RK INSTITUTIONAL PARTNERS

Version 0.2
July 2026

DRONā

Accreditation Framework for Teaching Professionals in Higher Education Institutions

Competence Standard for Teaching Professionals in Higher Education Institutions

DRONā Framework - Draft for Public Consultation

Scheme Owner

RajKaruna (RK) Institutional Partners LLP

6/1075-C, EB Colony, Paramathi Road,
Namakkal, Tamil Nadu - 637001
www.rkip.in | 9042763777 | info@rkip.in

DRONā

Accreditation Framework for Teaching Professionals in Higher Education Institutions

Competence Standard for Teaching Professionals in Higher Education Institutions

Version 0.2
Document Type: Competence Standard
Standard Reference: ISO/IEC 17024:2026 – Conformity Assessment — General Requirements for Bodies Operating Certification of Persons
Status: Draft for Technical Review

Document Control

Item	Details
Scheme Name	DRONā – Accreditation Framework for Teaching Professionals in Higher Education Institutions
Scheme Version	1.0
Document Version	0.2
Document Number	DRONā/CS/V0.2
Standard	ISO/IEC 17024:2026
Drafted By	Scheme Development Committee
Reviewed By	Technical Committee
Approved By	Scheme Owner
Effective Date	23-07-2026
Review Cycle	Every Three Years or Earlier if Required

Copyright Disclaimer

This document has been prepared exclusively for implementing the **DRONā Accreditation Framework for Teaching Professionals in Higher Education Institutions** and shall be used by approved Personnel Certification Bodies operating in accordance with ISO/IEC 17024:2026.

For permissions or inquires regarding the use of this document, please contact RajKaruna (RK) Institutional Partners LLP on info@rkip.in.

Table of Contents

1. Purpose

The primary purpose of the DRONā Certification Scheme is assessing, recognizing, certifying, and continually improving the professional competence of teaching professionals serving in higher education institutions.

2. Scope

This framework applies and addresses **common (generic) competence** to teaching professionals working in all categories of Higher Education Institutions. The Competence Standard is discipline-neutral and can be applied across diverse academic fields with appropriate contextual interpretation.

3. Eligibility Requirements

3.1 Recommended Educational Background

Applicants shall possess qualifications recognized by the competent statutory authority applicable to their discipline and appointment in higher education.

Examples include:

- Master's Degree
- Professional Degree
- Doctoral Degree (where applicable)
- Equivalent qualifications recognized by the relevant statutory authority

3.2 Professional Experience Requirements

All applicants seeking certification under the framework should possess a minimum of two years in teaching profession.

4. Competence Framework Structure

All candidates seeking certification at any level are expected to have competence across FIVE (5) domains as given below:

Domain Number	Competence Domain
1	Teaching and Student Success
2	Research, Innovation and Professional Excellence
3	Academic Contribution and Leadership
4	Professionalism and Social Responsibility
5	Digital Competency and Future Readiness

Maximum Total Score : 1000 Marks

5. Competence Domain Descriptions

5.1 Domain 1 - Teaching and Student Success

Focus: Competence in teaching, mentoring, learning outcomes, and student development

Weightage: 350 Marks (35%)

Integrated Components:

SD	Subdomain	Marks
D1.1	Teaching Effectiveness & Course Delivery	150
D1.2	Student Performance & Learning Outcomes	100
D1.3	Mentoring, Guidance & Student Support	50
D1.4	Skill Development & Employability Contribution	50

Key Indicators:

- Pedagogical innovation (OBE, experiential learning, flipped learning)
- ICT-enabled teaching & LMS usage
- AI-supported teaching-learning practices
- Student feedback & satisfaction
- Course design & delivery effectiveness
- Mentoring & academic advising
- Internship facilitation & career guidance
- Placement & higher education outcomes
- Student achievements (competitions, startups, innovation activities)
- Skill development and employability initiatives

Assessment Criteria:

Code	Indicator	Marks	Evidence
D1.1 — Teaching Effectiveness & Course Delivery (150)			
D1.1.1	Courses handled per academic year	10	Timetable / workload order
D1.1.2	LMS-enabled course implementation	20	LMS screenshots / analytics
D1.1.3	Outcome-Based Education (OBE) implementation	20	Course file / CO-PO mapping
D1.1.4	ICT enabled and smart teaching practices	20	Digital content / class evidence
D1.1.5	Andragogy based facilitation in learning process	50	Evidence report
D1.1.6	Innovative teaching practices adopted	30	Supporting evidence upload
D1.2 — Student Performance & Learning Outcomes (100)			
D1.2.1	Pass percentage in handled courses	20	Result analysis
D1.2.2	CO attainment achievement	20	Attainment reports
D1.2.3	Support system for the diversified learners	30	Identification & additional efforts records
D1.2.4	Students Feedback on Facilitation	15	Admission proofs / records
D1.2.5	Student academic achievement under mentorship	15	Awards / ranks / Comp.Exam achievements
D1.3 — Mentoring, Guidance & Student Support (50)			

D1.3.1	Assigned mentoring responsibility	5	Mentor allocation order
D1.3.2	Mentoring interaction frequency	5	Mentor logbook / portal data
D1.3.3	Career guidance and counselling activities	10	Event reports / student records
D1.3.4	Internship guidance support	15	Internship records
D1.3.5	Support for student wellbeing and inclusion	10	Verified activity evidence
D1.3.6	Student satisfaction on mentoring	5	Survey analytics
D1.4 — Skill Development & Employability Contribution (50)			
D1.4.1	Skill development programmes conducted	15	Programme reports
D1.4.2	Industry interaction activities	5	MoUs / guest lecture reports
D1.4.3	Placement support	5	Internship data
D1.4.4	Certification-oriented training initiatives	10	Activity, Training records / certificates
D1.4.5	Student innovation/startup support	15	Innovation cell/start-up/funding records

5.2 Domain 2: Research, Innovation and Professional Excellence

Focus: Knowledge creation, research impact, innovation, consultancy, and professional recognition

Weightage: 350 Marks (35%)

Integrated Components:

SD	Subdomain	Marks
D2.1	Research Publications & Citation Impact	150
D2.2	Funded Projects, Consultancy & Grants	100
D2.3	Patents, Innovation & Technology Development	80
D2.4	Professional Recognition & Academic Engagement	20

Key Indicators:

- Publications in Scopus/WoS/High-impact journals
- Patents filed/granted/commercialized
- Funded research projects
- Consultancy & industry projects
- National & international collaborations
- FDPs, certifications & continuous professional development
- Editorial/reviewer roles
- Membership in professional bodies
- Awards & recognitions
- Visiting faculty/global academic exposure

Assessment Criteria:

D2.1 — Research Publications & Citation Impact (150)			
Code	**Indicator**	**Marks**	**Evidence**

D2.1.1	Scopus/Wos-indexed journal publications	80	DOI / Scopus link
D2.1.2	Citation impact (Scopus/GS/WoS)	20	Citation profile link
D2.1.3	h-index / scholarly metrics	20	Profile screenshot/link
D2.1.4	Books / book chapters / edited volumes	10	Index-DOI /ISBN proof / publisher page
D2.1.5	International/National conference publications/presentations	20	Conference certificate/proceedings
D2.2 — Funded Projects, Consultancy & Grants (100)			
D2.2.1	Funded research projects sanctioned (as both PI & Co-PI)	50	Sanction order, UC
D2.2.2	Total research grant amount secured (as both PI & Co-PI)	10	Financial sanction document
D2.2.3	Consultancy projects completed (as both PI & Co-PI)	20	Consultancy agreement/report
D2.2.4	PhD PG guided/Labs/Facilities established	20	Linked outputs/report
D2.3 — Patents, Innovation & Technology Development (80)			
D2.3.1	Patents published (Utility only)	20	Patent application proof
D2.3.2	Patents granted (Utility only)	20	Grant certificate
D2.3.3	Patent commercialization / technology transfer	20	Commercialization agreement
D2.3.4	Startup/Entrepreneurship/incubation establishment	20	Incubation records
D2.4 — Professional Recognition & Academic Engagement (20)			
D2.4.1	FDPs / certifications completed	2	Certificates
D2.4.2	Editorial board / reviewer roles	5	Appointment email/certificate
D2.4.3	Membership in professional bodies	2	Membership certificate
D2.4.4	Awards and recognitions received	5	Award certificate
D2.4.5	Invited talks / keynote lectures	3	Invitation/programme brochure
D2.4.6	International academic engagement / visiting faculty activities / Post Doctoral	3	Official invitation/report

5.3 Domain 3: Academic Leadership, Curriculum & Institutional Contribution

Focus: Academic governance, curriculum innovation, institutional quality systems, and leadership contribution

Weightage: 100 Marks (10%)

Integrated Components:

SD	Subdomain	Marks
D3.1	Curriculum Development & Academic Design	40
D3.2	Institutional Responsibilities & Leadership	30
D3.3	Accreditation, Quality & Academic Governance Contribution	30

Key Indicators:

- Curriculum design aligned with NEP 2020
- Interdisciplinary & multidisciplinary programme development
- Academic reforms & policy contributions
- Content development (Books, MOOCs, Digital Resources)
- Board of Studies / Academic Council participation

- IQAC, NBA, NAAC, NIRF responsibilities
- Administrative leadership roles (HoD, Dean, Coordinator)
- Accreditation & ranking contributions
- Institutional policy implementation
- Strategic leadership initiatives

Assessment Criteria:

D3.1 — Curriculum Development & Academic Design (40)			
Code	**Indicator**	**Marks**	**Evidence**
D3.1.1	Academic Regulation, Curriculum Governance & Programme Structuring Contribution	8	relavent evidence
D3.1.2	Academic Programme & Course Development	12	relavent evidence
D3.1.3	Development of Academic Resources, MOOCs & E-Content	20	Resource links / content evidence
D3.2 — Institutional Responsibilities & Leadership (30)			
D3.2.1	Leadership & Administrative Responsibilities Held	5	Appointment orders/circulars/minutes
D3.2.2	Institutional Committees, Events & Operational Responsibilities	15	Committee orders/reports
D3.2.3	Contribution to Institutional Transformation Initiatives	10	Official records/reports
D3.3 — Accreditation, Quality & Academic Governance Contribution (30)			
D3.3.1	Contribution to Accreditation, Rankings & Quality Assurance Activities	7	Official assignment/order
D3.3.2	Participation in academic governance bodies of other Instutions	15	BOS/Academic Council records
D3.3.3	Policy development and institutional documentation support	8	Policy documents/reports

5.4 Domain 4: Ethics, Social Responsibility and Wellbeing

Focus: Professional ethics, inclusivity, societal contribution, sustainability, and student wellbeing

Weightage: 100 Marks (10%)

Integrated Components:

SD	Subdomain	Marks
D4.1	Professionalism, Inclusivity & Student Wellbeing	35
D4.2	Community Engagement, Sustainability & Social Impact	65

Key Indicators:

- Ethical teaching and professional practices
- Inclusivity, equity & diversity support
- Community engagement & outreach activities
- SDG-oriented initiatives
- Student counselling & wellbeing support
- Social innovation & societal impact activities
- Environmental sustainability contribution
- Value-based education practices

Assessment Criteria:

D4.1 — Professionalism, Inclusivity & Student Wellbeing (35)			
Code	**Indicator**	**Marks**	**Evidence**
D4.1.1	Adherence to Professionalism & Institutional Code of Conduct	10	Institutional verification / disciplinary records
D4.1.2	Student Support, Counselling & Wellbeing Activities	10	Official counselling/mentoring/activity records
D4.1.3	Responsible Academic & Research Practices	15	Integrity/plagiarism/examination compliance records
D4.2 — Community Engagement, Sustainability & Social Impact (65)			
D4.2.1	Participation in Outreach, Community Engagement, NSS, NCC & Social Service Activities	35	Programme/project reports/photos
D4.2.2	Contribution to Sustainability & Green Campus Initiatives	15	Activity reports/certificates
D4.2.3	Community Development Projects & Social Impact Initiatives	15	Project reports / beneficiary records / certificates

5.5 Domain 5: Digital Competency & Future Readiness

Focus: Digital transformation, AI integration, Education 5.0 readiness, and future-oriented academic practices

Weightage: 100 Marks (10%)

Integrated Components:

SD	Subdomain	Marks
D5.1	Digital Teaching, AI Integration & Learning Analytics	65
D5.2	Emerging Technologies, Education 5.0 & Global Readiness	35

Key Indicators:

- AI/ML integration in teaching-learning
- Digital content creation
- EdTech adoption & smart learning systems
- Learning analytics & data-driven education
- Virtual/hybrid learning innovation
- Emerging technology integration
- Education 5.0 readiness
- Digital academic portfolio & online engagement

Assessment Criteria:

Code	Indicator	Marks	Evidence
D5.1 — Digital Teaching, AI Integration & Learning Analytics (65)			
D5.1.1	Use of AI Tools in Teaching-Learning Practices	40	Demonstration/evidence records
D5.1.2	Learning Analytics & Data-Driven Student Support	15	Analytics reports
D5.1.3	Development of Digital Learning Resources using AI	10	Course delivery records
D5.2 — Emerging Technologies, Education 5.0 & Global Readiness (35)			
Code	**Indicator**	**Marks**	**Evidence**

D5.2.1	Use of Virtual Laboratory, Simulation & Digital Experimentation Practices	20	Supporting academic evidence
D5.2.2	Industry 4.0 & Education 5.0 Academic Implementation Initiatives	15	Supporting academic evidence

6. Rubrics for Assessment Criteria

A detailed indicator-wise rubrics are presented in the Annexure 1 – 5.

7. Certification Levels

The Certification Scheme recognizes progressive levels of professional competence:

Level	Accreditation Title	Total Score (Maximum Score 100)
Level 1	Associate Faculty	<350
Level 2	Accredited Faculty	351-500
Level 3	Senior Accredited Faculty	501-650
Level 4	Distinguished Faculty	651-800
Level 5	Master Faculty	>801

8. Certification Categories

Recognizing the diversity of academic roles, the framework accommodates different categories of teaching professionals, including:

- Teaching-Intensive Faculty
- Research-Intensive Faculty
- Teaching and Research Faculty

Competence Score and weightage for different category of Teaching Professionals:

Domain No	Competence Domain	Score for Teaching and Research Faculty	Score for Teaching-Intensive Faculty	Score for Research-Intensive Faculty
1	Teaching and Student Success	350	500	200
2	Research, Innovation and Professional Excellence	350	200	500
3	Academic Contribution and Leadership	100	100	100
4	Professionalism and Social Responsibility	100	100	100
5	Digital Competency and Future Readiness	100	100	100

9. Abbreviations

Abbreviation	Definition
AI	Artificial Intelligence
AI/ML	Artificial Intelligence / Machine Learning
CO	Course Outcome
CO–PO	Course Outcome – Programme Outcome Mapping
DOI	Digital Object Identifier
EdTech	Educational Technology
FDP	Faculty Development Programme
GS	Google Scholar
HEI	Higher Education Institution
h-index	Hirsch Index (Research Impact Metric)
ICT	Information and Communication Technology
IQAC	Internal Quality Assurance Cell
ISBN	International Standard Book Number
ISO/IEC	International Organization for Standardization / International Electrotechnical Commission
LMS	Learning Management System
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
MOOCs	Massive Open Online Courses
NAAC	National Assessment and Accreditation Council
NBA	National Board of Accreditation
NCC	National Cadet Corps
NEP	National Education Policy
NIRF	National Institutional Ranking Framework
NSS	National Service Scheme
OBE	Outcome-Based Education
PI	Principal Investigator
Co-PI	Co-Principal Investigator
PG	Postgraduate
PhD	Doctor of Philosophy
RIPE	Research, Innovation and Professional Excellence
Scopus	Scopus Abstract and Citation Database
SD	Subdomain
SDG	Sustainable Development Goals
UC	Utilization Certificate
WoS	Web of Science

10. Glossary

Term	Definition
Competence Standard	A structured framework defining the knowledge, skills, behaviours, and evidence required for certification.
Competence Domain	A major area of professional competence assessed under the DRONā framework.
Subdomain	A specific component within a competence domain that groups related assessment indicators.
Indicator	A measurable criterion used to assess professional competence.
Assessment Criteria	The evidence-based requirements against which each indicator is evaluated.
Evidence	Documentary proof submitted by an applicant to substantiate claims of competence.
Teaching-Intensive Faculty	Faculty members whose primary responsibilities focus on teaching, mentoring, and student success.
Research-Intensive Faculty	Faculty members whose primary responsibilities focus on research, innovation, publications, and funded projects.
Teaching and Research Faculty	Faculty members with balanced responsibilities in teaching, research, and institutional contributions.
Weightage	The maximum marks allocated to a domain or assessment component.
Competence Score	The total marks obtained by a candidate across all assessed domains.
Professional Recognition	Recognition earned through awards, memberships, invited talks, editorial roles, or similar academic achievements.
Digital Competency	The ability to effectively use digital technologies, AI tools, learning analytics, and emerging educational technologies in higher education.
Future Readiness	The preparedness of teaching professionals to adopt emerging technologies, Education 5.0 practices, and evolving pedagogical approaches.

11. Annexure – 1: Rubrics for Domain 1

DOMAIN 1 — Teaching & Student Success (350 Marks)			
SD	**Subdomain**	**Type**	**Score**
D1.1	Teaching Effectiveness & Course Delivery	Qn	150
D1.2	Student Performance & Learning Outcomes	Qn	100
D1.3	Mentoring, Guidance & Student Support	Qn	50
D1.4	Skill Development & Employability Contribution	Qn	50

D1.1 — Teaching Effectiveness & Course Delivery (150)

SOP and Rubrics
Max. Mark = 10

Questionnaire — D1.1.1 Courses Handled per Academic Year

Purpose
To assess teaching workload considering:

- number of courses,
- UG/PG category,
- student strength,
- and completion authenticity.

Questionnaire

Q. No	Question	Response Type	Scoring Relevance
1	Total number of courses handled during the assessment year	Numeric	Teaching workload
2	Number of UG courses handled	Numeric	Higher weightage
3	Number of courses with enrollment >30 students	Numeric	Higher workload weightage
4	Were all assigned courses completed with proper academic records?	Yes/No	Compliance verification
5	Upload consolidated workload/course allocation document	File Upload	Evidence verification

Rubric — D1.1.1 (1 Mark)

Criteria	Marks
Multiple UG courses with >30 enrollment completed with verified records	10
UG/PG mixed workload with verified records	7.5
Mainly PG/small-strength workload with records	5
Partial completion/documentation	2.5
No verifiable evidence	0

Scoring Formula
Instead of forcing 3-year data for everyone:

$$\text{Final Score} = \frac{\text{Total Obtained Score}}{\text{Number of Eligible Years}}$$

- evaluation is only for the years the faculty actually served,

D1.1.2 — LMS-Enabled Course Implementation

Mark = 20

Purpose

To assess the effective integration of LMS platforms in teaching-learning processes considering:

- academic engagement,
- digital assessment practices,
- student participation,
- and implementation scale.

Questionnaire

Q. No	Question	Response Type	Scoring Relevance
1	Number of courses actively managed through LMS	Numeric	LMS adoption scale
2	Number of courses where assignments/quizzes were conducted through LMS	Numeric	Digital assessment integration
3	Number of courses with >70% active student participation in LMS	Numeric	Student engagement quality
4	Were LMS analytics/activity records maintained and verifiable?	Yes/No	Evidence authenticity

Rubric — D1.1.2 (2 Marks)

Criteria	Marks
Extensive LMS implementation with assessments and high student engagement across multiple UG/high-strength courses	20
Strong LMS implementation with moderate engagement and assessment integration	15
LMS used mainly for content/material sharing	10
Minimal or irregular LMS implementation	5
No verifiable LMS implementation	0

Scoring Formula

Instead of forcing 3-year data for everyone:

$$\text{Final Score} = \frac{\text{Total Obtained Score}}{\text{Number of Eligible Years}}$$

- evaluation is only for the years the faculty actually served,

D1.1.3 OBE Implementation

Mark = 20

Purpose

To assess the effective implementation of Outcome-Based Education practices through:

- CO attainment,
- assessment alignment,
- attainment analysis,
- and improvement actions.

The questionnaire is intentionally minimal and scoring-oriented.

Questionnaire

Q. No	Question	Response Type
1	Percentage of handled courses implementing formal CO attainment process	Percentage (%)
2	Percentage of courses where attainment targets were achieved	Percentage (%)
3	Were improvement actions taken based on attainment gaps?	Yes/No
4	OBE implementation maturity level	Dropdown
5	Upload one consolidated OBE summary report	File Upload

OBE Maturity Levels

Level	Description
L0	No OBE implementation
L1	Basic CO definition only
L2	CO assessment implemented
L3	Attainment analysis performed
L4	Continuous improvement actions implemented

Faculty simply select one level.

$$\text{OBE Score} = (0.4 \times Q_1) + (0.3 \times Q_2) + (0.2 \times Q_3) + (0.1 \times Q_4)$$

Variable	Meaning	Initial Logic
Q1	CO implementation coverage	Most fundamental
Q2	Actual attainment achievement	Second important
Q3	Improvement actions	Important but binary
Q4	Maturity declaration	More subjective

Normalized Scoring Tables

Q1 — CO Implementation %

Range	Score
≥90%	1.0
70–89%	0.8
50–69%	0.6
30–49%	0.4
<30%	0.2

Q2 — Target Attainment Achievement %

Range	Score
≥85%	1.0
70–84%	0.8
50–69%	0.6
30–49%	0.4
<30%	0.2

Q3 — Improvement Actions

Response	Score
Yes	1
No	0

Q4 — OBE Maturity Level

Level	Score
L4	1.0
L3	0.8
L2	0.6
L1	0.3
L0	0

Final Rubric — D1.1.3 (20 Marks)

Final Computed Score	Marks
≥0.85	20
0.70–0.84	15
0.50–0.69	10
0.30–0.49	5
<0.30	0

D1.1.4 ICT enabled and smart teaching practices

Mark = 20

Purpose

To assess the effective integration of ICT tools and smart teaching practices in enhancing:

- student engagement,
- interactive learning,
- digital pedagogy,

- and technology-enabled classroom delivery.

