NATIONAL BOARD OF ACCREDITATION

NBCC Place, East Tower, 4th Floor, Bhisham Pitamah Marg,
Pragati Vihar, New Delhi-110 003
Tel: +91 11 2436 0620-22 ; Telefax: +91 11 4308 4903
Website: www.nbaind.org

NATIONAL BOARD of ACCREDITATION

File No. 11-227-2015/NBA **Date: 16-10-2017**

To

The Principal
Keshav Memorial Institute of Technology,
3-5-1026, Narayanguda, Hyderabad-500029,
Telangana

Subject: Accreditation status of programme applied by Keshav Memorial Institute of Technology, 3-5-1026, Narayanguda, Hyderabad-500029, Telangana.

Sir,

This has reference to your Application ID No. 1586 dated 06/10/2015 in Tier-II format seeking accreditation by National Board of Accreditation to UG Engineering programme offered by **Keshav Memorial Institute of Technology, 3-5-1026, Narayanguda, Hyderabad-500029, Telangana.**

2. An Expert Team conducted on-site evaluation of the programme during 09th to 10th September, 2017. The report submitted by the Expert Team was considered by the concerned Committees constituted for the purpose in NBA. The Competent Authority in NBA has approved the following accreditation status to the programme as given in the table below:

S.No	Name of the Programme (UG)	Basis of Evaluation	Accreditation Status	Period of validity	Remarks
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
1.	Information Technology	Tier-II June 2015 Document	Provisionally Accredited	Academic Years 2017-2018 to 2019-2020 i.e., up to 30-06-2020	Accreditation status granted is valid for the period indicated in col.5 or till the program has the approval of the competent authority, whichever is earlier

3. It may be noted that only students who graduate during the validity period of accreditation, will be deemed to have graduated with an NBA accredited degree.

4. The programme has been granted provisional accreditation. **Keshav Memorial Institute of Technology, 3-5-1026, Narayanguda, Hyderabad-500029, Telangana** should submit the Compliance Report at least six months before the expiry of validity of accreditation mentioned above to be eligible to be considered by the concerned Committee in NBA for further processing of the accreditation status. This could entail further extension of accreditation or a revisit, as deemed appropriate by NBA Committees.

Contd../-

5. The accreditation status awarded to the programme as indicated in the above table does not imply that the accreditation has been granted to **Keshav Memorial Institute of Technology, 3-5-1026, Narayanguda, Hyderabad-500029, Telangana** as a whole. **As such the Institution should nowhere along with its name including on its letter head etc. write that it is accredited by NBA because it is programme accreditation and not institution accreditation. If such an instance comes to NBA's notice, this will be viewed seriously.** Complete name of the programme(s) accredited, level of programme(s) and the period of validity of accreditation, as well as the Academic Year from which the accreditation is effective should be mentioned unambiguously whenever and wherever it is required to indicate the status of accreditation by NBA.

6. The accreditation status of the above programme is subject to change on periodic review, if needed by the NBA. It is desired that the relevant information in respect of accredited programme as indicated in the table in paragraph 2, appears on the website and information bulletin of the Institute.

7. The accreditation status awarded to the programme as indicated in table in paragraph 2 above is subject to maintenance of the current standards during the period of accreditation. If there are any changes in the status (major changes of faculty strength, organizational structure etc.), the same are required to be communicated to the NBA, with an appropriate explanatory note.

8. A copy of the Report of Chairman of the Visiting Team and a copy of the Evaluators' report in respect of the above programme are enclosed.

9. If the Institute is not satisfied with the decision of NBA, it may appeal within thirty days of receipt of this communication giving reasons for the same and by paying the requisite fee.

Yours faithfully,

(Dr. Anil Kumar Nassa)
Member Secretary

Encls: 1. Copy of Report of Chairman of the Visiting Team.

2. Copy of Expert Report of the Visiting Team.

Copy to:

1. The Principal Secretary (Higher Education),
   Government of Telangana,
   D Block, Secretariat Building,
   Hyderabad- 500022 Telangana

2. The Director of Technical Education,
   State Board of Technical Education and Training
   Govt. of Telangana,
   7th Floor, B.R.K.R. Bhavan
   Tankbund Road, Saifabad
   Hyderabad- 500 063, Telangana

3. The Vice Chancellor,
   Jawaharlal Nehru Technological University Hyderabad.
   Kukatpally, Hyderabad - 500 085, Telangana

4. Accreditation File

5. Master Accreditation file of the State.

NATIONAL BOARD OF ACCREDITATION

PART A

Chairperson's Visit Report

Undergraduate Engineering Program

TIER-II

Name of the Institution

Keshav Memorial Institute of Technology
3-5-1026, Narayanguda, Hyderabad, Telangana 500029,

Name of the Program

B.Tech (Information Technology

Visit Dates

9-10th September 2017

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

Team composition

Name of the Chairperson: Dr. MOIN UDDIN
Designation: Professor

Program 1:

Program evaluator 1	Name Prof. Bharti Sarri
	Organization: USICT, GGS IP University, Sector 16-C, Dwarka DELHI - 110070

Program evaluator 2	Name Prof. G.P. Bhole, Deptt. of CSE
	Organization: Veermata Jijabai Technology Institute (VJTI) H.R. Mahajan Marg, Matunga Mumbai - 400019

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: 2007

Physical Infrastructure and Ambience: Good.

