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, 2436 0654 ; Telefax: +91 11 4308 4903
Website: www.nbaind.org

NATIONAL BOARD of ACCREDITATION

Dated: 26-07-2018

F.No. 11-133-2010-NBA

To
The Principal
Vidya Jyothi Institute of Technology,
Azeez Nagar Gate, Himayat Nagar (V), C.B. Post,
Hyderabad- 500075,Telangana

Subject: Accreditation status of programmes applied by Vidya Jyothi Institute of Technology, Azeez Nagar Gate, Himayat Nagar (V), C.B. Post, Hyderabad- 500075,Telangana.

Sir,

This has reference to your application I.D. No. 2034 dated 08/09/2016 seeking accreditation by National Board of Accreditation in Tier-II format to UG Engineering programs offered by **Vidya Jyothi Institute of Technology, Azeez Nagar Gate, Himayat Nagar (V), C.B. Post, Hyderabad- 500075, Telangana.**

2. An Expert Team conducted on-site evaluation of the programs from **20th -22nd April,2018**. 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 programs as given in the table below:

Sl. No	Name of the Program (UG)	Basis of Evaluation	Accreditation Status	Period of validity	Remarks
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
1.	Information Technology	Tier-II June 2015 Document	Accredited	Academic Years 2018-2019 to 2019-2021 i.e. Up to 30-06-2021	Accreditation status granted is valid for the period indicated in Col.5 or till the programs has the approval of the competent authority, whichever is earlier
2.	Computer Science & Engineering		Accredited		
3.	Electronics & Communication Engineering		Accredited		
4.	Electrical & Electronics Engineering		Accredited		
5.	Mechanical Engineering		Accredited		

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 programs have been granted provisional accreditation. **Vidya Jyothi Institute of Technology, Azeez Nagar Gate, Himayat Nagar (V), C.B. Post, Hyderabad- 500075,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 programs as indicated in the above table does not imply that the accreditation has been granted to Vidya Jyothi Institute of Technology, Azeez Nagar Gate, Himayat Nagar (V), C.B. Post, Hyderabad- 500075,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 programs accreditation and not Institution accreditation. If such an instance comes to NBA's notice, this will be viewed seriously.** Complete name of the programs accredited, level of programs 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 programs is subject to change on periodic review, if needed by the NBA. It is desired that the relevant information in respect of accredited programs 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 programs 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 eachof the Report of Chairman of the Visiting Team and Evaluators' Report in respect of the above programs 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 each of Expert Report of the Visiting Team.

Copy to:

1. The Director of Technical Education
5th and 6th Floor, B.R.K.R. Bhawan
Tankbund Road, Saifabad
Hyderabad- 500063

2. The Registrar
Jawaharlal Nehru Technological University, Kukatpally,
Hyderabad- 500085, Telangana

3. Accreditation file

4. Master Accreditation folder of the State

PART A

Evaluator's Visit Report

Undergraduate Engineering Program

Tier-II

Name of the Institution

Vidya Jyothi Institute of Technology, Azeez Nagar Gate, Himayat Nagar (V), C.B.Post, Hyderabad 500075, Telangana

Name of the Program

UG – Mechanical Engineering

Visit Dates

20th to 22nd April, 2018

NATIONAL BOARD OF ACCREDITATION
NBCC Place, East Tower, 4th Floor, BhishamPitamahMarg,
PragatiVihar, New Delhi 110003
Tel: +91 112430620-22; 01124360654; www.nbaind.org

