

## PERFORMANCE AUDIT FORMS (FINAL ROUND under TEQIP-II)

### INSTITUTIONAL PERFORMANCE PROFILE

NAME OF PERFORMANCE AUDITOR: Dr B K Sthapak

DATES OF PERFORMANCE AUDIT: 1, 2 and 3 Aug 2016

NAME OF INSTITUTION WITH LOCATION: S G S I T S Indore

PIP REF	INSTITUTIONAL PERFORMANCE PROFILE	OVERALL EVALUATION GRADES
<b>COMPONENT 1: IMPROVING THE QUALITY OF EDUCATION IN SELECTED INSTITUTIONS</b>		
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	1
1.2.1	ESTABLISHING CENTRES OF EXCELLENCE	NA
1.3	FACULTY DEVELOPMENT FOR EFFECTIVE TEACHING (PEDAGOGICAL TRAINING)	2
<b>COMPONENT 2: IMPROVING SYSTEM MANAGEMENT</b>		
2.1	CAPACITY BUILDING TO STRENGTHEN MANAGEMENT	1
2.1.1	IMPLEMENTATION OF GOOD GOVERNANCE	2
2.2	PROJECT MANAGEMENT, MONITORING AND EVALUATION	2

INSTITUTIONAL PERFORMANCE PROFILE GRADES AND GRADE DESCRIPTORS	
1.	<b>Substantial evidence of good practice</b> in the quality and standards achieved (Assessment identifies clear supporting evidence for at least 75% of the relevant practices.)
2.	<b>Some evidence of good practice</b> in the quality and standards achieved (Assessment identifies clear supporting evidence for at least 50% of the relevant practices.)
3.	<b>Not in place</b> (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: Dr B K Sthapak

DATES OF PERFORMANCE AUDIT: 1 ,2 and 3 Aug 2016

NAME OF INSTITUTION WITH LOCATION: S G S I T S Indore

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

<b>MONITORING AND PROJECT OUTPUT/OUTCOME PARAMETERS</b>	<b>SUPPORTING EVIDENCE</b> (NOTE: GRADES MUST BE SUPPORTED BY SOUND EVIDENCE OF ACHIEVEMENT OF THE INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL GOALS AND TARGETS)
<p><b>A. Effectiveness of funds utilized for the teaching, training, learning and research equipment, library, computers, etc. by Institutions, including:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Increase in the satisfaction index of student and faculty</li> </ul>	<p>The total allocated funds for the Project – Rs 1250 lacs.            Total fund received –Rs 800 lacs, Total fund utilised – Rs Rs 804.33 lacs. The funds have been effectively utilized for the purpose meant. There has been a noticeable increase in the satisfaction index of the students and faculty as evidenced in the meeting with students and faculty.</p>
<p><b>B. Obtaining Academic Autonomy status, including:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Number of institutions that have obtained 'Autonomous Institution status' as per University Grants Commission process</b> within 2 years of joining the Project, or</li> <li>▪ Effectiveness of utilization of academic autonomy possessed/ obtained (See Table-26 in PIP)</li> </ul>	<p>The Academic Autonomy was obtained by the Institute in the year 1989 and existed till 2015. The Institute has applied for continuance of the same.</p> <p>The Autonomy has been effectively utilized in designing curriculum, scheme of teaching and evaluation.</p>
<p><b>C. Effort made by Institutions for upgrading qualifications of faculty members, including:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Percentage of faculty enrolled in MTech and PhD</li> </ul>	<p>Nine Faculty Members are pursuing Ph. D. under TEQIP. All the Faculty Members are having M Tech degree. Total number of regular faculty members are 108. Apart from TEQIP, 21 members are also doing their Ph .D . in the Institute.</p>
<p><b>D. Existing teaching and staff vacancies and effort made by Institutions for filling the vacancies, including:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Percentage of faculty and staff positions filled and vacant</li> <li>▪ Increase in faculty appointed on regular basis</li> </ul>	<p>Total No of sanctioned posts of teaching faculty -230            Posts filled by regular faculty -108 (47% )            Posts filled by contractual faculty -105 (45.6%)</p> <p>There has been no increase in the faculty during the project period.</p>
<p><b>E. Effectiveness of equity at Institutional level, including:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Transition rate of students from the First to the Second year in Undergraduate programmes</li> </ul>	<p>76% of the student shave have transitioned from The First to Second year.</p>

