

A STUDY OF DELHI UNIVERSITY COLLEGES RANKED IN TOP 100 BY NATIONAL INSTITUTIONAL RANKING FRAMEWORK

DECEMBER 2019

Satvinder Kaur*

Riyanka Jain**

PURPOSE

THE objective of the study was to analyse and interpret how and where the top 27 colleges of University of Delhi have focused to obtain high ranking in NIRF, the National Institutional Ranking Framework particularly keeping in mind its various parameters which has led to an increase in their ranks from the year 2018 to the current year 2019.

Design/Methodology/Approach: Secondary data have been used for this research and collected from the NIRF website. A comparison was done for 27 colleges of University of Delhi which secured a ranking in top 100 colleges in India in the year 2019. The respective change in these scores over the past one year and its weighted implications are also considered and have been compared with their respective scores on various parameters in the year 2018.

Findings: The findings revealed that in order to increase the rank of colleges in NIRF, it is important to increase the faculty student ratio with emphasis on permanent faculty and also it is necessary to increase the number of faculty with Ph.D. and experience. The combined metric for publications particularly for quality of publications should also be increased. The metric for university examinations and the combined percentage of students for placement, higher studies, and entrepreneurship should also be increased. Colleges should focus on increasing the region diversity and facilities for physically challenged students to score high in NIRF ranking. Lastly, perception should also be increased by looking at the top colleges' best practices and various aspects like peer perception, public perception, & competitiveness.

Research Limitations: The study is only limited to the conclusion made on the basis of parameters used by NIRF, and hence there is scope of improvement in ranking on the basis of other factors and considerations used by other reputed accreditation and ranking institutions. Also, the study is only limited to colleges of University of Delhi and hence, has limited implications for the rest of the colleges of the country.

Practical Implications: The results of the study can be very helpful for the colleges of University of Delhi as well as other colleges in India as the institutions are working on all areas of quality improvement for survival, sustenance, and for establishing distinct standards in the highly competitive market. The ranking and recognition through accreditation add to the prestige of an educational institution and be beneficiary of funding, increased enrolment of students, improved public image, and perception.

* Assistant Professor, Department of Commerce, Sri Guru Gobind Singh College of Commerce, University of Delhi, Delhi.

** Assistant Professor, Department of Business Economics, Sri Guru Gobind Singh College of Commerce, University of Delhi, Delhi.

Satvinder Kaur and Riyanka Jain

Originality/Value: *This study is probably the first to empirically analyse and interpret how and where the top 27 colleges of University of Delhi have focused to obtain high ranking in NIRF, keeping in mind its various parameters which has led to an increase in their ranks from the year 2018 to the current year 2019.*

Key Words: *Ranking, Comparative Analysis, Parameters, Perception, Research, Higher Education, Accreditation, NIRF, University of Delhi.*

Introduction

Education has always been given due importance in India with its foundation in metaphysical, epistemological, and the axiological outlook of great educational philosophers like Rabindranath Tagore, Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi, Sri Surobindo, Jiddu Krishnamurthi, etc., who efficiently conceptualised the education system in terms of nature, extent, and scope. The Constitution of India through its Fundamental Rights and Directive Principles of State Policy has entrusted upon the citizens the right to education (Right to Education Act 2009). This indeed made the country to see a new beginning in the field of education.

Obtaining quality education is the foundation of sustainable development. The setting up of All India Council for Technical Education, AICTE in 1945 and University Grants Commission, UGC in 1956 speak volume about the vision and responsibility of our leaders and planners in those early years. The challenge to maintain quality education becomes difficult when the institutions have to face competition from within and outside the country. Education must essentially comply with certain standards of compliance. These standards are provided by regulatory agencies.

As the institutions are working on all area of quality improvement for survival, sustenance, and for establishing distinct standards in the highly competitive market, it is increasingly becoming important that these educational institutions undergo explicit quality evaluation and assurance processes. National Quality Assurance Organisations accredit the institution and assigns a rank that augments its current position or gives direction for future improvement. The ranking and recognition through accreditation add to the prestige of an educational institution and be beneficiary of funding, increased enrolment of students, improved public image, and perception.

National Institutional Ranking Framework (NIRF) is a framework which was approved by the Ministry of Human Resource development and was introduced on 29th September 2015. This framework ranks various educational institutions all over the country in different categories based on teaching standards, research work, placements, and outreach programmes, among other parameters. These categories are classified into engineering, pharmacy, management, colleges, medical, law, architecture, and overall universities. The methodology used by the framework considers various parameters approved by the core committee to rank universities and institutions around the country.

Ranking promotes competition among the institutions and drive them to strive for excellence. As ranking is an extremely challenging task, highly experienced experts are required who have great knowledge of higher education system in India and has full commitment for this cause. This culture is important as provides several insights to all about major areas such as faculty development, student needs and focus areas, placement improvements, infrastructure requirements, library, and laboratory needs etc.

Based on several categories, 16-18 parameters which are organised into five major groups, have been considered and being ranked for evaluation and streamlining processes to create efficiencies. The parameters have been designed considering certain technicalities and details and are accepted globally by serving as pointers to ambience for teaching, learning, and research. The five parameters according to which the institutions and universities are ranked are elaborated in detail.

Parameter 1: Teaching, Learning & Resources (TLR)

This parameter which accounts for a ranking weight of 0.40 tests various colleges on the following sub parameters:

- Student Strength which includes Doctoral students as well and carries 20 marks.

The formula used is “ $SS = f(NT, NE) * 20$ ”

Where, SS refers to the student strength, $f(NT, NE)$ are the functions determined by NIRF, NT refers to the total sanctioned strength of under graduate and post graduate approved intake in the institution and NE is the total number of enrolled students in all under graduate and post graduate programs of the institution.

- Faculty Student ratio with emphasis on permanent faculty carries 30 marks.

The formula used is “ $FSR = 30 * [20 * (F/N)]$ ”

Where, FSR refers to the Faculty student ratio, F is the parameter which considers regular full time faculty in the previous year in the respective institution and N is nothing but NT referred in the previous point.

- Combined metric for Faculty with PhD and Experience carries 20 marks.

The formula used is “ $FQ = 10 * (FRA/75)$, $FRA \leq 75\%$ and $FQ = 10$, $FRA > 75\%$ ”

Where, FQ refers to the combined metric for Faculty with PhD and Experience and FRA is the percentage of Faculty with PhD with respect to total number of faculty required or actual faculty whichever is higher in the previous year.

- Financial Resources and their Utilisation has been given weightage of 30 marks.

The formula is “ $FRU = 10p(BT) + 10\min(4*BC/BT, 1) + 10\min(4*BO/3BT, 1)$ ”

Where, FRU refers to Financial Resources and Utilisation, BT considers the amount spent on an average per student out of annual expenditure in the previous three years excluding the expenditure on buildings or infrastructure etc., BC is the amount spent on an average out of annual capital expenditure per student which includes the amount spent on academic activities and resources. This amount can be spent on library resources, workshops, new equipment for laboratories, studios, other identified academic activities excluding expenditure on buildings etc., BO is the operational expenditure per student spent on faculty resources and staff salaries and the function p is the percentile fraction.

Source: www.nirfindia.org

Parameter 2: Research and Professional Practice (RP)

This parameter which accounts for a ranking weight of 0.15 tests various colleges on the following sub parameters:

- Combined metric for Publications carries 70 marks.

The formula used is “ $PU = 30 * p(P/F)$ ”

Where, PU refers to the combined metric for publications, P refers to the number of publications which is include on the basis of weighted average of the largest numbers given in Web Science, Scopus, FT 45, PUBMED in two resources over the previous 3 years, F is the number of faculty members which is considering nominal number and is calculated on basis of an FSR of 1:10.

- Combined Metric for Quality of Publications carries 30 marks.

The formula used is “ $QP = 15 * p(CC/P) + 12.5 * p(NCI) + 12.5 * p(TOP@%P)$ ”

Where, QP refers to the quality of publications which includes combined metric for publications, CC refers to the citation count which includes total citations in past 3 years, P is the total number of publications over the period computed for PU, CC is equal to $(0.45CCW + 0.45CCS + 0.1CCI)$, NCI is the normalized citation index which includes average of past 3 years and is equal to $(0.5NCIW + 0.5NCIS)$ and TOP25 refers to the citations in top 25 percentile which considers the average of past 3 years and is equal to $(0.5TOP25PW + 0.5TOP25PS)$.

Source: www.nirfindia.org

Parameter 3: Graduation Outcomes (GO)

This parameter which accounts for a ranking weight of 0.25 tests various colleges on the following sub parameters:

- Combined percentage for Placement, Higher Studies and Entrepreneurship has been given weightage of 40 marks.

The formula used is “ $GPHE = 30 * (Np/100 + Nhs/100) + 10p3$ ”

Where, GPHE refers to the combined % for placement, higher studies and entrepreneurship, Np refers to the percentage of graduating students at both under graduate and post graduate level. It includes the students those who are placed either through campus placement or centralised placement and number is included on an average of past 3 years, Nhs includes the percentage of graduating students at undergraduate and postgraduate level, who have been selected for higher studies in the past 3 years and their number is included on average basis, p3 is equal to p(NE) and NE is the number of sustained spin-off companies set up over past 5 years period.

- Metric for University Examinations carries 40 marks.

The formula used is “ $GUE = 15 * \min[(Ng/80), 1]$ ”

Where, GUE refers to the metric for university examinations and Ng is the percentage of students included as a fraction of approved intake and are taken on an average of past 3 years, this number includes those students who have passed the respective university examinations in a stipulated time for the program in which they were enrolled.

- Median Salary carries 20 marks.

The formula used is “ $GMS = 20 * p(MS)$ ”

Where, GMS refers to the median salary and MS is the median salary of graduates from an institution.

Source: www.nirfindia.org

Parameter 4: Outreach and Inclusivity (OI)

This parameter which accounts for a ranking weight of 0.10 tests various colleges on the following sub parameters:

- Region Diversity parameter includes Percentage of Students from other States/ Countries carries 30 marks.

