

**A STUDY OF TEACHING-LEARNING AND EVALUATION
PRACTICES IN HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS
OF UTTAR PRADESH**

SUMMARY OF THE THESIS

SUBMITTED FOR THE AWARD OF THE DEGREE OF

Doctor of Philosophy
IN
EDUCATION

**BABASAHEB
BHIMRAO
AMBEDKAR
UNIVERSITY**



• LUCKNOW •

प्रज्ञा शील करुणा
ESTABLISHED 1996

Submitted by

SHASHWAT KUMAR

Enrolment No. 1413/19

Under the Supervision of

DR. SANGEETA CHAUHAN

**DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
BABASAHEB BHIMRAO AMBEDKAR UNIVERSITY
(A CENTRAL UNIVERSITY) (NAAC A++ ACCREDITED)
VIDYA VIHAR, RAEBARELI ROAD, LUCKNOW-226025
UTTAR PRADESH, INDIA**

2024

SUMMARY

Education is one of the primary agents that develop every individual in society. It is education that brings us from darkness to light. India has one of the world's largest and most diversified education systems. Policies aimed at providing equal opportunities for higher education to all, along with privatization, widespread expansion, increased autonomy, and the introduction of programs in new and emerging areas, have improved access to higher education for all. However, this expansion has also raised widespread concerns about the quality and relevance of higher education. Any democratic society must ensure the quality of life by providing quality education for all. Pursuing excellence is a primary concern for teachers, professionals, policymakers, and regulatory bodies, especially in higher education. The issue of quality is related to the concepts of autonomy, democratization, and stakeholders' participation in the decision-making process. Currently, the number of higher education institutions is continuously increasing. At the same time, the quality of these institutions has declined due to limited funding, poor dynamic leadership, and inadequate policy implementation. Various commissions, committees, and agencies play a crucial role in enhancing the quality of education. Improving the quality of education necessitates a strong focus on the teaching-learning and evaluation processes, which serve as a bridge between teachers and students across primary, secondary, and higher education. The teaching-learning process forms the foundation for any stage of education. To achieve educational goals, this process must be standardized. Higher education plays a vital role in educating individuals. Universities are where students' personalities are uplifted. Each state has established different types of universities to serve this purpose. In higher education, students come from diverse backgrounds, environments, and economic statuses, leading to varying perceptions of different aspects of education. To improve the teaching-learning and evaluation process, the Ministry of Education has emphasized the need for accreditation of higher education institutions. Maintaining the quality of higher education requires ongoing research on the teaching-learning process. Statutory bodies should conduct periodic assessments of higher education institutions like NAAC. This research aimed to assess the calibre of the teaching-learning and evaluation process in universities in Uttar Pradesh. This evaluation was based on the second criterion of NAAC and the perceptions of both students and teachers. Hence, the researcher selected the title "**A Study of Teaching-Learning and Evaluation Practices in Higher Education Institutions of Uttar Pradesh.**"

❖ Operational Definition of the Terms

- (a) **Teaching-Learning and Evaluation Practices:** Educators demonstrate their behaviour inside and outside the classroom by engaging in various activities. This exchange of ideas is two-way, where teachers and students actively engage with each other, exchanging knowledge using different techniques and

methods to assess and improve outcomes and address shortcomings continuously.

- (b) Higher Education:** Refers to programs at the university level or those pursued after completing at least 12 years of schooling. This includes undergraduate and postgraduate studies. These programs provide students with advanced knowledge and skills in their chosen fields, preparing them for careers or further research.
- (c) Seven Key Indicators of the Second Criterion (Teaching-Learning and Evaluation Practices) of NAAC**
- i. Student Enrollment and Profile:** This indicates that the institution enrolls students in programs through a transparent, well-organized process and emphasises the representation of students from diverse backgrounds.
 - ii. Catering to Student Diversity:** This implies that teacher education institutions (TEIs) meet the needs of students from all backgrounds. Admission opportunities for students with disabilities and gender equality are also considered.
 - iii. Teaching-Learning Process:** This demonstrates how teachers effectively utilize e-resources and provide interactive, participatory learning experiences.
 - iv. Teacher Profile and Quality:** This indicates that teachers are well-qualified and dynamically fulfil their tasks in a professionally relevant manner.
 - v. Evaluation Process and Reforms:** This key indicator aims to examine ways to enhance the efficacy and efficiency of student learning through continuous internal assessment.
 - vi. Student Performance and Learning Outcomes:** This indicator relates to students' understanding of the Performance and Learning Outcomes (PLOs) and their performance, which indicates the program's success or outcome.
 - vii. Student Satisfaction Survey:** This survey pertains to student feedback. The level of student satisfaction can directly determine the success of the institution's teaching-learning process.

❖ Research Questions

1. What is the perception of teachers and students towards the teaching-learning and evaluation practices followed by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in the context of discipline, levels of program and types of institution?
2. What is the perception of teachers and students towards the indicators of teaching- learning and evaluation practices followed by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in the context of discipline, levels of program and types of institution?
3. Are the teaching-learning and evaluation practices followed by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) affected by the discipline, levels of program and types of institution?
4. Are the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired Higher Education

Institutions (HEIs) affected by the interaction effects of discipline, levels of program and types of institution?

5. Is there any significant difference in teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in the context of discipline, levels of program and types of institution on the basis of students' interview?

❖ **Major Objective of Quantitative Analysis**

(I) Based on the Perception of Students

To study the teaching-learning and evaluation practices followed by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) as perceived by students in the context of discipline, levels of program and types of institution.

Main Objective 1.1: To study the impact of discipline, levels of program and types of institution and their various interactions on the perception of students towards the first indicator, "Student Enrollment and Profile", of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 1.1.1: To study the impact of levels of program on the perception of students towards the first indicator "Student Enrollment and Profile" of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 1.1.2: To study the impact of discipline on the perception of students towards the first indicator "Student Enrollment and Profile" of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 1.1.3: To study the impact of types of institution on the perception of students towards the first indicator "Student Enrollment and Profile" of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 1.1.4: To study the impact of interaction between levels of program and discipline on the perception of students towards the first indicator "Student Enrollment and Profile" of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 1.1.5: To study the impact of interaction between levels of program and types of institution on the perception of students towards the first indicator "Student Enrollment and Profile" of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 1.1.6: To study the impact of interaction between discipline and types of institution on the perception of students towards the first indicator "Student Enrollment and Profile" of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 1.1.7: To study the impact of interaction among levels of program, discipline and types of institution on the perception of students towards the first indicator "Student Enrollment and Profile" of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Main Objective 1.2: To study the impact of discipline, levels of program and types of institution and their various interactions on the perception of students towards the second indicator “Catering to Student Diversity” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 1.2.1: To study the impact of levels of program on the perception of students towards the second indicator “Catering to Student Diversity” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 1.2.2: To study the impact of discipline on the perception of students towards the second indicator “Catering to Student Diversity” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 1.2.3: To study the impact of types of institution on the perception of students towards the second indicator “Catering to Student Diversity” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 1.2.4: To study the impact of interaction between levels of program and discipline on the perception of students towards the second indicator “Catering to Student Diversity” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 1.2.5: To study the impact of interaction between levels of program and types of institution on the perception of students towards the second indicator “Catering to Student Diversity” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 1.2.6: To study the impact of interaction between discipline and types of institution on the perception of students towards the second indicator “Catering to Student Diversity” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 1.2.7: To study the impact of interaction among level of program, discipline and types of institution on the perception of students towards the second indicator “Catering to Student Diversity” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Main Objective 1.3: To study the impact of discipline, levels of program and types of institution and their interaction on the perception of students towards the third indicator “Teaching-Learning Process” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 1.3.1: To study the impact of levels of program on the perception of students towards the third indicator “Teaching-Learning Process” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 1.3.2: To study the impact of discipline on the perception of students towards the third indicator “Teaching-Learning Process” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 1.3.3: To study the impact of types of institution on the perception of students towards the third indicator “Teaching-Learning Process” of the teaching-

learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 1.3.4: To study the interaction impact between levels of program and discipline on the perception of students towards the third indicator “Teaching Learning Process” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 1.3.5: To study the impact of interaction between levels of program and types of institution on the perception of students towards the third indicator “Teaching-Learning Process” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 1.3.6: To study the impact of interaction between discipline and types of institution on the perception of students towards the third indicator “Teaching-Learning Process” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 1.3.7: To study the impact of interaction among levels of program, discipline and types of institution on the perception of students towards the third indicator “Teaching- Learning Process” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Main Objective 1.4: To study the impact of discipline, levels of program and types of institution and their interaction on the perception of students towards the fourth indicator “Teacher Profile and Quality” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 1.4.1: To study the impact of levels of program on the perception of students towards the fourth indicator “Teacher Profile and Quality” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 1.4.2: To study the impact of discipline on the perception of students towards the fourth indicator “Teacher Profile and Quality” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 1.4.3: To study the impact of types of Institution on the perception of students towards the fourth indicator “Teacher Profile and Quality” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 1.4.4: To study the impact of interaction of levels of program and discipline on the perception of students towards the fourth indicator “Teacher Profile and Quality” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 1.4.5: To study the impact of interaction between levels of program and types of institution on the perception of students towards the fourth indicator “Teacher Profile and Quality” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 1.4.6: To study the impact of interaction between discipline and types of institution on the perception of students towards the fourth indicator “Teacher Profile and Quality” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by

Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 1.4.7: To study the impact of interaction among levels of program, discipline and types of institution on the perception of students towards the fourth indicator “Teacher Profile and Quality” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Main Objective 1.5: To study the impact of discipline, levels of program, and types of institution and their interaction on the perception of students towards the fifth indicator “Evaluation Process and Reforms” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 1.5.1: To study the impact of levels of program on the perception of students towards the fifth indicator “Evaluation Process and Reforms” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 1.5.2: To study the impact of discipline on the perception of students towards the fifth indicator “Evaluation Process and Reforms” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 1.5.3: To study the impact of types of institution on the perception of students towards the fifth indicator “Evaluation Process and Reforms” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 1.5.4: To study the impact of interaction between levels of program and discipline on the perception of students towards the fifth indicator “Evaluation Process and Reforms” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 1.5.5: To study the impact of interaction between levels of program and types of institution on the perception of students towards the fifth indicator “Evaluation Process and Reforms” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 1.5.6: To study the impact of interaction between discipline and types of institution on the perception of students towards the fifth indicator “Evaluation Process and Reforms” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 1.5.7: To study the impact of interaction among levels of program, discipline and types of institution on the perception of students towards the fifth indicator “Evaluation Process and Reforms” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Main Objective 1.6: To study the impact of discipline, levels of program and types of institution and their interaction on the perception of students towards the sixth indicator “Student Performance and Learning Outcomes” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 1.6.1: To study the impact of levels of program on the perception of

students towards the sixth indicator “Student Performance and Learning Outcomes” of the teaching- learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 1.6.2: To study the impact of discipline on the perception of students towards the sixth indicator “Student Performance and Learning Outcomes” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 1.6.3: To study the impact of types of institution on the perception of students towards the sixth indicator “Student Performance and Learning Outcomes” of the teaching- learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 1.6.4: To study the impact of interaction between levels of program and discipline on the perception of students towards the sixth indicator “Student Performance and Learning Outcomes” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 1.6.5: To study the impact of interaction between levels of program and types of institution on the perception of students towards the sixth indicator “Student Performance and Learning Outcomes” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 1.6.6: To study the impact of interaction between discipline and types of institution on the perception of students towards the sixth indicator “Student Performance and Learning Outcomes” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 1.6.7: To study the impact of interaction among levels of program, discipline and types of institution on the perception of students towards the sixth indicator “Student Performance and Learning Outcomes” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Main Objective 1.7: To study the impact of discipline, levels of program and types of institution and their interaction on the perception of students towards the seventh indicator “Student Satisfaction Survey” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 1.7.1: To study the impact of levels of program on the perception of students towards the seventh indicator “Student Satisfaction Survey” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 1.7.2: To study the impact of discipline on the perception of students towards the seventh Indicator, “Student Satisfaction Survey,” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 1.7.3: To study the impact of types of institution on the perception of students towards the seventh indicator “Student Satisfaction Survey” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 1.7.4: To study the impact of interaction between levels of program

and discipline on the perception of students towards the seventh indicator “Student Satisfaction Survey” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 1.7.5: To study the impact of interaction of between levels of program and types of institution on the perception of students towards the seventh indicator “Student Satisfaction Survey” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 1.7.6: To study the impact of interaction between discipline and types of institution on the perception of students towards the seventh indicator “Student Satisfaction Survey” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 1.7.7: To study the impact of interaction among levels of program, discipline and types of institution on the perception of students towards the seventh indicator “Student Satisfaction Survey” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Main Objective 1.8: To study the impact of discipline, levels of program and types of institution and their interaction on the perception of students towards “Teaching-Learning and Evaluation Practices” acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 1.8.1: To study the impact of levels of program on the perception of students towards “Teaching-Learning and Evaluation Practices” acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs)

Sub Objective 1.8.2: There is no significant impact of discipline on the perception of students towards “Teaching-Learning and Evaluation Practices” acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 1.8.3: To study the impact of types of institution on the perception of students towards “Teaching-Learning and Evaluation Practices” acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs)

Sub Objective 1.8.4: To study the impact of interaction between levels of program and discipline on the perception of students towards “Teaching-Learning and Evaluation Practices” acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 1.8.5: To study the impact of interaction between levels of program and types of institution on the perception of students towards “Teaching-Learning and Evaluation Practices” acquired Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 1.8.6: To study the impact of interaction between discipline and types of institution on the perception of students towards “Teaching-Learning and Evaluation Practices” acquired Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 1.8.7: To study the impact of interaction among levels of program, discipline and types of institution on the perception of students towards “Teaching-Learning and Evaluation Practices” acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

❖ **(II) Based on the Perception of Teachers**

To study the teaching-learning and evaluation practices followed by Higher

Education Institutions (HEIs) as perceived by teachers in the context of discipline, levels of program and types of institution.

