

Institutional Performance Profile

AUDIT VISIT NUMBER: 2

Dates of Performance Audit: 26.06.2014 to 28.06.2014

Institutional Performance Profile:

Name of the Performance Auditor: Dr. S.ARUMUGAM

Name of the Institution with location: GOVERNMENT ENGINEERING COLLEGE KOZHIKODE

Date of Performance Visit: 26.06.2014 to 28.06.2014

PIP REF	INSTITUTIONAL PERFORMANCE PROFILE	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	Not applicable
1.2.1	Establishing centres of excellence	Not applicable
1.3	Faculty development for effective teaching (pedagogical training)	2
Component 2: Improving system management		
2.1	Capacity building to strengthen management	3
2.1.1	Implementation of good governance	2.6
2.2	Project management, monitoring and evaluation	2

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).

COMPONENT 1: IMPROVING QUALITY OF EDUCATION IN SELECTED INSTITUTIONS

Name of Performance Auditor: Dr. S.ARUMUGAM

Dates of Performance Audit: 26.06.2014 to 28.06.2014

Name of Institution with Location: GOVERNMENT ENGINEERING COLLEGE KOZHICODE

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

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 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 	<p style="text-align: center;">2</p> <p>The College has effectively utilised the funds allotted to them. The Students are satisfied with the purchase of the equipment and they want that they must be effectively used for the benefit of the students. The Faculty members are satisfied with the effective purchase of equipment and use of the fund for other specified purpose.</p>	
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) 	<p style="text-align: center;">2</p> <p>The status of obtaining autonomy is in the same state as in the last year. The BOG must pursue the matter with University and UGC for getting the autonomy at the earliest. The College has applied for accreditation for 4 UG courses (Chemical Engineering, Civil Engineering, Mechanical Engineering and Applied Electronics and Instrumentation 09.04.2014 and visit is expected in the end of 2014 or beginning of 2015.,</p>	
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 	<p style="text-align: center;">2</p> <p>The state Government is sending faculty to acquire PhD qualifications under QIP scheme formulated by State Government.</p>	
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 	<p style="text-align: center;">3</p> <p>The vacancy positions are filled with contract faculty. The effort must be taken to fill the vacancies by regular faculty</p>	
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 	<p style="text-align: center;">1</p> <p>77% students from first year moved to second year without arrears</p>	
<p style="text-align: right;">Evaluation Grade for 1.1</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Using the 3-point grading scale and grade descriptors in Annex 4(1)</p>		<p style="font-size: 24pt;">2</p>

COMPONENT 1: IMPROVING QUALITY OF EDUCATION IN SELECTED INSTITUTIONS

Name of Performance Auditor: Dr. S.ARUMUGAM

Dates of Performance Audit: 26.06.2014 to 28.06.2014

Name of Institution with Location: GOVERNMENT ENGINEERING COLLEGE KOZHIKODE

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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase in the satisfaction index of student and faculty 	
B. Effectiveness of scaling-up Postgraduate Technical Education, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased enrolment for MTech and PhD • Establishment of proposed laboratories • Cumulative number of assistantships granted 	
C. Progress/achievement in starting new Postgraduate programmes, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Securing AICTE approval • Establishment of laboratories • Adequacy of student enrolments 	
D. Effectiveness of collaborations made with other Institutions in India and abroad, including <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase in number of co-authored publications in refereed journals 	
E. Increased collaboration with industry in research and development, including <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase in number of joint and industry sponsored research and development work undertaken • Increase in financial contribution by industry for R & D • Increase in industry personnel registered for Masters and Doctoral programmes • Increase in industry personnel trained by the institution in knowledge and/or skill areas • Increase in the number of consultancy assignments secured • Increase in the number of students' and faculty visits to and/or training in industry • Improvements in graduate placement rate • Increase in involvement of industry experts in curricula & syllabi improvements, laboratory improvements, evaluation of students and delivering expert lectures • Increase in the number of sandwich programmes between industries and the institution. 	
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	
G. Increase in the number of publications in refereed journals	
H. Increase in the number of patents filed	
Evaluation Grade for 1.2 Using the 3-point grading scale and grade descriptors in Annex 4(1)	