Number of programs being run in the Institute*:

(i) UG- (4) FOUR.

(ii) PG - NA

Total Number of Students:

(i) In UG programs - 660 x 4yr = 2640

(ii) In PG programs - - NIL -

Name of programs applied for accreditation

(i) Information Technology

(ii)

(iii)

(iv)

(v)

**to be verified from SAR*

CHAIRMAN'S REPORT:

INSTITUTE NAME: **Keshav Memorial Institute of Technology (KMIT), 3-5-1026, Narayangada – Hyderabad – 500029.**

PROGRAMME: **B. Tech (IT)**

VISIT DATE: 9th – 10th September, 2017

NBA Team

1. Prof. Moin Uddin,
   Dept. of CSE, School of Engineering Science & Technology
   Jamia Hamdard, Hamdard University
   New Delhi – 110062.

2. Dr. G. P. Bhole
   Associate Professor
   Dept. of CS
   Veemata Jijabai Tech. Institute (JJTII)
   Mumbai – 400019.

3. Prof. Bharti Sevri
   USICT
   GGSIP University
   Sector -16, Dwarka
   Delhi -110078.

1. OVERVIEW

The visiting team constituted by National Board of Accreditation (NBA) conducted a two days accreditation visit to **Keshav Memorial Institute of Technology (KMIT), 3-5-1026, Narayangada – Hyderabad – 500029,** to evaluate 10 parameters prescribed by NBA of B.Tech. (IT) programme offered by the institute from September 9-10, 2017.

A pre-visit meeting was arranged on 8.4.2017 at 9.00 PM in the hotel. Dr. G. P. Bhole could not join the meeting due to delay of his flight. However, another pre-visit meeting was held in the morning where all the members were present. During 30 minutes discussion on 9.9.2017, we shared the information submitted by the program experts. We had detailed discussion on the SAR submitted by the institute and prepared a set of queries for obtaining clarification from the principal and HOD.

1/9/9

Day 01

The Peer review team led by the chairperson reached the institute at 9-15 AM on 9.9.2017. The Principal, HOD and 3 faculty members received the team at the institute Principal was advised for presentation as per NBA schedule and guide lines. After Principal's presentation, there was 20 minutes discussion on various issues and also collected relevant information. We advised the HOD, administration office to keep the data ready for verification and evaluation.

For assessment of common facilities, team started visiting infrastructural facilities like library, sports, career guidance, sports Grievance Cell Ambulance, cafeteria, applied Science, Computer Centre, TPO, W/s Entrepreneur Cell etc. Between 12.30 – 1.00 PM. The members shared the data and information collected during the visit of common facilities. A working lunch was arranged by the institute.

The experts visited Department of IT where HOD gave his presentation about the department/ Chairman, collected data from the Office of the Registrar about GB, BOS, AICTE approval, University approval, rules, policies, procedures, service book, recruitment policy, pay scale, placement, feedback form and analysis, List of faculty, CR, SFR, List faculty involved in first year courses and results of last 3 years, Admission, retention rate, Budget allocation, and Audit etc..

CRITERION 1:

- Vision & Mission are properly defined displaced at various locations and also visible on the website of the institute and also as manual, and other printed documents.
- Consistency between institute Vision and Mission and Department exists.
- Correlation parameters of PEO and Mission matrix is logically arranged but have minor correlation

CRITERION 2:

- Attainment of POs and PSOS are presented
- Contents beyond syllabus are observed (trisul and Tessellar) are special Apps designed by the institute to improve the quality of teaching and learning
- Good quality of projects and integrated with POS.

1/9

CRITERION 3:

- Mapping of course outcomes with programme are appropriately done
- Assessment process for evaluation course outcomes are adequately done
- Demonstration of attainment of POS and PSOS are very nicely presented.
- Attainment of course outcomes are carried out systematically
- Efforts are made and tools are used to assess to POS and PSOS.

CRITERION 4:

- Percentage of students enrolled during the period of assessment is more than 80%
- Success rate during last 3 years is good.
- Department is publishing student magazine.
- Student chapters of ISIE, CSI and IEEE are mentioned but member-ship is low.
- Placement, Higher studies and entrepreneurship are extremely good

CRITERION 5:

- STR is better than 1:20 but CR is extremely poor
- By designing Tribul and Tesellar are praise worthy
- Institute has created APPS, an innovative teaching method. All students have appreciated and liked
- Faculty qualification as per norms
- Faculty retention is 68.25%
- Academic research and sponsored research both are very poor
- No consultancy under taken 50 hrs. per year by the adjunct faculty – not seen

CRITERION 6:

- As per syllabus, the institute have labs. However, needs modernization
- No relevant additional facilities created.

