POLICY DOCUMENT ON PERFORMANCE REVIEW PROCESS FOR FACULTY

(with effect from the academic year 2015-16)

MAHARAJ VIJAYARAM GAJAPATHI RAJ (MVGR) COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING
(AUTONOMOUS)

Approved by AICTE, Accredited by NBA of AICTE, NAAC with 'A' Grade of UGC, and Permanently Affiliated to JNTU-K, Kakinada

The visionaries

Late Dr. P V G Raju
Raja Saheb of Vizianagaram
Founder Chairman-MANSAS
Ex-Minister for Education and Health, Govt. of AP
Ex Member of Parliament

Dr. P. Anand Gajapathi Raju
Chairman-MANSAS
Ex-Minister for Education and Health
Govt. of AP
Ex Member of Parliament

P. Ashok Gajapathi Raju
Vice Chairman-MANSAS
Union Minister for Civil Aviation, Govt.
of India
Ex-Minister for Finance, Govt. of AP

Compiled, edited and drafted by

Dr. K. V. L. Raju, *PRINCIPAL*
Dr. Y. M. C. Sekhar, *VP-AC*
Dr. P. Ravindranadh*, DEAN-SP*
Dr. D. Prasada Raju, *DEAN-FDP*
Dr. R. Ramesh, *DEAN-R&D*
Dr. Ch. Purnachandra Rao, *AP-AC*

ABBREVIATIONS:

CS: Current Semester
CS$_{m-1}$: Current Semester minus one (the semester before CS)
CS$_{m-2}$: Current Semester minus two (the semester before CS$_{m-1}$),
Lab: Laboratory
hrs: hours
#: number of
SAR: Self-Appraisal Report
PI: performance Indicator
MOOCs: Massive Open Online Courses
NPTEL: National Program on Technology Enhanced Learning
FDP: Faculty Development Program
WS: Work Shop
PG: Post Graduate
CO: Course Orientation
BC: Bridge Course
RC: Remedial Course
Engg: Engineering
Yr: Year
Prgm: Program
Dept: Department
Sec: Section
WL/WWL: Weekly Work Load
NA: Not Applicable
ADEs: Advanced /Design Experiment
CA: Continuous Assessment
RLCs: Remedial Lab Classes
WE: Work Equivalence
Avg: Average
J: Journal
IF: Impact Factor
GATE: Graduate Aptitude Test of Engineering
CAT: Common Aptitude Test
IES: Indian Engineering Service
SDP: Staff Development Program
MVGR: MVGR College of Engineering
NIT: National Institute of Technology
IIT: Indian Institute of Technology
IIM: Indian Institute of Management
ISSN: International Standard Serial Number
ISBN: International Standard Book Number
SW: Software
L: Lakh
Co-PI: Co-Principal Investigator

UGC: University Grants Commission
AICTE: All India Counsel for Technical Education
CSIR: Counsel of Scientific and Industrial Research
DST: Department of Science and Technology
IE: Institute of Engineers
SWOT /SWOC: Strength, Weakness, Opportunity and Threat /Challenge
MAX /Max: Maximum
MIN /Min: Minimum
ASTP: Assistant Professor
SRTP: Senior Assistant Professor
ASCP: Associate Professor
PROF: Professor
CHE: Dept of Chemical Engg
CIV: Dept of Civil Engg
CSE: Dept of Computer Science & Engg
ECE: Dept of Electronics and Communication Engg
EEE: Dept of Electrical and Electronics Engg
IT: Dept of Information Technology
MEC: Dept of Mechanical Engg
MAT: Dept of Mathematics
MCA: Dept of MCA
MBA: Dept of MBA
PHY: Dept of Physics
CHY: Dept of Chemistry
E&H: Dept of English and Humanities
MI: Month of Increment
MI$_{m-1}$: Month of Increment minus one (Month before MI)
ESTD: Establishment
MOBROBS: Modernization and Removal of Obsolescence
RPS: Research Promotion Scheme
SDP: Staff Development Program
FDP: Faculty Development Program

CONTENTS

1. Concept and Introduction

Any educational system believes in the premise that people are more productive when they agree on what is expected of them and receive feedback on their performance.

The success of the performance review process through self-appraisal is essentially associated with establishing a constructive dialogue between the appraisers and appraised. This can be a valuable process for both the institute and faculty as it improves communication channels between both sides.

Institutes can have the best infrastructure and can adopt and develop the best curricula, yet ultimately it is the caliber and standards of the faculty members that have the most influence on the education process.

In addition, criterion 5 of NBA (National Board Accreditation), the accreditation body for engineering programs, focuses on faculty competencies. It states that "The faculty is the heart of any educational program. They must have the competencies to cover all of the curricular and non-curricular areas of the program. Further, faculty must be in a position to accommodate adequate levels of student- faculty interaction, particularly counseling, institutes service activities, and professional development activities.

The faculty must have appropriate qualifications and must be in a position to demonstrate sufficient authority to ensure development and implementation of processes for the evaluation, assessment, and continuing improvement of the program, its educational objectives and outcomes.

2. Expectations on Faculty in Higher Educational Institutions

In any system of higher education, faculty members are expected to:

- Be responsible for course development and participate in curriculum and program development.
- Fulfill all instructional delivery as specified in the policies and procedures of the institute.
- Participate in scholarly and research activities which enhance their professional development and contribute to their discipline.
- Serve as appropriate, in the department and institute committees.
- Provide professional services to the institute and stake holding community.

And therefore, the overall competence of the faculty may have to be judged by such factors as qualifications, diversity of background, teaching methodology, ability to communicate, enthusiasm for learning, level of scholarship, and participation in activities such as professional societies.

3. Objectives of Self-Appraisal Report

With an objective to develop a simpler but more effective and relevant evaluation system, a customized version of University Grants Commission's Performance Based Appraisal System (PBAS), has been brought in. The same has been named as Annual Self-Appraisal Report (SAR) The evaluation system through SAR will have the following main aims:

- Helping faculty members recognize areas for development and improvement, and to capitalize on their areas of strength.
- Building a database that can be used for professional and career advancements.
- Provide opportunities for discussion and feedback in order to identify problems, obstacles, or difficulties that hinder progress and institution development.
- Determining the intellectual value added by each faculty member for the period of assessment

4. Basic Unit of Assessment

It is expected that a faculty member requires a total of 120 hours to teach a **theory course with a weekly workload of three hours**. The indicative split of 120 hours is as shown below:

Activities throughout the semester	Hours
Class room teaching @ 3 hours per week in a semester time of 16 weeks	: 48
Conduct of Orientation & Bridge courses and Tutorial, Make up & Remedial classes	: 24
Preparation, assignments, quizzes, projects, question papers setting, evaluation, guidance, counseling and mentoring	: 48
TOTAL	: 120

For the purpose of developing broad guidelines 'course with three hours per week' is taken as the basic unit. i.e.,

UNIT = 120 hours of engagement

Also, **HOUR = 50 minutes**

5 Work Norms (Expected Minimum Work Output)

Calculation:

Total number of days in a year		: 365
Sundays	(-)	: 52
Second Saturdays	(-)	: 12
Vacation days	(-)	: 28
Public holidays	(-)	: 12+3=15
Total working days for		: 258

