
INDIA

**TECHNICAL EDUCATION QUALITY
IMPROVEMENT PROJECT II (TEQIP-II)**

Sixth Joint Review Mission

March 1-14, 2016

Aide Memoire

I. INTRODUCTION

1. The World Bank and Ministry of Human Resource Development (MHRD) team carried out the 6th Joint Review Mission (JRM) from March 1-14, 2016. The World Bank team¹ would like to extend its gratitude to Ms. Tripti Gurha, Director (MHRD) for her guidance and advice throughout the mission and to officials at National Project Implementation Unit (NPIU) for overall coordination of the JRM, especially in the preparation of various background materials, organization of workshops, IIMs and IITs), field visits, informative presentations and participation in discussions.²
2. The objectives of the JRM were to review the overall progress of the project with MHRD, NPIU, SPFUs and other implementing partners. The mission reviewed actions taken by the project as proposed in the Implementation Support Mission held in July 2015. The mission also visited three Centers of Excellence (CoEs) in the states of Jharkhand, Maharashtra and Uttar Pradesh. Meetings were also held with IITs and IIMs to evaluate the impact of their work on pedagogical and management training, respectively. The Mission also met with officials in the University Grants Commission (UGC) and the National Board of Accreditation (NBA) to seek advice on expediting the autonomy and accreditation processes respectively for TEQIP institutes. A workshop with TEQIP colleges on mechanisms to improve student transition rates was held, incorporating behavioural insights on interventions to help students make decisions at different points in the undergraduate program with a view to completing their degree. The status of studies, including impact assessment of TEQIP II, was reviewed, as was the status of sustaining TEQIP reforms post-project through the Four Funds programme. In meetings where participants from Low-income States (LIS) and non-LIS were both present, the mission took the opportunity to understand twinning opportunities for engineering education institutes going forward.

II. KEY PROJECT DATA

Project Data	Details		Current Ratings	<i>Last</i>	<i>Now</i>
Board Approval	03/18/2010		Development Objectives	S	S
Effectiveness	08/6/2010		Implementation Progress	S	MS
Closing date (Revised)			Project Management	S	MS
Original Credit amount	SDR 186.4mmm	US\$ 259.3 m	Procurement	MS	MS
Revised Credit amount	SDR 134.6m	US\$ 187 m	Financial Management	MS	MU
Amount disbursed (March 1, 2016)	SDR 78.79 m	US\$ 110.92 m	Counterpart Funding	MS	MS

¹ Tara Bêteille (TTL), Senior Economist; Toby Linden, Lead Education Specialist (co-TTL); Kurt Larsen, Senior Education Specialist; Javier Botero, Senior Education Specialist; Supriti Dua, Financial Management Specialist; Satya Panda, Procurement Specialist; Sangeeta Kumari, Senior Social Development Specialist; Karthika Radhakrishnan-Nair, Operations Analyst; Rudraksh Mitra, Consultant and Ritu Sharma, Program Assistant.

² See Annex 1 for list of people met.

% Disbursed (March 1, 2016)	58.5	Monitoring and Evaluation	S	S
Age of the Project	5.3 years			

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

Note: fluctuation in exchange rate between SDR and USD means USD figures may vary from last JRM.

III. OVERALL FINDINGS

3. The progress against the Project Development Objective (PDO) is rated as Satisfactory as all PDO indicators are on track to be achieved (Annex 2).
4. The mission recommends the following change in ratings: Implementation (S to MS), Project Management (S to MS) and Financial Management (MS to MU). With regard to implementation, activities at the institutional level are proceeding well, with nearly two-thirds of institutions meeting the bar for being a “well-performing” institute in terms of performance against benchmark indicators (set in each JRM). This, however, is a sharp drop from the previous JRM, where nearly 87% of institutes were ranked as well-performing. Institutes not meeting the benchmarks report common reasons: low expenditure, failure to get autonomy and NBA accreditation. Nearly Rs 165 crores is lying with states and is yet to be disbursed to institutes. The bulk of this undisbursed amount is with six states: Maharashtra, Punjab, Telangana, Karnataka, Andhra Pradesh, and Chhattisgarh (70% of total)³. With approximately six months to closing, there was little evidence provided to the Mission that NPIU and the respective State Project Facilitation Units (SPFU) had proactively engaged with states to expedite the release of funds to institutes. Moreover, neither NPIU nor SPFUs have adequately ensured institutes develop a realistic plan regarding progress against their institutional development plans or expenditures for the remaining project period, especially in the context of delayed receipt of funds. Greater proactivity by NPIU would also have helped more institutes achieve autonomy and accreditation. Two additional issues affected implementation: disruption in the functioning of the e-procurement system (PMSS) and poor checks on data quality in MIS. Pro-active monitoring on the part of NPIU could have minimized their impact on the project. Finally, while four institutes were asked to leave TEQIP II due to non-performance as reported in the 5th JRM, these were brought back into the project in October 2015. There has, however, been no improvement in their performance.
5. As per the central budget FY 2016-17 the allocation for TEQIP programs is Rs. 251 crores. The mission was informed that this allocation is for expenditures under both TEQIP-II and TEQIP-III, and only approximately Rs 188.25 crores is against TEQIP-II. The mission would like to highlight that given the future expenditure plan presented during the JRM; the allocation may need to be further increased. A detailed analysis of future availability of funds and projected expenditure needs to be carried out to assess fund-expenditure position for the remaining project life, with focused attention on areas such as: (i) unreleased funds with States; (ii) unspent funds with institutions; (iii) reasonableness of projected expenditures; and (iv) anticipated contribution towards States/ institutes shares.

³ States have been listed in descending order of balance to be released.

6. As per the Department Order from the Department of Expenditure dated October 28, 2015 on funding pattern of centrally sponsored schemes, MHRD informed the mission team that it has opted for a centre-state funding proportion of 50:50 for TEQIP II, effective April 1, 2015. As a consequence, there has been an increase in the counterpart contribution from States and institutes to 50% as against the earlier 40%. The mission was informed that this arrangement is yet to become effective in practice in specific states and there continues to be funding gaps on this account. In this context, it was agreed that since the World Bank has been reimbursing the Government of India for 60 percent of project expenditures, based upon a centre-state 60:40 funding pattern, the new funding pattern will require modifying the Financing Agreement between the Government of India and the World Bank.
7. Finally, as the closing date for TEQIP II is six months away, it is important that MHRD/NPIU initiate the following studies agreed in the PIP: TEQIP II Impact Assessment, Bibliometric Study, Resource Utilization Study, Faculty, Staff and Student Satisfaction Study and Tracer Study.

IV. INSTITUTIONAL PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT

8. The NPIU has carried out the sixth institutional performance assessment of all 191 TEQIP institutes (Annex 3). The following bullets summarizes the institutes' performance as per the institutional performance indicators applicable over the last three JRMs. Eight institutional performance indicators were set, and one state-level indicator was set. Of the 8 institutional performance indicators decided during the 5th JRM:
 - 85 institutes have achieved all indicators
 - 40 have achieved 7 indicators
 - 41 have achieved 6 indicators
 - 25 institutes have achieved 5 indicators or less.
9. Although over two-thirds of institutes have met the benchmark for well-performing institutes, this is a drop from the previous JRM, when nearly 87% were well-performing. The indicators on UGC autonomy, NBA accreditation, expenditure of at least 70% of total funds received, and depositing the required funds in the 'four funds' are the indicators which have been achieved by less than 160 institutes:
 - Autonomy (obtained; or applied to UGC, but only after receiving 2 (f) status from UGC and with no objection for autonomy application from university): **155 institutes**
 - NBA accreditation (55% of programs accredited or applied for): **155 institutes**
 - Expenditure of at least 70% of total funds received: **154 institutes**
 - Depositing required funds in each of the Four Funds, as against annual recurring expenditure reported in the MIS: **147 institutes**
10. Faculty shortages continue to prevent several institutes from being eligible for NBA accreditation and, consequently, UGC autonomy. Further, the autonomy applications of institutes in Gujarat and Kerala have been delayed because of a change in their affiliating university, due to the establishment of new affiliating technical universities in these states. The indicator on four funds is of particular concern, with only 129 institutes having achieved this indicator; the funds are a key pillar of project sustainability.
11. The state level indicator — 'Funds released by the state to the institution within 45 days of receipt' was met by only two states, Gujarat and Madhya Pradesh, suggesting this indicator was unable to motivate the desired change in behaviour at the state level.

12. Regarding autonomy, the JRM team met with Dr. Manju Singh, Joint Secretary, UGC to discuss pending autonomy applications of TEQIP institutes. It was decided that the UGC would place a list of pending applications, with the application status and the required next steps clearly indicated, on its website. In addition, the NPIU will identify institutes that are close to completing all the requirements for obtaining autonomy, and will work with these institutes to ensure they submit complete applications for autonomy to the UGC expeditiously. The NPIU will conduct monthly reviews on the status of the expenditure action plans submitted by the states during the meeting with the MHRD on 8-9 February, 2016.

Recommendations

13. The following recommendations are made with regard to further fund releases to institutes and states:
- (i) Further fund releases to be made only to those institutes that have achieved 6 or more of the institute-related performance indicators applicable for the 5th JRM.
 - (ii) However, MHRD will withhold further fund releases to states that have not released to institutes all funds received from the MHRD till date, along with the corresponding state share.
 - (iii) In view of the time taken by the states to release funds to institutes and the time required for institutes to effectively utilize these funds, all releases by the MHRD to states will need to be completed by June 30, 2016. This is necessary to enable the utilization of funds by October 31, 2016.

V. KEY ACTIVITIES

14. This JRM investigated in detail seven specific issues: Governance, Autonomy, Accreditation, Faculty and Student Development, Centres of Excellence, Performance Auditing and Mentorship and the Four Funds. The following sections take each issue in turn and examine the current status, outline key concerns, and make recommendations. Recommendations focus on what can be realistically achieved by Project closing.

A. Governance

Current Status

15. Strengthening the governance of TEQIP institutions is a high priority under TEQIP II. Overall, there has been good progress in achieving the governance performance assessment indicators as indicated in the table below. Out of the 191 institutions participating in TEQIP, the vast majority have published the minutes of the Board of Governor’s (BoG) meeting within the last 4 months and have a revised Institutional Development Plan that is published on the institution’s web-site.

Table 1: Governance Indicators

Performance Assessment Indicator	Number of institutions (as at July	Number of institutions (as of
----------------------------------	---------------------------------------	----------------------------------

	2015)	February 2016)
Published the minutes of the Board of Governor’s meeting (last 4 months) on their institution’s web-site	177	186
Institutions having a revised Institutional Development Plan published on the institution’s web-site	178	181
Institutional Governance Guidelines has been developed	2	70

Source: NPIU

- Less than a third of the TEQIP institutions have developed their own Governance Guidelines which sets out an institution's governance processes and practices. The aim of the Governance Guidelines document is to give stakeholders, including students and faculty, a clear understanding of how governance supports institutional performance and development and that governance practices are open and transparent.

Key concerns

- Despite a series of well-received training workshops for institutional leaders and BoG members on Good Governance with the participation of 164 TEQIP institutions, it is evident that some institutions and state government Departments of Technical Education still have difficulty in developing and implementing the good governance guidelines. This underscores the importance of sharing examples of good governance practices across states and institutions. It is important that institutions understand that their BoG is for the whole institution, and that the BoG is permanent — not just for TEQIP activities and/or for a limited period. Evidence has shown that institutions that have recognized this are doing well in TEQIP II.

Recommendations

- NPIU will hire a consultant to provide feedback to all 61 institutions that have finalized a draft of their Institutional Governance Guidelines. It is furthermore suggested that NPIU will organize a Good Governance workshop where the same 61 institutions will be invited to share and discuss their experiences on how they developed their Governance Guidelines as well as how they are implementing them. Based on the conclusions from the workshop, NPIU will draft a report of the key lessons learnt in the process of developing the Guidelines as well as identify good and bad practices in drafting them.

B. Autonomy

Current Status

- Currently, there are 131 TEQIP institutes which have obtained academic autonomy from the University Grants Commission (UGC), while 60 institutes are at various stages of applying to become autonomous (Table 1). This shows some acceleration in approvals since the last JRM and means that the Project KPI (70 percent of institutes should have become autonomous) is very close to being met (currently at 68.6 percent). It also means that about one quarter of the autonomous institutes in the country are in the Project, which is noteworthy.

Table 2: Status of applications for autonomy

	December 2013	April 2014	December 2014	July 2015	March 2016
--	---------------	------------	---------------	-----------	------------

Participating TEQIP institutes	190	190	190	186	191
Autonomous	112	115	118	121	131
Pending applications for autonomy	78	75	72	65	60
• Applied to UGC for Autonomy, UGC assessment	33	47	44	50	46
• Applied to University for forwarding Autonomy application to UGC	31	19	25	15	14

Source: NPIU

20. Only 3 more institutes need to acquire autonomy for the Project KPI to be met. During the JRM, the status of all the remaining Project institutes was reviewed. There are 4 institutes⁴ with applications with UGC which have completed the 3 main steps (received a No Objection Certificate from their respective affiliating university; have three courses accredited by NBA; and have '2f' status). These institutes are waiting for approval from UGC. A further 5 institutes⁵ only need to get '2f' status from UGC – a straightforward application letter – before their application can be considered completed and ready for UGC review.

Concerns

21. TEQIP institutes continue to be unnecessarily passive in the application process and/or have ineffective internal systems. For example, during discussions with Dr. Manju Singh, Joint Secretary UGC, it became clear that two institutes which had informed the NPIU that their application was pending with UGC had in fact received notification from UGC that they had been granted autonomous status (in one case more than a year ago). In addition, many of the institutes appear to be unaware of the application status or that action is required from their side (such as submitting documents or having the state/ATU nominate someone to the review committee); and this could quickly be determined by a call to the relevant officer in UGC.
22. Dr. Singh agreed to put on the UGC website the current status and next steps for all applications (not just those from TEQIP institutes). This is a welcome step. Dr. Singh also mentioned that they have engaged NIC to update and streamline their various internal processes; in due course the process for reviewing applications for autonomy will be addressed.
23. The NPIU informed the Bank team that institutes in low-income/special category states which were allowed to participate in TEQIP, even if only 4 years old, would not be able to obtain autonomy from UGC; UGC informed the NPIU that it could not waive the requirement to be at least 10 years old. This affects 4 TEQIP institutes.

Recommendations

⁴ Government College of Engineering, Kannur, KE; Madhav Institute of Technology & Science, Gwalior, MP; College of Engineering & Management, Kolaghat, West Bengal; and M.C.K.V Institute of Engineering, Howrah, West Bengal.

⁵ Lukhdirji Engineering College, Morbi, GJ; Government Engineering College, Thrissur, KE; Rajiv Gandhi Institute of Technology, Kottayam, KE; LBS Institute of Technology for Women, Poojappura, Thiruvananthapuram, KE; Thangal Kunju Musaliar College of Engineering, Kollam, KE.

- NPIU should work closely with institutes that are close to receiving autonomy to ensure all necessary actions have been taken for UGC to grant them autonomy before project closing.
- TEQIP institutes and the NPIU should use the list placed on the UGC website as official source of data for the status of autonomy applications, and take action accordingly.

