

PERFORMANCE AUDIT FORMS (2012-2013)

INSTITUTIONAL PERFORMANCE PROFILE

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 : 20<sup>th</sup> 21<sup>st</sup> and 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2014

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

PIP REF	INSTITUTION PERFORMANCE PROFILE	OVERALL EVALUATION GRADES
<b>COMPONENT 1: IMPROVING THE QUALITY OF EDUCATION IN SELECTED INSTITUTIONS</b>		
1.1	STRENGTHENING INSTITUTIONS 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
<b>COMPONENT 2: IMPROVING SYSTEM MANAGEMENT</b>		
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 plan in place implementation)

NOTE: SUPPORTING EVIDENCE- PERFORMANCE AUDITORS WILL PROVIDE A BULLET POINT LIST OF THE STRONGEST CLEARST 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)

DSM02

## COMPONENT 1: IMPROVING QUALITY OF EDUCATION IN SELECTED INSTITUTIONS

NAME OF THE DATA AUDITOR: Dr. K. Balaveera ReddyDATES OF DATA AUDIT : 20<sup>th</sup> 21<sup>st</sup> and 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2014NAME OF INSTITUTION WITH LOCATION: WALCHAND COLLEGE OF ENGG., SANGLI

## 1.1 STRENGTHENING INSTITUTIONS TO IMPROVE LEARNING OUTCOMES AND EMPLOYABILITY OF GRADUATES

MONITORING AND PROJECT OUTPUT/OUTCOME PARAMETERS	SUPPORTING EVIDENCE (NOTE: GRADES MUST SUPPORTED BY SOUND EVIDENCE OF ACHIEVEMENT OF THE INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL GOALS AND TARGETS)
<p>A. Effectiveness of funds utilized for the teaching, training, learning and research equipment, library, computers, etc. by institutions, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increase in the satisfaction index of student and faculty</li> </ul>	<p>Component 1.1 NOT APPLICABLE (As the institution is consider for TEQIP-Phase II 1.2)</p>
<p>B. Obtaining Academic Autonomy status, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of Institutions that have obtained "Autonomous institutions status as per University Grants Commission Process Within 2 years of joining the project, or</li> <li>Effectiveness of utilization of academic autonomy possessed/obtained (See Table -26 in PIP)</li> </ul>	
<p>C. Efforts made by institutions for upgrading qualifications of faculty members, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Percentage of faculty enrolled in MTech and PhD</li> </ul>	
<p>D. Existing teaching and staff vacancies and effort made by institutions for filling the vacancies, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Percentage of faculty and staff position filled and vacant</li> <li>Increase in faculty appointed on regular basis</li> </ul>	
<p>E. Effectiveness of equity at Institutional level, including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transition rate of students from the First to the Second year in Under graduate Programmes</li> </ul>	
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>OVERALL EVALUATION GRADE FOR 1.1</b> USING THE 3-POINT GRADING SCALE AND GRADE DESCRIPTORS IN ANNEX 4(1)</p>	

## COMPONENT 1: IMPROVING QUALITY OF EDUCATION IN SELECTED INSTITUTIONS

NAME OF THE DATA AUDITOR: Dr. K. Balaveera ReddyDATES OF DATA AUDIT : 20<sup>th</sup> 21<sup>st</sup> and 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2014NAME OF INSTITUTION WITH LOCATION: WALCHAND COLLEGE OF ENGG., SANGLI

