Evaluation Team (ET) Report
(For Accreditation Criteria ACC-MAN-02-V2.2)

1. General Information

1.1 Institution

Name of the University	
Name of the Faculty	
Address	

1.2 Program for Accreditation

Name of the Program	
Abbreviation of the Program	
Name of the Department	
Duration of the Program	
Year of Graduation of First Batch	
Current Accreditation Expires on (if applicable)	

1.3 Response of the Program to the Preliminary Questions

Is the response of the program to all 09 (nine) preliminary questions affirmative	yes	no
List of the negative responses to the preliminary questions (if any)		
In case of any negative reply, accreditation evaluation is not necessary. Registrar, BAETE is to be contacted		

1.4 Evaluation Team

Team Chairperson (name)	
Team Members (name)	
Observer (if any) (name)	

1.5 Date of Evaluation

Dates of Pre-visit Meeting	
Dates of On-site Visit	

2. Criteria

Evaluation for each criterion and sub-criterion falls under one of the following four categories: compliance, concern, weakness, deficiency. Justifications should be provided for evaluation of each sub-criterion and criterion. It should be noted that no sub-criterion is assigned any weight. Each criterion is to be holistically evaluated in terms of the qualitative bench-mark requirements.

Criterion 1: Organization and Governance			
Sub-criteria	Findings from SAR	Findings from onsite visit	Evaluation
i. Major positions of the institution are filled.			
ii. The statutory bodies/committees of the institution are formed in accordance with the applicable rules and guidelines.			
iii. The position appointees and committee members function effectively as per the roles defined in the relevant act/statute.			
iv. The institution has published policies including a mechanism for addressing grievance.			
v. The academic and administrative policies are put into practice.			
Overall criterion 1 (provide justification)			

Criterion 2: Financial and Physical Resources			
Sub-criteria	Findings from SAR	Findings from onsite visit	Evaluation
i. Financial resources are adequate for achieving institutional mission and appropriate functioning of the program. The financial resources committed to the program are also adequate for the appropriate functioning of the program.			
ii. The institution has a process for budget planning and allocate resources to the priority areas as required.			
iii. Campus infrastructure, extra- and co-curricular facilities, support facilities including maintenance are adequate for all the students and staff.			
iv. Any risk from manmade or natural hazards preferably be properly assessed and addressed in the Safety Plan, which addresses safety issues as the situation demands. Adequate measures are in place to make the campus safe for students, employees and visitors.			
v. Fire detection and fighting facilities are adequate.			
vi. All labs have their own plans to prevent and manage incidents and accidents.			
Overall criterion 2 (provide justification)			

Criterion 3: Faculty Members			
Sub-criteria	Findings from SAR	Findings from onsite visit	Evaluation
i. Department has adequate number of full-time faculty members.			
ii. The proportion of senior and junior faculty members preferably is appropriate.			
iii. The teacher-student ratio, class size and teaching load does not compromise opportunities for interaction.			
iv. The faculty members have adequate academic qualifications with specializations in areas closely related to the program(s) offered by the department.			
v. Faculty members preferably are motivated to improve their pedagogy and assist the students in achieving outcomes. They preferably are committed to the continuous quality improvement activities of the department.			
vi. Faculty members have the responsibility to design and update the curriculum, establish course and program outcomes, and select and use appropriate assessment tools.			
vii. Faculty members are engaged in research, development and professional activities. They are preferably involved in relevant professional societies. The results of these activities preferably benefit the students.			
viii. The institution or department periodically arranges training for the faculty members on outcome-based education and assessment. All the faculty members are adequately trained on how to establish course outcomes, conduct teaching-learning activities that are appropriate for the outcomes and assess the level of outcome achievement.			
Overall criterion 3 (provide justification)			

Criterion 4: Students			
Sub-criteria	Findings from SAR	Findings from onsite visit	Evaluation
i. Policy for admission and transfer of students is published. The admission or transfer requirements is preferably appropriate for the selection of students with the potential to achieve the program's outcomes.			
ii. The policy is implemented in practice. Transfer students show the attainment of program outcomes from courses in the institution.			
iii. Students' achievement of outcomes is monitored and feedback is given. Provisions for remedial or corrective measures preferably exist when necessary.			
iv. Every student is assigned an advisor who preferably counsels, guides and mentors the student.			
v. Students have opportunities to participate in extra- and co-curricular activities, and relevant professional societies. The institution preferably ensures the participation of a significant number of students.			
Overall criterion 4 (provide justification)			

Criterion 5: Academic Facilities and Learning Environment			
Sub-criteria	Findings from SAR	Final findings	Evaluation
i. The institution has a well-stocked library. The resources in the library are preferably adequate.			
ii. The number of classrooms is adequate and the classroom facilities and the environment are preferably conducive to learning.			
iii. The number of laboratories and equipment are adequate for conducting the program's various laboratory courses.			
iv. Every student has the opportunity for hands-on activity in the laboratories.			
v. Students and faculty members have access to adequate computing and Internet facilities.			
Overall criterion 5 (provide justification)			

