| r. no. | Name | Marks Obtained (Percentage) | Average of all the faculty | Remarks |
|--------|------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------|---------|
| | 1 Paul Koshy | 96% | | |
| | 2 Pankaj Deshmukh | 90% | | |
| | 3 Anupam Dhoundiyal | 94% | | |
| | 4 Cletus Paul | 94% | | |
| | 5 Sunil Salunke | 96% | | |
| | 6 Siraj Shaikh | 90% | | |
| | 7 R S Verma | 92% | | |
| | 8 Haresh Rankhambhe | 94% | | 25 |
| | 9 Rajesh Rai | 90% | 91% | |
| | 10 Chandan Pardeshi | 96% | _ | |
| | 11 Archana Yendarkar | 88% | | |
| | 12 Pooja Bhoir | 94% | | |
| | 13 Meena Thapa | 88% | | |
| | 14 Meera Maya Singjali | 86% | | |
| | 15 Nandini Nambaiya | 86% | | |
| | 16 Ganesh Adlikar | 88% | | |
| | 17 Tejaswita Zanke | 92% | | |
| Total | 17 | 00 1554 | | |

Analysis of faculty Evaluation by faculty (CMC&HS) April 2023

Colandeshi Prepared By Chandan Parelethi

Checked By ANUPAM P,

HOD

| | TRAINING SHIF Faculty / Visiting Faculty | | |
|------------|--|--|--|
| Evalu | lated Officer's Name: Dr. Pankaj Deshmuki | h | Faculty Disiting Faculty |
| Lectu | rre Time, From 9.00 To: 9.50 | | on (Date) 18/4/23 |
| Cour | se Name: TY BSC MHS | | |
| Subje | | - Elem | ent of Professional Service web. |
| inclu | (New appointment- at interview / initial evaluation- when e scale of 1 of 5, please indicate the extent to which the de comments in the column on the right. Attach addition accellent, 4- Above Average, 3- Average, 2- Below Average | ithin probati ne person m nal commer | neets the teaching criteria listed below. Please nts as necessary. |
| SI. No. | Assessment by Evaluator | Rating | Comments |
| 1. | <i>Objective:</i> The faculty made a clear statement of the objectives of the session at the beginning or at another appropriate time. | 05 | |
| 2. | <i>Preparation:</i> The faculty was well prepared for the class & with necessary materials. | 04 | and the second states of |
| 3. | Organisation: Faculty presented the material in an | | ()) () () () () () () () () (|
| 0. | organised manner as per the plan of instruction. | 04 | |

| 5. | Expertise: Faculty displayed expertise in the subject/topic being taught. | 05 | |
|-----|---|----|---|
| 6. | Comprehension: The faculty periodically checked student understanding and modified teaching strategies as required. | 04 | |
| 7. | Responsiveness: The faculty was attentive to student questions & comments & provided clear explanations. | 05 | |
| 8. | Classroom Management: Faculty demonstrated effective classroom management skills | 04 | - |
| 9. | Respect: The faculty treated all students respectfully. | 05 | |
| 10. | Summation: Faculty carried out the summation of lecture / concluding of practical in an effective manner. | 05 | |

In the event the performance is below average or poor the evaluators should specify reason.

Name & Sig. of Evaluator 1:

Name & Sig. of Evaluator 2:

Name & Sig. of Officer:

CLETUS AUL Dr. ANUPAM DHOUNDIYA Dr. Panky Deshonuk

For new appointment & Probation Period Evaluation Remarks by

HOD/ Principal (Name & Signature)

PART II: For Regular Faculty Evaluation on the basis of trainees' feedback in part 'Trainee's Evaluation of the Faculty'. 1. a) Credit Points earned (calculated in accordance with CIP checklist under 'Overall Performance & Mgmt.' section). 46.27 b) Strength & weakness of faculty identified by trainees in their feedback: Self-Evaluation: State your teaching activities during the past year, summarise the student evaluation & 2. how you have dealt with their suggestions & make a self-evaluative statement about your teaching: commodation of facility Management. Theory. Training need for faculty identified based on Training evaluators report, student feedback on faculty 3. and self-evaluation report by faculty. NIL Training programme suggested by HOD for the faculty (if any). 3. NIL Name of training course, In-house/external /seminar attended by faculty with duration: 4. SENSITIZATION. GENDER Evaluation of Effectiveness of training imparted to Faculty by ANY one : (HOD/ Principal / Based on 5. student feedback /Training Evaluators who identified the need initially) NIL Satisfactory Improvement, Remark: (Tick appropriately) : Significant Improvement, 6. □ Needs further improvement, □ Any other remarks (state clearly): CLETUS PAUL C Date: Name & Sig. of Evaluator 1: ANUPAM DZ Date: Name & Sig. of Evaluator 2: Date: Name & Sig. of Officer/Instructor: Dr Pankaj Deshanulu HOD/Principal (Name & Signature) Capt. (Dr.) Ashutosh Apandkey

