

Criteria wise Evaluation Guidelines and
Document Verification during NBA team
visit
(Tier – II Institution)

Dr. Jagada Nand Jha

Principal

MIT Muzaffarpur

Email: jagadanand@gmail.com

Criteria wise Marks

Criteria No.	Criteria	Tier – I Marks	Tier-II Marks
	Programme Level Criteria		
1	Vision, Mission and Program Educational Objectives	50	60
2	Program Curriculum and Teaching-Learning Processes	100	120
3	Program Outcomes and Course Outcomes	175	120
4	Students' Performance	100	150
5	Faculty Information and Contributions	200	200
6	Facilities and Technical Support	80	80
7	Continuous Improvement	75	50
	Institute Level Criteria		
8	First Year Academics	50	50
9	Student Support Systems	50	50
10	Governance, Institutional Support, and Financial Resources	120	120
	Total	1000	1000

Sub-Criteria and Allocation of Marks

Sub-Criterion	Tier I	Tier II
7.1 Actions taken based on the results of evaluation of each of the POs and PSOs	30	20
7.2 Academic Audit and actions taken during the period of Assessment	15	10
7.3 Improvement in Placement, Higher Studies and Entrepreneurship	10	10
7.4 Improvement in the quality of students admitted to the program	20	10
TOTAL	75	50

Sub-Criterion 7.1

Actions taken based on the results of evaluation of each of the POs and PSOs.

- Evaluation Guidelines:
 - A. Documentary evidences of POs and PSOs attainment levels 15 Marks: Tier I; 5 Marks: Tier II
 - B. Identification of gaps/shortfalls 5 Marks for both Tier I and Tier II Institutes.
 - C. Plan of action to bridge the gap and its Implementation 10 Marks for both Tier I and Tier II Institutes.
 - A. Documentary evidences of POs and PSOs attainment levels
 - Target levels and attainment levels of POs and PSOs are already recorded under Criterion 3.
 - B. Identification of gaps/shortfalls
 - Gaps must be identified and analyzed to determine plans for improvements in the attainment levels. We need to analyze the attainment gaps of COs also for this purpose.

C. Plan of action to bridge the gap and its Implementation

- Improvement plans must be documented for each PO and PSO.

For each PO / PSO:

- State the PO / PSO
- Indicate the target level, attainment level.
- Record your observations about the attainment gaps. (The gaps could be positive or negative.)
- Record the action plans. (Guidelines regarding the action plans have already been discussed in Module 1)
- The above information is to be provided in the format specified in the SAR.

Sub- Criterion-7.2:Academic Audit and actions taken during the period of Assessment

- Assessments during the audit typically address the following academic issues:
 - COs of all the courses, their target levels, attainment levels, and action plans based on gap analysis.
 - CO – PO/PSO mappings.
 - Target levels, attainment levels, gap analysis, and consequent action plans with respect to POs and PSOs.
 - Quality of all assessment instruments including internal tests, quizzes, assignments; and end semester examinations for Tier I Institutes.
 - Process for validation of assessment instruments.
 - Rubrics for Seminars, Mini Projects, and Main Project.
 - Conduct of Laboratories.
 - Actions implemented by the department based on the report of the previous academic audit.

Sub- Criterion-7.2.....Contd.

- The process must include the objectives of the audit, unit of audit, assessment criteria, frequency of audit, composition of the audit teams, guidelines for the conduct of the audit, format for reporting the audit results and so on.
- Records of the academic audit must be maintained.
- Departments must analyze the audit reports, plan actions based on the analysis, and implement the actions. Records of all these activities must be maintained.
- Frequency of audit is typically once every semester.
- The audit team is generally composed of internal faculty only. However, external members are included in some institutes in an annual audit.
- Audit must be conducted in the spirit of mutual respect and trust.
- Audit must be seen as the process to improve the quality; not as a mechanism for just finding faults.

Sub-Criterion 7.3

Improvement in Placement, Higher Studies and Entrepreneurship

- Evaluation Guidelines:
 - A. Improvement in Placement numbers, quality, core hiring industry and pay packages. (5 Marks. Common to both types of Institutes.)
 - B. Improvement in Higher Studies admissions for pursuing PhD. in premier institutions (3 Marks. Common to both types of Institutes.)
 - C. Improvement in number of Entrepreneurs (2 Marks. Common to both types of Institutes.)

(The required data is already provided under sub-criterion 4.5. Marks are given proportionately considering numbers in the base year CAYm3)

Sub-Criterion 7.4

Improvement in the quality of students admitted to the program.

- Evaluation Guidelines: 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.
- The required data is to be provided in the format specified in the SAR.
- Documentary evidence to support the data provided must be maintained.

All the sources used for presentation are duly acknowledged

Thanks