CRITERION 7:

- Areas of weaknesses are identified and recorded
- No academic Audit by external body was recorded
- Placement is satisfactory
- No significant encouragement for higher studies
- Few students joined entrepreneurship programmes
- Quality of students admitted degraded during last 3 years.

CRITERION 8:

- STR of first year is satisfactory (4.82)
- Quality of faculty associated with 1st year subjects is good (3.69)
- First year Academic performance is not satisfactory.(6.16)
- Attainment of COS of 1st year courses is satisfactory
- Well defined attainment process of program outcome of all first year subjects.
- Action taken based on the result of evaluation of POS/PSOS is good.

CRITERION 9:

- Satisfactory mentoring system but need affirmative action
- Good feedback system and some corrective measures are taken.
- Excellent Self Learning mechanism
- Appropriate Career Guidance and TPO facilities
- Active entrepreneur Cell
- Not very good co-curricular and extra-curricular activities undertaken during last 3 years.

CRITERION 10:

- Well defined Mission and Vision statements
- Properly constituted GB, BOS, and Service rules.

- Not effective promotion policy
- Grievance Cells are in place
- Delegation, decentralized policy and financial powers implemented.
- Good internet, Wi-Fi facilities but students are not allowed to access.

STRENGTHS

- Vision and mission are well defined.
- PEOs are also very well defined, published and also disseminated among stakeholders process is followed.
- POS and PSOS are identified in the university curriculum and delivery mechanism followed to attain POs and PSOS.
- Excellent initiatives for designing beyond the syllabus coverage which resulted to improve the quality of teaching- learning.
- Good efforts for industry internship & summer training programmes provision.
- Enrollment is extremely good.
- Placement, Higher studies and entrepreneurship is good.
- Faculty qualification as per AICTE norms.
- Good faculty retention. (68%)
- For effective and efficient innovation by the faculty few Apps are developed.
- Good SFR
- Attainment of POS, of all first year subjects is good.
- Appropriate Steps taken after evaluation of relevant POS and PSOS.
- Well Adopted mechanism for self-learning.
- GB Service rules, Procedure are in place. Minutes of meetings presented
- Learning resources are available.
- Good Innovations by the faculty in teaching and learning
- Quality of internal papers and assignments are good

WEEKNESSES.

- Poor library support.
- No hostel facilities to students.
- Limited sport facilities.
- Few FDP Programmes undertakes.
- No Proof of academic research.
- Limited Sponsored research project and also development activities.
- Attainment level of outcomes are satisfactory
- Cadre Ratio not upto the desired level i.e. 1:2:4
- Zero consultancy from Industry
- Regular Scales and PF contribution to faculty not given
- Insufficient budget allocation, distribution and utilization.
- Poor action taken related to industry/summer training
- Outcomes of all courses with respect to set6 attainment just satisfactory. It needs more efforts.
- Success rate without backlog is very low (5.28)
- Almost no publication in SCI journals
- Additional facilities not created
- Access of Wi-Fi facility to students is prohibited
- No proper faculty space created
- Affirmative actions on the results not implemented

NATIONAL BOARD OF ACCREDITATION

PART A

Evaluator's Visit Report

Undergraduate Engineering Program

Tier-II

Name of the Institution

Keshav Memorial Institute of Technology, 3-5-1026, Narayanguda, Hyderabad, 500029, Telangana

Name of the Program

B.Tech IT

Visit Dates

9th – 10th Sept. 2017

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~~ 2 day accreditation visit from 9th to 10th Sept 2017 to evaluate UG Engineering program B-Tech IT.

Pre visit meeting of the expert tea was held on at 8.9.2017 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/Dean on 9-9-2017. The briefing on the institution was given by Principal and on the program was given by the Mr. Neil Gogte 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)

As recorded in the evaluation Sheet

Program Details

Name of the Program			
Year of Commencement			
Student	Year	Sanctioned Intake	Actual Admitted
	CAY (2015-2016)	60	60
	CAY m1 (2014-2015)	60	59
	CAY m2 (2013-2014)	60	60
	Total Students in the Programme 1st to Final Year	240, 239, 240	
	Averaged over three assessment years	239.66 (99.44%)	
Placement %	CAY (2013-2014)	45/59	
	CAY m1 (2014-2015)	46/59	
	CAY m2 (2015-2016)	47/56	
	Averaged over three assessment years	76%	
Faculty (Attach a Copy of faculty list compared with Time Table)	Regular	Professor	01
		Associate professor	0
		Assistant professor	14
	Ad-hoc	Professor	
		Associate professor	
		Assistant professor	
	Contractual	Professor	
		Associate professor	
		Assistant professor	
	Student-Teacher ratio	1:12	
	Visiting/guest faculty (Total Numbers of Hours)		
Previous accreditation(if any)	First accreditation	No. of years accredited for	NA
		With effect from	
	Previous accreditation	No. of years accredited for	NA
		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 B. Tech (IT)

Strengths:

1. Please see attached sheet
2.
3.
4.
5.

Weakness/Areas of improvement:

1.
2. Please see attached sheet
3.
4.
5.