TRAINING SHIP 'RAHAMAN'

| | Faculty / Visiting Faculty | EVALU | JATION FORM |
|------------|---|---|--|
| Evalu | ated Officer's Name: Mr. Anupam Dhow | rdiyal | Faculty Disiting Faculty |
| | re Time, From 1320 To: 1420 | , in the second s | on (Date) 11/4/23 |
| Cours | | unita | |
| Subje | ect / Topic: Fabrication of Meet | (Revis | lity Stoches (First year) |
| | PAR (New appointment- at interview / initial evaluation- wi | | tion period / regular faculty evaluation) |
| includ | the scale of 1 of 5, please indicate the extent to which the comments in the column on the right. Attach addition | nal comme | ents as necessary. |
| | cellent, 4- Above Average, 3- Average, 2- Below Avera | age, 1 - Poo | or, NA- Not Applicable |
| SI. No. | Assessment by Evaluator | Rating | Comments |
| 1. | Objective: The faculty made a clear statement of the objectives of the session at the beginning or at another appropriate time. | 5 | neerood haardig oo werstellen oo gebreek in de soort oo de soor • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • |
| 2. | Preparation: The faculty was well prepared for the class & with necessary materials. | 4 | - 1 NAP |
| 3. | Organisation: Faculty presented the material in an organised manner as per the plan of instruction. | 4 | tar el metergio e de negateri (en cart |
| 4. | Clarity: The faculty presented the instructional material clearly. | 4 | 1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1. |
| 5. | <i>Expertise:</i> Faculty displayed expertise in the subject/topic being taught. | 5 | stance is him by the second second |
| 6. | <i>Comprehension:</i> The faculty periodically checked student understanding and modified teaching strategies as required. | 5 | |
| 7. | Responsiveness: The faculty was attentive to student questions & comments & provided clear explanations. | 5 | an ann allen Sannan à la donnaithe ann an a |
| 8. | Classroom Management: Faculty demonstrated effective classroom management skills | 5 | |
| 9. | Respect: The faculty treated all students respectfully. | 5 | and the second second second |
| 10. | Summation: Faculty carried out the summation of lecture / concluding of practical in an effective | 5 | |

Name & Sig. of Evaluator 1:

Name & Sig. of Evaluator 2:

Name & Sig. of Officer:

Mr. Cletus Paul _____ Mr. Anypam Dhoundiya

For new appointment & Probation Period Evaluation Remarks by

HOD/ Principal (Name & Signature) Capt. (Dr.) Ashutosh Apand

Rev - 01 Training Shapproved by: Chairman Principal Page 1 of 2

PART II: For Regular Faculty 1. Evaluation on the basis of trainees' feedback in part 'Trainee's Evaluation of the Faculty'. a) Credit Points earned (calculated in accordance with CIP checklist under 'Overall Performance & Mgmt.' section). 48.23 b) Strength & weakness of faculty identified by trainees in their feedback: - N11 -Self-Evaluation: State your teaching activities during the past year, summarise the student evaluation & 2. how you have dealt with their suggestions & make a self-evaluative statement about your teaching: Food Production, Homan Resource Management Training need for faculty identified based on Training evaluators report, student feedback on faculty 3. and self-evaluation report by faculty. -N12-Training programme suggested by HOD for the faculty (if any). 3. -NIL-Name of training course, In-house/external /seminar attended by faculty with duration: 4. Gender Sensitisation Evaluation of Effectiveness of training imparted to Faculty by ANY one : (HOD/ Principal / Based on 5. student feedback /Training Evaluators who identified the need initially) -NIL -Satisfactory Improvement, <u>Remark</u>: (Tick appropriately) : Significant Improvement, 6. □ Needs further improvement, □ Any other remarks (state clearly): Date: 11/4/23. Name & Sig. of Evaluator 1: Mr. Cletus Paul Mr. Anupam Dhoundiyal Date: 11/ Name & Sig. of Evaluator 2: Date: 11/4 (2023 Name & Sig. of Officer/Instructor: HOD/Principal (Name & Signature) Capt. (Dr.) Page 2 of 2 03rd Sep 2019 Rev - 01 WP1F-7.1-01-02

| ir. no. | Name | Marks Obtained (Percentage) | Average of all the faculty | Remarks |
|---------|-----------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------|---------|
| 1 | Paul Koshy | 98% | | |
| 2 | Pankaj Deshmukh | 92% | | |
| 3 | Anupam Dhoundiyal | 96% | | |
| 4 | Cletus Paul | 96% | | |
| 5 | Sunil Salunke | 92% | | |
| e | Siraj Shaikh | 98% | | |
| 7 | R S Verma | 92% | - | |
| 8 | Haresh Rankhambhe | 94% | | |
| g |) Rajesh Rai | 94% | | |
| 10 |) Baptist Rodrigues | 92% | 92% | |
| 1: | 1 Alpan Govitrikar | 86% | | |
| 12 | 2 Chandan Pardeshi | 90% | | |
| 1 | 3 Anurag Mishra | 88% | | |
| 1 | 4 Archana Yendarkar | 96% | | |
| 1 | 5 Pooja Bhoir | 90% | | • |
| 1 | 6 Meena Thapa | 90% | _ | |
| 1 | 7 Meera Maya Singjali | 88% | _ | |
| 1 | 8 Nandini Nambaiya | 88% | | |
| Total | 180 | 0 1660 | | |

Analysis of faculty Evaluation by faculty (CMC&H) - 2022

TRAINING SHIP 'RAHAMAN' Faculty / Visiting Faculty EVALUATION FORM

DESHMUKH Evaluated Officer's Name: PANKAJ

Faculty Visiting Faculty

| Lecture Time, From | 10.30 AM | To: | 11.30 AM | |
|--------------------|-----------|-----|----------|--|
| Course Name: | Occ Mus 1 | | 2.0 | |

on (Date) @ 14/3/2022

Subject / Topic:

1

an Eco-priendly site Choosing

BSC MAS / CCMC

PART I

(New appointment- at interview / initial evaluation- within probation period / regular faculty evaluation)

On the scale of 1 of 5, please indicate the extent to which the person meets the teaching criteria listed below. Please include comments in the column on the right. Attach additional comments as necessary.

