

PERFORMANCE AUDIT FORMS (FINAL ROUND under TEQIP-II)

INSTITUTIONAL PERFORMANCE PROFILE

NAME OF PERFORMANCE AUDITOR: **Rohit Y Sharma**

DATES OF PERFORMANCE AUDIT: **12-15 August, 2016**

NAME OF INSTITUTION WITH LOCATION: **PESCE, Mandya, Karnataka**

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	1
1.2	SCALING-UP POSTGRADUATE EDUCATION AND DEMAND-DRIVEN RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT AND INNOVATION	2
1.2.1	ESTABLISHING CENTRES OF EXCELLENCE	NA
1.3	FACULTY DEVELOPMENT FOR EFFECTIVE TEACHING (PEDAGOGICAL TRAINING)	1
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: Rohit Y Sharma

DATES OF PERFORMANCE AUDIT: 12-15 August, 2016

NAME OF INSTITUTION WITH LOCATION: PESCE, Mandya, Karnataka

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)
<p>A. Effectiveness of funds utilized for the teaching, training, learning and research equipment, library, computers, etc. by Institutions, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Increase in the satisfaction index of student and faculty 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The institute has utilized fund for labs, library and furniture, refurbishment of class rooms and staff development activities. Kindly refer Evidence 1 • Students and faculty are highly satisfied with the facilities.
<p>B. Obtaining Academic Autonomy status, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Number of institutions that have obtained '<i>Autonomous Institution status</i>' 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) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The institution has got autonomous status by the UGC from the year 2008-09 for a period of 6 years and extended up to June, 2017. Kindly refer Annexure – 1 • Under CBCS with OBE scheme, institution has adopted core course, foundation course and foundation electives along with general electives and open electives. In order to enhance the efficiency of the student's self-study course and seminar is also adopted. Kindly refer Annexure - 4
<p>C. Effort made by Institutions for upgrading qualifications of faculty members, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Percentage of faculty enrolled in MTech and PhD 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The faculty members are deputed under QIP to do their PG / Ph.D to premier Institutes like IIT and IISc. Out of 187 permanent faculty members all are having Master degree except only three. All the three faculty members are in the verge of completing their master degree, M Sc. by research. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) B.E. to M.Tech 63.6%, ii) M.Tech to Ph.D 7% • Out of 76 M.Tech Faculty 31 have registered for Ph.D and 26 faculties have completed 3 years of Research work. • Kindly refer Annexure – 3 of data provided for Annexure 4
<p>D. Existing teaching and staff vacancies and effort made by Institutions for filling the vacancies, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Percentage of faculty and staff positions filled and vacant ▪ Increase in faculty appointed on regular basis 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The vacant faculty positions in Government aided and unaided department will be filled by the management time to time. The college management has taken necessary steps to maintain a 1: 15 staff – student ratio and to maintain the standard specified by the AICTE. Six positions are vacant. Kindly refer Annexure – 7 • Number of faculty members are increased from 141 in the year 2013-14 to 146 in the year 2015-16

<p>E. Effectiveness of equity at Institutional level, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Transition rate of students from the First to the Second year in Undergraduate programmes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Due to the implementation of TEQIP, the facility being assessed by different departments. The transition rate was 85% in 2012-13 and 87% in 2015-16.
<p>OVERALL EVALUATION GRADE FOR 1.1 USING THE 3-POINT GRADING SCALE AND GRADE DESCRIPTORS IN ANNEX 4(1)</p>	

