

Chapter-5

Discussion and Findings of the Study

Biographical Data

The respondents' profile comprises male and female respondents. Females are more as compared to males. The age group '20-less than 25' comprises the major chunk of the respondents. The highest number of respondents have English as their medium of instruction till the 12th standard. The highest number of respondents are from the faculty of Engineering and Technology of The M.S. University. There are more respondents from UG as compared to other courses/ programs. It is found that majority of respondents are aware about the correct NAAC grading of the M.S. University. It has also been found that majority of respondents are not aware about the correct ranking of the M.S. University.

Awareness about Ranking among students

There is no significant association between gender and awareness about ranking among respondents. However, there is a significant association between age and awareness about ranking among respondents. There is a significant association between medium of instruction and awareness about ranking. There is a significant association between program/ course and awareness about ranking among respondents.

Awareness about Grading among students

There is a significant association between gender and awareness of grade among respondents. There is a significant association between age and awareness of grade among respondents. There is a significant association between the medium of instruction and awareness of grade among respondents. There is a significant association between program/ course of respondents and awareness of the grade of The M.S. University among respondents.

Perception towards 'Curriculum Appropriateness' (CA) and 'Tech-pro teachers' (TPT) among students

There is a significant difference between males and females in their perception towards 'CA' and 'TPT'. Females have a significantly better perception towards 'CA' and 'TPT' than their male counterparts. Students with '25 and above' age group have a significantly better perception towards 'CA' and 'TPT' than their counterparts. Students with 'Gujarati' as a medium of instruction have a significantly better perception towards 'CA' and 'TPT' than their counterparts. Students pursuing Post graduation have a significantly better perception towards 'CA' and 'TPT' than their counterparts. There

is a significant difference among various faculties like Arts, Commerce, Education and Psychology, Pharmacy, E&T, F&CS, Law, Fine Arts, Management Studies, Science, Performing Arts, in their perception towards 'CA'. However, there is no significant difference in perception towards 'CA' between faculties of 'J&C' and 'Social Work'. For 'TPT', there is a significant difference among various faculties like Arts, Science, Commerce, Education and Psychology, Pharmacy, E&T, F&CS, Law, Fine Arts, Management Studies, and Science. It is found that there is no significant difference in perception towards 'TPT' among J&C, Social work and PA.

To enhance curriculum appropriateness and technology proficiency, respondents' preferences in chronological order are- 'Teachers should encourage innovation among students' than 'Teachers should adjust to new methods of teaching' and lastly, 'Teachers should keep on improving their digital skills'.

Perception towards 'Soft skills' (SS) and 'Technical skills' (TS) of teachers

Respondents have a better perception towards 'Soft skills of teachers' as compared to 'Technical skills of teachers.' There is a significant difference between males and females in their perception towards 'SS' and 'TS' of teachers. Females have a significantly better perception towards 'Soft Skills' and 'Technical Skills' of teachers than their male counterparts. There is a significant difference between '25 and above' age group of respondents in their perception towards 'SS' and 'TS' of teachers as compared to other age groups. Respondents with '25 and above' age group have a significantly better perception towards 'SS' and 'TS' of teachers than their counterparts. Respondents with all mediums of instruction are indifferent in their perception towards 'SS' and 'TS' of teachers. Respondents pursuing a Diploma have a significantly better perception towards 'SS' and 'TS' than their counterparts. There is a significant difference in perception towards 'SS' of teachers among various faculties like Arts, Commerce, E&P, Pharmacy, E&T, F&CS, Law, Fine Arts, Management Studies, Science, and Performing Arts. However, it is found that there is no significant difference in perception towards 'SS' of teachers between faculty of 'Management Studies' and other faculties. There is a significant difference in perception of respondents towards 'TS' of teachers among various faculties like Arts, Commerce, E&P, Pharmacy, E&T, F&CS, Law, Fine Arts, Science, and Performing Arts. It is found that there is no significant difference in perception of respondents towards 'TS' of teachers between the faculty of 'Management Studies' and the faculty of 'Social Work'. Respondents opine about teachers' involving students' participation through 'Field

work', 'Case studies', 'Internships', 'Seminars', and 'Arranging for faculty events' and it is found that respondents prefer students' participation through 'seminars' more as compared to others.

