AUDIT VISIT NUMBER: 1 (2) 3 4

(CIRCLE NUMBER OF THE VISIT AS APPROPRIATE)

NAME OF THE DATA AUDITOR: Dr. K. Balaveera Reddy

DATES OF DATA AUDIT   : 20th21st and22nd February 2014

NAME OF INSTITUTION WITH LOCATION: WALCHAND COLLEGE OF ENGG., SANGLI

PIP REF	INSTITUTION PERFORMANCE PROFILE	OVERALL EVALUATION GRADES
COMPONENT 1: IMPROVING THE QUALITY OF EDUCATION IN SELECTED INSTITUTIONS		
1.1	STRENTHENING INSTITUIONS TO IMPROVE LEARNING OUTCOMES AND EMPLOYABILITY OF GRADUATES	-
1.2	SCALING UP POSTGRADUATE EDUCATION AND DEMAND-DRIVEN RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT AND INNOVATION	2
12.1	ESTABLISHING CENTRES OF EXCELLENCE	-
1.3	FACULTY DEVELOPMENT FOR EFFECTIVE TEACHING (PEDAGOGICAL TRAINING)	1
COMPONENT 2: IMPROVING SYSTEM MANAGEMENT		
2.1	CAPACITY BUILDING TO STRENGTHEN MANAGEMENT	1
2.1.1	IMPLEMENTATION OF GOOD GOVERNANCE	1
2.2	PROJECT MANAGEMENT, MONITORING AND EVALUATION	1

	INSTITUTION PERFORMANCE PROFILE GRADES AND GRADE DESCRIPTORS
1.	Significant evidence of good practice. in the quality and standards achieved (Assessment identifies clear supporting evidence for at least 75% of the relevant practices can be considered good practice
2	Some evidence of good practice: in the quality and standards achieved (Assessment identifies clear supporting evidence that at least 50% of the relevant can be considered good practice
3	Good Practice not widespread or not in place: (Institutions may specify the expected date of completion if there are concrete plant in place implementation

NOTE: SUPPORTING EVIDENCE- PERFORMANCE AUDITORS WILL PROVIDE A BULLET POINT LIST OF THE STRONGEST CLEAREST EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE IN SUPPORT OF EVALUATION GRADES ON ALL ANNEX 4 FORMS

The grade descriptors have two elements, one relating to the amount and nature of the evidence for a given practice and one relating to the quality of the practice about which the evidence is gathered. So, for example a grade of 1 means both that the evidence is clear and that it amount to the 75% or more of the total evidence found and that the practice is good.

(K. BALAVEERA REDDY)

Co-ordinator TEQIP-II

SMC

NAME OF THE DATA AUDITOR: **Dr. K. Balaveera Reddy**

DATES OF DATA AUDIT   : **20th 21st and22nd February 2014**

NAME OF INSTITUTION WITH LOCATION: **WALCHAND COLLEGE OF ENGG., SANGLI**

1.1 STRENTHENING INSTITUTIONS TO IMPROVE LEARNING OUTCOMES AND EMPLOYABILITY OF GRADUATES

MONITORING AND PROJECT OUTPUT/OUTCOME PARAMENTERS	SUPPRORTING EVIDENCE (NOTE; GRADES MUST SUPPORTED BY SOUND EVIDENCE OF ACHIEVEMENT OF THE INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL GOALS AND TARGETS)
A. Effectiveness of funds utilized for the teaching, training, learning and research equipment, library, computers, etc. by institutions, including: • Increase in the satisfaction index of student and faculty	
B. Obtaining Academic Autonomy status, including: • Number of Institutions that have obtained "Autonomous institutions status as per University Grants Commission Process Within 2 years of joining the project, or • Effectiveness of utilization of academic autonomy possessed/obtained (See Table -26 in PIP)	
C. Efforts made by institutions for upgrading qualifications of faculty members, including: • Percentage of faculty enrolled in MTech and PhD	**Component 1.1 NOT APPLICABLE** (As the institution is considered for TEQIP-Phase II 1.2)
D. Existing teaching and staff vacancies and effort made by institutions for filling the vacancies, including: • Percentage of faculty and staff position filled and vacant • Increase in faculty appointed on regular basis	
E. Effectiveness of equity at Institutional level, including • Transition rate of students from the First to the Second year in Under graduate Programmes	
OVERALL EVALUATION GRADE FOR 1.1 USING THE 3-POINT GRADING SCALE AND GRADE DESCRIPTORS IN ANNEX 4(1)	

