PERFORMANCE AUDIT FORMS

INSTITUTIONALPERFORMANCE PROFILE

AUDIT VISIT NUMBER: 1   2   3   4
(Circle number of the visit, as appropriate)

NAME OF PERFORMANCE AUDITOR: **Prof. RAVANDE KISHORE**

DATES OF PERFORMANCE AUDIT: **13-15 March 2014**

NAME OF INSTITUTION WITH LOCATION: **Government College of Engineering, Bargur, T.N.**

PIP REF	INSTITUTIONAL PERFORMANCE PROFILE	OVERALL EVALUATION GRADES
COMPONENT 1: IMPROVING THE QUALITY OF EDUCATION IN SELECTED INSTITUTIONS		
1.1	STRENGTHENING INSTITUTIONS TO IMPROVE LEARNING OUTCOMES AND EMPLOYABILITY OF GRADUATES	**2**
1.2	SCALING-UP POSTGRADUATE EDUCATION AND DEMAND-DRIVEN RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT AND INNOVATION	**NA**
1.2.1	ESTABLISHING CENTRES OF EXCELLENCE	**NA**
1.3	FACULTY DEVELOPMENT FOR EFFECTIVE TEACHING (PEDAGOGICAL TRAINING)	**2**
COMPONENT 2: IMPROVING SYSTEM MANAGEMENT		
2.1	CAPACITY BUILDING TO STRENGTHEN MANAGEMENT	**2**
2.1.1	IMPLEMENTATION OF GOOD GOVERNANCE	**1**
2.2	PROJECT MANAGEMENT, MONITORING AND EVALUATION	**1**

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

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

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

NAME OF PERFORMANCE AUDITOR: **Prof. RAVANDE KISHORE**

DATES OF PERFORMANCE AUDIT: **13-15 March 2014**

NAME OF INSTITUTION WITH LOCATION: **Government College of Engineering, Bargur, T.N.**

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

MONITORING AND PROJECT OUTPUT/OUTCOME PARAMENTERS	SUPPORTING EVIDENCE (NOTE: GRADES MUST BE SUPPORTED BY SOUND EVIDENCE OF ACHIEVEMENT OF THE INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL GOALS AND TARGETS)
A. **Effectiveness of funds utilized for the teaching, training, learning and research equipment, library, computers, etc. by Institutions, including:** ▪ Increase in the satisfaction index of student and faculty	➢ *QEEE Classes attended by ECE, CSE& MECH., Students* ➢ *LCD Projectors provided in classrooms for demonstrating NPTEL materials and PPT of regular subjects.* ➢ *EDUSAT Facility (provided by ANNA UNIVERSITY)in Library providing online lectures for ECE, EEE, MECH & CSE students.* ➢ *N. of Computers increased in all Branches. (40 Nos.)* ➢ *Conducted ACADEMIC SUPPORT CLASSES for all Students.* ➢ *Conducted Various Technical Training Programs in Subject related areas in all branches.* ➢ *Conducted Various Placement oriented Training in New areas like PLC training, Renasses Microcontrollers, RC aircraft, Remote Infrastructure management Systems, Communication skills, Personality Development.* ➢ *Conducted GATE coaching classes for all branches* ➢ **Students final year projects in association with industry (TITAN Industry, BHEL, SAIL, Rajnikant Foundation, M/s & Motorola, Renasses Micro controllers, Remote infra structure Management Systems)** ➢ **Student won prizes in project contest.**
B. **Obtaining Academic Autonomy status, including:** ▪ **Number of institutions that have obtained '*Autonomous Institution status*' as per University Grants Commission process** within 2 years of joining the Project, or	Applied for academic autonomy

