

# राष्ट्रीय प्रत्यायन बोर्ड

चौथा तल, ईस्ट टावर, एन. बी. सी. सी. प्लेस, भीष्म पितामह मार्ग, प्रगति विहार, लोधी रोड, नई दिल्ली -110003

**NATIONAL BOARD OF ACCREDITATION**

4th Floor, East Tower, NBCC Place, Bhasham Pitamah Marg, Pragati Vihar, Lodhi Road, New Delhi 110003



File No. 35-87/2010-NBA

Date 06-10-2022

To  
The Director  
Meerut Institute of Engineering & Technology,  
NH-58, Bypass Road, Baghpat Crossing,  
Meerut- 250 005, Uttar Pradesh

**Subject: Further accreditation status on the basis of Compliance Report of UG-Pharmacy program offered by Meerut Institute of Engineering & Technology, NH-58, Bypass Road, Baghpat Crossing, Meerut- 250 005, Uttar Pradesh.**

Sir,

This is regarding Compliance Report submitted by **Meerut Institute of Engineering & Technology, NH-58, Bypass Road, Baghpat Crossing, Meerut- 250 005, Uttar Pradesh** for the UG-Pharmacy program which was accredited by NBA for academic years 2019-20 to 2021-22 whose validity of accreditation has expired on 30.06.2022.

2. An Expert Team conducted data verification of the program on 7<sup>th</sup> May, 2022. 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 program 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.	Pharmacy	January, 2016 Document	Accredited	Academic Years 2022-2023 to 2024-2025 i.e. upto 30-06-2025	Accreditation status granted is valid for the period indicated in Col.5 or till the program has the approval of the Competent Authority, whichever is earlier

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 program has been granted accreditation for further 3 years. **Meerut Institute of Engineering & Technology, NH-58, Bypass Road, Baghpat Crossing, Meerut- 250 005, Uttar Pradesh** should submit fresh online application under First Cycle SAR January 2016 document through eNBA portal at least five months before the expiry of validity of accreditation mentioned above.


5. The accreditation status awarded to the program as indicated in the above table does not imply that the accreditation has been granted to **Meerut Institute of Engineering & Technology, NH-58, Bypass Road, Baghpat Crossing, Meerut- 250 005, Uttar Pradesh** 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 program accreditation and not Institution accreditation. If such an instance comes to NBA's notice, this will be viewed seriously. Complete name of the program(s) accredited, level of program(s) 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 program is subject to change on periodic review, if needed by the NBA. It is desired that the relevant information in respect of accredited program as indicated in the table in paragraph 2, appears on the website and information bulletin of the Institute.

Contd./...

7. The accreditation status awarded to the program 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 of Report of the Visiting Team in respect of the above program is enclosed.

Yours faithfully,

  
(Dr. Anil Kumar Nassa)  
Member Secretary

**Encls:** 1.Copy of Report of the Visiting Team in respect of the program.

**Copy to:**

1. The Registrar  
APJ Abdul Kalam Technical University,  
Sec-11, Jankipuram, Vistar Yojna,  
Lucknow- 226 031  
Uttar Pradesh
2. Director Technical Education  
Govt. of Uttar Pradesh  
Vikas Nagar, Kanpur- 208 024  
Uttar Pradesh
3. Accreditation File
4. Master Accreditation file of the State.

# NATIONAL BOARD OF ACCREDITATION

NBCC Place, East Tower, 4<sup>th</sup> 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



F. No. 35-87/2010-NBA

Date: 03-02-2020

To  
The Director  
Meerut Institute of Engineering & Technology,  
NH-58, Bypass Road,  
Baghpat Crossing,  
Meerut- 250 005,  
Uttar Pradesh

**Subject: Accreditation status of UG Pharmacy program applied by Meerut Institute of Engineering & Technology, NH-58, Bypass Road, Baghpat Crossing, Meerut- 250 005, Uttar Pradesh.**

Sir,

This has reference to your application Id No. 2923-17/05/2018 seeking accreditation by National Board of Accreditation to the UG Pharmacy program offered by **Meerut Institute of Engineering & Technology, NH-58, Bypass Road, Baghpat Crossing, Meerut- 250 005, Uttar Pradesh.**

2. An Expert Team conducted on-site evaluation of the program from **8<sup>th</sup> to 9<sup>th</sup> November, 2019.** 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 program 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	Pharmacy	January, 2016 Document	Accredited	Academic Years 2019-20 to 2021-22 i.e. upto 30-06-2022	Accreditation status granted is valid for the period indicated in Col.5 or till the program has the approval of the competent authority, whichever is earlier.

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 program has been granted accreditation for three years. **Meerut Institute of Engineering & Technology, NH-58, Bypass Road, Baghpat Crossing, Meerut- 250 005, Uttar Pradesh** 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 visit, as deemed appropriate by NBA Committees.

Contd../-



5. The accreditation status awarded to the program as indicated in the above table does not imply that the accreditation has been granted to **Meerut Institute of Engineering & Technology, NH-58, Bypass Road, Baghpat Crossing, Meerut- 250 005, Uttar Pradesh** as a whole. As such the Institute should nowhere along with its name including on its letter head etc. write that it is accredited by NBA because it is program accreditation and not Institution accreditation. If such an instance comes to NBA's notice, this will be viewed seriously. Complete name of the program(s) accredited, level of program(s) and the period of validity of accreditation, as well as the date 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 program is subject to change on periodic review, if needed by the NBA. It is desired that the relevant information in respect of accredited program as indicated in the Table in paragraph 2, appears on the website and information bulletin of your Institution.
7. The accreditation status awarded to the program 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 each of Report of Chairman of the Visiting Team and Evaluators' report in respect of the above program is 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 of Expert Report of the Visiting Team.

**Copy to:**

1. The Registrar  
Dr. A.P.J. Abdul Kalam Technical University  
Sec-11, Jankipuram Vistar  
Lucknow – 226 031  
Uttar Pradesh
2. The Director Technical Education  
Vikas Nagar  
Kanpur- 208 024  
Uttar Pradesh
3. Master Accreditation Folder of the State
4. Accreditation File



# Chairperson's Visit Report

## Undergraduate Pharmacy Program

### Name of the Institution

MERUT INST. OF ENG. & TECH.

