



No. CDN-20011/65/2025-Coord-NMC
Government of India
National Medical Commission
Coordination Division



Pocket- 14, Sector- 8,
Dwarka, Phase-1, New Delhi-77
Dated the 10-05-2025

PUBLIC NOTICE

Subject: Seeking Comments from the stakeholders on the Draft framework for accreditation and ranking of Medical Colleges regulated by MARB, NMC. – reg.

The Medical Assessment and Rating Board (MARB), National Medical Commission (NMC), in exercise of the powers conferred under Section 26(1)(d) of the National Medical Commission Act, 2019; intends to carry-out accreditation & rating of all Medical Colleges regulated by the NMC, through an independent third party agency.

2. In this regard, the Draft Framework for Accreditation and Ranking of Medical Colleges comprising of total 11 criteria & 78 parameters, is hereby placed in the public domain for seeking comments/suggestions from stakeholders.

3. All stakeholders are requested to submit their comments/suggestions through an online form in the link provided below, within 21 days from the date of publication of this notice.

<https://forms.gle/nuk5fJgnxyKQZudk9>

Digitally signed by
Dr.Raghav Langer
Date: 10-05-2025
22:45:35

Raghav Langer
SECRETARY
r.langer@ias.nic.in

To

Dean/Principals of all Medical Colleges (under the purview of NMC) / All Stakeholders:

DRAFT FRAMEWORK FOR
ACCREDITATION AND RANKING OF COLLEGES
REGULATED BY NATIONAL MEDICAL COMMISSION

INDEX

S. No.	Particulars	Page No.
1.0	Scheme of Criteria & related Parameters and allocated weightages	03
2.0	Operational Definition of Criteria mapping with NMC Regulations for Assessment and Rating of Medical Colleges	04
3.0	Allocation of weightages to Parameters subsumed under Criteria	10
4.0	Operational Definition & Scoring Rubrics for Parameters subsumed under Criteria	20
01	Curriculum	20
02	Practical/Hand on/ Clinical Experiences	37
03	Teaching-Learning Environment- Physical Psychological & Occupational	60
04	Students' Admission, Attainment of Competence & Progression	81
05	Human Resource & Teaching – Learning Process	104
06	Assessment Policy: Formative, Internal & Summative Assessment	134
07	Research Output & Impact	148
08	Financial-Resource: Recurring & non-recurring expenditures	159
09	Community Outreach Programs	172
10	Quality Assurance System	177
11	Feedback & Perception of Stakeholders	183

1.0 Scheme of Criteria related Parameters & allocated weightages

S. No.	Assessment & Rating Criteria	Parameters		Total Parameters	Total allocated weightages
		Qualitative	Quantitative		
1	Curriculum Implementation and Capacity Building Activities	3	3	06	100
2	Clinical Exposure, Clinical Training, Internship and Clinical Facilities	1	10	11	100
3	Teaching –Learning Environment: - Physical, Psychological & Occupational	11	0	11	130
4	Students' Admission, Attainment of Competence & Progression	2	4	06	140
5	Human Resource & Teaching-Learning Process	2	09	11	160
6	Assessment Policy: Formative, Internal & Summative Assessment	4	0	4	60
7	Research Output & Impact	0	8	08	100
8	Financial-Resource: Recurring & non-recurring expenditures	0	10	10	100
9	Community Outreach Programs	1	1	2	40
10	Quality Assurance System	2	3	5	30
11	Feedback & Perception of Stakeholders	0	4	4	40
Total		26	52	78	1000

2.0. Operational Definition of Criteria mapping with NMC Regulations for Assessment and Rating of Medical Colleges

Criterion 1- Curriculum Implementation and Capacity Building Activities

Operational explanation- This criterion aims to capture information related to implementation of Competence Based Curriculum prescribed by Medical Regulators for UG Program. Some parameters of qualitative nature & some parameters of quantitative natures are subsumed under this criterion. Qualitative parameters are predominantly related to process aspects of implementation of Curriculum, for verification of curriculum implementation, sampled faculty staff representation from all subjects will be interacted. Further sampled students of all professional years will be interacted by Assessment Team members on the day of visit wherever required for capturing viewpoints of students.

For all qualitative & quantitative parameters, Data Capture Format (DCF) have been designed and accordingly Medical College will provide information related to each parameter. Under this criterion, parameters are designed related to Implementation of Competency Based Curriculum, Elective courses, constitution and functioning Academic Council, Curriculum Committee (CC) and MEU (Medical Education Unit), capturing information faculty wise for type of FDPs (Faculty Development Programs) have been attended like BCME (Basic Course in Medical Education), CISP, ACME (Advance Course in Medical Education) and further parameters are designed related to Collaboration with Academic or Research Institutions in India and abroad and further type of activities have been executed based on collaborations. Wherever required, Assessment Team will interact with sampled faculty and sampled students.

Prominently parameters framed under this criterion are related to implementation and compliance with standards laid down by UGMEB for Medical Colleges vis-à-vis Competency based Medical Education, provisions laid down for FDPs and further some parameters like Medical Colleges for collaboration with Academic and Research Institutions are related to academic excellence category of parameters mentioned in Assessment and Rating Regulations-2023. Since for several parameters, sampled students will also be interacted, this is also aligned with students' feedback on various affairs of Medical College category of parameters.

Criterion 2- Clinical Exposure, Clinical Training, Internship and Clinical Facilities

Operational explanation- Based on the curriculum laid down by the Medical Regulator for UG Program in Medical Education, students will be provided with mandatory hands-on experiences through clinical postings in Medicine and allied specialties, Surgery and allied specialties, Community Medicine and Obstetrics & Gynaecology etc. Hence parameters have been designed under this criterion pertaining to availability of required clinical materials in different specialties as mentioned above. Some parameters are designed to capture information like number laboratory-based investigations carried out in available clinical laboratories in attached teaching hospital, number of radiological investigations performed under department of radio-diagnosis, OPD attendance and IPD admission data in abovementioned clinical departments in attached teaching hospital etc. Parameters under this criterion has been designed with assumptions that adequate patient loads and other clinical materials are highly needed for clinical training of medical students in health care settings.

Prominently parameters framed under this criterion are related to standards laid down by UGMEB for clinical training of medical students in different health care setting and satisfactory teaching-learning environment category of parameters as per Assessment and Rating Regulations-2023. Since for several parameters, sampled students will also be interacted, this is also aligned with students' feedback on various affairs of Medical College category of parameters.

Criterion 3- Teaching –Learning Environment: - Physical, Psychological & Occupational

Operational explanation- With “Establishment of Medical institutions, Assessment & Rating Regulations, 2023”, there should be conducive teaching-learning environment for organization teaching learning activities. Under this criterion broadly three aspects of teaching-learning environments have been taken into considerations for deriving relevant parameters in sync with standards laid down by UGMEB.

While deriving parameters under this criterion, it has been assumed that adequate and functional Central Library, Student Practical Laboratories and Skill Laboratory are highly needed for creating conducive teaching learning environment for Training of practical and clinical skill competencies in these Laboratories and simulated setting created in Skill Laboratory. Some parameters are related to creation of Digital Library and adequate audio-visual facilities for creation of conducive digital teaching-learning environment.

Some parameters are framed with intention to study safety measures placed by Medical College in compliance with regulatory requirements like Ant-ragging measures, measures for prevention of Gender Harassment, fire safety measures and measures established

for BMW management and prevention of HCAI (Health Care Associated Infections) etc. Further how teaching hospital is practising safety measures pertaining to medical radio-diagnosis equipment set-up and available in the concerned clinical department.

Further, parameters are framed related to student amenities like availability of facilities for indoor and outdoor sports and organization of Sport Program and Cultural Program which are also essential for creating conducive teaching learning environment. Hostel Facilities and associated health safety measures also covered under this criterion, it is assumed that these also contribute in creating satisfactory teaching-learning environment.

Prominently parameters framed under this criterion are related to standards laid down by UGMEB for Medical Colleges as per Assessment and Rating Regulations-2023. Since for several parameters, sampled students will also be interacted, this is also aligned with students' feedback on various affairs of Medical College category of parameters.

Criterion 4- Students' Admission, Attainment of Competence & Progression

Operational explanation- As per title of this criterion, parameters framed under this criterion are related to admission, competency attainment and progression of students. As UGMEB has prescribed CBME (Competency Based Medical Education) and accordingly subject wise competencies have been specified in GMER-2023. Starting tow parameters are related to assessment of competencies of students vis-à-vis prescribed competencies for all professional years. Competencies of the sampled students/interns will be assessed in Skill Laboratory based simulated setting and real clinical setting.

Some parameters are related to admissions of students in MBBS. NEET-UG scores/ranks of admitted students in Medical Colleges under unreserved category will be compared. It is assumed that College wise computation average UG-NEET scores/ranks vis-à-vis all admitted students may be proxy for reputations of colleges among students. Further College wise average NEET-PG ranks/scores of minimum cut-off qualified students under unreserved category will be computed, further it is assumed that it may be proxy of quality of teaching-learning environment in the concerned Medical Colleges. One parameter is related to students' progression towards higher program in medical education, for this NEET-PG admission under AIQ (All India Quota) organized by MCC will be taken into considerations, under this parameter, percentage of qualified students who have gotten admission under AIQ organized by MCC.

All parameters framed under this criterion serves as a proxy parameter for evaluating the quality of the teaching-learning process, academic excellence and Standards laid down by UGMEB for Medical Colleges. Hence parameters under this criterion are related to teaching-learning environment, standards laid down by UGMEB for Medical Colleges and academic excellence category of parameters mentioned in Assessment and Rating Regulations-2023.

Criterion 5- Human Resource & Teaching-Learning Process

Operational explanation- Parameters which are framed under this criterion are related to number of faculty vis-à-vis sanctioned intake, attrition rate of faculty, percentage of faculty (Professor, Associate Professor & Assistant Professor) with additional qualifications, academic presentations by faculty and students in conferences organized as International, National and State level, contribution of faculty in online & offline course materials, achievement of fellowship awards etc. Further, presentations by students and faculty in conferences will be accepted when conferences are organized by registered professional bodies. Professional bodies may be registered with EMRB-NMC and State Medical Council (SMC).

Prominently parameters framed under this criterion are related to standards laid down by UGMEB for Medical Colleges, quality of faculty is essential for academic excellence, presentations by students and faculty in recognized conferences is related to rating parameter of “Participation of students/faculty in academic activities at national and international level” as laid down in Assessment and Rating Regulations-2023. Since for several parameters, sampled students will also be interacted, this is also aligned with students’ feedback on various affairs of Medical College category of parameters

Criterion 6- Assessment Policy: Formative, Internal & Summative Assessment

Operational explanation- This criterion predominantly deals with formative, internal and summative assessment vis-à-vis competence-based Curriculum by Medical Regulators. For deriving parameters, guidelines and curriculum prescribed by UGMEB-NMC have been referred. For specifying rubrics for parameters framed under this criterion, documented developed by MCI/NMC like Module-3 Assessment for CISP-2019 and Logbook guideline-2019 and GMER-2019 & 2023 have been referred.

Parameters framed under this criterion is related to Formative Assessments, Internal Assessment Examinations and Support Programme/Remedial Instruction based on analysis of assessment data post Formative and Internal Assessment Examinations.

Prominently parameters of this criterion are related to standards laid down by UGMEB for Medical Colleges in sync with Assessment and Rating Regulations-2023. Since for several parameters, sampled students will also be interacted, this is also aligned with students’ feedback on various affairs of Medical College category of parameters.

Criterion 7- Research Output & Impact

Operational explanation- This criterion of “Research Output & Impact” related to assessment and rating parameter- “The research output of the medical institution that has contributed to the existing knowledge and the research impact created by the medical institution” as mentioned in Assessment and Rating Regulations-2023.

Under this criterion, parameters like number of research papers published in indexed journals, number of citations published research papers, impact factors of journals in which research papers are published, number and type of funded research projects completed/ongoing in College, number of patent filed/granted etc. are subsumed. While deriving parameters for this Criterion, it has been taken into account that parameters should be related to both quantity & quality of research activities in Medical College/Institution.

Criterion 8- Financial-Resource: Recurring & non-recurring expenditures

Operational explanation- Under this criterion, those parameters are kept which are proxy for effective teaching learning process and clinical training of students. Amount spent on procurement of consumable material/articles in Laboratories, amount spent on purchasing of Books & Journals, amount spent on procuring consumables for indoor & outdoor sports facilities, amount spent on conducting Professional Development programs for Faculty staff, amount spent on salary of teaching, amount spent on maintenance of non-consumable equipment in Laboratory, OTs and department of radio-diagnosis etc. all these are proxy for how teaching-learning activities are being organized as per standards laid down by UGMEB.

All these parameters are proxy for how effectively students are provided with learning experiences in Laboratory based simulated set up, how faculty staff are provided with opportunities for enhancing their teaching & training skills for implementation of Competence based Curriculum etc. Amount spent on Laboratories of Clinical departments are indicative of patient loads in teaching hospital, these are essential clinical materials for effective clinical training of students in actual clinical setting. This criterion is directly related to alignment of activities with standard laid down by UGMEB which is one major category of assessment and rating as per Assessment and Rating Regulations-2023.

Criterion 9- Community Outreach Programs

Operational explanation- This criterion deals with Community Outreach Programs being conducted by Medical College. As per GMER-2023, Family Adoption Programme (FAP) has been made essential component of Curriculum. Parameters under this criterion are derived from Guideline laid down by UGMEB for Family Adoption Programme like student wise adopted families in the villages, Organization of diagnostic camps and screening of family members, organization of follow-up diagnostic camps etc.

Prominently parameters mentioned under this criterion are related to assessment and rating category of Standards laid down by UGMEB for Medical Colleges as per Assessment and Rating Regulations-2023. Since for several parameters, sampled students will also be interacted, this is also aligned with students' feedback on various affairs of Medical College category of parameters

Criterion 10- Quality Assurance System

Operational explanation- This criterion deals with the Quality Assurance System (QAS). It encompasses practices related to the QAS, such as the proactive approach of Medical Colleges, including accreditation of Laboratories by specialized and recognized national or international bodies, as well as accreditation of Hospitals by specialized national or international bodies. This parameter primarily focuses on gathering information that indicates how the Medical College ensures compliance with Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) established by specialized accreditation bodies for the functioning of Laboratories and Hospitals. Additionally, information will be gathered regarding the implementation of safety measures in accordance with NMC guidelines and Constitution and functioning of Committees like Pharmacovigilance Committee, AMS Committee etc.

Prominently parameters mentioned under this criterion are related to assessment and rating category of Standards laid down by UGMEB for Medical Colleges as per Assessment and Rating Regulations-2023.

Criterion 11- Feedback & Perception of Stakeholders

Operational explanation- This criterion focuses on capturing feedback and information about the perception of stakeholders such as students, staff and alumni, regarding the quality of Medical Colleges. It is crucial to understand the facilities available in the Medical College from the students' perspective. Students have direct experience to these facilities and can provide relevant information about whether the available resources contribute to their training as intended by the Medical Regulator. Additionally, understanding the perception of alumni towards the Medical College is important to assess how their past training at the institution has influenced their professional lives and their overall experience of the College's quality. Feedback and satisfaction surveys will be conducted for faculty staff to gain insight into their experiences while implementing the Competence-Based Curriculum at the College, as well as their level of satisfaction regarding work conditions and financial entitlement and benefits provided by the institution. This criterion is associated with the assessment and rating criteria set forth by the NMC, specifically related to Students' Feedback, Academic Excellence, and Teaching-Learning Environment categories.

3.0. Allocation of weightages to Parameters subsumed under Criteria

S. No.	Criterion	Parameter	Weightage allocated to Parameter	Nature of Parameter (Qualitative or Quantitative)	Performance Level			
					1	2	3	4
1-	Curriculum Implementation and Capacity Building Activities	1. Implementation of Curriculum by Institution/College in alignment with Program Specific Competences laid down by NMC	30	Qualitative				
		2. Planning & offering of Elective Courses being offered by College/Institution within scope laid down by NMC	10	Qualitative				
		3. Functioning of College Council, Curriculum Committees & Medical Education Unit (MEU)	20	Qualitative				
		4. Faculty wise completed Faculty Development Programmes (FDP) vis-à-vis FDP Guidelines of NMC	10	Quantitative				
		5. No. of Collaborations/MOU's with National & International Institutions in the past 2 years	10	Quantitative				

		6. Outcomes of MOUs/Agreement signed for Collaboration/ Partnering with Institutions in India & abroad vis-à-vis Parameter-5	20	Quantitative				
2-	Clinical Exposure, Clinical Training, Internship and Clinical Facilities	1. Provision of Clinical Exposure/posting/internship to students/Interns vis-à-vis varied clinical specialties/Health Care setting	10	Qualitative				
		2. Specialty/Clinical Department wise OPD Attendance in the calendar year	15	Quantitative				
		3. Specialty wise % of Bed Occupancy in Hospital in the last calendar year	15	Quantitative				
		4. Specialty wise Number of Minor surgeries performed in OT in past 1 Year	10	Quantitative				
		5. Specialty wise Number of Major surgeries works performed in OT in past 1 Year	10	Quantitative				
		6. On Average Radiological Investigations performed in OPD & IPD together in past 1 Year	05	Quantitative				
		7. On Average Laboratory based Investigations performed in OPD & IPD together in past 1 Year	10	Quantitative				

		8. On Average Daily Patient admission/attendance Casualty/Emergency Department in past 1 year	05	Quantitative				
		9. Provision of Community Postings at RHC/UHC under Community Medicine in past 1 year	05	Quantitative				
		10. No. of patients treated in Intensive Care Areas/High Dependency Units in past 1 year	05	Quantitative				
		11. No. of deliveries (both normal & C-Section) in past 1 year	10	Quantitative				
3-	Teaching – Learning Environment: - Physical, Psychological & Occupational	1. Adequacy, Functionality & Optimum Utilization of Physical/Digital Library based resources	10	Qualitative				
		2. Adequacy, Functionality & Optimum Utilization of Student Practical Laboratories in Medical College	20	Qualitative				
		3. Adequacy, Functionality & Optimum Utilization of Clinical & Procedural Skill Laboratory based Resources	20	Qualitative				
		4. Adequacy, Functionality & Optimum Utilization of ICT Facilities/Medical Education Technology (MET) Unit	10	Qualitative				
		5. Provision and utilization of students' amenities (Indoor &	10	Qualitative				

		outdoor sport facilities, extra-curricular activities etc.)						
		6. Hostel Accommodation Capacities & Safety Measures	10	Qualitative				
		7. Provisions for Prevention of Ragging & Gender Harassment in Medical College	10	Qualitative				
		8. Provisions of Biomedical Waste Management in Medical College	10	Qualitative				
		9. Provisions of Hospital Infection Control Measures for HCAI (Health Care Associated Infection) in Medical College	10	Qualitative				
		10. Provisions for Safety Measures for Diagnostic Radiology/Radiotherapy vis-à-vis AERB (Atomic Energy Regulation Board)	10	Qualitative				
		11. Provisions for Fire Safety in Campus (Teaching Block, Hospital Block & Hostel Block)	10	Qualitative				
4-	Students' Admission, Attainment of Competence & Progression	1. Demonstration of procedures by Sampled students in Procedure & Clinical Skill Laboratory/Simulated Setting	35	Qualitative				
		2. Demonstration of Clinical procedures/clinical skill competency by sampled students/interns at Clinical site (Hospital)	35	Qualitative				

		3. Average NEET Scores of students admitted to the UG Programme in the last 5 academic calendar.	20	Quantitative				
		4. Average PG NEET Scores of UG Graduated students/UG alumni qualified minimum Cut-off Percentile in recently conducted NEET PG (Previous Year)	10	Quantitative				
		5. No. of UG Graduated students/UG Alumni taken admission in PG under recently organized AIQ (All India Quota) counselling by MCC and State Counselling in previous year	20	Quantitative				
		6. Performance of Students in Summative Assessment/Exit Examination in the last academic year	20	Quantitative				
5-	Human Resource & Teaching-Learning Process	1. Teaching –learning methods being employed by sampled Faculties in their Theory classes	20	Qualitative				
		2. Teaching –learning methods being employed by faculties for practical/clinical sessions in Laboratory/simulated setting/Bed side teaching	20	Qualitative				
		3. Programmed wise number of recruited Faculty Staff vis-à-vis Regulatory specifications	20	Quantitative				
		4. Programme wise number of Faculty Staff with additional	10	Quantitative				

		professional qualifications other than minimum qualifications laid down by NMC							
		5. Staff attrition rate in past 2 Years	15	Quantitative					
		6. No. of prestigious Awards/Grants instituted at International or National or State level availed by students in past 2 years	20	Quantitative					
		7. No. of prestigious Awards instituted at International or National or State level availed by Faculty of College in last 2 Years	15	Quantitative					
		8. Number of Extra/Co-curricular Student awards instituted at State/National/International level availed by students in past 2 years (for UG Student only)	10	Quantitative					
		9. Number of Faculty Staff contributed in Designing of Course Materials (Online & offline) at International or National or State level recognized platforms in past 2 years	15	Quantitative					
		10. Number of Paper Presentations by Faculty Staff in recognized International/National & State level Conferences/Competitions in last 2 Years	10	Quantitative					
		11. Number of Academic Presentations by Students in recognized International/National & State	05	Quantitative					

		level Conferences/Competitions in last 2 Years (UG Student only)						
6-	Assessment Policy: Formative, Internal & Summative Assessment	1. Regular Periodical Internal Assessment (IA) Examinations for theory & Practical/Clinical vis-à-vis NMC Guideline for Competence Based Assessment (CBA)	15	Qualitative				
		2. Usages of Formative Assessment methods vis-à-vis Continuous and Comprehensive Assessment Process	15					
		3. Log Books & Portfolio based Tracking learning progress of students vis-à-vis laid down clinical Skills/Competences	15	Qualitative				
		4. Department wise Analysis & reviewing of Students' Performance in Formative & Internal Assessments and taking corrective actions	15	Qualitative				
7-	Research Output & Impact	1. Total number of research paper publications by Faculty Staff with Institutional Affiliation in last 2 Years in indexed Journals	15	Quantitative				
		2. Cumulative Citation Scores of research papers published in indexed journals in last 2 years	15	Quantitative				
		3. Cumulative Impact Factors of all publications published by the Institute in indexed Journals in the last 2 Years	05	Quantitative				

		4. No. of patents/Design Registration filed by the Institution in the last 2 years	10	Quantitative				
		5. No. of patents granted, converted to products and commercialized in last 2 years	10	Quantitative				
		6. No. of extramural funded projects completed/ongoing in collaboration with Industry/Non-government (National, State/International) funding agencies in last 2 Financial Years	10	Quantitative				
		7. No. of extramural funded projects completed/ongoing in collaboration with Industry/Non-government (National, State/International) funding agencies in last 2 Financial Years	20	Quantitative				
		8. No. of clinical trials initiated/going on/approved for different phases in last 2 calendar year	15	Quantitative				
8-	Financial-Resource: Recurring & non-recurring expenditures	1. Total amount of Books & Journals and other Learning Resources purchased in previous financial year	10	Quantitative				
		2. Total amount spent on procurement of consumable Lab based materials in previous financial year	10	Quantitative				
		3. Total amount spent on maintenance of radiological	10	Quantitative				

		equipment in previous financial year						
		4. Total amount spent on procurement of non-consumable equipment in Clinical Laboratories in attached teaching hospital in previous financial year	10	Quantitative				
		5. Total amount spent on consumable resources for indoor & outdoor sports in previous financial year	10	Quantitative				
		6. Amount spent on salary for Faculty Staff and residents in the previous financial year	20	Quantitative				
		7. Percentage of Electricity (Units) vis-à-vis total consumed electricity in the previous financial year obtained from renewable energy (solar/wind)	10	Quantitative				
		8. Amount spent on procurement of consumable materials for clinical/ operational works in OT for meeting demands of patients in previous financial year.	10	Quantitative				
		9. Amount spent on maintenance of non-consumable equipment in OT in the previous financial year	05	Quantitative				
		10. Amount spent on strengthening of Safety Measures in Campus in the previous financial year	05	Quantitative				

9-	Community Outreach Programs	1. No. of families adopted by students and organization of diagnostic camps in villages of adopted families for screening & identification of disease/ill-health & malnutrition	15	Quantitative				
		2. Impact of family adoption/therapeutic intervention on health outcomes of adopted family	25	Qualitative				
10-	Quality Assurance System	1. Accreditations of Clinical Laboratories by NABL or nationally recognized body	05	Quantitative				
		2. NABH Accreditation of parent/attached hospital	10	Quantitative				
		3. Legal Licenses- (Availability & Validity as per NMC guidelines)	05	Quantitative				
		4. Pharmacovigilance Committee	05	Qualitative				
		5. Constitution and Functioning of Antimicrobial Stewardship (AMS) Committee	05	Qualitative				
11-	Feedback & Perception of Stakeholders	1. Feedback from sampled students & Inspiration Index	10	Quantitative				
		2. Feedback from sampled Faculty & Loyalty Index	10	Quantitative				
		3. Perception of Alumni towards quality of Institution	10	Quantitative				
		4. Parameter-11.4 Perception of Patients towards Health Care Services	10	Quantitative				

4.0. Operational Definition & Scoring Rubrics for Parameters subsumed under Criteria

Criterion-1: Curriculum Implementation and Capacity Building Activities

Parameter-1.1: Implementation of Curriculum by Institution/College in alignment with Program Specific Competences laid down by NMC

Operational explanation: - For capturing observations on this parameter, practices of college pertaining to implementation of Competence Based Curriculum will be verified. As per prescribed framework of curriculum by NMC, College is required to align Theory, practical & Clinical experiences in concerned subjects aligning with prescribed Competence and facilitating horizontal & vertical integration among competences prescribed for pre-clinical, para-clinical & clinical subjects. Further how competences will be developed in students is also suggested in Curriculum Framework like

- Specification of Learning Domains for desired behavioural changes in students
- Specification of Proficiency or Competency level (K, KH, S, SH & P) for Practical & clinical skills to be acquired by Medical Students
- Suggested teaching/training methods for Faculty
- Suggested assessments methods and tools for evaluating and monitoring mastery level of students over concerned Competences for concerned subjects/specialties et.

(Source: GMER-2023, Competency Based UG Curriculum for Indian Medical Students Vol. I, II & III-2018)

- ✓ *Note: For parameter-1, 2 & 3: 25% faculties from each pre-clinical, para-clinical & clinical subject/department will be randomly selected for interaction on the day of Physical visit. Randomly selected faculties should not be member of Curriculum Committee.*
- ✓ *For Parameter-1, 2 & 3: The central limit theorem (CLT) states that the distribution of sample means & other statistics approximates a normal distribution as the sample size gets larger, regardless of the population's distribution. Sample sizes equal to or greater than 30 are often considered sufficient for the CLT to hold. Students will be randomly selected based on following methods: -*

Professional Phase	% Students to be sampled
--------------------	--------------------------

First Professional	5% of total enrolled students
Second Professional	5 % of total enrolled students
Third Professional part-1	5 % of total enrolled students 1
Third Professional part-2	5 % of total enrolled students 1

Note: Total number of students sampled from all professional years should not be less than 30 and should not be more than 60.

Scoring Rubrics for this parameter: -

Sub-parameters	Rating Levels				Supporting documents
	Level-1	Level-2	Level-3	Level-4	
1.1.1-Alignmnet with Competences	If Less than 50% sampled Faculties are able to show documented evidences about alignment of Theory & Practical/clinical sessions with prescribed Competencies for the subject	If 50% to 70% sampled Faculties are able to show documented evidences about alignment of Theory & Practical/clinical sessions with prescribed Competencies for the subject	If 71% to 90% sampled Faculties are able to show documented evidences about alignment of Theory & Practical/clinical sessions with prescribed Competencies for the subject	If more than 90% sampled Faculties are able to show documented evidences about alignment of Theory & Practical/clinical sessions with prescribed Competencies for the subject	Curriculum Plan, Teaching/Lesson Plans, Subject Attendance Register etc.
1.1.2-Specifications of Learning Objectives	If less than 50% sampled faculties are able to show how theory & Practical/Clinical sessions are being conducted in sync with competency wise Learning Objectives aligned with Learning	If 50% to 70% sampled faculties are able to show how theory & Practical/Clinical sessions are being conducted in sync with competency wise Learning Objectives aligned with Learning	If 71% to 90% sampled faculties are able to show how theory & Practical/Clinical sessions are being conducted in sync with competency wise Learning Objectives aligned with Learning	If more than 90% sampled faculties are able to show how theory & Practical/Clinical sessions are being conducted in sync with competency wise Learning Objectives aligned with Learning	Curriculum Plan, Teaching/Lesson Plans, Subject Attendance Register etc.

	Domains like Knowledge (K), Skills (S) etc.	Domains like Knowledge (K), Skills (S) etc.	Domains like Knowledge (K), Skills (S) etc.	Domains like Knowledge (K), Skills (S) etc.	
1.1.3. Specification of Competency or Proficiency Levels	If less than 50% sampled faculties are able to show how Theory & Practical/Clinical sessions are being organized by specifying Competency wise Competency or proficiency levels based on Miller's Pyramid (K, KH, S, SH & P)	If 50% to 70% sampled faculties are able to show how Theory & Practical/Clinical sessions are being organized by specifying Competency wise Competency or proficiency levels based on Miller's Pyramid (K, KH, S, SH & P)	If 71% to 90% sampled faculties are able to show how Theory & Practical/Clinical sessions are being organized by specifying Competency wise Competency or proficiency levels based on Miller's Pyramid (K, KH, S, SH & P)	If more than 90% sampled faculties are able to show how Theory & Practical/Clinical sessions are being organized by specifying Competency wise Competency or proficiency levels based on Miller's Pyramid (K, KH, S, SH & P)	Curriculum Plan, Teaching/Lesson Plans, Subject Attendance Register etc.
1.1.4. Integrated Teaching-Learning	If Less than 50% sampled faculties are able to show documented evidences about how Integrated teaching learning sessions (Horizontal & Vertical Integration) are being planned & conducted	If 50% to 70% sampled faculties are able to show documented evidences about how Integrated teaching learning sessions (Horizontal & Vertical Integration) are being planned & conducted	If 71% to 90% sampled faculties are able to show documented evidences about how Integrated teaching learning sessions (Horizontal & Vertical Integration) are being planned & conducted	If more than 90% sampled faculties are able to show documented evidences about how Integrated teaching learning sessions (Horizontal & Vertical Integration) are being planned & conducted	Curriculum Plan, Teaching/Lesson Plans, Subject Attendance Register etc.
1.1.5. Interaction with Sampled	If Less than 30% sampled students	If 30% to 50% sampled students	Level-2 plus	Level-3 plus	Log Books of students etc.

students by Assessment Team	are able to tell type of competences they have been taught in recent theory & practical/clinical sessions	are able to tell type of competences they have been taught in recent theory & practical/clinical sessions	If 30% to 50% sampled students are able to tell about recently organized integrated teaching learning sessions (horizontal & vertical integration)	If 30% to 50% sampled students are able to tell about which type proficiency or competency levels (K, KH, S, SH & P) they were required to acquire vis-à-vis competence skills being taught recently	
------------------------------------	---	---	--	--	--

Note: for computing weightage score on this parameter based on above mentioned rubrics following formula will be used: -

Weightage score on Parameter-1.1=

$$\frac{\frac{\text{Obtained score on 1.1.1}}{4} + \frac{\text{Obtained score on 1.1.2}}{4} + \frac{\text{Obtained score on 1.1.3}}{4} + \frac{\text{Obtained score on 1.1.4}}{4} + \frac{\text{Obtained score on 1.1.5}}{4}}{5} \times \text{AW}$$

Where AW= Assigned weightage to Parameter-1.1

Parameter-1.2: Planning & offering of Elective Courses being offered by College/Institution within scope laid down by NMC

Operational explanation: - This parameter deals with elective courses. Elective Courses are offered to provide additional learning experiences within scope laid down in Curriculum. Erstwhile MCI through Modules on Elective Courses has laid down framework for offering Elective Courses at UG Programme in Medical Education. An elective is a learning experience created in the curriculum to provide an opportunity for the learner to explore, discover and experience areas or streams of interest. Electives (1 month) shall be included here. These will be in 2 blocks of 15 days each in Final first, 1st block after annual exam of III MBBS part I and 2nd block after the end of 1st elective. NMC has suggested including electives in areas such as the use of artificial intelligence and computer in health and medical education; Indian system of medicine; medical photography, art and music in Medicine, besides electives in medical subjects etc.

