



Faculty competencies in higher education in the emergence of NEP- A study with special reference to Karimnagar and Jagtial, Telangana

Dr Harjoth Kaur,

Asst Professor of Commerce

Government Degree College for Women, Jagtial.

Abstract:

It is well known fact that education is the key driver of economic and social progress since ages. Education is concerned with methods of teaching and learning in formal set up like schools, colleges or Universities. If educated, one can become better citizens, can get a better-paid job, can recognize the difference between good and bad. The Government therefore bring forward education policy. It works on to bring a well-defined, visionary and futuristic education policy taking into account the prevailing traditions and culture. Recently Government of India announced its New Education Policy 2020 (NEP 2020), which aimed at transforming our nation sustainably into an equitable and vibrant global knowledge society. NEP 2020 provides for quality education through multidisciplinary universities, autonomous colleges and schools. This is indeed a welcome step, which will bring about a paradigm shift in India's education system and will transform it into a modern, progressive, and equitable one. The success of any education policy depends on the competencies of a teacher as teachers are the backbone of an education system. The way the teachers do their teaching has a seminal influence on what the students learn. The role of the teachers and their competency in transactional processes of educational curriculum remain crucial to an effective outcome of learning. This research article aimed at to know whether faculty are aware of the new policy. The questionnaire has five parts – Awareness of NEP, understanding of NEP, Implementation of NEP, Benefits of NEP and teaching competencies of faculties for the success of NEP. The data from a sample of 92 respondents from Karimnagar and Jagtial are collected using convenient sampling method and analyzed using SPSS 26 version. The results revealed that moderate teaching competencies are there.

Keywords: National Education Policy 2020 (NEP 2020), Higher Education, Quality Education.

Introduction

Change is inevitable. No society is untouched by the process of change. The process of change socially, politically, demographically, technologically, culturally etc. are seen and witnessed especially during and after COVID-19. Changes are of two types – Controllable and Uncontrollable. Natural changes are uncontrollable whereas social changes can be controllable by bringing changes in life and society through education and research. That is the reason that countries come out with various education policies suiting to the needs and aspirations of their countries. In the same manner, India till today had come out with three education policies- one in 1968 by Smt. Indira Gandhi , the then Prime Minister of India, second in 1986 by Sri Rajiv Gandhi, the Prime Minister of India and third in 2020 by Sri Narendra Modi Prime Minister of India. This policy has come out after a gap of 34 years. The main aim of the policy is to make India a global knowledgeable society.

This policy has been prepared by keeping in view 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (SD) of UNO, which seeks to ensure inclusive and equitable quality education; and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all. To achieve this, Indian Government reconfigured and reformed the education system sustainably into an equitable and vibrant knowledge society, by providing high quality education to all. The rich heritage of ancient and eternal Indian knowledge and thoughts has guided to frame this Policy. The policy revised and revamped all the aspects of the education system, including its regulation and governance. The policy emphasized on development of the creative potential of each individual and higher order cognitive capacities, such as critical thinking and problem solving; and also social, ethical, and emotional capacities and dispositions.

Review of Literature

Dr. Rupesh G. Sawant et al in their research paper titled “National Education Policy 2020 and higher education: a brief review” discussed the background and emergence; vision, thrust areas and guidelines; and opportunities to all stakeholders. Finally, they concluded the need for planned, systematic and careful implementation of the policy.

Ajay Kurien et al in their paper titled “Impact of New Education Policy 2020 on Higher Education” and concluded that education system should constantly reform itself. Effective and time-bound implementation will help in obtaining its vision of a global vibrant knowledgeable power.

Dr. Hemlata Verma et al. in their paper titled “New Education Policy 2020 of India: A Theoretical Analysis” stated that the child are placed under right to education act 2009. It also stated that the policy aims at providing quality education to all and universalization of education system.

B.Venkateshwarlu in his paper titled “a critical study of nep 2020: issues, approaches, challenges, oppertunities and criticism” stated that “Himachal Pradesh has become the first state to implement New Education Policy 2020. The national educational policy should be implemented in all schools over India by 2022.”.

