

MANUAL FOR TVET INSTITUTION ACCREDITATION-2082

**Annex 9B: Criteria, Indicator,
Sub-indicators and Marking Criteria**



Approved by the Council for Technical
Education and Vocational Training (CTEVT)
on 2082/08/18

ANNEX 9B: Criteria, Indicators, Sub-indicators, and Marking Criteria
MANUAL FOR TVET INSTITUTION ACCREDITATION-2082

Reprint: January 2026

Quality Assurance and Accreditation Committee

Council for Technical Education and Vocational Training (CTEVT)

Sanothimi, Bhaktapur, Nepal

Approved by Council for Technical Education and Vocational Training (CTEVT) on 2082/08/18

The Quality TVET for Youth (QualiTY) Project supports the establishment and implementation of the TVET institution accreditation system in Nepal. As part of this initiative, technical assistance was provided to develop and validate the Manual for TVET Institution Accreditation – 2082. This project is a bilateral effort between the Swiss and the Nepal's governments. At the federal level, the Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology (MoEST) and the Council for Technical Education and Vocational Training (CTEVT) oversee the project, while at the provincial level, the Ministry of Social Development/Education (MoSD/E) is responsible for implementation. The Swiss Foundation for Technical Cooperation (Swisscontact), on behalf of the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC), offers technical support to the project.

Table of Contents

Criterion 1: Governance and Management (Indicators 10, Sub-indicators =34)	1
1.1. A strategic plan with a clear vision, mission, goals, objectives, and time-bound action-led indicators is operational (Sub-indicators: 5)	1
1.2. Green TVET policy in place with implementation strategies. (Sub-indicators: 3)	2
1.3. Organogram in place (Sub-indicators: 3)	3
1.4. The institution has approved program operating procedures or guidelines for effective implementation. (Sub-indicators: 3)	4
1.5. Management committee meetings are organised periodically. (Sub-indicators: 3)	5
1.6. The monitoring and evaluation plan (M&E) and its implementation (Sub-indicators: 3)	6
1.7. A system of periodic management review is in practice. (Sub-indicators: 3)	7
1.8. Periodic progress review of the strategic plan is in practice. (Sub-indicators: 3)	8
1.9. Procurement plan and its effective operation. (Sub-indicators: 3)	9
1.10. Implementation of internal quality assurance (IQA) plan (Sub-indicators: 5)	10
Criterion 2. Physical Learning and Resources (Indicators 13, Sub-indicators =53)	12
2.1. A departmental office for staff with the required facilities is available (Sub-indicators: 3)	12
2.2. The institute has a required number of classrooms (Sub-indicators: 5)	12
2.3. The institute requires laboratories and workshops regarding number, size, design, and specification. (Sub-indicators: 5)	14
2.4. Operational machines and equipment as specified in the curricula or approved guidelines. (Sub-indicators: 5)	16
2.5. Sufficiency and ownership of land and buildings. (Sub-indicators: 5)	17
2.6. Students find sufficient opportunities for practical exposure in the institute. (Sub-indicators: 5)	19
2.7. All the students have access to consumables. (Sub-indicators: 3)	20
2.8. The library with required reference materials (textbooks and reference books) is available in a minimum number. (Sub-indicators: 3)	20
2.9. Girls' and boys' hostels are available for needy students who reside in rental buildings. (Sub-indicators: 3)	21
2.10. Availability of restrooms and other hygiene facilities in the institution. (Sub-indicators: 5)	22
2.11. Institutions ensure access to physical facilities for people with disabilities. (Sub-indicators: 3)	23
2.12. The institute maintains occupational safety and health (OSH) measures. (Sub-indicators: 3)	24
2.13. The institute's property is regularly repaired and maintained. (Sub-indicators: 5)	25
Criterion 3. Human Resource (Indicators 9, Sub-indicators =44)	27
3.1. Qualified teaching staff are maintained as per the curriculum. (Sub-indicators: 5)	27
3.2. Teaching positions are filled with full-time staff. (Sub-indicators: 10)	28
3.3. Non-teaching positions are filled with formally appointed staff. (Sub-indicators: 5)	30
3.4. Plan for professional development/human resource development of teaching and	32

non-teaching staff. (Sub-indicators: 3)	
3.5. Teaching staff have sound pedagogical practices along with some types of teaching skills training (tot or is) from a recognised body. (Sub-indicators: 5)	33
3.6. Teaching staff have actual workplace-based occupational skills upgrading (OSU) training organised by a recognised body. (Sub-indicators: 5)	34
3.7. The institute maintains a teaching (work) load among the teaching staff. (Sub-indicators: 5)	36
3.8. A teaching staff backup plan is in place. (Sub-indicators: 3)	37
3.9. The teaching staff meetings are organised regularly for exchange and learning. (Sub-indicators: 3)	38
Criterion 4. Instruction and Learning (Indicators 15, Sub-indicators =67)	39
4.1. Nationally approved curriculum-based learning competencies in practice. (Sub-indicators: 5)	39
4.2. Session plans with learning outcomes in practice. (Sub-indicators: 5)	40
4.3. Theoretical-practical ratios are maintained as per the curriculum. (Sub-indicators: 5)	41
4.4. Curriculum delivery completed as planned. (Sub-indicators: 5)	42
4.5. Curriculum-provisioned teaching hours in industries. (Sub-indicators: 5)	43
4.6. Instructor-student ratio in classes and workshops. (Sub-indicators: 5)	45
4.7. Monitoring of learning achievements. (Sub-indicators: 5)	46
4.8. Regular assessment of classwork/practical workbooks. (Sub-indicators: 5)	48
4.9. Workplace-based learning/on-the-job training (OJT) in practice. (Sub-indicators: 5)	49
4.10. Exposure to emerging market skills. (Sub-indicators: 5)	50
4.11. Supplementary instructional practices that extend beyond the prescribed curriculum	51
4.12. Student attendance maintenance. (Sub-indicators: 3)	52
4.13. Student feedback collection and implementation. (Sub-indicators = 3)	53
4.14. Systematic stakeholder feedback. (Sub-indicators: 3)	54
4.15. Joint stakeholder review meetings (Sub-indicators = 3)	55
Criterion 5. Market Linkage and Sustainability (Indicators 9, Sub-indicators =33)	56
5.1. Linkages with industries and employers operating under industry-institute linkages (IIL). (Sub-indicators: 5)	56
5.2. Representation of business and industry associations (BIAs) in the institute management/ operational committee. (Sub-indicators: 5)	57
5.3. Institute maintains an active exchange with BIAs. (Sub-indicators: 5)	58
5.4. The institute has established a production unit (PU) (Sub-indicators: 3)	60
5.5. Maintenance of transparent accounts from sales of products. (Sub-indicators: 3)	60
5.6. Effective annual budgeting and expenditure. (Sub-indicators: 3)	61
5.7. Sufficient institutional income/budget. (Sub-indicators: 3)	62
5.8. Effective inventory control and management. (Sub-indicators: 3)	62
5.9. Students' exposure visits to industries/projects/communities. (Sub-indicators: 3)	63
Criterion 6. Student Support Services (Indicators 7, Sub-indicators =31)	65
6.1. The psychosocial counselling health services unit (PCHSU) is in place. (Sub-indicators: 5)	65

6.2. Student's aptitude test before enrolment is in practice. (Sub-indicators: 3)	66
6.3. Job placement service is available. (Sub-indicators: 5)	56
6.4. Scholarship and other incentives to pro/poor students (full scholarship, partial scholarship, support on accommodation, etc.). (Sub-indicators: 3)	68
6.5. The institute provides recreational facilities for the students (playgrounds, indoor games, facilities, meeting rooms, cafeteria, etc.) (Sub-indicators: 5)	68
6.6. Students' grievance redressal mechanisms are in place and practised. (Sub-indicators: 5)	70
6.7. Students are encouraged to innovate and engage in extracurricular technical activities. (Sub-indicators: 5)	71
Criterion 7. Research and Development (Indicators 10, Sub-indicators =38)	73
7.1. The institute has a clear communication strategy and knowledge management system, and operates effectively. (Sub-indicators: 3)	73
7.2. The TVET management information system (MIS) is in place and operational. (Sub-indicators: 3)	73
7.3. The labour market information system (LMIS) is in place and operational. (Sub-indicators: 3)	74
7.4. The institute organises learning sharing workshops with stakeholders. (Sub-indicators: 3)	75
7.5. A functional financial management information system (FMIS) is in place. (Sub-indicators: 5)	76
7.6. The institute conducts periodic independent evaluations, and findings are implemented. (Sub-indicators: 6)	76
7.7. The institute conducts tracer studies and uses its report for quality enhancement. (Sub-indicators: 5)	77
7.8. Students' enrollment, dropout and passout rates per the enrollment policy and criteria, including GESI. (Sub-indicators: 5)	78
7.9. Market assessment (Sub-indicators: 5)	80
7.10. Employment rate of graduates (average of last 3 years) (Sub-indicators: 5)	81

Criterion 1 Governance and Management (Total Indicators 10, Weightage =34)

1.1 A strategic plan with a clear vision, mission, goals, objectives, and time-bound action-led indicators is operational (Sub-indicators: 5)

1.1.1. The institution has an approved strategic plan (Assesses whether the Institution has a formally approved strategic plan with a vision, mission, goals, objectives, action plans, responsibilities, and a timeline.)

Marking Criteria	Sub-indicators
No strategic plan or draft plan exists, but it does not have at least two components: a) vision/mission, and b) goals/objectives.	0
A draft strategic plan has at least two components: a) vision/mission, and b) goals/objectives, but it has not been formally approved.	0.25
There is an approved strategic plan with at least two components: a) vision/mission, and b) goals/objectives, but it is missing action plans.	0.5
There is an approved strategic plan with vision/mission, goals/objectives, and action plans that miss responsibilities or a timeline.	0.75
There is an approved strategic plan with vision/mission, goals/objectives, action plans, responsibilities, and a timeline.	1.0

1.1.2. The strategic plan has coherence and consistency of different levels of goals along with the strategies/ action plan, timeline, responsibilities, and logical framework (Assesses the alignment among the vision, mission, goals, objectives, strategies, timelines, responsibilities, and the presence of a logical framework.)

Marking Criteria	Sub-indicators
Vision/mission does not guide the formulation of goals/ objectives.	0
Vision/mission informs the goals/objectives, but strategies/ action plans are not aligned.	0.25
Vision/mission, goals/objectives, and strategies/action plans are aligned, but timelines and responsibilities are missing or inconsistent.	0.5
Vision/mission, goals/objectives, strategies/action plans, timelines, and responsibilities are aligned, but there is no explicit logical framework or visual/chart showing their interconnections.	0.75
Vision/mission, goals/objectives, strategies/action plans, timelines, and responsibilities are aligned, along with a presented logical framework or flowchart that visually maps the strategic linkages.	1.0

1.1.3. The strategic plan has time-bound action plans with key performance indicators (KPIs) (Assesses whether the strategic plan includes time-bound action plans with tracked performance indicators.)

Marking Criteria	Sub-indicators
The strategic plan does not include both action plans and key performance indicators.	0
The strategic plan lists actions, but no timelines or key performance indicators.	0.25
The strategic plan has an action plan with timelines but no key performance indicators.	0.5
The strategic plan has a timeline and key performance indicators, but no evidence tracking those indicators. (Check for the last 12 months' tracking)	0.75

The strategic plan has a timeline and key performance indicators, and those indicators' progress is tracked at least annually. (Check for the last 12 months' tracking)	1.0
---	-----

1.1.4. There exists evidence of stakeholders' involvement in strategic plan development (Assesses the extent to which internal and external stakeholders were involved in developing or updating the strategic plan.)

Marking Criteria	Sub-indicators
No evidence of stakeholder consultation during the development/update of the strategic plan.	0
Evidence shows that consultation was limited to the school's internal leadership (e.g., principal, senior management).	0.25
Evidence shows broader internal leadership consultation and consultation with the faculty and staff members.	0.5
Evidence indicates that internal leadership, faculty, and staff, along with at least one of the external stakeholders, such as alumni or industry partners, were involved during the development or the strategic plan update.	0.75
Evidence of comprehensive consultation that includes internal stakeholders (leadership + faculty staff), parents and local community, and external stakeholders such as alumni and industry partners were engaged during the strategic plan's development or update.	1.0

1.1.5. Implementation status of the strategic plan is tracked and documented (Assesses whether the institution tracks and documents the implementation of its strategic plan over the past 12 months.)

Marking Criteria	Sub-indicators
No documentation is available to demonstrate the implementation of this year's plan (over the past 12 months).	0
Ad hoc or documentation covering less than 50% of the implementation of the strategic plan is observed regarding this year's plan (in the last 12 months).	0.25
There is documentation of 50% of the planned activities related to this year's plan (over the past 12 months).	0.5
There is documentation of more than 50% of the planned activities regarding this year's plan (in the last 12 months).	0.75
There is documentation of more than 75% of the planned activities regarding this year's plan (over the last 12 months).	1.0

1.2 Green TVET policy in place with implementation strategies. (Sub-indicators: 3)

1.2.1 The institution has a documented green TVET policy/guidelines (Assesses whether the institution has an approved green TVET policy/guideline that addresses key environmental focus areas.)

Marking Criteria	Sub-indicators
The institution does not have a green TVET policy/guideline document.	0
The institution has a draft green policy/guideline, but lacks an implementation plan.	0.25
The institution has an approved green policy/guideline and an action plan. Still, it does not plan to address at least two major environmental focus areas: greenery, energy, waste management, behavioural change, and water.	0.5

The institution has an approved green policy/guideline with an action plan. Still, it only addresses two key environmental focus areas: greenery, energy, waste management, behavioural change, and water.	0.75
The institution has an approved green policy/guideline with an action plan that covers at least three of the four major environmental focus areas: greenery, energy, waste management, behavioural change, and water.	1.0

1.2.2 The institution has an eco-club and implemented green practices per the policy/guideline (Assesses the extent to which the institution has implemented green practices in line with its policy or guideline.)

Marking Criteria	Sub-indicators
There is no evidence of the implementation of green practices through the eco-club, or only unstructured and undocumented ad-hoc efforts are observed.	0
Ad-hoc or occasional, green-related efforts, such as single-day clean-up drives or awareness events, are observed, but no documentation or structured planning to support these.	0.25
Evidence of the documented implementation of green practices through the eco-club in at least one area, such as greenery, energy, waste management, behavioural change, and water conservation	0.5
Evidence of documented efforts through the eco-club in at least two of the four major green practice areas: greenery, energy, waste management, behavioural change, and water conservation.	0.75
There is evidence of systemic implementation of green practices through the eco-club in three focus areas: greenery, energy, waste management, behavioural change, and water conservation.	1.0

1.2.3 Stakeholder engagement to implement the green policy in the institution (Assesses the level of involvement of different stakeholders in implementing the Institution's green policy.)

Marking Criteria	Sub-indicators
There is no evidence of any involvement of any stakeholder (students, staff/faculty, alumni/local community, and industry) in implementing the green policy.	0
Basic awareness activities related to green practices were conducted over the last 12 months, but those practices involved only students, for example, through green campaigns or workshops.	0.25
Evidence shows that at least two different types of stakeholders among the students, staff/faculty, alumni/local community, and industry were engaged in green initiatives or activities during the last 12 months.	0.5
There is evidence that both at least three different types of stakeholders among the students, staff/faculty, alumni/local community, and industry were engaged in green initiatives or activities during the last 12 months.	0.75
There is evidence that both at least four different types of stakeholders among the students, staff/faculty, alumni/local community, and industry were engaged in green initiatives or activities during the last 12 months.	1.0

1.3. Organogram in place (Sub-indicators: 3)

1.3.1 The institution has documented an organogram (Assesses whether the Institution has an officially approved, comprehensive, transparent, and publicly displayed organogram.)

Marking Criteria	Sub-indicators
The institution does not have an organogram in place.	0
A draft version of the organogram exists but has not yet been officially approved.	0.25

An approved organogram is in place but is missing roles or positions essential for institutional function, such as teachers, headteachers, department heads, and administrative staff.	0.5
The organogram is approved and includes all relevant roles and job descriptions; however, the reporting lines are unclear or poorly defined.	0.75
The organogram is fully approved, visually clear with defined reporting lines, and publicly displayed within the Institution.	1.0

1.3.2 Staff awareness regarding the organogram in the institution (Assesses the level of awareness among staff and faculty regarding their roles and responsibilities as outlined in the organogram.)

Instruction to assessor: Verify this indicator separately with the department/faculty heads, teachers, and administrative staff.

Marking Criteria	Sub-indicators
The organogram has not been communicated to the staff, and there is no evidence of awareness at any level.	0
Only the leadership team (headteacher and department/faculty heads) is aware of the organogram, with no formal communication shared with the broader staff.	0.25
Only half of the staff and teachers understand their roles and responsibilities outlined in the organogram.	0.5
Over half of the staff and teachers understand the roles and responsibilities outlined in the organogram.	0.75
Over three-quarters of the staff and teachers understand their roles and responsibilities outlined in the organogram.	1.0

1.3.3 Reviewing the mechanism of the organogram (Assesses whether the Institution has a formal mechanism to periodically review and update the organogram based on the level of effort or institutional changes.)

Marking Criteria	Sub-indicators
There is no process for reviewing the organogram, and no records of past reviews are available.	0
The organogram is reviewed only irregularly or in response to specific staffing or structural issues, without a schedule.	0.25
The organogram is reviewed occasionally, but there is no formal review process or documentation outlining the criteria or timing of the review.	0.5
The organogram is reviewed based on a Level of Effort (LoE) calculation, but the review is not conducted consistently on an annual basis.	0.75
The organogram is reviewed annually through a formalised process guided by Level of Effort (LoE) analysis, with documented records of decisions and updates.	1.0

Note: Level of Effort (LoE) in terms of person-days refers to the total number of working days required by one person to complete a task or activity. It is a standardised way to estimate or measure human resource input.

1.4. The institution has approved program operating procedures or guidelines for effective implementation. (Sub-indicators: 3)

1.4.1 Approval status of program operating procedures/guidelines (Assesses whether the program's operating procedures or guidelines are officially approved and documented.)

Marking Criteria	Sub-indicators
No program operating procedures or guidelines exist in written form.	0

Draft procedures/guidelines exist in print or digital form but have no official stamp or signature.	0.25
Printed procedures/guidelines are available and approved by the principal/management committee, but no record of the meeting or decision is available.	0.5
Printed and signed guidelines are available, and a meeting minute or resolution confirms their approval.	0.75
Printed and signed guidelines are available, approved by the management committee or relevant body, and recorded in official meeting minutes with a decision-reference number or date.	1.0

1.4.2 Coverage of program operating procedures or guidelines (Assesses whether the operating procedures or guidelines cover key components such as operational steps, responsibilities, safety, and monitoring.)

Marking Criteria	Sub-indicators
Procedures/guidelines include no key components (choose from: operational steps, roles and responsibilities, safety procedures, monitoring/review mechanisms).	0
Procedures/guidelines include one key component (choose from: operational steps, roles and responsibilities, safety procedures, monitoring/review mechanisms).	0.25
Procedures/guidelines include two key components (choose from: operational steps, roles and responsibilities, safety procedures, monitoring/review mechanisms).	0.5
Procedures/guidelines include three key components (choose from: operational steps, roles and responsibilities, safety procedures, monitoring/review mechanisms).	0.75
Procedures/guidelines include all four key components (choose from: operational steps, roles and responsibilities, safety procedures, monitoring/review mechanisms).	1.0

1.4.3 Accessibility, communication, and review of the program's operating procedures or guidelines (Assesses the accessibility of the guidelines to staff, how well they are communicated, and whether they are reviewed periodically.)

Marking Criteria	Sub-indicators
No staff members are aware of the existence of the guidelines.	0
1–2 staff members are informally aware, but no formal orientation or communication has occurred.	0.25
At least 25% of teaching or program-related staff can confirm awareness; no formal orientation record is available.	0.5
At least 50% of staff can explain the existence and purpose of the guidelines; orientation was done verbally or through a meeting.	0.75
75% or more of program-related staff confirm awareness; documentation (e.g., orientation attendance sheet or meeting note) exists.	1.0

1.5. Management committee meetings are organised periodically. (Sub-indicators: 3)

1.5.1 Frequency of the management committee meetings (Assesses how frequently the Institution's management committee meets within 12 months.)

Marking Criteria	Sub-indicators
The management committee has not held or held only one meeting in the last 12 months.	0
The management committee held two meetings in the last 12 months.	0.25
The management committee held three meetings in the last 12 months.	0.5
The management committee has held four meetings in the last 12 months.	0.75
The management committee held more than four meetings in the last 12 months.	1.0

1.5.2 Timeliness of meeting scheduling and agenda sharing (Assesses whether meeting agendas are prepared and shared in advance to allow effective participation.)

Marking Criteria	Sub-indicators
No agenda was prepared or shared in advance for any meetings held in the last 12 months.	0
Agendas were prepared but shared less than 2 days in advance for more than half of the meetings.	0.25
Agendas were shared at least 2 days before for 50% of the meetings.	0.5
Agendas were shared at least 3 days in advance for 75% of the meetings, with records (emails, memos, notices) available.	0.75
Agendas were shared at least 3 days in advance for all meetings in the last 12 months, with records (emails, memos, notices) available.	1.0

1.5.3 Decision implementation tracking of the management committee meetings (Assesses whether decisions made in management committee meetings are tracked and implemented.)

Marking Criteria	Sub-indicators
No follow-up on the decisions of the management committee.	0
Decisions of the management committee meetings are noted but not tracked	0.25
Evidence shows that 50% of the decisions made in the last 12 months were implemented.	0.5
There is evidence of the implementation of 75% decisions made in the last 12 months	0.75
There is evidence of the implementation of more than 75% decisions made in the last 12 months	1.0

1.6. The monitoring and evaluation plan (M&E) and its implementation (Sub-indicators: 3)

1.6.1 Existence of documented M&E plan (Assesses whether a documented M&E plan exists with defined indicators, data methods, and responsibilities.)