5- Excellent, 4- Above Average, 3- Average, 2- Below Average, 1- Poor, NA- Not Applicable

| SI. No. | Assessment by Evaluator | Rating | Comments |
|------------|--|--------|---|
| 1. | <i>Objective:</i> The faculty made a clear statement of the objectives of the session at the beginning or at another appropriate time. | 04 | n and the Plan of the second of the plant of the second second second second second second second second second |
| 2. | Preparation: The faculty was well prepared for the class & with necessary materials. | 05 | |
| 3. | <i>Organisation:</i> Faculty presented the material in an organised manner as per the plan of instruction. | 05 | Monober and a second second second second |
| 4. | Clarity: The faculty presented the instructional material clearly. | 05 | |
| 5. | <i>Expertise:</i> Faculty displayed expertise in the subject/topic being taught. | 04 | and a second |
| 6. | <i>Comprehension:</i> The faculty periodically checked student understanding and modified teaching strategies as required. | 04 | |
| 7. | <i>Responsiveness:</i> The faculty was attentive to student questions & comments & provided clear explanations. | 05 | n an |
| 8. | Classroom Management: Faculty demonstrated effective classroom management skills | 04 | |
| 9. | Respect: The faculty treated all students respectfully. | 05 | inglit (), while many in the firm of |
| 10. | Summation: Faculty carried out the summation of lecture / concluding of practical in an effective manner. | | - beats. El |
| Na | e event the performance is below average or poor the me & Sig. of Evaluator 1: <u>MR. CLITUS</u> | PAUL | - Marine |
| | me & Sig. of Evaluator 2: <u>CHEF SIRAJ</u> | SMAIKH | |
| Na | me & Sig. of Officer: PANKAT DES | HMUKH | Deshowit |

For new appointment & Probation Period Evaluation Remarks by

Principal, TSR (Name & Signature) Capt. (Dr.) Ashutosh Apandkar

N.A

PART II: For Regular Faculty 1. Evaluation on the basis of trainees' feedback in part 'Trainee's Evaluation of the Faculty'. a) Credit Points earned (calculated in accordance with CIP checklist under 'Overall Performance & Mgmt.' section). 50 b) Strength & weakness of faculty identified by trainees in their feedback: -Nil-Self-Evaluation: State your teaching activities during the past year, summarise the student evaluation & 2. how you have dealt with their suggestions & make a self-evaluative statement about your teaching: - NIL -Training need for faculty identified based on Training evaluators report, student feedback on faculty 3. and self-evaluation report by faculty. - Nil -Training programme suggested by CIC/Principal for the faculty (if any). 3. - Nil -Name of training course, In-house/external /seminar attended by faculty with duration: 4. - Nil -Evaluation of Effectiveness of training imparted to faculty by ANY one : (CIC/Principal, / Based on 5. student feedback /Training Evaluators who identified the need initially) - Nil -Satisfactory Improvement, Remark: (Tick appropriately) : Significant Improvement, 6. □ Needs further improvement, □ Any other remarks (state clearly): Date: Name & Sig. of Evaluator 1: Ne MR. CLETUS PAUL Date: Name & Sig. of Evaluator 2: CHEF SIRAJ SHAIKH Date: Name & Sig. of Officer/Instructor: PANKAJ DESHMUKH Principal, TSR (Name & Signature) Capt. (Dr.) Ashutosh Apandkar

Rev- 02 Training Ship Rahaman Page 2 of 2 Approved by: Chairman

TRAINING SHIP 'RAHAMAN' Faculty / Visiting Faculty EVALUATION FORM

Evaluated Officer's Name: ANUPAM DHOUNDIYAL, DEFaculty Usiting Faculty

| Lecture Time, From | 1430 | |
|--------------------|------|----|
| Course Name: | R.Sc | in |

Subject / Topic:

on (Date) 29-3-2022 то: 1530 B. Sc. in Maritime Hospitality Have Advance food Production - Masa paste uso alian cuising

PARTI

(New appointment- at interview / initial evaluation- within probation period / regular faculty evaluation)

On the scale of 1 of 5, please indicate the extent to which the person meets the teaching criteria listed below. Please include comments in the column on the right. Attach additional comments as necessary.

5- Excellent, 4- Above Average, 3- Average, 2- Below Average, 1- Poor, NA- Not Applicable

| SI. No. | Assessment by Evaluator | Rating | Comments |
|----------------|--|-----------------------------|--|
| 1. | <i>Objective:</i> The faculty made a clear statement of the objectives of the session at the beginning or at another appropriate time. | 5 | where the set of the s |
| 2. | Preparation: The faculty was well prepared for the class & with necessary materials. | 5 | A112 |
| 3. | Organisation: Faculty presented the material in an organised manner as per the plan of instruction. | 4 | 1929 and the formation of the state of the second |
| 4. | Clarity: The faculty presented the instructional material clearly. | 5 | The second s |
| 5. | <i>Expertise:</i> Faculty displayed expertise in the subject/topic being taught. | 5 | anti controlo de la controla de la c |
| 6. | <i>Comprehension:</i> The faculty periodically checked student understanding and modified teaching strategies as required. | 5 | |
| 7. | <i>Responsiveness:</i> The faculty was attentive to student questions & comments & provided clear explanations. | 4 | e antheorem bedrick in an front protector |
| 8. | Classroom Management: Faculty demonstrated effective classroom management skills | 5 | - ALL DE CONTRACTOR DE CARACTER |
| 9. | Respect: The faculty treated all students respectfully. | 5 | NUMBER OF STREET |
| 10. | Summation: Faculty carried out the summation of lecture / concluding of practical in an effective manner. | | Chantes I |
| Na Na Na | me & Sig. of Evaluator 2: | 12. Pa 12. Bi InvueAn | ns should specify reason. Inkaj Deshmukh aptist R. I DHOWDIYAL. |

