regarding research and innovation in the colleges.	Very Good	Good	Poor	Very Poor
Perceptions of students	18.09	64.52	8.09	9.3
Perceptions of Teachers	17.8	47.5	30.4	4.3
Perceptions of Students and Teachers	**17.94**	**56.01**	**19.24**	**6.8**

The above table shows the Perceptions of the 630 respondents on quality regarding research and innovation in the college and it was observed that 17.94% of them opined that it was very good, 56.01% of them perceived it as good, 19.24% of the respondents perceived that the quality regarding research and innovation in the college was poor and 6.8% of them perceived it as very poor. Therefore, the table implies that majority of the respondents perceived that the overall quality regarding research and innovation in the government general degree colleges were good.

Findings on the perceptions of stakeholders on the overall quality regarding examination and evaluation practices of the degree colleges of Mizoram.

Quality regarding examination and evaluation practices in the colleges.	Very Good	Good	Poor	Very Poor
Perceptions of students	52.22	33.73	10.16	3.89
Perceptions of Teachers	41.6	49.04	7.62	1.74
Perceptions of Students and Teachers	**46.91**	**41.39**	**8.9**	**2.80**

The Perceptions of the total respondents on quality regarding examination and evaluation practices in the college is presented in the above table and it is observed that 46.91% of the respondents perceived that it was very good, 41.39% of them perceived that it was good, 8.9% respondents perceived it as poor and 2.80% of the respondents opined that it was very poor. Though the findings reveal that the total respondents' perceptions on the quality regarding examination and evaluation practices in the government general degree colleges were positive, yet the findings also reveal that there exist a difference in the perception of students and teachers on the same. While majority of the students perceived it as very good, majority of the teachers perceived as good.

SJIF Impact Factor: 7.001| ISI I.F.Value:1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 5 | Issue: 12 | December 2020 - Peer Reviewed Journal

Findings on the perceptions of stakeholders on the overall quality regarding governance and leadership practices in the general degree colleges.

Quality regarding governance and leadership practices in the colleges.	Very Good	Good	Poor	Very Poor
Perceptions of students	48.32	34.05	12.63	5
Perceptions of Teachers	37.19	53.29	6	3.52
Perceptions of Students and Teachers	**42.76**	**43.67**	**9.31**	**4.26**

From the above table, it is observed that 42.76% of the respondents opined that the quality regarding governance and leadership practices in the college was very good, 43.67% of them perceived that it was good, while 9.31% of them opined it as poor and only 4.26% of the respondents perceived the quality regarding governance and leadership practices in the college as very poor. Therefore, a small majority of the respondents perceived that the overall quality regarding governance and leadership practices in the government general degree colleges was good though there is a slight difference in the perceptions between students and teachers while a small majority of the students perceived it as very good, majority of the teachers perceived it as good.

CONCLUSIONS

The quality of human resources in a country depends largely on the quality of higher education institutions and the quality of higher education largely depends on all the stake holders. Though there has been increase in enrolment, institutions, and human resources, the expansion and quality of higher education in Mizoram is still low in comparison to other states in the countries which clearly depicted that the higher education in Mizoram is very far from the international standard. The grade of the colleges in Mizoram accredited by NAAC reveals that the higher education in Mizoram has a long way to go to become a centre of excellence as well as to meet the international standard. On the contrary, the present study shows that the main stakeholders of higher education viz. students and teachers perceived that the quality of higher education is good. These contrasting results may be the very concept of good quality education is not widely understood by the stakeholders or may be the awareness level of stakeholders on quality education is low. Therefore, these contrasting results necessitated that awareness concerning quality of education must be organized frequently.

The state government should do an in-depth study of the performance of colleges on various criteria of assessment and accreditation of NAAC, and work its plan and strategies for the improvement of quality of its colleges. The present study reveals that the quality of higher education in Mizoram is not very deprived to become a centre of excellence. There are several strength areas as far as the quality of higher education in Mizoram is concerned which need to be maintained and promoted. However, many student support services such as career guidance cell, internet facilities, women's cell, human rights cell, grievance redressal cell, students counselling centre etc. must be established in every college for uplifting the standard of the higher education. The functioning of various committees constituted for academic and administrative purposes may be made more effective and efficient. Transparent, participative and accountable administrative practices need to be adopted. Internal Quality Assurance Cell (IQAC) must be made more practical to chalk out plan for quality initiatives and also monitor all the quality enhancement programmes conducted by the institution. Since government colleges are totally controlled by state government and Central University, many things may be delegated. So some kind of autonomy is required for these colleges like full or more autonomy to introduce new courses may be given to the colleges on criteria or norm based so that job-oriented courses like forestry, fisheries, farming, poultry, architecture, music, IT-oriented and Agro based courses which are relevant to the society for economic development of the state may be introduced. The state government may also introduce and monitor teacher's self-appraisal and student's feedback in all colleges more adequately. Therefore, it can be said that expansion of higher education particularly at collegiate level needs to be carried out in a planned manner, keeping in view the requirement of human resources and also to meet the needs of the society.

