



RESTRUCTURING PAPER
ON A
PROPOSED PROJECT RESTRUCTURING
OF
TECHNICAL EDUCATION QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PROJECT III
APPROVED ON JUNE 24, 2016
TO
REPUBLIC OF INDIA

EDUCATION

SOUTH ASIA

Regional Vice President:	Ethel Sennhauser
Country Director:	Junaid Kamal Ahmad
Senior Global Practice Director:	Jaime Saavedra Chanduvi
Practice Manager:	Cristian Aedo
Task Team Leader:	Tara Beteille, Francisco Marmolejo



ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

AICTE	All India Council for Technical Education
ATU	Affiliating Technical University
BoG	Board of Governors
DLI	Disbursement Linked Indicator
eSAR	e-Self Assessment Report
Gol	Government of India
MHRD	Ministry of Human Resource Development
MIS	Management Information System
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
NBA	National Board of Accreditation
NPIU	National Project Implementation Unit
PDO	Project Development Objective
PIP	Project Implementation Plan
PG	Post Graduate
PFMS	Public Financial Management System
SC	Scheduled Castes
SPT	State Project Team
TEQIP	Technical Education Quality Improvement Project
UG	Undergraduate
UGC	University Grants Commission



BASIC DATA

Product Information

Project ID P154523	Financing Instrument Investment Project Financing
Original EA Category Partial Assessment (B)	Current EA Category Partial Assessment (B)
Approval Date 24-Jun-2016	Current Closing Date 30-Sep-2020

Organizations

Borrower Republic of India	Responsible Agency Ministry of Human Resource Development
-------------------------------	--

Project Development Objective (PDO)

Original PDO

The proposed project development objective (PDO) is "to enhance quality and equity in participating engineering education institutes and improve the efficiency of the engineering education system in focus states".

Current PDO

The proposed project development objective (PDO) is "to enhance quality and equity in participating engineering education institutes and improve the efficiency of the engineering education system in focus states".

Summary Status of Financing

Ln/Cr/Tf	Approval	Signing	Effectiveness	Closing	Net Commitment	Disbursed	Undisbursed
IDA-58740	24-Jun-2016	01-Feb-2017	03-Mar-2017	30-Sep-2020	201.50	.25	201.25



Policy Waiver(s)

Does this restructuring trigger the need for any policy waiver(s)?

No

I. PROJECT STATUS AND RATIONALE FOR RESTRUCTURING

Background

The project was approved by the World Bank Board of Executive Directors on June 24, 2016. As per the request from Government of India, a level 2 restructuring was completed on January 25, 2017 to make changes to the disbursement linked indicators (DLIs) and the results framework was modified in line with the changes to the DLIs. The final restated Financing Agreement was signed on February 1, 2017 and the project became effective on March 3, 2017.

Progress toward PDO

There is no change in the PDO. The progress towards achievement of Project Development Objectives (PDO) is rated as Satisfactory in the last Implementation Status and Results Report (February 17, 2018). All PDO indicators are currently on track to be met (KPI 1: Average score of students participating in tests designed to measure technical and critical thinking skills; KPI 2: NBA-accredited and/ or applied for programs in participating institutes (UG programs and PG programs); KPI 3: Transition rate of UG engineering students from the first year to second year in participating institutes (Disaggregated by SC/ST groups and gender); KPI 4: Percentage of students from traditionally disadvantaged groups in total enrolment in participating institutes (SC/ST and Women)).

Implementation Status

The Project's disbursement rate has remained low, with only US\$253,965—or 0.13 percent of the loan amount—disbursed after 14 months of effectiveness. This disbursement is from Component 2 (non-DLI), with none of the DLIs having disbursed thus far. The Implementation Performance rating was Moderately Satisfactory in the last Implementation Status and Results Report (February 17, 2018).

While implementation has progressed well following effectiveness, and the project has incurred expenditures, specific changes in Disbursement Linked indicators (DLIs) are required for the project to disburse under Component 1. This is the primary rationale for restructuring. The changes for two of the DLIs are minor:

- (1) DLI #1: setting the correct baseline and resulting changes in the targets; and
- (2) DLI #2: modifying the definition of autonomy to be consistent with the definition employed by the AICTE, the statutory regulatory body overseeing engineering and technical education in India. The baselines and targets are also revised for the reasons as described in the section below on “proposed changes”.

Once these changes are made to the DLIs, both DLI #1 and DLI #2 can disburse this fiscal as Year 2 targets for each has been met, with adequate expenditure already incurred for DLI #1 and partially incurred for DLI #2 under the EEP. Adequate expenditure to permit disbursement of DLI #2 is expected to be met by June 30, 2018. The other DLIs are close to being met, but the project has not incurred adequate expenditures yet to be able to claim those (assuming it claims for DLI#1 and DLI#2).



The more substantive changes pertain to dropping two DLIs (current DLI#3 and current DLI#4) and adding three new ones. These DLIs were requested by Department of Economic Affairs (DEA) after negotiation and Board approval, which led to the first restructuring of the project. While broadly consistent with the PDO, DLI#3 and DLI#4 are beyond the scope of the project. In this restructuring, the proposal is to drop DLI#3 and DLI#4, and add three DLIs that fall within the scope of the project and align better with the PDO. These are:

Proposed DLI#3: Percentage of Participating Institutes in Focus States with a Board of Governors (BoG) composed as per prescribed structure that meets at least 4 times every calendar and which publicly discloses the minutes of all meetings.

Proposed DLI#4: Train final year engineering students to take exit examination (e.g. GATE) in each Focus State participating institution.

Proposed DLI#5: (i) Timeliness of allocations and utilization; and (ii) expenditure recognition against the utilization

DLI#3 and DLI#5 focus on efficiency, and hence align with the part of the PDO focusing on efficiency. The current set of DLIs do not look at efficiency, even though this is an important aspect of the PDO. The proposed restructuring will remedy the omission of efficiency-focused DLIs. DLI#4 focuses on quality.

In summary, the proposed changes not only align better with the PDO, but will also allow disbursement to proceed smoothly. Together, this provides the overall rationale for this restructuring.

Progress by Component

Component 1: A total of 160 institutes and 13 Affiliating Technical Universities (ATUs) have been selected to participate in the project. Of these, 91 institutes and 10 ATUs are from the focus states as identified in the Project Appraisal Document. Implementation proceeded at an accelerated pace following effectiveness. Twinning of institutes and ATUs from focus states with higher performing states has been completed. Faculty reforms have progressed well, with 1324 faculty across 33 disciplines being recruited under the project in accordance with AICTE norms. Indian Institutes of Technology and Indian Institutes of Management have commenced the delivery of training to project institutes. Work on strengthening governance has commenced with multiple trainings and a new toolkit having been designed to replace the earlier one.

Component 2: All India Council for Technical Education (AICTE)-Stanford Student Learning Assessment Study was initiated in May 2017 and has progressed successfully. A preliminary report on the first-round study is now available. This was presented in April 2018 at a close-group seminar of academicians and practitioners, led by Secretary (Higher Education). It was also presented to the Honorable Minister, Ministry of Human Resource Development (MHRD) and a joint media briefing was held between AICTE and the World Bank. AICTE capacity-building has also commenced. Staffing of the national project implementation unit (NPIU) is complete, but staffing in some state-level implementation agencies is incomplete. As an interim arrangement, NPIU has deputed consultants to manage state-level work.

Procurement: Procurement has been progressing smoothly in the majority of institutes, with 143 institutions having submitted their procurement plan in PMSS. All 143 procurement plans have been reviewed by NPIU. Procurement comprises 39 percent of expenditures.

Third-party Verification (TPV): Given the uncertainty on DLIs, the TPV agency has not yet been identified. An TPV is required for only one DLI in June 2019 and June 2020.

Given the slow pace of disbursement and staffing constraints at the state level, Implementation Progress is rated as Moderately Satisfactory.



II. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED CHANGES

Changes to DLIs

- 1) **DLI 1:** Number of undergraduate (UG) programs offered in Participating Institutes in *Focus States* that are NBA accredited.
 - a. The indicator name is changed to “Percentage of undergraduate (UG) programs offered in Participating Institutes in *Focus States* that are NBA accredited or for which NBA accreditation has been applied”. The name requires correction as the baseline specified for this indicator in the revised DLI matrix included programs in institutes in focus states for which NBA accreditation had been applied for.
 - b. The baseline data and targets are revised. The baseline data were collected when the TEQIP-II was in the last year (2016-17), and TEQIP III was being restructured, prior to effectiveness. Shortly thereafter, the National Board of Accreditation (NBA) introduced pre-qualification (PQ) criteria and all the applications submitted were scrutinized and failure to fulfil PQ criteria resulted in applications being either rejected or withdrawn. Due to this, the baseline (when TEQIP-III started in March 2017) got drastically reduced. This unforeseen situation necessitates to revise targets for every year.
 - c. The DLI amount for Year 4 is reduced to accommodate an additional DLI (DLI#5)
- 2) **DLI 2:** Percentage of Participating Institutes in Focus States with UGC autonomy.
 - a. The indicator name is changed to “Percentage of Participating Institutes in Focus States with autonomy”. This change is made to clarify that an autonomous Institution means the institution which can revise/modify its curriculum which includes centrally funded institutions (CFIs), Unitary /Deemed to be University, University Department/Faculty/single Constituent College and Institutions declared autonomous by University Grants Commission (UGC). The same definition is followed by NBA while categorizing TIER-1 and TIER 2 institutions, and this change in definition makes the two indicators internally consistent. The verification protocol is revised to reflect the change.
 - b. The baseline data and targets are revised. The base line was decided on the basis of prospective institutions identified for participation in the Project. However, there has been significant change in the list of participating institutions due to addition/deletion of the institution during selection process. The targets are modified as reduced targets for accreditation (DLI#1) have significant bearing on autonomy (eligibility for UGC autonomy requires at least 3 programs in the institute to be accredited by NBA).
 - c. The DLI amount for Year 2,3 and 4 are reduced to accommodate an additional DLI (DLI#5).
- 3) **DLI 3:** Percentage of students in the final year of UG program from Participating Institutes in Focus States who achieved the qualifying score in the GATE exam.
 - a. The indicator is dropped and a new indicator is introduced: Percentage of Participating Institutes in Focus States with a Board of Governors (BoG) composed as per prescribed structure that meets at least 4 times every calendar and which publicly discloses the minutes of all meetings. The GATE results are declared based on different zones of the country and further based on examination centers. Hence, obtaining accurate data institutions-wise is difficult. In view of the important role played by Board of Governors (BoG) in the progress of institutions (institutional development and accountability), formation of such BoGs capable of avoiding conflict of interest is insisted and introduced as a new DLI. This indicator is already included in the current Results Framework with the only change in the target for Year 3.
- 4) **DLI 4:** Development and implementation of GATE as a mandatory exit examination for students of engineering colleges.
 - a. This indicator is dropped and a new indicator is introduced: Percentage of Participating Institutes in Focus States that train final year engineering students to take exit examination (e.g. GATE). GoI has decided not



to impose GATE as a mandatory exit examination to avoid further stress on the students. The GATE exit exam will be a recommended condition for All India Council for Technical Education, but will not be made mandatory. Instead, the final year students should take additional work of completion of projects, simultaneously attend many other training programs for improving employability and entrepreneurial skills, and appear in many other examinations conducted by industries to test their aptitude. The revised DLI ensures enrichment of conceptual knowledge and skills of the students through additional training.

- 5) **New DLI 5:** (i) Timeliness of allocations and utilization; and (ii) expenditure recognition against the utilization. In view of the short duration of the project, it becomes necessary to increase the pace of activities targeted for improvement of quality. As the activities are directly related to expenditures, a new quantifiable DLI is proposed to measure (i) timeliness of allocations and utilization; and (ii) expenditure recognition against the utilization. Targets have been set for Year 2, 3 and 4.

Changes to Results Framework:

The Results Framework (RF) of the Project is being modified in line with the changes to the Disbursement Linked Indicators.

SN	Original Indicator	Revised Indicator	Changes
1	PDO 2: NBA-accredited programs in participating institutes	NBA-accredited and/ or applied for programs in participating institutes	The indicator name is changed for clarity and to be in line with DLI 1. In addition (i) baselines have been clarified after selection of institutions; (ii) Year 2 and 3 targets for UG programs in focus states pertains to “accredited or applied for”; and (ii) Year 2, 3, 4 and 5 targets are aligned to DLI targets for UG programs in focus states.
2	PDO 3: Percentage of students in the final year of UG program from Participating Institutes in Focus States who achieved the qualifying score in the GATE exam	Dropped	Indicator is dropped in line with changes made to the DLI.
3	Intermediate Outcome (IO) 3: Percentage of Participating Institutes in Focus States with UGC autonomy	Percentage of Participating Institutes in Focus States with autonomy	The indicator name is changed for clarity and to be in line with DLI 1 and the baseline targets and definition/ description are revised in line with the changes made to the DLI.
4	IO 6: Number of faculty trained in either their subject domain, pedagogy, or management in participating institutes	Number of faculty trained in either their subject domain, pedagogy, or management in participating institutes (cumulative)	The indicator name is clarified to specify that these are cumulative targets.
5	IO 9: Student, Staff, and Faculty Satisfaction Survey	No change	The Year 1 target is moved to Year 2 to account for the delay in implementation. There is no change to end of project target.



6	IO 10: Employer satisfaction with engineers recruited in the past year	No change	The Year 1 target is moved to Year 2 to account for the delay in implementation. There is no change to end of project target.
7	IO 11: Development and implementation of GATE as a mandatory exit examination for students of engineering colleges	Dropped. Replaced with the following new indicator "Percentage of participating institutes in Focus states that train final year engineering students to take exit examination (e.g. GATE)"	The indicator is dropped in line with the change made to the DLI. A new indicator has been introduced in its place.
8	IO 12: Number of engineering education institutes in focus states that meet the enabling mechanisms for participation in the project	No change	The Year 2 target is moved to Year 3 as institutions in focus states are likely to take more time to meet the enabling mechanisms.
9	IO 13: Percentage of eligible transactions, in the previous six months, against which funds are released in full to participating institutes by the MHRD, within 10 calendar days of the date on which the participating institute requests the payment	(i) Timeliness of allocations and utilization; and (ii) expenditure recognition against the utilization	This is in line with change introduced to the DLI matrix.
10	IO 14: Percentage of participating institutes with a BoG, Department Management Committee or equivalent that meets at least 4 times every calendar and which publicly discloses the minutes of all meetings	Percentage of participating institutes with a BoG composed as per prescribed structure that meets at least 4 times every calendar and which publicly discloses the minutes of all meetings	The indicator name is revised in line with the change made to the DLI and the DLI target for Year 3 has been revised to be in line with the DLI.
11	IO 15: Number of participating ATUs with MIS capable of producing annual report against prescribed indicators	No change	The Year 2 and 3 targets are adjusted to account for the delay in implementation. There is no change to end of project target.



12	IO 16: Percentage of participating institutes that produce and publish an annual report in the prescribed format in accordance with the requirements set out in the PIP	No change	The Year 2 and 3 targets are adjusted to account for the delay in implementation. There is no change to end of project target.
----	---	-----------	--

Changes to Disbursement Arrangements: Disbursement arrangements will change in accordance with the changes made to the DLIs.

Change to Disbursement Estimates: Disbursement estimates for the respective fiscal years will change in accordance with the changes made to the DLIs.

III. SUMMARY OF CHANGES

	Changed	Not Changed
Change in Results Framework	✓	
Change in Disbursements Arrangements	✓	
Change in Disbursement Estimates	✓	
Change in Implementing Agency		✓
Change in DDO Status		✓
Change in Project's Development Objectives		✓
Change in Components and Cost		✓
Change in Loan Closing Date(s)		✓
Cancellations Proposed		✓
Reallocation between Disbursement Categories		✓
Change in Overall Risk Rating		✓
Change in Safeguard Policies Triggered		✓
Change of EA category		✓
Change in Legal Covenants		✓
Change in Institutional Arrangements		✓
Change in Financial Management		✓
Change in Procurement		✓



Change in Implementation Schedule		✓
Other Change(s)		✓
Change in Economic and Financial Analysis		✓
Change in Technical Analysis		✓
Change in Social Analysis		✓
Change in Environmental Analysis		✓

IV. DETAILED CHANGE(S)

RESULTS FRAMEWORK

Project Development Objective Indicators

Average score of students participating in tests designed to measure technical and critical thinking skills Unit of Measure: Text Indicator Type: Custom				
	Baseline	Actual (Current)	End Target	Action
Value	n.a.	Test being administered for the first time	Test administered for third time and 5 percent increase over previous cycle.	No Change
Date	31-Dec-2015	01-Dec-2017	30-Sep-2020	
NBA-accredited and/ or applied for programs in participating institutes. Indicator will track increase in percentage points Unit of Measure: Text Indicator Type: Custom				
	Baseline	Actual (Current)	End Target	Action
Value	a) Focus States -Applied and accredited: 10 Other States -Accredited: 17.8	UG programs- Focus States -Applied and accredited: 28.47 Other States -Accredited: 55	a) Focus States -Applied and accredited: 40 Other States -Accredited: 15	Revised
	(b) Focus States -Applied and accredited: 4 Other States Accredited: 8.2		(b) Focus States -Applied and accredited: 20 Other States	