### Name of the Program

B. PHARM.

### Visit Dates

8 & 9 NOV., 2019

**NATIONAL BOARD OF ACCREDITATION**  
NBCC Place, East Tower, 4th Floor, Bhisham Pitamah Marg, Pragati  
Vihar, New Delhi 110003  
Tel: +91 112430620-22; 01124360654; [www.nbaind.org](http://www.nbaind.org)

**Team composition**

Name of the Chairperson: A. N. MISRA

Designation: PROFESSOR & UGC BSR FACULTY FELLOW.

Program Name:

Program evaluator 1	Name	<u>PROF. V. B. KISHIEN</u>
	Organization:	<u>JAKATIYA UNIV., WARANGAL</u>

Program evaluator 2	Name	<u>DR. P. D. CHAUDHARY</u>
	Organization:	<u>MODERN COLLEGE OF PHARMACY PUNE.</u>

## Institute Details

1. Year of Establishment: 2000
2. Physical Infrastructure and Ambience: SATISFACTORY
3. Number of programs being run in the Institute\*:  
(i) UG- ONE  
(ii) PG- THREE
4. Total Number of Students:  
(i) In UG programs - 240 (+18 by lateral entry)  
(ii) In PG programs - 2018-19-60 , 2017-18 } 108  
2016-17 }
5. Name of programs applied for accreditation  
(i) B.P.I.A.M.  
(ii) \_\_\_\_\_  
(iii) \_\_\_\_\_  
(iv) \_\_\_\_\_  
(v) \_\_\_\_\_

\*to be verified from SAR



## **Information for Evaluation**

### **Award of Accreditation (UG Pharmacy Programs)**

#### **1. Accreditation for Six years will be accorded to a program on fulfilment of the following requirements:**

- i. Program should score a minimum of 750 points in aggregate out of 1000 points with at least 60% in each criterion
- ii. The admissions in the undergraduate programs under consideration should be greater than or equal to 75%, averaged over three academic years i.e. Current Academic Year (CAY), Current Academic Year Minus One (CAYM1) and Current Academic Year Minus Two (CAYM2).
- iii. Faculty Student Ratio in the department of the program under consideration should be less than or equal to 1:15, averaged over three academic years i.e. Current Academic Year (CAY), Current Academic Year Minus One (CAYM1) and Current Academic Year Minus Two (CAYM2).
- iv. At least one Professor and one Associate Professor on regular basis should be available in the respective Department for two academic years i.e. Current Academic Year (CAY) and Current Academic Year Minus One (CAYM1).
- v. The placement, Higher Studies and Entrepreneurship ratio should be greater than or equal to 40%, averaged over three academic years i.e. Current Academic Year Minus One (CAYM1), Current Academic Year Minus Two (CAYM2) and Current Academic Year Minus Three (CAYM3).
- vi. HOD of the program under consideration possesses Ph.D. degree in the Current Academic Year (CAY).
- vii. Number of Ph.D. available in the department should be greater than or equal to 30% (including the director) of the required number of faculty, averaged over two academic years i.e. Current Academic Year (CAY) and Current Academic Year Minus One (CAYM1).

#### **2. Accreditation for Three years will be accorded to a program on fulfilment of the following requirements:**

- i. Program should score a minimum of 600 points in aggregate and at least 40% marks in Faculty Information and Contributions (Criterion V).
- ii. The admissions in the undergraduate programs under consideration should be greater than or equal to 50%, averaged over three academic years i.e. Current Academic Year (CAY), Current Academic Year Minus One (CAYM1) and Current Academic Year Minus Two (CAYM2).

- iii. Faculty Student Ratio in the department of the program under consideration should be less than or equal to 1:20, averaged over three academic years i.e. Current Academic Year (CAY), Current Academic Year Minus One (CAYM1) and Current Academic Year Minus Two (CAYM2).
- iv. At least one Professor or one Associate Professor should be available in the respective Department for two academic years i.e. Current Academic Year (CAY) and Current Academic Year Minus One (CAYM1).
- v. The placement, Higher Studies and Entrepreneurship ratio should be greater than or equal to 40%, averaged over three academic years i.e. Current Academic Year Minus One (CAYm1), Current Academic Year Minus Two (CAYM2) and Current Academic Year Minus Three (CAYM3).
- vi. HOD of the program under consideration possesses Ph.D. degree in the Current Academic Year (CAY).
- vii. Number of Ph.D. available in the department should be greater than or equal to 20% of the required number of faculty, averaged over two academic years i.e. Current Academic Year (CAY) and Current Academic Year Minus One (CAYM1).

### **3. No Accreditation of the program**

If the program fails to meet the criteria for award of accreditation for three years, it is awarded "Not Accredited" Status

## Overall Observations

1.

S. No.	Name of the Program	Intake			Admissions	Student-Faculty Ratio
		CAY	CAYm1	CAYm2	Average of CAY, CAYm1 and CAYm2	Average of CAY, CAYm1 and CAYm2
1.	B-pharm	234	236	240	236.66	16.19 (Avg.)
2.	M-pharm	60	108	108	92	(2018-19: 14.54)
3.						(2017-18: 17.42)
						(2016-17: 16.63)

- Also, see the evaluator's report for the above parameters and if you disagree with the same, kindly give your comment.

2. About the progress since last accreditation (to be filled for institutes who have applied for programs which has got accreditation in previous cycle.)

Not applicable

Kindly mention the changes made as recommended by NBA, since the previous visit.

3. Observation on general facilities and about the programs.

Kindly mention general observations about facilities like labs, library etc. and a general review about the programs.

- Academic Ambience
- Student Support Systems
- Strengths, Weaknesses, Suggestions

Satisfactory

Good

1) Results are good in terms of with & without backlogs. 2) Rest of needs improvement

4. Status of imbibing of outcome-based accreditation. For Example:

- Formulation of PEOs, COs and mappings carried out and implemented
- Methodology for assessing the attainment of outcomes
- Continual improvement process status
- Stakeholders (especially the faculty, HOD, students etc.) awareness about the process

needs improvement

1) Stakeholders are not fully aware  
2) Board of Governance need to approve it.

