Enhancing the Capabilities of Technical Education Institutions in India

TEQIP

Handbook for Mentors and Performance Auditors

January 2014

TEQIP
Handbook for Mentors and Performance Auditors

Government of India   THE WORLD BANK

CONTENTS

BACKGROUND

1. The Technical Education Quality Improvement Programme (TEQIP) is in its second phase. The objective of TEQIP-II is to improve 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 and Union Territories (Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Gujarat, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Jharkhand, Karnataka, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh, Maharasthra, Odisha, Punjab, Rajasthan, Tamil Nadu, Tripura UT-Chandigarh, UT-Puducherry, Uttar Pradesh, Uttarakhand, West Bengal, and the National Capital Territory (NCT of Delhi)).

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

    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 70+ 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 and in any institution strategic plan.

7. Performance Auditors provide stakeholders with periodic dipstick evaluations of institutional performance against the goals and targets set out in the Institutional Development Proposals and any institution strategic plan 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 legally binding on the States/State Project Facilitation Units and the Government of India/National Project Implementation Unit.

9. This Handbook was prepared by national and international experts working in India. Funding in part was provided by a generous grant from the United Kingdom's Department for International Development.

INTRODUCTION

10. The **TEQIP Handbook for Mentors and Auditors** replaces the 'National Project Implementation Unit Guidelines for Mentors', 'Guidelines for Performance Auditors', and 'Data Auditor Form'.

11. The guidelines were brought together:

    a. For ease of use for those Mentors and Performance Auditors carrying out both the 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 learn from the experience of the first round of performance audits

    e. To provide an opportunity to revise or update both sets of Guidelines in the light of experience gained.

12. There are high expectations from all institutions approved under the TEQIP initiative. There are also crosscutting TEQIP-II initiatives, such as the publication of the Good Practice Guide for Governing Bodies (published in December 2012), and the Good Governance Programme (launched in February 2013) which concern all TEQIP-II institutions. The work of both Mentors and Performance Auditors is important to the **support, transmission of good practices,** and **evaluation of the TEQIP project overall**.

13. 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 Proposals and any institution strategic plan. Performance Auditors provide stakeholders with periodic dipstick evaluations of institutional performance against the goals and targets set out in the Institutional Development Proposals and any institution strategic plans 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.*

14. Mentors are nominated to mentor TEQIP-II institutions in different States by the respective 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).**

MENTORING

15. 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 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 and any institution strategic plan. 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.

16. 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 the 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.

PERFORMANCE AND DATA AUDITS

17. Performance and Data Audits are carried out periodically to evaluate progress made by all the project institutions in achieving their set goals and targets, as per their Institutional Development Proposals and any institution strategic plans; 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 its 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.**

18. A further group of skilled professionals conduct the *Data Audits* and assist Performance Auditors before and during the performance audit visits. The Data Auditors are appointed by the State Project Facilitation Units for all State linked institutions (and by the National Project Implementation Unit for Centrally Funded Institutions). The State Project Facilitation Units, and the National Project Implementation Unit will meet all expenses for Performance and Data audits in respect of their institutions concerned as per approved norms that are reviewed from time to time.

19. 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.

20. The purpose of this handbook is to clarify these roles and the stakeholders' expectations of Mentors and Performance Auditors.

VALUES

21. 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 1 – MENTORING

Role of the Mentor

22. The principal role of the Mentor is to guide, support and encourage the institutions in their development as they work to achieve the goals and targets set out in the Institutional Development Proposal and any institution strategic plan, 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.

23. 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?

24. 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.

25. Good TEQIP-II Mentors are principal project representatives and 'agents of change' who keep up to date with initiatives and developments related to the institution and the project as a whole.

26. 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 and any institution strategic plan. 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.

27. 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.

28. Mentors do not know all the answers to everyone's problems, but they will not be afraid to discuss the problems and explore with an institution (at all levels) possible ways forward – to help institutions help themselves and to share experiences and good practices.

29. 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.

30. 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

31. 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)

    c. To devote at least 16 working hours (i.e. two days) to mentoring work during each of the two major visits 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 student support options)

- Faculty development for improved competence (see various avenues for this in the PIP) including pedagogical training

- Administrative and technical 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 progress[1] 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, high impact index 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 and any existing institution strategic plan.

---

1 PIP page 16.

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, the TEQIP Project team and other stakeholders.

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, and to encourage all the institutions to complete their self-reviews (in an honest, self-critical manner)

- 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

- To provide support to institutions when they prepare their Institutional Governance Guidelines

- To analyse the Institutional Governance Guidelines and provide feedback to the institution (either in writing or in discussion, as required by the institution or considered appropriate by the Mentor). Copies of the feedback points made to institutions should be sent to the SPFU and NPIU so that these can be used in the review and assessment of the governance programme

- Mentors are encouraged to consider that their advice on the three key governance elements that are outputs of the good governance programme (the self-review process, the identification of governance development needs and the Institutional Governance Guidelines) are fundamental to strengthening institutions and the TEQIP programme and can underpin all that the institution seeks to achieve (see Good Governance materials).

j. To comment on revisions of the Institutional Development Proposal, associated actions plans and any institution strategic plan, 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

32. For Mentors to work effectively with institutions good planning and clear arrangements need to be undertaken by all those involved - Mentors and institutions, alike. Mentors and institutions need to work in partnership in order to make the best use of their resources, especially time.

33. 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*], all the related action plans as developed initially and made or modified subsequently during the course of institutional project implementation, and any institution strategic plan

- 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 to the Mentors, in accordance with TEQIP regulations

- Arranging local transport and also reasonable levels of accommodation and boarding for Mentors (according to TEQIP regulations) during each visit to the institution.

