

Part B-Program Assessment Worksheet

Program Level Criteria - To be Assessed by Evaluator

Name of the Institution:

Name of the Program:

Criterion 1: Program Curriculum and Teaching–Learning Processes (100)						
S.No	Sub Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines	Marks Awarded		Overall Marks
				Marks	Total	
1.1	Program Curriculum	35				
1.1.1	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 (10).			
1.1.2	State the components of 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. 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 (10).			
1.1.3	Structure of the Curriculum	05	Refer to SAR: Expectation in 1.1.2 & 1.1.3 is that the curriculum is well balanced structure & appropriate for a PG program. 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 (5)			
1.1.4	Overall quality and level of program curriculum	10	Overall Judgment of the experts. 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 (5)			
In case of affiliated institutions, following criteria will be applicable for Program Curriculum:						
In case of affiliated institutions marks will be on content beyond syllabus 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:						
1.1.	Program Curriculum	35				

Signature (Program Evaluator 1)

Signature (Program Evaluator 2)

S.No.	Sub Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines	Marks Awarded		Overall Marks	Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)		
				Marks	Total				
1.1.1	Process used to identify extent of compliance of the university curriculum for attaining the program outcomes	10	A. Process used to identify extent of compliance of University curriculum for attaining POs (7)						
			B. List the curricular gaps for the attainment of defined POs (3)						
1.1.2	Appropriateness of the gaps identified	5	A. Steps taken to get identified gaps included in the curriculum (letter to university/BOS) (2)						
1.1.3	Actions taken to bridge the gap	10	A. Action taken details (7)						
			B. Mapping of events with the POs (3)						
1.1.4	Overall quality and the level of program curriculum	10							

Note: 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 for non-affiliated institutions.

S.No.	Sub Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines	Marks Awarded		Overall Marks	Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)
				Marks	Total		
1.2	Teaching-Learning Processes	65					
1.2.1	Quality of end semester examination, internal semester question papers, assignments and evaluation	10	A. Process for end semester examination, internal semester question paper setting, evaluation and effective process implementation (2)				
			B. Process to ensure questions from outcomes/learning levels perspective (2)				
			C. Evidence of COs coverage in class tests/ Midterm tests (3)				
			D. Quality of assignment and its relevance to COs (3)				

Signature (Program Evaluator 1)

Signature (Program Evaluator 2)

S.No.	Sub Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines	Marks Awarded		Overall Marks	Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)
				Marks	Total		
1.2	Teaching-Learning Processes	65					
1.2.2	Quality of student projects	25	A. Very clear and concise objectives (4)				
			B. Very clear methodology, articulated using technical terms indicating all steps and tools (4)				
			C. Cites substantial current and good quality literature (4)				
			D. Clarity in design/setting up of experiment (4)				
			E. Benchmarks used / assumptions made (2)				
			F. Interpretation of results and justification thereof and validity of the results presented (3)				
			G. Overall presentation of the report (4)				
1.2.3	Initiatives related to industry interaction including industry internship/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)				
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)				
1.2.5	Quality of laboratory work given	15	Qualitative judgement of the experts. 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.				
Total of Criterion 1:		100	Overall marks for Criterion 1:				

Signature (Program Evaluator 1)

3

Signature (Program Evaluator 2)

Criterion 2: Program Outcomes and Research Outcomes (75)							
S.No.	Sub Criteria	Max.	Evaluation Guidelines	Marks Awarded		Overall Marks	Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)
				Marks	Total		
2.1	Establish the connect between the courses and the POs	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 (3)				
			D. Explanation of Program Articulation Matrix tables to be ascertained (3)				
2.2	Attainment of Program Outcomes and research outcomes	40					
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)				
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)				
2.3	Attainment of Research Outcomes	25					
2.3.1	Describe the methods, tools and processes used for strengthening the research outcomes of the department and the program	5					
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 PO (15)				
			B. Overall levels of attainment (05)				
Total of Criterion 2:		75	Overall marks for Criterion 2:				

Signature (Program Evaluator 1)

Signature (Program Evaluator 2)

Criterion 3: Students' Performance (75)							
S.No.	Sub Criteria	Max.	Evaluation Guidelines	Marks Awarded		Overall Marks	Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)
				Marks	Total		
3.1	Enrolment Ratio through GPAT	20	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)				
3.2	Success Rate in the stipulated period of the program	20	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 last 3 batches Assessment points = 20 * Average S.I.				
3.3	Placement, Higher studies and Entrepreneurship	20	Assessment Points = 20 \times average placement, i.e., $(P1+P2+P3)/3$, Placement Index (P) = $[(X + Y + Z)/N]$; where, X=Number of students placed in companies or Government sector Y= Number of students pursuing Ph.D. / JRF/ SRF Z=No. of students turned entrepreneur in engineering/technology N = Total number of students admitted in first year				

