
INDIA

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

Fifth Joint Review Mission

July 6-August7, 2015

Aide Memoire

I. INTRODUCTION

1. The World Bank and Ministry of Human Resource Development (MHRD) team carried out the 5th Joint Review Mission (JRM) from July 6-17, 2015.¹The World Bank team²would 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 (with Mentors and Performance Auditors, institutions, (State Project Facilitation Units (SPFUs), IIMs and IITs), field visits,informativepresentations and proactive participation in discussions.
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 December 2014. The mission visited three institutions each in the states of Rajasthan, Telangana, Uttar Pradesh, and West Bengal. Meetings were also held with IITs and IIMs to evaluate the impact of their work on pedagogical and management training, respectively. Meetings were held with a group of Mentors and Performance Auditors to review the progress of their work. The team also met with officials in the All India Council of Technical Education to examine quality-related aspects in engineering education, as well as with the National Board of Accreditation (NBA) to seek advice on expediting the accreditation process for TEQIP institutes.Finally, a meeting was held with the Principal Secretaries Technical Education (or representatives), Technical Education of states participating in TEQIP II. Details on persons met and institutes visited are inAnnex 1 and state visit reports are in Annex 4.
3. In a Tripartite Project Pipeline Review held on July 22, 2015, chaired by the Department of Economic Affairs (DEA), the Joint Secretary, DEA, Mr Raj Kumar, advised the MHRD and the World Bank to consider including more institutes/activities under TEQIP II so that at least 90 percent of project funds were committed prior to approval of a new request for financial assistance. The Joint Secretaryagreed that if needed, TEQIP II's closure could be extended to allow institutes to complete activities (the World Bank Country Director also agreed to such a necessary extension). Mr. Kumar also advised considering a modality whereby activities initiated under TEQIP II could continue seamlessly into an additional phase of the project, which might take the form of additional financing or a new project (TEQIP III). Formal minutes of the meeting are awaited. In the interim, the World Bank team used the period scheduled for the TEQIP III preparation mission (August 3-7, 2015) to meet with MHRD, NPIU and State Principal Secretaries to consider mechanisms for strengthening and expanding TEQIP II's reach, as well as accelerating fund use.

¹ As discussed in paragraph 3, the period from July 23-Aug 7, 2015 was also used to review TEQIP II and explore possibilities for strengthening the Project.

² Toby Linden (TTL), Lead Education Specialist; Tara Beteille (co-TTL), Economist; Kurt Larsen, Lead Education Specialist; Francisco Marmalejo, Lead Education Specialist; Karthika Radhakrishnan-Nair, Operations Analyst; Rudraksh Mitra, Consultant and Ritu Sharma, Program Assistant.

II. KEY PROJECT DATA

Project Data	Details		Current Ratings	Last	Now
Board Approval	03/18/2010		Development Objectives	S	S
Effectiveness	08/6/2010		Implementation Progress	MS	S
Closing date (Revised)			Project Management	MS	S
Original Credit amount	SDR 186.4mm	US\$ 259.3 m	Procurement	MS	MS
Revised Credit amount	SDR 134.6m	US\$ 187 m	Financial Management	MS	MS
Amount disbursed (July 19, 2015)	SDR 68.5 m	US\$ 95.3 m	Counterpart Funding	MS	MS
% Disbursed (July 19, 2015)	51		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

4. The progress against the Project Development Objective (PDO) is rated as Satisfactory as all PDO indicators are ontrack to be achieved, with one exception (related to proportion of participating institutions from lagging states).
5. The mission recommends the following change in ratings: Implementation (MS to S) and Project Management (MS to S). With regard to implementation, activities at the institutional level are proceeding well, with an increasing number of institutions meeting the bar for being a “well-performing” institute. While 64 institutions met the bar set in the 3rd JRM, 162 institutions have met 8 or 9 of the indicators set in the 4th JRM. System-level activities (IIMs, QEEE and Good Governance and MIS) are also proceeding satisfactorily. In a meeting with the Chairman, NBA, Dr Nassa, the JRM team was informed that, in general, TEQIP institutes receive a higher score on NBA’s accreditation than other institutes. This is important both because NBA accreditation is difficult to achieve and because accreditation is voluntary. It indicates that TEQIP institutes have the will and the confidence to go through the accreditation process to signal their quality. Additionally, field visits as well as meetings held during the JRM indicate that TEQIP has built a strong brand name for itself. All these factors suggest implementation of the project is satisfactory. In terms of Project Management, MHRD and the NPIU have moved ahead by linking funding to performance at the institute-level by (i) weeding out poor-performing institutes from the project; and (ii) providing well-performing institutes additional resources. Both processes are difficult and required considerable effort and perseverance on the part of MHRD and NPIU. The World Bank team would like to congratulate MHRD and NPIU for taking difficult decisions in their endeavour to keep quality and accountability at the forefront of the project.
6. Fund flow delays, unfortunately, continue, with some states taking a long time to release funds to institutions. Of the total amount of Central, State and Institute share of Rs. 860 million (US\$14m, at 60:1) pending to be released by the States, an amount equivalent to Rs. 584 million (68%) pertains to funds not released for more than 50 days. If additional funds can be given to well-performing institutions, this will make it much more likely that all the available resources are utilized. It is noteworthy that 56 institutions have already received their full allocation.

IV. INSTITUTIONAL PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT

7. The fourth institutional performance assessment of all TEQIP institutes (186 in total, excluding the four institutes that have weeded out from the project³) has been effectively carried out by MHRD/ NPIU (Annex 3). Institutions continue to take this exercise seriously and the impact is clearly seen in the increasing number of institutions meeting all the specified performance indicators. A total of 122 institutions have met all the latest set of indicators compared to only 64 institutions meeting all the previous set of indicators.
8. In the most recent performance assessment (as of July 14, 2015), almost all the first cycle institutions (150 of 154) are achieving 7-9 of the indicators, and institutions from the second cycle also continue to show improvement with the majority (27 of 34) meeting 7-9 indicators.
9. The following shows institutional performance:
 - 122 institutions achieving all 9 indicators
 - 40 institutions achieving 8 indicators
 - 15 institutions achieving 7 indicators
 - 9 institutions achieving ≤ 6 indicators
10. In line with the recommendations of previous JRMs, the MHRD/NPIU has only released additional funds if an institution has met all the latest set of performance indicators.
11. The National Steering Committee (NSC) (at its 10th meeting on May 28, 2015) made noteworthy decisions regarding poorly performing institutions. Of the 17 institutions which had consistently been unable to achieve at least 60% of the indicators over the course of the past three institutional performance assessments (Dec 2013, April 2014 and Dec 2014), the NSC decided to weed out four institutions from the project. The NSC also decided to allow the remaining 13 institutions to continue under the project provided they meet all the indicators by August 31, 2015, failing which these institutions would also be removed from the project. As of July 14, 2015, five of these institutions have met all the 9 indicators, four have met 8 indicators and the remaining four have met ≤ 7 indicators. The JRM team commends the NSC for these difficult decisions.
12. The government has agreed in principle to release additional funds (Rs 5 crores for government institutions and Rs. 2 crores for private institutions) to well performing institutions (minutes of decision meeting are awaited). It is important that the additional funds are released quickly so that the institutions can utilize the funds within the project period.
13. The JRM also noted that inordinate delay in release of funds from some states to institutions continues to be a source of concern under the project. There are 57 institutions that reported delay in the release of funds from their respective state for more than 50 days. In addition, in some cases, only a partial amount has been released to the institution.

³ One additional institution that was earlier recommended for weeding out has been re-included by the National Steering Committee to participate, albeit with a reduced allocation. The formalities for this institution to participate have not yet been completed, so that institution has not been included in the statistical data presented in this AM.

Recommendations

- MHRD/NPIU should release funds to institutions which have met 8 or 9 of the indicators by August 31, 2015⁴. The indicator related to NBA accreditation should have been met.
- It is recommended to give all institutions a further set of performance indicators (5th JRM indicators), to be met by November 30, 2015. MHRD/NPIU is advised to release the next rounds of funds to institutes only once they have met *all* the indicators. It is recommended that an indicator is included which relates to the states' funds releases. The indicators could include:
 - i. Autonomy (received 2(f) recognition from UGC; and obtained autonomy or applied to UGC for autonomy with no objection from university)
 - ii. Minutes of meeting of Board of Governors taking place in last 4 months published on the institution's website
 - iii. NBA accreditation (55% accredited; or completion application for 55% sent to NBA, i.e., fee paid and Self-Assessment Report having been completed)
 - iv. Commitment of 100% of funds received
 - v. Expenditure of at least 70% of total funds received
 - vi. Procurement plan to cover 100% of planned procurement expenditures
 - vii. Completion of all data input into the MIS for 2014-15 (exception to be provided for institutions where the results are delayed)
 - viii. Funds released by the state to the institution within 45 days of receipt from MHRD
 - ix. Institution has deposited required funds in each of the Four Funds, as against annual expenditure reported in the MIS.

V. KEY ACTIVITIES

14. This JRM investigated in detail five specific issues: Governance, Affiliation System, Mentorship and Performance Auditing, Faculty Development, and the Four Funds. The following sections take each issue in turn and examine the current situation, outline the main issues and concerns, identify good practices that were found, and make recommendations. Recommendations include both short-term and long-term actions.

A. Governance

Current Status

15. Strengthening the governance of TEQIP institutions is a high priority under TEQIP II. This is reflected in the benchmarking where four of the ten performance assessment indicators identified in December 2014 are directly linked to strengthening the institutional governance.
16. Overall, there has been good progress in achieving the governance performance assessment indicators as indicated in the table below. Out of the 186 institutions that are participating in TEQIP the vast majority have met the four indicators pertaining to institutions being autonomous (obtained or applied for); institutions having published the minutes of the Board of Governor's meeting; institutions having completed their

⁴ This pertains to indicators determined in the 4th JRM.

governance development plan and/or institutional governance guidelines; and institutions having updated their Institutional Development Plan.

Performance Assessment Indicator	Number of institutions (as at July 2015)
Autonomy (obtained or applied to UGC with no objection from university and state government)	171
Published the minutes of the Board of Governor's meeting (last 4 months) on their institution's web-site	177
Institutions having completed their governance development plan and/or institutional governance guidelines, approved by governance body and published on institution's web-side	180
Institutions having a revised Institutional Development Plan published on the institution's web-site	178

Source: NPIU

17. Most of the SPFU representatives met during the JRM felt that the governance initiatives taken have had a positive impact on the institutions' ability to improve the quality and relevance of their teaching and learning. They were strongly in favour of the governance initiatives to be continued under the project. Many institutions within TEQIP that have a dynamic and active industrialist as Chairman of their Board of Governors (BoG) were said to have achieved significant progress.

Key concerns and examples of good practices

18. It is evident that some institutions and state government Departments of Technical Education have difficulties in understanding 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. Institutions that have recognized this are doing well. One such example is described in the report by the Observer Research Foundation Mumbai on how the College of Engineering in Pune (COEP) transformed itself into a high quality engineering institution when it became an autonomous engineering college in 2004⁵. Based on the experiences at COEP, the JRM was told that the State of Maharashtra with the support of the Governor has decided to launch an effort to create up to 50 more institutions on the governance model of COEP.
19. Most TEQIP institutions have not yet completed their Governance Guidelines Document, which is the third and final step of the good government process, and due in December. Again sharing learning from how other institutions have gone about preparing and implementing the institutional governance guidelines is important. BVB Hubli has developed their own governance guidelines that are customized to its need⁶. Other colleges can be inspired by these but will have to customize their documents to their own

⁵ The publication "Excellence Through Autonomy – Transformation of College of Engineering Pune into an IIT-like institution" is available on the URL http://orfnumbaionline.org/sites/default/files/publication_pdf/ExcellenceThroughAutonomy.pdf

⁶ The Government Guidelines Document for BVB Hubli is available at the following URL: www.teqipgoodgovernance.in/pdf/2.%20New-BVB%20Governance%20Document%20June%202014.pdf

needs. It should be noted, however, that one important lesson from the Hubli case is that the governance developments should be driven by the needs of the institution – and their understanding of the essential contribution good governance makes to becoming a better quality institution – and not some external need to meet TEQIP requirements.

Autonomous Institutions

20. The table below gives an overview of the status of academic autonomy of TEQIP institutions. Currently, 121 have obtained academic autonomy, while 65 institutions are at various stages of processing their application to become academic autonomous institutions. Progress has overall been slow; 9 additional TEQIP institutions have obtained autonomous status from UGC over the last 1.5 years. Fifteen institutions have their applications pending with the affiliating university and 50 institutions have their autonomy application pending with UGC.

	December 2013	April 2014	December 2014	July 2015
Participating TEQIP institutions	190	190	190	186
Autonomous	112	115	118	121
Pending applications for autonomy	78	75	72	65
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applied to UGC for Autonomy, UGC assessment 	33	47	44	50
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applied to University for Autonomy and to be forwarded to UGC 	31	19	25	15

Source: NPIU

21. By the end of TEQIP II, ten additional TEQIP institutions need to become autonomous in order to meet the project KPI on autonomous institutions.
22. As part of the TEQIP mission, Dr. Manju Singh Joint Secretary UGC met with the TEQIP institutions that have pending applications for autonomy with UGC. She mentioned that four pre-requisites are necessary to put together a complete application to become an autonomous college: 1) the college should be a minimum of ten years old, 2) it should be recognized under section 2(f) of the UGC Act, 3) have NBA accreditation in at least three courses or a minimum B grade in NAAC accreditation, and 4) the application has to be sent through the affiliating university.
23. Many TEQIP institutions have not met the second pre-requisite, though this is a straightforward step which they must take first. Ms. Singh reminded institutions to copy the affidavit word for word; else their application for 2(f) status would be rejected. Ms. Singh agreed to consult with her colleagues who process 2(f) applications to ensure those from TEQIP institutions are processed expeditiously.
24. A number of other institutions face a challenge that their affiliating university has recently changed because of the creation/restructuring of the affiliating university in their state, often into an affiliating technical university (ATU). These institutions will have to receive their no objection from their new university. Those institutions which are currently autonomous, but whose affiliating university has changed, are required to submit a simple change of information form to UGC but their autonomous status continues. In case of change in name (only), then a new Form 2(f) will have to be submitted.

25. Ms. Singh said that pre-requisite (3) would be considered to be met where NBA accreditation had recently lapsed and the institution has applied for re-accreditation. Ms. Singh also noted that the wording of the UGC regulations would suggest that either NBA or NAAC accreditation would suffice to meet this pre-requisite; though to date no technical college with only NAAC accreditation had applied for autonomy. Were such an institution to apply, she would seek clarification for this issue within UGC.
26. It was agreed that for the institutions that had not yet obtained autonomy, UGC will seek to make a decision on all the pending applications meeting the pre-requisites for obtaining autonomy within three months. Ms. Singh noted that one factor which often causes delay is the nomination of a state government and of an affiliating university representative to the review committee. She recommended that TEQIP institutions approach the chair of the committee if they have not heard about a visit date within 3 weeks of the committee's establishment.
27. Finally, the NPIU informed Ms. Singh that under the TEQIP project, institutions in low-income/special category states were allowed to participate in TEQIP even if only 4 years old; and are also expected to apply for autonomy. Ms. Singh said that the project unit should write to UGC to seek an exception for these institutions for requirement #1.
28. Now that increasing numbers of institutions have received or are likely to receive academic autonomy, it is important the project investigates more systematically the way institutions are *using* autonomy to make quality improvements.

