ENHANCING THE CAPABILITIES
OF TECHNICAL EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS IN INDIA

TEQIP

Handbook for Mentors and Performance Auditors

April 2018

Goverment of India

THE WORLD BANK

A Government of India, Ministry of Human Resources Development and World Bank Initiative
In partnership with State Governments of India

ENHANCING THE CAPABILITIES
OF TECHNICAL EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS IN INDIA

TEQIP

Handbook for Mentors and Performance Auditors

April 2018

सत्यमेव जयते
Goverment of India

THE WORLD BANK

A Government of India, Ministry of Human Resources Development and World Bank Initiative
In partnership with State Governments of India

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 3

VALUES 4

SECTION 1 – MENTORING

A ROLE OF THE MENTOR 5
B WHAT MAKES A GOOD MENTOR? 5
C GENERAL MENTOR DUTIES 5
D INSTITUTIONAL VISITS BY MENTORS 7

SECTION 2 – PERFORMANCE AUDITING

A ROLE OF THE PERFORMANCE AUDITOR 12
B PROPER USE OF EVALUATION GRADES 13
C WHAT MAKES A GOOD PERFORMANCE AUDITOR? 14
D GENERAL PERFORMANCE AUDITOR DUTIES 15
E INSTITUTIONAL VISITS BY PERFORMANCE AUDITORS 15
F FURTHER USE OF PERFORMANCE AUDIT REPORTS 18

SECTION 3 – ANNEXES

Annex 1 : Mentors' and Performance Auditors' Person Specification 19
Annex 2 : Mentors' and Performance Auditors' Terms of Reference 21
Annex 3 : Mentor Checklist 22
Annex 4 : Mentors Report Form 23
Annex 5 : Performance Auditor Checklist 25
Annex 6 : How to Write A Good Performance Audit 26
Annex 7 : Performance Audit Forms 28
Annex 8 : AICTE 10-Point Checklist 49
Annex 9 : Performance Feedback Checklist 51
Annex10 : Frequently Asked Questions 52

INTRODUCTION

This guide is meant to help mentors and performance auditors with their duties under TEQIP.

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 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-III Project Implementation Plan, which is available on the National Project Implementation Unit (NPIU) website.

GIVEN THEIR DIFFERENT PURPOSES, VISITS BY MENTORS AND PERFORMANCE AUDITORS SHOULD NOT TAKE PLACE AT THE SAME TIME.

AUDITORS AND MENTORS ARE NOMINATED BY NPIU PER THE APPROVAL OF MHRD.

Performance Auditors are senior academicians, many of them are from IITs and/or well-versed in TEQIP. They will be appointed for all project institutions by the NPIU per the approval of MHRD. Under TEQIP III, State Project Implementation Units (SPIUs) will be responsible for providing support in M&E, thus eliminating the need for a data auditor.

MENTORING

UNDER TEQIP III, THERE ARE TWO PRIMARY MENTOR RELATIONSHIPS:

TWINNING ARRANGEMENTS

1.1 institutes will be paired with a high-performing 1.3 TEQIP I/II institute with a formalized Memorandum of Understanding (MoU). This relationship is meant to be a partnership, with both institutions learning from one another and providing additional support/guidance for reform activities. 1.1 institutes will receive specific support for developing their Institutional Development Plan (IDP). ATUs are included in the twinning arrangements.

MENTORS

In addition, all TEQIP III institutes will be assigned an individual mentor from a roster approved by MHRD. To preserve the advisory role of mentors from TEQIP II, each individual mentor will be assigned to partnered institutes, i.e. one mentor takes on twinned institutions. Thus, the mentor can provide some assurance that the twinning arrangement is functioning well, and also provide more hands-on, targeted support to each institution.

These 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 other strategic plan.

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 SPIUs and the NPIU as well as MHRD/World Bank Project Team as part of the overall monitoring of the TEQIP project and the work of Mentors.

PERFORMANCE AUDITS

Performance Audits 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 willresult in a graded institutional profile that will indicatehow well an institution is doing in achieving its goals and targets in the context of the overall TEQIP/project objectives and performance indicators. Performance auditors will visit all 1.1 and 1.3 institutes and 1.2 ATUs.

VALUES

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.

MENTORING

A ROLE OF THE MENTOR

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 III. The project objective relevant for this mentor cohortis to support TEQIP III institutes with reform activities that help improve the quality and equity of technical education in India.

How often does a mentor visit?

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 can also utilize technology such as Skype, Face Time, and Videoconferencing to keep in touch with institutions if travel becomes too difficult.

B WHAT MAKES A GOOD MENTOR?

Good Mentors ***listen, understand, guide and advise*** - principally to support and assist institutions to stay focused on the goals and targets set out in their Institutional Development Proposal and any other strategic plan. Each institution will have different support and development needs, and Mentors can help them by providing an external view of how their institution fares.

Mentors offer a professional' sounding board' of external advice to institutions. They can point out talents and abilities in institutions, and then to help them to utilize these in the best and most innovative ways possible to help resolve issues within the institution.

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.

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.

A good Mentor provides feedback and explains to institutions what they find (good and bad practices) and bases their feedback on sound evidence.

C GENERAL MENTOR DUTIES

Each mentor is expected to carry out the following duties:

Time commitment

1. To mentor the TEQIPIII institutions assigned to themto mentor each of their institutions at least twice in a

year (or more as requested by the institution) as per the timelines given below:

An example illustrating timelines: If auditor visits in Xth month, First Menotrs visit to 1.1 institute in X+1.5th month, First visit to 1.3 institute in X+2.5th month, Second mentor visit to 1.1 institute in X+7.5th month, Second visit to 1.3 institute in X+8.5th month. The same timelines shall be repeated for Cycle 2 based on Aditors visit.

2. To devote at least 16 working hours (i.e. two days) to mentoring work during each of the two major visits to an institution.

TECHNICAL EXPERTISE

3. Understanding of the twinning arrangement and MoUs between the twinned institutes

4. 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
   - Generation, retention and utilisation of revenue generated through a variety of activities.

KNOWLEDGE OF TEQIP AND GOOD GOVERNANCE

5. To guide and assist institutions as they carry out key project activities, such as:
   - Improving teaching, learning, and research
   - Improving student learning
   - Improving student employability
   - Increasing faculty productivity and motivation through professional development

6. To guide and assist institutions in achieving project indicators, such as:
   - Increase in the average score of students participating in tests designed to measure technical and critical thinking skills
   - Increase in number of NBA accredited Undergraduate programs and Post-graduate programs
   - Increase in number of ATUs publicly declaring final semester exam results before the start of the next academic year
   - Increase in transition rate of undergraduate engineering students from the first year to second year, disaggregated by SC/ST and gender
   - Percentage of students from traditionally disadvantaged groups in total enrolment in participating institutions, disaggregated by SC/ST and gender
   - UGC autonomous status
   - Increase in percentage of PhD students in total enrolment in engineering disciplines
   - Percentage of sanctioned faculty positions in participating institutions filled by regular or contract faculty, contracted as per AICTE norms
   - Increase in number of Faculty Trained in either their subject domain, pedagogy or management
   - Percentage of externally funded research and development projects and consultancies in total

revenue
- Participation of affiliated institutes in participating ATUs in newly designed research-hub related activities
- Increase in average satisfaction level on the Student, Staff and Faculty Satisfaction Survey
- Institutes in focus states that meet enabling mechanisms for participation in the project
- Board of Governors or Institution/ Department Management Committee meets at least 4 times every calendar and publicly discloses the minutes of all meetings
- ATUs with MIS capable of producing annual report against prescribed indicators
- Annual report completed in prescribed format

7. 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.

8. To attend national and regional TEQIP III forums and conferences and to share experiences with other Mentors, the TEQIP Project team and other stakeholders.

9. 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).

10. To support the development and to help analyze institutional self-reviews and governance development plans.

REVIEW OF INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL

11. 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.