In this parameter more weightage is given to students from other states as compare to students from other countries. The formula used is $RD = 25 * \text{fraction of total students enrolled from other states} + 5 * \text{fraction students enrolled from other countries}$.

- Percentage of Women carries 30 marks.

The formula used is “ $WD = 10 * (NWS/50) + 10 * (NWF/20) + 5 * (NWA/2)$ ”

Where WD refers to the percentage of women, NWF is the percentage of female faculty, NWS refers to the percentage of students and NWA refers to the number of female members at senior administrative positions which includes deans, head of the Institute, department heads etc.

- Economically and Socially Challenged Students carries 20 marks.

The formula used is “ $ESCS = 25 * (necs/50)$ ”

Where, ESCS refers to the students who are economically and socially challenged and Necs is the percentage of students who are economically and socially challenged.

- Facilities for Physically Challenged Students carries 20 marks.

The formula used is “ $PCS = 20\text{marks}$ ”

Where, PCs refers to the facilities for physically challenged students.

Source: www.nirfindia.org

Parameter 5: Perception (PR)

This parameter which accounts for a ranking weight of 0.10 tests various colleges on the following sub parameters:

- Peer Perception includes Employees and Research Investors which carries 100 marks.

To fulfil the requirements of this parameter a survey is conducted with a large category of professionals from reputed organisations, also with officials of funding agencies in government sector as well as private sector and institution heads of NGOs. The lists are then obtained from institutions and a comprehensive list is then prepared based on several criteria where various sectors, regions etc. are taken into account and these lists are updated periodically.

Source: www.nirfindia.org

As seen above, each parameter is assigned a certain weightage. Various sub-heads also have an assigned weightage distribution within each group. These weightages are decided considering the specific discipline in mind. Since NIRF was launched in the year 2015, the weightage distribution has never been consistent and changes every year. The institutions are required to collect to collect relevant data which is easily available from third party sources and is also easily verifiable. A suitable metric then computes a core under each sub-head. The final score is calculated based on weights allocation done to each heading and a maximum of 100 value can be attained.

An Online Data Capturing System is used by NIRF to capture relevant data of registered institutions. The data is submitted by the registered institutions in this system using relevant authentication credentials provided by NIRF. The system sought required data in a format which helps in computing ranking of metrics for each parameter and verifies for consistency of data.

Review of Literature

Didham, & Paul (2015) conducted a conceptual study on the role of education in the sustainable development agenda, according to which obtaining quality education is the foundation for sustainable development. In addition to improving quality of life, access to inclusive education can equip locals with the tools required to develop innovative solutions to the world’s greatest problems. Since education has a long-term impact in an individual and society on a whole, it is essential that they comply with a

certain standard of compliance. The standards can be provided by the institution themselves or by the regulatory agencies. Also, accreditation matters most for a potential student who needs to be sure about the legitimacy and quality of the institution and thus, secure a place for a good future.

Corney, Froumin, Leshukov, & Marginson (2018) conducted a conceptual study to evaluate the role of federalism for shaping higher education in nine federal countries around the world. The authors have developed a comparative analysis between national and regional relationships in higher education in terms of legal, economic, and other aspects. An analysis of how countries' educational system has evolved their functions in highly varied cultural contexts has been done.

Barrio, Escamilla, Garcia, Fernandez, & Garcia (2015) conducted a conceptual study on influence of assessment in the teaching-learning process in the higher education. According to the study appraising self-evolution in education system, India has witnessed a transformation of the Guru-Disciple relation, taking contrasting examples of Dronacharya-Eklavya and Paramhans-Vivekananda, hinting towards the facilitation of constructivism and outreach in education. The paper puts an impetus on self-evaluation and undertaking self-driven initiatives by every Higher Education institution for ensuring quality enhancement and excellence in its vision. Regular transformations in curriculum and pedagogy are the evident of the efforts to move towards an integrated curriculum and assessment framework to encourage holistic development of the learner.

Talyor (2012) conducted a study that stressed on the need for scientific research to increase intelligence and creativity, improve academic performance, better health, decrease anxiety, higher moral reasoning, increase self-actualization, and better job performance which will benefit the individual to be successful in all avenues of life.

UN (2015) framed sustainable development goals in which there are 17 goals and 169 targets. Goal number four on education has clearly highlighted the need to develop the quality of education, inclusive education, and equal opportunities to access education for all sections of people by 2030.

MHRD (2019) framed a revised draft on National Education Policy to overcome the challenges faced by the education sector of India. The policy has highlighted the necessity of quality education and equal opportunity for all from pre-school to higher education. According to the Ministry, the draft of national education policy will meet the present need to improve the quality of education, research, innovation, and the lack of manpower in education system in India.

Sawant (2016) conducted a conceptual study in role of IQAC in maintaining quality standards in teaching, learning, and evaluation. According to which the establishment of Internal Quality Assurance Cell, IQAC by accredited institutions also plays a major role in asserting long-term quality standards. IQAC in any higher education institute takes up the prime responsibility to initiate, plan, and supervise various activities, necessary to increase the quality of education imparted in an institution. The role of IQAC in maintaining quality standards in teaching, learning, and evaluation is crucial for higher education institutions self-driven initiatives and quality enhancement measures.

Stewart (2012) conducted a study which focused on the United States as the world leader in education in 20th century. The study highlighted that how other countries around the world have learned from United States and hence are obtaining better results in education excellence of higher education. It was also analysed how to provide better education to the students in rapidly changing globalized and innovative-based environment.

Zhao, & Cziko (2001) conducted a conceptual study to understand the impact of technology in education sector. To accept and explore full benefits of technology, academicians need to manage and agree to

three conditions in their learning and teaching theatres. Firstly, they should accept the effectiveness of innovation and new technological tools. Secondly, beyond effectiveness they should see that innovation will not act as hurdle in delivery path. Lastly, academicians should believe that innovations have full authority to make any changes in given set of technological tools.

All India Survey on Higher Education (2017), prepared official statistics on many parameters based on the data received from various higher educational institutions in India. According to the survey report, gathering of relevant statistical data would facilitate the central and state government in devising future policies. The report has focused on the present scenario of education system which will be helpful in formulating the planning for development of education.

In the light of the literature cited above a study to analyse and interpret how and where the top 27 colleges of University of Delhi have obtained higher ranks in the National Institutional Ranking Framework (NIRF) has been conducted, particularly keeping in mind its various parameters which has led to an increase in their ranks from the year 2018 to the current year 2019.

Objectives of the Study

The present study has been undertaken with the following objectives:

- To analyse and interpret how and where the top 27 colleges of University of Delhi have focused to obtain high ranking in the National Institutional Ranking Framework (NIRF), particularly keeping in mind its various parameters which has led to an increase in their ranks from the year 2018 to the current year 2019.
- To understand each parameter used in NIRF ranking extensively and study various reasons for scoring higher marks in the same.
- To further understand and objectify the various reasons contributing to higher ranks of Delhi university colleges and hence adapt the same in other colleges to achieve higher ranks in future.

Research Methodology

Data collection instruments: Secondary data have been used for this research and collected from the NIRF website. A comparison was done for 27 colleges of University of Delhi which secured a ranking in top 100 colleges in India in the year 2019. The respective change in these scores over the past one year and its weighted implications are also considered and have been compared with their respective scores on various parameters in the year 2018.

Research Design: Descriptive research design is used in this research paper to obtain information of the reasons for high ranks scored by various colleges of University of Delhi. The analysis is based on secondary sources from national and international literature. Secondary data has been also collected from books, websites, various surveys, research papers, articles, journals. This research design has given us a general overview of some valuable pointers that enables the variables to be tested quantitatively in the future. Important recommendations are deduced using this research design which are elaborated further in the paper. Thereafter a prescriptive and predictive analysis is done to determine how ranking of colleges can be improved by deeply understanding the reasons for improvement in ranking of these top Delhi university colleges.

Analysis and Interpretation

The following table no. 1 shows the top 27 colleges of University of Delhi that were included in top 100 colleges of India according to the NIRF report 2019.

Table No. 1: Top 27 Colleges of University of Delhi in NIRF Ranking 2019

| Name of Institution | Rank |
|---|-------------|
| Miranda College | 1 |
| Hindu College | 2 |
| St. Stephens College | 4 |
| Lady Sri Ram College | 5 |
| Sri Ram College of Commerce | 7 |
| Hansraj College | 9 |
| Gargi | 12 |
| Atma Ram Sanatan Dharma College | 14 |
| Deen Dayal Upadhyaya College | 16 |
| Kirori Mal College | 18 |
| Sri Venkateswara College | 19 |
| Dayal Singh | 20 |
| Lady Irwin | 21 |
| Jesus And Mary College | 25 |
| Sri Guru Tegh Bahadur Khalsa College | 28 |
| Daulat Ram College | 37 |
| Maitreyi | 38 |
| Shyam Lal | 41 |
| Kamla Nehru | 43 |
| Indraprastha College | 46 |
| Maharaja Agrasen College | 47 |
| Shivaji | 53 |
| Shaheed Sukhdev College of Business Studies | 70 |
| Keshav Mahavidyalaya | 75 |
| Shri Guru Gobind Singh College of Commerce | 87 |
| Kalindi | 89 |
| Ramanujan | 100 |

Source: <https://www.nirfindia.org/2019/CollegeRanking.html>

Analysis and Interpretation of Parameter 1: Teaching, Learning & Resources

The following table no. 2 shows comparison of the scores obtained by the top 27 colleges of University of Delhi in the years 2019 and 2018 according to the first parameter Teaching, Learning and Resources, the respective change in these scores over the past one year, and its weighted implications.

