

**Workshop  
on  
National Institutional Ranking  
Framework (NIRF)**

**21 September, 2023**



**Organized by**

**Internal Quality Assurance Cell (IQAC)  
Govt. V.Y.T. PG Autonomous College,  
Durg, Chhattisgarh, India  
(Reaccredited Grade A+ NAAC)  
CPE-Phase-III by UGC  
Awarded Star College by DBT, New Delhi**



**ABOUT THE COLLEGE**

Govt. V.Y.T. PG Autonomous College, Durg (Chhattisgarh) India is the only NAAC Accredited A+ College of the State and is feathered with College with Potential for Excellence granted by UGC; Center of Excellence by Government of Chhattisgarh; Star College granted by Department of Biotechnology, Government of India. The college caters around 8000 students from diverse background viz. urban, rural & primitive tribals by offering UG, PG and Ph.D. programs under faculty of Science, Arts & Commerce.

**ABOUT THE IQAC**

The Internal Quality Assurance Cell (IQAC) of the college is actively engaged in faculty development/training activities to match up with the latest trends & knowledge required for best teaching- learning experience of students.

**OBJECTIVE OF THE WORKSHOP:**

- Understanding the link between five major themes and different sub themes of ranking framework of HEIs as stated by NIRF.
- Special emphasis on requirements of NIRF and its parameters.

# Schedule of Workshop

21 September, 2023

TIME	EVENT
10.30 am – 11.45 am	Session-I Teaching Learning & Resources (TLR)
11.45 am – 1.00 pm	Session-II Research and Professional Practice (RP)
1.00 pm – 1.30 pm	Break
1.30 pm – 2.15 pm	Session-III Graduation Outcomes (GO)
2.15 pm – 3.00 pm	Session-IV Outreach and Inclusivity (OI) and Perception (PR)
3.00- 3.30 pm	Discussion Forum
3.30 pm	Vote of Thanks

Venue: IQAC (Room No. 21)

## Patron & Principal

Dr. R.N. Singh

## Resource Person

Dr. Deepak Jaroliya

Professor and IQAC Head, NAAC

Accreditation Ambassador and In charge-

Good Governance Cell, PIMR, Indore

## Conveners

Dr. Anupama Asthana

Dr. Jagjeet Kaur Saluja

## Co-convener

Dr. Padmawati

## Organizing Secretary

Dr. Pragya Kulkarni

Dr. Sunitha B. Mathew

## Organizing Committee

Dr. Tarlochan Kaur Sandhu

Dr. Sanju Sinha

Dr. Anshumala Chandangar

Dr. Abhishek Kumar Misra

Dr. Kusumanjali Deshmukh

## Contact Persons

Dr. Anupama Asthana (9827162574)

Dr. Pragya Kulkarni (9826142086)

# **Workshop on NIRF Ranking**

**(21.09.2023)**

**Organized by IQAC**

**Govt. V.Y.T. PG Autonomous College, Durg**

A workshop for faculty members was organized to work out the lacuna regarding NIRF ranking of Govt. V.Y.T. PG Autonomous College, Durg on 21.09.2023.

Resource person was Dr. Deepak Jaroliya, Professor, Prestige Institute of Management and Research, Indore (M.P.)

The workshop started with welcome of guest resource person by Dr. Anupama Asthana followed by Presidential address by Principal, Dr. R.N. Singh. The speaker was introduced with the audience by Dr. Pragya Kulkarni.

Altogether, 28 participants including Principal, IQAC members and Heads of the department attended the workshop with active participation and discussion on the metric for attainment of ranking in NIRF.

The first lecture was on general overview, status of various states ranking and ranking procedure including the first parameter, Teaching Learning & Resources (TLR). The lecture started with highlights of NIRF 23 data on college category and revealed that Maharashtra, Tamil Nadu and Andhra Pradesh are the most dominating participating states in all. Discussion on NIRF process clarification of the concept of culture of collection, compilation and curation of data required for ranking of institutions. The data provided by the institutions are meticulously verified to reduce exaggerated figures and the variations, and illogicalities are identified and screened with thorough patience. Scopus (Elsevier Science) and Web of Science (Clarivate Analytics) were used for retrieving data on publications, citations, and highly cited publications and Derwent Innovation was used for retrieving data on patents.

The ranking parameters and weightages for colleges (2023) were discussed as there were five parameters consisting total 500 marks and each parameter have different weightages.

