

# **Chairperson's Visit Report**

## **Postgraduate Pharmacy Program**

**Name of the Institution**

---

**Name of the Program**

---

**Visit Dates**

---

**NATIONAL BOARD OF ACCREDITATION**  
NBCC Place, East Tower, 4th Floor, Bhisham Pitamah Marg, Pragati  
Vihar, New Delhi 110003  
Tel: +91 112430620-22; 01124360654; [www.nbaind.org](http://www.nbaind.org)

### ***Team composition***

Name of the Chairperson: \_\_\_\_\_

Designation: \_\_\_\_\_

#### **Program 1:**

Program evaluator 1	Name:
	Organization:

Program evaluator 2	Name:
	Organization:

#### **Program 2:**

Program evaluator 1	Name:
	Organization:

Program evaluator 2	Name:
	Organization:

#### **Program 3:**

Program evaluator 1	Name:
	Organization:

Program evaluator 2	Name:
	Organization:

#### **Program 4:**

Program evaluator 1	Name:
	Organization:

Program evaluator 2	Name:
	Organization:

#### **Program 5:**

Program evaluator 1	Name:
	Organization:

Program evaluator 2	Name:
	Organization:

## ***Institute Details***

**Year of Establishment:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Physical Infrastructure and Ambience:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Number of programs being run in the Institute\*:**

(i) UG- \_\_\_\_\_

(ii) PG - \_\_\_\_\_

**Total Number of Students:**

(i) In UG programs - \_\_\_\_\_

(ii) In PG programs - \_\_\_\_\_

**Name of programs applied for accreditation**

(i) \_\_\_\_\_

(ii) \_\_\_\_\_

(iii) \_\_\_\_\_

(iv) \_\_\_\_\_

(v) \_\_\_\_\_

*\*to be verified from SAR*

## **EVALUATION CRITERIA**

### **AWARD OF ACCREDITATION FOR THE PG PHARMACY PROGRAMS**

#### **Accreditation for 6 years:**

- i. Program should score greater than or equal to 375 with 60 per cent in each criterion.
- ii. Number of Ph.D. available in the department should be greater than or equal to 30 per cent of the required number of faculty, averaged over two academic years i.e. Current Academic Year (CAY) and Current Academic Year Minus One (CAYM1).
- iii. Faculty student ratio in the department under consideration should be less than or equal to 1:15, averaged over three academic years i.e. Current Academic Year (CAY), Current Academic Year Minus One (CAYM1) and Current Academic Year Minus Two (CAYM2).
- iv. At least two Professors or one professor and one associate professor on regular basis with a Ph.D. degree having expertise in the domain of the Program under consideration should be available for two academic years i.e. Current Academic Year (CAY) and Current Academic Year Minus One (CAYM1).

#### **Accreditation for 3 years:**

- i. Program should score greater than or equal to 300 with 50 per cent in Criterion-IV (Faculty Contribution).
- ii. The UG Program should be accredited by NBA.
- iii. The UG pharmacy program should have been granted with at least 650 marks out of 1,000.
- iv. At least two Professors or one professor and one associate professor on regular basis with Ph.D. qualification with expertise in the domain of the Program under consideration should be available for two academic years i.e. Current Academic Year (CAY) and Current Academic Year Minus One (CAYM1).
- v. The department should have at least two faculty having Ph.D. qualification for two academic year i.e. Current Academic Year (CAY) and Current Academic Year Minus One (CAYM1).
- vi. Faculty Student Ratio in the department under consideration should be less than or equal to 1:20, averaged over three academic year i.e. Current Academic Year (CAY), Current Academic Year Minus One (CAYM1) and Current Academic Year Minus Two (CAYM2)

#### **No Accreditation**

If the program fails to meet the criteria for award of accreditation for three years, it is awarded "Not Accredited" Statue

Name of the Program 1: \_\_\_\_\_

Marks given by Evaluators:

S. No.	Criteria	Max. Marks	Marks Awarded	Remarks
1.	Program Curriculum and Teaching-Learning Processes	100		
2.	Program Outcomes and Research Outcomes	75		
3.	Students' Performance	75		
4.	Faculty Contributions	100		
5.	Laboratories and Research Facilities	75		
6.	Continuous Improvement	75		
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>500</b>		

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature  
(Chairman)

Name of the Program 2: \_\_\_\_\_

Marks given by Evaluators:

S. No.	Criteria	Max. Marks	Marks Awarded	Remarks
1.	Program Curriculum and Teaching-Learning Processes	100		
2.	Program Outcomes and Research Outcomes	75		
3.	Students' Performance	75		
4.	Faculty Contributions	100		
5.	Laboratories and Research Facilities	75		
6.	Continuous Improvement	75		
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>500</b>		

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature  
(Chairman)

Name of the Program 3: \_\_\_\_\_

Marks given by Evaluators:

S. No.	Criteria	Max. Marks	Marks Awarded	Remarks
1.	Program Curriculum and Teaching-Learning Processes	100		
2.	Program Outcomes and Research Outcomes	75		
3.	Students' Performance	75		
4.	Faculty Contributions	100		
5.	Laboratories and Research Facilities	75		
6.	Continuous Improvement	75		
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>500</b>		

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature  
(Chairman)

Name of the Program 4: \_\_\_\_\_

Marks given by Evaluators:

S. No.	Criteria	Max. Marks	Marks Awarded	Remarks
1.	Program Curriculum and Teaching-Learning Processes	100		
2.	Program Outcomes and Research Outcomes	75		
3.	Students' Performance	75		
4.	Faculty Contributions	100		
5.	Laboratories and Research Facilities	75		
6.	Continuous Improvement	75		
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>500</b>		

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature  
(Chairman)



Name of the Program 5: \_\_\_\_\_

Marks given by Evaluators:

S. No.	Criteria	Max. Marks	Marks Awarded	Remarks
1.	Program Curriculum and Teaching-Learning Processes	100		
2.	Program Outcomes and Research Outcomes	75		
3.	Students' Performance	75		
4.	Faculty Contributions	100		
5.	Laboratories and Research Facilities	75		
6.	Continuous Improvement	75		
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>500</b>		

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature  
(Chairman)

## Overall Observations

### 1. Various programs detail

S.No.	Name of the Program	Intake			Admissions	Student-Faculty-Ratio
		CAY	CAYm1	CAYm2	3-year-average- percentage of admission (CAY, CAYm1, CAYm2)	3-year-average-SFR (CAY, CAYm1, CAYm2)

- Also, see the evaluator's report for the above parameters and if you disagree with the same, kindly give your comment.

### 2. About the progress since last accreditation (to be filled for institutes who have applied for re-accreditation)

Kindly mention the changes made as recommended by NBA, since the previous visit.

### 3. Observation on general facilities and about the programs.

Kindly mention general observations about facilities like labs, library etc. and a general review about the programs.

❖ Academic Ambience

❖ Student Support Systems

❖ Strengths, Weaknesses, Concerns, Suggestions

### 4. Status of imbibing of outcome-based accreditation. For Example:

❖ Formulation of PEOs, COs and mappings carried out and implemented

❖ Methodology for assessing the attainment of outcomes

❖ Continual improvement process has been set up

❖ Stakeholders (especially the faculty, HOD, students etc.) awareness about the process