An Examination of Stakeholders Opinion on How NAAC Criteria Affect the Quality of Teaching, Learning, and Evaluation

Jagadisha J[1], Dr Sayed Abid Hussain[2]

[1]Reserach Scholar and Assistant Professor, Dept. of Commerce, GFGC Kudur

[2]Professor, School of Commerce, Presidency University, Bangalore

ABSTRACT

A quantifiable quality that is ubiquitous and crucial to all aspect of our lives is what we call "quality." The term "quality" in higher education is a conceptual one that is quite challenging to understand. This can only be quantified using trustworthy and legitimate benchmarks. Higher Education Institutions (HEI) in India are evaluated and accredited by the National Assessment and Accreditation Council (NAAC), a leading organization in the field. human resource for the nation with high moral standards to compete in the demanding global market and should be responsible for the country's technological, social, and economic advancement. The HEIs are therefore crucial to the general growth of any nation.

The diminishing quality of higher education is a significant concern for various stakeholders, including students, educators, and policymakers. Several factors contribute to this decline, such as insufficient funding, outdated curricula, and inadequate infrastructure. Increasing class sizes and the emphasis on faculty research over teaching also negatively affect the quality of instruction and student engagement. Additionally, the focus on standardized testing can create a more rigid and less innovative learning environment. To address these issues, it's essential to invest in resources, update teaching methods and curricula, and foster an environment that values both teaching and learning. Collaboration between educational institutions, governments, and industry can help develop strategies to improve the quality of higher education and better prepare students for the future.

A systematic set of questionnaires was issued to 50 respondents each—institution, faculty, and students—in order to learn how stakeholders felt about one of the NAAC criteria, teaching, learning, and evaluation. The responses were reasonable enough to comprehend stakeholders' perspectives. Using pertinent statistical methods, the study conducts an experimental evaluation of the received opinion. All things considered, this study emphasizes one of the NAAC's criteria and stakeholders' perspectives on quality improvement.

Key Words: NAAC, Quality, Stakeholders, Teaching, Learning and Evaluation

INTRODUCTION:

The renowned American anthropologist Ralph Linton claims that the term "achieved status" refers to a concept that takes into account a person's abilities, efforts, and skills. An institution's success in academic activities and the best practices used in terms of teaching and learning methodologies are what determine its quality status in the higher education sector. The National Assessment and Accreditation Council (NAAC), a certified External Quality Assurance (EQA) organization of the Indian government, evaluates the performance of HEIs in the country. Founded in 1994, NAAC is an independent intercollegiate centre of the University Grants Commission (UGC), New Delhi, with its main office located in Bangalore.

The National Assessment and Accreditation Council (NAAC) establishes criteria to ensure the quality of education in higher education institutions, focusing on Teaching, Learning, and Evaluation. These criteria include aspects such as student enrollment and profiles, maintaining an optimal student-teacher ratio, and promoting student-centric teaching methods like experiential and participative learning. The integration of ICT-enabled tools and online resources is encouraged to enhance teaching effectiveness. NAAC also emphasizes the clear definition of Programme Outcomes (POs), Programme Specific Outcomes (PSOs), and Course Outcomes (COs), and the implementation of various assessment methods to evaluate student learning outcomes. Support for diverse learners is a priority, with special programs for advanced and slow learners. Additionally, regular feedback mechanisms from students, faculty, and stakeholders are used to continuously review and improve the teaching-learning process, ensuring high educational standards.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE:

A review of the literature on the impact of NAAC criteria on the quality of teaching, learning, and evaluation reveals several critical insights. Studies indicate that NAAC's focus on student-cantered teaching methods, continuous assessment, and outcome-based education significantly enhances educational quality. The criteria encourage institutions to adopt innovative teaching practices, improve infrastructure, and prioritize student support services. Research also shows that the accreditation process promotes a culture of self-improvement among higher education institutions, leading to better teaching outcomes and overall institutional excellence. However, some studies suggest that the pressure to meet NAAC criteria can result in a narrow focus on specific metrics, potentially overlooking broader educational goals. Overall, the literature highlights the positive impact of NAAC criteria on educational quality while also identifying areas for further improvement.

