

**Evaluation Guidelines with indicative exhibits/context to be Observed/Assessed - SAR (PG pharmacy)**

**First Time Accreditation**

**Criterion 1: Program Curriculum and Teaching–Learning Processes (100)**

<b>Sub Criteria</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>Evaluation Guidelines</b>
<b>1.1. Program Curriculum</b>	<b>35</b>	
1.1.1. State the process for designing the program curriculum	10	Process used to demonstrate how the program curriculum is evolved or gap analysis is done and periodically reviewed considering the POs.
<b>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</b>		
❖ <i>Documentary evidence to indicate the process which demonstrate how the program curriculum is evolved and periodically reviewed considering the POs.</i>		
1.1.2. State curriculum the components of the curriculum	10	Refer to SAR: Expectation in 1.1.2 & 1.1.3 is that the curriculum is well balanced structure & appropriate for a PG program
<b>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</b>		
❖ <i>In 1.1.2 the evaluator can see the distribution of credits amongst different components. It allows him to decide if the curriculum is balanced</i>		
1.1.3. Structure of the Curriculum	05	
<b>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</b>		
❖ <i>In 1.1.3 look at the entire curriculum in detail. It shall allow an evaluator to identify oddities (if any) at the individual course level.</i>		
1.1.4. Overall quality and level of program curriculum	10	Overall judgement of the experts.
<b>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</b>		
❖ <i>The intent of this section is to arrive at a judgment on whether or the program can allow attainment of Program Outcomes. As such it relies heavily on the domain expertise of the Evaluator. He alone can decide if the program, as given, is capable of leading to PO attainment. Were the POs actually attained is to be determined in a later section</i>		

## Evaluation Guidelines with indicative exhibits/context to be Observed/Assessed - SAR (PG pharmacy)

### First Time Accreditation

Note: In case of affiliated institutions, the marks will be awarded as below:

- 1.1.1. Process used to identify extent of compliance of the University curriculum for attaining the Program Outcomes – 10 Marks
- 1.1.2. Appropriateness of the gaps identified – 5 Marks
- 1.1.3. Actions taken to bridge the gap – 10 Marks
- 1.1.4. Overall quality and level of program curriculum – 10 Marks

In case program is able to demonstrate the compliance of university curriculum in attaining the program outcomes, then the marks distribution will be as indicated in 1.1.1 to 1.1.4.

<b>1.2. Teaching-Learning Processes</b>	<b>65</b>	
1.2.1. Quality of end semester examination, internal semester question papers, assignments and evaluation	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Process for end semester examination, internal semester question paper setting and evaluation and effective process implementation (2)</li> <li>B. Process to ensure questions from outcomes/learning levels perspective (2)</li> <li>C. Evidence of COs coverage in class test / mid-term tests (3)</li> <li>D. Quality of Assignment and its relevance to COs (3)</li> </ul>
<b>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>A. Process of end semester examination, internal semester question paper setting, model answers, evaluation and its compliance</i></li> <li><i>B. Question paper validation to ensure desired standard from outcome attainment perspective as well as learning levels perspective</i></li> <li><i>C. Mapping of questions with the course outcomes</i></li> <li><i>D. Assignments to promote self-learning, survey of contents from multiple sources, assignment evaluation and mapping with the COs</i></li> </ul>		
1.2.2. Quality of student projects	25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Very clear and concise objectives (4)</li> <li>B. Very clear methodology, articulated using technical terms indicating all steps and tools (4)</li> <li>C. Cites substantial current and good quality literature (4)</li> <li>D. Clarity in design/setting up of experiment (4)</li> <li>E. Benchmarks used / Assumptions made (2)</li> <li>F. Interpretation of results and justification thereof and validity of the results presented (3)</li> <li>G. Overall presentation of the report (4)</li> </ul>
<b>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</b>		
❖ <i>Self-Explanatory</i>		