A N Min

Signature of the Chairperson



**Guidelines for Faculty Norms and Faculty Student Ratio**

**1. Faculty Norms:**

- a. In case of regular faculty, the faculty to be counted in the respective year, if the faculty has joined on or before 31st August of the same year and has continued at least till 30th April of the next year.
- b. Minimum 75% should be Regular faculty and the remaining shall be Contractual faculty as per AICTE norms and standards. The contractual faculty (doing away with the terminology of visiting/adjunct faculty, whatsoever) who have taught for 2 consecutive semesters in the corresponding academic year on full time basis shall be considered for the purpose of calculation in the Faculty Student Ratio.
- c. The PhD faculty count requirement shall be calculated on the pro-rata basis – with at least 75% to be part of the regular faculty, and the remaining being part of the contractual\* faculty, if any.  
\*(Only those who have taught for consecutive 2 semesters on full time basis)
- d. The available and required number of PhD. in the department would be calculated on the average basis for CAY and CAYm1.
- e. The available and required number of PhD. in the department shall be truncated to its nearest lower integer.
- f. If a member of regular or contractual faculty is designated as lecturer, even though holding an M. Tech degree, the same will not be counted against the faculty requirements.
- g. In the multidisciplinary areas (like MBA or PGDM) or specialized areas like Biotechnology, all the qualifications relevant and purposeful to those disciplines need to be considered, in addition to the M. Tech/MBA/PGDM degrees.
- h. There is no age limit for consideration of the emeritus faculty as long as they are physically fit to take classes and engage with students, and are employed on a full time basis.
- i. Academic year is considered from July to June.
- j. If the SAR is submitted before 30<sup>th</sup> September, then the CAY shall be the previous academic year and if the SAR is submitted after 30<sup>th</sup> September, then the CAY shall be the running academic year for the purpose of data consideration and calculations.

**CAY: Current Academic Year**

**CAYm1: Current Academic Year minus 1 = Current Assessment Year**

**CAYm2: Current Academic Year minus 2 = Current Assessment Year minus 1**

**The year mentioned in the documents is exemplary; Institute has to consider the academic years as per the definition of CAY given in the document and according to the prevailing year.**

**2. The Student Faculty Ratio considered by NBA:**

1. **UG Engineering Programs (Tier I & Tier II):-** 25:1 for the Accreditation of 3 years and 15:1 for the Accreditation of 6 years.
2. **PG Engineering Programs:** 25:1 for the Accreditation of 3 years.
3. **Diploma Engineering Programs:** 30:1 for the Accreditation of 3 years
4. **PG Management Programs:** 25:1 for the Accreditation of 3 years and 15:1 for the Accreditation of 6 years.
5. **UG Pharmacy:** 20:1 for the Accreditation of 3 years and 15:1 for the Accreditation of 6 years.

**PART A**



# Evaluator's Visit Report

## Undergraduate Pharmacy Program

### Name of the Institution

Meerut Institute of Engineering & Technology  
NH-58, Bypass Road, Meerut - 250005.

### Name of the Program

UG Pharmacy Program (B.Pharm)

### Visit Dates

8<sup>th</sup> & 9<sup>th</sup> Nov. 2018

**NATIONAL BOARD OF ACCREDITATION**  
NBCC Place, East Tower, 4th Floor, Bhisham Pitamah Marg,  
Pragati Vihar, New Delhi 110003  
Tel: +91 112430620-22; 01124360654; www.nbaind.org



# Program Evaluator Summary

## Overview

The Expert team of National Board of Accreditation (NBA) conducted a two day accreditation visit from 8<sup>th</sup> to 9<sup>th</sup> November 2019 (Uk-pharmacy) to evaluate UG Pharmacy program at Meerut Institute of Engg. & Tech., Uttar Pradesh

Pre visit meeting of the expert team was held on 08/11/19 at Hotel 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 Prof. S.K. Gupta. The briefing on the institution was given by Prof. S.K. Gupta and on the program was given by the Prof. S.K. Gupta + Prof. Arora. 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Employers	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Parents	<input checked="" 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)

- overall findings :- Results are good.  
:- Research related contributions are weak & needs improvement.  
:- Infrastructure are good.  
:- few equipments needs to be equipped.  
:- Admissions are good. (100%).  
:- extra curricular activities are good.

D N Min  
9/11/2019

62  
9/11/2019

adw  
9.11.19

**Program Details**

Name of the Program					
Ua Pharmacy					
Year of Commencement	2000				
Student	Year	Sanctioned Intake	Actual Admitted		
	CAY (2018-2019)	240 + 18 (intercol entry)	234		
	CAY m1 (2017-2018)	240 + 18 "	236		
	CAY m2 (2016-2017)	240 + 18 (" )	240		
	Average over three academic years i.e. CAY, CAYm1 and CAYm2	Avg: 258	Avg: 236-60		
	Total Students in the Programme (1 <sup>st</sup> to Final Year)	2018-19 :- 234 + 60 2017-18 :- 236 + 108 2016-17 :- 240 + 108			
[Placement + Higher studies + Entrepreneurship] %	CAYm1 (2018-2019)	81%			
	CAY m2 (2017-2018)	82%			
	CAY m3 (2016-2017)	83%			
	Averaged over three academic years i.e. CAYm1, CAYm2 and CAYm3	82%			
Faculty (Attach a Copy of faculty list compared with time table)	Regular	Professor	CAY	CAYm1	CAYm2
		Associate professor	3	3	3
		Assistant professor	6	4	4
	Contractual	Professor	13	14	17
		Associate professor			
		Assistant professor			
	No. of PhD. available in the dept.		9	6	7
	Student - Faculty ratio (averaged over three academic years i.e. CAY, CAYm1 and CAYm2)		2018-19 : 14.54 2017-18 : 17.42 2016-17 : 16.63 Avg: 16-19		
Previous accreditation (if any)	✓ First accreditation	No. of years accredited for			
		With effect from			
	Previous accreditation	No. of years accredited for			
		With effect from			

CAY: Current Academic Year

CAYm1: Current Academic Year minus 1= Current Assessment year

CAYm2: Current Academic Year minus 2= Current Assessment year minus 1

**Note:** Minimum 75% should be Regular faculty and the remaining shall be Contractual Faculty as per AICTE norms and standards.

