



# INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CREATIVE RESEARCH THOUGHTS (IJCRT)

An International Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

## NIRF Ranking System and Rajasthan State

Divya Joshi<sup>1</sup> & N. Bhojak<sup>2\*</sup>,

<sup>1</sup>P.G. Department of English, <sup>2</sup>GCRC P.G. Department of Chemistry,  
Govt. Dungar College (Three times consecutively 'A' Grade by NAAC),  
MGS University, Bikaner 334001, India

### Abstract

The central government has ambition to reach at least 50 higher education institutions in top 1000 world rankings. On the other hand, the NIRF was launched to rank Indian Higher Education Institutions using country based parameters for inclusive and access education with the aim of international excellence to promote quality. The NIRF helped the institutions to understand their performance by each year and to know their competitors and peer performers. This has more advantages like valuing perception, attracting industry for better placement and become reliable tool for parents and students to know about the institution. The NIRF indirectly helps the top performing institution to build their brand and wide publicity without any additional expenses on marketing and branding. At present, the ranking is listed for top 100 for all categories and top 200 in engineering categories. The scores of other participating institutions are sent individually. While the institutions matures on quality and scores high in each parameter over the years but in Rajasthan state the scoring in NIRF ranking is still in its infancy. Among top 50 even a single college from Rajasthan state could not find its place but more dramatic situation arises when we observe the number of participating colleges. Among 1802 participating colleges only 7 were from Rajasthan and even a single Government college did not participated for it. The present paper discuss the procedure for NIRF participation and few problems in participation with respect to Rajasthan state.

**Keywords:** NIRF, NAAC, Ranking system, Rajasthan

### I. Introduction

In India, many accredited institutions are working to improve the quality of teaching, learning and research. India's central accreditation bodies include NAAC, NBA, BCI, UGC, MCI, AICTE and DCI, which assess and grant accreditation to institutions in specific areas. Many non-academic media such as newspapers, magazines also publish university rankings from time to time, but only a few universities participate and the main purpose of these rankings is to promote universities for admissions campaigns. To address these challenges, the National Institution of Ranking Framework (NIRF) was developed by MHRD, the government. Based on the recommendations of the Core Commission formed by the MHRD of India in 2015 on the evaluation of Indian institutions based on country-centred parameters for inclusive and accessible education to promote quality, across India. A methodology was developed for ranking institutions in The first ranking was published in 2016. The ranking is currently listed in the top 100 in all categories and the top 200 in the engineering category. Grades from other participating institutions will be sent separately. Although the institution has matured in quality over the years and has scored well in all parameters, Rajasthan's score in the NIRF ranking is still in its early stages. Not a single Rajasthan HEIs ranks in the top 50, but a more dramatic picture emerges when looking at the number of participating universities. Of the 1,802 participating colleges, only seven of them were from Rajasthan and none of the government college participated. Many HEIs are unaware of Green, Environmental, social, gender, academic audit and also in proper placement management system. This paper describes the procedures for NIRF participation and some issues of participation relevant to state of Rajasthan (1-7).

### II Methodology

#### Ranking Parameters for Colleges

In the NIRF ranking, the performance of an institution is evaluated by five parameters, and each parameter has been given a score of 100 by the sub-parameters of these parameters. The parameters used for evaluation are listed in five categories:

- Teaching Learning and Resources (TLR) where the core activity of academic is measured.
- Research and Professional Practice (RP) where the excellence in research outcome and scholarship is focused.
- Graduation Outcomes (GO) where the impact of learning outcome is measured.
- Outreach and Inclusivity (OI), the importance of economic, social and women representation.
- Perception (PR) by peer academic and employer

For different types of HEIs there is little variation in all of these. Marks and weightage for colleges are represented in Table 1

**Table 1 Summary of Ranking Parameters and Weightages for Colleges**

Sr. No.	Parameter	Marks	Weightage
1	Teaching, Learning & 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

Each parameter has its own importance and subsequently divided in few sub parameters are summarized in Table 2

