

## Perceptual Analysis of Students and Scholars towards Quality Education in Higher Educational Institutions

<sup>1</sup>Kamal Goel, <sup>2</sup>Dr. Surinder Singh

<sup>1</sup>Research Scholar, Department of Commerce, Chaudhary Devi Lal University, Sirsa, Haryana, India-125055

Email ID: [kamalgoelcomphd@cdlu.ac.in](mailto:kamalgoelcomphd@cdlu.ac.in)

<sup>2</sup>Professor, Department of Commerce, Chaudhary Devi Lal University, Sirsa, Haryana, India-125055

Email ID: [sskundu@cdlu.ac.in](mailto:sskundu@cdlu.ac.in)

### ABSTRACT

**Purpose:-** This paper aims to determine the students' perception of quality education in Higher Educational Institutions (HEIs) of the Jind and Sirsa Districts of Haryana State.

**Design/methodology/approach:-** Encompassing quality education is a significant concern nowadays. An attempt has been made to gather information about quality education. This study is exploratory cum descriptive in nature. A questionnaire, i.e., based on the criteria specified by NAAC on quality education, was framed, and data were collected from 100 students of Post-Graduation and PhD. Multi-stage sampling was used for collecting the data from respondents.

**Findings:-** The findings shows that there is a significant difference among students of both districts, namely Jind and Sirsa, in the frequency of feedback regarding curriculum designing ( $p = 0.028$ ) and students' contribution to overcoming social issues ( $p = 0.05$ ) in HEIs. As far as the focus of institutions on employability, entrepreneurship and skill development is concerned, HEIs in Sirsa emerged to have a high skill development rate.

**Originality/value:-** It is obvious that numerous authors had carried out multiple investigations from around the globe. They all offer recommendations for raising the standard of instruction in higher education institutions. Their research focused on topics including education, digital resources, and motivation at work. Examining the efficacy of high-quality education at institutions was made possible by all of these studies, which contributed to a better understanding of the idea. In light of the seven NAAC criteria, the current study examines how students perceive higher education to be of good quality.

**Research Limitations:** The study is limited to HEIs of only Two Districts of Haryana State in India.

**Keywords:** Students, Quality, Education, HEIs

**Paper Type:** Research Paper

### 1. INTRODUCTION

#### 1.1 Education system in India

It is generally accepted that India is famed for its value system. Religious values, social values, cultural values, and educational values are all examples of values. In ancient India, gurus and rishis who are today's instructors and lecturers were responsible for imparting knowledge. In Ancient Times, India's education system served as the foundation for the rest of the world's education systems. Takshila and Nalanda universities contribute to character development as well as nation-building.

The quality of education has declined over time due to a variety of factors such as Western education replacing ancient Indian education and an inferiority complex ingrained in society. As a result, today's education places a greater emphasis on studies, or it can be said that the education system appears equivalent to the exam system. It is the responsibility of teachers, academics, and society to create an educational system that is focused on learning rather than exams.

Every person of the country has a fundamental right to education under the country's constitution. Furthermore, education in India is overseen by both the Union and state governments. The Indian education system has several stages, including pre-primary, primary, elementary, secondary, and higher education. The National Council for Educational Research and Training (NCERT) is India's apex body for school education. Furthermore, the University Grants Commission (UGC) is India's apex body for higher education. The All-India Council for Technical Education (AICTE) is India's premier technical education body (Patel, 2013).

## 1.2 School Education

With 25% world's population and home to a high proportion of the world's out-of-school children and youth. A significant side also shows that India is raising its participation in school education system (**Census Survey, 2011**).

As far as literacy rates are concerned India is next to China if compared to its neighboring countries. Also from the previous decades the graph has been improved. Private schooling sector has also come to provide school education that charge high fees from children. Further with the help of schemes such as Sarv shiksha abhiyan, para- teacher scheme and use of Information and communication technologies helping in boosting the school education system (**Kingdon, 2007 and Oralbekova, et al., 2016**).

## 1.2 Higher education

To improve the lives of people and to provide a sustainable future to all by 2030, the United Nations came with seventeen Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) . These goals relate to poverty, hunger, health, education, peace, equality, and energy etc. Here the focus is on Quality education in higher education institutions in India ([www.undp.org](http://www.undp.org)).

Higher Educational Institutions face many challenges. These challenges are related to academics, finance, research enrollment, quality, political interference and use of e-learning facilities (**Sheikh, 2017; Anis, et al., 2018; Sarker, 2018**).

### 1.2.2 Digital resources and Higher education

The use of digital resources, application of Information and Communication Technology (ICT) and Artificial Intelligence helped in effectiveness of lesson delivery by the teachers. With the various digital initiatives taken by institutions and adoption of digital culture in the educational institutions better quality of materials as well as technical facilities are provided to the students. Also the efficiency of institutions are increased as well (**Allayarova, 2019; Chaudhary and Sharma, 2019; Devi, et al., 2021; Jokhan, et al., 2022**).

### 1.2.3 Factors affecting the Quality in Higher Education

**Academic Freedom:** Academic Freedom is the freedom of a student, scholar and a teacher to pursue their work with integrity and truth without any fear of punishment.

**Autonomy:** Autonomy relates to power of university or a college to make its own goals. (**Basheka, 2009**)

**Internal Education:** means education within the premises, also internal education is used as an evaluation factor in quality education (**Shvindt and Nikanorov, 2017**).

**Value- Based Education:** This includes access, equity, quality, expansion and funding (**Bhatia and Dash, 2011**).

**Resource Sharing:** This includes architectural components, lecture notes and course credits (**Huo, et al. 2019**).

### 1.2.4 Role of Motivation

Motivation plays an important role in increasing the quality of education in higher educational institutions, where intrinsic motivation affects students' perception positively and extrinsic motivation affects it negatively (**Dahl and Simmou, 2011**). Work motivation helps in increasing the leadership qualities and organizational commitment of employees (**Narang, 2021**). But when it relates to students there are differences in perceptions and expectations (**Upadhyay, et al., 2019**).

Furthermore, Institutions now a days start focusing on the establishing academic libraries where the relevant materials and proper training facilities are provided to students with the aim of increasing their work efficiency (**Dei and Asante, 2022**).

