

**MINUTES OF 10th MEETING OF THE BoG
COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING, THALASSERY
(SELECTED UNDER SUB-COMPONENT 1.1 OF TEQIP PHASE-II)**

Date: 28-09-2014

Venue: Mascot Hotel, Thiruvananthapuram

Time: 10:00 am

Members Present

1. Prof. K. C. Hari Kumar, IIT Madras
2. Dr. S. Raveendran, Director CAPE
3. Dr. Sajeev V, Principal
4. Prof. C. Ramachandran, Member
5. Mr. Binesh K., Member, TEQIP-II Co-ordinator
6. Dr. M. Ayyappan, Chairman and MD, HLL, Trivandrum
7. Dr. V. Gopakumar, Director, SPFU
8. Prof. M. K. Jayaraj, Professor & Head Dept. of Physics, CUSAT
9. Mr. R. Rajeev, Senior A.O, CAPE
10. Mr. B. Rajendra Babu, Administrative Officer, CAPE

Invitee Members

1. Dr. Prathapachandran Nair, Mentor COET
2. Dr. T. N. Pathpanabhan Nambiar, SRA COET

Professor.K.C. Hari Kumar, Chairman, Board of Governors presided over the meeting.
The items as per the Agenda Note were taken for discussion and consideration of the Board.

Part A
Procedural

Item No.A1: Confirming the Minutes of the 9th Meeting of the Board of Governors held on 01-03-2014 at Mascot hotel, Trivandrum

The Minutes of the 9th BoG meeting held on 01-03-2014 were read and after discussion, the minutes were approved by the Board.

Item No.A2: Report on the action taken/action pending on the pertinent decisions in the Minutes of the 9th Meeting of the Board of Governors held on 01-03-2014 at Mascot hotel, Trivandrum

The action taken report on the 9th meeting of the BoG held on 01-03-2014 was presented before the board .The principal read out the report and discussions were made on certain points and corrections were done for the same,which are shown below.

Sl.No	Decision Item	Action Taken	BoG decision
1	Suggested to give a request to the SPFU & NPIU to release an amount of Rs 2 Crore urgently	Request sent to SPFU and NPIU and received an amount of Rs 2.5 Crore	The Board agreed to the action taken by the college
2	Suggested to blacklist HCL for not supplying the goods as per the orders	Contacted CAPE & Govt. Engineering College, Kannur regarding the follow up action to be taken to blacklist HCL	Dr.Ayyappan, a member of the board discussed that there is a procedure to blacklist a company. Dr.Gopakumar suggested that only the govt. can blacklist the company. In order to blacklist there should be an evidence. The terms and conditions should be known. We should write a letter to the company explaining the situation regarding this. Hence the board decided to cancel the order not to blacklist.

3	Number of faculty members attended the training should be mentioned in the Agenda Note.	Number of the Faculty members attended the training Programme is indicated in the Agenda Note of the 10 th BOG meeting	The Board has agreed to the action taken by the college
4	Suggested to fix a date for mock accreditation and to contact COE, Vadakara in this regard.	Contacted COE, Vadakara regarding the accreditation and action has been taken by the accreditation co-ordinator to have a mock accreditation. SAR is included in the Agenda of 10 th BoG Meeting	The Board has agreed to the action taken by the college Members of the Board suggested to conduct a mock accreditation and the board members have asked to contact Prof. Shanthakumari and Prof. Vrindha of CET for conducting the mock survey
5	Suggested not to provide registration fee incurred by the UG students attending internship under III cell.	Travelling and lodging expenses were provided to students attending internship programme under III-Cell	The Board has agreed to the action taken by the college
6	Suggested that as per the decision of the SSC, any expenditure which has been made before the signing of the MoU cannot be sanctioned	Expenditure met by Mr.Sreenesh V for qualification Upgradation, before the signing the MOU of TEQIP was rejected	The Board has agreed to the action taken by the college

Part B

Discussion, Consideration and Ratification

Item No.B1: Consideration of the various procurement packages cancelled till date

Discussion: Mr.Binesh K, the TEQIP Co-ordinator presented the list of items cancelled in the approved procurement plan till date. The board discussed on the cancellation of the packages. The co-ordinator replied that the maximum amount for quotation has been extended from rupees ten lakh to twenty by NPIU. Hence the package of UPS Phase I and II was clubbed to a single one. The co-ordinator discussed that the amount for ERP software has been cut down from rupees Four lakh to one and a half like. Since PG courses were not commenced in the EEE department, the package Harmonic Analyzer was canceled.

