

PERFORMANCE AUDIT FORMS

INSTITUTIONAL PERFORMANCE PROFILE

AUDIT VISIT NUMBER: 2

NAME OF PERFORMANCE AUDITOR: Prof. T.Radhakrishna

DATES OF PERFORMANCE AUDIT: 29-01-2014 to 31-01-2014

NAME OF INSTITUTION WITH LOCATION: JIS College of Engineering, Kalyani, West Bengal

PIP REF	INSTITUTIONAL PERFORMANCE PROFILE	OVERALL EVALUATION GRADES
COMPONENT 1: IMPROVING THE QUALITY OF EDUCATION IN SELECTED INSTITUTIONS		
1.1	STRENGTHENING INSTITUTIONS TO IMPROVE LEARNING OUTCOMES AND EMPLOYABILITY OF GRADUATES	2
1.2	SCALING-UP POSTGRADUATE EDUCATION AND DEMAND-DRIVEN RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT AND INNOVATION	2
1.2.1	ESTABLISHING CENTRES OF EXCELLENCE	NOT APPLICABLE
1.3	FACULTY DEVELOPMENT FOR EFFECTIVE TEACHING (PEDAGOGICAL TRAINING)	3
COMPONENT 2: IMPROVING SYSTEM MANAGEMENT		
2.1	CAPACITY BUILDING TO STRENGTHEN MANAGEMENT	1
2.1.1	IMPLEMENTATION OF GOOD GOVERNANCE	1
2.2	PROJECT MANAGEMENT, MONITORING AND EVALUATION	1

INSTITUTIONAL PERFORMANCE PROFILE GRADES AND GRADE DESCRIPTORS	
1.	Substantial evidence of good practice in the quality and standards achieved (Assessment identifies clear supporting evidence for at least 75% of the relevant practices.)
2.	Some evidence of good practice in the quality and standards achieved (Assessment identifies clear supporting evidence for at least 50% of the relevant practices.)
3.	Not in place (there may be one of the three primary reasons for this: a) no evidence can be found, b) there is evidence, but it is not of acceptable quality, or c) that there are plans for development but these have not yet taken place - in which case the auditor can indicate the expected date of completion/implementation but the grade should remain 3.)

NOTE: Supporting evidence: The grade descriptors have two elements: one relating to the amount of the evidence (none, some or substantial); and one relating to the quality of the practice about which the evidence is gathered (is it good quality, or not?). So, for example, a grade of 1 means both that the evidence is good quality and that there is a substantial amount to demonstrate that it is of good quality (75% or more for the practices found).

PERFORMANCE AUDIT FORM (1.1)**COMPONENT 1: IMPROVING QUALITY OF EDUCATION IN SELECTED INSTITUTIONS**

NAME OF PERFORMANCE AUDITOR: Prof. T.Radhakrishna

DATES OF PERFORMANCE AUDIT: 29-01-2014 to 31-01-2014

NAME OF INSTITUTION WITH LOCATION: JIS College Of Engineering, Kalyani, West Bengal

1.1:STRENGTHENING INSTITUTIONS TO IMPROVE LEARNING OUTCOMES AND EMPLOYABILITY OF GRADUATES

MONITORING AND PROJECT OUTPUT/OUTCOME PARAMENTERS	SUPPORTING EVIDENCE (NOTE: GRADES MUST BE SUPPORTED BY SOUND EVIDENCE OF ACHIEVEMENT OF THE INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL GOALS AND TARGETS)
A. Effectiveness of funds utilized for the teaching, training, learning and research equipment, library, computers, etc. by Institutions, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Increase in the satisfaction index of student and faculty 	Funds utilized: Rs.156 Lakhs with a committed expenditure of Rs.18 Lakhs out of Rs.300Lakhs released. Hence, utilization of funds for various activities is around 60%
B. Obtaining Academic Autonomy status, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Number of institutions that have obtained 'Autonomous Institution status' as per University Grants Commission process within 2 years of joining the Project, or ▪ Effectiveness of utilization of academic autonomy possessed/ obtained (See Table-26 in PIP) 	College obtained autonomous status from UGC and affiliating university Vide No: F22-1/2011(AC) dt 31-10-2011 and No: 3.2/Regist/Auto(JIS) 2012 dtd 02-08-2012 respectively. Academic autonomy fully and effectively utilized.
C. Effort made by Institutions for upgrading qualifications of faculty members, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Percentage of faculty enrolled in MTech and PhD 	All faculty members are with M.Tech degree. Management encourages staff to upgrade qualification of faculty from M.Tech to Ph.D
D. Existing teaching and staff vacancies and effort made by Institutions for filling the vacancies, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Percentage of faculty and staff positions filled and vacant ▪ Increase in faculty appointed on regular basis 	All posts are filled – Zero vacancy All faculty are on regular basis
E. Effectiveness of equity at Institutional level, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Transition rate of students from the First to the Second year in Undergraduate programmes 	Transition rate from 1 st to 2 nd year is 93.5% during 2012-13
OVERALL EVALUATION GRADE FOR 1.1 2 USING THE 3-POINT GRADING SCALE AND GRADE DESCRIPTORS IN ANNEX 4(1)	