REFERENCES

1. *All India Survey on Higher Education (AISHE) (2018-2019). Retrieved from http://aishe.nic.in/aishe/viewDocument.action?documentId=263*
2. *Anandkrishnan, M. (2006). Imperatives of Student Involvement in Quality Enhancement. Proceeding of International perspectives on student participation in Quality enhancement, 1 - 3.*
3. *Kalirajan, R. (2010). Demand for Quality Higher Education and Efficiency Inequality among Students in Salem District. Ph.D Thesis.Retrieved from http://hdl.handle.net/10603/27821*
4. *Kaur, Daljit (2013). Quality Assurance in Higher Education: An Evaluative Study. Ph.d Thesis. Retrieved from http://hdl.handle.net/10603/36767*

SJIF Impact Factor: 7.001| ISI I.F.Value:1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 5 | Issue: 12 | December 2020 - Peer Reviewed Journal

5. *NAAC (2006). Quality Assurance in Higher Education: An Introduction. Bangalore, India: National Assessment and Accreditation Council.*
6. *NAAC. Student Participation in Quality Enhancement. Retrieved from http://www.naac.gov.in/docs/Students%20Participation%20in%20Quality%20Enhancement.pdf*
7. *Pfeffer, N. & Coote, A. (1991). Is Quality Good for You? A Critical Review of Quality Assurance in the Welfare Services. London: Institute of Public Policy Research.*
8. *Pramod, Tandon and Gupta, P K (2008). Quality and Relevance in Higher Education. University News, 46(46):14-29.*
9. *Rajasingh,S. (2009) . Quality Assessment in Higher Education. Ph.d Thesis. Retrieved from http://shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in/handle/10603/26765*

ABSTRACT

PERCEPTIONS OF STAKEHOLDERS ON QUALITY OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN MIZORAM IN THE CONTEXT OF RUSA

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

LALTLANZAUVI KAWLNI

MZU REGISRATION No.: 1506784
Ph.D REGISTRATION No. & DATE: MZU/PH. D/885 OF 19.04.2016

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION AND HUMANITIES

DECEMBER 2020

INTRODUCTION

Introduction

Higher education plays an important role in the development of a country. It is important for economic and social development as well as an essential tool to shape human resource as it provides people with an opportunity to react on the critical, socio-economic, cultural, moral and spiritual issues facing humanity. It has always been recognized as a major instrument to achieve the objectives of social, economic and political development of a nation. It is said that, the quality of a nation depends upon the quality of its citizens, which in turn, depends on the quality of education. Today's competitive environment demands better quality of education. Only those candidates who can get quality education on a continuous basis shall be in a position to compete in the global market. In order to compete in the global market, it is necessary to bring about qualitative improvement in the system of our higher education. Therefore, improving the quality of higher education has become a primary concern of countries all over the world.

Rationale of the study

Higher education has special value in the emerging society. There is a positive correlation between the extent of human capital and economic prosperity. So, one of the important determinants of national competitiveness in this global era is the quality of its

higher education. This quality comes from the combination of excellent learning process and public satisfaction in the service delivered (Hanasya and Warokka, 2011). Efficiency of students can be enhanced through the quality of education system. It is essential to have quality higher education to develop student with certain capacities and skills to face the challenges in the real world, in his professional career and also facilitate his participations in national development. Thus, it is necessary to improve the quality of higher education. It is important that the quality of the 'Product' of the program is satisfactory and according to expectations in the field.

India has the second largest educational system in the world. A focus on quality, access and relevance of higher education to achieve the required social transformation for sustainable economic development of the country has been the national priority. Qualitative improvement in higher education, to realize the desired dimensions of human resource development necessitated the establishment of the premier Quality Assurance Agency – National Assessment and Accreditation Council (NAAC) by the UGC, in 1994, to assess and accredit the country's higher education institution. This is the main agency which assesses the quality of the general education institutions and accredits them accordingly, so that they become dynamic, demand-driven, quality conscious, efficient and forward looking and responsive to rapid economic and technological developments occurring at the local, state, national and international levels. Government of India aims to improve the quality of State Universities and colleges and enhance their existing capacities with the help of accreditation agencies established for the purpose. Moreover, to improve access, equity and quality in higher

education through planned development of higher education at the state level, the Ministry of Human Resource Development (MHRD), launched an umbrella scheme of Rashtriya Uchchatar Shiksha Abhiyan (RUSA) in which creation of new academic institutions, expanding and upgrading the existing ones, developing institutions that are self-reliant in terms of quality education, professionally managed were included in the plan and is characterized by greater inclination towards research and provide students with education that is relevant to them as well the nation as a whole.

Enhancing quality is a holistic process. The quality of higher education is a result of collective effort of all stakeholders in higher education, which includes the state, the society, the employer, parents, the management, teachers and students. Therefore, all the stakeholders in higher education need to pay attention in strengthening the academic and the non- academic tools, and use them in holistic manner to enhance the quality of higher education.

