

PART - A

Chairperson's Visit Report

Undergraduate Engineering Programs

Tier-II

Name of the Institution

Name of the Programs

Visit Dates

Name of the Chairperson

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

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:

❖ Engineering programs

(i) No. of UG programs* : _____

(ii) No. of PG programs : _____

❖ No. of Non-Engineering programs

(i) No. of UG programs : _____

(ii) No. of PG programs : _____

Total Number of Students:

❖ Engineering programs

(i) In UG programs, total no. of students: _____

(ii) In PG programs, total no. of students: _____

❖ No. of Non-Engineering programs

(i) In UG programs, total no. of students: _____

(ii) In PG programs, total no. of students: _____

Name of programs applied for accreditation

(i) _____

(ii) _____

(iii) _____

(iv) _____

(v) _____

Note*: If any undergraduate (Engineering) program in the Department or allied Departments has been running for less than 3 years (CAY, CAYm1), specify the year of the program's start.

Name of the Program-1: _____

A. Department/Program Specific Criteria (Marks given by Evaluators)

S.N.	Criteria	Max. Marks	Marks Awarded	Remarks
1	Outcome-Based Curriculum	120		
2	Outcome-Based Teaching Learning	120		
3	Outcome-Based Assessment	120		
4	Students' Performance	120		
5	Faculty Information	100		
6	Faculty Contributions	120		
7	Facilities and Technical Support	100		
8	Continuous Improvement	80		
TOTAL		880		

B. Institute Level Criteria (Marks to be filled by the Chairperson)

S.N.	Criteria	Max. Marks	Marks Awarded	Remarks
9	Student Support System and Governance	120		
TOTAL		120		
GRAND TOTAL (A +B)		1,000		

Note: The assessment for Criterion 9.8 varies for each individual program

**Signature
(Chairperson)**

Name of the Program-2: _____

A. Department/Program Specific Criteria (Marks given by Evaluators)

S.N.	Criteria	Max. Marks	Marks Awarded	Remarks
1	Outcome-Based Curriculum	120		
2	Outcome-Based Teaching Learning	120		
3	Outcome-Based Assessment	120		
4	Students' Performance	120		
5	Faculty Information	100		
6	Faculty Contributions	120		
7	Facilities and Technical Support	100		
8	Continuous Improvement	80		
TOTAL		880		

B. Institute Level Criteria (Marks to be filled by the Chairperson)

S.N.	Criteria	Max. Marks	Marks Awarded	Remarks
9	Student Support System and Governance	120		
TOTAL		120		
GRAND TOTAL (A +B)		1,000		

Note: The assessment for Criterion 9.8 varies for each individual program.

**Signature
(Chairperson)**

Name of the Program-3: _____

A. Department/Program Specific Criteria (Marks given by Evaluators)

S.N.	Criteria	Max. Marks	Marks Awarded	Remarks
1	Outcome-Based Curriculum	120		
2	Outcome-Based Teaching Learning	120		
3	Outcome-Based Assessment	120		
4	Students' Performance	120		
5	Faculty Information	100		
6	Faculty Contributions	120		
7	Facilities and Technical Support	100		
8	Continuous Improvement	80		
TOTAL		880		

B. Institute Level Criteria (Marks to be filled by the Chairperson)

S.N.	Criteria	Max. Marks	Marks Awarded	Remarks
9	Student Support System and Governance	120		
TOTAL		120		
GRAND TOTAL (A +B)		1,000		

Note: The assessment for Criterion 9.8 varies for each individual program.

**Signature
(Chairperson)**

Name of the Program-4: _____

A. Department/Program Specific Criteria (Marks given by Evaluators)

S.N.	Criteria	Max. Marks	Marks Awarded	Remarks
1	Outcome-Based Curriculum	120		
2	Outcome-Based Teaching Learning	120		
3	Outcome-Based Assessment	120		
4	Students' Performance	120		
5	Faculty Information	100		
6	Faculty Contributions	120		
7	Facilities and Technical Support	100		
8	Continuous Improvement	80		
TOTAL		880		

B. Institute Level Criteria (Marks to be filled by the Chairperson)

S.N.	Criteria	Max. Marks	Marks Awarded	Remarks
9	Student Support System and Governance	120		
TOTAL		120		
GRAND TOTAL (A +B)		1,000		

Note: The assessment for Criterion 9.8 varies for each individual program.

**Signature
(Chairperson)**

Name of the Program-5: _____

A. Department/Program Specific Criteria (Marks given by Evaluators)

S.N.	Criteria	Max. Marks	Marks Awarded	Remarks
1	Outcome-Based Curriculum	120		
2	Outcome-Based Teaching Learning	120		
3	Outcome-Based Assessment	120		
4	Students' Performance	120		
5	Faculty Information	100		
6	Faculty Contributions	120		
7	Facilities and Technical Support	100		
8	Continuous Improvement	80		
TOTAL		880		

B. Institute Level Criteria (Marks to be filled by the Chairperson)

S.N.	Criteria	Max. Marks	Marks Awarded	Remarks
9	Student Support System and Governance	120		
TOTAL		120		
GRAND TOTAL (A +B)		1,000		

Note: The assessment for Criterion 9.8 varies for each individual program.