D INSTITUTIONAL VISITS BY MENTORS

Preparation for a Mentor's Visit

In preparation for a Mentor's visit each institution will be responsible for:

1. Providing their Mentor with a copy of the Institutional Development Proposal [in final form, once approvals and edits have been made], 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.

2. 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

3. Making directly and promptly all payments to the Mentors, in accordance with TEQIP regulations

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

Mentors and institutions should ensure that they have negotiated a well-planned schedule for the visits 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, available on the NPIU website.

Who should Mentors Meet With?

In order to best understand institutional developments, Mentors should meet with various stakeholder groups 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.

Mentors' should meet with the following groups to elicit their opinions, views, and suggestions on the suggested topics:

Undergraduate Students

- 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.

Postgraduate Students

- All of the above (same topics as undergraduate students), in addition to;
- Facilitating placement
- Working on industry-related projects
- Participation in research and development projects, consultancies and publications.

Faculty

- 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 through additional training, 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, 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.

Administrative and Technical Staff

- Their role in improving project implementation
- Improving their effectiveness and performance through professional training.

Senior Management

- 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.

Chairperson and Board of Governors

- 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 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.

Industry Representatives

- 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.

Head of Institution and Project Coordinator

- 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.

Finishing a Mentor Visit

At the end of a visit a Mentor will always meet with the Head of the Institution and Board of Governors (BoG) chairperson to provide an oral feedback of their findings, and will note the key outcomes of the discussion. The Mentor's feedback should be discussed at the following BoG meeting, with action steps outlined in the minutes.

Mentors' Deliverables Following their Visits

Mentors are required to prepare a report 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, SPIU, and NPIU within 10 days of completion of each visit. If there is an unavoidable delay in finalising the report, Mentors should report this to NPIU. Avoidable delays are not acceptable given the professional standards expected of Mentors. (Electronic copies of the forms will be made available by NPIU.) Examples of well-written and poorly written write-ups are available in Annex 5.

It is important to note that 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, the information is communicated to SPIUs, NPIU, and the TEQIP project team.

Mentor Commitment and Concerns with Mentors

Mentors may contact NPIU at any time if they have concerns or queries.

Mentors are also encouraged to use the Mentor network and Mentor Forums to discuss issues, share good practices and benchmark institutional progress/concerns. Some SPIUs may want to arrange regular meetings (biweekly/monthly) between Mentors in their state and SPIU officials to encourage more information sharing.

Feedback on the mentoring process should be encouraged for improvements to the work of Mentors to be made. Any complaints about the work of Mentors should be made in writing to NPIU. Should institutions wish to change their mentor, they should contact NPIU to assign another mentor. Similarly, Mentors who wish to be assigned to a different institution should also contact NPIU.

Mentors who are unable to complete their duties, for whatever reason, should notify NPIU as soon as possible so that a replacement can be found.

Finally, Mentors who fail to comply with these guidelines, or do not perform their duties to an acceptable standard, may be removed from the Mentor Register.

Performance Auditor

A ROLE OF THE PERFORMANCE AUDITOR

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 III project objectives and the key performance indicators.

SELECTION AND CRITERIA

Performance Auditors can only be assigned by the NPIU and can only operate outside of their 'home' State. They should not have any conflicts of interest (be an alumnus, former faculty, etc.)with the institutions to which they are assigned. This allows them to be objective when conducting the audit.

Performance audits are to be conducted periodically until the end of TEQIP III 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.

There are two main areas covered by a Performance Audit (listed below). This covers both TEQIP 1.1 and 1.3 institutions. The performance auditors will assign a grade to each of these main areas. This will form the **Institutional Performance Profile.**

PIP Ref	Institutional performance profile	Overall evaluation grades
Component 1: Improving quality and equity in engineering institutions in focusstates		
1.1	Institutional Development for Participating Institutions	
1.2	Widening impact through Affiliating Technical University (ATUs)	
1.3	Twinning Arrangements to Build Capacity and Improve Performance of Participating Institutions**	

**Note that performance indicators have not yet been determined for the twinning arrangements but the focus of these agreements will be knowledge transfer, exchange of experience, optimizing the use of resources, and developing long-term strategic partnerships. The exact nature of twinning activity would be

determined mutually between the two institutes, but could include interactions at four levels: BoG, institute's management/leadership, staff (teaching and non teaching), and students. For instance, activities could entail faculty and student exchange, joint conferences, and management coaching between the members of the two BoGs, the two principals, and the deans.

Performance Auditors are expected to evaluate the performance of TEQIP III 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 across the areas in the table above.

In addition, Performance Auditors can also check progress against the AICTE 10-Point Plan (see Annex 7), given that AICTE is a partner in TEQIP III and its mandate covers many of TEQIP III's project goals.

B PROPER USE OF THE EVALUATION GRADES

It is important to remember that TEQIP III follows on the progress of TEQIP II and is a development project. The grades indicate what developments have taken place, and what additional developments are needed. The institutional self-assessments have shown that confident institutions can grade themselves honestly and self-critically. This depth of analysis is also needed in the performance audits if they are to be of value to the institutions and the project.

The objective of a Performance Audit is to see the extent to which institutions have been successful in fulfilling their own goals and targets. Proper use of the grading profile should be a way to show institutions which level they are at, and how to get to the next level. A mature institution will value the external input made by a thorough and fair Performance Audit.

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:

1) It is important 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.
2) Documenting evidence promotes accountability, since the Performance Audit reports are public documents.
3) Providing evidence enables the NPIU to verify the grades given by the performance auditor are appropriate.

The grade descriptors have two elements: one relating to the quality of the practice; and the other relating to the quantity of the evidence for each area being evaluated.

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 larger amount of supporting evidence would be detailed against all the questions / areas listed in the Annex 6 tables for any Grade 1 to be awarded.

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 atleast 75% of the relevant practices are of good quality and there is nomal practice related to there main der of the provision.)
2.	Some evidence of good practice in the quality and standards achieved (Assess mentidentifies clear supporting evidence for at least 50% of there levant practices–there may bestill some way to go for the institution to achieve its full objectives but there should be nomal practice related to there mainder
3.	Not in place (there may be one of the three primary reasons for this: a) noevidence 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 remain3.)

Note: Support in gevidence: 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 asubstantial amount to demon strate tha titis of good quality (75% or more for the practices found).

C WHAT MAKES A GOOD PERFORMANCE AUDITOR?

Good auditors:

- Fulfill their responsibilities by basing their work on expert and objective scrutiny and analysis
- Aim to be fair, objective and honest, reporting on what they find, and basing their judgments on sound evidence as recorded in the Performance Audit report
- 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

Good Performance Auditors make the effort to constructively explain to institutions what they have found (good and bad practices).

The performance audit should be carried out with dignity and respect towards 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 can only be conducted if cooperation is fostered between all parties knowing that the audit will generate useful findings.

D GENERAL PERFORMANCE AUDITOR DUTIES

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

- 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
- Provide feedback to SPIUs and NPIU on the bottlenecks/ hurdles in their areas of responsibility which are causing under-achievement in one or more of the activities.

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:

- To ensure that reports are complete
- To ensure that supporting evidence has been included to support all the grades
- To ensure that the supporting evidence justifies the grade
- To monitor progress in project implementation from one Performance Audit to the next.

Performance Auditors will not look into procurement and financial management issues, as these will be covered by separate processes.

E INSTITUTIONAL VISITS BY PERFORMANCE AUDITORS

Roles during the Preparation for a Performance Audit

Performance Auditors and institutions need to work in partnership to ensure good time management and efficient use of their resources.

The **Performance Auditors** should 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 III Project Implementation Plan(PIP), and also the guidelines on the implementation of reforms, including the Good Practice Guide for Governing Bodies (all available on NPIU website)
- The most recent Performance Audit Report, Mentoring Report, and Institutional Progress Report showing improvements/changes made in view of observations/suggestions made by Performance Auditors and Mentors.