## 1.3 National Assessment and Accreditation Council (NAAC)

The National Assessment and Accreditation Council (NAAC) was founded in 1994 and is an autonomous institution within the University Grants Commission (UGC) of India. It is in charge of evaluating and accrediting colleges and universities in India in order to improve the standard of instruction, learning, and research . With quality assurance being a fundamental aspect of the running of Higher Education Institutions (HEIs), NAAC has selected seven criteria that serve as the foundation for assessing HEIs: (1) Curricular Aspects, (2) Teaching-Learning and Evaluation, (3) Research, Consultancy and Extension, (4) Infrastructure and Learning Resources, (5) Student Support and Progression, (6) Governance, Leadership and Management, and (7) Innovations & Best Practices (**Aithal, et al., 2016; NAAC manual for self-study reports of Universities, 2019**).

Quality education in higher education institutions is also assessed with the help of student satisfaction survey (**Kanwar and Sanjeeva, 2022**).

This research focuses on students' perceptions of quality education in higher education institutions in Haryana's Sirsa and Jind districts, and it suggests measures to improve education quality. The goal of this research is to broaden students'

understanding while also preparing institutions to correctly meet NAAC standards and contribute to the fulfilment of the NAAC's basic objectives.

The following is how the paper is structured: Section 1 is about the topic's introduction. The conceptual framework and associated investigations are covered in Section 2. The third section examines research problems and hypotheses. Section 4 discusses the data gathering procedure, Section 5 deals with data analysis and interpretations and Section 6 discusses the conclusions, limitations and further suggestions.

## 2. Conceptual framework and related investigations

Previous research acts as a guiding principle for researchers as well as the foundation for new research in all fields. These assist academics to better identify gaps in an endless sphere of study and provide insight into a topic previously handled by the researcher. As a result, the researcher must go over previous studies he or she has conducted. Several research studies are discussed in this section.

**Shyamala and Rajagopalan (2006)** created the data mining model in institutions to present and justify the possibilities of data mining. The authors presented a method for allocating students in order to forecast their final grade using variables taken from educational information sources. The study also detected dropouts and low-achieving pupils, allowing the teacher to deliver appropriate counseling/advising at the proper moment.

To enhance the effectiveness and efficiency of organizations, **Sohail, et al (2006)** determined the reengineering process of higher education institutions in Malaysia. In this process, authors linked the cost-cutting strategies to overall performance. Authors found that this linkage had a significant impact on sales costs and operating cost. Also the learning centers and online courses were increased on the other hand number of employment had been decreased.

According to **Kingdon (2005)**, a substantial part of the cause for gender inequality is found within the household, rather than institutional explanations. Using household fixed effects equations, the author discovered a large within-household bias against daughters in terms of school enrollment and household educational expenditure.

**Bashkeka (2009)** exercised the role of academic and management freedom in promoting quality education in higher education institutions. The rationale behind this study was to enhance moral prestige, value culture and academic autonomy in the higher education institutions. 296 respondents were surveyed in this study. Further the correlation and regression techniques were used for analysis of the study. The study found that the positive attitude of the management towards academic freedom.

**Bhatia and Dash (2011)** investigated the need for a value system in Indian higher education. This education system in India was compared to that in the United States, the United Kingdom, Australia, Brazil, China, and South Africa. The authors discovered a tremendous increase in the number of institutions in India over the years, as well as an increase in the gross enrollment ratio. In terms of spending, higher education institutions in the India spent significantly less per student than other countries.

**Dahl and Smimou (2011)** investigated the relationship between students' motivational orientation and educational quality. Primary data were collected from 271 undergraduate students for this study. Furthermore To test the relationship, correlation and regression analyses were performed. The study's findings revealed that intrinsic motivation was positively related to teaching quality, while extrinsic motivation was moderately related to teaching quality.

**Senthilkumar and Arulraj (2011)** developed a new model namely SQM-HEI for measuring the service quality in higher education institutions. In this study primary data were collected from students using the structured questionnaire. The results revealed that faculty, resources and disciplines were the important factors in increasing the quality of education. Also the placement emerged to be mediating factor for all the dimensions of quality education.

Students' perceptions of quality education in public institutions were highlighted by **Narang (2012)**. The research was exploratory in nature, with data collected from 750 students. The study found negative gaps in physical facilities as well as a negative score in academic facilities. Furthermore, there wasn't any correlation between student expectations and perceptions. The author also suggested that the same study be conducted with regard to private institutions.

The variables influencing the service quality of public and private institutions were defined by **Mukhtar, et al. (2015)**. From the 174 responses, it was revealed that the interaction between student teachers and political intrusions had the biggest impact on the level of service provided by public and private academic institutions.

**Zalutskaya, et al. (2015)** investigated the quality of higher education in European and Russian universities. The research was carried out with regard to the socioeconomic conditions of these universities. The study emphasized various factors in quality education, such as leadership, atmosphere, and teaching effectiveness. Furthermore, the authors addressed the role of resource sharing among universities in expanding the global education system.

**Aithal, et al. (2016)** used the ABCD approach to examine NAAC Accreditation Criteria. Advantages, Benefits, Constraints, and Disadvantages are abbreviated as ABCD. The authors discovered that factors promoting advantages and benefits were more significant than limits and drawbacks.

**Oralbekova, et al. (2016)** investigated fundamental issues and identified practical abilities linked to the use of information and communication technology by prospective primary school teachers in the context of inclusive education. The authors used a variety of theoretical and empirical methods to achieve the aforementioned goals and validate initial assumptions. According to the findings, children with disabilities are the world's most significant and marginalized minority group in terms of education.

**Sheikh (2017)** examined the challenges and opportunities of higher education system in India. Author used secondary research for the analysis of the study. It was determined that insufficient enrolment, lack of equity, low quality education, huge political interference, poor infrastructure, shortage of faculty and inadequate resources for research were major challenges for the growth of higher education in country. Further improvement can be made in aspect of quality education by making more and more industry collaborations with higher education institutions.

**Shvindt and Nikanorov (2017)** considered the quality of engineering education in Russia as stated by the expert community. In comparison to European higher education practises, the authors concluded that attention to internal evaluation mechanisms of education quality in the Russian normative framework of higher education system was insufficient. A pattern of involving students inside this internal evaluation of higher education quality had been identified as a method for improving engineering education quality.

**Anis, et al. (2018)** conducted a study to identify the challenges that Malaysian higher learning institutions face in providing quality education to their students. Semi-structured interviews with 29 respondents were used to collect data. Academics, students, teachers, and parents are among those who responded. According to the study's findings, academics was one of the major challenges, while research was found to be a minor challenge in achieving the goal of quality education.