Main Objective 2.1: To study the impact of discipline, levels of program and types of institution and their various interactions on the perception of teachers towards the first indicator “Student Enrollment and Profile” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 2.1.1: To study the impact of levels of program on the perception of teachers towards the first indicator “Student Enrollment and Profile” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 2.1.2: To study the impact of discipline on the perception of teachers towards the first indicator “Student Enrollment and Profile” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 2.1.3: To study the impact of types of institution on the perception of teachers towards the first indicator “Student Enrollment and Profile” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 2.1.4: To study the impact of interaction between levels of program and discipline on the perception of teachers towards the first indicator “Student Enrollment and Profile” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 2.1.5: To study the impact of interaction between levels of program and types of institution on the perception of teachers towards the first indicator “Student Enrollment and Profile” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 2.1.6: To study the impact of interaction between discipline and types of institution on the perception of teachers towards the first indicator “Student Enrollment and Profile” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 2.1.7: To study the impact of interaction among levels of program, discipline and types of institution on the perception of teachers towards the first indicator “Student Enrollment and Profile” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Main Objective 2.2: To study the impact of discipline, levels of program and types of institution and their interaction on the perception of teachers towards the second indicator “Catering to Student Diversity” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 2.2.1: To study the impact of levels of program on the perception of teachers towards the second indicator “Catering to Student Diversity” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 2.2.2: To study the impact of discipline on the perception of teachers towards the second indicator “Catering to Student Diversity,” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 2.2.3: To study the impact of types of Institution on the perception of teachers towards the second indicator “Catering to Student Diversity” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 2.2.4: To study the impact of interaction between levels of program and discipline on the perception of teachers towards the second indicator “Catering to Student Diversity” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 2.2.5: To study the impact of interaction between levels of program and types of institution on the perception of teachers towards the second indicator “Catering to Student Diversity” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 2.2.6: To study the impact of interaction between discipline and types of Institution on the perception of teachers towards the second indicator “Catering to Student Diversity” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 2.2.7: To study the impact of interaction among program, discipline and types of institution on the perception of teachers towards the second indicator “Catering to Student Diversity” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Main Objective 2.3: To study the impact of discipline, levels of program, and types of institution and their interaction on the perception of teachers towards the third indicator “Teaching-Learning Process” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 2.3.1: To study the impact of levels of program on the perception of teachers towards the third indicator “Teaching-Learning Process” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 2.3.2: To study the impact of discipline on the perception of teachers towards the third indicator “Teaching-Learning Process” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 2.3.3: To study the impact of types of institution on the perception of teachers towards the third indicator “Teaching-Learning Process” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs)

Sub Objective 2.3.4: To study the impact of interaction between levels of program and discipline on the perception of teachers towards the third indicator “Teaching-Learning Process” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 2.3.5: To study the impact of interaction between levels of program and types of institution on the perception of teachers towards the third indicator “Teaching-Learning Process” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 2.3.6: To study the impact of interaction between discipline and types

of institution on the perception of teachers towards the third indicator “Teaching-Learning Process” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 2.3.7: To study the impact of interaction among levels of program, discipline and types of institution on the perception of teachers towards the third indicator “Teaching- Learning Process” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Main Objective 2.4: To study the impact of discipline, levels of program, and types of institution and their interaction on the perception of teachers towards the fourth indicator “Teacher Profile and Quality” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 2.4.1: To study the impact of levels of program on the perception of teachers towards the fourth indicator “Teacher Profile and Quality” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 2.4.2: To study the impact of discipline on the perception of teachers towards the fourth indicator “Teacher Profile and Quality” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 2.4.3: To study the impact of types of institution on the perception of teachers towards the fourth indicator “Teacher Profile and Quality” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 2.4.4: To study the impact of interaction of levels of program and discipline on the perception of teachers towards the fourth indicator, “Teacher Profile and Quality,” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 2.4.5: To study the impact of interaction between levels of program and types of institution on the perception of teachers towards the fourth indicator “Teacher Profile and Quality” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 2.4.6: To study the impact of interaction of discipline and types of institution on the perception of teachers towards the fourth indicator “Teacher Profile and Quality” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 2.4.7: To study the impact of interaction among levels of program, discipline and types of institution on the perception of teachers towards the fourth indicator “Teacher Profile and Quality” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Main Objective 2.5: To study the impact of discipline, levels of program and types of institution and their interaction on the perception of teachers towards the fifth indicator “Evaluation Process and Reforms” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 2.5.1: To study the impact of levels of program on the perception of

teachers towards the fifth indicator “Evaluation Process and Reforms” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 2.5.2: To study the impact of discipline on the perception of teachers towards the fifth indicator “Evaluation Process and Reforms” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 2.5.3: To study the impact of types of institution on the perception of teachers towards the fifth indicator “Evaluation Process and Reforms” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 2.5.4: To study the impact of interaction of levels of program and discipline on the perception of teachers towards the fifth indicator “Evaluation Process and Reforms” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 2.5.5: To study the impact of interaction between levels of program and types of institution on the perception of teachers towards the fifth indicator, “Evaluation Process and Reforms,” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 2.5.6: To study the impact of interaction between discipline and types of institution on the perception of teachers towards the fifth indicator “Evaluation Process and Reforms” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 2.5.7: To study the impact of interaction among levels of program, discipline and types of institution on the perception of teachers towards the fifth indicator “Evaluation Process and Reforms” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Main Objective 2.6: To study the impact of discipline, levels of program, and types of institution and their interaction on the perception of teachers towards the sixth indicator “Student Performance and Learning Outcomes” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 2.6.1: To study the impact of levels of program on the perception of teachers towards the sixth indicator “Student Performance and Learning Outcomes” of the teaching- learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 2.6.2: To study the impact of discipline on the perception of teachers towards the sixth indicator “Student Performance and Learning Outcomes” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 2.6.3: To study the impact of types of institution on the perception of teachers towards the sixth indicator “Student Performance and Learning Outcomes” of the teaching- learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 2.6.4: To study the impact of interaction between levels of program and discipline on the perception of teachers towards the sixth indicator “Student Performance and Learning Outcomes” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 2.6.5: To study the impact of interaction between levels of program and types of institution on the perception of teachers towards the sixth indicator “Student Performance and Learning Outcomes” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 2.6.6: To study the impact of interaction between discipline and types of institution on the perception of teachers towards the sixth indicator “Student Performance and Learning Outcomes” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 2.6.7: To study the impact of interaction among levels of program, discipline and types of Institution on the perception of teachers towards the sixth indicator “Student Performance and Learning Outcomes” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Main Objective 2.7: To study the impact of discipline, levels of program and types of institution and their interaction on the perception of teachers towards the seventh indicator “Student Satisfaction Survey” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 2.7.1: To study the impact of levels of program on the perception of teachers towards the seventh indicator “Student Satisfaction Survey” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 2.7.2: To study the impact of discipline on the perception of teachers towards the seventh indicator “Student Satisfaction Survey” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 2.7.3: To study the impact of types of institution on the perception of teachers towards the seventh indicator “Student Satisfaction Survey” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 2.7.4: To study the impact of interaction between levels of program and discipline on the perception of teachers towards the seventh indicator “Student Satisfaction Survey” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 2.7.5: To study the impact of interaction between levels of program and types of institution on the perception of teachers towards the seventh indicator, “Student Satisfaction Survey,” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 2.7.6: To study the impact of interaction between discipline and types of institution on the perception of teachers towards the seventh indicator “Student Satisfaction Survey” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practice acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 2.7.7: To study the impact of interaction among levels of program, discipline, and types of institution on the perception of teachers towards the seventh indicator “Student Satisfaction Survey” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Main Objective 2.8: To study the impact of discipline levels of program and types of institution and their interaction on the perception of teachers towards the “Teaching-Learning and Evaluation Practices” acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 2.8.1: To study the impact of levels of program on the perception of teachers towards the “Teaching-Learning and Evaluation Practices” acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 2.8.2: To study the impact of discipline on the perception of teachers towards the “Teaching-Learning and Evaluation Practices” acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 2.8.3: To study the impact of types of institution on the perception of teachers towards the “Teaching-Learning and Evaluation Practices” acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 2.8.4: To study the impact of interaction between levels of program and discipline on the perception of teachers towards the “Teaching-Learning and Evaluation Practices” acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 2.8.5: To study the impact of interaction between levels of program and types of institution on the perception of teachers towards the “Teaching-Learning and Evaluation Practices” acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 2.8.6: To study the impact of interaction between discipline and types of institution on the perception of teachers towards the “Teaching-Learning and Evaluation Practices” acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Sub Objective 2.8.7: To study the impact of interaction among levels of program, discipline, and types of institution on the perception of teachers towards the “Teaching-Learning and Evaluation Practices” acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

❖ **Objective of Qualitative Analysis**

(I) Based on the Student's Interview

To study the perception of students towards the seven indicators of “Teaching-Learning and Evaluation Practices” acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) based on their interviews.

❖ **Null Hypotheses (H₀)**

(H₀) 1.1: There is no significant impact of levels of program, discipline, types of institution and their various interactions on the perception of students towards the first indicator “Student Enrollment and Profile” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

1.1.1: There is no significant impact of levels of program on the perception of students towards the first indicator “Student Enrollment and Profile” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices adopted by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

1.1.2 : There is no significant impact of discipline on the perception of students towards the first indicator “Student Enrollment and Profile” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices adopted by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

1.1.3 : There is no significant impact of types of institution on the perception of students towards the first indicator “Student Enrollment and Profile” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices adopted by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

1.1.4 : There is no significant impact of interaction between levels of program and discipline on the perception of students towards the first indicator “Student Enrollment and Profile” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

1.1.5 : There is no significant impact of interaction between levels of program and types of institution on the perception of students towards the first indicator “Student Enrollment and Profile” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

1.1.6 : There is no significant impact of interaction between discipline and types of institution on the perception of students towards the first indicator “Student Enrollment and Profile” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

1.1.7 : There is no significant impact of interaction between levels of program, discipline and types of institution on the perception of students towards the first indicator “Student Enrollment and Profile” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices adopted by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

(HO) 1.2: There is no significant impact of levels of program, discipline, types of institution and their various interactions on the perception of students towards the second indicator “Catering to Student Diversity” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

1.2.1 : There is no significant impact of levels of program on the perception of students towards the second indicator “Catering to Student Diversity” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

1.2.2 : There is no significant impact of discipline on the perception of students towards the second indicator “Catering to Student Diversity” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

1.2.3 : There is no significant impact of types of institution on the perception of students towards the second indicator “Catering to Student Diversity” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

1.2.4 : There is no significant impact of interaction between levels of program and discipline on the perception of students towards the second indicator “Catering to

Student Diversity” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

1.2.5 : There is no significant impact of interaction between levels of program and types of institution on the perception of students towards the second indicator “Catering to Student Diversity” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

1.2.6 : There is no significant impact of interaction between discipline and types of institution on the perception of students towards the second indicator “Catering to Student Diversity” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

1.2.7 : There is no significant impact of interaction between level of program, discipline and types of institution on the perception of students towards the second indicator “Catering to Student Diversity” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

(HO) 1.3: There is no significant impact of discipline, levels of program and types of institution and their interaction on the perception of students towards the third indicator “Teaching-Learning Process” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

1.3.1 : There is no significant impact of levels of program on the perception of students towards the third indicator “Teaching-Learning Process” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

1.3.2 : There is no significant impact of discipline on the perception of students towards the third indicator, “Teaching-Learning Process”, of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

1.3.3 : There is no significant impact of types of institution on the perception of students towards the third indicator “Teaching-Learning Process” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

1.3.4 : There is no significant impact between levels of program and discipline on the perception of students towards the third indicator “Teaching-Learning Process” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

1.3.5 : There is no significant impact of interaction between levels of program and types of institution on the perception of students towards the third indicator “Teaching-Learning Process” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

1.3.6 : There is no significant impact of interaction between discipline and types of institution on the perception of students towards the third indicator “Teaching-Learning Process” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

1.3.7 : There is no significant impact of interaction among levels of program, discipline and types of institution on the perception of students towards third indicator

“Teaching-Learning Process” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

(HO) 1.4: There is no significant impact of discipline, levels of program and types of institution and their interaction on the perception of students towards the fourth indicator “Teacher Profile and Quality” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

1.4.1 : There is no significant impact of levels of program on the perception of students towards the fourth indicator “Teacher Profile and Quality” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

1.4.2 : There is no significant impact of discipline on the perception of students towards the fourth indicator “Teacher Profile and Quality” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

1.4.3 : There is no significant impact of types of Institution on the perception of students towards the fourth indicator “Teacher Profile and Quality” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