Program Details

Name of the Program			
B. Tech in Mechanical Engineering			
Year of Commencement	**2006**		
Student	**Year**	**Sanctioned Intake**	**Actual Admitted**
	CAY (2016- 2017)	**240+48=288**	**225+53=278**
	CAY m1 (2015- 2016)	**240+48=288**	**217+48=265**
	CAY m2 (2014- 2015)	**240+48=288**	**212+40=252**
	Total Students in the Programme 1st to Final Year	**988**	
	Averaged over three assessment years	**894.6**	
Placement %	**CAY (2016 - 2017)**	**55.5%**	
	CAY m1 (2015 - 2016)	**40.5%**	
	CAY m2 (2014 - 2015)	**57.5%**	
	Averaged over three assessment years	**51.1%**	
Faculty (Attach a Copy of faculty list compared with Time Table)	**Regular**	Professor	02
		Associate professor	04
		Assistant professor	43
	Ad-hoc	Professor	Nil
		Associate professor	Nil
		Assistant professor	Nil
	Contractual	Professor	Nil
		Associate professor	Nil
		Assistant professor	Nil
	Student-Teacher ratio	18.85	
	Visiting/guest faculty (Total Numbers of Hours)	NIL	
Previous accreditation(if any)	**First accreditation**	No. of years accredited for	NA
		With effect from	NA
	Previous accreditation	No. of years accredited for	NA
		With effect from	NA

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

Signature
(Chairperson)

Mechanical Engg

Department/Programme Specific Criteria:

S.no.	Criteria	Max. Marks	Marks Awarded	Remarks
1.	Vision, Mission and Program Educational Objectives	60	35	58.33%
2.	Program Curriculum and Teaching-Learning Processes	120	78	65%
3.	Course Outcomes and Program Outcomes	120	70	58.33%
4.	Students' Performance	150	96	64%
5.	Faculty Information and Contributions	200	116	58%
6.	Facilities and Technical Support	80	52	65%
7.	Continuous Improvement	50	28	56%
	TOTAL	780	475	60.9%

21.4.18

Arshad Noor

Signature
Prof. Arshad Noor Siddiquee
(Program Evaluator 1)

Rajendra Sahu

Signature
Prof. Rajendra Sahu
(Program Evaluator 2)

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

Name of the Institution : Vidya Jyothi Institute of Technology, Azeez Nagar Gate, Himayat Nagar (V), C.B.Post, Hyderabad 500075, Telangana
Name of the ProgramUG-MECHANICAL ENGINEERING

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

S.No.	Sub Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines (Marks)	Marks Awarded: Marks	Marks Awarded: Total	Overall Marks	Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)
1.1.	State the Vision and Mission of the Department and Institute	5	A. Availability of statements of the Departments (1)	1	3.5	3.5	The statements of V&M statements appear not articulated effectively.
			B. Appropriateness/Relevance of the Statements (2)	1.5			
			C. Consistency of the Department statements with the Institute statements (2)	1			
1.2.	State the Program Educational Objectives (PEOs)	5	Program Educational Objectives (3 to 5) (5) Appropriateness	2.5	2.5	2.5	PEOs are articulated like POs
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)	1	6	6	Dissemination and awareness among all stakeholder (students, parents etc.) is poor
			B. Process of dissemination among stakeholders (2)	1.5			
			C. Extent of awareness of Vision, Mission & PEOs among the stakeholder (6)	3.5			
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	14	14	Tenets of process for definition/redefinition not evidenced.
			B. Description of process for defining the PEOs of the program (15)	8			
1.5.	Establish consistency of PEOs with Mission of the Department	15	A. Preparation of a matrix of PEOs and elements of Mission statement (5)	3	9	9	PEOs themselves not articulated effectively, mapping of constitutents of defined PEOs and M statement effectively mapped.
			B. Consistency/justification of co-relation parameters of the above matrix (10)	6			
Total of Criterion 1:		60	Overall Marks for Criterion 1:			35	

Arshad Noor Siddiqui 21/4/18
Signature (Program Evaluator 1)

Rajendra Sahu
Dr. Rajendra Sahu IIITM Gwalior
Signature (Program Evaluator 2)

Criterion 2: Program Curriculum and Teaching – Learning Processes (120)

