

Guidelines for Appeals

(format type-2

IIQA/SSR submission after July 2017)

**This format is applicable for
all Institutions which have
undergone A&A process by
submission of SSR and prefer
an Appeal.**

NAAC



NATIONAL ASSESSMENT AND ACCREDITATION COUNCIL

An Autonomous Institution of the University Grants Commission

P.O.Box No.1075, Nagarbhavi, Bangalore – 560072, India

Vision

To make quality the defining element of higher education in India through a combination of self and external quality evaluation, promotion and sustenance initiatives

Mission

- ❖ To arrange for periodic assessment and accreditation of institutions of higher education or units thereof, or specific academic programmes or projects;
- ❖ To stimulate the academic environment for promotion of quality of teaching-learning and research in higher education institutions;
- ❖ To encourage self-evaluation, accountability autonomy and innovations in higher education;
- ❖ To undertake quality-related research studies, consultancy and training programmes, and
- ❖ To collaborate with other stakeholders of higher education for quality evaluation, promotion and sustenance.

Contents

<i>Introduction</i>	<i>05</i>
<i>Frame work</i>	<i>05</i>
<i>Mechanism</i>	<i>06</i>
<i>Proforma for Review of Accreditation</i>	<i>08</i>

Introduction

The National Assessment and Accreditation Council (NAAC) established as an autonomous body in 1994 with its headquarters at Bangalore, by the University Grants Commission (UGC), has the mandate to assess and accredit institutions of higher education or their units thereof. The NAAC follows an internationally accepted methodology for assessment which is a combination of self-study on seven pre-determined criteria and validation of the self-study by peer review. The guidelines provided by the NAAC on preparation of the self-study report emphasise the need to conduct the self-study as a participatory exercise ensuring the wide involvement of the campus community, with utmost honesty.

The NAAC views the process of assessment and accreditation as an exercise in partnership, done jointly by the NAAC and the institution being assessed. Every stage of the process is marked by transparency. The institution is consulted at various stages of the process – eliminating conflict of interest with the peers, planning the visit schedule, sharing the draft peer team report before the team leaves the campus etc. In spite of this participatory approach, there may be institutions that might have grievances to be addressed. Therefore, to provide a review mechanism for institutions who are aggrieved about the process or its outcome or any other issues related thereof, the NAAC has evolved Grievance Redressal Guidelines. A broad outline of the structure and modus operandi for addressing the grievances of the institutions is given in the following pages.

Frame work

The Executive Committee (EC) of NAAC will be the authority to redress the grievance about grading or any other related matters raised by the institution. The EC will take decisions on the grievance of the institution based on the recommendations of an **Appeals Committee (AC)**. The AC will have five members two members to be nominated by the Chairman of EC, NAAC and two by President, GC one NAAC officer (Who will be the Convener of the AC) to be nominated by the Director of NAAC. None of the members of AC should be from decision making bodies (Executive Committee and Standing Committee)

Mechanism

1. Appeal by the institution to Director, NAAC

An aggrieved institution will make a written representation to the Director, NAAC within **thirty days** from the date of receipt of the accreditation certificate in the pro-forma as given at Annexure-I along with a non-refundable fee of Rs 1,00,000/- (+ service tax as applicable) in the form of DD drawn in favour of Director, NAAC payable at Bangalore.

2. Scrutiny by the Director, NAAC

The Director, NAAC after initial scrutiny will refer the pro-forma and other relevant documents to the **Appeals Committee** for further processing.

3. Appeals Committee (AC)

- The written appeal made by the institution along with the SSR and peer team report will be placed before the AC. The AC at its discretion may call for additional information or seek clarification through the chairperson, from the institution or the peer team members or DVV partner individually or collectively or from any other body or individuals who can be of help.
- After the hearing, the Appeals Committee will take necessary action to address the grievance. If the AC is satisfied that there is a possible error in judgment/perception of the peer team which visited the institution or in data validation, it may constitute a review team or identify a peer or a NAAC officer to visit the institution, or verify the data validation depending on the nature of data to be verified and validated. If the AC recommends a visit to the institution, expenses towards the same will be borne by the NAAC.
- The AC would consider the recommendations of the review team. The AC would recommend a change in the grade, if any, for consideration and approval of Executive Committee.

