

**Part B-Program Assessment Worksheet**  
**Program Level Criteria- To Be Assessed by Evaluator**

Name of the Institution :

Name of the Program :

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

S.No	Sub Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines (Marks)	Marks awarded		Overall marks	Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)
				Marks	Total		
1.1	State the Vision and Mission	5	A. Availability of the Vision and Mission Statements of the Department (1)				
			B. Appropriateness/Relevance of the Statements (2)				
			C. Consistency of the Department statements with the Institute statements (2)				
1.2	State the Program Educational Objectives (PEOs)	5	Listing of the Program Educational Objectives				
1.3	Indicate where and How the Vision, Mission and PEOs are Published and Disseminated among Stakeholders	15	A. Adequacy in respect of publication & dissemination (4)				
			B. Process of dissemination among stakeholders (4)				
			C. Extent of awareness of Vision, Mission & PEOs among the stakeholders (7)				
1.4	State the Process for Defining the Vision & Mission and PEOs of the Program	10	A. Description of process involved in defining the Vision, Mission of the Department (6)				
			B. Description of process involved in defining the PEOs of the program (4)				
1.5	Establish Consistency of PEOs with Mission of the Department	15	A. Preparation of a matrix of PEOs and elements of Mission statement (6)				
			B. Consistency/justification of co-relation parameters of the above matrix (9)				
<b>Total of Criterion 1:</b>		<b>50</b>	<b>Overall Marks for Criterion 1:</b>				

Signature of Program Evaluator 1

Signature of Program Evaluator 2

<b>Criterion 2: Program Curriculum and Teaching-Learning Processes (150)</b>							
<b>S.No</b>	<b>Sub Criteria</b>	<b>Max. Marks</b>	<b>Evaluation Guidelines</b>	<b>Marks awarded</b>		<b>Overall marks</b>	<b>Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)</b>
				<b>Marks</b>	<b>Total</b>		
<b>2.1</b>	<b>Program Curriculum</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>40 marks for autonomous institutions' programs</b>				
2.1.1	State the Process for Designing the Program Curriculum	20	Process used to demonstrate how the program curriculum is evolved and periodically reviewed considering the POs and PSOs				
2.1.2	State the Components of the Curriculum	5	Refer to SAR: Expectation in 2.1.2, 2.1.3 & 2.1.4 is that the curriculum is well balanced & appropriate for B. Arch degree				
2.1.3	Transaction of the Program Curriculum	5	Refer to SAR: Expectation in 2.1.2, 2.1.3 & 2.1.4 is that the curriculum is well balanced & appropriate for B. Arch degree				
2.1.4	State the Process Used to Identify Extent of Compliance of the Program Curriculum for Attaining the Program Outcomes (POs)	5	Refer to SAR: Expectation in 2.1.2 & 2.1.3 & 2.1.4 is that the curriculum is well balanced structure & appropriate for B. Arch degree				
2.1.5	Initiatives Towards the Educational Policy at Program Level	5					
<b>In case of affiliated institutions, following criteria will be applicable for Program Curriculum:</b>							
In case of affiliated institutions marks will be on content beyond to cover the gaps; if any from the POs attainment perspective. It will also include the weightage on efforts put in to cover the gaps. The marks distribution will be as given below							
<b>2.1</b>	<b>Program Curriculum</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>30 marks for affiliated institutions' programs</b>				
2.1.1	State the Process Used to Identify Extent of Compliance of the University Curriculum for Attaining the Program Outcomes (POs)	10	A.Process used to identify extent of compliance of the University curriculum for attaining the POs/PSOs (6)				
			B.List the curricular gaps for the attainment of defined POs/PSOs (4)				
2.1.2	State the Delivery Details of the Content beyond Syllabus for the Attainment of POs	15	A.Steps taken to get identified gaps included in the curriculum (letter to University/BoS) (2)				
			B.Delivery details of content beyond syllabus (6)				
			C.Mapping of events with the POs/PSOs (7)				
2.1.3.	Initiatives Towards the Educational Policy at Program Level	5					

