Article

Excellence in School Education through Quality Process Viability Assessment

Anjali Bhatnagar[1] ✉ and Sanjeev Sonawane[2]

[1]*Research Fellow, Department of Education & Extension, University of Pune, India*

[2]*Professor, Department of Education & Extension, University of Pune, India*

Abstract

Today Indian schools encounter challenges that are global in nature, and with this the most threatening concern that comes along is - Are we ready as educational leaders and Managers to face the same? There is no scope of denial for the fact that our schools definitely need to nurture the skills, culture, and disposition that would help them not only to identify but also effectively assess the quality processes that contribute to the school potential building through excellence. To meet the dynamic nature of excellence, a highly sensitive process of self-assessment is required. The 'Quality Excellence Model for Schools' is developed as a self-assessment tool that enables the schools identify their hidden potential for excellence performance and meet the global challenges. It also gives the schools a new vision to see their efforts on the backdrop of a process orientation. The structure of the model includes five categories; Leadership and School Governance, Infrastructure and Learning Resource Management, Student Focus Management, Human Resource Management and Stakeholder and Market Relation Management. These are divided into areas, which are further divided into indicators. The identified indicators are the quality processes, depicting the action oriented cycle of learning that takes place via feedback between the process and the result, involving four clearly defined stages, Approach, Deployment, Improvement, and Excellence.

1. Introduction

As we progress through the 21st century, the phenomenon of globalization has affected the education system across the world just like any other business unit. Intense competition has led to the urge for quality in education at all spheres. To meet the global challenges India today needs to derive and motivate the schools towards excellence. The present study is therefore undertaken with the objective of developing a model that insists in establishing the credential credibility of the schools through process viability assessment.

The researches conducted with a purpose of evaluating the status of Indian schools reveal poor quality of school education. Though 'The Annual Status of Education Report, 2005' when compared with 'The Annual Status of Education Report, 2007' (ASER, 2005, Pratham and ASER, 2007, Pratham) some improvement in the quality of school education could be observed, with respect to the availability of basic facilities like water, toilets etc., reading, writing and comprehending skills of students and the attendance rate of teachers, but still the goal of quality school education cannot be yet said to have achieved. The importance of quality in education in schools and a clearer understanding of the scope and purpose of quality assurance can lead to better embedded and more effective continuous improvement, (Geoffery D. Dohenty, 2008).

The concern for an effective assessment tool in developing countries is a priority and essential requirement in the changing educational context of today, (Niaz Ahmed, 2008). Realizing this educational concern, NABET (National Accreditation Board for Education and Training) under the purview of QCI (Quality Council of India) have been taken to develop 'Accreditation Standard for Quality School Governance' to improve the quality of school education in India.

However, the need of the cosmos educational environment is not of mere assessment and accreditation of schools but for deriving and motivating the schools to realize their true potential for excellence. The Malcolm Baldrige Criteria for Education Excellence, developed in the USA (1998, named after former Secretary of Commerce Malcolm Baldrige) for the quality improvement of education services have proved to be effective in the assessment of school education quality. The criteria defined in this model, however, need to be related to the Indian context. Therefore, the researcher takes up the task of developing a quality assessment tool for Indian schools that would help schools improve education performance practices, provide basis for self-assessment and a process for continuous, improvement through institutionalized feedback mechanism, facilitate communication and sharing of best practices within/among education institutions and foster partnerships across sectors for quality enhancement.

The tool, Quality Excellence Model for Schools (QEMS) based on Malcolm Baldrige Criteria for Education, identifies quality indicators as its core components that are dynamic in nature and efficient in catering to the quality needs and requirements of the differently-abled Indian schools. The following sections describe the development methodology and structure of the Quality Excellence Model for Schools (QEMS).

2. Quality Excellence Model for Schools (QEMS) -Development Methodology

The development of the Quality Excellence Model for Schools (QEMS) adopted New Product Development (NPD) methodology. This research methodology involves the development of a product using systematically designed stages. The development of Quality Excellence Model for Schools (QEMS) involved the following four main stages.

2.1 Market Research

2.1.1 Understanding the Malcolm Baldrige Criteria for Education in the Indian context

The Malcolm Baldrige Criteria for Education was studied in the Indian context using analysis method. Some of the quality aspects defined in the Malcolm Baldrige Criteria for Education was considered to be insignificant for the Indian schools. For instance, the concepts such as Senior Leadership, Student Stakeholder Market Focus, and Process Management as adopted by the Malcolm Baldrige model, may not be commonly understood by the Indian schools. The assessment and implementation procedures were far too complicated to find easy accessibility for the needful schools.