The contractual faculty (doing away with the terminology of visiting/adjunct faculty, whatsoever) who have taught for 2 consecutive semesters in the corresponding academic year on full time basis shall be considered for the purpose of calculation in the Student Faculty Ratio.

A.N.Mm  
9/11/2019

62  
9/10/2019

AMW  
9-11-19<sup>3</sup>



## Explicit observations about the program

(Please use additional sheets if necessary to elaborate)

Program title UG pharmacy

### Strengths:

1. Admissions in the college are satisfactory (around 1507.)
  2. Results of B.Pharm students are praiseworthy in terms of with & without backlog.
  3. The ambience of the college is good in terms of support facilities and college infrastructure.
  4. The extra curricular activities in the college are good and praiseworthy.
  5. No. of faculties with PhD qualification are in good numbers & their support in lifting Aq. of the institution is praiseworthy as expressed by the students
- Weakness/Areas of improvement:

1. The results of students in competitive examinations like UPAT, UATE, UPSC, etc. Needs improvement.
2. The institute must encourage the teachers in research in terms of publication & obtaining funding.
3. First<sup>time</sup> entrepreneurs are not existant and the area which needs strengthening.
4. Patent filing, more no. of equipments etc needs attention by the management.
5. Transparency in administration in terms of creation of budget & other rules of governance need to be improved.

ANM  
9/11/2019

62  
9/11/2019

ohw  
9/11/19



**Deficiencies:**

1. Few equipments such as HPLC, UV spectro <sup>equipped</sup> photometer, dissolution apparatus etc. should be
2. Results in terms of competitive exams needs attention,
3. Project Collaboration with industries need to be focused,
4. Research components in terms of publications, patents + funding are areas.
5. The courses other than the syllabus needs proper identification + should be imported in more  
judicious manner.

**Other Observations, if any:**

1. \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
2. \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
3. \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
4. \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
5. \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

A N Min  
9/11/2019

GS  
9/11/2019

AMW  
9.11.19<sub>5</sub>

## **Information for Evaluation**

### **Award of Accreditation (UG Pharmacy Programs)**

#### **1. Accreditation for Six years will be accorded to a program on fulfilment of the following requirements:**

- i. Program should score a minimum of 750 points in aggregate out of 1000 points with at least 60% in each criterion
- ii. The admissions in the undergraduate programs under consideration should be greater than or equal to 75%, averaged over three academic years i.e. Current Academic Year (CAY), Current Academic Year Minus One (CAYM1) and Current Academic Year Minus Two (CAYM2).
- iii. Faculty Student Ratio in the department of the program under consideration should be less than or equal to 1:15, averaged over three academic years i.e. Current Academic Year (CAY), Current Academic Year Minus One (CAYM1) and Current Academic Year Minus Two (CAYM2).
- iv. At least one Professor and one Associate Professor on regular basis should be available in the respective Department for two academic years i.e. Current Academic Year (CAY) and Current Academic Year Minus One (CAYM1).
- v. The placement, Higher Studies and Entrepreneurship ratio should be greater than or equal to 40%, averaged over three academic years i.e. Current Academic Year Minus One (CAYm1), Current Academic Year Minus Two (CAYM2) and Current Academic Year Minus Three (CAYM3).
- vi. HOD of the program under consideration possesses Ph.D. degree in the Current Academic Year (CAY).
- vii. Number of Ph.D. available in the department should be greater than or equal to 30% (including the director) of the required number of faculty, averaged over two academic years i.e. Current Academic Year (CAY) and Current Academic Year Minus One (CAYM1).

#### **2. Accreditation for Three years will be accorded to a program on fulfilment of the following requirements:**

- i. Program should score a minimum of 600 points in aggregate and at least 40% marks in Faculty Information and Contributions (Criterion V).
- ii. The admissions in the undergraduate programs under consideration should be greater than or equal to 50%, averaged over three academic years i.e. Current Academic Year (CAY), Current Academic Year Minus One (CAYM1) and Current Academic Year Minus Two (CAYM2).

- iii. Faculty Student Ratio in the department of the program under consideration should be less than or equal to 1:20, averaged over three academic years i.e. Current Academic Year (CAY), Current Academic Year Minus One (CAYM1) and Current Academic Year Minus Two (CAYM2).
- iv. At least one Professor or one Associate Professor should be available in the respective Department for two academic years i.e. Current Academic Year (CAY) and Current Academic Year Minus One (CAYM1).
- v. The placement, Higher Studies and Entrepreneurship ratio should be greater than or equal to 40%, averaged over three academic years i.e. Current Academic Year Minus One (CAYm1), Current Academic Year Minus Two (CAYM2) and Current Academic Year Minus Three (CAYM3).
- vi. HOD of the program under consideration possesses Ph.D. degree in the Current Academic Year (CAY).
- vii. Number of Ph.D. available in the department should be greater than or equal to 20% of the required number of faculty, averaged over two academic years i.e. Current Academic Year (CAY) and Current Academic Year Minus One (CAYM1).

### **3. No Accreditation of the program**

If the program fails to meet the criteria for award of accreditation for three years, it is awarded "Not Accredited" Status



Name of the Program: UG Pharmacy

**A. Program Specific Criteria:**

S. No.	Criteria	Max. Marks	Marks Awarded	Remarks
1.	Vision, Mission and Program Educational Objectives	50	32.5	good,
2.	Program Curriculum and Teaching - Learning Processes	150	95.5	good.
3.	Course Outcomes and Program Outcomes	100	65.0	good
4.	Students' Performance	180	132.69	good
5.	Faculty Information and Contributions	175	114.62	good
6.	Facilities	120	91.0	good.
7.	Continuous Improvement	75	45.0	good but needs improvement
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>850</b>	<b>576.31</b>	<b>good</b>

**B. Institute Level Criteria:**

S. No.	Criteria	Max. Marks	Marks Awarded	Remarks
8.	Student Support Systems	50	31.0	good.
9.	Governance, Institutional Support and Financial Resources	100	57.0	Satisfactory
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>150</b>	<b>88.0</b>	<b>good (needs improvement)</b>
<b>GRAND TOTAL (A + B)</b>		<b>1000</b>	<b>664.31</b>	

A N Min  
9/11/2019  
 Signature  
 (Chairman)

602  
9/11/2019  
 Signature  
 (Program Evaluator 1)