S.No	Sub Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines	Marks awarded		Overall marks	Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)
				Marks	Total		
2.2	Teaching Learning Processes	110 (120)	<b>110 marks for autonomous institutions' programs &amp; 120 marks for affiliated institutions' programs</b>				
2.2.1	Initiatives in Teaching and Learning Process	(15)(25)	A. Adherence to Academic Calendar (3) (3)				
			B. Use of various instructional methods and pedagogical initiatives (2) (4)				
			C. Methodologies to support weak students and encourage bright students (2) (4)				
			D. Quality of classroom teaching (Observation in a Class) (2) (4)				
			E. Conduct of experiments (Observation in Lab) (2) (4)				
			F. Student feedback of teaching learning process and actions taken (4) (6)				
2.2.2	Quality of Internal Semester Question Papers, Assignments and Evaluation	20(Same marks for both)	A. Process for internal semester question paper setting, evaluation and effective process implementation (3)				
			B. Process to ensure questions from outcomes/learning levels perspective (3)				
			C. Evidence of COs coverage in class test / mid-term tests (7)				
			D. Quality of Assignment and its relevance to COs (7)				
2.2.3	Quality of Student Projects	25(Same marks for both)	A. Identification of projects and allocation methodology to faculty members (3) (3)				
			B. Types and relevance of the reports and their contribution towards attainment of POs/PSOs (5) (7)				
			C. Process for monitoring and evaluation (5) (5)				
			D. Process to assess individual and team performance (5) (5)				
			E. Quality of completed projects/working prototypes (5) (3)				
			F. Evidences of papers published /awards received by projects etc. (2) (2)				

S.No	Sub Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines	Marks awarded		Overall marks	Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)
				Marks	Total		
2.2.4	Initiatives Related to Profession Interaction	10(Same marks for both)	A. Industry supported laboratories/studios (3) (2)				
			B. Guest lectures/seminars given by industry/research organization (5) (6)				
			C. Impact analysis of industry institute interaction and actions taken thereof (2) (2)				
2.2.5	Initiatives Related to Skill Development Programs/ Professional Internships/ Summer Training	20(Same marks for both)	A. Industrial skill development programs/ training/tours for students (5) (7)				
			B. Internships /summer training of more than two weeks (10) (10)				
			C. Impact analysis of industrial training/ tours/ Internships (5) (3)				
2.2.6	Quality of Studio Projects and Experiments	20(Same marks for both)	A. Quality of studio (5)				
			B. Quality of student projects/ experiments/ outcomes (15)				
<b>Total of Criterion 2:</b>		<b>150</b>	<b>Overall Marks for Criterion 2:</b>				

Criterion 3: Course Outcomes and Program Outcomes (100)							
S.No	Sub Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines	Marks awarded		Overall marks	Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)
				Marks	Total		
<b>3.1</b>	<b>Establish the Correlation between the Courses and Program Outcomes</b>	<b>20</b>					
3.1.1	Course Outcomes	5	Evidence of COs being defined for every course				
3.1.2	CO-PO Matrices of Courses Selected in 3.1.1 (ten matrices)	5	Explanation of tables to be ascertained				
3.1.3	Course-PO Matrix of all Five Years of Study	10	Explanation of table to be ascertained				
<b>3.2</b>	<b>Attainment of Course Outcomes</b>	<b>40</b>					
3.2.1	Describe the Assessment Processes Used to Gather the Data upon which the Evaluation of Course Outcome is Based	10	A. List of assessment tools & processes (6)				
			B. The quality/ relevance of assessment tools/ processes used (4)				
3.2.2	Record the Attainment of Course Outcomes of all Courses with Respect to Set Attainment Levels	30	Verify the attainment levels as per the benchmark set for all courses				
<b>3.3</b>	<b>Attainment of Program Outcomes and Program Specific Outcomes</b>	<b>40</b>					
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 (6)				
			B. The quality /relevance of assessment tools/ processes used (4)				
3.3.2	Provide Results of Evaluation of Each PO/PSO	30	A. Verification of documents, results and level of attainment of each PO and PSO (20)				
			B. Overall levels of attainment (10)				
<b>Total of Criterion 3:</b>		<b>100</b>	<b>Overall Marks for Criterion 3:</b>				