The Malcolm Baldrige though serves as an effective tool for assessment of education quality, but to be applicable in the Indian schools the model needed to be restructured to accommodate the quality aspects of the Indian schools. The model was redesigned keeping its sensitivity for assessing the quality aspects untouched. For instance just like the Malcolm Baldrige model the QEMS also (1) identifies the four process driven elements, Plan, Execute, Feedback and Action (2) seeks a perfect balance between the process and the results, (3) it is also non-perspective in nature, (4) it follows system's perspective to maintain institution-wide goal alignment, (5) the identified quality criteria are dynamic to effectively capture and assess the quality, (6) learning takes place via feedback between processes and results. The learning cycles have four clearly defined stages: planning, execution, feedback, and action. The quality aspects for the QEMS were synchronized to match the quality needs and requirements of the Indian schools.

3

2.1.2 Reviewing the related literature on quality assessment of schools in Indian context

The quality processes followed in the schools form the core of the QEMS; therefore, the task of identifying relevant quality processes was undertaken as the first step towards QEMS development using analysis method. To facilitate the same, the senior leaders of the schools were considered to be the most valuable resource. The senior leaders in the schools are involved in the common educational activities and therefore they are the best sources for recalling, stating and discussing on the encountered school related problems. Not only do they better understand the quality needs for their schools, but also have tentative solutions for the same. Due to this reason, they are willing to share their expertise and provide numerous diverse ideas for the development of the model. At the pre-stage ten schools from Pune district of different management background were selected randomly. The senior leaders of these schools were given a presentation on the need for quality in school education and the proposal to develop a quality assessment model as an effective solution for the same was put forward. The researcher interacted with the senior leaders of these school and paid a personal visit to the school to observe and catch the quality related processes in the schools. The main focus was on the aspects like leadership, infrastructure and other learning facilities, hygiene and sanitation, safety measures, student learning procedures, faculty competencies, relation with stakeholder, communication pattern etc. The records of the data and information collected were maintained for further references.

2.2 Product Design

2.2.1 Development of Quality Excellence Model for Schools (QEMS)

Further for product development, the senior leaders of the schools were approached and individual meetings were conducted on the quality issues involving three sessions of one and a half hours each. The key points of the interaction were recorded for further group discussions to be held. For the group interactions, the senior leaders from the ten selected schools were made to sit around the table. The discussion and the bombarding of ideas on quality aspects of the schools carried for two hours. Two such sessions were held in progression.

The researcher as a coordinator and the active participant at the same time had to ensure the active involvement and contribution from each member of the group. At times there was a conflict on the viewpoints of the members. For instance, the issues related to stakeholder participation came up with different opinions. According to some of the group members, the active participation of the stakeholders was a must for ensuring the quality of services and was just like keeping up with the growing changes as the schools cannot function in isolation. And at the same time, others believed the involvement of the stakeholder did not hold much

of significance in the school quality. At the end of the rigorous session, the discussion concluded with the identification of five major quality Criteria, forty-six quality areas and one hundred and fifty quality processes which were called as quality indicators.

The data collected through discussion was compiled in the proper manner. The processed data was presented to the members of the group for their second session of discussion. At this stage, the participants were much familiar with the identified quality indicators. Again the process of group discussion was held for a day and some questions were raised about the appropriateness of the identified quality indicators. For instance, the common concern was the repetition of a few quality indicators. The quality indicator on effective communication was repeated with almost all the quality criteria. After discussing the issue, it was unanimously agreed that at some places the repetition was unavoidable as the quality indicator had a different definition in the different quality criteria. Another major change was made for sequencing the quality indicators. At the end of the discussion the session was concluded with five quality criteria, forty-six quality areas and one hundred and nineteen quality indicators.

As the second part of this stage, the Quality Excellence Model for Schools (QEMS) with five quality criteria, forty-six quality areas and one hundred and nineteen quality indicators was forwarded to a panel of twenty educational experts from different regions and universities. The communication was established using electronic means for a faster and reliable interface. The expert's review was collected and processed for a meaningful interpretation. Changes were made in the model wherever felt relevant and appropriate. For instance, the quality areas in the quality criteria 2, the Infrastructure and the Learning Resource Management, were reduced from nine to four. Some quality indicators were found irrelevant or repeated, these were canceled. According to the expert's some quality, indicators were defined too vague which made in difficult for them to be assessed, in such cases the quality indicators were redefined specifically in measurable terms. After the expert's review and its analysis, the QEMS was refined and finalized with five quality criteria, twenty-eight quality areas and seventy-nine quality indicators. The selected quality indicators were described in detail for their operational definition, relevance, the source of data and information quality process (involving Plan, Execute, Feedback, and Action) and the quality results (expected outcomes). The suggestions and opinions from the panel of experts were used to establish direct structure validation of the QEMS. The development of the model involved the following processes carried out in a sequential order.