Conclusion/Resolution/Recommendation/Decision: The BoG discussed the cases in detail and approved the cancellations as per the details given in Annexure B1.

Action: - TEQIP-II Co-ordinator/Procurement Co-ordinator

Item No.B2: Consideration of newly created procurement packages

Discussion: The TEQIP Co-ordinator presented the new proposals for revising the procurement plan. Dr. Ayyappan, member of the board discussed that while purchasing the UPS, a detailed specification of UPS, its capacity and its estimated cost should be indicated in the agenda note. Similar should be with the case of generator, ERP software and fire extinguisher. The member also suggested that there is a lack of experience for purchasing the above items. So some training should be given to faculty members. The member also suggested to send some faculty members to HLL for getting training regarding this.

Conclusion/Resolution/Recommendation/Decision: The BoG discussed the cases in detail and approved the revision of procurement plan and asked the co-ordinator to consider this agenda in the next BOG meeting also.

Action: - TEQIP-II Co-ordinator/Procurement Co-ordinator

Item No.B3: Consideration of the various academic programmes for the next 3 months

Discussion: The board has taken up the agenda for discussion. The Chairman discussed that the training programme in LATEX and CYBER Security for final year students could be handled by the department faculty members. The BoG also asked the co-ordinator to indicate the anticipated cost for the programmes and also to have some industry experts to give expert talk for PG students.

Conclusion/Resolution/Recommendation/Decision: The BoG discussed the agenda and rejected the training programme in LATEX and CYBER security to be conducted in CSE department. The BoG also approved the FSD programme in compiler and language workshop for staff, FSD programme in RF engineering, expert talk on Signal processing for PG students and training programme in HFSS and PCB designing for UG students.

Action: - Academic co-ordinator

Item No.B4: Discussion regarding the observations on statutory audit report during 2013-2014

The board has taken up the agenda for discussion and discussed the various observations regarding the statutory audit report.

SL NO	OBSERVATIONS	MANAGEMENT REPLY	BoG Decision
I	FACULTY AND STAFF DEVELOPMENT		
1	An Expert talk on counseling for parents organized by the college amounting to Rs 5,120/-. Participated by parents and students. It is not an allowable expenditure under this head. Which will result in Disallowance of Rs 5,120/-.	As per the direction of the Chairman of the BOG, a counseling for the parents, students and the teachers are mandatory before the commencement of the programme. Therefore the conduct of the Expert talk has been justified and the amount spent will not be considered as a disallowance	The Board discussed that this is a part of skill development. And if it is not permissible then the same should be taken from PTA.
2	An Expenditure of Rs 17,919/- accounted under this head. Actually the expense was III related so it should be transferred to IIIC.	An Expenditure of Rs 17,919/-has already been indicated under the head III-Cell	The Board agreed the decision taken by the management
3	Rs 8,000/- incurred for Paper presentation by Faculty at ICMPE. It is an allowable expenditure under R &D. So it should be transferred to R &D.	As per the PIP, expenditure incurred for paper presentation by faculty can also be booked under FSD.As per the audit report the expenditure of RS 8000/- incurred for paper presentation by faculty at ICMPE will be transferred to R&D at the earliest	The Board agreed to the decision taken by the management
4	The college conducted a Seminar on "Eco Friendly Campus" for an amount of Rs	The topic for the seminar is relevant since the project of "Green & Eco friendly	The Board asked to give a correct

	19,120/-. How can be classified it as Subject related programme. If it is not subject related which will leads to disallowance of such expenditure.	Campus” has been widely acknowledged in all the campuses. Also this plays a major role in the TEQIP II project	justification regarding this issue
5	During the year the college incurred Rs 32,959/- for a workshop and accounted it under this head on 30.08.2013 But programme details (Such as attendance register, Programme schedule e.t.c.) are not available.	Attendance register, Programme schedule for the expert talk “Outcome-based Education and Learning Objectives and Assessment Techniques” has made available and it is filed along with other vouchers of the workshop. Copy of the same is attached along with the report for your kind perusal.	The Board agreed to the decision taken by the management

