

Enhancing the Capabilities of Technical Education Institutions in India

TEQIP

Handbook for Mentors and Performance Auditors

August 2013

CONTENTS

	PAGE
BACKGROUND	4
INTRODUCTION	5
VALUES	7
SECTION 1 – Mentoring	
Role of the Mentor	8
Mentors' duties	
General	9
Institutional Visits (before, during & after)	10
SECTION 2 – Performance Auditing	
Role of the Performance Auditor	15
Performance Auditors' duties	
General	17
Institutional Visits (before, during & after)	18
SECTION 3 – Annexes	
1. Mentors' and Auditors' Person Specification	23
2. Mentors' and Auditors' Terms of Reference	24
3. Mentors' Report Forms	25
4. Performance and Data Audit Forms	28
5. Institution Academic Grid	44
6. FAQs	57

BACKGROUND

1. The Technical Education Quality Improvement Programme (TEQIP) is in its second phase. The objective of TEQIP-II is to improve the quality of learning, teaching and research outcomes.
2. Central to achieving that objective is the need to 'Strengthen institutions'. This is a key TEQIP-II programme development objective aimed at 'Enhancing Institutional and System Management effectiveness', and 'Capacity Building to Strengthen Management'. TEQIP has evidenced that institutions that are successfully transforming themselves have both strong institutional leadership and good governance.
3. TEQIP-II is being implemented in 25 Centrally Funded Institutions (CFIs) and in government, government aided and private unaided institutions in 22 States (Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Gujarat, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Jharkhand, Karnataka, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Odisha, Punjab, Rajasthan, Tamil Nadu, UT-Chandigarh, UT-Puducherry, Uttar Pradesh, Uttarakhand and West Bengal, NCT of Delhi & Tripura).
4. Well performing Institutions that met the eligibility criteria were selected for TEQIP-II on the basis of their:
 - a. Agreement to implement all elements of the Project and to carry out all the agreed institutional reforms ;and
 - b. Institutional Development Proposals giving self- determined plans for development. The Institutional Development Proposals give all the planned activities ,their schedules and targets to be met..
5. Some 80+ senior academics have been engaged by the TEQIP Project to carry out the roles of both Mentors and Performance Auditors.
6. Mentors are engaged to act as 'critical friends', guides and advisors to institutions. Their principal role is to support institutional development and achievement of the goals and targets in the Institutional Development Proposal.
7. Performance Auditors provide stakeholders with bi-annual dipstick evaluations of institutional performance against the goals and targets set out in the Institutional Development Proposals in the context of the TEQIP project's key performance indicators, as set out in the TEQIP-II Project Implementation Plan.
8. In order to evaluate the project's (TEQIP-II) performance – Performance Audits (Evaluations) are a legal binding on the States/State Project Facilitation Units and the Government of India/National Project Implementation Unit.

INTRODUCTION

9. The **TEQIP Handbook for Mentors and Auditors** replaces the 'National Project Implementation Unit Guidelines for Mentors', 'Guidelines for Performance Auditors', and 'Data Auditor Form'.
10. The guidelines were brought together:
 - a. For ease of use for those Mentors and Performance Auditors carrying out both roles
 - b. For stakeholders to understand the differences between the two roles
 - c. To ensure consistency where needed and to avoid duplication, where not needed
 - d. To provide an opportunity to revise or update both sets of Guidelines in the light of experience.
11. There are high expectations from all institutions approved under the TEQIP initiative. There are also crosscutting TEQIP-II initiatives, such as the Good Governance Programme (launched in February 2013) and the publication of the Good Practice Guide for Governing Bodies (published in December 2012), which concern all TEQIP-II institutions. The work of both Mentors and Performance Auditors is important to the **support, transmission of good practice, and evaluation of the TEQIP project overall.**
12. Mentors provide professional support and advice on a regular basis, or as needed by the institution, on progress or difficulties, in meeting the goals and targets set out in the Institutional Development Proposal. Performance Auditors provide stakeholders with bi-annual dipstick evaluations of institutional performance against the goals and targets set out in the Institutional Development Proposals in the context of the TEQIP project's key performance indicators, as defined in the TEQIP-II Project Implementation Plan. Given their different purposes, visits by mentors and performance auditors should **not** take place at the same time.
13. Mentors are nominated to mentor TEQIP-II institutions by the State Project Facilitation Units. The National Project Implementation Unit nominates Mentors for Centrally Funded Institutions. Mentors carry out their work following set guidelines and terms of reference, including set fees regulated by the Government of India, but chosen by the institutions being mentored (**see Annex 2 - Mentors' Terms of Reference**).
14. Mentoring: Mentors usually mentor institutions in their 'home' States. This has the benefit of Mentors being familiar with the institutions, and being in relative geographical proximity. Mentors are engaged to act as 'critical friends', guides and advisors to institutions. Their principal role is to support institutional development and achievement of the goals and targets in the Institutional Development Proposal. This level and extent of professional support is considered important because most TEQIP-II institutions are in transition - working towards achieving effective academic, administrative and financial autonomy and accountability.
15. Mentors can offer a professional 'sounding board' of external advice to institutions. Mentors' reports are not graded nor made public as these reports are part of an on-going dialogue of support to institutions, but their reports and assessment of institutional needs and progress are reviewed by State Project Facilitation Units and the National Project Implementation Unit as well as the Ministry of Human Resources Development/World Bank Project Team as part of the overall monitoring of the TEQIP project and the work of Mentors.
16. Performance and Data Audits: Performance and Data Audits are carried out bi-annually to evaluate progress made by all project institutions in achieving their set goals and targets, as per their Institutional Development Proposals; such as implementation of agreed reforms, accuracy and validity of data, progress in faculty development, utilization of resources and achievement of targets set by the Institution to achieve academic excellence. The evaluation carried out by Performance Auditors will result in a graded institutional profile that will indicate how well an institution is doing in achieving their goals and targets in the context of the overall TEQIP/project objectives and performance indicators. **These are set out in the report forms in Annex 4.**

17. A further group of skilled professionals conduct the Data Audits and assist Performance Auditors during performance audit visits. The Data Auditors are appointed by the State Project Facilitation Units for all State linked institutions (and the National Project Implementation Unit for Centrally Funded Institutions). The State Project Facilitation Units, and the National Project Implementation Unit, in relation to Centrally Funded Institution performance audits, will meet all expenses for Performance and Data audits as per approved norms that are reviewed from time to time.
18. It is clear that institutional development, achievement and identification of major problems should be the central focus of the work of both Mentors and Performance Auditors, but there is a fundamental difference in the way these roles are undertaken. It is important for institutions, as well as all those undertaking these roles, to be clear about those differences. The purpose of this handbook is to clarify these roles and stakeholders' expectations of Mentors and Performance Auditors.

VALUES

19. The following key values are a foundation set of principles and standards for Mentors and Performance Auditors:

- *Integrity and Independence*

We will always aim to be fair, objective and honest in our work, and fulfil our responsibilities by basing our judgements on expert, objective scrutiny, analysis and sound evidence.

- *Professionalism*

We will set high professional standards in everything we do, providing relevant and effective support and evaluation that can be trusted by all stakeholders.

- *Accountability*

We believe that accountability starts with individuals taking proper responsibility for their own actions. We will report as we find. We will also seek to improve and evaluate our own work as much as we encourage others to do the same.

- *Openness*

We will be open and approachable about the work we do, and how we do it, believing that this encourages trust and confidence. We are committed to communicating clearly and accessibly about all aspects of our work.

SECTION 2 – MENTORING

"Man often becomes what he believes himself to be. If I keep on saying to myself that I cannot do a certain thing, it is possible that I may end by really becoming incapable of doing it. On the contrary, if I shall have the belief that I can do it, I shall surely acquire the capacity to do it, even if I may not have it at the beginning."(Mahatma Gandhi)

"Be the change you want to see in the world"(Mahatma Gandhi)

Role of the Mentor

20. The principal role of the Mentor is to guide, support and encourage institutions in their development as they work to achieve the goals and targets set out in the Institutional Development Proposal, and in alignment with the broad objectives of TEQIP-II. The project objectives for TEQIP-II are:
 - Strengthening institutions to produce high quality engineers for better employability
 - Scaling-up postgraduate education and demand-driven research, development and innovation
 - Establishing Centres of Excellence for focused applicable research
 - Training of faculty for effective teaching
 - Enhancing institutional and system management effectiveness.
21. Institutions may request a Mentor to visit at any time. Therefore, there is no formal timetable for visits. While Mentors are expected to make a minimum of two visits a year to each institution they mentor, they can actually visit an institution whenever institutions would like their help. Mentors should also expect to work by remote, between visits, maintaining communication with institutions as requested by the institutions.

What makes a good Mentor?

22. A good TEQIP-II Mentor is a 'critical friend' to an institution. Someone who is committed to supporting both the needs of those institutions to which they have been assigned, as well as the needs of the TEQIP project overall, as a principal project representative and 'agent of change' who keeps up to date with initiatives and developments related to the institution and the project as a whole.
23. Good Mentors listen, understand, guide and advise- principally to support and assist institutions to stay focused on the goals and targets set by the institution in their Institutional Development Proposal. This is important, because most TEQIP-II institutions are in transition –albeit at different stages – working towards achieving effective academic, administrative and financial autonomy and accountability. Each institution will have different support and development needs, and Mentors can help them by giving an external view of institutional difficulties, or indeed the measure of their strengths, or where they should gather further opinions, knowledge and experience.
24. Mentors offer a professional 'sounding board' of external advice to institutions. It takes considerable patience and skill to see more talent and abilities in institutions than they see in themselves, and then to help them to utilise these in the best and most innovative ways possible and to exploring problems that can begin both inside and/or externally to the institution.
25. Mentors do not know all the answers to everyone's problems, but they will not be afraid of discussing the problems and exploring with an institution (at all levels) possible ways forward – to help institutions help themselves and to share experiences and good practices. Good Mentors understand the need for institutions to feel ownership of their development. To do this well, Mentors have to be good learners and good communicators, themselves.
26. A good Mentor feeds back and explains to institutions what they find (good and bad practices) and bases their feedback on sound evidence. A good Mentor tries to leave an institution better than they found it.