Criterion 4: Students' Quality and Performance (180)										
S.No	Sub Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines	Marks awarded		Overall marks	Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)			
				Marks	Total			CAY	CAYm1	CAYm2
4.1	Enrolment Ratio	20	A. $\geq 90\%$ students enrolled at the 1 <sup>st</sup> Year Level on average basis during the three-year starting from current academic year (20)							
			B. $\geq 80\%$ students enrolled at the 1 <sup>st</sup> Year Level on average basis during the three-year starting from current academic year (18)				Sanctioned intake			
			C. $\geq 70\%$ students enrolled at the 1 <sup>st</sup> Year Level on average basis during the three-year starting from current academic year (16)				Students enrolled at first year level			
			D. $\geq 60\%$ students enrolled at the 1 <sup>st</sup> Year Level on average basis during the three-year starting from current academic year (14)				Enrolment ratio (ER)			
			E. $\geq 50\%$ students enrolled at the 1 <sup>st</sup> Year Level on average basis during the three-year starting from current academic year (12)				<b>Average ER for 3 years</b>			
			F. Otherwise '0'				<b>Comments (if any):</b> ❖			
4.2	Success Rate in the Stipulated Period of the Program	50								
4.2.1	Success Rate without Backlogs  [Without Backlogs means nocompartment or failures in any semester/year of study]	30	Success Index(SI)=(Number of students, who graduated from the program without backlogs)/ (Number of students admitted in the 1 <sup>st</sup> year of that batch)  <b>Average SI</b> = Mean of SI for past three batches  <b>Success rate without backlogs in any year of study</b> = 30 * Average SI							
							Success Index (SI)			
							<b>Average SI for 3 years</b>			
				<b>Comments (if any):</b> ❖						

S.No	Sub Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines	Marks awarded		Overall marks	Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)			
				Marks	Total			LYG	LYGm1	LYGm2
4.2.2	Success Rate in Stipulated Period (Actual Duration of the Program)  <b>[Total of with backlogs + without backlogs]</b>	<b>20</b>	Success Index ( <b>SI</b> )= (Number of students who graduated from the program in the stipulated period of course duration)/(Number of students admitted in the 1 <sup>st</sup> year of that batch)  <b>Average SI</b> = Mean of SI for past three batches  <b>Success rate</b> = 20 * Average SI							
							Success Index (SI)			
							<b>Average SI for 3 years</b>			
							<b>Comments (if any):</b> ❖			
<b>4.3</b>	<b>Academic Performance in Final Year</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>Academic Performance</b> =Average API (Academic Performance Index)  <b>API</b> = (Mean of final year Grade Point Average of all successful Students on a 10-point scale) or (Mean of the percentage of marks of all successful students in final year/10)) * (successful students/number of students appeared in the examination)  All successful students are those who are passed in al the final year courses.				<b>Average API</b> for past 3 years:  <b>Comments (if any):</b> ❖			
<b>4.4</b>	<b>Academic Performance in Fourth Year</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>Academic Performance</b> =Average API (Academic Performance Index)  <b>API</b> = (Mean of 4 <sup>th</sup> year Grade Point Average of all successful Students on a 10-point scale) or (Mean of the percentage of marks of all successful students in 4 <sup>th</sup> year/10)) * (successful students/number of students appeared in the examination)  All successful students are those who are permitted to proceed to the final year.				<b>Average API</b> for past 3 years:  <b>Comments (if any):</b> ❖			

