

**MINUTES OF SEVENH MEETING OF THE BOG**  
**GOVT. ENGINEERING COLLEGE KOZHIKODE, WESTHILL**  
**(SELECTED UNDER SUB-COMPONENT 1.1 OF TEQIP PHASE – II)**

**Date: 29.10.2013**

**Venue: GEC Kozhikode,**

**Time: 0930 hours**

**Members present**

1. Dr. K. Gopakumar, IISc., Bangalore (Chairman)
2. Dr. V. Gopakumar, SPFU Director
3. Dr. Elizabeth Elias, NIT Calicut
4. Prof. K. Vidyasagar, Principal, GEC Calicut
5. Prof. V.I. Balasubramanian, GEC Calicut
6. Dr. Abdul Hameed, GEC Calicut

Dr. K. Gopakumar, Chairman, Board of Governors presided over the meeting.

The items as per the agenda note were taken for discussion and approval.

**Minutes**

**PART A**

**Procedural**

**Item No.A1: Confirmation of the minutes of the sixth meeting of the BOG held on 29-07-2013.**

The minutes of the BOG meeting held on 29-07-2013 was read and confirmed. No Comments were received (**Annexure I**).

**PART B**

**Status Reports**

**Item No.B1: Status of fund position as on 25-07-2013.**

BoG discussed about the shortage of funds and decided to request the SPFU for the release of the second installment of funds at the earliest.

**Item No.B2: Activity report, August 2013 – October 2013.**

The TEQIP Coordinator presented the various academic activities conducted during August 2013 to October 2013 as per the agenda notes (Page no. 4 to 10).

The BoG expressed satisfaction and pointed out that quality of the programs has been improved from early stages of project implementation. The meeting also decided the following

1. The honorarium for expert/invited talk is limited to Rs. 3000.00/ day.
2. The meeting ratified the programs presented by the TEQIP Coordinator as per the agenda notes (**Annexure II**).
3. The meeting ratified the honorarium of Rs. 5000.00 given for the programs conducted as per **Annexure II (Page No. 8 & Sl. No.1, In house program, Page No. 9 & Sl. No.1, IIC activity)**.

### **PART C**

#### **Discussions, Considerations and Ratifications**

##### **Item No.C1.I: Progress report of the procurement activities**

Prof. Biju I.K., Procurement Nodal Officer presented the current status of procurement. He reported that as on 25-10-2013, 55 packages have been completed.

##### **Item No.C1.II: Ratification of the procurement package cancelled**

Prof. Biju I.K., Procurement Nodal Officer presented the cancelled item in the approved procurement plan. The BOG discussed the case and the Nodal officer explained the reason for cancellation. The BOG ratified the cancellation as per the details given in the Agenda notes (page No.11).

##### **Item No.C1.III: Ratification of newly created procurement packages.**

NPIU and SPFU have given permission for revising the existing procurement plan. For improving the learning facilities in the campus, the procurement Nodal Officer has presented newly created packages. The BOG discussed the matter in detail and ratified the list given in the Agenda notes (Page No. 12, Items from Sl. No. 1 to 09).

1. The BoG appreciated the inclusion of Video conferencing system in the procurement plan. The

BoG also suggested including the facility for the live recording of courses in the video conferencing system.

**Item No.C2: Approval of the action plan for the remaining project period.**

As per the direction from NIPU, it is mandatory to have the BoG approved action plan for the remaining project period and accordingly Principal presented the action plan for BoG approval.

The BoG discussed the action plan in detail and approved the action plan (**Annexure II**, Page No. 13 to 16).

**Item No.C3: Approval of Proposed action plan other than procurement for the next 3 months**

Meeting approved the various proposed in house training programs, faculty and staff training programs and conferences outside the institution as per the list given in the Agenda notes (**Annexure II**, Pages 17 to 21).