[Signature]  
9.11.19  
 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

*D. N. Mmm*  
*9/11/2019*

Signature  
(Chairperson)

**Guidelines for Faculty Norms and Faculty Student Ratio**

**1. Faculty Norms:**

- a. In case of regular faculty, the faculty to be counted in the respective year, if the faculty has joined on or before 31st August of the same year and has continued at least till 30th April of the next year.
- b. Minimum 75% should be Regular faculty and the remaining shall be Contractual faculty as per AICTE norms and standards. The contractual faculty (doing away with the terminology of visiting/adjunct faculty, whatsoever) who have taught for 2 consecutive semesters in the corresponding academic year on full time basis shall be considered for the purpose of calculation in the Faculty Student Ratio.
- c. The PhD faculty count requirement shall be calculated on the pro-rata basis – with at least 75% to be part of the regular faculty, and the remaining being part of the contractual\* faculty, if any.  
\*(Only those who have taught for consecutive 2 semesters on full time basis)
- d. The available and required number of PhD. in the department would be calculated on the average basis for CAY and CAYm1.
- e. The available and required number of PhD. in the department shall be truncated to its nearest lower integer.
- f. If a member of regular or contractual faculty is designated as lecturer, even though holding an M. Tech degree, the same will not be counted against the faculty requirements.
- g. In the multidisciplinary areas (like MBA or PGDM) or specialized areas like Biotechnology, all the qualifications relevant and purposeful to those disciplines need to be considered, in addition to the M. Tech/MBA/PGDM degrees.
- h. There is no age limit for consideration of the emeritus faculty as long as they are physically fit to take classes and engage with students, and are employed on a full time basis.
- i. Academic year is considered from July to June.
- j. If the SAR is submitted before 30<sup>th</sup> September, then the CAY shall be the previous academic year and if the SAR is submitted after 30<sup>th</sup> September, then the CAY shall be the running academic year for the purpose of data consideration and calculations.

**CAY: Current Academic Year**

**CAYm1: Current Academic Year minus 1 = Current Assessment Year**

**CAYm2: Current Academic Year minus 2 = Current Assessment Year minus 1**

The year mentioned in the documents is exemplary; Institute has to consider the academic years as per the definition of CAY given in the document and according to the prevailing year.



**2. The Student Faculty Ratio considered by NBA:**

1. **UG Engineering Programs (Tier I & Tier II):-** 25:1 for the Accreditation of 3 years and 15:1 for the Accreditation of 6 years.
2. **PG Engineering Programs:** 25:1 for the Accreditation of 3 years.
3. **Diploma Engineering Programs:** 30:1 for the Accreditation of 3 years
4. **PG Management Programs:** 25:1 for the Accreditation of 3 years and 15:1 for the Accreditation of 6 years.
5. **UG Pharmacy:** 20:1 for the Accreditation of 3 years and 15:1 for the Accreditation of 6 years.

## Part 3-Program Assessment Worksheet

Name of the Institution Meerut Institute of Engineering and Technology, Meerut - 250005 UP  
 Name of the Program B. Pharm.

Criterion 1: Vision, Mission and Program Educational Objectives (50)		S.No.	Sub Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines (Marks)		Marks Awarded		Overall Marks	Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)
A. Availability of statements (2)	B. Appropriateness/Relevance of the Statements (3)				Marks	Total				
1.1.	State the Vision and Mission	5		1.0	1.5	2.5		Overall Marks for 1.1	Satisfactory	
1.2.	State the Program Educational Objectives (PEOs)	5		3		3		Overall Marks for 1.2	Good.	
1.3.	Indicate where and how the Vision, Mission and PEOs are published and disseminated among stakeholders	15		3	3	6	12	Overall Marks for 1.3	Very good.	
1.4.	State the process for defining the Vision and Mission and PEOs	10		3	3	6		Overall Marks for 1.4	Define satisfactory	
1.5.	Establish consistency of PEOs with Mission of the Institute	15		3	6	9		Overall Marks for 1.5	Good.	
Total of Criterion 1:		50		Overall Marks for Criterion 1:		32.5			Good.	

6/2 9/11/2019

  
 9/11/2019  
 Dr. P.D. Chaudhary

  
 9/11/2019  
 Prof. V. Kishor

Criterion 2: Program Curriculum and Teaching – Learning Processes (150)

S.No.	Sub Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines	Marks Awarded		Overall Marks	Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)
				Marks	Total		
2.1.	Program Curriculum	40					
	Delivery of Syllabus Contents and compliance of the curriculum for attainment of POs	10	A. Process used to identify extent of compliance of University curriculum for attaining POs (6) B. List the curricular gaps for the attainment of defined POs (4)	5 3	8		Good. - Needs improvement in the attainment of POS.
2.1.1.	State the delivery details of the content beyond the syllabus for the attainment of POs	20	A. Steps taken to get identified gaps included in the curriculum (letter to university/BOS) (4) B. Delivery details of content beyond syllabus (10) C. Mapping of content beyond syllabus with the POs (6)	2 5 3	10	Overall Marks for 2.1 26.0	
2.1.2.	Adherence to Academic Calendar	10	Demonstrated notified academic calendar & its adherence (10)	8	8		
2.2.	Teaching-Learning Processes	110					
2.2.1	Initiatives in teaching and learning process	25	A. Use of various instructional methods and pedagogical initiatives (4) B. Methodologies to support weak students and encourage bright students(4) C. Quality of classroom teaching (Observation in a Class) (4) D. Conduct of experiments (Observation in Lab )(4) E. Continuous Assessment in the laboratory (3) F. Student feedback on teaching learning process and actions taken (6)	3 3 3 3 3 5	20		Good
2.2.2.	Quality of internal semester Question papers, assignments and Evaluation	10	A. Process for internal semester question paper setting, evaluation and effective process implementation (2) B. Process to ensure questions from outcomes/learning levels perspective (2) C. Evidence of COs coverage in class test / mid-term tests (3) D. Quality of Assignment and its relevance to COs (3) A. Identification of projects and allocation methodology (2) B. Types and relevance of the projects and their contribution towards attainment of POs (3) C. Process for monitoring and evaluation (3) D. Process to assess individual and team performance (2)	2 2 2 2 2 2 3 1	8	69.5	Very good.
2.2.3.	Quality of student projects	15				Overall Marks for 2.2	Good.