Marking Criteria	Sub-indicators
There is no Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) plan within the Institution.	0
A draft M&E plan has been developed but has not yet been formally approved by the relevant authority.	0.25
An approved M&E plan exists, but it does not include key indicators to measure program progress and performance.	0.5
An approved M&E plan includes key indicators; however, it lacks clear information on data collection methods or defined roles and responsibilities for implementation.	0.75
An approved M&E plan is in place that includes clearly defined and relevant indicators, detailed data collection methods, and assigned roles and responsibilities for implementation.	1.0

1.6.2 Implementation of the M&E plan & data utilisation (Assesses whether M&E data is regularly collected, analysed, and used for decision-making and program improvement.)

Marking Criteria	Sub-indicators
There is no evidence that the Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) plan has been implemented.	0
Data is being collected, but no evidence exists that it is being analysed or used for decision-making.	0.25
Fundamental or ad-hoc data analysis is conducted occasionally but is not systematic or linked to program improvements.	0.5
Regular data reporting occurs, and at least one documented action has been taken based on the findings.	0.75

Data regularly informs decisions, and two or more documented instances demonstrate that data-driven actions have led to programmatic improvements or changes.	1.0
---	-----

1.6.3 Learning meetups to share the best practices and lessons learned (Assesses whether learning meetups are conducted to share best practices and lessons learned, with proper documentation and follow-up.)

Marking Criteria	Sub-indicators
No learning meetups or reflective sessions were held during the last 12 months to share good practices or lessons learned from failures.	0
Learning meetups were held infrequently during the last 12 months, occurring less than once per academic year.	0.25
Learning meetups were held at least once per academic term during the last 12 months, but documentation was minimal, limited to attendance records only.	0.5
Learning meetups were held at least once per academic year during the last 12 months, with documented agendas, meeting minutes, and identified follow-up actions.	0.75
Learning meetups were held at least twice per academic year during the last 12 months, and each session had documented agendas, meeting minutes, and identified follow-up actions.	1.0

Note: A learning meetup is an internal or cross-functional session where employees come together to learn from one another through presentations, discussions, workshops, or hands-on activities.

1.7. A system of periodic management review is in practice. (Sub-indicators: 3)

1.7.1 Periodic management review frequency and structure (Assesses whether structured and documented management reviews are held periodically.)

Marking Criteria	Sub-indicators
No periodic management review system exists within the Institution.	0
Management reviews are conducted ad hoc without any documentation or formal records.	0.25
Annual management reviews are conducted, but these reviews are unstructured and lack an agenda or formal plan.	0.5
Annual management reviews have a formal agenda and a summary report documenting the discussions and findings.	0.75
Annual management reviews are conducted with a formal agenda, documented summary report, clearly defined action items, and a follow-up plan.	1.0

1.7.2 Decision implementation tracking of periodic management reviews (Assesses whether decisions from management reviews are implemented within defined timelines.)

Marking Criteria	Sub-indicators
No follow-up is conducted on the decisions made by the management review meetings.	0
Decisions from management reviews are documented, but there is no system to track their implementation.	0.25
At least 50% of the decisions are made by the management review meetings over the last 12 months are being implemented.	0.5
More than half of the decisions made by the management reviews are implemented with clearly defined timelines for each action.	0.75
All decisions made by the management review have been fully implemented within the agreed timelines.	1.0

1.7.3 Communication of the management reviews' decisions (Assesses whether the outcomes of management reviews are communicated across the Institution and followed up systematically.)

Marking Criteria	Sub-indicators
Decisions made by the management review are not communicated to anyone within the Institution.	0
Decisions are communicated informally only among the management team without formal documentation or wider dissemination.	0.25
Decisions are communicated to relevant departments, but there is no systematic process for follow-up.	0.5
Decisions are communicated organisation-wide, and implementation of the decisions is assigned and documented.	0.75
Decisions are communicated across the organisation, with implementation responsibilities assigned, documented, and followed up on at least once to monitor progress.	1.0

1.8. Periodic progress review of the strategic plan is in practice.
(Sub-indicators: 3)

1.8.1 Frequency of the periodic review of the strategic plan (Assesses how often the strategic plan is reviewed and whether the review is documented with action points.)

Marking Criteria	Sub-indicators
The Institution has not conducted any review of the strategic plan.	0
The strategic plan has been reviewed on an ad-hoc basis without formal documentation.	0.25
The strategic plan is reviewed once every three years, but only partial documentation is available (e.g., notes without clear outcomes or action points).	0.5
The strategic plan is reviewed once every two years, and each review results in a documented action plan.	0.75
The strategic plan is reviewed at least once a year, and all reviews are documented with action points.	1.0

1.8.2 Implementation tracking of the strategic plan (Assesses whether the Institution tracks progress against the strategic plan's action items with documented results.)

Marking Criteria	Sub-indicators
There is no system or evidence to track the implementation of the strategic plan.	0
Basic implementation tracking is done, but without analysis or documented follow-up.	0.25
The Institution tracks progress on at least 50% of the strategic plan's action items.	0.5
With some follow-up, the Institution tracks implementation of at least 75% of the strategic plan's action items.	0.75
The Institution tracks implementation of all the strategic plan's action items, with documented evidence of completed activities and achieved outcomes.	1.0

1.8.3 Stakeholder engagement and communication regarding the strategic plan implementation (Assesses the level and documentation of stakeholder engagement and communication related to strategic plan implementation.)

Marking Criteria	Sub-indicators
There has been no engagement or communication with stakeholders (teachers, administrative staff, parents, industry) regarding the review or implementation of the strategic plan.	0
Engagement is limited to senior management (SMC/Board of Directors and Headteachers), and no updates are shared with other stakeholders.	0.25

Middle management (head of departments/faculties) is occasionally informed about the strategic plan, but the communication is not formally documented.	0.5
Middle management (head of departments/faculties), teachers, and administrative staff are informed occasionally, and communication is supported by documentation.	0.75
Middle management (head of departments/faculties), teachers, administrative staff, and relevant external stakeholders (such as industry partners) are engaged and informed about the strategic plan implementation through documented communication efforts.	1.0

1.9. Procurement plan and its effective operation. (Sub-indicators: 3)

1.9.1 Procurement committee's functionality (Assesses whether the procurement committee is formally established, meets regularly, and keeps records documented.)

Marking Criteria	Sub-indicators
The institution does not have a formal procurement committee in place.	0
A procurement committee is formed on an as-and-when-required basis, without a permanent structure.	0.25
A procurement committee exists and operates with a clearly defined Terms of Reference.	0.5
The procurement committee meets on an as-and-when-required basis, and meeting decisions are formally documented in minutes.	0.75
The procurement committee meets regularly according to a pre-established procurement calendar, and all decisions are properly documented in minutes.	1.0

1.9.2 Procurement annual plan (Assesses whether an annual procurement plan is developed and approved, and includes budgets and timelines.)

Marking Criteria	Sub-indicators
No annual procurement plan exists; procurements are conducted on an as-and-when-required basis.	0
A draft annual procurement plan exists, but it has not yet been formally approved.	0.25
An annual procurement plan has been approved.	0.5
The approved procurement plan includes line-item estimated budgets for the planned procurements.	0.75
The approved procurement plan includes budgets and specific timelines for each procurement item.	1.0

1.9.3 Compliance of the procurement plan (Assesses whether procurement activities comply with the approved plan based on a sample of recent transactions.)

Instructions to auditors: Randomly check at least five transactions of the last 12 months.

Marking Criteria	Sub-indicators
There are violations in over 80% of the purchases reviewed in the sample check.	0
There are violations in 60% of the purchases reviewed in the sample check.	0.25
There are violations in 40% of the purchases reviewed in the sample check.	0.5
There are violations in 20% of the purchases reviewed in the sample check	0.75
All purchases are fully compliant with the sampled purchases.	1.0

1.10. Implementation of internal quality assurance (IQA) plan (Sub-indicators: 5)

1.10.1 Self-assessment report related to the indicator tracking system (Assesses whether the Institution has a system to regularly update and track the self-assessment report.)

Marking Criteria	Sub-indicators
There is no mechanism (infrastructure, such as software, tracking sheets) to update the Self-Assessment Report.	0
A mechanism exists, but the data/ information has not been updated for a year.	0.25
There exists a mechanism, but the data/ information has not been updated for the last six months	0.5
There exists a mechanism, but the data/information has not been updated for the last three months	0.75
There exists a mechanism, and data/ information has not been updated at least once a month	1.0

1.10.2 Existence of internal quality assurance (IQA) body/ committee (Assesses whether a formally approved internal quality assurance (IQA) body exists and operates effectively.)

Marking Criteria	Sub-indicators
The institution has no internal quality assurance (IQA) body/ committee.	0
The institution has a formally approved internal quality assurance (IQA) body/ committee.	0.25
The approved internal quality assurance (IQA) body/ committee operates with defined Terms of Reference (ToR).	0.5
The internal quality assurance (IQA) body/ committee conducts at least four annual meetings.	0.75
The internal quality assurance (IQA) body/ committee consistently follows up on the decisions made in previous meetings in each subsequent meeting.	1.0

1.10.3 Composition of the IQA system or committee (Assesses whether the IQA committee includes a diverse group of internal and external stakeholders.)

Marking Criteria	Sub-indicators
The internal quality assurance body/ committee consists only of members from the management committee.	0
Management committee members, staff, and faculty members are included as the internal quality assurance body/ committee members.	0.25
Management committee members, staff, faculty, and students are represented as the internal quality assurance body/ committee members.	0.5
Management committee members, staff, faculty, students, and members from the local community are included in the internal quality assurance body/ committee.	0.75
Management committee members, staff and faculty, students, members from the local community and industry sector representatives are included as internal quality assurance body/ committee members.	1.0

1.10.4 Internal quality assurance body/ committee conducts quality audits (Assesses whether the IQA committee conducts regular quality audits and provides recommendations.)

Marking Criteria	Sub-indicators
The internal quality assurance body/ committee conducts no quality audit.	0

The internal quality assurance body/ committee conducts a quality audit at least once yearly.	0.25
The internal quality assurance body/ committee conducts a quality audit at least once yearly and provides recommendations based on the findings.	0.5
The internal quality assurance body/ committee conducts quality audits twice a year.	0.75
The internal quality assurance body/ committee conducts at least two quality audits annually and provides actionable recommendations.	1.0

1.10.5 Compliance with internal quality audit recommendations (Assesses whether the IQA committee conducts regular quality audits and provides recommendations.)

Marking Criteria	Sub-indicators
1. The recommendations provided by the internal quality assurance and accreditation committee through quality audits are not implemented.	0
2. At least 25% of the recommendations made by the internal quality assurance and accreditation body/ committee through quality audits are implemented.	0.25
3. At least 50% of the internal quality assurance and accreditation body/committee's recommendations through quality audits are implemented.	0.5
4. At least 75% of the internal quality assurance and accreditation body/committee's recommendations through quality audits are implemented.	0.75
5. All the recommendations provided by the internal quality assurance and accreditation body/ committee through quality audits are fully implemented.	1.0

Criterion 2 Physical Learning and Resources (Indicators 13, Sub-indicators =53)

2.1. A departmental office for staff with the required facilities is available (Sub-indicators: 3)

2.1.1. Office space availability for the departments (Assesses whether departments have designated physical spaces for administrative and academic coordination.)

Marking Criteria	Full marks
No dedicated office space for departments.	0
Departments share space with other functions (e.g., classrooms).	0.25
A basic room is available for departments, but without partitions.	0.5
Separate and dedicated offices are available for each department.	0.75
Separate and dedicated offices are available for each department, where departmental meetings can be conducted.	1.0

2.1.2 Furniture adequacy in the departments (Checks if departmental staff have sufficient ergonomic furniture (tables, chairs, storage) to perform their duties comfortably.)

Marking Criteria	Full marks
No furniture is available.	0
Usable chairs and tables are available for at least 25% of the departmental staff.	0.25
Usable chairs and tables are available for at least 50% of the departmental staff.	0.5
Usable chairs and tables are available for about 75% of the departmental staff.	0.75
Usable chairs and tables are available for all of the departmental staff.	1.0

2.1.3 Computer availability in the departments (Evaluates if departmental staff have adequate access to internet-connected computers or laptops for academic and administrative tasks. Availability should be proportionate to the number of staff per department.)

Marking Criteria	Full marks
No computers with internet connectivity are available.	0
One shared PC with internet is available per department.	0.25
PCs/laptops with an internet connection are available for at least 25% of the departmental staff.	0.5
PCs/laptops with an internet connection are available for at least 50% of the departmental staff.	0.75
PCs/laptops with an internet connection are available for at least 75% of the departmental staff.	1.0

2.2. The institute has the required number of classrooms (Sub-indicators: 5)

2.2.1 Availability of classrooms in sufficient quantity (Assesses whether the number of classrooms meets the current enrollment needs of the institution.)

Marking Criteria	Full marks
The institute faces a severe shortage of classrooms, with less than 50% of its needs met.	0

The available classrooms meet 70% of the institute's needs.	0.25
The available classrooms meet 90% of the institute's needs.	0.5
The number of classrooms meets the requirement, but classrooms are overcrowded (more than 48 students per class on average).	0.75
There is at least one classroom per 40 students (or the quota provided by the CTEVT), with an additional 20% buffer capacity.	1.0

2.2.2 Quality of classrooms in terms of ventilation, lighting, and basic technology (Checks the usability and comfort of classrooms in terms of natural light, airflow, and presence of teaching aids like projectors or whiteboards.)

Marking Criteria	Full marks
More than one-fourth (25%) of the classrooms are unusable due to the absence of ventilation or natural lighting.	0
More than 10% of the classrooms are unusable due to inadequate ventilation or lighting.	0.25
All classrooms are functional, and at least 25% are equipped with basic instructional technology such as projectors.	0.5
All classrooms are functional, and at least 50% are equipped with basic instructional technology such as projectors.	0.75
All classrooms are functional, and over 50% are equipped with basic instructional technology such as projectors.	1.0

2.2.3 Availability of specialised learning spaces (e.g., computer lab, simulated lab) (Evaluates the presence and quality of subject-specific or skill-specific spaces for hands-on learning, such as nursing skills labs or electrical workshops.)

Marking Criteria	Full marks
The institute does not have any specialised learning spaces.	0
A single shared multi-purpose room is available for various learning activities.	0.25
A dedicated computer lab is available for students.	0.5
Subject-specific demonstration rooms are available, with at least one for each specialisation offered.	0.75
Subject-specific demonstration rooms are available, with at least one for each specialisation offered, and at least one industry-simulated laboratory (e.g., automotive, electrical, nursing) that reflects real-world work environments.	1.0

2.2.4 TVET optimised classroom design (Assesses whether the physical layout of classrooms is suitable for practical, skills-based instruction (e.g., space for demonstrations, tool racks, safety signs).)

Marking Criteria	Full marks
Classrooms follow a regular academic setup without tools, demonstration space, or safety features.	0
Classrooms have only basic modifications, such as movable tables or whiteboards, but lack demonstration areas and safety zones.	0.25
Classrooms include a designated demonstration area (e.g., practice table, tool stand) but lack a layout for practical training.	0.5
Classrooms include demonstration areas, subject-specific tools or equipment, and safety signage.	0.75
Classrooms have demonstration areas, subject-specific tools and equipment, safety signage, and noise-control features like acoustic panels or curtains.	1.0

2.2.5 Classroom accessibility and inclusiveness for people with disability (Assesses how well classrooms are designed to accommodate students with physical disabilities (e.g., ramps, wide doors, handrails)).

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
Classrooms are inaccessible to students with disabilities (e.g., no ramps, narrow doors, or lack of handrails).	0
At least one classroom is accessible to students with disabilities (e.g., ramps, wide doors, or handrails), but others are not adapted.	0.25
At least two classrooms are accessible to students with disabilities (e.g., ramps, wide doors, or handrails).	0.5
At least 25% of the classrooms are accessible to students with disabilities (e.g., ramps, wide doors, or handrails).	0.75
More than 25% of the classrooms are accessible to students with disabilities (e.g., ramps, wide doors, or handrails).	1.0

2.3. The institute requires laboratories and workshops regarding number, size, design, and specification. (Sub-indicators: 5)

2.3.1 Quantity of laboratories and workshops (per program for specific subjects) (Evaluates whether each program has access to dedicated laboratories or workshop spaces appropriate for their subject specialisation.)

Instructions to the assessors: This sub-indicator does not include basic science, such as a chemistry lab.

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
The institute does not have any dedicated laboratories or workshops.	0
There is one shared laboratory or workshop space for all programs.	0.25
There is one laboratory or workshop for every two programs.	0.5
There is one laboratory or workshop per program, but the spaces are undersized (at least half of the enrolled students cannot work simultaneously).	0.75
There is at least one laboratory or workshop per program, and more than half of the enrolled students can work at a time, with a 20% capacity buffer.	1.0

2.3.2 Optimised size & space in laboratories and workshops (Checks whether lab and workshop areas meet or exceed minimum size standards set by CTEVT or relevant authorities.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
The laboratory or workshop space is less than 50% of the CTEVT-prescribed minimum area.	0
The laboratory or workshop space is 50% of the CTEVT-prescribed minimum area.	0.25
The laboratory or workshop space is 80% of the CTEVT-prescribed minimum area.	0.5
The laboratory or workshop space is 100% of the CTEVT-prescribed minimum area.	0.75
The laboratory or workshop space is 100% + 20% buffer of the CTEVT-prescribed minimum area.	1.0

Note for the assessors: Refer to the table below for some CTEVT-prescribed minimum areas for labs and workshops. For those not mentioned here, please refer to the CTEVT standards (<https://ctevt.org.np/>)

Type of Laboratory/Workshop	Area per Trainee
General technical workshop/laboratory	1.0 – 1.5 m ² per trainee

Computer lab	1.2 – 1.5 m ² per workstation
Electrical/Electronic lab	1.0 – 1.5 m ² per trainee
Mechanical workshop	1.5 – 2.0 m ² per trainee
Nursing skills lab	1.5 – 2.0 m ² per trainee
Dental lab	1.2 – 1.5 m ² per trainee
Automotive workshop	2.0 – 3.0 m ² per trainee
Welding workshop	2.0 – 3.0 m ² per trainee
Hospitality/Kitchen lab	1.5 – 2.0 m ² per trainee
Renewable energy lab	1.0 – 1.5 m ² per trainee
Simulated industry lab	Per industry standards

2.3.3 Equipment specifications of the laboratories and workshops (Assesses whether tools and machines are present in the required number and specification as per curriculum guidelines.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
Less than 50% of the basic tools and equipment required for the programs are available.	0
50% of the basic tools and equipment required for the programs are available.	0.25
More than 50% of the basic tools and equipment required for the programs are available.	0.5
Complete tools and equipment are available, but some are outdated (Outdated means they are not used in the current industry but were used five years ago).	0.75
Complete sets of functional and the latest tools and equipment are available for the programs.	1.0

2.3.4 Safety and compliance in the laboratories and workshops (Evaluates whether safety protocols and equipment are in place, including PPE, safety signage, first aid, and regular safety drills.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
Laboratories and workshops are hazardous due to a lack of ventilation, fire exits, or other significant safety risks.	0
Basic personal protective equipment (PPE) such as gloves and goggles is available, but other safety measures (such as fire safety equipment, first aid facilities) are lacking.	0.25
Basic personal protective equipment (PPE), such as gloves and goggles, is available. Safety signs are also displayed, and first aid kits are available within laboratories and workshops.	0.5
Basic personal protective equipment (PPE), such as gloves and goggles, is available. Safety signs are also displayed, and first aid kits are available within laboratories and workshops. The institution also conducts regular safety drills at least two times a year.	0.75
Basic personal protective equipment (PPE), such as gloves and goggles, is available. Safety signs are also displayed, and first aid kits are available within laboratories and workshops. The institution also conducts regular safety drills at least two times a year. Safety equipment is kept up to date (such as a non-expired fire extinguisher)	1.0

2.3.5 Equipment matches the tools and processes used in the current local job markets. (Assesses how well the lab tools and machines reflect current industry practices, ensuring students are work-ready.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
Less than 25% of the equipment in laboratories and workshops matches the tools and processes currently used in local job markets.	0

At least 25% of the training or laboratory equipment reflects tools and processes used in current local job markets.	0.25
At least 50% of the equipment matches employers' tools and processes in the local job markets.	0.5
At least 75% of the laboratory or classroom tools reflect recent technologies such as automation kits or digital tools.	0.75
More than 75% of the laboratory and classroom tools fully reflect recent technologies and standards relevant to local job markets.	1.0

2.4. Operational machines and equipment as specified in the curricula or approved guidelines. (Sub-indicators: 5)

2.4.1 Availability of the machines and equipment in the workshops and laboratories (Assesses the presence of curriculum-mandated tools and equipment usable for practical instruction.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
Less than 50% of the machines and equipment required per the curriculum or guidelines are available in the institute.	0
Between 50% and 70% of the required equipment is available in the workshops or laboratories.	0.25
Between 70% and 90% of the required equipment is available.	0.5
Between 90% and 100% of the required equipment is available, but some items are outdated.	0.75
All required equipment is available and upgraded to match current industry standards.	1.0

2.4.2 Equipment functionality in the workshops and laboratories (Evaluates the proportion of machines and tools that are functional and maintained for regular student use.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
More than 50% of laboratory and workshop equipment is non-functional or unusable.	0
Between 50% and 70% of the equipment is functional, while the rest requires repair or replacement.	0.25
Between 70% and 90% of the equipment is functional and usable.	0.5
Between 90% and 100% of the equipment is functional, although some may be ageing or near end-of-life.	0.75
All equipment is fully operational, and the institute maintains preventive maintenance records and schedules as evidence of ongoing functionality.	1.0