Questionnaire

Q. No	Question	Response Type
1	Percentage of handled courses using ICT/smart teaching tools	Percentage (%)
2	Number of different ICT tools/platforms effectively used	Numeric
3	Percentage of classes involving interactive digital engagement (quiz, simulation, polling, smart board, etc.)	Percentage (%)
4	ICT implementation maturity level	Dropdown
5	Upload one consolidated ICT/smart teaching evidence document	File Upload

ICT Maturity Levels

Level	Description
L0	No ICT integration
L1	Basic PPT/content projection only
L2	Regular multimedia/digital teaching usage
L3	Interactive ICT-enabled learning practices
L4	Advanced smart teaching with analytics/simulations/AI-enabled tools

Scoring

$$\text{ICT Score} = \frac{Q_1 + Q_2 + Q_3 + Q_4}{4}$$

Variable Definitions

Variable	Meaning
Q_1	ICT implementation coverage
Q_2	Diversity of ICT tools used
Q_3	Interactive digital engagement level
Q_4	ICT maturity level

Normalized Scoring Tables

Q1 — ICT Usage Coverage

Range	Score
≥90%	1.0
70–89%	0.8
50–69%	0.6
30–49%	0.4
<30%	0.2

Q2 — Diversity of ICT Tools

Number of Tools	Score
≥5	1.0
4	0.8
3	0.6
2	0.4
1	0.2

Examples:

- LMS
- Smart board
- Simulation software
- Online polling
- Virtual labs
- AI teaching tools
- Video platforms

Q3 — Interactive Digital Engagement

Range	Score
≥80%	1.0
60–79%	0.8
40–59%	0.6
20–39%	0.4
<20%	0.2

Q4 — ICT Maturity Level

Level	Score
L4	1.0
L3	0.8
L2	0.6
L1	0.3
L0	0

Final Rubric — D1.1.4 (20 Marks)

Final Computed Score	Marks
≥0.85	20
0.70–0.84	15
0.50–0.69	10
0.30–0.49	5
<0.30	0

D1.1.5 — Andragogy-Based Facilitation in Learning Process

Mark = 50

Purpose

To assess the adoption of learner-centric andragogical practices that promote:

- active learning,
- self-directed learning,
- experiential engagement,
- collaborative participation,
- and higher-order thinking.

Questionnaire — D1.1.5

Q. No	Question	Response Type
1	Percentage of courses where learner-centric/andragogical methods were implemented	Percentage (%)
2	Number of different active learning methods used during the assessment period	Numeric
3	Percentage of sessions involving student participation/activity-based engagement	Percentage (%)
4	Andragogy implementation maturity level	Dropdown
5	Upload one consolidated evidence/report for andragogical practices	File Upload

Examples of Accepted Andragogical Methods

- Case-based learning
- Problem-based learning
- Project-based learning
- Experiential learning
- Peer learning
- Flipped classroom
- Collaborative learning
- Industry-based assignments
- Reflective learning
- Self-directed learning

Andragogy Maturity Levels

Level	Description
L0	Traditional lecture-only approach
L1	Occasional learner interaction
L2	Regular active learning integration
L3	Structured learner-centric facilitation
L4	Advanced self-directed and experiential learning ecosystem

Scoring

$$\text{Andragogy Score} = \frac{Q_1 + Q_2 + Q_3 + Q_4}{4}$$

Variable Definitions

Variable	Meaning
Q_1	Coverage of andragogical implementation

Variable	Meaning
Q_2	Diversity of active learning methods
Q_3	Student participation/activity engagement
Q_4	Andragogy maturity level

Normalized Scoring Tables

Q1 — Implementation Coverage

Range	Score
≥90%	1.0
70–89%	0.8
50–69%	0.6
30–49%	0.4
<30%	0.2

Q2 — Diversity of Methods

Number of Methods	Score
≥5	1.0
4	0.8
3	0.6
2	0.4
1	0.2

Q3 — Student Participation Engagement

Range	Score
≥80%	1.0
60–79%	0.8
40–59%	0.6
20–39%	0.4
<20%	0.2

Q4 — Andragogy Maturity Level

Level	Score
L4	1.0
L3	0.8
L2	0.6
L1	0.3
L0	0

Final Rubric — D1.1.5 (50 Marks)

Final Computed Score	Marks
≥0.85	50
0.70–0.84	40

Final Computed Score	Marks
0.50–0.69	30
0.30–0.49	15
<0.30	0

D1.1.6 — Innovative Teaching Practices Adopted

Mark = 30

Purpose

To assess genuinely innovative academic practices introduced beyond regular ICT usage or routine active learning.

Questionnaire — D1.1.6

Q. No	Question	Response Type
1	Number of innovative teaching practices newly introduced during the assessment period	Numeric
2	Did any innovation involve industry, research, AI, simulation, interdisciplinary, or real-world integration?	Yes/No
3	Did the innovation demonstrate measurable student impact/improvement?	Yes/No
4	Upload one consolidated innovation evidence/report	File Upload

Examples of Accepted Innovative Practices

- Industry-integrated assignments
- Real-time problem-solving classrooms
- Simulation-driven learning
- Interdisciplinary mini-project ecosystems
- Gamified learning models
- Reverse teaching/student-led instruction
- Research-integrated UG teaching
- Digital twin-based teaching
- Community/problem immersion learning

Scoring

$$\text{Innovation Score} = \frac{Q_1 + Q_2 + Q_3}{3}$$

Variable Definitions

Variable	Meaning
Q_1	Innovation implementation scale
Q_2	Advanced integration level
Q_3	Measurable impact evidence

Normalized Scoring Tables

Q1 — Number of Innovative Practices

Number	Score
≥4	1.0
3	0.8
2	0.6
1	0.4
0	0

Q2 — Advanced Innovation Integration

Response	Score
Yes	1
No	0

Q3 — Measurable Student Impact

Response	Score
Yes	1
No	0

Final Rubric — D1.1.6 (30 Mark)

Final Computed Score	Marks
≥0.85	30
0.60–0.84	20
0.40–0.59	10
0.20–0.39	5
<0.20	0

Not to be Considered

- Routine PPT teaching or Normal LMS usage
- Repeated classroom activities already counted in D1.1.5
- Unsupported “innovative” claims or Cosmetic/non-academic changes
- Duplicate submissions across semesters/years

***** End of Domain 1.1 *****

D1.2 — Student Performance & Learning Outcomes (100)

D1.2.1 Pass Percentage in Handled Courses

Mark = 20

Purpose

To assess academic effectiveness through student pass performance while considering:

- course responsibility,
- class strength,
- and sustained academic outcomes.

Questionnaire — D1.2.1

Q. No	Question	Response Type
1	Average pass percentage across handled courses during the assessment period	Percentage (%)
2	Upload consolidated result analysis/pass percentage report	File Upload

Direct Rubric — D1.2.1 (2 Marks)

Average Pass Percentage	Marks
≥95%	20
85–94%	15
75–84%	10
60–74%	5
<60%	0

D1.2.2 — CO Attainment Achievement

Mark = 20

Purpose

To assess the achievement level of Course Outcomes (COs) in handled courses based on institutional OBE targets.

This is already a direct measurable indicator,

Questionnaire — D1.2.2

Q. No	Question	Response Type
1	Average CO attainment percentage across handled courses during the assessment period	Percentage (%)
2	Upload consolidated CO attainment report	File Upload

Direct Rubric — D1.2.2 (2 Marks)

Average CO Attainment	Marks
≥90%	20
80–89%	15
70–79%	10

Average CO Attainment	Marks
60–69%	5
<60%	0

D1.2.3 — Support System for Diversified Learners

Mark = 30

Purpose

To assess faculty efforts in supporting diversified learner groups such as:

- slow learners,
- advanced learners,
- academically weak students,
- and students requiring special academic support.

Questionnaire — D1.2.3

Q. No	Question	Response Type
1	Number of structured support/remedial/enrichment initiatives conducted for diversified learners during the assessment period	Numeric
2	Percentage of identified students showing measurable improvement after intervention	Percentage (%)
3	Upload consolidated support activity/improvement report	File Upload

Scoring

$$\text{Learner Support Score} = \frac{Q_1 + Q_2}{2}$$

Variable Definitions

Variable	Meaning
Q_1	Structured learner support initiatives
Q_2	Student improvement after intervention

Normalized Scoring Tables

Q1 — Support/Intervention Initiatives

Number of Initiatives	Score
≥5	1.0
4	0.8
3	0.6
2	0.4
1	0.2
0	0

Examples:

- Remedial coaching
- Bridge classes

- Slow learner support
- Advanced learner mentoring
- Peer-assisted learning
- Special tutorial sessions

Q2 — Student Improvement After Intervention

Improvement Percentage	Score
≥80%	1.0
60–79%	0.8
40–59%	0.6
20–39%	0.4
<20%	0.2

Final Rubric — D1.2.3 (30 Marks)

Final Computed Score	Marks
≥0.85	30
0.70–0.84	20
0.50–0.69	10
0.30–0.49	5
<0.30	0

D1.2.4 — Students Feedback on Facilitation

Mark = 15

1. Purpose

To assess the effectiveness of faculty facilitation of student learning based on direct student feedback.

The assessment shall capture student perceptions regarding:

- teaching effectiveness,
- classroom engagement,
- communication clarity,
- learning support,
- fairness,
- accessibility,
- and overall facilitation of learning.

2. Data Collection Method

Feedback shall be collected directly from students through the RKIP Student Feedback Portal.

Faculty members shall not submit data under this SD.

Students shall anonymously respond to the prescribed questionnaire.

3. Assessment Period

Assessment shall be based on feedback collected during the preceding three academic years.

Special Cases

Faculty Service Period	Data Considered
≥3 years	Last 3 years

Faculty Service Period	Data Considered
2–3 years	Available years
1–2 years	Available years
<1 year	Current completed semester(s)

4. Eligible Student Respondents
For each course:

Course Enrollment	Minimum Response Requirement
≤30	70% of students
31–60	60% of students
>60	50% of students

Responses below the threshold shall not be considered.

Score Rubric (15 Marks) – cumulative marks on the feedback report

Student Feedback Score (%)	Marks
≥95	15
90–94.99	13
85–89.99	11
80–84.99	9
75–79.99	7
70–74.99	5
65–69.99	3
<65	0

8. Verification
Data shall be automatically retrieved from:

- structured Student Feedback System
- ERP Feedback Module
- LMS Feedback Records

No manual score entry by faculty shall be permitted.

9. Not to be Considered

- Anonymous external surveys
- WhatsApp polls
- Manual spreadsheets
- Feedback collected by faculty personally
- Responses below minimum participation threshold
- Duplicate student submissions
- Incomplete feedback forms

D1.2.5 — Student Academic Achievement under Mentorship
Mark = 15
Purpose

To assess faculty contribution toward enabling notable student academic achievements such as:

- university ranks,
- competition achievements,
- paper/project awards,
- hackathons,
- technical contest success,
- research recognitions.

Questionnaire — D1.2.5

Q. No	Question	Response Type
1	Number of students/teams achieving recognized academic or technical achievements under your mentorship during the assessment period	Numeric
2	Upload consolidated achievement proof/report	File Upload

Direct Rubric — D1.2.5 (15 Mark)

Number of Verified Achievements	Marks
≥10	1
6–9	0.75
3–5	0.5
1–2	0.25
0	0

Accepted Achievements

- University ranks
- Technical competition awards
- Hackathon achievements
- Project competition prizes
- Paper presentation awards
- Research recognitions
- Innovation awards
- National/international student competition achievements

***** End of Domain 1.2 *****

D1.3 — Mentoring, Guidance & Student Support (50)

D1.3.1 — Assigned mentoring responsibility

Mark = 5

Purpose

To assess formal mentoring responsibility and active mentoring engagement with assigned mentees.

This SD measures:

- mentoring responsibility scale,
- continuity of mentoring,
- and formal engagement with assigned mentees.

Questionnaire — D1.3.1

Q. No	Question	Response Type
1	Number of students officially assigned for mentoring	Numeric
2	Percentage of mentoring sessions conducted as per institutional schedule	Percentage (%)
3	Were mentoring records maintained and verifiable?	Yes/No
4	Upload consolidated mentoring log/report	File Upload

Scoring

$$\text{Mentoring Engagement Score} = \frac{Q_1 + Q_2 + Q_3}{3}$$

Variable Definitions

Variable	Meaning
Q_1	Mentoring responsibility scale
Q_2	Mentoring engagement compliance
Q_3	Record verifiability

Normalized Scoring Tables

Q1 — Assigned Mentee Strength

Number of Students	Score
≥40	1.0
31–39	0.8
21–30	0.6
10–20	0.4
<10	0.2

Q2 — Mentoring Schedule Compliance

Range	Score
≥90%	1.0
70–89%	0.8
50–69%	0.6
30–49%	0.4
<30%	0.2

Q3 — Record Verification

Response	Score
Yes	1

Response	Score
No	0

Final Rubric — D1.3.1 (5 Mark)

Final Computed Score	Marks
≥0.85	1
0.60–0.84	0.75
0.40–0.59	0.5
0.20–0.39	0.25
<0.20	0

D1.3.2 — Mentoring Interaction Frequency

Mark = 5

Purpose

To assess the regularity and continuity of faculty mentoring interactions with assigned mentees.

Questionnaire — D1.3.2

Q. No	Question	Response Type
1	Average number of mentoring interactions conducted per month	Numeric
2	Percentage of scheduled mentoring sessions actually conducted	Percentage (%)
3	Were mentoring interaction records maintained and verifiable?	Yes/No
4	Upload consolidated mentoring interaction log/report	File Upload

---

RKIP Formula-Based Scoring

Mentoring Interaction Score= (Q1+Q2+Q3)/3

Variable Definitions

Variable	Meaning
Q1	Monthly mentoring interaction frequency
Q2	Mentoring schedule compliance
Q3	Record verifiability

Normalized Scoring Tables

Q1 — Average Monthly Mentoring Interactions

Interactions/Month	Score
≥4	1.0
3	0.8
2	0.6
1	0.4
0	0

Q2 — Scheduled Mentoring Compliance

Range	Score
≥90%	1.0
70–89%	0.8
50–69%	0.6
30–49%	0.4
<30%	0.2

Q3 — Record Verification

Response	Score
Yes	1
No	0

Final Rubric — D1.3.2 (5 Mark)

Final Computed Score	Marks
≥0.85	1
0.60–0.84	0.75
0.40–0.59	0.5
0.20–0.39	0.25
<0.20	0

Not to be Considered

- Informal/unrecorded meetings
- Duplicate interaction entries
- Non-verifiable mentoring claims
- One-time interactions without continuity
- Non-assigned student interactions

D1.3.3 — Career Guidance and Counselling Activities

Mark = 10

Purpose

To assess faculty contribution toward guiding students in:

- career planning,
- higher education preparation,
- competitive examinations,
- employability awareness,
- and professional development.

This SD focuses on:

- structured guidance activities,
- not routine mentoring interactions.

Questionnaire — D1.3.3

Q. No	Question	Response Type
1	Number of career guidance/counselling activities conducted during the assessment period	Numeric
2	Percentage of mentees/students participated in the guidance activities	Percentage (%)
3	Did the activities include higher studies, competitive exams, placements, or career readiness components?	Yes/No
4	Upload consolidated career guidance/counselling activity report	File Upload

Scoring

$$\text{Career Guidance Score} = \frac{Q_1 + Q_2 + Q_3}{3}$$

Variable Definitions

Variable	Meaning
Q_1	Career guidance activity scale
Q_2	Student participation level
Q_3	Career relevance and structured scope

Normalized Scoring Tables

Q1 — Guidance/Counselling Activities

Number of Activities	Score
≥6	1.0
4–5	0.8
3	0.6
2	0.4
1	0.2
0	0

Q2 — Student Participation

Participation Percentage	Score
≥90%	1.0
70–89%	0.8
50–69%	0.6
30–49%	0.4
<30%	0.2

Q3 — Structured Career Readiness Scope

Response	Score
Yes	1

Response	Score
No	0

Final Rubric — D1.3.3 (10 Mark)

Final Computed Score	Marks
≥0.85	10
0.60–0.84	7.5
0.40–0.59	5
0.20–0.39	2.5
<0.20	0

D1.3.4 — Internship Guidance Support

Mark = 15

Purpose

To assess faculty contribution toward facilitating and supporting student internships through:

- guidance,
- coordination,
- industry linkage,
- and internship monitoring.

Questionnaire — D1.3.4

Q. No	Question	Response Type
1	Number of students supported/guided for internships during the assessment period	Numeric
2	Percentage of assigned/eligible students successfully completing internships	Percentage (%)
3	Did the faculty contribute to internship coordination/industry facilitation/monitoring?	Yes/No
4	Upload consolidated internship support/report document	File Upload

Scoring

$$\text{Internship Support Score} = \frac{Q_1 + Q_2 + Q_3}{3}$$

Variable Definitions

Variable Meaning

Q_1	Internship guidance scale
Q_2	Internship completion effectiveness
Q_3	Faculty involvement in coordination/facilitation

Normalized Scoring Tables

Q1 — Students Supported for Internship

Number of Students	Score
≥40	1.0
31–39	0.8
21–30	0.6
10–20	0.4
<10	0.2

Q2 — Internship Completion Rate

Completion Percentage	Score
≥90%	1.0
70–89%	0.8
50–69%	0.6
30–49%	0.4
<30%	0.2

Q3 — Coordination/Facilitation Contribution

Response	Score
Yes	1
No	0

Final Rubric — D1.3.4 (15 Mark)

Final Computed Score	Marks
≥0.85	1
0.60–0.84	0.75
0.40–0.59	0.5
0.20–0.39	0.25
<0.20	0

Accepted Evidence

- Internship allocation/support records
- Industry communication records
- Internship monitoring reports
- Student completion records
- Department internship coordination documents

Not to be Considered

- Student self-arranged internships without faculty involvement

- Informal guidance without evidence
- Duplicate internship records
- Placement activities unrelated to internships
- Unsupported completion claims

D1.3.5 — Support for Student Wellbeing and Inclusion

Mark = 10

Purpose

To assess faculty contribution toward promoting:

- student wellbeing,
- inclusiveness,
- emotional support,
- equitable learning environment,
- and support for diverse student needs.

Questionnaire — D1.3.6

Q. No	Question	Response Type
1	Number of wellbeing/inclusion support initiatives undertaken during the assessment period	Numeric
2	Percentage of identified students supported through inclusion/wellbeing interventions	Percentage (%)
3	Did the faculty provide support for academically/socially disadvantaged or special-needs students?	Yes/No
4	Upload consolidated wellbeing/inclusion support report	File Upload

Scoring

$$\text{Wellbeing \& Inclusion Score} = \frac{Q_1 + Q_2 + Q_3}{3}$$

Variable Definitions

Variable	Meaning
Q_1	Wellbeing/inclusion initiative scale
Q_2	Student support coverage
Q_3	Inclusive support implementation

Normalized Scoring Tables

Q1 — Wellbeing/Inclusion Initiatives

Number of Initiatives	Score
≥6	1.0

Number of Initiatives	Score
4–5	0.8
3	0.6
2	0.4
1	0.2
0	0

Examples:

- wellbeing awareness sessions, inclusive classroom support,
- support for slow learners,
- support for economically/socially disadvantaged students,
- gender sensitivity initiatives,
- special-needs academic assistance.

Q2 — Student Support Coverage

Coverage Percentage	Score
≥90%	1.0
70–89%	0.8
50–69%	0.6
30–49%	0.4
<30%	0.2

Q3 — Inclusive Support Implementation

Response	Score
Yes	1
No	0

Final Rubric — D1.3.6 (10 Mark)

Final Computed Score	Marks
≥0.85	1
0.60–0.84	0.75
0.40–0.59	0.5
0.20–0.39	0.25
<0.20	0

Accepted Evidence

- Student wellbeing activity reports
- Inclusion support documentation
- Special support records
- Institutional wellbeing programme records
- Verified student support initiatives

Not to be Considered

- Informal/unverified support claims
- Duplicate activity reporting

- General classroom teaching without inclusion focus
- Unsupported wellbeing claims

One-time non-academic informal interactions

D1.3.6 — Student Satisfaction on Mentoring

Mark = 5

Purpose

To assess student perception and satisfaction regarding the effectiveness of faculty mentoring support.

This SD focuses purely on:

- student feedback,
- mentoring satisfaction,
- and perceived support quality.

Questionnaire — D1.3.5

Q. No	Question	Response Type
1	Average student satisfaction score on mentoring effectiveness	Percentage (%)
2	Percentage of mentees participating in mentoring feedback process	Percentage (%)
3	Were mentoring feedback records officially documented and verifiable?	Yes/No
4	Upload consolidated mentoring feedback report	File Upload

Scoring

$$\text{Mentoring Satisfaction Score} = \frac{Q_1 + Q_2 + Q_3}{3}$$

Variable Definitions

Variable	Meaning
Q_1	Student satisfaction level
Q_2	Feedback participation coverage
Q_3	Feedback record authenticity

Normalized Scoring Tables

Q1 — Student Satisfaction Score

Satisfaction Percentage	Score
≥90%	1.0
80–89%	0.8
70–79%	0.6
60–69%	0.4
<60%	0.2

Q2 — Feedback Participation Coverage

Participation Percentage	Score
≥90%	1.0
70–89%	0.8
50–69%	0.6
30–49%	0.4
<30%	0.2

Q3 — Feedback Documentation Verification

Response	Score
Yes	1
No	0

Final Rubric — D1.3.5 (1 Mark)

Final Computed Score	Marks
≥0.85	1
0.60–0.84	0.75
0.40–0.59	0.5
0.20–0.39	0.25
<0.20	0

Accepted Evidence

- Official mentoring feedback reports
- Student satisfaction survey analytics
- ERP mentoring feedback summaries
- Authenticated feedback dashboards

Not to be Considered

- Informal verbal feedback
- Unsupported satisfaction claims
- Duplicate feedback submissions
- Non-mentoring-related student feedback
- Feedback without identifiable response records

***** End of Domain 1.3 *****

D1.4 — Skill Development & Employability Contribution (50)

D1.4.1 — Skill Development Programmes Conducted

Mark = 15

Purpose

To assess faculty contribution toward enhancing student skills beyond regular curriculum through structured skill development activities.

Questionnaire — D1.4.1

Q. No	Question	Response Type
1	Number of skill development programmes/workshops/FDP-style student trainings conducted	Numeric
2	Total number of students benefited through the programmes	Numeric
3	Did the programmes include industry/employability/digital/technical skill components?	Yes/No
4	Upload consolidated programme report/evidence	File Upload

Scoring

$$Skill\ Development\ Score = \frac{Q1 + Q2 + Q3}{3}$$

Variable Definitions

Variable	Meaning
Q1	Number of programmes conducted
Q2	Student reach/beneficiary scale
Q3	Employability relevance

Normalized Scoring Tables

Q1 — Skill Development Programmes

Number	Score
≥6	1.0
4–5	0.8
3	0.6
2	0.4
1	0.2
0	0

Q2 — Students Benefited

Students	Score
≥200	1.0
150–199	0.8

Students	Score
100–149	0.6
50–99	0.4
<50	0.2

Q3 — Employability/Skill Relevance

Response	Score
Yes	1
No	0

Final Rubric — D1.4.1 (15 Mark)

Final Computed Score	Marks
≥0.85	1
0.60–0.84	0.75
0.40–0.59	0.5
0.20–0.39	0.25
<0.20	0

Accepted Activities

- Technical workshops
- Employability skill training
- Coding/AI tool training
- Communication skill programmes
- Industry readiness training
- Software certification preparation
- Domain skill enhancement programmes

Not to be Considered

- Regular classroom teaching
- Routine lab sessions
- Faculty-only FDPs
- Unsupported programme claims
- Duplicate programme submissions

D1.4.2 — Industry Interaction Activities

Mark = 5

Purpose

To assess faculty contribution toward establishing and facilitating industry-academia interaction through:

- industry MoUs,
- guest lectures,
- expert interactions,

- and professional engagement activities.