Deficiencies:

1.

2.

3.

4. Please see

5. Chairman's Report

Other Observations, if any:

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

10/9

Department/Programme Specific Criteria:

S.no.	Criteria	Max. Marks	Marks Awarded	Remarks
1.	Vision, Mission and Program Educational Objectives	60	42	
2.	Program Curriculum and Teaching-Learning Processes	120	83	Very Fair and Transparent evaluation by the experts
3.	Course Outcomes and Program Outcomes	120	68	
4.	Students' Performance	150	106	
5.	Faculty Information and Contributions	200	135	
6.	Facilities and Technical Support	80	46	
7.	Continuous Improvement	50	28	
	TOTAL	780	508	

10/9/17

Signature
(Program Evaluator 1)

10/8/17

Signature
(Program Evaluator 2)

1/9

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)

Part B-Program Assessment Worksheet
Program Level Criteria - To be Assessed by Evaluator

Name of the Institution : Keshav Memorial Institute of Technology, Hydrabad, Telangana
Name of the Program Information Technology

Criterion 1: Vision, Mission and Program Educational Objectives (60)

S.No.	Sub Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines (Marks)	Marks Awarded		Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)
				Marks	Total	
1.1.	State the Vision and Mission of the Department and Institute	5	A. Availability of statements (1)	1	5	
			B. Appropriateness/Relevance of the Statements (2)	2		
			C. Consistency of the Department statements with the Institute statements (2)	2		
1.2.	State the Program Educational Objectives (PEOs)	5	Program Educational Objectives (3 to 5) (5) Appropriateness	4	4	
1.3.	Indicate where and how the Vision, Mission and PEOs are published and disseminated among stakeholders	10	A. Adequacy in respect of publication & dissemination (2)	2	8	
			B. Process of dissemination among stakeholders (2)	2		
			C. Extent of awareness of Vision, Mission & PEOs among the stakeholder (6)	4		
1.4.	State the process for defining the Vision and Mission of the Department, and PEOs of the program	25	A. Description of process for defining the Vision, Mission of the Department (10)	6	16	
			B. Description of process for defining the PEOs of the program (15)	10		
1.5.	Establish consistency of PEOs with Mission of the Department	15	A. Preparation of a matrix of mapping PEOs and elements of Mission statement (5)	3	9	
			B. Consistency/justification of mapping of the matrix (10)	6		
Total:		60			42	

10/9/17

10/9/17

10/9/17

Criterion 2: Program Curriculum and Teaching – Learning Processes (120)						
S.No.	Sub Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines	Marks Awarded		Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)
				Marks	Total	
2.1.	**Program Curriculum**	**20**			16	
2.1.1.	State the process used to identify extent of compliance of the University curriculum for attaining the Program Outcomes (POs) & Program Specific Outcomes (PSOs), mention the identified curricular gaps, if any	10	A. Process used to identify extent of compliance of University curriculum for attaining POs & PSOs (6)	4	7	
			B. List the curricular gaps for the attainment of defined POs & PSOs (4)	3		
2.1.2.	State the delivery details of the content beyond the syllabus for the attainment of POs & PSOs	10	A. Steps taken to get identified gaps included in the curriculum.(letter to university/BOS) (2)	1	9	
			B. Delivery details of content beyond syllabus (5)	5		
			C. Mapping of content beyond syllabus with the POs & PSOs (3)	3		
2.2.	**Teaching-Learning Processes**	**100**			67	
2.2.1	Describe the Process followed to improve quality of Teaching Learning	25	A. Adherence to Academic Calendar (3)	3	18	
			B. Use of various instructional methods and pedagogical initiatives (3)	3		
			C. Methodologies to support weak students and encourage bright students(4)	2		
			D. Quality of classroom teaching (Observation in a Class) (3)	2		
			E. Conduct of experiments (Observation in Lab)(3)	2		
			F. Continuous Assessment in the laboratory (3)	2		
			G. Student feedback on teaching learning process and actions taken (6)	4		
2.2.2.	Quality of internal semester Question papers, assignments and Evaluation	20	A. Process for internal semester question paper setting, evaluation and effective process implementation (5)	4	13	
			B. Process to ensure questions from outcomes/learning levels perspective (5)	3		
			C. Evidence of COs coverage in class test / mid-term tests (5)	3		
			D. Quality of Assignment and its relevance to COs (5)	3		