<b>OVERALL EVALUATION GRADE FOR 1.1</b> USING THE 3-POINT GRADING SCALE AND GRADE DESCRIPTORS IN ANNEX 4(1)	1
--	---

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

NAME OF PERFORMANCE AUDITOR: Dr B K Sthapak

DATES OF PERFORMANCE AUDIT: 1 ,2 and 3 Aug 2016

NAME OF INSTITUTION WITH LOCATION: SGSITS Indore

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

<b>MONITORING AND PROJECT OUTPUT/OUTCOME PARAMENTERS</b>	<b>SUPPORTING EVIDENCE</b> (NOTE: GRADES MUST BE SUPPORTED BY SOUND EVIDENCE OF ACHIEVEMENT OF THE INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL GOALS AND TARGETS)
<b>A. Effectiveness of funds utilised for the teaching, training, learning and research equipment, library, computers, etc. by the institutions, including:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Increase in the satisfaction index of student and faculty</li> </ul>	100% fund utilization has been made for procurement of research equipments, library books and related soft softwares. There is a good degree of satisfaction amongst students and faculty as observed in the meeting with students and faculty.
<b>B. Effectiveness of scaling-up Postgraduate Technical Education, including:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Increased enrolment for MTech and PhD</li> </ul>	Increase has been observed in the enrolment of students in PG programs from 349 to 416 during the Project period registering a growth of 19%. The Ph.D. enrolment has increased from 136 to 144 during the Project period.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Establishment of proposed laboratories</li> </ul>	Three laboratories have been established –(1) Structures (2) VLSI (3) CAD –CAM
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Cumulative number of assistantships granted</li> </ul>	Total of 175 assistantships have been accorded
<b>C. Progress/achievement in starting new Postgraduate programmes, including:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Securing AICTE approval</li> </ul>	No new PG programs have been started during the project period .
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Establishment of laboratories</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Adequacy of student enrolments</li> </ul>	
<b>D. Effectiveness of collaborations made with other Institutions in India and abroad, including</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase in number of co-authored publications in refereed journals</li> </ul>	4 MOUs have been signed .1 with an Industry and 3 with educational institutions within India. Collaborative efforts have been made to improve teaching & research. The number of co-authored publications with researchers from outside the Institution totals to 50.
<b>E. Increased collaboration with industry in research and development, including:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Increase in number of joint and industry sponsored research and development work undertaken</li> </ul>	There has been an increase in the number of joint research project with Industry from 2 to 5.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Increase in financial contribution by industry for R &amp; D</li> </ul>	There has been 10% increase in the financial contribution by industry for R & D.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Increase in industry personnel registered for Masters and Doctoral programmes</li> </ul>	5 Industry personnels have been registered for M Tech programs.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Increase in industry personnel trained by the institution in knowledge and/or skill areas</li> </ul>	Nil
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Increase in the number of consultancy assignments secured</li> </ul>	There has been 30% increase from 1500 to 2000 consultancy assignments.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Increase in the number of students' and faculty visits to and/or training in industry</li> </ul>	Only a marginal increase in the number of students and faculty visits to Industry
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Improvements in graduate placement rate</li> </ul>	14% increase in the placement rate of graduates from 66% to 80 % during the project period.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Increase in involvement of industry experts in curricula &amp; syllabi improvements, laboratory improvements, evaluation of students and delivering expert lectures</li> </ul>	No perceptible increase observed
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Increase in the number of sandwich programmes between industries and the institution.</li> </ul>	Nil
<b>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</b>	2.5% increase found in the revenue generated from the consultancy work as a percentage of total revenue of the Institute .
<b>G. Increase in the number of publications in refereed journals</b>	During the period of last three years faculty has published 249 papers in referred journals .The percentage increase is about 8%.
<b>H. Increase in the number of patents filed</b>	Two patents filed during the period of TEQIP. Earlier there were none .
<b>OVERALL EVALUATION GRADE FOR 1.2</b>	
USING THE 3-POINT GRADING SCALE AND GRADE DESCRIPTORS IN ANNEX 4(1)	
1	