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

MONITORING AND PROJECT OUTPUT/OUTCOME PRARAMENTERS	SUPPORTING EVIDENCE (NOTE: GRADES MUST SUPPORTED BY SOUND EVIDENCE OF ACHIEVEMENT OF THE INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL GOALS AND TARGETS)
<p>A. Effectiveness of funds utilized for the teaching, training, learning and research equipment, library, computers, etc. by institutions, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increase in the satisfaction index of student and faculty</li> </ul>	<p>88.02 out of 200 lakhs (Refer FMR March 2013)</p>
<p>B. Effectiveness of scaling-up Postgraduate Technical Education, including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased enrolment for MTech and PhD</li> <li>Establishment of proposed laboratories</li> </ul>	<p>One P.G. Program (M.Tech. CSE – Specialization IT is started in 2012-13 with an intake of 18 students) 20 faculties are perusing Ph.D. Procurement of Equipments is in progress for establishment of proposed laboratories</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cumulative number of assistantship granted</li> </ul> <p>C. Progress/achievement in starting new Postgraduate programmes including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Securing AICTE approval</li> </ul>	<p>14 No. of Assistantships are granted for M.Tech. students</p> <p>AICTE approval for One P.G. Program (M.Tech. CSE – Specialization IT is started in 2012-13 with an intake of 18 students)</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Establishment of laboratories</li> <li>Adequacy of student enrolments</li> </ul>	<p>Process of establishing new 4 PG laboratories are initiated</p> <p>142 students are admitted to PG program out of 144 intake</p>
<p>D. Effectiveness of collaborations made with other institutions in India and abroad, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increase in number of Co-authored publication in refereed journals</li> </ul>	<p>Increase in number is 4</p>
<p>E. Increased collaboration with industry in research and development, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increase in number of joint and industry sponsored research and development work undertaken</li> </ul>	<p>7 (New 7 AICTE sponsored projects are sanctioned)</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase in financial contribution industry for R&amp;D</li> </ul>	Nil
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase in Industry personnel registered for Masters and Doctoral programmes</li> </ul>	M.Tech – 2 Ph.D. – 0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase in Industry personnel trained by institution in knowledge and/or skill areas</li> </ul>	Nil
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase in the number of consultancy assignments secured</li> </ul>	11-Number of consultancy assignments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase in the number of students and faculty visits to and/ or training in industry</li> </ul>	44% students and 56% faculty.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improvements in graduate placement rate</li> </ul>	95% placed
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase in involvement of industry experts in curricula &amp; syllabi improvements, laboratory improvements evaluation of students and delivering expert lectures</li> </ul>	12 (2 experts each for 6 departments)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase in the number of sandwich programmes between industries and the institution</li> </ul>	Planning to start PG Diploma sandwich programmes
<p><b>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</b></p>	69.26% for year 2012-13 (As against 49.29% of 2011-12) (externally funded research and development projects and consultancies = 5,00,59,979 and total revenue of the institution = 7,17,51,713)
<p><b>G. Increase in the number of publications in refereed journals</b></p>	Total International Publications – 31
<p><b>H. Increase in the number of patents filed</b></p>	1 (A system and method for detecting unbalance of a rigid rotor using dynamic balancing machine)
Grade-2	<p><b>OVERALL EVALUATION GRADE FOR 1.2</b></p> <p>USING THE 3-POINT GRADING SCALE AND GRADE DESCRIPTORS IN ANNEX 4(1)</p>

COMPONENT 1: IMPROVING QUALITY OF EDUCATION IN SELECTED INSTITUTIONS

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

DATES OF DATA AUDIT : 20<sup>th</sup> 21<sup>st</sup> and 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2014

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

1.2.1 ESTABLISHING CENTRES OF EXCELLENCE

MONITORING AND PROJECT OUTPUT/OUTCOME PARAMETERS	SUPPORTING EVIDENCE (NOTE: GRADES MUST SUPPORTED BY SOUND EVIDENCE OF ACHIEVEMENT OF THE INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL GOALS AND TARGETS)
<p><b>A. Establishing Centre of Excellence:</b> Improvement in Research and Development facilities through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establishment of new laboratories for applicable thematic research</li> <li>• Establishment of a knowledge resource centre (library) in thematic area</li> <li>• Procumbent of furniture</li> <li>• Civil Works</li> </ul>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Component 1.2.1 Not Applicable</b></p>
	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>OVERALL EVALUATION GRADE FOR 1.2.1</b> USING THE 3-POINT GRADING SCALE AND GRADE DESCRIPTORS IN ANNEX 4(1)</p>

## COMPONENT 1: IMPROVING QUALITY OF EDUCATION IN SELECTED INSTITUTIONS

NAME OF THE DATA AUDITOR: Dr. K. Balaveera ReddyDATES OF DATA AUDIT : 20<sup>th</sup> 21<sup>st</sup> and 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2014NAME OF INSTITUTION WITH LOCATION: WALCHAND COLLEGE OF ENGG., SANGLI

