NATIONAL BOARD OF ACCREDITATION

Pro-forma for Evaluation of Compliance Report for Tier II institutions

Profile of the Institute

1. Name of the College: ATRIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

2. Name of the program: B.E. in Mechanical Engineering

3. Current Accreditation period for which the compliance report is being submitted from Aug 2021-22 to Aug 2025-26

Compliance Status - PART A

S.No.	Parameters	Minimum Requirement	Calculations	Remarks of the Evaluator (to be left blank)
1.	Attach the copy of the AICTE approval for the Current Academic Year	YES	Attached	
2.	Attach the copy of University Affiliations for the Current academic Year (If Applicable)	YES	Attached	
3.	Admissions at the program level average for the previous three academic years (including actual admission through lateral entry) for CAYm1, CAYm2 and CAYm3		% Admissions at first year level = (Students Admitted (including lateral entry)/ Total Students Intake) X 100 Year Sanctione Admitted Admission 2023-24 60 16+20=36 60 2022-23 60 10+6=16 27 2021-22 120 9+5=14 12 Average = 33	

			CAY 2023			CAY 2024-25				Remarks
		V	Vith Ph	D.	With		With	PhD.	With	of the Evaluator (to be left blank)
s.N.	Designation	Regular	Contr	actual	out PhD	Regular	Co	ntractual	out PhD	
4a.	Professors	3		-	:=:	4		(#))	Œ	
4b.	Associate Professors	*(į	+ 0	5 9 1	1		1750	•	
4c.	Assistant Professors	14		2 7	10	8		:=:	3	
4d.	Total number of Faculty in the Department (UG+PG)	17		-	10	13		(#)	3	
5. S	FR Calculations	•								
		74 July 1	Secry W	Minim um	- 115	Aca	demic	Year	Remai	ks of the
S. N	Parameter	Calcula	ations	Requi	CAYm	2 C	AYm1	CAY	Evaluator	
				rement	2022-		023- 24	2024- 25	(to be left blank)	
5a.	Total number of sanctioned intake at UG + Actual admitted lateral entry students + PG level for the previous three academic years including the current academic year	* Total I Students Departm (S)	in the	€)	(120+5 + (120+1 + (120+5) = 379	1) 1 3) 1	566 + 225 + 30 = 21	(60+6) + (66+6) + (120+5) = 257		
* Studer	nts of all UG Programs from 2	nd years onwa	rds							
					379		21	257		
	The student faculty ratio (SFR)	SFR = S Where	S=		19	1	/ 17	13		
it	in the department averaged for	Total nur			19.94	1 18	3.88	19.76		
	previous three	the dept.	and total							
5b.	academic years including the current academic year.	number faculty in dept.	of	1:25	A	verage	= 1	9.52		



S.N	Parameters	Calculations	Prior to the Visit		After the visit			Remarks of the Evaluator (Tobe Left Bank)	
6	Improvement in success rate without backlog for past three batches	SI= (Number of students who have graduated from the program without backlog) / (Number of students admitted in the first year of that batch and admitted in 2nd year via lateral entry and separate division, if applicable) Average SI = mean of Success Index (SI) for past three batches	CAY m2 (2017-21) 139 7 0.05	CAY m1 (2016 -20) 133 5 0.03	CAY m (2015 -19) 95 6 0.06	CAYm2 (2018 -22) 71 5 0.07	CAYm1 (2019 -23) 46 6 0.13 verage =	CAYm (2020 -24) 57 5 0.08	
7	Improvement in success rate with backlog for past three batches	SI= (Number of students who graduated from the program in the stipulated period of course duration) / (Number of students admitted in the first year of that batch and admitted in 2nd year via lateral entry and separate division, if applicable) Average. Average SI = mean of Success Index (SI) for past three batches	CAYm2 (2017-21) 139 63 0.453	CAYm1 (2016-20) 133 81 0.609 verage	CAYm (2015-19) 95 49 0.517 = 0.52	CAYm2 (2018-22) 71 35 0.49	CAYm1 (2019-23) 46 18 0.4 /erage =	CAYm (2020-24) 57 25 0.43	

