
INDIA

TECHNICAL EDUCATION QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PROJECT II (TEQIP-II)

Implementation Support Mission

April 28 - May 2, 2014

Aide Memoire

I. INTRODUCTION

1. The World Bank team carried out an Implementation Support Mission (ISM) from April 28 – May 2, 2014. The ISM team (see Annex 1 for list of members) would like to extend its gratitude to Ms. Amita Sharma, Additional Secretary, Department of Higher Education, Ministry of Human Resource Development (MHRD) for her leadership of the TEQIP project and her guidance during the ISM. The ISM team would also like to thank the Central Project Advisor and his colleagues at National Project Implementation Unit (NPIU) for overall coordination of the ISM, especially in the preparation of various workshops (with SPFUs, CFIs, IIMs and IITs), informative presentations and proactive participation in discussions.
2. The objectives of the ISM were to review the overall progress of the project with Ministry of Human Resource Development (MHRD), National Project Implementation Unit (NPIU), State Project Implementation Units (SPFUs), and other implementing partners. The mission reviewed actions taken by the project as proposed in the Second Joint Review Mission/ Mid-term Review held in December 2013. Five half day workshops were conducted with SPFUs on Institutional Performance Assessment, role of Centrally Funded Institutions, Environment, Equity Action Plans and FM issues. The mission also met IITs and IIMs to evaluate the impact of their work on pedagogical and management training under the project as well as met with University Grants Commission to discuss the status of autonomy. In addition, a presentation to the ISM was made by the Administrative Staff College of India (ASCI) on the evaluation study of TEQIP II. (The full schedule is at Annex 2.)

Project Data		
Board Approval	03/18/2010	
Effectiveness	08/6/2010	
Closing date (Original)	12/31/2014	
Original Credit amount	SDR 186.4 m	US\$ 289.5 m
Revised Credit amount	SDR 134.6 m	US\$ 209.1 m
Amount disbursed (Apr 28, 2014)	SDR 30.5 m	US\$ 47.4 m
% Disbursed (April 28, 2014)	22.7	
Age of the Project	4.1 years	

Current Ratings	Last	Now
Development Objectives	MS	S
Implementation	MU	MS
Project Management	MS	MS
Procurement	MS	MS
Financial Management	MU	MS
Counterpart Funding	MU	MS
Monitoring and Evaluation	MS	S

Ratings: **HS**=Highly Satisfactory; **S**=Satisfactory; **MS**= Moderately Satisfactory; **MU**= Moderately Unsatisfactory; **U**=Unsatisfactory; **HU**=Highly Unsatisfactory; **NA**=Not Applicable; **NR**=Not Rated.

II. OVERALL FINDINGS

3. There has been significant improvement in project implementation since the last Joint Review Mission in December; this improvement is reflected in the upgraded ratings for

the project. The progress made against the Key Performance Indicators is especially welcome.

4. In December, there were four main areas of concern, and in all areas improvements have been made:
 - Data. The amount and quality of the data in the MIS is now much improved, with reliable data available across years, across all indicators and for almost all institutions. In addition, there has been a significant increase in the number of Performance Audit reports, which will enable these to be reviewed for information about progress at the institutional level. Finally, the ASCI evaluation is nearing completion. All these sources of information will significantly help the project agencies monitor progress and, especially, target support and capacity development to where it is most needed.
 - Faculty development/pedagogical training. The new approach to faculty development was embryonic at the last JRM. Since then, the work of the IITs, the QEEE program, and the activities institutions themselves have organized are giving a significant thrust to faculty development. The work of the IITs and QEEE was specifically reviewed during this Mission and found to have very high promise; these initiatives are likely to have a strong impact. It is therefore especially important to ensure effective reviews to learn what is working and why.
 - Fund releases. The Mission is pleased to see how much progress has been made on this issue, which has plagued the project from the beginning; and solving this problem is vital to continued acceleration of project progress. Only a small number of states are now taking unacceptably long to release funds, and MHRD/NPIU will be following up with these states.
 - Expenditure. Expenditure continues to show an upward trend, with significant procurement activities in the pipeline. The last two withdrawal applications received by the Bank show significant increase in expenditure compared to the previous period. However, institutions will continue to have to keep pushing hard to ensure all resources are spent effectively as well as efficiently.
5. The Mission notes the success of the latest round of Institutional Performance Assessment. This mechanism has demonstrated its effectiveness in spurring improved institutional performance. The Mission therefore recommends that further parameters are set for institutions to meet (see next section).
6. The Mission also is very pleased to see the continuing policy impact of the project, with more activities now challenging policy or capacity bottlenecks, increasing the pressure on decision-makers to address these hurdles. For example, since the last JRM the IIT and QEEE initiatives have found that institutions either do not have sufficient autonomy or do not exercise their available autonomy to make effective changes to curriculum, examinations and/or textbooks, let alone broader changes like student credit transfer arrangements which would allow students in TEQIP institutions to take courses at IITs. The longer these kinds of TEQIP initiatives go on, the deeper the policy implications of the project will become.

III. INSTITUTIONAL PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT

7. The Mission is pleased to see that MHRD/NPIU has effectively carried out the second institutional performance assessment of all TEQIP institutes based upon their performance on ten key parameters. The majority of institutes in the first cycle have

performed satisfactorily on 9 or 10 of these indicators (see Annex 3 for full details). Second cycle institutes, which received funds relatively late, have not been as successful in general. Nevertheless, there are cases of several such institutes having met more than 8 indicators. Institutes that have not met the targets have been asked to submit their plan of action for meeting the targets by May 15, 2014 to NPIU, and are expected to meet these targets by May 31, 2014.

8. The assessment process has had a clear impact on project implementation momentum. The data gathered has enabled the review team – and, more importantly, the project implementing agencies – to obtain a more objective view about project progress.
9. Institutes that have met 7 or fewer indicators will need close review. At this point, it is unclear how much of their poor performance is due to the institute itself versus the state government. In the case of specific second cycle institutes, it was noted that they had not received any funds in the previous financial year and hence requiring them to meet the condition of statutory audits was inapplicable. Importantly, it was also noted that certain states, namely, Chhattisgarh, Bihar and Punjab, have made slow progress. The reasons for this are not clear. It was agreed that MHRD would write to these institutions, and their respective state governments, and ask them directly if they wish to continue in the project.

Recommendations

- The Mission recommends that MHRD gives further releases only to those institutions which have met all 10 parameters, as notified to institutions previously. In the Mission's view, it is essential to give this strong message about expectations of institutions. The MHRD/NPIU should write to all institutions, informing them of the results of the performance assessment, using the updated information agreed during the Mission.
- MHRD also noted that Punjab had not released funds to two government institutes for approximately a year, and not responded to inquiries by NPIU. There should be no further disbursements unless this issue is resolved.
- MHRD should consider whether to provide additional resources (over and above the initial Rs. 10 or 12.5 crores) to those institutions which are performing well and could use these resources effectively. The previous JRM made a similar recommendation.
- A further set of performance parameters should be given to institutions, to be met by October 31st, 2014. This would enable the next review mission to take place in December 2014. These parameters could include:
 - i. Autonomy (applied for or obtained)
 - ii. Minutes of meeting of Board of Governors taking place in last 4 months published on the institution's website
 - iii. NBA accreditation (50% accredited or applied for)
 - iv. Statutory audit completed
 - v. Completion of a second Performance and Data Audit
 - vi. Completion of an initial governance development plan
 - vii. Commitment of 100% of funds received
 - viii. Expenditure of at least 50% of total funds received
 - ix. Procurement plan to cover 100% of planned procurement expenditures
 - x. Completion of all data input into the MIS for 2013-14.

- xi. Participation in CII-AICTE survey
- xii. Participation in TEQIP faculty, staff and student survey

IV. KEY THEMATIC ACTIVITIES

10. This ISM investigated in detail five specific issues: Autonomy, Faculty Development, Support to Weaker Students, Management and Governance and Management Information System. The following sections take each issue in turn and examine the current situation, outline the main issues and concerns, identify good practices that were found, and make recommendations.

A. Autonomy

Current situation

11. Autonomous institutions in TEQIP under a University will be able to exercise academic autonomy except for the award of degrees, which will continue to be conferred by the University. All institutions are required to have a Board of Governors. All powers for institutional management through exercise of the 4 autonomies (academic, administrative, managerial and financial) are to be vested in the BoG and will be exercised as per the Memorandum of Association (MoA)/Government Orders/Government Regulations. These important pre-requisites lay the foundations for many of the institutional development activities such as stronger institutional governance, teacher development, student support systems and strengthening of III. To date, however, autonomy is limited very largely to academic autonomy.
12. The table below gives an overview over the status of academic autonomy of TEQIP institutions as of December 2013 (the last JRM) and April 2014. Currently, out of 190 institutions, 115 have obtained academic autonomy, while 75 institutions are at various stages of processing their application to become academic autonomous institutions. 47 institutions have submitted their application to UGC and are awaiting its response, 19 institutions are awaiting their applications for autonomy at their affiliated university, and 9 institutions have yet to apply for autonomy.
13. Progress has overall been slow in terms of increasing the number of autonomous institutions from December 2013 to April 2014. Only 3 additional TEQIP institutions have obtained autonomous status from UGC. The number of TEQIP institutions that have yet to apply for autonomy have gone down from 14 to 9 institutions while the number of TEQIP institutions that are applying to their affiliated university also have decreased from 31 to 19. On the other hand, the pile of TEQIP institutions that have applied to the University Grant Commission (UGC) for autonomy has significantly increased from 33 to 47 institutions.

	Dec. 2013	April 2014
Participating TEQIP institutions	190	190
Autonomous	112	115
Pending applications for autonomy	78	75
• Applied to UGC, UGC assessment	33	47
• Applied to University, but not granted yet	31	19
• Yet to apply for Autonomy (2 nd cycle of TEQIP II)	14	9

Source: NPIU

Key issues and concerns

14. The JRM team met with the Vice-Chairman Prof. H. Devaraj at the UGC to discuss the issue of pending applications for TEQIP institutions that are seeking autonomy. Prof. Devaraj said that UGC will fast track the 47 TEQIP institutions' applications for autonomy within a month.
15. UGC has guidelines that have to be met to obtain academic autonomous status. Permanent affiliation status to a University and NBA accreditation are mandatory conditions for obtaining autonomy by UGC. These are the two main reasons for the relative high number of TEQIP institutions that have still not obtained their academic autonomy. An overview of the status of NBA accreditation showed that there are now 131 TEQIP institutions out of 190 (up from 119 in December 2013) that had obtained NBA accreditation or were in the process of seeking such accreditation. Progress has thus been slow in terms of the additional TEQIP institutions that have obtained NBA accreditation.
16. The Mission team believes that there are substantial benefits for the TEQIP institutions that obtain autonomous status if this autonomy is effectively used. Furthermore much of the progress anticipated in the Good Governance Programme as well as teacher development and leadership programmes are dependent on that TEQIP institutions gaining and using autonomous status.

Good practices

17. There is strong international evidence that good performing higher education institutions have significant levels of academic, administrative and financial autonomy. Autonomous TEQIP institutions have the possibility without seeking permission at their affiliated university to give students the choice to select multi-disciplinary courses either as electives and/or mandatory courses. The Quality Enhancement in Engineering Education (QEEE) is furthermore much easier to roll out at colleges that have obtained academic autonomy.

Recommendations

- NPIU should work case by case with the TEQIP institutions that have not obtained autonomy status and NBA accreditation in coordination with UGC and NBA. The mentors and the performance auditors should also take a proactive role in supporting

the institutions in obtaining autonomous status through the affiliated universities and SPFUs.

B. Faculty Development and Quality Improvement

Current Status

18. There have been important and very encouraging developments since the last JRM. The IIT and QEEE initiatives have taken off. Quality Circles/Knowledge Incubation Centres under TEQIP (KIT) have been started in earnest at 4 IITs (Kanpur, Bombay, Hyderabad and Madras); while IITs at Gandhinagar, Kharagpur, Delhi, Gowhati and Roorkee have also agreed to participate. The different IITs are offering a wide variety of activities – such as online courses, face-to-face pedagogical training, research seminars, curriculum development, etc. IITs can be seen as ‘academic mentors’ for TEQIP institutions. The offerings are driven both by TEQIP institutions’ demands and IIT faculty interests, thus ensuring that there are strong incentives for participation by both sides, and activities are subject- or topic-based. It is encouraging to see that different institutions are offering different options. To date, 550 faculty members have participated (according to data provided to the Mission).
19. Institutions also have been very active in utilizing their funds to support faculty development of various kinds; again, this heterogeneity is to be encouraged, since different institutions and different faculty members have different needs. The MIS records that, to date, 6160 faculty members have participated in these events. In addition, the Mission met with ICT Mumbai which has established a virtual ‘Innovation Networking’ of TEQIP institutions; which is a welcome initiative.
20. Mission members were pleased to see the QEEE program, led by Professor Jhunjunwala from IIT Madras, off to a promising start. The program comprises three types of activities: (1) Directly training students, albeit remotely; (2) Better teacher recruitment and training -- some of this will be done remotely, but some, such as mentoring promising students to take up teaching, will involve some time in IITs; and (3) Policy recommendations to improve accountability and transparency. A pilot of the student program, including 105 TEQIP and non-TEQIP institutes (the majority being TEQIP), has been completed. Of these institutes, 73 participated routinely and regularly. An action-research methodology, including student, teacher, and administrator surveys as well as discussions through video-conferencing, was incorporated into the pilot. The data from the study has been very useful in gauging areas of satisfaction among students, teachers and administrators as well as those needing considerable improvement. On teacher training, this component is expected to start in July 2014. A draft plan has been submitted by IIT, Mumbai. Regarding policy reform, an interim report has also been submitted.
21. The QEEE project holds considerable promise in terms of reaching quality education to students. It is a very exciting program for a number of reasons: (a) it allows the skills of the best faculty at the IITs to be available to students (and teachers) everywhere; (b) it is candid about discussing the findings, both favorable and unfavorable, of its surveys – this is excellent practice as it helps the program improve; and (c) it is based on a solid technological platform. It was decided that QEEE be extended for at least two years, with an initial size of 125 institutes. Prof Jhunjunwala has agreed to continue leading the

effort. MHRD also recommended that NPIU modify its website to allow interested teachers, regardless of which institute they come from, access to QEEE and all related material. It was further decided that the QEEE team work on a revenue model that allows interested private sector players to access the program. In the long run, such a model will contribute to its financial sustainability. The Mission supports all these recommendations.

