

## Annexure-II

### PRE-VISIT EVALUATION REPORT

<<INSTITUTE NAME>>

<<PROGRAMME>>

<<VISIT DATE>>

For all accreditation criteria, the findings shall be 'Y' Compliance, 'C' Concern, 'W' Weakness and 'D' Deficiency. No cells are to be left blank. Justification is required for 'C' Concern, 'W' Weakness and 'D' Deficiency. Please provide the justification below the table.

Criteria	Compliance	Observation and remarks for Non-Compliance
<b>Criterion-1: Vision, Mission and Programme Educational Objectives</b>		
Vision of the institute and department should be futuristic and the mission helps to achieve.		
Defined PEOs must reflect the career and professional accomplishments of the graduates and also measurable		
Program Curriculum and other attributes must contribute to the achievement of stated PEO's.		
Administrative system must help in the assessment and attainment of PEO's.		
Assessment tools and processes must be appropriate and sufficient for measuring the attainment of PEOs.		
The questions in the survey questionnaires must elicit required information from the stakeholders to measure the attainment of PEOs.		
List the identified documents/evidences which are to be verified for evaluating the attainment of PEOs.		
<b>Criterion-2: Programme Outcomes</b>		
Defined POs must address all the GAs of NBA.		
Established correlations among PEOs, POs and COs must be appropriate and meaningful.		
Each PO should be addressed by one or more course outcomes.		
Adapted content delivery methods must contribute in achieving COs.		
Course assessment tools and mechanisms must be appropriate for measuring the attainment of COs.		
Curriculum improvements brought in must be significant for improving the attainment of POs.		
List the identified documents/evidences which are to be verified for evaluating the attainment of POs.		
<b>Criterion-3: Programme Curriculum</b>		
The programme curriculum must satisfy the program specific criteria considered.		
The curricular components must contribute to the attainment of articulated PEOs and POs.		

Curriculum design and development process must fulfill the requirements of stakeholders.		
Industry institute interaction must facilitate in achieving POs.		
<b>Criterion-4: Student Performance</b>		
Number of students admitted against the approved intake over the 3 academic years must be either maximum or increasing.		
Placement/higher studies information provided must be Consistent with SI & API?		
Stated professional activities must be appropriate and sufficient in achieving PEO's and PO's.		
List the documents to be verified to assess the programmes claim vis-a-vis in placement and higher studies.		
List the documents/evidences to be verified for confirming the entries made in SI and API?		
<b>Criterion-5: Faculty Contributions</b>		
Observations made on STR, FQI, Faculty Cadre Ratio, FRP, Faculty interactions outside world, and patents filed must comply with the programme requirements.		
Programme under accreditation must have faculty competency stated in SAR.		
Faculty publications must be located in internet with DOI/Publisher and reflecting the entries made in FRP.		
List the documents to be verified to ensure the entries for STR, FCR, FQI, FRPI, FRP, FIPR & FIP?		
<b>Criterion-6 : Facilities and Technical Support</b>		
Lecture hall, tutorial halls, seminar halls and laboratory etc., stated must satisfy the programme requirements.		
Programme must have qualified and adequate technical staff to conduct the laboratory courses.		
<b>Criterion-7: Academic Support and Teaching and Learning process</b>		
Number of faculty and their qualifications must be adequate to handle the first year courses of all programs offered by the institute.		
Laboratories listed in the SAR for first year courses of the institute including language laboratory must be sufficient.		
Teaching – Learning process adopted in First year courses as per SAR must meet the outcome based education.		
<b>Criterion-8: Governance, Institutional Support and Financial Resources</b>		
Campus infrastructure, administrative setup, etc., must be as per the programme requirements.		
Budget allocation must be adequate to run the programmes offered by the institute.		
List the documents/evidences to be verified for confirming the entries made in SAR		
<b>Criterion-9: Continuous Improvement</b>		
Newly created facilities in the program must contribute towards attainment of PEO's/PO's.		
Overall improvements made for the programme since last accreditation must be significant.		

## Annexure-III

### CHAIRPERSON EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

<<INSTITUTE NAME>>

<<PROGRAMME>>

<<VISIT DATE>>

#### 1. OVERVIEW

##### 1.1 Visit of Information

The visiting team of National Board of Accreditation (NBA) conducted a three day accreditation visit to <insert name of institution/university>, to evaluate <number > programmes from \_\_\_\_ to \_\_\_\_.

During the visit, the visiting team met with Head of the Institution/Dean ----- . The briefing on the institution was given by ----- and on programmes were given by the respective Head of the Departments/Programme Coordinators. The respective programme evaluators also visited the various facilities of the programmes. Apart from comprehensive review of documental evidences pertaining to various accreditation criteria, the visiting team also held meetings and interviews with all the stakeholders such as faculty, staff members, alumni, employers, parents and students.

The visiting team of NBA comprised:

Visiting Team Chairperson	<name, affiliation, contact information>
<programme title with abbreviation>	
Programme Evaluator 1	<name, affiliation, contact information>
Programme Evaluator 2	<name, affiliation, contact information>
<programme title with abbreviation>	
Programme Evaluator 1	<name, affiliation, contact information>
Programme Evaluator 2	<name, affiliation, contact information>
<programme title with abbreviation>	
Programme Evaluator 1	<name, affiliation, contact information>
Programme Evaluator 2	<name, affiliation, contact information>
<programme title with abbreviation>	
Programme Evaluator 1	<name, affiliation, contact information>
Programme Evaluator 2	<name, affiliation, contact information>
<programme title with abbreviation>	
Programme Evaluator 1	<name, affiliation, contact information>
Programme Evaluator 2	<name, affiliation, contact information>

## 1.2 Previous Accreditation Details

Programme title	First accredited		Last accredited	
	Number of years/Grade	With effect from	Number of years/ Grade	With effect from

## 1.3 Institutional Information

Name of the Institution/University	
Address	
Year of Establishment	
Name of Head of the Institution/Dean	
Number of Departments/Faculties	
Number of Undergraduate Programmes	
Number of Postgraduate Programmes	
Ph.D degree programmes offering, if applicable	Yes/no
Intake Details : UG/PG/Ph.D	
Number of Teaching faculty	
Number of supporting staff	
Any Special recognition e.g: a prominent public research center, strong industry involvement	

## 1.4 Summary of findings

### Programme Title 1 < Name of the programme >

Strength:

Concern:

Weakness:

Deficiency:

### Programme Title 2 < Name of the programme >

Strength:

Concern:

Weakness:

Deficiency:

### Programme Title 3 < Name of the programme >

Strength:

Concern:

Weakness:

Deficiency:

**Programme Title 4 < Name of the programme>**

Strength:

Concern:

Weakness:

Deficiency:

**Programme Title 5 < Name of the programme>**

Strength:

Concern:

Weakness:

Deficiency:

**Signature of the Chairperson**

**Annexure-IV**

**CHAIRPERSON REPORT**

<<INSTITUTE NAME>>

<<PROGRAMME>>

<<VISIT DATE>>

For all accreditation criteria, the findings shall be 'Y' Compliance, 'C' Concern, 'W' Weakness and 'D' Deficiency. No cells are to be left blank. Justification is required for 'C' Concern, 'W' Weakness and 'D' Deficiency. Please provide the justification below the table.

