

## Assessment of Quality Status in Management Institutes

Dr. A. P. Unde<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Director, PIRENS IBMA, Loni

### ABSTRACT

In the present dynamic and competitive environment, business organizations are more focused on quality manpower with managerial skills. Management education is capable of providing such skills, but does it really able to produce quality output. Quality assurance and sustenance is possible with the help adopting and implementing Total Quality Management (TQM) philosophy and practices. Therefore, need to assess present status of quality in management institutes. This study and paper tried to assess various quality perspectives perceived by the internal stakeholders (Head, faculty members, support-staff & students) of the management institutes. The present study also assesses the students' outlook about management program for the strategic planning in the institutes. From the study it is revealed that, quality of management institutes are at average level and there is need to improve to meet the expectations of business organizations.

**Key words:** : Management-education, Management Institutes, Quality, TQM

### Introduction

Quality improvement and quality assurance are among the most complicated problems facing higher education, because they touch on almost every aspect of the system. Likewise quality in management education, how to enhance it and how to evaluate it, has been placed squarely on the contemporary agenda in higher education. 'Total Quality Management (TQM)' is an alternative methodology/philosophy for governance. It is high time to focus on quality assurance and sustenance, which is possible only if all stakeholders, especially the students play their proper role and discharge responsibilities effectively. To impart quality education, management institutes should have seven pre-requisites: qualitative teachers, qualitative input, qualitative teaching and evaluation, qualitative infrastructure, qualitative syllabus, qualitative leadership and qualitative research. Management education institutions struggle to improve their traditional approaches and pedagogies in order to achieve ever-greater value propositions, they will need to acquire policies which make them different from their competitors and show their value. The most competitive business schools are already looking for standardize chances as well as enhanced quality programmes which provide them an opportunity to get a complete understanding of their strengths and weaknesses, to develop new and better programmes, and to prove the level of their offerings to the market through accreditations. Students and faculty will also benefit greatly from having tools that aid them in their choice of institution and programme. The successful business schools of the future will offer innovative programmes, backed by the appropriate resources, to guarantee an excellent faculty body, an international experience and a multi-cultural environment to its students. The top business schools of the future will not only implement changes to remain competitive, but they will seek accreditation and quality improvement programmes to prove to the market that they are committed to excellence and innovation.

### Need of the Study

Several issues trouble quality standards in management education which are from the operational constraints and they are coordinated by attracting quality faculty and students, which leads to the need for increasing interactions with the industry to ensure currency of the course material. Mainly, students assume the business school education is a way of getting a high paying job; and gaining the required skills and knowledge is of secondary importance. Business schools have, in turn, been investing tremendous efforts to ensure that their students get placed, rather than in inculcating employable skills. Considering the dynamics of external environment, rigid working system, stiff competition, decline of funds, seats not

being filled, and demand for accountability from stakeholders and customers, perspective of quality has crept in, and need for quality assessment is felt.

### Objective and Scope of the Study

The main aim of the study was to assess and address various quality issues perceived by stakeholders about management institutes. The study was confined to affiliated management institutes to the Savitribai Phule Pune University, Shivaji University Kolhapur and Solapur and having Post-graduate programs which are approved by AICTE, New Delhi (India).

From the selected 75 sample institutes, respondents are selected using stratified random sampling from each category (Director/Head of Institution, Faculty members, Non-teaching Staff & students) from which responses are taken and recorded in the Questionnaire/schedule designed separately for each category. The primary data is collected through pre-tested structured questionnaires/schedules from the selected institutes and sample respondents of Management Institutes. For recording responses close ended as well as open ended questions/statements are used. In questionnaires, 5-point Likert scales, Ranking, Yes/No type and multiple choice questions are also used. For Likert Scales 1- is poor, 2- Average, 3-is Good, 4-is Very Good, 5-is Excellent type responses are recorded for various aspects.

Keeping the research objective in mind, attempt was made to analyze the present status of quality perspectives among selected management institutes in the study area. Various quality parameters are identified and analyzed regarding management institutes, faculty & teaching, students, non-teaching staff and other quality perspectives of the selected management institutes. Also Students' Outlook about Management program and Institutes have been studied.