2.4.3 Maintenance and calibration system for equipment (Assesses whether there is a documented and followed system for maintenance and calibration of key equipment.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
There is no system or record for the maintenance or calibration of equipment. Most machines are used without inspection.	0
Maintenance is done ad hoc, with no documented schedule or log. Calibration is rarely conducted.	0.25
A basic maintenance plan exists with irregular documentation; calibration is only done for some key equipment.	0.5
Preventive maintenance and calibration are performed regularly for most equipment, with partial documentation available.	0.75

The institution follows a documented maintenance and calibration plan, with up-to-date logs for all major equipment.	1.0
--	-----

2.4.3 Student-to-equipment Ratio for equipment and machines in the laboratories or workshops (Evaluates whether students have adequate access to equipment during practical sessions, ensuring small group hands-on practice.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
There is only one functional tool or equipment for more than 10 students, limiting hands-on practice significantly.	0
One functional tool or equipment is available for every 9 to 10 students.	0.25
One functional tool or equipment is available for every 7 to 8 students.	0.5
There is one functional tool or equipment available for every six students.	0.75
One functional tool or equipment is available for fewer than six students, aligning with industry-standard training ratios.	1.0

2.4.5 Ageing and industry relevance of the equipment in the laboratories and workshops (Assesses whether the equipment is modern and aligned with current industry trends and technologies.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
More than 75% of the laboratory or workshop equipment is over 10 years old and no longer aligns with current industry practices.	0
Between 50% and 75% of the equipment is between 6 and 10 years old and only partially reflects current job market tools.	0.25
At least 50% of the available tools and machines match those commonly used in local small and medium enterprises (SMEs).	0.5
At least 75% of the equipment reflects the tools and standards used in large industries or is aligned with government-endorsed occupational standards.	0.75
The available equipment includes up-to-date technologies such as digital systems, automated machines, and other tools that reflect current and emerging industry practices.	1.0

2.5. Sufficiency and ownership of land and buildings. (Sub-indicators: 5)

2.5.1 Land ownership status (Checks whether the land used by the institution is institution-owned, rented, or shared, and if ownership supports long-term development.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
The institution does not own any land and operates entirely on rented property.	0
The institution owns at least 25% of the land it uses for its facilities.	0.25
The institution owns at least 50% of the total land for its operation.	0.5
The institution wholly owns its land, but the total area is insufficient, as indicated in discussions with teachers and students.	0.75
The institution owns its land, and the area is sufficient for academic and institutional functions, confirmed through discussions with teachers and students.	1.0

2.5.2 Land area adequacy (Assesses if the total land area meets CTEVT's per-student space requirements, allowing for expansion and quality education.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
The institution has less than 50% of the required land area, based on the standard of 4 square meters per student.	0
The institution has 75% of the required land area, calculated using the standard of 4 m ² per student.	0.25
The institution has secured between 95% of the required land area.	0.5
The institution meets the minimum required land area, providing at least 4 square meters per student.	0.75
The institution exceeds the required land area by at least 20%, providing 4.8 square meters per student.	1.0

2.5.3 Building ownership (Checks the extent to which institutional buildings are owned rather than rented, which affects sustainability and planning.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
The institution does not own any of the buildings it occupies and operates entirely on rented premises.	0
The institution owns at least 25% of the total building space used for its operations.	0.25
The institution owns at least 50% of its total building space.	0.5
The institution owns at least 75% of the total building space.	0.75
The institution owns over 75% of the total building space for academic and administrative purposes.	1.0

2.5.4 Building sufficiency (Assesses whether buildings meet the required size standards for theory and practical classes.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
None of the classrooms meet the required space standards of at least 0.75 m ² per student for theory and 1 m ² for practical classes.	0
Less than 25% of the classrooms meet the minimum space standards of 0.75 m ² per student for theory and 1 m ² per student for practical classes.	0.25
Less than 50% of the classrooms meet the required minimum space standards.	0.5
Less than 75% of the classrooms meet the minimum space requirements for theory and practical classes.	0.75
More than 75% of the classrooms meet or exceed the minimum space standards of 0.75 m ² per student for theory and 1 m ² per student for practical classes.	1.0

2.5.5 Future extension capacity (Evaluates whether the institution has space or infrastructure plans that allow for future growth.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
The institution has no available land or building space for future expansion.	0
The institution has limited potential for expansion, with less than 10% additional space available.	0.25
The institution has moderate potential for expansion, with 25% additional space available.	0.5
The institution has good potential for expansion, with 50% additional space available.	0.75
The institution has excellent potential for expansion, with more than 50% additional space available.	1.0

2.6. Students find sufficient opportunities for practical exposure in the institute. (Sub-indicators: 5)

2.6.1 Curriculum integrated practice hours (Assesses whether the number of practical hours delivered aligns with what is prescribed in the curriculum. Auditors should verify both scheduled and conducted hours.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
Students receive less than 30% of the required practical hours integrated within the curriculum.	0
Students receive 50% of the required practical hours integrated within the curriculum.	0.25
Students receive 75% of the required practical hours integrated within the curriculum.	0.5
Students receive 90% of the required practical hours integrated within the curriculum.	0.75
Students receive between 100% of the required practical hours integrated within the curriculum.	1.0

2.6.2 Workshop/Lab utilisation rate (Evaluates how frequently the institution uses its labs and workshops for student practice, indicating whether resources are effectively employed.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
Less than 20% of the workshop or laboratory equipment is utilised for practical sessions.	0
Workshop or laboratory equipment is utilised 20% of the time.	0.25
Workshop or laboratory equipment is utilised 30% of the time.	0.5
Workshop or laboratory equipment is utilised 40% of the time.	0.75
Workshop or laboratory equipment is utilised 50% of the time.	1.0

2.6.3 Industry standard equipment access (Checks whether the tools and equipment used in practical sessions are current and aligned with the tools used in industry settings.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
The institution has no tools or equipment aligned with current industry standards.	0
Less than 30% of the available equipment meets current industry standards.	0.25
60% of the equipment is aligned with industry requirements.	0.5
90% of the equipment meets industry standards.	0.75
100% of the equipment is industry-standard, including recent upgrades.	1.0

2.6.4 Instructor-guided practical sessions (Assesses the extent of instructor involvement in guiding students through hands-on projects, ensuring that learning is structured and supervised.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
No live projects or practical sessions are conducted under instructor guidance.	0
Instructors conduct occasional demonstrations of practical work.	0.25
Students engage in at least one instructor-guided project per semester.	0.5
Students participate in two to three instructor-guided projects per semester.	0.75
Students are involved in continuous instructor-guided industry projects, with three or more projects offered per semester.	1.0

2.6.5 Industry collaboration for practice (Evaluates how well the institute engages with local industries to provide real-world practical exposure through visits, internships, or apprenticeships.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
The institution has no collaboration or links with industry partners.	0
Industry collaboration is limited to occasional guest lectures.	0.25
The institution organises field visits to industries as part of practical exposure.	0.5
Structured internships are provided in collaboration with industry partners.	0.75
Apprenticeships are organised regularly in partnership with industries.	1.0

2.7. All the students have access to consumables. (Sub-indicators: 3)

2.7.1 Inventory adequacy for student use (Assesses the Availability of necessary consumable items (e.g., materials, components) for all students during practical sessions.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
Less than 50% of the required consumable items are available for students.	0
50% of the required consumable items are available for students' use.	0.25
More than 50% of the required consumable items are available for students.	0.5
More than 75% of the required consumable items are available for students.	0.75
100% of the required consumable items, including a 10% buffer stock, are available.	1.0

2.7.2 Monitoring and recordkeeping of consumables usage (Evaluates whether the institute maintains systematic records of consumables and uses those records for planning and restocking)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
No records of the use of consumables are maintained.	0
Records are maintained inconsistently and are not updated regularly.	0.25
Records are maintained regularly but lack disaggregation by program or batch.	0.5
Records are maintained regularly and disaggregated by program or batch, but are not used for planning.	0.75
Records are systematically maintained, disaggregated, and used to inform planning and restocking.	1.0

2.7.3 Equity of access (random observation of one practical class) of the consumables (Checks if all students can equally access consumables during a randomly observed session, ensuring no group is disadvantaged.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
More than 40% of students face shortages of consumables during the observed class.	0
25% of students face shortages of consumables during the observed class.	0.25
10% of students face shortages of consumables during the observed class.	0.5
Less than 10% of students face shortages of consumables during the observed class.	0.75
All students (100%) have access to the required consumables during the observed class.	1.0

2.8. The library with required reference materials (textbooks and reference books) is available in a minimum number. (Sub-indicators: 3)

2.8.1 Minimum book collection in the library (Assesses whether the library has sufficient textbook titles per subject as outlined in the curriculum.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
Fewer than three required titles per subject are available for any course in the curriculum.	0
At least three required titles are available for 50% of the curriculum subjects.	0.25
At least three required titles are available for 75% of the curriculum subjects.	0.5
At least three required titles are available for 100% of the curriculum subjects.	0.75
At least three required titles are available for all curriculum subjects, and additional reference materials for 50%.	1.0

2.8.2 Curriculum alignment of the books and library resources (Checks whether there are enough physical copies of each title to meet student demand, based on a per-student ratio.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
Fewer than one copy per 10 students for most titles.	0
At least one copy per 10 students for 50% of the required titles.	0.25
At least one copy per 10 students for 75% of the required titles.	0.5
At least one copy per 5 students for 90% of the required titles.	0.75
At least one copy per 3 students for all required titles.	1.0

2.8.3 Accessibility and utilisation of the books and library resources (Evaluates how easy it is for students to access library resources, including digital access, open hours, and usability.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
Students do not have open access to the library resources.	0
The library offers open access with limited operating hours (20 or fewer hours/ week).	0.25
The library remains open at least 40 hours weekly and provides open access.	0.5
The library remains open at least 60 hours per week and includes a digital search system.	0.75
At least 50% of the library resources are accessible online 24/7.	1.0

2.9. Girls' and boys' hostels are available for needy students who reside in rental buildings. (Sub-indicators: 3)

2.9.1 Hostel availability for boys and girls (Assesses whether hostel facilities exist, are gender-segregated, and can accommodate students who require housing.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
The institution does not provide any hostel facilities for students.	0
A single shared hostel is available without gender separation.	0.25
Separate hostels are available for boys and girls, but the total capacity is inadequate.	0.5
The hostels can accommodate at least 75% of the students who require accommodation.	0.75
The hostels meet the full demand for student accommodation with an additional 10% buffer capacity.	1.0

2.9.2 Basic amenities in the hostel (Evaluates whether hostels provide necessary living conditions such as beds, sanitation, study areas, security, and internet.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
The hostel infrastructure is unsafe or uninhabitable for students.	0
Only a basic shelter is provided, with no beds or sanitary facilities.	0.25
The hostel includes beds and shared bathroom facilities.	0.5

The hostel has study areas, laundry facilities, beds, and bathrooms.	0.75
The hostel includes Wi-Fi access, a cafeteria or mess, 24/7 security services, study areas, laundry facilities, beds, and bathrooms.	1.0

2.9.3 Accessibility of the hostel for needy students (Checks whether hostels prioritise economically disadvantaged students for allocation and provide subsidies.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
Hostel seats are not allocated based on student need or economic status.	0
At least 25% of the hostel capacity is allocated for disadvantaged students.	0.25
At least 50% of hostel seats are reserved for disadvantaged students, and partial subsidies are provided.	0.5
At least 75% of hostel capacity is reserved for needy students, and full subsidies are provided to them.	0.75
All needy students who require accommodation are provided with hostel facilities, either free or at a subsidised rate.	1.0

2.10. Availability of restrooms and other hygiene facilities in the institution. (Sub-indicators: 5)

2.10.1 Physical availability of the restrooms/toilets (Assesses whether there are enough separate and functional restroom facilities for male and female students across buildings.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
Gender-friendly restrooms are not available on campus.	0
A single shared restroom facility is available for the entire campus, without gender separation.	0.25
Separate restrooms are available for boys and girls, but are poorly maintained.	0.5
Separate restrooms are available and accessible in at least 50% of the institution's buildings and floors.	0.75
Separate restrooms are available and functional in all buildings and floors.	1.0

2.10.2 Accessibility features of restrooms for people with disability (Evaluates whether restrooms include features like ramps, grab bars, or accessible stalls for students with physical disabilities.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
Restrooms do not have any accessibility features for people with disabilities.	0
Ramps are available, but restrooms lack further accessible features, such as grab bars.	0.25
Restrooms are equipped with grab bars and accessible ramps.	0.5
Wheelchair-accessible stalls are available within the restroom facilities.	0.75
Restrooms are fully accessible and include Braille signage or audio guidance.	1.0

2.10.3 Safety & privacy of the restrooms (Checks whether restroom facilities offer adequate Privacy (doors, locks, lighting) and include emergency safety features)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
Restrooms do not have functioning doors or locks, compromising safety and Privacy.	0
Only basic locks are provided, offering minimal Privacy and security.	0.25
Each restroom stall has solid doors, whole partitions, and secure internal locks that function correctly.	0.5

Panic buttons or emergency alert systems are installed in the restrooms to enhance student safety.	0.75
Restrooms provide complete safety and Privacy with gender-specific signage, private stalls with working locks, and sufficient lighting.	1

2.10.4 Hygiene standards maintenance in the restrooms (Assesses the cleanliness of restrooms, including cleaning frequency and whether hygiene-enhancing technologies are in place.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
Restrooms are unusable due to a lack of water supply or cleaning services.	0
Restrooms are cleaned only once per week.	0.25
Restrooms are cleaned daily using manual cleaning methods.	0.5
Restrooms are equipped with semi-automated or self-cleaning systems to maintain hygiene.	0.75
Restrooms have sensor-based cleaning systems and provide facilities for safe menstrual waste disposal.	1.0

2.10.5 Sanitary pad availability and disposal facility (Evaluates the Availability of menstrual hygiene products and proper disposal systems, including student involvement and regular audits.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
No system is in place to ensure the Availability and disposal of sanitary pads.	0
Only basic signage regarding menstrual hygiene is available.	0.25
The institution conducts annual gender sensitivity workshops addressing menstrual hygiene.	0.5
Student-led inclusion committees are actively involved in promoting menstrual hygiene and pad access.	0.75
The institution conducts regular audits and incorporates feedback on menstrual hygiene during Internal Quality Assurance and Accreditation reviews.	1.0

2.11. Institutions ensure access to physical facilities for people with disabilities. (Sub-indicators: 3)

Mobility access for people with disability (Assesses whether students with mobility impairments can move freely across campus buildings through ramps or barrier-free designs.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
The institution has no physical accessibility features for individuals with mobility impairments.	0
Ramps are available in only one or two key areas within the campus.	0.25
Ramps are available in more than 50% of the institution's areas.	0.5
At least 80% of the institution's facilities, with ramps, are physically accessible to people with disabilities.	0.75
All institutional buildings and facilities are 100% barrier-free, including features such as tactile guiding paths.	1.0

2.11.1 Adaptive learning facilities to ensure access for students with disability (Evaluates the Availability of tools and learning spaces tailored for students with various disabilities (e.g., hearing, visual, mobility))

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
There are no adaptive measures or resources to support students with disabilities in learning environments.	0
Only basic assistive tools, such as magnifying glasses and large print materials, are provided.	0.25

Laboratory spaces and learning areas include adjustable-height workstations.	0.5
Specialised equipment, such as Braille kits or hearing support devices, is available.	0.75
Advanced assistive technologies are fully integrated, such as voice-enabled AI systems for ICT labs and digital tools for accessible learning.	1.0

2.11.2 Inclusive communication & signage (Checks for inclusive communication strategies, support staff, training, and involvement of students with disabilities in planning.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
Institutional staff have not received any training related to disability or communication.	0
Annual sensitivity workshops are conducted to raise awareness about inclusive communication.	0.25
A designated support officer is available to assist students with disabilities.	0.5
Peer-buddy programs are implemented to support inclusive learning and campus engagement.	0.75
The institution conducts regular accessibility audits and incorporates feedback from students with disabilities into ongoing improvements at least two times a year.	1.0

2.12. The institute maintains occupational safety and health (OSH) measures. (Sub-indicators: 3)

2.12.1 Safety equipment & infrastructure regarding occupational safety and health measures (Assesses the presence of PPE, emergency exits, and fire safety systems in areas where practical or technical work is done.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
The institute provides no personal protective equipment (PPE) or hazard control systems in workspaces.	0
Basic PPE, such as gloves or goggles, is available in only one lab or workshop.	0.25
Full PPE and marked emergency exits are available in at least 50% of practical or workspaces.	0.5
PPE is available in at least 80% of relevant areas, and functional first-aid kits are installed.	0.75
All workspaces are fully equipped with PPE and supported by automated safety systems such as fire suppression or alarm systems.	1.0

2.12.2 Training and compliance regarding occupational safety and health measures (Evaluates the frequency and depth of safety training, including hands-on drills and student certification in OSH practices.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
The institute does not conduct any training or awareness sessions related to occupational safety and health.	0
Safety training is limited to annual lecture-based sessions without practical engagement.	0.25
The institute organises annual safety drills and displays educational posters on occupational safety and health practices.	0.5
Safety drills, with at least one practical session, are conducted once in every semester.	0.75
Monthly hands-on safety drills are conducted, and students receive certifications aligned with industry occupational safety and health standards.	1.0

2.12.3 Hazard monitoring & response regarding occupational safety and health measures (Checks whether the institute regularly assesses and addresses risks in work areas through documented audits or detection systems.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
No formal risk assessments or monitoring systems are in place to detect safety hazards.	0
Inspections are conducted on an ad-hoc basis without systematic documentation or follow-up.	0.25
Annual safety audits are conducted, but only 50% of corrective actions are taken.	0.5
Hazard audits are conducted quarterly, with mitigation measures implemented for at least 75% of identified issues.	0.75
Real-time hazard detection systems (e.g., sensors) are installed, and 100% of identified risks are addressed through timely corrective action.	1.0

2.13. The institute's property is regularly repaired and maintained. (Sub-indicators: 5)

2.13.1 Preventive maintenance system (Assesses whether the institute follows a planned and scheduled approach to maintaining facilities and equipment.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
The institute does not follow any structured facility or equipment maintenance system.	0
Repairs and maintenance are conducted only on an ad hoc or emergency basis.	0.25
An annual maintenance schedule exists but is inconsistently implemented, with gaps in coverage.	0.5
Quarterly inspections are conducted to identify and address maintenance issues.	0.75
Quarterly inspections are conducted, and timely actions are taken based on inspection findings.	1.0

2.13.2 Workshop/Lab equipment condition (Evaluates the functionality of laboratory and workshop equipment and how well they are maintained.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
More than 30% of the workshop or laboratory equipment is non-functional.	0
20% of the workshop or laboratory equipment is non-functional.	0.25
10% of the workshop or laboratory equipment is non-functional.	0.5
Less than 10% of the equipment is non-functional, with the rest in usable condition.	0.75
All equipment is fully operational and supported by up-to-date calibration and maintenance records.	1.0

2.13.3 Structural integrity (Checks the physical soundness of buildings through inspections, audits, and repair records.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
The infrastructure has hazardous conditions such as visible cracks, water leaks, or damaged roofing.	0
Minor structural issues are observed, but no formal audit system exists.	0.25
Qualified professionals conduct annual structural audits.	0.5
Repairs and structural improvements are made semi-annually based on periodic assessments.	0.75
The institution uses real-time monitoring tools like moisture or vibration sensors to assess structural integrity.	1.0

2.13.4 Responsiveness to repair (Assesses how quickly and efficiently the institute responds to repair requests, especially for critical infrastructure.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
Repair requests take more than 30 days to be addressed.	0

Repairs are generally addressed within 30 days.	0.25
Repairs are completed within 14 days of reporting.	0.5
Repairs, especially critical ones, are responded to within 48 hours.	0.75
Critical repairs are addressed within 24 hours, ensuring minimal disruption.	1.0

2.13.5 Sustainability practices for repairing and maintenance (Evaluates whether environmentally sustainable materials and methods are used in maintenance activities, and whether reuse and documentation practices exist.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
Repair and maintenance activities do not consider environmental sustainability, using only non-eco-friendly materials.	0
Durable materials are used, but no reuse, recycling, or documentation practices exist.	0.25
Some parts and materials are reused, and selective equipment is repaired instead of replaced.	0.5
Maintenance activities include maintaining eco-friendly materials (e.g., LED lighting, water-saving fixtures) and keeping records.	0.75
A formal green maintenance policy is in place, emphasising energy efficiency, reuse, recycling, and sustainable procurement in all maintenance activities.	1.0

Criterion 3 Human Resource (Indicators 9, Sub-indicators =44)

3.1. Qualified teaching staff are maintained as per the curriculum. (Sub-indicators: 5)

3.1.1 Staff-to-student ratio (Assesses whether the number of teaching staff is sufficient to provide effective instruction and individual attention to students, based on the curriculum demands and recommended ratios in TVET settings.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
The student-to-teacher ratio exceeds 35:1.	0
The student-to-teacher ratio is 35:1.	0.25
The student-to-teacher ratio is 30:1.	0.5
The student-to-teacher ratio is 25:1.	0.75
The student-to-teacher ratio is 20:1 or less.	1.0

3.1.2 Qualification compliance of the teaching staff (Measures the extent to which teaching staff possess the minimum academic and professional qualifications required for their assigned roles and program levels.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
Less than 50% of teaching staff meet the minimum qualification requirements.	0
65% of teaching staff meet the minimum qualification requirements.	0.25
80% of teaching staff meet the minimum qualification requirements.	0.5
95% of teaching staff meet the minimum qualification requirements.	0.75
100% of teaching staff meet the minimum qualification requirements.	1.0

3.1.3 Industry experience of the teaching staff (Evaluates how many teaching staff have prior practical experience working in the relevant industry, ensuring they can connect classroom instruction to real-world applications)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
Less than 50% of teaching staff have any industry experience.	0
At least 50% of teaching staff have less than one year of industry experience.	0.25
At least 50% of teaching staff have at least one year of industry experience.	0.5
At least 50% of the teaching staff have at least three years of industry experience.	0.75
At least 50% of the teaching staff have over three years of industry experience.	1.0

3.1.4 Certification alignment of the teaching staff (certified instructors) (Looks at the proportion of teachers who have completed formal instructor training programs aligned with national or international standards to ensure competent delivery.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
None of the teaching staff has completed a certified instructor training course of at least 40 hours.	0
At least 25% of teaching staff have completed a certified instructor training course of at least 40 hours.	0.25

At least 50% of the teaching staff have completed a certified instructor training course of at least 40 hours.	0.5
At least 75% of teaching staff have completed certified instructor training of at least 45 hours.	0.75
More than 90% of teaching staff have completed a certified instructor training course of at least 40 hours.	1.0

3.1.5 Special needs awareness received by the teaching staff (Assesses the level of training staff have received to support students with special needs, ensuring inclusive teaching practices.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
No teaching staff have participated in a special needs awareness session lasting at least 8 hours in the last three years.	0
At least 25% of teaching staff have participated in a special needs awareness session lasting at least 8 hours in the last three years.	0.25
More than 25% to less than 50% of teaching staff have participated in a special needs awareness session lasting at least 8 hours in the last three years.	0.5
At least 50% of teaching staff have participated in a special needs awareness session lasting at least 8 hours in the last three years.	0.75
Over 50% of teaching staff have participated in a special needs awareness session lasting at least 8 hours in the last three years.	1.0

3.2. Teaching positions are filled with full-time staff. (Sub-indicators: 10)

3.2.1 Vacancy rate (vacant position status) of teaching staff (Monitors how many approved teaching positions remain unfilled, indicating staffing adequacy and recruitment effectiveness.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
More than 20% of sanctioned teaching positions are vacant.	0
20% of sanctioned teaching positions are vacant.	0.25
15% of sanctioned teaching positions are vacant.	0.5
10% of sanctioned teaching positions are vacant.	0.75
Less than 10% of sanctioned teaching positions are vacant.	1.0

3.2.2 Full-time vs part-time ratio of the teaching staff (Assesses the proportion of full-time versus part-time teachers, with a preference for full-time staff to ensure continuity, accountability, and availability.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
More than 40% of the teaching staff are employed part-time.	0
40% of the teaching staff are employed part-time.	0.25
30% of the teaching staff are employed part-time.	0.5
20% of the teaching staff are employed part-time.	0.75
Less than 20% of the teaching staff are employed part-time.	1.0

3.2.3 Recruitment timeliness of the teaching staff (Evaluates how quickly vacant teaching positions are filled, which reflects the institution's responsiveness and HR management efficiency.)