Perception towards 'Pedagogy' (P) of 'Teacher Engagement' (TE) with students

Males and females are indifferent in their perception towards 'P' of teachers and 'TE' with students. Respondents from all age groups are indifferent in their perception towards 'Pedagogy' of teachers.

There is a significant difference between '25 and above' age group of students in their perception towards 'TE' with students. Respondents with '25 and above' age group have a significantly better perception towards 'TE' with students than their counterparts. There is no significant difference among respondents of various mediums of instruction in perception towards 'P' of teachers and 'TE' with students. There is no significant difference among students of various programs/ courses in perception towards 'P' of teachers and 'TE' with students. There is a significant difference among various faculties like Arts, Commerce, Education and Psychology, Pharmacy, E&T, F&CS, Law, Fine Arts, Management Studies, Science, and Performing Arts in their perception towards 'P' of teachers. There is a significant difference among various faculties like Arts, Commerce, Education and Psychology, Pharmacy, E&T, F&CS, Law, Fine Arts, Management Studies, Science, and Performing Arts in their perception towards 'TE'.

Students opine about improvement required in various skills of teachers. The highest improvement is required in communication skills and lowest improvement is required in risk-taking abilities. Yashpal Committee (2009), Anil Kakodkar Committee (2010-2011), and Twelfth five-year plan have also stressed upon the need for communication skills for university/ college teachers.

For Leadership Qualities of Teachers (LQT)

There is no significant difference between males and females in their perception towards 'Leadership qualities of teachers'. There is no significant difference among students of various age groups in their perception towards 'Leadership qualities of teachers'. There is no significant difference among respondents of various mediums of instruction in their perception towards 'Leadership qualities of teachers'. There is no significant difference among respondents of various programs/ courses in their perception towards 'Leadership qualities of teachers'. There is a significant difference

in perception towards ‘Leadership Qualities of teachers’ among faculties like Arts, Commerce, Education and Psychology, Pharmacy, E&T, F&CS, Law, Fine Arts, Management Studies, Science, and Performing Arts. Asked upon the feedback statements from students about ‘Leadership qualities of teachers’, it is found that ‘Teachers help us to look at problems through different angles and arrive at solutions’ scores the highest and ‘Teachers train us on presentation skills’ has the lowest mean score, which is a matter of concern.

Improvement in ‘Perception of teachers’ from the current position among various faculties

For ‘**Enhancing creativity skills of students**’, the faculty of ‘Performing Arts’ is significantly better as compared to the faculty of ‘Science’.

For the ‘**quality of faculty members’ knowledge**’, the faculty of ‘Performing Arts’ is significantly better as compared to the faculty of ‘Journalism and Communication’.

For ‘**Performance of teachers’ w.r.t. communication**’, the faculty of ‘Commerce’ is significantly better as compared to the faculty of ‘Engineering & Technology’.

For ‘**Making curriculum more of industry-oriented**’, the faculty of ‘Management Studies’ is significantly better as compared to the faculty of ‘E&T’.

For ‘**Placement activities**’, the faculty of ‘Management Studies’ is significantly better as compared to the faculty of ‘E&T’.

For ‘**Industry-academic collaboration**’, the faculty of ‘E&P’ is significantly better as compared to the faculty of ‘E&T’.

For ‘**Treating students fairly**’, the faculty of ‘Law’ is significantly better as compared to the faculty of ‘E&T’.

For ‘**Foreign teachers to teach few classes**’, the faculty of ‘E&P’ is significantly better as compared to the faculty of ‘E&T’.

For ‘**More experiential learning than theoretical learning**’, the faculty of ‘Performing Arts’ is significantly better as compared to the faculty of ‘E&T’.

Ability enhancing tools: Curriculum, Teaching methods (TM), and Assessment methods (AM) for enhancing abilities of students

It has been found that ‘Teaching methods’ play a pivotal role in enhancing most of abilities of students. Teaching methods help to enhance the problem- solving skills,

critical thinking skills, engagement in deeper learning, team building attributes, enhancing innovation and creativity among students, confidence building, enriching professional (skill) education, business and entrepreneurial skills, research orientation, teaching ethics and values, enhancing chances of students' employability, and clearing basic concepts of students. However, it has also been found that strengths and weaknesses of students can be significantly identified through 'assessment methods' and not through 'curriculum' and 'Teaching methods.' It has been found that 'curriculum' does not contribute to enhancing any of the abilities of students discussed above.