S.No	Sub Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines	Marks awarded		Overall marks	Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)
				Marks	Total		
4.5	Academic Performance in Third Year	10	<p><b>Academic Performance</b>= Average API (Academic Performance Index)</p> <p><b>API</b> = (Mean of 3<sup>rd</sup> year Grade Point Average of all successful Students on a 10-point scale) or (Mean of the percentage of marks of all successful students in 3<sup>rd</sup> year/10)) * (successful students/number of students appeared in the examination)</p> <p>All successful students are those who are permitted to proceed to the fourth-year.</p>				<p><b>Average API</b> for past 3 years:</p> <p><b>Comments (if any):</b> ❖</p>
4.6	Academic Performance in Second Year	10	<p><b>Academic Performance</b>= Average API (Academic Performance Index)</p> <p><b>API</b> = (Mean of 2<sup>nd</sup> year Grade Point Average of all successful Students on a 10-point scale) or (Mean of the percentage of marks of all successful students in 2<sup>nd</sup> year/10)) * (successful students/number of students appeared in the examination)</p> <p>All successful students are those who are permitted to proceed to the third-year.</p>				<p><b>Average API</b> for past 3 years:</p> <p><b>Comments (if any):</b> ❖</p>
4.7	Academic Performance in First Year	10	<p><b>Academic Performance</b>=Average API (Academic Performance Index)</p> <p><b>API</b> = (Mean of 1<sup>st</sup> year Grade Point Average of all successful Students on a 10-point scale) or (Mean of the percentage of marks of all successful students in 1<sup>st</sup> year/10)) * (successful students/number of students appeared in the examination)</p> <p>All successful students are those who are permitted to proceed to the second-year</p>				<p><b>Average API</b> for past 3 years:</p> <p><b>Comments (if any):</b> ❖</p>



S.No	Sub Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines	Marks awarded		Overall marks	Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)		
				Marks	Total			CAYm1	CAYm2
4.8	<b>Placement, Higher Studies and Entrepreneurship</b>	<b>40</b>	<p>Assessment Points = <math>40 * \text{average of three years of } [X+Y+Z]/N</math> Where, N is no. of final year students.</p> <p>X is no. of students placed/involved in projects in Professional Bodies /Government sector through on/off campus recruitment or offices of private architectural practices.</p> <p>Y is no. of students admitted to higher studies with valid scores in various qualifying exams.</p> <p>Z=No. of students opted for entrepreneurs</p>						
4.9	<b>Professional Activities</b>	<b>20</b>							
4.9.1	Professional Societies/ Chapters and Organizing Architectural Events	5	<p>A. Availability &amp; activities of professional societies /chapters (3)</p> <p>B. Number, quality of management events organized at Institute (3) (level- Institute/ State/ National/ International)</p>						
4.9.2	Publication of Technical Magazines, Newsletters, etc.	5	<p>A. Quality &amp; Relevance of the contents and Print Material (3)</p> <p>B. Participation of Students from the program (2)</p>						
4.9.3	Participation in Inter-Institute Events by Students of the Program of Study ( <b>at other institutions</b> )	10	<p>A. Events within the state (2)</p> <p>B. Events outside the state (3)</p> <p>C. Prizes/awards received in such events (5)</p>						
<b>Total of Criterion 4:</b>		<b>180</b>	<b>Overall Marks for Criterion 4:</b>						

Criterion 5: Faculty attributes and Contributions (200)										
S.No	Sub Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines	Marks awarded		Overall marks	Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)			
				Marks	Total			CAY	CAYm1	CAYm2
5.1	Student-Faculty Ratio (SFR)	20	Marks to be given proportionally 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. Marks distribution is given as below SFR ≤15 --20 Marks SFR ≤16 --18 Marks SFR ≤17 --16 marks SFR ≤18 --14 marks SFR ≤19 --12 marks SFR ≤20 --10 marks SFR >20 --00 mark							
							Total No. of students in all UG+PG programs in Dept.(S)			
							Total no. of faculty in the Dept. (F)			
							SFR (S/F)			
							<b>Average SFR for 3 years</b>			
<b>Note: Refer criteria 5.1 in the SAR.</b> ❖ <b>SFR</b> should be calculated for each Department, taking into account <b>all students</b> enrolled in both <b>UG</b> and <b>PG</b> programs. ❖ In cases where a program has an enrolment lower than its sanctioned intake of students, the sanctioned intake of that program should be used for SFR calculation. ❖ Other quotas, such as EWS, etc., should not be considered when calculating the SFR. <b>Comments (if any):</b> ❖										
5.2	Faculty Cadre Ratio	20	❖ Faculty cadre ratio= $\left[ \frac{AF1}{RF1} + \left[ \frac{AF2}{RF2} \times 0.6 \right] + \left[ \frac{AF3}{RF3} \times 0.4 \right] \right] \times 10.$ ❖ If AF1 = AF2= 0 then zero marks ❖ Maximum marks to be limited if it exceeds 20(Refer calculation in SAR)							
							No. of Professors			
							No. of Associate Professors			
							No. of Assistant Professors			
<b>Comments (if any):</b> ❖										