COMPONENT 1: IMPROVING QUALITY OF EDUCATION IN SELECTED INSTITUTIONS

Name of Performance Auditor: Dr. S.ARUMUGAM

Dates of Performance Audit: 26.06.2014 to 28.06.2014

Name of Institution with Location: GOVERNMENT ENGINEERING COLLEGE KOZHIKODE

1.2.1 ESTABLISHING CENTRES OF EXCELLENCE

MONITORING AND PROJECT OUTPUT/ OUTCOME PARAMETERS	SUPPORT OF EVIDENCE Note: Grades must be supported by sound evidence of achievement of the institutional development proposal goals and targets)	
<p>A. Establishing Centres of Excellence Improvement in Research and Development facilities through:</p> <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 <p>Civil works</p>	NA	
Evaluation Grade for 1.2.1 Using the 3-point grading scale and grade descriptors in Annex 4(1)		NA

COMPONENT 1: IMPROVING QUALITY OF EDUCATION IN SELECTED INSTITUTIONS

Name of Performance Auditor: Dr. S.ARUMUGAM

Dates of Performance Audit: 26.06.2014 to 28.06.2014

Name of Institution with Location: GOVERNMENT ENGINEERING COLLEGE KOZHIKODE

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)	
<p>A. Effort made by Institutions providing Pedagogy Training to faculty, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of faculty who have benefitted from the core and advanced modules of pedagogy training Improvements in (and/or updating, and more relevant) curricula and/or syllabi Improvements in (and/or updating, more relevant) course assessment methods Improvements in teaching and learning methods, including provision for students needing extra/remedial support Percentage of faculty with UG qualification registered/deputed for improving their qualification (see Section-3, 4(b) on page 20 of PIP) Percentage of faculty deputed for subject domain training, seminars, etc. (faculty are required to share their gains with peers and put reports on training on institution's web site) Progress in securing accreditation of eligible UG & PG programmes (institutions to achieve target of 60% of eligible UG & PG programmes accredited - applied for within 2 years of joining the Project) 	<p style="text-align: right;">2</p> <p>Faculty development programs were conducted and Faculty members were benefited by the programs.</p> <p>The Syllabi is decided by the University</p> <p>Remedial classes were conducted and students were benefited by the program</p> <p>NIL</p> <p>The Faculty sharing the knowledge gained after attending the training/seminar is not reported.</p> <p>The College has applied for accreditation of 4 UG courses. All other courses are not eligible for applying accreditation.</p>	
<p>B. Effectiveness of Pedagogy Training, including</p> <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 	<p>The students are satisfied with the quality of the teachers.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">2</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Evaluation Grade for 1.3 Using The 3-Point Grading Scale and Grade Descriptors in Annex 4(1)</p>		<p style="text-align: right;">2</p>

COMPONENT 2: IMPROVING SYSTEM MANAGEMENT

Name of Performance Auditor: Dr. S.ARUMUGAM

Dates of Performance Audit: 26.06.2014 to 28.06.2014

Name of Institution with Location: GOVERNMENT ENGINEERING COLLEGE KOZHIKODE

2.1: CAPACITY BUILDING TO STRENGTHEN MANAGEMENT

MONITORING AND PROJECT OUTPUT/ OUTCOME	SUPPORTING EVIDENCE (Note: Grades must be supported by sound evidence of achievement of the institutional development proposal goals and targets)
<p>A. Implementation of academic and non-academic reforms, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improved understanding of the need and ways for increased autonomy, and new instruments for accountability Modernization and decentralisation of administration and financial management Extent of delegation of administrative and financial decision making powers to senior functionaries Responsiveness to stakeholders (students, faculty, staff, industry, local communities) Institutional quality assurance and enhancement strategies, including student feedback mechanisms Maintenance of academic and non-academic infrastructure and facilities, including sufficiency and quality of academic buildings Development, maintain and utilisation of institutional resources Generation, retention and utilization of Income Revenue Generation. 	<p>The College has applied for autonomy and inspection Committee is not yet appointed by UGC.</p>
	<p>Financial management is good.</p>
	<p>The delegation of power let the procurements faster. The College has utilized the money allotted and waiting for the clearance of money from SPIU.</p>
	<p>100% student feedback system is present. The feedback is used for counselling the faculty.</p>
	<p>The maintenance of the academic and non academic infrastructure and facilities are poor.</p>
	<p>Institution resources are utilized</p>
	<p>A portion of the revenue generated is given to the faculty</p>

