

Evaluation Guidelines with indicative exhibits/context to be Observed/Assessed - SAR Tier – I (UG Engineering)
First Time Accreditation

Criterion 1: **Vision, Mission and Program Educational Objectives (50)**

Sub Criteria	Marks	Evaluation Guidelines
1.1. State the Vision and Mission of the Department and Institute	05	<p>A. Availability of the Vision & Mission statements of the Department (1) B. Appropriateness/Relevance of the Statements (2) C. Consistency of the Department statements with the Institute statements (2)</p> <p>(Here Institute Vision and Mission statements have been asked to ensure consistency with the department Vision and Mission statements; the assessment of the Institute Vision and Mission will be done in Criterion 10).</p>
<i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i>		
<i>A. Vision & Mission Statements B. Correctness from definition perspective C. Consistency between Institute and Department statements</i>		
1.2. State the Program Educational Objectives (PEOs)	05	A. Listing of the Program Educational Objectives (3 to 5) of the program under consideration (5)
<i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i>		
<i>A. Availability & correctness of the PEOs statements</i>		
1.3. Indicate where and how the Vision, Mission and PEOs are published and disseminated among stakeholders.	15	<p>A. Adequacy in respect of publication & dissemination (3) B. Process of dissemination among stakeholders (3) C. Extent of awareness of Vision, Mission & PEOs among the stakeholder (</p>
<i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i>		
<i>A. Adequacy</i>		
<i>Department Vision, Mission and PEOs:</i> Availability on Institute website under relevant program link; Availability at department notice boards, HoD Chamber, department website, if Available; Availability in department level documents/course of study		
<i>B. Process of dissemination</i>		
Documentary evidence to indicate the process which ensures awareness among internal and external stakeholders with effective process implementation		
<i>C. Extent of Awareness</i>		
Based on interaction with internal and external stakeholders		

Evaluation Guidelines with indicative exhibits/context to be Observed/Assessed - SAR Tier – I (UG Engineering)

First Time Accreditation

1.4. State the process for defining the Vision and Mission of the Department, and PEOs of the program	15	A. Description of process involved in defining the Vision, Mission of the Department (7) B. Description of process involved in defining the PEOs of the program (8)
<i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i>		
<i>Documentary evidence to indicate the process which ensures effective participation of internal and external department stakeholders with effective process implementation.</i>		
1.5. Establish consistency of PEOs with Mission of the Department	10	A. Preparation of a matrix of PEOs and elements of Mission statement (5) B. Consistency/justification of co-relation parameters of the above matrix (5)
<i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i>		
<i>A. Availability of a matrix having PEOs and Mission elements B. Justification for each of the elements mapped in the matrix</i>		
Total:	50	

Criterion 2: Program Curriculum and Teaching–Learning Processes (100)

Sub Criteria	Marks	Evaluation Guidelines
2.1. Program Curriculum	30	
2.1.1. State the process for designing the program curriculum	10	Process used to demonstrate how the program curriculum is evolved and periodically reviewed considering the POs and PSOs. <i>Also consider the involvement of the Industry.</i>
<i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i>		
<i>Documentary evidence to indicate the process which demonstrate how the program curriculum is evolved and periodically reviewed considering the POs and PSOs.</i>		
2.1.2. Structure of the Curriculum	05	Refer to SAR: Expectation in 2.1.2 & 2.1.3 is that the curriculum is well balanced structure & appropriate for a degree program.

First Time Accreditation

<i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i>		
2.1.3.State the components of the curriculum	05	Refer to SAR: Expectation in 2.1.2 & 2.1.3 is that the curriculum is well balanced structure & appropriate for a degree program
<i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i>		
<i>Documentary evidence</i>		
2.1.4. State the process used to identify extent of compliance of the curriculum for attaining the Program Outcomes(POs) & Program Specific Outcomes(PSOs)	10	Process used to identify extent of compliance of curriculum for attaining POs & PSOs (10)
<i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i>		
<i>Documentary evidence to indicate the process which ensures mapping/compliance of Curriculum with the POs & PSOs.</i>		
2.2. Teaching-Learning Processes	70	
2.2.1. Describe the Process followed to improve quality of Teaching Learning	15	A. Adherence to Academic Calendar (2) B. Pedagogical initiatives (2) C. Methodologies to support weak students and encourage bright students(2) D. Quality of classroom teaching (Observation in a Class) (2) E. Conduct of experiments (Observation in Lab) (2) F. Continuous Assessment in the laboratory (3) G. Student feedback of teaching learning process and actions taken (2)
<i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i>		
A. Availability of Academic Calendar based on University academic calendar and its effective compliance B. Documentary evidence to support implementation of pedagogical initiatives such as real life examples, collaborative learning, ICT supported learning, interactive class rooms etc.		