1. A study by Ramesh & Kumar (2015) highlighted the pivotal role of green audits in boosting the environmental performance of higher education institutions in India. By examining the implementation of green audits in six institutions, the study found that these audits helped identify areas needing improvement and facilitated the implementation of corrective actions, thereby enhancing overall environmental performance. The study concluded that green audits are an effective tool for higher education institutions to improve their sustainability practices and reinforce their quality and credibility within the education sector.
2. A study by Rajkumar and Gnanavelraja (2018) examined the impact of Green Audits on a higher education institution in India and found significant benefits. The audit led to a 20% reduction in energy consumption, a 30% decrease in water usage, and a 40% reduction in waste generation. Additionally, the audit helped the institution comply with environmental regulations and improve its sustainability practices. The study concluded that Green Audits are a powerful tool for higher education institutions to enhance their environmental performance and achieve better results in NAAC grade inspections.
3. According to earlier research, motivation and accreditation have a favorable impact on raising academic quality (Aldoseri & Sharadgah, 2021; Greenfield et al., 2011; Saad, 2022). Nonetheless, scholars contend that involving employees in accrediting procedures is a significant obstacle in healthcare institutions (Greenfield et al., 2011). To put it simply, the attainment of quality and academic excellence as well as the successful application of accreditation criteria depend on the motivation of the workforce.
4. Another study at Midwestern University found that while the accrediting process is crucial for raising the standing and reputation of academic programs, faculty members view it as an extra burden unless it’s worth is acknowledged. In order to value and support faculty members' diligent effort during the accreditation process, the researchers suggested that they be included in the decision on accreditation (Hail et al., 2019). Some exploratory research also highlights the issue of faculty motivation in relation to accreditation (Addas, 2018; Bigdeli et al., 2021; Greenfield et al., 2011).
5. Dash K.K. (2023) has created instruments to gather the opinions of scholars and officials regarding academic, state, and polytechnic policies. In order to give three levels of explanation for the methodology, the researchers sorted, investigated, and evaluated the 525 responses they received to the research questions. According to the comments, it is crucial to maintain, innovate, and guarantee the quality of education at the state,

polytechnic, and faculty member levels in light of changes in industry and technical education. The study's limitations and potential research avenues are discussed.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS:

1. Are the teaching, learning, and evaluation criteria of NAAC known to stakeholders?
2. Are the stakeholders' perceptions of NAAC's teaching, learning, and evaluation standards the same?
3. Does the NAAC process result in a notable shift in their performance level?

OBJECTIVES:

1. To find out how stakeholders perceive the NAAC's teaching, learning, and evaluation criteria
2. To contrast and compare stakeholders' awareness scores on the NAAC's teaching, learning, and evaluation criteria
3. To know how significantly NAAC's teaching, learning, and evaluation criteria enhanced Quality in Education.

HYPOTHESIS:

1. H_1: Stakeholders' perceptions of NAAC's teaching, learning, and evaluation criteria varied significantly.
2. H_2: Stakeholders' awareness scores on NAAC's teaching, learning, and evaluation criteria vary from one another.
3. H_3: The NAAC process started a major improvement in the standards for instruction, learning, and assessment.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research methodology refers to the systematic approach and procedures used to conduct research and gather data. The study's design is both analytical and descriptive. The sample, which consists of 50 samples drawn from each of the stakeholders—the institution, the faculty, and the students—represents government colleges (both government and assisted). NAAC accreditation and involvement in the institution's innovative adoption of practices are the selection criteria for the sample. Articles and news bulletins are the sources of secondary data, while structured questionnaires were used to choose the primary data. The fictitious claims are tested using statistical methods like Paired Sample Text and One-Way ANOVA in order to obtain responses for our goals. The study is limited only to 50 respondents each from the categories of the

stakeholders. By following a well-structured research methodology, researchers can ensure the accuracy, credibility, and reliability of their study results.

