

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING IN CONNECTION WITH FINALIZING  
NETWORKING ACTIVITIES OF TEQIP INSTITUTIONS HELD ON 11<sup>th</sup>  
DECEMBER, 2006 AT CONFERENCE HALL, 7<sup>th</sup> FLOOR, SBTET, BRKR  
BHAVAN, HYDERABAD**

---

The State Project Advisor, Heads of four Cells, 3 mentors and the faculty incharge of Networking activities in all 12 TEQIP institutions were present during the meeting.

1. Mr. A.V.Srikanth, Head Programme Cell has welcomed the participants and emphasized the importance of finalizing the networking activities to be taken up by the end of the project period.
2. Meeting started with introduction of participants as several new participants not known earlier were present.
3. Prof. N.P.Rao, Mentor has briefly outlined the requirement of presenting their Networking activities to be taken up by the institutions and what is expected from the institutions presentations.
4. Presentation started with A.U.College of Engineering, Visakhapatnam represented Prof. B.S.Prakasa Rao, on going through the presentation, the following are the observations made by the Mentors and Heads of SPFU.
  - i. The presentation was made in the format as envisaged.
  - ii. Majority of the activities expressed were either faculty exchange or Trainings & Workshops. Activities like Joint Research programmes, Joint Consultancies, Joint Publication of Technical papers, Joint Projects and Co-authoring can be taken up.
  - iii. Several of the activities which were planned for the past months were also included without the information whether they were really taken up or not. Some activities are planned after March, 2007 but not by all departments and activities without giving schedule viz., Workshops, Training programmes and Seminars by the Dept of Mechanical Engg., were presented.
  - iv. It was advised to include more activities giving schedule and also financial requirement commensurating their life time allocation under networking.
  - v. Consolidated finance statement was not given
5. Presentation of SVUCE, Tirupati was made by Prof A.Ramakrishna Rao.
  - i. The presentation is not uniform for all the departments and not in consonance with the standard format given during the workshop at Hotel Ramada
  - ii. The networking partners were not mentioned as which activity is to be taken with which networking partner in some places.
  - iii. The presentation was not made in the format as envisaged.
  - iv. Institution was requested to submit the reformatted networking activities by 13<sup>th</sup> December, 2006.
6. Presentation of O.U. College of Engineering, Hyderabad was made by Prof. N.Murali Krishna.
  - i. The presentation was not made in the format as envisaged.
  - ii. Networking partners, beneficiaries, budget requirement etc., were not given.
  - iii. The institution was advised to re-do the whole thing and submit the information as desired by SPFU by 13<sup>th</sup> December, 2006.

7. Presentation of Bapatla Engineering College, Bapatla was made by Dr. J.Girish.
  - i. The presentation was not made in the format as envisaged.
  - ii. Majority of the activities expressed were either faculty exchange or Trainings or Seminars / Workshops. Activities like Joint Research programmes, Joint Consultancies, Joint Publication of Technical papers, Joint Projects and Co-authoring can be taken up.
  - iii. Consolidated finance statement for networking activities was not given.
  - iv. The institution was advised to make minor corrections and submit the information in the desired format given by SPFU by 13<sup>th</sup> December, 2006
  
8. Presentation of O.U. College of Technology, Hyderabad was made by Prof. A. Ravindranath
  - i. Networking partners, beneficiaries, etc., were not given under sharing of resources and expertise and Joint Activities.
  - ii. Majority of the activities expressed were either faculty exchange or Trainings or Seminars / Workshops.
  - iii. Included in almost all the activities, the beneficiaries of Industry which shows the institution does not have clear concept on networking. The main focus shall be between the partners and only a substantial number of people from Industry can be planned without diluting the major Networking activities.
  - iv. More Consultancies & Research activities required to be included.
  - v. The expected expenditure is around 50% of Life Time allocation under networking without the participation of Textile and Food Technology Departments.Hence they have to plan for more number of activities.
  - vi. Consolidated finance statement for networking activities was not given. and were requested to submit by 13<sup>th</sup> December, 2006
  
9. Presentation of GIOE, Secunderabad was made by Sri. M. Hari Murthy,
  - i. Presentation was totally different proposing certain of the activities of previous years to be continued, as they were not dealt previously.
  - ii. Networking partners and number of beneficiaries, etc., were not given.
  - iii. Consolidated finance statement for networking activities was not given and were requested to submit by 13<sup>th</sup> December, 2006
  - iv. However, the presentation sent by email was different and some extent in the format envisaged by SPFU.
  - v. The expected expenditure is around 50% of Life Time allocation under networking and hence they have to plan for more number of activities.
  - vi. Institution is required to plan more activities and submit the comprehensive Action plan under Networking. and were requested to submit by 13<sup>th</sup> December, 2006.
  