Table No. 2: Comparison of Top 27 Colleges of University of Delhi based on Parameter 1: Teaching, Learning & Resources

| Name of Institution | TLR | | | Change | | | | | | | Interpretation |
|-----------------------------|------|-------|-------|--------|-------|--------|--------|-------|--------|--------|---------------------------------------|
| | SS | FSR | Total | FRU | Total | SS | FSR | FQE | ERU | Total | |
| Miranda College | 16 | 25.26 | 14.87 | 21.58 | 77.71 | 0 | 0.732 | 0.194 | -1.125 | -0.136 | increase in FSR and FQE max in FSR |
| | 16 | 27.7 | 15.84 | 17.83 | 77.37 | | | | | | |
| | 20 | 30 | 20 | 30 | 100 | | | | | | |
| Hindu College | SS | FSR | FQE | FRU | Total | SS | FSR | FQE | ERU | Total | increase in FSR and FQE max in FSR |
| | 14 | 24.08 | 15.18 | 21.49 | 74.75 | 0 | 0.483 | 0.14 | -0.996 | -0.404 | |
| | 14 | 25.69 | 15.88 | 18.17 | 73.74 | | | | | | |
| Total | 20 | 30 | 20 | 30 | 100 | | | | | | |
| St. Stephens College | SS | FSR | FQE | FRU | Total | SS | FSR | FQE | ERU | Total | increase in FSR and FQE max in FSR |
| | 9.89 | 29.75 | 16.59 | 23.12 | 79.35 | -0.014 | 0.075 | 0.058 | -1.413 | -1.696 | |
| | 9.82 | 30 | 16.88 | 18.41 | 75.11 | | | | | | |
| Total | 20 | 30 | 20 | 30 | 100 | | | | | | |
| Lady Sri Ram College | SS | FSR | FQE | FRU | Total | SS | FSR | FQE | ERU | Total | increase in FSR and FQE max in FSR |
| | 14 | 25.21 | 14 | 18.41 | 71.62 | 0 | 0.615 | 0.114 | -1.119 | -0.444 | |
| | 14 | 27.26 | 14.57 | 14.68 | 70.51 | | | | | | |
| Total | 20 | 30 | 20 | 30 | 100 | | | | | | |
| Sri Ram College of Commerce | SS | FSR | FQE | FRU | Total | SS | FSR | FQE | ERU | Total | increase in FQE |
| | 12 | 27.88 | 11.96 | 20.33 | 72.17 | 0 | -0.081 | 0.108 | -0.684 | -0.804 | |
| | 12 | 27.61 | 12.5 | 18.05 | 70.16 | | | | | | |
| Total | 20 | 30 | 20 | 30 | 100 | | | | | | |
| Hansraj College | SS | FSR | FQE | FRU | Total | SS | FSR | FQE | ERU | Total | increase in FSR and FQE max in FSR |
| | 18 | 20.9 | 11.94 | 19.94 | 70.78 | -0.4 | 0.531 | 0.134 | -0.438 | -0.408 | |
| | 16 | 22.67 | 12.61 | 18.48 | 69.76 | | | | | | |
| Total | 20 | 30 | 20 | 30 | 100 | | | | | | |

Contd...

| Name of Institution | TLR | | | | Change | | | | Interpretation | | | |
|---------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|-------|--------|-------|----------------|--------|--------|---------------------------------------|
| | SS | FSR | FQE | FRU | Total | SS | FSR | FQE | | ERU | Total | |
| Gargi | 2018 | 16 | 26.51 | 14.53 | 20.06 | 77.1 | -0.126 | 1.047 | 0.314 | -1.2 | 0.172 | increase in FSR and FQE max in FSR |
| | 2019 | 15.37 | 30 | 16.1 | 16.06 | 77.53 | | | | | | |
| | Total | 20 | 30 | 20 | 30 | 100 | | | | | | |
| ARSD | 2018 | SS | FSR | FQE | FRU | Total | SS | FSR | FQE | ERU | Total | increase in FSR and FQE max in FQE |
| | 2019 | 13.54 | 28.39 | 14.17 | 22.34 | 78.44 | 0.092 | 0.405 | 0.482 | -1.338 | -0.096 | |
| | Total | 14 | 29.74 | 16.58 | 17.88 | 78.2 | | | | | | |
| DDU | 2018 | 20 | 30 | 20 | 30 | 100 | | | | | | increase in FSR and FQE max in FSR |
| | 2019 | SS | FSR | FQE | FRU | Total | SS | FSR | FQE | ERU | Total | |
| | Total | 12 | 26.72 | 16.66 | 21.45 | 76.83 | 0 | 0.597 | 0.196 | -0.777 | 0.152 | |
| Kirori Mal College | 2018 | 12 | 28.71 | 17.64 | 18.86 | 77.21 | | | | | | increase in all max in ERU |
| | 2019 | 20 | 30 | 20 | 30 | 100 | | | | | | |
| | Total | SS | FSR | FQE | FRU | Total | SS | FSR | FQE | ERU | Total | |
| Venky | 2018 | 18 | 21.26 | 13.79 | 19.93 | 72.98 | 0 | 0.222 | 0.082 | 0.978 | 1.764 | increase in FSR and FQE max in FSR |
| | 2019 | 18 | 22 | 14.2 | 23.19 | 77.39 | | | | | | |
| | Total | 20 | 30 | 20 | 30 | 100 | | | | | | |
| Dayal Singh | 2018 | SS | FSR | FQE | FRU | Total | SS | FSR | FQE | ERU | Total | increase in all max in FSR |
| | 2019 | 16 | 21.72 | 14.49 | 19.73 | 71.94 | -0.4 | 1.38 | 0.542 | -0.927 | 0.888 | |
| | Total | 14 | 26.32 | 17.2 | 16.64 | 74.16 | | | | | | |
| Dayal Singh | 2018 | 20 | 30 | 20 | 30 | 100 | | | | | | increase in all max in FSR |
| | 2019 | SS | FSR | FQE | FRU | Total | SS | FSR | FQE | ERU | Total | |
| | Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3.6 | 8.01 | 3.404 | 4.935 | 31.268 | |
| Total | 18 | 26.7 | 17.02 | 16.45 | 78.17 | | | | | | | |
| Total | 20 | 30 | 20 | 30 | 100 | | | | | | | |

Contd...

| Name of Institution | | TLR | | | | | | Change | | | | | | Interpretation |
|---------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------------------------------------|--|----------------|
| | | SS | FSR | FQE | FRU | Total | SS | FSR | FQE | ERU | Total | | | |
| Lady Irwin | 2018 | 9.68 | 29.93 | 17.93 | 23.66 | 81.2 | 0.064 | -1.305 | -0.376 | 0.051 | -2.296 | increase in ERU max in FSR | | |
| | 2019 | 10 | 25.58 | 16.05 | 23.83 | 75.46 | | | | | | | | |
| | Total | 20 | 30 | 20 | 30 | 100 | | | | | | | | |
| JMC | 2018 | SS | FSR | FQE | FRU | Total | SS | FSR | FQE | ERU | Total | increase in FSR and FQE max in FSR | | |
| | 2019 | 14 | 20 | 11.42 | 18.51 | 63.93 | 0 | 1.086 | 0.298 | -0.6 | 1.244 | | | |
| | Total | 14 | 23.62 | 12.91 | 16.51 | 67.04 | | | | | | | | |
| SGTB | 2018 | SS | FSR | FQE | FRU | Total | SS | FSR | FQE | ERU | Total | increase in FSR and FQE max in FSR | | |
| | 2019 | 14 | 26.33 | 15.86 | 23.73 | 79.92 | 0 | 0.126 | 0.022 | -1.173 | -1.352 | | | |
| | Total | 14 | 26.75 | 15.97 | 19.82 | 76.54 | | | | | | | | |
| DRC | 2018 | SS | FSR | FQE | FRU | Total | SS | FSR | FQE | ERU | Total | increase in all max in FSR | | |
| | 2019 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3.2 | 6.657 | 2.558 | 3.639 | 25.244 | | | |
| | Total | 16 | 22.19 | 12.79 | 12.13 | 63.11 | | | | | | | | |
| Maitreyi | 2018 | SS | FSR | FQE | FRU | Total | SS | FSR | FQE | ERU | Total | increase in FSR and FQE max in FSR | | |
| | 2019 | 14 | 15.16 | 9.72 | 20.79 | 59.67 | 0 | 3.366 | 1.112 | -1.614 | 4.56 | | | |
| | Total | 14 | 26.38 | 15.28 | 15.41 | 71.07 | | | | | | | | |
| Shyam Lal | 2018 | SS | FSR | FQE | FRU | Total | SS | FSR | FQE | ERU | Total | increase in FSR and FQE max in FSR | | |
| | 2019 | 14 | 19.97 | 11.33 | 18.11 | 63.41 | -0.168 | 1.008 | 0.348 | -1.11 | 0.224 | | | |
| | Total | 13.16 | 23.33 | 13.07 | 14.41 | 63.97 | | | | | | | | |

Contd...

| Name of Institution | TLR | | | | Change | | | | Interpretation | | | |
|----------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|-------|--------|-------|----------------|--------|----------------------------|------------------------------------|
| | SS | FSR | FQE | FRU | Total | SS | FSR | FQE | | ERU | Total | |
| Kamla Nehru | 2018 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.256 | 8.676 | 3.278 | 4.077 | 28.072 | increase in all max in FSR | |
| | 2019 | 11.28 | 28.92 | 16.39 | 70.18 | | | | | | | |
| | Total | 20 | 30 | 20 | 30 | 100 | | | | | | |
| IP College For Women | 2018 | SS | FSR | FQE | FRU | Total | SS | FSR | FQE | ERU | Total | increase in FSR and FQE max in FSR |
| | 2019 | 13.98 | 21.7 | 12.05 | 17.15 | 64.88 | -0.232 | 0.549 | 0.196 | -0.429 | 0.088 | |
| | Total | 20 | 30 | 20 | 30 | 100 | | | | | | |
| Maharaja Agrasen | 2018 | SS | FSR | FQE | FRU | Total | SS | FSR | FQE | ERU | Total | increases in ERU |
| | 2019 | 12 | 30 | 18.76 | 1.71 | 62.47 | -0.146 | 0 | -0.194 | 4.152 | 4.856 | |
| | Total | 20 | 30 | 20 | 30 | 100 | | | | | | |
| Shivaji | 2018 | SS | FSR | FQE | FRU | Total | SS | FSR | FQE | ERU | Total | increase in FSR and FQE max in FSR |
| | 2019 | 14 | 26.03 | 14.56 | 17.32 | 71.91 | 0 | 0.792 | 0.126 | -0.951 | 0.04 | |
| | Total | 20 | 30 | 20 | 30 | 100 | | | | | | |
| SSCBS | 2018 | SS | FSR | FQE | FRU | Total | SS | FSR | FQE | ERU | Total | increase in all max in FSR |
| | 2019 | 8 | 21.38 | 12.03 | 17.88 | 59.29 | 1.6 | 6.414 | 2.406 | 5.364 | 23.716 | |
| | Total | 20 | 30 | 20 | 30 | 100 | | | | | | |
| Keshav M. | 2018 | SS | FSR | FQE | FRU | Total | SS | FSR | FQE | ERU | Total | increase in FSR and FQE max in FSR |
| | 2019 | 9.03 | 26.84 | 15.67 | 17.55 | 69.09 | 0.194 | 0.948 | 0.082 | -0.723 | 0.852 | |
| | Total | 20 | 30 | 20 | 30 | 100 | | | | | | |