C. NBA Accreditation

Current Status

24. The JRM team met with Dr. AK Nassa, Member Secretary, NBA to review the status of the accreditation applications of TEQIP institutes. Dr. Nassa recommended a focus on undergraduate programs for the remaining project period, since the accreditation process for undergraduate programs can be completed faster than the process for postgraduate programs. The NBA reported the current status of applications for the accreditation of undergraduate and post-graduate programs in TEQIP institutes as follows:

Table 3: NBA Accreditation Status, March 2016

Status	UG Programmes		PG Programmes	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
1) Accreditation Status Conveyed	124	18%	75	13%
2) Problem with AICTE or autonomous status	64	9%	37	6%
3) Not applied	6	1%	43	7%
4) Application Referred Back	30	4%	30	5%
5) Application Withdrawn by the College	7	1%	1	0%
6) Fee Approved	0	0%	11	2%
7) Fee Not Received	12	2%	24	4%
8) SAR Not Received	90	13%	51	9%
9) Updated or review SAR required	46	7%	71	12%
10) Problems with SAR	9	1%	9	2%
11) Requested to Apply in Tier I	0	0%	8	1%
12) Revised/Fresh Visit Dates Requested	63	9%	52	9%
13) Visit Dates Not Received	18	3%	18	3%
14) Visit Dates Received	125	19%	96	16%
15) Visit fixed	23	3%	17	3%
16) Visit Held	19	3%	18	3%
17) Visit Cancelled	6	1%	1	0%
18) Others	32	5%	20	3%
Total—Can be expedited	254	38%	212	36%
Total	674	100%	582	100%

25. It is to be noted that the self-assessment report (SAR) for 7% of undergraduate programs are to be updated or reviewed. This is due to the revision of the accreditation assessment parameters by the NBA, upon the introduction of outcome based accreditation in 2013.

Institutions that had submitted their application as per the old format, prior to this change, are required to revise their SARs as per the new format.

Recommendations

- In order to have the maximum impact from accreditation over the remaining project period, it is recommended that the NBA prioritize pending applications for the accreditation of undergraduate programs for which progress on accreditation can be made most quickly and a larger number of students will benefit. As per the above table, 254 such programs where evaluation team visits are scheduled or pending dates (in categories 12-17) have been identified.

D. Faculty and Student Development

Current Status

26. Eight IITs⁶ have been actively providing a range of opportunities to TEQIP colleges to improve faculty domain knowledge and student learning. Interventions have taken the form of: (1) summer/winter schools; (2) research collaboration among TEQIP faculty and students and IIT faculty; (3) short-term training sessions for faculty; (4) sharing equipment and infrastructure; and (5) blended MOOCs. Each IIT has documented its work in detail. Some examples:
- Student-led mentorship: IIT Bombay has initiated a student mentorship program to address the problem of faculty shortage, whereby high-achieving students mentor TEQIP students when they come to the IIT for research/training programs. IIT Bombay faculty have also agreed to be research guides for students in TEQIP colleges.
 - IIT Kanpur has undertaken a number of summer and winter internships for students from TEQIP colleges where they come and work on research projects with IIT Kanpur professors and students. They also held a workshop for two weeks (June 29-July 11, 2015), which targeted BSc students with the aim of motivating them to become teachers.
 - IIT Kharagpur has also held several successful summer and winter schools, leading to GIAN (Global Initiative in Academic Network).
 - IIT Gandhinagar has provided considerable mentoring help to TEQIP colleges in Gujarat, ranging from addressing administrative issues to advice on equipment purchase. They have also held a number of successful summer schools
 - IIT Hyderabad has been focusing primarily on faculty development and is planning to engage more closely with female faculty to understand their specific problems
 - IIT Guwahati has been undertaking a range of faculty development programs
 - IIT Delhi has focused its activities in three areas: capacity building of faculty; knowledge transfer and institutional development.
 - IIT Chennai has developed QEEE, a blended MOOC, now in its 6th semester. It is being used by 71 TEQIP colleges.

⁶ The IITs of Delhi, Gandhinagar, Guwahati, Hyderabad, Kanpur, Kharagpur, Mumbai, Roorkee have established Knowledge Incubation Cells.

27. The current status for faculty and management development is shown in the table below. It is encouraging that the number of participants who have received training by IITs was 2,816 by February 2016 which exceeds the end-of-project target of 2,200. There is also good progress in the number of participants trained by IIMs⁷. It has reached 2088 by February 2016 and it is expected that the end target of 2280 will be reached. There are 7 IIMs offering management and leadership development including on the Good Governance Programme and 8 IITs are offering a variety of faculty and students development activities.

Table 4: Faculty and Management Development

Target Indicators for faculty and management development	Achievement July 2015	Achievement February 2016	Project Target October 2016
Number of faculty members benefitted from the training by IITs	2,000	2,816	2,200
Number of faculty/officials attended management capacity enhancement training at IIMs	1,302	2,088	2,280

Concerns

- A number of the training sessions provided by the IITs to faculty are 2-3 days long, and not recognized for promotions. This reduces faculty commitment.
- Faculty often register for training programs, but do not show up or fail to complete the training.
- There is low awareness in TEQIP colleges about training programs on offer. Often people with no relation to the training are sent to the IITs for training programs.
- Several of the participants joining the IIMs management capacity training are not having a management position at their institution. The immediate impact of the training might therefore be limited

Recommendations

- IITs and IIMs could initiate a system as in IIT Kharagpur, where a security deposit is taken when participants register and only refunded on completion of the training.
- NPIU should gather the evaluation reports on the impact of the IIT and IIM training on teaching and research quality, student learning and employability as well as the efficiency of leadership and management of the institution by end of April 2016. In the assessments of IITs work, it would be worth having each IIT visit colleges that are part of another IIT's Quality Circle. Likewise with IIMs.
- Based on the evaluation reports, NPIU will hire two consultants to write up the good practices and learnings from the activities done respectively by the IIT Quality Circles and by the IIM MCEP activities.
- NPIU should prepare a list, by TEQIP institute, of the number of IIT- and IIM-led trainings/internships/seminars that faculty and students have participated in.

⁷ The IIMs of Bangalore, Indore, Kozhikode, Lucknow, Raipur, Trichy, and Udaipur are providing Management Capacity Enhancement Programmes (MCEP).

E. Centres of Excellence

Current status

28. Thirty Centres of Excellence (CoEs) among 27 TEQIP institutions have been selected to carry out collaborative and multi-disciplinary Research and Development (R&D) activities. Among the 27 selected institutions, seven are NITs, ten are government funded institutions, seven are government aided institutions, and three are private un-aided institutions. The selected institutions cover the following 13 research areas: 1) nano-technology; 2) biotechnology; 3) biomedical engineering; 4) chemical engineering; 5) environmental engineering; 6) water resources engineering; 7) disaster management; 8) signal processing; 9) mechanical and material science; 10) process control; 11) data mining and computer sciences; 12) electronics systems; and 13) energy systems.
29. The JRM Team visited four CoEs: the Institute of Chemical Technology, Mumbai; College of Engineering, Chandrapur; Harcourt Butler Technological Institute, Kanpur; and Birla Institute of Technology, Mesra, Ranchi. The visits gave the JRM Team insights in the development potentials and the challenges that the institutions are facing in establishing CoEs. Annex 4 provides an overview of the progress as well as the challenges of the CoEs and lists the findings for the considerations of the CoEs visited.
30. Over the next two months all the 30 CoEs will be assessed in depth by senior academics/peer reviewers from ITTs using a Progress Review Sheet. The peer reviewers will assess the overall progress of the CoE against its objectives and indicators, its collaborative efforts, its interaction with industry, its production of graduate students and trained researchers, and its sustainability. The assessment will serve as a guidance for the CoEs identifying areas where they are on track as well as issues that need improvement. It is suggested that the two first finalized Progress Review Sheets will be shared with all the peer reviewers as examples of good practice for CoE feedback.
31. The Progress Review Sheet will be shared with the Head of the CoE with a copy to the Principal of the institution. The Head of the CoE will have one week to provide comments on the Review Sheet, if any. Based on the suggested recommendations in the Review Sheet, the Head of the CoE will draft an Action Plan within two weeks with concrete and time bound initiatives to implement the recommendations. The Action Plan should also include concrete suggestions on how to sustain its activities and will be shared with the institute's mentor, the SPFU, the NPIU and the peer reviewer. The peer reviewers will review the Action Plan and start a dialog with the Head of the CoE, if the Action Plan does not sufficiently address the recommendations.
32. It is suggested that the NPIU with the peer reviewers should select a few successful CoEs and showcase them widely in the media and with all TEQIP institutions as examples of good practice in establishing and sustaining CoEs.
33. Establishing a CoE is new to many of the 30 TEQIP institutions that have received funding, while others already have extensive experience in establishing and running CoEs. Based on the peer reviews already finalized a number of good practices for building and sustaining a CoE can be identified: competent leadership with clear goals, strategies and performance indicators for the development of the CoE; significant collaboration with other research institutions and with industrial partners in India and abroad; attracting full-time Ph.D.s and industrial chairs; doing interdisciplinary R&D; publishing in reputed journal; filing of patents and commercialization of "Proof-of-Concept" (PoC) type projects; and developing new and updated curriculum for UG and PG students in the discipline areas of the CoE.

Concerns

34. The funding of the CoEs will terminate October 2016. It is therefore very important that the CoEs systematically identify their resource needs (for sustaining and developing the COE) and seek other funding resources to sustain their activities from for example the Ministry of Science and Technology, Ministry of Defence; UGC, AICTE and from industry partners. TEQIP institutions will also be able to benefit from the new IMPacting Research INnovation and Technology (IMPRINT) launched by MHRD addressing major science and engineering challenges in India (for further information <http://imprint-india.org>).

Recommendations

- NPIU will organize the CoE peer review visits with the aim that all the 30 Head of CoEs will have received their Progress Review Sheet at the latest by May 1 2016;
- Based on the suggested recommendations in the Review Sheet, the Head of the CoE will draft an Action Plan within two weeks with concrete and time bound initiatives to implement the recommendations and share them with NPIU, the institute's mentor, the SPFU, and the peer reviewer. The Action Plan should include concrete suggestions for how to sustain the CoE activities after the utilization of the TEQIP funds. The peer reviewers will review the Action Plan and start a dialog with the Head of the CoE, if the Action Plan does not sufficiently address the recommendations.

F. The Four Funds

Current Status

35. To sustain development activities initiated in project institutes under TEQIP II post project closure, all project funded institutes are required to have established four funds: *Corpus Fund, Faculty Development Fund, Equipment Replacement Fund and Maintenance Fund*. Project institutes are required to build these funds with annual contribution into each Fund equal to at least 0.5% of annual recurring expenditure of the institute; institutes can deposit additional funds if they wish. The PIP says that: Annual recurring expenditure could be a definite percentage of fee collection from students, savings from Block Grant, donations from alumni and charitable organizations, IRG including commercial use of facilities, consultancy earnings (institutional share), and matching Grants from Government/management on IRG etc. Further, each project institute is encouraged to additionally contribute an amount from its savings into the Corpus Fund. Institutes may not contribute this amount from the Project resources. Funds reported in the MIS for a given year should reflect annual recurring expenditure earned in the same financial year (even if the money is actually deposited after the year in question, once the final amount of annual recurring expenditure is known).
36. The amount of money reported as having been deposited in the Funds each year of the Project has varied considerably (Table 5). Significantly more money has been deposited into the Corpus Fund than the other Funds (perhaps because the Corpus Fund can be used for a wider range of activities). The amount of money deposited above the minimum is entirely at the discretion of the institute; however, a significant minority of institutions have deposited the same amount of money in each Fund (according to data provided to

the JRM). A very high proportion of the money deposited, however, has been deposited by Centrally Funded Institutes – at least two-thirds in the three years for which full reporting is available. CFIs have significantly higher revenue potential for revenue generation because of their higher fees and better infrastructure enables more interactions with industry. In non-CFI institutes, on average about 3 crores has been raised during the lifetime of the Project – though these sums vary very considerably across institutes.

Table 5: Funds added each year across TEQIP institutes (INR lakhs)

	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
Corpus	47974	31153	54633	2702
Faculty Development	5725	2636	4812	1104
Equipment Replacement	5677	2154	5109	1039
Maintenance	6378	2307	3882	968
Totals for all institutes	65754	38250	68436	5812
Totals without CFIs	23001	7961	15172	4149
Average per non-CFI institute (No. 166)	139	48	91	25
% contributed by CFIs	65%	79%	78%	29%

Source: TEQIP MIS. Notes: (1) Figures reported here for 2013-14 are slightly higher than reported in the last JRM, due to additional institutes reporting. (2) Not all institutes have reported figures for 2015-16.

Key Issues

37. The most pressing and important issue is to verify the numbers reported from the MIS to the JRM. The figures for CFIs and some other institutes seem inappropriately high. The relationship to annual recurring expenditure also needs to be investigated as a further check.
38. The NPIU has not followed up on two related issues recommended during the last JRM. First, one of the issues reported in the last JRM was the confusion and lack of guidance for institutes as to whether, when and how they can use the resources in the Four Funds. This relates both to institutes which have continued under TEQIP II but have Funds from TEQIP I and those which only participated in TEQIP I; these institutes should be available immediately to these Funds to sustain TEQIP I activities subject to the BoGs continuing to exercise the same decision-making power over the Funds that they exercise during the Project. It is the responsibility of State Governments to issue guidelines to their respective institutes about the use of the Four Funds, following consultation with NPIU. No consolidated information was available to the JRM team as to how many states have prepared guidelines, though a small number reported that they had done so during the JRM.
39. Second, private unaided institutes had raised the question whether they are required to maintain the Equipment Replacement and the Maintenance Funds since they have not

been able to purchase equipment using TEQIP II resources. No action has been taken on this.

Recommendations

- All colleges need to ensure that all required resources are deposited in the four funds and report this through the MIS. SPFUs should monitor and follow up as necessary. No further funds should be released to institutes by MHRD until the funds have been replenished to the required amounts.
- NPIU to verify the figures reported as being deposited into the four funds.
- NPIU to follow up the last JRM recommendations guidance on the use of the four funds.

G. Mentorship/ Performance Auditing

Current Status

40. The NPIU conducted a comprehensive survey of institutes, performance auditors and mentors to obtain feedback on the effectiveness of the performance auditing and mentorship activities. Overall feedback was very positive— 89.6% of institutes agreed that the mentorship support they received was useful and should be continued. The corresponding figure for performance auditing support was 91.4%.
41. A majority of performance auditors felt that two days were not sufficient for the performance audit process, and a third day was required. Almost 70% of institutes reported that the mentor reports are discussed in their BoG meetings. However, the qualitative responses of some mentors and performance auditors indicate the need for greater follow up action on their findings and recommendations.
42. All institutes will undergo a further round of performance auditing by August 30, 2016. The NPIU is working with the IITs and the NBA to finalize a list of performance auditors. The performance auditing process will be extended to three days.