This SD evaluates:

- external industry linkage,
- not internship or placement execution.

Questionnaire — D1.4.2

Q. No	Question	Response Type
1	Number of industry interaction activities organized/coordinated (guest lectures, expert talks, industry sessions, etc.)	Numeric
2	Number of industry collaborations/MoUs facilitated or actively supported	Numeric
3	Number of external industry experts/professionals engaged	Numeric
4	Upload consolidated MoU/guest lecture/activity report	File Upload

RKIP Formula-Based Scoring

$$Industry\ Interaction\ Score = \frac{Q1 + Q2 + Q3}{3}$$

Variable Definitions

Variable	Meaning
Q1	Industry interaction activity scale
Q2	Industry collaboration/MoU contribution
Q3	External professional engagement strength

Normalized Scoring Tables

Q1 — Industry Interaction Activities

Number of Activities	Score
≥8	1.0
6–7	0.8
4–5	0.6
2–3	0.4
1	0.2
0	0

Q2 — MoUs/Collaborations Facilitated

Number	Score
≥4	1.0
3	0.8
2	0.6
1	0.4
0	0

Q3 — Industry Experts Engaged

Number	Score
≥10	1.0

Number	Score
7–9	0.8
4–6	0.6
2–3	0.4
1	0.2
0	0

Final Rubric — D1.4.2 (5 Mark)

Final Computed Score	Marks
≥0.85	1
0.60–0.84	0.75
0.40–0.59	0.5
0.20–0.39	0.25
<0.20	0

Accepted Evidence

- MoU documents
- Guest lecture reports
- Industry expert session reports
- Professional interaction records
- Industry collaboration letters

Not to be Considered

- Internship activities
- Placement drives
- Student training programmes already counted in D1.4.1
- Vendor promotional sessions
- Internal department seminars
- Duplicate reporting across SDs

D1.4.3 — Placement Support

Mark = 5

Purpose

To assess faculty contribution toward enhancing student employability through:

- placement preparation,
- interview preparation,
- and career-readiness initiatives.

This SD focuses on:

- employability preparation support,
- not internships or industry interaction activities.

Questionnaire — D1.4.3

Q. No	Question	Response Type
1	Number of placement support initiatives conducted	Numeric

Q. No	Question	Response Type
2	Number of students benefited through the initiatives	Numeric
3	Number of students successfully completing placement readiness programmes	Numeric
4	Upload consolidated placement training report	File Upload

RKIP Formula-Based Scoring

$$Placement\ Score = \frac{Q1 + Q2 + Q3}{3}$$

Variable Definitions

Variable	Meaning
Q1	Placement initiative scale
Q2	Student participation reach
Q3	Readiness outcome effectiveness

Normalized Scoring Tables

Q1 — Placement Initiatives

Number of Initiatives	Score
≥8	1.0
6–7	0.8
4–5	0.6
2–3	0.4
1	0.2
0	0

Examples:

- Aptitude training
- Coding preparation
- Interview preparation
- Resume building workshops
- Technical placement bootcamps

Q2 — Students Benefited

Number of Students	Score
≥200	1.0
150–199	0.8
100–149	0.6
50–99	0.4
<50	0.2

Q3 —Readiness Outcomes

Number of Successful Students	Score
≥100	1.0

Number of Successful Students	Score
75–99	0.8
50–74	0.6
25–49	0.4
<25	0.2

Final Rubric — D1.4.3 (5 Mark)

Final Computed Score	Marks
≥0.85	1
0.60–0.84	0.75
0.40–0.59	0.5
0.20–0.39	0.25
<0.20	0

Accepted Evidence

- Placement training reports
- Student participation records
- Employability training documentation

Not to be Considered

- Internship activities already counted in D1.4.3
- Guest lectures already counted in D1.4.2
- Regular classroom teaching
- Unsupported placement claims
- Duplicate programme reporting
- Informal/unstructured guidance sessions

D1.4.4 —Certification-Oriented Training Initiatives

Mark = 10

Purpose

To assess faculty contribution toward enhancing student employability through:

- aptitude/technical training,
- certification guidance,

This SD focuses on:

- employability preparation support,
- not internships or industry interaction activities.

Questionnaire — D1.4.4

Q. No	Question	Response Type
1	Number of placement certification-oriented training initiatives conducted	Numeric
2	Number of students benefited through the initiatives	Numeric
3	Number of students successfully completing certifications programmes	Numeric
4	Upload consolidated certification training report	File Upload

RKIP Formula-Based Scoring

$$Certification\ training\ initiative\ Score = \frac{Q1 + Q2 + Q3}{3}$$

Variable Definitions

Variable	Meaning
Q1	certification initiative scale
Q2	Student participation reach
Q3	Certification effectiveness

Normalized Scoring Tables

Q1 —Certification Initiatives

Number of Initiatives	Score
≥8	1.0
6–7	0.8
4–5	0.6
2–3	0.4
1	0.2
0	0

Examples:

- Aptitude training
- Coding preparation
- Certification coaching
- Soft skill training

Q2 — Students Benefited

Number of Students	Score
≥200	1.0
150–199	0.8
100–149	0.6
50–99	0.4
<50	0.2

Q3 — Certification Outcomes

Number of Successful Students	Score
≥100	1.0
75–99	0.8
50–74	0.6
25–49	0.4
<25	0.2

Final Rubric — D1.4.4 (10 Mark)

Final Computed Score	Marks
≥0.85	1

Final Computed Score	Marks
0.60–0.84	0.75
0.40–0.59	0.5
0.20–0.39	0.25
<0.20	0

Accepted Evidence

- Certification programme reports
- Student participation records
- Certification completion lists

Not to be Considered

- Internship activities already counted in D1.4.3
- Guest lectures already counted in D1.4.2
- Regular classroom teaching
- Unsupported placement claims
- Duplicate programme reporting
- Informal/unstructured guidance sessions

D1.4.5 — Student Innovation & Startup Support

Mark = 15

Purpose

To assess faculty contribution toward promoting:

- innovation culture,
- student projects,
- idea incubation,
- entrepreneurship,
- startup activities,
- and technology commercialization support.

This SD focuses on:

- innovation ecosystem enablement,
- not placement, internships, or routine academic projects.

Since this SD carries higher weightage (2 Marks),
the evaluation should emphasize:

- measurable innovation outcomes,
- ecosystem contribution,
- and student impact.

Questionnaire — D1.4.5

Q. No	Question	Response Type
1	Number of student innovation/startup initiatives mentored/supported during the assessment period	Numeric
2	Number of student teams/projects achieving innovation outcomes (prototype, patent, startup registration, incubation, funding, competition award, product development, etc.)	Numeric

Q. No	Question	Response Type
3	Number of innovation/startup ecosystem activities facilitated (hackathons, ideathons, incubation support, innovation workshops, startup mentoring, etc.)	Numeric
4	Upload consolidated innovation/startup support report	File Upload

RKIP Formula-Based Scoring

$$Innovation\ \&\ Startup\ Support\ Score = \frac{Q1 + Q2 + Q3}{3}$$

Variable Definitions

Variable	Meaning
Q1	Innovation mentoring/support scale
Q2	Innovation outcome effectiveness
Q3	Innovation ecosystem contribution

Normalized Scoring Tables

Q1 — Innovation/Startup Initiatives Supported

Number of Initiatives	Score
≥10	1.0
7–9	0.8
4–6	0.6
2–3	0.4
1	0.2
0	0

Examples:

- Student startup mentoring
- Innovation project guidance
- Prototype mentoring
- Entrepreneurship mentoring
- Product development support
- Innovation challenge mentoring

Q2 — Verified Innovation Outcomes

Number of Outcomes	Score
≥8	1.0
6–7	0.8
4–5	0.6
2–3	0.4
1	0.2
0	0

Accepted outcomes:

- Prototype development

- Patent filing/publication
- Startup registration
- Incubation selection
- Funding/grant support
- Innovation awards
- Product commercialization
- National hackathon achievements

Q3 — Innovation Ecosystem Activities

Number of Activities	Score
≥8	1.0
6–7	0.8
4–5	0.6
2–3	0.4
1	0.2
0	0

Examples:

- Hackathons
- Ideathons
- Startup bootcamps
- Incubation programmes
- Innovation workshops
- Entrepreneurship awareness programmes

Final Rubric — D1.4.5 (15 Marks)

Final Computed Score	Marks
≥0.85	2
0.70–0.84	1.5
0.50–0.69	1
0.30–0.49	0.5
<0.30	0

Accepted Evidence

- Prototype/project reports
- Patent filing documents
- Startup registration/incubation proof
- Innovation competition certificates
- Funding/grant sanction letters
- Innovation activity reports

Not to be Considered

- Routine academic mini-projects
- Unsupported startup claims
- Informal idea discussions without outcomes
- Duplicate reporting across SDs

- Placement/certification activities already counted elsewhere
- Non-verified innovation activities

***** End of Domain 1 *****

12. Annexure – 2: Rubrics for Domain 2

DOMAIN 2 — Research & Innovation (350 Marks)			
SD	**Subdomain**	**Type**	**Score**
D2.1	Research Publications & Citation Impact	Qn	150
D2.2	Funded Projects, Consultancy & Grants	Qn	100
D2.3	Patents, Innovation & Technology Development	Qn	80
D2.4	Professional Recognition & Academic Engagement	Qn	20

D2.1 — Research Publications & Citation Impact (150)

D2.1.1 Scopus/WoS-Indexed Journal Publications

Mark = 80

1. Objective

To assess the research publication output of faculty members through peer-reviewed journal publications indexed in recognized international scholarly databases such as Scopus and Web of Science.

This metric reflects the institution's research productivity, academic visibility, and contribution to global scholarly literature.

Scope of Eligible Publications

The following publication categories shall be considered:

- Research articles
- Review articles
- Short communications
- Technical papers
- Early-access journal articles with DOI

The publication must be indexed in:

- Scopus and/or
- Web of Science

4. Non-Eligible Publications

The following shall NOT be considered:

- Non-indexed journals
- Predatory journals
- Magazine articles
- Editorials without peer review
- Conference abstracts
- Duplicate submissions
- Retracted publications
- Publications without valid DOI

5. Assessment Period

Only publications falling within the prescribed assessment period shall be considered.

Example:

- Last 3 assessment years
  (as defined by the framework)

6. Faculty Submission Requirements

Each applicant shall submit only the following:

Mandatory Inputs

1. DOI of the publication

2. Author name exactly as appearing in the publication

Author Identification Variations
To improve author matching accuracy, the applicant shall additionally provide possible publication name variations used in different journals.
Example:

- S. Kumar
- S Kumar
- Sivakumar R
- R. Sivakumar
- R Sivakumar

These variations shall be used exclusively for automated author identification and metadata verification.

7. Verification Methodology
Primary Verification Process
The publication shall be considered valid only if:
Condition 1 — DOI Validation
The DOI is successfully retrievable through:

- Crossref
  or
- Official publisher metadata source

Condition 2 — Author Metadata Match
At least one submitted author name variation shall match the author metadata associated with the DOI record.

Condition 3 — Publication Authenticity
The retrieved metadata shall confirm:

- Publication title
- Journal identity
- Publication year
- Author list
- Publication existence

8. Additional Validation Parameters
The institution may additionally verify:

- Scopus indexing status
- Web of Science indexing status
- Institutional affiliation
- Duplicate DOI submissions
- Retraction status

9. Recommended Supporting Identifiers (Optional)
Applicants may additionally provide:

- ORCID ID
- Scopus Author ID
- Web of Science Researcher Profile
- Google Scholar profile link

These may improve automated validation reliability but shall not be mandatory.

10. Rejection Conditions

A publication shall be rejected if:

- DOI is invalid or non-resolvable
- Author name does not match metadata
- DOI metadata corresponds to a different publication
- Duplicate claim is detected
- Publication is retracted
- Journal is identified as predatory/questionable

11. Scoring Methodology

Valid DOI Publications	Marks
≥ 100	80
50–90	50
30-40	30
10-30	15
1-10	5

13. Recommended Digital Implementation

Institutions are encouraged to implement:

- Automated DOI verification
- Crossref API integration
- Research publication dashboard
- Faculty publication repository
- ORCID synchronization
- Duplicate DOI detection system

14. Expected Outcomes

Strong performance in this metric demonstrates:

- Active research ecosystem
- Faculty scholarly engagement
- International publication visibility
- Quality-oriented research culture
- Enhanced institutional academic reputation

SOP — D2.1.2 Citation Impact

Mark = 20

1. Objective

To assess the scholarly influence and academic visibility of faculty research through citation performance in recognized academic citation databases such as Scopus, Google Scholar, and Web of Science.

This metric reflects the extent to which faculty research publications are referenced and utilized within the academic and research community.

2. Scope of Assessment

This metric evaluates:

- Citation performance of faculty publications
- Research visibility

- Scholarly influence
- Academic utilization of published work

Citation data may be obtained from:

- Web of Science
- Scopus
- Google Scholar

3. Questionnaire

Question Code	Question	Response Type	Evidence Required
Q1	Provide the public Web of Science researcher profile link and total citation count.	URL + Numeric	Profile screenshot/export
Q2	Provide the public Scopus author profile link and total citation count.	URL + Numeric	Profile screenshot/export
Q3	Provide the public Google Scholar profile link and total citation count.	URL + Numeric	Profile screenshot/export

4. Verification Methodology

Automated/System-Based Verification

The institutional system may automatically:

- Access publicly available citation profiles
- Retrieve visible citation metrics
- Match applicant identity with profile metadata
- Detect duplicate/suspicious profiles
- Validate citation counts against visible profile data

Profile Validation Conditions

A submitted citation profile shall be considered valid if:

- The profile is publicly accessible.
- The applicant identity reasonably matches the profile.
- Citation metrics are visibly available.
- Scholarly publication records exist within the profile.

5. Citation Normalization Model

Since citation counts differ significantly across databases, normalized weighted citation scoring shall be used.

Citation Source	Weight Factor
Web of Science	1.00
Scopus	0.85
Google Scholar	0.60

6. Weighted Citation Formula

Formula

Weighted Citation Score (WCS) shall be calculated as:

$$WCS = (WoSc \times 1.00) + (Scopusc \times 0.85) + (GSc \times 0.60)$$

Where:

- WoSc = Verified Web of Science citation count
- Scopusc = Verified Scopus citation count
- GSc = Verified Google Scholar citation count

Example

Source	Citations	Weight	Adjusted Score
WoS	120	1.00	120
Scopus	180	0.85	153
Google Scholar	400	0.60	240

Total Weighted Citation Score
120+153+240=513

7. Scoring Methodology
Marks assigned based on the final Weighted Citation Score (WCS).

Suggested Scoring Bands

Weighted Citation Score (WCS)	Marks
≥ 500	20
200 – 499	15
50 – 199	10
1 – 49	5
0	0

8. Rejection Conditions
The submission may be rejected if:

- The profile is inaccessible/private.
- Identity mismatch is detected.
- Citation data appears manipulated or fabricated.
- Duplicate or fraudulent profiles are identified.
- Submitted citation values do not match visible profile metrics.

D2.1.3 h-index / Scholarly Metrics
Mark = 20
1. Objective
To assess the sustained scholarly contribution, research consistency, and long-term academic impact of faculty members through recognized scholarly metrics such as h-index available in major academic citation databases.
This metric reflects both publication productivity and citation performance over time.

2. Scope of Assessment
This metric evaluates:

- h-index performance
- Research consistency
- Long-term citation influence
- Sustained scholarly contribution

Scholarly metrics may be obtained from:

- Web of Science
- Scopus
- Google Scholar

3. Questionnaire

Question Code	Question	Response Type	Evidence Required
Q1	Provide the public Web of Science researcher profile link and h-index value.	URL + Numeric	Profile screenshot/export
Q2	Provide the public Scopus author profile link and h-index value.	URL + Numeric	Profile screenshot/export
Q3	Provide the public Google Scholar profile link and h-index value.	URL + Numeric	Profile screenshot/export

4. Verification Methodology

Automated/System-Based Verification

The institutional system may automatically:

- Access publicly available scholarly profiles
- Retrieve visible h-index values
- Match applicant identity with profile metadata
- Detect duplicate or suspicious profiles
- Validate submitted h-index values against visible profile data

Profile Validation Conditions

A submitted profile shall be considered valid if:

- The profile is publicly accessible.
- The applicant identity reasonably matches the profile.
- h-index value is visibly available.
- Scholarly publication records exist within the profile.

5. Scholarly Metric Normalization Model

Since h-index values vary across databases, weighted normalization shall be applied.

Source Weight Factors

Source	Weight Factor
Web of Science	1.00
Scopus	0.85
Google Scholar	0.60

6. Weighted h-index Formula

Formula

Weighted Scholarly Metric Score (WSMS):

$$WSMS = (WoS_h \times 1.00) + (Scopus_h \times 0.85) + (GS_h \times 0.60)$$

Where:

- WoS_h = Verified WoS h-index
- $Scopus_h$ = Verified Scopus h-index
- GS_h = Verified Google Scholar h-index

Example

Source	h-index	Weight	Adjusted Score
WoS	8	1.00	8
Scopus	10	0.85	8.5
Google Scholar	18	0.60	10.8

Final WSMS

8 + 8.5 + 10.8 = 27.3

7. Scoring Methodology
Marks shall be assigned based on the final Weighted Scholarly Metric Score (WSMS).

Suggested Scoring Bands

Weighted Scholarly Metric Score (WSMS)	Marks
≥ 25	1
10 – 24.99	0.75
1 – 9.99	0.5
0	0

8. Rejection Conditions
The submission may be rejected if:
- The profile is inaccessible/private.
- Identity mismatch is detected.
- Submitted h-index values do not match visible profile metrics.
- Fake/manipulated scholarly profiles are identified.
- Duplicate/fraudulent profiles are used.

D2.1.4 Books / Book Chapters / Edited Volumes

Mark = 10

1. Objective
To assess faculty contribution to scholarly knowledge dissemination through authorship or editorial contribution in books, book chapters, and edited volumes published by recognized academic or professional publishers.
This metric reflects academic expertise, scholarly contribution, and subject-level intellectual engagement beyond journal publications.

2. Scope of Assessment
This metric evaluates:
- Authored books
- Edited books/volumes
- Book chapters
- Scholarly monographs
- Academic reference books

Eligible publications may include:
- ISBN-registered books
- DOI-enabled book chapters
- Publications from recognized academic/professional publishers

3. Questionnaire

Question Code	Question	Response Type	Evidence Required
Q1	Enter the total number of authored books published during the assessment period.	Numeric	ISBN number / publisher link
Q2	Enter the total number of published book chapters during the assessment period.	Numeric	DOI/ISBN number / publisher link

Question Code	Question	Response Type	Evidence Required
Q3	Enter the total number of edited books/volumes published during the assessment period.	Numeric	ISBN number / publisher link

4. Verification Methodology

Automated/System-Based Verification

The institutional system may automatically:

- Validate ISBN format
- Validate DOI existence where applicable
- Match author/editor names with submitted records
- Detect duplicate submissions
- Verify publisher/publication metadata

Validation Conditions

A submitted publication shall be considered valid if:

- ISBN or DOI is verifiable.
- The applicant's name appears as author/editor/contributor.
- Publication metadata is reasonably accessible.
- The publication falls within the assessment period.

5. Eligible Evidence

Accepted evidence may include:

- ISBN number
- DOI metadata
- Publisher webpage
- Catalog/index entry
- Public publication metadata

6. Non-Eligible Publications

The following shall NOT be considered:

- Self-declared unpublished manuscripts
- Non-verifiable publications
- Duplicate claims
- Informal course notes
- Magazine compilations
- Unregistered publications without identifiable metadata

7. Scoring Methodology

Marks shall be assigned based on verified scholarly publication contributions.

Suggested Weightage Model

Publication Type	Suggested Weight
Authored Book	1.00
Edited Volume	0.75
Book Chapter	0.25

Weighted Publication Formula

$$WPS = (AB \times 1.00) + (EV \times 0.75) + (BC \times 0.25)$$

Where:

- AB = Number of authored books
- EV = Number of edited volumes

- BC = Number of book chapters

Weighted Publication Score (WPS)	Marks
≥ 5	10
2 – 4.99	7.5
1 – 1.99	5
0.1 – 0.99	2.5
0	0

8. Rejection Conditions

The submission may be rejected if:

- ISBN/DOI is invalid or unverifiable.
- Author/editor identity mismatch is detected.
- Duplicate publication claims exist.
- Evidence appears manipulated/fabricated.
- Publication metadata is unavailable.

D2.1.5 International/National Conference Publications & Presentations

Mark = 20

1. Objective

To assess faculty participation and scholarly contribution in national and international academic conferences through research paper publications and presentations.

This metric reflects research dissemination, academic interaction, professional networking, and global scholarly engagement.

2. Scope of Assessment

This metric evaluates:

- Conference paper publications
- Oral paper presentations
- Poster presentations
- Published conference proceedings contributions

Eligible events may include:

- National conferences
- International conferences hosted in India
- International conferences hosted outside India
- Indexed conference proceedings
- Conferences organized by recognized academic/professional bodies
- Institutionally approved scholarly conferences

3. Questionnaire

Question Code	Question	Response Type	Evidence Required
Q1	Enter the total number of national conferences presented during the assessment period.	Numeric	Conference certificate / proceedings link / conference webpage
Q2	Enter the total number of international conferences presented which is hosted inside India during the assessment period.	Numeric	Conference certificate / proceedings link / conference webpage
Q3	Enter the total number of international conferences presented which are hosted outside India under: (a) virtual participation and (b) physical participation	Numeric (Two Fields)	Conference certificate / proceedings link / conference webpage

4. Verification Methodology

Automated/System-Based Verification

The system may automatically:

- Validate conference webpages/proceedings links
- Match applicant names with conference records
- Detect duplicate submissions
- Verify event metadata and participation evidence
- Identify conference hosting country/location

Validation Conditions

A submission shall be considered valid if:

- The conference/event is identifiable.
- The applicant's name appears in the proceedings/certificate/event record.
- The event occurred within the assessment period.
- Supporting evidence is reasonably verifiable.

5. Eligible Evidence

Accepted evidence may include:

- Conference participation certificate
- Proceedings link
- DOI/proceedings metadata
- Conference webpage
- Program schedule
- Presentation listing

6. Non-Eligible Activities

The following shall NOT be considered:

- Informal seminars without verifiable records
- Internal department meetings
- Duplicate claims
- Non-academic promotional events
- Unverifiable conference participation
- Fake/predatory conference events

7. Scoring Methodology

Marks shall be assigned based on verified conference publication/presentation contributions.