Contd...

| Name of Institution | TLR | | | Change | | | Interpretation | | |
|---------------------|-------|-------|-------|--------|--------|--------|----------------|--------|--------|
| | SS | FSR | Total | SS | FSR | Total | ERU | FQE | Total |
| SGGSCC | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.8 | 8.178 | 28.204 | 4.404 | 2.914 | 28.204 |
| | 14 | 27.26 | 14.57 | | | | | | |
| | 20 | 30 | 30 | | | | | | |
| Total | | | 70.51 | | | 100 | | | |
| Kalindi | SS | FSR | Total | SS | FSR | Total | ERU | FQE | Total |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.75 | 7.278 | 26.332 | 4.095 | 2.834 | 26.332 |
| | 13.75 | 24.26 | 14.17 | | | | | | |
| Total | 30 | 20 | 100 | | | | | | |
| Ramanujan | SS | FSR | Total | SS | FSR | Total | ERU | FQE | Total |
| | 12 | 29.35 | 11.42 | 0 | -2.949 | -5.712 | -0.909 | -0.284 | -5.712 |
| | 12 | 19.52 | 10 | | | | | | |
| Total | 20 | 30 | 100 | | | | | | |

Source: Analysis based on secondary data

Note. TLR: Teaching, Learning & Resources; the first parameter of National Institutional Ranking Framework which carries a ranking weight of 0.40

SS: Student Strength which includes Doctoral students as well and carries 20 marks

FSR: Faculty Student ratio with emphasis on permanent faculty carries 30 marks

FQE: Combined metric for Faculty with PhD and Experience carries 20 marks.

FRU: Financial Resources and their Utilisation carries 30 marks

The first parameter ‘Teaching, Learning & Resources’ carries the maximum weightage. In the previous two years, it is observed that the colleges have improved their ranking by increasing their FSR i.e. Faculty Student Ratio with emphasis on permanent faculty and by increasing their faculty with Ph.D. and experience. Atma Ram Sanatan Dharam College is a top scorer in this parameter in the year 2019. Also, colleges like Gargi, Shri Venkateswara, Jesus and Mary College, Maitreyi and Shyam Lal College have substantially improved their ranks from the previous year by improving their scores on this parameter. Improvement in the operational expenses per students can also increase the rankings of colleges in this parameter.

Analysis and Interpretation of Parameter 2: Research & Professional Practice

The following table no. 3 shows comparison of the scores obtained by the top 27 colleges of University of Delhi in the years 2019 and 2018 according to the second parameter Research & Professional practice, the respective change in these scores over the past one year and its weighted implications.

The second parameter ‘Research & Professional Practice’ carries third highest weightage. In the previous two years it is observed that the colleges have improved their ranking by increasing their PU i.e. Combined metric for Publications. Hence focus should be made on increasing the number of publications in Scopus, Web of Science, PUBMED, FT 45 over the previous 3 years. Miranda house is the leader in terms of scoring in this parameter, followed by Deen Dayal Upadhyay College and Sri Guru Teg Bahadur Khalsa College in the year 2019. Also, colleges like Miranda, Hansraj, Atma Ram Sanatan Dharma, Deen Dayal Upadhyaya, Kirori Mal College, Shri Venkateshwara College, Shri Guru Tegh Bahadur Khalsa College and Keshav Mahavidyala have substantially improved their ranks from the previous year by improving their scores on this parameter.

Table No. 3: Comparison of Top 27 Colleges of University of Delhi based on Parameter 2: Research & Professional Practice

| Name of Institution | RP | | | Change | | | Interpretation |
|----------------------|-------|-------|-------|--------|-------|--------|------------------------------------|
| | PU | QP | Total | PU | QP | Total | |
| Miranda College | PU | QP | Total | | | | increase in PU and QP max in PU |
| 2018 | 12.96 | 16.82 | 29.78 | 5.67 | 0.408 | 1.419 | |
| 2019 | 21.06 | 18.18 | 39.24 | | | | |
| Total | 70 | 30 | 100 | | | | |
| Hindu College | PU | QP | Total | | | | increase in PU and QP max in PU |
| 2018 | 10.6 | 15.14 | 25.74 | 0.518 | 0.045 | 0.1335 | |
| 2019 | 11.34 | 15.29 | 26.63 | | | | |
| Total | 70 | 30 | 100 | | | | |
| St. Stephens College | PU | QP | Total | | | | increase in QP |
| 2018 | 8.88 | 7.48 | 16.36 | -2.016 | 0.174 | -0.345 | |
| 2019 | 6 | 8.06 | 14.06 | | | | |
| Total | 70 | 30 | 100 | | | | |
| Lady Sri Ram College | PU | QP | Total | | | | increase in PU and QP |
| 2018 | 0.88 | 2.87 | 3.75 | 0.315 | 0.297 | 0.216 | |
| 2019 | 1.33 | 3.86 | 5.19 | | | | |
| Total | 70 | 30 | 100 | | | | |

| Name of Institution | RP | | | Change | | | Interpretation |
|-----------------------------|-------|-------|-------|--------------|---------------|---------------|------------------------------------|
| | PU | QP | Total | | | | |
| Sri Ram College of Commerce | PU | QP | Total | | | | increase in PU and QP max in QP |
| 2018 | 0.13 | 0.49 | 0.62 | 0.007 | 0.105 | 0.054 | |
| 2019 | 0.14 | 0.84 | 0.98 | | | | |
| Total | 70 | 30 | 100 | | | | |
| Hansraj College | PU | QP | Total | | | | increase in PU and QP max in PU |
| 2018 | 3.92 | 8.66 | 12.58 | 2.436 | 0.399 | 0.7215 | |
| 2019 | 7.4 | 9.99 | 17.39 | | | | |
| Total | 70 | 30 | 100 | | | | |
| Gargi | PU | QP | Total | PU | QP | Total | increase in PU |
| 2018 | 1.3 | 7.7 | 9 | 0.973 | -0.135 | 0.141 | |
| 2019 | 2.69 | 7.25 | 9.94 | | | | |
| Total | 70 | 30 | 100 | | | | |
| ARSD | PU | QP | Total | | | | increase in all max in PU |
| 2018 | 9.29 | 15.01 | 24.3 | 3.038 | 0.165 | 0.7335 | |
| 2019 | 13.63 | 15.56 | 29.19 | | | | |
| Total | 70 | 30 | 100 | | | | |
| DDU | PU | QP | Total | | | | increase in all max in PU |
| 2018 | 14.28 | 12.23 | 26.51 | 6.146 | 0.738 | 1.686 | |
| 2019 | 23.06 | 14.69 | 37.75 | | | | |
| Total | 70 | 30 | 100 | | | | |
| KMC | PU | QP | Total | | | | increase in PU |
| 2018 | 9.83 | 16.67 | 26.5 | 1.806 | -0.381 | 0.1965 | |
| 2019 | 12.41 | 15.4 | 27.81 | | | | |
| Total | 70 | 30 | 100 | | | | |
| Venky | PU | QP | Total | | | | increase in PU |
| 2018 | 13.03 | 15.44 | 28.47 | 3.01 | -0.33 | 0.48 | |
| 2019 | 17.33 | 14.34 | 31.67 | | | | |
| Total | 70 | 30 | 100 | | | | |
| Dayal Singh | PU | QP | Total | | | | increase in all max in PU |
| 2018 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8.288 | 4.143 | 3.8475 | |
| 2019 | 11.84 | 13.81 | 25.65 | | | | |
| Total | 70 | 30 | 100 | | | | |

Contd...

| Name of Institution | | RP | | | Change | | | Interpretation |
|---------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|---------------|---------------|----------------|------------------------------------|
| Lady Irwin | | PU | QP | Total | | | | increase in PU and QP max in PU |
| | 2018 | 6.96 | 7.77 | 14.73 | 2.282 | 0.234 | 0.606 | |
| | 2019 | 10.22 | 8.55 | 18.77 | | | | |
| | Total | 70 | 30 | 100 | | | | |
| JMC | | PU | QP | Total | | | | decrease in all |
| | 2018 | 0.19 | 0.41 | 0.6 | -0.014 | -0.027 | -0.0165 | |
| | 2019 | 0.17 | 0.32 | 0.49 | | | | |
| | Total | 70 | 30 | 100 | | | | |
| SGTB | | PU | QP | Total | | | | increase in PU and QP max in PU |
| | 2018 | 10.05 | 18.2 | 28.25 | 4.669 | 0.345 | 1.173 | |
| | 2019 | 16.72 | 19.35 | 36.07 | | | | |
| | Total | 70 | 30 | 100 | | | | |
| DRC | | PU | QP | Total | | | | increase in PU and QP max in QP |
| | 2018 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.826 | 1.227 | 0.7905 | |
| | 2019 | 1.18 | 4.09 | 5.27 | | | | |
| | Total | 70 | 30 | 100 | | | | |
| Maitri | | PU | QP | Total | PU | QP | Total | increase in PU and QP max in PU |
| | 2018 | 2.77 | 7.48 | 10.25 | 1.939 | 0.48 | 0.6555 | |
| | 2019 | 5.54 | 9.08 | 14.62 | | | | |
| | Total | 70 | 30 | 100 | | | | |
| Shyam Lal | | PU | QP | Total | | | | increase in PU and QP max in PU |
| | 2018 | 1.77 | 7.05 | 8.82 | 0.707 | 0.597 | 0.45 | |
| | 2019 | 2.78 | 9.04 | 11.82 | | | | |
| | Total | 70 | 30 | 100 | | | | |
| Kamla Nehru | | PU | QP | Total | | | | increase in PU and QP max in QP |
| | 2018 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.224 | 0.396 | 0.246 | |
| | 2019 | 0.32 | 1.32 | 1.64 | | | | |
| | Total | 70 | 30 | 100 | | | | |
| IP | | PU | QP | Total | | | | increase in PU |
| | 2018 | 0.07 | 0.57 | 0.64 | 0.021 | -0.075 | -0.033 | |
| | 2019 | 0.1 | 0.32 | 0.42 | | | | |
| | Total | 70 | 30 | 100 | | | | |