Accredited: 15				
Date	31-Dec-2015	01-Dec-2017	30-Sep-2020	
<p>Percentage of students in the final year of UG program from Participating Institutes in Focus States who achieved the qualifying score in the GATE exam (DLI 3)</p> <p>Unit of Measure: Percentage Indicator Type: Custom</p>				
	Baseline	Actual (Current)	End Target	Action
Value	13.00		25.00	Marked for Deletion
Date	31-Dec-2015	01-Dec-2017	30-Sep-2020	
<p>Transition rate of UG engineering students from the first year to second year in participating institutes.(Disaggregated by SC/ST groups and gender)</p> <p>Unit of Measure: Text Indicator Type: Custom</p>				
	Baseline	Actual (Current)	End Target	Action
Value	Focus States-All: 50 -SC/ST: 40 -Female: 45 Other States -All: 67 -SC/ST: 54 -Female: 64	Focus States: 67 SC/ST: 56.56 Female: 72.18 Other States: 69.19 SC/ST: 56.68 Female: 75.28	Focus States -All: 60 -SC/ST: 50 -Female:55 Other States -All: 77 -SC/ST: 65 -Female:75	No Change
Date	31-Dec-2015	01-Dec-2017	30-Sep-2020	
<p>Percentage of students from traditionally disadvantaged groups in total enrolment in participating institutes (a) SC/ST (b) Women</p> <p>Unit of Measure: Text Indicator Type: Custom</p>				
	Baseline	Actual (Current)	End Target	Action
Value	SC/ST:15 Women: 26	Focus States: SC/ST: 25, Female: 23.22 Other States: SC/ST: 20.73; Female: 28.15	SC/ST:20 Women: 30	No Change
Date	31-Dec-2015	01-Dec-2017	30-Sep-2020	

Intermediate Indicators



Direct project beneficiaries Unit of Measure: Number Indicator Type: Custom				
	Baseline	Actual (Current)	End Target	Action
Value	1469441.00	1483863.00	3210204.00	No Change
Date	31-Dec-2015	01-Dec-2017	30-Sep-2020	

Female beneficiaries Unit of Measure: Percentage Indicator Type: Custom Supplement				
	Baseline	Actual (Current)	End Target	Action
Value	26.00	24.68	30.00	No Change

Percentage of participating institutes in focus states with autonomy (DLI 2) Unit of Measure: Text Indicator Type: Custom				
	Baseline	Actual (Current)	End Target	Action
Value	44	47.78	55	Revised
Date	31-Dec-2015	01-Dec-2017	30-Sep-2020	

Percentage of PhD students in total enrolment in engineering disciplines in participating institutes. Indicator will track percent increase over baseline Unit of Measure: Text Indicator Type: Custom				
	Baseline	Actual (Current)	End Target	Action
Value	Focus States: 1.6	Focus States: 1.81	Focus States: 100	No Change
	Other States: 2.5	Other States: 8.94	Other States: 100	
Date	31-Dec-2015	01-Dec-2017	30-Sep-2020	

Percentage of sanctioned faculty positions in participating institutes filled by regular or contract faculty, contracted as per AICTE norms Unit of Measure: Text Indicator Type: Custom				
	Baseline	Actual (Current)	End Target	Action



Value	Focus States:40 Other States:65	Focus States:67.36 Other States:81.48	Focus States:85 Other States:85	No Change
Date	31-Dec-2015	01-Dec-2017	30-Sep-2020	
<p>Number of faculty trained in either their subject domain, pedagogy or management in participating institutes (cumulative) Unit of Measure: Text Indicator Type: Custom</p>				
	Baseline	Actual (Current)	End Target	Action
Value	0	Focus States: 1197 Other States: 1497	Focus States:5000 Other States:6000	Revised
Date	31-Dec-2015	01-Dec-2017	30-Sep-2020	
<p>Percentage of externally funded research and development projects and consultancies in total revenue in participating institutes Unit of Measure: Text Indicator Type: Custom</p>				
	Baseline	Actual (Current)	End Target	Action
Value	Focus States: 2 Other States: 10	Focus States: 3.27 Other States: 16.79	Focus States: 7 Other States: 15	No Change
Date	31-Dec-2015	01-Dec-2017	30-Sep-2020	
<p>Participation of affiliated institutes in participating ATUs in newly designed research-hub related activities Unit of Measure: Text Indicator Type: Custom</p>				
	Baseline	Actual (Current)	End Target	Action
Value	0	Research hubs yet to be established	Focus States: 30 Other States: 150	No Change
Date	31-Dec-2015	01-Dec-2017	30-Sep-2020	
<p>Student, Staff and Faculty Satisfaction Survey Unit of Measure: Text Indicator Type: Custom</p>				
	Baseline	Actual (Current)	End Target	Action
Value	NA	Survey will be carried out in 2nd year i.e. after	15 percent increase in average satisfaction	Revised



		March 2018	level over the previous round	
			Report on third round published and action plan prepared.	
Date	31-Dec-2015	01-Dec-2017	30-Sep-2020	
<p>Employer satisfaction with engineers recruited in the past year Unit of Measure: Text Indicator Type: Custom</p>				
	Baseline	Actual (Current)	End Target	Action
Value	NA	-	10 percent increase in average satisfaction level over the previous round	Revised
			Report on third round published and action plan prepared	
Date	31-Dec-2015	01-Dec-2017	30-Sep-2020	
<p>Development and implementation of GATE as a mandatory exit examination for students of engineering colleges (DLI 4) Unit of Measure: Text Indicator Type: Custom</p>				
	Baseline	Actual (Current)	End Target	Action
Value	-	AICTE order is awaited. 40% students of 70% institutions participating in GATE 2018 examination.	At least 90% (78) Participating Institutes assist at least 75% of their graduating students in preparing for the GATE	Marked for Deletion
Date	31-Dec-2015	01-Dec-2017	30-Sep-2020	
<p>Number of engineering education institutes in focus states that meet the enabling mechanisms for participation in the project Unit of Measure: Number Indicator Type: Custom</p>				
	Baseline	Actual (Current)	End Target	Action
Value	21.00	74.00	87.00	Revised



Date	31-Dec-2015	01-Dec-2017	30-Jun-2019	
Release of Funds by MHRD (see detailed description below) Unit of Measure: Percentage Indicator Type: Custom				
	Baseline	Actual (Current)	End Target	Action
Value	0.00		95.00	Marked for Deletion
Date	31-Dec-2015		30-Sep-2020	
Percentage of participating institutes with a BoG composed as per prescribed structure that meets at least 4 times every calendar and which publicly discloses the minutes of all meetings (DLI #3) Unit of Measure: Text Indicator Type: Custom				
	Baseline	Actual (Current)	End Target	Action
Value	Focus States: 35 Other States: 60	Focus States: 45 Other States: 40	Focus States: 95 Other States: 95	Revised
Date	31-Dec-2015	01-Dec-2017	30-Sep-2020	
Number of participating ATUs with MIS capable of producing annual report against prescribed indicators Unit of Measure: Text Indicator Type: Custom				
	Baseline	Actual (Current)	End Target	Action
Value	NA	MIS yet to be developed for generating such report.	MIS functional: Focus States: At least 5 ATUs Non-LIS: At least 3 ATUs	Revised
Date	31-Dec-2015	01-Dec-2017	30-Sep-2020	
Percentage of participating institutes that produce and publish an annual report in the prescribed format in accordance with the requirements set out in the PIP Unit of Measure: Text Indicator Type: Custom				
	Baseline	Actual (Current)	End Target	Action
Value	0	-	Focus States :85 Other States:85	No Change
Date	31-Dec-2015	01-Dec-2017	30-Sep-2020	



Number of participating ATUs in focus states that publicly declare final semester examination results before the start of the next academic year

Unit of Measure: Text

Indicator Type: Custom

	Baseline	Actual (Current)	End Target	Action
Value	0	9	6	No Change
Date	31-Dec-2015	01-Dec-2017	30-Sep-2020	

Percentage of participating institutes in Focus states that train final year engineering students to take exit examination (e.g. GATE) (DLI#4)