10/9

10/9/17

10/8/17

TIER II

S.No.	Sub Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines (Marks)	Marks Awarded		Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)
				Marks	Total	
2.2.3.	Quality of student projects	25	A. Identification of projects and allocation methodology to Faculty (3)	3	17	
			B. Types and relevance of the projects and their contribution towards attainment of POs and PSOs(5)	3		
			C. Process for monitoring and evaluation (5)	4		
			D. Process to assess individual and team performance(5)	3		
			E. Quality of completed projects/working prototypes (5)	4		
			F. Evidences of papers published /Awards received by projects etc. (2)	0		
2.2.4.	Initiatives related to industry interaction	15	A. Industry supported laboratories (5)	1	9	No initiative observed
			B. Industry involvement in the program design and partial delivery of any regular courses for students (5)	4		
			C. Impact analysis of industry institute interaction and actions taken thereof (5)	4		
2.2.5.	Initiatives related to industry internship/summer training	15	A. Industrial training/tours for students (3)	1	10	
			B. Industrial /internship /summer training of more than two weeks and post training Assessment (4)	4		
			C. Impact analysis of industrial training (4)	2		
			D. Student feedback on initiative (4)	3		
Total:		120			83	

10/9/17

10/9/17

10/9/17

TIER II

Criterion 3: Course Outcomes and Program Outcomes (120)						
S.No.	Sub Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines	Marks Awarded		Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)
				Marks	Total	
3.1.	**Establish the correlation between the courses and the POs & PSOs**	**20**			10	
3.1.1.	Course Outcomes	5	Evidence of COs being defined for every course (5)	3	3	
3.1.2.	CO-PO/PSOs matrices of courses selected in 3.1.1 (six matrices)	5	Explanation of table to be ascertained (5)	2	2	OBE awareness is present to certain extend
3.1.3.	Program level Course-PO/PSOs matrix of ALL courses including first year courses	10	Explanation of tables to be ascertained (10)	5	5	
3.2.	**Attainment of Course Outcomes**	**50**			26	
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 processes (2)	2	6	process of assesment and attainment
			B. The quality /relevance of assessment processes & tools used (8)	4		
3.2.2.	Outcomes of all courses with respect to set attainment levels	40	Verify the attainment levels as per the benchmark set for all courses (40)	20	20	
3.3.	**Attainment of Program Outcomes and Program Specific Outcomes**	**50**			32	
3.3.1.	Describe assessment tools and processes used for assessing the	10	A. List of assessment tools & processes (5)	4	7	
			B. The quality/relevance of assessment tools/processes used (5)	3		
3.3.2.	Provide results of evaluation of each PO & PSO	40	A. Verification of documents, results and level of attainment of each PO/PSO (24)	15	25	
			B. Overall levels of attainment (16)	10		
Total:		**120**			68	

10/9

10/9/17

10/9/17

TIER II

Criterion 4: Students' Performance (150)						
S.No.	Sub Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines	Marks Awarded		Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)
				Marks	Total	
4.1.	**Enrolment Ratio (20)**	20	A. >= 90% students enrolled at the First Year Level on average basis during the period of assessment (20) B. >= 80% students enrolled at the First Year Level on average basis during the period of assessment (18) C. >= 70% students enrolled at the First Year Level on average basis during the period of assessment (16) D. >= 60% students enrolled at the First Year Level on average basis during the period of assessment (14) E. Otherwise '0'.	20	20	
4.2.	**Success Rate in the stipulated period of the program**	40			17	
4.2.1.	Success rate without backlogs in any Semester/year of study Without Backlog means no compartment or failures in any semester/year of study	25	SI= (Number of students who graduated from the program without backlog)/(Number of students admitted in the first year of that batch and admitted in 2nd year via lateral entry and separate division, if applicable) Average SI = Mean of success index (SI) for past three batches Success rate without backlogs in any year of study = 25 × Average SI	5	5	25 x 0.21 = 5.28
4.2.2.	Success rate in stipulated period (actual duration of the program)	15	SI= (Number of students who graduated from the program in the stipulated period of course duration)/(Number of students admitted in the first year of that batch and admitted in 2nd year via lateral entry and separate division, if applicable) Average SI = mean of success index (SI) for past three batches Success rate = 15 × Average SI	12	12	15 x 0.78 = 11.67

10/9/17

10/9/17

10/9/17

S.No.	Sub Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines	Marks Awarded		Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)
				Marks	Total	
4.3.	Academic Performance in Third Year	15	Academic Performance = 1.5 * Average API (Academic Performance Index)	9	9	1.5 x 5.93 = 8.9
4.4.	Academic Performance in Second Year	15	Academic Performance Level = 1.5 * Average API (Academic Performance Index)	9	9	1.5 x 6.22 = 9.33
4.5.	Placement, Higher studies and Entrepreneurship	40	Assessment Points = 40 × average of three years of [(x + y + z)/N] where, x = Number of students placed in companies or Government sector through on/off campus recruitment y = Number of students admitted to higher studies with valid qualifying scores (GATE or equivalent State or National level tests, GRE, GMAT etc.) z = No. of students turned entrepreneur in engineering/technology . N =Total number of final year students	38	38	40 x 0.95 = 38.0
4.6.	Professional Activities	20			13	
4.6.1.	Professional societies/chapters and organizing engineering events	5	A. Availability & activities of professional societies/chapters (3)	3	4	
			B. Number, quality of engineering events (organized at institute) (2)	1		
4.6.2.	Publication of technical magazines, newsletters, etc.	5	A. Quality & Relevance of the contents and Print Material (3)	3	5	
			B. Participation of Students from the program (2)	2		
4.6.3.	Participation in inter-institute events by students of the program of study (at other institutions)	10	A. Events within the state (2)	1	4	no eveidance of Prizes/awards in inter institute events
			B. Events outside the state (3)	1		
			C. Prizes/awards received in such events (5)	2		
Total:		150			106	