**Pandi, et al. (2018)** investigated the operation of the IEQMS model in engineering schools in India. The goal of this study was to determine the factors that influence this model. Primary data were gathered from 324 engineering college lecturers. The structural equation model was employed for analysis in this study. The study's findings revealed a significant association between IEQMS criteria and educational institution performance. These criteria also aided in improving academic achievement.

**Sethy, et al. (2018)** talked about the importance, relevance, and utility of professional ethics in the higher education context. The author emphasized the importance of professional ethics in helping teachers understand their responsibilities, duties, rights, and institutional obligations as they strive to provide quality education. The volume investigated the relationship between individual faculty members' adoption of professional ethics in higher education and the development of workplaces in institutions of higher learning.

**Yosuf, et al. (2018)** reviewed the perspectives of industry persons on journalism education to better understand their role in curriculum development of mass media students. For this purpose thematic analysis was used on the data collected from fifteen experts. The analysis of the study outlined various themes that are related to knowledge, ability, adoption, skill and specialization. Further the authors suggested the need to make more collaborations between industry persons and institutions.

**Allayarova (2019)** examined teacher and student perceptions of information and communication technology (ICT) in order to encourage the use of ICT-based technology. In this study, there were two ways to conduct the interview: one used pen and paper, the other digital assistance. Data gathered from 1553 respondents revealed that ICT contributed to the development of a modern educational infrastructure.

Between higher education institutions and social institutions, there can be no longer be any trust barriers, and the credit recognition system can effectively safeguard individual privacy. A strategy to create a global platform for exchanging educational resources was put out by **Huo, et al. (2019)** using the Blockchain network's underlying technology. e explained architectural components and preliminary solutions for implementation.

**Naveena and Geevarghese (2019)** assessed the level of employee satisfaction in the higher education sector. The study's intention was to provide employees with a positive work environment and job security so that they can contribute to the growth of institutions. In order to analyse the study, secondary data were collected. It was reported that job performance and organizational productivity were significantly correlated with work satisfaction.

**Sarker, et al. (2019)** identified the opportunities and challenges of online courses in higher education institutions. The purpose of this work was to gain suitability of online courses. Primary data were collected from 54 students. The study found that students had a positive attitude towards online courses. Further the authors suggested that online courses be made more technologically and administratively sound.

**Upadhyay, et al. (2019)** studied the role of leadership and organizational commitment in increasing the work motivation in higher educational institutions. The motive behind the study was to deliver quality education to students. 312 responses were collected from the faculties of higher educational institutions. Further it was found that organizational commitment and leaders had a significant impact on performance of higher educational institutions.

The function of cloud computing in the long-term sustainability of higher education institutions was defined by **Ali (2020)**. Reduced costs, free software, high-quality training, and resource flexibility were cited as potential benefits of cloud computing. In addition, security concerns frequently involve data protection, data privacy, and data sanitization. The author also mentioned management, personnel, and culture as opportunities and difficulties.

The digital activities of Indian higher education institutions were examined by **Chaudhary and Sharma in 2021**. In this study, 60 respondents provided the structured questionnaire. The research revealed a lack of commitment, vision, and preparation on the part of institutions to adopt new technology.

**Devi et al. (2021)** investigated the impact of knowledge management competencies on higher education institution performance. To get their opinions on the knowledge management strategies used by educational institutions in Coimbatore, 720 self-financing arts and science faculty members were given a questionnaire as part of this study. The findings revealed no significant relationship between teacher rank and students' perceptions of monitoring, promotions, and recognition in the institutions.

**Singh (2021)** concentrated on Indian higher education trends. According to the author's examination of many research papers and publications, a need for an effective management system as well as sound research and development procedures had been identified.

The significance of academic libraries in reaching SDG 4 was discussed by **Dei and Asante (2022)** in order to promote the Sustainable Development Goal (SDG). The academic libraries of four universities were the researchers' main emphasis in order to achieve the goal. Sixteen participants were used to gather the study's primary data. The authors discovered that library officials had a substantial level of SDG 4 awareness. Additionally, library offers students necessary training and learning materials.

**Jokhan (2022)** discussed how digital resources and artificial intelligence might help in improving student performance in higher education institutions. The data received from 1523 respondents suggested that providing an adequate resources to students and educators can lead to sustainability in education.

**Kanwar and Sanjeeva (2022)** conducted a satisfaction survey of students to improve the quality of education in higher educational institutions. More than 500 students were asked questions related to curriculum, teaching, administration, infrastructure and student support. Further the authors concluded that teachers quality and library services contribute in increasing satisfaction level of students.

### 3. Research Gaps and Hypotheses Formulation

From the literature review, it is clear that number of studies had been conducted by various authors from all over the world. All of them give their suggestions for improvement of quality in education in higher education institutions. Their studies were related to work motivation, digital resources and schooling etc. All these studies helped in gaining the better understanding of the concept. As per the literature review conducted no such used the quality indicators to examine the effectiveness of quality education in institutions. The present study analyzes the student perception towards quality education in higher educational institutions with respect to seven criteria given by NAAC.

### 3.3 Objectives of the study

- To examine the perception of students towards quality education in higher education institution.
- To suggest the ways to improve quality education in higher education institution.

### 3.2 Hypothesis Formulation

Based on the above literature review, the study examines the perception of students towards quality education in higher education institutions in the Jind and Sirsa district of Haryana state. So, to validate the results of the study following hypothesis is formulated:

H01: There is no significant difference between perception of students towards quality education in higher education institution.

## 4. Data gathering procedures

### 4.1 Research Design

In this study, qualitative research has been employed where the exploratory research design has been used to unfold the various aspects related to quality education. Further, the descriptive research design has been used to describe the multiple characteristics of the sample.

### 4.2 Sampling

In the present study, multi-stage sampling has been used to select the geographical area for the study, and convenience sampling has been used to gather the data from respondents. Data were collected from the post-graduate students and scholars of HEIs of Jind and Sirsa Districts. A total of 117 responses were received. Later, 17 responses were discarded due to response error. One hundred responses taken for analysis consists of 50 each from the two districts. Table A shows the demographic profile of respondents, which clearly states that the majority of the respondents are between the age group of 20 - 25 years and unmarried.

