

**Part B-Program Observation Worksheet
Program Level Criteria**

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	Vision and Mission of Statements	5	A. Availability of the Vision and Mission statements (2)				
			B. Appropriateness/Relevance of the Statements (3)				
1.2	Program Educational Objectives (PEOs)	5	Listing of the Program Educational Objectives (3 to 5) of the program under consideration (5)				
1.3	Dissemination among Stakeholders	10	A. Adequacy in respect of publication & dissemination (2)				
			B. Process of dissemination among stakeholders (2)				
			C. Extent of awareness of Vision, Mission & PEOs among the stakeholders (6)				
1.4	Formulation Process	15	A. Description of process involved in defining the Vision and Mission (5)				
			B. Description of process involved in defining the PEOs of the program (10)				
1.5	Consistency of PEOs with Mission (15)	15	A. Preparation of a matrix of PEOs and elements of Mission statement (5)				
			B. Consistency/justification of co-relation parameters of the above matrix (10)				
Total of Criterion 1:		50	Overall Marks for Criterion 1:				

Criterion 2: Governance, Leadership and Financial Resources (100)							
S.No	Sub Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines (Marks)	Marks awarded		Overall marks	Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)
				Marks	Total		
2.1	Governance and Leadership	60					
2.1.1	Governance Structure and Policies	30					
2.1.1.1	Governing Structure	10	A. List the governing, senate, and all other academic and administrative bodies; their memberships, functions, and responsibilities; frequency of the meetings; and attendance therein, details of monitoring of performance done by the BoG. (10)				
2.1.1.2	Service Rules	10	A. The published service rules, policies and procedures with year of publication (10)				
2.1.1.3	Policies	5	A. Well defined and implemented policies of governance with stakeholders participating in the development of these policies. Extent of awareness among the faculty and students (5)				
2.1.1.4	Strategic Plan	5	Availability and implementation (5)				
2.1.2	Faculty Empowerment	15					
2.1.2.1	Faculty Development Policies	5	The institution should have a well-defined faculty development policy to ensure that faculty continues to meet high standards (5)				
2.1.2.2	Decentralization, delegation of power and collective decision making	10	A. List the names of the faculty members who have been delegated powers for taking administrative decisions. Mention details in respect of decentralization in working (1)				
			B. Financial and administrative powers delegated to the Principal, Heads of Departments and relevant in-charges (1)				
			C. Demonstrate the utilization of financial and administrative powers for each of the assessment years (5)				
			D. Procedure for decision making on issues such as strategic development and resourcing with respect to educational provision and management of educational resources (3)				

S.No	Sub Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines (Marks)	Marks awarded		Overall marks	Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)
				Marks	Total		
2.1.3	Effective Governance Indicators	15					
2.1.3.1	Grievance redressal mechanism	2	A. Specify the mechanism and composition of grievance redressal cell (1) B. Action taken report as per 'A' above (1)				
2.1.3.2	Transparency	5	A. Information on the policies, rules, processes is to be made available on website (2) B. Dissemination of the information about student, faculty and staff (3)				
2.1.3.3	Leader and Faculty selection process	5	A. Effective implementation (3) B. A well-defined and followed selection process should be there for leader and faculty selection process. Institute should provide sufficient proofs of such process being in existence (2)				
2.1.3.4	Stability of the academic leaders	3	Retention of HOD and Dean (3)				
2.2	Financial Resources	40					
2.2.1	Budget Allocation, Utilization, and Public Accounting at Institute level	40					
2.2.1.1	Adequacy of budget allocation	15	A. Quantum of budget allocation for three years (7) B. Justification of budget allocated for three years (8)				
2.2.1.2	Utilization of allocated funds	15	A. Budget utilization for three years (15)				
2.2.1.3	Availability of the audited statements on the institute's website	10	A. Availability of Audited statements on website (10)				
Total of Criterion 2:		100	Overall Marks for Criterion 2:				