Bhavani 10/9/17

10/9

10/9/17

Criterion 5: Faculty Information and Contributions (200)						
S.No.	Sub Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines	Marks Awarded		Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)
				Marks	Total	
5.1.	**Student-Faculty Ratio (SFR)**	20	Marks to be given proportionally from a maximum of 20 to a minimum of 10 for average SFR between 15:1 to 20:1, and zero for average SFR higher than 20:1 (Refer calculation in SAR) Regular Faculty means: • Full time on roll with prescribed pay scale. An employee on contract for a period of not less than two years AND drawing consolidated salary not less than applicable gross salary shall only be counted as a regular employee. • Prescribed pay scales means pay scales notified by the AICTE/Central Government and implementation as prescribed by the State Government. In case State Government prescribes lesser consolidated salary for a particular cadre then same will be considered as reference while counting faculty as a regular faculty.	15	15	
5.2.	**Faculty Cadre Proportion**	25	Cadre Proportion Marks = $\left[\left(\frac{AF1}{RF1}\right) + \left(\frac{AF2}{RF2} \times 0.6\right) + \left(\frac{AF3}{RF3} \times 0.4\right) \times 12.5\right]$ • If AF1 = AF2= 0 then zero marks • Maximum marks to be limited if it exceeds 25	20	20	(1.0 + 0+0.62)x12.5 =20.27
5.3.	**Faculty Qualification**	25	FQ = 2.5 x [{10X +6Y}/F] where X is no. of faculty with Ph.D., Y is no. of faculty with M.Tech, F is no. of faculty required to comply 1:15 Faculty Student ratio (no. of faculty and no. of students required to be calculated as per 5.1)	21	21	2.5 x 8.1 = 21.25
5.4	**Faculty Retention**	25	A. ≥ 90% of required Faculties retained during the period of assessment keeping CAYm2 as base year (25) B. ≥ 75% of required Faculties retained during the period of assessment C. ≥ 60% of required Faculties retained during the period of assessment D. ≥ 50% of required Faculties retained during the period of assessment keeping CAYm2 as base year (10) E. Otherwise (0)	20	20	68.25% Retention rate

10/9 10/9/17 10/9/17

S.No.	Sub Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines	Marks Awarded		Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)
				Marks	Total	
5.5.	Innovations by the Faculty in Teaching and Learning	20	A. The work must be made available on Institute Website (4)	4	17	
			B. The work must be available for peer review and critique (4)	4		
			C. The work must be reproducible and developed further by other scholars (2)	2		
			D. Statement of clear goals, use of appropriate methods, significance of results, effective presentation and reflective critique (10)	7		
5.6	Faculty as participants in Faculty development /training activities /STTPs	15	For each year: Assessment = 3×Sum/0.5RF Average assessment over three years (Marks limited to 15)	10	10	
5.7.	Research and Development	30		12		
5.7.1.	Academic Research	10	A. Number of quality publications in refereed/SCI Journals, citations, Books/Book Chapters etc. (6)	4	4	No quality publications,
			B. PhD guided /PhD awarded during the assessment period while working in the institute (4)	0		
5.7.2	Sponsored Research	5	Funded research from outside; Cumulative during Assessment years: Amount > 20 Lacs – 5 Marks Amount >= 16 Lacs and <= 20 lacs – 4 Marks Amount >= 12 Lacs and < 16 lacs – 3 Marks Amount >= 8 Lacs and < 12 lacs – 2 Marks Amount >= 4 Lacs and < 8 lacs – 1 Mark Amount < 4 Lacs – 0 Mark	2	2	zero funded research project
5.7.3	Development Activities	10	A. Product Development B. Research laboratories C. Instructional materials D. Working models/charts/monograms etc.	6	6	

Bhaskar 10/9/17

10/9

10/9/17

TIER II

S.No.	Sub Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines	Marks Awarded		Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)
				Marks	Total	
5.7.4.	Consultancy (From Industry)	5	Consultancy; Cumulative during Assessment years: Amount > 10 Lacs – 5 Marks Amount >= 8 Lacs and <= 10 lacs – 4 Marks Amount >= 6 Lacs and < 8 lacs – 3 Marks Amount >= 4 Lacs and < 6 lacs – 2 Marks Amount >= 2 Lacs and < 4 lacs – 1 Mark Amount < 2 Lacs – 0 Mark	0	0	No consultancy
5.8.	**Faculty Performance Appraisal and Development System (FPADS)**	30	A. A well defined performance appraisal and development system instituted for all the assessment years (10)	5	15	No effective implematation and analysis of FPADS
			B. Its implementation and effectiveness (20)	10		
5.9.	**Visiting/Adjunct/Emeritus Faculty etc.**	10	Provision of Visiting /Adjunct/Emeritus faculty etc.(1)	1	5	
			Minimum **50** hours per year interaction per year to obtain three marks : 3 x 3 = 9	4		
Total:		200			135	