Evaluation Grade for 2.1
Using the 3-point grading scale and grade descriptors in Annex 4(1)

3

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)	GRADE
Section A: Primary accountabilities		
<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? (Give dates of governing body meetings where the minutes record these matters having been discussed, approved and/or followed up.) 	The first BOG meeting was held on 29.10.2010 and the importance of TEQIP phase II was discussed. The institutions strategic vision, mission and plan were placed in the 3 rd BOG meeting held on 13.06.2012.	3
<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? (Give dates of governing body meetings where the minutes record these matters having been discussed, approved and/or followed up at the systems level.) 	The second BOG meeting was conducted on 13.06.2012. The establishment of TEQIP office was approved. 4.79 crore rupees purchase proposal was approved.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the Governing Body monitoring institutional performance and quality assurance arrangements? (Give dates of governing body meetings where the minutes record these matters having been discussed, approved and/or followed up at the systems level.) 	The 5 th BOG meeting it was decided to monitor the performance of the progress in TEQIP.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has the Governing Body put in place suitable arrangements for monitoring the head of the institution's performance? (Give dates of governing body meetings where the minutes record these matters having been discussed, approved and/or followed up.) 	No such proposal was taken by BOG.	
Section B: Openness & transparency in the operation of governing bodies		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the Governing Body publish an annual report on institutional performance? (Give the publication date and type of publication of the most recent annual report, if there is one) 	No annual was prepared on Institutional performance	2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the Governing Body maintain, and publicly disclose, a register of interests of members of its governing body? (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) 	Minutes of the BOG are maintained in the form of register.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the Governing Body conducted in an open 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? (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) 	The minutes of the BOG meetings are placed in the College web site.	
Section 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? (Specify the range of skills and experience that the members of the governing body, and especially the external members, have) 	Well experienced persons are appointed as members of the BOG.	3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are the recruitment processes and procedures for governing body members rigorous and transparent? (Specify how governing body members are selected, and whether that process is transparent) 	BOG consists of 2 members. 3 members are nominated by State Government and one will be the Chairman of BOG. AICTE nominates its nominee. State Government appoints its official as its nominee. University nominates its nominee. One industrialist and two faculty are appointed by the Principal. DTE and Principal are ex-officio members.	
<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? (Give examples, where possible, of the role of external members in improving the performance of the institution) 	No political interference in the BOG.	
<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? (If yes, specify the document where these roles are defined) 	No	
<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? (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) 	4 meetings are conducted in the year 2013-14. On average 50% of the members attended the meetings.	
Section 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? (If yes, give the date(s) of governing body meetings where the minutes show that such a review has been discussed) 	The matters relating to TEQIP are discussed in the BOG	3
<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? (If yes, give examples of how these two tasks are carried out) 	For the past four years the members of the Governing council are not changed..	
Section 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. (If yes, give the date(s) of governing body meetings where the minutes show that regulatory compliance has been discussed) 	NO	2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the regulatory compliance include demonstrating compliance with the 'not-for-profit purpose of education institutions? (If yes, give evidence that the governing body has been directly involved) 	YES. The Institution is a Government Institution.	
<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. (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) 	4 UG courses are eligible for accreditation. The College has applied for accreditation. SAR submitted to NBA	
Overall Evaluation Grade for Governance 2.1.1 A-E Using the 3-point grading scale and grade descriptors in Annex 4(1)		2.6

