

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

Name of the Institution :

Name of the Program :

Criterion 1: Outcome-Based Curriculum (120)

S.N.	Sub-Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines (Marks)	Marks Awarded		Overall		Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)
				Marks	Total	Marks	Grade (Y,C,W,D)	
1.1	Vision, Mission, Program Educational Objectives (PEOs)	35						
1.1.1	State the Vision and Mission of the Institute and the Department	05	A. Availability of the vision and mission statements of the Department (01) B. Appropriateness and relevance of the Statements (02) C. Consistency of the Department vision and mission statements with the Institute vision and mission (02)	01 5 02 02	5	MM 30		VMO updatations and justification documents are required
1.1.2	State PEOs of the Programme	05	Listing of the Program Educational Objectives (3 to 5) of the program under consideration and their appropriateness	5	5	Mark 35		-
1.1.3	Process of Defining Vision, Mission and PEOs	10	A. Description of the process involved in defining the Vision, Mission of the Department (06) B. Description of the process involved in defining the PEOs of the program (04)	6 4	10	Arg 32		A link of documents of department meeting, with a few AC examples is to be maintained
1.1.4	Dissemination of Vision, Mission and PEOs	05	A. Adequacy in respect of publication & dissemination (03) B. Process of dissemination among stakeholders (02)	03 02	5			
1.1.5	Mapping of PEOs with Mission	10	A. Preparation of a matrix of PEOs and mission statement (05) B. Consistency/ justification cf correlation parameters of the above matrix (05)	5 5	10			

Signature (Program Evaluator 1)

1

Signature (Program Evaluator 2)

B.S. Gavali

Dr. Sonavane S.P.

15791203

S.N.	Sub-Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines (Marks)	Marks Awarded		Overall		Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)
				Marks	Total	Marks	Grade (Y,C,W,D)	
1.2	Curriculum Structure and Features	30						
1.2.1	State the Process for Developing/ Revising the Curriculum	10	Periodic review through search conferences/curriculum development workshops, identifying job roles etc., taking into account the POs and PSOs. Involvement of the industry in this process.	8	8			Additional relevant Periodic Review documents are required
1.2.2	Curriculum Structure	10	Courses required for the degree programme and distribution of learning hours assigned in terms of attaining POs and PSOs.	8	8	Min 20	Mark 22	Satisfactory
1.2.3	Components of Curriculum	05	Verify curricular components for the attainment of POs and PSOs	03 05	03 05			Verification with justification is required
1.2.4	Strategies for Education Reforms	05	Curriculum design in terms of various educational reforms such as multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary approaches, multipoint entry/exit options, academic bank of credits, skill-based courses, and recognition of prior learning, etc	3	3			- Educational Reforms (e.g. V6.0 V7.0 (nep)) component mapping be provided

Signature (Program Evaluator 1)

2

Signature (Program Evaluator 2)

S.N.	Sub-Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines (Marks)	Marks Awarded		Overall		Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)
				Marks	Total	Marks	Grade (Y,C,W,D)	
1.3	PO, PSO and their Mapping Courses	20						
1.3.1	POs and PSOs	05	Listing of the Program Specific Outcomes (up to 3) of the program under consideration and their appropriateness	5	13	Min 10 Max 15		- Satisfactory as per AICTE guidelines
1.3.2	Mapping between the Courses and POs/ PSOs	15	Justification of mapping between courses and POs and PSOs	8				Justification of Mapping needs to be improved.
1.4	Course Outcomes and Course Articulation Matrix	30						
1.4.1	Course Outcome (Semester wise)	15	Availability of appropriate COs for every course	12	22	Min 20 Max 22		- COs are available - CO action verbs need to be relooked
1.4.2	Course Articulation Matrix	15	Availability of Course Articulation Matrix and its appropriateness in terms of level of correlation	10				- level of co-relation needs re-exercise if required
1.5	Program Articulation Matrix	05	Availability of Mapping of Courses and POs/ PSOs	4	9	Min 4 Max 5		- Level 1 mapping is not observed - no justification of any form of decision
Total of Criterion 1:		120	Overall Marks and Grade for Criterion 1:					

Signature (Program Evaluator 1)

Signature (Program Evaluator 2)

Criterion 2: Outcome-Based Teaching Learning (120)

S.N.	Sub-Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines (Marks)	Marks Awarded		Overall		Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)
				Marks	Total	Marks	Grade (Y,C,W,D)	
2.1	Describe Processes Followed to Ensure Quality of Teaching & Learning	20	A. Adherence to Academic Calendar (02) B. Pedagogical initiatives (05) C. Support students based on their ability (04) D. Quality of classroom teaching (04) E. Conduct of experiments (05)	2 5 3 4 5	20	Min 18 Mark 20		- Satisfactory
2.2.	Quality of Student Capstone Project	25	A. Identification of capstone/major project and allocation of guides (05) B. Types and relevance of the capstone/ major project and their contribution towards the attainment of POs and PSOs (06) C. Continuous monitoring process (04) D. Quality of completed projects/ working models/ prototypes in relation to environment, sustainability, safety, ethics and cost (10)	5 4 4 7	16	Min 15 Mark 22		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Dept /Program specific terms for safety / sustainability need to be framed. - Project category to the required parameters need to be arranged
2.3	Internship/ Industrial Training	10	A. Process of Internship/ Industrial training for students (03) B. Mapping of Industrial training/ internships with POs and PSOs (04) C. Student feedback on training /internships and its analysis (03)	3 4 1	8	Min 6 Mark 9		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Internship documents/ feed back & analysis is required