Tang and Hussin (2011) opined that in higher education, stakeholders' views are crucial and should be taken into consideration by the education providers in transcending cognitive skills as well as improving quality processes. Rajasingh,S.(2009) also suggested that quality of higher education cannot be achieved without knowing the perceptions of stakeholders and their perceptual divide. Students and teachers are the largest group within any HEI, and therefore are the main stakeholders who have a much stronger voice than any other stakeholders. Therefore, the students and teachers are one of the most important stakeholders of Higher Education systems. To date, quality criteria have reflected administrators' or faculty priorities. However, the perceptions of all

stakeholders, namely industries, faculty, student and alumni on quality of higher education were hardly studied while it was clearly shown from the review of literature that the stakeholders' perceptions on quality are very essential to improve the quality of higher education. Thus seeking students' and teachers' views on all the aspects of higher education experiences should be regarded as essential for effective monitoring of quality in higher education.

As far as Mizoram is concerned, there is little research study on higher education in the state particularly on the quality of higher education with respect to Mizoram. Mizoram's higher education system has not expanded as much as like primary and secondary education. It has one Central University and a few numbers of colleges. As higher education institution which strives to provide excellent quality of education should strive to fully understand the needs of its stakeholders. One of the best ways to do so is through direct feedback from its stakeholders proportionally. The perceptions of the major stakeholders namely students and teachers on quality of higher education, hence, need to be investigated as is crucial to improve the quality of higher education. As the higher education system in Mizoram is striving to improve the overall quality of existing state higher educational institutions by ensuring conformity to prescribed norms and standards and adoption of accreditation as a mandatory quality assurance framework under RUSA, this study will aid the development of the system by bringing in suggestions to the policy makers which will enhance the quality of higher education institutions in Mizoram.

Hence, the study of perceptions of all stakeholders on quality of higher education is the need of the hour for effective quality assessment of higher education in the state as it is often said that quality of higher education cannot be achieved practically without knowing the perceptions of stakeholders. The findings of the study, based on perceptions of major stakeholders, therefore, will throw light on issues and areas that need to be strengthened and identify areas that contribute towards learning enhancement. In order to do so the researcher conducted the study.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of the study has been stated as follows:

Perceptions of stakeholders about Quality of Higher Education in Mizoram in the Context of RUSA

Objectives of the Study

The overall aim of the present study is to examine the perceptions of stakeholders (students, teachers) participating in the RUSA program. The study therefore attempts:

1. To examine the status of implementation of RUSA programs in general degree colleges of Mizoram.

2. To examine the perception of stakeholders on the quality of infrastructure and instructional facilities available in the general degree colleges of Mizoram.
3. To examine the views of stakeholders on the quality of curriculum transacted in the general degree colleges of Mizoram.
4. To elicit the views of stakeholders on the quality of student support service in the general degree colleges of Mizoram.
5. To examine the perceptions of stakeholders on the quality regarding research and innovation in general degree colleges of Mizoram.
6. To investigate the perceptions of stakeholders on the quality regarding examination and evaluation practices in the general degree colleges of Mizoram.
7. To find out the views of stakeholders on the quality regarding governance and leadership practices in the general degree colleges of Mizoram.
8. To find out the perceptions of stakeholders regarding the autonomy of general degree colleges of Mizoram.

Operational Definitions of the Key Terms

Perception

Perception means the ability to see, hear, or become aware of something through the senses. It is the way in which something is regarded, understood, or interpreted. In the

present study the score on the questionnaire which will be developed by the researcher is perception of the stakeholders towards quality of higher education in the context of RUSA.

Stakeholders

Individuals or entities that have an interest in the activities of an institution or organization. In the context of higher education quality, stakeholders are those groups that have an interest in the quality of provision and standard of outcomes. In this study, stakeholders will include students and teachers.

Quality

Oxford Dictionary defines Quality as degree, especially high degree of goodness or worth. Quality is Fitness for purpose, effectiveness in achieving institutional goals, meeting customer's stated or implied needs. It can also be said that quality refers to standards of resourcing and provision, and the achievements or outputs of an institution or system.

Higher Education

The term 'higher education' is presumed as education beyond the school level. covers all studies and training activities at the tertiary level. For the purpose of this study, studies in general degree colleges which come under the purview of RUSA are higher education.

RUSA

Rashtriya Uchchatar Shiksha Abhiyan (RUSA) is a centrally sponsored scheme proposed by the Ministry of Human Resource Development to ensure holistic planning at the state level and enhancement of allocations for the State Universities & Colleges, which will spread over the two plan periods (XII and XIII).

METHODOLOGY

The methodology provides a brief picture of the method used in conducting the research, the sample and the tools used in conducting the research. It also gives the procedure adopted for the collection of the data along with the Statistical techniques used and the rationale underlined them.

Design of the study

A descriptive survey method was used for the present study. For the purpose of the study mixed methods research design was followed. Hence the study is both quantitative and qualitative in nature. It is qualitative method as observation and in-formal interviews were used for case study of college as well as to examine the status of implementation of RUSA. The study is also quantitative as structured questions along with fixed responses were used in questionnaire to elicit the perceptions of stakeholders on quality of higher education.

