

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 | | | | |
| 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 | 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 | 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. | | | | |
| 2.1.1.2 | Service Rules | 10 | The published service rules, policies and procedures with year of publication | | | | |
| 2.1.1.3 | Policies | 5 | Well defined and implemented policies of governance with stakeholders participating in the development of these policies. Extent of awareness among the faculty and students | | | | |
| 2.1.1.4 | Strategic Plan | 5 | Availability and implementation | | | | |
| 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 | | | | |
| 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 | | | | | | |
| 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 | Budget utilization for three years | | | | | | |
| 2.2.1.3 | Availability of the Audited Statements on the Institute's Website | 10 | Availability of Audited statements on website | | | | | | |
| 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 | | | | |
| 3.1.2 | CO-PO/PSOs Matrices of courses selected in 3.1.1 (four matrices) | 5 | Explanation of tables to be ascertained | | | | |
| 3.1.3 | Course-PO Matrix of all Courses in the Program | 10 | Explanation of table to be ascertained | | | | |
| 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 | Verify the attainment levels as per the benchmark set for all courses | | | | |
| 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 | | |
| 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 | | | | |
| 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 | | | | |
| 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 | | | | |
| 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 | | | | |
| 4.2 | Learning Processes | 75 | | | | | |
| 4.2.1 | Describe the Process Followed to Improve Quality of Teaching Learning | 20 | A. Adherence to Academic Calendar (2) | | | | |
| | | | B. Improving instructional methods and using pedagogical initiatives (5) | | | | |
| | | | C. Methodologies to support weak students and encourage bright students (4) | | | | |
| | | | D. Quality of classroom teaching (Observation in a Class) (5) | | | | |
| | | | E. Student feedback of teaching learning process and actions taken (4) | | | | |

| S.No. | Sub-Criteria | Max. Marks | Evaluation Guidelines | Marks awarded | | Overall marks | Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons) |
|-----------------------|--|------------|---|---------------|-------|---------------|--|
| | | | | Marks | Total | | |
| 4.2.2. | Quality of Continued Assessment Evaluation Process | 40 | 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 Repots/ Dissertation | 15 | A. Identification of projects and allocation methodology to faculty members (1) | | | | |
| | | | B. Types and relevance of the reports and their contribution towards attainment of POs (3) | | | | |
| | | | C. Process for monitoring and evaluation (3) | | | | |
| | | | D. Process to assess individual and team performance (5) | | | | |
| | | | E. Quality of dissertation (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 | | | | | |
| 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 = $10 * \text{Average SI}$ | | | | 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)) * (number of successful students/number of students appeared in the examination). | | | | API | | | |
| | | | Successful students are those who have passed in all final year courses | | | | 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 * 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) | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5.6 | 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 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 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 - 00 Mark | | | | | CAY | CAYm1 | CAYm2 |
| | | | | | | | 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 all 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 | Faculty Cadre Proportion Marks: $\left[\frac{AF1}{RF1} \right] + \left[\frac{AF2}{RF2} \right] * 0.6 + \left[\frac{AF3}{RF3} \right] * 10$ ❖ If AF1 = AF2= 0 then zero marks ❖ Maximum marks to be limited if it exceeds 20 (Refer calculation in SAR) | | | | | CAY | CAYm1 | CAYm2 |
| | | | | | | | 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 | | | | | |
| 6.3 | Faculty Qualification | 20 | FQ=2.0*[{10X +4Y}/F] 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) | | | | | CAY | CAYm1 | CAYm2 |
| | | | | | | | 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. ≥ 90% of required Faculties retained during the period of assessment keeping CAYm2 as base year (20) | | | | | | CAY | CAYm1 |
| | | | B. ≥ 75% of required Faculties retained during the period of assessment keeping CAYm2 as base year (15) | | | | No.of Faculty Retained | | | |
| | | | C. ≥ 60% of required Faculties retained during the period of assessment keeping CAYm2 as base year (10) | | | | Total No.of Required Faculty in CAYm2 | | | |
| | | | D. ≥ 50% of required Faculties retained during the period of assessment keeping CAYm2 as base year (08) | | | | Percentage of faculty retained | | | |
| | | | E. Otherwise (0) | | | | 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. | | | | | | |
| 6.7 | Faculty Performance Appraisal 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: 4*2=8) | | | | Comments (if any): ❖ | | |

| S.No. | Sub-Criteria | Max. Marks | Evaluation Guidelines | Marks awarded | | Overall marks | Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons) | | | |
|-----------------------|---|------------|---|---------------|-------|---------------|--|-------|-------|-------|
| | | | | Marks | Total | | | | | |
| 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 | | | | | | | |
| 6.13 | Preparation of Teaching Cases | 10 | The development and use of cases in teaching and thus promoting learners critical thinking skills | | | | | | | |
| 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: | | | | |