**Table 2 Five parameters and sub parameters for Colleges**

<b>Teaching, Learning &amp; Resources (TLR)</b> <b>Ranking weight: 0.40</b>
A. Student Strength (SS): 20 marks B. Faculty-student ratio with emphasis on permanent faculty (FSR): 30marks C. Combined metric for Faculty with PhD (or equivalent) and Experience (FQE): 20 marks D. Financial Resources and their Utilisation (FRU): ): 30 marks
<b>Research and Professional Practice (RP)</b> <b>Ranking weight: 0.15</b>
A. Combined metric for Publications (PU): 70 marks B. Combined metric for Quality of Publications (QP): 30 marks
<b>Graduation Outcomes (GO)</b> <b>Ranking weight: 0.25</b>
A. Combined metric for Placement and Higher Studies(GPH): 40 marks B. Metric for University Examinations(GUE): 40 marks C. Median Salary(GMS): 20 marks
<b>Outreach and Inclusivity (OI)</b> <b>Ranking weight: 0.10</b>
A. Percentage of Students from Other States/Countries (Region Diversity RD): 30 marks B. Percentage of Women (Women Diversity WD): 30 marks C. Economically and Socially Challenged Students (ESCS): 20 marks D. Facilities for Physically Challenged Students (PCS): 20 marks
<b>Perception (PR) Ranking</b> <b>weight: 0.10</b>
A. Peer Perception: Employers & Academic Peer (PR): 100 marks

### III Discussions

#### Significance of NIRF Ranking

The government has the ambition to mark Indian higher educational institutions in top world universities; hence NIRF was established, which was driven from the concept of QS (Quacquarelle Symonds) world ranking; however, it was modified based on Indian educational institution's environment. The ranking is calculated based on certified data given by the institutions, and even after receiving the certified data, "the data is checked regarding the data validation that has built-in." NIRF score is a relative score, not an absolute like an accreditation score. The ranking is provided each year, and all the institutes are invited to participate in the NIRF ranking by registration through the NIRF portal, whereas accreditation is not provided to all the institutions, and the evaluation process takes place in five years. Stakeholders are concerned to know whether the performance of an institution is rising

or falling each year.

### Accreditation VS Ranking

The NAAC is the major accrediting agency in India which provides the accreditation for respective HEI. Accreditation is a 5-year comprehensive assessment of the institution as a whole. There are few ranking systems in India but NIRF is the major and popular among all HEIs in India. Ranking is a yearly affair. Accreditation gives absolute grade, ranking is relative to the other institutions similarly placed. Since Accreditation is a one-time (5 year) event. Accredited Institutions can slip in their yearly performance. Stakeholders, particularly parents are interested in knowing whether the institution is doing better or worse at the end of each year. Here is actual role of Ranking starts. It is just like an Annual Report Card to the Nation and to the stakeholders on what has been done by the institution in the last one year, on the given performance. The accreditation, procedure is little tedious this is why very few HEIs goes for it, however now it is mandatory to get the different grants like RUSA. While ranking is open to all. This is why across the Countries, there is both accreditation and ranking. The score of each institution reflective of their performance and moreover it is a relative score, not absolute. Hence if one institution with fail marks is ranked in the top 100 or 200 not necessarily a bad institution, It is quite possible that it may be better in one or other area. Conclusion is that HEIs should go for both Accreditation and Ranking in order to get a proper development plan and also to provide a better vision to its stakeholders.

### Analysis for Colleges of Rajasthan state

The NIRF ranking analysis of colleges of Rajasthan state is done on the following parameters:

1. High Overall Score
2. Total Number of Faculty (Number of Women Faculty and faculty with Ph.D.)
3. Student ratio (i.e. outside Student, Female Student, Socially Challenged Student)
4. Placement Number
5. Annual Salary
6. Publication and citations (from UGC care list, Web of Sciences and Scopus)
7. Total Expenditure, Sponsorship and Consultancy
8. Perception