Population

The study is delimited to general degree colleges of Mizoram affiliating to Mizoram University. In Mizoram, there are 21 affiliated government general degree colleges. So the population for the study includes all the students and teachers in these 21 colleges. As of June 2017, there were 13039 students and 772 teachers in these colleges.

Sample

Selection of sample for the present study was simple random sampling in nature. 10 teachers and 20 students from each degree college of Mizoram i.e. 210 teachers and 420 students were selected randomly who so ever available in the college on the day of data collection as sample of the study. Further, Director of State Higher Education Council and 10 Principals of degree colleges were selected as sample of the study.

Tools and Techniques

As there was no readymade questionnaire which was relevant for the present study, the investigator developed questionnaire for the students and teachers of government general degree colleges in Mizoram to examine the perceptions on quality of higher education in Mizoram. The investigator also developed Interview Schedule to collect certain information from the principals of government general degree colleges in Mizoram and Director of State Higher Education Council regarding status of implementation of RUSA.

For developing the questionnaire, the researcher reviewed the parameters set by NAAC for appraisal of colleges and the model sample student feedback questionnaires suggested by NAAC to obtain feedback from students. The issues dealing with different aspects of quality inputs in higher education from NAAC reports and RUSA along with other documents, researches and literature about quality on higher education were also thoroughly reviewed and studied for the purpose. Further, informal interactions with teachers working in colleges helped the researcher broaden the perspective. After thorough study of the related literature and informal interactions with many stakeholders, preliminary draft of the questionnaire was prepared and this preliminary draft of the questionnaire was then reviewed with the supervisor. The required modifications were made by incorporating the valuable suggestions made by the supervisor to maintain the quality of questionnaire.

The draft questionnaire was then given to veteran experts of education to seek their valuable suggestions and opinions in order to remove the ambiguity in the questions and to have content validity. Some items and some statements – in form of structural framing of items and/or statements, mutual exclusivity of items, inclusion and deletion of items were then incorporated in the questionnaire based on their feedback and suggestions. The final draft of the questionnaire was then evolved which was used for collection of data regarding the perceptions of stakeholders on quality of higher education. The final questionnaire is divided into two parts. The first section is about the basic personal profile of the respondents consisting information regarding gender, age, name of the college, subject/stream, qualification level, and experience of respondents

and second section includes certain questions for examining their perceptions regarding quality of colleges. All these questions were closed type which include probable answers to tick mark the most appropriate answers out of the multiple-choice items.

Statements in the questionnaire were written on seven components/aspects which are – curriculum transacted; examination and evaluation practices; research and innovation; infrastructure and instructional facilities; student support service; governance and leadership practices; autonomy of the college. These components were framed as per blending of the quality concerns of RUSA and the criteria adopted by NAAC for assessment and accreditation of higher education institutions.

Since the knowledge level about institution and the experiences would be different for students and teachers, separate questionnaire was prepared for students and teachers. The questionnaire meant for students had 40 questions while the questionnaire meant for teachers consists of 47 questions.

Interview schedule was prepared for Principals of the colleges after careful study of the requirement of the research, in order to examine the status of implementation of RUSA programs in general degree colleges of Mizoram.

Reliability of Tool

After the preparation of final draft of the questionnaire for the college teachers and students as per the suggestions and remarks of the experts, the investigator first administered the questionnaire over a sample of 20 college teachers and 20 students from two colleges of Aizawl district. After getting the responses the investigator tabulated the responses. To estimate the reliability of the questionnaire the investigator

again administered the previous questionnaire on the sample previously covered after one month. The responses taken from the respondents in the second time were tabulated. The investigator, thus, co-related the two sets of scores by product moment method. The statistical formula used to calculate the co-efficient of co-relation has been given by Garrett. (1971).

$$r_{xy} = \frac{\sum x^1 y^1}{N} - C^1 x C^1 y$$

Where x^1, y^1 are the deviations from the assumed mean. N is the size of the sample, C^1x, C^1y are co-relation factors. The value of r found was **0.716** which is very high. Thus, the questionnaire was very reliable.

Procedure of data collection

The investigator covered all colleges personally. After reaching the college the investigator met the principal of the concerned college and randomly selected teachers and students who ever available in that day from each sample college and established rapport with them. Then she gave the questionnaire and requested them to answer the entire question. The investigator explained how to answer the questions and clarified the doubts if the sample raised any. They were given sufficient time to fill in the questionnaires and when they were finished the filled in questionnaires were collected by the researcher. The above process was adopted for all the colleges to collect data for present study. The filled in the questionnaires collected from the samples personally

were critically examined, cleaned and quantified as far as possible and tabulated systematically for further analysis. Principals were also met by the researcher and informal interviews were done in order to collect information regarding the first objective of the study which is to examine the status of implementation of RUSA programmes in government general degree colleges of Mizoram. The investigator was fully satisfied that the data collected were genuine.

Mode of Analysis

Keeping in view the objectives of the study and nature of data, descriptive techniques such as percentages was employed for the analysis and interpretation of data. Tabulation of data for percentages was done manually.

