

**Evaluation Guidelines with Indicative Exhibits / Context to be Observed/Assessed - SAR Tier – I (UG Engineering)**  
**2<sup>nd</sup> Cycle Accreditation**

**Criterion 1: Course Outcomes and Program Outcomes (100)**

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

<b>1.3. Establish consistency of PEOs with Mission of the Department</b>	05	A. Preparation of a matrix of PEOs and elements of Mission statement (2) B. Consistency/justification of co-relation parameters of the above matrix (3)
<b><i>Exhibits / Context to be Observed / Assessed</i></b>		
<i>A. Availability of a matrix having PEOs and Mission elements B. Justification for each of the elements mapped in the matrix</i>		
<b>1.4. Establish the correlation between the courses and the POs &amp; PSOs</b>	10	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 (2) D. Explanation of Program Articulation Matrix tables to be ascertained (4)
<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 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup> and final year of study</i></p> <p><i>B. Mapping to be verified for at least two matrices</i></p> <p><i>C. Mapping to be verified for at least one course per year of study; program outcomes and program specific outcomes getting mapped with the core courses are also to be verified</i></p>		
<b>1.5. Attainment of Course Outcomes</b>	25	
1.5.1. Describe the assessment tools and processes used to gather the data upon which the evaluation of Course Outcome is based	5	A. List of assessment processes (1) B. The quality /relevance of assessment processes & tools used (4)
<b><i>Exhibits / Context to be Observed / Assessed</i></b>		
<i>A. &amp; B. Evidence for appropriate assessment processes including data collection, verification, analysis, decision making</i>		
1.5.2. Record the attainment of Course Outcomes of all courses with respect to set attainment levels	20	A. Verify the attainment levels as per the benchmark set for all courses (20)
<b><i>Exhibits / Context to be Observed / Assessed</i></b>		
<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>		

<b>1.6. Attainment of Program Outcomes and Program Specific Outcomes</b>	<b>25</b>	
1.6.1. Describe assessment tools and processes used for measuring the attainment of each POs and PSOs	5	A. List of assessment tools & processes (2) B. The quality/relevance of assessment tools/processes used (3)
<b><i>Exhibits / Context to be Observed / Assessed</i></b>		
<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>		
1.6.2. Provide results of evaluation of each PO & PSO	20	A. Verification of documents, results and level of attainment of each PO/PSO (15) B. Overall levels of attainment (5)
<b><i>Exhibits / Context to be Observed / Assessed</i></b>		
<i>A. &amp; B. Appropriate attainment level and documentary evidences; details for POs &amp; PSOs attainment from core courses to be verified. Also, at-least twoPOs &amp; two PSOs attainment levels shall be verified</i>		
<b>1.7. Evidence of Solving Complex Engineering Problems</b>	<b>25</b>	A. Verification of documents related to mini projects/major projects/ term projects/ independent study/ problem-based learning approach adopted or any other activities conducted specifically which reflect the solving of complex engineering problems (25)
<b><i>Exhibits / Context to be Observed / Assessed</i></b>		
<i>A. Presentation and Documentary evidence of mini projects/major projects/ term projects/ independent study/ problem-based learning approach adopted or any other activities conducted specifically which reflect the solving of complex engineering problems. Evidence of evaluation of such projects and their mapping towards attainment of POs / PSOs</i>		
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	

**Criterion 2: Program Curriculum and Teaching–Learning Processes (75)**

<b>Sub Criteria</b>	<b>Mark s</b>	<b>Evaluation Guidelines</b>
<b>2.1. Program Curriculum</b>	<b>15</b>	
2.1.1. Structure of the Curriculum	5	Refer to SAR: Expectation in 2.1.1 is that the curriculum is well balanced & appropriate for a degree program.(5)
<i>Exhibits / Context to be Observed / Assessed</i>  <i>Documentary evidence</i>		
2.1.2 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 &amp; PSOs.</i>		
<b>2.2. Teaching-Learning Processes</b>	<b>60</b>	
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 action taken (2)

