



# **Policy for Awarding Best Teachers Award**

## **Contents**

Section-1: Definitions	3
Section-2: Policy for Awarding the Best Teachers Award	4
Terms and Conditions for Teachers	5
Eligibility	5
Evaluation Parameters & Assessment Mechanism	5
Guidelines for Filling Questionnaires	8
Supporting Documents	9
Section-3: Questionnaires	10
Questionnaire - Eligibility Requirements	10
Questionnaire on Evaluation Parameters	12
Student Feedback Form	22

## **Section-1: Definitions**

In this Policy Document, unless otherwise specified, or anything repugnant to the Act and Statutes of National University of Modern Languages, the following expressions shall have the meanings as follows:

- **1.1 Procedure** is the process followed for implementing the policy.
- **1.2** *Incentive* means awarding Certificate of Appreciation.
- **1.3** *University-Level Best University Teacher Award* is conferred directly by the University.
- **1.4 Research Paper** means the production of original scholarly work that illustrates an outcome of scientific research with supporting data.
- **Journal** means a periodical scholarly publication that contains research papers written by the researchers in any particular field of study.
- **1.6** *Impact Factor* is a measure of the frequency with which the "average article" published in a given scholarly journal has been cited in a particular year or period. It is often used to measure or describe the importance of a particular journal to its field.
- **1.7** Research Publications recognized by HEC means publications which meet the minimum criteria for recognition from HEC.

## **Section-2: Policy for Awarding the Best Teachers Award**

#### 1. Purpose:

Teacher Awards aim at recognizing efforts and contributions of outstanding teachers of National University of Modern Languages (NUML). The incentive in terms of: cash prize, *certificate of appreciation*, *and shields etc.* is envisaged to encourage teachers of NUML.

#### 2. Scope:

All teachers of NUML can apply for this award.

### 3. Policy Statement:

- **3.1** A Certificate of Appreciation, Shield and Cash Prizes will be given to Outstanding Teachers of the Calendar Year.
- 3.2 Sixteen teachers will be Awarded as Best Teachers each year as per the following detail: Main Campus (Islamabad): In total, eight awards will be given at the Main Campus. Three best teachers will be selected from all faculties throughout the University. Additionally, five more teachers will be awarded one teacher from each faculty.
  Other Campuses: Eight separate awards will be given to other campuses (one for each
- campus) except Islamabad.

  3.3 The Detail of Cash award is as under:

Main Campus: First Prize: Rs. 2,00,000. Second Prize: Rs. 1,75,000. Third Prize: Rs.

**1,50,000**. Each Faculty's Best Teacher: **Rs. 1,00,000**.

Other Campuses: Each Campus's Best Teacher (except Islamabad): Rs. 100,000.

#### 4. Procedure:

- **4.1** In the Convocation Ceremony, Best Teachers will be recognized through Best Teachers Award for Main Campus Islamabad as well as for all the Regional Campuses.
- **4.2** The Best Teachers will be selected from the basis of his/her score against the parameters mentioned below:
  - 1. Command of Subject (10)
  - 2. Teaching Philosophy (10)
  - 3. Course Syllabus (10)
  - 4. Grading System, Tests and Assignments (10)
  - 5. Lesson Plan (5)
  - 6. Classroom Teaching (20)
  - 7. Use of Technology (5)
  - 8. Student Interaction and Mentoring (10)
  - 9. Students Evaluations (20)
  - 10. Research Excellence (20)

Total = 120

**4.3** Applications of faculty members within the concerned calendar year shall be forwarded on prescribed form to Registrar Office through HoD, Dean Faculty, and/or Regional Director.

- **4.4** Quality Enhancement Cell (QEC) will provide technical support in data provision through Evaluation Forms (in support of parameters 3 to 9).
- **4.5** Registrar Office will check eligibility of candidates on basis of basic criteria (given in next section).
- **4.6** A *Selection* Committee, headed by Rector, comprised of Registrar, Deans, HoDs, Director QEC and Director ORIC will review applications and select winners in all categories. The Committee would finalize its decision by first week of April.
- **4.7** Final awarding authority will be Rector.
- **4.8** Registrar Office will address grievances of faculty members.
- **4.9** For nominating faculty members in HEC National Award Competition Registrar Office will convey results to Higher Education Commission (HEC) with documentary evidences.