Recommendations

- All performance auditors participating in the upcoming round of performance auditing, participate in a mandatory training provided by NPIU which includes specific clarifications and training on the required characteristics that good performance audit reports should have.
- Mentors and performance auditors hold wrap-up meetings with the institutes' BoGs and the state departments of technical education, after the next round of mentoring and performance auditing, to present their findings and discuss areas for further action.
- Conduct a final round of performance auditing by August 30, 2016, with clear guidelines for quality assurance of reports.

VI. MONITORING AND EVALUATION

43. The project has made good progress towards achieving the revised end-of-project targets, with a number of indicators already surpassing their targets. The percentage of institutions with academic autonomy is 68.5 against a target of 70 and the share of programs that are accredited/ applied for accreditation is 63 against a target of 55. The percentage of faculty with at least an MTech is 91 against a target of 88 and the number of master and PhD. students enrolled is 46,160 (academic year 2014-15⁸) against a target of 41,000. The Results Framework Document is updated (Annex 1). The number of institutions now providing adequate data in the MIS has also increased to 175 for the year 2014-15 and 186 for the year 2015-16. Data entry for the year 2015-16 is currently under progress. NPIU is continuing to (i) follow-up with institutions to ensure that data-entry is completed; and (ii) conduct trainings as required.
44. The data for 2013-14 has been locked.
45. **Sustainability of the MIS:** MHRD has planned to contract National Informatics Center (NIC) for developing the Project Management System (PMS) for TEQIP III. The PMS will include modules for (i) monitoring fund transfer and utilization; (ii) academic MIS; and (iii) Procurement Support System. All MIS data from TEQIP II will be migrated to the Project Management System (PMS) that will be developed under TEQIP III.
46. **Verification of MIS data:** The data on indicators, such as autonomy and four funds, appear to be erroneous. NPIU should develop a sample check mechanism to ensure the veracity of data being entered into the MIS.
47. **Tracer Study:** NPIU will use Survey Monkey to administer the tracer study survey. It is expected that the survey will be conducted during the month of March/April 2016. The results from the survey will be analysed by NPIU and the results will be shared by June 1, 2016.
48. **Faculty, Staff and Student Satisfaction Survey:** As Infova did not provide the raw data for the survey conducted by them, it has been decided to use Survey Monkey to administer the survey again. NPIU will conduct (i) the first round in April 2016 and share the results by May 2016; and (ii) the second round in September 2016 and share the results by October 2016.
49. **NPIU will need to initiate the following studies detailed in the PIP:** Bibliometric Study, Impact Assessment and Resource Utilization Study.

Table 6: Studies to be undertaken under TEQIP II

Administer Tracer Study Survey	March 2016
Share results from Tracer Study Survey	June 1, 2016
Administer Faculty, Staff and Student Satisfaction Survey	April 2016 and September 2016
Share Results from Satisfaction Survey	May 2016 (1 st round); October 2016 (2 nd)

⁸ Data entry for 2015-16 is in progress.

	round)
TEQIP II Impact Assessment	Researcher (firm or individual) to be selected through open competition by April 30, 2016 for study to be completed by Sept 1, 2016
Bibliometric study	NPIU to request Indian Institute of Science Bangalore to undertake the study by March 31, 2016, for completion by August 1, 2016
Resource utilization study	Researcher (firm or individual) finalized (open competition) by April 30, 2016

VII. FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT

50. **Disbursement status:** Disbursement as on 1 March, 2016 stands at XDR 78.79 million (USD 110.92 million) reflecting 58.5% disbursement against an allocation of XDR 134 million (USD 189.5 million). This includes disbursement up to quarter ending September 2015. Further, disbursement application amounting to approximately Rs. 50 crores (USD 7.4 million) against expenditures for the period October to December 2015 shall be filled shortly to CAAA. This is likely to take the disbursement percentage to appx. 62%.

51. **Budget allocation and funds position:** As per the central budget FY 2016-17 the allocation for TEQIP programs is Rs. 251 crores. The mission was informed that this allocation is for expenditures under both TEQIP-II and TEQIP-III and only approximately Rs 188.25 crores is against TEQIP-II. We would like to highlight that given the future expenditure plan, the allocation needs to be further assessed and increased, as deemed necessary. The table below reflects the expected fund position for the remaining project life:

Assessment of Fund availability and expected expenditure for remaining project life		
S.No.	Particulars	Amt in INR crores
A	Flow of Funds Assessment for remaining project life	884.84
I	Fund Balance unspent (for FY 2015-16)	508.34
II	Budget Allocations (Center and State in 50:50 ratio)	376.50
B	Total Expected Expenditure from Jan. to Oct., 2016 *	1057.74
C	Funding Gap	172.90
* State (Rs 876 cr); CFI (Rs 158 cr); IITs 7 IIMs (Rs 20cr); NPIU (Rs 4 cr)		

52. **Projected Expenditure:** The projected expenditure for the period Jan to October 2016 (Rs. 1,057 crores) appears inordinately high. The projections reflect that in the final 10 months of the project life, the expenditure rate is 82% as against the actual expenditure from inception up till December 2015 (Rs.1,288 crores). Rationality needs to be assessed as this will enable assessment of total fund requirement.

53. **Delay in Release of State Share:** On analysis of the position of release of funds by States as on 31st January 2016, it is observed that inordinate time is still being taken by some states. Of the total amount of Central, State and Institute share of INR 182 crores pending to be released by the States, an amount equivalent to appx. INR 47 crores (i.e 26%) pertains to funds not released for more than 180 days. We further understand that with effect from 1st April 2015, there has been an increase in the counterpart contribution from the States and institutes to 50% as against the earlier 40%. The mission was informed that

the arrangement is yet to become effective in practice and there continue to be funding gaps on this account as well.

54. **E-FMR** continues to be implemented partially and IUFs submitted to the Bank are based on monthly excel summaries sent by the institutes and the SPFUs. Visit to Jharkhand showed that SPFU receives monthly IUFs in excel sheets from the institutes and quarterly E-FMRs are manually, subsequently updated on the E-FMR system.
55. **Internal controls:** FM Indicators Report reflects pending bank reconciliations (BRS) in some institutes in Chhattisgarh, Gujarat, Telangana, Uttarakhand, UP and some CFIs. Additionally, areas of control of assets and management of advances require constant attention and supervision.
56. **Effective Integration** of observations raised as part of External and Internal Audits remains a challenge. The visit to Jharkhand showed that Internal Audit Reports were not available in time for statutory audit of FY 2014-15. The SPFUs must also ensure that all audit reports are shared promptly with the institutes, as during the visit to BIT Mesra in Jharkhand, the mission was informed that internal audit reports for Apr-Sep 2015 were received only recently.
57. **Compliance of Audit Observations:** Compliance of audit observations needs to be strengthened significantly. While SPFUs are required to monitor compliance of all observations by the institutes, NPIU should also monitor the status of compliance in states on a regular basis. In BIT Mesra in Jharkhand, compliance of internal audit for FY 2013-14 and FY 2014-15 had not been submitted to the SPFU whereas CIT had submitted compliance to the SPFU.
58. **Recommendations**
 - A detailed analysis of future availability of funds and projected expenditure is suggested to be carried out to assess fund-expenditure position for remaining project life, with focused attention on areas like (i) unreleased funds with States; (ii) unspent funds with institutions; (iii) reasonability of projected expenditures; (iv) anticipated contribution towards States/ institutes shares.
 - Timeliness of flow of fund: Proactive engagement by both NPIU and SPFUs in ensuring (i) compliance and following-up with the various State (treasuries) procedural requirements; (ii) extensive follow-up with States finance departments, as required; and (iii) proactive planning by SPFUs & institutes to enable speedy usage/transfers of funds, once the same are received in their Bank accounts.
 - NPIU should issue instructions and clarifications to all implementing agencies of the project (SPFUs, institutes, IITs and IIMs) regarding procedures to be adopted to ensure smooth project closure e.g., deadline for releases by MHRD (if any); period up to which payments can be made for procurement of goods and services, audit fees etc.; period up to which claims have to be submitted to the Bank; and early time lines for audit completion etc.

VIII. PROCUREMENT

59. **Procurement in the project.** The status of procurement as planned for the entire period was discussed during the mission. The agreed action plan of last mission was also

reviewed. NPIU furnished a current national summary of procurement status under the project.

60. Mission noted that after the last JRM, which was held in July 2015; in the month of Sept 2015, the vender providing AMC to PMSS was declared bankrupt and placed under liquidation. As a result, the PMSS went defunct from middle of Sept 2015. This led to stalemate in procurement activity and as a result, MHRD allowed institutions for manual entry of procurement activity till PMSS is functional.
61. After lot of follow up and with the direction of Bombay High court, NPIU finally got the source code from the liquidated firm in February 2016. NPIU is in the process of making a trial run of the data and source code in their server before going for hosting the same in a third party server for use by the project institutions. Mission advised NPIU that once the PMSS is functional, the PMSS should be updated with manually procurement data, so that procurement data in PMSS is upto date and current.
62. At the end of Jan 2016, the actual expenditure under procurement: Rs. 659 Crores. Contracts worth Rs.96.63 cr are already committed and for Rs. 127.2 cr worth of cases, the procurement is “In pipeline” i.e at various stages of procurement.
63. Further as per PMSS data, it is planned to procure goods worth Rs. 1005.5 Crores till Sept 2015 end. With additional procurement component worth Rs. 170 cr after Sept 2015, the total planned procurement will be Rs. 1175.5 cr. After deducting the total procurement expenditure, there is approx. Rs.292.67 cr worth of goods, for which procurement action is yet to be initiated.
64. As discussed during the last mission, around Rs. 170 cr more amount is going to be used by some select good performing institutions on procurement as they have received additional funding. MHRD has issued instruction for the institutions to finish procurement by end of April 2016. However mission felt that there is a need for giving more time for the institutions to procure as they have received additional funding in recent times.
65. **Procurement Post Review (PPR) FY 15:** Mission noted that for the PPR FY 16, the PPR report is already shared with NPIU and compliance to PPR comments from the institutes is awaited.
66. **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.
67. **Rating for Procurement.** Though procurement activities have picked up in recent times, the cumulative procurement committed till date is around 75% of planned procurement. The project institutions have to expedite the completion of all the planned procurement in time. Considering the above the procurement performance during the period of review has been retained as **Moderately Satisfactory**.

IX. PROJECT MANAGEMENT

68. The Central Project Advisor's position was advertised and a committee was formed to review the applications in July 2015. Given that considerable time has elapsed since then, it is important to close the position and re-advertise.
69. Currently there are eleven vacant positions in the NPIU (including the CPA). A couple of positions have been suspended.
70. First, in April 2015, the company providing annual maintenance services for the e-procurement system for the project, Glodyne, went bankrupt and subsequently ceased providing services. The Bank was informed about this by NPIU only in September 2015. Institutes did not undertake procurement between September 15-November, 2015, a crucial period for such activity, given the academic cycle and the project's closing date. Institutes were thereafter allowed to undertake manual entry of procurement between November 20, 2015 and March 31, 2016, by which time the new service provider is expected to be available. Second, in a number of cases, such as autonomy and four funds, the MIS data has been found to be erroneous, leading to faulty conclusions about project progress against objectives.

X. SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS

71. A workshop with TEQIP colleges on mechanisms to improve student transition rates was held, incorporating behavioural insights on interventions to help students make decisions at different points in the undergraduate program with a view to completing their degree (Annex 5).
72. The interaction at the workshop helped develop an enhanced view of the positive targeting needed for students from vulnerable communities, SCs, STs and girls. One of the conclusions was that only reservation of seats for the students belonging to vulnerable categories is not sufficient. Coordinators from various institutes discussed the problems faced in terms of dropouts from vulnerable categories and the subsequent good practices they adopted towards improving transition rates for these students.

Recommendations

- A quick documentation exercise to highlight good practices adopted by various institutes towards improving performance of students belonging to vulnerable categories would be beneficial in capturing positive outcomes in the ICR. This study will not only help to capture varied and distinct efforts undertaken by institutes over the years, but also provide a necessary insight to LIS states, which have a larger presence of vulnerable communities. The study could focus on analysing indicative parameters such as:
 1. Percentage of reservation seats filled for SCs, STs and girls
 2. Transition rates of SCs, STs and girls
 3. Steps taken by the institute towards improving retention rates
 4. Work readiness: Placement percentage of students from vulnerable categories
 5. Scholarship disbursement: This can be used to analyse effectiveness with respect to retention rates among students from poor households and also to estimate ease of access
 6. Focus on capturing qualitative aspects related to efficiency of institutional delivery mechanisms majorly concerning - infrastructure, safety and hygiene issues, innovative methods adopted, for instance, change in title from 'weak students' to 'potential

performers', course structure and delivery, teachers' training and course material available in lucid language and so forth

7. Lastly, the study should highlight good practices that make optimal use of resources so that upscaling and adoption in the context of LIS states is possible.

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

73. These are described in detail in Annex 6.

XII. NEW ACTIONS TO BE TAKEN FROM THIS JRM

74. These are listed in Annex 7.

INDIA

TECHNICAL EDUCATION QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PROJECT II (TEQIP-II)

Sixth Joint Review Mission

March 1-14, 2016

Annexures to Aide Memoire

List of Annexures

1. List of persons met and Institutes visited
2. Results Framework
3. Institutional Performance Assessment
4. CoE visit report
5. Equity Action Plan seminar report
6. Action Taken Report from 5th JRM
7. Actions to be Taken
8. JRM Schedule

Annex 1: Persons Met and Institutes Visited

MHRD/NPIU:

S. No.	Name of the participants	Designation
1	Ms. Tripti Gurha	Director (IITs) MHRD & CPA In-charge, NPIU
2	Dr. Rita Goyal	Sr. Consultant (Academic)
3	Dr. N D Kulkarni	Sr. Consultant (Academic)
4	Dr. Yogesh Srivastava	Consultant (Academic)
5	Shri Anup Mehrotra	Consultant (Academic)
6	Shri N S Agnihotri	Consultant (Finance)
7	Shri R. K. Arya	Consultant (Finance)
8	Shri Bhanu Pratap Singh	Consultant (IT)
9	Shri Rajiv Mishra	Consultant (Admin)
10	Shri Sachin Gupta	Associate Consultant (Academic)
11	Dr. Prakash C Kuniyal	Associate Consultant (Academic)
12	Dr. Uma Bansal	Associate Consultant (Academic)
13	Ms. Rupali Jha	Associate Consultant (CS)

Representatives from IITs and IIMs (Meeting held on 7th March)

S. No.	Name of the participants	Designation	Name of the Institution/organization	Name of the State
1	Prof O P Shah	Dean Continuing Education	IIT Kharagpur	West Bengal
2	Prof C S Upadhyay	Coordinator-KIT	IIT Kanpur	Uttar Pradesh
3	Prof Amit Prashant	Coordinator-KIT	IIT Gandhinagar	Gujarat
4	Prof Pradeep Kumar	Professor	IIT Roorkee	Uttarakhand
5	Prof V Gopal	Professor	IIM Tiruchirappali	Tamil Nadu
6	Prof V M Gadre	Professor	IIT Bombay	Maharashtra
7	Prof C Raju	Professor	IIM Kozhikode	Kerala
8	Prof Bharat Panigrahi	Professor	IIT Hyderabad	Telangana
9	Prof Prashant Salwan	Professor	IIM Indore	Madhya Pradesh
10	Prof Rajeev Kumra	Professor	IIM Lucknow	Uttar Pradesh
11	Prof Sunil Khijwania	Professor	IIT Guwahati	Assam
12	Prof Mandar Nayak	Professor	IIM Udaipur	Rajasthan
13	Dr. Mahim	Professor	IIT Delhi	Delhi
14	Prof Rajat K Baldha	Professor	IIT Delhi	Delhi