For Soft Skills of Staff (SSS)

There is no significant difference between males and females in their perception towards 'Soft Skills of Staff'. There is no significant difference among respondents of various age groups in their perception towards 'Soft Skills of Staff'. There is no significant difference among respondents of various mediums of instruction in their perception towards 'Soft Skills of Staff'. There is no significant difference among respondents of various courses/ programs in their perception towards 'Soft Skills of Staff'. It has been found that of all feedback statements about perception of students towards the staff, 'Language used by the staff is clear' scores the maximum. 'There is a grievance redressal mechanism available if I have any grievance against my teacher/s' scores the lowest, which is a matter of concern.

Current Employment Structure at universities

It has been found that permanent teachers exceed temporary/ contractual, in both A++ universities. The number of non-teaching staff is also close to the number of teaching staff. There are no other types of teachers including guest faculty, or on deputation in these universities. The non-teaching staff of both the 'A++' universities do not exceed the permanent teaching staff unlike MSU. Out of the three 'A' grade universities, two universities have temporary/ contractual teachers. The remaining 'A' grade university has an equal number of permanent and temporary/contractual teachers. One of these university's non-teaching staff exceed the permanent teachers.' The other universities' non-teaching staff does not exceed the permanent teachers. The number of permanent teachers exceed the temporary/ contractual teachers in all the three 'no grade' universities. There are teachers on deputation and guest faculty in two of these universities. The non-teaching staff exceeds the permanent teachers in two of these

universities. It has been found that permanent teachers exceed temporary/ contractual teachers in all universities taken for the purpose of study. This is in total contradiction at MSU, where temporary staff exceeds permanent staff. This is found to be a matter of concern for MSU. The M.S. University has the highest number of non-teaching staff as compared to all other universities that have been selected for this study. It has been found that the total number of permanent and temporary/ contractual teachers at MSU far exceed the same at other universities. Despite this, MSU has the least favourable ratio of permanent teachers to temporary/ contractual teachers.

Guidelines followed for recruitment of Teachers

It has been found that universities with 'A++' grade both follow strict UGC guidelines and one of them also follow AICTE w.r.t. faculty. It has been seen that universities with an 'A' grade follow both UGC and AICTE w.r.t. type of faculty. Universities with 'no grade' only follow strict UGC guidelines. The M.S. University follows the same pattern as that of 'A' grade universities. It follows both UGC and AICTE w.r.t. type of faculty.

Training to newly appointed Teachers

The Maharaja Sayajirao university (MSU) of Baroda gives training to its newly appointed teachers in 'Clarity about university's vision/ mission', 'Evaluation process and marking system', 'Knowledge of rules and regulations of the university', 'Information and Communication Technology (ICT)', 'Research orientation', 'Effective use of various pedagogical tools and techniques for class', 'Orientation programs', 'Enhancement of soft skills in teachers', 'Commitment towards students', 'Cross-disciplinary thinking', 'Inclusion and Equity', 'Entrepreneurship development in students', 'Refresher courses', 'Training to be adaptive to change', 'Training on updating curriculum in alignment with best industry practices'. The M.S. University does not provide training to its newly appointed teachers in the areas: 'stress management techniques', 'inter-disciplinary thinking', and 'modular training'.

It is seen that most universities including one of the 'A++' universities give training to the newly appointed teachers on: 'clarity about university's vision/ mission', 'evaluation process and marking system', and 'knowledge of rules and regulations of the university'. The other 'A++' university gives training in other areas including- 'Information and Communication Technology (ICT)', 'research orientation', 'orientation programs', 'Enhancement of soft skills in teachers', 'Cross-disciplinary thinking',

‘Stress management techniques’, ‘Refresher courses’, ‘Inter-disciplinary thinking’, ‘Training on updating curriculum in alignment with best industry practices.’ Universities with an ‘A’ grade provide training in areas that are discussed above and additional areas like ‘effective use of various pedagogical tools and techniques for class’ and ‘training in placement’. Universities with ‘no grade’ provide ‘Training to be adaptive to change’ in addition to all other areas mentioned above. It is found that universities provide training in all areas to the newly appointed teachers.