PERFORMANCE AUDIT FORM (1.2)**COMPONENT 1: IMPROVING QUALITY OF EDUCATION IN SELECTED INSTITUTIONS**

NAME OF PERFORMANCE AUDITOR: Prof. T.Radhakrishna

DATES OF PERFORMANCE AUDIT: 29-01-2014 to 31-01-2014

NAME OF INSTITUTION WITH LOCATION: JIS College Of Engineering, Kalyani, West Bengal

1.2: SCALING-UP POSTGRADUATE EDUCATION AND DEMAND-DRIVEN RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT AND INNOVATION

MONITORING AND PROJECT OUTPUT/OUTCOME PARAMETERS	SUPPORTING EVIDENCE (NOTE: GRADES MUST BE SUPPORTED BY SOUND EVIDENCE OF ACHIEVEMENT OF THE INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL GOALS AND TARGETS)
A. Effectiveness of funds utilised for the teaching, training, learning and research equipment, library, computers, etc. by the institutions, including: ▪ Increase in the satisfaction index of student and faculty	Around 60% of sanctioned money is utilized for various activities mentioned.
B. Effectiveness of scaling-up Postgraduate Technical Education, including: ▪ Increased enrolment for MTech and PhD	8 P.G programs in various branches are offered with good laboratories. All eligible P.G students are given assistance.
▪ Establishment of proposed laboratories	For the two new P.G programs started during 2013-2014, laboratories are established
C. Progress/achievement in <u>starting new Postgraduate programmes</u>, including: ▪ Securing AICTE approval	73, total amount given in Rs 65.86 lakhs Two new P.G programs are started in Mechanical Engineering and NST during 2013-14.
▪ Establishment of laboratories	All P.G programs are approved by AICTE Good Laboratories are established
▪ Adequacy of student enrolments	Student enrolment is good.
D. Effectiveness of collaborations made with other Institutions in India and abroad, including • Increase in number of co-authored publications in refereed journals	123 research papers are published in referred journals.
E. Increased collaboration with industry in research and development, including: ▪ Increase in number of joint and industry sponsored research and development work undertaken	Nil – Efforts are on the way for collaboration with industry in research and development.
▪ Increase in financial contribution by industry for R & D	Nil
▪ Increase in industry personnel registered for Masters and Doctoral programmes	Nil

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Increase in industry personnel trained by the institution in knowledge and/or skill areas 	Nil
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Increase in the number of consultancy assignments secured 	Nil
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Increase in the number of students' and faculty visits to and/or training in industry 	About 50%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Improvements in graduate placement rate 	An increase of 4.02% as compared to last year. For the academic year 2013-2014 campus placements are going on.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Increase in involvement of industry experts in curricula & syllabi improvements, laboratory improvements, evaluation of students and delivering expert lectures 	Industry representation is given in Board of Studies in framing Syllabus
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Increase in the number of sandwich programmes between industries and the institution. 	Nil
F. Increase in percentage of revenue from externally funded research and development projects and consultancies as a percentage of the total revenue of the institution from all sources	DST-Rs 4,20,000, CSIR-Rs4,89,125, and Institution of Engineers Rs 50,000
G. Increase in the number of publications in refereed journals	123 research papers from the date of joining of the project
H. Increase in the number of patents filed	2 patents filed so far.
OVERALL EVALUATION GRADE FOR 1.2 ² USING THE 3-POINT GRADING SCALE AND GRADE DESCRIPTORS IN ANNEX 4(1)	

