### PART A

# **Chairperson's Visit Report**

# Undergraduate Engineering Program TIER-I

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:		<u> </u>
Program 1:		
Program evaluator 1	Name	
	Organization:	
Program evaluator 2	Name	
	Organization:	
Program 2:		
Program Evaluator 1	Name	
	Organization:	
Program Evaluator 2	Name	
Trogram Evaluator 2	Organization:	
Program 3:		
Program Evaluator 1	Name	
	Organization:	
Drogram Evaluator 2	Name	
Program Evaluator 2	Organization:	
Program 4:		
Program Evaluator 1	Name	
	Organization:	
Duaguaga Frankratan 2	Name	
Program Evaluator 2	Organization:	
Program 5:		
Program Evaluator 1	Name	
	Organization:	

Program Evaluator 2

Name

Organization:

## **Institution Details**

Year o	t Establishment:					
Physic	Physical Infrastructure and Ambience:					
Numb	er of programs being run in the Institution*:					
(i) (ii)	UG PG					
Total	Number of Students:					
	In UG programs					
Name	of programs applied for accreditation					
(i) (ii) (iii) (iv)						

<sup>\*</sup>to be verified from SAR

#### Information for Evaluation

#### Award of Accreditation [TIER I (UG)]

# 1. Accreditation for Six years will be accorded to a program on fulfillment of the following requirements:

Y	С	W	D
>=7	<=3	0	0

- i. There should not be any "Deficiency" or "Weakness" in any of the Criteria and at least Seven Criterion must be fully Compliant with only "Concerns" in the remaining three 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 year i.e. Current Academic Year (CAY) and Current Academic Year Minus One (CAYM1).
- iii. The admissions in the UG program should be more than or equal to 60 per cent, 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).
- iv. Faculty Student Ratio in the department should be less than or equal to 1:20 averaged over three academic year i.e. Current Academic Year (CAY), Current Academic Year Minus One (CAYM1) and Current Academic Year Minus Two (CAYM2).
- v. At least 2 Professors or 1 Professor and 1 Associate Professor (on regular basis) with Ph.D. degree are available in the respective department for two academic year i.e. Current Academic Year (CAY) and Current Academic Year Minus One (CAYM1).
- vi. HoD of the program under consideration possess Ph.D. degree in the Current Academic Year (CAY).

# 2. Accreditation for Three years will be accorded to a program on fulfillment of the following requirements:

Y	D
>=4	0

- i. There should be at least four criteria fully compliant with zero (0) "Deficiency" in the remaining criteria.
- ii. The admissions in the UG program should be more than or equal to 60 per cent, 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).
- iii. At least 2 Professors or 1 Professor and 1 Associate Professor (on regular basis) with Ph.D. degree are available in the respective department for two academic year i.e. Current Academic Year (CAY) and Current Academic Year Minus One (CAYM1).

- iv. 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).
- v. Number of available Ph.D. in the department should be greater than or equal to 20 per cent of the required number of faculty averaged over two academic year i.e. Current Academic Year (CAY) and Current Academic Year Minus One (CAYM1).
- vi. HoD of the program under consideration should possess Ph.D. degree in the Current Academic Year (CAY).

#### 3. 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.

SI. No.	Criteria	Max. Marks	Marks Awarded	Grade (Y, C, W, D)	Remarks
1.	Vision, Mission and Program Educational Objectives	50			
2.	Program Curriculum and Teaching-Learning Processes	100			
3.	Course Outcomes and Program Outcomes	175			
4.	Students' Performance	100			
5.	Faculty Information and Contributions	200			
6.	Facilities and Technical Support	80			
7.	Continuous Improvement	75			
	TOTAL	780			
. Inst	itute Level Criteria (to b Criteria	Max. Marks	Marks Awarded	(Y, C, W, D)	Remarks
8.	First Year Academics*	50			
9.	Student Support Systems	50			
10.	Governance, Institutional support and Financial Resources*	120			
	TOTAL	220			
	GRAND TOTAL (A +B	1000			
ssmen	t for Criteria 8 (8.3, 8.4 &8	.5) and 10 (	10.3) is differe	ent for individual prog	gram.
Grade:					
Y:	, C:		_, W:	, D:	

Name of the Program 1:

Name of the Program 2:
------------------------

## A. Department/Program Specific Criteria:

S. No.	Criteria	Max. Marks	Marks Awarded	Grade (Y, C, W, D)	Remarks
1.	Vision, Mission and Program Educational Objectives	50			
2.	Program Curriculum and Teaching-Learning Processes	100			
3.	Course Outcomes and Program Outcomes	175			
4.	Students' Performance	100			
5.	Faculty Information and Contributions	200			
6.	Facilities and Technical Support	80			
7.	Continuous Improvement	75			
	TOTAL	780			