Training to teaching and non-teaching staff in other universities

It has been found that training is given to both teaching and non-teaching staff in ‘Quality Assurance’ (QA) by both the universities with an ‘A++’ grade. In addition to this, one of them gives training in other areas like ‘Collaboration and Teamwork’, ‘Training in Technology’, ‘Soft Skills Training’, and ‘Total quality management’ to both teaching and non-teaching staff. However, one of them provides training in technology to only the teaching staff. Other areas of training remain not applicable like: 5S, ISO, conflict management, and time management, for both these universities. For the ‘A’ grade universities, the pattern is similar like that of ‘A++’ universities as training are provided to both teaching and non-teaching staff in two ‘A’ grade universities in ‘Quality assurance’, ‘collaboration and teamwork’, ‘soft skills training’, and ‘training in technology’. Training in ‘soft skills’ is only provided to non-teaching staff by one of these universities.

One of the universities with an ‘A’ grade provide training in ‘quality assurance’, ‘total quality management (TQM)’, 5S, ISO, ‘collaboration and teamwork’, ‘training in technology’ to both teaching and non-teaching staff. However, training provided to only non-teaching staff includes areas like ‘soft skills training’, ‘training in time management’, and ‘conflict management’. It is found that training in these areas is not provided to teaching staff exclusively. Another university with an ‘A’ grade has different areas of training for teaching and non-teaching staff. Training areas for teaching and non-teaching staff include ‘quality assurance’, ‘collaboration and teamwork’, ‘soft skills training’, and ‘training in technology’. Training is not given to non-teaching staff exclusively unlike the other university discussed above. However, training in ‘TQM’ is given to only teaching staff. Training is not applicable in other areas like ‘conflict management’, ‘time management’, ‘5S’, and ‘ISO’. Another university with an ‘A’ grade provides training in areas like ‘QA’, ‘TQM’, and ‘collaboration and teamwork’.

(CT)' to both teaching and non-teaching staff. Training is not applicable in other areas like 'ISO', '5S', 'soft skills training', 'training in technology', 'training in conflict management', and 'training in time management'. It is seen that training is not provided to teaching and non-teaching staff exclusively in the above-mentioned areas.

Another university with a 'no grade', but '22 NIRF ranking', areas where training is given to both teaching and non-teaching staff include: 'ISO', 'collaboration and teamwork', 'soft skills training', and 'time management'. Training provided to teaching staff includes areas like 'QA', 'TQM', '5S', and 'training in technology'. Training provided to non-teaching staff includes 'conflict management'. No area of training remains 'not applicable'. The university with 'no grade' does not provide any training to teaching and non-teaching staff. However, training is provided to teaching staff exclusively in areas like: 'collaboration and teamwork', 'soft skills training', 'training in technology', and 'time management'. The other areas are not applicable for training. It is seen that training is not provided to non-teaching staff exclusively. It has been found that training to teaching and non-teaching staff in any of the above-mentioned areas is not applicable in one of the universities with 'no grade'. However, the M.S. University does not provide training to both teaching and non-teaching staff, neither teaching staff exclusively. The M.S. University provides 'training in technology' only to its non-teaching staff. Other areas of training remain not applicable.

Sources of funds for faculty development programs (FDPs)

It is found that majority of faculty development programs are funded through students' fees which is done by both 'A++' universities. Funds from State government grants, funds from Central govt. grants and funds from ICSSR. The source of funds for 'A' grade universities is from students' fee, state government grants and UGC. For universities with 'no grade', funds from students' fee, UGC, state government grants, central govt grants, and funds from AICTE. Similarly, it is found that The M.S. University follows the same pattern as above and FDPs are funded through AICTE, state government. grants, and central government grants. Thus, it is seen that the largest source of funds for conducting FDPs is funds from students' fee and the lowest contributor is funds from AICTE.