PERFORMANCE AUDIT FORM (1.2.1)**COMPONENT 1: IMPROVING QUALITY OF EDUCATION IN SELECTED INSTITUTIONS**

NAME OF PERFORMANCE AUDITOR: Prof T.Radhakrishna

DATES OF PERFORMANCE AUDIT: 29-01-2014 to 31-01-2014

NAME OF INSTITUTION WITH LOCATION: JIS College Of Engineering, Kalyani, West Bengal

1.2.1 ESTABLISHING CENTRES OF EXCELLENCE - Not Applicable

MONITORING AND PROJECT OUTPUT/OUTCOME PARAMETERS	SUPPORTING EVIDENCE (NOTE: GRADES MUST BE SUPPORTED BY SOUND EVIDENCE OF ACHIEVEMENT OF THE INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL GOALS AND TARGETS)
A. Establishing Centres of Excellence Improvement in Research and Development facilities through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Establishment of new laboratories for applicable thematic research ▪ Establishment of a knowledge resource centre (library) in the thematic area ▪ Procurement of furniture ▪ Civil works 	
	OVERALL EVALUATION GRADE FOR 1.2.1 NOT APPLICABLE USING THE 3-POINT GRADING SCALE AND GRADE DESCRIPTORS IN ANNEX 4(1)

PERFORMANCE AUDIT FORM (1.3)**COMPONENT 1: IMPROVING QUALITY OF EDUCATION IN SELECTED INSTITUTIONS**

NAME OF PERFORMANCE AUDITOR Prof.T.Radhakrishna

DATES OF PERFORMANCE AUDIT: 29-01-2014 to 31-01-2014

NAME OF INSTITUTION WITH LOCATION: JIS College Of Engineering, Kalyani, West Bengal

1.3: FACULTY DEVELOPMENT FOR EFFECTIVE TEACHING (PEDAGOGICAL TRAINING)

MONITORING AND PROJECT OUTPUT/OUTCOME PARAMETERS	SUPPORTING EVIDENCE (NOTE: GRADES MUST BE SUPPORTED BY SOUND EVIDENCE OF ACHIEVEMENT OF THE INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL GOALS AND TARGETS)
A. Effort made by Institutions providing Pedagogy Training to faculty, including:	Selection of training organization for pedagogical training is under process.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of faculty who have benefitted from the core and advanced modules of pedagogy training 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improvements in (and/or updating, and more relevant) curricula and /or syllabi 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improvements in (and/or updating, more relevant) course assessment methods 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improvements in teaching and learning methods, including provision for students needing extra/remedial support 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of faculty with UG qualification registered/deputed for improving their qualification (<i>see Section-3, 4(b) on page 20 of PIP</i>) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of faculty deputed for subject domain training, seminars, etc. (<i>faculty are required to share their gains with peers and put reports on training on institution's web site</i>) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Progress in securing accreditation of eligible UG & PG programs (<i>institutions to achieve target of 60% of eligible UG & PG programmes accredited - applied for within 2 years of joining the Project</i>) 	
B. Effectiveness of Pedagogy Training, including	Nil
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of students satisfied with the quality of teachers and changes/developments specifically undertaken as a result of student evaluations 	
OVERALL EVALUATION GRADE FOR 1.3	
USING THE 3-POINT GRADING SCALE AND GRADE DESCRIPTORS IN ANNEX 4(1)	
3	

PERFORMANCE AUDIT FORM (2.1)
COMPONENT 2: IMPROVING SYSTEM MANAGEMENT

NAME OF PERFORMANCE AUDITOR: T.Radhakrishna

DATES OF PERFORMANCE AUDIT: 29-01-2014 to 31-01-2014

NAME OF INSTITUTION WITH LOCATION: JIS College Of Engineering, Kalyani, West Bengal