1.4.4 : There is no significant impact of interaction between levels of program and discipline on the perception of students towards the fourth indicator “Teacher Profile and Quality” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

1.4.5 : There is no significant impact of interaction between levels of program and types of institution on the perception of students towards the fourth indicator “Teacher Profile and Quality” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

1.4.6 : There is no significant impact of interaction between discipline and types of institution on the perception of students towards the fourth indicator “Teacher Profile and Quality” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

1.4.7 : There is no significant impact of interaction among levels of program, discipline and types of institution on the perception of students towards the fourth indicator “Teacher Profile and Quality” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

(HO) 1.5: There is no significant impact of discipline, levels of program and types of institution and their interaction on the perception of students towards the fifth indicator “Evaluation Process and Reforms” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

1.5.1 : There is no significant impact of levels of program on the perception of students towards the fifth indicator “Evaluation Process and Reforms” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

1.5.2 : There is no significant impact of discipline on the perception of students towards the fifth indicator “Evaluation Process and Reforms” of the teaching-learning

and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

1.5.3 : There is no significant impact of types of institution on the perception of students towards the fifth indicator “Evaluation Process and Reforms” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

1.5.4 : There is no significant impact of interaction between levels of program and discipline on the perception of students towards the fifth indicator “Evaluation Process and Reforms” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

1.5.5 : There is no significant impact of interaction between levels of program and types of institution on the perception of students towards the fifth indicator “Evaluation Process and Reforms” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

1.5.6 : There is no significant impact of interaction between discipline and types of institution on the perception of students towards the fifth indicator “Evaluation Process and Reforms” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

1.5.7 : There is no significant impact of interaction among levels of program, discipline and types of institution on the perception of students towards the fifth indicator “Evaluation Process and Reforms” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

(HO) 1.6: There is no significant impact of discipline, levels of program and types of institution and their interaction on the perception of students towards the sixth indicator “Student Performance and Learning Outcomes” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

1.6.1 : There is no significant impact of levels of program on the perception of students towards the sixth indicator “Student Performance and Learning Outcomes” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

1.6.2 : There is no significant impact of discipline on the perception of students towards the sixth indicator “Student Performance and Learning Outcomes” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

1.6.3 : There is no significant impact of types of institution on the perception of students towards the sixth indicator “Student Performance and Learning Outcomes” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

1.6.4 : There is no significant impact of interaction between levels of program and discipline on the perception of students towards the sixth indicator “Student Performance and Learning Outcomes” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

1.6.5 : There is no significant impact of interaction between levels of program and types of institution on the perception of students towards the sixth indicator “Student Performance and Learning Outcomes” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

1.6.6 : There is no significant impact of interaction between discipline and types of institution on the perception of students towards the sixth indicator “Student Performance and Learning Outcomes” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

1.6.7 : There is no significant impact of interaction among Level of program, discipline and types of institution on the perception of students towards the sixth indicator “Student Performance and Learning Outcomes” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

(HO) 1.7: There is no significant impact of discipline, levels of program and types of institution and their interaction on the perception of students towards the seventh indicator “Student Satisfaction Survey” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

1.7.1 : There is no significant impact of levels of program on the perception of students towards the seventh indicator “Student Satisfaction Survey” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

1.7.2 : There is no significant impact of discipline on the perception of students towards the seventh Indicator, “Student Satisfaction Survey,” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

1.7.3 : There is no significant impact of types of institution on the perception of students towards the seventh indicator “Student Satisfaction Survey” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

1.7.4 : There is no significant impact of interaction between levels of program and discipline on the perception of students towards the seventh indicator “Student Satisfaction Survey” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

1.7.5 : There is no significant impact of interaction between levels of program and types of institution on the perception of students towards the seventh indicator “Student Satisfaction Survey” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

1.7.6 : There is no significant impact of interaction between discipline and types of institution on the perception of students towards the seventh indicator “Student Satisfaction Survey” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

1.7.7 : There is no significant impact of interaction among levels of program, discipline and types of institution on the perception of students towards the seventh indicator “Student Satisfaction Survey” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

(HO) 1.8: There is no significant impact of discipline, levels of program and types of institution and their interaction on the perception of students towards “Teaching-Learning and Evaluation Practices” acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

1.8.1 : There is no significant impact of levels of program on the perception of students towards Teaching-Learning and Evaluation Practices” acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

1.8.2 : There is no significant impact of discipline on the perception of students towards “Teaching-Learning and Evaluation Practices” acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

1.8.3 : There is no significant impact of types of institution on the perception of students towards “Teaching-Learning and Evaluation Practices” acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

1.8.4 : There is no significant impact of interaction between levels of program and discipline on the perception of students towards “Teaching-Learning and Evaluation Practices” acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

1.8.5 : There is no significant impact of interaction between levels of program and types of institution on the perception of students towards “Teaching-Learning and Evaluation Practices” acquired Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

1.8.6 : There is no significant impact of interaction between discipline and types of institution on the perception of students towards “Teaching-Learning and Evaluation Practices” acquired Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

1.8.7 : There is no significant impact of interaction among levels of program, discipline and types of institution on the perception of students towards “Teaching-Learning and Evaluation Practices” acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

(HO) 2.1: There is no significant impact of levels of program, discipline, types of institution and their various interactions on the perception of teachers towards the first indicator “Student Enrollment and Profile” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

2.1.1 : There is no significant impact of levels of program on the perception of teachers towards the first indicator “Student Enrollment and Profile” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

2.1.2 : There is no significant impact of discipline on the perception of teachers towards the first indicator “Student Enrollment and Profile” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

2.1.3 : There is no significant impact of types of institution on the perception of teachers towards the first indicator “Student Enrollment and Profile” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

2.1.4 : There is no significant impact of interaction between levels of program and discipline on the perception of teachers towards the first indicator “Student Enrollment and Profile” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

2.1.5 : There is no significant impact of interaction between levels of program and types of institution on the perception of teachers towards the first indicator “Student Enrollment and Profile” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

2.1.6 : There is no significant impact of interaction between discipline and types of institution on the perception of teachers towards the first indicator “Student Enrollment and Profile” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

2.1.7 : There is no significant impact of interaction among levels of program, discipline and types of institution on the perception of teachers towards the first indicator “Student Enrollment and Profile” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

(HO) 2.2: There is no significant impact of discipline, levels of program and types of institution and their interaction on the perception of teachers towards the second indicator “Catering to Student Diversity” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

2.2.1 : There is no significant impact of levels of program on the perception of teachers towards the second indicator “Catering to Student Diversity” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

2.2.2 : There is no significant impact of discipline on the perception of teachers towards the second indicator “Catering to Student Diversity,” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

2.2.3 : There is no significant impact of types of Institution on the perception of teachers towards the second indicator “Catering to Student Diversity” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

2.2.4 : There is no significant impact of interaction between levels of program and discipline on the perception of teachers towards the second indicator “Catering to Student Diversity” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

2.2.5 : There is no significant impact of interaction between levels of program and types of institution on the perception of teachers towards the second indicator “Catering to Student Diversity” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

2.2.6 : There is no significant impact of interaction between discipline and types of Institution on the perception of teachers towards the second indicator “Catering to Student Diversity” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

2.2.7 : There is no significant impact of interaction among program, discipline and types of institution on the perception of teachers towards the second indicator “Catering to Student Diversity” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

(HO) 2.3: There is no significant impact of discipline, levels of program, and types of institution and their interaction on the perception of teachers towards the third indicator “Teaching-Learning Process” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

2.3.1 : There is no significant impact of levels of program on the perception of teachers towards the third indicator “Teaching-Learning Process” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

2.3.2 : There is no significant impact of discipline on the perception of teachers towards the third indicator “Teaching-Learning Process” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

2.3.3 : There is no significant impact of types of institution on the perception of teachers towards the third indicator “Teaching-Learning Process” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

2.3.4 : There is no significant impact of interaction between levels of program and discipline on the perception of teachers towards the third indicator “Teaching-Learning Process” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

2.3.5 : There is no significant impact of interaction between levels of program and types of institution on the perception of teachers towards the third indicator “Teaching-Learning Process” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

2.3.6 : There is no significant impact of interaction between discipline and types of institution on the perception of teachers towards the third indicator “Teaching-Learning Process” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

2.3.7 : There is no significant impact of interaction among levels of program, discipline and types of institution on the perception of teachers towards the third indicator “Teaching-Learning Process” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

(HO) 2.4: There is no significant impact of discipline, levels of program, and types of institution and their interaction on the perception of teachers towards the fourth indicator “Teacher Profile and Quality” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

2.4.1 : There is no significant impact of levels of program on the perception of teachers towards the fourth indicator “Teacher Profile and Quality” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

2.4.2 : There is no significant impact of discipline on the perception of teachers towards the fourth indicator “Teacher Profile and Quality” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

2.4.3 : There is no significant impact of types of institution on the perception of teachers towards the fourth indicator “Teacher Profile and Quality” of the teaching-

learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

2.4.4 : There is no significant impact of interaction between levels of program and discipline on the perception of teachers towards the fourth indicator, “Teacher Profile and Quality,” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

2.4.5 : There is no significant impact of interaction between levels of program and types of institution on the perception of teachers towards the fourth indicator “Teacher Profile and Quality” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

2.4.6 : There is no significant impact of interaction between discipline and types of institution on the perception of teachers towards the fourth indicator “Teacher Profile and Quality” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

2.4.7 : There is no significant impact of interaction among levels of program, discipline and types of institution on the perception of teachers towards the fourth indicator “Teacher Profile and Quality” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

(HO) 2.5: There is no significant impact of discipline, levels of program and types of institution and their interaction on the perception of teachers towards the fifth indicator “Evaluation Process and Reforms” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

2.5.1 : There is no significant impact of levels of program on the perception of teachers towards the fifth indicator “Evaluation Process and Reforms” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

2.5.2 : There is no significant impact of discipline on the perception of teachers towards the fifth indicator “Evaluation Process and Reforms” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

2.5.3 : There is no significant impact of types of institution on the perception of teachers towards the fifth indicator “Evaluation Process and Reforms” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

2.5.4 : There is no significant impact of interaction between levels of program and discipline on the perception of teachers towards the fifth indicator “Evaluation Process and Reforms” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

2.5.5 : There is no significant impact of interaction between levels of program and types of institution on the perception of teachers towards the fifth indicator, “Evaluation Process and Reforms,” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

2.5.6 : There is no significant impact of interaction between discipline and types of

institution on the perception of teachers towards the fifth indicator “Evaluation Process and Reforms” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

2.5.7 : There is no significant impact of interaction among levels of program, discipline and types of institution on the perception of teachers towards the fifth indicator “Evaluation Process and Reforms” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

(HO) 2.6: There is no significant impact of discipline, levels of program, and types of institution and their interaction on the perception of teachers towards the sixth indicator “Student Performance and Learning Outcomes” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

2.6.1 : There is no significant impact of levels of program on the perception of teachers towards the sixth indicator “Student Performance and Learning Outcomes” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

2.6.2 : There is no significant impact of discipline on the perception of teachers towards the sixth indicator “Student Performance and Learning Outcomes” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

2.6.3 : There is no significant impact of types of institution on the perception of teachers towards the sixth indicator “Student Performance and Learning Outcomes” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

2.6.4 : There is no significant impact of interaction between levels of program and discipline on the perception of teachers towards the sixth indicator “Student Performance and Learning Outcomes” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

2.6.5 : There is no significant impact of interaction between levels of program and types of institution on the perception of teachers towards the sixth indicator “Student Performance and Learning Outcomes” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

2.6.6 : There is no significant impact of interaction between discipline and types of institution on the perception of teachers towards the sixth indicator “Student Performance and Learning Outcomes” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

2.6.7 : There is no significant impact of interaction among levels of program, discipline and types of Institution on the perception of teachers towards the sixth indicator “Student Performance and Learning Outcomes” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

(HO) 2.7: There is no significant impact of discipline, levels of program and types of institution and their interaction on the perception of teachers towards the seventh

indicator “Student Satisfaction Survey” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

2.7.1 : There is no significant impact of levels of program on the perception of teachers towards the seventh indicator “Student Satisfaction Survey” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

2.7.2 : There is no significant impact of discipline on the perception of teachers towards the seventh indicator “Student Satisfaction Survey” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

2.7.3 : There is no significant impact of types of institution on the perception of teachers towards the seventh indicator “Student Satisfaction Survey” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

2.7.4 : There is no significant impact of interaction between levels of program and discipline on the perception of teachers towards the seventh indicator “Student Satisfaction Survey” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

2.7.5 : There is no significant impact of interaction between levels of program and types of institution on the perception of teachers towards the seventh indicator, “Student Satisfaction Survey,” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

2.7.6 : There is no significant impact of interaction between discipline and types of institution on the perception of teachers towards the seventh indicator “Student Satisfaction Survey” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practice acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

2.7.7 : There is no significant impact of interaction among levels of program, discipline, and types of institution on the perception of teachers towards the seventh indicator “Student Satisfaction Survey” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

(HO) 2.8: There is no significant impact of discipline, levels of program and types of institution and their interaction on the perception of teachers towards the “Teaching-Learning and Evaluation Practices” acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

2.8.1 : There is no significant impact of levels of program on the perception of teachers towards the “Teaching-Learning and Evaluation Practices” acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

2.8.2 : There is no significant impact of discipline on the perception of teachers towards the “Teaching-Learning and Evaluation Practices” acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

2.8.3 : There is no significant impact of types of institution on the perception of teachers towards the “Teaching-Learning and Evaluation Practices” acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

2.8.4 : There is no significant impact of interaction between levels of program and discipline on the perception of teachers towards the “Teaching-Learning and

Evaluation Practices” acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

2.8.5 : There is no significant impact of interaction between levels of program and types of institution on the perception of teachers towards the “Teaching-Learning and Evaluation Practices” acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

2.8.6 : There is no significant impact of interaction between discipline and types of institution on the perception of teachers towards the “Teaching-Learning and Evaluation Practices” acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

2.8.7 : There is no significant impact of interaction among levels of program, discipline, and types of institution on the perception of teachers towards the “Teaching-Learning and Evaluation Practices” acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Delimitation of the Study

- The study will be restricted to only teachers and students of Non-Professional UG and PG programs in the arts and science discipline.
- The study will be restricted to only the four types of Universities- Central University, State University, Deemed University, and Private University of Uttar Pradesh.
- The present study will be restricted to only seven indicators of the second criterion of NAAC- Teaching-Learning and Evaluation.
- Self-made tools have been used based on the second criterion of NAAC, including all key indicators.