Key Issues and Concerns

22. The activities related to faculty development are now also raising important policy questions, which is very encouraging as it deepens the engagement of TEQIP as a policy lever. For example, the IIT and QEEE initiatives have found that institutions either do not have sufficient autonomy or do not exercise their available autonomy to make effective changes to curriculum, examinations and/or textbooks, let alone broader changes like student credit transfer arrangements which would allow students in TEQIP institutions to take courses at IITs. These constraints exist even in autonomous institutions, because of the affiliation system; the situation is even more serious in those which do not have formal autonomy. IITs reported that a major concern they have is with the nature of the examination system in TEQIP institutions, which test only rote learning. Moreover, emerging constraints on effective teacher practice are frequent faculty transfers and the lack of effective academic leadership of institutions which focuses on improving teaching and learning (which links to the IIM training activities). It will be important to document these emerging challenges; and the QEEE work on policy reform is a good opportunity.
23. The diverse nature of IIT activities means that a single formal external evaluation would not be appropriate. However, the IITs agreed to develop a robust system of peer review to monitor and thereby improve their work. Similarly, the diverse activities means that detailed coordination does not make sense. However, the IITs agreed to put notices of activities online which would facilitate institutions to plan and participate in the most convenient activities.
24. The IITs agreed that their activities should cover faculty teaching both undergraduates as well as graduate students.
25. There are continuing concerns about the role of contract faculty in TEQIP activities and, indeed, in TEQIP institutions. Data reported to the JRM found that the overall picture is not as bad as some feared; only 15 percent of faculty are on a contractual basis (the Mission did not conduct a detailed institution-by-institution review). However, it is true that of these faculty members, slightly less than 2/3 have an MTech. degree compared with more than 85 percent for regular faculty. There is a concern that contract faculty are not participating (or perhaps being allowed to participate) in TEQIP activities. While some institutions may be concerned that these contract faculty will leave the institution and therefore 'waste' their TEQIP resources, it is likely that these faculty, if they leave an institution, will continue to teach and therefore their improved skills will still benefit students.
26. There are also concerns about faculty vacancies affecting the ability of institutions to improve their teaching. The lack of technical staff is affecting the ability of TEQIP institutions to maintain good quality laboratories.
27. A number of institutions reported to the Mission that they have Quality Assurance Cells (or similar bodies). However, these units seem to perform multi-various and different

functions, but the Mission is concerned about the effectiveness of these units given the larger concerns about the quality of education/teaching at TEQIP institutions.

Good Practices

28. In general the work of the IITs and QEEE shows promise of becoming good practice at improving subject, research and pedagogical skills and knowledge of teachers. What is clear already is that they are demonstrating good practice in reviewing and evaluating their work as they go along and being open to the possibility that some aspects of their programs might not work as expected.
29. The Mission was impressed by the seriousness and depth of stakeholder engagement by IIT Gandhinagar, as a prelude to the start of its activities. This enabled it to understand much more clearly the issues facing faculty, technical staff and students at TEQIP institutions.

Recommendations

- Contract faculty at TEQIP institutions should be able and encouraged to participate in these activities in the same way as their colleagues on permanent appointments. In addition, faculty at non-TEQIP institutions should be able to participate, where space permits.
- The Mission commends QEEE on its multifaceted approach to monitoring and evaluation through stakeholder dialogue. The Mission suggests that, in addition, it would be important to evaluate student outcomes (learning and employment) more rigorously, given the nature of its activities. In this way, lessons can be learned about the effectiveness of the program and the findings used in any decision to scale up.
- IITs should develop an annual peer review mechanism to assess and enhance the effectiveness of the quality circles. This mechanism should be agreed within 2 months.
- IITs should be encouraged to capture evidence about the impact of the examination system on teaching and learning, with a view to feeding into the policy discussions.
- The NPIU should organise a workshop on internal quality assurance mechanisms for improving teaching, learning and research in TEQIP institutions, with the view to reporting to the next Mission.
- The NPIU should conduct a review of faculty transfers at a sample of government TEQIP institutions, to provide some concrete evidence about the scale of the problem which has been highlighted in several Missions.

C. Supporting Students' Needs

Current status

30. The second JRM (and MTR) held in December 2013 noted that TEQIP institutes had, in general, been conducting remedial education classes, especially in the areas of language and communication skills. However, it noted that the transition rates of UG students were relatively low, especially for those from disadvantaged backgrounds. This review mission confirms the fact that the vast majority of non-CFI TEQIP institutes have provisions for

weaker and disadvantaged students as well as institute-level Equity Action Plans. CFIs, in general, reported to the Mission that they do not have such plans; many, however, reported that the state in which they were located had sub-plans focused on equity, and they did not want to duplicate those efforts.

31. The most recent data on transition rates received from NPIU shows improvement in transition rates, both for all students, as well as for students from disadvantaged backgrounds. It should be noted that the rates for 2010-11 and 2011-12 are different from those provided to the mission in December 2013. NPIU’s explanation for this difference is that more institutes have now submitted their data.

Transition rates of UG students from first year to second year (%)			
	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
All students	55.38	59.83	55.80
Disadvantaged students	53.13	56.97	51.74

Source: NPIU

Key Issues and Concerns

32. The key issues and concerns noted in the mission workshop include (i) inadequate staff/teaching resources; (ii) poor academic background of students in general, especially in the area of mathematics — students learn how to master the entrance test through coaching classes, but know little else; (iii) the reluctance of students to attend remedial classes either because they are held over the weekend or because they are worried about the stigma associated with being a remedial student (noted only in the case of a handful of states); (iv) weak ability to diagnose student learning levels and weaknesses at the start of the program; and (v) lateral entry of students.
33. The Mission was also concerned by the widespread assumption by institutions that students were wholly to blame for failing their courses. Only one CFI meeting with the Mission reported pedagogical training of faculty as part of the response to poor student transition rates and examination results (despite the fact that, amongst other things, all institutions also reported difficulty of faculty adopted new technology).

Good practices

34. A significant effort was made toward sharing best policies and practices through two regional conferences (in Tamil Nadu and Maharashtra). The conference organized jointly by SPFU Maharashtra and SGGs Institute of Engineering and Technology, Nanded in January 2014 resulted in the publication of conference proceedings, and provides detailed examples of best practice in various domains relating to meeting student needs. This is a commendable effort, and should be made available to all TEQIP institutes through NPIU’s website.
35. NIT Tiruchirappalli reported holding a month-long orientation program for new students, so as to ease their transition into the institution.
36. A number of CFIs were using peer tutoring (an approach also reported by the IITs), to assist students who need additional help with their studies. The CFIs reported good success, both for helping students improve, but also giving the tutors positive and responsible experiences.

37. In terms of their ability to diagnose student learning levels, while a number of states expressed this as an area of concern, where they would appreciate guidance, some states, such as Himachal Pradesh, West Bengal, Uttar Pradesh, and Tamil Nadu provided examples of good practice.
38. Some CFIs reported that they offer all their additional support services to all students, thereby avoiding the stigma of labelling students as ‘remedial’. For example, NIT Surathkal called its classes ‘FAQ classes’.

Recommendations

39. The recommendations made in the December 2013 JRM remain important.
40. This review mission would like to emphasize the following:
 - Systematically diagnosing the different needs of students when they enter an institute, and tracking whether mechanisms designed to address these needs are meeting their objectives. A number of institutes currently conduct diagnostic tests, but it is unclear whether their quality is suitable for the purpose they are being used for. NPIU, working with SPFUs, should organise a review of these tests and identify those that are most effective;
 - Institutions should consider using MOOCs and distance learning techniques to compensate for the lack of adequate faculty;
 - More sharing of good practices and challenges among TEQIP institutes. It is important capture this good practice in readily-accessible but also reliable and robust ways through documented evidence of effectiveness. The NPIU should prepare, with expert guidance as necessary, guidelines for documenting good practice.

D. Management Development and Governance

Current Status

41. The TEQIP Good Governance initiative was launched in March 2013. There are three key outputs expected: for institutions to undertake a ‘self-review’ of their current governance practice; from the self-review identify governance development needs; and finally to set out institutional governance guidelines that can be shared publicly and thereby demonstrate a clear engagement with governance implementation and development.
42. One hundred and sixty two TEQIP institutions out of 190 institutions have completed governance self-reviews. All TEQIP institutions in nine States (HP, Jharkhand, Karnataka, Kerala, MP, TN, Tripura, NCT-Delhi & UT Chandigarh) have completed their self-reviews. Several TEQIP colleges have done promising work, and very few institutions did not take this exercise seriously enough. The number of TEQIP institutions that have prepared their initial governance development plans has increased from one in December 2013 to 15 as of April 2014.

	December 2013	April 2014
Number of self-reviews	80	162
Number of governance development plans	1	15

Source: NPIU

43. Seven IIMs have been commissioned to undertake management development training for TEQIP-II institutions. In April 617 participants (up from 464 in December 2014) out of a planned 2268 have participated in training by five IIMs at a total cost of 497.77 Rs.Lakhs. Two IIMs have yet to start their training courses.

IIMs	Academic Year (2012-13)		Academic Year (2013-14)	
	No. of batches organized	Total no. of participants attended training	No. of batches organized	Total no. of participants attended training
Indore	4	77	5	129
Lucknow (Noida Campus)	2	50	7	163
Bangalore	1	40	-	-
Kozhikode	2	48	3	84
Trichy	-	-	1	26
Raipur	-	-	-	-
Udaipur	-	-	-	-
Total	9	215	16	402

Source: NPIU

44. The TEQIP Good Governance web-site has now finally been launched (<http://www.teqipgoodgovernance.in/index.html>). This will be an important tool for sharing good governance practices for TEQIP institutions and beyond.

Key Issues and Concerns

45. Almost 86 per cent of the TEQIP institutions have completed governance self-reviews, which is a significantly achievement. However only 15 institutions have produced a governance development plan and very few of them had produced a governance development plan with clear target dates and target outcomes. More work will thus need to be done in this respect by the institutions. BVBCET Hubli is the only institution, so far, to write an Institution Governance Guidelines Document as one of the two pilot institutions.

46. It follows that there is scope for continuing the Good Governance capacity building effort e.g. through support by the institution's Mentor to improve the self-reviews and drafting the governance developing plan with a key priority to give examples of satisfactory evidence and of drawing robust conclusions from that evidence. Furthermore, it was agreed that regional NPIU Good Governance workshops should be organized in October to share experiences across institutions as well as giving guidance for how they can improve their governance and management performance with participation of senior academics and staff from the TEQIP institutions, IIMs involved the management capacity building, and SPFUs.
47. The TEQIP review team met with the IIM Professors of Indore, Kozhikode, Lucknow, Raipur, Tiruchy and Udaipur who are delivering the leadership and management training under the Management Capacity Enhancement Program. Several key issues were discussed:
- The challenges of getting the “right” participants to attend the courses. It was decided that only VCs, Principals, Deans, Registrar, senior administrative staff, HoDs and former HoDs should attend the courses. This will be communicated to the TEQIP institutions.
 - Many senior teachers and staff lack elementary knowledge and understanding of governance and management concepts. Several of them have no clear notion of what institutional autonomy and accountability signifies.
 - Some of the CFIs informed that the management training provided by the IIM was not sufficiently customized to the needs of their institutions; and given their similar management structures and arrangements, a targeted program could be developed for them.
 - Several of the participants expressed that did not have many opportunities to practice what they had learnt doing the courses. This raises the question about how to improve the impact of the Programme.
 - Many regulatory issues such as a lack of academic, administrative and financial autonomy make it a challenge for many especially public colleges to significantly improve their governance and management performance.

Good Practices

48. For all institutions the need to improve their governance and management practices will be an on-going agenda, but there are some excellent examples of good practice as such the two pilot institutions COEP and BVBCET Hubli. Good governance is inextricably linked to good leadership and efficient management. It is therefore very important that the strengthening of the governance of TEQIP institutions through well-functioning BoG is linked the strong and qualified leadership and management capacity
49. There are many examples in TEQIP that hands-on institutional coaching, mentoring and systematic strategy development can improve governance performance despite the regulatory challenges that many TEQIP have such as lack of administrative, managerial and financial autonomy. However, all these initiatives would be more efficient, if there were less regulatory challenges. Case studies can help identifying the regulatory challenges and guide possible ways in which regulatory reforms can facilitate good governance performance.

Recommendations

- Regional Good Governance Workshops should be organized in October to share experiences and give guidance across institutions.
- To increase the impact of the leadership and management training, it is encouraged that the IIMs would follow-up with 1) hands-on institutional capacity building, 2) developing a standard questionnaire to participants e.g. 3 or months after the course to measure impact of the courses and suggest possible follow-ups; and 3) ask the participants to share their institution's governance self-assessment and governance development plan with the IIM on a continuous basis as this can form the basis for a dialog between the institutions and the IIMs.
- A range of collaborative initiatives in the Management Capacity Enhancement Programme should be organized such as 1) the development of a joint core curriculum on strengthening governance and management at TEQIP institutions across IIMs including through e-learning courses; and 2) drafting case studies that demonstrate how TEQIP institutions are seeking to improve institutional governance and management.
- Efforts to build synergies between the Management Capacity Enhancement Programme and the Good Governance Programme under TEQIP should be pursued. This should include the following initiatives: 1) the governance self-assessment questionnaire should be shared with IIMs; 2) the TEQIP Good Governance web-site can be used as a common platform; 3) the IIMs will be invited to join the planned regional workshops on the TEQIP Good Governance Programme where further synergies can be explored; and 4) coordination between the mentor activities and the IIMs' hands-on institutional advisory services to increase the value-added for the institutions.