10. Presentation of JNTU College of Engineering, Anantapur was made by Prof. A.V.N.Swamy.
  - i. The presentation was made in the format as envisaged by NPIU, giving the detailed Inflow & Outflow activities.
  - ii. Consolidated finance statement for networking activities was not given and were requested to submit by 13<sup>th</sup> December, 2006

- iii. Majority of the activities expressed were either faculty exchange or Trainings or Seminars / Workshops. Activities like Joint Research programmes, Joint Consultancies, Joint Publication of Technical papers, Joint Projects and Co-authoring can be taken up.
11. Presentation of JNTU College of Engineering, Hyderabad was made by Prof. G.K.Vishwanath and Prof J. Amarnath.
    - i. The presentation was not made in the format as envisaged.
    - ii. Majority of the activities expressed were either faculty exchange or Trainings or Seminars / Workshops.
    - iii. Networking partners, beneficiaries, and estimated expenditure etc., were not given.
    - iv. The institution was advised to re-do the whole thing and submit the information as desired by SPFU and were requested to submit by 13<sup>th</sup> December, 2006
  12. Presentation of Institute of Science & Technology, JNTU, Hyderabad was made by Prof. M. Lakshmi Narsu.
    - i. The presentation included networking activities in all the nine *heads*. But need some more number of activities in Joint Research programmes, Joint Consultancies, Joint Publication of Technical papers, Joint Projects and Co-authoring can be taken up.
    - ii. Networking partners, beneficiaries etc., were not given.
    - iii. The institution was advised to submit their revised action plans in the format by 13<sup>th</sup> December, 2006.
  13. Presentation of RGM College of Engineering, Nandyal was made by Mr. R. Thyagaraju, Nodal Officer
    - i. Networking partners, beneficiaries, etc., were not given.
    - ii. Majority of the activities expressed were either faculty exchange or Trainings or Seminars / Workshops or National Conferences / Symposia.
    - iii. Consolidated finance statement for networking activities was not given and were requested by 13<sup>th</sup> December, 2006
    - iv. The institution was advised to plan relevant activities with Networking partners and define the beneficiaries as required and submit by 13<sup>th</sup> December, 2006
  14. Presentation of JNTU College of Engineering, Kakinada was made by Prof. Dr.N.V.Ramana.
    - i. Majority of the activities expressed were either faculty exchange or Trainings or Seminars / Workshops
    - ii. Networking partners, beneficiaries, etc., were not given.
    - iii. Consolidated finance statement for networking activities was not given and were requested by 13<sup>th</sup> December, 2006
    - iv. The institution was advised to plan relevant activities with Networking partners and define the beneficiaries as required by 13<sup>th</sup> December, 2006.

15. Dr. C.S.R.Prabhu, Deputy Director, NIC, has made an oral presentation on “Product Solutions through Projects”. He has explained in detail about the proposed scheme wherein IT products can be developed in different components by institutions and finally integrate to come out with fantastic IT product. This concept was well appreciated and the institutions were requested to take up this project as Joint Research activity. The institutions are requested to explore and give a detailed action plan in this regard.
16. Presentation of Sreenidhi Institute of Science & Technology, Ghatkesar was made by Prof. K. Sivasai
  - i. Majority of the activities expressed were either faculty exchange or Trainings or Seminars / Workshops or Conferences. Activities like Joint Research programmes, Joint Consultancies, Joint Publication of Technical papers, Joint Projects and Co-authoring can be taken.
  - ii. Consolidated finance statement for networking activities was not given and were requested to submit by 13<sup>th</sup> December, 2006
  - iii. Presentation was proposing certain of the activities of previous months, which were either completed or postponed.
  - iv. It was advised to include more activities giving schedule and also financial requirement commensurating their life time allocation under networking by 13<sup>th</sup> December, 2006
  - v. Networking partners were not given in the majority of the activities and the institution was requested to mention and send the detailed Action Plan by 13<sup>th</sup> December, 2006.
17. After the institutional presentations, the mentors and Heads of SPFU have made their remarks. The consolidated list of remarks are :
  - i. All the institutions have to reformat their Action Plans on Networking activities in the format enclosed and send to SPFU by 13<sup>th</sup> December, 2006.
  - ii. The presentations of all the institutions are enclosed in the CD format and institutions were advised to take up the other institutional activities, if required.
  - iii. The activities have to be clearly given head-wise and department-wise as proposed in their CIPs and also as drafted during the exclusive Workshop on Networking held on 25-26<sup>th</sup> September, 2006. While drafting the action plans, they are required to clearly mention the Inflow & Outflow Networking activities, Networking partners, Beneficiaries and their number, expected expenditure and the month in which it is schedule. (format is enclosed )
  - iv. It was informed that the conduct of Conferences cannot be a Networking activity. However, on request of the institutions, it was informed that any such proposals would be discussed on case to case basis.
  - v. All the institutions have to stick to their Action Plans and start taking up their activities from 15<sup>th</sup> December,2006 positively.

- vi. The representatives of all the institutions for the networking activities will facilitate in implementing these activities and send the report after completion giving the actual details.
  - vii. Consolidated finance requirements shall also be necessarily given.
  - viii. The institutions may draft their own guidelines for their financial requirements in undertaking networking activities. However, no honorarium can be paid to the faculty for Networking.
  - ix. Institutions were advised to keep their Networking activities on their websites for larger participation among the TEQIP institutions.
  - x. Institutions were advised to take help of mentors. Prof. NP Rao has accepted to facilitate the institutions in this regard.
  - xi. Action Plans submitted by the institutions shall be reviewed by the SPFU and discussed during the next review meeting. However, the institutions are advised to go ahead with their action plans immediately, unless otherwise asked not to do so.
18. Sri. A.V.Srikanth, Head Programme Cell, SPFU, had thanked all the participants and mentors for all the support they have rendered in planning and conducting the meeting.

Sd/- RAJENDRA NARENDRA NIMJE  
STATE PROJECT ADVISOR

FOR STATE PROJECT ADVISOR