The main objective of this framework is to prepare Indian institutions for the competitive environment that exists in today's world. A clear definition and identification of important parameters will help institutions get serious about improving their rankings. These parameters are strong indicators of the scientific research quality of faculty and students, and of an institution's student supervision culture. The parameters chosen also have strong messages, especially relevant to our country's educational scenario. With so many different academic institutions and universities, this is a very difficult task. The Indian higher education system is far from basic. It has a complex multi-tiered structure with different sectors, levels and types of financial support, autonomy and many other parameters. At the top are IIT and IISc, and some famous Chuo Universities. At the intermediate level there are various central and state universities and so-called private and ostensible universities. On the other side, there are many universities that offer bachelor's and master's degrees in various fields such as science, arts and engineering. This differs from most global practices where the structure is well defined and the types of forms are limited to a very small number. The situation of higher education institutions in Rajasthan is not a promising one. On the one hand, the number of higher education institutions has increased recently, which is essential for the quantitative growth of higher education, but at the same time, the qualitative aspects of higher education institutions lag far behind when it comes to accreditation and ranking.

## IV Conclusion and Recommendations

### 1. Visibility and High Variation Level

It happens as larger institute with large faculty base gets more visibility. For example, Central Universities, IITs and highly funded colleges has very high faculty strength and big infrastructure gets more visibility and hence more fund. But smaller institute doesn't get the visibility and therefore gets less access to government funding. Further There is a wide variation of ranking in last five years. That means there is some flaw in the methodology adopted because it doesn't make sense that an institute with a good rank in one year was not even placed in top 100 in very next year.

### 2. Improper Comparison and Assignment of Weightage

Comparing HEIs like Hindu College and a small college in desert area doesn't make sense as both are with different mode of expenditure, funding obligations etc. NIRF does its ranking on the cumulative score based on different parameters like TLR, RPC, GO and OI, and PR. Various heads come under the aforesaid parameters and NIRF keeps changing the marks allotted to various heads frequently. This makes it difficult to analyze the true nature of rank change over successive year.

### 3. Autonomy and Quantitative area

Approved intake is an issue because in government institute it is not in the hand of college management to decide the number of student to take. It is in the hand of government. Also larger institute have more resources at their disposal to conduct extensive research which colleges lacks. High weightage is given to number of publication is another area. Now the problem is institute with higher faculty will always have more publication than the institutes with less number of faculties. So the former one will always have an upper hand.

### 4. Low Participation and Psychological Impact

Due to rigid framework of NIRF many institutes are left as they are not being able to meet such criteria. Although it is good to have institute to have healthy competition among themselves but filtering out most of the colleges and universities has a very bad psychological impact on students as well as faculties. It gives them a sense of mediocre and inferior category.

### 5. Best practices and audit managements

At state level due to the lack of awareness institutional distinctiveness and best practices have not been developed and propagated in correct direction. Green, Environmental, social, gender, academic and even normal audit also requires a specified cell or management system.

The state government will have to focus on creating a small cluster of faculty and colleges at Divisional headquarters who should design plan, execute and perform for few selected HEIs for at least three to four years to get desired results.

### References

- [1] Divya Joshi & Bhojak N., Importance of NAAC Accreditation for Higher Education Institutes, International Journal of Allied Practice, Research and Review, 7 (12): 01-07. (2020).
- [2] SSR, Govt. Dungar College, Bikaner. Rajasthan. 2<sup>nd</sup> cycle and 3<sup>rd</sup> cycle, Criterion III. (2014)
- [3] Divya Joshi & Bhojak N., Quality Assurance Ranking systems for Higher Education Institutes, JETIR 6 (6): 1381-83. (2019).
- [4] <https://www.nirfindia.org/2021/Ranking.html>
- [5] Divya Joshi & Bhojak N., Criterion III of NAAC Research, Innovations and Consultancy : A study, International Journal of Research and Analytical Reviews (IJRAR), 8 (4): 515-519. (2021).
- [6] Divya Joshi & Bhojak N., Criterion I in SSR: Curricular Aspects as Total Learning Experience, International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Invention, 10 (8): 21-23. (2021).
- [7] Bhojak N and Bhandari H.S. et.al., Green audit & green campus: need of the hour, International Journal of Current Advanced Research, 10 (7): 24742-43. (2021).