MAJOR FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

1. **Findings relating to status of implementation of RUSA programs in general degree colleges of Mizoram.**

- The State Higher Education Council of Mizoram was formed by an Executive Order on 13th May 2014.
- The following are the primary components of RUSA that the state government pursued for the fulfillment of the targets from Academic year 2013 to 2017:
    i. Upgrading existing autonomous colleges to Universities
    ii. Conversion of colleges to Cluster Universities
    iii. Infrastructure grants to colleges
    iv. New Model Colleges (General)
    v. Upgrading existing degree colleges to model colleges
    vi. New Colleges (Professional)
    vii. Infrastructure grants to colleges

viii. Research, innovation and quality improvement
ix. Equity initiatives
x. Faculty Recruitment Support
xi. Faculty improvements
xii. Vocationalization of Higher Education
xiii. Support to polytechnics
xiv. Capacity building and preparation, data collection and planning
xv. Management Monitoring Evaluation and Research

- The council planned that all colleges have to go for NAAC accreditation mandatorily. The government also planned to strengthen SHEC and State Project Directorate with resource centre to organize meetings, workshops, consultations and preparation of plans under component (xiv) of RUSA 2.0. Out of 32 colleges 25 colleges were included under different components of RUSA.
- *In RUSA 1.0, Mizoram was approved for funding under 5 Components: -*
    i. Upgradation of Existing Degree Colleges to Model Degree Colleges- (2-Colleges, viz. Govt. Hrangbana College & Govt. Residential Science College.) – Project Amount 8 crore (@ Rs. 4 crore each).
    ii. Infrastructure Grants to Colleges – (21 Govt. Colleges) – Project Amount 42 crore (@ Rs. 2 Crore each).
    iii. New Professional College (Mizoram Engineering College) -Project Amount Rs. 26 crore.
    iv. Equity Initiatives (24- Govt. Colleges) – Project Amount 5 crore for 24 Colleges.
    v. Faculty Recruitment Support (72- posts of Assistant Professors).
- All projects under RUSA 1.0 have been completed with the exception of activities being funded under Equity Initiatives 3rd Installment, Rs. 125/- lakh (Central share Rs 112.5 lakh and SMS 12.50 lakh).
- Construction of 8- buildings for New professional college i.e. Mizoram Engineering College has been completed with RUSA fund (Rs. 26 crore). The

College was constructed at Pukpui, Lunglei on 22nd April, 2016 and was completed on 16th November, 2018.

- Government Hrangbana College, Aizawl, and Government Zirtiri Residential Science College, Aizawl were upgraded to model degree colleges in the 5th PAB on 10-12-2014. Four colleges namely Government Mamit college, Government Hnahthial college, Government Saiha college, Government J.Thankima college had received grant under RUSA 2.0 for upgradation to Model Degree Colleges.
- In the 9th PAB meeting 24 government colleges were included in RUSA Equity Initiative Component and received the funds. Total amount of Rs 5 crore for Equity Initiative was approved by PAB in 2015, of which Rs 3.750 crore released as first and second instalment for the 24 colleges/institutions in 2016 and 2017 respectively which were fully utilized. Accordingly, the equity initiative grants were released to the beneficiary colleges/ institutions during April & May, 2019 and College were utilizing the fund for conduct of Spoken English and Hindi class, addition of Spoken Burmese Class is organized in Champhai college. The fund was also utilized for organising remedial class, various personality development programmes, computer training, PWD and gender sensitization, career guidance and awareness programme, etc. Beneficiary Colleges are still in final stage of utilizing the 3rd and final instalment amounting Rs 1.125 crore, (Central Share) and the state matching share of 10% i.e. Rs 12.50 lakh due to Covid-19 crisis and nationwide lockdown which otherwise would have been fully utilized by April 2020.
- Under RUSA, 21 colleges of Mizoram received the grants of Rs 1.8 crore for each college for the strengthening of Infrastructure and instructional facilities. Under RUSA 2.0, 13 colleges received grants of Rs 1.8 crore for development of infrastructural facilities. With regards to faculty requirement 69 Assistant professors had been filled up out 72 posts.

2. Findings on the perceptions of stakeholders on the quality of infrastructure and instructional facilities available in the degree colleges of Mizoram.

The perceptions of stakeholders on the quality of infrastructure and instructional facilities available in the degree colleges of Mizoram were analyzed as follows:

2.1. Findings on perceptions of students on quality of infrastructure and instructional facilities available in the degree colleges of Mizoram.

- Majority (56.2%) perceived that use of modern teaching aids in the college was good.
- Majority (61.93%) perceived that the college buildings and infrastructures were good.
- A small majority (53.82%) perceived that maintenance of physical infrastructure in the college was good.
- More students (41.92%) perceived that library material and facilities available in the general degree colleges were good.
- More students (39.06%) perceived that the equipments of laboratories in the government general degree colleges were good.
- A small majority (49.54%) perceived that classroom settings in the government general degree colleges were good.
- A small majority (43.82%) perceived that Computer facilities and internet connections in the government general degree colleges were very poor.
- Majority (66.68%) perceived that the books and journals available in the colleges were good.
- Majority (52.39%) perceived that the recreational centers/rooms in the college were good.
- Majority (56.2%) perceived that the infrastructural facilities for co-curricular activities available in the college were poor.
- A small majority (42.87%) perceived that the hostel facilities available in the government general degree colleges were good.