Unit of Measure: Percentage

Indicator Type: Custom

	Baseline	Actual (Current)	End Target	Action
Value	25.00		60.00	New
Date	31-Dec-2015		30-Sep-2020	

i) Timeliness of allocations, and utilization; and (ii) expenditure recognition against the utilization (DLI #5)

Unit of Measure: Text

Indicator Type: Custom

	Baseline	Actual (Current)	End Target	Action
Value	NA	NA	For the last two quarters: (i) Fund utilization (eligible payments made) are equivalent to at least 90% or more, of the approved allocations for the participating institutes; and (ii) At least 90% of the funds utilized to date have been accounted for as expenditures in the Books of Accounts of the participating institutes.	New
Date	31-Dec-2015	01-May-2018	30-Jun-2020	



DISBURSEMENT ESTIMATES

Change in Disbursement Estimates

Yes

Year	Current	Proposed
2016	0.00	0.00
2017	4,000,000.00	0.00
2018	50,000,000.00	12,000,000.00
2019	69,000,000.00	40,000,000.00
2020	75,000,000.00	70,000,000.00
2021	3,500,000.00	79,500,000.00
2022	0.00	0.00



ANNEX 1: REVISED DISBURSEMENT LINKED INDICATORS MATRIX AND VERIFICATION PROTOCOL

Disbursement-Linked Indicators	Disbursement-Linked Targets				
	Baseline	Targets to be Achieved in TY 2017 (Year 1) (July 2016- June 2017)	Targets to be Achieved in TY 2018 (Year 2) (July 2017-June 2018)	Targets to be Achieved in TY 2019 (Years 3) (July 2018-June 2019)	Targets to be Achieved in TY 2020 (Year 4) (July 2019-June 2020)
DLI#1 Percentage of undergraduate (UG) programs offered in Participating Institutes in Focus States that are NBA accredited or for which NBA accreditation has been applied	10%	N/A	At least 20%: US\$ 10 million US\$ 1 million for every additional 1% programs accredited or applied for, up to a maximum of 3% programs	At least 35%: US\$ 15 million US\$ 1 million for every additional 2% programs accredited, up to a maximum of 6% programs	At least 50%
DLI Values		N/A	US\$13 million	US\$ 18 million	US\$20 million
DLI# 2 Percentage of Participating Institutes in Focus States with autonomy	44%	N/A	At least 47%	At least 50%	At least 55%
DLI Values		N/A	US\$ 10 million	US\$ 12 million	US\$ 13 million
DLI#3 Percentage of Participating Institutes in Focus States with a BoG composed as per prescribed structure that meets at least 4 times every calendar and which publicly discloses the minutes of all meetings.	35%	N/A	At least 60%	At least 70%	At least 95%
DLI Values		N/A	US\$ 7 million	US\$ 9 million	US\$ 11 million
Percentage of participating institutes in Focus states that train final year engineering students to take exit examination (e.g. GATE)	25%	N/A	At least 30%	At least 50%	At least 60%



DLI Values			US\$ 5 million	US\$ 10 million	US\$ 14 million
DLI#5 (i) Timeliness of allocations, and utilization; and (ii) expenditure recognition against the utilization.	N/A	N/A	In the previous six (6) months: (i) MHRD provides allocation in public finance management system for at least 75% of the fund requests submitted by the participating institutes, within ten (10) calendar days from the start of quarter; and (ii) At least 70% of the payments requests made by the participating institutes are honored within thirty (30) calendar days from the date on which the participating institute requests the payment for eligible transactions.	For the last two quarters: (i) Fund utilization (eligible payments made) are equivalent to at least 70% or more, of the approved allocations for the participating institutes; and (ii) At least 70% of the funds utilized to date have been accounted for as expenditures in the Books of Accounts of the participating institutes.	For the last two quarters: (i) Fund utilization (eligible payments made) are equivalent to at least 90% or more, of the approved allocations for the participating institutes; and (ii) At least 90% of the funds utilized to date have been accounted for as expenditures in the Books of Accounts of the participating institutes.
DLI Values		N/A	US\$ 4 million	US\$ 6 million	US\$ 7 million



DLI Verification Protocol

NOTE: An institute is considered as participating for these indicators if an MOU has been signed between the institute and the state government or MHRD/NPIU (as the case may be). All indicator values achieved at each date of reporting will be rounded down to the nearest whole number, including for verifying whether a DLI has been achieved.

DLI	Verification Protocol
<p>DLI #1 Percentage of undergraduate (UG) programs offered in Participating Institutes in Focus States that are NBA accredited or for which NBA accreditation has been applied</p>	<p>Applicable to all institutes under Subcomponent 1.1 which have signed an MOU with the MHRD or respective state government (as the case may be) for participation in the project.</p> <p>NBA accreditation of the program(s) offered by an institute is applied for if the institute offering the program has completed the following steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Registration with the NBA (b) Completion of the online application form for NBA accreditation of the program(s) and payment of the accreditation fee (c) Submission of the eSAR for the program(s) to the NBA <p>A program is accredited if the NBA has accredited it for two or five years. A program will continue to be considered accredited for six months after the date on which its accreditation expires, conditional on it having applied for renewal.</p> <p>If the NBA has accredited a program at any time previously, for two or five years, it will be considered accredited only if it receives five-year accreditation in subsequent accreditation cycles.</p> <p>To avoid double-counting, no program that is accredited will be included in calculating the number of programs that have applied for accreditation.</p> <p>The percentage of programs accredited (and/or applied for) will be calculated out of the total number of AICTE approved eligible UG/PG programs offered by institutes as of the date of reporting.</p> <p><i>Source</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Project MIS. For the program(s) for which accreditation has been applied for, the institute uploads, to the MIS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) a copy of the receipt for payment of accreditation fees to the NBA. (b) a copy of the eSAR submitted to the NBA.



DLI	Verification Protocol
	<p>For the program(s) that have been accredited: The institute will upload, to the MIS, a copy of the notification from the NBA on the accreditation status of the program(s).</p> <p>NPIU will provide the World Bank a list of institutes which have provided proof of having applied for accreditation or received accreditation as per the guidelines above. The World Bank will verify this information through a 10% sample check using publicly-available data from the NBA’s website.</p> <p>This DLI can be carried forward or met early.</p>
<p>DLI# 2 Percentage of Participating Institutes in Focus States with autonomy</p>	<p>Applicable to all institutes participating under Subcomponents 1.1, which have signed an MOU with the MHRD or respective state government (as the case may be) for participation in the project.</p> <p>An Autonomous Institution means the institution which can revise/modify its curriculum which includes centrally funded institutions (CFIs), Unitary /Deemed to be University, University Department/Faculty/single Constituent College and Institutions declared autonomous by UGC.</p> <p>UGC autonomy refers to the delegation of powers to an institute, by the UGC, according to the UGC Guidelines for Autonomous Institutes 2012–17. An institute is considered autonomous once it receives a formal notification from the UGC that it has been granted autonomy.</p> <p><i>Source:</i></p> <p>(i) Project MIS. Institutes will upload the autonomy status to the MIS.</p> <p>(ii) UGC/ University website</p> <p>NPIU will provide the World Bank a list of institutes which have provided proof of autonomy as per the guidelines above. The World Bank will verify this information through a 10% sample check using publicly-available data from the UGC or University’s website.</p> <p>This DLI can be carried forward or met early.</p>
<p>DLI#3 Percentage of Participating Institutes in Focus States with a BoG composed as per prescribed structure that meets at least 4 times every calendar and</p>	<p>Applicable to institutes under Component 1.1, which have signed an MOU with the MHRD or respective state government (as the case may be) for participation in the project.</p> <p>Participating affiliated colleges and constituent colleges, which have autonomous status from the UGC will be required to constitute a BoG according to the norms of</p>



DLI	Verification Protocol
<p>which publicly discloses the minutes of all meetings.</p>	<p>the UGC and as defined in the PIP. BoG refers to a body with overall responsibility for the strategic direction and accountability of the college, constituted according to the norms of the UGC, contained in the UGC Approval of Colleges Offering Technical Education by Universities Regulation, 2013, Appendix 16 of Annexure C.</p> <p>Participating affiliating universities and constituent colleges which do not have autonomous status from UGC will be required to constitute a BoG as defined in the PIP.</p> <p>All participating institutes will declare the composition of their BoGs, with the professional background of BoG members on their websites. Minutes of all BoG meetings will be published on institutes' websites within two months of the date of the meeting, such that a search from the institute's website using the term 'Board of Governors' yields a link/links to the minutes. Each state project implementation unit will collect a consolidated list of the links at the time of reporting which the NPIU will collate.</p> <p><i>Source:</i> Institutes' websites and a consolidated report prepared by NPIU.</p> <p>This DLI can be carried forward.</p>