Programme Title < Name of the Programme>

Criteria	Programme Evaluator 1		Programme Evaluator 2	
	Compliance	Observation and remarks for Non-Compliance	Compliance	Observation and remarks for Non-Compliance
<b>Criterion-1: Vision, Mission and Programme Educational Objectives</b>				
The published PEOs should reflect the professional and career accomplishments of graduates and be in line with the mission				
Administrative system should be in place to monitor the process of attaining PEOs				
There should be documented process to assess the attainment of PEOs				
Published PEOs must be achieved through the attainment of POs				
There must be a documented and effective process for the periodic review and revision of these PEOs				
<b><u>Comments of the Chairperson</u></b>				

Criteria	Programme Evaluator 1		Programme Evaluator 2	
	Compliance	Observation and remarks for Non- Compliance	Compliance	Observation and remarks for Non- Compliance
<b>Criterion-2:Programme Outcomes</b>				
There must be a documented process in place to measure the attainment of defined POs				
The defined COs must contribute to the attainment of POs				
Attainment of defined POs with respect to the Graduate Attributes (GAs) of NBA				
1. Engineering Knowledge				
2. Problem Analysis				
3. Design/development of solutions				
4. Conduct investigations of complex problems				
5. Modern tool usage				
6. The engineer and society				
7. Environment and sustainability				
8. Ethics				
9. Individual and team work				
10. Communication				
11. Project management and finance				
12. Life-long learning				
Appropriate content delivery and assessment methods/tools should be employed in attainment of POs				
Curricular delivery and assessment methods should be amended based on the attainment of POs				
Each PO must contribute significantly to achieve at least one of the PEOs				
There must be a documented and effective process for the periodic review and revisions of these POs				
<b><u>Comments of the Chairperson</u></b>				

Criteria	Programme Evaluator 1		Programme Evaluator 2	
	Compliance	Observation and remarks for Non- Compliance	Compliance	Observation and remarks for Non- Compliance
<b>Criterion-3:Programme Curriculum</b>				
The structured curriculum must address programme specific criteria				
Components of the curriculum must sufficiently address these defined POs/COs				
Outcomes of the core engineering courses must help the graduate to acquire the professional competence, knowledge and skills.				
The process must have the feature of justifying the requirements for improvement in courses, curriculum, content delivery and assessment methods				
The programme must have the participation/involvement of relevant industries in content delivery and curriculum design.				
<b><u>Comments of the Chairperson</u></b>				

Criteria	Programme Evaluator 1		Programme Evaluator 2	
	Compliance	Observation and remarks for Non- Compliance	Compliance	Observation and remarks for Non- Compliance
<b>Criterion-4: Student Performance</b>				
Success rate, Academic performance, Placement and Higher Studies and Professional activities which include entrepreneurship initiative, product design, innovations etc., must be in consistent with attained POs and PEOs.				
<b><u>Comments of the Chairperson</u></b>				

Criteria	Programme Evaluator 1		Programme Evaluator 2	
	Compliance	Observation and remarks for Non- Compliance	Compliance	Observation and remarks for Non- Compliance
<b>Criterion-5: Faculty Contributions</b>				
Faculty strength, qualification, cadre and competencies must help the graduates to attain the defined COs and POs				
Research activities of faculty including consultancy and knowledge transfer must contribute for better content delivery and project work towards the attainment of COs and POs				
<b><u>Comments of the Chairperson</u></b>				

Criteria	Programme Evaluator 1		Programme Evaluator 2	
	Compliance	Observation and remarks for Non- Compliance	Compliance	Observation and remarks for Non- Compliance
<b>Criterion-6 : Facilities and Technical Support</b>				
Facilities provided to faculty and students including teaching aids, lecture halls, faculty rooms, engineering laboratories, equipment etc. and competent technical staff must be helpful to enhance and innovate the teaching – learning process towards the attainment of POs				
<b><u>Comments of the Chairperson</u></b>				

Criteria	Programme Evaluator 1		Programme Evaluator 2	
	Compliance	Observation and remarks for Non- Compliance	Compliance	Observation and remarks for Non- Compliance
<b>Criterion-7: Academic Support and Teaching and Learning process</b>				
Academic support units such as basic science/engineering laboratories, language laboratory, etc., must fulfill the prerequisite of core and optional engineering courses				
Teaching learning process including tutorial classes, mentoring system, feedback analysis, scope for self-learning, career guidance etc., must be functionally in place to impart knowledge and inculcate skills and attitudes in relation to basic science, mathematics and engineering.				
<b><u>Comments of the Chairperson</u></b>				

Criteria	Programme Evaluator 1		Programme Evaluator 2	
	Compliance	Observation and remarks for Non- Compliance	Compliance	Observation and remarks for Non- Compliance
<b>Criterion-8: Governance, Institutional Support and Financial Resources</b>				
Campus Infrastructure and other related facilities as library, internet, safety equipment's, counselling and emergency medical care facilities must satisfy the requirements of the programme				
Budget allocated and utilized must be adequate to run the programme and audited statements must be made available for stakeholders				
Governing body, functional administrative structure, policies and procedures, decentralization of power, delegation of financial power, grievance redressal mechanism etc., must satisfy the requirements/norms of concerned regulatory authorities and helpful to progress towards vision.				
<b><u>Comments of the Chairperson</u></b>				

Criteria	Programme Evaluator 1		Programme Evaluator 2	
	Compliance	Observation and remarks for Non- Compliance	Compliance	Observation and remarks for Non- Compliance
<b>Criterion-9: Continuous Improvement</b>				
Improvements/attainments in SI, API, STR, FQI, FRP etc., must be appreciable				
Efforts made by the faculty towards continuing education, new facility created and overcoming the shortcomings listed during the last accreditation/since the inception of the programme must be evident				
<b><u>Comments of the Chairperson</u></b>				

## Annexure-V

### PROGRAMME EVALUATOR SUMMARY

<<INSTITUTE NAME>>

<<PROGRAMME>>

<<VISIT DATE>>

#### 1. OVERVIEW

The visiting team of National Board of Accreditation (NBA) conducted a three day accreditation visit to <insert name of institution/university>, to evaluate UG programme <name of the programme> from \_\_\_\_ to \_\_\_\_\_. The programme of <name of the programme> offered in --- ----- . A Day 0 meeting was held on ----- at ----- to exchange of findings among evaluation team members, based on review of Self-Assessment Report (SAR) submitted by ----- - and the pre-visit evaluation reports. During the Day 0 meeting, a list of queries was consolidated to seek further clarification and understanding on the programme in addition to the discussion of identified common issues to all programmes.

During the visit, the visiting team met with Head of the Institution/Dean ----- The briefing on the institution was given by ----- and on the programme was given by the respective Head of the Department/Programme Coordinator. The respective programme evaluators also visited the various facilities -----, -----, of the programme. Apart from comprehensive review of documental evidences pertaining to various accreditation criteria, the visiting team also held meeting and interviews with all the stakeholders such as faculty, staff members, alumni, employers, parents and students.

The Programme Evaluation Team found a number of deficiencies, related primarily to non-compliance with criteria -----, ----- and ----- . Further, there are significant weaknesses in criteria -----, ----- and ----- .

#### 2. GENERAL INFORMATION

The <name of the programme> was first started in ----- The programme is offered as a full-time programme for four years duration for applicants with ----- qualification ----- . The total number of students in the programme is ----- . The total number of faculty members with the programme is ----- . The programme is -----

### **3. GENERAL OBSERVATIONS**

#### **Criterion 1: Vision, Mission and Programme Educational Objectives**

The <name of the institution> and the <name of the department/school> have well-defined vision and mission statements. The defined vision statements are futuristic and aspirational and mission statements are the means of attaining the vision. The PEOs are reflecting the professional and career accomplishments of the graduates after 4 to 5 years of graduation and also they are contributing to achieve the vision and mission of the department. Moreover, these PEOs address the needs of the programme stakeholders.

There is no well-defined process and support administrative setup for assessment and evaluation of PEOs. There was no evidence of assessment and evaluation process for assessment of attainment of PEOs. There are no formal mechanisms in place to receive feedbacks from practicing engineers and local industry for evaluating the attainment of PEO. There is no department level industry advisory committee for the programme offered.

The broad curriculum components of the programme are not sufficient to support the achievement of PEOs. There is no process for reviewing and redefining of the PEOs.

The major shortcomings is assessment and Evaluation of PEOs is not there.

Evaluation of Criterion 1 is a prime criterion for outcome based accreditation process. The programme evaluation team found a deficiency in the achievement of this criterion.

#### **Criterion 2: Programme Outcomes**

Programme Outcomes are well defined and they are in line with the NBA graduate attributes. All the POs are helpful to achieve the PEOs. All Course Outcomes are written in higher order blooms taxonomy. These COs are sufficient enough to achieve the Programme Outcomes. The methods of delivery of the courses are not suitable to achieve Course Outcomes as well as Programme Outcomes. There is large gap between the theory and laboratory work. Student projects are not suitable for the attainment of POs. The quality of laboratory experiments is poor.

There was no effective mechanism to assess the attainment of COs and also the documented process vis-à-vis the results of attainment of each PO was not properly illustrated. The faculty interviewed during the accreditation visit was ignorant of the concept of COs and POs. The course assessment tools and mechanisms are not appropriate for measuring the attainment of COs.