- More students (38.59%) perceived that the transport facilities available in the government general degree colleges were very poor.

Out of 420 students, majority (47.88%) perceived that the overall quality of infrastructure and infrastructure facilities was good.

2.2. Findings on perceptions of teachers on quality of infrastructure and infrastructure facilities available in the general degree colleges of Mizoram.

- A large majority (72.4%) perceived that use of modern teaching aids in the general degree colleges was good.
- Majority (66.68% %) perceived that the college buildings and infrastructures were good.
- A high majority (85.73%) perceived that maintenance of physical infrastructure in the college was good.
- Majority (68.1%) perceived that Library material and facilities were good.
- A small majority (47.14%) perceived that the equipments of laboratories and their maintenance were good.
- A large majority (75.26%) perceived that classroom settings in the government general degree colleges were good.
- A small majority (46.68%) perceived that computer facilities and internet connections in the government general degree colleges were good.
- Books and journals available in the libraries of government general degree colleges were perceived by a small majority of the teachers (40.97%) as good.
- Recreational centers/rooms in the government general degree colleges were perceived as poor by a small majority (46.21%).
- The infrastructural facilities for co-curricular activities available in the government general degree colleges were perceived as good by a small majority (43.80%).

- A small majority (47.87%) perceived that the hostel facilities in the government general degree colleges were good.
- The transport facilities in the government general degree colleges were perceived as very good by a small majority (35.42%).
- A small majority (39.07%) perceived that the overall strength of teaching faculty in the government general degree colleges was good.

Thus, out of 210 teachers, majority of them (52.75%) perceived that the overall quality of infrastructure and infrastructural facilities was good.

2.3. Findings on perceptions of students and teachers on the overall quality of infrastructure and infrastructure facilities available in the general degree colleges of Mizoram.

Out of 630 respondents, majority (50.31%) perceived that the overall quality of infrastructure and infrastructural facilities in the government general degree colleges of Mizoram was good.

3. Findings on the perceptions of stakeholders on quality of curriculum transacted in the general degree colleges of Mizoram.

The perceptions of students and teachers on quality of curriculum transacted in the general degree colleges of Mizoram were analyzed as follows:

3.1. Findings on perceptions of students on quality of curriculum transacted in the general degree colleges of Mizoram.

- Majority (64.28%) perceived that that the syllabus of the course in the general degree colleges was poor.
- Majority (59.04%) perceived that the understandable level of the course in the general degree colleges was good.

- Majority (67.6%) perceived that the types of subjects provided in the general degree colleges were good.
- Majority (57.14%) perceived that coverage of the syllabus in class was very good.
- A small majority (51.44%) perceived that availability of materials for the prescribed readings was good.
- Yet again, a small majority (45.73%) perceived that the choice of course offered in the government general degree colleges was very good.
- More students (40.47%) perceived that the attitude of teachers towards extra-curricular activities was good.
- Majority (52.4%) perceived that teachers' preparations for the classes were good in the government general degree colleges.
- The teachers' encouragement of student participation in the class was perceived as good by more students (44.76%).

Thus, regarding the perceptions of students on the quality of curriculum transacted in the government general degree colleges, it is revealed that a small majority of the students (43.18%) perceived as good.

3.2. Findings on perceptions of teachers on quality of curriculum transacted in the general degree colleges of Mizoram.

- It is found that majority teachers (63.8%) perceived that the quality of syllabus of their respective course was very good.
- A very high percentage (93.80%) perceived that the level of understandable of the course was good.
- Majority (58.09%) perceived that the types of subjects provided in the general degree colleges were good.
- Majority (69.05%) perceived that the effectiveness of the courses for students to stand on their own was good.

- Majority (55.71%) perceived that the quality of their preparation for the classes was good.
- A small majority (47.62%) perceived that their encouragement of student's participation in the class was good.

Thus the overall quality of curriculum transacted in the government general degree college was perceived as good by majority of the teachers (50.27%).

3.3 Findings on perceptions of students and teachers on the overall quality of curriculum transacted in the general degree colleges of Mizoram.

More number of respondents (46.73%) perceived that the overall quality of curriculum transacted in the government general degree colleges was good.

4. Findings on the perceptions of stakeholders on the quality of student support services in the degree colleges of Mizoram.

The major findings on perceptions of stakeholders on the quality of student support services in the degree colleges of Mizoram were presented as follows:

4.1. Findings on perceptions of students on the quality of student support services in the degree colleges of Mizoram.

- The student-teacher relationship in the government general degree colleges was perceived as good by majority (58.57%).
- A small majority (38.09%) students perceived that the employment of participatory activities by the teachers to make the learning process more student-centred as very good.
- More students (47.14%) perceived that the ability of communication with teachers was perceived as very good.

