

Ranking Frameworks : A Comparative Study

Ar Kanchan Garg , Dr. Prof. Prabhjot Kaur

IKG Punjab Technical University, Kapurthala Road, Jalandhar, Punjab, India

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.

Keywords: Ranking Frameworks, Accreditation boards, Course Experience Questionnaire, Quality, Architectural Education

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 frame work 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".^[1] 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.^[2] 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

¹ Tombs, S., 2005. "Quality Indicators in the Design of Schools (QIDS): A tool for assessing school design" Evaluating quality in educational facilities 2005, OECD/PEB, pp 68-71.

² <https://www.topuniversities.com/university-rankings/world-university-rankings/2018>, QS World University Ranking 2017, accessed on 03.08.2017

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

Item	NIRF		QS		THE	
	Category Name	Relative Weight in %	Category Name	Relative Weight in %	Category Name	Relative Weight in %
Indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teaching, Learning & Resources Research and Professional Practice Graduation Outcomes Outreach and Inclusivity Perception 	30 30 20 10 10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Academic Reputation Employer Reputation Faculty/Student Ratio Citations per faculty International Faculty Ratio International Student Ratio 	40 10 20 20 5 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teaching (the learning environment) Research (volume, income and reputation) Citations (research influence) International outlook (staff, students and research) Industry income (knowledge transfer) 	30 30 30 7.5 2.5
Deals In	Ranking		Ranking		Ranking	
Assessment	Academic Quality		Academic Quality		Academic Quality	
Level	National		International		International	
Type	Online Survey		Online Survey		Online Survey	
Participation (no of universities)	724		916		981	
Educationa Level	Higher Education		Higher Education		Higher Education	

Source: <https://planning.curtin.edu.au/mir/ceq.cfm>, <https://www.timeshighereducation.com/world-university-rankings/methodology-world-university-rankings-2016-2017>, <http://www.naac.gov.in/index.asp>, <https://www.nirfindia.org/Home> accessed on 05.08.17 accessed on 05.08.17

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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Curricular Aspects Teaching - Learning and Evaluation Research, Innovations and Extension Infrastructure and Learning Resources Student Support and Progression Governance, Leadership and Management Innovations and Best Practices 	15 20 25 10 10 10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Part 1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identity and Self-Assessment Resources Part 2: Educational Outcomes And Curriculum <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Student Performance- Educational Realms And Student Performance Criteria Curricular Framework Evaluation Of Preparatory Education Public Information Part 3: Annual And Interim Reports 	Decision by NAAB Board of Directors whether to grant initial accreditation after going through the procedure defined by NAAB
Assessment	Academic Quality		Academic Quality	
Country	India		United States	
Educationa Level	Higher Education		Higher Education	

* last Accreditation, **2014

Sources: <http://archdesign.vt.edu/architecture/naab> accessed on 06.08.2017, <http://www.naac.gov.in/index.asp>, <https://www.nirfindia.org/Home> accessed on 05.08.17

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.

Quality in architectural education can be assessed and checked by the combined result of indicators both in ranking frameworks and in RCEQ. Ranking of Indian schools of architecture has been done by Outlook Magazine and The Times of India. Many of the renowned institutes did not participate. While giving ranking participation of maximum institutes should be encouraged, so that actual ranking could be worked out.

Comparison of indicators of CEQ and RCEQ:

Table 3

Particular	CEQ	RCEQ
Measure Basics	To measure students overall satisfaction with the course	To measure students experience with the course in addition CEQ data
Scales	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Required Core Scales: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good Teaching Scale (GTS) • Generic Skills Scale (GSS) • Overall Satisfaction Item (OSI) ➤ Optional Scales: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Basic CEQ data ➤ Questionnaire on discipline-specific issues with 5 sections: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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

Sources: <https://planning.curtin.edu.au/mir/> accessed on 05.08.2017, Murray, P., 2002. "The CEQ: Is it a measure of Architecture program quality?" HERSDA 2002, pp 472-480

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.

III. REFERENCES

- [1]. Murray, P., 2002. "The CEQ: Is it a measure of Architecture program quality" HERSDA 2002, pp 472-480.
- [2]. Tombs, S., 2005. "Quality Indicators in the Design of Schools(QIDS): A tool for assessing school design" Evaluating quality in educational facilities2005, OECD/PEB, pp 68-71.
- [3]. Tzonis, A., 2014. "A framework for architectural education" *Frontiers of Architectural Research* , Elsevier, Open access under CC BY-NC-ND, Vol 3, pp 477-479. Websites Referred
- [4]. <http://archdesign.vt.edu/architecture/naab> accessed on 06.08.2017
- [5]. <http://www.naac.gov.in/index.asp>, <https://www.nirfindia.org/Home> accessed on 05.08.17 accessed on 05.08.17
- [6]. <http://www.naac.gov.in/index.asp>, <https://www.nirfindia.org/Home> accessed on 05.08.17
- [7]. <https://planning.curtin.edu.au/mir/> accessed on 05.08.2017
- [8]. <https://planning.curtin.edu.au/mir/ceq.cfm>
- [9]. <https://www.britishcouncil.in/about/press/qs-university-rankings-asia-2014>, accessed on 06.04.2017
- [10]. <https://www.timeshighereducation.com/world-university-rankings/methodology-world-university-rankings-2016-2017>
- [11]. <https://www.topuniversities.com/university-rankings/world-university-rankings/2018>, QS World University Ranking 2017, accessed on 03.08.2017