REVISED FRAMEWORK FOR HEC BEST UNIVERSITY TEACHER AWARD

The Best University Teacher Award was established in 2003 to recognize outstanding teachers, and incentivize all faculty members to enhance their pedagogical skills. It is open to BPS, TTS, and contract faculty from public as well as private universities.

The framework of Best University Teacher Award was revised in 2019 wherein a different set of awards criteria, based on indicators of effective teaching, was incorporated with an aim to encourage more attention to teaching.

Objectives: Best University Teacher Award has three objectives.

- *Incentive*: Provide an incentive to faculty members to improve the quality of their teaching and pedagogy;
- *Pedagogical*: build a national consensus on what constitutes good teaching;
- *Capacity Building*: build a national database, accessible to all faculty members, especially junior faculty members, of syllabuses, grading systems (including tests, exams, quizzes), lesson plans, and lecture slides (PPTs).

A. Award Levels

The Best University Teacher Award has been split into two levels:

a. University-Level Best University Teacher Award
   The university level awards would be conferred directly by the universities. Each university's best teacher awards will consist of a certificate of merit, plus, if a university Syndicate so decides, a cash award of up to Rs. 200,000/-.

Only the winners of university level awards would be eligible for competing in the HEC national award competition.

b. National-Level Best University Teacher Award
   HEC would confer one or more national awards, to a limited number of recipients, to ensure their exclusivity and prestige. The HEC National Level Best University Teacher Award consists of a cash prize of Rs. 1,000,000/- (Rupees ten Lac only) along with a certificate of merit.

B. Award Criteria and Assessment Mechanism

The basic eligibility and revised set of criteria is placed below and at **Annex-I.**

i. Eligibility Requirements

Only those candidates who meet all these eligibility requirements will be considered for University-Level as well as National-Level Best University Teacher Awards.

Table 1: Eligibility Requirements			
SN	Check List (Please check all the boxes)	Response (Yes/No)	Attach evidence
1.	Is the candidate a full-time permanent faculty member, on TTS, BPS, or long-term contract, at an	Yes ☐ No ☐	*Employment Letter*

		HEC recognized public or private sector university or DAI?			
2.		Has the candidate completed three years of consecutive /active service as a permanent faculty at the nominating university or DAI?	Yes ☐	No ☐	*Letter from Registrar/VC/ Director QEC*
3.		Is the candidate less than 60 years of age?	Yes ☐	No ☐	*Copy of CNIC*
4.		Was the candidate physically present at the university in the previous three years?	Yes ☐	No ☐	*Letter (s) from VC/Registrar/ Director QEC*
5.		Did the candidate attend every class during the period of evaluation?	Yes ☐	No ☐	
6.		In case the candidate missed a class, was it on account of ill health or medical emergency (documentary evidence to be provided), and was the absence compensated by a make-up class?	Yes ☐	No ☐	
7.		Did the candidate avail long-term leave (i.e., exceeding 3 weeks during the period of evaluation?	Yes ☐	No ☐	*Leave Orders*
8.		Were there any disciplinary proceedings against the candidate during the previous three (03) years?	Yes ☐	No ☐	*Letter (s) from VC/Registrar/ Director QEC*
9.		Were there any adverse remark recorded in the ACRs of the candidate during the previous three (03) years?	Yes ☐	No ☐	
10.		Did the candidate receive the national Best University Teacher Award in the last five years?	Yes ☐	No ☐	
11.		Did the candidate serve as Vice Chancellor or any other key administrative position at the university during the past three years?	Yes ☐	No ☐	