Representatives from States (9th March)

S. No.	Name of the participants	Designation	Name of the Institution/organization	Name of the State
1	Smt. B Udaya Laxmi, IAS	Commissioner of Technical Education & State Project Advisor	SPFU Andhra Pradesh	Andhra Pradesh
2	Prof B Sampath Kumar	Head Academic & Finance Coordinator	SPFU Andhra Pradesh	Andhra Pradesh
3	Prof K Ramji	TEQIP Co-ordinator & Co E Coordinator	AUCE-A, Andhra University, Vishakhapatnam	Andhra Pradesh
4	Dr. Sushant Samir		SPFU Chandigarh	Chandigarh
5	Shri Animesh Garg	Consultant (P & FM)	SPFU Chandigarh	Chandigarh
6	Shri Gaurav Kathpal	Consultant (A & M&E)	SPFU Chandigarh	Chandigarh
7	Shri S D Burman		SPFU Chhattisgarh	Chhattisgarh
8	Dr. R S Parihar	TEQIP Coordinator	SPFU Chhattisgarh	Chhattisgarh
9	Shri O P Shukla	Deputy Director & TEQIP Coordinator	SPFU Delhi	Delhi
10	Prof Vishal Verma		DTU, Delhi	Delhi
11	Prof Usha Neelkantan		SPFU Gujarat	Gujarat
12	Dr. V S Purani	Joint Director	SPFU Gujarat	Gujarat
13	Ms. Paras		SPFU Haryana	Haryana
14	Shri K P Singh	Joint Director & TEQIP Coordinator	SPFU Haryana	Haryana
15	Shri G S Sharma		SPFU Jharkhand	Jharkhand
16	Prof Manohar G Nayak	State Project Coordinator	SPFU Karnataka	Karnataka
17	Dr. Virinda V Nair	Director & TEQIP Coordinator	SPFU Kerala	Kerala
18	Dr. V Gopa Kumar		SPFU Kerala	Kerala
19	Dr. Ashok T. Pisc	State Project Coordinator	SPFU Maharashtra	Maharashtra
20	Shri Avinash V Amte	Head Academic	SPFU Maharashtra	Maharashtra
21	Dr. G Sivaraj	TEQIP Coordinator	SPFU Puducherry	Puducherry
22	Dr. S Subramanian		SPFU Puducherry	Puducherry
23	Shri Sham Goyal	Dy. Director	SPFU Punjab	Punjab
24	Dr. Ajay Kaushik	State Project Coordinator	SPFU Rajasthan	Rajasthan
25	Prof Dr. C Chinnaraj	State Project Coordinator	SPFU Tamil Nadu	Tamil Nadu
26	Sri G Jaya Sekhar	I-C Coordinator	SPFU Telangana	Telangana
27	Sri S.Sreenivas	Head Procurement	SPFU Telangana	Telangana
28	Prof Neelam Srivastava	Chief Project Coordinator	SPFU Uttar Pradesh	Uttar Pradesh
29	Shri Alam Siddique		SPFU Uttar Pradesh	Uttar Pradesh
30	Prof Avnish Jain	Project Coordinator	SPFU Uttarakhand	Uttarakhand
31	Prof S Dasgupta	State Project Advisor	SPFU West Bengal	West Bengal
32	Prof Chatopadhyay	Academic Advisor Cum Coordinator	SPFU West Bengal	West Bengal

Representatives from SPFU and Institutions (11th March)

S. No.	Name of the participants	Designation	Name of the Institution/organization	Name of the State
1	Dr. S B Jaju	TEQIP Coordinator	G H Rasoni College of Engineering, Nagpur	Maharashtra
2	Dr. Virendra Pathak	Professor & Dean	Dr. APJ Abdul Kalam Technical University, Lucknow	Uttar Pradesh
3	Prof P R Vavia	Dean	Institute of Chemical Technology, Mumbai	Maharashtra
4	Prof R N Awale	TEQIP Coordinator	VJTI Mumbai	Maharashtra
5	Dr. V M Phalle		VJTI Mumbai	Maharashtra
6	Prof Shreekanth M Prabhu		PESIT Bangalore	Karnataka
7	Dr. P K Singh	TEQIP Coordinator	MMMUT Gorakhpur	Uttar Pradesh
8	Dr. U Sripathi	Co-Coordinator	NITK Surathkal	Karnataka
9	Dr. Laxminidhi T	Nodal Officer (Academic)	NITK Surathkal	Karnataka
10	Prof Manohar G Nayak	State Project Coordinator	SPFU Karnataka	Karnataka
11	Dr. G N Sekhar	Vice President & TEQIP Coordinator	BMSCE Banaglore	Karnataka
12	Shri Shailender Sharma	Coordinator	MLV Textile Engineering College, Bhilwara	Rajasthan
13	Dr. A K Dwivedi	Professor	Rajasthan Technical University, Kota	Rajasthan
14	Prof Anil Kumar	Assistant Professor	KNIT Sultanpur	Uttar Pradesh
15	Dr. Anka Swami	Nodal officer	GCET Bikaner	Rajasthan
16	Dr. S.K Bishnoi	TEQIP Coordinator	Government Engineering College, Bikaner	Rajasthan
17	Mr. Manoj	TEQIP Coordinator	Government Engineering College, Bikaner	Rajasthan
18	Prof A K Gupta	TEQIP Coordinator	MJP Rohilkhand University, Bareilly	Uttar Pradesh
19	Dr. M K Verma	Vice Chancellor	CSUTU, Bilai	Chhattisgarh
20	Ms. Sangeeta Datt		The World Bank	New Delhi
21	Prof S K Soni	TEQIP Coordinator	Shri G.S. Institute of Technology and Science, Indore	Madhya Pradesh
22	Dr. A K Dubey	TEQIP Coordinator	Government Engineering College, Raipur	Chhattisgarh
23	Shri N P Singh	Associate Professor	Government Engineering College, Bilaspur	Chhattisgarh
24	Prof M R Khan	Professor	Government Engineering College, Jagdalpur	Chhattisgarh
25	Shri T P Singh	Assistant Professor	Government Engineering College, Jagdalpur	Chhattisgarh
26	Shri D Mathur		Rajasthan Technical	Rajasthan

S. No.	Name of the participants	Designation	Name of the Institution/organization	Name of the State
			University, Kota	
27	Shri A K Nigam		Bundelkhand Institute of Engineering & Tech. Jhansi	Uttar Pradesh
28	Prof R K Agarwal	Professor	IET, Alwar	Rajasthan
29	Shri Shiva Kant Dwivedi	State Project Advisor	Special Secretary Technical Education	Uttar Pradesh
30	Ms. Neelam Srivastava	Chief Project Coordinator	SPFU Lucknow	Uttar Pradesh
31	Dr. Ashish Dutta		SIRT Bhopal	Madhya Pradesh
32	Dr. Akhilesh Upadhyay		SIRT Bhopal	Madhya Pradesh
33	Mr. Alam Siddiquee		SPFU Uttar Pradesh	Uttar Pradesh
34	Prof A Usmani		CIT Ranchi	Jharkhand
35	Dr. A Bhattacharyay		CIT Ranchi	Jharkhand
36	Dr. Ritesh Kumar Singh	TEQIP Coordinator	BIT Mesra	Jharkhand
37	Dr. Devendra Choudhary		Government Engineering College, Ajmer	Rajasthan
38	Mr. Manoj Kr Singh		MJP Rohilkhand University, Bareilly	Uttar Pradesh
39	Dr. Moti Lal		Government Engineering College, Jhalawar	Rajasthan
40	Dr. S M Prasanna Kumar		Rungta College Engineering & Technology, Bilai	Chhattisgarh
41	Dr. Ranjan		College of Engineering & Technology, Bhubneswar	Odisha
42	Dr. B P Nandwane		CTAE Jaipur	Rajasthan
43	Dr. Mahesh Kothari	Nodal Officer	CTAE	Rajasthan
44	Dr. Gurdeep Singh	Vice Chancellor	Vinoba Bhave Unversity	Jharkhand
45	Shri G S Sharma		SPFU Jharkhand	Jharkhand
46	Shri S D Burman		SPFU Chattisgarh	Chattisgarh
47	Shri D R S Parihar		SPFU Chattisgarh	Chattisgarh
48	Prof Yaduvir Singh		HBTI Kanpur	Uttar Pradesh
49	Dr. P K S Yadav		HBTI Kanpur	Uttar Pradesh
50	Dr. Anis		IFTM University	Moradabad
51	Shri Sanjeev Agarwal		IFTM University	Moradabad

Annex 2: 6th JRM - Update on Results Framework

Indicator	2009-10	2010-2011		2011-2012		2012-2013		2013-14		2014-15		2015-16**		Project End Target
		Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	
Share of supported programs that are accredited or applied for	30	35	23 (Accredited: 9 Applied :14)	40	30 (Accredited: 13 Applied :17)	45	40 (Accredited: 12 Applied :28)	50	55 (Accredited: 18 Applied : 37)	52	65 (Accredited: 21 Applied : 44)	54	63 (Accredited: 18 Applied : 45)	55
			No. of total eligible programs: 2036		No. of total eligible programs: 2159		No. of total eligible programs: 2295		No. of total eligible programs: 2429		No. of total eligible programs: 2567		No. of total eligible programs: 2729	
			No. of programs accredited: 192		No. of programs accredited: 284		No. of programs accredited: 269		No. of programs accredited: 436		No. of programs accredited: 524		No. of programs accredited: 491	
			No. of programs applied for: 280		No. of programs applied for: 351		No. of programs applied for: 660		No. of programs applied for: 905		No. of programs applied for: 1136		No. of programs applied for: 1221	
Percentage Faculty with at least an M. Tech (regular and contract)	45	45	86.87	50	86.1	55	87.1	60	88.5	86	90.65	87	90.92	88
Percentage of Faculty with or pursuing M. Tech and PhD (regular and contract)	63	63	87.64	64	87	68	88.15	73	89.66	88	91.90	89	92.2	90
			Total no. of faculty: 17705		Total no. of faculty: 19429		Total no. of faculty: 21605		Total no. of faculty: 22692		Total no. of faculty: 23088		Total no. of faculty: 23261	
			No. of faculty with highest qualification MTech only: 8572		No. of faculty with highest qualification MTech only: 9663		No. of faculty with highest qualification MTech only: 11424		No. of faculty with highest qualification MTech only: 12597		No. of faculty with highest qualification MTech only: 13396		No. of faculty with highest qualification MTech only: 13603	
			No of faculty with highest qualification PhD: 6433		No of faculty with highest qualification PhD: 6686		No of faculty with highest qualification PhD: 7204		No of faculty with highest qualification PhD: 7374		No of faculty with highest qualification PhD: 7515		No of faculty with highest qualification PhD: 7541	

Indicator	2009-10	2010-2011		2011-2012		2012-2013		2013-14		2014-15		2015-16**		Project End Target
		Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	
			No. of faculty enrolled in M.Tech: 137		No. of faculty enrolled in M.Tech: 183		No. of faculty enrolled in M.Tech: 228		No. of faculty enrolled in M.Tech: 263		No. of faculty enrolled in M.Tech: 284		No. of faculty enrolled in M.Tech: 293	
Total number of Master and PhD students	30000	32000	35240	33000	37790	34000	44000	34000	48820	40000	46160	41000	**	41000
Number of publications in refereed journals (within the field of Engineering)	7032	7500	11370	8000	15985	8500	18040	9000	19860	14000	18600	14500	**	15000
Percentage of externally funded research and development projects and consultancies in total revenue	6	7	8.55	8	9.40	9	11.6	10	15	11	11.5	12	**	12
			Total Revenue: 271374 lacs		Total Revenue: 253437 lacs		Total Revenue: 229090 lacs		Total Revenue: 277749 lacs		Total Revenue: 212411 lacs			
			Revenue from externally funded research and development projects and consultancies: 232116 lacs		Revenue from externally funded research and development projects and consultancies: 238590 lacs		Revenue from externally funded research and development projects and consultancies: 265561 lacs		Revenue from externally funded research and development projects and consultancies: 422717 lacs		Revenue from externally funded research and development projects and consultancies: 245179 lacs			
Transition rate of all students from the first year to the second year of under graduate study	--	48	64.25	51	68.95	54	68.39	58	69.72	61	58.75	65	--	--
			Total no. of students in the first year: 88062		Total no. of students in the first year: 90377		Total no. of students in the first year: 93754		Total no. of students in the first year: 93440		Total no. of students in the first year: 91820			
			No. of students who transitioned from the first year to second year: 56582		No. of students who transitioned from the first year to second year: 62258		No. of students who transitioned from the first year to second year: 64119		No. of students who transitioned from the first year to second year: 65107		No. of students who transitioned from the first year to second year: 53937			
Transition rate of	45	45	60.24	48	64.26	51	62.39	55	63.9	57	53.85	60	--	--

Indicator	2009-10	2010-2011		2011-2012		2012-2013		2013-14		2014-15		2015-16**		Project End Target
		Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	
students from disadvantaged backgrounds from the first year to second year of undergraduate study			Total no. of students from disadvantaged backgrounds in the first year: 38704		Total no. of students from disadvantaged backgrounds in the first year: 38817		Total no. of students from dis - advantaged backgrounds in the first year: 40723		Total no. of students from disadvantaged backgrounds in the first year: 41036		Total no. of students from disadvantaged backgrounds in the first year: 42166			
			No of students from disadvantaged backgrounds who transitioned from the first year to second year: 23314		No. of students from disadvantaged backgrounds who transitioned from the first year to second year: 24932		No. of students from disadvantaged backgrounds who transitioned from the first year to second year: 25408		No. of students from disadvantaged backgrounds who transitioned from the first year to second year: 26213		No. of students from disadvantaged backgrounds who transitioned from the first year to second year: 22706			
Direct Beneficiaries (number)	300000	300000	374606	320000	394155	335000	423113	350000	444068	395000	441875	405000	**	405000
			Total no. of student beneficiaries: 353581		Total no. of student beneficiaries: 371131		Total no. of student beneficiaries : 397446		Total no. of student beneficiaries: 417226		Total no. of student beneficiaries: 413243		Total no. of student beneficiaries: **	
			Total no. of faculty beneficiaries: 21025		Total no. of faculty beneficiaries: 23024		Total no. of faculty beneficiaries : 25609		Total no. of faculty beneficiaries: 26842		Total no. of faculty beneficiaries: 27300		Total no. of faculty beneficiaries: **	
of which female (percentage)	26	26	27.9	27	28.6	28	30	30	30	30	30	30	**	30
			Total no. of female student beneficiaries: 98202		Total no. of female student beneficiaries: 105737		Total no. of female student beneficiaries: 114365		Total no. of female student beneficiaries: 121667		Total no. of female student beneficiaries: 121518		Total no. of female student beneficiaries: 84800	
			Total no. of female faculty		Total no. of female faculty		Total no. of female faculty		Total no. of female faculty		Total no. of female faculty		Total no. of female faculty beneficiary	

Indicator	2009-10	2010-2011		2011-2012		2012-2013		2013-14		2014-15		2015-16**		Project End Target
		Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	
		beneficiaries :6254		beneficiaries : 6970		beneficiaries: 7937		beneficiaries: 8347		beneficiaries: 8457		beneficiaries: 8523		
Percentage of institutions with academic autonomy	30	40	51	50	57	60	58	65	63	66	65	68	69	70
Number of faculty members that have benefitted from the teaching effectiveness training	—	—	—	—	—	182	182	1000	1210	1500	2000	2000	2816	2200
Share of TEQIP Supported Engineering Institutions from lagging states as agreed by DEA and World Bank (i.e. Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Rajasthan, Jharkhand, Orissa, Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh) ¹	17.7	20	0	20	0	20	19	20	19	20	19	20	19	20
Number of governance self reviews received	—	—	—	—	—	—	65	80	166	180	184	190	184	--
Number of Governance Development	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	20	38	120	180	170	180	180

¹ At the time of project approval, the indicator on “States lagging in technical education” was defined as those that either have only one Engineering Institution or less than one Engineering Institution per million population as per AICTE’s approved list of Engineering Degree Institutions in 2004. As per this definition, the following states are identified as lagging states in technical education: Nagaland, A&N Islands, Dadra Nagar Haveli, Daman and Diu, Lakshadweep, Assam, Meghalaya, Manipur, J&K, Arunachal Pradesh, Bihar, Chattisgarh, Gujarat, Himachal Pradesh, Jharkhand, Rajasthan, Tripura, UP and West Bengal. As per this definition, the actual achievement of “Share of TEQIP supported institutions from States lagging in technical education” is 23.5%. This has changed since last mission as one institution (from West Bengal) has been converted to a CFI.