**Signature
(Chairperson)**

1. Overall Observations

S.N.	Name of the program	Average SFR for 3 years (CAY, CAYm1, CAYm2) in the Department and allied Departments	No. of Professors in the Department and allied Departments (Refer to section 5.3. of SAR)†		No. of Associate Professors in the Department and allied Departments (Refer to section 5.3. of SAR)†		No. of faculty having Ph. D degree available in the Department & allied Departments (Refer to section 5.2. of SAR)†	
			CAY	CAYm1	CAY	CAYm1	CAY	CAYm1

Note[†]: Data should be consistent with PART-A of the evaluator report.

2. 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 including faculty:

❖ Strength, Weakness, Suggestions:

3. 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 status**

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

- ❖ **Implementation of education policy (like NEP 2020, state educational policy, etc.)**

- ❖ **Support to Implementation of Institute-Industry Linkage Policy.**

- ❖ **Support to Startup eco-culture**

- ❖ **Any other**

Note *: If any undergraduate (Engineering) program in the Department or allied Departments has been running for less than 3 years (CAY, CAYm1), specify the year of the program's start.

Name of the UG (Engineering) program*:

Year started:

Note: Programs such as MCA, BCA, Diploma (Engineering), and other non-engineering programs running in the Department or allied Departments need to have sufficient faculty members to support those programs. These faculty members and students should not be included in the aforementioned table.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR TIER-II (UG (ENGG.,))

Information for Evaluation

Y=75% or Above; **C**= 60% and < 75%; **W**=40% and < 60%; **D** < 40%.

Accreditation for 6 years:

- i. There should not be any 'Deficiency (D)' or 'Weakness (W)' in any of the criteria and at least six criteria must be fully compliant (Y), with only 'Concerns (C)' in the remaining criteria (Y \geq 6, W & D=0).
- ii. The number of faculty having Ph. D degree available in the Department and allied Departments is greater than or equal to 30% 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. The Student Faculty Ratio (SFR) in the Department and allied Departments should be less than or equal to 20:1, averaged over 3 academic years i.e. Current Academic Year (CAY), Current Academic Year Minus One (CAYm1) and Current Academic Year Minus Two (CAYm2).
- iv.
 - Case 1: If the Department/School is not running multiple UG (Engineering) programs and does not have allied Departments, which are running undergraduate engineering program, then the program under consideration needs either 2 Professors or 1 Professor and 1 Associate Professor on a regular basis with Ph.D. degree in the current academic year (CAY) and the previous academic year (CAYm1).
 - Case 2: If the Department/School, including allied Departments, is running multiple UG (Engineering) programs, the program under consideration needs either 2 Professors or 1 Professor and 1 Associate Professor on a regular basis with Ph.D. degree in CAY and CAYm1. Additionally, the remaining UG (Engineering) programs (N*) need "N" Professors or "N" Associate Professors in the Department/ School/ Allied departments on a regular basis with Ph.D. degree in CAY and CAYm1 in total.
- v. The HoD of the department in which the program under consideration is running should be appointed on regular basis and should possess Ph.D degree in the Current Academic Year (CAY).

Note *: Exclude the number of Professors/Associate Professors for the UG programs (Engineering) that have been running for less than 3 years (CAY, CAYm1).

Accreditation for 3 years:

- i. There should not be any Deficiency (D) and at least three criteria must be fully compliant (Y).

- ii.** The number of faculty having Ph. D degree available in the Department and allied Departments is greater than or equal to 10% 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.** The Student Faculty Ratio (SFR) in the Department and allied Departments should be less than or equal to 25:1, averaged over 3 academic years i.e. Current Academic Year (CAY), Current Academic Year Minus One (CAYm1) and Current Academic Year Minus Two (CAYm2).

vi.

- Case 1:

If the Department/School is not running multiple UG (Engineering) programs and does not have allied departments, which are running undergraduate engineering programs, then the program under consideration needs either 1 Professor or 1 Associate Professor on a regular basis with Ph.D. degree in the current academic year (CAY) and the previous academic year (CAYm1).

- Case 2:

If the Department/School, including allied departments, is running multiple UG (Engineering) programs, the program under consideration needs either 1 Professor or 1 Associate Professor on a regular basis with Ph.D. degree in CAY and CAYm1. Additionally, the remaining UG (Engineering) programs (N*) need "N" Professors or "N" Associate Professors in the Department/ School/ Allied departments on a regular basis with Ph.D. degree in CAY and CAYm1 in total.

- vii.** The HoD of the department in which the program under consideration is running should be appointed on regular basis and should possess Ph.D degree in the Current Academic Year (CAY).

Note *: Exclude the number of Professors/Associate Professors for the UG programs (Engineering) that have been running for less than 3 years (CAY, CAYm1).

No Accreditation

- i.** If the program fails to meet the criteria for award of accreditation for 3 years, it is awarded "Not Accredited" Status.