### **Terms and Conditions for Teachers**

### **Eligibility**

The following are the eligibility requirements for University-Level Best Teacher Awards:

- i. Candidates are full-time permanent faculty members, including those on TTS, BPS, or long-term contract.
- ii. They have completed a minimum of three years of consecutive /active service as a permanent faculty prior to the date of the award.
- iii. They are less than 60 years of age.
- iv. They should have been physically present at the University in the previous three years.
- v. They did not miss any class during the calendar year. An exemption may be provided in cases of ill health or medical emergency, on the production of documentary evidence, and if the absence was compensated by the organization of make-up classes in consultation with the students. QEC is responsible for validating this information.
- vi. They did not avail long-term leave (i.e., exceeding 3 weeks during the year of evaluation).
- vii. There were no disciplinary proceedings against them, e.g., on charges of plagiarism.
- viii. There are no adverse remarks in their ACRs during the previous three (03) years.
- ix. They did not receive the Best Teacher Award in the last Three years. A teacher who has already received a Best Teacher Award may apply after a lapse of Three years.
- x. For the purpose of Research Excellence, the performance of last three years will considered from the date of application by the candidate.
- xi. They did not serve on any key administrative positions in the University in the past three years.
- xii. Anyone who provides false or misleading evidence will be barred from the competition for life. An award granted on the basis of false and misleading evidence will be withdrawn.

### **Evaluation Parameters & Assessment Mechanism**

Selection Committee will evaluate the candidates for University-Level Best Teacher Award on the basis of parameters (mentioned in 4.2) and assessment mechanism (given on next page; Table-1) keeping in perspective Questionnaire (based on Evaluation Parameters) and Student Feedback Forms (form given in Section-3).

	Table 1:					
Item	Evaluation Parameters an Description	d Assessment Mechanism How Assessed	Marks			
	Candidates should	Review all relevant	10			
Command of the	demonstrate effective		10			
Subject		materials to assign a				
	command of the	grade.				
	subject. In this regard,	Quality is based on				
	the relevant	qualifications plus direct evidence from				
	information includes					
	their degrees and	syllabus, lectures, and				
	certificates, the course	tests, etc.				
	syllabus, tests, exams,					
	and assignments					
	prepared, and classroom interaction.					
Tanahina Dhilasanhu	Candidates should	Cuplingto avality and	10			
Teaching Philosophy		Evaluate quality and	10			
	submit a short (max	originality of statement.				
	one page) statement of	Statement.				
	their teaching					
Carrage Cullabora	philosophy.	Assistant a supplied become a	25			
Course Syllabus,	"Syllabus" includes (a) succinct description of	Assign a grade based on the assessment of the	25			
including the grading system, tests, and	the <i>subject</i> of the	syllabus, grading	(10 for Course Syllabus			
assignments, and the	course, (b) the <i>learning</i>		(10 for Course Syllabus, 10 for Grading and 5 for			
Lesson Plan	objectives of the course	system, tests, etc., and lesson plan submitted	Lesson Plan)			
LESSOII PIUII	(i.e., what would the	by candidates.	Lesson Flair)			
	students learn by taking	by carididates.				
	the course), (c) the					
	textbook (or textbooks)					
	and supplementary					
	course materials if					
	needed, (d)					
	expectations from the					
	students, (e) grading					
	system, (f) the lesson					
	plan, (g) reference to					
	any relevant university					
	or HEC rules (e.g., on					
	plagiarism), and (h) any					
	special condition or					
	requirement.					
	The good grading					
	system should induce					
	students to undertake					
	the work required for					
	effective learning.					
	Besides the grading					
	scheme, it also includes					
	tests, quizzes, if any,					

	assignments, both inclass and homework, class participation, field work, lab work, and group work. The detailed lesson plan divides the course materials into individual lectures, each with its own (clearly defined) content, learning objectives, assigned readings, other homework assignments, and power point slides, if any.		
Classroom Teaching	Evaluation of (at least one) videotaped lecture by a candidate, including assessment of how the teacher set out the learning objectives at the start of the lecture, his/ her lecture style, classroom atmosphere, use of active learning, use of current event examples, student engagement. It should also be examined whether the teacher was able to achieve the learning objectives in the lecture.	Assign a grade based on review of the videotape, PPTs and background material (e.g., announcements regarding active learning practices).	20
Use of Technology	Candidates will submit a statement on their approach to using modern technology tools in teaching, including audiovisual materials, flipped classrooms, automated grading systems, class blogs and social media, and others. Evidence should be provided on	Assign a grade based on review of the candidate's statement on the technology tools used by her/ him. Given that good teachers are looking for ways in which technology can help pedagogy, the Questionnaire (based on evaluation	5