1

PERFORMANCE AUDIT FORM (1.2)**COMPONENT 1: IMPROVING QUALITY OF EDUCATION IN SELECTED INSTITUTIONS**NAME OF PERFORMANCE AUDITOR: **Rohit Y Sharma**DATES OF PERFORMANCE AUDIT: **12-15 August, 2016**NAME OF INSTITUTION WITH LOCATION: **PESCE, Mandya, Karnataka****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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The institute has utilized fund for labs, library, furniture, refurbishment of class rooms for both UG, PG students as well as research scholars. Kindly refer Evidence 1 • PG Students and faculty are highly satisfied with the research facilities.
B. Effectiveness of scaling-up Postgraduate Technical Education, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Increased enrolment for MTech and PhD 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Institute proposed four PG courses in IDP out of which three M.Tech courses were started. Kindly refer Annexure 6 • The student enrollment increased from 90 in 2010-11 to 126 in 2013-14
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Establishment of proposed laboratories 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The institute has established the following new laboratories: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i) Cloud Computing Lab ii) Storage Area Network Lab iii) High Voltage Lab iv) The laboratories have been upgraded in all the engineering departments.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Cumulative number of assistantships granted C. Progress/achievement in <u>starting new Postgraduate</u>programmes, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Securing AICTE approval 	<p>Totally 60 M.Tech students are being granted assistantship of Rs. 8,000=00 each</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As proposed in TEQIP II - IDP the following new PG programs have been started <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i) 2012-13 - Computer Engineering under department of CS & E. ii) 2012-13 - VLSI Design and Embedded system under department of E & CE and iii) 2013-14 - Machine Design under Mechanical Engineering department <p>All the PG programmes have an intake of 24 students Kindly refer Annexure - 6</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Establishment of laboratories 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Labs being modernized for both UG and PG departments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Adequacy of student enrolments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More than 66% students have been enrolled for the academic year 2015-16
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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Journals 74 International Journals 242. Kindly refer the Kindly refer Annexure – 15

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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The institution has got MoUs with 21 different industries of high repute. Kindly refer Annexure – 9 The institution had seven MoUs in the year 2013-14 and 21 in the year 2014 to 2016.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase in financial contribution by industry for R & D 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are eight ongoing sponsored projects from various agencies. Kindly refer Annexure – 12
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase in industry personnel registered for Masters and Doctoral programmes 	<p style="text-align: center;">Nil</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase in industry personnel trained by the institution in knowledge and/or skill areas 	<p style="text-align: center;">Nil</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase in the number of consultancy assignments secured 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are 74 consultancy projects taken up by the institution. Kindly refer Annexure – 13
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase in the number of students’ and faculty visits to and/or training in industry 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students are regularly going for industrial visits and internships every year as part of their curriculum. The faculties are mentoring the students in all the above activities and projects.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improvements in graduate placement rate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The graduate placement rate has increased from 62% in 2010-11 to 92% in 2015-16. Kindly refer Annexure – 18
<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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Industry experts are involved in curriculum design as members of Board of Studies. Several training programs have been conducted under TEQIP by industry experts.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase in the number of sandwich programmes between industries and the institution. 	<p style="text-align: center;">NIL</p>
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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the year 2014-2016 the institution has received Rs. 112 Lakhs from various agencies . Kindly refer Annexure – 12 The institution has generated IRG around Rs. 29 Lakhs from consultancy. Kindly refer Annexure – 13
G. Increase in the number of publications in refereed journals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Journal publication 38 in 2013-14 to 158 in 2014-16. Total National Journals are 74 and International Journals are 242. <p style="text-align: center;">Kindly refer the Kindly refer Annexure – 15</p>
H. Increase in the number of patents filed	<p>One filled and Published.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> “Smart Sensor based on Conducting Polymers (PANI) and Nano Particles for Biological Real Time Applications”. Application No. 2859/CHE/2012 Dated: 14/07/2012 Publication date: 20/06/2014. Dr. B Ramachandra, Professor and Head, E & EE Department.
OVERALL EVALUATION GRADE FOR 1.2 USING THE 3-POINT GRADING SCALE AND GRADE DESCRIPTORS IN ANNEX 4(1)	
2	

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

NAME OF PERFORMANCE AUDITOR: **Rohit Y Sharma**
 DATES OF PERFORMANCE AUDIT: **12-15 August, 2016**
 NAME OF INSTITUTION WITH LOCATION: **PESCE, Mandya, Karnataka**

1.2.1 ESTABLISHING CENTRES OF EXCELLENCE

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)
<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 	Not Applicable
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Establishment of a knowledge resource centre (library) in the thematic area 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Procurement of furniture 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Civil works 	
<p>OVERALL EVALUATION GRADE FOR 1.2.1 USING THE 3-POINT GRADING SCALE AND GRADE DESCRIPTORS IN ANNEX 4(1)</p>	