Indicator	2009-10	2010-2011		2011-2012		2012-2013		2013-14		2014-15		2015-16**		Project End Target
		Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	
plans received														
Fully functional MIS -Number of institutions reporting at least 70% of the indicators	—	—	—	—	—	—	43	150	156	155	175	160	186	160

Annex 3: 6th JRM: Performance Assessment Indicators (as on 10th March 2016)

6th JRM: Performance Assessment Indicators (as on 10th March 2016)												
S.N.	Name of States/Uts	Category	Name of Institutions	1 Autonomy (received 2(f) recognition from UGC; and obtained autonomy or applied to UGC for autonomy with no objection from university) (Yes/No)	2 Minutes of meeting of Board of Governors taking place in last 4 months published on the institution's website (Yes/No)	3 NBA accreditation (55% accredited; or completion application for 55% sent to NBA, i.e., fee paid and Self-Assessment Report having been completed) (Yes/No)	4 Commitment of 100% of funds received (Yes/No)	5 Expenditure of at least 70% of total funds received (Yes/No)	6 Procurement plan to cover 100% of planned procurement expenditures (Yes/No)	7 Completion of all data input into the MIS for 2014-15 (exception to be provided for institutions where the results are delayed) (Yes/No)	8 Institution has deposited required funds in each of the Four Funds, as against annual expenditure reported in the MIS (Yes/No)	No. of Indicators Met
1	Andhra Pradesh	Private unaided	Sree Vidyanikethan Engineering College, Chittoor	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
2	Andhra Pradesh	Govt.	A U College of Engineering, Andhra University, Visakhapatnam	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
3	Andhra Pradesh	Private unaided	VR Siddhartha Engineering College, Kanuru, Vijaywada	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
4	Andhra Pradesh	Private unaided	Aditya Institute of Technology & Management, Tekkali, Srikakulam	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
5	Andhra Pradesh	Private unaided	Shri Vishnu Engineering College for women, Vishnupur, Bhimavaram	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
6	Andhra Pradesh	Private unaided	Gayatri Vidya Parishad College of Engineering, Madhurawada, Visakhapatnam	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
7	Andhra Pradesh	Private unaided	GITAM Institute of Technology - GITAM University, Vishakhapatnam	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	7
8	Andhra Pradesh	Private unaided	Madanapalle Institute of Technology & Science, Madanapalle	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8

9	Andhra Pradesh	Govt.	SVU College of Engineering, Tirupati	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	7
10	Andhra Pradesh	Govt.	JNTU College of Engineering, Kakinada	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
11	Andhra Pradesh	Govt.	JNTU College of Engineering, Pulivendula, Kadappa	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
12	Bihar	Govt.	Bhagalpur College of Engineering, Bhagalpur	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	0
13	Bihar	Govt.	Muzaffarpur Institute of Technology, Muzaffarpur	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	0
14	Centrally Funded Institutions	CFI	IIST Shibpur	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
15	Centrally Funded Institutions	CFI	ISM Dhanbad	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
16	Centrally Funded Institutions	CFI	NERIST Itanagar	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	6
17	Centrally Funded Institutions	CFI	NIT Agartala	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	6
18	Centrally Funded Institutions	CFI	NIT Allahabad	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
19	Centrally Funded Institutions	CFI	NIT Bhopal	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	7
20	Centrally Funded Institutions	CFI	NIT Calicut	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
21	Centrally Funded Institutions	CFI	NIT Durgapur	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
22	Centrally Funded Institutions	CFI	NIT Hamirpur	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	7
23	Centrally Funded Institutions	CFI	NIT Jaipur	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
24	Centrally Funded Institutions	CFI	NIT Jalandhar	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	7
25	Centrally Funded Institutions	CFI	NIT Jamshedpur	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	7
26	Centrally Funded Institutions	CFI	NIT Kurukshetra	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	7

27	Centrally Funded Institutions	CFI	NIT Nagpur	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
28	Centrally Funded Institutions	CFI	NIT Patna	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
29	Centrally Funded Institutions	CFI	NIT Raipur	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
30	Centrally Funded Institutions	CFI	NIT Rourkela	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
31	Centrally Funded Institutions	CFI	NIT Silchar	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
32	Centrally Funded Institutions	CFI	NIT Surat	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
33	Centrally Funded Institutions	CFI	NIT Surathkal	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
34	Centrally Funded Institutions	CFI	NIT Tiruchirappally	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
35	Centrally Funded Institutions	CFI	NIT Warangal	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
36	Centrally Funded Institutions	CFI	NITTTR Chandigarh	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	6
37	Centrally Funded Institutions	CFI	School of Technology - Assam University Silchar	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
38	Centrally Funded Institutions	CFI	SLIET Sangrur	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	7
39	Centrally Funded Institutions	CFI	ZH College of Engg & Tech-AMU Aligarh	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	7
40	Chhattisgarh	Govt.	Government Engineering College, Bilaspur	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	7
41	Chhattisgarh	Private unaided	Rungta College of Engineering & Technology, Bilhail	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	6
42	Chhattisgarh	Govt.	Government Engineering College, Jagdalpur, Bastar	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	7
43	Chhattisgarh	Govt.	Government Engineering College, Raipur	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	6
44	Gujarat	Govt.	Government Engineering College, Bhavnagar	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	6
45	Gujarat	Govt. aided	Birla Vishvakarma Mahavidyalaya, Vallabh Vidyanagar	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	7

46	Gujarat	Govt.	Government Engineering College, Patan, Gujarat	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	5
47	Gujarat	Govt.	Government Engineering College, Rajkot, Gujarat	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	6
48	Gujarat	Govt.	Shantilal Shah Engg. College, Bhavnagar, Gujarat	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	6
49	Gujarat	Govt.	Lukhidhirji Engg. College, Morbi, Gujarat	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	7
50	Gujarat	Govt.	Government Engineering College, Gandhinagar, Gujarat	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	6
51	Haryana	Govt.	University Institute of Engineering & Technology, MDU, Rohtak	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	5
52	Haryana	Private unaided	N.C College of Engineering, Panipat	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	5
53	Haryana	Govt. aided	Faculty of Engineering & Technology, Guru Jambheshwar University of Science & Technology, Hissar	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	6
54	Haryana	Govt.	Faculty of Science, Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	7
55	Haryana	Govt.	University Institute of Engineering & Technology (UIET), Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	6
56	Haryana	Govt.	Faculty of Engineering & Technology, Deenbandhu Chhotu Ram University of Science & Technology, Murthal, Sonapat	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	5
57	Himachal Pradesh	Govt.	Jawaharlal Nehru Government Engineering College, Sundernagar, Mandi	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	5
58	Jharkhand	Govt. aided	BIT, Mesra Ranchi	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	7
59	Jharkhand	Private unaided	Cambridge Institute of Technology, Ranchi	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	7
60	Karnataka	Private unaided	Siddhaganga Institute of Technology, Tumkur, Karnataka	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
61	Karnataka	Govt. aided	Dr. Ambedkar Institute of Technology, Bangalore	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8

62	Karnataka	Private unaided	Nitte Meenakshi Institute of Technology (NMIT)	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	7
63	Karnataka	Govt.	University Visvesvaraya College of Engg., Bangalore	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	6
64	Karnataka	Govt. aided	BVB College of Engineering & Technology	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
65	Karnataka	Govt. aided	National Institute of Engineering, Mysore	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
66	Karnataka	Govt. aided	Malnad College of Engineering, Hassan, Karnataka	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	7
67	Karnataka	Govt. aided	BMS College of Engineering, Bangalore, Karnataka	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
68	Karnataka	Private unaided	Sri Siddhartha Institute of Technology, Tumkur	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
69	Karnataka	Govt. aided	Basaveshwar Engineering College (Autonomous) Bagalkot	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
70	Karnataka	Govt. aided	PES college of engineering Mandya	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	7
71	Karnataka	Govt. aided	Sri Jayachamarajendra College of Engineering, Mysore	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
72	Karnataka	Private unaided	PES institute of technology, Bangalore	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
73	Karnataka	Govt. aided	PDA College of Engineering, Gulbarga	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
74	Karnataka	Private unaided	MS Ramaiah Institute of Technology, Bangalore	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
75	Karnataka	Private unaided	SDM College of Engineering and Technology, Dhavalagiri, Dharwad	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	7
76	Karnataka	Govt.	Sri Krishnarajendra Silver Jubilee Technological Institute (SKSJTII)	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	6
77	Karnataka	Private unaided	R.V. College of Engineering (RVCE), Bangalore	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
78	Karnataka	Private unaided	NMAM Institute of Technology, Nitte	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
79	Kerala	Govt.	Rajiv Gandhi Institute of Technology, Kottayam	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	7

80	Kerala	Govt.	Government College of Engineering, Kannur	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
81	Kerala	Govt.	Government Engineering College, Thrissur	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	7
82	Kerala	Govt.	Government Engineering College, Kozhikode	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
83	Kerala	Govt.	Government Engineering College, Painavu, Idukki	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	7
84	Kerala	Govt.	School of Engineering, Cochin University of Science & Technology, Cochin	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
85	Kerala	Govt.	Government Engineering College, Bartonhill, Thiruvananthapuram	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
86	Kerala	Govt.	LBS Institute of Technology for Women, Poojappura, Thiruvananthapuram	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	7
87	Kerala	Govt.	College of Engineering Perumon, Perinad, Kollam	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	7
88	Kerala	Govt. aided	Cooperative Institute of Technology, Vadakara, Kozhikode	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	7
89	Kerala	Govt.	College of Engineering Trikaripur, Cheemeni, Kasargod	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	7
90	Kerala	Govt.	College of Engineering Thalassery, Kannur	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	7
91	Kerala	Govt.	College of Engineering, Kidangoor, Kottayam	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	6
92	Kerala	Govt.	Government Engineering. College, wayanad Thalappuzha, Kerala	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	6
93	Kerala	Govt.	Thangal Kunju Musaliar College of Engineering, Karicode,	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	7
94	Kerala	Govt.	Government Engineering. College, Sreekrishnapuram, Kerala	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	6
95	Kerala	Govt.	College of Engineering, Adoor, Manakkala, Kerala	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	7
96	Kerala	Govt.	College of Engineering, Karunagappaly, Thodiyoor, Kollam, Kerala	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	6

97	Kerala	Govt.	College of Engineering, Cherthala, Pallippuram, Alappuzha, Kerala	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	7
98	Madhya Pradesh	Govt. aided	Samrat Ashok Technological Institute (Engineering College), Vidisha	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	7
99	Madhya Pradesh	Private unaided	Sagar Institute of Research & Technology, Bhopal	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	7
100	Madhya Pradesh	Govt. aided	Madhav Institute of Technology & Science, Gwalior	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
101	Madhya Pradesh	Govt. aided	Rajiv Gandhi Proudयोगिकी Vishwavidyalaya, Bhopal	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	5
102	Madhya Pradesh	Govt. aided	Shri GS Institute of Technology & Science, Indore	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	7
103	Maharashtra	Govt. aided	Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Technological University, Lonere, Raigad	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
104	Maharashtra	Govt.	College of Engineering, Shivajinagar, Pune	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
105	Maharashtra	Govt. aided	Shri Guru Gobind Singhji Institute of Engineering & Technology, Nanded	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
106	Maharashtra	Govt. aided	Walchand College of Engineering, Sangli	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
107	Maharashtra	Govt. aided	BVB's Sardar Patel College of Engineering, Mumbai	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
108	Maharashtra	Govt.	Govt. College of Engineering, Aurangabad	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
109	Maharashtra	Govt. aided	Veeramata Jijabai Technological Institute, Matunga, Mumbai	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
110	Maharashtra	Govt.	Government College of Engineering, Jalgaon	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
111	Maharashtra	Govt.	Govt. College of Engineering, Amravati	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
112	Maharashtra	Govt.	Government College of Engineering, Karad	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
113	Maharashtra	Private unaided	Rajarambapu Institute of Technology, Islampur, Sangli	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8

114	Maharashtra	Govt. aided	Institute of Chemical Technology, Matunga, Mumbai	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
115	Maharashtra	Private unaided	Bharati Vidyapeeth University, College of Engineering, Pune	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
116	Maharashtra	Private unaided	GH Rasoni College of Engineering, Nagpur	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
117	Maharashtra	Govt.	Government College of Engineering, Chandrapur	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	7
118	Maharashtra	Govt.	Department of Technology, Shivaji University, Kolhapur, Maharashtra	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
119	Maharashtra	Govt.	Department of Chemical Technology, North Maharashtra University, Jalgaon, Maharashtra	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	6
120	NCT-Delhi	Govt.	Delhi Technological University, Delhi	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	6
121	Odisha	Govt.	College of Engineering & Technology, Bhubaneswar	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	6
122	Odisha	Govt.	Veer Surendra Sai University of Technology, Burla, Sambalpur	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
123	Punjab	Govt. aided	Thapar University, Patiala, Punjab	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	7
124	Punjab	Govt. aided	Guru Nanak Dev Engineering College, Ludhiana, Punjab	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
125	Punjab	Govt. aided	SBS College of Engineering & Technology, Ferozpur, Punjab	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
126	Punjab	Private unaided	Chandigarh Engineering College, Mohali, Punjab	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	7
127	Punjab	Govt. aided	Beant College of Engineering Technology, Gurdaspur, Punjab	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	7
128	Punjab	Govt.	GZS-PTU, Bhatinda, Punjab	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
129	Punjab	Govt.	College of Agriculture Engineering and Technology, Punjab Agriculture University, Ludhiana, Punjab	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	3
130	Punjab	Govt.	Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar, Punjab	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	3