Instructions to the assessors: Take an example of the last vacancy fulfilment timeline.

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
Vacant teaching positions take more than 6 months to be filled.	0
Vacant teaching positions take up to 6 months to be filled.	0.25
Vacant teaching positions take up to 3 months to be filled.	0.5
Vacant teaching positions take up to 2 months to be filled.	0.75
Vacant teaching positions are filled within a month.	1.0

3.2.4 Subject specialisation matches the teaching staff (Measures whether teachers are instructing subjects for which they are academically or professionally specialised.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
Less than 50% of teaching staff have subject specialisations that align with their teaching subjects.	0
50% of the teaching staff have relevant subject specialisations.	0.25
75% of teaching staff have relevant subject specialisations.	0.5
90% of teaching staff have relevant subject specialisations.	0.75
All of the teaching staff have relevant subject specialisations.	1.0

3.2.5 Teaching staff's retention rate (Tracks how many staff continue employment year by year, indicating job satisfaction, stability, and institutional consistency.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
Less than 60% of teaching staff are retained annually.	0
60% of the teaching staff are retained annually.	0.25
70% of teaching staff are retained annually.	0.5
80% of teaching staff are retained annually.	0.75
More than 80% of teaching staff are retained annually.	1.0

3.2.6 Professional development participation of the teaching staff (Assesses the extent of teaching staff participation in regular training or workshops for pedagogical and technical skill enhancement.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
No professional development opportunities are offered, nor have any staff participated.	0
Occasional workshops (at least once every two years) have been attended by less than 20% of teaching staff.	0.25
At least one professional development activity annually is attended by 50% of teaching staff.	0.5
Regular professional development (at least two per year) is attended by 50% of teaching staff.	0.75
A culture of continuous professional development exists, with at least two annual activities attended by more than 80% of staff.	1.0

3.2.7 Industry collaboration roles of the teaching staff (Evaluates how actively teachers engage with industry stakeholders through partnerships, secondments, curriculum input, or other forms of collaboration.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
At least one teaching staff member has no formal or informal engagement with industry professionals.	0

At least one teaching staff member occasionally consults with industry experts through guest lectures or one-off meetings.	0.25
At least one teaching staff member collaborates with part-time industry advisors who contribute irregularly (once a year).	0.5
At least one teaching staff member is involved in annual formal secondment or exchange programs with industry for at least a month.	0.75
At least one teaching staff member collaborates continuously with industry professionals in integrated roles such as adjunct faculty or mentors.	1.0

3.2.8 Diversity & inclusion maintained among the teaching staff (Looks at the representation of marginalised or underrepresented groups among the teaching staff, reflecting the institution's equity and inclusion practices.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
Less than 10% of teaching staff are from marginalised or underrepresented groups.	0
At least 10% of teaching staff are from marginalised or underrepresented groups.	0.25
At least 20% of teaching staff are from marginalised or underrepresented groups.	0.5
At least 33% of teaching staff are from marginalised or underrepresented groups.	0.75
More than 33% of teaching staff are from marginalised or underrepresented groups.	1.0

3.2.9 Performance evaluation of the teaching staff (Assesses whether there is a structured process to evaluate teaching performance, provide feedback, and guide professional growth.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
No performance evaluations are conducted for teaching staff.	0
Annual performance evaluations are conducted, but no feedback is provided.	0.25
Annual performance evaluations are conducted and include feedback.	0.5
Biannual evaluations are conducted with improvement plans developed.	0.75
Quarterly evaluations are conducted, including improvement plans and defined career progression pathways.	1.0

3.2.10 Succession planning of the teaching positions (Checks if a system is in place to prepare and promote internal candidates for key teaching roles in the future.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
No succession planning system exists.	0
Informal mentoring occurs, but there is no documented succession plan.	0.25
A documented succession plan exists, identifying key roles and potential successors.	0.5
The institution implements cross-training programs to prepare staff for key roles.	0.75
A structured leadership pipeline includes cross-training, shadowing of key roles, and annual succession planning cycles.	1.0

3.3. Non-teaching positions are filled with formally appointed staff. (Sub-indicators: 5)

3.3.1 Appointment formality of the non-teaching staff (Tenure type) (Examines whether non-teaching staff have formal employment status, contributing to institutional stability and clarity of responsibility.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
More than 50% of non-teaching staff are employed on a temporary or contractual basis.	0

Up to 50% of non-teaching staff are formally appointed.	0.25
Up to 60% of non-teaching staff are formally appointed.	0.5
Up to 70% of non-teaching staff are formally appointed.	0.75
Up to 80% of non-teaching staff are formally appointed.	1.0

3.3.2 Role clarity of the non-teaching staff (Assesses whether non-teaching staff have defined roles and responsibilities, including documented job descriptions and performance indicators.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
No written job descriptions exist for any non-teaching staff positions.	0
Role descriptions exist for fewer than 50% of non-teaching staff, without detailed responsibilities and performance expectations.	0.25
Role descriptions exist for 50% of non-teaching staff, with detailed responsibilities and performance expectations.	0.5
75% of non-teaching staff have role descriptions, with detailed responsibilities and performance expectations.	0.75
Role descriptions exist for all non-teaching staff, with detailed responsibilities and performance expectations.	1.0

3.3.3 Qualification alignment of the non-teaching staff (Evaluates whether non-teaching staff meet the qualification requirements for their respective job roles.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
Less than 50% of non-teaching staff meet the minimum qualification requirements.	0
Up to 60% of non-teaching staff meet the qualification requirements.	0.25
Up to 70% of non-teaching staff meet the qualification requirements.	0.5
Up to 80% of non-teaching staff meet the qualification requirements.	0.75
90% or above of all non-teaching staff meet the qualification requirements.	1.0

3.3.4 Training compliance of the non-teaching staff (Measures whether non-teaching staff receive relevant training or upskilling opportunities to enhance institutional efficiency.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
No training or professional development has been provided to non-teaching staff in the last three years.	0
At least 20% of non-teaching staff have participated in work-related training in the last two years.	0.25
Annual basic training has been provided for at least 20% non-teaching staff positions.	0.5
Annual basic training has been provided for at least 50% non-teaching staff positions.	0.75
Annual basic training has been provided for more than 50% non-teaching staff positions.	1.0

3.3.5 Performance evaluation frequency of the non-teaching staff (Assesses the regularity and structure of evaluating non-teaching staff performance, including feedback and development support.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
No performance evaluations are conducted for non-teaching staff.	0
Annual performance evaluations are conducted, but no feedback is provided.	0.25
Annual performance evaluations are conducted and include feedback.	0.5
Biannual evaluations are conducted with improvement plans developed.	0.75

Quarterly evaluations are conducted, including improvement plans and defined career progression pathways.	1.0
---	-----

3.4. Plan for professional development/human resource development of teaching and non-teaching staff. (Sub-indicators: 3)

3.4.1 Existence of documented human resource development (HRD) plan (Evaluates whether the institution has a formal Human Resource Development (HRD) plan that guides the professional growth of all staff.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
No Human Resource Development (HRD) plan exists.	0
A draft HRD plan has been prepared but has not yet been approved.	0.25
The HRD plan has been formally approved but has not yet been implemented.	0.5
At least 50% of the HRD plan activities have been implemented.	0.75
More than 90% of the HRD plan activities have been implemented.	1.0

3.4.2 Training needs assessment of teaching or non-teaching staff (Assesses the institution's efforts to identify training needs systematically through structured methods like surveys, assessments, or consultations.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
No training needs assessment has been conducted for either teaching or non-teaching staff.	0
Training needs have been identified through informal or undocumented means.	0.25
An introductory survey has been conducted to assess training needs.	0.5
A comprehensive training needs analysis has been conducted using structured methods.	0.75
Training needs assessments are conducted regularly and updated at least quarterly.	1.0

3.4.3 Monitoring and evaluation of HRD implementation (Assesses whether the institution systematically monitors and evaluates the effectiveness of its Human Resource Development (HRD) activities for continuous improvement.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
No mechanism exists to track or evaluate the implementation or outcomes of HRD activities.	0
Basic attendance records are maintained, but no feedback or evaluation is collected after HRD activities.	0.25
Post-training feedback forms are collected for at least 50% of HRD activities, but the data is not analysed or used for improvement.	0.5
Feedback from participants is analysed, and at least one adjustment/improvement has been made in HRD planning based on evaluation findings.	0.75
A formal M&E system exists for HRD, with pre- and post-training assessments, feedback analysis and more than one adjustment/improvement made in HRD planning based on evaluation findings.	1.0

3.5. Teaching staff have sound pedagogical practices along with some types of teaching skills training (tot or is) from a recognised body. (Sub-indicators: 5)

3.5.1 Training of Trainers (ToT) or similar certification (Assesses how many teaching staff have received formal pedagogical training to improve their instructional delivery and classroom management.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
None of the teaching staff has completed a ToT or equivalent instructional skills training course of at least 45 hours.	0
At least 25% of teaching staff have completed a ToT or similar certification (minimum 45 hours).	0.25
At least 50% of teaching staff have completed a ToT or similar certification (minimum 45 hours).	0.5
At least 75% of teaching staff have completed a ToT or similar certification (minimum 45 hours).	0.75
Over 75% of teaching staff have completed a ToT or similar certification (minimum 45 hours).	1.0

3.5.2 Pedagogical plans (Evaluates the extent to which teaching staff use varied, learner-centred, and industry-relevant methods as reflected in lesson plans.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
Lesson plans rely solely on lecture-based instruction without other teaching strategies.	0
Lesson plans show the use of basic group work or collaborative tasks.	0.25
Lesson plans incorporate blended learning methods, integrating face-to-face instruction and digital tools (e.g., videos, quizzes, online activities).	0.5
Lesson plans follow Competency-Based Education (CBE) principles, including clearly defined learning outcomes, practical tasks, formative assessments, and opportunities for self-paced learning.	0.75
Lesson plans integrate at least one real-life problem-solving, such as industry simulations, case studies, and hands-on tasks that mirror workplace environments.	1.0

3.5.3 Internal assessments: (Assess the nature and quality of assessments teachers use to measure student competencies, beyond written exams.)

Instruction to assessors: Take an example of at least two teachers' practices randomly.

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
Teachers use written exams only.	0
Some practical tests are conducted, but they are irregular.	0.25
Assessments are based on structured competency rubrics with defined performance criteria for specific tasks or skills.	0.5
Assessments include structured rubrics and various assessment types (e.g., presentations, case studies, demonstrations), with evidence of alignment to learning outcomes and practical competencies.	0.75
Student performance is evaluated through portfolio assessments, including various collected works (e.g., projects, assignments, reports).	1.0

3.5.4 Learning management system (LMS) (Evaluates the use of digital tools and platforms in the teaching-learning process to enhance student engagement and resource access.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
No digital tools or Learning Management Systems (LMS) are used in teaching and learning.	0
At least 50% of teachers occasionally use PowerPoint or other slide-based tools to deliver lectures at least once a month.	0.25
At least 50% of teachers regularly use an LMS (e.g., Moodle, Google Classroom) to distribute materials, assign tasks, or collect submissions.	0.5
At least 75% of teachers regularly use LMS (e.g., Moodle, Google Classroom) to distribute materials, assign tasks, or collect submissions.	0.75
More than 75% of teachers regularly use an LMS (e.g., Moodle, Google Classroom) to distribute materials, assign tasks, or collect submissions.	1.0

3.5.5 Peer learning implementation (Looks at the existence of collaborative teaching and peer learning systems among staff for mutual growth and sharing good practices.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
Teaching staff work in isolation with no structured peer observation or collaboration opportunities.	0
Informal peer observations occur occasionally (e.g., once or twice a year), without structured feedback or documentation.	0.25
Monthly peer observation sessions are held with structured feedback and proper documentation.	0.5
At least 20% of teaching staff participate in co-teaching activities, involving co-planning and co-delivery of lessons.	0.75
A formal Community of Practice (CoP) is established, meets regularly, documents learnings, and shares best practices at least twice a year.	1.0

Note for the assessors: Community of Practice (CoP) refers to a formal group of teaching staff who regularly come together to discuss, reflect on, and improve their teaching practices. A CoP typically meets on a scheduled basis (e.g., monthly or quarterly), keeps records of discussions and outcomes (e.g., meeting minutes, action plans), and shares practical teaching strategies, challenges, and solutions. Evidence of a CoP includes documented agendas, attendance sheets, meeting summaries, and examples of best practices shared or adopted.

3.6. Teaching staff have actual workplace-based occupational skills upgrading (OSU) training organised by a recognised body. (Sub-indicators: 5)

3.6.1 Recency of occupational skills upgrading (OSU) training (Evaluates the proportion of teaching staff who have recently undergone hands-on industry-based training to update their skills.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
No teaching staff have participated in workplace-based OSU training in the past year.	0
Less than 25% of teaching staff have participated in at least 1 week of OSU training in the past year.	0.25
At least 25% of teaching staff have participated in at least 1 week of OSU training in the past year.	0.5
At least 50% of teaching staff have participated in at least 1 week of OSU training in the past year	0.75
More than 50% of teaching staff have participated in at least 1 week of OSU training in the past year	1.0

3.6.2 Certification alignment regarding actual workplace-based occupational skills (Assesses

the number of teaching staff certified in skills directly related to occupational standards or industry requirements)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
No teaching staff have earned any certifications related to workplace-based occupational skills.	0
At least 10% of teaching staff have earned workplace-based occupational skills certifications.	0.25
At least 25% of teaching staff are certified in workplace-based occupational skills.	0.5
At least 50% of the teaching staff are certified in workplace-based occupational skills.	0.75
At least 75% of teaching staff are certified in workplace-based occupational skills.	1.0

3.6.3 Equipment proficiency of the teaching staff (Evaluates whether teaching staff can independently operate, maintain, and teach using the current tools and machinery used in industry.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
Teaching staff have not received training in using modern or industry-standard tools and equipment.	0
At least 50% of instructors can independently operate, maintain, and train others using industry-standard equipment.	0.25
More than 50% of instructors can independently operate, maintain, and train others using industry-standard equipment.	0.5
More than 90% of instructors can independently operate, maintain, and train others using industry-standard equipment.	0.75
All instructors can independently operate, maintain, and train others using industry-standard equipment.	1.0

3.6.4 Institutional support for OSU participation (Assesses how much institutional effort is made to collaborate with industry to support occupational skills alignment and curriculum improvement.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
There is no evidence of input or collaboration with industry partners to support OSU training or curriculum implementation.	0
Industry experts are consulted informally or occasionally (e.g., during accreditation or reviews), but no documented input is reflected in teaching or curriculum.	0.25
The institution organises industry feedback for at least one subject to support curriculum alignment with occupational skills.	0.5
Industry partners are formally involved in enhancing practical or elective modules for at least two subjects.	0.75
Industry partners are regularly involved in enriching more than two subjects.	1.0

3.6.5 Post-training application and knowledge sharing (Evaluates how effectively OSU training is translated into improved teaching practices, based on employer feedback and implementation tracking.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
No employer feedback is collected or used regarding the application of OSU training.	0
Employer feedback is collected once a year through surveys, but the implementation of suggestions is unclear or minimal.	0.25
Employer feedback is collected twice a year, and minor adjustments (e.g., in practical sessions or internship structure) are made based on the input.	0.5

Quarterly consultations are held with employers, and feedback is used to revise teaching methods or enhance practical training.	0.75
Employer feedback is collected and integrated quarterly, and all curriculum and teaching adjustments are documented and systematically tracked.	1.0

3.7. The institute maintains a teaching (work) load among the teaching staff. (Sub-indicators: 5)

3.7.1 Contact hours compliance of teaching staff (Assesses whether teachers are assigned a reasonable number of direct teaching hours per week, ensuring effectiveness and avoiding burnout.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
Teaching staff are assigned more than 25 contact hours per week.	0
Teaching staff are assigned between 22 and 25 contact hours per week.	0.25
Teaching staff are assigned between 18 and 21 contact hours per week.	0.5
Teaching staff are assigned between 15 and 17 contact hours per week.	0.75
Teaching staff are assigned between 12 and 14 contact hours per week.	1.0

3.7.2 Administrative task ratio of teaching staff (Evaluates the time spent by teaching staff on non-teaching (administrative) tasks, which may detract from instructional responsibilities.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
Teaching staff spend over 50% of their hours on administrative tasks.	0
Teaching staff spend over 40% of their hours on administrative tasks.	0.25
Teaching staff spend over 30% of their hours on administrative tasks.	0.5
Teaching staff spend over 20% of their hours on administrative tasks.	0.75
Teaching staff spend 20% or less of their working hours on administrative tasks.	1.0

3.7.3 Practical vs theoretical balance of teaching staff (Assesses the extent to which the teaching content is practically oriented and aligned with industry standards, as required in TVET.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
Teaching assignments consist entirely of theoretical instruction (100% theory).	0
Teaching assignments consist of approximately 80% theoretical and 20% practical content.	0.25
Teaching assignments consist of approximately 60% theoretical and 40% practical content.	0.5
Teaching assignments consist of approximately 40% theoretical and 60% practical content.	0.75
Teaching assignments comprise 20–30% theoretical and 70–80% practical content, ensuring industry-relevant instruction.	1.0

3.7.4 Student advising allocation (Mentor and Mentee) of teaching staff (Looks at how teaching staff are involved in mentoring or advising students beyond classroom teaching, contributing to holistic development.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
No student advising or mentoring responsibilities are assigned to teaching staff.	0
Each teaching staff member mentors between 1 and 5 students.	0.25
Each teaching staff member mentors between 6 and 10 students.	0.5

Each teaching staff member mentors between 11 and 15 students.	0.75
Each teaching staff member mentors between 16 and 20 students.	1.0

3.7.5 Overtime monitoring of the teaching staff (Evaluates how effectively the institution monitors and manages overtime work among teaching staff, especially unpaid hours.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
Teaching staff work more than 10 hours of unpaid overtime per month.	0
Teaching staff work between 8 and 10 hours of unpaid overtime per month.	0.25
Teaching staff work between 5 and 7 hours of unpaid overtime per month.	0.5
Teaching staff work between 2 and 4 hours of unpaid overtime per month.	0.75
Teaching staff work less than 2 hours of unpaid overtime per month.	1.0

3.8. A teaching staff backup plan is in place. (Sub-indicators: 3)

3.8.1 Substitute teaching staff pool (Assesses whether the institution has a roster of substitute teachers who can ensure continuity during staff absences.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
The institution has no substitute teaching staff available.	0
The institution has at least one untrained substitute who is not formally prepared to deliver instruction.	0.25
The institution maintains a pool of 5% of the total teachers who are partially trained or have limited teaching experience.	0.5
The institution maintains a pool of 10% qualified substitute teachers of the total teachers who are prepared to take over classes when needed.	0.75
The institution maintains a pool of more than 20% certified substitute teachers of the total teachers.	1.0

3.8.2 Cross-subject training coverage of the teaching staff (Looks at how many teaching staff are trained in multiple subject areas, enabling coverage flexibility during staff shortages.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
None of the teaching staff has received cross-subject training.	0
At least 10% of teaching staff are trained to teach at least two subjects.	0.25
At least 25% of teaching staff are trained to teach at least two subjects.	0.5
At least 50% of the teaching staff are trained to teach at least two subjects.	0.75
At least 75% of teaching staff are trained to teach at least two subjects.	1.0