Recommendations

- Strengthening the Good Governance Programme should remain a priority in TEQIP II. NPIU and SPFUs should facilitate the completion of the Good Governance Programme through hands-on workshops, sharing good practice (including through the website) and guidance, such that BoG would complete their Governance Guidelines Document before December 2015.
- NPIU should plan a series of training workshops for BoG members at the request of SPFUs.
- NPIU should undertake an evaluation of 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 by December 2015.
- NPIU and SPFUs should develop an action plan for each institution that has not obtained academic autonomy from UGC. Where necessary, SPFUs should approach the affiliating university to expedite the autonomy application. NPIU should follow up on the agreed actions with UGC and monitor progress. The action plan should be developed by 30th September 2015.

B. Affiliation System

Current Status

29. In a majority of states, engineering colleges (both government and private unaided) are affiliated to an ATU. ATUs serve a large number of academic and administrative functions in relation to their affiliated colleges (AC) including managing the admissions process, setting curricula, conducting examinations, appointing faculty, processing

applications for accreditation and autonomy, carrying out inspections and reviews, and awarding degrees.

30. One of the goals of TEQIP-II is to strengthen institutional capacity of colleges, which makes it pertinent to address their relationship with their respective ATU. Some ATUs are being supported under TEQIP-II but only in relationship to the teaching-research activities that they conduct for their own students.
31. The leadership and management capacity of the university administration and the academic capacity of university teaching departments are important resources in ATUs that could be leveraged for the development of affiliated colleges. However, in most cases, ATUs are currently limited to playing a compliance monitoring role. This problem is exacerbated in cases of ATUs having a large number of ACs under their jurisdiction.

Concerns

32. Most ATUs are severely understaffed. Faculty from their university teaching departments and constituent colleges are frequently diverted from their academic duties in order to assist with admissions, examinations, and reviews of ACs. Further, Vice-Chancellor, Registrar and even regular faculty member positions are either vacant or temporarily filled at many of those institutions.
33. Understaffing results in long procedural delays and in an ineffective affiliating role, for example in reporting examination results. Understaffing also restricts the role the ATU can play in supporting the development of ACs. In some cases, there are a large number of faculty vacancies in project ACs, which results in ACs being ineligible for accreditation and autonomy (which are prerequisites for funding under TEQIP-II). In many cases, the accreditation and autonomy applications of eligible ACs are held up because of delays in obtaining 'no objection certificates' from ATUs.
34. Some states (for e.g. UP and Kerala) have attempted to introduce efficiency in the affiliation system by setting up technical universities which are mandated to manage the affiliation process for all colleges in the state and do not carry out teaching or research. This is intended to reduce the administrative burden on teaching universities.
35. The affiliation system presents significant operational variations across states. At the same time, autonomy is interpreted differently across ATUs considering that in many cases, full academic and administrative autonomy has not been granted to project ACs that have obtained academic autonomy from the UGC.

Recommendations

- NPIU, with the assistance of the World Bank, should carry out a comprehensive assessment of the functioning of the affiliation system across states in terms of its scope, variations, procedures, advantages and limitations. The assessment should focus on ATUs, and should analyse the related academic, logistical and financial implications of ATUs for the entire system and their relationship with ACs. It also should include a deeper analysis of the extent to which procedures are duplicated across the accreditation and affiliation systems, and a review of means to simplify these processes. To be completed by December 2015.
- NPIU and the SPFUs should prepare a report describing lessons learned and good practices in the affiliation system and in the process for obtaining autonomy by ACs by June 2016. Such a report should be considered by the State Steering Committee and disseminated among TEQIP and non TEQIP ACs.

- NPIU to explore means to adequately integrate ATUs in the TEQIP project by fostering a more effective quality-focussed relationship between them and ACs. This will also strengthen their role as focal points for the dissemination of good practices to both project and non-project ACs.
- State governments to incentivise reform of the affiliation system, including a feasibility analysis and related stimulus aimed at merging small colleges and creating college cluster universities.
- NPIU to include specific activities devoted to foster effective exchange of information and sharing of experiences among ATUs. Starting immediately.

C. Mentorship/ Performance Auditing

Current status

36. The mission is very pleased to witness the important role being played by both mentors and performance auditors in providing candid feedback and support (on academic and administrative issues) to institutions. The JRM team also heard how mentors working together with SPFUs can have a larger impact. Also, it is encouraging to observe that when necessary NPIU has acted in replacing a few mentors and performance auditors unable to fulfil their assignments.
37. Before closure of the TEQIP-II project (as per the current plan), a final Performance Audits expected to be held, tentatively between January-March 2016. It is expected that mentors will continue their work with institutions in the remaining period of TEQIP II.

Key Issues and Concerns

38. There is some confusion among participating institutions regarding the different but complementary roles of mentors and performance auditors (as outlined in the Handbook). Consequently, institutions do not fully benefit from both advisory/assessment advice available to them.
39. Several of the institutions are not systematically taking advantage of their mentors. There are even some cases in which institutions have never requested the mentorship support. Likewise, the mentorship support seems sometimes to be provided to institutions on an ad-hoc basis. Nevertheless, other than anecdotal information, no hard evidence exists about the usefulness of mentors' role and functions in the project from the point of view of the beneficiary institutions, and about ways in which such activity can be improved for their benefit.
40. There are cases in which non-existing mentorship is a reality either because institutions are not interested on their support, or because mentors are not engaged/available. However, no systematic detection mechanism is in place in order to timely and adequately identify those inadequacies and to make necessary changes. Also, mentors are not presently assigned while taking into account an institution's strengths and weaknesses (and hence specific mentorship needs).
41. In order for the next round of Performance Auditing to be effective, i.e., to provide effective feedback to institutions, to benchmark institutional performance in a consistent way, and to document project achievements, it is necessary to ensure all Performance Auditors are trained and an effective quality assurance system for Performance Audit reports is in place.

Recommendations

- NPIU should conduct two separate 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 survey should be conducted in August-September 2015.
- NPIU should further refine the selection process, profile, training, and assignment of mentors. In reviewing the entire process, it is recommended: (i) to more systematically assign mentors to institutions based on their strengths/weaknesses, (ii) to have a mechanism in place in order to more systematically evaluate the relationship between mentors and mentee institutions, and (iii) to include a mechanism under which participating institutions can provide input on best matchmaking mentorship arrangements. Some options to consider are the following:
 - Participating institutions being able to suggest in advance names of potential mentors.
 - Participating institutions and mentors conduct a preliminary meeting to discuss if a good match for further mentorship exists.
- NPIU should establish a mandatory standardized training for all mentors, by the end of September, and establish an adequate mechanism for them to continuously exchange ideas, experiences and practice-sharing.
- NPIU, working with SPFUs, should foster a more systematic, frequent and effective communication system between mentors and institutions, measuring and monitoring more effectively such interaction not only in terms of onsite visits and online communications, but also in the achievement of goals and performance indicators of institutions. In addition to providing general mentorship support to institutions, mentors should connect institutes with adequate specialised resources based on concrete needs on specific areas.
- NPIU should take advantage of upcoming interactions of mentors with institutions by asking them in advance to collect, using a simple template, information about institutional good practices on the different components of the project to be later compiled and shared among institutions and with the public at large.
- All Performance Auditors should participate in a mandatory training provided by NPIU which includes specific clarifications and training on the required characteristics that good PA reports should have.
- NPIU needs to develop an effective quality assurance system for Performance Audit reports prior to the next round of visits.
- NPIU should review the effectiveness of the current Performance-Auditing function and, if necessary, consider alternative ways to carry out this function. An option being suggested is to build into the MIS system components aimed at obtaining such information directly from institutions, and conducting on-site PA more on a random or selective basis.
- It is recommended that NPIU hosts workshops periodically with mentors and performance auditors in order to obtain their input and recommendations for strengthening TEQIP institutes. These workshops should be informed by the results of the surveys recommended in the previous paragraphs.

D. Faculty and Student Development

Current Status

42. The current status for faculty and management development is shown in the table below. It is positive that the number of participants who have received training at IITs is 2,000 by July 2015 which is close to the end-of-project target of 2,200. A special effort is required to meet the target for the number of faculty/officials attended management capacity enhancement training at IIMs, which was 1302 as of July 2015. The target to be met by October 2016 is 2280.

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

43. There are 7 IIMs offering management and leadership development and 8 IITs offering a variety of faculty development activities. IIMs are working well together and have developed a core curriculum which is used by all the IIMs for the basic courses offered to institutions. The links with the Good Governance Programme have become strong. The IITs are offering a more diverse set of activities, centred on specific subject areas, and driven by the availability of faculty in each IIT and the demand from TEQIP institutions.
44. The team had a video-conference with the team at IIT Madras that is spearheading the Quality Enhancement in Engineering Education (QEEE) initiative. The program consists of live lectures, remote tutorials, remote labs, open courses, bridge programs, e-books and remote quizzes. About 10,000 students and their teachers from 87 TEQIP institutions are participating in the programme. The JRM team also noted that QEEE includes non-TEQIP institutions, which is a welcome sign of the impact that TEQIP can have beyond the institutions in the project. The initiative started in early 2014 and has matured through several rounds of gaining experience of how best to deliver the different activities.
45. The progress in terms of student and faculty feedback has been significant over the last year. The feedback from the QEEE delivery from January to April 2014 was mixed. Forty per cent of the students and 63 per cent of the teachers rated the activities above expectations and 35 per cent of the students and 21 per cent of the teachers rated the activities below expectations. In the QEEE semester January to April 2015, the percentage of the students rating the QEEE activities above expectation rose to 70 per cent and for teachers to 79 per cent.
46. QEEE has two major challenges: 1) many institutions did not have the necessary technological requirements and connectivity in place from the start and 2) syllabus mismatch between the colleges and the offerings under QEEE. The first problem is being addressed by TEQIP institutions from their project funds, albeit slowly. The second is a never-ending challenge given the diversity of curricula across the country. The QEEE team aims to address this in the upcoming semester by taking a topic-focussed approach, where each topic will be covered in three sessions (total of six hours). The lectures and quiz will focus only on the integral parts of a module in order to overcome the challenge of syllabus mismatches. It was important to note that this approach is consistent with the

views of SPFUs, who were overwhelmingly in favour of QEEE focusing on basic courses, reaching a larger number of students and especially those in rural areas, rather than on advanced courses.

47. During the meeting with SPFUs, several states anecdotally mentioned that the different training activities carried out by IITs had had a positive impact of the quality of teaching and learning as faculty have gained knowledge about the use of E-library, e-learning material and improved pedagogy. However, SPFUs also noted that the incentives for faculty to participate in training increases significantly when that training is for 5 days or more as in this way the training can be counted towards the necessary professional certifications for career development.

Key issues and concerns

48. Despite recommendations to this effect in previous JRMs, there are as yet no mechanisms in place to understand better the quality and relevance of the faculty development and management activities initiated under TEQIP II. IIMs have made some strides in this direction, given their common core curriculum. The JRM has recognised that the work of the IITs is necessarily tailored to the needs of different institutions; but the JRM still believes that there should be a more robust collection of data against agreed indicators to measure the difference that these activities are making to faculty at TEQIP institutions; these indicators might vary across IITs, but it is incumbent on the IITs to propose a monitoring scheme.
49. The Mission found the QEEE program to be very effective and there appears to be the capacity to extend the program, both in terms of services offered (to include a faculty development component) and number of institutions served. This may require a different form of organization in order to ensure the longer-term sustainability of these activities.
50. The QEEE program is collecting an impressive array of data about its program implementation. Now that the program interventions are settling down, it is an opportune time to review the data being collected so that as the program moves forward the effectiveness of different interventions can be assessed.
51. The number of faculty requiring pedagogical and subject-based training, even in TEQIP institutions, means that there will need to be multiple avenues through which institutions support faculty development (i.e., institutions should not just rely on the work of the IITs).
52. International travel for faculty and students is an important element of capacity building, since this exposes faculty and students to new ideas and enables India to display the progress it is making in engineering education. Present policy under the project is that those institutions which are well-performing should have the final decision-making authority over who undertakes international travel; other institutions need to seek approval from MHRD.
53. The JRM also was informed about the success of a couple of students under the MITACS program, who were able to adapt cutting-edge research to India's needs. The MITACS program this year has started relatively small; but with hopes that next year it will expand.

Recommendations

- NPIU should commission 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 by December 1, 2015;
- NPIU should develop an action plan with the IITs and IIMs to ensure that the targets for IIT and IIM training will be reached by October 2016;
- NPIU should discuss with the QEEE program the data that is being gathered currently, what analyses can be done and what analyses should be done going forward;
- MHRD/NPIU to consider and agree with IIT Madras how to continue the QEEE program by 31st December 2015, including the possibility of a faculty development program.
- MHRD should continue to allow the BoGs to give approval for international travel of faculty in those TEQIP institutions that have met all the performance benchmarks. A final decision on this should be made soon.
- NPIU to organize a meeting of students who participated in the MITACS program in order to learn lessons for the program's expansion next year.
- Faculty and management training should be organized systematically and information about the offerings should be available on NPIU web-site with links to the course offerings by the individual course delivery institutions. The courses should furthermore largely be based on demand from TEQIP institutions (and should also be available for use by non-TEQIP institutions);
- Based on the peer-reviewers' CoE Progress Review Sheets it is suggested that NPIU engage two experts to do a desk review of good practices of the CoEs and issues that represent challenges for the CoEs to meet their targets. The report is to be finalized by December 1, 2015 and will be useful for strengthening the CoE initiative.

E. The Four Funds

Current Status

54. To sustain development activities initiated in project institutions 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 institutions are required to build these funds with annual contribution into each Fund equal to at least 0.5% of annual recurring expenditure of the institution. Further, each project institution is encouraged to additionally contribute an amount from its savings into the Corpus Fund. Importantly, institutions are required to contribute this amount from their own funds and not from the project funds.
55. The Project Implementation Plan says that institutions are to utilize the revenue from the four funds only after the project closes, following approval from the BoGs as per rules developed in consonance with state government guidelines (if any).

56. Project institutes in all states and UTs have been building the four funds, with the exception of three cases: Delhi, Puducherry and Tripura. In general, the amount deposited in the corpus fund is much higher than the amount in the other funds, often by a multiple of ten (Table 1).

Table 1: TEQIP II Four Funds Summary (INR lakhs)

	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15
Corpus	12333.43	30234.57	53579.37	89414.85	90400.93
Faculty Development	2003.68	3916.67	5762.54	8505.43	8974.86
Equipment Replacement	2450.88	3705.63	5320.63	7459.53	7895.42
Maintenance	3403.77	4502.9	5951.82	8225.75	8697.45

Source: TEQIP MIS

57. There is considerable variation in amounts generated across states, with Karnataka leading. There appears to be little association between the number of institutes in a state and that state's aggregate generation of the four funds. For instance, while Karnataka, followed by Maharashtra and Telangana — all states with a large number of TEQIP institutes — lead in terms of amount of funds generated, West Bengal and Kerala, also states with a large number of project institutes, are among the states with the least generation of funds. In the former group of states, high levels of local industry presence are likely to have contributed to revenue generation efforts. The capacity of institutions to retain student fees (and therefore have this as a source of revenue) varies across states.

58. There is also considerable variation across institutes in the amount generated, with the bulk of funds having been generated by CFIs across all years and the least amount by private unaided colleges.

Key Issues

59. With some exceptions, such as Telangana institutes, project institutions have not begun planning the utilization of the four funds. In Telangana, for instance, many of the colleges have drawn plans to use the four funds to continue their project activities beyond October 2016, whereas some need clarity and are in the process of making plans. In some cases, the respective BoGhas already approved these plans. In most other states, while most TEQIP colleges have been depositing funds into the four accounts (even if minimally), to date no discussion has taken place in the colleges or the state about how to use these funds following the project.

60. During field visits, colleges mentioned that different colleges may wish to use their funds in different ways, in line with decisions made in the respective BoG (and subject to the overall requirement to use the funds to sustain activities initiated under TEQIP II). Importantly, colleges which have not purchased equipment under TEQIP II would like to redeploy funds from the Equipment Replacement Fund and Maintenance Fund to other developmental uses.