**Table A**

Table 11

Demographic Analysis						
			District		Total	
			Jind	Sirsa		
Age (Years)	20-25	N	34	37	71	
		P	68.0%	74.0%	71.0%	
	25-30	N	14	7	21	
		P	28.0%	14.0%	21.0%	
	30 and above	N	2	6	8	
		P	4.0%	12.0%	8.0%	
	Total		N	50	50	100
			P	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Gender	Male	N	27	22	49	
		P	54.0%	44.0%	49.0%	
	Female	N	23	28	51	
		P	46.0%	56.0%	51.0%	
Total		N	50	50	100	
		P	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Qualification	Post-graduation	N	41	38	79
		P	82.0%	76.0%	79.0%
	PhD.	N	9	12	21
		P	18.0%	24.0%	21.0%
Total		N	50	50	100
		P	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Marital Status	Married	N	9	10	19
		P	18.0%	20.0%	19.0%
	Unmarried	N	41	40	81
		P	82.0%	80.0%	81.0%
Total		N	50	50	100
		P	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

#### 4.3 Measurement

A questionnaire was created using the nominal and Likert scale ranging from 1( strongly disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). The questionnaire was divided into two parts . Part A consists of perception of students towards quality education in HEIs of Jind and Sirsa Districts. Part B consists of the Demographic profile of respondents.

#### 5. Data Interpretation and Findings

**Table 1**

**Districts wise Students' awareness about Quality Education and its Criteria**

Awareness about Quality Education and its criteria							
Nature of Responses			District		Total	$\chi^2$ (d.f = 2)	Sign.
			Jind	Sirsa			
Listen or Read the concept of Quality Education	Listen	N	13	9	22	3.015	0.221
		P	26.0%	18.0%	22.0%		
	Read	N	3	8	11		
		P	6.0%	16.0%	11.0%		
	Both	N	34	33	67		
		P	68.0%	66.0%	67.0%		
Total		N	50	50	100		
		P	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
Curricular Aspects	Listen	N	16	19	35	2.902	0.234
		P	32.0%	38.0%	35.0%		

	Read	N	8	13	21				
		P	16.0%	26.0%	21.0%				
	Both	N	26	18	44				
		P	52.0%	36.0%	44.0%				
Total		N	50	50	100				
		P	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%				
Teaching - Learning and Evaluation	Listen	N	11	12	23			2.389	0.303
		P	22.0%	24.0%	23.0%				
	Read	N	10	16	26				
		P	20.0%	32.0%	26.0%				
	Both	N	29	22	51				
		P	58.0%	44.0%	51.0%				
Total		N	50	50	100				
		P	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%				
Research, Innovations and Extensions	Listen	N	14	8	22			2.519	0.284
		P	28.0%	16.0%	22.0%				
	Read	N	12	17	29				
		P	24.0%	34.0%	29.0%				
	Both	N	24	25	49				
		P	48.0%	50.0%	49.0%				
Total		N	50	50	100				
		P	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%				
Infrastructure and Learning Resources	Listen	N	12	13	25			0.077	0.962
		P	24.0%	26.0%	25.0%				
	Read	N	14	13	27				
		P	28.0%	26.0%	27.0%				
	Both	N	24	24	48				
		P	48.0%	48.0%	48.0%				
Total		N	50	50	100				
		P	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%				
Student Support and Progression	Listen	N	11	20	31			4.266	0.118
		P	22.0%	40.0%	31.0%				



	Read	N	10	10	20				
		P	20.0%	20.0%	20.0%				
	Both	N	29	20	49				
		P	58.0%	40.0%	49.0%				
Total		N	50	50	100				
		P	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%				
Governance, Leadership and Management	Listen	N	15	12	27			0.624	0.732
		P	30.0%	24.0%	27.0%				
	Read	N	14	17	31				
		P	28.0%	34.0%	31.0%				
	Both	N	21	21	42				
		P	42.0%	42.0%	42.0%				
Total		N	50	50	100				
		P	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%				
Institutional Values and Best Practices	Listen	N	16	16	32			2.419	0.298
		P	32.0%	32.0%	32.0%				
	Read	N	8	14	22				
		P	16.0%	28.0%	22.0%				
	Both	N	26	20	46				
		P	52.0%	40.0%	46.0%				
Total		N	50	50	100				
		P	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%				

**Table 1** depicts how students learned about the concept of quality education and its criteria. 67% of students listen to and read about the concept of quality education. 68% were from Jind, and 66% were from Sirsa. More than half of Jind students have heard and read about Curricular Aspects, Teaching - Learning and Evaluation, Student Support and Progression, and Institutional Values and Best Practices. In contrast, the same number of Sirsa students have heard and read about Research Innovation and Extensions.

**Table 2**  
**Districts wise Students' perception towards Curricular Aspects**

Curricular Aspects							
Nature of Responses			District		Total	$\chi^2$ (d.f =1)	Sign.
			Jind	Sirsa			
	Yes	N	32	39	71	2.38	0.123

Satisfaction related to curricula		P	64.0%	78.0%	71.0%	2.767	0.096
	No	N	18	11	29		
		P	36.0%	22.0%	29.0%		
Total		N	50	50	100		
		P	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
Curricula Relevance	Yes	N	35	42	77		
		P	70.0%	84.0%	77.0%		
	No	N	15	8	23		
		P	30.0%	16.0%	23.0%		
Total		N	50	50	100		
		P	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
Syllabus Revision	Yes	N	34	36	70	0.19	0.663
		P	68.0%	72.0%	70.0%		
	No	N	16	14	30		
		P	32.0%	28.0%	30.0%		
Total		N	50	50	100		
		P	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		

**Table 2** displays students' satisfaction with curricula, their relevance, and syllabus revision. Students at Sirsa HEIs appeared to have more satisfaction than students at Jind HEIs.

**Table 3**

**Districts-wise Institutional Focus**

Institutional Focus							
Nature of Responses			District		Total	$\chi^2$ (d.f = 1)	Sign.
			Jind	Sirsa			
Focus on Employability	Yes	N	33	34	67	0.045	0.832
		P	66.0%	68.0%	67.0%		
	No	N	17	16	33		
		P	34.0%	32.0%	33.0%		
Total		N	50	50	100	0.174	0.677
		P	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
Focus on Entrepreneurship	Yes	N	31	33	64		
		P	62.0%	66.0%	64.0%		