Bhavani 10/9/17

10/9/17

10/9

Criterion 6: Facilities and Technical Support (80)						
S.No.	Sub Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines	Marks Awarded		Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)
				Marks	Total	
6.1.	Adequate and well equipped laboratories, and technical manpower	30	A. Adequate well-equipped laboratories to run all the program-specific curriculum (20)	10	15	Just sufficient
			B. Availability of adequate technical supporting staff (5)	3		
			C. Availability of qualified technical supporting staff (5)	2		
6.2.	Additional Facilities created for improving the quality of learning experience in Laboratories	25	A. Availability and relevance of additional facilities(10)	8	16	
			B. Facilities utilization and effectiveness (10)	5		
			C. Relevance to POs and PSOs (5)	3		
6.3.	Laboratories: Maintenance and overall ambience	10	Maintenance and overall ambience (10)	7	7	
6.4.	Project laboratory	5	Facilities & Utilization (5)	3	3	
6.5.	Safety measures in laboratories	10	Safety measures in laboratories (10)	5	5	
Total:		80			46	

10/9

10/9/17

10/9/17

Criterion 7: Continuous Improvement (50)						
S.No.	Sub Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines	Marks Awarded		Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)
				Marks	Total	
7.1.	Actions taken based on the results of evaluation of each of the POs and PSOs	20	A. Documentation of POs and PSOs attainment levels (5)	3	11	OBE awareness is present
			B. Identification of gaps/shortfalls (5)	2		
			C. Plan of action to bridge the gap and its Implementation (10)	6		
7.2.	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)	5	5	
7.3.	Improvement in Placement, Higher Studies and Entrepreneurship	10	A. Improvement in Placements (5)	4	7	No documentry evidance available
			B. Improvement in Higher Studies (3)	2		
			C. Improvement in number of Entrepreneurs (2)	1		
7.4.	Improvement in the quality of students admitted to the program	10	Assessment is based on improvement in terms of ranks/score in qualifying state level/national level entrances tests, percentage Physics, Chemistry and Mathematics marks in 12th Standard and percentage marks of the lateral entry students	5	5	
Total		50			28	

10/9

10/9/12

10/9/12

Part B-Program Assessment Worksheet
Institute Level Criteria to be Assessed by Chairman

Name of the Institution Keshav Memorial Institute of Technology
Name of the Program _ Information Technology

Criterion 8: First Year Academics (50)							
S.No.	Sub Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines	Marks Awarded: Marks	Marks Awarded: Total	Overall Marks	Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)
8.1.	First Year Student- Faculty Ratio (FYSFR)	5	For each year of assessment = (5 × 15)/ FYSFR (Limited to Max. 5) Average of Assessment years	3	3	3	4.82
8.2.	Qualification of Faculty Teaching First Year Common Courses	5	A. Assessment of faculty qualification (5x + 3y)/RF B. Average of Assessment of last three years (Refer 8.2. for x, y and RF)	4	4	4	3.69
8.3.	First Year Academic Performance	10	Academic Performance = ((Mean of 1st Year Grade Point Average of all successful Students on a 10 point scale) or (Mean of the percentage of marks in First Year of all successful students/10)) x (successful students/number of students appeared in the examination) Successful students are those who are permitted to proceed to the Second year	4	4	4	6.16
8.4.	Attainment of Course Outcomes of first year courses	10				7	
8.4.1.	Describe the assessment processes used to gather the data upon which the evaluation of Course Outcomes of first year is based	5	A. List of assessment processes (1)	1			
			B. The relevance of assessment tools used (4)	3	4		
8.4.2.	Record the attainment of Course Outcomes of all first year courses	5	Verify the records as per the benchmark set for the courses (5)	3	3		As per Annexure
8.5.	Attainment of Program Outcomes of all first year courses	20				15	
8.5.1.	Indicate results of evaluation of each relevant PO/PSO	15	A. Process of computing POs/PSOs attainment level from the COs of related first year courses (5)	4			
			B. Verification of documents validating the above process (10)	8			
8.5.2.	Actions taken based on the results of evaluation of relevant POs /PSOs	5	Appropriate actions taken (5)	3	15		
Total of Criterion 8:		50			Overall Marks for Criterion 8:	33	

Signature of Chairman

10/9/17

10/9/17

Criterion 9: Student Support Systems (50)