I. Preparation of the Questionnaires

The QEMS uses the questionnaire as a tool for assessing the quality of school education. Two sets of questionnaire were prepared: the 'Preliminary Quality Assessment' (undertaken

by the management and the teachers separately) and the 'Formal Quality Assessment' (undertaken by the management and the teachers unanimously). The 'Preliminary Quality Assessment', constituted of the twenty-eight statements framed with reference to the twenty-eight Quality Areas identified in the QEMS. This assessment was undertaken to get a brief outline on the quality related issues of the school as a first step towards quality assessment. Each statement was given a choice of three responses: Yes, No and Not Sure/ Don't know. The respondents had to make their most appropriate choice. To understand the weak areas for improvement, each statement in the two questionnaires (for the management and the teachers separately) was framed in such a way so as to give it the same meaning but in a different perspective. For instance, the first statement under the first category, leadership and school governance management, for the teachers framed as 'I am aware of my organization's objectives and goals that it intends to accomplish.' The same statement in the questionnaire for the management was framed as 'Our employees know our organization's mission (what we are trying to accomplish)'. The questionnaire was validated for its effectiveness by the panel of experts using the set guidelines for assessment.

For the quality assessment procedure, the questionnaire 'Formal Quality Assessment' was prepared. The questionnaire had all the seventy-nine quality indicators translated into the tentative statements. These quality indicators were assessed to facilitate the continuous improvement of the quality status in the school. The quality indicators were evaluated on the five point Likert Scale. The scale was carefully calibrated with expert's opinion. Though there were a few options that came up in the discussion for the calibration of the scale. The simpler and easier option was found to be the most effective according to the experts. And thus this procedure was adopted for the evaluation of the quality indicators.

II. Preparing Scoring Guidelines

The QEMS identified six stages for excellence that have been described as under:

Table 1: Six Stages for Excellence

Score in %	Performance level	Remark
0-20	Critical stage	Poor performance
21-40	Preliminary stage	Initialization of quality process
41-60	Progressive stage	Processes resulting in satisfactory outcomes
61-80	Optimum stage	Good performance and shows signs of improvement and adjustments for quality
81-90	Advanced stage	Good performance in all most all the areas of improvement and upgrading
< 90	Perfection stage	Excellent performance

III. Quality Indicator Description

Further, each quality indicator is described in detail in the following format:

Quality Criteria 1: Leadership & School Governance.

Quality Area 1: Institutional Vision

Quality Indicator 1: Senior leaders set and deploy the organization vision clear to all through effective leadership system, with mechanisms to monitor its effectiveness on a regular basis.

Operational definition: The senior leaders of the organization set and deploy long-term vision to guide the effective functioning of the organization. The senior leaders assure the vision statement within the legal framework of National policy. The effectiveness of the vision deployment within the organization and with its key stakeholders is monitored on a regular basis for quality assurance.

Relevance: A predetermined vision and effective deployment help the organization to grow and function in the most effective and efficient manner by focusing towards the desired goal. A regular assessment helps to identify the gaps, if any, and also suggest remedial measures to fill up the gaps for the smooth functioning of the organization towards vision achievement.

Data & Information: Prospectus, policy related documents, management, and staff.

Quality process

Plan: Senior leaders set the organization vision clear to all within the organization and with its key stakeholders.

Execute: Senior leaders deploy the set organization vision clear to all through effective leadership system involving all the key participants.

Feedback: The effectiveness of vision deployment is monitored using pre-determined mechanisms with respect to the outcomes of the organizational functioning. Gaps are identified for further excelling in the organization competencies.

Action: The senior leaders analyze the reasons and remedial measures for the existing gaps. The corrective measures are taken and outcomes evaluated for the quality functioning of the processes.

Quality result: The outcomes reflect a regular improvement in the functioning of processes due to effective deployment of organization vision.

2.3 Product Testing

2.3.1 Studying applicability of QEMS on the Indian Schools

In this stage, the QEMS was validated for structure oriented behavior validity using the quasi-experimental method. For the purpose, the model was subjected to a randomly selected sample of ten schools. A combination of the formal and informal tool was used to collect data that included a questionnaire, oral interaction, discussion, and observations. Also, ten experts for assessing the ten sample schools were selected. As no standardized tool was available to measure the expertise of the experts, for the present study, informal procedures, including oral interaction, unstructured interviews, experience and qualification were considered as the vital parameters for selecting the experts. The model score, calculated through the questionnaire 'Formal quality Assessment', administered by the school team, and the expert score calculated by the expert's assessment of the school, were correlated using Pearson's correlation formula.