	No	N	19	17	36		
		P	38.0%	34.0%	36.0%		
Total		N	50	50	100		
		P	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
Focus on Skill Development	Yes	N	35	42	77	2.767	0.96
		P	70.0%	84.0%	77.0%		
	No	N	15	8	23		
		P	30.0%	16.0%	23.0%		
Total		N	50	50	100		
		P	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
Benefit of Employability	Yes	N	20	24	44	0.649	0.42
		P	40.0%	48.0%	44.0%		
	No	N	30	26	56		
		P	60.0%	52.0%	56.0%		
Total		N	50	50	100		
		P	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
Benefit of Entrepreneurship	Yes	N	16	21	37	1.073	0.3
		P	32.0%	42.0%	37.0%		
	No	N	34	29	63		
		P	68.0%	58.0%	63.0%		
Total		N	50	50	100		
		P	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
Benefit of Skill Development	Yes	N	35	35	70	0	1
		P	70.0%	70.0%	70.0%		
	No	N	15	15	30		
		P	30.0%	30.0%	30.0%		
Total		N	50	50	100		
		P	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		

**Reliability Statistics**

Cronbach's Alpha		N of Items				
		.875	3			
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	F	Sign.
Employability Rate	Jind	50	3.04	1.414	2.719	0.102
	Sirsa	50	3.48	1.249		
	Total	100	3.26	1.346		
Entrepreneurship Rate	Jind	50	3.16	1.361	0.139	0.71
	Sirsa	50	3.26	1.322		
	Total	100	3.21	1.336		
Skill Development Rate	Jind	50	3.48	1.359	0.925	0.339
	Sirsa	50	3.72	1.126		
	Total	100	3.60	1.247		

**Table 3** shows that more than 60% of the students view that their Institutions focus on employability, entrepreneurship, and skill development. Further, these students got benefitted from the skill development programme. Also, it is found that students in Sirsa District agree with the skill development programme of their institution.

**Table 4**

**Districts-wise Students' perception regarding working of their HEIs**

Working							
Nature of Responses			District		Total	$\chi^2$ (d.f = 1)	Sign.
			Jind	Sirsa			
Choice-Based Credit System	Yes	N	29	36	65	2.154	0.142
		P	58.0%	72.0%	65.0%		
	No	N	21	14	35		
		P	42.0%	28.0%	35.0%		
Total		N	50	50	100	1.084	0.298
		P	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
Education on Issues	Yes	N	39	43	82		
		P	78.0%	86.0%	82.0%		
	No	N	11	7	18		
		P	22.0%	14.0%	18.0%		
Total		N	50	50	100		
		P	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		

Project Offered	Yes	N	36	32	68	0.735	0.391
		P	72.0%	64.0%	68.0%		
	No	N	14	18	32		
		P	28.0%	36.0%	32.0%		
Total		N	50	50	100		
		P	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		

**Table 4** shows how students thought about the working of their institution. In Sirsa, 72% of the students have a view that their institution has adopted the CBCS system, whereas in Jind there are only 58%. Further majority of the students of both of these districts have a view that their institution offer education on several issues, offer projects and internships.

**Table 5**

**District- wise Students' Feedback regarding Curriculum Designing and Learning Level**

Feedback							
			District		Total	$\chi^2$	Sign.
			Jind	Sirsa			
Feedback regarding Curriculum Designing	Yes	N	30	33	63	0.386 (d.f = 1)	0.534
		P	60.0%	66.0%	63.0%		
	No	N	20	17	37		
		P	40.0%	34.0%	37.0%		
Total		N	50	50	100		
		P	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
Frequency of feedback	Half-yearly	N	21	32	53	4.857 (d.f = 1)	0.028*
		P	42.0%	64.0%	53.0%		
	Yearly	N	29	18	47		
		P	58.0%	36.0%	47.0%		
Total		N	50	50	100		
		P	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
Assessment of learning level	Monthly	N	14	18	32	1.044 (d.f = 3)	0.791
		P	28.0%	36.0%	32.0%		
	Quarterly	N	10	8	18		
		P	20.0%	16.0%	18.0%		
	Half-yearly	N	21	18	39		
		P	42.0%	36.0%	39.0%		
	Yearly	N	5	6	11		
		P	10.0%	12.0%	11.0%		
Total		N	50	50	100		
		P	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		

**Table 5** depicts about the feedback of students regarding curriculum designing and learning level. 63% of the students says that the feedback is received from them regarding curriculum designing.

**Table 6**

**District- wise Students' perception regarding Teaching Practices**

Teaching							
Nature of Responses			District		Total	$\chi^2$ (d.f = 1)	Sign.
			Jind	Sirsa			
Special Programmes for Students	Yes	N	42	42	84	0	1
		P	84.0%	84.0%	84.0%		
	No	N	8	8	16		
		P	16.0%	16.0%	16.0%		
Total		N	50	50	100	1.449	0.229
		P	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
Method of Teaching	Teacher-centric	N	26	20	46		
		P	52.0%	40.0%	46.0%		
	Student-centric	N	24	30	54		
		P	48.0%	60.0%	54.0%		
Total		N	50	50	100	1.073	0.3
		P	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
Experiential Methodology	Yes	N	16	21	37		
		P	32.0%	42.0%	37.0%		
	No	N	34	29	63		
		P	68.0%	58.0%	63.0%		
Total		N	50	50	100	0.641	0.423
		P	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
Participative Methodology	Yes	N	26	22	48		
		P	52.0%	44.0%	48.0%		
	No	N	24	28	52		
		P	48.0%	56.0%	52.0%		
Total		N	50	50	100	1.004	0.316
		P	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
Problem-solving Methodology	Yes	N	21	26	47		
		P	42.0%	52.0%	47.0%		

	No	N	29	24	53		
		P	58.0%	48.0%	53.0%		
Total		N	50	50	100		
		P	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		

**Table 6** shows that in both the districts special programmes are organized for the students. Also, in Jind district 52% students said that teacher- centric method is used in their institution, whereas in Sirsa 60% students said that student- centric method is used in their institution. It is also analyzed that participative and problem-solving methodology used in institutions.