| Name of Institution | RP | | | Change | | | Interpretation |
|---------------------|------|-------|-------|--------------|---------------|---------------|------------------------------------|
| | PU | QP | Total | | | | |
| Maharaja Agrasen | PU | QP | Total | | | | increase in PU and QP max in PU |
| 2018 | 1.71 | 3.97 | 5.68 | 0.588 | 0.051 | 0.1515 | |
| 2019 | 2.55 | 4.14 | 6.69 | | | | |
| Total | 70 | 30 | 100 | | | | |
| Shivaji | PU | QP | Total | | | | increase in PU and QP max in PU |
| 2018 | 0.58 | 3.55 | 4.13 | 0.91 | 0.834 | 0.612 | |
| 2019 | 1.88 | 6.33 | 8.21 | | | | |
| Total | 70 | 30 | 100 | | | | |
| SSCBS | PU | QP | Total | | | | increase in PU and QP max in QP |
| 2018 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.742 | 0.819 | 0.5685 | |
| 2019 | 1.06 | 2.73 | 3.79 | | | | |
| Total | 70 | 30 | 100 | | | | |
| Keshav M. | PU | QP | Total | | | | increase in PU |
| 2018 | 2.69 | 9.25 | 11.94 | 2.079 | -0.807 | 0.042 | |
| 2019 | 5.66 | 6.56 | 12.22 | | | | |
| Total | 70 | 30 | 100 | | | | |
| SGGSCC | PU | QP | Total | | | | increase in all max in PU |
| 2018 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5.18 | 2.997 | 2.6085 | |
| 2019 | 7.4 | 9.99 | 17.39 | | | | |
| Total | 70 | 30 | 100 | | | | |
| Kalindi | PU | QP | Total | | | | increase in PU and QP max in QP |
| 2018 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.226 | 3.024 | 1.989 | |
| 2019 | 3.18 | 10.08 | 13.26 | | | | |
| Total | 70 | 30 | 100 | | | | |
| Ramanujan | PU | QP | Total | | | | no increase |
| 2018 | 0.04 | 1.1 | 1.14 | 0 | -0.33 | -0.165 | |
| 2019 | 0.04 | 0 | 0.04 | | | | |
| Total | 70 | 30 | 100 | | | | |

Source: Analysis based on Secondary Data

Note. RP: Research and Professional Practice; the second parameter accounts for a ranking weight of 0.15

PU: Combined metric for Publications carries 70 marks

QP: Combined Metric for Quality of Publications carries 30 marks

Analysis and Interpretation of Parameter 3: Graduation Outcomes

The following table no. 4 shows comparison of the scores obtained by the top 27 colleges of University of Delhi in the years 2019 and 2018 according to the third parameter Graduation Outcomes, the respective change in these scores over the past one year and its weighted implications.

Table No.4: Comparison of Top 27 Colleges of University of Delhi based on Parameter 3: Graduation Outcomes

| Name of Institution | Go | | | | Change | | | | Interpretation | |
|-----------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|-------|--------|--------|---|-------|
| | GPHE | GUE | MS | Total | GPHE | GUE | MS | Total | MS | Total |
| Miranda College | 32.71 | 30 | 22.61 | 85.32 | -0.02 | 4 | -1.384 | 0.7575 | increase in GUE | |
| 2018 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2019 | 32.66 | 40 | 15.69 | 88.35 | | | | | | |
| Total | 40 | 40 | 20 | 100 | | | | | | |
| Hindu College | 30.62 | 30 | 26.28 | 86.9 | -0.016 | 4 | -1.414 | 0.7225 | increase in GUE | |
| 2018 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2019 | 30.58 | 40 | 19.21 | 89.79 | | | | | | |
| Total | 40 | 40 | 20 | 100 | | | | | | |
| St. Stephens College | 34.66 | 30 | 30 | 94.66 | -7.072 | 4 | -2 | -4.42 | increases in GUE max in GUE | |
| 2018 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2019 | 16.98 | 40 | 20 | 76.98 | | | | | | |
| Total | 40 | 40 | 20 | 100 | | | | | | |
| Lady Sri Ram College | 27.61 | 28.61 | 25.71 | 81.93 | 3.248 | 4.556 | -1.526 | 2.97 | increase in GPHE and GUE max in GUE | |
| 2018 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2019 | 35.73 | 40 | 18.08 | 93.81 | | | | | | |
| Total | 40 | 40 | 20 | 100 | | | | | | |
| Sri Ram College of Commerce | 28.63 | 30 | 24.85 | 83.48 | 1.188 | 4 | -1.276 | 1.6475 | increases in GPHE and GUE max in GUE | |
| 2018 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2019 | 31.6 | 40 | 18.47 | 90.07 | | | | | | |
| Total | 40 | 40 | 20 | 100 | | | | | | |
| Hansraj College | 12.97 | 27.73 | 24 | 64.7 | 4.744 | 4.908 | -1.114 | 4.64 | increases in GPHE and GUE max in GUE | |
| 2018 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2019 | 24.83 | 40 | 18.43 | 83.26 | | | | | | |
| Total | 40 | 40 | 20 | 100 | | | | | | |

Contd...

| Name of Institution | Go | | | | Change | | | | Interpretation |
|---------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|--------|--------|---------|---|
| | GPHE | GUE | MS | Total | GPHE | GUE | MS | Total | |
| Gargi | 14.76 | 30 | 20.18 | 64.94 | 6.672 | 4 | -0.894 | 5.5525 | increase in GPHE and GUE max in GPHE |
| | 31.44 | 40 | 15.71 | 87.15 | | | | | |
| | 40 | 40 | 20 | 100 | | | | | |
| ARSD | 30.62 | 30 | 26.28 | 86.9 | -3.008 | 4 | -2.418 | -2.4025 | increase in GUE |
| | 23.1 | 40 | 14.19 | 77.29 | | | | | |
| | 40 | 40 | 20 | 100 | | | | | |
| DDU | 10.1 | 28.89 | 18.12 | 57.11 | 1.224 | 4.444 | -1.006 | 2.285 | increase in GPHE, GUE max in GUE |
| | 13.16 | 40 | 13.09 | 66.25 | | | | | |
| | 40 | 40 | 20 | 100 | | | | | |
| KMC | 7.6 | 30 | 21.47 | 59.07 | 0.524 | 4 | -1.156 | 1.3825 | increases in GPHE & GUE max in GUE |
| | 8.91 | 40 | 15.69 | 64.6 | | | | | |
| | 40 | 40 | 20 | 100 | | | | | |
| Venky | 8.25 | 28.77 | 23.37 | 60.39 | 1.988 | 4.476 | -1.428 | 2.255 | increase in GPHE and GUE max in GUE |
| | 13.22 | 39.96 | 16.23 | 69.41 | | | | | |
| | 40 | 40 | 20 | 100 | | | | | |
| Dayal Singh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6.88 | 15.776 | 2.95 | 17.8475 | increase in all max in GUE |
| | 17.2 | 39.44 | 14.75 | 71.39 | | | | | |
| | 40 | 40 | 20 | 100 | | | | | |

Contd...

| Name of Institution | Go | | | | Change | | | | Interpretation |
|---------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|-------|--------|--------|------------------------------------|
| | GPHE | GUE | MS | Total | GPHE | GUE | MS | Total | |
| Lady Irwin | 2018 | 30 | 14.51 | 68.86 | -0.912 | 4 | -0.846 | 0.8725 | increase in GUE |
| | 2019 | 40 | 10.28 | 72.35 | | | | | |
| | Total | 40 | 20 | 100 | | | | | |
| JMC | 2018 | 30 | 6.74 | 65.3 | 2.812 | 4 | 1.74 | 6.4325 | increase in all max in GUE |
| | 2019 | 40 | 15.44 | 91.03 | | | | | |
| | Total | 40 | 20 | 100 | | | | | |
| SGTB | 2018 | 29.35 | 21.91 | 53.33 | 0.156 | 4.26 | -1.266 | 1.1775 | increase in GPHE & GUE max in GUE |
| | 2019 | 40 | 15.58 | 58.04 | | | | | |
| | Total | 40 | 20 | 100 | | | | | |
| DRC | 2018 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12.724 | 16 | 3.13 | 21.865 | increase in all max in GUE |
| | 2019 | 31.81 | 40 | 87.46 | | | | | |
| | Total | 40 | 20 | 100 | | | | | |
| Maitri | 2018 | 1.21 | 22.01 | 53.22 | 4.284 | 4 | -1.356 | 3.4825 | increase in GPHE & GUE max in GPHE |
| | 2019 | 11.92 | 40 | 67.15 | | | | | |
| | Total | 40 | 20 | 100 | | | | | |
| Shyam Lal | 2018 | 19.9 | 18.34 | 66.57 | 3.512 | 4.668 | -1.056 | 3.7925 | increase in GPHE & GUE max in GUE |
| | 2019 | 28.68 | 40 | 81.74 | | | | | |
| | Total | 40 | 20 | 100 | | | | | |

Contd...