- ✓ Sampled faculties for Parameter-1 will also be interacted by Assessment Team Members for this parameter

- ✓ Sampled students of Third Professional Part-1 & 2 for parameter-1 will also be interacted by Assessment Team Members for this parameter

Scoring Rubrics for this parameter: -

Sub-parameters	Rating Levels				Supporting documents
	Level-1	Level-2	Level-3	Level-4	
1.2.1-Planning of Electives	When for less than 50% of electives opted by students in previous/ongoing academic calendar, LOs (Learning Objectives), List of Activities, List of Preceptors or Supervisors, Prerequisites for students, Assessment Methods and required entries in Logbooks & Portfolio etc. have not been specified	When for 50% to 70% of electives opted by students in previous/ongoing academic calendar, College produces documented evidences for specified LOs (Learning Objectives), List of Activities for student participation, List of Preceptors or Supervisors, Prerequisites for students, Assessment Methods and required entries in Logbooks & Portfolio etc.	When for 71% to 90% of electives opted by students in previous/ongoing academic calendar, College produces documented evidences for specified LOs (Learning Objectives), List of Activities for student participation, List of Preceptors or Supervisors, Prerequisites for students, Assessment Methods and required entries in Logbooks & Portfolio etc.	When more than 90% of electives opted by students in previous/ongoing academic calendar, College produces documented evidences for specified LOs (Learning Objectives), List of Activities for student participation, List of Preceptors or Supervisors, Prerequisites for students, Assessment Methods and required entries in Logbooks & Portfolio etc.	Teaching Plans, Curriculum Plan, Logbooks of students, Elective wise decided Learning Objectives, List of Activities etc.
1.2.2- Conduct of electives vis-à-vis sampled students	If less than 50% sampled students have confirmed that they are provided	If less than 50% sampled students have confirmed that they are provided	Level-2 plus If 50% to 70% sampled students have confirmed that	Level-3 plus If 50% to 70% sampled students are able to explain	Documented Learning Evidences

	with choice-based options for selection of electives	with choice-based options for selection of electives	elective wise List of preceptors or supervisors & List of Learning Activities and prerequisites for electives were notified by college before selection of electives	elective wise Learning Objectives (LOs) & List of learning activities performed by showing documented evidences in their Portfolio & Logbooks	(Logbooks & Portfolios)
1.2.3- Documentation of Learning Evidences	If less than 50% sampled faculties are able to explain and produce documented evidences how performed activities of students allotted under their supervision were verified and rated as satisfactory completion of elective	If 50% to 70% sampled faculties are able to explain and produce documented evidences how performed activities of students allotted under their supervision were verified and rated as satisfactory completion of elective	If 71% to 90% sampled faculties are able to explain and produce documented evidences how performed activities of students allotted under their supervision were verified and rated as satisfactory completion of elective	If more than 90% sampled faculties are able to explain and produce documented evidences how performed activities of students allotted under their supervision were verified and rated as satisfactory completion of elective	Documented evidences like submitted Portfolios & Logbooks by students

Note: for computing weightage score on this parameter based on above mentioned rubrics following formula will be used: -

Weightage score on Parameter-1.2=

$$\frac{\frac{\text{Obtained score on 1.2.1}}{4} + \frac{\text{Obtained score on 1.2.2}}{4} + \frac{\text{Obtained score on 1.2.3}}{4}}{3} \times \text{AW}$$

Where AW= Assigned weightage to Parameter-1,2

Parameter-1.3: Functioning of College Council, Curriculum Committee & Medical Education Unit (MEU)

Operational explanation: - This Parameter requires College/Institution to align their academic functioning with Curriculum prescribed by the regulatory body. This parameter deals with functioning of College Council, Curriculum Committee & Medical Education Unit. The College Council shall meet at least four times in a year to draw up the details of curriculum and training programme, enforcement of discipline and other academic matters etc. The Curriculum Committee shall ensure implementation and monitoring of Curriculum. There shall be MEU, who will be conducting Faculty Development Programmes as per training needs of Faculties.

- ✓ *Interaction required with College Council Members*
- ✓ *Interaction with Curriculum Committee members*
- ✓ *Interaction with Medical Education Unit (MEU) members*
- ✓ *Interactions required with sampled students as mentioned under Parameter-1 of this Criterion*

Scoring Rubrics for this parameter: -

Sub-parameters	Rating Levels				Supporting documents
	Level-1	Level-2	Level-3	Level-4	
1.3.1-College Council	If College Council has not been constituted as per provisions mentioned in Regulation	If the College Council has been constituted as per provisions mentioned in Regulation	Level-2 plus If the minimum meetings of College Council are being organized as per provisions mentioned in regulation	Level-3 plus If in meeting, subject wise implementation of curricular activities and performance of students are reviewed. If ATR vis-à-vis recommendations of previous meeting presented and discussed.	Constitution of College Council, MOMs & Agenda of the meetings & ATRs
1.3.2- Curriculum Committee	If the Curriculum Committee has not	If the Curriculum Committee has	Level-2 plus	Level-3 plus	Constitution of Curriculum

	been constituted as per provisions laid down by Medical Regulator	been constituted as per provisions laid down by Medical Regulator	If meetings of Curriculum Committee are being organized as per provisions laid down by Medical Regulator	If Time Table/Teaching Schedule & Clinical Posting Rotation plans and further Teaching hours or weeks are allocated to Lectures, SDL, SGL and Clinical postings etc. are prepared and finalized by each professional year in sync with prescribed Curriculum	Committee, MOMs & Agenda of the meetings & ATRs
1.3.3 Monitoring of Curriculum Implementation by Curriculum Committee	If Curriculum Committee is not monitoring implementation of Curriculum	If Curriculum Committee has specified professional year wise no. of lecture sessions, tutorials, seminars, DOAP Sessions, Bed Side Clinics or teaching etc. will be held subject wise as per applicability	Level-2 plus If further Curriculum Committee has specified on average per student how many OSCE/OSPE, MINI CEX & DOPS based skill assessment will be conducted.	Level-3 plus If based on Curriculum Implementation indicators mentioned under Level 2 & 3, Curriculum Committee is supervising implementation of Curriculum by faculties subject wise for each professional year	MOMs, ATRs and Review of Curriculum Implementation (Planned vs. Actuals) and Periodical Reports submitted to Convenors of respective NC/RC etc.
1.3.4-Medical Education Unit	If composition of MEU is not aligning with provisions laid	If composition of MEU is aligning with provisions	Level-2 plus If Curriculum Committee & MEU	Level-3 plus If MEU has organized BCME (Basic Course	Document for composition of MEU, Training

	down by Medical Regulator	laid down by Medical Regulator	has identified training needs of Faculties for smooth implementation of Competency Based Curriculum	in Medical Education) & CISP (Curriculum Implementation Support Programme) with proper documentation of attended participants	needs identification for FDP, evidences for organization of BCME & CISP etc.
1.3.5-Curricular Activities vis-à-vis Sampled Student	If less than 50% sampled students have confirmed that in previous academic calendar without any major deviations approximately Lectures, Seminars, Tutorials, DOPA Sessions and Bed Side Clinics or Teachings etc. held in sync with number provided by college	If 50% to 70% of sampled students have confirmed that in previous academic calendar without any major deviations approximately Lectures, Seminars, Tutorials, DOPA Sessions and Bed Side Clinics or Teachings etc. held in sync with number provided by college	Level-2 plus If 50% to 70% of sampled students have confirmed without any major deviations approximately on average how many times per student OSCE/OSPE based assessments were conducted for practical/clinical skills in sync with number provided by College	Level-3 plus If 50% to 70% of sampled students have confirmed without any major deviations approximately on average how many times per student MINI CEX/DOPS based assessments were conducted for clinical skills in real health care setting in sync with number provided by college	Documented evidences, Subject Attendance Records, Logbooks etc.

Note: for computing weightage score on this parameter based on above mentioned rubrics following formula will be used: -

Weightage score on Parameter-1.3=

$$\frac{\frac{\text{Obtained score on 1.3.1}}{4} + \frac{\text{Obtained score on 1.3.2}}{4} + \frac{\text{Obtained score on 1.3.3}}{4} + \frac{\text{Obtained score on 1.3.4}}{4} + \frac{\text{Obtained score on 1.3.5}}{4}}{5} \times \text{AW}$$

Where AW= Assigned weightage to Parameter-1.3

Parameter-1.4: Faculty wise completed Faculty Development Programmes (FDP) vis-à-vis FDP Guidelines of NMC

Operational explanation: This parameter is derived from the guideline developed by NMC for Faculty development programs like revised Basic Course Workshop (rBCW) in MET now rechristened as BCME (Basic Course in Medical Education), CISP (Curriculum Implementation Support Programme) and Advance Course in Medical Education (ACME) now rechristened as FIME (Fellowship in Medical Education). Based on this parameter, Faculty wise information will be captured vis-à-vis their completion of above-mentioned Faculty Development Programs.

Scoring Rubrics for this parameter: -

Sub-parameters	Rating Levels				Supporting documents
	Level-1	Level-2	Level-3	Level-4	
1.4.1- Percentage of Faculties completed BCME/rBCW	If less than 50% of faculties have completed BCME or revised BCW FDP within scope laid down by NMC for FDP	If 50% to 70% of faculties have completed BCME or revised BCW FDP within scope laid down by NMC for FDP	If 71% to 90% of faculties have completed BCME or revised BCW FDP within scope laid down by NMC for FDP	If more than 90% of faculties have completed BCME or revised BCW FDP within scope laid down by NMC for FDP	Documented evidences- Certificate issued from RC/NC and certificates of in-house FDP with signature of Observer or Coordinator appointed by NMC
1.4.2- Percentage of Curriculum Committee (CC) Members completed BCME/revised BCW at RC/NC	If Less than 50% of faculties (including Chairman) constituted CC have completed their BCME or revised BCW at RC/NC	If 50% to 70% of faculties (including Chairman) constituted CC have completed their BCME or revised BCW at RC/NC	If 71% to 90% of faculties (including Chairman) constituted CC have completed their BCME or revised BCW at RC/NC	If more than 90% of faculties (including Chairman) constituted CC have completed their BCME or revised BCW at RC/NC	Documented evidences- Certificate issued from RC/NC

1.4.3- MEU Members completed BCME/revised BCW at RC/NC	If Less than 50% of faculties (including Office-in charge & Coordinator) constituted MEU have completed their BCME or revised BCW at RC/NC	If 50% to 70% of faculties (including Office in-charge & Coordinator) constituted MEU have completed their BCME or revised BCW at RC/NC	If 71% to 90% of faculties (including Office in-charge & Coordinator) constituted MEU have completed their BCME or revised BCW at RC/NC	If more than 90% of faculties (including Office in-charge & Coordinator) constituted MEU have completed their BCME or revised BCW at RC/NC	Documented evidences- Certificate issued from RC/NC
1.4.4 No of faculties completed ACME at Nodal	If no faculty has completed ACME at NC	If minimum one faculty has completed ACME at NC	If 2 or more faculties have completed ACME at NC	If 4 or more faculties have completed ACME at NC	Documented evidences- Certificate issued from NC
1.4.5 Percentage of Faculties completed CISP	If less than 50% of faculties have completed CISP within scope laid down by NMC for FDP	If 50% to 70% of faculties have completed CISP FDP within scope laid down by NMC for FDP	If 71% to 90% of faculties have completed CISP FDP within scope laid down by NMC for FDP	If more than 90% of faculties have completed CISP FDP within scope laid down by NMC for FDP	Documented evidences- Certificate issued from RC/NC and certificates of in-house FDP with signature of Observer or Coordinator appointed by NMC

Note: for computing weightage score on this parameter based on above mentioned rubrics following formula will be used: -

Weightage score on Parameter-1.4=

$$\frac{\frac{\text{Obtained score on 1.4.1}}{4} + \frac{\text{Obtained score on 1.4.2}}{4} + \frac{\text{Obtained score on 1.4.3}}{4} + \frac{\text{Obtained score on 1.4.4}}{4} + \frac{\text{Obtained score on 1.4.5}}{4}}{5} \times \text{AW}$$

Where AW= Assigned weightage to Parameter-1.4

Parameter-1.5: No. of Collaborations/MOU's with National/International Institutions in the past 2 years

Operational explanation: - This parameter deals with Collaboration/MOUs executed by Medical College/Institution with partnering Institutions located in India and abroad. Collaborations with partnering Institutions, may bring about channel of mobility which will equip students & Faculty staff with best practices, approaches and methods of Teaching and Training of students in Medical Education. Collaborations in domain academic and research may offer opportunities to students & Faculty staff for visiting to reputed partnering Institutions in India and abroad based on conducting short-duration research projects, expanding research based strategic partnership, conducting workshops & conferences etc.

As per requirement of this parameter, differential weightage scores will be given vis-à-vis collaboration/MOUs has been executed with which of the following category of Academic/Research Institutions: -

<i>Category of Institutions</i>	<i>Descriptions</i>	<i>Weightage score per MOU for collaboration</i>
Category-1	If Collaborating/Partnering Institution is not participant in any ranking system either in NIRF or any abroad ranking system (QS, THE World University Ranking, ARWU-Shanghai Ranking System etc.). Further If the Collaborating/Partnering Institution is not accredited/rated by government recognized accreditation/assessment & rating bodies in India for Higher Education/Health Education	25
Category-2	If the Collaborating/Partnering Institution is accredited/Rated by government recognized accreditation/assessment & rating bodies for Higher Education/Health Education	150
Category-3	If the Collaborating/Partnering Institution is participant in government recognized ranking (NIRF) with positions under top 50	200

Category-4	If the Collaborating/Partnering Institution is participant in government recognized ranking (NIRF) with positions beyond top 50	100
Category-5	If the Collaborating/Partnering Institution is participant in world ranking system (QS, THE World University Ranking, ARWU-Shanghai Ranking System etc.) with ranking within 500	200
Category-6	If the Collaborating/Partnering Institution is participant in world ranking system (QS, THE World University Ranking, ARWU-Shanghai Ranking System etc.) with ranking beyond 500	100
Category-7	MOUs or collaboration with Central Govt. Body & State Govt. body which does not offer any type Academic or Professional Programs but these are specialized research or technical body, funding agency etc.	150

Note:

- ***Collaboration should be for any of the following (a)-Research based strategic Partnership for conducting collaborative Research Projects (b)-Organization of Research and Academic workshops, conferences & seminars for students & faculty***
- ***In each Category maximum 2 MOUs/Collaborations will be considered for scoring.***
- ***Further if MOUs/Collaborations have been signed more than 2 years before and no tangible action has been taken as such no score will be assigned to such type MOUs/Collaborations.***

Scoring Rubrics for using separately for the parameter 5 & 6: -

For normalization of scores on this parameter following formula will be employed: -

$$\frac{\text{Average score of College on the parameter } (x') - \text{Minimum obtained score on the parameter } (x)}{\text{Maximum obtained score on this parameter } (y) - \text{Minimum obtained score on this parameter } (x)} \times 100$$

Where x'= for concerned college, Average score per sanctioned intake obtained by college on this parameter

y= Maximum Value for "Maximum average score per sanctioned intake obtained by any college on this parameter" across all colleges

x = Minimum value for “Minimum average score per sanctioned intake obtained by any College on this parameter” across all colleges

Note: Based on above mentioned formula, value on this parameter may range between 0 to 100

Scoring Rubrics: -

Level	Required conditions	Supporting documents
Level-1	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≤ 25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Documented evidences of MOUs ○ Documented evidences of accreditation/rating of Collaborating Institution by govt. recognized Accreditation/Rating Body for Higher Education or Health Education ○ Documented evidences of participation and ranks of Collaborating Institutions in NIRF or any world ranking systems or regulatory body recognized rating body etc.
Level-2	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >25 to ≤ 50	As mentioned above
Level-3	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >50 to < 75	As mentioned above
Level-4	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≥ 75	As mentioned above

Parameter-1.6: Outcomes of MOUs/Agreement signed for Collaboration/Partnering with Institutions in India & abroad vis-à-vis Parameter-1.5

Operational explanation: - This parameter deals with execution of Collaboration/MOUs by Medical College/Institution with partnering Institutions located in India/abroad as mentioned under Parameter-5. Collaborations with partnering Institutions by conducting short-duration research projects, expanding research based strategic partnership, workshops & conferences etc.

Scoring Rubrics for sub-parameters under Parameter-1.6: -

Category of Institutions	Descriptions	*Weightage score per Collaborative Research or Academic or Clinical Project	Weightage score for organization of per Workshop in collaboration with Partnering Institution	Weightage score for organization of per Conference or Seminars in collaboration with Partnering Institution
Category-1	If Collaborating/Partnering Institution is not participant in any ranking system either in NIRF or any abroad ranking system (QS, THE World University Ranking, ARWU-Shanghai Ranking System etc.). Further If the Collaborating/Partnering Institution is not accredited/rated by government recognized accreditation/assessment & rating bodies in India for Higher Education/Health Education	50	5 score per 3- or 4-hours duration	5 score per 3- or 4-hours duration
Category-2	If the Collaborating/Partnering Institution is accredited/Rated by government recognized accreditation/assessment & rating	100	10 score per 3- or 4-hours duration	10 score per 3- or 4-hours duration

	bodies for Higher Education/Health Education			
Category-3	If the Collaborating/Partnering Institution is participant in government recognized ranking (NIRF)/Rating System (Third Party Rating) with positions under top 50	150	25 score per 3- or 4-hours duration	25 score per 3- or 4-hours duration
Category-4	If the Collaborating/Partnering Institution is participant in government recognized ranking (NIRF)/Rating System (Third Party Rating) with positions beyond top 50	100	20 score per 3- or 4-hours duration	20 score per 3- or 4-hours duration
Category-5	If the Collaborating/Partnering Institution is participant in world ranking system (QS, THE World University Ranking, ARWU-Shanghai Ranking System etc.) with ranking within 500	150	30 score per 3- or 4-hours duration	30 score per 3- or 4-hours duration
Category-6	If the Collaborating/Partnering Institution is participant in world ranking system (QS, THE World University Ranking, ARWU-Shanghai Ranking System etc.) with ranking beyond 500	100	25 score per 3- or 4-hours duration	25 score per 3- or 4-hours duration
Category-7	MOUs or collaboration with Central Govt. Body & State Govt. body which does not offer any type Academic or Professional Programs but these are specialized body, funding agency etc.	150	30 score per 3- or 4-hours duration	30 score per 3- or 4-hours duration

Note:

- Under this category those research projects will be considered which are being self-financed by both or collaborating Institutions. If Research Project is funded by any funding agency as such this will be reported under Criterion-7.
- **Seminars/Conference up to maximum 20 hours will be considered for scoring. It is assumed that one full day Seminar/conference will be of maximum 6 hours' duration. Half day programme will be of minimum 3 hours' duration.**
- **Workshops up to maximum 20 hours will be considered for scoring under this parameter. It is assumed that one full day workshop will be of maximum 6 hours' duration. Half day programme will be of minimum 3 hours' duration.**
- Self-financing Collaborative Project with Academic/Research Institutions will be considered for this Parameter. For any partnering Institution, one ongoing project during required data for the year, initiated during required Year and completed project during required will be considered for the scoring.

Scoring Rubrics: -

Level	Required conditions	Supporting documents
Level-1	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≤ 25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Video recorded sessions for Workshops organized in collaboration with partnering Institutions ○ Geo tagged photographs of Seminars or Conferences ○ Records of Resource Persons from Partnering Institutions conducted sessions for college along with Photography ○ Attendance Records for participants & Resource Persons ○ Documented evidences for Research Projects conducted in collaboration with partnering institutions like Proposal, published research papers in joint collaboration etc. ○ List of Faculty visited from both side, Communication of visits etc. ○ List of students visited from both side, communication of visits etc.
Level-2	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >25 to ≤ 50	As mentioned above
Level-3	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized	As mentioned above

	score of the College is falling in the range of >50 to < 75	
Level-4	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≥ 75	As mentioned above

Criterion-2: Clinical Exposure, Clinical Training, Internship and Clinical Facilities

Parameter-2.1: Provision of Clinical Exposure/posting/internship to students/Interns vis-à-vis varied clinical specialties/Health Care setting

Operational explanation: Based on curriculum prescribed by NMC, students will be mandatorily provided clinical experiences in diverse clinical settings like Urban Health Centres (UHCs) & Rural Health Centres (RHCs) under Community Medicines and Hospital (Secondary & tertiary level health care services). Further medical students will be provided with opportunities for clinical posting in specialties like **Medicine and allied specialties** (General Medicine, Paediatrics, Respiratory Medicine, Dermatology and Psychiatry), **Surgery & allied specialties** (General Surgery, Orthopaedics-Including Trauma/PM & R, Ophthalmology, **Oto**-rhino-laryngology, **Dentistry** & Anaesthesia), Obstetrics & gynaecology and Emergency Medicine.

With reference to Curriculum prescribed and regulations laid down by Medical Regulator UG Program in Medical Education, specifications of clinical posting hours starting from second professional onwards have been categorically laid down. In addition to mandatory provisions of clinical postings, internship for 1 year has been also set forth in regulations for UG Program. Clinical postings have been provisioned for keeping in mind nature of subjects. Students will be provided early clinical exposures in first professional year. Clinical exposure to learners in UG Program will be in the form of learner-doctor method of clinical training (Clerkship based Clinical Experiences) in all phases.

Further regarding clinical posting in Rural and Urban Health Training Centres, in regulation-2023 It has been mentioned that every hospital seeking permission to start medical college, the medical college shall have Rural Health Training Centres/ Community Health Centres/Urban Health Centres affiliated to it; as per the geographical location of the college, which shall be used for internship training.

The number of these centres adopted by the college should fulfil the need of posting 15 interns per centre as required in CRMI regulations 2021.

Verification Process for this parameter: -

- ✓ Desk top assessment of information provided by the Medical College in the portal against parameter.
- ✓ Interaction with same set of students sampled under Criterion-1 for parameter-1 & Parameter-2 or same sampling procedure may be followed for sampling different set of students
- ✓ Sampled students of Second Professional, third professional part-1 & part-2 and sampled interns will be interacted
- ✓ Same set of faculties sampled for clinical subjects under Criterion-1 for parameter 1 & 2 may be interacted.

Scoring Rubrics for this parameter: -

Sub-parameters	Rating Levels				Supporting documents
	Level-1	Level-2	Level-3	Level-4	
2.1.1- Specialty wise clinical posting duration vis-à-vis prescribed hours or weeks	If attached Teaching hospital is equipped with required Clinical specialties required for clinical postings of Students related to Medicine and allied specialties, Surgery and allied specialties, Obstetrics & Gynaecology and Emergency Medicine	Level-1 plus If on average per student of 2 nd Professional is deputed for minimum prescribed hours or weeks for clinical postings/exposures in the required specialties.	Level-2 plus If on average per student of 3 rd Professional part-1 & 2 is deputed for minimum prescribed hours or weeks for clinical postings in above mentioned required specialties.	Level-3 plus If on average per intern is provided opportunity for required prescribed hours or weeks for rotatory internships in above mentioned required specialties (excluding Community Medicine)	Clinical Posting Rotation Schedules for all Professional Years Rotatory Internship schedule for Interns Logbooks of students and interns

2.1.2- Rotatory Internship in Community Medicine	If Medical College has arrangement of required number of Rural & Urban Health Centres for posting of maximum 15 interns at a time	Level- 1 plus If all interns are deputed for internship in Urban Health Centres for required hours of internships	Level- 2 plus If all interns are deputed for internship in Rural Health Centres for required hours of internships	Level-3 plus If internships duration for Urban and Rural Health Centres is minimum 2 months duration	Logbooks maintained by Interns Internship Schedule for Rural and Urban Health Centres
2.1.3 Interaction with Sampled students by Assessment team	If less than 25 % sampled students are able to confirm and produce documented evidences about their clinical postings in above mentioned specialties	If 25% to 50% of sampled students are able to confirm and produce documented evidences about their clinical postings in above mentioned specialties	If 50% to 75 % of sampled students are able to confirm and produce documented evidences about their clinical postings in above mentioned specialties	If more than 75 % of sampled students are able to confirm and produce documented evidences about their clinical postings in above mentioned specialties	Logbooks of students Case Records & History Taking records etc.
2.1.4 Interaction with Sampled Interns by Assessment team	If less than 25 % sampled interns are able to confirm and produce documented evidences about their clinical postings in above	If 25% to 50% of sampled interns are able to confirm and produce documented evidences about their clinical postings in above mentioned	If 50% to 75 % of sampled interns are able to confirm and produce documented evidences about their clinical postings in	If more than 75 % of sampled interns are able to confirm and produce documented evidences about their clinical postings in above mentioned	Logbooks of students Case Records & History Taking records etc.

	mentioned specialties & Community Medicine	specialties & Community Medicine	above mentioned specialties & Community Medicine	specialties & Community Medicine	
--	--	----------------------------------	--	----------------------------------	--

Note: for computing weightage score on this parameter based on above mentioned rubrics following formula will be used: -

Weightage score on Parameter-2.1=

$$\frac{\frac{\text{Obtained score on 2.1.1}}{4} + \frac{\text{Obtained score on 2.1.2}}{4} + \frac{\text{Obtained score on 2.1.3}}{4} + \frac{\text{Obtained score on 2.1.4}}{4}}{4} \times \text{AW}$$

Where AW= Assigned weightage to Parameter-2.1

Parameter-2.2.: Specialty/Clinical Department wise OPD Attendance in the calendar year

Operational explanation: With reference to regulations and curriculum laid down by Medical Regulator, the quality of entire training and clinical postings are entirely dependent on patient loads in departments/specialties of concerned Teaching Hospital. Quality of students in UG will be determined how rigorously they are being provided training in real clinical setting with fairly good number of patient loads. Further in the regulation-2023, it has been mentioned that there shall be a minimum daily OPD attendance of 8 patients (old & new) per sanctioned student intake annually in the Specialties/ subjects of undergraduate curriculum.

- ✓ ***Note: OPD Data provided by college shall be physically verified for randomly selected OPD Data***
- ✓ ***For sampled OPD Attendance data will be auto generated for sampled months or days for physical verification***
- ✓ ***If during physical verification sampled data could not be authenticated due to some kind of manipulations, OPD data shall be reduced in conjunction with quantity of manipulation in the OPD Data.***

Scoring Rubrics for this parameter 2.2: -

Following formula will be employed for normalization of OPD Attendance data as per requirement of this parameter- :

$$\frac{\text{On average per intake OPD Attendance Data } (x') - \text{Minimum value obtained } (x)}{\text{Maximum Value obtained } (y) - \text{Minimum value obtained } (x)} \times 100$$

Where x ='for concerned college, on average per intake OPD Attendance data in past 1 calendar year

y =Maximum Value for "On average per intake OPD Attendance data "across all colleges

x =Minimum value for "On average per intake OPD Attendance Data "across all colleges

Note :Based on above mentioned formula, value on this parameter may range between 0 to 100. For averaging out per sanctioned intake total OPD Data, sanctioned intakes of UG program or sanctioned intake of both UG and PG programs shall be used as denominator in the case both programs are being offered.

Scoring Rubrics for this parameter: -

Sub-parameters	Rating Levels				Supporting documents
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	
2.2.1- OPD Attendance across all clinical departments/specialties annually	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≤ 25	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >25 to ≤ 50	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >50 to < 75	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≥ 75	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Old & new Out-patient load data department/specialty clinics wise • OPD Register • Cash Receipts Physical verification and interaction with patients etc.
2.2.2- OPD Attendance across Medicine and	If based on normalized	If based on normalized	If based on normalized	If based on normalized	Same as above

allied specialties annually	scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≤ 25	scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >25 to ≤ 50	scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >50 to < 75	scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≥ 75	
2.2.3- OPD Attendance across Surgery and allied specialties annually	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≤ 25	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >25 to ≤ 50	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >50 to < 75	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≥ 75	Same as above
2.2.4 OPD Attendance in Obstetrics and Gynaecology specialty/department annually	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≤ 25	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >25 to ≤ 50	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >50 to < 75	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≥ 75	Same as above

* Medicine and allied specialties (General Medicine, Paediatrics, Dermatology, Psychiatry), Surgery and allied specialties (General Surgery, Orthopaedics, ENT, Ophthalmology), Obstetrics & Gynaecology.

Note: for computing weightage score on this parameter based on above mentioned rubrics following formula will be used: -

Weightage score on Parameter-2.2=

$$\frac{\frac{\text{Obtained score on 2.2.1}}{4} + \frac{\text{Obtained score on 2.2.2}}{4} + \frac{\text{Obtained score on 2.2.3}}{4} + \frac{\text{Obtained score on 2.2.4}}{4}}{4} \times \text{AW}$$

Where AW= Assigned weightage to Parameter-2.2

Parameter-2.3: Specialty wise % of Bed Occupancy in Hospital in the last calendar year

Operational explanation: With reference to regulations and curriculum laid down by Medical Regulator, the quality of entire training and clinical postings are entirely dependent on patient loads in departments/specialties of concerned Teaching Hospital. Quality of students in UG will be determined how rigorously they are provided training in actual clinical setting with good number of IPD patient loads. Further regulations laid down by the Medical Regulator has insisted on adequate number of patient loads in IPD areas of concerned departments. As per, MSR-2023, Average occupancy of indoor beds shall be a minimum of 80% per annum.

- ✓ *To calculate the total number of occupied bed days for each month, please calculate the daily count of patients who remained in beds at midnight*
- ✓ *IPD admissions and Bed days data provided by College shall be physically verified based on random sampling*
- ✓ *Sampled IPD admissions and Bed days data will be auto generated for sampled months or days for physical verification*
- ✓ *If during physical verification sampled data could not be authenticated due to some kind of manipulations, IPD admissions and Bed days data shall be reduced in conjunction with quantity of manipulation observed.*

Scoring Rubrics for this parameter 2.3: -

Following formula will be employed for normalization of total Bed days as per requirement of this parameter- :

$$\frac{\text{On average per intake IPD Days data } (x') - \text{Minimum value obtained } (x)}{\text{Maximum Value obtained } (y) - \text{Minimum value obtained } (x)} \times 100$$

Where x ='for concerned college, on average per unit **IPD Bed days data** in past 1 calendar year

y =Maximum Value for “on average per unit **IPD Bed days data**” across all colleges

x =Minimum value for “on average per unit **IPD Bed days data**” across all colleges

Note :Based on above mentioned formula, value on this parameter may range between 0 to 100. For averaging out per unit IPD Bed days data for past calendar year, required teaching beds for UG program or required teaching beds of both UG and PG programs shall be used as denominator in the case both programs are being offered.

Scoring Rubrics for this parameter: -

Parameter	Rating Levels				Supporting documents
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	
2.3.1- Percentage Bed occupancy across all clinical departments/specialties annually	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≤ 25	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >25 to ≤ 50	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >50 to < 75	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≥ 75	IPD Register Cash Receipts Physical Verification etc.
2.3.2- Percentage Bed occupancy across Medicine and allied specialties annually	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≤ 25	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >25 to ≤ 50	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >50 to < 75	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≥ 75	Same as above
2.3.3- Percentage Bed Occupancy across	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the	Same as above

Surgery and allied specialties annually	normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≤ 25	normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >25 to ≤ 50	normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >50 to < 75	normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≥ 75	
2.3.4 Percentage Bed Occupancy in Obstetrics and Gynaecology specialty/department annually	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≤ 25	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >25 to ≤ 50	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >50 to < 75	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≥ 75	Same as above

* Medicine and allied specialties (General Medicine, Paediatrics, Dermatology, Psychiatry), Surgery and allied specialties (General Surgery, Orthopaedics, ENT, Ophthalmology), Obstetrics & Gynaecology.

Note: for computing weightage score on this parameter based on above mentioned rubrics following formula will be used: -

Weightage score on Parameter-2.3=

$$\frac{\frac{\text{Obtained score on 2.3.1}}{4} + \frac{\text{Obtained score on 2.3.2}}{4} + \frac{\text{Obtained score on 2.3.3}}{4} + \frac{\text{Obtained score on 2.3.4}}{4}}{4} \times \text{AW}$$

Where AW= Assigned weightage to Parameter-2.3

Parameter-2.4: Specialty wise Number of Minor surgeries performed in OT in past 1 Year

Operational explanation: With reference to regulations and curriculum laid down by Medical Regulator, as per requirements of concerned subject/specialty students will be provided with mandatory clinical training either under clinical clerkship approach or rotatory internship-based approach. For providing clinical exposure to students in Surgery and allied specialties, it is essential that there should be varied clinical materials with good number of minor surgeries being carried out in OTs. This parameter has been devised with intents of capturing data pertaining to minor surgical works carried out in past 1 year in concerned Operation Theatres (OTs) of the teaching hospital.