34. Mentors and institutions should ensure that they have negotiated a well-planned schedule for the 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

35. 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 alumni, industry and industry associations, and the Head of the Institution. Meeting these stakeholder groups should take place at least twice a year. For any additional visits the mentor might not meet all groups on each occasion, since this will depend on the reason for the visit.

36. 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 industry-related 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 and any institution strategic plan:

- 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, research and development

- Ways and means for increasing exchange of knowledge through conferences, etc. and increasing both quality and quantity of publications (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 to support curricula improvement, research and development activities

- Improving faculty satisfaction with the academic matters, leadership, management and governance of the institution.

d. With administrative and technical **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:

- The development of any institution strategic plan
- 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
- Strengthening the institution by improving institutional management and governance, and the institutional response to the TEQIP-II Good Governance Programme.

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 fulfilling the requirements of the TEQIP-II Good Governance Programme (namely development of a governance self-review, identification of governance development needs and the preparation of institutional governance guidelines; and (ii) to solicit their guidance and help for timely and effective action by the Institution, for example, on the following:

- Fulfilling all the requirements for obtaining Autonomous Institution status, if not yet obtained
- Making all the 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 the institution's strategies and plans for filling up teaching and staff vacancies
- Reviewing the institution's incentives to faculty for continuing education, consultancy, research and development
- Reviewing the institution's 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 and any institution strategic plan

- Increasing transparency and openness of the governance process and discussion of issues that prevent further improvement of governance principles and practice.

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 and learning processes to increase the employability of graduate 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 programmes

- 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

- Problems faced in exercising autonomies, and how these could be overcome.

37. 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.

38. Wherever possible Mentors should meet the Head of the Institution and Chair of the Governing Body on their two major visits in the year.

Mentors' Deliverables Following their Visits

39. Mentors are required to prepare a report in the specified format (See Annex 3) following each mentoring visit reporting what they find, and giving constructive critical feedback to help institutions understand deficiencies with clear examples and evidence. 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**. If there is an unavoidable delay in finalising the report, Mentors should report this to the SPFU concerned. Avoidable delays are not acceptable given the professional standards expected of Mentors. (Electronic copies of the forms will be made available by NPIU.)

40. **Mentors do not grade institutions and their reports are not made public** as they are part of an on-going dialogue of support to institutions. However, mentors' reports are reviewed by State Project Facilitation Units and National Project Implementation Unit as well as by the Government of India/World Bank Project Team and are a valuable contribution to the overall monitoring of TEQIP-II, as well as a key output of the work of Mentors.

41. Mentors may contact their State Project Facilitation Units or the National Project Implementation Unit at any time if they have concerns or queries.

42. 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.

43. 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.

44. 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.

45. 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

46. 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, and any institution strategic plan, 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.

47. 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 the institutions to which they are assigned. This allows them to be neutral in their relationship with the institutions and to 'report as they find' when carrying out their work.

48. Performance audits are to be conducted periodically until the end of TEQIP-II (December 2014) on a schedule determined by the NPIU. 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.

49. There are seven main areas covered by a Performance Audit (listed below). These cover both TEQIP 1.1 and 1.2 institutions. The performance auditors will assign a grade to each of these seven main areas. This will form the **Institutional Performance Profile**.

PIP Ref	Institutional 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	

50. Performance Auditors are expected to evaluate the performance of TEQIP-II Institutions against the goals and targets they have set out in their Institutional Development Proposal, and any institution strategic plan, in the context of the TEQIP key performance indicators[2] across the seven areas in the table above.

51. The **only variance** between sub-component 1.1 and 1.2 Institutional 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 Institutional Performance Profile for all TEQIP institutions.

Proper Use of the Evaluation Grades

52. It is important to remember that TEQIP-II is a development project. The grades indicate what developments have taken place, and what other developments are needed. The evidence of some early self-assessments is that 'confident' institutions are able to grade themselves honestly and self-critically. This critical depth of analysis is also needed in the performance audits if they are to be of value to the institutions and the project.

53. Performance audits are trying to establish to what extent institutions have been successful in fulfilling their own goals and targets. Proper use of the grading profile should therefore be seen as a development tool, as well as a dipstick evaluation of progress to date. A mature institution will value the external input made by a thorough and fair Performance Audit.

54. **The Institutional Performance Profile grades should be based on sound supporting evidence**, and use the performance auditing evaluation grades 1-3 and grade descriptors below. Performance Auditors are expected to provide a bullet point list of the evidence that supports their evaluation against each question/area evaluated. Providing sound supporting evidence is necessary for three critical reasons. First, so that the development needs of the institutions are accurately identified and the institution is able to make progress by building on its strengths and addressing its weaknesses. Giving a grade which is not supported by the evidence does not help the institution meet its TEQIP goals. Second, documenting evidence promotes accountability, since the Performance Audit reports are public documents. And, third, providing evidence enables the NPIU to verify the grades given by the performance auditor are appropriate.

55. **The grade descriptors have two elements: one relating to the quantity of the evidence for each area being evaluated; and the other relating to the quality of the practice.** So, for example, a grade of 1 means there is substantial evidence (75% or more), which identifies that the practice is of good quality. Therefore, a great deal

---

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

of supporting evidence would be detailed against all the questions/ areas listed in the Annex 4 tables for any Grade 1 to be awarded.

56. If there is no evidence that a given good practice takes place, or the evidence is weak, a grade 3 should be given for that practice or area.