2.1: CAPACITY BUILDING TO STRENGTHEN MANAGEMENT

MONITORING AND PROJECT OUTPUT/OUTCOME PARAMETERS	SUPPORTING EVIDENCE (NOTE: GRADES MUST BE SUPPORTED BY SOUND EVIDENCE OF ACHIEVEMENT OF THE INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL GOALS AND TARGETS)
A. Implementation of academic and non-academic reforms, including:	Academic and non-academic reforms are implemented
▪ Improved understanding of the need and ways for increased autonomy, and new instruments for accountability	College enjoys full autonomy
▪ Modernization and decentralisation of administration and financial management	Powers are decentralized
▪ Extent of delegation of administrative and financial decision making powers to senior functionaries	Delegation of powers is noticed
▪ Responsiveness to stakeholders (students, faculty, staff, industry, local communities)	Stakeholders responsiveness noticed
▪ Institutional quality assurance and enhancement strategies, including student feedback mechanisms	Quality assurance including student feedback mechanism is existing
▪ Maintenance of academic and non-academic infrastructure and facilities, including sufficiency and quality of academic buildings	Infrastructure is very good and well maintained
▪ Development, maintain and utilisation of institutional resources	Institution resources are properly used
▪ Generation, retention and utilization of Income Revenue Generation.	
OVERALL EVALUATION GRADE FOR 2.1	
USING THE 3-POINT GRADING SCALE AND GRADE DESCRIPTORS IN ANNEX 4(1)	
1	

PERFORMANCE AUDIT FORM (2.1.1)**COMPONENT 2: IMPROVING SYSTEM MANAGEMENT****2.1: CAPACITY BUILDING TO STRENGTHEN MANAGEMENT (Continued)****2.1.1: IMPLEMENTATION OF GOOD GOVERNANCE**

(See Also Annex 4 of the Good Governance Guide for Governing Bodies for examples of supporting evidence)

MONITORING AND PROJECT OUTPUT/OUTCOME PARAMETERS	SUPPORTING EVIDENCE (NOTE: GRADES MUST BE SUPPORTED BY SOUND EVIDENCE OF ACHIEVEMENT OF THE INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL GOALS AND TARGETS)	
A. PRIMARY ACCOUNTABILITIES		GRADE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the Governing Body approved the institutional strategic vision, mission and plan – identifying a clear development path for the institution through its long-term business plans and annual budgets? <i>(Give dates of governing body meetings where the minutes record these matters having been discussed, approved and/or followed up.)</i> 	Yes	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the Governing Body ensured the establishment and monitoring of proper, effective and efficient systems of control and accountability to ensure financial sustainability? <i>(Give dates of governing body meetings where the minutes record these matters having been discussed, approved and/or followed up at the systems level.)</i> 	Yes	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Is the Governing Body monitoring institutional performance and quality assurance arrangements? <i>(Give dates of governing body meetings where the minutes record these matters having been discussed, approved and/or followed up at the systems level.)</i> 	Yes	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Has the Governing Body put in place suitable arrangements for monitoring the head of the institution's performance? <i>(Give dates of governing body meetings where the minutes record these matters having been discussed, approved and/or followed up.)</i> 	Yes	
EVALUATION GRADE FOR PRIMARY ACCOUNTABILITIES		1
USING THE 3-POINT GRADING SCALE AND GRADE DESCRIPTORS IN ANNEX 4(1) FOR ALL GOVERNANCE SECTIONS		

B. OPENNESS & TRANSPARANCY IN THE OPERATION OF GOVERNING BODIES		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the Governing Body publish an annual report on institutional performance? <i>(Give the publication date and type of publication of the most recent annual report, if there is one)</i> 		Yes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the Governing Body maintain, and publicly disclose, a register of interests of members of its governing body? <i>(Given that a formal register is not yet normal practice in colleges, provide evidence of any published information on governing body members' financial and commercial interests)</i> 		Yes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Is the Governing Body conducted in an open a manner, and does it provide as much information as possible to students, faculty, the general public and potential employers on all aspects of institutional activity related to academic performance, finance and management? <i>(Say whether the governing minutes are published on the institution website, and note any other steps that the governing body takes to communicate with its stakeholders on its work as a Board)</i> 		Yes
GRADE FOR OPENNESS & TRANSPARANCY IN THE OPERATION OF GOVERNING BODIES 1		
C. KEY ATTRIBUTES OF GOVERNING BODIES		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Are the size, skills, competences and experiences of the Governing Body, such that it is able to carry out its primary accountabilities effectively and efficiently, and ensure the confidence of its stakeholders and constituents? <i>(Specify the range of skills and experience that the members of the governing body, and especially the external members, have)</i> 		Yes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Are the recruitment processes and procedures for governing body members rigorous and transparent? <i>(Specify how governing body members are selected, and whether that process is transparent)</i> 		Yes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Does the Governing Body have actively involved independent members and is the institution free from direct political interference to ensure academic freedom and focus on long term educational objectives? <i>(Give examples, where possible, of the role of external members in improving the performance of the institution)</i> 		Yes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Are the role and responsibilities of the Chair of the institution and the Member Secretary serving the governing body clearly stated? 		Yes