## 1.3 FACULTY DEVELOPMENT FOR EFFECTIVE TEACHING (PEDAGOGICAL TRAINING)

MONITORING AND PROJECT OUTPUT/OUTCOME PARAMETERS	SUPPORTING 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:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Percentage of faculty who have benefitted from the core and advanced modules of pedagogy training</li> </ul>	25% of faculty members have benefitted
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improvements in (and/or updating, and more relevant) curricula and/or syllabi</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>70% restructured (New Curriculum of UG FY, SY and PG effected from 2012-13)</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improvements in (and/or updating, and more relevant) course assessment methods</li> </ul>	60% improved (increasing online exams of few subjects in 2012-13)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improvements in (and/or updating, and more relevant) curricula and/or syllabi</li> </ul>	40% (Syllabus of few subjects is revised in the year 2012-13)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Percentage of faculty with UG qualification registered/deputed for improving their qualification (See section-3, 4(b) on page 20 of PIP</li> </ul>	All faculty members posses PG Degrees 4 faculties are deputed for Ph.D.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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)</li> </ul>	60 out of 132 deputed for short term (45%) (such as STTP on Lab View, STTP-Soft computing tools and practice on signal, Workshop on Cloud Computing, Workshop on Emerging Technologies in Smart Grid)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Progress in securing accreditation of eligible UG &amp; PG programs (institutions to achieve target of 60% of eligible UG &amp; PG programmes accredited- applied within 2 years of joining the project</li> </ul>	UG – Total Program – 6, Accredited – 1, Applied – 5 PG – Total Program – 9, Accredited – 6, Applied – 3
B. Effectiveness of Pedagogy Training, Including	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Percentage of students satisfied with the quality of teachers and changes/developments specifically undertaken as a result of student evaluations.</li> </ul>	90% satisfied (Online course feedback by students is obtained for each subject)
<b>Grade-1</b>	<b>OVERALL EVALUATION GRADE FOR 1.3</b> USING THE 3-POINT GRADING SCALE AND GRADE DESCRIPTORS IN ANNEX 4(1)

## COMPONENT 2: IMPROVING SYSTEM MANAGEMENT

NAME OF THE DATA AUDITOR: Dr. K. Balaveera ReddyDATES OF DATA AUDIT : 20<sup>th</sup> 21<sup>st</sup> and 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2014NAME OF INSTITUTION WITH LOCATION: WALCHAND COLLEGE OF ENGG., SANGLI

## 2.1.CAPACITY BUILDING TO STRENGTHEN MANAGEMENT

MONITORING AND PROJECT OUTPUT/OUTCOME PARAMETERS	SUPPORTING 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:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improved understanding of the need and ways for increased autonomy, and new instruments for accountability</li> </ul>	<p>Yes, improved (Referred to Annual Report 2012-13) Updating of curriculum/syllabi; planning PG Diploma sandwich programmes; new electives have been added and on-line examination</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Modernization and decentralization of administration and financial management</li> </ul>	<p>Yes(MIS is well in place)</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Extent of delegation of administrative and financial decision making powers to senior functionaries</li> </ul>	<p><b>Very Good</b> (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 HODs upto Rs.5000/-)</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Responsiveness to stakeholders (students, faculty, staff, industry, local communities)</li> </ul>	<p><b>Very good</b> (Annual feedback report of these stakeholders)</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>institutional quality assurance and enhancement strategies, including student feedback mechanisms</li> </ul>	<p><b>Very good</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Internal / External academic audit in place</li> <li>To improve skills of teaching/non teaching, TNA is worked out</li> <li>Institutional goals with strategies to improve over all development</li> </ol>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Maintenance of academic and non-academic infrastructure and facilities, including sufficiency and quality of academic buildings</li> </ul>	<p><b>Very good-Quality of Academic Buildings</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All classrooms equipped with LCDs</li> <li>Campus is Wi-Fi</li> <li>Every dept. has computing facilities</li> <li>Institute has central computer facility</li> <li>Institute has a very good library</li> <li>Labs are open even after college working hours</li> </ol>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development, maintain and utilization of institutional resources</li> </ul>	<p><b>Very good</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) 50% of Development Reserve Fund (DRF) of every year is deposited in corpus.</li> <li>ii) As per the requirement of TEQIP 4 funds have been set up</li> <li>iii) 50% of remaining DRF, IRG used 100% every year</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Generation, retention and utilization of Income Revenue Generation</li> </ul>	<p><b>Very good</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) 60% of consultancy amount given back to concerned faculty</li> <li>ii) 50% of testing amount given back to concerned faculty</li> <li>iii) Remaining funds are fully utilized every year</li> </ul>
<p>Grade-1</p>	<p><b>OVERALL EVALUATION GRADE FOR 2.1</b> USING THE 3-POINT GRADING SCALE AND GRADE DESCRIPTORS IN ANNEX 4(1)</p>