**Item No.C4: Enhancement of R&D and institutional consultancy.**

The NPIU directed the project institutions to appoint retired teachers from IISc./IITs/NITs/other reputed institutions as **Senior Research Advisor (SRA)** and directed to constitute a **Research Guidance Committee (RGC)** for the enhancement of Research and Development activities based on the institutional requirement. The BoG meeting held on 29/07/2013 discussed the matter in detail and authorised Principal and R&D Coordinator to appoint SRA and form RGC. Accordingly R&D Coordinator presented the names of SRA and RGC members and BoG approved the same as per the details given below

**Senior Research Advisor (SRA)**

**Prof. L.M Patnaik**

Honorary Professor, Department of Systems Engineering,  
Indian Institute of Science Bangalore

**Research Guidance Committee (RGC)**

1. Prof. L.M Patnaik (Chairman)

Honorary Professor, Department of Systems Engineering,  
IISc Bangalore

2. Dr. C. B. Sobhan,  
Professor and Head, School of Nano Science and  
Technology, National Institute of Technology Calicut,  
Kerala
3. Dr.S M Sameer, Associate Dean,  
Department of Electronics& Communication Engineering,  
National Institute of Technology Calicut, Kozhikkode
4. Dr.N.Ganesan, Professor, Department of Civil Engineering  
National Institute of Technology Calicut, Kozhikkode
5. Dr G. Unnikrishnan ,Professor,  
Department of Chemistry,  
National Institute of Technology Calicut

**Item No.D1: Other items.**

The SPFU Director, Dr. V. Gopakumar, mentioned the importance of self-review of Governing Body as per the direction from NPIU. In the meeting, the BoG conducted a self-review based on the guidelines given in the MHRD prepared booklet on “TEQIP good governance guide for governing bodies”. The details of the self-review is given below

*(1 for clear evidence, 2 for some evidence and 3 for not in place)*

<b>A - PRIMARY ACCOUNTABILITIES</b>		
<b>SELF-REVIEW QUESTIONS</b>		<b>Assessment</b>
<b>1</b>	<p><b>Has the Governing Body approved the institutional strategic vision, mission and plan - identifying a clear development path for the institution through its long-term business plans and annual budgets?</b></p> <p><u>SUPPORTING EVIDENCE</u></p> <p>Vision &amp; Mission strategic plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vision, Mission and strategic plan are evolved by institute faculty through extensive deliberations. Vision &amp; Mission have been displayed on college website and lesson plans given to students.</li> </ul> <p>Strategic Initiatives approvals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Road Map for R&amp;D activities of the institute and Appointment of Senior Research Advisor and Research Guidance Committee</li> </ul>	<b>2</b>

	<p>(minutes of Sixth and Seventh BoG meeting, published in the web site)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Guidelines for Industry Institution interaction activities</li> <li>• Faculty and staff development programs</li> <li>• Guidelines for soft skill training programs for improving the employability of graduates</li> </ul> <p>(Regular BoG meetings and minutes published in the web sites)</p>	
2	<p><b>Has the Governing Body ensured the establishment and monitoring of proper, effective and efficient systems of control and accountability to ensure financial sustainability (including financial and operational controls, risk management, clear procedures for managing physical and human resources.)?</b></p> <p><b><u>SUPPORTING EVIDENCE</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Procurement plan and revisions are discussed and approved or ratified or modified as per the decisions of BoG meetings.</li> </ul>	2
3	<p><b>Is the Governing Body monitoring institutional performance and quality assurance arrangements? Are these benchmarked against other institutions (including accreditation, and alignment with national and international quality assurance systems) to show that they are broadly keeping pace with the institutions they would regard as their peers or competitors to ensure and enhance institutional reputation?</b></p> <p><b><u>SUPPORTING EVIDENCE</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Institution has a benchmarking process on the basis of rankings of the incoming students</li> <li>• Institution has applied for NBA accreditation</li> </ul>	1
4	<p><b>Has the Governing Body put in place suitable arrangements for monitoring the head of the institution's performance?</b></p> <p><b><u>SUPPORTING EVIDENCE</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Formal arrangement for monitoring does not exist, however his performance is reviewed in an informal way when he presents progress report in the Governing Body meetings.</li> </ul>	3