131	Rajasthan	Govt.	Govt. Engineering College, Bikaner, Rajasthan	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	6
132	Rajasthan	Govt.	University College of Engineering, RTU, Kota, Rajasthan	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	5
133	Rajasthan	Private unaided	Institute of Engineering & Technology, Alwar, Rajasthan	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	6
134	Rajasthan	Govt.	M L V Textile & Engineering College, Bhilwara, Rajasthan	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	6
135	Rajasthan	Govt.	College of Technology and Engineering, Maharana Pratap University of Agriculture and Technology, Udaipur, Rajasthan	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	7
136	Rajasthan	Govt.	Govt Engineering College, Ajmer, Rajasthan	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	5
137	Rajasthan	Govt.	College of Engineering and Technology, Bikaner, Rajasthan	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	6
138	Rajasthan	Govt.	Government Women Engineering College, Ajmer, Rajasthan	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	5
139	Rajasthan	Govt.	Government Engineering College, Jhalawar, Rajasthan	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	5
140	Tamil Nadu	Govt.	Govt. College of Engineering, Baragur, Krishnagiri	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
141	Tamil Nadu	Govt.	Govt. College of Technology, Coimbatore	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
142	Tamil Nadu	Govt.	Alagappa Chettiar College of Engineering and Technology, Karaikudi	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
143	Tamil Nadu	Govt.	Government College of Engineering, Salem	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
144	Tamil Nadu	Govt.	Manonmaniam Sundaranar University, Abishekapatti, Tirunelveli	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
145	Tamil Nadu	Govt.	Thiagaraja College of Engineering, Madurai, Tamil Nadu	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
146	Tamil Nadu	Govt.	P.S.G College of Technology, Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8

147	Tamil Nadu	Govt.	Bharathidasan Institute of Technology Campus, Trichirapalli, Tamil Nadu	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
148	Tamil Nadu	Govt.	Coimbatore Institute of Technology, Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
149	Telangana	Private unaided	Aurora's Scientific, Technological & Research Academy, Bandlaguda, Hyderabad	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
150	Telangana	Govt.	JNTUH College of Engineering, Hyderabad	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
151	Telangana	Govt.	University College of Engineering, Osmania University, Hyderabad	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
152	Telangana	Govt.	University College of Technology, Osmania University, Hyderabad	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	7
153	Telangana	Private unaided	Anurag Engineering College, Kodad, Nalgonda	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	6
154	Telangana	Private unaided	Chaitanya Bharathi Institute of Technology, Gandipet, Hyderabad	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	7
155	Telangana	Private unaided	Gokaraju Rangaraju Institute of Engineering & Technology, Kukatpally, Hyderabad	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
156	Telangana	Private unaided	Vasavi College of Engineering, Ibrahimbagh, Hyderabad	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
157	Telangana	Private unaided	Vallurupalli Nageswara Rao Vignana Jyothi Institute of Engg. & Technology, Hyderabad	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	7
158	Telangana	Private unaided	Malla Reddy Engineering College, Medchal, R.R. District, Hyderabad	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	6
159	Telangana	Private unaided	Sreenidhi Institute of Science & Technology, Ghatkesar, Hyderabad	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	7
160	Telangana	Govt.	University College of Engineering, Kakatiya University, Kothagudem	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	5
161	Telangana	Govt.	JNTU Institute of Science & Technology, Hyderabad	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8

162	Telangana	Private unaided	Nizam Institute of Engineering & Technology, Hyderabad	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	2
163	Tripura	Govt.	Tripura Institute of Technology, Narsingarh, Tripura	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	5
164	UT-Chandigarh	Govt.	PEC University of Technology, Chandigarh	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
165	UT-Chandigarh	Govt.	University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Chandigarh	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
166	UT-Chandigarh	Govt.	Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering and Technology UICET), Punjab University, Chandigarh, UT-Chandigarh	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
167	UT-Puducherry	Govt.	Pondicherry Engineering College, Puducherry	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
168	Uttar Pradesh	Govt.	Institute of Engineering & Technology, Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
169	Uttar Pradesh	Govt.	Madan Mohan Malviya Engineering College, Gorakhpur, Uttar Pradesh	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
170	Uttar Pradesh	Private unaided	School of Engineering & Technology, IFTM University, Lodhipur Moradabad, Uttar Pradesh	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
171	Uttar Pradesh	Govt. aided	Harcourt Butler Technological Institute, (HBTI), Kanpur, Uttar Pradesh	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
172	Uttar Pradesh	Govt. aided	Faculty of Engineering and Technology, M.J.P. Rohilkhand University, Bareilly, Uttar Pradesh	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	6
173	Uttar Pradesh	Govt. aided	Bundelkhand Institute of Engg. & Technology, Jhansi, Uttar Pradesh	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	6
174	Uttar Pradesh	Govt. aided	Kamla Nehru Institute of Technology, Sultanpur, Uttar Pradesh	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
175	Uttarakhand	Govt. aided	Govind Ballabh Pant Engineering College, Pauri Garhwal	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	7
176	Uttarakhand	Govt.	VCT Kumaon Engineering College, Dwarahat, Dist-Almora	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	7

177	Uttarakhand	Govt. aided	College of Technology - GB Pant University of Agriculture & Technology, Pantnagar	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
178	West Bengal	Govt. aided	Birbhum Institute of Engineering & Technology, Birbhum	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
179	West Bengal	Private unaided	JIS College of Engineering, Nadia	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
180	West Bengal	Private unaided	Heritage Institute of Technology, Kolkata	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
181	West Bengal	Govt. aided	College of Engineering & Management, Kolaghat	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
182	West Bengal	Private unaided	M.C.K.V Institute of Engineering, Howrah	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
183	West Bengal	Govt.	University Institute of Technology, The University of Burdwan, Burdwan	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
184	West Bengal	Govt. aided	Bankura Unnayani Institute of Engineering, Bankura	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
185	West Bengal	Govt. aided	West Bengal University of Technology, Kolkata	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
186	West Bengal	Govt.	University College of Technology - University of Calcutta, Kolkata	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
187	West Bengal	Govt. aided	Faculty of Engineering and Technology - Jadavpur University, Kolkata	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
188	West Bengal	Private unaided	Narula Institute of Technology, Parganas	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
189	West Bengal	Govt. aided	RCC Institute of Information Technology, Kolkata	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
190	West Bengal	Govt. aided	Govt College of Engineering and Textile & Technology, Berhampore, West Bengal	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
191	West Bengal	Govt. aided	Murshidabad College of Engineering and Technology, Berhampore, Murshidabad, West Bengal	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
Total no. of institutions that achieved the particular indicator				155	186	155	188	154	188	186	147	

Annex 4: CoE visit report

Thirty Centres of Excellence (CoEs) among 27 TEQIP institutions have been selected to carry out collaborative and multi-disciplinary Research and Development (R&D) activities. Among the 27 selected institutions, seven are NITs, ten are government funded institutions, seven are government aided institutions, and three are private un-aided institutions. The selected institutions cover the following 13 research areas: 1) nano-technology; 2) biotechnology; 3) biomedical engineering; 4) chemical engineering; 5) environmental engineering; 6) water resources engineering; 7) disaster management; 8) signal processing; 9) mechanical and material science; 10) process control; 11) data mining and computer sciences; 12) electronics systems; and 13) energy systems.

The JRM Team visited four CoEs: the Institute of Chemical Technology, Mumbai; College of Engineering, Chandrapur; Harcourt Butler Technological Institute, Kanpur; and Birla Institute of Technology, Mesra, Ranchi. The visits gave the JRM Team insights in the development potentials and the challenges that the institutions are facing in establishing CoEs. Annex xx provides an overview of the progress as well as the challenges of the CoEs and lists the findings for the considerations of the CoEs visited.

Over the next two months all the 30 CoEs will be assessed in depth by senior academics/peer reviewers from ITTs using a Progress Review Sheet. The peer reviewers will assess the overall progress of the CoE against its objectives and indicators, its collaborative efforts, its interaction with industry, its production of graduate students and trained researchers, and its sustainability. The assessment will serve as a guidance for the CoEs identifying areas where they are on track as well as issues that need improvements.

The Progress Review Sheet will be shared with the Head of the CoE with a copy to the Principal of the institution. The Head of the CoE will have one week to provide comments on the Review Sheet, if any. Based on the suggested recommendations in the Review Sheet, the Head of the CoE will draft an Action Plan within two weeks with concrete and time bound initiatives to implement the recommendations. The Action Plans should also include concrete suggestions on how to sustain its activities and will be shared with the institute's mentor, the SPFU, the NPIU and the peer reviewers. The peer reviewers will review the Action Plan and start a dialog with the Head of the CoE, if the Action Plan does not sufficiently address the recommendations.

Good Practices

Establishing a CoE is new to many of the 30 TEQIP institutions that have received funding, while others already have extensive experience in establishing and running CoEs. Based on the peer reviews already finalized a number of good practices for building and sustaining a CoE can be identified: competent leadership with clear goals, strategies and performance indicators for the development of the CoE; significant collaboration with other research institutions and with industrial partners in India and abroad; attracting full-time Ph.D.s and industrial chairs; doing interdisciplinary R&D; publishing in reputed journal; filing of patents and commercialization of "Proof-of-Concept" (PoC) type projects; and developing new and updated curriculum for UG and PG students in the discipline areas of the CoE.

The funding of the CoEs will terminate October 2016. It is therefore very important that the CoEs systematically identify their resource needs (for sustaining and developing the COE) and seek other funding resources to sustain their activities from for example the Ministry of Science and Technology, Ministry of Defence; UGC, AICTE and from industry partners. TEQIP institutions will also be able to benefit from the new **Impacting Research Innovation and Technology (IMPRINT)** launched by MHRD addressing major science and engineering challenges in India (for further information <http://imprint-india.org>).

Recommendations

- NPIU will organize the CoE peer review visits with the aim that all the 30 Head of CoEs will have received their Progress Review Sheet at the latest by May 1 2016
- It is suggested that the two first finalized Progress Review Sheets will be shared with all the peer reviewers as examples of good practice for CoE feed-back
- Based on the suggested recommendations in the Review Sheet, the Head of the CoE will draft an Action Plan within two weeks with concrete and time bound initiatives to implement the recommendations and share them with NPIU and the peer reviewers. The Action Plan should include concrete suggestions for how to sustain the CoE activities after the utilization of the TEQIP funds
- The peer reviewers will review the Action Plan and start a dialog with the Head of the CoE, if the Action Plan does not sufficiently address the recommendations
- NPIU with the peer reviewers should select a few successful CoEs and showcase them widely in the media and with all TEQIP institutions as examples of good practice in establishing and sustaining CoEs.

Visit to the Center of Excellence in Applied Research, Training & Education in Lipid Science at the Oil and Painting Technology Department at Harcourt Butler Technological Institute in Kanpur

The Department of Oil and Painting Technology has a record of solid academic achievements. All faculty members have Ph.D.s and the Department and are publishing in national and international reputed journals. The Department is working in a very specialized research area as it is one out of only four Departments of Oil and Painting Technology in India. The Department has an excellent placement rate for B. Tech students who overall get jobs in industry with a competitive salary.

Progress of the CoE

The Department has successfully identified and procured laboratory equipment and is in the process of building several new laboratory facilities which will help advance the research agenda of the Department. It has also started to reach out to industry partners for collaboration for example through workshops discussing research findings of relevance to industry. Three MoUs have or are in the process of being signed with industry partners. Although the Department does collaborate with other research institutes more could be done to increase the partnership with other national and international academic and research institutions.

A major issue for the CoE is the fact that it has not been able to recruit new post-graduate students from within the State of UP. All CoEs are expected to further post-graduate education through increased enrolments for Master and Doctoral programmes. Even if it is foreseen that TEQIP II will be finalized by October 2016, it is important that the Department would immediately seek to recruit Ph.D. students. It is possible to use resources from the CoE grant and from the Four Funds to guarantee a full Ph.D. contract for the candidates also after October 2016. This issue was also discussed with the Principal Secretary for Technical Education in UP and he was supportive that the Ph.D. recruitment should be national and international and not only confined to the State of UP.

Overall the Department has made good progress in acquiring new equipment and improving the laboratory facilities committing the 55 per cent upper limit for procurable goods of the total project allocation of 5 crores for the CoE. However, very little of the remaining 2.25 crores for the “soft components” such as recruitment of Masters and Doctoral students and research assistantships have been committed, and it is not foreseen that the Department can utilize the full CoE amount of 5 crores by October 2016.

Recommendations:

- Take immediate action to recruit new Ph.D. students to the Department within the next couple of months recruiting at the national and international level;
 - Enhance the collaboration with industry through joint R&D projects on specific research questions posed by industry as well as formalized student internships in industry;
 - Intensify the collaboration with national and foreign research institutes on R&D projects and faculty and student exchange.
-

**Visit to Centre of Excellence at the Institute of Chemical Technology, Mumbai,
March 3, 2016**

The Institute of Chemical Technology (ICT) is a deemed university that offers undergraduate and graduate programs in chemical technology. The Institute is ranked in the top 5 globally in terms of research output in chemical engineering and has 1000 undergraduate, 450 M.Tech, 740 PhD students and 120 full-time faculty. The Centre of Excellence (CoE) at ICT, Mumbai conducts research on Process Intensification.

1. There is active student involvement in the CoE. PhD students are active collaborators in the Centre's research. The Centre has also trained 70 M.Tech students as research assistants.
2. The Centre's work has yielded 4 patents and 10 papers in peer-reviewed journals. Another 15 papers are in the pipeline. All research projects at the Centre aim to produce products or processes that can be commercialized or are socially relevant, several of which are at an advanced stage of development.
3. A key feature of the Centre's work is the **strong external linkages** it has established:
 - i. An Innovation Networking (INN) project with 14 TEQIP and non-TEQIP institutes has been setup. The project has created research groups to leverage varying technical competencies across institutes.
 - ii. Some of the Centre's products are already in use by industry or are ready for distribution through NGOs.
 - iii. The Centre has conducted workshops and certificate programs on MATLAB and research methods. These workshops are open to outside participation.
 - iv. The Centre hosts 70 undergraduate students from institutes across the country for a six-week research apprenticeship over the summer holidays. The students work as research assistants and are instructed in research methods. They are paid stipends during this period, funded partially from TEQIP funds.
 - v. The Centre also conducts training sessions for technicians/non-teaching staff, which are open to outside participation as well.
4. The Centre has spent all the funds it received under TEQIP. These funds have been supplemented with the Institute's own resources. There is a sustainability plan in place; the majority of the Centre's funding will come from government/industrial projects, to be topped up with the Institute's funds if required.

5. The Centre reported that TEQIP institutes have been added to the list (alongside CFTIs) of institutes to which the principal investigator of a research project must be affiliated, in order for the project to be eligible for funding under the MHRD's Impacting Research Innovation and Technology (IMPRINT) scheme. Alongside other activities, the scheme funds research to address key scientific and engineering challenges.