Suggested Weightage Model

Activity Type	Suggested Weight
National Conference Presentation	0.50
International Conference Presentation - hosted in India	1.00
International Conference Presentation - hosted outside India (Virtual Participation)	1.25
International Conference Presentation - hosted outside India (Physical Participation)	1.50

Weighted Conference Contribution Formula

$$WCCS = (NC \times 0.60) + (ICI \times 1.00) + (ICOV \times 1.25) + (ICOP \times 1.50)$$

Where:

- NC = National conference contributions

- IC = International conferences hosted in India
- ICOV = International conferences hosted outside India (Virtual)
- ICOP = International conferences hosted outside India (Physical)

Suggested Scoring Bands

Weighted Conference Contribution Score (WCCS)	Marks
≥ 5	20
2 – 4.99	15
1 – 1.99	10
0.1 – 0.99	5
0	0

8. Rejection Conditions
The submission may be rejected if:

- Conference/event cannot be verified.
- Identity mismatch is detected.
- Duplicate submissions exist.
- Simple certificate
- Evidence appears manipulated/fabricated.
- Predatory/fake conferences are identified.

***** End of Domain 2.1 *****

==========

D2.2 — Funded Projects, Consultancy & Grants (100)

D2.2.1 Funded Research Projects Sanctioned

Mark = 50

1. Objective
To assess faculty capability in securing funded research projects from government agencies, industries, non-government organizations, and recognized institutions.
This metric reflects research competitiveness, proposal development capability, sponsored research engagement, collaborative research participation, and institutional research strength.

2. Scope of Assessment
This metric evaluates:

- Externally funded research projects
- Sponsored research initiatives
- Government-funded research projects
- Industry-supported research projects
- Institutionally funded research projects
- Collaborative research grants

Both Principal Investigator (PI) and Co-Principal Investigator (Co-PI) roles shall be treated with equal academic weightage under this framework.
Both ongoing and completed projects sanctioned during the assessment period may be considered.

3. Questionnaire

Question Code	Question	Response Type	Evidence Required
Q1	Enter the total number of Central Government funded research projects sanctioned during the assessment period.	Numeric	Sanction order / approval letter
Q2	Enter the total number of State Government funded research projects sanctioned during the assessment period.	Numeric	Sanction order / approval letter
Q3	Enter the total number of NGO, funded research projects sanctioned during the assessment period.	Numeric	Sanction order / approval letter
Q4	Enter the total number of Institution funded research projects sanctioned during the assessment period.	Numeric	Sanction order / approval letter
Q5	Enter the total number of Industry funded research projects (excluding consultancy projects) sanctioned during the assessment period.	Numeric	Funding agreement / sanction letter

4. Verification Methodology

Automated/System-Based Verification

The institutional system may automatically:

- Validate sanction order details
- Match applicant identity with project records
- Detect duplicate project claims
- Verify funding agency/project metadata
- Identify funding category
- Validate sanction period

Validation Conditions

A project shall be considered valid if:

- Official sanction/approval evidence exists.
- The applicant is identified as PI or Co-PI.
- The project falls within the assessment period.
- Funding agency/project metadata is reasonably verifiable.

5. Eligible Funding Categories

The following categories may be considered:

Category	Examples
Central Government Funded	DST, DRDO, ISRO, CSIR, AICTE, SERB, ANRF, DBT, ICMR
State Government Funded	State councils, state departments, state innovation agencies
NGO/Trust Funded	Foundations, charitable research organizations
Institution Funded	Seed grants, internal research grants
Industry Funded	Sponsored industrial R&D projects

6. Non-Eligible Activities

The following shall NOT be considered:

- Consultancy projects
- Unapproved proposals
- MoUs without funded research activity

- Internal departmental activities without sanctioned funding
- Duplicate project claims
- Unverifiable project sanctions

7. Scoring Methodology
Marks shall be assigned based on the category and number of verified funded research projects.

Suggested Weightage Model

Funding Category	Suggested Weight
Central Government Funded Project	1.50
Industry Funded Research Project	1.25
State Government Funded Project	1.00
NGO Funded Project	0.75
Institution Funded Project	0.50

Project Score Formula

$$PS = (CG \times 1.50) + (IND \times 1.25) + (SG \times 1.00) + (NGO \times 0.75) + (INST \times 0.50)$$

Where:

- CG = Central Government funded projects
- IND = Industry funded research projects
- SG = State Government funded projects
- NGO = NGO funded projects
- INST = Institution funded projects

Suggested Scoring Bands

Project Score (PS)	Marks
≥ 6	50
3 – 5.99	30
1 – 2.99	15
0	0

8. Rejection Conditions
The submission may be rejected if:

- Sanction evidence cannot be verified.
- Identity mismatch is detected.
- Duplicate project submissions exist.
- Evidence appears manipulated/fabricated.
- The claimed activity is not a funded research project.

D2.2.2 Total Research Grant Amount Secured
Mark = 10

1. Objective
To assess the research funding strength and grant mobilization capability of faculty members through the total value of sanctioned research grants secured from recognized funding agencies and organizations.
This metric reflects institutional research capacity, funding competitiveness, and ability to attract sponsored research resources.

2. Scope of Assessment

This metric evaluates:

- Total sanctioned research grant amount secured
- External sponsored research funding
- Government research grants
- Industry-supported research funding
- Institutional and NGO-supported research funding

Both Principal Investigator (PI) and Co-Principal Investigator (Co-PI) roles shall be treated with equal academic weightage under this framework.
Only sanctioned grant amounts during the assessment period shall be considered.

3. Questionnaire

Question Code	Question	Response Type	Evidence Required
D2.2.2-Q1	Enter the total sanctioned research grant amount received from Central Government funding agencies during the assessment period (in INR).	Currency/Numeric	Financial sanction document
D2.2.2-Q2	Enter the total sanctioned research grant amount received from State Government, funding sources during the assessment period (in INR).	Currency/Numeric	Financial sanction document
D2.2.2-Q3	Enter the total sanctioned research grant amount received from NGO, funding sources during the assessment period (in INR).	Currency/Numeric	Financial sanction document
D2.2.2-Q4	Enter the total sanctioned research grant amount received from Institution funding sources during the assessment period (in INR).	Currency/Numeric	Financial sanction document
D2.2.2-Q5	Enter the total sanctioned research grant amount received from Industry-funded research projects during the assessment period (in INR).	Currency/Numeric	Funding agreement / sanction document

4. Verification Methodology

Automated/System-Based Verification

The institutional system may automatically:

- Validate sanction amount details
- Match applicant identity with project records
- Detect duplicate grant claims
- Verify funding agency metadata
- Validate financial sanction documentation
- Aggregate eligible sanctioned grant amounts

Validation Conditions

A grant shall be considered valid if:

- Official financial sanction evidence exists.
- The applicant is identified in the project sanction record.
- The grant falls within the assessment period.
- Funding amount is clearly identifiable and verifiable.

5. Eligible Funding Categories

Category	Examples
Central Government Funding	DST, DRDO, ISRO, CSIR, SERB, ANRF, DBT, AICTE
State Government Funding	State research councils, innovation missions

Category	Examples
NGO/Trust Funding	Foundations, research trusts
Institution Funding	Seed grants, internal research funding
Industry Research Funding	Sponsored industrial R&D projects

6. Non-Eligible Funding

The following shall NOT be considered:

- Consultancy payments
- Equipment donations without sanctioned projects
- Informal financial support
- Duplicate grant claims
- Unverifiable grant sanctions
- Non-research financial assistance

7. Scoring Methodology

Marks shall be assigned based on verified total sanctioned grant amount and funding source category.

Suggested Weightage Model

Funding Category	Suggested Weight
Central Government Funding	1.50
Industry Research Funding	1.25
State Government Funding	1.00
NGO Funding	0.75
Institution Funding	0.50

Weighted Grant Score Formula

$$WGS = (CG \times 1.50) + (IND \times 1.25) + (SG \times 1.00) + (NGO \times 0.75) + (INST \times 0.50)$$

Where:

- CG = Central Government grant amount (in lakhs INR)
- IND = Industry-funded research amount
- SG = State Government grant amount
- NGO = NGO-funded grant amount
- INST = Institution-funded grant amount

Suggested Scoring Bands

Weighted Grant Score (WGS)	Marks
≥ 100	10
25 – 99.99	6
1 – 24.99	3
0	0

8. Rejection Conditions

The submission may be rejected if:

- Financial sanction evidence cannot be verified.
- Identity mismatch is detected.
- Duplicate grant claims exist.
- Evidence appears manipulated/fabricated.
- The claimed amount is unrelated to research funding.

D2.2.3 Consultancy Projects Completed

Mark = 20

1. Objective

To assess faculty engagement in professional consultancy activities through completed consultancy projects executed for industries, government agencies, institutions, or external organizations.
This metric reflects applied expertise, industry interaction, problem-solving capability, and professional contribution beyond academic research.

2. Scope of Assessment

This metric evaluates:

- Technical consultancy projects
- Industrial consultancy assignments
- Government consultancy projects
- Professional advisory assignments
- Testing/analysis-based consultancy work
- Design/development consultancy activities

Only completed consultancy projects during the assessment period shall be considered.
Both Principal Consultant and Co-Consultant roles shall be treated with equal academic weightage under this framework.

3. Questionnaire

Question Code	Question	Response Type	Evidence Required
D2.2.3-Q1	Enter the total number of industry consultancy projects completed during the assessment period.	Numeric	Consultancy agreement / completion letter
D2.2.3-Q2	Enter the total number of government/non-govt. consultancy projects completed during the assessment period.	Numeric	Consultancy agreement / completion letter
D2.2.3-Q3	Enter the total consultancy revenue generated from completed consultancy projects during the assessment period (in INR).	Currency/Numeric	Financial completion document / utilization record

4. Verification Methodology

Automated/System-Based Verification

The institutional system may automatically:

- Validate consultancy agreement details
- Match applicant identity with consultancy records
- Detect duplicate consultancy claims
- Verify organization/client metadata
- Validate project completion status
- Validate consultancy revenue records

Validation Conditions

A consultancy project shall be considered valid if:

- Official consultancy evidence exists.
- The consultancy activity is completed.

- The applicant is identified in the consultancy record.
- The consultancy falls within the assessment period.
- Revenue/project details are reasonably verifiable.

5. Eligible Consultancy Activities
The following may be considered:

- Industrial problem-solving consultancy
- Product/process development consultancy
- Testing and certification consultancy
- Technical advisory services
- Design consultancy
- Technology implementation consultancy
- Specialized professional consultancy assignments

6. Non-Eligible Activities
The following shall NOT be considered:

- Research grants/projects
- MoUs without consultancy execution
- Informal advisory discussions
- Internal departmental activities
- Duplicate consultancy claims
- Unverifiable consultancy records
- Training programs without consultancy component

7. Scoring Methodology
Marks shall be assigned based on verified consultancy projects completed and consultancy revenue generated.

Suggested Weightage Model

Consultancy Type	Suggested Weight
Industry Consultancy Project	1.25
Government/Institution Consultancy Project	1.00
Consultancy Revenue ≥ ₹5 Lakhs	Additional 0.50

Consultancy Score Formula

$$CS = (IND \times 1.25) + (GOV \times 1.00) + RV$$

Where:

- IND = Industry consultancy projects completed
- GOV = Government/institution consultancy projects completed
- RV = Additional revenue-based score

Suggested Scoring Bands

Consultancy Score (CS)	Marks
≥ 5	20
2 – 4.99	15
1 – 1.99	10
0.1 – 0.99	5
0	0

8. Rejection Conditions

The submission may be rejected if:

- Consultancy completion evidence cannot be verified.
- Identity mismatch is detected.
- Duplicate consultancy claims exist.
- Evidence appears manipulated/fabricated.
- The activity is not a genuine consultancy project.

D2.2.4 PhD PG guided/Labs/Facilities established

1. Objective

To assess faculty contribution toward research ecosystem development through doctoral guidance, postgraduate research supervision, and establishment or enhancement of research laboratories and facilities.

This metric reflects sustained academic engagement, research mentoring, and institutional research capacity building.

2. Scope of Assessment

This metric evaluates:

- PhD candidate guidance/completion
- PG dissertation/thesis supervision
- Research laboratory establishment
- Research facility enhancement
- Research infrastructure development

Activities completed or actively functioning during the assessment period may be considered.

3. Questionnaire

Question Code	Question	Response Type	Evidence Required
Q1	Enter the total number of PhD candidates guided/completed during the assessment period.	Numeric	Scholar list / university recognition record
Q2	Enter the total number of PG dissertation/thesis projects supervised during the assessment period.	Numeric	Project list / departmental record
Q3	Enter the total number of major research laboratories/centers established during the assessment period.	Numeric	Lab approval/order/facility document
Q4	Enter the total number of significant research facility/equipment upgrades completed during the assessment period.	Numeric	Equipment sanction/purchase/facility document
Q5	Enter the total number of minor research infrastructure enhancements completed during the assessment period.	Numeric	Department/lab enhancement record

4. Verification Methodology

Automated/System-Based Verification

The institutional system may automatically:

- Validate scholar/project records
- Match applicant identity with supervision records
- Verify laboratory/facility establishment records
- Detect duplicate claims
- Validate institutional approval metadata
- Verify infrastructure enhancement records

Validation Conditions

A submission shall be considered valid if:

- Institutional or official evidence exists.
- The applicant is reasonably linked to the claimed activity.
- The activity falls within the assessment period.
- Supporting records are verifiable.

5. Eligible Activities

The following may be considered:

- Recognized PhD supervision
- PG dissertation/thesis supervision
- Establishment of funded/specialized research labs
- Major research equipment/facility upgrades
- Research infrastructure enhancement activities

6. Non-Eligible Activities

The following shall NOT be considered:

- UG mini-project supervision
- Informal mentoring without records
- Duplicate claims
- Unverifiable facilities/infrastructure
- Routine departmental maintenance
- Non-functional or inactive facilities

7. Scoring Methodology

Marks shall be assigned based on verified research ecosystem development contributions.

Suggested Weightage Model

Activity Type	Suggested Weight
PhD Candidate Guided/Completed	1.50
PG Dissertation/Thesis Supervised	0.50
Major Research Lab/Center Established	2.00
Significant Research Facility Upgrade	1.00
Minor Research Infrastructure Enhancement	0.50

Research Ecosystem Contribution Formula

$$RECS = (PhD \times 1.50) + (PG \times 0.50) + (MRL \times 2.00) + (SFU \times 1.00) + (MRE \times 0.50)$$

Where:

- PhD = PhD candidates guided/completed
- PG = PG dissertations/theses supervised
- MRL = Major research laboratories/centers established
- SFU = Significant research facility upgrades
- MRE = Minor research infrastructure enhancements

Suggested Scoring Bands

Research Ecosystem Contribution Score (RECS)	Marks
≥ 8	20
4 – 7.99	15
1 – 3.99	10
0.1 – 0.99	5
0	0

Framework administrators may customize thresholds depending on discipline or institutional category.

8. Rejection Conditions

The submission may be rejected if:

- Institutional evidence cannot be verified.
- Identity mismatch is detected.
- Duplicate submissions exist.
- Evidence appears manipulated/fabricated.
- The claimed activity is unrelated to research ecosystem development.

***** End of Domain 2.2 *****

==========

D2.3 — Patents, Innovation & Technology Development (80)

D2.3.1 Patents Published (Utility Only)

Mark = 20

1. Objective

To assess faculty contribution to intellectual property creation through publication of utility patent applications.

This metric reflects innovation capability, research translation potential, and generation of protectable intellectual assets.

2. Scope of Assessment

This metric evaluates:

- Published utility patent applications
- National patent publications
- International patent publications

Only officially published patent applications shall be considered.

Design patents, trademarks, copyrights, and industrial designs shall not be considered under this metric.

3. Questionnaire

Question Code	Question	Response Type	Evidence Required
D2.3.1-Q1	Enter the total number of Indian utility patent applications published during the assessment period.	Numeric	Patent publication number
D2.3.1-Q2	Enter the total number of international utility patent applications published during the assessment period.	Numeric	Patent publication number
D2.3.1-Q3	Provide the publication/application numbers for all claimed patents.	Text/List	Patent publication record

4. Verification Methodology

Automated/System-Based Verification

The institutional system may automatically:

- Verify patent publication number
- Validate publication status
- Match inventor names
- Detect duplicate claims
- Validate patent publication date

Validation Conditions

A patent shall be considered valid if:

- Patent publication record exists.
- Applicant/inventor identity is verifiable.
- Patent is officially published.
- Publication falls within the assessment period.

5. Eligible Patents

Eligible:

- Utility patents
- Process patents
- Product patents
- System/device patents

Not eligible:

- Design patents
- Copyrights
- Trademarks
- Geographical indications

6. Scoring Methodology

Suggested Weightage

Patent Type	Weight
Indian Utility Patent Published	1.00
International Utility Patent Published	1.50

Patent Publication Score

$$PPS = (IP \times 1.00) + (INTP \times 1.50)$$

Where:

- IP = Indian patent publications
- INTP = International patent publications

Suggested Scoring Bands

PPS	Marks
≥ 3	20
1 – 2.99	10
0	0

7. Rejection Conditions
The submission may be rejected if:
- Patent publication cannot be verified.
- Inventor identity mismatch is detected.
- Duplicate patent claims exist.
- Patent is not a utility patent.
- Evidence appears manipulated or fabricated.

D2.3.2 Patents Granted (Utility Only)
Mark = 30
1. Objective
To assess faculty contribution to innovation and intellectual property generation through the successful grant of utility patents.
This metric reflects the novelty, technical merit, and protectability of innovations that have successfully completed the patent examination process.

2. Scope of Assessment
This metric evaluates:
- Granted utility patents
- National patent grants
- International patent grants
- Product patents
- Process patents
- System/device patents

Only officially granted patents shall be considered.
Design patents, trademarks, copyrights, and other non-utility intellectual property shall not be considered under this metric.

3. Questionnaire

Question Code	Question	Response Type	Evidence Required
D2.3.2-Q1	Enter the total number of Indian utility patents granted during the assessment period.	Numeric	Patent grant number / grant certificate
D2.3.2-Q2	Enter the total number of international utility patents granted during the assessment period.	Numeric	Patent grant number / grant certificate
D2.3.2-Q3	Provide the grant numbers for all claimed patents.	Text/List	Official patent grant record

4. Verification Methodology
Automated/System-Based Verification
The institutional system may automatically:
- Verify patent grant number
- Validate grant status
- Match inventor names
- Detect duplicate claims

- Validate patent grant date
- Identify granting jurisdiction

Validation Conditions
A patent shall be considered valid if:
- Official patent grant record exists.
- The applicant is listed as inventor/co-inventor.
- The patent grant falls within the assessment period.
- Patent metadata is publicly verifiable.

5. Eligible Patents
The following may be considered:
- Utility patents
- Product patents
- Process patents
- Device/system patents
- Engineering innovations
- Technology-oriented inventions

6. Non-Eligible Intellectual Property
The following shall NOT be considered:
- Design patents
- Copyrights
- Trademarks
- Geographical indications
- Plant variety registrations
- Utility models (where applicable)
- Duplicate grant claims

7. Scoring Methodology
Marks shall be assigned based on verified granted utility patents.

Suggested Weightage Model

Patent Type	Weight
Indian Utility Patent Granted	1.00
International Utility Patent Granted	1.50

Patent Grant Score Formula

$$PGS = (IG \times 1.00) + (INTG \times 1.50)$$

Where:
- IG = Indian utility patents granted
- INTG = International utility patents granted

Suggested Scoring Bands

Patent Grant Score (PGS)	Marks
≥ 4	30
2 – 3.99	20
1 – 1.99	10
0	0

8. Rejection Conditions
The submission may be rejected if:
- Patent grant cannot be verified.
- Inventor identity mismatch is detected.
- Duplicate patent claims exist.
- Patent is not a utility patent.
- Evidence appears manipulated or fabricated.
- The patent remains only at application/publication stage without grant status.

D2.3.3 Patent Commercialization / Technology Transfer

Mark = 20

1. Objective
To assess the successful translation of research and innovation into practical application through patent commercialization, technology licensing, technology transfer, industrial adoption, or market deployment.
This metric reflects the real-world impact of innovation beyond patent generation.

2. Scope of Assessment
This metric evaluates:
- Patent commercialization
- Technology licensing
- Technology transfer agreements
- Industrial technology adoption
- Prototype-to-product conversion
- Revenue-generating innovation deployment

Both patented and institutionally recognized technologies may be considered, provided evidence of transfer or adoption exists.

3. Questionnaire

Question Code	Question	Response Type	Evidence Required
D2.3.3-Q1	Enter the total number of patented technologies commercialized or licensed during the assessment period.	Numeric	Licensing/commercialization agreement
D2.3.3-Q2	Enter the total number of technologies transferred or adopted by industry/government organizations during the assessment period.	Numeric	Technology transfer agreement / adoption letter
D2.3.3-Q3	Enter the total revenue generated through technology commercialization, licensing, or transfer during the assessment period (in INR).	Currency/Numeric	Revenue sharing agreement / institutional financial record

4. Verification Methodology
Automated/System-Based Verification
The institutional system may automatically:
- Validate commercialization agreements
- Verify technology transfer records

- Match inventor/applicant identity
- Detect duplicate claims
- Validate industry/government partner information
- Verify commercialization revenue where applicable

Validation Conditions
A claim shall be considered valid if:
- Formal technology transfer/commercialization evidence exists.
- The applicant is reasonably linked to the innovation.
- The activity occurred within the assessment period.
- Industry/government adoption is verifiable.

5. Eligible Activities
The following may be considered:
- Patent licensing
- Technology transfer agreements
- Technology adoption by industry
- Technology adoption by government agencies
- Commercial deployment of patented innovations
- Prototype commercialization
- Innovation-based revenue generation

6. Non-Eligible Activities
The following shall NOT be considered:
- Patent publication alone
- Patent grant alone
- Consultancy projects
- Research publications
- MoUs without technology transfer
- Unverified adoption claims
- Technology demonstrations without actual adoption

7. Scoring Methodology
Marks shall be assigned based on verified commercialization and technology transfer outcomes.

Suggested Weightage Model

Activity Type	Weight
Patent Commercialization / Licensing	1.50
Technology Transfer / Industry Adoption	1.00
Commercialization Revenue ≥ ₹1 Lakh	Additional 0.50

Technology Impact Score Formula

$$TIS = (PC \times 1.50) + (TT \times 1.00) + RV$$

Where:
- PC = Commercialized/licensed patents
- TT = Technology transfers/adoptions
- RV = Revenue bonus score

Suggested Scoring Bands

Technology Impact Score (TIS)	Marks
≥ 3	1
1 – 2.99	0.5
0	0

8. Rejection Conditions
The submission may be rejected if:

- Commercialization evidence cannot be verified.
- Technology transfer records are unavailable.
- Identity mismatch is detected.
- Duplicate claims exist.
- Evidence appears manipulated or fabricated.
- The claim represents only patent filing/publication without actual transfer, licensing, or adoption.