Performance auditing evaluation grades and grade descriptors

1.	**Substantial evidence of good practice** in the quality and standards achieved against the institutional goals and targets (Assessment identifies clear supporting evidence that at least 75% of the relevant practices are of good quality and there is no malpractice related to the remainder of the provision.)
2.	**Some evidence of good practice** in the quality and standards achieved (Assessment identifies clear supporting evidence for at least 50% of the relevant practices – there may be still some way to go for the institution to achieve its full objectives but there should be no malpractice related to the remainder of the provision.)
3.	**Not in place** (there may be one of the three primary reasons for this: a) no evidence can be found, b) there is evidence, but it is not of acceptable quality, or c) that there are plans for development but these have not yet taken place – in which case the auditor can indicate the expected date of completion/ implementation but the grade should remain 3.)

Note: Supporting evidence: The grade descriptors have two elements: one relating to the amount of the evidence (none, some or substantial); and one relating to the quality of the practice about which the evidence is gathered (is it good quality, or not?). So, for example, a grade of 1 means both that the evidence is good quality and that there is a substantial amount to demonstrate that it is of good quality (75% or more for the practices found).

What Makes a Good Performance Auditor?

57. 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 as recorded in the Performance Audit report. It is this sound evidence that will support the evaluation grades given by the 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 the stakeholders

- Will be open and approachable and try to build an effective dialogue with all those involved to encourage trust and confidence. They will be committed to communicating clearly and accessibly about all aspects of their work.

58. Good Performance Auditors feedback and explain to institutions what they have found (good and bad practices) constructively.

59. 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

60. Each Performance Auditor is expected to carry out the following duties:

    - Liaise closely with the Data Auditor and only submit a final report once consideration of the Data Auditor's report has been taken into account. NB: A Performance Audit is only considered complete if both Performance and Data Audits have been carried out and both reports are submitted

    - Assess the degree/extent of progress in implementation of Institutional Development Proposal's, and any institution strategic plan's, proposed goals, targets, activities and reforms

    - Identify areas for institutional improvement in project implementation

    - Feed back to the State Project Facilitation Units and the National Project Implementation Unit the removal of bottlenecks/hurdles in their areas of responsibility which are causing under-achievement in one or more of the activities.

61. The key output of the Performance Auditors' visits is the **Institutional Performance Profile and the supporting evidence**. The Institutional Performance Profile and the supporting evidence will be monitored at the national level for consistency:

    a. To ensure that reports are complete

    b. To ensure that supporting evidence has been included to support all the grades

    c. To ensure that the supporting evidence justifies the grade

    d. To monitor progress in project implementation from one Performance Audit to the next.

62. 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

63. For Performance Auditors to work effectively with the institutions good planning and clear arrangements need to be undertaken by all those 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.

64. The Performance Auditors will ensure that they have read through (and have readily available for reference during the visit):

    - A copy of the Institutional Development Proposal and any institution strategic plan 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 Document[3]

---

3   The 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.

- 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.

65. The Head of the Institution will ensure that the Institutional Response Sheet (Annex 5) will be made available to the Performance Auditor and the 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.

66. 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.

67. The Data Auditors should visit the institution prior to the Performance Auditors, say a week before or at least at the same time as the Performance Auditors. The Data Auditor can carry out the verification of data and prepare a completed form for the Performance Auditor in advance. This enables the Data Auditor to provide better support to the Performance Auditor during their performance audit visit.

68. The Data Auditor should check the latest available information available at the institution as entered into the MIS and report their findings to the Performance Auditor.

69. The State Project Facilitation Units for the State Institutions and the National Project Implementation Unit for the Centrally Funded Institutions are responsible for:

- Contacting the Auditors and the Institutions to work out the three-day visit schedule and any pre-visit requirements for the Performance and Data Auditors - well in advance of the visit date

- Ensuring 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 Data Auditor's visit.

Guidelines for the Institution

70. 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.

71. 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 Data Auditor's visit, and in the office room to be 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 and any other supporting documentation).

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

Focused Group Discussions

73. Focused Group Discussions will be arranged by the host institution in consultation with the Performance Auditor prior to the visit. The Performance Auditor should meet both groups of students and groups of faculty.

74. It is suggested that a random sample of students is selected for the meetings with 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:** An equal number of students should preferably be drawn from each year of study/research, with balanced distribution across all disciplines and genders.

75. Faculty: A desirable group size will include representatives from each department with balanced distribution across all disciplines and all levels, and both genders.

Procedure and Activities

76. The performance audits will be conducted over three days for each institution.

77. Suggested programme:

Day One:

   a. Studying any additional documentation provided in the base room, such as course documents, samples of student work, administration records/documents as requested to be available during the visit

   b. Discussion with the Head of Institution along with Project Coordinator and project nodal officers

   c. Three Focused Group Discussions [the first two with the undergraduate and postgraduate/research students, and the third with the faculty], each lasting approximately 60 minutes.

Day Two:

   a. Visits to institutional facilities and observation of some teaching and learning activities

   b. Discussions with Deans, Heads of Departments and Senior Management.

Day Three:

   a. Discussion with governing body members, including the Chair of the Governing Body

   b. Completion of the draft Institutional Performance Profile and Supporting Evidence

c. Oral feedback to the Head of the Institution and the Chair of the Governing Body prior to departure.

78. 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 (see paragraphs 52-56).

79. 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, Senior Management including Deans, 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 the utility and relevance of reported actions/processes.

80. At the end of each audit visit Performance Auditors are to provide **oral feedback** on all the 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 Institutional Performance Profile. (see Annex 4)

81. If this is the second or subsequent visit, Performance Auditors will also give his/her evaluation on any improvements noticed since the last performance audit visit in the supporting evidence.