Criterion 6: Curriculum and Teaching-Learning Process			
Sub-criteria	Findings from SAR	Findings from onsite visit	Evaluation
i. Curriculum satisfies relevant program-specific criteria.			
ii. Breadth and depth of the curriculum are appropriate for solving complex engineering problems in the relevant discipline.			
iii. Curriculum contains adequate number of courses on mathematics, physical science, humanities and non-engineering subjects.			
iv. The teaching-learning processes and activities are effective and appropriate for achieving relevant outcomes including solution of complex engineering problems and activities, if applicable.			
v. Adequate hands-on activities are an integral part of teaching and learning. Learning is preferably enhanced through student participation.			
vi. The program demonstrates the culmination of program outcomes (POs) at the level of solving complex engineering problems, preferably through a final-year design project or capstone project extending over a period of one year.			
Overall criterion 6 (provide justification)			

Criterion 7: Program Educational Objectives (PEO)			
Sub-criteria	Findings from SAR	Findings from onsite visit	Evaluation
i. PEOs are published and are clear, concise, assessable and realistic within the context of the available resources.			
ii. PEOs are consistent with the vision and mission of the institution or the department offering the program.			
iii. Curriculum and teaching-learning processes support the attainment of PEOs. Justifications are provided for how these contribute to the attainment of the PEOs.			
iv. A process is developed to assess the level of attainment of each PEO. Adequate evidence and documentation on the assessment of PEO attainment are provided. Assessment tools are preferably indicated, and the way in which these tools are used is preferably explained.			
v. PEO assessment leads to the periodic review of PEOs.			
Overall criterion 7 (provide justification)			

Criterion 8: Program Outcomes and Assessment			
Sub-criteria	Findings from SAR	Findings from onsite visit	Evaluation
i. The POs of the program are substantially equivalent to the 12 BAETE specified PO statements.			
ii. POs contribute to each PEO.			
iii. There is a process to define and refine the POs. The course outcomes (COs) are correlated to POs through the mapping of COs onto POs.			
iv. Mapping demonstrates that each attribute of the Knowledge Profile (K1 – K8) is addressed in the curriculum. It is also demonstrated that the attributes of the Range of Complex Engineering Problems (P1 – P7) and Complex Engineering Activities (A1 – A5) are incorporated in the teaching, learning and assessment.			
v. Course file is maintained for each course. Course file preferably includes the assessment of outcomes, curriculum, examination questions and sample answer scripts, the results of other assessment tools and samples of corresponding student works, and a summary of performance and attainment of course outcomes with suggestions or feedback for future development.			
vi. POs are assessed using direct methods. In addition, indirect methods may also be used for PO assessment. The way in which various assessment tools, including examinations and rubrics, contribute to the evaluation of attainment of each PO are described. The results of the evaluation of PO attainment are shown.			
vii. It is demonstrated through evidence from appropriate evaluation that the students attain all the POs by the time of the graduation.			
Overall criterion 8 (provide justification)			

Criterion 9: Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI)			
Sub-criteria	Findings from SAR	Findings from onsite visit	Evaluation
i. The program demonstrates an established system for periodically compiling the level of attainment of PEOs, including a mechanism for tracking and obtaining feedback from graduates and their employers.			
ii. Findings of the CQI exercises for PEOs are evaluated, and the identified shortcomings and limitations are used to refine and improve the program.			
iii. POs are assessed on a regular cycle. The program prepares CQI file for each of the 12 POs to review considering feedback from relevant stakeholders including graduates.			
iv. Each course has clear quality requirements and facilitate the achievement of COs through teaching-learning and assessment methods.			
v. Course instructor prepares course review reports including CQI files for the courses he/she is teaching.			
vi. The program evaluates the curriculum and teaching quality on a regular basis while considering feedback from faculty members and students. The program demonstrates that the results of this periodic evaluation are used for continuous improvement.			
Overall criterion 9 (provide justification)			

Criterion 10: Interactions with the Industry			
Sub-criteria	Findings from SAR	Findings from onsite visit	Evaluation
i. The industry participates in the development of the curriculum to ensure that it is relevant, regularly updated, and meets the needs of the industry, particularly in areas experiencing rapid changes.			
ii. The program preferably has an Industry Advisory Panel (IAP) and an Alumni Association (AA) for this purpose. The IAP or AA may meet at certain intervals with the department to provide feedback.			
iii. The program provides students with the opportunity to obtain industrial experience through internships, industry visits or design projects conducted by practicing engineers and faculty members with industrial experience.			
Overall criterion 10 (provide justification)			

Any additional comment(s)

3. Strengths of the Program and the Institution:

   Strength in a criterion is demonstrated when the program or the institution significantly exceeds the bench-mark requirements for that criterion. The strengths of the program and the institution may be briefly highlighted as encouragement and in recognition of good practices.

4. Broad Level Recommendations:

   The Evaluation Team should provide some broad-level recommendations and suggestions to assist the program to improve without being prescriptive. Details of the corrective measures to be taken should not be prescribed.

5. Signatures of the Members of the Evaluation Team

	Name	Signature with Date
Team Chairperson		
Team members		

The recommendation made by the Evaluation Team has to be communicated separately to the Board.