D2.3.4 Startup/Entrepreneurship/incubation establishment
Mark = 30
1. Objective
To assess faculty establishment as entrepreneur, startup, innovation incubation, and commercialization of research through recognized startup and incubation ecosystems.
This metric reflects the faculty member evolve as entrepreneur/start-up/incubatee

2. Scope of Assessment
This metric evaluates:

- Startup founding/co-founding
- Faculty as startups
- Incubated startup
- Innovation commercialization through startups

Only activities associated with recognized startups or incubation programs shall be considered.

3. Questionnaire

Question Code	Question	Response Type	Evidence Required
D2.3.4-Q1	Enter the total number of startups founded or co-founded during the assessment period.	Numeric	Startup registration / incorporation record
D2.3.4-Q2	Enter the total number of startups established in recognized incubation centres during the assessment period.	Numeric	Incubation/mentoring record
D2.3.4-Q3	Enter the total number of startups successfully incubated, graduated, funded, or commercially operational by the faculty	Numeric	Incubation centre record / funding proof / startup status record

4. Verification Methodology
Automated/System-Based Verification
The institutional system may automatically:

- Verify startup registration details
- Validate incubation centre records
- Match applicant identity with startup/incubation records
- Detect duplicate claims
- Verify startup operational status
- Validate mentoring records

Validation Conditions
A claim shall be considered valid if:
- Startup/incubation records exist.
- The applicant is reasonably linked to the claimed activity.
- The activity falls within the assessment period.
- Supporting records are verifiable.

5. Eligible Activities
The following may be considered:
- Founder/co-founder of startup
- Faculty startup creation
- Incubated startup
- Startup graduation from incubation centre
- Startup funding achievement
- Technology-based startup development

6. Non-Eligible Activities
The following shall NOT be considered:
- Mentor activity
- Attendance in entrepreneurship workshops
- Participation in startup awareness programs
- Informal mentoring without records
- Student project supervision alone
- Startup competition participation without incubation
- Duplicate claims
- Unverifiable startup activities

7. Scoring Methodology
Marks shall be assigned based on verified startup and incubation contributions.

Suggested Weightage Model

Activity Type	Weight
Startup Founded / Co-founded	1.50
Startup through Recognized Incubation Centre	0.50
Successfully Incubated / Funded / Operational Startup	1.00

Startup Contribution Score Formula

$$SCS = (SF \times 1.50) + (SM \times 0.50) + (SI \times 1.00)$$

Where:
- SF = Startups founded/co-founded
- SM = Startups formally mentored
- SI = Successfully incubated/funded/operational startups

Suggested Scoring Bands

Startup Contribution Score (SCS)	Marks
≥ 2	1
1 – 1.99	0.5
0	0

8. Rejection Conditions
The submission may be rejected if:

- Startup registration cannot be verified.
- Incubation records are unavailable.
- Identity mismatch is detected.
- Duplicate claims exist.
- Evidence appears manipulated/fabricated.
- The claimed activity is unrelated to startup creation, incubation, or entrepreneurship development.

***** End of Domain 2.3 *****

==========

D2.4 — Professional Recognition & Academic Engagement (20)

D2.4.1 FDPs / Certifications Completed

Mark = 2

1. Objective
To assess faculty commitment to continuous professional development through participation in Faculty Development Programmes (FDPs), professional training programmes, and recognized certification courses.
This metric reflects efforts toward upskilling, knowledge enhancement, pedagogical improvement, and professional competency development.

2. Scope of Assessment
This metric evaluates:

- Faculty Development Programmes (FDPs)
- Professional training programmes
- Skill enhancement programmes
- Industry-recognized certifications
- Professional competency certifications

Only successfully completed activities during the assessment period shall be considered.

3. Questionnaire

Question Code	Question	Response Type	Evidence Required
D2.4.1-Q1	Enter the total number of FDPs/training programmes completed with a duration of less than 30 hours during the assessment period.	Numeric	Certificate / completion record
D2.4.1-Q2	Enter the total number of FDPs/training programmes completed with a duration of 30 hours or more during the assessment period.	Numeric	Certificate / completion record

Question Code	Question	Response Type	Evidence Required
D2.4.1-Q3	Enter the total number of professional or industry-recognized certifications completed during the assessment period.	Numeric	Certification record

4. Verification Methodology
Automated/System-Based Verification
The institutional system may automatically:

- Verify certificate authenticity where possible
- Match applicant identity with certification records
- Detect duplicate submissions
- Validate programme duration
- Verify certification provider details

Validation Conditions
A submission shall be considered valid if:

- Completion evidence exists.
- The applicant is identified in the certificate/record.
- The activity falls within the assessment period.
- The programme/certification is reasonably verifiable.

5. Eligible Activities
The following may be considered:

- Faculty Development Programmes
- Refresher programmes
- Pedagogy training programmes
- Research methodology programmes
- Technical skill development programmes
- Industry certifications
- Professional certifications
- Digital competency certifications

6. Non-Eligible Activities
The following shall NOT be considered:

- Orientation/induction sessions shorter than institutional minimum requirements
- Informal webinars without completion certification
- Duplicate claims
- Unverifiable certificates
- Attendance-only events without successful completion

7. Scoring Methodology
Marks shall be assigned based on verified professional development activities.

Suggested Weightage Model

Activity Type	Weight
FDP/Training Programme (<30 Hours)	0.50
FDP/Training Programme (≥30 Hours)	1.00
Professional/Industry Certification	1.50

Professional Development Score Formula

$$PDS = (FDPS \times 0.50) + (FDPL \times 1.00) + (CERT \times 1.50)$$

Where:

- FDPS = FDPs less than 30 hours
- FDPL = FDPs of 30 hours or more
- CERT = Professional/industry certifications

Suggested Scoring Bands

Professional Development Score (PDS)	Marks
≥ 3	2
1 – 2.99	1
0	0

8. Rejection Conditions

The submission may be rejected if:

- Completion evidence cannot be verified.
- Identity mismatch is detected.
- Duplicate claims exist.
- Evidence appears manipulated/fabricated.
- The activity does not qualify as a professional development programme or recognized certification.

D2.4.2 Editorial Board / Reviewer Roles

Mark = 5

1. Objective

To assess faculty contribution to scholarly publishing and academic quality assurance through service as editorial board members, journal editors, reviewers, and peer-review experts.
This metric reflects academic reputation, subject expertise, and contribution to maintaining research quality within the scholarly community.

2. Scope of Assessment

This metric evaluates:

- Editorial board memberships
- Associate Editor roles
- Section Editor roles
- Guest Editor roles
- Peer reviewer activities
- Conference proceeding reviewer roles

Only roles held or activities performed during the assessment period shall be considered.

3. Questionnaire

Question Code	Question	Response Type	Evidence Required
D2.4.2-Q1	Enter the total number of editorial positions held (Editor, Associate Editor, Section Editor, Guest Editor, Editorial Board Member) during the assessment period.	Numeric	Appointment letter / journal webpage
D2.4.2-Q2	Enter the total number of journals or conferences for which you served as a reviewer during the assessment period.	Numeric	Reviewer certificate / reviewer recognition record

Question Code	Question	Response Type	Evidence Required
D2.4.2-Q3	Enter the total number of verified peer reviews completed during the assessment period.	Numeric	Reviewer recognition profile (Publons/Web of Science/Publisher record)

4. Verification Methodology
Automated/System-Based Verification
The institutional system may automatically:

- Verify editorial board listings
- Validate reviewer records
- Match applicant identity with journal records
- Detect duplicate claims
- Verify reviewer recognition profiles
- Validate activity period

5. Validation Conditions
A submission shall be considered valid if:

- The editorial/reviewer role is verifiable.
- The applicant's name appears in official records.
- The activity falls within the assessment period.
- The journal/conference is identifiable.

6. Eligible Activities
The following may be considered:

- Editorial Board Member
- Associate Editor
- Section Editor
- Guest Editor
- Journal Reviewer
- Conference Proceedings Reviewer
- Reviewer recognized through publisher platforms

7. Non-Eligible Activities
The following shall NOT be considered:

- Informal review requests without evidence
- Self-declared reviewing activities
- Duplicate claims
- Predatory journal editorial positions
- Unverifiable editorial appointments

8. Scoring Methodology
Marks shall be assigned based on verified editorial and reviewer contributions.

Suggested Weightage Model

Activity Type	Weight
Editorial Position Held	1.50
Reviewer Role (Journal/Conference)	0.50
Verified Peer Reviews Completed	0.10 per review

Academic Service Score Formula

$$ASS = (EP \times 1.50) + (RJ \times 0.50) + (PR \times 0.10)$$

Where:

- EP = Editorial positions held
- RJ = Journals/conferences served as reviewer
- PR = Verified peer reviews completed

Suggested Scoring Bands

Academic Service Score (ASS)	Marks
≥ 3	5
1 – 2.99	2.5
0	0

9. Rejection Conditions

The submission may be rejected if:

- Editorial/reviewer role cannot be verified.
- Identity mismatch is detected.
- Duplicate claims exist.
- Evidence appears manipulated/fabricated.
- The journal/conference is identified as predatory or non-scholarly.

D2.4.3 Membership in Professional Bodies

Mark = 2

1. Objective

To assess faculty engagement with recognized professional societies, technical associations, academic organizations, and learned bodies that contribute to professional growth, networking, and disciplinary advancement.

This metric reflects active participation in the broader professional and academic community.

2. Scope of Assessment

This metric evaluates:

- Membership in professional societies
- Membership in technical associations
- Membership in academic organizations
- Fellowship status in recognized professional bodies
- Senior membership status in recognized professional bodies

Only active memberships valid during the assessment period shall be considered.

3. Questionnaire

Question Code	Question	Response Type	Evidence Required
D2.4.3-Q1	Enter the total number of active professional memberships held during the assessment period.	Numeric	Membership certificate / membership record
D2.4.3-Q2	Enter the total number of Senior Member-grade memberships held during the assessment period.	Numeric	Membership certificate / membership profile

Question Code	Question	Response Type	Evidence Required
D2.4.3-Q3	Enter the total number of Fellow-grade memberships held during the assessment period.	Numeric	Fellowship certificate / official membership record

4. Verification Methodology
Automated/System-Based Verification
The institutional system may automatically:

- Verify membership status
- Validate membership period
- Match applicant identity with membership records
- Detect duplicate claims
- Verify organization details

5. Validation Conditions
A membership shall be considered valid if:

- Membership is active during the assessment period.
- The professional body is recognized and identifiable.
- The applicant's name appears in the membership record.
- Membership status is verifiable.

6. Eligible Professional Bodies
Examples may include:

- Professional engineering societies
- Scientific societies
- Technical associations
- Learned academic bodies
- International professional organizations
- National professional organizations

Examples include (but are not limited to):

- IEEE
- ASME
- SAE International
- ISTE
- IEI

7. Non-Eligible Memberships
The following shall NOT be considered:

- Expired memberships
- Student memberships
- Informal online community memberships
- Social clubs
- Unverifiable organizations
- Duplicate membership claims within the same organization and grade

8. Scoring Methodology
Marks shall be assigned based on verified professional membership status.

Suggested Weightage Model

Membership Grade	Weight
Professional Member	1.00
Senior Member	1.50
Fellow	2.00

Professional Membership Score Formula

$$PMS = (PM \times 1.00) + (SM \times 1.50) + (FM \times 2.00)$$

Where:

- PM = Professional memberships
- SM = Senior Member memberships
- FM = Fellow-grade memberships

Suggested Scoring Bands

Professional Membership Score (PMS)	Marks
≥ 2	2
1 – 1.99	1
0	0

9. Rejection Conditions

The submission may be rejected if:

- Membership status cannot be verified.
- Identity mismatch is detected.
- Membership has expired.
- Evidence appears manipulated/fabricated.
- The organization is not a recognized professional or academic body.

D2.4.4 Awards and Recognitions Received

Mark = 5

1. Objective

To assess faculty achievements and professional recognition received from academic, research, professional, industrial, governmental, or societal organizations.

This metric reflects external recognition of excellence in teaching, research, innovation, professional service, leadership, or societal contribution.

2. Scope of Assessment

This metric evaluates:

- Academic awards
- Research awards
- Innovation awards
- Professional excellence awards
- Teaching awards
- Leadership awards
- Industry recognitions
- Government recognitions

Only awards and recognitions received during the assessment period shall be considered.

3. Questionnaire

Question Code	Question	Response Type	Evidence Required
D2.4.4-Q1	Enter the total number of institutional-level awards and recognitions received during the assessment period.	Numeric	Award certificate / official announcement
D2.4.4-Q2	Enter the total number of state/national-level awards and recognitions received during the assessment period.	Numeric	Award certificate / official announcement
D2.4.4-Q3	Enter the total number of international-level awards and recognitions received during the assessment period.	Numeric	Award certificate / official announcement

4. Verification Methodology
Automated/System-Based Verification
The institutional system may automatically:

- Verify award records
- Match applicant identity with award documentation
- Detect duplicate claims
- Validate awarding organization details
- Verify award date and category

5. Validation Conditions
An award shall be considered valid if:

- Official recognition evidence exists.
- The awarding organization is identifiable.
- The applicant is clearly named in the award record.
- The award falls within the assessment period.

6. Eligible Awards and Recognitions
The following may be considered:

- Best Teacher Awards
- Research Excellence Awards
- Innovation Awards
- Young Scientist Awards
- Professional Achievement Awards
- Industry Recognition Awards
- Government Recognition Awards
- Distinguished Service Awards

7. Non-Eligible Awards and Recognitions
The following shall NOT be considered:

- Participation certificates
- Attendance certificates
- Appreciation certificates for routine duties
- Membership recognitions
- Duplicate claims
- Unverifiable awards
- Awards from predatory or non-credible organizations

8. Scoring Methodology
Marks shall be assigned based on the level of verified recognition.

Suggested Weightage Model

Award Level	Weight
Institutional Level	0.50
State/National Level	1.00
International Level	1.50

Recognition Score Formula

$$RS = (INST \times 0.50) + (NAT \times 1.00) + (INT \times 1.50)$$

Where:

- INST = Institutional-level awards
- NAT = State/National-level awards
- INT = International-level awards

Suggested Scoring Bands

Recognition Score (RS)	Marks
≥ 2	5
1 – 1.99	2.5
0	0

9. Rejection Conditions

The submission may be rejected if:

- Award evidence cannot be verified.
- Identity mismatch is detected.
- Duplicate claims exist.
- Evidence appears manipulated/fabricated.
- The recognition does not represent a genuine award or professional distinction.

D2.4.5 Invited Talks / Keynote Lectures

Mark = 3

1. Objective

To assess faculty recognition as a subject expert through invitations to deliver keynote lectures, invited talks, distinguished lectures, plenary presentations, and expert sessions at academic, professional, industrial, or governmental forums.

This metric reflects academic reputation, professional visibility, and recognition by external organizations.

2. Scope of Assessment

This metric evaluates:

- Keynote lectures
- Invited talks
- Distinguished lectures
- Plenary lectures
- Expert sessions
- Guest lectures delivered upon formal invitation

Only activities delivered during the assessment period shall be considered.

3. Questionnaire

Question Code	Question	Response Type	Evidence Required
D2.4.5-Q1	Enter the total number of invited talks/guest lectures delivered at institutional level during the assessment period.	Numeric	Invitation letter / programme brochure
D2.4.5-Q2	Enter the total number of keynote lectures or invited talks delivered at state/national level events during the assessment period.	Numeric	Invitation letter / programme brochure
D2.4.5-Q3	Enter the total number of keynote lectures or invited talks delivered at international events during the assessment period.	Numeric	Invitation letter / programme brochure

4. Verification Methodology

Automated/System-Based Verification

The institutional system may automatically:

- Verify programme brochures
- Validate invitation records
- Match applicant identity with event records
- Detect duplicate claims
- Verify organizing institution/event details

5. Validation Conditions

An activity shall be considered valid if:

- Formal invitation evidence exists.
- The applicant is identified as speaker/keynote/invited expert.
- The event is identifiable.
- The activity falls within the assessment period.

6. Eligible Activities

The following may be considered:

- Keynote lectures
- Invited conference talks
- Distinguished lectures
- Plenary lectures
- Expert technical sessions
- Invited guest lectures
- Invited industry expert sessions

7. Non-Eligible Activities

The following shall NOT be considered:

- Regular classroom teaching
- Internal departmental presentations
- Paper presentations claimed under D2.1.5
- Workshop participation without invited speaker role
- Informal talks without evidence
- Duplicate claims

8. Scoring Methodology

Marks shall be assigned based on the level of verified academic engagement.

Suggested Weightage Model

Activity Type	Weight
Institutional-Level Invited Talk	0.50
State/National-Level Invited Talk or Keynote	1.00
International Invited Talk or Keynote	1.50

Academic Engagement Score Formula

$$AES = (INST \times 0.50) + (NAT \times 1.00) + (INT \times 1.50)$$

Where:

- INST = Institutional-level invited talks
- NAT = State/National-level invited talks or keynotes
- INT = International invited talks or keynotes

Suggested Scoring Bands

Academic Engagement Score (AES)	Marks
≥ 2	3
1 – 1.99	1.5
0	0

9. Rejection Conditions

The submission may be rejected if:

- Invitation evidence cannot be verified.
- Identity mismatch is detected.
- Duplicate claims exist.
- Evidence appears manipulated/fabricated.
- The activity represents a regular conference paper presentation already claimed elsewhere in the framework.

D2.4.6 International Academic Engagement / Visiting Faculty Activities/ Post-Doc

Mark = 3

1. Objective

To assess faculty engagement with international academic institutions, research organizations, and global scholarly networks through visiting appointments, academic exchanges, collaborative teaching, research residencies, and other international academic activities.

This metric reflects global academic visibility, international collaboration, and contribution to cross-border knowledge exchange.

2. Scope of Assessment

This metric evaluates:

- Visiting faculty assignments
- Visiting researcher appointments
- International academic exchange programmes
- International collaborative teaching assignments
- Research residencies
- International scholarly mobility activities

Only activities completed during the assessment period shall be considered.

3. Questionnaire

Question Code	Question	Response Type	Evidence Required
D2.4.6-Q1	Enter the total number of international academic engagements completed through virtual mode during the assessment period.	Numeric	Official invitation / participation record
D2.4.6-Q2	Enter the total number of international academic engagements completed through physical visit during the assessment period.	Numeric	Official invitation / visit record
D2.4.6-Q3	Enter the total number of visiting faculty, visiting researcher, or academic exchange appointments/post-Doc completed during the assessment period.	Numeric	Appointment/order/invitation document

4. Verification Methodology

Automated/System-Based Verification

The institutional system may automatically:

- Verify host institution details
- Validate appointment/invitation records
- Match applicant identity with institutional records
- Detect duplicate claims
- Verify activity period and international affiliation

5. Validation Conditions

An activity shall be considered valid if:

- Official evidence exists.
- The host institution/organization is identifiable.
- The applicant is formally associated with the activity.
- The activity falls within the assessment period.

6. Eligible Activities

The following may be considered:

- Visiting faculty assignments
- Visiting researcher appointments
- International teaching engagements
- Academic exchange programmes
- Research residencies
- International collaborative academic assignments
- International scholar mobility programmes

7. Non-Eligible Activities

The following shall NOT be considered:

- Conference paper presentations claimed under D2.1.5
- Invited talks/keynotes claimed under D2.4.5
- Informal academic meetings
- Attendance-only activities
- Duplicate claims
- Unverifiable international engagements

8. Scoring Methodology

Marks shall be assigned based on verified international academic engagement activities.

Suggested Weightage Model

Activity Type	Weight
International Academic Engagement (Virtual)	0.75
International Academic Engagement (Physical)	1.00
Visiting Faculty / Visiting Researcher / Academic Exchange Appointment	1.50

International Engagement Score Formula

$$IES = (VIR \times 0.75) + (PHY \times 1.00) + (VFA \times 1.50)$$

Where:

- VIR = Virtual international academic engagements
- PHY = Physical international academic engagements
- VFA = Visiting faculty/researcher/exchange appointments

Suggested Scoring Bands

International Engagement Score (IES)	Marks
≥ 2	3
1 – 1.99	1.5
0	0

9. Rejection Conditions

The submission may be rejected if:

- Official evidence cannot be verified.
- Identity mismatch is detected.
- Duplicate claims exist.
- Evidence appears manipulated/fabricated.
- The activity does not represent a genuine international academic engagement.

***** End of Domain 2 *****

13. Annexure – 3: Rubrics for Domain 3

DOMAIN 3 — Academic Contribution & Leadership (100 Marks)			
SD	**Subdomain**	**Type**	**Score**
D3.1	Curriculum Development & Academic Design	Qn	40
D3.2	Institutional Responsibilities & Leadership	Qn	30
D3.3	Accreditation, Quality & Academic Governance Contribution	Qn	30

D3.1 — Curriculum Development & Academic Design (40)

D3.1.1 Academic Regulation, Curriculum Governance & Programme Structuring Contribution

Maximum Marks: 2
Evidence: Academic Council/BoS minutes, committee orders, approved regulations, programme revision documents

1. Objective
To assess faculty contribution to institutional academic governance through participation in the development, revision, implementation, and oversight of academic regulations, curriculum frameworks, programme structures, and related academic policies.
This metric recognizes contributions that influence institutional academic systems beyond individual course delivery.

2. Scope of Assessment
This metric evaluates contributions related to:

- Academic regulation development or revision
- Curriculum framework development
- Programme structure design or restructuring
- Credit framework development
- NEP implementation in academic programmes
- Academic policy development
- Board of Studies (BoS) academic governance activities
- Academic Council academic governance activities
- Interdisciplinary programme structuring initiatives

Only institutionally approved activities completed during the assessment period shall be considered.

3. Questionnaire

Question Code	Question	Response Type	Evidence Required
D3.1.1-Q1	Enter the total number of academic regulation, curriculum governance, or programme structuring activities in which you served as Lead/Chairperson/Coordinator during the assessment period.	Numeric	Committee order / approved document / minutes

Question Code	Question	Response Type	Evidence Required
D3.1.1-Q2	Enter the total number of such activities in which you served as a Core Committee Member during the assessment period.	Numeric	Committee order / approved document / minutes
D3.1.1-Q3	Enter the total number of such activities in which you served as a Member/Contributor during the assessment period.	Numeric	Committee order / approved document / minutes

4. Verification Methodology

Automated/System-Based Verification

The institutional system may:

- Verify committee membership records
- Validate approved academic regulations and programme documents
- Match applicant identity with institutional records
- Detect duplicate claims
- Verify approval dates and issuing authorities

Validation Conditions

A contribution shall be considered valid if:

- Official institutional evidence exists.
- The applicant is identified in the approved records.
- The activity falls within the assessment period.
- The contribution relates to institutional academic governance or programme structuring.