	whether and how they deployed such tools.	parameters) can reveal the interest and commitment of candidates.	
Student interaction and mentoring	Candidates will provide a statement describing whether they were available for office hours, the time they spent per week on mentoring students, their approach to mentoring and supervision of research scholars and research teams, and their engagement in classroom blogs and social media channels.	Assign a grade based on review of candidate's statement and background materials. Besides interaction with course students, the Questionnaire (based on evaluation parameters) provides a metric to determine the quality of the mentorship provided to graduate students.	10
Student Evaluations	Student evaluations are one of the means of assessing teaching effectiveness.	This helps make comparative assessment of candidates. Assign a comparative grade based on review of all evaluation results.	20
Research Excellence	Doing high quality research is one of the hallmarks of university teaching experience. Candidates should provide the proof of their research activities in the last three years of university teaching.	Assign a grade based on the research excellence in terms of Research Publication, Research Projects and Research Supervision.	(5 for Research Projects, 8 for Research Publications, 7 for Research Supervision)

## **Guidelines for Filling Questionnaires**

- a.) Appropriate spaces have been provided in the Questionnaire(s) so that the softcopies of relevant documentary evidences can be attached in that space and hyperlink is created to the source folder. This will facilitate the Committee Members to have access to the evidences just by clicking on the link.
- b.) While sending the filled electronic Questionnaires, also send the softcopies of the documents for which hyperlinks were created in the questionnaire. For that matter, it is recommended to save both the questionnaire and the hyperlinked documents in one/single folder and send that folder in a USB/CD to Registrar Office along with the duly signed covering letter.

### **Supporting Documents**

The complete dossier of the applicant will comprise of the following documents, which must be maintained in electronic form.

- i. A covering note prepared by the candidate.
- ii. Latest CV of the candidate.
- iii. Completed Questionnaire (based on Evaluation Parameters), including following attachments:
  - The syllabus or syllabuses (including grading systems, exams, tests, quizzes, assignments and lesson plans) prepared by the candidates during the calendar year.
  - Video tapes of lectures and PPTs
  - Student evaluations of the courses being considered for the award, and the average evaluation scores of faculty member and courses across the department, faculty, and the entire university. Student evaluations are confidential documents, and would be available only to the Committee members.
  - Three one-page statements prepared by the candidates. The three statements are:
    - 1. Statement of teaching philosophy.
    - 2. Statement on how the faculty member used technology in the courses being evaluated.
    - 3. Statement on student interaction and mentoring.
- vi. List of Research Projects showing their name, number and cost of at least one year duration or above funded by National / International agencies completed during the last three years.
- vii. List and details of Publications at National & International level must be attached separately for the last three years and the list of books published during the last three years.
- viii. List of papers presented in the National and International Seminars / Conferences during last 3 years.
- ix. Separate lists of the students supervised at M.Phil and Ph.D level with a copy of Approval Page of thesis supervised by the teacher including Supervisor Name.
- x. The details of projects written in the proforma must be approved and notified by the Department. Copy of notification must be provided.

## **Section-3: Questionnaires**

## **Questionnaire - Eligibility Requirements**

### A. GENERAL INFORMATION

1.	Name	
2.	Present Position & Department	
3.	Discipline & Area of Specialization	
4.	University	
5.	Date of joining (present position)	
6.	Total Teaching Experience	
7.	Terminal Qualification & University	
8.	Date of Birth & Domicile	
9.	Received Teacher Award previously (Year)	
10.	Contact Information (Tel, email, Fax)	
11.	Covering Note	(Please attach softcopy of covering note provide hyperlink to source folder)
12.	Curriculum Vitae	(Please attach softcopy of covering note provide hyperlink to source folder)

### **ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS**

(Please check all the boxes and attach softcopies of evidences with hyperlink to source folder in provided column).