<b>S.No.</b>	<b>Parameter</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>Weightage</b>
1	Teaching-Learning and Resources	100	0.40
2	Research and Professional Practice	100	0.15
3	Graduation Outcomes	100	0.25
4	Outreach and Inclusivity	100	0.10
5	Perception	100	0.10



## 1. Teaching-Learning and Resources:

- Student Strength (SS): 20 marks
- Faculty-student ratio with emphasis on permanent faculty (FSR): 30 marks
- Combined metric for Faculty with PhD (or equivalent) and Experience (FQE): 20 marks
- Financial Resources and their Utilization (FRU): 30 marks

$$\text{TLR} = \text{SS (20)} + \text{FSR (30)} + \text{FQE (20)} + \text{FRU (30)}$$

$$\text{A. SS} = f(\text{NT, NE}) \times 20$$

**NT:** Total sanctioned approved intake in the institution considering all UG and PG programs of the institution.

**NE:** Total number of students enrolled in the institution considering all UG and PG Programs of the institution.

- **The closer the current student strength (inclusive of UG and PG) is to the total approved intake, the higher the score**
- **The financial resources are utilized judiciously i.e., amount of money spent per student**
- **If the expected ratio is 1, ie No. of students admitted is equal to the approved intake, the score maximum marks**
- **Students counted under socially challenged shall not be counted in economically backward and vice versa**
- **Own faculty registered for Ph.D. in some other institutions or even in your own institution should not be counted and entered**

$$\text{B. FSR} = 30 \times [20 \times (F/N)]$$

**N= NT** = Number of students

**F:** Full time regular faculty in the institution in the previous year

- **F/N < 1: 70, FSR will be set to zero**
- **Faculty who joined the institute same year won't be considered even if they possess a PhD**

$$\text{C. FQE} = \text{FQ} + \text{FE}$$

$$\text{FQ} = 10 \times (\text{FRA}/75)$$

$$\text{FE} = 3\min(3\text{F1}, 1) + 3\min(3\text{F2}, 1) + 4\min(3\text{F3}, 1)$$

**FRA** is the percentage of Faculty with Ph.D. (or equivalent qualification) with respect to the total no. of faculty required or actual faculty whichever is higher, in the previous year

**F1=Fraction with Experience up to 8 years; F2= Fraction with Experience between 8+ to 15 years; F3=Fraction with Experience > 15 years**

- **FE: Full marks for a ratio of 1:1:1 (F1: F2: F3)**

$$\text{D. FRU} = 7.5 \times f(\text{BC}) + 22.5 \times f(\text{BO})$$

**BC:** Average Annual Capital Expenditure per student for previous three years

**BO:** Average Annual Operational (or Recurring) Expenditure per student for previous three years

- **To score a maximum of 30 marks, BO should be 3/4 (75 %) of BT (BC + BO) BC should be 1/4 (25%) of BT (BC + BO)**

The second lecture was on Research and Professional Practice (RP). The lecture started with the need of research, the basis and the ways to progress research in colleges. The research should be need based with applied orientation and accomplished with development of research eco system and research park along with provision for resource mobilization. There are many national and international agencies providing fundings for research in various streams. Organization of Conferences/ Symposia/ Workshops/ Seminar and Scientific meetings will support the institution for getting better points for ranking. Research collaboration in the form of faculty/ Student exchange, Internship & Field trip, On-the- Job Training & Research, MOU's with National and International Institutions, Universities, Industries, Corporate Houses will moreover provide extra points along with consultancy.

## **2. Research and Professional Practice (RP):**

$$\text{A. RP} = \text{PU (70)} + \text{QP (30)}$$

- Combined Metric for Publications (PU)
- Combined metric for Quality of Publications (QP)

$$\text{B. PU} = 70 \times f(\text{P/FRQ})$$

**P:** Weighted number of publications as ascertained from suitable third- party sources.

**FRQ:** Maximum of nominal number of faculty members as calculated on the basis of a required FSR of 1:20 or the available faculty in the institution.

$$\text{QP} = 30 \times f(\text{CC/P})$$

**CC:** Total Citation Count over previous three years

**P:** computed for PU

The Percentile Parameters (expressed as fraction) on the basis of (P/Frq) , CC/Frq) and (TOP 25 P/P)

- **More number of publications should be executed by institution**
- **Affiliation of the institute should be uniform in all publication**

- **Your publication should be reflected in the third-party source**
- **Every faculty should contribute to get more no of publication**
- **The quality of publication is correlated with the number of the publications**
- **The amount of library expenditure increases, then scholarly output is also increased**

**C. IPR and Patents: Patents Published and Granted (IPR) - Overall Category**

**D. Footprint of Projects and Professional Practice (FPPP) - Overall Category**

The third lecture was on Graduation Outcomes (GO). The data on number of students graduated in minimum stipulated time, further placed or selected for higher studies is correlated with the graduation outcomes.