Criterion 3: Program Outcomes and Course Outcomes (100)							
S.No	Sub Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines	Marks awarded		Overall marks	Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)
				Marks	Total		
3.1	Establish the correlation between the courses and the Program Outcomes (POs) & Program Specific Outcomes	20					
3.1.1	Course Outcomes (COs)	5	List of course outcomes at least one course for each semester (5)				
3.1.2	CO-PO/PSOs matrices of courses selected in 3.1.1 (four matrices)	5	Explanation of table to be ascertained (5)				
3.1.3	Course-PO matrix of all courses in the program	10	Explanation of tables to be ascertained (10)				
3.2	Course Outcomes	40					
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 (2)				
			B. The quality/relevance of assessment tools/ processes used (8)				
3.2.2	Record the attainment of Course Outcomes of all courses with respect to set attainment levels	30	A. Verify the attainment levels as per the benchmark set for all courses (30)				
3.3	Attainment of Program Outcomes and Program Specific Outcomes	40					
3.3.1	Describe the assessment tools and processes used to gather the data to evaluate and Program Outcomes and Program Specific Outcomes	10	A. List of assessment processes (3)				
			B. The quality /relevance of assessment processes & tools used (7)				
3.3.2	POs and PSO attainment levels	30	A. Verification of documents, results and level of attainment of each PO and PSO (10)				
			B. Overall levels of attainment (20)				
Total of Criterion 3:		100	Overall Marks for Criterion 3:				

Criterion 4: Curriculum and Learning Process (125)							
S.No	Sub Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines	Marks awarded		Overall marks	Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)
				Marks	Total		
In case of autonomous institutions, following sub-criteria/marks will be applicable for Curriculum							
4.1	Curriculum	50					
4.1.1	State the process for designing the program curriculum	10	Process that periodically documents and demonstrates how the program curriculum is evolved or give the process of gap analysis, whichever is applicable, considering POs (10)				
4.1.2	State the components of the curriculum	15	Refer to SAR: Expectation in 4.1.2, 4.1.3 & 4.1.4 is that the curriculum is well balanced structure & appropriate for a Postgraduate Program (15)				
4.1.3	Transaction of the Curriculum	10	Refer to SAR: Expectation in 4.1.2, 4.1.3 & 4.1.4 is that the curriculum is well balanced structure & appropriate for a Postgraduate program (10)				
4.1.4	Overall quality and level of program curriculum	15	Refer to SAR: Expectation in 4.1.2, 4.1.3 & 4.1.4 is that the curriculum is well balanced structure & appropriate for a Postgraduate program (15)				
In case of affiliated institutions, following sub-criteria/marks will be applicable for Curriculum:							
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 of curriculum will be as given below							
4.1	Curriculum	25					
4.1.1	State the process used to identify extent of compliance of the University curriculum for attaining the Program Outcomes	10	A.State the process used to identify extent of compliance of the University curriculum for attaining the Program Outcomes (6)				
			B.List the curricular gaps for the attainment of defined POs & PSOs (4)				
4.1.2	Appropriateness of the gaps identified and actions taken to bridge the gap	15	A.Steps taken to get identified gaps included in the curriculum (letter to University/BoS) (2)				
			B.Action taken details (10)				
			C.Mapping of events with the POs & PSOs (3)				

S.No	Sub Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines	Marks awarded		Overall marks	Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)
				Marks	Total		
4.2	Learning Processes	(75)(100)	75 marks for autonomous institutions &100 marks for affiliated institutions				
4.2.1	Describe the Process followed to improve quality of Teaching Learning	(20)(40)	A. Adherence to Academic Calendar (2) (5)				
			B. Improving instructional methods and using pedagogical initiatives (5) (10)				
			C. Methodologies to support weak students and encourage bright students (4) (10)				
			D. Quality of classroom teaching (Observation in a Class) (5) (10)				
			E. Student feedback of teaching learning process and actions taken (4) (5)				
4.2.2.	Quality of continued assessment of evaluation process	40 (Same marks for both types)	A. Process for internal semester question paper setting, evaluation and effective process implementation (10)				
			B. Process to ensure questions from outcomes/learning levels perspective (10)				
			C. Evidence of COs coverage in class test / mid-term tests (10)				
			D. Quality of Assignment and its relevance to COs (10)				
4.2.3	Quality of student reports/ dissertation	(15)(20)	A. Identification of projects and allocation methodology to faculty members (1) (2)				
			B. Types and relevance of the reports and their contribution towards attainment of POs (3) (5)				
			C. Process for monitoring and evaluation (3) (5)				
			D. Process to assess individual and team performance (5) (5)				
			E. Quality of dissertation (3) (3)				
Total of Criterion 4:		125	Overall Marks for Criterion 4:				