3.8.3 Emergency replacement of the teaching staff (Evaluates whether a formal and efficient process exists to replace teachers quickly in case of sudden absence.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
There is no formal procedure for the emergency replacement of teaching staff.	0
Emergency replacements are handled informally or ad hoc, typically taking more than 7 days to fill the vacancy.	0.25
A documented emergency replacement plan exists, but it takes 4 to 7 days to implement.	0.5
Emergency replacements are arranged within 3 days using a list of pre-identified substitute contacts.	0.75
The institution has an immediate replacement system that activates within 24 hours, supported by an on-call substitute list and clear communication protocols.	1.0

3.9. The teaching staff meetings are organised regularly for exchange and learning. (Sub-indicators: 3)

3.9.1 Meeting frequency of the teaching staff (Assesses how regularly teaching staff meetings are conducted to ensure collaboration, updates, and academic coordination.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
No meetings have been held among teaching staff during the academic year.	0
Teaching staff meetings are held once per semester.	0.25
Teaching staff meetings are held every quarter.	0.5
Teaching staff meetings are held monthly.	0.75
Teaching staff meetings are held bi-weekly and are guided by formal agendas.	1.0

3.9.2 Knowledge-sharing in the teaching staff meeting (Evaluates whether meetings serve as platforms for instructional improvement by sharing teaching strategies and innovations.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
Teaching staff meetings focus only on administrative updates, with no exchange of teaching practices.	0
Occasional teaching tips are shared informally, approximately once per quarter.	0.25
During teaching staff meetings, structured peer feedback sessions are held at least once per quarter.	0.5
Meetings include workshops and case study discussions at least twice a year.	0.75
Meetings include workshops and case study discussions at least three times a year.	1.0

3.9.3 Meeting participation and inclusivity during the teaching staff meetings (Assesses attendance rates and inclusiveness in teaching staff meetings, ensuring shared ownership of institutional goals.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
There are no attendance records, and participation in meetings is optional, with fewer than 25% attending any of the last three meetings.	0
Attendance is tracked, but fewer than 50% of staff attended any of the last three teaching staff meetings.	0.25
At least 70% of the teaching staff attended the last three scheduled teaching staff meetings.	0.5
At least 80% of the teaching staff attended the last three scheduled teaching staff meetings.	0.75
At least 90% of the teaching staff attended the last three scheduled teaching staff meetings.	1.0

Criterion 4 Instruction and Learning (Indicators 15, Sub-indicators =67)

4.1. Nationally approved curriculum-based learning competencies in practice. (Sub-indicators: 5)

4.1.1 Curriculum alignment in lesson planning (Assesses how well lesson plans refer and align with officially approved learning competencies.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
None of the five randomly selected teachers has lesson plans referencing learning competencies.	0
At least one of the five lesson plans (20%) shows alignment with learning competencies.	0.25
At least two of the five lesson plans (40%) show alignment with learning competencies.	0.5
At least three of the five lesson plans (60%) show alignment with learning competencies.	0.75
At least four of the five lesson plans (80% or more) show alignment with learning competencies.	1.0

4.1.2 Teacher familiarity and use of learning competencies (Measures the extent that teachers understand and apply subject-specific learning competencies.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
None of the teachers can identify or explain learning competencies in their subject, as verified through interaction with teachers.	0
Up to 25% of teachers demonstrate familiarity with subject-specific learning competencies verified through interaction with teachers.	0.25
Up to 50% of teachers demonstrate familiarity with subject-specific learning competencies verified through interaction with teachers.	0.5
Up to 75% of teachers demonstrate familiarity with subject-specific learning competencies, verified through interaction with teachers.	0.75
More than 75% of teachers demonstrate familiarity with subject-specific learning competencies verified through interaction with teachers.	1.0

4.1.3 Integration of competencies in assessments (Measures the extent to which student assessments are designed to evaluate the achievement of defined learning competencies.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
None of the subjects includes any competency-based assessments.	0
At least 25% of subjects include one assessment linked to learning competencies.	0.25
At least 50% of subjects include one assessment linked to learning competencies.	0.5
At least 75% of subjects include one assessment linked to learning competencies.	0.75
More than 75% of subjects include at least one assessment linked to learning competencies.	1.0

4.1.4 Teaching materials supporting competency learning (Measures the extent to which instructional materials are aligned with curriculum-based learning competencies.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
No teaching and learning materials are aligned with competencies in any subject.	0
At least 25% of subjects have teaching and learning materials that are linked to learning competencies.	0.25

At least 50% of subjects have teaching and learning materials that are linked to learning competencies.	0.5
At least 75% of subjects have teaching and learning materials that are linked to learning competencies.	0.75
More than 75% of subjects have teaching and learning materials that are linked to learning competencies.	1.0

4.1.5 Evidence of competency mastery in student work (Measures the extent to which student work demonstrates application and mastery of expected learning competencies.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
None of the reviewed student work samples (at least five randomly selected) demonstrates application of learning competencies.	0
At least 20% (1 out of 5) of the reviewed student work samples demonstrate application of learning competencies.	0.25
At least 60% (3 out of 5) of the reviewed student work samples demonstrate application of learning competencies.	0.5
At least 80% (4 out of 5) of the reviewed student work samples demonstrate application of learning competencies.	0.75
More than 80% (all 5) of the reviewed student work samples demonstrate application of learning competencies.	1.0

4.2. Session plans with learning outcomes in practice. (Sub-indicators: 5)

4.2.1 Existence of session plans (Measures the extent to which teachers maintain structured and detailed class session plans.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
None of the five randomly selected session plans exists or is available for review.	0
The five-session plans consist only of ad-hoc notes with no structured format.	0.25
At least 60% (3 of 5) of the five session plans use basic templates that outline session structure.	0.5
At least 80% of the five session plans are detailed, including objectives, content, and activities.	0.75
All five session plans (100%) are comprehensive, clearly documenting learning outcomes and activities.	1.0

4.2.2 Learning outcome alignment (Measures the extent to which session plans include learning outcomes aligned with national curriculum competencies.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
None of the session plans includes defined learning outcomes.	0
Learning outcomes are included but are loosely defined without clear links to curriculum competencies.	0.25
At least 50% of the session plans' learning outcomes align with the national curriculum.	0.5
At least 75% of the session plans' learning outcomes align with the national curriculum.	0.75
More than 75% of the session plans' learning outcomes align with the national curriculum.	1.0

4.2.3 Teaching methodology (Measures the extent to which teaching plans incorporate varied instructional strategies, including active learning methods.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
------------------	------------

100% of planned teaching time in the session plans is lecture-based with no inclusion of group work, practice, or active learning methods.	0
Less than 20% of planned teaching time uses non-lecture methods such as occasional group work, demonstrations, or discussions.	0.25
At least 30% of planned teaching time uses blended methods, combining lectures with practical activities like labs or case discussions.	0.5
At least 40% of planned teaching time involves active learning techniques such as group projects, role-play, simulations, or problem-based learning.	0.75
At least 50% of planned teaching time involves active learning techniques such as group projects, role-play, simulations, or problem-based learning.	1.0

4.2.4 Assessment integration (Measures the extent to which session plans include assessment components aligned with learning outcomes.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
No assessments are planned in the session plans.	0
Only informal checks of student understanding are planned.	0.25
Basic assessment rubrics are included for at least 50% of the sessions.	0.5
Detailed assessment rubrics are included for at least 75% of the sessions.	0.75
Detailed assessment rubrics are included for all the planned sessions.	1.0

4.2.5 Instructor compliance (observe at least two classes) (Measures the extent to which teachers follow their session plans during classroom instruction as observed.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
Teachers do not follow their session plans during class observations.	0
Teachers follow at least 25% of their session plans during class observations.	0.25
Teachers follow at least 50% of their session plans during class observations.	0.5
Teachers follow at least 75% of their session plans during class observations.	0.75
Teachers follow almost 100% of their session plans during class observations.	1.0

4.3. Theoretical-practical ratios are maintained as per the curriculum. (Sub-indicators: 5)

4.3.1 Curriculum compliance (Measures the extent to which the delivery of theoretical and practical hours follows the prescribed curriculum ratio.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
Less than 50% of courses meet the prescribed theory-to-practical hour ratio, based on analysis of annual teaching plans, time logs, and schedules.	0
As curriculum documents reflect, up to 60% of courses meet the prescribed theory-to-practical hour ratio (e.g., 60:40 split).	0.25
Up to 80% of courses adhere to the prescribed theory-practical hour ratio based on instructional hours allocated.	0.5
Up to 90% of courses comply with the required theory-practical hour ratio, verified through session logs and lesson plans.	0.75
More than 90% of courses maintain the mandated theory-practical hour ratio, verified through session logs and lesson plans.	1.0

4.3.2 Practical training facilities (Measures the extent to which workshops and labs are equipped and functional to support hands-on learning.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
No practical or laboratory training facilities exist, or all facilities are non-functional.	0
Basic practical tools and equipment are present, but less than 50% are functional or maintained.	0.25
Functional, practical tools exist but are outdated and used by less than 50% of training programs.	0.5
Up to 90% of practical training areas are adequately equipped and functional with minor deficiencies.	0.75
More than 90% of training areas are adequately equipped and functional with up-to-date equipment.	1.0

4.3.3 Instructor preparedness (Measures the extent to which instructors are capable of effectively delivering practical lessons.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
No instructors have received formal or informal training in practical teaching methods.	0
At least 50% of instructors demonstrate only basic procedural competence in practical teaching.	0.25
At least 50% of instructors demonstrate competence in lesson planning or delivering practical content.	0.5
At least 75% of instructors are proficient in delivering hands-on practical training.	0.75
Almost all (more than 95%) instructors deliver hands-on, practical training proficiently.	1.0

4.3.4 Assessment balance (Measures the extent to which assessment practices reflect an appropriate mix of theoretical and practical components.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
All assessments are written exams with no practical component in skill-based subjects.	0
Practical components constitute less than 25% of the total assessment marks in skill-based subjects.	0.25
Practical components constitute less than 50% of the total assessment marks in skill-based subjects.	0.5
Practical components constitute less than 75% of the total assessment marks in skill-based subjects.	0.75
Practical components constitute over 75% of total assessment marks in skill-based subjects.	1.0

4.3.5 Aligning and approving practical elements (Measures the extent to which industry stakeholders validate and support practical components.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
No engagement with industry stakeholders to validate practical training content.	0
Informal verbal feedback is received from local employers, but no documentation exists.	0.25
Formal feedback is collected at least once per year from two or more employers.	0.5
Practical assessment components are developed or reviewed collaboratively with industry representatives.	0.75
Industry partners deliver Practical training or co-supervise in workplace settings (e.g., OJT, apprenticeship).	1.0

4.4. Curriculum delivery completed as planned. (Sub-indicators: 5)

4.4.1 Syllabus coverage (Measures the extent to which the course syllabus is fully delivered within the planned timeline.)

Instructions to assessors: Select one course as a sample of students who recently appeared for the final exam.

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
Less than 50% of the syllabus is completed by the end of the course.	0
50% of the syllabus is completed by the end of the course.	0.25
75% of the syllabus is completed by the end of the course.	0.5
More than 75% of the syllabus is completed by the end of the course.	0.75
100% of the syllabus is completed by the end of the course.	1.0

4.4.2 Adherence to schedule (Measures the extent to which courses are delivered on schedule with minimal delays or deviations.)

Instructions to assessors: Compare planned vs actual timelines for two randomly selected courses.

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
The course progress is delayed by more than 4 weeks compared to the planned schedule.	0
The course progress is delayed by 3 weeks compared to the planned schedule.	0.25
The course progress is delayed by 2 weeks compared to the planned schedule.	0.5
The course progress is delayed by 1 week compared to the planned schedule.	0.75
The course progress matches the planned schedule within a margin of ± 3 days.	1.0

4.4.3 Competency achievement (Measures the extent to which a high percentage of students meet the competency standards through assessments.)

Instructions to auditor: Use the most recent exam or assessment record for two subjects.

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
Less than 60% of students achieved minimum competency per the assessment criteria.	0
Up to 70% of students achieved minimum competency.	0.25
Up to 80% of students achieved minimum competency.	0.5
Up to 90% of students achieved minimum competency.	0.75
More than 90% of students achieved minimum competency.	1.0

4.4.4 Resource availability (Measures the extent to which lessons proceed without interruption due to teacher or material shortages.)

Instructions to assessors: Review lesson logs, teacher substitution records, and resource shortages

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
Over 50% of lessons involve workarounds or delays due to resource shortages.	0
Over 30% of lessons involve workarounds or delays due to resource shortages.	0.25
Over 20% of lessons involve workarounds or delays due to resource shortages.	0.5
Over 10% of lessons involve workarounds or delays due to resource shortages.	0.75
No resource shortages affecting curriculum delivery have been reported in the past three months.	1.0

4.4.5 Contingency management (Measures the extent to which the institution manages disruptions effectively to maintain class continuity. Review institutional responses to disturbances such as staff absences, strikes, or natural events.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
More than three monthly disruptions lead to class cancellations or significant delays without backup arrangements.	0
Two to three monthly disruptions cause lesson gaps, and temporary adjustments are made without a formal process.	0.25
At least 50% of disruptions are managed through adjustments, but delays occur more than once a month.	0.5
At least 75% of disruptions are managed without causing a significant impact on lesson continuity.	0.75
All disruptions are managed with timely adjustments and backup measures, with no class cancellations in the last three months.	1.0

4.5. Curriculum-provisioned teaching hours in industries. (Sub-indicators: 5)

4.5.1 Hours completion (Measures the extent to which students complete the required industrial exposure hours per curriculum, based on the curriculum-required industrial teaching hours vs. actual hours completed.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
Less than 50% of the curriculum-required industrial teaching hours have been completed.	0
Up to 70% of the curriculum-required industrial teaching hours have been completed.	0.25
Up to 80% of the curriculum-required industrial teaching hours have been completed.	0.5
Up to 90% of the curriculum-required industrial teaching hours have been completed.	0.75
More than 90% of the curriculum-required industrial teaching hours have been completed.	1.0

4.5.2 Industry partnership quality (Measures the extent to which formal and active partnerships exist with industries for student training.)

Instruction to Auditor: Review formal agreements, such as MoUs or contracts with industry partners.

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
There are no formal agreements with any industry partners.	0
Industry partnerships exist only through verbal or ad-hoc arrangements.	0.25
There are 1–2 signed MoUs with a limited scope or engagement.	0.5
3–5 active industry partners are involved in student placements or teaching hours.	0.75
A structured network of more than 5 active industry partners contributes to placements or curriculum delivery.	1.0

4.5.3 Supervision and mentoring (Measures the extent to which students receive regular supervision and mentoring during industry placements. Review mentoring logs, student reports, and supervisor engagement schedules.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
No supervision is provided during the industry-based teaching hours.	0
Supervisors or mentors conduct check-ins irregularly or only at the start/end of the placement.	0.25
Supervisors review student progress at least once per month during placement.	0.5
Mentoring and supervision occur at least once per week during the placement period.	0.75
Daily supervision is maintained through logs, with industry and institutions jointly conducting performance assessments.	1.0

- 4.5.4 Student preparedness for industry placement** (Measures the extent to which students undergo proper orientation and preparation before industry placements. Review training attendance records and orientation content.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
No orientation or skills preparation sessions are provided to students before industry placement.	0
A short pre-placement session of 1–2 hours is conducted.	0.25
A structured orientation of 3–5 hours is provided, covering workplace safety and soft skills.	0.5
Students complete an induction program of 6–10 hours, including technical, behavioural, and safety topics.	0.75
Students undergo a preparation program exceeding 10 hours, including mock interviews, technical readiness, and simulations.	1.0

- 4.5.5 Post-industry feedback integration** (Measures the extent to which feedback from industry placements is analysed and used for instructional improvement. Review feedback tools, records of analysis, and implementation actions.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
No feedback is collected from students or employers after the industry placement.	0
Feedback is collected informally (e.g., verbal or handwritten notes) but not analysed or used for improvement.	0.25
Feedback is collected through structured surveys, but no formal analysis or action follows.	0.5
Feedback from students and employers is collected, analysed, and used to make at least one documented adjustment in the teaching or placement process.	0.75
Structured feedback from students and employers is systematically analysed, and results are used to update placement strategies and improve instructional delivery.	1.0

4.6. Instructor-student ratio in classes and workshops. (Sub-indicators: 5)

- 4.6.1 Classroom ratio compliance** (Measures the extent to which classroom student-to-instructor ratios meet recommended standards. Based on the average number of students per instructor in theory classes.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
The average student-to-instructor ratio in classrooms exceeds 50:1.	0
The average student-to-instructor ratio in classrooms is 50:1.	0.25
The average student-to-instructor ratio in classrooms is 45:1	0.5
The average student-to-instructor ratio in classrooms is 40:1.	0.75
The average student-to-instructor ratio in classrooms is less than 40:1.	1.0

- 4.6.2 Workshop ratio compliance** (Measures the extent to which workshop instructor ratios ensure adequate supervision during practical sessions. Based on the average number of students per instructor in practical/workshop settings.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
The average student-to-instructor ratio in workshops exceeds 25:1.	0
The average student-to-instructor ratio in workshops is between 25:1	0.25
The average student-to-instructor ratio in workshops is 23:1	0.5
The average student-to-instructor ratio in workshops is 20:1.	0.75
The average student-to-instructor ratio in workshops is less than 20:1.	1.0

- 4.6.3 High-risk equipment supervision** (Measures the extent to which hazardous equipment is used under close instructor supervision: review workshop layout and instructor deployment for hazardous machinery like welding, CNC, etc.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
There is no dedicated instructor supervision when students use high-risk equipment.	0
One instructor is responsible for supervising every 10 students using high-risk tools.	0.25
One instructor is responsible for supervising every eight students using high-risk tools.	0.5
One instructor is responsible for supervising every six students using high-risk tools.	0.75
One instructor is responsible for supervising four students using high-risk tools.	1.0

- 4.6.4 Special needs accommodation** (Measures the extent to which support staff are available to assist students with special needs. Based on the student-to-support ratio for learners with special needs.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
No staffing adjustments are made for students with special needs.	0
One support person is available for every 15 students with special needs.	0.25
One support person is available for every 10 students with special needs.	0.5
One support person is available for every five students with special needs.	0.75
One support person is available for fewer than five students with special needs.	1.0

- 4.6.5 Availability of assistant/support staff (e.g., Lab Assistants, Demonstrators)** (Measures the extent to which labs and workshops are supported by sufficient technical or instructional assistants. Based on the presence of technical or instructional support staff in workshops/labs.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
No assistants or support staff are present in workshops or labs.	0
One assistant is present in workshops or labs for every 50 students.	0.25
One assistant is present in workshops or labs for every 30 students.	0.5
One assistant is present in workshops or labs for every 15 students.	0.75
One assistant is present in workshops or labs for every group of fewer than 15 students in workshops/labs.	1.0

4.7. Monitoring of learning achievements. (Sub-indicators: 5)

- 4.7.1 Assessment frequency** (Measures the extent to which formal assessments are conducted regularly in each subject. Based on the frequency of formal assessments undertaken in a semester, per subject.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
No formal assessments are conducted on any subject.	0
One or two formal assessments are conducted per semester in each subject.	0.25
Three to four formal assessments are conducted per semester in each subject.	0.5
Formal assessments are conducted monthly in each subject.	0.75
Formal assessments are conducted more than once a month in each subject.	1.0

- 4.7.2 Competency tracking** (Measures the extent to which student competency achievement is systematically tracked and recorded. Review the system used to track student achievement of learning competencies.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
------------------	------------

The institution does not track student learning competencies.	0
Competency achievement is tracked using manual methods such as paper-based checklists.	0.25
Competency achievement is recorded digitally using tools like spreadsheets without analytics.	0.5
A digital tracking system generates reports on student progress toward competencies, but the reports are limited to overall summaries.	0.75
A digital system is used to generate detailed reports showing individual student progress on each specific competency.	1.0

4.7.3 Intervention strategies (Measure the extent to which students who fall behind receive structured academic support. Review how struggling students are supported through extra instruction.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
The institution does not provide any intervention for students who are behind.	0
Support is provided informally or occasionally, without a set schedule.	0.25
At least one scheduled support class is conducted weekly for groups of more than five students needing help.	0.5
At least one scheduled support class is conducted weekly for groups of three to five students needing help.	0.75
At least one scheduled support class is conducted weekly for groups of one to three students needing help.	1.0

4.7.4 Stakeholder feedback (Measures the extent to which feedback from students and stakeholders informs instructional improvements. Evaluate feedback systems used to improve teaching and learning.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
The institution does not collect feedback from any stakeholders about teaching and learning.	0
Only teacher self-assessments are conducted annually, without input from students or external stakeholders.	0.25
Student surveys are conducted at least once a year in 50% or more subjects or with 50% or more teachers.	0.5
Student feedback and feedback from at least three employer partners are collected annually and used to review instruction.	0.75
Feedback is collected regularly from students, teachers, employers, and academic peers, and the data is analysed for decision-making.	1.0

4.7.5 Data use for instructional improvement (Assess to the extent that assessment and learning data guide and improve teaching practices. Review how assessment and competency data are used by faculty.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
Learning achievement data is not analysed or used in instructional planning or decision-making.	0
Learning achievement data is collected but only used informally, with no documentation.	0.25
Learning achievement data is occasionally used to make decisions such as adjusting pacing or grouping, but there is no formal process.	0.5
Learning achievement data is formally reviewed at least once per semester by at least 50% of faculty members	0.75
Learning achievement data is formally reviewed at least once per quarter by faculty teams and is used to revise teaching methods and instructional materials.	1.0

4.8. Regular assessment of classwork/practical workbooks. (Sub-indicators: 5)

4.8.1 Assessment frequency (Assess how often classwork or practical workbooks are formally assessed per subject)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
No assessments of classwork or practical workbooks are conducted.	0
Classwork or practical workbooks are assessed one to two times per semester.	0.25
Classwork or practical workbooks are assessed once per month.	0.5
Classwork or practical workbooks are assessed once every two weeks.	0.75
Classwork or practical workbooks are assessed weekly.	1.0

4.8.2 Rubric standardisation (Assess the quality and consistency of rubrics used to evaluate classwork/practical work)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
No rubrics are used to assess classwork or practical work.	0
Basic criteria are listed, but they lack scoring guidelines or performance levels.	0.25
Some teachers (25% to 50% of the total) use detailed rubrics, which are not standardised across subjects or teachers.	0.5
A standardised rubric format is used consistently by all teachers to assess classwork and practical work.	0.75
Industry-aligned rubrics are used consistently across subjects, allowing structured and comparable assessments.	1.0

Note: Rubric standardisation refers to using a clear and consistent scoring guide to evaluate students' assignments, so that all teachers assess work similarly using the same criteria.