<b><i>Exhibits / Context to be Observed / Assessed</i></b>		
<p>A. Availability of Academic Calendar based on University academic calendar and its effective compliance</p> <p>B. Documentary evidence to support implementation of pedagogical initiatives such as real life examples, collaborative learning, ICT supported learning, interactive class rooms, etc.</p> <p>C. Guidelines to identify weak and bright students; post identification actions taken; impact observed</p> <p>D. Class room ambience; efforts to keep students engaged (also to be verified during interaction with the students)</p> <p>E. Quality of laboratory experience with respect to conducting, recording observations, analysis etc. (also to be verified during interaction with the students)</p> <p>F. 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</p> <p>G. Feedback format, frequency, analysis and actions taken (also to be verified during interaction with students)</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)</p> <p>B. Process to ensure questions from outcomes/learning levels perspective (2)</p> <p>C. Evidence of COs coverage in class test / mid-term tests (5)</p> <p>D. Quality of Assignment and its relevance to COs (5)</p>
<b><i>Exhibits / Context to be Observed / Assessed</i></b>		
<p>A. Process of internal semester question paper setting, model answers, evaluation and its compliance</p> <p>B. Question paper validation to ensure desired standard from outcome attainment perspective as well as learning levels perspective</p> <p>C. Mapping of questions with the Course outcomes</p> <p>D. Assignments to promote self-learning, survey of contents from multiple sources, assignment evaluation and feedback to the students, mapping with the COs</p>		
2.2.3. Quality of student projects	15	<p>A. Identification of projects and allocation methodology to Faculty Members (1)</p> <p>B. Types and relevance of the projects and their contribution towards attainment of POs and PSOs (2)</p> <p>C. Project related to Industry (2)</p> <p>D. Process for monitoring and evaluation (2)</p> <p>E. Process to assess individual and team performance (2)</p> <p>F. Quality of completed projects/working prototypes (4)</p> <p>G. Evidences of papers published / Awards received by projects, etc. (2)</p>

<b><i>Exhibits / Context to be Observed / Assessed</i></b>		
<p>A. <i>Projects identification and guide allocation process</i></p> <p>B. <i>Projects classification (application, product, research, review, etc.) consideration to factors such as environment, safety, ethics, cost, standards and mapping with program outcomes and program specific outcomes</i></p> <p>C. <i>Evidence for industry related projects through their participation</i></p> <p>D. <i>Continuous monitoring mechanism and evaluation</i></p> <p>E. <i>Methodology (Appropriately documented) to assess individual contribution/understanding of the project as well as collective contribution/understanding</i></p> <p>F. <i>Based on Projects demonstration. Evidence for complex engineering problem solving.</i></p> <p>G. <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/industry/internship /summer training	10	<p>A. Industry supported laboratories (2)</p> <p>B. Industry involvement in the Curriculum design and in partial delivery of any regular courses for students (2)</p> <p>C. Industrial /internship /summer training of more than two weeks and post training Assessment(2)</p> <p>D. Impact analysis of industry institute interaction &amp; industrial training and actions taken there of (2)</p> <p>E. Student feedback on initiative (2)</p>
<b><i>Exhibits / Context to be Observed / Assessed</i></b>		
<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>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>D. &amp; E. <i>Impact analysis and feedback format, analysis and actions taken (also to be verified during interaction with students)</i></p>		
2.2.5. Initiatives towards the New Education Policy	5	A. Initiatives towards the New Education Policy (5)
<b><i>Exhibits / Context to be Observed / Assessed</i></b>		
A. <i>Documentary evidence to support implementation of initiatives</i>		
<b>Total:</b>	<b>75</b>	