Note: As per requirements of this parameter, all surgical which were performed under local anaesthesia, will be treated as minor surgeries.

Scoring Rubrics for this parameter (4 & 5): -

Since number of major or minor surgeries to be performed in Clinical Departments have been not laid down in regulation. As such obtained values on this parameter College will be subjected to normalization based on following formula: -

$$\frac{\text{On average per intake performed operative works (x')} - \text{Minimum value obtained (x)}}{\text{Maximum Value obtained (y)} - \text{Minimum value obtained (x)}} \times 100$$

Where x' = for concerned college, on average per intake performed minor or major surgeries in past 1 year

y = Maximum Value for "On average per intake carried out major or minor surgeries" across all colleges

x = Minimum value for "On average per intake carried out major or minor surgeries" across all colleges

Note: Based on above mentioned formula, value on this parameter may range between 0 to 100. For parameter-4, minor surgeries will be considered and for parameter-5 major surgeries will be considered for computing parameter wise normalized score for College. While computing average score per sanctioned intake, sanctioned intakes of UG and PG both will be considered, if both programs are being offered by the College.

Level	Required conditions	Supporting documents
Level-1	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≤ 25	Data of minor operative works performed Physical verification is required.
Level-2	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >25 to ≤ 50	As mentioned above
Level-3	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >50 to < 75	As mentioned above

Level-4	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≥ 75	As mentioned above
----------------	--	--------------------

Parameter-2.5: Specialty wise Number of Major surgeries performed in OT in past 1 Year

Operational explanation: With reference to regulations and curriculum laid down by Medical Regulator, as per requirements of concerned subject/specialty students will be provided with mandatory clinical training either under clinical clerkship approach or rotatory internship-based approach. For providing clinical exposure to students in Surgery and allied specialties, it is essential that there should be varied clinical materials with good number of major surgeries being carried out in OTs. This parameter has been devised with intents of capturing data pertaining to major surgical works carried out in past 1 year in concerned Operation Theatres (OTs) of the teaching hospital.

Note: As per requirements of this parameter, all surgical which were performed under General/Regional Anaesthesia, will be treated as Major surgeries.

Scoring Rubrics: - (Please refer explanation given under Parameter-4 as mentioned above for how rubrics has been devised)

Level	Required conditions	Supporting documents
Level-1	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≤ 25	Data of Major operative works performed Physical verification is required.
Level-2	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >25 to ≤ 50	As mentioned above
Level-3	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >50 to < 75	As mentioned above
Level-4	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≥ 75	As mentioned above

Parameter-2.6: On Average Radiological Investigations performed in OPD & IPD together in past 1 Year

Operational explanation: Based on curriculum prescribed by Medical Regulator/NMC, there shall be a well-equipped department of radio diagnosis. It is evident that quality of clinical training department of Radio-diagnosis is dependent on varied radiological investigation performed in department.

Scoring Rubrics for this parameter-2.6: -

Since number of investigations to be performed in Clinical Departments have been not laid down in regulation. As such obtained values on this parameter College will be subjected to normalization based on following formula: -

$$\frac{\text{On average per intake performed investigations (x')} - \text{Minimum value obtained (x)}}{\text{Maximum Value obtained (y)} - \text{Minimum value obtained (x)}} \times 100$$

Where x'= for concerned college, on average per intake performed radiological investigations

y= Maximum Value for "On average per intake performed radiological investigations" across all colleges

x= Minimum value for "On average per intake performed radiological investigations" across all colleges

Note: Based on above mentioned formula, value on this parameter may range between 0 to 100. While computing average score per sanctioned intake, sanctioned intakes of UG and PG both will be considered, if both programs are being offered by the College.

Scoring Rubrics: -

Level	Required conditions	Supporting documents
Level-1	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≤ 25	Data of radiological investigations performed in Department of Radio-diagnosis

Level-2	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >25 to ≤ 50	As mentioned above
Level-3	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >50 to < 75	As mentioned above
Level-4	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≥75	As mentioned above

Parameter-2.7: On Average Laboratory based Investigations performed in OPD & IPD together in past 1 Year

Operational explanation: Based on the curriculum prescribed by the Medical Regulator/NMC, well-equipped and up-to-date central Central/clinical laboratories, preferably with a common collection area, shall be provided for all investigations in histopathology, cytopathology, haematology, immune pathology, microbiology, biochemistry, and other specialised work, if any. It is evident that lab based clinical investigations is one of the significant factors for clinical training of students, hence good clinical materials are essential in Clinical Laboratories in teaching hospital.

AS per MSR-2023, The number of samples in Histopathology lab shall be at least 20% of total major surgeries, number of samples in cytopathology lab shall be at least 1% of the total hospital OPD. The number of samples in Haematology lab, Clinical Pathology, and Clinical Biochemistry shall be at least 15% of OPD and 30% of indoor beds, and in Microbiology lab these shall be at least 30% of indoor beds and 50 % total surgery cases.

Scoring Rubrics for this parameter-6: -

For normalization of college scores on this parameter, college wise per unit average value shall be calculated. As such obtained values on this parameter College will be subjected to normalization based on following formula: -

$$\frac{\text{On average per unit performed investigations (x')} - \text{Minimum value obtained (x)}}{\text{Maximum Value obtained (y)} - \text{Minimum value obtained (x)}} \times 100$$

Where x' = for concerned college, on average per unit performed radiological investigations

y = Maximum Value for “On average per unit performed radiological investigations” across all colleges

x = Minimum value for “On average per unit performed radiological investigations” across all colleges

Note: Based on above mentioned formula, value on this parameter may range between 0 to 100. For computation of sub-parameter wise per unit average score like for 2.7.1 total carried out concerned lab based investigations shall be divided by total major surgeries carried out in past calendar year, for 2.7.2 total carried out concerned lab based investigations shall be divided by total OPD attendance in past calendar year, for 2.7.3 total carried out concerned lab based investigations shall be divided by total OPD attendance and IPD admissions in past calendar year, for 2.7.4 total carried out concerned lab based investigations shall be divided by total carried out surgeries and IPD admissions in past calendar year.

Scoring Rubrics: -

Sub-Parameters	Rating Levels				Supporting documents
	Level-1	Level-2	Level-3	Level-4	
2.7.1- % Laboratory based investigations performed in Histopathology Lab in past 1 year	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≤ 25	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >25 to ≤ 50	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >50 to < 75	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≥ 75	Cash Receipts Lab entries Investigation reports generated etc.
2.7.2- % Laboratory based investigations performed in Cytopathology Lab in past 1 year	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≤ 25	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >25 to ≤ 50	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >50 to < 75	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≥ 75	Same as mentioned above

2.7.3- % Laboratory based investigations performed in Haematology, Clinical Pathology and Clinical Biochemistry Labs in past 1 year vis-à-vis IPD data	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≤ 25	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >25 to ≤ 50	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >50 to < 75	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≥ 75	Same as mentioned above
2.7.4- % Laboratory based investigations performed in Microbiology Labs vis-à-vis IPD Admissions in past 1 year	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≤ 25	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >25 to ≤ 50	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >50 to < 75	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≥ 75	Same as mentioned above
2.7.5- % Laboratory based investigations performed in Microbiology Labs vis-à-vis total surgery cases in past 1 year	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≤ 25	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >25 to ≤ 50	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >50 to < 75	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≥ 75	Same as mentioned above

Note: for computing weightage score on this parameter based on above mentioned rubrics following formula will be used: -

Weightage score on Parameter-2.7=

$$\frac{\frac{\text{Obtained score on 2.7.1}}{4} + \frac{\text{Obtained score on 2.7.2}}{4} + \frac{\text{Obtained score on 2.7.3}}{4} + \frac{\text{Obtained score on 2.7.4}}{4} + \frac{\text{Obtained score on 2.7.5}}{4}}{5} \times \text{AW}$$

Where AW= Assigned weightage to Parameter-2.7

Parameter-2.8: On Average Daily Patient admission/attendance Casualty/Emergency Department in past 1 year

Operational explanation: The Medical Regulator has laid through GMER-2023 that medical students of second professional and third professional will be exposed to clinical training in Department of Emergency Medicine also. With reference to MSR laid down for programs, it is clear that for developing required clinical competences in students pertaining to patient handling, triaging, and stabilisation in emergency rooms, it is essential that students must be exposed to clinical material in Emergency Department. In Minimum Requirements for Annual MBBS Admission-2020, number of teaching beds as per sanctioned intake had been defined. As per MSR-2023, number of teaching beds to be allocated in department of emergency medicine is not very much clear, but GMER-2023 has prescribed clinical postings of medical students in department of emergency medicine hence, IPD & OPD data will be captured as per requirement of this parameter.

Scoring Rubrics for this parameter: -

In absence of reference points for drawing meaningful inferences on this parameters, college wise obtained values will be subjected to normalization based on following formula: -

$$\frac{\text{On average per intake OPD/IPD Data (x')} - \text{Minimum value obtained (x)}}{\text{Maximum Value obtained (y)} - \text{Minimum value obtained (x)}} \times 100$$

Where x'= for concerned college, on average per intake OPD attendance/IPD admission data separately

y= Maximum Value for "On average per intake OPD Attendance/IPD admissions" across all colleges

x= Minimum value for "On average per intake OPD Attendance/IPD admissions" across all colleges

Note: Normalized scores will be separately computed for Department of Emergency Medicine vis-à-vis IPD admission data and OPD attendance data. Based on above mentioned formula, value on this parameter may range between 0 to 100.

Scoring Rubrics: -

Sub-Parameters	Rating Levels				Supporting documents
	Level-1	Level-2	Level-3	Level-4	

2.8.1- IPD Admission data vis-à-vis sanctioned intake	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≤ 25	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >25 to ≤ 50	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >50 to < 75	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≥75	OPD attendance and IPD admission records in Emergency Department etc. Cash Receipts etc.
2.8.2- OPD Attendance vis-à-vis sanctioned intake	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≤ 25	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >25 to ≤ 50	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >50 to < 75	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≥75	Same as mentioned above

Note: for computing weightage score on this parameter based on above mentioned rubrics following formula will be used: -

Weightage score on Parameter-2.8=

$$\frac{\frac{\text{Obtained score on 2.8.1}}{4} + \frac{\text{Obtained score on 2.8.2}}{4}}{2} \times \text{AW}$$

Where AW= Assigned weightage to Parameter-2.8

Parameter-2.9: Provision of Community Postings at RHC/UHC under Community Medicine in past 1 year

Operational explanation: As per MSR -2023 It has been mentioned that every hospital seeking permission to start medical college, the medical college shall have Rural Health Training Centres/ Community Health Centres/Urban Health Centres affiliated to it; as per the geographical location of the college, which shall be used for internship training. The number of these centres adopted by the college should fulfil the need of posting 15 interns per centre as required in CRMI regulations 2021. As per requirement of this parameters, data pertaining to OPD attendance and IPD admission data will be captured.

Scoring Rubrics for this parameter: -

In absence of reference points for drawing meaningful inferences on this parameters, college wise obtained values will be subjected to normalization based on following formula: -

$$\frac{\text{On average per intake IPD Data/OPD Data } (x') - \text{Minimum value obtained } (x)}{\text{Maximum Value obtained } (y) - \text{Minimum value obtained } (x)} \times 100$$

Where x'= for concerned college, on average per intake IPD Admissions/OPD Attendance separately for Urban/Rural Health Training Centres

y= Maximum Value for “On average per intake IPD admission data/OPD Attendance” across all colleges

x= Minimum value for “On average per intake IPD admission data/OPD attendance” across all colleges

Note: Normalized scores will be separately computed for UHC and RHC vis-à-vis per sanctioned intake, sanctioned intakes of UG and PG both will be considered, if both programs are being offered by the College. Based on above mentioned formula, value on this parameter may range between 0 to 100.

Scoring Rubrics: -

Sub-Parameters	Rating Levels				Supporting documents
	Level-1	Level-2	Level-3	Level-4	
2.9.1- IPD Admission data vis-à-vis sanctioned intake for UHCs	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of	OPD attendance and IPD admission records etc. Cash Receipts etc.

	College is falling in the range of ≤ 25	College is falling in the range of >25 to ≤ 50	College is falling in the range of >50 to < 75	the College is falling in the range of ≥ 75	
2.9.2- OPD Attendance vis-à-vis sanctioned intake for UHCs	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≤ 25	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >25 to ≤ 50	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >50 to < 75	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≥ 75	Same as mentioned above
2.9.3- IPD Admission data vis-à-vis sanctioned intake for RHCs	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≤ 25	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >25 to ≤ 50	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >50 to < 75	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≥ 75	OPD attendance and IPD admission records etc. Cash Receipts etc.
2.9.4- OPD Attendance vis-à-vis sanctioned intake for RHCs	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≤ 25	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >25 to ≤ 50	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >50 to < 75	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≥ 75	Same as mentioned above

Note: for computing weightage score on this parameter based on above mentioned rubrics following formula will be used: -

Weightage score on Parameter-2.9=

$$\frac{\frac{\text{Obtained score on 2.9.1}}{4} + \frac{\text{Obtained score on 2.9.2}}{4} + \frac{\text{Obtained score on 2.9.3}}{4} + \frac{\text{Obtained score on 2.9.4}}{4}}{4} \times \text{AW}$$

Where AW= Assigned weightage to Parameter-2.9

Parameter-2.10: No. of patients treated in Intensive Care Areas/High Dependency Units in past 1 year

Operational explanation: Students will be required to complete clinical experiences in a hospital (teaching/parent) that is well equipped and updated with an intensive care unit (ICU), an intensive coronary care unit (ICCU), an intensive respiratory care unit, a paediatric intensive care unit (PICU), a neonatal intensive care unit (NICU), a critical care burns unit, a post-op surgical critical care unit, and an obstetric HDU/ICU. Furthermore, the MSR established by NMC specifies the number of beds/units required for Programmes in Medical as per sanctioned intakes.

Scoring Rubrics for this parameter: -

With reference to regulations laid down by Medical Regulator, regulatory requirements of clinical material like what should be patient load (IPD admission) in Critical Care Units have not been specified. In absence of reference points for drawing meaningful inferences on this parameters, college wise obtained values will be subjected to normalization based on following formula: -

$$\frac{\text{On average per intake clinical materail } (x') - \text{Minimum value obtained } (x)}{\text{Maximum Value obtained } (y) - \text{Minimum value obtained } (x)} \times 100$$

Where x'= for concerned college, on average per intake Clinical Material-admission/stays in Critical Care Units

y= Maximum Value for "On average per intake clinical material" in all colleges

x= Minimum value for "On average per intake clinical material" in all colleges

Note: Based on above mentioned formula, value on this parameter may range between 0 to 100. Per sanctioned intake average value shall be calculated, sanctioned intakes of UG and PG both will be considered, if both programs are being offered by the College

Scoring Rubrics: -

Level	Required conditions	Supporting documents
Level-1	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≤ 25	Patient Admission Records Critical Care Units and Cash Receipts etc.
Level-2	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >25 to ≤ 50	As mentioned above
Level-3	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >50 to < 75	As mentioned above
Level-4	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≥ 75	As mentioned above

Parameter-2.11: No. of deliveries (both normal & C-Section) in past 1 year

Operational explanation: Based on curriculum prescribed by NMC, students will be mandatorily provided clinical experiences in Hospital (Teaching/parent) in Obstetrics & Gynaecology department. Furthermore, the MSR established by NMC specifies the number of beds/units in the clinical department required for Programmes in Medical as per sanctioned intakes.

Scoring Rubrics for this parameter: -

In absence of reference points for drawing meaningful inferences on this parameters, college wise obtained values will be subjected to normalization based on following formula: -

$$\frac{\text{On average per intake clinical materail } (x') - \text{Minimum value obtained } (x)}{\text{Maximum Value obtained } (y) - \text{Minimum value obtained } (x)} \times 100$$

Where x' = for concerned college, on average per intake no. of deliveries performed (Normal & C-section separately) in department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology

y = Maximum Value for “On average per intake no. of deliveries performed (Normal & C-section separately)” across all colleges

x = Minimum value for “On average per intake no. of deliveries performed (Normal & C-section separately)” across all colleges

Note: Normalized score will be computed separately for C-section & Normal deliveries. Based on above mentioned formula, value on this parameter may range between 0 to 100. Per sanctioned intake average value shall be calculated, sanctioned intakes of UG and PG both will be considered, if both programs are being offered by the College

Scoring Rubrics: -

Sub-Parameters	Rating Levels				Supporting documents
	Level-1	Level-2	Level-3	Level-4	
2.11.1- No. of C-section deliveries performed vis-à-vis Sanctioned intake	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≤ 25	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >25 to ≤ 50	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >50 to < 75	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≥ 75	IPD admissions in Department of Gynaecology Records of deliveries performed etc.
2.11.2- No. of normal deliveries performed vis-à-vis sanctioned intake	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≤ 25	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >25 to ≤ 50	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >50 to < 75	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≥ 75	Same as mentioned above

--	--	--	--	--	--

Note: for computing weightage score on this parameter based on above mentioned rubrics following formula will be used: -

Weightage score on Parameter-2.11=

$$\frac{\frac{\text{Obtained score on 2.11.1}}{4} + \frac{\text{Obtained score on 2.11.2}}{4}}{2} \times \text{AW}$$

Where AW= Assigned weightage to Parameter-2.11

Criterion-3: Teaching –Learning Environment: - Physical, Psychological & Occupational

Parameter-3.1: Adequacy, Functionality & Optimum Utilization of Physical/Digital Library based resources

Operational explanation: With reference to MSR-2023, it has been specified that there will be Library in the Medical College/Institution. Further number of Titles, Books & journals are prescribed by linking to sanctioned intake in the concerned program. This parameter is primarily dealing with how available Library based facilities are being utilized.

- ✓ Note: Same set of students sampled for Parameter-1 & 2 of Criterion-1 may be interacted or same sampling procedure may be employed for sampling different set of students for this parameter. Sampled students of 1st Professional, 2nd Professional, 3rd Professional part-1 & 2 will be interacted.

Scoring Rubrics: -

Sub-Parameters	Rating Levels				Supporting documents
	Level-1	Level-2	Level-3	Level-4	
3.1.1- Available journals vis-à-vis sanctioned intake	If the number of total available Books (Print) are in sync with MSR <i>(30 books per intake covering all subjects)</i>	Level-1 plus If the number of total available Books (Print) are less than 5% more than MSR	Level-2 plus If the number of total available Books (Print) are 5% to 10% more than MSR	Level-3 plus If the number of total available Books (Print) are more than 10% vis-à-vis MSR	Accession Records & Registers Stock Registers
3.1.2- Available textbooks vis-à-vis sanctioned intake	If the number of total available Journals (Print & electronic both) are in sync with MSR <i>(Minimum one journal for each specialty,</i>	Level-1 plus If the number of total available Journals (Print & electronic both) are less than 5% more than MSR	Level-2 plus If the number of total available Journals (Print	Level-3 plus If the number of total available Journals (Print	Annual subscriptions of all electronic Journals

	1% of total number of prescribed books & 15 journals each 50 students)		& electronic both) are 5% to 10% more than MSR	& electronic both) are more than 10% vis-à-vis MSR	Invoices and payment records
3.1.3- Automation & Creation of e-Library	If the Medical College has adopted automation/digitization of Library by using Library Management Software or applications	Level-1 plus College has created e-Library for providing search & access facilities to electronic resources accessible to College/Institution users (Faculties & students etc.) by procuring/subscribing vast electronic resources from the NML-ERMED Consortium, e-Sodh Sindhu Consortium for HE e-resources and other relevant electronic platforms etc.	Level-2 plus If 50% of sampled students are able to show how they are able to access electronic resources procured by Medical College from NML-ERMED Consortium or any other Consortium	Level-3 plus If the Medical College has evolved mechanism for online tracking about type of electronic resources are being accessed by students and faculties and how many times etc.	Procurements records for procuring electronic resources from NML-ERMED Consortium or any other platforms Electronic evidences about type of electronic resources as user can be accessed by Students & faculties

Note: for computing weightage score on this parameter based on above mentioned rubrics following formula will be used: -

Weightage score on Parameter-3.1=

$$\frac{\text{Obtained score on 3.1.1}}{4} + \frac{\text{Obtained score on 3.1.2}}{4} + \frac{\text{Obtained score on 3.1.3}}{4} \times \text{AW}$$

3

Where AW= Assigned weightage to Parameter-3.1

Parameter-3.2: Adequacy, Functionality & Optimum Utilization of Student Practical Laboratories in Medical College

Operational explanation: With reference to regulations laid down by Medical Regulators for UG, Laboratory based experiences in clinical & non-clinical subjects have been emphasized. There shall be 8 student practical laboratories, one each for Histology, Clinical Physiology, Biochemistry, Histopathology & cytopathology, Clinical pathology & Haematology, Microbiology, Clinical Pharmacology, and Computer Assisted Learning (CAL) in Pharmacology. (Source: - MSR-2023, Minimum Requirements for Annual MBBS Admission-2020, Standard Assessment Form for AY 2022-23).

- ✓ Note: Same set of students sampled for Parameter-1 & 2 of Criterion-1 may be interacted or same sampling procedure may be employed for sampling different set of students for this parameter. Sampled students of 1st Professional, 2nd & Professional will be only interacted. Because, Practical Laboratories are being used for subjects like Human Anatomy, Physiology, Biochemistry, Pathology, Microbiology, Pharmacology, Forensic Medicine and these subjects prominently dealing with 1st Professional and 2nd Professional students.
- ✓ Interaction with the same set of faculties sampled under Parameter-1& 2 under Criterion-1 for the Subjects-Human Anatomy, Physiology, Biochemistry, Pathology, Microbiology, Pharmacology, Forensic Medicine

Scoring Rubrics: -

Sub-Parameters	Rating Levels				Supporting documents
	Level-1	Level-2	Level-3	Level-4	
3.2.1- Availability and usages of Practical Laboratories by Faculty	If the Medical College has all 8 Practical Laboratories	Level-1 plus If minimum 25% to 50% sampled faculties are able to Produce documented evidences about no. of DOAP Sessions conducted by them for concerned subjects in the Concerned Laboratories in past academic year.	Level-2 plus If minimum 25% to 50% sampled faculties are able to Produce documented evidences about on average how many times OSPE/OSCE based formative	If in Level-2 & 3 both, more than 50% sampled faculties of subjects as mentioned above are able to produce evidences	Physical Verification of each Practical Laboratory Records of DOAP sessions conducted for each Practical Laboratory

			assessment conducted for each student in Practical Laboratory of the concerned subjects in in past academic year		Subject wise DOAP sessions planned in Skill Laboratory Records of above mentioned assessments conducted (electronic or any other)
3.2.2- Intercation with sampled students by Assessment Team <i>(sampled students of 1st and 2nd professional year shall be interacted)</i>	If about 25% of sampled students are able to confirm that Practical Laboratories are being used for conducting subject specific DOAP Sessions as pre-planned through Teaching Schedule or Time Table for concerned Practical Laboratory	Level-1 plus If 25% to 50% of sampled students are able to confirm that Practical Laboratories are being used for conducting subject specific DOAP Sessions as planned through Teaching Schedule or Time Table for concerned Practical Laboratory	Level-2 plus If about 25% of sampled students are able to confirm whether they had any prior information or List of subject wise OSCE/OSPE based formative assessments pre-planned to be conducted in Practical Laboratories	Level-3 plus If 25% to 50% of sampled students are able to confirm whether they had any prior information or List of subject wise OSCE/OSPE based formative assessments pre-planned to be conducted in Practical Laboratories	Subject wise list of OSCE/OSPE based formative assessments pre-planned for conducting subject wise in concerned Practical Laboratory Subject wise pre-planned DOAP Sessions to be conducted in concerned Practical Laboratory

Note: for computing weightage score on this parameter based on above mentioned rubrics following formula will be used: -

Weightage score on Parameter-3.2=

$$\frac{\frac{\text{Obtained score on 3.2.1}}{4} + \frac{\text{Obtained score on 3.2.2}}{4}}{2} \times \text{AW}$$

Where AW= Assigned weightage to Parameter-3.2

Parameter-3.3: Adequacy, Functionality & Optimum Utilization of Clinical & Procedural Skill Laboratory based Resources

Operational explanation: With reference to regulations laid down by Medical Regulator, every medical institution shall have a Skills Laboratory where students can practice and improve skills pre-specified in the curriculum. The skills laboratory attempts to recreate the clinical environment and tasks which future health care workers have to perform with various levels of complexity and fidelity. Six (6) weeks of skill lab training including evaluation before the students are posted to the wards for clinical training shall be mandatory. (Source: MSR-2023)

- ✓ Note: Same set of students sampled for Parameter-1 & 2 of Criterion-1 may be interacted or same sampling procedure may be employed for sampling different set of students for this parameter. Sampled students of 2nd & 3rd Professional Part-1 & 2 will be interacted. Because as per MSR-2023, Skill lab training is primarily for the students who are to be deputed for Clinical Postings
- ✓ Interaction with the same set of faculties sampled under Parameter-1& 2 under Criterion-1 for the clinical subjects.

Scoring Rubrics: -

Sub-Parameters	Rating Levels				Supporting documents
	Level-1	Level-2	Level-3	Level-4	
3.3.1- Availability and usages of Skill Laboratory by Faculty	If the Medical College has Skill Laboratory	Level-1 plus If minimum 25% to 50% sampled faculties are able to Produce documented evidences about no. of DOAP Sessions conducted	Level-2 plus If minimum 25% to 50% sampled faculties are able to Produce	If in Level-2 & 3 both, more than 50% sampled faculties of subjects as mentioned	Physical Verification of Skill Laboratory Records of subject wise

		by them for concerned subjects in the Skill Laboratory	documented evidences about on average how many times OSPE, OSCE & DOPS based formative assessment conducted for each student in concerned subjects in Skill Laboratory in past academic year	above are able to produce evidences	DOAP sessions conducted in Skill Laboratory Subject wise DOAP sessions planned in Skill Laboratory Records of above mentioned assessments conducted (electronic or any other)
3.3.2- Intercation with sampled students by Assessment Team	If about 25% of sampled students are able to confirm that Skill Laboratory is being used for conducting subject specific DOAP Sessions as pre-planned through Teaching Schedule or Time Table for Skill Laboratory	Level-1 plus If 25% to 50% of sampled students are able to confirm that Skill Laboratory is being used for conducting subject specific DOAP Sessions as pre-planned through Teaching Schedule or Time Table	Level-2 plus If about 25% of sampled students are able to confirm whether they had any prior information or List of subject wise OSCE/OSPE or DOPS based formative assessments pre-planned to	Level-3 plus If 25% to 50% of sampled students are able to confirm whether they had any prior information or List of subject wise OSCE/OSPE or DOPS based formative assessments pre-planned to	Subject wise list of OSCE/OSPE and DOPS based formative assessments pre-planned for conducting subject wise in Skill Laboratory Subject wise pre-planned DOAP Sessions to be conducted in Skill Laboratory

			be conducted in Skill Laboratory	be conducted in Skill Laboratory	
--	--	--	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--

Note: for computing weightage score on this parameter based on above mentioned rubrics following formula will be used: -

Weightage score on Parameter-3.3=

$$\frac{\frac{\text{Obtained score on 3.3.1}}{4} + \frac{\text{Obtained score on 3.3.2}}{4}}{2} \times \text{AW}$$

Where AW= Assigned weightage to Parameter-3.3

Parameter-3.4: Adequacy, Functionality & Optimum Utilization of ICT Facilities/Medical Education Technology (MET) Unit

Operational explanation: With reference to regulations laid down by Medical Regulator, it has emphasized that Audio Visual Aids facilities shall be available in Medical College. AV Aids facilities shall be available in Lecture Theatres, Teaching Rooms, Museums, Practical Laboratories, Skill Laboratory, MEU Department/Unit and Central Library, Practical Laboratory with Computer Assisted Learning (CAL) based modules for Pharmacology etc.

Scoring rubrics for this Parameter-

Level	Required conditions	Supporting documents/evidences
Level-1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the College has all Lecture Theatres, Teaching Rooms, Laboratories (Practical & Skill Laboratory) equipped with Audio-Visual Aids Facilities Laboratory for Pharmacology is equipped with Computer Assisted Learning (CAL) modules If MEU (Medical Education Unit) is equipped with required audio-visual facilities as per DCF 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Physical Verification required
Level-2	Level-1 plus	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Physical Verification required

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If LMS is being by Medical Education Unit (MEU) during in-house Faculty Development Programme (FDP) for faculties or FDP for faculties of other Medical Colleges etc. 	
Level-3	<p>Level-2 plus: If the Medical College has created LMS (Learning Management System) based on MOODLE or any other open source or closed source applications for managing teaching learning process with any of the two features: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Giving assignments & their submissions, ○ Conducting Formative Assessments Knowledge domains ○ Conductive formative assessments for skill domains ○ Making recorded sessions of DOAPs, Bed Side Clinics etc. accessible to students etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Physical Verification required by using user log in for students & faculties
Level-4	<p>Level-3 plus</p> <p><i>If Skill Laboratory is equipped with any one of the following: -</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Equipped with Virtual Reality (VR) or augmented reality-based Simulation software & applications for creating simulated clinical setting related to several clinical departments like ICU Emergency Room etc. • Computer Based Simulations for AETCOM Modules • Computers based Simulations for training of Clinical Skills & Competences in clinical subjects etc. • Computer Based Simulations for conducting performance-based assessment of Competences like OSCE/OSPE/DOPS etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Physical Verification required by using user log in for Faculties

Parameter-3.5: Provision and utilization of students' amenities (Indoor & outdoor sport facilities, extra-curricular activities etc.)

Operational explanation: With reference to regulations laid down for programs in Medical Education by Medical Regulator, it has been emphasized that adequate student amenities shall be provided. These shall include facilities for common rooms for boys and girls (separate), cafeteria, cultural activities, indoor games and student counselling services. There shall be gymnasium, facilities for outdoor games and track events in the college. (Source: MSR-2023)

- ✓ Note: Same set of students sampled for Parameter-1 & 2 of Criterion-1 may be interacted or same sampling procedure may be employed for sampling different set of students for this parameter.

Scoring Rubrics: -

Sub-Parameters	Rating Levels				Supporting documents
	Level-1	Level-2	Level-3	Level-4	
3.5.1- Basic Student Amenities	<p>If the Medical College has cafeteria and separate common room for boys and girls</p> <p>If the Medical College has set up gymnasium.</p> <p>If the Medical College has facilities for more than one indoor sports-activities</p>	<p>Plus-1 plus</p> <p>If the College have auditorium or multi-purpose hall for cultural activities</p>	<p>Level-2 plus</p> <p>If the Medical College has minimum two outdoor sports facilities out of the following options: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Facility for Badminton ○ Tennis Court ○ Basketball court ○ Facility for Volleyball ○ Facility for Football ○ Facility for Cricket ○ Athletic Track 	<p>Level-2 plus</p> <p>If the Medical College has more than two outdoor sports facilities out of the following options: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Facility for Badminton ○ Tennis Court ○ Basketball court ○ Facility for Volleyball ○ Facility for Football ○ Facility for Cricket ○ Athletic Track 	Physical verification required

3.5.2- Organziation of Annual Sports activities	If the Medical College is organizing Annual Sports activities in each academic year	Level-1 plus If minimum 25% of sampled students have confirmed about organization of Annual Sports activities with minimum two outdoor sports and two indoor sports. Same should be evidenced by recording and photographs produced by college.	Level-2 plus If minimum 25% to 50% of sampled students have confirmed about organization of Annual Sports activities with more than two outdoor sports and more than two indoor sports. Same should be evidenced by recording and photographs produced by college.	Level-3 plus If more than 50% of sampled students have confirmed about organization of Annual Sports activities with more than 4 outdoor sports and more than 4 indoor sports. Same should be evidenced by recording and photographs produced by college.	Documented evidences about organization of Annual Sports activities like recording & photographs etc.
3.5.3- Organziation of Annual Cultural Program	If the Medical College is organizing Annual Cultural Program in each academic year	Level-1 plus If minimum 25% of sampled students have confirmed about organization of Annual Cultural Program with minimum two activities. Same should be evidenced by recording and	Level-2 plus If minimum 25% to 50% of sampled students have confirmed about organization of Annual Cultural Program with more than 2 activities. Same should be evidenced by recording and photographs produced by College.	Level-3 plus If more than 50% of sampled students have confirmed about organization of Annual Cultural Program with more than 4 activities. Same should be evidenced by recording and photographs produced by College.	Documented evidences about organization of Annual Cultural activities like recording & photographs etc.

		photographs produced by College.			
3.5.4-Measures for Hygiene and Sanitation	If there is SOPs for maintenance sanitation & hygiene in Medical College and same is evidenced through sanitation and cleanliness of washrooms, Classrooms, campus and Cafeteria	Level-1 plus If there is SOPs for maintenance sanitation & hygiene in Hostel and same is evidenced through sanitation and cleanliness of washrooms, Mess and Rooms etc.	Level-2 plus If there is SOPs for maintenance sanitation & hygiene in attached teaching hospital and same is evidenced through sanitation and cleanliness of washrooms (on sample basis washrooms in OPD areas may be checked) and cafeteria	Level-3 plus If minimum 70% of sampled student are satisfied with sanitation and cleanliness measures in Medical College, attached Teaching Hospital and Hostel separately	Physical Verification is required

Note: for computing weightage score on this parameter based on above mentioned rubrics following formula will be used: -

Weightage score on Parameter-3.5=

$$\frac{\frac{\text{Obtained score on 3.5.1}}{4} + \frac{\text{Obtained score on 3.5.2}}{4} + \frac{\text{Obtained score on 3.5.3}}{4} + \frac{\text{Obtained score on 3.5.4}}{4}}{4} \times \text{AW}$$

Where AW= Assigned weightage to Parameter-3.5

Parameter-3.6: Hostel Accommodation Capacities & Safety Measures

Operational explanation: With reference to regulations laid down by Medical Regulator, The College/Institution shall make provision to provide accommodation for at least 75% of all students enrolled and interns, and all girl students who request for it. Each student shall be provided with independent and separate furniture which shall include chair, table, bed and full size cupboard at the least (provide for

at least 9 sq. m. area/student). It is desirable that hostel rooms are either single or double accommodation facilities. Adequate recreational, dining and 24x7 security facilities shall be provided at the hostels. (Source: MSR-2023).