*[Signature]*  
19.11.19

*[Signature]*  
19.11.2019

*[Signature]*  
Signature of Chairperson

Signature of Evaluator



					1.5	9.5	
					0		
					0		
					6	6.0	Needs to be improved.
2.2.4.	Initiatives related to industry interaction and/or Hospital interaction	20			2		Good.
2.2.5.	Initiatives related to skill development programs/industry internship/summer training	10			3	7.0	Good.
2.2.6.	Continuous Evaluation Process	10			2		Good.
2.2.7.	Quality of Experiments	20			7	7.0	Good.
Total of Criterion 2:		150			12	12	Good.
					Overall Marks for Criterion 2:		95.5

*[Signature]*  
09.11.19

*[Signature]*  
09/11/19

*[Signature]*  
Signature of Chairperson

Signature of Evaluator

Criterion 3: Course Outcomes and Program Outcomes (100)

S.No.	Sub Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines	Marks Awarded		Overall Marks	Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)
				Marks	Total		
3.1.	Establish the correlation between the courses and the POs	20					
3.1.1.	Course Outcomes	5	Evidence of COs being defined for every course (5)	4	4	Overall Marks for 3.1	good
3.1.2.	CO-PO matrices of courses selected in 3.1.1 (Four matrices)	5	Explanation of table to be ascertained (5)	3	3	12	satisfactory
3.1.3.	Course-PO matrix of courses for all years of study (Four years)	10	Explanation of tables to be ascertained (10)	5	5		satisfactory
3.2.	Attainment of Course Outcomes	40					
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	Overall Marks for 3.2	good
			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	30	Verify the attainment levels as per the attainment levels set for all courses (30)	21	21	28	good.
3.3.	Attainment of Program Outcomes	40					
3.3.1.	Describe assessment tools and processes used for assessing the attainment of each of the POs	10	A. List of assessment tools & processes (3)	2	7	Overall Marks for 3.3	good
			B. The quality/relevance of assessment tools/processes used (7)	5			
3.3.2.	Provide results of evaluation of each PO	30	A. Verification of documents, results and level of attainment of each PC (20)	12	18	25	very good.
			B. Overall levels of attainment (10)	6			
Total of Criterion 3:				Overall Marks for Criterion 3:		65.0	good.

*Signature of Chairperson*  
 9/11/2019

*Signature of Evaluator*  
 9/11/2019

*Signature of Evaluator*  
 9/11/2019



Criterion 4: Students' Performance (180)

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	<p>A. <math>\geq 90\%</math> students enrolled at the First Year Level on average basis during the previous three academic years starting from current academic year(20)</p> <p>B. <math>\geq 80\%</math> students enrolled at the First Year Level on average basis during the previous three academic years starting from current academic year(18)</p> <p>C. <math>\geq 70\%</math> students enrolled at the First Year Level on average basis during the previous three academic years starting from current academic year(16)</p> <p>D. <math>\geq 60\%</math> students enrolled at the First Year Level on average basis during the previous three academic years starting from current academic year(12)</p> <p>E. <math>\geq 50\%</math> students enrolled at the First Year Level on average basis during the previous three academic years starting from current academic year(08)</p> <p>E. Otherwise '0'.</p>	20	20	Overall Marks for 4.1 20.0	Excellent.
4.2.	Success Rate in the stipulated period of the program	50					
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	30	<p>SI= (Number of students who graduated from the program without backlog)/ {(Number of students admitted in the first year of that batch) plus (actual lateral entry students admitted in second year of study)}</p> <p>Average SI = Mean of success index (SI) for past three batches</p> <p>Success rate without backlogs in any year of study = <math>30 \times</math> Average SI</p>	16.8	16.8	16.8	<p>Average SI = 0.56 Success rate = <math>30 \times 0.56</math> Success Rate = 16.8 Mention Numbers Good</p>
4.2.2.	Success rate in stipulated period (actual duration of the program) [Total of with backlog + without backlog]	20	<p>SI= (Number of students who graduated from the program in the stipulated period of program)/ {(Number of students admitted in the first year of that batch) plus (actual lateral entry students admitted in second year of study)}</p> <p>Average SI = mean of success index (SI) for past three batches</p> <p>Success rate = <math>20 \times</math> Average SI</p> <p>Note: if 100% students clear without any backlog then total marks scored will be 50 as both 4.2.1 &amp; 4.2.2 will be applicable simultaneously</p>	17.4	17.4	Overall Marks for 4.2 17.4	<p>Average SI = 0.87 Success rate = <math>20 \times 0.87</math> Success rate = 17.4 Mention Numbers Very good.</p>

Signature of Chairperson  
Date: 11/11/19



Academic Performance in Final Year	10	<p>Academic Performance = Average API</p> <p>Academic Performance Index (API) = ((Mean of Final 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 Final Year/10)) x (successful students/number of students appeared in the examination)</p>	6.05	6.05	Overall Marks for 4.3 6.05	Academic performance = 4.88 + 6.59 + 6.68 / 3 = 6.6 Mention Numbers Good.
4.4. Academic Performance in Third Year	10	<p>Academic Performance = Average API</p> <p>Academic Performance Index = ((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)</p> <p>Successful students are those who are permitted to proceed to the final year</p>	6.84	6.84	Overall Mark for 4.4 6.84	Academic performance = 6.63 + 6.94 + 6.96 / 3 = 6.84 Mention Numbers Good.
4.5. Academic Performance in Second Year	10	<p>Academic Performance = Average API</p> <p>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 students in Second Year/10)) x (successful students/number of students appeared in the examination)</p> <p>Successful students are those who are permitted to proceed to the third year</p>	7.05	7.05	Overall Marks for 4.5 7.05	Academic performance = 7.06 + 6.99 + 7.11 / 3 = 7.05 Mention Numbers Good.
4.6. Academic Performance in First Year	20	<p>Academic Performance = 2.0 * Average API</p> <p>Academic Performance Index (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 first Year/ 10)) x (successful students/number of students appeared in the examination)</p> <p>Successful students are those who are permitted to proceed to the second year</p>	13.78	13.78	Overall Marks for 4.6 13.78	Academic performance = 6.79 + 7.03 + 6.92 / 3 = 6.89 Mention Numbers API = 2 * 6.89 = 13.78 Satisfactory.