Principal, TSR

(Name & Signature) Capt. (Dr.) Ashutosh Apandkar

| | PART II: For Regular Faculty | | | | | | |
|----|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | Evaluation on the basis of trainees' feedback in part 'Trainee's Evaluation of the Faculty'. | | | | | | |
| | a) Credit Points earned (calculated in accordance with CIP checklist under 'Overall Performance & Mgmt.' section). | | | | | | |
| | 49.83 (F.YMHS) | | | | | | |
| | b) Strength & weakness of faculty identified by trainees in their feedback: | | | | | | |
| | -NiL- | | | | | | |
| | Lovern carries | | | | | | |
| | Self-Evaluation: State your teaching activities during the past year, summarise the student evaluation & how you have dealt with their suggestions & make a self-evaluative statement about your teaching: | | | | | | |
| | Student gave lessor rating on 'is available outside class' as half of session was online. Frequent interaction with students was not possible. Training need for faculty identified based on Training evaluators report, student feedback on faculty and self-evaluation report by faculty. | | | | | | |
| | -NIL- | | | | | | |
| | Training programme suggested by CIC/Principal for the faculty (if any). | | | | | | |
| | -NIL- | | | | | | |
| ŀ. | Name of training course, In-house/external /seminar attended by faculty with duration: | | | | | | |
| | Evaluation of Effectiveness of training imparted to faculty by ANY one : (CIC/Principal, / Based on student feedback /Training Evaluators who identified the need initially) | | | | | | |
| | -NIL- | | | | | | |
| | 2 | | | | | | |
| 6. | <u>Remark</u> : (Tick appropriately) : Significant Improvement, Satisfactory Improvement, Needs further improvement, Any other remarks (state clearly): | | | | | | |
| Na | ame & Sig. of Evaluator 1: Deshowed Mp. Pankai Deshmukh. Date: 29/3/22 | | | | | | |
| Na | ame & Sig. of Evaluator 1: Deshourd Mr. Pankaj Deshoukh. Date: 29/3/22 ame & Sig. of Evaluator 2: Roduer Mr. Rantist R. Date: 29/3/22 | | | | | | |
| Na | ame & Sig. of Officer/Instructor: ANUPAM DHOUNDWAN Date: 29/3/22 - | | | | | | |
| | Principal, TSR | | | | | | |
| | (Name & [#] Signature) | | | | | | |
| | Capt. (Dr.) Ashutosh Apandkar | | | | | | |

Rev- 02 Training Ship Rahaman Page 2 of 2 Approved by: Chairman

2021

| | Faculty/Visiting Faculty EVAL | UATIO | NFORM for VC/LVS ¹ |
|------------|---|-------------------------------|---|
| | | | |
| alua | ated Officer's Name: ANUPAM DHOUNDIY | AL. | Faculty Visiting Faculty |
| C /L | VS Lecture Time, From 0930 To: 0 | 0930 | on (Date) 16/2/21 |
| | e Name: B.SC MHS, (HRM) | | In the second |
| ubje | ct/Topic: PROCESS OF HRM | HR P | OLICIES, |
| | PAR | | |
| | (New appointment- at interview / initial evaluation- wi | 1.1.1 | and have the standard |
| | e scale of 1 of 5, please indicate the extent to which th le comments in the column on the right. Attach addition | | |
| - Ex | cellent, 4- Above Average, 3- Average, 2- Below Avera | age, 1- Po | oor, NA- Not Applicable |
| SI. No. | Assessment by Evaluator | Rating | Comments |
| 1. | Objective: The faculty made a clear statement of the objectives of the VC /LVS session at the beginning or at another appropriate time. | 5 | Question bank de |
| 2. | Preparation: The faculty was well prepared for the class & with necessary onlinematerials. | 5 | HIX SA & F.Y - Fand MA |
| 3. | Organisation: Faculty presented the material in an organised manner as per the plan of instruction. | 5 | - <u>5 114</u> - |
| 4. | Clarity: The faculty presented the instructional material clearly. | 4 | |
| 5. | <i>Expertise:</i> Faculty displayed expertise in the subject/topic being taught. | 5 | |
| 6. | <i>Comprehension:</i> The faculty periodically checked student understanding and modified teaching strategies as required. | 4 | - 7114 - |
| 7. | <i>Responsiveness:</i> The faculty was attentive to student'schats /questions and provided clear explanations. | 4 | Varian EDP's alganized |
| 8. | Classroom Management: Faculty demonstrated effective classroom management skills for VC/LVS | 5 | |
| 9. | Respect: The faculty treated all students respectfully. | 5 | A.14 - |
| 10. | Summation:Faculty carried out the summation of lecture in an effective manner. | 5 | |
| In th | e event the performance is below average or poor the | evaluator | s should specify reason. |
| Na | me & Sig. of Evaluator 1: | Mo. PA | IUL KOSHY. |
| Na | me & Sig. of Evaluator 2: | | ANKAJ DESHMUKH. |
| Na | me & Sig. of Officer: | ANUP | AM DHOUNDIYAL. |
| Fo | r new appointment & Probation Period Evaluation Rem | Contexturine of the residence | A-NoA- |
| | 41 PANKAT Q 16/9/21 | a l'un | N |

1st Jun 2020

Principal, TSR (Name & Signature)

PART II: For Regular Faculty

1. Evaluation on the basis of trainees' feedback in part 'Trainee's Evaluation of the Faculty'.

a) Credit Points earned (calculated in accordance with CIP checklist under 'Overall Performance & Mgmt.' section).

49.76 (Out of 50)

b) Strength & weakness of faculty identified by trainees in their feedback:

Explains with selevent industry examples.

2. Self-Evaluation: State your teaching activities during the past year, summarise the student evaluation & how you have dealt with their suggestions & make a self-evaluative statement about your

Question bank discussed with students as per new examination scheme Tet, S.Y & F.Y - food Production, S.Y-P.O.M & T.Y Research Project.