NAME OF THE DATA AUDITOR: **Dr. K. Balaveera Reddy**

DATES OF DATA AUDIT   : **20ᵗʰ 21ˢᵗ and 22ⁿᵈ February 2014**

NAME OF INSTITUTION WITH LOCATION: **WALCHAND COLLEGE OF ENGG., SANGLI**

1.2 SCALING-UP POSTGRADUATE EDUCATION AND DEMAND-DRIVEN RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT AND INNOVATION

MONITORING AND PROJECT OUTPUT/OUTCOME PARAMENTERS	SUPPROTING EVIDENCE (NOTE: GRADES MUST SUPPORTED BY SOUND EVIDENCE OF ACHIEVEMENT OF THE INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL GOALS AND TARGETS)
A. Effectiveness of funds utilized for the teaching, training, learning and research equipment, library, computers, etc. by institutions, including:	TEQIP-II Project sanctioned in the Year 2010
• Increase in the satisfaction index of student and faculty	Nil (TEQIP II funds were not received in the year 2011-12)
B. Effectiveness of scaling-up Postgraduate Technical Education, including	
• Increased enrolment for MTech and PhD	Nil (TEQIP II funds were not received in year 2011-12)
• Establishment of proposed laboratories	Nil (TEQIP II funds were not received in year 2011-12)
• Cumulative number of assistantship granted	Nil (TEQIP II funds were not received in year 2011-12)
C. Progress/achievement in starting new Postgraduate programmes including:	
• Securing AICTE approval	Nil (TEQIP II funds were not received in year 2011-12)
• Establishment of laboratories	Nil (TEQIP II funds were not received in year 2011-12)
• Adequacy of student enrolments	Full capacity (From student enrollment record 2011-12)
D. Effectiveness of collaborations made with other institutions in India and abroad, including:	
• Increase in number of Co-authored publication in refereed journals	Total no. of co-authored publications in referred journals are 30(increased by 20%)
E. Increased collaboration with industry in research and development, including:	
• Increase in number of joint and industry sponsored research and development work undertaken	8 AICTE sponsored projects and Total no. 4 projects sponsored by other institutes/industries (increased by 40%)

• Increase in financial contribution industry for R&D	Nil
• Increase in Industry personnel registered for Masters and Doctoral programmes	M.Tech – 4 Ph.D. – 1
• Increase in Industry personnel trained by institution in knowledge and/or skill areas	Nil
• Increase in the number of consultancy assignments secured	56% increase in consultancy. (No. of consultancies 300 as compared to 192 of last year)
• Increase in the number of students and faculty visits to and/ or training in industry	40% students and 50% faculty. (300 students and 50 faculty visited industry)
• Improvements in graduate placement rate	88.58 % placed (427 students are placed as against 482 students)
• Increase in involvement of industry experts in curricula & syllabi improvements, laboratory improvements evaluation of students and delivering expert lectures	12 (2 experts each for 6 departments)
• Increase in the number of sandwich programmes between industries and the institution	Planning to conduct sandwich programmes between industries and institution
F. **Increase in Percentage of revenue from externally funded research and development projects and consultancies as a percentage of the total revenue of the institution from all sources**	49.29% for year 2011-12 (externally funded research and development projects and consultancies = 1,95,65,350/- and total revenue of the institution = 3,96,90,424/-)
G. **Increase in the number of publications in refereed journals**	Total International Publications – 28 20% increase in publications.
H. **Increase in the number of patents filed**	1 (Process for image authorization, authentication and integrity check)
Grade-2	OVERALL EVALUATION GRADE FOR 1.2 USING THE 3-POINT GRADING SCALE AND GRADE DESCRIPTORS IN ANNEX 4(1)