Following are the various quality perspectives are identified and analyzed,

1. Quality of Management Institute
2. Quality of Management Faculty and teaching
3. Interaction and cordial relation
4. Facilities and Physical amenities
5. General impression
6. Quality of Management students
7. Other quality perspectives

**Table 1:** Assessment of Quality in Management Institutes perceived by Directors and Faculty Members  
(Descriptive Statistics)

S.N.	Particulars/ Attributes	Director/HOD	Faculty
		n= 75	n= 375
		Mean $\pm$ SD	Mean $\pm$ SD
1	Quality of Management Institute	2.58 $\pm$ 0.86	3.00 $\pm$ 0.77
2	Teaching Perspectives	2.83 $\pm$ 0.94	3.20 $\pm$ 0.73
3	Interaction with Management, Staff & Students	3.19 $\pm$ 1.01	3.55 $\pm$ 0.79
4	General Impression	2.82 $\pm$ 0.87	3.14 $\pm$ 0.86
5	Physical Amenities	2.67 $\pm$ 0.96	3.05 $\pm$ 1.05
6	Quality of Management students	2.04 $\pm$ 0.73	2.38 $\pm$ 0.83
7	Other quality perspectives	3.16 $\pm$ 0.82	3.38 $\pm$ 0.91

Source: Primary Data

Table 1 presents the perceived level of various quality perspectives in the management institutes as perceived by Directors and Faculty members. From the descriptive statistics, it is seen that, mean score for all quality parameters are at average to good level. Other aspects like support from top management for carrier and other development is at good level. Utility of higher qualification, participation and involvement in Extra-curricular and co-curricular activities, confidence to take up additional responsibilities and Satisfaction about teaching profession are at good level as perceived by the Directors and Faculty. But participation in decision making about institute development, utility of short-term courses/workshops attended and participation in producing technical & working papers are at average to good level as expressed by the Directors and Faculty.

**Table 2:** Assessment of Quality perspectives in Management Institutes by Non-Teaching Staff  
(Descriptive Statistics)

S.N.	Particulars/ attributes	Non-teaching n= 225
		Mean $\pm$ SD
1	Facilities and their Utility	3.46 $\pm$ 0.74
2	Cordial relationship with Director, Faculty, Staff	3.47 $\pm$ 0.79
3	Physical amenities	3.22 $\pm$ 0.65
4	Interaction with	3.46 $\pm$ 0.56
5	Other quality perspectives	3.15 $\pm$ 0.66

Source: Primary Data

Table 2 presents the quality perspectives about management institutes perceived by non-teaching staff. It visualizes from descriptive statistics that, quality perspectives about facilities and their utilities are at good level having mean score 3.46. Non-teaching staff expressed that they have good cordial relations with Director, HOD, teaching faculty, administrative staff and other staff. For other aspects they viewed good support from top-management for other development, they are satisfied about the work done, supported teaching faculty and aware of the roles and responsibilities. They perceived that workload is at higher side, average participation in the decision making about institute development and limited support for carrier advancement. They expressed that they have close interaction at all levels amongst themselves, with the faculty, students and management. Physical amenities available perceived by non-teaching staff are at good level having mean score 3.22.

Assessment of quality of management institutes and faculty members perceived by the students are conducted. Table 3 presents the quality perspectives about management institutes and faculty perceived by students.

**Table 3:** Assessment of Quality perspectives in Management Institutes by Students (Descriptive Statistics)

S.N.	Particulars/ attributes	Students n= 375
		Mean $\pm$ SD
<b>I</b>	<b>Quality of Mgt. Institutes</b>	
1	Selection process	3.06 $\pm$ 1.03
2	Academic content of course taught	3.10 $\pm$ 0.89
3	Status of student-faculty ratio	3.07 $\pm$ 0.99
4	Interaction with Faculty	3.39 $\pm$ 0.92
5	Interaction with administrative staff	2.99 $\pm$ 0.91
6	Fairness of Internal Examination	3.01 $\pm$ 1.06
7	Fairness of External Examination	2.95 $\pm$ 1.08
8	Case studies & Assignments	2.92 $\pm$ 1.03
9	Infrastructure of Institute/college campus	3.18 $\pm$ 1.25
10	Library Facility	3.16 $\pm$ 1.23
11	Computer Facility	2.85 $\pm$ 1.12
12	Academic reputation	3.05 $\pm$ 1.01
13	Educative values of summer training	3.01 $\pm$ 1.09
14	Industrial visits	2.71 $\pm$ 1.09
15	Summer training by the Institute	2.64 $\pm$ 1.11
16	Guest faculty from corporate	2.83 $\pm$ 1.23
17	Placement facility by Institute	2.25 $\pm$ 1.05
18	Student exposure to corporate	2.26 $\pm$ 1.12
19	National & International conferences	2.11 $\pm$ 1.02
20	International exposure & placement	1.51 $\pm$ 0.85
21	Discipline in the Institute	2.67 $\pm$ 1.21
22	Institutional growth as you heard from your seniors	2.63 $\pm$ 1.08
23	Rating of this Institute in University	2.45 $\pm$ 0.93
24	Environment for learning in the Institute	2.87 $\pm$ 0.95
	<b>TOTAL MEAN SCORE</b>	<b>2.78 <math>\pm</math> 0.68</b>
<b>II</b>	<b>Quality of Faculty</b>	
1	Communication skills	3.33 $\pm$ 1.04
2	Command on subject	3.39 $\pm$ 1.08
3	Discipline in class	3.30 $\pm$ 1.01
4	Sincerity and commitment	3.41 $\pm$ 0.99
5	Encouraging Class participation	3.25 $\pm$ 1.24
6	Interest generated in the class	3.18 $\pm$ 1.19
7	Ability to integrate course with other work	2.94 $\pm$ 1.12
8	Accessibility of teachers in & out of Class	3.27 $\pm$ 1.06
9	Ability to design exams/projects/assignments	3.25 $\pm$ 1.16
10	Use of modern teaching methodology	2.91 $\pm$ 1.08
11	Timely feedback	3.24 $\pm$ 1.05
12	General rating about teacher relationship	3.32 $\pm$ 1.00
	<b>TOTAL MEAN SCORE</b>	<b>3.23 <math>\pm</math> 0.90</b>