SN	Check List (Please check all the boxes)		onse /No)	Attach evidence(s) (with title)
1.	Is the candidate a full-time permanent faculty member, on TTS, BPS, or long-term contract, at a recognized public or private sector university or DAI?	Yes 🗆	No 🗆	For example: Employment Letter
2.	Has the candidate completed three years of consecutive /active service as a permanent faculty at the nominating university or DAI?	Yes □	No □	For example:  Letter from Rector/ Registrar/ Director  QEC
3.	Is the candidate less than 60 years of age?	Yes □	No □	Copy of CNIC
4.	Was the candidate physically present at the university in the previous three years?	Yes 🗆	No □	For example:
5.	Did the candidate attend every class during the calendar year?	Yes □	No □	Letter (s) from Rector/ Registrar/ Director
6.	In case the candidate missed a class, was it on account of ill health or medical emergency	Yes 🗆	No □	<u>QEC</u>

Name of the Teacher:	Department:	University:
Trance of the Teacher.	Вериннені.	Chiversity.

	(documentary evidence to be provided), and was the absence compensated by a make-up class?			
7.	Did the candidate avail long-term leave (i.e., exceeding 3 weeks during the year of evaluation?	Yes 🗆	No □	For example: Leave Orders
8.	Were there any disciplinary proceedings against the candidate during the previous three (03) years?	Yes 🗆	No 🗆	
9.	Were any adverse remark recorded in the ACRs of the candidate during the previous three (03) years?	Yes □	No 🗆	<u>For example:</u>
10.	Did the candidate receive the national best university teacher award (BUTA) in the last five years?	Yes □	No 🗆	Letter (s) from Rector/ Registrar/ Director
11.	Did the candidate hold an administrative position at the university (e.g., VC, Registrar, COE, Treasurer, Director (QEC) during the past three years?	Yes □	No □	<u>QEC</u>
12.	Has the candidate attached their research related activities only in the last three (3) years	Yes □	No □	QEC /ORIC

### **Questionnaire on Evaluation Parameters**

#### **Important Notes:**

- i). Faculty members are required to follow guidelines given in Table-1 (Evaluation Parameters and Assessment Mechanism) while responding to questions against each of the parameters.
- ii). Please check all the boxes against each question under a parameter. All questions carry equal marks, as below:

Yes = 2, Somewhat = 1, No = 0.

iii). Marks against each parameter may be calculated as per following formulae and total marks obtained will be calculated by adding marks obtained by the candidate against each parameter:

(Marks Secured/Max Marks x Weightage) x 100

Solved Example for Parameter 2 below (Course Syllabus) which has 11 questions (so max marks are 22) and weightage of 10% (as per table 1 above)

 $\{21 \text{ (marks secured)/22 (Max Marks)} \times 10/100 \text{ (Weightage)} \times 100 = 9.5$ 

- iv). Name of the candidate along with his/her department, university and year of award must be mentioned on each page of the questionnaire.
- v). Faculty members are required *only* to use the template below in responding against each question under various evaluation parameters. Questionnaire not filled as per the below format will not be accepted. Student feedback form is provided below with parameter 9 (Student Evaluations) for collecting information from students.
- vi). Attach softcopies of the evidences in the space provided in the questionnaires. No marks will be accepted if the required documentary evidence is not attached in support of achievements claimed against each of the parameters.
- vii). Softcopies of all the filled questionnaires along with evidences attached/hyperlinked must be saved in PDF/Non-Editable file format in one single folder. Faculty members are required to ensure that proper hyperlinks to the attachments are created and saved in the same folder.

	Questionnaire based on Evaluation Parameters									
SN	Parameter	Check List	(	<b>Response</b> Yes/Somewhat/No)	Attach softcopies of evidences with adequate title					
	Command	<ul><li>i. Does candidate have a degree in the discipline?</li></ul>	Yes 🗆	No □	For example: Copy of Degree					
1.	of the Subject Maximum marks (10);	ii. Does candidate have a certificate, diploma, or other qualification in the course topic?	Yes 🗆	No □	For example: Copy of Diploma					
		iii. Does the syllabus demonstrate command of the subject?	Yes □	No □						

	Weightage (10%)	iv.	Do the exams/assignments demonstrate command?	Yes 🗆	Somewhat □	No □	
		V.	Does the lecture and classroom interaction demonstrate command of the subject?	Yes 🗆	Somewhat □	No □	
Mark	s obtained by	the	candidate under "Command of				Total =
Subje	ct"						