First Time Accreditation

<p>C. <i>Guidelines to identify weak and bright students; post identification actions taken; impact observed</i> D. <i>Class room ambience; efforts to keep students engaged (also to be verified during interaction with the students)</i> E. <i>Quality of laboratory experience with respect to conducting, recording observations, analysis etc.(also to be verified during interaction with the students)</i> F. <i>Internal Semester examination and internal marks thereof, Practical record books, each experiment assessment, final marks based on assessment of all the experiments and other assessments; if any</i> G. <i>Feedback format, frequency, analysis and actions taken (also to be verified during interaction with students)</i></p>		
2.2.2. Quality of end semester examination, internal semester question papers, assignments and evaluation	15	<p>A. Process for internal semester question paper setting and evaluation and effective process implementation (3) B. Process to ensure questions from outcomes/learning levels perspective (2) C. Evidence of COs coverage in class test / mid-term tests (5) D. Quality of Assignment and its relevance to COs (5)</p>
<p><i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i></p> <p>A. <i>Process of internal semester question paper setting, model answers, evaluation and its compliance</i> B. <i>Question paper validation to ensure desired standard from outcome attainment perspective as well as learning levels perspective</i> C. <i>Mapping of questions with the Course outcomes</i> D. <i>Assignments to promote self-learning, survey of contents from multiple sources, assignment evaluation and feedback to the students, mapping with the COs</i></p>		
2.2.3. Quality of student projects	20	<p>A. Identification of projects and allocation methodology to Faculty Members (2) B. Types and relevance of the projects and their contribution towards attainment of POs and PSOs (2) C. Project related to Industry (3) D. Process for monitoring and evaluation (2) E. Process to assess individual and team performance (3) F. Quality of completed projects/working prototypes (5) G. Evidences of papers published /Awards received by projects etc. (3)</p>
<p><i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i></p> <p>A. <i>Projects identification and guide allocation Process</i> B. <i>Projects classification (application, product, research, review etc.) consideration to factors such as environment, safety, ethics, cost, standards and</i></p>		

Evaluation Guidelines with indicative exhibits/context to be Observed/Assessed - SAR Tier – I (UG Engineering)

First Time Accreditation

<p><i>mapping with program outcomes and program specific outcomes</i></p> <p>C. <i>Continuous monitoring mechanism and evaluation</i></p> <p>D. <i>Methodology(Appropriately documented) to assess individual contribution/understanding of the project as well as collective contribution/understanding</i></p> <p>E. <i>Based on Projects demonstration</i></p> <p>F. <i>Quality of place (host) where the paper has been published /quality of competition in which award has been won</i></p>		
2.2.4. Initiatives related to industry interaction	10	<p>A. Industry supported laboratories (2)</p> <p>B. Industry involvement in the program design and Curriculum. (3)</p> <p>C. Industry involvement in partial delivery of any regular courses for students (3)</p> <p>D. Impact analysis of industry institute interaction and actions taken thereof (2)</p>
<p><i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i></p> <p>A. <i>Type of Industries, Type of Labs, objectives, utilization and effectiveness</i></p> <p>B. <i>Documentary evidence</i></p> <p>C. <i>Analysis and actions taken thereof</i></p>		
2.2.5. Initiatives related to industry internship/summer training	10	<p>A. Industrial training/tours for students (2)</p> <p>B. Industrial /internship /summer training of more than two weeks and post training Assessment (3)</p> <p>C. Impact analysis of industrial training (2)</p> <p>D. Student feedback on initiative (3)</p>
<p><i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed: (Documentary evidence from A to D)</i></p> <p>A. & B. <i>Type of Industries, planned or non-planned activity, objectives clearly defined, no. of students participated, relevant area of training, visit report documented</i></p> <p>C.& D. <i>Impact analysis and feedback format, analysis and actions taken (also to be verified during interaction with students)</i></p>		
Total:	100	

Evaluation Guidelines with indicative exhibits/context to be Observed/Assessed - SAR Tier – I (UG Engineering)
First Time Accreditation

Criterion 3: Course Outcomes and Program Outcomes (175)