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.

NPIU, with assistance from SPIUs, is responsible for:

- Contacting the Performance Auditors and the Institutions to work out the three-day visit schedule and any pre-visit requirements for the Performance Auditors at least a month ahead of the visit date

GUIDELINES FOR THE INSTITUTION

The Institution will ensure that during the visit the Performance Auditors have a private office in which they can work and are provided with normal hospitality, taking account of dietary requirements. Performance Auditors will bring their own computers, but the institutions should enable the Auditors to access the Internet, as necessary, through institutional facilities.

The Institution will ensure that any documentation requested before or during the Audit visit, by the Performance Auditors, is supplied at least two weeks before the Auditor's visit.

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.

PROCEDURE AND ACTIVITIES

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

Suggested Agenda

Day One:

- 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
- Discussion with the Head of Institution along with Project Coordinator and project nodal officers
- 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:

- Visits to institutional facilities and observation of some teaching and learning activities
- Discussions with Deans, Heads of Departments and Senior Management.

Day Three:

- Discussion with governing body members, including the Chair of the Governing Body
- Completion of the draft Institutional Performance Profile and Supporting Evidence
- Oral feedback to the Head of the Institution and the Chair of the Governing Body prior to departure.

Performance Auditors should record their evaluations/observations and evaluation grades for each area of performance in the Forms provided (see Annex 6).

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.

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 6)

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.

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 NPIU.

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 judgments and recommendations and that follow up action is required to areas of concern. The Performance Auditor should remind the Institution that the assigned Mentor can assist in identifying possible solutions.

DELIVERABLES AND PROCEDURES FOLLOWING A PERFORMANCE AUDIT VISIT

Following the audit visit the Performance Auditors will ensure that the Institutional Performance Profile and all supporting evidence (completed Annex 6 Forms) are sent (electronically) to NPIU within 10 days of completion of the Performance Audit visit.

The reports will be reviewed at the national level by a senior group of Performance Auditors commissioned to undertake this work by NPIU within 7 days from receipt of a Performance Audit Report.

NPIU 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.

The report, once logged and checked centrally by NPIU, will be forwarded by the NPIU to the Institution, their Mentor and respective SPIU, within a month from the date of the actual Performance Audit.

If there are any delays to this schedule NPIU will contact the institution concerned and inform them of the reason for the delay.

The Performance Audit report is a public document. The institution should therefore essentially keep it

on their website for making it available to those who wish to see. NPIU will also place the performance audit reports on its website.

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

Any complaints about the work of Performance Auditors should be made in writing to NPIU.

F FURTHER USE OF PERFORMANCE AUDIT REPORTS

NPIU and the World Bank will use all the individual Institution Performance Profiles and Supporting Evidence as contribution to the overall TEQIP III project performance evaluation report.

The Performance Audit reports will be used by NPIU 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.

ANNEXES

ANNEX 1

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:

- 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.

ANNEX 2

Mentors' and Performance Auditors' Terms of Reference

APPOINTMENT

1) Mentors will be assigned by NPIU through an approved roster.
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 NPIU.
4) NPIU will carry out any change of Performance Auditors at any time during the life of the project due to unavoidable reasons.

EMOLUMENTS

1) 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.

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

MENTORS DUTIES

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 III 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.
d. Additional studies/reports as they become available on the NPIU website.

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

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

ANNEX 3

Mentor Checklist

BEFORE VISIT

- Agree on visit date with institution
- Request Institutional Development Plan from institution for review a head of time
- Schedule interviews with:
  - Undergraduate students
  - Postgraduate students
  - Faculty
  - Staff (non-academic)
  - Senior management
  - Members of the Board of Governors
  - Industry representatives
  - Head of Institution

DURING VISIT

- Review TEQIP III project component 1: Improving quality and equity in engineering institutions in focus states
  - 1.1: Institutional Development for Participating Institutions
  - 1.2: Widening impact through Affiliating Technical University (ATUs)
  - 1.3: Twinning arrangement

- Conduct interviews with:
  - Undergraduate students
  - Postgraduate students
  - Faculty
  - Staff (non-academic)
  - Senior management
  - Members of the Board of Governors
  - Industry representatives
  - Head of Institution

- Record key points and discuss with head of institution and leadership
- Note any follow-up required

AFTER VISIT

- Submit write-up no later than 10 days to Head of Institution, SPIU, and NPIU (remember mentors are not supposed to grade institutions)

ANNEX 4

MENTORS' REPORT FORM

1. Name of Mentor:

Name of Institution with Location:

Dates of Visit :

Number of Visit (1st / 2nd / 3rd Etc.)

2. Strength and weakness of the institution

Strengths:	Weaknesses:
1.	1.
2.	2.
3.	3.
4.	4.
5.	5.

3. Actions taken on last recommendations (from second round onwards)

S. No.	Outcome Parameters	Actions Suggested	Compliance
1	Effectiveness of funds utilized:		
2	Improvement in Teaching, Learning and Research competence.		
3	Implementation of AICTE mandate		
4	Increasing faculty productivity/ motivation		
5	Effectiveness of equity at Institutional level:		
6	Improved system efficiency		
7	Twinning Activities:		

4. Comments on Performance Audit report:

5. Actions suggested for future

S. No.	Outcome Parameters	Actions Suggested	Timeline
1	Effectiveness of funds utilized:		
2	Improvement in Teaching, Learning and Research competence.		
3	Implementation of AICTE mandate		

S. No.	Outcome Parameters	Actions Suggested	Timeline
4	Increasing faculty productivity/ motivation		
5	Effectiveness of equity at Institutional level:		
6	Improved system efficiency		
7	Twinning Activities:		

6. Any Innovative approach practiced by the Institution:

7. Any other comment:

8. Visit Description (Proceedings of visit in short)

S. No.	List of Interviews & Activities	Key Discussion Summary Points
1	Undergraduate Students	
2	Postgraduate Students	
3	Faculty	
4	Senior Management	
5	Members of The Governing Body	
6	Industry Representatives	
7	Head of The Institution	
8	TEQIP Functionaries	

9. Conclusions

ANNEX 5

Performance Auditor Checklist

BEFORE VISIT

- Agree on schedule of activities with the Head of the Institution
- Review TEQIP III project documentation (Project Implementation Plan, Good Practice Guide for Governing Bodies)
- Request Institutional Development Plan from institution for review a head of time

DURING VISIT

- Conduct focused group discussions with:
  - Undergraduate engineering students
  - Master's and Doctoral students in engineering
  - Faculty

- See suggested agenda on P. 15
- Draft Institutional Performance Profile and list of supporting evidence

AFTER VISIT

- Ensure that the Institutional Performance Profile and supporting evidence are sent to NPIU and SPIU within 10 days

ANNEX 6

How to write a good performance audit report?

It is important for performance auditors to be able to effectively communicate the status and condition of the institution they have evaluated. This can only be done through clear and succinct writing. Auditors should aim to "paint a picture" for those who have not gone on the visit.

Performance Audits should contain the following characteristics:

(I) Completeness : All the fields/parameters of the reporting format i.e. all tables mentioned in Annex 6 are completed

(ii) Consistency and relevance : There should be consistency between observations, evidence presented and grade given; and the evidence given should be relevant to the field/parameter in question. The evidence based approach is needed while the auditing activity.

(iii) Details and specificity : Rationally analysed data should be entered wherever expected. Proper justifications wherever required be given in the audit report.

(iv) Meticulousness : Process of filling in the information should be done carefully and legibly. (Note: performance auditors are now expected to use the electronic forms and type their reports.)

(v) Feedback clarity : The feedback to institutes should be clear and practical.