61. A number of colleges have not been able to use the funds generated under TEQIP I for project sustenance. In some cases this was because the institution continued in TEQIP II and there was a lack of clarity whether they could utilize their funds collected under TEQIP I, and whether the TEQIP FM Manual would be applicable for the use of these funds. Of greater concern is that some states did not allow TEQIP I institutions (who did not continue into TEQIP II) to spend the money accumulated in the funds because they took back the decision-making power granted to the Boards of Governors and/or the Finance Department took over the funds; or no rules were formulated either by the SPFU or the colleges.

Recommendations

- All colleges need to ensure that all required resources are deposited in the four funds and report this through the MIS, by 31st October 2015. SPFUs should monitor and follow up as necessary.
- Colleges should discuss guidelines for the management of these funds, and SPFUs should issue, by the end of November 2015, guidelines (as per PIP requirement), including the discretion available to individual colleges and their BoGs. The expectation is that BoGs would continue to exercise the decision-making powers over the Funds (and indeed over the whole institution) that they exercise during the Project.
- NPIU should consult with SPFUs by October 2015, so that SPFUs can clarify in their guidance the circumstances under which:
 - Funds marked for one purpose could be used for another purpose, but still used for sustaining TEQIP activities, especially for those colleges that have not purchased equipment.
 - TEQIP II institutions which also participated in TEQIP I (and built up funds under that project) are able to use these funds immediately for sustaining TEQIP I activities.
 - Institutions which have spent all their allocation under TEQIP II (including any additional funds received as a result of being a well-performing institution) are able to utilize their Four Funds, in order to ensure continuity of TEQIP II activities (for example, for faculty development and student scholarships) even before TEQIP II ends.

F. Other Issues

62. The mission met with the Chairman, NBA, Dr Nassa, to review the status of accreditation applications of TEQIP institutes with NBA. The Chairman shared a list of the status of applications of all TEQIP institutes, noting that fourteen had completed all formalities and an inspection committee would be sent soon. He mentioned that in a large number of the remaining cases, the institute had either not submitted the self assessment report or not provided dates for the committee to visit. In addition, the Chairman flagged two issues. First, the accreditation process for PG programmes is lengthier, and hence MHRD may want to consider whether NBA should prioritize accreditation of UG programmes. Second, in Karnataka, UGC had not yet renewed the autonomous status of previously autonomous institutes whose autonomy period had expired. Since autonomous colleges are Tier I colleges with different criteria for accreditation, unless NBA knows whether a college is to be regarded as Tier I or Tier II, it is unable to complete the accreditation

process. Finally, the Chairman noted that TEQIP institutes are the top performers in their accreditation scale.

Recommendations

- MHRD, NPIU and the World Bank should decide whether they would prefer to prioritize accreditation of UG programmes and communicate the same to the NBA by the latest at end of September 2015.
 - NPIU should follow up with institutes that have not submitted their self assessment forms and ask them to expedite the process. Starting immediately.
 - NPIU should seek clarification from UGC on renewal/cancellation of autonomous status for previously autonomous institutes in Karnataka, whose autonomous status needs to be renewed/cancelled. Starting immediately.
63. The NPIU and World Bank conducted a survey of TEQIP institutes on faculty transfers between 2011 and 2014. Of the 190 TEQIP institutes, faculty transfers happen in only 53 institutes. Preliminary findings suggest that in these institutes, the volume of faculty transfers is non-trivial. Since 2011, 29 percent of faculty were transferred, and 5% retired. A slightly higher percentage of women faculty members were transferred relative to male faculty members. Especially worrying is the fact that a much higher percentage of principals were transferred (55 percent) relative to other faculty members, suggesting leadership discontinuities. States varied in teacher transfer rates, with some states registering transfer rates upwards of 30percent, while others were less than 5percent. There is little relationship between transfer rates and faculty tenure in these data; for instance, in Kerala, approximately 40percent of faculty was transferred between 2011 and 2014, but the average tenure of faculty in sample institutes was only 2.89 years. Overall, across all states, 76percent of vacancies were filled in the same semester or next, but in 24percent of cases, vacancies were not filled for over a year.

Recommendations

- States should examine their faculty transfer policies, and learn from good practices of states such as Tamil Nadu that mandate all faculty to spend a minimum period of time in (clearly identified) less popular locations.

VI. MONITORING AND EVALUATION

64. The project continues to make good progress towards achieving the revised end-of-project targets. The Results Framework Document is updated (as per Annex 2). The number of institutions now providing adequate data in the MIS has also increased to 173 compared to 156 institutions in the last JRM. An additional round of training was held in March 2015 for institutions with incomplete MIS. NPIU should continue to follow-up and train the remaining institutions in completing the data-entry.
65. The data for 2012-13 has been locked.
66. **Sustainability of the MIS:** The contract with CORE has been amended and will be effective till September 30, 2016. SPFUs overwhelmingly expressed the view that they find the MIS useful and would like to continue using the MIS after the project period. They also expressed that it would be helpful to make it more user friendly by enabling further drill-down. In addition, it would help if institutions could customize the report

based on their needs. SPFUs also wished that the MIS should be made available to non-TEQIP institutions.

67. **Tracer Study:** A meeting was held with experts to finalize the Terms of Reference of the tracer study.
68. **Faculty, Staff and Student Satisfaction Survey:** The vendor for the survey, Infova, has not provided NPIU the data or institute report cards in the prescribed format.

Recommendations

- NPIU to freeze the data for 2013-14 by 15th November, 2015.
- MHRD/ NPIU to explore the possibility of migrating the MIS to a server and to an agency maintained by the government so that TEQIP II institutions can continue to use the MIS after the project, and the system would be accessible to non-TEQIP institution. The MIS should be enhanced to include the feature of customizing reports based on need, for example, for AICTE, NBA and NAAC. A sustainability plan should be developed by October 31, 2015.
- The TORs for the Tracer Study will need to be revised and finalized 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. Subsequently, focus group discussions with some students and employers can be held.

VII. FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT

69. Release of Funds by States continues to be an area of concern. MHRD is now consistently taken less than one month to consider requests and make releases to state governments. However, even though state governments are gradually reducing the time taken to release funds, most states are generally taking 3 months or more to release their and MHRD funds to institutions. The Table below provides details. One of the institutional performance assessment indicators is proposed to be on state fund releases (see Section IV above).

Installments	MHRD releases								State releases								COE
	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
	AP	47	35	15	10				190	130	91	75	17				
TELANGANA	53	47	0	68				186	132	111	217						
CHHATTISGARH	0	0						439									
NCT-Delhi	34							177									
GUJARAT	80	15						89	119	61							
HARYANA	79							323	58								
HIMACHAL PRADESH	22	143	11					326	117	72	136						
JHARKHAND	97	65	25					128	149	313						252	
KARNATAKA	46	40						226	116	131						134	
KERALA	45	75	55	10	11	0		67	75	81	96	171					
MADHYA PRADESH	80	20	15					107	21	161	65						

MAHARASHTRA	40	53	21	23	9	22	147	94	112	82	132	106	146		
ODISHA	55	20					27	35	30						
PUNJAB	42						331								
RAJASTHAN	34	18					232	96	164						
TAMIL NADU	58	66	72	26	10	0	92	85	51	59	78	74			
TRIPURA							92								
UT-CHANDIGARH	46	46	55				84	81	114				98		
UT-PUDUCHERRY	27	15					123	147	98						
UTTAR PRADESH	76	14					189	135	108				209		
UTTARKHAND	76	42	9				186	103	172				109		
WEST BENGAL	65	63	51	22	11	8	27	104	46	49	69	92	86	90	67

Source: NPIU data provided to the JRM. Note: no data is available for the first release from MHRD, since this was not made on request but at the start of the project activities.

70. Adequacy of State/ Institutes Share: On the whole it is observed that for a number of States there is shortfall of release of State and Institute's respective shares.
71. Compliance of Audit Observations: This remains an area of concern. Presently there is no formal audit observation compliance mechanism in place to ensure timely follow-up of the audit observations of each audit.
72. Monitoring by NPIU and SPFUs: Regular monitoring of FM issues by NPIU and SPFUs is crucial for improving the FM performance of the project.
73. Financial Reporting: The mission was informed that E-FMR continues to be implemented partially and IFR submitted to the Bank is based on the excel summaries sent by the institutes and the SPFUs.

Recommendations

- The mission suggests pilot in few states/institutes setting up formal audit observation compliance mechanism like Audit Committee at SPFUs.
- The PMSS should be amended so that the e-FMR can be generated automatically rather than institutions having to enter the information separately into the e-FMR.
- A relevant arrangement should be designed and implemented for monitoring and reporting the utilization of interest received on funds.

VIII. PROCUREMENT

74. The gap in expenditure is reported in the FMR and PMSS. The procurement expenditure reported in PMSS is Rs. 429.32 crores whereas the expenditure reported in FMR is Rs. 579.68 crores. This Rs. 150.36 cr difference in both the figures is due to some of the payments are not updated in PMSS by the participating institutions. NPIUs may impress upon all SPFUs who in turn advise institutions under their control to enter payments details in PMSS so that the gaps between two figures is eliminated. For this a time bound action plan is need to be implemented to clear the backlog.
75. The total procurement expenditure estimated upto June 2015 end is Rs. 929 Crores. The mission noted that the revised loan amount for this project is USD 220 mn. As per project requirement, the maximum procurement allowed for Institutes under component 1.1 and

Centre of excellence is 55% of the outlay and that for 1.2 Institutes, the cap is 45%. Taking avg cap of 50%, the total revised expenditure under procurement for the project will be USD 110 mn approx. Taking US\$ conversion rate as INR 60 and Bank reimburse 60% of eligible expenditure, the projected eligible expenditure in procurement will be $(110 \times 6) / 60\% = \text{INR } 1100\text{cr}$. The projected procurement expenditure shows a gap of Rs. 171 crores. This may need to be compensated through additional planning of procurement of items by the Institutes or increase in the expenditure under soft component. It is also recommended that institutes should plan 20% additional procurement to take care of materialization factor.

76. There is a continuing need for procurement activities to be completed in a timely fashion.
77. **Procurement Post Review (PPR) FY 15:** Mission noted that for the PPR FY 15, the PPR report was shared with NPIU and compliance to PPR comments have been received from the institutes.
78. **Complaint Handling.** The mission informed the Procurement staff of NPIU about the mandatory requirement of Bank's review of the complaints and their resolution. Project should submit the details of procurement complaints if any with actions taken on it to Bank for review and its closer. JRM noted that the complaint regarding non-payment of one supplier bills by RTU Kota has since been resolved.

Recommendations

- NPIU should notify institutions that procurement activities for goods and works should be completed (i.e., final payments made) by 31st December 2015. For those well-performing institutions, this deadline should be set at 6 months from the release of additional funds.
- NPIU will need to clarify the situation for those 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?
- NPIU should look into the feasibility of linking the PMSS to the FMR such that institutions do not have enter spending data twice. This should be done by 15th September 2015.

IX. PROJECT MANAGEMENT

79. The Central Project Advisor's position was advertised and a committee has been formed to review the applications.
80. Currently there are nine vacant positions in the NPIU (including the CPA). A couple of positions have been suspended. It would be important to complete the hiring of required positions as soon as possible.

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

81. These are described in detail in Annex 6.

XI. NEW ACTIONS TO BE TAKEN FROM THIS JRM

82. These are listed in Annex 7.

Annex 1: Persons Met and Institutes Visited

S.No.	Name of the Participant	Designation	Organization
Ministry of HRD			
1	Ms. Tripti Gurha	Director (TC)	Ministry of HRD, New Delhi
UGC			
2	Ms. Manju Singh	Joint Secretary	UGC New Delhi
The World Bank			
3	Mr. Toby Linden	Lead Education Specialist	The World Bank
4	Mr. Francisco Marmalejo	Lead Education Specialist	The World Bank
5	Mr. Satya Mishra	Social Development Specialist	The World Bank
6	Ms. Karthika Radhakrishnan Nair	Operations Analyst	The World Bank
7	Mr. Satya Panda	Procurement Specialist	The World Bank
8	Mr. Rudraksha Mitra	Consultant (H.E)	The World Bank
9	Ms. Tara Beteille	Economist	The World Bank
10	Mr. Kurt Larsen	Senior Education Specialist	The World Bank
11	Ms. Asha Bhagat	Consultant	The World Bank
12	Ms. Supriti Dua	Financial Management Specialist	The World Bank
13	Ms. Neha Vyas	Senior Environmental Specialist	The World Bank
14	Ms. Ritu Sharma	Program Assistant	The World Bank
Expert (MHRD nominee/IIT Experts)			
15	Prof N K Mehta	Expert (MHRD nominee)	IIT Roorkee
16	Dr. R N Herkal	Expert (MHRD nominee)	BEC Bagalkot
17	Prof Manoj K Arora	Expert (MHRD nominee)	PE
18	Prof N C Shivaprakash	Expert	IISc Bangalore
IIMs			
19	Prof Prashant Salwan		IIM Indore
20	Prof Punam Sahgal		IIM Lucknow (Noida Campus)
21	Prof Manoj Anand		IIM Lucknow (Noida Campus)
22	Prof V Gopal		IIM Trichy
23	Prof PRS Sharma		IIM Raipur
24	Mr. MandarNayak		IIM Udaipur
Mentors			
25	Prof Vikram M Gadre	Expert (MHRD nominee)	IIT Bombay

S.No.	Name of the Participant	Designation	Organization
26	Prof B S Sonde	Mentor	Ex Professor, IISc Bangalore
27	Prof N C Shivaprakash	Mentor	IISc Bangalore
28	Prof A K Nema	Mentor	IIT Delhi
29	Prof Rajneesh Prakash	Mentor	Ex Principal (PECUT, Chandigarh)
State Institutions			
30	Prof V S S Kumar	Vice Chancellor	JNTU Kakinada
31	Prof S K Roy	Pro. VC	West Bengal University of Technology, Kolkata
32	Prof M B Chaudhari	Principal (In-charge)	Govt. Engineering College, Gandhinagar
33	Mr. AP Raja Sarkar		MCET (42) West Bengal
34	Dr. S Ayoob	Prinicpal	TKM Engineering College, Kollam
35	Prof U Rasheed Kutty		TKM Engineering College, Kollam
36	Dr. B Sesha	Principal	UCE, Kakatiya University, Kothagdem
37	Prof Praveen Kumar	TEQIP Coordinator	J N Govt. Engineering College, Sundernagar
38	Prof Swapnesh S	Astt. TEQIP Coordinator	RGIT, Govt. Engineering College, Kottayam
39	Prof K Subathra		Govt. College of Engineering, Bargur, Tamilnadu
40	Prof P Thirumal		Govt. College of Engineering, Bargur, Tamilnadu
41	Prof B Pattnain		Chandigarh Engineering College, Landran, Mohali
42	Prof Satya Mandal	Registrar	RCC IIT Beliaghat, Kolkata
43	Prof Anirban Mukherjee		RCC IIT Beliaghat, Kolkata
44	Prof K Govinde	Principal	JNTU College of Engineering, Muddanur Road, Pulivendula
45	Dr. B S Pabla	Director	NITTTR, Chandigarh
46	Prof S Dutta	Principal	BankuraUnnayani Institute of Engineering, Bankura
47	Prof M V Garach	Principal	Government Engineering College, Rajkot
48	Dr. N N Jana	Director	College of Engineering and Management, Kolaghat
49	Prof. Md. Abu Safi	Director	Birbhum Institute of Engineering and