4.8.3 Feedback quality on assessment (Evaluates the type of feedback provided to students on their classwork/practical assessments)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
No feedback is given on assessed classwork or practical work.	0
Only numerical scores or marks are provided without any comments.	0.25
Short comments are given, but without specific guidance for improvement.	0.5
Written feedback includes constructive comments highlighting strengths and areas to improve.	0.75
Feedback is personalised for each student and includes specific action steps.	1.0

4.8.4 Practical task evaluation (Assesses how practical tasks are evaluated and validated)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
Practical tasks are not evaluated at all.	0
Practical tasks are observed informally without documentation or structured assessment.	0.25
Practical tasks are evaluated using checklists that record task completion only.	0.5
Practical tasks are assessed using structured tools based on competency-based education principles.	0.75
Practical assessments are validated through involvement and feedback from industry representatives or supervisors.	1.0

4.8.5 Recordkeeping & documentation of assessments (Assesses how records of classwork and practical assessments are maintained and used)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
The institution maintains no records of classwork or practical assessments.	0
Assessment records are maintained inconsistently or only on paper, without summaries or individual tracking.	0.25
Records are maintained for most students using basic formats like notebooks or spreadsheets, but without analysis or aggregation.	0.5
A structured or digital format records assessments, and summaries are prepared by subject or task.	0.75
A digital record-keeping system is used to maintain student-wise and task-wise records for tracking progress, giving feedback, and generating reports.	1.0

4.9. Workplace-based learning/on-the-job training (OJT) in practice. (Sub-indicators: 5)

4.9.1 Work-based learning/ OJT model implementation (Assesses the extent to which OJT is structured and institutionalised)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
No work-based learning/ On-the-Job Training (OJT) or internship program is implemented in any course.	0
A pilot work-based learning/ OJT or internship model is being evaluated in one department or program.	0.25
One or two work-based learning/ OJT or internship partnerships have been established and implemented.	0.5
Structured work-based learning/ OJT or internship programs are implemented through at least three industry partners.	0.75
Structured work-based learning/ OJT or internship programs are implemented through more than three industry partners.	1.0

4.9.2 Industry-partnership depth (Assesses the quality and depth of institutional collaboration with industry for OJT)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
No formal or informal partnerships exist with industry for work-based learning/ OJT.	0
Informal verbal or ad-hoc agreements are in place with local companies without written documentation.	0.25
Formal MoUs are signed with at least two industry partners to implement work-based learning/ OJT.	0.5
Training plans for work-based learning/ OJT are jointly developed and coordinated with at least three industry partners.	0.75
Training plans for work-based learning/ OJT are jointly developed and coordinated by more than three industry partners.	1.0

4.9.3 Student participation rate (Measures the percentage of eligible students who participate in OJT)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
Less than 10% of eligible students participate in work-based learning/ OJT programs.	0
30% of eligible students participate in work-based learning/ OJT programs.	0.25
60% of eligible students participate in work-based learning/ OJT programs.	0.5
90% of eligible students participate in work-based learning/ OJT programs.	0.75
More than 90% of eligible students participate in work-based learning/ OJT programs.	1.0

4.9.4 Supervision & assessment (Assesses the monitoring and assessment mechanisms for students during OJT)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
No supervision or assessment is conducted during work-based learning/ OJT placements.	0
Ad-hoc supervisory visits or checks are made without consistent documentation.	0.25
Academic supervisors review work-based learning/ OJT performance at least once a month.	0.5
Academic supervisors review work-based learning/ OJT performance at least once a week.	0.75
Work-based learning/ OJT performance is tracked in real-time using logbooks or digital tools, and employers provide structured feedback.	1.0

4.9.5 Employment outcomes (Measures post-OJT employment rate among graduates)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
The institution does not track employment outcomes after work-based learning/ OJT.	0
Less than 20% of students are employed within six months after completing work-based learning/ OJT.	0.25
Up to 50% of students are employed within six months after work-based learning/ OJT.	0.5
Up to 80% of students are employed within six months after work-based learning/ OJT.	0.75
More than 80% of students are employed within six months after work-based learning/ OJT.	1.0

4.10. Exposure to emerging market skills. (Sub-indicators: 5)

4.10.1 Emerging skills identification (Assesses whether the institution systematically tracks new labour market trends and emerging skill areas)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
The institution has not conducted any formal or informal research on emerging skills.	0
Emerging skills are identified through informal discussions or occasional, non-documented interactions with industry.	0.25
The institution formally maps emerging skills at least once a year.	0.5
Emerging skill needs are updated twice per year using documented internal reviews.	0.75
Emerging skills are identified through biannual reviews with documented inputs from at least three external stakeholders, including employers or sector bodies.	1.0

4.10.2 Training program availability for emerging skills development (Assesses the quantity of structured programs offered by the institution to develop emerging skills)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
No training programs focused on emerging skills are available.	0
One-time or occasional workshops related to emerging skills have been conducted without a consistent structure.	0.25
At least one modular course (minimum 3 hours) has been offered in the last 12 months.	0.5
At least three modular courses (totalling at least 9 hours) have been delivered on emerging skill topics in the last 12 months.	0.75
At least five modular courses (totalling 15 or more hours) have been delivered on emerging skills in the last 12 months.	1.0

4.10.3 Industry collaboration for emerging skills development (Assess the extent of industry engagement in developing or delivering emerging skills content)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
The institution has no formal or informal collaboration with industry for emerging skills development.	0
Industry professionals are occasionally invited for guest lectures related to emerging skills.	0.25
Joint short-term projects on emerging skills have been implemented in collaboration with industry partners.	0.5
At least one technology transfer or collaboration agreement exists with industry to support emerging skills training.	0.75
The institution has co-developed at least one lab or learning facility with an industry partner for training in emerging skill areas.	1.0

4.10.4 Student participation in training for emerging skills development (Measures the percentage of final year or semester students involved in structured emerging skills training)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
Less than 10% of final year/semester students have participated in any emerging skills training in the past academic year.	0
30% of final year/semester students have completed at least one emerging skills training.	0.25
60% of final year/semester students have completed at least one emerging skills training.	0.5
90% of final year/semester students have completed at least one emerging skills training.	0.75
Over 90% of final year/semester students have completed at least one emerging skills training.	1.0

4.10.5 Faculty capacity in emerging skills (Measures how many faculty members have been trained in emerging skills)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
No faculty members have received training in emerging skill areas in the last two years.	0
In the last two years, at least one faculty member has attended an external event such as a seminar or workshop on an emerging skills topic.	0.25
25% of faculty members have undergone formal training or certification in emerging skills within the last two years.	0.5
50% of faculty members have completed training in at least one emerging skill area in the last two years.	0.75
Over 50% of faculty members have been trained in at least one emerging skills topic in the last two years.	1.0

4.11. Supplementary instructional practices that extend beyond the prescribed curriculum

4.11.1 Frequency of supplementary Sessions (Evaluates how often additional learning sessions are organised outside the regular curriculum)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
No supplementary instructional sessions were conducted during the reference academic year.	0
Supplementary instructional sessions were conducted less than once per semester.	0.25
Supplementary instructional sessions were conducted once per semester.	0.5
Supplementary instructional sessions were conducted at least once every month.	0.75
Supplementary instructional sessions were conducted more than once per month.	1.0

4.11.2 Diversity of instructional methods used in the supplementary sessions (Evaluates how many different instructional strategies beyond lectures are used in supplementary sessions)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
No instructional method beyond the standard lecture format was used during the supplementary instructional practices.	0
One supplementary instructional method (e.g., group discussion) was used occasionally during the supplementary instructional practices.	0.25
Two supplementary instructional methods (e.g., group work and case studies) were used regularly during the supplementary instructional practices.	0.5
Four distinct instructional methods (e.g., role plays, peer teaching, project work, and flipped classrooms) were used consistently during the supplementary instructional practices.	0.75
Five or more supplementary instructional methods were integrated systematically across multiple sessions.	1.0

4.11.3 Integration of real-world applications used in the supplementary sessions (Assesses the inclusion of practical, real-world examples or experiences in supplementary instruction)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
No supplementary sessions included real-world examples, projects, or applications.	0
At least one supplementary session during the reference year included a real-world application.	0.25
At least two supplementary sessions during the reference year included real-world applications.	0.5
Between three and four supplementary sessions during the reference year included real-world applications.	0.75
Five supplementary sessions during the reference year included real-world applications, such as live projects, industry visits, or guest-led problem-solving.	1.0

4.11.4 Teacher training for supplementary practices used in the supplementary sessions (Assesses how teachers are trained or supported to use supplementary instructional techniques)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
No training or orientation was provided to teachers for supplementary instruction practices.	0
Teachers attended informal or ad-hoc workshops related to supplementary instruction.	0.25
Formal training related to supplementary instruction was provided to teachers once in the academic year.	0.5
Formal professional development focused on instructional innovation was conducted at least twice in the academic year.	0.75
Professional development focused on supplementary instructional techniques was provided more than twice in the academic year.	1.0

4.11.5 Student engagement in supplementary activities (Assesses the level of student participation in supplementary instructional sessions)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
No students participated in supplementary instructional activities.	0
Fewer than 10% of students participated occasionally in supplementary activities.	0.25
30% of students regularly participated in supplementary instructional sessions.	0.5
60% of students actively participated in supplementary instructional sessions.	0.75
More than 60% of students consistently participated in supplementary instructional sessions.	1.0

4.12. Student attendance maintenance. (Sub-indicators: 3)

4.12.1 Attendance tracking system (Assesses the type and sophistication of attendance tracking used by the institution.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
No attendance tracking system is in place for regular classes.	0
Attendance is recorded manually using paper-based registers.	0.25
Attendance is maintained in basic digital formats such as Excel sheets, without any automation or system integration.	0.5
A partially automated system (e.g., RFID/barcode scanner) is used, with manual backup entries when necessary.	0.75
A fully automated attendance tracking system is implemented and integrated with the institution's student information system.	1.0

4.12.2 Attendance rate of the students (Measures the average attendance rate based on records from the last five instructional days.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
The average student attendance over the last five instructional days is 50% or fewer.	0
The average student attendance over the last five instructional days is 60%.	0.25
The average student attendance over the last five instructional days is 70%.	0.5
The average student attendance over the last five instructional days is 80%.	0.75
The average student attendance over the last five instructional days is 90% or more.	1.0

4.12.3 Follow up for absenteeism (Assesses the level of institutional response to student absenteeism.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
The institution does not follow up on student absenteeism.	0
The institution makes occasional or ad-hoc phone calls in response to student absences.	0.25
A standardised system is in place for following up on absenteeism (e.g., notices, attendance monitoring logs).	0.5
Counselling services and scheduled meetings with parents are conducted in response to attendance issues.	0.75
Personalised support plans are developed for students with chronic absenteeism.	1.0

4.13. Student feedback collection and implementation. (Sub-indicators = 3)

4.13.1 Feedback collection system (Assesses the frequency and structure of collecting feedback from students on teaching and learning quality.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
No formal or informal system is in place to collect feedback from students.	0
Feedback is collected only on an ad hoc basis without a defined schedule.	0.25
Student feedback is collected once per academic year using a standardised format.	0.5
Student feedback is collected twice per academic year with a consistent tool or platform.	0.75
Student feedback is collected three times per academic year through a structured and scheduled process.	1.0

4.13.2 Response rate of student feedback collection (Evaluates students' participation level in the most recent feedback collection.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
Less than 50% of students participated in the most recent feedback collection process.	0

50% of students participated in the most recent feedback collection process.	0.25
75% of students participated in the most recent feedback collection process.	0.5
90% % of students participated in the most recent feedback collection process.	0.75
More than 90% of students participated in the most recent feedback collection process.	1.0

4.13.1 Actionable insights from students' feedback collection (Assesses the extent to which student feedback is analysed and acted upon by teaching staff)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
No analysis of the feedback collected is conducted.	0
Only basic summaries of student feedback are prepared without categorisation.	0.25
Feedback is categorised by subject or instructor, and findings are compiled.	0.5
Based on the analysed feedback, at least 50% of teachers prepare specific action plans.	0.75
More than 75% of teachers prepare specific action plans based on the analysis of feedback.	1.0

4.14. Systematic stakeholder feedback. (Sub-indicators: 3)

4.14.1 Stakeholder coverage (Measures the range of stakeholder groups from whom feedback is systematically collected.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
No feedback is collected from teachers, parents, students, employers, and alumni.	0
Feedback is collected from only one stakeholder group (e.g., teachers).	0.25
Feedback is collected from two stakeholder groups (e.g., teachers and employers).	0.5
Feedback is collected from three stakeholder groups (e.g., teachers, employers, and parents).	0.75
Feedback is collected from all key stakeholder groups: teachers, employers, parents, alumni, and students.	1.0

4.14.2 Feedback mechanism from the stakeholders (Evaluates the regularity and methods used to collect feedback from stakeholders.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
Feedback is collected only through informal verbal input without a formal process.	0
Feedback is collected through annual surveys with a defined questionnaire.	0.25
Feedback is collected through surveys conducted twice a year.	0.5
Feedback is collected twice a year through surveys, supplemented with group discussions.	0.75
Feedback is collected twice a year through surveys, supplemented by group discussions and individual in-depth interviews.	1.0

4.14.3 Action & transparency of the feedback (Assesses whether collected feedback leads to improvements and how transparently these changes are communicated.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
No actions are taken based on the collected stakeholder feedback.	0
Feedback is reviewed internally, but no changes are made to policies or practices.	0.25
At least one improvement or adjustment is made in response to stakeholder feedback.	0.5
At least two improvements or adjustments are implemented based on stakeholder feedback.	0.75
At least two improvements or adjustments are implemented and communicated publicly through forums such as websites or newsletters.	1.0

4.15. Joint stakeholder review meetings (Sub-indicators = 3)

4.15.1. Meeting frequency & representation in the joint stakeholders review meetings (Measures how often review meetings are held and the diversity of stakeholder groups participating.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
No joint stakeholder review meetings are held.	0
Review meetings include one stakeholder group per year.	0.25
Review meetings include two different stakeholder groups in a year.	0.5
Review meetings include three different stakeholder groups each year.	0.75
Review meetings include at least four stakeholder groups from industry, parents, alumni, students, and teachers in a year.	1.0

4.15.2. Agenda transparency in the joint stakeholders review meetings (Evaluates the clarity and documentation of meeting agendas and decisions.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
No agendas or documents are prepared for the meetings.	0
Meetings involve informal or ad-hoc discussions without structured agendas.	0.25
All meetings are conducted with a structured agenda that is documented in advance.	0.5
Meeting decisions are action-oriented with assigned responsibilities and clear timelines.	0.75
Meeting agendas and decisions are published and disseminated through public forums such as websites.	1.0

4.15.3 Decision implementation of the joint stakeholders review meetings (Assesses the extent to which decisions from the review meetings are put into Practice with evidence.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
No actions are taken based on decisions made in stakeholder review meetings.	0
Less than 25% of meeting decisions are implemented.	0.25
50% of meeting decisions are implemented.	0.5
75% of meeting decisions are implemented.	0.75
More than 75% of meeting decisions are implemented, with documented evidence of implementation.	1.0

Criterion 5 Market Linkage and Sustainability (Indicators 9, Sub-indicators =33)

5.1. Linkages with industries and employers operating under industry-institute linkages (IIL). (Sub-indicators: 5)

5.1.1 Industry partnerships (MoUs/Agreements) (Assesses the number and level of activity in formal partnerships with industry.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
The institute does not have any formal partnerships with industries.	0
The institute has 1–2 MoUs with industries, but no activities have been conducted under them in the last year.	0.25
The institute has 2–3 MoUs, and each MoU has supported at least one activity in the last year.	0.5
The institute has 3–5 active industry partnerships, with each MoU supporting at least one activity in the last year.	0.75
The institute has more than five active industry partnerships, with each MoU supporting at least one activity in the last year.	1.0

5.1.2 Industry participation in curriculum enrichment (Measures how actively industry partners contribute to curriculum enrichment and updates.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
No industry representatives have provided input on curriculum enrichment through the extra or co-curricular activities in the last two years.	0
Industry representatives have provided feedback during only one consultation round in the last two years.	0.25
The industry has participated in at least two curriculum enrichment consultations or feedback rounds in the last two years.	0.5
The industry has been involved in at least three structured consultation rounds on curriculum enrichment over the last two years.	0.75
The industry has been involved in more than three structured consultation rounds on curriculum enrichment in the last two years.	1.0

5.1.3 Work-Based learning (Internships/Apprenticeships) (Evaluates the placement of students in real workplace settings.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
The institute does not provide any form of work-based learning, such as internships or apprenticeships.	0
Less than 30% of students are in work-based learning during the academic year.	0.25
Up to 60% of students are placed in internships or apprenticeships.	0.5
Up to 90% of students are placed in work-based learning opportunities.	0.75
Over 90% of students are placed in internships or apprenticeships.	1.0

5.1.4 Employment tracking & graduate absorption rate (Assesses how well the institute tracks employment outcomes of graduates.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
------------------	------------

The institute does not track graduate employment data for the reference year.	0
Employment data has been collected for less than 20% of graduates.	0.25
Employment data has been collected for 50% of graduates.	0.5
Employment data has been collected for 80% of graduates.	0.75
Verified employment information is available for more than 80% of graduates.	1.0

5.1.5 Industry participation in institutional or advisory committees (Assesses the extent to which industry representatives are involved in institutional governance, strategic planning, or advisory bodies.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
No industry representatives are included in any institutional committee or board.	0
One industry representative is informally consulted but not part of formal committees.	0.25
At least one industry representative is a formal academic, curriculum, or advisory committee member.	0.5
Two industry representatives are active members of institutional committees and participate in documented meetings.	0.75
More than two industry representatives are active members of institutional committees and participate in documented meetings.	1.0

5.2. Representation of business and industry associations (BIAs) in the institute management/ operational committee. (Sub-indicators: 5)

5.2.1 Institute management/operational committee (Assesses the level of BIA representation in key decision-making bodies.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
No Business and Industry Association representative is included in the institute's management or operational committee.	0
One Business and Industry Association member is listed as a representative but was absent from the last two committee meetings.	0.25
One Business and Industry Association member has attended at least one of the last two committee meetings.	0.5
Two Business and Industry Association members are on the committee, and at least one attended the last two meetings.	0.75
Two Business and Industry Association members are on the committee, and both attended the last two committee meetings.	1.0

5.2.2 BIA participation rate in decision-making meetings (Measures the consistency of BIA attendance in institutional decision-making meetings.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
Business and Industry Association representatives have not participated in management/ operational committee meetings during the last 12 months.	0
All Business and Industry Association members have participated in at least 25% management/ operational committee meetings in the last 12 months.	0.25
All Business and Industry Association members have participated in at least 50% of management/operational committee meetings in the last 12 months.	0.5

All Business and Industry Association members have participated in at least 75% of the management/operational committee meetings in the last 12 months.	0.75
All Business and Industry Association members have participated in over 75% of the management/operational committee meetings in the last 12 months.	1.0

5.2.3 BIA involvement in strategic planning (Assesses the extent to which BIAs are involved in shaping the institute's strategic direction.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
Business and Industry Associations have not been involved in the institute's strategic planning process.	0
Business and Industry Associations have been informally consulted, but no documentation or structured input is available.	0.25
Business and Industry Associations' feedback has been collected and incorporated into the institute's strategic planning documents.	0.5
Business and Industry Associations have participated in joint planning sessions with the institute.	0.75
Business and Industry Associations have co-developed the strategic plan with the institute management and are named contributors.	1.0

5.2.4 Business and Industry Associations led/ present committees/ subcommittees (Evaluates whether BIAs are leading or formally involved in specialised working groups or task forces.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
There are no committees or subcommittees involving Business and Industry Association members.	0
Business and Industry Associations' input is received ad hoc, but no formal committees exist.	0.25
One standing committee exists where Business and Industry Association members are regularly involved.	0.5
Two functional committees exist where Business and Industry Associations are actively engaged.	0.75
A representative of a Business and Industry Association chairs at least one committee.	1.0

5.2.5 Business and industry associations' engagement in student employability activities (Assesses the degree of BIA participation in student-focused career and employability initiatives.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
Business and Industry Associations have not participated in any student employability-related activities.	0
Business and Industry Associations have conducted only one guest lecture, job talk, or similar engagement in the past year.	0.25
Business and Industry Associations have facilitated at least one internship or placement opportunity during the academic year.	0.5
Business and Industry Associations have been involved in two or more student employability activities, such as mock interviews, mentoring, or internships.	0.75
A structured annual plan with Business and Industry Associations includes three or more activities like internships, placements, mentoring, or exposure visits.	1.0

5.3. Institute maintains an active exchange with BIAs. (Sub-indicators: 5)

5.3.1 Regular communication channels (Assesses whether structured and ongoing communication exists between the institute and BIAs.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
The institute has no established communication channels with Business and Industry Associations (BIAs).	0
Communication with BIAs occurs informally and irregularly without a set schedule.	0.25
The institute holds at least one scheduled meeting with BIAs annually.	0.5
The institute conducts structured meetings with BIAs twice a year.	0.75
The institute maintains formal quarterly communication with BIAs, including feedback mechanisms.	1.0

