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ABSTRACT

Ranking frameworks and questionnaires are in practice to assess quality of education imparted and to rank institutes on this basis. Accreditations are also given after assessing the quality of education imparted. This paper is discussing and comparing different assessing indicators, their need and outcome of major assessing institutes/organisations such as QS, THE, NIRF, NAAC, NAAB, NCARB, COA etc. Assessment of any field in any organisation to maintain minimum set standards of quality in education creates interest to be superior than others. Ranking frameworks do not only assess and rank the institutes/universities rather provides transparency in front of the students who are looking for admission in the specific field. India had invented many basic concepts such as zero, decimal etc. in its early time. Quality of architectural education needs to be improved to compete at world level. This paper talks in particular about the ranking frameworks regarding architectural education as no exhaustive ranking frameworks are available for the architectural education.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Rapid growth of institutes started around 2 decades ago to meet the demands of human being in India. The new institutes were allowed to be run by private firms. Many institutes for the courses of engineering, architecture, MBA etc. came into existence. More institutes means more demand of students and teachers. Among all these demands quality was main parameter to be discussed time to time. Ranking frameworks came into existence to assess the quality of institutes. Concept of Ranking frameworks for universities, institution etc started at the start of 21st century. Ministry of Human Resource development, Govt of India, introduced 1st of its kind of ranking frameworks in 2015.

Basic parameters to evaluate the progress in any field like education, profession or business etc is to work on the quality of the input and output. Consolidation of all the parameters i.e. indicators by providing defined weightage is called ranking frame work. Ranking frameworks tend to motivate any organisation to improve in relation to all the points of grading to make out itself on the top. Assessment of quality in education is very important as it leads in making the nation great. Many professional bodies have developed their own ranking frameworks e.g. National Institute Ranking Framework (NIRF) by Ministry of Human Resource-India, Times Higher Education World University Rankings, QS University Rankings-A British company specialised in education and study and Rankings done at individual organisation level etc. Different streams have their own frameworks, but, there is no exhaustive framework meant for architecture. Architecture is being ranked as a part of Engineering institutions in NIRF. In fact, architecture differentiates itself from engineering on many counts. This paper discusses about different assessment indicators and need for exhaustive ranking frameworks for architecture education.
Architecture and engineering both deal with technology. The only difference is the creative work done on the basis of calculations as in engineering or on the artistic basis as in architecture. Parameters for ranking framework of architecture education should be based on art, science, consultancy and technological advances etc.

Quality of a building can be assessed by its "Commodity, Firmness and Delight" Sir Henry Wootton and later Alex Reid in architectural terms said it as "Humanity, Efficiency and Delight". Quality of education can also be assessed by different indicators as defined in many ranking frameworks set by different bodies worldwide. Different parameters to assess the quality of architectural education are either quantifiable and measurable or judged.

The list of the quality assessing bodies for universities/Institutions/Architects is as follows.

- NIRF - National Institute Ranking Frameworks
- QS - Quacquarelli Symonds
- THE- Times Higher Education World University Rankings
- NAAC - National Assessment and Accreditation Council
- NAAB - National Architectural Accrediting Board
- RIBA - Royal British Institute of Architects
- AASA - Australasia Association of Schools of Architecture
- ACT - Architect Council of Thailand
- ARB - Architects Registration Board of Hong Kong
- CAA - Commonwealth Association of Architects
- CHED - Commission of Higher Education (Philippines)
- HEEACT - Higher Education Evaluation and Accreditation Council of Taiwan
- HKIA Hong Kong Institute of Architects
- IAI Indonesian Institute of Architects
- JABEE Japan Accreditation Board for Eng. Education
- JPA Public Service Department (Malaysia)
- JUAA Japan University Accreditation Association
- KAAB Korean Architectural Accreditation Board
- LAM (or BAM) Board of Architects Malaysia
- NBAA National Board of Architectural Accreditation (China)
- PAM Malaysian Institute of Architect
- FICCI - Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry
- NCARB - National Council of Architectural Registration Boards etc.

QS World University Ranking publishes rank place every year. It is surprising to mention that there is no Indian university occupies rank in first one hundred rank places in the world in any of the fields in the year 2017. Indian Institute of Technology got 172nd rank, which is 1st institute in the list of 2017 ranking list. Indian Institute of Madras is the 1st Indian university in the field of Architecture, got 150th rank. Quality education is directly linked with the ranking frameworks. India is lacking in respect of quality of architectural education in particular. China is one of the few countries in the world where design institutes, attached to schools of architecture that deliver products of high professional quality, already exists"[Tzonis]2014.

Ranking list published accurately is required by students for seeking admission in architecture institutes with options according to their competence. In the current scenario of privatisation candidates

---


who deserve admission in high ranked institutions might get sidetracked. Many lollipops are being provided to the students to misguide them for admission in the institute with relatively low quality of education in the field.

