

Section-4

ELIGIBILITY AND SELECTION PROCESS

4.1 Participation:

The Project will support around 200 eligible Government funded, Government aided and private unaided Engineering Institutions from the selected States including Centrally Funded Institutions.

Institutions need to apply only for one of the 2 Sub-components—(either for 1.1 or 1.2.)

4.2 Selection of States:

4.2.1 Eligibility Criteria for Selection of States and Union Territories:

The States¹ will be selected based on merit of their proposals and on meeting the following Eligibility Criteria:

1. **Autonomous Status:** The Institutions selected to participate in Sub-component 1.1 have to obtain autonomous Institution status as per UGC norms to enable them to improve quality and relevance of the knowledge and skills of their graduates through betterment in curricula and assessment methods. The States need to issue orders to such project institutions to seek and obtain autonomous status as per UGC norms and procedures (refer Annex-II) before signing of an MoU with MHRD [refer Annex-III (a)]

Continuation of funding to any project institution beyond the second year of the Project will be subject to its obtaining autonomous Institution status.

2. **Decentralization of Financing Framework:** The States need to create an Enabling Financing Framework that decentralizes a reasonable share of financial discretion to the Institution's leadership to incentivize the Institution to increase its internally generated revenue, and to establish funds to allow for mid-term financial planning. The States need to:

- a) **Adopt a Block Grant pattern:** (as described in Annex-I) for fund release of at least the **non-salary non-Plan component** of grants to the funded (and aided as the case may be) project institutions. The funds' utilization is to be left to the decision of the project institution as it deems fit during each financial year to achieve its mission, respecting regular Government purchasing and accounting guidelines.
- b) **Retention of IRG:** Permit project institutions to retain and utilize the revenue generated, including 100% of tuition and other fee and charges from students without adjusting the revenue retained in their non-Plan grants.
- c) **Establishment of four funds:** Permit the funded and aided project institutions to establish four funds (as recommended in Annex-I), each in a separate Bank Account, namely the Corpus Fund, Faculty Development Fund, Equipment Replacement Fund and Maintenance Fund (for maintenance of buildings and equipment). The States in this regard need to:
 - Direct project institutions to build these funds with annual contribution into each Fund equal to at least 0.5% of annual recurring expenditure of the Institution, and direct each project institution to also additionally contribute from savings into the Corpus Fund;

¹ Throughout the PIP, the word "State" implies both the State Governments and the Union Territory Governments.

- Issue guidelines for proper management of the four Funds after closure of this Project.
3. **Filling-up the faculty vacancies:** The benchmark value for the faculty positions on regular full time basis for Institutions under Sub-components 1.1 and 1.2 are mentioned in Table-6 & 9 respectively. The States need to authorize each project institution to fill-up all faculty vacancies through 11-month or longer contracts till such time that these vacancies are filled-up on a regular basis.
 4. **Establishment of SPFU:** Establish an SPFU, located in the Department of the State Government responsible for **Technical Education**. The head of SPFU shall be the Director or the equivalent officer responsible for **Technical Education** in that Department and will be designated as the State Project Advisor (SPA). The SPA will be assisted by a Project Coordinator who will be an academician. Each State should be willing to take a decision not to transfer / change the SPFU officials for the duration of the Project.
 5. **Constitution of Board of Governors in each project institution:** Establish a governance model that will hold each Government funded and Government aided Institution accountable towards Government, civil society and Industry. In particular, the States need to constitute/ensure formation of a BoG in each project institution as suggested in Section-5 and Annex-II and ensure that the BoG meets at least 4 times in a year.
 6. **Reforms implementation:** Each State is to implement the Project according to the Project Implementation Plan. This includes support and facilitation to project institutions to implement both academic and non-academic reforms prescribed for implementation. (refer Annex-I)
 7. **Conduct of Pedagogical Training:** Each State has to ensure that each project institution gets imparted Pedagogical Training to faculty members. The benefit of the Pedagogical Training is also to be extended to faculty of non-project institutions on cost sharing basis.

Note: Release of the first instalment of Central Project funds to a State for its Institutions will be subject to receipt by the NPIU of the necessary documentation in respect of compliance with the Eligibility Criteria 1- and subsequent signing of MoU with MHRD.