E. Monitoring and evaluation

Current Situation

50. There has been substantial improvement in the area of monitoring and evaluation since the last JRM in December 2013. The mission is very pleased to note that 158 institutions are now reporting on at least 70% of the indicators. This means that it can be shown that the project has achieved many of the revised end-of-project targets as set in the last JRM/MTR. The mission commends NPIU in continuously carrying out its own assessment of the quality and quantity of data entry. Two large workshops on MIS conducted in March 2014 were attended by nearly 80 institutions – this has substantially contributed towards helping institutions in completing the data entry. NPIU needs to continue helping the few institutions that have not completed the data entry.
51. A total of 169 Performance Audits have been carried out with their accompanying data audits. This is a substantial increase compared to the figures reported in the last JRM (28). A meeting was held on April 3, 2014 to set the parameters for the review of Performance Audit reports to ensure that they are of acceptable quality before being sent to institutions and placed in the public domain. The meeting was attended by 14 experts and the criteria for grading were finalized in the meeting. Subsequently, 35 performance audit reports were sent for grading out of which 20 have been reviewed so far. These

reports have been placed on the NPIU's website. The mission is very pleased to note the candid feedback provided by the auditors.

52. As part of their work, the data auditors are also verifying the data that the institutions have entered in the MIS. Based on the information provided by data auditors, NPIU will need to follow-up with institutions to ensure that required corrections are made by the institutions in the MIS. The Performance and Data Audit system will meet its objective only if it is carried out to a high quality.
53. A statistician needs to be recruited by the NPIU to analyse the available data so that better project implementation can be done, identify standard reports which are useful to MHRD, institutions, implementing agencies and the public, and carry out data quality checks. NPIU has requested the Bank to help in drafting the Terms of Reference for hiring the statistician.
54. MHRD and NPIU have also initiated several other important monitoring and evaluation initiatives. The Administrative Staff College of India (ASCI) gave a presentation with preliminary results of an independent review of TEQIP. The evaluation study is based on interviews of senior management and a survey of staff and students in 30 of the TEQIP institutions. The Mission Team believes that there is now a lot of interesting data (including from the MIS) that can sharpen the evaluation of the TEQIP performance which is very useful for an efficient monitoring of TEQIP.
55. NPIU has furthermore engaged a company to conduct a large-scale satisfactory survey of all students, faculty as well as administrative and technical staff. A pilot will soon be launched and based on the lessons learnt the on-line survey will be rolled out in the 190 TEQIP institutions. The intention is that over time the TEQIP institutions themselves will be able to carry out these on-line surveys to guide them in their own evaluation and monitoring of students', faculty and staff satisfaction.
56. Solid monitoring and evaluation mechanisms are also being put in place for the recently launched 30 Centers of Excellence (CoEs). Each of the CoE will be peer reviewed on a continuous basis by IIT professors in specific research clusters. The Mission Team had the opportunity to participate in one such peer panel review discussion. The concept of CoEs as well as the peer review model seemed new to several of the TEQIP CoEs teams. It was difficult for the teams to formulate a strategic vision and focus of their CoEs and indeed for them to distinguish between the activities of the CoE and all the other research activities initiated in their Departments. It is therefore important that the peer review process for the CoEs is continued as it will be a very useful learning process for the TEQIP institutions that have received resources to build up CoEs.

Recommendations

- It will be very important for MHRD/NPIU to monitor the CoEs activities very closely through the peer review process being set in place. It is suggested that the peer reviewers should be given an important role in guiding the CoEs in focusing on a few research and technology problems that they seek to find solutions to through a well-designed research methodology. More emphasis for CoEs to work with research partners from other research institutions and companies should also be encouraged. A targeted dissemination strategy of the research results delivered should be developed upfront which would increase the sustainability of the CoE when the TEQIP funding is no longer available.

- NPIU uses the data audit reports received to verify the data in the MIS (by June 30, 2014)
- NPIU to ensure that the remaining institutions (that have not completed the data entry for 4 years) should complete the data entry (by June 30, 2014)
- NPIU to freeze the data in the MIS for 2010-11, 2011-12, 2012-13 (June 30, 2014).
- NPIU to freeze the data in the MIS for 2013-14 (October 31, 2014)
- NPIU to ensure that the reviewed performance audit reports are reviewed by experts on a regular, two-week cycle
- Bank provides draft ToR to NPIU to recruit a statistician (May 23, 2014).

The Results Framework Document is updated (as per Annex 4)

V. FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT AND PROCUREMENT (SEE ALSO ANNEXES 7 AND 8)

Procurement

57. The Mission noted that the participating institutions have developed good experience of working on PMSS and have good knowledge of Bank's procurement guidelines. To expedite the procurement activity, the application of the Bank's new business model in procurement for this project was discussed. After discussion with NPIU officials, the new, higher thresholds for different procurement methods are agreed to; this will reduce the number of contracts which require prior review either by the NPIU or the World Bank. In this regard, a separate letter from the Bank will be sent MHRD.
58. All procurement under TEQIP II is carried out through the PMSS. The mission noted that there is mismatch between the procurement figures reported in the PMSS vs. FMR. The reason for this gap is because the institutions are not reporting the payment details in the PMSS. Institutions need to take action to correct this in the PMSS.
59. Procurement planning has not been completed for Rs. 140 cr. Institutions need to include additional items (as required) in their respective procurement plans and request approval of the same from their respective BoGs. Further, the mission noted that procurement action has been initiated for approximately Rs. 600 cr, leaving a balance of Rs. 265 cr for which procurement action is yet to be initiated. Therefore, urgent action is required from all the participating institutions to initiate procurement action including adding new items in the procurement plan as required.
60. **Procurement Post Review (PPR) FY 14:** For the PPR FY 14, GPCL has conducted the review from March 18-22, 2014. The report is awaited from M/S GPCL. Once the report is received, it will be shared with NPIU for compliance of PPR observations if any.
61. **Complaint Handling.** The mission informed the procurement staff of NPIU about the mandatory requirement of Bank's review of the complaints and their resolution. Project should submit the details of procurement complaints, if any with actions taken on it for Bank's review and its closure.
62. The Bank team emphasised the importance of the institutions/NPIU submitting the final contract copy with check list for all prior review cases to the Bank.

Financial Management

63. Disbursement as on 30 Apr, 2014 stands at USD 47 million reflecting approximately 23% disbursement against an allocation of USD 208.63 million. This includes disbursement for the period till January 2014 and forecast till March 2014.
64. During the period of the mission, the Bank approved an IUFRR for the period February-March 2014. The IUFRR reported gross expenditure of INR 1234.2 million (approximately USD 20.5 million) and expenditure forecast for 3 months (Apr-June 2014) of INR 1020 million (Bank share 60% i.e. INR 612 million or approximately USD 10.1 million). Against this IUFRR, an application of USD 22.12 million is under process as per the Bank's client connection system. It was agreed that IUFRR for Apr-June 2014 would be submitted including forecast for Jul-September 2014.
65. Flow of Funds and Budget: MHRD released INR 3997.1 million to the states for FY 2013-14 against budget of INR 4000 million. As on 31 March 2014, cumulative total of funds released by the MHRD to states is INR 5416.9 million, out of which the states have released INR 4665.9 million i.e. 86% of the central share. The cumulative total of state share released to institutions till 31 March 2014 is INR 1521.7 million.
66. Since the last JRM, the NPIU has been closely following up with the states regarding the issue of delay in release of funds to the institutes. The mission noted significant improvements in status of releases to institutes by different states, which addresses what has been a major concern of the project for a considerable time. However, in Punjab, Andhra Pradesh and Karnataka, the issue of pending releases to institutes needs to be addressed immediately.
67. For 2014-15, information on budget provision by the states and the MHRD was shared with the mission and, in general, is adequate to meet the forecast of expenditure for FY 2014-15.
68. Consolidated Audit Report for the project for FY 2012-13 was submitted to the Bank. Most states have appointed auditors for statutory audit of FY 2013-14 but a few states have yet to appoint the auditors. Some states have submitted summary of internal audit reports to the NPIU for FY 2013-14. However, there are some states which have either not appointed the internal auditor for FY 2013-14 or in which internal audit has not started. The NPIU conducted Training of Trainers for SPFUs in April 2014 and training schedule for May-July was shared with the mission. The module of FM training by the NPIU has been shared with the Bank. A module for online training is under preparation. One post of Consultant-Finance has fallen vacant in March 2014 in NPIU.

Recommendations

- Punjab, Andhra Pradesh and Karnataka to take immediate action for long pending release of funds to institutes, and NPIU to inform the Bank about the status of releases of all states by 25 May 2014 which have not released funds for more than 50 days;
- NPIU to continue monthly system of monitoring of status of flow of funds, share the monthly summary with the Bank and revise FM indicators to include information on flow of funds;
- IUFRR for Apr-June 2014 to be submitted, including forecast for July-September;

- States to ensure timely completion of statutory audit for FY 2013-14 and availability of internal audit reports for 2013-14 for the statutory auditors;
- NPIU to complete training as per schedule and share module of e-training with the Bank; and,
- Vacancy of consultant finance at NPIU should be filled at the earliest in view of several key FM tasks to be completed in the coming months.

VI. ENVIRONMENT AND SOCIAL

69. Social: good progress is being made on the faculty and student survey. A pilot is planned in May, with 8 institutions; the first full round to be conducted in July.
70. Environment: Four regional workshops (dates as given below) will be organized with institutions and SPFU to discuss the implementation of EMF under the project. Institutions will need to draw their respective plans for implementation and NPIU will prepare/compile plans for the National Project Director and the Bank.
- Western Zone: To be held in Gujarat in May
 - Northern Zone: To be held in Haryana on June 10
 - Southern Zone: To be held in Karnataka in last week of June
 - Eastern Zone: To be held in West Bengal in last week of June.

VII. MISCELLANEOUS ISSUES

71. During the Mission, there were discussions between the MHRD and the Bank about a possible extension to the project, beyond the current Closing Date of December 31, 2014. MHRD informed the Bank that it had also discussed the issue with DEA. The Bank informed MHRD that it had not, to date, received any formal request for an extension. The Bank team also suggested that, were an extension to be granted, this would require a plan for action for the remaining project period to ensure sustained progress and agreement on revised targets.
72. The Project Implementation Plan has been under revision for a considerable time. In order to provide clear guidance to institutions, it is important that it is finalized quickly. The PIP needs to be agreed by MHRD and the World Bank.

VIII. STATUS OF ACTIONS TO BE TAKEN REPORT FROM PREVIOUS JRM

73. These are described in detail in Annex 5.

IX. NEW ACTIONS TO BE TAKEN FROM THIS JRM

74. These are listed in Annex 6.

Annex 1: Implementation Support Mission Team Members

Mr. Toby Linden, Lead Education Specialist and Task Team Leader

Mr. Kurt Larsen, Senior Education Specialist

Ms. Tara Beteille, Economist

Ms. Karthika Radhakrishnan, Operations Analyst

Mr. Satyanarayan Panda, Procurement Specialist

Ms. Asha Bhagat, Consultant, Financial Management

Ms. Neha Vyas, Environment Specialist

Ms. Renu Gupta, Program Assistant

Annex 2: Mission Schedule

April/May 2014											
Date	Meeting/Purpose	Participants	Est. Time	Meeting venue/Purpose	Participants	Est. Time	Comments	Meeting/Purpose	Participants	Est. Time	Comments
Monday	MHRD/AS	All mission members	2 hours	India Habitat Centre, New Delhi			MHRD				
28th April	- Orientation for mission members	+ NPIU									
	- Agree main issues for review										
	ASCI	All mission members	2 hours				MHRD				
	- Update on their evaluation findings										
	Project progress overview	All mission members	½ day				Might be necessary to have parallel session at NPIU to discuss fiduciary issues				
	- KPIs										
	- Institutional performance assessment										
	- Procurement – including spending projections										
	- FM – including fund flows/releases										
	- Action Taken Report										
Tuesday	Environmental issues	SPFUs/ environment	½ day	India Habitat	Selection of mission	Whole day	IIMs to be invited to	Padagogical training	Selection of	Whole day	IITs to be invited to

29th April	- Meeting with SPFUs to discuss the findings of the JRM	liaisons		Centre, New Delhi /	members		Delhi	with IITs and QEEE - Agree on how to evaluate the impact of their work	mission members		Delhi
	Equity Action Plans	SPFUs/Equity liaisons	½ day	IIM management training, including basic and advanced training; link to governance							
	- Meeting with SPFUs to review conclusions of workshops organized by NPIU in Feb/March										
Wednesday	FM issues	SPFUs/FM specialists	½ day	India Habitat Centre, New Delhi		Whole day					
30th April	- Meeting with SPFUs to review action plans to speed up fund flows			CFIs : - Review their role in the project across all aspects							
	Mentoring and performance auditing	SPFUs	½ day	- CFI Director plus Project Coordinators to attend							
	- Review with SPFUs to ensure they understand their role and set timetable for										

	completing PA visits										
	Project review with SPFUs										
	- General issues										
Thursday	Internal team discussions and writing aide-memoire						Additional meetings might be organized as necessary				
1st May											
	-										
Friday											
2nd May											
	MHRD						DEA to be invited to wrap up				
	- Wrap up										

Annex 3: Performance Assessment of Institutions (as of April 28, 2014)

				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
S. N.	Name of the State/UT	Category of the Institution	Name of the Institution	Autonomy (Yes/No) Yes = obtained or applied for	BoG (Yes/No)	MoM of BoG published on institution's website (Yes/No)	Governance Self Review Submitted (Yes/No)	NBA Accreditation (% accredited + applied for) (≥ 50% = Yes)	Statutory Audit (Yes/No)	Performance Auditing (Yes/No) Yes= Performance + Data Auditng	MIS Data Entry Status (Yes=Adequate, No=Inadequate)	Actual expenditure against 1st installment (≥ 60% = Yes)	Committed Expenditure (Yes/No) (Yes = 100% against fund received till 31 March 2014)	Indicators Met
1	Andhra Pradesh	Private unaided	Sree Vidyanikethan Engineering College, Chittoor	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
2	Andhra Pradesh	Private unaided	Aurora's Scientific, Technological & Research Academy, Bandlaguda, Hyderabad	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
3	Andhra Pradesh	Govt.	A U College of Engineering, Andhra University, Visakhapatnam	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	9
4	Andhra Pradesh	Private unaided	VR Siddhartha Engineering College, Kanuru, Vijaywada	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
5	Andhra Pradesh	Private unaided	Aditya Institute of Technology & Management, Tekkali, Srikakulam	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	9
6	Andhra Pradesh	Private unaided	Shri Vishnu Engineering College for women, Vishnupur, Bhimavaram	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
7	Andhra Pradesh	Govt.	JNTUH College of Engineering, Hyderabad	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	8
8	Andhra Pradesh	Govt.	University College of Engineering, Osmania University, Hyderabad	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
9	Andhra Pradesh	Govt.	University College of Technology, Osmania University, Hyderabad	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
10	Andhra Pradesh	Private unaided	Gayatri Vidya Parishad College of Engineering, Madhurawada, Visakhapatnam	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10