Recommendations:

- The Centre's strong external linkages, which have added significant value to other TEQIP and
- Non-TEQIP institutes as well as contributed to the financial sustainability of the Centre, are an excellent example of good practice under the project that merit further study and dissemination. This can also serve as a good model for CoEs under TEQIP III, in order to extend the reach of the project.
- While the Centre appreciated the systems and processes instituted under the project (particularly the MIS and procurement processes), it was recommended that CoEs be allowed to set aside a contingency fund to allow for the procurement of equipment that was not anticipated under the CoE's original proposal and procurement plans. This is necessary given the inherent uncertainty involved in research projects.
- The eligibility of projects led by a principal investigator affiliated to a TEQIP institute for funding under IMPRINT is an important recognition of the potential of TEQIP institutes to lead major research projects. TEQIP institutes must be made aware of this opportunity, both as a source of funding and in terms of their role in enabling non-TEQIP institutes to benefit from IMPRINT, by leading projects in which these non-TEQIP institutes participate.

Visit to CoE at the Government College of Engineering, Chandrapur

The affiliating university of the Government College of Engineering, Chandrapur has been bifurcated and it is now affiliated to Gondwana University. This change has delayed the College's application for NBA accreditation and, consequently, UGC autonomy. The Maharashtra SPFU is working with the institution to ensure that its SAR for NBA accreditation is submitted within the next month.

Discussion on twinning arrangements under TEQIP III with the representatives of well-performing CoEs²

The representatives of the CoEs strongly supported the twinning component of TEQIP III and agreed that it can be an effective means to spread the gains from TEQIP I & II to institutes in focus states. A number of recommendations regarding the matching of institutes and the design of twinning arrangements were made:

Recommendations:

- While twinning institutes as a whole can facilitate the adoption of good administrative practices and systems by institutes in focus states, meaningful academic collaboration requires that the twinning takes place at the departmental level.
- It was suggested that, as far as possible, autonomous colleges be matched to other autonomous colleges. Since these colleges are not restricted to adopting their respective affiliating university's curriculum and assessment process, this will enable the exchange of innovative practices across institutes.

² Representatives from the CoEs at ICT, Mumbai, VJIT, Mumbai, and CoE, Pune were present.

- Institutes that have expertise in a particular area (e.g. systems development, curriculum design, pedagogy etc.) can be identified and can train several other institutes in these areas.
- A functioning MIS is an important prerequisite to a well-functioning twinning relationship. The availability of data would enable twin institutions to identify areas of weakness, strength and complementarity and would facilitate effective collaboration.
- Some of the areas for academic collaboration under twinning arrangements that were identified are: joint curriculum design, faculty and student exchanges, shared courses with online content, and joint research with a view to enable institutes in focus states without a large industrial base to participate in industry led/financed projects.

The Knowledge Incubation for TEQIP program

A meeting was held with Professor Gadre at IIT Bombay to discuss the Knowledge Incubation for TEQIP (KIT) program. The program aims to equip TEQIP institutes to adopt good academic practices through pedagogical training, distance learning courses, and training on research methods and approaches to research. About 6-7 TEQIP institutes in Maharashtra have been participating in the program regularly.

Recommendations:

- Inadequate dissemination has led to a lack of awareness about KIT. As a result, geographical proximity is the main factor in determining participation. Better dissemination can ensure wider participation, particularly given the existing infrastructure for online delivery of training and distance learning courses.
- One of the workshops on research methods organized by IIT Bombay, in which TEQIP institutes in Maharashtra participated was, thereafter, adapted and delivered to non-TEQIP institutes by the College of Engineering, Pune. This practice multiplies the impact of the project and should be adopted more widely.

Visit to The Tinkerers' Laboratory, IIT Bombay

The Tinkerers' Laboratory is a workshop, open 24 hours a day to all students of IIT Bombay, which enables students to pursue their own engineering projects. A large number of students are utilizing the facility and a major expansion is planned.

A key factor behind the success of the Tinkerers' Laboratory is that it is entirely student-managed. The facility has also been fully funded by alumni donations.

The MHRD has recommended that all IITs establish a Tinkerers' Laboratory.

Annex 5

Workshop on Improving Transition, Retention and Completion Rates in Engineering Institutes in India, March 11, 2016

The NPIU organized a workshop on behavioral interventions to improve transition, retention and completion rates in engineering institutes, with a focus on successful interventions in TEQIP institutes, international lessons on which interventions are successful, and means to measure and evaluate the impact of such interventions.

The workshop saw participation from 7 TEQIP institutes where transition rates had risen substantially during the course of TEQIP II; representatives of 4 affiliating technical universities from UP, Bihar, Chhattisgarh and Rajasthan; and officials from the Departments of Technical Education and SPFUs of several states. Varun Gauri, the Head of the World Bank's Global Insights Initiative (GINI) and Saugato Datta, the MD of Ideas42 (an organization that specializes in behavioral science research), participated as international experts on designing and measuring the impact of behavioral interventions, including those that have been used to mitigate the impact of low transition, retention, and completion in higher education.

The international experts outlined the theoretical basis for behavioral interventions and the measurement of their impact, along with several examples of successful interventions internationally. The following points were emphasized:

- Low cost, targeted, 'light-touch' interventions aimed at reducing barriers to successful transition, retention, and completion have been shown to be successful across diverse settings. For instance, email prompts reminding teachers to refer students to certain programs can significantly raise student participation in those programs.
- A range of such interventions can be deployed in India, suitably adapting the intervention to fit the specific context.
- To successfully evaluate the impact of an intervention, it must be designed keeping in mind the need to incorporate a testing methodology from the outset. This can include randomizing interventions across students.

The 7 participating TEQIP institutes presented the interventions that have led to improvements in transition rates in their institutes. Several common themes emerged:

- Institutes place emphasis on identifying students who need academic support early, using admission test ranks, results on diagnostic tests, and internal examinations as benchmarks. These students usually receive support in the form of extra/remedial classes and mentoring from teachers.
- Institutes are sensitive to the idea that how these support activities are named, will have an impact on student participation in these activities. For instance, students who are identified as requiring extra support are often called 'potential achievers' rather than being labelled as weak students. This represents a first step towards understanding the psychological barriers that prevent student participation in these activities.
- There has been no systematic evaluation of which interventions work and which do not. While there are a broad range of activities that have been carried out to improve transition rates, there has been no analysis of the data generated by these activities and no synthesis of the lessons learned.

The presentations were followed by several rounds of discussion and the following next steps were identified:

- The GINI team and Ideas42 will work with institutes to design targeted interventions, specific to the institute's context, in a manner that the effectiveness of the intervention can be scientifically evaluated. At the outset, these interventions may be implemented in select institutes on a pilot basis.
- An important starting point is an understanding and analysis of existing interventions in place at various institutes. This could be leveraged, for instance, to design interventions to reduce barriers to student participation in existing activities. To facilitate this analysis, institutes will share data related to these interventions with the NPIU.

Annex 6: Action Taken Report of 5th JRM

S.N.	ACTIONS	COMPLIANCE																								
1	Release funds to institutions which have met 8 or 9 of the indicators determined in the 4th JRM. The indicator related to NBA accreditation should have been met.	Action taken accordingly: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 122 institutions meeting all the indicators were eligible to receive funds-released as per requirements Out of 14 institutions meeting 8/9 indicators, funds were released to 8 institutions meeting NBA indicator 																								
2	Release the next rounds of funds to institutes only once they have met all the indicators determined in the 5th JRM.	Being followed scrupulously <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 139 institute are fulfilling all the PAIs by 31st January 2016 as per 4th JRM and fund is being released. 																								
3	ToRs for study to evaluate the governance initiatives undertaken under TEQIP-II to inform which governance initiatives should be continued as well as new ones to be developed going forward.	To evaluate the governance initiatives undertaken, the ToRs shall be finalized in consultation with some BoG Chairman/IIMs and the World Bank. Once the ToRs finalized, the study/survey shall be done so that existing governance initiative(s) or new one can be continued. The advice from the World Bank is appreciated in this regard.																								
4	Action plan for each institution that has not obtained academic autonomy from UGC.	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr style="background-color: #d9e1f2;"> <th style="text-align: center;">Autonomy Status</th> <th style="text-align: center;">No of institutions</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Total institutions participating in TEQIP-II</td> <td style="text-align: center;">191</td> </tr> <tr> <td>No. of institutions under sub-component 1.1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">114</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>No. of institutions Applied for Autonomy with</i></td> <td style="text-align: center;">64</td> </tr> <tr> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> minimum 3 courses accredited by NBA </td> <td style="text-align: center;">13</td> </tr> <tr> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "2F" Status from UGC </td> <td style="text-align: center;">24</td> </tr> <tr> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> NOC from University </td> <td style="text-align: center;">51</td> </tr> <tr> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> application pending at UGC with above 3 conditions fulfilled </td> <td style="text-align: center;">5</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Autonomous institutions</i></td> <td style="text-align: center;">50</td> </tr> <tr> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Autonomous by UGC </td> <td style="text-align: center;">28</td> </tr> <tr> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Autonomous being CFIs, Deemed Universities, Universities Faculty/department etc. </td> <td style="text-align: center;">22</td> </tr> <tr> <td>No. of institutions under sub-component 1.2</td> <td style="text-align: center;">77</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Autonomy Status	No of institutions	Total institutions participating in TEQIP-II	191	No. of institutions under sub-component 1.1	114	<i>No. of institutions Applied for Autonomy with</i>	64	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> minimum 3 courses accredited by NBA 	13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> "2F" Status from UGC 	24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NOC from University 	51	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> application pending at UGC with above 3 conditions fulfilled 	5	<i>Autonomous institutions</i>	50	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Autonomous by UGC 	28	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Autonomous being CFIs, Deemed Universities, Universities Faculty/department etc. 	22	No. of institutions under sub-component 1.2	77
Autonomy Status	No of institutions																									
Total institutions participating in TEQIP-II	191																									
No. of institutions under sub-component 1.1	114																									
<i>No. of institutions Applied for Autonomy with</i>	64																									
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> minimum 3 courses accredited by NBA 	13																									
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> "2F" Status from UGC 	24																									
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NOC from University 	51																									
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> application pending at UGC with above 3 conditions fulfilled 	5																									
<i>Autonomous institutions</i>	50																									
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Autonomous by UGC 	28																									
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Autonomous being CFIs, Deemed Universities, Universities Faculty/department etc. 	22																									
No. of institutions under sub-component 1.2	77																									

S.N.	ACTIONS	COMPLIANCE	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Autonomous by UGC 	42
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Autonomous being CFIs, Deemed Universities, Universities Faculty/department etc. 	35
5	BoGs complete their Governance Guidelines Document	Institutional Governance Guidelines document has been received from 61 institutions.	
6	Series of training workshops for BoG members to be organized	<p>A series of Learning Fora were organized for the Chairs of the Governing Bodies and the Directors of the Institutes.</p> <p>Learning Forum on Good Governance Leadership and Management was held On: 12th – 13th October 2014: 14th – 15th October 2014 16th – 17th October 2014: Representatives from 95 institutions participated 4th & 5th May 2015. Representatives of 24 CFIs participated 11th – 12th December 2016: Representatives of 45 institutions participated In total about 164 institutions have been imparted training. However, as per the request made by many institutes to frequently conduct such workshops, we are planning one such fora in April/May 2016.</p>	
7	<p>ToRs for a comprehensive assessment of the functioning of the affiliation system</p> <p>Assessment of the functioning of the affiliation system</p> <p>Report describing lessons learned and good practices in the affiliation system and in the process for obtaining autonomy by ACs to be</p>	To be shared by the World Bank	
8			

S.N.	ACTIONS	COMPLIANCE
9	prepared	
10	Explore means for integration of ATUs in the TEQIP project	Already considered in TEQIP-III
11	Incentivise reform of the affiliation system, including a feasibility analysis and related stimulus aimed at merging small colleges and creating college cluster universities Activities to foster effective exchange of information and sharing of experiences among ATUs	Already considered in TEQIP-III
12	(a) Draft of short anonymous surveys of no more than 10 questions each for (i) participating institutions and (ii) mentors and performance auditors, in order to obtain their general feedback about the usefulness and areas for future improvement of the mentorship and performance auditing components of the project.	The surveys were conducted in the month of October 2015. An encouraging response was received from the participating institutions as well as from mentors & performance auditors. (The survey report is attached as Annex-I)
	(b) Implementation of survey (c) Analysis of results	The questionnaire for the surveys were prepared in consultation with some mentors and performance auditors and approved by the World Bank. The surveys were implemented in the month of October 2015 giving a time period 15 days for obtaining response. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 58 Mentors/Performance auditors have responded • 170 institutions have responded <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 63% of the Mentors have expressed satisfaction for completing Mentoring activity in 2 days. However, about 57% of the Performance Auditors wish to add one more day to effectively carry out Performance Auditing.

S.N.	ACTIONS	COMPLIANCE
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 52% of the Performance Auditors also mentor the institutions with respect to certain issues raised by the institute. ▪ 96% of the performance Auditors have stated that they receive full co-operation from the institution during their visit. ▪ About 43% of the Performance Auditors had to make concrete changes in MIS. ▪ 60% of the Performance Auditors have attended the training programmes organized by NPIU and out of which 41.7% of the found this training very useful. Similarly, 64% of the Mentors have attended the training programmes organized by NPIU out of which 50% found this training very useful ▪ 77.6% of Performance Auditors expressed that, performance Auditing should be continued in the current format only. ▪ 91.7% of the Mentors expressed that e-mail is best way to communicate with the institutions. ▪ 40% mentors expressed that they meet with DTE and SPFU of the states in which they mentor TEQIP institutes once every 4-6 months to provide advice on next steps for improvement. ▪ 46.9% of the mentors found the feedback template is very useful.
13	Developing more systematic, frequent and effective communication system between mentors and institutions	Already in place
14	Mandatory standardized training for all mentors	It is planned in May 2016.
15	Hosting of periodic workshops with mentors and performance auditors	Will be hosted once the ToRs to review the effectiveness of the auditing activities are finalized by the World Bank
16	Template to share with mentors about institutional good practices on the different components of the project	Draft template has been prepared and submitted to the World Bank. After getting the concurrence of the World Bank, it will be shared with Institutions, Mentors as well as Performance Auditors.