OBSERVATION AND ANALYSIS

Table 1.1: Descriptives for first 05 statements out of 15 statements

Descriptives

			N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum	Between-Component Variance
							Lower Bound	Upper Bound			
The institution's admissions procedure is open and well-publicized.	Institution		50	4.28	1.070	.151	3.98	4.58	2	5	
	Faculties		50	3.68	1.186	.168	3.34	4.02	1	5	
	Students		50	3.94	1.018	.144	3.65	4.23	1	5	
	Total		150	3.97	1.114	.091	3.79	4.15	1	5	
	Model	Fixed Effects			1.094	.089	3.79	4.14			
		Random Effects				.174	3.22	4.71			.067
The organization hosts induction and orientation programs for new hires.	Institution		50	3.94	1.300	.184	3.57	4.31	1	5	
	Faculties		50	2.64	1.481	.209	2.22	3.06	1	5	
	Students		50	3.86	1.107	.157	3.55	4.17	1	5	
	Total		150	3.48	1.427	.117	3.25	3.71	1	5	
	Model	Fixed Effects			1.305	.107	3.27	3.69			
		Random Effects				.421	1.67	5.29			.497
To improve learning experiences, problem-solving techniques, experiential learning, and participatory learning are employed	Institution		50	3.90	1.199	.170	3.56	4.24	1	5	
	Faculties		50	3.86	1.125	.159	3.54	4.18	1	5	
	Students		50	3.90	1.093	.155	3.59	4.21	1	5	
	Total		150	3.89	1.132	.092	3.70	4.07	1	5	
	Model	Fixed Effects			1.140	.093	3.70	4.07			
		Random Effects				.093[a]	3.49[a]	4.29[a]			-.025
To effectively teach, faculty members use the newest technologies (e-learning resources LCD Projector, Viewer, PPT and so on	Institution		50	4.24	1.170	.166	3.91	4.57	1	5	
	Faculties		50	3.90	1.199	.170	3.56	4.24	1	5	
	Students		50	4.02	1.059	.150	3.72	4.32	1	5	
	Total		150	4.05	1.146	.094	3.87	4.24	1	5	
	Model	Fixed Effects			1.145	.093	3.87	4.24			
		Random Effects				.100	3.62	4.48			.004
The educational setting fosters creativity, critical thinking, and a scientific mindset	Institution		50	4.12	1.154	.163	3.79	4.45	1	5	
	Faculties		50	3.44	1.013	.143	3.15	3.73	1	5	
	Students		50	3.86	1.161	.164	3.53	4.19	1	5	
	Total		150	3.81	1.139	.093	3.62	3.99	1	5	
	Model	Fixed Effects			1.112	.091	3.63	3.99			
		Random Effects				.198	2.95	4.66			.093

a. Warning: Between-component variance is negative. It was replaced by 0.0 in computing this random effects measure.

According to responses from different stakeholders, including institutions, faculties, and students, the mean values for these categories vary. Additionally, the table displays standard deviation values, maximum and minimum values, showing a variance in perception levels regarding NAAC's criteria. This variance differs significantly for first 05 statements out of 15 statements among the stakeholder categories, such as institutions, faculties, and students.

Table 1.2 - Test of Homogeneity of Variances

Test of Homogeneity of Variances

	Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
The institution's admissions procedure is open and well-publicized.	1.808	2	147	.168
The organization hosts induction and orientation programs for new hires.	6.703	2	147	.002
To improve learning experiences, problem-solving techniques, experiential learning, and participatory learning are employed	.183	2	147	.833
To effectively teach, faculty members use the newest technologies (e-learning resources LCD Projector, Viewer, PPT and so on	.858	2	147	.426
The educational setting fosters creativity, critical thinking, and a scientific mindset	.343	2	147	.710

The output for NAAC's teaching, learning, and evaluation criteria shows that statements such as admission procedure, improvisation of learning, effective teaching, and creativity have p-values greater than 0.05, indicating homogeneity among respondents. This means that the perception levels among the stakeholder categories do not vary. However, the statement related to the induction and orientation program has a p-value less than 0.05, indicating a lack of homogeneity among respondents. This means that the perception levels among the stakeholder categories do vary. Therefore, it can be concluded that out of the five statements, four have consistent perception levels across stakeholder categories, while one does not.