ii.   **Parameters and Assessment Mechanism**

Table 2: Parameters and Assessment Mechanism			
Item	**Description**	**How Assessed**	**Weight**
Command of the Subject	Candidates should demonstrate effective command of the subject. In this regard, the relevant information includes their degrees and certificates, the course syllabus, tests, exams, and assignments prepared, and classroom interaction.	Review all relevant materials to assign a grade. Quality is based on qualifications plus direct evidence from syllabus, lectures, and tests, etc.	**10%**
Teaching Philosophy	Candidates should submit a short (max one page) statement of their teaching philosophy.	Evaluate quality and originality of statement.	**10%**
Course Syllabus, including the	"Syllabus" includes (a) succinct description of the *subject* of the course, (b) the *learning objectives*	Assign a grade based on the	**25%**

grading system, tests, and assignments, and the Lesson Plan	of the course (i.e., what would the students learn by taking the course), (c) the textbook (or textbooks) and supplementary course materials if needed, (d) expectations from the students, (e) grading system (see below), (f) the lesson plan (see below), (g) reference to any relevant university or HEC rules (e.g., on plagiarism), and (h) any special condition or requirement. The good grading system should induce students to undertake the work required for effective learning. Besides the grading scheme, it also includes tests, quizzes, if any, assignments, both in-class and homework, class participation, field work, lab work, and group work. The detailed lesson plan divides the course materials into individual lectures, each with its own (clearly defined) content, learning objectives, assigned readings, other homework assignments, and power point slides, if any	assessment of the syllabus, grading system, tests, etc., and lesson plan submitted by candidates.	(10% for Course Syllabus, 10 % for Grading and 5 % for Lesson Plan)
Classroom Teaching	Evaluation of (at least one) videotaped lecture by a candidate, including assessment of how the teacher set out the learning objectives at the start of the lecture, his/ her lecture style, classroom atmosphere, use of active learning, use of current event examples, student engagement. It should also be examined whether the teacher was able to achieve the learning objectives in the lecture.	Assign a grade based on review of the videotape, PPTs and background material (e.g., announcements regarding active learning practices).	**20%**
Use of Technology	Candidates will submit a statement on their approach to using modern technology tools in teaching, including audiovisual materials, flipped classrooms, automated grading systems, class blogs and social media, and others. Evidence should be provided on whether and how they deployed such tools.	Assign a grade based on review of the candidate's statement on the technology tools used by her/ him. Given that good teachers are looking for ways in which technology can help pedagogy, these questionnaires in Table 3 (Annex-I) can reveal the interest and commitment of candidates.	**5%**

Student interaction and mentoring	Candidates will provide a statement describing whether they were available for office hours, the time they spent per week on mentoring students, their approach to mentoring and supervision of research scholars and research teams, and their engagement in classroom blogs and social media channels.	Assign a grade based on review of candidate's statement and background materials. Besides interaction with course students, the questions in table 3 (Annex-I) provides a metric to determine the quality of the mentorship provided to graduate students.	**10%**
Student Evaluations	Student evaluations are one of the means of assessing teaching effectiveness.	This helps make comparative assessment of candidates. Assign a comparative grade based on review of all evaluation results	**20%**

These criteria may be revised from time to time. However, any future change in criteria will take effect only in the following year. The questionnaire at Table-3 (**Annex-I)** is to be filled as per the Parameters and Assessment Mechanism provided in Table-2 above.

C. PROCEDURE

a. All awards pertain to a particular academic year (Fall to Spring).

b. Upon announcement by HEC, the participating universities will issue the call for nominations, widely disseminating the information to all the departments, for University-Level Best University Teacher Award competitions.

c. Each participating university would set up a permanent selection committee, chaired by the Vice Chancellor (and including the Registrar, Director QEC, and other members) to review the applications or nominations and select the winners. The selection committee would finalize its decision by 15th November, and the results conveyed to HEC.

d. University-level best university teacher awards would be distributed at the time of the university convocation.

e. The winners of the university-level best teacher awards would automatically be entered into the competition for the HEC national best university teacher award. Only those whose application and supporting documents that were submitted for university-level award will be eligible for the national award.

f. Ten copies of the complete dossier, comprising all the documents and assessment (properly ordered, tagged/annexed with page numbers inserted) of the winner of the university-level best teacher award, must be submitted to HEC for consideration for National-Level Best University Teacher Award. The dossier must include the following:

   i.   A covering note prepared by the candidate.