				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
S. N.	Name of the State/UT	Category of the Institution	Name of the Institution	Autonomy (Yes/No) Yes = obtained or applied for	BoG (Yes/No)	MoM of BoG published on institution's website (Yes/No)	Governance Self Review Submitted (Yes/No)	NBA Accreditation (% accredited + applied for) (≥ 50% = Yes)	Statutory Audit (Yes/No)	Performance Auditing (Yes/No) Yes= Performance + Data Auditng	MIS Data Entry Status (Yes= Adequate, No= Inadequate)	Actual expenditure against 1st installment (≥ 60% = Yes)	Committed Expenditure (Yes/No) (Yes = 100% against fund received till 31 March 2014)	Indicators Met
11	Andhra Pradesh	Private unaided	GITAM Institute of Technology - GITAM University , Vishakhapatnam	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
12	Andhra Pradesh	Private unaided	Anurag Engineering College, Kodad, Nalgonda	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
13	Andhra Pradesh	Private unaided	Chaitanya Bharathi Institute of Technology, Gandipet, Hyderabad	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
14	Andhra Pradesh	Private unaided	Gokaraju Rangaraju Institute of Engineering & Technology, Kukatpally, Hyderabad	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
15	Andhra Pradesh	Private unaided	Madanapalle Institute of Technology & Science, Madanapalle	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
16	Andhra Pradesh	Private unaided	Vasavi College of Engineering, Ibrahimbagh, Hyderabad	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
17	Andhra Pradesh	Private unaided	Vallurupalli Nageswara Rao Vignana Jyothi Institute of Engg. & Technology, Hyderabad	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
18	Andhra Pradesh	Govt.	SVU College of Engineering, Tirupati	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	8
19	Andhra Pradesh	Govt.	JNTU College of Engineering, Kakinada*	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
20	Andhra Pradesh	Private unaided	Malla Reddy Engineering College, Medchal, R.R. District, Hyderabad	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	9
21	Andhra Pradesh	Private unaided	Sreenidhi Institute of Science & Technology, Ghatkesar, Hyderabad	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	9

				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
S. N.	Name of the State/UT	Category of the Institution	Name of the Institution	Autonomy (Yes/No) Yes = obtained or applied for	BoG (Yes/No)	MoM of BoG published on institution's website (Yes/No)	Governance Self Review Submitted (Yes/No)	NBA Accreditation (% accredited + applied for) (≥ 50% = Yes)	Statutory Audit (Yes/No)	Performance Auditing (Yes/No) Yes= Performance + Data Auditng	MIS Data Entry Status (Yes=Adequate, No=Inadequate)	Actual expenditure against 1st installment (≥ 60% = Yes)	Committed Expenditure (Yes/No) (Yes = 100% against fund received till 31 March 2014)	Indicators Met
22	Andhra Pradesh	Govt.	University College of Engineering, Kakatiya University, Kothagudem, Andhra Pradesh	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	3
23	Andhra Pradesh	Govt.	JNTU College of Engineering, Pulivendula, Kadapa District, Andhra Pradesh	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	7
24	Andhra Pradesh	Govt.	JNTU Institute of Science & Technolgy, Hyderabad, Andhra Pradesh	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	NA	No	No	No	Yes	5
25	Bihar (State lagging in technical education)	Govt.	Bhagalpur College of Engineering, Bhagalpur	Yes	NA	NA	NA	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	5
26	Bihar (State lagging in technical education)	Govt.	Muzaffarpur Institute of Technology, Muzaffarpur	Yes	NA	NA	NA	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	5
27	Centrally Funded Institutions	CFI	ISM Dhanbad	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
28	Centrally Funded Institutions	CFI	NERIST Itanagar	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
29	Centrally Funded Institutions	CFI	NIT Agartala	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
30	Centrally Funded Institutions	CFI	NIT Allahabad	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
31	Centrally Funded Institutions	CFI	NIT Bhopal	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9

				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
S. N.	Name of the State/UT	Category of the Institution	Name of the Institution	Autonomy (Yes/No) Yes = obtained or applied for	BoG (Yes/No)	MoM of BoG published on institution's website (Yes/No)	Governance Self Review Submitted (Yes/No)	NBA Accreditation (% accredited + applied for) (≥ 50% = Yes)	Statutory Audit (Yes/No)	Performance Auditing (Yes/No) Yes= Performance + Data Auditng	MIS Data Entry Status (Yes= Adequate, No= Inadequate)	Actual expenditure against 1st installment (≥ 60% = Yes)	Committed Expenditure (Yes/No) (Yes = 100% against fund received till 31 March 2014)	Indicators Met
32	Centrally Funded Institutions	CFI	NIT Calicut	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	7
33	Centrally Funded Institutions	CFI	NIT Durgapur	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
34	Centrally Funded Institutions	CFI	NIT Hamirpur	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
35	Centrally Funded Institutions	CFI	NIT Jaipur	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
36	Centrally Funded Institutions	CFI	NIT Jalandhar	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
37	Centrally Funded Institutions	CFI	NIT Jamshedpur	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	8
38	Centrally Funded Institutions	CFI	NIT Kurukshetra	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	9
39	Centrally Funded Institutions	CFI	NIT Nagpur	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	8
40	Centrally Funded Institutions	CFI	NIT Patna	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	9
41	Centrally Funded Institutions	CFI	NIT Raipur (2nd cycle entrant)	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	4

				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
S. N.	Name of the State/UT	Category of the Institution	Name of the Institution	Autonomy (Yes/No) Yes = obtained or applied for	BoG (Yes/No)	MoM of BoG published on institution's website (Yes/No)	Governance Self Review Submitted (Yes/No)	NBA Accreditation (% accredited + applied for) (≥ 50% = Yes)	Statutory Audit (Yes/No)	Performance Auditing (Yes/No) Yes= Performance + Data Auditng	MIS Data Entry Status (Yes=Adequate, No=Inadequate)	Actual expenditure against 1st installment (≥ 60% = Yes)	Committed Expenditure (Yes/No) (Yes = 100% against fund received till 31 March 2014)	Indicators Met
42	Centrally Funded Institutions	CFI	NIT Rourkela	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
43	Centrally Funded Institutions	CFI	NIT Silchar	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
44	Centrally Funded Institutions	CFI	NIT Surat	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
45	Centrally Funded Institutions	CFI	NIT Surathkal	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
46	Centrally Funded Institutions	CFI	NIT Tiruchirapally	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
47	Centrally Funded Institutions	CFI	NIT Warangal	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
48	Centrally Funded Institutions	CFI	NITTR Chandigarh (2nd cycle entrant)	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
49	Centrally Funded Institutions	CFI	School of Technology-Assam University Silchar	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
50	Centrally Funded Institutions	CFI	SLIET Sangrur	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
51	Centrally Funded Institutions	CFI	ZH College of Engineering & Technology-AMU Aligarh	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10

				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
S. N.	Name of the State/UT	Category of the Institution	Name of the Institution	Autonomy (Yes/No) Yes = obtained or applied for	BoG (Yes/No)	MoM of BoG published on institution's website (Yes/No)	Governance Self Review Submitted (Yes/No)	NBA Accreditation (% accredited + applied for) (≥ 50% = Yes)	Statutory Audit (Yes/No)	Performance Auditing (Yes/No) Yes= Performance + Data Auditng	MIS Data Entry Status (Yes=Adequate, No=Inadequate)	Actual expenditure against 1st installment (≥ 60% = Yes)	Committed Expenditure (Yes/No) (Yes = 100% against fund received till 31 March 2014)	Indicators Met
52	Chhattisgarh (State lagging in technical education)	Govt.	Government Engineering College, Bilaspur	Yes	NA	NA	NA	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	7
53	Chhattisgarh (State lagging in technical education)	Private unaided	Rungta College of Engineering & Technology, Bilhail	Yes	NA	NA	NA	No	NA	No	No	NA (fund not received)	NA	7
54	Chhattisgarh (State lagging in technical education)	Govt.	Government Engineering College, Jagdalpur, Bastar	Yes	NA	NA	NA	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	7
55	Chhattisgarh (State lagging in technical education)	Govt.	Government Engineering College, Raipur	Yes	NA	NA	NA	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	7
56	Gujarat	Govt.	Government Engineering College, Bhavnagar	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
57	Gujarat	Govt. aided	Birla Vishvakarma Mahavidyalaya, Vallabh Vidynagar	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
58	Gujarat	Govt.	Government Engineering College, Patan, Gujarat	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	8
59	Gujarat	Govt.	Government Engineering College, Rajkot, Gujarat	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	8
60	Gujarat	Govt.	Shantilal Shah Engg. College, Bhavnagar, Gujarat	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	8

				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
S. N.	Name of the State/UT	Category of the Institution	Name of the Institution	Autonomy (Yes/No) Yes = obtained or applied for	BoG (Yes/No)	MoM of BoG published on institution's website (Yes/No)	Governance Self Review Submitted (Yes/No)	NBA Accreditation (% accredited + applied for) (≥ 50% = Yes)	Statutory Audit (Yes/No)	Performance Auditing (Yes/No) Yes= Performance + Data Auditng	MIS Data Entry Status (Yes= Adequate, No= Inadequate)	Actual expenditure against 1st installment (≥ 60% = Yes)	Committed Expenditure (Yes/No) (Yes = 100% against fund received till 31 March 2014)	Indicators Met
61	Gujarat	Govt.	Lukhidhirji Engg. College, Morbi, Gujarat	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	8
62	Gujarat	Govt.	Government Engineering College, Gandhinagar, Gujarat	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	8
63	Haryana	Govt.	University Institute of Engineering & Technology, MDU, Rohtak	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
64	Haryana	Private unaided	N.C College of Engineering, Panipat	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
65	Haryana	Govt. aided	Faculty of Engineering & Technology, Guru Jambheshwar University of Science & Technology, Hissar	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
66	Haryana	Govt.	Faculty of Science, Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
67	Haryana	Govt.	University Institute of Engineering & Technology (UIET), Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
68	Haryana	Govt.	Faculty of Engineering & Technology, Deenbandhu Chhotu Ram University of Science & Technology, Murthal, Sonapat	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	7
69	Himachal Pradesh	Govt.	Jawaharlal Nehru Government Engineering College, Sundernagar, Mandi	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10

				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
S. N.	Name of the State/UT	Category of the Institution	Name of the Institution	Autonomy (Yes/No) Yes = obtained or applied for	BoG (Yes/No)	MoM of BoG published on institution's website (Yes/No)	Governance Self Review Submitted (Yes/No)	NBA Accreditation (% accredited + applied for) (≥ 50% = Yes)	Statutory Audit (Yes/No)	Performance Auditing (Yes/No) Yes= Performance + Data Auditng	MIS Data Entry Status (Yes= Adequate, No= Inadequate)	Actual expenditure against 1st installment (≥ 60% = Yes)	Committed Expenditure (Yes/No) (Yes = 100% against fund received till 31 March 2014)	Indicators Met
70	Jharkhand	Govt. aided	BIT, Mesra Ranchi	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
71	Jharkhand	Private unaided	Cambridge Institute of Technology, Ranchi	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
72	Karnataka	Private unaided	Siddhaganga Institute of Technology, Tumkur, Karnataka	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
73	Karnataka	Govt. aided	Dr. Ambedkar Institute of Technology, Bangalore	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
74	Karnataka	Private unaided	Nitte Meenakshi Institute of Technology (NMIT)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
75	Karnataka	Govt.	University Visvesvaraya College of Engg., Bangalore	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
76	Karnataka	Govt. aided	BVB College of Engineering & Technology	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
77	Karnataka	Govt. aided	National Institute of Engineering, Mysore	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
78	Karnataka	Govt. aided	Malnad College of Engineering, Hassan, Karnataka	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
79	Karnataka	Govt. aided	BMS College of Engineering, Bangalore, Karnataka	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10

				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
S. N.	Name of the State/UT	Category of the Institution	Name of the Institution	Autonomy (Yes/No) Yes = obtained or applied for	BoG (Yes/No)	MoM of BoG published on institution's website (Yes/No)	Governance Self Review Submitted (Yes/No)	NBA Accreditation (% accredited + applied for) (≥ 50% = Yes)	Statutory Audit (Yes/No)	Performance Auditing (Yes/No) Yes= Performance + Data Auditing	MIS Data Entry Status (Yes= Adequate, No= Inadequate)	Actual expenditure against 1st installment (≥ 60% = Yes)	Committed Expenditure (Yes/No) (Yes = 100% against fund received till 31 March 2014)	Indicators Met
80	Karnataka	Govt. aided	Sri Siddhartha Institute of Technology, Tumkur	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
81	Karnataka	Govt. aided	Basaveshwar Engineering College (Autonomous) Bagalkot	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
82	Karnataka	Govt. aided	PES college of engineering Mandya	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
83	Karnataka	Govt. aided	Sri Jayachamarajendra College of Engineering, Mysore	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
84	Karnataka	Private unaided	PES institute of technology, Bangalore	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
85	Karnataka	Private unaided	PDA College of Engineering, Gulbarga	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
86	Karnataka	Private unaided	MS Ramaiah Institute of Technology, Bangalore	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	9
87	Karnataka	Private unaided	SDM College of Engineering and Technology, Dhalavagiri, Dharwad	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
88	Karnataka	Govt.	Sri Krishnarajendra Silver Jubilee Technological Institute (SKSJTI)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
89	Karnataka	Private unaided	R.V. College of Engineering (RVCE), Bangalore	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10