The correlation value calculated for the five quality criteria and the model as a system were interpreted confirming for the positive relationship the between the developed system (QEMS) and the real system outside. The table below presents the correlation value calculated for establishing the structure oriented behavior validity of the QEMS;

Table 2: Structure Oriented Behavior Validity of the QEMS

	Quality Criteria	Correlation (r)
1.	Leadership and School Governance	.75
2.	Infrastructure and Resource Management	.82
3.	Student Focus Management	.87
4.	Human Resource Management	.78
5.	Stakeholder & Market Relationship Management	.97
6.	Model as System: Quality Criteria 1- 5	.87

2.4 Product pre-implementation

2.4.1 Studying applicability of QEMS on the Indian Schools

At this stage, the QEMS was validated for its behavior pattern validity (reliability) using the quasi-experimental method. For the purpose, after a considerable period of time (six to ten

months) the previously selected ten sample schools were once again subjected to the QEMS. A combination of formal and informal data collection tool, including oral interaction, discussions, observation and the questionnaire was used. The previously selected experts again assessed the sample schools. Model score and the expert score were correlated using Pearson's correlation formula. Further, the correlation values were interpreted as the possible relationship between the two systems. The table presents the correlation values calculated for establishing the behavior pattern validity:

Table 3: Behavior Pattern Validity of the QEMS

	Quality Criteria	Correlation (r)
1.	Leadership and School Governance	.92
2.	Infrastructure and Resource Management	.75
3.	Student Focus Management	.88
4.	Human Resource Management	.71
5.	Stakeholder & Market Relationship Management	.76
6.	Quality Criteria 1-5	0.95

2.4.1 QEMS- Implementation

The QEMS followed preset procedures to study the applicability of QEMS on the Indian schools. To start with, the ten sample schools and ten experts were selected using the random sampling technique. School management identified the team consisting of innovative and committed representatives of senior leaders and teachers. For this the school management had the choice to opt for any of their best practice, however, one recommended effective method was to conduct an open discussion (may be in groups) on the quality of school education and thereby select those members for the initiative who contribute in the discussion.

Continuous adequate meetings/discussions were held get conceptual clarity about the basic concepts of the plan, execute, feedback and action. The school team furnished the information required under the category, the school profile. Now as the first step to implementation, the members of the school team conduct the exercise suggested in 'Preliminary Quality Assessment' (as mentioned for the management and teachers separately), to help the team understand the weak areas for improvement. The QEMS team assists the school team in designing and implementing improvement program. Next, the school the team now attempts the questionnaire 'Formal Quality Assessment'. The selected expert visits and assesses the school. The observation and the scores are recorded in the

provided format. Lastly, the observation and the findings are discussed with the team and the improvement measures suggested. After a period of time (six to ten months) the school is assessed using the QEMS and the expert opinion to study the improvement in the level of performance of the schools respectively.

3. Discussion and Conclusion

In retrospect, the quality concerns that led to the development of the model QEMS, as the self-assessment tool was achieved. The methodology adopted enabled active and productive participation of the education experts in the developed of the model. The developed model for excellence performance would enable the schools to realize their potential for excellence and thus aim to deliver the quality educational services to all the concerned. The model is designed with features like user-friendly, easy to access, flexible to cater to the needs and requirements of the differently abled group of users, easily understandable, cost saving and still sensitive enough to catch the dynamism inherent in the quality-related processes. All these features facilitate the model to be used as a self-assessment tool for achieving credential creditability through process viability assessment.

The model seeks to provide a systematic approach towards quality process viability assessment for school education. The quality indicators defined in the model would serve for the quality improvement of schools by ushering the awareness for quality among the schools and by applying as guidelines for self-assessment and carrying out management functions efficiently and effectively. Nevertheless, the process of any product development is an exploratory, rhetorical, emergent, opportunistic and reflective human activity (Cross, 1999), it is indirectly influenced by a number of unexamined assumptions. For instance, with reference to the present study, no standardized tool for measuring the selected ten expert's expertise was taken into consideration. It could be claimed that the expertise of the selected ten experts was at different level and therefore equating the same could not be scientifically justified. But at the same time, looking from the other angle the variance in the expertise was in favor of the present study keeping its nature into account. Secondly, the term 'quality' in itself is a dynamic term and therefore the parameters defined to assess the same have to be dynamic. It is for this reason that though the quality parameters defined in the model are of dynamic nature, also, there is a provision of adding or modifying the currently identified quality parameter to address the individual requirement for quality.

Thirdly, though all measures were taken to describe the quality indicators using the most appropriate vocabulary, chances of its misinterpretation cannot be denied. Also, a few quality indicators identified in the model structure are not purely quantifiable, as a result, while scoring these quality indicators more emphasize is given to the perception of the scorer rather than on the concrete evidence. This could lead to varied results in some cases.