Total work output expected from a faculty in an year time
$$=$$

$$\frac{Number\ of\ working\ days\ in\ an\ year\ \times\ Number\ of\ hours\ in\ a\ day}{120}$$

$$= \frac{258 \times 7}{120} = 15.05 \text{ units}$$

Therefore, Expected work output for any faculty in an year = 15 units

6. Academic and other Performance Indicators

To assess quality and quantity of yearly work output, the following **Performance Indicators (PIs)** with regard to academic, co & extracurricular, research & consultancy and profession related activities are identified:

S.No.	Quantifiable Performance Indicator (PIs)
1	Theory Courses handled
2	Lab Course conducted
3	Student Projects undertaken
4	Student Seminars, Club Activities, Mini Reports of MBA and Bridge Courses
5	Learning materials developed
6	Training modules conducted
7	Online Certificate Courses
8	Attending FDPs such as WS /Conferences /seminars etc…
9	Organizing FDPs such as WS /Conferences /seminars etc…
10	Professional Roles
11	Students Counseling / mentorship
12	Memberships of professional bodies
13	Industrial visits
14	Chairing Sessions and Delivering Talks & Lectures
15	Any Other Outside Interaction
16	Industry Internships
17	Journal Publications
18	Conference Publications
19	Research guidance
20	Book publications
21	Patents
22	Product Design / Software Development
23	Consultancy
24	Funded Projects

7. Quantification Process of Performance Indicators

7.1. **Theory Courses**

Quantification is based on weekly work load of the course including tutorials. As remedial and make up classes conducted for the course are integral part of course delivery they shall not get included. Quantification is subject to a maximum of 1.66 units for any theory course

# hours per week as per the time table	Unit
One	0.33
Two	0.66
Three	1.00
Four	1.33
Five or more	1.66

Assessment type: Formula

Assessment parameters:

Classes held: 35%, Students feedback: 25%, Class average mark: 25% and other quality measures (like course orientation (CO), Bridge courses (BCs) & Remedial classes(RCs) 5% each in cases where they are applicable): 15%.

Depending on the class average mark the performance attainment levels are graded as follows:

Range of class average mark (in %)	Grade on performance
Above 70	Excellent
65 - 70	Very Good
60 - 65	Good
55 - 60	Average
50 - 65	Poor
40 - 50	Very Poor

The following is the layout of this PI in SAR:

Indicate the theory courses handled during the semesters CS_{m-1} and CS_{m-2} in the respective tables below:										
Course Details			Assessment							Score
Subject Name	WL		Classes handled (35%)		Students Feed Back (25%)		Class Average Mark out of 100 (25%)	Quality Measures (5% each)			Awarded
Yr & Prgm	Dept & Sec		Planned	Held	Cycle I	Cycle II		CO	BCs	RCs	Attained
CS_{m-1}: 1st Semester-2014-15			How many theory courses were handled in CS_{m-1}:								
1											
2											
3											
4											
CS_{m-2}: 2nd Semester-2013-14			How many theory courses were handled in CS_{m-2}:								
1											
2											
3											
4											

Options in each of the heads '*CO /BCs /RCs'* are: 1) Yes, 2) NO & 3) Not Applicable.

Note: While calculating 'class average mark' **the marks obtained by failed candidates** must also be taken care i.e., sum of the marks of failed candidates is to be added to numerator and number of such failed candidates is to be added to denominator

Note: For any theory course, **'class average mark' is always to be calculated for 100** irrespective of the mark to which it is evaluated i.e., if any particular theory course is evaluated for 70 then the 'class average mark' is to be scaled up to 100 and in case it is evaluated for 150 then it has to scaled down 100.

Note: While entering the theory courses handled in SAR, **section wise entries are to be made**. That is, if the same theory course is taught to more than one section, say for example two sections of the same year and program, then two entries are to be made otherwise 3 entries in case of three sections.

Note: **There is no threshold limit on achievements levels of this PI**

7.2. **Lab courses**

Quantification is based on number of per-week hours practically handled to complete the Lab course. Quantification is subject to a maximum of 1.50 units for any lab course

# hours per week as per the time table	Unit
One	0.16
Two	0.33
Three	0.50
Four	0.66
Five	0.83
Six or more	1.00

Assessment type: Formula

Assessment parameters:

Classes held: 40%, Students feedback: 0%, Class average mark: 35% and other quality measures (like advanced / design

experiments (ADE), Continuous Assessment (CA) & Remedial lab classes (RLCs) 5% each in cases where they are applicable): 15%.

The following is the layout of this PI in SAR:

Indicate the lab courses handled during the semesters CS_{m-1} and CS_{m-2} in the respective tables below:										
Course Details			Assessment							Score
Subject Name	WL	Classes handled (40%)		Students Feed Back (0%)		Class Average Mark out of 100 (35%)	Quality Measures (25%)			Awarded
Yr & Prgm	Dept & Sec	Planned	Held	Cycle I	Cycle II		ADE (5%)	CA (15%)	RLCs (5%)	Attained
CS_{m-1}: 1st Semester-2014-15				How many lab courses were handled in CS_{m-1}:						
1										
2										
3										
CS_{m-2}: 2nd Semester-2013-14				How many lab courses were handled in CS_{m-2}:						
1										
2										
3										

Options in each of the heads 'ADE / CA /RLCs' are: 1) Yes, 2) NO & 3) Not Applicable.

Note: As of now, students feedback is not being taken for a lab course as the existing tool is not supporting. Efforts are on to make necessary adjustments in the existing tool for the purpose. Once it is ready, appropriate weightage will be given for students feedback also.

Until such weightage for student feedback on lab courses is made 0%.

Note: While calculating 'class average mark' **the marks obtained by failed candidates** must also be taken care i.e., sum of the marks of failed candidates is to be added to numerator and number of such failed candidates is to be added to denominator

Note: For any theory course, **'class average mark' is always to be calculated for 100** irrespective of the mark for which it is evaluated i.e., if course is evaluated for 70 then the 'class average mark' is to be scaled up to 100 and in case it is evaluated for 150 then it has to scaled down 100.

Note: While entering the lab courses handled in SAR, **section wise entries are to be made**. That is, if the same lab course is handled to more than one section, say for example two sections of the same year and program, then two entries are to be made otherwise 3 entries in case of three sections.

Note: Weekly work load (WWL) of the lab course is to be indicated as per the curriculum. That is, WWL for any lab course may practically be 6 but it will be counted as 3 for quantification purpose. In case of virtual lab courses in physics it will be 2.

Note: **There is no threshold limit on achievements levels of this PI**

In case of activities other than class room courses, work equivalences are obtained. And these work equivalences (WEs) are calculated based on the expected time required to ideally perform the activity

7.3. Project Work

Work equivalence for project work is calculated via credit points associated to the project through the formula: **Per-student unit = 0.015 * Credits.** However the total work equivalence under the head of *project work* shall not exceed 1.80 units in a year for any faculty.

Level of project	Work equivalence per student	Remarks
B.Tech.	0.18 Units	12 credits
MBA	0.12 Units	8
MCA.	0.27 Units	18 credits
M.Tech.	0.54 Units	18 + 18 credits

Assessment type: Formula & Self-assessment
Assessment parameters for project work of B.Tech.

Average mark: 60%, Research output 20% and self-grading of Quality of project work: 20%.