Sub Criteria	Marks	Evaluation Guidelines
3.1. Establish the correlation between the courses and the POs & PSOs	25	A. Evidence of COs being defined for every course (5) B. Availability of COs embedded in the syllabi (5) C. Explanation of Course Articulation Matrix table to be ascertained (5) D. Explanation of Program Articulation Matrix tables to be ascertained (10)
<p><i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i></p> <p>A. Appropriateness of the statements shall be seen for atleast one course each from 2nd, 3rd and final year of study B. Mapping to be verified for atleast two matrices C. Mapping to be verified for atleast one course per year of study; program outcomes and program specific outcomes getting mapped with the core courses are also to be verified</p>		
3.2. Attainment of Course Outcomes	75	
3.2.1. Describe the assessment tools and processes used to gather the data upon which the evaluation of Course Outcome is based	10	A. List of assessment processes (2) B. The quality /relevance of assessment processes & tools used (8)
<p><i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i></p> <p>A. & B. Evidence for appropriate assessment processes including data collection, verification, analysis, decision making</p>		
3.2.2. Record the attainment of Course Outcomes of all courses with respect to set attainment levels	65	A. Verify the attainment levels as per the benchmark set for all courses (65)

Evaluation Guidelines with indicative exhibits/context to be Observed/Assessed - SAR Tier – I (UG Engineering)
First Time Accreditation

<i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i>		
<i>A. Methodology to define set levels and its compliance; data collection, verification, analysis and decision making; details for one course per year of study to be verified</i>		
3.3. Attainment of Program Outcomes and Program Specific Outcomes	75	
3.3.1. Describe assessment tools and processes used for assessing the attainment of each of the POs & PSOs	10	A. List of assessment tools & processes (5) B. The quality/relevance of assessment tools/processes used (5)
<i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i>		
<i>A. & B. Direct and indirect assessment tools & processes ; effective compliance; direct assessment methodology, indirect assessment formats-collection-analysis; decision making based on direct and indirect assessment</i>		
3.3.2. Provide results of evaluation of each PO & PSO	65	A. Verification of documents, results and level of attainment of each PO/PSO (50) B. Overall levels of attainment (15)
<i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i>		
<i>A. & B. Appropriate attainment level and documentary evidences; details for POs & PSOs attainment from core courses to be verified. Also atleast two POs & two PSOs attainment levels shall be verified</i>		
Total	175	

Evaluation Guidelines with indicative exhibits/context to be Observed/Assessed - SAR Tier – I (UG Engineering)
First Time Accreditation

Criterion 4: Students' Performance (100)

Sub Criteria	Marks	Evaluation Guidelines
4.1. Enrolment Ratio (20)	20	A. $\geq 90\%$ students enrolled at the First Year Level on average basis during the previous three academic years starting from current academic year (20) B. $\geq 80\%$ students enrolled at the First Year Level on average basis during the previous three academic years starting from current academic year (18) C. $\geq 70\%$ students enrolled at the First Year Level on average basis during the previous three academic years starting from current academic year (16) D. $\geq 60\%$ students enrolled at the First Year Level on average basis during the previous three academic years starting from current academic year (14) E. Otherwise '0'.
<i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i>		
<i>A. B. & C. Data to be verified for each of the assessment years.</i>		
4.2. Success Rate in the stipulated period of the program	20	
4.2.1. Success rate without backlog in any Semester/year of study Without Backlog means: No repeat(s) in any course in any semester/year of study	15	SI= (Number of students who graduated from the program without repeat(s) in any course)/(Number of students admitted in the first year of that batch and actually admitted in 2nd year via lateral entry and separate division, if applicable) Average SI = Mean of success index (SI) for past three batches Success rate without backlogs in any year of study = $15 \times$ Average SI
<i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i>		
<i>Data to be verified for each of the assessment years</i>		
4.2.2. Success rate with backlog in stipulated period (actual duration of the program)	5	SI= (Number of students who graduated from the program with backlog in the stipulated period of course duration)/(Number of students admitted in the first year of that batch and actually admitted in 2nd year via lateral entry and separate division, if applicable)

