Review of Performance Audit Report

Name of the Institution	:	MITS Chittoor, AP			Sub-component	:	
Name of Performance Auditor of the institution		:	PROF. ROHIT Y SHARMA				
Name of Data Auditor of the institution		:	na				

CRITERIA	Rating (A, B, or C)	Comments to assist NPIU in handling the report. [1]
i. Completeness	A	Yes
ii. Consistency and relevance	A	Acceptable
iii. Details and specificity	A	Yes
iv. Meticulousness	B	No
v. Feedback clarity	A	Yes
Overall rating for the report	A	

---

[1] The Evaluators should indicate changes needed to be made to the report before it can be sent back to the institution. For good reports (rated 'A'), these can be sent to the institution formally as a completed report. For average reports (rated 'B'), the evaluators should provide guidance on what needs to be done: such as providing more evidence in particular sections, clarifying some points, or some quick editing of the report. For poor reports (rated 'C'), the performance auditor may need to substantially revise the report, or, if too much time has passed, conduct the audit visit again and write the report.

PERFORMANCE AUDIT FORMS (FINAL ROUND under TEQIP-II)

INSTITUTIONALPERFORMANCE PROFILE

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

DATES OF PERFORMANCE AUDIT: 31st August – 3rd September, 2016

NAME OF INSTITUTION WITH LOCATION: MITS, Chittoor, AP

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	3
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: 31st August – 3rd September, 2016

NAME OF INSTITUTION WITH LOCATION: MITS, Chittoor, AP

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	So far 538.59 lakhs are spent, which is 99% of funds received. For Faculty & Staff Development (FSD) 133.15 lakhs are spent. Beneficiaries about 1200 faculty with multiple participation in training programs, subject domain, pedagogy trainings, seminars, workshops, continuing education programs etc. the technical staff also have been trained under different areas. An amount of 80 lakhs is spent on library which includes E-Journals, E-Books, and Text books .All these resources are available to the students & faculty which resulted in the increase of their satisfaction and an enormous increase in the usage
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	Autonomous Obtained on 19.06.2014 (File no:22-1/2014/AC) by the UGC for a period of 6 years.

	▪ 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:** ▪ Percentage of faculty enrolled in MTech and PhD	In order to enhance the qualification of faculty members who have registered for Ph.D, their registration fee is paid. They are sent to different FSD programs, which would be helpful in their research work.
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	The percentage of faculty & staff positions filled by 100%. Faculty positions are filled by rolling advertisements in press and also through the website.
	▪ Increase in faculty appointed on regular basis	• All faculty appointed on regular basis only.
E.	**Effectiveness of equity at Institutional level, including:** ▪ Transition rate of students from the First to the Second year in Undergraduate programmes	• **The transition rate at institutional has increased by 10%.**
	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: **Rohit Y Sharma**

DATES OF PERFORMANCE AUDIT: 31st August – 3rd September, 2016

NAME OF INSTITUTION WITH LOCATION: MITS, Chittoor, AP

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	Funds have been utilized for the teaching, training, learning and research equipment, library, computers, etc., very effectively. There is a marked improvement in labs & Teaching. Faculty &students are satisfied with progress of institution. •
B. **Effectiveness of scaling-up Postgraduate Technical Education, including:** ▪ Increased enrolment for MTech and PhD	• There is an increase in enrollment of Ph.D. but enrollment of PG programmes has been declined over the past two years. But essential concerted effort has been made at different level in the institution to improve the enrollment in PG programmes.
▪ Establishment of proposed laboratories	▪ All the proposed laboratories have been established.
▪ Cumulative number of assistantships granted	▪ There are 54 assistantships granted.