II ACADEMIC SUPPORT FOR WEAKER STUDENTS

1	<p>Remuneration paid to faculties for GATE coaching to students :</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Date</th> <th>Amount</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>15.04.2014</td> <td>600.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>15.04.2014</td> <td>600.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>15.04.2014</td> <td>2,400.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>15.04.2014</td> <td>6,000.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>15.04.2014</td> <td>6,000.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>15.04.2014</td> <td>6,000.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>27.01.2014</td> <td>4,200.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TOTAL</td> <td>25,800.00</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>As Per Clause 14 of Table 18 “Honorarium to faculty and staff for taking bridge courses, remedial teaching classes and skills development training” is permissible. So Honorarium paid for GATE coaching can't be treated as an allowable expense under this head.</p>	Date	Amount	15.04.2014	600.00	15.04.2014	600.00	15.04.2014	2,400.00	15.04.2014	6,000.00	15.04.2014	6,000.00	15.04.2014	6,000.00	27.01.2014	4,200.00	TOTAL	25,800.00	<p>1)Auditors have wrongly indicated the date of remuneration since the remuneration for the same was done in the year 2013</p> <p>2) An Additional amount of Rs 6000/ was also wrongly indicated for the date 15-04-2013</p> <p>3)Date indicated for the remuneration for an amount of Rs 4200/- was given as 27-01-2013 but it should be corrected as 15-04-2013.</p> <p>As per the direction of BOG, GATE coaching should be carried out in the college</p> <p>Since GATE Coaching can be treated under Professional skill development Training, the vouchers indicated for the same will be changed to as professional skill development training under this head.</p>	The Board agreed to the decision taken by the management
Date	Amount																				
15.04.2014	600.00																				
15.04.2014	600.00																				
15.04.2014	2,400.00																				
15.04.2014	6,000.00																				
15.04.2014	6,000.00																				
15.04.2014	6,000.00																				
27.01.2014	4,200.00																				
TOTAL	25,800.00																				

III INCREMENTAL OPERATING COST

A OPERATION AND MAINTANENCE

1	<p>TDS not deducted for the following advertisement expenditures relating to NCB :</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Date</th> <th>Particulars</th> <th>Amount</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>26.07.2013</td> <td>Advertisement in Hindu.</td> <td>1,77,520/-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>14.08.2013</td> <td>Advertisement in Hindu - Campus networking.</td> <td>1,56,448/-</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Date	Particulars	Amount	26.07.2013	Advertisement in Hindu.	1,77,520/-	14.08.2013	Advertisement in Hindu - Campus networking.	1,56,448/-	<p>Except for the amount for Rs 1, 77520/-, all other payments are made to an advertising agency M/s Valappila Communications.</p> <p>Since there is no prior information regarding this, the payment has met under TEQIP without deducting the Income tax.</p> <p>Further action regarding this will be carried out after the direction of the BOG.</p>	The Board decided that the Principal has to contact Valappila Communication regarding this and ask them to provide the proof for paying the TDS with evidence.
Date	Particulars	Amount										
26.07.2013	Advertisement in Hindu.	1,77,520/-										
14.08.2013	Advertisement in Hindu - Campus networking.	1,56,448/-										