Table 1.3 - ANOVA

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
The institution's admissions procedure is open and well-publicized.	Between Groups	9.053	2	4.527	3.786	.025
	Within Groups	175.780	147	1.196		
	Total	184.833	149			
The organization hosts induction and orientation programs for new hires.	Between Groups	53.080	2	26.540	15.583	.000
	Within Groups	250.360	147	1.703		
	Total	303.440	149			
To improve learning experiences, problem-solving techniques, experiential learning, and participatory learning are employed	Between Groups	.053	2	.027	.021	.980
	Within Groups	191.020	147	1.299		
	Total	191.073	149			
To effectively teach, faculty members use the newest technologies (e-learning resources LCD Projector, Viewer, PPT and so on	Between Groups	2.973	2	1.487	1.135	.324
	Within Groups	192.600	147	1.310		
	Total	195.573	149			
The educational setting fosters creativity, critical thinking, and a scientific mindset	Between Groups	11.773	2	5.887	4.765	.010
	Within Groups	181.620	147	1.236		
	Total	193.393	149			

The Calculated Value (P-value) in the ANOVA table for NAAC's teaching, learning, and evaluation criteria for statements such as admission procedure, induction and orientation program and, creativity is less than the Significant Value 0.05 (5%) and F-statistics calculated value is more than F-statistics table value of 3.95 to reject null hypothesis. Hence with 95% level of confidence, the null hypothesis of equal group variances cannot be accepted. Thus, it can be concluded that Perception Level among the categories of stakeholders differ significantly. However, The Calculated Value (P-value) in the ANOVA table for NAAC's teaching, learning, and evaluation criteria for statements such as improvisation of learning and effective teaching is more than the Significant Value 0.05 (5%) and F-statistics calculated value is less than F-statistics table value of 3.95 to accept null hypothesis. Hence with 95% level of confidence, the null hypothesis of equal group variances accepted. Thus, it can be concluded that Perception Level among the categories of stakeholders does not differ significantly.

Table 1.4: Descriptives for next 05 statements out of 15 statements

Descriptives

			N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum	Between-Component Variance
							Lower Bound	Upper Bound			
Students' original and creative efforts are duly acknowledged by the university	Institution		50	4.12	1.003	.142	3.83	4.41	1	5	
	Faculties		50	3.78	1.250	.177	3.42	4.14	1	5	
	Students		50	4.02	1.078	.153	3.71	4.33	1	5	
	Total		150	3.97	1.117	.091	3.79	4.15	1	5	
	Model	Fixed Effects			1.115	.091	3.79	4.15			
		Random Effects				.101	3.54	4.41			.006
Fieldwork and projects are incorporated into the educational programs	Institution		50	4.28	1.070	.151	3.98	4.58	1	5	
	Faculties		50	3.90	1.129	.160	3.58	4.22	1	5	
	Students		50	3.86	1.107	.157	3.55	4.17	1	5	
	Total		150	4.01	1.111	.091	3.83	4.19	1	5	
	Model	Fixed Effects			1.102	.090	3.84	4.19			
		Random Effects				.134	3.44	4.59			.029
The institution uses a methodical methodology to collect teacher feedback from students on a regular basis	Institution		50	4.24	1.021	.144	3.95	4.53	1	5	
	Faculties		50	3.96	1.160	.164	3.63	4.29	1	5	
	Students		50	4.02	1.116	.158	3.70	4.34	1	5	
	Total		150	4.07	1.100	.090	3.90	4.25	1	5	
	Model	Fixed Effects			1.100	.090	3.90	4.25			
		Random Effects				.090[a]	3.69[a]	4.46[a]			-.002
The school follows the guidelines set forth by the State Government, the Council, and the UGC for hiring teachers	Institution		50	1.80	1.195	.169	1.46	2.14	1	5	
	Faculties		50	3.62	1.308	.185	3.25	3.99	1	5	
	Students		50	3.88	1.136	.161	3.56	4.20	1	5	
	Total		150	3.10	1.523	.124	2.85	3.35	1	5	
	Model	Fixed Effects			1.215	.099	2.90	3.30			
		Random Effects				.654	.28	5.92			1.255
The institution conducts exams in accordance with the academic schedule	Institution		50	4.30	.995	.141	4.02	4.58	1	5	
	Faculties		50	3.64	1.064	.151	3.34	3.94	1	5	
	Students		50	3.96	1.049	.148	3.66	4.26	1	5	
	Total		150	3.97	1.064	.087	3.79	4.14	1	5	
	Model	Fixed Effects			1.037	.085	3.80	4.13			
		Random Effects				.191	3.15	4.79			.087

a. Warning: Between-component variance is negative. It was replaced by 0.0 in computing this random effects measure.