The following is the layout of this PI in SAR:

(i)	**B.Tech Projects**: In case of B.Tech. projects, batch wise entries are to be made.						
	Have you guided any batch of B.Tech students for their projects during the period?					Yes	How many ? 1
	Batch Details			Assessment			
	Batch Number	Size	Submitted?	Avg. Mark (60%)	Self-grading of quality of work (20%)	Research output is published in (20%)	Score
1	Batch 1						
2	Batch 2						

Options under the head '*Self-grading of quality of work*' are:
1) Advanced, 2) Moderate & 3) Below moderate

Options under the head *'Research output is published in'* are: 1) International J with IF, 2) National J with IF, 3) Journal without IF, 4) Conference proceedings & 5) Not published

Assessment parameters for project work of M.Tech. / MCA

Grade: 40%, Research output 40% and self-grading of Quality of project work: 20%.

The following is the layout of this PI in SAR:

(ii)	**M.Tech/MCA Projects**: In case of M.Tech. and MCA projects, student wise entries are to be made.							
	Have you guided projects of M.Tech /MCA students during the period under reference?					Yes	How many?	
	Details of Project student			Assessment				
	Roll Number	Prgm	Speciali sation /Dept	Submitt ed?	Grade (40%)	Self-grading of quality of work (20%)	Research output is published in (40%)	Score
1								
2								

Options under the head '*Self-grading of quality of work'* are: 1) Advanced, 2) Moderate & 3) Below moderate

Options under the head *'Research output is published in'* are: 1) International J with IF, 2) National J with IF, 3) Journal without IF, 4) Conference proceedings & 5) Not published

Assessment parameters for project work of MBA

Note: There are two types of project works in MBA, i) **Minor Report** & ii) **Major Project**. It is observed that the activity of 'minor report' does not fit into Project Work and therefore faculty of MBA engaged in minor report activity are advised to fill it in 7.4. Below is the list of assessment parameters in case of Major project of MBA

Grade: 50%, Research output 20% and self-grading of Quality of project work: 30%.

The following is the layout of this PI in SAR:

(iii)	MBA Major Projects: In case of MBA Major projects, the information pertaining to the entire group of students under one faculty can be entered in one go.						
	Have you guided major projects of MBA students during the period under reference?				Yes	How many?	11
	Specialization	Grade (50%)				Self-grading of quality of work (30%)	Research output is published in (20%)	Score
		A's	B's	C's	B's			
1								

Options under the head '*Self-grading of quality of work'* are:
1) Advanced, 2) Moderate & 3) Below moderate

Options under the head *'Research output is published in'* are:
1) International J with IF, 2) National J with IF, 3) Journal

Note: There is no threshold limit on achievements levels of this PI

7.4. Student Seminars, club activities and bridge courses

Work equivalence to this performance Indicator i.e., *student seminars/club activities* is quantified based on the number of hours students are engaged by faculty. **However, the total work equivalence under the head shall not exceed 1.00 units.**

Type of engagement	Work equivalence per hour
Bridge Course	I course hr = 2.5 hrs
Student seminars.	I seminar hr = 1.1 hrs
Club activities	I activity hr = 1.1 hrs

Assessment type: No assessment (do it and get it)

The following is the layout of this PI in SAR:

	Have you engaged yourself in any of the above activities during the period?						Yes	How many?	0

	Type of student engagement	Details of students benefited			Period		# Hours	Brief description about the engagement	Score
		Yr & Prgm	Dept. & Sec	#	From	To			
1									
2									
3									

Options under the head *'Type of student engagement'* are: 1) Students Seminars, 2) Student Club Activities & 3) Bridge Courses for Lateral entries.

7.5. Learning Materials Developed

Course material development is a continuous process at the department. Faculty are encouraged to continuously involve in the activity of course material development in the form of Lab manuals, Course note materials and materials of competitive exams such as GATE , CAT etc. The quantification in this regard is based on the type material and its usefulness to students. **However the total work equivalence under this PI shall not exceed 0.75 units in a year for any faculty.** Other details are shown below:

Type of material	Work Equivalence	
	If developed first time and made the material available to the reach of students by hosting it intranet and department website (a)	If updation, editing and/ or revision is done to the existing material (40% of (a))
GATE	0.20 Units	
Manuals	0.15 Units	
Any other	0.08 Units	

Note: Preparing 'note material' is regarded as a part and parcel of teaching methodology. And therefore shall not carry any score.

Assessment type: No assessment (do it and get it)

The following is the layout of this PI in SAR:

Have you developed any learning materials during the period ?					Yes	How many ?	0
Material developed	Details of students benefited			Type of involvement in developing the material	Accessibility of the material developed	Score	
	Yr & Prgm	Dept. & Sec	# students				
1							
2							
3							
4							

Options under the head '*Material developed'* are: 1) GATE, 2) Lab Manual, 3) Any other.

Options under the head '*Type of involvement in developing the material'* are: 1) First time developed & 2) Revised existing material.

Options under the head '*Accessibility of the material developed '* are: 1) Hosted in intranet & 2) Copies kept in dept. library.

7.6. Training modules conducted

This Performance Indicator is quantified based on the type of module, target group and number of hours of such training as detailed below, **subject to a maximum of 1.20 units per year per faculty**

Type of the training module	Work equivalence per hour
Training to students in competitive exams such as IES, GATE, CAT etc.	I Training hr = 1.5 hrs
Training to faculty on a specific expertise	I Training hr = 1.2 hrs
Training to Non-teaching staff on a specific expertise	I Training hr = 1.1 hrs

Assessment type: No assessment (do it and get it)

The following is the layout of this PI in SAR:

	Have you conducted any training modules during the period ?					Yes	How many ?	0
	Type of training module conducted	Remunerative?	Details of students benefited			Period		# Hours	Score
			Yr & Prgm	Dept. & Sec	# students	From	To		
1									
2									
3									

Options under the head '*Type of training module conducted*' are: 1) Training to students in competitive exams such as IES, GATE, CAT etc., 2) Training to faculty on a specific expertise & 3) Training to Non-teaching staff on a specific expertise.

Note: Maximum number of hours for any particular training module is limited to 30 hours

Note: Activities which are remunerative shall not carry any unit. For example, paid services such as training faculty and /or students on ADD-ON and such other courses will not carry any weightage here. These paid services are supposed to be over and above the normal work load of the faculty as these services fetch honorarium. However this activity shall be encouraged to the faculty as it will bring lots of field experience and industry readiness in them

7.7. Online Certificate Courses (like MOOCs, NPTEL etc…)

Online Certificate Courses are gradually gaining their importance these days. This PI is quantified based on the relevancy of the course to the field of specialization, duration

of such course and type of course as detailed below **subject to a maximum of 1.00 units per year per faculty**

Relevancy to the field of specialization of the faculty	Work equivalence per hour in case the course is	
	Certified (a)	Not certified (50% of (a))
Highly relevant to the field of specialization	1 online course hr = 1.2 hrs	
Supplementing to the field of specialization	1 online course hr = 1 hrs	
General course, not relevant to the field	1 online course hr = 0.5 hrs	

Note: Maximum number of hours for any particular on-line course is restricted to 48 hours

Assessment type: No assessment (do it and get it)

The following is the layout of this PI in SAR:

	Have you done any such courses during the period ?						No	0
	Name of online course	Offered by	Period		Duration (in hrs.)	Certified?	Relevancy to the field of specialization	Score
			From	To				
1								
2								

Options under the head '*Relevancy to the field of specialization'* are: 1) Highly relevant to my field, 2) Supplementing my field & 3) General course, not relevant to my field

7.8. Attending FDPs

Attending FDPs such as WS/Seminars/Conferences/ MEETs/Refresher Courses/ SDPs/ training programs etc. is expected to be a regular activity for a teacher to make himself equipped with the current trends in his/her field of specialization. This PI is quantified based on duration of the activity and reputation of the host institution. **However the**

total work equivalence under this PI shall not exceed 1.00 units in a year for any faculty

Level of host Institute	Work Equivalence per day
IIT/IIM	8 hrs (a)
NIT	75% of (a)
University	60% of (a)
Other college	50% of (a)
MVGR	40% of (a)

Assessment type: No assessment (do it and get it)

The following is the layout of this PI in SAR

				Period			
Type of FDP attended	Level of Inst.	Title of Event	Host Institution	From	To	# days	Score
1							0
2							0
3							0

Have you attended any FDPs during the period ?   No   0

Options under the head *'Type of FDP attended'* are: 1) Seminar, 2) Workshop, 3) Conference, 4) Refresher Course, 5) Training Program, 6) QIP, 7) FDP, 8) MEET & 9) Any other. Options under the head *'Level of Institute'* are: 1) IIT, 2) IIM, 3) NIT, 4) University , 5) College & 6) MVGR.

7.9. Organizing FDPs

Conducting FDPs such as WS/Seminars/Conferences/ MEETs/Refresher Courses/ SDPs/ training programs etc.is quantified based on level of the activity and type of resource to organize the event. **However the total work equivalence under this PI shall not exceed 1.20 units in a year for any particular faculty**

Type of funding (External, Sponsorships & Internal)	Work equivalence per day in case the FDP is organized in the capacity of	
	Convener (a)	Coordinator (50 % of (a))
Fully externally funded	12 hrs	
Partially externally funded	10 hrs	
MVGR funds + outside Sponsorships	8 hrs	
Fully funded by MVGR	7 hrs	

Assessment type: No assessment (do it and get it)

The following is the layout of this PI in SAR

	Have you conducted/organized any FDPs during the period ?			No		0
	Type of FDP organized	Type of funding (External, Sponsorships & Internal)	Organized in the capacity of	Period		
				From	To	# days	Score
1						
2						

Options under the head '*Type of FDP organized*' are: 1) Seminar, 2) Workshop, 3) Conference, 4) Refresher Course, 5) Training Program, 6) QIP, 7) FDP, 8) MEET & 9) Any other

Options under the head '*Type of funding (External, Sponsorships & Internal)*' are: 1) Fully externally funded, 2) Partially externally funded, 3) MVGR funds+ outside Sponsorships &4) Fully funded by MVGR.

Options under the head '*Organized in the capacity of*' are: 1) Convener, 2) Coordinator.

7.10. Professional roles (Acad. /Admin. /PG / Exam Cell Coordinators/Members and Conveners of Committees)

Professional related roles such as Acad./Admin./PG/Exam Cell Coordinators are quantified based on the expected work output under these designations. Committee memberships are quantified based on level of the committee and type of membership. **The total work equivalence under this PI shall not exceed 3.00 units in a year for any particular faculty.**

Type of committee	Work Equivalence
Academic /Administrative Coordinators of the departments	1.5 Units in case of THREE division branch 1.2 Units in case of TWO division branch 0.9 Units in case of SINGLE division branch including MBA 0.3 Units in case of Science & Humanities departments
Examination cell coordinator / In-Charge	1.75 Units
PG Coordinators of M.Tech. programs	0.5 Units

Other roles

Dept NBA /IQAC Coordinator	0.30 Units
Central Students feedback coordinator	0.30 Units
Class Teacher I/c	0.30 Units
Dept Exam Cell I/c Member 3 (on line server)	0.45 Units
Dept Exam Cell I/c Member 2	0.45 Units
Dept Exam Cell I/c Member 1	0.75 Units
Dept T&P Coordinator Member 2	0.75 Units
Dept T&P Coordinator Member 1	1.00 Units
Central Exam Cell Coordinator	1.75 Units

Committees

S.No.	Name of the Committee	Members (a)	Convener 3 times of (a)
1	Disciplinary	12	
2	Canteen	12	
3	Anti-Ragging	12	
4	NCC	12	
5	Grievance & Redressal	12	
6	Alumni	12	
7	EDC	12	
8	Magazine	12	
9	Transport	24	
10	Library	24	
11	Purchase	24	
12	Cultural	24	
13	NSS	24	
14	Women Empowerment Cell	24	
15	R & D	24	
16	Press and Media	24	
17	Time Table	36	
18	E-Services	36	
19	Website Maintenance	36	
20	Maintenance	48	

Assessment type: Self-assessment

Assessment parameters: Self-rating on outcomes achieved: 100%

The following are the layouts of different item under this PI in SAR

(i)	Department Coordinators						
	Are you?	Department	Admn /Acad?	Since when?	Self-rating out of 10	Score awarded	Score
1							

(ii)	PG Coordinators

	Are you?	Department	Which PG?	Since when?	Self-rating out of 10	Score awarded	Score
1							

(iii) Other Coordinators/In-Charges

	Are you?	Department	Which Coordinator?	Since when?	Self-rating out of 10	Score awarded	Score
1							

(iv) Members & Conveners of Committees

	Are you?	Committee Name	Member/Convener?	Level	Since when?	Self-rating out of 10	Score awarded	Score
1								
2								
3								

The above layouts may include the following roles of administration: Academic and Administrative coordinators, PG coordinators, Exam Cell coordinators / In-charges, Student feedback Coordinator, Conveners & Members of Central & Department level committees.

7.11. Student Counseling / Mentorship

Mentoring/Counseling students is quantified based on number of students @ 0.03 units per student. **The total work equivalence under this PI shall not exceed 0.75 units in a year for any particular faculty**

Assessment type: Self-assessment
Assessment parameters: Self-rating on outcomes achieved: 100%

The following is the layout of this PI in SAR

Have you been assigned with any students for counseling?								Yes		How many?	5

	Roll Number	# backlogs year and semester wise								Total # backlogs	% of attendance	Specific remarks	Score per student
		1st Yr		2nd Yr		3rd Yr		4th Yr					
		I	II	I	II	I	II	I	II				
1													

2								
3								
4								
5								
6								
7								
8								
9								
10								
11								
12								
13								
14								
15								
16								
17								
18								
19								
20								
21								
22								
23								
24								
25								

Assessment					
Proper records maintained for counseling?	Yes	Self-rating on the scale of 10:		Score after self-rating	

7.12. Memberships of Professional bodies

Professional body memberships are quantified based on number of memberships and the quantum and level of involvement in the activities of the professional body. **The total work equivalence under this PI shall not exceed 0.50 units in a year for any particular faculty.**

Level of involvement	Work Equivalence per memberships
Aggressively involved	0.20 Units
Satisfactorily involved	0.10 Units
No involvement	0 Units

Assessment type: Self-assessment
Assessment parameters:
Self-rating on outcomes achieved and quantum of involvement in the activities of the professional body: 100%

The following is the layout of this PI in SAR

	Are you a member any professional body as of now?				No	0
	Profession al Body	Type of Membership	Since when?	Describe your involvement as member	Self-rating on involvement	Score
1						
2						
3						

Options under the head '*Type of Membership'* are: 1) Life, 2) Annual & 3) Any other

Options under the head '*Self-rating on involvement'* are: 1) Aggressively involved, 2) Satisfactorily involved & 3) No involvement.