4.2.2 State Selection Process:

The steps for the selection of States are as follow:

- (a) State Governments would be invited by MHRD to submit the State-Proposals in the prescribed format [(refer Annex-IV (A))] by a specified date. The State Proposal should contain:
 - Evidence that the State's participation in the Project is linked to its policy objectives for Technical Education.
 - Evidence that the State has identified, understood and discussed with key stakeholders (State Finance Department and affiliating Universities) the main steps and challenges for implementation of the required reforms.
 - Evidence that the State has a plan to sustain the gains of the Project after it has been closed.

- (b) Receipt of State Proposals by the NPIU.
- (c) Evaluation of State Proposals by a National Evaluation Committee (NEC) appointed by the NPD in respect of Eligibility Criteria, actions proposed and information as required in the prescribed format. Evaluation parameters are given in Table-5.
- (d) Feedback of NEC observations to the States for improvements in the Proposal (suggested by NEC).
- (e) Consideration of new and improved State Proposals.
- (f) Review and validation of NEC's Reports on State Proposals and its recommendations for State selection by the National Steering Committee (NSC).
- (g) Announcement of selection of States by NSC through the NPIU.

Table-5
Parameters for Evaluation of State Proposals

S. No.	Evaluation Parameters
(i)	Clarity and importance of the key policy objectives and challenges to enhance quality of Technical Education as whole in the State with participation in the Project
(ii)	Plan to implement increased academic autonomy to Institutions (for Sub-component 1.1) and establishing a Board of Governors
(iii)	Capacity and plan to implement the Enabling Financing Framework in consultation with the State Finance Department
(iv)	Plan and feasibility for sustaining the gains from the Project after Project closure

Note: The scheme for proposal evaluation is given in Annex-X [Table-43].

4.3 Selection of Institutions under Sub-Component 1.1 (Strengthening Institutions to Improve Learning Outcomes and Employability of Graduates):

The selection of Institutions will take place in two steps:

- a) *Short listing institutions based on Eligibility Proposals:* Institutions that had participated in TEQIP-I are not eligible for participation in this Sub-component. Solely for equity purposes, the NEC may recommend inclusion of Institutions from the new States lagging in Technical Education that do not adequately meet Eligibility Criteria, subject to the conditions that the Institutions: (i) are at least four years old, and (ii) show commitment to meet all the Eligibility Criteria for regular States during the Project period and to achieve all institutional targets (Table-30). New States lagging in Technical Education are objectively defined as those that either have only one Engineering Institution or less than one Engineering Institution per million population as per AICTE's approved list of Engineering Degree Institutions in 2004 and have not participated in TEQIP-I. These States namely are: Andaman & Nicobar Islands, Arunachal Pradesh, Assam, Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Jammu & Kashmir, Meghalaya, Manipur, Mizoram, Rajasthan, Sikkim and Tripura.
- b) *Selection of institutions based on merit of their Institutional Development Proposals (IDPs)*

4.3.1 Eligibility Criteria for Sub-Component 1.1:

Institutions to be eligible under the Sub-component 1.1 should fulfil the following benchmarks:

Table-6
Eligibility Criteria for Sub-Component 1.1

S. No.	Attainment Parameters	Benchmark values
1.	Agreement to implement all academic and non-academic reforms listed below: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Curricular Reforms• Exercise of autonomies• Establishment of Corpus Fund, Faculty Development Fund, Equipment Replacement Fund and Maintenance Fund• Generation, retention and utilization of revenue generated through a variety of activities• Filling up all existing teaching and staff vacancies• Delegation of decision making powers to senior Institutional functionaries with accountability• Improved student performance evaluation• Performance appraisal of faculty by students• Faculty incentives for Continuing Education (CE), consultancy and R&D• Accreditation of eligible UG and PG programmes	Yes
2.	Age of the Institution from the start of its first academic session (in years) <ul style="list-style-type: none">a) Regular Statesb) New States lagging in Technical Education	6 4
3.	Total number of UG and PG programmes currently conducted	4
4.	Faculty positions filled on regular full-time basis as percentage of the total faculty positions sanctioned in accordance with the AICTE prescribed student-to-faculty ratio	50%
5.	Presence of Board of Governors (as per recommended structure given in Section-5) with an eminent Academician or Industrialist as the Chairperson	Yes

4.3.2 Evaluation of Eligibility Proposals:

The Institutions are required to prepare the Eligibility Proposals in the prescribed formats [Annex-IV-(B)(a)(i)]. The evaluation will be based on meeting the Eligibility Criteria (refer Table-6) and Institutional capability to undertake key reforms (refer Table-7).