General Mentor duties

27. Each mentor is expected to carry out the following duties:
- a. To mentor TEQIP-II institutions assigned to them
 - b. To mentor each of their institutions at least twice in a year (or more as requested by the institution) at approximately equal periodic intervals, or in a timely manner
 - c. To devote at least 16 working hours (i.e. two days) to mentoring work during each major visit to an institution
 - d. To guide and support institutions as they carry out the following institutional reforms:
 - Implementation of curricular reforms
 - Exercise academic, administrative, financial and managerial autonomies and accountabilities
 - Improve student performance and evaluation
 - Implement performance appraisal of faculty by students
 - Obtaining accreditation of eligible undergraduate and postgraduate programmes
 - Establishment of a corpus fund, faculty development fund, equipment replacement fund and maintenance fund (otherwise referred to as the 'four funds')
 - Generation, retention and utilisation of revenue generated through a variety of activities.
 - e. To guide and assist institutions as they carry out key project activities, such as:
 - Obtaining Autonomous Institution status from the University Grants Commission within 2 years of joining the Project, and making all arrangements including building institutional and faculty capacity for exercising academic autonomy
 - Providing academic support to weak students to improve their learning outcomes and employability. (For example, Mentors could discuss institutional plans to organize and establish remedial support options.)
 - Faculty development for improved competence (see various avenues for this in the PIP) including pedagogical training
 - Staff development through professional training
 - Enhanced Interaction with Industry
 - Institutional management capacity enhancement, and implementation of the TEQIP-II Good Governance Programme (for example, going through the project's good governance expectations for TEQIP-II approved institutions, and ensuring all Members of the Governing Body have received and act on the TEQIP Good Practice Guide for Governing Bodies).
 - f. To guide and assist institutions in improving their performance in the following areas:
 - Increased employability of students as measured by, for example, improvements in the placement rate and the average salary of placement packages
 - Improved learning among students as indicated by, for example, the share of the first year students that complete the full first year and transition successfully to second year (disaggregated by social group)
 - Overall Institutional progress¹ as measured through:
 - Increase in the overall student and faculty satisfaction
 - Number of registrants for Masters and Doctoral degrees (and number of Masters and Doctoral graduates).
 - Percentage of external revenue from research and development projects and consultancies in the total revenue of the institution
 - Increase in the number of publications in refereed Journals
 - Increased collaboration with research institutions and Industry.
 - g. To guide and assist institutions in establishing effective strategic planning mechanisms, updated as appropriate, and in delivering the timely achievement of targets for Key Performance Indicators based on those in the Institutional Development Proposal.
 - h. To attend national and regional TEQIP-II forums and conferences, as required both to learn about new initiatives, such as the Good Governance Programme, and to share experiences with other Mentors with the TEQIP Project team and other stakeholders.

¹PIP page 16

- i. To contribute to the delivery of the TEQIP Good Governance initiative and ensure consistency of support, for example, in using the TEQIP Good Practice Guide for Governing Bodies and the Supplementary Resource Materials, and supporting the Good Governance Programme within the project time frame, including:
 - To provide support to institutions when they are completing their governance self-reviews, as required
 - To provide support to institutions when they use their governance self-reviews to identify governance development needs (at the individual, institutional and systems levels), as required
 - To analyse institutional self-reviews and development plans, and prepare reports on these for the Governance Programme Group, as required
 - To provide support to institutions when they prepare their Institutional Governance Guidelines
 - To comment on revisions of the Institutional Development Proposal and associated action plans, as necessary, to respond to implementation progress experience and/or changes in the environment external to the institution.

Institutional Visits by Mentors

Preparation for a Mentor's Visit:

28. For Mentors to work effectively with institutions good planning and clear arrangements need to be undertaken by all involved - Mentors and institutions, alike. Mentors and institutions need to work in partnership in order to make best use of their resources, especially time.
29. In preparation for a Mentor's visit each institution will be responsible for:
 - Providing their Mentor with a copy of the Institutional Development Proposal *[as accepted for final selection by the National Selection Committee including the changes made in accordance with the improvements recommended by the National Evaluation Committee]*, and all the related action plans as developed initially and made/modified subsequently during the course of institutional project implementation.
 - Arranging meetings, as desired by the mentor, with: (a) students, faculty and staff; (b) senior management of the institution; (c) chairperson and members of the Board of Governors; and (d) alumni, employers and industry associations.
 - Making directly and promptly all payments, in accordance with TEQIP regulations, to the mentors.
 - Arranging local transport and also reasonable levels of accommodation and boarding for Mentors (according to TEQIP regulations) during each visit to the institution.
30. Mentors should ensure they have negotiated a well-planned schedule for their visits well in advance. This will ensure that senior management and governing body members are available. They should also be up to date with all TEQIP documentation (See Mentors' Terms of Reference, Annex 2) including the TEQIP Good Practice Guide for Governing Bodies and the TEQIP-II Good Governance Programme document in order to best advise institutions about such programmes. Mentors should feel free to contact the National Project Implementation Unit or their local State Project Facilitation Unit contact for further information about any aspect of TEQIP-II.

Mentors' Activities During a Visit

31. In order to best understand institutional developments, Mentors will wish to hold a number of meetings with undergraduate and postgraduate students, faculty, staff, senior management, the Chair and Members of the Governing Body, representatives of industry and industry associations, and the Head of the Institution. Meeting these stakeholder groups should take place at least twice a year; and therefore, depending on the frequency of the mentor's visits, the mentor might not meet each group on each visit.
32. Mentors' meetings will cover a range of interests, such as:
 - a. **With a cross-section of undergraduate students** to elicit their views with regard to:
 - Desired improvements in student performance evaluation
 - Curricular reforms including improvement in teaching-learning processes
 - Exposure to industry
 - Responsiveness of the institution to suggestions from stakeholders (implementation of academic autonomy)
 - Increasing effectiveness of academic support to weak students to improve their learning outcomes, and support to all students to improve their employability
 - Improving student satisfaction with the academic and administrative functioning of the institution
 - Student contribution to management and governance.

- b. With **a cross-section of postgraduate students** to elicit their views with regard to:
- All of the above
 - Facilitating placement
 - Working on industrial projects
 - Participation in research and development projects, consultancies and publications.
- c. With **faculty** to elicit their views and suggestions with regard to range of matters set out in the Institutional Development Proposals:
- Improving responsiveness to student performance evaluation
 - Effectiveness of curricular reforms carried out, including improvement in teaching-learning processes
 - Effective implementation of academic autonomy
 - Increasing effectiveness of academic support to weak students to improve their learning outcomes, and support to all students to improve their employability
 - Increasing admissions to Masters and Doctoral programmes
 - Improving Faculty Development for improved competence including pedagogical training
 - Improving research facilities and research environment in the institution
 - Satisfaction with incentives for continuing education, consultancy and research and development
 - Ways and means for increasing exchange of knowledge through conferences, etc. and increasing publication of research papers, books, monographs, etc.
 - Increasing collaboration with industry for securing research and development projects and consultancy assignments, and for increased flow of industrial expertise towards curricula improvement and research and development activities
 - Improving faculty satisfaction with the academic matters, leadership, management and governance of the institution.
- d. With **staff** to elicit their views and suggestions with regard to:
- Their role in improving project implementation
 - Improving their effectiveness and performance through professional training.
- e. With **senior management** to elicit their views and suggestions with regard to:
- Preparations for obtaining Autonomous Institution status, if not yet obtained
 - Ensuring all programmes are accredited
 - Capacity building for exercising academic autonomy once the autonomous status is obtained
 - Improving learning outcomes and employability
 - Organization and conduct of Finishing School
 - Increasing admissions to Masters and Doctoral programmes
 - Implementation of curricular reforms
 - Increasing the number of accredited programmes
 - Making effective use of the findings from the students' evaluation of teachers
 - Increasing collaboration with industry
 - Improving institutional management capacity of senior faculty, Head of Departments, Deans and Head of Institution
 - Involving students in management and governance at all levels.
- f. With **Chairperson and members of governing body** to: (i) orient them to, and assist them in, pursuing the recommendations made in the 'TEQIP Good Practice Guide For Governing Bodies', and (ii) to solicit their guidance and help for timely and effective action by the Institution, for example, on the following:
- Fulfilling all requirements for obtaining Autonomous Institution status, if not yet obtained
 - Making all academic and administrative preparations for exercising academic autonomy as accorded under autonomous institution status
 - Exercise of administrative and financial autonomies as accorded by the sponsoring government/Trust/Society
 - Delegation of decision making powers to senior functionaries with accountability
 - Reviewing strategies and plans for filling up teaching and staff vacancies
 - Reviewing incentives to faculty for continuing education, consultancy, research and development
 - Reviewing strategies and plans for increasing the number of accredited programmes
 - Enhancing interaction and collaboration with industry
 - Promoting management capacity building of senior functionaries

- Increasing revenue from research and development projects and consultancies
 - Reviewing research strategies, plans and key performance indicators such as increased number of research publications in refereed Journals
 - Achievement of goals and targets for Key Performance Indicators as given in the Institutional Development Proposal
 - Increasing transparency and openness of the governance process.
- g. With **representatives of industries and industry associations** to promote effective action, for example, in the following:
- Industry participation in curricula revision and development of new curricula, in the reform of teaching-learning processes and in the functioning of 'Finishing Schools' to increase employability of graduates and post-graduates
 - Increasing exposure of student and faculty to industrial practices
 - Increasing industry sponsored and joint research and development and consultancies
 - Increasing enrolment of industry employees in Masters and Doctoral programs
 - Increasing expert lectures from industry, and securing adjunct faculty from industry.
- h. Meet the **Head of Institution and Project Coordinator** during each visit to discuss:
- Progress in implementation of various aspects of the project
 - Shortfalls in progress, if any, and the steps that could be taken to increase the pace of implementation and achievement of targets
 - Issues arising out of meetings with students, faculty, staff and senior functionaries, the recommendations made and progress in their compliance, and
 - Problems faced in exercise of autonomies, and how these could be overcome.
33. At the end of a visit a Mentor will always meet with the Head of the Institution to provide an oral feedback of their findings, and will note the key outcomes of the discussion.
- Mentors' deliverables following their visits
34. Mentors are required to prepare a report in the specified format (See Annex 3) following each mentoring visit. They should also provide electronic copies of the same report to the Head of Institution, State Project Facilitation Units and the National Project Implementation Unit within 10 days of completion of each visit.
35. **Mentors do not grade institutions and their reports are not made public** as they are part of an ongoing dialogue of support to institutions. However, mentors' reports are reviewed by State Project Facilitation Units and National Project Implementation Unit as well as the Government of India/World Bank Project Team as part of the overall monitoring of TEQIP-II, and the work of Mentors.
36. Mentors may contact their State Project Facilitation Units or the National Project Implementation Unit at any time if they have concerns or queries.
37. Mentors are also encouraged to use the Mentor network and Mentor Forums to discuss issues, share good practices and benchmark institutional progress/concerns. Some State Project Facilitation Units are arranging regular (monthly/bi-monthly) meetings between Mentors and the State Project Facilitation Unit officials to provide a vehicle for information exchange and support.
38. Feedback on the mentoring process should be encouraged in order for improvements to the work of Mentors to be made. Any complaints about the work of Mentors should be made in writing to the State Project Facilitation Units concerned that will, in turn, send a copy to the National Project Implementation Unit. Should institutions wish to change their mentor, they should contact their State Project Facilitation Unit to assign another mentor. Mentors who wish to be assigned to a different institution should contact the relevant State Project Facilitation Unit and the National Project Implementation Unit.
39. Mentors who are unable to complete their duties, for whatever reason, should notify the National Project Implementation Unit and State Project Facilitation Units accordingly, and as soon as is possible.
40. Finally, Mentors who fail to comply with these guidelines, or do not perform their duties to an acceptable standard, will face the possibility that they will be removed from the Mentor Register.