5.3.2 Joint training programs (Evaluates the frequency and structure of training programs conducted jointly with BIAs.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
No joint training programs have been conducted with BIAs.	0
One ad-hoc training program was conducted with BIA support during the last year.	0.25
At least two collaborative training programs with BIAs were conducted during the last year.	0.5
At least three collaborative training programs with BIAs were conducted during the last year.	0.75
At least four collaborative training programs with BIAs were conducted during the last year.	1.0

5.3.3 Industry expert engagement (Assesses how actively industry professionals contribute to instruction and training.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
No industry experts have been involved in training or instructional activities.	0
Industry experts have occasionally delivered guest lectures without a fixed schedule or minimum hour requirement.	0.25
Industry experts are regularly visiting instructors, contributing at least 15 hours of training annually.	0.5
Part-time industry trainers deliver at least 45 hours of instruction annually at the institute.	0.75
At least one full-time faculty member is an industry expert with at least 10 years of relevant experience.	1.0

5.3.4 Equipment/technology sharing (Assesses how BIAs support the institute by providing or sharing tools, materials, and equipment.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
The institute has not received any material or equipment donations from BIAs.	0
BIAs have provided consumable materials such as raw materials or supplies, but no tools or equipment.	0.25
BIAs have provided at least one piece of non-consumable equipment in the last three years.	0.5
BIAs have provided at least two pieces of non-consumable equipment in the last three years.	0.75
BIAs have provided at least three pieces of non-consumable equipment in the last three years.	1.0

5.3.5 Job placement collaboration (Measures the level of BIA involvement in supporting student job placements.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
BIAs do not provide any support for the job placement of graduates.	0
BIAs occasionally refer to job openings at the institute without formal processes.	0.25
BIAs regularly announce job openings at the institute and accept applications from graduates.	0.5

The institute organises structured recruitment events in partnership with BIAs (e.g., job fairs, placement days).	0.75
The institute has signed guaranteed hiring agreements with BIAs annually for at least three graduates.	1.0

5.4. The institute has established a production unit (PU) (Sub-indicators: 3)

5.4.1 Operational status of the PU (Assesses whether a production unit is functional and the extent of its operational duration.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
The institute does not have a production unit.	0
A production unit is in the planning phase but has not started operations.	0.25
The production unit has been operating on a pilot basis for less than 3 months.	0.5
The production unit operates seasonally and has been functional for 3 to 9 months per year.	0.75
The production unit is fully operational throughout the year (12 months).	1.0

5.4.2 Students' participation in the PU (Measures how many students are involved in the production unit activities.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
No students participate in the production unit.	0
Fewer than 25% of students are involved in the production unit's activities.	0.25
50% of students are involved in the production unit's activities.	0.5
75% of students are involved in the production unit's activities.	0.75
Over 75% of students are engaged in the production unit's activities.	1.0

5.4.3 Financial sustainability of the PU (Assesses whether the production unit generates enough income to support its operational expenses.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
The production unit generates no revenue.	0
The production unit covers less than 25% of its operational costs through income.	0.25
The production unit covers 50% of its operational costs through income.	0.5
The production unit covers 75% of its operational costs through income.	0.75
The production unit covers over 75% of its operational costs through income.	1.0

5.5. Maintenance of transparent accounts from sales of products. (Sub-indicators: 3)

5.5.1 Financial record-keeping system (Assesses the level of systematisation in managing financial records related to product sales.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
The institute does not maintain any financial records for product sales.	0
The institute maintains basic manual product sales records (e.g., notebooks, ledgers).	0.25
A partial digital system (e.g., spreadsheets without structured software) records sales data.	0.5
A complete digital financial record-keeping system (e.g., accounting software) is in place.	0.75

An automated accounting system is in place, and at least one internal and one external audit is conducted annually.	1.0
---	-----

5.5.2 Revenue sharing mechanism (Evaluates whether a formal revenue-sharing policy exists and how clearly it is defined.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
The institute does not have any revenue-sharing policy related to product sales.	0
Revenue from product sales is shared on an ad hoc basis without consistency.	0.25
Revenue sharing is based on informal verbal agreements without documentation.	0.5
A written and documented revenue-sharing policy exists.	0.75
A formal revenue-sharing contract is in place, specifying precise percentages for all stakeholders.	1.0

5.5.3 Transparency and accountability (Examines how financial information is reported and whether it is accessible to stakeholders.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
The institute does not produce any financial reports related to product sales.	0
Financial reports are produced occasionally, without a regular schedule.	0.25
Internal financial reports on product sales are prepared regularly every quarter.	0.5
Financial reports on product sales are publicly available (e.g., on noticeboards, websites).	0.75
Financial reports are verified by a third party and disseminated through public platforms (e.g., website, annual report printed).	1.0

5.6. Effective annual budgeting and expenditure. (Sub-indicators: 3)

5.6.1 Participatory budget preparation (Assesses the level of stakeholder involvement in the budget preparation process.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
The institute does not follow any budgeting process.	0
Budgets are prepared using a top-down approach without stakeholder involvement.	0.25
Limited consultation is conducted with stakeholders, but their input is not consistently reflected in the final budget.	0.5
Departmental-level inputs are collected and incorporated into the institutional budget.	0.75
The budget is prepared through a fully participatory process involving staff, students, and industry representatives.	1.0

5.6.2 Budget utilisation rate (Measures how effectively the allocated budget is used within the financial year.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
The institute does not track budget expenditure for the last financial year.	0
Less than 50% of the allocated budget was utilised during the last financial year.	0.25
75% of the allocated budget was utilised in the last financial year.	0.5
90% of the allocated budget was utilised in the last financial year.	0.75
Over 90% of the allocated budget was utilised, with clear documentation.	1.0

5.6.3 Financial reporting & audit (Evaluates the frequency and rigour of financial reporting and auditing.)

Marking Criteria	Full marks
The institute does not produce any financial reports.	0
A single annual financial report is prepared, without interim updates.	0.25
Financial reports are prepared semi-annually.	0.5
Financial reports are prepared quarterly.	0.75
Financial reports are prepared monthly, and an external audit is conducted annually.	1.0

5.7. Sufficient institutional income/budget. (Sub-indicators: 3)

5.7.1 Budget adequacy ratio (Assesses whether the available budget is adequate to support all planned programs and activities.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
The institute receives less than 60% of the budget to implement its annual programs fully.	0
The institute receives 70% of the required budget.	0.25
The institute receives 80% of the required budget.	0.5
The institute receives 90% of the required budget.	0.75
The institute receives more than 90% of the required budget.	1.0

5.7.2 Diversified income sources (Evaluates the breadth and diversity of income sources supporting the institution.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
The institute relies entirely on a single funding source.	0
The institute has two sources of income: government funding and student fees.	0.25
The institute has three sources of income: government, student fees, and industry partnerships.	0.5
The institute has four sources of income: government, fees, industry, and project-based funding.	0.75
The institute has five sources of income: grants, endowments, consultancy services, and alumni contributions.	1.0

5.7.3 Reserve fund availability (Assesses the institution's financial resilience regarding emergency funds.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
The institute has no financial reserves in place.	0
The reserve fund is insufficient and can cover less than one month of institutional expenses.	0.25
The reserve fund can cover between one and two months of operating expenses.	0.5
The reserve fund can cover operating expenses for between three and five months.	0.75
The reserve fund can cover at least six months of institutional operating expenses.	1.0

5.8. Effective inventory control and management. (Sub-indicators: 3)

5.8.1 Inventory tracking system (Assesses how inventory is monitored, updated, and tracked across the institution.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
The institute does not maintain any inventory records.	0
Inventory is tracked only through manual registers or paper-based logs.	0.25
Inventory is tracked without automation using a basic digital system, such as spreadsheets.	0.5

The institute uses an automated inventory system with barcode scanning and tracking features.	0.75
Inventory is managed through a digital system, allowing real-time tracking.	1.0

5.8.2 Maintenance and utilisation rate (Assesses whether tools and equipment are maintained and optimally used.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
The institute does not have a system in place for maintenance or utilisation tracking.	0
Repairs and maintenance are conducted on an ad-hoc basis without planning.	0.25
A schedule is followed for the routine maintenance of tools and equipment.	0.5
A preventive maintenance plan exists, including periodic service to avoid breakdowns (at least once a year).	0.75
More than 90% of the equipment and tools are regularly maintained and actively utilised in training or production activities (at least two times a year).	1.0

5.8.3 Audit and reconciliation (Measures the frequency and thoroughness of inventory audits and reconciliations.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
The institute does not conduct any inventory audits or reconciliations.	0
Inventory is physically verified only once per year.	0.25
Inventory audits are conducted twice a year.	0.5
Inventory is audited and reconciled quarterly.	0.75
Inventory audits and reconciliations are conducted every month.	1.0

5.9. Students' exposure visits to industries/projects/communities. (Sub-indicators: 3)

5.9.1 Frequency of organised visits (Assesses how frequently the institution organises exposure visits for students to real-world industry, projects, or community settings.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
No exposure visits were conducted during the academic year.	0
One exposure visit was organised during the academic year.	0.25
Two exposure visits were organised during the academic year.	0.5
Three exposure visits were organised during the academic year.	0.75
Four or more exposure visits were organised during the academic year.	1.0

5.9.2 Student participation rate in exposure visits (Assesses the proportion of students participating in these exposure visits.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
No students participated in any exposure visits during the academic year.	0
Less than 25% of students attended exposure visits during the academic year.	0.25
50% of students participated in exposure visits during the academic year.	0.5
75% of students participated in exposure visits during the academic year.	0.75
Over 75% of students participated in exposure visits during the academic year.	1.0

5.9.3 Reporting of the exposure visits (Assesses whether students complete structured reflection or documentation following exposure visits.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
No follow-up or reporting activities were conducted after exposure visits.	0
Only informal discussions or verbal reflections were conducted following the visits.	0.25
At least 25% of students prepared and presented structured reports based on their exposure visits.	0.5
At least 50% of students prepared and presented structured reports based on their exposure visits.	0.75
At least 75% of students prepared and presented structured reports based on their exposure visits.	1.0

Criterion 6 Student Support Services (Indicators 7, Sub-indicators =31)

6.1. The psychosocial counselling health services unit (PCHSU) is in place. (Sub-indicators: 5)

6.1.1 Institutional commitment for the psychosocial counselling health services (Assesses whether there is a formal institutional policy and mechanism for maintaining psychosocial and health support.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
The institution has no policy or guidelines for psychosocial counselling or health services.	0
A draft policy on psychosocial counselling or health services has not yet been approved.	0.25
An approved policy document for psychosocial counselling and health services is in place.	0.5
A policy is in place, and a specific budget is allocated to support psychosocial counselling and health services.	0.75
A policy with an allocated budget exists and is reviewed annually as part of institutional planning processes.	1

6.1.2 Service accessibility of the psychosocial counselling health services (Assesses the physical and practical accessibility of the counselling and health services unit.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
There is no dedicated space for counselling or health services within the institution.	0
Counselling services are offered in a shared or temporary space without privacy.	0.25
A permanent room or office is available for counselling or health support services.	0.5
A well-equipped, private, and confidential office allows students to access services.	0.75
Services are available in a private office, and after-hours access is also provided to students.	1

6.1.3 Professional staffing for the psychosocial counselling health services (Assesses the level and qualification of staff available to provide psychosocial support and health services.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
There are no trained or designated staff providing psychosocial counselling or health support.	0
Volunteer or peer counsellors provide services without formal training or contracts.	0.25
A part-time trained counsellor or health professional is available on campus.	0.5
The institution employs a full-time trained counsellor or health staff member.	0.75
A multidisciplinary team is available, including at least two professionals such as a counsellor, nurse, or social worker.	1

6.1.4 Preventive programs for the psychosocial counselling health services (Assess the institution's efforts to support student well-being through workshops or awareness activities proactively.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
No preventive or awareness activities related to psychosocial or health services were conducted.	0
One annual awareness session was conducted in the last 12 months.	0.25
Awareness sessions or preventive programs are organised semi-annually.	0.5
Awareness sessions or preventive programs are conducted at the end of each term (at least 3 times a year).	0.75
Awareness sessions or preventive programs are conducted at least 4 times a year.	1

6.1.5 Monitoring and impact of the psychosocial counselling health services (Assesses whether the institution tracks service usage, gathers feedback, and evaluates the impact.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
No data is collected on the use or impact of psychosocial or health services.	0
Only basic service usage records (e.g., number of students visiting) are maintained.	0.25
A system is in place to collect student feedback about counselling or health services.	0.5
The institution tracks outcomes such as changes in academic performance or behaviour for students who use the services.	0.75
Annual compiled reports on service usage, student outcomes, and program effectiveness are prepared and reviewed.	1

6.2. Student's aptitude test before enrolment is in practice. (Sub-indicators: 3)

6.2.1 Aptitude test or entrance examination implementation (Assesses the presence and quality of aptitude testing before student enrolment.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
The institution does not conduct any aptitude tests or entrance exams before enrolment.	0
Only informal assessments, such as interviews, are conducted without written tests.	0.25
A written test is administered to applicants.	0.5
A standardised aptitude test using validated assessment tools is administered before enrolment.	0.75
Standardised aptitude and skill tests using validated assessment tools are administered before enrollment.	1

6.2.2 Counselling and course alignment (Assesses whether aptitude test results are used to counsel students and align course choices.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
No counselling is provided based on aptitude/entrance test for course alignment.	0
Generic advice is given to students on an as-needed basis without a structured system.	0.25
A basic program exists to recommend courses to students based on aptitude/entrance test results.	0.5
Structured course counselling sessions are conducted at least once per admission cycle.	0.75
A comprehensive career and course alignment system is implemented, including individualised counselling for all students and documented session logs.	1

6.2.3 Impact on retention rates (Assesses the retention rate of students from admission to exam appearance as an indicator of aptitude testing and counselling effectiveness.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
The retention rate from admission to exam appearance is below 50%.	0
The retention rate from admission to exam appearance is 50%.	0.25
The retention rate from admission to exam appearance is 70%.	0.5
The retention rate from admission to exam appearance is 90%.	0.75
The retention rate from admission to exam appearance is more than 90%.	1

6.3. Job placement service is available. (Sub-indicators: 5)

6.3.1 Dedicated placement cell (Assesses the existence and staffing of a placement service cell.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
The institution does not have a dedicated placement cell.	0
Faculty members handle placement activities on an ad hoc basis.	0.25
A part-time coordinator who works less than 20 hours a week for this cell manages placement services.	0.5
A part-time placement coordinator who works more than 20 to less than 40 hours a week is appointed to manage placement activities.	0.75
A part-time placement coordinator is appointed to manage placement activities and works 40 hours a week.	1

6.3.2 Industry partnerships for placements (Assesses the strength and formalisation of industry partnerships facilitating placements.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
The institution has no ties with industries for placement purposes.	0
There are 1-2 informal industry partners without formal agreements (MoUs) for placement purposes.	0.25
At least one signed memorandum of understanding (MoU) exists with industry partners for placement purposes.	0.5
Two signed memoranda of understanding (MoUs) exist with industry partners for placement purposes.	0.75
More than two signed memoranda of understanding (MoUs) exist with industry partners for placement purposes.	1

6.3.3 Student placement rate by the efforts of the placement cell (Measures the percentage of students placed through the placement cell's efforts.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
No students are placed through the placement cell.	0
Less than 25% of students are placed in jobs or internships.	0.25
More than 25% of students are successfully placed.	0.5
More than 50% of students are placed.	0.75
More than 75% of students are placed, and placement records are verified.	1

6.3.4 Workplace-Based Learning (WBL) integration for students' placement (Evaluates the extent to which work-based learning is part of placement services.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
The institution does not offer any work-based learning or internship programs.	0
Occasional work-based learning or internships are available, but not formally structured.	0.25
Structured short-term work-based learning or internship (at least 45 hours) programs are provided.	0.5
Structured short-term work-based learning or internship (at least 90 hours) programs are provided.	0.75
Internships are mandatory for all students.	1

6.3.5 Post-placement Tracking (Assesses the tracking and feedback mechanisms following student placements.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
No tracking of students' status after placement is conducted.	0

Informal contact with alumni is maintained without structured data collection.	0.25
Employer feedback is collected annually but not complemented by graduate surveys.	0.5
Annual graduate surveys are conducted to monitor employment outcomes.	0.75
Both employer and graduate surveys are conducted annually to improve placement services.	1

6.4. Scholarship and other incentives to pro/poor students (full scholarship, partial scholarship, support on accommodation, etc.). (Sub-indicators: 3)

6.4.1 Scholarship availability and coverage (Measures the availability and proportion of students receiving scholarships.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
The institution does not provide any scholarships.	0
Scholarships cover approximately 2% of the student population.	0.25
Scholarships are provided to 5% of the students.	0.5
Scholarships are provided to 10% of the students.	0.75
Scholarships are provided to more than 10% of the students.	1

6.4.2 Types of financial support (Assesses the comprehensiveness of financial support offered.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
No financial support or incentives are provided.	0
Only tuition fee waivers are offered as financial support.	0.25
Tuition fee waivers plus support for learning materials are provided.	0.5
Full scholarships covering tuition, learning materials and living expenses are granted.	0.75
A comprehensive support package including tuition, learning materials, living expenses, and transportation is provided.	1

6.4.3 Disadvantaged group (DAG) access (Evaluates the inclusion of disadvantaged groups in scholarship/incentive programs.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
No support is provided for disadvantaged groups in the current year.	0
Disadvantaged groups are informally considered for support without formal tracking.	0.25
20% of beneficiaries belong to disadvantaged groups.	0.5
33% of scholarship/incentive beneficiaries are from disadvantaged groups.	0.75
More than 33% of the beneficiaries are members of disadvantaged groups.	1

6.5. The institute provides recreational facilities for the students (playgrounds, indoor games, facilities, meeting rooms, cafeteria, etc.) (Sub-indicators: 5)

6.5.1 Outdoor sports facilities (Evaluates the availability and ownership status of outdoor sports facilities.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
The institute does not have any outdoor sports facilities.	0
The institute has one outdoor sports field or court shared with other institutions.	0.25

The institute owns one outdoor sports field or court exclusively for its students.	0.5
The institute has at least one shared and one owned outdoor sports facility, totalling two facilities. (Having the institution's own two facilities is well and fine)	0.75
The institute maintains at least two shared and one owned outdoor sports facility, totalling three facilities. (Having the institution's own three facilities is well and fine)	1

6.5.2 Indoor recreational spaces (Assess the presence and variety of indoor recreational spaces.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
No indoor recreational facilities are available.	0
The institute has one shared multi-purpose room for indoor activities.	0.25
The institute provides a specialised game room for student recreation.	0.5
There are at least two specialised activity rooms for indoor recreational use.	0.75
The institute has three or more specialised activity rooms available for students.	1

6.5.3 Student lounge/Cafeteria (Evaluates the availability and capacity of student common areas and food facilities.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
There is no common space for students to relax or eat.	0
A seating area with an open roof is provided for students.	0.25
The institute has a closed room student lounge, but food is not cooked there.	0.5
There is a cooking cafeteria with the capacity to serve at least 10% of the regular student population.	0.75
The cooking cafeteria can serve at least 20% of the regular student population.	1

6.5.4 Extracurricular activity support (Measures the extent and frequency of organised extracurricular activities.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
No organised extracurricular activities take place.	0
The institute organises occasional extracurricular events (one event).	0.25
Regular extracurricular events are conducted, with at least two events held annually.	0.5
Students organise at least three extracurricular events per year.	0.75
A total of four or more extracurricular events is held annually.	1

6.5.5 Accessibility and maintenance (Assesses the safety, maintenance, and accessibility features of recreational facilities.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
Recreational facilities are unsafe or inaccessible to students.	0
Facilities receive only basic maintenance with no regular cleaning.	0.25
Recreational spaces (playground, courts, cafeteria) receive basic maintenance and are cleaned regularly.	0.5
With regularity of cleaning, scheduled upgrades and maintenance are conducted on a routine basis (at least once a year)	0.75
With regularity of cleaning, scheduled upgrades and maintenance are conducted on a routine basis (at least once a year). The facilities also include accessibility features such as ramps for students with disabilities on top of regular upgrades, maintenance, and cleaning.	1

6.6. Students' grievance redressal mechanisms are in place and practised. (Sub-indicators: 5)

6.6.1 Grievance policy framework (Evaluates the existence and maturity of grievance policies.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
No grievance policy exists at the institute.	0
A draft grievance policy document is available but has not yet been approved.	0.25
The institute has an approved, written grievance policy.	0.5
The grievance policy is approved and includes detailed implementation guidelines.	0.75
A comprehensive grievance policy is in place with mechanisms for periodic review and update (at least once a year).	1

6.6.2 Reporting mechanisms for grievance (Assesses the availability and accessibility of complaint reporting channels.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
There are no channels available for students to report grievances.	0
Students report grievances informally through verbal communication.	0.25
A written complaint system, such as a complaint box, is available.	0.5
Formal channels exist for grievance reporting, such as a dedicated email.	0.75
An anonymous digital platform and physical reporting options are provided to students.	1

6.6.3 Grievance redressal process (Measures the clarity and structure of grievance resolution procedures.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
No formal grievance resolution process exists.	0
Grievances are handled on an ad-hoc basis without standardised procedures.	0.25
A standard response timeframe for grievance resolution is established.	0.5
Documented case management procedures are followed for grievances.	0.75
Documented case management is practised with follow-up on grievances.	1

6.6.4 Awareness & accessibility of the grievance redressal mechanism (Evaluates how well students are informed about grievance procedures.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
Students are generally unaware of grievance redressal mechanisms.	0
Basic information about grievance procedures is posted on noticeboards/ citizen charters.	0.25
Orientations on grievance procedures are provided at the beginning of the academic session.	0.5
At least two orientations on grievance redressal are conducted during the academic year.	0.75
Two orientations are provided, and grievance procedures are embedded in the student handbook.	1

6.6.5 Effectiveness tracking of the grievance redressal (Assesses monitoring and continuous improvement of grievance mechanisms.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
No tracking of grievances or their resolutions is conducted.	0
Basic records of complaints are maintained.	0.25