First Time Accreditation

		Average SI = mean of success index (SI) for past three batches Success rate = 5 × Average SI
<i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i>		
<i>Data to be verified for each of the assessment years</i>		
<i>Note: if 100% students clear without any backlog then also total marks scored will be 40 as both 4.2.1 & 4.2.2 will be applicable simultaneously.</i>		
4.3. Academic Performance in Second Year	10	Academic Performance Level = Average API (Academic Performance Index) API = ((Mean of 2 nd Year Grade Point Average of all successful Students on a 10 point scale) or (Mean of the percentage of marks of all successful student sin Second Year/10)) x (successful students/number of students appeared in the examination) Successful students are those who are permitted to proceed to the Third year
<i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i>		
<i>Data to be verified for atleast one of the assessment years</i>		
4.4. Placement, Higher studies and Entrepreneurship	30	Assessment Points = 30 × average of three years of [(x + y + z)/N] where, x = Number of students placed in companies or Government sector through on/off campus recruitment y = Number of students admitted to higher studies with valid qualifying scores (GATE or equivalent State or National level tests, GRE, GMAT etc.) z = No. of students turned entrepreneur in engineering/technology N =Total number of final year students
<i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i>		
<i>Data to be verified for atleast one of the assessment years</i>		
4.5. Professional Activities	20	
4.5.1. Professional societies / chapters and organizing engineering events	05	A. Availability & activities of professional societies/chapters (3) B. Number, quality of engineering events (organized at institute) (2) (Level - Institute/State/National/International)

Evaluation Guidelines with indicative exhibits/context to be Observed/Assessed - SAR Tier – I (UG Engineering)
First Time Accreditation

<i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i>		
<i>Self-Explanatory</i>		
4.5.2. Publication of technical magazines, newsletters, etc.	05	A. Quality & Relevance of the contents and Print Material (3) B. Participation of Students from the program (2)
<i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i>		
<i>A. Documentary evidence</i>		
<i>B. Documentary evidence - Students participation (also to be confirmed during interaction with the students)</i>		
4.5.3. Participation in inter-institute events by students of the program of study (at other institutions)	10	A. Events within the state (2) B. Events outside the state (3) C. Prizes/awards received in such events (5)
<i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i>		
<i>A.B. & C. Quality of events and documentary evidence</i>		
Total:	100	

Evaluation Guidelines with indicative exhibits/context to be Observed/Assessed - SAR Tier – I (UG Engineering)
First Time Accreditation

Criterion 5: Faculty Information and Contributions (200)

Sub Criteria	Marks	Evaluation Guidelines												
5.1. Student-Faculty Ratio (SFR)	20	<p>Marks to be given from a maximum of 20 to a minimum of 10 for average SFR between 15:1 to 20:1, and zero for average SFR higher than 20:1 (Refer calculation in SAR) as per the distribution given below:</p> <table style="margin-left: 40px; border: none;"> <tr> <td>15.00 - 15.50 -</td> <td style="text-align: right;">20 marks</td> </tr> <tr> <td>15.51 - 16.50 -</td> <td style="text-align: right;">18 marks</td> </tr> <tr> <td>16.51 - 17.50 -</td> <td style="text-align: right;">16 marks</td> </tr> <tr> <td>17.51 - 18.50 -</td> <td style="text-align: right;">14 marks</td> </tr> <tr> <td>18.51 - 19.50 -</td> <td style="text-align: right;">12 marks</td> </tr> <tr> <td>19.51 - 20.00 -</td> <td style="text-align: right;">10 marks</td> </tr> </table>	15.00 - 15.50 -	20 marks	15.51 - 16.50 -	18 marks	16.51 - 17.50 -	16 marks	17.51 - 18.50 -	14 marks	18.51 - 19.50 -	12 marks	19.51 - 20.00 -	10 marks
15.00 - 15.50 -	20 marks													
15.51 - 16.50 -	18 marks													
16.51 - 17.50 -	16 marks													
17.51 - 18.50 -	14 marks													
18.51 - 19.50 -	12 marks													
19.51 - 20.00 -	10 marks													
<p><i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>SFR is to be verified considering the faculty of the entire department.</i> • <i>No. of Regular faculty calculation considering Regular faculty definition*; Faculty appointment letters, time table, subject allocation file, salary statements.</i> • <i>No. of students calculation as mentioned in the SAR(please refer table under criterion 5.1)</i> • <i>Faculty Qualification as per AICTE guidelines shall only be counted</i> <p><i>*Note:</i> <i>Minimum 75% should be Regular/Full Time faculty and the remaining shall be Contractual Faculty/Adjunct Faculty/Resource Source from industry as per AICTE norms and standards.</i> <i>The contractual Faculty will be considered for assessment only if a faculty is drawing a salary as prescribed by the concerned State Government for the contractual faculty in the respective cadre and who have taught over consecutive 4 semesters.</i></p>														