S.No.	Sub Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines	Marks Awarded: Marks	Marks Awarded: Total	Overall Marks	Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)
2.1.	**Program Curriculum**	20				14	
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)	5	8		currriculam gap identification is not articulated properly and with clarity.
			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	6		content beyond syllabus is not worked out properly
			B. Delivery details of content beyond syllabus (5)	3			
			C. Mapping of content beyond syllabus with the POs & PSOs (3)	2			
2.2.	**Teaching-Learning Processes**	100			65	30	
2.2.1	Describe the Process followed to improve quality of Teaching Learning	25	A. Adherence to Academic Calendar (3)	3	18		The feedback questionaires design ineffective to draw meaningful feedback.
			B. Use of various instructional methods and pedagogical initiatives (3)	2			
			C. Methodologies to support weak students and encourage bright students(4)	3			
			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)	3	12		Evaluation of COs and internal assessment synchronization inadequate
			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			

22.4.18

Signature (Program Evaluator 1)

Rajendra Kumar
Prof Rajendra Kumar
IIITM Gwalior

Signature (Program Evaluator 2)

2.2.3.	Quality of student projects	25	A. Identification of projects and allocation methodology to Faculty (3)	2	17	34	Design and Analysis experience in the projects, in general is inadequate
			B. Types and relevance of the projects and their contribution towards attainment of POs and PSOs(5)	4			
			C. Process for monitoring and evaluation (5)	3			
			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)	1			
2.2.4.	Initiatives related to industry interaction	15	A. Industry supported laboratories (5)	1.5	7	~~34~~ ~~35~~	Institute industry engagement is inadequate. Impact anaylsis is apparently very poor. No industry supported laboratory. Institute's engagment with reputed core industries is poor.
			B. Industry involvement in the program design and partial delivery of any regular courses for students (5)	2.5			
			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)	2	10 ~~10~~ ~~11~~		Only few intership training. Most training is on a paid (by the students) basis. Indutry internship certificates, surprisingly indicate training during college working days.
			B. Industrial /internship /summer training of more than two weeks and post training Assessment (4)	3.5			
			C. Impact analysis of industrial training (4)	2			
			D. Student feedback on initiative (4)	2.5			
Total of Criterion 2:		120	Overall Marks for Criterion 2:			~~76~~ 79 78	

Arshad Noor Siddiqui 21/4/18

Signature (Program Evaluator 1)

Rajendra Sahu
Rajendra Sahu
Prof. IIITM Gwalior

Signature (Program Evaluator 2)

Criterion 3: Course Outcomes and Program Outcomes (120)

S.No.	Sub Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines	Marks Awarded: Marks	Marks Awarded: Total	Overall Marks	Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)
3.1.	**Establish the correlation between the courses and the POs & PSOs**	**20**				12	
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)	3	3		CO and PO matrix not effectively done
3.1.3.	Program level Course-PO/PSOs matrix of ALL courses including first year courses	10	Explanation of tables to be ascertained (10)	6	6		PSOs articulated in an skewed manner and do not cover important specializations of the dsicipline.
3.2.	**Attainment of Course Outcomes**	**50**				30	
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	7		Assessment tools usage is pooly done.
			B. The quality /relevance of assessment processes & tools used (8)	5			
3.2.2.	Record the attainment of Course Outcomes of all courses with respect to set attainment levels	40	Verify the attainment levels as per the benchmark set for all courses (40)	23	23		assesment of level of attainment and benchmarking for CO calculation inappropriately articulated
3.3.	**Attainment of Program Outcomes and Program Specific Outcomes**	**50**				28	
3.3.1.	Describe assessment tools and processes used for assessing the attainment of each of the POs & PSOs	10	A. List of assessment tools & processes (5)	3	6		
			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)	13	22		Direct assesment tool's usage is weak
			B. Overall levels of attainment (16)	9			
Total of Criterion 3:		**120**	**Overall Marks for Criterion 3:**			**70**	

21.4.18

Ahmed Naseem Siddiqui (JMI)

Signature (Program Evaluator 1)

Rajendra Kumar

Prof Rajendra Kumar IIITM, Gwalior

Signature (Program Evaluator 2)