The institute tracks grievance resolution rates.	0.5
Student satisfaction surveys are conducted to assess grievance redressal effectiveness.	0.75
An annual report on grievance handling is conducted.	1

6.7. Students are encouraged to innovate and engage in extracurricular technical activities. (Sub-indicators: 5)

6.7.1 Innovation support programs (Assesses the availability and scope of institutional programs supporting innovation.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
The institute does not offer any innovation support programs.	0
Occasional workshops/programs on innovation are organised for students (at least once a year).	0.25
The institute conducts an annual innovation challenge or similar programs.	0.5
The institute conducts an annual innovation challenge or similar programs, and has a dedicated makerspace, innovation lab, or incubation centre available for student use.	0.75
The institute conducts an annual innovation challenge or similar programs. It has a dedicated makerspace, innovation lab, or incubation centre available for student use, and it maintains an institutional innovation fund and provides incubation support.	1

6.7.2 Student clubs and competitions (Evaluates student technical clubs' presence, activity level, and competitive participation.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
There are no student clubs in the institute.	0
At least one informal club exists.	0.25
At least one officially registered club exists.	0.5
The institute participates regularly in at least two inter-college technical competitions annually.	0.75
The institute participates in national or international technical competitions at least once annually with at least one registered technical club.	1

6.7.3 Industry-linked projects (Measures the extent of student involvement in industry-related projects.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
There are no industry-linked student projects.	0
Industry experts provide occasional guest lectures related to projects.	0.25
Industry partners sponsor at least one class project.	0.5
At least one student from the institution engages in live problem-solving projects sourced from industry.	0.75
Students have commercialised innovations resulting from industry-linked projects. (Record of history also counts.)	1

6.7.4 Faculty mentorship system to promote innovation (Assesses the support system for student innovation through faculty mentorship.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
No faculty mentorship is provided for student innovations.	0
Faculty provide informal guidance to students on innovation activities.	0.25
Students are assigned official project advisors.	0.5

A structured mentorship program focused on innovation is in place.	0.75
At least one faculty member collaborates with industry experts to mentor students.	1

6.7.5 Recognition and incentives for the innovations (Evaluates the incentives and recognition mechanisms for student innovations.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
No formal recognition is given for student innovations.	0
Students receive certificates acknowledging their innovations.	0.25
Students receive certificates acknowledging their innovations, and cash prizes are awarded for innovative achievements.	0.5
Students receive certificates acknowledging their innovations, and cash prizes are awarded for innovative achievements. Also, the institute provides startup funding for student innovation.	0.75
Students receive certificates acknowledging their innovations, and cash prizes are awarded for innovative achievements. Also, the institute provides startup funding for student innovation. Support is provided for student innovation- patenting, copyrights, and startup funding.	1

Criterion 7 Research and Development (Indicators 10, Sub-indicators =38)

7.1. The institute has a clear communication strategy and knowledge management system, and operates effectively. (Sub-indicators: 3)

7.1.1 Communication policy and channels (Evaluates the existence and sophistication of the institute's communication strategy and channels.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
The institute does not have a formal communication strategy.	0
Communication is limited to basic noticeboards and word-of-mouth methods.	0.25
The institute maintains a website or social media for communication.	0.5
More than one communication channel is implemented.	0.75
An integrated communication system with regular feedback loops is in place.	1

7.1.2 Information accessibility and responsiveness (Measures how effectively information is shared and inquiries are responded to within the institute.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
There is no system for sharing information or responding to queries.	0
A basic system exists, such as fixed office hours or a physical suggestion box, but without tracking response times.	0.25
Email or phone contact points are available, but average responses take more than five days.	0.5
Digital contact systems (including email, hotline, or online forms) are used with logs to track response times, achieving average resolution within three days.	0.75
A real-time response system (such as a chatbot) operates with resolution tracking, analytics, and regular improvements based on user feedback.	1

7.1.3 Stakeholder engagement system regarding communication (Assesses the mechanisms for involving stakeholders in communication and knowledge sharing.)

Instructions to the assessors: Consider the following as the stakeholders: Students, teachers, parents, employers, government officials, local community, and the management committee

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
No formal mechanism exists to engage stakeholders.	0
The institute holds an annual open house event for stakeholder engagement.	0.25
Biannual meetings are held to engage stakeholders in institutional matters.	0.5
Sector-specific advisory groups (at least one) meet at least once a year to provide input and guidance.	0.75
Formalised public-private partnerships exist, jointly preparing learning reports at least once annually.	1

7.2. The TVET management information system (MIS) is in place and operational. (Sub-indicators: 3)

7.2.1 MIS infrastructure and accessibility (Evaluates the type and sophistication of the institute's MIS infrastructure and how accessible it is.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
The institute does not have a Management Information System (MIS).	0
A standalone spreadsheet system is used for data management.	0.25
The institute maintains a basic digital database for key information.	0.5
A cloud-based institutional MIS system is operational and accessible.	0.75
The institute's MIS is integrated with the national TVET MIS platform.	1

7.2.2 Data comprehensiveness of the MIS: Assesses the extent of data collected and maintained by the MIS.

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
No key student or institutional data is collected.	0
Only enrollment data is collected and maintained.	0.25
Enrollment and graduation data are systematically recorded.	0.5
The MIS includes data on on-the-job training (OJT)/ internship and employment outcomes.	0.75
Full lifecycle tracking is implemented, covering data from enrollment through to employment.	1

7.2.3 Data security & governance (Evaluates the security measures and governance practices related to the MIS data.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
No data security measures are in place.	0
Basic password protection is applied to MIS data access.	0.25
Role-based access control limits data access according to staff responsibilities.	0.5
Role-based access is combined with activity logs or audit trails to monitor data usage.	0.75
Data is encrypted, and regular backups are maintained to prevent loss.	1

7.3. The labour market information system (LMIS) is in place and operational. (Sub-indicators: 3)

7.3.1 LMIS functionality and data coverage (Assesses the existence and sophistication of the LMIS and the range of labour market data it covers.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
The institute does not have a labour market information system (LMIS).	0
The labour market information system maintains basic job vacancy data.	0.25
The labour market information system tracks sectoral demand trends for labour and skills.	0.5
The labour market information system includes skills forecasting based on labour market analysis.	0.75
The labour market information system operates real-time labour market analytics and predictions.	1

7.3.2 Use of LMIS data in decision making (Assesses how actively the institution uses LMIS data for planning programs, curriculum updates, and student services.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
LMIS data is not used for any academic or institutional planning.	0
LMIS data is reviewed but not formally used for decision-making.	0.25
LMIS data is used to inform career guidance or student counselling activities.	0.5

LMIS data informs curriculum enrichment or aligns teaching and learning programs with labour market demands.	0.75
LMIS data is used to revise the organisational action plan and programs.	1

7.3.3 Stakeholder engagement and accessibility (Measures how LMIS access is provided to various stakeholders and the governance model.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
No Labour Market Information System access is provided to anyone other than the data admin.	0
Only institutional staff have access to the Labour Market Information System.	0.25
An employer portal is available for Labour Market Information System access and input.	0.5
Students and the public can access the Labour Market Information System dashboards and information.	0.75
The LMIS is accessible to staff, students, employers, and the public through an online platform, with mechanisms for feedback and data contribution.	1

7.4. The institute organises learning sharing workshops with stakeholders. (Sub-indicators: 3)

7.4.1 Workshop frequency and participation in learning sharing workshops (Assesses how often the institute organises workshops and the level of participation.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
The institute does not conduct any learning-sharing workshops.	0
The institute organises a learning and sharing workshop annually.	0.25
The institute holds two learning sharing workshops per year.	0.5
The institute conducts quarterly workshops with stakeholder participation (at least three learning sharing workshops)	0.75
The institute organises monthly thematic workshops regularly.	1

7.4.2 Stakeholder diversity and representation in the learning sharing workshops (Measures the variety and inclusiveness of stakeholders involved in the workshops.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
Only a single type of stakeholder participated in the workshops.	0
Workshops included at least two stakeholder categories, such as employers and teachers.	0.25
Workshops involved three stakeholder types, including students.	0.5
Workshops engaged four categories of stakeholders, including policymakers.	0.75
Workshops engaged more than four categories of stakeholders, including policymakers.	1

7.4.3 Outcome implementation of the learning sharing workshop (Evaluates the follow-up actions and measurable impact resulting from the workshops.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
No follow-up actions were taken after the workshops.	0
Only informal commitments were made following the workshops.	0.25
Documented action points were created from workshop discussions.	0.5
Institutionalised changes have been implemented with evidence documented at the program implementation level.	0.75

Institutionalised changes have been implemented with evidence documented at the strategy level.	1
---	---

7.5. A functional financial management information system (FMIS) is in place. (Sub-indicators: 5)

7.5.1 FMIS functionality and integration (Assesses the sophistication and integration level of the FMIS.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
The institute does not have a Financial Management Information System (FMIS).	0
The institute maintains financial records using manual methods only.	0.25
The institute uses a basic digital accounting system for financial management.	0.5
The institute operates an integrated financial system covering budgeting, payroll, and related modules.	0.75
The institute employs a fully automated, cloud-based FMIS.	1

7.5.2 Transparency and compliance of financial measures (Assesses the level of transparency and audit compliance supported by the FMIS.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
There is no audit trail or transaction logging in the financial system.	0
Basic transaction logs are maintained within the financial records.	0.25
The institute conducts regular internal financial audits.	0.5
Real-time expenditure tracking is implemented in the FMIS.	0.75
Automated compliance alerts are active, and the FMIS integrates with external audit processes.	1

7.5.3 Decision making and reporting based on FMIS (Evaluates financial reporting and decision support quality and frequency.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
The institute does not generate any financial reports.	0
Annual summary financial reports are prepared.	0.25
Quarterly financial statements are generated for review.	0.5
A dashboard with key financial performance indicators is maintained.	0.75
FMIS supports predictive financial modelling to aid decision-making.	1

7.6. The institute conducts periodic independent evaluations, and findings are implemented. (Sub-indicators: 6)

7.6.1 Evaluation scope & frequency (Assesses how comprehensively and regularly the institute conducts evaluations.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
The institute does not conduct any evaluations.	0
Evaluations are conducted on an ad-hoc basis without a regular schedule.	0.25
Partial evaluations covering one to two performance indicators are carried out.	0.5
The institute conducts annual comprehensive evaluations covering at least five performance indicators.	0.75
At least five performance indicators are evaluated through public portals for transparency.	1

7.6.2 Evaluator independence & expertise (Measures the independence and qualification of evaluators involved in assessments.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
Evaluations are conducted solely by internal staff members.	0
External evaluators are partially involved in the evaluation process.	0.25
Evaluations are carried out entirely by external experts.	0.5
Certified external evaluators conduct the assessments.	0.75
The institute has undergone reviews by national or international accreditation bodies within the last five years.	1

7.6.3 Implementation of findings (Evaluates how effectively the institute acts on evaluation recommendations.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
No actions are taken based on evaluation findings.	0
Less than 25% of evaluation recommendations have been implemented with documented evidence of impact.	0.25
50% of recommendations are implemented with documented evidence of impact.	0.5
75% of recommendations are implemented with documented evidence of impact.	0.75
More than 75% of recommendations are implemented with documented evidence of impact.	1

7.7 The institute conducts tracer studies and uses its report for quality enhancement. (Sub-indicators: 5)

7.7.1 Tracer study frequency and coverage (Assesses how often tracer studies are conducted and the percentage of graduates covered.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
The institute does not conduct any tracer studies.	0
Tracer studies are conducted on an ad hoc basis.	0.25
Tracer studies are conducted once every two years.	0.5
Annual tracer studies are conducted covering 50% of graduates.	0.75
Annual tracer studies cover more than 90% of graduates.	1

7.7.2 Employment outcome analysis in the tracer study (Evaluates the depth of employment-related data collected through tracer studies.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
No employment data is collected from tracer studies.	0
Only basic employment status is recorded (e.g., employed or unemployed).	0.25
Employment data includes the type of employment and sector information.	0.5
Tracer studies collect data on the type of employment, sector information, and job relevance to training.	0.75
Comprehensive tracking of career progression is maintained through tracer studies.	1

7.7.3 Program implementation alignment mechanism based on the tracer study findings (Measures how tracer study findings inform program adjustments.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
------------------	------------

There is no linkage between tracer study findings and program implementation.	0
Feedback from tracer studies is shared informally within the institute.	0.25
Annual program review meetings incorporate tracer study feedback.	0.5
A structured and documented process exists for using tracer study results to improve program implementation, but changes have not yet been implemented or tracked.	0.75
The institution has implemented at least two documented changes to program delivery in the past two years based on tracer study findings	1

7.7.4 Dissemination of tracer study findings (Assesses dissemination and engagement with tracer study findings among stakeholders.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
Tracer study findings are not disseminated.	0
Findings are shared only through internal reports.	0.25
Findings are presented to faculty and management teams.	0.5
Results are presented to industry partners and stakeholders.	0.75
Findings are available publicly.	1

7.7.5 Documented quality improvements based on tracer study findings (Evaluates documented changes made based on tracer study findings.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
No changes have been made based on tracer study findings.	0
One minor program adjustment has been made and documented.	0.25
Two program modifications have been made and documented.	0.5
Based on tracer study findings, at least one significant change (e.g., curriculum delivery method overhaul, or introduction of supplementary new modules) has been implemented and documented in the past two years.	0.75
Institutional reforms (e.g., policy changes, creation of quality monitoring units, or strategic partnerships) have been implemented, with evidence provided.	1

7.8. Students' enrollment, dropout and passout rates per the enrollment policy and criteria, including GESI. (Sub-indicators: 5)

7.8.1 Enrollment policy and GESI criteria (Evaluates the existence of the enrollment policy and its coverage in terms of GESI.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
No written enrollment policy exists, or enrollment is done without using defined criteria (e.g., entrance exams, merit lists).	0
A written enrollment policy exists, but less than 50% of enrolled students meet the defined admission criteria (e.g., entrance test, academic merit).	0.25
At least 70% of enrolled students meet the documented admission criteria, but the process does not address GESI quotas or inclusion provisions.	0.5
At least 90% of enrolled students meet the documented admission criteria, and partial GESI disaggregation is used (e.g., gender only).	0.75
100% of enrolled students meet all documented admission criteria. GESI targets (at least three disaggregated categories such as gender, caste/ethnicity, disability, or geographic region) are applied and reported during enrollment.	1

7.8.2 Enrollment rate vs capacity (Assesses how well enrollment fills the institute's available capacity.)

Instructions to the auditors: Check the latest enrollment data.

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
Less than 50% of the available enrollment capacity is filled.	0
70% of the available enrollment capacity is filled.	0.25
90% of the available enrollment capacity is filled.	0.5
100% of the available enrollment capacity is filled.	0.75
100% of the available enrollment capacity is filled, with the competition among more than the defined capacity or quota.	1

7.8.3 Dropout rate management (Evaluates the dropout rate and interventions to reduce it.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
The dropout rate exceeds 40%, based on the overall retention rate calculated from the number of students who enrolled in the first year/semester and remained in the same cohort to appear in the end-of-semester examination	0
The dropout rate is 30%, based on the overall retention rate calculated from the number of students who enrolled in the first year/semester and remained in the same cohort to appear in the end-of-semester examination	0.25
The dropout rate is 20%, based on the overall retention rate calculated from the number of students who enrolled in the first year/semester and remained in the same cohort to appear in the end-of-semester examination	0.5
The dropout rate is 10%, based on the overall retention rate calculated from the number of students who enrolled in the first year/semester and remained in the same cohort to appear in the end-of-semester examination	0.75
The dropout rate is less than 10%, based on the overall retention rate calculated from the number of students who enrolled in the first year/semester and remained in the same cohort to appear in the end-of-semester examination	1

7.8.4 Graduation rate (Measures the proportion of students graduating from their programs.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
The graduation rate is below 50%, calculated by comparing the total number of students who submitted exam forms to those who graduated across all programs.	0
The graduation rate is 60%, calculated by comparing the total number of students who submitted exam forms to those who graduated across all programs.	0.25
The graduation rate is 70%, calculated by comparing the total number of students who submitted exam forms to those who graduated across all programs.	0.5
The graduation rate is 80%, calculated by comparing the total number of students who submitted exam forms to those who graduated across all programs.	0.75
The graduation rate is 90% or above, calculated by comparing the total number of students who submitted exam forms to those who graduated across all programs.	1

7.8.5 Gender Equality & Social Inclusion (GESI) disaggregation of the data in the enrollment (Assesses the monitoring and inclusion of GESI in enrollment.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
No GESI data on student enrollment has been collected.	0
The institute tracks only one GESI disaggregation (gender, caste, disability, geography and so on) of the enrollment data.	0.25

The institute tracks two GESI disaggregation (gender, caste, disability, geography and so on) of the enrollment data	0.5
The institute tracks three GESI disaggregation (gender, caste, disability, geography and so on) of the enrollment data	0.75
The institute tracks four GESI disaggregation (gender, caste, disability, geography and so on) of the enrollment data	1

7.9. Market assessment (Sub-indicators: 5)

7.9.1 Market assessment frequency (Measures how regularly the institute conducts market assessments to align programs with labour market needs.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
The institute has not conducted any market assessments.	0
The institute conducts market assessments on an ad hoc basis, without a fixed schedule.	0.25
The institute conducts market assessments once every two years.	0.5
The institute conducts a comprehensive market assessment every year.	0.75
The institute conducts annual comprehensive market assessments and prepares detailed reports.	1

7.9.2 Sectoral coverage of the market assessment (Assesses how many sectors are included in market assessments and the depth of data analysed.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
The market assessment is limited to a single sector.	0
The market assessment includes only basic data from two sectors.	0.25
The market assessment includes two sectors with trend analysis.	0.5
The market assessment includes two sectors, with trend analysis and identifying emerging skills.	0.75
The market assessment includes two sectors, with trend analysis and identifying emerging skills. It also includes forecasting future labour market needs.	1

7.9.3 Employer engagement in the market assessment (Evaluates the extent of employer involvement in market assessments.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
Employers are not involved in the market assessment process.	0
Employers provide input informally without structured feedback mechanisms.	0.25
Structured surveys are conducted with feedback from at least 10 firms.	0.5
Sector-wise focus group discussions (at least two) and 10 firm surveys are organised with employers.	0.75
Market assessments are co-designed and implemented in collaboration with employer associations.	1

7.9.4 Stakeholder dissemination of the market assessment results (Measures how effectively the market assessment findings are shared with relevant stakeholders and whether their feedback is collected and used for future improvements.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
Market assessment findings are not shared with any stakeholders.	0
Findings are shared informally with internal staff or trainers only.	0.25

A summary report of market findings is prepared and shared with selected external stakeholders (e.g., employers) and staff.	0.5
A formal dissemination event (e.g., workshop, roundtable) is organised with participation from external stakeholders, such as employers, government officials	0.75
Market assessment findings are disseminated publicly through the website or social media.	1

7.9.5 Utilisation of the market assessment data (Measures how market assessment findings are used to revise or introduce training courses.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
No changes have been made to programs based on market assessments.	0
A day of orientation was made to meet the skills gaps diagnosed by the market assessment.	0.25
Based on assessment findings, one non-credit course (minimum 15 hours) has been implemented in the past 12 months.	0.5
Based on assessment findings, two non-credit courses (each at least 15 hours) or one 30-hour course have been implemented in the past 12 months.	0.75
Based on assessment findings, three non-credit courses (each at least 15 hours) or one 45-hour course have been implemented in the past 12 months.	1

7.10. Employment rate of graduates (average of last 3 years) (Sub-indicators: 5)

7.10.1 Overall employment Rate (Measures the proportion of graduates employed across all sectors, averaged over the past three years.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
Less than 30% of graduates are employed, based on current data.	0
50% of graduates are employed, based on current data.	0.25
70% of graduates are employed, based on current data.	0.5
90% of graduates are employed, based on current data.	0.75
More than 90% of graduates are employed, based on current data.	1

7.10.2 Field-relevant employment (Assesses the extent to which graduates work in jobs aligned with their field of study.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
Less than 30% of employed graduates work in jobs relevant to their training/education.	0
50% of employed graduates work in jobs relevant to their training/education.	0.25
70% of employed graduates work in jobs relevant to their training/education.	0.5
90% of employed graduates work in jobs relevant to their training/education.	0.75
More than 90% of employed graduates work in jobs relevant to their training/education.	1

7.10.3 Formal employment rate (Measures how many graduates are in formal employment (e.g., with contracts, benefits, and formal recognition).)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
Less than 30% of employed graduates are working in formal jobs.	0
50% of employed graduates are working in formal jobs.	0.25
70% of employed graduates are working in formal jobs.	0.5
90% of employed graduates are working in formal jobs.	0.75

More than 90% of employed graduates are working in formal jobs.	1
---	---

7.10.4 Wage/Salary of graduates (Evaluates the proportion of graduates earning at or above the minimum government wage (As of 2082 BS, it is NPR 17,300).)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
Less than 30% of tracked graduates earn the government's minimum wage.	0
50% of tracked graduates earn the government's minimum wage.	0.25
70% of tracked graduates earn the government's minimum wage.	0.5
90% of tracked graduates earn the government's minimum wage.	0.75
More than 90% of tracked graduates earn the government's minimum wage.	1

7.10.5 Employer satisfaction (Measures the satisfaction level of employers who hire graduates from the institute.)

Marking Criteria	Full Marks
There is no system in place to collect employer feedback.	0
Less than 50% of employers report satisfaction with the graduates' performance.	0.25
70% of employers report satisfaction with the graduates' performance.	0.5
90% of employers report satisfaction with the graduates' performance.	0.75
More than 90% of employers report satisfaction with the graduates' performance.	1



Council for Technical Education and Vocational Training (CTEVT)

Madhyapur Thimi-2, Sanothimi, Bhaktapur, Nepal
Contact No: 01-6630408, 6630769

Email: info@ctevt.org.np; research@ctevt.org.np
Website: www.ctevt.org.np