At present, the model QEMS has established a positive correlation with the predefined qualities for school education for excellence when applied to ten selected schools of Indian origin. Howsoever the aim is to further test and validate the model so as to gather more data to confirm the applicability of the model in the schools of Indian origin. The researches have emphasized the role of quality assessment tools in enhancing the learning achievements of the students through a continuous improvement. The results of the present research work are supported by the following research studies:

3.1 Accreditation Standard for Quality School Governance

The National Accreditation Board for Education and Training (NABET) functioning under the Quality Council of India (QCI) standardized the parameters for quality school education. The developed framework provides the basis for assessment for facilitating further improvement. The main focus is on enabling high-quality learning through a cycle of continuous improvement. Howsoever the developed framework identifies five quality criteria divided into quality indicators, further divided into fifty quality indicators in comparison to the seventy-nine quality indicators defined in the QEMS. The quality criteria in the QEMS differ from the quality criteria identified by the NABET framework for quality school governance.

3.2 Karnataka Schools Quality Assessment Organization (KSQAO)

The project was undertaken by the government of Karnataka and the Sarva Siksha Abhiyan to gauge the quality of schools by assessing student learning outcomes across the state. Within a period of three years, the project aimed to achieve enrolment of all children in the age group of 6 to 14 with a high level of competencies. The KSQAO identifies the quality parameters based on the quality challenges faced by the schools of a particular community. On one hand, where the KSQAO focuses on the measuring the learning achievements of students at a state level the QEMS finds applicability in all the primary/secondary schools of Indian origin. The quality issues identified in the QEMS find relevance in the all primary/secondary schools of Indian origin.

QEMS- Structure

The structure of QEMS is as under:

Quality Criteria 1: Leadership & School Governance
Quality Area 1: Institutional Vision
         Quality Indicator 1: Senior leaders set and deploy the organization vision clear to all

through effective leadership system, with mechanisms to monitor its effectiveness on a regular basis.

Quality Area 2: Values & Discipline

Quality Indicator 2: The organization follows a predetermined widely accepted code for values and discipline, which also helps the senior leaders in fostering a healthy environment for effective learning teaching process.

Quality Area 3: Social Responsibility

Quality Indicator 3: Organization takes up the social responsibility of developing skills, emotional competencies and qualities students need to succeed as contributing members of the society, through specially designed outreach programs /activities /projects and real life exposure.

Quality Area 4: Communication System

Quality Indicator 4: Senior leaders encourage frank two ways, reliable, economic, efficient communications throughout the organization and with its stakeholders on programs/services and offerings to receive a prompt and actionable feedback.

Quality Area 5: Legal & Grievances Management

Quality Indicator 5: Senior leaders demonstrate code of ethics by considering all concerned fairly, equitably with dignity and respect. Quality Indicator 6: Senior leaders fulfill all legal and contractual obligations as and when required by applying the laws and procedures fairly, wisely and considerably.

Quality Area 6: Safety & Security

Quality Indicator 7: Senior leaders ensure the safe and healthy environment within and outside the organization by applying all the safety norms and using technology for the same.

Quality Area 7: Finance Management

Quality Indicator 8: Senior leaders conduct regular internal/external audits for monitoring the accounts and ensure proper utilization of resources and transparency in financial matters. Quality Indicator 9: The organization ensures adequate financial resources for its smooth functioning.

Quality Area 8: Supervision of Quality of Management

Quality Indicator10: Senior leaders monitor and ensure all the processes follow the guidelines as directed in the organization manual and regulations for implementations. Quality Indicator 11: The operational processes are modified with changing concerns and expectations from the organization to maintain quality outcomes. Quality Indicator 12: All the processes are evaluated from a system perspective for quality measures

Quality Area 9: Strategy Development & Deployment

Quality Indicators 13: Senior leaders frame administrative policy which is appropriate, clear, inclusive and widely publicized. Quality Indicator 14: Organization adheres to defined administrative criteria and procedure, ensuring fair and transparent administrative processes. Quality Indicator 15: Senior leaders conduct strategy planning on the basis of the relevant data and information collected from all the key participants. Quality Indicator 16: Strategy plans are deployed in the form of action plans to achieve the strategic objectives and ensure optimum utilization of resources available.

Quality Area 10: Research & Innovation

Quality Indicator 17: Organization provides the workforce with adequate opportunities to explore better effective and efficient ways of functioning. Quality Indicator 18: Senior

leaders adopt policies and strategies for adequate technology deployment and its use for learning enhancement. Quality Indicator 19: The creative and innovative work were undertaken is encouraged by appraising and initiating sponsored research projects relevant to the organization.

Quality Criteria 2: Infra- structure & Learning Resources Management

Quality Area11: Physical Infra- structure

Quality Indicator 20: The physical infrastructure of the organization is suitable and adequate for effectively implementing the designed learning teaching strategies.