				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
S. N.	Name of the State/UT	Category of the Institution	Name of the Institution	Autonomy (Yes/No) Yes = obtained or applied for	BoG (Yes/No)	MoM of BoG published on institution's website (Yes/No)	Governance Self Review Submitted (Yes/No)	NBA Accreditation (% accredited + applied for) (≥ 50% = Yes)	Statutory Audit (Yes/No)	Performance Auditing (Yes/No) Yes= Performance + Data Auditng	MIS Data Entry Status (Yes= Adequate, No= Inadequate)	Actual expenditure against 1st installment (≥ 60% = Yes)	Committed Expenditure (Yes/No) (Yes = 100% against fund received till 31 March 2014)	Indicators Met
90	Karnataka	Private unaided	NMAM Institute of Technology, Nitte	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
91	Kerala	Govt.	Rajiv Gandhi Institute of Technology, Kottayam	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
92	Kerala	Govt.	Government College of Engineering, Kannur	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
93	Kerala	Govt.	Government Engineering College, Thrissur	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
94	Kerala	Govt.	Government Engineering College, Kozhikode	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
95	Kerala	Govt.	Government Engineering College, Painavu, Idukki	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
96	Kerala	Govt.	School of Engineering, Cochin University of Science & Technology, Cochin	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
97	Kerala	Govt.	Government Engineering College, Bartonhill, Thiruvananthapuram	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
98	Kerala	Govt.	LBS Institute of Technology for Women, Poojappura, Thiruvananthapuram	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
99	Kerala	Govt.	College of Engineering Perumon, Perinad, Kollam	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10

				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
S. N.	Name of the State/UT	Category of the Institution	Name of the Institution	Autonomy (Yes/No) Yes = obtained or applied for	BoG (Yes/No)	MoM of BoG published on institution's website (Yes/No)	Governance Self Review Submitted (Yes/No)	NBA Accreditation (% accredited + applied for) (≥ 50% = Yes)	Statutory Audit (Yes/No)	Performance Auditing (Yes/No) Yes= Performance + Data Auditng	MIS Data Entry Status (Yes=Adequate, No=Inadequate)	Actual expenditure against 1st installment (≥ 60% = Yes)	Committed Expenditure (Yes/No) (Yes = 100% against fund received till 31 March 2014)	Indicators Met
100	Kerala	Govt. aided	Cooperative Institute of Technology, Vadakara, Kozhikode	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
101	Kerala	Govt.	College of Engineering Trikaripur, Cheemeni, Kasargod	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
102	Kerala	Govt.	College of Engineering Thalassery, Kannur	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
103	Kerala	Govt.	College of Engineering, Kidangoor, Kottayam	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
104	Kerala	Govt.	Government Engineering. College, wayanad Thalappuzha, Kerala	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
105	Kerala	Govt.	Thangal Kunju Musaliar College of Engineering, Karicode,	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
106	Kerala	Govt.	Government Engineering. College, Sreekrishnapuram, Kerala	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
107	Kerala	Govt.	College of Engineering, Adoor, Manakkala, Kerala	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
108	Kerala	Govt.	College of Engineering, Karunagappally, Thodiyoor, Kollam, Kerala	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
109	Kerala	Govt.	College of Engineering, Cherthala, Pallippuram, Alappuzha, Kerala	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10

				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
S. N.	Name of the State/UT	Category of the Institution	Name of the Institution	Autonomy (Yes/No) Yes = obtained or applied for	BoG (Yes/No)	MoM of BoG published on institution's website (Yes/No)	Governance Self Review Submitted (Yes/No)	NBA Accreditation (% accredited + applied for) (≥ 50% = Yes)	Statutory Audit (Yes/No)	Performance Auditing (Yes/No) Yes= Performance + Data Auditing	MIS Data Entry Status (Yes=Adequate, No=Inadequate)	Actual expenditure against 1st installment (≥ 60% = Yes)	Committed Expenditure (Yes/No) (Yes = 100% against fund received till 31 March 2014)	Indicators Met
110	Madhya Pradesh	Govt. aided	Samrat Ashok Technological Institute (Engineering College), Vidisha	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
111	Madhya Pradesh	Private unaided	Sagar Institute of Research & Technology, Bhopal	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	9
112	Madhya Pradesh	Govt. aided	Madhav Institute of Technology & Science, Gwalior	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
113	Madhya Pradesh	Govt. aided	Rajiv Gandhi Pradyogiki Vishwavidhyalaya, Bhopal	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	8
114	Madhya Pradesh	Govt. aided	Shri GS Institute of Technology & Science, Indore	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	6
115	Maharashtra	Govt. aided	Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Technological University, Lonere, Raigad	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
116	Maharashtra	Govt.	College of Engineering, Shivajinagar, Pune	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
117	Maharashtra	Govt. aided	Shri Guru Gobind Singhji Institute of Engineering & Technology, Nanded	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
118	Maharashtra	Govt. aided	Walchand College of Engineering, Sangli	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
119	Maharashtra	Govt. aided	BVB's Sardar Patel College of Engineering, Mumbai	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10

				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
S. N.	Name of the State/UT	Category of the Institution	Name of the Institution	Autonomy (Yes/No) Yes = obtained or applied for	BoG (Yes/No)	MoM of BoG published on institution's website (Yes/No)	Governance Self Review Submitted (Yes/No)	NBA Accreditation (% accredited + applied for) (≥ 50% = Yes)	Statutory Audit (Yes/No)	Performance Auditing (Yes/No) Yes= Performance + Data Auditng	MIS Data Entry Status (Yes= Adequate, No= Inadequate)	Actual expenditure against 1st installment (≥ 60% = Yes)	Committed Expenditure (Yes/No) (Yes = 100% against fund received till 31 March 2014)	Indicators Met
120	Maharashtra	Govt.	Govt. College of Engineering, Aurangabad	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
121	Maharashtra	Govt. aided	Veermata Jijabai Technological Institute, Matunga, Mumbai	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
122	Maharashtra	Govt.	Government College of Engineering, Jalgaon	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	9
123	Maharashtra	Govt.	Govt. College of Engineering, Amravati	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
124	Maharashtra	Govt.	Government College of Engineering, Karad	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
125	Maharashtra	Private unaided	Rajarambapu Institute of Technology, Islampur, Sangli	Yes	yes	yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
126	Maharashtra	Govt. aided	Institute of Chemical Technology, Matunga, Mumbai	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
127	Maharashtra	Private unaided	Bharati Vidyapeeth University, College of Engineering, Pune	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
128	Maharashtra	Private unaided	GH Rasoni College of Engineering, Nagpur	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
129	Maharashtra	Govt.	Government College of Engineering, Chandrapur	Yes	yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10

				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
S. N.	Name of the State/UT	Category of the Institution	Name of the Institution	Autonomy (Yes/No) Yes = obtained or applied for	BoG (Yes/No)	MoM of BoG published on institution's website (Yes/No)	Governance Self Review Submitted (Yes/No)	NBA Accreditation (% accredited + applied for) (≥ 50% = Yes)	Statutory Audit (Yes/No)	Performance Auditing (Yes/No) Yes= Performance + Data Auditng	MIS Data Entry Status (Yes= Adequate, No= Inadequate)	Actual expenditure against 1st installment (≥ 60% = Yes)	Committed Expenditure (Yes/No) (Yes = 100% against fund received till 31 March 2014)	Indicators Met
130	Maharashtra	Govt.	Department of Technology, Shivaji University, Kolhapur, Maharashtra	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
131	Maharashtra	Govt.	Department of Chemical Technology, North Maharashtra University, Jalgaon, Maharashtra	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
132	NCT-Delhi	Govt.	Delhi Technological University, Delhi	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	NA	No	No	No	No	4
133	Odisha	Govt.	College of Engineering & Technology, Bhubaneswar	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
134	Odisha	Govt.	Veer Surendra Sai University of Technology, Burla, Sambalpur	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	7
135	Punjab	Govt. aided	Thapar University, Patiala, Punjab	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
136	Punjab	Govt. aided	Guru Nanak Dev Engineering College, Ludhiana, Punjab	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
137	Punjab	Govt. aided	SBS College of Engineering & Technology, Ferozpur, Punjab	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
138	Punjab	Private unaided	Chandigarh Engineering College, Mohali, Punjab	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
139	Punjab	Govt. aided	Beant College of Engineering Technology, Gurdaspur, Punjab	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
140	Punjab	Govt.	GZS-PTU, Bhatinda, Punjab	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	9

				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
S. N.	Name of the State/UT	Category of the Institution	Name of the Institution	Autonomy (Yes/No) Yes = obtained or applied for	BoG (Yes/No)	MoM of BoG published on institution's website (Yes/No)	Governance Self Review Submitted (Yes/No)	NBA Accreditation (% accredited + applied for) (≥ 50% = Yes)	Statutory Audit (Yes/No)	Performance Auditing (Yes/No) Yes= Performance + Data Auditng	MIS Data Entry Status (Yes= Adequate, No= Inadequate)	Actual expenditure against 1st installment (≥ 60% = Yes)	Committed Expenditure (Yes/No) (Yes = 100% against fund received till 31 March 2014)	Indicators Met
141	Punjab	Govt.	College of Agriculture Engineering and Technology, Punjab Agriculture University, Ludhiana, Punjab	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	NA	No	No	NA (fund not received)	NA	6
142	Punjab	Govt.	Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar, Punjab	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	NA	No	No	NA (fund not received)	Na	6
143	Rajasthan (State lagging in technical education)	Private unaided	Institute of Engineering & Technology, Alwar, Rajasthan	Yes	NA	NA	NA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	9
144	Rajasthan (State lagging in technical education)	Govt.	Govt. Engineering College, Bikaner, Rajasthan	Yes	NA	NA	NA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	8
145	Rajasthan (State lagging in technical education)	Govt.	M L V Textile & Engineering College, Bhilwara, Rajasthan	Yes	NA	NA	NA	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	7
146	Rajasthan (State lagging in technical education)	Govt.	College of Technology and Engineering, Maharana Pratap University of Agriculture and Technology, Udaipur, Rajasthan	Yes	NA	NA	NA	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	5
147	Rajasthan (State lagging in technical education)	Govt.	University College of Engineering, RTU, Kota, Rajasthan	Yes	NA	NA	NA	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
148	Rajasthan (State lagging in technical education)	Govt.	Govt Engineering College, Ajmer, Rajasthan	Yes	NA	NA	NA	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	7

				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
S. N.	Name of the State/UT	Category of the Institution	Name of the Institution	Autonomy (Yes/No) Yes = obtained or applied for	BoG (Yes/No)	MoM of BoG published on institution's website (Yes/No)	Governance Self Review Submitted (Yes/No)	NBA Accreditation (% accredited + applied for) (≥ 50% = Yes)	Statutory Audit (Yes/No)	Performance Auditing (Yes/No) Yes= Performance + Data Auditng	MIS Data Entry Status (Yes= Adequate, No= Inadequate)	Actual expenditure against 1st installment (≥ 60% = Yes)	Committed Expenditure (Yes/No) (Yes = 100% against fund received till 31 March 2014)	Indicators Met
149	Rajasthan (State lagging in technical education)	Govt.	College of Engineering and Technology, Bikaner, Rajasthan	No	NA	NA	NA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
150	Rajasthan (State lagging in technical education)	Govt.	Government Women Engineering College, Ajmer, Rajasthan	No	NA	NA	NA	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	4
151	Rajasthan (State lagging in technical education)	Govt.	Government Engineering College, Jhalawar, Rajasthan	No	NA	NA	NA	No	No	No	No	No	No	3
152	Tamil Nadu	Govt.	Govt. College of Engineering, Baragur, Krishnagiri	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
153	Tamil Nadu	Govt.	Govt. College of Technology, Coimbatore	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
154	Tamil Nadu	Govt.	Alagappa Chettiar College of Engineering and Technology, Karaikudi	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
155	Tamil Nadu	Govt.	Government College of Engineering, Salem	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
156	Tamil Nadu	Govt.	Manonmaniam Sundaranar University, Abishekapatti, Tirunelveli	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
157	Tamil Nadu	Govt.	Thiagaraja College of Engineering, Madurai, Tamil Nadu	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
158	Tamil Nadu	Govt.	P.S.G College of Technology, Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
159	Tamil Nadu	Govt.	Bharathidasan Institute of Technology Campus, Trichirapalli, Tamil Nadu	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9

				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
S. N.	Name of the State/UT	Category of the Institution	Name of the Institution	Autonomy (Yes/No) Yes = obtained or applied for	BoG (Yes/No)	MoM of BoG published on institution's website (Yes/No)	Governance Self Review Submitted (Yes/No)	NBA Accreditation (% accredited + applied for) (≥ 50% = Yes)	Statutory Audit (Yes/No)	Performance Auditing (Yes/No) Yes= Performance + Data Auditng	MIS Data Entry Status (Yes=Adequate, No=Inadequate)	Actual expenditure against 1st installment (≥ 60% = Yes)	Committed Expenditure (Yes/No) (Yes = 100% against fund received till 31 March 2014)	Indicators Met
160	Tamil Nadu	Govt.	Coimbatore Institute of Technology, Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
161	Tripura	Govt.	Tripura Institute of Technology, Narsingarh, Tripura	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	NA	No	Yes	No	No	5
162	UT- Chandigarh	Govt.	PEC University of Technology, Chandigarh	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
163	UT- Chandigarh	Govt.	University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Chandigarh	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
164	UT- Chandigarh	Govt.	Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering and Technology UICET), Punjab University, Chandigarh, UT- Chandigarh	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	7
165	UT- Puducherry	Govt.	Pondicherry Engineering College, Puducherry	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
166	Uttar Pradesh	Govt.	Institute of Engineering & Technology, Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
167	Uttar Pradesh	Govt.	Madan Mohan Malviya Engineering College, Gorakhpur, Uttar Pradesh	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
168	Uttar Pradesh	Private unaided	School of Engineering & Technology, IFTM University, Lodhipur Moradabad, Uttar Pradesh	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	9
169	Uttar Pradesh	Govt. aided	Harcourt Butler Technological Institute, (HBTI), Kanpur, Uttar Pradesh	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10