NAME OF THE DATA AUDITOR:**Dr. K. Balaveera Reddy**

DATES OF DATA AUDIT   : **20ᵗʰ 21ˢᵗ and22ⁿᵈ February 2014**

NAME OF INSTITUTION WITH LOCATION:**WALCHAND COLLEGE OF ENGG., SANGLI**

1.2.1 ESTABLISHING CENTRES OF EXCELLENCE

MONITORING AND PROJECT OUTPUT/OUTCOME PRARAMENTERS	SUPPROTING EVIDENCE (NOTE: GRADES MUST SUPPORTED BY SOUND EVIDENCE OF ACHIEVEMENT OF THE INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL GOALS AND TARGETS)
A. Establishing Centre of Excellence: Improvement in Research and Development facilities through: • Establishment of new laboratories for applicable thematic research • Establishment of a knowledge resource centre (library0 in thematic area • Procumbent of furniture • Civil Works	**Component 1.2.1 Not Applicable**
	OVERALL EVALUATION GRADE FOR 1.2.1 USING THE 3-POINT GRADING SCALE AND GRADE DESCRIPTORS IN ANNEX 4(1)

NAME OF THE DATA AUDITOR: Dr. K. Balaveera Reddy

DATES OF DATA AUDIT : **20th 21st and 22nd February 2014**

NAME OF INSTITUTION WITH LOCATION: **WALCHAND COLLEGE OF ENGG., SANGLI**

1.3 FACULTY DEVELOPMENT FOR EFFECTIVE TEACHING (PEDAGOGICAL TRAINING)

MONITORING AND PROJECT OUTPUT/OUTCOME PARAMENTERS	SUPPROTING EVIDENCE (NOTE: GRADES MUST SUPPORTED BY SOUND EVIDENCE OF ACHIEVEMENT OF THE INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL GOALS AND TARGETS)
A. Effort made by institutions providing Pedagogy Training to Faculty, including:	
• Percentage of faculty who have benefitted from the core and advanced modules of pedagogy training	50% (Training program on outcome based education by US experts Prof. John Lamancusa, Penn State University, USA and Prof. LuenyMorell – HP Labs, USA)
• Improvements in (and/or updating, and more relevant) curricula and/or syllabi	20% (Syllabus of few subjects is revised in the year 2011-12)
• Improvements in (and/or updating, and more relevant) course assessment methods	20% (online exams of few subjects started in 2011-12) and planning to conduct for all subject
• Improvements in (and/or updating, and more relevant) curricula and/or syllabi	20% (Syllabus of few subjects is revised in the year 2011-12)
• Percentage of faculty with UG qualification registered/deputed for improving their qualification (See section-3, 4(b) on page 20 of PIP	All faculty members passes PG Degrees 4 faculties are deputed for Ph.D.
• Percentage of faculty deputed for subject domain training, seminars, etc. *(faculty are required to share their gains with peers and put reports on training on institution's Website)*	25% (faculty attended courses such as New Trends in P.S.Protection & Control Techniques, Operation & Management of emerging power systems, STTP Recent advances in Genetic Algorithms & Techniques, NRDMS (DST) sponsored training on Geoinformatics)
• Progress in securing accreditation of eligible UG & PG programs *(Institutions to achieve target of 60% of eligible UG & PG programmes accredited-applied within 2 years of joining the project*	UG – Total Program – 6, Accredited – 3, Applied – 3 PG – Total Program – 9, Accredited – 5, Applied – 4
B. Effectiveness of Pedagogy Training, Including	
• Percentage of students satisfied with the quality of teachers and changes/developments specifically undertaken as a result of student evaluations.	90% satisfied (Online course feedback by students is obtained for each subject)
Grade-1	**OVERALL EVALUATION GRADE FOR 1.3** USING THE 3-POINT GRADING SCALE AND GRADE DESCRIPTORS IN ANNEX 4(1)