	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>31.07.2013</td> <td>Advertisement in Hindu - CNC machine.</td> <td>1,30,373/-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>31.07.2013</td> <td>Advertisement in Mathrubhumi - CNC machine.</td> <td>10,389/-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>14.08.2013</td> <td>Avertisement in Mathrubhumi - Campus networking.</td> <td>12,467/-</td> </tr> </table>	31.07.2013	Advertisement in Hindu - CNC machine.	1,30,373/-	31.07.2013	Advertisement in Mathrubhumi - CNC machine.	10,389/-	14.08.2013	Avertisement in Mathrubhumi - Campus networking.	12,467/-		
31.07.2013	Advertisement in Hindu - CNC machine.	1,30,373/-										
31.07.2013	Advertisement in Mathrubhumi - CNC machine.	10,389/-										
14.08.2013	Avertisement in Mathrubhumi - Campus networking.	12,467/-										
	<p>All the above payments are made to an Advertising agency M/s Valappila Communications Private Limited. As per Section 194 C of Income Tax Act 1961 "Any person responsible for paying any sum to a resident contractor for carrying out any work (work includes advertising) must deduct income tax at the prescribed rates from such sum at the time of credit or payment whichever is earlier if such sum exceeds Rs 30,000/- in single payment or Rs 75,000/- in aggregate".</p>											
2	<p>BOG Expense amounting to Rs 67,622/- (dated 31.05.2013). In relation to which honorarium was paid to BOG members and Rs 1,200/- deducted from that Honorarium as TDS on 19.05.2013 but not paid yet and expense booked under this head short by that amount.</p>	<p>Honorarium to BOG members was given after deducting 10%TDS. But the amount after deducting the TDS has indicated in the expenditure statement (10800/- instead of 12000/-) Hence an amount of Rs1200/ lies in the books of account of TEQIP.</p> <p>Immediate action will be taken to remit an amount of Rs1200/- as TDS from TEQIP-II account</p>	<p>The Board asked the Principal to contact a TAX consultant regarding this issue.</p>									
3	<p>On 04.05.2013 an amount of Rs 31,050/- incurred as expenditure in relation to Performance audit. As per the information received from SPFU performance audit expenditures are reimbursed by SPFU. So it is not an allowable expenditure for the institutions.</p>	<p>As per the direction of SPFU, hospitality for the performance auditor should be met from TEQIP-II account. TA and honorarium for the same has been met by SPFU Kerala. Hence an amount of Rs 31,050/ has been incurred as expenditure in relation to the visit of the performance auditor on 04-05-2014.</p>	<p>Dr.Gopakumar, the Director of SPFU asked to send all the bills related to the performance auditor to SPFU so that the same will be reimbursed from SPFU.</p>									
4	<p>During the year the institution paid Rs 30,900/- as Registration fee of students for the participation in various conferences for paper presentation. The details of which are given below :</p>	<p>Date indicated by the auditors for an amount of Rs 4500/- was wrongly mentioned as 25-02-2014 instead of 26-02-2014 As per the direction of NPIU and the mail from the director of NPIU, Prof A U Digraskar, paper presentations</p>	<p>The Board agreed to the decision taken by the management</p>									

	<table border="1" data-bbox="240 285 695 783"> <thead> <tr> <th>Date</th> <th>Amount</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>30.04.2013</td> <td>3,000/-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>30.04.2013</td> <td>5,000/-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>20.03.2014</td> <td>3,000/-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>15.03.2014</td> <td>1,500/-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>13.12.2013</td> <td>400/-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>15.03.2014</td> <td>3,000/-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>20.03.2014</td> <td>6,000/-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>25.02.2014</td> <td>4,500/-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>25.02.2014</td> <td>4,500/-</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>As per Table 18 of PIP Paper presentation by faculty in international journals are permissible under R &D. Paper presentation by students in conferences is not an allowable expenditure under this head.</p>	Date	Amount	30.04.2013	3,000/-	30.04.2013	5,000/-	20.03.2014	3,000/-	15.03.2014	1,500/-	13.12.2013	400/-	15.03.2014	3,000/-	20.03.2014	6,000/-	25.02.2014	4,500/-	25.02.2014	4,500/-	<p>by the students in conferences can be met under TEQIP-II and it should be booked under IOC.</p>	
Date	Amount																						
30.04.2013	3,000/-																						
30.04.2013	5,000/-																						
20.03.2014	3,000/-																						
15.03.2014	1,500/-																						
13.12.2013	400/-																						
15.03.2014	3,000/-																						
20.03.2014	6,000/-																						
25.02.2014	4,500/-																						
25.02.2014	4,500/-																						
5	<p>TA for meeting the previous principal for clarifying doubt :</p> <p>a. On 21.12.2013 Rs 1,754/- b. On 21.12.2013 Rs 1,750/-</p> <p>This is not an allowable expenditure under this head.</p>	<p>Expenditure incurred to meet the former principal for clarifying TEQIP related doubts has been met from TEQIP. Since there is an audit objection for this the same has been met from college fund and the expenditure incurred will be transferred to TEQIP account.</p>	<p>The Board agreed to the decision taken by the management</p>																				
6	<p>During the year the college incurred Rs 16,964/- as expense in connection with mentor's visit (accounted on 12.04.2013). This includes Honorarium of Rs 12,000/- for 2 days. As per G.O.(Rt).No.1355/08/H.Edn. Maximum permissible Honorarium is Rs 3,000/- per day. Here Rs 6,000/- paid in excess of the amount prescribed, which seems to be non permissible.</p>	<p>As per the direction and order from SPFU, honorarium given for mentor's visit should be for four days instead of two days. Because of this an amount of Rs 12,000/ was paid as honorarium for the mentor.</p>	<p>The Board agreed to the decision taken by the management</p>																				
B SALARY																							
1	<p>As per section 194 J of The Income Tax Act 1961 " Every person who is responsible for paying to a resident any sum by way of fees for professional services in excess of Rs 30,000/- shall deduct Tax @ 10% from such payment". During the year the college paid Rs 1,77,123/- as Professional charges to MIS Officer but TDS not deducted for It.</p>	<p>Appointment of MIS officer is on contract basis for a monthly remuneration of Rs 25000/-and her service is not considered to be a professional service .Hence there is no need to deduct 10% TDS from the salary of MIS officer.</p>	<p>The Board agreed to the decision taken by the management</p>																				
IV GENERAL																							
1	<p><u>Establishment of four Funds:</u></p>	<p>The college has deposited the EMD in the Corpus fund instead of depositing the</p>	<p>The Board agreed to the decision taken by</p>																				