DLI	Verification Protocol
<p>DLI #4 Percentage of participating institutes in Focus states that train final year engineering students to take exit examination (e.g. GATE)</p>	<p>Applicable to all institutes under Subcomponent 1.1 engineering colleges which have signed an MOU with the MHRD or respective state government (as the case may be) for participation in the project.</p> <p>Exit examination refers to the examination for testing technical and / or aptitude of the students, for example. GATE, pre-placement training etc.</p> <p>Assistance includes the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">(1) Providing focused coaching (with internal faculty or outsourced service provider) for exit examination preparation through classroom teaching at no additional cost to the student(2) Providing focused learning material for exit examination preparation at no additional cost to the student(3) Providing scholarships for exit examination preparation if college is unable to provide appropriate assistance. <p>Source: Institutes will be required to train at least 70% of students in the final year. Institutes will provide NPIU a list of students who were provided assistance for exit exam preparation, along with details of type of assistance and student contact details. The data will be uploaded to the project MIS.</p> <p>Third party verification required for target years 2019 and 2020. This will include random checks with students on the veracity of information provided in institute lists.</p> <p>This DLI can be met early.</p>



DLI	Verification Protocol
<p>DLI#5 (i) Timeliness of allocations and utilization; and (ii) expenditure recognition against the utilization.</p>	<p><i>Applicability:</i> All institutes under Component 1, which have signed an MOU with the MHRD or respective state government (as the case may be) for participation in the project.</p> <p><i>Definition:</i> The MHRD provides allocation of funds to institutes through the Public Financial Management System (PFMS) at the start of each quarter and on a rolling basis honors the payment requests made by institutes against eligible transactions as defined in the PIP based on agreement between MHRD and the World Bank.</p> <p><i>Eligible utilization:</i> Utilizations implies actual payments through PFMS towards eligible transactions requests raised by the participating institutes. Only transactions entered by institutes that meet the performance benchmarks, defined in the PIP based on agreement between MHRD and the World Bank, and are eligible for continued funding will be considered for the purpose of this indicator.</p> <p><i>Time frame:</i> The DLI for any target year, can be met early and claim can be lodged ahead of the target date. However, no claim can be lodged for that specific year where the DLI is met after the respective timeframe for the target year is over.</p> <p><i>Base data source:</i> The PFMS will track utilization of funds allocated to institutes. Institutions will be required to account (in the Books of Accounts) for expenditures recognized against these utilizations.</p> <p><i>Detailed information requirement:</i> NPIU will provide the World Bank: <u>For Year 2</u> (a) the number of calendar days between the start of the related quarter and the date on which the allocation was provided to institutes in PFMS (supported by PFMS report); (b) the number of calendar days between (i) date of payment request: the date the institute applies its Digital Signature Certificate (DSC) reflected by 'Date of Advice Generation' in PFMS; and (ii) Date of payment: when the amount was debited from the central pool bank account reflected by 'Debit Status Date' in PFMS.</p> <p><u>For Year 3 and 4</u>, (a) percentage of funds utilized by institute against allocations received for the last two quarters (supported by PFMS report); (b) evidence that institutes have accounted for (in the books of accounts) expenditure against total funds utilized till date which will be subsequently substantiated through annual Statutory Audit Reports issued by the External Auditors.</p>



ANNEX 2: REVISED RESULTS FRAMEWORK

Indicator Name	Baseline	Cumulative Target Values					
		YR1 (July 2016–June 2017)	YR2 (July 2017–June 2018)	YR3 (July 2018–June 2019)	YR4 (July 2019–June 2020)	YR5 (July 2020–September 2020)	End Target (September 2020)
1. Average score of students participating in tests designed to measure technical and critical thinking skills		[No target as the test will be designed and piloted during this period]	Test administered for first time and baseline established	Test administered for second time and 5 percent increase over baseline		Test administered for third time and 5 percent increase over previous cycle	
2. NBA-accredited and/ or applied for programs in participating institutes (a) UG programs (DLI1) (b) PG programs Indicator will track increase in percentage points	(a) Focus States -Applied and accredited: 10 Other States -Accredited: 17.8 (b) Focus States -Applied and accredited: 4 Other States Accredited: 8.2	(a) Focus States -Applied and accredited: 2 Other States -Accredited: 1 (b) Focus States -Applied and accredited: 2 Other States Accredited: 1	(a) Focus States - Applied and Accredited: 10 Other States -Accredited: 4 (b) Focus States -Applied and accredited: 5	(a) Focus States - Applied and Accredited: 25 Other States -Accredited: 8 (b) Focus States -Applied and accredited: 15	(a) Focus States -Applied and accredited: 40 Other States -Accredited:15 (b) Focus States -Applied and accredited: 20 Other States	(a) Focus States -Applied and accredited: 40 Other States -Accredited: 15 (b) Focus States -Applied and accredited: 20 Other States	(a) Focus States -Applied and accredited: 40 Other States -Accredited: 15 (b) Focus States -Applied and accredited: 20 Other States



Indicator Name	Baseline	Cumulative Target Values					
		YR1 (July 2016–June 2017)	YR2 (July 2017–June 2018)	YR3 (July 2018–June 2019)	YR4 (July 2019–June 2020)	YR5 (July 2020–September 2020)	End Target (September 2020)
			Other States Accredited: 5	Other States Accredited: 8	Accredited: 15	Accredited: 15	Accredited: 15
3. Transition rate of UG engineering students from the first year to second year in participating institutes. (Disaggregated by SC/ST groups and gender)	Focus States-All: 50 -SC/ST: 40 -Female: 45 Other States -All: 67 -SC/ST: 54 -Female: 64	Focus States -All: 51 -SC/ST: 41 -Female: 46 Other States -All: 68 -SC/ST: 56 -Female: 66	Focus States -All: 53 -SC/ST: 43 -Female: 48 Other States -All: 70 -SC/ST: 58 -Female: 68	Focus States -All: 55 -SC/ST: 45 -Female: 50 Other States -All: 75 -SC/ST: 60 -Female: 70	Focus States -All: 60 -SC/ST: 50 -Female: 55 Other States -All: 77 -SC/ST: 65 -Female: 75	Focus States -All: 60 -SC/ST: 50 -Female: 55 Other States -All: 77 -SC/ST: 65 -Female: 75	Focus States -All: 60 -SC/ST: 50 -Female: 55 Other States -All: 77 -SC/ST: 65 -Female: 75
4. Percentage of students from traditionally disadvantaged	SC/ST: 15 Women: 26	SC/ST: 16 Women: 26.5	SC/ST: 17 Women: 27	SC/ST: 18 Women: 28	SC/ST: 20 Women: 30	SC/ST: 20 Women: 30	SC/ST: 20 Women: 30



Indicator Name	Baseline	Cumulative Target Values					
		YR1 (July 2016–June 2017)	YR2 (July 2017–June 2018)	YR3 (July 2018–June 2019)	YR4 (July 2019–June 2020)	YR5 (July 2020–September 2020)	End Target (September 2020)
groups in total enrolment in participating institutes							
(a) SC/ST							
(b) Women							
Intermediate Results Indicators							
1. Direct project beneficiaries (Number) -	1,469,441	1,496,759	1,541,801	1,614,472	1,690,643	1,690,643	3,210,204 (cumulative)
2. Female beneficiaries (Percentage - Sub-Type: Supplemental) -	26	26.5	27	28	30	30	30
Quality indicators							



Indicator Name	Baseline	Cumulative Target Values					
		YR1 (July 2016–June 2017)	YR2 (July 2017–June 2018)	YR3 (July 2018–June 2019)	YR4 (July 2019–June 2020)	YR5 (July 2020–September 2020)	End Target (September 2020)
3. Percentage of participating institutes in focus states with autonomy (DLI 2)	44	45	47	50	55	55	55
4. Percentage of PhD students in total enrolment in engineering disciplines in participating institutes Indicator will track percent increase over baseline	Focus States: 1.6 Other States: 2.5	Focus States:10 Other States:10	Focus States:30 Other States:30	Focus States:70 Other States:70	Focus States:100 Other States:100	Focus States:100 Other States:100	Focus States:100 Other States:100
5. Percentage of sanctioned faculty positions in participating institutes filled by regular or contract faculty, contracted according to AICTE norms	Focus States: 40 Other States: 65	Focus States: 42 Other States: 66	Focus States: 50 Other States: 68	Focus States: 65 Other States: 70	Focus States: 85 Other States: 85	Focus States: 85 Other States: 85	Focus States: 85 Other States: 85