SECTION 2 – Performance Auditing

Role of the Performance Auditor

41. The main role of the Performance Auditor is to carry out audit visits to assess progress made by all project institutions to achieve specified goals set out in their Institutional Development Proposals, such as implementation of agreed reforms, accuracy and validity of data, progress in faculty development, utilization of resources and achievement of targets set by the Institution to achieve academic excellence in the context of the TEQIP-II project objectives and the key performance indicators.
42. Performance Auditors can only be assigned by the National Project Implementation Unit and can only operate outside of their 'home' State. They should not have any 'conflicts of interest' with institutions to which they are assigned. This allows them to be neutral in their relationship with institutions and to 'report as they find' when carrying out their work.
43. The performance audits are to be conducted bi-annually. Progress will be monitored against successive evaluations as Performance Auditors will also be interested to note what progress has been achieved since previous Mentor visits and/or Performance Audits.
44. There are seven main areas covered by a Performance Audit (listed below). These cover both TEQIP I.1 and I.2 institutions. The performance auditors will assign a grade to each of these seven main areas. This will form the **Institution Performance Profile**.
45. Performance Auditors are expected to evaluate the performance of TEQIP-II Institutions against the goals and targets they have set out in their Institution Development Proposal, in the context of the TEQIP key performance indicators² across the following seven areas:

PIP REF	INSTITUTION PERFORMANCE PROFILE	OVERALL EVALUATION GRADES
COMPONENT 1: IMPROVING THE QUALITY OF EDUCATION IN SELECTED INSTITUTIONS		
1.1	Strengthening Institutions To Improve Learning Outcomes And Employability Of Graduates	
1.2	Scaling-Up Postgraduate Education And Demand-Driven Research, Development And Innovation	
1.2.1	Establishing Centres of Excellence	
1.3	Faculty Development For Effective Teaching (Pedagogical Training)	
COMPONENT 2: IMPROVING SYSTEM MANAGEMENT		
2.1	Capacity Building to Strengthen Management	
2.1.1	Implementation of Good Governance	
2.2	Project Management, Monitoring and Evaluation	

46. The **only variance** between sub-component 1.1 and 1.2 Institution Performance Profiles is that there will be the option **not** to grade: *PIP Ref 1.2: Scaling-up Postgraduate Education and Demand-driven Research, Development and Innovation* for 1.1 institutions, unless there is postgraduate practice actually taking place, in which case this will be recognised as a contribution to the overall development of the institution and included in the evaluation. **Also, only those institutions selected to be Centres of Excellence will receive a grading against 1.2.1 Establishing Centres of Excellence.** The Performance Auditor will complete all other sections of the Institution Performance Profile for all TEQIP institutions.
47. **The Institution Performance Profile grades should be based on sound supporting evidence**, and use the performance auditing evaluation grades 1-3 and grade descriptors below. The grade descriptors have two elements: one relating to the amount and nature of the evidence for a given practice; and one relating

²Taken from the PIP with the addition of 2.1.1 the Implementation of Good Governance

to the quality of the practice about which the evidence is gathered. So, for example, a grade of 1 means both that the evidence is clear and that it is available for 75% or more of the practices found; and, that the practice is good. Supporting evidence should be detailed against all the areas listed in the Annex 4 tables.

Performance auditing evaluation grades and grade descriptors:

1.	Significant evidence of good practice in the quality and standards achieved (Assessment identifies clear supporting evidence for at least 75% of the relevant practices can be considered good practice)
2.	Some evidence of good practice in the quality and standards achieved (Assessment identifies clear supporting evidence that at least 50% of the relevant practices. can be considered good practice)
3.	Good practice not widespread or not in place (Institutions may specify the expected date of completion if there are concrete plans in place for implementation.)

NOTE: Supporting evidence: Performance Auditors will provide a bullet point list of the strongest, clearest examples of evidence in support of their evaluation against each question/area evaluated. The grade descriptors have two elements: one relating to the amount and nature of the evidence for a given practice; and one relating to the quality of the practice about which the evidence is gathered. So, for example, a grade of 1 means both that the evidence is clear and that it amounts to 75% or more of the total evidence found; and, that the practice is good.

What makes a good Performance Auditor?

48. Good TEQIP-II Performance Auditors:
 - Will fulfil their responsibilities by basing their work on expert and objective scrutiny and analysis
 - Will always aim to be fair, objective and honest, reporting on what they find, and basing their judgements on sound evidence. It is this sound evidence that will support the evaluation grades given by performance auditors
 - Will set high professional standards, undertaking effective evaluation that is consistent with the protocols (as set out in this handbook) and expected by all stakeholders
 - Will be open and approachable and try to build an effective dialogue with all involved to encourage trust and confidence. They will be committed to communicating clearly and accessibly about all aspects of their work.
49. Good Performance Auditors feedback and explain to institutions what they have found (good and bad practices).
50. The performance audit should be carried out with dignity and respect from, and for, the institution concerned, even when the messages are challenging. It should also be recognized that carrying out the role of Performance Auditor is demanding on every level. A good performance audit will be helped, therefore, if cooperation is fostered between all those concerned and all maintain a focus that a good performance audit is serving the interests of promoting, developing and ensuring high quality for Indian students and the country.

General Performance Auditor duties

51. Each Performance Auditor is expected to carry out the following duties:
 - Assess the degree/extent of progress in implementation of InstitutionalDevelopment Proposal's proposed goals, targets, activities and reforms
 - Identify areas for institutional improvement in project implementation
 - Feedback to State Project Facilitation Units and the National Project Implementation Unitthe removal of bottlenecks / hurdles in their areas of responsibility which are causing under-achievement in one or more of the activities.
52. The key output of the Performance Auditors' visits is the **Institution Performance Profile** and Supporting Evidence. The Institution Performance Profile **and** Supporting Evidence will be monitored at the State and at the national level for consistency:
 - a. To ensure that supporting evidence has been included to support a grade
 - b. To ensure that the supporting evidence justifies the grade
 - c. To show the status of progress in project implementation from one Performance Audit to another.

53. **There will be four Performance Audits for each institution prior to the end of the TEQIP-II project period (December 2014).**
54. The National Project Implementation Unit and State Project Facilitation Units will furnish a copy of the Institution Performance Profile and supporting evidence to the concerned Mentors.
55. **Performance Auditors will not look into procurement and financial management issues as these will be covered by separate processes.**

Institutional Visits by Performance Auditors

Preparation for a Performance Audit

56. For Performance Auditors to work effectively with institutions good planning and clear arrangements need to be undertaken by all involved - Auditors and Institutions alike. Performance Auditors and institutions need to work in partnership in order to ensure good time management and efficient use of their resources.
57. The Performance Auditors will ensure that they read through (and have readily available for reference during the visit):
 - A copy of the Institutional Development Proposals for the respective institution, the TEQIP-II Project Implementation Plan (PIP), and also the guidelines on implementation of reforms, including the Good Practice Guide for Governing Bodies, and the Good Governance Programme Document⁴.
 - The most recent performance audit report, mentoring report, Head of Institution's filled-in response sheet and institutional progress report showing improvements/ changes made in view of observations/suggestions made by performance auditors and mentors.
58. The Head of the Institution will ensure that the Institutional Response Sheet (Annex 5) will be made available to the Performance Auditor and State Project Facilitation Units for State Project Institutions, and the National Project Implementation Unit for Centrally Funded Institutions – at least two weeks before the visit starts. The Institutional Response Sheet is to be signed off by the Head of the Institution.
59. The Performance Auditor and the Head of the Institution should agree a schedule of activities for the audit visit prior to the start of the visit.
60. The National Project Implementation Unit will inform the month during which the audits are to be completed.
61. The State Project Facilitation Units for the State Institutions and the National Project Implementation Unit for the Centrally Funded Institutions will:
 - Contact the auditors and the institutions to work out a 3-day visit schedule and any pre-visit requirements for the Performance and Data Auditors each half year - well in advance of the visit date.
 - Ensure that the blank Institutional Response Sheet is made available to the Head of Institution well before the Auditor's visit and advise the Director/ Principal to return the completed response sheet at least two weeks before the commencement of the visit.

Activities during a Performance Audit

Guidelines for the Institution

62. The institution will ensure that during the visit the Performance and Data Auditors have a private office in which they can work and are provided with normal hospitality, taking account of dietary requirements. Performance and Data Auditors will bring their own computers, but the institutions should enable the Auditors to access the Internet, as necessary, through institutional facilities.
63. The institution will ensure that any documentation requested before or during the Audit visit, by the Performance and Data Auditors, is supplied either two weeks before the visit, or in the office room to be

⁴The Good Governance Programme Document sets out a programme of self-review, identification of governance development needs and a requirement for all institutions to prepare their own Institutional Governance Guidelines to be completed during TEQIP-II, and by no later than September 2014.

used by the Auditors (including all the previous reports of the Performance Audit and mentoring, the institutional response sheet, and the institutional progress report on changes/rectifications and improvements made since the last audit).

64. Focused Group Discussions are to be conducted by the Auditors alone. During any focused discussion group meeting others cannot be present, even as observers.

Focused Group Discussions

65. Focused Group Discussions will be arranged by the host institution in consultation with the Performance Auditor prior to the visit.
66. It is suggested that a random sample of students is selected for the meetings with students:
- a. Students:
 - Undergraduate Engineering Students: Students should be drawn from each year of study, across all disciplines, genders, and general and reserved category students.
 - Master's and Doctoral Students in Engineering: postgraduate engineering student population. An equal number of students should preferably be drawn from each year of study/research, with balanced distribution across all disciplines and genders.
 - b. Faculty: A desirable group size will include representatives from each department with balanced distribution across all disciplines and all levels, and both genders.

Performance Auditors' Procedure and Activities During a Visit

Procedure

67. The performance audits will be conducted over three days for each institution.
68. **DAY ONE** - Suggested programme:
- a. Studying any additional documentation provided in the base room, such as course documents, samples of student work, administration records/documents requested to be available during the visit.
 - b. Discussion with the Head of Institution along with Project Coordinator and project nodal officers.
 - c. Holding three Focused Group Discussions (the first two with the undergraduate and postgraduate students, and the third with the faculty), each lasting approximately 90 minutes.
69. **DAY TWO** -Suggested programme:
- a. Visits to institutional facilities and observation of some teaching and learning activities
 - d. Holding discussions with Deans and Heads of Departments
70. **DAY THREE** - Suggested programme:
- a. Discussion with governing body members, including the Chair of the Governing Body
 - b. Completion of the draft Institution Performance Profile and Supporting Evidence
 - c. Oral feedback to the Head of the Institution and the Chair of the Governing Body prior to departure.
71. Performance Auditors will record their evaluations/ observations and evaluation grades for each area of performance in the Forms provided (see Annex 4) along with the supporting evidence for the grade assigned. **The grade descriptors have two elements: one relating to the amount and nature of the evidence for a given practice; and one relating to the quality of the practice about which the evidence is gathered. So, for example, a grade of 1 means both that the evidence is clear and that it amounts to 75% or more of the total evidence found; and, that the practice is good.**
72. The Performance Auditor's evaluation will be based on evidence gathered from:
- Focused Group Discussions with faculty and students
 - Discussions with the Head of Institution, Deans and Heads of Departments, and the Governing Body
 - Selective visits to observe teaching and learning, laboratories, workshops, hostels and the campus in general
 - A sample review of student work, course documentation/records/ and other institutional documentation to look deeper into utility and relevance of reported actions/ processes.

73. At the end of each audit visit Performance Auditors are to provide **oral** feedback of all key points arising from the audit visit to the Head of the Institution and the Chair of the Governing Body. These key points will be delivered using supporting evidence against the seven categories of the Performance Audit and the draft summary Institution Performance Profile. (See Paragraph 51 above and Annex 4)
74. If this is the second or subsequent visit, Performance Auditors will also give his/her evaluation on any improvements since the last performance audit visit in the supporting evidence.
75. The draft Institution Performance Profile shared orally with the Head of the Institution and the Chair of the Governing Body during the final feedback meeting should not be disclosed to any other persons associated in any capacity with the institution until the grades have been confirmed by the National Project Implementation Unit.
76. During the oral feedback Performance Auditors may be asked to give a solution to a particular problem identified. It is not the Performance Auditors' role to provide solutions to any one problem, since there may be a number of different ways to solve such problems and this may be viewed as imposing a solution. However, the Performance Auditor will ensure that they articulate the evidence on which they are basing their judgements and recommendations and that follow up action is required to areas of concern. The Performance Auditor can also remind the institution that the assigned Mentor can assist in identifying possible solutions.