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

Sub Criteria	Marks	Evaluation Guidelines
<b>3.1. Enrolment Ratio</b>	<b>15</b>	A. $\geq 90\%$ students enrolled at the First Year Level on average basis during the previous three academic years starting from current academic year (15) B. $\geq 80\%$ students enrolled at the First Year Level on average basis during the previous three academic years starting from current academic year (12) C. $\geq 70\%$ students enrolled at the First Year Level on average basis during the previous three academic years starting from current academic year (10) D. $\geq 60\%$ students enrolled at the First Year Level on average basis during the previous three academic years starting from current academic year (08) E. Otherwise '0'.
<p><i>Exhibits / Context to be Observed / Assessed</i></p> <p><i>A. B. &amp; C. 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>15</b>	
3.2.1. Success rate without backlog in any Semester/year of study  Without Backlog means: <b>No repeat(s) in any course in any semester/year of study</b>	10	$SI = \frac{\text{Number of students who graduated from the program without repeat(s) in any course}}{\text{Number of students admitted in the first year of that batch and actually admitted in 2nd year via lateral entry and separate division, if applicable}}$ Average SI = Mean of success index (SI) for past three batches Success rate without backlogs in any year of study = $10 \times \text{Average SI}$
<p><i>Exhibits / Context to be Observed / Assessed</i></p> <p><i>Data to be verified for each of the assessment years</i></p>		
3.2.2. Success rate in stipulated period of study (actual duration of the program) <b>[Total of with backlog + without backlog]</b>	5	$SI = \frac{\text{Number of students who graduated from the program in the stipulated period of course duration}}{\text{Number of students admitted in the first year of that batch and actually admitted in 2nd year via lateral entry and separate division, if applicable}}$ Average SI = mean of success index (SI) for past three batches Success rate = $5 \times \text{Average SI}$

<b><i>Exhibits / Context to be Observed / Assessed:</i></b>		
<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 15 as both 4.2.1 &amp; 4.2.2 will be applicable simultaneously.</i>		
<b>3.3. Academic Performance in Second Year</b>	<b>5</b>	Academic Performance Level = 0.5 * Average API (Academic Performance Index) <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 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
<b><i>Exhibits / Context to be Observed / Assessed</i></b>		
<i>Data to be verified for at least one of the assessment years</i>		
<b>3.4. Academic Performance in Third Year</b>	<b>5</b>	Academic Performance Level = 0.5 * Average API (Academic Performance Index) <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 Third Year/10)) x (successful students/number of students appeared in the examination) Successful students are those who are permitted to proceed to the final year
<b><i>Exhibits / Context to be Observed / Assessed</i></b>		
<i>Data to be verified for at least one of the assessment years</i>		
<b>3.5. Placement, Higher studies and Entrepreneurship</b>	<b>15</b>	Assessment Points = 15 × 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



<b><i>Exhibits / Context to be Observed / Assessed</i></b>		
<i>Data to be verified for at-least one of the assessment years</i>		
<b>3.6. Professional Activities</b>	<b>20</b>	
3.6.1. 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: Institution / State / National / International)
<b><i>Exhibits / Context to be Observed / Assessed</i></b>		
<i>Self-Explanatory</i>		
3.6.2. 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)
<b><i>Exhibits / Context to be Observed / Assessed</i></b>		
A. <i>Documentary evidence</i> B. <i>Documentary evidence - Students participation (also to be confirmed during interaction with the students)</i>		
3.6.3. Participation in inter-institute events by students of the program of study ( <b>at other institutions</b> )	5	A. Events within the state (1) B. Events outside the state (1) C. Prizes/awards received in such events (3)
<b><i>Exhibits / Context to be Observed / Assessed</i></b>		
A.B.& C. <i>Quality of events and documentary evidence</i>		
3.6.4. Participation in national/international competitive events by students of the program of study	5	A. Participation in national competitive events (2) B. Participation in international competitive events (3)

<i>Exhibits / Context to be Observed / Assessed</i>		
<i>A.B. &amp; C. Quality of events and documentary evidence</i>		
<b>Total:</b>	<b>75</b>	