   ii. Filled application form, duly signed by the VC/Registrar.

   iii. Latest CV of the candidate.

   iv. A certificate, duly signed by all members of the University's Selection Committee (in original), certifying that all eligibility criteria has been met.

   v.   Completed questionnaire (see **Annex-I**) with marks added and supporting documents of the candidate included, pertaining to the particular assessment period. The supporting documents must include the following:

   - The syllabus or syllabuses, including grading systems, exams, tests, quizzes, assignments and lesson plans.

   - Video tapes of lectures and PowerPoint presentation (PPTs). The videos are to be provided within a USB or uploaded at any hosting service over internet, for which a working link is to be provided).

   - Student evaluations of the courses being considered for the award, and the average evaluation scores of faculty member and courses across the department, faculty, and the entire university. Student evaluations are confidential documents, and would be available only to the evaluation committees.

   - Three one-page statements prepared by the candidate. The three statements are:
     1. Statement of teaching philosophy;
     2. Statement on how the faculty member used technology in the courses being evaluated.
     3. Statement on student interaction and mentoring.

g. HEC will set up a national evaluation committee (EC) to review the dossiers of the eligible candidates. Members of the EC will be selected carefully from amongst the best teachers in the country. They themselves will not be eligible for the award for a period of ten years.

h. The EC will finalize its recommendations by 31st December. The Commission Meeting in January will review the recommendations and approve the final selection.

D. TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF THE AWARD

1. The HEC Best University Teacher Award consists of a cash prize of Rs. 1,000,000 (Rupees one million) and a certificate of merit.

2. Each university's best teacher awards will consist of a certificate of merit, plus, if a university Syndicate so decides, a cash award of up to Rs. 200,000.

3. Only those who have won the competition for the University-Level Best Teacher Award are eligible to compete for the national level Best University Teacher Award.

4. The following are the eligibility requirements for university-level best teacher awards as well as the national best university teacher awards:

   i. They are full-time permanent faculty members, including those on TTS, BPS, or long-term contract, at any public or private sector university or DAI recognized by the HEC.

   ii. They have completed a minimum of three years of consecutive /active service as a permanent faculty of the nominating university or DAI prior to the date of the award.

   iii. They are less than 60 years of age.

   iv. They should have been physically present at the nominating university in the previous three years.

   v. They did not miss any class during the calendar year. An exemption may be provided in cases of ill health or medical emergency, on the production of documentary evidence, and if the absence was compensated by the organization of make-up classes in consultation with the students. QEC is responsible for validating this information.

   vi. They did not avail long-term leave (i.e., exceeding 3 weeks during the year of evaluation).

   vii. There were no disciplinary proceedings against them, e.g., on charges of plagiarism.

   viii. There are no adverse remarks in their ACRs during the previous three (03) years.

   ix. They did not receive the national Best University Teacher Award in the last five years. A teacher who has already received Best University Teacher Award may apply after a lapse of five years.

   x. They did not serve as Vice-Chancellors or on other key administrative positions in the university in the past three years.

   xi. Their application/ nomination along with all supporting documents have been provided on or before the annual deadline.

5. The Selection Committee will certify that all eligibility criteria have been met, and send the certificate, duly signed by all members, to HEC.

6. The Selection Committee of the University/DAI will select a winner and two runners up for the university-level award process.

7. HEC will only entertain nominations received according to the prescribed channel and procedure. HEC's decision will be based solely on the documentary record, plus the recommendation of the university selection committee.

8. Winners of the national Best University Teacher Award will not be allowed to compete for the award for a period of five years. Also, if they reapply after a lapse of five years or more, they will have to provide their syllabuses and supporting documents for the entire intervening period since their receipt of the award. The Evaluation Committee would have the right to examine the entire dossier in order to judge their eligibility for the subsequent awards.