Scoring rubrics for this Parameter-

Level	Required conditions	Supporting documents/evidences
Level-1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the College has accommodation facilities for 75% of all enrolled students, Interns and Resident Doctors as per requirements of MSR. If Hostel for Girls & Boys are equipped with 	Physical verification required
Level-2	<p>Level-1 plus Separately for Girls Hostel & Boys Hostel:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provisions of 24 hours' water supply & quality drinking water facilities 24 Hours manned with security guards Provisions of indoor/outdoor sports facilities Provisions of Mess Facilities Adequate washroom & toilets facilities Maintenance of cleanliness & sanitation in washrooms & entire block Computer systems and internet facilities etc. 	Physical verification required
Level-3	<p>Level-2 plus If the College is providing Hostel facilities with mess to all interns during internship at UHCs/RHCs</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Physical verification Records of occupancy & records of students accommodated
Level-4	<p>Level-3 plus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If College has accommodation facilities for accommodating 75% of students, Interns and Resident doctors in single or double occupancy rooms. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Physical verification Records of occupancy & records of students accommodated

Parameter-3.7: Provisions for Prevention of Ragging & Gender Harassment in Medical College

Operational explanation: - With reference to Ragging Prohibition Regulations laid down by Medical Regulator, this parameter has been devised predominantly to deal with Anti-ragging measures placed in Medical Colleges in compliance with above mentioned regulations. (Source: National Medical Commission (Prevention and Prohibition of Ragging in Medical Colleges and Institutions) Regulations, 2021.)

Further this parameter is intended to capture information pertaining to gender harassment prevention measures adhering to order of Hon'ble Supreme Court.

Scoring rubrics for this Parameter: -

Sub-Parameters	Rating Levels				Supporting documents
	Level-1	Level-2	Level-3	Level-4	
3.7.1- Anti-Ragging Measures	<p>If the College has constituted Anti-ragging Committee in sync with regulatory requirements</p> <p>If the College has constituted Anti-ragging squad for enforcing anti-ragging measures and being vigilant 24x7</p>	<p>Level-1 plus</p> <p>If the contact numbers of officers/Faculties & staff accountable for anti-ragging measures have been shared and displayed in campus at prominent places</p> <p>If the College is disseminating essential information about zero tolerance policy for Ragging through electronic & print media</p> <p>If students are required to submit undertaking as part of anti-ragging</p>	<p>Level-2 plus</p> <p>If the College is providing counselling services to Fresher students and others by arranging professional counsellors for addressing personal, emotional and adjustment issues</p> <p>If College is taking proactive measures for facilitating interaction among freshers and</p>	<p>Level-3 plus</p> <p>If the anti-ragging squad has identified potential or hot spots areas of ragging in the campus & hostels</p> <p>If the anti-ragging squad has identified potential or hot spots areas of ragging in the campus & hostels</p> <p>If reported Ragging are investigated thoroughly and resolved timely</p>	<p>Evidences of constitution of Committees and Anti-ragging squad etc.</p> <p>MOMs of regular meeting of Anti-Ragging Committee and Display/sharing key person/officers accountable for anti-ragging measures</p> <p>Evidences for organizations of counselling session for students for addressing adjustment issues</p> <p>Evidences for organization of sports</p>

		measures at the time admission in campus & hostel both mentors of freshers & junior students etc.	seniors through organization of sports and extra-curricular activities, establishing Mentoring cells (senior becoming		and extra-curricular activities among freshers and senior students Evidences for thorough & timely investigations & closure of reported cases of ragging campus or hostel etc.
3.7.2- Measures for Gender Harassment Prevention	If the functional POSH or Internal – complaint Committee has been constituted in sync with regulatory requirements	Level-1 plus If the contact numbers of officers/Faculties & staff accountable for prevention of gender harassment have been shared and displayed in campus at prominent places If the College is disseminating essential information about zero tolerance policy towards Gender Harassment through electronic & print media	Level-2 plus When frequently sensitization & awareness programmes are organized based on POSH Act	Level-3 plus If reported Gender Harassment cases are investigated thoroughly and resolved timely	Evidences of constitution of Committee MOMs of regular meeting of Committee and Display/sharing key person/officers accountable for Prevention of Gender Harassment Evidences for thorough & timely investigations & closure of reported cases of gender harassment in campus or hostel etc.

Note: for computing weightage score on this parameter based on above mentioned rubrics following formula will be used: -

Weightage score on Parameter-3.7=

$$\frac{\frac{\text{Obtained score on 3.7.1}}{4} + \frac{\text{Obtained score on 3.7.2}}{4}}{2} \times \text{AW}$$

Where AW= Assigned weightage to Parameter-3.7

Parameter-3.8: Provisions of Biomedical Waste Management in Medical College

Operational explanation: This parameter deals with the Biomedical Waste Management. The Medical Institution must ensure compliance with the Bio-medical Waste (Management & Handling) Rules, 2019 and as notified from time to time. They shall have a robust institutional policy on biomedical waste management of human origin, with a well-defined arrangement for segregation and discarding of biomedical waste.

Scoring rubrics for this Parameter-

Level	Required conditions	Supporting documents/evidences
Level-1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the functional Biomedical Waste Management Committee has been constituted in sync with regulatory requirements 	Evidences Constitution of BMW Committee & MOMs of functioning of BMW Committee
Level-2	Level-1 plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the Medical College has established physical facilities for BMW like segregation, transportation & disposal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Physical Facilities like different coloured containers, vehicles for transportation, Incinerator & ETP etc.
Level-3	Level-2 plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the College maintaining annual reports for generation of biomedical waste If the College is maintaining annual Details of Incineration Ash (if applicable) & ETP (Effluent Treatment Plant) sludge 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual Data and reports for generation of BMW under different category Annual data and reports Incineration Ash and ETP sludge and their disposal etc.

	generated & disposed during treatment of biomedical waste	
Level-4	Level-3 plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If more than 80% health care workers directly involved in BMW management have been trained ○ If 100% health care workers directly engaged in BMW management have immunised against Hepatitis B/Tetanus (if applicable) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Evidences of training of healthcare workers & their vaccination for immunization against Hepatitis B and Tetanus

Parameter-3.9: Provisions of Hospital Infection Control Measures for HCAI (Health Care Associated Infection) in Medical College

Operational explanation: -NMC through dated 18th October, 2021 had advised all Medical Colleges to constitute HICT (Health Infection Control Committee). NCDC-MoHFW has notified guidelines for Hospital Infection Prevention & Control, adhering to this guidelines, Medical Colleges are required to align their safety measures for prevention and control of HCAI (Health Care Associated Infection).

Scoring rubrics for this Parameter: -

Level	Required conditions	Supporting documents/evidences
Level-1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If the College has constituted HICC (Health Infection Control Committee) involving senior microbiologist and medical faculties etc. ○ If the College has constituted HICT (Health Infection Control Team) involving Infection Control Officer, Infection Control Nurse and microbiologist etc. 	Evidences of Constitution of HICC & HICT
Level-2	Level-1 Plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If HICC meets regularly/monthly for tacking stock of implementation of all policies related to Hospital Infection Prevention and Control ○ If HICT meets daily and ensure implementation of measures for Hospital Infection and Control in all clinical departments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ MOMs of the meeting of HICC regarding implementation of all Policies related to Hospital Infection & Control ○ Daily audit records of HICT regarding implementation of measures for Hospital Infection & Control

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If SOPs for implementation essential policies like Antimicrobial policy, Surveillance policy, Disinfection policy, Isolation policy, Policy for investigation of an outbreak of infection have been developed 	
Level-3	Level-2 plus All 100% staff (doctors, residents, interns, nursing & housekeeping departments etc.) are trained on SOPs developed for implementation of policies for prevention & control of infections in all Clinical Departments & Critical Care Units, ICU/HDU etc.,	Training of all staff on SOPs and policies related to Hospital Infection & Control
Level-4	Level-3 Plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If all policies-based SOPs are being implemented in all clinical departments and critical care units 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Evidences for implementation of all SOPs & policies

Parameter-3.10: Provisions for Safety Measures for Diagnostic Radiology/Radiotherapy vis-à-vis AERB (Atomic Energy Regulation Board)

Operational Definition: - With reference to regulations laid down for UG Program by Medical Regulator pertaining to housing and operations of medical radiation/imaging facilities in hospital, the parameter is predominantly dealing with available facilities and compliance of medical institution with regulations laid down by AERB (Atomic Energy Regulatory Body).

Scoring rubrics for this Parameter-

Level	Required conditions	Supporting documents/evidences
Level-1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the College is adhering to AERB (Atomic Energy Regulatory Board) regulations pertaining to housing of medical radiation/imaging facilities in hospital. 	Evidences for compliance with AERB regulations
Level-2	Level-1 plus	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Evidences for compliance with AERB regulations

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If all Medical Radiation equipment (X-Ray, CT, USG etc.) owned by teaching hospital is certified by AERB through e-LORA 	
Level-3	Level-2 plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If the Medical College is established stringent SOPs for operational safety & Design safety for Radiation Equipment installed in department of Radio-diagnosis ○ If periodically audit of operational & design safety are conducted for each Medical Radiation equipment on criteria like handling by qualified person, Usages of protective accessories, Usage of Personnel monitoring devices (TLD), Preventive maintenance and periodic QA of equipment, Updating with the current regulatory requirements, Patient Dose Management and Protection Measures etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Evidences for SOPs for enforcement of operational & design safety measures for all Medical Radiation Equipment
Level-4	Level-3 plus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If the Medical College based on periodical audit on criteria as mentioned above is identifying gaps (if any) and are taking measures for enforcement of operational & design safety measures for radiation equipment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Evidence for audit of radiation equipment & department of radio-diagnosis in teaching hospital for enforcement of safety measures

Parameter-3.11: Provisions for Fire Safety in Campus (Teaching Block, Hospital Block & Hostel Block)

Operational Definition: With reference to regulations laid down for UG Program by Medical Regulator & NBC-2016, Fire Safety Measures are essential in blocks (teaching, hostel & hospital etc.). This parameter has been devised for capturing information pertaining to fire safety measures in Medical College, Hostel block and attached teaching hospital.

Sub-Parameters	Rating Levels				Supporting documents
	Level-1	Level-2	Level-3	Level-4	

3.11.1- Fire NOC	<p>If the College is possessing any of the following as per applicability: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fire NOC as required under National Building Code (NBC) • If the Medical College is Military Establishment as such fire safety audit certificate issued by MES 	<p>Level-1 plus If the Medical College is able to produce Fire NOC in which teaching blocks are mentioned categorically</p>	<p>Level-2 plus If the Medical College is able to produce Fire NOC in which hostel blocks are mentioned categorically</p>	<p>Level-3 plus If the Medical College is able to produce Fire NOC in which all blocks of attached teaching hospital are mentioned categorically</p>	<p>Documented evidences Fire NOCs issued from competent authority of concerned department of Government</p>
<p>3.11.2- Firefighting equipment & preparedness (Medical College-Teaching Blocks)</p>	<p>Fire Extinguishers: - If functional fire extinguishers are placed at prominent places on each floor in Medical College</p>	<p>Level-1 plus Fire Alarm System: - If functional Fire Alarm system is functional in Medical College</p>	<p>Level-2 plus Evacuation & Exit Plan: - If Evacuation and Exit Plan is prominently visible on each floor in Medical College</p>	<p>Level-3 plus Mock Drills If Mock drills are conducted regularly in Teaching Blocks</p> <p>Quality Assurance System If Medical College has established Quality Assurance System (QAS for enforcement of</p>	<p>Physical Verification required</p> <p>AMCs for Fire Extinguishers</p> <p>Recorded evidences of Mock Drills</p> <p>Documented evidences of Quality Assurance System</p>

				Fire Safety Measures	
3.11.3- Firefighting equipment & preparedness (Hostel Blocks)	Fire Extinguishers: - If functional fire extinguishers are placed at prominent places on each floor in Hostel Blocks	Level-1 plus Fire Alarm System: - If functional Fire Alarm system is functional in Hostel Blocks	Level-2 plus Evacuation & Exit Plan: - If Evacuation and Exit Plan is prominently visible on each floor in Hostel Blocks	Level-3 plus Mock Drills If Mock drills are conducted regularly in Hostel Blocks Quality Assurance System If Medical College has established Quality Assurance System (QAS for enforcement of Fire Safety Measures)	Physical Verification required AMCs for Fire Extinguishers Recorded evidences of Mock Drills Documented evidences of Quality Assurance System
3.11.4- Firefighting equipment & preparedness (Attached Teaching Hospital)	Fire Extinguishers: - If functional fire extinguishers are placed at prominent places on each floor in attached Teaching Hospital	Level-1 plus Fire Alarm System: - If functional Fire Alarm system is functional in attached Teaching Hospital	Level-2 plus Evacuation & Exit Plan: - If Evacuation and Exit Plan is prominently visible on each floor in attached Teaching Hospital	Level-3 plus Mock Drills If Mock drills are conducted regularly in attached teaching hospital	Physical Verification required AMCs for Fire Extinguishers Recorded evidences of Mock Drills

			Auto sprinkle & wet raiser: - If teaching hospital is equipped with auto sprinkle If applicable, teaching hospital is equipped with wet raiser	Quality Assurance System If Medical College has established Quality Assurance System (QAS for enforcement of Fire Safety Measures	Documented evidences of Quality Assurance System
--	--	--	---	---	--

Note: for computing weightage score on this parameter based on above mentioned rubrics following formula will be used: -

Weightage score on Parameter-3.11=

$$\frac{\frac{\text{Obtained score on 3.11.1}}{4} + \frac{\text{Obtained score on 3.11.2}}{4} + \frac{\text{Obtained score on 3.11.3}}{4} + \frac{\text{Obtained score on 3.11.4}}{4}}{4} \times \text{AW}$$

Where AW= Assigned weightage to Parameter-3.11

Criterion-4: Students' Admission, Attainment of Competence & Progression

Parameter-4.1: Demonstration of procedures by Sampled students in Procedure & Clinical Skill Laboratory/Simulated Setting

Operational explanation: - With reference to Competency based Curriculum for Medical Education, medical students will be mandatorily provided with hands on experiences for acquiring subject specific competencies in Practical Laboratory, Skill Laboratory, Simulated setting and real clinical setting.

Hands on experiences in Clinical & procedural Skill Laboratories will facilitate strengthening of mastery over skill competencies & procedures pertaining to clinical subjects. Skill Laboratories based hands on experiences for practising skill competencies & procedures are pre-requisites for learning and demonstration of skill competencies and procedures in actual clinical setting/Health care setting. As students directly cannot be allowed for applying clinical procedures on actual patients in clinical setting, hence within simulated and controlled situations in Skill Laboratory by progressively increasing complexities of given clinical procedural tasks, students are allowed to develop mastery over required skill competencies and procedures by operating over SP (Standardized/Simulated Patients) and working under Computer Based Simulations of clinical setting.

Sampling of students for Parameter-4.1 and 4.2 of Criterion-4

*The central limit theorem (CLT) states that the distribution of sample means & other statistics approximates a normal distribution as the sample size gets larger, regardless of the population's distribution. Sample sizes equal to or greater than 30 are often considered sufficient for the CLT to hold. **Note:***

- Total number of students sampled from all professional years should not be less than 30 and should not be more than 60.
- All sampled students from first Professional and Second Professional will be randomly assigned Practical or clinical skill competencies/procedures to demonstrate in Skill Laboratory or simulated setting Or clinical setting as per requirements of the concerned subjects.
- All sampled Third Professional part-1 and third professional part-2 and interns may be assigned clinical skill competencies and procedures to demonstrate in real clinical setting vis-à-vis 4.2 parameter of this Criterion-4.

Scoring Rubrics for this parameter: -

Sub-Parameters	Rating Levels				Supporting documents
	Level-1	Level-2	Level-3	Level-4	
4.1.1-Group <i>Performance by 3 Students vis-à-vis Human Anatomy</i> (First Professional) (Assessment Setting-concerned Practical Laboratory)	If assigned tasks by Group is performed less than 40% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by 41 % to 60% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by 61 % to 80% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by more than 80% correctness	App based auto generation of group of students. App based random assignment of group tasks to the group App based evaluation of group for assigned tasks
4.1.2-Group <i>Performance by 3 Students vis-à-vis Physiology</i> (First Professional)	If assigned tasks by Group is performed less than 40% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by 41 % to 60% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by 61 % to 80% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by more than 80% correctness	Same as mentioned above

(Assessment Setting- concerned Practical Laboratory)					
4.1.3- Group <i>Performance by 3 Students vis-à-vis Biochemistry</i> (First Professional) (Assessment Setting- concerned Practical Laboratory)	If assigned tasks by Group is performed less than 40% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by 41 % to 60% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by 61 % to 80% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by more than 80% correctness	App based auto generation of group of students. App based random assignment of group tasks to the group App based evaluation of group for assigned tasks
4.1.4- Group <i>Performance by 3 Students vis-à-vis AETCOM</i> (First Professional) (Assessment Setting- Skill Laboratory)	If assigned tasks by Group is performed less than 40% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by 41 % to 60% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by 61 % to 80% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by more than 80% correctness	Same as mentioned above
4.1.5- Group <i>Performance by 3</i>	If assigned tasks by Group is performed less than 40% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by	Same as mentioned above

<i>Students vis-à-vis Pathology</i> (Second Professional) (Assessment Setting-concerned Practical Laboratory)		41 % to 60% correctness	61 % to 80% correctness	more than 80% correctness	
4.1.6- Group Performance by 3 Students vis-à-vis Pharmacology (Second Professional) (Assessment Setting-concerned Practical/Clinical Laboratory)	If assigned tasks by Group is performed less than 40% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by 41 % to 60% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by 61 % to 80% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by more than 80% correctness	Same as mentioned above
4.1.7- Group Performance by 3 Students vis-à-vis Microbiology (Second Professional) (Assessment Setting-Concerned Practical Lab)	If assigned tasks by Group is performed less than 40% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by 41 % to 60% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by 61 % to 80% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by more than 80% correctness	Same as mentioned above

4.1.8- Group Performance by 3 Students vis-à-vis Forensic Medicine and Toxicology (Second Professional) (Assessment Setting- concerned practical Lab or Skill Lab)	If assigned tasks by Group is performed less than 40% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by 41 % to 60% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by 61 % to 80% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by more than 80% correctness	Same as mentioned above
4.1.9- Group Performance by 3 Students vis-à-vis AETCOM (Second Professional) (Assessment Setting- Skill Lab)	If assigned tasks by Group is performed less than 40% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by 41 % to 60% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by 61 % to 80% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by more than 80% correctness	Same as mentioned above

Note-

- **Sampling of students shall be as per provided data by college in sync with required Data Capturing Format. For each subject different set of 3 students shall be auto generated by the Assessment and Rating Portal. For each subject different set of 3 students will be auto generated by the portal itself as per provided data by the College. In the group students can mutually decide which steps or questions shall be performed or responded by them. Sampling will be based on stratifications of students based on NEET Score or University Examinations, in each group there shall be one randomly sampled student from sampling strata like high performing, average performing and other than high & average performing.**

- If for any assigned group task to the students of First and Second Professional for any subjects, required articles & equipment are not available in the concerned Practical Laboratory as such next task will be assigned randomly. If for both occasions required articles and equipment are not available as such “not performed” shall be selected and submitted for the concerned subject.

Note: for computing weightage score on this parameter based on above mentioned rubrics following formula will be used - :

Weightage score on Parameter-4.1=

$$\frac{\text{Parameters (4.1.1+4.1.2+4.1.3+4.1.4+4.1.5+4.1.6+4.1.7+4.1.8+4.1.9)}}{4} \times \text{AW}$$

9

Where AW =Assigned weightage to Parameter-4.1

Parameter-4.2: Demonstration of Clinical procedures/clinical skill competency by sampled students/interns at Clinical site (Hospital)

Operational explanation: -Based on curriculum prescribed by NMC, students are required to go for clinical posting, and they will be exposed to longitudinal patient care, being part of health care team and hands on care of patients in outpatient and inpatient clinical setting. Under this parameter 4.2 subject specific clinical skills of students of third professional part-1 and part-2 shall be assessed in the concerned clinical department/specialties.

Further after successful completion of Summative Examinations at the end of third professional part-2, medical students will undergo rotatory internship and they will be called as interns. As per requirements of this parameter, interns may be randomly assigned clinical skill competencies/procedures to demonstrate in real clinical setting.

Sampling of students for Parameter-4.2 of Criterion-4

The central limit theorem (CLT) states that the distribution of sample means & other statistics approximates a normal distribution as the sample size gets larger, regardless of the population's distribution. Sample sizes equal to or greater than 30 are often considered sufficient for the CLT to hold.

Note:

- *Sampling of students shall be as per provided data by college in sync with required Data Capturing Format. For each subject different set of 3 students shall be auto generated by the Assessment and Rating Portal. For each subject different set of 3 students will be auto generated by the portal itself as per provided data by the College. In the group students can mutually decide which steps or questions shall be performed or responded by them. Sampling will be based on stratifications of students based on NEET Score or University Examinations, in each group there shall be one randomly sampled student from sampling strata like high performing, average performing and other than high & average performing.*
- *Students of third professional part-I and part-II and interns shall be assessed in concerned clinical departments at teaching hospital Only. If for the assigned task, there is no patient available in concerned Clinical Department as such new assessment task shall be assigned*

Scoring Rubrics for this parameter: -

Sub-Parameters	Rating Levels				Supporting documents
	Level-1	Level-2	Level-3	Level-4	
4.2.1- Group <i>Performance by 3 students vis-à-vis General Medicine</i> (Third Professional part-1) (Assessment Setting- concerned clinical department)	If assigned tasks by Group is performed less than 40% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by 41 % to 60% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by 61 % to 80% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by more than 80% correctness	Same as mentioned above
4.2.2- Group <i>Performance by 3 students vis-à-vis General Surgery</i>	If assigned tasks by Group is performed less than 40% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by 41 % to 60% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by 61 % to 80% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by more than 80% correctness	Same as mentioned above

<i>(Third Professional part-1)</i> <i>(Assessment Setting-concerned clinical department)</i>					
<i>4.2.3- Group Performance by 3 students vis-à-vis Obstetrics and Gynaecology</i> <i>(Third Professional part-1)</i> <i>(Assessment Setting-concerned clinical department)</i>	If assigned tasks by Group is performed less than 40% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by 41 % to 60% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by 61 % to 80% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by more than 80% correctness	Same as mentioned above
<i>4.2.4- Group Performance by 3 students vis-à-vis Paediatrics</i> <i>(Third Professional part-1)</i> <i>(Assessment Setting-concerned clinical department)</i>	If assigned tasks by Group is performed less than 40% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by 41 % to 60% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by 61 % to 80% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by more than 80% correctness	Same as mentioned above

4.2.5- Group Performance by 3 students vis-à-vis Orthopaedics (Third Professional part-1) (Assessment Setting- concerned clinical department)	If assigned tasks by Group is performed less than 40% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by 41 % to 60% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by 61 % to 80% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by more than 80% correctness	Same as mentioned above
4.2.6- Group Performance by 3 students vis-à-vis Dermatology (Third Professional part-1) (Assessment Setting- concerned clinical department)	If assigned tasks by Group is performed less than 40% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by 41 % to 60% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by 61 % to 80% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by more than 80% correctness	Same as mentioned above
4.2.6- Group Performance by 3 students vis-à-vis Community Medicine (Third Professional part-1)	If assigned tasks by Group is performed less than 40% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by 41 % to 60% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by 61 % to 80% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by more than 80% correctness	Same as mentioned above

(Assessment Setting- concerned clinical department)					
4.2.8- Group <i>Performance by 3 students vis-à-vis AETCOM</i> (Third Professional part-1) (Assessment Setting- concerned clinical department)	If assigned tasks by Group is performed less than 40% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by 41 % to 60% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by 61 % to 80% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by more than 80% correctness	Same as mentioned above
4.2.9- Group <i>Performance by 3 students vis-à-vis General Medicine</i> (Third Professional part-II) (Assessment Setting- concerned clinical department)	If assigned tasks by Group is performed less than 40% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by 41 % to 60% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by 61 % to 80% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by more than 80% correctness	Same as mentioned above
4.2.10- Group <i>Performance by 3 students vis-à-vis Psychiatry</i>	If assigned tasks by Group is performed less than 40% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by 41 % to 60% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by 61 % to 80% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by more than 80% correctness	Same as mentioned above

<i>(Third Professional part-II)</i> <i>(Assessment Setting-concerned clinical department)</i>					
<i>4.2.11- Group Performance by 3 students vis-à-vis Dermatology, Venerology and Leprosy (DVL)</i> <i>(Third Professional part-II)</i> <i>(Assessment Setting-concerned clinical department)</i>	If assigned tasks by Group is performed less than 40% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by 41 % to 60% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by 61 % to 80% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by more than 80% correctness	Same as mentioned above
<i>4.2.12- Group Performance by 3 students vis-à-vis General Surgery</i> <i>(Third Professional part-II)</i> <i>(Assessment Setting-concerned clinical department)</i>	If assigned tasks by Group is performed less than 40% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by 41 % to 60% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by 61 % to 80% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by more than 80% correctness	Same as mentioned above

4.2.13- Group <i>Performance by 3 students vis-à-vis Otorhinolaryngology</i> (Third Professional part-II) (Assessment Setting- concerned clinical department)	If assigned tasks by Group is performed less than 40% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by 41 % to 60% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by 61 % to 80% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by more than 80% correctness	Same as mentioned above
4.2.14- Group <i>Performance by 3 students vis-à-vis Ophthalmology</i> (Third Professional part-II) (Assessment Setting- concerned clinical department)	If assigned tasks by Group is performed less than 40% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by 41 % to 60% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by 61 % to 80% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by more than 80% correctness	Same as mentioned above
4.2.15- Group <i>Performance by 3 students vis-à-vis Orthopaedics</i> (Third Professional part-II)	If assigned tasks by Group is performed less than 40% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by 41 % to 60% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by 61 % to 80% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by more than 80% correctness	Same as mentioned above

(Assessment Setting- concerned clinical department)					
4.2.16- Group <i>Performance by 3 students vis-à-vis Dentistry</i> (Third Professional part-II) (Assessment Setting- concerned clinical department)	If assigned tasks by Group is performed less than 40% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by 41 % to 60% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by 61 % to 80% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by more than 80% correctness	Same as mentioned above
4.2.17- Group <i>Performance by 3 students vis-à-vis Anaesthesiology and Radiodiagnosis</i> (Third Professional part-II) (Assessment Setting- concerned clinical department)	If assigned tasks by Group is performed less than 40% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by 41 % to 60% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by 61 % to 80% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by more than 80% correctness	Same as mentioned above
4.2.18- Group <i>Performance by 3 students vis-à-vis</i>	If assigned tasks by Group is performed less than 40% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by 41 % to 60% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by	Same as mentioned above

<i>Obstetrics and Gynaecology</i> (Third Professional part-II) (Assessment Setting-concerned clinical department)			61 % to 80% correctness	more than 80% correctness	
4.2.19- Group <i>Performance by 3 students vis-à-vis Paediatrics</i> (Third Professional part-II) (Assessment Setting-concerned clinical department)	If assigned tasks by Group is performed less than 40% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by 41 % to 60% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by 61 % to 80% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by more than 80% correctness	Same as mentioned above
4.2.20- Group <i>Performance by 3 Interns vis-à-vis General Medicine</i> (Interns) (Assessment Setting-concerned clinical department)	If assigned tasks by Group is performed less than 40% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by 41 % to 60% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by 61 % to 80% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by more than 80% correctness	Same as mentioned above
4.2.21- Group <i>Performance by 3</i>	If assigned tasks by Group is performed less than 40% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by	Same as mentioned above

<i>Interns vis-à-vis General Surgery</i> (Interns) (Assessment Setting-concerned clinical department)		41 % to 60% correctness	61 % to 80% correctness	more than 80% correctness	
4.2.22- Group Performance by 3 Interns vis-à-vis Gynaecology and Obstetrics (Interns) (Assessment Setting-concerned clinical department)	If assigned tasks by Group is performed less than 40% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by 41 % to 60% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by 61 % to 80% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by more than 80% correctness	Same as mentioned above
4.2.23- Group Performance by 3 Interns vis-à-vis Paediatrics (Interns) (Assessment Setting-concerned clinical department)	If assigned tasks by Group is performed less than 40% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by 41 % to 60% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by 61 % to 80% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by more than 80% correctness	Same as mentioned above
4.2.24- Group Performance by 3 Interns vis-à-vis Orthopaedics including PM & R	If assigned tasks by Group is performed less than 40% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by 41 % to 60% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by 61 % to 80% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by more than 80% correctness	Same as mentioned above

(Interns) (Assessment Setting- concerned clinical department)					
4.2.25- Group <i>Performance by 3 Interns vis-à-vis Otorhinolaryngology</i> (Interns) (Assessment Setting- concerned clinical department)	If assigned tasks by Group is performed less than 40% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by 41 % to 60% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by 61 % to 80% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by more than 80% correctness	Same as mentioned above
4.2.26- Group <i>Performance by 3 Interns vis-à-vis Ophthalmology</i> (Interns) (Assessment Setting- concerned clinical department)	If assigned tasks by Group is performed less than 40% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by 41 % to 60% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by 61 % to 80% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by more than 80% correctness	Same as mentioned above
4.2.27- Group <i>Performance by 3 Interns vis-à-vis Casualty (Interns)</i> (Assessment Setting- concerned clinical department)	If assigned tasks by Group is performed less than 40% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by 41 % to 60% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by 61 % to 80% correctness	If assigned tasks by Group is performed by more than 80% correctness	Same as mentioned above

Note: for computing weightage score on this parameter based on above mentioned rubrics following formula will be used - :

Weightage score on Parameter-4.2=

$$\frac{\text{Parameters (4.2.1+4.2.2+4.2.3+4.2.4+4.2.5+4.2.6+4.2.7+4.2.8+4.2.9+4.2.10+4.2.11+4.2.12+4.2.13+4.2.14+4.2.15+4.2.16+4.2.17+4.2.18+4.2.19+4.2.20+4.2.21+4.2.22+4.2.23+4.2.24+4.2.25+4.2.26+4.2.27)}}{27} \times \text{AW}$$

Where AW =Assigned weightage to Parameter-4.2

Parameter 4.3: Average NEET Scores of students admitted to the UG Programme in the last 5 academic calendar.