A well-written performance audit includes complete, descriptive information about each aspect with supporting evidence, see below:

Sl. No.	Aspect	Assessment Grade (1-3)	Supporting Evidence
3.	Progress/achievement in starting new PG programs as evidenced by: • Securing AICTE approval • Establishment of laboratories • Adequacy of student enrolments • Cumulative number of assistantships granted	3 2 3 3	• Application for AICTE approval not made as yet; • Work now in progress; equipment procurement being speeded up; • No new programmes started and no new students admitted; • No new programmes started and no new students admitted;

A poorly written performance audit is vague and does not provide enough justification for the assessment grade, see below:

Sl. No.	Aspect	Assessment Grade (1-3)	Supporting Evidence
3.	Progress/achievement in starting new PG programs as evidenced by: • Securing AICTE approval • Establishment of laboratories • Adequacy of student enrolments • Cumulative number of assistantships granted	1	• AICTE approval Letters • Data Auditor' s Report • Physical Evidence

A well-written audit also has detailed notes on the discussions with the head of institution and indicates the nature of the conversation, see below:

A. Project Implementation

S. No.	Evaluation Parameters	Responses
1.1	Briefly describe the actions taken for obtaining Autonomous Institution status, and the status of your applications as made.	Institute has acquired autonomy in 2006, vide UGC approval letter no. F-22-1, 2007 (AC) dated 24/07/ 2007. In July 30-31, 2012 UGC committee has visited the institute for the extension of autonomy and has recommended for extension till 2018.
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	After acquiring autonomy in 2006, new curriculum was designed involving members from industries and academicians from renowned institutions. Since then curricula have been revised as and when required through the DSB meetings held at least twice a year. In 2012 the whole curriculum has been revamped as per guidelines for outcome based education.
	2. Improvements introduced in student evaluation	The institute has adopted continuous evaluation system consisting of 40% weightage to the semester performance and 60% weightage to the end semester examination. The continuous evaluation during semester consists of various aspects like test, quizzes, assignments, mini projects, presentation etc. as per requirement of the concerned subject.
	3. Addition of electives	The concept of general elective has been introduced at second year level where in a student can opt a variety of electives offered by various departments, in addition to the core electives offered at third year and final year level. Mandatory subject like environmental science has also been introduced.
	4. Carrying out teacher evaluation by students	As of now, so far teachers' evaluation by students was taken once in a semester in written form. Now onwards, we shall plan to provide on-line arrangement for feeding in information in soft copies with appropriate anonymity.

A poorly written audit includes general note taking and no formal organization of discussion points, see below:

This is the first Performance Audit. The short comings have been noted in support to weak UG students and to some extend in the project implementation. Perhaps the reason are as follows:

1. Lack of awareness amongst the weak students.
2. Late starting of the projects.

ANNEX 7

Performance Audit Form

Institutional Performance Profile

Audit Visit Number:

Name of the Performance Auditor:

Name of the Institution with location:

Date of Performance Visit:

PIPREF	INSTITUTIONAL PERFORMANCEPROFILE	EVALUATIONGRADES
Component 1: Improving quality and equity in engineering institutions in focus		
1.1	Institutional Development for Participating Institutions	
1.2	Widening impact through Affiliating Technical University (ATUs)	
1.3	Twinning Arrangements to Build Capacity and Improve Performance of Participating Institutions	

INSTITUTIONAL PERFORMANCE PROFILE GRADES AND GRADEDESCRIPTORS	
1.	**Substantial evidence of good practice** in the quality and standards achieved (Assessment identifies clear supporting evidence for atleast 75% of the relevant practices.)
2.	**Some evidence of good practice** practice in the quality and standards achieved (Assessment identifies clear supporting evidence for atleast 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, orc) 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 remain3.)

Note

Supporting evidence: The grade descript or shave 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).

COMPONENT 1.1: Institutional Development for Participating Institutions

P MONITORING AND PROJECT OUTPUT/OUT COMEPARAMENTERS	GRADE	SUPPORT IN GEVIDENCE (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: • Percentage utilization of the funds released by MHRD to the institutions (90%). • Percentage of expenditure accounted in the book of accounts against funds utilized (90%).		
Average of A		
B. Improvement in Teaching, Learning and Research competence. • Percentage of NBA-accredited programs (UG and PG) or applied for out of eligible programs (at least 60% of eligible programs). • Implementation of GATE: Percentage of UG students enrolled for GATE (70%) • Implementation of GATE: Percentage of final students provided GATE training(70%) • Implementation of GATE: Percentage of UG student acquired GATE valid score (17%) • Percentage increase In employability skills based on third party employability skill test (SLA) (Satisfactory/ Not satisfactory) • Employer satisfaction index of engineers recruited in the past year(Max. 4 on 5 point scale) • Percentage of PhD students in total enrolment in engineering disciplines in participating institute		
Average of B		
C. Implementation of AICTE mandate • Percentage of newly admitted 1st year students attended three weeks Induction program conducted by mentor faculty of the institute (100%) • Percentage of pre-final and final year UG students participated in Industry readiness program. • Institute has Start-up /innovation cell and the activities (start-up ecosystem, drive for promoting creativity, Hackath on participation etc.) are evident (Y/N) • Percentage of UG students undergone internships spanning 4 to 8 weeks in industry (100%). • In case of autonomous institutes, presence of industry consultation committee (ICC) and no. of meetings arranged for Curriculum review/ revision (Y/N). **Or** Presence ICC and Verification of PEO by ICC for non-autonomous institutes (Y/N). • Percentage of students who have been imparted training in technical and soft skills required for working in the industry.		
Average of C		

P MONITORING AND PROJECT OUTPUT/OUT COMEPARAMENTERS	GRADE	SUPPORT IN GEVIDENCE (Note: Grades must be supported by sound evidence of achievement of the institutional development proposal goals and targets)
D. Increasing faculty productivity and motivation • Sanctioned faculty positions are as per AICTE norms (1:20 ratio) in all the programs eligible for accreditation (Y/N). • Percentage of sanctioned faculty positions in participating institutes filled by regular or contract faculty (60%). • Number of facultymembers deputed for upgradation of qualification. • Percentage of faculty that have taken annual refresher delivered through SWAYAM portal (50%). • Percentage of faculty trained in either their subject domain, pedagogy, or management capacity building and leadership programs 70%). • Percentage of externally funded R&D projects and consultancies in total revenue in participating institutes (7%)		
Average of D		
E. Effectiveness of equity at Institutional level: • Transition rate of students (percentage) from the First to the Second year (without backlog) in Undergraduate programmes ✓ Total (60%) : ✓ ST (50%) : ✓ SC (50%) : ✓ Female (55%) : • Percentage of students from traditionally disadvantaged groups in total enrolment in the institute. (a) SC/ST (20%) : (b) Women (28%) :		
Average of E		
F. Improved system efficiency, as demonstrated through: • Constitution of BoG as per the prescribed format (Y/N). • BoG, Department Management Committee or equivalent that meets at least 4 times every calendar (Y/N) • Minutes of all the above 4 meetings disclosed publically (on website) (Y/N). • Status of Autonomy (Academic, Administrative, Financial) ✓ UGC Autonomy (Y/N) ✓ If Autonomous, continuation granted by UGC (Y/N) • Institute produces and publish an annual report in the prescribed format in accordance with the requirements set out in the PIP (Y/N). • Student, Staff, and Faculty Satisfaction Survey index (Max. 4 on 5 point scale).		
Average of F		