5. Eligible Activities

Examples include:

- Academic Regulation Revision Committee
- Curriculum Framework Development Committee
- Academic Council Sub-Committee
- Board of Studies Academic Governance Activities
- NEP Implementation Committee
- Credit Structure Revision Committee
- Programme Restructuring Committee
- Interdisciplinary Programme Framework Development
- Academic Policy Drafting Committee

6. Non-Eligible Activities

The following shall NOT be considered:

- Individual course syllabus preparation
- Routine course updates
- Lesson planning
- Classroom teaching activities

- Course file preparation
- OBE mapping activities
- Accreditation documentation activities
- Routine meeting attendance without identifiable contribution
- Activities already claimed under other RKIP indicators

7. Scoring Methodology
Contribution Weightage

Role	Weight
Lead / Chairperson / Coordinator	1.50
Core Committee Member	1.00
Member / Contributor	0.50

Academic Governance Contribution Score (AGCS)

$$AGCS = (LC \times 1.50) + (CC \times 1.00) + (MC \times 0.50)$$

Where:

- **LC** = Lead/Chairperson/Coordinator roles
- **CC** = Core Committee Member roles
- **MC** = Member/Contributor roles

Scoring Bands

AGCS	Marks Awarded
≥ 3.0	2
1.5 – 2.99	1. 5
0.5 – 1.49	1.00
0.1 – 0.49	0.5
0	0

8. Rejection Conditions
A submission may be rejected if:

- The activity cannot be verified through official records.
- The applicant's role cannot be established.
- Duplicate claims are detected.
- Evidence appears altered, fabricated, or misleading.
- The activity relates primarily to teaching delivery rather than institutional academic governance.

D3.1.2 Academic Programme & Course Development
Maximum Marks: 6

Evidence: Approval order, syllabus document, programme proposal, Academic Council/BoS approval record

1. Objective
To assess faculty contribution toward the development of new academic courses, programmes, specializations, and learning pathways that enhance curriculum relevance, employability, interdisciplinary learning, and academic innovation.
This metric recognizes faculty members who actively contribute to expanding and modernizing institutional academic offerings.

2. Scope of Assessment
This metric evaluates contributions related to:

- New course development
- New elective development
- Value-added course development
- Certificate programme development
- Minor/Honours programme development
- New academic programme proposals
- Skill-oriented academic offerings
- Emerging technology-based courses

Only formally approved academic offerings shall be considered.

3. Questionnaire

Question Code	Question	Response Type	Evidence Required
D3.1.2-Q1	Enter the total number of new academic programmes, minors, honours tracks, or certificate programmes developed where you served as Lead/Coordinator during the assessment period.	Numeric	Approval order / programme document
D3.1.2-Q2	Enter the total number of new courses/electives developed where you served as Lead Developer during the assessment period.	Numeric	Approved syllabus / course approval record
D3.1.2-Q3	Enter the total number of new courses/programmes where you contributed as a Core Member or Contributor during the assessment period.	Numeric	Committee document / approval record

4. Verification Methodology
Automated/System-Based Verification
The institutional system may:

- Verify programme approval records
- Verify course approval documents
- Match applicant identity with development records
- Detect duplicate claims
- Validate implementation dates

5. Validation Conditions
A contribution shall be considered valid if:

- Formal institutional approval exists.
- The applicant's contribution can be established.
- The course/programme was approved during the assessment period.

- Supporting documents are verifiable.

6. Eligible Activities

Examples include:

- New elective course development
- Value-added course development
- Certificate programme creation
- Minor programme development
- Honours programme development
- Emerging technology course development
- Industry-oriented course development
- New degree programme proposal development

7. Non-Eligible Activities

The following shall NOT be considered:

- Routine syllabus updates
- Teaching an existing course
- Course coordination activities
- OBE mapping activities
- Academic regulation revision
- MOOCs/e-content creation
- Duplicate claims

8. Scoring Methodology

Contribution Weightage

Contribution Type	Weight
Lead Development of Programme/Minor/Honours/Certificate Programme	2.00
Lead Development of New Course/Elective	1.50
Core Member/Contributor	0.75

Academic Development Score (ADS)

$$ADS = (PD \times 2.00) + (CD \times 1.50) + (CM \times 0.75)$$

Where:

- **PD** = Programme-level developments
- **CD** = Course-level developments
- **CM** = Contributor roles

Scoring Bands

ADS	Marks Awarded
≥ 3.0	1.0
1.5 – 2.99	0.75
0.5 – 1.49	0.50

ADS	Marks Awarded
0.1 – 0.49	0.25
0	0

9. Rejection Conditions
A submission may be rejected if:

- Institutional approval cannot be verified.
- The applicant's contribution cannot be established.
- Duplicate claims are detected.
- Evidence appears altered or fabricated.
- The activity represents routine maintenance of an existing course.

D3.1.3 Development of Academic Resources, MOOCs & E-Content

Maximum Marks: 12
Evidence: Resource links, LMS records, MOOC links, repository records, publication/hosting records

1. Objective
To assess faculty contribution toward the development of high-quality academic learning resources that enhance teaching, learning, self-learning, digital education, and knowledge dissemination.
This metric recognizes the creation of reusable educational assets that extend beyond routine classroom teaching and contribute to wider learner engagement.

2. Scope of Assessment
This metric evaluates contributions related to:

- MOOCs
- SWAYAM/NPTEL course development
- Online learning modules
- E-content development
- Digital learning resources
- Virtual laboratory resources
- Course manuals
- Laboratory manuals
- Open Educational Resources (OER)
- Instructional video series
- Learning repositories
- Interactive learning resources

Only resources developed, published, hosted, or institutionally deployed during the assessment period shall be considered.

3. Questionnaire

Question Code	Question	Response Type	Evidence Required
D3.1.3-Q1	Enter the total number of MOOCs, online courses, or structured digital learning modules developed as	Numeric	Course link / hosting record

Question Code	Question	Response Type	Evidence Required
	Lead Developer/Instructor during the assessment period.		
D3.1.3-Q2	Enter the total number of academic resources (course manuals, lab manuals, virtual labs, instructional video series, OER resources, e-content packages, etc.) developed as Lead Developer during the assessment period.	Numeric	Resource link / repository record
D3.1.3-Q3	Enter the total number of such resources where you served as a Co-Developer or Contributor during the assessment period.	Numeric	Resource record / contribution evidence

4. Verification Methodology

Automated/System-Based Verification

The institutional system may:

- Verify resource URLs and repository records.
- Validate LMS publication records.
- Match applicant identity with resource ownership or contributor records.
- Detect duplicate claims.
- Verify publication, deployment, or hosting dates.

Validation Conditions

A contribution shall be considered valid if:

- The resource is accessible or institutionally recorded.
- The applicant's contribution is identifiable.
- The resource was developed during the assessment period.
- Supporting evidence is verifiable.

5. Eligible Activities

Examples include:

- SWAYAM course development
- NPTEL instructor content creation
- MOOCs
- Digital learning modules
- Virtual laboratory development
- Laboratory manuals
- Course manuals
- Instructional video lecture series
- Open Educational Resources (OER)
- LMS-based structured learning packages
- Interactive learning resources

6. Non-Eligible Activities

The following shall NOT be considered:

- Routine classroom teaching
- Uploading lecture notes without substantial development effort

- Course delivery activities
- FDP training materials
- Curriculum documents claimed under D3.1.1 or D3.1.2
- Research publications claimed under Domain 2
- Duplicate claims

7. Scoring Methodology
Contribution Weightage

Resource Type	Weight
MOOC / Online Course / Structured Learning Module (Lead Developer)	2.00
Academic Resource Developed (Lead Developer)	1.00
Co-Developer / Contributor	0.50

Academic Resource Development Score (ARDS)

$$ARDS = (MOOC \times 2.00) + (ARD \times 1.00) + (CD \times 0.50)$$

Where:

- **MOOC** = MOOCs/Online Courses developed as Lead Developer
- **ARD** = Academic Resources developed as Lead Developer
- **CD** = Co-Developer/Contributor roles

Scoring Bands

ARDS	Marks Awarded
≥ 5.0	2.0
3.0 – 4.99	1.5
1.5 – 2.99	1.0
0.5 – 1.49	0.5
0	0

8. Rejection Conditions
A submission may be rejected if:

- The resource cannot be verified.
- The applicant's contribution cannot be established.
- Duplicate claims are detected.
- Evidence appears altered or fabricated.
- The activity represents routine teaching rather than educational resource development.

***** End of Domain 3.1 *****

==========

D3.2 — Institutional Responsibilities & Leadership (30)

D3.2.1 Leadership & Administrative Responsibilities Held

Maximum Marks: 5
Evidence: Appointment orders, official notifications, institutional circulars

1. Objective

To assess faculty contributions through formally assigned leadership and administrative responsibilities that support the academic, operational, and strategic functioning of the institution.

This metric recognizes faculty members who undertake institutional leadership roles beyond their regular teaching and research responsibilities.

2. Scope of Assessment

This metric evaluates officially assigned positions such as:

- Principal / Vice Principal
- Dean
- Director
- Head of Department (HoD)
- Controller of Examinations
- IQAC Coordinator
- Centre Coordinator
- Programme Coordinator
- Research Coordinator
- Placement Coordinator
- Other institutionally approved leadership positions

Only responsibilities held during the assessment period shall be considered.

3. Questionnaire

Question Code	Question	Response Type	Evidence Required
D3.2.1-Q1	Enter the total number of institution-level leadership positions (Principal, Dean, Director, Controller of Examinations, IQAC Coordinator, etc.) held during the assessment period.	Numeric	Appointment order / official notification
D3.2.1-Q2	Enter the total number of department/centre-level leadership positions (HoD, Centre Coordinator, Programme Coordinator, etc.) held during the assessment period.	Numeric	Appointment order / official notification
D3.2.1-Q3	Enter the cumulative duration (in months) for which the above leadership positions were held during the assessment period.	Numeric (Months)	Appointment order / official notification

4. Verification Methodology

Automated/System-Based Verification

The institutional system may:

- Verify appointment records from institutional databases.
- Validate tenure periods.
- Match applicant identity with official appointment orders.
- Detect duplicate claims across overlapping positions.

5. Validation Conditions

A leadership role shall be considered valid if:

- The appointment was officially approved.

- Documentary evidence is available.
- The role was held during the assessment period.
- The responsibility carried identifiable administrative or leadership functions.

6. Eligible Roles

Examples include:

Institution-Level

- Principal
- Vice Principal
- Dean
- Director
- Controller of Examinations
- IQAC Coordinator
- Chief Warden
- Research Director

Department/Centre-Level

- Head of Department
- Programme Coordinator
- Centre Coordinator
- Research Coordinator
- Placement Coordinator
- Academic Coordinator

7. Non-Eligible Roles

The following shall NOT be considered:

- Committee memberships
- Event coordinators
- Temporary task assignments
- Teaching responsibilities
- Informal responsibilities without official appointment
- Activities claimed under D3.2.2 or D3.2.3

8. Scoring Methodology

Leadership Responsibility Score (LRS)

Position Type	Weight
Institution-Level Leadership Position	2.0
Department/Centre-Level Leadership Position	1.0

$$LRS = (ILP \times 2.0) + (DLP \times 1.0)$$

Where:

- **ILP** = Number of institution-level leadership positions held
- **DLP** = Number of department/centre-level leadership positions held

Duration Adjustment Factor (DAF)

Duration Held	Factor
Less than 6 months	0.50
6–12 months	1.00

Duration Held	Factor
More than 12 months	1.25

Adjusted Score=LRS × DAF

Scoring Bands

Adjusted Score	Marks Awarded
≥ 3.0	1.0
2.0 – 2.99	0.75
1.0 – 1.99	0.50
0.1 – 0.99	0.25
0	0

9. Rejection Conditions

A submission may be rejected if:

- The appointment cannot be verified.
- The tenure period cannot be established.
- Duplicate claims are detected.
- Evidence appears altered or fabricated.
- The role does not represent a formal leadership or administrative responsibility.

D3.2.2 Institutional Committees, Events & Operational Responsibilities

Maximum Marks: 15

Evidence: Committee orders, event orders, responsibility assignments, reports, official records

1. Objective

To assess faculty contributions toward the effective functioning of the institution through committee coordination, event management, operational responsibilities, and institutional support activities.

This metric recognizes faculty members who contribute beyond formal leadership positions by supporting institutional administration, governance, student services, and campus operations.

2. Scope of Assessment

This metric evaluates contributions related to:

- Institutional committees
- Academic committees
- Student support committees
- Examination-related responsibilities
- Admission-related responsibilities
- Event coordination
- Convocation coordination
- Campus operational activities

- Institutional service assignments

Only officially assigned responsibilities performed during the assessment period shall be considered.

3. Questionnaire

Question Code	Question	Response Type	Evidence Required
D3.2.2-Q1	Enter the total number of committees, events, or institutional responsibilities in which you served as Chairperson/Coordinator/Convener during the assessment period.	Numeric	Committee order / event order / official assignment
D3.2.2-Q2	Enter the total number of committees, events, or institutional responsibilities in which you served as Member Secretary/Joint Coordinator/Core Member during the assessment period.	Numeric	Committee order / official assignment
D3.2.2-Q3	Enter the total number of committees, events, or institutional responsibilities in which you served as Member/Supporting Contributor during the assessment period.	Numeric	Committee order / official assignment

4. Verification Methodology

Automated/System-Based Verification

The institutional system may:

- Verify committee membership records.
- Validate event and responsibility assignments.
- Match applicant identity with institutional records.
- Detect duplicate claims.
- Verify activity dates and reporting records.

5. Validation Conditions

A responsibility shall be considered valid if:

- It was officially assigned.
- The applicant's role is identifiable.
- The activity falls within the assessment period.
- Supporting records are available.

6. Eligible Activities

Examples include:

Committees

- Admission Committee
- Examination Committee
- Anti-Ragging Committee
- Discipline Committee
- Library Committee
- Hostel Committee
- Student Welfare Committee
- Grievance Redressal Committee

Events

- Convocation
- Orientation Programme
- Open House
- Academic Festivals
- Institutional Conferences
- Major Institutional Events

Operational Responsibilities

- Examination Coordination
- Admission Coordination
- Timetable Coordination
- Student Activity Coordination
- Institutional Service Assignments

7. Non-Eligible Activities

The following shall NOT be considered:

- Formal leadership appointments already claimed under D3.2.1
- Accreditation activities claimed under D3.3.1
- Policy drafting claimed under D3.3.3
- Routine teaching duties
- Informal activities without official assignment
- Duplicate claims

8. Scoring Methodology

Responsibility Weightage

Role	Weight
Chairperson / Convener / Coordinator	1.50
Member Secretary / Joint Coordinator / Core Member	1.00
Member / Contributor	0.50

Institutional Service Score (ISS)

$$ISS = (CC \times 1.50) + (CM \times 1.00) + (MB \times 0.50)$$

Where:

- **CC** = Chairperson/Convener/Coordinator roles
- **CM** = Member Secretary/Joint Coordinator/Core Member roles
- **MB** = Member/Contributor roles

Scoring Bands

ISS	Marks Awarded
≥ 3.0	1.0
1.5 – 2.99	0.75
0.5 – 1.49	0.50
0.1 – 0.49	0.25
0	0

9. Rejection Conditions

A submission may be rejected if:

- The assignment cannot be verified.
- The applicant's role cannot be established.
- Duplicate claims are detected.
- Evidence appears altered or fabricated.
- The activity represents a formal leadership appointment already claimed under D3.2.1.

D3.2.3 Contribution to Institutional Transformation Initiatives

Maximum Marks: 10

Evidence: Official assignment orders, project reports, implementation records, institutional notifications

0. **Objective**

To assess faculty contributions toward major institutional transformation, modernization, and development initiatives that create measurable improvements in academic, administrative, research, innovation, or student support systems.

This metric recognizes contributions that extend beyond routine committee work and contribute to long-term institutional growth and excellence.

2. Scope of Assessment

This metric evaluates contributions related to:

- Digital transformation initiatives
- ERP implementation projects
- Academic process automation
- Research ecosystem development
- Innovation and entrepreneurship ecosystem development
- Institutional digitalization initiatives
- Student success enhancement initiatives
- Establishment of new centres, cells, or institutional units
- Academic reform implementation
- Strategic institutional development projects

Only institutionally approved initiatives implemented during the assessment period shall be considered.

3. Questionnaire

Question Code	Question	Response Type	Evidence Required
D3.2.3-Q1	Enter the total number of institutional transformation initiatives in which you served as Lead/Project Coordinator during the assessment period.	Numeric	Project order / implementation report
D3.2.3-Q2	Enter the total number of institutional transformation initiatives in which you served as Core Team Member during the assessment period.	Numeric	Official assignment / implementation report
D3.2.3-Q3	Enter the total number of institutional transformation initiatives in which you contributed as Member/Supporting Contributor during the assessment period.	Numeric	Official assignment / project record

4. Verification Methodology

Automated/System-Based Verification

The institutional system may:

- Verify project assignments and implementation records.
- Validate institutional approval documents.
- Match applicant identity with project records.
- Detect duplicate claims.
- Verify project implementation dates.

5. Validation Conditions

A contribution shall be considered valid if:

- The initiative was officially approved by the institution.
- The applicant's role can be established.
- Evidence of implementation exists.
- The activity falls within the assessment period.

6. Eligible Activities

Examples include:

Academic Transformation

- Academic process automation
- Curriculum management system implementation
- Outcome assessment system deployment
- Academic ERP implementation

Research & Innovation Ecosystem Development

- Research promotion initiatives
- Innovation ecosystem development
- Incubation ecosystem strengthening
- Research information management systems

Institutional Development

- Digital campus initiatives
- New centre/cell establishment
- Student success improvement initiatives
- Institutional data management systems
- Strategic development projects

7. Non-Eligible Activities

The following shall NOT be considered:

- Routine committee work claimed under D3.2.2
- Formal leadership appointments claimed under D3.2.1
- NAAC/NBA/NIRF/IQAC activities claimed under D3.3.1
- Policy drafting claimed under D3.3.3
- Routine operational responsibilities
- Duplicate claims

8. Scoring Methodology

Contribution Weightage

Role	Weight
Lead / Project Coordinator	1.50
Core Team Member	1.00
Member / Contributor	0.50

Institutional Transformation Score (ITS)

$$ITS = (LI \times 1.50) + (CT \times 1.00) + (MC \times 0.50)$$

Where:

- **LI** = Lead/Project Coordinator roles
- **CT** = Core Team Member roles
- **MC** = Member/Contributor roles

Scoring Bands

ITS	Marks Awarded
≥ 3.0	1.0
1.5 – 2.99	0.75
0.5 – 1.49	0.50
0.1 – 0.49	0.25
0	0

9. Rejection Conditions

A submission may be rejected if:

- The initiative cannot be verified.
- The applicant's contribution cannot be established.
- Evidence appears altered or fabricated.
- Duplicate claims are detected.
- The activity represents routine administrative work rather than institutional transformation.

Examples of Strong Claims

- ERP implementation across the institution
- Digital transformation projects
- Establishment of a new research centre
- Institution-wide automation initiatives
- Student success and retention improvement systems
- Research ecosystem development programmes

***** End of Domain 3.2 *****

==========

D3.3 — Accreditation, Quality & Academic Governance Contribution (30)

D3.3.1 Contribution to Accreditation, Rankings & Quality Assurance Activities

Maximum Marks: 7
Evidence: Official assignment orders, committee orders, accreditation/ranking reports, institutional records

1. Objective
To assess faculty contributions toward institutional quality assurance, accreditation, ranking exercises, academic audits, and continuous improvement initiatives that enhance institutional reputation and performance.
This metric recognizes faculty members who actively contribute to quality-related activities beyond their routine academic responsibilities.

2. Scope of Assessment
This metric evaluates contributions related to:

- NAAC accreditation activities
- NBA accreditation activities
- NIRF submissions
- IQAC activities
- QS/THE ranking exercises
- ABET accreditation activities
- Academic and administrative audits
- Internal quality assurance initiatives
- Institutional ranking and benchmarking exercises
- Continuous quality improvement activities

Only officially assigned and verifiable contributions during the assessment period shall be considered.

3. Questionnaire

Question Code	Question	Response Type	Evidence Required
D3.3.1-Q1	Enter the total number of accreditation, ranking, audit, or quality assurance activities in which you served as Institutional Coordinator, Criterion Lead, SAR/SSR Lead, or equivalent lead role during the assessment period.	Numeric	Official assignment order
D3.3.1-Q2	Enter the total number of accreditation, ranking, audit, or quality assurance activities in which you served as Core Team Member during the assessment period.	Numeric	Committee order / official assignment
D3.3.1-Q3	Enter the total number of accreditation, ranking, audit, or quality assurance activities in which you contributed as Member/Supporting Contributor during the assessment period.	Numeric	Committee order / official assignment

4. Verification Methodology
Automated/System-Based Verification
The institutional system may:

- Verify committee assignments.
- Validate accreditation and ranking records.

- Match applicant identity with institutional documentation.
- Detect duplicate claims.
- Verify activity timelines.

5. Validation Conditions

A contribution shall be considered valid if:

- The activity was officially assigned, The applicant's role can be established.
- Documentary evidence exists.
- The activity falls within the assessment period.

6. Eligible Activities

Examples include:

Accreditation

- NAAC
- NBA
- ABET
- AACSB
- International accreditation exercises

Rankings

- NIRF
- QS Rankings
- Times Higher Education (THE)
- Subject-specific ranking exercises

Quality Assurance

- IQAC initiatives
- Academic audits
- Administrative audits
- Internal quality reviews
- Quality benchmarking exercises

7. Non-Eligible Activities

The following shall NOT be considered:

- Formal administrative appointments claimed under D3.2.1
- Routine committee activities claimed under D3.2.2
- Institutional transformation initiatives claimed under D3.2.3
- Policy drafting claimed under D3.3.3
- Routine teaching activities
- Duplicate claims

8. Scoring Methodology

Contribution Weightage

Role	Weight
Institutional Coordinator / Criterion Lead / SAR-SSR Lead	1.50
Core Team Member	1.00
Member / Supporting Contributor	0.50

Quality Contribution Score (QCS)

$$QCS = (LR \times 1.50) + (CT \times 1.00) + (MC \times 0.50)$$

Where:

- **LR** = Lead Roles
- **CT** = Core Team Roles
- **MC** = Member/Contributor Roles

Scoring Bands

QCS	Marks Awarded
≥ 3.0	1.0
1.5 – 2.99	0.75
0.5 – 1.49	0.50
0.1 – 0.49	0.25
0	0

9. Rejection Conditions

A submission may be rejected if:

- The assignment cannot be verified.
- The applicant's role cannot be established.
- Duplicate claims are detected.
- Evidence appears altered or fabricated.
- The activity represents routine administrative work without a quality assurance component.

10. Anti-Redundancy Rule

This indicator recognizes **quality assurance, accreditation, ranking, and audit-related contributions**.

The same activity shall not be claimed under:

- D3.2.1 Leadership & Administrative Responsibilities Held
- D3.2.2 Institutional Committees, Events & Operational Responsibilities
- D3.2.3 Contribution to Institutional Transformation Initiatives
- D3.3.3 Policy Development & Institutional Documentation Support

Only accreditation, ranking, audit, and quality assurance activities shall be considered under this indicator.