**Evaluation Guidelines with indicative exhibits/context to be Observed/Assessed - SAR (PG pharmacy)**

**First Time Accreditation**

1.2.3. Initiatives related to industry interaction /summer training	10	A. Industry supported laboratories (2) B. Industrial training/tours for students (2) C. Industrial /internship /summer training of more than two weeks and post training Assessment (3) D. Impact analysis of industrial training (3)
<p><b>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</b></p> <p><i>A. Type of Industries, Type of Labs, objectives, utilization and effectiveness</i>  <i>B. &amp; C. Type of Industries, planned or non-planned activity, objectives clearly defined, no. of students participated, relevant area of training, visit report documented</i>  <i>D. Impact analysis and feedback format, analysis and actions taken</i></p>		
1.2.4. Participation of Industry professionals in curriculum development, as examiners, in major projects	05	A. Industry involvement in the program design and Curriculum (1) B. Industry involvement in partial delivery of any regular courses for students (2) C. Industry involvement as examiners in major or minor project (2)
<p><b>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</b></p> <p><i>A &amp; B &amp; C. Documentary evidence</i></p>		
1.2.5. Quality of laboratory work given	15	Qualitative judgement of the expert.
<p><b>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</b></p> <p>❖ <i>Are the experiments so well structured that these can be done by simply following the given set of instructions? One may not learn much in that case. Usefulness of laboratory work can be better evaluated by the amount of thought effort a student is required to put in to complete the tasks. In that case learning can happen and POs can be attained.</i></p>		
<b>Total:</b>	<b>100</b>	

**Evaluation Guidelines with indicative exhibits/context to be Observed/Assessed - SAR (PG pharmacy)**

**First Time Accreditation**

**Criterion 2: Program Outcomes and Course Outcomes (75)**

<b>Sub Criteria</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>Evaluation Guidelines</b>
<b>2.1. Establish the connect between the courses and the POs</b>	<b>10</b>	A. Evidence of COs being defined for every course (2) B. Availability of COs embedded in the syllabi (2) C. Explanation of Course Articulation Matrix table to be ascertained (3) D. Explanation of Program Articulation Matrix tables to be ascertained (3)
<b><i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i></b>		
<p><i>A. Appropriateness of the statements shall be seen for at least one course each from 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> year of study</i></p> <p><i>B. Mapping to be verified for at least two matrices</i></p> <p><i>C. &amp; D. Mapping to be verified for at least one course per year of study; program outcomes getting mapped with the core courses are also to be verified</i></p>		
<b>2.2. Attainment of Program Outcomes</b>	<b>40</b>	
2.2.1. Describe the assessment tools and processes used to gather the data upon which the evaluation of Program Outcome is based	10	A. List of assessment tools & processes (4) B. The quality/relevance of assessment tools/processes used (6)
<b><i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i></b>		
<p><i>A &amp; B. Direct and indirect assessment tools &amp; processes; effective compliance; direct assessment methodology, indirect assessment formats-collection-analysis; decision making based on direct and indirect assessment</i></p>		
2.2.2. POs attainment levels with observations	30	A. Verification of documents, results and level of attainment of each PO (20) B. Overall levels of attainment (10)
<b><i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i></b>		
<p><i>A &amp; B. Appropriate attainment level and documentary evidences; details for POs attainment from core courses to be verified. Also at least two POs attainment levels shall be verified</i></p>		
<b>2.3. Attainment of research Outcomes</b>	<b>25</b>	

**Evaluation Guidelines with indicative exhibits/context to be Observed/Assessed - SAR (PG pharmacy)**

**First Time Accreditation**

2.3.1 Describe the methods, tools and processes used for strengthening the research outcomes of the department and the program	5	
<p><b><i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i></b></p> <p>❖ <i>Documentary Evidence</i></p>		
2.3.2.ROs attainment levels with observations for the immediate last 3 years	20	A. Verification of documents, results and level of attainment of each RO (15) B. Overall levels of attainment (5)
<p><b><i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i></b></p> <p><i>A. &amp; B. Appropriate attainment level and documentary evidences; details for ROs attainment from core courses to be verified. Also at least two ROs attainment levels shall be verified</i></p>		
<b>Total</b>	<b>75</b>	