SN	Parameter	Check List	Response (Yes/Somewhat/No)			Attach softcopies of evidences with adequate title
2.	Teaching Philosophy Maximum marks (10); Weightage (10%)	i. Has the candidate submitted their statement of teaching philosophy?	N/A	N/A	N/A	Statement on Teaching Philosophy
	Marks obtained by the candidate under "Teaching Philosophy"					Total =

SN	Parameter	Check List	Response (Yes/Somewhat/No)			Attach softcopies of evidences with adequate title
	Course	i. Was the syllabus made available ahead of time?	Yes □		No □	
	Course Syllabus	<ul><li>ii. Does the syllabus describe the subject matter effectively?</li></ul>	Yes □	Somewhat $\square$	No □	
2		iii. Are the learning objectives clear and well crafted?	Yes □	Somewhat □	No □	Syllabus(s)
3.	Maximum marks (22);	iv. Does the syllabus list any prerequisites for the course?	Yes □		No □	
	Weightage (10%)	v. Is there a main textbook for the course?	Yes □		No □	
	(-5/5)	vi. Was the textbook published in the last three years?	Yes □		No □	

	vii.	Are other course materials (if any)	Yes □	Somewhat $\square$	No □	
		selected professionally?				
	viii	. Does the syllabus list the	Yes □		No □	
		expectations from the students?				
	ix.	Does the course ask students to read	Yes □		No □	
		the assigned materials ahead of				
		time?				
	x.	Does the syllabus list or refer to	Yes □		No □	
		relevant university or HEC rules (e.g.,				
		on plagiarism)?				
	xi.	Does the syllabus describe any	Yes □		No □	
		special condition or requirement for				
		the course?				
Marks obtained	by the ca	andidate under "Course Syllabus"				Total =

SN	Parameter	Check List		Response (Yes/Somewhat/N	,	Attach softcopies of evidences with adequate title	
		<ul> <li>i. Does the syllabus describe the grading system (i.e., distribution of grades for different exams, tests, assignments, etc.)?</li> </ul>	Yes 🗆	Somewhat □	No □	Syllabus (s)	
		ii. Have the tests, if any, been prepared professionally?	Yes □	Somewhat □	No □		
	Grading System, Tests, and Assignments	_	iii. Do the test questions assess proficiency in the learning objectives?	Yes 🗆	Somewhat $\square$	No □	Tests
			iv. Have the quizzes, if any, been prepared professionally?	Yes □	Somewhat □	No □	Quizzes
		v. Do the quizzes reward preparation or insight?	Yes □	Somewhat □	No □	, Quizzoo	
4.	Maximum	vi. Has the professor given in-class assignments?	Yes □		No □	Assignments	
	marks (32); Weightage	vii. Has the professor given homework assignments?	Yes □		No □		
	(10%)	viii. Do the students receive grades for completion of the assignments?	Yes □		No □		
		ix. Does the grading system encourage students to act in ways as to achieve learning objectives?	Yes 🗆	Somewhat	No □	Grading System	
		x. Does the professor assign grades for class participation?	Yes □		No □		
		xi. Do the course describe how class participation will be graded?	Yes 🗆		No □		

		xii.	Does the course require field work?	Yes □		No □	
		кііі.	Does the course require lab work?	Yes □		No □	
		xiv.	Does the course outline describe how field work or lab work, if relevant, will be graded?	Yes 🗆	Somewhat $\square$	No □	Grading System
		XV.	Does the course require group work?	Yes □		No □	
		xvi.	Does the course outline describe how group work will be graded?	Yes □		No □	Grading System
Marks obtained by the candidate under "Grading System,					Total =		
Tests, and Assignments "							