- Provision of information regarding admission and completion requirements for any courses in the government general degree colleges was perceived as good by a large majority (70%).
- Majority (69.52%) perceived that provision of information regarding fees, financial aid and student support service available in the government general degree colleges was good.
- The monitoring of student progression in the government general degree colleges was perceived as good by majority students (70.47%).
- More students (60%) perceived that the guidance provided by the teachers to students in the government general degree colleges was good.
- Student's union was perceived as good by majority (61.92%) so as to represent the student community.
- Majority (58.09%) perceived that helpfulness of teachers in advising was perceived as very good.

Therefore, the quality regarding student support service in the government general degree colleges was perceived as good by majority of the students (54.12%).

4.2.Findings on perceptions of teachers on the quality of student support services in the degree colleges of Mizoram.

- A large majority (70.47%) perceived that the student-teacher relationship was good.
- Majority (60%) perceived that the employment of participatory activities by the teachers to make the learning process more student-centred was good.
- A high majority (80%) perceived that the provision of information regarding admission and completion requirements for any courses in the college was good.

- Provision of information regarding fees, financial aid and student support service available in the college was perceived as good by a large majority (75.71%).
- Monitoring of student progression in the college was perceived by a high majority (72.38%) as good.
- A large percentage (72.85%) perceived that the guidance provided by teachers to students in the government general degree colleges was good.

Thus a high majority of the teachers (71.91%) perceived that the quality regarding student support services in the government general degree colleges was good.

4.3. Findings on perceptions of students and teachers on the overall quality of student support services in the degree colleges of Mizoram.

Majority of the respondents (63.01%) perceived that the overall quality regarding student support services in the government general degree colleges was good.

5. Findings on the perceptions of stakeholders on the quality regarding research and innovation in degree colleges of Mizoram.

The major findings on the perceptions of stakeholders regarding research and innovation in the degree colleges of Mizoram were presented as follows:

5.1. Findings on the perceptions of students on the quality regarding research and innovation in the degree colleges of Mizoram

- A large majority (70.95%) perceived that the institution's responsiveness to community needs and any relevant extension programmes was good.
- The extension activities of the college were perceived as good by majority (58.09%).

Therefore, majority of the students (64.52%) perceived that the quality regarding research and innovation in the government general degree colleges was good.

5.2. Findings on the perceptions of teachers on the quality regarding research and innovation in the degree colleges of Mizoram

- A small majority (48.09%) perceived that the opportunities of teachers to continue their academic progress and professional development were very good.
- Majority (51.43%) perceived that the encouragement of faculty to publish in academic forums by the college was poor.
- Promotion of faculty participation in consultancy work by the college was perceived as good by majority (69.05%).
- Majority (64.77%) perceived that the responsiveness of the college to community needs and relevant extension programmes were good.
- Majority (52.38%) perceived that the extension activities of the college were good.
- A small majority (36.67) perceived that the number of research activities done by the teachers of government general degree colleges was poor.
- Majority (69.52%) perceived that the professional development of faculty through participation in research activities was good.

Thus, a small majority of the teachers (47.5%) perceived that the quality regarding research and innovation in the college was good.

5.3. Findings on the perceptions of students and teachers on the overall quality regarding research and innovation in the degree colleges of Mizoram.

Out of 630 respondents, majority (56.01%) perceived that the overall quality regarding research and innovation in the government general degree colleges of Mizoram was good.

6. Findings on the perceptions of stakeholders on the quality regarding examination and evaluation practices of the degree colleges of Mizoram.

The major findings on the perceptions of students and teachers on the quality regarding examination and evaluation practices in the general degree colleges of Mizoram were presented as follows:

6.1. Findings on the perceptions of students on the quality regarding examination and evaluation practices of the degree colleges of Mizoram.

- A large majority (76.67%) perceived that the quality of internal assessment procedures and systems was good.
- A high majority (82.39%) perceived that the effectiveness of internal assessment on course grade was very good.
- A small majority (37.61%) of the students perceived that discussion of their assignments with the teachers was good.
- A high majority (77.61%) perceived that the existing external evaluation system was very good.
- A high majority (84.77%) perceived that regularity of conducting internal assessment was very good.
- Majority (60.48%) perceived that the returning of evaluated written assignments by teachers with helpful comments was good.

Thus, majority of the students (52.22%) perceived that the overall quality regarding examination and evaluation practices in the government general degree colleges was very good.

6.2. Findings on the perceptions of teachers on the quality regarding examination and evaluation practices of the degree colleges of Mizoram.

- Majority (66.67%) perceived that the quality of internal assessment procedures and systems was good.

- A high majority (74.78%) perceived that the current weightages of internal assessment was very good.
- The existing quality of external assessment procedures and systems was perceived as good by majority (69.05%).

Thus, a small majority of the teachers (49.04%) perceived that the quality regarding examination and evaluation practices in the government general degree colleges was good.

6.3. Findings on the perceptions of students and teachers on the overall quality regarding examination and evaluation practices of the degree colleges of Mizoram.