The major shortcomings are i) Assessment and Evaluation is not there and ii) Delivery of courses is not satisfactory

The programme evaluation team determined that the programme has a

deficiency/weakness in demonstrating the achievement of this criterion.

### **Criterion 3: Programme Curriculum**

The curriculum is developed <name of the programme> satisfies the applicable program criteria specified by < Professional society>. The curriculum documentation is satisfactory with all the information like prerequisites etc.

Students are required to complete ----- units of credit for graduation. Each course carries -- -- credit units. The final year project carries ----- credit units. Credit exemption is four. The total number of credits allocated for laboratory are ----- (distribution of theory and laboratory in terms of percentage).

Core engineering subjects and their relevance to programme outcomes are well illustrated. There were little evidences provided to demonstrate the industry's participation in the programme . There was no documented evidence of continuous improvement of courses and curriculum. The stated industry institute interaction is not facilitating in achieving POs.

The major shortcomings are i) The curriculum components are not suitable for the attainment of PEOs ii) No industry involvement is in the curriculum design, iii) The content is not sufficient in some of the courses for the attainment of POs and iv) The design experience is not sufficient for attaining the Program Outcomes b and c.

The programme evaluation team determined that the programme has a deficiency/weakness in demonstrating the achievement of this criterion.

### **Criterion 4: Students' Performance**

Student input quality is good and consistent. The success rate of students and academic performance are good.

The placement and higher studies information provided are not reflecting the attainment of POs. There is no proper document to assess the genuine of the programmes claim vis-à-vis in placement and higher studies.

The involvement of students in professional activities is not sufficient for the attainment of some of the POs defined. The student publications and organization of technical events are also average. There is no student magazine/news letter in the department for dissemination of various activities in the department. No innovative product designs/ Projects and entrepreneurship initiatives are evident by the students in the department.

The major shortcomings are i) Poor placement and higher studies record and ii) No innovative product design.

### **Criterion 5: Faculty Contributions**

The faculty competencies are not correlating to programme specific criteria defined. But STR is as per the AICTE norms. Faculty cadre ratio is not as per the AICTE norms. Faculty qualifications are average. Faculty participations in faculty development and training activities are poor. Faculty retention is average. No IPRs and no funded R&D projects. Faculty interaction with outside world is poor.

The major shortcomings are i) Competencies of faculty are not suitable to PSC and ii) Poor R&D

### **Criterion 6: Facilities and Technical Support**

Lecture halls, tutorial halls, seminar halls, laboratories and other teaching facilities are generally adequate to support the basic needs of the programme. However, the collection of books and reference materials in the department library is good. Laboratory facility may be further improved and to allow more accessibility to students.

It is noted that inadequate qualified technical supporting staff are there for program-specific laboratories.

The major shortcomings are i) Laboratory facilities needs improvement and ii) Inadequate qualified technical staff

### **Criterion 7: Academic Support Units and Teaching-Learning Process**

The number of faculty members and their qualifications are adequate to handle the first year courses of all programmes offered by the institute. The laboratory facilities for first year courses of the institute are sufficient. However, the language laboratory may further be improved.

There is no scope for self-learning in the teaching learning process adopted in first year courses. The provision for tutorial classes is not in time table. There is no evidence of feedback mechanism and remedial classes. The central computing facilities need improvement.

The major shortcomings are i) Feedback mechanism is not there, ii) Remedial classes are not conducted for weak students and iii) Quality of First year lab experiments is poor

### **Criterion 8: Governance, Institutional Support and Financial Resources**

All committees are constituted as per the statutory bodies regulations. Institutional support system is adequate for the programme. The financial resources to support the program and department are sufficient. But there is no proper mechanism in the institution for budget proposal, approval and procurement.

The major shortcomings is Poor budget planning mechanism

#### **Criterion 9: Continuous Improvement**

The improvement in the success index, academic performance and STR is good. But improvement in faculty qualification index is average. No improvement is seen in R&D. Continuing education activities are very less.

The newly created facilities in the programme are not contributing to attain of POs.

Overall improvements made for the programme since last accreditation are poor.

The major shortcomings are i) No improvement in the faculty qualifications and ii) R&D improvement is poor

#### **4. AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENTS**

- a) PEO and PO assessment and evaluation process need to be defined and implemented
- b) Continuous improvement based on the assessment of PEOs, POs and COs
- c) Feedback and follow up action mechanism need improve teaching and learning
- d) Use modern teaching aids
- e) Course delivery needs improvement

#### **5. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

The NBA Evaluation Team would like to thank <name of the institute> for their cooperation for smooth conducting of evaluation.

#### **6. PROGRAMME EVALUATION FORM**

The observations of the NBA Evaluation Team for consideration of the Programme relating to various criteria are contained in Appendix 1: Programme Evaluation worksheet – A and Appendix 2: Programme Evaluation worksheet - B

## Annexure -VI

### PROGRAMME EVALUATION WORK SHEET – PART A

#### Institution

Name of institution/university	
Name of affiliating university (if applicable)	
Address with Phone and email	

#### Programme for accreditation

Name of the programme (as it appears on graduate's certificate)	
Abbreviation of Programme	
Name of the Department/School	
Year of starting of the programme	
Expiry date of last accreditation (if applicable)	

#### Evaluation Team

Name, designation and affiliation of Visiting Team Chairperson	
Name, designation and affiliation of Programme Evaluator 1	
Name, designation and affiliation of Programme Evaluator 2	
Dates of the present accreditation visit	

For all accreditation criteria, the findings shall be 'Y' Compliance, 'C' Concern, 'W' Weakness and 'D' Deficiency. No cells are to be left blank. Justification is required for 'C' Concern, 'W' Weakness and 'D' Deficiency. Please provide the justification below the table.

Criteria	Compliance	Observation and remarks for Non-Compliance
<b>Criterion-1: Vision, Mission and Programme Educational Objectives</b>		
The published PEOs should reflect the professional and career accomplishments of graduates and be in line with the mission		
Administrative system should be in place to monitor the process of attaining PEOs		
There should be documented process to assess the attainment of PEOs		
Published PEOs must be achieved through the attainment of POs		
There must be a documented and effective process for the periodic review and revision of these PEOs		
<b>Criterion-2:Programme Outcomes</b>		
There must be a documented process in place to measure the attainment of defined POs		
The defined COs must contribute to the attainment of POs		
Attainment of defined POs with respect to the Graduate Attributes (GAs) of NBA		
1. Engineering Knowledge		
2. Problem Analysis		
3. Design/development of solutions		
4. Conduct investigations of complex problems		
5. Modern tool usage		
6. The engineer and society		
7. Environment and sustainability		
8. Ethics		
9. Individual and team work		
10. Communication		
11. Project management and finance		
12. Life-long learning		
Appropriate content delivery and assessment methods/tools should be employed in attainment of POs		
Curricular delivery and assessment methods should be amended based on the attainment of POs		
Each PO must contribute significantly to achieve at least one of the PEOs		
There must be a documented and effective process for the periodic review and revisions of these POs		
<b>Criterion-3:Programme Curriculum</b>		
The structured curriculum must address programme specific criteria		
Components of the curriculum must sufficiently address these		