•	Effectiveness of utilization of academic autonomy possessed/ obtained (S*ee Table-26 in PIP*)	Applied for academic autonomy
C.	**Effort made by Institutions for upgrading qualifications of faculty members, including:** • Percentage of faculty enrolled in M.Tech and Ph.D	➢ *Completed Ph.D – 3/36 (8.33%)* ➢ *Ongoing Ph.D-7/36(19.44%)* ➢ *Registered for PhD – 3/36(8.33%) – Jan' 2014* ➢ *Applied for enrolment in PhD – 9/36 (18.0%) – Feb 2014*

D. Existing teaching and staff vacancies and effort made by Institutions for filling the vacancies, including:
- Percentage of faculty and staff positions filled and vacant

(a) FACULTY Strength (As on date)

Sl.No	Branch	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor
1.	Mech	Nil	Nil	7
2.	EEE	1	NIL	6
3.	ECE	1	1	7
4.	CSE	Nil	Nil	6
5.	S&H	Nil	Nil	7

Sanctioned Faculty strength = 52
Filled Post = 36
Faculty filled percentage = 36/52 *100 = 69.23%
Faculty vacant percentage = 100-69.23= 30.76%

(a) STAFF Strength (As on date)

Sl.No	Branch	Sanctioned post	Filled post
1.	Lab assistant	6	6
2.	Electrician	1	Nil
3.	Electrical Mastery	1	Nil
4.	Instrument Mechanic	1	Nil

Sanctioned staff strength = 09
Filled Post = 06
Staff filled percentage = 6/9 *100 = 66.66%
Staff vacant percentage = 100-66.66= 33.33%

•	Increase in faculty appointed on regular basis	Proposal sent for approval of additional faculty

E. Effectiveness of equity at Institutional level, including:
- Transition rate of students from the First to the Second year in Undergraduate programmes

Transition Rate(for FIRST YEAR only)

Branch	Overall Transition Rate	
	Dec 2012	Dec 2013
Mech	39.66	41.38
EEE	69.49	69.61
ECE	81.81	82.22
CSE	70.9	71.5

OVERALL EVALUATION GRADE FOR 1.1 USING THE 3-POINT GRADING SCALE AND GRADE DESCRIPTORS IN ANNEX 4(1)	**2**

PERFORMANCE AUDIT FORM (1.2)

COMPONENT 1: IMPROVING QUALITY OF EDUCATION IN SELECTED INSTITUTIONS

NAME OF PERFORMANCE AUDITOR: **Prof. RAVANDE KISHORE**

DATES OF PERFORMANCE AUDIT: **13-15 March 2014**

NAME OF INSTITUTION WITH LOCATION: **Government College of Engineering, Bargur, T.N.**

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

MONITORING AND PROJECT OUTPUT/OUTCOME PARAMENTERS	SUPPORTING EVIDENCE (NOTE: GRADES MUST BE SUPPORTED BY SOUND EVIDENCE OF ACHIEVEMENT OF THE INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL GOALS AND TARGETS)
A. **Effectiveness of funds utilised for the teaching, training, learning and research equipment, library, computers, etc. by the institutions, including:** ▪ Increase in the satisfaction index of student and faculty	
B. **Effectiveness of scaling-up Postgraduate Technical Education, including:** ▪ Increased enrolment for MTech and PhD	
▪ Establishment of proposed laboratories	
▪ Cumulative number of assistantships granted	
C. **Progress/achievement in starting new Postgraduate programmes, including:** ▪ Securing AICTE approval	
▪ Establishment of laboratories	
▪ Adequacy of student enrolments	NOT APPLICABLE
D. **Effectiveness of collaborations made with other Institutions in India and abroad, including** • Increase in number of co-authored publications in refereed journals	
E. **Increased collaboration with industry in research and development, including:** ▪ 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	NOT APPLICABLE
▪ 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**	

OVERALL EVALUATION GRADE FOR 1.2 USING THE 3-POINT GRADING SCALE AND GRADE DESCRIPTORS IN ANNEX 4(1)	**NA**

PERFORMANCE AUDIT FORM (1.2.1)