82. The draft Institutional 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.

83. 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

84. Following the audit visit the Performance Auditors will ensure that the Institutional Performance Profile and all supporting evidence (completed Annex 4 Forms) and the Data Audit report are sent (electronically) to the National Project Implementation Unit and the concerned State Project Facilitation Unit **within 10 days of completion of the Performance Audit** visit.

85. The reports will be scrutinised at the national level by a senior group of Performance Auditors commissioned to undertake this work by the National Project Implementation Unit within 7 days from receipt of a Performance Audit Report.

86. The National Project Implementation Unit will send a draft copy of the report and supporting evidence to the Head of the Institution and the Chair of the Governing Body and ask them to check it through for factual accuracy within 7 days. Any dispute about grading profiles will be reviewed, but institutions will need to provide clear supporting evidence in support of any concerns. After this period the report will be deemed to be ready for publication.

87. The report, once logged and checked centrally by the National Project Implementation Unit, will be forwarded by the NPIU to the Institution, their Mentor and the State Project Facilitation Unit concerned, within a month from the date of the actual Performance Audit.

88. If there are any delays to this schedule the National Project Implementation Unit will contact the institution concerned and inform them of the reason for the delay.

89. The Performance Audit report is a public document. The institution should therefore make reasonable attempts to ensure it is available to those who wish to see it, for example, by placing it on their website or committing to make copies for whomever should ask. The National Project Implementation Unit will also place the performance audit reports on its website.

90. Feedback on the process should be encouraged in order for improvements to the work of the Performance Auditors to be made.

91. Any complaints about the work of Performance or Data Auditors linked to the States 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.

Further Use of Performance Audit Reports

92. 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.

93. 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.

94. The Performance Audit reports will be used by the National Project Implementation Unit to assess the work of individual Auditors. Those who are not adhering to the high professional standards and expectations of the role will be removed from the roster.

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 Response Forms

Annex 6:   FAQs

Please note that the forms in Annexes 3, 4 and 5 are sample pages only. Mentors and Performance Auditors must complete and submit the electronic (expandable PDF) versions of the forms.

Mentors' and Performance Auditors' Person Specification

Essential experience, knowledge and skills required for Mentors/ Performance Auditors:

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, 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.

7. Any additional requests for Mentor visits by their institutions must be approved by the concerned State Project Facilitation Unit.

Mentors Duties

8. Mentors and Performance Auditors will work in accordance with all aspects of this Handbook, and in addition, be fully conversant with 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**, and any institution strategic plan, of each of the assigned project institutions along with the associated action plans, developed initially and as modified, and 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** and any institution governance self-review and governance development plan

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.

9. **Mentors and Performance Auditors should not** guide/advise/ assist institutions in matters connected with financial management and procurement of Works, Goods and Services.

10. Any deviation from these terms of reference may result in removal from the Mentors' and/or Performance Auditors' Registers.

ANNEX 3: MENTOR REPORT FORM (1)

Name of Mentor: Dates of Mentoring Visit:

Name of Institution with Location:

NO.	SEVEN KEY 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		
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 institutional governance		
2.2	Project management, monitoring and evaluation		

* More key bullet points may be added as necessary in the electronic forms that should be used when submitted by Mentors and Performance Auditors.

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	

ANNEX 3: MENTOR 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.			

ANNEX 4: PERFORMANCE AUDIT FORM (1)

Institutional Performance Profile

AUDIT VISIT NUMBER

Institutional Performance Profile:

Name of the Performance Auditor:

Name of the Institution with location:

Date of Performance Visit:

Dates of Performance Audit:

PIP REF	INSTITUTIONAL PERFORMANCE PROFILE	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	

INSTITUTIONAL PERFORMANCE PROFILE GRADES AND GRADE DESCRIPTORS	
1.	**Substantial evidence of good practice** in the quality and standards achieved (Assessment identifies clear supporting evidence for at least 75% of the relevant practices.)
2.	**Some evidence of good practice** in the quality and standards achieved (Assessment identifies clear supporting evidence for at least 50% of the relevant practices.)
3.	**Not in place** (there may be one of the three primary reasons for this: a) no evidence can be found, b) there is evidence, but it is not of acceptable quality, or c) that there are plans for development but these have not yet taken place – in which case the auditor can indicate the expected date of completion/implementation but the grade should remain 3.)

Note: Supporting evidence: The grade descriptors have two elements: one relating to the amount of the evidence (none, some or substantial); and one relating to the quality of the practice about which the evidence is gathered (is it good quality, or not?). So, for example, a grade of 1 means both that the evidence is good quality and that there is a substantial amount to demonstrate that it is of good quality (75% or more for the practices found).