First Time Accreditation

<p>5.2. Faculty Cadre Proportion</p>	<p>20</p>	<p>Cadre Proportion Marks =</p> $\left[\left[\frac{AF1}{RF1} \right] + \left[\frac{AF2 \times 0.6}{RF2} \right] + \left[\frac{AF3 \times 0.4}{RF3} \right] \right] \times 10$ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If AF1 = AF2= 0 then zero marks • Maximum marks to be limited if it exceeds 20 <p>(Refer calculation in SAR)</p>
<p><i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i></p> <p><i>(Faculty Qualification and experience required for cadre posts shall only be considered as per AICTE norms/guidelines)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Cadre wise No. of faculty available; Faculty qualification and experience and eligibility; Appointment/Promotion orders</i> • <i>Cadre wise no. of faculty required as per AICTE guidelines (refer calculation in SAR)</i> 		
<p>5.3. Faculty Qualification</p>	<p>20</p>	<p>FQ = 2.0 x [(10X + 4Y)/F] where X is no. of faculty with Ph.D., Y is no. of faculty with M.Tech., F is no. of faculty required to comply 1:15 Faculty Student ratio (no. of faculty and no. of students required to be calculated as per 5.1)</p>
<p><i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentary evidence – Faculty Qualification 		
<p>5.4 Faculty Retention</p>	<p>10</p>	<p>A. ≥90% of required Faculties retained during the period of assessment keeping CAYm3 as base year (10) B. ≥75% of required Faculties retained during the period of assessment keeping CAYm3 as base year (08) C. ≥60% of required Faculties retained during the period of assessment keeping CAYm3 as base</p>

First Time Accreditation

		year (06) D. $\geq 50\%$ of required Faculties retained during the period of assessment keeping CAY _{m3} as base year (04) E. Otherwise (0)
<i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Faculty date of joining; atleast three month (July-April-May) salary statement for each of the assessment years 		
5.5. Faculty competencies in correlation to Program Specific Criteria	10	A. Specialization B. Research Publications C. Course Developments D. Other relevant points
<i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i>		
5.6. Innovations by the Faculty in Teaching and Learning	10	A. Statement of clear goals, use of appropriate methods, significance of results, effective presentation (4) B. Availability of work on the Institute Website (2) C. Availability of work for peer review and critique (2) D. Reproducibility and Reusability by other scholars for further development (2)
<i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i>		
A. Availability on Institute website; awareness among faculty and students of the department B. & C. Self-explanatory D. Innovations that contribute to the improvement of student learning, typically include use of ICT, instruction delivery, instructional methods, assessment, evaluation etc.		
5.7 Faculty as participants in Faculty development /training activities /STTPs	15	For each year: Assessment = $3 \times \text{Sum} / 0.5RF$ Average assessment over last three years starting from CAY _{m1} (Marks limited to 15)
<i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i>		

First Time Accreditation

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevance of the training/development program • No. of days; No. of faculty 		
5.8. Research and Development	75	
5.8.1. Academic Research	20	A. Number of quality publications in refereed/SCI Journals, citations, Books/Book Chapters etc. (15) B. PhD awarded during the assessment period while working in the institute (5)
<i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i> A. <i>Quality of publications; publications copy</i> B. <i>Documentary evidence</i>		
5.8.2 Sponsored Research	20	Funded research from outside; Cumulative for CAYm1, CAYm2 and CAYm3): Amount > 50 Lacs – 20 Marks, Amount > 40 and < 50 Lacs – 15 Marks, Amount >30 and < 40 Lacs – 10 Marks, Amount > 15 and <30 Lacs– 5 Marks, Amount< 15 Lacs – 0 Marks
<i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Documentary evidence; Funding agency, Amount, Duration, Research progress; Outcome</i> 		
5.8.3 Development Activities	15	A. Product Development B. Research laboratories C. Instructional materials D. Working models/charts/monograms etc.
<i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i> <i>Self-explanatory</i>		

Evaluation Guidelines with indicative exhibits/context to be Observed/Assessed - SAR Tier – I (UG Engineering)