PERFORMANCE AUDIT FORM (1.3)**COMPONENT 1: IMPROVING QUALITY OF EDUCATION IN SELECTED INSTITUTIONS**NAME OF PERFORMANCE AUDITOR: **Rohit Y Sharma**DATES OF PERFORMANCE AUDIT: **12-15 August, 2016**NAME OF INSTITUTION WITH LOCATION: **PESCE, Mandya, Karnataka****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:	
<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"> Regular Pedagogical training program are organized for all the faculty members for overall development of their academic skills. Kindly refer Annexure - 8
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improvements in (and/or updating, and more relevant) curricula and /or syllabi 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CBCS with OBE scheme has been introduced Core course, foundation course and foundation electives along with general electives and open electives adopted. Kindly refer Annexure - 4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improvements in (and/or updating, more relevant) course assessment methods 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continuous Internal Evaluation (CIE) has been introduced for both UG and PG level. The students are provided with SEE answer scripts to check for any discrepancies. A student has to secure a minimum of 45% of marks (50% in CIE and 40% in SEE marks put together) to complete a course. Kindly refer Annexure - 3
<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"> Students are taught with audio-visuals aides for teaching learning process. Remedial classes have been conducted for the students in the academically weaker section. 52 students have been benefitted during 2015-16. Kindly refer Annexure – 16
<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"> Three faculties which UG qualifications pursuing PG and they are in the verge of completing PG course.
<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"> More than 80% of faculties have been benefitted by the training in the domain area/seminar/conference/ Workshops/FDPs
<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 - appliedfor within 2 years of joining the Project</i>) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The institute has registered on NBA website seeking accreditation for all UG courses in two phases i.e., 5+3. Kindly refer Annexure – 14
B. Effectiveness of Pedagogy Training, including	

<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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teacher's performance will be evaluated by students by giving feedback in each theory subject using online feedback form. Kindly refer Annexure - 5
OVERALL EVALUATION GRADE FOR 1.3 USING THE 3-POINT GRADING SCALE AND GRADE DESCRIPTORS IN ANNEX 4(1)	

1

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

NAME OF PERFORMANCE AUDITOR: **Rohit Y Sharma**

DATES OF PERFORMANCE AUDIT: **12-15 August, 2016**

NAME OF INSTITUTION WITH LOCATION: **PESCE, Mandya, Karnataka**

2.1: CAPACITY BUILDING TO STRENGTHEN MANAGEMENT

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. Implementation of academic and non-academic reforms, including:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Improved understanding of the need and ways for increased autonomy, and new instruments for accountability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The institute has introduced following value added courses/Software and Hardware as per market demand. Kindly refer Annexure – 2. • Transparency in Examination system. • Introducing new curriculum based on the industry demand as and when required.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Modernization and decentralisation of administration and financial management 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The institute has decentralized overall institutional activities for the effective functioning of the autonomous system. Faculty members have been given responsibilities for various activities. Kindly refer Evidence – 3.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Extent of delegation of administrative and financial decision making powers to senior functionaries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Having full financial power, any purchases of equipment, the Head of the Institution has to get formal approval from the BOG. • The HoDs are given financial powers as per budget allocation.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Responsiveness to stakeholders (students, faculty, staff, industry, local communities) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students, faculty, alumni, parents and all other stack holders are very much satisfied with responsiveness by the institution.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Institutional quality assurance and enhancement strategies, including student feedback mechanisms 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The institution regularly gets feedback from its students, alumni, and parents. The placements have been exceptionally increased. Kindly refer Annexure – 17.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Maintenance of academic and non-academic infrastructure and facilities, including sufficiency and quality of academic buildings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The institution has well maintained infrastructure with modern learning methods, amenities, and equipments in order to cater the need of quality education.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Development, maintain and utilisation of institutional resources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The optimum utilization of resources and other facilities are made use by the students and faculty.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Generation, retention and utilization of Income Revenue Generation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The institution has generated revenue of Rs.1301 Lakhs including fees, externally funded projects, consultancy ect. This amount is being utilized by institution for overall development purpose.