- NIL-

3. Training need for faculty identified based on Training evaluators report, student feedback on faculty and self-evaluation report by faculty.

-NIL-

3. Training programme suggested by CIC/Principal for the faculty (if any).

- N11 -

4. Name of training course, In-house/external/seminar attended by faculty with duration: Various FOP's arganized by miversity of Mombai, D.C.S & Pare fie University, Udaipus.

5. Evaluation of Effectiveness of training imparted to facultyby ANY one : (CIC/Principal, / Based on student feedback /Training Evaluators who identified the need initially)

- N.A.

6. <u>Remark</u>: (Tick appropriately) : □Significant Improvement, ↓ □Satisfactory Improvement, □Needs further improvement, □Any other remarks (state clearly):

THE ACT OF

| 1000 101 101 | and the part | N CASS | |
|--|-------------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Name & Sig. of Evaluator 1: | ALL AL | Mr. PAUL KOSMY | Date: 16/2/21 |
| Name & Sig. of Evaluator 2: | Seshmul | MY. PANKAJ.D | Date: 16/2/21 |
| Name & Sig. of Officer/Instructor: | app | ANUPAND | Date: 16/2/2) |
| WPIF-7.1- 01-02-01 Prepared by: Head Management System: | 1 st Jun 2020 S | Dir Caling finder | Page 2 of 2 Approved by: Chairman |

TRAINING SHIP 'RAHAMAN' Faculty/Visiting Faculty EVALUATION FORM

| | ame: VINAYAK DEFaculty DVisiting Faculty | |
|--------------------|--|---------------------|
| Lecture Time, From | 9:30 am To: 10:30 am | on (Date) 21/09/202 |
| Course Name: | TY. B.A. C.A. | |
| Subject / Topic: | 1 Y. B.A. C.A. | |

PARTI

(New appointment- at interview / initial evaluation- within probation period / regular faculty evaluation)

On the scale of 1 of 5, please indicate the extent to which the person meets the teaching criteria listed below. Please include comments in the column on the right. Attach additional comments as necessary.

5- Excellent, 4- Above Average, 3- Average, 2- Below Average, 1- Poor, NA- Not Applicable

| SI. No. | Assessment by Evaluator | Rating | Comments | |
|------------|---|--------|--|--|
| 1. | <i>Objective:</i> The faculty made a clear statement of the objectives of the session at the beginning or at another appropriate time. | 5 | | |
| 2. | class & with necessary materials. <i>Organisation:</i> Faculty presented the material in an organised manner as per the plan of instruction. | | | |
| 3. | | | | A REAL PROPERTY AND A REAL |
| 4. | | | | |
| 5. | <i>Expertise:</i> Faculty displayed expertise in the subject/topic being taught. | 5 | the second s | |
| 6. | . Comprehension: The faculty periodically checked student understanding and modified teaching strategies as required. | | | |
| 7. | questions & comments & provided clear explanations. | | | |
| 8. | | | | |
| 9. | Respect: The faculty treated all students respectfully. | | and an and the second of the second of the | |
| 10. | Summation: Faculty carried out the summation of lecture / concluding of practical in an effective manner. | | | |
| In th | e event the performance is below average or poor the | | | |
| Na | me & Sig. of Evaluator 1: Mr. Anupam | Dha | sundiyal. | |
| Na | me & Sig. of Evaluator 1: Mr. Anupan me & Sig. of Evaluator 2: Mr. Cletus | Paul | | |
| Na | me & Sig. of Officer: VINAMAK. SIA | ETTIC | AR. difayen | |
| | r new appointment & Probation Period Evaluation Rem | | | |

Principal, TSR (Name & Signature)

| PART II: For Regular Faculty | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Evaluation on the basis of trainees' feedback in part 'Trainee's Evaluation of the Faculty'. | | | | | | |
| a) Credit Points earned (calculated in accordance with CIP checklist under 'Overall Performance & Mgmt.' section). | | | | | | |
| b) Strength & weakness of faculty identified by trainees in their feedback: | | | | | | |
| Self-Evaluation: State your teaching activities during the past year, summarise the student evaluation & how you have dealt with their suggestions & make a self-evaluative statement about your teaching: | | | | | | |
| Training need for faculty identified based on Training evaluators report, student feedback on faculty and self-evaluation report by faculty. | | | | | | |
| Training programme suggested by CIC/Principal for the faculty (if any). | | | | | | |
| Name of training course, In-house/external /seminar attended by faculty with duration: | | | | | | |
| A | | | | | | |
| Evaluation of Effectiveness of training imparted to facultyby ANY one : (CIC/Principal, / Based on student feedback /Training Evaluators who identified the need initially) | | | | | | |
| Remark: (Tick appropriately) : Significant Improvement, Satisfactory Improvement, Needs further improvement, Any other remarks (state clearly): | | | | | | |
| me & Sig. of Evaluator 1: Mr. Anupan Dhoundiyal Date: 21/9/21 | | | | | | |
| ime & Sig. of Evaluator 2: Mr. Cletus Paul Date: 21/9/21 | | | | | | |
| ame & Sig. of Officer/Instructor: VINAVAK. SHETTIGAR. JUST Date: 21/9/21 | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

| | TRAINING SHIP 'RAH Faculty / Visiting Faculty EVA | |
|----------------------------------|--|--|
| Lecture Time, From | ame: Hareoh Rankharfe. 0830 To: 1230. | Faculty \Box Visiting Faculty on (Date) <u>$15/1/2020$</u> |
| Course Name: Subject / Topic: | SY BSC MHS Food Production Fractical - Free | h Pasta (Demo.) |

PARTI

(New appointment- at interview / initial evaluation- within probation period / regular faculty evaluation)

On the scale of 1 of 5, please indicate the extent to which the person meets the teaching criteria listed below. Please include comments in the column on the right. Attach additional comments as necessary.

