

International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews

Journal homepage: www.ijrpr.com ISSN 2582-7421

National Education Policy 2020 on Higher Education: A Study on Outcome Based Perspective

Dr. Ajay Chakraborty

Assistant Professor, Tetso College, Sovima, Chumukdima, Nagaland

ABSTRACT

The vision of India is crafted in National Education Policy 2020 to ensure the growth and development of the country and to create equitable society. The unfinished agenda of National Policy on education 1986 was incorporated. Policy in absence of outcomes is mere a document. Outcomes such as lesson, course, program and exit must be reflected at the end of leaning. Hence, the present study attempts to bring few facts into light before implementation.

The study explore whether the National Education policy 2020 can bring pre assumed outcomes at the end of learning. This research collected primary data from 97 teachers of higher education. Regression and correlation analysis were used to test the hypothesis. It was found that there was a significant association between 'National Education Policy 2020' and on 'Outcomes of learning' and 'Skills development' but fail to generate required 'employment' as perceived by the teachers.

Hence, the necessary steps in advance have to be initiated to restrict the barriers of implementation. Adopting best practices rather than following best rules and regulations may bring success in the life of 21st Century learners.

Key Words: National Education Policy 2020, Learning Outcomes, Skill Development and Employment.

I.INTRODUCTION

Policy in absence of outcomes is a mere document rather than perspective plan. The vision of India is crafted in National Education Policy 2020 to lit light on the life of each student and in turn they contribute to the growth and development of the country on one hand and to create equitable society on the other. National Education Policy 2020 revised and revamped the educational structure of National Policy on Education 1986. The goals of 21st century education emphasizes on value education. The unfinished agenda of National Policy on education 1986 modified in 1992 is incorporated in the present policy. This policy envisaged on good educational institutions that provide quality education. The quality of education will be discernible when it has valuable outcomes. Beside these, it has intended to inspire current and future learners, policy makers, educator and scholars to align their efforts towards innovation and creativity.

Meaning of Outcome Based Education

The concept of Outcomes-based education was coined by Spady in 1988. According to him, organizing "an educational system around what is essential for all students to be able to do successfully at the end of their learning experience" is called Outcomes-based education. It is not the end semester result given in a piece of paper that measure memory, not on skill that is required for a person to perform a task.

The term "outcome" is lexically defined as "something that follows as a result or a consequence" and "the way a thing turns out". He emphasizes on all levels of outcomes of education, i.e., Lesson Outcomes, Course Outcome, Program Outcomes and Exit Outcomes. However, according to **Spady**, the most important form of outcomes which reflect real life roles that learners will perform the moment they exit the education system is called culminating outcome.

II. HIGHER EDUCATION IN INDIA

India is the main supplier of human resource to the world. Hence, the Education system of India has gained an important place in the global education. There are 998 Universities, 39,931 Colleges and 10,725 Standalone institutions in the country. It has 34.6 million enrolled students, it is 2nd largest in terms of enrolment.

III. NATIONAL EDUCATION POLICY ON HIGHER EDUCATION

The National Education Policy 2020 was released in July 2020. The main foundational pillars of this policy are: Access, Equity, Quality, Affordability and Accountability. This policy is aligned with the agenda of 2030 which aimed for sustainable development. This policy aims to bring paradigm shift by emphasizing on multidisciplinary and liberal education, faculty autonomy, coexistence of public and private higher educational institutions, creating research ecosystem, credit based system and focusing on emerging technologies to deliver quality education to the 21st century learners.

IV. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

There are few studies carried on the basis of concept of NEP. Aithal et al (2020) analyzed National Education Policy 2020 towards achieving its objectives. Sujatha Ramesh and Natarajan (2019) compared the proposed NEP with the American Education system. Kalervo N Gulson and Sam seller (2018) focused on topology of policy by private and public partnership. Nikil Govind (2019), Aithal and Shybhrajyotsna Aithal (2019) analyzed positive and negative aspect of proposed NEP and came up with some suggestion for further improvement. But the present study differs from others, concentrated on likelihood outcomes of National Education Policy 2020.

V. OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY

Given the survey of literature and scope, the following objective established for the purpose of the study is:

- 1. To explore likelihood Outcomes of National Education Policy 2020 in Higher Education.
- 2. To review the likelihood impact of National Education Policy on Higher Education in imparting of 'Skills' and 'Employment'.

VI. HYPOTHESES

Given the objectives, survey of literature and scope, the following hypotheses are established for the purpose of the study is:

- H₁: There is no significant likelihood impact of 'National Education Policy' on the 'Outcomes' of Higher Education as perceived by the teachers.
 - H2: There is no significant likelihood impact of 'National Education Policy' on the 'Development of Skills' as perceived by the teachers.
- H₃: There is no significant likelihood impact of 'National Education Policy' on the 'Generation of Employment' as perceived by the teachers

VII. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The data were collected through a survey with a set of questionnaire with the help of 5 Points Likert Scale, for National Education Policy 2020, likelihood outcomes, Skills and Employment. 97 teachers from the Higher Educational Institutions have taken part in the survey.

VIII. Latent Variable Considered for the Study

- [a] National Education Policy this variable has been considered to measure the degree of or intensity of National Education Policy2020 adopted by the Government as perceived by the teachers.
- [b] Outcomes this has been used in the sense of measuring the degree of Outcomes (Lesson Outcomes, Course Outcomes, Program Outcomes and Exit Outcomes) achieved by the students of higher educational institutions as perceived by the teachers.
- [c] Development of Skills this has been used in the sense of measuring the degree of Development of Skills by National Educational Policy 2020 as perceived by the teachers.
- [d]Generation of Employment- this has been used in the sense of measuring the degree of Employment Generated by National Educational Policy 2020 as perceived by the teachers.

IX. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The results obtained from the analysis of data based on hypotheses statements are tested by using correlation and regression analysis with the model summary to prove each hypothesis.

[a] Likelihood impact of 'New Education Policy' on 'Outcomes'

 H_1 : There is no significant likelihood impact of 'National Education Policy' on the 'Outcomes' of Higher Education as perceived by the teachers.

Table No:1						
Descriptive Statistics of 'New Education Policy' on 'Outcomes'						
	Mean	Std. Deviation	N			
Outcomes	3.6495	.69432	97			
National Education Policy 2020	3.7776	.55135	97			

Source: Survey Data

Table No.1 represents the mean value of 'New Education Policy' on 'Outcomes'. It has been observed that the mean value of Outcomes is 3.64 and the mean value of National Education Policy is 3.77. The relationship between the variables is presented in the following table.

Table No:2			
Correlations between 'New	w Education Policy' and 'Outcomes'		
		Outcomes	National Education Policy 2020
Pearson Correlation	Outcomes	1.000	.316
earson Correlation	National Education Policy 2020	.316	1.000
Sig. (1 tailed)	Outcomes	•	.001
Sig. (1-tailed)	National Education Policy 2020	.001	•
.T	Outcomes	97	97
V	National Education Policy 2020	97	97

Source: Survey Data

From the above tests, it is discernible that there exists low level of positive relationship between [a] Outcomes and [b] National Education Policy. Therefore, the National Education Policy will have an impact on Outcomes of higher education since they are positively associated. This is further discussed in the following regression model.

Table No	:3									
Model Su	ımmary ^b f	or 'New Edu	cation Policy	on 'Outcomes'						
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted	RStd. Error of the	eChange Statistic	es				Durbin-Watson
			Square	Estimate	R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change	
1	.316a	.100	.090	.66230	.100	10.508	1	95	.002	1.759
		tant), National		licy 2020			l			

Source: Survey Data

Table No: 3 shows the R and R² values. The R value represents the simple correlation which is 0.316 (the "R" Column), which indicates a low degree of positive correlation between the variables. The R² value (the "R Square" column) indicates how much of the total variation in the dependent variable, outcomes, can be explained by the independent variable, National Education Policy. In this case 31.6% can be explained, which is moderate. It is observed that R²value is 10% and there are 90% of factors other than National Education Policy have an impact on Outcomes of Higher Education. The significance value is 0.002 which is smaller than the table values of 0.05, hence the hypothesis is rejected. Thus, there is a significant likelihood impact of 'National Education Policy' on the 'Outcomes' of Higher Education as perceived by the teachers. This is further discussed in the given ANOVA analysis below.