P MONITORING AND PROJECT OUTPUT/OUT COMEPARAMENTERS	GRADE	SUPPORT IN GEVIDENCE (Note: Grades must be supported by sound evidence of achievement of the institutional development proposal goals and targets)
G. Twinning Activities: • The long term and short term twinning plan (action plan) on activities is available and implemented (Y/N). • No. of courses/ classes/workshops conducted by the faculty of Institute under sub component 1.3 for students of 1.1 institute for training and academic development and vice versa (Min 1 per program per year). • No. of students attended the course/s at 1.3 institution under student exchange program and vice versa (Min 1 per program per year). • No. of Trainings conducted for faculty/ support staffof 1.1 institute by Institute under sub component 1.3 for training and academic development and vice versa (Min 1 per program per year). • No. of Seminars / Techfest, and conferences conducted by Institute under sub component 1.3 for 1.1 institute for students to share research and discuss technological advancements in dynamic industrial and business environment (Min 1 per year). • No. of Seminars/ conferences and academic meeting conducted by Institute under sub component 1.3 for 1.1 institute for faculty to share research, discuss technological advancements in dynamic industrial and business environment(Min 1 per year). • No. of departmental partnership for joint research activities for applied research and technological development (1 per program). • Number of Industry partnership for joint R & D, and internships (Min 1 per year) • Number of Industry partnership for placement activity (Min 1 per program per year). • Number of Seminars and learning forums conducted by Institute under sub component 1.3 for 1.1 institute on Governance practices, institutional management, academic and non-academic reforms (Min 1 per year). • Number of faculty of 1.1 institute inducted on various bodies (BoG, BoS, Senate etc.) of 1.3 institute for learning on good governance practices and vice versa. • Assistance provided in short term advisory and consultancy services by Institute under sub component 1.3 for 1.1. • Workshop conducted on Outcome Based Education (NBA) by Institute under sub component 1.3 for 1.1 institute. • Assistance given by the Institute under sub component 1.3 for 1.1 institute in filling-up of SAR for getting accreditation.		
Average of G		

Summary of Performance of COMPONENT 1.1: Institutional Development for Participating Institutions

P MONITORING AND PROJECT OUTPUT/OUT COMEPARAMENTERS	GRADE	Weightage%	Total Score (Grade x Weightage/100)
A. Effectiveness of funds utilized for the teaching, training, learning and research equipment, library, computers, etc. by Institutions		15	
B. Improvement in Teaching, Learning and Research competence.		20	
C. Implementation of AICTE mandate		20	
D. Increasing faculty productivity and motivation		10	
E. Effectiveness of equity at Institutional level		05	
F. Improved system efficiency		15	
G. Twinning Activities		15	
***The grade for each parameter is calculated based on the average of all sub-parameters.**		**Average**	

COMPONENT 1.3: Institutional Development for Participating Institutions

MONITORING AND PROJECT OUTPUT/OUT COMEPARAMENTERS	GRADE	SUPPORT IN GEVIDENCE (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: • Percentage utilization of the funds released by MHRD to the institutions (90%). • Percentage of expenditure accounted in the book of accounts against funds utilized (90%).		
Average of A		
B. Improvement in Teaching, Learning and Research competence. • Percentage of NBA-accredited programs (UG and PG) or applied for out of eligible programs (at least 70% of eligible programs). • Implementation of GATE: Percentage of UG students enrolled for GATE (70%) • Implementation of GATE: Percentage of final students provided GATE training (70%) • Implementation of GATE: Percentage of UG student acquired GATE valid score (17%) • Percentage increase In employability skills based on third party employability skill test (SLA) (Satisfactory/ Not satisfactory) • Employer satisfaction index of engineers recruited in the past year (Max. 4 on 5 point scale) • Percentage of PhD students in total enrolment in engineering disciplines in participating institutes		
Average of B		
C. Implementation of AICTE mandate • Percentage of newly admitted 1st year students attended three weeks Induction program conducted by mentor faculty of the institute (100%) • Percentage of pre-final and final year UG students participated in Industry readiness program. • Institute has Start-up /innovation cell and the activities (start-up ecosystem, drive for promoting creativity, Hackath on participation etc.) are evident (Y/N) • Percentage of UG students undergone internships spanning 4 to 8 weeks in industry (100%). • In case of autonomous institutes, presence of industry consultation committee (ICC) and no. of meetings arranged for Curriculum review/ revision (Y/N). • Percentage of students who have been imparted training in technical and soft skills required for working in the industry.		
Average of C		

P MONITORING AND PROJECT OUTPUT/OUT COMEPARAMENTERS	GRADE	SUPPORT IN GEVIDENCE (Note: Grades must be supported by sound evidence of achievement of the institutional development proposal goals and targets)
D. Increasing faculty productivity and motivation • Sanctioned faculty positions are as per AICTE norms (1:20 ratio) in all the programs eligible for accreditation (Y/N). • Percentage of sanctioned faculty positions in participating institutes filled by regular or contract faculty (75%). • Number of faculty members deputed for up gradation of qualification. • Percentage of faculty that have taken annual refresher delivered through SWAYAM portal (50%). • Percentage of faculty trained in either their subject domain, pedagogy, or management capacity building and leadership programs (70%). • Percentage of externally funded R&D projects and consultancies in total revenue in participating institutes (15%)		
Average of D		
E. Effectiveness of equity at Institutional level: • Transition rate of students (percentage) from the First to the Second year (without backlog) in Undergraduate programmes ✓ Total (77%) : ✓ ST (65%) : ✓ SC (65%) : ✓ Female (75%) : • Percentage of students from traditionally disadvantaged groups in total enrolment in the institute. (a) SC/ST (20%) : (b) Women (28%) :		
Average of E		
F. Improved system efficiency, as demonstrated through: • Constitution of BoG as per the prescribed format (Y/N). • BoG, Department Management Committee or equivalent that meets at least 4 times every calendar (Y/N) • Minutes of all the above 4 meetings disclosed publically (on website) (Y/N). • Status of Autonomy (Academic, Administrative, Financial) ✓ UGC Autonomy (Y/N) ✓ If Autonomous, continuation granted by UGC (Y/N) • Institute produces and publish an annual report in the prescribed format in accordance with the requirements set out in the PIP (Y/N). • Student, Staff, and Faculty Satisfaction Survey index (Max. 4 on 5 point scale).		
Average of F		

P MONITORING AND PROJECT OUTPUT/OUT COMEPARAMENTERS	GRADE	SUPPORT IN GEVIDENCE (Note: Grades must be supported by sound evidence of achievement of the institutional development proposal goals and targets)
G. Twinning Activities: • The long term and short term twinning plan (action plan) on activities is available and implemented (Y/N). • No. of courses/ classes/workshops conducted by the faculty of Institute under sub component 1.3 for students of 1.1 institute for training and academic development and vice versa (Min 1 per program per year). • No. of students of 1.1 institution attended the course/s at 1.3 institution under student exchange program and vice versa (Min 1 per program per year). • No. of Trainings conducted for faculty/ support staff of 1.1 institute by Institute under sub component 1.3 for training and academic development and vice versa (Min 1 per program per year). • No. of Seminars/ Techfest, and conferences conducted by Institute under sub component 1.3 for 1.1 institute for students to share research and discuss technological advancements in dynamic industrial and business environment (Min 1 per year). • No. of Seminars/ conferences and academic meeting conducted by Institute under sub component 1.3 for 1.1 institute for faculty to share research, discuss technological advancements in dynamic industrial and business environment (Min 1 per year). • No. of departmental partnership with corresponding department of 1.1 institute for joint research activities for applied research and technological development (1 per program). • Number of Industry partnership with 1.1 institute for joint R & D, and internships (Min 1 per year) • Number of Industry partnership for placement activity (Min 1 per program per year). • Number of Seminars and learning forums conducted by Institute under sub component 1.3 for 1.1 institute on Governance practices, institutional management, academic and non-academic reforms (Min 1 per year). • Number of faculty of 1.1 institute inducted on various bodies (BoG, BoS, Senate etc.) of 1.3 institute for learning on good governance practices and vice versa. • Assistance provided in short term advisory and consultancy services by Institute under sub component 1.3 for 1.1.		