Dr, Rahul Pratap Singh Kaurav et al in their paper entitled “new education policy: qualitative (contents) analysis and twitter mining (sentiment analysis)” stated that most of people consider this policy as a positive and welcoming step.

P. S. Aitha et al in their paper titled “Analysis of the Indian National Education Policy 2020 towards Achieving its Objectives” stated that “ the Indian higher education system is moving from teacher centric to student centric, information centric to knowledge centric, marks centric to skills centric, examination centric to experimental centric, learning centric to research centric, and choice centric to competency centric.”.

Objectives of the study

The primary objective of this research is to study whether the faculty are aware of New Education Policy 2020. The other aim is to know whether present faculty competencies in Karimnagar and Jagtial are adequate to adopt to new policy.

Research methodology

The questionnaire has five parts – Awareness of NEP, understanding of NEP, Implementation of NEP, Benefits of NEP and teaching competencies of faculties for the success of NEP. The data is collected through Google Form. The data from a sample of 92 respondents from Karimnagar and Jagtial are collected using convenient sampling method and analyzed using SPSS 26 version. The necessary secondary data was collected from various websites including those of Government of India, magazines, journals, other publications, etc. This data was then analysed and reviewed to arrive at the inferences and conclusions.

Limitations of the Study

1. The study cannot be generalized as it is confined to two districts of Telangana only.

2. The responses may be subjective
3. The data received is online only.

Data Analysis and Interpretation

Demographic Analysis

		Place		Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
		Frequency	Percent		
Valid	Karimnagar	56	60.9	60.9	60.9
	Jagtial	36	39.1	39.1	100.0
	Total	92	100.0	100.0	

Source: Questionnaire

It can be concluded from the above table most of the respondents are from Karimnagar i.e., 60.9 percent followed by 39.1 percent. This shows that number of faculty are more in number in Karimnagar.

		Age		Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
		Frequency	Percent		
Valid	Below 25 Yrs	10	10.9	10.9	10.9
	25-30 Yrs	18	19.6	19.6	30.4
	31-35 Yrs	20	21.7	21.7	52.2
	36 - 40 Yrs	19	20.7	20.7	72.8
	41-45 Yrs	17	18.5	18.5	91.3
	Above 45 Yrs	8	8.7	8.7	100.0
	Total	92	100.0	100.0	

Source: Questionnaire

It is observed from the above table that majority of the respondents belong to the age group 31-35 years i.e. 21.7 percent followed by 36-60 years i.e. 20.7 percent, 25-30 years i.e. 19.6 percent, 41-45 years i.e. 18.5 percent and above 45 years i.e. 8.7 percent respectively. This shows that majority of the faculty are young adults.

		Designation		Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
		Frequency	Percent		
Valid	Professor	10	10.9	10.9	10.9
	Associate Professor	19	20.7	20.7	31.5
	Assistant Professor	28	30.4	30.4	62.0
	Lecturer	18	19.6	19.6	81.5
	Other	17	18.5	18.5	100.0
	Total	92	100.0	100.0	

Source: Questionnaire

It is observed from the above table that majority of the respondents are assistant professors i.e. 30.4 percent followed by associate professors i.e. 20.7 percent, lecturer i.e. 19.6 percent, other categories like PGT etc. i.e. 18.5 percent and Professor i.e. 10.9 percent respectively. This shows that majority of the faculty are assistant professors.

		Department		Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
		Frequency	Percent		
Valid	Arts	10	10.9	10.9	10.9
	Commerce	24	26.1	26.1	37.0
	Management	19	20.7	20.7	57.6
	Science	22	23.9	23.9	81.5
	Other	17	18.5	18.5	100.0
	Total	92	100.0	100.0	

Source: Questionnaire

It is observed from the above table that majority of the respondents are of Commerce department i.e. 26.1 percent followed by Science department i.e. 23.9 percent, Management department i.e. 20.7 percent, other departments like Education etc. i.e. 18.5 percent and Arts department i.e. 10.9 percent respectively. This shows that majority of the faculty are from Commerce department.