HR practices

Motivation

It has been found that one of the universities with 'A++' grade 'always' engages in motivation practices, and such practices are linked to vision/ mission of the institution. The motivation practices are: 'Teachers are rewarded on students' feedback', 'To ensure teachers are well-engaged', 'To ensure teachers are encouraged in advancing towards their profession', 'Teachers get adequate time to interact with students', 'Incentivising excellence through appropriate rewards', 'Incentivising excellence through appropriate promotions', 'Incentivising excellence through appropriate recognitions', 'Comfortable working environment (for e.g. ambience, positive work culture etc.)'. The other 'A++' university engages in these motivational practices 'occasionally' and 'often' that are rated as (3) and (4) respectively. Two 'A grade' universities engage in most of motivational practices 'always' and 'often'. One of the 'A' grade universities engages in 'Incentivising excellence through appropriate rewards' and 'Comfortable working environment (for e.g. ambience, positive work culture etc.)', only 'occasionally'. All universities link these practices to vision/ mission of the institutions. However, one of the 'no grade' university does not engage in these motivational practices at all. These practices are not linked to vision/ mission of the institution. The other 'no grade' university 'always' engages in these motivational practices and these are linked to vision/ mission of the institution. The other 'no grade' university engages in motivational practices that range from 'often' to 'always' except for two motivational practices: 'Incentivising excellence through appropriate promotions', and 'Incentivising excellence through appropriate recognitions.'

The M.S. University reports that they only 'Occasionally' reward teachers on students' feedback' and 'Ensure teachers are well-engaged'. Their approach here is different from that of the other A++ rated universities that indulge in these activities often or always. Thus, this becomes an area of improvement. Aside from this, in terms of ensuring that teachers are encouraged towards advancing their profession, that they get adequate time to interact with students, incentivizing excellence through – appropriate rewards, promotions, and recognition, and providing a comfortable working environment, The M.S. University rates these factors highest by engaging in them 'Always'. The same varies from 'Often' to 'Always' for both the A++ universities and the A rated universities. Additionally, these practices are linked to the vision and

mission of The M.S. University – like it is for all A++ and A grade universities. It has been found that only one university does not link motivation practices to the vision/mission of the university.

Empowerment and Participation

These practices include: ‘Teachers are allowed to participate in the departmental decision-making’, ‘Teachers are given autonomy in designing curriculum’, ‘Teachers are given autonomy in deciding the pedagogies they want to adopt’, and ‘Teachers are empowered to evaluate students in their own ways’.

With regards to this aspect, it is noted that MSU ‘Always’ allows teachers to participate in the process of departmental decision making. This is very much in line with the mean score of all other universities. With respect to the universities ranked A++ which do it ‘often’, MSU has an upper hand in this aspect. The university with 22 NIRF ranking’ follows the same trend as MSU in this regard. MSU is seen to be more consistent in these aspects compared to the A++ ranked universities which allow autonomy in designing curriculum ranging from ‘Occasionally’ to ‘Always’. Two other universities with an ‘A’ grade engage in these practices from ‘often’ to always.’ However, one of the universities with an ‘A’ grade engages in practices ‘Teachers are given autonomy in designing curriculum’, ‘Teachers are given autonomy in deciding the pedagogies they want to adopt’, and ‘Teachers are empowered to evaluate students in their own way’ ‘occasionally’. Thus, this is an area where MSU can remain consistent to keep abreast and even ahead of other top ranked institutions as MSU ‘always’ engages in ‘Teachers are given autonomy in designing curriculum’, ‘Teachers are given autonomy in deciding the pedagogies they want to adopt’ and ‘often’ engages in ‘Teachers are empowered to evaluate students in their own way’. Universities with ‘no grade’ rate these practices between ‘occasionally’ (3) to ‘always’ (5). Additionally, these practices are linked to the vision and mission of MSU – like it is for all universities.

Career Development

For career development, it is observed that MSU and one of the ‘A++’ ranked and all ‘A’ grade universities ‘rarely’ provide scholarships to teachers. Although the second ‘A++’ ranked university provides scholarships ‘Occasionally’. Since both are close to the mean, it can be concluded that scholarships are not a regular occurrence at any university. However, it is observed that MSU ‘always’ motivates the faculty to attend Faculty Development programs, and for them to have clear vision for career

development. This is in line with one of the 'A++' universities as well, who operate in the same manner as MSU. The other university with 'A++' grade 'often' motivates the faculty to attend FDPs. Furthermore, MSU 'often' offers financial aids to faculty for their development, which is like the 'A++' universities, and above the mean score – indicating that MSU is doing better than most universities including one of the 'A++' university. Universities with no grade rate these practices somewhere between 'never' to 'always.' Additionally, these practices are linked to the vision and mission of MSU – like it is for all 'A++', A grade and other 'no grade' universities.