COMPONENT 1: IMPROVING QUALITY OF EDUCATION IN SELECTED INSTITUTIONS

NAME OF PERFORMANCE AUDITOR: **Prof. RAVANDE KISHORE**

DATES OF PERFORMANCE AUDIT: **13-15 March 2014**

NAME OF INSTITUTION WITH LOCATION: **Government College of Engineering, Bargur, T.N.**

1.2.1 ESTABLISHING CENTRES OF EXCELLENCE(NOT APPLICABLE)

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. Establishing Centres of Excellence Improvement in Research and Development facilities through: ▪ Establishment of new laboratories for applicable thematic research ▪ Establishment of a knowledge resource centre (library) in the thematic area ▪ Procurement of furniture ▪ Civil works	NOT APPLICABLE
OVERALL EVALUATION GRADE FOR 1.2.1 USING THE 3-POINT GRADING SCALE AND GRADE DESCRIPTORS IN ANNEX 4(1)	**NA**

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

NAME OF PERFORMANCE AUDITOR: **Prof. RAVANDE KISHORE**

DATES OF PERFORMANCE AUDIT: **13-15 March 2014**

NAME OF INSTITUTION WITH LOCATION: **Government College of Engineering, Bargur, T.N.**

1.3: FACULTY DEVELOPMENT FOR EFFECTIVE TEACHING (PEDAGOGICAL TRAINING)

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. **Effort made by Institutions providing Pedagogy Training to faculty, including:**	
• Percentage of faculty who have benefitted from the core and advanced modules of pedagogy training	• Core module 4/26 (15.38%) Evidence (IIT Pedagogical training certificates) • Other 22 faculty attended pedagogy courses conducted by ISTE, NIT-Trichy
• Improvements in (and/or updating, and more relevant) curricula and /or syllabi	Awaiting for Autonomous status.
• Improvements in (and/or updating, more relevant) course assessment methods	Three tests conducted per semester. No change, Awaiting for grant of Autonomous status.

• Improvements in teaching and learning methods, including provision for students needing extra/remedial support	• NPTEL Video courses streamed in classes
	 • Academic support for weak students is given:
	 QEEE courses from IIT streamed, Anna University EDUSAT- Live video lectures streamed
	  Faculty training in Domain field
	  Faculty training in Pedagogical aspect.

• Percentage of faculty with UG qualification registered/deputed for improving their qualification (*see Section-3, 4(b) on page 20 of PIP*)	Nil
• 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*)	100 % (FDP certificates)
• Progress in securing accreditation of eligible UG & PG programs *(institutions to achieve target of 60% of eligible UG & PG programmes accredited - appliedfor within 2 years of joining the Project)*	Applied for NBA accreditation. Fees paid. Awaiting for NBA Team visit
B. **Effectiveness of Pedagogy Training, including**	
• Percentage of students satisfied with the quality of teachers and changes/developments specifically undertaken as a result of student evaluations	90 % Feedback obtained from students and evaluated report is given back to faculty. Improvement in teaching performance is evidenced by latest student feedback.
OVERALL EVALUATION GRADE FOR 1.3 USING THE 3-POINT GRADING SCALE AND GRADE DESCRIPTORS IN ANNEX 4(1)	**2**

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

NAME OF PERFORMANCE AUDITOR: **Prof. RAVANDE KISHORE**

DATES OF PERFORMANCE AUDIT: **13-15 March 2014**

NAME OF INSTITUTION WITH LOCATION: **Government College of Engineering, Bargur, T.N.**