S.N.	ACTIONS	COMPLIANCE
17	Develop an effective quality assurance system for Performance Audit reports.	The assurance system for performance audit reports were developed in April 2014 in which it was decided that all performance reports should be evaluated by the experts but results were below expectations. Therefore, the performance auditing activities have been put on hold since last year. For the final round of performance auditing, based on the past experiences a best dummy performance audit report shall be handed to Auditors before his visit to institution(s). Final round of auditing activities shall be started once the World Bank finalize the ToRs to review the effectiveness of the performance activities. The final PA Report will have to be displayed on the website by the institutions.
18	ToRs to review the effectiveness of the current Performance-Auditing function	The ToRs to review the effectiveness of the auditing activities has to be finalized by the World Bank.
19	ToRs and initiation of an evaluation of the activities undertaken by the IIMs and by the IITs, taking into account the proposals from the IIMs and IITs for how to do this	<p>IIMs: The ToRs for evaluation of MCEPs have already been developed in consultation of IIMs and approved by MHRD as well. The approved ToRs circulated to IIMs for further action. Out of 7 IIMs, IIM Indore, IIM Raipur, IIM Udaipur, IIM Kozhikode and IIM Trichy have conducted case studies for evaluation of MCEPs at some institutions. The reports of these studies yet to be received from these IIMs. IIM Lucknow and IIM Bangalore shall be conducting case studies on MCEPs by April 2016.</p> <p>IITs: ToRs have been finalized after incorporating the suggestions given by the World Bank and approved by MHRD. The ToRs have been forwarded to the IITs along with the names of the institutions where the activities undertaken by the IITs are required to be evaluated. Each IIT is given list of 4 institutions that attended the training programmes. The IITs are expected to submit the evaluation report by 31st March 2016.</p>
20	Action plan with the IITs and IIMs to ensure that the targets for IIT and IIM training will be reached by October 2016	<p>IIMs: As for training at IIMs, 91% target have been met. Out of 2280 (target), a total of 2088 participants have been trained at IIMs. IIM Udaipur, IIM Kozhikode, IIM Lucknow and IIM Raipur are planning to conduct training in a few more batches by October 2016. So in a couple of months the target of IIM Training shall be met.</p> <p>IITs: IITs have submitted the calendar of activities to be conducted and same have been uploaded on the NPIU website and also sent to institutions. The targets of IITs training are met. As of now, 2816 participants have been imparted training against the target of 2300. However, more trainings</p>

S.N.	ACTIONS	COMPLIANCE
		are being continued by IITs.
21	Data collection formats/survey instruments used to collect feedback by QEEE	QEEE Team sent the data collection/formats on analysis of the activities and same have been forwarded to World Bank
22	Discuss plan for incorporating faculty development program into QEEE program	The request for incorporating faculty development program into QEEE program has been initiated through communication by AS to IIT Madras. Prof. Ashok Jhunjunwala have agreed to deliver a brief presentation before AS/Secretary and for entire QEEE program before HRM.
23	Meeting of students who participated in the MITACS program	<p>Feedback has been asked from students by email. Some of the interns have submitted their feedbacks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The program is an excellent opportunity for UG students in terms of research exposure with a thrust to take research as their career and learnt about the extensive research going on in Canadian universities. • Mentors were assigned to the students to settle down at Canada and as an emergency contact and were encouraging and co-operative. • They felt internship help them to be strong, independent and confident and the global exposure for their overall growth. • Weekly reviews on their progress helped them manage their timelines. • The funding was adequate, and MITACS provided a stress-free environment to focus on their research. • A chance to go out of our comfort zone and collaborate with international faculty and scholars, industry personnel to get involved in hands-on research with practical applications in daily life. • Some helpline or email should be available where students can directly contact MHRD/TEQIP personnel.
24	Allow BoGs to give approval for international travel of faculty in TEQIP Institutions that have met all performance benchmarks	For 122 Institutions meeting all the PAIs, approval has been accorded by MHRD for empowering BoG of the respective institutions to approve the international travel and institutions have been informed accordingly. The institutions are availing this facility
25	Faculty and management trainings to be organized with detailed information available on NPIU websites with links to course offerings	Already in place

S.N.	ACTIONS	COMPLIANCE
26	Desk review of good practices of the CoEs and issues that represent challenges for the CoEs to meet their targets.	Onsite visit to three CoEs in the thematic area of Signal and Image processing have been completed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • College of Engg, Pune: Report received • VJTI, Mumbai: Report received • SGGS institute of Engg & Tech, Nanded,: Report is yet to be received
27	All required resources to be deposited in the four funds and report this through the MIS	Already in place
28	Consultation with SPFUs for sorting out clarifications in guidelines wherever required	Several consultations sessions were held with States/SPFUs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7th August 2015 • 9th October 2015 • Review Meeting held on 8th & 9th February 2016, • Field visits to the States viz. Uttar Pradesh, Karnataka, Moreover, this is an ongoing process, wherever the clarification (s) are required, due explanation is given to the SPFUs, Institutions as well as Students through physical visits, mails and tele – conversations etc.
29	Issue guidelines (as per PIP requirement) to colleges on usage of four funds and decision-making process regarding usage	Guidelines to colleges on usage of four funds and decision-making process regarding usage as per the norms laid down in PIP already issued.
30	Decision on whether to prioritize accreditation of UG programmes and communicate the same to the NBA.	The matter was discussed but it was opined that the accreditation of both UG & PG programmes has to be at equal pace.
31	Follow up with institutes that have not submitted their self-assessment forms and ask them to expedite the process.	The follow up is a regular process
32	Seek clarification from UGC on renewal/cancellation of autonomous status for previously autonomous institutes in Karnataka, whose	All institutions where autonomy has expired but are exercising autonomy as per clearance giving by affiliating universities will be treated as autonomous till extension of autonomy is granted by UGC. In Karnataka, for previously autonomous institutes are exercising autonomy and considered as Autonomous.

S.N.	ACTIONS	COMPLIANCE
	autonomous status needs to be renewed/cancelled.	
33	Learn from good practices regarding faculty transfer policies from Tamil Nadu	Due intimation has been sent to all the institutions
34	Freeze the data for 2013-14	Data is frozen
35	Sustainability plan for the MIS should be developed	Current MIS will be migrated on the TEQIP-III's Project Management System
36	Finalize ToRs for tracer study based on discussions held during the JRM. The survey should be designed, administered and the data collection for the 2013-14 batch as well as 2014-15 batch should be completed by December 2015.	ToRs have been approved by the World Bank. The procurement of Monkley survey is in final stages with EdCIL India Limited. After, procuring the survey will be carried out.
37	Pilot in few states/ institutes setting up formal audit observation compliance mechanism like Audit Committee at SPFUs.	The instructions have been issued to the 10 States to set up the audit observation Committee
38	Plan for the PMSS to be amended so that the e-FMR can be generated automatically (rather than institutions having to enter the information separately into the e-FMR).	This will be done while developing the software of PMSS and e-FMR for TEQIP-III
39	Relevant arrangement designed for monitoring the utilization of interest received on funds.	Instructions have been issued to the States/CFIs for monitoring of utilization of interest received on funds
40	Notify institutions that procurement activities for goods and works should be completed (i.e., final payments	Action is already taken

S.N.	ACTIONS	COMPLIANCE
	made) by 31st December 2015. For those well-performing institutions, this deadline should be set at 6 months from the release of additional funds.	
41	Clarification to institutions which do not spend their whole allocation; should the limit on funds to be spent on procurement apply to the original allocation or only the amount of funds actually spent?	Mail sent to all institutions reg..
42	Linking the PMSS to the FMR	This will be done while developing the software of PMSS and e-FMR in TEQIP-III
43	One-day orientation session on good governance for BoG Chairs and College Principals	Already done
44	Hold BoG meetings in July, with one agenda item to schedule BoG meetings for the remaining of the academic year	Due Intimation to be sent to the institutions
45	Constitution of BOGs of remaining government colleges in Rajasthan	All the Govt colleges in Rajasthan constituted BoG as per the required composition
46	Colleges to apply to RTU to support their request for autonomy and decision by RTU to be given within 3 months	The status of Academic Autonomy of Project Colleges of Rajasthan. All the nine Project Institutions have initiated the process for obtaining Academic Autonomy from UGC through "Rajasthan Technical University, Kota". As per the BOM meeting of RTU Kota, the NOC has been granted to UCE, RTU Kota however a committee is constituted for rest of the TEQIP Colleges with regard to autonomy to be granted in view of academic, financial and other aspects. The committee shall submit its report.
47	Follow up with NBA to review status of pending applications and expedition of same	Being followed regularly

S.N.	ACTIONS	COMPLIANCE
48	Set up of date by which all procurement to be completed and inform SPFUs and colleges	Competent Authority issued instructions for completion of all procurement activities by 30th April 2016. In case, the purchase orders are placed by 30th April 2016, the institutes can go ahead with the procurement.
49	Training on Procurement and Financing Management to be organized	The Financial Management Training was scheduled to be held at Mumbai on 24th, 25th, and 26th of Feb., 2016. Due to pre-occupation in the JRM, the trainings are being shifted in the month of March 2016. Procurement training is pending till PMSS becomes operational.
50	Filling the post of Central Project Advisor's	The scrutiny committee meeting for shortlisting applications have been postponed. Date is awaited.
51	Filling vacancies in NPIU	The vacant positions in Academic and Procurement will be filled up during TEQIP-III implementation.
52	Follow-up with UGC on relaxation of age criteria for autonomy for TEQIP institutes in low-income and special category states	The matter was discussed on relaxation of age criteria for autonomy for TEQIP institutes in low-income and special category states with Dr Manju Singh, Joint Secretary, UGC. However, it was not agreed upon by UGC.
53	Finalize data availability status with Infova	Notice for termination of the contract is being served to Infova. The data of all the 190 Project institutions w.r.t. Students, Faculty and Staff indicating their average satisfaction level with respect to the thematic area's viz. Pre-Admission Facilities and Student's counselling, Infrastructure, Availability and Access, Support and Attitude towards students, Exposure and Opportunity, collaborations, Placement and Employability, Pedagogy and Research activity, Opportunities and Performance Appraisal, Governance and Institutional Reforms etc is available with NPIU as extracted from Infova through reports.
54	Training sessions for BoG members	Already done
55	Decision on international travel decision-making authority for the duration of the project	It will be decided after the 6 th JRM.
56	Low-income and special category state strategy	Already worked out for TEQIP-III
57	Colleges to collect and report	Placement rate data has been received from 105 out of 191 Project institutions. The data has been

S.N.	ACTIONS	COMPLIANCE
	placement data as per the NPIU guidelines	shared with the World Bank. The State wise overall analysis of the PG placement Rate is attached.

Annex 7: Actions to be Taken

<i>S.no</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>By Whom</i>	<i>To be Completed by</i>
1.	Expedite the release of balance funds with states, prioritizing states with the highest unspent balances	MHRD/NPIU	March 31, 2016
2.	Release the next rounds of funds to institutes having met at least 6 indicators from 5 th JRM <i>and</i> in states with no pending balances	MHRD/NPIU	June 10, 2016
3.	Detailed analysis of future availability of funds and projected expenditure to assess fund-expenditure position for remaining project life, with focused attention on areas like (i) unreleased funds with States; (ii) unspent funds with institutions; (iii) reasonability of projected expenditures; (iv) anticipated contribution towards States/ institutes shares. In the case of unspent balances with institutes that will not incur expenditure of the entire amount, reallocation to institutes not participating in TEQIP III	MHRD/NPIU	April 15, 2016
4.	Complete all release of funds from MHRD to states	MHRD	June 30, 2016
5.	Facilitate the granting of autonomy to five more institutes	NPIU and SPFUs	August 31, 2016
6.	Report on key lessons in drafting good governance guidelines based upon workshop with 61 institutes	NPIU	August 31, 2016
7.	Prioritize NBA accreditation of UG programmes	NBA and MHRD	August 31, 2016
8.	Summary report of individual IIT and IIM evaluation reports	NPIU	August 31, 2016
9.	Action Plans from CoEs based upon peer evaluation comments	NPIU	July 1, 2016
10.	All colleges should deposit required four funds. Verification of fund data required.	NPIU and SPFUs	August 31, 2016
11.	Final round of performance auditing, with defined quality assurance system for reports	NPIU	August 31, 2016
12.	Verify MIS data on sample check basis and take remedial action	NPIU	April 30, 2016
13.	Complete following studies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact Assessment • Tracer Study • Bibliometric Assessment • Resource Utilization Study 	NPIU	August 31, 2016
14.	Provide analysis of satisfaction surveys based upon two rounds of faculty, staff and student satisfaction surveys (April and September 2016)	NPIU	First round: May 31, 2016 Second round: October 15, 2016
15.	Meeting of students who participated in the	NPIU	April 30, 2016

	MITACS program in 2015 and those expected to participate in 2016		
16.	Allow BoGs to give approval for international travel of faculty in TEQIP Institutions that have met all performance benchmarks	MHRD	Ongoing and to be continued
17.	Finalize vendor for AMC of PMSS	MHRD/NPIU	March 31, 2016
18.	Filling the post of Central Project Advisor's	MHRD	As soon as possible
19.	Filling vacancies in NPIU	MHRD	As soon as possible
20.	Initiate arbitration proceedings against Infova	MHRD	As soon as possible
21.	Organize concluding JRM	NPIU	September 2016
22.	Share internal audit reports of states for FY 2014-15 with the Bank	NPIU	As soon as possible
23.	<i>FM Monitoring:</i> Submit quarterly information to the Bank on FM Indicators, including release of funds	NPIU	Ongoing and to be continued

Annex 8: TEQIP II Joint Review Mission Schedule - March 1-14, 2016

MHRD-World Bank 6th Joint Review Mission			
March 1-14, 2016			
	10-1 pm	2-5 pm	Venue
March 1	World Bank team meeting @ 10 am	Recap of meetings held on Feb 8-9, 2016 @ 4 pm <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key Issues of Concern • Next steps 	World Bank
March 2	Action Taken Report Institutional Performance Assessment and benchmarks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of indicators and achievement of targets • Status of funding (disbursement and utilization) to well-performing institutes • Status of funding (disbursement and utilization) to poorly-performing institutes • Status of funding (disbursement and utilization) to poorly-performing institutes that were removed and subsequently brought back into the Project 	Review of disbursement plan till Oct 2016 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plan for spending the remaining money • Review of releases (MHRD and states) • When will the requests for reimbursement come and how much are they likely to be for? • Next steps Meeting with NBA @ 4.30 pm	World Bank
March 3	Field visit to CoEs in Kanpur, Ranchi and Mumbai		
March 4	Meeting with UGC @ 10 am to review autonomy Review of Procurement System and Plan for integration of manual entries into online system @ 11.30 am	Review of process for CoE Review <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Status of expert review • Key findings from field visits 	World Bank
March 7	Review of IIT Quality Circles <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Findings from study • Next steps Review of IIM Study <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Findings from study 	Performance Audit and Mentoring <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Findings from survey • Plan for final round of performance auditing Review of Governance work <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How many institutes have 	IHC

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Next steps 	<p>prepared governance documents? Discuss sample of 5.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Next steps 	
March 8	Meeting with MHRD and EdCil on pending issues <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recruitment of NPIU staff PMSS and Infova TEQIP III recruitments and contracts 	Status of Four Funds <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What actions have been taken to ensure BoGs can determine usage after project closing? Review of Status of studies and next steps <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Faculty and student satisfaction survey Resource utilization study Bibliometric study Impact evaluation 	NPIU
March 9	VC with States <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What worked and what did not Action Plan till Oct 31, 2016 Twinning Arrangements 		Ministry
March 10	Internal Bank Meetings and Writing up Aide-Memoire		
March 11	Review of Equity Action Plans with institutes in all LIS. ATUs from LIS also invited <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Well-performing colleges under TEQIP II to discuss their efforts Develop action plan for all colleges to improve retention rates and performance of students		IHC
March 14	Wrap-up with MHRD		Ministry