Quality Indicator 21: The physical infrastructure is monitored and upgraded to keep up with the changing needs and safety norms. Quality Indicator 22: The school has a good facility of required physical amenities like water, electricity etc.

Quality Area 12: Instructional Infra- structure

Quality Indicator 23: All learning teaching resources that may be required to efficiently carry out the learning objectives are adequately available. Quality Indicator 24: The instructional material is monitored and upgraded to keep up with the changing requirements and safety norms. Quality Indicators 25: The organization uses social/ cultural / educational activities as an important resource for instruction to enhance students' capabilities. Quality Indicators 26: Teachers design innovative learning material that is used as regular practice. Quality Indicators 27: Organization observes ICT facility as its one of the most efficient and effective learning resource by students and the workforce.

Quality Area 13: Environmental factor

Quality Indicator 28: The organization is well equipped with adequate and appropriate facilities to support the hygiene and sanitation in and around the campus. The students are taught the values of hygiene and sanitation to adopt in their daily routine activities.

Quality Indicator 29: The personal action of the workforce and senior leaders reflects the dedication and commitment towards these values. Quality Indicators 30: Organization is well versed with the importance of growing need for an eco-friendly environment. Senior leaders inculcate the same in their students through awareness programs / activities/ projects like tree plantation, rainwater harvesting, vermiculture etc.

Quality Area 14: Human Resource

Quality indicators 31: Organization has well qualified, experienced and adequate human resource to facilitate the organization objectives.

Quality Area 15: Curriculum design

Quality Indicator 32: Senior leaders frame the curriculum keeping in mind the organizational mission and vision to be achieved. Quality Indicator 33: Curriculum is flexible to adapt emerging knowledge concerns and expectations Quality Indicator 34: Definite and appropriate time is allotted and strictly followed for physical/social/cultural/ activities for the overall personality development

Quality Criteria 3: Student Focus Management

Quality Area 16: Student's Learning Procedures

Quality Indicators 35: The procedures involve mentoring to identify, bring out and nurture the hidden talents in the students. Quality Indicator 36: All the learning procedures are followed by feedback, reflection, and follow-up. Quality Indicators 37:

13

Organization has facilities (infrastructure and mentors) to better facilitate inclusive learning. Quality Indicator 38: Students are encouraged and appreciated for their creativity, innovative learning approach and research work by publicizing their efforts in school journal, magazines, organizing exhibitions etc. Quality Indicator 39: Students are exposed to programs that encourage exchange of ideas for channelizing their efforts in the right direction

Quality Area 17: Student's Assessment Procedures

Quality Indicator 40: Student's achievement record is maintained on a regular basis using formal and informal assessment procedures. Quality Indicator 41 The maintained records are monitored, discussed and remedial programs designed to further strengthen competencies and overcome weakness for the all-around development of the child. Quality Indicator 42: The mechanisms employed for gathering, consolidating and disseminating evaluation data ensures fairness and transparency by employing advanced technology like the use of ICT.

Quality Area 18: Student's Satisfaction & Dissatisfaction

Quality Indicator 43: Organization has set mechanisms which are actively used to determine satisfaction / dissatisfaction of students in all key areas. Quality Indicator 44: The information collected via these set mechanisms is used for further improvement / changes as required and appropriate. Quality Indicator 45: Students play an important role in formulating improvement strategies via feedback. Quality Indicator 46: Students are allotted responsibilities for organization related task to build a sense of responsibility and leadership among them

Quality Area 19: Student Support System

Quality Indicator 47: Organization has a well-structured organized proactive guidance and counseling cell with qualified and experienced staff, accessible for all students for their overall development. Quality Indicator 48: A student representative addresses to the complaints of students at a lower level, ensuring confidentiality and easy accessibility. Quality Indicator49: Facilities like a well-maintained hygiene cafeteria with healthy and fresh food articles, Safe and guarded transport facility, well maintained medical care facility, are regularly monitored and maintained for continuous delivery of quality services. Quality Indicator 50: Transparent, impartial and fair reward system is framed and practiced to build confidence and healthy competitive practice among the students. Quality Indicator 51: Corporal punishments are strictly prohibited.

Quality Criteria 4: Human Resource Management

Quality Area 20: Work Organization & Management

Quality Indicator 52: Organization enforces team spirit and clearly defines the roles and functions of the workforce for effective functioning. Quality Indicator 53: Organization ensures efficient and optimum use of available resources by the workforce and regular monitoring of activities at all levels. Quality Indicator 54: The senior leaders emphasize on cooperation, initiation, empowerment and innovation among the workforce for quality outcomes. Quality Indicator 55: The teachers are exposed to workshops / programs for better understanding of child psychology so as to provide students with the stress-free learning environment. Quality Indicator 56: Organization ensures active participation of the workforce in the decision making and strategy formulation concerning the key areas.