Examples

Eligible Claim	Indicator
NAAC Criterion Coordinator	D3.3.1
NBA SAR Preparation Team	D3.3.1
NIRF Data Submission Coordinator	D3.3.1
IQAC Academic Audit Team	D3.3.1
QS/THE Ranking Team Member	D3.3.1

D3.3.2 Participation in Academic Governance Bodies of Other Institutions

Maximum Marks: 15
Evidence: Appointment letters, meeting invitations, BoS minutes, Academic Council records, official nomination orders

1. Objective

To assess faculty recognition and contribution through participation in academic governance bodies of other institutions, universities, professional organizations, and regulatory academic structures.
This metric recognizes external academic standing and peer recognition reflected through invitations and appointments to academic decision-making bodies.

2. Scope of Assessment

This metric evaluates participation in:

- Board of Studies (BoS)
- Academic Council
- Senate
- Faculty Boards
- Curriculum Committees
- Research Advisory Boards
- Doctoral Committees
- Academic Review Committees
- University-level academic bodies
- National academic governance panels

Only formally constituted bodies external to the applicant's parent institution shall be considered.

3. Questionnaire

Question Code	Question	Response Type	Evidence Required
D3.3.2-Q1	Enter the total number of appointments to academic governance bodies of other institutions/universities during the assessment period.	Numeric	Appointment letter / nomination order
D3.3.2-Q2	Enter the total number of meetings attended as part of these academic governance bodies during the assessment period.	Numeric	Meeting minutes / attendance record / invitation
D3.3.2-Q3	Upload supporting evidence for the highest-level academic governance role claimed.	Attachment	Appointment letter / official record

4. Verification Methodology

Automated/System-Based Verification
The institutional system may:

- Verify appointment records.
- Validate external institutional affiliations.
- Verify meeting participation records.
- Detect duplicate claims.

- Match applicant identity with official documents.

5. Validation Conditions

A contribution shall be considered valid if:

- The appointment is external to the applicant's parent institution.
- Documentary evidence exists.
- The applicant's role can be verified.
- The appointment falls within the assessment period.

6. Eligible Activities

University-Level Governance

- Academic Council Member
- Senate Member
- Faculty Board Member
- Research Board Member

Curriculum Governance

- Board of Studies Member
- Board of Studies Chairman
- Curriculum Review Committee Member

Research Governance

- Doctoral Committee Member
- Research Advisory Board Member
- University Research Committee Member

National/Professional Academic Bodies

- Academic panels constituted by universities or recognized academic organizations
- National curriculum committees
- Regulatory academic working groups

7. Non-Eligible Activities

The following shall NOT be considered:

- Internal committees of the applicant's own institution
- Guest lectures
- Conference participation
- Editorial boards
- Reviewer activities
- Professional society memberships
- Activities already claimed under Domain 2
- Informal advisory roles without formal appointment

8. Scoring Methodology

Appointment Weightage

Appointment Type	Weight
Academic Council / Senate / University-Level Governing Body	2.00
Board of Studies Chairman / Research Board Member	1.50
Board of Studies Member / Academic Committee Member	1.00

Academic Governance Score (AGS)

$$AGS = (UGB \times 2.00) + (RB \times 1.50) + (BM \times 1.00)$$

Where:

- **UGB** = University-level governing body appointments
- **RB** = Research Board/BoS Chair appointments
- **BM** = BoS/Academic Committee memberships

Participation Adjustment

To ensure active involvement:

$$Final\ AGS = AGS \times Participation\ Factor$$

Meetings Attended	Participation Factor
1–2	0.75
3–5	1.00
>5	1.25

Scoring Bands

Final AGS	Marks Awarded
≥ 3.0	1.0
2.0 – 2.99	0.75
1.0 – 1.99	0.50
0.1 – 0.99	0.25
0	0

9. Rejection Conditions

A submission may be rejected if:

- The appointment cannot be verified.
- The role is internal to the applicant's own institution.
- Meeting participation cannot be established where claimed.
- Evidence appears altered or fabricated.
- Duplicate claims are detected.

10. Anti-Redundancy Rule

This indicator recognizes **external academic governance appointments and participation**. The same activity shall not be claimed under:

- D2.4 Professional Recognition & Academic Engagement
- D3.2 Institutional Responsibilities & Leadership
- D3.3.1 Accreditation, Rankings & Quality Assurance Activities
- D3.3.3 Policy Development & Institutional Documentation Support

Only formal participation in academic governance bodies external to the applicant's institution shall be considered under this indicator.

Examples

Activity	Eligible
External BoS Member of another autonomous college	Yes
Academic Council Member of another university	Yes
Senate Member of a university	Yes

Activity	Eligible
Doctoral Committee Member (external university)	Yes
Internal BoS Member of own institution	No
Reviewer for a journal	No
Editorial Board Member	No

D3.3.3 Policy Development & Institutional Documentation Support

Maximum Marks: 8
Evidence: Approved policy documents, institutional manuals, official reports, committee orders, approval records

1. Objective

To assess faculty contributions toward the development of institutional policies, governance frameworks, strategic documents, and quality-related documentation that support institutional planning, compliance, and continuous improvement.
This metric recognizes contributions that shape institutional systems, procedures, and governance practices.

2. Scope of Assessment

This metric evaluates contributions related to:

- Policy formulation
- Institutional manual development
- Governance framework development
- Strategic planning documents
- Quality assurance documentation
- Regulatory compliance documentation
- Institutional process documentation
- Academic and administrative procedure manuals

Only officially approved or formally submitted institutional documents shall be considered.

3. Questionnaire

Question Code	Question	Response Type	Evidence Required
D3.3.3-Q1	Enter the total number of institutional policies, regulations, or governance frameworks developed as Lead Author/Coordinator during the assessment period.	Numeric	Approved policy document / approval record
D3.3.3-Q2	Enter the total number of institutional manuals, strategic documents, SSR/SAR/AQAR reports, or quality documentation developed as Lead Author/Coordinator during the assessment period.	Numeric	Approved document / submission record

Question Code	Question	Response Type	Evidence Required
D3.3.3-Q3	Enter the total number of such documents in which you contributed as Core Team Member or Contributor during the assessment period.	Numeric	Committee order / contribution record

4. Verification Methodology

Automated/System-Based Verification

The institutional system may:

- Verify document approval records.
- Validate authorship or committee membership.
- Match applicant identity with official documents.
- Detect duplicate claims.
- Verify submission or approval dates.

5. Validation Conditions

A contribution shall be considered valid if:

- The document is officially approved, adopted, or formally submitted.
- The applicant's role can be established.
- The document falls within the assessment period.
- Supporting records are verifiable.

6. Eligible Activities

Policy Development

- Research Policy
- Consultancy Policy
- IPR Policy
- HR Policy
- Examination Policy
- Academic Integrity Policy
- Innovation & Startup Policy

Institutional Documentation

- SSR
- SAR
- AQAR
- Strategic Plan
- Perspective Plan
- Institutional Quality Manual
- Academic Manual
- Process Manuals
- Governance Handbooks

Governance Frameworks

- Academic Regulations Framework
- Quality Assurance Frameworks
- Institutional Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs)
- Compliance Frameworks

7. Non-Eligible Activities

The following shall NOT be considered:

- Routine meeting minutes
- Event reports
- Department annual reports
- Routine data compilation
- Committee activities already claimed under D3.2.2
- Accreditation activities already claimed under D3.3.1
- Academic programme/course development claimed under D3.1
- Duplicate claims

8. Scoring Methodology

Contribution Weightage

Role	Weight
Lead Author / Coordinator	1.50
Core Team Member	1.00
Contributor / Supporting Member	0.50

Policy & Documentation Score (PDS)

$$PDS = (LA \times 1.50) + (CT \times 1.00) + (CN \times 0.50)$$

Where:

- **LA** = Lead Author/Coordinator roles
- **CT** = Core Team Member roles
- **CN** = Contributor roles

Scoring Bands

PDS	Marks Awarded
≥ 3.0	1.0
1.5 – 2.99	0.75
0.5 – 1.49	0.50
0.1 – 0.49	0.25
0	0

9. Rejection Conditions

A submission may be rejected if:

- The document cannot be verified.
- The applicant's contribution cannot be established.
- The document lacks institutional approval or formal submission.
- Evidence appears altered or fabricated.
- Duplicate claims are detected.

Examples of Strong Claims

Lead author of Research Policy - Yes
Coordinator for Institutional Strategic Plan - Yes
Lead contributor for AQAR preparation - Yes
Lead author of IPR Policy - Yes
Coordinator for Institutional Quality Manual - Yes
Department annual report preparation - No
Event report preparation - No
Routine committee minutes - No
Data entry work for accreditation exercises - No

***** End of Domain 3 *****

14. Annexure – 4: Rubrics for Domain 4

DOMAIN 4 — Professionalism & Social Responsibility (100 Marks)			
SD	**Subdomain**	**Type**	**Score**
D4.1	Professionalism, Inclusivity & Student Wellbeing	Qn	35
D4.2	Community Engagement, Sustainability & Social Impact	Qn	65

D4.1 — Professionalism, Inclusivity & Student Wellbeing (35)

4.1.1 RKIP Faculty Integrity & Compliance Declaration

Category: Mandatory Compliance Requirement
Scoring: 10 Mark for complete "Yes" answered (binary condition)

1. Objective
To ensure that applicants uphold professional, ethical, and academic standards expected of higher education faculty members.
This declaration serves as a compliance and integrity check and is not included in the RKIP score calculation.

2. Declaration Questionnaire

Question Code	Question	Response Type
FIC-Q1	Have you been subjected to any proven disciplinary action by your institution during the assessment period?	Yes / No
FIC-Q2	Have you been found guilty of proven plagiarism, research misconduct, or publication malpractice during the assessment period?	Yes / No
FIC-Q3	Have you been subjected to any proven examination malpractice, academic fraud, or serious violation of institutional regulations during the assessment period?	Yes / No
FIC-Q4	Do you declare that the information submitted in this application is true and accurate to the best of your knowledge?	Yes / No

3. Applicant Declaration
The applicant shall certify that:
"I hereby declare that all information submitted under RKIP is true, complete, and supported by authentic evidence. I understand that any false claim, fabricated evidence, or deliberate misrepresentation may result in rejection of my application and future disqualification from assessment."

4. Verification Methodology
Verification may be conducted through:

- Institutional records
- Documentary review
- Third-party verification where applicable
- Random audit by RKIP administrators

5. Review Conditions
Applications may be flagged for manual review if:

- Any response is marked "Yes".
- Contradictory evidence is identified.
- Fabricated or altered documents are suspected.
- Significant discrepancies are detected during verification.

D4.1.2 — Student Support, Counselling & Wellbeing Activities

Maximum Marks: 10
Intent:
To recognize faculty members who provide meaningful support, guidance, counselling, or wellbeing assistance to students **beyond their formally assigned mentees, research scholars, project students, or course responsibilities.**

Eligible Examples
Student Support Beyond Assigned Wards

- Counselling students from other departments
- Supporting students not formally assigned as mentees
- Career guidance provided to institution-wide student groups
- Assisting students facing academic, personal, financial, or adjustment challenges
- Supporting first-year students during transition programmes
- Serving as student welfare volunteers
- Conducting wellbeing sessions open to all students
- Providing support during crisis situations

Institution-Level Student Support

- Student welfare initiatives
- Open counselling programmes
- Special support camps
- Examination stress management sessions
- Personal development programmes

Not Eligible

- Regular mentor-mentee meetings
- Assigned faculty advisor duties
- Academic counselling of officially allotted mentees
- Research scholar supervision
- Project supervision
- Course-related academic guidance
- Activities already claimed under Domain 1

Questionnaire
D4.1.2-Q1
How many student support, counselling, or wellbeing activities were conducted for students beyond your officially assigned mentees, research scholars, or course responsibilities during the assessment period?
Response Type: Numeric
Evidence:

- Programme report
- Attendance record
- Circular
- Activity certificate

D4.1.2-Q2
How many institution-level student welfare, counselling, or wellbeing initiatives did you coordinate or actively support during the assessment period?
Response Type: Numeric
Evidence:

- Appointment order
- Programme report
- Official assignment

D4.1.2-Q3
Upload evidence of the most significant student support or wellbeing activity claimed.
Response Type: Attachment

Scoring

Verified Contribution	Marks
Significant institution-wide or multi-department contribution (≥5 activities)	10
3–4 verified activities	7.5
1–2 verified activities	5
Limited but verifiable contribution	2.5
No valid evidence	0

D4.1.3 Responsible Academic & Research Practices

Maximum Marks: 15
Evidence: Plagiarism reports, ethics approvals, examination-related assignments, awareness programme records, policy implementation records

1. Objective
To assess faculty contributions toward promoting academic integrity, ethical research conduct, fair assessment practices, and responsible scholarly behaviour within the institution. This indicator rewards faculty who actively support and strengthen integrity systems rather than merely complying with regulations.

2. Scope of Assessment
This metric evaluates contributions related to:

- Academic integrity promotion
- Research ethics awareness
- Plagiarism prevention initiatives
- Responsible use of AI in education and research
- Examination integrity processes
- Ethics committee participation
- Research ethics training programmes
- Academic misconduct prevention activities

3. Questionnaire

Question Code	Question	Response Type	Evidence Required
Q1	How many academic integrity, research ethics, plagiarism awareness, or responsible AI awareness programmes did you organize or deliver during the assessment period?	Numeric	Programme report / certificate
Q2	How many institutional responsibilities related to academic integrity, examination integrity, ethics review, plagiarism screening, or research compliance did you hold during the assessment period?	Numeric	Appointment order / official assignment
Q3	Upload supporting evidence for the most significant activity claimed.	Attachment	Report / order / certificate

4. Verification Methodology

The system may verify:

- Programme reports
- Official assignments
- Ethics committee records
- Examination committee assignments
- Plagiarism awareness activities
- Institutional notifications

5. Eligible Activities

Academic Integrity

- Plagiarism awareness workshops
- Academic integrity training
- Responsible use of AI workshops
- Research ethics awareness programmes

Institutional Responsibilities

- Research Ethics Committee member
- Ethics Review Board member
- Academic Integrity Committee member
- Examination malpractice prevention committee
- Plagiarism screening coordinator

Compliance Promotion

- Development of integrity guidelines
- Awareness campaigns
- Faculty/student training on ethical practices

6. Non-Eligible Activities

- Mere absence of disciplinary action
- Regular invigilation duty
- Routine question paper setting
- Regular evaluation work

- Activities already claimed under accreditation or governance indicators
- Personal declarations without evidence

7. Scoring Methodology

Verified Contribution Level	Marks
Major institutional contribution (multiple activities and responsibilities)	15
Significant contribution	10
Moderate contribution	7
Limited but verifiable contribution	5
No valid evidence	0

***** End of Domain 4.1 *****

==========

D4.2 — Community Engagement, Sustainability & Social Impact (65)

D4.2.1 Participation in Outreach, Community Engagement, NSS, NCC & Social Service Activities

Maximum Marks: 35
Evidence: Programme reports, participation certificates, activity brochures, official orders, photographs, beneficiary records

1. Objective
To assess faculty contributions toward community engagement, social responsibility, outreach programmes, and nation-building activities conducted through institutional, governmental, or societal platforms.
This indicator recognizes faculty members who actively contribute to community welfare and public engagement beyond their regular academic responsibilities.

2. Scope of Assessment
This metric evaluates participation in:

- NSS activities
- NCC activities
- Community outreach programmes
- Social service initiatives
- Village adoption programmes
- School outreach programmes
- Health and awareness campaigns
- Literacy and digital literacy initiatives
- Skill development programmes for the community
- Community development activities
- Government-sponsored outreach programmes
- Extension activities conducted through the institution

Only activities conducted during the assessment period shall be considered.

3. Questionnaire

Question Code	Question	Response Type	Evidence Required
D4.2.1-Q1	Enter the total number of outreach, community engagement, NSS, NCC, extension, or social service activities in which you served as Coordinator/Programme Officer/Lead during the assessment period.	Numeric	Official order / programme report
D4.2.1-Q2	Enter the total number of outreach, community engagement, NSS, NCC, extension, or social service activities in which you actively participated during the assessment period.	Numeric	Certificate / report / attendance record
D4.2.1-Q3	Upload supporting evidence for the most significant outreach or community engagement activity claimed.	Attachment	Programme report / certificate / brochure

4. Verification Methodology

The system may verify:

- Activity reports
- Programme brochures
- Official assignment orders
- Participation certificates
- Event photographs
- Beneficiary details (where available)

AI-assisted verification may be used to identify activity type, dates, institutional affiliation, and applicant participation.

5. Validation Conditions

A contribution shall be considered valid if:

- The activity has a community, social, or public engagement component.
- The applicant's role can be verified.
- Documentary evidence exists.
- The activity falls within the assessment period.

6. Eligible Activities

NSS & NCC

- NSS Special Camps
- NSS Regular Activities
- NCC Camps
- NCC Community Programmes

Community Outreach

- Village adoption activities
- School outreach programmes
- Community awareness campaigns
- Public education programmes

Social Service

- Blood donation camps
- Health awareness programmes
- Environmental awareness campaigns
- Disaster relief activities
- Community welfare programmes

Skill & Knowledge Transfer

- Digital literacy programmes
- Skill development workshops
- Technology awareness programmes
- Career guidance programmes for school students

7. Non-Eligible Activities

- Regular classroom teaching
- Department-level student activities only
- Internal institutional meetings
- Research projects already claimed under Domain 2
- Curriculum-related activities already claimed under Domain 3
- Duplicate claims under other RKIP indicators

8. Scoring Methodology

Outreach Contribution Score (OCS)

Leadership Role Weight

Role	Weight
Coordinator / Programme Officer / Lead	2.0
Active Participant	1.0

$$OCS = (LeadActivities \times 2.0) + (ParticipantActivities \times 1.0)$$

Scoring Bands

OCS	Marks Awarded
≥ 8	35
5 – 7.99	25
2 – 4.99	15
1 – 1.99	5
0	0

9. Rejection Conditions

A submission may be rejected if:

- The activity cannot be verified.
- The applicant's role cannot be established.
- Evidence appears altered or fabricated.
- Duplicate claims are detected.
- The activity lacks a genuine community engagement component.

10. Anti-Redundancy Rule

This indicator recognizes **community-facing outreach and social service activities**.

The same activity shall not be claimed under:

- D4.2.2 Sustainability & Green Campus Initiatives
- D4.2.3 Community Development & Social Impact Initiatives
- Any teaching, research, or governance indicator under Domains 1–3

Only activities involving direct community engagement, outreach, extension, or social service shall be considered under this indicator.

Examples

Activity	Eligible
NSS Special Camp Coordinator	Yes
NCC Community Service Programme	Yes
Village Adoption Activity	Yes
Digital Literacy Camp for Public	Yes
Blood Donation Camp Coordinator	Yes
Internal Student Orientation Programme	No
Regular Classroom Teaching	No
Research Project Activity	No

D4.2.2 Contribution to Sustainability & Green Campus Initiatives

Maximum Marks: 15
Evidence: Activity reports, implementation records, certificates, official orders, project reports, audit records

1. Objective

To assess faculty contributions toward environmental sustainability, resource conservation, green campus development, and sustainable institutional practices.
This indicator recognizes faculty members who actively contribute to making the institution and surrounding community more environmentally responsible and sustainable.

2. Scope of Assessment

This metric evaluates contributions related to:

- Green campus initiatives
- Energy conservation programmes
- Water conservation initiatives
- Waste management initiatives
- Plastic-free campus programmes
- Tree plantation drives
- Biodiversity conservation activities
- Renewable energy awareness programmes
- Environmental sustainability campaigns
- Green audit support activities
- Sustainable campus development projects

Only activities conducted during the assessment period shall be considered.

3. Questionnaire

Question Code	Question	Response Type	Evidence Required
D4.2.2-Q1	Enter the total number of sustainability or green campus initiatives in which you served as Coordinator/Lead during the assessment period.	Numeric	Official order / activity report
D4.2.2-Q2	Enter the total number of sustainability or green campus initiatives in which you actively participated during the assessment period.	Numeric	Certificate / report / participation record
D4.2.2-Q3	Upload supporting evidence for the most significant sustainability or green campus initiative claimed.	Attachment	Project report / certificate / implementation record

4. Verification Methodology

The system may verify:

- Activity reports
- Institutional orders
- Green audit records
- Sustainability project reports
- Certificates
- Photographic evidence
- Implementation documents

AI-assisted verification may be used to identify sustainability-related activities and validate participation.

5. Validation Conditions

A contribution shall be considered valid if:

- The activity directly contributes to sustainability or environmental responsibility.
- The applicant's role can be established.
- Documentary evidence exists.
- The activity falls within the assessment period.

6. Eligible Activities

Green Campus Initiatives

- Plastic-free campus campaigns
- Campus greening programmes
- Green audit activities
- Environmental awareness programmes

Resource Conservation

- Water conservation initiatives
- Energy conservation programmes
- Waste reduction initiatives
- Recycling campaigns

Environmental Sustainability

- Tree plantation drives
- Biodiversity conservation activities

- Environmental protection campaigns
- Renewable energy awareness programmes

Sustainable Development Projects

- Sustainable infrastructure initiatives
- Eco-friendly campus projects
- Environmental monitoring programmes

7. Non-Eligible Activities

- Routine participation without evidence
- Research publications on sustainability (claim under Domain 2)
- Sustainability-related curriculum development (claim under Domain 3)
- Classroom teaching on sustainability topics
- Duplicate claims under other RKIP indicators

8. Scoring Methodology

Sustainability Contribution Score (SCS)

Role Weightage

Role	Weight
Coordinator / Lead	2.0
Active Participant	1.0

$$SCS = (LeadActivities \times 2.0) + (ParticipantActivities \times 1.0)$$

Scoring Bands

SCS	Marks Awarded
≥ 4	15
2 – 3.99	10
1 – 1.99	5
0.1 – 0.99	2.5
0	0

Examples

Activity	Eligible
Green Campus Coordinator	Yes
Green Audit Team Member	Yes
Tree Plantation Programme Lead	Yes
Plastic-Free Campus Initiative	Yes
Water Conservation Campaign	Yes
Sustainability Research Publication	No
Classroom Teaching on SDGs	No
Curriculum Revision Including Sustainability Topics	No

D4.2.3 Community Development & Social Impact Initiatives

Type: Hybrid (Hy)
Maximum Marks: 15
Evidence: Project reports, beneficiary records, official certificates, implementation reports, institutional records

1. Objective
To assess faculty contributions toward community development, social impact, capacity building, and societal improvement initiatives that create measurable benefits for individuals, communities, schools, villages, industries, or public institutions.
This indicator recognizes faculty efforts that extend institutional expertise beyond campus and generate tangible societal impact.

2. Scope of Assessment
This metric evaluates contributions related to:

- Community development projects
- Rural development initiatives
- School adoption programmes
- Village adoption programmes
- Skill development programmes for the public
- Women empowerment initiatives
- Youth development initiatives
- Digital literacy programmes
- Community technology transfer initiatives
- Health and wellbeing awareness programmes
- Social innovation projects
- Public capacity-building programmes

Only activities implemented during the assessment period shall be considered.