S.No.	Name of the Participant	Designation	Organization
			Technology, (BIET) Suri Birbhum
50	Dr. A S Jethoo		Government Woman Engineering College, NasirabadRoad,Makhupura, Ajmer
51	Dr. R P Sharma		Cambridge Institute of Technology, Ranchi
52	Dr.Anindya Ghosh		Govt. College of Engineering & Textile Tech, Berhampur
53	Dr. B Anil	Principal	Govt. Engineering College, Trivendrum
54	Dr. V Syam Prakash	Principal	Govt. College of Engineering, Kannur
55	Dr. Om Pal Singh		Beant College of Engineering & Technology, Gurdaspur
56	Dr.Byjubai T.P	Principal	Govt. Engineering College, Kozhikode
57	Dr K C Raveendranathan	Principal	LBS Institute of Technology for Women, Trivendrum
58	Dr. Z A Zoya	Principal	College of Engineering, Perumon, Kollam
59	Dr. P K Singhal		MITS, Gwalior
60	Dr. M G Bhatt	Principal	SS Engineering College, Bhavnagar
61	Dr. B S Chawla	Principal	Govt. Engineering College, Bilaspur
62	Dr. Ashish Dutta	Coordinator	SIRT Bhopal
63	Dr. Y P Banjare		Govt. Engineering College, Jagdalpur
64	Prof T Krishna Kumar		Govt. Engineering College Trichy
65	Dr. Sanjeev Jain		MITS Gwalior
66	Prof M V Bhatti		S.S Engineering Colelge, Bhavnagar
67	Prof PardeepAshri		UIET, Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra
68	Prof O P Sharma		UIET, Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra
69	Dr. T Senthil Kumar	Dean	BIT Campus, Anna University
70	Dr. P Suresh Kumar	Coordinator	BIT Campus, Anna University
71	Prof Bijoy Kr Upadhyay	Associate Professor	Tripura Institue of

S.No.	Name of the Participant	Designation	Organization
			Technology, Nasirgarh
72	Prof Samir KantiBhusan	Associate Professor	Tripura Institue of Technology, Nasirgarh
73	Dr K G Chandrashekara	Principal	Govt. Sri Krishnarajendra Silver Jubilee Technological Institute
74	Prof Nagesh R	Associate Professor	Govt. Sri Krishnarajendra Silver Jubilee Technological Institute
75	Prof S K Bansal		Government College of Engineering, Bikaner
76	Dr. Ajay Kaushik		M L V Textile & Engineering College, Bhilwara
77	Dr. G GBhutada		Government Engineering College, Chandigarh
78	Dr. P M Joshi		Government Engineering College, Karad
79	Dr. R S Parihar		Government Engineering College, Raipur
80	Dr. S D Burman		Government Engineering College, Raipur
81	Prof Dr. A Rajadurai	Dean	MIT Anna University
82	Dr. V B Gaikwad	Director	SavitribaiPhule Pune University, Pune
83	Prof Suni S Atre	Dy. Registrar, Academic	SavitribaiPhule Pune University, Pune
84	Prof I N Trivedi	TEQIP Coordinator	GEC Gandinagar
85	Prof K E Prakash	Registrar	VTU Belagavi, Karnataka
86	Dr. J N Jha	TEQIP Coordinator	Guru Nanak Dev Engineering College, Ludhiana
87	Dr.Harwinder Singh	Nodal Officer	Guru Nanak Dev Engineering College, Ludhiana
88	Prof Suresh Verma		DeenbandhuChhotu Ram University of Science and Technology, Murthal
89	Prof Raj Kumar		DeenbandhuChhotu Ram University of Science and Technology, Murthal
90	Prof Rahul Rishi		UIET, MDU Rohtak
91	Prof Raj Kumar		UIET, MDU Rohtak
92	Prof S R Upadhyay		UIET, MDU Rohtak
93	Dr.Anuj Srivastava		IFTM University, Moradabad
94	Mr. Sanjeev Agarwal		IFTM University, Moradabad

S.No.	Name of the Participant	Designation	Organization
95	Mr. Satendra Kumar		KIET
96	Mr. H S Khatak		NCCE Israna
97	Dr. R P Singh		NCCE Israna
98	Prof Ashok Kumar		NCCE Israna
99	Ms. S Madhumati IAS	DTE	SPFU Tamilnadu
100	Prof Dr. C Chinnaraj	Project Coordinator	SPFU Tamilnadu
101	Dr.Himanshu Agarwal	Joint Director, DTE	SPFU Chhattisgarh
102	Prof B K Saha	TEQIP Coordinator	SPFU West Bengal
103	Mr. Moninder Singh	Procurement Coordinator	SPFU Punjab
104	Dr.Ajoy Kaushik		SPFU Rajasthan
105	Dr. R N Gupta	SPA	SPFU Jharkhand
106	Shri G S Sharma	State Nodel Officer	SPFU Jharkhand
107	Shri Masoom Ali Sarwar, IAS	Special Secretary (TE) &SPA	SPFU Uttar Pradesh
108	Ms. Neelam Srivastava	CPC	SPFU Uttar Pradesh
109	Mr. Alam Siddique	Nodal Officer	SPFU Uttar Pradesh
110	Mr. SampaGuha	Accounts officer	SPFU West Bengal
111	Dr. Subhash Mahajahan	SPA	SPFU Maharashtra
112	Dr. Ashok	State Project Coordinator	SPFU Maharashtra
113	Mr. AvinashAmte	Head Academic Unit	SPFU Maharashtra
114	Dr. V Gopakumar	TEQIP Coordinator	SPFU Kerala
115	Prof A Ravindra Babu	TEQIP Coordinator	SPFU Telangana
116	Prof Avnish Jain	Project Coordinator	SPFU Uttarakhand
117	Prof S P Sachan		SPFU Uttarakhand
118	Mr. Samir KantiBhusan	Nodal Officer (Procurement & FMR)	SPFU Tripura
119	Mr. Bijoy Kumar Upadhyay	Nodel Officer	SPFU Tripura
120	Prof G S Varadje		SPFU Puducherry
121	Shri G Panneerselvam	DTE	SPFU Puducherry
122	Shri Amit Talwar	DTE	SPFU Chandigarh
123	Dr. Tilak Thakur	TEQIP Coordinator	SPFU Chandigarh
124	Prof B Sampathkumar	TEQIP Coordinator	SPFU AP
125	Prof Lalkit K Awasthi	Principal, JNGEC Sundernagar	SPFU Himachal Pradesh
126	Mr. Sham Goyal	Dy. Director	SPFU Punjab
127	Ms. Paras Parashar		SPFU Haryana
128	Dr. PK Satpathy	Professor, CE&T, Bhubaneshwar	SPFU Odisha
129	Shri K P Singh	Jt. Director (TE)	SPFU Haryana
130	Dr. V S Purani	Jt Director	SPFU Gujarat
131	Prof UshaNeelakanthan	Coordinator	SPFU Gujarat
132	Shri Manohar G Naik	OSD	SPFU Karnataka
133	Mr. Parameshwarappa	P.O (Academics)	SPFU Karnataka
NPIU			
134	Dr. Rita Goyal	Sr. Consultant (Academic)	NPIU

S.No.	Name of the Participant	Designation	Organization
135	Dr. Narendra D Kulkarni	Sr.Consultant (Academic)	NPIU
136	Dr. Yogesh Srivastava	Consultant (Academic)	NPIU
137	Mr. Anoop Mehrotra	Consultant (Academic)	NPIU
138	Mr. N S Agnihotri	Consultant (Finance)	NPIU
139	Mr. Rajkumar Arya	Consultant (Finance)	NPIU
140	Mr Rajiv Mishra	Consultant (Admn)	NPIU
141	Mr. Bhanu Pratap Singh	Consultant (IT)	NPIU
142	Mr. Sachin Gupta	Associate Consultant (Academic)	NPIU
143	Dr. Prakash Chandra Kuniyal	Associate Consultant (Academic)	NPIU
144	Dr. Uma Bansal	Associate Consultant (Academic)	NPIU
145	Ms. Rupali Jha	Associate Consultant (CS)	NPIU

Annex 2: Results Framework

Indicator	2009-10	2010-2011		2011-2012		2012-2013		2013-14		2014-15**	
		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	29 (Accredited: 13 Applied :16)	45	40 (Accredited: 11 Applied :29)	50	55 (Accredited: 16 Applied : 39)	52	63 (Accredited: 16 Applied : 47)
			No. of total eligible programs: 2033		No. of total eligible programs: 2154		No. of total eligible programs: 2293		No. of total eligible programs: 2429		No. of total eligible programs: 2577
			No. of programs accredited or applied for: 468		No. of programs accredited or applied for: 630		No. of programs accredited or applied for: 916		No. of programs accredited or applied for: 1340		No. of programs accredited or applied for: 1613
			No. of institutions reporting: 186		No. of institutions reporting: 186		No. of institutions reporting: 186		No. of institutions reporting: 186		No. of institutions reporting: 186
Percentage Faculty with at least an M. Tech (regular and contract)	45	45	86.71	50	85.95	55	86.89	60	88.17	86	89.36
			Total no. of faculty: 17694 Contract-		Total no. of faculty: 19420 Contract-1785		Total no. of faculty: 21592 Contract-		Total no. of faculty: 22476 Contract-3110		Total no. of faculty: 22691 Contract-3313

Indicator	2009-10	2010-2011		2011-2012		2012-2013		2013-14		2014-15**	
		Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
			1363				2555				
			No. of faculty with highest qualification MTech only: 8722 Contract-597		No. of faculty with highest qualification MTech only: 9823 Contract-786		No. of faculty with highest qualification MTech only: 11590 Contract-1245		No. of faculty with highest qualification MTech only: 12598 Contract-1801		No. of faculty with highest qualification MTech only: 13021 Contract-2118
			No of faculty with highest qualification PhD: 6620 Contract-127		No of faculty with highest qualification PhD: 6869 Contract-139		No of faculty with highest qualification PhD: 7171 Contract-183		No of faculty with highest qualification PhD: 7220 Contract-193		No of faculty with highest qualification PhD: 7255 Contract-214
			No. of institutions reporting: 186		No. of institutions reporting: 186		No. of institutions reporting: 186		No. of institutions reporting: 186		No. of institutions reporting: 186
Total number of Master and PhD students	30000	32000	35265	33000	37515	34000	43464	34000	46835	40000	37800
			No. of institutions reporting: 186		No. of institutions reporting: 186		No. of institutions reporting: 186		No. of institutions reporting: 186		No. of institutions reporting: 165

Indicator	2009-10	2010-2011		2011-2012		2012-2013		2013-14		2014-15**	
		Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
Number of publications in refereed journals (within the field of Engineering)	7032	7500	11176	8000	15945	8500	17596	9000	19526	14000	7890
			No. of institutions reporting: 186		No. of institutions reporting: 186		No. of institutions reporting: 186		No. of institutions reporting: 186		No. of institutions reporting: 145
Percentage of Faculty with or pursuing M. Tech and PhD (regular and contract)	63	63	87.56	64	87	68	88.14	73	89.67	88	90.88
			Total no. of faculty: 17694		Total no. of faculty: 19420		Total no. of faculty: 21592		Total no. of faculty: 22476		Total no. of faculty: 22691
			No. of faculty with highest qualification MTech only: 8722		No. of faculty with highest qualification MTech only: 9823		No. of faculty with highest qualification MTech only: 11590		No. of faculty with highest qualification MTech only: 12598		No. of faculty with highest qualification MTech only: 13021
			No of faculty with highest qualification PhD: 6620		No of faculty with highest qualification PhD: 6869		No of faculty with highest qualification PhD: 7171		No of faculty with highest qualification PhD: 7220		No of faculty with highest qualification PhD: 7255
			No. of faculty enrolled in M.Tech: 151		No. of faculty enrolled in M.Tech : 203		No. of faculty enrolled in M.Tech: 271		No. of faculty enrolled in M.Tech: 337		No. of faculty enrolled in M.Tech: 345
			No. of institutions reporting:		No. of institutions		No. of institutions reporting:		No. of institutions		No. of institutions

Indicator	2009-10	2010-2011		2011-2012		2012-2013		2013-14		2014-15**				
		Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual			
			186		reporting: 186		186		reporting: 186		reporting: 186			
Percentage of externally funded research and development projects and consultancies in total revenue	6	7	9.71	8	9.67	9	13.47	10	12.68	11	--			
			Total Revenue: Rs. 252545 lacs				Total Revenue:Rs. 258808 lacs					Total Revenue:Rs. 203402 lacs		Total Revenue:Rs. 256975 lacs
			Revenue from externally funded research and development projects and consultancies : Rs.24541 lacs				Revenue from externally funded research and development projects and consultancies: Rs. 25036 lacs					Revenue from externally funded research and development projects and consultancies :Rs. 27392 lacs		Revenue from externally funded research and development projects and consultancies: Rs. 32573 lacs
	No. of institutions reporting: 186		No. of institutions reporting: 186		No. of institutions reporting: 180		No. of institutions reporting: 180							
Transition rate of all students from the first year to the second year of	--	48	63.36	51	67.81	54	67.85	58	66.14	61	--			
					Total no. of students in				Total no. of students in the				Total no. of students in	

Indicator	2009-10	2010-2011		2011-2012		2012-2013		2013-14		2014-15**	
		Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
under graduate study			the first year: 86821		first year: 88936		the first year: 92352		first year: 91721		
			No. of students who transitioned from the first year to second year: 55010		No. of students who transitioned from the first year to second year: 60309		No. of students who transitioned from the first year to second year: 62664		No. of students who transitioned from the first year to second year: 60662		
			No. of institutions reporting: 180		No. of institutions reporting: 183		No. of institutions reporting: 184		No. of institutions reporting: 170		
Transition rate of students from disadvantaged backgrounds from the first year to second year of undergraduate study	45	45	59.71	48	63.41	51	62.25	55	61.33	57	--
			Total no. of students from disadvantaged backgrounds in the first year: 38287		Total no. of students from disadvantaged backgrounds in the first year: 38152		Total no. of students from disadvantaged backgrounds in the first year: 39886		Total no. of students from disadvantaged backgrounds in the first year: 40508		
			No of students from disadvantaged backgrounds		No. of students from disadvantaged backgrounds who transitioned		No. of students from disadvantaged backgrounds who transitioned		No. of students from disadvantaged backgrounds who transitioned		

Indicator	2009-10	2010-2011		2011-2012		2012-2013		2013-14		2014-15**	
		Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
			who transitioned from the first year to second year: 22863		from the first year to second year: 24192		transitioned from the first year to second year: 24828		from the first year to second year: 24842		
		No. of institutions reporting: 180	No. of institutions reporting: 183	No. of institutions reporting: 184	No. of institutions reporting: 170						
Direct Beneficiaries (number)	300,000	300,000	372,353	320,000	389,439	335,000	415,949	350,000	434,539	395,000	381,926
		Total no. of student beneficiaries: 351331	Total no. of student beneficiaries: 366413	Total no. of student beneficiaries: 390343	Total no. of student beneficiaries: 407936	Total no. of student beneficiaries: 355099	Total no. of student beneficiaries: 390343	Total no. of student beneficiaries: 407936	Total no. of student beneficiaries: 407936	Total no. of student beneficiaries: 355099	Total no. of student beneficiaries: 355099
		Total no. of faculty beneficiaries: 21022	Total no. of faculty beneficiaries: 23026	Total no. of faculty beneficiaries: 25606	Total no. of faculty beneficiaries: 26601	Total no. of faculty beneficiaries: 26827	Total no. of faculty beneficiaries: 25606	Total no. of faculty beneficiaries: 26601	Total no. of faculty beneficiaries: 26601	Total no. of faculty beneficiaries: 26827	Total no. of faculty beneficiaries: 26827
		No. of institutions reporting: 186	No. of institutions reporting: 186	No. of institutions reporting: 186	No. of institutions reporting: 186	No. of institutions reporting: 186	No. of institutions reporting: 186	No. of institutions reporting: 186	No. of institutions reporting: 186	No. of institutions reporting: 186	No. of institutions reporting: 186

Indicator	2009-10	2010-2011		2011-2012		2012-2013		2013-14		2014-15**	
		Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
of which female (percentage)	26	26	28	27	29	28	29	30	29	30	30
			Total no. of female student beneficiaries: 97819		Total no. of female student beneficiaries: 104637		Total no. of female student beneficiaries: 112719		Total no. of female student beneficiaries: 119233		Total no. of female student beneficiaries: 104870
			Total no. of female faculty beneficiaries: 6254		Total no. of female faculty beneficiaries : 6972		Total no. of female faculty beneficiaries: 7944		Total no. of female faculty beneficiaries: 8235		Total no. of female faculty beneficiaries: 8294
			No. of institutions reporting : 186		No. of institutions reporting: 186		No. of institutions reporting: 186		No. of institutions reporting: 186		No. of institutions reporting: 186
Percentage of institutions with academic autonomy	30	40	51	50	57	60	58	65	61	66	65
			Total no. of institutions: 156		Total no. of institutions: 156		Total no. of institutions: 190		Total no. of institutions: 190		Total no. of institutions: 186
			No. of institutions with academic autonomy: 80		No. of institutions with academic autonomy: 89		No. of institutions with academic autonomy: 111		No. of institutions with academic autonomy: 115		No. of institutions with academic autonomy: 120

Indicator	2009-10	2010-2011		2011-2012		2012-2013		2013-14		2014-15**	
		Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
Number of faculty members that have benefitted from the teaching effectiveness training (under sub-component 1.3)	--	--	--	--	--	--	187	1000	1210 (c)	1500	2000 (c)
						No. of institutions: 70	No. of institutions: 164		No. of institutions: 186		
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) ⁷	17.7	20	--	20	--	20	19	20	19	20	18
Number of governance self reviews received	--	--	--	--	--	--	65	80	162 (c)	180	184(c)
Number of Governance Development plans received	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	20	38	120	174 (c)
Fully functional MIS - Number of institutions	--	--	--	--	--	--	43	150	156	155	173

⁷ 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 24%.