Signature (Program Evaluator 1)

4

Signature (Program Evaluator 2)

S.N.	Sub-Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines (Marks)	Marks Awarded		Overall		Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)
				Marks	Total	Marks	Grade (Y,C,W,D)	
2.4	Seminar and Mini/Micro Projects	10	A. Mapping of Seminars presented by the students with POs and PSOs (05)	9	8	Min 6 Max 8		- Additional documentation is required
			B. Mapping of the mini/micro project and their contribution with POs and PSOs (05)	4				
2.5.	Case Studies and Real-Life Examples	10	Use of case studies and real-life examples in teaching and their mapping with POs and PSOs	8	8	Min 7 Max 9		- Real life examples can be started
2.6.	SWAYAM/ NPTEL/ MOOC/ Learning	10	A. Number of students obtained MOOCs certification through platforms like SWAYAM/NPTEL, etc and their mapping with POs and PSOs (07)	6	9	9		
			B. Scope for self-learning & facilities and its use (03)	3				
2.7	Solving Complex Engineering Problems Incorporating Sustainability Goals	20	List of complex engineering problems from different courses/activities, mini projects, etc. along with the targeted SDGs.	15				- Documents need to be provided
2.8	Steps Taken for Enhancing Industry Institute Partnerships	15	A. Industry involvement in the partial delivery of any regular courses for students (05)	3	23	Min 24		
			B. Industry offered courses/training (04)	3		Min 20		- Good scope for department to demonstrate the activity
			C. Industry-supported laboratories (03)	2				- Plus point of dept
			D. Impact analysis and actions taken thereof (03)					
Total of Criterion 2:		120	Overall Marks and Grade for Criterion 2:					

Signature (Program Evaluator 1)

Signature (Program Evaluator 2)

Criterion 3: Outcome-Based Assessment (120)

S.N.	Sub-Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines (Marks)	Marks Awarded		Overall		Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)
				Marks	Total	Marks	Grade (Y,C,W,D)	
3.1	Evaluation of Continuous Assessment: Assignments, Unit Tests, Mid-Term, etc	10	A. Process for setting and evaluation of internal semester question paper (02)	2	8			- Action on Question paper audit - Demonstration of improvement in the quality of a paper
			B. Quality of questions, appropriateness of mapping with the COs (03)	2				
			C. Assessment of COs coverage in unit tests/class tests/mid-term tests/assignments (03)	2				
			D. Sharing of post evaluation feedback with students for performance improvement (02)	2				
3.2	Evaluation of Semester End Exam (SEE Question Paper)	10	A. Process for setting and evaluation of semester-end exam question paper (03)	2	7			- Assessment to the (PI) Program Indicators as per Exam Reforms (2018)
			B. Quality of questions, appropriateness of mapping with the COs (05)	3				
			C. Transparency of post evaluation process (02)	2				
3.3	Evaluation of Laboratory Work and Workshop (Continuous and SEE)	10	A. Evaluation of experiments conducted in workshops/laboratories (05)	4	8			K-S-A assessment & separate rubrics can be given
			B. Use of rubrics for assessing student performance with relevance to COs/POs (05)	4				
3.4	Evaluation of Industrial Training/ Internship (Continuous and SEE)	10	A. Relevance of internships/ industrial training (04)	03	7			- Record of Internship projects with feedback & assessment
			B. Rubrics used for assessing student industrial training/ internships and appropriateness of mapping with POs (06)	04				
3.5	Evaluation of Projects	20	A. Rubrics used for assessing complexity, cost, relevance to the environment, and sustainability. (10)	5	13	M=10 Max 13		As required
			B. Rubrics used for assessing team work, communication, and use of project management concepts (10)	8				PI needs to be reduced from ref. (Exam Reforms)

Signature (Program Evaluator 1)

Signature (Program Evaluator 2)

