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 (125)							
S.No.	**Sub Criteria**	**Max. Marks**	**Evaluation Guidelines**	**Marks Awarded**		**Overall**	**Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)**
				Marks	**Total**	**Marks**	
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.				
1.1.2.	Structure of the Curriculum	5	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 look at the entire curriculum in detail. It shall allow an evaluator to identify oddities (if any) at the individual course level.				
1.1.3.	State the components of the 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 1.1.3 the evaluator can see the distribution of credits amongst different components. It allows him to decide if the curriculum is balanced			Overall Marks for 1.1	
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.				

In case of affiliated institutions following criteria will be applicable for Program 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 will be as given below:

1.1.	**Program Curriculum**	**35**			

1.1.1.	Process used to identify extent of compliance of the University curriculum for attaining the Program Outcomes	10				Overall Marks for 1.1	
1.1.2.	Appropriateness of the gaps identified	5					
1.1.3.	Actions taken to bridge the gap	10					
1.1.4.	Overall quality and 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	Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)
				Marks	Total	Marks	
1.2.	**Teaching-Learning Processes**	**90**					
1.2.1.	Quality of end semester examination, internal semester question papers, assignments and evaluation	20	A. Process for end semester examination, internal semester question paper setting, evaluation and effective process implementation (3)				
			B. Process to ensure questions from outcomes/learning levels perspective (3)				
			C. Evidence of COs coverage in class tests/ Mid term tests. (7)				
			D. Quality of Assignment and its relevance to COs (7)				
1.2.2.	Quality of student projects	30	A. Very clear and concise objectives (5)				
			B. Very clear methodology, articulated using technical terms indicating all steps and tools (5)				
			C. Cites substantial current and good quality literature (4)				
			D. Clarity in design/setting up of experiment (4)				
			E. Benchmarks used / Assumptions made (4)				
			F. Interpretation of results and justification thereof and validity of the results presented (4)				
			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)			Overall Marks for 1.2	
			B. Industry involvement in partial delivery of any regular courses for students (1)				
			C. Impact analysis of industry institute interaction and actions taken thereof (1)				
			D. Industrial training/tours for students (1)				
			E. Industrial /internship /summer training of more than two weeks and post training Assessment (2)				
			F. Impact analysis of industrial training (1)				
			G. Student feedback on initiative (2)				
1.2.4.	Participation of Industry professionals in curriculum development, as examiners, in major projects	10	Documentary Evidence				

1.2.5.	Quality of laboratory work given	20	Qualitative judgment 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:		**125**	**Overall Marks and Grade for Criterion 1:**				

Criterion 2: Program Outcomes and Course Outcomes (75)							
S.No.	**Sub Criteria**	**Max. Marks**	**Evaluation Guidelines**	**Marks Awarded**		**Overall**	**Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)**
				Marks	**Total**	**Marks**	
2.1.	**Establish the connect between the courses and the POs**	**15**	A. Evidence of COs being defined for every course (3)			**Overall Marks for 2.1**	
			B. Availability of COs embedded in the syllabi (3)				
			C. Explanation of Course Articulation Matrix table to be ascertained (3)				
			D. Explanation of Program Articulation Matrix tables to be ascertained (6)				
2.2.	**Attainment of Program Outcomes**	**60**				**Overall Marks for 2.2**	
2.2.1.	Describe the assessment tools and processes used to gather the data upon which the evaluation of Program Outcome is based	20	A. List of assessment tools & processes (10)				
			B. The quality/relevance of assessment tools/processes used (10)				
2.2.2.	Pos attainment levels with observations	40	A. Verification of documents, results and level of attainment of each PO (30)				
			B. Overall levels of attainment (10)				
Total of Criterion 2:		**75**	**Overall Marks and Grade for Criterion 2:**				

Criterion 3: Students' Performance (75)							
S.No.	Sub Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines	Marks Awarded		Overall	Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)
				Marks	Total	Marks	
3.1.	**Enrolment Ratio through GATE**	20	A. >= 80% students enrolled through GATE at the First Year Level on average basis during the last three years starting from current academic year (20) B. >= 60% students enrolled through GATE at the First Year Level on average basis during the last three years starting from current academic year(16) C. >= 50% students enrolled through GATE at the First Year Level on average basis during the last three years starting from current academic year (12) D. >= 40% students enrolled through GATE at the First Year Level on average basis during the last three years starting from current academic year(8) E. >= 20% students enrolled through GATE at the First Year Level on average basis during the last three years starting from current academic year(6) E. < 20 % students enrolled through GATE at the First Year Level on average basis during the last three years starting from current academic year(0)			Overall Marks for 3.1	Mention Numbers
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 X Average S.I.			Overall Marks for 3.2	Mention Numbers
3.3.	**Placement, Higher studies and Entrepreneurship**	20	Assessment Points = 20 × 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			Overall Marks for 3.3	Mention Numbers