S.No	Sub Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines	Marks awarded		Overall marks	Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)			
				Marks	Total			CAY	CAYm1	CAYm2
5.3	Faculty Qualification	25	$FQ = 2.5 * [(2X + 5Y + 3Z) / F]$ where, X is no. of faculty with Ph.D., Y is no. of faculty with M. Arch Z is no. of faculty with B. Arch 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)							
							No. of faculty with Ph.D:			
							No. of faculty with M.Arch:			
							No. of faculty with B.Arch:			
							Faculty Qualification (FQ)			
							Average FQ for 3 years			
							<b>Comments (if any):</b> ❖			
5.4	Faculty Retention	20	A. $\geq 90\%$ of required Faculties retained during the period of assessment keeping CAYm2 as base year (20) B. $\geq 75\%$ of required Faculties retained during the period of assessment keeping CAYm2 as base year (15) C. $\geq 60\%$ of required Faculties retained during the period of assessment keeping CAYm2 as base year (10) D. $\geq 50\%$ of required Faculties retained during the period of assessment keeping CAYm2 as base year (08) E. Otherwise (0)							
								CAY	CAYm1	
							No. of Faculty Retained			
							Total No. of Required Faculty in CAYm2			
							Percentage of faculty retained			
							Average percentage of faculty retained for 2 years			
							<b>Comments (if any):</b> ❖			
5.5	Innovations by the Faculty in Teaching and Learning	15	A. The work must be made available on Institute Website (4) B. The work must be available for peer review and critique (4) C. The work must be reproducible and developed further by other scholars (2) D. Statement of clear goals, use of appropriate methods, significance of results, effective presentation and reflective critique (5)							

S.No	Sub Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines	Marks awarded		Overall marks	Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)			
				Marks	Total			CAYm1	CAYm2	CAYm3
5.6	Faculty as Participants in Faculty Development / Training Activities/ STTPs	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ For each year: Assessment=3*Sum/0.5*RF</li> <li>❖ Average assessment over three years starting from CAYm1(Marks limited to 15)</li> </ul>							
5.7	Research and Development	45								
5.7.1	Academic Research	5	<p>A. Number of quality publications in refereed/ SCI Journals, citations, Books/Book Chapters etc. (2)</p> <p>B. No. of students received Ph.D/No. of faculty guided Ph.D students/No. of faculty awarded Ph.D during the assessment period while working in the institute (3)</p>							
5.7.2	Sponsored Research	10	<p>Funded research from external source; Cumulative during CAYm1, CAYm2 and CAYm3</p> <p>Amount <math>\geq</math> 15 Lakhs – 10 Marks  Amount <math>\geq</math> 12 Lakhs and &lt;15 Lakhs–8 Marks  Amount <math>\geq</math> 9 Lakhs and &lt;12 Lakhs–6 Marks  Amount <math>\geq</math> 6 Lakhs and &lt;9 Lakhs–4 Marks  Amount <math>\geq</math> 3 Lakhs and &lt;6 Lakhs– 2 Marks  Amount &lt; 3 Lakhs – 0 Mark</p>							

S.No	Sub Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines	Marks awarded		Overall marks	Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)				
				Marks	Total			CAYm1	CAYm2	CAYm3	
5.7.3	Consultancy	15	Consultancy from Industry/Government; (Cumulative during CAYm1, CAYm2 and CAYm3) Amount $\geq$ 25 Lakhs - 15 Marks Amount $\geq$ 20 Lakhs and $<$ 25 Lakhs-12 Marks Amount $\geq$ 15 Lakhs and $<$ 20 Lakhs-9 Marks Amount $>$ 10 Lakhs and $<$ 15 Lakhs-6 Marks Amount $>$ 5 Lakhs and $<$ 10 Lakhs-3 Marks Amount $<$ 5 Lakhs- 0 Mark								
5.7.4	Development Activities	15	❖ Product Development ❖ Research laboratories ❖ Instructional materials ❖ Working models/charts/monograms etc.								
<b>5.8</b>	<b>Faculty Performance Appraisal and Development System (FPADS)</b>	<b>15</b>	A. A well-defined performance appraisal and development system instituted for all the assessment years (7)								
			B. Its implementation and effectiveness (8)								
<b>5.9</b>	<b>Visiting/ Adjunct/ Emeritus Faculty, etc</b>	<b>25</b>	A. Provision of Visiting /Adjunct/Emeritus faculty, etc. (5)								
			B. Minimum 50 hours per year interaction (20) (per year to obtain four marks: 4x5=20)								
<b>Total of Criterion 5:</b>		<b>200</b>	<b>Overall Marks for Criterion 5:</b>								