S.N.	Sub-Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines (Marks)	Marks Awarded		Overall		Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/Reasons)
				Marks	Total	Marks	Grade (Y,C,W,D)	
3.6	Evidence of Addressing Sustainable Development Goals (SDG)	10	Evidence of Addressing Sustainable Development Goals relevant to the program	8	8	8		- Clarity with sustainable goals is required with relevant evidences
3.7	Attainment of Course Outcomes	25						
3.7.1	Describe the Assessment Tools and Processes Used to Gather the Data for the Evaluation of Course Outcome	05	A. List of assessment tools and processes (02) B. The quality/ relevance of assessment tools/ processes used (03)	2 5	20			- WCB ref calculator works till 103 COG onwards calculations need to relook Co - levels , mapping
3.7.2	Record the Attainment of Course Outcomes of all Courses with Respect to Set Attainment Levels	20	Verification of attainment levels as per the benchmark set for COs of all courses	15 15				assessment - hence attainment are interconnected. ⇒ CO - PO mapping levels need careful attention
3.8	Attainment of Program Outcomes and Program Specific Outcomes	25						
3.8.1	Provide Results of Evaluation of Each PO & PSO	25	A. Verification of documents, results and the level of attainment of each PO/PSO (10) B. Assessment of overall levels of attainment (15)	15 0	15	15		
Total of Criterion 3:		120	Overall Marks and Grade for Criterion 3:					
Signature (Program Evaluator 1)				Signature (Program Evaluator 2)				

Criterion 4: Students' Performance (120)

SN	Sub Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines (Marks)	Marks Awarded		Overall		Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)
				Marks	Total	Marks	Grade (Y,C,W,D)	
4.1	Enrolment Ratio in the First Year	20	A. >=90% students enrolled in the First Year on average over 3 academic years(CAY, CAYm1 and CAYm2) (20)	20	20			Sanctioned intake (N)
			B. >=80% students enrolled in the First Year on average over 3 academic years(CAY, CAYm1 and CAYm2) (17)					Students enrolled in 1 st year (N1+N4)
			C. >=70% students enrolled in the First Year on average over 3 academic years(CAY, CAYm1 and CAYm2) (14)					Enrolment ratio (ER)= (N1+N4)/N
			D. >=60% students enrolled in the First Year on average over 3 academic years(CAY, CAYm1 and CAYm2) (11)					Average ER
			E. >=50% students enrolled in the First Year on average over 3 academic years(CAY, CAYm1 and CAYm2) (08)					Comments (if any):
			F. >=40% students enrolled in the First Year on average of current academic year (CAY), CAYm1 and CAYm2 (05)					❖
			G. Otherwise '0'.					
4.2	Success Rate of the Students in the Stipulated Period of the Program	15	Success Rate (SR) = B/A* A=(No. of students admitted in the 1 st year of that batch and those actually admitted in the 2 nd year via lateral entry, plus the number of students admitted through multiple entry (if any) and separate division if applicable, minus the number of students who exited through multiple entry (if any). B= (No. of students who graduated from the program in the stipulated course duration) Note *: If the value of A is less than the sum of the sanctioned intake (N) and the lateral entry including leftover seats (N2), then the value of B should be the sum of the sanctioned intake (N) and the lateral entry including leftover seats (N2). Average SR = Mean of SR for the past three batches. SR Points = 1.5 * (Average SR/10).	16.32 16.32				LYG
			LYGm1					
			LYGm2					
			Success Rate (SR)= (B/A) * 100					
								Average SI
								Comments (if any):
								❖

Signature (Program Evaluator 1)

Signature (Program Evaluator 2)

S.N.	Sub-Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines (Marks)	Marks Awarded		Overall		Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/Reasons)												
				Marks	Total	Marks	Grade (Y,C,W,D)													
4.3	Academic Performance of the First Year Students of the Program	10	<p>Academic Performance=Average Academic Performance Index (API), where</p> <p>API = ((Mean of 1st Year Grade Point Average of all successful students on a 10-point scale) or (Mean of the percentage of marks of all successful students in 1st Year/10))*(Number of successful students/number of students appeared in the examination).</p> <p>Successful students are those who have proceeded to the 2nd year.</p>	758	758			<table border="1"> <tr> <td></td><td>CAYm1</td><td>CAYm2</td><td>CAYm3</td></tr> <tr> <td>Academic Performance Index (API)</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td>Average Academic Performance Index (API)</td><td colspan="3"></td></tr> </table> <p>Comments (if any): ❖</p>		CAYm1	CAYm2	CAYm3	Academic Performance Index (API)				Average Academic Performance Index (API)			
	CAYm1	CAYm2	CAYm3																	
Academic Performance Index (API)																				
Average Academic Performance Index (API)																				
4.4	Academic Performance of the Second Year Students of the Program	10	<p>Academic Performance=Average Academic Performance Index (API), where</p> <p>API = ((Mean of 2nd Year Grade Point Average of all successful students on a 10-point scale) or (Mean of the percentage of marks of all successful students in 2nd Year/10))*(Number of successful students/number of students appeared in the examination).</p> <p>Successful students are those who have proceeded to the 3rd year</p>	7.79	7.79			<table border="1"> <tr> <td></td><td>CAYm1</td><td>CAYm2</td><td>CAYm3</td></tr> <tr> <td>Academic Performance Index (API)</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td>Average Academic Performance Index (API)</td><td colspan="3"></td></tr> </table> <p>Comments (if any): ❖</p>		CAYm1	CAYm2	CAYm3	Academic Performance Index (API)				Average Academic Performance Index (API)			
	CAYm1	CAYm2	CAYm3																	
Academic Performance Index (API)																				
Average Academic Performance Index (API)																				
4.5	Academic Performance of the Third Year Students of the Program	10	<p>Academic Performance=Average Academic Performance Index (API), where</p> <p>API = ((Mean of 3rd Year Grade Point Average of all successful students on a 10-point scale) or (Mean of the percentage of marks of all successful students in 3rd year/10))*(Number of successful students/number of students appeared in the examination)</p> <p>Successful students are those who have proceeded to the 4th year.</p>	7.96	7.96			<table border="1"> <tr> <td></td><td>CAYm1</td><td>CAYm2</td><td>CAYm3</td></tr> <tr> <td>Academic Performance Index (API)</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td>Average Academic Performance Index (API)</td><td colspan="3"></td></tr> </table> <p>Comments (if any): ❖</p>		CAYm1	CAYm2	CAYm3	Academic Performance Index (API)				Average Academic Performance Index (API)			
	CAYm1	CAYm2	CAYm3																	
Academic Performance Index (API)																				
Average Academic Performance Index (API)																				