5- Excellent, 4- Above Average, 3- Average, 2- Below Average, 1- Poor, NA- Not Applicable

| SI. No. | Assessment by Evaluator | Rating | Comments |
|------------|--|--------|---|
| 1. | <i>Objective:</i> The faculty made a clear statement of the objectives of the session at the beginning or at another appropriate time. | 5 | |
| 2. | Preparation: The faculty was well prepared for the class & with necessary materials. | 5 | |
| 3. | Organisation: Faculty presented the material in an organised manner as per the plan of instruction. | 4 | nto Very paradogo in continue tra graduat |
| 4. | Clarity: The faculty presented the instructional material clearly. | 5 | |
| 5. | <i>Expertise:</i> Faculty displayed expertise in the subject/topic being taught. | 5 | Subarrangente d'annue agrésitent (or junyat |
| 6. | <i>Comprehension:</i> The faculty periodically checked student understanding and modified teaching strategies as required. | 5 | |
| 7. | Responsiveness: The faculty was attentive to student questions & comments & provided clear explanations. | 4 | weighted an easy concern to reas |
| 8. | Classroom Management: Faculty demonstrated effective classroom management skills | | |
| 9. | Respect: The faculty treated all students respectfully. | | mane Concernations and a scool |
| 10. | Summation: Faculty carried out the summation of lecture / concluding of practical in an effective manner. | 5 | |

In the event the performance is below average or poor the evaluators should specify reason.

Name & Sig. of Evaluator 1:

Name & Sig. of Evaluator 2:

Name & Sig. of Officer:

Cletus kul M Anupam Dhoundiy w Harest Rankhanbe. W/M

For new appointment & Probation Period Evaluation Remarks by

2020

PART II: For Regular Faculty Evaluation on the basis of trainees' feedback in part 'Trainee's Evaluation of the Faculty'. 1. a) Credit Points earned (calculated in accordance with CIP checklist under 'Overall Performance & Mgmt.' section). 49.54 b) Strength & weakness of faculty identified by trainees in their feedback: MMM.S. :- GOOD PREDUCTION PRACTICAL Self-Evaluation: State your teaching activities during the past year, summarise the student evaluation & 2. how you have dealt with their suggestions & make a self-evaluative statement about your teaching: P.YMMS. & S.Y.M.M.S. FOOD PRODUCTION PRACTICAL + OCC.P: - GALLEY PARAMAREI 247104 Training need for faculty identified based on Training evaluators report, student feedback on faculty 3. and self-evaluation report by faculty. Training programme suggested by CIC/Principal for the faculty (if any). 3. Name of training course, In-house/external /seminar attended by faculty with duration: 4. Evaluation of Effectiveness of training imparted to faculty by ANY one : (CIC/Principal, / Based on 5. student feedback /Training Evaluators who identified the need initially) 6. Remark: (Tick appropriately) : Significant Improvement, Satisfactory Improvement, □ Needs further improvement, □ Any other remarks (state clearly): Anupaul Dhoundiged Name & Sig. of Evaluator 1: Date: Name & Sig. of Evaluator 2: Date: Haresh Rankhanke Name & Sig. of Officer/Instructor: Date: Principal, TSR (Name & Signature)

| | Faculty | TRAINING SHIP 'RA | | Ö |
|-----------------------|-----------|-------------------|-----------------------------|--------|
| Evaluated Officer's N | ame: Pank | aj Deshmuth | Faculty Disiting Fa | aculty |
| Lecture Time, From | 1320 | To: 1420 | on (Date) 14/ | 1/2020 |
| Course Name: | SYE | BSC MHS | by out a placetti minatta e | |
| Subject / Topic: | Affr | 7-IV Theory- Uni | form. flinen. | |
| | | DADTI | | |

(New appointment- at interview / initial evaluation- within probation period / regular faculty evaluation)

On the scale of 1 of 5, please indicate the extent to which the person meets the teaching criteria listed below. Please include comments in the column on the right. Attach additional comments as necessary.

5- Excellent, 4- Above Average, 3- Average, 2- Below Average, 1- Poor, NA- Not Applicable

| SI. No. | Assessment by Evaluator | Rating | Comments |
|------------|--|--------|--|
| 1. | <i>Objective:</i> The faculty made a clear statement of the objectives of the session at the beginning or at another appropriate time. | 5 | |
| 2. | <i>Preparation:</i> The faculty was well prepared for the class & with necessary materials. | | |
| 3. | Organisation: Faculty presented the material in an organised manner as per the plan of instruction. | | |
| 4. | Clarity: The faculty presented the instructional material clearly. | 5 | |
| 5. | <i>Expertise:</i> Faculty displayed expertise in the subject/topic being taught. | | e provincia de la contra y a ciulta la revende a |
| 6. | <i>Comprehension:</i> The faculty periodically checked student understanding and modified teaching strategies as required. | 4 | |
| 7. | | | an exploring of a state of the others are in |
| 8. | Classroom Management: Faculty demonstrated effective classroom management skills | 5 | |
| 9. | Respect: The faculty treated all students respectfully. | | and the second second second second |
| 10. | Summation: Faculty carried out the summation of lecture / concluding of practical in an effective manner. | | |

In the event the performance is below average or poor the evaluators should specify reason.