Criterion 4: Students' Performance (150)							
S.No.	Sub Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines	Marks Awarded		Overall Marks	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	20	Average enrolment ratio is 90.83% considering lateral entry intake. (student's performane related data could not be verified from the source document)
4.2.	**Success Rate in the stipulated period of the program**	40				28	
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	15	15		**Average success rate without backlog is 0.593 (student's performane related data could not be verified from the source document)**
4.2.2.	Success rate with backlog in stipulated period (actual duration of the program)	15	SI= (Number of students who graduated from the program with backlog 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	13	13		**Average success rate is 0.91**
4.3.	**Academic Performance in Third Year**	15	Academic Performance = 1.5 * Average API (Academic Performance Index) 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 Third Year/10)) x (successful students/number of students appeared in the examination) Successful students are those who are permitted to proceed to the final year	9	9	9	**Avg API = 6.31**

Arshad Noor Siddiqui
24-4-18
Signature (Program Evaluator 1)

Rajendra Sahu
Prof Rajendra Sahu
IIITM Gwalior
Signature (Program Evaluator 2)

4.4.	Academic Performance in Second Year	15	Academic Performance Level = 1.5 * Average API (Academic Performance Index) 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 student sin Second Year/10)) x (successful students/number of students appeared in the examination)	9	9	9	Avg API = 6.29 as per table. (student's performane related data could not be verified from the source document)
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	20	20	20	AVG placement = 0.51 (Several placements on a package of 1.5L p.a.)
4.6.	**Professional Activities**	20					
4.6.1.	Professional societies/chapters and organizing engineering events	5	A. Availability & activities of professional societies/chapters (3)	1	2		Student chapters of main and core professional society e.g. SAE/ASME missing
			B. Number, quality of engineering events (organized at institute, Level- Institute/State/National/International) (2)	1			
4.6.2.	Publication of technical magazines, newsletters, etc.	5	A. Quality & Relevance of the contents and Print Material (3)	1.5	3	10	Programme student's involvement is missing/negligible.
			B. Participation of Students from the program (2)	1.5			
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)	1.5	5		The participation in the assessment duration is not regular. Participated in one event.
			B. Events outside the state (3)	1.5			
			C. Prizes/awards received in such events (5)	2			
Total of Criterion 4:		150		**Overall Marks for Criterion 4:**		96	

Ashad Noor Siddique
JMI 21.4.18
Signature (Program Evaluator 1)

Rajendra Sahu
Dr Rajendra kumar Sahu
IIITM Gwalior
Signature (Program Evaluator 2)

Criterion 5: Faculty Information and Contributions (200)

S.No.	Sub Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines	Marks Awarded: Marks	Marks Awarded: Total	Overall Marks	Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)
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.	18	18	**18**	SFR = 15.7
5.2.	Faculty Cadre Proportion	25	Cadre Proportion Marks = $\left[\left(\frac{AF1}{RF1}\right) + \left(\frac{AF2}{RF2} \times 0.6\right) + \left(\frac{AF3}{RF3} \times 0.4\right)\right] \times 12.5$ • If AF1 = AF2= 0 then zero marks • Maximum marks to be limited if it exceeds 25 (Refer calculation in SAR)	14	14	**14**	**FCR=13.32**
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)	16	16	**16**	**FQ= 15.61**
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 keeping CAYm2 as base year (20) C. ≥ 60% of required Faculties retained during the period of assessment keeping CAYm2 as base year (15) D. ≥ 50% of required Faculties retained during the period of assessment keeping CAYm2 as base year (10) E. Otherwise (0)	20	20	**20**	Faculty retention is more than 75%

Signature (Program Evaluator 1)

21.4.18

Rajendra Sahu

IIITM Gwalior

Signature (Program Evaluator 2)