<i>(If yes, specify the document where these roles are defined)</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Does the Governing Body meet regularly? Is there clear evidence that members of the governing body attend regularly and participate actively? <p><i>(State the number of meetings in the last year, and the average number of those Board members present and those members absent at those meetings)</i></p>	Yes	
GRADE FOR KEY ATTRIBUTES OF GOVERNING BODIES		1
D. EFFECTIVENESS AND PERFORMANCE REVIEW OF GOVERNING BODIES		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Does the Governing Body keep their effectiveness under regular review and in reviewing its performance, reflect on the performance of the institution as a whole in meeting its long-term strategic objectives and its short-term indicators of performance/success? <p><i>(If yes, give the date(s) of governing body meetings where the minutes show that such a review has been discussed)</i></p>	Yes	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Does the Governing Body ensure that new members are properly inducted, and existing members receive opportunities for further development as deemed necessary? <p><i>(If yes, give examples of how these two tasks are carried out)</i></p>	Yes	
GRADE FOR EFFECTIVENESS AND PERFORMANCE REVIEW OF GOVERNING BODIES		1
E. REGULATORY COMPLIANCE		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Does the Governing ensure regulatory compliance* and, subject to this, take all final decisions on fundamental matters of the institution. <p><i>(If yes, give the date(s) of governing body meetings where the minutes show that regulatory compliance has been discussed)</i></p>	Yes	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Does the regulatory compliance include demonstrating compliance with the ‘not-for-profit’ purpose of education institutions? <p><i>(If yes, give evidence that the governing body has been directly involved)</i></p>	Yes	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Has there been accreditation and/or external quality assurance by a national or professional body? If so, give name, current status of accreditation etc <p><i>(Provide lists of all courses which have already been accredited, all courses where an application has been made, and all courses where no such application has yet been made)</i></p>	Yes	
GRADE FOR REGULATORY COMPLIANCE		1
OVERALL EVALUATION GRADE FOR GOVERNANCE 2.1.1 A-E		1
<small>USING THE 3-POINT GRADING SCALE AND GRADE DESCRIPTORS IN ANNEX 4(1)</small>		

PERFORMANCE AUDIT FORM (2.2)**COMPONENT 2: IMPROVING SYSTEM MANAGEMENT**

NAME OF PERFORMANCE AUDITOR: T.Radhakrishna

DATES OF PERFORMANCE AUDIT: 29-01-2014 to 31-01-2014

NAME OF INSTITUTION WITH LOCATION: JIS College Of Engineering, Kalyani, West Bengal

TABLE 2.2: PROJECT MANAGEMENT, MONITORING AND EVALUATION

MONITORING AND PROJECT OUTPUT/OUTCOME PARAMENTERS	SUPPORTING EVIDENCE (NOTE: GRADES MUST BE SUPPORTED BY SOUND EVIDENCE OF ACHIEVEMENT OF THE INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL GOALS AND TARGETS)
A. Effectiveness of mentoring, reviews, surveys and audits conducted, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Increase in the achievement of the institutions goals and targets set out in the Institutional Development Proposal 	Very effective mentoring. The goals and the targets as stated in IDP are in progress
B. Effective project management and monitoring, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Precise and reliable information/ data through web based MIS available to stakeholders at all time 	No
C. Effectiveness of faculty evaluation by students, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Percentage/ increase in percentage of faculty evaluated by students in one or more subjects ▪ Are results of evaluation properly used for teacher improvement? If yes, is the procedure adopted for teacher improvement including counseling appropriate and effective?	100% Yes. The procedure is appropriate.
OVERALL EVALUATION GRADE FOR 2.2 1 USING THE 3-POINT GRADING SCALE AND GRADE DESCRIPTORS IN ANNEX 4(1)	

