

PART A

Evaluator's Visit Report

Undergraduate Engineering Program

Tier-II

Name of the Institution

BMS Institute of Technology and Management

Name of the Program

UG - Computer Science & Engineering

Visit Dates

11th to 13th November, 2016

Program Evaluator Summary

Overview

The Expert team of National Board of Accreditation (NBA) conducted a three day accreditation visit from 11th to 13th Nov 16 BMS Institute of Technology and to evaluate UG Engineering program U.G. - Computer Science & Engineering management

Pre visit meeting of the expert tea was held on at hotel 8:30 pm 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 Dr. P.M. Babu G.M. The briefing on the institution was given by Dr. P.M. Babu G.M. and on the program was given by the Dr. Thiruppeswamy G. / Mrs. Nishalatha Yadav. 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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Alumni	<input type="checkbox"/>
Employers	<input type="checkbox"/>	Parents	<input type="checkbox"/>
Staff members	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Students	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

1. Infrastructure and ambience is good.
2. Quality of student intake is improving.
3. Student academic performance and placement is satisfactory.
4. Faculty quality, ratio and cadre ratio is o.k.
5. Industry sponsored R&D and consultancy is very poor.
6. Faculty R&D work & publication is not upto the mark.
7. Reasonably good work has been done in identifying and all OBE related processes.

elb

Program Details

Name of the Program				
Year of Commencement				
Student	Year	Sanctioned Intake	Actual Admitted	
	CAY (2015-2016)	90	126 (90+4+4+18)	
	CAY m1 (2014-2015)	90	130 (90+4+4+13+18)	
	CAY m2 (2013-2014)	90	129 (91+2+4+4+11+17)	
	Total Students in the Programme 1 st to Final Year	2016-17: 440 (140 to 190)		
Averaged over three assessment years	421.33 [(425+430+405)/3]			
Placement %	CAY (2015-2016)	97%		
	CAY m1 (2014-2015)	92.5%		
	CAY m2 (2013-2014)	98.5%		
	Averaged over three assessment years	95.83%		
Faculty (Attach a Copy of faculty list compared with Time Table)	Regular	Professor	3	
		Associate professor	01	
		Assistant professor	20	
	Ad-hoc	Professor	Nil	
		Associate professor		
		Assistant professor		
	Contractual	Professor	Nil	
		Associate professor		
		Assistant professor		
	Student-Teacher ratio		18	
Visiting/guest faculty (Total Numbers of Hours)		1. Dr. Narayan Iyer		
Previous accreditation(if any)	First accreditation	No. of years accredited for	Nil	
		With effect from		
	Previous accreditation	No. of years accredited for	Nil	
		With effect from		

CAY: Current Assessment Year
 CAYm1: Current Assessment Year minus 1
 CAYm2: Current Assessment Year minus 2

led

Explicit observations about the program

(Please use additional sheets if necessary to elaborate)

Program title UG: Computer Science & Engineering**Strengths:**

1. Mission & vision and OBE related processes are properly implemented.
2. Teaching learning methodology is effectively evolving. Both weak and bright students are taken care of.
3. Assessment process is auditable and back traceable.
4. Better students are taking admissions and student academic performance as well as placement are improving.
5. Faculty retention is good.

Weakness/Areas of improvement:

1. More elaborate process should be used in identifying the gaps in curriculum and same information should be passed on to university RAC and institute RAC.
2. Impact analysis of institute industry needs to be done properly.
3. 4. Faculty needs to be properly encouraged to become innovative and independent original thinkers.
5.

Deficiencies:

1. Sponsored research project and consultancy work need major focus.
2. More efforts are needed for properly establish industry institute interaction.
3. In student projects completion of concept and testing steps need proper completion.
4. More attention needs to be given to academics of 2nd yr and 3rd yr students.
- 5.

Other Observations, if any:

1. Institute is poised to achieve excellence with little more effort in R&D and industry institute collaboration.
2. Infrastructure is good. Lots of improvement can be achieved by recruiting senior people from industry and other institutes of higher learning.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

ced

Information for Evaluation

Award of Accreditation

Full Accreditation for 6 years

Minimum of 750 points in aggregate out of 1000 points with minimum score of 60% in mandatory fields (criteria 4 to 6)

In addition at least 30 % of the required Faculty shall be Ph.D.