S.N.	Parameters	Calculations	Prior to the Visit			Afte	er the	visit	Remark s of the Evaluat or (to be left blank)	
8	Improvement In academic performance for the previous three years in Academic Performance for the previous three years	Academic Performance = Average API (Academic Performance Index) API = ((Mean of 2nd Year Grade Point Average of all successful Students on a 10 point scale) or (Mean of the percentage of marks of all successful students in Second Year/10)) X (number of successful students/number of students appeared in the examination). Successful Students are those who are permitted to proceed to the Third year.	CAYun2 (2018-19) 6.94 60 78 2.17	CAYm1 (2019-20) 7.62 50 61 6.24 erage = 4.	CAY (2020-21) 6.45 13 39 2.17	(20	AYm2 121-22) 5.24 50 51 5.13 Aver	CAYm1 (2022 -23) 6.43 16 16 6.43 age =	CAY (2023 -24) 6.92 18 19 6.55 6.03	
9	The Placement +Higher Studies+ Entrepreneurs hip ratio averaged for previous three academic years.		Entreprene Where, Z = higher stud State or Na Entreprene N= No. of For the A Total Year No. of Place No. o	ies with valitional Leve urship f Students a cademic y	ZN dents Place id qualifyid Tests, Gloppeared in cars:	Ym3 1-22)	CAYm (2022 - 2	ATE or pted ination	CAYm1 .023 -24) .52 .33	
			admi studi	tted for high	р	5 1	5		2	
			Ratio	0		70= 514	37/46 0.804		36/52= 0.692	
					Avera			1112		

Compliance status - PART B (Faculty Research and Development)

S. N.	Criteria	Prior to the Accreditation Visit	After the Accreditation Visit	Remarks of the Evaluator (to be left Blank)
	Improvement in the number	CAYm3 (2018 -19) (2019 -20) (2020 -21)	CAYm3 CAYm2 CAYm1 (2021-22) (2022-23) (2023-24)	
1	of Faculty Development program (FDP)	48 35 39 Total: 122	95 160 165 Total : 420	
2	Improvement in the number of Publications	CAYm3 (2018 -19) (2019 -20) CAYm1 (2020 -21) 4 1 5 Total :10	CAYm3 (2022-23) CAYm2 (2023-24) CAYm1 (2024-25) 4 13 13 Total: 30	
3	Quality of Publications	a. No. of papers in Non-SCI SCI/ESCI Scopus 7 IEEE conference /IET Conferences Books Book's chapter Non-Indexed Journal b. Patent/ copyrights Total:10	a. No. of papers in Non-SCI SCI/ESCI Scopus 15 IEEE conference /IET Conferences Books 2 Book's chapter 4 Non-Indexed Journal b. Patent/ copyrights Total:30	
4	Amount of funded research received	33,000	46,18,013	
5	Amount of funded consultancy	4,99,000	18,86,496	
6	Number of PhD. Produced		5	
7	Number of PhD. Pursuing	3	03	

Compliance status - PART C (Overall Compliance)

S.N.	Parameter	Criteria	Observations	Remarks of the Evaluator (to be left blank)
Criter	ion – 01			
1	1.4	State the process for defining the Vision and Mission of the Department, and PEOs of the program	Description of the process available but limited implementation	
2	1.5	Establish consistency of PEOs with Mission of the Department	Matrix available but inadequate justification	
Criteri	ion – 02			
3	2.1.2	State the delivery details of the content beyond the syllabus for the attainment of POs & PSOs	No effective Communication with university available. Limited delivery details and mapping	
4	2.2.1	Describe the Process followed to improve quality of Teaching Learning	Weak continuous assessment	
5	2.2.2	Quality of internal semester question papers, assignments and evaluation	Assignment Evaluation limited	
6	2.2.4	Initiatives related to industry interaction	No industry supported labs. Inadequate involvement of Industry	
7	2.2.5	Initiatives related to Industry internship /summer training	No impact analysis of industry training.	

Criteri	on – 03		
8	3,1.1	Course Outcomes	CO statements Needs improvement
9	3.1.2	CO-PO/PSOs matrices of courses selected in 3.1.1 (six matrices)	Weak explanation
10	3.2.3	Program level Course - PO/PSOs matrix of ALL courses including	Weak explanation
Criteri	ion – 04		
11	4.1	Enrolment Ratio	Nil
12	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	Very poor. Needs Significant improvement
13	4.2.2	Success rate with backlogs in stipulated period (actual duration of the program)	Needs improvement
14	4.3	Academic performance in third year	Needs improvement
15	4.4	Academic performance in second year	Needs improvement
16	4.5	Placement, Higher studies and Entrepreneurship	Needs Significant improvement.