defined POs/COs		
Outcomes of the core engineering courses must help the graduate to acquire the professional competence, knowledge and skills.		
The process must have the feature of justifying the requirements for improvement in courses, curriculum, content delivery and assessment methods		
The programme must have the participation/involvement of relevant industries in content delivery and curriculum design.		
<b>Criterion-4: Student Performance</b>		
Success rate, Academic performance, Placement and Higher Studies and Professional activities which include entrepreneurship initiative, product design, innovations etc., must be in consistent with attained POs and PEOs.		
<b>Criterion-5: Faculty Contributions</b>		
Faculty strength, qualification, cadre and competencies must help the graduates to attain the defined COs and POs		
Research activities of faculty including consultancy and knowledge transfer must contribute for better content delivery and project work towards the attainment of COs and POs		
<b>Criterion-6 : Facilities and Technical Support</b>		
Facilities provided to faculty and students including teaching aids, lecture halls, faculty rooms, engineering laboratories, equipment etc. and competent technical staff must be helpful to enhance and innovate the teaching – learning process towards the attainment of POs		
<b>Criterion-7: Academic Support and Teaching and Learning process</b>		
Academic support units such as basic science/engineering laboratories, language laboratory, etc., must fulfill the prerequisite of core and optional engineering courses		
Teaching learning process including tutorial classes, mentoring system, feedback analysis, scope for self-learning, career guidance etc., must be functionally in place to impart knowledge and inculcate skills and attitudes in relation to basic science, mathematics and engineering.		
<b>Criterion-8: Governance, Institutional Support and Financial Resources</b>		
Campus Infrastructure and other related facilities as library, internet, safety equipment's, counselling and emergency medical care facilities must satisfy the requirements of the programme		
Budget allocated and utilized must be adequate to run the programme and audited statements must be made available for stakeholders		
Governing body, functional administrative structure, policies and procedures, decentralization of power, delegation of financial power, grievance redressal mechanism etc., must satisfy the requirements/norms of concerned regulatory authorities and helpful to progress towards vision.		
<b>Criterion-9: Continuous Improvement</b>		
Improvements/attainments in SI, API, STR, FQI, FRP etc., must		

be appreciable		
Efforts made by the faculty towards continuing education, new facility created and overcoming the shortcomings listed during the last accreditation/since the inception of the programme must be evident.		

**PROGRAMME EVALUATION WORKSHEET – B**

Programme Name: \_\_\_\_\_

For all accreditation criteria, the findings shall be ‘Y’ Compliance, ‘C’ Concern, ‘W’ Weakness and ‘D’ Deficiency. No cells are to be left blank. Justification is required for ‘C’ Concern, ‘W’ Weakness and ‘D’ Deficiency. Please provide the justification below the table.

<b>Criterion 1: Vision, Mission and Programme Educational Objectives</b>								
No.	Criteria	Points		Compliance		Non Compliance		Brief statement detailing evidence used to determine ‘C’, ‘W’ or ‘D’
		Max. Points	Points Awarded	Without concern	With concern	Weakness	Deficiency	
1.1	<b>Mission and Vision</b>	5		<overall level of compliance for sub-criterion 1.1>				
	1.1.1 Vision and Mission statements of the Institute and Department	1						
	1.1.2 Publishing and Dissemination of Vision and Mission statements	2						
	1.1.3 Process for defining Vision and Mission of the department	2						
1.2	<b>Programme Educational Objectives</b>	15		<overall level of compliance for sub-criterion 1.2>				
	1.2.1 Description of PEOs	2						
	1.2.2 Publishing and Dissemination of PEOs	2						
	1.2.3 Stakeholders of the programme and their relevance	1						
	1.2.4 Process for establishing the PEOs	5						
	1.2.5 Consistency of PEOs with Mission	5						
1.3	<b>Attainment of Programme Educational Objectives</b>	30		<overall level of compliance for sub-criterion 1.3>				
	1.3.1 Justifications for contributions of programme curriculum towards attainment of PEOs	15						
	1.3.2 Administrative system helps in ensuring the attainment of the PEOs	15						
1.4	<b>Assessment of attainment of Programme Educational Objectives</b>	40		<overall level of compliance for sub-criterion 1.4>				
	1.4.1 Tools and Processes used in assessment of the attainment of the PEOs	10						
	1.4.2 Evidences for the attainment of the PEOs	30						
1.5	<b>Results of assessment of achievement of PEOs used for redefining PEOs</b>	10		<overall level of compliance for sub-criterion 1.5>				

Criterion 2: Programme Outcomes								
No.	Criteria	Points		Compliance		Non Compliance		Brief statement detailing evidence used to determine 'C', 'W' or 'D'
		Max. Points	Points Awarded	Without concern	With concern	Weakness	Deficiency	
2.1	Definition and Validation of Course Outcomes and Programme Outcomes	30		<overall level of compliance for sub-criterion 2.1>				
	2.1.1 List COs and POs	2						
	2.1.2 Publishing and Dissemination of POs	3						
	2.1.3 Process employed for defining of the POs	5						
	2.1.4 POs alignment with NBA Graduate Attributes	10						
	2.1.5 Establishment of the correlation between the POs and PEOs	10						
2.2	Attainment of Programme Outcomes	40		<overall level of compliance for sub-criterion 2.2>				
	2.2.1 Illustration of COs contribution to the POs	10						
	2.2.2 Description of modes of course delivery helping in attainment of the POs	10						
	2.2.3 Indication of tools used to assess the impact of delivery of course/course content contribute towards the attainment of COs/POs	10						
	2.2.4 Justification for the extent to which the laboratory and project work contributing towards the attainment of the POs	10						
2.3	Assessment of attainment of Programme Outcomes	125		<overall level of compliance for sub-criterion 2.3>				
	2.3.1 Description of assessment tools and processes used for assessing the attainment of each PO	25						
	2.3.2 Results of attainment of each POs	100						
2.4	Use of assessment results towards improvement of programme	30		<overall level of compliance for sub-criterion 2.4>				
	2.4.1 Results of assessment of POs used for curricular improvements	5						
	2.4.2 Results of assessment of POs used for improvement of course delivery and assessment	10						
	2.4.3 Process used for revising/redefining the POs	15						

Criterion 3: Programme Curriculum								
No.	Criteria	Points		Compliance		Non Compliance		Brief statement detailing evidence used to determine 'C', 'W' or 'D'
		Max. Points	Points Awarded	Without concern	With concern	Weakness	Deficiency	
3.1	Curriculum	20		<overall level of compliance for sub-criterion 3.1>				
	3.1.1 Description of the Structure of the Curriculum	5						
	3.1.2 Prerequisite flow chart of courses	5						
	3.1.3 Justification for the programme curriculum satisfying the programme specific criteria	10						
3.2	Curriculum components and relevance to Programme Outcomes and Programme Educational Objectives	15						
3.3	Core engineering courses and their relevance to Programme Outcomes including design experience	60						
3.4	Industry interaction/internship	10						
3.5	Curriculum Development	15		<overall level of compliance for sub-criterion 3.5>				
	3.5.1 The process for designing the programme curriculum	5						
	3.5.2 Illustration the measures and processes used to improve courses and curriculum	10						
3.6	Course Syllabi	5						

Criterion 4: Students' Performance								
No.	Criteria	Points		Compliance		Non Compliance		Brief statement detailing evidence used to determine 'C', 'W' or 'D'
		Max. Points	Points Awarded	Without concern	With concern	Weakness	Deficiency	
4.1	Success rate	20						
4.2	Academic performance	20						
4.3	Placement and higher studies	20						
4.4	Professional activities	15		<overall level of compliance for sub-criterion 4.4>				
	4.4.1 Professional societies / chapters and organising engineering events	3						
	4.4.2 Organisation of paper contests, design contests, etc. and achievements	3						
	4.4.3 Publication of technical magazines, newsletters, etc.	3						
	4.4.4 Entrepreneurship initiatives, product designs, and innovations	3						
	4.4.5 Publications and awards in inter-institute events by students of the programme of study	3						
Criterion 5: Faculty Contributions								
No.	Criteria	Points		Compliance		Non Compliance		Brief statement detailing evidence used to determine 'C', 'W' or 'D'
		Max. Points	Points	Without concern	With concern	Weakness	Deficiency	
5.1	Student-teacher ratio	20						
5.2	Faculty cadre ratio	20						
5.3	Faculty qualifications	30						
5.4	Faculty competencies correlation to Programme Specific Criteria	15						
5.5	Faculty as participants/resource persons in faculty development/training activities	15						
5.6	Faculty retention	15						
5.7	Faculty research publications	20						
5.8	Faculty intellectual property rights	10						
5.9	Faculty R&D and Consultancy (FRDC) work	20						
5.10	Faculty interaction with outside world	10						