Indicator Name	Baseline	Cumulative Target Values					
		YR1 (July 2016–June 2017)	YR2 (July 2017–June 2018)	YR3 (July 2018–June 2019)	YR4 (July 2019–June 2020)	YR5 (July 2020–September 2020)	End Target (September 2020)
6. Number of faculty trained in either their subject domain, pedagogy, or management in participating institutes (cumulative)	0	Focus States:500 Other States: 1,000	Focus States: 1,000 Other States: 2,000	Focus States: 2,500 Other States: 3,000	Focus States: 5,000 Other States: 6,000	Focus States: 5,000 Other States: 6,000	Focus States: 5,000 Other States: 6,000
7. Percentage of externally funded R&D projects and consultancies in total revenue in participating institutes	Focus States: 2 Other States: 10	Focus States: 3 Other States: 11	Focus States: 4 Other States: 12	Focus States: 5 Other States: 13	Focus States: 7 Other States: 15	Focus States: 7 Other States: 15	Focus States: 7 Other States: 15
8. Participation of affiliated institutes in participating ATUs in newly designed research-hub related activities (number)	0	Focus States: 5 Other States: 20	Focus States: 10 Other States: 30	Focus States: 15 Other States: 60	Focus States: 30 Other States:150	Focus States: 30 Other States:150	Focus States: 30



Indicator Name	Baseline	Cumulative Target Values					
		YR1 (July 2016–June 2017)	YR2 (July 2017–June 2018)	YR3 (July 2018–June 2019)	YR4 (July 2019–June 2020)	YR5 (July 2020–September 2020)	End Target (September 2020)
							Other States: 150
9. Student, Staff, and Faculty Satisfaction Survey			Report on first round published and action plan prepared	15 percent increase in average satisfaction level over the previous round Report on second round published and action plan prepared		15 percent increase in average satisfaction level over the previous round Report on third round published and action plan prepared	



Indicator Name	Baseline	Cumulative Target Values					
		YR1 (July 2016–June 2017)	YR2 (July 2017–June 2018)	YR3 (July 2018–June 2019)	YR4 (July 2019–June 2020)	YR5 (July 2020–September 2020)	End Target (September 2020)
10. Employer satisfaction with engineers recruited in the past year			First round of employer satisfaction survey conducted Report on first round published and action plan prepared	10 percent increase in average satisfaction level over the previous round Report on second round published and action plan prepared		10 percent increase in average satisfaction level over the previous round Report on third round published and action plan prepared	
11. Percentage of participating institutes in Focus states that train final year engineering students to take exit examination (e.g. GATE) (DLI 4)	25%		30%	50%	60%	NA	p60%



Indicator Name	Baseline	Cumulative Target Values					
		YR1 (July 2016–June 2017)	YR2 (July 2017–June 2018)	YR3 (July 2018–June 2019)	YR4 (July 2019–June 2020)	YR5 (July 2020–September 2020)	End Target (September 2020)
Equity							
12. Number of engineering education institutes in focus states that meet the enabling mechanisms for participation in the project	21	55		87			
System efficiency							
13. (i) Timeliness of allocations, and utilization; and (ii) expenditure recognition against the utilization (DLI 5).	NA		In the previous six (6) months: (i) MHRD provides allocation in public finance management system for at least 75% of the fund requests submitted by the participating	For the last two quarters: (i) Fund utilization (eligible payments made) are equivalent to at least 70% or more, of the approved allocations for	For the last two quarters: (i) Fund utilization (eligible payments made) are equivalent to at least 90% or more, of the approved allocations for the participating institutes; and		



Indicator Name	Baseline	Cumulative Target Values					
		YR1 (July 2016–June 2017)	YR2 (July 2017–June 2018)	YR3 (July 2018–June 2019)	YR4 (July 2019–June 2020)	YR5 (July 2020–September 2020)	End Target (September 2020)
			institutes, within ten (10) calendar days from the start of quarter; and (ii) At least 70% of the payments requests made by the participating institutes are honored within thirty (30) calendar days from the date on which the participating institute requests the payment for	the participating institutes; and (ii) At least 70% of the funds utilized to date have been accounted for as expenditures in the Books of Accounts of the participating institutes.	(ii) At least 90% of the funds utilized to date have been accounted for as expenditures in the Books of Accounts of the participating institutes.		



Indicator Name	Baseline	Cumulative Target Values					
		YR1 (July 2016–June 2017)	YR2 (July 2017–June 2018)	YR3 (July 2018–June 2019)	YR4 (July 2019–June 2020)	YR5 (July 2020–September 2020)	End Target (September 2020)
			eligible transactions.				
14. Percentage of participating institutes with a BoG composed as per prescribed structure that meets at least 4 times every calendar and which publicly discloses the minutes of all meetings (DLI 3)	Focus States: 35 Other States: 60		Focus States: 60 Other States: 80	Focus States: 70 Other States: 95	Focus States: 95 Other States: 95	Focus States: 95 Other States: 95	Focus States: 95 Other States: 95
15. Number of participating ATUs with MIS capable of producing annual report against prescribed indicators	0		MIS designed: Focus States: At least 1 ATU Non-LIS: At least 1 ATU	MIS developed: Focus States: At least 3 ATUs Non-LIS: At least 2 ATUs	MIS functional: Focus States: At least 5 ATUs Non-LIS: At least 3 ATUs	MIS functional: Focus States: At least 5 ATUs Non-LIS: At least 3 ATUs	MIS functional: Focus States: At least 5 ATUs Non-LIS: At least 3 ATUs
16. Percentage of participating institutes that produce and	0		Focus States: 20	Focus States: 60	Focus States: 85	Focus States: 85	Focus States: 85



Indicator Name	Baseline	Cumulative Target Values					
		YR1 (July 2016–June 2017)	YR2 (July 2017–June 2018)	YR3 (July 2018–June 2019)	YR4 (July 2019–June 2020)	YR5 (July 2020–September 2020)	End Target (September 2020)
publish an annual report in the prescribed format in accordance with the requirements set out in the PIP			Other States: 20	Other States: 60	Other States: 85	Other States: 85	Other States: 85
17. Number of participating ATUs in focus states that publicly declare final semester examination results before the start of the next academic year	0		1	3	6	6	6



Definitions and Descriptions of Monitoring Indicators

NOTE: Unless otherwise specified, participating institutes are those under Component 1. An institute is considered as ‘participating’ for these indicators if an MOU has been signed between the institute and the state government or MHRD/NPIU (as the case may be). All indicator values achieved at each date of reporting will be rounded down to the nearest whole number, including for verifying whether a DLI has been achieved.

Indicator	Description
PDO Level Results Indicators	
<p>1. Average score of students participating in tests designed to measure technical and critical thinking skills</p>	<p>Applicable to all institutes participating under Component 1, which have signed an MOU with the MHRD or respective state government (as the case may be) for participation in the project.</p> <p>The project will pilot low-stakes testing, at the UG level, to measure the progress of cohorts of students in project institutes. The test will be designed as part of the project and is expected to test the following areas: technical skills in physics, mathematics, and informatics; critical thinking and creativity; and quantitative literacy skills.</p> <p>The test will be voluntary. Average scores of students from institutes from which at least 20 percent of students, in the relevant year, appeared for the tests will be considered for this indicator. The indicator will be considered met if the average score increases by at least 5 percent from the previous cycle.</p> <p><i>Source:</i> Results submitted by the testing agency to the NPIU. Project MIS.</p>
<p>2. NBA-accredited and/ or applied for programs in participating institutes</p>	<p>Applicable to all institutes participating under Component 1, which have signed an MOU with the MHRD or respective state government (as the case may be) for participation in the project.</p>



Indicator	Description
<p>(a) UG programs (b) PG programs</p>	<p>NBA accreditation of the program(s) offered by an institute is applied for if the institute offering the program has completed the following steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">(a) Registration with the NBA(b) Completion of the online application form for NBA accreditation of the program(s) and payment of the accreditation fee(c) Submission of the e-self assessment report (eSAR) for the program(s) to the NBA <p>A program is accredited if the NBA has accredited it for two or five years. A program will continue to be considered accredited for six months after the date on which its accreditation expires, conditional on it having applied for renewal.</p> <p>If a program has been accredited by the NBA at any time previously, for two or five years, it will be considered accredited only if it receives five-year accreditation in subsequent accreditation cycles.</p> <p>The indicator will track the increase in percentage points of programs as defined above. The percentage of programs accredited (and/or applied for) in a particular year will be calculated out of the total number of AICTE-approved eligible UG/PG programs offered by an institute as of the date of reporting.</p> <p>To avoid double-counting, no program that is accredited will be included in calculating the number of programs that have applied for accreditation.</p> <p><i>Source</i> Project MIS. For the program(s) for which accreditation has been applied for, the institute uploads, to the MIS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">(a) a copy of the receipt for payment of accreditation fees to the NBA; and(b) a copy of the eSAR submitted to the NBA. <p>For the program(s) that have been accredited: The institute will upload, to the MIS, a copy of the notification from the NBA on the accreditation status of the program(s).</p>