Criterion 5: Students' Quality and Performance (100)										
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	Enrolment Ratio	20	A. $\geq 90\%$ students enrolled at the First Year Level on average basis during the three-year starting from current academic year (20)					CAY	CAYm1	CAYm2
			B. $\geq 80\%$ students enrolled at the First Year Level on average basis during the three-year starting from current academic year (16)				Sanctioned intake			
			C. $\geq 70\%$ students enrolled at the First Year Level on average basis during the three-year starting from current academic year (12)				Students enrolled at first year level			
			D. $\geq 60\%$ students enrolled at the First Year Level on average basis during the three-year starting from current academic year (8)				Enrolment ratio(ER)			
			E. Otherwise '0'				Average ER for 3 years			
			Comments (if any): ❖							
5.2	Success Rate (Students clearing in minimum time)	10	S.I.=Number of students completing program in minimum duration/ Number of students admitted					LYG	LYGm1	LYGm2
			Average SI = Mean of Success Index (SI) for past three batches				Success Index(SI)			
			Success rate = $10 \times$ Average SI				Average SI for 3 years			
			Comments (if any): ❖							
5.3	Academic Performance (Percentage marks scored)	10	Academic Performance = Average API (Academic Performance Index)					CAYm1	CAYm2	CAYm3
			API = ((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)) \times (number of successful students/number of students appeared in the examination) Successful students are those who have passed in all final year courses				API			
			Average API for 3 years							
Comments (if any):										

S.No	Sub Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines	Marks awarded		Overall marks	Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)			
				Marks	Total					
5.4	Placement, Higher studies and Entrepreneurship	40								
5.4.1	Placement	30	Assessment Points = $30 \times \text{average of three years of } [X+Y+(1.2*Z)]/N$ Where, N is the total no. of students admitted in first year, X is No. of students placed in companies or Government Sector, Y is No. of students pursuing Ph.D./ Higher Studies, Z is No. of students turned entrepreneur (In the areas related to management discipline)					CAYm1	CAYm2	CAYm3
							Placement Index			
							Average Placement Index for 3 years			
							Comments (if any): ❖			
5.4.2	Quality of placement	10								
5.5	Student Diversity	05	Diversity may include Experience, Gender diversity, Qualification, Geographic diversity (within state, outside state, outside country) (5)							
5.6	Professional Activities	15								
5.6.1	Student participation in Professional societies/ chapters and organizing management events	10	A. Availability & activities of professional societies/chapters (2) B. Number, quality of management events (8) (organized at Institute level- Institute/State/ National/ International)							
5.6.2	Student Publications	05	List the publications along with the names of the authors and publishers, etc (5)							
Total of Criterion 5:		100	Overall Marks for Criterion 5:							