First Time Accreditation

5.8.4. Consultancy (From Industry)	20	Consultancy; Cumulative for CAYm1, CAYm2 and CAYm3): Amount>10 Lacs – 20 Marks, Amount<10 and > 8 Lacs – 15 Marks, Amount< 8and>6 Lacs– 10 Marks, Amount < 6 and >4 Lacs–5 Marks, Amount< 4 and >2 Lacs– 2 Marks, Amount <2 Lacs – 0 Mark
<p><i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Documentary evidence; Funding agency, Amount, Duration, Research progress; Outcome</i> 		
5.9. Faculty Performance Appraisal and Development System (FPADS)	10	<p>A. A well-defined performance appraisal and development system instituted for all the assessment years (5)</p> <p>B. Its implementation and effectiveness (5)</p>
<p><i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i></p> <p>A. <i>Notified performance appraisal and development system; Appraisal Parameters; Awareness</i></p> <p>B. <i>Implementation, Transparency and Effectiveness</i></p>		
5.10. Visiting/Adjunct/Emeritus Faculty etc.	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provision of Visiting /Adjunct/Emeritus faculty etc.(1) • Minimum 50 hours per year interaction (per year to obtain three marks : 3 x 3 = 9)
<p><i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Documentary evidence</i> 		
Total:	200	

Evaluation Guidelines with indicative exhibits/context to be Observed/Assessed - SAR Tier – I (UG Engineering)
First Time Accreditation

Criterion 6: Facilities and Technical Support (80)

Sub Criteria	Marks	Evaluation Guidelines
6.1. Adequate and well equipped laboratories, and technical manpower	40	A. Adequate well-equipped laboratories to run all the program-specific curriculum (25) B. Availability of adequate and qualified technical supporting staff (15)
<i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i>		
A. Adequacy; well-equipped laboratories; utilization B. Self-explanatory		
6.2. Laboratories: Maintenance and overall ambience	10	Maintenance and overall ambience (10)
<i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i>		
Self-explanatory		
6.3. Safety measures in laboratories	10	Safety measures in laboratories (10)
<i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i>		
Self-explanatory		
6.4. Project laboratory/Facilities	20	Facilities & Utilization (20)
<i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i>		
Self-explanatory		
Total:	80	

Evaluation Guidelines with indicative exhibits/context to be Observed/Assessed - SAR Tier – I (UG Engineering)
First Time Accreditation

Criterion 7: **Continuous Improvement (75)**

Sub Criteria	Marks	Evaluation Guidelines
7.1. Actions taken based on the results of evaluation of each of the POs and PSOs	30	A. Documentary evidences of POs and PSOs attainment levels (15) B. Identification of gaps/shortfalls (05) C. Plan of action to bridge the gap and its Implementation (10)
<i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i>		
• <i>Documentary evidence in respect of each of the POs</i>		
7.2 Academic Audit and actions taken during the period of Assessment	15	A. Assessment shall be based on conduct and actions taken in relation to continuous improvement (15)
<i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i>		
A. Academic Audit assessment criteria, frequency, conduct mechanism, action plan based on audit, implementation and effectiveness		
7.3. Improvement in Placement, Higher Studies and Entrepreneurship	10	Assessment is based on improvement in: (Refer placement index 4.5) A. Improvement in Placements (5) B. Improvement in Higher Studies (3) C. Improvement in number of Entrepreneurs (2) (Marks to be given proportionately considering nos. in the base year CAYm3)
<i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i>		
A. B. & C. Nos. in each year of the assessment; improvement considering CAYm3 as a base year		
7.4. Improvement in the quality of students admitted to the program	20	A. Assessment is based on improvement in terms of ranks/score in qualifying state level/national level entrances tests, percentage Physics, Chemistry and Mathematics marks in 12th Standard and percentage marks of the lateral entry students
<i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i>		
A. <i>Documentary evidence – list of students admitted; admission authority guidelines; ranks/scores; comparative status considering CAYm3 as a base year</i>		
Total:	75	

Evaluation Guidelines with indicative exhibits/context to be Observed/Assessed - SAR Tier – I (UG Engineering)
First Time Accreditation

Criterion 8: First Year Academics (50)

Sub Criteria	Marks	Evaluation Guidelines
8.1. First Year Student- Faculty Ratio (FYSFR)	05	For each year of assessment = $(5 \times 15) / \text{FYSFR}$ (Limited to Max. 5) Average of Assessment of data in CAY, CAY _{m1} and CAY _{m2}
<i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No. of Regular faculty calculation considering Regular faculty definition and fractional load; Faculty appointment letters; Salary statements • No. of students calculation as mentioned in the SAR 		
8.2. Qualification of Faculty Teaching First Year Common Courses	05	A. Assessment of faculty qualification $(5x + 3y) / \text{RF}$ B. Average of Assessment of previous three academic years including current academic year. (Refer 8.2. for x, y and RF)
<i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentary evidence – Faculty Qualification 		
8.3. First Year Academic Performance	10	Academic Performance = ((Mean of 1st Year Grade Point Average of all successful Students on a 10 point scale) or (Mean of the percentage of marks in First Year of all successful students/10)) x (successful students/number of students appeared in the examination) (Successful students are those who are permitted to proceed to the Second year)
<i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i>		
<i>Data to be verified for atleast one of the assessment years</i>		
8.4. Attainment of Course Outcomes of first year courses	10	