C. Progress/achievement in <u>starting new Postgraduate</u>programmes, including: ■ Securing AICTE approval	■ As per the IDP, Mechanical Engineering Department introduced Machine Design (MD) from the academic year 2011-12.
■ Establishment of laboratories	■ In the academic year 2012-13 two new programmes has been introduced i) Advanced Manufacturing Systems (AMS) under department of Mechanical Engineering ii) Micro Nano Electronics (MNE) under department of Electronic Communication Engineering. In the academic year 2014-15 two new programmes have been introduced i)Solar Power Systems(SPS) under department of Electrical & Electronics Engineering. ii) VLSI & Embedded Systems under department of Electronic Communication Engineering.
■ Adequacy of student enrolments	■ Enrollment of PG programmes has declined, but sincere effort has been made to improve enrollment in PG.
D. Effectiveness of collaborations made with other Institutions in India and abroad, including • Increase in number of co-authored publications in refereed journals	To collaborate with other institutes in India & abroad, institute need to take permission from affiliated university. But institute making effort for networking with other institution in India & abroad. • There is an improvement in the number of co-authored publications in refereed journals. The faculty members have been invited to improve the networking with R&D labs,IITs,NITs,IISC etc., to identify research areas of collaborations. The Dean R&D looking after all these activities.
E. Increased collaboration with industry in research and development, including: • Increase in number of joint and industry sponsored research and development work undertaken	• There is a Dean-IIIC appointed to looking after the industry interaction activities. • There is one industry sponsored research project and many are in process.

• Increase in financial contribution by industry for R & D	• Effort has been made to get industry sponsored consultancy by R&D.
• Increase in industry personnel registered for Masters and Doctoral programmes	• None
• Increase in industry personnel trained by the institution in knowledge and/or skill areas	• Institution conducting many industry related workshops, some industry people are also attending the workshops.
• Increase in the number of consultancy assignments secured	• There is one consultancy assignment gained by MITS worth of 2.5 lakhs title: up gradation of automatic identification system(ais) for Indian navy
• Increase in the number of students' and faculty visits to and/or training in industry	• There is a marked improvement in number of visits to industry by students & Faculty.
• Improvements in graduate placement rate	• Graduate placement rate is improved
• Increase in involvement of industry experts in curricula & syllabi improvements, laboratory improvements, evaluation of students and delivering expert lectures	• As per the guidelines of the UGC, the industry experts are included in BoS meetings in each department. The industry expert attended BoS meeting and suggested improvements in syllabus, laboratories etc.there is an enormous increase in industry experts lectures.
• Increase in the number of sandwich programmes between industries and the institution.	• None
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	• There are externally funded research projects from different agencies like DST, UGC etc., to the tune of 3 crores.

G.	**Increase in the number of publications in refereed journals**	There is a marked increase in of publications in refereed journals like SCI,Scopus etc.,
H.	**Increase in the number of patents filed**	7 patents have been filed since joining the project
	OVERALL EVALUATION GRADE FOR 1.2 USING THE 3-POINT GRADING SCALE AND GRADE DESCRIPTORS IN ANNEX 4(1)	**3**

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: 31st August – 3rd September, 2016

NAME OF INSTITUTION WITH LOCATION: MITS, Chittoor, AP

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	• NITTR has organized in house pedagogy program for the faculty. These programs have very good impact on faculty in improving the quality of teaching .many faculty attended pedagogical training programs organized in various NITs, IITs etc.,
• Improvements in (and/or updating, and more relevant) curricula and /or syllabi	• A lot of improvement in curricula restructure through autonomy accorded by UGC.
• Improvements in (and/or updating, more relevant) course assessment methods	• Recently MITS got accreditation under Outcome Based Education (OBE).many reforms in course assessments have been made.
• Improvements in teaching and learning methods, including provision for students needing extra/remedial support	• Through academic autonomy lot of development has been made including new courses through involvement of stakeholders ,Content dvelopement,pedagogy training, use of power point, animations,demos,videos ,assignments,quiz,E-learning resources are

	being used for teaching & learning. MOODLE has been put into practice and UGC recommended software URKUND (Anti-Plagiarism) also has been put in use for testing plagiarism when the students submit their assignments through MOODLE. The faculty & students are encouraged to look into Open Courseware materials by MIT, Stanford, NPTEL etc., to improve their teaching & learning. The Weak students are identified based on mid-examinations performance & remedial classes are being conducted for those students. The tough and difficult subjects are also being identified by the respective HoDs by discussing with the respective faculty and the remedial classes are also being conducted for these subjects.
• Percentage of faculty with UG qualification registered/deputed for improving their qualification (*see Section-3, 4(b) on page 20 of PIP*)	• None
• 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*)	• Most of the faculty attended programs in subject domain training, seminars, workshops etc., training impact analysis has been carried out to share their gains with colleagues.