9. Winners of university-level best teachers awards will be allowed to compete in future university-level competitions, and therefore indirectly in the national Best University Teacher Award competition, but will not be eligible for another cash prize from the university.

10. Members of the Evaluation Committee will not be eligible for the award for a period of ten years

11. The university will set up a mechanism to address grievances if any.

12. The University/DAI is responsible to ensure the transparency of the process.

13. HEC has the right to not make an award in a particular year.

14. The decision of the HEC will be final.

15. Anyone who provides false or misleading evidence will be barred from the competition for life. An award granted on the basis of false and misleading evidence will be withdrawn.

Questionnaires on Best University Teacher Award Evaluation Parameters

Important Notes:

i). Universities are required to follow "Parameters and Assessment Mechanism" mentioned in Table 2 above while responding to questions and assigning weights against each of the parameters.

ii). Response to all the questions within the questionnaires is mandatory. The questions carry equal marks, as below:

Yes = 2, Somewhat = 1, No = 0

iii). Weightage against each parameter must be calculated as per the following formulae:

(Marks Secured divided by Maximum Marks multiply by Weightage) x 100

Solved example for Parameter 3 below (Course Syllabus) in a scenario where answer to 9 questions is "Yes" and 2 questions is "Somewhat":

Total questions in parameter 3 are 11, thus maximum marks are 22

Weightage of parameter 3, as per Table 2 above, is 10 % or 10/100

Marks Secured for Yes: 9 x 2 = 18 and for Somewhat: 2x1 = 2, so total marks secured are 20

Weight calculation = (20/22 x 10/100) x 100 = 9.09

The total weight obtained by the candidate will be the sum of weights obtained by the candidate in all the nine parameters.

(Weight calculated on any other method or without responding against all questions will not be accepted).

iv). Universities are required to use the provided template in responding against each question under various evaluation parameters. Questionnaires not filled as per the below format will not be accepted.

v). No marks will be accepted if the required documentary evidence is not attached in support of accomplishments claimed. The evidences must be attached in order against each parameter and must be tagged properly to facilitate evaluation. The entire dossier must be page numbered.

vi). The questionnaires would be submitted to HEC along with other documents of the candidates for consideration of HEC National-Level Best University Teacher Award (see "Procedure" section above).

		Table 3 – Questionnaires on Best University Teacher Award Evaluation Parameters				
Name of Teacher: _____						
Designation & Department: _____						
University: _____						
Assessment Period: **Fall 2020 – Spring 2021**						
SN	**Parameter**	**Check List**	**Response (Yes/Somewhat/No)**			**Attach evidences (with appropriate title/Annex number)**
1.		i. Does candidate have a degree in the discipline?	Yes ☐		No ☐	

			Response (Yes/Somewhat/No)			
	Command of the Subject	ii. Does candidate have a certificate, diploma, or other qualification in the course topic?	Yes ☐		No ☐	*For example: Copies of Degree, Diploma, certificates etc.*
	Maximum marks (10);	iii. Does the syllabus demonstrate command of the subject?	Yes ☐		No ☐	
	Weight (10%)	iv. Do the exams/assignments demonstrate command?	Yes ☐	Somewhat ☐	No ☐	
		v. Does the lecture and classroom interaction demonstrate command of the subject?	Yes ☐	Somewhat ☐	No ☐	
Weight obtained by the candidate under "Command of Subject"						

Table-3 – Questionnaires on Best University Teacher Award Evaluation Parameters					
SN	**Parameter**	**Check List**	**Response (Yes/Somewhat/No)**		**Attach evidences (with appropriate title/Annex number)**
2.	*Teaching Philosophy* *Weight (10%)*	i. Has the candidate submitted their statement of teaching philosophy?	Yes ☐	No ☐	*One page statement on Teaching Philosophy*
Weight obtained by the candidate under "Teaching Philosophy"			*Weight should be assigned upon evaluating the quality and originality of the statement.*		