		College		Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
		Frequency	Percent		
Valid	Intermediate	17	18.5	18.5	18.5
	Degree	31	33.7	33.7	52.2
	PG	15	16.3	16.3	68.5
	Engineering	5	5.4	5.4	73.9
	Medical	6	6.5	6.5	80.4
	Vocational	8	8.7	8.7	89.1
	Law	7	7.6	7.6	96.7
	Other	3	3.3	3.3	100.0
	Total	92	100.0	100.0	

Source: Questionnaire

It is observed from the above table that majority of the respondents are working in Degree Colleges i.e., 33.7 percent followed by Intermediate i.e. 18.5 percent, PG i.e. 16.3 percent, Vocational i.e. 8.7 percent and Law i.e. 7.6 percent, Medical i.e. 6.5 percent and other Education etc. i.e. 3 percent respectively. This shows that majority of the faculty are working in Degree Colleges.

		Marital Status		Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
		Frequency	Percent		
Valid	Married	41	44.6	44.6	44.6
	Unmarried	21	22.8	22.8	67.4
	Separated/Divorced	17	18.5	18.5	85.9
	Prefer not to say	13	14.1	14.1	100.0
	Total	92	100.0	100.0	

Source: Questionnaire

It is observed from the above table that majority of the respondents are married i.e., 44.6 percent followed by unmarried i.e. 22.8 percent, separated/Divorced i.e. 18.5 percent, and preferred not to say are 13 i.e. 14.1 percent respectively. This shows that majority of the faculty are married.

Awareness of NEP

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Poor Awareness of NEP	14	15.2	15.2	15.2
	Moderate Awareness of NEP	67	72.8	72.8	88.0
	High Awareness of NEP	11	12.0	12.0	100.0
	Total	92	100.0	100.0	

Source: Questionnaire

It is observed from the above table that majority of the respondents are moderately aware of NEP i.e., 72.8 percent followed by poorly aware i.e. 15.2 percent highly aware are 11 i.e. just 12 percent respectively. This shows that majority of the faculty are moderately aware of NEP.

Understanding of NEP

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Poor Understanding of NEP	14	15.2	15.2	15.2
	Moderate Understanding of NEP	67	72.8	72.8	88.0
	High Understanding of NEP	11	12.0	12.0	100.0
	Total	92	100.0	100.0	

Source: Questionnaire

It is observed from the above table that majority of the respondents are moderately understood about NEP i.e., 72.8 percent followed by poorly understood about NEP i.e. 15.2 percent highly understood about NEP are 11 i.e. just 12 percent respectively. This shows that majority of the faculty have understood about NEP moderately.

Implementation of NEP

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Poor Implementation of NEP	16	17.4	17.4	17.4
	Moderate Implementation of NEP	71	77.2	77.2	94.6
	High Implementation of NEP	5	5.4	5.4	100.0
	Total	92	100.0	100.0	

Source: Questionnaire

It is observed from the above table that majority of the respondents are moderately agree on the implementation of NEP i.e., 77.2 percent followed by poorly agree on the implementation of NEP i.e. 17.4 percent highly agree on the implementation of NEP are 5 i.e. just 5.4 percent respectively. This shows that majority of the faculty are moderately agreed on the implementation of NEP.

Benefits of NEP

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Poor benefits of NEP	17	18.5	18.5	18.5
Moderate benefits of NEP	62	67.4	67.4	85.9
High benefits of NEP	13	14.1	14.1	100.0
Total	92	100.0	100.0	

Source: Questionnaire

It is observed from the above table that majority of the respondents are moderately agree on the benefits of NEP i.e., 67.4 percent followed by poorly agree on the benefits of NEP i.e. 18.5 percent highly agree on the benefits of NEP are 13 i.e. just 14.1 percent respectively. This shows that majority of the faculty are moderately agreed on the benefits of NEP.