3. Questionnaire

Question Code	Question	Response Type	Evidence Required
D4.2.3-Q1	Enter the total number of community development or social impact projects in which you served as Project Lead/Coordinator during the assessment period.	Numeric	Project report / official order
D4.2.3-Q2	Enter the approximate total number of external beneficiaries directly reached through the above initiatives during the assessment period.	Numeric	Beneficiary records / attendance records / reports
D4.2.3-Q3	Upload supporting evidence for the most significant community development or social impact initiative claimed.	Attachment	Project report / certificate / implementation record

4. Verification Methodology
The system may verify:

- Project reports

- Beneficiary records
- Institutional approvals
- Government or NGO collaboration documents
- Programme completion reports
- Participation records

AI-assisted verification may identify project type, beneficiary reach, implementation status, and faculty role.

5. Validation Conditions

A contribution shall be considered valid if:

- The initiative has a clearly identifiable community or societal beneficiary.
- The applicant's contribution can be verified.
- Documentary evidence exists.
- The activity falls within the assessment period.

6. Eligible Activities

Community Development

- Village development projects
- School improvement programmes
- Community infrastructure support initiatives
- Rural technology deployment

Capacity Building

- Public skill development programmes
- Digital literacy campaigns
- Financial literacy programmes
- Entrepreneurship awareness programmes

Social Impact

- Women empowerment programmes
- Youth development initiatives
- Community wellbeing programmes
- Health awareness campaigns

Technology Transfer

- Deployment of appropriate technologies for community use
- Community innovation projects
- Low-cost engineering solutions for local problems

7. Non-Eligible Activities

- Research publications (Domain 2)
- Funded research projects already claimed under D2.2
- Curriculum or course development (Domain 3)
- Regular classroom teaching (Domain 1)
- One-time awareness programmes without identifiable beneficiaries
- Duplicate claims under other indicators

8. Scoring Methodology

Social Impact Score (SIS)

Project Leadership

Role	Weight
Project Lead / Coordinator	2.0
Project Team Member	1.0

Beneficiary Reach Factor

Beneficiaries Reached	Factor
< 50	1.0
50–199	1.25
200–499	1.50
≥ 500	2.0

$$SIS = Project\ Weight \times Beneficiary\ Factor$$

Scoring Bands

SIS	Marks Awarded
≥ 4.0	15
3.0 – 3.99	10
2.0 – 2.99	5
1.0 – 1.99	2.5
0	0

***** End of Domain 4 *****

16. Annexure – 5: Rubrics for Domain 5

DOMAIN 5 — Digital & Future Readiness (100 Marks)			
SD	**Subdomain**	**Type**	**Score**
D5.1	Digital Teaching, AI Integration & Learning Analytics	Qn	65
D5.2	Emerging Technologies, Education 5.0 & Global Readiness	Qn	35

D5.1 — Digital Teaching, AI Integration & Learning Analytics (65)

D5.1.1 Use of AI Tools in Teaching-Learning Practices

Maximum Marks: 40
Evidence: AI-generated learning resources, course materials, assessment designs, AI-assisted teaching records, screenshots, LMS records, demonstration documents

1. Objective
To assess the meaningful integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools into teaching-learning processes for enhancing content development, student engagement, assessment, feedback, personalization, and academic productivity.
This indicator recognizes faculty members who effectively utilize AI tools to improve learning outcomes and teaching effectiveness.

2. Scope of Assessment
This metric evaluates the academic use of AI tools such as:

- ChatGPT
- Microsoft Copilot
- Google Gemini
- NotebookLM
- Claude
- Perplexity
- AI-powered LMS tools
- AI-based content creation tools
- AI-assisted assessment tools
- AI-powered tutoring or feedback systems

Only academic applications related to teaching-learning shall be considered.

3. Questionnaire
D5.1.1-Q1
In how many courses/subjects did you meaningfully integrate AI tools into teaching-learning activities during the assessment period?
Response Type: Numeric
Evidence:

- Course materials
- LMS screenshots
- Lesson plans
- Activity records

D5.1.1-Q2
Select the AI-supported teaching-learning activities implemented during the assessment period.
Response Type: Multiple Selection

- AI-assisted content preparation
- AI-assisted lesson planning
- AI-generated quizzes/assessments
- AI-supported student assignments
- AI-assisted feedback generation
- AI-supported personalized learning activities
- AI-assisted project guidance
- AI-powered academic tutoring
- AI literacy training for students
- Other (specify)

Evidence:

- Sample outputs
- Screenshots
- Course records

D5.1.1-Q3
Upload ONE representative evidence document demonstrating your most significant AI-enabled teaching practice.
Response Type: Attachment
Examples:

- AI-generated learning module
- AI-assisted assignment design
- AI-based student activity
- AI-enabled assessment workflow
- AI literacy workshop material

4. Verification Methodology
The system may verify:

- Presence of AI-generated artefacts
- Course integration evidence
- LMS records
- Teaching materials
- Student activity documentation
- AI tool references

AI-assisted document analysis may be used to identify the nature and extent of AI integration.

5. Validation Conditions
A contribution shall be considered valid if:

- AI usage is linked to teaching-learning activities.
- Documentary evidence exists.
- The applicant's role can be established.
- The activity occurred during the assessment period.

6. Eligible Practices

Content Development

- AI-assisted lecture notes
- AI-generated case studies
- AI-generated learning resources
- AI-assisted question banks

Teaching Support

- AI-assisted lesson planning
- AI-supported classroom activities
- AI-enhanced student engagement

Assessment & Feedback

- AI-generated quizzes
- AI-assisted rubric preparation
- AI-supported formative assessment
- AI-assisted feedback systems

Student Learning Support

- AI tutoring activities
- AI literacy programmes
- AI-supported project mentoring
- AI-assisted self-learning activities

7. Non-Eligible Practices

- Mere attendance in AI FDPs or workshops (claim under D2)
- General awareness of AI tools
- Personal use unrelated to teaching
- AI use without evidence of classroom implementation
- Duplicate claims under other indicators

8. Scoring Methodology

AI Integration Score (AIS)

Course Adoption Score

Courses with Verified AI Integration	**Score**
5 or more	20
3–4	15
1–2	10
None	0

AI Practice Diversity Score

Verified AI Activities Implemented	**Score**
5 or more categories	20
3–4 categories	15
1–2 categories	10
None	0

Final Score

$$AIS = Course\ with\ AI\ Adoption\ Score + AI\ Practice\ Diversity\ Score$$

Maximum = **40 Marks**

Examples

Activity	Eligible
Using ChatGPT to create course-specific case studies	Yes
AI-generated formative quizzes used in class	Yes
NotebookLM-based student learning activity	Yes
AI-assisted personalized feedback for assignments	Yes
Attending an AI FDP	No
Publishing an AI research paper	No
Simply having a ChatGPT account	No

D5.1.2 Learning Analytics & Data-Driven Student Support

Maximum Marks: 15
Evidence: Analytics reports, result analysis reports, slow learner identification records, intervention reports, LMS reports, performance tracking records

1. Objective

To assess the use of learner data, academic performance data, attendance data, assessment analytics, or LMS analytics to identify student learning needs and implement targeted academic support interventions.
This indicator recognizes faculty members who use evidence-based approaches rather than intuition alone to support student success.

2. Scope of Assessment

This metric evaluates:

- Student performance analysis
- Assessment analytics
- Attendance analytics
- LMS learning analytics
- Slow learner identification
- Advanced learner identification
- At-risk student identification
- Remedial intervention planning
- Data-driven academic counselling
- Outcome improvement initiatives

Only activities conducted during the assessment period shall be considered.

3. Questionnaire

D5.1.2-Q1

In how many courses did you perform documented student performance analysis and implement corrective academic interventions during the assessment period?

Response Type: Numeric

Evidence:

- Result analysis report
- Course outcome analysis
- Remedial action records
- Intervention reports

D5.1.2-Q2

Which of the following data sources were used to support student interventions?

Response Type: Multiple Selection

- Internal assessment results
- End-semester examination performance
- Attendance analysis
- LMS analytics
- Course Outcome (CO) attainment analysis
- Student engagement metrics
- Assignment performance analysis
- Learning behaviour analytics
- Other (specify)

Evidence:

- Analytics report
- Dashboard screenshot
- Analysis document

D5.1.2-Q3

Upload ONE representative evidence document demonstrating a data-driven student support intervention implemented by you.

Response Type: Attachment

Examples:

- Slow learner intervention report
- CO attainment improvement action plan
- Attendance-based counselling record
- Learning analytics report

4. Verification Methodology

The system may verify:

- Performance analysis reports
- CO attainment reports
- Remedial action documentation
- Student intervention records
- LMS analytics screenshots
- Attendance analysis reports

AI-assisted review may identify:

- existence of analytics,
- intervention actions,
- student support evidence,
- outcome improvement plans.

5. Validation Conditions

A contribution shall be considered valid if:

- Student-related data was analyzed.
- An intervention or support action followed the analysis.
- Documentary evidence exists.
- The activity falls within the assessment period.

6. Eligible Practices

Academic Analytics

- Course result analysis
- CO attainment analysis
- Assessment performance analysis
- Question-wise analysis

Student Monitoring

- Slow learner identification
- Advanced learner identification
- Attendance-based interventions
- Student progression tracking

Digital Analytics

- Moodle analytics
- Google Classroom analytics
- LMS dashboards
- Online learning engagement analysis

Academic Interventions

- Remedial coaching
- Targeted mentoring
- Improvement plans
- Academic counselling based on evidence

7. Non-Eligible Practices

- Preparing result analysis reports without any intervention
- Routine examination work
- General mentoring without supporting data
- Unsupported claims of student counselling
- Activities already claimed under D1 mentoring indicators

8. Scoring Methodology
Learning Analytics Score (LAS)
Course Coverage Score

Courses with Verified Analytics-Based Interventions	Score
5 or more	15
3–4	10
1–2	5
None	0

Analytics Diversity Score

Types of Analytics Used	Score
5 or more	15
3–4	10
1–2	5
None	0

Final Score

$$LAS = \frac{Course\ Coverage\ Score + Analytics\ Diversity\ Score}{2}$$

Maximum = 15 Marks

D5.1.3 Development of Digital Learning Resources using AI

Maximum Marks: 10
Evidence: LMS records, digital learning resources, recorded lectures, course webpages, MOOCs, e-content links, online course records

1. Objective
To assess faculty contributions toward the development, deployment, and effective use of digital learning resources and online/blended learning environments that enhance student access, engagement, and self-directed learning.
This indicator recognizes faculty members who create and utilize digital educational resources beyond routine classroom teaching.

2. Scope of Assessment
This metric evaluates:

- Digital learning resources
- Recorded lecture content
- LMS-based course delivery
- Online learning modules
- Blended learning practices
- Flipped classroom resources
- MOOCs and self-learning resources
- Interactive digital content
- Digital assessment resources

- Online student engagement platforms

Only activities conducted during the assessment period shall be considered.

3. Questionnaire

D5.1.3-Q1

In how many courses did you provide structured digital learning resources for student learning during the assessment period?

Response Type: Numeric

Evidence:

- LMS screenshots
- Course pages
- Learning resource repositories
- Course records

D5.1.3-Q2

Select the digital learning resources developed and/or deployed by you during the assessment period.

Response Type: Multiple Selection

- Recorded lecture videos
- Video demonstrations
- LMS course modules
- Interactive learning materials
- Digital assignments
- Digital assessment resources
- Flipped classroom resources
- MOOCs/SWAYAM/NPTEL integration
- Digital study materials
- Self-learning resource repositories
- Other (specify)

D5.1.3-Q3

Upload ONE representative evidence demonstrating your most significant digital learning resource or online course delivery contribution.

Response Type: Attachment

Examples:

- LMS course page
- Digital learning module
- Recorded lecture repository
- Online learning portal screenshot
- Course resource package

4. Verification Methodology

The system may verify:

- LMS course records
- Digital resource repositories
- Learning management systems
- Video content links
- Course webpages

- Online learning modules

AI-assisted review may identify:

- type of resource,
- course integration,
- deployment evidence,
- student accessibility.

5. Validation Conditions

A contribution shall be considered valid if:

- The resource supports student learning.
- The applicant contributed to its development or deployment.
- Documentary evidence exists.
- The activity falls within the assessment period.

6. Eligible Contributions

Digital Content Development

- Recorded lecture series
- Video demonstrations
- Interactive learning materials
- Digital study guides

LMS-Based Teaching

- Moodle course management
- Google Classroom deployment
- Canvas or Blackboard course delivery
- Structured LMS learning modules

Online Learning Resources

- MOOCs
- Self-learning modules
- Digital repositories
- Online course support materials

Blended Learning

- Flipped classroom implementation
- Hybrid learning environments
- Digital reinforcement resources

7. Non-Eligible Contributions

- Conducting online classes without supporting digital resources
- Uploading PPT files only
- Routine sharing of notes through WhatsApp
- Activities already claimed under AI integration (D5.1.1)
- Activities already claimed under Virtual Laboratory & Simulation (D5.2.1)
- Mere participation in online courses

8. Scoring Methodology
Digital Learning Resource Score (DLRS)
Course Adoption Score

Courses Supported by Structured Digital Resources	Score
5 or more	10
3–4	7.5
1–2	5
None	0

Resource Diversity Score

Types of Digital Resources Developed/Used	Score
5 or more	10
3–4	7.5
1–2	5
None	

Final Score

$$DLRS = \frac{Course\ Adoption\ Score + Resource\ Diversity\ Score}{2}$$

Maximum = 10 Marks

***** End of Domain 5.1 *****

==========

D5.2 — Emerging Technologies, Education 5.0 & Global Readiness (35)

D5.2.1 Virtual Laboratory, Simulation & Digital Experimentation Practices

Maximum Marks: 20
Evidence: Course records, simulation files, laboratory manuals, screenshots, student activity records, software usage evidence

1. Objective
To assess faculty contributions toward the use of virtual laboratories, simulation platforms, digital experimentation environments, and computational tools that enhance student learning, experimentation, and practical understanding.
This indicator recognizes faculty who supplement or enhance physical laboratory experiences through technology-enabled experimentation and simulation.

2. Scope of Assessment
This metric evaluates the academic use of:
Virtual Laboratories

- Virtual Labs (MoE Virtual Labs)
- Remote laboratories
- Online experimentation platforms

Simulation Platforms

- MATLAB
- Simulink
- ANSYS
- COMSOL
- SolidWorks Simulation
- AutoCAD Simulation
- Multisim
- Proteus
- LabVIEW
- Aspen Plus
- ETAP
- Any discipline-specific simulation software

Digital Experimentation

- Digital twins
- Virtual prototyping
- Computational experimentation
- Interactive simulation-based learning

Only activities implemented for teaching-learning purposes during the assessment period shall be considered.

3. Questionnaire

D5.2.1-Q1

In how many courses/laboratory subjects did you integrate virtual laboratories, simulation tools, or digital experimentation platforms during the assessment period?

Response Type: Numeric

Evidence:

- Course file
- Laboratory manual
- LMS records
- Activity reports

D5.2.1-Q2

Select the types of virtual laboratory or simulation practices implemented during the assessment period.

- **Response Type:** Multiple Selection
- Virtual laboratory experiments
- Simulation-based assignments
- Computational modelling exercises
- Digital twin activities
- Virtual prototyping exercises
- Software-based laboratory sessions
- Remote laboratory activities
- Industry-standard simulation platforms
- Student simulation projects
- Other (specify)

D5.2.1-Q3
Upload ONE representative evidence document demonstrating your most significant simulation, virtual laboratory, or digital experimentation practice.
Response Type: Attachment
Examples:

- Laboratory manual
- Simulation assignment
- Student activity sheet
- Software exercise
- Virtual lab implementation report

4. Verification Methodology
The system may verify:

- Laboratory manuals
- Course files
- Simulation screenshots
- Student activity records
- Software usage evidence
- LMS activity records

AI-assisted review may identify:

- software platforms,
- simulation activities,
- laboratory integration,
- educational usage.

5. Validation Conditions
A contribution shall be considered valid if:

- The tool is integrated into teaching-learning activities.
- Students actively engage with the platform.
- Documentary evidence exists.
- The activity falls within the assessment period.

6. Eligible Contributions
Virtual Laboratories

- Virtual Lab experiment delivery
- Remote laboratory implementation
- Online experimental demonstrations

Simulation-Based Learning

- MATLAB-based problem solving
- ANSYS simulation exercises
- COMSOL modelling activities
- Circuit simulation exercises

Digital Experimentation

- Virtual prototyping
- Digital twin exercises
- Computational laboratory activities

Student Learning Activities

- Simulation projects

- Design optimization exercises
- Virtual experimentation assignments

7. Non-Eligible Contributions

- Using software only for personal research
- Software training attended as a participant
- Simulation work already claimed as research output
- Demonstration without student involvement
- Routine CAD drafting exercises without analytical or simulation components

8. Scoring Methodology
Simulation Integration Score (SIS)
Course Coverage Score

Courses/Labs Using Simulation or Virtual Labs	Score
5 or more	20
3–4	15
1–2	10
None	0

Practice Diversity Score

Types of Practices Implemented	Score
5 or more	20
3–4	15
1–2	10
None	0

Final Score

$$SIS = \frac{Course\ Coverage\ Score + Practice\ Diversity\ Score}{2}$$

Maximum = 20 Marks

D5.2.2 Industry 4.0 & Education 5.0 Academic Implementation Initiatives

Maximum Marks: 15
Evidence: Course files, project reports, laboratory records, student activity reports, institutional reports, implementation documentation

1. Objective

To assess faculty contributions toward the implementation of AI, Industry 4.0, smart technologies, and Education 5.0 practices in teaching-learning, laboratory activities, student projects, innovation ecosystems, and institutional initiatives.
This indicator recognizes demonstrated implementation and adoption rather than mere participation in training programmes.

2. Scope of Assessment

The indicator evaluates implementation of:

Artificial Intelligence

- Generative AI applications
- Machine learning activities
- AI-enabled learning activities
- Intelligent tutoring systems

Industry 4.0 Technologies

- Internet of Things (IoT)
- Robotics
- Automation
- Smart Manufacturing
- Digital Twins
- Industrial Data Analytics
- Cyber-Physical Systems

Education 5.0 Practices

- Human-centred learning
- Innovation-driven learning
- Interdisciplinary learning
- Technology-enabled experiential learning
- Real-world problem-solving initiatives

3. Questionnaire

D5.2.2-Q1
In how many courses, laboratories, student projects, innovation activities, or institutional initiatives did you implement AI, Industry 4.0, or Education 5.0 practices during the assessment period?
Response Type: Numeric
Evidence:

- Course files
- Laboratory records
- Project reports
- Activity reports

D5.2.2-Q2
Select the technology domains implemented during the assessment period.

Response Type: Multiple Selection

- Artificial Intelligence
- Machine Learning
- Internet of Things (IoT)
- Robotics
- Automation
- Digital Twin
- Smart Manufacturing
- Industrial Data Analytics
- Cyber-Physical Systems
- Education 5.0 Practices
- Other Emerging Technologies

D5.2.2-Q3
Approximate number of students directly engaged through the above implementations during the assessment period.
Response Type: Numeric
Evidence:

- Course enrolment records
- Project records
- Laboratory records
- Activity reports

D5.2.2-Q4
Upload ONE representative evidence document demonstrating your most significant AI, Industry 4.0, or Education 5.0 implementation initiative.
Response Type: Attachment

4. Verification Methodology
The system may verify:

- Course files
- Project reports
- Student activity reports
- Laboratory records
- Innovation centre reports
- Institutional implementation records

AI-assisted review may identify:

- technology category,
- implementation context,
- student involvement,
- evidence consistency.

5. Validation Conditions
A contribution shall be considered valid if:

- Technology implementation can be demonstrated.
- Student engagement is evident.
- Documentary evidence exists.

- The activity occurred during the assessment period.

6. Eligible Contributions

Teaching-Learning

- AI-enabled classroom activities
- IoT-integrated laboratory activities
- Industry 4.0 course implementations
- Education 5.0 learning models

Student Projects

- AI projects
- Robotics projects
- IoT systems
- Smart manufacturing projects
- Digital twin projects

Innovation Ecosystem

- Innovation challenges
- Technology competitions
- Startup-oriented technology initiatives
- Future technology clubs

Institutional Initiatives

- Smart campus projects
- Digital transformation initiatives
- AI adoption initiatives
- Industry 4.0 implementation programmes

7. Non-Eligible Contributions

- FDPs, workshops, webinars, or certifications attended
- Publications already claimed under Domain 2
- Funded projects already claimed under Domain 2
- Consultancy activities already claimed under Domain 2
- Purely personal learning activities
- Activities without student engagement

8. Scoring Methodology

Future Readiness Implementation Score (FRIS)

Component A — Implementation Coverage (5 Marks)

Verified Implementations	Marks
≥ 10	5
7–9	3
4–6	2
1–3	1
0	0

Component B — Technology Diversity (5 Marks)

Technology Domains Implemented	Marks
≥ 5 Domains	5
4 Domains	3
3 Domains	2
1–2 Domains	1
0	0

Component C — Student Reach (5 Marks)

Students Directly Benefited	Marks
≥ 300	5
200–299	3
100–199	2
25–99	1
< 25	0

Final Score

$$FRIS = A + B + C$$

Maximum = 15 Marks

9. Rejection Conditions

A submission may be rejected if:

- Only training participation evidence is submitted.
- No implementation evidence exists.
- Student involvement cannot be established.
- Duplicate claims are detected.
- Evidence appears fabricated or misleading.

10. Anti-Redundancy Rule

The following shall not be claimed under D5.2.2:

Domain	Activity
D2	Publications, patents, funded projects, consultancy
D2.4.1	FDPs, certifications, workshops attended
D5.1.1	AI use for routine teaching support
D5.1.2	Learning analytics
D5.1.3	Digital learning resources
D5.2.1	Virtual laboratories and simulation activities

Only **implemented future-oriented technologies and Education 5.0 practices involving students** shall be considered.

Examples

Activity	Eligible
IoT-based student project ecosystem	Yes
AI-enabled laboratory exercises	Yes
Robotics challenge integrated into coursework	Yes

Activity	Eligible
Smart manufacturing training modules with student participation	Yes
Digital twin-based student innovation project	Yes
Attending an AI FDP	No
Publishing an AI research paper	No
Using ChatGPT to prepare lecture notes	No

***** End of Domain 5 *****

***** End of the Competence Standard *****

DRONā Framework - Draft for Public Consultation

RAJKARUNA (RK) INSTITUTIONAL PARTNERS LLP

(An Incubated Startup at IIIT Hyderabad)

6/1075-C, EB Colony, Paramathi Road

Namakkal, Tamil Nadu - 637001

info@rkip.in | 9042763777 | www.rkip.in