Signature (Program Evaluator 1)

Signature (Program Evaluator 2)

S.N.	Sub-Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines (Marks)	Marks Awarded		Overall		Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)																
				Marks	Total	Marks	Grade (Y,C,W,D)																	
4.6	Placement, Higher Studies and Entrepreneurship	30	<p>Assessment Points = 0.3 * Average of Placement Index (P).</p> $\text{Placement Index}(P) = (((X+Y+Z)/FS)*100, \text{ where}$ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ X=No. of students placed ❖ Y=No. of students admitted to higher studies ❖ Z=No. of students taking up entrepreneurship ❖ FS=Total no. of final year students <p>Note: If the value of FS is less than the sum of the sanctioned intake (N) and the lateral entry including leftover seats (N2), then the value of FS should be the sum of the sanctioned intake (N) and the lateral entry including leftover seats (N2)</p>	27.38	27.38			<table border="1"> <tr> <td></td><td>CAYm1</td><td>CAYm2</td><td>CAYm3</td></tr> <tr> <td>Placement Index (P)</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td>Average Placement Index (P)</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td>Comments (if any):</td><td>❖</td><td></td><td></td></tr> </table>		CAYm1	CAYm2	CAYm3	Placement Index (P)				Average Placement Index (P)				Comments (if any):	❖		
	CAYm1	CAYm2	CAYm3																					
Placement Index (P)																								
Average Placement Index (P)																								
Comments (if any):	❖																							
4.7	Professional Activities	25																						
4.7.1	Professional Societies/ Bodies, Chapters, Clubs, and Professional Engineering Events Organized	05	<p>A. Availability and number of activities organized through professional societies/ chapters/ clubs (02)</p> <p>B. Number and quality of engineering events organized at the Institute, categorized by level (National/ International) (03)</p>	2	5			<p>- Activity details, Attendance, student count etc. are required</p>																
4.7.2	Student's Participations in Professional Events (at other institutions)	10	<p>A. No. of students participated in the state level events (03)</p> <p>B. No. of students participated in the national level/ international events (03)</p> <p>C. Number of students received prizes/ awards in such events (04)</p>	3	10			<p>— 4 —</p> <p>Student chapters (web portal details etc.)</p>																

Signature (Program Evaluator 1)

10

Signature (Program Evaluator 2)

S.N.	Sub- Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines (Marks)	Marks Awarded		Overall		Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)
				Marks	Total	Marks	Grade (Y,C,W,D)	
4.7.3	Publication of Journals, Magazines, Newsletters, etc in the Department	05	A. Quality and relevance of the contents and print material/e-format (03)	03	04			1% of total students, area of publication, mapping to PEO etc can be maintained
			B. Student involvement in publication of journals, magazines, newsletters (02)	01				
4.7.4	Student Publications	05	A. No. of journal papers published by students during the assessment period (02)	2	01 01 01			As per standard calculator
			B. No. of conference papers published by students during the assessment period (02)	2				
			C. No. of student publications that received prizes/ awards during the assessment period (01)	1				
Total of Criterion 4:		120	Overall Marks and Grade for Criterion 4:					

Signature (Program Evaluator 1)

11

Signature (Program Evaluator 2)

Criterion 5: Faculty Information (100)