P MONITORING AND PROJECT OUTPUT/OUT COMEPARAMENTERS	GRADE	SUPPORT IN GEVIDENCE (Note: Grades must be supported by sound evidence of achievement of the institutional development proposal goals and targets)
• Workshop conducted on Outcome Based Education (NBA) by Institute under sub component 1.3 for 1.1 institute. • Assistance given by the Institute under sub component 1.3 for 1.1 institute		
Average of G		

Summary of Performance of COMPONENT 1.3: Institutional Development for Participating Institutions

P MONITORING AND PROJECT OUTPUT/OUT COMEPARAMENTERS	GRADE*	Weightage%	Total Score (Grade x Weightage/100)
A. Effectiveness of funds utilized for the teaching, training, learning and research equipment, library, computers, etc. by Institutions		10	
B. Improvement in Teaching, Learning and Research competence.		15	
C. Implementation of AICTE mandate		15	
D. Increasing faculty productivity and motivation		10	
E. Effectiveness of equity at Institutional level		05	
F. Improved system efficiency		15	
G. Twinning Activities		30	
* **The grade for each parameter is calculated based on the average of all sub-parameters.**		**Average**	

COMPONENT 1.2: Widening Impact through ATUs

MONITORING AND PROJECT OUTPUT/OUT COMEPARAMENTERS	GRADE	SUPPORT IN GEVIDENCE (Note: Grades must be supported by sound evidence of achievement of the institutional development proposal goals and targets)
A. Effectiveness of funds utilized for widening impact of the project for the benefit of faculty/students of affiliated institutions by ATU. • Establishment of research hub (Y/N). • Utilization of research hub by faculty/ students of affiliated institutions (200 faculty/ Students of affiliated institutes). • Increase in Percentage of affiliated institutes in participating ATUs in newly designed research hub related activities (Satisfactory/ Not Satisfactory). • Availability of MIS/ ERP having student and faculty data of affiliated institutions (Y/N). • MIS is capable of producing annual report against prescribed indicators (Y/N). • Presence of modern HR system for efficient personnel management of University (Y/N) • Percentage utilization of the funds released by MHRD to the ATU (90%). • Percentage of expenditure accounted in the book of accounts against funds utilized (90%).		
Average of A		
B. Improvement in Teaching, Learning and Research competence of affiliated institutions • Availability of statute for autonomy (Y/N). • Number of autonomous institutes granted autonomy to affiliated institution on the approval of UGC (Min. 1, Max. 7). • Number of applications of affiliated institutions forwarded to UGC for autonomy (Min.1, Max. 10). • Ordinances making accreditation mandatory amended. • Affiliation norms and formats making accreditation mandatory, failing which affiliation may not be granted, are available • No. of workshops arranged for faculty on accreditation procedures & Norms and rubrics for student's performance assessment are available. • Number institutions having atleast 3 programs NBA accredited/ applied for among eligible courses (Min. 20%, Max. 100%) • Increase in accredited/applied courses for NBA accreditation per year (Min. 10% of eligible programs,		

COMPONENT 1.2: Widening Impact through ATUs

MONITORING AND PROJECT OUTPUT/OUT COMEPARAMENTERS	GRADE	SUPPORT IN GEVIDENCE (Note: Grades must be supported by sound evidence of achievement of the institutional development proposal goals and targets)
Max. 20%). • Availability of Massive Open Online Course (MOOCs) facilitating access of institution to MOOCs (Y/N). • Developed credit based systems for the students facilitating e-learning courses as a part of their degree programme (Y/N). • Number of days, before the start of the next academic year, final semester examination results are declared by ATU.		
Average of B		
C. Implementation of AICTE mandate in affiliated institutes • Affiliation process considers implementation of AICTE mandate by affiliated institutes (Y/N) • Academic calendar of ATU indicates the period for implementation of 3 weeks induction program for newly admitted first year students (Y/N) • ATU has conducted Training of faculty mentors from affiliated private institutes by experts for conduct of induction program (Y/N). • Percentage of newly admitted 1st year students of affiliated institutes attended three weeks Induction program conducted by mentor faculty of the affiliated institute (100%) • Design separate subject on development of leadership skills, entrepreneurship skills, managerial skills, communication skills, collaborative skills, etc. and incorporated in curriculum (Y/N). • Organized mock Interviews and Group Discussions (Y/N). • Instructed affiliated colleges to set up Language Labs for communication skills in every affiliated private institution (Y/N). • All affiliated institutions have formed Start-up cell/club with and the activities (start-up ecosystem, drive for promoting creativity, Hackath on participation etc.) are evident (Y/N) • Number of awareness drive/ workshops about the idea of 'Innovation' & 'Start-up' by ATU in affiliated institutions. • Number of competitions conducted by ATU for students		

COMPONENT 1.2: Widening Impact through ATUs

MONITORING AND PROJECT OUTPUT/OUT COMEPARAMENTERS	GRADE	SUPPORT IN GEVIDENCE (Note: Grades must be supported by sound evidence of achievement of the institutional development proposal goals and targets)
of affiliated institutions on Idea stage, prototype stage, business plan, etc. every month • No. of E-summits, conferences, seminars and Entrepreneurship fests conducted by ATU for students from affiliated institutions. • Introduced choice based credit system (CBCS) (Y/N). • Introduced flexibility of opting for credit transfer (As per UGC guidelines, 20% credit courses can be done through SWAYAM portal) (Y/N). • If credit transfer not possible, at least 1 course done by students through SWAYAM (Non-credit), appearing for examination & certification • No. of workshops organized for faculty to implement AICTE model curriculum. • Program-wise Industry Consultation Committee (ICC) consisting of Industry experts is available (Y/N). • ICCs have discussed on: • Examining AICTE model curriculum for its suitability of industry demand in ICC (December every year) ✓ Revision of curriculum ✓ Vetting of PEO, PO, CO ✓ Activities for industry institute interaction ✓ Guidance/assistance on internships and placement • Compulsory internship is included in the curriculum of all engineering degree programs in the form of credit course (Y/N). • Academic calendar prepared indicated completion of examinations in engineering degree programs before the end of April every year for allowing students to take mandatory internship in vacation (Y/N) • Institutions are instructed to Identify faculty coordinator for internship program (Y/N). • Discipline specific list of industries / companies/ organisations (small scale, MSME, large scale, Internshala etc.) is prepared (Y/N) • Instructed affiliated colleges to updating their website with all the details of students (contact info, CV, performance etc.) (Y/N) • Institute details and student profiles are communicated with the industries / organisations / companies (Y/N). • Sign MoU / Agreement with the industries for accommodating students of all affiliated institutions for internship (Y/N).		

COMPONENT 1.2: Widening Impact through ATUs

MONITORING AND PROJECT OUTPUT/OUT COMEPARAMENTERS	GRADE	SUPPORT IN GEVIDENCE (Note: Grades must be supported by sound evidence of achievement of the institutional development proposal goals and targets)
• Organized awareness workshops for students regarding the different career paths (Y/N). • Arranged industry conclave for the students and faculty of affiliated institutions (Y/N). • Percentage of UG students undergone internships spanning 4 to 8 weeks in industry (100%).		
Average of C		
D. Effort made by ATU for Increasing faculty productivity and motivation • Average percentage of sanctioned faculty positions in the affiliating institutes filled by regular or contract faculty in the affiliated institutes as per AICTE norms (1:20). • Visible efforts made by ATU for motivating institutions to fill up the vacancies (Y/N). • Percentage of faculty participated from affiliated institutions in annual refresher course training through, Pedagogy or leadership training through Swayam Prabha. • Percentage of faculty availed pedagogical training through Swayam platform (50%). • Percentage of Principals of the of affiliated institutions undertaken leadership training through Swayam Portal (50%). • Number of training programmes organized by ATU for faculty of affiliated institutions. • Number of training programmes conducted for staff of affiliated institutions.		
Average of D		
E. Effectiveness of equity at university level: • Transition rate of students (percentage) from the First to the Second year (without backlog) in Undergraduate programmes ✓ Total (77%) : ✓ ST (65%) : ✓ SC (65%) : ✓ Female (75%) : • Percentage of students from traditionally disadvantaged groups in total enrolment in the institute. (a) SC/ST (20%) : (b) Women (28%) :		
Average of E		