5.5.	Innovations by the Faculty in Teaching and Learning	20	A. The work must be made available on Institute Website (4)	2.5	10	10	No product development and innovation is noticed
			B. The work must be available for peer review and critique (4)	1.5			
			C. The work must be reproducible and developed further by other scholars (2)	1.5			
			D. Statement of clear goals, use of appropriate methods, significance of results, effective presentation and reflective critique (10)	4.5			
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	**12**	
5.7.	**Research and Development**	**30**				9	
5.7.1.	Academic Research	10	A. Number of quality publications in refereed/SCI Journals, citations, Books/Book Chapters etc. (6)	3	4		**quality publications few and poor. One Faculty shown as contributing belongs to Pure Physics stream.**
			B. PhD guided /PhD awarded during the assessment period while working in the institute (4)	1			
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	0	0		**No sponsored project. (One Faculty shown as contributing to this belongs to Pure Physics stream.)**
5.7.3	Development Activities	10	A. Product Development B. Research laboratories C. Instructional materials D. Working models/charts/monograms etc.	5	5		**Reseach activity poor**
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 noticable consultancy work**
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)	6	17	**17**	Implementation is not effective
			B. Its implementation and effectiveness (20)	11			
5.9.	**Visiting/Adjunct/Emeritus Faculty etc.**	**10**	Provision of Visiting /Adjunct/Emeritus faculty etc.(1)	0	0	**0**	No formal/proper adjunct faculty
			Minimum **50** hours per year interaction per year to obtain three marks : 3 x 3 = 9	0			
Total of Criterion 5:		**200**	**Overall Marks for Criterion 5:**			**116**	

21.4.18

Signature (Program Evaluator 1)

Signature (Program Evaluator 2)

Criterion 6: Facilities and Technical Support (80)

S.No.	Sub Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines	Marks Awarded		Overall Marks	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)	13	20	20	W/p in poor shape, Labs such as metrology lab/SoM/MMS lab etc. have old equipment. Classrooms (including furniture) appear insufficient to house all students of secion.
			B. Availability of adequate technical supporting staff (5)	3.5			
			C. Availability of qualified technical supporting staff (5)	3.5			
6.2.	Additional Facilities created for improving the quality of learning experience in Laboratories	25	A. Availability and relevance of additional facilities(10)	5	14	14	No new lab equipment created. Some new builtup, however is being created and it is partcially done.
			B. Facilities utilization and effectiveness (10)	6			
			C. Relevance to POs and PSOs (5)	3			
6.3.	Laboratories: Maintenance and overall ambience	10	Maintenance and overall ambience (10)	7	7	7	
6.4.	Project laboratory	5	Facilities & Utilization (5)	4	4	4	
6.5.	Safety measures in laboratories	10	Safety measures in laboratories (10)	7	7	7	safety measures inadequate
Total of Criterion 6:		80	Marks for Criterion 6:			52	

Arshad Noor Siddiquee
JMI
21.9.18
Signature (Program Evaluator 1)

Rajendra Sahu
Rajendra Sahu
Prof. Rajendra Sahu
IIITM, Gwalior
Signature (Program Evaluator 2)

Criterion 7: Continuous Improvement (50)

S.No.	Sub Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines	Marks Awarded: Marks	Marks Awarded: Total	Overall Marks	Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)
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)	2	11	11	Improper tool usage for measurement of PO and PSO. Process/systemic plan for bridging the gap is not observed.
			B. Identification of gaps/shortfalls (5)	2.5			
			C. Plan of action to bridge the gap and its Implementation (10)	6.5			
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	5	Action taken from feedback from academic audit not worked out
7.3.	Improvement in Placement, Higher Studies and Entrepreneurship	10	A. Improvement in Placements (5)	3	5	5	Stagnation/ Severala placements on a packed of about 1.5L per annum
			B. Improvement in Higher Studies (3)	1			
			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 entrance tests, percentage Physics, Chemistry and Mathematics marks in 12th Standard and percentage marks of the lateral entry students	7	7	7	
Total of Criterion 7:		50	Marks for Criterion 7:			28	

Total 475

Ashad Noor Siddiquee
JMI 21.4.18
Signature (Program Evaluator 1)

Rajendrasahu
Rajendra Sahu
Prof IIITM Gwalior
Signature (Program Evaluator 2)

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

Name of the Institution Vidya Jyothi Institute of Technology, Aziz Nagar, Hyderabad, Telangana 500075
Name of the Program: 4. Mechanical Engineering