## COMPONENT 2: IMPROVING SYSTEM MANAGEMENT

## 2.1: CAPACITY BUILDING TO STRENGTHEN MANAGEMENT (continued)

NAME OF THE DATA AUDITOR: Dr. K. Balaveera ReddyDATES OF DATA AUDIT : 20<sup>th</sup> 21<sup>st</sup> and 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2014NAME OF INSTITUTION WITH LOCATION: WALCHAND COLLEGE OF ENGG., SANGLI

## 2.1.1IMPLEMENTATION OF GOOD GOVERNANCE

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

<b>MONITORING AND PROJECT OUTPUT/OUTCOME PARAMENTERS</b>		<b>SUPPORTING EVIDENCE (NOTE: GRADES MUST SUPPORTED BY SOUND EVIDENCE OF ACHIEVEMENT OF THE INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL GOALS AND TARGETS)</b>
<b>A. PRIMARY ACCOUNTABILITIES:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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?</li> </ul>	Yes	i) Annual Budget Reports of 2012-13 ii) Annual Budget Report of 2012-13
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has the Governing Body ensured the establishment and monitoring of proper, effective and efficient systems of control and accountability to ensure financial sustainability</li> </ul>	Yes	i) Balance sheets of every year shows financial sustainability
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is the Governing Body monitoring institutional performance and quality assurance arrangements?</li> </ul>	Yes	i) Three meetings per year of Administrative Council and its reports (04.09.2012, 04.12.2012, 19.02.2013)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has the Governing Body put in place suitable arrangements for monitoring the head of the institutions performance?</li> </ul>	Yes	i) Performance appraisal of Head of Institute is done annually by the chairman of Administrative Council
<b>Grade-1</b>		<b>EVALUATION GRADE FOR 2.1.1A USING THE 3-POINT GRADING SCALE AND GRADE DESCRIPTORS IN ANNEX 4(1)</b>
<b>B. OPENNESS &amp; TRANSPARANCY IN THE OPERATION OF GOVERNING BODIES</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the Governing Body publish an annual report on institutional performance?</li> </ul>	Yes	Yes-Every year publishes Annual Report Annual Report of 2012-13
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the Governing Body maintain, and publicly disclose, a register of interests of members of its governing body?</li> </ul>	Yes	Yes Annual Report of 2012-13

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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?</li> </ul>	<p><b>Yes</b></p> <p>All required academic performance information is displayed to faculty, students and general public</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Grade-1</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>EVALUATION GRADE FOR 2.1.1B</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">USING THE 3-POINT GRADING SCALE AND GRADE DESCRIPTORS IN ANNEX 4(1)</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>C. KEY ATTRIBUTES OF GOVERNING BODIES</b></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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?</li> <li>Are the recruitment processes and procedures for governing body members rigorous and transparent?</li> <li>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?</li> <li>Are the role and responsibilities of the Chair of the institution and the Member Secretary serving the Governing Body clearly stated?</li> <li>Does the Governing Body meet regularly? Is their clear evidence that members of the governing body attend regularly and participate actively?</li> </ul>	<p><b>Yes-Well qualified, competent and experienced members</b></p> <p>Minutes of Administrative Council meetings are referred to</p> <p><b>Yes-Quite transparent</b></p> <p>As per the Administrative Council rules</p> <p><b>Yes-Academic freedom exists</b></p> <p>As observed from the Administrative Council Structure</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are the role and responsibilities of the Chair of the institution and the Member Secretary serving the Governing Body clearly stated?</li> <li>Does the Governing Body meet regularly? Is their clear evidence that members of the governing body attend regularly and participate actively?</li> </ul>	<p><b>Yes</b></p> <p><b>Bylaws and rules of Administrative Council</b></p> <p><b>Yes-Minimum four meetings per year</b></p> <p>As seen from the minutes of Administrative Council meetings –members attend regularly</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Grade-1</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>EVALUATION GRADE FOR 2.1.1C</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">USING THE 3-POINT GRADING SCALE AND GRADE DESCRIPTORS IN ANNEX 4(1)</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>D. EFFECTIVENESS AND PERFORMANCE REVIEW OF GOVERNING BODIES</b></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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?</li> <li>Does the Governing Body ensure that new members are properly inducted, and existing members receive opportunities for further development as deemed necessary?</li> </ul>	<p><b>Yes-Review performance-results, placements, research, consultancy etc.</b></p> <p>As seen from the minutes of Administrative Council meetings</p> <p><b>Yes-Government Aided Institution</b></p> <p>As seen from the Administrative council meeting minutes</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Grade-1</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>EVALUATION GRADE FOR 2.1.1D</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">USING THE 3-POINT GRADING SCALE AND GRADE DESCRIPTORS IN ANNEX 4(1)</p>