A. N. Min  
9/11/2015  
Signature of Chairperson

6/10/2015  
Signature of Evaluation

Signature  
1.1.19

4.7.	Placement, Higher studies and Entrepreneurship	40	Assessment points = $40 \times$ average of three years of (x + y)/N, where, x = Number of students placed in Industries/ Hospitals/ Government sector through on/off campus recruitment or opted for Entrepreneurship y = No. of students admitted to higher studies with valid scores in various Govt. Approved/Recognized qualifying exams N = Total number of final year students	32.8	32.8	Overall Marks for 4.7	4.7	Average of placement Index = $0.81 + 0.82 + 0.82$ T = $\frac{0.82}{3}$ Mention Numbers Assesment = $40 \times 0.82$ = 32.8 CROOD.
4.8.	Professional Activities	20						
4.8.1.	Professional societies/chapters and organizing pharmacy events	5	A. Availability & activities of professional societies/chapters (2) B. Number, quality of pharmacy related events (organized at institute) (3)	1 2	3			
4.8.2.	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)	2 1	3			CROOD.
4.8.3.	Participation in inter-institute events by students	10	A. Events within the state (1) B. Events outside the state (2) C. Prizes/awards received in such events (7)	1 0 5	6			
Total of criterion 4:		180				Overall Marks for Criterion 4: <del>132.72</del>	132.72	CROOD.

*Signature*  
9.11.19

*Signature*  
9/11/2019

Signature of Chairperson

Signature of Chairperson



Criterion 5: Faculty Information and Contributions (175)

S.No.	Sub Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines	Marks Awarded		Overall Marks	Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)
				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. Marks distribution is given as below:</p> <p>15.00 - 15.50 - 20 marks                      15.51 - 16.50 - 18 marks                      16.51 - 17.50 - 16 marks                      17.51 - 18.50 - 14 marks                      18.51 - 19.50 - 12 marks                      19.51 - 20.00 - 10 marks</p> <p><b>Note: Minimum 75% should be Regular faculty and the remaining shall be Contractual Faculty as per AICTE norms and standards.</b></p> <p>The contractual faculty (going away with the terminology of visiting/adjunct faculty, whatsoever) who have taught for 2 consecutive semesters in the corresponding academic year on full time basis shall be considered for the purpose of calculation in the Student Faculty Ratio.</p>	18	18	Overall Marks for 5.1 18	SFR = 15.75  very good.
5.2.	Faculty Cadre Proportion	20	<p>Cadre Proportion Marks =</p> $\left[ \frac{AF1}{RF1} + \frac{AF2 \times 0.6}{RF2} + \frac{AF3 \times 0.4 \times 10}{RF3} \right]$ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If AF1 = AF2 = 0 then zero marks</li> <li>Maximum marks to be limited if it exceeds 20 (Refer calculation in SAR)</li> </ul> <p>FQ = 2 x [(10X + 4Y)/F] where                      X is no. of faculty with Ph.D., Y is no. of faculty with M.Pharm., 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>	16.29	16.29	Overall Marks for 5.2 16.29	$\left[ \frac{3.0}{2.53} + \left( \frac{4.67}{5.06} \times 0.6 \right) + \left( \frac{14.6}{15.17} \times 10 \right) \right]$ <p>Mention numbers = 16.29 Good</p>
5.3.	Faculty Qualification	20	<p>A. ≥ 90% of required Faculties retained during the period of assessment keeping CAYm2 as base year (20)                      B. ≥ 75% of required Faculties retained during the period of assessment keeping CAYm2 as base year (16)</p>	16.33	16.33	Overall Marks for 5.3 16.33	$FQ = 2 \times [16 \times 40 / F]$ <p>Mention numbers Average = <math>\frac{17.75 + 15.0 + 16.25}{3}</math> = 16.33</p>
						Overall	

Signature of Chairperson  
 16/06/2017

Signature of Chairperson  
 16/06/2017



of assessment	of assessment	of assessment	of assessment	of assessment	of assessment	of assessment	of assessment	of assessment	of assessment
5.5.	Innovations by the Faculty in Teaching and Learning	15	8	8	8	8	8	8	Mention numbers Faculty retention = 52.63% - Needs improvement - Poor - Needs improvement
5.6	Faculty as participants in Faculty development /training activities	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	Excellent. Mention numbers
5.7.	Research and Development	40	4	3	7	7	7	7	very good
5.7.1.	Academic Research	10	4	3	7	7	7	7	excellent. Mention numbers
5.7.2	Sponsored Research (By DST, DBT, ICMR, AICTC, etc.)	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	

D. N. Min  
9/11/2019

9/11/2019  
D. N. Min

D. N. Min  
9/11/19

Signature of Chairperson

Signature of Evaluator1

5.7.3.	Consultancy (From Industry)	10	Consultancy; Cumulative for CAYm1, CAYm2 and CAYm3): Amount > 25 Lacs - 10 Marks Amount >= 22 Lacs and <= 25 lacs - 9 Marks Amount >= 19 Lacs and < 22 lacs - 8 Marks Amount >= 16 Lacs and < 19 lacs - 7 Marks Amount >= 13 Lacs and < 16 lacs - 6 Mark Amount >= 10 Lacs and < 13 lacs - 5 Marks Amount >= 08 Lacs and < 10 lacs - 4 Mark Amount >= 06 Lacs and < 08 lacs - 3 Mark Amount >= 05 Lacs and < 06 lacs - 2 Marks Amount >= 04 Lacs and < 05 lacs - 1 Mark Amount <= 4 Lacs - 0 Mark	0	0	Overall Marks for 5.7	- Needs improvement
5.7.4.	Honorary Consultancy from Central/State/Local Government Organizations	5		0	0	21	- Needs improvement.
5.7.5.	Development Activities	5	A. Product Development (1) B. Research laboratories (2) C. Instructional materials (1) D. Working models/charts/monograms etc. (1)	1 1 1 1	4		Very good.
5.8.	Faculty Performance Appraisal and Development System (FPADS)	20	A. A well defined performance appraisal and development system instituted for all the assessment years as stipulated by the regulatory authority (5) B. Its implementation and effectiveness (15)	4	14	Overall Marks for 5.8	Good
				10	14	14	