Source: Primary Data

From above table it is seen that, quality perspectives and environment in the management institutes are at average level having mean score 2.78. Quality perspectives about faculty are at good level having mean score 3.23 as perceived by the students. It is inferred that, present quality of the management institutes are at average level perceived by the Directors/ Head of the institutions, Faculty members, Non-teaching staff and students.

### Students Outlook about Management Education/ Institutes

Students are the important customer of the management institute to have management education. It is very important to know the present students outlook about management program for the strategic planning in the institutes. Strategic planning assures top management commitment and that leads towards adoption of TQM practices and processes. To study the students outlook about management program and the management institutes, responses from students are recorded using 5-point Likert scale (Strongly agree to strongly disagree) on various aspects like what is the rationale behind pursuing management education, basis for choosing the institute, expectations after completion of the course, how is the conceptual understanding of the course, syllabus coverage, core & elective courses selection, opinion on exam and marks and suggested duration of summer training. The responses recorded are presented with mean score and standard deviations (SD) in the table 4.

**Table 4:** Students Outlook about Management program and Institutes  
(Descriptive Statistics)

S.N.	Particulars/ attributes	Students n= 375	RANK
		Mean $\pm$ SD	
<b>I.</b>	<b>Rationale for pursuing Management Program</b>		
1	To acquire skills of Management	4.09 $\pm$ 0.56	I
2	Friends are doing or have done	2.92 $\pm$ 1.17	VI
3	An easy course	3.03 $\pm$ 1.27	IV
4	Parent compelled for the course	2.48 $\pm$ 1.22	VII
5	Couldn't get entry in other course	2.35 $\pm$ 1.16	VIII
6	Easy in getting job on completion	3.49 $\pm$ 0.92	III
7	Interest in the course	4.07 $\pm$ 0.84	II
8	Get financial aid from Govt./ Educational Loan	2.94 $\pm$ 1.17	V
	<b>TOTAL MEAN SCORE</b>	<b>3.17 <math>\pm</math> 0.58</b>	
<b>II</b>	<b>Institute Choice:</b>		
1	Good reputation of the Institute	3.19 $\pm$ 1.14	II
2	Convenient location	3.58 $\pm$ 1.22	I
3	No admission elsewhere	2.14 $\pm$ 1.23	III
	<b>TOTAL MEAN SCORE</b>	<b>2.97 <math>\pm</math> 0.71</b>	
<b>III</b>	<b>Expectations on Completion of Course</b>		
1	Get good Job	3.81 $\pm$ 1.00	I
2	Will start own business	3.36 $\pm$ 1.08	II
3	Better handling of parental business	2.46 $\pm$ 1.18	III
	<b>TOTAL MEAN SCORE</b>	<b>3.21 <math>\pm</math> 0.76</b>	
<b>IV</b>	<b>Conceptual understanding of the course</b>		
1	Easy	3.37 $\pm$ 1.02	II
2	Manageable	3.52 $\pm$ 0.85	I
3	Difficult	2.39 $\pm$ 0.70	III
4	Very difficult	1.41 $\pm$ 0.97	IV
	<b>TOTAL MEAN SCORE</b>	<b>2.67 <math>\pm</math> 0.31</b>	
<b>V</b>	<b>Syllabus Coverage</b>		
1	90-100 %	3.74 $\pm$ 1.08	I
2	75-90 %	3.57 $\pm$ 0.68	II
3	50-75 %	2.31 $\pm$ 0.70	III
4	Less than 50%	1.11 $\pm$ 0.43	IV
	<b>TOTAL MEAN SCORE</b>	<b>2.68 <math>\pm</math> 0.27</b>	