<p>i. Creation and establishment of Four Funds is a Project requirement that is to be complied with by all institutions.</p> <p>ii. These Funds should not be used during the Project period as funds for various activities are available under the Project.</p> <p>iii. Each project institution is to build these Funds with annual contribution into each Fund equal to at least 0.5% (total 2%) of annual total recurring expenditure of the institution.</p> <p>During the course of audit it was noticed that the institution opened "four funds" but not contributed the above mentioned sum. During the year the college deposited Security deposit of Rs 4,58,654/- & EMD of Rs 3,15,750/- into that account (Corpus Fund account) and withdrawn Rs 60,000/- from it as Repayment of EMD. These are violations from the TEQIP Rules. Since withdrawals are not permitted from these accounts, Security deposit, EMD e.t.c. should not be deposited under this account.</p>	<p>same in TEQIP-II main account. It has also withdrawn an EMD of Rs. 60,000/- from the corpus fund since the same has to be given to the supplier after their period.</p> <p>As per the direction of the departmental auditor, the security deposit of Rs.4,58,654/- & EMD of Rs 3,15,750/- for the period of 2013-14 has been transferred to TEQIP-II main account from the corpus account.</p>	<p>the management</p>
--	---	-----------------------

Action: - TEQIP-II Co-ordinator/Academic co-ordinator/Finance co-ordinator

Item No.B5: Discussion to begin M.Tech programmes in CS/IT departments

Discussion: The board has taken up the agenda for discussion and discussed that it is not necessary to start M.Tech in CS/IT as it is not viable. The board asked the present faculty members to give proposals for research funds from DST, UGC and AICTE so that the governing body will give sanction to start M.Tech programme. The board also mentioned that none of the faculty members has registered for the Ph.D programme.

Conclusion/Resolution/Recommendation/Decision: The BoG discussed the agenda and concluded not to start M.Tech in CS/IT departments.

Action: - TEQIP-II Co-ordinator/Academic co-ordinator/HOD CS/IT

Item No.B6: Discussion regarding the Assistantship to be given for newly admitted M.Tech students.

Discussion: The board has taken up the agenda for discussion and discussed that the assistantship for newly admitted M.Tech students should follow the rules as per the govt. norms. The board also suggested to give an amount of Rs6000/- per month as teaching assistantship M.Tech students and should be properly monitored by the co-ordinators.

Conclusion/Resolution/Recommendation/Decision: The BoG discussed the agenda and approved to give Rs 6000/- per month as Teaching Assistantship for MTech students.

Action: - TEQIP-II Co-ordinator/Academic co-ordinator

Item No.B7: Discussion to give permission for faculty doing qualification upgradation programme for the year 2014-16 under TEQIP-II

Discussion: The board has taken up the agenda for discussion and has given permission for the faculty doing qualification upgradation programme. The board has also mentioned that faculty should do there qualification up gradation in a reputed college. Also, the board decided to provide them the govt. tuition fees as per the TEQIP norms.

Conclusion/Resolution/Recommendation/Decision: The BoG discussed the agenda and gave permission to three faculty members to do qualification upgradation programme under TEQIP-II

Action: - TEQIP-II Co-ordinator/Academic co-ordinator

Item No.B8: Discussion regarding the staff members who attended the Moodle course

Discussion: The BoG has taken up the agenda. The Director of the SPFU, Dr. Gopakumar discussed this issue with the Principal of S.H College, Tevaara. But they didn't give any reply. The member of the board Dr.Jayaraj opined that such type of activities should not be allowed under the TEQIP. So the Chairman told that the staff who had attended the course should refund an amount of Rs. 35,000/- sanctioned

as advance. When the TEQIP Co-ordinator expressed his apprehension regarding what has to be done if the staff pose any objection, the Chairman and the members replied that, if at all they object, then the entire files should be handed over to the CAPE head office.