				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
S. N.	Name of the State/UT	Category of the Institution	Name of the Institution	Autonomy (Yes/No) Yes = obtained or applied for	BoG (Yes/No)	MoM of BoG published on institution's website (Yes/No)	Governance Self Review Submitted (Yes/No)	NBA Accreditation (% accredited + applied for) (≥ 50% = Yes)	Statutory Audit (Yes/No)	Performance Auditing (Yes/No) Yes= Performance + Data Auditing	MIS Data Entry Status (Yes=Adequate, No=Inadequate)	Actual expenditure against 1st installment (≥ 60% = Yes)	Committed Expenditure (Yes/No) (Yes = 100% against fund received till 31 March 2014)	Indicators Met
170	Uttar Pradesh	Govt. aided	Faculty of Engineering and Technology, M.J.P. Rohilkhand University, Bareilly, Uttar Pradesh	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
171	Uttar Pradesh	Govt. aided	Bundelkhand Institute of Engg. & Technology, Jhansi, Uttar Pradesh	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	No	No	NA (fund not received)	NA (fund not received)	8
172	Uttar Pradesh	Govt. aided	Kamla Nehru Institute of Technology, Sultanpur, Uttar Pradesh	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	No	No	NA (fund not received)	NA (fund not received)	8
173	Uttarakhand	Govt. aided	Govind Ballabh Pant Engineering College, Pauri Garhwal	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
174	Uttarakhand	Govt.	VCT Kumaon Engineering College, Dwarahat, Dist-Almora	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
175	Uttarakhand	Govt. aided	College of Technology - GB Pant University of Agriculture & Technology, Pantnagar	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
176	West Bengal	Govt. aided	Birbhum Institute of Engineering & Technology, Birbhum	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
177	West Bengal	Private unaided	JIS College of Engineering, Nadia	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
178	West Bengal	Private unaided	Heritage Institute of Technology, Kolkata	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
179	West Bengal	Govt. aided	College of Engineering & Management, Kolaghat	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
180	West Bengal	Private unaided	M.C.K.V Institute of Engineering, Howrah	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10

				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
S. N.	Name of the State/UT	Category of the Institution	Name of the Institution	Autonomy (Yes/No) Yes = obtained or applied for	BoG (Yes/No)	MoM of BoG published on institution's website (Yes/No)	Governance Self Review Submitted (Yes/No)	NBA Accreditation (% accredited + applied for) (≥ 50% = Yes)	Statutory Audit (Yes/No)	Performance Auditing (Yes/No) Yes= Performance + Data Auditng	MIS Data Entry Status (Yes=Adequate, No=Inadequate)	Actual expenditure against 1st installment (≥ 60% = Yes)	Committed Expenditure (Yes/No) (Yes = 100% against fund received till 31 March 2014)	Indicators Met
181	West Bengal	Govt.	Bengal Engineering and Science University, Shibpur, Howrah	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
182	West Bengal	Govt.	University Institute of Technology, The University of Burdwan, Burdwan	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
183	West Bengal	Govt. aided	Bankura Unnayani Institute of Engineering, Bankura	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
184	West Bengal	Govt. aided	West Bengal University of Technology, Kolkata	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
185	West Bengal	Govt.	University College of Technology - University of Calcutta, Kolkata	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	8
186	West Bengal	Govt. aided	Faculty of Engineering and Technology - Jadavpur University, Kolkata	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
187	West Bengal	Private unaided	Narula Institute of Technology, Pargnas	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
188	West Bengal	Govt. aided	RCC Institute of Information Technology, Kolkata	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	10
189	West Bengal	Govt. aided	Govt College of Engineering and Textile & Technology, Berhampore, West Bengal	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	NA	No	Yes	Yes	6
190	West Bengal	Govt. aided	Murshidabad College of Engineering and Technology, Berhampore,	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	NA	Yes	Yes	Yes	8

				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
S. N.	Name of the State/UT	Category of the Institution	Name of the Institution	Autonomy (Yes/No) Yes = obtained or applied for	BoG (Yes/No)	MoM of BoG published on institution's website (Yes/No)	Governance Self Review Submitted (Yes/No)	NBA Accreditation (% accredited + applied for) (≥ 50% = Yes)	Statutory Audit (Yes/No)	Performance Auditing (Yes/No) Yes= Performance + Data Auditng	MIS Data Entry Status (Yes= Adequate, No= Inadequate)	Actual expenditure against 1st installment (≥ 60% = Yes)	Committed Expenditure (Yes/No) (Yes = 100% against fund received till 31 March 2014)	Indicators Met
			Murshidabad, West Bengal											

Annex 4: Update on Results Framework

Indicator	2009-10	2010-2011		2011-2012		2012-2013		2013-14		2014-15	
		Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	End Target	Actual
Share of supported programs that are accredited or applied for	30	35	19% (Accredited : 7% Applied :12%)	40	25% (Accredited: 11% Applied :14%)	45	32% (Accredited: 10% Applied :22%)	50	44% (Accredited: 13% Applied : 31%)	50	
			No. of total eligible programs: 2092		No. of total eligible programs: 2299		No. of total eligible programs: 2427		No. of total eligible programs: 2455		
			No. of programs accredited or applied for: 404		No. of programs accredited or applied for: 574		No. of programs accredited or applied for: 785		No. of programs accredited or applied for: 1080		
			No. of institutions reporting: 186		No. of institutions reporting: 186		No. of institutions reporting: 186		No. of institutions reporting: 186		
Percentage Faculty with at least an M. Tech (regular and contract)	45	45	86.81%	50	85.77%	55	86.20%	60	87.39%	60	
			Total no. of faculty: 17189 Contract-1277		Total no. of faculty: 19028 Contract-1748		Total no. of faculty: 20775 Contract-2494		Total no. of faculty: 22029 Contract-3108		
			No. of faculty with highest qualification MTech only: 8869 Contract-537		No. of faculty with highest qualification MTech only: 10001 Contract-733		No. of faculty with highest qualification MTech only: 11188 Contract-1138		No. of faculty with highest qualification MTech only: 12350 Contract-1731		
			No of		No of		No of		No of		

Indicator	2009-10	2010-2011		2011-2012		2012-2013		2013-14		2014-15	
		Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	End Target	Actual
			faculty with highest qualification PhD: 6052 Contract-104 No. of institutions reporting: 185		faculty with highest qualification PhD: 6319 Contract-87 No. of institutions reporting: 186		faculty with highest qualification PhD. 6721 Contract-172 No. of institutions reporting: 186		faculty with highest qualification PhD: 6901 Contract-185 No. of institutions reporting: 186		
Total number of Master and PhD students	30000	32000	36103	33000	35509	34000	39790	34000	37086	34000	
			No. of institutions reporting: 182		No. of institutions reporting: 180		No. of institutions reporting: 179		No. of institutions reporting: 171		
Number of publications in refereed journals (within the field of Engineering)	7032	7500	9771	8000	15720	8500	16364	9000	11938	9000	
			No. of institutions reporting: 184		No. of institutions reporting: 184		No. of institutions reporting: 185		No. of institutions reporting: 180		
Percentage of Faculty with or pursuing M. Tech and PhD (regular and contract)	63	63	87.84%	64	87.02%	68	87.74%	73	89.11%	73	
			Total no. of faculty: 17189		Total no. of faculty: 19028		Total no. of faculty: 20775		Total no. of faculty: 22029		
			No. of faculty with highest qualification MTech only: 8869		No. of faculty with highest qualification MTech only: 10001		No. of faculty with highest qualification MTech only: 11188		No. of faculty with highest qualification MTech only: 12350		

Indicator	2009-10	2010-2011		2011-2012		2012-2013		2013-14		2014-15	
		Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	End Target	Actual
			No of faculty with highest qualification PhD: 6052		No of faculty with highest qualification PhD: 6319		No of faculty with highest qualification PhD: 6721		No of faculty with highest qualification PhD: 6901		
		No. of faculty enrolled in M.Tech: 179	No. of faculty enrolled in M.Tech : 240		No. of faculty enrolled in M.Tech: 320		No. of faculty enrolled in M.Tech: 381				
		No. of institutions reporting: 185	No. of institutions reporting: 186		No. of institutions reporting: 186		No. of institutions reporting: 186				
Percentage of externally funded research and development projects and consultancies in total revenue	6	7	9.12%	8	8.70%	10	11.34%	12	11.24%	12	
			Total Revenue: Rs. 230616 lacs		Total Revenue: Rs. 248988 lacs		Total Revenue: Rs. 173035 lacs		Total Revenue: Rs. 151699 lacs		
			Revenue from externally funded research and development projects and consultancies: Rs.21035 lacs		Revenue from externally funded research and development projects and consultancies: Rs. 21654 lacs		Revenue from externally funded research and development projects and consultancies: Rs. 19617 lacs		Revenue from externally funded research and development projects and consultancies: Rs. 17048 lacs		
			No. of institutions		No. of institutions		No. of institutions		No. of institutions		

Indicator	2009-10	2010-2011		2011-2012		2012-2013		2013-14		2014-15	
		Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	End Target	Actual
			reporting: 171		reporting: 169		reporting: 161		reporting: 155		
Transition rate of all students from the first year to the second year of under graduate study	--	--	55.38%	--	59.83%	--	55.80%	--		--	
			Total no. of students in the first year: 86639		Total no. of students in the first year: 88222		Total no. of students in the first year: 91290				
			No. of students who transitioned from the first year to second year: 47983		No. of students who transitioned from the first year to second year: 52784		No. of students who transitioned from the first year to second year: 50943				
			No. of institutions reporting: 156		No. of institutions reporting: 159		No. of institutions reporting: 154				
Transition rate of students from disadvantaged backgrounds from the first year to second year of undergraduate study	45	45	53.13%	48	56.97%	51	51.74%	55		55	
			Total no. of students from disadvantaged backgrounds in the first year: 37936		Total no. of students from disadvantaged backgrounds in the first year: 38209		Total no. of students from disadvantaged backgrounds in the first year: 39667				
			No of students from disadvantaged		No. of students from disadvantaged		No. of students from disadvantaged				

Indicator	2009-10	2010-2011		2011-2012		2012-2013		2013-14		2014-15	
		Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	End Target	Actual
			backgrounds who transitioned from the first year to second year: 20156 No. of institutions reporting: 156		backgrounds who transitioned from the first year to second year: 21769 No. of institutions reporting: 159		backgrounds who transitioned from the first year to second year: 20522 No. of institutions reporting: 154				
Direct Beneficiaries (number)	300,000	300,000	377492	320,000	370133	335,000	383190	350,000	361809	350,000	
			Total no. of student beneficiaries: 357085		Total no. of student beneficiaries: 347583		Total no. of student beneficiaries: 358576		Total no. of student beneficiaries: 335732		
			Total no. of faculty beneficiaries: 20407		Total no. of faculty beneficiaries: 22550		Total no. of faculty beneficiaries: 24614		Total no. of faculty beneficiaries: 26077		
			No. of institutions reporting: 186		No. of institutions reporting: 186		No. of institutions reporting: 186		No. of institutions reporting: 186		
of which female (percentage)	26%	26%	28%	27%	29%	28%	29%	30%	30%	30%	
			Total no. of female student beneficiaries: 99756		Total no. of female student beneficiaries: 100408		Total no. of female student beneficiaries: 104662		Total no. of female student beneficiaries: 98960		
			Total no. of female faculty beneficiaries		Total no. of female faculty beneficiaries		Total no. of female faculty beneficiaries		Total no. of female faculty beneficiaries		

Indicator	2009-10	2010-2011		2011-2012		2012-2013		2013-14		2014-15	
		Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	End Target	Actual
			es :6074 No. of institutions reporting : 186		s :6822 No. of institutions reporting: 186		:7611 No. of institutions reporting: 186		: 8070 No. of institutions reporting: 186		
Percentage of institutions with academic autonomy	30	40	51 Total no. of institutions : 156 No. of institutions with academic autonomy: 80	50	57 Total no. of institutions: 156 No. of institutions with academic autonomy: 89	60	58 Total no. of institutions: 190 No. of institutions with academic autonomy: 111	65	61 Total no. of institutions: 190 No. of institutions with academic autonomy: 115	65	
Number of faculty members that have benefitted from the teaching effectiveness training (under sub-component 1.3)	0	0	--	0	--	182	182 No. of institutions: 70	1000	550 No. of institutions: 125	1000	
Share of TEQIP Supported Institutions from states lagging in technical education	14	20		20		20	24	20	25	20	
Number of governance self reviews received	0	0		0		0	65	80	162	80	
Number of Governance Development plans received	0	0		0		0	1	20	15	20	
Fully functional MIS - Number of institutions reporting at least 70% of the indicators	0						43	150	158	150	

Annex 5: Status of Actions Taken from Previous Joint Review Mission

Sr. No.	Activity	Status
1	Second cycle institutions are set the same performance parameters	Institutions performance assessment was carried out on 10 parameters viz. Autonomy, NBA Accreditation, BoG, BoG Minutes on website, Governance Self Reviews, Statutory Audit, Performance/Data Audit, MIS Data entry status, expenditure reimbursed (60%) against 1 st instalment and Committed expenditure. The assessment analysis is as follows:
2	All first cycle institutions that met the first set of parameters should be given a further set of performance parameters to meet	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 94 institutions are meeting all the 10 indicators • 49 Institutions are meeting 9/10 indicators • 21 Institutions are meeting 8/10 indicators • 12 Institutions are meeting 7/10 indicators • 14 Institutions are meeting ≤6/10 indicators • 158 institutions have fully functional MIS reporting at least 70% of the indicators
Autonomy		
3	Principal Secretaries to directly address the UGC and the affiliated universities with the issue that a number of their colleges have still not obtained academic autonomy	<p>MHRD has requested UGC to expedite the grant of Autonomous status to TEQIP Institutions</p> <p>The status of Autonomy in 190 Project Institutions is as below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 115 institutions have obtained autonomous institution status by UGC. • 47 institutions have applied to UGC • 19 institutions have applied to Affiliating University • 9 institutions have not applied at all
Faculty Development and Quality Improvement		
4	Urgent study to draw on the growing experience of Quality Circles and the QEEE initiative, on information available from mentors' reports and on feedback from workshops at national level to identify good practices. Those institutions identified as delivering good practices should be invited to become quality hubs within the TEQIP Programme	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Feedback meeting was held on 1st February 2014 followed by a Review meeting with 73 institutions on 13th March 2014. <p>Feedback from IIT Madras is requested on the performance of participating institutions. A meeting is planned with IIT Madras in June 2014 to identify Best institutions that can become quality hubs within TEQIP Programmes.</p>
5	Efforts to appoint well qualified regular staff, including where appropriate appointing retired staff rather than those with only a BTech degree	Faculty strength with at least an MTech degree is increased to 87.5% from the baseline of only 45%.
6	Training to be made available on an equal basis to both regular and contract staff	<p>Trainings are being made available on an equal basis to both regular and contract staff.</p> <p>A total of 1430 faculty members undertook training out of which 550 faculty obtained Pedagogical Training from IITs.</p>
Supporting Student Needs		
7	TEQIP should sponsor a National project to identify existing good practice and make it widely available. Initiatives which might be included in	<p>Two regional workshops were arranged:</p> <p>1st Workshop on Good practices and experiences on improving transition rate of students was arranged</p>