Provisional Accreditation for 3 years

Score of greater than or equal to 600 points with minimum 40% marks in Faculty Information and Contributions (Criterion V) and also availability of at least one (1) Professor or one (1) Associate Professor (As per AICTE Qualification) in the respective Department

No Accreditation

Less than 600 points or less than 40% marks in Faculty Information and Contributions (Criterion V) or non-availability of at least one (1) Professor or one (1) Associate Professor (As per AICTE Qualification) are not eligible for accreditation.

eed

Department/Programme Specific Criteria:

S.no.	Criteria	Max. Marks	Marks Awarded	Remarks
1.	Vision, Mission and Program Educational Objectives	60	40	
2.	Program Curriculum and Teaching-Learning Processes	120	79	
3.	Course Outcomes and Program Outcomes	120	88	
4.	Students' Performance	150	105	
5.	Faculty Information and Contributions	200	140	
6.	Facilities and Technical Support	80	59	
7.	Continuous Improvement	50	38	
TOTAL		780	549	

Chauhan
 12.11.16
 Signature (S.L. Rana)
 (Program Evaluator 1)

 Signature
 (Program Evaluator 2)

Declaration of Conformity with evaluator's report by the Team Chair

I agree with the observations of the program evaluators on each criterion.



Or

I agree with most of the observations of the program evaluators. However, I have following comments to make on certain criteria:

Criteria	Comments

Dr. Suran Laha

Signature
(Chairperson)

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

Name of the Institution BMS Institute of Technology and Management
 Name of the Program UG - Computer Science & Engineering

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) B. Appropriateness/Relevance of the Statements (2) C. Consistency of the Department statements with the Institute statements (2)	2	4	
1.2.	State the Program Educational Objectives (PEOs)	5	Program Educational Objectives (3 to 5) (5) Appropriateness	4	4	In line with CBE
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) B. Process of dissemination among stakeholders (2) C. Extent of awareness of Vision, Mission & PEOs among the stakeholder (5)	2 2 4	8	Dissemination done at all leverage points.
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) B. Description of process for defining the PEOs of the program (15)	7 7	14	
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) B. Consistency/justification of mapping of the matrix (10)	3 7	10	
Total:		60		7	40	

17/11/21

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)	TIER II
				Marks	Total		
2.1.	Program Curriculum	20					
	State the process used to identify extent of compliance of the University curriculum for attaining POs & PSOs (4)		A. Process used to identify extent of compliance of University curriculum for attaining POs & PSOs (4)	5			
2.1.1.	the Program Outcomes (POs) & Program Specific Outcomes (PSOs), mention the identified curricular gaps, if any	10	B. List the curricular gaps for the attainment of defined POs & PSOs (4)	3	8	Process is meticulous and proper by implementer	
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) B. Delivery details of content beyond syllabus (5) C. Mapping of content beyond syllabus with the POs & PSOs (3)	1 3 2	6	People identifying gaps, implementer under the purview of CPEE	
2.2.	Teaching-Learning Processes	100					
			A. Adherence to Academic Calendar (3)	3			
			B. Use of various instructional methods and pedagogical initiatives (3)	2			
			C. Methodologies to support weak students and encourage bright students (4)	3	18		
			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			
2.2.1	Describe the Process followed to improve quality of Teaching Learning	25	A. Process for internal semester question paper setting, evaluation and effective process implementation (5) B. Process to ensure questions from outcomes/learning levels perspective (5) C. Evidence of COs coverage in class test / mid-term tests (5) D. Quality of Assignment and its relevance to COs (5)	3 3 4 3	13		
2.2.2.	Quality of internal semester Question papers, assignments and Evaluation	20					

20

S.No.	Sub Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines (Marks)	Marks Awarded		Observations of Evaluation/Justifications/ Reasons
				Marks	Total	
2.2.3.	Quality of student projects	25	A. Identification of projects and allocation methodology to Faculty (3)	2	16	
			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)	3		
			F. Evidences of papers published /Awards received by projects etc. (2)	1		
2.2.4.	Initiatives related to industry interaction	15	A. Industry supported laboratories (5)	00	6	
			B. Industry involvement in the program design and partial delivery of any regular courses for students (5)	3		
			C. Impact analysis of industry institute interaction and actions taken thereof (5)	3		
2.2.5.	Initiatives related to industry internship/summer training	15	A. Industrial training/tours for students (3)	3	12	more efforts are being made in this matter.
			B. Industrial /internship /summer training of more than two weeks and post training Assessment (4)	3		
			C. Impact analysis of industrial training (4)	3		
			D. Student feedback on initiative (4)	3		
Total:					79	

Handwritten signature or initials.