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> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes. Mission, vision statements are in place and published thru the college web portal. These statements were in place before TEQIP activities. 	
<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> 	<p style="text-align: center;">Yes.</p> <p>27-11-10, 31-12-12, 31-01-13, 27-02-13, 30-03-13, 30-04-13, 29-06-13, 31-08-13, 16-11-13, 27-06-14, 27-08-14, 27-10-14, 27-12-14, 26-05-15, 01-08-15, 26-09-15, 07-11-15, 27-02-16.</p>	
<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> 	<p style="text-align: center;">Yes.</p> <p>31-01-13, 27-02-13, 30-03-13, 30-04-13, 29-06-13, 31-08-13, 16-11-13, 27-06-14, 27-08-14, 27-10-14, 27-12-14, 26-05-15, 01-08-15, 26-09-15, 07-11-15, 27-02-16.</p>	
<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> 	<p style="text-align: center;">Yes.</p> <p>31-01-13, 27-02-13, 30-03-13, 30-04-13, 29-06-13, 31-08-13, 16-11-13, 27-06-14, 27-08-14, 27-10-14, 27-12-14, 26-05-15, 01-08-15, 26-09-15, 07-11-15, 27-02-16.</p>	
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. Published on Web portal regularly
GRADE FOR OPENNESS & TRANSPARENCY IN THE OPERATION OF GOVERNING BODIES		
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. Governing body has representative from all domains.
<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> 		Board of Governors(BoG) are nominated as per the TEQIP norms
<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> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> BoG members monitor all the activities of TEQIP. Former Vice Chancellor of VTU Dr. Balaveer Reddy is one of the members who is actively involved in improving the performance of the institution. 	
<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? <i>(If yes, specify the document where these roles are defined)</i> 		Yes. Specified in PIP and IDP

<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) 	<p>Yes. In total 19 BoG meetings are conducted from the inception of TEQIP. Six meetings were held during 2015-16</p>
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? (If yes, give the date(s) of governing body meetings where the minutes show that such a review has been discussed) 	<p>Yes. Regularly discussed with the principal and TEQIP coordinator.</p>
<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) 	<p>No new members have been inducted during the year 2015-16</p>
GRADE FOR EFFECTIVENESS AND PERFORMANCE REVIEW OF GOVERNING BODIES	
2	
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) 	<p>Yes.</p>
<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) 	<p>Yes</p>
<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) 	<p>Yes. Twice accredited by NBA. Now applied for re accreditation by NBA</p>
GRADE FOR REGULATORY COMPLIANCE	
1	
OVERALL EVALUATION GRADE FOR GOVERNANCE 2.1.1 A-E	
USING THE 3-POINT GRADING SCALE AND GRADE DESCRIPTORS IN ANNEX 4(1)	
1	

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

NAME OF PERFORMANCE AUDITOR: **Rohit Y Sharma**

DATES OF PERFORMANCE AUDIT: **12-15 August, 2016**

NAME OF INSTITUTION WITH LOCATION: **PESCE, Mandya, Karnataka**

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)
<p>A. Effectiveness of mentoring, reviews, surveys and audits conducted, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Increase in the achievement of the institutions goals and targets set out in the Institutional Development Proposal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maximum achievement of targets set. • Got autonomy extended. Kindly refer Annexure – 01. • Applied for re accreditation. Kindly refer Annexure – 14. • Teaching assistance ship provided under TEQIP. • Laboratories have been modernized; software, library books and e-journals have been procured. • Improvement in placement. Kindly refer Annexure – 17.
<p>B. Effective project management and monitoring, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Precise and reliable information/ data through web based MIS available to stakeholders at all time 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes. • Transparency is maintained by publishing all information to the stakeholders thru the college web portal .
<p>C. Effectiveness of faculty evaluation by students, including:</p> <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 counseling appropriate and effective?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All the faculty members are been evaluated by each students thru online feedback method – 100%. • The feedback results are evaluated by the principal and the head of the department.
<p align="right">OVERALL EVALUATION GRADE FOR 2.2</p> <p align="center">USING THE 3-POINT GRADING SCALE AND GRADE DESCRIPTORS IN ANNEX 4(1)</p>	

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: **Rohit Y Sharma**

DATES OF PERFORMANCE AUDIT: **12-15 August, 2016**

NAME OF INSTITUTION WITH LOCATION: **PESCE, Mandya, Karnataka**

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

1. In my opinion, the college has a lot of potential. One way to harness is by going for university status.
2. I also recommend promotion of interdisciplinary teaching and research activities by way of the following:
 - a. Final year projects
 - b. Joint inter-departmental courses (particularly electives)
 - c. Joint proposal by various faculty members to external funding agency.
3. Start of another M.Tech. programme in Electrical Engineering.

KEY IMPROVEMENTS NOTICED ON SHORTCOMINGS REPORTED DURING EARLIER PERFORMANCE AUDITS

1. One of the short coming was the start of the fourth MTech programme in Electrical Engineering.
2. External academic and industry experts should be inducted in the Governing Body (BoG) on a regular basis.

BRIEF STATEMENTS ON CONTINUING SHORTCOMINGS, AND REASONS:

Nil

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR MENTORS:

No recommendations as this is the last performance audit under TEQIP