Indicator	2009-10	2010-2011		2011-2012		2012-2013		2013-14		2014-15**	
		Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
reporting at least 70% of the indicators											

**data entry in progress

Annex 3: 5th JRM: Performance Assessment Indicators (UPDATED as on 16th July 2015)

				1	2	3	4	5		6	7	8	9	
S.N.	Name of State/UT	Category	Name of Institution	Autonomy (obtained or applied to UGC with no objection from university and state government)	MoM of BoG (last 4 Months) published on institution's website (Yes/No)	NBA accreditation atleast 55% programmes accredited+applied-for	Statutory Audit FY: 2013-14: Yes/No	Timeline for completion of governance development plan and/or institutional governance guidelines, approved by governing body and published on institution's website	Revised IDP published on the institution's website	Completion of all data input into the MIS	Procurement Plan to cover 100% procurement expenditure (Yes/No)	Actual expenditure 50% of funds received : Yes/No	100% Actual expenditure +committed expenditure against funds received = Yes/No	No. of Indicators Met
1	Andhra Pradesh	Private unaided	SreeVidyanikethan Engineering College, Chittoor	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
2	Andhra Pradesh	Govt.	A U College of Engineering, Andhra University, Visakhapatnam	Yes	Yes	No	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	Yes	Yes	9
4	Andhra Pradesh	Private unaided	Aditya Institute of Technology & Management, Tekkali, Srikakulam	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
5	Andhra Pradesh	Private unaided	Shri Vishnu Engineering College for women, Vishnupur, Bhimavaram	Yes	Yes	No	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	Yes	Yes	9
7	Andhra Pradesh	Private unaided	GITAM Institute of Technology - GITAM University , Vishakhapatnam	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
8	Andhra Pradesh	Private unaided	Madanapalle Institute of Technology & Science, Madanapalle	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
9	Andhra Pradesh	Govt.	SVU College of Engineering, Tirupati	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
10	Andhra Pradesh	Govt.	JNTU College of Engineering, Kakinada	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9

11	Andhra Pradesh	Govt.	JNTU College of Engineering, Pulivendula, Kadappa	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
12	Centrally Funded Institutions	CFI	IIST Shibpur	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
13	Centrally Funded Institutions	CFI	ISM Dhanbad	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
14	Centrally Funded Institutions	CFI	NERIST Itanagar	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
15	Centrally Funded Institutions	CFI	NIT Agartala	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
16	Centrally Funded Institutions	CFI	NIT Allahabad	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
17	Centrally Funded Institutions	CFI	NIT Bhopal	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
18	Centrally Funded Institutions	CFI	NIT Calicut	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
19	Centrally Funded Institutions	CFI	NIT Durgapur	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
20	Centrally Funded Institutions	CFI	NIT Hamirpur	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
21	Centrally Funded Institutions	CFI	NIT Jaipur	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
22	Centrally Funded Institutions	CFI	NIT Jalandhar	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
23	Centrally Funded Institutions	CFI	NIT Jamshedpur	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
24	Centrally Funded Institutions	CFI	NIT Kurukshetra	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
25	Centrally Funded Institutions	CFI	NIT Nagpur	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
26	Centrally Funded Institutions	CFI	NIT Patna	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
27	Centrally Funded Institutions	CFI	NIT Raipur	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	8

28	Centrally Funded Institutions	CFI	NIT Rourkela	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
29	Centrally Funded Institutions	CFI	NIT Silchar	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
30	Centrally Funded Institutions	CFI	NIT Surat	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
31	Centrally Funded Institutions	CFI	NIT Surathkal	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
32	Centrally Funded Institutions	CFI	NIT Tiruchirappally	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
33	Centrally Funded Institutions	CFI	NIT Warangal	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
34	Centrally Funded Institutions	CFI	NITTTR Chandigarh	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
35	Centrally Funded Institutions	CFI	School of Technology - Assam University Silchar	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
36	Centrally Funded Institutions	CFI	SLIET Sangrur	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	7
37	Centrally Funded Institutions	CFI	ZH College of Engg& Tech-AMU Aligarh	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
38	Chhattisgarh	Govt.	Government Engineering College, Bilaspur	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	7
39	Chhattisgarh	Private unaided	Rungta College of Engineering & Technology, Bhillai	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	6
40	Chhattisgarh	Govt.	Government Engineering College, Jagdalpur, Bastar	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
41	Chhattisgarh	Govt.	Government Engineering College, Raipur	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
42	Gujarat	Govt.	Government Engineering College, Bhavnagar	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
43	Gujarat	Govt. aided	Birla VishvakarmaMahavidyalaya, VallabhVidynagar	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
44	Gujarat	Govt.	Government Engineering College, Patan, Gujarat	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
45	Gujarat	Govt.	Government Engineering College, Rajkot, Gujarat	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	7

46	Gujarat	Govt.	Shantilal Shah Engg. College, Bhavnagar, Gujarat	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
47	Gujarat	Govt.	Lukhidhirji Engg. College, Morbi, Gujarat	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
48	Gujarat	Govt.	Government Engineering College, Gandhinagar, Gujarat	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
49	Haryana	Govt.	University Institute of Engineering & Technology, MDU, Rohtak	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
50	Haryana	Private unaided	N.C College of Engineering, Panipat	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
51	Haryana	Govt. aided	Faculty of Engineering & Technology, Guru Jambheshwar University of Science & Technology, Hissar	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
52	Haryana	Govt.	Faculty of Science, Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
53	Haryana	Govt.	University Institute of Engineering & Technology (UIET), Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
54	Haryana	Govt.	Faculty of Engineering & Technology, Deenbandhu Chhotu Ram University of Science & Technology, Murthal, Sonapat	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
55	Himachal Pradesh	Govt.	Jawaharlal Nehru Government Engineering College, Sundernagar, Mandi	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
56	Jharkhand	Govt. aided	BIT, Mesra Ranchi	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
57	Jharkhand	Private unaided	Cambridge Institute of Technology, Ranchi	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
58	Karnataka	Private unaided	Siddhaganga Institute of Technology, Tumkur, Karnataka	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
59	Karnataka	Govt. aided	Dr. Ambedkar Institute of Technology, Bangalore	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
60	Karnataka	Private unaided	Nitte Meenakshi Institute of Technology (NMIT)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
61	Karnataka	Govt.	University Visvesvaraya College of Engg., Bangalore	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8

62	Karnataka	Govt. aided	BVB College of Engineering & Technology	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
63	Karnataka	Govt. aided	National Institute of Engineering, Mysore	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
64	Karnataka	Govt. aided	Mainad College of Engineering, Hassan, Karnataka	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
65	Karnataka	Govt. aided	BMS College of Engineering, Bangalore, Karnataka	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
66	Karnataka	Private unaided	Sri Siddhartha Institute of Technology, Tumkur	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
67	Karnataka	Govt. aided	Basaveshwar Engineering College (Autonomous) Bagalkot	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
68	Karnataka	Govt. aided	PES college of engineering Mandya	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
69	Karnataka	Govt. aided	Sri Jayachamarajendra College of Engineering, Mysore	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
70	Karnataka	Private unaided	PES institute of technology, Bangalore	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	7
71	Karnataka	Govt. aided	PDA College of Engineering, Gulbarga	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
72	Karnataka	Private unaided	MS Ramaiah Institute of Technology, Bangalore	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
73	Karnataka	Private unaided	SDM College of Engineering and Technology, Dhavalagiri, Dharwad	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
74	Karnataka	Govt.	Sri Krishnarajendra Silver Jubilee Technological Institute (SKSJTI)	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	7
75	Karnataka	Private unaided	R.V. College of Engineering (RVCE), Bangalore	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
76	Karnataka	Private unaided	NMAM Institute of Technology, Nitte	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
77	Kerala	Govt.	Rajiv Gandhi Institute of Technology, Kottayam	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
78	Kerala	Govt.	Government College of Engineering, Kannur	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9

79	Kerala	Govt.	Government Engineering College, Thrissur	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
80	Kerala	Govt.	Government Engineering College, Kozhikode	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
81	Kerala	Govt.	Government Engineering College, Painavu, Idukki	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
82	Kerala	Govt.	School of Engineering, Cochin University of Science & Technology, Cochin	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
83	Kerala	Govt.	Government Engineering College, Bartonhill, Thiruvananthapuram	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
84	Kerala	Govt.	LBS Institute of Technology for Women, Poojappura, Thiruvananthapuram	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
85	Kerala	Govt.	College of Engineering Perumon, Perinad, Kollam	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
86	Kerala	Govt. aided	Cooperative Institute of Technology, Vadakara, Kozhikode	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
87	Kerala	Govt.	College of Engineering Trikaripur, Cheemeni, Kasargod	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
88	Kerala	Govt.	College of Engineering Thalassery, Kannur	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
89	Kerala	Govt.	College of Engineering, Kidangoor, Kottayam	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
90	Kerala	Govt.	Government Engineering. College, wayanadThalappuzha, Kerala	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
91	Kerala	Govt.	ThangalKunjuMusaliar College of Engineering,Karicode,	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
92	Kerala	Govt.	Government Engineering. College, Sreekrishnapuram, Kerala	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
93	Kerala	Govt.	College of Engineering, Adoor, Manakkala, Kerala	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
94	Kerala	Govt.	College of Engineering, Karunagappaly, Thodiyoor, Kollam, Kerala	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
95	Kerala	Govt.	College of Engineering, Chertthala, Pallippuram, Alappuzha, Kerala	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9

96	Madhya Pradesh	Govt. aided	Samrat Ashok Technological Institute (Engineering College), Vidisha	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
97	Madhya Pradesh	Private unaided	Sagar Institute of Research & Technology, Bhopal	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
98	Madhya Pradesh	Govt. aided	Madhav Institute of Technology & Science, Gwalior	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
99	Madhya Pradesh	Govt. aided	Rajiv Gandhi Proud yogiki Vishwavidyalaya, Bhopal	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	5
100	Madhya Pradesh	Govt. aided	Shri GS Institute of Technology & Science, Indore	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
101	Maharashtra	Govt. aided	Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Technological University, Lonere, Raigad	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
102	Maharashtra	Govt.	College of Engineering, Shivajinagar, Pune	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
103	Maharashtra	Govt. aided	Shri Guru Gobind Singhji Institute of Engineering & Technology, Nanded	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
104	Maharashtra	Govt. aided	Walchand College of Engineering, Sangli	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
105	Maharashtra	Govt. aided	BVB's Sardar Patel College of Engineering, Mumbai	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
106	Maharashtra	Govt.	Govt. College of Engineering, Aurangabad	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
107	Maharashtra	Govt. aided	Veermata Jijabai Technological Institute, Matunga, Mumbai	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
108	Maharashtra	Govt.	Government College of Engineering, Jalgaon	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
109	Maharashtra	Govt.	Govt. College of Engineering, Amravati	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
110	Maharashtra	Govt.	Government College of Engineering, Karad	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
111	Maharashtra	Private unaided	Rajarambapu Institute of Technology, Islampur, Sangli	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
112	Maharashtra	Govt. aided	Institute of Chemical Technology, Matunga, Mumbai	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9

113	Maharashtra	Private unaided	BharatiVidyapeeth University, College of Engineering, Pune	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
114	Maharashtra	Private unaided	GH Raison College of Engineering, Nagpur	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
115	Maharashtra	Govt.	Government College of Engineering, Chandrapur	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
116	Maharashtra	Govt.	Department of Technology, Shivaji University, Kolhapur, Maharashtra	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
117	Maharashtra	Govt.	Department of Chemical Technology, North Maharashtra University, Jalgaon, Maharashtra	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
118	NCT-Delhi	Govt.	Delhi Technological University, Delhi	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	5
119	Odisha	Govt.	College of Engineering & Technology, Bhubaneswar	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
120	Odisha	Govt.	Veer Surendra Sai University of Technology, Burla, Sambalpur	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
121	Punjab	Govt. aided	Thapar University, Patiala, Punjab	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	7
122	Punjab	Govt. aided	Guru Nanak Dev Engineering College, Ludhiana, Punjab	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
123	Punjab	Govt. aided	SBS College of Engineering & Technology, Ferozpur, Punjab	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
124	Punjab	Private unaided	Chandigarh Engineering College, Mohali, Punjab	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
125	Punjab	Govt. aided	Beant College of Engineering Technology, Gurdaspur, Punjab	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
126	Punjab	Govt.	GZS-PTU, Bhatinda, Punjab	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
127	Rajasthan	Govt.	Govt. Engineering College, Bikaner, Rajasthan	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	5
128	Rajasthan	Govt.	University College of Engineering, RTU, Kota, Rajasthan	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
129	Rajasthan	Private unaided	Institute of Engineering & Technology, Alwar, Rajasthan	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8

130	Rajasthan	Govt.	M L V Textile & Engineering College, Bhilwara, Rajasthan	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	7
131	Rajasthan	Govt.	College of Technology and Engineering, Maharana Pratap University of Agriculture and Technology, Udaipur, Rajasthan	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
132	Rajasthan	Govt.	Govt Engineering College, Ajmer, Rajasthan	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	6
133	Rajasthan	Govt.	College of Engineering and Technology, Bikaner, Rajasthan	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	7
134	Rajasthan	Govt.	Government Women Engineering College, Ajmer, Rajasthan	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	7
135	Rajasthan	Govt.	Government Engineering College, Jhalawar, Rajasthan	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	6
136	Tamil Nadu	Govt.	Govt. College of Engineering, Baragur, Krishnagiri	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
137	Tamil Nadu	Govt.	Govt. College of Technology, Coimbatore	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
138	Tamil Nadu	Govt.	AlagappaChettiar College of Engineering and Technology, Karaikudi	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
139	Tamil Nadu	Govt.	Government College of Engineering, Salem	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
140	Tamil Nadu	Govt.	ManonmaniamSundaranar University, Abishekapatti, Tirunelveli	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
141	Tamil Nadu	Govt.	Thiagaraja College of Engineering, Madurai, Tamil Nadu	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
142	Tamil Nadu	Govt.	P.S.G College of Technology, Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
143	Tamil Nadu	Govt.	Bharathidasan Institute of Technology Campus, Trichirapalli, Tamil Nadu	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
144	Tamil Nadu	Govt.	Coimbatore Institute of Technology, Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
145	Telangana	Private unaided	Aurora's Scientific, Technological & Research Academy, Bandlaguda, Hyderabad	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	6