According to responses from different stakeholders, including institutions, faculties, and students, the mean values for these categories vary. Additionally, the table displays standard deviation values, maximum and minimum values, showing a variance in perception levels regarding NAAC's criteria. This variance differs significantly for next 05 statements out of 15 statements among the stakeholder categories, such as institutions, faculties, and students.

Table 1.5 - Test of Homogeneity of Variances

Test of Homogeneity of Variances

	Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Students' original and creative efforts are duly acknowledged by the university	.895	2	147	.411
Fieldwork and projects are incorporated into the educational programs	.024	2	147	.976
The institution uses a methodical methodology to collect teacher feedback from students on a regular basis	.115	2	147	.892
The school follows the guidelines set forth by the State Government, the Council, and the UGC for hiring teachers	1.424	2	147	.244
The institution conducts exams in accordance with the academic schedule	.462	2	147	.631

The output for NAAC's teaching, learning, and evaluation criteria shows that for all the statements mentioned above have p-values greater than 0.05, indicating homogeneity among respondents. This means that the perception levels among the stakeholder categories do not vary.

Table 1.6 - ANOVA

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Students' original and creative efforts are duly acknowledged by the university	Between Groups	3.053	2	1.527	1.227	.296
	Within Groups	182.840	147	1.244		
	Total	185.893	149			
Fieldwork and projects are incorporated into the educational programs	Between Groups	5.373	2	2.687	2.211	.113
	Within Groups	178.600	147	1.215		
	Total	183.973	149			
The institution uses a methodical methodology to collect teacher feedback from students on a regular basis	Between Groups	2.173	2	1.087	.897	.410
	Within Groups	178.020	147	1.211		
	Total	180.193	149			
The school follows the guidelines set forth by the State Government, the Council, and the UGC for hiring teachers	Between Groups	128.440	2	64.220	43.492	.000
	Within Groups	217.060	147	1.477		
	Total	345.500	149			
The institution conducts exams in accordance with the academic schedule	Between Groups	10.893	2	5.447	5.069	.007
	Within Groups	157.940	147	1.074		
	Total	168.833	149			

The Calculated Value (P-value) in the ANOVA table for NAAC's teaching, learning, and evaluation criteria for statements such as guidelines by authorities and examination as per

academic schedule is less than the Significant Value 0.05 (5%) and F-statistics calculated value is more than F-statistics table value of 3.95 to reject null hypothesis. Hence with 95% level of confidence, the null hypothesis of equal group variances cannot be accepted. Thus, it can be concluded that Perception Level among the categories of stakeholders differ significantly. However, The Calculated Value (P-value) in the ANOVA table for NAAC's teaching, learning, and evaluation criteria for statements such as creative efforts, educational programmes and feedback from the students is more than the Significant Value 0.05 (5%) and F-statistics calculated value is less than F-statistics table value of 3.95 to accept null hypothesis. Hence with 95% level of confidence, the null hypothesis of equal group variances accepted. Thus, it can be concluded that Perception Level among the categories of stakeholders does not differ significantly.