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 engineering events	5	A. Availability & activities of professional societies/chapters (3)			Overall Marks for 3.4	
			B. Number, quality of engineering 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 and Grade for Criterion 3:**				

Criterion 4: Faculty Contributions (75)							
S.No.	**Sub Criteria**	**Max. Marks**	**Evaluation Guidelines**	**Marks Awarded**		**Overall**	**Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)**
				Marks	**Total**	**Marks**	
4.1.	**Student-Faculty Ratio (SFR)**	**10**	•Marks to be given proportionally from a maximum of 10 to a minimum of 05 for average SFR between 15:1 to 25:1, and zero for average SFR higher than 25:1. Marks distribution is given as below: < = 15-10 Marks < = 17-09 Marks < = 19-08 Marks < = 21-07 Marks < = 23- 06 Marks < = 25-05 Marks >25.0-0 Marks • **Number of Regular faculty will be calculated as per the definition given below:** **All the faculty whether regular or contractual (except Part-Time), will be considered. The contractual faculty (doing away with the terminology of visiting/adjunct faculty, whatsoever) who have taught for 2 consecutive 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:** **1. Shall have the AICTE prescribed qualifications and experience.** **2. Shall be appointed on full time basis and worked for consecutive 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.**			**Overall Marks for 4.1**	
4.2.	**Faculty competencies in the area of Program Specialization**	**30**				**Overall Marks for 4.2.**	
4.2.1.	Faculty competency in the domain area.	10					
4.2.2	Faculty Research Publication	10					
4.2.3.	Faculty Development work	10					
4.3.	**Faculty as participants in Faculty development /training activities STTPs**	**5**	Relevance of Training Program			**Overall Marks for 4.3.**	

S.No.	Sub Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines	Marks Awarded		Overall	Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)
				Marks	Total	Marks	
4.4.	**Research and Development**	**30**					
4.4.1.	Sponsored Research	15	Funded research from outside; Cumulative for CAYm1, CAYm2 and CAY m3: Amount >50Lacs 15 Marks, Amount >40 and <50Lacs - 10 Marks, Amount >30 and <40Lacs - 5 Marks, Amount>15and <30Lacs - 2 Marks, Amount< 15 Lacs - 0 Mark			Overall Marks for 4.4.	Mention numbers
4.4.2.	Consultancy (From Industry)	15	Consultancy; Cumulative for CAYm1, CAYm2 and CAY m3: Amount>10 Lacs 15 Marks, Amount<10 and > 8 Lacs 10 Marks, Amount< 8 and >6 Lacs 8 Marks, Amount < 6 and >4 Lacs 5 Marks, Amount< 4 and >2 Lacs 2 Marks, Amount <2 Lacs 0 Mark				
Total of Criterion 4:		**75**	**Overall Marks and Grade for Criterion 4:**				

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	30	A. Adequate well-equipped laboratories to run all the program-specific curriculum (20) B. Availability of adequate and qualified technical supporting staff (10)			Overall Marks for 5.1	
5.2.	Research facilities / center of excellence	30				Overall Marks for 5.2	
5.3.	Access to laboratory facilities, training in the use of equipment	15				Overall Marks for 5.3	
Total of Criterion 5:		75	Overall Marks and Grade for Criterion 5:				

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 (5) C. Plan of action to bridge the gap and its Implementation (10)			Overall Marks for 6.1	
6.2.	Improvement in quality of projects	10				Overall Marks for 6.2	
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 PhD. in premier institutions (3) C. Improvement in number of Entrepreneurs (2)			Overall Marks for 6.3	
6.4.	Improvement in the quality of students admitted to the program	10	Assessment is based on improvement in terms of ranks/score in GATE examination			Overall Marks for 6.4	
6.5.	Improvement in quality of paper publication	10				Overall Marks for 6.5	
6.6.	Improvement in laboratories	10				Overall Marks for 6.6	
Total of Criterion 6:		75	Overall Marks and Grade for Criterion 6				