Criterion 6: Facilities and Technical Support								
No.	Criteria	Points		Compliance		Non Compliance		Brief statement detailing evidence used to determine 'C', 'W' or 'D'
		Max. Points	Points Awarded	Without concern	With concern	Weakness	Deficiency	
6.1	Classrooms	20		<overall level of compliance for sub-criterion 6.1>				
	6.1.1 Adequate number of rooms for lectures (core/electives), seminars, tutorials, etc., for the program	10						
	6.1.2 Teaching aids---multimedia projectors, etc.	5						
	6.1.3 Acoustics, classroom size, conditions of chairs/benches, air circulation, lighting, exits, ambience, and such other amenities/facilities	5						
6.2	Faculty rooms	15		<overall level of compliance for sub-criterion 6.2>				
	6.2.1 Availability of individual faculty rooms	5						
	6.2.2 Room equipped with white/black board, computer, Internet, and such other amenities/facilities	5						
	6.2.3 Usage of room for counselling/discussion with students	5						
6.3	Laboratories including computing facility	25		<overall level of compliance for sub-criterion 6.3>				
	6.3.1 Adequate, well-equipped laboratories to meet the curriculum requirements and the POs	10						
	6.3.2 Availability of computing facilities in the department	5						
	6.3.3 Availability of laboratories with technical support within and beyond working hours	5						
	6.3.4 Equipment to run experiments and their maintenance, number of students per experimental setup, size of the laboratories, overall ambience, etc.	5						
6.4	Technical manpower support	15		<overall level of compliance for sub-criterion 6.4>				
	6.4.1 Availability of adequate and qualified technical supporting staff for programme-specific laboratories	10						
	6.4.2 Incentives, skill-upgrade, and professional advancement	5						

Criterion 7: Academic Support Units and Teaching-Learning Process								
No.	Criteria	Points		Compliance		Non Compliance		Brief statement detailing evidence used to determine 'C', 'W' or 'D'
		Max. Points	Points Awarded	Without concern	With concern	Weakness	Deficiency	
7.1	Academic Support Units	35		<overall level of compliance for sub-criterion 7.1>				
	7.1.1 Assessment of First Year Student Teacher Ratio (FYSTR)	10						
	7.1.2 Assessment of Faculty Qualification Teaching First Year Common Courses	15						
	7.1.3 Basic science/engineering laboratories (adequacy of space, number of students per batch, quality and availability of measuring instruments, laboratory manuals, list of experiments)	8						
	7.1.4 Language laboratory	2						
7.2	Teaching – Learning Process	40		<overall level of compliance for sub-criterion 7.2>				
	7.2.1 Tutorial classes to address student questions: size of tutorial classes, hours per subject given in the timetable	5						
	7.2.2 Mentoring system to help at individual levels	5						
	7.2.3 Feedback analysis and reward / corrective measures taken, if any	5						
	7.2.4 Scope for self-learning	5						
	7.2.5 Generation of self-learning facilities, and availability of materials for learning beyond syllabus	5						
	7.2.6 Career Guidance, Training, Placement, and Entrepreneurship Cell	5						
	7.2.7 Co-curricular and Extra-curricular Activities	5						
	7.2.8 Games and Sports, facilities, and qualified sports instructors	5						

Criterion 8: Governance, Institutional Support and Financial Resources								
No.	Criteria	Points		Compliance		Non Compliance		Brief statement detailing evidence used to determine 'C', 'W' or 'D'
		Max. Points	Points Awarded	Without concern	With concern	Weakness	Deficiency	
8.1	Campus Infrastructure and Facility	10		<overall level of compliance for sub-criterion 8.1>				
	8.1.1 Maintenance of academic infrastructure and facilities	4						
	8.1.2 Hostel (boys and girls), transportation facility, and canteen	2						
	8.1.3 Electricity, power backup, telecom facility, drinking water, and security	4						
8.2	Organisation, Governance, and Transparency	10		<overall level of compliance for sub-criterion 8.2>				
	8.2.1 Governing body, administrative setup, and functions of various bodies	2						
	8.2.2 Defined rules, procedures, recruitment, and promotional policies, etc.	2						
	8.2.3 Decentralisation in working including delegation of financial power and grievance redressal system	3						
	8.2.4 Transparency and availability of correct/unambiguous information	3						
8.3	Budget Allocation, Utilisation, and Public Accounting	10		<overall level of compliance for sub-criterion 8.3>				
	8.3.1 Adequacy of budget allocation	4						
	8.3.2 Utilisation of allocated funds	5						
	8.3.3 Availability of the audited statements on the institute's website	1						
8.4	Programme Specific Budget Allocation, Utilisation	10		<overall level of compliance for sub-criterion 8.4>				
	8.4.1 Adequacy of budget allocation	5						
	8.4.2 Utilisation of allocated funds	5						
8.5	Library	20		<overall level of compliance for sub-criterion 8.5>				
	8.5.1 Library space and ambience, timings and usage, availability of a qualified librarian and other staff, library automation, online access, networking, etc.	5						
	8.5.2 Titles and volumes per title	4						
	8.5.3 Scholarly journal subscription	3						
	8.5.4 Digital Library	3						
	8.5.5 Library expenditure on books,	5						

	magazines/journals, and miscellaneous contents							
8.6	Internet	5						
8.7	Safety Norms and Checks	5	<overall level of compliance for sub-criterion 8.7>					
	8.7.1 Checks for wiring and electrical installations for leakage and earthing	1						
	8.7.2 Fire-fighting measurements	1						
	8.7.3 Safety of civil structure	1						
	8.7.4 Handling of hazardous chemicals and such other activities	2						
8.8	Counselling and Emergency Medical Care and First-aid	5						
	8.8.1 Availability of counselling facility	1						
	8.8.2 Arrangement for emergency medical care	2						
	8.8.3 Availability of first-aid unit	2						
<b>Criterion 9: Continuous Improvement</b>								
No.	Criteria	Points		Compliance		Non Compliance		Brief statement detailing evidence used to determine 'C', 'W' or 'D'
		Max. Points	Points Awarded	Without concern	With concern	Weakness	Deficiency	
9.1	Improvement in Success Index of Students	5						
9.2	Improvement in Academic Performance Index of Students	5						
9.3	Improvement in Student-Teacher Ratio	5						
9.4	Enhancement of Faculty Qualification Index	5						
9.5	Improvement in Faculty Research Publications, R&D Work and Consultancy Work	10						
9.6	Continuing Education	10						
9.7	New Facility Created	15						
9.8	Overall Improvements since last accreditation, if any, otherwise, since the commencement of the programme	20						

Prepared and submitted by Programme Evaluation Team

	Name	Signature
Chairperson		
Evaluator 1		
Evaluator 2		

***Declaration of Conformity with evaluator's report by the Team Chair***

I agree with the observations of the program evaluators on each criterion.

YES

NO

If no, kindly mention the reasons thereof:

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**Signature  
(Chairperson)**

## Annexure -VII

### DAY-WISE PROGRAMME AUDIT SHEETS

<<INSTITUTE NAME>>

<<PROGRAMME>>

<<VISIT DATE>>

#### Day 1

Time	Programme Evaluator	Remarks and Observations
07:00 - 08:00	Breakfast at Hotel	
08:00 - 09:00	Move to the University/ Institute	
09:00 – 09:15	NBA visiting team to be received by University/Institutional representatives	
09:15 – 10:15	Presentation on University/Institution by dean/head of the institution <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overview on governance, organizational structure, academic infrastructure</li> <li>• Institutional financial resources and their effective utilization for continuous quality improvement</li> <li>• Academic support units and their contributions to the programs</li> <li>• Overview on recent developments in education delivery, mentoring and learning facilities</li> <li>• Q&amp;A on the issues common to all Programmes</li> </ul> <b>Criterion 8: Governance, Institutional support and Financial Resources</b> <b>Criterion 7: Academic Support Units and Teaching-Learning Process</b>	
10:15 - 11:15	Tour of basic science and engineering laboratories, language laboratory and career guidance facilities by Team A* Tour of library, hostel facilities, sports facilities and other amenities by Team B* <b>Criterion 8: Governance, Institutional support and Financial Resources</b> <b>Criterion 7: Academic Support Units and Teaching-Learning Process</b> *Team A and Team B are constituted by TC with one PE from each program and TC can be member of any team	