Method of the Study

Type of the Research

Mixed method research was used in the present study.

Research Design

Convergent parallel design was used in the present study.

Population of the Study

Among Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) of Uttar Pradesh (UP) all Central Universities, State Universities, Private Universities, and Deemed Universities where Non-Professional UG and PG programs are running with Arts and Science stream have been taken as the population of the present study.

Sample of the study

Since there are total 06 Central Universities, 33 state universities, 33 private universities and total 09 Deemed Universities in Uttar Pradesh. Out of 81 universities, researcher has taken randomly total 08 universities (one central university, three state universities, three private universities, and one Deemed university) which are offering Non-Professional U.G. and P.G. level programs in the science and arts stream as the sample of the present study. Total 802 students and total 211 teachers have been

participated in quantitative data analysis and 80 students have been participated in interview for qualitative data analysis. Therefore, total 1093 subjects have been participated in the present study.

Sampling Technique: In the present study, the researcher used Stratified Random Sampling to identify the institutions and respondents among teachers and students in science and arts streams from non-professional UG and PG level program.

Variables of the Study

| | | | |
|-----------|------------------------------|----|--|
| A. | Criterion Variables | a) | Types of Institution (Central, State, Private and Deemed) |
| | | b) | Levels of Program (UG and PG) |
| | | c) | Discipline (Science and Art Stream) |
| B. | Dependent Variables | a) | Teaching-Learning and Evaluation Practices. Teaching-Learning and Evaluation Practices Having seven key indicators. Seven key indicators: 1) Student Enrollment and Profile 2) Catering to Student Diversity 3) Teaching-Learning Process 4) Teacher Profile and Quality 5) Evaluation Process and Reforms 6) Student Performance and Learning Outcomes 7) Student Satisfaction Survey |
| C. | Controlled Variables | a) | Gender |
| | | b) | Types of Institution (Central, State, Private and Deemed) |
| | | c) | Levels of Program (UG and PG) |
| | | d) | Discipline (Science and Art Stream) |
| D. | Intervening Variables | a) | Teaching Experiences |
| | | b) | Teachers Qualification |
| | | c) | Designation |
| | | d) | Monotony |
| | | e) | Fatigue |
| | | f) | Busy Schedule of Teachers |

Tools of the Study (Tools Description)

1. Perception Scale of Teaching-Learning and Evaluation Practices for Teachers (PSTLEPT) constructed by researcher with the help of Supervisor.
2. Perception Scale of Teaching-Learning and Evaluation Practices for Students (PSTLEPS) constructed by researcher with the help of Supervisor.
3. Structured Interview Schedule of Teaching-Learning and Evaluation Practices for Students (SISTLEPS) constructed by researcher with the help of Supervisor.

Statistical Techniques Employed

In the current study's data analysis was analysed by using SPSS version 23, a statistical package for social sciences. A significance threshold of 0.05 was used to test each hypothesis. To examine the data for present study, variety of statistical methods were applied. Mainly, the following metrics were utilised: Levene's test, Kolmogorov-Smirnov & Shapiro-Wilk test (KSSW test), mean, standard deviation, Pearson correlation coefficient, percentile, Three Way ANOVA as per the nature of the research and requirement of the data.

Findings and Conclusions of Quantitative Analysis**(I) Based on the perception of Students****Finding- 1.1.1:**

Students those are studying in Non-Professional Undergraduate and Postgraduate Programs were found to have same perception towards the first indicator "Student Enrollment and Profile" of Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Conclusion- 1.1.1

Non-professional undergraduate and Postgraduate Programs have similar perceptions because they attract students with comparable academic interests or career objectives, resulting in a more homogeneous student body.

Finding- 1.1.2

Students studying in Science Stream and Art Stream were found to have the perception of students towards first indicator "Student Enrollment and Profile" of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) to the same extent.

Conclusion- 1.1.2

Students in both the Science and Arts streams have similar perceptions because higher education institutions apply standardised admission processes and policies across all streams.

Finding- 1.1.3

Students studying in Central university, State University, Deemed University and Private University were found to have the perception of students towards first indicator "Student Enrollment and Profile" of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by higher education institutions (HEIs) to the same extent.

Students studying in Central university, State University, Deemed University and Private University were found to have the perception of students towards first indicator “Student Enrollment and Profile” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by higher education institutions (HEIs) to the same extent.

Conclusion- 1.1.3

Students at Central, State, Deemed, and Private Universities had similar perceptions. This similarity in student perceptions is due to standardised enrolment policies and profiles across different institutions and harmonised national educational regulations.

Finding- 1.1.4

Perception of students towards first indicator “Student Enrollment and Profile” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by higher education institutions (HEIs) was found to be independent of interaction between the Levels of Program and Discipline.

Conclusion- 1.1.4

The independence of students' perceptions toward the first indicator, "Student Enrollment and Profile," from the interaction between the Levels of Program and Discipline in higher education institutions (HEIs) can be attributed to several factors. HEIs typically host diverse student populations with varying academic backgrounds and interests. This diversity often results in a broad spectrum of perspectives regarding enrollment and profile, regardless of the specific program or discipline.

Finding- 1.1.5

Perception of students towards first indicator “Student Enrollment and Profile” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) was found to be independent of interaction between the Levels of Program and Types of Institution.

Conclusion- 1.1.5

The independence of students' perceptions regarding the first indicator, "student enrollment and profile," from interactions between program levels and institution types in higher education institutions (HEIs) can be attributed to several key factors. The overall mission and academic focus of HEIs often transcend specific program levels or institutional types, leading to consistent practices and perceptions across different categories. Additionally, students' perceptions may be more strongly influenced by broader institutional factors such as culture, reputation, and resources, rather than by specific program or institutional types.

Finding- 1.1.6

Science Stream and Arts Stream students belonging to State University, Deemed University, and Private University had perception to the same extent. On the other hand, Science Stream students studying in Central University had higher perception towards “Student Enrollment and Profile” as compared to the Arts Stream students.)

Conclusion- 1.1.6

Amongst Central University Science Stream students had a higher perception than Arts Stream students but Science Stream students as well as Arts Stream students studying at State University, Deemed University, and Private University had a perception towards "Student Enrolment and Profile" to the same extent. In contrast, State, Deemed, and Private Universities may offer more inclusive admission processes, aligning the perceptions of both Arts and Science students.

Finding- 1.1.7

Perception of students towards first indicator "Student Enrollment and Profile" of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by higher education institutions (HEIs) was found to be independent of interaction among the Levels of Program, Discipline and Types of Institution.

Conclusion- 1.1.7

Students' perceptions of the first indicator, "Student Enrollment and Profile," of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices adopted by higher education institutions (HEIs) are independent of the interaction among program levels, disciplines, and types of institutions. The main reasons for this may include standardised admission processes and consistent evaluation metrics across institutions, which result in homogeneous student profiles.

Finding- 1.2.1

Students studying in Non-Professional Undergraduate and Postgraduate Program were found to have the perception of students towards second indicator "Catering to Student Diversity" of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by higher education institutions (HEIs) to the same extent.

Conclusion- 1.2.1

It can be concluded that students enrolled in non-professional undergraduate and postgraduate programs have similar perceptions regarding the second indicator "Catering to Student Diversity" in teaching-learning and assessment practices implemented by higher education institutions (HEIs). Non-professional undergraduate and postgraduate programs typically enroll students from diverse backgrounds, thereby promoting a collective awareness and appreciation for accommodating diverse student needs.

Finding- 1.2.2

Students studying in Science Stream and Art Stream were found to have the perception of students towards second indicator "Catering to Student Diversity" of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) to the same extent.

Conclusion- 1.2.2

Students from science and arts streams have similar perceptions about "catering to student diversity" in HEIs, as standardized institutional policies promote

inclusiveness and equal opportunities. These policies ensure similar teaching-learning and evaluation practices across all subjects. Additionally, both streams likely share similar classroom experiences and support services, resulting in comparable views on diversity.

Finding- 1.2.3

Students studying in Central University, State University, Deemed University and Private University were found to have the perception of students towards second indicator

Conclusion- 1.2.3

It can be said that students studying in central, state, deemed, and private universities have similar perceptions regarding the second indicator "catering to student diversity" in the teaching-learning and evaluation practices of higher education institutions (HEIs), as nationwide educational policies promote inclusiveness and uniform standards. These policies ensure consistent teaching-learning and evaluation practices across institutions.

Finding- 1.2.4

Perception of students towards second indicator "Catering to Student Diversity" of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) was found to be independent of interaction between the Levels of Program and Discipline.

Conclusion- 1.2.4

Students' perceptions of the second indicator, "catering to student diversity," were found to be independent of the interaction between program and discipline levels in higher education institutions' (HEIs) teaching-learning and assessment practices. Student diversity is often a core value across different program levels and disciplines within HEIs, creating a coherent approach to meeting diverse student needs.

Finding- 1.2.5

Perception of students towards second indicator "Catering to Student Diversity" of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) was found to be independent of interaction between the Levels of Program and Types of Institution.

Conclusion- 1.2.5

The independence of students' perceptions from interactions between program levels and types of institutions regarding "Catering to Student Diversity" is due to standardized educational policies and practices. National guidelines ensure uniformity in addressing diversity across programs and institutions. Faculty training and institutional support services generally follow similar protocols, thereby reducing variation in students' experiences.

Finding- 1.2.6

perception of students towards second indicator "Catering to Student Diversity" of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education

Institutions (HEIs) was found to be independent of interaction between the Discipline and Types of Institution.

Conclusion- 1.2.6

It can be said that students' perceptions of the second indicator, "catering to student diversity," in the teaching-learning and evaluation practices of higher education institutions (HEIs) were found to be independent of the interaction between disciplines and institution types. This stems from broader educational policies that emphasize inclusiveness and standardization. These policies ensure a consistent approach across disciplines and institution types.

Finding- 1.2.7

Science Stream students at Central and Deemed University had a higher perception of "Catering to Student Diversity" for Non-Professional Undergraduate Programs than Arts Stream students. On the other hand, Science Stream students studying in State and Private Universities had a lower perception of "Catering to Student Diversity" for Non-Professional Undergraduate Programs than Arts Stream students.

Science Stream students at Central Universities had a higher perception of "Catering to Student Diversity" for Non-Professional Postgraduate Programs than Arts Stream students but a lower perception at Deemed Universities. On the other hand, Arts Stream students at State and Deemed Universities had a higher perception of "Catering to Student Diversity" for Non-Professional Postgraduate Programs compared to Science Stream students but a lower perception at Central and Private Universities.

Conclusion- 1.2.7

Science stream students at central and deemed universities may have a higher perception of "catering to student diversity" in non-professional undergraduate programs due to better resources, more experienced faculty, and a greater focus on inclusiveness. These institutions may provide tailored support and diverse learning opportunities to enhance student experiences. In contrast, science stream students at state and private universities may perceive less attention to diversity due to limited resources, less experienced faculty, and less emphasis on personalized support.

Science stream students at central universities are more likely to perceive better "catering to student diversity" in non-professional postgraduate programs due to superior resources and inclusive policies. In deemed universities, arts stream students may benefit more from such initiatives, resulting in higher perceptions. Arts stream students at state and deemed universities may experience more customized support and diverse opportunities, while science stream students may not receive the same level of attention. In central and private universities, science stream students may receive more support due to a greater focus on science programs, which may result in a lower perception of diversity among arts stream students.

Finding- 1.3.1

Students studying in Non-Professional Undergraduate and Postgraduate Program were found to have the perception of students towards third indicator “Teaching-Learning Process” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) to the same extent.

Conclusion- 1.3.1

Students in non-professional undergraduate and postgraduate programs share similar perceptions of the "Teaching-Learning Process" in higher education institutions due to the emphasis on effective teaching practices that transcend program boundaries. This includes creating supportive learning environments, maintaining high expectations, engaging students through group activities and discussions, and ensuring clear explanations.

Finding- 1.3.2

Students studying in Science Stream and Art Stream were found to have the perception of students towards third indicator “Teaching-Learning Process” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) to the same extent.

