

PART A

Evaluator's Visit Report

Diploma 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; www.nbaind.org

Program Evaluator Summary

Overview

The Expert team of National Board of Accreditation (NBA) conducted a three day accreditation visit from _____ to _____ to evaluate Diploma program in Engineering & Technology discipline .

Pre visit meeting of the expert team was held on at _____ to exchange the respective 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/Principal/Head of the Department _____. The briefing on the institution was given by _____ and on the program was given by the . The respective program evaluators also visited the various facilities of the program. Apart from comprehensive review of documented evidences pertaining to various accreditation criteria, the visiting team also held meeting and discussions with the following stakeholders (kindly tick).

- | | | | |
|---------------|--------------------------|----------|--------------------------|
| Faculty | <input type="checkbox"/> | Alumni | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Employers | <input type="checkbox"/> | Parents | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Staff members | <input type="checkbox"/> | Students | <input type="checkbox"/> |

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

Program Details

Name of the Program			
Year of Commencement			
Student	Year	Sanctioned Intake	Actual Admitted
	CAY (20__ - 20__)		
	CAY m1 (20__ - 20__)		
	CAY m2 (20__ - 20__)		
	Total Students in the Programme 1 st to Final Year		
	Averaged over three assessment years		
Placement %	CAY (20__ - 20__)		
	CAY m1 (20__ - 20__)		
	CAY m2 (20__ - 20__)		
	Averaged over three assessment years		
Faculty (Attach a Copy of faculty list compared with Time Table)	Regular	Professor	
		Associate professor	
		Assistant professor	
	Ad-hoc	Professor	
		Associate professor	
		Assistant professor	
	Contractual	Professor	
		Associate professor	
		Assistant professor	
	Student-Teacher ratio		
Visiting/guest faculty (Total Numbers of Hours)			
Previous accreditation (if any)	First accreditation	No. of years accredited for	
		With effect from	
	Previous accreditation	No. of years accredited for	
		With effect from	

CAY: Current Assessment Year

CAYm1: Current Assessment Year minus 1

CAYm2: Current Assessment Year minus 2

Explicit observations about the program

(Please use additional sheets if necessary to elaborate)

Program title _____

Strengths:

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

4. _____

5. _____

Weakness/Areas of improvement:

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

4. _____

5. _____

Other Observations, if any:

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

4. _____

5. _____

Information for Evaluation

Award of Accreditation

Full Accreditation for 6 years

Programs of the institutions scoring a minimum of 750 points in aggregate out of 1000 points with minimum score of 60% in mandatory fields (criteria 4 to 6) shall be eligible for accreditation for 6 years.

Provisional Accreditation for 3 years

The program with the score of minimum 600 points in aggregate shall be eligible for provisional accreditation for 3 years

No Accreditation

Less than 600 points are not eligible for accreditation.

Department/Programme Specific Criteria:

S. No.	Criteria	Max. Marks	Marks Awarded	Remarks
1.	Vision, Mission and Program Educational Objectives	50		
2.	Program Curriculum and Teaching – Learning Processes	200		
3.	Course Outcomes and Program Outcomes	100		
4.	Students’ Performance	200		
5.	Faculty Information and Contributions	150		
6.	Facilities and Technical Support	100		
7.	Continuous Improvement	75		
TOTAL		875		

Signature
(Program Evaluator)

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 criteria:

Criteria	Comments

Signature
(Chairperson)