11:30 – 12:00	Observe lecture and tutorial in progress  <b>Criterion 2: Programme Outcomes</b> <b>Criterion 3: Programme Curriculum</b>	
12:00 – 13:00	Presentation on Department Overview and UG (.....) programme by Head of the Department / Programme Coordinator <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Programme Educational Objectives, participation of constituents, level of implementation</li> <li>• Overview on Course content delivery, Course outcome assessment and evaluation methods</li> <li>• Overview on Assessment and Evaluation of Programme Outcomes</li> <li>• Curriculum design and revision, and Programme specific criteria</li> <li>• Academic performance of students, participation in professional activities and their achievements</li> <li>• Faculty development and research activities</li> </ul> <b>Criterion 1: Vision, Mission and Programme Educational Objectives</b> <b>Criterion 2: Programme Outcomes</b> <b>Criterion 3: Programme Curriculum</b> <b>Criterion 4: Students' Performance</b> <b>Criterion 5: Faculty Contributions</b>	
13:00 – 14:00	Lunch	
14:00 – 15:00	Tour of laboratory facilities, computing facilities, department library etc. relevant to the programme Interview with concerned faculty / staff to evaluate: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The laboratory facilities to conduct the curricular practical courses</li> <li>• Availability of adequate technical supporting staff</li> <li>• Adequacy of well-furnished lecture/tutorial/seminar halls to run the programme</li> </ul> <b>Criterion 6: Facilities and Technical Support</b>	
15:00 – 15:30	Review of Final year project report to evaluate their relevance to Programme Outcomes <b>Criterion 2: Programme Outcomes</b>	
15:45 – 16:30	Interview with students to evaluate, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• effectiveness of Content delivery and assessment methods</li> <li>• participation in professional society activities / Club activities</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Any other issues identified by the PEs related accreditation criteria</li> </ul> <p><b>Criterion 2: Programme Outcomes</b> <b>Criterion 4: Students' Performance</b></p>	
16:30 – 18:00	<p>Meeting with Programme Coordinator, Course Coordinator etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evaluation of Content delivery methods and Course outcomes towards attainment of POs</li> <li>Improvements in the course content, delivery and assessment methods based on level of attainment of COs and POs</li> </ul> <p><b>Criterion 2: Programme Outcomes</b> <b>Criterion 3: Programme Curriculum</b></p>	
18:00 – 19:00	Move back to Hotel	
19:00 – 20:30	Team Dinner	
20:30 – 22:00	<p>Team meeting: Chaired by TC at Hotel</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Exchange and discuss about the issues of Day 1 evaluation</li> <li>Discussion between PEs and TC to maintain consistency across all programmes</li> <li>Submit Day 1 draft evaluation report to TC</li> </ul>	

## Day 02

Time	Programme Evaluator	Remarks and Observations
07:00 - 08:00	Breakfast at Hotel	
08:00 - 09:00	Move to the University/ Institute	
09:00 - 09:15	NBA visiting team to be received by Head of the Department/Programme Coordinator	
09:15 - 10:45	<p>Interview with faculty members to evaluate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Faculty competency against programme specific criteria</li> <li>Updating of faculty domain knowledge</li> <li>Faculty research, consultancy and Knowledge transfer</li> <li>Documents pertained to faculty profile, faculty contributions etc.</li> <li>Any other issues identified by the PEs related accreditation criteria</li> </ul> <p><b>Criterion 5: Faculty Contributions</b> <b>Criterion 9: Continuous Improvements</b></p>	
10:45-11:30	<p>Meeting with programme coordinator/Head of the Department</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Documents pertained to student academic performance, student accomplishments etc.</li> </ul> <p><b>Criterion 4: Students' Performance</b> <b>Criterion 9: Continuous Improvements</b></p>	

11:45-12:30	<p>Interview with faculty/Board of studies /advisory board to evaluate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Level of involvement of stakeholders in the programme development</li> <li>• Consistency of PEOs with the mission of the department</li> <li>• Level of Contributions of industry to programme</li> </ul> <p><b>Criterion 1: Vision, Mission and Programme Educational Objectives</b>  <b>Criterion 3: Programme Curriculum</b></p>	
12:30-01:00	<p>Interview with sampled students (academic performance) to evaluate,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Level of attainment of knowledge skills and attitudes</li> </ul> <p><b>Criterion 2: Programme Outcomes</b>  <b>Criterion 4: Students' Performance</b></p>	
13:00 – 14:00	Lunch	
14.00- 14.45	<p>Meeting with Alumni of the programme (graduates considered for the attainment of PEOs) to evaluate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• level of participation in the programme after the graduation</li> <li>• level of attainment of PEOs</li> </ul> <p><b>Criterion 1: Vision, Mission and Programme Educational Objectives</b></p>	
14.45-16.30	<p>Meeting with Programme Coordinator/Head of the Department to evaluate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Check on remediation of shortcomings/improvements from previous accreditation visit</li> <li>• Appropriateness of assessment tools used for POs and PEOs</li> <li>• Level of attainment of POs and PEOs</li> <li>• Check all the documents and evidences relevant to the attainment of POs and PEOs</li> </ul> <p><b>Criterion 9: Continuous Improvement</b>  <b>Criterion 1: Vision, Mission and Programme Educational Objectives</b>  <b>Criterion 2: Programme Outcomes</b></p>	
16.30-17.30	<p>Private meeting of PEs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussion among PEs for summarizing the observations made during evaluation of day-1 and day-2 vis-à-vis accreditation criteria</li> </ul>	
17.30-18.00	Meeting with programme coordinator/Head of the Department for any further clarifications	
18:00 – 19:00	Move back to Hotel	
19:00 – 20:30	Team Dinner	

20:30 – 22:00	Team meeting: Chaired by TC at Hotel <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exchange and discuss about the issues of Day 2 evaluation</li> <li>• Discussion between PEs and TC to maintain consistency across all programmes</li> <li>• Submit Day 2 draft evaluation report to TC</li> </ul>	
---------------	---	--

### Day 3

Time	Programme Evaluators	Remarks and Observations
07:00 - 08:00	Breakfast at Hotel	
08:00 - 09:00	Move to the University/ Institute	
09:00 - 09:15	NBA visiting team to be received by Head of the Institute/Dean	
9.15-10.30	Prepare the exit-meeting statement by PEs and TC	
10.30-11.30	Exit-meeting chaired by TC. Read the exit-meeting statements of all the programmes	
11.30-1.00	Submit visit report and close the visit activity	
1.00-2.00	Lunch	

## Annexure-VIII

### Visit Schedule

>>Institute Name and place<<

>>Date of Visit<<

#### Day 0

Time	Programme Evaluators(PEs)	Team Chairperson (TC)
- 17:00	Arrival at Hotel	
18:30 – 20:00	Team meeting: Chaired by TC at Hotel <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review of pre-visit evaluation reports of all Programmes</li> <li>• Identify and discuss issues common to all Programmes</li> </ul>	Introductions: PE and TC at Hotel <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Collate pre-visit evaluation reports of all programs</li> <li>• Finalize the scope/ purpose of meetings scheduled</li> <li>• Briefing to PEs on evaluation process during visit followed by Q&amp;A session</li> </ul>
20:00-21:30	Team Dinner	

#### Day 1

Time	Programme Evaluators(PEs)	Team Chairperson (TC)
07:00 - 08:00	Breakfast at Hotel	
08:00 - 09:00	Move to the University/ Institute	
09:00 – 09:15	NBA visiting team to be received by University/Institutional representatives	
09:15 – 10:15	Presentation on University/Institution by dean/head of the institution <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overview on governance, organizational structure, academic infrastructure</li> <li>• Institutional financial resources and their effective utilization for continuous quality improvement</li> <li>• Academic support units and their contributions to the programs</li> <li>• Overview on recent developments in education delivery, mentoring and learning facilities</li> <li>• Q&amp;A on the issues common to all Programmes</li> </ul> <p><b>Criterion 8: Governance, Institutional support and Financial Resources</b>  <b>Criterion 7: Academic Support Units and Teaching-Learning Process</b></p>	
10:15 - 11:15	Tour of basic science and engineering laboratories, language laboratory and career guidance facilities by Team A* Tour of library, hostel facilities, sports facilities and other amenities by Team B*	