Conclusion- 1.3.2

Students in the Science and Art streams have similar perceptions of the "Teaching-Learning Process" in higher education institutions due to the emphasis on effective teaching practices that transcend disciplinary boundaries.

Finding- 1.3.3

Central University had a higher perception, and students belonging to the Deemed University had a lower perception towards the "Teaching-Learning Process".

Conclusion- 1.3.3

Central universities are generally viewed more favourably due to better resources, higher quality faculty, and a superior academic environment. Therefore, students' perceptions of the "Teaching-learning Process" can vary significantly depending on their university.

Finding- 1.3.4

perception of students regarding the third indicator, "Teaching-Learning Process," in the teaching-learning and evaluation practices of higher education institutions (HEIs) was found to be independent of the interaction between levels of program and discipline.

Conclusion- 1.3.4

Higher education institutions (HEIs) often employ effective pedagogical strategies across various programs and disciplines, ensuring consistency in the learning experience.

Finding- 1.3.5

perceptions regarding the third indicator, "Teaching-Learning Process," in the teaching, learning, and evaluation practices of higher education institutions (HEIs) were independent of the interaction between program levels and types of institutions.

Conclusion- 1.3.5

The independence of student perceptions regarding the "Teaching- Learning Process" from the interaction between program levels and types of institutions can be attributed to standardised teaching methodologies and consistent faculty training programs across HEIs.

Finding- 1.3.6

Science stream students at central university have a higher perception of the "Teaching-Learning Process," while private university students have a lower perception. On the other hand, arts stream students at private universities have a higher perception, while those at deemed universities have a lower perception of the "Teaching-learning process."

Conclusion- 1.3.6

Science stream students at central universities are likely to have a higher perception of the "Teaching-Learning Process" because of better infrastructure, more effective teaching methods, and more experienced faculty. On the other hand, private university students may perceive it less positively due to limited resources, the need for enhancements in teaching quality.

Finding- 1.3.7

students' perceptions of the third indicator, "Teaching-Learning Process," of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices in higher education institutions (HEIs) were found to be independent of the interaction among Program Levels, Discipline, and Type of Institution.

Conclusion- 1.3.7

These could include consistency in teaching methods across programs and institutions, similar student expectations or experiences irrespective of these factors, or the influence of unexamined variables that affect student perceptions.

Finding- 1.4.1

Non-professional undergraduate and postgraduate students had similar perceptions of the fourth indicator, "Teacher Profile and Quality," of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices in higher education institutions (HEIs).

Conclusion- 1.4.1

The similarity in perceptions among non- professional undergraduate and postgraduate students regarding the "Teacher Profile and Quality" indicator arises from various factors. Students likely share similar educational backgrounds and experiences that shape their expectations of effective teaching.

Finding- 1.4.2

Students in the Science Stream and Art Stream had similar perceptions regarding the fourth indicator, "Teacher Profile and Quality," of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices in higher education institutions (HEIs).

Conclusion- 1.4.2

The similarity in perceptions about the "teacher profile and quality" indicator between science stream and arts stream students is likely due to shared emphasis on qualities such as subject expertise, communication skills, and teaching effectiveness, all of which are valued across all subjects.

Finding- 1.4.3

Students at central universities have a higher perception of "Teacher Profile and Quality," whereas students at deemed universities have a lower perception.

Conclusion- 1.4.3

Students at central universities often perceive "Teacher Profile and Quality" more highly due to rigorous faculty recruitment processes, substantial funding, and extensive research opportunities, which attract highly qualified and experienced faculty members. Conversely, students at deemed universities may have a lower perception of teacher quality because these institutions, despite their autonomy, often struggle to maintain consistent faculty s

Finding- 1.4.4

Students' perceptions of the fourth indicator, "Teacher Profile and Quality," of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices in higher education institutions (HEIs) were found to be independent of the interaction between Program Levels and Discipline.

Conclusion- 1.4.4

Students' views on teacher quality are often influenced by the effectiveness and engagement of individual teachers rather than the structural context of program levels or disciplines. Second, universal teaching competencies, such as communication skills, subject expertise, and approachability, significantly shape perceptions.

Finding- 1.4.5

students' perceptions of the fourth indicator, "Teacher Profile and Quality," of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices in higher education institutions (HEIs) were found to be independent of the interaction between Program Levels and Types of Institution.

Conclusion- 1.4.5

The primary reasons students' perceptions of "Teacher Profile and Quality" are independent of the interaction between Program Levels and Types of Institution include the universal importance of teacher effectiveness, which transcends specific contexts. Students across various programs and institutions tend to value qualities such as subject expertise, teaching methods, and accessibility similarly.

Finding- 1.4.6

Students' perceptions of the fourth indicator, "Teacher Profile and Quality," of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices in higher education institutions (HEIs) were found to be independent of the interaction between Discipline and Types of Institution.

Conclusion- 1.4.6

The primary reasons students' perceptions of "Teacher Profile and Quality" are independent of the interaction between Discipline and Types of Institution include the universal importance of teacher effectiveness, which transcends specific contexts. Students from various disciplines and institutions similarly value qualities such as subject expertise, teaching methods, and approachability.

Finding- 1.4.7

Students' perceptions of the fourth indicator "Teacher Profile and Quality" of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices in higher education institutions (HEIs), were found to be independent of the interaction among Program Levels, Disciplines, and Types of Institution.

Conclusion- 1.4.7

Consistent standards and expectations for faculty performance across different institutions and disciplines contribute to uniform perceptions. Consequently, students' views are more influenced by individual teacher characteristics rather than program level, discipline, or type of institution.

Finding- 1.5.1

Students enrolled in Non-Professional Undergraduate and Postgraduate Programs hold similar perceptions regarding the fifth indicator, "Evaluation Process and Reforms," of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices in higher education institutions (HEIs).

Conclusion- 1.5.1

Evaluation process and reforms may be uniformly implemented across Non-Professional Undergraduate and Postgraduate Programs, leading to similar student experiences and perceptions. Secondly, the nature of these programs may dictate a certain level of consistency in evaluation methods and practices.

Finding- 1.5.2

students in the Science Stream and Art Stream hold similar perceptions regarding the fifth indicator, "Evaluation Process and Reforms," of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices in higher education institutions (HEIs).

Conclusion- 1.5.2

Evaluation processes and reforms may be standardised across both Science and Art streams, leading to consistent experiences. Secondly, students in both streams might share similar expectations and priorities regarding assessment and feedback.

Finding- 1.5.3

Students studying at Central University, State University, Deemed University, and Private University hold similar perceptions regarding the fifth indicator, "Evaluation Process and Reforms," of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices in higher education institutions (HEIs).

Conclusion- 1.5.3

This similarity in perception likely occurs due to standardised evaluation processes and reforms implemented across these universities, leading to consistent student experiences.

Finding- 1.5.4

Students' perceptions of the fifth indicator, "Evaluation Process and Reforms," of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices in higher education institutions (HEIs) were found to be independent of the interaction between Levels of Program and Discipline

Conclusion- 1.5.4

The uniform implementation of evaluation processes and reforms across different program levels and disciplines could lead to similar experiences and perceptions among students. Secondly, students across various program levels and disciplines may share common expectations and priorities regarding evaluation processes and reforms.

Finding- 1.5.5

students' perceptions of the fifth indicator, "Evaluation Process and Reforms," of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices in higher education institutions (HEIs) were found to be independent of the interaction between Levels of Program and Types of Institution.

Conclusion- 1.5.5

This independence may be attributed to consistently implementing evaluation processes and reforms across different program levels and institution types, leading to similar student experiences and perceptions. Students across various program levels and institution types may share common expectations and priorities regarding evaluation processes and reforms.

Finding- 1.5.6

Students' perceptions of the fifth indicator, "Evaluation Process and Reforms," in the teaching-learning and evaluation practices of higher education institutions (HEIs) are independent of the interaction between Discipline and Types of Institution.

Conclusion- 1.5.6

Uniform implementation of the evaluation process and reforms across disciplines and institution types may be a key contributor. Secondly, students' perceptions of evaluation processes might be more influenced by universal factors such as fairness, clarity, and relevance rather than specific disciplinary or institutional characteristics.

Finding- 1.5.7

Students' perceptions of the fifth indicator, "Evaluation Process and Reforms," in the teaching-learning and evaluation practices of higher education institutions (HEIs) are independent of the interaction among levels of program, discipline, and institution types.

Conclusion- 1.5.7

The key reason for this independence could be the universal significance of fairness, clarity, and relevance in evaluation processes, which might overshadow the specific characteristics of disciplines or institutions.

Finding- 1.6.1

students enrolled in non-professional undergraduate and postgraduate programs perceive the sixth indicator, "Student Performance and Learning Outcomes," of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices in higher education institutions (HEIs) to the same extent.

Conclusion- 1.6.1

The key factor contributing to this could be the standardized evaluation criteria and learning outcomes across non-professional undergraduate and postgraduate programs. Similarly, the similarity in teaching methods and assessment practices across these programs could lead to a consistent perception among students.

Finding- 1.6.2

students in the science and arts streams perceive the sixth indicator, "Student Performance and Learning Outcomes," of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices in higher education institutions (HEIs) to the same extent.

Conclusion- 1.6.2

The consistent perceptions among science and arts students may result from standardized evaluation criteria and learning outcomes across disciplines. Both streams likely use similar teaching methods and assessment practices, creating uniformity in student experiences.

Finding- 1.6.3

Students studying at Central Universities, State Universities, Deemed Universities, and Private Universities have similar perceptions regarding the sixth indicator, "Student Performance and Learning Outcomes," of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices in higher education institutions (HEIs).

Conclusion- 1.6.3

The similar perceptions among students at Central, State, Deemed, and Private Universities regarding "Student Performance and Learning Outcomes" can be attributed to standardised evaluation criteria and consistent teaching practices across institutions.

Finding- 1.6.4

Students' perceptions of the sixth indicator, "Student Performance and Learning Outcomes," of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices in higher education institutions (HEIs) were found to be independent of the interaction between program levels and disciplines.

Conclusion- 1.6.4

This independence could be attributed to consistently applying evaluation criteria and teaching methods across various program levels and disciplines. The emphasis on foundational skills and theoretical understanding in both science and arts programs, irrespective of the level of study, might contribute to similar perceptions of learning outcomes.

Finding- 1.6.5

Students' perceptions of the sixth indicator, "Student Performance and Learning Outcomes," of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices in higher education institutions (HEIs) were independent of the interaction between program levels and types of institutions.

Conclusion- 1.6.5

This independence may stem from the predominant influence of factors like teaching quality, institutional policies, and infrastructure, which could significantly impact students' perceptions more than the interaction between program levels and types of institutions.

Finding- 1.6.6

Students' perceptions of the sixth indicator, "Student Performance and Learning Outcomes," of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices in higher education institutions (HEIs) were independent of the interaction between discipline and types of institutions.

Conclusion- 1.6.6

There could be a standardised approach to teaching methods and evaluation criteria across various disciplines and types of institutions, resulting in similar perceptions among students.

Finding- 1.6.7

Students' perceptions of the sixth indicator, "Student Performance and Learning Outcomes," of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices in higher education institutions (HEIs) were independent of the Interaction among levels of program, discipline, and institution types.

Conclusion- 1.6.7

There could be a consistent approach to teaching and evaluation practices across different levels of programs, disciplines, and types of institutions, resulting in similar perceptions among students.

Finding- 1.7.1

Students enrolled in non-professional undergraduate and postgraduate programs perceive the seventh indicator, "Student Satisfaction Survey," of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices in higher education institutions (HEIs) to the same extent.

Conclusion- 1.7.1

Non-professional undergraduate and postgraduate programs may employ similar teaching and evaluation methods, resulting in consistent experiences and perceptions among students.

Finding- 1.7.2

Students in the Science Stream and Arts Stream perceive the seventh indicator, "Student Satisfaction Survey," of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices in higher education institutions (HEIs) to the same extent.

Conclusion- 1.7.2

This consistent perception could be attributed to several factors. Both science and arts streams may employ similar teaching and evaluation methods, resulting in consistent perceptions of teaching quality and satisfaction.

Finding- 1.7.3

Students at the private university had a higher perception. In comparison, students at the deemed university had a lower perception of the "Student Satisfaction Survey."

Conclusion- 1.7.3

Students at private universities often perceive the "Student Satisfaction Survey" more positively due to superior infrastructure, personalized attention, and responsive administration, which enhance the academic environment. In contrast, students at deemed universities may have a lower perception because these institutions frequently face challenges such as inconsistent funding, administrative inefficiencies, and less emphasis on student feedback, resulting in a less favourable view of student satisfaction.

Finding- 1.7.4

Arts stream students in the non-professional undergraduate program had a higher perception of the "Student Satisfaction Survey." In comparison, those in the non-professional postgraduate program had a lower perception. In contrast, science stream students in the non- professional postgraduate program had a higher perception. Non-professional undergraduate students had a lower perception of the "Student Satisfaction Survey."

Conclusion- 1.7.4

Arts stream students in non-professional undergraduate programs often perceive the "Student Satisfaction Survey" more due to a supportive academic environment, closer faculty-student relationships, and a curriculum tailored to their initial academic interests. In contrast, postgraduate students may have a lower perception because they

face more significant academic pressures, receive less personalized attention. Conversely, science stream students in non-professional postgraduate programs often have a higher perception of the "Student Satisfaction Survey" because they benefit from focused research opportunities, specialized coursework, and closer mentorship from faculty, aligning with their advanced academic goals. In contrast, undergraduate students may have a lower perception due to a broader, less specialized curriculum, larger class sizes, and less individualized attention.