**Table 7**  
**Services Available to Students**

Services Available to Students

Services							
Nature of Responses			District		Total	$\chi^2$ (d.f = 1)	Sign.
			Jind	Sirsa			
Career counselling services	Yes	N	34	32	66	0.178	0.673
		P	68.0%	64.0%	66.0%		
	No	N	16	18	34		
		P	32.0%	36.0%	34.0%		
Total		N	50	50	100	2.778	0.096
		P	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
Placement to students	Yes	N	36	28	64		
		P	72.0%	56.0%	64.0%		
	No	N	14	22	36		
		P	28.0%	44.0%	36.0%		
Total		N	50	50	100	0.762	0.383
		P	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
Vision and Mission reflected in working	Yes	N	33	37	70		
		P	66.0%	74.0%	70.0%		
	No	N	17	13	30		
		P	34.0%	26.0%	30.0%		
Total		N	50	50	100	0.932	0.334
		P	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
Participative approach of management	Yes	N	41	37	78		
		P	82.0%	74.0%	78.0%		

	No	N	9	13	22		
		P	18.0%	26.0%	22.0%		
Total		N	50	50	100		
		P	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
Optimal utilization of resources	Yes	N	35	35	70	0	1
		P	70.0%	70.0%	70.0%		
	No	N	15	15	30		
		P	30.0%	30.0%	30.0%		
Total		N	50	50	100		
		P	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		

**Table 8****Resources available to students**

Resources							
Nature of Responses			District		Total	$\chi^2$ (d.f = 1)	Sign.
			Jind	Sirsa			
Use of ICT-enabled resources	Yes	N	40	37	77	0.508	0.476
		P	80.0%	74.0%	77.0%		
	No	N	10	13	23		
		P	20.0%	26.0%	23.0%		
Total		N	50	50	100	0.051	0.822
		P	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
Grievances settlement mechanism	Yes	N	37	36	73		
		P	74.0%	72.0%	73.0%		
	No	N	13	14	27		
		P	26.0%	28.0%	27.0%		
Total		N	50	50	100	2.25	0.134
		P	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
Satisfaction with Teaching-learning process	Yes	N	37	43	80		
		P	74.0%	86.0%	80.0%		
	No	N	13	7	20		
		P	26.0%	14.0%	20.0%		
Total		N	50	50	100		



		P	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
Research and Innovation	Yes	N	39	38	77	0.056	0.812
		P	78.0%	76.0%	77.0%		
	No	N	11	12	23		
		P	22.0%	24.0%	23.0%		
Total		N	50	50	100		
		P	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
Adequate Research facilities	Yes	N	33	33	66	0	1
		P	66.0%	66.0%	66.0%		
	No	N	17	17	34		
		P	34.0%	34.0%	34.0%		
Total		N	50	50	100		
		P	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
Participation in research activities	Yes	N	35	36	71	0.049	0.826
		P	70.0%	72.0%	71.0%		
	No	N	15	14	29		
		P	30.0%	28.0%	29.0%		
Total		N	50	50	100		
		P	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
Institution efforts to overcome social issues	Yes	N	40	41	81	0.065	0.799
		P	80.0%	82.0%	81.0%		
	No	N	10	9	19		
		P	20.0%	18.0%	19.0%		
Total		N	50	50	100		
		P	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
Students' contribution to overcoming social issues	Yes	N	39	46	85	3.843	0.05*
		P	78.0%	92.0%	85.0%		
	No	N	11	4	15		
		P	22.0%	8.0%	15.0%		
Total		N	50	50	100		
		P	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
	Yes	N	37	44	81	3.184	0.074

Adequate number of classrooms		P	74.0%	88.0%	81.0%		
	No	N	13	6	19		
		P	26.0%	12.0%	19.0%		
Total		N	50	50	100		
		P	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
Adequate Laboratory facilities	Yes	N	38	38	76	0	1
		P	76.0%	76.0%	76.0%		
	No	N	12	12	24		
		P	24.0%	24.0%	24.0%		
Total		N	50	50	100		
		P	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
Cultural facilities	Yes	N	42	42	84	0	1
		P	84.0%	84.0%	84.0%		
	No	N	8	8	16		
		P	16.0%	16.0%	16.0%		
Total		N	50	50	100		
		P	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
Library Automated	Yes	N	29	33	62	0.679	0.41
		P	58.0%	66.0%	62.0%		
	No	N	21	17	38		
		P	42.0%	34.0%	38.0%		
Total		N	50	50	100		
		P	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
Library Digitized	Yes	N	24	32	56	2.597	0.107
		P	48.0%	64.0%	56.0%		
	No	N	26	18	44		
		P	52.0%	36.0%	44.0%		
Total		N	50	50	100		
		P	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
			District		Total	$\chi^2$ (d.f = 3)	Sign.
			Jind	Sirsa			
	Daily	N	27	21	48	4.05	0.256

Frequency of visits in library		P	54.0%	42.0%	48.0%		
	Weekly	N	17	23	40		
		P	34.0%	46.0%	40.0%		
	Monthly	N	6	4	10		
		P	12.0%	8.0%	10.0%		
	No-visit	N	0	2	2		
		P	.0%	4.0%	2.0%		
Total		N	50	50	100		
		P	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
			District		Total	$\chi^2$ (d.f = 1)	Sign.
			Jind	Sirsa			
E-resource facilities in library	Yes	N	34	31	65	0.396	0.529
		P	68.0%	62.0%	65.0%		
	No	N	16	19	35		
		P	32.0%	38.0%	35.0%		
Total		N	50	50	100		
		P	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		

Table 8 shows that institutions in Jind and Sirsa Districts are committed to provide resources and facilities to the students. Also, the results showed significant difference among students of both districts regarding students' contribution to overcoming social issues ( $p = 0.05$ ) in HEIs.

**Table 9****Energy Conservation Measures**

Energy Conservation Measures							
Nature of Responses			District		Total	$\chi^2$ (d.f = 1)	Sign.
			Jind	Sirsa			
Solar energy facility	Yes	N	32	38	70	1.714	0.19
		P	64.0%	76.0%	70.0%		
	No	N	18	12	30		
		P	36.0%	24.0%	30.0%		
Total		N	50	50	100		
		P	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
Biogas plant	Yes	N	11	17	28	1.786	0.181

		P	22.0%	34.0%	28.0%		
	No	N	39	33	72		
		P	78.0%	66.0%	72.0%		
Total		N	50	50	100		
		P	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
Wheeling to grid	Yes	N	19	21	40	0.167	0.683
		P	38.0%	42.0%	40.0%		
	No	N	31	29	60		
		P	62.0%	58.0%	60.0%		
Total		N	50	50	100		
		P	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
Sensor-based energy conservation	Yes	N	16	20	36	0.694	0.405
		P	32.0%	40.0%	36.0%		
	No	N	34	30	64		
		P	68.0%	60.0%	64.0%		
Total		N	50	50	100		
		P	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
Use of LED bulbs	Yes	N	41	42	83	0.071	0.79
		P	82.0%	84.0%	83.0%		
	No	N	9	8	17		
		P	18.0%	16.0%	17.0%		
Total		N	50	50	100		
		P	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		

**Table 9** shows that solar energy facilities and LED bulbs facilities are available in the institutions, whereas institution lacks in wheeling to grid, sensor- based energy conservation and bio-gas facilities.