A small majority out of the total respondents (46.91%) perceived that the overall quality regarding examination and evaluation practices in the government general degree colleges was very good.

7. Findings on the perceptions of stakeholders on the quality regarding governance and leadership practices in the college.

The major findings on the perceptions of students and teachers on the quality regarding governance and leadership practices in the general degree colleges of Mizoram were presented as follows:

7.1. Findings on the perceptions of students on the quality regarding governance and leadership practices in the college.

- Majority (65.23%) perceived that the helpfulness of Students' body in the government general degree colleges was very good.
- Majority (53.33%) perceived that the activities of students' organization/Union were good.

Thus, out of 420 students, a small majority (48.32%) perceived that the quality regarding governance and leadership practices in the college was very good.

7.2. Findings on the perceptions of teachers on the quality regarding governance and leadership practices in the general degree colleges.

- A small majority (43.80%) perceived that the college's mechanism to use students' feedback for quality enhancement was very good.
- A high majority (84.29%) perceived that the helpfulness of Students' organization/Union in the college was very good.
- A high majority (75.72%) perceived that the activities of Students' organization/Union were good.
- Majority (53.81%) perceived that the governance of office and departments of the institution on the principles of participation and transparency as good.
- Majority (66.19%) perceived that the quality of grievance redresser mechanism at all levels of the institution's functioning was good.
- Majority (53.34%) perceived that the utilization of funds/finances by the college was very good.
- A small majority (45.24%) perceived that the faculty involvement in decision-making regarding the functioning of the college was very good,
- Majority (60.47%) perceived that the functioning of IQAC in the government general degree colleges was good.
- Majority (64.28%) perceived that the coordination between RUSA authority and respective authority of the college authority was good.
- Majority (62.38%) perceived that the relationship between Principal and staffs of the colleges was good.

Therefore, majority of the teachers (53.29%) perceived that the quality regarding governance and leadership practices in the government general degree colleges of Mizoram was good.

7.3. Findings on the perceptions of students and teachers on the overall quality regarding governance and leadership practices in the general degree colleges.

A small majority of the respondents (43.67%) perceived that the overall quality regarding governance and leadership practices in the college was good.

8. **Findings on the perceptions of stakeholders regarding the autonomy of degree colleges of Mizoram.**

Regarding the autonomy of degree colleges, data was not collected from students as majority of the students were unaware about it. So the data was collected from the teachers only by administering questionnaires to the selected samples.

- Majority (63.81%) perceived that the autonomy of the college to run course independently was poor.
- Majority (59.04%) perceived that the autonomy of the staff to attend any refresher course/seminar/workshop/conference etc. was good.
- A small majority (34.29%) perceived that it was good that the autonomy to procure any materials for the betterment of the college was very good.

Thus, out of 210 teachers, a small majority (38.73%) perceived that the quality regarding autonomy in the government general degree colleges was good.

RECOMMENDATIONS

On the basis of the findings of the present study, the following recommendations have been drawn out in order to improve the quality of higher education in Mizoram:

1. The issue of autonomy is crucial to the growth and development of higher education. Autonomy has been a subject of discourse in the reports of the Commissions and Committees set up from time to time, since our independence, to review the system of education and to initiate the much needed reforms and innovations. However, the general degree colleges in the state have a very limited autonomy. Hence, the government needs to look upon the issue of autonomy for qualitative improvement of its higher education.
2. IQAC must be strengthened and made more functional as an effective pro-active body in quality enhancement.

3. Courses in higher education should be broadened by introducing locally relevant courses like IT-oriented and Agro based courses and it is also recommended that colleges must offer atleast Vocational and Job oriented certificate courses alongwith studying the current courses.
4. Authorities and experts must revise and reframe the Syllabus from time to time according to the needs and requirement of the society as well as to deal with latest knowledge.
5. Student support services must be strengthened by establishing student grievance cell in all colleges. Moreover, student's health care facilities, hostel facilities and transport facilities need to be taken care of by authorities of the colleges and the government.
6. The higher education institutions must organize seminars/workshop in academic and socially relevant areas frequently by inviting academicians from Universities and experts from industries.
7. Students' feedback mechanism must be taken seriously and students' assessment of teachers may be evaluated properly and positive suggestions may be adopted for improvement of teaching learning.

8. Vacant teaching posts are matter of serious concern. The state government must equip the higher education institutions with quality teachers for quality education.
9. Class room teaching may be made more interesting and participatory with the use of modern teaching aids.
10. Though the general infrastructural facilities are satisfactory yet considering the changing needs of the students, the facilities are inadequate. The computer facilities and internet facilities should be developed in the colleges of Mizoram
11. Teachers may be encouraged to participate in national/international seminars in their subject area conducted inside or outside the state.
12. The extension activities for community development like health camps, adult education & literacy, blood donation, AIDS awareness and environmental conservation must be enhanced in the colleges.
13. A policy on consultancy services must be encouraged. Higher educational institutions must have linkages with industries and organizations so that they can provide knowledge in latest areas of work, new methods, sharing of information, generation of funds and dimensions for research activities.