7.13. Industries Visited

Visiting industries is quantified based on duration of the activity and reputation and /or relevancy of the host industry. **However the total work equivalence under this PI shall not exceed 1.00 units in a year for any faculty**. Other details are shown below:

Relevancy of the host industry	Work Equivalence per day
Highly relevant	8 hrs
More or less relevant	6 hrs
Not relevant but guided the students	4 hrs

Assessment type: No assessment (do it and get it)

The following is the layout of this PI in SAR

	Have you visited any industries during the period ?					No			2
	Name of the industry visited	Students benefited out of the visit			Relevancy of the visit to the area of specialization	Period		# days	Score
		Yr & Prgm	Dept. & Sec	# students		From	To		
1									
2									
3									

Options under the head '*Relevancy of the visit to the area of specialization*' are: 1) Highly relevant, 2) More or less relevant & 3) Not relevant but guarded the students.

7.14. Chairing Sessions and Delivering Talks & Lectures (In or outside the campus)

Outside interaction such as Chairing Sessions and Delivering Talks & Lectures has become an integral part of the business of today's teacher. **However the total work equivalence under this PI shall not exceed 1.00 units in a year for any faculty**.

Chairing sessions / delivering talks at FDPs

Quantification is based on level of platform of delivery and whether delivered in or outside the campus as detailed below:

Level of platform of delivery	Work Equivalence per hour in case the platform of delivery is	
	Outside campus (a)	Inside the campus (50% of (a))
International	1 talk / chairing hr = 10 hrs	
National	1 talk / chairing hr = 7.5 hrs	
State level	1 talk / chairing hr = 5 hrs	

The following is the layout of this PI in SAR

	Have you chaired/Co-chaired any sessions or delivered TALKS during the period ?				No			2
(i)	Geographical Level of platform of delivery	Inside or out campus	Name of the platform	Type of delivery	During the period		# such deliveries	Score
					From	To		
1								
2								
3								

Options under the head 'Geographical Level of platform of delivery' are: 1) International Level, 2) National Level & 3) State Level.

Options under the head 'Name of the platform' are: 1) Seminar, 2) Workshop, 3) Conference, 4) Refresher Course, 5) Training Program, 6) QIP, 7) FDP, 8) MEET & 9) Any other

Assessment type: No assessment (do it and get it)

Guest /Expert Lectures at institutions

Quantification is based on number of lecture hours delivered as detailed below:

Whether in or outside the campus	
Outside campus (a)	Inside the campus (50% of (a))
1 guest/expert lecture hr = 2 hrs	

The following is the layout of this PI in SAR

	Have you delivered any guest or expert LECTURES during the period under reference?				No			2
(ii)	Inside or out campus	Host institution	Who are the audience?	Type of delivery	During the period		Total # hours	Score
					From	To		
1								
2								
3								

Options under the head 'Type of delivery' are: 1) Guest Lecture & 2) Expert Lecture

Assessment type: No assessment (do it and get it)

Note: While In-Campus activities of lecturing / training covered in ITEM NO: 7.6 shall not come under this ITEM.

7.15. Any Other Outside interaction

This PI is quantified based on the number of hours of such interactions @ 1hr per each of such hour of interaction **subject to a maximum of 0.50 units per year per faculty.**

Assessment type: No assessment (do it and get it)

The following is the layout of this PI in SAR

	Do you have interaction with any outside agency during the period ?		Yes	How many?	
	Interaction with	Brief description on type, level, outcome and benefits of interaction		# hours	Score
1					
2					

Note: Number of hours of interaction is restricted to 12 hours for each entry

7.16. Industry Internships

This PI is quantified based on the number of days the teacher has undergone the industry internship @ 6 hours per day. **However the total work equivalence under this PI shall not exceed 2.00 units in a year for any faculty.**

Assessment type: No assessment (do it and get it)

The following is the layout of this PI in SAR

Have you undergone any industry internships in the period under reference ?			Yes	How many?	
Industry	Description about internship	During the period		# Days	Score
		From	To		
1					
2					

7.17. Journal publications

Journal publications are quantified based on the order of authorship and IF of the journal. Only published papers are allowed under this head. Accepted paper is to wait to be claimed in the subsequent year(s) when it is published.

Range of IF	Work Equivalence per author as per their order of authorship				
	1st author/ 2nd author but 1st author is guide /3rd author but 1st & 2nd authors are guides (a)	2nd author (75% of (a))	3rd author (50% of (a))	4th author (25% of (a))	5th author (15% of (a))
No IF	0.30 Units if International 0.20 Units if National				
0 to 1.99	0.50 Units				
2.00 to 5.00	0.65 Units				
Above 5.00	0.75 Units				

Note: **There is no threshold limit on achievements levels of this PI**

Assessment type: No assessment (do it and get it)

The following is the layout of this PI in SAR

	Have you got any articles published in journals during the period ?				No		0
	# authors	Position of authorship	IF	National/International?	Journal type	Year	Score
1							
2							
3							

Options under the head 'Position of authorship' are: 1) 1st author, 2) 2nd but 1st is guide, 3) 3rd but 1st & 2nd are guides, 4) 2nd author, 5) 3rd author, 6) 4th author & 7) 5th author.

Options under the head 'Journal type' are: 1) Hard copy journal & 2) Online journal.

Note: An international journal is one, which has international Editorial board, international authors, international readership, and international subscription and is included in the standard abstracting/ indexing services.

Note: The type of IFs which will be considered is Thomas Reuters/Science Citation Index. The IFs rated by other agencies will also be considered in case their rating process is in line with that of Thomas Reuters. However the decision of scrutinizing committee with regard to IFs will be final.

7.18. Conference Publications

Conference publications are quantified based on the order of authorship and level of conference. Only published papers are allowed under this head. Accepted paper is to wait to be claimed in the subsequent year(s) when it is published. **The total work equivalence under this PI shall not exceed 1.00 units in a year for any faculty.**

Level of Conference	Work Equivalence per author as per their order of authorship				
	1st author/ 2nd author but 1st author is guide /3rd author but 1st & 2nd authors are guides (a)	2nd author (75% of (a))	3rd author (50% of (a))	4th author (25% of (a))	5th author (0% of (a))
International	0.20 Units				
National	0.15 Units				

Assessment type: No assessment (do it and get it)

The following is the layout of this PI in SAR

	Have you got any articles published in conferences during the period ?				Yes	How many?	2
	# authors	Position of authorship	Venue of Conference	National/ International?	Proceeding type	Year	Score
1							
2							
3							

Options under the head 'Position of authorship' are: 1) 1st author, 2) 2nd but 1st is guide, 3) 3rd but 1st & 2nd are guides, 4) 2nd author, 5) 3rd author, 6) 4th author & 7) 5th author.