Comparison of indicators followed by some of the top ranking frameworks in the year 2017 is as under:

**Table 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>NIRF</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>QS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>THE</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category Name</td>
<td>Relativ e Weight in %</td>
<td>Category Name</td>
<td>Relativ e Weight in %</td>
<td>Category Name</td>
<td>Relativ e Weight in %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching, Learning &amp; Resources</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Academic Reputation</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Teaching (the learning environment)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and Professional Practice</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Faculty/Student Ratio</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation Outcomes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Citations per faculty</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach and Inclusivity</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>International Faculty Ratio</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception</td>
<td></td>
<td>International Student Ratio</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Reputation</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Research (volume, income and reputation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer Reputation</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Citations (research influence)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/Student Ratio</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>International outlook (staff, students and research)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citations per faculty</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Industry income (knowledge transfer)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Faculty Ratio</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Student Ratio</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Deals In Ranking Ranking Ranking
Assessment Academic Quality Academic Quality Academic Quality
Level National International International
Type Online Survey Online Survey Online Survey
Participatio(n(no of universities) 724 916 981
Educational Level Higher Education Higher Education Higher Education


Comparison of Indicators of Assessment and Accreditation bodies is as under:

**Table 2**

| Item | NAAC* | | | NAAB** | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |
| Category Name | Relative Weight in % | Category Name | Relative Weight in % | |
| Indicators | | | | |
| Curricular Aspects | 15 | Part 1: | |
| Teaching - Learning and Evaluation | 20 | Identity and Self-Assessment |
| Research, Innovations and Extension | 25 | Resources |
| Infrastructure and Learning Resources | 10 | Part 2: Educational Outcomes And Curriculum |
| Student Support and Progression | 10 | Student Performance- Educational Realms And Student Performance Criteria |
| Governance, Leadership and Management | 10 | Curricular Framework |
| Innovations and Best Practices | 10 | Evaluation Of Preparatory Education |
| Assessment | Academic Quality | Academic Quality |
| Country | India | United States |
| Educational Level | Higher Education | Higher Education |

* last Accreditation, **2014

RCEQ i.e. Review of Course Experience Questionnaire and CEQ i.e. Course Experience Questionnaire are the indicators of performance in higher education governed by Graduate careers council of Australia. CEQ is 1st part of three parts of RCEQ. A study carried out for architecture program being run in the University of New South Wales was to assess the course satisfaction level, quality control and student satisfaction by CEQ and RCEQ respectively [Murray]2002.

Comparison of indicators of CEQ and RCEQ:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Particular</th>
<th>CEQ</th>
<th>RCEQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure Basics</td>
<td>To measure students overall satisfaction with the course</td>
<td>To measure students experience with the course in addition CEQ data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Scales | Required Core Scales:  
- Good Teaching Scale (GTS)  
- Generic Skills Scale (GSS)  
- Overall Satisfaction Item (OSI)  
Optional Scales:  
- Clear Goals and Standards Scale (CGSS)  
- Appropriate Assessment Scale (AWS)  
- Appropriate Workload Scale (AWS)  
- Student Support Scale (SSS)  
- Learning Resources Scale (LRS)  
- Learning Community Scale (LCS)  
- Graduate Qualities Scale (GQS)  
- Intellectual Motivation Scale (IMS) | Divided into 3 parts:  
- Basic CEQ data  
- Questionnaire on discipline-specific issues with 5 sections:  
  - Course structure, perception to cope up, relative importance and weightage  
  - Perception of the opportunities  
  - Design studio Assessment and its environment  
  - Perception to impact of culture and language, access to financial resources  
  - Range of employment and practice issue  
- Demographic data |
| Outcome | Broad | Detailed |


In the past, India was known for imparting quality education. The knowledge of 'Decimal' and 'Zero' provided by India to the world are examples of quality as well as depth of understanding the concepts. Quality in architectural education is being discussed in different seminars, conferences etc. Ranking frameworks play an important role in maintaining the quality of the education. So, there seems a dire need to develop dedicated ranking frameworks for architectural education.
II. CONCLUSION

Ranking and assessment are basic tools for judging the quality of an institute. Maximum participation may be encouraged by the regulatory authorities. Though infrastructure, well qualified and experienced faculty, facilities, curriculum, design studios and assessment, environment etc are an integral part of any assessment yet ranking and accreditation of the institutes may play a vital role in the outcomes for quality education as every institute would like to be at top. Imparting quality education by an institute will provide confidence in their students to prove themselves in the market for better prospectus. If more and more institutes participate for assessment, it will be also helpful to the deserving students to get admission in the better institutes as per their competence. India is one of the fast growing country, lacking in providing quality education especially in architecture. So the authors feel that exhaustive and devoted ranking frameworks for architectural education in India should be in existence to have a check on quality to compete worldwide.
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