Chairperson's Visit Report

Undergraduate Engineering Program
TIER-II

2nd Cycle Accreditation

(Applicable for all those programs which have been granted full accreditation of 6 years under Tier- II)

Name of the Institution

....

Name of the Program

....

Visit Dates

....

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 Institution*

(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)………………………………………………………

(IIV)………………………………………………………

(V)………………………………………………………

*to be verified from the SAR

Information for Evaluation
Award of Accreditation - Second Cycle Accreditation
of
UG Engineering Programs in TIER II (UG)

i) **Accreditation for Six years will be accorded to a program on fulfilment of the following requirements:**

1. Program should score greater than or equal to 375 with 60 percent in each criterion.

2. 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)

3. The admissions in the UG program under consideration should be more than or equal to 50 percent, averaged over three academic years (including lateral entry), i.e., Current Academic Year minus One (CAYm1), Current Academic Year minus Two (CAYm2) and Current Academic Year minus Three (CAYM3).

4. Faculty Student Ratio in the department 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).

5. At least 2 Professors or 1 Professor and 1 Associate Professor on regular basis with Ph.D. degree should be available in the respective department for two academic years i.e. Current Academic Year (CAY) and Current Academic Year Minus One (CAYM1).

6. HOD of the program under consideration possesses Ph.D. degree in the Current Academic Year (CAY).

ii) **Accreditation for Three years will be accorded to a program on fulfilment of the following requirements:**

1 Program should score greater than or equal to 300 with 40 percent in Criterion–IV (Faculty Contribution)

2 The admissions in the UG program under consideration should be more than or equal to 50 percent, averaged over three academic years (including lateral entry), i.e., Current Academic Year minus One (CAYm1), Current Academic Year minus Two (CAYm2) and Current Academic Year minus Three (CAYM3).

3 At least one Professor or one Associate Professor on regular basis with Ph.D. degree is available in the respective department for two academic years i.e. Current Academic Year (CAY) and Current Academic Year Minus One (CAYM1).

4 The 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).

5 Number of Ph.D. available in the department should be greater than or equal to 10 percent 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) **No Accreditation of the program**

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.	Course Outcomes and Program Outcomes	75		
2.	Program Curriculum and Teaching – Learning Processes	75		
3.	Students' Performance	75		
4.	Faculty Information and Contributions	125		
5.	Resources	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.	Course Outcomes and Program Outcomes	75		
2.	Program Curriculum and Teaching – Learning Processes	75		
3.	Students' Performance	75		
4.	Faculty Information and Contributions	125		
5.	Resources	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.	Course Outcomes and Program Outcomes	75		
2.	Program Curriculum and Teaching – Learning Processes	75		
3.	Students' Performance	75		
4.	Faculty Information and Contributions	125		
5.	Resources	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.	Course Outcomes and Program Outcomes	75		
2.	Program Curriculum and Teaching – Learning Processes	75		
3.	Students' Performance	75		
4.	Faculty Information and Contributions	125		
5.	Resources	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.	Course Outcomes and Program Outcomes	75		
2.	Program Curriculum and Teaching – Learning Processes	75		
3.	Students' Performance	75		
4.	Faculty Information and Contributions	125		
5.	Resources	75		
6.	Continuous Improvement	75		
	TOTAL	500		

_____
Signature
(Chairperson)

Overall Observations

1.

SI 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, kindlygive 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.

☞ 1st year

☞ Academic Ambience

☞ Student Support Systems

☞ Strengths, Weaknesses, Concerns, Suggestions

4. Status of imbibing of outcome-based accreditation. For Example:

☞ Formulation of PEOs, PSOs, 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