Criterion 6: Faculty attributes and Contributions (250)										
S.No	Sub Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines	Marks awarded		Overall marks	Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)			
				Marks	Total			CAY	CAYm1	CAYm2
6.1	Student-Faculty Ratio (SFR)	10	Marks to be given from a maximum of 10 to a minimum of 5 for average SFR between 15:1 to 25:1, and zero for average SFR higher than 25:1 (Refer calculation in SAR) as given below: < = 15 - 10 Marks < = 17 - 09 Marks < = 19 - 08 Marks < = 21 - 07 Marks < = 23 - 06 Marks < = 25 - 05 Marks > 25.0 - 0 Mark							
							Total No.of of students in all PG management programs in Dept. (S)			
							Total no.of faculty members in the Dept(F)			
							SFR=(S/F)			
							Average SFR for 3 years			
Note: Refer criteria 6.1 in the SAR. ❖ SFR should be calculated for Department by considering all students in PG management programs in the Department. ❖ Any program is having less than sanctioned intake of students, need to take sanctioned intake of a program. ❖ No other quota like EWS, etc to be taken for SFR purpose. Comments (if any): ❖										
6.2	Faculty Cadre Proportion	20	Cadre Proportion Marks: $\left[\left[\frac{AF1}{RF1} \right] + \left[\frac{AF2}{RF2} \times 0.6 \right] + \left[\frac{AF3}{RF3} \times 0.4 \right] \right] \times 10.$ ❖ 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			
							Comments (if any): ❖			

S.No	Sub Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines	Marks awarded		Overall marks	Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)			
				Marks	Total			CAY	CAYm1	CAYm2
6.3	Faculty Qualification	20	$FQ = 2.0 \times \left[\frac{10X + 4Y}{F} \right]$ where, X is no. of faculty with Ph.D., Y is no. of faculty with MBA, 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 6.1)							
							No. of faculty with Ph.D;			
							No. of faculty with Master degree:			
							Faculty Qualification (FQ) value			
							Average FQ value for 3 years			
							Comments (if any): ❖			
6.4	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			
							Comments (if any): ❖			

S.No	Sub Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines	Marks awarded		Overall marks	Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)		
				Marks	Total				
6.5	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 (4)						
			D. Statement of clear goals, use of appropriate methods, significance of results, effective presentation and reflective critique (3)						
6.6	Management Development Programme	5	No.of programs organized and duration of each program & no.of candidates participated (5)						
6.7	Faculty Performance and Development System (FPADS)	15	A. A well-defined performance appraisal and development system instituted for all the assessment years (5)						
			B. Its implementation and effectiveness (10)						
6.8	Visiting/ Adjunct Faculty	10	A. Provision of Visiting /Adjunct/Emeritus faculty etc. (2)					CAY/CAYm1	CAYm1/CAYm2
			B. Minimum 50 hours per year interaction (8) (per year to obtain four marks: 4x2=8)				No.of hours		
							Comments (if any): ❖		

S.No	Sub Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines	Marks awarded		Overall marks	Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)			
				Marks	Total			CAYm1	CAYm2	CAYm3
6.9	Academic Research	70	A. Faculty Paper Publication (List of Publications in referred journals, reputed conferences, books, book chapters, case studies in public domain etc.) (50)							
			B. No.of Ph.Ds produced/No.of faculty received Ph.Ds/ Fellowship titles (FPM) awarded during the assessment period while working in the institute (20)							
6.10	Sponsored Research	20	Funded research from outside; considering faculty members contributing to the program Funding Amount (Cumulative for CAYm1, CAYm2 and CAYm3): Amount>30 Lacs - 20 Marks Amount>=20 Lacs & <30 Lacs - 15 Marks Amount >=10 Lac & <20 Lacs - 10 Marks Amount >=5 Lacs & <10 Lacs - 5 Marks Amount >=3 Lacs & <5 Lacs - 2 Marks Amount < 3 Lacs - 0 Mark					CAYm1	CAYm2	CAYm3
							No.of projects			
							Amount(Rs.In Lakhs)			
							Total amount for 3 years			
Comments (if any): ❖										
6.11	Consultancy/Testing/ Training	25	Funding amount (Cumulative for CAYm1, CAYm2 and CAYm3): Amount>= 25 Lacs - 25 Marks, Amount>=20 and <25 lacs - 20 marks, Amount>=15 and <20 lacs - 15 marks, Amount>=10 and <15 lacs - 10 marks Amount>= 5 and <10 Lacs - 5 Marks, Amount<5 Lacs - 0 Marks					CAYm1	CAYm2	CAYm3
							No.of projects			
							Amount(Rs.In Lakhs)			
							Total amount for 3 years			
Comments (if any): ❖										
6.12	Faculty as consultant of the industries	10	Qualitative assessment on the basis of type of consultancy, number of faculty involved, type of industries and completion of consultancy assignments (10)							
6.13	Preparation of teaching Cases	10	The development and use of cases in teaching and thus promoting learners critical thinking skills (10)							
Total of Criterion 6:		250	Overall Marks for Criterion 6:							