	such a study are: summer courses in communication skills for school leavers; pre-engineering tests before the start of courses; bringing in outside expertise to deliver support classes; improving the range and quality of student counselling; initiating pilot bridging courses; the use of ICT; and evaluating the impact of different approaches	at Govt College of Technology, Coimbatore on 28th January 2014 for 20 institutions from Southern region and 2 nd workshop was held on 7 th April 2014 at Govt College of Engg, Aurangabad for 19 institutions from western region The report on the Workshops is attached as Annex-I.
8	All institutions should complete governance self reviews and initial governance development plans.	Out of 190 institutions, 162 institutions have submitted the “Self Governance reports” and “Governance development plans” are submitted by 15 institutions
9	All institutions should attend two management development programmes - a basic one (such as that offered currently by IIM Indore) and a more advanced course for leadership capacity building.	617 faculty members from 155 institutions have attended Management Development Programmes. Faculty members from 136 institutions have attended two or more management development programmes. The programme has (i) Basic and (ii) Advance Modules at all IIMs
Industry Institution Interaction		
10	Mandatory participation of all TEQIP institutions in the AICTE-CII Survey of and Industry-Linked Engineering Institutions.	All the 190 institutions shall be informed for mandatory participation in the AICTE-CII Survey for the year 2014-15 once the Survey is made available in May 2014.
11	Good performing institutions to draft their case study on how they enhanced their I-I-I activities and to elaborate on what their next steps would be to even further strengthen their I-I-I activities. MHRD and NPIU/SPFU to share these case studies widely.	ICT Mumbai, one of the well performing institutions has been identified to further strengthen the I-I-I activities on “ Innovation networking (INN) of TEQIP institutions ” - to share existing infrastructure expertise to innovate for new products/processes/ systems to address needs of regional industries and society, converting innovative and out of box ideas into prototypes for demonstration and possible commercialization. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 07 good performing TEQIP institutions from western region (CoE, Pune, VJTI, Mumbai, BATU, Lonere, BVB Sardar Patel, SGGs, Nanded, RTI, Sangli and GHREC, Nagpur willing for INN with ICT, Mumbai – are acting as a Lead and coordinating Institute. • 14 Innovation projects identified by the network of the institutions.
Monitoring and Evaluation		
12	NPIU to gather all the data audit reports	Mentoring Reports received: 1 st round: 175 2 nd round: 56 3 rd round: 14 4 th round: 03 Performance Audit received: 1 st round: 169 2 nd round: 10 Data Audit received: 1 st round: 169

		2 nd round: 10
13	NPIU to develop a system whereby the Performance Audit reports are verified and sent to institutions within one month of receipt (as per the Handbook)	A meeting to set the parameters for Review of Performance Audit Reports was held on 3 rd April 2014. 14 experts were invited for the purpose. The criteria for grading were finalized. In the 1 st round, 35 Performance Audit Reports were sent for assessment/grading to the 14 experts out of which 20 reports have been reviewed.
14	NPIU to recruit a statistician	Requested the World Bank to suggest ToRs and qualification
Financial Management and Procurement		
15	Submit revised FMR for April-Sept 2013 to the Bank	Submitted to the World Bank
16	Share Road Map for E-FMR to be fully implemented in all project implementing agencies	Schedule of Training has been finalized and attached as Annex-II.
17	Agreed plans to speed up disbursement of state funds	AS (T), MHRD directed the Principal Secretaries of the States to speed up disbursement. Accordingly, expenditure has been increased to Rs 82 crores in the month of March 2014 from Rs 41.60 crore in the month of February 2014.
18	For each financial year it should be ensured that at State level there are adequate budget provisions for the expenditures under TEQIP programme in the State budget.	Adequate budgetary provisions have been ensured. As detailed in Annex-III.
19	NPIU's Audit Report and Consolidated Audit Report for FY 2012-13 (overdue)	The Reports have been submitted to the World Bank on 30 th January 2014
20	Completion of Audit Reports for FY 2013-14	Audit Reports for FY 2013-14 will be completed by July 2014
21	Procurement Post Review (PPR) FY 14	PPR was conducted by the World Bank from 18 th – 22 nd March 2014.
22	Develop training modules, including e-modules and conduct training of SPFU trainers	Training of SPFU trainers was conducted on 16 th April 2014 at Mumbai. 35 participants from 16 States attended the training.
Environment and Social		
23	Workshop to discuss the implementation of EMF by the institutions (NPIU to take advice from Bank's Environment Specialist for organizing the workshop)	A meeting with all SPFUs is planned on 29 th April 2014.
24	Review of Institutions' Equity Action Plan	Action taken as per Sr No. 7

Annex 6: New Actions to be taken from this Mission

<i>S.No.</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>By Whom</i>	<i>To be Completed by</i>
1.	NPIU to send revised FMR for the remaining balance that was not requested by CAAA.	NPIU	May 10, 2014
2.	Institutions that have not met the performance indicators to submit their plan of action for meeting the targets by May 15, 2014 to NPIU, and are expected to meet these targets by May 31, 2014	Institutions, NPIU	May 31, 2014
3.	Further fund releases are made only to those institutions which have met all 10 performance parameters, as notified to institutions previously.	MHRD and NPIU	With immediate effect
4.	No further fund releases to be made to Punjab until the issues are resolved	MHRD and NPIU	With immediate effect
5.	MHRD to consider providing additional resources to institutions which are performing and could use these resources effectively.	MHRD and NPIU	With immediate effect
6.	A further set of parameters to be given to institutions to be met by October 31, 2014	MHRD and NPIU	October 31, 2014
7.	Review of institutional performance against the set of parameters	MHRD and NPIU	November 15, 2014
8.	Conduct next JRM	MHRD and NPIU	December 2014
Autonomy			
9.	NPIU in coordination with UGC and NBA to review case by case the status of autonomy and accreditation with the TEQIP institutions that have not obtained autonomy status and NBA accreditation.	NPIU	May 31, 2014
Faculty Development and Quality Improvement			
10.	Contract faculty at TEQIP institutions should be able and encouraged to participate in activities in the same way as their colleagues on permanent appointments. In addition, faculty at non-TEQIP institutions should be able to participate, where space permits	MHRD and NPIU	With immediate effect
11.	QEEE to evaluate student outcomes (learning and employment) more rigorously	IIT Madras	June 30, 2014
12.	IITs to develop an annual peer review mechanism to assess and enhance the effectiveness of the quality circles. This mechanism should be agreed within 2 months	IITs	June 30, 2014
13.	IITs to capture evidence about the impact of the examination system on teaching and learning, with a view to feeding into the policy discussions	IITs	June 30, 2014

14.	NPIU to organise a workshop on internal quality assurance mechanisms for improving teaching, learning and research in TEQIP institutions, with the view to reporting to the next Mission	NPIU	July-August, 2014
15.	NPIU to conduct a review of faculty transfers at a sample of government TEQIP institutions, to provide some concrete evidence about the scale of the problem which has been highlighted in several Missions	NPIU	July-August, 2014
Supporting Students' Needs			
16.	NPIU, working with SPFUs, should organise a review of various diagnostic tests conducted by institutions these tests and identify those that are most effective	SPFUs, Institutions	July 31, 2014
17.	Institutions should consider using MOOCs and distance learning techniques to compensate for the lack of adequate faculty	SPFUs, Institutions	With immediate effect
18.	More sharing of good practices and challenges among TEQIP institutes	SPFUs, Institutions	With immediate effect
19.	NPIU should prepare, with expert guidance as necessary, guidelines for documenting good practice.	NPIU	August 31, 2014
Management Development and Governance			
20.	Regional Good Governance Workshops should be organized to share experiences across institutions as well as giving guidance for how they can improve their governance and management performance with participation of BoG members, senior academics and staff from the TEQIP institutions, IIMs involved the management capacity building, and SPFUs.	NPIU	October 15, 2014
21.	Gather governance and management case studies to identify the regulatory challenges that TEQIP institutions are facing in their effort to improve their governance and management capacity. The NPIU, with expert help as necessary, should develop a methodology for capturing good practice in a consistent, reliable way, which is based on evidence	NPIU	October 15, 2014
22.	To increase the impact of the leadership and management training, it is encouraged that the IIMs would follow-up with: 1) hands-on institutional capacity building, 2) developing a standard questionnaire to participants e.g. 3 months after the course to measure impact of the courses and suggest possible follow-ups; and	IIMs and NPIU	With Immediate Effect June 30, 2014

	3) ask the participants to share their institution's governance self-assessment and governance development plan with the IIM on a continuous basis as this can form the basis for a dialog between the institutions and the IIMs		Continuously
23.	<p>A range of collaborative initiatives in the Management Capacity Enhancement Programme should be organized such as</p> <p>1) the development of a joint core curriculum on strengthening governance and management at TEQIP institutions across IIMs including through e-learning courses; and</p> <p>2) drafting case studies that demonstrate how TEQIP institutions are seeking to improve institutional governance and management</p>	IIMs and NPIU	<p>Core curriculum to be developed by October 15, 2014</p> <p>October 15, 2014</p>
24.	<p>Efforts to build synergies between the Management Capacity Enhancement Programme and the Good Governance Programme under TEQIP should be pursued. This should include the following initiatives: 1) the governance self-assessment questionnaire should be shared with IIMs;</p> <p>2) the TEQIP Good Governance web-site can be used as a common platform;</p> <p>3) the IIMs will be invited to join the planned regional workshops on the TEQIP Good Governance Programme where further synergies can be explored; and</p> <p>4) coordination between the mentor activities and the IIMs' hands-on institutional advisory services to increase the value-added for the institutions.</p>	NPIU	<p>With immediate effect</p> <p>With immediate effect</p> <p>October 15, 2014</p> <p>With immediate effect</p>
Monitoring and Evaluation			
25.	<p>Peer Review process in CoE to be given an important role in guiding the CoEs in focusing on a few research and technology problems that they seek to find solutions to through a well-designed research methodology</p> <p>More emphasis for CoEs to work with research partners from other research institutions and companies</p> <p>Development of a dissemination strategy of the research results delivered</p>	MHRD and NPIU	<p>With immediate effect</p> <p>With immediate effect</p> <p>October 31, 2014</p>

26.	NPIU uses the data audit report received to verify the data in the MIS	NPIU	June 30, 2014
27.	NPIU to ensure that the remaining institutions (that have not completed the data entry for 4 years) should complete the data entry.	NPIU	June 30, 2014
28.	NPIU to freeze the data in the MIS for 2010-11, 2011-12. NPIU to freeze the data in the MIS for 2012-13	NPIU	June 30, 2014 October 31, 2014
29.	NPIU to ensure that the reviewed performance audit reports are reviewed by experts on a regular, two-week cycle.	NPIU	Continuously
30.	Bank provides draft ToR to NPIU to recruit a statistician	World Bank	May 23, 2014
Financial Management and Procurement			
31.	<i>Budget and Flow of Funds:</i> a) States which have not released funds for more than 50 days to release the same immediately and status to be shared with the Bank b) NPIU to share monthly summary of status of flow of funds by MHRD/states with the Bank c) FM Indicators Summary for states/CFIs to be shared, including information on flow of funds d) Updated summary of Budget Provision by States to be shared with the Bank	Concerned States/MHRD NPIU/SPFUs NPIU/States/CFIs NPIU	May 25, 2014 Within 15 days after every month Next JRM May 15, 2014
32.	<i>Statutory Audit</i> a) Response to Bank's letter of review of consolidated audit report of FY 2012-13 b) Submit consolidated audit report for FY 2013-14 to the Bank	NPIU NPIU/States/CFIs	June 7, 2014 September 30, 2014
33.	<i>Financial Reporting</i> a) Submit FMR for Apr-June 2014, including forecast for July-Sep to the Bank	NPIU/states/CFIs	July 31, 2014
34.	<i>FM Staffing:</i> Vacancy of NPIU FM consultant to be filled	MHRD	July 15, 2014
35.	<i>Training:</i> a) Implement training schedule b) Share module of online training with the Bank	NPIU/SPFUs NPIU	July 31, 2014 May 20, 2014
36.	<i>Internal Audit:</i> a) Share status of internal audit in states/CFI for 2013-14 b) Internal audit reports should be available for	NPIU States/CFIs	June 30, 2014 Before start of

	statutory audit of FY 2013-14		statutory audit of FY 2013-14
37.	<i>Disclosure:</i> of FM information as per FM Manual on websites	NPIU and states	Continuous
38.	Institutions to take the required action to correct the expenditure gap between the PMSS and FMR	Institutions	Immediately
39.	Institutions to complete the procurement planning for the remaining amount of Rs. 140 cr.	Institutions	May 30, 2014
40.	Institutions to take required action to initiate the procurement action for the remaining balance of Rs. 265 cr.	Institutions	May 30, 2014
41.	Share the PPR report with NPIU	World Bank	As soon as available
42.	Project should submit the details of procurement complaints, if any with actions taken on it for Bank's review and its closure.	NPIU	With immediate effect
43.	Institutions/NPIU to submit the final contract copy with check list for all prior review cases to the Bank	NPIU/ Institutions	With immediate effect
Environment and Social			
44.	Four regional workshops to discuss the implementation of EMF by the institutions (NPIU to take advice from Bank's Environment Specialist for organizing the Workshop).	NPIU, SPFUs	Western Zone: To be held in Gujarat in May Northern Zone: To be held in Haryana on June 10 Southern Zone: To be held in Karnataka in last week of June Eastern Zone: To be held in West Bengal in last week of June.
Project Implementation			
45.	Project Implementation Plan to be revised, approved and placed on the NPIU website	NPIU, MHRD, World Bank	June 30, 2014

Annex 7: Procurement

Procurement in the project. The status of procurement as planned for the entire period was discussed during the mission. Besides the agreed action plan of last mission was also reviewed. Procurement team of NPIU furnished a national summary of procurement status under TEQIP II project.