**Graduation Outcome (GO):**

$$\text{GO} = \text{GPH (40)} + \text{GUE (40)} + \text{GMS (20)}$$

A. Combined metric for Placement and Higher Studies: GP

B. Metric for University Examinations: GUE

C. Median Salary: GMS

**A. Combined Metric for Placement and Higher Studies (GPH):**

$$\text{GPH} = 40 \times (\text{Np}/100 + \text{Nhs}/100)$$

**Np = Percentage of graduating students (in UG/PG programs) placed in the previous three years**

**Nhs = Percentage of graduating students (in UG/PG programs) who have been selected for higher studies in the previous three years**

- **Institute should ensure all student got placed or selected for higher studies**
- **One institute's data has no impact on the results of other institutes for GPH**

**B. Metric for University Examinations (GUE):**

$$\text{GUE} = 40 \times \min [(\text{Ng}/80), 1]$$

**Ng : Percentage of Students (as a fraction of the approved intake), averaged over the previous three years, passing the respective university examinations in stipulated time for the program in which enrolled**

- **If all students finished their coursework and received their degrees within the time frame specified, the Institute will receive the highest score**

- **One institute's data has no impact on the results of other institutes for GUE**

#### **C. Median Salary (GMS):**

$$\text{GMS} = 20 \times f(\text{MS})$$

**MS = median salary of graduates (in UG/PG programs) in the previous three years from an institution**

- **Primary Data: To be made available by the institutions in the prescribed format giving names of companies, number of students recruited by each, and the maximum, minimum and median salary, offered by each**
- **Institute result depends upon other institute students salary data for GMS**

#### **D. Number of Ph.D. Students Graduated (GPHD) (Overall Category)**

$$\text{GPHD} = 20 \times f(\text{Nphd})$$

**Nphd = Average number of Ph.D. students graduated (awarded Ph.D.) over the previous three years**

- **Institute result depends upon other institute no of PhD students graduated**

The fourth lecture was on Outreach and Inclusivity (OI) and Perception (PR). This parameter is based on the diversity of students catered by the institution. Inclusion of regional diversity, women diversity, entry of socially and economically challenged students support the metric.

#### **A. Outreach and Inclusivity (OI):**

$$\text{OI} = \text{RD}(30) + \text{WD}(30) + \text{ESCS}(20) + \text{PCS}(20)$$

**RD: Percentage of Students from Other States/Countries (Region Diversity)**

**WD: Percentage of Women (Women Diversity)**

**ESCS: Economically and Socially Challenged Students**

**PCS: Facilities for Physically Challenged Students**

- **One institute's data has no impact on the results of other institutes for OI**

$$\text{WD} = 15 \times (\text{NWS}/50) + 15 \times (\text{NWF}/20)$$

**NWS: Percentage of Women students; NWF: Percentage of Women Faculty**

- **Expectation: 50% women students and 20% women faculty**
- **One institute's data has no impact on the results of other institutes for WD**

**Economically and Socially Challenged Students (ESCS)**

$$\text{ESCS} = 20 \times f(\text{Nesc})$$

**Nesc: Percentage of UG students being provided full tuition fee reimbursement by the institution**

- **Institute result depends upon other institute who reimbursement full tuition fee to more undergraduate students**

#### **Facilities for Physically Challenged Students (PCS)**

PCS = 20 marks, if the Institute provides full facilities for physically challenged students, as outlined

- **One institute's data has no impact on the results of other institutes**

#### **B. Perception (PR)**

**Peer Perception: Employers & Academic Peers:** This is to be done through a survey conducted over a large category of Employers, Professionals from Reputed Organizations and a large category of academics

- **One institute's data has no impact on the results of other institutes in terms of PR**
- Factors influencing PR: Management, Institution, Alumni, Faculty, Student and Social-media through branding, social and community service, upgraded infrastructure, library, hostel, café, gym and other sports facility, technology-based teaching, Alumni connect, Conducting seminars, workshops, webinars, Online teaching content upload, faculty exchange, guest lectures and outreach activities, project work, exhibition, hackathon, engagement of alumni in academic committee, updated website, improvement in the search engine and online advertising campaign etc.

The discussion session was conducted by Dr. Jagjeet Kaur Saluja. The questions regarding departmental responsibilities, possible reformations in data collection and handling, types of expenditures to be considered as capital and operational, the ways to increase expenditure per student, branding of institution through participation and organization of various activities by faculties and students and approaches to connect alumni, were discussed.

The workshop ended with a formal vote of thanks by Dr. Sunitha Mathew.