Deliverables following a Performance Audit visit

77. Following the audit visit the Performance Auditors will ensure the Institutional Performance Profile and all supporting evidence (completed Annex 4 Forms) are sent to the concerned State Project Facilitation Unit and the National Project Implementation Unit (electronically) **within 7 days of completion of the Performance Audit** visit.
78. The Institution Performance Profile will be made public by the State Project Facilitation Unit and the National Project Implementation Unit following their crosschecking of the grades and supporting evidence. Prior to publication of the Institution Performance Profile, the National Project Implementation Unit will send a draft copy of the profile and supporting evidence to the Head of the Institution and the Chair of the Governing Body so that they have one week to check through it for factual accuracy prior to finalization and publication.
79. On subsequent visits Performance Auditors will also give their evaluation on any improvements since the last audit visit in their supporting evidence.
80. Feedback on the process should be encouraged in order for improvements to the work of Performance Auditors to be made.
81. Any complaints about the work of Performance or Data Auditors should be made in writing to the State Project Facilitation Unit concerned, which will in turn send a copy to the National Project Implementation Unit. Any dispute about grading profiles will be reviewed, but institutions will need to provide clear supporting evidence related to concerns.
82. From the evidence/data that is provided by the Performance Audit, the State Project Facilitation Units and the National Project Implementation Unit will generate summary Project Performance Profiles for the State institutions and the Centrally Funded Institutions.
83. The National Project Implementation Unit and the World Bank will use all the individual Institution Performance Profiles and Supporting Evidence as contribution to the overall TEQIP-II project performance evaluation report.

SECTION 3 – ANNEXES

Annex 1 –Mentors’ and Auditors’ Person Specification

Annex 2 –Mentors’ and Auditors’ Terms of Reference

Annex 3 - Mentors’ Report Forms

Annex 4 –Performance and Data Audit Forms

Annex 5 – Institutional Academic Grid

Annex 6 - FAQs

Mentors' and Performance Auditors' Person Specification

Essential experience, knowledge and skills required for Mentors:

Education and qualifications

- A postgraduate and/or professional qualification

Experience of:

- Teaching and/or training adults
- Working as part of a team
- Working with senior leaders and understanding the challenges facing higher education in India
- Senior leadership within, or of, running a higher education establishment
- Strategic planning and management/change management
- Serving on a governing body, or of governance in higher education
- Making senior appointments, managing and developing people
- Peer review/assessment/evaluation – at the subject and/or institutional levels.

Knowledge of:

- Higher education at State and national levels, including legal and quality systems
- The role of HE in Indian Society
- Governance processes and procedures for higher education in India
- Governance processes and procedures for the public/private sector and for higher education internationally (desirable)
- Current higher education policies and issues (desirable)

Skills

- High level of interpersonal skills
- Ability to engage with leaders/senior managers, understand and assess their development needs with managerial and academic credibility
- Ability to support training workshops for senior delegates (i.e. governors)
- Writing and presenting reports
- Ability to prepare and deliver presentations
- IT (Word, PowerPoint and email)
- Ability to understand and present financial concepts, information and documentation
- Ability to analyse, synthesize and evaluate a large quantity of documentation of all kinds (academic, administrative, management and policy/strategic)
- Good time management.

Mentors' and Performance Auditors' Terms of Reference

Appointment

1. Mentors for the State-sponsored institutions are to be appointed by the respective SPFUs in consultation with the National Project Implementation Unit
2. The National Project Implementation Unit appoints all Performance Auditors.
3. Any change of Mentors at any time during the life of the project due to unavoidable reasons will be carried out by the State Project Facilitation Units in consultation with the National Project Implementation Unit
4. The National Project Implementation Unit will carry out any change of Performance Auditors at any time during the life of the project due to unavoidable reasons
5. Mentors for the Centrally Funded Institutions will be appointed by the National Project Implementation Unit

Emoluments

6. Daily honorarium and travel entitlements for Mentors and Performance Auditors will be as approved from time to time. For each visit, a Mentor or Performance Auditor is to be paid for each day they spend at an institution plus one additional day to cover time spent in preparation, at the institution, travel and report writing. There will be no other payment to the Mentors and Performance Auditors, other than payment as per the set terms and conditions agreed by the National Project Implementation Unit.

Mentors duties

7. Mentors and Performance Auditors will be fully conversant with all aspect of this handbook, and in addition, the following:
 - a. Project details and concepts as given in the **TEQIP-II Project Implementation Plan** of the Government of India
 - b. **Institutional Development Proposal** of each of the assigned project institutions along with the associated action plans, developed initially and as modified, as also any new action plans developed during the project life
 - c. **TEQIP Good Practice Guide For Governing Bodies** and the **TEQIP-II Good Governance Programme document**
 - d. Findings from '**Employability and Skill Set of Newly Graduated Engineers in India**'— survey report prepared by Andreas Blom and Hiroshi Saeki
 - e. Findings from '**Impact Evaluation of TEQIP-I**'—conducted by Spectrum Planning (India) Limited, New Delhi for the Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India.
 - f. Study on Utilization of Institutional Resources created under TEQIP in programme institutions
 - g. Faculty Development Evaluation
 - h. Implementation Survey of TEQIP-I
 - i. **Improving the Performance of Weak Students**, an Operational Brief by Ms. Meera Chatterjee

Mentors and Performance Auditors should not:

8. Guide/advise/assist institutions in matters connected with financial management and procurement of Works, Goods and Services.

MENTOR'S REPORT FORM (1)

NAME OF MENTOR:

DATES OF MENTORING VISIT:

NAME OF INSTITUTION WITH LOCATION:

No.	SEVENKEY ASPECTS	QUALITATIVE SUMMARY AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE OF PROGRESS	PROGRESS SINCE PREVIOUS VISIT
COMPONENT 1: IMPROVING THE QUALITY OF EDUCATION			
1.1	STRENGTHENING INSTITUTIONS TO IMPROVE LEARNING OUTCOMES AND EMPLOYABILITY OF GRADUATES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ▪ ▪ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ▪ ▪
1.2	SCALING UP POSTGRADUATE EDUCATION AND DEMAND-DRIVEN RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT AND INNOVATION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ▪ ▪ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ▪ ▪
1.2.1	ESTABLISHING CENTRES OF EXCELLENCE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ▪ ▪ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ▪ ▪
1.3	FACTULTY DEVELOPMENT FOR EFFECTIVE TEACHING (PEDAGOGICAL TRAINING)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ▪ ▪ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ▪ ▪
COMPONENT 2: IMPROVING SYSTEM MANAGEMENT			
2.1	CAPACITY BUILDING TO STRENGTHEN MANAGEMENT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ▪ ▪ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ▪ ▪
2.1.1	IMPLEMENTATION OF GOOD INSTITUTIONAL GOVERNANCE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ▪ ▪ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ▪ ▪
2.2	PROJECT MANAGEMENT, MONITORING AND EVALUATION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ▪ ▪ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ▪ ▪

MENTOR'S REPORT FORM (2)

NAME OF MENTOR:

DATES OF MENTORING VISIT:

NAME OF INSTITUTION WITH LOCATION:

No.	LIST OF INTERVIEWS	KEY DISCUSSION SUMMARY POINTS
1.	UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS	
2.	POSTGRADUATE STUDENTS	
3.	FACULTY	
4.	STAFF	
5.	SENIOR MANAGEMENT	
6.	MEMBERS OF THE GOVERNING BODY	
7.	INDUSTRY REPRESENTATIVES	
8.	HEAD OF THE INSTITUTION	

MENTOR'S REPORT FORM (3)

NAME OF MENTOR:

DATES OF MENTORING VISIT:

NAME OF INSTITUTION WITH LOCATION:

No.	RECORD OF KEY POINTS (Discussed with Head of the Institution, Chair of the Governing Body)	INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSE	NOTE OF ANY FOLLOW-UP NEEDED BY MENTORS, SPFU, NPIU
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			
6.			

PERFORMANCE AUDIT FORMS

INSTITUTION PERFORMANCE PROFILE

AUDIT VISIT NUMBER: 1 2 3 4
(Circle number of the visit, as appropriate)

NAME OF PERFORMANCE AUDITOR:

DATES OF PERFORMANCE AUDIT:

NAME OF INSTITUTION WITH LOCATION:

PIP REF	INSTITUTION PERFORMANCE PROFILE	OVERALL EVALUATION GRADES
COMPONENT 1: IMPROVING THE QUALITY OF EDUCATION IN SELECTED INSTITUTIONS		
1.1	STRENGTHENING INSTITUTIONS TO IMPROVE LEARNING OUTCOMES AND EMPLOYABILITY OF GRADUATES	
1.2	SCALING-UP POSTGRADUATE EDUCATION AND DEMAND-DRIVEN RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT AND INNOVATION	
1.2.1	ESTABLISHING CENTRES OF EXCELLENCE	
1.3	FACULTY DEVELOPMENT FOR EFFECTIVE TEACHING (PEDAGOGICAL TRAINING)	
COMPONENT 2: IMPROVING SYSTEM MANAGEMENT		
2.1	CAPACITY BUILDING TO STRENGTHEN MANAGEMENT	
2.1.1	IMPLEMENTATION OF GOOD GOVERNANCE	
2.2	PROJECT MANAGEMENT, MONITORING AND EVALUATION	

INSTITUTION PERFORMANCE PROFILE GRADES AND GRADE DESCRIPTORS	
1.	Significant evidence of good practice in the quality and standards achieved (Assessment identifies clear supporting evidence for at least 75% of the relevant practices can be considered good practice)
2.	Some evidence of good practice in the quality and standards achieved (Assessment identifies clear supporting evidence that at least 50% of the relevant practices. can be considered good practice)
3.	Good practice not widespread or not in place (Institutions may specify the expected date of completion if there are concrete plans in place for implementation.)

NOTE: SUPPORTING EVIDENCE - PERFORMANCE AUDITORS WILL PROVIDE A BULLET POINT LIST OF THE STRONGEST, CLEARST EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE IN SUPPORT OF EVALUATION GRADES ON ALL ANNEX 4 FORMS.

The grade descriptors have two elements: one relating to the **amount and nature of the evidence** for a given practice; and **one relating to the quality** of the practice about which the evidence is gathered. So, for example, a grade of 1 means both that the evidence is clear and that it amounts to 75% or more of the total evidence found; and, that the practice is good.