**Evaluation Guidelines with indicative exhibits/context to be Observed/Assessed - SAR (PG pharmacy)**

**First Time Accreditation**

**Criterion 3: Students' Performance (75)**

Sub Criteria	Marks	Evaluation Guidelines
<b>3.1. Enrolment Ratio through GPAT (20)</b>	<b>20</b>	A. $\geq 80\%$ students enrolled through GPAT at the First Year Level on average basis during the last three years starting from Current Academic Year (20) B. $\geq 60\%$ students enrolled through GPAT at the First Year Level on average basis during the last three years starting from Current Academic Year (16) C. $\geq 50\%$ students enrolled through GPAT at the First Year Level on average basis during the last three years starting from Current Academic Year (12) D. $\geq 40\%$ students enrolled through GPAT at the First Year Level on average basis during the last three years starting from Current Academic Year (8) E. $\geq 20\%$ students enrolled through GPAT at the First Year Level on average basis during the last three years starting from Current Academic Year (6) F. $< 20\%$ students enrolled through GPAT at the First Year Level on average basis during the last three years starting from Current Academic Year (0)
<p><b>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</b></p> <p><i>A. B. C. &amp; D. Data to be verified for each of the assessment years</i></p>		
<b>3.2. Success Rate in the stipulated period of the program</b>	<b>20</b>	S.I. = Number of students completing program in stipulated duration/ Number of students admitted in first year of same batch; Average S.I. = Mean of S.I. for the past 3 batches. Assessment points = 20 * Average S.I.
<p><b>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</b></p> <p><i>❖ Data to be verified for each of the assessment years</i></p>		
<b>3.3. Placement, Higher studies and Entrepreneurship</b>	<b>20</b>	Assessment Points = 20 * Average Placement i.e. $(P_1+P_2+P_3)/3$ Placement Index $(P) = [(X + Y + Z)/N]$ where, X = Number of students placed in companies or Government sector through on/off campus recruitment Y = No. of students pursuing Ph.D. / JRF/ SRF Z = No. of students turned entrepreneur in engineering/technology N = Total no. of students admitted in first year

**Evaluation Guidelines with indicative exhibits/context to be Observed/Assessed - SAR (PG pharmacy)**

**First Time Accreditation**

***Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:***

❖ *Data to be verified for at least one of the assessment years*

<b>3.4. Professional Activities</b>	<b>15</b>	
3.4.1. Students' participation in professional societies/chapters and organizing pharmacy events	05	A. Availability & activities of professional societies/chapters (3) B. Number, quality of pharmacy events (organized at institute) (2) (Level - Institute/State/National/International)
<b><i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i></b>		
❖ <i>Self-Explanatory</i>		
3.4.2. Students' Publications	10	A. Quality & Relevance of the contents and Print Material (3) B. Participation of Students from the program (2) C. List the publications along with the names of the authors and publishers, etc. (5)
<b><i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i></b>		
A. & C. <i>Documentary evidence</i> B. <i>Documentary evidence - Students participation (also to be confirmed during interaction with the students)</i>		
<b>Total:</b>	<b>75</b>	