Indicator	Description
<p>3. Transition rate of UG engineering students from the first year to the second year in participating institutes</p> <p>(a) SC/ST</p> <p>(b) Women</p>	<p>Applicable to all institutes participating under Component 1, which have signed an MOU with the MHRD or respective state government (as the case may be) for participation in the project.</p> <p>Defined as the percentage of UG students registered in the fourth semester (in year t), out of those registered in the second semester (in year t-1). Students must have passed all their examinations; if a student does not sit for an examination for any reason, he/she is considered to have not passed the examination, for this indicator.</p> <p>A student is registered in a semester if he/she paid the semester tuition fees to the institute by the end of the first month of the semester.</p> <p>Source: Project MIS.</p>
<p>4. Percentage of students from traditionally disadvantaged groups in total enrolment in participating institutes</p> <p>(a)SC/ST</p> <p>(b)Women</p> <p>(Percentage)</p>	<p>Applicable to all institutes participating under Component 1, which have signed an MOU with the MHRD or respective state government (as the case may be) for participation in the project.</p> <p>Categories of disadvantaged groups are defined as (a) SC and ST and (b) females. These two categories will be monitored separately.</p> <p>Total enrolment is the number of PG and UG students who have paid the semester tuition fees to the institute by the end of the first month of the semester completed immediately before the time of reporting. Enrolment is of students in all years of their respective program and includes those students who are still enrolled but have not completed their degree program on schedule.</p> <p>Source: Project MIS.</p>



Indicator	Description
Intermediate Results Indicators	
1. Direct project beneficiaries (Number) -	<p>The number of UG and PG students enrolled and teachers and staff/ administrators employed in participating institutes in Component 1, which have signed an MOU with the MHRD or respective state government (as the case may be) for participation in the project. For this indicator, the colleges (whether government, government aided, or private unaided) affiliated to an ATU participating under Subcomponent 1.2 are also included.</p> <p>Enrolment is the number of PG and UG students who have paid the semester tuition fees to the institute by the end of the first month of the semester completed immediately before the time of reporting. Enrolment is of students in all years of their respective program and includes those students who are still enrolled but have not completed their degree program on schedule.</p> <p><i>Source: Project MIS.</i></p>
2. Female beneficiaries (Percentage - Sub-Type: Supplemental) -	<p>As a percentage of the number reported in Intermediate Results Indicator 1. Direct project beneficiaries.</p> <p><i>Source: Project MIS.</i></p>
3. Percentage of participating institutes in focus states with autonomy	<p>Applicable to all institutes participating under Subcomponents 1.1, which have signed an MOU with the MHRD or respective state government (as the case may be) for participation in the project.</p> <p>An Autonomous Institution means the institution which can revise/modify its curriculum which includes centrally funded institutions (CFIs), Unitary /Deemed to be University, University Department/Faculty/single Constituent College and Institutions declared autonomous by UGC.</p> <p>UGC autonomy refers to the delegation of academic powers to an institute, by the UGC, according to the UGC Guidelines for Autonomous Institutes 2012–17. An institute is considered autonomous once it receives a formal notification from the UGC that it has been granted autonomy.</p> <p><i>Source: Project MIS.</i></p>



Indicator	Description
4. Percentage of PhD students in total enrolment in engineering disciplines in participating institutes	<p>Applicable to all institutes participating under Component 1, which have signed an MOU with the MHRD or respective state government (as the case may be) for participation in the project.</p> <p>Total enrolment is the number of PG and UG students who have paid the semester tuition fees to the institute by the end of the first month of the semester completed immediately before the time of reporting. Enrolment is of students in all years of their respective program, and includes those students who are still enrolled but have not completed their degree program on schedule. PhD students may include those who are enrolled part-time or full-time for a PhD at the respective institute.</p> <p>The increase in percentage will be tracked under this indicator.</p> <p>Engineering disciplines are those under the category 'Engineering and Technology', as classified by the AICTE.</p> <p><i>Source: Project MIS</i></p>
5. Percentage of sanctioned faculty positions, in participating institutes, filled by regular or contract faculty, contracted according to AICTE norms	<p>Applicable to all institutes participating under Component 1, which have signed an MOU with the MHRD or respective state government (as the case may be) for participation in the project.</p> <p>AICTE norms refer to the pay scales, service conditions, and qualifications of faculty as required by the AICTE regulations prevailing at the time of reporting.</p> <p><i>Source: Project MIS</i></p>
6. Number of faculty trained in either their subject domain, pedagogy, or management in participating institutes	<p>Applicable to all institutes participating under Component 1, which have signed an MOU with the MHRD or respective state government (as the case may be) for participation in the project.</p> <p>Faculty will be considered to have received training if they have attended a total of at least 7 days of training across their subject domain, pedagogy, or management in the last complete academic year.</p> <p><i>Source: Project MIS</i></p>
7. Percentage of externally funded R&D projects and	<p>Applicable to all institutes participating under Component 1, which have signed an MOU with the MHRD or respective state government (as the case may be) for participation in the project.</p>



Indicator	Description
consultancies in total revenue in participating institutes	<p>Externally funded R&D projects and consultancies refer to any research and consulting activity funded through a formal agreement entered into by the institute and the external agency commissioning the research/project/consultancy.</p> <p>Total revenue refers to revenue from all sources as declared in the institutes' annual financial statements of the last complete financial year.</p> <p><i>Source:</i> Project MIS. Institutes to upload copies of funding agreements and annual financial statements to the MIS.</p>
8. Participation of affiliated colleges in participating ATUs in newly designed research-hub related activities (number)	<p>Research hub activities refer to all activities to promote collaborative research across the institutes affiliated to an ATU, as specified in the PIP.</p> <p>Applicable to all affiliated colleges of ATUs participating under Component 1, which have signed an MOU with the MHRD or respective state government (as the case may be) for participation in the project.</p> <p>Participation refers to at least one faculty member from an affiliated institute conducting research using the facilities of the research hub.</p> <p><i>Source:</i> Project MIS. ATUs to upload a list of collaborative research activities, participating institutes, and faculty members.</p>
9. Student, Staff, and Faculty Satisfaction Survey	<p>Applicable to all institutes participating under Component 1, which have signed an MOU with the MHRD or respective state government (as the case may be) for participation in the project.</p> <p>Satisfaction levels will be assessed based on surveys, representative across project beneficiaries as defined in Intermediate Results Indicator 1. Survey commissioned by the NPIU. Results will be reported separately by each stakeholder group, that is, students, faculty, and nonteaching staff.</p> <p><i>Source:</i> Survey data.</p>



Indicator	Description
10. Employer satisfaction with engineers recruited in the past year	<p>Applicable to all institutes participating under Component 1, which have signed an MOU with the MHRD or respective state government (as the case may be) for participation in the project.</p> <p>Satisfaction levels will be assessed based on sample surveys of employers (with at least 10 percent of new recruits being TEQIP III graduates), representative across industrial sectors and regions, commissioned by the NPIU. Increase in satisfaction will be tracked.</p> <p><i>Source: Survey data.</i></p>
11. Percentage of participating institutes in Focus states that train final year engineering students to take exit examination (e.g. GATE)	<p>Applicable to all institutes under Subcomponent 1.1 engineering colleges which have signed an MOU with the MHRD or respective state government (as the case may be) for participation in the project.</p> <p>Exit examination refers to the examination for testing technical and / or aptitude of the students, for example. GATE, pre-placement training etc.</p> <p>Assistance includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">(1) Providing focused coaching (with internal faculty or outsourced service provider) for exit examination preparation through classroom teaching at no additional cost to the student(2) Providing focused learning material for exit examination preparation at no additional cost to the student(3) Providing scholarships for exit examination preparation if college is unable to provide appropriate assistance. <p><i>Source: Project MIS. Institutes will be required to train at least 70% of students in the final year. Institutes will provide NPIU a list of students who were provided assistance for exit exam preparation, along with details of type of assistance and student contact details. The data will be uploaded to the project MIS.</i></p>
12. Number of engineering education institutes in focus states that meet the enabling	<p>Applies to all AICTE-approved government and government-aided engineering degree colleges in focus states. An institute must have in place all 8 mechanisms to count toward achievement of the target.</p>