Table No	Table No:4								
ANOVA	^a for 'New Education	Policy' on 'Outcomes'							
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.			
	Regression	4.609	1	4.609	10.508	.002b			
1	Residual	41.671	95	.439					
	Total	46.280	96						
a. Depend	dent Variable: Outcom	es	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1	J.	1			
b. Predict	tors: (Constant), Nation	nal Education Policy 2020							

Source: Survey Data

ANOVA Table No: 4 show that the significant value is smaller than 0.05, which means dependent variable Outcomes of Higher Education is significantly predicted by independent variable National Education Policy at 95% of confident level.

Table I Coeffic	No:5 :ients ^a for 'New Education Po	licy' on 'O	utcomes'						
Model		Unstandard	lized Coefficients	Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95.0% Confider		
		В	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound	
	(Constant)	2.148	.468		4.590	.000	1.219	3.077	
1	National Education Policy 2020	.397	.123	.316	3.242	.002	.154	.641	

Source: Survey Data

The common regression equation is

Y = a + bX

Table No:5 shows the effects of National Educational Policy on the Outcomes of Higher Education is given by the regression equation, the regression Model for the study can be written as follows:

Outcomes = 2.148 –0.397 (National Education Policy)

Since the model established for the study fit, the null hypothesis is rejected. Hence, there is a significant likelihood impact of 'National Education Policy' on the 'Outcomes' of Higher Education as perceived by the teachers.

[b] Likelihood impact of 'New Education Policy' on 'Development of Skills'

H2: There is no significant likelihood impact of 'National Education Policy' on the 'Development of Skills' as perceived by the teachers.

Table No:6						
Descriptive Statistics of 'New Education Policy' and 'Development of Skills'						
	Mean	Std. Deviation	N			
Development of Skills	3.8157	.54935	97			
National Education Policy 2020	3.7776	.55135	97			

Source: Survey Data

Table No.6 represents the mean value of 'New Education Policy' on 'Development of Skills'. It has been observed that the mean value of Development of Skills is 3.81 and the mean value of National Education Policy is 3.77. The relationship between the variables is presented in the following table.

Table No:7			
Correlations between of '	New Education Policy' and 'Development of Skil	ls'	
		Development of Skills	National Education Policy 2020
Pearson Correlation	Development of Skills	1.000	.307
rearson Correlation	National Education Policy 2020	.307	1.000
Sig. (1-tailed)	Development of Skills	•	.001
Sig. (1-tailed)	National Education Policy 2020	.001	•
N	Development of Skills	97	97
LN	National Education Policy 2020	97	97

Source: Survey Data

From the above tests, it is discernible that there exists low level of positive relationship between [a] Development of Skills and [b] National Education Policy. Therefore, the National Education Policy will develop of Skills when the students assess higher education since they are positively associated. This is further discussed in the following regression model.

Table No	o:8									
Model St	ummary ^b f	or 'New Edu	cation Policy'	on 'Developmen	nt of Skills'					
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted		heChange Statist	tics				Durbin-Watson
			Square	Estimate	R Squar Change	reF Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change	
1	.307ª	.094	.085	.52562	.094	9.864	1	95	.002	1.594
a. Predict	tors: (Const	tant), National	Education Po	licy 2020					I	ı
b. Depend	dent Variab	ole: Developm	ent of Skills							

Source: Survey Data

Table No: 8 shows the R and R^2 values. The R value represents the simple correlation which is 0.307 (the "R" Column), which indicates a low degree of positive correlation between the variables. The R^2 value (the "R Square" column) indicates how much of the total variation in the dependent variable, development of skills, can be explained by the independent variable, National Education Policy. In this case 30.7% can be explained, which is moderate. It is observed that R^2 value is 9.4% and there are 90.6% of factors other than National Education Policy have an impact on Developing of Skills in Higher Education. The significance value is 0.002 which is smaller than the table values of 0.05, hence the hypothesis is rejected. Thus, there is a significant likelihood impact of 'National Education Policy' on the 'Development of Skills' of students as perceived by the teachers. This is further discussed in the given ANOVA analysis below.