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				
3.1.1.	Course Outcomes	5	Evidence of COs being defined for every course (5)	5	5	
3.1.2.	CO-PO/PSOs matrices of courses selected in 3.1.1 (six matrices)	5	Explanation of table to be ascertained (5)	4	4	
3.1.3.	Program level Course-PO/PSOs matrix of ALL courses including first year courses	10	Explanation of tables to be ascertained (10)	7	7	
3.2.	Attainment of Course Outcomes	50				
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	8	Complete central Medicines
3.2.2.	Outcomes of all courses with respect to set attainment levels	40	B. The quality /relevance of assessment processes & tools used (8)	6	28	
3.3.	Attainment of Program Outcomes and Program Specific Outcomes	50	Verify the attainment levels as per the benchmark set for all courses (40)	28	28	
3.3.1.	Describe assessment tools and processes used for assessing the	10	A. List of assessment tools & processes (5)	4	7	
3.3.2.	Provide results of evaluation of each PO & PSO	40	B. The quality/relevance of assessment tools/processes used (5)	3	29	mostly in soft copy form
			A. Verification of documents, results and level of attainment of each	18		
			B. Overall levels of attainment (16)	11	88	
Total:		120				

23/10

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. $\geq 90\%$ students enrolled at the First Year Level on average basis during the period of assessment (20) B. $\geq 80\%$ students enrolled at the First Year Level on average basis during the period of assessment (18) C. $\geq 70\%$ students enrolled at the First Year Level on average basis during the period of assessment (16) D. $\geq 60\%$ students enrolled at the First Year Level on average basis during the period of assessment (14) E. Otherwise '0'.	20	20	Better students are taking admission
4.2.	Success Rate in the stipulated period of the program	40	(2A)			
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	$SI = \frac{\text{Number of students who graduated from the program without backlog}}{\text{Number of students admitted in the first year of that batch and admitted in 2nd year via lateral entry and separate division, if applicable}}$ Average SI = Mean of success index (SI) for past three batches Success rate without backlogs in any year of study = $25 \times \text{Average SI}$	14	14	Ave. 52.057 Ave. 57.057 ed
4.2.2.	Success rate in stipulated period (actual duration of the program)	15	$SI = \frac{\text{Number of students who graduated from the program in the stipulated period of course duration}}{\text{Number of students admitted in the first year of that batch and admitted in 2nd year via lateral entry and separate division, if applicable}}$ Average SI = mean of success index (SI) for past three batches Success rate = $15 \times \text{Average SI}$	13	13	Mention Numbers Ave. 6122 Mention Numbers

ed

S.No.	Sub Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines	Marks Awarded		Observations of Evaluation/Justifications/ Reasons
				Marks	Total	
4.3.	Academic Performance in Third Year	15	Academic Performance = 1.5 * Average API (Academic Performance Index)	9	9	
4.4.	Academic Performance in Second Year	15	Academic Performance Level = 1.5 * Average API (Academic Performance Index)	8	8	Mention Numbers Avg. AP2 5.46
4.5.	Placement, Higher studies and Entrepreneurship	40	Assessment Points = 40 x 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	27	27	Needs improvement Avg. placement Mention Numbers 0.688
4.6.	Professional Activities	20	(14)			
4.6.1.	Professional societies/chapters and organizing engineering events	5	A. Availability & activities of professional societies/chapters (3) B. Number, quality of engineering events (organized at institute) (2)	2	4	Events are organized regularly.
4.6.2.	Publication of technical magazines, newsletters, etc.	5	A. Quality & Relevance of the contents and Print Material (3) B. Participation of Students from the program (2) A. Events within the state (2) B. Events outside the state (3) C. Prizes/awards received in such events (5)	2	4	
4.6.3.	Participation in inter-institute events by students of the program of study (at other institutions)	10		2	6	More participation should be encouraged
Total:					105	

led

Criterion 5: Faculty Information and Contributions (200)

S.No.	Sub Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines	Marks Awarded		Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)	TIER II
				Marks	Total		
5.1.	Student-Faculty Ratio (SFR)	20	<p>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)</p> <p>Regular Faculty means:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	18	18	Ave. SFR 16.04	
5.2.	Faculty Cadre Proportion	25	<p>Cadre Proportion Marks =</p> $\left[\frac{AF1}{RF1} + \frac{AF2}{RF2} \times 0.6 + \frac{AF3}{RF3} \times 0.4 \times 12.5 \right]$ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If AF1 = AF2 = 0 then zero marks • Maximum marks to be limited if it exceeds 25 	18	18	mention numbers	
5.3.	Faculty Qualification	25	<p>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)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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) 	16	16	Ave FQ: 16 mention numbers	
5.4	Faculty Retention	25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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) 	22	22	Retention is good.	