**Evaluation Guidelines with indicative exhibits/context to be Observed/Assessed - SAR (PG pharmacy)**

**First Time Accreditation**

**Criterion 4: Faculty Contributions (100)**

Sub Criteria	Marks	Evaluation Guidelines														
<p><b>4.1. Student-Faculty Ratio (SFR)</b></p>	<p align="center"><b>10</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Marks to be given proportionally from a maximum of 10 to a minimum of 05 for average SFR between 15:1 to 20:1, and zero for average SFR higher than 20:1. Marks distribution is given as below:                             <table border="0" style="margin-left: 40px;"> <tr> <td>SFR ≤ 15</td> <td align="right">- 10 Marks</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SFR &gt; 15.01 and &lt; = 16</td> <td align="right">- 09 Marks</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SFR &gt; 16.01 and &lt; = 17</td> <td align="right">- 08 Marks</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SFR &gt; 17.01 and &lt; = 18</td> <td align="right">- 07 Marks</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SFR &gt; 18.01 and &lt; = 19</td> <td align="right">- 06 Marks</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SFR &gt; 19.01 and &lt; = 20</td> <td align="right">- 05 Marks</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SFR &gt; 20</td> <td align="right">- 00 Mark</td> </tr> </table> </li> </ul>	SFR ≤ 15	- 10 Marks	SFR > 15.01 and < = 16	- 09 Marks	SFR > 16.01 and < = 17	- 08 Marks	SFR > 17.01 and < = 18	- 07 Marks	SFR > 18.01 and < = 19	- 06 Marks	SFR > 19.01 and < = 20	- 05 Marks	SFR > 20	- 00 Mark
SFR ≤ 15	- 10 Marks															
SFR > 15.01 and < = 16	- 09 Marks															
SFR > 16.01 and < = 17	- 08 Marks															
SFR > 17.01 and < = 18	- 07 Marks															
SFR > 18.01 and < = 19	- 06 Marks															
SFR > 19.01 and < = 20	- 05 Marks															
SFR > 20	- 00 Mark															
<p><b>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ <i>All the faculty whether regular or contractual (except Part-Time or hourly based), will be considered. The contractual faculty appointed with any terminology whatsoever, who have taught for 2 consecutive semesters with or without break between the two semesters in the corresponding academic year on full time basis shall be considered for the purpose of calculation in the Faculty Student Ratio. However, following will be ensured in case of contractual faculty</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>Shall have the PCI prescribed qualifications and experience.</i></li> <li>2. <i>Shall be appointed on full time basis and worked for consecutive two semesters with or without break between the two semesters during the particular academic year under consideration.</i></li> <li>3. <i>Should have gone through an appropriate process of selection and the records of the same shall be made available to the visiting team during NBA visit.</i></li> </ol> </li> <li>❖ <i>Faculty to be calculated Department wise as per the format given in SAR; Faculty appointment letters, time table, subject allocation file, salary statements and random interaction in person.</i></li> <li>❖ <i>No. of students calculation as mentioned in the SAR (please refer table under criterion 3.1)</i></li> <li>❖ <i>Faculty Qualification as per PCI guidelines shall only be counted</i></li> </ul> <p><i>Note:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ <i>If the Institute/Department is running Diploma, UG, PG programs parallelly, then for the UG &amp; PG programs, total number of faculty will be calculated as mention below:</i></li> </ul> <p align="center"><i>Total Number of faculty(F) in the Institute/Department <b>minus</b> Required number of faculty for Diploma programs (1:20).</i></p>																
<p><b>4.2. Faculty competencies in the area of Program specialization</b></p>	<p align="center"><b>55</b></p>															
<p>4.2.1. Faculty name and specialization for the program under consideration</p>	<p align="center">10</p>															





**Evaluation Guidelines with indicative exhibits/context to be Observed/Assessed - SAR (PG pharmacy)**

**First Time Accreditation**

4.3.2. Consultancy (From Industry)	10	Consultancy; Cumulative for CAYm1, CAYm2 and CAYm3 Amount $\geq$ 10 Lacs                    10 Marks, Amount $<$ 10 and $\geq$ 8 Lacs        08 Marks, Amount $<$ 8 and $\geq$ 6 Lacs        06 Marks, Amount $<$ 6 and $\geq$ 4 Lacs        03 Marks, Amount $<$ 4 and $\geq$ 2 Lacs        01 Marks, Amount $<$ 2 Lacs                        00 Mark
<p><b><i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ <i>Documentary evidence</i></li> <li>❖ <i>Funding agency,</i></li> <li>❖ <i>Amount &amp; Duration</i></li> <li>❖ <i>Research progress &amp; Outcome</i></li> </ul>		
<b>4.4. Faculty as participants in Faculty development /training activities /STTPs</b>	<b>05</b>	
<p><b><i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ <i>Relevance of the training/development program.</i></li> <li>❖ <i>No of days;</i></li> <li>❖ <i>No. of faculty</i></li> </ul>		
<b>Total:</b>	<b>100</b>	