146	Telangana	Govt.	JNTUH College of Engineering, Hyderabad	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
147	Telangana	Govt.	University College of Engineering, Osmania University, Hyderabad	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
148	Telangana	Govt.	University College of Technology, Osmania University, Hyderabad	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
149	Telangana	Private unaided	Anurag Engineering College, Kodad, Nalgonda	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
150	Telangana	Private unaided	Chaitanya Bharathi Institute of Technology, Gandipet, Hyderabad	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
151	Telangana	Private unaided	GokarajuRangaraju Institute of Engineering & Technology, Kukatpally, Hyderabad	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
152	Telangana	Private unaided	Vasavi College of Engineering, Ibrahimbagh, Hyderabad	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
153	Telangana	Private unaided	VallurupalliNageswara Rao VignanaJyothi Institute of Engg. & Technology, Hyderabad	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
154	Telangana	Private unaided	Malla Reddy Engineering College, Medchal, R.R. District, Hyderabad	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	7
155	Telangana	Private unaided	Sreenidhi Institute of Science & Technology, Ghatkesar, Hyderabad	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
156	Telangana	Govt.	University College of Engineering, Kakatiya University, Kothagudem	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	7
157	Telangana	Govt.	JNTU Institute of Science & Technology, Hyderabad	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
158	Tripura	Govt.	Tripura Institute of Technology, Narsingarh, Tripura	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	7
159	UT-Chandigarh	Govt.	PEC University of Technology, Chandigarh	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
160	UT-Chandigarh	Govt.	University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Chandigarh	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
161	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	Yes	Yes	9

162	UT-Puducherry	Govt.	Pondicherry Engineering College, Puducherry	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
163	Uttar Pradesh	Govt.	Institute of Engineering & Technology, Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
164	Uttar Pradesh	Govt.	Madan Mohan Malviya Engineering College, Gorakhpur, Uttar Pradesh	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	7
165	Uttar Pradesh	Private unaided	School of Engineering & Technology, IFTM University, Lodhipur Moradabad, Uttar Pradesh	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
166	Uttar Pradesh	Govt. aided	Harcourt Butler Technological Institute, (HBTI), Kanpur, Uttar Pradesh	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	7
167	Uttar Pradesh	Govt. aided	Faculty of Engineering and Technology, M.J.P. Rohilkhand University, Bareilly, Uttar Pradesh	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
168	Uttar Pradesh	Govt. aided	Bundelkhand Institute of Engg. & Technology, Jhansi, Uttar Pradesh	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	6
169	Uttar Pradesh	Govt. aided	Kamla Nehru Institute of Technology, Sultanpur, Uttar Pradesh	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	6
170	Uttarakhand	Govt. aided	Govind Ballabh Pant Engineering College, PauriGarhwal	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8
171	Uttarakhand	Govt.	VCT Kumaon Engineering College, Dwarahat, Dist- Almora	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	7
172	Uttarakhand	Govt. aided	College of Technology - GB Pant University of Agriculture & Technology, Pantnagar	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
173	West Bengal	Govt. aided	Birbhum Institute of Engineering & Technology, Birbhum	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
174	West Bengal	Private unaided	JIS College of Engineering, Nadia	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
175	West Bengal	Private unaided	Heritage Institute of Technology, Kolkata	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
176	West Bengal	Govt. aided	College of Engineering & Management, Kolaghat	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
177	West Bengal	Private unaided	M.C.K.V Institute of Engineering, Howrah	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9

178	West Bengal	Govt.	University Institute of Technology, The University of Burdwan, Burdwan	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
179	West Bengal	Govt. aided	BankuraUnnayani Institute of Engineering, Bankura	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
180	West Bengal	Govt. aided	West Bengal University of Technology, Kolkata	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
181	West Bengal	Govt.	University College of Technology - University of Calcutta, Kolkata	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
182	West Bengal	Govt. aided	Faculty of Engineering and Technology - Jadavpur University, Kolkata	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
183	West Bengal	Private unaided	Narula Institute of Technology, Pargnas	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
184	West Bengal	Govt. aided	RCC Institute of Information Technology, Kolkata	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
185	West Bengal	Govt. aided	Govt College of Engineering and Textile & Technology, Berhampore, West Bengal	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
186	West Bengal	Govt. aided	Murshidabad College of Engineering and Technology, Berhampore, Murshidabad, West Bengal	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9
Total no. of institutions that achieved the particular indicator				171	177	142	186	180	178	174	185	180	182	

Annex 4: State Visit Reports

State Visits: July 7-9, 2015

TEQIP JRM – Rajasthan visit – 7 to 9 July 2015

Governance. The situation in Rajasthan has been difficult, with Boards of Governors not appointed or reconstituted following the end of terms of some members and with principals for most government colleges not appointed for the past two years.

This means of course that the Governance Self-Reviews and Governance Development Plans have not in fact been prepared, since there have been no governing body meetings to review and discuss them. It also means that minutes of recent BoG meetings cannot have been posted on the institutions' respective websites. **These Performance Indicators have therefore not been met.**

However, in the last few weeks significant movement has been noted: the BoGs have been formed (in all but 2 cases), the Chairs (all educationalists) have been appointed and the principals are now in place. It is also noteworthy that the BoGs are for the whole institution, not just for TEQIP activities. Unfortunately, no BoG meetings have been held because the colleges have been waiting for the Minister to give some dates when the meetings can be held. The Minister is not on the BoG, but is the President of each of the Societies under which the Colleges are formed. The last time BoG meetings were held, the Minister presided over a collective meeting with all BoGs present. Fortunately, the SPFU has now written to all institutions to tell them to hold BoG meetings.

The colleges reported that there has been an almost complete turnover of the members of the BoG. The World Bank promised that if a one-day meeting of the Chairs and the Principals is organized, the NPIU/World Bank will ensure that appropriate experts are available to provide training on good governance.

Autonomy and NBA progress. These are major hurdles. Again, however, there has been progress very recently. The Rajasthan Technical University had not taken any action of the applications of the various colleges for autonomy, because the University was debating whether it had the power to grant autonomy and under what conditions. The University has now passed a Resolution to this effect and colleges can now apply formally to the University for autonomy. In discussions with RTU, the University indicated that decisions on autonomy could be made within 3 months.

Colleges in Rajasthan have applied to NBA for course accreditation. However, the response from NBA has been very slow. However, not all colleges have prepared their self-assessment reports.

Finances. Some colleges have received 6 crores while others only 3 crores; first releases were only towards the end of calendar year 2013. At the present rate of spending, the colleges will not spend all their respective allocations, especially if all the Performance Indicators are required to be met. The SPFU requested that the indicator on autonomy is waived – on the grounds that this was not in control of the colleges – so that additional releases could be made.

The JRM team also flagged the likelihood that a date will be set by which point all procurement must be completed. During the discussion:

- The colleges argued that this should be 31st March 2016 at the earliest.
- They asked what will happen if a college cannot spend all its original allocation (10/12.5 crores as the case may be); will they still be able to spend 55% of the original allocation on procurement or only 55% on the money actually spent? [To date, the colleges have been advised that they need not limit their spending on any particular category against any releases, subject to maintaining the prescribed limits at the end of the project. This advice of course was predicated on the assumption that colleges will spend all their allocation.]
- Clarity is needed on what counts as ‘completed’, i.e., commitment made in the form of a contract or all payments made (or something in between).
- Colleges requested additional training from NPIU on procurement and financial management issues and reported difficulties contracting with experts from the PMSS.

Four Funds. Most TEQIP colleges have been depositing funds into four accounts. To date no discussion has taken place in the colleges or the state about how to use these funds following the project. It was noted during the discussion that different colleges may wish to use their funds in different ways, in line with decisions made in the respective BoG (and subject to the overall requirement to use the funds to sustain activities initiated under TEQIP II).

Placement rates. All colleges reported low overall placement rates. However, it became clear during the discussion that different colleges were using different definitions (for example, whether including off-campus placements or those pursuing post-graduate courses). The NPIU has recently issued guidelines for more consistent college of placement data.

Affiliation system. Discussions with the Rajasthan Technical University raised the following issues:

- The number of affiliating colleges has been declined, due to over-capacity in the sector. RTU expects this number to continue to fall over the next several years, to below 100 from the present around 130. Only a very few colleges have been de-affiliated since RTU was established in 2006.
- RTU will launch in July a faculty registration portal, with the aim to ensure the quality of faculty in colleges. Where the RTU nominee on the college selection board says, the faculty member will be deemed ‘duly selected’.
- RTU has conducted a 10-day pedagogy training programme; it wishes to increase the number of such programmes to reach more faculty. There are about 15,000 faculty across the colleges affiliated to the University.

- RTU is planned to introduce a system to rate colleges. It does not at present publish the pass rates of examinations.
- RTU is developing its Statutes. It is anticipated that permanent affiliation will be possible under the new Statutes.

Other issues.

- GEC Jahalawar – they have not been able to schedule mentoring or PA due to unavailability of mentors/PAs.
- Ajmer – mentor has only visited once.
- Pedagogical training – colleges reported varying success in finding good training on pedagogy. SPFU should organize a sharing of information and different colleges' experiences.
- Alwar – IIT Delhi has not responded to request for participation in quality circle
- Student assistantships – colleges asked for clarity as to whether assistantships could be provided to PhD students (Masters Students can receive assistantships only if the course is accredited, but PhD courses are not accredited).

Recommendations

- It was agreed that all colleges with BoGs in place, would hold BoG meetings in July, with one agenda item to schedule BoG meetings for the remaining of the academic year
- Government of Rajasthan to constitute the BOGs of the remaining two government colleges
- SPFU/colleges to organize a one-day orientation session on good governance for BoG Chairs and College Principals. NPIU/World Bank will identify experts to facilitate this session as needed.
- BoGs to discuss good governance programme documents, and prepare and approve the governance self-assessment, development plan and institutional guidelines.
- Colleges to apply to the university to support their request for autonomy. RTU to decide within 3 months.
- NPIU to follow up with NBA to review status of pending applications and seek to expedite them.
- Colleges to prepare self-assessment reports for NBA as necessary
- NPIU/MHRD to consider the date by which all procurement must be completed, and notify SPFUs and colleges
- NPIU to organize further training on procurement and financing management
- Colleges to ensure all required resources are deposited in the four funds.
- Colleges to discuss guidelines for the management of these funds, and SPFU to issue guidelines (as per PIP requirement), including the discretion available to individual colleges.
- NPIU to clarify the use of the four funds for those colleges which participated in TEQIP I (and built up funds under that project). At present, these funds are not being used.

- All colleges to collect and report placement data as per the NPIU guidelines. Colleges can then discuss how to improve these rates.
- NPIU to organize events to discuss good practice in placement, especially for colleges in rural areas

State Visit to Telangana July 7-9, 2015

State level project implementation

- A State Steering Committee (SSC) has very recently been established to supervise the project implementation at the state level. The Principal Secretaries for Education and Finance; the Commissioner, Technical Education; the SPFU coordinator; a MHRD representative; two industry representatives and a group of five academics are members.
- The SSC meets quarterly to review project implementation. Institutions that needed to improve their performance against TEQIP benchmarks were identified and their Principals/Directors were invited to the SSC meetings to discuss action plans.
- The SSC is exploring means to extend TEQIP best practices to non-TEQIP institutions.
- Disbursement of funds from the state treasury is a bottleneck. Some institutions are yet to receive funds disbursed by the NPIU in December 2014.

Suggestions

- The Commissioner, TE suggested benchmarks and incentives for state government performance in addition to institutional performance in TEQIP III.
- The SSC is a possible vehicle at the state level for having a smoother implementation of TEQIP III with better possibilities of systemic reform and improvement of all engineering colleges in the state.

Affiliating universities

- After the formation of the State, regular Vice Chancellors (VC) have not yet been appointed at all three universities to which TEQIP institutes in the State are affiliated. The Government of Telangana was aiming for a new university act but realized that it would be too big a task and has now opted for amendments to the Universities Act. In the meantime, cadre IAS officers have been designated as Vice Chancellors in-charge with additional responsibility. The Government is very well aware of this fact and shall take steps in appointing regular VCs as soon as possible.
- The absence of regular VCs in the universities has indeed impacted the administrative processes, in particular, related to the appointment of faculty and applications for granting autonomy to affiliated colleges.
- Interestingly, the Jawaharlal Nehru Technological University is systematically assessing all its affiliated colleges against infrastructure, equipment, and student-teacher ratio norms. As a result, about 40 colleges have had their affiliation withdrawn and cannot admit new students until they meet these norms. It is expected that the inspections will lead to additional engineering colleges being weeded out. The State Government has realised that there are too many engineering colleges with too many seats in Telangana.

Suggestions

- Expedite the appointment of the search/selection committees for appointment of VCs with representation from all stakeholders.

- Encourage affiliating universities to develop a mentoring relationship with affiliated colleges. Universities should facilitate the development of colleges with a focus on quality and not be limited to a compliance-monitoring role.
- Extend the full range of UGC autonomy benefits to autonomous colleges, including autonomy in appointing faculty in accordance with UGC and state government policy.

Placements and employability

- Placement rates for undergraduate students range from 65-90%. Postgraduate placement rates remain low, 30% on an average.
- Most of the institutions have placed a great deal of emphasis on soft skills training and have conducted ‘finishing schools’. Some institutions conduct such types of schools in the 2nd year of the UG program.
- Institutions commented that having industry representatives on their BoGs/BoS has certainly improved their placement records.
- There appears to be inconsistency in generating placement records from one institution to other. Many of the institutions indicated that a large number of students opted for higher studies abroad and starting of their own businesses.
- The institutions have been taking measures to improve the placement records but the quality of placement in terms of salary packages type of job etc. remain low.
- The State Govt. is in the process of establishing a committee with representation from various govt. departments, academia and industry to identify skill gaps and facilitate employability training. The Chief Secretary will be the Chair of this committee.

Suggestions

- Encourage PG students to work with industry to develop topics for their Master’s projects. At the UG level, the institutes may consider embedding mandatory internships during summers or for full semester into their curricula.
- Establish alumni tracking systems to obtain feedback on employability and skill gaps. Create forums for feedback from industry.
- Adopt a uniform definition for placement rates and specify data collection processes.
- Strengthen linkages by encouraging industry to co-sponsor student researchers who work in relevant areas.
- Diversify target companies beyond IT to core-engineering firms.
- Institutes were suggested to have network meetings amongst themselves and adopt best practices existing in each of the institutes regarding improvement in the placements in their own institute.

The performance of TEQIP colleges and Centres of Excellence (CoE)

- Most colleges in the state are performing well and have met all benchmarks for the 5th JRM.
- All the institutions visited (OUCOE, JNTU IST and GRIET) had good research projects in several areas and were able to attract government sponsored research projects with a number of active faculty and student researchers.