| Name of Institution | Go | | | | Change | | | | Interpretation |
|---------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|-------|--------|---------|--|
| | GPHE | GUE | MS | Total | GPHE | GUE | MS | Total | |
| Kamla Nehru | 2018 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9.8 | 16 | 2.806 | 19.6325 | increase in GPHE, GUE and MS max in GUE |
| | 2019 | 24.5 | 40 | 14.03 | 78.53 | | | | |
| | Total | 40 | 40 | 20 | 100 | | | | |
| IP | 2018 | 8.87 | 30 | 25.21 | 64.08 | 4 | -1.96 | 1.82 | increases in GUE and GPHE max in GUE |
| | 2019 | 15.95 | 40 | 15.41 | 71.36 | | | | |
| | Total | 40 | 40 | 20 | 100 | | | | |
| Maharaja Agrasen | 2018 | 7.87 | 30 | 19.09 | 56.96 | 0.92 | -0.934 | 1.655 | increase in GPHE and GUE max in GUE |
| | 2019 | 10.17 | 38.99 | 14.42 | 63.58 | | | | |
| | Total | 40 | 40 | 20 | 100 | | | | |
| Shivaji | 2018 | 10.52 | 25.57 | 17.61 | 53.7 | 0.968 | -0.814 | 2.8125 | increases in GPHE and GUE max in GUE |
| | 2019 | 12.94 | 38.47 | 13.54 | 64.95 | | | | |
| | Total | 40 | 40 | 20 | 100 | | | | |
| SSCBS | 2018 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9.74 | 3.688 | 20.6975 | increase in all max in GUE |
| | 2019 | 24.35 | 40 | 18.44 | 82.79 | | | | |
| | Total | 40 | 40 | 20 | 100 | | | | |
| Keshav M. | 2018 | 1.99 | 30 | 11.1 | 43.09 | -0.06 | 1.204 | 3.9675 | increases in GUE and MS max in GUE |
| | 2019 | 1.84 | 40 | 17.12 | 58.96 | | | | |
| | Total | 40 | 40 | 20 | 100 | | | | |

Contd....

| Name of Institution | Go | | | | Change | | | | Interpretation |
|---------------------|-------|-------|----|-------|--------|-----|--------|---------|--------------------------------------|
| | GPHE | GUE | MS | Total | GPHE | GUE | MS | Total | |
| SGGSCC | 2018 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9.932 | 16 | 3.686 | 20.815 | increase in all max in GUE |
| | 2019 | 24.83 | 40 | 18.43 | 83.26 | | | | |
| | Total | 40 | 40 | 20 | 100 | | | | |
| Kalindi | 2018 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.044 | 16 | 2.568 | 15.7375 | increase in all max in GUE |
| | 2019 | 10.11 | 40 | 12.84 | 62.95 | | | | |
| | Total | 40 | 40 | 20 | 100 | | | | |
| Ramanujan | 2018 | 17.12 | 30 | 23.96 | 71.08 | 4 | -1.362 | 1.1425 | increases in GPHE and GUE max in GUE |
| | 2019 | 18.5 | 40 | 17.15 | 75.65 | | | | |
| | Total | 40 | 40 | 20 | 100 | | | | |

Source: Analysis based on secondary Data

Note. GO: Graduation Outcomes; the third parameter which accounts for a ranking weight of 0.25

GPHE: Combined % for Placement, Higher Studies and Entrepreneurship carries 40 marks

GUE: Metric for University Examinations carries 40 marks

MS: Median Salary carries 20 marks

The third parameter 'Graduation Outcomes' carries second highest weightage. In the previous two years it is observed that the colleges have improved their ranking by increasing their GUE i.e. Metric for University Examinations. Hence focus should be made on ensuring increase in percentage of students which is a fraction of approved intake and is averaged over past 3 years who have passed the respective university exams in a stipulated time for the program in which enrolment was made. Lady Shri Ram College has the highest score in this parameter followed by Jesus and Mary College in the year 2019. Also, colleges like Lady Sri Ram, Hansraj, Deen Dayal Upadhyaya, Shri Venkateshwara College, Shri Guru Tegh Bahadur Khalsa College, Shyam Lal College and Shivaji College have substantially improved their ranks from previous years by improving their scores on this parameter.

Analysis and Interpretation of Parameter 4: Outreach & Inclusivity

The following table no. 5 shows comparison of the scores obtained by the top 27 colleges of University of Delhi in the years 2019 and 2018 according to the fourth parameter Outreach & Inclusivity, the respective change in these scores over the past one year and its weighted implications.

The fourth parameter 'Outreach & Inclusivity' carries the minimum weightage. In the previous two years it is observed that the colleges have improved their ranking by increasing their RD i.e. Region Diversity and PCS i.e. Facilities for physically challenged students. Hence focus should be made to increase the fraction of total students enrolled from other states as well as students enrolled from other countries. Hansraj College has the maximum score in this parameter in the year 2019. Also, colleges like Hindu College, Atma Ram Sanatan Dharma College, Lady Irwin College, Jesus and Mary College, Keshav Mahavidyalaya, Hansraj College and Sri Ram College of Commerce have substantially improved their ranks from previous years by improving their scores on these parameters.

Analysis and Interpretation of Parameter 5: Perception

The following table no. 6 shows comparison of the scores obtained by the top 27 colleges of University of Delhi in the years 2019 and 2018 according to the fifth parameter Perception the respective change in these scores over the past one year and its weighted implications.

The fifth parameter 'Perception' also carries the minimum weightage, but it plays a significant role in determining ranking. Some colleges have although a low score in Research and Professional practices, but since they scored exceptionally high in perception their overall rank is higher than others. St. Stephens College has the highest score in this parameter in the year 2019. Also, in the previous two years it is observed that the colleges like St. Stephens & Hindu have substantially increased their perception over the past years and hence improved their overall ranking.

Conclusion of the Study

- To increase the rank of colleges by scoring high in parameter 1: Teaching, Learning & Resources, it is important to increase the Faculty Student Ratio with emphasis on Permanent faculty and also it is necessary to increase the number of faculty with PhD and experience.
- To increase the rank of colleges by scoring high in parameter 2: Research & Professional practice, it is important to increase the Combined metric for Publications and it is necessary to increase the Combined Metric for Quality of Publications.
- To increase the rank of colleges by scoring high in parameter 3: Graduation Outcomes, it is important to increase the Metric for University Examinations and it is necessary to increase the Combined percentage of students for Placement, Higher Studies and Entrepreneurship.
- To increase the rank of colleges by scoring high in parameter 4: Research & Professional practice, it is important to increase the Region Diversity and it is necessary to increase the Facilities for physically challenged students.

Table No. 5: Comparison of Top 27 Colleges of University of Delhi based on Parameter 4: Outreach & Inclusivity

| Name of Institution | OI | | | | Change | | | | Interpretation | | |
|---------------------|-------|-------|------|-------|--------|--------|--------|--------|----------------|--------|---|
| | RD | WD | ESCS | PCS | Total | RD | WD | ESCS | | PCS | Total |
| Miranda College | 22.06 | 30 | 1.15 | 20 | 73.21 | 0.717 | 0 | 0.058 | 0 | 0.268 | increase in RD & ESCS max increase in RD |
| | 24.45 | 30 | 1.44 | 20 | 75.89 | | | | | | |
| | 30 | 30 | 20 | 20 | 100 | | | | | | |
| Hindu College | RD | WD | ESCS | PCS | Total | RD | WD | ESCS | PCS | Total | increase in RD max increase in RD |
| | 21.1 | 26.99 | 3.7 | 20 | 71.79 | 1.308 | -0.111 | -0.2 | 0 | 0.299 | |
| | 25.46 | 26.62 | 2.7 | 20 | 74.78 | | | | | | |
| Total | 30 | 30 | 20 | 20 | 100 | | | | | | |
| | RD | WD | ESCS | PCS | Total | RD | WD | ESCS | PCS | Total | increase in RD & WD max in RD |
| | 21.28 | 29.9 | 2.16 | 15 | 68.34 | 0.459 | 0.03 | -0.052 | -0.2 | 0.037 | |
| 22.81 | 30 | 1.9 | 14 | 68.71 | | | | | | | |
| Total | 30 | 30 | 20 | 20 | 100 | | | | | | |
| | RD | WD | ESCS | PCS | Total | RD | WD | ESCS | PCS | Total | increase in ESCS |
| | 19.16 | 30 | 2.09 | 20 | 71.25 | -2.946 | 0 | 0.026 | 0 | -0.969 | |
| 9.34 | 30 | 2.22 | 20 | 61.56 | | | | | | | |
| Total | 30 | 30 | 20 | 20 | 100 | | | | | | |
| | RD | WD | ESCS | PCS | Total | RD | WD | ESCS | PCS | Total | increase in Rdand PCS max in PCS |
| | 21.3 | 29.84 | 1.65 | 9 | 61.79 | 0.861 | -0.003 | -0.206 | 2.2 | 1.283 | |
| 24.17 | 29.83 | 0.62 | 20 | 74.62 | | | | | | | |
| Total | 30 | 30 | 20 | 20 | 100 | | | | | | |
| | RD | WD | ESCS | PCS | Total | RD | WD | ESCS | PCS | Total | increase in all max in RD |
| | 21.74 | 27.16 | 0.67 | 17 | 66.57 | 0.957 | 0.246 | 0.708 | 0.6 | 1.055 | |
| 24.93 | 27.98 | 4.21 | 20 | 77.12 | | | | | | | |
| Total | 30 | 30 | 20 | 20 | 100 | | | | | | |

Contd...