Teaching Competencies

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Moderate Teaching Competencies	84	91.3	91.3	91.3
Poor Teaching Competencies	8	8.7	8.7	100.0
Total	92	100.0	100.0	

Source: Questionnaire

It is observed from the above table that majority of the respondents are moderately agree on having moderate teaching competencies for the success of NEP i.e. 91.3 percent followed by poorly agree on the having poor teaching competencies for the success of NEP i.e. 8.7 percent respectively. This shows that majority of the faculty are moderately agreed of having moderate teaching competencies for the success of NEP.

Findings of the Study

1. The number of faculty are more in Karimnagar.
2. Majority of the faculty are young adults.
3. Majority of the faculty are assistant professors.
4. Majority of the faculty are from Commerce department.
5. Majority of the faculty are working in Degree Colleges.
6. Majority of the faculty are married.
7. Majority of the faculty are moderately aware of NEP.
8. Majority of the faculty have understood about NEP moderately.
9. Majority of the faculty are moderately agreed on the implementation of NEP.
10. Majority of the faculty are moderately agreed on the benefits of NEP.
11. Majority of the faculty are moderately agreed of having moderate teaching competencies for the success of NEP.

Conclusion and Suggestions

All higher education institutions will become multi-disciplinary autonomous colleges. They will have the power to provide certificate, diploma, degree and degree with research in their name. Research is given utmost preference. Faculty and students can get funding from an impartial agency- National Research Foundation. It will fund for innovative projects in priority research areas of basic sciences, applied sciences, and social sciences & humanities. HE system will transform itself as student centric with the freedom to choose core and allied subjects within a discipline and across disciplines. Faculty members also get autonomy to choose curriculum, methodology, pedagogy and evaluation models within the given policy framework. Hence, the Indian higher education system is focusing on developing the teaching competencies of faculty by way of four-year teacher training. There was no formal training for college teachers. But now, the teachers have to undergo training in teaching. As Higher Education is transformed from teacher centric to student centric, the student has power to choose a teacher for the completion of their credits. Therefore, it is suggested that the faculty has to develop their competencies in all aspects as their role is multi facet. The competencies like Communication and Interpersonal Skills, Organization and Planning of curriculum, Classroom Management, Facilitation and Engagement, Assessment and Coaching, Mentoring skills, Collaboration and Teamwork, Caring and Inclusiveness, Flexibility and Adaptability to name a few.

References

- Aithal, Sreeramana and Aithal, Shubhrajyotsna(2020). Analysis of the Indian National Education Policy 2020 towards Achieving its Objectives, Munich Personal RePEc Archive , 30 July 2020, 1-22
- Ajay Kurien1, Dr Sudeep B. Chandramana(2020).Impact of New Education Policy 2020 on Higher Education, Conference: Atma Nirbhar Bharat: A Roadmap to Self-reliant IndiaAt: Thiruvalla.
- B.Venkateshwarlu(2020).a critical study of NEP 2020: issues, approaches, challenges, oppertunities and criticism, International journal of multidisciplinary educational research, ISSN:2277-7881; impact factor :6.514(2020); IC value:5.16; ISI value:2.286, 1-6
- Dr. Hemlata Verma and Adarsh Kumar (2021). New Education Policy 2020 of India: A Theoretical Analysis, International Journal of Business and Management Research (IJBMR) Open Access | Rapid and quality publishing, Review Article | Volume 9, Issue 3 | Pages 302-306 | e-ISSN: 2347-4696.
- Dr, Rahul Pratap Singh Kaurav, Prof. K.G. Suresh, Dr. Sumit Narula & Raturaj Baber(2020).New education policy: qualitative (contents) analysis and Twitter mining (sentiment analysis), Journal of Content, Community & Communication Amity School of Communication, Vol. 12 Year 6, December - 2020 [ISSN: 2395-7514 (Print)] Amity University, Madhya Pradesh [ISSN: 2456-9011 (Online)], 1-10
- Dr. Rupesh G. Sawant & Dr. Umesh B. Sankpal(2021).National Education Policy 2020 and higher education: a brief review, International Journal of Creative Research Thoughts (IJCRT).1-5.
- Kumar, K. (2005). Quality of Education at the Beginning of the 21st Century: Lessons from India. Indian Educational Review, 40(1), 3-28.