- The University College of Engineering, Kakatiya, has met only 5 indicators and is on the 'weeding out' list. Half of the faculty has been transferred out. These vacancies have not been filled due the absence of a permanent vice-chancellor. This has made the college ineligible for autonomy and NBA accreditation. The PS, Education said that this would be look at as a matter of urgency and efforts will be taken to support the Kakatiya college to meet its benchmarks by August 31 2015.
- Both Centres of Excellence (JNTUH and OU) have not made any significant progress in meeting their research targets and have not been able to manage the equipment procurement process. There is lack of leadership with no permanent CoE coordinators designated. In its last meeting, the SSC took note of the issues concerning CoEs and will now call a meeting to work with the two colleges to improve their performance.

Suggestions

- The State Governments should encourage and support engineering colleges to commercialise research projects, engage in industry consultancies and develop self-sustaining research programs. An initiative such as Chandigarh Region Innovation and Knowledge Cluster (<http://cric.k.puchd.ac.in>) could be envisaged as a possible part of the Chief Secretary's Skills Development Initiative in Telangana.
- Given the poor performance of the CoEs in Telangana, it would be a good idea to do a thorough evaluation of the CoEs under TEQIP II. CoE's should have one highly competent coordinator who are actively leading the CoE's research project. Greater interaction with the TEQIP mentors is also required.
- CoEs should be exposed to the best practices at top research institutions through collaboration, exchanges and visits.

Four Funds

- Colleges have substantial reserves in the four funds with a median value of approximately 1 crore.
- Many of the colleges have drawn plans to use the four funds to continue their project activities beyond October 2016 whereas some need clarity and are in the process of making plans. In some cases, the respective BoG has already approved these plans.
- Several colleges raised queries about whether funds marked for one purpose could be diverted to another. In particular, colleges that have not purchased equipment would like to redeploy their ERF and MF.
- After the end of TEQIP II, some institutions expressed uncertainty about to which extend the institutions can decide on how to spend the funds.

State Visit to Uttar Pradesh: July 7-9, 2015

This note begins by summarizing discussions on project progress, where after it describes outcomes of on consultations along the following themes: (1) the affiliation system; (2) AFRC functioning and (3) recommendations for reform. Annex 1 provides a list of people/institutes who were part of the discussion.

I. Project progress

- 1) Four funds: All the institutes have been setting money aside into the four funds, with **considerable variation across colleges**. KNIT, Sultanpur is the only college that mentioned forming a committee to determine how the four funds will be used.
- 2) Masters and PhD admissions: Uttar Pradesh Technical University (UPTU) is responsible for admissions at the post-graduate level. In general, there **are considerable delays in the process, as the result of which prospective applicants have lost interest in applying to UP colleges**.
- 3) Autonomy: All the TEQIP-funded government colleges, namely IET, Lucknow (constituent college), HBTI Kanpur, KNIT Sultanpur, MMM Gorakhpur, and BIET Jhansi have academic autonomy, which allows them to design their own curriculum as well as conduct examinations. However, the affiliated government colleges at Banda, Bijnor, Azamgarh and Ambedkar Nagar that were started four years ago and the associated government colleges at Kanauj&Mainpuri (mentored by HBTI Kanpur) and Sonbhadra (mentored by KNIT Sultanpur) do not have academic autonomy which means that their curriculum and examinations are under the control of UP Technical University.
- 4) Role of Board of Governors: In Uttar Pradesh, **the Board is subordinate to the state government**, in that all proposals to the Board can only be made *after* the state government approves the proposal. The vice chairman of the Board is the Principal Secretary, Technical Education.
- 5) Accreditation: As of now, **none of the TEQIP institutions of Uttar Pradesh has NBA affiliation** of any of its programs, though all (but two) of them have applied for affiliation of their eligible programs and are awaiting further action on the part of AICTE.
- 6) FM Issues: SPFU had to extend the contract of internal auditors for one year for audit of FY 2014-15. The audit should normally be done for Apr-Sep and Oct-March. The report of internal audit should be available before the start of statutory audit. Both the audits have to cover all the institutes. Regular and timely internal audit is helpful for identifying any discrepancies in following FM procedures and taking remedial actions. There has been a problem with delay in approval of extension of contract of internal auditor. The extension was approved only on July 7, 2015. **It is necessary to appoint auditors for each year on time in future so that six-monthly internal audit is done immediately after the end of each such period**. This will also ensure that statutory audit is not delayed as internal audit reports will be available on time.

7) Other issues impacting TEQIP performance:

- a. Delay in declaration of results of admission tests: UPTU conducts the UP State Entrance Examinations (UPSEE) for admission into all programs in all engineering colleges in Uttar Pradesh. **Delays in declaring results, has often meant that applicants leave UP for another state.** This year, examination results for Bachelors program was declared on time.
- b. Faculty shortage: All colleges noted **high vacancy rates** (on average, 40%). Between 1998 and 2014 the state government froze the amount of funds it gave to government colleges in nominal terms. At the same time, colleges noted that they were unable to raise fees freely. As a result, funding for salaries has been meagre, making it difficult to attract permanent faculty. The government has recently increased its fund allocation to colleges, and the mission team was informed that recruitments will take place shortly. (Faculty recruitment is undertaken by individual colleges/universities and is not dependent upon the public service commission.)
- c. Curriculum revision: At present, there is a **complete overhaul of the curriculum**. It is a continuous process, wherein the syllabus is reviewed year-wise starting from the First Year, so that the cycle is completed and repeated every four years. However, its timing is poor as it does not allow colleges time to train faculty or stock their libraries in time for implementation of the curriculum.
- d. New colleges: Three new (buildingless) colleges have been started, two of which have been assigned to HBTI, Kanpur for mentoring, and the third to KNIT, Sultanpur. The mentor colleges complained of shortage in faculty in their own colleges, and felt that it was difficult for them to also meet the needs of new colleges. The mission team discussed this issue with the state government, and were informed that mentor colleges are free to assign guest faculty in the new colleges.

II. Affiliation system

Uttar Pradesh has one affiliating technical university, UPTU, which was set up in 2002. UPTU has four constituent colleges and affiliates 639 colleges (only 10 are government). UPTU has three departments: finance; registrar; and examinations. It has a fulltime Vice-Chancellor. Its three departments are headed by full-time permanent staff on deputation. Important features include:

- 1) Understaffed: It has no permanent positions, other than those noted above. All committees and other staff associated with the departments have this job as additional charge.
- 2) Splitting and merging: UPTU was split into two universities in 2010, with the new university located in NOIDA and the old one remaining in Lucknow. In 2013, the NOIDA university was closed, as it was felt that having two universities perform the

affiliation function was leading to excessive lobbying for resources and dilution in standards.

- 3) Funding source: The state government does not fund UPTU; its sources of revenue comprise affiliation fees, closure fees, examination fees and degree fees.

UPTU engages with engineering colleges in the following areas: affiliation and closure; admissions; curriculum and examinations; and awarding degrees. Key points in each include:

1. Affiliation and closure

a. All government colleges are affiliated permanently once when they are opened after AICTE clearance and no renewal is required.

b. For private institutions, affiliation happens upon clearance from AICTE. One time fees are Rs 15 lakhs; annual renewal costs Rs 50,000. Renewal is annual, since that is what is required from AICTE and UPTU just follows accordingly.

c. Affiliation is currently being **conducted through an online process**. This year 15 private colleges were affiliated in this manner, and affiliations were completed before the start of counselling.

d. Affiliation requirements and norms are not always met; yet, colleges receive affiliation suggesting problems in implementation.

Closure: If a college wants to close, it needs to take permission from the state and apply to UPTU with a fee of Rs 50,000. **Last year 20 private colleges were closed; this year five have already been closed.** Closure is done in a phased manner so students do not suffer.

2. Admissions

a. UPSEE is managed by a committee comprising faculty from constituent colleges.

b. UPTU also **manages the counselling process**, whereby students are admitted to colleges based upon a match between the student's choice and what he/she is eligible for, based upon his/her score in the entrance examinations. However, although over 1 lakh students took examinations this year, only 30% went through the counselling process. The reasons for this include:

i. System and server problems, whereby the names of certain colleges were incorrectly displayed, and/ or the server was down at various points.

ii. Allowing direct admission in private colleges: Private colleges are allowed to admit students even if they do not go through the counselling process, so long as students meet the state government's eligibility criteria for admission. Interviews suggested that private colleges offer freebies to lure students, many of who are eligible for government scholarships. In this way, private colleges are able to fill seats and stay financially viable.

3. Curriculum and examinations

- a. Curriculum revision has generally been superficial, except for a recent exercise of revamping the curriculum entirely. Further, this exercise should have been initiated by the university, but instead was done at the Principle Secretary's initiative. UPTU charges fees for the following exam based issues: (i) entrance examinations for all students (ii) regular annual fees for some semester examinations in non autonomous colleges (Rs 6500 per year), which include all private colleges, the bulk of colleges, and (iii) revaluation of examination papers.
- b. As discussed previously, there have been several hiccups in the counselling process, which has compromised the efforts to keep the admission system fair and transparent.

4. Awarding degrees

- a. UPTU is mandated with awarding degrees to all students in engineering in the state.
- b. There were no complaints about delays in awarding degrees.

III. Functioning of the AFRC

1. UPTU financially supports the AFRC, but that is the extent of its involvement.
2. There was lack of consensus on whether the AFRC process for determining fees is indeed fair and transparent. While the bulk of costs in all colleges is salaries, we were informed that private colleges rarely pay the salary mandated by norms, indicating that their salary costs are unlikely to be the bulk of their costs.
3. There was concern from the state government that the formula used by the AFRC was cost based, and encouraged inefficiencies by discouraging colleges from reducing their costs.
4. There was concern from the Directors of private institutions regarding irregular working of the AFRC and it was pointed out that the AFRC had not held a meeting in the last two years. This was countered in meetings at UPTU.

IV. Recommendations for reform

1. UPTU is planning a teacher training institute in NOIDA and has initiated a dialogue with IIT Kanpur to conduct some sessions. Going forward, it sees its role as providing teachers in all engineering colleges to be trained on a regular basis.
2. UPTU has also been conducting jobs fairs to help with student placement, and expects to play this role more actively going forward.
3. All admissions should be through the counselling process as direct admissions have generated a series of problems and corruption. It is important for the counselling process to be simplified and made more user friendly.
4. Government colleges should be allowed to charge higher fees, and this can be built into their performance parameters.
5. Building a personnel management system is important, since promotions are frequently delayed due to internal institute level politics, and this is demotivating to faculty.
6. UPTU should be mandated to use some percentage of the fees from affiliation for the capacity development of colleges.

7. Merger possibilities should be explored. Some colleges in Lucknow and Kanpur have merged on their own initiative.

State Visit to West Bengal: July 7-9, 2015

Overview

A total of 14 institutions in the state of West Bengal are participating in TEQIP-II. SPFU confirmed that all participating institutions have met the previously agreed nine Performance Agreement Indicators (PAI). Regarding the use of funds nearly 68% of the total allocation (81% of released amount) has been utilized and it is expected that the remaining funds will be utilized by project closing.

1) General observations:

- a. In general, it is being seen a significant commitment both from the state government and the participating institutions.
- b. It is observed the existence of a process towards strengthening of a still informal network of institutions and their representatives that can be highly instrumental in the future. Credit is due to SPFU and its leadership.
- c. It is in place a comprehensive operationalization of the project. A significant reason seems to be associated with stability on the continued leadership of SPFU since the inception of TEQIP-I.
- d. In general, institutions are eager to comply with the performance indicators established under TEQIP-II although there are perceived limitations in the way that such indicators reflect real progress attained by them.
- e. Overall expenditures in the project is around 80 percent in comparison with original budget. It is expected to achieve 100 percent within the project closure. In procurement, more than 90 percent is committed and it is expected that it will be completed 100 percent during procurement extension period.
- f. Government and institutional representatives express high expectations regarding participation on a potential TEQIP-III initiative, and indicate reservations about perceived limitations on the current project.

2) Specific observations:

- a. **Differential levels of participation.** It was observed that the performance of the affiliating universities was the weak - high faculty vacancies, lower transition rate, BOG meetings not held frequently. Several but not consistent reasons for limited compliance with PAI are being mentioned by institutional representatives. In some cases, an apparent compliance with the agreed performance is achieved, but with poor results or, at last, limited evidence of its impact. A good example is the case of Jadhavpur University where although it has met the PAI for faculty training, only one faculty has attended the pedagogical training and only two have attended MCEP.

- b. **Limitations in the Faculty Training and Development:** Timing of training, course content were reasons given by some institutions for not attending the training. It was also expressed that pedagogy training under TEQIP-II (usually 3 days) does not give them the credit for career advancement (minimum 5 days training gives the credit whereas they do not get credit for three days training!)
- c. **Employability:** In general, it was observed that the salaries of PG students were lower than UG students. The institutions attribute this to weaker students joining the PG programs and good performers from UG programs moving to centrally funded institutions/ IITs.
- d. **Transition rates.** In general, the transition rate is high (80s and 90s) in all institutions except for Jadhavpur University where the transition rate is in the 70s.
- e. **Autonomy:** A significant delay in the process towards obtaining an institutional autonomous status is prevalent. A main reason being expressed by institutional and government representatives is that such process cannot be expedited due to the fact that a requisite for achieving autonomy is to have the institution complying with the accreditation requirements. Currently, six institutions out of fourteen are accredited and one additional institution is expected to be accredited soon (visit from UGC completed). Accreditation requirement was recurrently mentioned as the bottleneck by the remaining institutions for not obtaining/applying for autonomy.
- f. **MIS:** A significant contribution towards the development of institutional capacity under TEQIP-II is the implementation of MIS. The general perception of institutional representatives is that it is a useful tool to gather and have available consistent information, especially considering that nearly all institutions have no other MIS other than the TEQIP MIS. While some operational problems are in place (for instance a couple of institutions had issues with MIS as the data entered was erased), few institutions mentioned that they also use the TEQIP MIS for other reporting purposes – NBA, districts reports etc.

3) Specific recommendations:

- a. **Faculty development:** Reviewing the effectiveness of the current arrangement for faculty pedagogical training, and establishing more flexible mechanisms towards achievement of agreed goals at the institutional level.
- b. **Accreditation:** Discussing with NBA ways in which the accreditation process can be expedited without compromising its integrity.
- c. **MIS:** Sustainability of TEQIS MIS beyond the life cycle of the project was a concern raised and needs to be addressed.
- d. **International Training for Faculty:** Now that all the institutions have met the PAIs, institutions requested if the approval authority for participation in international conferences/ training could be decentralized to BOG for all of them.

- e. **Student Fee:** Fees for students in government colleges has remained the same since 2008, limiting capacity of institutions to diversify sources of support for operational expenditures and expansion. A discussion about alternative pathways towards institutional diversification of funds seems adequate.
- f. **Strengthening of the institutional network:** Efforts can be fostered in order to further strengthen the network of institutions participating in the project, and to further conduct transversal analysis of overall impact of the project, good practices and lessons learned.
- g. **Completion of the project:** Institutions to focus on activities for 100 percent fund utilisation. Enter all expenditure related to procurement in PMSS system for bridging the gap between PMSS and FMR figures.

Annex 5: Action Taken Report (status of 4th JRM recommendations)

S.No.	ACTIONS	COMPLIANCE
1.	MHRD to contact 19 low performing institutions that have consistently not met the performance benchmarks.	Due intimation to 19 low performing institutions was sent to comply with all the performance benchmarks by 31 st March 2015 along with indication that non-compliance of the same would result in weeding out from the Project.
	Nineteen low performing institutions to meet the 11 performance benchmarks.	As on 28 th May 2015, the status is as below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 institutions achieved: 10 indicators • 4 institutions : 9 indicators • 3 institutes : 8 indicators • 3 institutes : 7 indicators • 3 institutes : 5 indicators • 2 institutes : 3 indicators • 2 institutes : 1 indicator
	Mentors to provide additional support and guidance to 19 low-performing institutions.	These institutions were also advised to seek additional guidance from their Mentors for early compliance of the benchmarks. Moreover visits by NPIU officials to some of these institutions were also undertaken.
2.	Decision on removing low-performing institutions from the project if they are unable to achieve eleven of the October 2014 benchmarks.	The matter of weeding out consistently low performing institutions was put up before the 10 th NSC meeting held on 28 th May 2015. Decisions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 institutions (2each from the State of Punjab and Bihar) meeting less than 5 indicators have been weeded out from the Project. • 13 institutions achieving 5 or more than 5 indicators were given time till 31st August 2015 failing which these institutions would stand weeded out from the Project.
3.	Pursue recommendation on providing additional resources to well-performing institutions (cabinet approval)	MHRD has given approval for providing additional resources to well-performing institutions. However the decision of EFC is pending for final approval.