Finding- 1.7.5

students' perception of the seventh indicator, "Student Satisfaction Survey," of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices in higher education institutions (HEIs) was independent of the interaction between the Levels of Program and Types of Institution.

Conclusion- 1.7.5

Several factors that could explain students' perceptions of the "Student Satisfaction Survey" were independent of the interaction between program levels and types of institutions. The survey questions may have been designed to assess general satisfaction, which could be influenced by factors common to all students, such as teaching quality and infrastructure.

Finding- 1.7.6

Arts stream students at the private university had a higher perception of the "Student Satisfaction Survey." In comparison, those at central and deemed universities had a lower perception. On the other hand, science stream students at the state university had a higher perception, whereas those at the deemed university had a lower perception of the survey.

Conclusion- 1.7.6

Arts stream students at private universities have higher perceptions due to resources and support systems tailored to their needs. In contrast, those at central and deemed universities have lower perceptions due to larger class sizes and less personalised attention. For science stream students, those at state universities report higher perceptions due to better research facilities and practical opportunities. In comparison, those at deemed universities have lower perceptions due to fewer resources or support for scientific research.

Finding- 1.7.7

Students' perceptions of the seventh indicator, "Student Satisfaction Survey," of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices in higher education institutions (HEIs) were independent of the interaction among the Levels of Program, Discipline, and Types of Institution.

Conclusion- 1.7.7

The criteria used in the survey may have been broad and applicable across different program levels, disciplines, and types of institutions, leading to similar perceptions among students. Furthermore, students' backgrounds and prior experiences might

have played a role, potentially overshadowing any interaction effects among these factors on their perceptions.

Finding- 1.8.1

Studying in Non-Professional Undergraduate and Postgraduate Programs were found to have the same perception of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by higher education institutions (HEIs).

Conclusion- 1.8.1

Non-Professional Undergraduate and Postgraduate Program students likely share similar teaching and evaluation methods, leading to consistent perceptions. Focusing on foundational knowledge and theoretical understanding rather than specialized skills might contribute to a consistent perception of teaching quality and effectiveness.

Finding- 1.8.2

Students studying in the Science Stream and the Arts Stream were found to have the same perception of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by higher education institutions (HEIs).

Conclusion- 1.8.2

Students in the Science and Art Streams likely share similar foundational academic experiences, focusing on theoretical understanding and analytical skills over vocational or specialized training. The teaching methods and evaluation criteria in these streams may also align, contributing to a consistent perception among students.

Finding- 1.8.3

Students at Central University had a higher perception, but Deemed University students had a lower perception of the "Teaching-Learning and Evaluation Practices."

Conclusion- 1.8.3

Students at Central University have a higher perception due to better infrastructure, faculty quality, and teaching methodologies. Conversely, students at the Deemed University have a lower perception, likely because of fewer resources, less experienced faculty, or inadequate teaching methods.

Finding- 1.8.4

Students' perception of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by higher education institutions (HEIs) was independent of the interaction between the Levels of Program and Discipline.

Conclusion- 1.8.4

Standardised teaching methods and evaluation criteria across various program levels and disciplines could lead to consistent experiences and perceptions among students. Additionally, emphasising foundational knowledge and theoretical understanding, rather than specialized skills, in science and arts streams might foster a uniform perception of teaching quality and effectiveness.

Finding- 1.8.5

Non-professional undergraduate students at Central University had a higher perception of "Teaching-Learning and Evaluation Practices." In comparison, those at Deemed University had a lower perception. Conversely, non-professional postgraduate students at State and Private Universities had a higher perception, whereas those at Deemed University had a lower perception of "Teaching-Learning and Evaluation Practices."

Conclusion- 1.8.5

Due to superior infrastructure, experienced faculty, and effective teaching methodologies, non-professional undergraduate students at Central University have a higher perception. In contrast, those at Deemed University have a lower perception due to limited resources and less effective teaching practices. Non-professional postgraduate students at state and private universities have a higher perception because of better research opportunities and academic support. However, the perception of postgraduate students at Deemed Universities is low due to inadequate resources and low support for advanced studies.

Finding- 1.8.6

science stream students at Central University had a higher perception of "Teaching-Learning and Evaluation Practices," while those at Deemed University had a lower perception. Conversely, arts stream students at Private University had a higher perception, while those at Deemed University had a lower perception of "Teaching-Learning and Evaluation Practices."

Conclusion- 1.8.6

Science stream students at Central University have a higher perception due to better resources, faculty expertise, and teaching methodologies tailored to scientific education. In contrast, those at Deemed University have a lower perception due to limited resources and less effective teaching practices. Similarly, arts stream students at Private Universities have a higher perception, attributed to personalised attention, diverse course offerings, and supportive learning environments. Conversely, arts stream students at Deemed University have a lower perception due to insufficient resources and less supportive academic environments.

Finding- 1.8.7

Students' perceptions of teaching-learning and evaluation practices in higher education institutions (HEIs) were independent of interactions among Levels of Program, Discipline, and Types of Institution.

Conclusion- 1.8.7

Evaluation methodology might lack the necessary nuance to identify differences. Additionally, this independence might indicate a shared quality of teaching or common factors influencing students' perceptions, such as faculty quality and support services, across different categories.

(II) Based on the perception of teachers

Finding- 2.1.1

Non-professional undergraduate and postgraduate program teachers have similar perceptions of the first indicator, "Student Enrollment and Profile," in higher education institutions' teaching-learning and evaluation practices.

Conclusion- 2.1.1

Teachers' experiences and expectations of student profiles might be consistent across different program levels. This uniformity could also reflect standard institutional policies and support systems that influence how teachers perceive and engage with student enrollment and profiles, resulting in similar perceptions across different teaching levels.

Finding- 2.1.2

Art stream teachers had a higher perception of "student enrollment and profile" than science stream teachers.

Conclusion- 2.1.2

Art stream teachers have a higher perception because art programs have better alignment between student interests and enrollment trends, and these departments have more effective communication and support systems. In contrast, science stream teachers have a lower perception, possibly due to high enrollment pressure, resource limitations, or less effective support systems for managing student diversity and enrollment in science programs.

Finding- 2.1.3

Teachers in central, state, deemed, and private universities have similar perceptions towards the first indicator, "Student Enrollment and Profile," in the teaching-learning and evaluation practices of higher education institutions (HEIs).

Conclusion- 2.1.3

Teachers in central, state, deemed and private universities may have similar perceptions towards "Student Enrollment and Profile" due to standardized enrollment criteria and processes across these institutions. Higher education policies and regulatory frameworks often ensure consistency in student demographics and profiles.

Finding- 2.1.4

The independence of teachers' perceptions regarding "Student Enrollment and Profile" in HEIs from the interaction between program levels and disciplines.

Conclusion- 2.1.4

The criteria for evaluating "student enrollment and profile" may be consistently applied across different program levels and disciplines, leading to similar perceptions. The nature of student enrollment and profile management in HEIs might be standardized, minimizing variation in perceptions.

Finding- 2.1.5

Perception of teachers towards first indicator “Student Enrollment and Profile” of the teaching- learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) was found to be independent of interaction between the Levels of Program and Types of Institution.

Conclusion- 2.1.5

The criteria for evaluating student enrollment and profile may be consistently applied across different program levels and types of institutions, leading to similar perceptions. Secondly, the nature of student enrollment and profile management in HEIs might be standardized, minimizing variation in perceptions.

Finding- 2.1.6

Perception of teachers towards first indicator “Student Enrollment and Profile” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) was found to be independent of interaction between the Discipline and Types of Institution.

Conclusion- 2.1.6

The criteria for evaluating student enrollment and profile may be consistently applied across different disciplines and types of institutions, leading to similar perceptions. Secondly, the nature of student enrollment and profile management in HEIs might be standardized, minimizing variation in perceptions.

Finding- 2.1.7

Perception of teachers towards first indicator “Student Enrollment and Profile” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) was found to be independent of interaction among the Levels of Program, Discipline and Types of Institution.

Conclusion- 2.1.7

The criteria for evaluating student enrollment and profile may be consistently applied across different programs, disciplines, and institution types, leading to similar perceptions. Secondly, the nature of student enrollment and profile management in HEIs might be standardized, minimizing variation in perceptions.

Finding- 2.2.1

Teachers teaching in Non-Professional Undergraduate and Postgraduate Program were found to have the perception of teachers towards second indicator “Catering to Student Diversity” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) to the same extent.

Conclusion- 2.2.1

Consistent professional development and training programs often emphasize inclusive teaching strategies, resulting in uniform approaches to student diversity. Additionally, comparable institutional support systems and resources for managing diverse student needs contribute to the consistency in teachers' experiences and perceptions.

Finding- 2.2.2

Teachers teaching in Science Stream and Art Stream were found to have the perception of teachers towards second indicator “Catering to Student Diversity” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) to the same extent.

Conclusion- 2.2.2

Teachers in the Science and Arts Streams have similar perceptions of "Catering to Student Diversity" because higher education institutions often employ standardized policies and practices to address diversity. Professional development programs across disciplines usually emphasize inclusive teaching strategies, promoting a common approach to managing diverse student needs.

Finding- 2.2.3

Teachers at Central University have a higher perception of "Catering to Student Diversity," while teachers at Deemed University have a lower perception.

Conclusion- 2.2.3

Teachers at Central University often have a higher perception of "Catering to Student Diversity" due to more excellent institutional support, resources, and inclusive policies that effectively address diverse student needs. In contrast, teachers at Deemed University may have a lower perception because these institutions often face challenges such as limited resources, inconsistent administrative support, and less comprehensive diversity policies.

Finding- 2.2.4

Teachers' perception towards second indicator “Catering to Student Diversity” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) was found to be independent of interaction between the Levels of Program and Discipline.

Conclusion- 2.2.4

HEIs may have established inclusive teaching practices and policies uniformly implemented across different program levels and disciplines, resulting in consistent perceptions. Secondly, recognising student diversity as a crucial component of effective education might be deeply embedded in the institutional ethos, promoting a shared understanding and approach across various contexts.

Finding- 2.2.5

Perception of teachers towards second indicator “Catering to Student Diversity” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) was found to be independent of interaction between the Levels of Program and Types of Institution.

Conclusion- 2.2.5

The main reason might be the uniformity in institutional policies and practices regarding student diversity across different program levels and types of institutions. Development programs and training often emphasize inclusive teaching strategies

applicable to all kinds of institutions, leading to consistent approaches to addressing student diversity.

Finding- 2.2.6

Perception of teachers towards second indicator “Catering to Student Diversity” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) was found to be independent of interaction between the Levels of Program and Types of Institution.

Conclusion- 2.2.6

The reason might be the standardization of policies and practices related to student diversity across different disciplines and types of institutions. Moreover, the assessment methodologies used to measure perceptions may not differentiate between disciplines and types of institutions, contributing to the perception of independence.

Finding- 2.2.7

Perception of teachers towards second indicator “Catering to Student Diversity” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) was found to be independent of interaction among the Levels of Program, Discipline and Types of Institution.

Conclusion- 2.2.7

The reason might be the standardization of policies and practices related to student diversity across different program levels, disciplines, and types of institutions. On the other hand, various programs and training often emphasize inclusive teaching strategies applicable across multiple disciplines and institution types, leading to a consistent approach to addressing student diversity.

Finding- 2.3.1

Teachers instructing in Non-Professional Undergraduate and Postgraduate Programs exhibited similar perceptions regarding the third indicator "Teaching- Learning Process" of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices in higher education institutions (HEIs).

Conclusion- 2.3.1

Teachers in Non-Professional Undergraduate and Postgraduate Programs may share similar perceptions of the "Teaching-Learning Process" due to a standardized curriculum, uniform teaching methodologies, consistent assessment practices, similar training, and a relatively homogenous student cohort.

Finding- 2.3.2

Teachers in both the Science and Art streams have similar perceptions regarding the third indicator "Teaching-Learning Process," of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices in higher education institutions (HEIs).

Conclusion- 2.3.2

Teachers in the Science and Art streams may share similar perceptions of the "Teaching-Learning Process" due to standard institutional policies, standardized

evaluation criteria, and shared professional development programs. Higher education institutions' overarching educational framework and teaching philosophies often promote a consistent pedagogical approach across different disciplines.

Finding- 2.3.3

Teachers in central, state, deemed, and private universities have similar perceptions regarding the third indicator, "Teaching-Learning Process," of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices in higher education institutions (HEIs).

Conclusion- 2.3.3

Teachers in central, state, deemed, and private universities may have similar perceptions of the "Teaching-Learning Process" due to uniform accreditation standards, common regulatory frameworks, and similar professional development opportunities.

Finding- 2.3.4

Teachers' perceptions of the third indicator "Teaching-Learning Process" of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices in higher education institutions (HEIs) are independent of the interaction between Levels of Program and Discipline.

Conclusion- 2.3.4

Teachers' perceptions of the "Teaching-Learning Process" may be independent of the interaction between Levels of Program and Discipline due to the overarching focus on pedagogy and educational outcomes in higher education institutions (HEIs).

Finding- 2.3.5

Perception of teachers towards the third indicator "Teaching-Learning Process" of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) was found to be independent of interaction between the Levels of Program and Types of Institution.