**Evaluation Guidelines with indicative exhibits/context to be Observed/Assessed - SAR (PG pharmacy)**

**First Time Accreditation**

**Criterion 5: Laboratories and Research Facilities (75)**

Sub Criteria	Marks	Evaluation Guidelines
<b>5.1. Adequate and well equipped laboratories in area of Program specialization</b>	<b>25</b>	A. Adequate well-equipped laboratories to run all the program-specific curriculum (20) B. Availability of adequate and qualified technical supporting staff (05)
<b>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</b>  <i>A. Adequacy; well-equipped laboratories and utilization</i> <i>B. Self-explanatory</i>		
<b>5.2. Research facilities/center of excellence</b>	<b>30</b>	
<b>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</b>  ❖ <i>Self-explanatory</i>		
<b>5.3. Access to laboratory facilities, training in the use of equipment</b>	<b>05</b>	
<b>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</b>  ❖ <i>Self-explanatory</i>		
<b>5.4. Drug Museum</b>	<b>05</b>	
<b>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</b>  ❖ <i>Self-explanatory</i>		
<b>5.5. Medicinal Plant Garden</b>	<b>10</b>	
<b>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</b>  ❖ <i>Self-explanatory</i>		
<b>Total:</b>	<b>75</b>	

**Evaluation Guidelines with indicative exhibits/context to be Observed/Assessed - SAR (PG pharmacy)**

**First Time Accreditation**

**Criterion 6: Continuous Improvement (75)**

<b>Sub Criteria</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>Evaluation Guidelines</b>
<b>6.1. Actions taken based on the results of evaluation of each of the POs</b>	<b>25</b>	A. Documentary evidences of POs attainment levels (10) B. Identification of gaps/shortfalls (05) C. Plan of action to bridge the gap and its Implementation (10)
<b><i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i></b>		
❖ <i>Documentary evidence in respect of each of the POs</i>		
<b>6.2. Improvement in Quality of Projects</b>	<b>10</b>	
<b><i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i></b>		
❖ <i>Self-Explanatory</i>		
<b>6.3. Improvement in Placement, Higher Studies and Entrepreneurship</b>	<b>10</b>	Assessment is based on improvement in: (Refer placement index 3.3) A. Improvement in Placement numbers, quality, core hiring industry and pay packages (5) B. Improvement in Higher Studies admissions for pursuing PhD. in premier institutions (3) C. Improvement in number of Entrepreneurs (2) (Marks to be given proportionately considering nos. in the base year CAYm2)
<b><i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i></b>		
<i>A. B. &amp; C. Nos. in each year of the assessment; improvement considering CAYm2 as a base year</i>		
<b>6.4. Improvement in the quality of students admitted to the program</b>	<b>10</b>	A. Assessment is based on improvement in terms of ranks/score in GPAT examination
<b><i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i></b>		
<i>A. Documentary evidence– list of students admitted; admission authority guidelines; ranks/scores; comparative status considering CAYm2 as a base year</i>		
<b>6.5. Improvement in quality of paper publication</b>	<b>10</b>	

**Evaluation Guidelines with indicative exhibits/context to be Observed/Assessed - SAR (PG pharmacy)**

**First Time Accreditation**

<b><i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i></b>		
<i>❖ Documentary evidence in respect of quality publication in journal and conference &amp; publications copy</i>		
<b>6.6. Improvement in laboratories</b>	<b>10</b>	
<b><i>Exhibits/Context to be Observed/Assessed:</i></b>		
<i>❖ Documentary evidence in respect of good infrastructure in laboratories and research laboratories and CoEs</i>		
<b>Total:</b>	<b>75</b>	