S.No.	ACTIONS	COMPLIANCE
4.	A further set of parameters to be given to institutions to be met	<p>All institutions were informed about further set of indicators to be complied by 30th April 2015. These are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Autonomy granted by UGC / Applied for: • Board of Governors (BoG) meetings: • Accreditation (atleast 55%)(<i>Obtained / Applied for</i>) for eligible UG&PG prog: • Statutory Audit completed (2013-14): • Completion of Governance Development Plan (GDP) and timeline for completion of institutional Governance guidelines, approved by governing body and published on institutional website • Submission of revised IDP for 2016 with updated target indicators • Completion of all data entry into MIS for 2013-14 • Procurement Plan to cover 100% procurement expenditures in PMSS • % of Expenditure against total funds received (atleast 50%) • % of Expenditure + Committed expenditure against Total funds received should be 100%
5.	Review of institutional performance against the set of parameters	<p>Institutions performance assessment was carried out on 9 parameters:</p> <p>The assessment analysis is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 9 indicators: 122 • 8 indicators: 40 • 7 indicators: 15 • ≤6 indicators: 09
6.	Conduct next JRM	To be decided
7.	Regularly monitor TEQIP institutions engagement and outcomes of the online course on Good Governance.	Ongoing process
S.No.	ACTIONS	COMPLIANCE
8.	New Performance benchmark to be included	To be decided

	on Good Governance	
9.	Work with UGC in fast tracking the pending applications	A meeting was held with Joint Secretary, UGC for expediting the cases of pending applications for Autonomy. Also, the status of all applications was obtained.
10.	Inform institutions the possibility of suggesting 5-6 member's for the appointment of UGC representatives for the Board of Governors at TEQIP institutions.	5-6 Academicians at the level of Associate Professor and above were invited from all 190 institutions and the nominations received were forwarded to UGC for appointment of UGC representatives for the Board of Governors at TEQIP institutions as and when required by Institutions.
11.	Good Governance Learning Workshop for CFIs	Learning Forum on Good Governance Leadership and Management was held on 4 th & 5 th May 2015. Representatives of 24 CFIs participated.
12.	Continue mentoring in its current form	Being continued
13.	Next Performance Audit	One Performance Audit is planned tentatively between January – July 2016.
14.	Publicly disclose the performance audits.	Action has been taken. Reports are being reviewed. Out of the 100 reports already reviewed, 32 reports of the respective institutions graded as 'A' were informed for disclosure of the Audit Reports on their institutions website.
15.	Release non-performing mentors and performance auditors	Few performance auditors have been detached from the TEQIP activity. Formal intimation has been made.
16.	Identify additional mentors/ performance auditors by contacting IIT Directors	New Mentors and Performance Auditors have been identified
17.	Two additional on-site visits by the already identified peer-reviewers undertaken during the remaining period of TEQIP II	Institutions have been informed about the visit.
18.	Common evaluation template should be developed in collaboration with the peer-reviewers that would be used in the performance assessment of the CoEs	Template has been developed

S.No.	ACTIONS	COMPLIANCE
19.	IIMs and IITs to develop a proposal to evaluate their programs	IIT Khargapur and IIT Bombay submitted the proposals on evaluation. IIMs have also developed a common methodology in consultation with NPIU.
20.	Remove geographical allocation of TEQIP institutions to particular IIMs and IITs	Removed
21.	IITs and IIMs to offer their programs to non-TEQIP institutions (and charge an appropriate fee), subject to no TEQIP participant being turned away	The matter regarding offering programmes run by IITs and IIMs to non-TEQIP institutions was put up before NSC meeting on 28 th May 2015. NSC has stated that it will be reviewed separately by MHRD.
22.	Equity Action Plan guidelines to be revised by NPIU with World Bank guidance	Revised guidelines were prepared in collaboration with the World Bank. Further work on the proposed changes is in progress. Some of the institution examples on good practices have been sent to him by NPIU. A visit to DTU, Delhi has also been undertaken to discuss equity and project progress.
23.	NPIU to develop guidelines to calculate placement rates	Guidelines on Placement Rate have been developed and shared with the World Bank.
24.	NPIU in collaboration with World Bank will organize a workshop for institutions on good practices in enhancing students' employability that would inform institutional Action Plans on Improving Students' Employability both for UG and in particular for PG where placement rates are in general much lower.	The guidelines on Placement Rates have been sent to the Project institutions. After collecting data, the Workshop on good practices in enhancing students' employability will be planned.
25.	NPIU in collaboration with the World Bank will carry out a tracer study for TEQIP II Discuss ToRs	Draft ToRs on Tracer Studies have been prepared and WB comments have been received. After discussion on 13 th July 2015, further work will be undertaken.

Advertise		
S.No.	ACTIONS	COMPLIANCE
26.	Report card for each institution that presents some of the main messages to the institution in a graphically attractive and useful manner	Report card for each institution is under revision by the Infova Consultancy Services Ltd.
27.	Next full round of Survey	2 nd round of Survey is planned in the month of September 2015
28.	Include an additional question on “overall satisfaction” in each survey	“Overall satisfaction” has been included in the questionnaire.
29.	Use data audit report received to verify the data in the MIS	On-going
30.	Freeze the data for 2010-11 and 2011-12 for the remaining 34 institutions	The data for all institutions for three years i.e 2010-11, 2011-12 and 2012-13 is locked.
31.	Freeze the data for 2012-13	
32.	Provide hands-on-support and training to institutes on MIS (especially in institutions with high turnover in staff designated for data-entry)	MIS Hands on Training was conducted for 34institutions (where data was inadequate) on 26-27 th March, 2015 at Mumbai. This has resulted in increasing the adequacy of MIS data from 156 to 172 institutions as on date.
33.	Complete recruitment for the vacant positions, including the two positions that need to be advertised	Consultant (Admn)- filled Sr Consultant (Academic)- filled Consultant (Fin)- filled Assoc Consultant (Fin)- filled Store Asst. (Fin)- filled <i>Sr Consultant M&E – selected candidate has refused to join and an approval for waiting candidate is under process with MHRD</i>
S.No.	ACTIONS	COMPLIANCE
34.	Empower BoG of institutions that have met all the required performance benchmarks to make effective choices about the	For 64 Institutions meeting all the 12 PAIs, approval has been accorded by MHRD for empowering BoG of the respective institutions to approve the international travel and institutions have been informed

	use of project funds on international travel	accordingly.
35.	<p><i>Budget and Flow of Funds:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) States which have not released funds for more than 50 days to release the same immediately and status to be shared with the Bank b) NPIU to share monthly summary of status of flow of funds by MHRD/states with the Bank c) FM Indicators Summary for states/CFIs to be shared, including information on low of funds 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The latest position has been sent to The World Bank on 26th June, 2015 b) It is being shared every month c) FM Indicators for 31st March 2015 have been sent to The World Bank on 5th June, 2015
36.	<p><i>Statutory Audit</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Submit NPIU's PFS b) Submit consolidated audit report for FY 2013-14 to the Bank 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Submitted to the World Bank b) The Consolidated Audit Report for the F.Y. 2013-14 have been submitted to the World Bank on 28th Jan. 2015
37.	<p><i>Monitoring by NPIU</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Share status of appointment of Internal Auditor for SPFUs/ CFIs for FY 2014-15 b) Share draft format for quarterly reporting by SPFUs/ CFIs to NPIU c) Share draft audit observation compliance mechanism to be followed in future. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Latest status of appointment of Internal Auditor have been submitted on 5th June, 2015 b) Submitted on 5th June, 2015 <p>Issues are being addressed to the States for compliance.</p>
S.No.	ACTIONS	COMPLIANCE

38.	<p><i>FM Staffing:</i></p> <p>Vacancy of NPIU FM consultant to be filled</p> <p>Share Vacancy status at SPFUs/ CFIs</p>	<p>Vacancies already filled</p> <p>Submitted on 20th April, 2015</p>
39.	<p>Review and plan the procurement for the remaining funds available (apprx.Rs. 105 cr.)</p>	<p>Indicative procurement allocation of all 187 project institution comes out to be Rs. 948 Cr (approx..) & against this, the actual procurement planning carried out by the institutions upto 30th June, 15 is Rs. 923 cr. (approx.)</p>
40.	<p>Institutes to plan 20% additional procurement to address materialization factor</p>	<p>Other provisions have been made to address this issue.</p>
41.	<p>Review all ongoing contracts and extensions processed accordingly</p>	<p>Review carried out.</p>
42.	<p>PPR report to be shared with institutions</p>	<p>PPR forwarded to all concerned institutions for obtaining their necessary comments on observed points. The response received from the most of the institutions had already been submitted to World Bank for their kind perusal.</p>
43.	<p>Submit the details of procurement complaints if any with actions taken on it to Bank for review and its closer</p>	<p>The matter discussed with the WB procurement specialist & mechanism for the same is being worked out.</p>
44.	<p>Guidelines to be issued to all institutions on the observations of the PPR.</p>	<p>Letters sent to all institutions.</p>

Annex 6: New Actions from 5th JRM

<i>S.no</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>By Whom</i>	<i>To be Completed by</i>
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.	MHRD/NPIU	August 31, 2015
2.	Release the next rounds of funds to institutes only once they have met all the indicators determined in the 5th JRM.	MHRD/NPIU	November 30, 2015
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.	World Bank	December 2015
4.	Action plan for each institution that has not obtained academic autonomy from UGC.	NPIU and SPFUs	September 30, 2015
5.	BoGs complete their Governance Guidelines Document	NPIU and SPFUs	December 2015
6.	Series of training workshops for BoG members to be organized	NPIU	As and when requested by SPFUs
7.	ToRs for a comprehensive assessment of the functioning of the affiliation system	World Bank	Immediate
8.	Assessment of the functioning of the affiliation system	NPIU and World Bank	December 30, 2015
9.	Report describing lessons learned and good practices in the affiliation system and in the process for obtaining autonomy by ACs to be prepared	NPIU and SPFUs	June 2016
10.	Explore means for integration of ATUs in the TEQIP project	NPIU	Immediate
11.	Incentivise reform of the affiliation system, including a feasibility analysis and related stimulus aimed at merging small colleges and creating college cluster universities	State Governments	Immediate
12.	Activities to foster effective exchange of information and sharing of experiences among ATUs	NPIU	Immediate
	(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.	NPIU and World Bank	August 2015
	(b) Implementation of survey	NPIU	September 1-30, 2015
	(c) Analysis of results	NPIU and World Bank	October 31, 2015
13.	Developing more systematic, frequent and effective communication system between mentors and institutions	NPIU	Immediate
14.	Mandatory standardized training for all	NPIU	September 30,

	mentors		2015
15.	Hosting of periodic workshops with mentors and performance auditors	NPIU	Every few months
16.	Template to share with mentors about institutional good practices on the different components of the project	NPIU	September 1, 2015
17.	Develop an effective quality assurance system for Performance Audit reports.	NPIU/MHRD	November 1, 2015
18.	ToRs to review the effectiveness of the current Performance-Auditing function	World Bank	Immediate
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	MHRD/NPIU	December 1, 2015
20.	Action plan with the IITs and IIMs to ensure that the targets for IIT and IIM training will be reached by October 2016	MHRD/NPIU	Immediate
21.	Data collection formats/survey instruments used to collect feedback by QEEE	MHRD/NPIU	September 15, 2015
22.	Discuss plan for incorporating faculty development program into QEEE program	MHRD/NPIU	December 31, 2015
23.	Meeting of students who participated in the MITACS program	NPIU	November 1, 2015
24.	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
25.	Faculty and management trainings to be organized with detailed information available on NPIU websites with links to course offerings	NPIU	Ongoing
26.	Desk review of good practices of the CoEs and issues that represent challenges for the CoEs to meet their targets.	NPIU	December 1, 2015
27.	All required resources to be deposited in the four funds and report this through the MIS	NPIU and SPFUs	October 31, 2015
28.	Consultation with SPFUs for sorting out clarifications in guidelines wherever required	NPIU and SPFUs	October 31, 2015
29.	Issue guidelines (as per PIP requirement) to colleges on usage of four funds and decision-making process regarding usage	NPIU and SPFUs	November 30, 2015
30.	Decision on whether to prioritize accreditation of UG programmes and communicate the same to the NBA.	MHRD, NPIU and the World Bank	September 30, 2015
31.	Follow up with institutes that have not submitted their self assessment forms and ask them to expedite the process.	NPIU and SPFUs	Immediate
32.	Seek clarification from UGC on renewal/cancellation of autonomous status for previously autonomous institutes in Karnataka, whose autonomous status needs to be renewed/cancelled.	MHRD/NPIU	Immediate
33.	Learn from good practices regarding faculty transfer policies from Tamil Nadu	SPFUs	Immediate
34.	Freeze the data for 2013-14	NPIU	November 15,

			2015
35.	Sustainability plan for the MIS should be developed	NPIU	October 31, 2015
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.	NPIU	ToRs by August 2015 Data collection by December 1, 2015
37.	Pilot in few states/ institutes setting up formal audit observation compliance mechanism like Audit Committee at SPFUs.	NPIU	December 1, 2015
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).	NPIU and World Bank	November 15, 2015
39.	Relevant arrangement designed for monitoring the utilization of interest received on funds.	NPIU	November 1, 2015
40.	Notify institutions that procurement activities for goods and works should be completed (i.e., final payments made) by 31st December 2015. For those well-performing institutions, this deadline should be set at 6 months from the release of additional funds.	NPIU	Immediate
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?	NPIU	Immediate
42.	Linking the PMSS to the FMR	NPIU	September 15, 2015
43.	One-day orientation session on good governance for BoG Chairs and College Principals	NPIU/World Bank	At the earliest possible
44.	Hold BoG meetings in July, with one agenda item to schedule BoG meetings for the remaining of the academic year	Colleges with BOGs	Continuous
45.	Constitution of BOGs of remaining government colleges in Rajasthan	Government of Rajasthan	At the earliest possible
46.	Colleges to apply to RTU to support their request for autonomy and decision by RTU to be given within 3 months	Colleges/RTU	Immediate
47.	Follow up with NBA to review status of pending applications and expedition of same	NPIU	Immediate
48.	Set up of date by which all procurement to be completed and inform SPFUs and colleges	NPIU/MHRD	Immediate
49.	Training on Procurement and Financing Management to be organized	NPIU	Immediate
50.	Filling the post of Central Project Advisor's	MHRD	As soon as possible
51.	Filling vacancies in NPIU	MHRD	As soon as possible
52.	Follow-up with UGC on relaxation of age	MHRD/NPIU	September 15,

	criteria for autonomy for TEQIP institutes in low-income and special category states		2015
53.	Finalize data availability status with Infova	MHRD	November 1, 2015
54.	Training sessions for BoG members	NPIU	December 1, 2015
55.	Decision on international travel decision-making authority for the duration of the project	MHRD/NPIU	As soon as possible
56.	Low-income and special category state strategy	MHRD/NPIU/World Bank	November 15, 2015
57.	Colleges to collect and report placement data as per the NPIU guidelines	Colleges	Immediate