S.N.	Particulars/ attributes	Students n= 375	RANK
		Mean $\pm$ SD	
<b>VI</b>	<b>Elective courses</b>		
1	100 % Core courses	3.11 $\pm$ 1.24	II
2	75 % Core courses	3.57 $\pm$ 0.80	I
3	50 % core courses	2.77 $\pm$ 1.02	III
4	25 % core courses	1.18 $\pm$ 0.41	IV
<b>5</b>	<b>Choice of elective courses in each functional area as per liking of student necessary</b>	<b>4.07 <math>\pm</math> 0.84</b>	
	<b>TOTAL MEAN SCORE</b>	<b>2.94 <math>\pm</math> 0.31</b>	
<b>VII</b>	<b>Opinion on Marks / Exam assessment</b>		
1	100 % internal assessment	2.76 $\pm$ 1.16	II
2	50% internal assessment	3.98 $\pm$ 1.00	I
3	25 % internal assessment	2.46 $\pm$ 0.86	III
4	Less than 25 % internal assessment	1.35 $\pm$ 0.77	IV
	<b>TOTAL MEAN SCORE</b>	<b>2.64 <math>\pm</math> 0.19</b>	
<b>VIII</b>	<b>Suggested duration of Summer training</b>		
1	6- weeks	1.81 $\pm$ 0.97	IV
2	8- weeks	2.70 $\pm$ 0.89	III
3	3-Months	3.59 $\pm$ 0.93	I
4	6-months	3.26 $\pm$ 1.68	II
	<b>TOTAL MEAN SCORE</b>	<b>2.84 <math>\pm</math> 0.38</b>	

Source: Primary Data

The above table envisages the student's outlook on management education in the selected management institutes of the study area. It is observed that, rationale for pursuing management education is to acquire skills followed by interest in the course, and ease in getting job on completion of the course. Student chose the institution on the basis of convenient location and reputation of the institutes. The largest segment of students are expected to get good job after completion of management program and some of them are interested in starting own business. Conceptual understanding of management course is manageable as perceived by the students. Student viewed that, normal syllabus coverage is 90-100% followed by 75-90%. Majority of the students consider the system of 75 percent elective courses, however significant numbers consider the system of 75 percent elective courses. Choice of elective courses in each functional area should be as per liking of student necessity. Majority of the students are in favour of 50% internal assessment in the examinations. Majority of the students wish to have summer training of 3-months and significant number of students wish to have summer training of 6-months duration.

### Conclusion

The management education is one of the emerging developments in the field of services sector. Like over services it is characterized by its diversity. For any constant development it is necessary to have efficient efforts, qualitative and reliable feedback accumulation and the most important is the assessment procedure of teaching & learning with the result distinctly characterized and evaluated. The required procedures should ceaselessly accumulate, examine, and pursue on customer information. TQM is one of the most efficient tools in the field of teaching & learning criterion in management education. This study investigates various quality management perspectives perceived by the internal stakeholders about the management institutes. Also studied the outlook of management education perceived by the students and present status of the management institutes. Furthermore, the findings also shows that, the level of quality practices in management institutes are not at the acceptable level, therefore greater scope of improvement. As per the demands of a fast-changing business environment the Management institutes have to manage and produce future managers

which will be equipped with all the skills required to articulate the best possible strategies. The main task today for the management institutes is the task of developing the competency level of students to meet corporate expectations. To achieve this, there is a need of significant change in the curriculum, teaching pedagogy and pose great challenges to all involved in the process of management education.

### Reference

- Becket, N. B. (2005). "Analyzing quality audits in higher education", *Brookes e-learning Journal of Learning and Teaching*, 1(2), 1-22.
- Black, A. P. (1996). "Identification of the critical factors of TQM", *Decision Sciences*, 27(1), pp. 1–21.
- French, R. G. (1996). "*Rethinking management education*", London: Sage Ltd.
- Lakhe, R.,(1994). "Total quality management-Concepts, Evolution and Acceptability in Developing Economics". *International Journal of quality and reliability management*, Vol.11 (9), 09-33.
- Motwani, J. (2001). "Critical factors and performance measures of TQM", *The TQM Magazine*, 13(4), pp. 292–300.
- Murad A., R. K. (2010). "Implementation of Total Quality Management in Higher Education". *Asian Journal of Business Management*, 2(1), 9-16.
- P.Unde, A. (2013). "*A Critical Study of Total Quality Management Practices in Management Institutions of Western Maharashtra*", Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Pune.
- R. Narendran, V. N. (2000). "*Changing Scenario of Management Education in India*", *University News*, 38( 50), December(2011), pp.4-5.
- Sangeeta, S. B. (2004). "Conceptualising total quality management in higher education". *The TQM Magazine*, 16(2), pp. 145-159.
- Zakuan, N. M. (2012). "Critical Success Factors of Total Quality Management Implementation in Higher Education Institution: A Review", *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 2(12), 19-32.