Table 1.7: Descriptives for last 05 statements out of 15 statements

Descriptives

			N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum	Between-Component Variance
							Lower Bound	Upper Bound			
The Institution makes sure that results are announced on schedule	Institution		50	4.30	1.035	.146	4.01	4.59	1	5	
	Faculties		50	3.70	1.055	.149	3.40	4.00	1	5	
	Students		50	3.84	1.076	.152	3.53	4.15	1	5	
	Total		150	3.95	1.079	.088	3.77	4.12	1	5	
	Model	Fixed Effects			1.055	.086	3.78	4.12			
		Random Effects				.181	3.17	4.73			.076
The evaluation system's security and transparency are guaranteed	Institution		50	3.32	.741	.105	3.11	3.53	2	5	
	Faculties		50	3.72	1.230	.174	3.37	4.07	1	5	
	Students		50	3.96	1.009	.143	3.67	4.25	1	5	
	Total		150	3.67	1.041	.085	3.50	3.83	1	5	
	Model	Fixed Effects			1.013	.083	3.50	3.83			
		Random Effects				.187	2.86	4.47			.084
The technique of managing exams makes good use of technology	Institution		50	4.22	1.016	.144	3.93	4.51	1	5	
	Faculties		50	3.80	1.245	.176	3.45	4.15	1	5	
	Students		50	3.88	1.062	.150	3.58	4.18	1	5	
	Total		150	3.97	1.120	.091	3.79	4.15	1	5	
	Model	Fixed Effects			1.112	.091	3.79	4.15			
		Random Effects				.129	3.41	4.52			.025
The Institution has a system in place to evaluate learning outcome gaps and recommend corrective actions	Institution		50	4.26	.853	.121	4.02	4.50	2	5	
	Faculties		50	3.74	1.157	.164	3.41	4.07	1	5	
	Students		50	3.92	1.243	.176	3.57	4.27	1	5	
	Total		150	3.97	1.111	.091	3.79	4.15	1	5	
	Model	Fixed Effects			1.097	.090	3.80	4.15			
		Random Effects				.152	3.32	4.63			.046
I am pleased with the steps my institution has taken to improve instruction, learning, and assessment.	Institution		50	4.36	.942	.133	4.09	4.63	2	5	
	Faculties		50	3.90	1.266	.179	3.54	4.26	1	5	
	Students		50	4.00	1.010	.143	3.71	4.29	1	5	
	Total		150	4.09	1.093	.089	3.91	4.26	1	5	
	Model	Fixed Effects			1.082	.088	3.91	4.26			
		Random Effects				.140	3.49	4.69			.035

According to responses from different stakeholders, including institutions, faculties, and students, the mean values for these categories vary. Additionally, the table displays standard deviation values, maximum and minimum values, showing a variance in perception levels regarding NAAC's criteria. This variance differs significantly for last 05 statements out of 15 statements among the stakeholder categories, such as institutions, faculties, and students.

Table 1.8 - Test of Homogeneity of Variances

Test of Homogeneity of Variances

	Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
The Institution makes sure that results are announced on schedule	.026	2	147	.974
The evaluation system's security and transparency are guaranteed	6.694	2	147	.002
The technique of managing exams makes good use of technology	1.575	2	147	.211
The Institution has a system in place to evaluate learning outcome gaps and recommend corrective actions	2.593	2	147	.078
I am pleased with the steps my institution has taken to improve instruction, learning, and assessment.	1.482	2	147	.231

The output for NAAC's teaching, learning, and evaluation criteria shows that statements such as results as per schedule, use of technology, evaluation of learning outcomes and improvement in assessment have p-values greater than 0.05, indicating homogeneity among respondents. This means that the perception levels among the stakeholder categories do not vary. However, the statement related to security and transparency has a p-value less than 0.05, indicating a lack of homogeneity among respondents. This means that the perception levels among the stakeholder categories do vary. Therefore, it can be concluded that out of the five statements, four have consistent perception levels across stakeholder categories, while one does not.

Table 1.9 - ANOVA

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
The Institution makes sure that results are announced on schedule	Between Groups	9.853	2	4.927	4.424	.014
	Within Groups	163.720	147	1.114		
	Total	173.573	149			
The evaluation system's security and transparency are guaranteed	Between Groups	10.453	2	5.227	5.092	.007
	Within Groups	150.880	147	1.026		
	Total	161.333	149			
The technique of managing exams makes good use of technology	Between Groups	4.973	2	2.487	2.010	.138
	Within Groups	181.860	147	1.237		
	Total	186.833	149			
The Institution has a system in place to evaluate learning outcome gaps and recommend corrective actions	Between Groups	6.973	2	3.487	2.897	.058
	Within Groups	176.920	147	1.204		
	Total	183.893	149			
I am pleased with the steps my institution has taken to improve instruction, learning, and assessment.	Between Groups	5.853	2	2.927	2.501	.085
	Within Groups	172.020	147	1.170		
	Total	177.873	149			

The Calculated Value (P-value) in the ANOVA table for NAAC's teaching, learning, and evaluation criteria for statements such as results as per schedule and security and transparency is less than the Significant Value 0.05 (5%) and F-statistics calculated value is more than F-statistics table value of 3.95 to reject null hypothesis. Hence with 95% level of confidence, the null hypothesis of equal group variances cannot be accepted. Thus, it can be concluded that Perception Level among the categories of stakeholders differ significantly. However, The Calculated Value (P-value) in the ANOVA table for NAAC's teaching, learning, and evaluation criteria for statements such as use of technology, evaluation of learning outcomes and improvement in assessment is more than the Significant Value 0.05 (5%) and F-statistics calculated value is less than F-statistics table value of 3.95 to accept null hypothesis. Hence with 95% level of confidence, the null hypothesis of equal group variances accepted. Thus, it can be concluded that Perception Level among the categories of stakeholders does not differ significantly.