Criterion 7: Industry & International Connect (100)							
S.No	Sub Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines	Marks awarded		Overall marks	Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)
				Marks	Total		
7.1	Industry Connect	60					
7.1.1	Initiatives related to industry interaction including industry internship/summer training/ study tours/guest lectures	15					
7.1.2	Participation of Industry professionals in curriculum development, projects, assignments as examiners, in summer projects	15					
7.1.3	Initiatives related to industry including executive education, industry sponsored labs, and industry sponsorship of student activities	15					
7.1.4	Involvement of industry professional as members of various academic bodies/board	15					
7.2	International Connect	40	International Students, Student Immersion Programs, Faculty Exchange Programs and Collaborative Research Projects. These would also include online initiatives to engage with international academic communities				
Total of Criterion 7:		100	Overall Marks for Criterion 7:				

Criterion 8: Infrastructure (75)							
S.No	Sub Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines	Marks awarded		Overall marks	Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)
				Marks	Total		
8.1	Classrooms & Learning facilities	25	A. Adequate well-equipped classrooms to meet the curriculum (10)				
			B. Availability of E-learning facilities, utilization; initiatives to ensure students learning (15)				
8.2	Library	20	A. Availability of relevant learning resources including e-resources and Digital Library (15)				
			B. Accessibility to students (5)				
8.3	IT Infrastructure and Learning Management System	30	A. Availability of composite hardware, software, network resources and services required for the existence, operation and management of an institution's IT environment (15)				
			B. Availability of LMS related core functionalities like sharing of learning resources, Assessment and external learning linkages, 24/7 learner support, Discussion Forums and learner engagement (15)				
Total of Criterion 8:		75	Overall Marks for Criterion 8:				

Criterion 9: Alumni Performance and Connect (50)							
S.No	Sub Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines	Marks awarded		Overall marks	Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)
				Marks	Total		
9.1	Alumni association	10	A. Duly formed (5)				
			B. Registered (5)				
9.2	Involvement of alumni	25	Alumni meet, visit to institution and interaction with students, involvement in curriculum development, project guidance, assistance in entrepreneurship, mentoring of students, assistance in placement, resources raised, etc. (25)				
9.3	Methodology to connect with Alumni and its implementation	15	Alumni portal, database, alumni meet, frequency of meets, alumni chapters, newsletter (15)				
Total of Criterion 9:		50	Overall Marks for Criterion 9:				

Criterion 10: Continuous Improvement (50)							
S.No	Sub Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines	Marks awarded		Overall marks	Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)
				Marks	Total		
10.1	Actions taken based on the results of evaluation of each of the POs and PSOs	20	Action taken details for each of the POs and PSOs (20)				
10.2	Academic Audit and actions taken during the period of Assessment	10	Assessment shall be based on conduct and actions taken in relation to continuous improvement (10)				
10.3	Improvement in Placement, Higher Studies and Entrepreneurship	10	A. Improvement in Placements (5) Assessment is based on improvement in: (Refer placement index 5.4) (Marks to be given proportionately considering nos. in the base year CAYm2)				
			B. Improvement in Higher Studies (3) Assessment is based on improvement in: (Refer placement index 5.4) (Marks to be given proportionately considering nos. in the base year CAYm2)				
			C. Improvement in number of Entrepreneurs (2) Assessment is based on improvement in: (Refer placement index 5.4) (Marks to be given proportionately considering nos. in the base year CAYm2)				
10.4	Improvement in the quality of students admitted to the program	10					
Total of Criterion 10:		50	Overall Marks for Criterion 10:				