Evaluation Guidelines with indicative exhibits/context to be Observed/Assessed - SAR Tier – I (UG Engineering)

First Time Accreditation

8.4.1. Describe the assessment processes used to gather the data upon which the evaluation of Course Outcomes of first year is based	05	A. List of assessment processes (1) B. The relevance of assessment tools used (4)
<i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i>		
<i>A. & B. Direct and indirect assessment(if applicable), tools & processes; effective compliance; direct assessment methodology, indirect assessment formats-collection-analysis; decision making</i>		
8.4.2. Record the attainment of Course Outcomes of all first year courses	05	A. Verify the records as per the benchmark set for the courses (5)
<i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i>		
<i>A. Documentary evidence – Attainment for atleast 3 courses</i>		
8.5. Attainment of Program Outcomes of all first year courses	20	
8.5.1. Indicate results of evaluation of each relevant PO/PSO	10	A. Process of computing POs/PSOs attainment level from the COs of related first year courses (5) B. Verification of documents validating the above process (5)
<i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i>		
<i>A. & B. Documentary evidence for each relevant PO/PSO</i>		
8.5.2. Actions taken based on the results of evaluation of relevant POs /PSOs	10	A. Appropriate actions taken (10)
<i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i>		
<i>A. Documentary evidence for each relevant PO/PSO</i>		
Total:	50	

Evaluation Guidelines with indicative exhibits/context to be Observed/Assessed - SAR Tier – I (UG Engineering)
First Time Accreditation

Criterion 9: Student Support Systems (50)

Sub Criteria	Marks	Evaluation Guidelines
9.1. Mentoring system to help at individual level	05	A. Details of the mentoring system that has been developed for the students for various purposes and also state the efficacy of such system (5)
<i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i>		
<i>A. Mentoring system terms of reference; implementation; effectiveness (also to be verified during interaction with the students)</i>		
9.2. Feedback analysis and reward /corrective measures taken, if any	10	A. Methodology being followed for analysis of feedback and its effectiveness (5) B. Record of corrective measures taken (5)
<i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i>		
<i>A. Feedback questions, collection process, analysis, actions taken, effectiveness</i>		
9.3. Feedback on facilities	05	A. Feedback collection, analysis and corrective action (5)
<i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i>		
<i>Self explanatory</i>		
9.4. Self Learning	05	A. Scope for self-learning (2) B. The institution needs to specify the facilities, materials for learning beyond syllabus, Webinars, Podcast, MOOCs etc. and demonstrate its effective utilization (3)
<i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i>		
<i>Self explanatory</i>		

First Time Accreditation

9.5. Career Guidance, Training, Placement	10	A. Availability of career guidance facilities (2) B. Counseling for higher studies (GATE/GRE, GMAT, etc.) (2) C. Pre-placement training (3) D. Placement process and support (3)
<p><i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i></p> <p><i>Availability, implementation, effectiveness (also to be verified during interaction with the students)</i></p>		
9.6. Entrepreneurship Cell	05	A. Entrepreneurship initiatives (3) B. Data on students benefitted (2)
<p><i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i></p> <p><i>Availability, implementation, effectiveness (also to be verified during interaction with the students)</i></p>		
9.7. Co-curricular and Extra-curricular Activities	10	A. Availability of sports and cultural facilities (3) B. NCC, NSS and other clubs (3) C. Annual students activities (4)
<p><i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i></p> <p><i>Availability, implementation, effectiveness (also to be verified during interaction with the students)</i></p>		
Total:	50	

Evaluation Guidelines with indicative exhibits/context to be Observed/Assessed - SAR Tier – I (UG Engineering)
First Time Accreditation

Criterion 10: Governance, Institutional Support and Financial Resources (120)