SN	Parameter	Check List	Response (Yes/Somewhat/No)			Attach softcopies of evidences with adequate title
5.	Lesson Plan Maximum marks (14); Weightage (05%)	<ul> <li>i. Has the faculty member (candidate) submitted a detailed lesson plan for the entire semester (i.e., division of the course materials into individual lectures, with clearly defined content, learning objectives for each lecture, assigned readings, other homework assignments, and power point slides, if any)?</li> <li>ii. Does the lesson plan provide learning objectives for each lecture?</li> <li>iii. Does the lesson plan provide a precise reading assignment (both textbook and other readings) for each lecture?</li> <li>iv. Is the volume of assigned readings for each lecture feasible for students to undertake?</li> <li>v. Does the lesson plan include homework assignments?</li> </ul>	Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes	Somewhat   Somewhat	No	Lesson Plan(s)

		vi. Does the lesson plan include in-class assignments or quizzes?	Yes □		No 🗆	
		vii. Does the lesson plan provide for active learning in the classroom?	Yes □	Somewhat $\square$	No 🗆	
Marks obtained by the candidate under "Lesson Plan"					Total =	

SN	Parameter	Check List	Response (Yes/Somewhat/No)			Attach softcopies of evidences with adequate title
	Classroom Teaching	<ul> <li>i. Does the professor use PPTs?</li> <li>ii. Have the PPTs been made available to the students?</li> <li>iii. Is the length of the PPTs suitable for the time allotted for the lecture?</li> <li>iv. Are the PPTs designed professionally (i.e., they are not just a handful of slides thrown together without regard to the learning objectives, assigned readings, in-class assignments, or active learning modules)?</li> <li>v. Do the PPTs demonstrate the faculty member's command of the subject?</li> </ul>	Yes  Yes  So	omewhat $\square$	No	PPTs
6.	Maximum marks (34); Weightag e (20%)	vi. Has the university submitted a videotaped lecture by the candidate?  vii. In the videotape, did the candidate introduce the learning objectives for that specific lecture?  viii. In the videotape, did the faculty member succeed in achieving the learning objectives for the specific lecture?  ix. In the videotape, does the faculty member demonstrate adequate command of the subject?  x. In the videotape, does the faculty member's lecture style engage the attention and interest of the students?	Yes □ So	omewhat  omewhat  omewhat  omewhat	No	Videotape (s) of Lectures

		xi.	(If relevant) In the videotape, if there was the presentation of a mathematical or quantitative example or problem, was the professor well-prepared in presenting such a problem?	Yes □	Somewhat □	No □	
	-	xii.		Yes 🗆	Somewhat $\square$	No □	
		xiii.	In the videotape, does the faculty member create a respectful classroom atmosphere?	Yes 🗆	Somewhat □	No □	
		xiv.	In the videotape, is there a use of active learning?	Yes 🗆	Somewhat $\square$	No □	
		XV.	(If relevant), in the videotape, are the active learning modules effective and have been designed carefully?	Yes □	Somewhat □	No □	
		xvi.	(If relevant) In the videotape, does the faculty member use current event examples to illustrate the issues and motivate the discussion?	Yes □	Somewhat	No □	
		xvii.	(If relevant) In the videotape, does the faculty member handle politically controversial issues in a balanced manner?	Yes □	Somewhat	No □	
	-	the c	andidate under "Classroom				Total =
Teachi	ing						

SN	Parameter	Check List	Response (Yes/Somewhat/No)			Attach softcopies of evidences with adequate title
	Use of Technology	<ul><li>i. Did the candidate submit a statement on their use of technology in teaching?</li></ul>	N/A	N/A	N/A	Statement by the candidate on Use of Technology
7.	Maximum marks (18);	ii. Does the faculty member use any of the modern technological tools listed below?	Yes □	Somewhat □	No 🗆	
	Weightage (05%)	iii. Does the faculty member assign any audiovisual materials as homework assignment or use them in the classroom?	Yes □		No □	

	he faculty member use the I classroom approach?	Yes □	No □	
v. Does the automotion	he faculty member use an ated grading system, e.g., for squizzes?	Yes 🗆	No 🗆	
studen	he faculty member ask ts to participate in a class class-related social media	Yes 🗆	No 🗆	
commu throug	he faculty member unicate with students h email list servers or other arrangements?	Yes □	No 🗆	
encour	he faculty member rage or require assignments ubmitted electronically?	Yes □	No 🗆	
smart o	he faculty member use classroom technology for ctive learning?	Yes 🗆	No □	
Marks obtained by the candidate	e under "Use of			Total =
Technology"				