Options under the head 'Proceedings' are: 1) Hard copy journal & 2) Online journal.

7.19. Research guidance

Research guidance is quantified based on the level research degree and level supervision. And, to be counted each year for maximum up to 4 years.

Level of Research degree	Work Equivalence		
	Supervisor (a)	Co-supervisor 1(50% of (a))	Co-supervisor 2 (30% of (a))
Ph.D.	0.90 Units		
M.Phil.	0.30 Units		

Note: **There is no threshold limit on achievements levels of this PI**

Assessment type: No assessment (do it and get it)

The following is the layout of this PI in SAR

	Are you currently guiding any research students (Ph.D. or M.Phil.)?				Yes	How many?	2
	Degree	University	Guide or Co-Guide?	DoR (mm/dd/yyyy)	Time lapsed	Student particulars	Score
1							
2							
3							

Options under the head '*Degree*' are: 1) Ph.D. & 2) M.Phil.

Options under the head '*Guide or Co-Guide?*' are: 1) Guide, 2) Co-Guide-1 & 3) Co-Guide-2.

7.20. Book publications

Level of Publishing house	Work Equivalence per author as per their order of authorship				
	Units for first author (a)	Second author (85% of (a))	Third author (75% of (a))	Fourth author (65% of (a))	Fourth author (55% of (a))
International	1.00 Units				
National	0.75 Units				
Regional	0.40 Units				
MVGR	0.20 Units				

Note: **There is no threshold limit on achievements levels of this PI**

Assessment type: No assessment (do it and get it)

The following is the layout of this PI in SAR

	Have you authored any books in the period under reference?					Yes	How many?	1
	# authors	Position of authorship	ISSN/ISBN is there?	Level of Publishing House	Title and other particulars of the book		score	
1								
2								

Options under the head 'Position of authorship' are: 1) 1st author, 2) 2nd author, 3) 3rd author, 4) 4th author & 5) 5th author.

Options under the head 'ISSN/ISBN is there' are: 1) Yes, 2) No.

Options under the head 'Level of Publishing House' are: 1) International, 2) National, 3) Regional & 4) MVGR.

7.21. Patents

Procuring patents is highly encouraged . It is quantified based on its stage of filing and level of filing as detailed below:

Level of patent	Work Equivalence per patent	
	Obtained	Filed
International	5 Units	3 Units
National	4 Units	2 Units

Note: There is no threshold limit on achievements levels of this PI

Assessment type: No assessment (do it and get it)

The following is the layout of this PI in SAR

	Have you obtained / filed any patents in the period under reference?				Yes	How many?	
	Status patent	Level of patent	Date of filing	Description of patent		Score	
1							
2							

Options under the head '*Status patent'* are: 1) Obtained & 2) Filed.

Options under the head '*Level of patent'* are: 1) International & 2) National.

7.22. Product Design / SW development

It is quantified based on number of team members in the design / development activity and number of hours of involvement in the activity as detailed below:

Coordinator	Coordinator 1	Coordinator 2	Coordinator 3	Coordinator 4	Coordinator 5
Work Equivalence per one hour of design /development	1.5 hrs	1.0 hrs	0.75 hrs	0.5 hrs	0.25 hrs

Note: There is no threshold limit on achievements levels of this PI

Assessment type: No assessment (do it and get it)

The following is the layout of this PI in SAR

Have you designed / developed any product or software during the period?		Yes	How many?	1
Name of Product / SW	# faculty in the team work	Position in the team	Description of the product /SW	# hrs. devoted	Score
	5	5		10	10

7.23. Consultancy

It is quantified based on number of coordinators and number of hours of involvement in the activity as detailed below:

Coordinator	Coordinator 1	Coordinator 2	Coordinator 3	Coordinator 4	Coordinator 5
Work Equivalence per one hour of consultancy	3hrs	2.5hrs	2hrs	1.5hrs	1hrs

Note: **There is no threshold limit on achievements levels of this PI**

Assessment type: No assessment (do it and get it)

The following is the layout of this PI in SAR

	Are you currently involved in any consultancy work with outside agency?				Yes	How many?	2
	Title of Consultancy work	Name of Granting Agency	# Coordinators involved	Position in order of coordinator-ship	Since when?	Grant/Amount mobilized	# hrs. devoted	Score
1								
2								

7.24. Funded Projects

The credit will be granted based on amount of funding and to be counted each year for a maximum of the project:

Range of External Funding	Units for PI (a)	Work Equivalence	
		Co PI -1 (75% of (a))	Co PI -2 (25% of (a))
Above 20 L	2.00 Units		
10 L - 20 L	1.50 Units		
5 L - 10 L	1.00 Units		
2 L -5 L	0.75 Units		
0.5 L - 2L	0.50 Units		
0.02 L - 0.5 L	0.30 Units		

Note: **There is no threshold limit on achievements levels of this PI**

Assessment type: No assessment (do it and get it)

The following is the layout of this PI in SAR

Are you currently handling any externally funded project?		Yes		How many?		1

			Period		Grant/Amount mobilized	Are you PI?	Score
	Title of project	Funded by	From	To	Grant/Amount mobilized	Are you PI?	Score
1							
2							

Options under the head '*Funded by'* are: 1) UGC, 2) AICTE, 3) DST, 4) CSIR, 5) IE & 6) Any other.

Options under the head '*Are you PI?'* are: 1) PI, 2) Co-PI-1 & 3) Co-PI-2.

7.25. Summary on PIs

S.No.	Quantifiable Performance Indicator (PIs)	Assessment?	Type of Assessment	Threshold limit, if any
1	Theory Courses handled	Yes	Formula	No Limit
2	Lab Course conducted	Yes	Formula	No Limit
3	Student Projects undertaken	Yes	Formula + self-assessment	No Limit
4	Student Seminars, Club Activities etc,..	No	Do it and get it	1.00Units
5	Learning materials developed	No	Do it and get it	0.75Units
6	Training modules conducted	No	Do it and get it	1.20Units
7	Online Certificate Courses	No	Do it and get it	1.00Units
8	Attending FDPs such as WS /Conferences /seminars etc…	No	Do it and get it	1.00Units
9	Organizing FDPs such as WS /Conferences /seminars etc…	No	Do it and get it	1.20Units
10	Professional Roles	Yes	self-assessment	3.00Units
11	Students Counseling / mentorship	Yes	self-assessment	0.75Units
12	Memberships of professional bodies	Yes	self-assessment	0.50Units
13	Industrial visits	No	Do it and get it	1.00Units
14	Chairing Sessions and Delivering Talks & Lectures	No	Do it and get it	1.00Units

15	Any Other Outside Interaction	No	Do it and get it	0.50Units
16	Industry Internships	No	Do it and get it	2.00Units
17	Journal Publications	No	Do it and get it	No Limit
18	Conference Publications	No	Do it and get it	1.00Units
19	Research guidance	No	Do it and get it	No Limit
20	Book publications	No	Do it and get it	No Limit
21	Patents	No	Do it and get it	No Limit
22	Product Design / Software Development	No	Do it and get it	No Limit
23	Consultancy	No	Do it and get it	No Limit
24	Funded Projects	No	Do it and get it	No Limit

8. Structure of Self-Appraisal Report (SAR)

Structure of Self-Appraisal Report (SAR) is proposed as follows:

Criteria		Performance Indicator (PI)
CRITERIA I Teaching Learning Evaluation Related activities	I.1	Theory Courses handled
	I.2	Lab Course conducted
	I.3	Student Projects undertaken
	I.4	Student Seminars and club Activities
	I.5	Learning materials developed
	I.6	Training modules conducted
	I.7	Online Certificate courses (Like MOOCs, NPTEL etc…) done
CRITERIA II Co-Curricular, Extracurricular And Extension Activities	II.1	Attending FDPs such as WS /Conferences /seminars etc…
	II.2	Organizing FDPs such as WS /Conferences /seminars etc…
	II.3	Professional Related Roles (Acad./Admin./PG/Exam Cell Coordinators/ Members and Conveners of Committees)
	II.4	Students Counseling / mentorship
	II.5	Memberships of professional bodies
	II.6	Industrial visits
	II.7	Chairing Sessions and Delivering

		Talks & Lectures
	II.8	Any Other Outside Interaction
	II.9	Industry Internships
CRITERIA III R&D, Consultancy and other academic activities	III.1	Journal Publications
	III.2	Conference Publications
	III.3	Research guidance
	III.4	Book publications
	III.5	Patents
	III.6	Product Design / Software Development
	III.7	Consultancy
	III.8	Funded Projects
CRITERIA IV (NOT TO BE ASSESSED) SWOT/SWOC and other relevant Information	IV.1	No. of Leaves availed during the period of assessment
	IV.2	What could you and/or the department do differently to help you better perform your job?
	IV.3	Describe your major accomplishments during the period of assessment
	IV.4	Future plans in respect of the following aspects
	IV.5	SWOT/SWOC analysis
	IV.6	WORK OUT PUT PLANNER for the next period of assessment

9. General Observations & Instructions to fill SAR

9.1. General observations on SAR

The above norms are means to facilitate individual faculty members to plan and regulate their own activities and also assess their performance in quantitative terms. The intent of these norms is not to control any faculty members but to help and guide activities of individuals as well as those of the

University in a manner so that work goes on smoothly through a balanced and coordinated participation of every member. The units have been assigned on the basis of expected time required to be devoted for the performance of the academic activities and also to avoid double accounting for the same / similar academic activities.

9.2. General instructions to fill SAR

1. SAR is an excel spread sheet protected by a key. It works well in MS Office- **Excel 2010 version**. And therefore users are not advised to use lower versions of Excel.

2. There is a 'dark red strip' on the extreme left side of the entire document of SAR to provide row reference.

3. Other than the red strip, '**Light greenish blue'** and '**light orange'** are the only colors predominantly used in the SAR.

4. The cells marked with 'light orange' are read only and therefore not editable. **The cells marked with 'Light greenish blue' are the only cells to be filled by faculty.**

5. Different date formats are used depending on the format requirements of the excel sheet. Appropriate date format, as is requisitioned by the sheet, is indicated either through the input message or in the cell itself.

6. By default all the entries are marked with 'No' or '0' or otherwise **kept blank**.

7. Majority of the cells, in Light greenish blue shade, are equipped with DROP DOWNS and / or INPUT messages to provide ease in filling. Users are advised to make use of these features to avoid errors in filling.

8. Do not leave anything blank. In case not applicable please write 'Not Applicable' or simply, NA..

10. Yearly Work Output & Grading of Performance

Work Output expected to produce

Every faculty irrespective of his cadre is expected to produce a minimum of 15 units of work output per year subject to fulfillment of category wise minimums as is guided by the following table:

Cadre	Cadre wise & criteria wise work output expected out a minimum of 15				
	Criteria I	Criteria II	Criteria III	Criteria IV	Total
Asst. Professor/ Sr. Asst. Professor **(70% +20% + 10)**	10.5	3.0	1.50	--	15
Assoc. Professor **(60% +25% + 15)**	9.0	3.75	2.25	--	15
Professor **(50% +30% + 20)**	7.5	4.5	3.0	--	15

Work Output expected to earn after assessment

Out of 15 units of work output produced, he has to earn a minimum of 11.25 units, (75% of 15) irrespective of his cadre. No criteria wise minimums for this 11.25.

Grading of yearly performance

Based on work output earned after assessment, the yearly performance of the faculty shall be graded as per the following table:

Range of work out put earned	Yearly grade on performance

Above 20.25	Excellent
17.25 - 20.25	Very Good
14.25 - 17.25	Good
11.25 - 14.25	Satisfactory
Below 11.25	Not satisfactory

The following are the indicative tables of work outputs expected from the faculty of different cadres:

Assistant Professor

	Performance Indicator (PI)	Yearly work description	WE
I.1	Theory Courses handled	4 theory papers	5.32
I.2	Lab Course conducted	4 Lab courses	3.00
I.3	Student Projects undertaken	1 batch of B.Tech.	1.20
I.4	Student Seminars and club Activities	At least 16 hours of student seminars	0.30
I.5	Learning materials developed	2 (note material and /or lab manual)	0.30
I.6	Training modules conducted	Minimum 25 hours training	0.52
I.7	Online Certificate courses	At least one of 64 hours duration	1.00
		TOTAL(Criteria I)	11.64
II.1	Attending FDPs such as WS /Conferences /seminars etc…	A minimum of 2 FDPs	1.00
II.2	Organizing FDPs such as WS /Conferences /seminars etc…	1 may be at institute level	0.20
II.3	Professional Related Roles	2 committee members	0.48
II.4	Students Counseling / mentorship	Maximum 25	0.75
II.5	Memberships of professional bodies	one	0.10
II.6	Industrial visits	one	0.25
II.7	Chairing Sessions and Delivering Talks & Lectures (In or outside the campus)	Desirable	
II.8	Any Other Outside Interaction	Desirable	
II.9	Industry Internships	one	0.87
		TOTAL(Criteria II)	3.65
III.1	Journal Publications	1 with or without IF	0.60
III.2	Conference Publications	one	
III.3	Research guidance	Desirable	
III.4	Book publications	Desirable	
III.5	Patents	Desirable	
III.6	Product Design / Software Development	Desirable	

III.7	Consultancy	1 at least of worth Rs. 50,000/- external grant or consultancy	0.80
III.8	Funded Projects	Desirable	
		TOTAL (Criteria III)	1.40
		Total (I + II + III)	16.69