COMPONENT 2: IMPROVING SYSTEM MANAGEMENT

Name of Performance Auditor: Dr. S.ARUMUGAM

Dates of Performance Audit: 26.06.2014 to 28.06.2014

Name of Institution with Location: GOVERNMENT ENGINEERING COLLEGE KOZHIKODE

TABLE 2.2: PROJECT MANAGEMENT, MONITORING AND EVALUATION

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)	GRADE
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 	The mentor has conducted one meeting and the improvements are indicated in the report. Reviews are conducted to monitor the progress of the goals and targets by the Principals.	2
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 	The details are uploaded in the web site.	2
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? <p>If yes, is the procedure adopted for teacher improvement including counselling appropriate and effective?</p>	The Faculty evaluation by students are conducted at the end of the semester. The best performing faculty is awarded. The low performing faculty is counselled by the Head of the Department.	2
Overall Evaluation Grade for 2.2 Using the 3-point grading scale and grade descriptors in Annex 4(1)		2

DATA AUDIT FORMS

Name of the Data Auditor: Dr. MINI M G

Dates of Data Audit: 26.06.2014 to 28.2014

Name of Institution with Location: GOVERNMENT COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING KOZHIKODE

DATA AUDIT FORM (1)

No.	Particulars	Figure in MIS	Year	Verified figure	Institutional data source*	Comments†
1	Information in respect to bachelors programmes in engineering/technology					
	a. Number of UG programmes conducted during the latest academic year	5	2013-14	5	Departments	
	b. Total number of UG students during the latest academic year	1238		1206	Departments	
	c. Total number of women students in UG programmes during the latest academic year	477		508	Departments	
	d. Total number of SC students in UG programmes during the latest academic year	101		101	Office	
	e. Total number of ST students in UG programmes during the latest academic year	10		10	Office	
	f. Total number of OBC students in UG programmes during the latest academic year	406		406	Office	
	g. Percentage of final year UG students during the latest academic year placed through campus interviews	6.88		6.88	Departments	
	h. Percentage of final year UG students during the latest that passed out with 75% or more aggregate marks					Results awaited
	i. Percentage of all 1st year students [as at 1(b)] during the latest that passed all courses fully and successfully got admitted to 2nd year in the 2013 -14 academic year	75.73		77	MIS	
	j. Percentage of 1st year women students [as at 1(c)] during the latest academic year that passed all courses fully and successfully got admitted to 2nd year in the current academic year	76.31		78	Departments	
	k. Percentage of 1st year SC students [as at 1(d)] during the latest that passed all courses fully and successfully got admitted to 2nd year in the current academic year	24.13		24.13	Office	
	l. Percentage of 1st year ST students [as at 1(e)] during the latest that passed all courses fully and successfully got admitted to 2nd year in the current academic year	0		0		
	m. Percentage of 1st year OBC students [as at 1(f)] during the latest that passed all courses fully and successfully got admitted to 2nd year in the current academic year	79.49		79.49	Office	

* This could include how the figure was calculated if appropriate.

† For example, if there are any discrepancies in the figures – the reasons, or whether information is being updated by the institution and if so, when?

DATA AUDIT FORM (2)

No.	Particulars	Figure in MIS	Year	Verified figure	Institutional data source *	Comment †
2	Information in respect to masters programmes in engineering/ Technology					
	a. Number of full-time Masters programmes during the latest academic year	3	2013-14	3	Department	
	b. Number of part-time and sandwich (Joint) Masters programmes during the latest academic year	NIL			Department	
	c. Total number of students enrolled for all Masters programmes during the latest academic year	51		51	Department	
	d. Number of faculty in-house enrolled for Masters programmes during the latest academic year	0		0	Department	
	e. Number of students enrolled for all Masters programmes during the latest academic year with scholarship	21		21		
	f. Number of students enrolled for all Masters programmes during the latest academic year with TEQIP assistantship	30		30		
	g. Total number of women students in all Masters programmes during the latest academic year	24		24		
	h. Total number of SC students in all Masters programmes during the latest academic year	4		4		
	i. Total number of ST students in all Masters programmes during the latest academic year	0		0		
	j. Total number of OBC students in all Masters programmes during the latest academic year	25		25		
	k. Percentage of final year Masters students during the latest academic year placed through campus interviews	0		0	Department	
	l. Percentage of final year Masters students during the latest that passed out with 75% or more aggregate marks				Department	Results awaited

* This could include how the figure was calculated if appropriate.