	<p><b>Criterion 8: Governance, Institutional support and Financial Resources</b>  <b>Criterion 7: Academic Support Units and Teaching-Learning Process</b>  *Team A and Team B are constituted by TC with one PE from each program and TC can be member of any team</p>	
11:30 – 12:00	<p>Observe lecture and tutorial in progress</p> <p><b>Criterion 2: Programme Outcomes</b>  <b>Criterion 3: Programme Curriculum</b></p>	<p>Interview with Faculty of mathematics, basic sciences and engineering supporting the programmes under accreditation</p> <p><b>Criterion 7: Academic Support Units and Teaching-Learning Process</b>  <b>Criterion 2: Programme Outcomes</b></p>
12:00 – 13:00	<p>Presentation on Department Overview and UG (.....) programme by Head of the Department / Programme Coordinator</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Programme Educational Objectives, participation of constituents, level of implementation</li> <li>• Overview on Course content delivery, Course outcome assessment and evaluation methods</li> <li>• Overview on Assessment and Evaluation of Programme Outcomes</li> <li>• Curriculum design and revision, and Programme specific criteria</li> <li>• Academic performance of students, participation in professional activities and their achievements</li> <li>• Faculty development and research activities</li> </ul> <p><b>Criterion 1: Vision, Mission and Programme Educational Objectives</b>  <b>Criterion 2: Programme Outcomes</b>  <b>Criterion 3: Programme Curriculum</b>  <b>Criterion 4: Students' Performance</b>  <b>Criterion 5: Faculty Contributions</b></p>	<p>Interview with officers concerned to evaluate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• academic infrastructure and facilities</li> <li>• budget allocation and utilization</li> <li>• practices of Organization and Governance</li> </ul> <p><b>Criterion 8: Governance, Institutional support and Financial Resources</b></p>
13:00 – 14:00	Lunch	
14:00 – 15:00	<p>Tour of laboratory facilities, computing facilities, department library etc. relevant to the programme</p> <p>Interview with concerned faculty / staff to evaluate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The laboratory facilities to conduct the curricular practical courses</li> <li>• Availability of adequate technical supporting staff</li> <li>• Adequacy of well-furnished lecture/tutorial/seminar halls</li> </ul>	<p>Check and evaluate the documents pertaining to :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Admissions quality</li> <li>• Academic support units</li> <li>• Teaching and learning process</li> </ul> <p><b>Criterion 7: Academic Support Units and Teaching-Learning Process</b></p>

	to run the programme <b>Criterion 6: Facilities and Technical Support</b>	
15:00 – 15:30	Review of Final year project report to evaluate their relevance to Programme Outcomes <b>Criterion 2: Programme Outcomes</b>	Interview with Controller of Examinations: Assessment and Evaluation practices, Auditing process, Grievances and Redressal system <b>Criterion 2: Programme Outcomes</b>
15:45 – 16:30	Interview with students to evaluate, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>effectiveness of Content delivery and assessment methods</li> <li>participation in professional society activities / Club activities</li> <li>Any other issues identified by the PEs related accreditation criteria</li> </ul> <b>Criterion 2: Programme Outcomes</b> <b>Criterion 4: Students' Performance</b>	Evaluate supporting systems vis-à-vis training and placement and Career Guidance <b>Criterion 4: Students' Performance</b>
16:30 – 18:00	Meeting with Programme Coordinator, Course Coordinator etc. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evaluation of Content delivery methods and Course outcomes towards attainment of POs</li> <li>Improvements in the course content, delivery and assessment methods based on level of attainment of COs and POs</li> </ul> <b>Criterion 2: Programme Outcomes</b> <b>Criterion 3: Programme Curriculum</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Make a survey visit to programme to ensure consistency and to answer any uncommon issues raised during programme specific evaluation.</li> <li>Meet with Dean/Head of the Institution to discuss the findings of Day-I evaluation.</li> </ul>
18:00 – 19:00	Move back to Hotel	
19:00 – 20:30	Team Dinner	
20:30 – 22:00	Team meeting: Chaired by TC at Hotel <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Exchange and discuss about the issues of Day 1 evaluation</li> <li>Discussion between PEs and TC to maintain consistency across all programmes</li> <li>Submit Day 1 draft evaluation report to TC</li> </ul>	TC chairs the meeting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide general guidelines for decision to PEs</li> <li>Check the consistency for all the programmes</li> </ul>

## Day 02

Time	Programme Evaluators(PEs)	Team Chairperson (TC)
07:00 - 08:00	Breakfast at Hotel	
08:00 - 09:00	Move to the University/ Institute	
09:00 - 09:15	NBA visiting team to be received by Head of the Department/Programme Coordinator	
09:15 - 10:45	<p>Interview with faculty members to evaluate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Faculty competency against programme specific criteria</li> <li>• Updating of faculty domain knowledge</li> <li>• Faculty research, consultancy and Knowledge transfer</li> <li>• Documents pertained to faculty profile, faculty contributions etc.</li> <li>• Any other issues identified by the PEs related accreditation criteria</li> </ul> <p><b>Criterion 5: Faculty Contributions</b> <b>Criterion 9: Continuous Improvements</b></p>	<p>Meeting with the officials concerned to evaluate the effective functioning of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Industry-Institute interaction Board</li> <li>• Institution level Quality Monitoring and Assurance</li> </ul> <p><b>Criterion 3: Programme Curriculum</b> <b>Criterion 9: Continuous Improvement</b></p>
10:45-11:30	<p>Meeting with programme coordinator/Head of the Department</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documents pertained to student academic performance, student accomplishments etc.</li> </ul> <p><b>Criterion 4: Students' Performance</b> <b>Criterion 9: Continuous Improvements</b></p>	<p>Meeting with the officials concerned to evaluate the effective functioning of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Institution level Quality Monitoring and Assurance</li> </ul> <p><b>Criterion 3: Programme Curriculum</b> <b>Criterion 9: Continuous Improvement</b></p>
11:45-12:30	<p>Interview with faculty/Board of studies /advisory board to evaluate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Level of involvement of stakeholders in the programme development</li> <li>• Consistency of PEOs with the mission of the department</li> <li>• Level of Contributions of industry to programme</li> </ul> <p><b>Criterion 1: Vision, Mission and Programme Educational Objectives</b> <b>Criterion 3: Programme Curriculum</b></p>	<p>Meeting with Governing Body members to evaluate Governance, Organisation and decentralization</p> <p><b>Criterion 8: Governance, Institutional support and Financial Resources</b></p>
12:30-01:00	<p>Interview with sampled students (academic performance) to evaluate,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Level of attainment of knowledge skills and attitudes</li> </ul> <p><b>Criterion 2: Programme Outcomes</b> <b>Criterion 4: Students' Performance</b></p>	<p>Meeting with the officials concerned to evaluate the effective functioning of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Academic Council</li> </ul> <p><b>Criterion 3: Programme Curriculum</b> <b>Criterion 9: Continuous Improvement</b></p>
13:00 – 14:00	Lunch	

14.00- 14.45	Meeting with Alumni of the programme (graduates considered for the attainment of PEOs) to evaluate: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• level of participation in the programme after the graduation</li> <li>• level of attainment of PEOs</li> </ul> <b>Criterion 1: Vision, Mission and Programme Educational Objectives</b>	Meeting with potential employer/industry to evaluate : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• level of participation</li> <li>• performance of the graduates in their organization</li> </ul> <b>Criterion 1: Vision, Mission and Programme Educational Objectives</b>
14.45-16.30	Meeting with Programme Coordinator/Head of the Department to evaluate: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Check on remediation of shortcomings/improvements from previous accreditation visit</li> <li>• Appropriateness of assessment tools used for POs and PEOs</li> <li>• Level of attainment of POs and PEOs</li> <li>• Check all the documents and evidences relevant to the attainment of POs and PEOs</li> </ul> <b>Criterion 9: Continuous Improvement</b> <b>Criterion 1: Vision, Mission and Programme Educational Objectives</b> <b>Criterion 2: Programme Outcomes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Make a survey visit to programme to ensure consistency and to answer any uncommon issues raised during programme specific evaluation.</li> </ul>
16.30-17.30	Private meeting of PEs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussion among PEs for summarizing the observations made during evaluation of day-1 and day-2 vis-à-vis accreditation criteria</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Make a survey visit to programme to ensure consistency and to answer any uncommon issues raised during programme specific evaluation</li> </ul>
17.30-18.00	Meeting with programme coordinator/Head of the Department for any further clarifications	Meeting with Dean/Head of the Institution to discuss the findings of Day-2 evaluation
18:00 – 19:00	Move back to Hotel	
19:00 – 20:30	Team Dinner	
20:30 – 22:00	Team meeting: Chaired by TC at Hotel <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exchange and discuss about the issues of Day 2 evaluation</li> <li>• Discussion between PEs and TC to maintain consistency across all programmes</li> <li>• Submit Day 2 draft evaluation report to TC</li> </ul>	TC chairs the meeting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide general guidelines for decision to PEs</li> <li>• Check the consistency for all the programmes</li> </ul>