Name & Sig. of Evaluator 1:

Name & Sig. of Evaluator 2:

Name & Sig. of Officer:

Chardan Pardeshi - Colordeshi R.S. Verne - Burg. Pankaj Deshonikh Deshowik

For new appointment & Probation Period Evaluation Remarks by

Principal, TSR (Name & Signature)

| | PART II: For Regular Faculty | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | Evaluation on the basis of trainees' feedback in part 'Trainee's Evaluation of the Faculty'. | | | | | | |
| a) Credit Points earned (calculated in accordance with CIP checklist under 'Overall Performance & Mgmt.' section). | | | | | | | |
| 50.00 | | | | | | | |
| b) Strength & weakness of faculty identified by trainees in their feedback: | | | | | | | |
| | A State of the real state of the | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Self-Evaluation: State your teaching activities during the past year, summarise the student evaluation & how you have dealt with their suggestions & make a self-evaluative statement about your teaching: | | | | | | | |
| | Sem IT BSC MHS - AFM, BSC MHS -SEM TY - AFM, BACA - SEM I - Culinary I | | | | | | |
| | Training need for faculty identified based on Training evaluators report, student feedback on faculty | | | | | | |
| | and self-evaluation report by faculty. | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | The second s | | | | | | |
| | Training programme suggested by CIC/Principal for the faculty (if any). | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | Name of training course, In-house/external /seminar attended by faculty with duration: | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | Evaluation of Effectiveness of training imparted to faculty by ANY one : (CIC/Principal, / Based on | | | | | | |
| | Evaluation of Effectiveness of training imparted to faculty by ANY one : (CIC/Principal, / Based on student feedback /Training Evaluators who identified the need initially) | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | student feedback /Training Evaluators who identified the need initially) | | | | | | |
| | student feedback /Training Evaluators who identified the need initially) | | | | | | |
| | student feedback /Training Evaluators who identified the need initially) | | | | | | |
| | student feedback /Training Evaluators who identified the need initially) Remark: (Tick appropriately) : Significant Improvement, Satisfactory Improvement, | | | | | | |
| | student feedback /Training Evaluators who identified the need initially) Remark: (Tick appropriately) : Significant Improvement, Needs further improvement, Any other remarks (state clearly): | | | | | | |
| | student feedback /Training Evaluators who identified the need initially) Remark: (Tick appropriately) : Significant Improvement, Needs further improvement, Needs further improvement, Any other remarks (state clearly): me & Sig. of Evaluator 1: Mandan Kadbelu Mandan Kadbelu Onte: 14/1 Jame | | | | | | |
| 1 | student feedback /Training Evaluators who identified the need initially) Remark: (Tick appropriately) : Significant Improvement, Needs further improvement, Needs further improvement, Any other remarks (state clearly): Imme & Sig. of Evaluator 1: Mandan Kadulu' Mandan Kadulu' Bate: 14/1 [2000 Date: 14/1 [2000 | | | | | | |
| 1 | student feedback /Training Evaluators who identified the need initially) Remark: (Tick appropriately) : Significant Improvement, Needs further improvement, Needs further improvement, Any other remarks (state clearly): Imme & Sig. of Evaluator 1: Mandan Kadulu' Mandan Kadulu' Bate: 14/1 [2000 Date: 14/1 [2000 | | | | | | |
| 1 | student feedback /Training Evaluators who identified the need initially) Remark: (Tick appropriately) : Significant Improvement, Satisfactory Improvement, Needs further improvement, Any other remarks (state clearly): Imme & Sig. of Evaluator 1: Unaudan Kadulu' Chaudan Imme & Sig. of Evaluator 2: R.S. Verma - Aveg | | | | | | |
| 3 | student feedback /Training Evaluators who identified the need initially) Remark: (Tick appropriately) : Significant Improvement, Needs further improvement, Needs further improvement, Any other remarks (state clearly): Imme & Sig. of Evaluator 1: Mandan Kadushi Remark Sig. of Evaluator 2: R.S. Verma Remark Sig. of Evaluator 2: | | | | | | |

2019

| | | | SHIP 'RAHAMAN' |
|------------|--|--|--|
| Evalu | uated Officer's / Instructor's Name: | the second s | A state July 5 |
| | | | on (Date) 21/1/19 Valid till: 20/1/20 |
| | se Name: BSc MH. | | |
| Subje | ect / Topic: Food E | Ber | rage Service (Issuing of Beverages) |
| Evalu | Jator's Name: 1. PANKAJ | Desh | MUKH 2. CHANDON PARDESHI |
| On th | ne scale of 1 of 5, please indicate the extended of the comments in the column on the right. | ent to wh Attach a | nich the faculty meets the teaching criteria listed below. Please dditional comments as necessary. |
| | ccellent, 4 - Above Average, 3 - Average, 2 | 2- Below | Average, 1- Poor, NA- Not Applicable |
| SI. No. | Assessment by Evaluator | Rating | Comments |
| 1. | <i>Objective:</i> The faculty made a clear statement of the objectives of the session at the beginning or at another appropriate time. | 5 | |
| 2. | <i>Preparation:</i> The faculty was well prepared for the class & with necessary materials. | | |
| 3. | <i>Organisation:</i> Faculty presented the material in an organised manner as per the plan of instruction. | | |
| 4. | <i>Clarity:</i> The faculty presented the instructional material clearly. | 5 | |
| 5. | <i>Expertise:</i> Faculty displayed expertise in the subject/topic being taught. | 5 | |
| 6. | <i>Comprehension:</i> The faculty periodically checked student understanding and modified teaching strategies as required. | 4 | |
| 7. | Responsiveness: The faculty was attentive to student questions & comments & provided clear explanations. | 4 | |
| 8. | Classroom Management: Faculty demonstrated effective classroom management skills | 6 | |
| 9. | Respect: The faculty treated all students respectfully. | 5 | |
| 10. | Summation: Faculty carried out the summation of lecture / concluding of practical in an effective manner. | 5 | and heaven and the |
| | e event the performance is below averag | 1 | |
| Nan | ne & Sig. of Evaluator 1: PAN | KAJ | BESHMUKH Seshul |
| | ne & Sig. of Evaluator 2: | ANDA | DESHMUICH Seshill N PARDEJHI (Alardestri |
| Nan | ne & Sig. of Officer/Instructor: | Tus | Par 12 |
| | | | HOD/Principal (Name & Signature) |