| Name of Institution | OI | | | | Change | | | | Interpretation | | | |
|---------------------|-------|-------|-------|------|--------|-------|--------|--------|----------------|------|--------|------------------------------------|
| | RD | WD | ESCS | PCS | Total | RD | WD | ESCS | | PCS | Total | |
| Gargi | 2018 | 16.33 | 30 | 1.27 | 20 | 67.6 | 0.954 | 0 | -0.128 | 0 | 0.254 | increase in RD |
| | 2019 | 19.51 | 30 | 0.63 | 20 | 70.14 | | | | | | |
| | Total | 30 | 30 | 20 | 20 | 100 | | | | | | |
| ARSD | 2018 | 14.36 | 25.61 | 3.64 | 20 | 63.61 | 2.16 | -0.201 | -0.11 | 0 | 0.598 | increase in RD |
| | 2019 | 21.56 | 24.94 | 3.09 | 20 | 69.59 | | | | | | |
| | Total | 30 | 30 | 20 | 20 | 100 | | | | | | |
| DDU | 2018 | 21.28 | 27.94 | 3.04 | 20 | 72.26 | -1.254 | -0.036 | -0.226 | 0 | -0.543 | no increase |
| | 2019 | 17.1 | 27.82 | 1.91 | 20 | 66.83 | | | | | | |
| | Total | 30 | 30 | 20 | 20 | 100 | | | | | | |
| KMC | 2018 | 21.97 | 25.12 | 3.61 | 20 | 70.7 | 0.345 | -0.168 | -0.262 | 0 | -0.072 | increase in RD |
| | 2019 | 23.12 | 24.56 | 2.3 | 20 | 69.98 | | | | | | |
| | Total | 30 | 30 | 20 | 20 | 100 | | | | | | |
| Venky | 2018 | 19.54 | 27.74 | 1.76 | 15 | 64.04 | 0.462 | 0.147 | -0.11 | -0.2 | 0.048 | increase in RD and WD max in RD |
| | 2019 | 21.08 | 28.23 | 1.21 | 14 | 64.52 | | | | | | |
| | Total | 30 | 30 | 20 | 20 | 100 | | | | | | |
| Dayal Singh | 2018 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5.757 | 8.544 | 0.276 | 2.8 | 6.305 | increase in all max in WD |
| | 2019 | 19.19 | 28.48 | 1.38 | 14 | 63.05 | | | | | | |
| | Total | 30 | 30 | 20 | 20 | 100 | | | | | | |

Contd...

| Name of Institution | OI | | | | Change | | | | Interpretation | | | |
|---------------------|-------|-------|-------|------|--------|-------|--------|--------|----------------|-------|--------|--|
| | RD | WD | ESCS | PCS | Total | RD | WD | ESCS | | PCS | Total | |
| Lady Irwin | 2018 | 4.41 | 30 | 0.91 | 12 | 47.32 | 2.109 | 0 | 0.11 | 1.6 | 1.558 | increase in all max in RD |
| | 2019 | 11.44 | 30 | 1.46 | 20 | 62.9 | | | | | | |
| | Total | 30 | 30 | 20 | 20 | 100 | | | | | | |
| JMC | 2018 | 6.47 | 30 | 0.69 | 20 | 57.16 | 2.184 | 0 | -0.108 | 0 | 0.674 | increase in RD |
| | 2019 | 13.75 | 30 | 0.15 | 20 | 63.9 | | | | | | |
| | Total | 30 | 30 | 20 | 20 | 100 | | | | | | |
| SGTB | 2018 | 16.46 | 27.69 | 0.68 | 17 | 61.83 | 0.219 | 0.06 | -0.06 | 0.6 | 0.363 | increase in RD, WD & PCS max in RD |
| | 2019 | 17.19 | 27.89 | 0.38 | 20 | 65.46 | | | | | | |
| | Total | 30 | 30 | 20 | 20 | 100 | | | | | | |
| DRC | 2018 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5.253 | 9 | 0.364 | 0 | 4.933 | increase in all max in RD |
| | 2019 | 17.51 | 30 | 1.82 | 0 | 49.33 | | | | | | |
| | Total | 30 | 30 | 20 | 20 | 100 | | | | | | |
| Maitri | 2018 | 17.4 | 30 | 0.26 | 20 | 67.66 | -0.063 | 0 | -0.026 | 0 | -0.034 | no increase |
| | 2019 | 17.19 | 30 | 0.13 | 20 | 67.32 | | | | | | |
| | Total | 30 | 20 | 20 | 100 | | | | | | | |
| Shyam Lal | RD | WD | ESCS | PCS | Total | RD | WD | ESCS | PCS | Total | | increase in RD, ESCS & PCS max increase in PCS |
| | 2018 | 12.97 | 26.26 | 0.37 | 15 | 54.6 | 0.363 | -0.294 | 0.052 | 1 | 0.549 | |
| | 2019 | 14.18 | 25.28 | 0.63 | 20 | 60.09 | | | | | | |
| Total | 30 | 30 | 20 | 20 | 100 | | | | | | | |

Contd...

| Name of Institution | OI | | | | Change | | | | Interpretation | | |
|---------------------|------|-------|-------|-------|--------|-------|--------|--------|----------------|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| | WD | ESCS | PCS | Total | RD | WD | ESCS | PCS | | Total | |
| Kamla Nehru | RD | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5.169 | 9 | 0.064 | 1 | increase in all max increase in WD | |
| | 2018 | 17.23 | 30 | 0.32 | 52.55 | | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 30 | 30 | 20 | 100 | | | | | | |
| Total | RD | WD | ESCS | PCS | Total | RD | WD | ESCS | PCS | Total | increase in RD |
| IP | RD | 15.86 | 30 | 3.26 | 69.12 | 0.555 | 0 | -0.184 | 0 | 0.093 | increase in RD |
| | 2018 | 17.71 | 30 | 2.34 | 70.05 | | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 30 | 30 | 20 | 100 | | | | | | |
| Total | RD | WD | ESCS | PCS | Total | RD | WD | ESCS | PCS | Total | increase in WD |
| Maharaja Agrasen | RD | 13.56 | 25.87 | 1.18 | 60.61 | -0.03 | 0.024 | -0.148 | 0 | -0.076 | increase in WD |
| | 2018 | 13.46 | 25.95 | 0.44 | 59.85 | | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 30 | 30 | 20 | 100 | | | | | | |
| Total | RD | WD | ESCS | PCS | Total | RD | WD | ESCS | PCS | Total | increase in RD |
| Shivaji | RD | 13.08 | 27.28 | 2.04 | 62.4 | 0.507 | -0.228 | -0.064 | -0.8 | -0.339 | increase in RD |
| | 2018 | 14.77 | 26.52 | 1.72 | 59.01 | | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 30 | 30 | 20 | 100 | | | | | | |
| Total | RD | WD | ESCS | PCS | Total | RD | WD | ESCS | PCS | Total | increase in all max in WD |
| SSCBS | RD | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3.726 | 7.539 | 0.004 | 4 | 5.757 | increase in all max in WD |
| | 2018 | 12.42 | 25.13 | 0.02 | 57.57 | | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 30 | 30 | 20 | 100 | | | | | | |
| Total | RD | WD | ESCS | PCS | Total | RD | WD | ESCS | PCS | Total | increase in RD & WD max in RD |
| Keshav M. | RD | 9 | 23.67 | 0.15 | 52.82 | 1.05 | 0.33 | -0.03 | 0 | 0.445 | increase in RD & WD max in RD |
| | 2018 | 12.5 | 24.77 | 0 | 57.27 | | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 30 | 30 | 20 | 100 | | | | | | |
| Total | RD | WD | ESCS | PCS | Total | RD | WD | ESCS | PCS | Total | |

Contd...

| Name of Institution | OI | | | | Change | | | | Interpretation | | | |
|---------------------|------|-------|-------|------|--------|-------|--------|--------|----------------|-------|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| | RD | WD | ESCS | PCS | TOTAL | RD | WD | ESCS | | PCS | Total | |
| SGGSCC | 2018 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7.479 | 8.394 | 0.842 | 4 | 7.712 | increase in all max in WD | |
| | 2019 | 24.93 | 27.98 | 4.21 | 20 | | | | | | | |
| Total | 30 | 30 | 20 | 20 | 100 | | | | | | | |
| Kalindi | 2018 | RD | WD | ESCS | PCS | TOTAL | RD | WD | ESCS | PCS | Total | increase in RD & WD, ESCS max in WD |
| | 2019 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 20 | 2.514 | 9 | 0.146 | -0.4 | 3.711 | |
| Total | 30 | 30 | 20 | 20 | 100 | | | | | | | |
| Ramanujan | 2018 | RD | WD | ESCS | PCS | Total | RD | WD | ESCS | PCS | Total | decrease in all |
| | 2019 | 18.45 | 27.9 | 8.94 | 20 | 75.29 | -0.759 | -0.303 | -1.302 | -1 | -1.505 | |
| Total | 30 | 30 | 20 | 20 | 100 | | | | | | | |

Source: Analysis based on Secondary data

Note. OI: Outreach and Inclusivity; the fourth parameter which accounts for a ranking weight of 0.10

RD: Percent Students from other States / Countries (Region Diversity) carries 30 marks

WD: Percentage of Women carries 30 marks

ESCS: Economically and Socially Challenged Students carries 20 marks

PCS: Facilities for Physically Challenged Students carries 20 marks

Contd...