S.N.	Sub-Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines (Marks)	Marks Awarded		Overall		Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)														
				Marks	Total	Marks	Grade (Y,C,W,D)															
5.1	Student-Faculty Ratio (SFR)	30	<p>Marks to be given proportionally from a maximum of 30 to a minimum of 10 for average SFR between 15:1 to 25:1, and zero for average SFR higher than 25:1. Marks distribution is given as below</p> <table> <tr><td>SFR ≤ 15</td><td>- 30 Marks</td></tr> <tr><td>≤ 17</td><td>- 26 Marks</td></tr> <tr><td>≤ 19</td><td>- 22 Marks</td></tr> <tr><td>≤ 21</td><td>- 18 Marks</td></tr> <tr><td>≤ 23</td><td>- 14 Marks</td></tr> <tr><td>≤ 25</td><td>- 10 Marks</td></tr> <tr><td>> 25</td><td>- 00 Marks</td></tr> </table> <p>Note: All the faculty whether regular or contractual (except part-time or hourly based), will be considered. All regular faculty members shall meet the AICTE qualifications and experience requirements. 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:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p>Programs such as MCA, BCA, and other non-engineering programs running in the Department or allied Departments need to have sufficient faculty members to support those programs. These faculty members and students should not be included here.</p>	SFR ≤ 15	- 30 Marks	≤ 17	- 26 Marks	≤ 19	- 22 Marks	≤ 21	- 18 Marks	≤ 23	- 14 Marks	≤ 25	- 10 Marks	> 25	- 00 Marks	10	10			<p>DS=Total no. of students in all UG and PG programs in the Department</p> <p>AS=Total no. of students of all UG and PG programs in allied departments</p> <p>S=Total no. of students in the Department (DS) and allied departments (AS)</p> <p>DF=Total no. of faculty members in the Department</p> <p>AF=Total no. of faculty members in the allied Departments</p> <p>F=Total no. of faculty members in the Department (DF) and allied Departments (AF)</p> <p>FF=The faculty members in F who have a 100% teaching load in the first-year courses</p> <p>Student Faculty Ratio (SFR)= $S/(F-FF)$</p> <p>Average SFR</p> <p>Note: No. of students = Sanctioned Intake (SA)+ Actual admitted students via lateral entry including leftover seats if any (limited to 10 % of SA) (Refer to criteria 5.1 in the SAR).</p> <p>Comments (if any): ❖</p> 
SFR ≤ 15	- 30 Marks																					
≤ 17	- 26 Marks																					
≤ 19	- 22 Marks																					
≤ 21	- 18 Marks																					
≤ 23	- 14 Marks																					
≤ 25	- 10 Marks																					
> 25	- 00 Marks																					

Signature (Program Evaluator 1)

12

Signature (Program Evaluator 2)



S.N.	Sub-Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines (Marks)	Marks Awarded		Overall		Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)			
				Marks	Total	Marks	Grade (Y,C,W,D)	CAY	CAYm1	CAYm2	
5.2	Faculty Qualification	25	<p>FQI=2.5 * [{10X +4Y}/RF] where, X=No. of faculty members with Ph.D., Y=No. of faculty members with M.Tech/ ME. RF=No. of required faculty in the Department including allied Departments to adhere to the 20:1 Student-Faculty ratio, with calculations based on both student numbers and faculty requirements as per section 5.1 of SAR; (RF=S/20)</p> <p>To determine the RF value, all students (S as defined in section 5.1 of SAR) in the department, as well as those in allied departments, need to be considered.</p>	13.5	13.5						
								No. of faculty members with Ph.D:			
								No. of faculty members with M.Tech/ ME :			
								RF			
								Faculty Qualification Index (FQI)			
								Average FQI for past 3 years			
								❖ Does the Head of the Department (HoD) hold Ph.D. degree in CAY (Yes / No) =			
								Comments (if any):			
								❖			
5.3	Faculty Cadre Proportion	25	<p>Cadre Proportion Marks:</p> $\left[\frac{AF_1}{RF_1} + \left[\frac{AF_2 * 0.6}{RF_2} + \frac{AF_3 * 0.4}{RF_3} \right] \right] * 12.5$ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ If AF1=AF2=0, then zero mark ❖ Maximum marks to be limited to 25 if it exceeds the allocated marks. <p>All Professors (RF1, AF1), all Associate Professors (RF2, AF2), and all Assistant Professors (RF3, AF3) in the department, as well as those in allied departments, should be considered for the calculation of faculty cadre proportion marks.</p> <p>To determine the RF1, RF2, and RF3 values, all students (S as defined in section 5.1 of SAR) in the department, as well as those in allied departments, need to be considered.</p>	6	6						
								Total no. of UG (Engineering) programs in the department and allied departments			
								No. of Professors			
								No. of Associate Professors			
								No. of Assistant Professors			
								Comments (if any):			
								❖			

Signature (Program Evaluator 1)

Signature (Program Evaluator 2)

S.N.	Sub-Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines (Marks)	Marks Awarded		Overall		Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/Reasons)
				Marks	Total	Marks	Grade (Y,C,W,D)	
5.4.	Visiting/Adjunct Faculty/Professor of Practice	10	A. Provision of visiting or adjunct faculty/emeritus professor/professor of practice, etc (01) B. Minimum 50 hours per year interaction (09) (Per year to obtain three marks: $3 * 3 = 09$)					
				05	05			
5.5	Faculty Retention	10	FR=((A*0) +(B*1) +(C*2) +(D*3) +(E*4))/RF * 2.50 (points limited to 10) RF=No. of required faculty in the Department including allied Departments to adhere to the 20:1 Student-Faculty ratio, with calculations based on both student numbers and faculty requirements as per section 5.1 of SAR; (RF=S/20) AF=The no. of available faculty members in the Department including allied Departments. A= The no. of faculty members at the current institute with less than 1 year of experience (A in AF) B= The no. of faculty members at the current institute with more than 1 year and less than 2 years of experience (B in AF) C= The no. of faculty members at the current institute with more than 2 years and less than 3 years of experience (C in AF) D= The no. of faculty members at the current institute with more than 3 years and less than 4 years of experience (D in AF). E= The no. of faculty members at the current institute with more than 4 years of experience (E in AF)					
				07	07			
Total of Criterion 5:		100	Overall Marks and Grade for Criterion 5:		54.52			