ANNEX 4: 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 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 utilized for the teaching, training, learning and research equipment, library, computers, etc. by Institutions, including:** • Increase in the satisfaction index of student and faculty	
B. **Obtaining Academic Autonomy status, including:** • **Number of institutions that have obtained 'Autonomous Institution status' as per University Grants Commission process** within 2 years of joining the Project, or • Effectiveness of utilization of academic autonomy possessed/obtained (See Table-26 in PIP)	
C. **Effort made by Institutions for upgrading qualifications of faculty members, including:** • Percentage of faculty enrolled in MTech and PhD	
D. **Existing teaching and staff vacancies and effort made by Institutions for filling the vacancies, including:** • Percentage of faculty and staff positions filled and vacant • Increase in faculty appointed on regular basis	
E. **Effectiveness of equity at Institutional level, including:** • Transition rate of students from the First to the Second year in Undergraduate programmes	
Evaluation Grade for 1.1 Using the 3-point grading scale and grade descriptors in Annex 4(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: 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: • Increase in the satisfaction index of student and faculty	
B. Effectiveness of scaling-up Postgraduate Technical Education, including: • Increased enrolment for MTech and PhD • Establishment of proposed laboratories • Cumulative number of assistantships granted	
C. Progress/achievement in starting new Postgraduate programmes, including: • Securing AICTE approval • Establishment of laboratories • Adequacy of student enrolments	
D. Effectiveness of collaborations made with other Institutions in India and abroad, including • Increase in number of co-authored publications in refereed journals	
E. Increased collaboration with industry in research and development, including • 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	
	Evaluation Grade for 1.2 Using the 3-point grading scale and grade descriptors in Annex 4(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: • Establishment of new laboratories for applicable thematic research • Establishment of a knowledge resource centre (library) in the thematic area • Procurement of furniture • Civil works	
Evaluation Grade for 1.2.1 Using the 3-point grading scale and grade descriptors in Annex 4(1)	

ANNEX 4: 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: • Percentage of faculty who have benefitted from the core and advanced modules of pedagogy training • Improvements in (and/or updating, and more relevant) curricula and/or syllabi • Improvements in (and/or updating, more relevant) course assessment methods • Improvements in teaching and learning methods, including provision for students needing extra/remedial support • Percentage of faculty with UG qualification registered/deputed for improving their qualification (*see Section-3, 4(b) on page 20 of PIP*) • Percentage of faculty deputed for subject domain training, seminars, etc. *(faculty are required to share their gains with peers and put reports on training on institution's web site)* • Progress in securing accreditation of eligible UG & PG programmes *(institutions to achieve target of 60% of eligible UG & PG programmes accredited - applied for within 2 years of joining the Project)*	
B. Effectiveness of Pedagogy Training, including • Percentage of students satisfied with the quality of teachers and changes/developments specifically undertaken as a result of student evaluations	
Evaluation Grade for 1.3 Using The 3-Point Grading Scale and Grade Descriptors in Annex 4(1)	

ANNEX 4: **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 PARAMENTERS	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: • Improved understanding of the need and ways for increased autonomy, and new instruments for accountability • Modernization and decentralisation of administration and financial management • Extent of delegation of administrative and financial decision making powers to senior functionaries • Responsiveness to stakeholders (students, faculty, staff, industry, local communities) • Institutional quality assurance and enhancement strategies, including student feedback mechanisms • Maintenance of academic and non-academic infrastructure and facilities, including sufficiency and quality of academic buildings • Development, maintain and utilisation of institutional resources • Generation, retention and utilization of Income Revenue Generation.	
Evaluation Grade for 2.1 Using the 3-point grading scale and grade descriptors in Annex 4(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)	GRADE
Section A: Primary accountabilities		
• **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?** *(Give dates of governing body meetings where the minutes record these matters having been discussed, approved and/or followed up.)*		
• **Has the Governing Body ensured the establishment and monitoring of proper, effective and efficient systems of control and accountability to ensure financial sustainability?** *(Give dates of governing body meetings where the minutes record these matters having been discussed, approved and/or followed up at the systems level.)*		
• **Is the Governing Body monitoring institutional performance and quality assurance arrangements?** *(Give dates of governing body meetings where the minutes record these matters having been discussed, approved and/or followed up at the systems level.)*		
• **Has the Governing Body put in place suitable arrangements for monitoring the head of the institution's performance?** *(Give dates of governing body meetings where the minutes record these matters having been discussed, approved and/or followed up.)*		
Section B: Openness & transparency in the operation of governing bodies		
• **Does the Governing Body publish an annual report on institutional performance?** *(Give the publication date and type of publication of the most recent annual report, if there is one)*		
• **Does the Governing Body maintain, and publicly disclose, a register of interests of members of its governing body?** *(Given that a formal register is not yet normal practice in colleges, provide evidence of any published information on governing body members' financial and commercial interests)*		
• **Is the Governing Body conducted in an open 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?** *(Say whether the governing minutes are published on the institution website, and note any other steps that the governing body takes to communicate with its stakeholders on its work as a Board)*		
Section C: Key attributes of governing bodies		
• **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?** *(Specify the range of skills and experience that the members of the governing body, and especially the external members, have)*		
• **Are the recruitment processes and procedures for governing body members rigorous and transparent?** *(Specify how governing body members are selected, and whether that process is transparent)*		
• **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?** *(Give examples, where possible, of the role of external members in improving the performance of the institution)*		
• **Are the role and responsibilities of the Chair of the institution and the Member Secretary serving the governing body clearly stated?** *(If yes, specify the document where these roles are defined)*		
• **Does the Governing Body meet regularly? Is there clear evidence that members of the governing body attend regularly and participate actively?** *(State the number of meetings in the last year, and the average number of those Board members present and those members absent at those meetings)*		
Section D: Effectiveness and performance review of governing bodies		
• **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?** *(If yes, give the date(s) of governing body meetings where the minutes show that such a review has been discussed)*		
• **Does the Governing Body ensure that new members are properly inducted, and existing members receive opportunities for further development as deemed necessary?** *(If yes, give examples of how these two tasks are carried out)*		
Section E: Regulatory compliance		
• **Does the Governing ensure regulatory compliance* and, subject to this, take all final decisions on fundamental matters of the institution.** *(If yes, give the date(s) of governing body meetings where the minutes show that regulatory compliance has been discussed)*		
• **Does the regulatory compliance include demonstrating compliance with the 'not-for-profit' purpose of education institutions?** *(If yes, give evidence that the governing body has been directly involved)*		
• **Has there been accreditation and/or external quality assurance by a national or professional body? If so, give name, current status of accreditation etc.** *(Provide lists of all courses which have already been accredited, all courses where an application has been made, and all courses where no such application has yet been made)*		
Overall Evaluation Grade for Governance 2.1.1 A-E Using the 3-point grading scale and grade descriptors in Annex 4(1)		