PERFORMANCE AUDIT FORM (1.1)**COMPONENT 1: IMPROVING QUALITY OF EDUCATION IN SELECTED INSTITUTIONS**

NAME OF PERFORMANCE AUDITOR:

DATES OF PERFORMANCE AUDIT:

NAME OF INSTITUTION WITH LOCATION:

1.1: STRENGTHENING INSTITUTIONS TO IMPROVE LEARNING OUTCOMES AND EMPLOYABILITY OF GRADUATES

MONITORING AND PROJECT OUTPUT/OUTCOME PARAMETERS	SUPPORTING EVIDENCE (NOTE: GRADES MUST BE SUPPORTED BY SOUND EVIDENCE OF ACHIEVEMENT OF THE INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL GOALS AND TARGETS)
A. Effectiveness of funds utilized for the teaching, training, learning and research equipment, library, computers, etc. by Institutions, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Increase in the satisfaction index of student and faculty 	
B. Obtaining Academic Autonomy status, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Number of institutions that have obtained '<i>Autonomous Institution status</i>' as per University Grants Commission process within 2 years of joining the Project, or 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Effectiveness of utilization of academic autonomy possessed/ obtained (<i>See Table-26 in PIP</i>) 	
C. Effort made by Institutions for upgrading qualifications of faculty members, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Percentage of faculty enrolled in MTech and PhD 	
D. Existing teaching and staff vacancies and effort made by Institutions for filling the vacancies, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Percentage of faculty and staff positions filled and vacant 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Increase in faculty appointed on regular basis 	
E. Effectiveness of equity at Institutional level, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Transition rate of students from the First to the Second year in Undergraduate programmes 	
OVERALL EVALUATION GRADE FOR 1.1	
USING THE 3-POINT GRADING SCALE AND GRADE DESCRIPTORS IN ANNEX 4(1)	

PERFORMANCE AUDIT FORM (1.2)**COMPONENT 1: IMPROVING QUALITY OF EDUCATION IN SELECTED INSTITUTIONS**

NAME OF PERFORMANCE AUDITOR:

DATES OF PERFORMANCE AUDIT:

NAME OF INSTITUTION WITH LOCATION:

1.2: SCALING-UP POSTGRADUATE EDUCATION AND DEMAND-DRIVEN RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT AND INNOVATION

MONITORING AND PROJECT OUTPUT/OUTCOME PARAMENTERS	SUPPORTING EVIDENCE (NOTE: GRADES MUST BE SUPPORTED BY SOUND EVIDENCE OF ACHIEVEMENT OF THE INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL GOALS AND TARGETS)
A. Effectiveness of funds utilised for the teaching, training, learning and research equipment, library, computers, etc. by the institutions, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Increase in the satisfaction index of student and faculty 	
B. Effectiveness of scaling-up Postgraduate Technical Education, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Increased enrolment for MTech and PhD ▪ Establishment of proposed laboratories ▪ Cumulative number of assistantships granted 	
C. Progress/achievement in <u>starting new Postgraduate</u>programmes, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Securing AICTE approval ▪ Establishment of laboratories ▪ Adequacy of student enrolments 	
D. Effectiveness of collaborations made with other Institutions in India and abroad, including <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase in number of co-authored publications in refereed journals 	
E. Increased collaboration with industry in research and development, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Increase in number of joint and industry sponsored research and development work undertaken 	

▪ Increase in financial contribution by industry for R & D	
▪ Increase in industry personnel registered for Masters and Doctoral programmes	
▪ Increase in industry personnel trained by the institution in knowledge and/or skill areas	
▪ Increase in the number of consultancy assignments secured	
▪ Increase in the number of students' and faculty visits to and/or training in industry	
▪ Improvements in graduate placement rate	
▪ Increase in involvement of industry experts in curricula & syllabi improvements, laboratory improvements, evaluation of students and delivering expert lectures	
▪ Increase in the number of sandwich programmes between industries and the institution.	
F. Increase in percentage of revenue from externally funded research and development projects and consultancies as a percentage of the total revenue of the institution from all sources	
G. Increase in the number of publications in refereed journals	
H. Increase in the number of patents filed	
OVERALL EVALUATION GRADE FOR 1.2	
USING THE 3-POINT GRADING SCALE AND GRADE DESCRIPTORS IN ANNEX 4(1)	

PERFORMANCE AUDIT FORM (1.2.1)
COMPONENT 1: IMPROVING QUALITY OF EDUCATION IN SELECTED INSTITUTIONS

NAME OF PERFORMANCE AUDITOR:

DATES OF PERFORMANCE AUDIT:

NAME OF INSTITUTION WITH LOCATION:

1.2.1 ESTABLISHING CENTRES OF EXCELLENCE

MONITORING AND PROJECT OUTPUT/OUTCOME PARAMENTERS	SUPPORTING EVIDENCE (NOTE: GRADES MUST BE SUPPORTED BY SOUND EVIDENCE OF ACHIEVEMENT OF THE INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL GOALS AND TARGETS)	
A. Establishing Centres of Excellence Improvement in Research and Development facilities through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Establishment of new laboratories for applicable thematic research 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Establishment of a knowledge resource centre (library) in the thematic area 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Procurement of furniture 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Civil works 		
		<p align="center">OVERALL EVALUATION GRADE FOR 1.2.1 USING THE 3-POINT GRADING SCALE AND GRADE DESCRIPTORS IN ANNEX 4(1)</p>

PERFORMANCE AUDIT FORM (1.3)**COMPONENT 1: IMPROVING QUALITY OF EDUCATION IN SELECTED INSTITUTIONS**

NAME OF PERFORMANCE AUDITOR:

DATES OF PERFORMANCE AUDIT:

NAME OF INSTITUTION WITH LOCATION:

1.3: FACULTY DEVELOPMENT FOR EFFECTIVE TEACHING (PEDAGOGICAL TRAINING)

MONITORING AND PROJECT OUTPUT/OUTCOME PARAMENTERS	SUPPORTING EVIDENCE (NOTE: GRADES MUST BE SUPPORTED BY SOUND EVIDENCE OF ACHIEVEMENT OF THE INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL GOALS AND TARGETS)	
A. Effort made by Institutions providing Pedagogy Training to faculty, including:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of faculty who have benefitted from the core and advanced modules of pedagogy training 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improvements in (and/or updating, and more relevant) curricula and /or syllabi 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improvements in (and/or updating, more relevant) course assessment methods 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improvements in teaching and learning methods, including provision for students needing extra/remedial support 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of faculty with UG qualification registered/deputed for improving their qualification (<i>see Section-3, 4(b) on page 20 of PIP</i>) 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of faculty deputed for subject domain training, seminars, etc. (<i>faculty are required to share their gains with peers and put reports on training on institution's web site</i>) 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Progress in securing accreditation of eligible UG & PG programs (<i>institutions to achieve target of 60% of eligible UG & PG programmes accredited - appliedfor within 2 years of joining the Project</i>) 		
B. Effectiveness of Pedagogy Training, including		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of students satisfied with the quality of teachers and changes/developments specifically undertaken as a result of student evaluations 		
		<p align="center">OVERALL EVALUATION GRADE FOR 1.3</p> <p align="center">USING THE 3-POINT GRADING SCALE AND GRADE DESCRIPTORS IN ANNEX 4(1)</p>

PERFORMANCE AUDIT FORM (2.1)
COMPONENT 2: IMPROVING SYSTEM MANAGEMENT

NAME OF PERFORMANCE AUDITOR:

DATES OF PERFORMANCE AUDIT:

NAME OF INSTITUTION WITH LOCATION:

2.1:CAPACITY BUILDING TO STRENGTHEN MANAGEMENT

MONITORING AND PROJECT OUTPUT/OUTCOME PARAMETERS	SUPPORTING EVIDENCE (NOTE: GRADES MUST BE SUPPORTED BY SOUND EVIDENCE OF ACHIEVEMENT OF THE INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL GOALS AND TARGETS)	
A. Implementation of academic and non-academic reforms, including:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Improved understanding of the need and ways for increased autonomy, and new instruments for accountability 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Modernization and decentralisation of administration and financial management 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Extent of delegation of administrative and financial decision making powers to senior functionaries 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Responsiveness to stakeholders (students, faculty, staff, industry, local communities) 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Institutional quality assurance and enhancement strategies, including student feedback mechanisms 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Maintenance of academic and non-academic infrastructure and facilities, including sufficiency and quality of academic buildings 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Development, maintain and utilisation of institutional resources 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Generation, retention and utilization of Income Revenue Generation. 		
		OVERALL EVALUATION GRADE FOR 2.1 USING THE 3-POINT GRADING SCALE AND GRADE DESCRIPTORS IN ANNEX 4(1)

PERFORMANCE AUDIT FORM (2.1.1)
COMPONENT 2: IMPROVING SYSTEM MANAGEMENT
2.1: CAPACITY BUILDING TO STRENGTHEN MANAGEMENT (Continued)

2.1.1: IMPLEMENTATION OF GOOD GOVERNANCE

(See Also Annex 4 of the Good Governance Guide for Governing Bodies for examples of supporting evidence)

MONITORING AND PROJECT OUTPUT/OUTCOME PARAMENTERS	SUPPORTING EVIDENCE (NOTE: GRADES MUST BE SUPPORTED BY SOUND EVIDENCE OF ACHIEVEMENT OF THE INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL GOALS AND TARGETS)
A. PRIMARY ACCOUNTABILITIES	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Has the Governing Body approved the institutional strategic vision, mission and plan – identifying a clear development path for the institution through its long-term business plans and annual budgets? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Has the Governing Body ensured the establishment and monitoring of proper, effective and efficient systems of control and accountability to ensure financial sustainability 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Is the Governing Body monitoring institutional performance and quality assurance arrangements? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Has the Governing Body put in place suitable arrangements for monitoring the head of the institution’s performance? 	
EVALUATION GRADE FOR 2.1.1 A	
USING THE 3-POINT GRADING SCALE AND GRADE DESCRIPTORS IN ANNEX 4(1)	
B. OPENNESS & TRANSPARANCY IN THE OPERATION OF GOVERNING BODIES	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Does the Governing Body publish an annual report on institutional performance? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Does the Governing Body maintain, and publicly disclose, a register of interests of members of its governing body? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Is the Governing Body conducted in an open a manner, and does it provide as much information as possible to students, faculty, the general public and potential employers on all aspects of institutional activity related to academic performance, finance and management? 	
EVALUATION GRADE FOR 2.1.1 B	
USING THE 3-POINT GRADING SCALE AND GRADE DESCRIPTORS IN ANNEX 4(1)	
C. KEY ATTRIBUTES OF GOVERNING BODIES	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Are the size, skills, competences and experiences of the Governing Body, such that it is able to carry out its primary accountabilities effectively and efficiently, and ensure the confidence of its stakeholders and constituents? 	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are the recruitment processes and procedures for governing body members rigorous and transparent? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the Governing Body have actively involved independent members and is the institution free from direct political interference to ensure academic freedom and focus on long term educational objectives? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are the role and responsibilities of the Chair of the institution and the Member Secretary serving the Governing Body clearly stated? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the Governing Body meet regularly? Is there clear evidence that members of the governing body attend regularly and participate actively? 	

EVALUATION GRADE FOR 2.1.1 C

USING THE 3-POINT GRADING SCALE AND GRADE DESCRIPTORS IN ANNEX 4(1)

D. EFFECTIVENESS AND PERFORMANCE REVIEW OF GOVERNING BODIES

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the Governing Body keep their effectiveness under regular review and in reviewing its performance, reflect on the performance of the institution as a whole in meeting its long-term strategic objectives and its short-term indicators of performance/success? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the Governing Body ensure that new members are properly inducted, and existing members receive opportunities for further development as deemed necessary? 	