The steps leading to evaluation of Eligibility Proposals and call for submission of Institutional Development Proposals (IDPs) are as follow:

- (a) Advertisement will be issued in newspapers by the NPIU followed by State advertisement inviting Eligibility Proposals from Institutions in the prescribed format.
- (b) Only those Institutions that meet the minimum benchmarks for Eligibility Criteria should prepare and submit Eligibility Proposals to the State Department responsible for Technical Education (in most cases States Directorate for Technical Education, DTE).
- (c) Eligibility Proposals will be evaluated and ranked by the concerned Directorate and approved by the State Steering Committee (SSC). Only objective factors related to Education Policy are to be taken into account in this evaluation.
- (d) States forward the endorsed Eligibility Proposals to the NPIU.
- (e) New CFIs will submit the Eligibility Proposals directly to the NPIU.
- (f) Scrutiny of Eligibility Proposal as received from States, UTs and new CFIs by the NPIU for completeness.
- (g) Evaluation and ranking of Eligibility Proposals by the National Evaluation Committee (Evaluation Scheme is given in Table-7).
- (h) Ranking of all received Proposals will be done by the National Evaluation Committee (NEC) in two Groups (a) Proposals from new States, new CFIs and new lagging States in Technical Education (b) Proposals from old States.
- (i) Review by the NPD of the NEC's recommendations and short listing of Institutions from various States, UTs and new CFIs, for inviting to submit the IDPs.
- (j) NPIU will forward the list of the eligible Institutions to States and CFIs for invitation of IDPs. All the selected and non-selected institutions will receive feedback on their Proposals.

Table-7
Evaluation Scheme for Eligibility Proposals under Sub-Component 1.1

Evaluation Parameters	Evaluation Scheme
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality of SWOT analysis 	25
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarity and importance of the objectives and expected results for Institutional strengthening and employability and learning outcomes of graduates; and the link with the SWOT analysis 	25
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality and feasibility of the action plan to implement the institutional project, and the link with the objectives and expected results 	25
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation of reforms, capacity and plan for obtaining and effectively utilizing increased autonomy with accountability 	25
Total	100 Marks

Note: The full scheme for eligibility proposal evaluation is given in Annex-X [Table-44].

4.3.3 Evaluation of Institutional Development Proposal under Sub-Component 1.1:

The Institutions found eligible will be invited for submission of Institutional Development Proposals (IDPs).

The IDPs will be invited and evaluated in the following manner:

- (a) States invite IDPs from the eligible Institutions
- (b) States screen IDPs for completeness and short list the Institutions
- (c) States forward short listed IDPs to the NPIU
- (d) Eligible CFIs submit their IDPs directly to the NPIU
- (e) NPIU screens the IDPs received by a cut-off date for completeness (only the proposals found complete will be placed before the NEC)
- (f) Evaluation and ranking of IDPs by the NEC (evaluation scheme is given in Table-8)
- (g) Review and validation of the NEC's report on IDPs and its recommendations for selection and fund allocation by the National Steering Committee (NSC)
- (h) Declaration of selected Institutions to States with feedback to selected and non-selected institutions regarding the evaluation of their proposals. The selection of certain Institutions may be subject to a few mandatory improvements being made in their IDP.
- (i) Declaration of selected CFIs after signing of Memorandum of Understanding [refer Annex-III (b)].

Table-8
Evaluation Scheme for Institutional Development Proposals under Sub-Component 1.1

S. No.	Evaluation Parameters	Evaluation Scheme
1	Institutional Preparedness and Implementation Feasibility	
	• Overall proposal implementation feasibility, including its Implementation Plan and quality of expected results	15
	• Quality of SWOT analysis including links with the proposed action plan to mitigate Institutional weakness	10
	• Reasonability of proposed Budget	5
	• Engagement of departments/faculty in proposal preparation and implementation	5
	• Coherence of proposal with State's/Regional Development Plan	5
	Sub-Total (a)	40 Marks
2	Clarity and Quality of the Action Plan to achieve	
	• Autonomy, accreditation and implementation of reforms	15
	• Improvement in employability of graduates	10
	• Increased learning outcomes of students	10
	• Improvement in learning of weak students	10
	• Improvement in faculty qualifications including Pedagogical Training	10
	• Interaction with Industry	5
Sub-Total (b)	60 Marks	
Total (a+b)		100 Marks

Note : The full scheme for IDP evaluation is given in Annex-X [Table-45].