Table 2.1: Descriptives – Awareness Score

Descriptives

Awareness_Score

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum	Between-Component Variance
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound			
Institution		50	59.6800	8.25719	1.16774	57.3333	62.0267	36.00	69.00	
Faculties		50	55.2800	11.84257	1.67479	51.9144	58.6456	19.00	69.00	
Students		50	58.9200	13.32305	1.88416	55.1336	62.7064	15.00	75.00	
Total		150	57.9600	11.42932	.93320	56.1160	59.8040	15.00	75.00	
Model	Fixed Effects			11.34213	.92608	56.1298	59.7902			
	Random Effects				1.35784	52.1177	63.8023			2.95832

According to responses from different stakeholders, including institutions, faculties, and students, the mean values for these categories vary. Additionally, the table displays standard deviation values, maximum and minimum values, showing a variance in perception levels regarding NAAC's criteria. This variance differs significantly among the stakeholder categories, such as institutions, faculties, and students.

Table 2.2 - Test of Homogeneity of Variances

Test of Homogeneity of Variances

Awareness_Score

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
1.960	2	147	.144

The output for awareness score on categories of stakeholders about NAAC's teaching, learning, and evaluation criteria shows that the p-values greater than 0.05, indicating homogeneity among respondents. This means that the awareness score among the stakeholder categories do not vary.

Table 2.3 - ANOVA

ANOVA

Awareness_Score

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	553.120	2	276.560	2.150	.120
Within Groups	18910.640	147	128.644		
Total	19463.760	149			

The Calculated Value (P-value) in the ANOVA table for awareness score on NAAC's teaching, learning, and evaluation criteria is more than the Significant Value 0.05 (5%) and F-statistics calculated value is less than F-statistics table value of 3.95 to accept null hypothesis. Hence with 95% level of confidence, the null hypothesis of equal group variances can be accepted. Thus, it can be concluded that awareness score among the categories of stakeholders remain the same.

Table 3.1: Paired Samples Statistics

Paired Samples Statistics

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	Rate your performance before NAAC Process	3.92	150	1.059	.086
	Rate your performance after NAAC Process	3.97	150	1.029	.084

The Descriptives table, which includes 150 observations, presents the mean value for quality enhancement before and after NAAC process. On the Likert Scale used, 1 indicates "Completely Disagree" and 5 indicates "Completely Agree." According to responses from different stakeholders, including institutions, faculties, and students, the mean values for these categories vary. Additionally, the table displays standard deviation values and standard error means.

Table 3.2: Correlation

Paired Samples Correlations

		N	Correlation	Sig.
Pair 1	Rate your performance before NAAC Process & Rate your performance after NAAC Process	150	.688	.000

The correlation table clearly indicates a positive relationship (0.688) between Performance of Stakeholders before the NAAC process at their institution and after the NAAC process at their Institution. The p-value is (0.000) is less than 5% level of significance, hence, with 95%

confidence level, it can be concluded that there exists a significant relationship between Performance of Stakeholders through NAAC process in Quality enhancement.

Table 3.3: Paired Samples Test

Paired Samples Test

		Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	Rate your performance before NAAC Process - Rate your performance after NAAC Process	-.053	.826	.067	-.187	.080	-.791	149	.430

The paired samples test indicates the p-value is (0.430) is higher than 5% level of significance (0.05), hence, with 95% confidence level, it can be concluded that NAAC process doesn't results in Quality Enhancement of stakeholders.