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:	
▪ Improved understanding of the need and ways for increased autonomy, and new instruments for accountability	Academic autonomy will help to change the Curriculum based on the industry needs. (Applied for academic autonomy) Faculty are accountable to feed back
▪ Modernization and decentralisation of administration and financial management	Administration -Financial Management: Power to sanction/approve State Government Norms: (a) Rs: 2, 00,000/- Maintenance (b) Rs: 50,000/- (For funding state allotted funds) TEQIP – II: (C) Rs: 10, 00,000/-
▪ Extent of delegation of administrative and financial decision making powers to senior functionaries	HOD Control the faculty and staff of his/her Department in Sanction of leave, OD, recommending the faculty and staff for training and doing Ph.D etc.,
▪ Responsiveness to stakeholders (students, faculty, staff, industry, local communities)	All faculty member will be made to involve in the academic reforms after getting academic autonomy
▪ Institutional quality assurance and enhancement strategies, including student feedback mechanisms	Feed back offered from students Faculty Publication in international refereed journals Action taken reports in BOG meetings.
▪ Maintenance of academic and non-academic infrastructure and facilities, including sufficiency and quality of academic buildings	Regular Maintenance of building is done PWD (PWD file)
▪ Development, maintain and utilisation of institutional resources	Additional equipment are procured under TEQIP - II Utilized in Student project,FDP,Faculty Research
▪ Generation, retention and utilization of Income Revenue Generation.	IRG generated: 1, 37,850 /- Retained: 60 percent 40 percent paid to faculty
OVERALL EVALUATION GRADE FOR 2.1 USING THE 3-POINT GRADING SCALE AND GRADE DESCRIPTORS IN ANNEX 4(1)	**2**

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**
• **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.)*	Before starting the project SWOT analysis was conducted with Student, Faculty members, HOD and Principal. Based on the SWOT analysis draft institutional development plan was finalized. Draft IDP was placed in BoG and got improved and finalized in 2012-13. (First BOG meeting on 3/4/2012) For 2013-14 again IDP was revised in BoG and got approved in BoG. (4ᵗʰ BOG meeting on 14/05/2013) State budget, TEQIP procurement, Faculty and staff training activities and all other academic activities are planned and placed before BoG for discussion and got approved.(3ʳᵈ BOG on 6/3/13, 4ᵗʰ BOG on 14/5/2013 & 7ᵗʰ BOG on 30/12/2013)	
• **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.)*	Yes. All the subcommittee decisions are placed in BoG for approval and process.(Sub-committee meeting held on 22/2/2013) The activities of institution are monitored by the BoG; on every BoG meeting an action taken report is placed based on the previous minutes.	
▪ **Is the Governing Body monitoring institutional performance and quality assurance arrangements?**	BoG is informed in each meeting about;	

(Give dates of governing body meetings where the minutes record these matters having been discussed, approved and/or followed up at the systems level.)	1. Academic Results and transition rate.(6th BOG on 18/10/2013 & 8th BOG on 15/3/2014) 2. External funding obtained from other research agencies. (6th BOG on 18/10/2013) 3. Testing and consultancy services and IRG generated. (7th BOG on 30/12/2013) 4. Training programmes for faculty, technical staff, and students. (4th BOG on 14/05/2013 , 6th BOG on 18/10/2013 & 7th BOG on 18/10/13) 5. Industry need based training for students and industry projects taken by the students. 6. Comparing the output with top institutions based on Anna University results in each semester. 7. Adopting the best practice in the leading institutions. 8. In every BoG meeting, action taken report placed based on previous BoG meeting minutes. 9. Mentor's report & Performance Auditor's report is placed in BoG. SPFU review report approved by Commissioner of technical education is placed in BoG (7th BOG on 18/10/13)
▪ **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.)*	Yes. Monitoring is based on completion of BoG agenda. Mentor's report on the performance of Head of Institution is given to BoG chairman after every visit. BoG Chairman will record the action taken report of the previous BoG minutes in every meeting.