Recognition and Rewards

Considered one of the best motivators for any employee, MSU is seen to beat all the mean scores as MSU engages 'often' in these two categories: 'Preferring senior faculty to be promoted as departmental heads' and 'Teachers are given a raise in salary packages/ increments based on their performance'. However, 'providing a fast-track promotion system for recognizing high impact research and contribution' is 'rarely' done at MSU. The similar pattern is followed by one of the A++ universities as well. However, one of the 'A++' universities rates all other practices except for the first one, as 'never'. This means that this university never indulges in any of the above-mentioned practice for recognizing and rewarding teachers. Two universities with an 'A' grade too 'often' engage in 'preferring senior faculty to be promoted as departmental heads.' 'Teachers are given a raise in salary packages/ increments based on their performance' has been highly rated by The M.S. University, which is also rated high by one of the A++ university, and two universities with an 'A' grade. Surprisingly, engagement level in these practices ranges from 'often' to 'always' for one of the universities with 'no grade'. The other university with 'no grade' engages in these practices 'occasionally'. Additionally, these practices are linked to the vision and mission of all universities and MSU – like it is for all A++ and A grade, and other 'no grade' universities.

Feedback System

The feedback from students is scored the highest of all. This is 'always' considered by one of the A++ university, one of the 'A' grade universities, and The M.S. University. Two universities with 'no grade' and NIRF ranking 22 have considered this 'occasionally'. The two other 'A' grade universities rated this as 'occasionally' and 'often'. Feedback from the departmental heads is rated 'always' by one of the A++

university, one 'A' grade university, and the M.S. University. It has been found that this feedback from departmental heads is considered as 'often' by one of the A++ university. This feedback has been considered as 'occasionally' by 'no grade' university, by another university with 'no grade' (22 NIRF ranking), and by one of the 'A' grade universities. It has been found that The M.S. University 'never' considers the feedback from colleagues. However, The M.S. University 'always' considers taking feedback from Departmental Heads, Students, and Self. Feedback from self has been highlighted by both A++ universities and feedback from colleagues has been highlighted by one of the A++ university. All these practices are linked to vision/ mission by all universities.

Teachers going for Orientation and Refresher courses

It has been found that percentage of teachers going for orientation programs for 15 days or more is less as compared to teachers going for orientation programs for less than 15 days. It means that orientation programs are attended for less than 15 days by teachers. In other words, it highlights that all universities except one that is newly created, make sure that teachers go for orientation programs and MSU is no different. However, on the other hand, it has been found that percentage of teachers going for refresher courses for 15 days or more is more as compared to teachers going for refresher courses for less than 15 days. However, The M.S. University sends teachers for both orientation and refresher courses for 15 days or more.

Teacher-student ratios

Teacher-student ratios are maintained by both 'A++' universities, both 'A grade' universities, and two 'no grade' universities including the M.S. University. However, in the remaining two universities with an 'A grade' and 'no grade', it is maintained in most of the faculties. In a nutshell, teachers- student ratio are maintained by six out of eight universities i.e. (75%) and MSU is no different. However, two universities maintain student-teacher ratios in most of faculties.

Developing competencies of teachers through various methods

In methods for developing competencies of teachers, it has been found that moderate importance is given to these major methods by MSU: 'Training of faculty are done in areas like enriching curriculum', 'teachers are sent for industrial training', 'Teachers go for professional training', 'teaching collaborations with foreign institutions', 'Conduct faculty exchange programmes'. The M.S. University too considers all these methods as 'moderately important' for developing competencies of