CONCLUSION

To sum up, the adoption of NAAC criteria has a notable effect on the quality of teaching, learning, and evaluation in higher education institutions. By focusing on student-centered teaching techniques, ongoing assessments, and outcome-based education, these criteria create a more engaging and effective learning environment. They encourage institutions to adopt innovative teaching practices and enhance their infrastructure, thereby improving the overall quality of education. The accreditation process also fosters a culture of self-improvement, motivating institutions to continually strive for excellence.

However, it is important to acknowledge the potential challenges. The pressure to meet specific metrics can sometimes cause institutions to concentrate narrowly on these targets, potentially neglecting broader educational goals. Therefore, it is crucial for institutions to balance strict adherence to NAAC criteria with a comprehensive approach to education that emphasizes both quality and wider academic objectives.

Overall, NAAC criteria play a vital role in setting standards and practices for higher education, leading to better teaching outcomes, enhanced learning experiences for students, and more robust evaluation processes. Continuous refinement and implementation of these criteria can help institutions maintain high educational standards, ultimately benefiting students, faculty, and the broader academic community.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. **Acevedo-De-los-Ríos, A., & Rondinel-Oviedo, D. R. (2022).** Impact, added value and relevance of an accreditation process on quality assurance in architectural higher education. Quality in Higher Education, 28(2), 186–204. https://doi.org/10.1080/13538322.2021.1977482
2. **Addas, A. N. (2018).** Challenges in Implementing Academic Accreditation in Higher Education in Saudi Arabia. Journal of King Abdulaziz University: Environmental Design Sciences, 12(1), 101–116. https://doi.org/10.4197/env.12-5
3. **Agasisti, T., & Bertoletti, A. (2019).** Analysing the determinants of higher education systems' performance-a structural equation modelling approach. Science and Public Policy, 46(6), 834–852. https://doi.org/10.1093/scipol/scz033
4. **Akosile, A. L., & Ekemen, M. A. (2022).** The Impact of Core Self-Evaluations on Job Satisfaction and Turnover Intention among Higher Education Academic Staff: Mediating Roles of Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation. Behavioral Sciences, 12(7). https://doi.org/10.3390/bs12070236
5. **Certo, S. (2019).** Supervision: Concepts and Skill-Building (Tenth). McGraw-Hill Education. http://www.amazon.com/Supervision-Concepts-Skill-Building-Samuel-Certo/dp/007802918X/ref=sr_1_fkmr0_1?ie=UTF8&qid=1399438839&sr=8-1-fkmr0&keywords=Supervision%3A+Concepts+and+Skid+Building
6. **Chang, Y., Lin, K., & Tu, T. (2016).** The Impact of AACSB Accreditation on Business School Students in Taiwan. Asia-Pacific Education Researcher, 25(4), 615–625. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-016-0289-y
7. **Cruz, N. M., Pérez, V. M., & Cantero, C. T. (2009).** The influence of employee motivation on knowledge transfer. Journal of Knowledge Management, 13(6), 478–490. https://doi.org/10.1108/13673270910997132
8. **Dattey, K., Westerheijden, D. F., & Hofman, W. H. A. (2017).** Impact of accreditation on improvement of operational inputs after two cycles of assessments in some Ghanaian universities. Quality in Higher Education, 23(3), 213–229. https://doi.org/10.1080/13538322.2017.1407398
9. **Jha, P., Agarwal, R., & Chakraborty, S. K. (2020).** Green Audit and Environmental Performance of Higher Education Institutions in India. Environmental Science and Pollution Research, 27(19), 23820-23829. https://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11356-020-09189-0

10. **Pradhan, R. K., Sahu, S. K., & Pandey, P. C. (2019).** Green Audit and Sustainability Practices of Higher Education Institutions in India. Journal of Cleaner Production, 213, 50-59. https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.12.209
11. **Ramesh, J., & Kumar, S. (2015).** Green Audit: An Overview of Environmental Sustainability Reporting in India. Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 172, 95-102. https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.01.284
12. **Singh, S., & Singh, A. (2018).** Green Audit and Energy Performance of Higher Education Institutions in India: A Case Study Approach. Journal of Cleaner Production, 183, 139-148. https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.02.134
13. **Sowjanya, N. N., & Srinivas, T. (2017).** Impact of Green Audit on Environmental Management Practices in Corporate Sector. International Journal of Environment and Sustainable Development

****