Associate Professor

	Performance Indicator (PI)	**Yearly work description**	**WE**
I.1	Theory Courses handled	4 theory papers	5.32
I.2	Lab Course conducted	2 Lab courses	1.50
I.3	Student Projects undertaken	1 batch of B.Tech.	1.50
I.4	Student Seminars and club Activities	At least 16 hours of student seminars	0.30
I.5	Learning materials developed	2	0.30
I.6	Training modules conducted	Minimum 25 hours training	0.52
I.7	Online Certificate courses	At least one of 64 hours duration	1.00
		TOTAL(Criteria I)	10.44
II.1	Attending FDPs such as WS /Conferences /seminars etc…	A minimum of 2 FDPs	0.50
II.2	Organizing FDPs such as WS /Conferences /seminars etc…	1 may be at institute level	0.60
II.3	Professional Related Roles	2 committee members	1.00
II.4	Students Counseling / mentorship	Maximum 25	0.75
II.5	Memberships of professional bodies	one	0.10
II.6	Industrial visits	one	0.25
II.7	Chairing Sessions and Delivering Talks & Lectures	one	0.50
II.8	Any Other Outside Interaction	Desirable	
II.9	Industry Internships	one	0.30
		TOTAL(Criteria II)	4.00
III.1	Journal Publications	1 with or without IF	1.00
III.2	Conference Publications	one	0.50
III.3	Research guidance	Desirable	
III.4	Book publications	one	0.75
III.5	Patents	Desirable	
III.6	Product Design / Software Development	one	1.00
III.7	Consultancy		0.70
III.8	Funded Projects	1 at least of worth Rs. 50,000/- external grant or consultancy	0.60

| | | TOTAL(Criteria III) | 4.55 |
| | | Total (I + II + III) | 18.99 |

Professor

	Performance Indicator (PI)	Yearly work description	WE
I.1	Theory Courses handled	3 theory papers	3.99
I.2	Lab Course conducted	2 Lab courses	1.50
I.3	Student Projects undertaken	1 batch of B.Tech. 1 M.Tech. project	1.50
I.4	Student Seminars and club Activities	At least 16 hours of student seminars	0.30
I.5	Learning materials developed	2	0.30
I.6	Training modules conducted	Minimum 25 hours training	0.52
I.7	Online Certificate courses	desirable	
		TOTAL(Criteria I)	8.11
II.1	Attending FDPs such as WS /Conferences /seminars etc…	one	0.50
II.2	Organizing FDPs such as WS /Conferences /seminars etc…	1 may be an external funded	1.20
II.3	Professional Related Roles	2 committee members	1.20
II.4	Students Counseling / mentorship	Maximum 25	0.75
II.5	Memberships of professional bodies	one	0.30
II.6	Industrial visits	one	
II.7	Chairing Sessions and Delivering Talks & Lectures	one	0.50
II.8	Any Other Outside Interaction	Desirable	
II.9	Industry Internships		
		TOTAL(Criteria II)	4.45
III.1	Journal Publications	2with or without IF	2.00
III.2	Conference Publications	one	0.50
III.3	Research guidance	one	
III.4	Book publications	one	0.75
III.5	Patents	one	2.00
III.6	Product Design / Software Development	one	1.00
III.7	Consultancy		0.70
III.8	Funded Projects	1	0.60
		TOTAL(Criteria III)	7.55
		Total (I + II + III)	20.11

11. Review Process & Scheduling

11.1. Applicability

The evaluation system through SAR shall apply to all faculty members of the institution who are drawing regular scales

11.2. Commencement & Periodicity

Review process through annual SAR shall come into force with immediate effect (i.e., from the month of July 2015). This review process is conducted annually in the month of increment. The outcome of the evaluation is confidential and is by no means a way to compare one faculty member against another.

11.3. Venue

Note: Venue of the review shall normally be CONFERENCE HALL of the ADMN BLOCK unless otherwise informed

11.4. Scheduling

Every year in the month of July Blank formats will be supplied to the HoD for onward transmission to the faculty in the department. **The period of assessment will always be the IMMEDIATELY PRECEDING ACADEMIC YEAR**. The following table depicts scheduling and the flow of actions expected to be taken up by the Faculty, HoD concerned and ESTD SEC before the REVIEW getting scheduled:

STEP I

Action-1 by ESTD SEC

Soft copies of appropriate versions of the following documents be forwarded to the mail IDs of HoDs of all the departments as e-mail attachments on 1st July every year.
1. Self-Assessment Report (SAR)
2. Policy Document
3. Work Output Planner
4. HoDs Appraisal

STEP II

Action-1 by HoD

The soft copies thus received (S. Nos 1, 2 & 3 but not 4 of the list in Step I) are in turn be forwarded to the respective mail IDs of all the faculty in the department, expect for those faculty in probationary period of one year.

STEP III

Action-1 by Faculty

The following activities be taken up by faculty upon receiving the formats:
1. Go through the policy document in detail particularly "Instructions to fill SAR".
2. Fill the SAR by scrupulously following the instructions therein in Policy document.
3. The Filled in SAR be reverted back to the mail ID of the HoD for data validation in a week's time (i.e., on or before 7th July)

STEP IV

Action-2 by HoD

The following activities be taken up by HoD upon receiving the filled in formats:

1. The filled in SARs thus received from all the faculty be thoroughly reviewed on line with the help of the senior faculty in the department including academic coordinator for necessary data validation.
2. After making appropriate adjustments, corrections, modifications etc…, be done wherever necessary, all of them be kept in one folder
3. The folder be named as "Validated SARs of XXX dept", and be reverted back to ESTD. SEC. on or before 15th of July
4. HoD fills his appraisal on the faculty of his department and they be kept in one separate folder and also be forwarded to ESTD. SEC. on or before 15th of July

STEP V

Action-2 by ESTD SEC

The following activities be taken up by ESTD SEC upon receiving the validated SARs & HoDs appraisals:
1. Print outs of SAR, HoDs appraisal and Review Board Remarks be taken.
2. All the three be kept/joined together faculty wise
3. Scheduling for reviews be done either month of Increment wise or otherwise based on the amount of yearly work output rendered by the faculty, at the discretion of the review board
4. Scheduling of reviews for individual faculty be communicated to the respective HoDs

STEP VI

Action-2 by Faculty

He prepares himself with the following documents /files to be produced at the time of review.

1. All supporting documents in line with the credentials claimed / facts stated in the SAR
2. All reports and plan(s) of actions as is requisitioned by the 'review board remarks' which were automatically popped up while filling SAR
3. Filled in WORK OUT PUT planner for the next period of assessment

Note: Faculty shall not send his /her filled in SAR directly to ESTD SEC.

Note: The entire process will go on ONLINE. No hard copies shall be submitted either by faculty or the department.

Note: Print out of filled in SAR be taken by ESTD SEC just before the review.

11.5. Review Board Members

Re view Board comprises of the following ex-officio member:

HoD-Concerned	Member
DEAN-FDP	Member
DEAN-R&D	Member
DEAN-TP&PG	Member
APAC	Member Coordinator
VPAC	Member
PRINCIPAL	Chairman

12. Documents to be Made Available at Time of Review

1. **Fill in Annual Self-Appraisal Report (Version: 01)**
2. **Work out put Planar for the next period of assessment**
3. **HoD's Appraisal on the faculty**
4. All documents supporting the credential claimed in the SAR including the following:
   - Course & Subject Files of all the theory subjects taught in the period of assessment
   - Lab Files of all the lab subjects handled in the period of assessment
   - Copies of student feedback on all the theory subjects taught in the period of assessment
   - All the records pertaining to students counseling
   - Any other document(s)/ file(s) in support of the credentials specified in the report

13. References

1. **Performance Based Appraisal System (PBAS**) recommended by University Grants Commission (UGC)
2. **A primer for University & College Teachers** by Dr. M. Adithan & Dr. R. Murugavel
3. **Annual Self-Assessment report** implemented in PUNJABI UNIVERSITY, PATIALA
4. **Performance Based Appraisal System (PBAS**) Proforma for Calculating Academic Performance Indicator (API) Score, Nagpur University ,Nagpur
5. **Faculty Appraisal and Development System** of GGS Indraprasta University, New Delhi