17		4.6.1	Professional Societies /chapters and organizing engineering events	Only two societies found with limited events	
18		4.6.3	Participation in inter institute events by students of the program of study (at other institutions)	Poor events outside the state	
Crite	erion -	- 05			
19		5.1	Student-Faculty Ratio (SFR)	Needs improvement	
20		5.3	Faculty qualifications	Needs improvement	
21		5.4	Faculty Retention	Needs improvement	
22	2	5.5	Innovations by the Faculty in Teaching and Learning	Innovations not so significant	
2	23	5.7.1	Academic Research	Limited No. of publications and PhD guidance	
	24	5.7.2	Sponsored Research	Nill	
	25	5.7.4	Consultancy (From Industry)	Needs improvement	

Principal
Atrla Institute of Technology
Anandanagar, Bengaluru-24

8

26	5.8	Faculty Performance and appraisal and development system (FPADS)	Inadequate implementation	
27	5.9	Visiting/Adjunct/ Emeritus faculty etc.	Only one visiting faculty	
Criteri	on – 07			
28	7.2	Academic Audit and actions taken during the period of Assessment	Internal academic audit	
29	7.3	Improvement in Placement, Higher Studies and Entrepreneurship.	No significant improvement	
30	7.4	Improvement in the quality of students admitted to the program.	No significant improvement	
Criteri	ion – 08			
31	8.4.1	Describe the assessment processes used to gather the data upon which the evaluation of Course	Assessment tools to be improved	
32	8.4.2	Record the attainment of course outcomes of all the first-year courses	Record keeping to be improved	-
33	8.5.1	Indicate the result of evaluation of each relevant PO/PSO	Attainment computing needs attention	

34	8.5.2	Action Taken based on the results of evaluation of relevant POs/PSOs	Appropriate actions should be more systematically planned						
Criteri	Criterion – 09								
35	9.1	Mentoring system to help at individual level	Needs to be improved by Engaging Psychologist						
36	9.2	Feedback Analysis and award/Corrective measures taken, if any	Records are to be maintained						
37	9.3	Feedback on facilities	Corrective actions need improvement	-					
38	9.4	Self-Learning	No Records on Effective Utilization						
39	9.5	Career Guidance, Training and Placements	Career guidance, training, placement are motivating for GATE/GRE, GMAT						
40	9.6	Entrepreneurship Cell	The Entrepreneurship cell and the recordkeeping need to be improved						

41	9.7	Co-curricular and Extra Curricular Activities	Co-curricular and extracurricular activities need to be more systematic actions required for NSS and Club activities More Planned actions are needed for NSS and available clubs No NCC	
Criteri	on – 10			
42	10.1.2	Governing body, administrative setup, Functions of various bodies, Service rules, Procedures, recruitment and promotional bodies	The Governing body, administrative setup, functions of various bodies, service rules procedures, recruitment and promotional policies and there is no proper record keeping for meetings one BOGS meeting in a year and the committees & rules/policies are in place	
43	10.1.3	Decentralization in working and grievance redressal mechanism	There is a decentralization in working and grievance redressal mechanism and the action taken reports for meeting records are to be kept systematically and to be created and to be maintained. Delegation is low	

44	10.1.4	Delegation of financial powers	The delegation of financial powers, Transparency and availability of correct/unambiguous information in public domain is low and so the utilization is available and needs to be improved.	
45	10.1.5	Transparency and availability of correct/unambiguous information in public domain	The delegation of financial powers, Transparency and availability of correct/unambiguous information in public domain is low and so the utilization is available and needs to be improved. Dissemination needs improvement	
46	10.2.1 and 10.3.1	Adequacy of budget allocation	Allocation, utilization both are low	
47	10.3.2	Utilization of allocated funds	Justification not available	
48	10.4.1	Quality of learning resources	Fire safety certificate not available	
49	10.4.2	Internet	Digital learning resources in diverse areas need to improved	

Principal

Compliance status to Compliance Report-Tier II Institutions

S.N.	Pre-Visit Qualifiers (Average of Assessment years)	Requirement for 3 years	YES/NO	Requirement for 6 years	YES/NO
1	Admissions in the undergraduate programs under consideration including students admitted through lateral entry (average of the previous three academic years CAYm1,CAYm2 and CAYm3)	50%	NO	75%	NO
2	Faculty student ratio in the department under consideration (Averaged over previous three academic years including Current Academic Year.)	1:25	YES	1:20	YES
3	At least one Professor or one Associate Professor on regular basis with Ph.D. degree should be available in the respective Department during previous two academic years including current academic year.	YES	YES	At least two Professors or one Professor and one Associate Professor on regular basis with Ph.D. degree should be available in the respective Department for previous two years (including Current Academic Year).	YES
4	Number of available Ph.Ds. in the department (Averaged for previous two academic years including Current Academic Year.)	10%	YES	30%	YES
5	The HOD of the department in which the program under consideration is running should be appointed on regular basis and should possess PhD degree in the Current Academic Year (CAY).	NA	YES	YES	YES