teachers except ‘special programmes to bring changes in attitude’ and ‘training of faculty are done in areas like technology which are considered ‘neutral’ by the university. Other methods that are between ‘neutral’ to moderately important’ are: ‘training of faculty are done in areas like enriching curriculum’, ‘training of faculty are done in areas like assessment methods’, ‘research collaborations with foreign institutions’, ‘conduct faculty exchange programmes’, and ‘continuous professional development of teachers is ensured’. The M.S. University considers all these methods ranging from ‘neutral to moderately important’ except for ‘research collaborations with foreign institutions’ which is considered as ‘very important’. Methods that fall between ‘slightly important’ to ‘neutral’ are: ‘teachers go for professional training’, and ‘training is given to teachers on new methods of teaching’. It has been found that all methods of developing competencies have been rated between moderately to highly important for one of the ‘A++’ universities. It goes similar with NIRF 22 ranked university and the M.S. University where just 2-3 methods of developing competencies have been rated as neutral for both above-mentioned universities respectively. Another A++ university rates all methods between neutral to slightly important except for one method, ‘special programs to bring changes in attitude’ as highly important. One of the ‘A’ grade universities rates all methods as highly important. Another ‘A’ university rates all the methods between neutral to not important except for two methods that are rated as moderately important. Surprisingly, one university with ‘no grade’ has rated all methods except for two methods between moderately important to highly important. Another such university with ‘no grade’ has rated six methods as moderately important to highly important and other five methods range between slightly important to neutral. It has also been found that two methods range between low important to neutral: ‘Teachers go for professional training’ and ‘Training is given to teachers in new methods of teaching’. However, the M.S. University has rated ‘training given to teachers in new methods of teaching’ as neutral, which is a matter of concern.

Factors considered by universities to measure Return on Investment (ROI)

It has been observed that all universities consider ‘students’ satisfaction’ and ‘Teachers’ contribution to research’ as two major factors that are considered by universities. The M.S. University equally agrees and follows the same. Universities with ‘A++ grade’ highlight ‘competencies of teachers’ and ‘performance-based rewards’ along with above mentioned factors. ‘Conferences at the university’ are not

considered by any university to measure ROI including MSU. ‘Competencies of teachers’ is the second most important factor which is considered by all universities including MSU except for one of the ‘no grade’ university. The least important factor to be considered by any university is ‘consultancy projects taken by teachers’, but MSU differs as this factor is considered by MSU. All universities with an ‘A grade’ highlight the contribution of ‘students’ satisfaction’, ‘Teachers’ contribution to academia and research’, and ‘Commitment to university’s vision/ mission’. However, the M.S. University considers ‘students’ satisfaction’, ‘teachers’ contribution to research’, ‘performance-based rewards’, ‘commitment to university’s vision/ mission’, and ‘consultancy projects taken by teachers’ as major factors considered by the university. MSU does not consider ‘Training and development activities for teachers’ to spend funds/ grants on, which is a matter of concern.

Factors measuring Teachers’ performance

The factor that contributes to measure teachers’ performance is ‘communication with students’, ‘Teachers involved in self-appraisal’, ‘Teachers’ aligning their efforts with institutional vision/ mission/ strategy’ which is stated by all universities including MSU. Another factor that holds importance is ‘Teachers’ aligning their efforts with institutional vision/ mission/ strategy’ which is considered by most of universities including MSU, except for one of the ‘A grade’ university, for measuring teachers’ performance. ‘Number of seminars attended’ has not been considered by universities except one of the ‘A grade’ university. The M.S. University believes that the above-mentioned factors help to measure teachers’ performance except ‘teachers involved in self-appraisal’, ‘maximum development programs completed’, ‘adaptation on technology’, ‘clarity of institutional goals’, and ‘introduction of new courses by the teacher’. Factors considered by one of the A++ universities are: ‘Number of papers published in journals of high repute in last 5 years’, ‘Maximum training programs completed’, ‘Assessment work completed on time’, ‘Innovation and creativity in curriculum’, ‘Achievements and receiving awards outside university’, and ‘Clarity of institutional goals’.

Attributes of teachers that help to make university students friendly

The attributes highlighted by the ‘no grade’ university is ‘communication with students and ‘involvement in research activities.’. Universities with an ‘A’ grade highlight the importance of ‘career counselling’, ‘soft behaviour’, and ‘commitment towards

teaching'. Universities with 'A++' grades underline the importance of 'innovative teaching-learning processes', and 'co-curricular activities.' The university with '22 NIRF' ranking highlights the importance of teaching and research. It is found that teaching and research activities has been a concern for universities with better grades and ranks. The M.S. University does not highlight any factor to make the university student friendly.