**Table 10****Waste Management**

Waste Management						
			District		Total	$\chi^2$ (d.f = 1)
			Jind	Sirsa		
	Yes	N	29	27	56	0.162
						0.687

Solid Waste Management		P	58.0%	54.0%	56.0%		
	No	N	21	23	44		
		P	42.0%	46.0%	44.0%		
Total		N	50	50	100		
		P	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
Liquid Waste Management	Yes	N	13	17	30	0.762	0.383
		P	26.0%	34.0%	30.0%		
	No	N	37	33	70		
		P	74.0%	66.0%	70.0%		
Total		N	50	50	100		
		P	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
Bio-medical Waste Management	Yes	N	10	14	24	0.877	0.349
		P	20.0%	28.0%	24.0%		
	No	N	40	36	76		
		P	80.0%	72.0%	76.0%		
Total		N	50	50	100		
		P	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
E-waste Management	Yes	N	19	16	35	0.396	0.529
		P	38.0%	32.0%	35.0%		
	No	N	31	34	65		
		P	62.0%	68.0%	65.0%		
Total		N	50	50	100		
		P	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
Water Recycling systems	Yes	N	17	24	41	2.026	0.155
		P	34.0%	48.0%	41.0%		
	No	N	33	26	59		
		P	66.0%	52.0%	59.0%		
Total		N	50	50	100		
		P	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		

Table 10 shows that in Jind and Sirsa districts, more than 50% of students are satisfied with solid- waste management, whereas same were unsatisfied with other systems of waste management.

**Table 11**  
**Water Management Systems**

Water Management							
			District		Total	$\chi^2$ (d.f = 1)	Sign.
			Jind	Sirsa			
Rainwater Harvesting	Yes	N	24	26	50	0.16	0.689
		P	48.0%	52.0%	50.0%		
	No	N	26	24	50		
		P	52.0%	48.0%	50.0%		
Total		N	50	50	100		
		P	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
Borewell	Yes	N	18	23	41	1.033	0.309
		P	36.0%	46.0%	41.0%		
	No	N	32	27	59		
		P	64.0%	54.0%	59.0%		
Total		N	50	50	100		
		P	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
Construction of tanks and bunds	Yes	N	21	19	40	0.167	0.683
		P	42.0%	38.0%	40.0%		
	No	N	29	31	60		
		P	58.0%	62.0%	60.0%		
Total		N	50	50	100		
		P	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
Waste water recycling	Yes	N	15	16	31	0.047	0.829
		P	30.0%	32.0%	31.0%		
	No	N	35	34	69		
		P	70.0%	68.0%	69.0%		
Total		N	50	50	100		
		P	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		

Table 11 shows that more than 50% of students are not satisfied with waste- management systems of their institutions except Rainwater harvesting wherein 52% of the students from Sirsa are satisfied.

**Table 12****Green Campus Initiatives**

Green Campus Initiatives							
			District		Total	$\chi^2$ (d.f = 1)	Sign.
			Jind	Sirsa			
Restricted Entry of Automobiles	Yes	N	14	18	32	0.735	0.391
		P	28.0%	36.0%	32.0%		
	No	N	36	32	68		
		P	72.0%	64.0%	68.0%		
Total		N	50	50	100		
		P	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
Use of bicycles	Yes	N	27	19	46	2.576	0.108
		P	54.0%	38.0%	46.0%		
	No	N	23	31	54		
		P	46.0%	62.0%	54.0%		
Total		N	50	50	100		
		P	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
Pedestrian friendly pathways	Yes	N	22	27	49	1	0.317
		P	44.0%	54.0%	49.0%		
	No	N	28	23	51		
		P	56.0%	46.0%	51.0%		
Total		N	50	50	100		
		P	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
Ban on use of plastic	Yes	N	24	24	48	0	1
		P	48.0%	48.0%	48.0%		
	No	N	26	26	52		
		P	52.0%	52.0%	52.0%		
Total		N	50	50	100		
		P	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		

Table 11 shows that more than 50% of students are not satisfied with green campus initiatives of their institutions except use of pedestrian friendly pathways wherein 54% of the students from Sirsa are satisfied and use of bicycles wherein 54% of the students from Jind are satisfied.

**Table 12**  
**Strengths and Opportunities**

			District		Total	$\chi^2$ (d.f = 1)	Sign.
			Jind	Sirsa			
Celebration of festivals	Yes	N	46	45	91	0.122	0.727
		P	92.0%	90.0%	91.0%		
	No	N	4	5	9		
		P	8.0%	10.0%	9.0%		
Total		N	50	50	100		
		P	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
Dedication in quality education	Yes	N	39	39	78	0	1
		P	78.0%	78.0%	78.0%		
	No	N	11	11	22		
		P	22.0%	22.0%	22.0%		
Total		N	50	50	100		
		P	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
Helping in overcoming social issues	Yes	N	37	39	76	0.219	0.64
		P	74.0%	78.0%	76.0%		
	No	N	13	11	24		
		P	26.0%	22.0%	24.0%		
Total		N	50	50	100		
		P	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
Need for Improvement	Yes	N	42	43	85	0.078	0.779
		P	84.0%	86.0%	85.0%		
	No	N	8	7	15		
		P	16.0%	14.0%	15.0%		
Total		N	50	50	100		
		P	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		



**Table 12** shows that both the districts, namely Jind and Sirsa Institutions, celebrate festivals dedicated to providing quality education and helping overcome social issues. Further 84% of the students from Jind and 86% from Sirsa said there is a need for improvement.

## CONCLUSIONS

In today's world, if one wants to win, the biggest weapon is knowledge. With knowledge, one can beat another. This study focused on the quality of education in the HEIs of Haryana state's Jind and Sirsa districts research reveals that there are substantial differences between students from both communities, Jind and Sirsa, in terms of how frequently they provide feedback on curriculum design ( $p = 0.028$ ) and how much they help HEIs address social concerns ( $p = 0.05$ ). In terms of the emphasis placed by institutions on employability, entrepreneurship, and skill development, HEIs in Sirsa have been found to have a high rate of skill development.