Signature (Program Evaluator 1)

Signature (Program Evaluator 2)

Criterion 6: Faculty Contributions (120)

S.N.	Sub-Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines (Marks)	Marks Awarded		Overall		Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/Reasons)
				Marks	Total	Marks	Grade (Y,C,W,D)	
6.1	Professional Development Activities	60						
6.1.1	Memberships in Professional Societies at National/International Levels	05	Memberships in Professional Societies at National/International Levels: Faculty members who have active recognized professional memberships and their positions and contributions to professional societies during the assessment period.	5	5			- Membership details with period & fees paid
6.1.2	Faculty as Resource Persons or Participants in STTPs/FDPs	10						
6.1.2.1	Faculty as Resource Persons in STTPs / FDPs	05	A. An average of more than 3 faculty members from the Department served as resource persons in STTPs/FDPs during the assessment period (05) B. An average of more than 2 and less than 3 faculty members from the Department served as resource persons in STTPs/FDPs during assessment period (02)	3 5	5	3		- Senior / Permanent faculty have major contribution as resource but number of contractual faculty in less as resource
6.1.2.2	Faculty Members' Participation in STTPs/FDPs	05	A faculty scores maximum five points for participation. ❖ Participation in 2 to 5 days Faculty development program: 3 Points ❖ Participation in >5 days Faculty development program: 5 points ❖ RDF= Number of faculty required to comply with the 20:1 student-faculty ratio in the Department alone, as per section 5.1 (RDF= DS/20). ❖ For each year, Assessment Points (AP)=Sum of faculty participation score / (0.5 * RDF). ❖ Average assessment over last three years starting from CAYm1 (Marks limited to 05)	5	10			CAYm1 CAYm2 CAYm3 Assessment points (AP) are: Average Assessment points (AP) are Comments (if any) ❖ - As per calculator

Signature (Program Evaluator 1)

15

Signature (Program Evaluator 2)

S.N.	Sub-Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines (Marks)	Marks Awarded		Overall		Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/Reasons)												
				Marks	Total	Marks	Grade (Y,C,W,D)													
6.1.3	Faculty Contribution in Development of SWAYAM MOOCs and other E-Content	05	A. Faculty member(s) involvement in developing SWAYAM MOOCs (3)	01	03			— E-Content creation & usage record on courses												
			B. Involvement of faculty members in developing E-Content (2)	2																
6.1.4	Faculty Certification of MOOCs through SWAYAM, etc	10	Percentage of faculty members in the Department obtained MOOCs certification through platforms like SWAYAM/NPTEL and marks distribution as follows: ❖ ≥ 30% of available faculty members in the Department obtained MOOCs certification through platforms like SWAYAM/NPTEL during the assessment period (07-10) ❖ ≥ 20% and <30% of available faculty members in the Department obtained MOOCs certification through platforms like SWAYAM/NPTEL during the assessment period (04-06) ❖ < 20% of available faculty members in the Department obtained MOOCs certification through platforms like SWAYAM/NPTEL during the assessment period (00-03)	10	10			- As per dept record - faculty individual/personal files to be prepared												
6.1.5	FDP/STTP Organized by Department Faculty	10	❖ The minimum duration of FDP/STTP is 5 days. ❖ 2 points per FDP/STTP, with a maximum of 4 marks per assessment year and a total maximum of 10 marks	04	04			<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%;"></td> <td>CAYm1</td> <td>CAYm2</td> <td>CAYm3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>No. of FDP/STTP conducted</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Assessment points (AP) are</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table> Comments ❖		CAYm1	CAYm2	CAYm3	No. of FDP/STTP conducted				Assessment points (AP) are			
	CAYm1	CAYm2	CAYm3																	
No. of FDP/STTP conducted																				
Assessment points (AP) are																				

Signature (Program Evaluator 1)

16

Signature (Program Evaluator 2)