COMPONENT 1.2: Widening Impact through ATUs

MONITORING AND PROJECT OUTPUT/OUT COMEPARAMENTERS	GRADE	SUPPORT IN GEVIDENCE (Note: Grades must be supported by sound evidence of achievement of the institutional development proposal goals and targets)
F. Twinning Activities: • The long term and short term twinning plan (action plan) with 1.3 ATU on activities is available and implemented (Y/N). • Credit transfer facility is created with 1.3 ATU through amendments in ordinances and vice versa(Y/N). • Assistance provided by 1.3 ATU in formulating statute for autonomy(Y/N). • No. of students of affiliated institution attended course/s at 1.3 ATU affiliated institution under credit transfer facility and vice versa (Min. 1 per program). • No. of Trainings conducted for 1.1 ATU functionaries on governance by 1.3 ATU and vice versa (Min 1 per program per year). • Participation of 1.1 ATU functionaries in Management Council/ Senate/ BoS of 1.3 ATU statutory bodies (atleast 1 per body). • No. of Seminars/ conferences/ Conclaves and academic meeting conducted by 1.3 ATU (Min 1 per year). • Number of Seminars and learning forums conducted by 1.3 ATU for 1.2ATU on Governance practices, university management, academic and non-academic reforms (Min 1 per year). • Assistance provided in establishment of research hub (Visible). • Assistance provided by 1.3 ATU for ordinances, statues, directions etc. (Visible)		
Average of F		

Summary of Performance of COMPONENT 1.2: Institutional Development for Participating Institutions

P MONITORING AND PROJECT OUTPUT/OUT COMEPARAMENTERS	GRADE	Weightage%	Total Score (Grade x Weightage/100)
A. Effectiveness of funds utilized for the teaching, training, learning and research equipment, library, computers, etc. by Institutions		15	
B. Improvement in Teaching, Learning and Research competence of affiliated institutions.		20	
C. Implementation of AICTE mandate in affiliated institutions		25	
D. Effort made by ATU for Increasing faculty productivity and motivation		5	
E. Effectiveness of equity at university level		3	
F. Twinning Activities		30	
* **The grade for each parameter is calculated based on the average of all sub-parameters.**		**Average**	

COMPONENT 1.3: ATUs

MONITORING AND PROJECT OUTPUT/OUT COMEPARAMENTERS	GRADE	SUPPORT IN GEVIDENCE (Note: Grades must be supported by sound evidence of achievement of the institutional development proposal goals and targets)
A. Effectiveness of funds utilized for widening impact of the project for the benefit of faculty/students of affiliated institutions by ATU. • Establishment of research hub (Y/N). • Utilization of research hub by faculty/ students of affiliated institutions (200 faculty/ Students of affiliated institutes). • Increase in Percentage of affiliated institutes in participating ATUs in newly designed research hub related activities (Satisfactory/ Not Satisfactory). • Availability of MIS/ ERP having student and faculty data of affiliated institutions (Y/N). • MIS is capable of producing annual report against prescribed indicators (Y/N). • Presence of modern HR system for efficient personnel management of University (Y/N) • Percentage utilization of the funds released by MHRD to the ATU (90%). • Percentage of expenditure accounted in the book of accounts against funds utilized (90%).		
Average of A		
B. Improvement in Teaching, Learning and Research competence of affiliated institutions • Availability of statute for autonomy (Y/N). • Number of autonomous institutes granted autonomy to affiliated institution on the approval of UGC (Min. 1, Max. 7). • Number of applications of affiliated institutions forwarded to UGC for autonomy (Min.1, Max. 10). • Ordinances making accreditation mandatory amended. • Affiliation norms and formats making accreditation mandatory, failing which affiliation may not be granted, are available • No. of workshops arranged for faculty on accreditation procedures & Norms and rubrics for student's performance assessment are available. • Number institutions having at least 3 programs NBA accredited/ applied for among eligible courses (Min. 20%, Max. 100%) • Increase in accredited/applied courses for NBA accreditation per year (Min. 10% of eligible programs, Max. 20%).		

COMPONENT 1.2: Widening Impact through ATUs

MONITORING AND PROJECT OUTPUT/OUT COMEPARAMENTERS	GRADE	SUPPORT IN GEVIDENCE (Note: Grades must be supported by sound evidence of achievement of the institutional development proposal goals and targets)
• Availability of Massive Open Online Course (MOOCs) facilitating access of institution to MOOCs (Y/N). • Developed credit based systems for the students facilitating e-learning courses as a part of their degree programme (Y/N). • Number of days, before the start of the next academic year, final semester examination results are declared by ATU.		
Average of B		
C. Implementation of AICTE mandate in affiliated institutes • Affiliation process considers implementation of AICTE mandate by affiliated institutes (Y/N) • Academic calendar of ATU indicates the period for implementation of 3weeks' induction program for newly admitted first year students(Y/N) • ATU has conducted Training of faculty mentors from affiliated private institutes by experts for conduct of induction program (Y/N). • Percentage of newly admitted 1st year students of affiliated institutes attended three weeks Induction program conducted by mentor faculty of the affiliated institute (100%) • Design separate subject on development of leadership skills, entrepreneurship skills, managerial skills, communication skills, collaborative skills, etc. and incorporated in curriculum (Y/N). • Organized mock Interviews and Group Discussions (Y/N). • Instructed affiliated colleges to set up Language Labs for communication skills in every affiliated private institution (Y/N). • All affiliated institutions have formed Start-up cell/club with and the activities (start-up ecosystem, drive for promoting creativity, Hackath on participation etc.) are evident (Y/N) • Number of awareness drive/ workshops about the idea of 'Innovation' & 'Start-up' by ATU in affiliated institutions. • Number of competitions conducted by ATU for students of affiliated institutions on Idea stage, prototype stage, business plan, etc. every month • No. of E-summits, conferences, seminars and		

COMPONENT 1.2: Widening Impact through ATUs

MONITORING AND PROJECT OUTPUT/OUT COMEPARAMENTERS	GRADE	SUPPORT IN GEVIDENCE (Note: Grades must be supported by sound evidence of achievement of the institutional development proposal goals and targets)
Entrepreneurship fests conducted by ATU for students from affiliated institutions. • Introduced choice based credit system (CBCS) (Y/N). • Introduced flexibility of opting for credit transfer (As per UGC guidelines, 20% credit courses can be done through SWAYAM portal) (Y/N). • If credit transfer not possible, at least 1 course done by students through SWAYAM (Non-credit), appearing for examination & certification • No. of workshops organized for faculty to implement AICTE model curriculum. • Program-wise Industry Consultation Committee (ICC) consisting of Industry experts is available (Y/N). • ICCs have discussed on: • Examining AICTE model curriculum for its suitability of industry demand in ICC (December every year) ✓ Revision of curriculum ✓ Vetting of PEO, PO, CO ✓ Activities for industry institute interaction ✓ Guidance/assistance on internships and placement • Compulsory internship is included in the curriculum of all engineering degree programs in the form of credit course (Y/N). • Academic calendar prepared indicated completion of examinations in engineering degree programs before the end of April every year for allowing students to take mandatory internship in vacation (Y/N) • Institutions are instructed to Identify faculty coordinator for internship program (Y/N). • Discipline specific list of industries/companies/ organizations (small scale, MSME, large scale, Internshala etc.) is prepared (Y/N) • Instructed affiliated colleges to updating their website with all the details of students (contact info, CV, performance etc.) (Y/N) • Institute details and student profiles are communicated with the industries/ organizations/ companies (Y/N). • Sign MoU/Agreement with the industries for accommodating students of all affiliated institutions for internship (Y/N). • Organized awareness workshops for students regarding the different career paths (Y/N). • Arranged industry conclave for the students and faculty of affiliated institutions (Y/N).		