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 x 15)/ FYSFR (Limited to Max. 5) Average of Assessment years	3.7	3.7	3.7	(5*15/20.2)
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)	3.1	3.1	3.1	(5*7+3*58)/68
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	6.4	6.4	6.4	(6.72+6.36+6.34)/3
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)	2	3		The tools are used to address lower level of ablities
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)	4	4		Records are available
8.5.	Attainment of Program Outcomes of all first year courses	20				11	
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)	3			
			B. Verification of documents validating the above process (10)	6			COs from lab couses are not well defined
8.5.2.	Actions taken based on the results of evaluation of relevant POs /PSOs	5	Appropriate actions taken (5)	2	11		More action is required
Total of Criterion 8:		50	Overall Marks for Criterion 8:			31.2	

Signature of Chairman

28/6/18

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	mentoring system that has been developed for the students require more refinement.
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		6	
			B. Record of corrective measures taken (5)	3	6		
9.3.	Feedback on facilities	5	Feedback collection, analysis and corrective action (5)	3	3	3	
9.4.	Self Learning	5	A. Scope for self-learning (2)	1			
			B. Self Learning facilities, materials for learning beyond syllabus, Webinars, Podcast, MOOCs etc. and demonstrate its effective utilization (3)	2	3	3	
9.5.	Career Guidance, Training, Placement	10	A. Availability of career guidance facilities (2)	1			
			B. Counseling for higher studies (GATE/GRE, GMAT, etc.) (2)	1			
			C. Pre-placement training (3)	2			
			D. Placement process and support (3)	2	6	6	
9.6.	Entrepreneurship Cell	5	A. Entrepreneurship initiatives (1)	1			
			B. Data on students benefitted (4)	2	3	3	
9.7.	Co-curricular and Extra-curricular Activities	10	A. Availability of sports and cultural facilities (3)	1			
			B. NCC, NSS and other clubs (3)	2			
			C. Annual students activities (4)	2	5	5	
Total of Criterion 9:		50	Overall Marks for Criterion 9:			29	

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				26	
10.1.1.	State the Vision and Mission of the Institute	5	A. Availability of the Vision & Mission statements of the Institute (2)	2	4		
			B. Appropriateness/Relevance of the Statements (3)	2			
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)	3	7		
			B. The published service rules, policies and procedures with year of publication (3)	2			
			C. Minutes of the meetings and action-taken reports (3)	2			
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	6		
			B.Specify the mechanism and composition of grievance redressal cell (2)	1			
			C. Action taken report as per 'B' above (7)	4			
10.1.4.	Delegation of financial powers	10	A. Financial powers delegated to the Principal, Heads of Departments and relevant in-charges (3)	2	6		
			B. Demonstrate the utilization of financial powers for each of the assessment years (7)	4			
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)	1	3		
			B. Dissemination of the information about student, faculty and staff (3)	2			
10.2.	**Budget Allocation, Utilization, and Public Accounting at Institute level**	30	Expenditure per student : ______ Fee per student: ______			23	
10.2.1.	Adequacy of Budget allocation	10	A. Quantum of budget allocation for three years (5)	4	8		Budget provison is good for various departments
			B. Justification of budget allocated for three years (5)	4			
10.2.2.	Utilization of allocated funds	15	Budget utilization for three years (15)	10	10		
10.2.3.	Availability of the audited statements on the Institute's website	5	Availability of Audited statements on website (5)	5	5		

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)	4		20	Budget provison is good for department
			B. Justification of budget allocated for three years (5)	4	8		
10.3.2.	Utilization of allocated funds	20	Budget utilization for three years (20)	12	12		
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)	5		15	
			B. Accessibility to students (3)	2	7		
10.4.2.	Internet	10	A. Available bandwidth (4)	3			
			B. Wi Fi availability (2)	2			
			C. Internet access in labs, classrooms, library and offices of all Departments (2)	1			
			D. Security mechanism (2)	2	8		
Total of Criterion 10:		120	Overall Marks for Criterion 10:			84	

144.2

28/6/16