## REFERENCES

1. Aithal, P. S., Shailashree, V., & Kumar, P. M. (2016). Analysis of NAAC Accreditation System using ABCD framework. *International Journal of Management, IT and Engineering*, 6(1), 30-44.
2. Ali, A. (2020). Cloud computing adoption at higher educational institutions in the KSA for Sustainable Development. *International Journal of Advanced Computer Science and Applications*, 11(3).
3. Allayarova, S. N. (2019). Implementation of modern information communication technologies (ICT) in higher education sector: International experience and the example of Uzbekistan. *International Journal of Innovative Technology and Exploring Engineering*, 9(1), 386-392.
4. Basheka, B. (2009). Management and academic freedom in higher educational institutions: Implications for quality education in Uganda. *Quality in Higher Education*, 15(2), 135-146.
5. Chaudhary, P., & Sharma, K. K. (2021). Implementation of digital strategy in higher educational institutions in India. *International Journal of Business and Globalisation*, 27(2), 248-272.
6. Devi, K. M., Radha, P., & Kiruthika, R. J. (2021, March). A Deep Knowledge and Digital Culture Management System. In *2021 7th International Conference on Advanced Computing and Communication Systems (ICACCS)* (Vol. 1, pp. 1759-1765). IEEE.
7. Hou, Y., Wang, N., Mei, G., Xu, W., Shao, W., & Liu, Y. (2019). Educational resource sharing platform based on blockchain network. In *2019 Chinese Automation Congress (CAC)* (pp. 5491-5494). IEEE.
8. Jokhan, A., Chand, A. A., Singh, V., & Mamun, K. A. (2022). Increased digital resource consumption in higher educational institutions and the artificial intelligence role in informing decisions related to student performance. *Sustainability*, 14(4), 2377.
9. Kareena, B., & Manoj, K. D. (2011). A demand of value based higher education system in India: A comparative study. *Journal of public Administration and policy Research*, 3(5), 156-173.
10. Kanwar, A., & Sanjeeva, M. (2022). Student satisfaction survey: A key for quality improvement in the higher education institution. *Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship*, 11(1), 1-10.
11. Kingdon, G. G. (2007). The progress of school education in India. *Oxford Review of Economic Policy*, 23(2), 168-195.
12. Mukhtar, U., Anwar, S., Ahmed, U., & Baloch, M. A. (2015). Factors effecting the service quality of public and private sector universities comparatively: an empirical investigation. *Researchers World*, 6(3), 132.
13. Naveena, M., & Geevarghese, G. (2019). Job satisfaction of academicians-a conceptual study in higher educational sector. *International Journal of Recent Technology and Engineering*, 8, 17-21.
14. Oralbekova, A. K., Arzymbetova, S. Z., Begalieva, S. B., Ospanbekova, M. N., Mussabekova, G. A., & Dauletova, A. S. (2016). Application of Information and Communication Technologies by the Future Primary School Teachers in the Context of Inclusive Education in the Republic of Kazakhstan. *International Journal of Environmental and Science Education*, 11(9), 2813-2827.
15. Pal Pandi, A., Paranitharan, K. P., & Jeyathilagar, D. (2018). Implementation of IEQMS model in engineering educational institutions—a structural equation modelling approach. *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence*, 29(1-2), 29-57.

16. Romanova, S. A., Gulaya, T. M., & Gerasimenko, T. L. (2018). Legal regulation of educational activities in public schools. *J. Advanced Res. L. & Econ.*, 9, 265.
17. Sarker, M. F. H., Al Mahmud, R., Islam, M. S., & Islam, M. K. (2019). Use of e-learning at higher educational institutions in Bangladesh: Opportunities and challenges. *Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education*.
18. Senthilkumar, N., & Arulraj, A. (2011). SQM-HEI–determination of service quality measurement of higher education in India. *Journal of Modelling in Management*.
19. Sethy, S. S. (Ed.). (2018). *Higher education and professional ethics: Roles and responsibilities of teachers*. Taylor & Francis.
20. Sheikh, Y. A. (2017). Higher education in India: Challenges and opportunities. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 8(1), 39-42.
21. Shvindt, A., & Nikanorov, I. (2017). Internal education quality evaluation as a factor of development of engineering education quality in Russia. In *MATEC Web of Conferences* (Vol. 102, p. 01032). EDP Sciences.
22. Shyamala, K., & Rajagopalan, S. (2006). Data mining model for a better higher educational system. *Information Technology Journal*, 5(3), 560-564.
23. Sohail, M. S., Daud, S., & Rajadurai, J. (2006). Restructuring a higher education institution: A case study from a developing country. *International Journal of Educational Management*.
24. Unterhalter, E. (2019). The many meanings of quality education: Politics of targets and indicators in SDG 4. *Global Policy*, 10, 39-51.
25. Upadhyay, R. K., Pandey, V. K., & Mishra, A. K. (2019). Transformational leadership and organisational commitment with mediating effect of work motivation in higher educational institutions. *International Journal of Environment, Workplace and Employment*, 5(4), 322-335.
26. Walimbwa, M. (2015). Supporting Student Engagement in E-learning in a Resource-Constrained Institution: Experiences From Makerere University. In *International Handbook of E-learning, Volume 2* (pp. 335-342). Routledge.
27. Yusof, N., Ismail, A., Ismail, R., Aripin, N., Kassim, A., & Ishak, M. S. (2018). Industry perspective on journalism education curriculum in Malaysia. *Malaysian Journal of Learning and Instruction*, 15(1), 149-172.
28. Zalutskaya, S. U., Panina, S. V., Zhondorova, G. E., & Yakovleva, V. V. (2015). A Lecturer and New Quality of Russian Professional Education. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 6(3 S3), 409-409.
29. <https://censusindia.gov.in/census.website/data/census-tables> retrieved on august 19, 2022
30. [https://www.undp.org/sustainable-development-goals?utm\\_source=EN&utm\\_medium=GSR&utm\\_content=US\\_UNDP](https://www.undp.org/sustainable-development-goals?utm_source=EN&utm_medium=GSR&utm_content=US_UNDP)
31. [http://www.naac.gov.in/images/docs/Manuals/Revised-University-Manual\\_1.pdf](http://www.naac.gov.in/images/docs/Manuals/Revised-University-Manual_1.pdf) 20
32. [http://www.naac.gov.in/images/docs/Manuals/Revised-University-Manual\\_1.pdf](http://www.naac.gov.in/images/docs/Manuals/Revised-University-Manual_1.pdf) 20
33. [file:///C:/Users/hp/Desktop/Quality%20education/EMRALD%20QUALITY/Revised-University-Manual\\_1.pdf](file:///C:/Users/hp/Desktop/Quality%20education/EMRALD%20QUALITY/Revised-University-Manual_1.pdf)