#### Criterion 4: Faculty Information and Contributions (100)

Sub Criteria	Marks	Evaluation Guidelines
4.1. Student-Faculty Ratio (SFR)	15	<p>Marks to be given proportionally from a maximum of 15 to a minimum of 03 for average SFR between 20:1 to 25:1, and zero for average SFR higher than 25:1. Marks distribution is given as below:</p> <p>&lt; = 20 - 15 Marks            &lt; = 21 - 12 Marks            &lt; = 22 - 09 Marks            &lt; = 23 - 06 Marks            &lt; = 25 - 03 Marks            &gt; 25 - 0 Marks</p>
<p><b><i>Exhibits / Context to be Observed / Assessed</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SFR is to be verified considering the faculty of the entire department.</li> <li>• No. of faculty calculation considering <b>faculty definition</b>*; Faculty appointment letters, time table, subject allocation file, salary statements.</li> <li>• No. of students calculation as mentioned in the SAR (please refer table under criterion 5.1)</li> <li>• Faculty Qualification as per AICTE guidelines shall only be counted</li> </ul> <p><b>* Note:</b> All the faculty whether regular or contractual (except Part-Time), will be considered. The contractual faculty (doing away with the terminology of visiting/adjunct faculty, whatsoever) who have taught for 2 consecutive 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:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Shall have the AICTE prescribed qualifications and experience.</li> <li>2. Shall be appointed on full time basis and worked for consecutive two semesters during the particular academic year under consideration.</li> <li>3. 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.</li> </ol>		

<p><b>4.2. Faculty Cadre Proportion</b></p>	<p><b>10</b></p>	<p>Cadre Proportion Marks =</p> $\left[ \left[ \frac{AF1}{0.4} \right] + \left[ \frac{AF2}{5} \times 0.6 \right] + \left[ \frac{AF3}{RF1} \right] \right] \times RF2 \times RF3$ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If AF1 = AF2= 0 then zero marks</li> <li>• Maximum marks to be limited if it exceeds 10(Refer calculation in SAR)</li> </ul>
<p><b><i>Exhibits / Context to be Observed / Assessed</i></b>  <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"> <li>• Cadre wise No. of faculty available; Faculty qualification and experience and eligibility; Appointment/Promotion orders</li> <li>• Cadre wise no. of faculty required as per AICTE guidelines (refer calculation in SAR)</li> </ul>		
<p><b>4.3. Faculty Qualification</b></p>	<p><b>10</b></p>	<p>FQ = (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 1:20 Faculty Student ratio  (no. of faculty and no. of students required to be calculated as per 5.1)</p>
<p><b><i>Exhibits / Context to be Observed / Assessed</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentary evidence – Faculty Qualification</li> </ul>		
<p><b>4.4 Faculty Retention</b></p>	<p><b>5</b></p>	<p>A. ≥ 90% of required Faculties retained during the period of assessment keeping CAYm2 as baseyear (5)  B. ≥ 75% of required Faculties retained during the period of assessment keeping CAYm2 as baseyear (4)  C. ≥ 60% of required Faculties retained during the period of assessment keeping CAYm2 as base</p>