S.N.	Sub Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines (Marks)	Marks Awarded		Overall		Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)
				Marks	Total	Marks	Grade (Y,C,W,D)	
6.1.6	Faculty Support in Student Innovative Projects	10	<p>Percentage of faculty members in the Department supporting as a mentor, facilitator, etc. in student innovation projects in various events like hackathons, codeathons, ideathons, open research, etc & marks distribution as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ $\geq 30\%$ of available faculty members in the Department support as a mentor, facilitator, etc. in student innovation projects in various events during the assessment period (07-10) ❖ $\geq 20\%$ and $< 30\%$ of available faculty members in the Department support as a mentor, facilitator, etc. in student innovation projects in various events in the past 3 years (04-06) ❖ $< 20\%$ of available faculty members in the Department support as a mentor, facilitator, etc. in student innovation projects in various events in the past 3 years (00-03) 	10	min 8 Max 10			- List of faculty / Dept orders in the activity engagement or conduct can be provided
6.1.7	Faculty Internship/ Training/ Collaboration with Industry	10	<p>Percentage of faculty members in the Department, who have undergone faculty internships/trainings/ collaboration with industry & marks distribution as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ $\geq 30\%$ of available faculty members in the Department have undergone faculty internships/ trainings/ collaboration with industry during the assessment period (07-10) ❖ $\geq 20\%$ and $< 30\%$ of available faculty members in the Department have undergone faculty internships/ trainings/ collaboration with industry during the assessment period (04-06) ❖ $< 20\%$ of available faculty members in the Department have undergone faculty internships/ trainings/collaboration with industry during the assessment period (00-03) 	10	min 8 Max 10			— 11 —

Signature (Program Evaluator 1)

17

Signature (Program Evaluator 2)

S.N.	Sub Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines (Marks)	Marks Awarded		Overall		Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)																
				Marks	Total	Marks	Grade (Y,C,W,D)																	
6.2	Research and Development Activities	60																						
6.2.1	Academic Research	10	A. No. of Publications (04) B. Quality of publications (06)	04 06				<table border="1"> <tr> <td></td> <td>CAYm1</td> <td>CAYm2</td> <td>CAYm3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>No. of peer reviewed journal papers</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>No. of peer reviewed conference papers</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>No. of books/book chapters</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table> <p>Comments (if any): ❖</p>		CAYm1	CAYm2	CAYm3	No. of peer reviewed journal papers				No. of peer reviewed conference papers				No. of books/book chapters			
	CAYm1	CAYm2	CAYm3																					
No. of peer reviewed journal papers																								
No. of peer reviewed conference papers																								
No. of books/book chapters																								
6.2.2	Ph.D. Student Details	05	A. No. of students enrolled for Ph.D. degree in the Department during the assessment period (02) B. No. of Ph.D. graduated in the Department during the assessment period (03)	02 03				<table border="1"> <tr> <td></td> <td>CAYm1</td> <td>CAYm2</td> <td>CAYm3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>No. of students enrolled for Ph.D. in the Department</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>No. of Ph.D. students graduated in the Department</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table> <p>Comments (if any): ❖</p>		CAYm1	CAYm2	CAYm3	No. of students enrolled for Ph.D. in the Department				No. of Ph.D. students graduated in the Department							
	CAYm1	CAYm2	CAYm3																					
No. of students enrolled for Ph.D. in the Department																								
No. of Ph.D. students graduated in the Department																								
6.2.3	Development Activities	10	A. Patents granted during the assessment period (04) B. Patents published during the assessment period (03) C. Working models and prototypes developed during the assessment period (03)	02 03 02	MTM 5 Mark 07			<p>→ IPR titles to be mapped with PEO & teacher competency</p>																

Signature (Program Evaluator 1)

18

Signature (Program Evaluator 2)

S.N.	Sub Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines (Marks)	Marks Awarded		Overall		Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)			
				Marks	Total	Marks	Grade (Y,C,W,D)	CAYm1	CAYm2	CAYm3	
6.2.4	Sponsored Research Project	15	Funded research from the external sources; Cumulative during CAYm1, CAYm2 and CAYm3: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Amount \geq 20 Lacs - 15 Marks ❖ Amount \geq 16 Lacs and $<$ 20 lacs- 12 Marks ❖ Amount \geq 12 Lacs and $<$ 16 lacs -9 Marks ❖ Amount \geq 8 Lacs and $<$ 12 lacs -6 Marks ❖ Amount \geq 4 Lacs and $<$ 8 lacs -3 Marks ❖ Amount \geq 1 Lac and $<$ 4 lacs -1 Mark ❖ Amount $<$ 1 Lac - 0 Mark 	0	0						No.of projects received
6.2.5	Consultancy Work	15	Consultancy work from external sources; Cumulative CAYm1, CAYm2 and CAYm3: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Amount \geq 20 Lacs - 15 Marks ❖ Amount \geq 16 Lacs and $<$ 20 lacs-12 Marks ❖ Amount \geq 12 Lacs and $<$ 16 lacs -9 Marks ❖ Amount \geq 8 Lacs and $<$ 12 lacs -6 Marks ❖ Amount \geq 4 Lacs and $<$ 8 lacs -3 Marks ❖ Amount \geq 1 Lac and $<$ 4 lacs -1 Mark ❖ Amount $<$ 1 Lac - 0 Mark. 	03	3						Amount (Rs.In Lakhs)
6.2.6	Institution Seed Money or Internal Research Grant to its Faculty for Research Work	05	A. Amount received (3 marks) Institution seed money or Internal research grants received by faculty members; Cumulative CAYm1, CAYm2 and CAYm3: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Amount \geq 6 Lacs - 3 Marks ❖ Amount \geq 4 Lacs and $<$ 6 lacs-2 Marks ❖ Amount \geq 2 Lacs and $<$ 4 lacs -1 Mark ❖ Amount $<$ 1 Lac - 0 Mark. B. Amount utilized (2 marks)	02	03						Total amount for past 3 years
Total of Criterion 6:		120	Overall Marks and Grade for Criterion 6:								Comments (if any): ❖ As per dept record