† For example, if there are any discrepancies in the figures – the reasons, or whether information is being updated by the institution and if so, when?

ATA AUDIT FORM (3)

No.	Particulars	Figure in MIS	Year	Verified figure	Institutional data source *	Comments †
3	Information in respect to doctoral programmes					NOT APPLICABLE
	a. Number of Doctoral candidates on roll up to March 31, 2011					NOT APPLICABLE
	b. Number of in-house faculty enrolled for Doctoral programmes during the latest academic year					NOT APPLICABLE
	c. Number of students enrolled for Doctoral programmes during the latest academic year with scholarship					NOT APPLICABLE
	d. Number of students enrolled for Doctoral programmes during the latest academic year with TEQIP assistantship					NOT APPLICABLE

DATA AUDIT FORM (4)

No.	Particulars	Figure in MIS	Year	Verified figure	Institutional data source *	Comment †
4	Information in respect to Faculty					
	a. Total number of regular full-time faculty excluding adjunct and emeritus faculty during the latest academic year	60	2013-14	62		
	b. Total number of regular full-time faculty in engineering disciplines excluding adjunct and emeritus faculty during the latest academic	52		53		
	c. Number of regular full-time faculty in engineering disciplines with Masters degree as their highest qualification excluding adjunct and emeritus faculty during the latest academic year	38		43		
	d. Number of regular full-time faculty in engineering disciplines with Doctoral degree as their highest qualification excluding adjunct and emeritus faculty during the latest academic year	9		9		
	e. Number of regular full-time faculty in engineering disciplines with Bachelors degree as their highest qualification faculty during the latest academic year	2		0		
	f. Number of faculty with Bachelors degree which are enrolled in-house for Masters programmes in parent institution during academic year the latest:	0		0		
	(i) Engineering teachers	0		0		
	(ii) Applied Science teachers	0		0		
	(iii) Other teachers					
	g. Number of faculty with Bachelors degree which are enrolled in-house for Masters programmes at other institutions during academic year the latest:	0		0		
	(i) Engineering teachers:	0		0		
	(ii) Applied Science teachers:	0		0		
	(iii) Other teachers:					
	h. Number of faculty with Masters degree which are enrolled in-house for PhD programmes in parent institution during academic year the latest:	0		0		
	(i) Engineering teachers	0		0		
	(ii) Applied Science teachers	0		0		
	(iii) Other teachers					
	i. Number of faculty with Masters degree which are enrolled in-house for PhD programmes at other institutions during academic year the latest:	24		24		
	(i) Engineering teachers	2		2		
	(ii) Applied Science teachers	0		0		
	(iii) Other teachers					
	j. Number of faculty that have attended a professional training programme of 5 or more days duration during the latest academic year	12		12		
	k. Number of all faculty (irrespective of specialization) that have attended the Basic Module of pedagogy training during the latest	NIL		NIL		
	l. Number of all faculty (irrespective of specialization) that have attended both the Basic and Advanced Modules of pedagogy training during the latest academic year	10		10		
	m. Number of faculty appraised by students during the latest academic year	44		44		

* This could include how the figure was calculated if appropriate.

† For example, if there are any discrepancies in the figures – the reasons, or whether information is being updated by the institution and if so, when?

