

PART A



Evaluator's Visit Report

Postgraduate Engineering 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

Program Evaluator Summary

Overview

The Expert team of National Board of Accreditation (NBA) conducted a three day accreditation visit from _____ to _____ *<<name of institution>>* to evaluate PG Engineering program *<<name of the program>>*.

Pre visit meeting of the expert team was held on at _____ to exchange the respective findings with the evaluation team members, based on review of Self-Assessment Report (SAR) and the pre-visit evaluation reports.

During the visit, the visiting team met with Head of the Institution/Dean _____. The briefing on the institution was given by _____ and on the program was given by the *(Name of the respective Head of the Department/Program Coordinator)*. The respective program evaluators also visited the various facilities of the program. Apart from comprehensive review of documental evidences pertaining to various accreditation criteria, the visiting team also held meeting and discussions with the following stakeholders (kindly tick).

Faculty ☐

Alumni ☐

Employers ☐

Parents ☐

Staff members ☐

Students ☐

The Program Evaluation Team found that (general findings about the program to be mentioned)

Program Details

Name of the Program					
Year of Commencement					
Student	Year	Sanctioned Intake		Actual Admitted	
	CAY (20__ - 20__)				
	CAY m1 (20__ - 20__)				
	CAY m2 (20__ - 20__)				
	Total Students in the Programme 1 st & 2 nd Year				
	Averaged for CAY, CAYm1 and CAYm2				
Faculty (Attach a Copy of faculty list compared with Time Table)	Regular		CAY	CAYm1	CAYm2
		Professor			
		Associate professor			
	Contractual	Assistant professor			
		Professor			
		Associate professor			
	Name of the faculty with the domain specific qualification for the program under consideration	Assistant professor			
		No. of PhD. available in the dept.			
		Student - Faculty ratio averaged over CAY, CAYm1 and CAYm2			
		CAY	CAYm1		
	Previous accreditation (if any)	First accreditation	No. of years accredited for		
With effect from					
Previous accreditation		No. of years accredited for			
		With effect from			

CAY: Current Academic Year

CAYm1: Current Academic Year minus 1= Current Assessment Year

CAYm2: Current Academic Year minus 2= Current Assessment Year minus 1

Consideration of Contractual Faculty means:

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 2 semesters in 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:

1. Shall have the AICTE prescribed qualifications and experience.
2. Shall be appointed on full time basis and worked for consecutive two semesters with or without break between the 2 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

Explicit observations about the program

(Please use additional sheets if necessary to elaborate)

Program title _____

Strengths:

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

4. _____

5. _____

Weakness/Areas of improvement:

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

4. _____

5. _____

Deficiencies:

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

4. _____

5. _____

Other Observations, if any:

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

4. _____

5. _____

EVALUATION CRITERIA

AWARD OF ACCREDITATION FOR THE PG ENGINEERING PROGRAMS

Accreditation for 6 years:

- i. Program should score greater than or equal to 375 with 60 per cent in each criteria.
- 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 1:20, 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 corresponding UG Program in the department under consideration is accredited by NBA in Tier I/Tier II - Cycle I/Cycle 2, as the case may be.
- iii. 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).
- iv. 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).
- v. Faculty Student Ratio in the department under consideration should be less than or equal to 1:25, 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" Status

Department/Programme Specific Criteria:

S. No.	Criteria	Max. Marks	Marks Awarded	Remarks
1.	Program Curriculum and Teaching-Learning Processes	125		
2.	Program Outcomes and Course Outcomes	75		
3.	Students' Performance	75		
4.	Faculty Contributions	75		
5.	Laboratories and Research Facilities	75		
6.	Continuous Improvement	75		
TOTAL		500		

Signature
(Program Evaluator 1)

Signature
(Program Evaluator 2)

Declaration of Conformity with evaluator's report by the Team Chair

I agree with the observations of the program evaluators on each criterion.

☐

Or

I agree with most of the observations of the program evaluators. However, I have following comments to make on certain criteria:

Criteria	Comments

**Signature
(Chairperson)**