

ANNEX 4: PERFORMANCE AUDIT FORM (1)

Institutional Performance Profile

AUDIT VISIT NUMBER

Institutional Performance Profile:

Name of the Performance Auditor:

Name of the Institution with location:

Date of Performance Visit:

Dates of Performance Audit:

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	
1.2	Scaling-up postgraduate education and demand-driven research and development and innovation	
1.2.1	Establishing centres of excellence	
1.3	Faculty development for effective teaching (pedagogical training)	
Component 2: Improving system management		
2.1	Capacity building to strengthen management	
2.1.1	Implementation of good governance	
2.2	Project management, monitoring and evaluation	

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).

ANNEX 4: PERFORMANCE AUDIT FORM (1.1)

COMPONENT 1: IMPROVING QUALITY OF EDUCATION IN SELECTED INSTITUTIONS

Name of Performance Auditor:

Dates of Performance Audit:

Name of Institution with Location:

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 		
B. Obtaining Academic Autonomy status, including: <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) 		
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 		
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 		
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 		
		Evaluation Grade for 1.1 Using the 3-point grading scale and grade descriptors in Annex 4(1)

ANNEX 4: PERFORMANCE AUDIT FORM (1.2)

COMPONENT 1: IMPROVING QUALITY OF EDUCATION IN SELECTED INSTITUTIONS

Name of Performance Auditor:

Dates of Performance Audit:

Name of Institution with Location:

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

MONITORING AND PROJECT OUTPUT/OUTCOME PARAMETERS	SUPPORTING EVIDENCE <small>(Note: Grades must be supported by sound evidence of achievement of the institutional development proposal goals and targets)</small>
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)	

ANNEX 4: PERFORMANCE AUDIT FORM (1.2.1)

COMPONENT 1: IMPROVING QUALITY OF EDUCATION IN SELECTED INSTITUTIONS

Name of Performance Auditor:

Dates of Performance Audit:

Name of Institution with Location:

1.2.1 ESTABLISHING CENTRES OF EXCELLENCE

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. Establishing Centres of Excellence</p> <p>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 • Civil works 	<div style="border-bottom: 1px dotted black; height: 20px;"></div> <div style="border-bottom: 1px dotted black; height: 20px;"></div> <div style="border-bottom: 1px dotted black; height: 20px;"></div> <div style="border-bottom: 1px dotted black; height: 20px;"></div>	
<p>Evaluation Grade for 1.2.1</p> <p>Using the 3-point grading scale and grade descriptors in Annex 4(1)</p>		

ANNEX 4: 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)

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 <i>(see Section-3, 4(b) on page 20 of PIP)</i> 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> Progress in securing accreditation of eligible UG & PG programmes <i>(institutions to achieve target of 60% of eligible UG & PG programmes accredited - applied for within 2 years of joining the Project)</i> 		
<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>Evaluation Grade for 1.3 Using The 3-Point Grading Scale and Grade Descriptors in Annex 4(1)</p>

ANNEX 4: PERFORMANCE AUDIT FORM (2.1)

COMPONENT 2: IMPROVING SYSTEM MANAGEMENT

Name of Performance Auditor:

Dates of Performance Audit:

Name of Institution with Location:

2.1: CAPACITY BUILDING TO STRENGTHEN MANAGEMENT

MONITORING AND PROJECT OUTPUT/ OUTCOME PARAMETERS	SUPPORTING EVIDENCE (Note: Grades must be supported by sound evidence of achievement of the institutional development proposal goals and targets)	
<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. 	Empty space for supporting evidence	
<p style="text-align: right;">Evaluation Grade for 2.1</p> <p>Using the 3-point grading scale and grade descriptors in Annex 4(1)</p>		Empty space for evaluation grade

ANNEX 4: 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 <small>(Note: Grades must be supported by sound evidence)</small>	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? <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"> 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> 		
<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> 		
<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> 		
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? <i>(Give the publication date and type of publication of the most recent annual report, if there is one)</i> 		
<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> 		
<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> 		
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? <i>(Specify the range of skills and experience that the members of the governing body, and especially the external members, have)</i> 		
<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> 		
<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"> 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> 		
<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? <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> 		
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? <i>(If yes, give the date(s) of governing body meetings where the minutes show that such a review has been discussed)</i> 		
<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? <i>(If yes, give examples of how these two tasks are carried out)</i> 		
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. <i>(If yes, give the date(s) of governing body meetings where the minutes show that regulatory compliance has been discussed)</i> 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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> 		
<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. <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> 		
Overall Evaluation Grade for Governance 2.1.1 A-E		
Using the 3-point grading scale and grade descriptors in Annex 4(1)		

ANNEX 4: PERFORMANCE AUDIT FORM (2.2)

COMPONENT 2: IMPROVING SYSTEM MANAGEMENT

Name of Performance Auditor:

Dates of Performance Audit:

Name of Institution with Location:

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 		
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 		
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 counseling appropriate and effective?</p>		
Overall Evaluation Grade for 2.2 Using the 3-point grading scale and grade descriptors in Annex 4(1)		

ANNEX 4: (FEEDBACK)

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:

Dates of Performance Audit:

Name of Institution with Location:

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

Key improvements noticed on shortcomings reported during earlier Performance Audits

Brief statements on continuing shortcomings, and reasons

Recommendations for Mentors