COMPONENT 1.2: Widening Impact through ATUs

MONITORING AND PROJECT OUTPUT/OUT COMEPARAMENTERS	GRADE	SUPPORT IN GEVIDENCE (Note: Grades must be supported by sound evidence of achievement of the institutional development proposal goals and targets)
• Percentage of UG students undergone internships spanning 4 to 8 weeks in industry (100%).		
Average of C		
D. Effort made by ATU for Increasing faculty productivity and motivation • Average percentage of sanctioned faculty positions in the affiliating institutes filled by regular or contract faculty in the affiliated institutes as per AICTE norms (1:20). • Visible efforts made by ATU for motivating institutions to fill up the vacancies (Y/N). • Percentage of faculty participated from affiliated institutions in annual refresher course training through, Pedagogy or leadership training through Swayam Prabha. • Percentage of faculty availed pedagogical training through Swayam platform (50%). • Percentage of Principals of the of affiliated institutions undertaken leadership training through Swayam Portal (50%). • Number of training programmes organized by ATU for faculty of affiliated institutions. • Number of training programmes conducted for staff of affiliated institutions.		
Average of D		
E. Effectiveness of equity at university level: • Transition rate of students (percentage) from the First to the Second year (without backlog) in Undergraduate programmes ✓ Total (77%) : ✓ ST (65%) : ✓ SC (65%) : ✓ Female (75%) : • Percentage of students from traditionally disadvantaged groups in total enrolment in the institute. (a) SC/ST (20%) : (b) Women (28%) :		
Average of E		

MONITORING AND PROJECT OUTPUT/OUT COMEPARAMENTERS	GRADE	SUPPORT IN GEVIDENCE (Note: Grades must be supported by sound evidence of achievement of the institutional development proposal goals and targets)
F. Twinning Activities: • The long term and short term twinning plan (action plan) with 1.2 ATU on activities is available and implemented (Y/N). • Credit transfer facility is created for 1.2 ATU through amendments in ordinances and vice versa(Y/N). • Assistance is provided to 1.2 ATU in formulating statute for autonomy(Y/N). • No. of students of affiliated institution of 1.2 ATU attended course/s at 1.3 ATU affiliated institution under credit transfer facility and vice versa (Min. 1 per program). • No. of Trainings conducted for 1.2 ATU functionaries on governance by 1.3 ATU and vice versa (Min 1 per program per year). • Participation of 1.2 ATU functionaries in Management Council/ Senate/ BoS of 1.3 ATU statutory bodies (at least 1 per body). • No. of Seminars/ conferences/ Conclaves and academic meeting conducted for 1.2 ATU affiliated institutions by 1.3 ATU (Min 1 per year). • Number of Seminars and learning forums conducted by 1.3 ATU for 1.2 ATU on Governance practices, university management, academic and non-academic reforms (Min 1 per year). • Assistance provided by 1.3 ATU in establishment of research hubin 1.2 ATU (Visible). • Assistance provided by 1.3 ATU for ordinances, statues, directions etc. to 1.2 ATU (Visible)		
Average of F		

Summary of Performance of COMPONENT 1.3: ATUs

MONITORING AND PROJECT OUTPUT/OUT COMEPARAMENTERS	GRADE*	Weightage%	Total Score (Grade x Weightage/100)
A. Effectiveness of funds utilized for the teaching, training, learning and research equipment, library, computers, etc. by Institutions		15	
B. Improvement in Teaching, Learning and Research competence of affiliated institutions.		20	
C. Implementation of AICTE mandate in affiliated institutions		25	
D. Effort made by ATU for Increasing faculty productivity and motivation		5	
E. Effectiveness of equity at university level		5	
F. Twinning Activities		30	
* **The grade for each parameter is calculated based on the average of all sub-parameters.**		**Average**	

ANNEX 8

AICTE 10-Point Plan

1. **Planning:** Perspective Plans will be prepared for each State in consultation with the concerned State Government for assessing the demand-supply situation projected for the next 10 years. This will be a guiding document while approving new institutions by AICTE.

2. **Selection:** The students for the technical courses shall be selected based on performance in the single National Entrance Examination for Technical Institutions (NEETI). The **All India Council for Technical Education Regulations for admissions in technical institutions through National Entrance Examination, 2017** is approved by the Council for admissions starting from academic session 2018-19. The Regulation stipulates single test, conducted multiple times, by an Agency authorized by MHRD; and bans conduct of such exam by any other institution or university or agency. This will ensure that the students taking the technical education courses possess minimum skills and aptitude required for the study.

3. **Induction Training:** Every student, on admission, shall be put through a mandatory Induction training to reinforce the fundamental concepts and the required language skills required for the technical education. The model curriculum and the periodicity of this induction training will be separately notified by the AICTE.

4. **Revision of Curriculum:** Every affiliating Technical University shall constitute subject-wise industry consultation committee (ICC) with the mandate of examining the existing curriculum and for making suitable changes in the curriculum every year. This process shall be completed in the month of December each year for the courses to be offered in the coming Academic year. Each institution, while applying for approval, shall certify completion of this process, which will be mandatory.

5. **Mandatory Internships:** Every student in technical institution shall do three internships each spanning 4 to 8 weeks before completion of the under-graduation. The responsibility will be on the institution for helping the students in finding suitable industry or organization for the internship.

6. **Industry Readiness:** All students passing out of the undergraduate courses shall be imparted technical and soft skills required for working in the industry encompassing- managerial skills, entrepreneurial skills, leadership skills, communication skills, team-working skills and technical skills..

7. **Promotion Innovation/start-ups:** There shall be efforts at every level for promoting innovation and creativity in the students. The innovation drives like Hackathon shall be promoted, so that innovative ideas would emerge that can be incubated in the start-up centres..

8. **Exam Reforms:** The final exams being conducted by the institutions shall test the understanding of the concepts and the skill – rather than the subject knowledge. A model exam format would be prepared and shared with the institutions and the technical universities for suitable adoption. This aspect would be reviewed at the time of approval.

9. **Training of Teachers:** Ever teacher in each of the technical education disciplines shall mandatorily undergo an annual refresher course delivered through SWAYAM portal, encapsulating all the major

advances in the field of their study. Online courses would also be prepared and delivered through the SWAYAM platform for improving the pedagogical techniques of the teachers. The participation in the courses by atleast 50% of the faculty would be a mandatory condition for approval of the institution. Similarly, there should be leadership training to the heads of the institutions once in 2 years. These trainings would also be hosted through the SWAYAM platform.

10. **Mandatory Accreditation:** At least half of all the programmes in the technical institutions shall be accredited through the NBA before 2022. Unless there is credible progress each year, the approval of the institutions can be refused. In order to assist the institutions in meeting the mandatory requirements for applying for accreditation, a separate mechanism will be put in place.

ANNEX 9

Performance Feedback Checklist

Key points fed back by the Performance Auditor to the institution at the end of the visit
Key improvements noticed on shortcomings reported during earlier Performance Audits
Brief statements on continuing shortcomings, and reasons
Recommendations for Mentors

ANNEX 10

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-III 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 time frame.

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: The mentor will address how well the institution is achieving its goals set out in the Institutional Development Proposal. 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 national apex 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, and any other of the key performance indicators set out in the TEQIP-III 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 at NPIU. 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 virtually in between sessions, as requested by the institutions.

9. **Q: What does a typical Mentoring assignment include?**
   A: Two full-day institutional visits for discussing/reviewing TEQIP activities and progress with the relevant stakeholders at each institution.

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 NPIU for monitoring progress.

PERFORMANCE 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. 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: What are Performance Audits under TEQIP?**
   A: The performance audit is 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.

3. **Q: What type of evaluation is done by Performance Auditors?**
   A: 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.

4. **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 KPIs.

5. **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, focused 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.

6. **Q: What is the utility of Performance 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 Audits are made at certain points in the TEQIP project – often referred to as 'dipstick' evaluations to monitor progress throughout the life of the project.

7. **Q: What are the deliverables of each Performance 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). 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 audits institutions in other states.
   - The mentor's report is not published but any part of the on- going 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
   - The values they uphold during their work
   - 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).