Signature (Program Evaluator 1)

5

Signature (Program Evaluator 2)

S.No.	Sub Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines	Marks Awarded		Overall Marks	Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)
				Marks	Total		
3.4	Professional Activities	15					
3.4.1	Student's 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) Level- Institute/State/ National/ International Levels) (2)				
3.4.2	Student's 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)				
Total of Criterion 3:		75	Overall marks for Criterion 3:				

Signature (Program Evaluator 1)

Signature (Program Evaluator 2)

Criterion 4: Faculty Contributions (100)							
S.No.	Sub Criteria	Max.	Evaluation Guidelines	Marks Awarded		Overall Marks	Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)
				Marks	Total		
4.1	Student-Faculty Ratio (SFR)	10	<p>Marks to be given proportionally from a maximum of 10 to a minimum of 5 for average SFR between 15:1 to 20:1, and zero for average SFR higher than 20:1. Marks distribution is given as below:</p> <p>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 Marks</p> <p>Consideration of Contractual Faculty means:</p> <p>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:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Shall have the PCI prescribed qualifications and experience. 2. 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. 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. <p>Note: If the Institute/Department is running Diploma, UG, PG programs parallelly, then for the UG & PG programs, total number of faculty will be calculated as mention below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Total Number of faculty(F) in the Institute/Department minus Required number of faculty for Diploma programs (1:20). 				

Signature (Program Evaluator 1)

Signature (Program Evaluator 2)

S.No.	Sub Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines	Marks Awarded		Overall Marks	Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)
				Marks	Total		
4.2	Faculty competencies in the area of Program Specialization	55					
4.2.1	Faculty name and specialization for the program under consideration	10					
4.2.2	Faculty Research Publication	35	A.Number of quality publications in refereed/SCI Journals, citations, Books/Book Chapters etc (25)				
			B.Ph.D. guided /Ph.D. awarded during the assessment period while working in the institute (10)				
4.2.3	Faculty Development work	10					
4.3	Research and Development	30					
4.3.1	Sponsored Research	20	Funded research from outside; Cumulative for CAYm1, CAYm2 and CAY m3: Amount \geq 50 Lacs - 20 Marks, Amount \geq 40 and < 50 Lacs - 16 Marks, Amount \geq 30 and < 40 Lacs - 12 Marks, Amount \geq 15 and < 30 Lacs - 06 Marks, Amount < 15 Lacs - 00 Mark				
4.3.2	Consultancy (From Industry)	10	Consultancy; Cumulative for CAYm1, CAYm2 and CAY m3: 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 Mark, Amount <2 Lacs - 00 Mark				
4.4.	Faculty as participants in Faculty development /training activities / STTPs	05	Relevance of Training Program				
Total of Criterion 4:		100	Overall Marks for Criterion 4:				

Signature (Program Evaluator 1)

8

Signature (Program Evaluator 2)

Criterion 5: Laboratories and Research Facilities (75)							
S.No	Sub Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines	Marks Awarded		Overall Marks	Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)
				Marks	Total		
5.1.	Adequate and well-equipped laboratories in area of Program specialization	25	A. Adequate well-equipped laboratories to run all the program-specific curriculum (20)				
			B. Availability of adequate and qualified technical supporting staff (05)				
5.2.	Research facilities/ center of excellence	30					
5.3	Access to laboratory facilities, training in the use of equipment	05					
5.4	Drug Museum	05					
5.5	Medicinal Plant Garden	10					
Total of Criterion 5:		75	Overall Marks for Criterion 5:				

Signature (Program Evaluator 1)

Signature (Program Evaluator 2)

Criterion 6: Continuous Improvement (75)							
S.No.	Sub Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines	Marks Awarded		Overall Marks	Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)
				Marks	Total		
6.1.	Actions taken based on the results of evaluation of each of the POs	25	A. Documentary Evidence of POs attainment levels (10)				
			B. Identification of gaps/shortfalls (05)				
			C. Plan of action to bridge the gap and its Implementation (10)				
6.2.	Improvement in quality of projects	10					
6.3	Improvement in placement, higher studies and entrepreneurship	10	A. Improvement in placements numbers, quality, core hiring industry and pay packages(5)				
			B. Improvement in higher studies admissions for pursuing Ph.D. in premier institutions (3)				
			C. Improvement in number of entrepreneurs (2)				
6.4	Improvement in the quality of students admitted to the program	10	Assessment is based on improvement in terms of ranks/score in GPAT examination				
6.5	Improvement in quality of paper publication	10					
6.6	Improvement in laboratories	10					
Total of Criterion 6:		75	Overall Marks for Criterion 6:				

Signature (Program Evaluator 1)

10

Signature (Program Evaluator 2)