		year (3) D. $\geq 50\%$ of required Faculties retained during the period of assessment keeping CAYm2 as baseyear (2) E. Otherwise (0)
<i>Exhibits / Context to be Observed / Assessed</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Faculty date of joining; at-least three months (July-Nov –April salary statement for each of the assessment years</li> </ul>		
<b>4.5. Faculty competencies in correlation to Curriculum</b>	<b>5</b>	A. Specialization B. Research Publications C. Course Developments D. Other relevant points
<i>Exhibits / Context to be Observed / Assessed</i>		
<b>4.6. Innovations by the Faculty in Teaching and Learning</b>	<b>5</b>	A. Statement of clear goals, use of appropriate methods, significance of results, effectivepresentation (2) B. Availability of work on the Institute Website (1) C. Availability of work for peer review and critique (1) D. Reproducibility and Reusability by other scholars for further development (1)
<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.		
<b>4.7. Faculty as participants in Facultydevelopment /training activities /STTPs</b>	<b>10</b>	For each year: Assessment = $2 \times (\text{Sum} / 0.5\text{RF})$ Average assessment over last three years starting from CAYm1 (Marks limited to <b>10</b> )
<i>Exhibits / Context to be Observed / Assessed</i>		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Relevance of the training/development program</li> <li>• No. of days; No. of faculty</li> </ul>		
<b>4.8. Research and Development</b>	<b>30</b>	
4.8.1. Academic Research	10	A. Number of quality publications in refereed/SCI Journals, citations, Books/Book Chapters etc. (7) B. PhD awarded during the assessment period while working in the institute (3)
<b><i>Exhibits / Context to be Observed / Assessed</i></b>		
A. <i>Quality of publications; publications copy</i> B. <i>Documentary evidence</i>		
4.8.2 Sponsored Research	10	Funded research from outside; Cumulative during CAYm1, CAYm2 and CAYm3 Amount > 50 Lakh – 10 Marks, Amount >40 and < 50 Lakh – 07 Marks, Amount >30 and < 40 Lakh – 05 Marks, Amount >15 and < 30 Lakh – 03 Marks, Amount < 15 Lakh – 0 Marks
<b><i>Exhibits / Context to be Observed / Assessed</i></b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Documentary evidence; Funding agency, Amount, Duration, Research progress; Outcome</i></li> </ul>		
4.8.3 Development Activities	5	A. Product Development B. Research laboratories C. Working models/charts/monograms, etc.
<b><i>Exhibits / Context to be Observed / Assessed</i></b>		
<i>Self-explanatory</i>		

4.8.4. Consultancy (From Industry)	5	Consultancy; Cumulative during CAYm1, CAYm2 and CAYm3 Amount >10 Lakh – 05 Marks, Amount <10 and > 8 Lakh – 04 Marks, Amount < 8 and > 6 Lakh – 03 Marks, Amount < 6 and > 4 Lakh – 02 Marks, Amount < 4 and > 2 Lakh – 01 Marks, Amount < 2 Lakh – 0 Mark
<p><b><i>Exhibits / Context to be Observed / Assessed</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Documentary evidence; Funding agency, Amount, Duration, Research progress; Outcome</i></li> </ul>		
<b>4.9. Faculty Performance Appraisal and Development System (FPADS)</b>	5	A. A well-defined performance appraisal and development system instituted for all the assessment years (2) B. Its implementation and effectiveness (3)
<p><b><i>Exhibits / Context to be Observed / Assessed</i></b></p> <p>A. <i>Notified performance appraisal and development system; Appraisal Parameters; Awareness</i> B. <i>Implementation, Transparency and Effectiveness</i></p>		
<b>4.10. Visiting/Adjunct/Emeritus Faculty etc.</b>	5	A. Provision of Visiting /Adjunct/Emeritus faculty etc. (1) B. Minimum <b>50</b> hours per year interaction (2 marks each for last two years: 2 x 2 = 4)
<p><b><i>Exhibits / Context to be Observed / Assessed</i></b></p> <p>A. &amp; B. <i>Documentary evidence</i></p>		
<b>Total:</b>	<b>100</b>	