Table-3 – Questionnaires on Best University Teacher Award Evaluation Parameters						
SN	**Parameter**	**Check List**	**Response (Yes/Somewhat/No)**			**Attach evidences (with appropriate title/Annex number)**
3.	*Course Syllabus* *Maximum marks (22);*	i. Was the syllabus made available ahead of time?	Yes ☐		No ☐	*Course Syllabus (s) developed during the assessment period*
		ii. Does the syllabus describe the subject matter effectively?	Yes ☐	Somewhat ☐	No ☐	
		iii. Are the learning objectives clear and well crafted?	Yes ☐	Somewhat ☐	No ☐	
		iv. Does the syllabus list any prerequisites for the course?	Yes ☐		No ☐	
		v. Is there a main textbook for the course?	Yes ☐		No ☐	
		vi. Was the textbook published in the last three years?	Yes ☐		No ☐	
		vii. Are other course materials (if any) selected professionally?	Yes ☐	Somewhat ☐	No ☐	

	Weight (10%)	viii. Does the syllabus list the expectations from the students?	Yes ☐		No ☐	
		ix. Does the course ask students to read the assigned materials ahead of time?	Yes ☐		No ☐	
		x. Does the syllabus list or refer to relevant university or HEC rules (e.g., on plagiarism)?	Yes ☐		No ☐	
		xi. Does the syllabus describe any special condition or requirement for the course?	Yes ☐		No ☐	
Weight obtained by the candidate under "Course Syllabus"						

Table-3 – Questionnaires on Best University Teacher Award Evaluation Parameters						
SN	**Parameter**	**Check List**	**Response (Yes/Somewhat/No)**			**Attach evidences (with appropriate title/Annex number)**
4.	*Grading System, Tests, and Assignments* Maximum marks (32); *Weight (10%)*	i. Does the syllabus describe the grading system (i.e., distribution of grades for different exams, tests, assignments, etc.)?	Yes ☐	Somewhat ☐	No ☐	*Grading System, Tests, Quizzes, Assignments, developed during the assessment period*
		ii. Have the tests, if any, been prepared professionally?	Yes ☐	Somewhat ☐	No ☐	
		iii. Do the test questions assess proficiency in the learning objectives?	Yes ☐	Somewhat ☐	No ☐	
		iv. Have the quizzes, if any, been prepared professionally?	Yes ☐	Somewhat ☐	No ☐	
		v. Do the quizzes reward preparation or insight?	Yes ☐	Somewhat ☐	No ☐	
		vi. Has the professor given in-class assignments?	Yes ☐		No ☐	
		vii. Has the professor given homework assignments?	Yes ☐		No ☐	
		viii. Do the students receive grades for completion of the assignments?	Yes ☐		No ☐	
		ix. Does the grading system encourage students to act in ways as to achieve learning objectives?	Yes ☐	Somewhat ☐	No ☐	
		x. Does the professor assign grades for class participation?	Yes ☐		No ☐	
		xi. Do the course describe how class participation will be graded?	Yes ☐		No ☐	
		xii. Does the course require field work?	Yes ☐		No ☐	
		xiii. Does the course require lab work?	Yes ☐		No ☐	

		xiv. Does the course outline describe how field work or lab work, if relevant, will be graded?	Yes ☐	Somewhat ☐	No ☐	
		xv. Does the course require group work?	Yes ☐		No ☐	
		xvi. Does the course outline describe how group work will be graded?	Yes ☐		No ☐	
Weight obtained by the candidate under "*Grading System, Tests, and Assignments*"						