Signature (Program Evaluator 1)

Signature (Program Evaluator 2)

Criterion 7: Facilities and Technical Support (100)

S.N.	Sub-Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines (Marks)	Marks Awarded		Overall		Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/Reasons)
				Marks	Total	Marks	Grade (Y,C,W,D)	
7.1	Adequate and Well-Equipped Laboratories, and Technical Manpower	40	A. Adequate and well-equipped laboratories to run the program (15)	15	W	1		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Dept of wic (central) lists are to be maintained - transfer documents be maintained - Lab registers with
			B. Quality of instruments (05)	5				
			C. Utilization (10)	5				
			D. Availability of adequate and qualified technical supporting staff (10)	10				
7.2	Additional Facilities Created for Improving the Quality of Learning Experience in Laboratories	20	A. Availability and relevance of additional facilities (10)	8	15			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lab registers with
			B. Utilization and effectiveness of facilities (05)	03				
			C. Relevance to POs/PSOs (05)	04				
7.3	Maintenance of Laboratories and Overall Ambience	10	A. Maintenance policy (02)	02	09			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Equipment prepared
			B. Corrective & preventive maintenance (03)	03				
			C. Overall ambience (05)	04				
7.4	Safety Measures in Laboratories	10	A. Basic safety measures (04)	04	8			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Separate lot of OSS & hence additional facility requirement/Relevance - Identify lab specific safety
			B. Lab specific safety measure (06)	04				
7.5	Project Laboratory/ Research Laboratory/ Centre of Excellence	20	A. Availability of project laboratories/ research laboratories (05)	5	MM 12 Mark 18			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Identify lab specific safety
			B. Availability of Centre of excellence (05)	5				
			C. Utilization of project laboratories/ research laboratory/ Centre of excellence (05)	5				
			D. Relevance to POs/PSOs (05)	2				
Total of Criterion 7:		100	Overall Marks and Grade for Criterion 7:					

Signature (Program Evaluator 1)

20

Signature (Program Evaluator 2)

Criterion 8: Continuous Improvement (80)

S.N.	Sub-Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines (Marks)	Marks Awarded		Overall		Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/Reasons)
				Marks	Total	Marks	Grade (Y,C,W,D)	
8.1	Actions Taken Based on the Results of Evaluation of the COs, POs, and PSOs	40						
8.1.1	Actions Taken Based on the Results of Evaluation of the COs Attainment	20	A. Documentary evidences of identification of gaps in COs attainment (05) B. Plan of action to bridge the gaps /Improvement (05) C. Implementation (10)	02 03 5	10			Process /Reson /MOM for setting and updating dept target & threshold
8.1.2	Actions Taken Based on the Results of Evaluation of the POs/PSOs Attainment	20	A. Documentary evidences of identification of gaps in POs/PSOs attainment (05) B. Plan of action to bridge the gaps/ Improvement (05) C. Implementation (10)	02 03 5.	10			→ Documents need to be prepared
8.2	Academic Audit and Actions Taken thereof during the Period of Assessment	15	A. Availability of external academic audit process (02) B. Plan of action to address the recommendation (03) C. Record of actions/corrective measures taken during the assessment period (10)	01 02 05	08			→ Documents need to be prepared

Signature (Program Evaluator 1)

21

Signature (Program Evaluator 2)

S.N.	Sub-Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines (Marks)	Marks Awarded		Overall		Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)
				Marks	Total	Marks	Grade (Y,C,W,D)	
8.3	Improvement in Faculty Qualification/ Contribution	15	A. Improvement in the no. faculty with Ph.D (06) ❖ The average no. of faculty members with Ph.D. degree over the past 3 years is more than 60% compared to the required no. of faculty members with Ph.D. (06) ❖ The average no. of faculty members with Ph.D. degree over the past 3 years is more than 40% compared to the required no. of faculty members with Ph.D. (04) ❖ The average no. of faculty members with Ph.D. degree over the past 3 years is more than 20% compared to the required no. of faculty members with Ph.D. (02) B. Improvement in the no. of publications in peer reviewed journals (06) C. Improvement in the no. of publications in conferences (03)	02	12	12	W	No. faculty members with Ph.D. No. of publications in peer reviewed journals No. of publications in conferences Comments (if any): ❖
8.4	Improvement in Academic Performance	10	A. Academic Performance Index (API) of the First-Year Students in the Program(03) B. Academic Performance Index (API) of the Second-Year Students in the Program (03) C. Academic Performance Index (API) of the Third Year Students in the Program (04)	02	02	06	C	API of 1 st year students in the Program API of 2 nd year students in the Program API of 3 rd year students in the Program Comments (if any): ❖
Total of Criterion 8:		80	Overall Marks and Grade for Criterion 8:					

Signature (Program Evaluator 1)

22

Signature (Program Evaluator 2)