D.W. Mhu  
9/11/2015

6/10/11/16  
D.W. Mhu

D.W. Mhu  
9/11/15

5.9.	Visiting/Adjunct/Emeritus Faculty etc.	5	Provision (Visiting /Adjunct/Emeritus faculty etc.(2) Minimum 50 hours interaction in a year will result in 1 mark for that year; 1 marks x 3 years = 3 marks	0 3	3	Overall Marks for Criterion 5: 114.62	Overall Marks for Criterion 5: 114.62	Overall Marks for 5.9 3	Good.
Total of Criterion 5:		175							Good

D N Sin  
9/11/2019

9/11/2019

*[Signature]*  
9.11.19

Signature of Chairperson

Signature of Evaluator1



Criterion 6: Facilities (120)

S.No.	Sub Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines	Marks Awarded		Overall Marks	Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)
				Marks	Total		
6.1.	Availability of adequate, well-equipped classrooms to meet the curriculum requirements	20	Adequate well-equipped classrooms to meet the curriculum (20)	16	16	Overall Marks for 6.1	Good.
6.2.	Faculty rooms	10	Availability of Conducive sitting place (10)	7	7	Overall Marks for 6.2	very good
6.3.	Laboratories including preparation room (wherever applicable), instrument/machine room and computer labs along with equipment and relevant facilities	60	A. Adequate well-equipped laboratories to run all the program-specific curriculum (40)	32	48	Overall Marks for 6.3	Good.
			B. Adequate well-equipped computer laboratory and IT infrastructure (20)	16			
6.4.	Drug Museum	5	Type & quality of collection in the museum with proper labeling and display (5)	3	3	Overall Marks for 6.4	Good
6.5.	Medicinal Plant Garden	5	Area, demarcation, temporary/permanent arrangement, planting of plants under the shade in demarcated areas, adequacy of the plants	4	4	Overall Marks for 6.5	Very good.
6.6.	Non Teaching Support	20					
6.6.1.	Availability of adequate and qualified technical supporting staff for program specific laboratories	10		7	7	Overall Marks for 6.6	Good.
6.6.2.	Incentives, skill upgrade, and professional advancement	10		6	6	13.0	Good.
Total of Criterion 6:				Marks for Criterion 6:		91.0	Good

D W M  
9/11/2019

9/11/2019

D W M  
9/11/19

Signature of Chairperson

Signature of Evaluator 1

Criterion 7: Continuous Improvement (75)

S.No.	Sub Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines	Marks Awarded		Overall Marks	Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)
				Marks	Total		
7.1.	Improvement in Success Index of Students without the backlog	15	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) Assessment is based on improvement in: • Placement: number, quality placement, core industry, pay packages etc. • Higher studies: performance in GPAT etc., and admissions in premier institutions Marks to be given proportionately considering nos. in the base year CAYm3	10	10	10.0 7.1	exceed.
7.2.	Improvement in Placement and Higher Studies	15	Academic Performance Index = ((Mean of Final 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 Final Year/10) x (successful students/number of students appeared in the examination) Successful students are those who passed in all the final year courses	6	6	6.0 7.3	exceed.
7.4.	Improvement in the quality of students admitted to the program	15	Assessment is based on improvement in terms of ranks/score in qualifying state level/national level entrances tests, percentage marks in Physics, Chemistry and Mathematics in 12th Standard and percentage marks of the lateral entry students.	9	9	9.0 7.4	exceed.
7.5.	Actions taken based on the results of evaluation of each of the POs	20	A. Documentation of POs attainment levels (5) B. Actions taken based on the actual attainment levels of the POs (15)	3	10	16 7.5	Needs improvement
Total of Criterion 7:				Marks for Criterion 7:		45	exceed but needs improvement

ANM  
9/11/2015

9/11/2015

ANM  
9.11.15

Signature of Chairperson

Signature of Evaluator 1



S.No.	Sub Criteria	Max. Marks	Evaluation Guidelines	Mark		Overall Marks	Observations of Evaluators (Provide Justifications/ Reasons)
				Marks	awarded Total		
8.1.	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)	4	4	Overall Marks for 8.1 4.6	Very good
8.2.	Feedback analysis and reward /corrective measures taken, if any	10	A. Methodology being followed for analysis of feedback and its effectiveness (5)	3	7	Overall Marks for 8.2 7.0	Good
			B. Record of corrective measures taken (5)	4			
8.3.	Feedback on facilities	5	Feedback collection, analysis and corrective action (5)	4	4	Overall Marks for 8.3 4.6	Very good
8.4.	Self Learning	5	The institution needs to specify facilities, materials and scope for self-learning, learning beyond syllabus and creation of facilities for self-learning and learning beyond syllabus	3	3	Overall Marks for 8.4 3.0	Good
8.5.	Career Guidance, Training, Placement	10	A. Availability of career guidance facilities (2)	1	6	Overall Marks for 8.5 6.0	Good
			B. Counseling for higher studies (2)	1			
			C. Industry interaction for training (3)	2			
			D. Placement Support (3)	2			
8.6.	Entrepreneurship Cell	5	Students success stories (5)	00	00	Overall Marks for 8.6 0.0	Need to be developed
8.7.	Co-curricular and Extra-curricular Activities	10	A. Availability of sports and cultural facilities (3)	2	7	Overall Marks for 8.7 7.0	Good.
			B. NCC and/or NSS and other clubs (3)	2			
			C. Annual students activities (4)	3			
Total of Criterion 8:		50	Overall Marks for Criterion 8:	31.0		31.0	Good.

Dr. M. S. 9/11/2019

Signature of Evaluator 1  
9/11/19

6/12/2019

Signature of Chairperson

Signature of Evaluator 1





9.3.	Library and Internet	20						
9.3.1.	Quality of learning resources (hard/soft)	10						
			A. Availability of relevant learning resources including e-resources and Digital Library (5)	3				
			B. Accessibility to students (5)	4				
9.3.2.	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)	1				
Total of Criterion 9:		100				Overall Marks for Criterion 9:	570	
							Overall Marks for	9.4
								14
								cred.
								Satisfactory

*D N Sharma*  
9/11/2019

*edw*  
9.11.19

*edw*  
9/11/2019