Operational explanation: As per requirement of this parameter, NEET scores of students who have taken admission in UG program in concerned Colleges will be captured College wise. Based on submitted data by College, College wise average score will be computed. This parameter will work as proxy of reputation of college among the students. This parameter is related to academic excellence category of assessment and rating criteria mentioned in regulation laid down for Assessment and Rating of Colleges.

This parameter is related to reputation of college among concerned stakeholders .

✓ **Note:** NEET-UG scores of students who have taken admission under General Category/unreserved shall be considered.

Submitted data by college will be subjected to normalization based on following formula :

$$\frac{\text{Average score per student of College on the parameter (x')} - \text{Minimum obtained average score on the parameter (x)}}{\text{Maximum obtained average score on this parameter (y) - Minimum obtained average score on this parameter (x)}} \times 100$$

Where x ='for concerned college, per student average score obtained by college on this parameter

y =Maximum Value for "Maximum obtained Average score by any college on this parameter "in all colleges

x =Minimum value for "Minimum obtained Average score by any College on this parameter "in all colleges

Note: Based on above mentioned formula, value on this parameter may range between 0 to 100

Scoring Rubrics- :

Sub-Parameters	Rating Levels				Supporting documents
	Level-1	Level-2	Level-3	Level-4	
4.3: - Rating levels based on UG NEET Scores of students admitted under Unreserved/General Category	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≤ 25	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >25 to ≤ 50	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >50 to < 75	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≥ 75	Required data to be submitted by College

Note: for normalization average value shall be calculated with respect to sanctioned intakes for the UG Program.

Parameter-4.4: Average PG NEET Scores of UG Graduated students/UG alumni qualified minimum Cut-off Percentile in recently conducted NEET PG (Previous Year)

Operational explanation: As per requirement of this parameter, information like how many UG graduated students/UG Alumni of concerned college have appeared for NEET-PG and how many students/alumni have cleared the NEET-PG minimum cut-off percentile, shall be captured for past 1 year. This parameter is proxy for quality of teaching learning process in College and this is related to standards of education and academic excellence category of assessment and criteria essential for assessment and rating of Medical Colleges/Institutions.

College is required to submit required NEET-PG data for the students/alumni who have appeared and qualified NEET-PG Examination held recently. As per requirement of this parameter 4.5, each College is providing data pertaining to how many alumni/students of MBBS Programs have qualified NEET-PG in previous year conducted by NTA.

Note: *NEET-PG* scores of students who have qualified under General Category/unreserved shall be considered.

Submitted data by college will be subjected to normalization based on following formula:

$$\frac{\text{Average score per student of College on the parameter } (x') - \text{Minimum obtained average score on the parameter } (x)}{\text{Maximum obtained average score on this parameter } (y) - \text{Minimum obtained average score on this parameter } (x)} \times 100$$

Where x = for concerned college, per student average score obtained by college on this parameter

y = Maximum Value for "Maximum obtained Average score by any college on this parameter "in all colleges

x = Minimum value for "Minimum obtained Average score by any College on this parameter "in all colleges

Note: Based on above mentioned formula, value on this parameter may range between 0 to 100

Scoring Rubrics- :

Sub-Parameters	Rating Levels				Supporting documents
	Level-1	Level-2	Level-3	Level-4	
4.4- Rating levels based on NEET-PG Scores of students qualified under Unreserved Category	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≤ 25	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >25 to ≤ 50	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >50 to < 75	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≥ 75	Required data to be submitted by College

Note: for normalization average value shall be calculated with respect to sanctioned intakes for the UG Program.

Parameter-4.5: No. of UG Graduated students/UG Alumni taken admission in PG under recently organized AIQ (All India Quota) counselling by MCC and State Counselling in previous year

Operational explanation: - As per requirements of this parameter data will be captured pertaining to college wise qualified NEET –PG students who have gotten admission in Medical College through AIQ being conducted by MCC or through State Counselling authority. This parameter is related to progression of students towards

This parameter may be accepted as proxy for quality of teaching learning process in college and this is related to standards of education and academic excellence category of assessment and criteria essential for assessment and rating of Medical Colleges/Institutions.

Scoring Rubrics- :

Sub-Parameters	Rating Levels				Supporting documents
	Level-1	Level-2	Level-3	Level-4	
4.5.1- PG Admission of students/alumni under AIQ MCC Counselling	If less than 3% of sanctioned intake, students/alumni of college have taken PG/MD admission under AIQ MCC counselling last academic calendar.	If equivalent to 3% to 5% of sanctioned intake, students/alumni of college have taken MD admission under AIQ MCC counselling last academic calendar.	If equivalent to 6% to 8% of sanctioned intake, students/alumni of college have taken MD admission under AIQ MCC counselling last academic calendar.	If more than 8% of sanctioned intake, students/alumni of college have taken MD admission under AIQ MCC counselling last academic calendar.	College to provide data of students/alumni of MBBS qualified NEET-PG in last academic year and taken MD admission under AIQ MCC counselling last academic calendar.
4.5.2- PG Admission of students/alumni under	If less than 5% of sanctioned intake, students/alumni of	If 5% to 10% of sanctioned intake, students/alumni of	If 10% to 15% of sanctioned intake,	If more than 15% of sanctioned	College to provide data of students/alumni

MCC and State Government Counselling	MBBS were able to take admission in MD Program after qualifying NEET-PG Examination in last academic year.	MBBS were able to take admission in MD Program after qualifying NEET-PG Examination in last academic year.	students/alumni MBBS were able to take admission in MD Program after qualifying NEET-PG Examination in last academic year.	intake, MBBS were able to take admission in MD Program after qualifying NEET-PG Examination in last academic year.	of MBBS qualified NEET-PG in last academic year and taken admission under AIQ MCC counselling & State Government Counselling in last academic year
--------------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--

Percentage shall be calculated with respect to sanctioned intakes for UG Program.

Note for computing weightage score on this parameter based on above mentioned rubrics following formula will be used - :

✓ Weightage score on Parameter-4.6=

$$\checkmark \frac{\frac{\text{Obtained score on 4.6.1}}{4} + \frac{\text{Obtained score on 4.6.2}}{4}}{2} \times \text{AW}$$

✓ Where AW =Assigned weightage to Parameter-4.6

Parameter-4.6: Performance of Students in Summative Assessment/Exit Examination in the last academic year

Operational explanation: - NMC has laid down that in coming years, National Exit Test will be considered yardstick for quality of Indian Medical Graduate. Unless NeXT is conducted, alternatively performance of students in Summative Assessment conducted by Affiliating Body will be captured as per requirement of this parameter. Summative Assessment data of Affiliating University and Internal Assessment data conducted at Medical College level will be uploaded by college in given format. This parameter will be proxy for attainment of competences & learning outcomes by the students. This parameter is related to academic excellence & standards of medical education laid down by NMC for assessment and rating of Medical Colleges/Institutions.

Scoring Rubrics for this parameter: -

Sub-parameters	Rating Levels				Supporting documents
	Level-1	Level-2	Level-3	Level-4	
4.6.1- % of appeared students qualified minimum passing percentage in each theory	If less than 50% of appeared *students secured minimum passing percentage in each theory examination	If 50% to 70% of appeared *students secured minimum passing percentage in each theory examination	If 71% to 90% of appeared *students secured minimum passing percentage in each theory examination	If more than 90% of appeared *students secured minimum passing percentage in each theory examination	Recently held Summative Assessment Data for theory & practical/clinical Examinations for students of all professional years for
4.6.2- % of appeared students minimum qualified minimum passing percentage in Practical/Clinical Assessment of each subject	If less than 50% of appeared *students secured minimum passing percentage in each Practical/ Clinical examination	If 50% to 70% of appeared *students secured minimum passing percentage in each Practical/ Clinical examination	If 71% to 90% of appeared *students secured minimum passing percentage in each Practical/ Clinical examination	If more than 90% of appeared *students secured minimum passing percentage in each Practical/ Clinical examination	Same as mentioned above
4.6.3- % of appeared students who have secured minimum passing percentage in each subject and overall secured minimum 75% in theory Examination	If less than 10% of appeared *students found to qualify this condition	If 10% to 15% of appeared *students found to qualify this condition	If 16% to 20% of appeared *students found to qualify this condition	If more than 20% of appeared *students found to qualify this condition	Same as mentioned above

4.6.4- % of appeared students who have secured minimum passing percentage in each Practical/Clinical Examination and overall secured minimum 75% in Practical/Clinical Examination	If less than 10% of appeared *students found to qualify this condition	If 10% to 15% of appeared *students found to qualify this condition	If 16% to 20% of appeared *students found to qualify this condition	If more than 20% of appeared *students found to qualify this condition	Same as mentioned above
---	--	---	---	--	-------------------------

*Students of all professional years

Note: for computing weightage score on this parameter based on above mentioned rubrics following formula will be used: -

Weightage score on Parameter-4.6=

$$\frac{\frac{\text{Obtained score on 4.6.1}}{4} + \frac{\text{Obtained score on 4.6.2}}{4} + \frac{\text{Obtained score on 4.6.3}}{4} + \frac{\text{Obtained score on 4.6.4}}{4}}{4} \times \text{AW}$$

Where AW= Assigned weightage to Parameter-4.6

Criterion-5: Human Resource & Teaching-Learning Process

Parameter-5.1: Teaching –learning methods being employed by sampled Faculties in their Theory classes

Operational explanation: - This parameter tends to capture information about type of teaching and training methods are being employed by Faculty staff in theory & practical classes. Based on prescribed Competence based Curriculum for UG program, it has been emphasized in Curriculum that teaching and training methods should facilitate development of mastery over subject specific Competences. This Parameter is primarily dealing with theory classes of faculties and further which type teaching –learning methods they are using in sync with subject specific competences. Theory classes primarily contribute in cognitive development of students and address two lowest level Know (K) and Know How (KH) of Miller Pyramid, hence during theory classes it would be observed that which type teaching learning methods are being employed by faculties.

Sample size of faculties for Interaction: -

- ✓ Interaction with 5% faculties sampled from each department. Department wise 5% sample of faculties may be drawn from the list of sampled faculties for Parameter-1 of Criterion-1.

Following methods will be employed to capture observations pertaining to broad components of theory sessions being planned & conducted by faculties: -

Components for capturing observations vis-à-vis Theory sessions	Assessment Methods
Alignment of Theory sessions with prescribed Competencies	Documented or electronic evidences like recorded videos/live streamed videos of recently held theory classes
Alignment of Theory sessions with Specific Objectives specified for competencies vis-à-vis K & KH levels of Miller's Pyramid	Documented or electronic evidences like recorded videos/live streamed videos of recently held theory classes
Formative Assessment Methods (Formal & informal methods)	Documented or electronic evidences like recorded videos/live streamed videos of recently held theory classes

Usages of Audio-visual aids	Documented or electronic evidences like recorded videos/live streamed videos of recently held theory classes
-----------------------------	--

Scoring Rubrics: -

Sub-parameters	Rating Levels				Supporting documents
	Level-1	Level-2	Level-3	Level-4	
5.1.1- Alignment of Theory sessions with Competencies prescribed	If less than 50% of sampled faculties are able to produce documented or electronic evidences to show how theory classes are aligned with Competency prescribed for the subjects	If 50% to 70% of sampled faculties are able to produce documented or electronic evidences to show how theory classes aligned with Competency prescribed for the subjects	If 71% to 90% of sampled faculties are able to produce documented or electronic evidences to show how theory classes aligned with Competency prescribed for the subjects	If more than 90% of sampled faculties are able to produce documented or electronic evidences to show how theory classes aligned with Competency prescribed for the subjects	Live streamed videos recorded on NMC portal or Recorded videos by college for last 1 month
5.1.2- Alignment of Theory sessions with Specific Objectives specified for competencies vis-à-vis K & KH levels of Miller's Pyramid	If less than 50% of sampled faculties are able to produce documented or electronic evidences to show how theory classes are aligned with specific objectives framed for competency in terms of K & KH	If 50% to 70% of sampled faculties are able to produce documented or electronic evidences to show how theory classes aligned with specific objectives framed for competency in terms of K & KH	If 71% to 90% of sampled faculties are able to produce documented or electronic evidences to show how theory classes aligned with specific objectives framed for competency in terms of K & KH	If more than 90% of sampled faculties are able to produce documented or electronic evidences to show how theory classes aligned with specific objectives framed for competency in terms of K & KH levels of Miller's Pyramid	Live streamed videos recorded on NMC portal or Recorded videos by college for last 1 month

	levels of Miller's Pyramid	levels of Miller's Pyramid	levels of Miller's Pyramid		
5.1.3- Formative Assessment Methods (Formal & informal methods)	If less than 50% of sampled faculties are able to produce type of varied formative assessment methods or Classroom Assessment Techniques, they are using for formative assessment purpose	If 50% to 70% of sampled faculties are able to produce type of varied formative assessment methods or Classroom Assessment Techniques, they are using for formative assessment purpose	If 71% to 90% of sampled faculties are able to produce type of varied formative assessment methods or Classroom Assessment Techniques, they are using for formative assessment purpose	If more than 90% of sampled faculties are able to produce type of varied formative assessment methods or Classroom Assessment Techniques, they are using for formative assessment purpose	Documented or electronic evidences for type of formative assessment methods are being used by faculties like Clickers, Muddiest points, One Minute Paper etc.
5.1.4- Interaction with students following completion of Theory Classes on the day of Assessment-by-Assessment Team Members (Non-Clinical)	If less than 10 students are able to tell which type competences were being taught	If minimum 10 students are able to tell or they are in agreement with others about the competences addressed in the theory class	Level-2 plus If minimum 10 students are able to tell or they are in agreement with others about the assessment methods or techniques used in the theory class for evaluating intended progress during theory class	Level-3 plus If minimum 10 students are able to tell or they are in agreement with others about the minimum 10% students were actively involved by asking questions or different teaching skills	Recording of interaction with students

5.1.5- Interaction with students following completion of Theory Classes on the day of Assessment-by-Assessment Team Members (Clinical)	If less than 10 students are able to tell which type competences were being taught	If minimum 10 students are able to tell or they are in agreement with others about the competences addressed in the theory class	Level-2 plus If minimum 10 students are able to tell or they are in agreement with others about the assessment methods or techniques used in the theory class for evaluating intended progress during theory class	Level-3 plus If minimum 10 students are able to tell or they are in agreement with others about the minimum 10% students were actively involved by asking questions or different teaching skills	Recording of interaction with students
5.1.6 Medium of Instruction (Regional Language) vis-à-vis interaction with 5% randomly selected students of each Professional Year	If less than 50% of sampled students are confirming that College has created provisions for organizing classes in regional language as per concerned State	If more than 50% of sampled students are confirming that College has created provisions for organizing classes in regional language as per concerned State	If more than 70% of sampled students are confirming that College has created provisions for organizing classes in regional language as per concerned State	Level 3 plus If more than 70% of sampled students have confirmed that College is providing Teaching Learning Materials in regional language as per concerned State	Interaction with students Documented evidence of availability of Learning Materials in Regional Language Time table for organization of Classes in regional Language

Note: for computing weightage score on this parameter based on above mentioned rubrics following formula will be used: -

Weightage score on Parameter-5.1=

$$\frac{\frac{\text{Obtained score on 5.1.1}}{4} + \frac{\text{Obtained score on 5.1.2}}{4} + \frac{\text{Obtained score on 5.1.3}}{4} + \frac{\text{Obtained score on 5.1.4}}{4} + \frac{\text{Obtained score on 5.1.5}}{4} + \frac{\text{Obtained score on 5.1.6}}{4}}{6} \times \text{AW}$$

Where AW= Assigned weightage to Parameter-5.1

Parameter-5.2: Teaching –learning methods being employed by faculties for practical/clinical sessions in Laboratory/simulated setting/Bed side teaching

Operational explanation: - This parameter tends to capture information about type of teaching-learning methods are being employed by faculties in their practical/clinical teaching sessions. In practical/clinical teaching sessions, main focus is to develop Show (S), Show how (SH) & perform independently (P) level of competences based on Miller's Pyramid. Hence, while observation of practical/clinical teaching sessions of sampled faculties, it will be observed whether they are focusing on following elements are not:

- a) Type of competences they will be developing in students in their practical/clinical teaching sessions
- b) For which type of competence level like Show (S), Show how (SH) & perform independently (P), practical/clinical teaching sessions are being organized
- c) Type of teaching learning methods faculties will be employing like DOAP session, Bed Side teaching (learner-doctor method) etc. so that students will be able to attain mastery over competences & corresponding competence level
- d) Type of Skill Assessment based Formative Assessment tools they will be employing so that progress of students for attaining mastery over above mentioned level of competences can be tracked when practical/clinical teaching is going on. When practical/clinical teaching is in progress some informal assessment tool like OMP (One Minute Preceptor), SNAPPS (Summarize history and findings, Narrow the differential; Analyse the differential; Probe preceptor about uncertainties; Plan management; Select case-related issues for self-study)
- e) Whether faculties will be using any kind of simulations or real clinical setting will be used

Sample size of faculties for Interaction: -

- ✓ Interaction with 5% faculties sampled from each department. Department wise 5% sample of faculties may be drawn from the list of sampled faculties for Parameter-1 of Criterion-1.

Following methods will be employed to capture observations pertaining to broad components of practical sessions being planned & conducted by faculties: -

Components for capturing observations vis-à-vis Practical Sessions	Assessment Methods
Alignment of Practical sessions with prescribed Competencies	Documented or electronic evidences like recorded videos/live streamed videos of recently held Practical classes
Alignment of Practical sessions with Specific Objectives specified for competencies vis-à-vis S, SH & P levels of Miller's Pyramid	Documented or electronic evidences like recorded videos/live streamed videos of recently held practical classes
Formative Assessment Methods (Formal & informal methods)	Documented or electronic evidences like recorded videos/live streamed videos of recently held practical classes
Usages of Audio-visual aids	Documented or electronic evidences like recorded videos/live streamed videos of recently held practical classes

Scoring Rubrics: -

Sub-parameters	Rating Levels				Supporting documents
	Level-1	Level-2	Level-3	Level-4	
5.2.1- Alignment of Practical sessions with Competencies prescribed	If less than 50% of sampled faculties are able to produce documented or electronic evidences to show how practical sessions are being aligned with Competency prescribed for the subjects	If 50% to 70% of sampled faculties are able to produce documented or electronic evidences to show how the practical sessions are aligned with Competency prescribed for the subjects	If 71% to 90% of sampled faculties are able to produce documented or electronic evidences to show how practical sessions are aligned with Competency prescribed for the subjects	If more than 90% of sampled faculties are able to produce documented or electronic evidences to show how practical sessions are aligned with	Live streamed videos recorded on NMC portal or Recorded videos by College for last 1 month

				Competency prescribed for the subjects	
5.2.2- Alignment of Theory sessions with Specific Objectives specified for competencies vis-à-vis S, SH & P levels of Miller's Pyramid	If less than 50% of sampled faculties are able to produce documented or electronic evidences to show how practical sessions are aligned with specific objectives framed for competency in terms of S, SH & P levels of Miller's Pyramid	If 50% to 70% of sampled faculties are able to produce documented or electronic evidences to show how practical sessions are aligned with specific objectives framed for competency in terms of S, SH & P levels of Miller's Pyramid	If 71% to 90% of sampled faculties are able to produce documented or electronic evidences to show how practical sessions are aligned with specific objectives framed for competency in terms of S, SH & P levels of Miller's Pyramid	If more than 90% of sampled faculties are able to produce documented or electronic evidences to show how practical sessions are aligned with specific objectives framed for competency in terms of S, SH & P levels of Miller's Pyramid	Live streamed videos recorded on NMC portal or Recorded videos by College for last 1 month
5.2.3- Formative Assessment Methods (Formal & informal methods)	If less than 50% of sampled faculties are able to produce type of formative assessment methods they are using in practical sessions for practical/clinical skills	If 50% to 70% of sampled faculties are able to produce type of formative assessment they are using in practical sessions for practical/clinical skills	If 71% to 90% of sampled faculties are able to produce type of formative assessment they are using in practical sessions for practical/clinical skills	If more than 90% of sampled faculties are able to produce type of formative assessment they are using in practical sessions for	Documented or electronic evidences for type of formative assessment methods are being used by faculties like OMP (One Minute Preceptor),

				practical or clinical skills	SNAAPS, OSCE/OSPE, DOPS
5.2.4-Observation of Practical Sessions in Skill Laboratory	If there is no clarity about type of Competency is being developed in students	If there is clarity about type of Competency is being developed in students	Level-2 plus If the varied formative assessment methods are being used to evaluate progress of the students in acquisitions of intended practical or clinical skills	Level-3 plus If faculty is able to involve minimum 10% students actively in the teaching learning process	Recording of Practical sessions
5.2.5-Observation of Bedside Clinics or teaching	If there is no clarity about type of Competency is being developed in students	If there is clarity about type of Competency is being developed in students	Level-2 plus If the varied formative assessment methods are being used to evaluate progress of the students in acquisitions of intended practical or clinical skills	Level-3 plus If faculty is able to involve minimum 10% students actively in the teaching learning process	Recording of the Bedside Clinics or Teaching

Note: for computing weightage score on this parameter based on above mentioned rubrics following formula will be used: -

Weightage score on Parameter-5.2=

$$\frac{\frac{\text{Obtained score on 5.2.1}}{4} + \frac{\text{Obtained score on 5.2.2}}{4} + \frac{\text{Obtained score on 5.2.3}}{4} + \frac{\text{Obtained score on 5.2.4}}{4} + \frac{\text{Obtained score on 5.2.5}}{4}}{5} \times \text{AW}$$

Where AW= Assigned weightage to Parameter-5.2

Parameter-5.3: Programmed wise number of recruited Faculty Staff vis-à-vis Regulatory specifications

Operational explanation: - This parameter deals with programme wise required Teaching staff. For designing Data Capture Format for this parameter, Minimum Requirements for Annual MBBS Admission Regulations-202 and Teachers Eligibility Qualifications in Medical Institutions Regulations-2022 have been referred. It has been emphasized in the regulation that practical instruction and demonstration in small groups are significant factors for preparing competent medical student; therefore, the number of teachers must be sufficient in accordance with the provisions of this indicator to allow for the delivery of instructions. All teaching staff members at the medical college must work full-time hours. These regulations cover the minimal criteria for undergraduate medical education as determined by the annual MBBS student intake, as well as the minimum patient load specified in the regulations.

Scoring Rubrics for this parameter: -

Level	Required conditions	Supporting documents
Level-1	<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ If number of *Faculty & Resident/Tutors○ /Demonstrators are falling short of required numbers in one or more Departments	Appointment & Joining Letters, Registration & Teacher ID Nos., Academic Qualifications & Professional Experiences
Level-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ If number of *Faculty cadre wise & Resident/Tutors/Demonstrators are in alignment with required numbers in all departments separately and taken together	Appointment & Joining Letters, Registration & Teacher ID Nos., Academic Qualifications & Professional Experiences
Level-3	Level-2 plus If in same department Number of excess faculties in higher cadre like Excess no. of Professors is compensating deficiency in numbers of Associate & Assistant Professors OR Excess no. of Associate Professors is compensating deficiency in the number of Assistant Professors.	Appointment & Joining Letters, Registration & Teacher ID Nos., Academic Qualifications & Professional Experiences
Level-4	Level-3 plus If proportion of Faculties in higher cadre (Professor & Associate Professor) is higher than MSR in one or more departments	Appointment & Joining Letters, Registration & Teacher ID Nos., Academic Qualifications & Professional Experiences

***Faculty-Professor, Associate Professor & Assistant Professor**

Parameter-5.4: Programme wise number of Faculty Staff with additional professional qualifications other than minimum qualifications laid down by NMC

Operational Explanation: This parameter deals with capturing information pertaining to additional qualification. Continuous Professional Development (CPD), has been recognized significant in the medical field for Faculties and other Medical Professional. It is assumed that additional qualifications will contribute into upgrading repertoire of knowledge and skills in sync with advancement in medical educational technology and knowledge in field of medical education. In the Teacher Eligibility Qualifications in Medical Institutions-2022, other than academic qualifications, it has been mentioned that faculty should have completed BCME (Basic Course in Medical Education Technology) and Basic Course in Biomedical Research from Institutions designated by NMC. It means regulations explicitly emphasizing that teaching staff should upgrade their repertoire of Knowledge and skills by undergoing some additional programmed and course etc.

- ✓ FAIMER-IFI, ACME (FIME-Fellowship in Medical Education) and IFME (Integrated Foundations of Medical Education) Program will be treated as additional qualifications for this parameter

Scoring Rubrics based on Common DCF for Parameter: -

Level	Required conditions	Supporting documents
Level-1	If all *Faculty are possessing minimum academic qualification laid down by possessing minimum years of experience as laid down by Medical Regulator	Supporting Documents for additional qualifications
Level-2	If 1% to 5% faculties are possessing additional qualifications as operationally defined for this parameter	Supporting Documents for additional qualifications
Level-3	If more than 5% faculties are possessing additional qualifications as operationally defined for this parameter	Supporting Documents for additional qualifications
Level-4	If more than 10% of total faculty are possessing additional qualification as operationally defined for this parameter	Supporting Documents for additional qualifications

***Faculty-Professor, Associate Professor & Assistant Professor**

Parameter-5.5: Staff attrition rate in past 2 Years

Operation explanation: Attrition rate is a metric that quantifies the rate at which employees depart an organization, whether voluntarily or involuntarily. For computation of attrition rate, no. of vacant positions created due to left of job by the faculty (Professor, Associate Professor & Assistant Professor) and other teaching staff Sr. Resident/Tutor/Demonstrator.

Rubrics for this parameter - :

Sub-parameters	Level-1	Level-2	Level-3	Level-4	Supporting Documents
5.5.1 Sub-parameter-Attrition in Cadre of Assistant Professor	If more than 25% of teaching staff have left the College in past 2 calendar years	If less than 25% of teaching staff have left the College in past 2 calendar years	If less than 15 % of teaching staff have left the College in past 2 calendar years	If less than 5 % of teaching staff have left the College in past 2 calendar years	Data of Faculty who resigned or terminated or retired should be provided by College on Assessment & Rating Portal
5.5.2 Sub-parameter-Attrition in Cadre of Associate Professor/Reader	If more than 25% of teaching staff have left the College in past 2 calendar years	If less than 25% of teaching staff have left the College in past 2 calendar years	If less than 15 % of teaching staff have left the College in past 2 calendar years	If less than 5 % of teaching staff have left the College in past 2 calendar years	Same as mentioned above
5.5.3 Sub-parameter-Attrition in Cadre of Professor	If more than 25% of teaching staff have left the College in past 2 calendar years	If less than 25% of teaching staff have left the College in past 2 calendar years	If less than 15 % of teaching staff have left the College in past 2 calendar years	If less than 5 % of teaching staff have left the College in past 2 calendar years	Same as mentioned above

Note-Required Faculty refers regular fulltime Professor, Associate Professor and Assistant Professor vis-à-vis Programs (UG & PG) being offered as per Regulation. Vacant positions due to resign or termination shall be considered while calculation of attrition. Vacant Position due to retirement shall not be considered for calculation of attrition if retirements happened in last 2 calendar years, otherwise it will be considered while calculation of attrition.

Weightage score on Parameter-5.5=

$$\frac{\frac{\text{Obtained score on 5.5.1}}{4} + \frac{\text{Obtained score on 5.5.2}}{4} + \frac{\text{Obtained score on 5.5.3}}{4}}{8} \times \text{AW}$$

AW= Weightage assigned to 5.5 Parameter

Parameter-5.6: No. of prestigious Awards/Grants instituted at International or National or State level availed by students in past 2 years

Operational explanation- This parameter deals with prestigious awards availed by students in past 2 years. Fellowship Awards (Academic or Research) given by recognized agency related to academic or research field in medical or health education will be accepted as per requirements of this parameters. This parameter has been derived from Academic Excellence and Research category of parameters laid down by MARB-NMC for assessment and rating of Medical Colleges. This parameter is proxy for quality teaching learning environment and ecosystem research activities in Medical College.

Computation of scores: -

- ✓ ICMR STS (Short Term Studentship) may come under this category of Awards
- ✓ If above criteria met, then score will be assigned. 90 scores will be for International Award, 60 scores for National Award and 30 scores for State Level Awards
- ✓ At last average score per student will be computed. For computing average scores, all students admitted in all professional years of MBBS will be considered.

Computation of scores - : Under this parameter scores will be assigned based on this criterion - :

Category of Awards for Scoring	Conditions for Scoring
Category-1 -Academic or Research or Studentship Grant/Awards given by Central Govt. Body/Institutes or International Organization (WHO etc.). or Central Govt. Bodies (<i>involving National Level screening/selections</i>)	Each valid entry 200 score

<i>(Merit Awards, Best Research/Academic awards, Studentship Grants or Awards, selection of Research Proposal for Research Grants will be considered)</i>	
Category-2 - :Academic or Research or Studentship Grants or Awards given by State Govt. Ministries/Departments/Institutes at State level or State Health Science Universities or State Govt. Body at State level (<i>involving State Level screening/selections</i>) <i>(Merit Awards, Best Research/Academic awards, Studentship Grants or Awards, selection of Research Proposal for Research Grants will be considered)</i>	Each valid entry 100 score
Category-3: - Academic or Research or Studentship Awards given by Deemed University/Private University (<i>involving minimum University & State Level screening/selections</i>) <i>(Merit Awards, Best Research/Academic awards, Studentship Grants or Awards, selection of Research Proposal for Research Grants will be considered)</i> <i>Note:</i> For Deemed University/Private University, University/state level applications/competitions must be organized and there must be well defined criteria for screening of Best Research/Academic Awards and Studentship Grants, Merit Award. Certificates should have signature of Registrar/Vice Chancellor of the University/Designated University level Authority. Essential Notifications required about modality and modus operandi of instituted awards by Deemed University for across all its constituent Colleges/other colleges. Only University/State level instituted Academic/Research & Studentship Awards OR Grants shall be considered for scoring. Further there must be well defined process and criteria for above mentioned awards. College specific Awards will not be accepted for scoring under this Category, only those best Research/Academic Awards will be accepted which are instituted at University Level involving multiple Colleges.	Each valid entry 100 score
Category-4: Academic or Research or Studentship Awards given by national Professional Body/National Associations recognized in Medical Education Fields without any collaboration with Central Govt. or state govt. body functioning at national and state level	Each valid entry 25

<p><i>(involving minimum State Level screening/selections)</i></p> <p><i>(Merit Awards, Best Research/Academic awards, Studentship Grants or Awards, selection of Research Proposal for Research Grants will be considered)</i></p>	
---	--

Note: If Certificates/Award Letter is having signatures of collaborating bodies/agency like College or University or Health Education Institute on one side and on another side collaborating body is National/State level Regulatory body or State Health Science University or Central or State Govt. Ministries/Departments as such claimed entries will be shifted to Category 1 or 2 based on consideration of Assessment Team, any entry will not be considered more than one category. If Certificate/Award Letter is having approval/endorsement only not having signatures of signing authority of National/State level Regulatory or State Health Science University or Central or State Govt. Ministries/Department as such entry shall be considered under concerned Category based on adequate validation by Assessment Team.

Scoring Rubrics for using separately for this parameter - :

Each entry mentioned under this parameter will be given score based on above Table ,Hereafter, college wise obtained values will be subjected to normalization based on following formula - :

$$\frac{\text{Average score of college on the parameter (x) – Minimum obtained score on the parameter (x)}}{\text{Maximum obtained score on this parameter (y) – Minimum obtained score on this parameter (x)}} \times 100$$

Where x ='for concerned college, Average score per sanctioned intake obtained by college on this parameter

y =Maximum Value for "Maximum average score per sanctioned intake obtained by any college on this parameter "across all colleges

x =Minimum value for "Minimum average score per sanctioned intake obtained by any College on this parameter "across all colleges

Note: Based on above mentioned formula, value on this parameter may range between 0 to 100 .For computing average score per sanctioned intake of the Programs will be considered.

Scoring Rubrics :-

Level	Required conditions	Supporting documents
Level-1	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≥ 25	Subject to evidences like Certificate/Award Letters regarding Awards submitted & verified for past 2 calendar years
Level-2	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >25 to ≥ 50	As mentioned above
Level-3	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >50 to < 75	As mentioned above
Level-4	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≤ 75	As mentioned above

Parameter-5.7: No. of prestigious Awards instituted at International or National or State level availed by Faculty of College in last 2 Years

Operational explanation- This parameter deals with prestigious awards availed by Teaching staff who is working the Medical College in past 2 years. Fellowship Awards (Academic or Research) given by recognized agency related to academic or research field in medical or health education will be accepted as per requirements of this parameters. This parameter has been derived from Academic Excellence and Research category of parameters laid down by MARB-NMC for assessment and rating of Medical Colleges. This parameter is proxy for quality teaching learning environment and ecosystem research activities in Medical College.