Indicator	Description
mechanisms for participation in the project	<p>The enabling mechanisms for institutes to participate in the project are the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. At least one cohort of students from the institute has completed their UG degrees. A cohort is defined as the set of all students who were admitted to the first year of any UG engineering degree program offered by the institute, in the same academic year. At least one cohort will be said to have passed if 50 percent of all students in any one cohort, admitted at any point in the institute’s history, pass all courses required for the completion of their UG degree. <i>Source:</i> The institute will submit a copy of the results of the final semester university examinations, of the first cohort, to the NPIU.2. The institute and the MHRD have signed an MOU which includes commitments to implement the prescribed academic and administrative reforms and the state government has passed any required government orders necessary to set these reforms in place. <i>Source:</i> The institute will submit a copy of the signed MOU to the NPIU (through the SPT). The SPTs will collect copies of all government orders.3. The institute offers at least 3 AICTE-approved programs in engineering disciplines. <i>Source:</i> The institute will submit a copy of the notification from the AICTE, approving at least 3 programs in engineering disciplines, to the NPIU.4. At least 40 percent of sanctioned faculty positions are filled with qualified faculty recruited on regular, contract, visiting or adjunct basis, contracted according to AICTE norms. If the institute has participated in TEQIP II, it is required to fill at least 55 percent of sanctioned positions with regular faculty, contracted according to AICTE norms.



Indicator	Description
	<p><i>Source:</i> The institute will submit a letter to the NPIU containing the number of sanctioned faculty positions, the names and academic qualifications of all faculty against each position, whether the terms of employment are regular and contract, and the length of contract for contract faculty, for each position.</p> <p>5. The institute has constituted a BoG (or equivalent) according to UGC norms if the institute is autonomous or AICTE norms if not.</p> <p><i>Source:</i> Institutes' websites. Institutes will declare the composition of their BoGs, with the professional background of BoG members on their websites, such that a search from the institute's website using the term 'Board of Governors' or 'BoG' yields a link/links to the minutes of meetings of the BoG.</p> <p>6. The college principal is appointed on a permanent, full-time basis and does not hold additional charge of another college.</p> <p><i>Source:</i> The State Department of Technical Education will submit a letter, to the NPIU, with the names of the principals of all government and government-aided colleges in the state and the college to which they have been appointed. The letter will contain an undertaking stating that none of the listed college principals hold full-time additional charge of another college and are appointed on a full-time basis to the participating institute.</p> <p>7. The college will have at least 500 students enrolled across all four years, of which 50 percent of students will be enrolled in AICTE-approved programs.</p> <p><i>Source:</i> The college will submit a list of students along with their university enrolment numbers to the NPIU. The MHRD will verify and forward the same to the Bank.</p> <p>8. The concerned state government has passed an order allowing the institute to retain all internally generated revenue, such as revenue generated through student fees, consultancies, conferences, and so on.</p>



Indicator	Description
	<p><i>Source:</i> The SPT will collect copies of the relevant orders.</p> <p>The NPIU (through the SPTs) will prepare a consolidated table, which provides information against each mechanism for all institutes. The list should include all institutes in each state, regardless of whether an institute has been deemed to have met all 8 mechanisms previously; institutes must continue to meet the mechanism at each date of reporting.</p>
13. (i) Timeliness of allocations, and utilization; and (ii) expenditure recognition against the utilization.	<p><i>Applicability:</i> All institutes under Component 1, which have signed an MOU with the MHRD or respective state government (as the case may be) for participation in the project.</p> <p><i>Definition:</i> The MHRD provides allocation of funds to institutes through the Public Financial Management System (PFMS) at the start of each quarter and on a rolling basis honors the payment requests made by institutes against eligible transactions as defined in the PIP based on agreement between MHRD and the World Bank.</p> <p><i>Eligible utilization:</i> Utilizations implies actual payments through PFMS towards eligible transactions requests raised by the participating institutes. Only transactions entered by institutes that meet the performance benchmarks, defined in the PIP based on agreement between MHRD and the World Bank, and are eligible for continued funding will be considered for the purpose of this indicator.</p> <p><i>Time frame:</i> The DLI for any target year, can be met early and claim can be lodged ahead of the target date. However, no claim can be lodged for that specific year where the DLI is met after the respective timeframe for the target year is over.</p> <p><i>Base data source:</i> The PFMS will track utilization of funds allocated to institutes. Institutions will be required to account (in the Books of Accounts) for expenditures recognized against these utilizations.</p> <p><i>Detailed information requirement:</i> NPIU will provide the World Bank: <u>For Year 2</u> (a) the number of calendar days between the start of the related quarter and the date on which the allocation was provided to institutes in PFMS (supported by PFMS report); (b) the number of calendar days between (i) date of payment request: the date the institute applies its Digital Signature Certificate (DSC) reflected by 'Date of Advice Generation' in PFMS; and (ii) Date of payment: when the amount was debited from the central pool bank account reflected by 'Debit Status Date' in PFMS.</p>



Indicator	Description
	<p>For Year 3 and 4, (a) percentage of funds utilized by institute against allocations received for the last two quarters (supported by PFMS report); (b) evidence that institutes have accounted for (in the books of accounts) expenditure against total funds utilized till date which will be subsequently substantiated through annual Statutory Audit Reports issued by the External Auditors.</p>
14. Percentage of participating institutes with a BoG composed as per prescribed structure that meets at least 4 times every calendar year and which publicly discloses the minutes of all meetings	<p>Applicable to institutes under Component 1, which have signed an MOU with the MHRD or respective state government (as the case may be) for participation in the project.</p> <p>Participating affiliated colleges and constituent colleges will be required to constitute a BoG as defined in the PIP. BoG refers to a body with overall responsibility for the strategic direction and accountability of the college, constituted according to the norms of the UGC, contained in the UGC Approval of Colleges Offering Technical Education by Universities Regulation, 2013, Appendix 16 of Annexure C. Participating affiliating universities and constituent colleges which do not have autonomous status from the UGC will be required to constitute a BoG according to the norms of the AICTE and as specified in the PIP.</p> <p>All participating institutes will declare the composition of their BoGs with the professional background of the BoG on their websites. Minutes of all BoG will be published on institutes' websites within two months of the date of the meeting, such that a search from the institute's website using the term 'Board of Governors' yields a link/links to the minutes. Each SPT will compile a consolidated list of the links at the time of reporting which the NPIU will collate.</p> <p><i>Source:</i> Institutes' websites and a consolidated report prepared by the NPIU.</p>
15. Number of participating ATUs with MIS capable of producing annual reports against prescribed indicators	<p>Applicable to all ATUs under Component 1, which have signed an MOU with the MHRD or respective state government (as the case may be) for participation in the project.</p> <p>MIS refers to a computer-based data management system.</p> <p>Prescribed indicators against which ATUs must report data annually will be specified in the PIP. The data must be published in the ATU's annual report.</p>



Indicator	Description
16. Percentage of participating institutes that produce and publish an annual report in the prescribed format in accordance with the requirements set out in the PIP	<p><i>Source:</i> Annual reports of ATUs.</p> <p>Applicable to institutes under Component 1, which have signed an MOU with the MHRD or respective state government (as the case may be) for participation in the project.</p> <p>The annual report format will be developed by the NPIU and agreed with the World Bank. It will be declared in the PIP and will include data on a set of prescribed indicators. Publication means placed on the website of the institute and where a search for 'annual report' generates a link to the report. The annual report (for the previous year) must be published by October 31 each year.</p> <p><i>Source:</i> Institutes' website. The NPIU will compile a list of institutes that have published a report in the required format, including data on all prescribed indicators, in the last 12 months.</p>
17. Number of participating ATUs in focus states that publicly declare final semester examination results before the start of the next academic year	<p>Applicable to all ATUs participating under Subcomponent 1.2, which have signed an MOU with the MHRD or respective state government (as the case may be) for participation in the project.</p> <p>Final semester examinations refer to examinations in all subjects offered to UG students, in engineering disciplines, in the 8th semester.</p> <p>Results will be considered declared on the date when</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">(a) the results of final semester examinations are available on the ATU website.(b) all requests for reevaluation have been completed and reevaluated results are available on the ATU website. <p><i>Source:</i> ATU website. The NPIU will send the Bank a list of the ATUs with a link to the results on the respective websites.</p>