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 PARAMENTERS	SUPPORTING EVIDENCE (Note: Grades must be supported by sound evidence of achievement of the institutional development proposal goals and targets)	GRADE
A. Effectiveness of mentoring, reviews, surveys and audits conducted, including: • Increase in the achievement of the institutions goals and targets set out in the Institutional Development Proposal		
B. Effective project management and monitoring, including: • Precise and reliable information/data through web based MIS available to stakeholders at all time		
C. Effectiveness of faculty evaluation by students, including: • 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 in MIS	Year	Verified figure	Institutional data source*	Comments†
1	**Information in respect to bachelors programmes in engineering/technology**					
	a. Number of UG programmes conducted during the latest academic year					
	b. Total number of UG students during the latest academic year					
	c. Total number of women students in UG programmes during the latest academic year					
	d. Total number of SC students in UG programmes during the latest academic year					
	e. Total number of ST students in UG programmes during the latest academic year					
	f. Total number of OBC students in UG programmes during the latest academic year					
	g. Percentage of final year UG students during the latest academic year placed through campus interviews					
	h. Percentage of final year UG students during the latest that passed out with 75% or more aggregate marks					
	i. Percentage of all 1st year students [as at 1(b)] during the latest that passed all courses fully and successfully got admitted to 2nd year in the 2011-12 academic year					
	j. Percentage of 1st year women students [as at 1(c)] during the latest academic year that passed all courses fully and successfully got admitted to 2nd year in the current academic year					
	k. Percentage of 1st year SC students [as at 1(d)] during the latest that passed all courses fully and successfully got admitted to 2nd year in the current academic year					
	l. Percentage of 1st year ST students [as at 1(e)] during the latest that passed all courses fully and successfully got admitted to 2nd year in the current academic year					
	m. Percentage of 1st year OBC students [as at 1(f)] during the latest that passed all courses fully and successfully got admitted to 2nd year in the current academic year					

* This could include how the figure was calculated if appropriate.
† For 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 in MIS	Year	Verified figure	Institutional data source*	Comments†
2	**Information in respect to masters programmes in engineering/ technology**					
	a. Number of full-time Masters programmes during the latest academic year					
	b. Number of part-time and sandwich (Joint) Masters programmes during the latest academic year					
	c. Total number of students enrolled for all Masters programmes during the latest academic year					
	d. Number of faculty in-house enrolled for Masters programmes during the latest academic year					
	e. Number of students enrolled for all Masters programmes during the latest academic year with scholarship					
	f. Number of students enrolled for all Masters programmes during the latest academic year with TEQIP assistantship					
	g. Total number of women students in all Masters programmes during the latest academic year					
	h. Total number of SC students in all Masters programmes during the latest academic year					
	i. Total number of ST students in all Masters programmes during the latest academic year					
	j. Total number of OBC students in all Masters programmes during the latest academic year					
	k. Percentage of final year Masters students during the latest academic year placed through campus interviews					
	l. Percentage of final year Masters students during the latest that passed out with 75% or more aggregate marks					

---

* This could include how the figure was calculated if appropriate.
† For 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 (3)

No.	Particulars	Figure in MIS	Year	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 the latest academic year					
	c. Number of students enrolled for Doctoral programmes during the latest academic year with scholarship					
	d. Number of students enrolled for Doctoral programmes during the latest academic year with TEQIP assistantship					

DATA AUDIT FORM (4)

No.	Particulars	Figure in MIS	Year	Verified figure	Institutional data source*	Comments†
4	**Information in respect to Faculty**					
	a. Total number of regular full-time faculty excluding adjunct and emeritus faculty during the latest academic year					
	b. Total number of regular full-time faculty in engineering disciplines excluding adjunct and emeritus faculty during the latest 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 the latest 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 the latest academic year					
	e. Number of regular full-time faculty in engineering disciplines with Bachelors degree as their highest qualification faculty during the latest academic year					
	f. Number of faculty with Bachelors degree which are enrolled in-house for Masters programmes in parent institution during academic year the latest: (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 the latest: (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 the latest: (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 the latest: (i) Engineering teachers (ii) Applied Science teachers (iii) Other teachers					
	j. Number of faculty that have attended a professional training programme of 5 or more days duration during the latest academic year					
	k. Number of all faculty (irrespective of specialization) that have attended the Basic Module of pedagogy training during the latest academic year					
	l. Number of all faculty (irrespective of specialization) that have attended both the Basic and Advanced Modules of pedagogy training during the latest academic year					
	m. Number of faculty appraised by students during the latest academic year					

---

* This could include how the figure was calculated if appropriate.
† For 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 in MIS	Year	Verified figure	Institutional data source*	Comments†
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 in MIS	Year	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 latest academic year					
	b. Number of research publications in International refereed journals during the latest 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 latest academic year					
	e. Number of patents in engineering related areas filed during the latest academic year					
	f. Number of sponsored research project completed during the latest academic year					
	g. Number of MOUs signed for collaborative programmes with Indian industry and R&D organizations					
	h. Number of MOUs signed for collaborative programmes with International academic institutions and R&D organizations					

---

* This could include how the figure was calculated if appropriate.
† For 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 in MIS	Year	Verified figure	Institutional data source*	Comments†
7	**Information in respect to finances**					
	a. Amount received as Block Grant during the latest academic year (Rs. in Lakhs)					
	b. IRG§ from students' tuition fee and other charges during the latest academic year (Rs. in Lakhs)					
	c. IRG from externally funded R&D projects and consultancies during the latest academic year (Rs. in Lakhs)					
	d. Total IRG during the latest academic year (Rs. in Lakhs)					
	e. Total annual recurring expenditure during the latest 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 in MIS	Year	Verified figure	Institutional data source*	Comments†
8	**With respect to institutional governance/management**					
	a. Number of Governing Body meetings held during the latest 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					

* This could include how the figure was calculated if appropriate.
† For example, if there are any discrepancies in the figures – the reasons, or whether information is being updated by the institution and if so, when?
§ IRG is the total revenue of the institution in a year, whether retained or not.