Table-3 – Questionnaires on Best University Teacher Award Evaluation Parameters						
SN	**Parameter**	**Check List**	**Response (Yes/Somewhat/No)**			**Attach evidences (with appropriate title/Annex number)**
5.	***Lesson Plan*** *Maximum marks (14);* ***Weight (05%)***	i. Has the faculty member (candidate) submitted a detailed lesson plan for the entire semester (i.e., division of the course materials into individual lectures, with clearly defined content, learning objectives for each lecture, assigned readings, other homework assignments, and power point slides, if any)?	Yes ☐		No ☐	*Lesson Plan (s) developed during the assessment period*
		ii. Does the lesson plan provide learning objectives for each lecture?	Yes ☐	Somewhat ☐	No ☐	
		iii. Does the lesson plan provide a precise reading assignment (both textbook and other readings) for each lecture?	Yes ☐	Somewhat ☐	No ☐	
		iv. Is the volume of assigned readings for each lecture feasible for students to undertake?	Yes ☐		No ☐	
		v. Does the lesson plan include homework assignments?	Yes ☐		No ☐	
		vi. Does the lesson plan include in-class assignments or quizzes?	Yes ☐		No ☐	
		vii. Does the lesson plan provide for active learning in the classroom?	Yes ☐	Somewhat ☐	No ☐	
Weight obtained by the candidate under "Lesson Plan"						

		Table-3 – Questionnaires on Best University Teacher Award Evaluation Parameters				
SN	Parameter	Check List	Response (Yes/Somewhat/No)			Attach evidences (with appropriate title/Annex number)
6.	*Classroom Teaching* *Maximum marks (34);* *Weight (20%)*	i. Does the professor use PPTs?	Yes ☐	Somewhat ☐	No ☐	*PPTs developed during the assessment period*
		ii. Have the PPTs been made available to the students?	Yes ☐		No ☐	
		iii. Is the length of the PPTs suitable for the time allotted for the lecture?	Yes ☐		No ☐	
		iv. Are the PPTs designed professionally (i.e., they are not just a handful of slides thrown together without regard to the learning objectives, assigned readings, in-class assignments, or active learning modules)?	Yes ☐	Somewhat ☐	No ☐	
		v. Do the PPTs demonstrate the faculty member's command of the subject?	Yes ☐	Somewhat ☐	No ☐	
		vi. Has the university submitted a videotaped lecture by the candidate?	Yes ☐		No ☐	*Videotape (s) of Lectures captured during the assessment period*
		vii. In the videotape, did the candidate introduce the learning objectives for that specific lecture?	Yes ☐	Somewhat ☐	No ☐	
		viii. In the videotape, did the faculty member succeed in achieving the learning objectives for the specific lecture?	Yes ☐	Somewhat ☐	No ☐	
		ix. In the videotape, does the faculty member demonstrate adequate command of the subject?	Yes ☐	Somewhat ☐	No ☐	
		x. In the videotape, does the faculty member's lecture style engage the attention and interest of the students?	Yes ☐	Somewhat ☐	No ☐	
		xi. (If relevant) In the videotape, if there was the presentation of a mathematical or quantitative example or problem, was the professor well-prepared in presenting such a problem?	Yes ☐	Somewhat ☐	No ☐	
		xii. (If relevant) was the mathematical/ quantitative problem explained effectively to students?	Yes ☐	Somewhat ☐	No ☐	
		xiii. In the videotape, does the faculty member create a respectful classroom atmosphere?	Yes ☐	Somewhat ☐	No ☐	

		xiv. In the videotape, is there a use of active learning?	Yes ☐	Somewhat ☐	No ☐	
		xv. (If relevant), in the videotape, are the active learning modules effective and have been designed carefully?	Yes ☐	Somewhat ☐	No ☐	
		xvi. (If relevant) In the videotape, does the faculty member use current event examples to illustrate the issues and motivate the discussion?	Yes ☐	Somewhat ☐	No ☐	
		xvii. (If relevant) In the videotape, does the faculty member handle politically controversial issues in a balanced manner?	Yes ☐	Somewhat ☐	No ☐	
Weight obtained by the candidate under "Classroom Teaching"						