Computation of scores - :Under this parameter scores will be assigned based on this criterion - :

Category of Awards for Scoring	Conditions for Scoring
Category-1 -Academic or Research Awards given by Central Govt. Body/Institutes or International Organization (WHO etc.). or Central Govt. Bodies (<i>involving National Level screening/selections</i>) <i>(Merit Awards, Best Research/Academic awards & Grants, selection of Research Proposal for Research Grants will be considered)</i>	Each valid entry 250 score

<p>Category-2 - :Academic or Research or Studentship Awards given by State Govt. Ministries/Departments/Institutes at State level or State Health Science Universities or State Govt. Body at State level (<i>involving State Level screening/selections</i>)</p> <p><i>(Merit Awards, Best Research/Academic awards & Grants, selection of Research Proposal for Research Grants will be considered)</i></p>	<p>Each valid entry 100 score</p>
<p>Category-3: - Academic or Research Awards given by Deemed University/Private University (<i>involving minimum University & State Level screening/selections</i>)</p> <p><i>(Merit Awards, Best Research/Academic awards & Grants, selection of Research Proposal for Research Grants will be considered)</i></p> <p><i>Note: For Deemed University/Private University, University/state level applications/competitions must be organized and there must be well defined criteria for screening of Best Research/Academic Awards & Grants, Merit Award. Certificates should have signature of Registrar/Vice Chancellor of the University/Designated University level Authority. Essential Notifications required about modality and modus operandi of instituted awards by Deemed University for across all its constituent Colleges/other colleges. Only University/State level instituted Academic/Research & Studentship Awards shall be considered for scoring. Further there must be well defined process and criteria for above mentioned awards. College specific Awards will not be accepted for scoring under this Category, only those best Research/Academic Awards will be accepted which are instituted at University Level involving multiple Colleges.</i></p>	<p>Each valid entry 100 score</p>
<p>Category-4: Best Academic/Research Awards given by national Professional Body/National Associations recognized in the field of medical fields with any without any collaboration with Central Govt. or state govt. body functioning at national and state level</p> <p><i>(involving minimum State Level screening/selections)</i></p>	<p>Each valid entry 100 score</p>

<i>(Merit Awards, Best Research/Academic awards & Grants, selection of Research Proposal for Research Grants will be considered)</i>	
---	--

****Minimum regular full-time faculties required vis-à-vis sanctioned intakes for UG Program and also minimum additional full-time/regular Faculty/teachers for PG Program if it is being offered. It will also be considered for averaging out per Faculty value.***

Note: If Certificates/Award Letter is having signatures of collaborating bodies/agency like College or University or Health Education Institute on one side and on another side collaborating body is National/State level Regulatory body or State Health Science University or Central or State Govt. Ministries/Departments as such claimed entries will be shifted to Category 1 or 2 based on consideration of Assessment Team any entry will not be considered more than one category. If Certificate/Award Letter is having approval/endorsement only not having signatures of signing authority of National/State level Regulatory or State Health Science University or Central or State Govt. Ministries/Department as such entry shall be considered under concerned Category based on adequate validation by Assessment Team.

Scoring Rubrics for using separately for this parameter - :

Each entry mentioned under this parameter will be given score based on above Table .Hereafter, college wise obtained values will be subjected to normalization based on following formula - :

$$\frac{\text{Average score of college on the parameter } (x') - \text{Minimum obtained score on the parameter } (x)}{\text{Maximum obtained score on this parameter } (y) - \text{Minimum obtained score on this parameter } (x)} \times 100$$

Where x ='for concerned college, Average score per Faculty obtained by college on this parameter

y =Maximum Value for "Maximum average score per Faculty obtained by any college on this parameter "across all colleges

x =Minimum value for "Minimum average score per Faculty obtained by any College on this parameter "across all colleges

Note: Based on above mentioned formula, value on this parameter may range between 0 to 100 .For computing average score per sanctioned intake of the Programs will be considered.

Scoring Rubrics- :

Level	Required conditions	Supporting documents
Level-1	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≥ 25	Subject to evidences like Certificate/Award Letters and relevant documents pertaining to Awards submitted & verified for past 2 calendar years
Level-2	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >25 to ≥ 50	As mentioned above
Level-3	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >50 to < 75	As mentioned above
Level-4	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≤ 75	As mentioned above

Parameter-5.8: Number of Extra/Co-curricular Student awards instituted at State/National/International level availed by students in past 2 years (for UG Student only)

Operational explanation- This parameter deals with prestigious awards availed by students of Medical College in past 2 years. Extra/Co-curricular Awards given by recognized association/agency will be only considered for this parameter.

This parameter has been derived from Academic Excellence and satisfactory teaching –learning environment categories of parameters laid down by MARB-NMC for assessment and rating of Medical Colleges. This parameter is proxy for quality teaching learning environment and ecosystem created for holistic development of medical students. Extra/Co-curricular awards should meet following criteria for considerations under this parameter.

Category of Awards for Scoring	Conditions for Scoring
Category-1 -Sports Awards, Visual & Performing Awards (Song, Dance, drawing etc.) and Outreach/Social Service Awards given by Central Govt. Body/Institutes or International Organization (WHO etc.). <i>(involving screening or selection at minimum national level)</i>	Each valid entry 250 score

Category-2 Sports Awards, Visual & Performing Awards (Song, Dance, drawing etc.) and Outreach/Social Service Awards given by State Govt. Body or Institutes at State level.	Each valid entry 100 score
Category-3: - Sports Awards, Visual & Performing Awards (Song, Dance, drawing etc.) and Outreach/Social Service Awards given by Deemed University/Private University (<i>involving screening or selection at minimum state/University level</i>) Note: Note: For Deemed University/Private University, University/state level applications/competitions must be organized and there must be well defined criteria for screening of Awards mentioned under this category. Certificates should have signature of Registrar/Vice Chancellor of the University/Designated University level Authority. Essential Notifications required about modality and modus operandi of instituted awards by Deemed University for across all its constituent Colleges/other colleges. Only University/State level instituted Awards under this category shall be considered for scoring. Further there must be well defined process and criteria for above mentioned awards. College specific Awards will not be accepted for scoring under this Category, only those Awards will be accepted which are instituted at University Level involving multiple Colleges.	Each valid entry 100 score
Category-4: Sports Awards, Visual & Performing Awards (Song, Dance, drawing etc.) and Outreach/Social Service Awards given by Professional Body/National Associations recognized by concerned Regulatory Body (<i>involving screening or selection at minimum state level</i>)	Each valid entry 100 score

Note: If Certificates/Award Letter is having signatures of collaborating bodies/agency like College or University or Health Education Institute on one side and on another side collaborating body is National/State level Regulatory body or State Health Science University or Central or State Govt. Ministries/Departments as such claimed entries will be shifted to Category 1 or 2 based on consideration of Assessment Team, any entry will not be considered more than one category. If Certificate/Award Letter is having approval/endorsement only not having signatures of signing authority of National/State level Regulatory or State Health Science University or Central or State Govt. Ministries/Department as such entry shall be considered under concerned Category based on adequate validation by Assessment Team.

Scoring Process:

Each entry mentioned under this parameter will be given score based on above Table. Hereafter, college wise obtained values will be subjected to normalization based on following formula - :

$$\frac{\text{Average score of college on the parameter } (x') - \text{Minimum obtained score on the parameter } (x)}{\text{Maximum obtained score on this parameter } (y) - \text{Minimum obtained score on this parameter } (x)} \times 100$$

Where x ='for concerned college, Average score per sanctioned intake obtained by college on this parameter

y =Maximum Value for "Maximum average score per sanctioned intake obtained by any college on this parameter "across all colleges

x =Minimum value for "Minimum average score per sanctioned intake obtained by any College on this parameter "across all colleges

Note: Based on above mentioned formula, value on this parameter may range between 0 to 100 .For computing average score per sanctioned intake will be considered for concerned programs.

Scoring Rubrics- :

Level	Required conditions	Supporting documents
Level-1	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≥ 25	Subject to documented evidences like Certificate, Recognition Letters etc. submitted & verified for past 2 years
Level-2	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >25 to ≥ 50	Same as mentioned above
Level-3	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >50 to < 75	As mentioned above

Level-4	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≤ 75	As mentioned above
----------------	--	--------------------

Parameter-5.9: Number of Faculty Staff contributed in Designing of Course Materials (Online & offline) at International or National or State level recognized platforms in past 2 years

Operational explanation- This parameter is related to capturing information about contribution in designing courses (online or offline courses) at International or National or State level platforms/Academic Institutions. This parameter is proxy for quality of recruited Faculty staff. As per category of assessment and rating criteria laid down MARB-NMC, this parameter is indirectly related to academic excellence & minimum standards laid down for quality of teaching staff. Contribution in SWAYAM Portal or any other national portal, Contribution in designing content materials for FDPs being organized by NMC, contribution in designing of course materials for Foreign, Central & State Universities, contributed in CPD course materials for Professional Body recognized by EMRB-NMC and State Medical Council will be considered as per requirement for this parameter

Computation of scores- :Only those contributions will be accepted which satisfy following criteria :

Category for Scoring	Conditions for Scoring
Category-1- Designed Study/course & training Materials or contributed to policy or regulatory documents for Central Govt. Body/Institutes or International Organization (WHO etc.), contributed to online Platforms like SWAYAM etc. managed by Central Government body, worked as Resource Person for Central Govt. body/Institutes or International Organization (WHO etc.)	Each valid entry 250 score
Category-2 - :Designed Study/course & training Materials or contributed to policy or regulatory documents for State Govt. Body or Institutes or contributed to online Platforms managed by State Government body, worked as Resource Person for State Govt. body or Institutes	Each valid entry 100 score
Category-3: - Designed Study/course & training Materials for Deemed Universities/Private University or contributed to online Platforms managed by Deemed	Each entry 100 score

<p>University or worked as Resource Persons for Deemed University/Private University and Colleges (Health Education)</p> <p>Note: Certificates should have signature of Registrar/Vice Chancellor or University level authorized authority and tasks must be assigned from University Level designated authority only.</p> <p>For Colleges, Resource Persons will be considered for those programs which are initiated in collaboration with Affiliating or State Health Science University. Certificates should have signatures of competent & designated authority of each collaborating bodies/agency on the issued certificates for Resource Persons or trainers or experts.</p>	
<p>Category-4: Designed study/course or training materials or worked as resource persons for nationally Professional Bodies or national associations in the Medical Fields without any collaboration with central govt. or state govt. body functioning at national or state level</p>	<p>Each entry 25 score</p>
<p>Category-5 (International in the domain of Health Education): Designed Study/course & training Materials or worked as Resource Persons for Academic or Research Institutes with ranking Positions in QS or Times Higher Education World University Rankings</p> <p>Condition-1: 150 score, if organized or sponsored by Academic or Research Institutes with ranking positions up to 250 in past two years</p> <p>Condition-2: 50 score, if organized or sponsored by Academic or Research Institutes with ranking positions beyond 250 in past 2 years</p> <p>Note: Certificates must have signature of Vice Chancellor or Registrar or nominated authority by university</p>	<p>Each Valid entry 150 score (Condition-1) Or 50 score (Condition-2)</p>

***Minimum regular full-time faculties required vis-à-vis sanctioned intakes for UG Program and also minimum additional full-time/regular Faculty/teachers for PG Program if it is being offered. It will be also considered while averaging out per Faculty value. Multiple entry of same faculty for same assigned tasks will not be considered multiple times.**

Note: If Certificates (of assigned tasks) is having signatures of collaborating bodies/agency like College or University or Health Education Institute on one side and on another side collaborating body is National/State level Regulatory body or State Health Science University or Central or State Govt. Ministries/Departments as such claimed entries will be shifted to Category 1 or 2 based on consideration of Assessment Team, any entry will not be considered more than one category. If Certificate is having approval/endorsement only not having signatures of signing authority of National/State level Regulatory or State Health Science University or Central or State Govt. Ministries/Department as such entry shall be considered under concerned Category based on adequate validation by Assessment team.

Scoring Rubrics for using separately for the parameter - :

Each entry mentioned under this parameter will be given score based on above Table .Hereafter, college wise obtained values will be subjected to normalization based on following formula - :

$$\frac{\text{Average score of college on the parameter } (x') - \text{Minimum obtained score on the parameter } (x)}{\text{Maximum obtained score on this parameter } (y) - \text{Minimum obtained score on this parameter } (x)} \times 100$$

Where x ='for concerned college, Average score per faculty obtained by college on this parameter

y =Maximum Value for "Maximum average score per faculty obtained by any college on this parameter "across all colleges

x =Minimum value for "Minimum average score per faculty obtained by any College on this parameter "across all colleges

Note: Based on above mentioned formula, value on this parameter may range between 0 to 100.*Minimum regular full-time faculties required vis-à-vis sanctioned intakes for UG Program and also PG Program if it is being offered, while per faculty averaging out score.*

Scoring Rubrics for this parameter - :

Level	Required conditions	Supporting documents
-------	---------------------	----------------------

Level-1	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≤ 25	Valid Contribution Certificates & Evidence of designed Course Materials
Level-2	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >25 to ≤ 50	Valid Contribution Certificates & Evidence of designed Course Materials
Level-3	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >50 to < 75	Valid Contribution Certificates & Evidence of designed Course Materials
Level-4	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≥ 75	Valid Contribution Certificates & Evidence of designed Course Materials

Parameter-5.10: Number of Paper Presentations by Faculty Staff in recognized International/National & State level Conferences/Competitions in last 2 Years

Operational explanation- This parameter is related to capturing information about paper presentation (Invited Speaker, oral & postal) by Faculty in reputed conferences & competitions organized by professional bodies registered with EMRB-NMC and State Medical Council. This parameter is proxy for academic excellence and quality of teaching-learning process. This parameter is derived from academic excellence and Research Output & Impact categories assessment and rating criteria laid down by MARB-NMC.

Computation of scores - : Under this parameter scores will be assigned based on this criterion - :

Category for Scoring	Conditions for Scoring
Category-1- Seminars and conferences sponsored or organized by Central Govt. Body or Govt. National Institutes or International Organization (WHO etc.). or Central Govt. Ministry/Departments/body at national level <i>(involving screening or selection or participation at minimum national level)</i>	Each valid entry 250 score

<p>Category-2 - :Seminars or conferences Sponsored/organized by State Govt. Ministry/Departments/Body or State Health Science University or State Affiliating University at State level. <i>(involving screening or selection or participation at minimum state level)</i> <i>(involving screening or selection at minimum state level)</i></p>	Each valid entry 100 score
<p>Category-3: - Seminars or Conferences organized/sponsored by Deemed University/Private University and Colleges</p> <p>Note: For Deemed University/Private University, state level organized seminars & conferences will be considered. Certificates should have signature of Registrar/Vice Chancellor of the University.</p> <p>For Colleges or Health Education Institutes, only those seminars or conferences will be considered which are initiated in collaboration with Affiliating or State Health Science University. Certificates should have signatures of designated competent authority of each collaborating bodies/agency.</p>	For valid entry 100 score
<p>Category-4: Seminars or conferences organized/sponsored by national Professional Body or National Associations in the Medical Fields without any collaboration with central govt. or state govt. body functioning at national or state level</p>	For valid entry 25 score
<p>Category-5 (International in the domain of Health Education): Seminars or Conferences organized/sponsored by Academic or Research Institutes with ranking Positions in QS or Times Higher Education World University Rankings <i>(Physical Mode only and abroad travelling involved)</i> Condition-1: 150 score, if organized or sponsored by Academic or Research Institutes with ranking positions up to 250 in past two years Condition-2: 50 score, if organized or sponsored by Academic or Research Institutes with ranking positions beyond 250 in past 2 years</p>	For Valid entry 150 score or 50 score

Note: Certificates must have signature of Vice Chancellor or Registrar or nominated authority by university	
--	--

Note: Minimum regular full-time faculties required vis-à-vis sanctioned intakes for UG Program and also minimum additional full-time/regular Faculty/teachers for PG Program if it is being offered. It will also be considered while averaging out per Faculty average value. College to Provide Faculty wise data. Per Faculty Maximum 5 valid entries shall be considered. Under each category oral presentation shall be given full score and postal presentation shall be given half of assigned score.

Note: If Certificates (of organized programs) is having signatures of collaborating bodies/agency like College or University or Health Education Institute on one side and on another side collaborating body is National/State level Regulatory body or State Health Science University or Central or State Govt. Ministries/Departments as such claimed entries will be shifted to Category 1 or 2 based on consideration of Evaluation Committee, any entry will not be considered more than one category. If Certificate is having approval/endorsement only not having signatures of signing authority of National/State level Regulatory or State Health Science University or Central or State Govt. Ministries/Department as such entry shall be considered under concerned Category based on adequate validation by Assessment Team.

Scoring Rubrics for the parameter - :

Each entry mentioned under this parameter will be given score based on above Table. Hereafter, college wise obtained values will be subjected to normalization based on following formula - :

$$\frac{\text{Average score of college on the parameter } (x') - \text{Minimum obtained score on the parameter } (x)}{\text{Maximum obtained score on this parameter } (y) - \text{Minimum obtained score on this parameter } (x)} \times 100$$

Where x ='for concerned college, Average score per faculty obtained by college on this parameter

y =Maximum Value for "Maximum average score per faculty obtained by any college on this parameter "across all colleges

x =Minimum value for "Minimum average score per faculty obtained by any College on this parameter "across all colleges

Note:-

- Based on above mentioned formula, value on this parameter may range between 0 to 100 .
- Further if College is offering both UG & PG Programs as such required minimum regular full time Faculty (Professor, Associate Professor & Assistant Professor) shall be considered for averaging out cumulative scores on this Parameter.

Scoring Rubrics- :

Level	Required conditions	Supporting documents
Level-1	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≤ 25	Acceptance letter & Certificates for presentations, Documented evidences for organizing & funding body etc. as required for validations
Level-2	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >25 to ≤ 50	Acceptance letter & Certificates for presentations
Level-3	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >50 to < 75	As mentioned above
Level-4	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≥ 75	As mentioned above

Parameter-5.11: Number of Academic Presentations by Students in recognized International/National & State level Conferences/Competitions in last 2 Years (UG Student only)

Operational explanation- This parameter is related to capturing information about paper presentation (Invited Speaker, oral & postal) by students in reputed conferences & competitions organized by professional bodies registered with EMRB-NMC and State Medical Council. This parameter is proxy for academic excellence and quality of teaching-learning process. This parameter is derived from academic excellence and Research Output & Impact categories assessment and rating criteria laid down by MARB-NMC.

Scoring Process for this Parameter will be based on following criteria-

Category for Scoring	Conditions for Scoring
Category-1- Seminars and conferences sponsored or organized by Central Govt. Body or Govt. National Institutes or International Organization (WHO etc.). or Central Govt. Ministry/Departments/body at national level <i>(involving screening or selection or participation at minimum national level)</i>	Each valid entry 250 score
Category-2 - :Seminars or conferences Sponsored/organized by State Govt. Ministry/Departments/Body or State Health Science University or State Affiliating University at State level. <i>(involving screening or selection or participation at minimum state level)</i> <i>(involving screening or selection at minimum state level)</i>	Each valid entry 100 score
Category-3: - Seminars or Conferences organized/sponsored by Deemed University/Private University and Colleges <i>Note:</i> For Deemed University/Private University, state level organized seminars & conferences will be considered. Certificates should have signature of Registrar/Vice Chancellor of the University. <i>For Colleges or Health Education Institutes, only those seminars or conferences will be considered which are initiated in collaboration with Affiliating or State Health Science University. Certificates should have signatures of designated competent authority of each collaborating bodies/agency.</i>	For valid entry 100 score
Category-4: Seminars or conferences organized/sponsored by national Professional Body or National Associations in the Medical Fields without any collaboration with central govt. or state govt. body functioning at national or state level	For valid entry 25 score
Category-5 (International in the domain of Health Education): Seminars or Conferences organized/sponsored by Academic or Research Institutes with ranking	For Valid entry 150 score or 50 score

<p>Positions in QS or Times Higher Education World University Rankings (Physical Mode only and abroad travelling involved)</p> <p>Condition-1: 150 score, if organized or sponsored by Academic or Research Institutes with ranking positions up to 250 in past two years</p> <p>Condition-2: 50 score, if organized or sponsored by Academic or Research Institutes with ranking positions beyond 250 in past 2 years</p> <p>Note: Certificates must have signature of Vice Chancellor or Registrar or nominated authority by university</p>	
---	--

Note: Per students Maximum four valid entries shall be considered.

Note: If Certificates (of organized programs) is having signatures of collaborating bodies/agency like College or University or Health Education Institute on one side and on another side collaborating body is National/State level Regulatory body or State Health Science University or Central or State Govt. Ministries/Departments as such claimed entries will be shifted to Category 1 or 2 based on consideration of Evaluation Committee, any entry will not be considered more than one category. If Certificate is having approval/endorsement only not having signatures of signing authority of National/State level Regulatory or State Health Science University or Central or State Govt. Ministries/Department as such entry shall be considered under concerned Category based on adequate validation by Assessment Team.

Scoring Rubrics for using separately for the parameter - :

Each entry mentioned under this parameter will be given score based on above Table .Hereafter, college wise obtained values will be subjected to normalization based on following formula - :

$$\frac{\text{Average score of college on the parameter } (x') - \text{Minimum obtained score on the parameter } (x)}{\text{Maximum obtained score on this parameter } (y) - \text{Minimum obtained score on this parameter } (x)} \times 100$$

Where x'= concerned college, Average score per student obtained by college on this parameter

y =Maximum Value for "Maximum average score per student obtained by any college on this parameter "across all colleges

x =Minimum value for “Minimum average score per faculty obtained by any College on this parameter ”across all colleges.

Note: For averaging out the Cumulative scores of concerned colleges, sanctioned intakes of UG Program will be considered.

Scoring Rubrics- :

Level	Required conditions	Supporting documents
Level-1	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≤ 25	Acceptance letter & Certificates for presentations, Documented evidences for organizing & funding body etc. as required for validations
Level-2	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >25 to ≤ 50	Acceptance letter & Certificates for presentations
Level-3	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >50 to < 75	As mentioned above
Level-4	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≥ 75	As mentioned above

Criterion-6: Assessment Policy: Formative, Internal & Summative Assessment

Parameter-6.1: Regular Periodical Internal Assessment (IA) Examinations for theory & Practical/Clinical vis-à-vis NMC Guideline for Competence Based Assessment (CBA)

Operational explanation: - Medical Regulator through regulations for MBBS, has laid down that internal assessment examinations as regular periodical examinations shall be conducted prior to professional year end Summative Assessment. Within scheme of Competence Based Assessment (CBA), internal assessments have been given due importance.

Internal Assessment examinations have been given paramount importance in implementation of Curriculum for Competence Based Medical Education. Thorough IA examinations all aspects of learning Cognitive, Affective & Psychomotor etc. can be assessed which is not possible through Summative Assessment. There are certain components of Internal Assessment (IA) like

- **Theory Paper:** Since Competence Based Curriculum has been prescribed by medical regulator as such theory examinations should be aligned with some set of competences. Since Knowledge competencies can be best assessed by theory or written examinations, hence it is essential that theory examination paper should be aligned with Competencies and questions should be framed in sync with K (Know) and KH (Know How) competency levels as per Miller's Pyramid of assessing competencies.
- **Practical/Clinical Examination:** Practical/Clinical Examinations shall be another paramount component under Internal Assessment Examinations for assessment of Skill Competencies, Communication, Attitude among others which cannot be effectively assessed through theory examinations. As per Miller's pyramid of assessing Competencies-S (Show), SH (Show How)

and P (Perform) levels of competencies can be best assessed through Practical/Clinical examinations by using multiple assessment tools & capturing evidence of learning across multiple setting like Laboratory, Skill Laboratory based simulated setting and real clinical setting etc. Practical/Clinical examination should also be aligned with competences and appropriate assessment tools like OSCE, OSPE, DOPS & Mini CEX etc. should be used keeping in mind nature competencies.

As per requirements of this parameter, practical/clinical examination data maintained for all professional years' students (either in hard copies or electronic version) will be checked on random basis.

- **Log Book based Assessment:** Log book-based assessment will be given certain weightage in IA. Certifiable competences will be certified in Log Books of students.
- **Professional Development Programme (PDP)-AETCOM:** Competencies pertaining to Professional Development Programme (PDP) should be integrated with theory & practical/clinical Internal Assessments of other subjects.

Verification approach for this parameter (Faculty Interaction): -

- Department wise 25% sampled faculties under parameter-1 of Criterion-1 will also be interacted for this parameter

Verification approach for this parameter (student Interaction):

- Same set of students sampled under parameter-1 of criterion-1 may be interacted for this parameter or same process will be used for sampling different set of students for interaction as per requirements of this parameter.

Scoring Rubrics for this parameter: -

Sub-parameters	Rating Levels				Supporting documents
	Level-1	Level-2	Level-3	Level-4	
6.1.1- Conduct of required number of Internal Assessment (IA) Examinations with supporting evidences	If Medical College is conducting less than prescribed number of Internal Assessment Examinations professional year wise	If Medical College is conducting Internal Assessment examinations professional year wise as per prescribed	Level-2 plus If Medical College is able to produce documented evidences for recently conducted subject wise theory papers in IA Examinations for	Level-3 plus If Medical College is able to produce documented or electronic evidences for recently conducted IA Examinations for	Answer sheets of students of sampled batches for all theory papers and filled assessment tools by faculties for sampled students related to Practical/Clinical Skill assessments in recently

		numbers by Regulator	all professional years like Examination Papers for all subjects, responded & verified answer sheets for sampled students	Practical/Clinical skill Assessments and Internal Assessments conducted End of Postings (EOP). Documented or electronic evidences student wise filled assessment tools used for practical/clinical skill assessments for sampled students of all professional years	conducted Internal Assessment Examinations for all professional years
6.1.2- Planning & Conduct of Theory Papers	If less than 50% of sampled faculties are able to show documented evidences about guideline for developing Theory papers for aligning with subject specific competence and K (Know), KH (Know How) competency levels as per	If 50% to 70% of sampled faculties are able to show documented evidences about guideline for developing Theory papers for aligning with subject specific competence and K (Know), KH (Know How) competency levels as per	If 71 % to 90% of sampled faculties are able to show documented evidences about guideline for developing Theory papers for aligning with subject specific competence and K (Know), KH (Know How) competency levels as per	If more than 90% of sampled faculties are able to show documented evidences about guideline for developing Theory papers for aligning with subject specific competence and K (Know), KH (Know How) competency	Documented Guidelines, Developed subject wise Theory Papers for all professional Years of recently held IA Examinations

	Miller's Pyramid etc.	Miller's Pyramid & Bloom's Taxonomy etc.	Miller's Pyramid & Bloom's Taxonomy etc.	levels as per Miller's Pyramid & Bloom's Taxonomy etc.	
6.1.3- Planning & Conduct of Practical/Clinical Skill Assessments	If less than 50% of sampled faculties are able to show documented evidences about guideline for planning and conducting Practical and Clinical Assessments aligning with subject specific competence and S (Show), SH (Show How) and P(Perform) competency levels as per Miller's Pyramid etc.	If 50% to 70% of sampled faculties are able to show documented evidences about guideline for planning and conducting Practical and Clinical Assessments aligning with subject specific competence and S (Show), SH (Show How) and P(Perform) competency levels as per Miller's Pyramid etc.	If 71 % to 90% of sampled faculties are able to show documented evidences about guideline for planning and conducting Practical and Clinical Assessments aligning with subject specific competence and S (Show), SH (Show How) and P(Perform) competency levels as per Miller's Pyramid etc.	If more than 90% of sampled faculties are able to show documented evidences about guideline planning and conducting Practical and Clinical Assessments aligning with subject specific competence and S (Show), SH (Show How) and P(Perform) competency levels as per Miller's Pyramid etc.	Documented Guidelines, Used filled Assessment Tools for Clinical & Practical Assessments during recently held IA Examinations for all professional years
6.1.4- Planning and Conducting assessment of Professional Development Program (PDP)-	If less than 50% of sampled faculties are able to show documented evidence about how assessment of knowledge	If 50% to 70% of sampled faculties are able to show documented evidence about how assessment of knowledge	If 71% to 90% of sampled faculties are able to show documented evidence about how assessment of knowledge	If more than 90% of sampled faculties are able to show documented evidence about how assessment of	Documented evidences about inclusions knowledge competencies related questions in theory papers of Clinical specialties and testing skill competencies in

AETCOM Competencies	competencies of PDP-AETCOM at least one question is included in each clinical specialty subjects	competencies of PDP-AETCOM at least one question is included in each clinical specialty subjects and further how acquired Skill Competencies of PDP-AETCOM by students are tested during Practical, Clinical Assessments and viva-voce during Internal Assessment Examinations	competencies of PDP-AETCOM at least one question is included in each clinical specialty subjects and further how acquired Skill Competencies of PDP-AETCOM by students are tested during Practical, Clinical Assessments and viva-voce during Internal Assessment Examinations	knowledge competencies of PDP-AETCOM at least one question is included in each clinical specialty subjects and further how acquired Skill Competencies of PDP-AETCOM by students are tested during Practical, Clinical Assessments and viva-voce during Internal Assessment Examinations	Clinical & Practical Assessments etc.
6.1.5-Objective & Structured scoring process for Theory and Practical/Clinical Assessments in IA Examinations	If less than 50% of sampled faculties are able to produce scoring process for Theory and Practical/Clinical Assessments	If 50% to 70% of sampled faculties are able to produce objective, structured & self-explanatory scoring criteria & process for Theory and Practical/Clinical Assessments	If 71% to 90% of sampled faculties are able to produce objective, structured & self-explanatory scoring criteria & process for Theory and Practical/Clinical Assessments	If more than 90% of sampled faculties are able to produce objective, structured & self-explanatory scoring criteria & process for Theory and Practical/Clinical Assessments	Documented evidences like Scoring Sheets of recently held Theory and practical & clinical assessments, filled assessment tools/sheets for scoring of students/performance by faculties in recently held IA Examinations

6.1.6-Scoring Performance of Students in Practical/Clinical Assessments in IA Examinations vis-à-vis Interaction with 5% sampled students of each professional year by Assessment Teams	If less than 50% of sampled students are able to tell which type assessment tools were used and how (scoring criteria) they have been given scores in recently conducted Practical and Clinical Assessments in IA Examinations	If 50% to 70% of sampled students are able to tell which type assessment tools were used and how (scoring criteria) they have been given scores in recently conducted Practical and Clinical Assessments in IA Examinations	If 71% to 90% of sampled students are able to tell which type assessment tools were used and how (scoring criteria) they have been given scores in recently conducted Practical and Clinical Assessments in IA Examinations	If more than 90% of sampled students are able to tell which type assessment tools were used and how (scoring criteria) they have been given scores in recently conducted Practical and Clinical Assessments in IA Examinations	Documented evidences like Scoring Sheets of recently held practical & clinical assessments, filled assessment tools/sheets for scoring of students/performance by faculties in recently held IA Examinations
--	--	---	---	--	--

Note: for computing weightage score on this parameter based on above mentioned rubrics following formula will be used: -

Weightage score on Parameter-6.1=

$$\frac{\frac{\text{Obtained score on 6.1.1}}{4} + \frac{\text{Obtained score on 6.1.2}}{4} + \frac{\text{Obtained score on 6.1.3}}{4} + \frac{\text{Obtained score on 6.1.4}}{4} + \frac{\text{Obtained score on 6.1.5}}{4} + \frac{\text{Obtained score on 6.1.6}}{4}}{6} \times \text{AW}$$

Where AW= Assigned weightage to Parameter-6.1

Parameter-6.2: Usages of Formative Assessment methods vis-à-vis Continuous and Comprehensive Assessment Process

Operational explanation: -As per requirements of Competency Based Curriculum for Medical Education, formative assessments have been recognized as integral components of theory, practical and clinical teaching learning activities. Continuous and ongoing formative assessments are highly needed for providing positive and developmental feedback to students for where they are actually standing vis-à-vis acquired competencies and further how can improve upon acquired competencies. It has been recommended that for competence-

based curriculum, learning evidences should be collected by using multiple assessment tools and from multiple setting (Demonstration Room, Laboratory, Simulated setting and real clinical setting). Formative assessments should be planned and conducted for providing developmental feedbacks to students for competencies they are required to accomplish.