### Day 3

Time	Programme Evaluators(PEs)	Team Chairperson (TC)
07:00 - 08:00	Breakfast at Hotel	
08:00 - 09:00	Move to the University/ Institute	

09:00 - 09:15	NBA visiting team to be received by Head of the Institute/Dean
9.15-10.30	Prepare the exit-meeting statement by PEs and TC
10.30-11.30	Exit-meeting chaired by TC. Read the exit-meeting statements of all the programmes
11.30-1.00	Submit visit report and close the visit activity
1.00-2.00	Lunch

## Annexure- X

# Form - A

### Feedback Form to be filled by the Institution Regarding Accreditation Visit

#### Purpose

*This form is designed to have a fair opinion of the team which has visited your institution. This will enable the NBA to improve its system and make it more effective. We thank you in advance for the time and effort you are investing in filling out this form.*

1. Name of the Institution: \_\_\_\_\_
2. Programme(s) evaluated: \_\_\_\_\_
3. Date(s) of visit: \_\_\_\_\_
4. Name of Chairperson: \_\_\_\_\_
5. Names of Evaluators:  
1. \_\_\_\_\_ 2. \_\_\_\_\_ 3. \_\_\_\_\_  
4. \_\_\_\_\_ 5. \_\_\_\_\_ 6. \_\_\_\_\_  
7. \_\_\_\_\_ 8. \_\_\_\_\_ 9. \_\_\_\_\_  
10. \_\_\_\_\_ 11. \_\_\_\_\_ 12. \_\_\_\_\_

6. Please comment on the evaluation methodology adopted by the team during the visit.

7. Whether the evaluators have tendered any advice to improve the system? If yes, please specify.

(i) Name of the Evaluator:

(ii) Advice:

8. Whether any of the evaluators were specific about the relevant topics related to the programme? If no, please specify.

9. Whether the evaluators interacted with students and faculty in groups or with students and faculty in private? If yes, please specify the name of the students/faculty.

10. Whether the head of the institute or any representative of the management was also present during the interaction? If yes, please specify.

(i) Name of the representative:

(ii) Observation of the representative about interaction:

11. Whether evaluators have been facilitated by the institute for outdoor activity? If yes, please specify.

(i) On whose insistence:

(ii) What activity:

12. Whether the exit meeting met the purpose i.e., to share the visiting team's perceptions and general observations about the institution and programmes.

13. Specify the participants of the exit meeting.

14. Please comment on the general behaviour of the visiting team (Chairperson and evaluators) during the visit? Whether hospitality was extended to the visiting team? If yes, please specify the participants and the kind of hospitality offered.

Signature of the Head of Institution

---

Thank you for your feedback!

# Form - B

## Feedback Form to be filled by the Chairperson about the Institution and Team Members

### Purpose

*This form is designed to have a fair opinion about the team members who have assisted you during the visit. This will enable the NBA to improve its system and make it more effective. We thank you in advance for the time and effort you are investing in filling out this form.*

1. Name of the Institution: \_\_\_\_\_
2. Programme(s) evaluated: \_\_\_\_\_
3. Date (s) of visit: \_\_\_\_\_
4. Name of Chairperson: \_\_\_\_\_
5. Name of Evaluators: 1. \_\_\_\_\_ 2. \_\_\_\_\_  
4. \_\_\_\_\_ 5. \_\_\_\_\_ 6. \_\_\_\_\_  
7. \_\_\_\_\_ 8. \_\_\_\_\_ 9. \_\_\_\_\_  
10. \_\_\_\_\_ 11. \_\_\_\_\_ 12. \_\_\_\_\_
6. Please comment on the evaluation methodology adopted by the evaluators.
7. Whether the evaluator has tendered any advice to improve the system? If yes, please specify.
  - i) Name (s) of the Evaluator:
  - ii) Advice:
8. Whether the evaluators were specific about the relevant topics related to the programme? If no, please specify.
9. Whether the evaluator interacted with students and faculty in groups or with students and faculty in private? If yes, please specify the name of the students/faculty.
10. Whether the evaluator has been facilitated by the institution for outdoor activity? If yes, please specify.
  - i) On whose insistence:
  - ii) What activity:
11. Please comment on the general behaviour and etiquette of the evaluators during the visit.
12. Please comment on the general behaviour and etiquette of the Head of the Institution/other key officials.
13. Please comment on the cooperation and coordination rendered by the institution.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of the Chairperson

Thank you for your feedback!

# Form - C

---

## Feedback Form to be filled by the Evaluator about the Institution, Co-evaluator and Chairperson

### Purpose

*This form is designed to have a fair opinion about the team members who have assisted you during the visit. This will enable the NBA to improve its system and make it more effective. We thank you in advance for the time and effort you are investing in filling out this form.*

1. Name of the Institution : \_\_\_\_\_
2. Programme (s) evaluated : \_\_\_\_\_
3. Date (s) of visit : \_\_\_\_\_
4. Name of Chairperson : \_\_\_\_\_
5. Name of Evaluator : \_\_\_\_\_
6. Name of Co-Evaluator : \_\_\_\_\_
  
7. Please comment on the ability of the chairperson to resolve disputes, if any, between the evaluators.
8. Whether the chairperson has tendered any advice to improve the system? If yes, please specify.
9. Whether the chairperson has extended openness with the evaluators? If no, please specify.
10. Whether the chairperson has been facilitated by the institute for outdoor activity. If yes, please specify.
  - i) On whose insistence:
  - ii) What activity:
11. Please comment on the general behaviour and etiquette of the chairperson during the visit.
12. Please comment on the general behaviour and etiquette of the Head of the Institution / other key officials.
13. Please comment on the general behaviour and etiquette of the co-evaluator.
14. Please comment on the cooperation rendered by the co-evaluator.
15. Please comment on the cooperation and coordination rendered by the institution.

---

Signature of the Evaluator

Thank you for your feedback!

# Form - D

---

## Feedback Form to be filled by the Chairperson/Evaluator(s) about Service Provider

### Purpose

*This form is designed to have a fair opinion about the Service Provider hired by the NBA. This will enable the NBA to improve its system and make it more effective. We thank you in advance for the time and effort you are investing in filling out this form.*

1. Name of the Institution:
  
2. Date (s) of visit:
  
3. Name of the Chairperson/Evaluator\*:
  
4. Name of the Service Provider:

### Assessment of the Service Provider

- I How was your overall experience with the service provider?
  
- II Please comment on customer service, travel management and consulting services.
  
- III Please comment on the travel and lodging requirements met during the visit.
  
- IV Please comment on your travel documentation.
  
- V Are you satisfied with the service provided by the Service Provider? If no, please specify.

---

\*Please strike out whichever is not applicable

Signature of the Chairperson/Evaluator

Thank you for your feedback!

## **DECLARATION FORM**

**Name and Address of the Institution to be visited:**

---

---

---

**Name and Address of the Chairperson/Expert Member of the Evaluation Team:**

---

---

---

---

I do hereby declare that I don't have or didn't have had a close or active association with the above institution in any of the following form:-

1. I am neither employed currently nor was employed in the past as faculty, staff or Consultant by the institution;
2. I am neither engaged currently nor was engaged in the past in any discussion or negotiation of employment with the institution;
3. I have never attended the above institution as a student;
4. I have never received an honorary degree from the institution;
5. No close/family relative of mine is a student or employee of the institution
6. I do not own a membership in the institution's Board of Trustees/Industry Advisory Board.

I hereby declare that I have no conflict of interest in the proposed NBA accreditation assignment at this institution and I will follow the NBA conflict of interest Policies. I shall abide by the code of conduct and will conduct myself in professional manner and uphold the dignity and esteem of the position bestowed upon me.

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_