Table-3 – Questionnaires on Best University Teacher Award Evaluation Parameters						
SN	**Parameter**	**Check List**	**Response (Yes/Somewhat/No)**			**Attach evidences (with appropriate title/Annex number)**
7.	***Use of Technology*** *Maximum marks (16) for questions ii-ix with **03% weightage;*** ***2 % weight*** *for the Statement on use of technology by the candidate*	i. Did the candidate submit a statement on their use of technology in teaching?	Yes ☐		No ☐	*One page statement by the candidate on Use of Technology.* *(Weight to the statement should be assigned upon evaluating its quality and originality)*
		ii. Does the faculty member use any of the modern technological tools listed below?	Yes ☐	Somewhat ☐	No ☐	
		iii. Does the faculty member assign any audiovisual materials as homework assignment or use them in the classroom?	Yes ☐		No ☐	
		iv. Does the faculty member use the flipped classroom approach?	Yes ☐		No ☐	
		v. Does the faculty member use an automated grading system, e.g., for in-class quizzes?	Yes ☐		No ☐	
		vi. Does the faculty member ask students to participate in a class	Yes ☐		No ☐	

		blog or class-related social media pages?				
		vii. Does the faculty member communicate with students through email list servers or other group arrangements?	Yes ☐		No ☐	
		viii. Does the faculty member encourage or require assignments to be submitted electronically?	Yes ☐		No ☐	
		ix. Does the faculty member use smart classroom technology for interactive learning?	Yes ☐		No ☐	
Weight obtained by the candidate under "Use of Technology"						

Table-3 – Questionnaires on Best University Teacher Award Evaluation Parameters						
SN	Parameter	Check List	Response (Yes/Somewhat/No)			Attach evidences (with appropriate title/Annex number)
8.	*Student interaction and mentoring* *Maximum marks (14) for questions ii-viii with 05% weightage;* *5 % weight for the Statement on Mentoring and Student Interaction Activities*	i. Did the candidate provide a statement regarding their mentoring and student interaction activities?	Yes ☐		No ☐	*Statement by the candidate on Mentoring and Student Interaction Activities* *(Weight to the statement should be assigned upon evaluating its quality and originality)*
		ii. Does the faculty member announce regular office hours in which students could see her/him for follow up questions or course-related help?	Yes ☐		No ☐	
		iii. In the videotape, does the faculty member try to create an interactive learning environment in which students feel comfortable in asking questions?	Yes ☐	Somewhat ☐	No ☐	
		iv. Does the faculty member make an attempt to link the subject to current events or other issues that might be of interest to students?	Yes ☐	Somewhat ☐	No ☐	
		v. (For faculty members advising graduate students) Does the	Yes ☐	Somewhat ☐	No ☐	

		faculty member have a clearly articulated system for supervising graduate students and research teams?				
	vi.	(For faculty members advising graduate students) Does the faculty member meet regularly with their graduate student mentees?	Yes ☐	Somewhat ☐	No ☐	
	vii.	(For faculty members advising graduate students) Does the faculty member allocate a minimum of 8 hours per week on mentoring students outside of the classroom?	Yes ☐	Somewhat ☐	No ☐	
	viii.	Does the faculty member participate personally in classroom blogs or class-related social media pages, e.g., by commenting on posts, raising issues, or providing guidance?	Yes ☐	Somewhat ☐	No ☐	
Weight obtained by the candidate under "*Student Interaction and Mentoring*"						

Table-3 – Questionnaires on Best University Teacher Award Evaluation Parameters						
SN	**Parameter**	**Check List**	**Response (Yes/Somewhat/No)**			**Attach evidences (with appropriate title/Annex number)**
9.	***Student Evaluations*** *Maximum marks (04); Weightage (20%)*	i. Has the university submitted student evaluations for the candidate faculty member?	Yes ☐		No ☐	*Student Evaluation Forms/Results For the assessment period*
		ii. Has the university provided evaluation averages across the entire universities and for the department and faculty of the candidate?	Yes ☐		No ☐	
Weight obtained by the candidate under "*Student Evaluations*"						