<b>E. REGULATORY COMPLIANCE</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the Governing ensure regulatory compliance* and, subject to this take all final decisions on fundamental matters of the institution.</li> <li>Does the regulatory compliance include demonstrating compliance with the 'not-for-profit' purpose of education institutions?</li> <li>Has there been accreditation and/or external quality assurance by a national or professional body? If so, give name, current status of accreditation etc.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Yes-Government Aided Institution</b> As seen from the minutes of Administrative Council meetings</p> <p><b>Yes-Government Aided Institution</b> As seen from the minutes of Administrative Council meetings</p> <p><b>Yes</b> For programme accreditation, National Board of Accreditations (NBA's) certificate is taken Current status : UG – Total Program – 6, Accredited – 1, Applied – 5 PG – Total Program – 9, Accredited – 6, Applied – 3</p>
<b>Grade-1</b>	<b>EVALUATION GRADE FOR 2.1.1E</b> USING THE 3-POINT GRADING SCALE AND GRADE DESCRIPTORS IN ANNEX 4(1)
<b>Grade-1</b>	<b>OVERALL EVALUATION GRADE FOR 2.1.1A-E</b> USING THE 3-POINT GRADING SCALE AND GRADE DESCRIPTORS IN ANNEX 4(1)

PERFORMANCE AUDIT FORM (2.2) (2012-2013)

ANNEX 4(2.2)

COMPONENT 2: IMPROVING SYSTEM MANAGEMENT

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

DATES OF DATA AUDIT : 20<sup>th</sup> 21<sup>st</sup> and 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2014

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

TABLE 2.2 PROJECT MANAGEMENT, MONITORING & EVALUATION

MONITORING AND PROJECT OUTPUT/OUTCOME PRARAMENTERS		SUPPORTING EVIDENCE (NOTE: GRADES MUST SUPPORTED BY SOUND EVIDENCE OF ACHIEVEMENT OF THE INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL GOALS AND TARGETS)
<p><b>A. Effectiveness of mentoring, reviews, surveys and audits conducted including:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increase in the achievement of the institutions goals and targets set out in the institutional Development Proposal</li> </ul>	<p>Yes, Very good</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Internal / External academic audit in place</li> <li>ii) To improve skills of teaching/non teaching, TNA is worked out</li> <li>iii) For programme accreditation, National Board of Accreditations (NBA's) certificate is taken</li> </ul>	
<p><b>B. Effective Project Management and Monitoring, Including:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Precise and reliable information/data through web based MIS available to stakeholders at all time</li> </ul>	<p>Good</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) MIS is well in place-Available to stake holders at all time</li> </ul>	
<p><b>C. Effectiveness of faculty evaluation by students, including:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Percentage/increase in percentage of faculty evaluated by students in one or more subjects</li> <li>Are results of evaluation properly used for teacher improvement? If yes, is the procedure adopted for teacher improvement including counseling appropriate and effective?</li> </ul>	<p>Yes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Feedback from analysis is very good and well in place</li> <li>ii) Counseling of Teachers is done based on students feed back by Deans and Head of Departments</li> </ul>	
Grade-1		OVERALL EVALUATION GRADE FOR 2.2 USING THE 3-POINT GRADING SCALE AND GRADE DESCRIPTORS IN ANNEX 4(1)