Verification approach for this parameter (Faculty Interaction): -

- Department wise 25% sampled faculties under parameter-1 of Criterion-1 will also be interacted for this parameter

Verification approach for this parameter (student Interaction):

- Same set of students sampled under parameter-1 of criterion-1 may be interacted for this parameter or same process will be used for sampling different set of students for interaction as per requirements of this parameter.

Scoring Rubrics for this parameter: -

Sub-parameters	Rating Levels				Supporting documents
	Level-1	Level-2	Level-3	Level-4	
6.2.1- Planning and conduct of Formative Assessments vis-à-vis theory teaching	If Less than 50% of sampled faculties are able to produce documented evidences about how they are planning and conducted formative assessments in theory teaching	If 50% to 70% of sampled faculties are able to produce documented evidences about type of formative assessments tools they are using and how these tools are related to K & KH Levels of Miller's Pyramid and further what is periodicity of	If 71% to 90% of sampled faculties are able to produce documented evidences about type of formative assessments tools they are using and how these tools are related to K & KH Levels of Miller's Pyramid and further what is periodicity of	If more than 90% of sampled faculties are able to produce documented evidences about type of formative assessments tools they are using and how these tools are related to K & KH Levels of Miller's Pyramid and further what is periodicity of conducting	Documented evidences of usages multiple assessment tools for formative assessments in related to theory teaching like One Minute Paper, Clickers, Muddiest Point, MCQs, Clinical Case Discussion, Problem based Questioning, Assignments, Online Assessment through

		conducting formative assessments	conducting formative assessments	formative assessments	Learning Management System (LMS) etc.
6.2.2- Planning and conduct of Formative Assessments vis-à-vis Practical & clinical teaching	If Less than 50% of sampled faculties are able to produce documented evidences about how they are planning and conducted formative assessments in Practical & Clinical Teaching	If 50% to 70% of sampled faculties are able to produce documented evidences about type of formative assessments tools they are using and how these tools are related to S, SH & P Levels of Miller's Pyramid and further what is periodicity of conducting formative assessments	If 71% to 90% of sampled faculties are able to produce documented evidences about type of formative assessments tools they are using and how these tools are related to S, SH & P Levels of Miller's Pyramid and further what is periodicity of conducting formative assessments	If more than 90% of sampled faculties are able to produce documented evidences about type of formative assessments tools they are using and how these tools are related to S, SH & P Levels of Miller's Pyramid and further what is periodicity of conducting formative assessments	Documented evidences of usages multiple assessment tools for formative assessments in related to Practical and Clinical teaching like OMP (One Minute Preceptor), SNAPPS, OSCE, OSPE, DOPS (Directly Observed Procedural Skills), Mini-CEX (Mini Clinical Evaluation Exercise) etc.
6.2.3-Conducts of Formative Assessments for positive & developmental feedback to students vis-à-vis Interaction with 5% sampled students of each	If less than 50% of sampled students are able to tell How frequently they are provided with positive feedback to reflect over their performance vis-	If 50% to 70% of sampled students are able to tell How frequently they are provided with positive feedback to reflect over their performance vis-	If 71% to 90% of sampled students are able to tell How frequently they are provided with positive feedback to reflect over their performance vis-	If more than 90% of sampled students are able to tell How frequently they are provided with positive feedback to reflect over their performance vis-à-vis competencies	Documented evidences about used assessment tools for formative assessments in Theory, Practical & Clinical teachings etc.

professional year by Assessment Team Members	à-vis competencies being acquired by them in theory, Practical & Clinical teaching and which type assessment tools are used	à-vis competencies being acquired by them in theory, Practical & Clinical teaching and which type assessment tools are used	à-vis competencies being acquired by them in theory, Practical & Clinical teaching and which type assessment tools are used	being acquired by them in theory, Practical & Clinical teaching and which type assessment tools are used	
---	---	---	---	--	--

Note: for computing weightage score on this parameter based on above mentioned rubrics following formula will be used: -

Weightage score on Parameter-6.2=

$$\frac{\frac{\text{Obtained score on 6.2.1}}{4} + \frac{\text{Obtained score on 6.2.2}}{4} + \frac{\text{Obtained score on 6.2.3}}{4}}{3} \times \text{AW}$$

Where AW= Assigned weightage to Parameter-6.2

Parameter-6.3: Log Books & Portfolio based Tracking learning progress of students vis-à-vis laid down clinical Skills/Competences

Operational explanation: - With respect to Competence Based Curriculum prescribed by Medical Regulators for UG programme in Medical Education, log book based capturing learning evidence have been emphasized. NMC has defined the Log Book as verified record of the progression of the learner documenting the acquisition of the requisite knowledge, skills, attitude and/or competences. In the log book, competence wise performance/learning along with activities allowing/enabling students for demonstration of concerned competence, learning contexts in which students have been provided opportunity for learning like Skill Laboratory, Seminars, Symposia, predetermined patient or community interactions, rating for each competence performed by student along with decision of faculty etc. Following practices will be checked as per requirement of this parameter: -

- Subject wise finalization of essential certifiable competences to be placed in Log book.
- Activity organized for acquiring & showcasing achieved competence

- Rating given by faculty pertaining to achievement of competence by the student
- Decision of Faculty about certification of competence, repeating activity or remediation required etc.
- Further how weightage given to Log Book based assessment in Internal Assessment/Examinations

Verification approach for this parameter (Faculty Interaction): -

- Department wise 25% sampled faculties under parameter-1 of Criterion-1 will also be interacted for this parameter

Verification approach for this parameter (student Interaction):

- Same set of students sampled under parameter-1 of criterion-1 may be interacted for this parameter or same process will be used for sampling different set of students for interaction as per requirements of this parameter.

Scoring Rubrics for this parameter: -

Sub-parameters	Rating Levels				Supporting documents
	Level-1	Level-2	Level-3	Level-4	
6.3.1-Guideline for Activities and Certifiable Competencies to be placed in Logbooks	If less than 50% of sampled faculties are able to produce documented evidences about which type activities and certifiable competencies are to be placed in logbooks by students for their subjects	If 50% to 70% of sampled faculties are able to produce documented evidences about which type activities and certifiable competencies are to be placed in logbooks by students for their subjects	If 71% to 90% of sampled faculties are able to produce documented evidences about which type activities and certifiable competencies are to be placed in logbooks by students for their subjects	If more than 90% of sampled faculties are able to produce documented evidences about which type activities and certifiable competencies are to be placed in logbooks by students for their subjects	Documented evidences about how Logbooks will be created and which type activities and certifiable competencies will be placed in logbooks of students subject wise for each professional year

					Logbooks maintained by students
6.3.2-Methods for Certification of acquiring of certifiable competencies by students	If less than 50% of sampled faculties are able to produce documented evidences about type of activities will be organized vis-à-vis certifiable competencies, criteria to be used by faculty for rating whether student is meeting expectations or not and further accomplishment of certifiable competencies have been completed or not, if not completed then repeat of activity is required or remedial session is required	If 50% to 70% of sampled faculties are able to produce documented evidences about type of activities will be organized vis-à-vis certifiable competencies, criteria to be used by faculty for rating whether student is meeting expectations or not and further accomplishment of certifiable competencies have been completed or not, if not completed then repeat of activity is required or remedial session is required	If 71% to 90% of sampled faculties are able to produce documented evidences about type of activities will be organized vis-à-vis certifiable competencies, criteria to be used by faculty for rating whether student is meeting expectations or not and further accomplishment of certifiable competencies have been completed or not, if not completed then repeat of activity is required or remedial session is required	If more than 90% of sampled faculties are able to produce documented evidences about type of activities will be organized vis-à-vis certifiable competencies, criteria to be used by faculty for rating whether student is meeting expectations or not and further accomplishment of certifiable competencies have been completed or not, if not completed then repeat of activity is required or remedial session is required	Documented evidences for subject wise identified certifiable competencies and activities & criteria to be used by faculties for determination whether students have accomplished certifiable competencies or not Logbooks maintained by students
6.3.3-Maintenance of Logbooks by students	If less than 50% of sampled students are able to show maintained logbooks	If 50% to 70% of sampled students are able to show maintained logbooks	If 71% to 90% of sampled students are able to show maintained logbooks	If more than 90% of sampled students are able to show maintained logbooks	Logbooks maintained by students by all Professional Years

	as per instruction and along with signature of concerned faculties	as per instruction and along with signature of concerned faculties	as per instruction and along with signature of concerned faculties	as per instruction and along with signature of concerned faculties	
6.3.4-Process of Certification of Competencies vis-à-vis Interaction with 5% sampled students of each professional year by Assessment Team	If less than 50% of sampled students are able to tell with supporting evidences about type of activities were required to demonstrate and type of criteria were used by faculties for certification whether they have completed accomplishment of certifiable competencies or not	If 50% to 70% of sampled students are able to tell with supporting evidences about type of activities were required to demonstrate and type of criteria were used by faculties for certification whether they have completed accomplishment of certifiable competencies or not	If 71% to 90% of sampled students are able to tell with supporting evidences about type of activities were required to demonstrate and type of criteria were used by faculties for certification whether they have completed accomplishment of certifiable competencies or not	If more than 90% of sampled students are able to tell with supporting evidences about type of activities were required to demonstrate and type of criteria were used by faculties for certification whether they have completed accomplishment of certifiable competencies or not	Logbooks maintained by students

Note: for computing weightage score on this parameter based on above mentioned rubrics following formula will be used: -

Weightage score on Parameter-6.3=

$$\frac{\frac{\text{Obtained score on 6.3.1}}{4} + \frac{\text{Obtained score on 6.3.2}}{4} + \frac{\text{Obtained score on 6.3.3}}{4} + \frac{\text{Obtained score on 6.3.4}}{4}}{4} \times \text{AW}$$

Where AW= Assigned weightage to Parameter-6.3

Parameter-6.4: Department wise Analysis & reviewing of Students' Performance in Formative & Internal Assessments and taking corrective actions

Operational Explanation: - This parameter aims to capture information regarding the analysis of formative and summative assessment data of students and their categorization into high, average, and low performers based on their performance. It also focuses on identifying students who require additional support or remedial measures to improve their performance and ensuring that students who demonstrate exceptional performance are provided with advanced and challenging tasks to enhance their learning progress.

Verification approach for this parameter:

- Same set of faculties sampled for Parameter-1 of Criterion 1 will be interacted for this parameter
- Same set of sampled students for Parameter-1, will be interacted for this parameter also or same process may be followed for sampling of different set of students for this parameter

Scoring Rubrics for this parameter: -

Sub-parameters	Rating Levels				Supporting documents
	Level-1	Level-2	Level-3	Level-4	
6.4.1-Post Analysis of Formative & Internal Assessment data	If Medical College has ad-hoc policy for analysing post formative assessment and internal assessment examination data	If Medical College has established policy for analysing post formative assessment and internal assessment examination data	Level-2 plus If based on analysis of post formative and internal assessment data, College is identifying High Performing, Average Performing and Below expectation performing students	Level-3 plus If College is organizing remedial sessions for students who have not performed as per expectations and further tracking data based impact of remedial sessions on below expectation performing students	Documented evidences about analysis of formative assessment data and internal assessment data for identifying students who are not performing as per expectations

6.4.2-Remedial or additional support based on Post analysis of Formative & Internal assessment data vis-à-vis interaction with 5% sampled students of each professional year by Assessment Team	If less than 50% of sampled students able to tell whether College is organizing remedial sessions for students performing below expectations and providing any type additional supports to students who are performing exceptionally well	If 50% to 70% of sampled students able to tell whether College is organizing remedial sessions for students performing below expectations and providing any type additional supports to students who are performing exceptionally well	If 71% to 90% of sampled students able to tell whether College is organizing remedial sessions for students performing below expectations and providing any type additional supports to students who are performing exceptionally well	If more than 90% of sampled students able to tell whether College is organizing remedial sessions for students performing below expectations and providing any type additional supports to students who are performing exceptionally well	Professional Year Wise List of below expectation performing students Evidence of organization of remedial sessions Evidence of Advance Learning Programme or Capsules for students showing remarkable performance
--	---	--	--	---	---

Note: for computing weightage score on this parameter based on above mentioned rubrics following formula will be used: -

Weightage score on Parameter-6.4=

$$\frac{\frac{\text{Obtained score on 6.4.1}}{4} + \frac{\text{Obtained score on 6.4.2}}{4}}{2} \times \text{AW}$$

Where AW= Assigned weightage to Parameter-6.4

Criterion-7: Research Output & Impact

With reference to regulations laid down by Medical Regulator for assessment and rating of Medical College/Institutions, Research Output and Impact category of assessment criteria have been mentioned. In this criterion, all parameters are related to Research Output rating category mentioned in MARB Regulations-2023.

Note: Under this criterion, all provided data must be related to Faculties recruited for MBBS programme only.

Normalization Formula for Scoring Rubrics for parameter 1, 2 & 3

Since there is no minimum value fixed by Medical Regulator regarding number of paper publications and number cite values etc. In absence of reference points for drawing meaningful inferences on this parameters, college wise obtained values will be subjected to normalization based on following formula: -

$$\frac{\text{Per faculty average score of College on the parameter } (x') - \text{Minimum obtained score on the parameter } (x)}{\text{Maximum obtained score on this parameter } (y) - \text{Minimum obtained score on this parameter } (x)} \times 100$$

Where x' = for concerned college, per faculty obtained average score (*Faculty-Professors, Associate Professors & Assistant Professors who are recruited for MBBS Program*)

y = Maximum Value for "Maximum per faculty obtained average score by any college on this parameter" across all colleges

x = Minimum value for "Minimum per faculty obtained average score by any College on this parameter" across all colleges

Note: Based on above mentioned formula, value on this parameter may range between 0 to 100. College wise average score per faculty shall be calculated. If college is offering both UG & PG Programs as such minimum required full-time faculties for both programs shall be considered vis-à-vis sanctioned intakes otherwise only UG Program shall be considered.

Parameter-7.1: Total number of research paper publications by Faculty Staff with Institutional Affiliation in last 2 Years in indexed Journals

Operational explanation: - As per this criterion number of total number of research paper publications by Faculty Staff and Students in past 2 years will be considered. Research papers should be published in Journals indexed in following database Provided- Medline/PubMed, Central Science Citation index, Science Citation Index, Expanded Embase, Scopus, Directory of Open access journals (DoAJ) will be considered.

Note: List of these indexed journals have been taken from 'Teacher Eligibility Qualifications in Medical Institutions-2022'.

Note: while computation of per faculty average score on this parameter, each research paper publication in indexed Journals will be assigned scores based on following criteria: -

Each valid entry 200 score for Q1 Category Journal

Each valid entry 150 score for Q2 Category Journal

Each valid entry 100 score for Q3 & Q4 Category Journal

Note :Any Research Paper shall be considered once for assignment of scores to College in any category. If any research paper is written by group of Faculty or student despite this as whole published paper will be considered once for assigning scores. This is rating exercise for College, hence any paper with multiple authors will be considered once for assignment of scores. If any Faculty/Teacher is not associated with the College at the time of submission, acceptance and publications of papers as such these entries shall not be considered for any type of scoring. Further If First author is not associated with concerned College as such 50% scores shall be assigned for claimed entries or any other score as decided by the Assessment Team (applicable for 7.1, 7.2 & 7.3)

Scoring Rubrics for this parameter: -

Level	Required conditions	Supporting documents
Level-1	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≤ 25	Submission details uploaded soft copies research papers published in indexed journals for given database only
Level-2	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >25 to ≤ 50	As mentioned above
Level-2	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >50 to < 75	As mentioned above
Level-4	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≥ 75	As mentioned above

Parameter-7.2: Cumulative Citation Scores of research papers published in indexed journals in last 2 years

Operational explanation: - As per this parameter, cumulative citation scores of all published research papers published in indexed journals as mentioned under parameter-1 of this criterion, will be computed.

Note :while computation of per faculty average score on this parameter, for each citation of published paper in Q1 & Q2 Category will be given 100 score, while for each citation of research paper published in Q3 & Q4 shall be given 50 scores.

Scoring Rubrics for this parameter: -

Level	Required conditions	Supporting documents
Level-1	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≤ 25	Submission details uploaded soft copies research papers published in indexed journals for given database only

Level-2	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >25 to ≤ 50	As mentioned above
Level-2	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >50 to < 75	As mentioned above
Level-4	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≥ 75	As mentioned above

Parameter-7.3: Cumulative Impact Factors of all publications published by the Institute in indexed Journals in the last 2 Years

Operational explanation: -Impact Factor of Journal is yardstick for significance and rank of Journal calculated with respect to citations of papers published in this Journal.

Note: Cumulative Impact factors of the journals in which papers shall be validated under 7.1 parameter as per defined conditions

Cumulative impact factors for all journals in which College has published in indexed journal as mentioned under 7.1 Parameter shall be considered under this Parameter. Cumulative Impact Factors shall be multiplied by 500. After that per faculty average score shall be calculated. If College is offering both UG & PG programs as such minimum Faculty required for sanctioned intake of concerned Program shall be considered.

Scoring Rubrics for this parameter - :

Level	Required conditions	Supporting documents
Level-1	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≤ 25	Submission details uploaded soft copies of research papers published in indexed journals for given database along with Impact Factor of in which Paper has been published.

Level-2	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >25 to ≤ 50	As mentioned above
Level-3	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >50 to < 75	As mentioned above
Level-4	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≥ 75	As mentioned above

Parameter-7.4: - No. of patents/Design Registration filed by the Institution in the last 2 years

Operational explanation: - This parameter is primarily dealing with no of patents granted and number of patents filed by Medical College in past 2 years. A Patent is a statutory right for an invention granted for a limited period of time to the patentee by the Government, in exchange of full disclosure of his invention for excluding others, from making, using, selling, importing the patented product or process for producing that product for those purposes without his consent.

Computation Process: - -

With reference to regulations laid down by Medical Regulator for assessment and rating of Medical College/Institutions, Research Output and Impact category of assessment criteria have been mentioned.

Note: *Each Patent with publication number filed by the College in past 2 Calendar years shall be assigned 50 scores per entry and each design registration with certificate only will be assigned 100 scores. Further it is mandatory that, Faculty/Teachers mandatorily to be associated with the concerned College, when college is claiming scores. If any Faculty/Teacher is not associated with the College at the time of filing and award of Patent or Design Registrations as such these entries shall not be considered for any type of scoring. Further If First author is not associated with concerned College as such 50% scores shall be assigned for claimed entries or any other score as decided by the Assessment team.*

Scoring Rubrics for using separately for the parameter- For normalization of data provided by college on each parameter, parameter wise data will be subjected to normalization based on following formula - :

$$\frac{\text{Average per faculty average score of College on the parameter } (x') - \text{Minimum obtained score on the parameter } (x)}{\text{Maximum obtained score on this parameter } (y) - \text{Minimum obtained score on this parameter } (x)} \times 100$$

Where x = for concerned college, per faculty average score of college on this parameter

y = Maximum Value for "Maximum per faculty average score obtained by any college on this parameter " across colleges

x = Minimum value for "Minimum per faculty average score obtained by any College on this parameter " across all colleges

Note : For computation of per faculty average score if the college is offering both UG & PG programs as such minimum required Faculties against sanctioned intakes for both programs shall be considered. Based on above mentioned formula, value on this parameter may range between 0 to 100.

Scoring Rubrics for this parameter- :

Level	Required conditions	Supporting documents
Level-1	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≤ 25	Date of Filing of Patent Applications along with Publication Number, Design Granted Certificate
Level-2	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >25 to ≤ 50	As mentioned above
Level-3	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >50 to < 75	As mentioned above
Level-4	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≥ 75	As mentioned above

Parameter-7.5: - No. of patents granted, converted to products and commercialized in last 2 years

Operational explanation: - This parameter is related to number filled patent applications in past 2 years have been granted along with patent number.

Note: *Each Patent grant filed by the College in past 2 Calendar years shall be assigned 200 scores per entry. Patent converted to product and commercialized shall be assigned 300 score. Further it is mandatory that, Faculty/Teachers mandatorily to be associated with the concerned College, when college is claiming scores. If any Faculty/Teacher is not associated with the College at the time of filing and award of Patent as such these entries shall not be considered for any type of scoring. Further If First author is not associated with concerned College as such 50% scores shall be assigned for claimed entries or any other score as decided by the Assessment Team.*

Scoring Rubrics for this parameter: -

Level	Required conditions	Supporting documents
Level-1	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≤ 25	Date of Granting of Patent along with Patent Number
Level-2	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >25 to ≤ 50	As mentioned above
Level-3	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >50 to < 75	As mentioned above
Level-4	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≥ 75	As mentioned above

Parameter-7.6: - No. of extramural funded projects completed/ongoing in collaboration with Industry/Non-government (National, State/International) funding agencies in last 2 Financial Years

Operational explanation: - This parameter deals with number of projects completed or being completed funded by Industry or any non-government agencies in India and abroad and further projects completed or being completed in collaboration with academic/research institutes. Here entries will be submitted by college pertaining to extramural funded research projects which are ongoing or being initiated or completed in last 2 financial years. Score will be given to each **extramural funded projects vis-a-vis total sanctioned amount received in past 2 financial years** in the account of College or Investigators associated with concerned College as Full-time Faculty or Students.

Note-For computation of per faculty average score, following scores will be assigned to each research project for parameter-7.6

Amount for Extramural Funds for sanctioned projects (Project wise)	Assigned weightage Score (Project wise)	Conditions for Scoring (Project wise)
≤ 1 Lakh	50	Sanctioned Letter, Fund Release Letter, Utilization Letter, Project Completion Certificate
≤ 5 Lakh	100	Same as mentioned above
≤ 10 Lakhs	150	Same as mentioned above
≤ 25 Lakhs	200	Same as mentioned above
> 25 Lakhs to ≤ 50 Lakhs	250	Same as mentioned above
≥ 51 Lakhs to ≤ 1 crore	300	Same as mentioned above
>1 crore to ≤ 2 crore	350	Same as mentioned above
>2 crore	400	Same as mentioned above

Note: Cumulative scores shall be averaged out with respect to required full time Faculties for sanctioned intakes of UG & PG Programs (if PG Program is being offered).

Scoring Rubrics for this parameter - :

Level	Required conditions	Supporting documents
Level-1	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≤ 25	Sanctioned Letter, Fund Release Letter, Utilization Letter, Project Completion Certificate
Level-2	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >25 to ≤ 50	As mentioned above
Level-3	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >50 to < 75	As mentioned above
Level-4	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≥ 75	As mentioned above

Parameter-7.7: - No. of extramural funded projects completed/ongoing/being funded by government agency in India and abroad like CSIR, ICMR & DST etc. in last 2 Financial Years

Operational explanation: - This parameter assesses the number of projects that have been completed or are currently being completed with funding from government agencies, both in India and abroad. Here entries will be submitted by College pertaining to extramural funded research projects which are ongoing or being initiated or completed in last 2 financial years. Score will be given to each **extramural funded projects vis-a-vis total sanctioned amount** received in past 2 financial years in the account of College or Investigators associated with concerned College as Full-time Faculty or Students.

Note-For computation of per faculty average score, following scores will be assigned to each research project for parameter-7.7

Amount for Extramural Funds for sanctioned projects (Project wise)	Assigned weightage Score (Project wise)	Conditions for Scoring (Project wise)
≤ 1 Lakh	50	Sanctioned Letter, Fund Release Letter, Utilization Letter, Project Completion Certificate
≤ 5 Lakh	100	Same as mentioned above
≤ 10 Lakhs	150	Same as mentioned above
≤ 25 Lakhs	200	Same as mentioned above

> 25 Lakhs to ≤ 50 Lakhs	250	Same as mentioned above
≥ 51 Lakhs to ≤ 1 crore	300	Same as mentioned above
>1 crore to ≤ 2 crore	350	Same as mentioned above
>2 crore	400	Same as mentioned above

Note: Cumulative scores shall be averaged out with respect to required full time Faculties for sanctioned intakes of UG & PG Programs (if PG Program is being offered).

Scoring Rubrics for this parameter - :

Level	Required conditions	Supporting documents
Level-1	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≤ 25	Sanctioned Letter, Fund Release Letter, Utilization Letter, Project Completion Certificate
Level-2	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >25 to ≤ 50	As mentioned above
Level-3	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >50 to < 75	As mentioned above
Level-4	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≥75	As mentioned above

Parameter-7.8: - No. of clinical trials initiated/going on/approved for different phases in last 2 calendar year

Operational explanation: - This parameter deals with capturing information pertaining to clinical trials which have been initiated, or which are already going on or which have approved for different phases progressively by regulatory body (DGCI through CDSCO) enforcing regulatory framework for clinical trials related to drugs or treatment etc.

Note: Only those clinical trials shall be considered for the college in which full time faculty of the concerned college is either PI (Principal Investigator) or Co-investigator. Faculty must be associated with the concerned college for any clinical trial reported under this parameter. If PI is associated with concerned college, then full assigned score shall be given to college, if the only co-investigator is associated as such 50% of assigned weightage score shall be given based on below mentioned table.

Following process will be used for computation of scores: -

Condition	Assigned weightage score
Category-1: Non-regulatory Clinical trial registered with CTRI	150
Category-2: Regulatory Clinical trial registered with CTRI	300
Category-3: Clinical trial being funded by Industry	150
Category-4: Clinical trial being funded by ICMR/designated govt. body	250
Category-5: Clinical trial approved for second phase by DGCI through CDSCO	400
Category-6: Clinical trial approved for third phase by DGCI through CDSCO	600
Category-7: Clinical trial approved for fourth phase by DGCI through CDSCO	800

Note: any entry submitted by college if qualifies for more than one category as such concerned entry shall be placed under category with highest score. *Cumulative scores shall be averaged out with respect to required full time Faculties for sanctioned intakes of UG & PG Programs (if PG Program is being offered).*

Scoring Rubrics for this parameter - :

Level	Required conditions	Supporting documents
Level-1	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≤ 25	Sanctioned Letter, Fund Release Letter, Utilization Letter, Project Completion

		Certificate, DGCI approval letter, CTRI registration certificate etc.
Level-2	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >25 to ≤ 50	As mentioned above
Level-3	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >50 to < 75	As mentioned above
Level-4	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≥75	As mentioned above

Criterion-8: Financial-Resource: Recurring & non-recurring expenditures

Normalization approach for devising Scoring Rubrics for parameters from 1 to 11 under this criterion-

In absence of reference points for drawing meaningful inferences on each parameter under criterion-8, for each parameter under this criterion, college wise obtained values will be subjected to normalization based on following formula: -

$$\frac{\text{Average score of College on the parameter } (x') - \text{Minimum obtained score on the parameter } (x)}{\text{Maximum obtained score on this parameter } (y) - \text{Minimum obtained score on this parameter } (x)} \times 100$$

Where x'= for concerned college, average score will be computed as per requirement of parameter per student across all professional years or per faculty recruited for MBBS Programme

Note: for computation of average value per unit following methods will be used:

- If in the College, in addition to MBBS Programme, PG Programmes are also being offered as such if submitted financial data is applicable for all programmes being offered, then for computation of average value per student, all students across all courses being offered will be taken into considerations.

- Further wherever as per requirements of parameter, if submitted financial data is applicable for all faculties (Professor, Associate Professor and Assistant Professor) recruited for all programmes (UG & PG Programmes) as such for computation of average value per faculty, all faculties on College's roll will be considered.
- Further wherever applicable, parameter which are applicable to Clinical departments of teaching hospital, for these parameters, average value per unit will be computed. For computation of average value per unit, as per requirement of the parameter, total number of laboratory-based investigations carried out, total number of radiological investigations carried and total number of operative works performed, total OPD, Total IPD admissions etc. shall be considered as per nature of parameters.

y= Maximum Value for "Maximum obtained per faculty or student score by any college on this parameter" across all colleges

x= Minimum value for "Minimum obtained per faculty or per student score by any College on this parameter" across all colleges

Note: Based on above mentioned formula, value on this parameter may range between 0 to 100

Cut-off ranges for each Performance level of Rubrics:

Level	Required conditions	Supporting documents
Level-1	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≤ 25	As per requirement of concerned parameter
Level-2	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >25 to ≤ 50	As mentioned above
Level-3	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >50 to < 75	As mentioned above
Level-4	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≥ 75	As mentioned above

Parameter-8.1: Total amount of Books & Journals and other Learning Resources purchased in previous financial year

Operational explanation: - Based on this parameter, data will be captured regarding amount spent on addition of new books & subscription of new journals etc. This parameter is proxy for enriching knowledge & skills of students by making new literatures available related to medical field. Total amount spent in INR in past 1 year will be captured college wise.

Note: As given in very beginning under the Criterion-8, for this parameter, average value per sanctioned intake shall be calculated. If College is offering PG programmes as such PG sanctioned intake shall also be considered for computing average value per student for the concerned college.

Scoring Rubrics for this parameter- :

Level	Required conditions	Supporting documents
Level-1	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≤ 25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Subject to List of Books & Journals procured/subscribed ○ Invoices related to procurement and subscriptions of print copies or electronic copies of Library Resources for teaching and learning ○ Purchase Order, Tax Invoices and Receipts etc.
Level-2	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >25 to ≤ 50	As mentioned above
Level-3	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >50 to < 75	As mentioned above
Level-4	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≥ 75	As mentioned above

Parameter-8.2: Total amount spent on procurement of consumable Lab based materials in previous financial year

Operational explanation: As per requirements of Curriculum, in each Medical College there shall be 8 Practical Laboratories and Skill Laboratory for training of Practical/Clinical skill competencies and procedures.

In addition to above mentioned Laboratories in Medical College campus, there will be Clinical Laboratories in the attached teaching hospital for exposure of students to adequate clinical materials (Laboratory based investigations). Further procurement of consumable materials in laboratory-based investigations in clinical departments in hospital, is proxy of patient loads which is essential for clinical training of students.

As per requirements of the parameter, Medical College is required to provide total amount spent in INR separately under following heads:

-
- Total amount spent on consumables materials in Laboratories set up in Medical College (8 Practical Laboratories & Skill Laboratory) in past 1 year
- Total amount spent on consumables materials in clinical Laboratories set up in attached teaching hospital

Note: for computation of average value per unit, following methods will be used-

- For computation of normalized score for 8.2.1 as given below, first average value will be computed taking into considerations of sanctioned intake for UP program. If PG Programs are also being offered as such sanctioned intakes of UG and PG shall be taken into considerations for computation of average value per student. Normalization formula is given at the beginning of Criterion-8.
- For computation of normalized score for 8.2.2 as given below, first average value for this sub-parameter will be computed, total amount spent on procuring consumables for clinical laboratories set-up in attached teaching hospital will be divided by total number of OPD attendance and IPD admissions in last 1 calendar year. Normalization formula is given at the beginning of Criterion-8.

Scoring Rubrics for Parameter: -

Sub-parameters	Rating Levels				Supporting documents
	Level-1	Level-2	Level-3	Level-4	
8.2.1-Amount spent on consumables for Laboratories set-up in Medical College	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≥ 75	Purchase order, Invoices, receipts and stock registers for Practical Laboratories & Skill Laboratory

	in the range of ≤ 25	in the range of >25 to ≤ 50	in the range of >50 to < 75		
8.2.2-Amount spent on consumables for Clinical Laboratories set-up in attached Teaching Hospital	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≤ 25	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >25 to ≤ 50	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >50 to < 75	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≥75	Purchase order, Invoices, receipts

Note: for computing weightage score on this parameter based on above mentioned rubrics following formula will be used: -

Weightage score on Parameter-8.2=

$$\frac{\frac{\text{Obtained score on 8.2.1}}{4} + \frac{\text{Obtained score on 8.2.2}}{4}}{2} \times \text{AW}$$

Where AW= Assigned weightage to Parameter-8.2

Parameter-8.3: Total amount spent on maintenance of radiological equipment in previous financial year

Operational explanation: According to NMC guidelines there shall be facilities for conventional and static and portable X-rays, fluoroscopy, contrast studies, ultra-sonography and computerized tomography. Spending of amount for maintenance of equipment in department of radio-diagnosis is indicative of radiological investigations as result of patient loads which is further essential for clinical training of students.

Note: for computation of average value per unit, following method will be used-

- For computation of normalized score for this parameter, first computation of average value for this parameter will be computed, total amount spent on maintenance of radiological equipment in attached teaching hospital, will be divided by total number of radiological investigations carried out in last 1 calendar year. Normalization formula is given at the beginning of Criterion-8.