DATA AUDIT FORM (5)

No.	Particulars	Figure in MIS	Year	Verified figure	Institutional data source*	Comments †
5	Information in respect to Accreditation of Programmes					
	a. Number of UG programmes accredited	NIL		NIL		
	b. Number of UG programmes for which accreditation applied for	4		4		One program is not eligible
	c. Number of PG programmes accredited	NIL		NIL		
	d. Number of PG programmes for which accreditation applied for	NIL		NIL		Not eligible for applying for accreditation

DATA AUDIT FORM (6)

No.	Particulars	Figure in MIS	Year	Verified figure	Institutional data source*	Comments †
6	Information in respect to research and patents					
	a. Number of research publications in Indian refereed journals during the latest academic year	4		4		
	b. Number of research publications in International refereed journals during the latest academic year	10		10		
	c. Number of research publications co-authored with faculty/researchers/industry experts from outside the institution	NIL		NIL		
	d. Number of patents in engineering related areas obtained during the latest academic year	NIL		NIL		
	e. Number of patents in engineering related areas filed during the latest academic year	NIL		NIL		
	f. Number of sponsored research project completed during the latest academic year	NIL		NIL		
	g. Number of MOUs signed for collaborative programmes with Indian industry and R&D organizations	13		14	IIC	
	h. Number of MOUs signed for collaborative programmes with	NIL		NIL		

* This could include how the figure was calculated if appropriate.

† For example, if there are any discrepancies in the figures – the reasons, or whether information is being updated by the institution and if so, when?

DATA AUDIT FORM (7)

No.	Particulars	Figure in MIS	Year	Verified figure	Institutional data source*	Comments †
7	Information in respect to finances					
	a. Amount received as Block Grant during the latest academic year (Rs. in Lakhs)	NIL		NIL		
	b. IRG§ from students' tuition fee and other charges during the latest academic year (Rs. in Lakhs)	30.01967				
	c. IRG from externally funded R&D projects and consultancies during the latest academic year (Rs. in Lakhs)	5.93				
	d. Total IRG during the latest academic year (Rs. in Lakhs)	36.02				
	e. Total annual recurring expenditure during the latest academic year (Rs. in Lakhs)	15.31				
	f. Amount available in Corpus Fund on March 31, 2013	5575		5575	Bank statement	
	g. Amount available in Faculty Development Fund on March 31, 2013	5575		5575	Bank statement	
	h. Amount available in Equipment Replacement Fund on March 31, 2013	5575		5575	Bank statement	
	i. Amount available in Maintenance Fund on March 31, 2013	5575		5575	Bank statement	

DATA AUDIT FORM (8)

No.	Particulars	Figure in MIS	Year	Verified figure	Institutional data source*	Comments †
8	With respect to institutional governance/management					
	a. Number of Governing Body meetings held during the latest academic year (with minutes on the web)	4		4		Minutes book
	b. Number of institutional functionaries (Deans, HoDs, senior faculty and senior officials) that have undergone Management Capacity Enhancement training	10		10		

* This could include how the figure was calculated if appropriate.

† For example, if there are any discrepancies in the figures – the reasons, or whether information is being updated by the institution and if so, when?

§ IRG is the total revenue of the institution in a year, whether retained or not.

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: Dr. S.ARUMUGAM Dates of Performance Audit: 26.06.2014 to 28.06.2014

Name of Institution with Location: GOVERNMENT ENGINEERING COLLEGE KOZHIKODE

Key points fed back by the Performance Auditor to the institution at the end of the visit - against the seven aspects of evaluation

The Institution has effectively utilised funds allotted to them. The status of autonomy still in the same status in the last visit. The vacancy positions are filled with contract faculty. It is not healthy for achieving the goals of TEQIP. The student performance is good. Remedial coaching are useful for the students. Faculty attended good training. The faculty is assessed by the students. Placement is poor. Research activity must be increased. The BOG must be strengthened. The laboratory equipment purchased must be put into use for the students. More MoUs are signed. Transfer of faculty should be avoided.

Key improvements noticed on shortcomings reported during earlier Performance Audits

Financial spending is very good. More training programs are arranged

Brief statements on continuing shortcomings, and reasons

Infrastructure: The infrastructure facility is not yet improved.

Faculty members with PhD qualifications are not allowed to guide the scholars.

Campus placement is very low. Steps must be taken to improve the placement.

Recommendations for Mentors