B. Institution Level Criteria (to be filled-in by the Chairperson)

S. No.	Criteria	Max. Marks	Marks Awarded	Grade (Y, C, W, D)	Remarks
8.	First Year Academics*	50			
9.	Student Support Systems	50			
10.	Governance, Institutional support and Financial Resources*	120			
	TOTAL	220			
	GRAND TOTAL (A +B)	1000			

	GRAND TOTAL (A 10)	1000			
*Assessment for	Criteria 8 (8.3, 8.4 &8.5)	and 10 (10	.3) is differen	t for individual progr	am.
Total Grade:					
No. of Y:	, C:	, v	<b>/</b> :	, D:	
Signature (Chairman)					

. No.	Criteria	Max. Marks	Marks Awarded	Grade (Y, C, W, D)	Remarks
1.	Vision, Mission and Program Educational Objectives	50			
2.	Program Curriculum and Teaching-Learning Processes	100			
3.	Course Outcomes and Program Outcomes	175			
4.	Students' Performance	100			
5.	Faculty Information and Contributions	200			
6.	Facilities and Technical Support	80			
7.	Continuous Improvement	75			
	TOTAL	780			
	TOTAL te Level Criteria (to be filled Criteria		nairman) :  Marks Awarded	Grade (Y, C, W, D)	Remarks
	te Level Criteria (to be filled	by the Ch	Marks	Grade (Y, C, W, D)	Remarks
S. No.	te Level Criteria (to be filled Criteria	by the Ch Max. Marks	Marks		Remarks
<b>S. No.</b> 8.	te Level Criteria (to be filled  Criteria  First Year Academics*	by the Ch Max. Marks 50	Marks		Remarks
<b>S. No.</b> 8. 9.	te Level Criteria (to be filled  Criteria  First Year Academics*  Student Support Systems  Governance, Institutional support and Financial	by the Ch Max. Marks 50	Marks		Remarks
<b>S. No.</b> 8. 9.	te Level Criteria (to be filled  Criteria  First Year Academics*  Student Support Systems  Governance, Institutional support and Financial Resources*	by the Ch Max. Marks 50 50	Marks		Remarks
<b>S. No.</b> 8. 9.	Criteria  First Year Academics*  Student Support Systems  Governance, Institutional support and Financial Resources*  TOTAL  GRAND TOTAL (A +B)  ent for Criteria 8 (8.3, 8.4 &8.5)	by the Ch Max. Marks 50 50 120 220	Marks Awarded	(Y, C, W, D)	

Signature (Chairman)

Name of the Program 4:	

## A. Department/Program Specific Criteria:

S. No.	Criteria	Max. Marks	Marks Awarded	Grade (Y, C, W, D)	Remarks
1.	Vision, Mission and Program Educational Objectives	50			
2.	Program Curriculum and Teaching-Learning Processes	100			
3.	Course Outcomes and Program Outcomes	175			
4.	Students' Performance	100			
5.	Faculty Information and Contributions	200			
6.	Facilities and Technical Support	80			
7.	Continuous Improvement	75			
	TOTAL	780			

## B. Institute Level Criteria (to be filled by the Chairman):

S. No.	Criteria	Max. Marks	Marks Awarded	Grade (Y, C, W, D)	Remarks
8.	First Year Academics*	50			
9.	Student Support Systems	50			
10.	Governance, Institutional support and Financial Resources*	120			
	TOTAL	220			
	GRAND TOTAL (A +B)	1000			

<sup>\*</sup>Assessment for Criteria 8 (8.3, 8.4 &8.5) and 10 (10.3) is different for individual program.

Total Grade: No. of Y:	, C:	, W:	, D:	
Signature (Chairman	<u> </u>			

. No. Criteria		Max. Marks	Marks Awarded	Grade (Y, C, W, D)	Remarks
1.	Vision, Mission and Program Educational Objectives	50			
2.	Program Curriculum and Teaching-Learning Processes	100			
3.	3. Course Outcomes and Program Outcomes				
4.	Students' Performance	100			
5.	Faculty Information and Contributions	200			
6.	Facilities and Technical Support	80			
7.	Continuous Improvement	75			
	TOTAL	780			
S. Instit	cute Level Criteria (to be fille Criteria	d by the ( Max. Marks	Chairman) : Marks Awarded	Grade (Y, C, W, D)	Remarks
8.	First Year Academics*	50			
9.	Student Support Systems	50			
10.	Governance, Institutional support and Financial Resources*	120			
	TOTAL	220			
	GRAND TOTAL (A +B)	1000			
Assessme	ent for Criteria 8 (8.3, 8.4 &8.5)	and 10 (10	0.3) is different	t for individual prograr	n.
zar arau				, D:	

Signature (Chairman)

#### **Overall Observations**

1.

S. No.	Name of the Program	Intake		e	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 reaccreditation)

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.

- 1<sup>st</sup> 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