Quality Area 21: Performance Management System

Quality Indicator 57: Organization uses comprehensive feedback mechanisms for

collecting relevant data / information for improving the performance of workforce. Quality Indicator 58: Organization follows well developed transparent, fair appraisal system by a peer, senior leaders to identify gaps in excellence performance. Quality Indicator 59: The organization considers the promotion/demotion, any kind of reward or appreciation based on the data gathered through regular monitoring and recording of the performance.

Quality Area 22: Training & Advancement programs

Quality Indicator 60: The workforce is enriched with quality training programs at regular intervals to enhance their professional competencies with regard to key organizational objectives like diversity in the classroom, ethical behavior, leadership development, safety etc. Quality Indicator 61: There is a systematic approach to transfer the acquired knowledge and skills from the retiring / departing employee for the organization use Quality Indicator 62: Organization monitors and accordingly plans further training and development programs to ensure required competencies for delivering learning-centered processes

Quality Area 23: Motivation: satisfaction and dissatisfaction

Quality Indicator 63: The senior leaders observe mechanisms of motivation as ongoing processes to ensure optimum utilization of workforce potential. Quality Indicator 64: The feedback from the workforce, taken from time to time on key areas, forms an important source for determining the satisfaction and dissatisfaction of the workforce for improvement. Quality Indicator 65: Organization provides support services to deal with expectations and requirements of differently abled workforce.

Quality Area 24: Recruitment, Induction & Termination

Quality Indicators 66: The workforce recruitment is made in accordance with legally viable, clear, transparent procedures by the relevant regulatory bodies to attract competent and qualified persons. Quality Indicator 67: The senior leaders of the organization introduce the organizational mission and vision to the fresher through a well-developed effective orientation/induction program. Quality Indicator 68: The termination procedures adheres to the policy of termination that is legally viable, clear, transparent and mutually agreed upon

Quality Criteria 5: Stakeholder & Market Relation Management

Quality Area 25: Stakeholder Participation and Interaction

Quality Indicator69: Organization incorporates stakeholder and market participation in formulating its learning-centered process and its requirement. Quality Indicator 70: Organization emphasizes on building and retaining healthy relationships with the stakeholder for better opportunities and facilities for improvement. Quality Indicator 71: Stakeholder participation assures new and continuing interactions and positive referrals Quality Indicator 72: Organization uses ICT as an effective and reliable means of communication that enables stakeholder to seek information, pursue common purpose and make complaints

Quality Area 26: Satisfaction & Dissatisfaction

Quality Indicator 73: Organization has mechanisms, tailored to the specific need and requirement of the stakeholder group, to seek information about their satisfaction / dissatisfaction. Quality Indicator 74: The information collected is effectively used to

exceed in stakeholder expectations, secure future interaction with organization and encourage positive referrals

Quality Area 27: Community challenges

Quality Indicator75: Organization functions as an integral part of the community. Quality Indicator76: Organization continuously monitors for any adverse impact of its programs, services offerings on the community. Quality Indicator 77: The information collected / received is used to further modify / improve / redesign the programs / services/offering

Quality Area 28: Linkage for Quality Assurance

Quality Indicator 78: Organization is linked with other concerned organizations that provide an important source of review / critics for quality assurance. Quality Indicator 79: The effectiveness of these linkages is reflected in the outcomes of the organization functioning in terms of its product quality.

References

1. Asadullah, M.N. and Chaudhury, N. (2006) Religious Schools, Social Values, and Baker, D. P., Goesling, B. and LeTendre, G. K. 2002. Socioeconomic status, school quality, and national economic development: a cross-national analysis of the 'Heyneman-Loxley effect' on mathematics and science achievement. Comparative Education Review, Vol. 46, No. 3, pp. 291-312.
2. Benavot, A. and Tanner, E. 2007. The growth of national learning assessments in the world, 1995– 2006. Background paper for EFA Global Monitoring Report 2008.
3. David Langford and Barbara Cleary (1995). Orchestrating Learning with Quality. Published by ASQ Quality Press, Wisconsin, USA.
4. Drèze, Jean and G. Kingdon (February 2001). "School Participation in Rural India", Review of Development Economics, 5, No. 1: 1-33,
5. Excellence in Schools (1997). Published by Department of Education and Employment London, UK:
6. Geeta Gandhi Kingdon (2007). The Progress of School Education in India (GPRG-WPS071). Global Poverty Research Group- report, E.S.R.C. Economic & Social Research Council.
7. Garcia, G; and Pearson, P. (1991). The Role of Assessment in a Diverse Society. pp 253- 278 Joseph Zajda (1995). Defining Excellence and Quality in Education.
8. Kingdon, G (2007). "The Progress of School Education in India", Oxford Review of Economic Policy, 23, No. 2: 168-195,
9. Kanji, Malek and Tambi (1999). Total quality Management in UK Higher Education Institutes. Total Quality Management and Business Excellence, 10 (1), 129-153.
10. Niaz Ahmed (2008). Emerging Systems of Educational Quality assessment in Developing Countries. Quality assessment in Education, 16 (2).
11. Public Report on Basic Education in India; The PROBE Team (1999), in association with the Centre for Development Economics; Oxford University Press, New Delhi, 1-156.
12. National Assessment and Accreditation Council (2007). Quality Assurance Toolkit for Teacher Education Institutions