4.4 Selection of Institutions under Sub-Component 1.2 (Scaling-Up PG Education and Demand-Driven Research & Development and Innovation):

The Institutions will be selected from the selected States subject to their meeting the Eligibility Criteria and based upon the merit of their Institutional Development Proposals (IDPs).

4.4.1 Eligibility Criteria for Sub-Component 1.2:

Institutions to be eligible for participation in the Project under the Sub-component 1.2 must meet the following benchmarks:

**Table-9
Eligibility Criteria for Sub-Component 1.2**

S. No.	Attainment Parameters	Benchmark values
1.	Agreement to implement all academic and non-academic reforms given as below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Curricular Reforms • Exercise of autonomies • Establishment of Corpus Fund, Faculty Development Fund, Equipment Replacement Fund and Maintenance Fund • Generation, retention and utilization of revenue generated through variety of activities • Institutions to fill-up all existing teaching and staff vacancies • Delegation of decision making powers to senior functionaries with accountability • Improved student performance evaluation • Performance appraisal of faculty by students • Faculty incentive for Continuing Education (CE), consultancy and R&D • Accreditation of UG and PG programmes 	Yes
2.	<i>Availability of Academic Autonomy</i> *as recognized by UGC for both UG and PG programmes	Yes
3.	Presence of Board of Governors with an eminent Academician or Industrialist as the Chairperson	Yes
4.	Percentage of eligible UG programmes accredited or applied for	60%
5.	Percentage of eligible PG programmes accredited or applied for	40%
6.	Cumulative number of PhDs produced in the last three academic years (2007-08, 2008-09 and 2009-10) or Cumulative number of MTech produced in the last three academic years (2007-08, 2008-09 and 2009-10)	5 50
7.	Faculty positions filled on regular full time basis as percentage of total faculty positions sanctioned in accordance with the AICTE prescribed student-to-faculty ratio	65%
8.	Percentage of regular faculty with PhD in Engineering ² as percentage of total faculty	15%

² PhD in Engineering and Science for Special Category States

*Institutions that have already applied for Autonomous Institution status can also apply. However the selection of such institutions and consequent signing of MoU will be subject to the Institution having actually obtained Autonomous Institution status.

4.4.2 Evaluation of Institutional Development Proposal under Sub-Component 1.2:

Institutions meeting the above Eligibility Criteria are invited to submit their Development Proposals.

Institutional Development Proposals (IDPs) will be evaluated as per the following:

- (a) States invite through advertisement in newspapers for submission of “IDPs” from eligible Institutions [only those Institutions that meet the Eligibility Criteria should prepare and submit such Proposals] [Format given in Annex-IV-(B)(b)]
- (b) States screen IDPs for completeness and short list the Institutions
- (c) States forward short listed IDPs to the NPIU
- (d) NPIU screens the received IDPs for completeness (only complete Proposals will be evaluated)
- (e) Evaluation and ranking of IDPs by the NEC (Evaluation Scheme is given in Table-10)
- (f) Review and validation of the NEC’s report on IDPs and its recommendations for selection and Fund allocation by the National Steering Committee
- (g) Declaration of selected Institutions to States with feedback to selected and non-selected institutions regarding the evaluation of their Proposals. The selection of certain Institutions may be subject to a few mandatory improvements to be made in their IDPs.
- (h) Declaration of selected CFIs after signing of Memorandum of Understanding (refer Annex–III (b))

**Table-10
Evaluation Parameters and Evaluation Scheme for Institutional Development Proposals under Sub-Component 1.2**

S. No	Evaluation Parameters	Evaluation Scheme
1	Institutional Preparedness and Implementation Feasibility	
	• Overall implementation feasibility, including its implementation arrangements plan and quality of expected results	15
	• Quality of SWOT analysis including links with the proposed action plan to mitigate Institutional weaknesses	10
	• Reasonability of proposed Proposal Budget	5
	• Engagement of departments/faculty in the Proposal preparation and implementation	5
	• Coherence of Proposal with State’s/Regional Development Plan	5
	Sub-total (a)	40
2	Clarity and Quality of the Action Plan to achieve;	
	• Scaling-up research and innovation	15
	• Scaling-up PhD enrolment	10
	• Scaling-up enrolment into Masters Programmes	10
	• Research collaborative activities with Institution at National and International levels	10
	• Improving interaction with Industry	10
	• Improving faculty qualifications	5
Sub-total (b)	60	
	Total marks	100

Note : The scheme for proposal evaluation is given in Annex-X [Table-46].