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

NAME OF PERFORMANCE AUDITOR: Dr B K Sthapak

DATES OF PERFORMANCE AUDIT: 1,2 and 3 Aug 2016

NAME OF INSTITUTION WITH LOCATION: S G I T S Indore

**1.2.1 ESTABLISHING CENTRES OF EXCELLENCE**

<b>MONITORING AND PROJECT OUTPUT/OUTCOME PARAMETERS</b>	<b>SUPPORTING EVIDENCE</b> (NOTE: GRADES MUST BE SUPPORTED BY SOUND EVIDENCE OF ACHIEVEMENT OF THE INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL GOALS AND TARGETS)	
<b>A. Establishing Centres of Excellence</b> Improvement in Research and Development facilities through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Establishment of new laboratories for applicable thematic research</li> </ul>	Not Applicable	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Establishment of a knowledge resource centre (library) in the thematic area</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Procurement of furniture</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Civil works</li> </ul>		
		<p align="center"><b>OVERALL EVALUATION GRADE FOR 1.2.1</b>    <b>–</b></p> <p align="center">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:

DATES OF PERFORMANCE AUDIT:

NAME OF INSTITUTION WITH LOCATION:

**1.3: FACULTY DEVELOPMENT FOR EFFECTIVE TEACHING (PEDAGOGICAL TRAINING)**

<b>MONITORING AND PROJECT OUTPUT/OUTCOME PARAMENTERS</b>	<b>SUPPORTING EVIDENCE</b> (NOTE: GRADES MUST BE SUPPORTED BY SOUND EVIDENCE OF ACHIEVEMENT OF THE INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL GOALS AND TARGETS)
<b>A. Effort made by Institutions providing Pedagogy Training to faculty, including:</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Percentage of faculty who have benefitted from the core and advanced modules of pedagogy training</li> </ul>	Nil
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improvements in (and/or updating, and more relevant) curricula and /or syllabi</li> </ul>	About 10% of the syllabi are up dated every year.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improvements in (and/or updating, more relevant) course assessment methods</li> </ul>	Some improvements have been made in the assessment methods such as presentations in the form of seminar, class room quiz test etc
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improvements in teaching and learning methods, including provision for students needing extra/remedial support</li> </ul>	Remidial classes are arranged for week students.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Percentage of faculty with UG qualification registered/deputed for improving their qualification (<i>see Section-3, 4(b) on page 20 of PIP</i>)</li> </ul>	All the teachers in the Institute are having PG qualifications.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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>)</li> </ul>	97 teachers have been deputed for domain training during the Project period amounting to about 45% of the faculty on role .However,the reports are not seen on their web site.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Progress in securing accreditation of eligible UG &amp; PG programs (<i>institutions to achieve target of 60% of eligible UG &amp; PG programmes accredited - appliedfor within 2 years of joining the Project</i>)</li> </ul>	Out of the total 10 UG programs 5 have been accredited.Application for 4 more programs submitted. Out of 14 PG programs, 5 have been accredited.
<b>B. Effectiveness of Pedagogy Training, including</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Percentage of students satisfied with the quality of teachers and changes/developments specifically undertaken as a result of student evaluations</li> </ul>	About 70%of the students seem to be satisfied with the quality of teachers .

**OVERALL EVALUATION GRADE FOR 1.3**

**2**

USING THE 3-POINT GRADING SCALE AND GRADE DESCRIPTORS IN ANNEX 4(1)