NAME OF THE DATA AUDITOR: **Dr. K. Balaveera Reddy**

DATES OF DATA AUDIT   : **20ᵗʰ 21ˢᵗ and 22ⁿᵈ February 2014**

NAME OF INSTITUTION WITH LOCATION: **WALCHAND COLLEGE OF ENGG., SANGLI**

2.1 CAPACITY BUILDING TO STRENTHEN MANAGEMENT

MONITORING AND PROJECT OUTPUT/OUTCOME PRARAMENTERS	SUPPROTING EVIDENCE (NOTE: GRADES MUST SUPPORTED BY SOUND EVIDENCE OF ACHIEVEMENT OF THE INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL GOALS AND TARGETS)
A. Implementation of academic and non-academic reforms, including:	
• Improved understanding of the need and ways for increased autonomy, and new instruments for accountability	**Yes, improved** (Referred to Annual Report 2011-12) **Able to update syllabi; New electives have been included; planning sandwich programmes and percentage of results improved**
• Modernization and decentralization of administration and financial management	**Yes** (MIS is well in place)financial powers to hoduptoRs 5000
• Extent of delegation of administrative and financial decision making powers to senior functionaries	**Very Good** (Leave sanction authority is handled by respective HoDs, full financial power to Director with the approval of Administrative Council, financial power to the Deans and HoDsupto Rs.5000/-)
• Responsiveness to stakeholders (students, faculty, staff, industry, local communities)	**Very good** (Annual feedback report of these stakeholders)
• Institutional quality assurance and enhancement strategies, including student feedback mechanisms	**Very good** i) Internal / External academic audit in place ii) To improve skills of teaching/non teaching, TNA is worked out iii) **Institutional goals with strategies to improve overall development**
• Maintenance of academic and non-academic infrastructure and facilities, including sufficiency and quality of academic buildings	**Very good-Quality of Academic buildings** i) All classrooms equipped with LCDs ii) Campus is Wi-Fi iii) Every dept. has computing facilities iv) Institute has central computer facility v) Institute has a very good library vi) Labs are open even after college working hours

• Development, maintain and utilization of institutional resources	**Very good** i) 50% of Development Reserve Fund (DRF) of every year is deposited in corpus. ii) As per the requirement of TEQIP 4 funds have been set up iii) 50% of remaining DRF, IRG used 100% every year
• Generation, retention and utilization of Income Revenue Generation	**Very good** i) 60% of consultancy amount given back to concerned faculty ii) 50% of testing amount given back to concerned faculty iii) Remaining funds are fully utilized every year

OVERALL EVALUATION GRADE FOR 2.1

USING THE 3-POINT GRADING SCALE AND GRADE DESCRIPTORS IN ANNEX 4(1)

Grade-1

COMPONENT 2: IMPROVING SYSTEM MANAGEMENT

2.1: CAPACITY BUILDING TO STRENGTHEN MANAGEMENT (continued)

2.1.1 IMPLEMENTATION OF GOOD GOVERNANCE

(See Also Annex 4 of the Good Governance for Governing Bodies for examples of supporting evidence)

MONITORING AND PROJECT OUTPUT/OUTCOME PARAMENTERS	SUPPROTING EVIDENCE (NOTE: GRADES MUST SUPPORTED BY SOUND EVIDENCE OF ACHIEVEMENT OF THE INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL GOALS AND TARGETS)
A. PRIMARY ACCOUNTABILITES:	
• 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?	**Yes** i) Annual Budget Reports of 2011-12 ii) Annual Budget Report of 2011-12
• Has the Governing Body ensured the establishment and monitoring of proper, effective and efficient systems of control and accountability to ensure financial sustainability	**Yes**-Government Aided Institution i) Balance sheets of every year shows financial sustainability
• Is the Governing Body monitoring institutional performance and quality assurance arrangements?	**Yes,** Four meetings per year of Administrative Council and its reports (meetings are held on 16.08.11, 07.12.2011, 21.02.2012, 06.06.2012)
• Has the Governing Body put in place suitable arrangements for monitoring the head of the institutions performance?	**Yes** i) Performance appraisal of Head of Institute is done annually by the chairman of Administrative Council
B. OPENNESS & TRANSPARANCY IN THE OPERATION OF GOVERNING BODIES	
• Does the Governing Body publish an annual report on institutional performance?	**Yes**-Every year publishes Annual Report Annual Report of 2011-12
• Does the Governing Body maintain, and publicly disclose, a register of interests of members of its governing body?	**Yes** Annual Report of 2011-12
Grade-1	**EVALUATION GRADE FOR 2.1.1A** USING THE 3-POINT GRADING SCALE AND GRADE DESCRIPTORS IN ANNEX 4(1)

