Evaluator'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

....

Program Evaluator Summary

Overview

The Expert team of National Board of Accreditation (NBA) conducted a three-day accreditation visit from

_____to_____**(name of institution)**_____

_____, to evaluate UG Engineering program (**name of the program**).

Pre-visit meeting of the expert team was held on at_____to

exchange therespective findings with the evaluation team members, based on review of Self-Assessment Report (SAR) and

the pre-visit evaluation reports.

During the visit, the visiting team met with Head of the Institution/Dean_____.

Thebriefing on the institution was given by_____and on the program

was given by the **(Nameof the respective Head of the Department/Program Coordinator)**. The respective

program evaluators also visited the various facilities of the program. Apart from comprehensive review of

documental evidences pertaining to various accreditation criteria, the visiting team also held meeting and

discussions with the following stakeholders (kindly tick).

Faculty	☐		Alumni	☐
Employers	☐		Parents	☐
Staff members	☐		Students	☐

The Program Evaluation Team found that (general findings about the program to be mentioned)

_____

_____

_____

Program Details

Name of the UG Program:						

Year of Commencement						

No.of Students (Total no.of students admitted in last 3 batches starting from CAYm1, CAYm2, CAYm3)	**Batch (Provide students information in batch wise)**	**Sanctioned Intake of the program as per AICTE/ Competent authority (S)**	**No.of students admitted including lateral entry in the respective batch**			**% of students admitted in respective batch (S3/S)**
			No.of students admitted in 1st year(S1)	No.of students admitted via lateral entry (S2)	Total(S3= S1+S2)	
	CAYm1 (20--20--)					
	CAYm2 (20--20--)					
	CAYm3 (20--20--)					
	Average percentage of students admitted over 3 years (Refer Table B.3a in the SAR)					

No.of Faculty (Attach a Copy of faculty list compared with Time Table)				**CAY (20-- 20--)**	**CAYm1 (20--20--)**	**CAYm2 (20--20--)**
	No.of Regular faculty members for past 3 years (Refer criteria-4.2 in the SAR)	No.of Professors	With Ph.D degree			
			Without Ph.D degree			
		No.of Associate Professors	With Ph.D degree			
			Without Ph.D degree			
		No.of Assistant Professors				
	No.of Contractual faculty members for past 3 years (Refer criteria-4.2 in the SAR)	No.of Professors	With Ph.D degree			
			Without Ph.D degree			
		No.of Associate Professors	With Ph.D degree			
			Without Ph.D degree			
		No.of Assistant Professors				
	No. of Ph.D holders in the Department (Refer criteria-4.3 in the SAR)					
	Student - Faculty Ratio averaged over CAY, CAYm1 and CAYm2 (Refer criteria 4.1 in the SAR)			**CAY (20-- 20--)**	**CAYm1 (20--20--)**	**CAYm2 (20--20--)**
		Total no. of students in Dept.(S)				
		No.of faculty in Dept.(F)				
		SFR (S/F)				
		Average SFR over 3 years				

Previous accreditation (if any)	**Last time NBA accreditation**	No. of years accredited by NBA for a program	
		With effect from	

CAY: Current Academic Year;
CAYm1: Current Academic Year minus 1=Current Assessment year
CAYm2: Current Academic Year minus 2=Current Assessment year minus 1

Note: Consideration of Contractual Faculty means:

- All the faculty whether regular or contractual (except part-time or hourly based), will be considered. The contractual faculty appointed with any terminology whatsoever, who have taught for 2 consecutive semesters with or without break between the 2 semesters in 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 with or without break between the 2 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*

- *Faculty to be calculated Department wise as per the format given in SAR; Faculty appointment letters, time table, subject allocation file, salary statements and random interaction in person.*
- *No. of student's calculation as mentioned in the SAR (please refer table under criterion 4.1)*
- *Faculty Qualification as per AICTE guidelines shall only be counted.*

Explicit observations about the program

(Please use additional sheets if necessary to elaborate)

Program title_____

Strengths:

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

Concerns:

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

Weakness/Areas of improvement:

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

Deficiencies:

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

Other Observations, if any:

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

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 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)

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 isawarded "Not Accredited" status.

Major Accreditation Criteria:

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
(Program Evaluator 1)

_____
Signature
(Program Evaluator 2)

Declaration of Conformity with Evaluator's Report by the Team Chair

I agree with the observations of the Program Evaluators on each criterion.

Or

I agree with most of the observations of the Program Evaluators. However, I have following comments to make on certain criterion:

Criteria	Comments

_____
Signature
(Chairperson)