

## Summary Results of TEQIP Implementation Survey 2008

This note very briefly summarizes the main results of the TEQIP Implementation Survey for 2008. The salient ratings from each question are described, and the recurrent comments/suggestions from each question are included. We have equally quoted a few comments that summarized frequent comments. These are marked in *Italic*. It is important to emphasize that this is only a summary of the results. The MHRD and World Bank team has taken note of the full set of results and comments/suggestion.

### **1. Overall Satisfaction with the Project**

#### *Ratings*

- Participants generally feel very proud to be a part of the project, with a high rating of 9.6, while the rating of the overall project implementation 8.1 indicates room for improvement.

#### *Comments:*

- The project should focus more on Research, Development and Innovation.
- The project should improve monitoring of utilization of equipment.
- Deadlines of project activities should be informed with more in advance to improve planning.
- Flexibility of grants should be enhanced.
- Too much paper work constrains efficient project implementation, and an efficient MIS should be established to reduce the paper work.
- Better understanding of project concept and discussion involving faculty could have improved impact of the project.
- There was a problem with frequent turn-over of staffing.

### **2. Project Design and Preparation**

#### *Ratings*

- Ratings show that the feature of competitive selection of institutions is well received (8.8).

#### *Comments*

- One of the received comments summarizes the major issues of services to community and networking; “*Services to community and networking were the weak components in the project. Need more conceptual clarity on these two components. Networking has to be based on need based, not by force or restrictions. (Choice available for formal networking was limited during the first phase of TEQIP)*”
- While networking and service to community are deemed important, there are few incentives for community services and networking among students and faculty.
- Autonomy is important for community services and networking.
- Some institutions did not have clear understanding of the project concepts.

### **3. Project Implementation – Policy Reform-**

#### *Ratings*

- “The intended government policy reform (autonomy and block grants) have been achieved” is not strongly agreed with rating of 6.9. Quality of function in the Board of Governors seems to be ambiguous (8.0).

#### *Comments*

- Initiatives of State Govt. could be of more help to facilitate the project implementation.
- The feature of BOG is well received, but there is room for improvement, in particular through higher representation of industry.
- More detailed guidelines for project implementation would be helpful.
- Some feel that autonomy should be given immediately while others prefer gradual steps to autonomy.

### **4. Project Implementation – Institutional Reform-**

#### *Ratings*

- Students’ evaluations of teachers is rated quite positively (8.4)
- Ratings show that creating incentives to teachers has not yet been achieved in a satisfactory manner.

#### *Comments*

- Awareness on what institutional reform really means is crucial to smoothly implement the project. *“A number of Reforms could not bear desired results due to lack of awareness amongst the stakeholders. Such awareness building exercise should be made an essential activity”*.
- *“Incentives to teachers and recognition will alone help in fostering competitiveness and improvement in performance”*.
- The use of four funds receives support, but due to lack of financial autonomy, the future use of these funds are questioned.

### **5. Project Implementation – Implementation of Soft components (Faculty Development, Networking, Service to economy and Tribal Development)-**

#### *Ratings*

- The importance of support to weaker students in each institution was rated high (8.2)
- Other ratings point to a relatively weak implementation of the soft components.

#### *Comments*

- There is strong support for the softer components of the project, but the design and/or the implementation of networking and service to community needs to be rethought.
- Networking activities are limited due to faculty shortage, slow dissemination of the project concept, pre-determined networks, and few incentives for participation for students and faculty.
- The concept of services to community was not fully understood.

## **6. Project Implementation – Joint Review Missions-**

### *Ratings*

- Implementation of JRMs is very well received, in particular the opportunity to sharing experiences and learning (9.0).

### *Comments*

- More advanced notice of the JRMs could help institutions/states prepare better.
- More knowledge sharing and discussion would be desirable during the JRMs.

## **7. Project Implementation – Project Monitoring and Reporting-**

### *Ratings*

- Ratings clearly show a demand for a web-based MIS (9.0).

### *Comments*

- Frequent changes in reporting format delays project implementation. Advanced preparation of a standardized set of indicators to be reported during the entire implementation period would be preferred.
- There is a need to review the stakeholder questionnaire as some questions were not clearly defined.
- Performance audit are considered beneficial. Some respondents suggest that the performance audit could be once a year in stead of twice a year.
- Excessive and repetitive paper work take away time from academic work.

## **8. Project Implementation – Financial management and Procurement-**

### *Ratings*

- The ratings of “The World Bank procedures are cumbersome” are not strongly agreed. (Relatively closer to disagree with rating of 5.2)

### *Comments*

- Desire for clearer guidance and continuous training with relevant case studies within procurement and fiduciary procedure dominates most of the comments.

## **9. Project Impact**

### *Ratings*

- Many agree on improvement of internal efficiency of project institutions. (8.55)
- “The project increased demand from industry for high quality professionals” is not strongly agreed. (7.75)

### *Comments*

- Many comments point to an important impact on improved management of the system and the institutions.
- Qualified faculty and institute-industry relationship are still bottlenecks.
- Some respondents suggest that improvement of academic performance and management capacity have helped students’ placements.

## **10. Project Impact - the project’s best and second best features -**

### *Ratings*

- The best feature of the project is improvement in teaching-training infrastructure, and the second best is improvement in quality of education in institutions.

*Comments*

- Change in Mind-set was equally suggested by many

**11. Project Impact - the project's greatest and second greatest weakness -**

*Ratings*

- Ratings show that too much paperwork is the greatest weakness of the project (29%), and absence of reward for good performance as the second (18%).

*Comments*

- Top-down communication sometimes happens.
- Absence of government support or policy for autonomy is a part of weakness of the project.

**12. Performance of the World Bank**

*Ratings*

- Overall, the respondents were quite satisfied with the Bank's assistance (8.9). Nevertheless, there is a room for improvement in timely provisions of technical assistance from the Bank and the Bank's responsiveness to inquiries.

*Comments*

- More interaction with the Bank would be helpful in all areas of project implementation.
- The Bank could act more as a guide.

**13. Performance of NPIU/MHRD**

*Ratings*

- Overall, the performance of NPIU/MHRD was clearly deemed satisfactory (8.5), especially with procurement in terms of procedures and guidelines (8.5).

*Comments*

- More direct interactions with NPIU/MHRD would have been helpful for smooth implementation.
- Frequent changes in implementing officers adversely affect project implementation.

**14. Performance of the State Governments (SPFUs)**

*Ratings*

- Overall, performance of SPFUs was rated satisfactory (8.2); especially their timely provision of funds (8.4) and responsiveness to inquiries (8.2) are appreciated.

*Comments*

- Frequent changes in SPFU coordinators cause confusion to some extent.
- More timely provision of funds would be necessary.

**15. Performance of Mentors/Auditors**

*Ratings*

- Respondents rated the work of mentors and auditors as satisfactory (8.1).
- Many agree that results and suggestions from performance auditors helped in improving institutional project implementation (8.6).

*Comments*

- *“Mentors contributed but it has become very personal and it is essential to have mentors from other states than from the same state as some of the mentors are faculty members of the same institution earlier - thus it has promoted unhealthy practices.”*
- Sample auditing should be conducted without notification.
- Quality in mentoring varies.