PERFORMANCE AND DATA AUDIT FEEDBACK
(FEEDBACK TO THE INSTITUTION, STATE PROJECT FACILITATION UNITS,
THE NATIONAL PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION UNIT/AND RELEVANT MENTOR)

NAME OF PERFORMANCE AUDITOR: T.Radhakrishna

DATES OF PERFORMANCE AUDIT: 29-01-2014 to 31-01-2014

NAME OF INSTITUTION WITH LOCATION: JIS College Of Engineering, Kalyani, West Bengal

KEY POINTS FED BACK BY THE PERFORMANCE AUDITOR TO THE INSTITUTION AT THE END OF THE VISIT - AGAINST THE SEVEN ASPECTS OF EVALUATION

- Pedagogical training to faculty needs to be initiated immediately.
- Approach Affiliating University to recognize eligible departments as research centers.
- Approach University to recognize senior faculty with Ph.D qualification as research supervisors.
- Approach University to recruit M.Tech students for enrolment into Ph.D
- Library with internet facility be extended to students for 12 to 15hrs.
- Cadre ratio of faculty is to be maintained
- Consultancy work is to be taken up to generate revenue
- Core companies to be invited for campus placements to increase employability rate of U.G and P.G students

KEY IMPROVEMENTS NOTICED ON SHORTCOMINGS REPORTED DURING EARLIER PERFORMANCE AUDITS

- Administrative and technical staff(27plus29)are trained
- I-I-I cellis formed and started functioning
- Finishing school and remedial classes progress is good

BRIEF STATEMENTS ON CONTINUING SHORTCOMINGS, AND REASONS:

Pedagogical training to faculty is not taken up so far. The institution is of the opinion that NPIU/SPFU will make arrangements for the same. As of now the institution is making efforts to contact Govt. Agencies for the same

Enhanced industry-institution interaction is needed. Steps initiated with local jute industry

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR MENTORS --NIL--

JIS College of Engineering

(An Autonomous Institution)

First Performance Audit

(16-18 July 2013)

Name of Performance Auditor: Dr. T. Radha Krishna

Dates of Performance Audit: 16-18 July 2013

Average Assessment of the Institute: **1.41** [As against **1** - for Very Good Practice;
2 - for Good Practice and **3** - for
Practice Not in Place]

Salient Observations of the Auditor

Sl. No.	Area/Aspect	Observation (Assessment Grade)
1	Project Implementation:	Good (2.00)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Some laboratories are to be equipped with good equipment (2)• Pedagogical training yet to be started (2)• No Associate Professor in the college; Cadre ratio is not maintained (2)• An increase of 4.02% placement rate as compared to earlier years (2)• No consultancy so far (2)• Increase in the no. of students' and faculty visits to and/or training in Industry-45% (2)• No Sandwich programs between Industries and Institution (2)
2	Implementation of Institutional Reforms:	Good, also needs improvement (2.00)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Planned to share consultancy amount @ 60:40 (2)
3	Administrative & Managerial Efficiency Improvement:	Very Good (1.00)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• No comments against (1)

4	Qualitative Improvements related to Education & Research:	PG and Research to be strengthened (2.00 -)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Curricula and Syllabi be relevance to Technology needs (2) • Increase in no. of joint and industry sponsored R&D work – proposed to be taken up (2) • Increase in financial contribution by Industry for R&D – proposed to be taken up (2) • Increase in % of Revenue from externally funded R&D projects and Consultancies in the total revenue of the institution from all sources (2) • Increase in the no. of Patents filed - No patents (3)
5	Institutional Governance:	Good governance noticed (1.00)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comments against (1)
6	Support to Weak UG Students:	Weak student programs to be strengthened (1.00)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Techniques used to identify weak students – by internal exams (2) • No. of internal and external students that attend high intensity training conducted by the Finishing School – only internal students (2)
Recommendations for Mentor:		Mentor may impress the management to fill all the vacant posts, mostly the Associate Professors.

Registrar