EVALUATION GRADE FOR 2.1.1 D

USING THE 3-POINT GRADING SCALE AND GRADE DESCRIPTORS IN ANNEX 4(1)

E. REGULATORY COMPLIANCE

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the Governing ensure regulatory compliance* and, subject to this, take all final decisions on fundamental matters of the institution. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the regulatory compliance include demonstrating compliance with the 'not-for-profit' purpose of education institutions? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has there been accreditation and/or external quality assurance by a national or professional body? If so, give name, current status of accreditation etc 	

EVALUATION GRADE FOR 2.1.1 E

USING THE 3-POINT GRADING SCALE AND GRADE DESCRIPTORS IN ANNEX 4(1)

OVERALL EVALUATION GRADE FOR 2.1.1 A-E

USING THE 3-POINT GRADING SCALE AND GRADE DESCRIPTORS IN ANNEX 4(1)

PERFORMANCE AUDIT FORM (2.2)
COMPONENT 2: IMPROVING SYSTEM MANAGEMENT

NAME OF PERFORMANCE AUDITOR:

DATES OF PERFORMANCE AUDIT:

NAME OF INSTITUTION WITH LOCATION:

TABLE 2.2: PROJECT MANAGEMENT, MONITORING AND EVALUATION

MONITORING AND PROJECT OUTPUT/OUTCOME PARAMETERS	SUPPORTING EVIDENCE (NOTE: GRADES MUST BE SUPPORTED BY SOUND EVIDENCE OF ACHIEVEMENT OF THE INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL GOALS AND TARGETS)	
A. Effectiveness of mentoring, reviews, surveys and audits conducted, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Increase in the achievement of the institutions goals and targets set out in the Institutional Development Proposal 		
B. Effective project management and monitoring, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Precise and reliable information/ data through web based MIS available to stakeholders at all time 		
C. Effectiveness of faculty evaluation by students, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Percentage/ increase in percentage of faculty evaluated by students in one or more subjects ▪ Are results of evaluation properly used for teacher improvement? If yes, is the procedure adopted for teacher improvement including counseling appropriate and effective?		
		OVERALL EVALUATION GRADE FOR 2.2 USING THE 3-POINT GRADING SCALE AND GRADE DESCRIPTORS IN ANNEX 4(1)

DATA AUDIT FORMS

NAME OF THE DATA AUDITOR:

DATES OF DATA AUDIT:

NAME OF INSTITUTION WITH LOCATION:

DATA AUDIT FORM (1)

NO.	PARTICULARS	FIGURE REPORTED IN MIS	VERIFIED FIGURE	INSTITUTIONAL DATA SOURCE ⁵	COMMENTS ⁶
1.	INFORMATION IN RESPECT TO BACHELORS PROGRAMMES IN ENGINEERING/TECHNOLOGY				
	a. Number of UG programmes conducted during 2010-11 academic year				
	b. Total number of UG students during 2010-11 academic year				
	c. Total number of women students in UG programmes during 2010-11 academic year				
	d. Total number of SC students in UG programmes during 2010-11 academic year				
	e. Total number of ST students in UG programmes during 2010-11 academic year				
	f. Total number of OBC students in UG programmes during 2010-11 academic year				
	g. Percentage of final year UG students during 2010-11 academic year placed through campus interviews				
	h. Percentage of final year UG students during 2010-11 that passed out with 75% or more aggregate marks				
	i. Percentage of all 1 st year students [as at 1(b)] during 2010-11 that passed all courses fully and successfully got admitted to 2 nd year in the 2011-12 academic year				
	j. Percentage of 1 st year women students [as at 1(c)] during 2010-11 that passed all courses fully and successfully got admitted to 2 nd year in the 2011-12 academic year				
	k. Percentage of 1 st year SC students [as at 1(d)] during 2010-11 that passed all courses fully and successfully got admitted to 2 nd year in the 2011-12 academic year				
	l. Percentage of 1 st year ST students [as at 1(e)] during 2010-11 that passed all courses fully and successfully got admitted to 2 nd year in the 2011-12 academic year				
	m. Percentage of 1 st year OBC students [as at 1(f)] during 2010-11 that passed all courses fully and successfully got admitted to 2 nd year in the 2011-12 academic year				

⁵ This could include how the figure was calculated if appropriate

⁶For example, if there are any discrepancies in the figures – the reasons, or whether information is being updated by the institution and if so, when?

DATA AUDIT FORM (2)

NO.	PARTICULARS	FIGURE REPORTED IN MIS	VERIFIED FIGURE	INSTITUTIONAL DATA SOURCE⁷	COMMENTS⁸
2.	INFORMATION IN RESPECT TO MASTERS PROGRAMMES IN ENGINEERING/TECHNOLOGY				
	a. Number of full-time Masters programmes during 2010-11 academic year				
	b. Number of part-time and sandwich (Joint) Masters programmes during 2010-11 academic year				
	c. Total number of students enrolled for all Masters programmes during 2010-11 academic year				
	d. Number of faculty in-house enrolled for Masters programmes during 2010-11 academic year				
	e. Number of students enrolled for all Masters programmes during 2010-11 academic year with scholarship				
	f. Number of students enrolled for all Masters programmes during 2010-11 academic year with TEQIP assistantship				
	g. Total number of women students in all Masters programmes during 2010-11 academic year				
	h. Total number of SC students in all Masters programmes during 2010-11 academic year				
	i. Total number of ST students in all Masters programmes during 2010-11 academic year				
	j. Total number of OBC students in all Masters programmes during 2010-11 academic year				
	k. Percentage of final year Masters students during 2010-11 academic year placed through campus interviews				
	l. Percentage of final year Masters students during 2010-11 that passed out with 75% or more aggregate marks				

DATA AUDIT FORM (3)

NO.	PARTICULARS	FIGURE REPORTED IN MIS	VERIFIED FIGURE	INSTITUTIONAL DATA SOURCE	COMMENTS
3.	INFORMATION IN RESPECT TO DOCTORAL PROGRAMMES				
	a. Number of Doctoral candidates on roll up to March 31, 2011				
	b. Number of in-house faculty enrolled for Doctoral programmes during 2010-11 academic year				
	c. Number of students enrolled for Doctoral programmes during 2010-11 academic year with scholarship				
	d. Number of students enrolled for Doctoral programmes during 2010-11 academic year with TEQIP assistantship				

⁷ This could include how the figure was calculated if appropriate

⁸For example, if there are any discrepancies in the figures – the reasons, or whether information is being updated by the institution and if so, when?

DATA AUDIT FORM (4)

NO.	PARTICULARS	FIGURE REPORTED IN MIS	VERIFIED FIGURE	INSTITUTIONAL DATA SOURCE ⁹	COMMENTS ¹⁰
4.	Information in respect to Faculty				
	a. Total number of regular full-time faculty excluding adjunct and emeritus faculty during 2010-11 academic year				
	b. Total number of regular full-time faculty in engineering disciplines excluding adjunct and emeritus faculty during 2010-11 academic year				
	c. Number of regular full-time faculty in engineering disciplines with Masters degree as their highest qualification excluding adjunct and emeritus faculty during 2010-11 academic year				
	d. Number of regular full-time faculty in engineering disciplines with Doctoral degree as their highest qualification excluding adjunct and emeritus faculty during 2010-11 academic year				
	e. Number of regular full-time faculty in engineering disciplines with Bachelors degree as their highest qualification faculty during 2010-11 academic year				
	f. Number of faculty with Bachelors degree which are enrolled in-house for Masters programmes in parent institution during academic year 2010-11: (i) Engineering teachers: (ii) Applied Science teachers: (iii) Other teachers:				
	g. Number of faculty with Bachelors degree which are enrolled in-house for Masters programmes at other institutions during academic year 2010-11: (i) Engineering teachers: (ii) Applied Science teachers: (iii) Other teachers:				
	h. Number of faculty with Masters degree which are enrolled in-house for PhD programmes in parent institution during academic year 2010-11: (i) Engineering teachers: (ii) Applied Science teachers: (iii) Other teachers:				
	i. Number of faculty with Masters degree which are enrolled in-house for PhD programmes at other institutions during academic year 2010-11: (i) Engineering teachers: (ii) Applied Science teachers: (iii) Other teachers:				
	j. Number of faculty that have attended a professional training program of 5 or more days duration during 2010-11 academic year				
	k. Number of all faculty (irrespective of specialization) that have attended the Basic Module of pedagogy training during 2010-11 academic year				
	l. Number of all faculty (irrespective of specialization) that have attended both the Basic and Advanced Modules of pedagogy training during 2010-11 academic year				
	m. Number of faculty appraised by students during 2010-11 academic year				

⁹ This could include how the figure was calculated if appropriate

¹⁰For example, if there are any discrepancies in the figures – the reasons, or whether information is being updated by the institution and if so, when?

DATA AUDIT FORM (5)

NO.	PARTICULARS	FIGURE REPORTED IN MIS	VERIFIED FIGURE	INSTITUTIONAL DATA SOURCE ¹¹	COMMENTS ¹²
5.	Information in respect to Accreditation of Programmes				
	a. Number of UG programmes accredited				
	b. Number of UG programmes for which accreditation applied for				
	c. Number of UG programmes accredited				
	d. Number of UG programmes for which accreditation applied for				

DATA AUDIT FORM (6)

NO.	PARTICULARS	FIGURE REPORTED IN MIS	VERIFIED FIGURE	INSTITUTIONAL DATA SOURCE	COMMENTS
6.	INFORMATION IN RESPECT TO RESEARCH AND PATENTS				
	a. Number of research publications in Indian refereed journals during the 2010-11 academic year				
	b. Number of research publications in International refereed journals during the 2010-11 academic year				
	c. Number of research publications co-authored with faculty/ researchers/ industry experts from outside the institution				
	d. Number of patents in engineering related areas obtained during the 2010-11 academic year				
	e. Number of patents in engineering related areas filed during the 2010-11 academic year				
	f. Number of sponsored research project completed during the 2010-11 academic year				
	g. Number of MOUs signed for collaborative programs with Indian industry and R&D organizations				
	h. Number of MOUs signed for collaborative programs with International academic institutions and R&D organizations				

¹¹ This could include how the figure was calculated if appropriate

¹²For example, if there are any discrepancies in the figures – the reasons, or whether information is being updated by the institution and if so, when?

DATA AUDIT FORM (7)

NO.	PARTICULARS	FIGURE REPORTED IN MIS	VERIFIED FIGURE	INSTITUTIONAL DATA SOURCE ¹³	COMMENTS ¹⁴
7.	INFORMATION IN RESPECT TO FINANCES				
	a. Amount received as Block Grant during the 2010-11 academic year (Rs. In Lakhs)				
	b. IRG ¹⁵ from students' tuition fee and other charges during the 2010-11 academic year (Rs. In Lakhs)				
	c. IRG from externally funded R&D projects and consultancies during the 2010-11 academic year (Rs. In Lakhs)				
	d. Total IRG during the 2010-11 academic year (Rs. in Lakhs)				
	e. Total annual recurring expenditure during the 2010-11 academic year (Rs. In Lakhs)				
	f. Amount available in Corpus Fund on March 31, 2011				
	g. Amount available in Faculty Development Fund on March 31, 2011				
	h. Amount available in Equipment Replacement Fund on March 31, 2011				
	i. Amount available in Maintenance Fund on March 31, 2011				

DATA AUDIT FORM (8)

NO.	PARTICULARS	FIGURE REPORTED IN MIS	VERIFIED FIGURE	INSTITUTIONAL DATA SOURCE	COMMENTS
8.	WITH RESPECT TO INSTITUTIONAL GOVERNANCE/ MANAGEMENT				
	a. Number of Governing Body meetings held during the 2010-11 academic year (with minutes on the web)				
	b. Number of institutional functionaries (Deans, HoDs, senior faculty and senior officials) that have undergone Management Capacity Enhancement training				

¹³ This could include how the figure was calculated if appropriate

¹⁴For example, if there are any discrepancies in the figures – the reasons, or whether information is being updated by the institution and if so, when?