Conclusion- 2.3.5

Standardized and consistently applied pedagogical methods and approaches in teaching-learning across different program levels and institution types lead to similar perceptions. Secondly, emphasising practical teaching strategies and student engagement is crucial in higher education, fostering a shared understanding and evaluation criteria across diverse contexts.

Finding- 2.3.6

Teachers' perceptions of the third indicator, "Teaching- Learning Process," in the teaching-learning and evaluation practices of higher education institutions (HEIs) are independent of the interaction between Levels of Program and Types of Institution.

Conclusion- 2.3.6

Teachers' perceptions of the "Teaching-Learning Process" may be independent of the interaction between Levels of Program and Types of Institution due to the standardized teaching practices and evaluation methods across different program levels and institutions.

Finding- 2.3.7

perception of teachers towards the third indicator “Teaching-Learning Process” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) was found to be independent of interaction among the Levels of Program, Discipline and Types of Institution.

Conclusion-2.3.7

Standardized and accepted pedagogical approaches and methods used in teaching-learning across different programs, disciplines, and institution types lead to consistent perceptions. Secondly, focusing on effective teaching strategies and student engagement is fundamental to higher education, fostering a shared understanding and evaluation criteria across diverse contexts.

Finding- 2.4.1

Teachers instructing in Non-Professional Undergraduate and Postgraduate Programs have similar perceptions regarding the fourth indicator, "Teacher Profile and Quality," of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices in higher education institutions (HEIs)

Conclusion- 2.4.1

Teachers in Non-Professional Undergraduate and Postgraduate Programs may share similar perceptions of the "Teacher Profile and Quality" indicator due to standardised hiring practices and professional development opportunities across these programs.

Finding- 2.4.2

Teachers instructing in the Science and Art streams have similar perceptions regarding the fourth indicator, "Teacher Profile and Quality," of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices in higher education institutions (HEIs).

Conclusion- 2.4.2

Teachers in the Science and Art streams may share similar perceptions of the "Teacher Profile and Quality" indicator due to common hiring criteria, professional development standards, and evaluation protocols across these streams.

Finding- 2.4.3

Teachers teaching in central universities, state universities, deemed universities, and private universities have similar perceptions regarding the fourth indicator, "Teacher Profile and Quality," of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices in higher education institutions (HEIs).

Conclusion- 2.4.3

The focus on academic excellence and student outcomes in higher education institutions transcends institutional differences, further aligning perceptions among teachers. Institutional policies emphasising quality teaching and faculty qualifications also contribute to this consistency.

Finding- 2.4.4

Teachers' perception of the fourth indicator, "Teacher Profile and Quality," of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices in higher education institutions (HEIs) is independent of the interaction between levels of program and discipline.

Conclusion- 2.4.4

Teachers' perceptions of the "Teacher Profile and Quality" indicator being independent of the interaction between Levels of Program and Discipline may stem from consistent hiring standards and professional development practices across different programs and disciplines.

Finding- 2.4.5

Perception of teachers towards the fourth indicator "Teacher Profile and Quality" of the teaching- learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) was found to be independent of interaction between the Levels of Program and Types of Institution.

Conclusion- 2.4.5

Uniform application of teacher quality standards and evaluation criteria across various programs and institution types leads to consistent perceptions. Secondly, the nature of teacher training and professional development in HEIs might promote a standardized view of what constitutes a good teacher, reducing variation in perceptions.

Finding- 2.4.6

Perception of teachers towards fourth indicator "Teacher Profile and Quality" of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) was found to be independent of interaction between the Levels of Program and Types of Institution.

Conclusion- 2.4.6

Well-defined and consistently applied criteria for evaluating teacher profile and quality across different programs and institutions lead to similar perceptions. Secondly, uniform professional standards and qualifications required for HEI teachers minimize variation in perceptions.

Finding- 2.4.7

Teachers towards the fourth indicator "Teacher Profile and Quality" of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) was found to be independent of interaction among the Levels of Program, Discipline and Types of Institution.

Conclusion- 2.4.7

Teacher quality perception may be more influenced by individual experiences and professional standards than program or institutional characteristics. Secondly, the criteria for evaluating teacher quality might be more applicable across disciplines and institution types.

Finding- 2.5.1

Teachers instructing in Non-Professional Undergraduate and Postgraduate Programs held similar perceptions regarding the fifth indicator, "Evaluation Process and Reforms," of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices in higher education institutions (HEIs).

Conclusion- 2.5.1

This may be due to standardised evaluation procedures and uniform reforms across these programs. The institutional focus on enhancing evaluation methods could also align teachers' perceptions.

Finding- 2.5.2

Teachers in both the Science and Art streams held similar perceptions regarding the fifth indicator, "Evaluation Process and Reforms," of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by higher education institutions (HEIs).

Conclusion- 2.5.2

Development programs and training initiatives often emphasize uniformity in evaluation practices, fostering a consistent understanding among teachers. The overarching goal of improving evaluation processes and implementing reforms uniformly across HEIs further contributes to this alignment.

Finding- 2.5.3

Teachers in central universities, state universities, deemed universities, and private universities held similar perceptions regarding the fifth indicator "Evaluation Process and Reforms" of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices in higher education institutions (HEIs).

Conclusion- 2.5.3

professional development programs and training often stress uniformity in evaluation methods, promoting a consistent understanding among teachers.

Finding- 2.5.4

Arts stream teachers in the non-professional undergraduate program had a higher perception of the "Evaluation Process and Reforms," while those in the non-professional postgraduate program had a lower perception. Conversely, science stream teachers in the non professional postgraduate program had a higher perception. In contrast, non-professional undergraduate students had a lower perception of the "Evaluation Process and Reforms."

Conclusion- 2.5.4

Arts undergraduate programs likely use well-established evaluation methods familiar to teachers, fostering their confidence and comfort with the process. In contrast, postgraduate programs may introduce newer, more complex evaluation methods, which can confuse arts teachers if they lack adequate training. This disparity in familiarity and training results in higher perceptions of the evaluation process in undergraduate programs and lower perceptions in postgraduate programs. Science

stream teachers in non-professional postgraduate programs have a higher perception of the "Evaluation Process and Reforms" because these programs offer advanced, research-driven evaluation methods that align with their expertise and academic goals. Conversely, non-professional undergraduate students have a lower perception due to broader, less specialised evaluation processes that may seem less relevant to their immediate academic interests.

Finding-2. 5.5

Perception of teachers towards the fifth indicator “Evaluation Process and Reforms” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) was found to be independent of interaction between the Levels of Program and Types of Institution.

Conclusion- 2.5.5

The nature of evaluation processes and reforms varies widely across programs and institutions, resulting in differing perspectives. Secondly, the autonomy granted to departments and faculties within HEIs enables customized evaluation practices, thereby enhancing the independence of perception.

Finding- 2.5.6

Teachers' perceptions of the fifth indicator, "Evaluation Process and Reforms," in the teaching-learning and evaluation practices of higher education institutions (HEIs) are independent of the interaction between Levels of Program and Types of Institution.

Conclusion- 2.5.6

Standardized evaluation methods and reforms implemented uniformly across different program levels and types of institutions could lead to consistent perceptions. Additionally, development programs often emphasize uniformity in evaluation practices, fostering a shared understanding among teachers.

Finding- 2.5.7

Perception of teachers towards the fifth indicator “Evaluation Process and Reforms” of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) was found to be independent of interaction among the Levels of Program, Discipline and Types of Institution.

Conclusion- 2.5.7

It can be concluded that standardized assessment policies and practices ensure consistency across higher education institutions. Development programs emphasize uniform assessment strategies applied across different disciplines and institution types.

Finding- 2.6.1

Teachers instructing in Non-Professional Undergraduate and Postgraduate Programs hold similar perceptions regarding the sixth indicator "Student Performance and Learning Outcomes" of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices in higher education institutions (HEIs).

Conclusion- 2.6.1

Similar perceptions might be due to consistent evaluation standards and academic expectations across these programs. The emphasis on educational quality and outcomes in HEIs also promotes a standardized approach to assessing student performance, leading to a uniform perception among teachers.

Finding- 2.6.2

Teachers in the Science Stream and Art Stream share similar perceptions regarding the sixth indicator, "Student Performance and Learning Outcomes," of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices in higher education institutions (HEIs).

Conclusion- 2.6.2

Teachers in the Science and Art streams likely share similar perceptions regarding student performance and learning outcomes due to common assessment practices and academic standards across these disciplines. The emphasis on quality education and outcomes in HEIs also promotes a standardized approach to evaluating student performance, leading to a consistent perception among teachers.

Finding- 2.6.3

Teachers in central universities, state universities, deemed universities, and private universities hold similar perceptions regarding the sixth indicator "Student Performance and Learning Outcomes" of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices in higher education institutions (HEIs).

Conclusion- 2.6.3

Teachers in various types of universities likely share similar perceptions regarding student performance and learning outcomes due to standardized assessment practices and academic expectations across these institutions. Additionally, emphasising educational quality and outcomes in higher education institutions promotes a uniform approach to evaluating student performance, leading to a consistent perception among teachers.

Finding- 2.6.4

Teachers' perception towards the sixth indicator "Student Performance and Learning Outcomes" of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by higher education institutions (HEIs) was independent of the interaction between the Levels of Program and Discipline.

Conclusion- 2.6.4

Standardised evaluation methods and criteria are often applied uniformly across different programs and disciplines, leading to consistent perceptions. Additionally, professional development programs usually emphasize a uniform approach to evaluating student performance, fostering a shared understanding among teachers.

Finding- 2.6.5

Perception of teachers towards the sixth indicator "Student Performance and Learning Outcomes" of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by

Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) was found to be independent of interaction between the Levels of Program and Types of Institution.

Conclusion- 2.6.5

Teachers' perceptions of "Student Performance and Learning Outcomes" are consistent across program levels and institution types due to standardized policies, uniform assessment strategies, and universally applicable institutional guidelines. These factors ensure that evaluation practices and learning outcome measures are perceived similarly, regardless of the program level or institution type.

Finding- 2.6.6

teachers' perception of the sixth indicator, "Student Performance and Learning Outcomes," in the teaching-learning and evaluation practices of higher education institutions (HEIs) is independent of the interaction between the Levels of Program and Types of Institution.

Conclusion- 2.6.6

Standardized assessment practices and academic expectations are often consistent across various programs and institutions, leading to uniform perceptions. Additionally, the overarching focus on enhancing student outcomes and learning experiences in HEIs encourages a standardized approach to evaluating student performance, fostering a shared perception among teachers.

Finding- 2.6.7

perception of teachers towards the sixth indicator "Student Performance and Learning Outcomes" of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) was found to be independent of interaction among the Levels of Program, Discipline and Types of Institution.

Conclusion- 2.6.7

Teachers' perceptions toward the sixth indicator, "student performance and learning outcomes," can be attributed to several factors independent of the interactions between program levels and institution types in higher education institutions (HEIs). These factors may include the standardized nature of assessment practices across various program levels and institution types, the emphasis on common academic standards and outcomes for all programs and institutions, and the pervasive influence of educational policies and frameworks that steer teaching, learning, and assessment practices regardless of specific program or institution characteristics.

Finding- 2.7.1

Teachers instructing in Non-Professional Undergraduate and Postgraduate Programs were found to have similar perceptions of the seventh indicator, "Student Satisfaction Survey," in the teaching-learning and evaluation practices of higher education institutions (HEIs).

Conclusion- 2.7.1

Teachers in Non-Professional Undergraduate and Postgraduate Programs likely share similar perceptions regarding the seventh indicator, "Student Satisfaction Survey," due to common institutional goals and practices to enhance student satisfaction. These programs often implement standardized approaches to gather feedback and assess student satisfaction, leading to consistent perceptions among teachers.

Finding- 2.7.2

Teachers teaching in Science Stream and Art Stream were found to have the perception of teachers towards seventh indicator "Student Satisfaction Survey" of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) to the same extent.

Conclusion- 2.7.2

The similar perception of teachers in the Science and Arts Streams toward "Student Satisfaction Survey" in teaching-learning and evaluation practices can be attributed to several factors. These may include the common goals of enhancing student learning experiences and outcomes, the shared commitment to improving teaching practices, the influence of institutional policies and guidelines that prioritize student feedback and satisfaction, and the professional ethos that emphasizes the importance of student centred education.

Finding- 2.7.3

Teachers at Central University had a higher perception. In contrast, those at State, Deemed, and Private Universities had a lower perception of the "Student Satisfaction Survey."

Conclusion- 2.7.3

Teachers at Central Universities have a higher perception of the "Student Satisfaction Survey" because these institutions prioritize student feedback and use survey results to improve educational practices, making teachers feel valued and supported. In contrast, state, deemed, and private universities may place less emphasis on these surveys or struggle with effectively implementing and acting on feedback, leading to lower teacher perception. This disparity in institutional priorities and capabilities results in varying levels of teacher appreciation and trust in the survey process across different types of universities.

Finding- 2.7.4

Teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) was found to be independent of interaction between the Levels of Program and Discipline.