Conclusion/Resolution/Recommendation/Decision: The board asked the staff who went for the Moodle course to refund the sanctioned amount.

Action: - The Principal/ TEQIP-II Co-ordinator/Academic co-ordinator/Finance co-ordinator

Item No.B9: Discussion regarding the R&D activities and Proposal for Seed Money

Discussion: The board took up the agenda and discussed that the Seed money could be utilized only for the preparation a bigger project. Dr. Gopakumar told that Mr.Rajeev had called him several times regarding the clarification of Seed money and he suggested to appoint some other faculty if Mr.Rajeev is not able to pull off things. Dr.Padmanabhan Nambiar, SRA had told that a proposal has been received from Ms.Ashitha.T of EEE dept. for providing Seed money for Rs. 14,800/- for UG project. The board discussed that since Ms.Ashitha does not have a PG degree, she has to associate with another faculty member of higher qualification in order to allow the proposal for Seed money. The board also discussed that the Seed money can be utilized for the preparation of a proposal and, stationary-consumer items related to the research work can also be purchased under this.

Conclusion/Resolution/Recommendation/Decision: The BoG concluded that Ms.Ashitha.T should associate with a faculty of high profile to utilize the Seed money.

Action: -TEQIP-II Co-ordinator/Academic co-ordinator/R&D co-ordinator

Item No.B10: Discussion regarding obtaining prior permission from the BoG for providing honorarium for experts from IITs & IIMs

Discussion: The board has taken up the agenda for discussion and discussed that the honorarium for experts from IITs & IIMs is Rs5000/- and there is a govt. order regarding this. The board has also asked to provide the details of faculties who come from IIT and IIM and what they have to do in the college. The board also asked to provide correct details regarding this agenda.

Conclusion/Resolution/Recommendation/Decision: The BoG discussed the agenda and decided that Mr. Rajeev has to provide details of the programme as well as of the faculties from IIT/IIM who come to the college.

Action: - TEQIP-II co-ordinator/Academic co-ordinator/R&D co-ordinator

Item No.B11: Ratification of expenditure met by faculty who has undergone qualification upgradation Programme under TEQIP-II

Discussion: The board has taken up the agenda for discussion and ratified the complete expenditure met by Mr. Lalji Cyraic who has done his M.Tech from CUSAT during 2013-15.

Conclusion/Resolution/Recommendation/Decision: The BoG discussed the agenda and ratified the expenditure of Mr. Lalji Cyraic.

Action: - TEQIP-II Co-ordinator/Academic co-ordinator

Item No.B12: Ratification of Expenditure for the conduct of employability assessment test by Nac Tech 3.0 by NASSCOM under CGPU

Discussion: The board has taken up the agenda and discussed that all the students who have registered for the NASSCOM test should take the test compulsorily. The board disagreed with the absentees. Dr. Gopakumar said that it is the responsibility of the Placement officer to take up the matter seriously and give the reason for the no. of absentees. The board also discussed on how the money has been spent.

Conclusion/Resolution/Recommendation/Decision: The BoG discussed the agenda and ratified the expenditure for the conduct of employability assessment test by Nac Tech 3.0 by NASSCOM under CGPU. The Members of the board also concluded that this agenda has to be presented in the next meeting with proper details and explanation from the placement officer regarding the placement test conducted by NASSCOM and the reason for the absence of the students.

Action: - TEQIP-II Co-ordinator/Academic co-ordinator/Placement co-ordinator

Item No.B13: Ratification of the various In-house training programs for the faculty, technical staff and administrative staff

Discussion: The board has taken up the agenda and discussed that the number of beneficiaries should be rational. The BoG discussed that in the next meeting all details

should be indicated in the agenda and the faculty giving the Expert talk should also be mentioned.

Conclusion/Resolution/Recommendation/Decision: The BoG discussed the agenda and ratified the various In-house training programmes other than Sl.No5 indicated in AnnexureE9.