4. Exclusions:

1. This mechanism is not applicable for any grievance related to IIQA submission. The IIQA itself provides for four opportunities to reapply within one year for the Institutions with registration fee paid once. In case the institution fails even after 3 attempts, they may re-apply by paying registration fee.

2. This mechanism is not applicable for institutions which fail to qualify for Peer Team Visit in QIF. The mechanism for re-application as prescribed by QIF will apply.

5. The Executive Committee of NAAC will be the final authority to decide on the recommendations of the Appeals Committee. The decision of the EC will be notified to the institution.

6. The institutions that would like to make an improvement in the institutional grade may volunteer for reassessment after completing at least one year of Accredited status by meeting the accreditation costs as per regulation.

Proforma for Review of Accreditation

SECTION-1: Institutional Profile

1. Name of the Institution:

Address:

Tel:

Fax:

Email:

2. Location: Urban/Semi-urban/Rural

3. Name of the Principal:

a. Present:

b. At the time of Peer Team Visit:

4. Name of the Steering Committee Coordinator at the time of the visit:

5. University affiliated to:

a. Name of the Vice Chancellor:

Tel:

Fax:

Email:

b. Name of the Director CDC/BCUD:

Tel:

Fax:

Email:

6. If recognized under 2f and 12b:

The UGC centre attached to:

Address:

Tel:

Fax:

Email:

SECTION – 2: Peer Team Visit and Accreditation

1. Dates of the peer team visit:

2. Peer Team Members names with designation at the time of the visit:

Name	Subject Specialization
Chairperson:	
Member:	
Member:	
Member Co-ordinator (if any)	

3. Name of the Coordinating officer from NAAC on site/operating from NAAC office:

4. Date of receipt of Accreditation Certificate:

5. Grade given:

SECTION – 3: Nature of Grievance

1. **On Grading:**

2. **On other Issues:** (other than grading)

3. **Grounds for Reconsideration** (Reconsideration will be granted where the Appellant demonstrates by clear and convincing evidences that the peer team erred in making its recommendations.)

a. General Points:

Name of the criteria 3 and 7 change as per Quality Indicator Frame Work (New)

b. Criterion-wise Reasons(The reasons given should be conclusive and supported by the evidence and not mere statement(s):)

Criterion 1: Curricular Aspects

Score given: -----Score expected: -----

Institutions perceptions/Reasons: (additional sheets may be used if required)

Criterion 2: Teaching, Learning and Evaluation

Score given: -----Score expected: -----

Institutions perceptions/Reasons: (additional sheets may be used if required)

Criterion 3: Research, Innovations and Extension

Score given: ----- Score expected: -----

Institutions perceptions/Reasons: (additional sheets may be used if required)

Criterion 4 : Infrastructure and Learning Resources

Score given: ----- Score expected: -----

Institutions perceptions/Reasons: (additional sheets may be used if required)

Criterion 5 : Student Support and Progression

Score given: ----- Score expected: -----

Institutions perceptions/Reasons: (additional sheets may be used if required)

Criterion 6 : Governance Leadership & Management.

Score given: ----- Score expected: -----

Institutions perceptions/Reasons: (additional sheets may be used if required)

Criterion 7 : Institutional Values and Best Practices

Score given: ----- Score expected: -----

Institutions perceptions/Reasons: (additional sheets may be used if required)

c. Other issues which you like to bring to the notice of the Appeals Committee relevant to your claims.

DECLARATION

1. All information provided in the above sections was mentioned in the SSR /RAR/SAR submitted (or) supplementary report submitted to peer team at the site and mailed to NAAC immediately after.
2. In case of request by the Appeals Committee to physically present our case we will undertake to appear before the committee at our own cost.
3. I agree to abide by the decision of the EC of NAAC.
4. Review fee is enclosed vide draft No..... payable in the name of the Director, NAAC payable at Bangalore for amount of Rs. 1,00,000/- (+ service tax as applicable) which is not refundable.

DATE:

PLACE:

SIGNATURE
of Head of the Institution
with Seal