Conclusion- 2.7.4

Initially, the emphasis on student satisfaction and feedback is a ubiquitous consideration, irrespective of the program's level or discipline, demonstrating a mutual dedication to enhancing educational quality. Moreover, institutional policies and guidelines frequently highlight the significance of student

Finding- 2.7.5

Teachers' perceptions of the seventh indicator, "Student Satisfaction Survey," in the teaching-learning and evaluation practices of higher education institutions (HEIs) were independent of the interaction between the Levels of Program and Types of Institution.

Conclusion- 2.7.5

student satisfaction surveys and their evaluation criteria might be standardized across program levels and institution types. Secondly, emphasising student feedback and satisfaction in HEIs could lead to a uniform understanding and approach among teachers from various program levels and institution types.

Finding- 2.7.6

Perception of teachers towards seventh indicator "Student Satisfaction Survey" of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) was found to be independent of interaction between the Levels of Program and Types of Institution.

Conclusion- 2.7.6

Objective of enhancing student experiences and outcomes transcends program levels and institution types, fostering a shared commitment to educational improvement. Secondly, institutional policies and guidelines often prioritize student feedback, impacting all teachers regardless of their teaching context.

Finding- 2.7.7

Perception of teachers towards the seventh indicator "Student Satisfaction Survey" of the teaching-learning and evaluation practices acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) was found to be independent of interaction among the Levels of Program, Discipline and Types of Institution.

Conclusion- 2.7.7

The survey questions may be designed to capture universal aspects of student satisfaction that are not significantly influenced by the specific program, discipline, or type of institution. Secondly, the survey methodology and administration might be standardized across different categories, ensuring consistency and minimizing bias.

Finding- 2.8.1

Non-Professional Undergraduate and Postgraduate Program teachers had a similar perception of the "Teaching-Learning and Evaluation Practices" implemented by higher education institutions (HEIs).

Conclusion- 2.8.1

The similarity in perception among teachers in Non- Professional Undergraduate and Postgraduate Programs can be attributed to their standardized training and professional development, which promote a consistent understanding of teaching-learning and evaluation practices.

Finding- 2.8.2

Teachers in the Science and Arts Streams had similar perceptions of the "Teaching-Learning and Evaluation Practices" implemented by higher education institutions (HEIs).

Conclusion- 2.8.2

Science and Arts stream teachers emphasize critical thinking, analysis, and application of concepts, necessitating similar teaching approaches. Secondly, evaluation methods in both streams often prioritize understanding and application over rote memorization.

Finding- 2.8.3

teachers at central, state, deemed, and private universities share similar perceptions regarding the "Teaching-Learning and Evaluation Practices" employed by higher education institutions (HEIs).

Conclusion- 2.8.3

Teachers at central, state, deemed, and private universities share similar perceptions of "Teaching-Learning and Evaluation Practices" due to standardized frameworks and guidelines from accreditation bodies and educational authorities.

Finding- 2.8.4

Teachers in the arts stream undergraduate program had a higher perception, while those in the postgraduate program had a lower perception toward "Teaching-Learning and Evaluation Practices." In contrast, science stream teachers in the postgraduate program had a higher perception, while those in the undergraduate program had a lower perception of "Teaching-Learning and Evaluation Practices."

Conclusion- 2.8.4

Undergraduate programs prioritize establishing a broad foundational knowledge base and the development of skills, aspects that teachers may view more favourably. Conversely, postgraduate programs typically concentrate on specialized, in-depth learning, which could be seen as more demanding or challenging, possibly resulting in a less favourable perception. Postgraduate science programs often explore specialized areas in greater depth, which teachers may value more, resulting in a more positive perception. Conversely, undergraduate programs tend to concentrate on foundational knowledge and broader skill development, which may be less advanced or stimulating, leading to a less favourable perception.

Finding- 2.8.5

Teachers' perceptions of the "Teaching-Learning and Evaluation Practices" in higher education institutions (HEIs) are independent of the interaction between program levels and types of institutions.

Conclusion- 2.8.5

Standardized teaching-learning, and evaluation practices are consistently applied across different institutions and program levels. Accreditation bodies and educational policies ensure these standards, promoting uniformity.

Finding- 2.8.6

Teachers' perceptions of the “Teaching-Learning and Evaluation Practices” in higher education institutions (HEIs) are independent of the interaction between program levels and types of institutions

Conclusion- 2.8.6

This independence occurs because higher education's fundamental teaching-learning and evaluation methods are typically standardized across institutions and program levels. Accreditation bodies and educational policies are crucial in maintaining these standards and ensuring consistency.

Finding- 2.8.7

The perception of teachers towards the “Teaching-Learning and Evaluation Practices” acquired by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) was found to be independent of interaction among the Levels of Program, Discipline and Types of Institution.

Conclusion- 2.8.7

These include the diverse nature of programs and disciplines, each with unique requirements and methodologies. Institutional types vary widely in their approaches and priorities, leading to differing perspectives.

Finding and Conclusion of Qualitative Analysis-

(I) Based on the Student’s Interview

Finding 1

In the present study, 80% of the participants reported satisfaction with their university's admission process, while 20% expressed dissatisfaction. Several reasons contribute to students' dissatisfaction with the admission process. Participants provided valuable feedback on the facilities available for students with disabilities during the admission process, as well as on the accessibility of admission-related information published by universities. Additionally, universities often implement a range of facilities and initiatives to increase the enrollment of female students.

Conclusion 1:

Overall, these insights highlight the importance of universities ensuring a transparent, fair, and inclusive admission process to meet the diverse needs of students.

Finding 2

Maintaining student diversity through admissions is essential for fostering a vibrant and inclusive university community. Participants noted that universities are making significant efforts to achieve this goal. Institutions implement a variety of programs and strategies to address the needs of students from diverse cultural, linguistic, and geographic backgrounds.

Conclusion 2:

Overall, universities play a crucial role in building an inclusive society through their initiatives and practices that promote diversity and inclusion.

Finding 3-

Teachers use a variety of teaching strategies beyond traditional lectures at both undergraduate and postgraduate levels to engage students and enhance learning. Universities frequently revise their curricula to improve the efficiency of the teaching-learning process.

Conclusion 3:

Efforts by teachers and universities contribute to a more engaging and effective teaching-learning process, preparing students for success in their academic and professional endeavours.

Finding 4

Teachers use a variety of teaching strategies beyond traditional lectures at both undergraduate and postgraduate levels to engage students and enhance learning. Universities frequently revise their curricula to improve the efficiency of the teaching-learning process.

Conclusion 4:

It is concluded that teachers in universities have significant flexibility and responsibility in shaping the learning environment to meet the needs of their students.

Finding 5

Higher educational institutions in Uttar Pradesh are making various efforts to bring transparency to the evaluation process. Participants provided multiple responses on this matter. In universities, teachers employ different methods to identify and support slow learners. Educational institutions also take several steps to enhance both academic and co-academic skills.

Conclusion 5:

Extracurricular and co-curricular activities, along with career counselling services, further contribute to the holistic development of students. Overall, these efforts aim to equip students with the necessary skills and knowledge for their future endeavours.

Finding 6

Universities undertake various initiatives to improve student learning outcomes and performance. Universities also strive to maintain a positive relationship with society and work to develop students' life skills. Many universities periodically organize community engagement programs involving faculty and students in volunteer work.

Conclusion 6:

Over all, these efforts collectively contribute to creating a holistic educational environment that prepares students for success in their academic pursuits and beyond.

Finding 7

The implementation of suggestions from student satisfaction surveys may vary over time due to several factors. If the tips are vague or incomplete, it can be challenging for the university administration to act on them.

Conclusion 7:

Student satisfaction surveys play an essential role in ensuring that student voices are heard and considered in university decision-making processes.

Overall Analysis

The researcher employed triangulation analysis by simultaneously examining both quantitative and qualitative data. The findings revealed that the results from the quantitative and qualitative data analysis supported each other on specific issues, questions, and objectives, indicating that the results were aligned.

EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS

Microscopic studies have been conducted on the teaching-learning and evaluation practices in various higher education institutions in Uttar Pradesh. This study aims to fill a gap in the existing research. The findings will benefit teachers, students, educational institutions, researchers, policymakers, the University Grants Commission (UGC), curriculum development and pedagogical innovations, faculty development programs, research and innovation, and assessment and evaluation reforms.

Limitations of the Research-

1. The researcher included only traditional courses, excluding vocational ones. Therefore, the results are limited and applicable solely to traditional courses.
2. University students and teachers were the respondents in this research. If college respondents had been included, the results might have differed.
3. Only students were selected for interviews. Including teachers' opinions could have yielded more accurate results.
4. Using the observation technique for data collection might have produced keen and more insightful results.
5. Increasing the sample size would have provided a greater diversity of information, potentially leading to improved results.

Suggestions for Further Research

Research is a dynamic process that constantly changes with new findings and understandings. Since every study is the foundation for subsequent research, it is never finished. The saying "we live in the past in the present for the future" sums up research perfectly.

In light of this study, several recommendations may be made to increase the effect and breadth of upcoming research:

- Comparative Evaluation Among Different University Types
- Regional Growth
- Adding Other Professions to the List
- Examination at Uttar Pradesh Colleges
- Assessment in Colleges with NAAC Accreditation

BIBLIOGRAPHY**Journals/Articles**

- Aithal, P. S., & Kumar, P. M. (2016). Teaching-learning process in higher education institutions. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Modern Education*, 2(1), 662–676. <http://www.rdmodernresearch.org>
- Alemu, R. (2016). Multimedia content for the enhancement of teaching and learning process in Ethiopian higher education institutions. *International Journal of Electronics, Electrical and Computational System*, 5(3), 30–39. <https://doi.org/10.0000/3mp7y-537>
- Ashwin, P. (2008). Accounting for structure and agency in “close-up” research on higher education teaching, learning, and assessment. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 47(3), 151–158. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2008.01.002>
- Chan, C. K., Luk, L. Y., & Zeng, M. (2014). Teachers' perceptions of student evaluations of teaching. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 20(4), 275–289. doi: 10.1080/13562510903050137
- Chua, C. (2004). Perception of quality in higher education. In *Proceedings of the Australian Universities Quality Forum (AUQA Occasional Publication)*. <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.1253578&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- Gomez, L. F., & Valdes, M. G. (2019). The evaluation of teacher performance in higher education. *Propositos y Representaciones*, 7(2), 479–515. http://www.scielo.org.pe/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S2307
- Gordillo, J. J. T., Aguila, N. M., & Jimenez, J. G. (2020). Improving the university teaching learning process with ECO methodology: Teachers' perceptions. *PLOS ONE*, <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0237712>
- Hanefar, S. B. M., Anny, N. Z., & Rahman, M. S. (2022). Enhancing teaching and learning in higher education through formative assessment: Teachers' perceptions. *International Journal of Assessment Tools in Education*, 9(1), 61–79.
- Kebritchi, M., Lipschuetz, A., & Santiago, L. (2017). Issues and challenges for teaching successful online courses in higher education. *Journal of Educational Technology Systems*, 46(1), 4–29. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047239516661713>
- Kreitzer, R. J., & Sweet-Cushman, J. (2022). Evaluating student evaluations of teaching: A review of measurement and equity bias in SETs and recommendations for ethical reform. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 20, 73–84.
- Mandavkar, P. (2019). Reform process in higher education and need of assessment and accreditation. *Research Journal of India*, 6(2), 1–6.

- Mishra, L., & Raina, R. L. (2021). Online teaching effectiveness in higher education: Faculty perspectives in India. *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice*, 18(8), 1-18.
- Petare, P. A. (2016). A case study on teaching learning (NAAC criteria 2:3) practices with reference to Sanjay Ghodawat Institute, Kolhapur. *International Journal of Business and Administration Research Review*, 1(1), 32–35.
- Pillai, V. N. R. (2004). Assessment and Accreditation of Institutions by NAAC: A total analysis of the Accreditation Process, *University News*, 42(33), 2-6.
- Rao, M. J. D. (2015). Teaching learning and evaluation practices in undergraduate colleges: Ideals and realities. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 20(3), 5-6. <https://doi.org/10.9790/0837-20380506>
- Sahoo, P. K., & Yadav, D. (2020). *Study of innovative teaching learning and evaluation practices in the best rated higher education institutions by 'NAAC' (Major Research Project)*. University of Allahabad.
- Sawant, D. G. (2016). Role of IQAC in maintaining quality standards in teaching, learning and evaluation. *Pacific Science Review B: Humanities and Social Sciences*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psrb.2016.09.016>

Webliography

- Criterion 2: teaching learning and evaluation. Retrieved from (15 Dec, 2023) <https://jvjaincollege.com/index.php/teaching-learning-and-evaluation/>
- Teaching-Learning Process and evaluation. Retrieved from (17 Dec, 2023) <https://jvjaincollege.com/index.php/teaching-learning-and-evaluation/>

Dissertation

- Chowdhary, S. (2012). *Impact of NAAC's Assessment and accreditation on some of the accredited colleges under Gauhati University - A study* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Gauhati University.

Thesis

- Kaur, M. (2017). *Study of quality assessment of teaching-learning process through NAAC criteria in universities of Punjab* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Banasthali Vidyapith. <http://hdl.handle.net/10603/254844>
- Sharma, S. (2017). *Role of NAAC accreditation in quality improvement: an evaluative study of north Indian universities* [Doctoral dissertation]. Lovely Professional University, Punjab.

Books

- Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2017). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (3rd Ed.). SAGE Publications. U.K.
- Sharma, R. A. (2017). *Foundamentals of Educational Research and statistics*, Mohan print