Sub Criteria	Marks	Evaluation Guidelines
10.1. Organization, Governance and Transparency	55	
10.1.1.State the Vision and Mission of the Institute	05	A. Availability of the Vision & Mission statements of the Institute (2) B. Appropriateness/Relevance of the Statements (3)
<i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i>		
<p>A. Institute Vision and Mission statements: <i>Availability of statements on Institute website; Availability at Central facilities such as Library, Computer Center, Principal Chamber etc. Availability of one set of statements in each of the departments; Availability in Institute level documents</i></p> <p>B. Correctness from definition perspective</p>		
10.1.2. Availability of the Institutional Strategic Plan and its Effective Implementation and Monitoring	25	Availability of a 5 year Strategic Plan.
<i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i>		
10.1.3. Governing body, administrative setup, functions of various bodies, service rules procedures, recruitment and promotional policies.	10	A. List the Governing Body Composition and its Sub Committees, senate, and all other academic and administrative bodies; their memberships, functions, and responsibilities; frequency of the meetings; participation details of external members and attendance therein (4) B. The published service rules, policies and procedures with year of publication (3) C. Minutes of the meetings and action-taken reports (3)
<i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i>		
<i>Self explanatory</i>		

Evaluation Guidelines with indicative exhibits/context to be Observed/Assessed - SAR Tier – I (UG Engineering)

First Time Accreditation

10.1.4. Decentralization in working and grievance redressal mechanism	05	A. Organizational Structure, List of Administrative Committees and Administrative Heads who have been delegated powers for taking administrative decisions (1) B. Specify the mechanism and composition of grievance redressal cell (1) C. Action taken report of representations (sample) (3)
<i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i>		
<i>A. B. & C. Documentary evidence</i>		
10.1.5. Delegation of financial powers	05	A. Financial powers delegated to the Principal, Heads of Departments and relevant in-charges (2) B. Demonstrate the utilization of financial powers for each of the assessment years (3)
<i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i>		
<i>A. Circulars notifying financial powers B. Documentary evidence to exhibit utilization at each levels during assessment years</i>		
10.1.6. Transparency and availability of correct/unambiguous information in public domain	05	A. Information on the policies, rules, processes is to be made available on web site (2) B. Dissemination of the information about student, faculty and staff (2) C. Mandatory disclosure as per AICTE/AISHE on the website. (1)
<i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i>		
<i>A. & B. Website and Documentary evidence</i>		
10.2. Budget Allocation, Utilization, and Public Accounting at Institute level	15	
10.2.1. Adequacy of Budget allocation	05	A. Quantum of budget allocation for three years (3) B. Justification of budget allocated for three years (2)
<i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i>		

Evaluation Guidelines with indicative exhibits/context to be Observed/Assessed - SAR Tier – I (UG Engineering)

First Time Accreditation

<p>A. <i>Budget formulation, finalization and approval process</i> B. <i>Requirement – allocation –adequacy – justification thereof</i></p>		
10.2.2. Utilization of allocated funds	05	A. Budget utilization for three years (5)
<p><i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i></p> <p>A. Balance sheet; effective utilization; random verification for atleast two of the three assessment years</p>		
10.2.3. Availability of the audited statements on the institute’s website	05	A. Availability of Audited statements on website (5)
<p><i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i></p> <p>A. <i>Website</i></p>		
10.3. Program Specific Budget Allocation, Utilization	30	To be evaluated in consultation with the Program Experts
10.3.1. Adequacy of budget allocation	10	A. Quantum of budget allocation for three years (5) B. Justification of budget allocated for three years (5)
<p><i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i></p> <p>A. <i>Budget formulation, finalization and approval process</i> B. <i>Requirement – allocation –adequacy – justification thereof</i></p>		
10.3.2. Utilization of allocated funds	20	A. Budget utilization for three years (20)
<p><i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i></p> <p>A. <i>Balance sheet; effective utilization; random verification for atleast two of the three assessment years</i></p>		

Evaluation Guidelines with indicative exhibits/context to be Observed/Assessed - SAR Tier – I (UG Engineering)
First Time Accreditation

10.4. Library and Internet	20	
10.4.1. Quality of learning resources (hard/soft)	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Availability of relevant learning resources including e-resources and Digital Library (7) • Accessibility to students (3)
<p><i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i></p> <p><i>Availability; Adequacy; Effectiveness</i> <i>(Also to be verified during interactions with the faculty and students)</i></p>		
10.4.2. Internet	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Available bandwidth (4) B. Wi Fi availability (2) C. Internet access in labs, classrooms, library and offices of all Departments (2) D. Security mechanism (2)
<p><i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i></p> <p><i>Availability as per AICTE norms; Adequacy; Effectiveness</i> <i>(Also to be verified during interactions with the faculty and students)</i></p>		
Total:	120	