ed

S.No.	Sub Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines	Marks Awarded		TIER II 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) B. The work must be available for peer review and critique (4) C. The work must be reproducible and developed further by other scholars (2) D. Statement of clear goals, use of appropriate methods, significance of results, effective presentation and reflective critique (10)	2 2 1 6	11	Innovation in teaching learning needs heavy encouragement.
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)	12	12	mention numbers 21.6
5.7.	Research and Development	30	(13)			
5.7.1.	Academic Research	10	A. Number of quality publications in refereed/SCI Journals, citations, Books/Book Chapters etc. (6) B. PhD guided /PhD awarded during the assessment period while working in the institute (4)	4 2	6	
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	00 00	00	mention numbers Nil
5.7.3	Development Activities	10	A. Product Development B. Research laboratories C. Instructional materials D. Working models/charts/monograms etc.	7	7	

S.No.	Sub Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines	Marks Awarded		Observations of Evaluation/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	00	00	
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) B. Its implementation and effectiveness (20)	9	23	mention numbers NA Company brochure appended scheme - society
5.9.	Visiting/Adjunct/Emeritus Faculty etc.	10	Provision of Visiting /Adjunct/Emeritus faculty etc.(1) Minimum 50 hours per year interaction per year to obtain three marks : 3 x 3 = 9	1	7	
Total:					140	

ecdr

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)	17	25	
			B. Availability of adequate technical supporting staff (5)	4		
			C. Availability of qualified technical supporting staff (5)	4		
6.2.	Additional Facilities created for improving the quality of learning experience in Laboratories	25	A. Availability and relevance of additional facilities(10)	6	18	Adequate lab facilities are properly catered
			B. Facilities utilization and effectiveness (10)	8		
			C. Relevance to POs and PSOs (5)	4		
6.3.	Laboratories: Maintenance and overall ambience	10	Maintenance and overall ambience (10)	9	9	Content PC crash software
6.4.	Project laboratory	5	Facilities & Utilization (5)	3	3	
6.5.	Safety measures in laboratories	10	Safety measures in laboratories (10)	4	4	
Total:					59	

Editor

Criterion 7: Continuous Improvement (50)

		TIER II			
S.No.	Sub Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines		Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)
			Marks Awarded	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)	4	Focus on in place to plan improvement in future.
			B. Identification of gaps/shortfalls (5)	4	
			C. Plan of action to bridge the gap and its implementation (10)	8	
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)	7	
7.3.	Improvement in Placement, Higher Studies and Entrepreneurship	10	A. Improvement in Placements (5)	4	
			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	8	better students are taking admissions.
Total		50		38	

23.11.16
 CAV
 Career Dept

Name of the Program 1: UG - Computer Sc. & Engg.

Marks given by Evaluators:

A. Department/Program Specific Criteria:

S. No.	Criteria	Max. Marks	Marks Awarded	Remarks
1.	Vision, Mission and Program Educational Objectives	60	40	
2.	Program Curriculum and Teaching-Learning Processes	120	79	
3.	Course Outcomes and Program Outcomes	120	88	
4.	Students' Performance	150	105	
5.	Faculty Information and Contributions	200	140	
6.	Facilities and Technical Support	80	59	
7.	Continuous Improvement	50	38	
TOTAL		780	549	

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

S. No.	Criteria	Max. Marks	Marks Awarded	Remarks
8.	First Year Academics	50	37	
9.	Student Support Systems	50	39	
10.	Governance, Institutional Support and Financial Resources	120	101	
TOTAL		220	177	
GRAND TOTAL (A+B)		1000	726	

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

SR Govindaraj

Signature
(Chairman)

16.11.2016

Final Program Assessment Worksheet
Institute level Criteria to be Assessed by Chairman
 Name of the Institution BMS Institute of Technology & Management (Bangalore)
 Name of the Program B.E., CSE, M.E., TCE, EEE (UG)

S.No.	Sub Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines	Marks Awarded		Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)
				Marks	Total	
8.1.	First Year Student- Faculty Ratio (FYSFR)	5	For each year of assessment = (5 x 15)/ FYSFR (Limited to Max. 5) Average of Assessment years	05	05	480/35 mention numbers
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)	04	04	mention numbers
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)	06	06	mention numbers
8.4.	Attainment of Course Outcomes of first year courses	10		05	05	
8.4.1.	Describe the assessment processes used to gather the data upon which the evaluation of Course Outcomes of first year is based	05	A. List of assessment processes (1) B. The relevance of assessment tools used (4)	1 4	05	
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)	04	04	
8.5.	Attainment of Program Outcomes of all first year courses	20				
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) B. Verification of documents validating the above process (10)	4 7	11	
8.5.2.	Actions taken based on the results of evaluation of relevant POs /PSOs	5	Appropriate actions taken (5)	02	02	
Total:		50		37	37	

[Handwritten Signature]