

News from IQAC, 2nd December 2016

IMPORTANCE OF MAINTAINING CONTINUOUSLY UPDATED INFORMATION ABOUT THE DEPARTMENT IN THE INFORMATION RESOURCE BOOK

Trust your department has completed the process of Student Feedback for the semester Jul-Dec 2016.

Further, this is to report that the PU has uploaded all the information required for participating in the National Institution Ranking Framework (NIRF). The rankings will be declared by the NIRF on April 1, 2017.

The entire team at IQAC thanks everyone on campus for being patient and helpful without which this task would not have been possible.

Much appreciated was the active participation of the departments and the faculty in providing information through the Information Resource Book (IRB) that was created by the IQAC earlier in 2016 (a pdf copy is available at the IQAC web page:[IRB PU](#)).

All departments were asked to fill up the IRB. Many did. Some delayed it. A few delayed the data till a few days ago. But in the end all did manage to submit the IRB.

To give you an idea of the information that was collected: the IRB for the smaller departments is some 70 pages long; departments that are larger or have a very active research culture have IRBs that are triple that size. Physically going through all this information takes time and effort.

The information from the IRB became the basis for filling up the data on the NIRF portal. However, a quick scrutiny of the IRB showed that

- a number of departments had provided no information on many counts (**Now, now, you can't do this!**)

- a number of departments had provided information that did not match internally (You can't do this either!!)
- some departments had given incorrect information (Oops!! Did the Chairperson certify wrong information?)

It took a long time and a lot of effort to sort out such glitches, get back to the departments to obtain information that was correct

In many cases personnel from the departments – faculty members, as well as ministerial staff—had to be called to the IQAC office to correct visible errors.

In some cases the department was advised to revise a lot of information.

Some departments had simply modified the IRB pro forma by deleting columns and rows from the tables that were provided. That resulted in data that was incompatible and inconsistent. Do remember, the pro forma has to be followed in full, under all circumstances. Otherwise the data that you submit becomes incompatible with all other.

Many of the science departments helped by filling up the faculty information on the NIRF portal. Some made errors in this too.

At least faculty from one department and their ministerial staff reported unwillingness to fill up the IRB. 'What is the use?', asked this faculty member and added that filling up such forms is 'a waste of time that can be fruitfully used for research'. Fortunately the Chairperson of the department stepped in and ensured that the data was provided. In another department the faculty in-charge seemed to be clueless on how to go about the task and was loth to ask anyone. Thankfully, after a little bit of drama, even they succeeded in providing information.

All these glitches and mismatches are, we hope, because all of us are still learning to handle data accurately and the unease that some of us

have about maintaining data. Today there is no option left. The days of being able to survive with a 'take it easy' policy are over, as far as maintaining information about the department and one's own work is considered.

This is the second round of NIRF. In the first round of NIRF, the results of which were declared in April 2016, the UIPS stood at #2 among all pharmacy institutions in India and PU's over all rank was #1 among all non-central institutions and #12 all-India. The institutions above PU, like JNU and the IITs, were those that were fully funded by the Central Government and were institutions working in specialized, narrow areas of knowledge.

Rankings 2016: [Rankings 2016 April](#)

We shall keep you updated.

Best wishes,

IQAC/PU