S. No	Parameter	Check List	(Yo	Response (Yes/Somewhat/No)		
	Student	i. Did the candidate provide a statement regarding their mentoring and student interaction activities?	N/A	N/A	N/A	Statement by the candidate on mentoring and student interaction activities.
8.	interaction and mentoring	ii. Does the faculty member announce regular office hours in which students could see her/him for follow up questions or course-related help?	Yes		No □	
	marks (16); Weightage (10%)	iii. In the videotape, does the faculty member try to create an interactive learning environment in which students feel comfortable in asking questions?	Yes 🗆	Somewhat $\square$	No □	
		iv. Does the faculty member make an attempt to link the subject to	Yes □	Somewhat $\square$	No □	

		current events or other issues that might be of interest to students?				
	v.	(For faculty members advising graduate students) Does the faculty member have a clearly articulated system for supervising graduate students and research teams?	Yes □	Somewhat □	NO □	
	vi.	(For faculty members advising graduate students) Does the faculty member meet regularly with their graduate student mentees?	Yes □	Somewhat □	No 🗆	
	vii.	(For faculty members advising graduate students) Does the faculty member allocate a minimum of 8 hours per week on mentoring students outside of the classroom?	Yes □	Somewhat □	No □	
	viii	Does the faculty member participate personally in classroom blogs or class-related social media pages, e.g., by commenting on posts, raising issues, or providing guidance?	Yes □	Somewhat	No 🗆	
	he ca	andidate under "Student				Total =
Evaluations"						

SN	Parameter	Check List	(Ye	Response es/Somewhat/No)	Attach softcopies of evidences with adequate title
9.	Student Evaluations *  Maximum marks (04); Weightage (20%)	<ul> <li>i. Has the university submitted student evaluations for the candidate faculty member?</li> <li>ii. Has the university provided evaluation averages across the entire universities and for the department and faculty of the candidate?</li> </ul>	Yes □ Yes □	No 🗆	Student Evaluation Forms/Results
Mark	s obtained by the	e candidate under "Student Evaluations"			Total =

Name of the Teacher: Department: University:

\* A form for getting students' feedback on candidate's teaching is provided.

## 10. Research Excellence (Marks 20) (Period of evaluation last 3 years)

Mar	Marks to this section 05 under Research									
1.		earch Projects Won kimum Marks (5)	Detail	Maximum Marks	Marks Secured	Attach softcopies of evidences with adequate title				
	i.	Research Projects funded by national agencies of at least one year duration or above.	0.5 Marks for each completed project (Max. 4)	2						
	ii.	Research Projects funded by International Agencies (greater than 0.5 million).	0.5 Marks for each completed project (Max. 6)	3						
			Total Marks	5						

Mar	ks to th	nis section 08 under Research				
2.		arch Publications recognized by HEC. mum Marks (8)	Detail	Max. Marks	Marks Secured	Attach softcopies of evidences with adequate title
	i.	International publication with impact factor as a first author	0.5 Marks per paper (Max. 2)	1		
	ii.	International publication with impact factor as a co-author	0.5 Marks per Paper (Max. 2)	1		
	iii.	Res. publication in referred local research journals of Int. repute recognized by HEC as a 1st author.	0.5 Mark per paper (Max. 2)	1		
	iv.	Res. publication in refereed local research journals of Int. repute recognized by HEC as second/third author	0.5 Mark per paper (Max. 2)	1		
	V.	No of Books Authored (not edited) and published by International Publisher (recognized by HEC)	0.5 Marks per book (Max. 2)	1		
	vi.	No of Books Authored (not edited) and published by national Publisher (HEC Recognized Publishers)	0.5 Marks per book (Max. 2)	1		
	vii.	Oral Presentations in an International Conference in the year concerned (Abroad)	0.5 Marks for presentation made per conference (Max. 2)	1		

N. C.1 T. 1	D	77
Name of the Teacher:	Department:	University:

viii.	Oral Presentations in a national	0.5 Mark for	1	
	Conference in the year concerned (local)	presentation		
		made per		
		conference		
		(Max. 2)		
		Total Marks	08	

We	Weightage Distribution to this section 07% under Research									
3.	Ma		sion (28); Weightage (7%) n is last three years)	Detail	Maximum Marks	Marks Secured	Attach softcopies of evidences with adequate title			
	i.	As a supervisor	Ph.D. (maximum 4 students)	1 Marks per student supervised (only completed thesis)	4					
			M.Phil./ MS (maximum 6 students)	0.5 Marks per student supervised	3					
				Total Marks	07					

<sup>\*</sup>In case of International Publication with the Impact Factor and publication in local journals as first author, if the nominee exceeds from the maximum limit but do not have any publication as co-author, the nominee will get the score of co-author automatically against his/her additional publications as first author. The same case will be applicable for books published by international and local publishers.