ANNEX 4: (FEEDBACK)

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 by the Performance Auditor 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

INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSE FORM (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 current application	
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 programmes 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 faulty for participation in consultancy assignments, research and development, and continuing education programmes conducted by the institution for industry	
3.1	Have the four 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	• 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	• 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	• 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	• 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 programmes 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 RESPONSE FORM (2)

(Engineering disciplines)

TABLE-1 (A): CONSOLIDATED STATEMENT

No.		Pre-TEQIP (2010-11)			Post-TEQIP (2012-13)		
1	No. of departments						
2	Levels of programmes	B.Tech	M.Tech	Phd	B.Tech	M.Tech	Phd
	(Number of programmes)						
3	Collaboration with industry (number of MoUs signed)						

TABLE-1 (B): DETAILS OF STUDENT ENROLMENT

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

No.	Name of the department		Pre-TEQIP (2010-11)			Post-TEQIP (2012-13)			Increase in percentage B.Tech.M.Tech. Ph.D	Total
			B.Tech	M.Tech	Phd	B.Tech	M.Tech	Phd		
		No. of faculty having highest qualification								
		Regular								
		Contractual								
		Total								

TABLE 1 (D): COLLABORATION WITH INDUSTRY

No.	Name of the department/institute	Name of the industry with whom MoU signed	
		Pre-TEQIP no. (2010-11)	Post-TEQIP no. (2012-13)

TABLE 2: SUMMARY SHEET FOR REVIEW

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 (31st Dec 2012)		Proposed Budget Estimate		Status due to input of TEQIP as on 31st Oct 2012		Outcome against Goals (TEQIP)	Remarks
			Physical (No.*/%age)	Institutional (No.*/%age)	TEQIP (No.*/%age)	Institutional (Rs. Lakh)	TEQIP (Rs. Lakh)	Physical (No.*/%age)	Financial (Rs. Lakh)		
A	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** • Undergraduates • Postgraduates									
A.1.2		**Students transition rate (percentage) from first year to second year of UG programmes (clearing all subjects/courses of 1st year in first attempt)**									
A.1.3		**Average scores (%/CGPA) at degree completion** • Undergraduates • Postgraduates									
A.1.4		No. of students enrolled in MTech programmes									
A.1.5		No. of students registered in PhD programmes in engineering									
A.1.6		**No. of Masters students enrolled with TEQIP teaching assistantship**									
A.1.7		**No. of PhD students enrolled with TEQIP research assistantship**									
A.1.8		**No. of Research projects taken by UG students**									
A.1.9		**Any other**									

	Strategy/Activities	Indicators	Institutional Baseline (Pre-TEQIP) in 2010-11	Proposed Target for 2 years (31st Dec 2012)		Proposed Budget Estimate		Status due to input of TEQIP as on 31st Oct 2012		Outcome against Goals (TEQIP)	Remarks
			Physical (No.*/%age)	Institutional (No.*/%age)	TEQIP (No.*/%age)	Institutional (Rs. Lakh)	TEQIP (Rs. Lakh)	Physical (No.*/%age)	Financial (Rs. Lakh)		
A.2	Faculty										
A.2.1	Capacity Development of Faculty • Recruitment of faculty • Subject domain training • Qualification upgradation • Pedagogical Training • E-enabled training • Management development training • Continuing Education Programme	% age of faculty positions filled-in (as per AICTE/MHRD required Teacher-Student ratio): • Regular • Regular + Contract									
A.2.2		% age of Faculty with B.Tech enrolled for M.Tech against total B.Tech faculty									
A.2.3		% age of Faculty with M.Tech enrolled for PhD in engineering against total MTech faculty									
A.2.4		% age of regular faculty with Masters degree in engineering against total engineering faculty									
A.2.5		% age 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									
A.2.8		Number of faculty members attended pedagogical training									
A.2.9		Any other									

	Strategy/Activities	Indicators	Institutional Baseline (Pre-TEQIP) in 2010-11	Proposed Target for 2 years (31st Dec 2012)		Proposed Budget Estimate		Status due to input of TEQIP as on 31st Oct 2012		Outcome against Goals (TEQIP)	Remarks
			Physical (No.*/%age)	Institutional (No.*/%age)	TEQIP (No.*/%age)	Institutional (Rs. Lakh)	TEQIP (Rs. Lakh)	Physical (No.*/%age)	Financial (Rs. Lakh)		
A.3	**Institutional Reforms**										
A.3.1	**Set of Reforms** • Academic reforms • Non-academic reforms • Enhance interaction with industry	**% age of NBA accredited UG & PG programmes including Applied- For cases, against total eligible programmes**									
A.3.2		**Autonomous institution status concurred by UGC (Yes/No/Applied For)**									
A.3.3		**No. of academic programmes i.e. M.Tech/ PhD etc. with industry**									
A.3.4		**No. of short term programmes with industry**									
A.3.5		**Academic networking with other institutions (No.)**									
A.3.6		**ICT (Information communication Technology) enabled learning (No. of programmes/courses)**									
A.3.7		**Curricula revised/ restructured (No.)**									
A.3.8		**Total IRG**									
A.3.9		**% age revenue from externally funded R&D projects and consultancies in total revenue**									
A.3.10		**IRG as % age of annual recurring expenditure**									
A.3.11		**Any other**									