<b>Criterion 6: Facilities (100)</b>							
<b>S.No</b>	<b>Sub Criteria</b>	<b>Max. Marks</b>	<b>Evaluation Guidelines</b>	<b>Marks awarded</b>		<b>Overall marks</b>	<b>Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)</b>
				<b>Marks</b>	<b>Total</b>		
<b>6.1</b>	<b>Availability of Adequate, Well-Equipped Classrooms and Workshops to Meet Requirements</b>	<b>15</b>	A.Adequate well-equipped classrooms and workshops to run the program (10)				
			B.Utilization (5)				
<b>6.2</b>	<b>Faculty Rooms</b>	<b>15</b>	Faculty rooms and utilization				
<b>6.3</b>	<b>Laboratories/Studios/Computer Labs/Construction Yard along with Equipment and Relevant Facilities</b>	<b>35</b>	A.Adequate well-equipped laboratories/ Studios/Computer Labs/ Construction Yard, etc to run the program (10)				
			B.Quality of instruments (15)				
			C.Safety measures (5)				
			D.Utilization (5)				
<b>6.4</b>	<b>Material Museum</b>	<b>15</b>	Type & quality of collection				
<b>6.5</b>	<b>Non-Teaching Support</b>	<b>20</b>					
<b>6.5.1</b>	Availability of Adequate and Qualified Technical Supporting Staff for Program Specific Laboratories, Workshops and Studio.	15	A.Availability of adequate technical supporting staff (6)				
			B.Qualification of technical supporting staff (9)				
<b>6.5.2</b>	Incentives, Skill Upgrade, and Professional Advancement.	5					
<b>Total of Criterion 6:</b>		<b>100</b>	<b>Overall Marks for Criterion 6:</b>				

Signature of Program Evaluator 1

Signature of Program Evaluator 2

<b>Criterion 7: Continuous Improvement (70)</b>							
<b>S.No</b>	<b>Sub Criteria</b>	<b>Max. Marks</b>	<b>Evaluation Guidelines</b>	<b>Marks awarded</b>		<b>Overall marks</b>	<b>Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)</b>
				<b>Marks</b>	<b>Total</b>		
<b>7.1</b>	<b>Improvement in Success Index of Students without the Backlogs</b>	<b>15</b>	Assessment proportional to the improvement				
<b>7.2</b>	<b>Improvement in Placement and Higher Studies</b>	<b>10</b>	Assessment is based on Nos., quality placements, core companies, Pay package, admission at premier institutions				
<b>7.3</b>	<b>Improvement in Sponsored Projects and Consultancy</b>	<b>10</b>	Assessment is based on nos., total amount, outcomes, core companies				
<b>7.4</b>	<b>Academic Audit and Actions Taken during the Assessment Period</b>	<b>10</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Audit Criteria</li> <li>❖ Frequency</li> <li>❖ Methodology</li> <li>❖ Effectiveness</li> <li>❖ Action Plan</li> </ul>				
<b>7.5</b>	<b>Improvement in the Quality of Students Admitted to the Program</b>	<b>10</b>	Assessment is based on improvement in terms of ranks/score in qualifying national/state level entrances tests and Overall percentage marks in 12 <sup>th</sup> Standard/equivalence exam				
<b>7.6</b>	<b>Actions Taken based on the Results of Evaluation of Each of the POs</b>	<b>15</b>	A. Documentary evidences of POs/PSOs attainment levels (5) B. Identification of gaps/shortfalls (5) C. Plan of action to bridge the gap and its Implementation (5)				
<b>Total of Criterion 7:</b>		<b>70</b>	<b>Overall Marks for Criterion 7:</b>				