13. http://ksqao.org/ (Karnataka School Quality Assessment Organization, Retrieved on 11.6.08)
14. http://www.asercentre.org/asersurvey/aser08.php (ASER, 2008, Retrieved on 22.4.08)
15. http://pisis.unalmed.edu.co/cursos/material/3004639/1/Barlas1996Formal%20aspects%20of%20model%20validity.pdf (Formal aspects of model validity and validation in system dynamics, Retrieved on 22.6.08)
16. www.qcin.org (Accreditation Standard for Quality School Governance, NABET, Retrieved on 28.7 08)
17. http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/custom/portlets/recordDetails/detailmini.jsp?_nfpb=true&_&ERICExtSearch_SearchValue_0=EJ441601&ERICExtSearch_SearchType_0=no&acc no=EJ441601 (Quality Education: An Inquiry into Its Definition and a Framework for Its Measurement, Retrieved on 17.3.08)
18. http://nationalstrategies.standards.dcsf.gov.uk/primary/literacysubjectarea (The National Strategies, Retrieved on 4.5.08)
19. http://www.amazon.com/reader/0195648706?_encoding=UTF8&page=random#reader (Public Report on Basic education in India, (Retrieved on 10.3.08)
20. http://india.gov.in/sectors/education/ministry_education.php (Ministry of Human Resource Development, Retrieved on 16.4.08)
21. http://www.unesco.org/en/education/improving-education-quality/(Improving Education Quality, UNESCO, Retrieved on 3.6.08)
22. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/UNESCO#Activities (UNESCO, Retrieved on3.6.08)
23. http://www.jamesnicholaspublishers.com.au/exqualbk.htm (Excellence and Quality in Education, Retrieved on12.4.08)
24. http://www.ukchildcare.ca/policy/whitepaper.shtml (The Excellence In Schools White Paper, Retrieved on 26.3.08)
25. http://www.unesco.org/iiep/eng/publications/recent/rec11.htm (Quality of education, Retrieved on 30.3.08)
26. http://www.open.ac.uk/cetl-workspace/cetlcontent/documents/464428ed4aa20.pdf (Issues in the assessment of practice-based professional learning, Retrieved on 5.5.08).
27. http://www.quality.nist.gov/Education_Criteria.htm(Malcolm Baldrige Criteria for Education, Retrieved on 25.2.08).
28. http://www.quality.nist.gov/PDF_files/2007_Education_Criteria.pdf (Malcolm Baldrige Criteria for Education, Retrieved on 26.3.08)
29. http:/www.gprg.org/ (The Progress of School Education in India, Retrieved on 26.4.08).
30. http://www.nysan.org/content/document/detail/1991/(NYSAN Quality Self-Assessment Tool, Retrieved on 26.4.08)
31. http://www.wikipedia.org/wiki/International_Institute_for_Educational_Planning_IIEP (Retrieved on 26.3.08)
32. http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/Home.Portal?_nfpb=true&_pageLabel=advanced (Retrieved on 20.4.08)

33. http://www.indiaeducationdiary.in/Statutory-Bodies/NCERT/Activities.asp   (NCERT; Programme and activities, Retrieved on 13.5 08)
34. http://tutor2u.net/business/presentations/marketing/newproductdevelopment/default.html (Product development technology. Retrieved on 15.4.08)
35. http://www.ncert.nic.in/sites/organisation/organisation.aspx

Author (s) Biography

Dr. Anjali Bhatnagar is an innovative, forward-thinking educator with over seventeen years of progressive experience and accomplishments as an administrator, author, and trainer through strategic planning, curriculum design; effective faculty interaction & communication, defining quality assessment of educational processes; development and conduction of teacher empowerment programs. 'Teacher Empowerment' is her key research interest.

Dr. Sanjeev Sonawane is a Professor of Physical Education and head of the department in the University of Pune, India. He is an innovative, forward thinking educator with over three decades of progressive experience and accomplishments as an administrator, author, researcher, through strategic planning, curriculum design; effective faculty interaction & communication. He established ICT base learning and research Lab for visually impaired at University of Pune.