	Strategy/Activities	Indicators	Institutional Baseline (Pre-TEQIP) in 2010-11	Proposed Target for 2 years (31st Dec 2012)		Proposed Budget Estimate		Status due to input of TEQIP as on 31st Oct 2012		Outcome against Goals (TEQIP)	Remarks
			Physical (No.*/%age)	Institutional (No.*/%age)	TEQIP (No.*/%age)	Institutional (Rs. Lakh)	TEQIP (Rs. Lakh)	Physical (No.*/%age)	Financial (Rs. Lakh)		
B	**Enhance Access to Knowledge Resources**										
B.1	**Improvement in Teaching, Training and Learning facilities** • New PG programmes • Updation of learning resources • Equipment details • Modernization of Labs and class rooms	**Laboratories:** • New laboratory (Nos.) for new PG programmes • New laboratory (Nos.) for existing PG programs • Existing laboratory (Nos.) modernized									
B.2		**Library** • Books (print) (Nos.) • e-books (Nos.) • Journals (print) (Nos.) • e-journals (Nos.) • Course specific softwares (Nos.)									
B.3		**Membership of online** 1. No. of journals 2. No. of consortium									
B.4		**No. of digitally/virtually accessible courses/ subjects**									
B.5		**Any other**									

	Strategy/Activities	Indicators	Institutional Baseline (Pre-TEQIP) in 2010-11	Proposed Target for 2 years (31st Dec 2012)		Proposed Budget Estimate		Status due to input of TEQIP as on 31st Oct 2012		Outcome against Goals (TEQIP)	Remarks
			Physical (No.*/%age)	Institutional (No.*/%age)	TEQIP (No.*/%age)	Institutional (Rs. Lakh)	TEQIP (Rs. Lakh)	Physical (No.*/%age)	Financial (Rs. Lakh)		
C	**Enhancement of Research and Development Activities**										
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:** • National journals • International journals									
C.2		**No. of Books published**									
C.3		**No. of Patents obtained/ filed**									
C.4		**Any other**									

	Strategy/Activities	Indicators	Institutional Baseline (Pre-TEQIP) in 2010-11	Proposed Target for 2 years (31st Dec 2012)		Proposed Budget Estimate		Status due to input of TEQIP as on 31st Oct 2012		Outcome against Goals (TEQIP)	Remarks
			Physical (No.*/%age)	Institutional (No.*/%age)	TEQIP (No.*/%age)	Institutional (Rs. Lakh)	TEQIP (Rs. Lakh)	Physical (No.*/%age)	Financial (Rs. Lakh)		
D	**Improve Employability of Graduates**										
D.1	**Improving competencies of graduates** • Industrial collaboration • Finishing School • Industrial training	**Campus placement percentage:** • Undergraduates • Postgraduates									
D.2		**Average annual salary (Rs. Lakh) of:** • Undergraduates • Postgraduates									
D.3		**Share of UG students attended industrial internship (percentage)**									
D.4		**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	2013-14	2014-15
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 upgradation, 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 their 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 and any institution strategic plan 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 and any institution strategic plans. For example, improving the quality of teaching, learning and research, increasing learning outcomes, employability of undergraduate and postgraduate students, postgraduate/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, high performing institution, for example, as the institution plans/implements new curricula, exercises all its autonomies, improves its performance as demonstrated by internal and external evaluation processes, including students' performance evaluations, implementation of faculty appraisal by students, and accreditation obtained 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 and capability development, enhancing interaction with industry, and improving internal revenue generation.

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

   A: Student transition rates, numbers/pay of graduates employed, examination results for students' learning, overall progress based on student/faculty satisfaction, postgraduate/doctoral students/awardees, refereed journal papers in respected journals nationally and internationally, 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 twice a 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 major two-day institutional visit for discussing/reviewing TEQIP activities and 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 and 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 (verification of data) as part of the performance audit.

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

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

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

   A: Both the 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 Institutional 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 under graduate and postgraduate/doctoral students, faculty, accreditation status, research publications/patents, financial status and governance/management functions for the latest available years as entered in the MIS.

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

A: A three-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: 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 Proposals and any institution strategic plans and improvements in shortcomings noticed in earlier audits. Performance and Data Audits are made a certain points in the TEQIP project – often referred to as 'dipstick' evaluations to monitor progress throughout the life of the project. A Performance Audit is not complete unless both a Performance and Data Audit have been undertaken and both reports submitted.

9. *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 review by the National Project Implementation Unit.

Mentors and Performance Auditors

1. *Q: What the main differences between mentoring and performance audits?*

A: The main differences are:

- A mentor works with institutions in his or her 'home' state, while a performance auditor audit institutions in other states.

- The mentor's report is not published but any part of the ongoing dialogue with the institution. The performance auditors report becomes a public document after it has been checked by the NPIU.

2. *Q: What are the main similarities between mentors and performance auditors?*

A: The main similarities are:

- Profile of mentors and performance auditors (see Annex 1)
- The values they uphold during their work (see page 5)
- The use of evidence, whether to provide advice about improvements (as mentors do) or to underpin the evaluation grades given to practices at an institution (as performance auditors do).

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