Table No:9								
ANOVA	A ^a for 'New Education	Policy' on 'Development o	f Skills'					
Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.		
	Regression	2.725	1	2.725	9.864	.002b		
	Residual	26.247	95	.276				
	Total	28.972	96					
. Depei	ndent Variable: Develop	oment of Skills			l	l .		
. Predi	ctors: (Constant), Nation	nal Education Policy 2020						

Source: Survey Data

ANOVA Table No: 9 show that the significant value is smaller than 0.05, which means dependent variable Development of Skills in Higher Education is significantly predicted by independent variable National Education Policy at 95% of confident level.

	Table No:10							
Coefficients ^a for 'New Education Policy' on 'Development of Skills' Model Unstandardized Coefficients Standardized t Sig. 95.0% Confidence Interval for Coefficients								nce Interval for B
		В	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
	(Constant)	2.661	.371		7.165	.000	1.924	3.399
1	National Education Policy 2020	.306	.097	.307	3.141	.002	.112	.499
a. Depe	. Dependent Variable: Development of Skills							

Source: Survey Data

The common regression equation is

Y = a + bX

Table No:5 shows the effects of National Educational Policy on the Outcomes of Higher Education is given by the regression equation, the regression Model for the study can be written as follows:

Development of Skills = 2.661 –0.306 (National Education Policy)

Since the model established for the study fit, the null hypothesis is rejected. Hence, there is a significant likelihood impact of 'National Education Policy' on the 'Development of Skills' when students assess higher education as perceived by the teachers.

[c] Likelihood impact of 'New Education Policy' on 'Generation of Employment'

 H_3 : There is no significant likelihood impact of 'National Education Policy' on the teachers. 'Generation of Employment' as perceived by the

Table No:11						
Descriptive Statistics of 'New Education Policy' and 'Generation of Employment'						
	Mean	Std. Deviation	N			
Generation of Employment	3.9670	.50057	97			
National Education Policy 2020	3.7776	.55135	97			

Source: Survey Data

Table No.11 represents the mean value of 'New Education Policy' on 'Generation of Employment'. It has been observed that the mean value of Generation of Employment is 3.96 and the mean value of National Education Policy is 3.77. The relationship between the variables is presented in the following table.

Table No:12								
Correlations for 'New Education Policy' on 'Generation of Employment'								
		Generation of Employment	National Education Policy 2020					
Pearson Correlation	Generation of Employment	1.000	.091					
r earson Correlation	National Education Policy 2020	.091	1.000					
Sig. (1-tailed)	Generation of Employment		.189					
Sig. (1-tailed)	National Education Policy 2020	.189	•					
N.I.	Generation of Employment	97	97					
IN	National Education Policy 2020	97	97					

Source: Survey Data

From the above tests, it is discernible that there exists low level of positive relationship between [a] Generation of Employment and [b] National Education Policy. Therefore, the National Education Policy will generate employment when the students assess higher education since they are positively associated. This is further discussed in the following regression model.

Table No:13										
Model Su	ımmary ^b f	or 'New Edu	cation Policy'	on 'Generation of	Employment'					
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted F Square		Change Statistics					Durbin-Watson
				Estimate	R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change	1
1	.091a	.008	002	.50112	.008	.788	1	95	.377	1.617
			Education Po				l		'	1
b. Depend	dent Variab	ole: Generation	n of Employm	ent						

Table No: 13 shows the R and R² values. The R value represents the simple correlation which is 0.091 (the "R" Column), which indicates a low degree of positive correlation between the variables. The R² value (the "R Square" column) indicates how much of the total variation in the dependent variable, generation of employment, can be explained by the independent variable, National Education Policy. In this case 9.1% can be explained, which is very low. It is observed that R²value is 0.8% and there are 99.2% of factors other than National Education Policy have an impact on generation of employment. The significance value is 0.377 which is greater than the table values of 0.05, hence the hypothesis is accepted. Thus, there is no significant likelihood impact of 'National Education Policy' on the 'Generation of Employment' as perceived by the teachers. This is further discussed in the given ANOVA analysis below.