• 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)*

Department	I-Round	II-Round	
Computer Science & Engineering(CSE)	2 years (2013-15) 18-09-13 to 18-09-15	2 years (2016-18) i.e., up to 30-06-18	
Electronics & Communication Engineering (ECE)	2 years (2013-15) 4-2-2014 to 4-2-2016	2 years (2016-18) i.e., up to 30-06-18	
Electrical & Electronics Engineering(EEE)	2 years (2013-15) 18-09-13 to 18-09-15	2 years (2016-18) i.e., up to 30-06-18	
Mechanical	2 years	2 years	

	Engineering(ME)	(2013-15) 18-09-13 to 18-09-15	(2016-18) i.e., up to 30-06-18	
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	• **Every semester student's feedback is being taken twice. From the feedback, majority of the students observed to be satisfied with the quality of the faculty.**			

OVERALL EVALUATION GRADE FOR 1.3   **1**

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: **Rohit Y Sharma**

DATES OF PERFORMANCE AUDIT: 31st August – 3rd September, 2016

NAME OF INSTITUTION WITH LOCATION: MITS, Chittoor, AP

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	▪ After the autonomy, the participation by faculty in implementation has improved and new instruments accountability has improved.
▪ Modernization and decentralisation of administration and financial management	▪ Delegation of decision making powers to senior institutional functionaries with accountability is formed. To implement managerial autonomy, the BoG has formed committees, sub committees and advisory committees. The BoG has delegated suitable academic, financial and administrative powers to various institutional functionaries and committees to streamline the smooth functioning of the institute.
▪ Extent of delegation of administrative and financial decision making powers to senior functionaries	▪ The extent of delegation of financial & administrative powers has been given to some extent, which has been defined in Institutional Governance Guidelines. Refer:- ***http://mits.ac.in/assets/pdf/teqip/Institution%20Governance%201.pdf***

▪ Responsiveness to stakeholders (students, faculty, staff, industry, local communities)	▪ The response from the faculty, students, and staff is very good.
▪ Institutional quality assurance and enhancement strategies, including student feedback mechanisms	▪ The internal quality assurance cell (IQAC) has been established as per UGC guidelines.
▪ Maintenance of academic and non-academic infrastructure and facilities, including sufficiency and quality of academic buildings	▪ There are sufficient quality academic buildings in the institute and all class rooms are equipped with LCD projectors.
▪ Development, maintain and utilisation of institutional resources	• Institutional reforms are constantly upgraded and utilization also is there
▪ Generation, retention and utilization of Income Revenue Generation.	The IRG is being utilized for various purposes.
OVERALL EVALUATION GRADE FOR 2.1 **1** USING THE 3-POINT GRADING SCALE AND GRADE DESCRIPTORS IN ANNEX 4(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 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.)*	The vision of MITS is To Become a globally recognized research and academic institution and thereby contribute to technological and socio-economic development of the nation. The vision, mission and strategic plan is evolved as applicable to engineering. The vision, mission & quality policy is published in institutional web site. The governing body regularly meets, approves and ratifies the decisions taken for the development of the institution. Annual budget is presented in the governing body. The business plan, annual budget are modified based on the views of the members in the governing body.	
• **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*	The proposal for infrastructure, development, Equipment & civil works etc. are placed before the governing body for approval. The preliminary processing of development proposals happens at department level. After approval from approving authority purchase is executed. Controls are exercised through empowered Committees,which are	

record these matters having been discussed, approved and/or followed up at the systems level.)	periodically reported to the Principal for approval and suggestions which he receives from BoG.
- **Is the Governing Body monitoring institutional performance and quality assurance arrangements?** *(Give dates of governing body meetings where the minutes record these matters having been discussed, approved and/or followed up at the systems level.)*	The BoG monitors the institutional performance regularly with respect to finance, results, placements, appointments, compliance etc. The internal quality assurance cell (IQAC) has been established as per UGC guidelines.
- **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.)*	The role and responsibility of the head of the institution is guided by UGC-AICTE guidelines. Performance of the head of the institute is monitored regularly through certain performance measures like admissions, results, and rankings research funds etc. on day-to-day basis and formal annual performance appraisal is conducted.