<b>B - OPENNESS &amp; TRANSPERENCY IN THE OPERATION OF GOVERNING BODIES</b>		
<b>SELF-REVIEW QUESTIONS</b>		<b>Assessment</b>
<b>1</b>	Does the Governing Body publish an annual report on institutional performance?	<b>3</b>
<b>2</b>	<p><b>Does the Governing Body maintain, and publicly disclose, a register of interests of members of its governing body?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes, Conduct of Governing body and appointment of members in transparent manner</li> </ul>	<b>1</b>
<b>3</b>	<p><b>Is the Governing Body conducted in an open a manner, and does it provide as much information as possible to students, faculty, the general public and potential employers on all aspects of institutional activity related to academic performance, finance management?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Governing body is conducted in an open manner and the proceedings of the minutes are not published</li> <li>• The sharing of relevant information with Head of the departments and faculty.</li> </ul>	<b>1</b>

**C - KEY ATTRIBUTES OF GOVERNING BODIES**

<b>SELF-REVIEW QUESTIONS</b>		<b>Assessment</b>
<b>1</b>	<p><b>Are the size, skills, competences and experiences of the Governing Body, such that it is able to carry out its primary accountabilities effectively and efficiently and ensure the confidence of its stakeholders and constituents?</b></p> <p><b><u>SUPPORTING EVIDENCE</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Governing body has been constituted as per the guidelines of statutory and regulating bodies (primarily UGC guidelines for autonomous bodies).</li> </ul>	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	<p><b>Are the recruitment processes and procedures for governing body members rigorous and transparent?</b></p> <p><b>Does the Governing Body have actively involved independent members and is the institution free from direct political interference to ensure academic freedom and focus on long-term educational objectives</b></p> <p><b><u>SUPPORTING EVIDENCE</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Nominations are decided by the Governing body based upon the merit and competencies in a transparent manner.</li> <li>Members are actively involved in furtherance of institutional objectives through the participation in regular board meetings.</li> </ul>	<b>2</b>
<b>3</b>	<p><b>Are the role and responsibilities of the Chair of the Governing Body, the Head of the Institution and the Member Secretary serving the governing body clearly stated?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Have come through practice, so far not clearly stated.</li> </ul>	<b>3</b>
<b>4</b>	<p><b>Does the Governing Body meet regularly? Is there clear evidence that members of the governing body attend regularly and participate actively?</b></p> <p><b>Yes</b></p> <p><b><u>SUPPORTING EVIDENCE</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BoG meetings in every 3 months and details published in the web site.</li> </ul>	<b>1</b>

**D – EFFECTIVENESS & PERFORMANCE REVIEW OF GOVERNING BODIES**

<b>SELF-REVIEW QUESTIONS</b>		<b>Assessment</b>
<b>1</b>	<p><b>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 ?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is an informal process to regularly review the performance of Governing body</li> </ul>	<b>2</b>
<b>2</b>	<p><b>Does the Governing Body ensure that new members are properly inducted, and existing members receive opportunities for further development as deemed necessary</b></p> <p><b><u>SUPPORTING EVIDENCE</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A new member is inducted (Faculty representative) because of the transfer of a faculty to another institution.</li> </ul>	<b>1</b>

**E – REGULATORY COMPLIANCE**

<b>SELF-REVIEW QUESTIONS</b>		<b>Assessment</b>
	<p><b>Does the Governing Body ensure regulatory compliance* and, subject to this, take all final decisions on matter of fundamental concern to the institution.</b></p> <p><b><u>SUPPORTING EVIDENCE</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AICTE approvals for all the courses</li> <li>• Calicut university affiliation for all the courses</li> <li>• Mandatory disclosure</li> </ul> <p>Does the regulatory compliance include demonstrating compliance with the ‘not-for- profit’ purpose of education institutions</p> <p>Yes</p> <p><b><u>SUPPORTING EVIDENCE</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fee structure as per State Govt. rules, and fee relaxation for socially and economically backward students as per Govt.</li> </ul>	<b>1</b>



	<p>norms.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Admissions are as per admission rules of Kerala State</li> </ul> <p><b>Have there been accreditation and/or external quality assurance by a national or professional body? If so, give details: name, status of current accreditation etc.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Every year mandatory disclosure is sent to AICTE and published on website.</li> <li>• Institution has been applied for accredited by NBA.</li> </ul>	
--	---	--