St	tudent Feedback	k Fo	orm			
Nan	ne of Teacher:			_		
Sub	ject & Departmen	t:				
Uni	versity:					
Dat			<del></del>			
	•		es equal marks, according to the criteria gi	ven below	<i>':</i>	
	= <b>2, Somewhat</b> = 1	1, No				
SN	Parameter		Questions		Response	
1.	Course Syllabus	i.	Does the syllabus list the expectations from the students?	Yes □		No □
		ii.	Does the course ask students to read the assigned materials ahead of time?	Yes □		No □
2.	Grading System, Tests,	i.	Do the quizzes reward preparation or insight?	Yes □	Somewhat $\square$	No □
	and Assignments	ii.	Has the professor given in-class assignments?	Yes □		No □
		iii.	Has the professor given homework assignments?	Yes □		No □
		iv.	Do the students receive grades for completion of the assignments?	Yes □		No □
		V.	Does the grading system encourage students to act in ways as to achieve learning objectives?	Yes 🗆	Somewhat $\square$	No □
		vi.	Does the professor assign grades for class participation?	Yes □		No □
3.	Lesson Plan	i.	Is the volume of assigned readings for each lecture feasible for students to undertake?	Yes □		No 🗆
		ii.	Does the lesson plan include homework assignments?	Yes □		No □
			Does the lesson plan include in-class assignments or quizzes?	Yes □		No □
		iv.	Does the lesson plan provide for active learning in the classroom?	Yes □	Somewhat □	No □
4.	Classroom	i.	Does the professor use PPTs?	Yes □	Somewhat $\square$	No □
	Teaching	ii.	Have the PPTs been made available to the students?	Yes □		No □
		iii.	Is the length of the PPTs suitable for the time allotted for the lecture?	Yes □		No □
		iv.	(If relevant) was the mathematical/ quantitative problem explained effectively to students?	Yes 🗆	Somewhat $\square$	No 🗆
		٧.	(If relevant) does the faculty member use current event examples to illustrate	Yes □	Somewhat 🗵	No □

Name of the Teacher: Department: University:

the issues and motivate the discussion?

		vi.	(If relevant) does the faculty member handle politically controversial issues in a balanced manner?	Yes 🗆	Somewhat $\square$	No □
5.	Use of Technology	i.	Does the faculty member assign any audiovisual materials as homework assignment or use them in the classroom?	Yes 🗆		No □
		ii.	Does the faculty member use the flipped classroom approach?	Yes □		No □
		iii.	Does the faculty member use an automated grading system, e.g., for inclass quizzes?	Yes □		No □
		iv.	Does the faculty member ask students to participate in a class blog or class-related social media pages?	Yes 🗆		No □
		V.	Does the faculty member communicate with students through email list servers or other group arrangements?	Yes 🗆		No □
		vi.	Does the faculty member encourage or require assignments to be submitted electronically?	Yes 🗆		No □
		vii.	Does the faculty member use smart classroom technology for interactive learning?	Yes □		No □
6.	Student Interaction & Mentoring	i.	Does the faculty member announce regular office hours in which students could see her/him for follow up questions or course-related help?	Yes □		No □
		ii.	Does the faculty member try to create an interactive learning environment in which students feel comfortable in asking questions?	Yes 🗆	Somewhat	No □
		iii.	Does the faculty member make an attempt to link the subject to current events or other issues that might be of interest to students?	Yes 🗆	Somewhat	No □
		iv.	(For faculty members advising graduate students) Does the faculty member meet regularly with their graduate student mentees?	Yes 🗆	Somewhat	No □
		V.	(For faculty members advising graduate students) Does the faculty member allocate a minimum of 8 hours per week on mentoring students outside of the classroom?	Yes 🗆	Somewhat	No □
		vi.	Does the faculty member participate personally in classroom blogs or class-related social media pages, e.g., by	Yes 🗆	Somewhat	No □

Tota	Marks obtained by the teacher		Total:
	providing guidance?		
	commenting on posts, raising issues, o	r	