**Criterion 5: Resources (75)**

<b>Sub Criteria</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>Evaluation Guidelines</b>
<b>5.1. Adequate and well-equipped laboratories, and technical manpower</b>	<b>25</b>	A. Adequate well-equipped laboratories to run all the program-specific curriculum (15) B. Availability of adequate and qualified technical supporting staff (10)
<i>Exhibits / Context to be Observed / Assessed</i>		
A. Adequacy; well-equipped laboratories; utilization B. Self – explanatory		
<b>5.2. Laboratories: Maintenance and overall ambience</b>	<b>5</b>	Maintenance and overall ambience (5)
<i>Exhibits / Context to be Observed / Assessed</i>		
Self-explanatory		
<b>5.3. Safety measures in laboratories</b>	<b>5</b>	Safety measures in laboratories (5)
<i>Exhibits / Context to be Observed / Assessed</i>		
Self – explanatory		
<b>5.4. Project laboratory</b>	<b>15</b>	Facilities & Utilization (15)
<i>Exhibits / Context to be Observed / Assessed</i>		
Self – explanatory		
<b>5.5. Feedback analysis and reward / corrective measures taken, if any</b>	<b>5</b>	A. Feedback collected for all courses: YES/NO (1) B. Feedback collection process (1) C. Average Percentage of students who participate (1) D. Feedback analysis process (1) E. Number of corrective actions taken (1)
<i>Exhibits / Context to be Observed / Assessed</i>		



<i>Self-explanatory</i>		
<b>5.6. Program Specific Budget Allocation, Utilization</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>To be evaluated in consultation with the Program Experts</b>
5.6.1. Adequacy of budget allocation	5	A. Quantum of budget allocation for three years (3) B. Justification of budget allocated for three years (2)
<b><i>Exhibits / Context to be Observed / Assessed</i></b>		
A. Budget formulation, finalization and approval process B. Requirement – allocation –adequacy – justification thereof		
5.6.2. Utilization of allocated funds	5	A. Budget utilization for three years (5)
<b><i>Exhibits / Context to be Observed / Assessed</i></b>		
A. Balance sheet; effective utilization; random verification for at least two of the three assessment years		
<b>5.7. Library and Internet</b>	<b>10</b>	
5.7.1. Quality of learning resources (hard/soft)	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Availability of relevant learning resources including e-resources and Digital Library, (4)</li> <li>• Accessibility to students (1)</li> <li>• Support for self-learning (1)</li> </ul>
<b><i>Exhibits / Context to be Observed / Assessed</i></b>		
Availability; Adequacy; Effectiveness (Also to be verified during interactions with the faculty and students)		
5.7.2. Internet	4	A. Available bandwidth and Wi Fi availability (2) B. Internet access in labs, classrooms, library and offices of all Departments and Security mechanism (2)
<b><i>Exhibits / Context to be Observed / Assessed</i></b>		
Availability as per AICTE norms; Adequacy; Effectiveness (Also to be verified during interactions with the faculty and students)		
<b>Total:</b>	<b>75</b>	

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

Sub Criteria	Marks	Evaluation Guidelines
<b>6.1. Actions taken based on the results of evaluation of each of the POs and PSOs</b>	<b>30</b>	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>		
<b>6.2 Academic Audit and actions taken during the period of Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>	A. Assessment shall be based on conduct and actions taken in relation to continuous improvement(10)
<i>Exhibits / Context to be Observed / Assessed</i>		
A. Academic Audit assessment criteria, frequency, conduct mechanism, action plan based on audit, implementation and effectiveness		
<b>6.3. Improvement in Placement, Higher Studies and Entrepreneurship</b>	<b>15</b>	Assessment is based on improvement in: (Refer placement index 4.5) 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(5) C. Improvement in number of Entrepreneurs (5) (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		
<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 qualifying state level/national level entrances tests, percentage Physics, Chemistry and Mathematics marks in 12th Standard and percentage marks of the lateral entry students (10)
<i>Exhibits / Context to be Observed / Assessed</i>		
A. Documentary evidence – list of students admitted; admission authority guidelines; ranks/scores; comparative status considering CAYm3 as a base year		
<b>6.5. Remedial action taken on the observations made during last</b>	<b>10</b>	A. New initiatives taken/New Facilities Introduced/Improvement made after last visit. (10)

<b>accreditation visit /New initiatives taken/New Facilities Introduced /Improvement made after last visit.</b>		
<i>Exhibits / Context to be Observed / Assessed</i>		
<i>Documentary evidence</i>		
<b>Total:</b>	<b>75</b>	

--