

Chairperson'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; Web Site: 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 andAmbience: _____

Number of programs being run in the Institute*:

(i) UG- _____

(ii) PG - _____

Total Number of Students:

(i) In UG programs - _____

(ii) In PG programs - _____

Name of programs applied for accreditation

(i) _____

(ii) _____

(iii) _____

(iv) _____

(v) _____

**to be verified from SAR*

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 available Ph.D. 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 are 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. Corresponding UG Program shall be accredited by NBA.
- iii. In case of Tier I, the corresponding UG Engineering program should have been granted at least 3 Compliances (Y) for the SAR with 9 criteria and 4 Compliances (Y) for the SAR with 10 criteria or In case of Tier II, the corresponding UG Engineering program should have been granted at least 650 marks out of 1000.
- iv. 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)
- v. The department should have at least two faculty having Ph.D. qualification for two academic years i.e. Current Academic Year (CAY) and Current Academic Year Minus One (CAYM1)
- vi. Faculty Student Ratio in the department under consideration should be less than or equal to 1:25 averaged over three academic years 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

Name of the Program 1: _____

Marks given by Evaluators:

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

Signature
(Chairperson)

Name of the Program 2: _____

Marks given by Evaluators:

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

Signature
(Chairperson)

Name of the Program 3: _____

Marks given by Evaluators:

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

Signature
(Chairperson)

Name of the Program 4: _____

Marks given by Evaluators:

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

Signature
(Chairperson)

Name of the Program 5: _____

Marks given by Evaluators:

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

Signature
(Chairperson)

Overall Observations

1.

S. No.	Name of the Program	Intake			Admissions	Student-Faculty Ratio
		CAY	CAYm1	CAYm2	Average of CAY, CAYm1 and CAYm2	Average of CAY, CAYm1 and CAYm2

- Also, see the evaluator's report for the above parameters and if you disagree with the same, kindly give your comment.

2. About the progress since last accreditation (to be filled for institutes who have applied for re-accreditation)

Kindly mention the changes made as recommended by NBA, since the previous visit.

3. 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
- Student Support Systems
- Strengths, Weaknesses, Concerns, Suggestions

4. 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 has been set up
- Stakeholders (especially the faculty, HOD, students etc.) awareness about the process