4.5 Selection of Institutions under Sub-Sub-Component 1.2.1 (Establishing Centres of Excellence):

Only the Institutions, which have already been selected under Sub-component 1.2, can on invitation submit proposals for establishing one or a maximum of two Centres of Excellence (CoEs) for receiving an additional grant of approximately Rs.5.00 Crore for each CoE. Expected period for invitation from NPIU/MHRD is three months from the date of commencement of the Project. The Institution desirous of having two Centres of Excellence needs to submit separate proposals for each CoE.

4.5.1 Eligibility Criteria for Sub-Component 1.2.1:

Institutions to be eligible under the Sub-sub-component 1.2.1 must meet the following benchmarks:

Table-11
Eligibility Criteria for Sub-Component 1.2.1

S. No.	Attainment Parameters	Benchmark values
1	Availability of Academic Autonomy	Yes
2	Percentage of eligible UG programmes accredited or applied for	75%
3	Percentage of eligible PG programmes accredited or applied for	60%
4	Cumulative number of PhDs produced in the last three academic years (2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10) in the departments participating for establishing CoEs	12
5	Faculty positions filled on regular full time basis as percentage of total faculty positions sanctioned in accordance with the AICTE prescribed student-to-faculty ratio in the departments participating for establishing CoEs	70%
6	Percentage of regular faculty with PhD in Engineering as percentage of total faculty	20
7	Number of sponsored research projects completed in the last three academic years (2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10)	07

Note: The benchmarks prescribed for Sub-component 1.2 are deemed to have been met by the applicant Institutions.

4.5.2 Evaluation of Development Proposal under Sub-Sub-Component 1.2.1:

Institutions should submit proposals for establishment of Centres of Excellence (CoE) only if they meet all the above mentioned Eligibility parameters.

The steps for evaluation of these proposals are:

- (a) Invitations by e-mail to the Institutions selected under Sub-component 1.2 to submit proposals to NPIU for establishing Centres of Excellence in the prescribed format [Format given in Annex-IV-(B)(c)].
- (b) NPIU screens the received proposals for completeness.
- (c) Incomplete proposals will be returned to the Institutions.
- (d) Evaluation and ranking of proposals by a National Evaluation Committee (NEC) (evaluation scheme is given in Table-12), taking into account the suggestions from the domains experts (Indian & Foreign) and Indian Industry experts.
- (e) NPIU will send comments given by the National Evaluation Committee (NEC) to Institutions for improvements of their proposals.

- (f) The proposals ranked “Good” may be asked to make presentation before the National Evaluation Committee (NEC).
- (g) NPIU will send comments and recommendations from the National Evaluation Committee (NEC) to the National Steering Committee (NSC).
- (h) Selection of Institutions by the National Steering Committee (NSC) along with fund allocation.
- (i) Declaration of selected Institutions.
- (j) Improved proposals to be reconsidered through the same selection process.

Table-12

Evaluation Scheme for Development Proposals under Sub-Sub-Component 1.2.1

S. No.	CATEGORIES	MARKS
1	Institutional Preparedness and Implementation Feasibility	
	• Applicability of focussed research, commercialisation of research and preparedness for obtaining patents	15
	• Quality of researchers involved/ engagement of various departments and disciplines in CoE activities	10
	• Reasonability of proposed budget and administration of CoE	10
	• Coherence of the proposal with National / State / Regional development and its importance for development	5
	Sub – total (a)	40
2	Clarity and Quality of Action Plan	
	• Quality of Proposal with full justification including Gap Areas and innovative nature of Proposal	20
	• Synergies and benefits from collaboration with National and International partners	20
	• Demand driven, proof in terms of tie-ups / MoUs with Private and Public Sector Industry and obtaining deliverables from Institution-Industry Interaction	15
	• Scale-up PG education and improve quality of PG courses	5
	Sub – total (b)	60 Marks
	Total	100 Marks