EVALUATION GRADE FOR PRIMARY ACCOUNTABILITIES _{USING THE 3-POINT GRADING SCALE AND GRADE DESCRIPTORS IN ANNEX 4(1) FOR ALL GOVERNNANCE SECTIONS}	**1**

B.	OPENNESS & TRANSPARANCY IN THE OPERATION OF GOVERNING BODIES	
• **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)*	Yes. One year report is published for 2012-13. Annual report for 2013-14 is being prepared and will be placed in next BoG.	
• **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)*	Yes. Every time members are asked to record opinion about the action taken report in BoG and the conduct of BoG.	
▪ **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?** *(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)*	Yes. After the meeting the minutes of the meeting is circulated to the Departments and the same is published on the web site.	
	GRADE FOR OPENNESS & TRANSPARENCY IN THE OPERATION OF GOVERNING BODIES	**1**
C.	KEY ATTRIBUTES OF GOVERNING BODIES	
▪ **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)*	Yes. BoG is constituted as per NPIU guidelines and approved by State Government. BoG Chairman has evaluated the expertise and competencies of BoG members	
▪ **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 does not have any member with political influence and its constitution is based on NPIU guidelines. The appointment of BoG member and Chairman is transparent. BoG consists of industry persons and senior academicians only.	
▪ **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)*	Yes, Institution is free from any direct political influence/interference and is focussing on long term educational objectives to ensure academic freedom.	

▪ **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)*	Yes
▪ **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)	The project started in July 2012 and till Dec-2013, **7** times BoG meetings were conducted and the minutes of the meeting are published on the Institution web site

GRADE FOR KEY ATTRIBUTES OF GOVERNING BODIES	**1**

D.	**EFFECTIVENESS AND PERFORMANCE REVIEW OF GOVERNING BODIES**	
	▪ **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 project started in July 2012 and till Dec-2013, **7** times BoG meetings were conducted and the minutes of the meeting are published on the Institution web site
	▪ **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)*	Being Govt. institution, academic members from the college get transferred. New members are appointed replacing the transferred faculty members in the immediate next BoG meetings itself. The appointments of new BoG members are subjected to the approval of the committee.

GRADE FOR EFFECTIVENESS AND PERFORMANCE REVIEW OF GOVERNING BODIES	**1**

E.	**REGULATORY COMPLIANCE**	
	▪ **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)*	Yes. Based on TEQIP guidelines – PIP and State Govt. Policy
	▪ **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. As per State Govt. Policy
	▪ **Has there been accreditation and/or external quality assurance by a national or professional body? If so, give name, current status of accreditation etc**	Already applied for NBA Accreditation and expecting the visit of Accreditation team within two months time.

(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)		
	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: **Prof. RAVANDE KISHORE**

DATES OF PERFORMANCE AUDIT: **13-15 March 2014**

NAME OF INSTITUTION WITH LOCATION: **Government College of Engineering, Bargur, T.N.**

TABLE 2.2: PROJECT MANAGEMENT, MONITORING AND EVALUATION

MONITORING AND PROJECT OUTPUT/OUTCOME PARAMENTERS	SUPPORTING EVIDENCE (NOTE: GRADES MUST BE SUPPORTED BY SOUND EVIDENCE OF ACHIEVEMENT OF THE INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL GOALS AND TARGETS)
A. **Effectiveness of mentoring, reviews, surveys and audits conducted, including:** ▪ Increase in the achievement of the institutions goals and targets set out in the Institutional Development Proposal	➢ Training in subject, pedagogy and Management Capacity Enhancement were given to the faculty member and staff as per individual needs and Institutional requirement. ➢ Academic support to weak Student ➢ R&D and Consultancy ➢ Research activities and Research Publications
B. **Effective project management and monitoring, including:** ▪ Precise and reliable information/ data through web based MIS available to stakeholders at all time	Up to 2013- 14 MIS updated
C. **Effectiveness of faculty evaluation by students, including:** ▪ Percentage/ increase in percentage of faculty evaluated by students in one or more subjects ▪ Are results of evaluation properly used for teacher improvement? **If yes, is the procedure adopted for teacher improvement including counseling appropriate and effective?**	100 percentage Yes (Faculty support for pedagogy training and subject domain training)
OVERALL EVALUATION GRADE FOR 2.2 USING THE 3-POINT GRADING SCALE AND GRADE DESCRIPTORS IN ANNEX 4(1)	**1**