Self-Evaluation: State your teaching activities during the past year, summarise the student evaluation & 1. how you have dealt with their suggestions & make a self-evaluative statement about your teaching Students were satisfied with the explanation of a subject. They requested for important questions / topics which are being discussed Training need for faculty identified based on Training evaluators report, student feedback on faculty 2. /instructors and self evaluation report by faculty/instructors by HOD/Principal Training programme suggested by HOD for the faculty /Instructor (if any). 3. Name of training course, In-house/external /seminar attended by faculty/ Instructor with duration: 4. Evaluation of Effectiveness of training imparted to Faculty/Instructor by ANY one : (HOD/ Principal 5. / Based on student feedback /Training Evaluators who identified the need initially) Remark: (Tick appropriately) : Significant Improvement, Satisfactory Improvement, 6. □ Needs further improvement, □ Any other remarks (state clearly): Name & Sig. of Evaluator 1: PANKAJ DESHMUKH Dete: 21/1/19 Name & Sig. of Evaluator 2: CHANDAN PARDESHI Collarder Date: 21/1/19 Date: 21/1/19 Name & Sig. of Officer/Instructor: CLETUS PAUL M Date: 21/1/19 HOD/Principal (Name & Signature) Approved by: Chairman Prepared by: Head Management Systems WPIF -7.1 - 01 - 02 1ST Oct 2017 Page 2 of 2 Rev-0

| Northerstelling a | TRAINING SHIP 'RAHAMAN' FACULTY EVALUATION FORM | |
|-----------------------|--|---------------------|
| Evaluated Officer's / | Instructor's Name: PANKAJ DESHMUKH | |
| Lecture Time, From | 12. 40 pm To: 13.20 pm on (Date) 17/1/19 | Valid till: 1611/20 |
| Course Name: | TY - BSC MMS | Construction CC |
| Subject / Topic: | Accommodation & facility myt Flow | er Ansongment |
| Evaluator's Name: | 1. chey Siboy shainh 2. chey | Silas Mivale |

On the scale of 1 of 5, please indicate the extent to which the faculty meets the teaching criteria listed below. Please include comments in the column on the right. Attach additional comments as necessary.

5- Excellent, 4- Above Average, 3- Average, 2- Below Average, 1- Poor, NA- Not Applicable

| SI. No. | Assessment by Evaluator | Rating | Comments |
|------------|--|--------|--|
| 1. | <i>Objective:</i> The faculty made a clear statement of the objectives of the session at the beginning or at another appropriate time. | 5 | |
| 2. | <i>Preparation:</i> The faculty was well prepared for the class & with necessary materials. | 5 | |
| 3. | Organisation: Faculty presented the material in an organised manner as per the plan of instruction. | 4 | ม พระกับของ (ความความใหญ่หลังไรการการและมายหม่าง) (ความไป) สามารถการการการการการการการการการการการการการก |
| 4. | <i>Clarity</i> : The faculty presented the instructional material clearly. | 5 | |
| 5. | Expertise: Faculty displayed expertise in the subject/topic being taught. | 4 | |
| 6. | <i>Comprehension:</i> The faculty periodically checked student understanding and modified teaching strategies as required. | ч | |
| 7. | Responsiveness: The faculty was attentive to student questions & comments & provided clear explanations. | 5 | |
| 8. | Classroom Management: Faculty demonstrated effective classroom management skills | 5 | • |
| 9. | Respect: The faculty treated all students respectfully. | 4 | Nor purchaster |
| 10. | Summation: Faculty carried out the summation of lecture / concluding of practical in an effective manner. | 5 | a mana per parte parte |
| Nam Nam | | ilas. | the evaluators should specify reason. M Shaikh M. Malury S. Himane HOD/Principal (Name & Signature) |

WPIF - 7.1 - 01 - 02

1ST Oct 2017

1. Self-Evaluation: State your teaching activities during the past year, summarise the student evaluation & how you have dealt with their suggestions & make a self-evaluative statement about your teaching) Accommedation and Facility Mangement -I 2) Accommodation and Facility Mangement - TI weakeness spidents called and discuss with them. Training need for faculty identified based on Training evaluators report, student feedback on faculty 2. /instructors and self evaluation report by faculty/instructors by HOD/Principal Training programme suggested by HOD for the faculty /Instructor (if any). 3. Name of training course, In-house/external /seminar attended by faculty/ Instructor with duration: 4. Evaluation of Effectiveness of training imparted to Faculty/Instructor by ANY one : (HOD/ Principal 5. / Based on student feedback /Training Evaluators who identified the need initially) Satisfactory Improvement, Remark: (Tick appropriately) : Significant Improvement, 6. □ Needs further improvement, □ Any other remarks (state clearly): Name & Sig. of Evaluator 1: Chef Stray M Shaith Il Sharhing Date: 17/1/2019 Name & Sig. of Evaluator 2: Chef Silas. S. Hiwale For Date: 17/1/2019 Name & Sig. of Officer/Instructor: Pankaj Deshowed Deshul Date: 17/11/1 whill wind IN grant have HOD/Principal (Name & Signature) Approved by: Chairman Prepared by: Head Management Systems 1ST Oct 2017 Page 2 of 2 WPIF - 7.1 - 01 - 02Rev - 0