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

NAME OF PERFORMANCE AUDITOR: Dr B K Sthapak

DATES OF PERFORMANCE AUDIT:1 ,2 and 3 Aug 2016

**2.1: CAPACITY BUILDING TO STRENGTHEN MANAGEMENT**

<b>MONITORING AND PROJECT OUTPUT/OUTCOME PARAMETERS</b>	<b>SUPPORTING EVIDENCE</b> (NOTE: GRADES MUST BE SUPPORTED BY SOUND EVIDENCE OF ACHIEVEMENT OF THE INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL GOALS AND TARGETS)
<b>A. Implementation of academic and non-academic reforms, including:</b>	Good
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Improved understanding of the need and ways for increased autonomy, and new instruments for accountability</li> </ul>	Autonomy has been well understood and being practiced.Accountability is displayed through interaction with all stake holders.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Modernization and decentralisation of administration and financial management</li> </ul>	`MIS is being practiced.The administration is fairly decentralized.Financial management is done in atrnsparent manner.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Extent of delegation of administrative and financial decision making powers to senior functionaries</li> </ul>	There is delegation powers to Heads of Departments .
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Responsiveness to stakeholders (students, faculty, staff, industry, local communities)</li> </ul>	Good responsiveness amongst all categories of staff
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Institutional quality assurance and enhancement strategies, including student feedback mechanisms</li> </ul>	Quality assurance strategies are fairly laid out
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Maintenance of academic and non-academic infrastructure and facilities, including sufficiency and quality of academic buildings</li> </ul>	Sufficient infrastructure has been created including buildings ,furniture and amenities to the students .
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Development, maintain and utilisation of institutional resources</li> </ul>	All the resources available are being utilized
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Generation, retention and utilization of Income Revenue Generation.</li> </ul>	<b>About Rs 137 lacs generated as IRG through consultancies during the Project period has been appropriately utilized.</b>
<b>OVERALL EVALUATION GRADE FOR 2.1</b>	
USING THE 3-POINT GRADING SCALE AND GRADE DESCRIPTORS IN ANNEX 4(1)	
<b>1</b>	

**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 PARAMENTERS	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"> <li>• <b>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?</b> <i>(Give dates of governing body meetings where the minutes record these matters having been discussed, approved and/or followed up.)</i></li> </ul>	116 th Governing Body meeting was held on 15-5-2013 117 th Governing Body meeting was held on 17-9 -2013 118 th Governing Body meeting was held on 30-5-2014 119 th Governing Body meeting was held on 25-4-2015 120 th governing Body meeting was held in Nov 2015 and last meeting in May 2016. The minutes of these meetings show the approval of vision, misson and plans chalked out by the relevant committees.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Has the Governing Body ensured the establishment and monitoring of proper, effective and efficient systems of control and accountability to ensure financial sustainability?</b> <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></li> </ul>	Yes The dates are same as above mentioned.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Is the Governing Body monitoring institutional performance and quality assurance arrangements?</b> <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></li> </ul>	Yes The dates are same as above mentioned.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Has the Governing Body put in place suitable arrangements for monitoring the head of the institution’s performance?</b> <i>(Give dates of governing body meetings where the minutes record these matters having been discussed, approved and/or followed up.)</i></li> </ul>	Yes The dates are same as above mentioned.	

**EVALUATION GRADE FOR PRIMARY ACCOUNTABILITIES**

**1**

USING THE 3-POINT GRADING SCALE AND GRADE DESCRIPTORS IN ANNEX 4(1) FOR ALL GOVERNANCE SECTIONS

<b>B. OPENNESS &amp; TRANSPARANCY IN THE OPERATION OF GOVERNING BODIES</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Does the Governing Body publish an annual report on institutional performance?</b> <i>(Give the publication date and type of publication of the most recent annual report, if there is one)</i></li> </ul>	No
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Does the Governing Body maintain, and publicly disclose, a register of interests of members of its governing body?</b> <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></li> </ul>	No
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>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?</b> <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></li> </ul>	Usually two to three meetings of the Governing Body are held during a year.No evidence of dissemination of information by the Governing Body has been found.
<b>GRADE FOR OPENNESS &amp; TRANSPARENCY IN THE OPERATION OF GOVERNING BODIES</b>	
<b>2</b>	
<b>C. KEY ATTRIBUTES OF GOVERNING BODIES</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>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?</b> <i>(Specify the range of skills and experience that the members of the governing body, and especially the external members, have)</i></li> </ul>	The Governing Body consists of 17 members including the Chairman who happens to be the Minister of Dept of Education Govt of Madhya Pradesh.The members of the Body are representatives from UGC, AICTE, State Govt, Judiciary and Public life.The Governing Body carry out its primary accountability effectively.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Are the recruitment processes and procedures for governing body members rigorous and transparent?</b> <i>(Specify how governing body members are selected, and whether that process is transparent)</i></li> </ul>	The Members of the Governing Body are appointed as per the constitution of the Institution.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>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?</b> <i>(Give examples, where possible, of the role of external members in improving the performance of the institution)</i></li> </ul>	It seems that by and large the Institution is free from direct political interference.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Are the role and responsibilities of the Chair of the institution and the Member Secretary serving the governing body clearly stated?</b></li> </ul>	No evidence provided.