¹⁵IRG is the total revenue of the institution in a year, whether retained or not.

PERFORMANCE AND DATA AUDIT FEEDBACK
(FEEDBACK TO THE INSTITUTION, STATE PROJECT FACILITATION UNITS,
THE NATIONAL PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION UNIT/AND RELEVANT MENTOR)

NAME OF PERFORMANCE AUDITOR:

DATES OF PERFORMANCE AUDIT:

NAME OF INSTITUTION WITH LOCATION:

KEY POINTS FED BACK TO THE INSTITUTION AT THE END OF THE VISIT AGAINST THE SEVEN ASPECTS OF EVALUATION

KEY IMPROVEMENTS NOTICED ON SHORTCOMINGS REPORTED DURING EARLIER PERFORMANCE AUDITS

BRIEF STATEMENTS ON CONTINUING SHORTCOMINGS, AND REASONS:

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR MENTORS

TECHNICAL EDUCATION QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMME-II (TEQIP-II)**INSTITUTION RESPONSE FORMS (1)**

(To be sent from the Head of the Institution to the Performance Auditor, 2 weeks before an audit visit)

PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION		
No.	INSTITUTIONAL MONITORING AND PROJECT OUTPUT/OUTCOMES	RESPONSES
1.1	Briefly describe the actions taken for obtaining Autonomous Institution status, and the status of your applications as made.	
1.2	If your institution is already an Autonomous Institution, briefly state actions taken for the following:	
	1. Value addition to courses as per market demand	
	2. Improvements introduced in student evaluation	
	3. Addition of electives	
	4. Carrying out teacher evaluation by students	
	5. Starting of new postgraduate programmes, as planned	
	6. For enhancing qualification, deputing to other institutions and/or admitting within the institution those teachers that have a Bachelors degree only	
	7. Conducting continuing education and/or skill enhancement programs for industry	
	8. Inviting experts from industry and eminent institutions for special lectures	
1.3	The amount of financial powers assigned / delegated to the following. If no delegations has been done so far, state the proposed action for each level with the corresponding timeline:	
	1. Governing Body	

	2. Head of Institution for: (a) single purchase of equipment, and (b) recurrent expenditure	
	3. Dean	
	4. Heads of Department	
1.4	Progress in starting new postgraduate programmes, as proposed	
1.5	Actions taken to fill up seats in the existing postgraduate programmes	
1.6	Actions taken to reduce vacancies in faculty positions	
1.7	Status of faculty appointed on regular basis, and proposed actions to fill up all faculty positions on regular basis	
1.8	Progress in getting pedagogical training in both the modules	
1.9	New Activities (since project start or the last performance audit) undertaken for enhancing interaction with industry	
1.10	Generation, retention and utilization of the non-tuition fee revenue generated through various activities	
2.1	Progress in instituting practice of teacher evaluation by students	
2.2	Current percentage of teachers evaluated by students in one subjects taught	
2.3	Current percentage of teachers evaluated by students in more than one subjects taught	

2.4	State the incentives being offered to the faculty for participation in consultancy assignments, research and development, and continuing education programmes conducted by the institution for industry	
3.1	Have the 4 funds been established?	
3.2	If yes, what is the amount in each fund?	
3.3	Is the contribution to each fund as per the requirement in the PIP? (see Annex-1, item-4 on page 148 of PIP)	
3.4	State the quantum of financial powers delegated to: (a) Governing Body; (b) Head of Institution; (c) Deans, and (d) Heads of Departments	
3.5	If less than those recommended in the PIP, state the reasons for the shortfall, and actions planned to comply with the project recommendations.	
4.1	Number of on-going sponsored projects from industry	
4.2	Number of industry awarded consultancy assignments completed	
4.3	Number of on-going industry awarded consultancy assignments	
4.4	Number of organizations and industries with whom Memoranda of Understanding have been signed for joint research and development	
5.1	List the undergraduate programmes accredited on date by name	
5.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State program-wise action taken to get accredited the eligible undergraduate programmes that are yet to be accredited. • Describe difficulties faced, if any. 	
5.3	List the postgraduate programmes accredited on date by name	
5.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State programme-wise action taken to get accredited the eligible postgraduate programmes that are yet to be accredited. • Describe difficulties faced, if any. 	

6.1	Give the number of papers published in national refereed journals from the date of joining the Project.	
6.2	Give the number of papers published in Foreign refereed journals from the date of joining the Project.	
6.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of patents filed since joining the Project • List the titles of patents filed since joining the Project along with names of contributors. 	
6.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of patents obtained since joining the Project • List the titles of the patents obtained since joining the Project along with the names of contributors 	
7.1	Actions being taken for identifying weak students	
7.2	Number of students that have benefited from remedial teaching since joining the Project/ since the last performance audit	
7.3	Number of students that have benefited from specialized soft skills and professional skills training programs conducted since joining the Project/ since the last performance audit	
7.4	Status of establishment and functioning of remedial options and activities (e.g. a finishing school)	

INSTITUTIONAL ACADEMIC GRID (2)
(Engineering disciplines)

Table-1(a): CONSOLIDATED STATEMENT

S.No.		PRE-TEQIP (2010-11)			POST-TEQIP (2012-13)		
		1	NO. OF DEPARTMENTS				
2	LEVELS OF PROGRAMMES (Number of Programmes)	B.TECH	M.TECH	PhD	B.TECH	M.TECH	PhD
3	COLLABORATION WITH INDUSTRY (Number of MoUs SIGNED)						

Table-1(b): DETAILS OF STUDENT ENROLMENT

S.No.	NAME OF THE DEPARTMENT		PRE-TEQIP (2010-11)			POST-TEQIP (2012-13)			INCREASE IN PERCENTAGE
			B.TECH	M.TECH	PhD	B.TECH	M.TECH	PhD	
		NO. OF FRESH STUDENTS ADMITTED IN THE INSTITUTE							

Table 1(c): FACULTY DETAILS

S.No.	NAME OF THE DEPARTMENT		PRE-TEQIP (2010-11)			POST-TEQIP (2012-13)			INCREASE IN PERCENTAGE			Total
			B.TECH	M.TECH	PhD	B.TECH	M.TECH	PhD	B.Tech	M.Tech	Ph.D	
		NO. OF FACULTY HAVING HIGHEST QUALIFICATION										
		Regular										
		Contractual										
		Total										

Table 1(d): COLLABORATION WITH INDUSTRY

S.No.	NAME OF THE DEPARTMENT/ Institute	NAME OF THE INDUSTRY WITH WHOM MOU SIGNED			
		PRE-TEQIP (2010-11)	No.	POST-TEQIP (2012-13)	No.

Table 2: SUMMARY SHEET FOR ACADEMIC GRID

Name of NPIU Official :

Name of Institute:

Sub-component:

Category of Institute:

	Strategy/Activities	Indicators	Institutional Baseline (Pre-TEQIP) in 2010-11	Proposed Target for 2 years (31 st Dec 2012)		Proposed Budget Estimate		Status due to input of TEQIP as on 31 st Oct 2012		Outcome against Goals (TEQIP)	Remarks	
				Physical(No.* /%age)	Institutional	TEQIP	Institutional	TEQIP	Physical(No.* /%age)			Financial (Rs. Lakh)
					(No.*/%age)	(No.*/%age)	(Rs.Lakh)	(Rs.Lakh)				
A.0	Goal : Improve Quality of Education in Selected Institutions											
A.1	Student											
A.1.1	Improvement in Students Knowledge and Skills - Diagnostic test - Remedial teaching - E-enabled learning - Research projects at UG levels - Assistantships	Percentage of female students against total engineering students in all years										
A.1.2		Students transition rate (percentage) from first year to second year of UG programs (clearing all subjects/ courses of 1 st year in first attempt)										
A.1.3		Average scores (%/ CGPA) at degree completion										
A.1.4		No. of students enrolled in MTech programs										
A.1.5		No. of students registered in PhD programs in engineering										
A.1.6		No. of Masters students enrolled with TEQIP teaching assistantship										
A.1.7		No. of PhD students enrolled										

	Strategy/Activities	Indicators	Institutional Baseline (Pre-TEQIP) in 2010-11	Proposed Target for 2 years (31 st Dec 2012)		Proposed Budget Estimate		Status due to input of TEQIP as on 31 st Oct 2012		Outcome against Goals (TEQIP)	Remarks	
				Physical(No.* /%age)	Institutional	TEQIP	Institutional	TEQIP	Physical(No.* /%age)			Financial (Rs. Lakh)
					(No.*/%age)	(No.*/%age)	(Rs.Lakh)	(Rs.Lakh)				
		with TEQIP research assistantship										
A.1.8		No. of Research projects taken by UG students										
A.1.9		Any other										
A.2	Faculty											
A.2.1	Capacity Development of Faculty <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Recruitment of faculty - Subject domain training - Qualification upgradation - Pedagogical Training - E-enabled training - Management development training - Continuing Education Programme 	Percentage of faculty positions filled-in (as per AICTE/MHRD required Teacher-Student ratio): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regular • Regular + Contract 										
A.2.2		Percentage of Faculty with BTech enrolled for MTech against total BTech faculty										
A.2.3		Percentage of Faculty with MTech enrolled for PhD in engineering against total MTech faculty										
A.2.4		Percentage of regular faculty with Masters degree in engineering against total engineering faculty										
A.2.5		Percentage of regular faculty with PhD degree in engineering against total engineering faculty										
A.2.6		Number of faculty members attended training in subject domain										
A.2.7		Number of faculty members attended management development training										

	Strategy/Activities	Indicators	Institutional Baseline (Pre-TEQIP) in 2010-11	Proposed Target for 2 years (31 st Dec 2012)		Proposed Budget Estimate		Status due to input of TEQIP as on 31 st Oct 2012		Outcome against Goals (TEQIP)	Remarks	
				Physical(No.* /%age)	Institutional	TEQIP	Institutional	TEQIP	Physical(No.* /%age)			Financial (Rs. Lakh)
					(No.*/%age)	(No.*/%age)	(Rs.Lakh)	(Rs.Lakh)				
A.2.8		Number of faculty members attended pedagogical training										
A.2.9		Any other										
A.3	Institutional Reforms											
A.3.1	Set of Reforms - Academic reforms - Non-academic reforms - Enhance interaction with industry	Percentage of NBA accredited UG & PG programs including Applied-For cases, against total eligible programs										
A.3.2		Autonomous institution status concurred by UGC (Yes/No/Applied For)										
A.3.3		No. of academic programs i.e. MTech/PhD etc. with industry										
A.3.4		No. of short term programs with industry										
A.3.5		Academic networking with other institutions (No.)										
A.3.6		ICT (Information communication Technology) enabled learning (No. of programs/ courses)										
A.3.7		Curricula revised/restructured (No.)										
A.3.8		Total IRG										
A.3.9		Percentage revenue from										