Action: - TEQIP-II Co-ordinator/Academic co-ordinator

Item No.B14: Ratification of the various In-house training programs for the students

Discussion: the BoG took up the agenda and discussed that the Internship undergone by five students in Saveetha University, Chennai cannot be sanctioned under TEQIP. The travel allowance should be met by the IOC head of TEQIP. The faculty should ensure that the students undergo their Internship in a reputed institution.

Conclusion/Resolution/Recommendation/Decision: The BoG ratified the amount spent for the diagnostic test conducted for the Ist year students.

Action: - TEQIP-II Co-ordinator/Academic co-ordinator/all Dept. Heads

Item No.B15: Ratification of the various training programmes attended by the faculty, technical and administrative staff outside the institution

Discussion: The board has taken up the agenda for discussion and discussed that the faculty, technical and administrative staff who have received training from outside the institution must share their experiences to other faculty/students and staff members.

Conclusion/Resolution/Recommendation/Decision: The BoG discussed the agenda and ratified the training programme attended by the faculty, staffs. Members of the board did not ratify the training programme attended by the staff members who have gone for the Moodle workshop as the decision for the same will be taken by the SPFU.

Action: - TEQIP-II Co-ordinator/Academic co-ordinator

Item No.B16: Ratification of the purchase of consumables and other minor items for the TEQIP office till date.

Discussion: The board discussed that a register should be maintained to make the entries.

Conclusion/Resolution/Recommendation/Decision: The BoG ratified the amount spent for consumables and other minor items purchased under TEQIP.

Action: - TEQIP-II Co-ordinator/Finance Co-ordinator

Part C

Reports

Item No.C1: The Status of fund position as on 25-09-2014

Discussion: Principal explained the status of fund position as on 25-09-2014, and also presented category wise expenditure given in Report C1.

Conclusion/Resolution/Recommendation/Decision: BoG was satisfied with the utilization of fund and asked the co-ordinator to speed up the procurement process at the earliest.

Action:- TEQIP-II Co-ordinator/Finance Co-ordinator

Item No.C2: The Status of four fund positions as on 25-09-2014

Discussion: The Principal explained the status of four fund position as on 25-09-2014.

Conclusion/Resolution/Recommendation/Decision: BoG members expressed that the report should be presented again in the next BOG meeting with the amount deposited by CAPE as FD (2% of tuition fee). BoG members told that this fund should be sustained after TEQIP.

Action:- TEQIP-II Co-ordinator/Finance Co-ordinator

Item No.C3: The Status of faculty position as on 25-09-2014

Discussion: The Principal presented the status of faculty position as on 25-09-2014. The members of the board were satisfied with the number of Assistant professors in each department. BoG reiterated its deep concern on the shortage of higher grade faculty members.

Conclusion/Resolution/Recommendation/Decision: The BoG members asked the Principal to take immediate action for the recruitment of higher grade faculty members. The board also suggested to intimate on the issue to CAPE.

Action:- The Principal/ TEQIP-II Co-ordinator/Academic Co-ordinator

Item No.C4: Status of the new PG/UG programmes as on 25-09-2014

Discussion: The Principal and the TEQIP co-ordinator presented the status of PG programmes and explained the difficulty due to lack of enough space and deficiency of senior faculty

Conclusion/Resolution/Recommendation/Decision: Members of the Board has decided to give letter to CAPE regarding this matter for further action.

Action:- TEQIP-II Co-ordinator/Academic Co-ordinator

Item No.C5: Accreditation status of the UG Programmes

Discussion: The TEQIP co-ordinator presented the SAR report and the marks obtained by each department which were uploaded in the NBA website. The board suggested that the Accreditation co-ordinator should be there to present this. Dr.Gopakumar, the Director of SPFU asked the Principal to bring a team from CET to College of Engineering Thalassery to conduct the mock accreditation survey.

Conclusion/Resolution/Recommendation/Decision: Members of the Board has decided to conduct a mock accreditation and the board members have asked to contact Prof. Shanthakumari and Prof. Vrindha of CET for conducting the mock survey. The board also asked to include this issue in the next BoG meeting and to present a report on the progress of Accreditation.

Action:- TEQIP-II Co-ordinator/Accreditation Co-ordinator/Academic Co-ordinator

Part D

Any other items with the permission of the Chair

- P
1. The Chairman and the board suggested that the annual report of the college should be published and included in the next BoG.
 2. The Chairman and the board decided that the next BoG should be arranged in the college within three months.

Action: Principal / TEQIP co-ordinator

The meeting was concluded by 3PM