Table No. 6: Comparison of Top 27 Colleges of University of Delhi based on Parameter 5: Perception

| Name of Institution | PR | | Change | | Interpretation |
|-----------------------------|-------|-------|--------|--------|----------------|
| | PREMP | Total | PREMP | Total | |
| Miranda College | PREMP | Total | PREMP | Total | |
| 2018 | 68.02 | 68.02 | 3.72 | 0.372 | |
| 2019 | 71.74 | 71.74 | | | |
| Total | 100 | 100 | | | |
| Hindu College | PREMP | Total | PREMP | Total | |
| 2018 | 47.9 | 47.9 | 23.56 | 2.356 | |
| 2019 | 71.46 | 71.46 | | | |
| Total | 20 | 20 | | | |
| St. Stephens College | PREMP | Total | PREMP | Total | max increase |
| 2018 | 60.75 | 60.75 | 32.12 | 3.212 | |
| 2019 | 92.87 | 92.87 | | | |
| Total | 20 | 20 | | | |
| Lady Sri Ram College | PREMP | Total | PREMP | Total | |
| 2018 | 66.99 | 66.99 | 14.25 | 1.425 | |
| 2019 | 81.24 | 81.24 | | | |
| Total | 20 | 20 | | | |
| Sri Ram College of Commerce | PREMP | Total | PREMP | Total | |
| 2018 | 79.74 | 79.74 | -12.28 | -1.228 | |
| 2019 | 67.46 | 67.46 | | | |
| Total | 20 | 20 | | | |
| Hansraj College | PREMP | Total | PREMP | Total | |
| 2018 | 41.54 | 41.54 | 14.55 | 1.455 | |
| 2019 | 56.09 | 56.09 | | | |
| Total | 20 | 20 | | | |
| Gargi | PREMP | Total | PREMP | Total | |
| 2018 | 13.91 | 13.91 | 14.13 | 1.413 | |
| 2019 | 28.04 | 28.04 | | | |
| Total | 100 | 100 | | | |
| ARSD | PREMP | Total | PREMP | Total | |
| 2018 | 19.45 | 19.45 | -3.39 | -0.339 | |
| 2019 | 16.06 | 16.06 | | | |
| Total | 20 | 20 | | | |

Contd...

| Name of Institution | | PR Change | | Interpretation | |
|---------------------|-------|-----------|-------|----------------|--------|
| DDU | | PREMP | Total | PREMP | Total |
| | 2018 | 35.39 | 35.39 | -6.56 | -0.656 |
| | 2019 | 28.83 | 28.83 | | |
| | Total | 20 | 20 | | |
| KMC | | PREMP | Total | PREMP | Total |
| | 2018 | 23.16 | 23.16 | 10.83 | 1.083 |
| | 2019 | 33.99 | 33.99 | | |
| | Total | 20 | 20 | | |
| Venky | | PREMP | Total | PREMP | Total |
| | 2018 | 20.72 | 20.72 | 10.03 | 1.003 |
| | 2019 | 30.75 | 30.75 | | |
| | Total | 20 | 20 | | |
| Dayal Singh | | PREMP | Total | PREMP | Total |
| | 2018 | 0 | 0 | 14.98 | 1.498 |
| | 2019 | 14.98 | 14.98 | | |
| | Total | 20 | 20 | | |
| Lady Irwin | | PREMP | Total | PREMP | Total |
| | 2018 | 34.05 | 34.05 | -2.56 | -0.256 |
| | 2019 | 31.49 | 31.49 | | |
| | Total | 20 | 20 | | |
| JMC | | PREMP | Total | PREMP | Total |
| | 2018 | | 27.65 | 27.65 | -4.27 |
| | 2019 | 23.38 | 23.38 | | |
| | Total | 20 | 20 | | |
| SGTB | | PREMP | Total | PREMP | Total |
| | 2018 | 12.41 | 12.41 | -3.93 | -0.393 |
| | 2019 | 8.48 | 8.48 | | |
| | Total | 20 | 20 | | |
| DRC | | PREMP | Total | PREMP | Total |
| | 2018 | 0 | 0 | 24.7 | 2.47 |
| | 2019 | 24.7 | 24.7 | | |
| | Total | 20 | 20 | | |

Contd...

| Name of Institution | PR | | Change | | Interpretation |
|---------------------|-------|-------|--------|-------|----------------|
| | PREMP | Total | PREMP | Total | |
| Maitri | PREMP | Total | PREMP | Total | |
| | 2018 | 12.41 | 12.41 | -5.22 | -0.522 |
| | 2019 | 7.19 | 7.19 | | |
| | Total | 100 | 100 | | |
| Shyam Lal | PREMP | Total | PREMP | Total | |
| | 2018 | 2.02 | 2.02 | 5.17 | 0.517 |
| | 2019 | 7.19 | 7.19 | | |
| | Total | 20 | 20 | | |
| Kamla Nehru | PREMP | Total | PREMP | Total | |
| | 2018 | 0 | 0 | 7.84 | 0.784 |
| | 2019 | 7.84 | 7.84 | | |
| | Total | 20 | 20 | | |
| IP | PREMP | Total | PREMP | Total | |
| | 2018 | 9.22 | 9.22 | 13.26 | 1.326 |
| | 2019 | 22.48 | 22.48 | | |
| | Total | 20 | 20 | | |
| Maharaja Agrasen | PREMP | Total | PREMP | Total | |
| | 2018 | 3.94 | 3.94 | -0.92 | -0.092 |
| | 2019 | 3.02 | 3.02 | | |
| | Total | 20 | 20 | | |
| Shivaji | PREMP | Total | PREMP | Total | |
| | 2018 | 1.02 | 1.02 | 4.14 | 0.414 |
| | 2019 | 5.16 | 5.16 | | |
| | Total | 20 | 20 | | |
| SSCBS | PREMP | Total | PREMP | Total | |
| | 2018 | 0 | 0 | 5.84 | 0.584 |
| | 2019 | 5.84 | 5.84 | | |
| | Total | 20 | 20 | | |
| Keshav M. | PREMP | Total | PREMP | Total | |
| | 2018 | 2.99 | 2.99 | 1.47 | 0.147 |
| | 2019 | 4.46 | 4.46 | | |
| | Total | 20 | 20 | | |

Contd...

| Name of Institution | PR | Change | | | Interpretation |
|---------------------|-------|--------|--------------|--------------|----------------|
| SGGSCC | PREMP | Total | PREMP | Total | |
| | 2018 | 0 | 0 | 56.09 | 5.609 |
| | 2019 | 56.09 | 56.09 | | |
| | Total | 20 | 20 | | |
| Kalindi | PREMP | Total | PREMP | Total | |
| | 2018 | 0 | 0 | 1.54 | 0.154 |
| | 2019 | 1.54 | 1.54 | | |
| | Total | 20 | 20 | | |
| Ramanujan | PREMP | Total | PREMP | Total | |
| | 2018 | 13.91 | 13.91 | -8.75 | -0.875 |
| | 2019 | 5.16 | 5.16 | | |
| | Total | 20 | 20 | | |

Source: Analysis based on Secondary Data

- Colleges must also focus on achieving a higher score in parameter 5: Perception, which although carries the minimum weightage but plays a significant role in determining higher rank of colleges.

Recommendations of the Study

- Apart from increasing their ranks by emphasising on Faculty Student Ratio and Faculty with PhD and Experience, the operational expenses per student can be improved in terms of expenses on activities like seminars, and conferences. Also keeping a record of our total sponsorship amounts event-wise which are spent on all academic and cultural fests can lead to a substantial increase in operational expenses per student, there on leading to a much higher rank of the college.
- To increase the score in parameter 2: Research & Professional practice, the enrolment to Ph.D. by new faculty members should be emphasized. Emphasis should be made towards increasing quality publications by faculty members. The college authorities can award such initiatives by faculty members to initiate the same.
- To improve the score for parameter 3: Graduation Outcomes, access to systematic data and information regarding admission to higher educational institutions of Alumni is needed as it forms a major part of the graduation outcomes. Data related to placements of outgoing students is needed. Hence, institutionalisation of alumni database in a systematic manner is needed.
- To improve the score in parameter 4: Outreach & Inclusivity, it is necessary to enhance the facilities provided by college for physically challenged students.
- A look at the top colleges' best practices and various aspects of perception like Peer perception, public perception & competitiveness can help in increasing the score in parameter 5: Perception.

Scope for further Research

Best practices incorporated in different departments can be accepted and combined in another research paper. The inputs from this paper can be then used to improve rank of respective institutions.

An inter-college team can be made to suggest various best practices incorporated by different colleges

for different stakeholders so that each college can improve their overall ranking. This association will mutually benefit all the colleges and help the University of Delhi in achieving a higher rank in the coming years while competing with different universities of India.

Another area of research can be comparison of different ranking parameters and frameworks which will help in designing new framework suitable as per individual needs and facts. The size of institutions and specialised fields of study calls for specialised ranking systems. Also, there is need for specialised ranking framework for management and commerce institutions.

Limitations of the Study

The present study has the following limitations:

- The study is only limited to the conclusions made on the basis of parameters used by NIRF, and hence there is always scope of improvement in ranking on the basis of other factors and considerations used by other reputed accreditation and ranking institutions.
- The study is only limited to colleges of University of Delhi and hence has limited implications for the rest of the colleges of the country.

References

- All India Survey on Higher Education. (2017). *All India Survey on Higher Education Report (2016-17)*. Retrieved from https://mhrd.gov.in/sites/upload_files/mhrd/files/statisticsnew/AISHE2015-16.pdf. Accessed on November 2, 2019.
- Barrio, M. I., Escamilla, A. C., Garcia, M. N., Fernandez, E. M., & Garcia, R. P. (2015). *Influence of assessment in the teaching-learning process in the higher education*. Procedia: Social and Behavioral Sciences.
- Corney, M., Froumin, I., Leshukov, O., & Marginson, S. (2018). *Higher education in federal countries: A comparative study*. Los Angeles: Sage Publications.
- Didham, R. J., & Paul, O. M. (2015). The role of education in the sustainable development agenda: Empowering a learning society for sustainability through quality education. In *Achieving the Sustainable Development Goals: From agenda to action*, Institute for Global Environmental Strategies.
- MHRD. (2019). *Draft National Education Policy 2019*. Retrieved from <https://innova.te.mygov.in/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/mygov15596510111.pdf>. Accessed on November, 7, 2019.
- Sawant, D. G. (2016). Role of IQAC in maintaining quality standards in teaching, learning and evaluation. *Pacific Science Review B: Humanities and Social Sciences*, 2, 66-69.
- Stewart, V. (2012). *A World Class Education: Learning from International Models of Experience and Innovation*. USA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum and Development (ASCD). US: ASCD Publications.
- Taylor, J. (2012). *Basics in Educational Research*. USA: NYX Academics LLC.
- UN. (2015). *Transforming our world: The 2030 agenda for sustainable development*. Retrieved from <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/21252030%20Agenda%20for%20Sustainable%20Development%20web.pdf>. Accessed on November 14, 2019.
- Zhao, Y., & Cziko, G. A. (2001). Teacher adoption of technology: A perceptual control theory perspective. *Journal of technology and teacher education*, 9(1), 5-30.

Referred Web Links

- <https://www.nirfindia.org>.
- Higher Education in India: Issues, Concerns and new Directions <http://www.ugc.ac.in/pub/heindia.pdf>.
- <https://www.topuniversities.com/university-rankings/world-university-rankings/2019>.
- <https://www.timeshighereducation.com/content/world-university-rankings>.