<i>(If yes, specify the document where these roles are defined)</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the Governing Body meet regularly? Is there clear evidence that members of the governing body attend regularly and participate actively? <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></li> </ul>	Yes. Three meetings have been held during the year 2015. The average number of members present in a meeting range from 50 % to 55%.
<b>GRADE FOR KEY ATTRIBUTES OF GOVERNING BODIES</b>	
<b>2</b>	
<b>D. EFFECTIVENESS AND PERFORMANCE REVIEW OF GOVERNING BODIES</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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? <i>(If yes, give the date(s) of governing body meetings where the minutes show that such a review has been discussed)</i></li> </ul>	No evidence found.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the Governing Body ensure that new members are properly inducted, and existing members receive opportunities for further development as deemed necessary? <i>(If yes, give examples of how these two tasks are carried out)</i></li> </ul>	Yes .
<b>GRADE FOR EFFECTIVENESS AND PERFORMANCE REVIEW OF GOVERNING BODIES</b>	
<b>E. REGULATORY COMPLIANCE</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the Governing ensure regulatory compliance* and, subject to this, take all final decisions on fundamental matters of the institution. <i>(If yes, give the date(s) of governing body meetings where the minutes show that regulatory compliance has been discussed)</i></li> </ul>	The governance of the Institution is as per the regulatory compliance. No evidences were made available.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the regulatory compliance include demonstrating compliance with the 'not-for-profit' purpose of education institutions? <i>(If yes, give evidence that the governing body has been directly involved)</i></li> </ul>	Yes. However no evidences were provided.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has there been accreditation and/or external quality assurance by a national or professional body? If so, give name, current status of accreditation etc <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></li> </ul>	Yes . 5 out of 9 UG courses are accredited. They are as follows: Civil Engineering Electrical Engineering Mechanical Engineering Electronics & Telecommunication Electronics & Instrumentation There are 12 PG courses running . Out of these 5 are accredited . They are as follows: Structural Engineering

	Optro Electronics Electronics & Telecommunication Electrical Engineering-Power Electronics Mechanical Engineering-Tribology&Maintainance Engineering
--	---

	<b>GRADE FOR REGULATORY COMPLIANCE</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>OVERALL EVALUATION GRADE FOR GOVERNANCE 2.1.1 A-E</b>		<b>2</b>
USING THE 3-POINT GRADING SCALE AND GRADE DESCRIPTORS IN ANNEX 4(1)		

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

NAME OF PERFORMANCE AUDITOR: Dr B K Sthapak

DATES OF PERFORMANCE AUDIT: 1, 2 and 3 Aug 2016

NAME OF INSTITUTION WITH LOCATION: S G I T S Indore

**TABLE 2.2: PROJECT MANAGEMENT, MONITORING AND EVALUATION**

<b>MONITORING AND PROJECT OUTPUT/OUTCOME PARAMENTERS</b>	<b>SUPPORTING EVIDENCE</b> (NOTE: GRADES MUST BE SUPPORTED BY SOUND EVIDENCE OF ACHIEVEMENT OF THE INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL GOALS AND TARGETS)
<p><b>A. Effectiveness of mentoring, reviews, surveys and audits conducted, including:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Increase in the achievement of the institutions goals and targets set out in the Institutional Development Proposal</li> </ul>	<p>The Institute has substantially achieved its targets set out in the Institutional Development Plan. The audits are conducted at regularly every year.</p>
<p><b>B. Effective project management and monitoring, including:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Precise and reliable information/ data through web based MIS available to stakeholders at all time</li> </ul>	<p>No evidences provided.</p>
<p><b>C. Effectiveness of faculty evaluation by students, including:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Percentage/ increase in percentage of faculty evaluated by students in one or more subjects</li> <li>▪ Are results of evaluation properly used for teacher improvement?</li> </ul> <p><b>If yes, is the procedure adopted for teacher improvement including counseling appropriate and effective?</b></p>	<p>The performance of faculty is evaluated by students having not less than 75% attendance in the class. The evaluation is done in all the subjects taught. The result of evaluation are communicated to the faculty. The evaluation seems to be effective.</p>
<p><b>OVERALL EVALUATION GRADE FOR 2.2</b>     <b>2</b></p> <p>USING THE 3-POINT GRADING SCALE AND GRADE DESCRIPTORS IN ANNEX 4(1)</p>	