All the procurement under TEQIP II is being done through PMSS and at the end of Mar 2014, the expenditure happened under procurement: Rs. 298.74 Crores as per FMR. Mission noted that as per PMSS, the actual expenditure at the end of Mar 2014 is Rs. 175.6 cr. The possible reason for wide gap between FMR and PMSS figures is the institutions are not updating the payment details in PMSS though the same is captured in FMR. Mission advised all the stake holders to update PMSS regularly so that such wide variation in figures of FMR and PMSS is reduced.

Mission noted that total allocation for this project for procurement is around Rs. 1005 cr. Against this, the total procurement planning done by all the participating institutions is Rs. 865.5 cr. Therefore for balance Rs. 140 cr, the institutions need to plan and include additional items for procurement in their respective procurement plans and get it approved by their respective BOGs. This action is required to be completed on priority.

Further from the national consolidated figures, mission noted that though planning has been done for Rs. 865 cr worth of procurement, but procurement action has been initiated for approximately Rs. 600 cr, leaving a balance of Rs. 265 cr worth of material against which procurement action is yet to be initiated. This is a real concern. Though it was informed earlier that no procurement will go beyond 31st Mar 2014, but the ground reality is that there is more than Rs. 400 cr worth of procurement for which the procurement action is not initiated. Therefore urgent action is required from all the participating institutions to act fast and initiate procurement action including adding new items in the procurement plan where ever required. NPIU is requested to do close monitoring of the participating institutions to see that in next three months Rs. 140 cr worth of materials are included in the revised procurement plan and procurement action is initiated in all pending items.

As on 31st Mar 2014, out of Rs. 600 cr in which procurement action is started, in Rs. 176 cr, the procurement is fully completed and for Rs. 249 cr, the procurement commitment is made and supply of items is awaited. For balance Rs. 175 cr, the procurement action is already initiated and it is in different stages of procurement.

Mission noted from ASCI MTR report that though there is no complaint on PMSS as a system, where ever there is new incumbent for TEQIP coordinator or procurement coordinator in the institutions, they require training on PMSS. NPIU may organize training on PMSS on regular interval so that whoever requires training on PMSS are imparted with requisite training.

Mission noted that the participating institutions have a good experience of working of PMSS and Bank's procurement guidelines. To expedite the procurement activity, the application of

new business model in procurement for this project was discussed. After discussion with NPIU officials, the new thresholds for different procurement methods are agreed to. In this regard, a separate letter from TTL of WB will be issued.

The PMSS was designed to support a decentralized procurement process at the institutional level, while promoting the uniformity, consistency and transparency in procurement process, conducted at multiple institutions.

The PMSS is also being used by the SPFUs (State Project Facilitation Unit) and NPIU (National Project Implementation Unit) for procurement as well as monitoring activities.

- 1) **Procurement Post Review (PPR) FY 14:** For the PPR FY 14, the GPCL, the authorized agency of World Bank has conducted the review from 18th to 22nd Mar 2014. The report is awaited from M/S GPCL. Once the report is received, it will be shared with NPIU for the compliance of PPR observations if any.
- 2) **Complaint Handling.** The mission informed the Procurement staff of NPIU about the mandatory requirement of Bank's review of the complaints and their resolution. Project to submit the details of procurement complaints if any with actions taken on it to Bank for review and its closer.
- 3) Project was explained about importance of submitting final contract copy with check list for all prior review cases to Bank for getting WBR no. In this project a large number of direct contract cases are cleared by Bank for which the list is shared with procurement expert of NPIU with a request to follow up with institutes to get the contract copy and check list so that WBR no can be allotted on priority.

Rating for Procurement. Though procurement activities are picked up in recent past, the cumulative procurement is still less. Hence the procurement performance during the period of review has been retained as Moderately **Satisfactory**.

Annex 8: Financial Management

The FM review included desk review of information presented by the NPIU and SPFUs on key FM areas and workshop with the SPFUs. The mission appreciates the comprehensive information prepared by the NPIU on provision of budget, expenditure and status of release of funds. All states, except 3, presented status of FM issues during the workshop, including flow of funds, budget provision, audit and FM staffing. The main focus of the workshop was to understand bottlenecks in flow of funds at the state level, particularly for states which have substantial delays in release of funds to institutes.

Disbursement

Disbursement: As on 30 April, 2014 stands at USD 47 million reflecting approx. 23% disbursement against allocation in USD of 208.63 million. This includes disbursement for period till January 2014 and forecast till March 2014. The Bank has approved the IUFR for February-March 2014. The IUFR reported gross expenditure of INR 1234.2 million (approximately USD 20.5 million) and expenditure forecast for 3 months (Apr-June 2014) of INR 1020 million (Bank share 60% i.e. INR 612 million or approximately USD 10.1 million). Against this IUFR, an application of USD 22.12 million is under process as per the Bank's client connection system. It was agreed that IUFR for Apr-June 2014 would be submitted including forecast for Jul-September 2014.

Expenditure

Total expenditure for the project in FY 2013-14 was INR 4843.6 million. Cumulative expenditure till 31 March 2014 is INR 5917.3 million.

Budget Provision

Budget Provisions by MHRD: A provision of INR 4500 million has been made in the Demand for Grants (Budget) for FY 2014-15.

Budget Provisions by States: All states/UTs have to make adequate budget provision for FY 2014-15, covering 100% provision for project activities for central share and state share. Review of information on budget provision showed that, in general, the states have provided sufficient funds to meet the forecast of expenditure for this financial year.

Information for Bihar, Odisha and NCT-Delhi was not available. In case of a few states (AP, Gujarat, HP and UT-Chandigarh), the figures of SPFUs showed some difference compared to the summary prepared by the NPIU. The mission requests that an updated summary be shared with the Bank, showing state-wise total budget provision, break-up between central share and state share and comparison against forecast of expenditure for this FY. This will help in monitoring adequacy of the budget provision for this FY

Flow of Funds

Flow of Funds: MHRD released INR 3997.1 million to the states for FY 2013-14 against budget of INR 4000 million. As on 31 March 2014, cumulative total of funds released by the

MHRD to states is INR 5416.9 million, out of which states have released INR 4665.9 million i.e. 86% of central share. The cumulative total of state share released to institutions till 31 March 2014 is INR 1521.7 million.

Since the last JRM, the NPIU has been closely following up with the states regarding the issue of delay in release of funds to the institutes. The mission noted some improvement in status of releases to institutes. However, in case of some states, such as Punjab, Andhra Pradesh and Karnataka, the issue of pending releases to institutes needs to be addressed immediately.

Based on presentations of the SPFUs, the following table summarizes the time taken for releases and targets (in terms of number of days) mentioned by the states for release of funds to the institutes.

Analysis of Time Taken in Releases by States/UTs

State	No. of Releases to Date	Time Taken by State for relasing funds	Target	Comment
Andhra Pradesh	12	62-215 days	30-40	1. Due to proposed bifurcation of state, any release can be done only till 15 May or after August. 2. In last FY, SPFU salary was not released for 1 year
Bihar				Information not available
Chhattisgarh	2	R1=45, R2=15	10-15	
Gujarat	3	R1=83, R2=94 and R3=31	30	
Haryana	3	R1=11.5 months, R2=55 days and R3=33 days	15-20	
Himachal Pradesh	3	R1= 10 months, R2=no release and R3=90 days	60-90	
Jharkhand		127-254 days	90	
Karnataka	10 by MHRD, 7 by state	44-220 days. R7 = 220 days		Last 3 releases by MHRD not released by the state
Kerala	7	R3=11 months, R7=42 days	14 days	
Madhya Pradesh	2	R1= Gen Category 5 day, SC/ST 90 days R2 = Gen. Cat. 25 days, SC/ST under process	General = 10-20 days and SC/ST=90-120 days	
Maharashtra	11	29-125 days. R11= 29 days	less than 45 days	
Odisha				Information not available
Punjab		2nd installment not released to all institutes. Funds have not released for more than 1 year for institutes. 27 crores to be released, including Rs.19.89 crores of central share		
Rajasthan	4	40days	30-45	
Tamil Nadu	9	days	45-50	
Tripura	1	60 days	30	
Uttar Pradesh	4	R1 to R3=90-150 days, R4= expected in 60 days	20	
Uttarakhand	2	17-120 days, R2=17 days		
West Bengal	7	18-71 days, R7=24 days	30	
NCT-Delhi				Information not available
UT-Chandigarh		73-173 days	10	
UT-Puducherry		131-132 days	30	

During the workshop with SPFUs, most states agreed that a target of 20 days to a maximum of 50 days was a feasible target for the states to release the project funds (central and state share) to the institutes. The presentations and discussion during the workshop also showed that as the basic procedures of fund release are quite similar in states, longer delays are mainly due to the time taken by the Finance Department of some states in releasing the funds. It was also agreed that SPFUs would also minimize the time taken by them for submission of proposals for release of funds to the Finance/Planning Departments and ensure that the paperwork is complete in all respects.

The mission recommends the following actions:

1. Some states to take **immediate action** for long pending release of funds to institutes e.g., Punjab, Andhra Pradesh and Karnataka. NPIU to inform the Bank about the status of releases of these states by 25 May 2014.
2. NPIU to continue **monthly system of monitoring** of status of flow of funds and share the monthly summary with the Bank.
3. NPIU to revise FM Indicators to include information on flow of funds and submit the state-wise information to the next JRM.

Status of Audit:

Statutory Audit: The Consolidated Audit Report for FY 2012-13 was submitted to the Bank. The NPIU has to submit a response to Bank's review letter dated April 4, 2014.

FY 2013-14: The consolidated audit report for the project needs to be submitted to the Bank by 30 September 2014. The status of appointment of auditors for FY 2013-14 was reviewed during the workshop with the SPFUs. The review showed that while many states were on target for submission of the audit report to NPIU by 31 July, the auditor is yet to be appointed in some states e.g., Chhattisgarh, Karnataka, Tamil Nadu and Uttarakhand. These states must expedite the process of appointment of the auditor.

As mentioned in the Bank's letter of April 4, 2014, the mission would like to reiterate that all states/CFIs must submit complete audit reports for FY 2013-14, including Management Letter, summary of reconciliation of audited expenditure and expenditure as per FMR and replies to auditor's observations.

Internal Audit: The status of internal audit in SPFUs for FY 2013-14 was presented during the workshop of the SPFUs. The auditor is yet to be appointed in some states e.g. Chhattisgarh, Himachal Pradesh, Jharkhand, Karnataka, Maharashtra, Uttar Pradesh and Uttarakhand. These states must ensure that the auditor for FY 2013-14 is appointed, so that internal audit reports are available to statutory auditors for the audit of FY 2013-14.

Training and FM Capacity: The last mission had recommended that in line with the FM manual, NPIU should scale up its role of establishing systems of training and monitoring FM training in the project, while the SPFUs undertake the responsibility for delivery and monitoring of training at the state level.

The NPIU conducted Training of Trainers (ToT) for SPFU trainers on 16 April 2014. 35 participants from 16 states participated in the training. The NPIU is planning 4 training workshops on E-FMR and Financial Management during the period May to July. These workshops will cover 11 SPFUs with their respective state institutes and 25 CFIs. Training module for the workshops was shared during the mission and the Bank will provide its comments/suggestions on the same to the NPIU within 1 week. The following actions are recommended:

1. After the ToT, SPFUs should inform the NPIU about their respective training plans for the institutes and SPFU staff. The status of implementation of NPIU and SPFU level training should be presented during the next JRM.

2. Online Training module, which is under preparation by the NPIU, should be shared with the Bank for comments by 20 May 2014.

Disclosure: As prescribed in the FM Manual, NPIU's website currently displays latest FMR, status of release of funds and Annual Audited Financial Statements. NPIU must monitor whether SPFUs are also complying with FM requirements of Disclosure Framework of the project, and share the status during next JRM. The SPFUs have to display Status of Release of Funds, FMRs and Annual Audited Financial Statements.

Monitoring by NPIU and SPFUs and FM Indicators

It was agreed during the last mission that NPIU and the SPFUs should implement the system of six-monthly submission of information on FM Indicators as per the FM Manual. The mission requests the NPIU to share the updated information of FM Indicators from SPFUs by 31 May 2014. During FM workshop with SPFUs in the JRM, It was also agreed that from next JRM, FM Indicators would also include an *indicator on flow of funds* to measure timeliness and adequacy of releases to institutes.

Key Action Points

<i>S.No.</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>By Whom</i>	<i>To be Completed by</i>
1.	<p><i>Budget and Flow of Funds:</i></p> <p>e) States which have not released funds for more than 50 days to release the same immediately and status to be shared with the Bank</p> <p>f) NPIU to share monthly summary of status of flow of funds by MHRD/states with the Bank</p> <p>g) FM Indicators Summary for states/CFIs to be shared, including information on low of funds</p> <p>h) Updated summary of Budget Provision by States to be shared with the Bank</p>	<p>Concerned States/MHRD</p> <p>NPIU/SPFUs</p> <p>NPIU/States/CFIs</p> <p>NPIU</p>	<p>25 May 2014</p> <p>Within 15 days after every month</p> <p>Next JRM</p> <p>15 May 2014</p>
2.	<p><i>Statutory Audit</i></p> <p>c) Response to Bank's letter of review of consolidated audit report of FY 2012-13</p> <p>d) Submit consolidated audit report for FY 2013-14 to the Bank</p>	<p>NPIU</p> <p>NPIU/States/CFIs</p>	<p>7 June 2014</p> <p>30 September 2014</p>
3.	<p><i>Financial Reporting</i></p> <p>a) Submit FMR for Apr-June 2014, including forecast for July-Sep to the Bank</p>	<p>NPIU/states/CFIs</p>	<p>31 July, 2014</p>
4.	<p><i>FM Staffing:</i> Vacancy of NPIU FM consultant</p>	<p>MHRD</p>	<p>15 July 2014</p>

	to be filled		
5.	<i>Training:</i> c) Implement training schedule d) Share module of online training with the Bank	NPIU/SPFUs NPIU	July 31, 2014 20 May 2014
6.	<i>Internal Audit:</i> c) Share status of internal audit in states/CFI for 2013-14 d) Internal audit reports should be available for statutory audit of FY 2013-14	NPIU States/CFIs	30 June 2014 Before start of statutory audit of FY 2013-14
7.	<i>Disclosure:</i> of FM information as per FM Manual on websites	NPIU and states	Continuous