Questions	Responses
• 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 and management?	**Yes** All required academic performance information is displayed to students and faculty
C. KEY ATTRIBUTES OF GOVERNING BODIES Grade-1	**EVALUATION GRADE FOR 2.1.1B** USING THE 3-POINT GRADING SCALE AND GRADE DESCRIPTORS IN ANNEX 4(1)
• Are the size, skill, 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?	**Yes-Well qualified, competent and experienced members** Minutes of Administrative Council meetings are referred to
• Are the recruitment processes and procedures for governing body members rigorous and transparent?	**Yes-Quite Transparent** As per the Administrative Council rules
• 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?	**Yes- Academic freedom exists** As observed from the Administrative Council Structure
• Are the role and responsibilities of the Chair of the institution and the Member Secretary serving the Governing Body clearly stated?	**Yes** Byelaws and rules of Administrative Council
• Does the Governing Body meet regularly? Is their clear evidence that members of the governing body attend regularly and participate actively?	**Yes-Minimum four meetings per year** As seen from the minutes of Administrative Council meetings-Members attend regularly
D. EFFECTIVENESS AND PERFORMANCE REVIEW OF GOVERNING BODIES Grade-1	**EVALUATION GRADE FOR 2.1.1C** USING THE 3-POINT GRADING SCALE AND GRADE DESCRIPTORS IN ANNEX 4(1)
• 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?	**Yes-Review performance-Results-Placements-Research etc.** As seen from the minutes of Administrative Council meetings
• Does the Governing Body ensure that new members are properly inducted, and existing members receive opportunities for further development as deemed necessary?	**Yes-Government Aided Institution** As seen from the minutes of Administrative Council held in the beginning of restructure which happens once in three year

	EVALUATION GRADE FOR 2.1.1D
	USING THE 3-POINT GRADING SCALE AND GRADE DESCRIPTORS IN ANNEX 4(1)

E. REGULATORY COMPLIANCE

	Grade-1
• Does the Governing ensure regulatory compliance* and, subject to this take all final decisions on fundamental matters of the institution.	Yes-Government Aided Institution As seen from the minutes of Administrative Council meetings
• Does the regulatory compliance include demonstrating compliance with the 'not-for-profit' purpose of education institutions?	Yes-Government Aided Institution As seen from the minutes of Administrative Council meetings
• Has there been accreditation and/or external quality assurance by a national or professional body? If so, give name, current status of accreditation etc.	Yes For programme accreditation, National Board of Accreditations (NBA's) certificate is taken Current status : UG – Total Program – 6, Accredited – 3, Applied – 3 PG – Total Program – 9, Accredited – 5, Applied – 4

	Grade-1
	EVALUATION GRADE FOR 2.1.1E
	USING THE 3-POINT GRADING SCALE AND GRADE DESCRIPTORS IN ANNEX 4(1)

	Grade-1
	OVERALL EVALUATION GRADE FOR 2.1.1A-E
	USING THE 3-POINT GRADING SCALE AND GRADE DESCRIPTORS IN ANNEX 4(1)

NAME OF THE DATA AUDITOR: **Dr. K. Balaveera Reddy**

DATES OF DATA AUDIT : **20ᵗʰ 21ˢᵗ and 22ⁿᵈ February 2014**

NAME OF INSTITUTION WITH LOCATION: **WALCHAND COLLEGE OF ENGG., SANGLI**

MONITORING AND PROJECT OUTPUT/OUTCOME

TABLE 2.2 PROJECT MANAGEMENT, MONITORING & EVALUATION

PRARAMENTERS	SUPPROTING EVIDENCE (NOTE: GRADES MUST SUPPORTED BY SOUND EVIDENCE OF ACHIEVEMENT OF THE INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL GOALS AND TARGETS)
A. Effectiveness of mentoring, reviews, surveys and audits conducted including: • Increase in the achievement of the institutions goals and targets set out in the institutional Development Proposal	**Yes, Very good** i) Internal / External academic audit in place ii) To improve skills of teaching/non teaching, TNA is worked out iii) For programme accreditation, National Board of Accreditations (NBA's) certificate is taken
B. Effective Project Management and Monitoring, Including: • Precise and reliable information/data through web based MIS available to stakeholders at all time	**Good** i) MIS is well in place-Available to stake holders at all time
C. Effectiveness of faculty evaluation by students, including: • Percentage/increase in percentage of faculty evaluated by students in one or more subjects • Are results of evaluation properly used for teacher improvement? If yes, is the procedure adopted for teacher improvement including counseling appropriate and effective?	**Yes** i) Feedback from analysis is very good and well in place ii) Counseling of Teacher is done based on students feedbacks by Deans and Heads of Departments
Grade-1	**OVERALL EVALUATION GRADE FOR 2.2** USING THE 3-POINT GRADING SCALE AND GRADE DESCRIPTORS IN ANNEX 4(1)