Scoring Rubrics for this parameter: -

Level	Required conditions	Supporting documents
Level-1	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≤ 25	Invoices and AMCs etc. Annual Budget, audited balance sheets etc.
Level-2	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >25 to ≤ 50	As mentioned above
Level-3	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >50 to < 75	As mentioned above
Level-4	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≥ 75	As mentioned above

Parameter-8.4: Total amount spent on procurement of non-consumable equipment in Clinical Laboratories in attached teaching hospital in previous financial year

Operational explanation: This parameter requires capturing data for procurement of non-consumable equipment in Laboratory other than minimum requirements. Procurement of non-equipment other than MSR laid down by Medical Regulator is indicative of augmentation of resources as a result of increased patient footfall, which are essential clinical materials for clinical training of students.

Note: for computation of average value per unit, following method will be used-

- For computation of normalized score for 8.4 as given below, first average value for this sub-parameter will be computed, total amount spent on procuring consumables for clinical laboratories set-up in attached teaching hospital will be divided by total number of OPD attendance and IPD admissions in last 1 calendar year. Normalization formula is given at the beginning of Criterion-8.

Scoring Rubrics for this parameter: -

Level	Required conditions	Supporting documents
Level-1	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≤ 25	Invoices, purchase order and receipts etc. Annual Budget, audited balance sheets etc.
Level-2	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >25 to ≤ 50	As mentioned above
Level-3	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >50 to < 75	As mentioned above
Level-4	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≥ 75	As mentioned above

Parameter-8.5: Total amount spent on consumable resources for indoor & outdoor sports in previous financial year

Operational explanation: It has been mentioned in the NMC guidelines that there shall be the provision of indoor games, gymnasium, and playground for outdoor games and track events in the college. As per requirement of this parameter, College is required to submit incurred expenditure data pertaining to augmentation of resources by **procuring consumables** for indoor and outdoor sports. This parameter is pertaining to satisfactory teaching learning environment as laid down by MARB-NMC for assessment and rating of Medical Colleges.

Note: As given at very beginning under the Criterion-8, for this parameter, average value per sanctioned intake shall be calculated. If College is offering PG programmes as such sanctioned intakes for both programs shall be considered for computing average value per student for the concerned college.

Scoring Rubrics for this parameter: -

Level	Required conditions	Supporting documents
Level-1	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≤ 25	Annual Budget and audited balance sheets etc. Purchase order, invoices and receipts
Level-2	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >25 to ≤ 50	As mentioned above
Level-3	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >50 to < 75	As mentioned above
Level-4	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≥ 75	As mentioned above

Parameter-8.6: Amount spent on salary for Faculty Staff and residents in the previous financial year

Operational explanation- As per requirements of this parameter, all colleges are required to submit amount spent on gross salary of Faculty and residents in the previous financial year.

Note :for computation of average value per unit, following method will be used-

- *For computing average value per Unit, amount spent by college on cadre wise gross salary payment of Faculty staff shall be considered as numerator and sanctioned intakes for UG program or UG plus PG if both programs are being offered, shall be considered as denominator.*
- *Computed per unit average value shall be subjected to normalization.*

Scoring Rubrics for Parameter- :

Level	Required conditions	Supporting documents
Level-1	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≤ 25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Form 16 B for each Faculty for previous Financial Year
Level-2	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >25 to ≤ 50	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ As mentioned above
Level-3	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >50 to < 75	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ As mentioned above
Level-4	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≥ 75	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ As mentioned above

Note: Here salary data for full time Faculty for Colleges shall be provided, supporting documents like Form 16 B, audited balance sheets (if required) shall be submitted. Here for this parameter, Colleges may be categorized in Govt., and Private category, and accordingly after normalizations, their level will be determined.

Parameter-8.7: Percentage of Electricity (Units) vis-à-vis total consumed electricity in the previous financial year obtained from renewable energy (solar/wind)

Operational explanation- This parameter is related to consumption of electricity (in units) in Medical College including teaching hospital. Further what percentage of consumed electricity are obtained from renewable energy sources like Solar/wind.

Scoring Rubrics for this parameter: -

Level	Required conditions	Supporting documents
Level-1	If less than 5% of total consumed electricity by Medical College and attached hospital is obtained from renewable energy	<p>Electricity Bills for last financial year separately for Medical College & attached Teaching Hospital</p> <p>Evidences of electricity produced from renewable sources</p>

Level-2	If more than 5% of total consumed electricity by Medical College and attached hospital is obtained from renewable energy	Same as mentioned above
Level-3	If more than 10% of total consumed electricity by Medical College and attached hospital is obtained from renewable energy	Same as mentioned above
Level-4	If more than 15% of total consumed electricity by Medical College and attached hospital is obtained from renewable energy	Same as mentioned above

Parameter-8.8: Amount spent on procurement of consumable materials for clinical/ operational works in OT for meeting demands of patients in previous financial year.

Operational explanation- This parameter is related to amount spent on consumable materials in Operation Theatres (OT) functioning in teaching hospital. Amount spent on consumables in OTs are indication about patient loads in hospital which is proxy for adequate clinical material for clinical training of students as per requirement of Curriculum. This parameter is related to MSR laid down by Medical Regulator for effective clinical training of students. Hence this is essential proxy parameter about availability of clinical material for rigorous clinical training.

Note: for computation of average value per unit, following method will be used-

- For computation of normalized score for this parameter, first computation of average value for this parameter will be computed, total amount spent on procurement of consumable materials in OTs in attached teaching hospital, will be divided by total number of operative works (Minor & Major) carried out in last 1 year. Normalization formula is given at the beginning of Criterion-8.

Scoring Rubrics for this parameter: -

Level	Required conditions	Supporting documents
Level-1	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≤ 25	Purchase order, Invoices, receipts and stock registers etc. Annual Budget, audited balance sheets etc.

Level-2	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >25 to ≤ 50	As mentioned above
Level-3	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >50 to < 75	As mentioned above
Level-4	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≥ 75	As mentioned above

Parameter-8.9: Amount spent on maintenance of non-consumable equipment in OT in the previous financial year

Operational explanation- This parameter is related to amount spent on maintenance of non-consumable equipment in OTs. Due to patient footfalls, maintenance of non-consumable equipment may arise. This parameter is related to MSR laid down by Medical Regulator for effective clinical training of students. Hence this is essential proxy parameter about availability of clinical material for rigorous clinical training.

Note: for computation of average value per unit, following method will be used-

- For computation of normalized score for this parameter, first computation of average value for this parameter will be computed, total amount spent on maintenance of equipment in OTs in attached teaching hospital, will be divided by total number of operative works (Minor & Major) carried out in last 1 year. Normalization formula is given at the beginning of Criterion-8.

Scoring Rubrics for this parameter: -

Level	Required conditions	Supporting documents
Level-1	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≤ 25	Purchase order, Invoices, receipts and AMCs etc. Annual Budget, audited balance sheets etc.
Level-2	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >25 to ≤ 50	As mentioned above

Level-3	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >50 to < 75	As mentioned above
Level-4	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≥ 75	As mentioned above

Parameter-8.10: Amount spent on strengthening of Safety Measures in Campus in the previous financial year

Operational explanation- This parameter is related to amount spent by Medical College for strengthening safety measures in entire campus including teaching hospital. This parameter is related to MSR laid down by Medical Regulator for providing safe physical environment to all stakeholders. This parameter is further related to satisfactory physical teaching learning environment laid down as assessment and rating criteria for Medical Colleges by NMC.

As per requirements of the parameter, Medical College is required to provide total amount spent in INR separately under following heads:

-

- Total amount spent on strengthening of safety measures in Medical College on following heads

Amount spent on maintenance of Fire Safety equipment
Amount spent on maintenance of existing facilities for Quality Drinking water
Amount spent on maintenance of CCTVs
Amount spent on maintenance of electrical gadgets

- Total amount spent on strengthening of safety measures in Hostels (Boys & Girls both) on following heads

Amount spent on maintenance of Fire Safety equipment
Amount spent on maintenance of existing facilities for Quality Drinking water
Amount spent on maintenance of CCTVs
Amount spent on maintenance of electrical gadgets
Amount spent on salary outsourced security Staff in the hostel

- Total amount spent on strengthening of safety measures in attached teaching hospital on following heads

Amount spent on maintenance of Fire Safety equipment
Amount spent on maintenance of existing facilities for Quality Drinking water
Amount spent on maintenance of CCTVs
Amount spent on maintenance of electrical gadgets
Amount spent maintenance of Lifts
Amount spent on maintenance of existing facilities for Biomedical Waste Management (BMW)
Amount spent procurement of wheel chairs & trolleys with railings

Note: for computation of average value per unit, following methods will be used-

- For computation of normalized score for 8.10.1 as given below, first average value will be computed taking into considerations of sanctioned intake for UG Program. If PG Programs are also being offered as such, sanctioned intakes of MBBS and PG Programs will be taken into considerations for computation of average value per student. For arriving at average value per student, total amount spent on strengthening of safety measures in Medical College & Hostels together will be divided by sanctioned intakes of the programs as defined above. Normalization formula is given at the beginning of Criterion-8.
- For computation of normalized score for 8.10.2 as given below, first average value for this sub-parameter will be computed, total amount spent strengthening of safety measures in attached teaching hospital will be divided total number of IPD admissions in past 1 calendar year. Normalization formula is given at the beginning of Criterion-8.

Scoring Rubrics for Parameter: -

Sub-parameters	Rating Levels				Supporting documents
	Level-1	Level-2	Level-3	Level-4	
8.10.1-Total amount spent on strengthening safety measures in Medical College and Hostels both	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of	Invoices and AMCs, Annual Budget and audited balance sheets etc.

	College is falling in the range of ≤ 25	College is falling in the range of >25 to ≤ 50	College is falling in the range of >50 to < 75	the College is falling in the range of ≥75	
8.10.2- Total amount spent on strengthening safety measures in attached teaching hospital	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≤ 25	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >25 to ≤ 50	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of >50 to < 75	If based on normalized scores of all colleges, if the normalized score of the College is falling in the range of ≥75	Invoices and AMCs, Annual Budget and audited balance sheets etc.

Note: for computing weightage score on this parameter based on above mentioned rubrics following formula will be used: -

Weightage score on Parameter-8.10=

$$\frac{\frac{\text{Obtained score on 8.2.1}}{4} + \frac{\text{Obtained score on 8.2.2}}{4}}{2} \times \text{AW}$$

Where AW= Assigned weightage to Parameter-8.10

Criterion-9: Community Outreach Programs

Parameter-9.1: No. of families adopted by students and organization of diagnostic camps in villages of adopted families for screening & identification of disease/ill-health & malnutrition

Operational Explanation: This parameter is related to capture number of Families adopted by student under Family adoption program as part of Curriculum of Community Medicines prescribed by Medical Regulator. The family adoption shall preferably include villages not covered under PHCs adopted by Medical Colleges. NMC has laid down that Medical Diagnostic Camps will be organized in village wherefrom Students have adopted families. Based on diagnostic medical camp, adopted family members will go screening for identification of disease/ill-health & malnutrition. Further in the GMER-2023, professional year wise competencies, teaching-learning methods and assessment methods have been specified for Family Adoption Programme. As per NMC notice 31st March, 2022, Medical Colleges in the country have been directed that they shall implement Competency Based Medical Education Curriculum from batch 2021-22 onwards. In the same notice, Family Adoption Programme has been mentioned as one significant component of Community Medicine.

Verification process: -

- ✓ Interaction with same set of students sampled under Parameter-1 of Criterion-1 or same sampling method may be used for sampling of another set of students for this parameter
- ✓ Interaction with same set of 25% faculties sampled from Department of Community Medicine under Parameter-1 of Criterion-1

Scoring Rubrics for Parameter: -

Sub-parameters	Rating Levels				Supporting documents
	Level-1	Level-2	Level-3	Level-4	
9.1.1-Adoption of Families by each professional year students	If all students from the batches 2022-23 onwards have adopted minimum 3 families in the villages as per guidelines of NMC	Level-1 plus If for minimum 25% or more adopted families, Medical College has submitted demographic data and Health Data or Clinical Examination data	Level-2 plus If MINIMUM 50% of adopted families, Medical College has submitted demographic data and Health Data or Clinical Examination data	Level-3 plus If MINIMUM 75% of adopted families, Medical College has submitted demographic data and Health Data or Clinical Examination data	Documented evidences related to Family Survey for Demographic Data Health Profile and Treatment History Records of adopted families Evidences for organization of Medical Camp or Community Clinics Mobile no. of Head of Family member of adopted families for cross verifications if required Logbooks of students

9.1.2-Organization of Medical Camp for Clinical Examination & screening of Family members of each adopted family	If minimum one Diagnostic Camp and minimum one annual follow-up diagnostic camp is organized	Level-1 plus If minimum 25% or more sampled students are able to produce documented evidences about how adopted family wise clinical examination or health data has been captured and further family members are screened with which type diseases	Level-2 plus If 25% to 50% of sampled students are able to produce documented evidences about how adopted family wise clinical examination or health data has been captured and further family members are screened with which type diseases	Level-3 plus If more than 50% of sampled students are able to produce documented evidences about how adopted family wise clinical examination or health data has been captured and further family members are screened with which type diseases	Same as mentioned above History Records and Clinical Examination Records etc. Mobile no. of Head of Family member of adopted families for cross verifications Logbooks of students
---	--	--	--	---	---

Note: for computing weightage score on this parameter based on above mentioned rubrics following formula will be used: -

Weightage score on Parameter-9.1=

$$\frac{\frac{\text{Obtained score on 9.1.1}}{4} + \frac{\text{Obtained score on 9.1.2}}{4}}{2} \times \text{AW}$$

Where AW= Assigned weightage to Parameter-9.1

Parameter-9.2: - Impact of family adoption/therapeutic intervention on health outcomes of adopted family

Operational Explanation: - As per requirement of this parameters, data will be captured pertaining to impact of family adoption programme on health outcome of adopted family members.

Verification process: -

- ✓ Interaction with same set of students sampled under Parameter-1 of Criterion-1 or same sampling method may be used for sampling of another set of students for this parameter
- ✓ Interaction with same set of 25% faculties sampled from Department of Community Medicine under Parameter-1 of

Scoring Rubrics for Parameter: -

Sub-parameters	Rating Levels				Supporting documents
	Level-1	Level-2	Level-3	Level-4	
9.2.1-Therapeutic interventions or treatment or suggested remedial measures on health outcome for allocated family members	If Medical College has submitted clinical examination data for all families adopted by students of batches 2022-23 onwards	Level-1 plus If minimum 25% of sampled students are able to produce documented evidences about type of therapeutic intervention or treatments were given to allocated family members as per clinical examination data if they were requiring	Level-2 plus If 25% to 50% of sampled students are able to produce documented evidences about type of therapeutic intervention or treatments were given to allocated family members as per clinical examination data if they were requiring	Level-3 plus If more than 50% of sampled students are able to produce documented evidences about type of therapeutic intervention or treatments were given to allocated family members as per clinical examination data if they were requiring	Family Survey data for demographic profiles Clinical Examination data family wise Medical History records of adopted Family Mobile no. of Head of Family member of adopted families for cross verifications Logbooks of students
9.2.2: -Impact and follow-up of suggested therapeutic interventions or treatment	If Medical College has submitted for students of all batches from session 2022-23	Level-1 plus If minimum 25% of sampled students are able to produce	Level-2 plus If 25% to 50% of sampled students are able to produce	Level-3 plus If more than 50% of sampled students are able to produce documented	Follow up diagnostic camp or community clinics organized

	onwards pertaining to follow-up status of therapeutic interventions or treatment if given to any adopted family members as per their clinical examination data	documented evidences about how they are following up of suggested treatments or remedial measures if given to adopted family members and further what is improvement in their health outcomes	documented evidences about how they are following up of suggested treatments or remedial measures if given to adopted family members and further what is improvement in their health outcomes	evidences about how they are following up of suggested treatments or remedial measures if given to adopted family members and further what is improvement in their health outcomes	<p>Medical History records</p> <p>Records of suggested Treatment or remedial measures</p> <p>Mobile no. of Head of Family member of adopted families for cross verifications</p> <p>Logbooks of students</p>
--	--	---	---	--	--

Note: for computing weightage score on this parameter based on above mentioned rubrics following formula will be used: -

Weightage score on Parameter-9.2=

$$\frac{\frac{\text{Obtained score on 9.2.1}}{4} + \frac{\text{Obtained score on 9.2.2}}{4}}{2} \times \text{AW}$$

Where AW= Assigned weightage to Parameter-9.2

Criterion-10: Quality Assurance System

Parameter-10.1: Accreditations of Clinical Laboratories by NABL or nationally recognized body

Operational Explanation: - Based on this parameter, College is required to provide information related to whether available clinical Laboratories in attached teaching hospital are accredited by NABL or any other nationally recognized accreditation body.

Scoring Rubrics for this parameter: -

Level	Required conditions	Supporting documents
Level-0	If each Laboratory is accredited for less than 25% tests being carried out	NABL certificate

Level-1	If each Laboratory is accredited for 25% to 50% tests being carried out	NABL certificate
Level-2	If each Laboratory is accredited for than 50% to 75% tests being carried out	NABL certificate
Level-3	If each Laboratory is accredited for more than 75% of tests being carried out	NABL certificate

Parameter-10.2: NABH Accreditation of parent/attached hospital

Operational Explanation: -Based on this parameter, information will be captured whether attached teaching hospital/parent hospital is accredited by NABH or any recognized accreditation body.

Scoring Rubrics for this parameter: -

Level	Required conditions	Supporting documents
Level-1	If teaching hospital is under accreditation process of NABH/any other national body and certificate is awaiting	NABH certificate or accreditation certificate of any other national body
Level-2	If teaching hospital is accredited with entry level accreditation of NABH/any other national body	Same as mentioned above
Level-3	Level-2 plus If teaching hospital has been granted full NABH/any other national body accreditation status	Same as mentioned above
Level-4	Level-3 plus If Full accreditation status of NABH/any other national accreditation is valid, and validity has not expired	Same as mentioned above

Parameter 10.3: Legal Licenses- (Availability & Validity as per NMC guidelines)

Operational Explanation: - This parameter requires capturing information pertaining to different Legal Licenses prescribed by NMC. NMC has prescribed about 54 types of Licensing required for Medical Colleges. This parameter is related to standards laid down by NMC for compliance.

Scoring rubrics for this parameter: -

Level	Required conditions	Supporting documents
Level-1	If the Medical College is complying with less than 25% Licenses prescribed by Medical Regulator	Certificate of each License issued from competent authority
Level-2	If the Medical College is complying with more than minimum 50% Licenses prescribed by Medical Regulator	Certificate of each License issued from competent authority
Level-3	If the Medical College is complying with minimum 75% % Licenses prescribed by Medical Regulator	Certificate of each License issued from competent authority
Level-4	If the Medical College is complying with 100% Licenses prescribed by Medical Regulator	Certificate of each License issued from competent authority

Parameter 10.4: Pharmacovigilance Committee

Operational Explanation: - This is mandatory requirements for Medical Colleges to set up Pharmacovigilance Committee. This parameter aims at capturing information related to and functioning of this Committee.

Scoring Rubrics for Parameter: -

Sub-parameters	Rating Levels				Supporting documents
	Level-1	Level-2	Level-3	Level-4	
10.4.1- Constitution of Pharmacovigilance Committee	If College has constituted Pharmacovigilance Committee as per regulatory required compositions	Level-1 plus If Pharmacovigilance Committee meets at least once in each six months	Level-2 plus If Pharmacovigilance Committee meets at least once in each 2-3 months	Level-3 plus If College is able to show documented evidences of all mentioned like MOMs and ATRs	Compositions of Committee MOMs and ATRs for organized meetings

10.4.2- Conducting Patient Education	If Committee has organized minimum one Patient sensitization and awareness Programme vis-à-vis Drug-drug interaction, Drug-food interaction and adverse drug effects etc.	Level-1 plus If Committee is organizing minimum one Patient sensitization and awareness Programme in each 6 months vis-à-vis Drug-drug interaction, Drug-food interaction and adverse drug effects etc.	Level-2 plus If Committee is organizing minimum one Patient sensitization and awareness Programme in each 2-3 months vis-à-vis Drug-drug interaction, Drug-food interaction and adverse drug effects etc.	Level-2 plus If Committee is organizing minimum one Patient sensitization and awareness Programme in each month vis-à-vis Drug-drug interaction, Drug-food interaction and adverse drug effects etc.	Records of Programme for Patient Education Records of conducted Patient Education Programme etc.
10.4.3-Resercah Paper Publications & reporting ADRs	If Committee has published minimum one research paper on ADRs in Indexed Journals	Level-1 plus If Committee has reported minimum 1 ADR report to INDIAN PHARMACOPOEIA COMMISSION	Level-2 plus If Committee has published more than one research paper in indexed journals in past 2 years	Level-3 plus If Committee has reported more than 1 ADR report to INDIAN PHARMACOPOEIA COMMISSION	Evidences of published Research Papers and Reported ADRs etc.

Note: for computing weightage score on this parameter based on above mentioned rubrics following formula will be used: -

Weightage score on Parameter-10.4=

$$\frac{\frac{\text{Obtained score on 10.4.1}}{4} + \frac{\text{Obtained score on 10.4.2}}{4} + \frac{\text{Obtained score on 10.4.3}}{4}}{3} \times \text{AW}$$

Where AW= Assigned weightage to Parameter-10.4

Parameter10.5: Constitution and Functioning of Antimicrobial Stewardship (AMS) Committee

Operational Explanation: - With reference to advisory issued by NMC in 2021, in every Medical College there shall be Antimicrobial Stewardship Committee. This parameter has been framed for capturing information pertaining to measures taken to sensitize and aware health care professional for judicious usages of antimicrobials etc.

Scoring Rubrics for Parameter: -

Sub-parameters	Rating Levels				Supporting documents
	Level-1	Level-2	Level-3	Level-4	
10.5.1- Constitution of Pharmacovigilance Committee	If College has constituted AMS Committee as per regulatory required compositions	Level-1 plus If AMS Committee meets at least once in each six months	Level-2 plus If AMS meets at least once in each 2-3 months	Level-3 plus If College is able to show documented evidences of all mentioned like MOMs and ATRs	Compositions of Committee MOMs and ATRs for organized meetings
10.5.2- Conducting workshops for Health Care Professionals vis-à-vis judicious usages of Antimicrobials & AMR	If less than 25% Doctors/Faculties of Clinical Departments & allied health care professional in attached hospital are trained as per parameter	Level-1 plus If more than 50% Doctors/Faculties of Clinical Departments and allied health care professional in attached hospital are trained as per parameter	Level-2 plus If more than 75% Doctors/Faculties of Clinical Departments and allied health care professional in attached hospital are trained as per parameter	Level-3 plus If minimum 50% of Interns have been trained as per this parameter	Records of Programme for Patient Education Records of conducted Patient Education Programme etc.
10.5.3-Contribution of Microbiology Lab in data-based surveillance of AMR	Whether Microbiology Laboratory has analysed trends of	Level-1 plus Whether Microbiology Laboratory has	Level-2 plus Whether Microbiology Laboratory in	Level-3 plus Whether contribution of	

	antimicrobials based on Laboratory investigation data	evolved any policy related to usages of antimicrobials and AMRs for doctors and allied health care professionals in college	attached hospital of Medical College has published minimum one research paper in past 2 years	Microbiology Laboratory in attached hospital of Medical College related to data-based reporting of visible trends of antimicrobials on human health outcome have been recognized by any concerned health department or agency of State or Central government	
--	---	---	---	--	--

Note: for computing weightage score on this parameter based on above mentioned rubrics following formula will be used: -

Weightage score on Parameter-10.5=

$$\frac{\frac{\text{Obtained score on 10.5.1}}{4} + \frac{\text{Obtained score on 10.5.2}}{4} + \frac{\text{Obtained score on 10.5.3}}{4}}{3} \times \text{AW}$$

Where AW= Assigned weightage to Parameter-10.5

Criterion-11: Feedback & Perception of Stakeholders

Parameter-11.1 - :Feedback from sampled students & Inspiration Index

Online Feedback/Responses from students (minimum 50% of total enrolled students) of First Professional, Second Professional, Third Professional, Interns shall be collected online .College will be required to upload Professional Year wise with information like ***“Name of students”*** and ***“their Email Ids”*** and further they are ***“living in Hostel provided by College or not”*** for taking online Feedback .Feedback will be taken based on following parameters- :

<i>*Dimension-1: Student Feedback vis-à-vis Teaching Learning Opportunities & Facilities</i>	<i>**Dimension-2: Impact of MBBS Program on Inspiration of Students</i>
1) <i>Clinical Postings & Exposure</i>	1) <i>Perceived Quality of Faculty</i>

2) Skill Laboratory/Simulation Lab 3) Support of Faculty for any difficulty in Learning 4) Indoor & Outdoor Sports facilities 5) Hygiene & Sanitation (College, Hostel & Teaching Hospital) 6) Quality drinking water & Canteen/Mess Facilities in College/Teaching Hospital 7) Hostel Facilities 8) Central Library Facilities 9) Safety Measures in Campus	2) Perceived Career Support Facilities & Programs 3) Perceived Motivation Level of Faculty 4) Perceived Motivation level of Medical Students 5) Perceived Readiness of UG Student in terms of Skills & Competencies required for Career in the medical field 6) Recommending medical field as career to relatives/known one/other aspirants for making their career as Health Care Professional
---	---

****Student Feedback for Teaching Learning Opportunities & Facilities will be online captured from First Professional & Second Professional.***

*****For analysing impact of UG Program on Inspiration of Students, responses of Third Professional & Interns will be online captured.***

Note :

- ***As per requirement of this parameter for dimension-1, each student of Professional First and Second will be given sub-parameters for responding related to Dimension-1. For dimension-2, each student of Third Professional & Interns will be required to give their responses for all 6 sub-parameters mentioned under Dimension-2.***
- ***For dimension-1, each sub parameter will be rated on 4-point scale.***
- ***For dimension-2, each sub parameter will be rated on 4-point scale.***

For computation of dimension wise average score, following formula will be used: -

$$\text{Dimension wise average rating score per student} = \frac{\text{Average rating score per student given to College}}{\text{Maximum possible score on dimension}} \times 100$$

Scoring Rubrics for this Parameter: -

Sub-Parameters	Rating Levels				Supporting documents
	Level-1	Level-2	Level-3	Level-4	
11.1.1- Student rating score on Dimension-1 (First & Second Professional students)	If the average score per student is equal or less than 25% of maximum score possible on this dimension	If the average score per student is >25% to ≤50% of maximum scores possible on this dimension	If the average score per student of >50% to ≤75% of maximum scores possible on this dimension	If the average score per student of ≥75 % of maximum scores possible on this dimension	Minimum 50% students of each Professional must submit their responses
11.1.2- Student & Intern rating score on Dimension-2 (Third Professional and interns)	If the average score per student is equal or less than 25% of maximum score possible on this dimension	If the average score per student is >25% to ≤50% of maximum scores possible on this dimension	If the average score per student of >50% to ≤75% of maximum scores possible on this dimension	If the average score per student of ≥75 % of maximum scores possible on this dimension	Minimum 50% students of each Professional must submit their responses

Note :for computing weightage score on this parameter based on above mentioned rubrics following formula will be used- :

Weightage score on Parameter-11.1=

$$\frac{\text{Obtained score on 11.1.1}}{4} + \frac{\text{Obtained score on 11.1.2}}{4} \times \text{AW}$$

2

Where AW =Assigned weightage to Parameter-11.1

Parameter-11.2: -Feedback from sampled Faculty & Loyalty Index

Feedback from all Faculty will be collected online .College will be required to upload Faculty names & their Email Ids for taking online Feedback .Feedback will be taken based on following parameters- :

Teacher Feedback vis-à-vis Work Conditions & Environment & Professional Aspiration	
1) Salary structures/Financial Entitlements 2) Promotion & Increments 3) Opportunity for Career Advancement 4) Faculty welfare and amenities (Privileges, Insurance, Health Check Ups) 5) Residential Facility /Accommodations for Staff 6) Workload 7) Recognition and Importance	8) Empathy of Management towards Faculty 9) Reward and Recognition for best performing tasks 10) Fair allocation & allotments of Responsibilities 11) Exposure to advanced Health Education Technology 12) Motivating Work Environment 13) Perceived reputation of the College 14) Academic Freedom & Flexibility 15) Recommending College among Medical Education aspirants for admission 16) Recommending College for Jobs

Note :

- **As per requirement of this parameter, each faculty (Professor, Associate Professor & Assistant Professors) will be required to online respond to above mentioned sub-parameter (1 to 16) in the above table.**

For computation of average score per faculty, following formula will be used: -

$$\text{Score of the College based on Feedback from Faculty} = \frac{\text{Average rating score per Faculty given to College}}{\text{Maximum overall possible score}} \times 100$$

Scoring Rubrics for this Parameter: -

Parameter	Rating Levels				Supporting documents
	Level-1	Level-2	Level-3	Level-4	
11.2- Rating based on Teaching Faculty Feedback	If the average score per teaching faculty is equal or less than 25% of maximum score	If the average score per teaching faculty is >25% to ≤50% of maximum scores possible on this dimension	If the average score per teaching faculty of >50% to ≤75% of maximum scores possible on this dimension	If the average score per teaching faculty of ≥75 % of maximum scores possible on this dimension	Minimum 50% of all full Faculties are essential

	possible on this dimension				
--	----------------------------	--	--	--	--

For computing Loyalty Index Following formula will be used:

$$\frac{\frac{\text{Score on 5.5 Parameter}}{4} + \frac{\text{Score on 11.2 Parameter}}{4}}{2} \times \text{Total weightgae assigned to Parameters 5.5 \& 11.2}$$

Note: Loyalty Index Value will range on the scale of 0 to 25.

Parameter-11.3 Perception of Alumni towards quality of Institution

Feedback from minimum 50 alumni representing oldest and youngest batches, shall be collected online .College will be required to upload Alumnus wise Names and their Email Ids for all batches for taking online Feedback .Feedback will be taken based on following parameters- :

- *Establishing Network of Alumni for Professional Interaction*
- *Organization of Alumni Meet*
- *Awards & Recognition for Best Performing Alumni*
- *Perceived Reputation of College among Medical Education aspirants*
- *Perceived reputation of college among employers*
- *Involvement of College at national & state level policy & decision making*
- *Perception of society towards alumni of this College*

For computation of average score per faculty, following formula will be used: -

$$\text{Score of the College based on Feedback from Alumni} = \frac{\text{Average rating score per Alumni given to College}}{\text{Maximum overall possible score}} \times 100$$

Scoring Rubrics for this Parameter: -

Parameter	Rating Levels				Supporting documents
	Level-1	Level-2	Level-3	Level-4	
11.3- Rating based on Alumni Feedback	If the average score per alumni faculty is equal or less than 25% of maximum score possible on this dimension	If the average score per alumni faculty is >25% to ≤50% of maximum scores possible on this dimension	If the average score per alumni faculty of >50% to ≤75% of maximum scores possible on this dimension	If the average score per teaching alumni of ≥75 % of maximum scores possible on this dimension	Minimum 50 Alumni are required to submit their Feedback

Parameter-11.4 Perception of Patients towards Health Care Services

Feedback from randomly selected minimum 2 OPD patient and 2 IPD Patient shall be collected on day of onsite visit from each clinical major clinical department namely Medicine and allied specialties (General Medicine, Paediatrics, Dermatology, Psychiatry), Surgery and allied specialties (General Surgery, Orthopedics, ENT, Ophthalmology), Obstetrics & Gynaecology on following parameters- :

- *Quality of Health Care Professional (Faculty of Clinical Departments, Residents)*
- *Attitude of Hospital Staff towards patients*
- *Measures for Hygiene and sanitation in Hospital*
- *Quality of Hospital Facility*

For computation of average score per faculty, following formula will be used: -

$$\text{Score of the College based on Feedback from Patients} = \frac{\text{Average rating score per Patient given to College}}{\text{Maximum overall possible score}} \times 100$$

Scoring Rubrics for this Parameter: -

Parameter	Rating Levels				Supporting documents
	Level-1	Level-2	Level-3	Level-4	

11.3- Rating based on Patient Feedback	If the average score per alumni faculty is equal or less than 25% of maximum score possible on this dimension	If the average score per alumni faculty is >25% to ≤50% of maximum scores possible on this dimension	If the average score per alumni faculty of >50% to ≤75% of maximum scores possible on this dimension	If the average score per teaching alumni of ≥75 % of maximum scores possible on this dimension	Minimum 10 to 15 Patient are required to submit their Feedback
---	---	--	--	--	--