Γable N						
ANOVA	A for 'New Education	Policy' on 'Generation of E	mployment'			-
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
	Regression	.198	1	.198	.788	.377 ^b
1	Residual	23.857	95	.251		
	Total	24.054	96			

Source: Survey Data

ANOVA Table No:14 show that the significant value is greater than 0.05, which means dependent variable Generation of Employment is not significantly predicted by independent variable National Education Policy at 95% of confident level.

Table No:15									
Coefficients ^a for 'New Education Policy' on 'Generation of Employment'									
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B		
		В	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound	
	(Constant)	3.656	.354		10.325	.000	2.953	4.359	
1	National Education Policy 2020	.082	.093	.091	.888	.377	102	.266	
ı. Dep	l endent Variable: Generation of	Employme	nt						

Source: Survey Data

The common regression equation is

Y = a + bX

Table No:15 shows the effects of National Educational Policy on Generation of Employment is given by the regression equation, the regression Model for the study can be written as follows:

Generation of Employment =3.656 – 0.082 (National Education Policy)

Since the model established for the study does not fit, the null hypothesis is accepted. Hence, there is no significant likelihood impact of 'National Education Policy' on the 'Generation of Employment' as perceived by the teachers.

X. LIMITATIONS

The sample considered for the study is very limited. This research paper did not collect any feedback from of the students regarding National Education Policy. The results are assumed by respondent and may not be true after implementation of the policy.

XI. CONCLUSION

National Education Policy 2020 is new benchmark strategy of Government of India to build a strong globally demanded education system. In the line of ensuring quality education, National Education Policy has to adopt best practice to bring best performance. It was found that there was a significant association between 'National Education Policy 2020' and on 'Outcomes of learning' and 'Skills development' but fail to generate required 'employment' as perceived by the teachers. This discernible that the policy needs strong strategic execution failing which it may find difficult to achieve exit outcomes of higher education i.e 'Skill' and 'Employment'.

References

Aithal, P. S. & Shubhrajyotsna Aithal (2019). Transforming Society by Creating Innovators through Skill & Research Focussed Education – A Case Study of Srinivas University. International Journal of Applied Engineering and Management Letters (IJAEML), 3(1).

Aithal, Sreeramana and Aithal, Shubhrajyotsna, (2020) Analysis of the Indian National Education Policy 2020 towards Achieving its Objectives, Munich Personal RePEc Archive, 1-20, Online at https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/102549/

Adukia, Anjali.(2019) "India's National Education Policy: A Need to Look Beyond the Classroom to Improve Results." Voxdev Health & Education, 2019, https://voxdev.org/topic/ health-education/india-s-national-educationpolicy-need-look-beyond-classroomimprove-results.

Aithal, P. S.(2019) "Analysis of Higher Education In Indian National Education Policy Proposal 2019 and its Implementation Challenges." International Journal of Applied Engineering and Management Letters, 3(2),1-35.

Govind, Nikil.(2019) "The New Educational Policy 2019: Opportunities and Challenges for Medical Ethics." Indian Journal of Medical Ethics,4(3), 175-177

Kelervo N Gulson and Sam Seller(2019). "Emerging Data Infrastructures and the New Topologies of Education Policy." Environment and Planning D: Society and Space, vol. 3(2), 350-366.

Maruthavanan M (2020), A Study on the Awareness on New Education Policy (2019) among the Secondary School Teachers in Madurai District, International Journal of Education, 8(3), 67-71.

Spady, William G,(1994) "Outcome-Based Education: Critical Issues and Answers", American Association of School Administrators, Arlington VA, ISBN-0-87652-183-9 94.

Singh, Ramit.(2020) "The National Education Policy 2019: An Alarming Attempt To Redefine India." Business world, 2020, http://www.businessworld.in/article/ The National Education Policy 2019-An-Alarming-Attempt-To-RedefineIndia/31-07-2019-174188.

Sohoni, Milind.(2020) "New Education Policy will Ensure our Higher Education System Remains a Client of Global Science." The Indian Express, 2020, https://indianexpress.com/ article/opinion/columns/the-aspiration-trapnational-education-policy-5834797.

Tilak, Jandhyala. B.G.(2019) "Promising but Perplexing Solutions: A Critique of the Draft National Education Policy 2019." Social Change, 49(4), 1-7