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)*	MITS publishing annual reports on institutional performance covering academic performance, financial performance, Teacher learning and trainings etc.
• **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)*	MITS is a private unaided institution running within guidelines of UGC & AICTE.A need of separate register of BoG interests is not felt and maintained. However the proposal for monitoring register of interest will be taken up in next BoG meeting.
▪ **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)*	The meeting of the governing body is conducted in an open manner for the benefit of the students, faculty and the general public and the potential employees academically. All discussions of BoG are maintained. Proceedings of the minutes are published on the web site. Pl .Refer:- **http://mits.ac.in/assets/pdf/bog/BOG%20Meetings.pdf**
GRADE FOR OPENNESS & TRANSPARENCY IN THE OPERATION OF GOVERNING BODIES	**2**
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?**	The governing body has been constituted as per the guidelines of the UGC.

(Specify the range of skills and experience that the members of the governing body, and especially the external members, have)	
▪ **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)*	The composition of the BoG is as per UGC guidelines. All recruitment is placed before the Bog, it is thoroughly discuss, approval taken from the BOG and minutes will be recorded.
▪ **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)*	It is clear from the composition of BoG and also from the minutes of BoG meetings that the independent members are proactive and have made many suggestions for improvement of the institutional objectives. The institution is free from the political interference.
▪ **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)*	Roles & responsibilities of the BoG is as per the guidelines of UGC
▪ **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)	Yes, it is also proposed to increase the frequency of the BoG meetings. Total 22 BoG meetings conducted till now.the average number of board members present is 9-10.
	GRADE FOR KEY ATTRIBUTES OF GOVERNING BODIES **2**

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)*	Even though, there is no formal process to regularly review the performance of the Bog, when the deficiencies in the governanceare observed, they will be discussed in the BoG meetings.
▪ **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)*	The new members are briefed by the chairman on their role and responsibility.
GRADE FOR EFFECTIVENESS AND PERFORMANCE REVIEW OF GOVERNING BODIES	
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)*	All regulatory compliances are followed. All required evidences are in place.
▪ **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)*	The budget clearly shows the academy is not-for-profit.

▪ **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)*	The latest accreditation is reaccreditation of NBA for 4 UG programmes. The institution has also applied for NAAC accreditation & visit is expected shortly. We have also applied for PG accreditation in engineering and we are awaiting for visit.

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: 31st August – 3rd September, 2016

NAME OF INSTITUTION WITH LOCATION: MITS, Chittoor, AP

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	Till now three mentoring have been completed. After each mentoring, based on mentor's reports a brainstorming session is conducted with senior functionaries in the institute. And all points are discussed and action taken report is sent to the mentors. There is enormous increase in achievements of institution goals and targets which are being set in the Institutional Development Plan(IDP) Ex I. There is a marked increase in faculty qualification with Ph.D. 　II .increased in research publications in SCI, SCOPUS indexed journals. 　III. Increase in enrollment of full time Ph.D courses.
B. Effective project management and monitoring, including: ▪ Precise and reliable information/ data through web based MIS available to stakeholders at all time	• **Precise and reliable data is being updated on regular basis in MIS. From now onwards it would be available to all stakeholders.**
C. Effectiveness of faculty evaluation by students, including:	Faculty evaluation by students is done twice in a semester .there is a notable improvement in the number of faculty with increased evaluation.

- 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?**	The results are used to award increments & sending them to trainings. The process I s effective.

OVERALL EVALUATION GRADE FOR 2.2 USING THE 3-POINT GRADING SCALE AND GRADE DESCRIPTORS IN ANNEX 4(1)	**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: 31st August – 3rd September, 2016

NAME OF INSTITUTION WITH LOCATION: MITS, Chittoor, AP

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

KEY IMPROVEMENTS NOTICED ON SHORTCOMINGS REPORTED DURING EARLIER PERFORMANCE AUDITS
The drawback with this institute is the PG programmes. The Institute proposed nearly 15 PG programmes and currently less than 50% are running. Many PG programmes have nominal to no students enrolled. This is serious lack of planning as far as PG studies are concerned.

BRIEF STATEMENTS ON CONTINUING SHORTCOMINGS, AND REASONS: Not applicable as this is the closing exercise.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR MENTORS: Not applicable as this is the closing exercise.