S.No.	Sub Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines	Marks Awarded: Marks	Marks Awarded: Total	Overall Marks	Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)
9.1.	Mentoring system to help at individual level	5	Details of the mentoring system that has been developed for the students for various purposes and also state the efficacy of such system (5)	3	3	3	
9.2.	Feedback analysis and reward /corrective measures taken, if any	10	A. Methodology being followed for analysis of feedback and its effectiveness (5)	3	5	5	
			B. Record of corrective measures taken (5)	2			
9.3.	Feedback on facilities	5	Feedback collection, analysis and corrective action (5)	2	2	2	
9.4.	Self Learning	5	A. Scope for self-learning (2)	1	4	4	
			B. Self Learning facilities, materials for learning beyond syllabus, Webinars, Podcast, MOOCs etc. and demonstrate its effective utilization (3)	3			
9.5.	Career Guidance, Training, Placement	10	A. Availability of career guidance facilities (2)	1	5	5	
			B. Counseling for higher studies (GATE/GRE, GMAT, etc.) (2)	1			
			C. Pre-placement training (3)	1			
			D. Placement process and support (3)	2			
9.6.	Entrepreneurship Cell	5	A. Entrepreneurship initiatives (1)	1	4	4	
			B. Data on students benefitted (4)	3			
9.7.	Co-curricular and Extra-curricular Activities	10	A. Availability of sports and cultural facilities (3)	1	5	5	
			B. NCC, NSS and other clubs (3)	2			
			C. Annual students activities (4)	2			
Total of Criterion 9:		50	Overall Marks for Criterion 9:			28	

10/9/17

10/9/17

18/9

Signature of Chairman

Criterion 10: Governance, Institutional Support and Financial Resources (120)

S.No.	Sub Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines	Marks Awarded: Marks	Marks Awarded: Total	Overall Marks	Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)
10.1.	**Organization, Governance and Transparency**	**40**					
10.1.1.	State the Vision and Mission of the Institute	5	A. Availability of the Vision & Mission statements of the Institute (2)	2			
			B. Appropriateness/Relevance of the Statements (3)	3	5		As per Annexure
10.1.2.	Governing body, administrative setup, functions of various bodies, service rules procedures, recruitment and promotional policies	10	A. Governing Body Composition, senate, and all other academic and administrative bodies; their memberships, functions, and responsibilities; frequency of the meetings; participation details of external members and attendance therein (4)	5			
			B. The published service rules, policies and procedures with year of publication (3)	1			
			C. Minutes of the meetings and action-taken reports (3)	1	5	27	As per Annexure
10.1.3.	Decentralisation in working and grievance redressal mechanism	10	A. List the names of the faculty members who have been delegated powers for taking administrative decisions (1)	1			
			B.Specify the mechanism and composition of grievance redressal cell (2)	2			
			C. Action taken report as per 'B' above (7)	4	7		As per Annexure
10.1.4.	Delegation of financial powers	10	A. Financial powers delegated to the Principal, Heads of Departments and relevant in-charges (3)	2			
			B. Demonstrate the utilization of financial powers for each of the assessment years (7)	4	6		
10.1.5.	Transparency and availability of correct/unambiguous information in public domain	5	A. Information on the policies, rules, processes is to be made available on web site (2)	2			
			B. Dissemination of the information about student, faculty and staff (3)	2	4		As per Annexure
10.2.	**Budget Allocation, Utilization, and Public Accounting at Institute level**	**30**	**Expenditure per student :_____**				
			Fee per student:_____				
10.2.1.	Adequacy of Budget allocation	10	A. Quantum of budget allocation for three years (5)	2			
			B. Justification of budget allocated for three years (5)	2	4		As per Annexure
10.2.2.	Utilization of allocated funds	15	Budget utilization for three years (15)	7	7	16	As per Annexure
10.2.3.	Availability of the audited statements on the institute's website	5	Availability of Audited statements on website (5)	5	5		As per Annexure

Signature of Chairman

10.3.	**Program Specific Budget Allocation, Utilization**	**30**	**To be evaluated in consultation with the Program Experts**				
10.3.1.	Adequacy of budget allocation	10	A. Quantum of budget allocation for three years (5)	2	4	14	As per Annexure
			B. Justification of budget allocated for three years (5)	2			
10.3.2.	Utilization of allocated funds	20	Budget utilization for three years (20)	10	10		As per Annexure
10.4.	**Library and Internet**	**20**					
10.4.1.	Quality of learning resources (hard/soft)	10	A. Availability of relevant learning resources including e-resources and Digital Library (7)	2	4	~~12~~ 13	As per Annexure
			B. Accessibility to students (3)	2			
10.4.2.	Internet	10	A. Available bandwidth (4)	4	9		As per Annexure
			B. Wi Fi availability (2)	2			
			C. Internet access in labs, classrooms, library and offices of all Departments (2)	2			
			D. Security mechanism (2)	1	~~8~~		
Total of Criterion 10:		**120**	**Overall Marks for Criterion 10:**			**69**	

10/9/17

10/9/17

Signature of Chairman

1.7.9