	Strategy/Activities	Indicators	Institutional Baseline (Pre-TEQIP) in 2010-11	Proposed Target for 2 years (31 st Dec 2012)		Proposed Budget Estimate		Status due to input of TEQIP as on 31 st Oct 2012		Outcome against Goals (TEQIP)	Remarks	
				Physical(No.* /%age)	Institutional	TEQIP	Institutional	TEQIP	Physical(No.* /%age)			Financial (Rs. Lakh)
					(No.*/%age)	(No.*/%age)	(Rs.Lakh)	(Rs.Lakh)				
		externally funded R&D projects and consultancies in total revenue										
A.3.10		IRG as percentage of annual recurring expenditure										
A.3.11		Any other										
B.0	Enhance Access to Knowledge Resources											
B.1	Improvement in Teaching, Training and Learning facilities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - New PG programmes - Updation of learning resources - Equipment details - Modernization of Labs and class rooms 	Laboratories: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New laboratory (Nos.) for new PG programs • New laboratory (Nos.) for existing PG programs • Existing laboratory (Nos.) modernized 										
B.2		Library <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Books (print) (Nos.) • e-books (Nos.) • Journals (print) (Nos.) • e-journals (Nos.) • Course specific softwares (Nos.) 										
B.3		Membership of online <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No. of journals 2. No. of consortium 										
B.4		No. of digitally/virtually accessible courses/subjects										
B.5		Any other										
C.0	Enhancement of Research and Development Activities											

	Strategy/Activities	Indicators	Institutional Baseline (Pre-TEQIP) in 2010-11	Proposed Target for 2 years (31 st Dec 2012)		Proposed Budget Estimate		Status due to input of TEQIP as on 31 st Oct 2012		Outcome against Goals (TEQIP)	Remarks	
				Physical(No.* /%age)	Institutional	TEQIP	Institutional	TEQIP	Physical(No.* /%age)			Financial (Rs. Lakh)
					(No.*/%age)	(No.*/%age)	(Rs.Lakh)	(Rs.Lakh)				
C.1	Promoting R&D culture in the Institution - Modern R&D equipment - Conferences / Workshops organized - Conferences / Workshops attended	No. of research publications in engineering in refereed journals:										
C.2		• National journals										
C.3		• International journals										
C.4		No. of Books published										
		No. of Patents obtained/ filed										
		Any other										
D.0	Improve Employability of Graduates											
D.1	Improving competencies of graduates - Industrial collaboration - Finishing School - Industrial training	Campus placement percentage:										
D.2		• Undergraduates										
D.3		• Postgraduates										
D.4		Average annual salary (Rs. Lakh) of:										
		• Undergraduates										
		• Postgraduates										
		Share of UG students attended industrial internship (percentage)										
		Any other										

Table-3: Institutional Project Budget*

TEQIP funds received (Instalment) : 1st / 2nd / 3rd / 4th

1st Instalment : Amount Rs. _____ Date : _____

2nd Instalment : Amount Rs. _____ Date : _____

Total funds received : Rs. _____

S. No	Activities	Project Life Allocation	Expenditure in Financial year	
			2011-12	2012-13 (as on 31 st Oct.12)
1	Improvements for teaching, training and learning facilities through:			
	a. Starting new PG programmes			
	b. Modernization and strengthening of laboratories ⁺			
	c. Establishment of new laboratories for existing UG and PG programmes and for new PG programmes			
	d. Modernization of classrooms ⁺			
	e. Updating of Learning Resources			
	f. Procurement of furniture			
	g. Establishment/Upgrading of Central and Departmental Computer Centers ⁺			
	h. Modernization/improvements of supporting departments ⁺			
	i. Modernization and strengthening of libraries and increasing access to knowledge resources			
	j. Minor Civil Works			
2	Providing Teaching and Research Assistantships to increase enrolment in existing and new PG programmes in Engineering disciplines			
3	Enhancement of R&D and institutional consultancy activities			
4	Faculty and Staff Development (including faculty qualification up-gradation, pedagogical training, and organising/participation of faculty in workshops, seminars and conferences) for improved competence			
5	Enhanced Interaction with Industry			
6	Institutional Management Capacity enhancement			
7	Implementation of institutional academic reforms			
8	Academic support for weak students			
9	Incremental Operating Cost			
TOTAL				

* Refer IDP

⁺ Not applicable for Institutions participating under Sub-component 1.2.

Note: Procurement of equipment, minor civil works, furniture etc. is not allowed for Private unaided Institutions.
Not applicable (NA) can be mention if appropriate.

Frequently Asked Questions

MENTORS

1. Q: Who are the TEQIP Mentors?

A: Mentors are senior academics with knowledge/experience in technical education, conversant with the TEQIP Project and key project initiatives and documentation (such as the TEQIP-II Project Implementation Plan). They are appointed to guide/assist TEQIP institutions in performing their approved functions.

2. Q: What is Mentoring under TEQIP?

A: It is a third party (external) strengthening mechanism at the institutional level specifically introduced under TEQIP to help support institutions achieve all the project goals optimally within a specified timeframe.

3. Q: What type of guidance is provided to a TEQIP institution by Mentors?

A: Advice and support on various reforms, implementation plans and remedial actions as envisaged by the institution in its Institutional Development Proposal to improve its performance in line with the quality and standards expected of all TEQIP institutions.

4. Q: What areas specifically need to be addressed by a Mentor?

A: How institutions are achieving their goals and targets as specified in their Institutional Development Proposals. For example, increasing learning outcomes, employability of undergraduate and postgraduate students, post graduate/doctoral admissions, research and development collaborations and papers/patents/products, accreditation, autonomies, effective governance and project acceleration.

5. Q: What are the major responsibilities of a Mentor to a TEQIP institution?

A: To support an institution in its transition to becoming a more autonomous institution, for example, as the institution plans/implements new curricula, exercises all the autonomies, Improves students' performance evaluations, implements faculty appraisal by students, and obtains accreditation from approved bodies.

6. Q: What are the key activities for a Mentor at a TEQIP institution?

A: Mentors will hold focused discussions with all stakeholder groups (students, faculty, staff, senior management, the governing body, and industry and community representatives). Through these discussions and the Mentor's observation of the institution's work and facilities, Mentors will guide and support institutional development. For example, helping the institution to provide better academic support to weak students, faculty/staff/management capacity development, enhancing interaction with industry & improving internal revenue generation.

7. Q: What institutional performance indices will be of concern to a Mentor?

A: Numbers/pay of graduates employed, examination results for students' learning, overall progress based on student'/faculty' satisfaction, postgraduate/ doctoral students/awardees, refereed journal papers, internal revenue generation as percentage of income and any other of the key performance indicators set out in the TEQIP-II Project Implementation Plan document.

8. Q: How often is Mentoring to be conducted at a TEQIP institution?

A: A minimum of 2-3 times/year at each TEQIP institution to enable timely meeting of the Institutional Development Proposal targets, but also as per the requirements of State Project Facilitation Units/the National Project Implementation Unit for State Sponsored and Centrally Funded institutions respectively. However, an institution may request as many Mentor visits as they feel they need. The Mentors are at the behest of the institutions, and so there is no formal timetable for visits in a year. They go when the institutions would like their help. And they should expect to work by remote between visits, as requested by the institutions.

9. Q: What does a typical Mentoring assignment include?

A: Two-day institutional visit for discussing/reviewing TEQIP activities & progress with head/coordinators/nodal officers, Heads of Departments, faculty, support staff, undergraduate, postgraduate/doctoral students/alumni/governing body, industry persons.

10. Q: What are the deliverables of a Mentor's institutional visit?

A: An oral feedback to the Head of the Institution and the Chair of the Governing Body. A formal report covering discussions held and project progress review in objective/open/transparent manner giving shortfalls in outputs/ outcomes, issues arising, action plan decided and help needed. These reports are sent to State Project Facilitation Units and the National Project Implementation Unit for monitoring of progress throughout the sector, and in order to monitor the Mentor's work. The main thrust of mentoring is for Mentors to play the role of *critical friend and guide* to TEQIP institutions.

PERFORMANCE & DATA AUDITORS:

1. Q: Who are the TEQIP Performance Auditors?

A: Performance Auditors are senior academics appointed by the National Project Implementation Unit out of the pool of TEQIP Mentors created by it jointly with State Project Facilitation Units, to conduct academic audits of TEQIP institutions. Performance Auditors are not allowed to audit institutions they mentor and generally work outside of their own State. They should have no conflict of interest with institutions they are auditing.

2. Q: Who are the TEQIP Data Auditors?

A: The Data Auditors are skilled professionals appointed by the State Project Facilitation Units/the National Project Implementation Unit for State Sponsored and Centrally Funded institutions respectively. They assist the Performance Auditor and conduct the Data Audits as part of the performance audit.

3. Q: What are Performance and Data Audits under TEQIP?

A: As envisaged, both the Audits are to be conducted to verify the validity and reliability of information provided by each institution and make an evaluation of the internal control of the TEQIP project to achieve its goals and targets as specified in their Institutional Development Proposals.

4. Q: What type of evaluation is done by Performance & Data Auditors?

A: Both auditors verify whether the project is being implemented at the institution as per the agreed the National Project Implementation Unit/Ministry of Human Resources Development-World Bank procedures and guidelines and combine factual assessment with a qualitative judgement about the institution's performance.

5. Q: What key areas are covered in Performance Audit?

A: Evaluation of institutional progress in implementing their goals and targets as per Institutional Development Proposals and agreed reforms. There are seven main areas that form the Institution Performance Profile:

1. STRENGTHENING INSTITUTIONS TO IMPROVE LEARNING OUTCOMES AND EMPLOYABILITY OF GRADUATES
2. SCALING-UP POSTGRADUATE EDUCATION AND DEMAND-DRIVEN RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT AND INNOVATION
3. ESTABLISHING CENTRES OF EXCELLENCE
4. FACULTY DEVELOPMENT FOR EFFECTIVE TEACHING (PEDAGOGICAL TRAINING)
5. CAPACITY BUILDING TO STRENGTHEN MANAGEMENT
6. IMPLEMENTATION OF GOOD GOVERNANCE
7. PROJECT MANAGEMENT, MONITORING AND EVALUATION.

6. Q: What are the key areas covered in Data Audit?

A: Verification of institutional information provided on undergraduate and postgraduate/ doctoral students, faculty, accreditation status, research publications/patents, financial status and governance/management functions.

7. Q: What is the Performance Audit procedure under TEQIP?

A: A two-day institutional visit covering the study of earlier reports/academic grid/ response sheet filled in, Focussed Group Discussions, visits and meetings with Head/coordinators/nodal officers/Heads of Departments/ Governing Body members and a sampling of student work/course documentation and teaching and learning.

8. Q: How often is Performance/Data Audit to be conducted under TEQIP?

A: Bi-annually, conducted together at each institution to assess progress made to achieve project goals for academic excellence as per Institutional Development Proposals, taking up reforms, data accuracy/validity, faculty development, resource usage.

9. Q: What is the utility of Performance/Data Audit under TEQIP?

A: To identify the degree of progress made in activities/reforms covered in the Institutional Development Plans and improvements in shortcomings noticed in earlier audits.

10. Q: What are the deliverables of each Performance/Data Audit?

A: An oral feedback to the Head of the Institution and the Chair of the Governing Body, including an assessment grading profile (The Institution Performance Profile) against the seven areas listed under question 5 above (this is a frank and constructive feedback with comments/ recommendations to the institution for improvement.) A formal evaluation report in both soft and hard copies covering the evaluation of each aspect in a format used for all TEQIP institutions is published after submission to the State Project Facilitation Units/the National Project Implementation Unit.